ORDINARY MEETING.*

PROFESSOR E. HULL, LL.D., F.R.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following Elections took place:

MEMBERS:—Rev. Professor Milton G. Evans, A.M., D.D., United States


The following subject was then taken up by the author:

CERTAIN INSCRIPTIONS AND RECORDS REFERRING TO BABYLONIA AND ELAM AND THEIR RULERS, AND OTHER MATTERS. BY
THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, M.R.A.S.

I.—THE EARTHLY PARADISE.

THE question of the position of the Garden of Eden is an attractive theme that will always, in all probability, find exponents to come forward with their ideas upon the subject, and far be it from me to find fault with any of them—there are probably but few that do not help the cause of science, either directly or indirectly. It is not with any new theory, however, that I now come to you—there is little or no fresh material for that. What I now refer to is the Babylonian idea of the position of Paradise, and wherein it agrees with, or differs from the Biblical account.

* January 20, 3rd meeting of Session 1896.—The investigation of the subject taken up at this Meeting has been delayed on account of the usual difficulties attendant on critical research among Babylonian records. The study of the texts was ended, so far, and the matter passed for press October 1, 1897, see also p. 90.—Ed.
The important text for this is the large tablet published in the W.A.I., v. pl. 15 (*), lines 25-67, which was first referred to, I believe, by Prof. Sayce, who has given translations of it. My excuse for again mentioning it is, that I have found some rather important additions nearly completing 2 (= 4 bilingual) lines of the inscription, and referring to the rivers, which, in this case, are an important indication of the spot where the Babylonians located their home of the blessed, called by them Eridu, a corruption of the Akkadian guru-duga, "the good city." This text reads as follows:

1. In Eridu there grew a dark vine—in a glorious place was it brought forth;
2. Its form bright lapis-stone, set in the world beneath.
3. The path of Aê in Eridu is filled (with) fertility;
4. His seat is the centre-place of the earth;
5. His couch is the bed of Nammu.
6. To the glorious house, which is like a forest, its shade is set—no man enters its midst.
7. In its interior is the sun-god, Tammuz,
8. Between the mouths of the rivers (which are) on both sides.

There is no doubt that this highly poetical description is that of the Babylonian paradise—the name Eridu, mentioned above, is a sufficient indication of that, for it is the name of a city, a "good city" which, at the time the Persian Gulf extended farther inland than now, stood upon its shore. Within it grew "the dark vine," probably so called from its shade-giving branches, which, according to the line numbered 6, extended like a forest to "the glorious house" (ana biti éllu), or, as the Akkadian has, "its glorious house" (é-azaggânita). Eridu was regarded by the Babylonians as being the place which the path of Éa, the god of rivers, streams, etc., filled with fulness of fertility, the "place of the eye of the land" (Akk. ki ígi kuram), where Nammu, the river-god, had his bed, which formed also the resting-place of Aê. Here, too, was the abode of Tammuz—"Tammuz of the Abyss," who dwelt between the mouths of the rivers that were on both sides (ina birit pî nárâ[tī] . . . kilallan).

The Babylonian paradise had, therefore, the tree, either of knowledge or of life, and the picture they give of it is grand in its way—a wide-extending vine, gloriously bright like unto beautiful lapis-lazuli, blue and white (uknu ébbi)
in colour and appearance. Once, probably, accessible to man, it was afterwards forbidden to him, for "no man enters its midst" (ana libbi-šu manma lá īrrubu). It was a well-watered place, for the river-gods seem to have had it under their special protection and to have devoted to it their special attention, for on each side of the abode of Tammuz flowed two rivers—beyond a doubt the Tigris and the Euphrates. The remarkable likeness of this account to that of the Hebrews differs in this last circumstance, namely, that the Babylonians pictured their Paradise as having two rivers only (ida-ka-mina, "river mouth two") and not four, as the Hebrews. As in the Flood-stories of the two nations, also, there is a great difference, for the monotheism of the Hebrew account is replaced, in that of the Babylonians, by their picturesque and interestingly symbolical polytheistic system. It will probably now take its place as one of the most charming which excavations in Babylonia and Assyria have restored to us.

II.—CHEDORLAOMER AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

I now come to what many will probably regard as the most interesting part of my lecture—namely, the tablets which seem to refer to Arioch, Tidal, and Chedorlaomer.* In speaking of these tablets I have decided to treat of them in the order in which they came to my notice, and shall begin with Sp. III. 2, which contains all three names. This text is the lower left-hand part of an unbaked clay tablet about 3¾ in. wide by 2¾ in. high, the obverse giving part of 16 and the reverse part of 12 lines of writing, mostly in a very mutilated condition. The earlier lines contain a reference to "work" (ipšetu-šu), and have the word ḫammu, in which Prof. Hommel sees the beginning of the name Hammurabi, who is identified by Prof. Schrader with

* At this stage I purposely say, "seem to refer," and I wish it to be noted that I have never spoken of these names without a note of interrogation, though this was probably an excess of caution. My audience will be able to judge whether three names so similar to those in the 14th chapter of Genesis are, or are not, those of the personages mentioned in that chapter. I do not ask them, however, to express an opinion as to the magnitude or the strangeness of the coincidence if they should decide that the names given by the tablets are not those of Arioch and his allies. The other Assyriologists are now adopting the views regarding these names held by Prof. Sayce, Prof. Hommel, and myself.
Amraphel (of this king I shall speak more fully farther on). Whether the name of Hammurabi be really here or not is, however, doubtful, because the word is incomplete, and the determinative prefix for the name of a man is wanting.

§. III. 2.

3. ip-še-tu-šu la his work not
   su ḫa-am-mu
   pan (?) ʾilāni nab-nit.
   before (?) the gods, the creation of

6. lu u-mu Šamaš mu-nam-mir
day Šamaš illuminator of

   bēl bēlē D.P. Marduk (?) ina kun-nu lib-
   the lord of lords, Merodach, in the faithfulness of his
   bi-šu
   heart
   ardu (?)-uš kip-pat kali-ša ma-al-ku la
   his servant (?) the region, all of it, the ruler not
   za-nin nourishing

9. -pa u-šam-kit. Šār-šīr-ʾilāni ablu ša
   caused to be slain. Šār-šīr-ʾilāni son of
   Šār-šīr-ʾilāni a-ku
   Artōch

10. na-a-tam iš-lul mē ʾēli Bābili D.S. u
    goods (?) he carried off, waters over Babylon and
    Šē-sag-gil
    the temple Šē-saggil
11. mārī (?) - šu ina kakki kāṭa - šu kima (?) as - lu
   his son (?) with the weapon of his hands like (?) a lamb
   u-ṭa-bi-hū šu
   slaughtered him

12. bil ik-šu (?) ši D.P. šēbu u māru ina
   spoke (?) to her (?), the old man and the child
   kakki
   with the sword
   māru ik-ki-is ṭu-ud-hul-a mār
   the child he cut off. Tidal son of
   ḫa śa
   Gazz[āni?] . . .
   ṭu-ud-šu mar
   Tidal Mn of
   Ga,. . .
   Gazz[āni?] . . .
   -a-tam šu-lul mē eši Bābīli D.S. u
   goods (?) he carried off, waters over Babylon and
   ḫa-ṣag-gil
   the temple ḫa-ṣag-gil

15. mārī-šu ina kakki kāṭa-šu muḫ-ḫa-šu
   his son with the weapon of his hands upon him
   im-ḫut
   fell
   be-.lu-ᵘ-ti-šu a-na pa-an bēt
   of his dominion before the temple
   An-nu-nit . . .
   of Annunit . . .

Sp. III, 2.

Reverse.

