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Who was Responsible for the Assyrian King List?

Synopsis

I argue that the Assyrian King List ("the AKL") was written in Middle Assyrian times, most probably by Aššur-nasir-pal I, or else by his father Šamši-Adad IV. The most plausible motive for its compilation was to preserve information about Assyria's kings which was already becoming lost.

I suggest that while the available evidence is too slim to prove my thesis beyond any doubt, the AKL was written with comments which vindicated Šamši-Adad IV's seizure of the throne of Aššur using Babylon as a point of departure if not as a base. I examine also Aššur-nasir-pal I's hymns to Ištar, his few inscriptions, and the White Obelisk. Accepting the attribution of the White Obelisk to Aššur-nasir-pal I, I provide a picture of his reign which is somewhat different from the standard account.

I therefore dispute the standard view that the AKL was created by Šamši-Adad I to legitimate his role as an "Amorite usurper". These ideas lead one to question the view that the AKL is not a reliable historical document in its earlier portions. I briefly examine the Amorites in the light of fresh material from Ebla. There, I take up the theory, hitherto advanced, that the early Amorites who moved into the east may have had a military expertise which enabled them to achieve conquests of the scale of Šamši-Adad's, with relatively few numbers.

Finally, by attributing the AKL to Middle Assyria one obtains fresh insights into the royal ideology and the character of Šamši-Adad I - revealing him to be an original and visionary monarch. I argue that he created a new role for himself, as the "pacifier of the land between the two rivers", and used this role as one item in his attempt to create a royal ideology which would have currency throughout his empire.
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Who was Responsible for the Assyrian King List?

Introduction

This paper considers the question: who caused the writing of the Assyrian King List ("the AKL")? The standard view is that it was written by Šamši-Adad I as propaganda, to fuse in the general mind his Amorite dynasty to the native Assyrian one, thus legitimizing his rule. For example, van Driel, referring to the presence of Ušpia (the first builder of the temple of Aššur) in the AKL says: "... the addition of Ušpia to the kinglist, i.e. to a list of the traditional ancestors of Šamši-Adad I, was an attempt to join the native Assyrian tradition to that of the conquerors of the west."¹

On the available material, I suggest that the person responsible for the AKL was Aššur-nasir-pal I. In so far as any motive for its creation is discernible from the text itself, I suggest that it was to preserve data about Assyria’s kings which was already becoming lost.

Whatever the ultimate motivation for the creation of the list, it was drafted in such a way that - together with anything else it may have communicated to an Assyrian audience - it vindicated the way that Aššur-nasir-pal’s father, Šamši-Adad IV, came up from Babylon to seize the throne which he claimed to be his. But it would be difficult to assert that this was the motive for the compilation of the list: rather, the compilation of the AKL seems to have been the occasion for the comments on Šamši-Adad I, Šamši-Adad IV, and some other monarchs associated with Babylon.

It is hard to find solid evidence that the AKL was a resource for use in a mortuary cult, as has been suggested: this may be so, but I do not find the arguments for this persuasive.

I suggest that the standard view (which I refer to as the "Şamši-Adad I" theory) can be subjected to some damaging examination, *pace* its proponents, namely:

1. If the AKL is propaganda for Şamši-Adad I, why would he refrain from criticizing his immediate predecessors either there or in any of his inscriptions? Why would he baldly state that he seized the throne from them without presenting this as an act of propriety or making any attempt to justify it?

2. Most of the names given in the AKL have a standard form: name of king and his father, and length of rule. The only annotations or additions to the standard entry worth mentioning are those which refer to Babylon. These end with Şamši-Adad IV. This leads to the suggestion that all of these annotations were written in the one transaction of creation. The only other thesis can be that Şamši-Adad I incorporated such a note for himself, and then, whenever Babylon had a role in Assyrian history, later editors mindlessly added references to it, but to no other place or event.

3. In the time of Şamši-Adad I, Babylon was not the important city it later became; but by the time of Şamši-Adad IV it was certainly a great city. Mentioning it to the exclusion of any other city would seem more appropriate at the time of its greatness.

4. There is a linguistic point. The AKL refers to Babylon as "Karduniaš", which is its Kassite name. Obviously, then, it was not known by that name in Old Assyria. It was, however, known by that name in Middle Assyria. Why would a Middle Assyrian editor rewrite place names found in the earlier material? Surely, the most likely scenario is that the passage dealing with Şamši-Adad I was written in the Middle Assyrian period: a scenario consistent with the suggestion that it was written by Aššur-nasir-pal I or his father. While the term "Karduniaš" could have been used anachronistically, there is no reason to positively believe that it was - other than the *a fortiori* thesis that Şamši-Adad I was responsible for the creation of the list and so would have used a different term in the original.
5. There is an excellent reason why Aššur-nasir-pal I or his father would have included the detailed reference to Šamši-Adad I conquering Aššur the way he did. That is, it appears that Šamši-Adad IV was one of the kings who had challenged the king of Aššur from their refuge in Babylon. Aššur-nasir-pal’s claim to the throne came through him. Thus, he would have been able to point to the actions of his father’s illustrious name-sake as a precedent.

6. One can understand why Šamši-Adad IV or Aššur-nasir-pal I would have sought legitimation and placed the references to kings who came up from Babylon to conquer Aššur in the AKL: Aššur was the very centre of their rule. Also, they ruled at a time when Aššur’s kingship had been much disputed, and there had been several palace revolutions. On the other hand, Šamši-Adad I did not need legitimation. Further, the main cities in his empire were Šubat-Enlil, Mari and Ekallatum. While Aššur was important to him, it was not so vital as these other three.

7. If the later tradition uncritically retained Šamši-Adad I’s propaganda, why did it omit reference to two members of his dynasty?

8. There is an argument that the names of the “kings in tents” of the AKL are found in slightly different form in the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty, (“GHD”). Clearly, those names in the GHD will be names of Amorite chieftains, and there would be no reason to think that they had any connection with the history of Aššur. Therefore, it is said, those “kings” in the AKL must have been placed there for some politically motivated reason and not to accurately record the history of Aššur.

However, the said names in the GHD are not identical to (or even strikingly similar to) the names of the “kings in tents”. Further, even if this was so, it does not follow that these kings were necessarily irrelevant for the history of Aššur.
9. In so far as there is any discernible motive for its creation, those are the ones mentioned above: to preserve records of royal Assyria - including records from after the time of Šamši-Adad I - and to legitimize the rule of Šamši-Adad IV, and thus his successor, Aššur-nasir-pal I.

10. There is no exemplar of the AKL from the time of Šamši-Adad I, but there is one from 700 years later, nearer to the time of Aššur-nasir-pal I. This, it is proposed, must - on methodological grounds - be relevant, although not decisive.

11. If Šamši-Adad I had intended to create a piece of propaganda, why would he have created such a patchwork effort, with references to deficient sources? The “composite nature” of the text and uneven amount of detail are surely more consistent with a later attempt to retain information (before its state of preservation deteriorates even further) than it is with what one might call a “public relations exercise”.

12. Further, the idea that twelve kings ruled Aššur after his father, but before he did, seems so incredible as to render it useless as a piece of “disinformation”.

13. Supposing Šamši-Adad placed his father Ilu-kabkabi in a list of kings of Aššur, why, in his extant texts, where he sometimes refers to himself as the son of Ilu-kabkabi, does he never state that Ilu-kabkabi was an ensi of Aššur? Why do the major inscriptions from Aššur mention other rulers of Old Assyria, but not Ilu-kabkabi if he was a part of Šamši-Adad’s attempt to legitimize his reign?

14. Finally, if Šamši-Adad also had his brother Aminu placed in the AKL where he did not belong, does he never refer to him in his inscriptions, let alone, say that he had been ensi of Aššur?

In examining the royal ideologies of my subject kings, one must - particularly with Šamši-Adad I - establish a negative i.e. that the ideology does not support
the accepted theory of the AKL, but is consistent with the theory propounded. When one considers the material it is necessary to have regard to the type of material one is discussing. I attempt to show how the letters of Šamši-Adad throw an interesting light upon one aspect of the royal ideology; a light which is all the more illuminating because its source is a personal letter to his son as opposed to a royal inscription. That is, while one might argue that royal inscriptions tend to run to a form, there is no doubt that the letters of Šamši-Adad are genuine expressions of his personal viewpoints.

If the thesis is correct, then it means that the AKL will be more trustworthy as a historical document - especially in its earlier portions - than has hitherto been accepted.

The procedure adopted here is to suggest motives for the AKL's creation, consider the royal ideology of Šamši-Adad I - revealing him to be an original and visionary monarch - and, hopefully, have the effect of revising the low profile presently enjoyed by Aššur-nasir-pal I. In doing so, it is necessary to briefly review the history of Assyria in the "dark ages": leading to the conclusion that there may well have been more movement and innovation there than we normally give the Assyrians credit for.

As with any art, this discussion has its assumptions. For example, it assumes that the king (and not a body of scribes) were responsible for the contents of the inscriptions and major documents of his reign, at least so far as they relate to royalty. This view finds some support in the letters of Šamši-Adad I, and in certain other considerations, but reservations are expressed as to how far it can be taken in Assyriology in general. That is, to what extent do inscriptions and documents reflect the personal view of the king, as opposed to those of his scribes? I will deal with those reservations as they apply to inscriptions, below. It should be noted here that in considering artworks, and particularly monumental
art, these reservations appear not to apply, as these works were all sponsored by the palace.  

The thesis develops along the following path:

(a) some general historiographical comments on using ancient texts;
(b) a consideration of the AKL, which is a foundation document for any study of Assyria, and a discussion of whether it explicitly legitimises Šamši-Adad's "usurpation" of the throne of Aššur. Once this has been considered, some consequential matters arise: this revised dating of the AKL offers a different perspective upon the Amorite background of Šamši-Adad I, and of the views of Assyriologists. As examples, the opinions of W. W. Hallo and Hildegard Lewy are reconsidered;
(c) the evidence for the thesis that Aššur-nasir-pal I was responsible for the AKL is considered;
(d) the royal ideology created by Šamši-Adad I is reviewed, concluding that it is more consistent with the thesis offered here than with Landsberger's view; and
(e) I consider some of the questions raised by scholars such as Oppenheim and Hallo about the "limits of scepticism", and restate some conclusions.

As stated, in considering the AKL, I deal briefly with Šamši-Adad's role as an Amorite chieftain. It is argued that this role clarifies certain aspects of his seizure of power: specifically, a suggestion is made, based upon earlier studies, that the Amorites entered Mesopotamia with the benefit of military expertise such that they could make a great political impression with relatively few numbers. It is noticeable that their political impact was out of all proportion to their linguistic and cultural impact upon Mesopotamia. The hypothesis is sketched, too, that when Šamši-Adad I found himself the ruler of an empire, the lack of an Amorite ideology of kingship left him little choice but to construct an ideology from

---

whatever material lay to hand: and that he did so in an original and
discriminating way, devoid of the less savoury qualities one would associate with
the word “propaganda”.

It is opportune to define the term “empire”. The Shorter Oxford Dictionary
defines “empire” as: “An extensive territory (esp. an aggregate of many states)
rule[d] over by an emperor.” One could amend this definition to say that the ruler
of such a territory is ipso facto an emperor, however he is styled.

It is useful, too, to articulate some methodological guidelines in respect of
historiography. These principles hopefully enable a clearer view of ancient
history; one which is a little freer from unnecessary judgements. To anticipate
some conclusions, those guidelines refer to the dating of texts, and the academic
amending or correction of texts. This is done not by way of criticism, but by way
of tribute to the efforts of scholars so far. It seems to not a few persons engaged
in the field that there is now a body of research of such substantial weight that it
is necessary for someone to stand back a little and attempt to formulate some
type of principles.

This thesis is informed by the view that history is very much an art as opposed to
a pure science. Therefore, such guidelines will be aids for the historian, to be
used judiciously: they are not and cannot be rigid rules.

Assyriology is a skilled application of judgement conducted in (and contributing
to) a cultural context. It is an art fed at its sources and along its course by
disciplines such as linguistics, archaeology and an ever-expanding number of
sciences from botany to climatology. Using these resources to the best of their
abilities, historians present what must be, in the final analysis, a personal point of
view: but one which can be rationally defended or queried.

In 1909, Lytton Strachey, a writer whose historical ability and insight has
perhaps been under-rated for a variety of reasons, wrote for the Spectator a
review of Gugliemo Ferrero’s *The Greatness and Decline of Rome* in which he made the stimulating comment:

“... the first duty of a ... historian is to be an artist. The function of art in history is something much more profound than mere decoration; to regard it, as some writers persist in regarding it, as if it were the jam around the pill of fact by cunning historians is to fall into a grievous error; a truer analogy would be to compare it to the process of fermentation which converts a raw mass of grape-juice into a subtle and splendid wine. Uninterrupted truth is as useless as buried gold; and art is the great interpreter. It alone can unify a vast multitude of facts into a significant whole, clarifying, accentuating, suppressing, and lighting up the dark places with the torch of the imagination.”

Ultimately, such a credo (these lines suggest a manifesto as well as comprising a historiographical dictum) must be personal. It must be accepted or rejected by historians, each for himself. Although Strachey states his ideas in an absolute manner, he probably did not intend to suggest that there exists a “purpose of history”. His reference was almost certainly to the modern writing of history. Each historian’s differing purpose serves to differentiate his craft from that of other historians. In a characteristic, but nonetheless effective, paradox, Chesterton remarked that: “Art indeed copies life in not copying life, for life copies nothing.” This has the necessary corollary that, from one view, there are as many crafts of history as their are historians. But one element which makes the discourse of historians, and their comments upon each other’s work deeper and more productive, is the existence of a dialogue between them. At least, there is a possibility of dialogue.

There are points at which it is a service to question received opinions if not only because the views were formulated much earlier, and not having been scrutinized, they continue to be accepted. Views tentatively expressed have often been seized upon and held more firmly than the original proponent had ever held.

---

them: one example of this phenomenon is that although Finkelstein expressed his theory of the "Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty" provisionally, it has now practically been taken as concluded. Again, it is salutary for a periodic review to restore the provisional nature of some of these theories. Such an endeavour might serve to re-open areas for discussion and fresh insight: it could provide a challenge to our conditioned perceptions.

One egregious modern example of the complete re-writing of views is the work done in the wake of the interlinked discovery of Ebla and a great Syrian (or Syro-Mesopotamian) civilization of unimagined splendour and development, the theory of a great "Kish civilization", and Ebla's most recent dating to a period immediately before Sargon the Great.4

Less striking, but also pertinent, is the thesis of an Akkadian conquest of Mesopotamia by extraneous Semites with its concomitant views of the "intrinsically" Sumerian city-state and the "intrinsically" Akkadian "idea of the state", which were then "fused" in Ur III.5 We now know of Semitic and Sumerian co-existence at much earlier stages than had ever been considered possible previously. Some of this evidence, such as the Semitic names in documents from Abu-Salabikh, also show that Sumerian literature was far older than previously suspected.6

The re-writing of history also knows its trends. According to Carena, von Soden wrote his Der Aufstieg des Assyrerreiches als geschichtliches Problem in 1937 to provide "a racial history of Assyria, which in contact with Aryan populations (at least on the upper level) developed characteristics which the Semitic world alone

---

5 see Adam Falkenstein The Sumerian Temple City trans. 1954 pp.5-6 and the notes in Mario Liverani "Akkad: An Introduction" in Akkad: The First World Empire (ed.) M. Liverani Padova 1993 1-10, p.2
could not explain." This is one example, but a glorious one, of what he calls the "Indo-Germanic mania" of 1932 to 1945. Carena observes that, initially, the discoveries of Ugarit and Mari were largely ignored, and remarks that: "one cannot deny that the prevailing ideology allowed little space to research about the Semites." 9

Another example is the complete re-writing of research on Neolithic civilizations. For example, in the first edition of Ancient Iraq, published in 1964, Georges Roux’s chapter 4 dealt with the "Hassuna-Samarra" period. It treated Samarra ware as the chronologically upper example of the Hassuna culture, and the Samarra craftsmen themselves were putatively from "that great province of painted pottery: Iran". Further, they were probably "small groups of perambulating craftsmen rather than conquerors." 10

In the third edition of 1992, Samarra is treated as an integrated culture, overlapping with, but distinct from the Hassuna culture. Further, the Samarra people were not Iranian, but "belonged to a hitherto unsuspected culture which flourished in the middle of the Tigris valley during the second half of the fourth millennium BC." 11

The significance of these examples, and the reason it is salutary to cite them is that they are examples of an understandable dash to certainty. There never was any evidence of a Semitic invasion of Early Dynastic Sumer. There never was any evidence that the upper echelons of Aššur were in contact with culture-bearing Aryans. There never was any evidence that the Samarran craftsmen were Iranian. Historians had available to them a few facts, and there was a need for an interpretation. While the positing of theories before they can be conclusively established is both legitimate and necessary, the interpretation was unnecessarily

---

2 _op. cit._ pp.122-123.
3 _op. cit._ pp.132-133.
5 Third edition p.53.
bound to previously held models e.g. of nomadic invasion, Aryan superiority over Semites, and Iranian prowess in producing painted pottery.

There is another aspect which is too far removed from the main course of the thesis to dwell upon here: bad history supported evil ideology in the period of the “Indo-Germanic mania”. Perhaps, then, there is also a moral dimension to good historiography. For example, it is probably a defensible reading of Plato to argue that he was really propounding the view that the arts (properly practised) and the virtues are an indivisible unity. Many of us suspect that they are.\footnote{12}

**Historiography**

Thus, we come to historiographic principles, as without guiding principles, the comments above are rather purposeless and futile unless they are simply a call for caution - and that needs no advocates.

First, regarding dating, we often have texts which refer to events of a period earlier than the time in which they were written. In those instances, the text may on its face be from that earlier period. For example, a modern reprint of the Acts of Parliament will contain significant portions of material from earlier years, and that material will on its face be from those earlier times. Here, the discussion is not about such texts as these.

These comments apply only to texts such as the AKL which do not on their own face say when the text, or more precisely, each of its portions, was first written. One may wish to, in that case, date it to a time earlier than that first exemplar.

The principle is that when presented with a text or a pericope which could have been written at a period earlier than that from which the exemplar itself originates, one should be reluctant to date the original of a text substantially prior to the earliest exemplar. It is worth repeating that this applies only in the absence

\footnote{12 This, of course, adds another level to the possible dignity of the art of history.}
of direct evidence for the history of a text, and if one is dating the original of a
text to a time before it is attested. For example, a text may contain a direct
statement about its authorship. This will have to be taken into account, and may
prove decisive. Of course, for very many texts our only exemplars come from a
time long after they were written. This suggested principle is not meant as an
absolute ban on the intelligent use and analysis of the texts. However, if one is
relying upon circumstantial evidence only to date a text, then the principle
applies to invite a high degree of caution.

The AKL affords an instance where at least part of it surely reflects an earlier
tradition (whether oral or written), and if there were original sources now lost to
us, those would be dated to a period long before the date of the earliest exemplar.
This must be the case with any chronological list; but in the instance of the AKL
this is also to be inferred from the fact that the material itself must have clearly
been very old at the time it was used in the compilation of the AKL. The re-
dating of the text proposed in this thesis illustrates these principles, and it is dated
it to a period quite close to the earliest exemplar.

The second historiographic principle is that one should be reluctant to accept a
modern correction to a reading in an ancient text, unless:
(1) one has first considered and excluded the possibility of variant readings;
(2) the difficulty is unlikely to simply be a lacuna in our knowledge;
(3) the text is unintelligible without such correction; or
(4) we have reasons extraneous to the text itself to believe that the scribe has
    erred.

Then, the correction should be the simplest possible. Of course, the question of
what the “simplest possible” is will vary from occasion to occasion. If the text is
unintelligible, the correction must make it intelligible. If there are reasons,
based on other documents or evidence, to believe that there is an outright error in
the text, then the suggested correction must respect and address those extraneous
reasons.
Third, if one suggests that a text is incorrect because of the operation of a prejudice (or any other factor) in the ancient writer, then the more thoroughly and consistently that factor is manifested in the text, the more credible will be the assertion that there is such a prejudice at work. The suggested re-writing will then have more credence, too. Thus, one sometimes says that “A” is an insertion to support such and such a view. But if “B”, which is contrary to “A” is also in that text, and could have been altered or removed, then surely the presence of “B” must undermine the credibility of the suggested amendment.

Why formulate such principles? The only reason can be to have some check upon the criticism and analysis of documents so that such criticism and analysis may take place within clear parameters, be more reliable, and minimize subjectivity.

An example of indiscriminate use of criticism is given by Saggs: a scholar proceeds by saying that “X [whatever notion or idea X represents] is absent from a particular text as it has come down to us. Had X been present, it would have been objectionable to its then contemporary audience. Therefore, it will have been deleted if present precisely because it would have been objectionable. Therefore, as it is not here, it must have been deleted as objectionable; it must have originally been present.” An example of this, although Saggs does not cite is such, could be the theory of the “suppression” of the role of Enmesharra and his seven sons as lords of the Sumerian pantheon.

The current moment in Assyriology is, perhaps, now ripe for the articulation and use of some canon of procedure. There appears below an attempt to formulate three of these, and I further endeavour to justify and apply these rules of thumb below. In particular, the first principle is used when tentatively proposing that the origin of the AKL should be sought for in the rule of Aššur-nasir-pal I. The second principle is especially used in considering proposed amendments by Hallo and Finkelstein to the AKL and the “Genealogy of the Hammurapi dynasty”,

---

13 H.W.F. Saggs The Encounter with the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel p.57
14 op. cit. pp.100-104.
respectively. The third is used in considering various suggestions about additions to the AKL e.g. that a filiation of Sulili was added to “standardize” the list with filiations.

The simplicity and obvious nature of these principles is apparent. Yet, it is hoped that this simplicity shows not that the principles are so jejune as to be useless, but that the discussion of such principles must commence somewhere.
Chapter One

What type of document is the “Assyrian King List”? Archaeologists have uncovered several documents referred to, individually, as the Assyrian King List (“the AKL”). The fullest exemplars are known as the “Aššur A”, “Khorsabad” and “SDAS” lists. The “Aššur A” list, published in 1927, is so fragmentary as to have been practically superseded by the others. The fragment BM128059 is tantalizing on certain abstruse points, but of too little assistance to consider here. What type of document is the list, and what are the grounds for attributing its authorship to Šamši-Adad I?

This question can be approached not only by considering the text (which I attempt below), but also by an examination of certain features of the very tablets on which the list was written. Then, it falls to consider it with reference to another important document from the Near East - the “Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty”. I conclude that there is some interesting evidence for an ancestral link between the Šamši-Adad I and Hammurapi dynasties. Further, this evidence indicates that Šamši-Adad I and Hammurapi may well have been aware of this relationship, and respected it.

To turn to the AKL; first, the Khorsabad list is fashioned to swing on some type of pivot, and has holes for pins. One could read the obverse (presumably be read inside a frame or case, hanging from pins), and then swing it upside down to read the reverse. It has only one set of pin holes, and they are found at the top centre of the obverse, and the bottom centre of the reverse. The design of the SDAS list is rather similar, except that the holes do not seem fashioned for pivot

---

18 See the attached photographs, and A. Poebel art. cit. p.248
swinging in an identical way. Gelb suggests that it was perforated for string, metal or wood.\textsuperscript{19} There seems to be no reason to doubt this.

Unfortunately, the Aššur A list is so damaged that I cannot tell from the photographs how it was fashioned.

Thus, on balance, the text must at least have been a reference tool; and one which was not to be taken away, but used at a specific place. A loose analogy might be the way that inter-State telephone directories were attached to their desks at the telephone exchange. The King List must have been in used over a period of time, as there are several versions created at different times, showing that it was updated. Thus, the “Aššur A” list [912BC] has only 97 kings, ending with Tukulti-apil-Ešarra II (Tiglath-Pileser);\textsuperscript{20} the Khorsabad list [738BC]\textsuperscript{21} is written in the time of the 108th king, Tukulti-apil-Ešarra III; and the SDAS list [722BC] closes with Šulmanu-ašarid V (Shalmaneser), thus effectively giving it two more kings than the Khorsabad list.\textsuperscript{22}

It seems that the versions we have were updated by adding details to the end of the text, rather than by any revision of earlier sections.

The Khorsabad and SDAS tablets bear the subscriptions of their copiers, each of whom was a temple scribe.\textsuperscript{23} The SDAS text states at line iv 28: “According to the original written (and collated), tablet of Bēl-šum-iddin the Maš-Maš priest of Aššur, (whoever) removes (the tablet) may Adad remove him”.\textsuperscript{24} The Khorsabad tablet was copied by a scribe in the temple of Ištar at Arbela. Unfortunately, neither say where the original(s) might be found, or who was responsible for its upkeep.

\textsuperscript{19} I.J. Gelb \textit{art. cit.} p.210
\textsuperscript{20} A. Poebel \textit{art. cit.} pp.250-1
\textsuperscript{21} The dates are calculated from the texts, and are found in \textit{The Cambridge Ancient History} 3rd ed. Volume 1 Part 2, 1971, Cambridge, per H. Lewy p.743
\textsuperscript{22} I.J. Gelb \textit{art. cit.} p.229
\textsuperscript{23} Aššur A lacks the relevant part: see Nassouhi \textit{art. cit. passim}
\textsuperscript{24} In Gelb’s translation \textit{art. cit.} p.230
The subscriptions suggest, however, that there was some authoritative exemplar from which copies could be made as needed; and we know that two copies were copied by temple staff. I am not sure that this necessarily means that they were copied for the temples, and if they were, whether they were wanted for cultic purposes. As is mentioned below, there is reason to think that this was possible.

These considerations, and particularly the inclusion of the curse formula, tend to justify the analogy of the telephone directory in a public place. In sum, it appears that we can safely conclude that the AKL was a reference tool, and a valued one at that.

Erica Reiner has noted that in its size, markings and rectangular projection for hanging, the Khorsabad tablet is identical to the house blessings in “amulet form” which she has considered; and thinks that the AKL - at least in this form - may have been hung in houses for the purpose of invoking a blessing. She notes that texts such as the Epic of Erra, pleas for health, apotropaic prayers against unspecified misfortune (the namburbi), a prayer to the triad Šamaš, Ea and Marduk (the namburbi lumun kalama - the apotropaion against all evil whatever), were located on amulets with a rectangular projection at the top. That projection is pierced through horizontally, and the amulet must have been intended to be hung by a thread or bracket of some kind in the projection.

This particular exemplar may have had such a purpose. However, the case is not free from doubt. First, I note that even Reiner does not attempt to draw any conclusion from the shape: that is, she does not conclude that this tablet too had an apotropaic function.

Second, it could well be that what we are seeing here is a similarity in form but not in function. First, Gelb refers to the size of the SDAS list, and to the rectangular protuberance. He then states: “... both in size and in shape, the SDAS list is almost identical with the Khorsabad list. The formal differences pertain

---

mainly to the number of lines in each column and to the horizontal lines marking the significant units.\textsuperscript{26} As noted, the tablets state who copied them, and give every impression of having been copied for temple purposes.\textsuperscript{27} Neither of the tablets contains invocations for good health which are found upon many of the other amulets Professor Reiner considers.

Perhaps the commonality found between amulets on the one hand, and the AKL tablets on the other, is due to the fact that both types of object were hung for retention and it was desired to keep them compact in size. What could be the power of a king list to avert evil? Surely there would be a prayer or plea for intercession if that was indeed its purpose.

There are three other things to add in a general way about the AKL: first, the lists always end with a subscription of the full details of a ruler. That is, it never ends noting the accession only of a king: rulers appear to be added only after their death. Thus, immediately before the scribe’s subscription, the Khorsabad list ends:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Aššur-ERIM-DÁH
  \item DUMU 1\textsuperscript{28} U-ERIM-DÁH
  \item 10 MU-MEŠ
  \item LUGAL-ta DÙ-uš
\end{itemize}

“Aššur-nirari, son of Adad-nirari, ruled ten years.”

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{art. cit.} p.210

\textsuperscript{27} It takes me too far from my thesis to consider what is involved in the term “temple purposes”, as they are so broad, especially in Assyria. Edmond Sollberger offered a definition of temple as: “... essentially the house in which a god lives, manages his worldly business, is served by his household and by his people, and through his own success, ensures the happiness and prosperity of his city and her inhabitants.” “The Temple in Babylonia” in \textit{RAI} 37 (1975) 31-5, p.35. This is, I think, an ostensive definition, as it does not say what the god’s “worldly business” is: this will have varied from temple to temple, time to time and region to region.

\textsuperscript{28} Rather than alter some of Gelb’s transcription (e.g. substituting “m” for “l”) I keep strictly to his text so that the reader can more easily refer to it to check my own writing.
The SDAS, just before the subscription, ends:

1 **dDI-ma-nu-MAŠ** DUMU 1 **GIŠ-KU-ti-A-É-šár-ra**
5 **MU.MEŠ** LUGAL-ta **DÛ-uš**

“Šulmanu-ašarid, son of Tukulti-apil-Ešarra, ruled five years.”

Second, the list is simply a genealogy in list form (although the earlier sections are a little more complex than this suggests). The vast bulk of genealogical detail available to Assyriologists is found in the context of other documents e.g. royal inscriptions. Even the Hammurapi genealogy is in a document which is clearly, as a whole, a ritual for the dead. This is dealt with below.

Third, the list consists chiefly of names, and details which provide information about the people named. The additional material is generally the fact that a certain named person (a king) was the son of another named person, also a king, and reigned for a certain number of years. The entries above for Aššur-nirari V and Šulmanu-ašarid V are examples of this.

However, there are some departures from this, where the list gives us more details. For example:

(a) It is noted at line 9 of the SDAS list concerning the first 17 kings:

PAB 17 **LUGAL.MEŠ-a-ni** a-ši-bu-ti kûl-ta-ri

“Total 17 kings who dwelt in tents”.

If the thesis set out here is correct, this passage may be saying that one need not be ruler in the town of Aššur itself in order to be a legitimate king. The purpose

---

29 The following translations are indebted to Gelb’s translations *art. cit. passim.*
of this statement would surely be chiefly to retain whatever information had survived through the ages, not to write a more comprehensive history.

(b) Of the next ten it is noted, at line 20:

PAB 10 LUGAL.MEŠ-a-ni ša AD-MEŠ-šu-nu?-ni

"Total ten kings whose fathers (are known?)".

(c) Of the next six it is said at lines 24 and 25:

PAB 6 LUGAL.MEŠ-a-ni

[x x x] r-x→ rSIG4 ← ša li-ma-a-ni--šu-nu la-u-tu-ni

"Total of six kings, ...[who occur? on?] bricks, whose (records of?) eponymies have been destroyed".

(d) At lines 26-7, there is an almost completely obliterated reference to Erišu I, which Gelb restores to read “Erišu son of Ilu-šuma, [whose eponymies] (are known?), 40 years he ruled”.31

(e) The next annotation is at lines 38 and following, and refers to Šamši-Adad I, who is the 39th king in the list. I set this pericope out in full below when I ask whether the list can be said to legitimatize his alleged usurpation of the Assyrian throne.

---

30 I differ from Gelb only in articulating in the translation the view - with which I agree - that the scribe must mean that the limmu records previously existed and were now lost.
31 I.J. Gelb “Two Assyrian King Lists” JNES 13 (1954) 209-30 p.224
Aššur-dugul, the 41st king, and the six rulers following, are dealt with in lines ii 8-12:

1 Aššur-dugul A 1 la ma-ma-na la EN GIŠ.GU.ZA 6 MU.MEŠ KI.MIN
ina tar-ši 1 Aššur-dugul DUMU 1 la ma-ma-na
Aššur-A-Zu 1 PAB-ir-dSin 1 dSin-na-mir 1 Ip-qi-15
1 dIM-ša-lu-lu 1 A-da-si 6 LUGAL.MEŠ-ni A la ma-ma-na
KÁ tup-pi-šu LUGAL-ta DÜ-uš

"Aššur-dugul, son of a nobody, not suitable to the throne, ruled six years.
At the period of Aššur-dugul, son of a nobody, Aššur-apli-idi, Nasir-Sin, Sin-namir, Ipqi-Ištar, Adad-salulu, (and) Adasi, six kings (each of them) son of a nobody Each considered himself true king, and ruled."

It is difficult to know what to make of this. Why has the list moved on to Aššur-dugul, while omitting reference to the descendants of Šamši-Adad I after Išme-Dagan, and to Puzur-Sin? It does appear that the house of Šamši-Adad continued after Išme-Dagan: the monarchs who succeeded Išme-Dagan may have been Mut-Aškur, Rimuš, Rimuni and Asinu. Asinu is known from the inscription of Puzur-Sin.33

But none of these are named in the AKL. Is the AKL engaging in some kind of editorial re-writing of Assyrian history? But why would it do so, and from what perspective? It would appear to have excluded some of the house of Šamši-Adad and the great opponent of that house (as known to us). If the AKL, or its writer, is taking a partisan position, it is hard to see what it is.

32 I translate the phrase "KÁ tup-pi-šu" thus, following Yamada's notes in "The Editorial History of the Assyrian King List" ZA (1994) 11-38 at pp.26-7, n.48 that it must mean something like "by his own authority", (lit. "by his tablet"). Today we say "in his own book he is ..." ("a legend", or whatever) meaning that "he may not be so objectively, but in his own conceited opinion, he is".
The simplest suggestion to account for these anomalies is that these rulers were not known to the compilers working in the time of Aššur-nasir-pal I. That is, their records were lost to the Assyrians of later ages. Clearly, the fortunes of Aššur waned dramatically when the house of Šamši-Adad could not keep his empire together. I cannot think of, and my research has not uncovered, any other reason for these omissions. The present proposal would at least accord with what we have seen of the AKL's preservation of imperfect records i.e. the writer of the AKL seems to have a penchant for retaining records of kings, even if those records are incomplete. If he had had available to him any record of the "missing" descendants of Šamši-Adad I, and of Puzur-Sin, surely the writer would have included it.

(g) It is interesting to note lines ii 13-20. Lullaya, the 53rd king, is described as being the son of a nobody in line ii 19. He succeeds Bazaya who reigned for 28 years, a son of Belu-bani the 48th king. The men named as ruling as the 49th to 52nd kings had each been the son of the one preceding. Libaya, the 49th king and presumably the eldest son of Belu-bani - ruled 17 years; his son Šarma-Adad I ruled 12 years; and his son Ip?-tar-Sin ruled for 12. Thus, Bazaya will have been at least 69 years old when he died, even if he had been born in the last year of his father's life.³⁴

There is no explanation of why Bazaya was succeeded by Lullaya (not of a royal line) for six years. Lullaya himself was followed by Kidin-Ninua, son of Bazaya. One could speculate that Lullaya was a "protector" and that the line of Libaya had been weak and died out.³⁵ However, one thing is clear - at this point at least - the list is not simply blindly asserting a principle of dynastic succession.

³⁴ This is not impossible: Nabonidus' mother lived to be 104, and a number of Babylonian scribes of the first millennium BC lived to be 70-90 years old at least. See M.A. Dandamayev "About Life Expectancy in Babylonia in the first millennium BC" in *Death in Mesopotamia* ed. B. Alster; pp.183-186, esp.183-4.
³⁵ Yamada says that there must have been "political strife resulting in the removal of Lullaya by force." *art. cit.* p.27. But the AKL does not say - and it is capable of doing so. Yamada could be right - how can we tell?
Then the AKL continues in an orderly fashion, giving for each king what I have referred to as the standard entry, until line ii 26, when it gives some additional family details other than merely filiation, and also notes filiation even where the king's father was not himself a king:

1 dŠam-si-ðIM A l Iš-me-dDa-gan  ŠEŠ-su ša 1 Šar-ma-ðIM
DUMU 1 ŠŪ-URU Ab HA  16 MU.MEŠ MAN-ta DÛ-uš

Šamši-Adad son of Išme-Dagan, his brother (was) Šarma-Adad
The son of Kidin-Ninua ruled for 16 years.

I agree with Yamada as against Gelb, that the Išme-Dagan who was Šamši-Adad III’s father, cannot have been the second king of that name. He must have been a son of a man named Kidin-Ninua who did not ever take the throne, but who being of the royal family, is named when his son takes the throne. Here, Yamada criticizes (with good cause) the methodology of those who would assimilate this Išme-Dagan to the king of that name, and then “correct” the AKL to fit in with their theory. Perhaps the AKL includes this information about the father and family of Šamši-Adad III to make clear who he was, and his connection to the throne.

Then, for the 65th king, Aššur-rabi I, at lines ii33-4, it reads:

[1 Aššu]r-GAL-bi A l dBE-PAB- [ir 1 Aššur-šad-u-ni ina GIŠ. GU.ZA]
[ú-šat-b]i GIŠ.GU.ZA iš-[bat x MU.MEŠ MAN-ta DÛ-uš]

“Aššur-rabi son of Enlil-nasir [deposed] Aššur-šaduni from the throne, [seized] the throne [and ruled (missing) years.]”

Now Aššur-šaduni, the son of Nur-ili, the grandson of Enlil-nasir, belonged to the line of the kings of Assyria accepted by those later Assyrians who used the

---

36 This name is also given as Šu-nimua by Yamada e.g. art. cit. p.28.
37 art. cit. p.28 n.51
AKL. The list is not attempting, at least not at this point, to present a picture of an unbroken chain of monarchs succeeding one another in orderly fashion from father to son. Aššur-rabi himself must have been his second predecessor Nur-ili's brother\(^{38}\) and thus Aššur-šaduni's uncle; but the deposition of his own nephew is passed over in this brief fashion by the list.

(j) Aššur-rabi was succeeded by his son, Aššur-nadin-ahhe. But the list notes that he was then deposed by his brother, Enlil-nasir. Again, the fact is simply noted.

(k) Similarly, the list briefly notes that the 78th ruler, Tukulti-Ninurta (one of the great kings of Assyria) was deposed by his son Aššur-nadin-apli. There is a short comment, perhaps to the effect that Tukulti-Ninurta was alive when the revolution occurred.

