COMMENTATIONES

Hammurabi's self-presentation[1]

(TAB. XXXI)

Marc VAN DE MIEROOP

In memoriam Jeremy Black

Preface

It is with sadness that I dedicate this article to the memory of my friend Jeremy Black. We discussed aspects of it a few weeks before his untimely death in the spring of 2004, and his last e-mail communication to me included answers to some lexical questions. He provided those with his usual generosity. The almost decade-long time lag between that moment and now was partly due to reasons beyond my control, but mostly because of other publishing obligations. When I submitted the manuscript for publication in *Orientalia*, Father W. Mayer revised the philological sections, and they are now also his work.

1. Introduction

Hammurabi of Babylon's fame rightly derives from his so-called law code, the two-and-a-quarter-meter high diorite stele that French archaeol-

[1] I have benefited from the help of several colleagues in the preparation of this article. Helen Whitehouse (Ashmolean Museum) allowed me to study the fragments from Kish, and Ulla Kasten (Yale Babylonian Collection) made the fragments published in YOS 9 available to me. Geoff Emberling and Walter Farber (University of Chicago) provided me with information and a photograph of the piece in the Oriental Institute (A3518), which is published here by courtesy of the Trustees of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Jonathan Taylor (British Museum) provided me with information and a photograph of BM 1927-5-27-24A, which is published here by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum. Benjamin R. Foster (Yale University) and Christopher Woods (University of Chicago) discussed several passages with me, and Fumi Karahashi (Chuo University, Tokyo) provided lexical information. To all I owe thanks.

ogists excavated in Susa and now on display in the Louvre Museum in Paris. The original location of the monument is often said to have been Sippar, north of the capital Babylon[2], but the inscription itself states Hammurabi set it up before his statue when referring to the city Babylon (CH XLVII 59-78)[3]. The "law code" has dominated Hammurabi's image in modern times among scholars of the Ancient Near East and non-scholars alike. When the former Iraqi Ba'th party wanted to inspire its legislators to obey the rule of law, it set up a massive statue of Hammurabi at the entrance of the parliament in Baghdad[4]. The same Hammurabi is portrayed in the US House of Representatives Chamber as one of the "historical figures noted for their work in establishing the principles that underlie American Law"[5]. Especially in the last half century scholars have argued convincingly that the stele does not contain a law code in the sense of the Napoleonic Code and the like and was not intended to guide judges in their deliberations of court cases. The stele was a public monument to commemorate Hammurabi as a king of justice (Akkadian *šar mīšarim*), and it demonstrated his accomplishments in that aspect of government by exemplifying legal principles that existed in his reign. There is scholarly disagreement about the relevance of the laws and whether the monument demanded respect for the king or for the law and the monument is certain to elicit further discussion[6].

[2] G. R. Driver – J. C. Miles *The Babylonian Laws* (Oxford 1952) Volume I 29 may be the first study to suggest that Sippar "presumably" was the original site of the stele, rejecting Babylon because the Elamite Shutruk-Nahhunte was not known to have reached that city. Some adopt the Sippar origin as certain, for example, G. Roux, *Ancient Iraq* (Harmondsworth/New York ²1980) 191, and P. O. Harper, *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre* (New York 1992) 159. More cautious are A. Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East c. 3000-330 BC* (London/New York 1995) 111, M. T. Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (Atlanta ²1997) 73, and B. André-Salvini, *Le Code de Hammurabi* (Paris 2003) 6, who all say "probably".

[3] Roth, *Law Collections* 133-134. Some conclude that Babylon was its original location, for example, D. J. Wiseman, "The Laws of Hammurabi Again", *JSS* 7 (1962) 166, Z. Bahrani, *Rituals of War* (New York/Cambridge 2008) 119; others state that we do not know, G. Leick, *The Babylonians. An Introduction* (London 2003) 37.

[4] A. Baram, *Culture, History and Ideology in the Formation of Ba'thist Iraq, 1968-89* (Oxford 1991) 71-72.