E-lam-mat āl ḫa-hi (?) - e ana (?)
Elam the city ḫa-hē (?) to (?)
māt Rab-ba-a-tum iš-lul
the land Rabbatuahu he spoiled
ku a bu ba-niš iš-kun ma (?) - ḫa-ḫu
in ruins he set the fortress (?)
māt Akkad D.S. gab-bi Bar-ši *
the whole of Borsippa (?)
3. ik-lu  \(\text{Ku-dur-lag-mal m\breve{a}ri-su ina}\)
ended. Chedorlaomer his son with
\(\text{pat\breve{r}i parzilli sibbi-su lib-ba-shu it-ta-}\)
the steel sword \{of his\} his heart pier[ced]
\(\text{D.P. nakri-su il-ki-ma ab'-\'sarr\breve{a}ni}\)
\(\text{his enemy took and the will (?) of these (?)}\)
'a-nu-tu b\breve{e}l\breve{e} ar-[ni]
kings, lords of sin (?)
\(\text{ru-tu ka-mu-tu \'sa \'sarri \'il\breve{a}ni}\)
\(\text{rebellions (?) who the king of the gods,}\)
\(\text{D.P. Marduk i-gu-ug-\'su-nu . . . Merodock was angry against them}\)
6. mar-\(\text{sa-a-tu} m\text{ i-rat-su-nu}\)
\(\text{(with) sicknesses (?) their breast}\)
ar-rat \(\text{u-\'sur-ta . . .}\)
was oppressed [their] place
\(\text{mar(?)-ru ana na-me-e is-*-me-ni}\)
\(\text{to ruin was reduced (?)}\)
kul-lat-su-nu \(\text{ana \'sarri \'b\breve{e}l-i-ni (?)}\)
\(\text{All of them to the king our lord}\)
di-e \(\text{lib-bi \'il\breve{a}ni rim(?)-nu-u}\)
\(\text{[knowing (?) the hearts of the gods, the gracious(?)}\)
\(\text{D.P. Marduk ana zi-kir \'sumi-su}\)
\(\text{Merodach for the renown of his name}\)
9. u \(\text{\'E-sag-gil ni-bu ana}\)
\(\text{\'and \'E-saggil proclaimed (?), to}\)
a\(\text{sh-ri-su li-tur}\)
its place may he return . .
\(\text{bi-ka li\'sh-kun an-na-a \'sarrru}\)
\(\text{thy . . . may he make. This, O king}\)
b\(\text{\'eli-ia ni\'sh-ta\'s . . .}\)
\(\text{my lord we . . . .}\)
After the reference to the work of some one whose name is not preserved, to the gods, and to “Šamaš (the sungod), illuminator of [the earth?]”, Merodach, “the lord of lords,” is spoken of as having, “in the faithfulness of his heart,” devastated (?) some region, “all of it,” and, perhaps, “caused to be slain” (obv., l. 9), the ruler who did not nourish (malku la zanin, l. 8), that is, in all probability, “patronize” [the temples]. Dūr-šir-ilānī, son of Eri-[E]aku (l. 9), is then spoken of, and the spoiling of some place and devastating (?) by water ( مجلة) of Babylon and the great temple E-saggil. This is followed by a reference to the slaughtering of some person “like (?) a lamb,” a deed committed (judging from the traces on the edge) by the son of some one whose name is lost. Old and young, too, [were slain] by the sword (l. 12), and some person or thing “cut off” (l. 13), and the writer immediately afterwards refers to Tudḫala (Tidal), son of Gazzā[ni ?], and to the spoiling of some place and the devastating by water of Babylon and the temple E-saggil (l. 14)—a statement which would lead one to suppose that Tidal had imitated Dūr-šir-ilānī (see lines (9, 10), and this supposition is strengthened by the following line, where we are informed that his (?) Gazzā[ni]’s son “fell upon him with the weapon of his hand (l. 15), and then [proclaimed ?] his dominion (?) before the temple of Anunit (l. 16).

The reverse begins with a reference to the land of Elam, the city Aḫḫē (?), and the land of Rabbatuū, and I at first thought that the latter two were spoiled by the king of the former, but one may just as easily refer this line to Tudḫala or Tidal—“he spoiled [from ?] Elam and the city of Aḫḫē (?)
to the land of Rabbatu’m.” Whether, however, it was he who made some district like ruin-heaps (l. 2), and captured (?) the fortresses of the land of Akkad and the whole of Borsippa (?) (l. 2), is more than doubtful. This line refers with more probability to Kudur-laḫmal or Chedor-laomer, whose name occurs in the next line (3), with the addition that “his son, pie[reed] his ( ? his father’s) heart with the iron sword of his girdle,” probably stamping him (like Tudgula or Tidal, obv. l. 15) as a parricide. In line 4 of the rev. the person who “took his enemy” was probably the legal ruler, referred to lower down as “the king my (our) lord,” the kings who were “lords of sin[l]” being apparently the seeming parricides, Tudgula, and Kudur-laḫmal, with whom Merodach, king of the gods, was angry (l. 5), whose breasts were oppressed with sickness, whose faces [were bowed down in the dust?] (l. 6), and whose territory (?) was reduced (?) to ruins (l. 7). All these to the king recognised by the people [were compelled to submit ?], by the power of him who “knows the heart of the gods, the gracious Merodach, for the renown of his name” (ll. 7, 8). The inscription finishes with a reference to [the writing, the contents of which were then] proclaimed in E-saggil, [and which the future prince who should restore that temple] should, [when he found it], restore to its place (l. 9) [after taking note of its contents], as was the custom in those days. The sense of the 10th line is uncertain, but the 11th and 12th seem to contain a pious hope that the gods might [keep all] evil (?) from the heart [of the ruler ?], and that “a lord of sin (biḫu) might no longer exist.”

The above is an attempt to form a connected narrative from this mutilated text, the great importance of which is that it gives the three names which so closely resemble those of the two Babylonian kings and one Elamite king of the 14th chapter of Genesis. At present I will not speak of the readings of these names, nor the variant characters in them— that will be best done afterwards, and in the notes. I will merely remark that the finding on one document of three names that we should expect to see mentioned in close connection, is a thing which anyone bringing objections will have to explain away. Unsatisfactory as the condition of this text is, it would nevertheless be hard to exaggerate its interest and importance.

The next document is a rather thin fragment of a tablet in the same style of writing, but of baked clay, the obverse being fairly well preserved, and therefore giving a fairly con-
nected narrative, notwithstanding that the end of every line is broken away. The reverse of this text, however, is so mutilated as to be practically worthless. The nature of the text is historical, and very detailed, and it is of importance in that it gives the names of two of the personages who are apparently mentioned in the inscription of which I have just given a description, namely, Kudur-laggamal (as he is apparently called here), and Eri-E-kua, or Eri-Akua, evidently a variant of Eri-[E]aku), whose son is spoken of. The following is a translation of this text:—

S², II, 987.

Obverse.

3. ... ki mar-kas šam-e ša ana ir-bit
    The bond of heaven which to the four
    in-ru ... regions (?) ...
    [i]-šim-šu-nu-tum šar-taša ima Bâbîli ál
    he set them the fame which in Babylon the city
    ta-na- ...
of [his] glo[ry] ...
    i-sim-šu-nu-tum nam-kur šu-ud Bâbîli
    he set them The property of the possession of Babylon
    ša-bar u ra- ...
    small and gre[at] ...

6. ina mil-ki-šu-nu ki-ni[u] ana Ku-dur-laḫ-ga-mal
    in their faithful counsel to Chedorlaomer
    šar mât E-la[--mat] ...
    king of the land of Ela[m] ...
u-kan-nu u rid-di ga-na ša ēli-šu-nu
they said (?) “Descend.” The thing that unto them (was)
št-a-a-bi . . . . .
good [he performed, and]
ina Bâbili āl Kar -(D.P.) Dun-ya-aš šarru-ta
in Babylon, the city of Kar-Duniaš sovereignty
ip-pu-uš . . .
he exercised . . .

9. ina Bâbili D.S. āl šar šläni (D.P.) Marduk
in Babylon, the city of the king of the gods, Merodach,
id-du-u is (?) . . .
they had overthrown, he . . .
su-kul-lum u kalbē bit hab-ba-a-ta
the herd and the dogs of the house of the dens (?)
i-ma-ag-ga . . . .
he favoureth (?) . . .
iḥ-tar-ku ki-i-nu a-ri-bi mut-tab-ri-šu
he captured constantly. The raven having wings
i-ra-mu . . .
he loveth . . .

12. i-nak-kar a-ri-bi šir-ḫu tab-bi-ik
changeth, the raven, the loud crying, which pours out
mar-tu
gall . . . .
kalbu ka-si-is NER-PAD-DA i-ma-ag-ga-ar
The dog who crunches the bone he favoureth.
D.P. Nin . . .
Nin . . . .
i-nak-kar šir-ḫuṣṣu amelu hab-ba-a-tu
changeth the great snake of the man of the dens,
ta-bi-ik . . . .
which pours out . . .
Referring to Babylonia and Elam, etc.

15. [I?] a - u šarri mat E - la - mat ša
What (?) king of the land of Elam (is there) who

D.P. nun - nu E - sag - gil u - . . .
the chapel (?) (on) E - saggil has [built ?]

. . . u (?) ablē Bābili iš - ku - nu - ma šip - ru -
The sons of Babylon made and their work

šu - nu i - . . .
he . . .

. . . e - tuś ša taš - tu - ru um - ma Ana ku
[the letter (?) that thou hast written thus I am

šarru mar šarri nu (?) . . .
a king, the son of a king . . . .

18. . . . u mar marat šarri ša ina D.P. kusši
the son of the daughter of a king who on the throne

šarru - tu u - ši - bu (?) . . .
of dominion have sat . . . .

. . . Dūr - šīr - ilāni maru ša Eri - ê - ku - a ša
. . . Dūr - šīr - ilāni the son of Eri - ēkua who

šal - lat . . .
the spoil of . . .

[ina] D.P. kusši šarru - tu u - ši - ib - ma ina ma - ḫar (?) [on] the throne of dominion sat and with the sword (?)

di - i - ku (?) . . .
was killed (?) . . .

