

T  
864

THE RISE AND FALL OF BABYLON  
DURING THE EARLY  
SECOND MILLENNIUM B.C.

By

SONA H. CHOUKASSIZIAN

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of Master of Arts in  
the Department of History and Archeology  
of the American University of Beirut

Beirut , Lebanon

June, 1967

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. . . . .	i
PREFACE. . . . .	ii
 Chapter	
I. THE AMORITES. . . . .	1
II. THE ISIN-LARSA PERIOD. . . . .	32
III. ASSYRIA. . . . .	49
EXCURSUS: AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORICAL SITUATION PRECEEDING THE RISE OF BABYLON. . . . .	72
IV. THE FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON. . . . .	77
 APPENDIX THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM	
B.C. . . . .	134
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	142

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to extend her sincere gratitude and appreciation to her advisor, Dr. W.A.Ward, without whose guidance and encouragement this work would not have been completed. She also thanks Dr. A. Bowling and Dr. N. Ziadeh who kindly accepted to read this thesis.

## PREFACE

The second millennium B.C. presents one of the interesting and fascinating periods of ancient Near Eastern history. It is a period of "empires". Political intrigues and economic rivalry lay under the seemingly cordial relations between the various strong states. The relative abundance of written records from this period has led us to a realization of ancient achievements in the field of recording facts, correspondance, and drawing binding contracts. Numerous inscribed clay tablets constituted palace, temple, and private archives. This bright and hopeful picture, however, is dimmed with many uncertainties and gaps. Our knowledge of the history of western Asia in the second millennium B.C. remains incomplete and any attempt at reconstruction is always open to criticism. The lacunae, blurred epigraphy, and the so-called "scribal errors" found in our texts allow room for interpretation of the intended facts. Hence, various translations and diverse conclusions are possible.



Although reference has just been made to Western Asia in general, the emphasis in the following pages will be on a small portion of this vast area. As the title indicates, we will be dealing with the rise and fall of the state of Babylon, a period which covers three hundred years. It is, however, impossible to isolate the activities of any single community from its contemporaries. Accordingly, the "history" of Babylon can only be understood after a consideration of the historical stage on which Babylon gradually emerged, and finally played an important role.

A present visitor to the site of ancient Babylon, in Iraq, will be disappointed on discovering that virtually nothing remains of the once glorious Babylon of Hammurapi (the presently remaining structures are Neo-Babylonian). Early in the second millennium B.C., Babylon was an insignificant city-state among other city-states existing in southern Mesopotamia. Throughout its history, Mesopotamian politics was characterized by the city-state form of government; among these city-states there existed constant rivalry and warfare. Frequently, however, a particular state, proving itself stronger than its neighbors, conquered other city-states, forming a

centralized government under one king. But these periods of unity were always short-lived. With the arrival of an Amorite dynasty, Babylon followed the road to supremacy in Southern Mesopotamia. Termed by historians as the First Dynasty of Babylon, the dynasty comprised eleven kings, ruling from 1894 B.C. to 1595 B.C. among whom the most famous and able was the sixth king, Hammurapi. This was the first period during which Babylon became a powerful and important member of the international community of its time.

It is the task of the present work to examine the basic problems underlying a study of the history of Babylonia during the first half of the second millennium B.C. Unfortunately, a final solution for many of these problems cannot be found; at best, one can only state the diverse scholarly opinions which in themselves are not final solutions. In spite of these uncertainties, however, a study of this period remains to be a most rewarding experience.

## CHAPTER I

### THE AMORITES

A study of the history of the First Dynasty of Babylon should start with a consideration of the Amorite problem, for the dynasty which ultimately made Babylon an important state was Amorite. However, we know very little about the Amorites as an ethnic group. While complete texts written in Amorite have not been found, personal names appear in other texts. Through these we are able to reconstruct the Amorite language. These names come from a variety of sources distributed over a rather extensive period of time. The discovery of the 20,000 tablets which had once formed the palace archives of Mari, has thrown considerable light on the study of Amorite personal names. However, an isolated study of any phenomena in history is not only fallacious but renders a distorted picture of the period of which it forms a part. Accordingly, it is impossible to discuss the Amorites and disregard the unstable political situation in southern Mesopotamia which paved the way for Amorite expansion and occupation of certain city-states. Hence, it is the objective of

the following paragraphs to discuss the role of the Amorites in the history of the early second millennium in Mesopotamia.

The existence of Amorite tribes is attested in ancient texts long before the First Dynasty of Babylon (1894-1595 B.C.). Our modern term "Amorite" comes from the Akkadian term amurru. In the earlier Sumerian texts these tribes are referred to as MAR.TU (the Sumerian word meaning "West"). From the preserved personal names, it is apparent that the Amorite language does not belong to the East Semitic languages, but rather to the West Semitic group. Scholarly opinions, however, have differed regarding terminology. Landsberger and Bauer, who were the first to analyze Amorite personal names, chose two terms to designate the people who used two groups of names at different historic periods. Those individuals who used these names during the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon were identified under the term "Canaanite", while the term "Amorite" was applied to the earlier group whose names had "MAR.TU" as an element. Later, Landsberger incorporated all under the term East Canaanites. Drawing lexical parallels with Aramaic, Noth called these people Proto-Arameans.

Edzard gave the name "Canaanites" to this new ethnic element appearing in the Near East.<sup>1</sup> Although, Kupper prefers the term "Amorite", he is in search of a more adequate term.<sup>2</sup> Goetze and Gelb, who have also worked considerably on these names, have found the term "Amorite" adequate for designating this new ethnic element.<sup>3</sup>

Evidence points to the fact that there was a steady eastward infiltration of Amorites into Mesopotamia at the end of the third and the beginning of the second millenia B.C. This infiltration, however, was not always peaceful. As early as the reign of Sharkali-sharri (2254 - 2230 B.C.), the last king of the

---

<sup>1</sup>H.B. Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>J. - R. Kupper, Les nomades en Mesopotamie au temps des rois de Mari (Paris: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de L'Université de Liège, CXLII, 1957), pp. 242 -244.

<sup>3</sup>A. Goetze, Review of J.-R. Kupper, Les nomades en Mesopotamie au temps des rois de Mari, Journal of Semitic Studies, IV (1959), 142 - 147.

I. Gelb, "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV (1961), 45 - 47.

Dynasty of Akkad, warring Amorite tribes are attested in one of his year-names. The year-name commemorates his victory over the MAR.TU 'in mount Basar' which is the modern Jebel Bishri.<sup>4</sup> Similar indications come from the texts of the Ur III period (ca. 2113-2006 B.C.).<sup>5</sup> The fourth year formula of Shu-Sin (2038-2030 B.C.) informs us that he 'built the fortress of MAR.TU (called) which keeps away Tidnum.' Earlier references come from texts of Shulgi (2095 - 2048 B.C.) and Amar-Sin (2047 - 2039 B.C.).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>G. Roux, Ancient Iraq (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1964), p. 147.

<sup>5</sup>The term Ur III refers to the Third Dynasty of Ur or the 'Neo-Sumerian' period. During the century specified above, the city of Ur became prominent and controlled a rather large empire. Ur-Nammu, the founder of this dynasty, had previously been a governor under the last king of the Fifth Dynasty of Uruk, Utu-Hegal (2120-2114 B.C.). In 2120 B.C. this latter had been able to defeat the Guti, who, having brought the Dynasty of Akkad to an end, established themselves as rulers in Mesopotamia. Ur-Nammu, however, overthrowing his master founded the Third Dynasty of Ur. The term 'neo-Sumerian' refers to the cultural contribution of this period. It saw a revival of Sumerian literature and art, and as such, the designation Sumerian Renaissance is highly descriptive of the Ur III period.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 146 - 147.

Tracing the spread of the Amorites leads to an inquiry into the question of the homeland of this ethnic group. The answer to this question is uncertain. Scholars in general point to the area west of the Euphrates. But due to the vast geographical area which is implied, this conclusion remains unsatisfactory. Kupper and Moscati suggest that the homeland of the Amorites should be the Syrian or the Syro-Arabian desert.<sup>7</sup> Gelb, on the other hand, suggests the area south of the Euphrates.<sup>8</sup> Reviewing Kupper's work, Goetze says that "it was from northern Syria that they expanded after 2000 into the Middle Euphrates valley."<sup>9</sup> The Jebel Bishri area has also been suggested by Edzard.<sup>10</sup>

Traces of Amorite infiltration into Mesopotamia are not as marked during the early Ur III period (ca. 2113-2006 B.C.) as it is toward the end of that period, and even more so, after the fall of the ruling dynasty. After the fall of the Ur III empire references to wars

---

<sup>7</sup>Kupper, op. cit., pp. 241 - 242.  
S. Moscati, The Semites in Ancient History  
(Cardiff: 1959), pp. 55 - 56.

<sup>8</sup>Gelb, op. cit., pp. 31-32, 36, 45.

<sup>9</sup>Goetze, op. cit., p. 146.

<sup>10</sup>Huffman, op. cit., p. 6.

with Amorites become more common in Mesopotamian texts. In fact, the presence of raiding Amorite tribes is considered to have been one of the important factors in causing the fall of that empire.<sup>11</sup> Starting with the second regnal year of Ibbi-Sin (2029-2006 B.C., last king of the Third Dynasty of Ur) several city-states seceded from the hegemony of Ur. This conclusion can be gathered from the fact that a substantial number of the texts gathered from throughout the empire, dating to the first two years of Ibbi-Sin's reign, carry Ibbi-Sin's date formulae. After the king's second regnal year such date formulae gradually decrease in number and disappear in some of the subject states, which suggests that the power of Ur over these states had been broken. The first state to win its independence was Eshnunna, after Ibbi-Sin's second year. By Ibbi-Sin's seventh year four other states had broken away from the authority of Ur.<sup>12</sup> Apart from the internal disunity of the empire, Ur also had to deal with

---

<sup>11</sup>Roux, op. cit., p. 150. also: Gelb, op. cit., p. 30.

<sup>12</sup>T. Jacobsen, "The Reign of Ibbi-Suen," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, VII (1953), 38.



raiding MAR.TU tribes, which, having penetrated the borders of the empire, were menancing the cities. These difficult circumstances are best reflected in a letter written to Ibbi-Sin by Išbi-Irra, one of the former's generals and, later, the founder of the dynasty of Isin. Previously, Išbi-Irra had been sent to the cities of Isin and Kazallu to buy grain which was to be sent to Ur. Hearing about raiding MAR.TU, Išbi-Irra transferred all the purchased grain to Isin. In his letter he informs his master of his inability to bring the grain to the capital. He asks the king for boats to transfer the grain, and also to delegate him the authority to organize the defense of the cities of Isin and Nippur.<sup>13</sup> According to Jacobsen, this event must have taken place in the fifth year of Ibbi-Sin since his date formula of the sixth year mentions the reconstruction of the walls of Ur and Nippur.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 41. also: Kupper, op. cit., p. 158. Although the above is the generally accepted manner of dating an event mentioned in a date formula, Jacobsen in n.58 quotes Goetze's conclusion which says, "It became quite clear that, during that period (i.e. Ur III) the event mentioned in the date formula is by no means an event of the preceeding year."

Whatever the exact details, Ur was unable to rely on its own internal forces, hence, the invasion of the MAR.TU presented not only a military problem but an economic one as well. From Ibbi-Sin's reply it can be gathered that Ur could not send the requested boats since Ibbi-Sin suggests that Išbi-Irra ask the northern governors for these. Furthermore, Ibbi-Sin delegates to Išbi-Irra the responsibility of organizing the defense of Isin and Nippur.<sup>15</sup>

The above-mentioned war with the Amorites which occurred early in the reign of Ibbi-Sin was not the only one of its kind. One of his year-names says "année où à Ibbi-Sin, Roi d'Ur, Martu, une force impétueuse qui depuis toujours ne connaissait pas de ville, se soumit." Another tablet from Ur with Ibbi-Sin's date formula mentions the capture of MAR.TU prisoners. We cannot know, says Kupper, if both statements refer to the same event.<sup>16</sup>

Meanwhile, Išbi-Irra, having succeeded in his military mission of driving the MAR.TU away, proclaimed

---

<sup>15</sup>Jacobsen, loc. cit.

<sup>16</sup>Kupper, op. cit., p. 158.

himself an independent king of Isin. Jacobsen concludes that Išbi-Irra "would appear to have considered himself formally independent and to have begun issuing his own date-formulas not earlier than the twelfth year of Ibbi-Suen."<sup>17</sup> Hence, the first year-name of Išbi-Irra as king of Isin (2017 B.C.) corresponds to the twelfth year of Ibbi-Sin.

Due to internal revolts and the increasing power of Išbi-Irra, Ibbi-Sin hoped to win the alliance of the MAR.TU in the event of war with Isin. This is reflected in the letters exchanged between Ibbi-Sin and Puzur-Numušda, the governor of Kazallu. In his letter, the governor informs Ibbi-Sin of the fortification Išbi-Irra has built around Isin and the fact that Išbi-Irra has asked him to be an ally.<sup>18</sup> In reply, Ibbi-Sin questions his governor for his unconcern and adds that Enlil, forsaking Sumer, gave the kingship "to a worthless man, to Išbi-Irra who is not of Sumerian seed." But, he goes on to say, the MAR.TU will defeat the Elamites and capture Išbi-Irra, and "With the restoration of the land to its

---

<sup>17</sup>Jacobsen, op. cit., p. 43.

<sup>18</sup>Jacobsen, op. cit., p. 44.

(former) place, (its) might will become known throughout all the lands."<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, Ibbi-Sin's hopes were not fulfilled, and the Elamites<sup>20</sup> destroyed Ur and took Ibbi-Sin captive to Elam. It is difficult for us to know the exact role that the MAR.TU played in bringing about the downfall of Ibbi-Sin. The evidence, however, points to the fact that the Amorites were indirectly responsible for the breakdown of Sumerian power. Similarly, we cannot offer a final answer to the problem regarding an Elamite alliance with Išbi-Irra since there is no evidence of an open battle between Išbi-Irra and Ibbi-Sin. Most probably, Amorite mercenaries formed part of both armies. Although Elamite forces remained in Ur after their victory, Išbi-Irra's date formulae, starting with his fifteenth, suggest that Isin finally incorporated Ur. The later formulae follow the Ur tradition.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>S.N. Kramer, "A Sumerian Letter", in J.B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (2d ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 481.

<sup>20</sup>The term Elamite refers to the people of Elam. Elam, whose capital was Susa, was situated south-east of Mesopotamia. Its land forms an extension of the southern Mesopotamian plains. Throughout its history, Elam was on uncordial relations with the Sumerian and Akkadian states of Mesopotamia. The Elamites were always ready to take advantage of every opportunity which favored their conquest of Mesopotamian cities.

<sup>21</sup>As reflected in the example UET I, 292.

After the fall of the Third Dynasty of Ur, Amorite power was on a steady rise. Amorite dynasties are established as rulers over many Mesopotamian states. At Larsa an Amorite dynasty was founded in 2025 B.C. under Nablânum. Išbi-Irra took over Isin in 2017 B.C. Sumu-abum founded an Amorite dynasty at Babylon in 1894 B.C. Mari received its first Amorite king, Iaggid-Lim, about 1850 B.C. Šamši-Adad I, an Amorite, managed to win the Assyrian throne in 1814 B.C.

Throughout the above presentation of the early historical evidence the term MAR.TU has been used interchangeably with the term Amorite. This has been done on the generally accepted assumption that MAR.TU refers to the same ethnic group, namely, the Amorites. In order to do this topic justice, an analysis of Amorite personal names should not be neglected, through which the terms MAR.TU and Amorite (West Semitic) will further be clarified.

Our written sources in Amorite consist of personal names only. Amorite names come from a wide chronological and geographic range. Accordingly, some scholars have divided these into categories based on their characteristic formation. Hence comes the much-

argued problem of the relationship between the names with the MAR.TU designation coming from the Ur III and early Isin period, and those names without this designation from the Isin-Larsa and Babylon I periods. The earliest theory was offered by two scholars, B. Landsberger and T. Bauer. Although their theory has been invalidated by modern scholars, it is essential for the present discussion to present their evidence. The Landsberger-Bauer theory is based on two assumptions. First, they assume that the language of the West Semitic names with the MAR.TU designation (Ur III) is different from the language of those names without the MAR.TU designation (Babylon I). According to them, the evidence indicates that the bearers of each of these two kinds come from a different linguistic background. Therefore the language of the Ur III MAR.TU names was termed dialektakkadisch (dialectal Akkadian), while the West-Semitic names of the Old Babylonian period belong to ostkanaanäish (east Canaanite). Secondly, they assume that the Amorites originally came from an area east of the Tigris rather than the West. Landsberger and Bauer say that the mention of Basar and Didnum in the texts cannot be taken as evidence for the fact that the Amorites came from the West since the exact location of these places cannot be

ascertained. They also add that the term Amurru, which also designates the term "west" on the compass, cannot be taken as supporting evidence because this may be a later Babylonian usage of the term. Furthermore, Landsberger and Bauer rely on two royal titles used by King Kudur-mabug of Emutbal.<sup>22</sup> The first title is ad-da KUR MAR.TU, while the second is ad-da E-mu-ut-ba-la (Sumerian) or a-bu E-mu-ut-ba-la (Akkadian). These titles which mean "Father of MAR.TU" or "Father of Emutbal," are considered to suggest the area east of the Tigris.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Emutbal, or yamūt̄bāl, is a country in ancient Mesopotamia, whose geographical location has not been ascertained. Goetze thinks it was located in the area around Kish (A. Goetze, "Sumu-yamūt̄bāl, a Local Ruler of the Old Babylonian Period," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IV (1950), 72). Finet locates it in the area at the junction of the Diyala River to the Tigris (Jean Bottéro and André Finet, Archives Royales de Mari, Vol. XV : Répertoire analytique des tomes I à V (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1954), p. 127). He also adds that it was under the rule of the city of Larsa.

Analyzing the name philologically, Goetze divides it into two parts: yamūt and bāla. The first part comes from the verb m-t "die", but probably meaning "he died"; while the second part is the name of the god Ba'l. The name, therefore, means "Ba'l died", but the final -a remains unexplained. In the spelling of Akkadian names, scholars use both ya- and ia- to represent an initial syllable.

<sup>23</sup>Gelb, op. cit., p. 31.

Both of these theories have been sharply criticized by modern scholars who offer a different interpretation. Although these new conclusions are accepted, they are not beyond doubt. Basar (Modern Jebel Bišri) and Didnum are considered to be in the West. Similarly the term "amurru" also means "west". As mentioned above, the third piece of evidence, which Landsberger and Bauer offer for their second theory which assumes that the Amorites came from an area east of the Tigris, is derived from two royal titles. Examining these royal titles, Kupper and Gelb have shown that the locations mentioned in the two royal titles do not imply that the Amorites came from the east. The titles can imply that Kudur-mabug had been a ruler of the Amorites in Emutbal which is east of the Tigris. Neither does the use of the term MAR.TU with Emutbal imply that MAR.TU is situated east of the Tigris. It was, therefore, because of their spread eastward that Amorites appear east of the Tigris.<sup>24</sup>

The discovery of new data has altered Landsberger's and Bauer's theory regarding Amorite names. The most important in this respect are the names appearing in the Mari letters. All present-day scholars

---

<sup>24</sup>Kupper, op. cit., p. 243. Gelb, op. cit., p. 32.



believe in some kind of relationship between the MAR.TU names and the later West-Semitic names of the Old Babylonian period. Kupper offers two different designations. He terms the MAR.TU people "Amorites" and the latter group "West Semites", thus rejecting the Landsberger-Bauer terminology "East Canaanites".<sup>25</sup> While accepting Kupper's rejection of the term "East Canaanite", Gelb disagrees to his use of two terms. Gelb argues for the linguistic identity of these names. He says that the relationship "has been seriously underestimated".<sup>26</sup> According to Gelb, the basic similarity of the characteristics of the MAR.TU names and the West Semitic names of the Old Babylonian period are suggestive of the fact that these groups are linguistically identical. First, the Ur III MAR.TU names have the -anum ending.<sup>27</sup> A second characteristic is that a

---

<sup>25</sup>Kupper, op. cit., p. 243.

<sup>26</sup>Gelb, op. cit., p. 33.

<sup>27</sup>It is a nominal affix ending (W. von Soden, Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik (Rome: 1952), (Sect. 56r.). This suffix had been considered as a criterion for distinguishing MAR.TU names from Amorite names. The -anum was taken to be a characteristic of MAR.TU names only. Since all names have now been identified under the term Amorite, the -anum ending is characteristic of an Amorite name. But every name with the -anum ending should not be categorized as Amorite, since this ending is also found in Akkadian names.

verbal element of the yaqtul from forms part of the name. Thirdly, an asseverative la occurs in some names of both groups. Gelb, however, does not deny the existence of other characteristics in the Ur III MAR.TU names which cannot be identified with the Old Babylonian names. But these, he says, are "pertaining to anomastic habits rather than to linguistic differences."<sup>28</sup> According to Landsberger and Bauer the characteristic ending -anum belongs to an Akkadian dialect, while the yaf'al - ʔel (yaqtal - ʔel)<sup>29</sup> formation -- an imperfect + a theophorous element -- is characteristic of the "East Canaanites." Goetze, on the other hand, concludes that

---

<sup>28</sup> Gelb, op. cit., p. 34.