[5] http://www.aoc.gov/cc/art/lawgivers/lawgivers.cfm

[6] The bibliography on this issue is now substantial. Seminal in the discussion were the articles by F. R. Kraus ("Ein zentrales Problem des altmesopotamischen Rechtes: Was ist der Codex Hammu-rabi?", *Genava* n.s. 8 [1960] 283-296 and J. Bottéro ("Le «code» de Hammurabi", *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*, III/xii: 4 [1982] 409-444, translated into English as Bottéro, *Mesopotamia: writing, reasoning, and the gods* [Chicago 1992] 156-184). For a recent survey, see M. Stol, in: D. Charpin – D. O. Edzard – M. Stol, *Mesopotamien. Die altbabylonische Zeit* (OBO 160/4; Fribourg 2004) 655-658. A later treatment is C. Wilcke, in: C. Wilcke (ed.), *Das geistige Erfassen der Welt im Alten Orient* (Wiesbaden 2007) 212-214. H. Steible, "Zu den Nahtstellen in den altmesopotamischen Codices", in: J. Marzahn (ed.), *Assyriologica et*

It is clear from the prologue that Hammurabi erected the stele only after he had conquered the states surrounding the small kingdom of Babylon he had inherited and when he had militarily established hegemony over Mesopotamia from the shores of the Persian Gulf to the Middle Euphrates region. Indeed, scholars use the list of cities Hammurabi professes to control to date the production of the stele in or after his thirty-eighth year of rule, as earlier on he could not have made these claims[7]. Moreover, we know now a lot about his military feats thanks to the Mari archives, which contain numerous reports on his actions[8]. These martial acts seem, however, to have been downplayed by Hammurabi, who in the Louvre stele focused on his justice.

There is no doubt that Hammurabi intended to stress that there was a proper system of justice under his rule. The Louvre stele is just one of several he set up in various locations to proclaim the idea that each wronged man could turn to them to seek redress for unfair treatment[9]. Nine fragments that belonged to up to four other steles were excavated at Susa in western Iran where they probably had been taken in the twelfth century[10]. Possibly Hammurabi set up such steles throughout his kingdom announcing the message that he was a king of justice. These were not the only monuments Hammurabi erected in his lifetime, however, and the purpose of this article is to round out the image of this king beyond what the "law code" has inspired. In his self-presentation Hammurabi stressed other aspects of his rule in the military and governmental fields, and he did so in monuments equally public as the Louvre stele, but now mostly destroyed.

Semitica: Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner (AOAT 252; Münster 2000) 447-455 treats the grammatical relationship between the prologue and epilogue and the paragraphs of the "code".

[7] For example, W. W. Hallo – W. K. Simpson, *The Ancient Near East: A History* (New York ²1998) 97.

[8] D. Charpin, "Hammu-Rabi de Babylone et Mari: Nouvelles sources, nouvelles perspectives", in: J. Renger (ed.), *Babylon: Focus mesopotamischer Geschichte, Wiege früher Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne* (CDOG 2; Saarbrücken 1999) 111-130, *Hammu-rabi de Babylone* (Paris 2003), and "Histoire Politique du Proche-Orient Amorrite (2002-1595)", in: OBO 160/4, 25-480, M. Van De Mieroop, *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A Biography* (Oxford 2005).

[9] I am not convinced by Roth's interpretation that this refers to a man who had already been tried, and had to "find solace only through prayer and by offering blessings to (the memory of) King Hammurabi" ("Hammurabi's Wronged Man", *JAOS* 122 [2002] 38-45). It would be a rather poor message to send out to one's subjects that unjust legal verdicts were possible and that the only recourse was consolation after praying to the king.

[10] J. Nougayrol, "Les fragments en pierre du code hammourabien", *Journal Asiatique* 245 (1957) 339-366 and 246 (1958) 143-155 suggests that they belonged to at least two steles; André-Salvini, *Code de Hammurabi* 52-53 and note 55 states that four different steles could have existed besides the well-preserved one.

The remains are pitiful fragments that are barely comprehensible, but in Hammurabi's days they formed testimonials that contained important messages. Those cannot be ignored when we study the king. They show that he was not someone who falsely presented himself as a man of peace while waging war (an impression one could get from reading the code by itself), but he proudly acknowledged his military prowess as well and claimed domination over the entire world. He presented that message to his subjects as clearly as his justice, perhaps causing great resentment among those whom he had recently defeated. The treatment of the monuments themselves after Hammurabi had set them up show that they became a source of contention.