21. . . nu šarru lil - lik ša ultu ū - mu da - ru - u - tu
the king may he go who from remote days to

kun (?) . . .
sat (?) . . .

. . in - nam - bi bēl Bābili D.S. ul i - kan - nu
was proclaimed lord of Babylon prepared not
še - . . . .
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Kisilimi u arah Du’uzi ina Bâbili
Kislev and Tammuz in Babylon

in-ni-ip-pu-...
was made...

24. ... še-e-a kalû (?) sa-pi-in-nu mâtî
my... the priest (?) who destroys the land
kalî-šu ?
all of [it ?]

... bi(?)-um ina mil-ki-šu-nu ki-nu-um...
... in their faithful counsel...
... nu-a kalû (?) ku(?)-um a-
my... the priest (?) instead of a
bu-bu (?)...
flood...

27. ... rabûti (?) ina šal-lat u-še-is-
... the great ones (?) with the spoil he caused to be
bi (?)...
taken (?)...

... ša-ri-tî dam-
... ravaging (?) the...

St. II, 987.

REVERSE.

1. ... nam (?) la ša-ma-* unrivalled (?)...

2. ... šarru šakkanaku ul... the king the ruler without (rival?).

3. ... tu= nap-šat-su ta (?)... his life...
Referring to Babylonia and Elam, etc.

4. . . . . . . di . . . . . . . . . . . .

5. . . . . . lu\(^w\) D.P. Šamaš . . . . . .
   [lo]rd (?) Šamaš

6. . . . . . da-ab . . . . . . . . . . . .

7. . . . . . ku (?) . . . . . . . . . . . .

8. . . . . (pl.) ku (?) . . . . . . . . . . .

9. . . . . . še . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

10. . . . . D.P. nam (?) . . . . . . . . .
    the officials (?) . . . . . . . . . . .

11. Ū-mu ma-la . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
    days, as many as . . . . . . . . . . .

12. belē ar-nu . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
    lords (of) sin . . . . . . . . . . . .

13. kal-la mar-sa . . . . . . . . . . . .
    all (?) the sick (?) . . . . . . . . .

14. gab-šu ut-ta . . . . . . . . . . . . .
    the power (?) . . . . . . . . . . . .

15. 'ir-šu man-nu . . . . . . . . . . . .
    the wise whoever . . . . . . . . . . .

    the good of Babylon (and) Ė-saggil . . .

17. . . . . . Duppi Tu-• . . . . . . . .
    tablet of Tu-• . . . . . . . . . . . .

18. . . . . . Nabâ (?) . . . . . . . . . .
    Nebo . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

...
(A free rendering.)

the gods ........................................
the rule of the heavens which he set for them in the four regions ............. the renown that in Babylon, the city of his glory, he had set for them ........ the goods of Babylon, small and great, ...... in their faithful counsel to Chedorlaomer, king of the land of Elam, they said (?) "descend" (and) the thing that unto them was good [they performed and], he exercised sovereignty in Babylon, the city of Kar-Dunaš, [and] he placed [his throne?] in Babylon, the city of the king of the gods, Merodach. ............ the herd (?) and the dogs (?) of bit ḫabbatu he favoureth (?) ........ he captured constantly. He loveth the winged raven ........ he changeth. The loud-crying raven, pouring out the bitterness ........ the dog who cruncheth the bone, he favoureth. Nin-........ changeth. The great snake of the man of ḫabbatu who poureth forth ........ What (?) king of Elam (is there) who has [erected] a chapel (?) on E-saggil? [That?] the Babylonians made, and their work [they have perfected?]. [The letter?] that thou hast written thus: "I am a king, the son of a king, a priest (?) .... the son of the daughter of a king, who on the throne of a dominion have sat." Dûr-maḫ-ilâni the son of Eri-ēkua, who [had carried off?] the spoil, sat [on] the throne of dominion and in the presence of........ Now let the king go, who from remote days has been ordained (?), [whose name?] has been proclaimed. The lord of Babylon prepares not ...... [in the month] Sivan and the month Tammuz (there) was made in Babylon ........ my ....... a high-priest (?) who destroyeth the land, all [of it?] .......... in their faithful counsel ............ my ...... the high-priest (?) instead (?) of destruction ............ he has caused the great ones to be taken (?) with the spoil ....... ravaging the ...

What I have just read is only a free rendering of the text, the connection of which is, in many cases, very doubtful. Nevertheless there are points that are certain enough—that Kudur-(lag)gamal ruled over Babylon, and was a great lover of animals. He seems to have claimed to have built a
part of the temple of Saggil or Sagila at Babylon, and the Babylonians apparently revolted against him when the son of Eri-ékua laid claim to the throne.

The third document is much larger and much more complete than the other two, though still sufficiently mutilated. This inscription is very long, the obverse having 41, and the reverse 39 lines of writing more or less complete, the text of the latter being divided into seven paragraphs. Its poetical form will readily be recognized.


Obverse.

- ma -
 kur-ra
 the temple (?)

E-lam-mat
 Elam

bu-šu-šu
 its goods

zi-mi-šu-nu
 their faces

- am-ma u-kal-lam D.P. Šam-ši
 and exposes to the sun

me (?) is-ni-ka a-na bâbi širi
 and they pressed on to the supreme gate

dalat Ištar is-sik is-suḫ-ma it-ta-di
the door of Istar he threw down, he removed and he cast down

gišgal - li - niš
 in the holy places

kima D.P. Ur-ra la ga-mil i-ru-um-ma Dû-maḫ-īš
like Ura the unsparing he descended also to Dû-maḫ

iz-ziz-ma ina Dû-maḫ i-na-å-tal Ė-kur
he stayed also in Dû-maḫ, he saw the temple

pi-šu ipuš-am-ma itti D.P. mārē i-dib-bu-ub
his mouth he opened, and with the children he spake,
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12. ana kal-la ḫu-ra-di-e-šu u-šah-miṭ ma-ag-ri-tu

to all his warriors he hastened the message

šu-ul-la-’ šal-lat ē-kur li-ḵa-a-ma

 Carry off the spoil of the temple, take also

bu-šu-šu

its goods

suḫ-ḫa-’ u-ṣur-ta-šu šup-ri-sa-a

destroy its barrier, cause its enclosures

sak-ki-e-šu
to be cut through

15. a-na iki šu...

to the channel...

i-bu-ut mal-ki ma (?) ḫar-šu (?)

he destroyed the ruler (?)... before (?)-him (?)

... ... ... ... ... Ė-šar-ra

... ... ... ... Ė-šarra

18. ... ... ... ur-rid še-du-uš-šu

... ... ... there came down his winged bulls

u (?) saḫ-ḫi it (?)-bal par-ši-šu

he destroyed carried away its ordinances

i-ru-um-ma pa-kid (?) 讵-ŧi-šu

he drove away also the overseer of the ruler, he took away

ka-tim-tu

the vail

21. a-na D.P. En-nun-dagal-la D.P. nakru (?) is-ni-ḵa

to Ennun-dagal-la D.P. nakru (?) is-ni-ḵa

lim-ni-iš evilly

ina pani-šu īlāni il-la-biš nu-u-ri

before him the gods were clothed with light

kima bir-ḵa ib-rīk-ka i-nu-uš aš-ru-ti

like lightning he lightened and he shook the (holy) places
24. ip (?) - luḥ - ma D.P. nakru uk - kiš ra - ma - šu
feared also the enemy, he hid himself

-rid (?) - ma D.P. ni - sak - ka - šu a - ma - ti - šak-bi - šu
descended (?) also its prince a command he speaks to him

. . . man - di . . . - i īlāni il - la - biš nūri the gods were clothed with light

27. [kima bir - ka ib - rīk -] ma i - nu - uš aš - ru - ti 
[like lightning he lightened] and he shook the (holy) places

. . . . . . . . . . En-nun-dagal - la suḥ - ḫi âgê - šu
. . . . . . . . . . En-nun-dagalā, remove his crowns

. . . . . . . . . . bītī (?) - šu ti - iš - bat kat - su
[enter into?] his house, seize his hand

30. . . . ul i - du - ur - ma ul (?) ih - su - su na - piš - tu m
. . . . he feared not and he regarded not (his) life

. . . . . . . . . . En-nun-dagal - la ul u - sāḫ - ḫi âgê - šu
. . . . . . . . . . En-nun-dagalā, he removes not his crowns

. . . . . . . . . . D.P. Elam (ki) - u iz - kur ma - ta (?) - tu m
. . . . . . . . . . the Elamite proclaimed (to) the lands

33. . . . D.P. Elamu D.P. ši - e - nu iz - kur pa (?) - a - a - *niš
. . . . the Elamite, the wicked man, proclaimed far and wide (?)

. . . ša - na kat - te - e u - ša - an - na - a na - pa - al - tu m (?)
. . . the kattē repeated the matter (?)