<sup>29</sup> The first element of this formation is the imperfect of the trilateral verb faʔala. In Semitic languages the common root is trilateral. In order to facilitate the understanding of the various stems and grammatical formations one trilateral root was chosen as a paradigm verb. Earlier grammarians had chosen the root faʔal for the above purpose. Later, however, it was realized that faʔal is not a totally adequate representative of a Semitic trilateral root due to two reasons: First, the initial letter could shift into p; and secondly, the letter ʔ cannot be doubled. Accordingly, the root qatal was chosen as the paradigm verb because it is formed of totally strong letters. Throughout the present essay the root qatal will be taken as the paradigm verb.

both of these formations "must be ascribed to the same language".<sup>30</sup> Hence, the term "East Canaanite" becomes un-necessary.

The term West Semitic, therefore, refers to the language of these Semitic names which are different from Akkadian (East Semitic). The bearers of these names are called Amorite. A positive characteristic of an Amorite name of the Ur III period is the MAR.TU designation. The West Semitic names without the MAR.TU designation appear after the end of the Third Dynasty of Ur as a result of Amorite invasions. The identity of this latter group of names with the former (with MAR.TU designation) has been established, as presented in the above paragraphs.

The Mari texts have shed great light on the study of Amorite names. About 900 such names have been collected. These personal names are limited both geographically, in that they come from Mari alone, and chronologically, in that they come primarily from the time of Zimri-Lim. Depending on the chronology followed, the widest time limit that could be allowed for the Mari texts is about

---

<sup>30</sup>Goetze, op. cit., . p. 143.

seventy years. Hammurapi destroyed Mari in his 34th year which can be taken as the latest date for any of the Mari texts. The earliest texts date from the reign of Yahdun-Lim, the father of Zimri-Lim and a contemporary of Šamši-Adad of Assyria. Furthermore, we know that Hammurapi of Babylon was also a contemporary of Šamši-Adad through a text dating to Hammurapi's 10th year. Knowing that Šamši-Adad reigned 33 years, and assuming that he died during Hammurapi's 10th year (at the earliest), we reach the conclusion that Šamši-Adad started his rule 58 years before the destruction of Mari. The total of 70 years is obtained from the assumed calculation of Yahdun-Lim's regnal years. The latter mentioned Mari king has nine year-dates and is assumed to have ruled for ten or twelve years which gives a total of 70 years for the period of the texts. Considering Zimri-Lim's year dates, a total of 68 years could be obtained by adding the following years. Zimri-Lim is assumed to have ruled for 33 years based on the obtainable year names from his reign. The Assyrian rule in Mari probably lasted 23 years. (There are 18 eponyms and 5 year names from this period). To these previously mentioned years should be added the total rule of Yahdun-Lim, which is considered to be twelve years; thus obtaining the total of 68 years for the period

of the Mari texts. However, an even further limited time span could be achieved by shortening Zimri-Lim's reign to 21-23 years. The time span would then be below 60 years.<sup>31</sup>

In spite of the limited nature of the Mari texts, their importance should not be underestimated. They provide us with a basic sample study of Amorite names. A complete scholarly study of Amorite personal names found in Mari texts is presented by H. Huffmon in his book entitled Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study. For further clarification, some characteristics of Amorite names will be presented below. Although this is based on the Amorite names from Mari, the basic characteristics apply likewise to names from other regions.

Since Amorite names are found mixed with non-Amorite names in the same texts our first task is to distinguish the Amorite names. Amorite names can be distinguished from Hurrian names, since Hurrian is a non-Semitic language.<sup>32</sup> The basic difficulty in this

---

<sup>31</sup>Huffmon, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

respect lies in separating Amorite names from Akkadian names. In some cases it is impossible to do so. Akkadian, however, is different in phonology and morphology. Amorite names with an imperfect verb can be identified, since the Akkadian preterit iprus can be easily distinguished from the Amorite imperfect yaqtul. The initial y- provides a key in distinguishing Akkadian and Amorite names which have an uncertain imperfect formation. The initial ya became i in Akkadian, and the initial yu became u. Amorite names can also be distinguished in nominal formation. For example, the meqtul formation is rare in Akkadian. Several examples of phonological changes can be presented. In West Semitic, the laryngeals (ʾ, h), pharyngeals (ħ, ʕ), and uvular fricatives (ħ, ʕ) are preserved. The West Semitic cognate of the Akkadian bēl "lord", is baʿl. Akkadian š corresponds to West Semitic s. Also, initial w in Akkadian has shifted into y in Amorite (West Semitic).<sup>33</sup> Another key for recognizing Amorite names is the divine name (e.g. Baʿl, Dagan) forming an element of Amorite names. But this could also be misleading. "The actual language of the name, is most probably indicated by the verbal form, if any, or epithet, rather than by the divine name."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., pp. 13-14.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

Amorite personal names can be classified into several categories according to their formation. Generally, Amorite names are sentence names, which can be either verbal or nominal sentences. They can also be interrogative sentences. Sentence names can be composed of two or three elements. Amorite names can also be abbreviated forms of complete names, referred to as hypocoristica. Apart from these multiple-element names, there are one-word names.

A verbal sentence name is composed of two elements, the first of which is a verb, and the second a theophorous element (the name of a deity). The verb in the name can be in the imperfect, perfect, or imperative form. In the first formation the verb would be in the third masculine singular (if the name is masculine). An example for a masculine name is ya-aṭ-ṭa-<sup>d</sup>Da-gan or ya-as-ma-ah-<sup>d</sup>IM. In feminine names, however, the theophorous element comes first and is followed by the verb, such as, An-nu-ta-(a)s-ma-ah. Other forms of the imperfect are also used.<sup>35</sup> In terms of the paradigm semitic verb this formation of personal names (imperfect + theophorous element) would fall under the pattern

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

yaqta1-3el. This formation has also been found in Amorite names from the Ur III texts, such as I-La-ap-ti-il.<sup>36</sup> North has concluded that names in the yaqta1-3el formation are Amorite, and that Akkadian formations on this pattern are abbreviations of longer names. Huffmon points out that there are Akkadian names with the yaqta1-3el formation and hence they should not be considered as abbreviated forms.<sup>37</sup>

A verbal sentence-name with the verb in the perfect form is more difficult to define because its formation is similar to the nominal formations. The perfect form of a verb appears in either of these formations: qatala, qatila, or qatula. This category of names is also formed of two elements, a perfect verb and a theophorous element. In this case, however, the order of the elements is not established. But in most cases the verb occupies the first place.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> A. Goetze, "Amurrite Names in Ur III and Early Isin Texts," Journal of Semitic Studies, IV (1959), 193. The ya- is written I-.

<sup>37</sup> Huffmon, op. cit., p. 16. Noth quoted by Huffmon.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., p. 87.



Examples:

Ya - sa - ar - ti - AN	(yšr, "be upright")
Ya - sa - ar. AN	(ysr, "form, design")
Ha - an - na - <sup>d</sup> IM	(hnn, "be merciful, favor")
Ra - sa - <sup>d</sup> Da-gan	(rdy/w, "be content")

An example for the verb as the second element would be Ha-am-mu-pa-ta-a (pataha, pth "open").<sup>39</sup>

The third category of verbal sentence names are those names with an imperative verbal formation as one of the two elements forming these names. This formation is rare in Amorite names. An example of this category would be Šu-ub-<sup>d</sup>IM or another variant Šu-ub-na-AN. Šu-ub represents tūb meaning "return". The -na in the second example is a precative particle which expresses entreaty or the like.<sup>40</sup>

Amorite sentence names can also be formed of a nominal sentence consisting of two elements: a subject and a nominal predicate. In this case the theophorous element is the subject which follows the first element: the predicate. There are, however, certain specific

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 88.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

types which are characteristic of Mari names which do not apply to names from other regions.<sup>41</sup> The noun formation of the predicates appear under the form qatl, qitl, or qutl. In personal names, predicates refer to some aspect of the nature of the deity or the theophorous element. For example, a predicate in the qitl formation would be mi-il-ki which will be followed by a theophorous element.<sup>42</sup> A variant of the former type have li or la inserted between the two elements. Example: Mi-il-ki-li-el, Sa-am-hi-li-AN, Si-id-qu-la-na-si "Justice Belongs to (the) Nasi". The name formation with the predicate niri (nīr "light") always appears in a feminine name and occupies the second position. Ex. Da-gan-ni-ri.<sup>43</sup>

An interrogative sentence name has as its first element an interrogative pronoun or adverb which is followed by the theophorous element. In the name A-ya-da-du, for example, ʔayya "where" is the interrogative adverb.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 95, 96.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., pp. 96, 97.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., pp. 102, 103.

Amorite sentence-names, however, are not always formed with two elements. Three-element names are also found; such as, Ha-ya-su-mu-abi-im or Ya-ku-un-su-mu-a-bi-im. Any two elements of these names make a complete sentence. Every element is either a verbal or a nominal formation. Akkadian names of this formation incorporate a royal name.

The hypocoristica form a separate class of Amorite names. These are the shortened forms of two-element names. They are composed of one element only which can be either the first or second element (verbal, nominal, or theophorous). There are Mari examples in which one element has been omitted, and hence, in most cases it is only the imperfect verb that remains, as in the case of the names Ya-ab-na-ah and Ya-a-pa-ah.<sup>45</sup> Certain suffixes can be added to hypocoristica, such as -um in masculine name as in A-hu-um. Other suffixes for masculine names are -iya as in A-bi-ya and A-hi-ya or the suffix -anu-(m) as in the names U-ra-nu-um and Da-da-nu-um. For feminine names the suffix -atum is used as in Sa-La-ma-tum and Mar-sa-tum, and the suffix -aya as in Ma-ar-sa-ya.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 130 - 131.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 132 - 135.

Finally, there remain the one-word Amorite names which can be confused with the hypocoristica. The suffixes mentioned above are also found in one-word names. Names describing a quality of the bearer are usually formed of one word, as are animal and plant names.<sup>47</sup> There are no guidelines for distinguishing these names from the hypocoristica, hence Huffmon says: "name elements that are not otherwise attested as part of a two-element name may be provisionally classified as being one-word names."<sup>48</sup>

Amorite words and personal names have been attested in the Cappadocian texts (Old Assyrian texts from Kültepe) dating to the 19th century B.C. The name of the god Amurru appears together with that of Aššur as a witness in these texts.<sup>49</sup> Names found in

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 141.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>Gelb, op. cit., p. 35.

the Egyptian Execration Texts of the 18th century B.C. are also Amorite.<sup>50</sup> Although, the major part of the names found in the Alalakh VII tablets<sup>51</sup> are Hurrian, there

---

<sup>50</sup>W. F. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957), p. 164.

The Egyptian Execration Texts were written for a magical purpose. The texts are inscribed on two kinds of objects: human clay statuettes, and red pottery bowls. They include the names of Syro-Palestinian rulers and cities. After the texts had been inscribed they were ceremonially broken, thus magically, the pharaoh broke the power of any actual or potential enemy. Some scholars have taken these texts as evidence for the existence of an Egyptian "empire" in Asia during the Twelfth Dynasty. Hence, the enemies mentioned in these texts were rebellious vassals. Dr. W. Ward indicates that the cities found in these texts represent hostile independent states, and thereby do not show Egyptian power in Asia, and that "the Execration Texts are evidence of the last feeble effort on the part of the weaker kings at the close of the Middle Kingdom to halt the imminent dangers occasioned by this Hurrian influx." (W.A. Ward, "Egypt and the East Mediterranean in the Early Second Millennium B.C.", Orientalia, XXX (1961), 141-143, 149). These texts are to be dated to the end of the Twelfth Dynasty.

<sup>51</sup>Alalakh is the ancient name of the modern Tell Atshānah in northern Syria. It was first excavated by Sir Leonard Woolley between 1937 and 1949. It revealed seventeen main occupation levels, designated I-XVII from the top downwards. Textually, however, Level VII and the later level IV are important. Level VII is dated to the 18th century B.C. when Alalakh was ruled by Iarimlim, the king of Iamhad the capital of which was Aleppo. It yielded a total of 175 tablets, the major part of which, came from a small room of the "Palace of Yarimlim". These texts are significant for the historical information they preserve regarding the prominent Near Eastern Kings of that period. Furthermore, they throw light on the Hurrian (a neither Semitic nor an Indo-European ethnic group) penetration into Northern Syria. 524 personal names (Amorite and Hurrian) have been gathered from the Level VII tablets. As mentioned above, Hurrian names predominate. (D.J. Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets (London: The British Institute of Archeology at Ankara, 1953), pp. 1 - 2, 9.

are a number of Amorite names. Hypocoristica with the -anum suffix are rare.<sup>52</sup>

The breakdown of the Ur III empire (see above p. ) granted independence to several city-states which had previously formed part of it. Amorite dynasties established themselves in many of these states. During this period the international scene was dominated by Isin, Larsa, Eshnunna, Mari, and Assyria. All of the above-mentioned states (and later Babylon) were occupied by Amorite ruling dynasties; hence the period can be described as "the rise of Amorite Kingdoms." However, scholars cannot define the extent of Amorite cultural contribution in Mesopotamia. Neither can they determine their number in relation to the East Semitic population of Mesopotamia. Doubtless, the nomadic Amorites had a lot to learn and borrow from the Sumero-Akkadian culture of Mesopotamia, a factor which adds to the difficulties inherent in defining any Amorite contribution. They probably were a warlike society or had a ruling class of warriors which reflects a different social structure than other Semites. An exaggerated and biased view is presented in a Sumerian hymn which describes the Amorites as follows:

---

<sup>52</sup>Goetze, Review of Kupper, p. 144.

A tent-dweller [buffeted (?)] by wind and rain,  
[he knows (?) not (?)] prayers,  
With the weapon he [makes (?)] the mountain his  
habitation,  
Contentious to excess, he turns (?) against the  
lands, known not to bend the knee,  
Eats uncooked meat,  
Has no house in his lifetime,  
Is not brought to burial when he dies.<sup>53</sup>

Pointing out the difference between Sumerian and Semitic institutions Saggs says that the basic difference lies in the area of land tenure. While in the Sumerian system all land belonged to the temple and the gods, in the Semitic system land belonged to the king or to individuals. The unit of government was not the temple state as had previously been under the Sumerians.<sup>54</sup> Saggs' conclusion is the traditional opinion held by Orientalists. This opinion, however, has been reconsidered and proven wrong by more recent scholars. Kramer says that "Sumerian economy was relatively free and that private property was the rule rather than the exception."<sup>55</sup> Although Saggs might be justified in his observation, he does not clearly define the specific Amorite contribution in this respect. Semites and Semitic institutions had

---

<sup>53</sup>S.N. Kramer, The Sumerians (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 253.

<sup>54</sup>H.W.F. Saggs, The Greatness that was Babylon (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1962), pp. 60 - 61.

<sup>55</sup>Kramer, op. cit., p. 75.

been present in Mesopotamia before the arrival of the Amorites. As will be mentioned later, not all the kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon were Amorites. Evidence supports the fact that Akkadians and Amorites were two distinctly identifiable groups in the Mesopotamian population as late as the latter half of the 17th century B.C., a fact which is inferred in the Edict of Ammi-Saduqa (1646 - 1626 B.C.), the tenth king of the First Dynasty of Babylon.<sup>56</sup> It should not be assumed, however, that discrimination was exercised against the Amorites. As Oppenheim suggests, all the changes that took place after the fall of the Ur III empire could be ascribed to the Amorites since our knowledge about them is limited. Defining these changes Oppenheim says:

These changes include the shift from a city-state concept to the concept of a territorial state, the growth of long-distance trade relations through private initiative, wider horizons in international politics, and swiftly changing allegiances. One can feel at work the directness of personal decision unhampered by the cumbersome way in which tradition-bound city rulers, accustomed to quarrel over arable ground or pastures, must have been moving.<sup>57</sup>

Oppenheim further adds that Amorite influence brought about

---

<sup>56</sup> A. Leo Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 59.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 58.



"new types of political ruler on the Mesopotamian scene."<sup>58</sup> Although there might be a certain amount of truth in Oppenheim's observation, an ethnic group need not be the major factor in achieving such profound changes. History has shown that human institutions develop. Most of the so-called "changes" could be found also true of Mesopotamian society before the arrival of the Amorites. Achieving a "territorial state" had hopelessly been the aim of every Mesopotamian city-state. A clear example can be found in the Ur III empire. All such attempts had failed, and the First Dynasty of Babylon shared the same fate. Similarly, a new ethnic group need not be a factor causing the widening of commercial contacts. A stable form of government enhances trade and encourages private initiative. It is undeniable that the new type of rulers appearing in this period were Amorites. But Mesopotamia had had non-Amorite, ambitious rulers who had likewise failed in their endeavours. Builders of territorial states were not new on the Mesopotamian scene, but their Amorite counterparts were more capable and successful. Unfortunately the Amorite influence and contribution to Mesopotamia, except in the linguistic field, cannot be defined.

---

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 59.

## CHAPTER II

### THE ISIN-LARSA PERIOD (2025-1794 B.C.)<sup>1</sup>

Emerging from the breakdown of Ur were the city-states which were to dominate the stage for several centuries to come. It is unnecessary to the present purpose to offer a detailed presentation of the history of each of these states. Emphasis will rather be placed on the

---

<sup>1</sup>The title of this period reflects the history of the period after the fall of the Ur III Dynasty. The second state to break away from Ur was Larsa in 2025 B.C., the first being Eshnunna in 2028 B.C. The Amorite dynasty which was established in Larsa was headed by Nablân-um (2025-2005 B.C.) Isin followed Larsa in 2017 B.C., as mentioned in the preceding chapter. During the beginning of this period Isin was the stronger state in south Mesopotamia, ruling several important Mesopotamian cities. On the other hand, Nablân-um had little more than his own state, Larsa. This situation, however, was reversed with the reign of Gungunum (1932-1906 B.C.), the fifth king of Larsa. Gungunum, a contemporary of Lipit-Ishtar of Isin (1934-1924 B.C.), reduced Isin's territories. Unfortunately, Isin had a succession of weak kings and usurpers and could not deal with Larsa, which, taking advantage of this situation, was pushing northward. This rivalry was soon minimized when a new enemy appeared-- Babylon with its new Amorite dynasty founded by Sumu-abum in 1894 B.C.

It is difficult to limit the dates of the Isin-Larsa period. Considering the fact that Larsa finally defeated Isin and brought its dynasty to an end, the date of 1794 B.C. (fall of Isin) has been taken as the end of the Isin-Larsa period. The date 1763 B.C. could also be ascribed for the end of that period, if the fall of Larsa is taken into consideration.

period of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Several problems, chronological or otherwise, face us in studying this period of history. We shall first deal with the southern Mesopotamian states.

An initial problem which is of major historical importance is that of the identity of Išbi-Irra, the founder of the dynasty of Isin. He is referred to as 'the man of Mari'. It is probable that he was an Amorite himself.<sup>2</sup> Albright, however, identifies Išbi-Irra as an "Accadian governor of Mari".<sup>3</sup> Thus we remain faced with two problems: The identity of Išbi-Irra and the nature of the office he occupies in the government of Mari.

---

<sup>2</sup>H.W.F. Saggs, The Greatness that was Babylon (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1962), p. 66.

<sup>3</sup>W.F. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957), p. 152.

Be that as it may, Isin<sup>4</sup> considered itself as the legitimate successor of Ur III. King-lists and ritual texts confirm this fact. The Isin King-list follows that of Ur without the indication of break. Secondly, the early kings of Isin acquired the title "King of Ur" rather than "King of Isin". The title "King of Isin" is first attested in the inscriptions of Išme-Dagan (1953-1935 B.C.), the fourth king of Isin, and Lipit-Ištar (1934-1924 B.C.), his successor. But they continued to use the title "King of Ur" on other inscriptions. Until the latter part of Lipit-Ištar's reign, Isin ruled Ur.<sup>5</sup> In fact Išbi-Irra had reconstructed that city, eight years after its destruction and had returned the statue of Nanna from Anshan where it had been taken by the conquerors, an act which legitimized Išbi-Irra as the heir to the Ur III Dynasty.<sup>6</sup> The control of southern Mesopotamia

---

<sup>4</sup>The First Dynasty of Isin is composed of fifteen kings ruling from 2017 to 1794 B.C., Relating to the First Dynasty of Babylon, Bur-Sin (1895-1874 B.C.), the seventh king of Isin would be contemporaneous to Sumuabum (1894-1881 B.C.), the founder of the Babylonian dynasty. Similarly, Damiq-ilušu (1816-1794 B.C.), the last king of the Isin dynasty, would be a contemporary of Sin-muballit (1812-1793 B.C.), the fifth king and the father of the great Hammurapi of Babylon.

<sup>5</sup>William W. Hallo, "The Last Years of the Kings of Isin", Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVIII (1959), 57.