The objects onto which royal inscriptions of Mesopotamia (or other ancient cultures for that matter) were carved or impressed determined to a great extent their purpose and intended audience[11]. In early Babylonian history, up to ca. 1600 BC, most royal inscriptions were probably reproduced on stone or clay tablets that were enclosed in buried foundation deposits, or on clay cones that were inserted into walls and invisible to the people who saw the buildings erect. From the early third millennium on, inscriptions also appeared on monuments that were publicly displayed and made of materials intended to last for a long time. Many of those have survived until today. Some famous examples are the stele of the Vultures, the stele of Naram-Sîn, and the Gudea statues[12]. Whereas the best-known ones are relatively intact, if not perfectly preserved, there are also numerous fragments of statues, steles and the like with bits of inscriptions. Moreover, we know that a substantial number of statues, now fully lost, were on display with inscriptions on their bodies and bases. Scribes in the Old Babylonian period and afterwards copied out these inscriptions onto tablets, sometimes with an indication of what was represented on the monument[13]. These records demonstrate that all dynasties from the Old Akkadian to the Old Babylonian set up inscribed statues that were still visible centuries later. Many of these statues stood in Nippur, from which most copies on tablets

[11] J. Cooper, *Reconstructing History from Ancient Inscriptions: The Lagash-Umma Border Conflict* (Malibu 1983) 12.

[12] For a survey, now somewhat out-of-date, see J. Börker-Klähn, *Altvorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs* (Baghdader Forschungen 4; Mainz am Rhein 1982).

[13] See, for example, G. Buccellati, "Through a Tablet Darkly. A Reconstruction of Old Akkadian Monuments described in Old Babylonian Copies", in: M. Cohen - D. Snell - D. Weisberg (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo* (Bethesda 1993) 58-71.

are preserved, but they also existed elsewhere. It is then no surprise that when the Elamite Shutruk-Nahhunte raided various Babylonian cities in the twelfth century, he could cart off to Susa monuments as old as twelve hundred years[14]. We do not know who in the days of the honored ruler and later on had access to them, but we should not imagine this to have been the select few. The scribes who copied the inscriptions must have seen them and in the epilogue of his code Hammurabi suggests that anyone could come up the stele: "Let any wronged man who has a lawsuit come before the statue of me, the king of justice" (CH XLVIII 3-8)[15]. Even if the majority of the population was illiterate, the intent of these monuments was to communicate a message about the ruler who dedicated them, and that message is important to us as well. The aim of this article is to edit or re-edit the textual material from Hammurabi's fragmentary monuments to the extent possible, and to interpret the messages it conveys about the king. These monuments raise some additional questions as well, such as the relationship between monumental inscriptions and texts on clay tablets, the fate of Hammurabi's monuments, and the use of bilingual inscriptions in early Mesopotamia.

2. Documentation

Besides the copies of the "law code", 51 stone fragments are known as most likely belonging to a Hammurabi stele or statue, ranging in size from small pieces with a few broken cuneiform signs to blocks with several columns of inscription (see Appendix 1). None is well preserved, however. They were excavated in Ur, Kish, and Susa, or acquired in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and of uncertain provenance.

A: Material from Ur

The largest number of pieces (17) was excavated at Ur; 16 of them were published as UET 1, 146[16]. Bought on the antiquities market by

[14] See Harper, *Royal City of Susa* 159-182, D. T. Potts, *The Archaeology of Elam* (Cambridge 1999) 235.

[15] Roth, *Law Collections* 134.

[16] Excavation numbers U.3263, U.3355, and U.6965, provenance "From Gipar-ku, Room C.7" (UE 7, 220). For photographs of the largest fragment, see UET 1, pl. Q and http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/.

D. Frayne, *Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595 BC)* (RIME 4; Toronto 1990) 357 reports the existence of an unpublished fragment, U116117 = 1927-5-27,24A. The U number should

Yale University, but most likely from Ur as well[17], are 21 fragments published as YOS 9, 39-59. Those were purchased a few years after Woolley excavated the pieces at Ur. Two additional fragments at Yale were acquired "several years earlier" (YOS 9, 60 and 61)[18], which may suggest that they are from elsewhere, but this seems unlikely. A further piece that probably belongs to this group is in the collection of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago[19]. C. J. Gadd published the excavated fragments in UET 1 as apparently from Hammurabi[20], but elsewhere as the work of that king without qualification[21]. That designation seems to be universally accepted[22], and the connection seems secure because of the phrase ([*a-*]*na-ku* [*Ḫa-am-mu-*]*ra-bi*) in UET 1, 146 fragment d lines 7′-8′[23] and parallels with other Hammurabi texts we will point out below.