. . . šu (?) ba . . is man - di lib - ba lu - bil - lu - u numerous (?) within (?), may they bring

ana è - kur to the temple

36. . . . . ina du - maḡ lu a - šib a - 'il ni - sak - [ku]
in Dū-maḡ then dwelling, staying (was) the chief.

. . . . . . . . . . u it (?) - bu (?) - uš D.P. kat - te - e
. . . . . . . . . . there came (?) to it the kattē

. . . . . . . . . . a (?) - al D.P. ni - sak - ku
. . . . . . . . . . stayed (?) the chief
THEO. G. PINCHES: ON CERTAIN INSCRIPTIONS AND RECORDS

39. 

mu - um eli - šu

over him

- tu

- ku

S². 158 + S². II, 962.

REVERSE.

mi . . aḫ (?) - ḫi (?) D.P. paššuru ša . . .

dish of . . .

I - nu - um ra - bi - šu šu - lum i - dib - . . .

When the guardian peace spake (?) . . .


there came down his winged bulls, who the temple

D.P. nakru D.P. Elam (?) (ki) - u ur - ri - iḫ lim - ni - e-tu

the enemy, the Elamite, multiplied evils

u Bêl ana Bâbîli (ki) u - šak - pi - du li - mun - tu

and Bel against Babylon caused to be planned evil.

6. I - nu - um la - ša - si (?) mi - ša - ri

When (there was) absence (?) of righteousness,

iz - ziz - zu - ma a - ḫi - tu

there was set also the destruction (?)

ša ē - šar - ra bit kiš - šat šăni ur - rid

of the temple, { the house of the gods, there came the multitude of }

še - du - uš - šu

down his winged bulls,

D.P. nakru D.P. Elam (ki) - u il - te - ki bu - šu - šu

the enemy, the Elamite, took its goods—
Bēl dwelling upon (?) it, had displeasure.

I-nu-um ša-bu-ru-u iš-ta-nu lim-nam (?)-šu-un
When the magicians repeated their evil (?)

D.P. Gul-šu-ma u imi-šu-lu-ma pa-as-si-ḫi (?)
Gullum and the evil wind performed (?)

[lim?] - ni-šu-un
their evil (?)

12. ur-ri-du-ma ilāni šu-nu u-ri-du-ma na-ḫab-bi-iš
come down also their gods, they have come down like a torrent

me-ḫi-e šāru lim-nu il-ma-a ša-ma-mi-iš
the storm (and) evil wind went round in the heavens

D.P. Anu pa-ti-ik-šu-nu ir-ta-ši ki-mil-tu
Anu, their creator, had displeasure

15. un-ni-ši zi-mi-šu-nu un-za-as-su
he made pale their face, he made desolate his place

[ina?] ni (?)-ib-ḫi E-an-na u-sah-ḫi ušurta-šu
in the shrine (?) of E-anna he destroyed its enclosure

. . . . a ê-šar-ra i-nu-uš ki-gal-la
. . . . . the temple, shook the platform.

18. . . . . . iz-kur šaḫ-lu-uk - tu
. . . . . . . . . he decreed destruction

. . . . . . . . . ir-ta-ši ki-mil-tu
. . . . . . . . . he had disfavour

ih (?)-pu (?)-un (?)-nat Bēl [E-] zi (?)-da
Barred (?) the people (?) of Bēl of E-zida (?)

ḫarran Šu-me-ri-iš
the road to Sumer

Who (is) Chedorlao[mer], the maker of the evils?

id-kam-ma D.P. umman ma-an-[da? . . .] un (?)-
he has gathered also the Umman-Man[da] the people (?)

nat Bēl
of Bēl,
u - na - am - ma - am - ma . . . . ina a - ḫi - šu - nu
he has laid in ruin . . . . by their side.

24. I - nu - um ša Ė - zi - da . . . . . ta - šu
When of Ėzida . . . . its . . . . .

u D.P. Nabû pa - ḫid kiš - šat ur - ri [-id ṣe - du - uš] - šu
and Nebo ruler of the host, {there came} his [winged bulls].

šap - liš ana Ti - aṃti (ki) iš - ku - [nu pa - ni - šu].
down to Tiamtu he set [his face]

27. I - ne - D.P. Tu - tu ša ki - rib Ti - aṃti (?) iḫ - muṭ
Ine-Tutu whom within Tiamtu hastened

D.P. Utu - gišgalu (?)
the Sungod (?)

i-bir - ma Ti - aṃtu (ki) ir - ma - a la šu - bat - su (?)
he entered also Tiamtu he set (that which was) not his seat

ša Ė - zi - da biti ki - nim šu - ṣur - ru - ur
of Ėzida, the everlasting temple, was the enclosure

sa ᵀ - e - šu (?)
causl to be broken through

30. [D.P. nakru D.P. Elam (ki) - u u - ṣe - šir ši - in - di - šu
[the enemy] the Elamite {caused his yoke} to be directed
{team of horses}

šap - liš ana Dûr - si - a - ab - ba iš - ku - nu pa - ni - šu
down to Borsippa he set his face

ur - ri - [da-am] - ma ħarran da - um - mat - tu ħarranu
he traversed (?) also the road of darkness, the road

Me - ēš - ki - iš
to Mešku

33. D.P. si - e - nu D.P. Elam (ki) - u u-nab - bil e-ma - aḫ - šu
the wicked man, the Elamite, destroyed its palace (?)

D.P. rubûti . . . . . i - na - ri ina kak - ki
the princes . . . . . subdued with the sword

ša Ė - kur - (ati), ka-la-šu-nu [iš] - lul (?) šal-lat-su-un
of the temples, all of them, he carried off (?) their spoil
36. [bu] - šu - šu - nu  [il?] - ki - e - ma  u - tab - ba - la  
their goods  he took and  carried off

E - lam - mat
(to) Elam

E - lam - mat

mal - ku  i - bu - ut  mal (?) - ki - šu
ruler,  he destroyed  its ruler

im - lu - u - ma  ma - a - tu
filled also  the land

39.

Si


(Free Translation of the Legend of Chedorlaomer.)

Obverse.

1. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
2. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . the temple (?)
3. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Elam
4. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . its goods
5. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . their faces.
6. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . and exposed to the sun.
7. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . and they pressed on to the supreme gate.
8. He threw down, removed, and cast down the door of Istar in the holy places,
9. He descended also, like Ura the unsparing, to Du-maḫ;
10. He stayed also in Du-maḫ, looking at the temple;
11. He opened his mouth and spake with the children (of the place).
12. To all his warriors (then) he hastened the message:—
13. “Carry off the spoil of the temple, take also its goods,
14. Destroy its barrier, cause its enclosures to be cut through.”
15. To the channel . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . they pressed on . . . .
16. He destroyed (?) the ruler (?) . . . . . . . . . before him
17. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . [from the temple] E-šarra
18. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . there came down his winged bulls
19. He destroyed . . . . . . . . . . . . he carried away its ordinances
20. He drove away also the director's overseer, he took away the vail.
21. The enemy pressed evilly on to Ennun-dagalla
22. The gods were clothed with light before him
23. He flashed like lightning and shook the (holy) places
24. The enemy feared, he hid himself
25. There descended (?) also its chief man, and he spoke to him a command
26. "... the gods were clothed with light
27. "[He* flashed like lightning] and shook the (holy) places.
28. "[Draw near unto?] Ennun-dagalla, remove his crowns!
29. "[Enter into?] his temple, seize his hand !"
30. ... he did not fear, and he regarded not (his) life
31. [He approacheth not (?)] Ennun-dagalla, he removeth not his crowns.
32. ... the Elamite proclaimed (to) the lands (?).
33. ... the Elamite, the wicked man, proclaimed far and wide (?)
34. ... the katté repeated the matter (?).
35. ... numerous (?) within (?), may they bring to the temple
36. ... the chief then dwelt and stayed in Dû-maḫ.
37. ... there came to it the katté.
38. ... the chief stayed.
39. ... over him.
40. ...
41. ...

Reverse.

1. ... dish of ...

2. When the guardian spoke (?) peace [to the city ?]
3. There came down his winged bulls, who [protect?] the temple.
4. The enemy, the Elamite, multiplied evils,
5. And Bel allowed evil to be planned against Babylon.

6. When righteousness was absent (?), there was decided (?) also the destruction
7. of the temple, the house of the multitude of the gods. (Then) came down his winged bulls.
8. The enemy, the Elamite, took its goods—
9. Bel dwelling upon † (?) it had displeasure.

10. When the magicians repeated their evil words (?)
11. Gulu[m and the evil wind performed (?) their evil (?)
12. There came down also their gods, they came down like a torrent.

* Probably Ennun-dagala.
† The characters in the original can hardly be anything else than e-li, "upon," and this would indicate that the "temple" spoken of was a tower in stages—probably that described by Diodorus as having statues of Zeus, Hera, and Rhea—the temple of Belus.
13. Storm and evil wind went round in the heavens—
14. Anu, their creator, had displeasure.
15. He made pale their face, he made desolate his place,
16. He destroyed the barrier in the shrine of E-anna,
17. [He overthrew?] the temple, (and) the platform shook.