<sup>6</sup>Saggs, op. cit., p. 62.

was Isin's greatest objective, which, however, was never realized. Isin, doubtless retained its rule over Nippur as late as the reign of Damiq-Ilišu, the last king of that dynasty and a contemporary of Sin-muballit, Hammurapi's father. The loss of the south represents a turning point in Isin's foreign policy. It looked northward for conquest. Although this has been the general interpretation of the evidence, it is far from conclusive. The important question is whether Isin actually ruled Babylon or not. Evidence from both Babylon and Isin suggests a positive answer.

The development of Isin's policy toward Ur is reflected through the inscriptions found on three cones belonging to three kings of Isin. The first cone, belonging to Enlil-bani (1860-1837 B.C.), carries a twelve-line inscription recording the construction of a temple called é-ní-dúb-bu "house of relaxation" for the goddess Nin-ti-la-ug-ga.<sup>7</sup> The second cone belongs to Zambia (1836 - 1834 B.C.), the successor of the former king. Zambia records his reconstructions of the great wall of Isin to which he gave his name. The inscription ends with:

---

<sup>7</sup>Hallo, op. cit., p. 54.

The beloved of the god Enlil  
and the goddess Nin-isina-  
the great wall  
of Isin  
he built.  
Of that wall,  
'Zambia-  
(is)-the-beloved-of-Istar'  
is its name.<sup>8</sup>

He then mentions his royal titles which are "the king of Isin" and "the king of Sumer and Akkad." Zambia's rule over Nippur is stated in his epithet sipani-tug En.LIL. KI, meaning "pious shepherded of Nippur," which appears on his cone among other epithets.<sup>9</sup> Another epithet, "beloved of Enlil and Ninisina" refers to both Nippur and Isin,<sup>10</sup> since the deities mentioned were the city-gods of these cities.

The third cone comes from the reign of Damiq-ilišu. On it the king announces his dedication of a building to the god Martu, which is described as Martu's "beloved store-house." The god himself is called "the child of Heaven (AN) who makes his attributes holy." These are two names referring to the Martu temple. Hallo thinks it is probable that Damiq-ilišu refers to two temples in Babylon.<sup>11</sup> Also to be considered, is the

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

building of a "Šamaš" temple by this king in Babylon which has been mentioned in one of his date formulas. Accordingly, Lewy has concluded that Damiq-ilišu must have "ruled not only over Nippur but over vast stretches of territory to the north of Enlil's holy city."<sup>12</sup> This conclusion is quite possible and it provides evidence for the change in Isin's policy, if not for an actual conquest of the north.

The royal titles assumed by the kings of Isin reflect their aspirations, though the argument from titles does not represent the total picture. While the interpretation of the changes in royal titles provides a good historical reference, such reference should be better documented, especially with texts, to enable us to draw definite conclusions.

Although the rule of the kings of Isin over Ur had weakened and their hopes for the conquest of the south had dimmed, the epithets of Išme-Dagan and of his successors, are indicative of their unyielding ambitions.

---

<sup>12</sup>Hildegard Lewy, "Chronological Notes Relating to a New Volume of Old Babylonian Contracts," Orientalia, XXIV (1955), 280.

The epithets of Išme-Degan are "he who is at the disposal of Ur, who daily enriches Eridu, high priest of Uruk."<sup>13</sup> By the time of Enlil-bani's reign, Isin had come to terms with its fate. His epithets omit references to Ur, Eridu, and Uruk. Nippur remained in Isin's possession. Hence, the reign of Enlil-bani represents a turning point in Isin's history.<sup>14</sup>

The above evidence, however, leads to several important questions especially relating to Babylon itself. Was Isin satisfied with its possession of Nippur alone, or was it more ambitious and, how successful was it in its new policy? Lewy concludes that Isin was successful in its new endeavors in the north. The gods mentioned in texts dating later than Enlil-bani's reign are those of Isin and northern deities, such as, Ištar, Šamaš, Martu, Nintinugga, and Dagan; while southern deities, such as Nanna, Enlil, Ningal, and Ninbil, appear in earlier texts (before Enlil-bani).<sup>15</sup> There

---

<sup>13</sup>Hallo, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 58.



is an apparent preference of northern deities accompanying the change marked in the epithets. Daniq-illisu's temple for Martu is a revealing factor in this regard.

Looking northward, Isin had to deal with new powers. It is likely that Isin and Babylon entered into rivalry for the control of the area around Aktab,<sup>16</sup> especially during the reign of Sin-magir (1827-1817 B.C.), the predecessor of Damiq-ilišu. Moreover, evidence points to the fact that Sin-magir ruled Babylon for a few years. One of his cones has been found there. Sin-magir's name also appears in a geographical term for a place situated north of Babylon.<sup>17</sup> Other evidence (see below) suggests that Damiq-ilišu also ruled Babylon. Therefore, two kings of Isin may have ruled Babylon during the reign

---

<sup>16</sup>The location of Aktab is uncertain. It was probably west of the Euphrates somewhere in the vicinity of Dilbat (modern Dulaim) and Barsippa (modern Birs). (Hallo quoting Kraus, "Provinzen des neusumerischen Reiches von Ur", Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, LI (1955), 60. Also: Hallo, "The Last Years of the kings of Isin," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVIII (1959), 58.).

<sup>17</sup>Hallo, op. cit., p. 58.

of two of the latter's early kings. Both of these are assumptions which should be further discussed. Let us first consider the assumption that Damiq-ilišu ruled Babylon in Sinmuballit's fourth and fifth year.

Several factors in Damiq-ilišu's reign should be considered, one of which is the overlordship of Nippur. The city of Nippur was alternately in the possession of either Larsa or Isin. Rim-Sin, the last king of Larsa, gained and lost this city several times. There is evidence that Nippur belonged to Larsa beginning in Rim-Sin's twenty-first year.<sup>18</sup> Prior to that date Isin had conquered it from Larsa. The year dates found in the Nippur texts provide the evidence. During the period between Rim-Sin's tenth and twentieth years, his year-names are not attested in Nippur texts; instead Damiq-ilišu's year-names become prominent. Therefore, Nippur belonged to Isin for eleven years before its reconquest by Larsa. H. Lewy, however, suggests that Damiq-ilišu enlarged his empire further north than Nippur. One of his year-names says "year in which he built (the temple) Esakudkalama for Šamaš."<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Lewy op. cit., p. 280.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

Since this temple was in Babylon, it is probable, Lewy adds, that Damiq-ilišu controlled Babylon as well. Furthermore, on an inscription on a nailhead from Nippur, Damiq-ilišu mentions his construction of "the Great Wall of Isin" which he called "Damiq-ilišu is the favorite of God Ninurta". Reference to this event is also made in a date formula in another text from Nippur. A similar date formula appears on a text from Sippar, which extends Damiq-ilišu's territory even further.<sup>20</sup>

The assumption that Damiq-ilišu was able to interrupt Sin-muballit's rule during the latter's fourth and fifth years can further be attested in the year names appearing on texts from other Babylonian cities, namely, Sippar, Dilbat, and Kish. Hence, the disappearance of Sin-muballit's year-names is suggestive of the break in his rule. In following this analysis it has been found that Sin-muballit's year-names disappear abruptly from the documents during his fourth and fifth years. Starting with his sixth year, year-names are regularly attested on these documents. Lewy concludes: "It thus becomes obvious that it was in Sin-muballit's fourth and fifth year that Damiq-ilišu pushed northward from Nippur capturing Dilbat, Kiš, Babylon, and Sippar".<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 281.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 282.

This conclusion may have a considerable amount of truth, and provides proof for the fact that the First Dynasty of Babylon was not powerful during its early years, and that it was Hammurapi who gave the dynasty its fame.

Evidence, however, exists that Sin-magir (1827-1817 B.C.), the predecessor of Damiq-ilišū, also ruled Babylon. He was a contemporary of Apil-Sin (1830-1813 B.C.), the grandfather of Hammurapi. The absence of Apil-Sin's year-names would similarly suggest his loss of control over his city. Apil-Sin's year dates are unattested in the texts of other Babylonian cities for a period of seven years, which corresponds to the period between his tenth and sixteenth regnal years. Date formulae of his thirteenth year, however, are abundantly found.<sup>22</sup> According to Kraus' chronology, these seven years correspond to the last four years of Sin-magir and the first three years of Damiq-ilišū. Hallo explains the exception attested in Apil-Sin's thirteenth year as coinciding with the event of Sin-magir's death and Damiq-ilišū's accession, which, probably, weakened Isin's control over its territories due to the court's short instability.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Hallo, op. cit., p. 58.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

Although the absence of date formulae is reflective of Babylon's weakness, it does not represent conclusive proof of Isin's rule, since Sin-magir or Damiq-ilišu formulas do not replace the omitted ones. Future discoveries of new texts may clarify the issue. Hence, we cannot measure the success Isin achieved in its new ambitions.

In order to establish the dates for the various events that have been mentioned above, we should refer to chronological synchronisms. The chronology of this period is uncertain (see below Appendix A) and hence a variety of dates are given by various scholars for the same event. The dates presented in this study follow the "Middle" chronology. There are established synchronisms, but it is the chronology followed which determines the absolute dates for these synchronisms.

The generally accepted equation is that which synchronizes year 61 of Rim-Sin (Larsa) with year 30 of Hammurapi (Babylon). Lewy, however, offers a new synchronism between Larsa and Babylon:

Warad-Sin year 2 = Sabium year 11 = 1838 B.C.<sup>24</sup> Sabium's twelfth year name says, "year in which the wall of Kazallu (was destroyed)". According to the Babylonian

---

<sup>24</sup>Lewy, op. cit., p. 285.

system, the year-name commemorates an event which had occurred in the preceding year. Hence the destruction of the wall of Kazallu was accomplished during Šabium's eleventh year, which, H. Lewy says, corresponds to the year 1838 B.C. Similarly, Warad-Sin's second year-name says "year in which the wall of Kazallu was destroyed and the army of (Mut) i (a) bal smitten with weapons within Larsa." It could, therefore, be assumed that the actual event occurred in Warad-Sin's first regnal year. But in the present case, says Lewy, this is improvable due to the presence of two names for that year, which suggests that an alteration was made because a more important event had taken place, namely, the destruction of the wall of Kazallu.<sup>25</sup> Assuming that Lewy's equation is correct, the date according to the "Middle" chronology would be 1833 B.C.<sup>26</sup> Based on the above evidence, Lewy concludes that,

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 283-285.

<sup>26</sup>The date 1833 can be reached by following the general chronological scheme of this period presented by the proponents of the "middle" chronology. Considering that Warad-Sin of Larsa started to rule in 1834, his second regnal year would be 1833. Similarly, assuming that Šabium's first regnal year was 1844, his eleventh year would be 1833.

Larsa and Babylon might have united in the war against Kazallu.

Be that as it may, there remains the synchronism, Isin-Babylon-Larsa to be established, namely Damiq-ilišu-Sin-muballit-Rim-Sin. First, Damiq-ilišu's regnal year during which he captured the Babylonian throne should be determined. Furthermore, there is evidence that Sin-muballit (Babylon) captured Isin. His seventeenth year name states:

mui-si-in-na<sup>ki</sup> in-dib-ba  
"year when he (i.e., Sin-muballit) took Isin."<sup>27</sup>

Jacobsen, accordingly paralleled Sin-muballit's sixteenth year with Damiq-ilišu's final regnal year, namely, year 23.<sup>28</sup> Lewy, however, following Ungnad's computations, says the fact that Sin-muballit's seventeenth year has an us-sa<sup>29</sup> name indicates that the name has been changed

---

<sup>27</sup>T. Jacobsen, The Sumerian King List (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 199.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>us-sa name

which signifies that Damiq-ilišu's last year should be equated with Sin-muballit's seventeenth rather than sixteenth. Hence Damiq-ilišu occupied the Babylonian throne in his tenth and eleventh year.<sup>30</sup> The latter years are dated by Lewy to the years 1813 and 1812 B.C. To complete her synchronism, Lewy adds the evidence from Larsa. Rim-Sin's fourteenth year-name states the victory of the king over Ernene, the king of Uruk, who had under his command the armies of Babylon, Isin, Sutium, and Rapiqum. Lewy assumes that the states which contributed to Ernene's army were his vassals, and hence, Rim-Sin in his thirteenth year, through defeating Ernene, gave Isin its independence from Uruk.<sup>31</sup> It was, therefore, after winning his freedom that Damiq-ilišu built the "Great wall of Isin", which is a logical undertaking. Damiq-ilišu's march over Babylon corresponds to Rim-Sin's fifteenth year. Lewy's chronological synchronism states:

Sin-muballit (Babylon) year 4 = Damiq-ilišu (Isin) year 10 =  
Rim-Sin (Larsa) year 15 = 1813 B.C.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>Lewy, op. cit., p. 283.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 286.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 287.



Lewy's synchronism, however, cannot be followed in terms of the strict "Middle" chronology. While we have evidence that Damiq-ilišu pushed northward toward Babylon during Sin-muballit's fourth and fifth year, it is difficult for us to determine the date of the same event in terms of Damiq-ilišu's regnal years. Lewy suggests that it should be the tenth and eleventh years of the latter king. According to the "Middle" chronology Damiq-ilišu's tenth year is 1806 B.C., having started to rule in 1816 B.C.; while Sin-muballit's fourth year is 1808 B.C., having started his rule in 1812 B.C. Considering that we have surer ground in assuming that Sin-muballit's fourth and fifth regnal years were interrupted, Lewy's same synchronism according to our chronology would be:

Sin-muballit year 4 = Damiq-ilišu year 8 = Rim-Sin year 14 = 1808 B.C.

It has been mentioned that Sin-muballit later captured Isin. This has been dated to his seventeenth year which corresponds to Damiq-ilišu's twenty-third and last regnal year. The Babylonian campaign, however, did not bring an end to the Isin dynasty. A tablet from Nippur dealing with the division of inheritance between

three brothers bears the following date formula:

In the month of Tebētum, the 26th year since  
d Rim-Sin, the king  
captured Isin.<sup>33</sup>

Hence, this tablet was written twenty six years after Rim-Sin's capture of Isin, which should correspond, according to O'Callaghan, to his fifty-fifth regnal year.<sup>34</sup> Rim-Sin, therefore, captured Isin in his twenty-ninth year thereby bringing Damiq-ilišu's dynasty to an end. The role that Babylon might have played in hastening Isin's fall is unknown. There is no evidence that Sin-muballit was directly involved in Rim-Sin's warfare against Isin. His conquest of Isin which did not lead to Damiq-ilišu's fall probably contributed to its weakness.

---

<sup>33</sup>Roger T. O'Callaghan, "New Inheritance Contract from Nippur," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, VIII (1954), 138.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 139.

## CHAPTER III

### ASSYRIA

In the preceding chapters we have presented the picture of Southern Mesopotamia during the period prior to the rise of Hammurapi of Babylon. A rather similar picture can be seen in Northern Mesopotamia where Assyria and Mari are the major powers. It is the object of the following paragraphs to present this latter picture.

It is apparent that early Aššur was a dependency of the south. An Assyrian inscription mentions the name of Zariqum, a governor, as a vassal of Amar-Sin (2047-2039 B.C.), the third king of the Third Dynasty of Ur.<sup>1</sup> The commercial activities of this early Assyrian state are reflected in the Assyrian texts coming from Kültepe

---

<sup>1</sup>Jørgen Laessøe, People of Ancient Assyria: Their Inscriptions and Correspondence (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), p. 39.

(ancient Kaniš)<sup>2</sup> in eastern Anatolia where an Assyrian merchant colony, dealing with metal trade, resided. Laessøe says that such colonies were established "during the domination of the Third Dynasty of Ur."<sup>3</sup> O'Callaghan, however, thinks that the Amorite influx into southern mesopotamia caused the Assyrians to look toward Anatolia

---

<sup>2</sup>Kaniš was the Assyrian name of Kültepe in Cappadocia. To the east of the larger mound of Kültepe lies the Assyrian town. Excavations in this area have uncovered the private houses and archives of these merchants. The site is formed by four levels of occupation. The upper level, level 1, is subdivided into 1a and 1b which are separated by a layer of burning. Level 1a contains no texts. It is in level 1b that a few Assyrian tablets were found. Level 2 represents the Assyrian merchant colony. At first some 2500 tablets were discovered which were followed by another eight to ten thousand tablets. Therefore, only level 1b and level 2 yielded texts. An interesting feature of level 2 is the fact that the houses of the Assyrian merchants are grouped in certain sectors separate from the natives. The houses of level 2 are built directly on those of level 3, a fact which leads T. Özgüç, the excavator, to think that the latter level (level 3) must also belong to the Assyrian period. Finally, level 4 rests on virgin soil. It is considerably separated from level 3 by an accumulation of earth. T. Özgüç believes that the beginning of the occupation cannot be dated as early as the Third Millennium B.C., but to the beginning of the Second Millennium, or towards the end of the Ur III period. (P. Garelli, Les Assyriens en Cappadoce, Bibliothèque Archeologique et Historique de l'Institut Français d'Archeologie d'Istanbul, XIX (Paris: Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve, 1963) pp. 18-24).

<sup>3</sup>Laessøe, loc. cit.

to satisfy their commercial interests during the nineteenth century B.C.<sup>4</sup> Being dependent on Ur, it was only natural for Assyria to turn to Anatolia after the stability of the south had wavered. Furthermore, the presence of Amorite names in these texts suggests that Amorites already formed part of the Assyrian population. It could also be assumed, with Laessøe, that trade under Ur III had grown to include Anatolian cities as well, but the formation of trade colonies was a later development, namely, after the fall of Ur. More specifically, Roux says that Assyrian merchant colonies were established in Anatolia "at least since the reign of Ibbi-Sin of Ur (2029-2006 B.C.)".<sup>5</sup> The opinion among some scholars that such colonies were initiated by Ur III kings was based on the fact that a Cappadocian text bore a seal impression naming king Ibbi-Sin.<sup>6</sup> This view, however, has been criticized by Lewy and Hrozný who suggest that

---

<sup>4</sup>R.T. O'Callaghan, Aram Naharaim (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1948), p. 22.

<sup>5</sup>G. Roux, Ancient Iraq (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1964), p. 190.

<sup>6</sup>Paul Garelli, Les Assyriens en Cappadoce, Bibliothèque Archeologique et Historique de l'Institut Français d'Archeologie d'Istanbul, XIX (Paris: Librairie Adrein Maisonneuve, 1963), p. 31.

the evidence should be interpreted as a later re-use of the seal since the name of that king does not appear in the body of the text.<sup>7</sup> K. Balkan explains the evidence as a case whereby scribes who emigrated from Ur after the fall of Ib-bi-Sin carried the seal with them which was later transmitted from generation to generation.<sup>8</sup> Two arguments must therefore be excluded from our discussion, first that Ur established colonies in Anatolia, and second, that these colonies formed part of the Ur III empire. Although these arguments have now been outdated, the argument that the Anatolian outposts suggest direct Assyrian rule over the area, continues to be held by Lewy and Hrozný. Hrozný is doubtful of the idea that the highly organized system established at Kaniš, as revealed through the documents, had only trade and economic goals as its objective. He further adds that they must have had a military force, which leads him to the conclusion that "the Assyrians were masters of these cities",<sup>9</sup> and that the native princes were on a subordinate level. Regarding the Assyrian ruler who

---

<sup>7</sup>B. Hrozný, "Assyriens et Hittites en Asie Mineure vers 2000 av. J.C.," Archiv Orientalni, IV (1932), 113.

<sup>8</sup>Garelli, op. cit., p. 32.

<sup>9</sup>Hrozný, op. cit., p. 112.

achieved this expansion, Hrozny thinks it was Ilušuma, who is famous for his conquests of parts of Babylonia. During the first part of his reign, Ilušuma was a contemporary of Išme-Dagan (1953-1935 B.C.) of Isin, and in the latter part he was a contemporary of Sumu-abum (1894-1881 B.C.), the founder of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Hrozny, however, carries his conclusions too far in saying that Assyria became a dependency of Isin after the fall of Ur and it was the weakness of Isin that provided the opportunity for Assyria to expand into Anatolia.<sup>10</sup> The same theory of an Assyrian empire in Anatolia during the 19th century B.C. is held by J. Lewy who considers the organization of the Kārum<sup>11</sup> as a politi-

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., pp. 113-114.

<sup>11</sup> This term, which often appears in the Cappadocian texts, originally designated the quay of a harbor, or the area around the harbor where commercial buildings were found. The meaning, however, was later extended to refer to such sectors of a city which were unrelated to river traffic or to associations of merchants. It is in this latter sense that the term is used in the Cappadocian texts, namely, that the term Karum designates the commercial center established in a city and also the assembly of merchants who administer it.

The Karum was a highly organized and active body. Its economic and financial activities were directed by the "bit Kārim". It provided storehouses for the storage of goods and collected a tax on imports. At certain periods all merchants met to add up their credit, and for what they termed "proclaiming the cast balance". The kinds of taxes that the Kārum collected are difficult for us to understand. The Kārum's activities ranged from judicial, political, financial, and economic. Doubtless the central treasury of Aššur as well as the Karum itself and the natives benefited from the capital that circulated through this organization. (Garelli, op. cit., pp. 171-204).

cal rather than an economic unit, and hence, the different Kāru from provinces of an empire controlled by Assur after the fall of Ur.<sup>12</sup> E. Meyer concluded that "il est clair qu'il ne peut s'agir ici d'un État vassal de l'Assyrie, mais seulement d'un territoire faisant directement partie de l'Assyrie".<sup>13</sup> Similarly, Landsberger gave a political interpretation to the Karum.<sup>14</sup>

In the preceding paragraphs the theory that the Assyrian establishments in Kaniš were of a political nature has been presented. It is, however, the opinion held by the majority of present-day Assyriologists that the Assyrians had economic interests in Anatolia rather than political. Accordingly, the following paragraphs will deal with the economic nature of the Assyrian establishments.