(l) At line iii 15, for the 82nd king, the AKL reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 \text{dMAŠ-DUMU.ÛŠ-} \text{Ékur} A1 dDINGIR-i-} \text{ṣad-da} & \quad \text{lib-lib ša?!} 1 \text{SU-} \text{DIM} \\
\text{ana KUR Kar-du-} \text{nī-āš} \text{il-lik} & \quad \text{TA KUR Kar-du-} \text{nī-āš} \text{e-la-a} \\
\text{GIŠ.GU.ZA iš-bat} & \quad 3 \text{MU.IMEŠ KL.MIN}
\end{align*}
\]

"Ninurta-apil-Ekur son of Ilu-ihadda descendant of Eriba-Adad went to Babylon, (then) came up from Babylon, seized the throne, and ruled for three years."

(m) At line iii 20, for the 85th king, the AKL notes that Mutakkil-Nusku fought with his brother, deported him to Babylon, held the throne and then died. It does not note the number of years that he reigned.\(^{39}\) If the length of his reign is unimportant, perhaps we are intended to understand that he was not a king whose rule was recognised as a kingly rule for the purposes of the list, but which was included to explain the descent of later kings: namely, Aššur-reš-isi, and the

\(^{38}\) Nur-ili held the throne in his own right.

\(^{39}\) I.J. Gelb "Two Assyrian King Lists" JNES 13 (1954) 209-30 p.228
famous king Tukulti-apil-Ešarra and his heirs, among whom were numbered Šamši-Adad IV and Aššur-nasir-pal I.

In this respect, no number of years is allocated to those persons named after Aššur-dugal and described as rulers “by their own authority” (if this translation is correct) who considered themselves to be true kings. However, as Adasi (one of their number) is father of Belu-bani and his dynasty, perhaps their names were included to give some context to him Adasi and Belu-bani.

Another possibility would be that a king had to be on the throne for at least the commencement of one full eponymous year, and if he died before that year, the period he was on the throne is counted within his predecessor’s year.40

(n) The next notation is that for Šamši-Adad IV - ruler 91 - at line iii33:

1 dŠam-ši-dIM A 1 GIŠ.KU-ti-A-É- šár-ra
1 SU-dIM DUMU 1 Aššur EN-ka-la

ina GIŠ.GU.ZA ú-šat-bi GIŠ.GU.ZA ış-bat 4 MU.MEŠ MAN-ta [DŮ-uš]

“Šamši-Adad son of Tukulti-apil-Ešarra
came up from Babylon
he deposed from the throne Eriba-Adad, son of Aššur-bel-kala
seized the throne and ruled for four years.”

It is important to note that there are no notations whatsoever for any of the other 18 kings after this point over and above the name of the king, the name of his father, and the number of years he ruled. Most importantly, this is the last reference to Babylon - however spelt!

40 There is no evidence for this; it is only a hypothesis.
Analysis

When the AKL provides notes over and above the standard details of its listed rulers, it usually gives only brief details. It also, as we have seen, provides references to Babylon exclusively for the kings prior to number 92 viz. Aššur-nasir-pal I. So what is the significance of the various references found over and above the standard details?

The first four notes [points (a) to (d) as set out above] all seem designed to set out the little which was known of the regnal details concerning the kings named at those points e.g. the kings in tents.

Then there are four references, at points (e), (l), (m) and (n) above, to Babylon. Significantly, three of these occur in a cluster, at kings 82, 88 and 91. In three instances: Šamši-Adad I and IV, and Ninurta-apil-Ekur, the man comes up from Babylon to take Aššur and rule. For the fourth instance, Mutakkil-Nusku, there is a note that he exiled his brother to Babylon.

Three references [at points (i), (j) and (k) above] note with a minimum of comment that a king was deposed.

Two references [at points (f) and (g) above] are to rulers being “sons of nobodies”: Aššur-dugul and his successors (if they succeeded him as king); and Lullaya. As I have hypothesized above, these seem to be there mainly to give context to Adasi and Belu-bani.

At one point only - (h) - the identity of a king’s brother is given because, as stated above, the king was doubtless of the royal family, although probably not the son of a king.

This does not tell us very much about what the Assyrians thought the list to be. But it must have had some importance to them, as it was updated from time to time. Grayson reflects what is probably still the consensus view when he opines
that it was created to "legitimatize the rule of the usurper, Šamši-Adad, by inserting his genealogy into a list of Assyrian rulers. Subsequent generations, motivated by both a sense of history and a feeling of pride in their native Assyrian monarchic heritage, added the names of successive Assyrian kings to the list." \(^{41}\)

This view has been held since Landsberger gave it currency in "Assyrische Königsliste und 'Dunkles Zeitalter'". \(^{42}\)

There is no other well-established theory of the original purpose of the AKL other than Lambert’s theory that it was to be used in a kispum ceremony; much like the GHD. I doubt that the Lewy opinion - that it was used to calculate periods for building purposes - is correct, but I deal with this below. Hallo proposed the view that it was an innovation of the sixteenth century to "conceal the subservience of Aššur". For reasons given below, this view is considered but is not adopted. \(^{43}\)

How does one approach such a document as the AKL? We know that many lists have survived from ancient Mesopotamia. Speaking of the various word lists which have come down to us, Larsen says that: "... the predominance of the unconnected list as a tool for scholarly work points to an oral complement, the 'teachings' of a master." \(^{44}\) This must be fundamentally correct so long as not interpreted too literally. That is, one cannot say that the AKL was necessarily related to the teachings of a "master". However, one can say that it must have existed within a larger cultural context which complemented it, and mediated its significance. That cultural context may have been preserved and passed on orally. What else can we say about this significance?

\(^{41}\) AK Grayson Assyrian Royal Inscriptions Volume 1 From the Beginning to Ashur-resha-ishi 1 Otto Harrassowitz Wiesbaden 1972, page 1.

\(^{42}\) JCS 8 (1954) 31-45, 47-73, 106-133.


First, it is distinct from other king lists such as the famous Sumerian one. As has been pointed out, that document is “carefully and deliberately organized on the basis of cities.” As Hallo says of the AKL, and, it is suggested, correctly: “Its sections ... feature a miscellany of subscripts which betray their composite origin ... If any principle ... underlies the grouping of kings.” However, Hallo finds a genealogical rather than geographical focus for early portions of the AKL. With respect to Hallo, for the reasons given in this thesis, I do not accept as he does, that this portion refers to the genealogy of Šamši-Adad I.

But what he says about the composite nature of the text seems reasonable. It can also be accepted that this distinguishes it from the other king lists which he considers. If Šamši-Adad I had been creating a tool for propaganda, why could he not have made it a seamless whole, much like the SKL, which it has been argued had a propagandistic use for the kings of Ur III, and Isin? This thesis differs when it hypothesizes that the composite nature is due to the fact that Aššur-nasir-pal I was trying to preserve valuable data, and that data existed only in this “patchwork” form. This is the only theory I can knit together - that explains the nature of the references in the early parts of the text: why else would there be any reason to say where the kings lived and how many kings had fathers of which they, the later writers, knew and how their names were preserved and the state of preservation and that the eponymies of Erišu are known [at points (a) to (d)]? Surely the compilers of the original AKL are saying that details of the eponymies before Erišu were not known to them.

The next stage of the argument is this: if the AKL was intended to legitimise Šamši-Adad, it could have explicitly done so, but it does not. I shall deal with this, to clear the ground - as it were - before returning to a consideration of what type of document the list might be.

47 ibid p.190
Chapter 2

Does the AKL explicitly legitimise Šamši-Adad’s “usurpation” of the throne of Aššur?

Is there good reason to accept that the AKL contains material “representing an alien tradition which was introduced by the Šamši-Adad dynasty, apparently for propagandistic reasons”?48 Does it really include the genealogical tree of Šamši-Adad I?49 Or, on the contrary, was it tampered with by the opponents of the Šamši-Adad dynasty to indicate that they (i.e. the opponents) were the “legitimate successors of Uṣpiā”?50 In my opinion, none of these views are plausible.

A point to be stated at the outset is that read on its own terms the AKL does not in the least legitimise Šamši-Adad. It states, without apology, that he seized the throne. There is no attempt whatsoever to explicitly justify this. For example, it does not state that “Šamši-Adad retook his father’s throne”; yet it could easily have done so, and it does give a lot of other detail about him. There is only one fact, the reference to an earlier king with the same name as his father, which links Šamši-Adad to any part of the “genealogical tree”. One might think that this alone would give pause to anyone who asserts that the creation of the list had a political or “public relations” motive.

As Hallou notes, there is no evidence that Šamši-Adad needed legitimization:

“... on the contrary, the abundant royal correspondence from his reign shows that he ruled his empire from Shubat-Enlil in the distant north-west, with Aššur merely a province of the viceregal domain administered by the crown-prince Ishme-Dagan from Ekallatum, a day’s march north of Aššur. In his inscriptions he never traces his descent further than his father, and while he mentions some of

48 M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State p.36
49 per Landsberger art. cit. p.33
50 H. Lewy art. cit. p.746
the Old Assyrian kings, it is the kings of Akkad from whom, if from anyone, he appears to derive his succession, some of his titles and, so to speak, his legitimacy.\textsuperscript{51}

The chief reservation with Hallo's view, one might think, is that it underplays the extent to which Šamši-Adad I does appear to be projecting the message that his rule is sanctioned by the gods, and this favour is justified by his perfect discharge of royal duties: he brings peace, builds and restores temples, and unites (or "pacifies") the land he rules: that is, he earns his divine favour and his rule. These texts when examined do, it is argued, comprise more than simply another way of expressing the dictum which has been expressed by countless governments, that good rule is self-justifying. Šamši-Adad adds the dimension of the gods' sanction.

Quite recently, Brinkman has opined that: "It is difficult to see why such an important ruler, who chose to make his capital in Western Mesopotamia, would have been interested in establishing a personal link with Aššur, which was then a lesser provincial town in his realm. The insertion of the genealogy of Šamši-Adad I might more plausibly be explained as an attempt by Assyrians, perhaps as late as the Middle Assyrian period, to co-opt the illustrious ruler and his ancestors as part of what would otherwise have been an undistinguished group of political forbears."\textsuperscript{52}

Four comments on this immediately suggest themselves: first, in the course of this thesis it is suggested that Aššur was important to Šamši-Adad; second, it is not accepted that the genealogy of Šamši-Adad has been inserted into the list; third, it is speculative to say that the Assyrians regarded their forbears as "undistinguished" - one only needs to note how often they were referred to by the later kings without any hint of embarrassment. Fourth, the basic insight that there is no evidence that Šamši-Adad craved "legitimation" is sound, and indeed there has never been any evidence for it.

\textsuperscript{51} W.W. Hallo "Assyrian Historiography Revisited" Eretz Israel 14 (1978) 5-6
\textsuperscript{52} J.A. Brinkman "Glassner's Mesopotamian Chronicles" JAOS 115 (1995) 667-70, p.669-70
Interestingly, the latest in-depth study concludes that there is no evidence for the legitimization theory. In Yamada’s view, the “compiler ... merely attempted to show in a single composition two aspects of Šamši-Adad’s kingship ... (viz) his Amorite dynastic descent ... and ... his membership in the Assyrian royal line.”

This view is cited at this point of the thesis only to demonstrate that any “legitimization” flows from the reader’s own interpretation of the text. As observed above, Brinkman suggests that the AKL was written by a ruler of perhaps the Middle Assyrian period who sought legitimation by association with Šamši-Adad I.

To deal with matters consecutively, there is a summary of the relevant pericope in Larsen. I shall set out here his table from page 36. The list refers to:

   “1) seventeen nomad chieftains;
2) ten ancestor kings;
3) six early kings;
4) the six Old Assyrian kings with genealogies;
5) the usurper Šamši-Adad I.”

I can discern no basis in the text itself for Larsen’s assertion that it “purports to be a complete list of all rulers of Assur from the earliest times.” The list itself does not explicitly “purport to be” anything. As Oates notes: “... the compiler of the list does not claim to give more than a group of names, with no statement of their relationship to one another ...” However, sometimes a matter can be implicitly asserted, or be so clear from the whole that it needs no separate asseveration.

---

53 Shigeo Yamada “The Editorial History of the Assyrian King List” ZA (1994) 11-38 p.19. I do not see that as expressed, this is necessarily inconsistent with the “legitimization” theory.
55 M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State p.34-6
56 M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State p.34
57 D. Oates Studies in the History of Northern Iraq OUP London 1968 p.22. Incidentally, kings with identical names are listed without the number we use to distinguish such.
One observes, for example, that there are remarks from which some relationship between the names can be derived: e.g. that one king is the son or brother of another, that another king seized the throne, or that some “lived in tents” etc.  

Reading the text at face value, i.e. before querying inclusions and omissions, it is a concise list setting out, where possible, the succession and length of reign of kings of Assyria. It also shows filial succession where applicable. It notes for the early periods that some data has been lost. In some instances, brief details are added. This is the case where someone did not take the throne by filial succession, but has seized it or was “the son of a nobody”; it is also the case where there is an association with Babylon, called here “Karduniāš”: see from the Khorsabad list examples of all these phenomena: (a) i 39-47, (b) ii 4 to 11, 22, 45-46, (c) iii 1-2, 21-22, 27-30, 34-36, and (d) iv 1-4. These are set out and considered in some detail below.

It has been noted elsewhere that the brief details often refer to Babylon. I speculate below as to why this was so. Of course, Babylon is referred to as “Karduniāš”. “Karduniāš” is probably a term used by the Kassites, first attested around the time of Kara-indaš (c. 1413BC), to refer to either Babylonia or the area which they ruled. Its use among the kings of Aššur is first known from the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (c. 1244-1208BC). After the fall of the Kassites (c. 1157BC) it is found in Assyrian inscriptions, apparently as a synonym for “Babylonia”.

---

58 See lines i 9 and 20 to 41, by way of example, Gelb art. cit. 211-13
59 This follows the numbering in Gelb art. cit. 211-30
60 P. Garelli “Réflexions sur les Listes Royales Assyriennes” p.93 in Miscellanea Babylonica ed. J-M Durand and J-R Kupper Paris 1985 91-5, who notes also that Grayson has remarked upon this.
As part of a royal title, at the time of publication, Seux found attested uses of the title “šar ṭiš Karduniaš” for the following Assyrian rulers: Tukulti-Ninurta I, Šamši-Adad V (823-811BC) and Esarhaddon (680-669BC).⁶³

Landsberger believes that the editor or updater of the AKL is consciously using an archaism for effect. This would mean, that the use of the term is of none but the most limited assistance in dating the text, and thus leaves Landsberger free to say that the creator of the original list was Šamši-Adad I.⁶⁴ But is there an objective basis for Landsberger’s view?

To claim that the use of a particular term is an “archaism” one needs a very fine understanding of the language and abundant examples of it. I am not convinced that anyone today can, at least in this instance, say that the term “Karduniaš” was such a term at the relevant periods. How can one be so confident that there may not have been other nuances to at least some of the audience, and to the writer? Oddly, although Landsberger says that the term is an archaism he says that the document is early - it is an archaism that finds its way into the text much later, when it is being edited. One might also have thought that if the writer was trying for an antique effect, he could easily have inserted other archaisms. But Landsberger does not point to any, neither does he attempt to show how such a literary device would have augmented the AKL. To put this another way, one can see how archaisms can be used and elaborated in substantial inscriptions, and their aesthetic effect explains their use. But what is the point of such effects in a list?

Because on the thesis below these references are dated to the reign of Aššur­nasir-pal I, and mindful of the apparently arbitrary nature of the assertion that they are archaisms, it is concluded that they are not archaisms at all.

⁶³ M.-J. Seux Épithètes Royales akkadiennes et sumériennes Paris 1967 p.302
⁶⁴ See “Assyrische Königsliste und ‘Dunkles Zeitalter’” JCS 8 (1954) 31-45, 47-73 and 106-33, p.35
It is pertinent to observe that logically, it is very difficult to sustain the argument that a phrase is an archaism unless one demonstrates the literary effect of it. Otherwise, the argument becomes self-supporting. A scholar argues that a particular text is early: when presented in that text with a term which cannot have been used by writers at the time, it must be tempting to argue that the use of the term in the document can only be an archaism placed there by a later editor.

If the sole condition for identifying a term as an “archaism” is whether the scholar accepts his own arguments, then the procedure is surely subjective. Can there be an objective check upon this procedure? Should scholars not consider the possibility that the term is correct and contemporary? With due respect to Landsberger, it seems that despite having no exemplar of the AKL from within about 700 years of Šamši-Adad I, and without any extant ancient tradition as to who created the AKL, he has already determined that it was created by Šamši-Adad.

Before departing this area, it could be observed that Larsen believes: “... the remark about the kings who lived in tents belongs to the Amorite tradition and has no real significance for the early history of Assur.” However, if we read the list as it is, surely we would understand that it is significant in the history of Aššur. Oates and Lewy draw this conclusion. Oates formulates a theory that nomadic ancestors of the Assyrians may have used Aššur as a seasonal base and cultic centre, eventually becoming entirely sedentary. Lewy concludes that “the tent-dwellers were not successive Assyrian kings but the ancestors of the nomadic tribes which constituted the Assyrian nation”.

At this juncture, the crucial issue is not the soundness of either theory - I consider their accuracy later - but they are noteworthy, as showing that this portion of the list can easily and without contrivance be read as being relevant to the history of the Assyrian “nation”. However, scholars have suggested that just this reading is

65 M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State p.36
66 Oates Studies in the History of Northern Iraq p.24
67 H. Lewy art. cit. pp.743-5
impossible. Could this be an example of the sort of situation where Oppenheim’s reference to “preconceptions” might be heeded? If so, it is also an example of a situation whereby the international body of scholars can correct each other’s preconceptions.

Before moving on, I set out the early passages of the AKL. It opens without any preface, with the name of the first king, Tudiya, but the numeration beside the names is provided for reference. The enumeration is not found in the AKL, although each name is given in the order in which it is found in the AKL (thus numbers 17 to 26 are in reverse order):

1. Țudiya
2. Adamu
3. Yağı
4. Kidamu
5. Ḫarḫaru
6. Mandaru
7. Imsu
8. Ḫarsu
9. Didanu
10. Ḥanu
11. Zuabu
12. Nuabu
13. Abazu
14. Belu
15. Azarah
16. Ušpia
17. Apiasha

PAB 17 LUGAL MEŠ-a-ni a-ši-bu-ti kúl-ta-ri
[Total: 17 kings who dwelt in tents.]
25. Ilu-kabkabi son of Yazkur-ihu
24. Yazkur-ihu son of Yakmeni
23. Yakmeni son of Yakmesi
22. Yakmesi son of Ilu-mer
21. Ilu-mer son of Ḥayanu
20. Ḥayanu son of Samanu
19. Samanu son of Ḥale
18. Ḥale son of Apiāšal
17. Apiāšal son of Ušpiā

PAB 10 LUGAL.MEŠ-a-ni ša-AD.MEŠ.šu -nu? -ni
[Total: 10 kings whose fathers (are known?)]

27. Sulili son of Aminu
28. Kikkia
29. Akia
30. Puzur-Âššur
31. Šallim-Âḫḫē
32. Ilu-šuma

PAB 6 LUGAL.MEŠ-a-ni ... SIG4 šā li-ma-a-ni-šū-nu la-u-ṭu-ni
[Total: 6 kings ... bricks, whose eponymies are destroyed(?)]

One should note that of the kings in tents, numbers 16 and 17 are “Ušpiā” and “Apiāšal” who are clearly mentioned again in the next section. There, “Apiāšal son of Ušpiā” appears as the tenth king in that section rather than - as might have been expected - the first of the kings. The ninth king in this part is “Ḥale”, Apiāšal’s son, and so on (in reverse order) up to king 26, “Aminu son of Ilu-kabkabi”.

The twenty-seventh king is given as Sulili, the son of Aminu. This must be the Aminu named in the section before. The six early kings who follow are not shown as being the son or father of anyone at all. The AKL then gives the name
of six kings, whom we call the “Old Assyrian kings”. The first of these, Erišu, is shown as the son of the last of the six early kings (Ilu-šumma). Erišu’s successors are his son, Ikunu; then Ikunu’s son, Sargon; Sargon’s son Puzur-Âššur; Puzur-Âššur’s son Naram-Sin, and then his son, another Erišu.

The fact that there are clearly different sections here, proceeding in two differing chronological orders - although each procedure is entirely logical - shows that source documents are being retained in their original form during the process of collation.

Then comes the passage dealing with Šamši-Adad. Combining material from different exemplars, this reads:68

[1 dŠam-ši- dIM DUMU 1 DINGIR-kab-ka-bi] [in tar-ṣi 1 Na-ram- dSin]
[a-na kurKar-du-ni-âš DU-ik ina lim-me 1 Iib-ni-diM] [1 dŠam-ši- dIM TA kurKar-du-ni-âš e-la-a]
uru.BAL.MEŠ iṣ-bat 3 MU.MEŠ i-na uru.BAL.MEŠ
lu ú-ši-ib ina lim-me 1 A-ta-mar-15
1 dŠam-ši- dIM TA uru.BAL.MEŠ *e-la-a
1 E-ri-šu DUMU 1 Na-ram- dSin
ina GIŠ.GU.ZA ú*-šat-bi GIŠ.GU.ZA iṣ-bat
33 MU.MEŠ LUGAL-ta DÚ-uš.

I translate this as:

“[Šamši-Adad, the son of I lu-kabkabi, at the time of Naram-Sin, went to Babylon. In the limmu- year of I bni-Adad, Šamši-Adad rose up from Babylon] and seized Ekallatum. For three years, indeed, he dwelt in Ekallatum. In the limmu-year of Atamat-Ištar, Šamši-Adad rose up from Ekallatum, and from the

---

68 I.J. Gelb “Two Assyrian King Lists” JNES 13 (1954) 209-30, p.213
throne, he deposed Erišu, the son of Naram-Sin. The throne he seized. 33 years he wielded the kingship”.

The text at this point follows the poetic pattern of Mesopotamian literature, that is, each line consists of “two half-verses separated by a caesura, which the scribes often carefully indicate by leaving a blank space.” I mention this, as it seems there is an emphasis on the words “lu u-ši-ib” - “indeed, he dwelt”. The use of the particle “lu”, and the deliberate use of poetic form, incline one to conclude that the scribe is asseverating the truth of this statement. Perhaps the period in Ekallatum was unknown, or not widely known, or was disputed.

This, in my view, tells against the opinion of van Seters that these lines concerning Šamši-Adad are “clearly fictional and anachronistic, reflecting a later period when Babylonia was actively meddling in Assyrian affairs.” First, there is a methodological matter - we use ancient materials to learn about the past. One can be too hasty to “correct” ancient texts to accord with our view of history. This is quite analogous to the point which arose when considering Landsberger’s theory that the reference to Karduniaš was an archaism.

With respect to van Seters, there is no discernible reason to declare this pericope a fiction. Perhaps the crucial question is: if this passage which could be fictional is in fact historical, what would it tell us about Assyrian history?

Second, there is no suggestion in the section concerned that Babylon is “meddling” in Assyria’s affairs. Rather, it records only that Šamši-Adad came up from there - the text is entirely silent as to anything else. The “doer”, if you like, is Šamši-Adad himself. No Babylonian is credited with anything, except in so far as we should perhaps understand that the Babylonians allowed Šamši-Adad to stay there. As I shall set out below, the evidence indicates that the Šamši-Adad and the Old Babylonian dynasties were friendly, and - however

---

70 J. van Seters In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History Yale 1983 p.75 939.4/27
distantly-related. Thus the historical fact is that if Šamši-Adad went to Babylon, and there is no reason to doubt that he did, he went as a person who would be harboured.\(^7\) I suspect that the author knew this, but did not think it necessary to state it in such a text.

Third, Ekallatum also plays an important role, and it is placed between the Babylonian incident and the seizure of the throne of Aššur. The pericope no more shows Babylon meddling than it shows Ekallatum doing so. The fineness of detail here strikes me as realistic. While this is subjective, it is a factor which induces belief that the account is more likely to be accurate than not.

These considerations are important, as the effect of vindicating the ancient text is to reinforce for the modern reader that - all things being equal - the word of the scribe has to be given some credit. Although the writer could be emphasizing the matter precisely because it is a fiction, a historian should need some evidence of this, and not just an \textit{a priori} scepticism. Below I shall develop what has been adumbrated above, about why Babylon may have been important to the Assyrians in this context.

\textbf{Bases of the Received Theory: (a) Interpretation}

How then, does the theory that the list legitimises the rule of Šamši-Adad arise? This might follow from the two following matters. First, from a particular interpretation of the text; and second, from the inscription of Puzur-Sin. The interpretation I refer to is, of course, unstated in the text itself. It is based on two fundamental assumptions:

(i) first, that the list of ancestors (kings 17 to 26) is a list of personal ancestors of Šamši-Adad I; and

\(^7\) D. Chapin and J.-M. Durand "Fils de Sim'âl" RA 80 (1986) 141-183, pp.170-171 Hammurapi harboured Ishme-Dagan when he was overthrown.
second, the Ilu-kabkabi named in the AKL as being the father of Šamši-Adad in the pericope which deals with Šamši-Adad, is identical to the king listed as the 25th in the list.

Then, so I think the modern argument really runs, the ancient Assyrian reader would think something along the lines that Ilu-kabkabi having been king before Erišu and his successors, Šamši-Adad was merely regaining his birthright. As Saggs put it, the AKL shows him: "... inheriting an ancestral right to the throne of Assyria, long prior to the supplanted dynasty."

It seems to me that this is a most unlikely interpretation for any reader. If it was the intention of the list’s author that a reader would so conclude, then the author was surprisingly inept. Granted the amount of detail offered about Šamši-Adad, why would the author not have added an extra phrase to explicate this? However, as is suggested below, the mooted interpretation was not the author’s intention at all.

As noted, if the list is to be read as suggested (as a straightforward chronology of successive kings), then it states that Ilu-kabkabi was succeeded by his son Aminu, and he by his son Sulili, who was followed by five kings, and then another six, each of whom is the son of the one who went before. Would anyone readily believe that 12 rulers had held the throne while Šamši-Adad dwelt in Babylon, and then spent three years in Ekallatum? I suspect that even an ancient Mesopotamian would have baulked at being asked to accept that Šamši-Adad I had been preceded on the throne of Aššur by his father, his brother, then his nephew (not that anyone today believes that Sulili was his nephew) and then eleven further monarchs.

If the reader is meant to take the Ilu-kabkabi first mentioned in the AKL as being Šamši-Adad’s father, then the time sequence is obviously absurd. The ancients were not presumptive idiots to a man. There are only two possibilities: either the

72 H.W.F. Saggs The Might that was Assyria London 1984 p.25
73 See Yamada art. cit. p.19
Ilu-kabkab: shown as reigning as a king of Aššur in his own right in this list is not the father of Šamši-Adad, or else the editor did not intend each portion of the list to be read in chronological sequence.74

There seems to be an unspoken assumption that there could only have been one Ilu-kabkabi. Yet, why should this be so? We know, for example, that there was a Hammurapi, king of Kurda who corresponded with the more famous Babylonian king of that name.75 This is probably a more striking coincidence.

There is one other matter which seems to be decisive here: in the extant major Assyrian inscriptions (including here the stamped bricks referred to below), Šamši-Adad does not refer to his father at all. Further, in other inscriptions, also from Aššur, where he does refer to his father, he never names him as having been the ensi of Aššur. If he had been willing to create a deceptive king list, why would he not have named his father as a king when mentioning him here?

This is such an important point that I shall briefly summarize the inscriptions, using the text numbers in RIMA:

1. In Grayson’s anthology, text 1 appears on bricks from the Aššur temple. This is the major inscription from the reign of Šamši-Adad. He refers to several Old Assyrian rulers and names them as such, but does not refer to his father at all.

2. Text 2 hails from Nineveh. Prior to Šamši-Adad’s conquest, Nineveh had been independent; thus I do not consider texts from Nineveh to be “Assyrian” in the sense of being relevant to the image he wished to disseminate in Aššur. The relevant portion is fragmentary, but there is no extant reference to his father.

74 I had already considered this to be a possibility before I became aware of the article by Wu Yuhong and Stephanie Dalley “The Origins of the Manana Dynasty at Kish, and the Assyrian King List” Iraq 52 (1990) 159-165
75 J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period p.210 There was also a Hammurapi in Ugarit: see the index to H. Klengel Syria 3000 to 300 B.C. Berlin 1992 p.250
3. Text 3 is also Ninevite. There is a lacuna where, judging by other texts, he would have been about to mention his father.

4-8. Texts 4 to 7 are from Mari and text 8 is from Terqa. They do not mention his father.

9. Text 9 is found on several stamped bricks from Aššur, and refers to himself as DUMU i-la-ka-ab-ka-bu *simpliciter*.

10. Text 10 is from a seal found on envelopes at Mari and elsewhere. Again, he is the son of Ilu-Kabkabi *simpliciter*.

11-12 Neither of these short texts is from Aššur, and neither mentions his father.

13. This text of uncertain provenance is fragmentary; its attribution to Šamši-Adad is uncertain. Needless to add, it does not mention his father.

2001-23 These twenty three dedicatory inscriptions by servants are short, and do not name his father.\(^{76}\)

Garelli had mused whether there might have been two persons named Ilu-kabkabi, but concluded that the AKL is referring to the same people.\(^{77}\) However, he did not attempt to consistently work out the ramifications of this speculation. In my opinion, the last word has not yet been written about Ilu-kabkabi and his family; and it is difficult to see that there is good reason to positively believe that they were one and the same.

What do we know of Ilu-kabkabi? We do not have independent evidence of any Ilu-kabkabi who ruled Aššur at all - although we do know that the father of Šamši-Adad ruled Ekallatum, and had contracted an alliance with Yaggid-Lim,

\(^{76}\) For all of these texts, see AK Grayson *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions Volume 1* pp.47-76.

\(^{77}\) P. Garelli "Réflexions sur les listes royales assyriennes" in *Miscellanea Babylonica* ed. J.-M. Durand and J.-M. Kupper 91-5, p.91
who probably ruled Suprum and Terqa (but not Mari). For some reason, this alliance faltered, and Ilu-kabkabi destroyed Suprum. The year after this conquest, Šamši-Adad took his father’s throne (we assume that Ilu-kabkabi died), controlling the same territory his father had.⁷⁸

There is evidence that Aminu (the brother of Šamši-Adad) was a ruler. The “Mari Eponym Chronicle”⁷⁹ shows that he may have ruled at the same time as Šamši-Adad, and fought Ipiq-Adad II of Eshnunna.⁸⁰ Aminu is said to reign for 15 years and be succeeded by Ilu-kabkabi. Birot suggests several scenarios: first, there could be two rulers of the name Ilu-kabkabi (meaning - as I surmise - that Aminu was succeeded by one of his sons, whom he had named after his father); second, Ilu-kabkabi could have dethroned his own son; or, third, Ilu-kabkabi could have retaken the throne from him. The material is, unfortunately, inconclusive.⁸¹

It is significant that there is no unequivocal evidence that the Aminu who was the brother of Šamši-Adad, ruled Assyria. There are the two seals of servants referred to in RIMA, but it is not universally agreed that this is the Aminu who was the brother of Šamši-Adad.⁸² Kupper seems to proceed on the basis that the first of these texts (which was the only one known until the second was recently recognized by Dominique Collon) must have been created by a servant of the brother, but he does not seem able to confidently integrate the role of Aminu into Assyrian history.⁸³

So we are left with a situation where there is in fact no evidence that the Aminu honoured on the seals was the brother of Šamši-Adad I. The Mari chronicle does not ever state that Aminu ruled Aššur. Thus, there could have been two persons named Aminu:

⁷⁹ In M. Birot “Les chroniques <assyriennes> de Mari” in MARI IV (1985) 219-42..
⁸¹ M. Birot “Les chroniques <assyriennes> de Mari” in MARI IV (1985) pp.221-224
⁸² M. Birot “Les chroniques <assyriennes> de Mari” in MARI IV (1985) p.221
⁸³ op. cit. pp.211-2
1. Aminu of the seals, who ruled Assur, and for whom there is no direct evidence that he was the brother of Šamši-Adad I; and
2. Aminu of the Mari chronicle, who was the brother of Šamši-Adad, but for whom there is no direct evidence that he ever ruled Assur.

We know little of the family of the mighty monarch who (on Birot's figures) ruled Assur for 33 years as part of an overall reign of 57 years! Significantly, Aminu was never said by Šamši-Adad to have ruled Assur. The royal inscriptions summarized from RIMA above for what they say - and do not say - in respect of Ilu-kabkabi are even blanker for Aminu! Surely this omission is incredible if Aminu had indeed ruled Assur. If Aminu the brother of Šamši-Adad I ever ruled anywhere, we can be fairly sure - in lieu of further evidence - that he did not rule Assur. Likewise, the ruler of Assur in its early days was not the brother of Šamši-Adad I.

It follows then, that if "Aminu of the seals" is not the brother of Šamši-Adad, then we possess independent evidence for the accuracy of the AKL in respect of this most controversial portion. That is, the seals themselves comprise independent evidence that the pericopes of the AKL which mention Aminu are accurate in that there was a ruler of Assur named Aminu. This would be a positive indication that neither his name nor the relevant pericopes had been inserted into Assyrian history for political reasons.

We do not know how the brother of Šamši-Adad I named Aminu met his end, or when, and what tradition made of him (if anything). I have found nothing in the royal correspondence of Mari which refers to him (although he was the uncle of Yasmah-Addu and Išme-Dagan). Letter 3 of book 1, of the Archives Royales de Mari, comprises the famous letter to a god. In that letter, Yasmah-Addu, the son of Šamši-Adad who ruled Mari, wrote that his family were known as a

---

16 M. Birot "Les chroniques <assyriennes> de Mari" in MARI IV (1985) p.224
16 D. Charpin and J.-M. Durand "La Prise du Pouvoir par Zimri-Lim" MARI IV (1985) p.293 part of a much larger article which deals at pp.299-300 with Šamši-Adad.
family which always kept its word, thus keeping its vows to the gods. He asseverates that it was Yaggid-Lim who transgressed against Ilu-kabkabi, and not vice versa. He seems also to mention Šamši-Adad in a similar context. However, there is no (surviving) mention in the letter of anyone named “Aminu”. Had Aminu his uncle been the ruler of Aššur, one would have expected such a reference.

As I mention below, there is evidence for some “name clusters” in Assyrian royal history, where groups of names recur together. Indeed, there is one point where we cannot be sure which Išme-Dagan is being referred to. It does not seem impossible that the father of Šamši-Adad I, when he was given the name “Ilu-kabkabi”, was named after Amorite who had indeed been a ruler of Aššur. Neither would it be wonderful that he should name one of his sons “Aminu”, as had the first ruler of Aššur who was named Ilu-kabkabi.

What flows from this? If the AKL is not in fact referring to the father and brother of Šamši-Adad, and there is no reason to imagine that anyone would have supposed this to be so - especially given the gap of several generations between the relevant persons - then the entire basis for the Landsberger theory attributing the AKL to Šamši-Adad collapses.

If, on the other hand, the list is read as meaning that these kings were important to the history of Aššur, in that their memory is worth preserving, and that they stood in some relation to each other, then the list is not at all absurd. In the ancient Near East, genealogies and lists, notably king lists, were created and maintained against a cultural background. This background gives point to Garelli’s suggestion that Shalmaneser III, in referring to Usipia, Erišu I and Šamši-Adad I, may have been referring to three principal ages of Aššur’s history: tents, Old Assyria and the foundation of an empire.88 This would indicate that

---

87 For one example of the description of the letter as being a letter to a god, see H. Lewy in “The Chronology of the Mari Texts” p.20, in J.-R. Kupper (ed) La Civilisation de Mari 15th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale 1966
later tradition accepted not only the AKL, but a larger, possibly oral, context for it. If so, we have two strands of tradition, of which one - that reduced to writing in the AKL - has left unambiguous evidence of its existence. The currency of the other strand must be inferred. Unfortunately, we know nothing of its extent, if it indeed existed.

Bases of the Received Theory: (b) Puzur-Sîn

The second matter which has buttressed the theory of the “legitimization” of Šamši-Adad, has been the influence of the inscription of Puzur-Sîn. Apart from this inscription, there may be one other surviving reference to Puzur-Sîn, but it is not certain that it concerns the author of the inscription, and besides, the reference is most uninformative.  

Puzur-Sîn refers to himself as ensi of Aššur, and says that he destroyed the evil (lemutu) of Asinum, the offspring of Šamši-Adad, and instituted (what may be) proper rule for Aššur. He boasts of destroying the wall and palace of Šamši-Adad, saying that Šamši-Adad himself had destroyed Assyrian shrines. He refers to Šamši-Adad as a “foreign plague, not of the flesh of the city Ashur”.  

What can be made of this text? That Šamši-Adad was not a native Assyrian, one can easily grant: he only ever claimed to be the ensi and to have governed well. He never presented himself or his family as being native Assyrian. But, I do not think that Puzur-Sîn is referring to race here: I think he is referring to provenance. In this respect, I disagree with Grayson who sees Puzur-Sîn as excoriating Šamši-Adad for being Amorite. Puzur-Sîn criticized the family as not being from Aššur. There is very little evidence of racism at this time in Mesopotamia. Even some of the Ur III derogatory references to Amorites may be criticizing lifestyle and culture rather than race. But that is not directly my concern here.

90 RIMA vol. 1 pp.77-8
When one considers the Assyrian inscriptions to this time have not had any references which could be construed as racist, then one must, I think, present good reasons to read this inscription in such a manner. A more acceptable interpretation is at hand: Oded’s view of this inscription is that Puzur-Sin made this allegation in order to bolster his own legitimacy. This does more respect to the text as it does not read a modern ideology into a few short lines.

The next point is that we know of no other allegation that Šamši-Adad destroyed anything in Aššur. If he had, one cannot conceive that he would have been lionized by four other kings who took his name. The man who was not accepted as a ruler by later Assyrian tradition, was Puzur-Sin. I note that Puzur-Sin says that he has destroyed a palace and wall which Šamši-Adad built. To destroy such constructions in one’s own city, when there is no suggestion that they were derelict, is most unusual in Mesopotamia.