18. . . . . . he decreed destruction,
19. . . . . . . he had disfavour.
20. The people(?) of Bel, of E-zida (?) barred (?) the road to Sumer.
21. Who is Chedor-lao[mer], the doer of the evils?
22. He has gathered also the Unman-Man[da against (?)] the people(?) of Bel—
23. He has laid in ruin . . . . . by their side.

24. When the [enclosure?] of E-zida (was) [broken down?].
25. And Nebo was ruler of the host, there came [down] his [winged bulls].
26. Down to Tiamtu he set[t his face].
27. Ine-Tutu, whom the Sungod (?) hastened within Tiamtu,
28. Entered Tiamtu, (and) founded a pseudo-capital.
29. The enclosure of E-zida, the everlasting temple, was caused to broken through.

30. [The enemy], the Elamite, caused his yoke of horses to be directed, (and)
31. Set his face (to go) down to Borsippa.
32. He traversed also the road of darkness, the road to Mesech.
33. The tyrant (?) Elamite destroyed its palace (?)
34. He subdued the princes of . . . . . with the sword,
35. He [car]ried off the spoil of all the temples,
36. [He] took their goods, and carried them away (to) Elam.
37. . . . . . . ruler, he destroyed its ruler (?),
38. . . . . . . filled also the land.
39. . . . . . .

Mutilated as it is, this text is nevertheless more satisfactory as to its condition than the other two published in this paper, and its nature is, therefore, not so difficult to determine. The obverse tells us what “the Elamite,” “the evil man” (lines 32, 33), “the enemy” (lines 21, 24) did in Du-maḫ (“the supreme seat”), where, like Ura (= Nergal, god of war and pestilence), he spoiled the temple of Istar and destroyed that of Du-maḫ, turning his attention especially to the deity Ennun-dagalla. If there be anything of truth in the narrative (and in all probability it indicates what
really took place, treated poetically), there must have been a severe thunderstorm, when "the gods flashed like lightning and shook the (holy) places," so much so that the enemy moved by superstitious fears, did not carry out his intention of carrying away the crowns of the statue of the god. He seems, however, to have taken and retained possession of the place.

The reverse seems to state why all these misfortunes came, and what further happened. It was because they accepted a foreign ruler (so it would seem from line 2); because there was denial of righteousness or justice (line 6), upon which the Babylonians set great store; because the šāburā repeated evil (words)—the winged bulls of Bēl came down, causing "storm and evil wind." The house of the host of heaven, "the temple of the multitude of the gods" (1. 7), apparently in Babylon, was destroyed, and the Elamite plundered it; the barrier of the shrine of Œ-anna (probably the temple of Nanâ at Erech) was broken down, and the platform shaken (16 and 17), it is to be supposed by some convulsion of nature.

This is followed by the reference to Chedorlaomer and the Umman-manda, whom he seems to have led when invading Sumer or Shinar (lines 18–23 of the reverse).

The next paragraph or stanza has a reference to Œ-zida, the great temple-tower of Borsippa, the enclosure of which was broken through. At this time Ine-Tutu, probably a patesi or viceroy of this district, fled to Tiamtu, the region of the Persian Gulf, where he founded a temporary capital (lines 24–29). The invader thereupon seems to have proceeded to Borsippa, and afterwards took the road to the north, to Mesech, probably the region north of Babylonia, unless we are to read, with Prof. Sayce, Šiškiš, "To Sheshach" or Babylon, as already stated.

It is noteworthy that, in the reference to Œ-anna (reverse, 1. 16), there is no mention of the carrying away of the image of the goddess Nanâ by Kudur-Nanêundi. The date given by Aššur-bani-âplî for the invasion of Akkad (Babylonia) by this ruler is 1635 or 1535 years before his own time, that is, about 2280 or 2180 B.C. Now the date of Hammurabi, who was a contemporary of Chedorlaomer, was about 2220 B.C., so that we ought probably to regard the earlier of Aššur-bani-âplî's two dates for Kudur-Nanêundi's inroad as being the more correct.

In the foregoing pages, I have treated of the three texts
referring to Chedorlaomer and the other kings in the order in which I identified them, but this is probably not their true order, for the determining of which we must wait for further material.

They refer to a very powerful ruler and conqueror of ancient times, who overran Babylonia, spoiling its cities and temples, which latter, from their great wealth, naturally excited his cupidity. The history of this conqueror seems to have been told at great length by the scribes, possibly on account of the circumstances attending his expulsion, as seems to be indicated by the second document (Sp. II., 987), which mentions the claim of a prince who is evidently the son of Arioch, who there (apparently) calls himself "a king, the son of a king, the son of the daughter of a king." Naturally these texts all refer, for the most part, to Babylonia, that being the country most affected by the conqueror's warlike zeal, though his conquests in other parts may possibly be spoken of in the first text (Sp. III., 2). The existence of portions of three tablets referring to the conquests of Kudur-laggamal show how profoundly the heart of Babylonia was stirred by the misfortunes that the conqueror brought upon their land, and their gratitude at final deliverance must have been proportionately great.

It is necessary, in view of the criticisms that have been made, to say something about the names. We will therefore take that of the chief personage, Kudur-laggamal, first. This name is written, as I have elsewhere remarked, in a very fanciful way, namely, with the character ku four (or three) times repeated, and mal, thus \[\text{Kudur-laggamal}\]. Now there are probably none who will deny that the group \[\text{Kudur}\]—that is regarded, by all who have seen the text, as certain. For the next character (\[\text{lag}\]) again I had suggested the value of laṭ (the polyphony of the Assyrian syllabary obliges the student to be constantly on the outlook for new values). For the fourth \[\text{gu}\] the bilingual lists suggested the value of gi or gu (a softening of the common value of the character, ku), and the syllabaries indicated for the last character, \[\text{mal}\], the value of mal. Now the name Tudgula in the first text (Sp. III., 2) corresponds, as far as the consonants are concerned, with the Tidal of Genesis xiv., and Eri-Eaku or Eri-Ekua corresponds very well with Arioch (of this name I shall speak later on).
our fancifully written name, therefore, a form corresponding with the Biblical Chedorlaomer was suggested, for which Kudur(laq)gumal gave, with little or no doubt, the first two and the last two syllables—those corresponding to Chedor and 'omer. For the remaining character the value of la or lag is required. These values are indicated by the syllabaries and bilingual-lists, and will be given in full in the notes. For the present we may simply say that the characters \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \) (the second component is slightly doubtful, but can hardly be anything else than here indicated, as a parallel passage shows) have the variant \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), pa-h-ih, showing that the second character has the value of lih (lih), and characters having that value (\( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \) and \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \)) can also be read lah and luh (laq, luq), as is shown in Brünnow's "Classified list." \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), moreover, has the meaning of ellig, as has also the character \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), one of whose values is, as already remarked, laq (laq)—indeed, the value of laq for \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \) seems to be clearly indicated by W.A.I. III., pl. 3, lines 51 and 52, where, as I have elsewhere pointed out, we must read \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), lag, for \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \). It is to be noted that Prof. Hommel's reading of dug is a very suggestive one. \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), as is well known, has that value, as well as that of tug, and t and l interchange in Akkadian, as shown by \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), uqa, and \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), ulaq, which are given as the Akkadian values of \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \) (W.A.I. V., pl. 38, lines 35 b and 61 c). Here, then, are three arguments for the values of lag, ligg, and ligg for \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), besides the intrinsic probability of the tablets themselves, for it is in the highest degree unlikely that tablets containing the name of Tidal and others closely resembling Arioch and Chedorlaomer, the last designated "king of Elam," and "the Elamite," should not, after all, refer to those personages.

The name identified with Arioch is written \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), Eri-E-a-ku, and \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), Eri-e-ku-a, the latter form showing that the character to be restored in the first form is \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \). The question naturally arises whether, in the form Eri-e-ku-a, the last two characters are not transposed (\( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \) for \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \)), as the final \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \) does not seem to belong to the word which follows, though that is certainly possible. The equivalence of the above forms, \( \text{\text{\text{\text{}}}a\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}}} \), is clear.
REFERRING TO BABYLONIA AND ELAM, ETC.

is placed beyond doubt by the fact that the son in both cases is , variant , a name meaning "the great" (or "supreme") "fortress of the gods."* The equivalence would not have been absolutely provable otherwise. With regard to the name Eri-Eaku, or Eri-ekua, an extremely important suggestion by Prof. Sayce is worthy of notice. In a communication that he has made to me upon the subject, he says: "Ea, must have been pronounced in late Babylonian, as is shown by the "Aos of Damascius." This is a suggestion that would indicate that Eri-Aaku and Eri-akua are better transcriptions than those indicated above, and probably explains the variant of , for the name of the well-known deity , or, as we should probably transcribe in both cases, Aa = "Aos, as mentioned in the note of Prof. Sayce already referred to.

