

On Two Babylonian Kings.

By

C. J. Gadd (London).

The small temple at Tell el-Obeid, not far from Ur, which was discovered and partly excavated by Dr. HALL in 1919, and completely laid bare in the winter of 1923—1924 by the Joint Expedition of the British Museum and the University of Pennsylvania under the direction of Mr. C. L. WOOLLEY, has yielded not only an astonishing wealth of archaeological material, but an inscription of the highest importance. It is now common knowledge that the foundation tablet¹ of the temple reveals the identity both of the building itself and of its builder — Tell el-Obeid covered the temple of Ninhursag, dedicated by A-anni-padda, king of Ur, the son of Mes-anni-padda, king of Ur. It is difficult to decide which of these items of information is the more interesting. The purpose of this note, however, is no more than to deal with one single detail of the many consequences which arise from this inscription.

The fortunate chance which prompted this ancient king to add the name of his father to his own has doubled for us the value of his record. Without that information, A-anni-padda would have been only one more among those early rulers whose names still float upon the unknown, devoid of context and significance. As it is, he fits immediately into his place, the second king of the First Dynasty of Ur, and therewith brings his whole line out of the region of mythology into the light of history. The dramatic emergence

¹ A photograph (upside down, unfortunately), appears in the *Antiquaries' Journal*, IV. Pl. XLV. c.

of this Dynasty cannot fail to affect our views concerning the authority of the Sumerian king-list for the earliest history, but this, again, is a question which cannot be discussed here. A-anni-padda declares himself the son of Mes-anni-padda, who heads the First Dynasty of Ur in the king-list with the highly improbable reign of 80 years. According to the list, he was succeeded by Mes-ki-ág ^dNannar, who is there called his son. It is at once obvious that the list has omitted A-anni-padda and ascribed the years of his reign to his father; Mes-anni-padda's 80 years is the sum of his own and of his son's reign. The tradition of the king-list had therefore lost sight of A-anni-padda, probably owing to the great similarity of his and his father's names. It can, I think, be shown that he survived in another tradition.

Three texts¹ from Nippur relate the history of a building in that city called the Tummal.² We hear that, after its third time of falling into decay, the work of restoring it was begun by a certain An-na-ni and completed by his son Mes-ki-ág ^dNannar. According to a variant³, however, the father's name was Na-an-ni. The son can be no other than that Mes-ki-ág ^dNannar, king of Ur, who was second in his dynasty according to the list⁴, and third in fact, and who was therefore the son, not of Mes-anni-padda, but of A-anni-padda. It needs little perspicacity to recognize that An-na-ni and Na-an-ni are simply different versions of a shortened form of the name A-anni(-padda). This ancient monarch, who has risen so unexpectedly from the ruins of Tell el-Obeid, was, therefore, not entirely unhonoured in Babylonian tradition, which seemed so unjustly to have forgotten him.

¹ POEBEL, PBS. V. nos. 6 and 7, LEGRAIN, PBS. XIII. no. 48. Col. 2.

² POEBEL, OLZ. 1924. 263. n. 4, proposes to read Ibmal.

³ LEGRAIN's text.

⁴ This king is, of course, given as Mes-ki-ág-nun-na in CBS. 13981 (POEBEL's no. 2. Col. 3. line 7), and Dr. LEGRAIN has very kindly informed me that this is undoubtedly the correct reading of the original tablet. But, since the appearance of the WELD-BLUNDELL prism (OECT. II. Pl. II. Col. 3, 42), this reading must be regarded as a scribal error, probably due to writing from dictation.

Rammân¹-apal-idinnam.