The initiator of this economic policy remains uncertain. The Cappadocian texts themselves fall in the period of the reigns of two Assyrian kings, Sargon I and his successor Puzur-Aššur II. But it does not follow that

---

<sup>12</sup> Garelli, op. cit., pp. 25-26.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 26.



these were the earliest monarchs concerned with the Cappadocian trade. Economic relations between Assyria and Cappadocia were established during the rule of Erišu I, the predecessor of Sargon I and probably a contemporary of Sumu-la-ilum (1880-1845 B.C.), the second king of the First Dynasty of Babylon. But we cannot prove that he was the initiator of that trade. His father Ilušuma could also be considered the initiator of that trade, but nothing in his inscriptions suggests this.<sup>15</sup> According to Garelli, it was with the reign of Erišu I that Assyrian merchants reached Anatolia. He, however, does not offer conclusive proof for his assumption and says that the written sources do not permit us to go beyond Erišu I.<sup>16</sup>

Assuming that the Kārum was an economic organization, and hence trade was its reason for existence, we come to the problem of the goods traded. The metal trade formed the largest and most important item. In this respect too, scholars remain uncertain about the nature of the metal traded. The key to this problem is the correct rendering of the meaning of the word anākum.

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 47-48.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

J. Lewy suggests that the word means lead (plumbum nigrum).<sup>17</sup> The Assyrians, therefore, sent lead ore to Kaniš where the silver content would be extracted and sent back to Assyria. J. Lewy explains this fact saying that Assyria lacked the wood needed to raise the temperature high enough which would separate the silver from lead. Furthermore, Anatolia had both the forests and the skilled labor. The fact is that forests exist in the area around Assyria and hence it seems strange for the Assyrians to choose a longer route.<sup>18</sup>

A second rendering of the meaning of the term anākum is given by Landsberger, and followed by K. Balkan, who say it designates tin. The latter rendering of the word has significance in that tin is necessary for the manufacture of bronze. Since Anatolia was rich in copper deposits, the Assyrians in exporting tin could obtain bronze. But Garelli states that references to bronze are not made in the texts. Assyrian exports of tin and import of bronze should have been mentioned. Archeology, on the other hand, has unearthed a large quantity of bronze objects.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>J. Lewy, "A propos of a Recent Study in Old Assyrian Chronology," Orientalia, XXVI (1957), 13n.2.

<sup>18</sup>Garelli, op. cit., p. 271.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., pp. 277-278.

The latest word on this problem, however, has been offered by Landsberger in a recent article in which he presents the history of the opinions offered around the meaning of two terms anākum and abaru. The word anāku appearing in earlier texts had been translated "lead", or, in some cases, it had been suggested that during ancient times there was some confusion in the usage of this term and therefore anāku might have meant "tin" or "lead". This latter, however, could not have been the case. The idea was fixed that anāku meant "lead". With the discovery of the Cappadocian texts, the problem of the correct rendering of anāku was reconsidered. The meaning "lead" was again applied. But now a new identification has been suggested, that anāku means "tin", and abaru means "lead". H. Lewy and Gadd (Cambridge Ancient History), on the other hand, still hold the traditional view.<sup>20</sup>

A further piece of evidence in favor of the identification of anāku as "tin" is found in a text from Tell Shemshāra in Northern Mesopotamia. This is a letter

---

<sup>20</sup> B. Landsberger, "Tin and Lead: The Adventures of Two Vocables, Journal of Near Eastern Studies", XXIV (1965), 285-296.

in which the writer demands some raw materials for the manufacture of weapons from his addressee. It seems he had received wood from another city and wants a large quantity of anākum. Lassøe thinks that the materials were needed for the manufacture of spears where the metal would be used for the spearheads and the wood for the shaft. Hence, considering that the metal was to be used for weapons, Lassøe suggests that the anākum was to be added to copper to make Bronze. He also adds that copper alloys from Ur have shown to have a higher percentage of tin than lead. Therefore, it is in accordance with the interpretation of the text that anāku be translated "tin".<sup>21</sup>

The third piece of evidence for anāku "tin" comes from the Armenian language. Jensen (1894) had already pointed out the relationship between Armenian anāk "tin" and Sanskrit nagam "tin" or "lead".<sup>22</sup> Confirming Lassøe's view Mr. Krikorian adds that the Armenian word ānāk which exclusively means "tin" is one of the Assyrian words borrowed into the Armenian

---

<sup>21</sup> J. Laessøe, "Akkadian Annakum: "Tin" or "Lead"?", Acta Orientalia, XXIV (1959), 83-94.

<sup>22</sup> Landsberger, op. cit., p. 287.

language and that the Assyrian endings -um or -u always dropped out after they were borrowed.<sup>23</sup>

It is difficult to explain the reasons for the sudden collapse of the Assyrian merchant colonies. For our present purposes, suffice it to say, that both Anatolian and Mesopotamian factors contributed their share. The textual evidence gathered through comparing the texts of level 2 (Kanish) with those of the later level 1b reveals a relative poverty during level 1b.<sup>24</sup> Archeological evidence shows two layers of burning: The earlier, marking the end of level 2, and the latter, marking the end of level 1b which is the end of the Assyrian settlement in Anatolia. According to Özgüç's estimations the last fire of Kaniš, and the following period when the site remained unoccupied lasted for 50 to 80 years. The 1b occupation may have lasted 40 to 50 years. Therefore, the two fires must have been separated by 90 to 130 years which would date the final fire of Kaniš c. 1820, 1730, or 1670 B.C., according to the "high", "middle", and "low" chronologies, respectively.

---

<sup>23</sup>M.K. Krikorian, "A Further Argument about "Annakum", "Acta Orientalia, XXV (1960), 171-172.

<sup>24</sup>Garelli, op. cit., p. 56.

In Anatolia this date would correspond to the reign of Tudhaliyas I (1740-1710 B.C.).<sup>25</sup> The fire was probably due to the internal warfare marking the beginning of the Hittite Old Kingdom. The Assyrians lost a great deal of their commercial enterprises with the fire of level 2, but it seems that they resumed their economic activities on a smaller scale as represented by level 1b.

One of the basic reasons for the collapse of the Anatolian colonies lies in the political situation in Assyria itself. Assyrian trade with Anatolia flourished during the rules of Erišu I and Puzur-Aššur II (see above, p. 55 ). Troubles had already started at the end of the latter's rule, and Landsberger thinks that one of his successors, Naram-Sin, is the king of Eshnunna himself, a fact which reflects the disturbed situation. Erišu II (dates uncertain), the predecessor of Šamši-Adad I (1814 - 1782) B.C.), therefore, managed to save the Assyrian throne from a usurper.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>He was the grandfather of Labarnas I. But it is doubtful whether he was a king of Hatti. If he is to be thus considered then he would be the first king of the Hittite Old Kingdom. (G.R. Gurney, The Hittites (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962), p. 217.)

<sup>26</sup>Garelli, op. cit., p. 77.

Be that as it may, Erišū II's reign, which was interrupted by Šamši-Adad I, an Amorite, lasted for about five years only. The Assyrian dynastic crises and the rise of the Amorites in Mesopotamia led to a neglect of trade, hence the collapse of the merchant colonies.

As it has previously been pointed out (Chapter I), Amorite dynasties had established themselves in several cities of southern Mesopotamia. Šamši-Adad I (1814-1782 B.C.) became the first Amorite king in Assyria. Originally he came from the city of Terqa<sup>27</sup> where his father Ila-Kabkabu was king. Terqa's relations with the city of Mari, in the middle Euphrates area, were unfriendly. Mari was also ruled by an Amorite dynasty. Its king Iaggid-Lim, the first of a new dynasty, and Ila-Kabkabu had signed a peace treaty which was later broken by Iaggid-Lim, according to Assyrian sources.<sup>28</sup> This fact is revealed in a Mari letter written by Iasmah-Adad (1796-1780 B.C.), a son

---

<sup>27</sup>Modern Tell Ashāra. It is situated on the right bank of the Euphrates about 70 Klm. north of Mari. (Jean Bottéro et André Finet, Archives Royales de Mari Vol. XV: Répertoire analytique des tomes I à V (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1954), 136.)

<sup>28</sup>Laessle, People of Ancient Assyria, op. cit., p. 41.

of Samsi-Adad and viceroy of Mari, to a certain important political figure of the time whose name, unfortunately, has not been preserved. Iasmah-Adad writes:

De mon lignage, il n'ya personne  
qui ait péché envers le dieu;  
tous tiennent les serments du dieu, en vérité.  
Autrefois, Ila-Kabkabu  
et Iaggid-Lim ont échangé  
des serments solennels.

Ila-Kabkabu envers Iaggid-Lim  
n'a pas péché;  
c'est Iaggid-Lim, au contraire, que envers Ila-  
Kabkabu a péché.<sup>29</sup>

The addressee of the letter, however, became an ally of Ila-Kabkabu in the war resulting from the breach of the treaty. It can also be gathered that Ila-Kabkabu was successful. Ultimately, however, Iaggid-Lim conquered Terqa and the family of Ila-Kabkabu was forced to leave the city. Most probably they resided in Babylonia.<sup>30</sup>

Concerning the early part of Šamši-Adad's lifetime the Assyrian kinglist says:

[Šam] ši-Adad (I) son of Ila-Kabkabi  
[at the t] ime of Nram-Sin  
[to Kardunia] š he went. In the eponymy of Ibni-Adad  
[Šamši] -Adad (I) from Karduniaš  
[he came up] , Ekallāte he seized,  
and 3 years in Ekallāte he resided.  
In the eponymy of Atamar-Ištar Šamši-Adad (I)  
from Ekallāte he came up,  
Erišu (II) son of Naram-Sin he deposed from the throne,  
The throne he seized, (and) 33 years he ruled.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Georges Dossin, Archives Royales de Mari, I: Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et de ses Fils (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1950), p. 25.

<sup>30</sup> Laessle, op. cit., p. 41.

<sup>31</sup> I. J. Gelb, "Two Assyrian King Lists," JNES, XIII (1954), p. 224-225.



According to the kinglist, therefore, Naram-Sin is the son of Puzur-Aššur II, and the father of Erišū II. Šamši-Adad took over Ekallatum and stayed there for three years before seizing the Assyrian throne from Erišū II. How Šamši-Adad could gather the army necessary for the capture of Aššur remains uncertain. Laessøe suggests that he probably had an Amorite mercenary army interested in booty or that he "probably could have gained financial support from interested parties in Babylon, who saw that their advantage lay in a weakening of Assyrian influence in the northern provinces."<sup>32</sup>

Under the rule of Šamši-Adad I Assyria became one of the important states in keeping the balance of power in Mesopotamia. He enlarged his kingdom by incorporating other northern Mesopotamian states. One of his important conquests was that of Mari. The first king of an Amorite dynasty established at Mari was Iaggid-Lim. His son Iahdun-Lim enlarged his kingdom considerably. This is revealed through a foundation inscription mentioning the name of king Iahdun-Lim. It commemorates the building of a temple for Šamaš. Starting with column II of the inscription Iahdun-Lim

---

<sup>32</sup>Laessøe, op. cit., p. 42.

presents his victorious deeds, saying:

- Iahdun-Lim,  
fils de Iaggid-Lim,  
5. le roi vaillant, le taureau sauvage parmi les roi,  
avec force  
et toute-puissance,  
alla  
10. au bord de la mer.  
It offrit a l'"Océan"  
ses grands sacrifices royaux  
et ses soldats se baignèrent  
dans l'"Océan."  
Il pénétra dans les montagnes  
de cèdres et de buis  
15. Montagnes élévees,  
de buis, de cedre, du cyprès  
et du bois de santal (?),  
ces arbres il coupa.  
Il fit un grand carnage,  
20. Il établit sa renommée  
et il fit counaitre sa vaillance  
Il soumit  
ce pays du bord de l'"Océan",  
il le plia a ses ordres  
25. (et) il l'oblige à marcher derrière lui.  
il lui imposa  
Col. III. un tribut perpétuel,  
qui'il lui apportait régulièrement.<sup>33</sup>

Although, the inscription suggests that Iahdun-Lim might have reached Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea, his expansion was cut short with his sudden murder by his servants. We are uncertain of Šamši-Adad I's direct role in causing the murder, but it is a fact that Assyria incorporated Mari in its territory. The

---

<sup>33</sup> Georges Dossin, "L'inscription de fondation de Iahdun-Lim, roi de Mari," Syria, XXXII (1955), pp. 13-14.

Assyrian King divided his empire giving the governorship of Mari to his son Iasmaḥ-Adad and made his elder son Išme-Dagan the Viceroy of Ekallate. The Mari letters dating to this period are highly interesting. Išme-Dagan proved himself to be a capable ruler and victorious in all battles. His brother, on the other hand, was constantly in need of advice and is regularly reproached by his father. Iasmaḥ-Adad was probably lazy rather than unable. In a letter to his son in Mari Šamši-Adad I writes:

Réjouis-toi ! Tandis que ton frère, ici,  
tue le dâwidûm, toi,  
là-bas, tu restes couché  
au milieu des femmes. Maintenant donc,  
quand tu iras à Qatanum avec l'armée,  
sois un homme !  
comme ton frère établit un grand nom,  
toi aussi, dans [ton pays]  
un grand nom é [tablis] .<sup>34</sup>

With Šamši-Adad I's death the political picture in northern mesopotamia changes. Assyria once again starts on the road to decline. The date of his death is difficult to establish. Relative chronology in terms of Hammurabi's reign leads us into fresh chronological problems. Šamši-Adad's death cannot be dated earlier than Hammurabi's 10th or 11th year since we have a contract from Sippar in which Hammurabi and Šamši-Adad are invoked in an oath dated to

---

<sup>34</sup> Georges Dossin, Archives Royales de Mari, I,  
p. 131.

the 10th year of the former king. On a tablet found at tell Harmal from the archives of a certain Uqā-il and his son Warad-Tišpak, the date formula says: "Year when Šamši-Adad died." Simmons concludes that the Harmal Date Lists prove that the event should correspond to the fifth year of king Ibal-pi-el II (1790-1761), the last king of Eshnunna.<sup>35</sup> Evidence from Larsa shows that Ibal-pi-el II's fifth year should fall between Rim-Sin year 42 and 44 which is between year 12 and 14 of Hammurapi's rule. Hence Šamši-Adad I died sometime between Hammurapi's year 12 and 14.<sup>36</sup> This analysis, however, is not conclusive and opinions on this matter vary with the general chronological scheme followed.

---

<sup>35</sup>Stephen D. Simmons, "Early Old Babylonian Tablets from Harmal and Elsewhere," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XIII (1959), 74.

Eshnunna is the modern site of Tell Asmar which is situated in the Diyala region. It had been one of the city-states of the Ur III empire. After its independence from Ur it successfully incorporated other cities in the Diyala region. This expansion, however, was followed by a period of decline after the reign of Bilalama, a contemporary of Šu-ilišu (1984-1975 B.C.), the second king of Isin. It later regained its power under Ipiq-Adad II (c. 1850 B.C.) who conquered as far north as Aššur. These last efforts were short-lived due to the rise of more powerful kingdoms -- Assyria, Mari, Babylon, and Larsa. (Roux, Ancient Iraq, pp. 155 - 162.)

<sup>36</sup>W.F. Leemans, Foreign Trade in the Old Babylonian Period as Revealed by Texts from Southern Mesopotamia (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960), p. 177. Also by the same author: "Le synchronisme Šamši-addu—Hammurabi d'après certains textes du Louvre," Revue d'Assyriologie, XLIX (1955), 202-204.

Išme-Dagan legitimately occupied the throne of his father and informed his brother Iasmaḥ-Adad assuring him of the throne of Mari.<sup>37</sup> Matters, however, did not remain peaceful. Zimri-Lim (1779-1791 B.C.), a member of the legitimate Mari dynasty, managed to regain the throne of his father.<sup>38</sup> He was aided in his endeavor by

---

<sup>37</sup>G. Dossin, Archives Royales de Mari, Vol IV: Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et de ses Fils (suite). (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1951), p. 37.

<sup>38</sup>The Amorite dynasty of which Zimri-Lim was its last member was founded at Mari by Iaggid-Lim, a contemporary of Ila-Kabkabu, Šamši-Adad I's father. He was followed by Iaḥdun-Lim whose reign ended with the Assyrian occupation of Mari. Zimri-Lim who was the heir to Iaḥdun-Lim's throne managed to flee and was given assylum by Iarim-Lim of Iamhad.

Evidence shows that the Iaggid-Lim dynasty at Mari was not a native dynasty, but from the Kingdom of Hana. In his inscription Iaḥdun-Lim says that he enlarged his territory to include Mari. He distinguishes between his native country and Mari. We know that Iaggid-Lim had founded the city Dur-Iaggid-Lim. Later this city appears under the name Dur-gid-li-mu which is found on the lower Habur, which itself formed part of the Kingdom of Hana. Iaggid-Lim, therefore, was a king of Hana, and his son Iaḥdun-Lim enlarging his territories incorporated Mari. At Mari he occupied the throne deposing its ruler, a certain Sumu-iamam. (H. Lewy, "The Kingdom of Hana at the Time of the Mari Texts," Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Congress of Orientalists, Cambridge 21st-28th August, 1954 (London: The Royal Asiatic Society, n.d.), 127-128).

Iarim-Lim of Iamhad (Aleppo), Hammurapi of Babylon and Ibal-pi-El II of Eshnunna. Iarim-Lim and Ibal-pi-El II appear to have been the most helpful. According to H. Lewy, Ibal-pi-El-II, in his 8th year, actually fought Iasmah-Adad and defeated him, thereby bringing Assyrian rule in Mari to an end.<sup>39</sup> A letter written by Warad-Sin (probably an official) to Iasmah-Adad says that Eshnunnian troops are heading towards Rapiqum (on the Euphrates, north of Sippar).<sup>40</sup> Ibal-pi-El's 8th year name says "year in which Rapiqum was destroyed." Lewy accordingly thinks that the army after its success at Rapiqum followed its victory and eventually captured Mari. She adds that this would correspond to the 16th year of Hammurapi of Babylon.<sup>41</sup> Dossin, on the other hand, suggests that Zimri-Lim regained the throne of Mari with the aid of the God Adad "Lord of Halab" (Aleppo). Moreover, he especially travelled to Aleppo to present Adad a statue. "In order to assure his

---

<sup>39</sup>H. Lewy, "The Historical Background of the Correspondence of Bahdi-Lim," Orientalia, XXV (1956), 330 n. 3.

<sup>40</sup>G. Dossin, Archives Royales de Mari, Vol V: Correspondance de Iasmah-Addu (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1952), p. 83,85.

<sup>41</sup>H. Lewy, op. cit., p. 331 n.3 con.

authority over the Middle-Euphrates", says Dossin, "Iarim-Lim gave his daughter in marriage to Zimri-Lim".<sup>42</sup> Although the Kingdom of Iamhad was one of the more powerful states, and helped Zimri-Lim regain his throne, whether Zimri-Lim became Iarim-Lim's vassal is uncertain. According to Dossin, a particular letter written by Zimri-Lim to Iarim-Lim suggests such a vassalage. The fact that throughout the letter Zimri-Lim addresses Iarim-Lim as "father" and refers to himself as "son", should be considered, says Dossin, as "suzerain" and "vassal". This status of dependence is further revealed through the content of the letter. Evidently Zimri-Lim had bought wheat from Imar, the arrival of which at Mari was being hindered by Iarim-Lim. Since Iarim-Lim had promised Zimri-Lim help in times of trouble, the latter does not understand the reason for the former's behavior. Furthermore, Zimri-Lim refused an offer of wheat from Hammurapi of Babylon. Quoting from the letter, Dossin says: "il préfère laisser à son 'père' Iarim-Lim l'occasion de le secourir et d'"affermie le

---

<sup>42</sup>G. Dossin, "Une lettre de Iarim-Lim, roi d'Alep, à Iašub-Iahad, roi de Dir," Syria, XXXIII (1946), 63.

fondement de son trône".<sup>43</sup> The lack of further evidence does not allow us to conclude with or against Dossin. It is, however, doubtful that Zimri-Lim became a vassal of Iarim-Lim. The titles "father" and "son" do not necessarily imply a "suzerain" and "vassal" relationship. Examining the nature of political relationship in the ancient Near East, Munn-Rankin says that the use of the terms "brother", "father", or "son" are not reliable guides to political status". He further adds that the "filial relationship was also assumed. . . by a sovereign ruler to an older and more experienced monarch".<sup>44</sup>

The preceding paragraphs have been an attempt at presenting the scene of international politics in the period before the reign of Hammurapi. The rise of new states dominates the scene. The influx of the Amorites, while not leaving tangible material evidence, uprooted the established dynasties, replacing them with Amorite

---

<sup>43</sup>G. Dossin, "Une lettre de Zimri-Lim a Iarim-Lim, roi d'Alep," Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Orientalists, Cambridge 21st-28th August, 1954 (London: The Royal Asiatic Society, n.d.), 121-122.