Monarchs such as Šamši-Adad are forever saying that they tore down those works which were in a state of disrepair. I suspect that this was explicitly expressed just so that one would not be suspected of tearing down perfectly good buildings. Apart from the wantonness of such an action, this desire to express the fact that the buildings were in bad repair may be connected with the royal fear that other rulers will not respect their monuments and replace their inscriptions. These kings were careful of the example they would be seen to set for posterity, and they wanted their successors to treat their works with reverence, so they laid down good precedents in this regard.

Has Puzur-Sin done exactly what he goes on to curse anyone else doing? And is he fabricating a reason for his impiety? That is, does he accuse Šamši-Adad of impiety in order to exculpate himself?

---

91 B. Oded War, Peace and Empire pp.73 and 76
The terms of the inscription appear to be an attempt to turn back the clock on Šamši-Adad’s use of the Babylonian dialect, and to revert to Old Assyrian.\(^2\) Clearly, he is rejecting Šamši-Adad’s innovation. But in the name of what? I suspect that we would be closer to an answer if we knew the identity of the god “Ilula” whose gate Puzur-Sin so honours. However, searches of Tallqvist and the \( RLA \) proved to be fruitless in this regard.

This inscription is eloquent also for what it does not say. Note that he does not say that he defeated the Šamši-Adad dynasty in battle, or that he is a warrior. Unlike the earlier native kings, he does not say that he has encouraged trade. Puzur-Sin does not say very much about what he actually did: and this is part of our problem. The Puzur-Sin text provides too slender a base for any substantial thesis.

All in all, I do not think that this text provides a sound basis for thinking of Šamši-Adad as an Amorite usurper. He was, however, a conqueror; and if the later Assyrian tradition is any guide - and one could find none better - he was respected as such. I think that the respect he showed the city of Aššur earned him - that (I refer elsewhere to his attitude to Aššur).

As against this, one must acknowledge the force of the argument that he was accepted by the tradition despite being an usurper, because of his achievements.\(^3\) There are two difficulties with this way of thinking, however: first, the view that Šamši-Adad was an usurper does not explain why Puzur-Sin was not accepted by the tradition. Second, it seems to be an archaism to use the term “usurper” and to assume it had all of the connotations in Assyria which it has for us today.

\(^2\) \( RIMA \) vol. 1 p.77
\(^3\) Thus Oded op. cit. p.81
Is the AKL relevant to the history of Old Assyria?

If the prevailing view is correct, it is surely odd that the list commences with those men who were not kings of the city Aššur. If one accepts the “legitimization” hypothesis, there is this mild paradox: it is a distortion of the emphasis of the list to say that it joins the history of Šamši-Adad I to that of Aššur; it would appear to do the opposite. That is, it would link the history of Aššur to that of Šamši-Adad. Is it really plausible that the Assyrian scribes maintained a list which fused their Assyrian history into second place behind an “alien” Amorite history?

Yuhong and Dalley have shown that in the early second millennium BC, and among the Amorites themselves, the term LUGAL did not necessarily refer to a ruler who had exclusive rights over one area - indeed, two “kings” could recognise each other’s rights “even in the same city”.

While Yuhong and Dalley’s other examples are unexceptional, I do not think it sound to offer, as they do, Šamši-Adad and Yasmah-Addu as an instance of two kings ruling at the same time in the same kingdom, recognizing each other’s jurisdiction. Throughout the surviving correspondence Šamši-Adad clearly orders his son, not only in military matters, but also in lesser affairs. The tone is peremptory throughout.

But even if the tone is a subjective matter, the contents of the letters shows Šamši-Adad’s control and suzerainty. For example, in letter 8 of ARM I, Šamši-Adad orders Yasmah-Addu to kill the sons of Wilanum who were at his court, not to allow any vigil, praise or bereavement for them, and tells him what to do with various other persons. Surely, to order a person to commit an assassination is to assume a very significant control over him. In letter 9 of volume 2, Šamši-

---

Adad orders Yasmah-Addu to leave at liberty the unemployed persons sent to him by his brother Išme-Dagan.66

However, this matter aside, Yuhong and Dalley conclude that: "If it is possible for a district to have two kings at one time, the one ruling the settled, urban population and the other the peripheral nomadic encampments, it becomes possible to apply to the Assyrian king list the same criteria as are now well established for the Sumerian king list, namely that parallel dynasties are represented as successive." Now, if this was indeed the case, what role did these other kings have - who were the nomads or semi-nomads over whom they ruled? We do not know of any Assyrian nomads, but we do know of the merchant colonies: the kārum and wabārtum, and it appears that their members led "an itinerant existence", being caravanners.99 I note that Lewy thinks it could be significant that there was a town quite close to Aššur named "Amurrum" from which the caravans for Asia Minor assembled." However, in this context, it might only be a reference to direction or geography.

Were the Assyrians related, perhaps closely related, to the Amorites (or some part of them)? Hallo says that the language and culture of the Old Assyrians show not only "strong links to Old Akkadian traditions", but also "a sizeable admixture of Amorite elements."100

Van Driel notes that in the temple of Aššur there was a chapel which was shared by Enlil and Dagan, and that Aššur would “visit” Dagan there101 (i.e. his statute would be taken there in procession). This could be significant, as a term for priest, kumrum, related to an Aramaic word, passed into Old Assyrian, indicating

66 Archives Royales de Mari (ed.) Andre Parrot and Georges Dossin, volume 2 “Lettres Diverses de Mari” Paris 1950 pp.30-31
68 The latest study is that of Larsen op. cit. My quotation is from Louis L. Orlin Assyrian Colonies in Cappadocia 1970 Paris p.29
69 Lewy in CAH VII p.721. I could find no reference at all to Amurrum in Larsen’s monograph.
100 W. W. Hallo “Assyrian Historiography Revisited” Eretz-Israel 14 (1978) 1-7, p.3 citing J. Lewy “Amurrumica” HUCA 32 (1961) 31-74; a work which I have not yet had the chance to read.
101 op. cit. pp.40-1 and 43
- I would think fairly persuasively - that cults had also entered Aššur from a West Semitic provenance.\footnote{Lewy op. cit. p.719. The CAD gives *kumru* as "priest" and notes that it was found only in Old Assyrian, Mari and Middle Assyrian. It does not give any derivation for it.}

I concede that there is no direct evidence that the rulers in tents are indeed relevant to the history of early Aššur. Yet, the idea is offered as a plausible possibility which would make sense of the evidence without doing violence to it. The effect of bold unwarranted conjecture may be that we over-rate our knowledge, and build ever more on unstable foundations, while unwittingly passing by some interesting, unexplored questions. On the other hand, the penalty for not speculating at all is that we just as surely close ourselves off from considering the material under a fresh light. Bare possibilities can be inspiring.

To summarize, I suggest that the AKL is not so propagandist as supposed in its early portions, and thus is useful for a history of early Aššur. This does not say anything about its intended use, and of course proceeds on the basis that it cannot be read chronologically throughout. I note, later, that some of the very earliest monarchs named in the list: Kikkia and Ušpia, were accepted by the tradition.

One of the main theories of the purpose of the AKL is that it was used for a liturgical purpose, as it seems the Genealogy of the Hammurapi dynasty ("GHD") was.\footnote{See W.G. Lambert "Another Look at Hammurabi’s Ancestors" *JCS* 22 (1968) 1-2, dealt with below.} I shall deal below with the GHD, and this theory. However, it does suggest a very important matter - the theories about the propagandistic use of the AKL assume that it had an audience who were amenable to that type of propaganda. Further, they must have been susceptible to it by reason of ignorance of history, and they must have been amenable to it by reason of interest.

Neither assumption is justified by any evidence. The question of the audience for monumental works of art has been raised, but not, so far as I can see, definitively
The point which has hopefully been reached is one where the prevailing theory of the purpose of the AKL is at least in question. This leaves us untrammeled by unnecessary preconceptions. Once it is demonstrated that there is no real evidence for the creation of the AKL by Šamši-Adad, the questions will arise - when and why was the list created?

However, before we reach that juncture, it is necessary to consider one prior matter. The whole thrust of this thesis is that Šamši-Adad I did not create the AKL to justify his position as an Amorite usurper.

Is it significant that Šamši-Adad I was an Amorite? What do we know of these people, and does what we know shed any light upon him and his possible motives? The question of the Amorites and the related issue of the nature of nomadism in the Mari period is a large one. But it is a necessary consideration, and I shall attempt to set out a bare sketch of the state of Amorite studies, and to restrict the discussion to the directly relevant issues.

---

Amorites and Nomadism

An examination of the Amorites at the time of Šamši-Adad is useful in making explicable the events which lead to the creation of his empire, the background against which he exercised kingship and the manner in which he did so. This Amorite setting serves to support the proffered view of his kingship: that is, an expression of an original ruler, using available models in an intelligent and selective way appropriate to his position and his empire. As an Amorite sheikh who founded an empire, preceding even Hammurapi, he was in a novel situation.

Šamši-Adad welded together an ideology of kingship which corresponded to his position, and served his purpose of presenting himself to the diverse parts of his empire, I would say, honourably and practically. The practicality of the solution he found is shown in his arrangement of himself as overall ruler in Šubat-Enlil (and king of Ekallatum) with his sons in two regional capitals; thus uniting a general and a particular approach to ruling his massive domains.¹⁰⁵

It is argued that Šamši-Adad presented an “honourable” ideology, because he did not resort to the vilification of his opponents, whether active or vanquished. Further, the word “honourable” has a special significance here, for it serves to distinguish the present theory from the received one that the “Amorite usurper” created the AKL for political reasons, and without regard to historical truth.

Studies of the Amorites such as Clay’s Empire of the Amorites (published in 1919) and Buccellati’s Amorites of the Ur III Period (1966) have, to a significant extent, set the terms within which the questions of whether the Amorites were partly or entirely nomadic during their history are discussed. Then, within this conceptual tradition, but with the benefit of the Mari tablets, followed J.-R.

¹⁰⁵ It would be easy to say that the “solution” did not outlive him, and hence depended upon his prodigious talents and energies. But we do not really know what troubles his sons faced, and thus we cannot really judge the soundness of the arrangements.
Kupper's *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari.*\(^{106}\) This material has been the subject of a good deal of comment and further research. The next major monographs are J.T. Luke's *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period,\(^{107}\)* V.H. Mathews' *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom (ca.1830-1760BC),\(^{108}\)* and Moshe Anbar's *Les Tribus amurrites de Mari.*\(^{109}\)

However, as we shall see in due course, the Ebla archives are starting to yield documents which supplement and alter the picture which has hitherto emerged. This does not apply to the Amorite language: apparently there is very little in the Ebla archives to assist in that regard.\(^{110}\) But major articles by Buccellati utilizing the Ebla archives to revise earlier Amorite research must be considered.\(^{111}\)

In our period, the study of nomadism cannot be separated from that of the Amorites. Both of these subjects are related to Šamši-Adad, for his family belonged to one of the Hanaean Amorite tribes.\(^{112}\) However, which Amorite tribe he may have belonged to is not, perhaps, so important as the fact that he was an Amorite. As Luke has noted, “In attempting to define the ancient ‘tribe’, it should be remembered that tribal systems are a means of identification and organization which functioned in the absence, for one or more reasons, of urban political identification and organization.”\(^{113}\) Further, the Mari documents do not themselves refer to “tribes”: this is a modern construct used to interpret the material.\(^{114}\)

As Mathews observes: “The picture which seems to emerge from the texts is one in which several different pastoral options are used or adopted by the Mari tribes.

---

106 J.-R. Kupper *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari* Paris 1957
108 Victor H. Mathews *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom (ca.1830-1760BC)* Ann Arbor 1977
109 M. Anbar *Les tribus amurrites de Mari* Freiberg 1991
112 Charpin and Durand “Fils de Sim'al” *RA* 80 (1986) 141-83, the earlier view is found in Kupper op. cit. pp.54-5.
113 J.T. Luke *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period* p.37
Because of this, it is not possible to place them into standardized divisions or categories. Members of the same tribe may be transhumants, semi-nomads, or fully sedentarized agriculturalists. The methods employed by individual groups in order to best exploit the natural resources of their area are the only criterion upon which they can be categorized. Nomadism serves as merely one of the adaptive tools upon which their economic success and cultural crystallization is based.”

The Amorite language was never, so far as we know, written, except as attested in names. Gelb’s study considered proper names and the few available names of geographical locations and divinities. Buccellati considered, I think rightly, that it was necessary to restrict oneself to those names which are given for persons qualified in texts as being MAR.TU. He, of course, had only Ur III within his purview. However, his views coincide with the broader study of Anbar, and the upshot is that an analysis of these names shows that Amorite is a north-west Semitic dialect.

When they appear in the Mari archive, the Amorites were treated as being differentiated into various tribes, of which the chief were the Hanaeans and the Benjamites. One must also mention another group: the Sutum. Those tribes and groups within the tribes were then organized in ways which are not entirely clear. However, since Mathews’ study it is clear that we should not assume that the tribes were internally homogenous.

---

115 Victor H. Mathews *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom* p.31
117 M. Ankar *Les Tribus amurrrites* p.9; and G. Buccellati *The Amorites of the Ur III Period* Naples 1966 pp.6-12. See also the notes in Giorgio Buccellati “Ebla and the Amorites” in *Eblaitica* 3 (1992) pp.96-97. Gelb and assistants note that there could in fact be more linguistic variety than we know of in the language called “Amorite” *op. cit.* p.2
118 I am not at all certain that the Sutum are Amorites. I note that Luke does not actually state that they are. Kupper certainly considers them as “nomads”.
119 Victor H. Mathews *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom* p.31, and his notes on tribal fluidity at p.176
Many Hanaeans seem to have been settled around the epicentre of Mari itself. They had various roles: the role for which they were remembered in later centuries was as soldiers (mercenaries, indifferent to who their employer was), see in this respect figure in letter 37, volume 1, from Šamši-Adad to Yasmah-Addu where I understand him to be referring to "all the Hanaean soldiers", rather than saying that "all Hanaeans are soldiers". Comparing the Israelite situation, and analyzing the Akkadian terms, Malamat concludes that their armies were organized along "gentilic principles". Kupper had independently reached a similar conclusion, at least for those stationed at Mari and Suprum. The military unit is referred to as a gayum, but unfortunately we know little of their military methods or their armour. They would be assigned lands, and this assignation was linked to the ritual purification or tēbibtum of the troops upon their enlistment.

When they are first evidenced, some of the Hanaeans comprised a sedentary population, holding lands along the middle Euphrates river side: this is said by Kupper to be a stage through which they, or a portion of them, passed after having entered the territories they came to hold. Kupper sees their mobility as being the reason for the wide distribution in historical times. Charpin and Durand see the family of Šamši-Adad as having made a similar transition several generations earlier, settling at Ekallatum. We appear to see such a state of transition taking place before our eyes in letter 6 of volume 1. There, Yasmah-Addu has asked his father whether to allow the Hanaeans of the steppe to keep

---

120 In this respect, Luke agrees with Kupper. Luke describes the Hanaeans as living in villages "... located in the very heart of the territory controlled by Mari ... they were a central population group of the kingdom." J.T. Luke *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period* p.245
121 Kupper *Les Nomades* pp.21 and 45.
122 ARM vol. 1 pp.84-87.
123 See also Kupper *Les Nomades* pp.1 and 11.
125 This term is problematical and may have had several uses, perhaps developed metaphorically. Mathews concludes that the most common usage is to refer to a section of a tribe: Victor H. Mathews *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom* p.97
126 Kupper *Les Nomades* pp.15 and 23.
128 Kupper *Les Nomades* p.1 and 11-12.
129 Charpin and Durand "Fils de Sim’al" RA 80 (1986) p.168
130 ARM pp.30-35.
the territory which they are appropriating along the banks of the Euphrates. His father tells him to let them keep what they have, but in future to only allow lands which have become vacant to them, and to safeguard the river banks against destruction: there, I think, referring to over-grazing. It would be a mistake to assume that the entire Amorite people went through some such transition. There is no proof of this. Besides, there is no reason to believe that this appropriation of land would lead to the sedentarization of the Hanaeans.

Kupper concludes that the Hanaeans were more settled than the Benjamites. Luke, on the other hand, sees this very view as being a function of Kupper’s acceptance of the paradigm that nomadic tribes gradually settled down: he sees “no essential difference between the village-pastoral culture of the Hanaeans and the (Benjamites...)”. In reply, Luke proposes that both opinions may in a way be true: that the Hanaeans were settled (along the Euphrates from Mari to Terqa) but also that they “seasonally migrated to pastures along the Habur to its northern reaches.”

Over all, it seems that when they appear in the Mari archives, the Hanaeans are widely spread, and perhaps the largest of the Amorite tribes or confederacies. They had certain political structures, but were ultimately subordinate to the king of Mari.

Harking back to an earlier period, there is reason to speculate that the Amorites owed their influence in Mesopotamia at the end of Ur III to their organization as mercenaries. This is perhaps even applicable to the Amorites of the Mari archives. Mathews says that: “One final category of economic activity engaged in by the pastoral nomads of the Mari kingdom to obtain food and manufactured goods from the sedentary community was raiding. The origins of this practice go

---

131 Kupper Les Nomades p.55
132 J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period p.141 (see also pp.139-40)
133 J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period pp.142-60
back to the need for constant regimentation of defences against predators by the pastoral nomadic peoples. This tended to develop within them an inherent militaristic quality. They would eventually have developed a skilled and well-equipped mobile military force as just another tool for the survival of the herding group. Still another result of this training would have been their achievement of military superiority over their settled neighbours.\textsuperscript{136}

Further, it has been noted in a later period that the tribes could become dangerous when they formed an alliance with another power.\textsuperscript{137} The Hanaeans, too, were known to provide mercenaries,\textsuperscript{138} and were always a volatile element in any equation: thus Ibal-El writes a self-congratulatory letter to King Zimri-Lim, saying that the Hanaeans have been satisfied, and a satisfied people is not warlike.\textsuperscript{139} After the death of Šamši-Adad they continued to occupy the thoughts of Išme-Daššu and Yasmah-Addu.\textsuperscript{140} Mathews refers to the nomadic “patent dislike of civil control”.\textsuperscript{141}

The Benjamites were also partly sedentary, and worked the fields between Mari, Terqa and Sagaratum along the Euphrates. They were also known on the western edges of the Syrian steppe and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{142} They, like the Hanaeans were known to live in towns: although pace Kupper, it begs some important questions to say that they were becoming sedentarized.\textsuperscript{143} The extent to which they were sedentary was probably understated by Kupper, but we are unsure of exactly in what their town life consisted. We know, for example, that they would frequently take their flocks to pasture lands.\textsuperscript{144} Anbar - amongst many others -

\textsuperscript{136} Victor H. Mathews \textit{Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom} p.162
\textsuperscript{138} J.T. Luke \textit{Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period} p.162
\textsuperscript{139} ARM vol. 2, letter 37 pp.82-3.
\textsuperscript{140} see ARM vcl. 1, letter 134 pp.214-5.
\textsuperscript{141} Victor H. Mathews \textit{Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom} p.42
\textsuperscript{142} ARM vol. 2, letter 37 pp.82-3.
\textsuperscript{143} see ARM vcl. 1, letter 134 pp.214-5.
\textsuperscript{144} J.T. Luke \textit{Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period} pp.71-5, and on the nature of their activities, at pp.75-9.
notes that a Hebrew tribe was similarly named. They were widely spread along the Euphrates, but were not solely riparian, and the term “Benjamite” may refer to a sort of “confederation” of tribes, with however, a political coherence sufficient for the ancient sources to speak of the “kings” (šarrānu). As Luke concludes, “... the (Benjamite) tribes were in one sense political entities”.

It was once thought that they had associates who were not Benjamites, but were referred to as their “brothers”, such as the Rabbu, referred to by Šamši-Adad in letter 6 ARM volume 1. However, it is tolerably clear on the basis of some otherwise unpublished material that the Rabbu were one of the tribes in this confederation, the others including the Ammanum, Ubrabum, Iahrurum and Iarihum.

There is reason to think that the tribal Amorites’ relations with the urban population of Mari were relatively benign while Šamši-Adad reigned, but turned sour during the tenure of Zimri-Lim. Why this should be is unclear. Could this be an indirect testimonial to Šamši-Adad’s ability as a ruler? Luke believes that Zimri-Lim could have annihilated them, but wanted, rather, to “subdue them in such a manner that he could utilize their resources.” This, of course, would prevent them forming alliances with his foes. Mathews is fairly consistent on this point: he sees Šamši-Adad as having had a wiser, more tolerant and more successful policy for the Amorite tribes than Zimri-Lim. Mathews is especially critical of Zimri-Lim’s technique of limiting the access of the tribes to their gods (meaning the statues of the gods).

145 M. Anbar Les Tribus amurrites p.10
146 J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period p.64
147 J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period p.83. For further details of the nature of the kingship, and their political organization, see pp.80-5 and 86-90.
148 Kupper op. cit. pp.47-53
150 Kupper op. cit. pp.63-7
153 Victor H. Mathews Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom pp.86-9 and 234-5
The third major putative "nomadic" tribe with a role in the history of Mari and its environs was the Sutum who, on at least one occasion, caused concern to Šamši-Adad. They were once thought to be entirely nomadic, but this view is only partially true. They are attested in Mesopotamia over lengthy periods, and seem to have lived along the Euphrates, south of Mari, but moved westward into the Syrian steppe to winter their flocks. As well, they - or parts of their tribe - had various other occupations such as mercenaries and couriers.

There are several live issues in respect of the Amorites, not all of which have been settled. For example, on what is probably now the mainstream view, Kupper mistook the "seasonal transhumance of sheep herding villagers" for nomadism. As an indication of the growing sophistication with which scholars are approaching the question of nomadism, Rowton has proposed an analysis of "dimorphic structure" ("enclosed nomadism") which would allow for considerable differentiation between various "nomadic" cultures. The term "dimorphic" refers here to the two forms of life: tribal and town. "Town" is not used to distinguish a settlement from a smaller village. For Rowton, all nomadism in the Mari texts is semi-nomadism. The "nomads" are in the settled zone itself as the steppe cuts directly into the areas settled on the Euphrates in Syria and Upper Mesopotamia. He identifies six "basic categories" of dimorphic society:

1. fully settled tribes retaining tribal institutions and traditions;
2. semi-nomadic: reverting to nomadism for several months each year;
3. a tribe, part of which is nomadic, the other part settled;
4. a region where tribe and town are distinct but interact;

---

154 See the fragmentary letter in ARM vol. 1, 100
155 Kupper op. cit. p.72
157 M. Anbar Les Tribus amurrites p.14
159 As also for Luke.
160 For further material on the inter-dependence of nomadic and settled communities, and reflections in literature and law, see J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period pp.24-32.
5. a village paying tax to a town and to a tribe; and
6. a socially uprooted band, whether uprooted from town or tribe.¹⁶¹

We do not know which type would have applied to the Amorites of Ekallatum, except, of course, that it will have not been either 5 or 6. Unfortunately, Rowton is only able to pose questions at this point, not to propound the significance of dimorphism in Mari or any other Amorite area. Later research, utilizing Rowton’s ideas, has concluded that in Mari and its environs, there was very little land available for irrigated farming. However, the resourceful peasants learnt to tap the artesian water beneath the steppes, providing them with sufficient water to utilize the steppes for their herds. Thus, the rural peasants became rather free of urban control. As Buccellati quips, instead of “sedentarization of the nomads”, we are faced with a “nomadization of the peasants”.¹⁶² This quip takes its point from the now discredited view that “nomadism must precede sedentarization”.¹⁶³

It is these independent pastoralists who, in Buccellati’s assessment, founded the “so-called Amorite dynasties”. This must be taken as referring to the Amorite dynasties of Babylon and the areas west and north of it e.g. Ekallatum. The Amorites, then, had an “independent base for economic growth”,¹⁶⁴ but, I think, a limited base. The area occupied by these “nomadizing peasants” becomes Khana.¹⁶⁵ This area is, nonetheless, under the control of Mari.¹⁶⁶

Now, pace Buccellati, his paper seems to me to be at its weakest when describing how the Amorites came to actually establish their dynasties. Noting the Amorite expansion at the end of the third and start of the second millennia, he says that:

¹⁶² Giorgio Buccellati “Ebla and the Amorites” in Eblaitica 3 (1992) 87 and n.8 recognizing his indebtedness to Rowton. Of course, in the quote “nomadization” should not be understood as thorough nomadization.
¹⁶⁴ Giorgio Buccellati “Ebla and the Amorites” in Eblaitica 3 (1992) p.94. For references to other literature or “the high antiquity and considerable importance of the agricultural village in the early history of the Near East...” see J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period p.23.
“This ties in well with the notion proposed above about a spread of the agro-pastoralists ... from the Middle Euphrates to the neighbouring regions, as a result of the process of nomadization and crystallization of ethnic consciousness.”

This thesis of the spread of these people also accords with Luke’s conclusion that “Early Mesopotamian culture evolved toward the steppe and the desert, not out of the desert to the sown.” But what, exactly, if we accept Buccellati’s view, would be the role of “crystallization of ethnic consciousness” in the stated process? How would nomadization facilitate the Amorite ascendancy? I suggest that something additional is needed to account for how the early Amorites came to migrate as they did and acquire such influence rather than becoming marginalized outsiders. I would like to adopt the thesis that the answer must be looked for in the later history of the Amorites as soldiers.

Let us recall that on Buccellati’s hypothesis the Amorites are pastoralists, utilizing well water. Later, they are occupied in a variety of callings: as pastoralists, mercenaries, traders, craftsmen and so on. What has happened in between? There is no direct evidence, to my knowledge. Mathews believes that as flocks grew, they would have started to move their flocks at opportune times of the year, thus introducing transhumance.

But does not explain how Amorite dynasties were established in Mesopotamia. As Weeks has noted, the Old Babylonian Amorites seem not to have left traces of gradual settlement and assimilation, as did the Aramaeans. They seem, too, to have been relatively few in numbers, for they adopted the Akkadian language, leaving little influence upon that tongue and culture. How did such people assimilate so quickly, taking political power? According to Weeks’ theory:

“Perhaps ‘mercenary’ is not the best term for this phenomenon. While some were employed as mercenaries, others operated in a more

---

169 Victor H. Mathews Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom p.33
The crucial point is that their essential characteristic was military organization and expertise. It is that expertise that explains political success with relatively small numbers.\textsuperscript{170}

The genealogy of the Hammurapi dynasty gives some support to this notion, as it speaks of the eras of two groups of soldiers and then one era of invaders: Amorite, Hanaean and Guti, respectively.\textsuperscript{171} Thus, it seems to me to be implying that not all Amorites and Hanaeans were invaders, but all Guti were; yet, they were such effective invaders that it speaks of an era (BAL) of them. On this view, one would need to be careful not to confuse the way of life of the Hanaeans and Benjamites with the related peoples who moved east earlier, bringing a high degree of military organization. One could speculate that it was precisely because of this military expertise that the armed force preceded the agropastoralists.

Mathews’ views on how and why the pastoralists would develop a military superiority over the townspeople have already been quoted above.\textsuperscript{172}

The questions for this paper are, what is the significance of the Amorites for the history of Aššur, and what effect did the Amorite tribes have upon the kingship of Šamši-Adad? Did his Amorite background lead him to utilize propaganda in order to reconcile Aššur to his rule?

The first point to note is how Weeks makes sense of Šamši-Adad’s rise to power. The lines in the AKL are quite terse. How could an exile in Babylonia recover power so quickly, and then after three years take Aššur? There are many possible scenarios, for example, he may have had the backing of a powerful faction within Ekallatum, which launched a coup on his behalf. But in lieu of any evidence, the explanation that as an Amorite sheikh - head of a small but expert group of

\textsuperscript{170} N.K. Weeks art. cit. p.50.
\textsuperscript{171} See the discussion in N.K. Weeks art. cit. 50-1. I must note that Charpin and Durand have suggested that it is not the “armies” of the Amorites and Hanaeans, but their “peoples” who are mentioned in this text: Charpin and Durand “Fils de Sim’al” RA 80 (1986) p.166
\textsuperscript{172} Victor H. Mathews Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom p.162
warriors - he could “come up from Babylon” and retake his native town, consolidate his position and take town after town is quite plausible, and nicely fills a gap in the evidence.

As Weeks argues: “(an) alternative (thesis) is that he was the leader of a military band which sold its services where it could and seized power for itself where it could. ... (This) thesis can (not) be proved from the records at our disposal. It does seem, however, given the lack of evidence for any extensive tribe accompanying him, and given the range and speed of his movements and conquests, that the military band is the more natural explanation.”

Further, letter 5 in volume 1 of *ARI* would indicate that - at least in the period of his empire - he relied upon mercenaries. The text is not unequivocal, but the release of troops referred to, together with the need to maintain a careful watch on them, is suggestive.

Relevant to both this issue and the “legitimation theory” is the fact that in his extant writings, Šamši-Adad says nothing which would give credence to the view that he was a prince in exile who had reclaimed his birthright. This silence is consistent with the practical attitude of a raider: he takes what he can, and what he can’t, he doesn’t take. Of course, this is not evidence: but the silence does seem to indicate an attitude, and that attitude is an consistent with what we do know.

Weeks marshals some other arguments which add to the likelihood that his thesis is correct: however, they take us from our immediate concerns, and so I will simply refer to the article where they can be found.

Having made a general submission about the Amorite background of Šamši-Adad, it falls to briefly consider the events which led up to his conquest of Mari.

---

173 N.K. Weeks *art. cit.* p.51
174 pp.28-31
175 N.K. Weeks *art. cit.* pp.51-57
Anbar has proposed the following chronology for Mari: the ancient kings ruled from about 2700 - 2300BC, followed by the governors 2280 or 2195 to 1806/5BC; then Yahdun-Lim 1806/5-1796/5; Sumu-Yamam 1795/4-1793/2; Yasmah-Addu 1793/2 - 1776/5; and Zimri-Lim 1775/4 - 1761/0.

Yaggid-Lim probably ruled Suprum and Terqa, but not Mari itself, although his son Yahdun-Lim ruled it. The conquest of Mari by Yahdun-Lim marks the introduction of writing in the Babylonian dialect in Mari, and the appearance of the component Ya- in Amorite names. Yahdun-Lim had had an alliance with the Ilu-kabkabi who was king of Ekallatum and the father of Šamši-Adad. The alliance was broken, and Ilu-kabkabi destroyed Suprum. The year after this, Šamši-Adad took his father’s throne, and controlled the same territory.

Yahdun-Lim may have originally had an alliance with Šamši-Adad, and visited him in Ekallatum, but even if this was so, he broke with Šamši-Adad, set fire to the harvest in land under Šamši-Adad’s rule, and may have inflicted a defeat upon him. However, it was Šamši-Adad who won the larger war. Yahdun-Lim’s son, Sumu-Yamam, was initially a vassal of Šamši-Adad; but he rebelled. His revolution ended when he was himself killed by his servants. Šamši-Adad took Mari, and as is well known, installed his son Yasmah-Addu as ruler. Some of Mari’s treasure was moved to Aššur by the victorious Šamši-Adad.

It has been noted that Šamši-Adad attributes his conquest of Mari and the Euphrates banks to the favour of the god Itûr-Mêr, and not Aššur. That is, it is the very god of Mari whom he represents as giving him the suzerainty of his lands. This does not seem exceptional to me.

177 M. Anbar Les Tribus amurrites p.37
178 J.T. Luke Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period p.189-90, with a brief discussion of the little that known of the transition from Yahdun-Lim’s reign to that of Yasmah-Addu.
Šamši-Adad’s conquest of Mari is mentioned in an inscription from that city: “When Itúr-Mér, my lord, gave me without reserve the land of Mari and the Euphrates bank to possess and govern”. Another inscription notes that he installed Yasmah-Addu (although part of it is missing) as ruler in Mari.\(^{181}\)

It is a trite observation that the land is the god’s. It seems that Šamši-Adad is invoking the god most appropriate to the conquered people: that is, he does not, as happened in later cultures, impose an alien view. He is no theocrat. Šamši-Adad could accept the devotions of his territories: it is administration and his own regal position - not religion or cult - which he uses to assimilate different peoples. Perhaps his epithet of the one who united (or “pacified”) the land between the rivers serves something of this purpose. I return to this when I consider his royal ideology.

Šamši-Adad always remained involved in the affairs of Mari: but it could well be that he was dragged into them rather more than he would have liked. Sumu-epuh, king of Halab, raided the territory of Ishi-Addu, who asked for Šamši-Adad’s help. Šamši-Adad replied that he was busy with other matters (probably a campaign in the Diyala region), but would help within a month or two. We do not know whether the help was sent or not - but there is extant a letter complaining that it has not come, while another letter refers to the return of an army from Qatanum. Šamši-Adad did, however, join a coalition with Haššum, Ursum and Karkamiš against Sumu-epuh.

Šamši-Adad, either solo or in partnership with Daduša, later conquered Arraphum, crossed the (lower) Zab and raided Qabra, destroying its harvest. He then conquered the towns of Urbel, leaving Qabra isolated until he conquered it a month later. It is believed that this could have been a joint expedition because Daduša also claimed to have conquered the towns of Urbel and Qabra, granting Qabra to “Šamši-Adad, king of Ekallatum”. Šamši-Adad probably attacked

\(^{181}\) M. Anbat *Les Tribus amurrites* p.44
Nurrugum just after this. In the years dated 1779/8 and 1776/5, by Anbar, Šamši-Adad again visited Mari.¹⁸²

Anbar concludes that "The kingdom of Šamši-Adad was a large centralised kingdom, based on three centres: Shubat-Enlil (Tell Leilan), the seat of the "great king"; Ekallatum (a day's march north of Aššur) the seat of Ishme-Dagan and Mari, the seat of Yasmah-Addu. This structure manifested itself clearly in Šamši-Adad's titulary "Prince of Mari, king of Ekallatum, governor of Shubat-Enlil."

This clearly represents the system of rule he instigated to correspond with his situation: he was emperor of an unprecedented empire, having carried his arms and set up an inscription even on the shores of the Mediterranean, in the Lebanon.¹⁸⁴ No Amorite had ever been in his position.

This chapter concludes, then, that the Amorites were variously nomadic, sedentary and to be found in all manner of dimorphic relations with the cities. To describe Šamši-Adad I as an "Amorite usurper" is not actually very informative, as the Amorites were such a diverse group. More importantly, there is no evidence at all that he saw himself this way. The inscription of Puzur-Sîn is interesting for the clues it gives us about Puzur-Sîn. It is of no value for the self-consciousness of Šamši-Adad, and even that does not castigate him upon the basis of being an Amorite.

In other words, when we examine the notion of the Amorite invaders raiding from their desert lands, conquering towns and seeking legitimation, it turns out that we are dealing with modern constructs, not ancient facts.

I turn at this point to consider when the AKL was compiled.

¹⁸² M. Anbar *Les Tribus amurrrites* pp.47-51.
¹⁸³ This is a title which Šamši-Adad took.
¹⁸⁴ *RIMA* vol. 1, text 1, page 50, lines 73ff.
When was the AKL compiled?

First, a historiographic point: the AKL refers *inter alia* to events most of which long antedated the creation of the known exemplars of the AKL. Further, the text does not explicitly state what materials it uses. It seems to me that one should resist the temptation to conclude on purely internal grounds that the original of the AKL should be dated substantially prior to the earliest exemplar. As stated above, this principle is applicable as we lack direct evidence for the development of the AKL.

This is not trite: thus Yamada states that although Lambert has shown that the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I may provide a *terminus ad quem* for the AKL (which, incidentally, is not accepted in this thesis) this "does not prove anything about the date of the original composition".\(^{185}\) Strictly speaking it would not *prove* anything except that this is the latest possible date for the AKL if one accepts Lambert's argument, as Yamada does. However, one might query whether the AKL should be dated substantially earlier without good reason. Such a consideration might be a reminder to deliberate upon all the possibilities. It is just here that the date of the earliest exemplar could serve as a valuable brake on overly confident historians.

Another trap is the question of motives: although motives are a part of history, one can too easily move from assigning motive to attributing authorship of any act which would have effectuated such a motive. It is safer to attribute responsibility for various acts or works, and then to induce motive from those actions.

For example, despite his insightful reservations, Yamada buttresses the Landsberger theory that the AKL was intended to legitimize Šamši-Adad I by

---

arguing that he and his son, Isme-Dagan had the motive to create such a list.\textsuperscript{186} While motive is important, when it appears by itself does it really provide a convincing argument? We know too little of the use of the AKL and of Assyrian history to speculate about motive (without more evidence). Who is to say that Belu-bani or some other almost invisible monarch did not have the motive to create the AKL?

There is always a danger that one will too readily find a “motive” and then use that to argue that because someone would have wanted to do something, then they did it. Also, if the presence of motive proved anything, every phenomenon would have an almost infinite number of authors.

Yamada makes a very good point when he observes that Sulili is said to be the son of Aminu, and that “the chronographer of Šamši-Adad’s family is too near the fact to deliberately give such wrong information.”\textsuperscript{187} However, rather than conclude that the compiler might have lived long after Šamši-Adad, he infers that this detail of filiation was “probably added in a later redaction in which the redactor attempted to understand the list as chronologically straightforward.”\textsuperscript{188}

Thus, Yamada speculates and accepts as fact that the ancient scribe erred, and recommends discounting the stated filiation of Sulili to “correct” the error. To sustain the Šamši-Adad I thesis, it was necessary to invent a correction for which there is no evidence whatsoever.