This ruler has long enjoyed a doubtful reputation and an even more doubtful parentage. As regards the latter, a Babylonian tradition² calls him the son of one Itti-Marduk-balaṣu, adding »an Aramaean, an usurping king», whereas the »Synchronous History»³ knows him as the son of Esaggil-šadūni, a »nobody». Both sources are united in their contempt for his forbears. It seems to be generally assumed⁴ that the Itti-Marduk-balaṣu mentioned by the Chronicle is identical with the king Itti-Marduk-balaṣu, the penultimate predecessor of Rammân-apal-idinnam, though there is no evidence for this, and the description »an Aramaean, an usurping king» almost certainly applies to Rammân-apal-idinnam himself, not to his father. For, if these epithets applied to king Itti-Marduk-balaṣu, it is very improbable that they should have been postponed for a merely incidental mention in the reign of his second successor, and, if they apply to Rammân-apal-idinnam, then his father was no king, but a common tribesman. The introduction of a second putative father, the totally unknown Esaggil-šadūni, makes the supposed royal descent even more unlikely. I have now to reveal a third claimant to the honour of Rammân-apal-idinnam's paternity! This king carried out a little repair work at Ur, and in two places were found fragments of his paving, made of stamped bricks mostly illegible. One broken specimen, however, could be rejoined and yields the following complete text: —

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 1. <i>a</i> .Rammân-apal (TUR.UŠ)-i-din-nam | Rammân-apal-idinnam |
| 2. <i>dumu</i> <i>a</i> .Nin-šer ⁵ -ukîn (K.I.NA) | son of Harru-ukin |

¹ I retain this name for convenience, though M. THUREAU-DANGIN has recently shown reason to doubt its correctness, RA XXI. 189. n. 2.

² KING, Chron. II. 59.

³ CT. XXXIV. Pl. 39, 34.

⁴ Most recently by BÖHL, *Archiv für Keilschr.* II. 49, following WINCKLER, PEISER, and SCHNABEL, though KING never committed himself to this view.

⁵ REC. 364. The name is possibly to be read *a*.Harru (Chicago Syllabary, 125), and is said to be that of a goddess, though *a*.NIN.ŠER need not be the same as *a*.NIN.ŠER + GUD. A male god *a*.NIN.ŠER + LA occurs in an unpublished inscription of Kurigalzu.

3. <i>lugal ká-dingir-ra^{ki}</i>	king of Babylon
4. <i>mussa (SAL.UŠ.DI)</i>	son-in-law
5. <i>^a.Ud-sar¹-ra-ge</i>	of (the god) Udsarra
6. <i>ú-a Uri^{ki}</i>	nourisher of Ur;
7. <i>ê-giš-šir-gal</i>	E-gish-shir-gal
8. <i>al-gibil-la</i>	he renewed
9. <i>^a.DU.UD.RA²</i>	for (the god)?
10. <i>lugal-a-ni-ir</i>	his king

We are presumably to see in ^aHarru-ukîn (*or*-kîn) the name of Rammân-apal-idinnam's real or alleged father³ according to himself. If so, the mystery of his birth becomes darker than ever, and it is very likely that a good deal of official fiction as to his antecedents was circulated at the time of his gaining the throne, thus allowing ample scope for the divergent accounts of courtiers and of detractors. In any case, we are justified in dismissing the notion of his being the son of King Itti-Marduk-balaṭu as extremely improbable.

The above text is, to my knowledge, only the second inscription of Rammân-apal-idinnam which has yet appeared. A third, which it may not be unsuitable to subjoin, is found upon a fairly well preserved tablet, no. 79503 in the British Museum. It is a copy of a votive inscription at Borsippa made by an Assyrian scribe, Arad-Gula, son of Adad-shum-ušur, both of whom are known from the Assyrian letters as persons of some importance⁴ during the reigns of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal; the father is here called the *šangamahhu* of Esarhaddon. As for the inscription itself, presumably it stood upon the girdle of Nabû at Borsippa as a bilingual, since it bears every mark of having been translated back

¹ REC. 152. For this divine name see DEIMEL, *Pantheon*, 1135.

Apparently unknown, both as to identity and reading, but doubtless another epithet of the Moon-god.