<sup>44</sup>J.M. Munn-Rankin, "Diplomacy in Western Asia in the Early Second Millennium B.C.," Iraq, XVIII (1956), 84.



rulers. Assyria and Mari in the north, Isin, Eshnunna, and ultimately Babylon in the south, were occupied by Amorite dynasties. The process through which all this came about, as well as, the internal history of each of these states remains uncertain. Textual evidence is unfortunately scarce. Above all, the chronological problem remains unresolved and adds considerably to the difficulties inherent in a study of the history of the Second Millennium B.C.

## EXCURSUS

### AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORICAL SITUATION PRECEDING THE RISE OF BABYLON

In the preceding chapters we have attempted an analysis of the historical problems involved in a study of the period prior to the rise of the First Dynasty of Babylon; or more precisely, prior to the rise of Hammurapi. For further clarification, however, it is necessary to present an outline of the history of these centuries.

Sumerian power manifested its last breath in the Third Dynasty of Ur. Ur, however, was unable to cope with the various problems which faced its empire during the last quarter of the 21st. century B.C. One of the basic problems faced by the kings of Ur was that of the infiltrating Amorites. Our present term "Amorite" comes from the Akkadian term amurru meaning "West", which reflects the original homeland of these people. They came from an area west of the Euphrates, probably northern Syria. Scholars have been able to reconstruct the Amorite language from groups of personal names dating to two

different historical periods. An earlier group, which comes from the Ur III and the early Isin periods, have the MAR.TU designation with each names. The second group of names which date to the Isin-Larsa and the Babylon I periods, do not have the MAR.TU designation. Previously it had been thought that each of these groups belong to two different ethnic groups. Presently, however, the linguistic identity of these names has been established. Amorite infiltration into Mesopotamia can be attested as early as the second half of the Third Millennium B.C.

The city-state of Eshnunna in 2028 B.C. was the first to break away from Ur. It was followed by Isin in 2017 B.C. under Išbi-Irra. Soon Ibbi-Sin, the last king of the Third Dynasty of Ur, was taken captive in 2006 B.C. and with him the Ur III period came to an end. Mesopotamia once again took its usual form of independent city-states. Each of these states passed into the hands of Amorite rulers, at Larsa an Amorite dynasty was founded in 2025 B.C. under Nablânum. Išbi-Irra took over Isin in 2017 B.C. Sumu-abum founded an Amorite dynasty at Babylon in 1894 B.C. Mari received its first Amorite king, Iaggid-Lim,

about 1850 B.C. Šamši-Adad I, an Amorite, managed to win the Assyrian throne in 1814 B.C.

Looking at the history of these dynasties in their respective states we have to divide Mesopotamia geographically into two parts. In southern Mesopotamia the period after the fall of Ur is dominated with the history of the rivalry of two states, Isin and Larsa which give the name to that period, namely, the Isin-Larsa period. During the early part of this period Isin played the major role. It then suffered a period of decline during which Larsa took the leading role. Isin, however, was able to regain its stability and evidence points to the fact that Damiq-ilišu, its last king, managed to interrupt Sin-muballit's reign, in the latter's fourth and fifth years. The problem lies in the uncertainty of equating these years in terms of Damiq-ilišu's regnal years. The balance, however, again tipped in favor of Larsa which under Ibbi-Sin defeated Isin in 1794 B.C. Larsa, therefore, remained alone in the south facing a rather strong Babylon. Eshnunna, in the Diyala region, also had plans for further expansion which were curtailed by the more powerful states in the north: Assyria and Mari.

After the fall of Ur, Assyria became an independent state especially interested in trade with central Anatolia. This trade dealt primarily with tin. Assyria established merchant colonies, the most important of which was that found at Kaniš. It is probable that the early Assyrian kings were uninterested in the political rivalry of the southern states. The Cappadocian trade provided a substantial revenue for the Assyrian treasury. With the accession of Šamši-Adad to the throne, Assyria was brought into the international picture. Šamši-Adad's ambitions were reflected in his expansion in Northern Mesopotamia. He took Mari and placed it under the viceroyship of his son Iasmah-Adad. To his more capable son, Išme-Dagan, he gave the viceroyship of Ekallatu, south of Aššur. As long as Šamši-Adad lived Assyria maintained an upper hand in Northern Mesopotamia. Unfortunately, however, Šamši-Adad died and his throne passed to Išme-Dagan who left his brother as king of Mari.

The southern Mesopotamian rulers who were in contact with north Syrian rulers saw that the time was ripe to end Assyrian supremacy. Iarim-Lim of Iamhad who had given Zimri-Lim, the legitimate heir to the

Mari throne, asylum during the years of Assyrian rule, Ibal-pi-El II of Eshnunna, and Hammurapi of Babylon managed to overthrow Iasmah-Adad. Most probably, Eshnunna provided the army. Zimri-Lim was established on his throne as an independent king.

Hence we can see that the rival kings in southern Mesopotamia were: Rim-Sin of Larsa and Hammurapi of Babylon. In the north, on the other hand, there were Ibal-pi-El II of Eshnunna, Zimri-Lim of Mari, and Išme-Dagan of Assyria. It is the purpose of the following part of the present study to take up the history of the First Dynasty of Babylon to its fall.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON

The international scene contemporary to the early decades of the First Dynasty of Babylon was given in the last chapter. It is evident that Babylon did not form an important factor in maintaining the balance of power in Mesopotamia at this time. The early history of this dynasty is obscure. The generally accepted theory is that Summu-abum (1894-1881 B.C.), of Amorite origin, was its founder. We know nothing of his early career, or of the circumstances by which he occupied the Babylonian throne.<sup>1</sup> From his year-formulae, however, we know that during his career he erected temples in Babylon and began the construction of the enclosure walls of the city. He also expanded his territories by taking Kazallu and Dilbat which he later fortified.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, we are also uncertain about the rulers of Babylon before the "First Dynasty", more specifically, about their relationship to the

---

<sup>1</sup>H.W.F. Saggs, The Greatness that was Babylon (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1960), pp. 64-65.

<sup>2</sup>H. Schmökel, Geschichte des alten Vorderasiens (Leiden: 1957), p. 106.

kings of Kish. In this respect the problems regarding the identity of a certain Sumu-yamūtbal and his contemporaneity to the first two kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon becomes important.

It is probable that Sumu-yamūtbal lived during the rule of the Larsan king Sin-iddinam (1849-1843 B.C.). His name appears on several tablets bearing Sin-iddinam's date formulae. The position occupied by Sumu-yamūtbal can be inferred from two tablets on which are found his date formulae. The formula on one tablet says:

"Year: 'Ningal's throne  
Sumu-emitbala  
fashioned'."<sup>3</sup>

On the second tablet we read:

"Year: 'A ...  
for Nanna Sumu-yamutba [1a] (fashioned)'."<sup>4</sup>

Although these formulae do not give us the name of the city where Sumu-yamūtbal ruled, the names of the two deities mentioned, Ningal and Nanna, would suggest that it was Kish. In terms of synchronism with the early kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon, a double oath appearing in a tablet is suggestive that Sumu-

---

<sup>3</sup>A. Goetze, "Sumu-Yamūtbal, a local ruler of the Old Babylonian Period," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IV (1950), 66.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 67.



kings of Kish. In this respect the problems regarding the identity of a certain Sumu-yamūtbal and his contemporaneity to the first two kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon becomes important.

It is probable that Sumu-yamūtbal lived during the rule of the Larsan king Sin-iddinam (1849-1843 B.C.). His name appears on several tablets bearing Sin-iddinam's date formulae. The position occupied by Sumu-yamūtbal can be inferred from two tablets on which are found his date formulae. The formula on one tablet says:

"Year: 'Ningal's throne  
Sumu-emitbala  
fashioned'."<sup>3</sup>

On the second tablet we read:

"Year: 'A ...  
for Nanna Sumu-yamutba [la] (fashioned)'."<sup>4</sup>

Although these formulae do not give us the name of the city where Sumu-yamūtbal ruled, the names of the two deities mentioned, Ningal and Nanna, would suggest that it was Kish. In terms of synchronism with the early kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon, a double oath appearing in a tablet is suggestive that Sumu-

---

<sup>3</sup>A. Goetze, "Sumu-Yamūtbal, a local ruler of the Old Babylonian Period," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IV (1950), 66.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 67.

yamūtbal might be a contemporary of Sumu-la-el (1880-1845 B.C.), the second king of Babylon. The inscription says:

That in the future they will not raise claims  
by Sumu-la-el and Marduk,  
by Nanna  
and Sumu-emitbala  
they swore.<sup>5</sup>

Furthermore, from the above synchronism we can infer that both rulers, Sumu-yamūtbal and Sumu-la-el, were contemporaries of Sin-iddinam, king of Larsa. We know that Sin-iddinam ruled for seven years only, the first of which parallels the thirty-first year of Sumu-la-el, and the last of which parallels the first year of Šabium (1844-1831 B.C.), the successor of Sumu-la-el. Putting the synchronism between Larsa and Babylon in more simpler terms we have:

Sin-iddinam (Larsa) 1 = Sumu-la-el (Babylon) 31

Sin-iddinam 7 = Šabium (Babylon) 1

The tablet, therefore, should be dated to the end of Sumu-la-el's reign. Goetze, however, offers a different interpretation, saying that Sumu-yamūtbal was first a vassal of Sumu-la-el, later, seeing Sin-iddinam victorious over Babylon, shifted his allegiance to Larsa.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p.

If Kish was the city where Sumu-yamūtbāl ruled, it could be inferred that he was the successor of Manana in whose date formulae the god Nanna is frequently invoked, and who may have come from Kish. Manana was contemporary to Sumu-abum, the founder of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Unfortunately, the history of the Manana dynasty remains obscure. Even more so is the problem of its relation with the first Babylonian dynasty. The god Nanna is attested in the date formulae of Sumu-abum, while starting with Sumu-label's twenty second year Marduk replaces Nanna in his date formulae. Hence, it is assumed that "these kings who eventually came to power in Babylon were closely associated with a city whose main deity was Nanna, and whose kings intermittently also ruled over Kish."<sup>7</sup> As Reiner points out, we are uncertain that Manana ruled at Kish. Rutten, on the other hand, establishes the Manana Dynasty at Kish.<sup>8</sup> Only further evidence can clarify the uncertainties regarding the political picture during the early

---

<sup>7</sup>Erica Reiner, "The Year Dates of Sumu-Yamūtbāl," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV (1961), p. 123.

<sup>8</sup>M. Rutten, "Un lot de tablettes de Manana," Actes du XXIe Congrès International des Orientalistes, Paris, 23-31 Juillet, 1948 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1949), pp. 27-28.

decades of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Babylon's independence was frequently interrupted by Isin or Larsa. In its times of strength it might have controlled Kish.

It was during the reign of Sin-muballit, Hammurapi's father, that Babylon established its identity as an independent state. Meanwhile Larsa's expansionist scheme had led to its conquest of Isin, leaving Larsa and Babylon as the two most powerful states in southern Mesopotamia. Hammurapi with diplomacy and administrative skill managed to realize the empire whose initial foundations were laid by his father.

Hammurapi's greatest achievement, which distinguished him from other Mesopotamian rulers, was his system of social reforms which are best revealed in his code of laws. Although Hammurapi should be given credit for his systematic arrangement of the Babylonian laws, it is not in this respect that his uniqueness lies, for prior to his age similar attempts had also been initiated. It is the nature of the laws presented in that code which reflects Hammurapi's social goals. The limit of his success in achieving the new society cannot be objectively measured by our modern standards of values. The interpretation of contemporary texts is our only

answer. to the question.

Before analyzing the contents of the Code, a word should be said about its discovery and date. Several isolated tablets had been found as early as 1890 which were said to have included parts of a legal code, and in some cases it was concluded that these laws were Hammurapi's. It was not until the excavation of Susa under Scheil in 1901-02 that the complete code was found. The code, which is carved on a diorite stela 2.25 meters high is now at the Louvre. Over the text of the code itself is a relief showing the seated image of the god Šamaš and Hammurapi in an attitude of respect receiving an object from the god. Several explanations have been offered concerning the object held by Šamaš. Scheil said that Šamaš is here dictating the laws to Hammurapi.<sup>9</sup> Goetze suggested that the king is presenting the laws to Šamaš.<sup>10</sup> According to Driver and Miles, the god is granting the circle and scepter to Hammurapi symbolizing the power which entitles the king to promulgate the code. The text of

---

<sup>9</sup>Scheil, *Delegation en Perse, Memoirs*. IV. 12.

<sup>10</sup>A. Goetze, *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer* ("Instituttet for sammenlignende Kulturforskning," Series A, Vol. XVII) Oslo: 1936. pp. 7-8.

the laws forming about 3600 lines are engraved vertically from top to bottom.<sup>11</sup> Probably, however, there was another stela originally of the same size and content of the Louvre stela, the fragments of which were found near by. In some cases these fragments fill in the gaps left in the Louvre stela caused by its having been broken into three large blocks.<sup>12</sup>

It is amazing that this code was found at Susa, the capital of Elam, instead of being found in one of the Babylonian cities. We know that the Elamite king Šuturuk-nahhunte conquered Sippar, but not Babylon, from which he took both the stela of the code and its accompanying fragments to Elam. It could be assumed that the stela was originally carved in Babylon, but copies were sent to principle cities and that it was this that the Elamite king took. The erased sections, which appear on the Louvre stela, were intentionally made by Šutruk-nahhunte who probably wished to incorporate his inscriptions but for some reason was unable to do so.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>G. R. Driver and J.C. Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I: Legal Commentary (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 27-28.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 29-30.

Contrary to popular thinking, the code is not a complete inscription and lacunae frequently appear. Fortunately, however, there are fragments of other editions of this code which help us to fill-in the missing parts. The fragments, being incomplete in themselves, add to the difficulties in deciding the part where the fragment should be fitted. Furthermore, specific words or even paragraphs of the text are vaguely understood. Several interpretations have been suggested. It is beyond the scope of the present study to mention the numerous such instances. Meek, for example, offers a new interpretation of sections 117 to 119 of the code. He analyzes the unclear words giving new meanings according to their context. Finally, he ends his article with his translation of the above mentioned three sections of the code.<sup>14</sup> Driver and Miles translate the passage differently, but keep the same overall meaning.<sup>15</sup> Contradictions, however, appear in their commentaries on the laws where they offer new meanings to certain terms

---

<sup>14</sup>Theophile J. Meek, "A New Interpretation of Code of Hammurapi } } 117-19," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, VII (1948), 180-183.

<sup>15</sup>G. R. Driver and J.C. Miles, The Babylonian Laws, II: Transliterated Texts, Translation, Philological Notes, Glossary (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 47-49.

which do not correspond to the actual provisions of the laws. While the law states that a debtor can sell a member of his family to pay off his debt, but for a limited period of three years "with their freedom established in the fourth year," Driver and Miles in the commentary say that the term ana kiššatim suggests that the individual was permanently sold.<sup>16</sup> Another example of the necessity of textual criticism, is the formation of the clauses following the word šumma which are termed asyndeton clauses. The nature of these clauses has been disputed. šumma is translated "If". The asyndeton clauses following it, Meek says, "are to be interpreted as circumstantial."<sup>17</sup>

Scholars face the further problem of dating the code. In which year of his reign did Hammurabi promulgate the code? His year names are not informative in this respect. His second year-name mentions the establishment of justice in the land. A similar statement is made in the Prologue, where he says, "I

---

<sup>16</sup>Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, p. 212.

<sup>17</sup>Theophile J. Meek, "The Asyndeton Clause in the Code of Hammurabi," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, V (1946), 65.



set forth truth and justice throughout the land (and) prospered the people."<sup>18</sup> His twenty-second year name commemorates a statue which represents Hammurapi as the king of justice. This incident is also mentioned in the Epilogue of the code, "I have inscribed my previous words on my monument and established (them) before my statue (called) 'King of Justice' in Babylon..."<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, in the Prologue he traces the extent of his empire which, we know through this year-names, was not realized until the latter part of his reign. Driver and Miles conclude that "the reference to the various events tabulated may be taken as making his 40th year as the earliest possible date for the publication of the laws in their present form."<sup>20</sup>

Hammurapi's code is formed of three parts. It starts with a Prologue which is in poetry. In it Hammurapi states that he had been chosen by Anum and Enlil "to make justice to appear in the land, to destroy the evil and the wicked that the strong might not oppress

---

<sup>18</sup> Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, II, p.13.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>20</sup> Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, p. 36.

the weak. . ." <sup>21</sup> He then states his many conquests, and goodness he had brought upon several cities. He calls himself, the "god-fearing prince", "shepherd", and "the favorite of Ishtar", to cite only a few of the attributes he gives to himself. Hammurapi ends his prologue saying: "When Marduk commanded me to give justice to the people of the land and to let (them) have (good) governance, I set forth truth and justice throughout the land (and) prospered the people." <sup>22</sup> Linguistic peculiarities in the Prologue suggest archaisms which are absent from the Epilogue and the text of the laws. An example of this is the use of the explicative pronoun šu in the Prologue. This pronoun is similar to Arabic dū and is translated "the one". Meek says that clauses constructed with šu or with its counterpart ša are similar in character. While šu is the Old Akkadian usage, ša is the later form used during the Old Babylonian period. In the code of Hammurapi this pronoun appears in both of its forms. Hence, since the Prologue was written in the Hymnal-Epic dialect, the archaic form of the pronoun (šu) was used. <sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, II, p.7.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>23</sup> T.J. Meek, "The Explicative Pronoun Šu/Ša in the Code of Hammurabi," Archiv Orientalni, XVIII, No. 4 (1950), 80-81.

Having presented the body of the laws, Hammurapi concludes his code with an Epilogue which is also in poetry. The initial sentences of the Epilogue state that "(these are) the just laws which Hammurabi the able king has established and (thereby) has enabled the land to enjoy stable governance and good rule."<sup>24</sup> He adds that Marduk commanded him to formulate a code and that he, accordingly, had placed the stela in Marduk's temple in Babylon in order that "the oppressed man who has a cause go before my statue (called) 'King of Justice' and then have the inscription on my monument read out and hear my precious words. . ."<sup>25</sup> Hammurapi ends his Epilogue with blessings on future kings who take heed of his laws and curses on those who do not.

Although Hammurapi's code was the most elaborate of its time, there are several cases for which provisions are not made. Scholars have, therefore, raised questions about the nature and purpose of this code, which they think, was different than a mere collection of laws. According to the Prologue and Epilogue of the Laws, it was by divine

---

<sup>24</sup> Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, II, p. 95.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 97.

command that Hammurapi formulated his code for the purpose of protecting the oppressed, and for the establishment of justice in the land. It is probable that Hammurapi's only intention was the organization of society in legal terms whereby similar offenses receive similar treatment. Oppenheim, however, thinks that the "contents are rather to be considered in many essential respects a traditional literary expression of the king's social responsibilities and his awareness of the discrepancies between existing and desirable conditions."<sup>26</sup> Saggs, on the other hand, sees an economic motive for the promulgation of law codes. He says that originally laws had the fixing of prices and wages as their objective and therefore, the stela of Hammurapi has its origin in price lists.<sup>27</sup> A third opinion is presented by Driver and Miles, who suggest that Hammurapi's stela was not intended to be a code, but rather "a collection of decisions on the facts of a number of isolated cases."

---

<sup>26</sup> A. Leo Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 158.

<sup>27</sup> Saggs, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

They also add that the organization is excellent which makes the stela "a work of art."<sup>28</sup>

The latter conclusion would lead us to question the nature of the laws. Scholars have suggested that the laws of Hammurapi are formed by a collection of 'royal ordinances', decrees, or reform acts. The Babylonian term for this is mišarum-act. An example of this is the Edict of Ammisaduqa, the tenth king of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Although this edict comes from a much later period than Hammurapi's code, part of its content can be found in the code. Apparently, Hammurapi initiated the tradition whereby a king in his second, or first, regnal year would initiate a mišarum-act. A mišarum was a declaration made by the king to deal with a specific situation and its effect was, therefore, intended for a limited period of time. A mišarum did not have the permanent nature of a law or reform. Once the situation was remedied the mišarum-act lost its effect. Generally, a mišarum dealt with economic problems. It was meant to condone certain types of debts which existed at the

---

<sup>28</sup>Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, pp. 48,49.

time of its declaration.<sup>29</sup> Essentially, however, an official text of the mišarum was not inscribed, if at all, until after the necessary measures provided by the act had been executed. Hammurapi's formula for his second year commemorates the proclamation of his mišarum-act. Scholars who suggest that a law code is composed of the mišarum acts draw their conclusions on the basis of Ammišaduqa's edict which has a mixed nature. The style of the edict differs from that of the code. According to Finkelstein, the šumma clauses found in the code are purely "hypothetical cases," while such clauses are absent from the edict which deals with "directives for specific measures to be taken for specific situations."<sup>30</sup> Ammišaduqa's Edict, however, contains two types of provisions. The provisions designated by the mišarum clause have a temporary nature, while those without that designation were pronouncements of a more permanent nature. Three articles of this edict could be termed as permanent reforms and have their counterparts in other codes of law.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>J.J. Finkelstein, "Ammissaduqa's Edict and the Babylonian "Law Codes", "Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV (1961), pp. 101-102.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 92.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 100.