Despite their uncertain provenance, we will consider the pieces Yale University and the University of Chicago acquired on the antiquities market together with the fragments Woolley excavated. The pieces have varied shapes (flat, rounded, with straight and oblique angles) and it seems unlikely that they all derive from a single monument. Many are so small that they reveal nothing about the inscription they contained beyond its language. We will focus here on the better preserved ones; also their interpretation is greatly hampered by their fragmentary state.

The largest preserved fragment Woolley excavated contains sections of six columns of inscription, alternating Sumerian and Akkadian versions of the same text and thus providing three passages. Two of those are first person narratives, as is the case for the inscriptions on several other fragments excavated at Ur or bought by Yale University. Too

be U.11677 (cf. UE 7, 233). The piece is published here courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum, see Appendix 2 and Plate XXXI. In UE 7, 233 its provenance is described differently than that of the majority of pieces, from "Zigg(urat) Court Chambers", which may refer to the Giparu, however.

[17] Cf. R. Borger, *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur* I (Berlin 1967) 143. Yale University acquired other material from Ur, such as the Old Babylonian tablets published as YOS 5, 1-110.

[18] F. Stephens, *Votive and Historical Texts from Babylonia and Assyria* (YOS 9; New Haven 1937) 14. They are part of the Yale Babylonian Collection, rather than the Nies Babylonian Collection, which holds YOS 9, 39-59. They are so similar to the others, however, that a common origin seems likely.

[19] A3518, reported in Frayne, RIME 4, 357. The fragment is published here courtesy of the Trustees of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, see Appendix 2 and Plate XXXI.

[20] UET 1 text volume viii.

[21] *History and Monuments of Ur* (London 1929) 187 and 189.

[22] For example, *HKL* I 143, *CAD* I/J 31b.

[23] Cf. I. J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians* (SAOC 22; Chicago 1944) 41 n. 128.

much is lost of the text to see a clear connection between the three passages.

1) UET 1, 146 cols. I-II

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	(broken)	⌜*i-na* me⌝-lám-*mi*
		ù na-aw-ra-tim
2′.		*šu-ba-at šar-ru-tim*
3′.		*šu-ur-šu-dam*
4′.		*i-na* igi-gál
		ù ne-me-qí-im
5′.		*ni-ši i-ta-ar-ra-am*
6′.		*i-na* sag-ki
		ù ra-šu-ba-tim
7′.		*sú-un-nu-uq a-wa-a-tim*
8′.		*a-la-ak-*[*ta-ši-na*]
		la[*-ma-da-am*]
9′.		*a*-WA-*a*[*t*?]

"To establish a residence of kingship in splendor and brightness, to rule the people with insight and wisdom, (and) to le[arn their(?) be]havior by investigating legal cases with the help of ..... and awesomeness, ..."

Notes

The grammatical structure of the first eight lines is three times the same: *ina* + logogram + *ù* + Akkadian word + infinitive in the accusative. Neither the main verb nor its subject is preserved, but line 9′ seems to be the start of the main clause.

Line **6′**: Both the reading and the meaning of sag-ki are problematic. The usual Akkadian equivalents are *nakkaptum* "temple" and *pūtum* "forehead, front" (rarely *būnū* "face", *zīmum* "appearance"). Perhaps *ina pūtim* could mean "with determination"(?).

CAD S 97a proposes to read SAG.KI as *sakkû* (pl. tt.) "rites, ritual regulations", although this word is not found elsewhere in Old Babylonian. Our *ina sakkî* would then mean "by / with the help of / using the rules / regulations"(?).

Line **8′**: We propose *-šina* referring to *nišī* in line 5′ (or possibly, *a-la-ak-*[*ti ni-ši*]).

2) UET 1, 146 cols. III-IV

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	lú [NI]M$^{?\lceil ki \rceil}$	[ ]
2′.	Gu-ti-um^{ki}	Gu-ti-um^{ki}
3′.	Su-bir$_4^{ki}$	Su-bir$_4^{ki}$
4′.	Tu-uk-ri-iš^{ki}-ke$_4$	Tu-uk-ri-iš^{ki}
5′.	kur-bi	*ša ša-du-šu-nu*
	bad-rá	*ne-su-ú*
6′.	eme-bi gilim-ma	*li-ša-an-šu-nu*
		e-eg-ru
7′.	ki-da-bi-šè	*a-na ri-it-ti-šu*
8′.	gišk[im ḫ]a-ma-tuk	*lu-we-di-a-am*
9′.	x[ ]-a-bi	*ṭe$_4$-em-šu-nu*
10′.	[k]i	*e-še-a-am a-na-ku-ma*
11′.	[ ]	[*lu*](-)*uš-te-eš-še-er*
12′.	[ ]	[*ḫur*]*-ša-ni se-bé-tam*

"The people/ruler(s) of Elam(?), Gutium, Subartu, and Tukrish, whose mountains are distant and whose language is obscure, I (= the god) assigned to his (= the king's) hand. I personally set their confused mind more and more aright. Seven mountains ..."