³ It is hardly possible to understand the line as meaning 'true son of ^aHarru' even in the extraordinary Sumerian of this and other of the king's inscriptions.

⁴ For information concerning them see BEHRENS, *Briefe* 24, 25, 39, 91, 94.

into Sumerian in a purely artificial manner with the aid of syllabaries. Even if the Akkadian version as it stands is the work of Arad-Gula himself, that would only imply that he was a sufficiently learned scribe to compose a readable translation out of the factitious jargon of the »original tongue».

The tablet measures $4\frac{1}{4}$ ins. by $2\frac{1}{2}$ ins., and was acquired in 1889, probably, as its contents imply, from Borsippa. I am indebted to the Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities for leave to publish it, and to Mr. SMITH for putting at my disposal the copies which he had already made.

B. M. 79503.

Obverse: —

1. la-bar [PAP-]PAP-gá ušumgal sag-gí-a [nu-tuk? ní]-gùr-gùr-ru gal še ni(?)
ana suk-kal-li šur-bi-i u-šum-gal la ma-har mut-li-li-i e SAR(?)
2. nam-áb(?)—ba(?) ^aMâr-dù-kù a-sag ŠÀ.AŠ.DU dumu-áb(?)
. ^aEru'a ù-tu-ud-da
bi-[en?-]bi-in dù-kù ap-li git-ma-li ma-[ri] kun-ni-i i-lit-ti ^aEru'a
3. lú ùr-ra sag-ki-ág-gá-bi mu-lu gi aš-te ma ^{giš}ù-luh sag-zi-bi
ha-mi-im sak-ki-e u te-ri-e-ti mu-šar-šid ku-us-si-e u-luh-hi
u-ma-ni
4. nig-bal(?) nam(?)—lugal sà mu-un Bád-si-ab-ba(ki)
ê-zid-da tuš-ma(r)-ra
mu e na-bu-u šar-ru-ti be-el Bar-sip(ki) a-šib ê-zid-da
5. ba(?) IZKIM-ti-mah-a-ni ù-ma (hi-bi eš-šu) en-di-di lugal-a-ni-ir
. lik i-di-šu tu-kul-ti-šu rabiti' mu-šak-šid ir-nit-ti-šu
be-lí-šu
6. ^[m.]d. Ramman-apal-i-di-nam lugal ká-dingir-ra(ki) a-ku (e-gu)
ní-tuk-bi
» » » » šar Ba-ab-i-lí ru-bu-u pa-lih-šu
7. ka-sí-sí(?) gú-mi-ni-íb-dub-ba šà-gi-gub lal-e-a-ni-ir
nig-zi-gál-sí-ga(?)
. ti-šu ši-bi (hi-bi eš-šu) libbi-šu a-ma-ri še-bi-e lit-tu-ti

8. mar-ra ka-gar (*hi-bi eš-šu*) da sag ^ú-ru ^úu-?
 aš-še-hu(?) (*hi-bi eš-šu*) e-piš a-bu-ti(?)

Reverse: —

9. KU.ÍB.LÁ.AD guškin-ruš-a ^{na}kal-la(?) mi-zi-dé-eš-dug-[ga]
ni-bi-ih hu-ra-ši ru-uš-ši-i ša ina ab-ni a-gar-ti(?)
 10. igi-GIR.PEŠ.BAL.A. am ù-na-gub-bu ugu-bi ma-an(?)gub(?)
ù ana šari irbittuⁱⁱ ri-mu kad-ru-tu e-liš na-zu-uz-zu
 11. me-te-ÍB.LÁ.keš-da-a-ni mu-un-na-ni-íb-dim-ma a-mu-un-na-ru
a-na si-mat šib-bi-šu qi-iš-šu-ra-a-ti u-še-piš-ma iš-ruq

Colophon: —

XI-ám MU.ŠID-bi-im ša eli ni-bi-hi ša bel Bar-sip(*ki*)

kima laberi-šu šafir bári

i-na pî tup-pi GAZ.MEŠ šà-ťir a-me-ru la i-ta-te(?)-hi pa-a-li šal-ši

tuppi ^{m.}Arad-^{d.}Gu-la ^{amel}mašmašu anaku(?)