FURTHER TEXTS BEARING ON THE ABOVE.

The letters of Hammurabi discovered in the Museum of Constantinople by Father Scheil are three in number, and are addressed by that ruler to a certain Sinidinnam, to whom he makes certain communications concerning the affairs of his kingdom. The text referring to Chedorlaomer I reproduce here after Father Scheil's copy, which I venture to retranscribe into the Babylonian character.

TEXT.

* At first, influenced by its meaning, I regarded this as the name of a city, but the text of Sp. II., 987, when brought to bear upon Sp. III., 2, precludes the possibility of that.
TRANSCRIPTION.

A - na    Sin - i - din - nam
ki    be - ma
3. um - ma    Ha - am - mu - ri - bi - ma
   I - la - a - ti₄ša E - mu - ut - ba - li₄
   ed - li - ti - ka
6. um - umša Ku - dur - la-ah - ga-mar
   u - ša - al - la - ma - ak - ū
   I - nu - ma is - ša - an - ba - ni - ik - ku
9. i - na umman - i₄ša ga - ti - ka
   umman - a₄ lu - pu - ut - ma
   i - la - a - ti₄
12. a - na šu - ub - ti - ši - na
  li - ša - al - li - mu

TRANSLATION.

1. To Sin-idinna salope also
3. thus Hammurabi
4. The goddesses of Emutbalu
5. (for) thy heroism
6. (on) the day of Chedorlaomer
7. I shall deliver to thee,
8. When they ask them back from thee
9. with the people of thine hand
10. overthrow the people, and
11. the goddesses
12. to their seats
13. let them deliver
FREE RENDERING.

"Hammurabi sends thus to Sin-idinna'. I shall hand over to thee the goddesses of Emutbalu (on account of) thy heroism on the day of Chedorlaomer. When they demand them back from thee, overthrow thou their people with the people who are with thee, and let them restore the goddesses to their shrines."

In other words, this was a gift to Sin-idinna' which he would have to renounce if there were difficulties connected with its retention, for the people might demand their goddesses back. Should this take place, Sin-idinna' was apparently to chastise the people, and then restore the images to their ancient shrines, in order that the conquered might see that the conqueror, though he would not be dictated to, was merciful.

Father Scheil seems to have found the true key of the situation. Sin-idinna' was, as is well known, king of Larsa, and he points out that he must have been the last ruler before the two Elamites, "princes of Emutbal," Kudur-Mabug and his son Rim-Agu or Eri-Aku (Arioch), dispossessed him, and the latter became king of Larsa. Sin-idinna' of Larsa is very probably the same person as the Sin-idinna' to whom Hammurabi writes, and to whom Hammurabi, if he did not actually replace him upon the throne of Larsa, at least gave considerable authority, and helped to drive out the Elamites from his territory.

As, in Gen. xiv, Chedorlaomer is called king of Elam, it is to be supposed that he had no authority in Babylonia itself. In all probability he simply invaded the country to help his countrymen and possibly kinsmen, Kadur-Mabug and his son Rim-Agu, Eri-Eaku, or Arioch, and it is to be supposed that they were all driven out together by the allied native princes of Babylonia, Hammurabi or Amraphel, and Sin-idinna', the rightful king or viceroy of Larsa.

Fortunately there exists what may be regarded as the official record of the victory gained by Hammurabi. It is the colophon-date of the tablet B, 64, which records the sale of a plantation by Ana-Sin-emida to Muhaddu' for 2½ shekels of silver. This important entry is as follows:

Iti Aš-a uda niš-eša-kama
Mu Ḫa-am-mu-ra-bi lugala
ma-da Ya-mu-ut-ba-lu
u lugala Ri-im-Agu
šu-ni sa-ne-du.

Month Sebat, day 23rd,
Year Hammurabi the king
the land of Yamutbālu
and king Rim-Agu
his hand captured.

Judging from Sp. III., 2, and Sp. II., 987 (see above, pp. 4–14), Dūr-ṣir-ilānī, son of Arioch, took part in certain political events, and even seems (p. 14) to have laid claim to the throne of Babylon. The history of that period will only be known, however, after the records here printed are completed by further discoveries in Babylonia, and possibly, in Assyria as well.†

Notes to Sp. III., 2 (pp. 46 ff).

Obverse.

4. Prof. Hommel here restores the name Hammurabi, as does likewise Prof. Sayce, who completes also at the beginning [ina tar-] su, making this part read “[In the] time of Hammurabi,” “whose praises,” he adds, “are sung in the following lines.”

8. Zanānu, from which zanin comes, mean “to rain,” and “to nourish,” or “be patron of,” as in the expression zanin

* The envelope here adds 𒀀, the determinative suffix indicating a place-name.
† The envelope has 𒈗₃₃𒈗, šu-ni sa-ne-šu-n-du. The root of the Akkadian verb is 𒈗₃₃𒈗 sa-du-ga, which is translated in W.A.I. II., pl. 15, l. 46a, by a form of the word kašādu, “to capture.”
‡ Another text regarded as referring to Rim-Agu is that published in W.A.I. iv., pl. 35, No. 8, in which the name is spelled Ri-im-D.P. A-gam-um or Rim-Agum. Prof. Hommel, at the Orientalist Congress lately held in Paris (1897), suggests, however, that this is possibly a mistake for Rim-Anu, the name of a king of Larsa recently found on tablets from Senkārah. Whether Rim-Agu and Rim-Anu be the same or different rulers is at present uncertain.
E-sagila und E-zida, "patron of (the temples) E-sagila and E-zida," and it is apparently the meaning which zanin has here.

9. Usomkit, "he causes to be slain," is apparently the verb to the lost portion of the line, and perhaps refers to malku la zanin [êšrêti?], "the ruler who was not patron of the [temples?]," in line 8.

Dûr-šir-ilâni, "the supreme fortress of the gods," is a phrase that one would hardly expect to find as the name of a man. Such names, however, were probably not uncommon at the time, for we find such expressions as Aûšur-dûr-pâni-ia, "Asshur is a fortress before me," etc., used as names of men. The transcription of the first syllable of Dûr-šir-ilâni is confirmed by the variant for E-saggil in Sp. II, 987, line 19 (plate II). Cf. page 69.

For Eri-(D.P.)[E]-a-ku, variant Eri-(D.P.) E-ku-a (apparently a mistake for the first form) and Prof. Sayce's remarks upon the pronunciation of E-sagila, see p. 69.

10. Islul, "he carried off," "spoiled," seems to belong to the words at the beginning of the line, now lost. The phrase "waters (mê) over Babylon and E-saggil" is obscure. The character ū has so many meanings besides that of "water," that it is difficult to choose between them. As, therefore, the meaning here adopted is by far the most common, it seems best to retain it, regarding the word as probably used as a poetical expression for "destruction." E-saggil was the name of the great temple-tower at Babylon, and it is noteworthy that the spelling E-saggil (probably pronounced E-sangil) is late. The earlier texts generally give E-sagila, which is more correct.

13. The name Tudhula corresponds very well with that of Tidal (Heb. ñûñññ), the Greek form of which is Θαργάλα, showing that the y had the guttural sound similar to the Arabic ğ, represented in Assyrian, as a rule, by b (= ṣ = ç), which was the nearest that those who used the wedge-writing could get to this sound. The LXX. had the disadvantage of an incorrect reproduction of the name (n for ñ)
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in the copy of the Hebrew text which they used, hence the form Θαργαλ for Θαδγαλ. The Babylonian scribes seem to have given it an Akkadian etymology, T dul'ula apparently meaning, in that language, “the evil offspring,” or (if we regard dul'ula as another form of gula or gala), “the great offspring.” The vowel of this name (if it be Akkadian) is probably incorrect in both the Hebrew and the Greek forms. How his father's name (of which we have only two syllables, namely, Gazza...) is to be completed, is uncertain, but the full form, as I have restored it, may be regarded as very probable, being based upon what is probably the same name on a tablet concerning which I hope to speak elsewhere.

14. This line is the same as line 10, which see.

15. The form muhha-su, “upon him,” for the more usual mubbi-su is noteworthy.

16. The last word, the name Annunit, is interesting on account of the archaic writing of the first syllable, the name being found at 2200 B.C. and thereabouts, spelled as above, but with the ending um (►+ ▼+ ▲ ▼, An-nu-ni-tu'm). The late style of writing is ►+ ▼+ ▲ ▼, D.P. A-nu-ni-tu'm. Of course it is possible that the form in the text originally had this ending, but if so, it probably had double t (►+ ▼+ ▲ ▼, An-nu-ni-tu'm).

REVERSE.