Notes

Line **6′**: *ša lišān-šunu egru.* Pace *AHw* and *CAD* L, *lišānu*(*m*) is not simply feminine; in OB it is masculine: see the attestations in *CAD* L 210a sub 1a, lines 4 and 12, 210b line 8; and *l*]*i-ša-na-am e-eg-ra-am JRAS* CSpl. 72 vi 11′ (hymn to Papulegara).

Line **7′**: The -bi in ki-da-bi-šè corresponds to the *-šu* in *ana rittī-šu*; see I. Kärki, StOr 35 (1967) 203 (-bi instead of -(a)-ni).

Lines **10′-11′**: The subject "I" is, of course, the same as in line 8′, i.e., the god. The form *uštešše̓r* belongs to the **Štn** of *ešēru* (not **Št$_2$** as *AHw* 256a and *CAD* E 361a suggest).

3) UET 1, 146 cols. V-VI

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	⌜DU⌝-D[U-x-x-b]i	*mu-ut-*[*ta-ar-ru*]-
	gá-e-m[e]-en	*ši-na* [*a-na-ku*]
2′.	lú-zi	*ki-nu-*[*um*]
3′.	lú-si-sá	*a-wi-lum i-ša-*[*rum*]
4′.	sag-bi-šè ma-gál	*i-na re-še-e-ti*[*m šu-ú*?]
5′.	inim ab-bé-en-na-mu	*a-wa-at a-qá-a*[*b-bu-ú*]
6′.	ság nu-di-dam	*ú-ul uš-t*[*a-sa-ak*]
7′.	nam-á-gál-mu	*le-iu-ú*[*-ti*]
8′.	nam-gal-a-ni	*šu-ur-bu*[*-su*]
9′.	me-téš ḫa-ba-i-i	*li-i-n*[*a-ad*]
10′.	á-kala-ga	*du*[*-un-ni*]
11′.	nam-ur-sag[-mu]	[*qar-ra-du-ti-ia*]

"... their guide, I am. The just man, the righteous man, [he] is favorite to me. The word that I speak is not to be dismissed. May my ability praise his greatness. The strength of my heroism ..."

Notes

Line **4**: *ina rēšētim* literally means "is amongst (partitive *ina*) the top quality" with *rēšētim* as plural of *rēštum*, *CAD* R 272b: *rēštum* **4** (in pl.). In other words "he is (Sum: + for me, i.e. in my opinion) amongst the best, the choicest, the top", "he is the most beloved (for me)".

The Akkadian version of line 4′ requires a parallel to Sumerian ma-gál. As there is insufficient space for a form of the verb *bašû*, a nominal sentence with the independent pronoun *šū* seems to be a possible reconstruction.

Lines **7′-11′**: The end of this passage is found in two other manuscripts, in Sumerian only. The small stone fragment, YOS 9, 53, contains five lines: [nam-á]-gál-m[u] / [nam-ga]l-la-ni / [me-téš] ⌞ḫa⌟-ba-i-i / [á-kal]a-ga / [nam-ur-sag]-mu. Since these lines are all that remain, the context is a mystery and we do not know whether or not more of UET 1, 146 was paralleled in it. The hymn to Hammurabi, TLB 2, 3 (see below), reads in line 27 nam á-gál-mu nam-gal-la-ni me-téš ḫa-ba-i-i, without quoting any of the other lines of this fragment.

Only two other fragments of the stele contain passages of sufficient length to reveal something about the contents.

4) UET 1, 146 fragment a

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1.	[lugal] ḫúl-ḫúl-	*šar ḫi-da-a-t[i-im]*
	[l]e-me-en	*a-na-[ku]*
2.	[nun]-me-en	*ru-ba-a-ku iš-tu [i-lu]*
3.	[dingir]-re-e-ne	*šu-mi ṣi-[ra-am]*
4.	[mu]-maḫ-mu	*ib-bu-[ù]*
5.	[mu-n]i-sa_4-a-ta	*nu-ḫu-uš š[a-me-e]*
6.	[ḫi-nun] an-ki-bi	*ù er-[ṣe-tim]*
7.	[mu-n]i-gar-gar-gar-gar	*ú-kam-[me-er]*

"I am the king of joys, I am the prince. Since the [gods] have called my exalted name, I have piled up abundance on heaven and earth."