[má]r ^{m.d.}Adad-šum-u-šur ^{amel}ša-an-gam-ma-hu

ša ^{[m.]^{d.}}Aššur-ah-iddin šar ^{mat.}Aš-šur (*ki*)

(1) »To the strong messenger, the sovereign unrivalled clad in splendour (2) grandson of the »Bright Chamber«, perfect heir, true son, offspring of Eru'a, (3) controlling powers and commands, founder of throne and sceptre . . . (4) (establisher of rule), decreeing kingship, lord of Borsippa, dwelling in E-zida, (5) that makes his mighty aid to go at his (i. e. the king's) side, and his victory to be won, (to) his lord (6) Rammân-apal-idinnam, king of Babylon, the prince that fears him (7. 8. *Fragmentary and uncertain*) (9) a band of shining gold, duly inlaid with precious stone (10) and rampant oxen standing upon it (facing) the four winds (11) he has had made as an ornament for his (the god's) well-bound girdle and has dedicated it».

NOTES: —

Line 1. [PAP-]PAP may be restored, cf. CT. XII. 20. 38276. Rev. 4. PAP.PAP = *rabû*, the Sumer-value ending in -ug, as required by *gá* in the present passage. [*nì*-]gùr-gùr-ru = *mutillû*, restored from SAI. 6308. Rest of the line uncertain.

Line 2. The unhesitating acceptance of the name Marduk as meaning »Son of the Duku« by the Akkad. translation *benben dū-kū* i. e. »son (Nabû) of the Son of Duku (i. e. Marduk)« is most noteworthy. It provides another and

more emphatic instance to be added to KING, *Magic*, no 9, 31 and no. 12, 24, and seems to confirm that this is in fact the true etymology of the name, or, at any rate, the Babylonian view of it.

Line 3. *sak-ki-e*, see THUREAU-DANGIN, RA. XI. 142. 5; it is here regarded as a loan-word from Sum. *sak-ki*, but this does not appear to be otherwise known. *ág-gá* = *tertu* evidently stands for *á-agga*. Both *ma* and *sag-zi-bi* are incomprehensible to me. The whole of the »Sumerian« line is obviously a mere learned compilation. In the Akkad. *ú-ma-ni* is equally obscure.

Line 4. Might be restored $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{nig-bal [gi] nam-lugal sà etc.} \\ \text{mu-[kin pa-li]-e etc.} \end{array} \right.$

mu-un (= *belu*) for *u-mu-un*? Is it a verbal play upon *mun* > *gun* = *biltu* (Br. 1288)?

Line 5. Akkad. probably read [*mu-ša-lik*] etc.

Line 6. *a-ku* (= *ru-bu-u* is glossed *e-gu*, cf. Br. 10501. and contrast Yale Syll. 149, 150 and CT. XXXV. 4. 52-3. The name ^dA-ku applied to the god Sin is therefore an epithet, and this agrees with SAI. 8972.

Line 9. For *mi* (*SAL*) *dug-ga* see RA. XI. 143. The infixing of a whole adverb (*zi-de-eš*) bodily is startling Sumerian. The Akkad. line may perhaps be completed *keniš kunnu*. *kal-NA* appears to be a scribal error for *kal-la(l)*.

Line 10. *igi-GIR.PEŠ.BAL.A* is a mystery to me. And where is *kadrutu* in the Sumer?

The above text, together with the other inscriptions of Ram-mân-apal-idinnam, shows us a serious rival to Shamash-shum-ukîn in the art of concocting bad Sumerian. But our king's father was a wild Aramaean tribesman —

Credo, sic mater sic Liber avunculus eius
Sic maternus avus dixerat atque avia.