1. The name of the city, Abbe, is doubtful with regard to the latter part, notwithstanding that the traces of characters and the needs of the text require some such character (Α, ή) as is here restored. As the character Χ, which the tablet has, seems to be impossible, I have regarded the horizontal wedge as accidental, and read simply Χ, ana.

2. Here the scribe seems to have written Ξ, zu, for Ξ, ma, in maḥazu. Prof. Sayce completes the last word as the name of Borsippa, which is possible, in which case the whole was probably written ξ | ξ | ξ | ξ | ξ | ξ, Bar-ši-ip, D.S. The common way of writing it is ξ | ξ | ξ | ξ, Bar-šip, D.S., but the forms ξ | ξ | ξ | ξ, Bar-šip, D.S., and ξ | ξ | ξ | ξ, Bar-šip, D.S., are also found, as well as Ξ | Ξ | Ξ | Ξ | Ξ | Ξ | Ξ | Ξ, Ba-ar-zi-pa, D.S.
3. \( \text{Ku-dur-la\text{-}gmal} \), is defectively written for \( \text{Ku\text{-}dur\text{-}la\text{-}ga\text{-}mar} \). For another way of writing it, see p. 28, and the note to Sp. II, 987, ll. 6–7, below.

4. \( \text{ab\text{-}rat} \). The translation of this word is a conjecture. \( \text{a\text{-}nu\text{-}tu} \), is possibly an old way of writing \( \text{ann\text{-}tu} \), plural masc. of \( \text{ann} \), this, agreeing with \( \text{sarr\text{-}ni} \). The form with one \( n \) occurs in \( \text{Assur\text{-}nasir\text{-}apli I, 90} \).

6. \( \text{ar\text{-}rat} \), is apparently 3rd pers. fem. permansive of \( \text{ar\text{-}ru} \), “to bind.”

9. \( \text{ni\text{-}bu} \), seems to be a byform of the permansive \( \text{nab\text{-}u} \), “to proclaim.”

NOTES TO SP. II, 987. (pp. 51 ff.).

4. \( \text{\text{-}sar\text{-}ta\text{-}m} \). The translation “fame” is a conjecture —the rendering “happiness” would also make good sense. The reading \( \text{sartam} \) is also possible.

6–7. Prof. Sayce here translates (ana \( \text{Kudur\text{-}la\text{-}gmal} \), etc.) “To Chedorlaomer the King of Elam they answered, ‘Descend!’ thereupon that which seemed good unto them [he performed].” The reading \( \text{Kudur\text{-}lag\text{-}mal} \) in Father Scheil’s tablets is also given as \( \text{Kudur\text{-}la\text{-}g\text{-}ga\text{-}mar} \), agreeing very closely with the \( \text{Ku\text{-}dur\text{-}la\text{-}g\text{-}m\text{-}al} \), cf this tablet. For the shorter form, see above.

8. Kar-Duniaš would appear from this to be the district in which the city Babylon was situated, confirming Delitzsch in \( \text{Wog} \text{lag das Paradys} \), p. 134.

10. \( \text{\text{-}bab\text{-}a\text{-}ta\text{--}} \) is apparently for \( \text{\text{-}hab\text{-}a\text{-}ta\text{--}} \), the character for “dog” followed by the plural sign. \( \text{\text{\text{-}hab\text{-}a\text{-}ta\text{--}}} \) is a doubtful expression, but it would seem, from its connection, to be a “house” where wild animals are kept, \( \text{bit \text{-}hab\text{-}ba\text{-}a\text{-}ta\text{--}} \). I regard \( \text{habbata\text{--}} \) as being the plural of a feminine noun, the singular being possibly \( \text{habbu} \) or \( \text{habbatu} \), and possibly derived from the Akk. \( \text{\text{-}hab\text{-}} \), “hollow place,” “den.” See the \textit{Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society}, 1894, p. 850, cuneiform text, line 18, (\( \text{\text{-}habbu} \)) and 25 (read \( \text{\text{-}hab\text{[\text{bu}]}} \)). The “house of robbers” does not seem to suit the context,
and we should not expect the form \( \text{hābbātu}' \), but \( \text{ḥabbātē} \).

11. ḫātkū is the secondary form of the kal of ḫarāku, the meaning of which, Delitzsch suggests, is “to engrave.” This, however, can hardly be correct, as such an expression would come in rather suddenly here. As it is animals that are referred to in this passage, this verb ought to express something relating to them, and in this connection we may perhaps compare the Heb. \( \text{ḇabbātē} \), not with the meaning of the A.V., “to roast,” but with that of the LXX., Chald. and Syr. “to take,” “catch.” The \( ḫ \) should be \( k \), not \( ḫ \). The word \( \text{kinu} \) may belong to what follows, and, if so, must be rendered “faithful”—“he loveth the faithful winged raven.”

12. The character \( \text{ḥē} \) here is equivalent to the Assyrian \( \text{ḥē} \), the values of which are \( \text{mu} \) and \( \text{sub} \). It is evidently used here, and in line 14, for \( \text{ḥē} \), Assyrian \( \text{ḥē} \), \( \text{nāk} \).

15–21. The lacunae here make the text very difficult. Prof. Sayce translates and completes thus: “Who (\( aū \)) is the king of Elam who has [removed?] the woodwork of E-saggil [which] the sons of Babylon had erected, and has [destroyed] their work? [These are the] words which thou has sent saying: ‘I am a king, the son of a king un[rivalled?]. Who (\( aū \)) is the son of a king’s daughter who has sat on the throne of royalty? Dūr-šīr-īlāmī, the son of Ėriāku, the son of the queen Kur . . . has sat on the throne of royalty, and in front of the sanctuary (\( ďī \)) has [worshipped] (\( ḫ\text{lākhhū} \)). Therefore (\( ēnū \)) let the king march,” etc.

In l. 15 \( \text{ḥē} \) \( \text{ḥē} \) \( \text{ḥē} \), D.P. \( \text{nūn-nū} \), is the difficult word. If from the Akk. \( \text{ḥē} \), \( \text{nūn} \), it should mean the great woodwork.” In my rendering I have regarded it as referring to the chapel or shrine at the top of E-saggil. The part of a word at the end of l. 16 may be restored as \( \text{ḥē} \) \( \text{ḥē} \), \( \text{ḥē} \), \( \text{ḥē} \), \( \text{nīsakkū} \), “ruler,” “prince.” Prof. Sayce has apparently completed this \( \text{ḥē} \) \( \text{ḥē} \) \( \text{ḥē} \) \( \text{ḥē} \), \( \text{lā ṣa-na-an} \), “unequalled.”

The last character of l. 21 is apparently to be completed as \( \text{idā} \), i.e., \( \text{idā} \), Assyrian \( \text{idā} \), \( \text{kūn} \). The full word was possibly \( \text{kūnū} \).
REVERSE.

This is very mutilated indeed, in fact, remains only of about 18 lines (including the colophon) exist, and profitable commentary upon these is impossible. All that may be said with safety is, that it probably gave a continuation of the historical narrative of the obverse.

Sp. 158 + Sp. II, 962. (pp. 57 ff.)

OBVERSE.

1-3. Prof. Sayce suggests that these lines should be completed in accordance with the rev. lines 33-36: [The Elamite destroyed] its palace, he subdued the princes (and) . . . . . with the sword, he carried off the spoil of] the temple(s), [all of them, he took their goods, and carried them off] (to) Elam.”

4. Here, possibly, we have to complete: “[The enemy, the Elamite, took] its goods.”

5. Prof. Sayce suggests the completion: “[he made pale] their faces, as in line 15 of the reverse.

7. The difference between ע and צ is not observed by the scribe. In insika, we must, of course, read the latter.

8. For ע, nis, we ought, perhaps, to read עע, eš, making the word gišgalëš. The adverbial -eš or -iš, in this text, is frequently used to express “in,” “to,” or “from,” like Du-mahš (l. 9), nakabbiš (rev., l. 12), šamamš (rev., 13), Šumerš (rev., l. 20), Meššš (rev., l. 32).

11. Prof. Sayce suggests that ע ע ע ע, mārē, “children,” here refers to the soldiers. They are, in fact called kuradē, “warriors,” in the next line.
12. *Magamum*, from the context, “message” or “command,” as the thing to be obeyed. Probably from *magāru*, “to obey.”


14. *Sūhā* is imperative plu. piel of *saḫū*, meaning “to destroy.” *Suprisā* is imperative plu. shaphel of *parāsu*, “to divide.” *Sakkē* I have rendered as plural, but it may be singular (see rev. l. 29). The meaning “enclosure” seems to be that required by the context.

17. Prof. Sayce regards a fresh paragraph beginning *Inum*, “when” (cf. rev., lines 2, 6, etc.), as having begun with this line.

18. *Urrid* is from *ārādu (= warādu), probably aor. of the pael. *Seduššu* is apparently for *šeduššu*, and, if so, is probably the plural of *šedu*, with suffixed pronoun. This phrase occurs also in lines 3, 7, and (25) of the reverse.