The relationship between mišarum-acts and law codes should, therefore, be considered on a more limited basis. Law codes, Finkelstein suggests, are formed of reform-acts which have a permanent nature and do not include temporary measures for the remission of debts.<sup>32</sup> Reference to a mišarum could be made in a law code. Furthermore, Finkelstein adds that the relationship between mišarum-acts and law codes become even more vague, assuming that the purpose of these law codes was "not legislative", but rather, "was to lay before the public, posterity, future kings, and, above all, the gods, evidence of the king's execution of his divinely ordained mandate: to have been "The Faithful Shepherd" and the Šar mišarim".<sup>33</sup> Mišarum-acts, therefore, constitute one of the sources of law codes. The absence in Hammurapi's year formulae of commemoration of his law code could therefore be explained by the above considerations. For the people of Babylon, Finkelstein says, a mišarum act had more significance than a stela "directed to posterity and to the gods."<sup>34</sup> Wiseman, on the other

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 103.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

hand, suggests that the laws are not to be considered as a "merely academic collection of decisions but as part of the means whereby the Babylonians sought to preserve law and order as a living and continuing tradition."<sup>35</sup> However, he misunderstands the evidence in attempting to find in the law code two kinds of provisions, those intended as reforms and those which form part of the "tradition." While the distinction between a mišarum-act and a reform seems to be convincing, the conclusions drawn from that basis are not. It should be considered that a year-name while commemorating an event, also displayed the power and goodness of that king. If the carving of a large stela, such as that of Hammurapi, was intended to show Hammurapi's achievements to the gods, then its absence in a year formula does not suggest its insignificance to the population. Finkelstein's attempt to explain the lack of a commemorative year-name for the law code, opens a new series of problems about the purpose and nature of year-names in the Old Babylonian period. Furthermore, regarding the code as a literary and

---

<sup>35</sup>D. J. Wiseman, "The Laws of Hammurabi Again," Journal of Semitic Studies, VII (1962), 166.



religious composition only minimizes a great deal of its original intent. Hammurapi's intent in compiling the laws can be read in both the Prologue and the Epilogue.

It is certain that Hammurapi was not the promulgator of all the laws found in the code. He drew on many sources, one of which, as mentioned above, were mišarum-acts. Ancient Mesopotamia had a long legal tradition, both Sumerian and Akkadian, before the promulgation of Hammurapi's laws. It can be assumed with Driver and Miles that each city-state had some kind of a collection of laws which governed its society. Whether these laws were written or not cannot be ascertained. The earliest collection is that of Ur-Nammu (2113-2096 B.C.), the first king of the Third Dynasty of Ur. Time has preserved a small portion of these Sumerian laws. One tablet only has been found in Nippur which was discovered to have been a good copy of the original text. The tablet is badly damaged and contains parts of the Prologue and possibly about 22 laws, of which five have been rather completely read. In the Prologue, apart from mentioning the divine choice of Ur, Ur-Nammu lists the many abuses which he has reformed, and then proceeds to list the laws.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>S.N. Kramer and A. Falkenstein, "Ur-Nammu Law-Code," Orientalia, XXIII (1954), 40-42.

The second Sumerian law code, which is more elaborate than the previous one, and which bears a closer similarity to the code of Hammurapi, is that compiled by Lipit-Ishtar (1934-1924 B.C.), the fifth king of Isin. The Lipit-Ishtar code is formed of several fragments, which when assembled give about a 1200 line text. This code has a Prologue, approximately 40 laws, and an Epilogue. Unfortunately, parts of each of these sections have been lost. In the prologue, Lipit-Ishtar says that the gods chose him to "establish justice in the land, to banish complaints, to turn back enmity and rebellion by force of arms, and to bring well-being to the Sumerians and Akkadians."<sup>37</sup> There is a striking resemblance between the above statement and that of Hammurapi's Prologue. Steele concludes that it "suggests either direct borrowing or derivation from a common source."<sup>38</sup> Similarly, certain laws have their counterpart in Hammurapi's code. Even closer similarity can be traced within the Epilogues. Lipit-Ishtar ends his laws with his achievements which "caused

---

<sup>37</sup>F.R. Steele, "The Code of Lipit-Ishtar," American Journal of Archeology, LII (1948), 432.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 446.

righteousness and truth to shine forth."<sup>39</sup> He then ends his epilogue with the traditional blessings on those who follow his pattern, and curses upon any who alters the text in any way. The similarity found in Hammurapi's code cannot be over-emphasized.

The first written law code in Accadian is that compiled by a certain Bilalama, king of Eshnunna. This code, however, is older than the Sumerian code of Lipit-Ishtar. The dates for Bilalama's rule is unknown, he might have been a contemporary of Šu-ilišu, the second king of Isin. The two tablets forming the code were found at Tell Abu Harmal which formed part of the territory of the kingdom of Eshnunna. It includes 59 laws.<sup>40</sup>

The code of Hammurapi is, therefore, the second Accadian code. Doubtless, the three preceding "codes" had their impact on the code of Hammurapi. Contrary

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 445.

<sup>40</sup> A. Goetze, "The Laws of Eshnunna, Actes du XXI<sup>e</sup> Congres International des Orientalistes, Paris, 23-31 Juillet, 1948 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1949), 136.

Also: Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, pp. 6-8.

Saggs, op. cit., p. 203.

to Steele's point of view, similarity of certain parts of the Prologue or the Epilogue need not suggest "direct borrowing." It could be assumed that it was the general style of writing such documents, and, hence, it was not borrowed. Identical provisions made in the different "codes" could also be explained otherwise. Driver and Miles suggest that the dissimilar arrangement of the laws "is an argument against any direct borrowing." Accordingly, they conclude that all the legal tradition of Mesopotamia (Sumerian to Assyrian) proves "the existence of a common Mesopotamian law in the third millennium B.C."<sup>41</sup> Hence, all the codes had a common source which was customary law. Driver and Miles extend their conclusions further and say "that there was a common customary law throughout the Fertile Crescent seems irresistible; and this common law was to a considerable extent written law."<sup>42</sup> The conclusions of Driver and Miles best explain the common features found among codes which are centuries apart. It is, however, unlikely that the customary law was written. Legal documents

---

<sup>41</sup> Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, p. 11.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

based on such law might be found, but it is improbable that legal decisions were written down in the form of definite statements, i.e. laws. A Sumerian tablet from Nippur is illustrative of the above statement. This tablet deals with the division of inheritance among three brothers. After defining the portion of the youngest brother, the tablet says:

by reason of Annu-pi-<sup>d</sup>Ilabrat's having no wife,  
the debt of his father's house he does not share;  
his brothers shall not raise claims against him.<sup>43</sup>

A similar provision is made in Hammurapi's code whereby the youngest unmarried son, after his father's death, receives sufficient money for a bridal price in addition to his portion of the inheritance. O'Callaghan, therefore, says that the fact that the younger brother of this Nippur tablet is not to share his father's debts, is a provision equivalent to giving the additional bridal price. Hammurapi, hence, incorporated a much

---

<sup>43</sup>Roger T. O'Callaghan, "A New Inheritance Contract from Nippur," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, VIII (1954), 138.

older tradition in his code.<sup>44</sup>

According to Speiser, on the other hand, the general similarity found among the various law codes, whether predating or postdating that of Hammurapi, has a similar underlying principle, which is a cosmic concept, rather than customary law. Law, says, Speiser, was considered to be a feature of the cosmic order and was granted by the forces of the universe. The role of the earthly ruler was to apply this cosmic order to his kingdom, and as such, was responsible to the gods.<sup>45</sup> It was, therefore, this idea of law which

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 141.

The law in Hammurapi's code says:

If a man has taken wives for the sons whom he has gotten (but) has not taken a wife for his young son, after the father goes to (his) fate, when the brothers divide (his estate), they shall set (aside something for) a bridal gift out of the property of the paternal estate for their young brother who has not had a wife, over and above his share and shall enable him to take a wife. (Article 166).

The translation of all the articles cited from Hammurapi's Code has been taken from, Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, II.

<sup>45</sup>E.A. Speiser, "Cuneiform Law and the History of Civilization," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, CVII (1963), 537.

appealed to other peoples of the Near East and which was ultimately diffused into these regions through trade, and the use of the Akkadian language in legal documents and contracts. Speiser concludes:

There is thus abundant and compelling evidence that legal tradition which originated in Mesopotamia had enough vitality to exceed its native limits in time as well as in space. It was a living and life-giving tradition because, in the final analysis, it sprang from man's hope to achieve harmony with the cosmos.<sup>46</sup>

Religion, being so important in ancient Babylonian society, had its influence on every facet of that society. Hence, the significance of a code, such as that of Hammurapi, to the Babylonian population can be measured by their concept of the relation existing between the divine world and the human world, the latter being the actualization of the former.<sup>47</sup>

Hammurapi, however, was not a mere compiler of the existing tradition (customary law), but a legislator too. Hammurapi's society was different from the preceding societies. New demands require new legislation,

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 540.

<sup>47</sup> Generally implied in: Madeleine David, "Le Code of Hammurabi et la notion babylonienne de Destin," Archiv Orientalni, XV (1946), 341-351.

a fact which explains the presence of laws which are ignored by previous compilers. Having the vision of a new society, his system of laws assumes new meaning in that they were intended to change the existing social phenomena. Whether he was successful in his endeavour, or not, will be the object of the latter part of this study.

It is certain that during his reign, Hammurapi was able to reorganize the internal structure of his empire. Hammurapi's first achievement was the union of a large number of city-states under one centralized form of government. In this state the king curtailed a great amount of temple authority. Power was mostly concentrated in him. The general trend of reducing temple interference is best revealed in the texts dealing with the appointment of judges. Mrs. Harris derives her evidence from the texts of the naditu<sup>48</sup> contracts from Sippar. The first witnesses appearing on these texts are the sanga officials, which are the heads of the Šamaš temple. The seal inscriptions of these officials show a different pattern.

---

<sup>48</sup>The term naditu refers to a special class of women, which was formed to meet certain social and economic problems. Some scholars refer to them as 'priestesses' which is unaffirmed. Their private dwellings formed part of the cloister which belonged to the temple of Šamaš. The officials of this cloister protected the interests of these women.



The inscriptions dated to the pre-Hammurabi period mention the official as the servant of Šamaš or Aja, while starting with the Hammurabi period the sanga become the servant of the king. Therefore, the appointment of the sanga had gone under royal authority. Similarly, the seals of other officials (cloister officials) of the temple of Šamaš, which date to the pre-Hammurabi period, demonstrate that these officials were under the authority of that temple. There are no seals from the period of Hammurabi or later to enable us to know the situation during or after his rule. "The stewards of the naditu of Šamaš" and "The doorkeepers of the gate of the cloister" were also temple servants during the pre-Hammurabi period. Harris comes to the same conclusion in analyzing the legal texts of the naditu. Cases of the naditu were tried by the judges of the temple of Šamaš and the decision was rendered by them. With the reign of Hammurabi cases of the naditu were not tried in the temple of Šamaš. This duty was transferred to the "judges of the king", whose seals read "servant of king \_\_\_\_\_." Harris concludes that prior to Hammurabi the temple appointed the judges, but that there is no evidence suggesting that priests acted as judges. Hence, she concludes, that "at some time during the reign of Hammurabi a thorough going

secularization of the temple offices took place."<sup>49</sup> It should be considered, however, that Harris' conclusions are limited to the naditu of Sippar. We cannot know whether this process of limiting temple authority was applied throughout the empire. Furthermore, was this policy directed against the Šamaš temples, in Sippar and elsewhere, due to the ascendancy of Marduk as the Babylonian national deity under Hammurapi? Was it that the Šamaš priesthood of Sippar was becoming too strong which made Hammurapi want to limit their power? No definite answer can be given to any of these questions. Evidence points to the fact that starting with Hammurapi's reign certain responsibilities of the Samas temple were transferred to secular institutions. It is possible that the actions taken at Sippar formed part of the general centralization of authority undertaken by Hammurapi. More evidence is necessary for a decisive conclusion. Generalizing from the evidence, Driver and Miles suggest that, since the priesthood formed the most educated class, it is likely that they

---

<sup>49</sup>R. Harris, "On the Process of Secularization under Hammurapi," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV (1961), 117-120.

actually acted as judges, and that there was "a gradual transition from the priestly to lay judges in the course of the first Babylonian dynasty, with the turning-point in the reign of Hammurabi."<sup>50</sup>

Hammurapi had to legislate in order to reform the many undesirable features of his society. His code was organized in terms of the existing class hierarchy: The court, the priests, the military, the free-born, the muškenum, and finally, the slaves.<sup>51</sup> It should be considered, however, that in most cases the rendering of an accurate translation of the Babylonian terms designating these classes is difficult and unprecise. The different translations offered for the term muškenum<sup>52</sup> is an example of such difficulty.

---

<sup>50</sup>Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, p.491.

<sup>51</sup>This categorization was suggested by Muller as quoted in Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, p.50 n.1.

<sup>52</sup>This term appears in several sources, such as, the Laws of Eshnunna, The Code of Hammurapi, and the Mari texts. It refers to a social class. The important problem in this respect is concerning the function of the muškenum in the society. In the Mari texts the muškenum is connected with the palace. Although they were given land they were distinct from the peasant class. The Babylonian laws protect the rights of the muškenum who was associated with the state.

One of Hammurapi's attempted reforms dealt with the problem of the sale of persons in order to pay a debt. Textual evidence shows that such sales were a common feature in Old Babylonian society. The archives of the Sin temple in Tutub (modern Khafajah) suggest that this temple was engaged in widespread economic activity. Furthermore, it also lent money with interest. Mostly, the enum-priest dealt with this activity and purchased persons if the debtor could not pay his debt in money. Hammurapi, accordingly, passed an article whereby those bought in slavery for the purpose of paying off a debt were to occupy that status for a limit of three years only (CH 117).<sup>53</sup>

In certain cases, however, we do not know whether Hammurapi's provisions were innovations or reliance on custom. His code suggests his concern about the rights of the soldiers, even when it clashed with the interests

---

Based on the lexical evidence, Speiser defines a muškenum as "the state's dependant, one who was compensated for his services by being made a fief-holder, and who was particularly prominent in Old Babylonian society." He further adds that the meaning of this word changed through age and place. It later assumed the meaning "underprivileged or pitiable." (E.A. Speiser, "The Muškenum," Orientalia, XXVII (1958), 19-28.).

<sup>53</sup>R. Harris, "The Archive of the Sin Temple in Khafajah (Tutub)," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IX (1955), 42.

of the temples. On the other hand, he sanctions the death penalty on a soldier for two crimes: desertion, and the hiring of a substitute to replace him (article 26). The defiant soldier's property is given to his substitute.<sup>54</sup> According to article 34, however, a soldier is protected from exploitation of his services as well as of his property by his superiors.<sup>55</sup> The necessity for Hammurapi's provisions can be seen in the texts belonging to the private archives of a private archives of a private soldier by the name of Ubarrum.

---

Article 117: If a man has become liable to arrest under a bond and has sold his wife his son or his daughter or gives (them) into servitude, for 3 years they shall do work in the house of him who has bought them or taken them in servitude; in the fourth year their release shall be granted.

<sup>54</sup> Article 26: If a runner or a fisher who is commanded to go on a mission of the king has not gone or has hired a hireling and sends (him as) his substitute, that runner or fisher shall be put to death, his hired (substitute) shall take and keep his house.

<sup>55</sup> Article 34: If a recruiting officer or an adjutant takes (any article of a runner, oppresses a runner, hires out (the services of) a runner, delivers a runner into (the power of) a great man in a lawsuit, (or) takes the gift which the king has given to the runner, that recruiting officer of adjutant shall be put to death.

This archive is dated to the middle of the reign of Abi-ešuh (1711-1684), the eighth king of the First Dynasty of Babylon, the grandson of Hammurapi. Two texts from the archive provide information about the relation of a soldier to the temples. In these texts Ubarrum receives an amount of silver from the Sin and Šamaš temples. This grant advanced to Ubarrum was not an act of charity on behalf of the temples. According to Landsberger, Ubarrum had to pay an annual due, termed kasap bit abim to that temple; and that the total of that due was five shekels per year.<sup>56</sup> Considering this conclusion with the provision of article 32 of the code,<sup>57</sup> it would be clear that Ubarrum had a right to receive the "grant" and the temple was following a general rule. In times of peace, therefore, a soldier had to pay his annual

---

<sup>56</sup> B. Landsberger, "Remarks on the Archives of the Soldier Ubarrum," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IX (1955), 130.

<sup>57</sup> Article 32: If either a runner or a fisher, who is taken captive on a mission of the king and a merchant has ransomed him and so has enabled him to regain his city, has the means for ransoming (himself) in his house, he shall himself ransom himself, if there are not the means of ransoming him in his house, he shall be ransomed out of (the resources of) the temple of his city; if there are not the means of ransoming him in the temple of his city, the palace shall ransom him. His field his plantation and his house shall not be given for his ransom.

due.<sup>58</sup> The terminology by which this due was described suggests that every head of a family had to fulfill his financial obligation to the temple.

The archives of Ubarrum, however, display other features too. We know that Ubarrum's position in the army was that of a rēdum, "private". His friend, Ili-  
iqišam, was his "substitute" (Akkadian tahhum). It is clear from the texts that there was some conflict between Ubarrum and his tahhum. The tahhum ranked the lowest in the military hierarchy. Two texts of this archive reflect this tension. In one tablet the mutual property of Ubarrum and his tahhum was divided into two parts based on a two to one ratio. In a second text, which was drawn later than the former by at least five months, the property is divided into two equal shares.<sup>59</sup> The existing relationship between Ubarrum and his tahhum, according to Evans, reflects a contradiction between the provisions of article 26 of the Code and the existence of a substitute soldier. It is probable that a soldier had a legal substitute who would take the duties during his

---

<sup>58</sup> Geoffrey Evans, "An Old Babylonian Soldier: Notes on the Archive of Ubarrum," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XIV (1960), 39.

<sup>59</sup> Landsberger, op. cit., p. 126.

absence; and that the Code legislated against paid substitutes who were hired. Evans, however, adds that legal substitutes were not created by Hammurapi, and that such a rank might have existed earlier.<sup>60</sup> Landsberger, on the other hand, thinks that a tahhum ranked low as far as the army was concerned, but otherwise, had equal social rights. Hence, he concludes "that this equalization of the two ranks was a novelty (social reform), upon which the whole litigation of Ubarrum and his substitute was based."<sup>61</sup> Evans suggests the possibility of the existence of a substitute to every rēdum and it was the division of responsibilities and rights which lead to conflict. Evans adds that the State supported the existence of 'substitute soldiers' through article 26 which forbade hired ones. Furthermore, the king obtained better service from the soldier who would not neglect his duties, being suspicious of his tahhum who could report his rēdum to the king. As stated above the archive comes from the reign of Abi-ešuh, which contrary to the general opinion, says Evans, suggests that Babylonian society

---

<sup>60</sup> Evans, op. cit., p. 41.

<sup>61</sup> Landsberger, op. cit., p. 128.



after Hammurapi was not in a "process of dissolution."<sup>62</sup> Further evidence is necessary to prove Evans' conclusion. A single piece of evidence cannot characterize a general social trend. However, we should not deny the fact that Mesopotamian social institutions changed during the Old Babylonian period. The development of such institutions cannot be ascribed to a single ruler, but rather it was characteristic of the centuries of the First Dynasty of Babylon. An important social change during this period was the disappearance of the ration system, which had characterized the Mesopotamian labor class until the Ur III period. Rations of oil, barley, and wool were given to a class of semifree workers (the guruš class) in reward for their services.<sup>63</sup> The ration system was gradually replaced by a system of wages paid to a free class of artisans. This trend was characteristic of Babylonia, more than the other states of the Near East.<sup>64</sup> Besides this class of artisans appeared a new class of small peasantry, which Gelb ascribes to the "redistribution of land as a result of Amorite invasions."<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Evans, op. cit., p. 42.

<sup>63</sup> I. J. Gelb, "The Ancient Mesopotamian Ration System," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XXIV (1965), 230.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., pp. 242-243.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., p. 243.

Finally, there remains the important question: to what extent were Hammurapi's laws actually enforced in Babylonian society? In other words, what was the measure of Hammurapi's success in his social reform? Various opinions have been given relative to this problem. Certainly if one considers the code as a monument for the gods, or a literary endeavor, then it follows that the laws need not have been practiced since they were not intended for that purpose. Others have concluded that the promulgation of the code was for the purpose of a reform which was never realized, and accordingly, Hammurapi is termed a "visionary". In this case, therefore, the code might have been enforced during Hammurapi's reign but neglected by his successors.