But, if this was so, why did the editor not add filiations for Sulili’s successors or for the kings in tents? The preferable thesis is the one which most respects the evidence, while being internally consistent and logical. One might almost say that the more simple a thesis, the more attractive it will be. Similarly, I have

\textsuperscript{186} \textit{art. cit.} 11-38 p.15
\textsuperscript{187} \textit{art. cit.} p.19 We are not sure that Sulili was not the son of Aminu - the evidence is non-existent. Yamada’s view depends upon the belief that this Aminu was the brother of Šamši-Adad I and that someone is attempting to forge an unhistorical link between the Amorite and the Assyrian kings.
\textsuperscript{188} \textit{art. cit. loc. cit.}
noted above how, to support his own thesis, van Seters says that the comments about Šamši-Adad I must have been fictional.

This suggests another idea which might be proposed as a principle of historiography. That is, if one offers a motive for editorial alteration with a text, one should assume that the motive will be consistently applied. To elaborate, as this is an important point, it has been said that an ancient scribe may have added the filiation of Sulili because he wanted to express an understanding that the AKL was "chronologically straightforward". However, in that case, the theory should point to a thorough working out of this principle. Otherwise, the penalty is credibility. In considering Yamada's view that the scribe added the detail of filiation to the name Sulili to express his (mis)understanding, one may ask why the scribe did not do similarly for each of the kings without filiation?

It is hard to think of a reason for such a haphazard procedure. Rather, the fact that of the six kings, the father of one only (Sulili) is named, suggests that the other relevant names were not known to the compiler of the AKL.

Yamada is also sceptical that Išme-Dagan ruled for 40 years as stated in the AKL, and concludes that this must have been written long after his reign, although after the surrounding portions of the list were written.189 Pace Yamada, this conclusion seems is arguably artificial. Why would a portion be inserted thus into the middle of a text to give a length for a reign?

Yamada also notes the errors in the AKL in the filiation of Aššur-narari II (the son of Aššur-rabi I not of Enlil-nasir II as stated in the AKL)190 and of Aššur-rēm-nišešu (the son of Aššur-narari II not of Aššur-bel-nišešu).191 Again, he states that the list must have (at least for this portion) been composed long afterwards, and that it could not be due to a scribal error as "there is no similarity phonetic or graphic, between the erroneous and correct names".192

189 art cit. pp.22-3
190 Yamada art. cit. 31 also RIMA vol. 1, per the inscription of Aššur-rēm-nišešu, p.101
191 Yamada art. cit. 31 also RIMA vol. 1, loc. cit.
192 Of course, this encourages me in my view that the AKL was created after all of these kings.
These rulers, Aššur-narari II and Aššur-rem-nišešu, were - so far as we know - minor rulers of the Assyrian dark ages. Yamada is surely correct to see an error rather than a deliberate misstatement here. But is there any need to conclude that there was a time gap between the writing of the preceding portions and this one? The occasion of this speculation is the circumstance that Yamada is already committed to the standard opinion that Šamši-Adad I created the AKL.

By contrast, the alternative view has the attraction of simplicity: when Aššur-nasir-pal I caused the AKL to be written, it was partly out of concern for the poor state of Assyrian records. The deficiencies of those records were even then apparent in three areas: antique history, the time immediately after Išme-Dagan I, and the generations immediately before Aššur-uballit I.

Yamada explains away the philological evidence that the AKL was created in the Middle Assyrian period by the hypothesis that "the original composition of Šamši-Adad I's family was later affected orthographically, linguistically and phraseologically." It is a further attraction of the alternative theory that one does not have to assume a later re-construction of the entire text in the (later) Middle Assyrian dialect, or to postulate several later redactions, as Yamada does.

Developing these ideas in a related direction, should a scholar not be particularly loathe to redate a text on internal grounds, and then speculate that a proposed amendment is plausible because the scribe did not know what he was copying? Someone copying a text soon after the creation of the original will generally be well placed to understand the meaning of the original and its context. We know that the scribes of the neo-Assyrian empire could on occasions annotate their tablets "ul idt" i.e. "I didn't know (what it meant)", or refer to a break in the tablet they were copying. Are we not more susceptible to misreading a sign than the contemporary scribe was? This point has been made before: for example, Nicola Vulpe cites Cyrus Gordon to the effect that the ancient epic

---

193 *art cit.* p.21
writers and compilers were "no less intelligent than we".\textsuperscript{105} This historiographic point, (i.e. principled reluctance to rewrite texts) is, of course, only an abstract, \textit{a priori} guide, and is liable to be discounted in an individual case.

However, the principle is particularly apt in respect of the literature concerning the AKL. For example, Lambert developed an interesting theory to the effect that Tukulti-Ninurta I had available to him an earlier edition of the AKL, and that the earlier edition differed slightly from the one we know. Lambert says that the AKL has 78 names, unless one follows Gelb, in his edition of the AKL, and takes the two references to Apiāšal as being references to the same person. He argues that the AKL available to us, must have one name more than that version available to Tukulti-Ninurta, and implies that the Assyrians would have read the two references to Apiāšal as references to two different persons.

In support of this reading, Lambert says that: "it is an assumption that such a critical approach was used in the thirteenth century BC. ... Further, with the modern critical approach to the early parts of the AKL the whole idea of numbering the rulers becomes futile."\textsuperscript{106} Before considering Lambert's solution, I pause to note that the simplest solution is Gelb's: count the two persons names Apiāšal as being one and the same.

Now, Lambert's suggestion for the "missing name" is that names 7 and 8, Imsu and Harsu, should only be one name, but they are shown as two, because the scribe did not realise that Harsu was a corrupt reading of Imsu. It is difficult not to be critical here - this "correction" was first proposed by J. Finkelstein,\textsuperscript{107} who thought that the scribe had confused the two signs IM and HAR.

Finkelstein thought that Nam-zu-ú was the "corresponding" entry in the GHD to the names Imsu and Harsu in the AKL (Finkelstein aligned the GHD alongside

\textsuperscript{105} N. Vulpe "Irony and Unity in the Gilgamesh Epic" \textit{JNES} 53 (1994) 275-283, p.275

\textsuperscript{106} W.G. Lambert "Tukulti-Ninurta I and the Assyrian King List" \textit{Iraq} 38 (1976) 85-94 p.88. Of course, I do not accept that the AKL was available to Tukulti-Ninurta I: but I would obviously concede that the materials which were used to compile it were.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{JCS} 20 (1966) 99
the AKL). As Im-su and HAR-su in the AKL were on one line, he argued that the GHD name “Namhu” (found on the very next line of the GHD) must have been a variation of the name Numhia/Numhu(m). That name is for some reason written as “Namhu” in the GHD, but Finkelstein argued that a “Vorlage” of the “prototype AKL” text must have preserved the more usual form of the name. Presumably the “more usual form” he refers to is “Numhia”/”Numhu”, but as we do not have any “Vorlage”, we shall never know.

In order to explain why the AKL, as preserved, gives the form Nuabu (see name 12 on page 34 above), Finkelstein suggests that the scribe of the AKL must have begun to write *Nu-um-hu-u, but his eye wandered back to the name he had just written, Zu-a-bu, thus he “dittographed” -a-bu in error after the Nu- and so made an error which was perpetuated by the AKL ever after.198 With respect to Finkelstein, the very convolution of such a re-creation, postulating errors in the copying of both the AKL and the GHD, tells against it.

While one could justifiably be sceptical of such arguments, it is a piece of evidence, and not a theory which renders the theory utterly untenable. Although fragment BM128059 of the AKL was published six years before his own article appeared, Lambert does not refer to it, citing only Finkelstein on this point. Millard reads two names here: Ah?-hi-su and Har-su. As he notes, this may “strengthen the case for scribal confusion”, but, first, it shows that they almost certainly were not the same name, and second, it makes the proposition that Nuabu is a corruption from Namzu or *Nu-um-hu-u (even) less likely.199

In other words, the AKL does not appear to need re-writing at this point. It is odd that “the modern critical approach” could serve to dissuade Lambert from the obvious - that the ancients were quite capable of an intelligent approach to their material. That they did not have the “modern critical” approach to documents does not mean that they would accept any illogicality. To say that Tukulti-Ninurta must have had the AKL available because he knew how many kings had

198 loc. cit.
preceded him is to turn one’s palm towards Ockham’s razor. At the highest, Lambert is in a position to show that the materials used to compile the AKL were available to Tukulti-Ninurta I. The re-writing of the AKL Lambert undertook was unnecessary.

This methodological discussion only suggests rules of thumb; but it must be useful at least to articulate a systematic approach to these historiographical questions. This approach will also apply to texts like the AKL. If one posits that the original text is between 700 and 800 years earlier than the oldest surviving text, there is a substantial onus to shift to allocate such an early date.

Now, there may be a *terminus ante quem*. The text refers to Babylon as “Karduniaš”, a pointer to the Middle Assyrian period. One would be fairly justified in assuming that the author of the text lived in that period, although it is possible that a copyist (himself universally followed from then on), wrote “Karduniaš”, updating the material before him. At the moment, the given *terminus post quem* is the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. This is accepted by the most recent serious study of the AKL. These views are not based upon any direct evidence, and are premised upon the creation of the early list by Šamši-Adad I.

The burden of this thesis is that the list was probably first compiled during the rule of Aššur-nasir-pal I, son of Šamši-Adad IV. The fact that his father was named Šamši-Adad is an important clue. Šamši-Adad IV saw himself as being like the first king of that name in some respects at least: and what would be more striking a similarity than that of having come up from Babylon and taken the throne of Aššur? Šamši-Adad IV is the last of the kings for whom there is a note which refers to his Babylonian connection.

---

200 see J.A. Brinkman in E. Ebeling et al. *Reallexicon der Assyriologie* volume 5 p.423
201 J. van Seters *In Search of History* pp.75-76
Yamada proposes a thesis which would - if correct - prove that the AKL was created by Šamši-Adad I. Yamada criticizes Landsberger’s rationale, and offers a view which needs a little space to do it justice. The thesis is that the ideological basis of Šamši-Adad’s rule was so complex that “it does not seem implausible that Šamši-Adad I attempted to place the Amorite descent of his own family and the local king list of the city of Assur together in a single composition ...” In support of this thesis, he cites the following considerations:

(a) Aššur, being a sacred city, would have been important to him;
(b) this is borne out by his frequent self-description as ÉNSI Aššur;
(c) in an inscription from Aššur he calls it “my city” four times; and
(d) at one time, Aššur comprised all of Išme-Dagan’s former kingdom.

Thus, Yamada concludes, both Šamši-Adad and Išme-Dagan had a motive to create the AKL. However, to describe Aššur as a sacred city at this point is, on analysis, meaningless. Yamada offers no evidence for this view. That hypothesis has been expressed in other places, chiefly by Lambert, who after noting that it appears as if the god Aššur was the deified city itself, says: “we suggest that it (i.e. the city Aššur) was a holy spot in prehistoric times. It was probably settled because of its strategic site, and the inhabitants, we suggest, exploited the holiness of their place by converting ‘the mountain’ into a city, both practically by building and ideologically, and by changing the numen loci into a deus persona.”

Larsen is unwilling to accept this theory of how the deification of the city may have come about. He prefers to state that “the basic insight that can be gained ... is that in the Old Assyrian texts the concepts [sc. of god and city] merged, for the city was the god and vice versa.” It is not necessary to enter into the controversy on this point, because one may doubt that Lambert’s thesis, even if accepted, will support Yamada’s proposition.

---
206 Larsen op.cit. pp.II5-7, quoting p.117
First, the theory is explicitly put forward as an unsupported one, and that type of hypothesis, although interesting in itself, is not a solid basis for another otherwise unsupported theory. Second, the holiness of the city would operate upon every king of Aššur - and the question is why Yamada believes Šamši-Adad and not some other monarch to have created the list.

Third, the issue is whether Šamši-Adad believed Aššur to be sacred - and I am unaware of any material which deals with this question either way.

One could wonder, too, how much weight one can place upon his inscriptions from Aššur itself, without comparing them to inscriptions from other places. In this respect, there is the accident of discovery to consider. As I shall show below, Aššur is important, but not overly so, in his inscriptions from other places.

As for Išme-Dagan, if Aššur was important to him, how does the AKL manifest that importance? Doubtless a kingdom - or a substantial town within it - must be important to any king. Perhaps its importance would fluctuate over time.

On the basis of these considerations, any king of Aššur had a motive to create the list. If one wishes to show that the house of Šamši-Adad created the list, one needs specific evidence relating to that king (or those kings) to the exclusion of all others. This is not to say that the early material which is incorporated in the list did not enter the tradition of Aššur at the time of Šamši-Adad. It may well have, but evidence for this has not survived.

Therefore, Yamada's thesis must be rejected, as the reasons given for it are inconclusive. They would show that any king of Aššur had a motive to create it. Further, I argue that the list as we have it today cannot be a document which is based upon a shorter original created by Šamši-Adad I. The most telling reasons are that not only does it make no attempt to legitimize his seizure of the throne, it makes no attempt to disguise the seizure! The second of the more persuasive reasons is that, as we have seen, the list often refers to Babylon. In fact, Babylon
is the most important place to the author other than Aššur. Now, that city was important to Šamši-Adad, as he had lived there, and probably had been harboured there. But it must have been important, too, to the following kings: Ninurta-apil-ekur, Mutakkil-Nusku and Šamši-Adad IV.

I suspect that all of the AKL references to Babylon (Karduniaš) were created at the same time. If not, why is no other town mentioned? Why would scribes updating a list refer only to Babylon, not once, but three times, after the rule of Tukulti-Ninurta I, if it had been created in his time?207 Prior to Tukulti-Ninurta I, Karduniaš is mentioned but once - and that in regard to Šamši-Adad I - hardly an iron precedent, obliging all scribes to unthinkingly imitate it.

Such is the nature of the references to Babylon, and their peculiarity in a list otherwise short of commentary, that one can only imagine that the interest in Babylon was the concern of a single author.

It has been previously noted that the entry for Šamši-Adad IV is the last one with information beyond simply the royal name, father and reigning years.208 The present proposal has the advantage of providing some reason for this: the additional material was composed to further an end of either that king or his son, Aššur-nasir-pal. That end having been met, there was no reason for any other scribe to have continued making such elaborations to the basic material. This is not to say that there was no other motive for writing the list: as stated, I suspect that the information was to be preserved at a time when it was perceived to be in danger of being lost. That information itself could have been valuable for any of a number of reasons: it could have been considered good in itself, it may have been wanted for a mortuary cult, for use in compiling inscriptions, or any combination of these or other circumstances. On the hypothesis posited here, the creation of the AKL was used as the occasion for the insertion of these "public relation" comments.

207 That is, referring to Ninurta-apil-Ekur, Mutakkil-Nusku and Šamši-Adad IV.
208 J.A. Brinkman "The Nassouhi and Assyrian Kinglist Tradition" Or. 42 (1973) 306-319, p.316 n.56
Every theory concerning the AKL, including the instant one, proceeds on the basis that at least one king - the initiator of the list - had a direct input into its writing. If once Šamši-Adad IV or Aššur-nasir-pal had inaugurated it, the list was maintained by temple scribes, then one would not expect that there was any elaboration to the basic details for each king without some direction.

On the other (current) theories, one must assume that there was an additional step: that is, that once it had been created by Šamši-Adad I or whoever, there were three occasions when scribes (either on their own initiative or at directions) decided to add elaborations, and they just happened to add details concerning a king's triumphant return from Babylon.

This is less plausible than the present hypothesis. That is, the AKL must have been created by 912BC (the date of the Aššur A exemplar), and for the reasons I give, cannot have been created before the time of Šamši-Adad IV and was most likely created by Aššur-nasir-pal I.
Chapter 5

Šamši-Adad I and the Dynasty of Akkad

How does one prove that Šamši-Adad and his successors were not responsible for the AKL? The most one could do, surely, is make it appear less probable that they created it, and more probable that someone else did. This is the only means by which I can proceed. The last chapter was aimed at the evidence, and the deficiencies in the evidence, for the thesis that the list was the product of Šamši-Adad. This chapter really continues that argument, but from a slightly different perspective: it focuses upon the man himself, and asks whether there is anything in what we know of him which bears upon the probabilities of authorship.

In an important article, Maurice Birot published the hitherto unknown Mari text 12803: a document which apparently comprises something of a liturgical calendar, but of which only the first part (related to the kispum ceremony) exists in more than fragments. Line 2 of column 1 specifically refers to the offering of kispum. It then goes on to speak of the sacrifice in the throne room of a sheep to the lamassātum of Sargon and Naram-Sin of Akkad. Neither name is preceded by the divine determinative. It says that after the offering to Šamaš, the kispum will be offered to Sargon and Naram-Sin; and then, perhaps as a postlude to the actual rite, to the Hanaean yaradu (Birot is unsure of the meaning of this term) and to the members of the Numha tribe.

Now, the text can be dated to the time of Šamši-Adad I, because it refers to the ceremony taking place in the month of Addar - a time period peculiar to Šamši-

---

209 M. Birot "Fragment de Rituels de Mari Relatif au Kispum" Death in Mesopotamia ed. B. Alster; pp.133-150 (this volume comprises papers read at the 26th RAI).
210 Šamaš, like his Ugaritic counterpart Šapšu, is associated with the underworld. There is evidence that Šapšu was essential to the Ugaritic equivalent of the kispum. See J.F. Healey "The Sun Deity and the Underworld: Mesopotamia and Ugarit" in Death in Mesopotamia ed. B. Alster pp.239-42. As well, Šamaš’s role in these ceremonies is noted by Birot art. cit. p.146.
Adad’s calendar.\textsuperscript{211} It is also identified with him by reason of a somewhat unique orthography for the sign ID.\textsuperscript{212}

We cannot be certain of the exact role of the Akkadian kings in the ceremony, but it is an indication of their importance to Šamši-Adad and his dynasty at Mari. One of the successors of Šamši-Adad who was not represented in the AKL was named Rimuš,\textsuperscript{213} showing the reverence of Šamši-Adad and his house towards the Sargonids. Birot notes some other matters, which by themselves probably count for little.\textsuperscript{214}

He properly concludes that Šamši-Adad - who called himself šar kiššati - saw himself as having a role of “world” importance. However, Birot draws back in a footnote, from disagreeing with Landsberger's interpretation of the AKL. He says that Šamši-Adad made use of a double patronage according to his circumstances and place.\textsuperscript{215} That is, as I understand it, that when in Aššur, Šamši-Adad would not allege links of whatever nature to the Akkad dynasty, as in Aššur, he wished to describe himself as being totally “Assyrian”, and to express such links would detract from this aim.

But why would he propagate a link with the Akkadians when he is dealing with Mari, and not do likewise with Aššur? If the principle of double patronage militated against claiming bonds with the Akkadians when he was in Aššur, why would it not so operate in Mari? The Sargon dynasty was clearly important to the Assyrians: two of the Assyrian kings preceding Šamši-Adad bore the names of just the two Akkadian monarchs found in the Mari kispum. Further, the earliest inscriptions known from Aššur are those of Ititi and Azuzu, each of whom bore Akkadian names, the second of whom appears to have been an Akkadian governor.

\textsuperscript{211} Birot art. cit. p.144
\textsuperscript{212} Birot art. cit. p.148
\textsuperscript{213} Shigeo Yamada art. cit. pp.24-5. That these persons succeeded Šamši-Adad on the throne of Aššur is not certain: the important point is that they belonged to his family.
\textsuperscript{214} Birot art. cit. p.148
\textsuperscript{215} Birot art. cit. p.150 n.19
On the whole, then, this excursus confirms the correctness of Hallo’s insight that there is no reason to think that Šamši-Adda needed legitimation and that: “... it is the kings of Akkad from whom, if from anyone, he appears to derive his succession, some of his titles and, so to speak, his legitimacy.”\textsuperscript{216} A recent study by Michalowski on the memory of the Sargonids comes to the conclusion that by claiming “linkage” with Akkad, Šamši-Adda could establish legitimacy.\textsuperscript{217}

We can see a similarity in style and titulature between Šamši-Adda and the Akkad dynasty. Was this similarity necessarily evident to the Assyrians, or was it perhaps simply seen as the accepted style of writing? One is reminded of Oded’s research, showing a sort of “canonical writing”. As he said of the “canonical” texts in inscriptions giving reasons for going to war: “In many cases, they could have been written by a scribe who had no knowledge of the precise and real reasons for the conflict.”\textsuperscript{218}

It is here that form-criticism could have a role. Is a similarity of style in an inscription really an attempt at linkage? One needs to take the form of the document into account. It seems to me that where a new style is inaugurated, or an earlier style which had passed out of use is revived, then there must be a significance in this. This is precisely what we have seen in the inscriptions of Šamši-Adda I: the use of a new dialect and a new ideology. If his inscriptions are reliable indicators of an individual thrust which he brought to his empire, then his religious rites: rites in which he acted, must be equally if not more so, guides to his ideology.

There can be little serious doubt that in the Mari \textit{kispum} ceremony he intended it to be understood that he embodied, in some way, a living link with the glories of the Sargonids. This argument is further strengthened in the text cited by Michalowski, where Šamši-Adda does, after all, refer to Manishtusu, son of Sargon.

\textsuperscript{216} W. W. Hallo “Assyrian Historiography Revisited” \textit{Eretz Israel} 14 (1978) 5-6
\textsuperscript{217} Piotr Michalowski “Memory and Deed: The Historiography of the Political Expansion of the Akkad State” in Liverani (ed.) \textit{op. cit.} 69-90, p.86
\textsuperscript{218} \textit{op. cit.} pp.188-9
This raises another interesting question: why did Šamši-Adad, inaugurating his new titulature and style, use the southern dialect? Was it perhaps to introduce an “imperial” style to Aššur?

I am reinforced in my view of the royal ideology of Šamši-Adad when one considers that he seems to have subtly cultivated the memory of the Sargonids as a means of establishing a general cult of kingship, suitable for an empire, a cult which cut across regionalization. He did not have to legitimize his rule of Aššur. What is perhaps more pertinent, he did not see himself as needing to do so.

It seems to me then, that Šamši-Adad created a sort of ideology of empire, using the various cults which he found in the cities and areas he conquered, respecting the acts and buildings of the preceding rulers, in Aššur giving an exalted position to Enlil, using in his inscriptions (where he mentions his role as peace bringer to the land between the rivers) his own dialect throughout his empire, and — again overall — giving honour to the Sargonids, the great emperors before him. To assist him in practically administering his empire, he used two centres of power: Mari and Ekallatum, centres which he co-ordinated from the seat of Enlil.

Might made right: but “might” which — so we are to understand from the inscriptions — would be renewed and sustained because it was employed as the gods directed in peace, war and personal piety.
Chapter Six

The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty

It has been noted that the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty ("the GHD") includes a series of names which appear to be similar to the names of the "kings who lived in tents" of the AKL. That is, there appears to be a resemblance between certain names in the GHD, and those of the putative "ancestors" of Šamši-Adad I in the AKL. The given names in the GHD being those of Amorites, so too, it has been argued, are the "kings who lived in tents" Amorites, and not Assyrians. The theory is that by virtue of being named in the GHD, one can infer that those very kings were revered in Babylon. Thus, says the thesis, the AKL names of kings in tents are indeed the names of Šamši-Adad's ancestors, and must have been placed there to a-historically link him to the legitimate rulers of Aššur.

But does this actually follow? A relatively recent study of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern genealogies, noted that they could be used in various settings: chiefly, domestic (to express kinship), in politics and law (to express the political and legal relationships between groups), and in religion.219 Now these uses are not necessarily mutually exclusive: Wilson notes that the genealogies can seem to conflict, yet each one still be considered "accurate in terms of its function".220

He draws the paradoxical conclusion that although they conflict, each of them actually is accurate when seen from the perspective of their different functions. In terms of the GHD and the AKL, this is an important consideration - if either list was used initially for political purposes, and then for religious ones, perhaps some discrepancies would appear. I shall return to this idea later, as its application becomes apparent when one has considered the GHD itself.

220 R. R. Wilson "Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research" p.182
Lambert has proffered good reasons to see the "Hammurapi Genealogy" as an exorcism, or at least a document for use in an exorcism. The background is the belief that if the dead were not properly buried, they might return as ghosts to trouble the living. To placate them, it was prudent to offer them food and drink. The central concern of the list appears to be with dead rulers and the retainers of the king. They, perhaps, could do the king greater harm than anyone else. This develops in a specific direction Finkelstein's suggestion that it was a memorial for the unknown dead, and a special food distribution to the dead, associated or identical with the kispum ceremony. In what follows, it should be borne in mind that Finkelstein himself presented many of his views as being tentative. However, as always, there is a tendency for unchallenged speculations to become treated as something more concrete than they were intended.

In his article, Finkelstein unfortunately does not mention whether the tablet has holes or is otherwise formed for display and reference. An examination of the photograph is not conclusive, but it appears to me to differ from the AKL in this respect. I do not think that one can conclude anything from this. The obverse of the tablet comprises what "looks like a roster of personal names", each on a separate line: e.g.

1      $A-ra-am-ma-da-ra$
     $Tu-ub-ti-ya-mu-ta$
     $Ya-am-qu-u-z-\text{ha-lam-ma}$
     $He-a-na$
5      $Nam-zu-u$
     $Di-ta-nu$ and so on.

221 W.G. Lambert "Another Look at Hammurabi's Ancestors" JCS 22 (1968) 1-2
223 To return to methodology, Brinkman notes that whereas Poebel had been cautious in his dating of a version of the AKL, "recent commentators have tended to become less reserved in their statements until AsKL has come to be designated simply as the oldest text of the Kinglist": see J.A. Brinkman "The Nassouhi and Assyrian Kinglist Tradition" Or. 42 (1973) 306-319 p.314. Needless to say, Brinkman is dubious about this proposition.
224 Finkelstein art. cit. p.95
There are twenty such names. The reverse opens with the names of the Old Babylonian dynasty kings, the fifth of whom was Hammurapi, hence the title of the list. The last king named is Ammi-ditana. A line is drawn across the tablet at that point, and it then reads:

29 BAL ERIN MAR.[TU]
30 BAL ERIN .{He-a-[na]}
   BAL Gu-ti-um
   BAL ša i-na tup-pi an-ni-i la ša-at-ru
   ū AGA.ÚŠ ša i-na da-an-na-at be-li-šu im-quitu
   DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL
35 DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ LUGAL ...

The other lines are not so tendentious, and can be given in Lambert’s translation: “All humanity, from the east to the west, who have no one to care for them or to call their names”, (continuing per Finkelstein): “come ye, eat this, drink this (and) bless Ammi-saduqa, the son of Ammi-ditana, the king of Babylon.”

Finkelstein notes that there is what he calls a “tick mark” opposite most of the names on the obverse. The mark is not shown against those names on the bottom of the obverse, or at all on the reverse. He thinks that the mark might have been omitted from the bottom of the obverse because there was little space, and from the reverse because the scribe knew those names without any difficulty. This may be so, but, equally, it may not be, and it is not productive - in this case - to speculate. However, Finkelstein proceeds from this point (although his argument could stand without it) to argue that the scribe has conflated two names into one, on three separate occasions, to produce the first three lines. His premises are arguably circular. To suggest some loose “canons”, it is generally unsafe to amend an ancient scribe unless:

(1) one has considered and excluded the possibility of variant readings;
(2) the difficulty cannot simply be a lacuna in our knowledge;

---

225 Finkelstein art. cit. p.95
226 Finkelstein art. cit. p.97
(3) the text is unintelligible without such correction; or
(4) one has reasons extraneous to the text itself to believe that the scribe has erred.

Then, one can more safely proceed as follows:
(5) if the third and fourth grounds are both present, one can be bolder in the suggested "correction". If one ground is absent, then the correction should be the simplest possible.

The first two pointers are required to obviate the risk that in studying ancient history we unwisely confirm our own views, when perhaps we should be reconsidering them. The fourth ground could be satisfied in any number of ways: for example, if other texts gave a different and sensible reading; or if one could show the presence of archaisms. One could invoke this fourth pointer if the error was a very common one, such as miscopying from the line above.

It is trite to say that the chance of error is always present. So, too, is the chance of variation. The present point is that when the chances of variation are reasonable, one should hesitate to say that it was the ancient scribe who did not know the ancient names as well as we did, and then proceed to correct him.

In this regard, one only needs to consider the variations between Old Amorite and Middle Amorite names collected by Buccellati to see this. Buccellati prepared a table which sets out various names with a corresponding one from the other period.

I do not think that they are necessarily meant to be read as renderings of the same name at different times, but as differing names relying upon the same Amorite root. Yet, as will be seen from the examples below, some are clearly the same name with minor variations:227

---

227 Giorgio Buccellati The Amorites of the Ur III Period Naples 1966 pp.230-231
So there is no doubt that there can be variations between names given in different periods. Equally, one cannot doubt but that a scribe could become confused. In his article, Finkelstein proceeds largely upon the basis that one or other of the AKL or GHD scribes must have erred. Thus, he disassembles the first three names of the GHD into six names in order to bring them into line with the names from the AKL. Thus, the line *Ya-am-qu-uz-oa-lam-ma* from the GHD, is seen as a corruption of line 2 of the AKL: *Ya-an-qi Ṣaḥ (sih/suḫ4)-la-mu*. His first reason for this is that the resemblance could not be coincidental, "and there would be every presumption in favour of viewing the two lines as containing the same name or names albeit in somewhat varying forms."228

Having regard to yet another text, he concludes that *A-ra-am-ma-da-ra* must be "a variant rendering of the two AKL names Ḥarḫaru and Mandara." Having concluded that this is so, he then sets out a hypothesis as to how the error was made: the scribe must have used a text which commenced with the words HAR.HAR, and read this according to its Sumerian value of arar.arar, but took it to be the Akkadian word ararru(m), or "miller". This leads to the next suggestion, that the scribe "no longer recognized (the second name on the line) as a separate name", and construed the whole to mean "the miller of Madara".229 Were the text another exemplar of the AKL, this would be reasonable. However, to amend it in order to make it into a parallel of that text is hardly convincing. On that basis, any number of texts could be re-written.

---

228 Finkelstein *art. cit.* p.98
229 Finkelstein *art. cit.* p.98-9
The argument here is that if we are quick to "correct" the text to "explain" it, we limit the field of enquiry, perhaps prematurely. One should probably be slow to conclude that the ancient scribe made some very poor errors which we can safely rectify, at the remove of some few years. Perhaps the scribe was in fact right, and we have more to learn about the Hammurapi dynasty. However, if other tablets are found which militate in favour of Finkelstein's theory, we would then have the extraneous grounds which the principles adumbrated above invite scholars to look for before making "corrections".

Charpin and Durand have considered the material, and offer an entirely different, and, it is suggested, more acceptable reconstruction of the first three lines:

- first, A-ra-am-ma-da-ra;
- second, Tu-ub-ti-ya-mu-ta; and
- third, Ya-am-qu-uz-ḥa-lam-ma.

The first line recalls West Semitic names in -MaDar, and is perhaps a divine name, being the land Aram and the divinised rain, for "maṭara" means "rainy". Charpin and Durand point to names such as Išhi-Matar and Ili-Matar as enhancing the plausibility of the reconstruction. 230

The second and third lines: the auspicious name of the first line is followed by two inauspicious ones: Tubti-Yamuta "my joy is dead" and Yamqut-šum ḪA.LAM.MA = "ruin fell upon him". 231 Each of these names bears a West Semitic element, -yamūta and ya-.

This reading of the three lines is clearly preferable to Finkelstein's as it respects the text, and does not require us to resort to torturous theories to explain what is relatively straightforward.

Perhaps an experienced scholar has an intuition: like the way an antique dealer can tell whether a piece is authentic by just looking at it, but pressed for reasons

---

often finds it hard to say what the reasons are. Then, in attempting to articulate the grounds of a sound intuition, the scholar may lead himself astray. But in fairness one should add that the scholarly culture does not always discourage bold re-writing of ancient documents.

Thus, although I think that Šamši-Adad did have an Amorite heritage, and was not ashamed of it, I suspect that the Amorites were also (and independently of that fact) important in the history of Aššur. That the kings who dwelt in tents have Amorite names is one thing; but they are not the same persons as mentioned in the GHD. I propose that the early portions of the AKL are more historical than thought by scholars, and not placed simply to incorporate Šamši-Adad’s ancestors into Aššur’s past. A consideration of the GHD does not alter the credibility of this thesis. But there are some other, interesting matters related to this.

Material now available from Mari strengthens the conclusion of the common Amorite link and Lambert’s hypothesis concerning the kispu(m) ceremony. In this recently recovered ritual, probably to be dated from the time of Šamši-Adad, the offerings are made to:

(a) Sargon and Naram-Sin;
(b) the Hanaeans “Yaradi” and those from Numha; and
(c) various others.

As Charpin and Durand note, the similarities to the GHD are startling, being the proper names of kings, and then the names of tribes. They suggest, on the basis of this similarity and their reconstruction of tribal politics in Mari and its environs, that the term palû must refer not to “dynasties”, but to the successive groups of people who come in their turn (their emphasis) to take part in the sacrifice.

---

232 See M. Birot “Fragment de Rituel de Mari Relatif au Kispum” Death in Mesopotamia ed. B. Alster, pp.139-150 (this volume comprises papers read at the 26th RAJ)
The differing views as to the *kispu(m)* are outside of the purview of this thesis. But the relationship between the dynasty of Șamši-Adad and the Old Babylonians is important. Even before I became aware of the work of Charpin and Durand, I thought that the relationship between them must have been a friendly one. This view received its initial stimulus from the work of Hildegard Lewy. She noted that Hammurapi expressed a reverence for the gods of Aššur, and rendered homage to the divine lady of Nineveh.

She also noted that Șamši-Adad himself had corresponded with Hammurapi, with the assistance of Yasmah-Aditu; and that Hammurapi had refused to join an alliance with Eshnunna against Șamši-Adad. Lewy concedes that she is on more tenuous ground when she argues that early in Hammurapi's career, Șamši-Adad had taken from Eshnunna, and restored to Hammurapi the towns of Rapipqum and Hit in exchange for Hammurapi's submission to his "overlordship". At some point, he also returned Sippar to Hammurapi.

Thus, she says, between his 4th and 19th years, Hammurapi does not engage in the construction of fortifications - something which was the privilege of an independent ruler. She says that even when he was no longer bound by a treaty, Hammurapi maintained his loyalty to the house of Șamši-Adad, retaking Aššur and Nineveh for Išme-Dagan. Although the argument concerning the lack of fortification building is an argument from silence, the most recent collection of Hammurapi's inscriptions still bears her out.

Since the deciphering of the Mari material, it now becomes possible to speculate that the Șamši-Adad and Hammurapi dynasties had a common origin. That these ties meant something to each of them is perhaps borne out by the fact not only that Șamši-Adad stayed in Babylon (in circumstances of which we are

---

235 H. Lewy "The Historical Background of the Correspondence of Bahdi-Lim" *Or* 25 (1956) 324-352 p.350
238 D. Charpin and J.-M. Durand "Fils de Sim'al" *RA* 80 (1986) 141-183, p.168
largely ignorant) but that Išme-Dagan did so too, with his forces, when he lost his kingdom. Apparently, even the officials of Ekallatum entered the service of Babylon as trusted agents.\(^{239}\) This is one of the matters which Charpin and Durand rely upon to prove the depth of tribal feeling amongst the Amorites of Mesopotamia.

While the real question is how the Amorite dynasty of Ekallatum related to that of Babylon, it is interesting to note that in Isin - more even than in those two places, the Amorites emphasized the Sumerian-Akkadian heritage to which they were heirs.\(^{240}\) Thus, there is nothing intrinsically impossible in the suggestion that an Amorite like Šamši-Adad could turn to the southern tradition when expressing his own royal ideology.

\(^{239}\) D. Charpin and J.-M. Durand “Fils de Sim’âl” RA 80 (1986) 141-183, pp.170-171

\(^{240}\) W.W. Hallo “The Limits of Scepticism” JAGS 110 (1990) 187-99, p.198. There is a question as to the precise degree and nature that the Isin dynasty was “Amorite”. I do not think it appropriate to go into that question here.
Chapter Seven

The Hallo Theory

In 1956, Hallo published an article which, among other matters, suggests a revision of the early parts of the AKL if it is to be read as a historically accurate list of rulers. He states that the names in the first portion of the AKL:

"make a decidedly artificial impression. I would suggest that, like the second group, the first must be reversed to restore the original sequence. We would then obtain three plausible names (one of them attested inscriptionally) for the early Sargonic period, followed by six "rhyming pairs" of names (omitting Iangi and the first reference to Apiašal) of highly unlikely historicity for the later Sargonic and the entire Ur III period."

I will pause here to note that this theory assumes that there was a straightforward chronological sequence for this list. This may not in fact be so, as noted above: among the Amorites, two "kings" could acknowledge each other in the one city.

Hallo presses on to observe that: "it remains to be explained why the "Ahnentafel" of Šamši-Adad stopped, not with Apiašal, the presumed fictitious father of Hale ... but with Ušpia, the father of Apiašal. I would resolve this difficulty by regarding the Apiašal at the end of the first group of kings as a secondary addition, and considering Ušpia, not Apiašal, as the intended common ancestor of the two royal lines." He suggests maintaining Sulili's patronymic (son of Aminu), but moving it to the start of the "Ahnentafel", having first removed six names from the family tree altogether. Interestingly, Hallo does not articulate why names should be removed because they were in rhyming pairs.

242 ibid p.221 n.9
244 Hallo art. cit. loc. cit.
Perhaps to spell out a theory such as “in real life sequential rulers never have rhyming names” would invite scepticism; whereas not to spell it out leaves one thinking in a vague sort of way, “yes, of course”.

Hallo then reconstructs parallel dynasties for Šamši-Adad’s “family tree” and the early Assyrian kings as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ušpia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apiašal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ţale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ţaianu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilu-Mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakmesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakmeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iazkur-lli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilu-Kabkabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulili</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Kikkia        |
| Akia          |
| Puzur-Aššur I |
| Šallim-ahhe   |
| Ilu-šuma      |
| Erišu I       |
| Ikunu         |
| Šarru-kin     |
| Puzur-Aššur II|
| Šamši-Adad    |
| Naram-Sin     |
| Išme-Dagan    |
| Erišu II      |

This, in his view, is attractive as also:

1. harmonizing the number of generations between Šamši-Adad, Naram-Sin and their “common” ancestors;
2. justifying Adad-Nirari’s statement that Ilu-Kabkabi preceded Sulili;
3. placing Ušpia and Kikkia at the beginning of Assyrian history, where as the builder of the walls of Aššur, they belong; and
4. assimilating the independence of Aššur to the beginning of the Old Babylonian period when “numerous other subject cities also gained their independence from the collapsing Ur III empire.”