Below these columns and separated from them by a double line are two unrelated columns with a text too fragmentary for comprehension.

5) UET 1, 146 fragment b

Although this fragment is relatively small and contains only a few lines of a bilingual text, it is of special interest because two parallels on tablets exist. The piece is important in the discussion of the relationship between stone inscriptions and royal hymns on tablets, which will be addressed later on. The various manuscripts are (using UET 1, 146 fragment b as the basis for the edition):

A = UET 1, 146 fragment b: bilingual text in parallel columns, with only 9 lines partly preserved. The fragment derives from the middle of the hymn.
  = here lines 2′–10′.

B = TLB 2, 3 lines 10-14: monolingual Sumerian, except for two glosses[24]. The tablet contains 30 lines; lines 10-14 parallel the preserved lines of manuscript A.
  = here lines 1′-11′.

[24] Å. Sjöberg, "Ein Selbstpreis des Königs Ḫammurabi von Babylon", *ZA* 54 (1961) 51-70.

C = VS 24, 41: interlinear bilingual text. The tablet seems to have been a scribal copy of a 4-line long passage, paralleling lines 2-6 in manuscript A[25]. It is now broken in half lengthwise.
= here lines 3′-7′.

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	al-lu$_5$-ḫáb lú-UB-ak-ak	[ ]
2′.	šu-dab$_5$-dab$_5$-bé-me-en	⌜*mu*- x - x⌝ - [x - x] (B: *mu*-DA)
3′.	ur-sag-ur-sag-e-ne	*qar-ra-ad qar-ra-a-di*
4′.	bàn-da giri$_{17}$-zal-e-ne	*e-ki-id mu-t[a-lu-tim]*
5′.	nam-šul nam-ur-sag / šu-du$_7$-du$_7$-me-en	*mu-ša-ak-li-[il]* *mu-tu-t[im a-na-ku]*
6′.	kalam ^{d}AMAR.UD-ke$_4$	*ma-tam ša a-na* ^{d}AMAR.UD
7′.	gú nu-gar-ra-šè (C: gú nu-un-g[ar-])	*la ka-an-ša-[at]*
8′.	^{giš}tukul-kala-ga-gá	*i-na k[a-ki-ia da-nim]*
9′.	ša-mu-na-ab-tu$_{10}$-bé-en	*a-ḫ[a-ti-šum]*
10′.	ma-da ^{d}En-líl-le ḫa-lam-e-dè	[ ]
11′.	bí-in-du$_{11}$-ga-gim	[ ]

"I am the battle-net that catches him who abuses me, the hero among heroes, the furious one among the proud, who has perfected manliness. I beat down for him with my mighty weapon the land that is not submitted to Marduk. Like the land that Enlil ordered to be destroyed, ..."

Notes

Line 1′: For lú-UB-ak-ak compare
a) ár-ak(-ak) = *nâdu* "to praise", **G/Dtn**; ár-re = *nâdu* **D**; ár-re = *tanittu* "praise";
b) ár-re = *namûtu* "joke, jest";
c) ub, ár-ak-a = *têlu* "to pronounce (a word), to tell (a proverb or riddle)", ár = *tēltu* "(popular) saying, proverb, adage".
(Both *namûtu* and *tēltu* are part of a group of six terms for "mockery, gossip" in the MB text HS 1893: 10-11; see A. Kilmer, *AoF* 18 [1991] 10 and 19.)

[25] The original tablet was very wide and a verse that required two lines on TLB 2, 3 could be written out as one line on VS 24, 41.

The basic element ub / ár has thus multiple meanings: a short and poignant saying that can be praising, joking, as well as mocking. Thus the expression *ana tēlti šakānu* "to make s.o. (the object of) a (mocking) saying, to make a laughing-stock of s.o., to ridicule s.o., to mock s.o.". See, in a Neo-Assyrian literary text: *ana tēlte u pilte ina pī nišī ittaškin* "he was made (the object of a mocking) saying and insult" SAA 3, No. 29 r. 9.