Evidence for or against the problem of the enforcement of the laws should be sought in the legal documents of the Hammurapi and subsequent periods. This evidence, however, is inconclusive, for it is inconsistent. While in some documents the provision of the law is applied, in others the practice is unlike the law. Of the many Babylonian documents reflecting positive evidence for the practice of the laws, are the documents of the naditu women of Sippar. Articles 178, 179 and 180 were concerning

these women. These particular texts where the above mentioned articles were enforced, are not all dated to the Hammurapi period, some are earlier. According to article 178 the brothers of a naditu were obliged to provide her necessities and cultivate her fields, after the father's death. If, however, the brothers fail in their duties the naditu has the right to hand her property to whomever she pleases, but she cannot sell it, and after her death "her inheritance belongs to her brothers." Texts from the naditu archives of Sippar, dating to Hammurapi's reign and to Abi-ešuh's, reveal the fact that a naditu's brothers were responsible for her, but that they took her property after her death. Article 179, on the other hand, provides that if a naditu's father had granted her the right to give her property to other than her brothers, then the latter may not claim it from her. Legal texts of the naditu show that a naditu's father granted her the freedom of choice from among her brothers. The choice, therefore, was limited to her brothers. One text only leaves the choice free to the naditu's wishes. Article 180 provides that a naditu receive a share equal to that of the male heirs in the case where the father had not specified the portion

of the inheritance belonging to her. A Sippar text dating to the reign of Šamšuiluna is in accordance with the law.<sup>66</sup> Although the above evidence suggests that the laws were practiced, the fact that it comes from Sippar alone, and is directed to a restricted part of the society, should be taken into consideration. Probably Hammurapi had a special interest in the naditu of Sippar, since his daughter and his sister had joined the naditu.<sup>67</sup> Harris concludes that although Hammurapi was not the initiator of the naditu laws, "nevertheless, the prestige of the code helped to ensure the enforcement of these laws."<sup>68</sup>

Concerning wages, the Sippar documents reflect the application of Hammurapi's prescriptions to a certain extent, not regularly. A hired ox-driver's monthly wage, as stated in the text, was 1/3 shekel of silver and I PI of barley. For the same job the law provides a yearly

---

<sup>66</sup>R. Harris, "The naditu Laws of the Code of Hammurapi in Praxis," Orientalia, XXX (1961), 163-169.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 169 n.3.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 169.

wage of 6 GUR of corn. According to Goetze's calculations the wage on the text is rather similar to that of the Code.<sup>69</sup> Another tablet deals with a man hired for one month and four days, whose wages was fixed at 1 GUR 1 pan and 40 seach of barley. In article 273 of the Code, Hammurapi offers 6 grains of silver a day during the first five months of the year and 5 grains of silver a day starting with the sixth month of the year. In this case, Goetze says, the wages in the text are higher in the code. One tablet mentions a wage for a hired man much lower than provided by the laws.<sup>70</sup> It is difficult to reach a definite positive or negative answer regarding the application of the laws dealing with wages. The evidence is inconsistent, only part of the evidence is in accordance with the laws. Furthermore, it should also be considered that such things as wage rates change so as to keep in step with the national economy.

The rates of interest charged on loans are also in accordance with the laws. Here too, however, Hammurapi

---

<sup>69</sup>A. Goetze, "Old Babylonian Documents from Sippar in the Collection of the Catholic University of America," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XI (1957), 27.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., pp. 27, 28.

is not the initiator of a new rate, for the same rate appears in the laws of Eshnunna. For barley the texts from Harmal require an interest of  $1/3$  kor per kor of barley, which is probably in accordance with the code.<sup>71</sup> Relative to silver, the interest is  $1/3$  shekel per shekel of silver. In both of these cases, Simmon concludes that the rate was  $33 \frac{1}{3}\%$ . The Code and the Laws of Eshunna require an interest of  $20\%$  on silver.<sup>72</sup> In the Old Babylonian texts from Ur, dealing with partnership in trade, the creditor does not agree to share the losses in case of a failure in trade. He will receive the amount he had given, under any circumstance. Oppenheim says that in Old and neo-Babylonian texts dealing with partnership the creditor receives his capital and an equal share of the profit. According to article 98 of the code, however, the creditor is to share both the profit or the loss, if such was the result of the enterprise. Oppenheim thinks that the relationship between the investing merchant and the travelling merchant as

---

<sup>71</sup>S. D. Simmon, "Early Old Babylonian Tablets from Harmal and Elsewhere," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XII (1959), 83.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 84.

pictured in the Code was only an unsuccessful attempt on the part of Hammurapi.<sup>73</sup> Hence, it is an example of a provision which could not have been applied.<sup>74</sup>

From the few examples presented above, to which many more could be added, it can be observed that the question of the enforcement of Hammurapi's code remains unanswered. Our answer would depend upon the view we hold concerning the nature of these laws. If we conclude that Hammurapi compiled a legal tradition into a code, then the wording of the question should be altered; we should instead ask: was Mesopotamian tradition still followed during the latter part of the Old Babylonian period, or was it replaced by new customs? Following the first assumption and thinking that tradition was not neglected, we would have indirectly answered our major question positively. Our basic assumption, however, is

---

<sup>73</sup>A.L. Oppenheim, "The Seafaring Merchants of Ur," Journal of the American Oriental Society, LXXIV (1954), 8.

<sup>74</sup>A parallel to an economic law which could not be applied in practise comes from Leviticus 25:10-34. In every 50th year, called the year of Jubilee, slaves are to be freed, and property sold during the previous 49 years is to revert to the original owner (except houses in walled cities). Such rules, if applied, would have brought economic chaos.

fallacious. Hammurapi was a legislator, as he was a compiler of tradition. On the other hand, considering the Code as a literary endeavor would lead to the conclusion that the Laws were not applied. Here too, the assumption is improbable. It is best to conclude that Hammurapi legislated and compiled the Babylonian laws with the intention of enforcement. There is positive evidence that some of these laws were actually applied; but, on the other hand, some legal texts are far from Hammurapi's provisions. Generally, however, the Code must have been a means through which laws were more effectively enforced. It was Hammurapi who received the credit. Knowing that Hammurapi promulgated the Code towards the end of his reign, it could be inferred that he did not have a fair chance to enforce it. It was to remain for his son and his later successors to do so. It is probable that had Hammurapi lived longer, the laws would have left a deeper impact on Babylonian society, and hence, more positive evidence would have reached us.

Having presented Hammurapi as an idealist, we should turn to Hammurapi the realist. In Hammurapi the realist we see the picture of an intelligent and slow



politician who can sense the exact time when he could get a better deal. He seems to have been an observer rather than a spontaneous actor. Comparing Hammurabi and Šamši-Adad, C. Gordon says that there was a "difference in ability between them. While, he adds, the later was no less capable as a monarch "he may well have lacked Hammurabi's long-range planning that ran into decades. Hammurabi was not only a master of prompt tactical action; he was also a master of long-range strategy and of biding his time."<sup>75</sup> This impression can be gathered from the few sources that have come to us concerning the political activities of Hammurabi. We know very little about the wars that he led and the powers which were involved in his campaigns. His date formulae and the Mari texts are the only sources which preserve any information concerning his military activities. It should also be remembered that the actual events mentioned in a date formula had taken place in the preceding year. For example, if the formula of year 4 mentions

---

<sup>75</sup>C.H. Gordon, "Šamši-Addad's Military Texts from Mari," Archiv Orientalni, XVIII, no. 1 (1950), 207.

the building of a wall, that wall was actually built during the king's third regnal year.

Through Hammurapi's date formulae<sup>76</sup> was gathered that his first six years on the Babylonian throne were devoted to building activities. Meanwhile, he probably organized his defences. The first cities to be conquered were Isin and Uruk, in his sixth year (formula of year 7). Other conquests were carried out in his seventh and ninth year, during which he took Malgu. The annexation of Rapiqu during his tenth year (formula of year 11) represents the last of the series of campaigns he carried out during the early part of his reign, after which references to wars cease for twenty years. Hammurapi apparently felt that the conquest of the remaining, and stronger Mesopotamian cities need additional resources which he did not possess.

---

<sup>76</sup>For the list of Hammurapi's date formulae the author has depended on the translation found in: A. Leo Oppenheim, "Texts from Hammurapi to the Downfall of the Assyrian Empire," in J.B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), pp. 269-271.

The formulae of these twenty years (10 - 29) demonstrate that he concentrated on internal reforms. These formulae refer to gifts (statues and thrones) he presented to the various gods and goddesses (formulae of years 12-18, 20 and 29). Four of his date formulae mention the construction of walls, the most important of which is that of the town of Bazu (year 21) and that of Sippar (year 25). His 24th year formula refers to the redigging of the tilida-canal (Flowing Vase Canal). In Babylon he built a temple of Adad called "House of Abundance." Unfortunately, we have no means of knowing about other reforms which have not formed part of a date formula.

Hammurapi's more important conquests were accomplished towards the end of his reign. With his 29th year, Hammurapi started on a series of campaigns aimed at forming a unified empire, which he accomplished during his 38th regnal year after the conquest of Assyria. During his 29th year he was attacked by a coalition of Elam, Guti, Subartu, Eshnunna and Malgi, which he defeated. In his 30th year, encouraged by an oracle given by Anu and Enlil, he marched against Rim-Sim of Larsa and defeated him. During his 31st year he faced that some coalition which had

attached him in his 29th year, and extended his borders as far north as the Assyrian frontier. This implies that Eshnunna was finally annexed to Hammurapi's territories. Analyzing the political situation behind these three successive campaigns as reflected through the Mari texts, H. Lewy says that Zimri-Lim aided Hammurapi of Babylon in his battle against the coalition of his 29th year and that the combined forces of Babylon and Mari under the command of Ibal-pi-El, a general of Mari in charge of the Mari troops dispatched to Babylon, defeated the coalition.<sup>77</sup> She also adds that Eshnunna was a vassal of Elam and Hammurapi's defeat of the coalition gave Eshnunna its freedom.<sup>78</sup> It later became an ally of Hammurapi of Babylon. With Eshnunna as its ally, Hammurapi asked Zimri-Lim for troops to aid him in his campaign against Larsa. This fact can be gathered from a letter sent by Ibal-El, a governor, to Zimri-Lim in which the former quotes the statement Hammurapi had previously written to Zimri-Lim which says:

---

<sup>77</sup> Charles-F. Jean, Archives Royales de Mari, Vol. II: Lettres Diverses (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1950), Nos. 20, 22, 30.

<sup>78</sup> H. Lewy, "The Historical Background of the Correspondence of Bahdi-Lim," Orientalia, XXV (1956), 334, 343.

Je vais me reconstruire avec Rim-Sim, roi de Larsa;  
[et l'homme d'E]šnunna s'est associé à moi.  
Dès maintenant, envoie-moi des troupes afin que  
je réalise ce désir  
Avec tes troupes je te (r)envoyerais des troupes d'élite.  
Réalise ton désir.<sup>79</sup>

Several other examples can be cited from the Mari correspondence where Hammurapi asks Zimri-Lim for troops, or Babylonian troops are requested by Mari. This friendly relationship, however, was short-lived. Hammurapi ultimately attacked Mari in his 32nd year and made Zimri-Lim his vassal. His 33rd date formula says, "Mari and Malgi he overthrew in battle and made Mari, and. . . and also several other cities of Subartu, by a friendly agreement, (listen) to his orders." Finally in his 34th year he destroyed the walls of Mari turning the city into a mound of debris. Northern Mesopotamia thus remained the only area to be incorporated within his empire. It took Hammurapi two campaigns to accomplish his goal. In his 36th and 38th years he faced the armies of the Assyrians and of the other countries in Northern Mesopotamia. Hammurapi, however, was unable to overthrow the Assyrian ruling dynasty, but Išme-Degan lost his supremacy in Northern Mesopotamia.

---

<sup>79</sup>Charles-F. Jean, op. cit., p. 75.

With his Assyrian campaign of his 38th year, Hammurapi ended his expansionist schemes. Unfortunately, he enjoyed his accomplishments in peace for four years only after which it passed to his son. In the total of nine years during which he was engaged in battle, Hammurapi did not neglect building activities in his empire. The date formula of year 33 which mentions his first attack on Mari (32nd year) also says that he redug the canal named "Hammurabi-(spells)-abundance-for-the-people, the Beloved-of-Anu-and-Enlil," which gave a "permanent and plentiful" supply of water to the cities of Nippur, Eridu, Ur, Larsa, Uruk, and Isin. He also restored and built several temples. Furthermore, he constructed the wall of Rapiqu and Sippar in his 41st and 42nd years respectively.

It is unfortunate, but a usual pattern in history, that the successors of a great empire builder undo the work of their father. Hammurapi's son, Šamšuiluna, managed to keep the larger part of the empire under his authority. But reduction of the empire gradually started with Hammurapi's grandson. We do not know the exact circumstances of Hammurapi's death. But, he apparently died of an illness. In a letter to a high official, Šamšuiluna

writes, "The king, my father, is s[ick] and I sat myself on the throne in order to [. . .] the country."<sup>80</sup>

The history of the latter part of the First Dynasty of Babylon is obscure. Five rulers followed Hammurapi on the Babylonian throne. An important problem facing the Babylonian kings of this period is the infiltration of a new ethnic group: The Kassites.<sup>81</sup> Although the Kassites were not a direct factor in bringing the First Dynasty of Babylon to an end, they disturbed the peace of Babylon frequently, thus weakening Babylon and paving the way for the Hittite attack, which in turn allowed the Kassites to establish their rule over Babylonia. The identity of the Kassites as a separate ethnic group presents a major linguistic problem, which is outside the scope of the present study.<sup>82</sup> As with all the major

---

<sup>80</sup>A.L. Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, p. 157.

<sup>81</sup>It is difficult to assign the Kassite language to a specific linguistic group, since we do not have texts written entirely in Kassite. Our conclusions regarding this problem are based on Akkadian Texts which contain Kassite words, bilingual lists of gods, a list of personal names, and a vocabulary. According to Roux, their language is "perhaps distantly related to Elamite," while others think it has some kinship with Hittite. The Indo-European element, however, is easily discernable especially in the Kassite pantheon where the names of Aryan gods appear, such as, Shurash (Ind. Surya), Maruttash (Ind. Marut), and Buriash. The original homeland of the Kassites is uncertain. The generally accepted conclusion is that they came from the region of the Zagros mountains in northern Mesopotamia.

<sup>82</sup>J.J. Finkelstein, "The Year Dates of Samsuditana," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XIII (1959), 47-48.  
also: S.I. Feigin, "The Date List of the Babylonian King Samsu-ditana," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XIV (1955), 137-160.

problems of second millennium Mesopotamia, the date of the fall of the Babylonian dynasty is uncertain. Furthermore, the total regnal years of Šamšu-ditana, the last king of the dynasty, is also indefinite. Several kinglists and datelists give various totals. It is, however, generally assumed that he ruled 31 years. We have his first nineteen year dates from contracts. Another fifteen formulae, some of which could be discarded, remain to be fitted into his years; thus ultimately giving a total of 31 regnal years.<sup>83</sup>

The fall of the First Dynasty of Babylon is closely related to Kassite infiltration. We should start with the assumption that the dynasty of the Sea-Land<sup>84</sup> in

---

<sup>83</sup>In the kinglist this dynasty is referred to as the Dynasty of URU.KU<sup>ki</sup> which designates the marshy area in Southern Mesopotamia around the Persian Gulf. Our term Sea-Land (or Sealand) in the literal translation of the Akkadian term. (A.L. Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, p. 404). The founder of this dynasty, a certain Iluma-ilum, claimed to be a successor of Damiq-ilišu, the last king of Isin. The activities of Iluma-ilum in the area south of Nippur presents the initial steps which led to the gradual decrease of Hammurapi's empire; a process that was underway as early as the rule of Šamšu-iluna. We know very little about the internal activities of this dynasty. Its kinglist contains a total of ten or eleven kings. The Sea-Land Dynasty remained in possession of the south until the Kassite king Ulamburiash defeated Ea-gamil, the last king of the Dynasty of the Sea-Land, in 1517 B.C. (Roux, Ancient Iraq, pp. 199, 203).

<sup>84</sup>S. Smith, Alalakh and Chronology (London: Luzac and Company, 1940), pp. 18-19.



Southern Mesopotamia was ruling contemporaneously with the First Dynasty of Babylon in Babylonia. King has proven that Iluma-ilum, the founder of the Sea-Land Dynasty, was a contemporary of Šamšu-iluna, the son of Hammurapi of Babylon. He also concludes, that the last king of the Sea-Land ruled contemporaneously with the twelfth king of the Kassite dynasty.<sup>85</sup> Kassite names are mentioned in First Dynasty documents. But evidence from the kingdom of Hana points at a different condition. The kingdom was usually a vassal state, either of Mari or of Assyria.<sup>86</sup> Evidence implies that the Kassites ruled Hana during the second half of the First Dynasty of Babylon. The Kassite infiltration, therefore, occurred during the reign of Šamšu-iluna, but they could not capture Babylon.<sup>87</sup> A date formula appearing on the tablet dealing with the purchase of real estates says: "Year (when) Šamšu-iluna, the king (defeated) the Kassite army."<sup>88</sup> The Kassites probably ruled Hana, but assigned a local prince as their vassal and

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., pp. 23-24.

<sup>87</sup> A. Goetze, "Old Babylonian Documents from Sippar in the Collection of the Catholic University of America," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XI (1957), 22

<sup>88</sup> Smith, op. cit., p. 24.

withdrew from the city. Šamšu-iluna's ninth year formula says: "Year that the Kassite army. . ." Although, if complete, this formula would have commemorated the victory of the Babylonian king it is apparent that he must have lost some territory.<sup>89</sup>

Having this as a brief background, we should consider the end of the First Dynasty of Babylon. It has been assumed that kings of the Sea-Land Dynasty ruled Babylon during the period between the fall of the First Dynasty, and the beginning of Kassite rule. Thureau-Dangin, who supports the latter view, presents two pieces of evidence. First, the fact that the canon of the Sea-Land is not only included, but given priority in the royal canon of the Kassites, implies that some of the Sea-Land kings ruled Babylon. Secondly, he says that the Sea-Land Dynasty bears the title, "dynasty of the Holy City" and that reference is made to Babylonia as "The Holy City."<sup>90</sup> According to Smith, both of these assumptions are fallacious. He says:

It should be apparent that none of the kings of the Sea-Land Dynasty ever ruled from Babylon, and that though they certainly ruled, probably

---

<sup>89</sup>F. Thureau-Dangin, *Revue d'Assyriologie*, XXIV (1930), 184-185.

<sup>90</sup>Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

in the exact order given in the list, the total of regnal years is grossly exaggerated. That conclusion invalidates any general assumption that kings named in the list necessarily ruled at Babylon.<sup>91</sup>

Furthermore, he explains the whole issue by saying that the Kassites were already ruling a part of Babylonia and that they did not meet the Hittite attack because the Hittites wished to destroy Amorite power in Syria, and Babylon became a victim only because it was an ally of the north Syrian state of Yamhad. Therefore, the Kassites could not have invaded from the east, because they would have aroused against themselves the hostility of the eastern Babylonian states which were not attacked by the Hittites. Hence, as previously stated, they had occupied the eastern provinces earlier and could, therefore, take over Babylon as soon as Muršiliš withdrew.<sup>92</sup> We know that the first Kassite king who restored Babylon was Agum II, the ninth Kassite King, dated to after 1600 B.C.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>93</sup>H. Lewy, "On Some Problems of Kassite and Assyrian Chronology," Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves, XIII (1953), 248.

In summary, Mr. Smith reaches two basic conclusions regarding the Kassite problem. First, they ruled Babylon as soon as Muršiliš withdrew, which means that the kings of the Sea-Land Dynasty never ruled Babylon. Second, the early Kassite kings already ruled Hana and had only occupied the eastern provinces of Babylonia before ruling Babylon. These conclusions are of great significance, for the more kings added to a list and their period of rule lengthened, the "higher" the chronology becomes. Hence, Thureau-Dangin, supporting the high chronology, suggests the rule of a few Sea-Land Dynasty kings in Babylon before the Kassites. Smith, on the other hand, follows a lower chronology and thus, not only discredits the evidence for the Sea-Land rule at Babylon, but considers the early Kassite kings of the king list contemporaneous with the kings of the second part of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Thureau-Dangin does not assume the occupation of Hana by the Kassites from their invasion of Babylon during the ninth year of Šamšu-illuna. He also disagrees with the idea that Hana was ruled by the Kassites during the reign of Šamšu-illuna. Lewy thinks that their failure in Babylon did not hinder them from establishing themselves at Hana, and therefore, another Kassite invasion took place during the reign of

Abi-ešuh, the successor of Šamšu-iluna, in which the Babylonians claimed victory.<sup>94</sup> Lewy's basic conclusion lies in her attempt to reconcile conflicting pieces of evidence; the fact that Gandaš, the first Kassite king on the kinglist, was successful in his conquest of Babylon, on the one hand; and the fact that the kings of the First Dynasty never lost their capital city, on the other. She assumes that there is a great possibility that Gandaš had a successful campaign which was not mentioned in Šamšu-iluna's year names. There is a fragmentary text in which Gandaš, speaking in the first person, says that he conquered Babylon.<sup>95</sup> Not only has the authenticity of this text been doubted, but it has also been considered a forgery.<sup>96</sup> Lewy thinks it is a genuine piece of an apocryphal text in which Gandaš is a figure.