---

245 Hallo *cit. loc. cit.*
Now, concerning these, I simply fail to see the attraction of the first point. On the contrary, the exercise seems arbitrary and deceptive. We are unsure whether this Naram-Sin was the king of Eshnunna and the conqueror of Aššur. Garelli noted that this is the majority view, but observed that this was odd, for one would expect such an invasion to have been noted in the year names. As well, the coincidence of names may prove, not that the two people were identical, but that the influences in their naming were similar. The Akkadian influence in and around Aššur has already been noted. The evidence for the identification is weak. In particular, no inscription of this king has survived, and there is no explicit statement in the texts that Narḫm-Sin the ruler of Ešnunna was the ensi of Aššur of the same name. I am not aware of any compelling reason to identify the ruler of Aššur named Narḫm-Sin with the king of Ešnunna of the same name.

Whichever way one might view the identity of Naram-Sin in the AKL, what would be the reason to harmonize his ancestors with Šamši-Adad’s? Nothing in the list itself, or in any established fact of history requires it. It is a view which can be supported only if one already accepts that it is the family tree of Šamši-Adad I.

Hallo’s second, third and fourth points do not need any reconstruction to make sense. In fact, they retain their sense if one entertains the theory that Aššur may have been a seasonal base or cultic centre, for the putative nomadic ancestors of the Assyrians, who finally settled there permanently. This theory has been propounded, in some form or other by Oates, Lewy and Garelli.

As against Hallo’s theory, there are some very significant matters. First, it does violence to the AKL by removing half of the names of the first part of the list altogether. Second, it over-rates our knowledge of nomenclature in this period. To say the names “make a decidedly artificial impression” is really to reveal the limits of our knowledge of history. In this respect, Hallo’s theory is like

Finkelstein's "correction" of the Hammurapi genealogy. See the comments above, based upon the article by Charpin and Durand.248

The more straightforward reading of the AKL suggested here respects the text, and avoids reworking, which, with respect to Hallo, could easily strike one as being even more artificial than the untouched text.

This raises another very interesting point: the apparently "knowing" reading of the AKL proposed by Landsberger, has served as the occasion for even more scholastic effort, "correction" and exegesis. Hallo perceived some anomalies; but rather than review the Landsberger thesis, he had to rewrite the initial passage of the AKL.

Then, one later scholar has tried to explain one of the "anomalies" noted by Hallo by suggesting even more re-writing. Wilson argues that although Hallo is correct to include Aminu, Sulili and Išme-Dagan in Šamši-Adad's genealogy, "it is unlikely that these three names were originally part of the genealogy if it was used by Šamši-Adad for political purposes."249 Thus, he contemplates an earlier stage of the genealogy, to which these three names were added.

But what if Šamši-Adad never used it for political purposes? The material reviewed above suggests that he did not. If not, there is no need to rewrite the AKL. Before moving on, it would be prudent to review another well developed theory as to the purpose of the AKL: that of Hildegard Lewy.

249 Robert R. Wilson Genealogy and History in the Biblical World Yale 1977 p.96 n.112
Chapter Eight

Lewy’s Views on the Assyrian King List, Chronology and Related Matters

While Lewy’s views on matters of Assyrian history, generally, are dealt with in the rest of the text together with those of others scholars, I wish to devote some substantial space to a discussion of her views on some matters which directly affect my thesis. This is done partly out of respect for her bold and well-researched theses, which link disparate elements of the topic together in a systematic way. Some important matters came to my attention by considering her arguments, especially where I disagreed with them, because I was led to a close review of my own opinions. However, it is also the fact that the views considered here are individual, and require some space to set them out with any justice. As Lewy provides the most fully argued rationale for the existence of the AKL, it is proper to accord her views this justice.

Lewy was probably trying to find a principle for the reading of history and for the significance of history in ancient Mesopotamia. The chief principle she discerns is that a religious principle is fundamental in Semitic history. Lewy has some other interesting notions which do not directly concern us here.

These views, potentially far reaching, are set out in the Cambridge Ancient History. Lewy’s opinions concerning the AKL itself are founded upon a putative Assyrian belief in “the periodic recurrence of historical events”, giving rise to an interest in chronology deeper than any evidenced by the Babylonians. This

250 Other scholars have commented upon the AKL as being related to the Assyrian “consciousness of history”, e.g. Oppenheim Ancient Mesopotamia pp.144-6. But Lewy is one of the few to ask what the meaning of history itself was to the ancients; another such was E.A. Speiser “Ancient Mesopotamia” in The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East (ed.) Robert C. Denton Yale 1955 pp.37-76
251 op. cit. p.738 “a belief common to the Semitic world ... the common Semitic origin of this belief”.
252 For example, what I suspect is a kind of Marxian colouring, in that she looks to technology to explain the early wealth of Assur op. cit. p.754 “As military might never creates wealth but is rather the consequence of the accumulation of wealth in a country, one must look for a technical discovery having, as so often in history, created the wealth which, in turn, produced the political power of a nation.”
253 op. cit. p.740
belief is said to be underpinned by *astrology*, or perhaps more accurately, by a *world view which includes and gives prominence to what today we would call astrological elements*.  

That view is the following: heavenly events are periodically repeated in that constellations and planets move through various paths time and time again. To the Assyrian mind, because there was "an interconnexion of events on earth and the motion of the stars", earthly events were expected to likewise repeat themselves. However, because the astronomical observations could not be precise, the Assyrians expected this pattern to be executed over a period calculated with reference to numbers with a "magical appeal". I pause in setting forth Lewy's views to note that it is unclear whether she means that this view was explicitly held by the Assyrians, or that although they never articulated it, it can be inferred from what we know of their beliefs. I suspect that we are meant to see in it an implicit belief which she has divined, and is articulating. For convenience, I shall refer to this belief as "the doctrine of cosmic recurrence".

Lewy cites as the earliest practical example of this doctrine, Šamši-Adad I's texts on the occasion of the rebuilding of the Ištar temple at Nineveh. He says there, in her translation, that "7 dāru periods" had elapsed since the end of the Akkad dynasty, which included Maništusu, the temple's builder. This is given by Šamši-Adad I as the time separating the dynasty of Akkad from his own capture of Nurrugu. Lewy says that the length of that period can be calculated from "the practice of later Assyrian kings to reconstruct sacred buildings after 350 years, or a multiple of this number had passed since the previous construction or reconstruction." As an example of this, Lewy offers the text of Tiglath-Pileser (Tukulti-apil-Ešarra) I concerning the Anu-Adad temple at Aššur. According to

---

254 The distinction between "astronomy" and "astrology" was adumbrated by Isidore of Seville, and was explicitly formulated by Hugh of St. Victor. Rupert Gleadow *The Origin of the Zodiac* London 1968 p.53. The distinction was certainly not made in Mesopotamia, see Ulla Koch-Westenholz *Mesopotamian Astrology: An Introduction to Babylonian and Assyrian Celestial Divination* Copenhagen 1995 p.21 and the reasons cited there.

255 *op. cit.* p.740

256 *op. cit.* pp.740-1
her account of matters, Tukulti-apil-Ešarra I in reconstructing the temple, noted that it had fallen into ruin so badly that Aššur-dan, his great-grandfather, had demolished it but not rebuilt as only 641 years had passed since its building. Thus, 700 years (twice 350) had to pass before the rebuilding could be done.\textsuperscript{257}

Lewy then cites two later examples, being Aššurbanipal’s restoration of the Ekhulkhul in Harran 350 years after Shalmaneser had restored it; and Nabonidus’ using a 700 period to establish the period between Hammurapi and Burnaburiash. She then says that if one considers Šamši-Adad’s inscription in view of this material, he thought Maništusu’s temple should be reconstructed, as 350 years had elapsed from the fall of Akkad.\textsuperscript{258} She finds further support for this in the naming of kings, which arguably reflects the doctrine of cosmic recurrence. Lewy argues that other observations of the period of time from the end of Akkad to the then present day had been made, and thus:

(a) Sargon I of Assyria (the fourth predecessor of Šamši-Adad I) took the name Sargon;
(b) his grandson (the second predecessor of Šamši-Adad I) took the name Narām-Sin; and
(c) about this time one Narām-Sin ruled over Ešnunna.

Faced with only two names from the Akkad dynasty appearing, Lewy states that the absence of a “Rimus” and a “Maništusu” after Sargon of Assyria shows “conspicuous familiarity with the tradition according to which both of these kings met a violent death.” She concludes that the bestowing of these names among the Assyrians and in Ešnunna, shows that they expected a new “universal empire like that of the Old Akkadians”.\textsuperscript{259}

To conduct these calculations, the Assyrians made co-ordinated use of the \textit{limum} (or “eponym canon”) and the AKL. Lewy derives the word \textit{limum} from a root meaning “to circle, to encircle”, thus seeing the term as denoting a “cycle”. The

\textsuperscript{257} op. cit. p.741  
\textsuperscript{258} op. cit. p.741  
\textsuperscript{259} op. cit. p.741
canon was "an outgrowth of the habit of the Assyrians of naming the years from an annual official, the *limum*."\(^{260}\) The names and titles of the successive eponyms were each inscribed on a stela, standing by that of the preceding eponym, and all maintained in a large square in the city Aššur. In addition, clay tablets were kept which recorded the name and title of each *limum*, together with the most noteworthy occurrence of their year.\(^{261}\)

While the practice with stelae is attested only from the Middle Assyrian period, Lewy reads the AKL at lines 25-6 of column 1 as necessarily referring to clay eponym lists.\(^{262}\) Thus, she has set the ground for an argument that the Assyrians had recourse to accurate records concerning their past, until those records became illegible.\(^{263}\)

Turning to the AKL itself, Lewy notes that Uṣpi̇a was called a king of Assyria by Shalmaneser I and Esarhaddon, who reconstructed the Aššur temple at Aššur.\(^{264}\) Lewy states that "in accordance with the principles outlined before, each of the two kings secured first the foundation stone of the building deposited by the previous builder in order to make sure that a full cycle of years had passed since a previous reconstruction" and they took "great pains to determine as exactly as possible the intervals between Erišum, the following builder, Šamši-Adad I and themselves ..."\(^{265}\) It is worth observing that there is in fact no evidence that either king acted as supposed, or took any pains whatsoever to calculate any time period. By this point, Lewy is using her thesis to conjecture what would have - or perhaps in her view - what should have happened.

Continuing Lewy’s analysis of the AKL, she notes the impossibility of relying upon any identification between Abazu of the AKL, and Azuzu who was present

\(^{260}\) *op. cit.* p.742

\(^{261}\) *op. cit.* pp.742-3

\(^{262}\) *op. cit.* p.743, where she also notes the various versions of the AKL, and the list synchronizing kings of Assyria from Erišum to Aššurbanipal with kings of Akkad.

\(^{263}\) For notes on the "uses of writing" in ancient Mesopotamia see Oppenheim *Ancient Mesopotamia* pp.230-5

\(^{264}\) *op. cit.* p.744

\(^{265}\) *op. cit.* p.744
in Aššur during the rule of Maništusu. However, from the names of the fifth king Kharkharu, the seventh king Imsu, the ninth king, Didanu, and the tenth king, Khanu, she deduces that "the tent-dwellers were not successive Assyrian kings but the ancestors of the nomadic tribes which constituted the Assyrian nation. They thus closely parallel the twelve sons of Jacob who figure in Jewish tradition as the ancestors of the twelve nomadic tribes of which the Israelite nation was composed." The significance of the name Didanu in the list is that Genesis 25.1-3 says that Dedan, grandson of Abraham, was ancestor of the Ashurim. Thus, the Jewish tradition "obviously" makes him the chieftain of a nomadic tribe which journeyed around with Abraham between Mesopotamia and Egypt.

Khanu is said to be "definitely the tribal ancestor of the Khanians" who are known from the Mari texts. "Kharkharu" is related to Kharkhar, a province of Media, possibly named after a trans-Tigris migration by nomads of whom Kharkhar "may well be" a tribal ancestor. "Imsu" is seen as a variant of the ancient West Semitic personal name "Iamsum" from the Mari texts. The fact that the AKL does not claim a family relationship between these "persons" is taken by Lewy to support her theory that these "names" are not of individual kings, but of legendary tribal ancestors. Taking this as reasonably certain, Lewy views the naming of Ušpia towards the end of this section as being the method used by the original compiler of the list to "indicate that the construction of the Aššur temple at Aššur marked the end of the nomadic period of the Assyrian people...

As for the next section, Lewy draws attention to its similarity to some Old and Middle Assyrian inscriptions (such as one of Aššur-uballit I). She thus concludes that it must have been copied from a royal inscription. That is,

---

266 This point is also made by M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies Copenhagen 1976 pp.37 and 39-40.
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because it is in a style reminiscent of inscriptions, the material must have originally come from an inscription. I do not find this persuasive.

However, Lewy does make a good point in respect of this section: it begins with Aminu, son of Ilu-kabkabi and traces his ancestry for nine generations to Apiashal, son of Ušpia i.e. the last two kings of the “tent-dwellers”. These “kings who were ancestors” cannot have been meant by the compiler of the AKL to be (primarily) the ancestors of Šamši-Adad I, because if that had been the intention, the ancestors could have been placed immediately before Šamši-Adad I, rather than interposed before ten others. Persons using the name Ilu-kabkabi have been not infrequently attested, and so the name need not belong to one individual only. The next section commences with “Sulili son of Aminu”. The list must be trying to say that these kings of the second section were the ancestors of Sulili, and, I would add, the kings who followed him.²²

The aim of Lewy’s analysis here is not to expose any political programme in the AKL, but to understand what it is literally saying. I think that Lewy’s point is well taken. For example, Larsen says: “... it is at any rate very unlikely that the filiation given to Sulili should be correct for Aminu was Šamši-Adad’s elder brother. In this way the usurper’s family is once again linked to the actual succession of rulers of the city.”²²² But if one does not assume that the Aminu referred to is the said brother - and the AKL certainly does not say that he was - then what grounds are we left with to doubt the filiation of Sulili? This underscores the vice of using the “usurpation” theory to effectively rewrite documents in accordance with what we claim to know, when we could so easily read them on their own terms and learn something new about history.

However, if Lewy’s suggestion there seems sound, her next one seems to be rather speculative. Lewy suggests that the ancestors of Sulili are given here to prove his legitimate succession from Ušpia. This was done, in her view, after the Šamši-Adad dynasty (which had displaced his own) was overthrown, and a

²² op. cit. pp. 745-6
²²² M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies Copenhagen 1976 p.38
partisan of the “Sulili-Puzur-Assur” dynasty wished to vindicate that dynasty’s claim.\(^{274}\) There is, of course, no evidence for this, and is, perhaps, discredited by the fundamental thesis set forth here.

Noting that Zariqum and Azuzu are not attested in the AKL, and there are later gaps when Assyria is under foreign domination, Lewy concludes, as does Larsen,\(^{275}\) that the list refers only to independent rulers, or in Lewy’s terms: “comprises only sovereigns who were responsible only to the god Aššur and not to any human being.” She notes that there is a fragmentary text (KAV14)\(^{276}\) which interposes between Ishme-Dagan and Aššur-dugul, the reigns of a son of Ishme-Dagan named Mut-Ashkur, and his son and last member of the Šamši-Adad dynasty, Talmu-Sharri. This last name is apparently a Hurrian one. Using the inscription of Puzur-Sin, with which I deal below, she concludes that the last two rulers of this dynasty were dependent upon Hurrian assistance, and so were rejected by the tradition which maintained the AKL.\(^{277}\)

I will note two important matters here: first, such lacunas, explicable upon the basis given by Lewy, would make the AKL useless for calculating periods of cosmic significance.\(^{278}\) Therefore, she is obliged to argue that there was another, as yet undiscovered, long list, while conceding that at least in the cases of Shalmaneser I and Esarhaddon, the shorter list - the AKL - was preferred.\(^{279}\) Clearly, the other alternative is that the figures given by the Assyrian kings in the texts she cites were not exactly accurate. This could mean either that they did not care and so did not hold a doctrine of cosmic recurrence; or that they thought the calculations were close enough.\(^{280}\)

\(^{274}\) Lewy op. cit. p.746  
\(^{275}\) M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies Copenhagen 1976 pp.39-40.  
\(^{277}\) op. cit. pp 746 and 749.  
\(^{278}\) The AKL also omits Puzur-Sin. This would suggest that he was a vassal of some other ruler, or was, for some unknown reason, omitted. Lewy notes his omission at p.750, but does not speculate on the reason.  
\(^{279}\) op. cit. p.750  
\(^{280}\) There are other possible permutations, e.g. they only counted the reigns of kings whom they accepted. Other rulers literally did not count.
Second, and importantly, is it really correct to say that the AKL rejects those rulers who were not independent? Are Larsen and Lewy (who, as noted, agree on this point), once again attempting to make too much out of the AKL?

Note the way that the AKL describes Aššur-Dugul (ruler 41) and his immediate successors as the "sons of a nobody." Further, it is known that prior to the accession of Aššur-uballit (ruler 73) the Assyrian kings may have been vassals of Mitannian overlords. Indeed, Nineveh may have been a Hurrian possession. Oppenheim states that: "The victory of the Hittite king Šuppiluliuma (c.1380-1340BC) sealed the doom of the Mitanni kingdom of which Assyria seems to have been a vassal for a prolonged period. This victory ... enabled Assyria to become independent ...". Yet, as he notes, the AKL shows that "the Assyrian political tradition was kept alive during this dark period ..."

The only rationale I can see for the omissions of Old Akkadian rulers and the inclusion of Mitannian vassals is not the so-called independence of the rulers but the reliability of the materials. That is, the AKL seems to be trying to preserve fragmentary records for posterity: hence the reference to the lost records and erasures. The compiler of the AKL did not (on the present thesis) know of, or have any information concerning Ititi, Azuzu, Zarriqum, Mut-Ashkur and Talmu-Sharri which he considered reliable. He must, however, have had information about the others which he had confidence in.

The same reason must apply to the puzzling omission of Puzur-Sin, an omission which no stated theory can justify. The only attempt to explain it, to the best of my knowledge, is the one which Larsen adapts from Landsberger. That is, that Puzur-Sin represented a revolt by the "old strong families of the city" but the revolution may not have been "effective" as Šamši-Adad's name became popular as a throne-name, and succumbing to the "influence of the short Šamši-Adad

281 Rulers 41 to 47; Adasi is number 47.
282 C.J. Gadd in CAH vol.2.2 Chapter 18 "Assyria and Babylon c.1370-1300BC", pp.22-3
283 Oppenheim Ancient Mesopotamia p.165.
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dynasty”, Puzur-Sin has thus been omitted from the AKL. As Larsen notes in a foot-note, so were the last members of the Šamši-Adad line. But if Šamši-Adad was so popular, why were members of his dynasty omitted? The only agent I can think of so impartial to the dynasty and its stated opponents is ignorance. That is, this was a “dark age” not only to us but also to the Assyrians of later times themselves.

This, of course, is more consistent with my theory of the creation of the AKL by Aššur-nasir-pal I than it is with the “Šamši-Adad I” theory, because if successors of Šamši-Adad I were so compliant as to retain a fictional genealogy, how does one explain their discrimination when it comes to two members of his own dynasty? Also, it is a difficulty for the Šamši-Adad I thesis of the AKL that if the list was created in the time of Šamši-Adad, one must assume that the AKL was preserved exactly as it was, but not updated: and that must be an unlikely scenario.

Further, there is an inconsistency in arguing that the AKL includes only “independent sovereigns of Aššur” and also arguing that Kikkia was “the first ruler who succeeded in throwing off the domination of the kings of Ur and in restoring Assyrian independence.” Despite her detective work based upon the building of the walls of Aššur (which is attributed to Kikkia by Aššur-rim-nišētu and Shalmaneser III), her own thesis about who was included in the list would count out his predecessors.

Lewy then observes what is, for the present thesis, quite important. The AKL says of the section of six rulers including Kikkia and Ilushuma, that the tablets were “eaten up”. Yet, Tukulti-Ninurta I was able to say, when restoring the temple of the goddess Ištar-Ašuritu, that 720 years had elapsed from the previous restoration by Ilushuma. It must, therefore, follow that the damage to the list (or

---

283 Larsen op. cit. p.221 and n.5 on that page.
286 op. cit. p.747
more accurately, one should say, to the raw materials upon which it was based) was “of comparatively late date”.

This observation stands independently of Lewy’s thesis, which I have myself criticised above. If the AKL had been created by Šamši-Adad I, the length of reign of Ilushuma should almost certainly have been known, and would have been included. This fact alone casts serious doubt upon the attributing of the AKL in its primary form to that ruler.

I should note in full Lewy’s thesis concerning the length of reign of Ilushuma. It is that in calculating the flow of time, the Assyrians counted the entirety of the rule of the predecessors including the one who had built or earlier restored the temple. Thus, Tukulti-Ninurta would have counted from the start of Ilushuma’s reign. As Tukulti-Ninurta would have allowed 700 years (for the reasons she gave above), but would not have completed the sanctuary within his accession year, then if he allowed one year to complete the project, he must have allowed 21 years for Ilushuma’s rule.

While this thesis is internally consistent, I do not see that she has proved that Tukulti-Ninurta had to count from the commencement of his accession year and that he must have allowed himself one year for the undertaking. The longer he could allow himself, the correspondingly less would be the reign of Ilushuma. Also, she assumes that the 700 year period was rigid. I do not, for the reasons given below, accept this.

Another aspect relating to Tukulti-Ninurta is the fact that his calculations are 89 years in excess of those found in the AKL. Further, they coincide with calculations of Tiglath-Pileser I in the Anu-Adad temple. Lewy cites this as further evidence for the “long list”. But may it not confirm the view that while Tukulti-Ninurta had access to the raw materials of the AKL, and indeed, had
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access to them in a better condition than Aššur-nasir-pal I did, he did not have the AKL? This supports the suggestion that Aššur-nasir-pal was trying, among other things, to maintain and preserve what he saw as reliable information from periods where such data was scarce and in danger of becoming even scarcer.290

However, there is one other matter which could be urged as indirectly supporting Lewy’s opinion that the Assyrians held a “doctrine of cosmic recurrence”. That is the notion that: “it was believed that the ten deities representing the moving and the fixed stars took turns in ruling the universe; and the earthly ruler of the “totality of the countries” was assumed to reside in one of the cities dedicated to the cult of the deity whose turn it was to rule the world and its inhabitants. When Sargon of Akkad founded his empire, Ištar, the patron goddess of the city of Akkad was assumed to rule the universe. When Šamši-Adad established his residence at Šubat-Enlil, the rule of Enlil, which is alluded to in a birth omen from Nineveh, was thought by him to have begun.” Lewy says that the establishment of the king, variously at Kalakh, Nineveh and Harran follows from this belief, and the length of each deity’s rule was assumed to be 350 years.291

Now, to analyze these views: first, there can be no doubt that astrology and astronomy developed and changed throughout Mesopotamia, over both time and space. As Oppenheim noted, the ideological background of divination in Mesopotamia is not understood; but the development of astrology along the lines for which it is best known today (i.e. the use of personal horoscopes) is quite late, perhaps as late as the fifth century BC.292 Generalizations about astrology in Assyria must be quite provisional and guarded. The most recent study known to me asserts that “there is as yet no evidence that the Assyrian kings before Sargon II took more than a marginal interest in astronomy.”293

290 I would add that it makes it unlikely that Tiglath-Pileser had the AKL. At p.752, Lewy notes that he believed Šamši-Adad to be the son of Išme-Dagan.
291 op. cit. pp.737-8
292 Ancient Mesopotamia p.225
293 Ulla Koch-Westenholz Mesopotamian Astrology: An Introduction to Babylonian and Assyrian Celestial Divination Copenhagen 1995 p.51
Now given that caveat, it is true that there are "canonical texts" which state that the signs of heaven and earth are interconnected: that heaven and earth comprise one whole. But the movements of the heavenly bodies were seen as signs (it) only until the rise of mathematical astronomy (which Koch-Westenholz also places in the fifth century BC), because from that point those movements could be predicted. No longer could they be seen as "portentous accidents or willed communications from the gods."

So, the idea of recurrence over long cycles is now believed to be a later apprehension. To apply it to Old Assyria would seem to be anachronistic. Also, it was signs - not happenings - which were related. It may appear to be a semantic distinction, but even in later astrology there does not seem to be a belief that events will be repeated.

This is not to dispute the hypothesis that particular events were seen as correlated to particular portentous signs. But for Lewy's thesis to be made out, she must show that there was a doctrine of cosmic recurrence. She presents only indirect evidence for it, and the little we know about Mesopotamian astrology would indicate that there could not have been such a doctrine. It falls now to now consider the evidence presented by Lewy in detail.

The first text is that of Šamši-Adad when restoring the Ištar temple at Nineveh. The complete text is set out in RIMA but in so far as the reference to "7 dårū", it is not at all clear that it has the meaning for which Lewy contends.

First, it does not unequivocally say that no one could rebuild until that period had passed. It says that no one had restored it since the time of Maništusu, and now, 7 dårū later, he i.e. Šamši-Adad I is restoring it. To read it, I have the impression

294 see Koch-Westenholz Mesopotamian Astrology pp.137-8; and Oppenheim JNES 33 1974
295 Koch-Westenholz Mesopotamian Astrology p.11
296 Koch-Westenholz Mesopotamian Astrology p.22
298 pp.51-5.
that if Šamši-Adad is making any point, it is that he is the greatest, or the most pious king, since Maništusu. Later, in the usual benediction and curse formula addressed to succeeding kings, he refers to the king whom Enlil appoints as the temple's restorer. Again, he could mean the king whom Enlil appoints 350 years hence, but this is not clear.

What, I think, establishes the correctness of reading the reference to 7 daru as simply a descriptive element of narrative (and not as bearing a religious significance) is a comparison with other texts of Šamši-Adad, and a consideration of the history of the temple.

Šamši-Adad I restored the Enlil temple which Ilu-šumma had built; and the temple of Ereškigal which Ikunu had built - there is no reference in these texts to 7 daru, and the idea of 350 years is clearly inapplicable to not-so-distant predecessors. 399

Then, if one examines the history of the restoration of the Ištar temple, one can readily see that the scheme of 350 year intervals is not maintained. In a text found in that temple, Aššur-uballit I states that he is restoring it after Šamši-Adad had renewed it. 300 That king ruled about 450 years after Šamši-Adad I. 301 It is next restored, after an earthquake, by Shalmaneser I, who refers to both of his restoring predecessors. 302 Brinkman’s chronology places Shalmaneser’s accession in 1273BC, only 90 years after that of Aššur-uballit. 303

Tukulti-Ninurta I, the son and successor of Shalmaneser, also restores Ištar’s temple in Nineveh. 304 There follow other restorations which offend the 350 year or its multiples rule, but one example is sufficient to show that there was no rule.
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299 See texts 1 and 3 for that king in RIMA pp.47-51 and 55-6
300 RIMA Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Mil lennia BC pp.115-6
301 Oppenheim Ancient Mesopotamia pp.344-5, in the chronology of J.A. Brinkman
302 RIMA Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Mil lennia BC pp.205-7. Other texts also attest this restoration.
303 Oppenheim Ancient Mesopotamia p.345
304 See text 33 and esp. 34 for that king in RIMA pp.284-5
In one of his texts, Shalmaneser states that he is restoring the temple of Aššur 580 years after Šamši-Adad I had restored it, and that Šamši-Adad had himself restored it 159 years after Erišu. Clearly, even putting aside Brinkman’s chronology as not determinative of what the ancients themselves considered the time scale to be, Shalmaneser’s restorations are not dictated by the elapsing of 7 dáru.

In this connection, I might note that Lewy’s view of an Assyrian view whereby the “world” was ruled by each of ten celestial deities in turn, is not supported by any citations. In an endeavour to track it down, I had regard to works on Babylonian and Assyrian astronomy. There was nothing of any assistance there, and in considering the history of astrology in general, the closest ideas I could find in the ancient world were associated with Plato and even then, the idea relates to twelve gods, not ten.

What would appear to be one of Lewy’s strongest arguments, that from Tiglath-Pileser’s restoration of the temple of Anu and Adad is, on inspection, without any discernible foundation. Having examined the relevant text, it is true that the king says that 641 years passed between Šamši-Adad III and Aššur-Dan, who demolished the dilapidated temple, but did not rebuild it; and that another 60 years had passed during which the foundation had not been relaid. But there is nothing in the text to indicate that it was mandatory to allow these periods to pass before rebuilding. The only reasonable reading seems to be restatable in the following terms: “although Aššur-Dan made a start he did not complete his restoration, and neither has anyone else since his time. It is a proof of the favour of Anu and Adad that I am given this opportunity to serve them by effecting the restoration.” It is hard to attribute any other meaning, for Aššur-Dan tore down the decayed temple but did not rebuild it.

305 See text 1 for that king in RIMA p.185
306 Gleadow op. cit. pp.78-85 although Plato’s ideas are not at all parallels of those attributed to the Assyrians, except in so far as gods are identified with celestial phenomena, and thus periods of time.
307 In RIMA Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC Toronto 1991 p.28
The next question is the naming of kings. Is this influenced by a belief that history is about to repeat itself? I think that there is something in this opinion, but not quite what Lewy makes of it.

"Naming" has been defined as "the process by which words become names by association."\(^{308}\) As Annemarie Schimmel has said of Islamic names:

"Names are surrounded by a taboo; they carry baraka, blessing power, but can also be used for magic. Everywhere one finds that by calling a child by the name of a saint or a hero ... parents hope to transfer some of the noble qualities ... of their patron to the child, and thus to make him participate in the patron's greatness. To change one's name means indeed to change one's identity ..."\(^{309}\)

Schimmel states that among the Arabs, a boy was frequently named after his grandfather, and that heroes of the faith or of early Islamic history were often flattered by the usage of their names.\(^{310}\)

This ties in with Nicolaisen's conclusions that when words become names there is a semantic change in the words' use. The names then reflect at least three levels of meaning:

(a) the lexical level i.e. the words' dictionary meaning
(b) the associative level i.e. the reason(s) why the particular lexical or onomastic items were used in the naming process
(c) the onomastic level i.e. its use as a name, or "its application based on lexical and associative semantic elements, but usually no longer dependent on them".\(^{311}\)

I suspect that the ideas which Schimmel notes among the Arabs are reflected in the naming of at least some Assyrian kings.\(^{312}\) To use Nicolaisen's schema, the
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\(^{308}\) See WFH Nicolaisen "Names as Verbal Icons" 246-52, p.246 in *Names and their Varieties: A Collection of Essays in Onomastics* Compiled by Kelsie B. Harder 1986 University Press of America Lanham, Maryland

\(^{309}\) p.ix of *Islamic Names* Edinburgh University Press 1995

\(^{310}\) Schimmel *Islamic Names* pp.15-17

\(^{311}\) art. cit. p.246
lexical level has become understood and is not determinative of the use of a name. It is now the onomastic level, and to an extent the associative, which dominate.

In support of this, one might note the following “clusters” of names in Assyrian history: according to Brinkman’s numbering, kings 56 to 59 of Assyria were Erišu III, Šamši-Adad II, Išme-Dagan II and Šamši-Adad III respectively. For the reasons given above, I agree with Yamada that the father of Šamši-Adad III (whose name is given in the list as Išme-Dagan) was not the king of that name. Thus, we have Kidin-Ninua naming (at least some of) his sons: Šarma-Adad, Erišu and Išme-Dagan. Erišu has a son whom he names Šamši-Adad, and this Šamši-Adad names one of his sons Išme-Dagan. Kidin-Ninua’s son Išme-Dagan names one of his sons Šamši-Adad.

Such a cluster of names from this period of early Assyrian history can hardly be a coincidence. It is also interesting that an Erišu should be named in company with others from the house which overthrew his namesake, and that he should name a son Šamši-Adad.

That a ruler in one of the darkest periods of Assyrian history should wish to attract some of “the noble qualities ... of their patron to the child, and thus to make him participate in the patron’s greatness” is understandable. Schimmel’s comments on Islamic concepts are apt for this cluster of names, the emphasis is on attracting desirable qualities. In this culture, it does not seem to be thought that unfortunate consequences could be attracted by naming if there is an auspicious meaning.313

Later, another ruler takes the name Šamši-Adad. This man, the fourth of that name, had come up from Babylon and deposed the previous ruler (as had his first

312 However, there is little solid data. Esarhaddon’s name is quite possibly a throne name, but despite Stamm’s views, there is simply no proof, and without proof, it is a question of construction. See J.J. Stamm Die Akkadische Namengebung Darmstadt 1968 p.11
313 The modern mind - or at least mine - might have wondered whether naming children after people who had feuded would really be auspicious.
namesake). His son is Aššur-nasir-pal, and his son is Shalmaneser. Later, another Aššur-nasir-pal has a son whom he names Shalmaneser: his grandson is a Šamši-Adad. Less than two hundred years separate these last clusters.

Striking, too, is the fact that the very last ruler of Aššur takes the name Aššur-uballit, the ruler who freed Aššur from Mitannian domination. Could it be that except in extremis that particular name was inappropriate as suggesting that the previous reign had been disastrous, but, that when Aššur was about to receive the death blow, the auspicious nature of the name proved irresistible?

Many questions arise: were these throne names taken by acceding rulers exercising some propagandistic or ideological point? If so, to whom were they addressing this? Were these names given by the rulers’ parents, or in consultation with someone else at the point of birth? Was there one means of naming only? Could some of the names have been throne names and others not? How many sons did these rulers have, and was their naming dependant upon whether they were expected to achieve the throne?

If some only of these names were throne names, then I would suggest that the similarities in the career of Šamši-Adad I and the fourth of that name are so great that one can only assume that the fourth took that name on overthrowing Eriba-Adad II. If it was a throne name, then it would not be so much a case of taking on a new identity by using that name, but rather of justifying one’s actions by reference to a glorious precedent. However, I concede that this is speculative.

One can conclude that care must be taken in making extrapolations from the use of names. That names were significant to the Assyrian monarchs is, I think, indisputable. But we do not understand how the names were given: for example, did each king take a throne name, or on accession did they retain the name given by at birth? Which name was bestowed in which fashion is hard, if not impossible, to say.

The difficulty is that the more we look at Mesopotamian history, the more we have the impression, almost the intuition, that names were important. Thus Oppenheim says of Assyria during the Mitannian ascendancy: “Although Assyria apparently disappeared under foreign domination, it is worthy of note that the official king list, which alone spans the gap in the historical tradition with its string of names, mentions six rulers who called themselves either Šamši-Adad (three kings) or Išme-Dagan (again three kings) ... There exists no better indicator for the importance of a ruler and his political and military program than the choice of such names.”

But he offers no evidence for this; and in a way, there can be none. It is not the sort of matter one would have reduced to writing by any civilization before the Classical Greek age or own, ages so full of self-referring analysis. In any event, I am not aware of any Mesopotamian text in which one finds explicit comments about the choice of names and why they are made.

Two final points regarding Lewy’s theories: first, she states that the naming of Sargon I and Naraḫ-Sin indicated an expectation of a new “universal empire like that of the Old Akkadians”. If this was based upon the doctrine of cosmic recurrence, as she argued, then each 350 years a new king would have been named Sargon. In fact, only one other was in the further 1200 years odd of Assyrian history.

Second, although one may disagree, Lewy’s theories, are not irrational. Assyrian rulers did rebuild temples and noted when this had happened. But there are other explanations. For example, Speiser says that: “Royal inquiries into the past are connected as a rule with religious matters. They may revolve, for instance, around the building history of major temples.” He cites *inter alia* the rebuilding by Shalmaneser and later Esarhaddon of the Aššur temple originally
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built by Ušpi, and restored by Irišum and Šamši-Adad. His explanation for these interests is that: "... temples were viewed in Mesopotamia, from early days on, as the embodiment of a covenant between a god and his community."\(^{318}\)

Without wishing to enter into this complex question of the role of the temple, and whether the role(s) changed through time and space, I think that to call these interests "religious" is accurate, so long as one remembers that "religion" and "politics" are terms we use to distinguish areas which were not at all distinct in Aššur. To see this, one needs only to consider the complex religious and political roles which were united in the person of the king in Aššur.\(^{319}\)

Thus, the Lewy thesis, although I think, mistaken, is intriguing, and throws up some useful ideas, even if only by striking sparks. Having examined the nature of the AL and theories concerning it, the next step is to consider its background: the royal traditions of Aššur.

\(^{318}\) ibid. p.47.

\(^{319}\) In this respect see the notes and the materials referred to by Simo Parpola Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars: SAA vol. X Helsinki 1993, pp.xiii-xvii.
Chapter Nine

Royal Traditions of Aššur

The focus of this chapter is inscriptions of Šamši-Adad I and his place in the royal tradition - or, perhaps better, traditions plural - of Aššur. This material is examined for what light it might throw upon the AKL and the history of its compilation. I conclude that it does not, except to make the theory proposed here appear to be a little more plausible.

Of course, to consider the AKL and the theory that it was initially written by or on behalf of Šamši-Adad I, one needs to relate him to his governing predecessors. It is also necessary to briefly consider his Amorite origins, and their influence upon him. Similarly, what of the southern or Babylonian influence often discerned in his career? Was he really an usurper (as is usually said), or is it more accurate to describe him as a conqueror, or perhaps both?

Clearly, the standard Landsberger theory rests upon the view that he was an outsider who created the AKL to legitimize himself. So, what of Puzur-Sîn, who is responsible for the view that Šamši-Adad I was a foreigner to Aššur? What do we make of him and what does the native tradition make of him and Šamši-Adad I?