Line **2′**: the signs *mu*–DA are written underneath UB on TLB 2, 3, and Sjöberg (*ZA* 54, 61) interpreted them as an incomprehensible gloss to that term. They may correspond to the fragmentary signs in the Akkadian column of UET 1, 146 fragment b ⌜*mu*– x – x⌝ – [x – x], where one would expect them to render a participle corresponding to lú–UB–ak–ak. The Akkadian was thus perhaps [*al–lu–ḫa–pu–um*] / [*mu–uṣ-ṣa–bi–it*] / ⌜*mu–ṭa–pí*⌝–[*li–a*], **D** stem of *ṭapālum* "to abuse, belittle, insult".

The pieces published as YOS 9, 39-61 and OIM A3518 (see Appendix 2) are most likely from Ur, but their relationship to the fragments Woolley excavated is unclear. It is unlikely that all of them derive from the same monument, as they can be flat or rounded in different ways. Most are too fragmentary to yield any comprehensible reconstruction. As mentioned above YOS 9, 53 repeats the lines in UET 1, 146 Col. V 7′-11′.

6) YOS 9, 45

Enough is preserved of this piece to understand its contents, albeit imperfectly. It celebrates how the subject of the passage supports festivals and offerings.

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	[ ]	⌜*šu*⌝–[ ]
	[ ]x	x[ ]
2′.	[ ] KU	*ú–š*[*e–*]
3′.	[g]al	*i–si–na–*[*ti–šu–nu*]
	]–bi	*ra–bi–*[*iš*]
4′.	[ ]–du$_7$	*ú–ša–ak–*[*li–il*]
5′.	[ ]–a	*á–ki–a–t*[*i–šu–nu*]
6′.	[n]e–ne	*ša–at–ti–š*[*a–ma*]
7′.	[ḫi]–li	*ú–ri–i*[*š*]
	[–s]ud	
8′.		*i–na nu–úḫ–ši–i*[*m*]

9′.	[	]x-bi	*ù* ḫé-gá[l]
10′.	[	]-ma	*re-eš mi-im-ma*
			dam-qí-im
11′.	[	]	[x u]d ninda *ù me-e*
			[e]l-lu-tim
12′.	[	]	[ ]*ni-šu*? [x?]

"... I/he perfectly performed their festivals with solemnity. Every year, I/he made their New Year's festivals exult. With abundant prosperity, the best of all that is good, [ ], bread, and pure water, ..."

Notes

For lines **3′ to 7′** compare Falkenstein, "akiti-Fest und akiti-Festhaus", in: R. von Kienle et al., *Festschrift Johannes Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg 1959) 167 (Akkadian text only).

The sign before ninda in line **11′** is unclear. After the possible *šu* in the final line (12′) there is hardly space for another sign.

B: Material from Kish

Already in 1818, C. Bellino picked up an inscribed basalt fragment at the Tell Uhaimir mound of Kish that contains the name of Hammurabi (*LIH* 67)[26]. Langdon excavated seven other fragments on the site and thought that all eight pieces belonged to the same monument[27]. An examination of the seven fragments that are in the Ashmolean Museum showed that this is unlikely, as some are flat while others are curved and there are some stylistic differences in the carving of the inscriptions. Only two of the eight pieces in total have sufficient text to reveal something about their contents[28].

[26] The fragment was first published in R. K. Porter, *Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenia, Ancient Babylonia* II (London 1822) pl. 77 h, which provides a rather accurate copy. It is now in the British Museum (BM 93029). P. R. S. Moorey, Kish Excavations 1923-1933 (Oxford 1978) 5 quotes Porter's report on the find.

[27] S. Langdon, *Excavations at Kish*, Volume I: *1923-1924* (Paris 1924) 15-16.

[28] The pieces Langdon excavated are published by J.-P. Grégoire, "Inscriptions de l'époque babylonienne ancienne", in: Moorey, *Kish Excavations* microfiche 3 E03-E06; id., *Contribution à l'histoire sociale, économique, politique et culturelle du Proche-Orient Ancien. Archives administratives et inscriptions cunéiformes de l'Ashmolean Museum et de la Bodleian Collection d'Oxford*, I. Les sources, 2 (Paris 2000) pls. 175-176. Grégoire's comment on Ash. 1931-988 is confusing (*Contribution* I/2, 240). It is not that inscription that appears on pl. 77 of Porter 1822, but *LIH* 67.

1) Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 175, Ash 1931-988

Remains of three columns exist. In column I, only the ends of lines in Akkadian are preserved, which indicates that a Sumerian column originally existed to the left. A few isolated words are clear, most importantly [*Ḫa-*]*am-mu-ra-bi* in line 6′.