19. *U-sah-hi* is the most probable completion of the word, after which Prof. Sayce suggests the restoration *usurta-sū* (“he destroyed its barrier”).

20. *Iṣṣu-ṣu* is the Akk. equivalent of *maliku*, “ruler.” Prof. Sayce suggests that *pakid* refers to the god *Nebo* (cf. rev., 1. 25). *Issuḫ* is from *nasāhu*, “to remove,” and *katimtu* from *katamu*, “to cover.”

21. *Ukkis*. This can hardly be the *ākasu* (*םקף*), “to put an end to,” of Delitzsch’s *Handwörterbuch*, but must be from *kus*, “to diminish,” the noun from which, *kus*, is explained as “the station where the moon is eclipsed.” It is with this meaning that the Babylonian word is apparently connected.

25. The first word should apparently be completed *urrid*. *Nisakku* is of Akkadian origin, and means “he who (*ni*) is head” (*sag*).
29. The form *tišbat* is interesting—it is an imperative like *tišab*, “set” in the American portion of the British Museum tablet 85–4–30, 48 (see my article upon this text in *Hebraica* for Oct., 1886, p. 17, l. 9).

33.  ḫēnu. This word generally means “good,” and in this agrees with the Akkadian ideograph expressing it, *nig-a-zi* (for *nig a-zi-du*), “he who” or “that which is right” (lit. “on the right hand”). This rendering, however, clearly fits neither here, nor in line 33 of the reverse. We have, therefore, to regard this word as the same as the *šēnu* or *šēnu* which translates the Akkadian *テーマ*, *šēnu*, and is a synonym of *bētu* (or *bētu*), “bad.” (See *J.R.A.S.* for 1894, p. 830). Prof. Sayce translates similarly, “wicked man,” and suggests the placing of *inum*, “when,” at the beginning of the line (cf. rev. ll. 3, 6, etc.).

34. *Napaltu* may be from *napalu*, or (if *l* represent a sibilant) from *napasu*, *napasu*, or *napašu*.

36. *A‘il* in this line and *a‘al* in l. 28 are possibly from the same root, and may be connected with the word *âlu*, “city,” as “dwelling-place.”

Sp. 158 + Sp. II, 962. (pp. 57 ff.)

Reverse.

Prof. Sayce suggests, as an alternative rendering of *Inum rabīṣu šulūm idib[uš]*, “When he said ‘Rabīṣu, peace!’”

6. The character Ṭ U are doubtful, but are more probable than any others. *La-šasi* may be a compound word meaning “non-pronouncement” (like *la-šubat-su*, “his pseudo-capital” in line 28). *Ahitu* is the fem. of *ahu*, “foreign,” here used, apparently, like *ahita* (acc.) in W.A.I. IV., 48, obv. l. 3, for “untoward” “contrary” (fate). (See Delitzsch, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 41b).

10. *Saburā* seems to be preferable to *aburā*. I have regarded the word as possibly a variant of *šabrā*, “magician,” “seer.” Further material is required to find out the true meaning.

11.  ḫēnu, or, giving the second character its earlier form, ḫēnu; D.P. *Gul-lum*, the god *Gullumm* or *Kullum*, is probably from the Akkadian, and would mean
“the god of destruction” (gul = ábātu, “to destroy”). The next word, imi-šullu (mer-šullu and tu-šullu are also possible readings) is likewise from the Akkadian, and means “evil wind” (imi, mer, or tu, “wind,” šul, “evil”).* Upassihi is for upassišu (sing. for plu., as in obv., ll. 22, 23, etc.), from pasāšu, probably not a variant form (with s for š) from pošāšu, “to cease,” “be quiet,” as this meaning does not seem to suit very well. The Heb. cognate of pašāšu, however, has s for š (יָשָׁפַל), as in the present text.

18. Prof. Sayce suggests the completion of this line as Inum nakru Elamû, “When the enemy, the Elamite (decreed destruction).”

28. La šubat-su, “not his seat.” This curious expression is not without its parallel in Assyrian, as in lá kēttu, “not right,” “wrong”; lá-annu, “unsin,” “innocence”; lá-bēl-kussî, “a not-lord-of-the-throne,” “a usurper.”

29. Šuḫurrur is shuphul permansive of ḫarāru, “to hollow out,” “dig through,” whence ḫurrû, “hollow,” “hole”; ḫarrû, ‘canal,” and ḫarranu, “road” (probably originally a dual). The expression šuḫurrur šakkē-šu is a parallel to šuprisa šakkē-šu, “came its enclosure to be cut through” in l. 14 of the obverse.

32. Meškiš. Prof. Sayce suggests here ל, ši (Šiškiš) for ל, me (Meškiš), which would mean “to Babylon” (יִשְׂרָאֵל, Jer. xxv, 26; li, 41). The character ל, however, is certain, and, if correct (as we are bound to assume it is) it implies a further extension of the Elamite conquests spoken of, and furnishes an interesting explanation of Psalm cxx, 5: “Woe is me, that I sojourn in Mesche,” i.e., in the land of darkness, the ḫarran daummata “road of darkness” of this passage. Prof. Hommel regards Ки (ki) as a determinative suffix, and reads “to Mish.”

**POSTSCRIPT.**

In the foregoing pages an attempt has been made to give fair renderings of three very difficult texts, one of them of considerable length. Their mutilated state has prevented the author from making translations which may be regarded

* Gullum u imi-šullum seems to be parallel to the mehe šāru limnu, “storm (and) evil wind,” in line 13.
as really satisfactory; improvements will doubtless be made as time goes on, and there is always the hope that perfect, or at least, more perfect copies than those here given, may come to light, changing much of what is uncertain and lacking, and giving us, instead, really trustworthy documents.

The author has not thought it necessary to reply specifically to the various criticisms that have been made, the critics having commented upon the texts without taking into consideration all the facts, even when they knew them, and he could, he thinks, place his finger upon at least one case of deliberate suppression. These critics it would be absolutely impossible to convert, even if the author had any desire to do so. With such imperfect texts as these, however, dogmatising is impossible, and the author disclaims any such intention. It is quite indifferent to him whether מֶרוּפֶּד be Chedorlaomer, Arioch, and Tidal respectively—they may be entirely different personages, but if they are not what they seem to be, it is a remarkable historical coincidence, and deserves recognition as such.

The author greatly regrets that he was not able to refer so much to Professor Hommel's Ancient Hebrew Tradition as he would have liked, this paper having already assumed its present form before that work came to hand. He here takes the opportunity, however, of publicly thanking Professor Hommel for the kind way in which he has mentioned his name, and referred to the texts here published, and he recommends to the reader desiring the opinion of another specialist and earnest student of Assyrian, the striking work of the well-known and eminent professor of Oriental languages in the University of Munich.
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DUR-MAĞ-ILANI (SON OF ERI-[E]AKU), TUDGULA, AND KUDUR-LAĞMAL.
* Or antasy

For the transcription and translation, see pp. 46–49.
It has not been thought worth while to print the text of the reverse, that portion being too mutilated to give any connected sense. A transcription and translation of the whole tablet, including the reverse, will be found on pp. 51–55.
Referring to Babylonia and Elam, etc.

1 Or ₪.

2 Or ₪.

For the transcription and translation, see pp. 57-65.
At the Meeting of the Victoria Institute at which the investigation of this subject was commenced the discussion was of a conversational character. Proof copies of the first eight pages of the paper were sent to members, especially known Assyriologists, among these Professors Hommel, Sayce, and others whose co-operation was desired.

The following letter, written by the Rev. Professor A. H. Sayce, D.D., refers to one of the very interesting points involved in the matter investigated.

Assuan, February 18, 1896.

I believe that we have at last an explanation of the enigmatic title given to Tidal in the 14th chapter of Genesis, “Tidal King of Nations.” Mr. Pinches read a very interesting paper on the important Babylonian texts recently discovered by him which relate to Kudur-Lagamar or Chedor-laomer, Tudkhula or Tidal, and Eri-Aker or Arioch. They are, unfortunately, all more or less mutilated; but one of them states that Kudur-Lagamar “assembled the Umman-Manda” or “nomad hordes” of the East when he “did evil” to the people and land of Bel. The Biblical Goyyim “nations” would be the Hebrew equivalent of the Babylonian Umman-Manda; and in Tidal, therefore, I see a king of the nomad hordes who adjoined Elam on the north. This throws light upon a passage in the great Babylonian work on astronomy which runs as follows:

“The Umman-Manda come and rule the land; the mercy-seats of the great gods are removed; Bel goes to Elam. It is prophesied that after thirty years the vanquished (?) shall be restored, and that the great gods shall return with them.”

As Kudur-Lagamar was King of Elam, we can understand why the consequence of the incursion of the Umman-Manda was that Bel should go to Elam. I may add that the texts discovered by Mr. Pinches seem to be oracles addressed to the Babylonian King Khammurabi.