The first task is to place Šamši-Adad within his Assyrian context. To what extent can we intelligently speak of an Assyrian royal ideology prior to Šamši-Adad, and what change (if any) does he introduce to it? I consider, in turn, the royal inscriptions, and then later tradition (of which the chief components are the Assyrian King List and the “Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty”). These are our two chief sources for this period.

I conclude that we have too little material to support the theories which are propagated about early Assyrian history - that there are more question marks than
full stops here. However, the few materials left by these early monarchs can sometimes be traced into the inscriptions of Šamši-Adad, and we can see how attuned he was to the pre-existing traditions of Assyria.

The Royal Inscriptions: Before Šamši-Adad

The starting point will be the Assyrian inscriptions, which have been most fully collated in A.K. Grayson *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Assyrian Periods*. We have to start here, because although the Assyrians were particularly interested in keeping records, they themselves realised that the records for this period had been substantially lost. After noting the contents of the inscriptions, I shall consider the Assyrian King List ("AKL").

*Ititi and Azuzu*

The earliest inscriptions are those of Ititi and Azuzu. Neither refers to himself as being the ensi of Aššur.

The Ititi inscription is a stone plaque in the Istar temple at Aššur, and commemorates the dedication to the goddess of an item taken as booty from Gasur. Ititi refers to himself as "PA DUMU i-nin-la-ba". Grayson translates this as "the ruler, son of Ininlaba". Larsen says that "Ititi" is an Akkadian name, but justly notes that it is not necessarily Sargonic - it could in fact be either pre- or post-Sargonic. He also concludes that he was probably an independent ruler - a waklum (UGULA).

The object dedicated by Azuzu, also an Old Akkadian name and from the same temple, is a copper spear-head. Azuzu describes himself as "servant" of Maništusu LUGAL KIŠ, dedicating it to Be-al-SI.SI, for his lord. Nothing is
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known of Azuzu. He was once thought to be the person "Abazu" named in the AKL, but this has been abandoned.\footnote{H. Levy in the Cambridge Ancient History 3rd ed. Volume 1, part II, p.744 and M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State p.31 n.24.}

I wonder, without any hope of answer, if Ititi was an Akkadian governor, as Borger suggested,\footnote{R. Borger Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften I, Leiden 1961 p.} why does the text not say so? Note that he does not say that he is the PA of Aššur. Is he Assyrian? As Larsen asks, why was he taking booty from Gasur? What does the controversial term PA mean in this context? Hallo is not sure how to translate it here, and to draw attention to the unknowns, adds that we do not really know whether Ititi preceded Zarriqum.\footnote{W.W. Hallo "Zariqum" JNES 15 (1956) 220-225, n.3 p.220}

Larsen argues that if Ititi was an Akkadian governor, it would be difficult to see why he had any booty to dedicate. However, he may have conducted a raid, or been given the booty by the raider. Yet, I suspect that Larsen's view of Ititi is ultimately correct - for Ititi dedicates the object in his own right - as opposed to dedicating it on behalf of his king, as Azuzu before him and Zarriqum (in the Ur III period) after him did. Most likely, then, in Ititi's inscription PA means "waklum".\footnote{M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies Copenhagen 1976 pp.31-2}

I suspect, although it would be argument from silence, that the title ensi (or iššiak Aššur) did not exist at the time of Ititi. I put it no higher than this, because it may be that previous rulers of Aššur had used the title, but for some reason, Ititi did not.

I need to interrupt the narrative at this point to mention the question of our understanding of ancient Near Eastern languages: not to expand this knowledge, but to note how provisional some of our conclusions must be. In his essay on "Ebla and the Kish Civilization", Gelb observed that while much of his own work in Old Akkadian, Amorite and Eblaic was based upon the grammar of names, there are "features in the grammar of names which are different from
features based on texts." In reading names, one needs to take into account the "various trends, vogues and conventions that are likely to develop in each period and area, specifically." The difficulties in reading names are stressed in that article. One must wonder: how certain can we be that the names "Ititi" and "Azuzu" are Old Akkadian, and if they are, that their bearers were themselves both Akkadians?

Zarriqum

Chronologically, long after the Gutu period, there follows a stone plaque for the same temple, by Zarriqum, who governed Assur during the reign of Amar-Sin. It refers to the temple of Belat-ekallim. As Hallo notes, it was actually found in the temple of Inanna. He asks therefore, whether the temple of Belat-ekallim might not be another name for Istar's temple? He cites in support Jacobsen's identification of the two goddesses, and the fact that in some inscriptions of Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin, both goddesses are referred to as dumu-gal dSin-na. This may be the case, but Lackenbacker is sceptical. I am sympathetic to her view, for the reasons she gives: the evidence is slight, and while the temple is not otherwise attested, the bulk of references to a temple of Istar are sufficiently specific for us to be able to say that this it is quite unlikely that the two temples were identical.

We should not be too quick to explain the unknown by the known, lest we just confirm ourselves within our given limitations. There is a danger of that here, because the earliest buildings we know of in Assur are the two temples of Istar known as "H" and "G". The cult of Istar was clearly a popular and ancient one in Assur. Even if it is not true that the earliest Semitic pantheon consisted of sun, moon and Venus, (and that these three deities thus retained a special significance wherever Semites went), Istar's importance for Assur is second only to that of
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Aššur himself. Who can say that there was not another temple of Ištar in Aššur prior to the accession of Šamši-Adad? This same question of methodology arises later, also, in an indirect way, in considering the question of whether a building referred to by Šamši-Adad as the “temple of Enlil” might not be in fact the temple of Aššur.

However, to return to the stone plaque, Hallo examining this dedication and other sources, deduces that Zarriqum (an Ur III official), was successively governor of Aššur, and then governor of Susa. We now know that his career was a little more complex: he was at one point the governor of Susa, then an official (NU-BANDA) at Nippur, possibly his home town, then governor at Aššur, and later, governor of Susa a second time. If Ur III could rotate its bureaucrats (and I do not use this term pejoratively), then this would indicate that Aššur was under the control of the Ur III empire at that period, but how far that control extended, we do not know.

For example, did the governor have any difficulty in exercising his authority, either within the city or outside? Were troops of Ur III stationed in Aššur? Was the city captured by the Sumerians? Did they come as conquerors or deliverers? How long were they there? Did all Assyrians remain in the city while it was under that jurisdiction, or were some of them in exile? Did the governor have to make any concessions to Assyrian feelings: popular feelings, the views of the nobility, or cults? Did the governor control trade or conduct building and restoration? There is no convincing evidence available to me for Oates’ view that Zarriqum rebuilt the temple of Ištar. In fact, we do not seem to know much about the effect of the Ur III rulers in Aššur and upon its society and culture.
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It would appear, if the accepted chronology is correct, that Aššur was independent for a time (at least for some of Ititi’s rule). However, it had been ruled by the Akkadian kings. We do not know if it ever regained its independence, as there are no records for the “lost” years of the Guti invasion in the south. Aššur was later, for an unknown period, governed by Ur III appointments.

It is a commonplace that in this period “Assyria was a cultural province of the Sumerian south.” In 1971 Mallowan concluded that the Sumerian influence was so strong that although the natives were Semites, the city must have been under Sumerian rule. He noted that at least one piece of sculpture in the temple of Ištar was out of keeping with the Sumerian style, and appeared to show Akkadian influence. Thus, he concluded, the temple was probably continually used from ED III into the Akkadian period before it was razed. That is, there was a continuity of occupation which spanned different cultural influences.

But influence is not necessarily exerted through the agency of conqueror upon the conquered. The greatest examples of the fallacy of this assumption are the influence which Greek culture exerted upon the Roman when the Romans had in fact conquered the Greeks; and the influence of Persian culture upon the Arab conquerors (the Umayyads, and to a greater extent, the Abbasids).

With respect to Mallowan’s view, the architectural remains of antique Aššur are nothing if not fragmentary. One sculptured piece mentioned by Mallowan is a nude figure relating to a fertility cult and is the counterpart of an ithyphallic male found much further north, in the Khabur valley, and not from the south.

However strong the southern influence was in that temple, one cannot assume that the entire city was subject to that influence, to an unvarying and strong
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degree. For example, could the nude figure point to a popular culture with different links and influences, which but rarely manifested in the temple? Then again, perhaps the temple’s cultural atmosphere was not typical of early Aššur. Once more, we do not really know.

It has been remarked before that not one of the persons known from early archaeology, and mentioned above (i.e. Ititi, Azuzu and Zarriqum), is named in the AKL. What flows from this? We can be sure only that this fact does not support any clear cut conclusions: we are uncertain of the precise purpose of the list’s compilation, and what materials were available to them. It is possible that these records we have discussed were unknown to the compilers of the AKL - or that they were not interested in these individuals.

Aminu

To return to the predecessors of Šamši-Adad, Grayson places Aminu after Zarriqum, but before Sulili. Aminu is attested only from two cylinder seals, which read “Ribam-ili, scribe, servant of Aminu” and “Muqaddimum, servant of Aminu”. Little can be gleaned from these, but they must be noted, as Aminu is thought to be the brother of Šamši-Adad. According to Adad-nirari III, Ilukakkababi (father of Aminu and Šamši-Adad) preceded Sulili. This, of course, would support the tradition found in the AKL. We have no inscriptions from Ilukakkababi, and do not know whether he or Aminu ever referred to themselves as ensi of Aššur.

Sulili

A text of Sulili is found on clay tablets from Kültepe, relics of the Assyrian colony there. It reads:
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Now, the reading a-šûr.KI might, at first blush, suggest that the reference is to the city Aššur alone. However, it would appear that the meaning of these signs is primarily, the god Aššur. Secondarily, they refer to the city. This is so, because the god was probably the deified city.\textsuperscript{34} That is, it could be that both references are equivocal: referring to the deified city and to the city itself, with the emphasis being upon the divine aspect.

For some reason which is not entirely clear, a royal inscription from the time of Tukulti-Ninurta I remembers the following kings (Ṣalim-ahum and others) not as the dynasty of Puzur-Aššur, but as the dynasty of Sulili.\textsuperscript{36} I can only conclude from this that Tukulti-Ninurta had access to a tradition (whether oral or written) which has since been lost, as if all he had was the AKL, he could not have concluded this.

However, it is important to note that Sulili is the earliest man known to have used the title ENsi of Aššur, and to be linked in that capacity with the trading colony at Kültepe. The importance of this is that it underscores how fragmentary our knowledge of this area of Assyrian history is. The origin of this institution and colony is lost to history. That, in turn, reminds us that we do not know what materials the author of the AKL had available to him, and should be cautious in “correcting” his knowledge of the distant Assyrian past without compelling evidence.

\textsuperscript{34} D. Oates \textit{Studies in the Ancient History of Northern Iraq} OUP London 1968 p.29
\textsuperscript{36} W.G. Lambert “Tukulti-Ninurta I and the Assyrian King List” \textit{Iraq} 38 (1976) 85-94 p.91
Unfortunately, we have no inscription of Puzur-Âšur, but a text of Šalim-aḫum has been found on a stone block in the oldest foundations of the Âšur temple.\textsuperscript{347}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{sa-lim-a-ḫu-um} & Šalim-aḫum \\
ÈNSI & Ensi \\
a-šûr.KI & of Âšur \\
DUMU pû-zur8-da-šûr & son of Puzur-Âšur \\
5 & 5 \\
ÈNSI & Ensi \\
a-šûr.KI & of Âšur. \\
da-šûr & Âšur \\
È i-ri-is-su-ma & requested of him a temple \\
È bu-x-mi(?) & and he (...) a temple \\
10 & 10 \\
a-na mu-ti-ma & forever (lasting) \\
i-pu-uš & built. \\
ù È.GAL & The palace \\
x-aDagan & of ... Dagan \\
ku-um-šu & its shrine \\
15 & 15 \\
i-sá-ri-šu xxx(x) & its ?temple area \\
È ū-ḫu-ri & its house of beer vats \\
ù a-bi-si-šu & and its storage area \\
a-na ba-la-ṭi-<šu> & for his life (he built) \\
ù ba-la-[… & and for the life \\
20 & 20 \\
a-[li]-šu & of his city \\
21-3 (erasure) & .... \\
a-na da-šûr & for Âšur
\end{tabular}

It is interesting to note the devotion to Dagan, another pointer to possible Amorite influence on Âšur.

\textsuperscript{347} A.K. Grayson \textit{op. cit.} p.14
Ilu-šumma

Ilu-šumma left a number of inscriptions, including one on a stone object in the Ištar temple at Aššur, reading:348

DINGIR-šumma
ÉNSI
a-šûr.KI
na-ra-am

Ilu-šumma
Ensi
of Aššur,
beloved

5 da-šûr
ù dINANNA
[mar ša]-lim-a-ḫum
ÉNSI
a-šûr.KI

of Aššur
and Ištar
[son of Šallim-aḫum,
Ensi
of Aššur,

10 a-na dINANNA
NIN.A.NI
a-na ba-la-ši-šu
É i-pu-uš
a-du-ra-ar

for Ištar
his mistress
for his life
a temple built; (and)
the freedom

15 a-kâ-di-i
iš-kun

of the Akkadians
established.

An important text by Ilu-šumma has been found on several bricks from Aššur. In this text, he calls himself Ensi of Aššur, and son of Šalim-aḫum, the son of Puzur-Aššur, each described as being ensi of Aššur. He states that he built the temple of Ištar.349

The text adds that he subdivided house plots for the city, built a facade and a new wall, and that Aššur opened for him two new springs of water in Mount Abûḫ. The spring water was used to make bricks for the wall. One spring flowed

348 A.K. Grayson *op. cit.* p.15
349 A.K. Grayson *op. cit.* pp.16-18
towards the Anšum gate, and the other to the Wertum gate. It states that he established the freedom of the Akkadians and their children, purifying their copper and establishing their freedom from the border of (perhaps) the marshes, Ur and Nippur, Awal and Kismar, Der of the God Ištaran, as far as the city (probably Aššur).

The phrase “establishing the freedom [addurārum] of the Akkadians” has been taken to mean that he liberated them by force of arms, perhaps attributing modern “double-speak” to the ancients.\(^{350}\) Lewy interprets the phrase to mean that he compelled the king of Isin to allow the Akkadians to trade with the merchants of Aššur.\(^{351}\) But, as Larsen has pointed out (referring to Edzard’s theory), even this last view still assumes: “that he must have been able to back up his economic measure with real power.”\(^{352}\)

A rather detailed analysis by Larsen has produced the conclusion that while we cannot be certain, it would appear that Ilu-šumma granted privileges to the southern traders, in an attempt to attract them to the Aššur market.\(^{353}\) This view would better accord with the evidence. When the ensi of Aššur wishes to say that he conducted a raid or campaign, he can do so quite unequivocally.\(^{354}\)

**Erišu and Ikunu**

A text of Erišu, on tablets from Kültepe found in the Aššur temple at Aššur (and elsewhere within that city), is problematical.\(^{355}\) However, it notes that Erišu is the son of Ilu-šumma, son of Šalim-ahum, son of Puzur-Aššur, and the PA (doubtless “ensî” here) of Aššur. Lines 4 to 18 describe his building in the temple area for Aššur, including the ‘step-gate’ (mušlalum) building two beer vats and placing two duck figures (each weighing one talent) by them; and reserving land for

---

\(^{350}\) See for example C.J. Gadd “Babylonia c.2120-1800BC” in CAH 1/1 p.638

\(^{351}\) in CAH 1/1 p.708

\(^{352}\) op. cit. p.68

\(^{353}\) ibid 63-80

\(^{354}\) The suggestion that there was some kind of program by these early rulers to establish an “Assyrian” reich is too flimsy to waste our time.

\(^{355}\) A.K. Grayson op. cit. p.19
Aššur from the Sheep Gate to the People’s Gate. This material is also found in the eleventh text for this king.\textsuperscript{356} I shall return to lines 19 to 22.

Among other things, the next lines name the seven judges of the step-gate (without any divine determinatives, although they would appear to be non-human figures); they describe Aššur as being like “reed swamps which cannot be traversed”, terrain which “cannot be trodden on” and impassable canals. Lines 39 to 52 set out the frightening details of what will happen to liars in the court, and judges who give false decisions. Lines 53 to 74 deal with miscellaneous matters.

Of greater interest, are lines 19 to 22, which are substantially reproduced in Grayson’s tenth text for this king,\textsuperscript{357} and which read:

\begin{verbatim}
19 ...  šu-ma
   be-tum e-na-ah-ša
20  LUGAL šu-um-šu ša ki-ma
    ia-ti be-tám
21  e-pā-āš ši-kā- tam-ša
    am-ša-šu-ú
22  lá ū-ra-a-áb a-na iš-ri-ša-ma
    (but) he will (restore it) to its place.
...
\end{verbatim}

Another text of Erišu is a stone door socket from Aššur,\textsuperscript{358} referring to certain economic measures, such as taxes on wool, bran and straw, the clearing of houses from the Sheep Gate to the People’s Gate, and work on the temple and a wall. At lines 39 to 44 he notes that he made his wall even higher than that which his father had built. Lines 45 to 48 look like the beginning of a curse formula, but they are cut off. They read:

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{356}] A.K. Grayson \textit{op. cit.} pp.33-34
\item[\textsuperscript{357}] A.K. Grayson \textit{op. cit.} pp.31-33
\item[\textsuperscript{358}] A.K. Grayson \textit{op. cit.} pp.22-23
\end{itemize}
Whoever removes without respect any of my work, the inscribed tablet

A third text of Erišu appears on numerous bricks from Aššur, describing his work on the Aššur temple, and the presentation of large storage containers. A fourth brick text refers to work on the Aššur temple at Aššur and on the step gate.  

Interestingly, both Erišu and his son, Ikunu, mention that they built a temple for Adad, an important Semite god, to whom - together with Anu - twin ziqqurats were later built within Aššur. There is a text of Ikunu, which is dedicated to Aššur, and notes that his son, Aššur-imitti took it into the temple. A third text, from the Nabû temple at Aššur has Ikunu’s patronymics all the way back to Puzur-Aššur. Most of the other texts do not name his forefathers at all.

Sargon

The next attested ruler, Sargon I, has left little, but what he has left, shows his name written with the divine determinative (contrary to von Soden’s assertion that the Assyrian kings never divinized themselves):  

\[ dLUGAL-GIN \]
\[ ÉNSI \]
\[ da-šûr \]
\[ DUMU i-ku-num \]

5
\[ ÉNSI \]
\[ da-šûr \]

\[ Sargon \]
\[ Ensi \]
\[ of Aššur, \]
\[ son of Ikunu \]
\[ Ensi \]
\[ of Aššur, \]

---

359 A.K. Grayson op. cit. p.25  
361 A.K. Grayson op. cit. p.42  
362 A.K. Grayson op. cit. p.43  
363 A.K. Grayson op. cit. p.45 W. von Soden The Ancient Near East p.68
Thus, the following chain of rulers (each of whom describes himself as the ensi of Aššur) is securely attested by original texts, wherein the latest refers to at least one or more of his forefathers:

- Puzur-Aššur (from whom there is no extant text)
- Šalim-aḫum
- Išu-šumma
- Erišu
- Ikunu
- Sargon (modernly renamed Sargon I)

Of these kings, it will be remembered that the AKL places Puzur-Aššur, Šalim-aḫum, and Išu-šumma among the six kings whose names are found on bricks, but for whom other records have been destroyed.\(^{36}\) The AKL then notes that:

(a) Erišu was the son of Išu-šumma, and ruled for forty years - it appears to say that his records are not lost;
(b) Ikunu was his son, and gives the number of years of his rule (there is space for these details, but the actual text is lost, bar the final verb);
(c) Sargon was his son, and gives the number of years of his rule (again lost);
(d) his son Puzur-Aššur ruled (the years are lost); and
(e) similar discrete entries follow for Narām-Sin (described as his son) and Erišu, named as Narām-Sin's son.

With the possible exception of the dedication of a spear taken from booty by Ititi, the other texts all represent the rulers engaged in the arts of peace. Even the dedication of a spear is in itself, not warlike. Although I concede that it is not irenic to have abstracted it from booty (if Ititi was responsible for its seizure, which is, perhaps the natural assumption).

\(^{36}\) I.J. Gelb "Two Assyrian King Lists" *JNES* 13 (1954) 209-230, pp.213 and 224
Certainly, the immediate and royal predecessors (we have no inscription from Naram-Sin) are seen dealing with building, restoration, improvements to the city, and economic matters. They are always absorbed in the affairs of Aššur, and if they exercised sovereignty outside of the city (other than in the colony) this is not otherwise attested.

Certainly, there is evidence of a concern with matters involving foreigners in a trading context. Also, there is Sumerian influence visible, especially in the form of the dedications “for the life of” the ruler, and placing the name of the ruler before the name of the god.  

Yet, the fact remains that Šamši-Adad is the first ruler of Aššur known to us who rules, and presents himself as ruling, more than the city itself. His presentation of himself is markedly more assertive than that of any of his predecessors in Aššur.

At this point of the AKL, there comes the controversial reference to Šamši-Adad 1. That reference does not deal with three features of Šamši-Adad’s self-representation in his own inscriptions. That is, in his own texts, Šamši-Adad presents himself as:

1. as a warrior;
2. as ruler of an empire; and
3. as having interests outside of Aššur.

I turn now to consider the royal ideology of Šamši-Adad.

365 Sylvie Lackenbacker *Le Roi Bâtisseur* p.3.
Chapter Ten

The Royal Ideology of Šamši-Adad I

The starting point of this chapter must be the inscriptions and letters of Šamši-Adad himself. The most relevant material will be found in his inscriptions. Building new temples and public works, and engaging in restoration was an unvarying role of the king in Mesopotamia. Not only is his interest and personal role noted, especially in the statuary and texts of Gudea and Ur-Nammu, but he also - at least on some occasions, personally did some of the work. From about 1000BC a month was known as “the month of the king’s brick mould: the king makes bricks in the brick-mould, all the people build their houses.”

The form of royal inscriptions and their contents did, of course, vary over the course of history. To cite but one example, in pre-Sargonic Sumer royal inscriptions followed a standard type of format (with variation), but curse formulas were not at all frequent, and seem to have been mostly restricted to the volatile border of Lagash and Umma! Conversely, the well-known blessing for those who restored or maintained the building or other item is also unknown. Cooper concludes that: “In the Presargonic period, an inscription is more likely to end with a prayer on the ruler’s behalf.”

This raises a very important issue: we know that “royal inscriptions are and have always been considered possibly affected by their celebrative purpose, bringing about a tendency to emphasize even to forge the positive aspects and to underestimate the negative ones ... (and) The literary texts are affected by the mythical and fantastic features proper to their genre.” Šamši-Adad I was celebrating the creation of a new empire, and his rule, which saw the pacification (or consolidation) of the “land between the rivers”. The great influence on

---

366 Richard S. Ellis Foundation Deposits in Mesopotamia Yale 1968 pp.5-23, quoting p.18.
Šamši-Adad’s material was the superimposition of the new empire upon its regions, while respecting their traditions. To this end, he wished to show continuity with the royal tradition, while giving himself a most glorious role in the freshest chapter of the tradition.

To consider, then, Šamši-Adad’s place in this royal tradition: first, he is one of the earliest rulers to have dedicated an inscribed prism: the next such ruler known is Tiglath-Pileser I. Šamši-Adad even had his prism pierced through the axis so that it could be read.\(^{369}\) One might say that a writer should not make very much of this: it could be an accident of discovery. But I think that it is more than this. One cannot help receiving the impression that Šamši-Adad was an innovator.

When Oded conducted his examination of the reasons given for going to war, the earliest king he could deal with was Šamši-Adad I. Table 1 in his book shows that two of the twelve canonical reasons found by Oded appear in Šamši-Adad’s inscriptions: the command of the god, and to quell rebellion (or punish oath breakers).

Turning to temple inscriptions, text 1 has been found on stone tablets at Aššur, mostly in the Aššur temple. Although in this text, Šamši-Adad refers to the temple of Enlil, many scholars believe that he is referring to the temple of the god Aššur. Both the dialect and the form of the inscription are said to show Babylonian influence.\(^{370}\)

This text reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
dUtu-ši-diŠKUR & \quad Šamši-Adad \\
LUGAL.KIŠ & \quad \text{King of the whole}^{371} \\
b-a-ni É & \quad \text{builder of the temple} \\
da-šur⁴ & \quad \text{of Aššur}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{369}\) Richard S. Ellis *Foundation Deposits in Mesopotamia* pp.113-4

\(^{370}\) A.K. Grayson *RIMA* p.47

\(^{371}\) The term “universe” has modern connotations which cannot, I think, have been intended. The meaning of “totality” or “whole” seems to correspond.
mu-uš-te-em-ki  
ma-tim  
bi-ir-it ÍD.IDIGNA  
ù ÍD.BURANUN.NA  
i-na qi-ib-it  

5 pacifier of the land  
between the Tigris and the Euphrates rivers  
by the command  

10 da-sur4  
ra-i-mi-šu  
ša AN ù den-líl  
i-na LUGAL.MEŠ  
a-li-ku-ut  

15 mah-ra  
šum-šu a-na ra-bé-e-tim  
ib-bu-ú

ra-i-mi-šu  
ša AN ù den-líl  
i-na LUGAL.MEŠ  
a-li-ku-ut  

18 É den-líl  
ša e-ri-šum  

20 DUMU DINGIR-šum-ma  
i-pu-šu  
É i-na-âlma  
-ú-ša- ras-si-ik-šum-ma  

25 be-li-ia  
BÁRA ra-aš-ba-am  
we-at-ma-nam  
ra-bé-e-em  
šu-ba-at den-líl  

30 be-li-ia  
ša i-na ši-pí-ir  
ne-me-eq

The temple of Enlil  
which Erišu  
son of Ilu-šumma  
had built  
had become dilapidated  
the temple of Enlil  
my lord,  
the fearful dais,  
the chapel  
large,  
the seat of Enlil  
my lord,  
which by craft  
the art

372 I do not follow Grayson in that when translating, I do not place the words “the god” before the name of the deity. My sense is that explicating the divine determinative in this way is artificial, and untrue to the Akkadian. It would be like writing the words “the plant” before the name of a plant whenever the determinative was used.

373 I follow here the translation in the CAD. The previous temple was not “abandoned”.
35 i-na qē-re-eb a-li-ia
a-šu4.KI a-ab-ni

Aššur, I built.

37 É GĪŠ.-ERIN →
ù-ša-li-il
i-na É.MEŠ

The temple (with beams of) cedar
I roofed;
in the rooms

giš.G. MEŠ GĪŠ.ERIN
ša MUL-ši-na KŪ.BABBAR ʿu KŪ.GI silver and gold stars.
uš-zi-iz
i-ga-ra-at É
i-na KŪ.BABBAR KŪ.GI

The temple (with beams of) cedar
I roofed;
in the rooms

50 be-li-ia
uš-te-es-bi-ma
é-am-kur-kur-ra
É ri-im-ma-ta-a-tim

The temple - the wild bull of the
lands",

55 be-li-ia
i-na qē-re-eb a-li-ia
a-šu4.KI

my lord,
within my city
Aššur

58 šum-šu a-ab-bi

I called it.

In lines 59-72, he gives the prices for barley, wool and oil within Aššur at the
time he built the temple. He states, then, that he received the tribute of the king
of Tukriš, and the king “of the upper land” (LUGAL ma-a-tim e-li-tim), within Aššur, his city. Continuing from line 80:

80  lu am-ta-ha-ar  Indeed, I set up
    šu-mi ra-bé-e-em  my great name
    ū na-re-ia  and my monumental inscription
    i-na ma-a-at  in the land
    la-ṣe-a-an.KI  of Lebanon
85  i-na a-aḥ A.AB.BA  on the shore
    ra-bi-i-tim  of the great
    lu-ū aš-ku-un  sea indeed I placed it.

The text then goes on to speak of how the temple had become dilapidated, and exhorts whoever of the kings - his sons - renovates the temple in the future, to anoint his inscriptions with oil, make a sacrifice, and return them to their places. He curses whoever substitutes their own name for his upon the inscriptions, or buries or sinks them. This is where the text appears to end.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this text is the reference in lines 5 to 8 to himself as: “pacifier of the land between the Tigris and the Euphrates rivers”. The Akkadian term “mu-uš-te-em-ki” puzzles Grayson and Kupper, who are unsure of its translation.374 Charpin and Durand speculate that the importance of this phrase, whatever its precise meaning, is that Šamši-Adad saw the region between the rivers as comprising a unity. Indeed, they term him “the man of the region of the two rivers”.375

The substantive will doubtless be formed from the Št stem of either mekū or an unidentified verb. Although that stem can have idiosyncratic meanings, it sometimes functions as the causative of the Gt stem, which apart from its

374 Grayson italicises the word in his translation. Kupper says simply that “we are not sure of this term”, in “Šamši-Adad et L’Assyrie” Miscellanea Babylonica: Mélanges Offerts à Maurice Birot (ed.) J.M. Durand Paris 1985; pp.147-151, p.148
reciprocal meaning, can have the sense of accomplishing something in perpetuity. The sort of verb which would make excellent sense here will be something akin to the Arabic verb “makana”, which in some of its stems has the meaning of “consolidate”. That is, “the one who has consolidated forever”: and between this and the idea of pacification, there may not be very much.\(^\text{376}\)

Charpin cites the literature, but going by sense, says that it must mean something like “rassembler”, and in the translation gives “qui a unifié(?) le pays.”\(^\text{377}\)

Incidentally, the conduct of war “with the proper intention of creating renewed stability” became a part of the canonical reasons given by the kings of Aššur for going to war.\(^\text{378}\)

This is most interesting, especially in view of Buccellati’s theory about the relationship between the Amorites and the region of Khana.\(^\text{379}\) Shortly, the starting point of this theory is the recent currency for the term “Syro-Mesopotamia”, which he defines - both culturally and “geo-historically” as “the urban civilization characterized most visibly by the use of a unified cuneiform scribal tradition, which implies a commonality of written language and underlying scribal training, as well as a commonality in the social texture serving as a presupposition for the use of scribal services.”\(^\text{380}\)

In this theory, Syro-Mesopotamia combines three macro-environments: the alluvial plain of the South-East, the steppeland of the middle Euphrates and lower Khabur, and the hills of the North and North-West.\(^\text{381}\) He seems to see Khana as the steppeland region, once known as the kingdom of Mari, and its collapse in the sixteenth century as being a major factor in the break-up of the

\(^{376}\) This is not to suggest that the noun has come from a verb which corresponds directly to the Arabic: after all, the Arabic verb has three consonants. But some such type of meaning seems called for.

\(^{377}\) D. Charpin “Inscriptions votives d’époque assyrienne” in MARI 3 42-68, p. 48

\(^{378}\) Oded op. cit. chapter 8, citing Šamši-Adad I at p. 109


\(^{380}\) ibid. p. 230

\(^{381}\) ibid. pp. 230-1
larger unity.\textsuperscript{382} Of course, he sees the development of the Amorites as being a by-product of events in the kingdom of Mari.\textsuperscript{381}

In his own phrase, “rather than viewing the Amorites as nomads or seminomads who are threatening Khana from the outside, we should understand them as the unique outgrowth, from within, of the rural class of Khana.”\textsuperscript{384}

The theory is so recent that I am yet to see any critiques of it, and one would only cautiously attempt to use it as the foundation of a thesis until more research has been done. However, there is much to be said for the view that while Khana is a modern construct, is it not part of Šamši-Adad I’s greatness as a ruler that he apprehended the socio-political situation which Buccellati is now tentatively suggesting existed? That is, he realized that there was a role for a pacifier of the land between the rivers, and their importance as a relatively unified and unifiable entity.

I suggest that this may be why he assumed the title LUGAL KIŠ only after he conquered Mari, and why he assumed the title King of Akkad at that time.\textsuperscript{385} I shall return to this later, in drawing together a conclusion concerning the royal ideology expressed. As well, he once again seems to influence later Assyrian imperialist ideology.\textsuperscript{386}

Another interesting point is his setting up a narû, “i-na ma-a-at la-ab-a-an.KI”. As I understand Ellis, it was Šamši-Adad who made use of the word narû to signify a stone tablet, the standard usage for Aššur in later times.\textsuperscript{387} To be more precise, the Assyrians decided to adopt the usage coined during his reign. As Kupper says, this must have occurred on a short expedition to the Lebanon, as his

\textsuperscript{382} ibid. pp.230-7  
\textsuperscript{384} “Ebla and the Eblaite” Eblaïtica 3 (1992) p.90  
\textsuperscript{385} For King of Akkad, see text 6, RIMA vol. 1 p.58 a text from Mari; for LUGAL KIŠ see as well D. Charpin and J.M. Durand “La Prise du Pouvoir par Zimri-Lim” p.300.  
\textsuperscript{386} See also Paul Garelli “L’influence de Samsi-Addu sur les titulaires royales assyriennes” in O. Tunca (ed.) De la babylone à la Syrie, en passant par Mari: Mélanges offerts à Monsieur J.-R. Kupper à l’occasion de son 70e anniversaire pp.97-102  
\textsuperscript{387} Richard S. Ellis Foundation Deposits in Mesopotamia pp.145-50 and 158
son Yasmah-Addu married the daughter of the king of Qatna to neutralize Aleppo and the kingdom of Yamkhad.\textsuperscript{388}

As Malamat notes, “the Mediterranean had fired the imagination and challenged the energies of mighty conquerors from the lands of the Twin Rivers ...”,\textsuperscript{389} commencing no later than Lugalzaggesi of Uruk, and being made the stuff of eternal legend by Sargon the Great. The word “legend” is appropriate in view of the recent re-assessment of Sargon’s military efforts.\textsuperscript{390} Further, according to Malamat the use of the word A.A.BA for the sea “serves to emphasize the divine nature of the Mediterranean”,\textsuperscript{391} and this term was used by both Šamši-Adad (cited above) and - its Akkadian form - by Yahdun-lim of Mari, who also reached the sea.\textsuperscript{392}

We know too little about why he went, or indeed, anything else about the expedition, to draw expansive conclusions. But it does point, in my view, to the objective fact that Šamši-Adad was a great warrior, who clearly justified the impression he made upon his contemporaries and his successors in Aššur.

Perhaps more to the point, it shows that he saw himself as a great king because he could perform such feats, and who could - boasting that his name was immortal - take steps to immortalize it.\textsuperscript{393} The importance of a “great name” - the very same words as appear in this text - reappears in letter 69 where he clearly infers that victory of arms is a brave way to establish a great name (see below).

\textsuperscript{388} J.-R. Kupper in \textit{CAH 3rd ed.} vol. 2.2 p.3
\textsuperscript{389} Abraham Malamat “Campaigns to the Mediterranean by Jahdunlim and other Early Mesopotamian Rulers” 365-73 \textit{Assyriological Studies} 16 (1965) 365-73, p.365
\textsuperscript{390} That is, the view he never carried his arms beyond the Middle Euphrates. See Liverani “Model and Actualization” \textit{art. cit}. pp.52-3. In the same volume, Michalowski notes that the evidence is that Naram-Sin conquered in the north-west, but he does not go so far in respect of Sargon as Liverani does. Piotr Michalowski “Memory and Deed: The Historiography of the Political Expansion of the Akkad State” in Liverani (ed.) \textit{op. cit.} 69-90, pp.76-84
\textsuperscript{391} Abraham Malamat “Campaigns to the Mediterranean by Jahdunlim and other Early Mesopotamian Rulers” p.367
\textsuperscript{392} \textit{ibid loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{393} I note that at lines 80-2 that he says “my great name \textit{and} my stela”.

It has been noted that Šamši-Adad was very lavish in filling the foundations with gold and jewels, and in mixing the mortar with such items. This placing of precious materials in the foundations was an enduring tradition in Assyria and neo-Babylonia. As for the mortar, Erišu I, by contrast, only poured in ghee and honey; although, of course, there is no suggestion that piety or tradition required anything more. 394 Ellis concluded that the substances contributed only to the “theoretical sumptuousness of the building”. 395 These facts may have a significance: namely, they suggest that Šamši-Adad is both placing himself within the royal tradition, and at the same time showing that he has opened the most splendid chapter in the history of that tradition.

This action was an ancient one: Cooper’s text Ad 3.2 comprises a copper foundation plate, copper and stone tablets from Adab and Nippur, inscribed: “For Dingirmah. E'iginimpe’e, the “ruler” of Adab built the Emah, and buried foundation deposits beneath its base.” 396

However, Erišu makes a point of saying that he laid a layer of bricks, and I wonder whether the items do not also underscore the king’s investment of his own labour into the mortar. There may even be a magical element that the place is a place of richness (or holiness).

However, for whatever reason, it would appear that Šamši-Adad gave the temple of Aššur a special treatment. He also may have built the old palace there. 397 He took a personal interest in the installation of statues there. 398 This, pace Brinkman, casts doubt on the view that the city of Aššur was, to him, a “lesser provincial town”. 399 The references to Aššur as being “my city” (a-li-ia) and to the love the god Aššur had for him could, of course, be purely formal.

394 Richard S. Ellis Foundation Deposits in Mesopotamia pp.30 and 126-34. The text of Erišu is in RIMA vol.1 p.22
395 Richard S. Ellis Foundation Deposits in Mesopotamia p.31
396 Jerrold Cooper op. cit. p.16
397 J.-R. Kupper “Šamši-Adad et L’Assyrie” p.148
398 A.R.M vol. 1 letter 74, pp.138-141
When we have examined the texts, I shall return to the question of whether Šamši-Adad was trying to introduce a cult of Enlil as a political ploy, and to identify Aššur with Enlil.

The second text was found on stone cylinders in Ištar's Nineveh temple, the Emašmaš. It concerns rebuilding the Emenne shrine in that complex. Grayson notes that it "highlights the significance of Šamši-Adad's capture of Nurrugu in the progress of his military career." However, there is one caveat on the use of the text: we cannot be sure that it has been correctly assembled. Some of this material may come from other texts. Of course, this is not satisfactory, but if I proceed taking it as one text, I am at least using the same text as other researchers.