According to Lewy, the second evidence supporting the view that Gandaš actually conquered Babylon, comes from

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., p. 253.

<sup>95</sup> P. Van der Meer, The Chronology of Ancient Western Asia and Egypt (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955), p. 23.

<sup>96</sup> Lewy, op. cit., pp. 254-256.

Šamšu-iluna's nineteenth and twentieth years during which contracts from Sippar disappear. The short stop of such activities, Mrs. Lewy concludes, was caused by disturbances and invasion. This was the second attack that the Kassites made due to their failure during Šamšu-iluna's ninth year, and Agum Kakrime, the ninth Kassite king recorded that he not only invaded Sippar, but also Babylonia. Agum also adds that he returned the statues of Marduk and his consort Sarpanitum from "the land of Hana" to Babylon, after rebuilding the temple. This statement suggests that an earlier Kassite king had taken these statues to Hana. That king, according to Lewy, must have been Gandaš. Hence she concludes, although Gandaš did not rule from Babylon, he was considered as the king of Babylon by virtue of the act of taking the deities. Therefore, after Gandaš took the statues Šamšu-iluna regained his capital and made new statues for the temple. It was these later ones that the Hittites took, and when the Kassites captured Babylon at last they brought back those statues that they had taken and which had previously remained in Hana.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup>Van der Meer, op. cit., p. 22. For evidence below.

Both Lewy and Smith do not present totally convincing solutions of the reconciliation. There are contradictory pieces of evidence. An immediate problem is the uncertainty of the reconstruction of the Kassite kinglist itself. Some scholars do not consider Agum Kakrime as the ninth king of the dynasty. Our second problem is that of reconciling evidence from the different texts which mention the fact of transferring the deities.<sup>98</sup> We know from a certain inscription that Marduk went to Hatti so as to guard the trade relations between Hatti and Babylon. As a result of his absence, Babylon entered into a state of trouble which ceased as soon as Marduk decided to return. Most probably, the period of confusion was the result of the capture of Babylon by Muršiliš I. According to the Babylonian chronicle, "in the time of Šamšiditana the Hittite came against the land of Akkad." The Telepinus text, which is a Hittite document, mentions that Muršiliš I took the statues of Marduk and Serpanitum as booty to Hattusas, which remained there for twenty-four years. An important contradiction can be seen in an inscription of Agum, in which he says that, in order to bring Marduk back and place him in the rebuilt temple, he went to Hana. This event took place twenty four

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., p. 23.

years after the sack of Babylon. We are not sure, however, of the length of Agum's reign, but he most probably had already been on the throne of Babylon before he planned the restoration of the temple. Hence, we are not certain whether Marduk was taken to Hana or to Anatolia. Considering a period of twenty-four years between the destruction of Babylon by the Hittites and the restoration of the temple by Agum II, would tempt us to conclude, against Smith, that it is likely that the Sea-Land dynasty managed to take over the rule of Babylon. Our conclusion would be better founded if we consider that the rebuilding of the temple was one of Agum's first acts which won for him the acceptance of the people. In that case, we would be following the "high" chronology. But we would be able to support the "low" chronology, if we follow Van der Meer's argument that the statement in the Babylonian chronicle, "in the time of Šamšuditana," could suggest that the Hittite invasion might have occurred during his rule, and that he continued as king of Babylon after Muršiliš withdrew.<sup>99</sup> Although it is not proven, it is generally thought that Šamšuditana lost both his life and his city after the Hittite invasion.

---

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., Synchronistic Table 3.



It is presently agreed that the early Kassite kings did rule Hana before they raided Babylon. Therefore, Agum II is considered to have been the first of that dynasty in Babylon. According to the "low" chronology, the reign of Šamšuditana, the last king of the First Dynasty of Babylon, lasted from 1557-1526 B.C. Hence, the beginning of Kassite rule in Babylon would be dated to 1525 B.C.<sup>100</sup> Considering the period of twenty-four years between the Hittite conquest of Babylon and the restoration of Marduk's temple by Agum II, Lewy dates the end of the First Dynasty to 1599 B.C., and the second event to 1577 B.C.<sup>101</sup> Smith dates the beginning of Kassite rule to 1600 B.C.<sup>102</sup> Roux considers 1595 B.C. as the year of both Šamšuditana's death and Agum's accession to the throne of Babylon.<sup>103</sup> Similarly, Saggs considers 1595 B.C. as the year of the Hittite raid and Agum's accession. Following the "high" chronology, Goetze, dates the Hittite campaign against Babylon to around 1650 B.C.<sup>104</sup> The writer thinks that a date between 1595 B.C. and 1600 B.C. for the event, remains the best solution at present.

---

<sup>100</sup> Lewy, op. cit., p. 258.

<sup>101</sup> Smith, op. cit., p. 21.

<sup>102</sup> Roux, op. cit., pp. 201,202.

<sup>103</sup> Saggs, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>104</sup> A. Goetze, "The Kassite and Near Eastern Chronology," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XVIII (1964), 101.

## APPENDIX

### THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM B.C.

Obtaining a fixed chronology for the second millennium B.C. has been one of the basic problems of the history of the Ancient Near East. The whole problem, however, is centered around the solution of one problem which is that of fixing the dates for Hammurapi's rule in Babylon. Three different dates have been proposed. These dates vary from 1900 B.C. for the accession of Hammurapi to 1728 B.C. for that same event. For our present purposes we would restrict our discussion to only three of the dates proposed. The highest dates given for Hammurapi's rule is 1848-1806 B.C., and accordingly the system is named the "high" chronology. The other extreme is what is termed the "low" chronology according to which Hammurapi must have reigned from 1728-1686 B.C. A "middle" chronology has also been offered, which proposes a date of 1792-1750 B.C. for Hammurapi's rule. Each of the three chronologies have

their adherents. Scholars supporting either view present supporting evidence from many aspects of the history of the Ancient Near East. Inscriptions, and most important, the reconstruction of the different kinglists forms an important part of the evidence. Archeological evidence has also been interpreted to support a particular chronology.

Thus by fixing Hammurapi's reign to any of the above mentioned dates, the chronology of the second millennium should similarly be altered. In many cases we have a rather certain knowledge of the number of years that elapsed between Hammurapi and another king, so that in order to fix the date of the latter king we should have taken our position regarding the date for Hammurapi so as to be able to add the specified number of years.

Reading through books on the history of Ancient Mesopotamia one is conscious of the chronology the author prefers through the dates he assigns for Hammurapi. Detailed explanations concerning the supporting evidence are not given. Similarly it can be said that recently published books on the history of Ancient Mesopotamia generally use the "middle" chronology. Only a few of the major scholars in the field have gone into the detailed

and involved arguments in support of their view. This does not mean that they are the only supporters of these views. The proponent of the "high" chronology is A. Goetze. The initiator of a possible "middle" chronology was S. Smith who was at first supported by Albright during 1940. E. Rowton who had been a supporter of the "low" chronology during 1951, changed his views in support of the "middle" chronology in 1958. W.A. Ward also supports the "middle" chronology but offers a different approach to the problem through his presentation of evidence from the history of Egypt. Finally, the fervent supporter of the "low" chronology remains W.F. Albright. The supporting evidence presented for each of these chronologies is almost the same; it is the interpretation which is different. Therefore, in most cases a scholar criticizes another's point of view while presenting his own. In the following paragraphs, however, we will not go into a detailed presentation of the arguments presented by the proponents of each of these chronologies.

Scholars draw on a variety of sources and scattered pieces of evidence from different periods of ancient Near Eastern history to provide proof for their particular chronological system. The reconstruction of the various king-lists, such as the Hittite, Yamhad

(Aleppo), or Alalakh, forms an important aspect of the argument. The basic problems regarding such a reconstruction are that of determining the sequence of the kings, the regnal years to be assigned to each, and also the synchronisms that should be established between kings from different lists. The proponents of the "high" chronology, for example, add more kings to the lists and assign them longer reigns than the proponents of the "low" chronology. Similarly, in situations which necessitate a calculation in terms of generations, the followers of the "high" chronology assign 28 years per generation, while the followers of the "low" chronology assign 25 years. The Khorsabad list of Assyrian kings has been of great significance in establishing the fact that Hammurapi was contemporaneous to both Šamši-Adad I and Išme-Dagan I. This king-list, however, like its counterparts has a gap of two kings. Therefore, the total years to be assigned for these kings will alter the chronological system significantly. An example of a chronological synchronism altered to suit only two of the chronological systems is that which synchronizes Neferhotep I of Egypt with Yantin-'ammu, a prince of Byblos, and Zimri-Lim, the last king of Mari. Since according to the "middle" chronology Neferhotep I and

Zimri-Lim could not have been contemporaries, Yantin-'ammu would be contemporaneous to only portions of the reigns of Zimri-Lim and Neferhotep I, and therefore, Neferhotep I need not be a contemporary of Zimri-Lim. Important textual evidence, especially in support of the "middle", or even the "low" chronology, is provided by the Mari archives.

Apart from the textual evidence, scholars also refer to archeological evidence. The dating of the various levels at Alalakh and of the kinds of pottery found there, has been referred to by the proponents of the "middle" chronology, in particular. In support for the date 1792-1750 B.C. ("middle" chronology) scholars have drawn evidence from Minoan history. This evidence is a Babylonian seal found among MM1a pottery and Egyptian scarabs, discovered in Tholos B at Platanos in Crete. Accordingly, a synchronism is established between MM1a and the reign of Hammurapi of Babylon. In the final part of the fourth chapter reference has been made to the relation of the date for the Kassite rule of Babylon to the general chronological problem.

In the preceding paragraphs the nature of the problem and of the supporting evidence have been sum-

marized. It is disappointing, however, that after the amount of analysis and time that scholars have devoted to the problem of chronology, it still remains one of the uncertain aspects of the history of the ancient Near East. History seems to move "slower" according to the "high" chronology. A great number of years are ascribed to a king's reign. Furthermore, gaps are calculated to have lasted longer. Events according to the "low" chronology move too "fast". The proponents of the "high" chronology, for example, have been accused for inserting kings into king-lists so as to lengthen the list and thereby obtain a "high" date for Hammurapi. Naturally, the "middle" chronology has the advantage of being the best solution at this stage because it is a middle solution between two extremes. The evidence from the history of Egypt, for example, would better fit in a chronological scheme which follows the "middle" chronology. The latter evidence, however, can also fit the "low" chronology. Finally, it remains to be added that a great deal of further research is necessary in order to establish a uniform chronology. Our ultimate hope lies in Archeology.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### THE "HIGH" CHRONOLOGY

Goetze, A. "Alalah and Hittite Chronology," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 146 (April 1957).

\_\_\_\_\_. "On the Chronology of the Second Millennium B.C.," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XI (1957).

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Date of the Hittite Raid on Babylon," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 127 (October 1952).

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of Chronology and Early Hittite History," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 122 (April 1951).

Sidersky, P. "Nouvelle étude sur la chronologie de la dynastie Hammurapienne," Revue d'Assyriologie, XXXVII (1940).

Thureau-Dangin, F. "La chronologie de la première dynastie Babylonienne," Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, XLIII (1942).

### THE "MIDDLE" CHRONOLOGY

Albright, W.F. "New Light on the History of Western Asia in the Second Millennium B.C.," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 77 (February 1940), 20 - 32.

Rowton, M.B. "The Date of Hammurapi," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVII (1958).



- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Date of the Hittite Capture of Babylon," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 126 (April 1952).
- Smith, S. Alalakh and Chronology. London: Luzac and Company, 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Middle Minoan I-II and Babylonian Chronology," American Journal of Archeology, XLIX (1945).
- Ward, W.A. "Egypt and The East Mediterranean in the Early Second Millennium B.C.," Orientalia, XXX (1961), 22 - 45 ; 120-155.

#### THE "LOW" CHRONOLOGY

- Albright, W.F. "An Indirect Synchronism between Egypt and Mesopotamia, cir. 1730 B.C.," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 99 (October 1945), 9-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Note on the Chronology of the Second Millennium B.C.," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 126 (April 1952).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Third Revision of The Early Chronology of Western Asia," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 88 (December 1942), 28-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Further Observations on the Chronology of Alalakh," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 146 (April 1957).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Further Observations on the Chronology of the Early Second Millennium B.C.," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 127 (October 1952).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Stratigraphic Confirmation of the Low Mesopotamian Chronology," Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research, 144 (December 1956).
- Rowton, M.B. "Tappu and the Date of Hammurabi," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, X (1951).
- Van der Meer, P. The Chronology of Ancient Western Asia and Egypt. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Albright, W.F. From the Stone Age to Christianity. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1957.
- Bottéro, Jean and Finet, André. Archives Royales de Mari. Vol. XV: Répertoire analytique des tomes I à V. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1954.
- Dossin, Georges. Archives Royales de Mari. Vol. I: Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et des ses Fils. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1950.
- Dossin, Georges. Archives Royales de Mari. Vol. IV: Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et de ses Fils (Suite). Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Archives Royales de Mari. Vol. V: Correspondance de Iasmah-Addu. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1952.
- Driver, G.R., and Miles, John C. The Babylonian Laws. Vol. I: Legal Commentary. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Babylonian Laws. Vol. II: Transliterated Text, Translation, Philological Notes, Glossary. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Garelli, Paul. Les Assyriens en Cappadoce. Bibliothèque Archeologique et Historique de l'Institut Français d'Archeologie d'Istanbul, XIX. Paris: Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve, 1963.
- Goetze, A. Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer. "Instituttet for sammenlignende Kulturforskning," Serie A, Vol. XVII. Oslo: 1936.
- Gurney, O.R. The Hittites. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962.

- Huffman, H.B. Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1965.
- Jacobsen, T. The Sumerian King List. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Jean, Charles-F. Archives Royales de Mari. Vol. II: Lettres Diverses. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1950.
- Kramer, S.N. "A Sumerian Letter," in J.B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Kupper, J. - R. Les nomade en Mesopotamie au temps des rois de Mari. Paris: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, CXLIII, 1957.
- Laessoe, Jorgen. People of Ancient Assyria: Their Inscriptions and Correspondence. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.
- Leemans, W.F. Foreign Trade in the Old Babylonian Period as Revealed by Texts from Southern Mesopotamia. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960.
- Moscatti, S. The Semites in Ancient History. Cardiff: 1959.
- O'Callaghan, R.T. Aram Naharaim. Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1948.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. Ancient Mesopotamia. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. "Texts from Hammurabi to the Downfall of the Assyrian Empire," in J.B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to The Old Testament. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Roux, Georges. Ancient Iraq. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964.
- Saggs, H.W.F. The Creatness that was Babylon. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1962.

- Schmokol, H. Geschichte des alten Vorderasiens. Leiden: 1957.
- Smith, S. Alalakh and Chronology. London: Luzac and Company, 1940.
- Van der Meer, P. The Chronology of Ancient Western Asia and Egypt. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955.
- Von Soden, W. Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik. Rome: 1952.
- Wiseman, D.J. The Alalakh Tablets. London: The British Institute of Archeology at Ankara, 1953.

#### Articles

- David, Madeleine, "Le Code du Hammurabi et la notion babylonienne de Destin," Archiv Orientalni XV (1946), 341-351.
- Dossin, Georges. "L'inscription de fondation de Iahdun-Lim, roi de Mari," Syria, XXXII (1955), 1-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Une Lettre de Iarim-Lim, roi d'Alep, a Iašub-Iahad, roi de Dir," Syria, XXXIII (1936), 63-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Une lettre de Zimri-Lim a Iarim-Lim, roi d'Alep," Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Orientlists, Cambridge, 21st-28th August, 1954, 121-123.
- Evans, G. "An Old Babylonian Soldier: Notes on the Archive of Ubarrum," Journal of Cuneiform Studies. XIV (1960), 34-42.

- Feigin, S.I. "The Date List of the Babylonian King Samsu-  
ditana," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XIV  
(1955), 137-160.
- Finkelstein, J.J. "Ammisaduqa's Edict and the Babylonian  
"Law Codes"," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV  
(1961), 91-104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Year Dates of Samsuditana," Journal of  
Cuneiform Studies, XII (1959), 39-49.
- Gelb, I. "The Ancient Mesopotamian Ration System," Journal  
of Near Eastern Studies, XXIV (1965), 230-243.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples,"  
Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV (1961), 27-47.
- Gelb, I. "Two Assyrian King Lists," Journal of Near Eastern  
Studies, XIII (1954), 209-230.
- Goetze, A. "Amurrite Names in Ur III and Early Isin Texts,"  
Journal of Semitic Studies, IV (1959), 193-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Babylonian Documents from Sippar in the  
Collection of the Catholic University of America,"  
Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XI (1957), 15-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of J.-R. Kupper, *Les nomades en Mesopotamie  
au temps de roi de Mari*, Journal of Semitic Studies,  
IV (1959), 142-147.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sumu-yamutbal, a Local Ruler of the Old Babylonian  
Period," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IV (1950),  
65-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Kassite and Near Eastern Chronology," Journal  
of Cuneiform Studies, XVIII (1964), 97-101.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Laws of Eshnunna," Actes de XXI<sup>e</sup> Congres  
International des Orientalistes, Paris, 23-31  
Paris: Imprimerie National, 1949, 136.
- Gordon, C.H. "Šamši-Adad's Military Texts from Mari,"  
Archiv Orientalni, CVIII, no. 1(1950), 199-207.
- Hallo, William W. "The Last Years of the Kings of Isin,"  
Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVIII (1959),  
54-72.

- Harris, R. "On the Process of Secularization under Hammurapi," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV (1961), 117-120.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Archive of the Sin Temple in Khafajah (Tutub)," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IX (1955), 31-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The naditu Laws of the Code of Hammurapi in Paraxis," Orientalia, XXX (1961), 163-169.
- Hrozny, B. "Assyriens et Hittites en Asie Mineure Vers 2000 av. J.-C." Archiv Orientalni, IV (1932), 112-117.
- Jacobsen, T. "The Reign of Ibbi-Suen," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, VII (1953), 36-47.
- Kramer, S.N., and Falkenstein, A. "Ur - Nammu Law-Code," Orientalia, XXIII (1954), 40-51.
- Krikorian, M.K. "A Further Argument about "Annakum"," Acta Orientalia, XXV (1960), 171-172.
- Laessle, J. "Akkadian Annakum: "Tin" or "Lead"?, " Acta Orientalia, XXIV (1959), 83-94.
- Landsberger, B. "Remarks on the Archives of the Soldier Ubarrum," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, IX (1955), 121-131.
- Landsberger, B. "Tin and Lead: The Adventures of Two Vocables," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XXIV (1965), 285-296.
- Leemans, W.F. "Le Synchronisme Samsi-Addu — Hammurabi d'apres textes du Louvre," Revue d'Assyriologie, XLIX (1955), 202-204.
- Lewy, Hildegard. "Chronological Notes Relating to a New Volume of Old Babylonian Contracts," Orientalia, XXIV (1955), 275-287.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Some Problems of Kassite and Assyrian Chronology," Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves, XIII (1953).

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Historical Background of the Correspondence of Bahdi-Lim," Orientalia, XXV (1956), 324-352.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Kingdom of Hana at the Time of the Mari Texts." Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Orientalists, Cambridge 21st-28th August, 1954. London: The Royal Asiatic Society, n.d.
- Lewy, J. "A Propos of a Recent Study in Old Assyrian Chronology," Orientalia, XXVI (1957), 12-36.
- Meek, Theophile J. "A New Interpretation of Code of Hammurabi 117-19," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, VII (1948), 180-183.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Asyndeton Clause in the Code of Hammurabi," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, V (1946), 64-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Explicative Pronoun Šu ša in the Code of Hammurabi," Archiv Orientalni, XVIII, No. 4 (1950), 78-81.
- Munn-Rankin, J.M. "Diplomacy in Western Asia in the Second Millennium B.C.," Iraq, XVIII (1956), 68-110.
- O'Callaghan, Roger T. "A New Inheritance Contract from Nippur," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, VIII (1954), 137-143.
- Oppenheim, A.L. "The Seafaring Merchants of Ur," Journal of The American Oriental Society, LXXIV (1954), 6-17.
- Reiner, Erica. "The Year Dates of Sumu-jamutbal," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV (1961), 121-124.
- Rutten, M. "Un lot de tablettes de Manana," Actes du XXI<sup>e</sup> Congress International des Orientalistes, Paris, 23-31 Juillet, 1948. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1949, 140-142.
- Simmons, Stephen D. "Early Old Babylonian Tablets from Harmal and Elsewhere," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XIII (1959), 71-93, 105-119.
- Speiser, E.A. "Cuneiform Law and the History of Civilization," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, CVII (1963), 536-541.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The muškenum," Orientalia, XXVII (1958),  
19-28.

Steele, F.R. "The Code of Lipit - Ishtar," American  
Journal of Archeology, LII (1948), 425-450.

Ward, W.A. "Egypt and the East Mediterranean in the Early  
Second Millennium B.C.," Orientalia, XXX (1961),  
22-45, 120-155.

Wiseman, D.J. "The Laws of Hammurabi Again," Journal of  
Semitic Studies, VII (1962), 161-172.