It opens:

—dUtu-ši d-IŞKUR

da-nûm

LUGAL.KIŠ

ša-ki-in ďen-lîl

ĔNSI da-[u]r

na-ra-am dINANNA

Šamši-Adad

The strong one,

King of the whole (universe)

Appointee of Enlil

Ensi of Aššur

Beloved of Ištar

He then refers to the fact that the temple had been built by Maništusu, DUMU šar-ru-ki-in, king of Akkad, and had become dilapidated. No king since the fall of Akkad until him has rebuilt it, but now he does so. He describes the building and restoration and restores Maništusu's narû and temennu to their place. Thus does Ištar constantly renew his rule. He curses whoever does not return his narû and temennu as he did for the earlier king.⁴⁰²

⁴⁰⁰ A.K. Grayson RIMA p.51
⁴⁰¹ A.K. Grayson RIMA p.52
⁴⁰² A.K. Grayson RIMA pp.52-5
First, he is rebuilding as no other king has for 7 darā: but to what other kings is Šamši-Adad referring? We know that in conformity with the Assyrian tradition he did not claim to be king of Aššur, and besides, it was he who first incorporated under one rule Aššur and Nineveh from where this text hails.403

The answer comes in line 4: šar KIŠ. Thus, he sees himself in direct line with the great rulers who claimed to be King of the Universe (or the whole), or King of Kish. Hallo found no difference in meaning between KIŠ as referring to kūšatim (“the entirety”) and to the city of Kish (not referring, of course, to ED).404

Second, despite the fact that Aššur and Nineveh were not previously linked, why - in a Ninevite inscription - does he refer to himself as the ensi of Aššur? He does so also in text 8 (from Terqa) and texts 4, 7 and 10 (from Mari).405

Could it be that Šamši-Adad realized Aššur’s potential to develop into a regional centre of influence? If it was simply a case of using whatever title was available, why did he not use the title prince of Mari in his Assyrian texts? Unless Aššur was important to him, and he wanted other people to see it as such, I cannot see why he would have made these references, and received the kings of Tikrish and the “upper lands” in Aššur.406

I suspect that this is another example of his extraordinary perspicacity and originality: insights which, thanks to the Amorites of Babylon and the Hurrians, were not to be realized for over 500 years.

Yet, such is the trick of the eye which the perspective of history plays on us, that it seems natural that the conqueror of Mari and Terqa should go to those places

403 Oates Studies p.31, and J.-R. Kupper “Šamši-Adad et l’Assyrie” p.147, no ruler claimed to be king in Aššur until Aššur-uballit I.
404 W.W. Hallo Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles: A Philologic and Historical Analysis AOS 1957 pp.22-3
405 The reference in text 5, page 57 of RIMA is a reconstruction.
406 Text 1, lines 73-79, RIMA p.50
under the title of vicar of Aššur (among others), and receive foreign rulers in Aššur: possibly for the first time in its history.

The third text is also from Nineveh. However, it appears to be a school text (it has the Assyrian genealogy at the end of it!), and relates to the rebuilding of a temple of Ereshkigal, surely at Aššur.407 Larsen is of the view that if it is not a late forgery, then it will refer to a chapel in the temple of Aššur.408 Borger thinks it unlikely that it is a copy of an original (that is, he does not accept that it could be a school text, which may contain excerpts from different works).409 In support, he refers to suspicious features of the text.410 I do not think it is safe to make any use of this document.

Texts 4 and 5 are each from Mari, and relate to the dedication of a throne to Itûr-Mêr. In each of these, he describes himself as šakin Enlil and the ensi of Aššur. He attributes to the god Itûr-Mêr his conquest of the land of Mari and the Euphrates bank. Text 6, also from Mari, is a dedication of a kettle drum to the goddess Istar-šarratum. As noted above, he refers to himself as LUGAL KALA.GA and king of Akkad.

Text 7 was found on a clay tablet in the Old Babylonian palace at Mari. The original would have been on various cultic objects dedicated to Dagan. It reads:

\[ \text{[dUtu]-ṣi d[Adad]} \quad \text{Samsi-Adad} \]
\[ \text{−LUGAL − da-[núm]} \quad \text{Strong king} \]
\[ \text{ša-ki-in d[Enlil?]}} \quad \text{Appointee of Enlil} \]
\[ \text{ENS} \text{ da-[ṣ[ur]} \quad \text{Ensi of Aššur} \]
\[ \text{na-ra-am d[Da-g[an]} \quad \text{Beloved of Dagan} \]
\[ \text{mu-uš-te-em-k[i ma]-a-tim} \quad \text{pacifier of the land} \]
\[ \text{bi-ir-it Í.D.IDIGNA} \quad \text{between the Tigris and} \]
\[ \text{ù Í.D.BURANUN.NA} \quad \text{Euphrates rivers} \]

407 RIMA p.55 No text by Ikuu concerning its dedication has survived.
408 M.T. Larsen The Old Assyrian City-State p.59
409 Reikele Borger Einleitung in Die Assyrischen Königsinschriften vol. 1 Leiden 1961 p.17
410 Reikele Borger Einleitung p.18
This text is quoted because it shows how his role as “pacifier of the land between the rivers” is presented at Mari as well as at Aššur: seen in the first text.

If Šamši-Adad is telling both Aššur and Mari that he is the appointee of Enlil, he is no less clearly telling them that it is he who has unified and calmed the land between the rivers, in which they find themselves.

As noted elsewhere, texts 9 and 10 are significant to me because they are from Aššur, and he refers to his father, but does not describe his father as an ensi of Aššur - a matter which I find inexplicable if he was trying in the AKL to dupe people into thinking that he was so!

Having examined these inscriptions, the next question arises: what are we to make of the references to Enlil?

Larsen treats the first text as referring to the rebuilding of the Aššur temple: seeing Šamši-Adad as having either (a) rededicated Aššur’s temple to Enlil, or (b) referring only to part of the temple, presumably a chapel within it. Borger also refers to these theories, and notes that this appears to be an attempt to induct Enlil into the Assyrian pantheon, and that Šamši-Adad did, after all, build for himself an administrative capital named “Šubat-Enlil.”

---

411 M.T. Larsen *The Old Assyrian City-State* p.59
412 Reikele Borger *Einleitung* p.16
However, if this is so, why did Šamši-Adad stop halfway? Why did he not thoroughly identify the two gods, and call himself ENSI Enlil? Would an incomplete identification of the gods cause less irritation among his subjects than an exhaustive one? In the very same text: text 1, he refers to himself as ba-ni Ša-da-šur; he refers to himself as loved by Aššur and called by name by Anu and Enlil. In texts 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 he is the appointee of Enlil and the ENSI of Aššur. In text 9 he refers to himself as having built a temple of Aššur. Šamši-Adad knows the difference between the gods, and clearly does not identify them in his own text.

The only grounds I can see for questioning his reference to a temple of Enlil is that we have no other evidence that it existed. But do we need other evidence? We have very little information from Aššur before his time, and a sort of dark age descended during the reign of Išme-Dagan.

However, there is another matter to take into account. The inscription for the Enlil temple has been found not only in the Aššur temple, but also in the Anu-Adad temple. Van Driel considers that there are only two possibilities: (a) the Enlil temple is a chapel within Aššur’s, or (b) it was a separate temple within the city of Aššur. Now, the temple of Aššur was known to have included a number of cultrooms dedicated to different gods, such as Ea, Ninurta, Nusku, Ninlil and Dagan, although Aššur was the chief god.

Van Driel then argues that it cannot have been a chapel, as that would make inexplicable the text referring to the temple i-na qē-re-eb a-li-ia a-šur.418 (“in the midst of my city Aššur, I built”). It is known that Dagan and Enlil shared a cultroom in the Aššur temple,419 but the text seems more appropriate to rebuilding a temple than to restoring a shared cultroom within a temple.

413 RIMA vol. 1 p.48
414 ibid. pp.52-61
415 The same type of argument is presented by Driel: The Cult of Aššur Assen 1969 p.10
416 G. van Driel The Cult of Aššur Assen 1969 p.10
417 ibid. p.11
418 RIMA p.49, lines 35 and 36
419 G. van Driel The Cult of Aššur pp.40-1
Rather, the temple may have indeed been built in the middle of the city; and its absence would explain the "isolated position of the great ziggurat". It would also make an impressive complex of temples, palace and ziggurat. However, the temple must later have been destroyed. This is not to say that the relationship between the gods Aššur and Enlil was not of interest to Assyrians: there is some reason to think that it may have been so in Middle and Neo-Assyrian times. But even so, this is no reason to say that Šamši-Adad tried to identify them.

It seems to me that there is something to be said for the view that Šamši-Adad not only gave all due honour to local deities, but also maintained and promoted a supra-regional cult. This would be in keeping with his role as a sort of "emperor", forging a new kingdom, and (perhaps) successor to the kings of Akkad. The ensi of Aššur had a role in relation to his god Aššur which was rather unique in Mesopotamia.

Perhaps this is the true significance of the establishment of a capital at Šubat-Enlil: he needed a centre for his new empire which was not identified with any particular region. It may not be too speculative to see an extension of this in his establishment of two princedoms: one under each of his sons. This would provide for closer governing of the parts of his kingdom, subject to his close supervision. Although Michalowski's comments concerning the AKL are inconsistent with this thesis, he is surely correct in maintaining that in so far as Šamši-Adad used a royal ideology which was influenced by "Akkadian idea of kingship" he could "combine local and global aspirations through linkage with Agade." To this one could add a linkage to the god Enlil, who from his temple in Nippur had always bestowed rulership: note the conspicuous position of Enlil

---

420 G. van Driel *The Cult of Aššur* pp.11-12
421 G. van Driel *The Cult of Aššur* pp.151
422 Parpola has a theory that the gods were all manifestations of one divine godhead. However, I do not deal with it here, chiefly because it is based to a good extent upon Assyrian art from after the age of Šamši-Adad I. See S. Parpola "The Tree of Life" *JNES 52* (1993) 1ff
423 I dealt with this above.
424 Paul Garelli "Les Temples et le Pouvoir Royal en Assyrie du XVe au VIIe Siècle" in *RAI* 37 (1975) 116-124, p.116
425 Michalowski *art. cit.* p.86
in Šamši-Adad’s inscriptions and the fact that he governed now from a town named Subat-Enlil.

However, as I noted above, as the emperor he did not have to legitimize his rule of Assur. His power was its own justification, especially as it would be continued because it was utilized in accordance with the directions of the gods.

This leads, naturally, to a brief examination of his letters. To read the correspondence of Šamši-Adad with his son Yasmah-Addu, is to peer over the shoulder of a seasoned campaigner, shrewd and attentive to detail, as he governs his realm and tries to instruct his son. Unfortunately, we do not have his correspondence to Išme-Dagan. Thus we cannot tell whether he hectored him the way he did his brother, although the general view is that Išme-Dagan was a warrior after his father’s own heart, while his brother was indecisive.\footnote{See for example, G. Dossin in the introduction to \textit{ARM vol 1}, p.vii \footnote{Liverani \textit{art. cit.} ("Model and Actualization") p.45}}

The letters are, potentially, of great importance, for they do not have the same propagandistic or “public relations” purpose as the inscriptions. As has been noted, the “aims and the political context” of our documents must be scrutinized.\footnote{Liverani \textit{art. cit.} ("Model and Actualization") p.45} There is no reason to think that Šamši-Adad would have been anything but candid in writing to his son.

It is interesting that there is no indication that he was a religious man at all. The will of the gods plays no part whatsoever in his correspondence with his son. I consider, then, that the references to the gods in the inscriptions are - almost certainly - placed there because such references were part of the formal culture of such inscriptions, and not because Šamši-Adad had a deep personal conviction of their truth (although he may have wished to appear as pious).

The letters are dated, and at times, even the portion of the day is given. This would allow his son to know which letter was earlier, should the messengers prove less than entirely reliable. But more than that, it has the distinctive savour
of this practical and particular monarch who would send his son more than one letter on some days.

It will be necessary to quote some of the letters. Citing only relevant portions from letter 8:

1 To Yasmah-Addu, say: "Thus speaks Šamši-Adad your father.
5 On the subject of the sons of Wilānum, who are with you, I told you to maintain them, in case, later on, an alliance might be made.
8 Now that there is to be no alliance with Wilānum,
10 I tell you the contrary now - seize them. As many of the sons of Wilānum as are
12 with you ..... order that they die the same night. Let there not be any vigil, praise, or bereavement. Prepare their graves for burial once they are dead. ... The finery of their head and their clothes
32 let them remove; take their silver and their gold; then bring their women to me.
35 The two females musicians, Nawira-Šarur and their women are ..... detain these women with you.
38 As for the servants of Sammētar, bring them to me.
Tr.40 In the month of Tirum, the fifteenth day, in the evening, this my tablet, have I sent you.

Šamši-Adad’s ruthlessness to the extent of homicide, and the concomitant savour of ghouliness, are his most repulsive features, although he could congratulate Yasmah-Addu on pacifying some conquered people by showing them clemency (letter 10). But the letter exhibits the careful attention to detail and the tone of imperative command which I have mentioned. That Yashmah-Addu was dependent upon his father in matters of administration appears clearly from his many requests for advice. For example, in letter 18:

428 All references to letters are to volume 1 of ARM.
Thus speaks Šamši-Adad your father. [Since Yašub]-El died in Tuttul
you have written to me [for his] replacement. [On the subject of
the settling] of [Abduma]-Dagan in Tuttul. His consignment
there) according to your tablet, is not clear. Do you settle him
definitively or do you have someone else in mind? As for
Abduma-Dagan, he is the man to put there: he is reliable.
Besides, he has slept among the takers of oracles, and when I
think of it,
he has never erred or been negligent. [He is ...] reliable. Place
[this man?] at Tuttul. Speak to him in these terms: “Why do you
live in Zibnatim, in residences not properly constructed and in a swampy field?
Live, rather, at Tuttul, where you can found a hearth and build a
house.
Arable land abounds;
the country is like that of Shubartu; arable land abounds there.
Install yourself down there, and build for yourself a lordly-
dwelling; establish a hearth.
Protect the town and the country for your master.” Tell him all
this, calm him and place him in Tuttul. At his side, place a
reliable chief of house,
and an officer of reliable ?stakes/posts (“piquets”), and to
Zibnatim, for Abduma-Dagan’s replacement, among the very sons
of this land, let it be a man from the palace stock in your service
or a reliable ušmu (?), for Zibnatim, for his replacement, install.

The letter is worth quoting to obtain the taste of how practical and methodical he
was. He also gave his son advice on how not to allow troops to put down roots
away from home. From letter 20:
I have read the tablet you sent me. On the subject of not dismissing the troops of the fortress at Tuttul and at Yabliya, ...

Do not say this:

5  “The troops who have come from Qatanum will reside here for the fortress. Let them (mutually) replace each other. Let one section live there for a month, and then, let it go away, and another section replace it.

10  “Let them alternate thus and let no one fix them.” On the contrary, occupy the fortresses of these villages with the native troops of the district; and the troops of the countryside release, and send them to me.

15  Don’t hold onto them.

In letter 24, which is not worth quoting in full, he dictates the terms of a letter for Yasmah-Addu to send on to someone else, and says: “recopy (it) onto another tablet with all sorts of amiabilities and send it.”

The letters cover all sorts of topics:

- the delivery of different timbers to Ekallatum, Nineveh and Šubat-Enlil (letter 7) and a carpenter to complete building at Šubat-Enlil⁴²⁹;
- census⁴³⁰ taking (letters 6, 7 and 87);
- the disposition of troops (13 and 23 among many others);
- the recruitment of troops (42);
- how and what to give as gift (17);
- delivering sesame and copper (21);
- criticism for poor rulership (28 and 61 among others);
- presenting him with “antique books” for his use (40);⁴³¹
- to imprison someone (57);
- of his own victories and exploits (92 among others);

⁴²⁹ ARM vol 2, letter 2
⁴³¹ So I translate “tup-pa-tim la-bi-ra-tim”, as “old tablets” would hardly make sense.
and the latest skilful conquest by Išme-Dagan using earthworks to capture a walled town (letter 4).

But perhaps the most important of these letters is number 69, which reports that Išme-Dagan has conquered the armies of Akhazim and Turukku, and tells him to rejoice for his brother, and not to lounge around with women, but to go to Qatanum with an army and establish for himself a great name in his own land as his brother has:

i-nu-ma it-ti um-ma-na-tim a-na Qa-ta-nim(ki)
ta-al-la-ku lu-ù a-wi-la-at
ki-ma a-lju-ka šu-ma-am ra-bé-e-em
iš-ta-ak-nu ū at-ta i-na ma-ti-ka
šu-ma-am ra-bé-e-em ši-it-ka-an.\(^{432}\)

This letter is quite important as it makes a connection between the formal elocution of the royal inscriptions and the personal view of Šamši-Adad. It shows beyond any doubt that he considered that the establishment of a great name in one’s own land was an all-powerful motive to urge upon a prince, and that feats of arms would accomplish this.

Unfortunately, all we have left of Yasmah-Addu’s replies to these taunts is some verbiage and fragments (108 and 113). When Yasmah-Addu writes to his father, as in letters 108 to 120, he addresses him as “Addá”, the equivalent of something like “daddy”. When Išme-Dagan writes to Yasmah-Addu, he addresses him as “my brother”, reports on his wars, and tells him not to worry for Mari. It seems to me that this indicates both brothers accepted their father’s views about the proper role of a king; although in the case of Yasmah-Addu, he may have been completely ill-equipped to discharge them, and preferred to remain with his harem.

\(^{432}\) ARM vol. 1 p.130
The next source for the royal ideology of Šamši-Adad is a tenuous one, but having so few sources, we should evaluate it, albeit cautiously: it is the artwork of his reign. Moortgat is of the opinion that of the works thought to be his, only one, the stela from Mardin can be safely attributed to him.

As Moortgat describes it: "its obverse shows a triumphant ruler placing his foot on a conquered enemy, while the reverse only displays some men, possibly also enemies, in strange garments with the "rounded tab" fringes which are generally a West Semitic characteristic." He also notes that in the "bull brought to sacrifice" wall paintings from Mari, the leader of the procession - who may be Yasmah-Addu - wears a girdle similar to that of Šamši-Adad in the Mardin stela, and a double-row of rounded tab fringes. Thus, one can infer that the westerners may not in fact be enemies.

Perhaps just as interesting, Moortgat thinks that the artwork from Yasmah-Addu’s Mari also shows a king in military splendour. He says: "The painters of this epoch not only used cult or mythical themes, but also had to glorify the concept of kingship. ... If one visualizes the painting on the four walls of Court 106 and considers its pictorial content and inter-relationship, one is reminded involuntarily of the decoration on the four walls of some Late Assyrian palace court ... Do the roots of Assyrian wall relief reach back to the period of Šamši-Adad I?"

The artwork of Mari is quite impressive, using variously as primary colours black, white, red and blue; or sometimes adding yellow, green, carmine and various ochres. Parrot concludes that it gives evidence of a long standing artistic tradition. If Moortgat is correct on its influence upon Assyria’s later rulers, it is easy to understand why.

434 ibid. p.72
435 The bull sacrifice procession and the military scene.
436 ibid pp.33-4
437 André Parrot Nineveh and Babylon trans. Gilbert and Emmons Thames and Hudson 1961 pp.260-1
In any event, if the Mardin stela can be attributed to Šamši-Adad, it confirms the importance of military exploits to him: something which - according to Moortgat - distinguishes him from Hammurapi who projected his ability in the arts of peace, but aligns him with the Akkadian concept of the conqueror of all forces of evil.\textsuperscript{433}

\textsuperscript{433} Moortgat \textit{op. cit.} p.104. It would be too much of a detour to consider whether Moortgat is entirely correct in this view. In one way, the impression is just as important as whether it is ultimately correct, as so much that one remembers of art work is simply a subjective impression. Were I making more of it for my thesis, I would, however, enter the fray.
Chapter Eleven

Šamši-Adad IV and Aššur-nasir-pal I

It is now time to look at Šamši-Adad IV and Aššur-nasir-pal. To understand their reign, one should start with the low international position to which Aššur had sunk prior to the accession of Aššur-uballit I in about 1365 BC. It is necessary to examine this portion of Assyrian history, at least briefly, to show how Babylon came to be such a major factor in Aššur’s affairs, and to indicate the background to Šamši-Adad IV and Aššur-nasir-pal I.

After the collapse of the house of Šamši-Adad I, our sources for the history of Aššur are most scarce. The period is, for us, a “dark age”. At some point, Aššur may even have been a possession of Mitanni, a situation from which Aššur-uballit rescued it, taking advantage of Mitanni’s own problems. It is this ruler who is the first to call himself king of Assyria. This style is found in the Amarna correspondence, but also in a seal where he is LUGAL KUR aš-šur. At the same time, Assyrian glyptic art under this king and his father Eriba-Adad I throws off the influence of Mitanni. Collon describes the art which surfaces under Eriba-Adad as “featuring a revival of earlier composite creatures and the creation of new ones ...”. I suspect that it will one day appear that the role of Eriba-Adad in liberating Aššur may prove to be greater than had been thought.

Aššur-uballit also had an interest in law-making, but the evidence is fragmentary. Yet, the laws must have been at least adequate for their purpose, as Tiglath-Pileser I had them collated. In the Amarna correspondence he addresses the Pharaoh as his brother and asks him for gold to build his palace. An indignant, but powerless, Burnaburriš of Babylon sends his own correspondence advising Pharaoh that the Assyrians are his vassals. The true status of the Assyrians emerges from the fact that Burnaburriš married Muballitat-Šerua, the daughter of...

439 CAH 2/II 3rd ed. per C.J. Gadd pp.22-4, and RIMA vol. 1 p.115
440 CAH 2/II 3rd ed. per C.J. Gadd p.24 and A. Moortgat op. cit. pp.112-3
441 Domenique Collon Ancient Near Eastern Art California 1995 p.114
442 von Soden op. cit. p.137 and D.J. Wiseman CAH 2/II 475
this Assyrian “vassal”, and she apparently became a “leading figure” in Babylon.443

When the Babylonians slew the son of Muballitat-Šerua, Assur-uballit invaded, revenged himself on the pretender, and placed his grandson Kurigalzu on the throne.444 Assur-uballit was succeeded by Enlil-Nirari and he by Arik-din-ili, who was responsible for the creation of a chronicle, of which, unfortunately, only fragments remain.445

His successor was Adad-nirari I from whom significant narratives of his campaigns survive. It is easy to make much of him, as we have lost so much of what preceded him. Perhaps his contribution would look different if we had even his father’s writings. Certainly, he saw himself as the scion of “awesome” sires such as Assur-uballit and his descendants.446 His texts are so fulsome in their praise of his predecessors that one must be inclined to think that they were actually perceived to be great kings, and that Adad-nirari I is reflecting that perception. Like Šamši-Adad I, he was a great warrior, and also laid emphasis upon the god Enlil and his own role as appointee of Enlil. More pertinently, Adad-nirari was the first king since Šamši-Adad to style himself LUGAL KIŠ.447

As Garelli has noted, the influence of Šamši-Adad I’s ideology (or at least his use of titles), was significant throughout Assyrian history, but seems particularly great on this king.448

As Moortgat writes: “The political and cultural fulfilment of all that Assyria had wished to achieve after throwing off the Hurrian-Mitannian yoke was brought
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443 CAH 2/II 3rd ed. per C.J. Gadd pp.24-8; she may, in fact, have married the son of Burnaburias.  
444 Gadd thinks that the revolt may have been provoked, in part, by Aššur’s calling on the Babylonians to aid them in their own battles with the Sutu, op. cit. pp.29-30.  
445 These are translated in Grayson RIMA vol. 2 pp.125-7  
446 It is too tangential for me to summarize the evidence in full, but see text 1 in RIMA vol. 2 pp.131-2 and also text 11, pp.144-5  
447 ibid see, inter alia, texts 1 and 14, line 2 p.148, text 15 line 3, p.150. For LUGAL KIŠ, see text 3 line 1, and CAH 2/II per J.M. Munn-Rankin, p.278  
about in the thirteenth century under its three great rulers, Adad-nirari I, Shalmaneser and Tukulti-Ninurta I.\textsuperscript{449}

His son is the Shalmaneser who cites Ušpia as builder of the temple of Aššur, and notes that it was rebuilt by Šamši-Adad I. He continues what is now becoming the tradition of military narratives, and ended forever the threat of the Hurrians, forestalling the Hittites in gaining control of Upper Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{450} He also built a new capital at Kalakh, which fell into disuse after his rule, to be rebuilt by Aššur-nasir-pal II, four hundred years later.

Tukulti-Ninurta I, a remarkable king, conquered Babylon, and assumed a bewildering variety of royal epithets, many of which linked him to southern Mesopotamian traditions. While he did not at all neglect Aššur, rebuilding the temple of Ištar according to new and magnificent canons, he also built his own capital, Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, stamping it with his own "self-willed personality" and his taste for Babylonian influences.\textsuperscript{451}

Reviewing Assyrian temple architecture at this time, Frankfort concludes that it is: "... all the more likely that the differences between Assyrian and Babylonian architecture are due to intentional innovations on the part of the Assyrians."\textsuperscript{452} In general, he considers that the Assyrian art of the late second millennium exhibited considerable energy.\textsuperscript{453}

In his rule, there were some remarkable literary productions, some in Akkadian and Sumerian: he also plundered the libraries of Babylon.\textsuperscript{454} From his reign, too, come two pedestal reliefs showing him worshipping Nusku and Šamaš, where a dynamic attitude finds expression despite the restraints inherent in the necessity of executing an "almost static composition".\textsuperscript{455}

\textsuperscript{449} op. cit. p.116
\textsuperscript{450} Grayson op. cit. p.180 and J.M. Munn-Rankin op. cit. pp.279-82
\textsuperscript{452} op. cit. p.140
\textsuperscript{453} op. cit. pp.140-1
\textsuperscript{455} Moortgat op. cit. p.120
Munn-Rankin makes an interesting remark in speaking of the military narratives which I have made occasional reference to i.e. that they are modelled upon the narrative of Šamši-Adad I because he was the only model connected with Assyria that they could look to.\(^{456}\)

As for Tukulti-Ninurta, great fighter though he was, there seems to have been widespread dissatisfaction within Assyria; it is conjectured that the discontent was caused or fanned because of the demands made by Tukulti-Ninurta’s ceaseless wars. In any event, it was his son who led the revolt which murdered him.\(^{457}\) There are also questions as to whether he showed too much favouritism to Babylonians in State appointments, and to Marduk in religion: but it makes one think that even to the Assyrians, while the perfect king might have been a warrior, there was a limit to how much combat could be tolerated. While his murder instigated (or was the first overt symptom of) a period of disorder in Assyria, the Elamites had already conducted deep raids into Babylon during his reign. Finally, they overthrew the Kassite regime in about 1152BC.\(^{458}\) After their victory and plundering, the Elamites withdrew, leaving a power vacuum filled, to some extent, by the Fourth Dynasty of Babylon\(^{459}\).

We now come to an important point, providing the background to part of my view of the authorship of the AKL. In political matters, the Elamites continued to raid Babylonia, and to war with Assyria.

Adad-šuma-usur of Babylon defeated in battle Enlil-kudurru-usur, one of the sons of Tukulti-Ninurta. Enlil-kudurru-usur had driven from Assyria Ninurta-apil-Ekur, one of the sons of Ili-khadda, who as a descendant of Eriba-Adad I, was supported by Babylon, where he found refuge. Then, Aššur itself was taken.\(^{460}\) With Babylonian aid, and using that city as a base, Ninurta-apil-Ekur

\(^{456}\) op. cit. p.295  
\(^{457}\) ibid pp.292-4.  
\(^{458}\) von Soden op. cit. p.53  
\(^{459}\) Also known as the second dynasty of Isin: G. Roux Ancient Iraq 3rd ed. p.277  
\(^{460}\) D.J. Wiseman op. cit. p.450
took the throne. This is noted in the AKL, being the 82nd royal entry, and extracted as point (1) above.\footnote{\textit{D.J. Wiseman op. cit.} pp.450-1}

We have thus entered the period when Babylonian intrigues in Assyria’s own affairs threatened the royal succession. Babylonian influence was at its zenith. While the old Assyrian eponym system continued, the calendar was changed to come into line with the Babylonian, at least in respect of the names of months and to commence with the spring equinox.\footnote{\textit{D.J. Wiseman op. cit.} pp.476-7}

After a brief rule, Ninurta-apil-Ekur was succeeded by his son, Aššur-dan I. We only have one bronze statuette from his reign, which commenced about 30 years after the death of Tukulti-Ninurta. After a reign of about 45 years, he died 20 years before Tiglath-Pileser took the throne. For such a long reign, the lack of materials is deplorable, but is itself a testimony to the extent to which political conditions were fragile. It is my thesis that the destruction of records was apparent even to the Assyrians themselves.

There is nothing extraordinary about the dedicatory text to Ištar,\footnote{\textit{RIMA} vol. 1 pp.307-8} but the statuette itself, with its elegant touches is “entirely comprised in the basic shape of the pillar, conceived from a single viewpoint, its details incised with great delicacy. There is no trace here of Aramaic influence, which at that period was already very evident in Babylon ...”\footnote{\textit{Moortgat op.cit.} pp.121-2} In connection with this statuette, Munn-Rankin notes that its location at Irbil indicates that Aššur-dan paid close attention to the needs of the Assyrian frontiers.\footnote{\textit{op. cit.} p.451}

Aššur-dan was not an ineffective king, struggling with Hittite and Elamite threats, but was slain in a palace revolt, and succeeded by his son Ninurta-Tukulti-Aššur who ruled for perhaps less than twelve months. But he was deposed by his brother Mutakkil-Nusku.\footnote{\textit{D.J. Wiseman op. cit.} pp.448-9} He was the 85th king in the AKL.
The notation that he had deported his brother was cited as point (m) when I considered the nature of the annotations in the AKL. He, like Ninurta-apil-Ekur, took refuge at the court of Babylon; and thus yet another rival claimant to the throne of Assyria received assistance from the Second Dynasty of Isin.

As that Babylonian dynasty gained in power and independence from Elam, it further contended with Aššur, threatening to replace Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur upon the throne of Aššur with its own nomination. This threat, however, came to nothing. But, still, we have a situation where the Babylonians have threatened the legitimacy of the Assyrian king.

Mutakkil-Nusku was followed by his son Aššur-reša-iši, who in a 17 year rule effectively dealt with some of Assyria’s enemies. In his inscriptions he portrays himself as MAN KISE⁴⁶⁹, the appointee of Enlil and a great warrior. He also stresses that he rebuilt temple towers of Ištar of Nineveh which had been damaged during the reign of Shalmaneser, but which had been left unrepaired. Again, we see the role of king as temple builder, and a competitive edge.⁴⁷⁰ Now, reflecting the changed conditions, in a fragment from Nineveh, he portrays himself as the scourge of rebels.⁴⁷¹ There is, however, no artwork that I know of from his reign. As evidence of his military ability, he enjoyed two victories over Nebuchadrezzar I of Babylon, on one occasion burning his siege equipment.⁴⁷²

But the most capable monarch of this period, appears to have been Tukulti-apil-Ešarra I (Tiglath-Pileser) the 87th ruler in the AKL. It was he who developed a strategic plan for Assyria’s defence: a notoriously difficult matter as it was so exposed.⁴⁷³ A many faceted man, and especially a tireless warrior, he pushed deep into Anatolia, crossed the Lebanese mountains, and sailed the Mediterranean. He may even have extended Assyrian power too far, making

⁴⁶⁷ D.J. Wiseman op. cit. pp.443-7
⁴⁶⁸ D.J. Wiseman op. cit. p.453
⁴⁶⁹ Grayson RIMA vol. 1 p.314
⁴⁷⁰ Grayson RIMA vol. 1 pp.309-11 and the other texts for this ruler, which are fairly similar, to p.322
⁴⁷¹ Grayson RIMA vol. 1 p.316
⁴⁷² D.J. Wiseman op. cit. p.454
⁴⁷³ D.J. Wiseman op. cit. p.457
If ever the king was the vicar of the gods - their glorious intermediary on earth - it was at this period. It is chiefly from this king that any important work has survived from the period, due, on some accounts, to the disturbed conditions in the Near East. But there is a significant qualification to be placed upon this, and that is the accident of discovery.

Because we have only a fragment of the famous “broken obelisk”, which is not an obelisk, we cannot be sure whether it comes from Tiglath-Pileser, or whether, with Frankfort, it dates from his son, Aššur-bel-kala. Frankfort cites it for the way it “impressively rendered” the “distance between (the) god (Aššur) and men.” This notion, of the distance between gods and men - mediated by the king - he also finds reflected in the configuration of temple immediately joined to ziggurats which are almost inaccessible, and the whole adjoining the palace.

It shows Tiglath-Pileser (or possibly one of his sons) in a long robe, with a dagger in his belt. He holds ropes which are attached to the nostrils of four captives. Two of these are distinguished from the other two by their headgear. Above, in the sky, are symbols of the gods; most notably the winged disk which represents Aššur himself. One of the hands extending from the disk proffers a bow, possibly as a sign of blessing. As Olmstead notes: “Already the chief characteristics of Assyrian relief are illustrated in this first dated example, the position of the monarch and the captive, the treatment of hair and drapery, the solid figures, the emphasis on muscular development.”

474 D.J. Wiseman op. cit. pp.461-2. Indeed, Babylon appears to have made good some of its losses and inflicted smarting blows upon Assyria later during his reign: ibid pp.464-5
475 Thus Moortgat op. cit. pp.120-1
476 Henri Frankfort The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient p.134
477 ibid pp.138-40 and 149
Olmstead attributes it to a son of Tiglath-Pileser, and tentatively, to Šamši-Adad IV. Moortgat thinks it is probably by Aššur-bel-kala. Grayson holds the same opinion as Moortgat, and is even more certain of it. Given the nature of the inscription, if it is between Aššur-bel-kala and Šamši-Adad IV, I think that it is unlikely that such a war-like account has come down to us from the elderly, short-reigning Šamši-Adad IV. I think then, that we can provisionally accept that it is by Aššur-bel-kala, whether it displays him or his father.

The importance of it for my thesis is that it is a “pillar-like stele”. That is, it comprises something in the direction of an obelisk (which I define below when I come to the White Obelisk) with a narrative relief: “the first pictorial annals of the Assyrian kings”, according to Moortgat. He considers it to evidence - for the obelisk - “the beginning of their development (having just) ... a single pictorial field, and the king’s report was still confined to the inscription.” As we shall see further when we come to consider the White Obelisk, the close artistic relationship between the Broken and the White Obelisks is another reason why one would conclude with Julian Reade that the White Obelisk was indeed constructed by Aššur-nasir-pal I.

To return to our chronological treatment, the military glories depicted on the Broken Obelisk did not last. Wiseman concludes that: “the very scale of Assyrian success therefore paved the way for a swift denial of the Assyrian overlordship and thus for the loss of the hard-won territories if ever the central government was weak.”

After the death of Tiglath-Pileser I, there was some confusion in the royal house. There was more disturbance at the death of the 89th king, Aššur-bel-kala (c.1074-1057BC), who although he had been hard pressed by Babylon and other foes, had kept Aššur safe. His relationship with Babylon has an unclear

---

479 op. cit. pp.121-2
480 RIMA vol. 2 pp.87-9
481 op. cit. p.122
482 CAH 2/II 3rd ed. per D.J. Wiseman pp.457-464, citing p.462
483 Wiseman op. cit. pp.466-7
history, but he seems to have raided the region when he suspected that they were aiding his brother, a rival claimant to his throne. He was succeeded by his son, Eriba-Adad II, the 90th king, who according to the AKL, ruled for two years.

Šamši-Adad IV

Now, although Wiseman says that Šamši-Adad IV was another son of Aššur-bel-kala, the AKL makes him a son of Tukulti-apil-Ešarra. Olmstead accepted that Šamši-Adad IV was the son of Tukulti-apil-Ešarra.\textsuperscript{484} Certainly, he himself claimed to be so! In this respect, his inscriptions are unanimous.\textsuperscript{485} I see no reason to doubt his claim that Tiglath-Pileser was his father.

The text of the AKL says that:

\textsuperscript{486}

\begin{verbatim}
TA kurKar-du-ni-āš e-la-a
1 SU-dIM DUMU 1 Aš+šur-EN-ka-la
ina Gïš.GU.ZA ú-šat-bi Gïš.GU.ZA is-bat 4 MU.MEŠ MAN-ta [DÛ-uš]
\end{verbatim}

I translate this as:

"Šamši-Adad, son of Tukulti-apil-Ešarra, from Babylonia came up (and) deposed Eriba-Adad, son of Aššur-bēl-kala. He seized the throne. Four years [he wielded] the kingship."

Unfortunately, we know very little about Šamši-Adad IV except that he received aid from Adad-apla-iddina, an Aramaean usurper on the throne of Babylon, under whose reign (1067-1046BC) the temple of Šamaš in Sippar was sacked.\textsuperscript{487}

It seems that Šamši-Adad IV deposed his nephew from the throne - which may account for his short reign i.e. that he was roughly the same age as Aššur-bēl-

\textsuperscript{484} A.T. Olmstead \textit{History of Assyria} U Chicago P 1923 p.71
\textsuperscript{485} \textit{RIMA} voi. 2 pp.117-21, texts 1, 2, 4 and 5.
\textsuperscript{486} Gelb \textit{art. cit.} p.221
\textsuperscript{487} Roux \textit{op. cit.} p.281
kala, who was Eriba-Adad’s father. Except in one respect, Šamši-Adad IV
deported himself in the manner that every great Assyrian king did. He built and
he restored - but he did not, so far as we know, go to war. It may of course be
simply an accident of discovery, but it would not be impossible that the aged
king had taken the throne on the understanding that he would not provoke any
hostilities in the region.

Aššur-nasir-pal I

As Grayson says: “Confusion is the key word for this reign (1049-1031BC)”.
It is, unfortunately, easy to confuse him with an Aššur-nasir-pal the son of
Tukulti-Nirurta I, and also with king Aššur-nasir-pal II.

The two texts in RIMA say little enough. The first is a brick inscription, which
appears to be a sort of property tag, specifying that it is the property of the palace
of Aššur-nasir-pal, king of the universe (MAN ŠÚ; ŠÚ=kiššati) and king of
Assyria (MAN KUR AŠ). The second text on a cone refers to him as šakin Enlil
and iššak aššur.

The really controversial element concerning this king is whether the inscription
on the White Obelisk is his. I deal with that question below, but first, one needs
to consider the material which is quite clearly his. There are two hymns written
by or for this king. These are given by Foster in modern translations, and are
both hymns to Ištar of Nineveh. Foster gives the first hymn the rubric “On
Occasion of Illness”, and it is the most important of the two. Extant copies have
been available since 1890, being located in the library of Ashurbanipal. A rather famous and very poetical translation was made by Olmstead, relevantly
reading:
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488 Wiseman op. cit. p.469
489 RIMA vol. 2 p.122
490 ibid pp.122-3
491 Benjamin R. Foster Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature Volume 1: Archaic, Classical, Mature Maryland 1993 pp.239-46
"The mother of wisdom, the lady of majesty who dwells in Emashmash, ... [there follows praise of Ištar] ... to whom all that are confounded bring their distress. The afflictions which I behold, before thee I bewail; to my words full of sighing, let thy ears be directed. To my afflicted speech let thy mind be opened; look upon me, O Lady, that through thy turning to me thy servant's heart may become strong.

"Aššur-nasir-pal am I, the afflicted, thy servant, humble and fearing thy divinity, provident and thy favourite, who hath established thy offerings, who without ceasing offers thy sacrifices, who is eager for thy festivals, who brings abundance upon thy shrine, who makes plentiful the wine, the desire of thy heart which thou lovest. The son of Šamši-Adad, who adores the great gods, I was begotten in the midst of mountains which none knoweth, I was without understanding and to thy Ladyship I never did pray, the people of Assyria did not know and did not receive thy divinity.

"But thou, O Ištar, mighty princess of the gods, in the lifting up of thine eyes didst teach me and didst desire my rule; thou didst take me from out of the mountains and didst call me to the threshold of the peoples. Thou didst preserve for me the sceptre of the temples until the growing old of mankind. And thou, O Ištar, didst magnify my name, and thou hast granted to the faithful salvation and mercy.

"Out of thy mouth came forth the command to renew the statues of the gods which had been burned. The temples which were fallen into ruins I repaired, the overthrown gods I restored and brought back to their places; they were exalted, thy offerings I established forever. [There follows more description of works on behalf of Ištar] ...

"In what have I done thee wrong? Why hast thou allotted me disease, boils and pestilence? As one who doth not honour thy divinity am I tormented. If I have
not incurred sin and evil, why am I thus inflicted? ... *a number of illustrations of woe are omitted* ... 

"... Make thy disease come forth and restrain my sin; let tranquillity for me be ordered ... then to the end of time, shall I exalt thy Ladyship."

There are several points to make:

1. as Olmstead says, there is clearly a deeply personal tone here, a "cry from the depths of a human soul". The first two paragraphs alone would make that point quite eloquently.

2. He states that he is the son of Šamši-Adad, and that he was born in the mountains and did not know of her or pray to her. As Olmstead says, he must have been born in exile. Certainly, he will have been raised in exile: I suspect in Babylon, perhaps at the court, and there followed Babylonian cults. This would probably explain why he says that he did not worship the goddess. Now, Seux and Labat make a little more of this point. They see these references as justifying — the creation of a new dynasty.

Labat argued that while Ištar had in recent times been worshipped at Aššur under a Hurrian name, it was Aššur-nasir-pal I who reinstated her rule. This would seem reasonable. Seux took the matter further, saying that whether his father had been governor of a mountain province, or simply an exile, the lines of this hymn were clearly more than merely a literary motif. He saw them as "supporting the claim (of a right to) inaugurate a new dynasty".

3. There is a reference to "the growing old of mankind" (*a-na li-tab-bur da-dād-mi*). I interpret this to mean that the goddess had granted him (what he hoped

---

493 A.T. Olmstead *History of Assyria* University of Chicago Press first printed in 1923, republished in 1960 pp.70-4, the hymn is at 72-4.


would be) a very long reign.\textsuperscript{496} Perhaps in a similar vein, the text says that his rule is “subject to the gods who [are the gods] of heaven and earth” (ina ili meš šu-ut šamē erset).\textsuperscript{497} But the phrase is striking. We know that there was current a notion of the youth of mankind, when the apkallu Adapa, Nunpirriggaldim, Piriggalnungal, Piriggalabzu, Lu-Nanna and two others, over a period of time, gave wise advice to kings in order to “insure the correct functioning of the plans of heaven and earth”.\textsuperscript{498} Thus, the idea of an “old age” for humanity is quite understandable.

Perhaps this was connected in Aššur-nasir-pal’s mind with the fact that the worship of Ištar had been forgotten (point 5 below). Is it too speculative to suggest that the AKL was created by Aššur-nasir-pal as a way of bolstering the memory of Assyrians in these late times?

4. Note that Ištar is praised in terms of the exaltation of her name: this is a standard in the royal ideology, and I do not seek to argue that it shows the direct influence of Šamši-Adad I.

5. He states that the people of Assyria did not know her, had forgotten her, and that he restored worship which had been abandoned, rebuilt temples and replaced statues (my emphasis). Given the personal note in this text, and the comments of Labat, I am inclined to accept the truth of these statements. Given my methodological principles, I add that there is nothing here which I do not accept as being the genuine perception of Aššur-nasir-pal; and on reading the text, one can see that indeed nothing strikes us unbelievable.

6. It is interesting to note that he has clearly done a lot of building and bestowed some lavish gifts upon the temple and cult. Many inscriptions and

\textsuperscript{496} We know from the second hymn that he did grow to be old: see Foster \textit{op. cit.} p.243. I have given reasons for thinking that Šamši-Adad IV was old when he took the throne. Although Aššur-nasir-pal I reigned for 18 years, he may have been in middle age when he took the throne, hence he says in the second hymn that he had been granted “(time) to grow old”. Of course, we do not know whether the second hymn was written before or after the first.

\textsuperscript{497} \textit{art. cit.} p.45

\textsuperscript{498} Erica Reiner “The Etiological Myth of the ‘Seven Sages’” \textit{Or NS} 30 (1961) 1-11, p.1
dedications must have been written. Yet, as was seen from the citations from Grayson, not a skerrick of evidence that this was so survives. Again, this underscores the chance of discovery.

7. The hymn is a prayer addressed by the king in a great sickness. We have no other evidence for this illness.

It is noteworthy that if his reference to having been born in mountains and chosen by the goddess are intended to vindicate the new dynasty, it is a subtle claim. Further, although Seux does not note it, the founder of the dynasty was Šamši-Adad IV. Thus, we have some of the features I have argued for in the AKL:

(a) the creation of a document for one purpose (that is, this text is a hymn, and the AKL is a list designed to preserve historical information); while

(b) that document is subtly used as the occasion to convey the notion of the legitimacy of the rule of Šamši-Adad IV.

The fact that no practically records remain of his works will indicate that Aššur-nasir-pal I is in many respects a great enigma: we cannot resist attributing documents or artwork to him on the sole grounds that we cannot believe that they could have originated from such an unknown king. Yet, Sollberger has effectively proffered this as a reason for denying the attribution of the White Obelisk to Aššur-nasir-pal I. For the reasons given below, I do not accept this. It is to this piece that I now turn.

According to Frankfort, the “obelisk”, as an art style, is a variant of the stela. He defines it as a “standing stone, more or less square in section, bearing designs and texts on all four sides.” As it happens, Frankfort attributes the famous “white obelisk” to Aššur-nasir-pal II, but unfortunately, gives no reasons. This is a little unusual, as those who are primarily art historians have tended to attribute it

499 Henri Frankfort The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient p.156
500 loc. cit.
to Aššur-nasir-pal I. For example, in an insightful passage, Dominique Collon states:

"Once even more hotly debated (than the Broken Obelisk) was the attribution of ... the 'White Obelisk'. It is decorated on all four sides with scenes of military campaigns, the bringing of tribute, victory banquets, religious and hunting scenes. The accompanying inscription names an Aššur-nasir-pal and should be dated to around 1050BC, although some scholars have opted for a later date. Holly Pittman has suggested that the seemingly disordered sequence of scenes actually makes sense if it is seen as the record of the decoration of the walls of a throne room. Such decoration would have been painted or executed in glazed bricks, but very little survives. In any case, grouped together here we have the earliest representations of what were to be the main themes of Assyrian narrative art from the ninth century onwards"\(^{501}\) (my emphasis).

Given the early nature of the material, but also how it adumbrates themes which were to be more artfully developed in the future, how did the idea that it was in fact a product as late as Aššur-nasir-pal II arise? I do not wish to suggest that the attribution to the latter monarch has no merit: after all, the first king of that-name is virtually unknown, and the monarch on the obelisk is depicted as a great ruler.

The text itself has some points of interest; relevant portions of it read in Sollberger's translation:

1-4  [In the first year of my reign, when] I sat in glory [on the throne], I moved by chariotry and numerous troops; I conquered inaccessible forts all round. I received contributions in horses from the land of Gilzanu ...

4-6  [Because] they did not (continue to) send the horses hither, I became angry and marched against the city of Harira (and) the city of Halhalauš, (cities) of [cr]iminal [lo]rds.

\(^{501}\) Dominique Collon *Ancient Near Eastern Art* UCP 1995 p.117
These (!) I conquered in the eponymy of Aššur-nasir-pal: I took out their goods, their captives, their possessions, their herds, (and) carried them to Aššur, my city; ...

**Epitaph** The *Bit-nathi* of the city of Nineveh: I performed the wine libation and sacrifice of the temple of the august goddess.\(^{502}\)

Since it was found in 1852/3 historians have naturally thought of the latter, and despite a shift to attribute it to the earlier ruler, Landsberger lent his considerable authority to reinstating the first view.\(^{503}\) An interesting position is that of Anton Moortgat. Like Collon, he concedes that the White Obelisk comprises the "earliest pictorial annals" and describes them as "even earlier than the wall relief of Aššur-nasir-pal II in Kalakh ... a continuous pictorial frieze ..."\(^{504}\)

Moortgat refers to the dispute between Landsberger and Unger (who championed the view expressed here), and found that one had to compare this obelisk to the known works of Aššur-nasir-pal II. This is, surely a reasonable procedure: to work from the known outwards. Moortgat then divided his analysis into three categories: subject matter, composition and "iconography and history of material civilization."

Dealing first with subject matter, these he described as "warlike expeditions to the mountains, conquests of strongholds and cities, the offering of tribute to the Assyrian king, sacrifices in front of the temple, (and) wild animals hunted on foot or from a chariot".\(^{505}\) These subjects, of course, are all found on the orthostats of the throne room of Aššur-nasir-pal II. The treatment of theme with text is analogous on both orthostat and obelisk, but the preparation of the pictorial fields and the arrangement thereof is "so uncoordinated and has so little reference to any planned design that this factor alone makes it difficult to believe that any
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\(^{504}\) Anton Moortgat *The Art of Ancient Mesopotamia* Phaidon 1969 pp.122-3

\(^{505}\) Anton Moortgat *The Art of Ancient Mesopotamia* p.123
single artist or patron was responsible both for the White Obelisk and for the historical reliefs at Kalakh.\footnote{Anton Moortgat \textit{The Art of Ancient Mesopotamia} p.123}

He develops this argument further, but there is no need to quote it in full. As one might expect, this argument has been countered by positing that the obelisk was created early in the reign of Aššur-nasir-pal II by less skilled craftsmen at Nineveh, not Kalakh.\footnote{Edmond Sollberger "The White Obelisk" \textit{Iraq} 36 (1974) p.231} This does not prove that it was so sculpted, and by these people: it is only to say that if it was created in the latter reign it must have been under such conditions.

A further weakness with that approach is that the obelisk does not simply display a lack of skill: it marked by a lack of apprehension that a surface could be planned, and the pictures carefully related to it. By the time of Aššur-nasir-pal II, Assyrian art had long mastered this secret, although its application to relief finds its first glorious expression with that king.\footnote{Andre Parrot \textit{Nineveh and Babylon} Thames and Hudson 1961 pp.24-44.} But on the White Obelisk, even the heights of the various illustrated registers are uneven, and illustrations are not contained upon one face, but continue around the corners of the stone itself.\footnote{Anton Moortgat \textit{The Art of Ancient Mesopotamia} pp.123-4}

Turning to iconography, Moortgat notes that hunting gear such as shield and chariots which were characteristic of the ninth century are lacking in the White Obelisk; also, the head decoration of horses is unvaryingly different; animals are shown like “bare carcasses” on the obelisk, they always have all four legs on the ground, and stylistic landscapes are used - both are things unseen in the latter king’s works.

But most persuasive of all: on the obelisk not only the king, but also several high officials wear the fez. This is never known in the later period. Also, in Kalakh reliefs Aššur-nasir-pal always sits on a stool without a back rest. On the obelisk the king has a chair and a high back rest. Further, the clothing, beards and hairstyle of the king and his officials on the obelisk are simply not the fashion of
the ninth century BC. Moortgat concludes that given the king is named as Aššur-nasir-pal, it must be first of that name: 510 but as Sollberger points out, in the notation which Moortgat attaches to the illustration in his book, he hedges his bet. 511

Sollberger presents no weak responses to Moortgat’s arguments, yet, I think that the better view is that it is, indeed, the work of Aššur-nasir-pal I. The counter argument is that the statistical sample of the animals’ feet is too small to make a meaningful comparison. 512 Let us grant this.

Also, the king’s fez on the obelisk is different from that of his courtiers: true, but the point remains that they still wear the fez at all. Also unconvincingly, his only example of Aššur-nasir-pal I sitting on a backed chair is a sedan chair. 513

Having made no dent in the main arguments, Sollberger then states what is, I think, the real motive for attributing the obelisk to Aššur-nasir-pal II - if one may put it this way with respect to Sollberger - it is fear of the unknown: “... mere stylistic differences cannot, I should have thought, suffice to attribute such an important monument to a rather obscure king who has left but a single original inscription, a three line brick from his palace at Aššur, especially when one considers that the next later comparable monument would then be an obelisk set up by his namesake.” 514

But is this view perhaps too polemical? For example, there is no reference to the magnificent hymn to Ištar, remarkable for its original and personal tone, especially coming from a monarch. Also, is it true that Aššur-nasir-pal has left one inscription only? Is not the true position that only one inscription has survived? As we saw in point 6 following the citation of the hymn, there is

510 Anton Moortgat The Art of Ancient Mesopotamia pp.124-5
reason to believe that Aššur-nasir-pal engaged in a lot of building and dedication of cult objects. There must have been many more texts.

More fundamentally, if the evidence points to the next “later comparable monument” being that of his namesake, then so be it. Perhaps Aššur-nasir-pal II took that name as having been impressed with the accomplishments of his namesake.515

Sollberger presents some more arguments, basing himself upon Landsberger:

(a) it cannot be a coincidence that both Aššur-nasir-pals received a tribute of horses from Gilzanu at the commencement of their reign;

(b) it cannot be a coincidence that both Aššur-nasir-pals in their second year were eponym, fought in Šubria and crossed the Kašiari range;

(c) it cannot be a coincidence that both Aššur-nasir-pals decided to commemorate their feats upon an obelisk;

(d) the reference to “inaccessible fortresses” in the White Obelisk text reminds one of the “difficult roads” in the annals of Aššur-nasir-pal II; and

(e) it cannot be a coincidence that the only reference to the É-na-at-hi of Nineveh, apart from the White Obelisk is on a brick of Aššur-nasir-pal II. As he argues: “it is, to say the least, highly improbable that a building should be mentioned only twice, at two centuries’ interval, by two kings bearing the same name.”516

However, he has still not dealt with the argument that the White Obelisk depicts the king and his officials with clothing, beards and hairstyle which were not known in the ninth century BC. It is rather like being presented with a picture of

515 See the material on names cited above.
516 art. cit. p.233
two different people, and then arguing that - appearances apart - they must be the same person. In a way, the appearances are the most important aspect.

In any event, Reade’s article has marshalled other arguments to show that the obelisk was created for Aššur-nasir-pal I.517 The first point he raises is that “all dating criteria are cumulative in value”. There can be all sorts of reasons why one such datum may be unreliable, such as the archaeological phenomenon of a “sloping horizon, whereby a particular characteristic or group of characteristics is transmitted gradually from place to place.”518 When the evidence has accumulated, the conclusions to which the aggregate point diminishes the chance that a determination will be tainted by such “factors for unreliability”.

After a discussion of other types of archaeological methodology which do not call for summary here, he says that the method of judging relative dates by typology “is ultimately dependent on the assumption that most ancient craftsmen conformed with the majority of their contemporaries; they do seem to have done so ... at least in restricted areas ... and the method is perfectly satisfactory so long as we are not carried away by imprecise, inadequate or spurious parallels.”519

He then goes on to say that where there are “narrative representations of the world in which it was made” these will be “most unlikely” to mislead if one dates by “iconographic criteria” or antiquaria. Changes in fashion and technology are reflected in ancient art: there may be anomalies, “but there is never a mass of anomalies at once.”520

I shall rearrange Reade’s arguments, partly to deal with Sollberger’s arguments in the order set out above:

518 *Ibid* pp.133-2
519 *Ibid* pp.132
520 *Ibid* pp.132-3, a method of dating which he distinguishes from the less reliable dating by “style”.
(a) The horse tribute from Gilzanu is not impossible from this period. (I would add that the references to Gilzanu can indeed be coincidental).\textsuperscript{521}

(b) The eponymy will be an Assyrian custom; and that Aššur-nasir-pal I fought in Šubria and Kašiari will not be unexpected, as Aššur-bel-kala also fought in these areas;\textsuperscript{522} that each went there in his eponymy year may be coincidental.

(c) Reade does not directly reply to the point that both Aššur-nasir-pals erected commemorative obelisks. Indirectly, though, he notes that such obelisks were a tradition of popularity in Assyria, but just how popular, we are unsure.\textsuperscript{523}

(d) Neither does he directly reply to the supposed similarity between "inaccessible fortresses" and "difficult roads". Personally, I cannot see any persuasive similarity. But he does concede that, provided panel D is not read as the first panel, it is consistent historically with a work of Aššur-nasir-pal II, but also that "there are ... considerable differences both of detail and emphasis between the WO text and the annals of Aššur-nasir-pal II".\textsuperscript{524}

I shall not summarize his review of the differences.

(e) As for the references to the É-na-at-hí of Nineveh, we know from the hymn of Aššur-nasir-pal I's devotion to Ištar, while the bit nathi mentioned in the White Obelisk belongs to her. As the term may in fact be Hurrian, pointing to an origin before the reign of Aššur-nasir-pal I\textsuperscript{525} there is "no reason why the building should not have existed in the reign of Aššur-nasir-pal I".\textsuperscript{526} Finally he argues that: "One coincidence ... is preferable to an accumulation of anomalies."\textsuperscript{527}

\textsuperscript{521} \textit{ibid} p.140
\textsuperscript{522} see \textit{RIMA} vol.2 p.102 and \textit{Reade art. cit.} pp.139-40
\textsuperscript{523} \textit{ibid} pp.143-4 and 150
\textsuperscript{524} \textit{ibid} p.141, and p.140
\textsuperscript{525} Indeed, before Aššur-uballit or even Eriba-Adad I. Further, to become established and accepted, the "house" was probably instituted during the Mitannian ascendancy early enough to put down roots.
\textsuperscript{526} \textit{ibid} p.139
\textsuperscript{527} \textit{ibid} p.42
But there is yet more: for various reasons which I shall not summarize in their entirety here, he argues that panel D should be read before panel A. I note that in reconstructing the relief so as to present the narrative element, Moortgat places panel D before A.\textsuperscript{528} When the result is examined, it is quite clear from registers 1-4 and 6 that panel D must precede A, at least so far as the illustration goes.

It is sufficient to say that this argument reversing the usual reading is the centrepiece of Reade’s \textit{tour de force}. It makes sense of the fact that the text is squeezed to fit at the bottom of panel A: something which is difficult to explain if panel D followed it.\textsuperscript{529} The crux of the argument is that if panel D precedes A, the text is actually incompatible with what is known of the reign of Aššur-nasir-pal II.\textsuperscript{530} Further, a number of campaigns which Aššur-nasir-pal II is known to have conducted are omitted.\textsuperscript{531}

There are some other factors:

(i) the reference to removing plunder to Aššur is more compatible with a time when Aššur was the capital.\textsuperscript{532}

(ii) The White Obelisk is made from limestone, probably one of the soft ones of Assyria. While such material was used in Middle Assyria e.g. by Aššur-bel-kala, in the ninth century this would have been unusual. It would be more likely that “Mosul marble” would be employed.\textsuperscript{533}

(iii) As well as the iconographic grounds given by Moortgat, and \textit{pace} Sollberger not all answered by him, the fly whisk on the White Obelisk is held by a bearded man, and such a man introduces tributaries to the king. But under Aššur-nasir-pal II these duties were discharged by eunuchs.\textsuperscript{534} Many other such

\textsuperscript{528} op. cit. p.123
\textsuperscript{529} ibid p.135
\textsuperscript{530} ibid p.140-1, where the details are given.
\textsuperscript{531} ibid p.142
\textsuperscript{532} ibid p.142
\textsuperscript{533} ibid pp.143-4
\textsuperscript{534} ibid p.145
details are also given, but no one of these, taken individually, seems to be as convincing as this point. Of course, they acquire a greater degree of persuasiveness by virtue of aggregation.

What can one conclude from the White Obelisk? First, there is its sheer physical impressiveness. Combined with the fact that Aššur had been in decline, it must have made an impression on contemporaries. It did strike Aššur-nasir-pal’s descendants, for as noted above, it is considered to be programmatic for developments in Assyrian art. It was used as a model and improved upon. If my view of names is correct, it is no accident that the great ruler Aššur-nasir-pal II chose the name he did.

Second, is the White Obelisk not subtly asserting the legitimacy of the monarch who created it? Is it not saying that those who did not acknowledge his sovereignty met their condign punishment?

Third, I think that the White Obelisk shows that this was no petty chieftain, but one of the great hitherto unappreciated rulers of Aššur. If that is so, to attribute the AKL to Aššur-nasir-pal I is not inappropriate.

Aššur-nasir-pal I and the AKL

However, if Aššur-nasir-pal I did see to the creation of the AKL, it is striking that it was king Šamši-Adad IV who came up from Babylon, like his great namesake. Could he have taken this name in order to remind people of Šamši-Adad I? The instant hypothesis raises the possibility that the list had several uses - and one of these may have been a subtly propagandistic one. Incidentally, this may explain one of Yamada’s concerns - he can see no reason why a later author would have said so much about Šamši-Adad I. If the present theory is correct, then there is a motive - so that his name-sake (or his son) could lay claim to reflections of his glory.

\[\text{ibid pp.145-6}\]

\[\text{S. Yamada "The Editorial History" ZA 1994 11-38 p.22}\]
Further, dating the AKL's creation - a mixture of compilation, editing and original writing - to the reign of Šamši-Adad IV or Aššur-nasir-pal - accords with the rules of thumb, outlined at the opening of this section. That is, by dating it to the 91st or 92nd king, one bring it closer to the earliest securely dated text, the Aššur A text, which ends with ruler 97, Tukulti-apil-Ešarra II. 337 The principles of historicography suggested above mean inter alia that we should be a little more cautious in dating the presumed original to a period significantly before the earliest example.

Thus, if the said rules of thumb are used, the present speculation has the attraction of giving a date very much closer to the earliest exemplar than the other hypotheses do.

Now, if the scribe of Šamši-Adad IV did make use of earlier written material - and I think that Lambert's thesis shows that much of this material was extant in the time of Tukulti-Ninurta I 338 - then those materials were "affected orthographically, linguistically and phraseologically." 339 As stated, there was clearly the compilation of earlier materials (whether written or oral), 340 the editing of those materials to form one text (perhaps the comments were the work of Šamši-Adad IV's editor, at Khorsabad i.10, 21 and 26 i.e. the totalling of the tent-dwellers, the note after the next ten names, and the remark after the next six).

In any event, it would appear that the compiler(s) knew that some of the materials had been lost: for example, line i.26 suggests (on Oates' reconstruction) 341 that the compiler knew that the six kings in question had ruled, and that their names were recorded on bricks, but that the eponymies from the

337 A. Poebel "The Assyrian King List from Khorsabad" pp.250-251
340 Note Brinkman's warning on unwarranted theorizing that there must have been previous king lists or chronologies: "The Nassouhi and Assyrian Kinglist Tradition" Or. 42 (1973) 306-319 p.317 n.69
341 D. Oates Studies in the History of Northern Iraq p.22
limmu list had been lost. Perhaps one of the purposes of this list was to ensure that the knowledge available to him at that time was not afterwards lost, especially for the first three groups of kings.

This line (i.e. i 26) is not however, entirely clear. It has been partially destroyed, and any restoration must be conjectural. Garelli asks whether it may not have stated that the preceding kings had lived in houses of brick, in distinction to those who lived in tents. Even Garelli thinks that Oates’ reading is the more likely, and I agree. If a number of persons are named as living in tents, one would generally understand that, of those listed, they alone lived in tents. Also, it was not only the kings between Sulili and Ilušumma who lived in “brick”.

There have been two chief suggestions concerning the use of the list to those who maintained and copied it (as opposed to its original purpose). Neither, of course, is mutually exclusive, as the list could have had any number of uses. The first suggestion is that the list could have been intended for cultic use, like the document known as the “Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty”. The second theory (which I have already dealt with) is Lewy’s, that it was used to calculate periods for building purposes. As the list was being copied by temple staff, I think that the Finkelstein/Lambert view is not impossible. However, I doubt that the AKL is as intended for cultic purposes as the “GHD”. A comparison of the two documents shows almost nothing in common. Rather, perhaps the most interesting thing about the AKL, if the thesis is correct, is that it presents an entirely new view of Aššur-nasir-pal I.

Aššur-nasir-pal appears now as a ruler who, in his vigorous middle age, returned from exile with his aged father. Šamši-Adad IV possibly took the name of the great king who like him had come up from Babylon. In this reign, (or in that of his son), the worship of Ištar was re instituted under her own name. He undertook

---

542 H. Lewy considers this passage, and notes that in Old Assyria the names of the eponyms may have been kept solely on clay tablets and not on stelae, as they later were: *art. cit.* p.743. For a treatment of how the limmu system worked in practice, see pp.742-3
543 P. Garelli “Réflexions sur les Listes Royales Assyriennes” pp.93-4
building works, but does not seem to have gone to war. That task, however, was immediately undertaken by his son with some enthusiasm. To this reign can be dated some very forward looking obelisk-art work which is later brought to a stage of near perfection during the time of his namesake, a greater conqueror.

Just as remarkable, if not more so, are two hymns which succeed in standing entirely within the tradition of royal hymns to the gods, while nevertheless expressing something tender and personal. Added to this, was the compilation of a remarkable document designed to preserve what was known of the names of Assyria’s kings, their fathers and the length of their reigns, the AKL. As with the hymns and the obelisk, this document, the AKL, was used by Aššur-nasir-pal to subtly send out the message that the rule of his dynasty was legitimate.
Chapter Twelve

The Limits of Scepticism

Before briefly setting out the findings of this thesis, it might be useful to sketch some thoughts on historiography as it relates to the thesis itself. Each historian, in making factual conclusions, has necessarily proceeded by a historiographic route, whether or not the principles applied are internally consistent. Thus, every exercise of the art of history entails the use of historiography. At this level of thesis, those principles should, I think, be articulated with some ideas about their application.

Throughout the discipline of history there is a tension. On the one hand we realize - perhaps more keenly than ever before - that our views are subjective and culturally conditioned. In addition, there is the possibility that our perspective on any object at all may also be linguistically (and to the extent that linguistics are a social phenomenon) socially conditioned. Associated with this is the fact that history is written, at least in part, as a literary exercise. This may not simply be a matter of semantics: through literature, the influence of genre can, arguably, exert itself on the historian, leading once again to subjectivity.

It also seems that we appreciate the limits of subjectivity more than ever before. The view that our statements refer to the person who articulates them and not to any objective reality, is an extreme one, but is not without its supporters in that form or, perhaps more often, in a weaker form. It is clear that even the consensus of scholars can be in error. In an area such as Assyriology, this insight has a special force as the chance of a new find in the field of archaeology can and has upset so many seemingly solid theories.

On the other hand, any attempt to write history is bound at some point and to a varying degree, to speculate and hypothesize. Without such speculation, history would often be little more than a dry recording of events and documents. That is,
it is bound to be subjective. It must, by its nature, reveal something about the historian. It seems to me that the subjective - or perhaps better, the personal - nature of historical interpretation is a significant part of its interest.

How can this tension be balanced? It seems to me that the first question is one of assumptions: if one does publish a particular hypothesis, surely one need not forget that the theory is disprovable. That is, it would be bad history to assume that one's own theory is an infallible pronouncement. For example, if having suggested that Aššur-nasir-pal I was responsible for the AKL, one then suggested amendments to historical documents which on their face would provide evidence against that view, and suggested such amendments solely upon the basis of one's theory, then this would be poor history. In a way, one's methodology and conclusions would prove to be self-referring and mutually supportive.

But the aim here was to sift the evidence, and to test the modern theories against it. This involves paying due respect to the opinions of other scholars, and then producing an individual hypothesis. The hypothesis itself cannot be directly used as an assumption to attack the evidence - but it is necessary to subject other theories to analysis and criticism. Part of this will involve a comparison of the relative credibility of competing theories.

In considering the tension between subjectivity and objectivity in history, the second question is one of purpose. What is the purpose of a historian? Can it be said that all historians do - or should - have the same purpose? While a general consideration of this issue would take me very far outside my charter, it would be useful to recap with something about the aim of this thesis.

To approach this first of all by a negative: I have conceived my purpose as being not to set out a definitive history with fixed answers. Rather, my goal has been to objectify my thought to myself, while using actual facts and the opinions of other writers. That is, to write an interpretation of history, and suggest some new ideas, but not to indulge in a self-referent fantasy. The difference between writing history and writing literature is, or perhaps could be, that a historian has a
duty to cultivate a respect for his historical subject and to try to be impartial to it. Thus, there can be a sort of dialogue between historian and source material.

In this respect, the subjective and the objective come into contact in and through the historian’s mind as it applies itself to research and conceptual thought. If one was to approach history with, for argument’s sake, a racist or a racial assumption, as some historians have, then perhaps an open approach to history could work to clear the mind of these prejudices.

In approaching the AKL, I have tried to read it as if I had never seen it before, and let it speak to me as it would. I doubt that anyone can truly succeed in such an endeavour, as even the medium of language must introduce fundamental assumptions and associations. But one can try to be impartial, and the attempt is, I suggest, useful and worthwhile.⁴⁴⁵

I think that this must be part, at least, of what T.S. Eliot meant in Little Gidding when he wrote that “History may be servitude, / History may be freedom.” That is, freedom from our unexamined, unchallenged selves, or servitude to it. As he says later: “We shall not cease from exploration / And the end of all our exploring / Will be to arrive where we started / And know the place for the first time.”

Thus, I suggest that one must be sceptical in approaching Assyriology, but one can take steps to inform oneself, meet other opinions, and then propound theories, setting out the grounds of the theory, its parameters, its assumptions and evaluate its plausibility as against other theories. Any deficiencies in logic should be accepted as gracefully as possible: what better way is there for one to learn?

⁴⁴⁵ Hardly less poetically, given its context, Liverani has said that we should “shift our focus from the information [texts] contain to the texts themselves ... This is a real ‘Copernican revolution’ which takes away the subject-matter of the text from the gravitational centre, and puts the political aims of the author in its place.” in Liverani art. cit. pp.46-7. Actually, pace Liverani, I do not accept that there is a hard distinction between “subject-matter of the text” and “political aims”. They are different categories which are inextricably inter-related and must always both be considered. It seems to me like saying that we should look at ice but not at water.
In this way, it is proposed that history is an art with a philosophical dimension. In fact, I personally find more philosophy in history than I think has survived in the academic discipline now known as “philosophy”.

In his presidential address of 1989 to the American Oriental Society, Hallo addressed what he called the “limits of scepticism”. He was stimulated to write the article by a paper of Miguel Civil’s which insisted that we do not have adequate material with which to describe the society and history of the ancient Near East. In the course of his paper, he referred to a number of sceptics, and also, to a number of “credulists” or “maximalists”, most particularly the “standard bearer” of scepticism, Leo Oppenheim. However, Kraus received the accolade for “scaling the zenith” of scepticism when he said (before reading a paper): “With the best will in the world, it is impossible for the conscientious Assyriologist, where ancient Mesopotamia is concerned, to do justice to the themes of this conference in a manner that would remotely begin to satisfy the most modest of prerequisites of current economic theory.”

Opposed to this is Hallo’s own view, inspired by Gelb, that “the abundant textual documentation from Mesopotamia and its environs provides a precious resource for tracing the origins and evolution of countless facets of civilization unrivalled anywhere else on the globe for so early a period ...”.

Hallo concluded by saying: “... yes, the textual documentation is limited. But the conclusion we draw from this premise is very different from his. We are not to limit the inferences we extract from the evidence, but to treat the evidence, precisely because it is limited, as a precious resource - none of it to be ignored, or squandered, but every fragmentary bit of it critically sifted so that it fits into our reconstruction of the history of antiquity ... The history so reconstructed will then be true to its textual documentation. However limited that documentation may

546 *JAOS* 110 (1990) 187-99
547 *ibid* 192
548 *ibid* 187
be, the only limits it imposes on us are to set reasonable limits to our own scepticism."

I do not intend to analyze Hallo's paper in meticulous detail, but I agree that one must try to make history "true" to the documentation. Otherwise, it is almost entirely subjective, and I am hardly alone in that I do not study history to soliloquize. Indeed, the international correspondence between scholars is a most important cultural phenomenon: it acts as a brake on both scepticism and credulity, it allows different minds to deepen each other by sharing their unique perspectives and insights.

It seems to me that we are now at a point where some type of canon of principles for proceeding in Assyriology can be formulated: provided, of course, that it is remembered that these are tools, not ends in themselves: helpers to facilitate communication.

To summarize: these principles were:

(a) One should be slow to date the original of a text to a time substantially prior to the earliest exemplar. As stated, this applies only (or perhaps chiefly) in the absence of direct evidence for the history of a text.

(b) One should be slow to accept a modern correction to a reading in an ancient text, unless the possibility of variant readings has been excluded, the difficulty is not simply a deficiency in our knowledge, and the text is unintelligible without correction; or there are reasons extraneous to the text itself to believe that the scribe has erred. And then, the correction should be the minimum required.

(c) Where one suggests that there is a prejudice (or any other distorting factor) in an ancient writer, and suggests a correction to balance out the operation

\[549\textit{ibid} 199\]
of that prejudice, that correction should be applied throughout the entirety of the
text wherever it would be applicable.

This leads to Hallo’s points about the limits of the documentation. In my view,
while they set limits to our scepticism, they are not less important as setting
limits to our speculations. One can speculate in a manner consistent with the
documents; in a manner which respects them and their makers - or one can
speculate what is effectively derision of them.

Another vital point which Hallo made is that one cannot collate all the evidence
before providing a theory. He said that we can and must: “... base such
hypotheses on the data already in hand and analyzed and then modify the
hypotheses in light of subsequent discoveries.”

Again, I agree, and wish to offer for consideration one other element: we can also
amend our published views in the light of the suggestions of other scholars, and
also in light of our subsequent insights and more mature reasoning.

If one accepts the arguments presented here for redating the AKL, the royal
ideologies of both Šamši-Adad I and Aššur-nasir-pal I look richer and more
interesting.

Šamši-Adad I emerges as a warrior-prince born into a prominent Amorite family
who conquers an empire unique at that time in that wider region. He welded
together an imperial ideology which was both suitable and sufficiently flexible to
meet his needs. At the same time as he established a system of administration
based on one chief centre in Šubat-Enlil, he divided the kingdom into two vice-
principalities centred on Mari and Ekallatum respectively, with his sons as rulers.
In addition, he foresaw the role which the city Aššur could play.
While he was responsible for introducing the southern dialect into the royal inscriptions of Aššur, promulgating at least the mortuary cult of the Akkadian Sargonic and promoting himself by reference to the role of Enlil, he dealt with the subjects of his own northern empire - including the nomadic and semi-nomadic Amorites - with enviable capacity. He himself does not appear to have been at all pious, if his letters to Yasmah-Addu are any guide. But those letters are interesting for showing that he does seem to have genuinely accepted the system of values according to which a king should win for himself a lasting name by performing deeds of valour on the battlefield.

As noted, Assyrian sculpture and inscriptional art, and it would appear the royal art of Mari, undergo a new vitalization during his reign, when they achieve a new and impressive style. If the fragments which have come down to us can be reliably attributed to his reign, he had himself artistically portrayed as a warrior king, defeating his enemies.

The brief scanning of the Middle Assyrian kingdom showed that if the introduction of trends in art and the literature which has survived are any guide, the Middle Assyrian kingdoms underwent a significant revival after Eriba-Adad I. In particular, Aššur-nasir-pal I emerges as a different and more colourful figure if one accepts the White Obelisk as his. This, together with the attributing of the AKL to him, and an examination of his hymns, points to a vigorous monarch from a line of the royal family of Aššur which had probably been exiled from their city.

Returning from Babylon with his aged father Šamši-Adad IV, he sees his role as establishing a new equilibrium in his city, restoring cults, rebuilding temples, regaining lands, and collating what was known of the distant past. As well, for subtle propaganda purposes, he included references to each and every occasion on which a king had retaken Aššur from Babylon, and dedicated an especially informative pericope on Šamši-Adad I, namesake of his father, and probably the most successful of the Assyrian kings to that date.
The result of all this is that no longer does it appear that Šamši-Adad I improperly claimed legitimation through the AKL: rather, it was the later Assyrians who sought a tincture of legitimacy from him.
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