Cols. II-III

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	á[ ]	[ ]
	á?[ ]	
2′.	mi-ni-[ ]	[ ]
	TÚG [ ]	
3′.	me-lám [ḫuš?]	[ ]
	Ḫa-am-mu-ra-[*bi*]	
4′.	lugal-kala-ga	[ ]
5′.	nim-⌊a?⌋	x[ ]
6′.	bí-in-du[l-dul]	[ ]
7′.	nim-gír an-na-g[im]	[ ]
8′.	igi bí-in-	[ ]
	du_8-àm	⌜*i*⌝-*m*[*u-ur-šu-ma*]
9′.	igi-bi ba-ku_{10}-ku_{10}	*i-ṭa-a* [*i-na-šu*]
10′.	u_4 gi_6-ù-na	u_4-*mu-*[*um*]
11′.	mu-na-ni-in-ku_4	⌊*i*?⌋-[*tu-ur-šum*]
12′.	ki-tuš-bi x x	[ ]
13′.	é-bi mu-un-x[ ]	[ ]
14′.	[lug]al?-e-n[e?]	[ ]

"The [fierce(?)] splendor of Hammurabi, the strong king, covered(?) the high land. Like a lightening bolt in heaven he (= the enemy) saw it/him, and his eyes darkened. The day turned for him into dark night. His dwelling [ ], his house [ ]. The kings(?) ..."

Notes

Collation of line **6′** shows that the verb d u l was reduplicated as otherwise the signs would not have been spread out over the entire case. In line 9′ *īṭâ* derives from *eṭû*, "to become dark" (*AHw* 266b, *CAD* E 412b). The Akkadian of line 10′ should be something like *ūmum ana mūšim itūršum* — cf. CH L 88-89 *ūmam ana mūšim litēr-šum* — but there is

insufficient space for u_4-*mu*-[*um a-na mu-ši-im*]; so one may propose *mu-ši-iš*. In line 12′ there are two or more strange and illegible signs after bi. Collation suggests that they were partly scratched into the stone in modern times.

Lines **9′**, **12′** and **13′**: -bi corresponds to *-šu*; see I. Kärki, StOr 35 (1967) 203 (-bi instead of -(a)-ni).

2) *LIH* 67

Sumerian

1′. x[ ]
2′. [ḫ]a?-bí-ak[ ]
3′. [ ] RI ŠÈ MU x[ ]
4′. [ ] LI NE x[ ]
5′. [ ]x ba ra mu [ ]
e-[ ]
6′. *Ḫa-am-mu*[*-ra-bi*]
7′. nam-lugal-ʳaˡ-n[i]
8′. kalam-ma pa-é[d]-
ak-a-me-e[n]
9′. ud ^{d}En-líl-l[e]

"... I am Hammurabi, whose kingship is made resplendent over the land. When Enlil ..."

Note

Compare TCL 16, 61, a prayer in honor of Hammurabi, line 5: me nam-lugal-la pa-éd ḫa-ra-ak-e "May he (Enki) make the divine powers of kingship resplendent for you" (see, J. van Dijk, "L'hymne à Marduk avec intercession pour le roi Abī'ešuḫ", *MIO* 12 [1966] 64).

C: Material from Susa

Excavated at Susa where it was probably taken in the twelfth century by the Elamite king Shutruk-Nahhunte from an unknown location in Babylonia, a granite block partly preserves a Sumerian inscription of Hammurabi (MDP 2, 82-85). From the copy by Jéquier it seems that there was a

second column to the right, possibly with an Akkadian version. The text was recently edited in RIME 4, 337-9.

Sumerian

1. [*Ḫa-am-m*]*u-ra-bi*
2. [ni]ta-kala-ga
3. [lu]gal ur-[sag]
4. lugal-an-ub-[da-]
   limm[u-ba]
5. gù-téš-[a]
6. bí-in-sì-g[a]
7. še-g[a]
   An-na
8. SI A [ ]
9. KA [ ]
10. ^{d}E[n-líl]
11. dalla-[è]
12. ud [An]
13. ^{d}En-[líl]
14. nam-a-[ni]
15. bí-íb-bùlug-g[e_{26}-]
    eš-a
16. dingir-gal-gal-e-ne
17. mu-ni-in-
    sa_4-e[š]
18. ^{giš}rab-
    ni-ta
19. lú-kúr
20. šu ḫé-íb-
    ri-ri-ge
21. ugni[m]
22. gú-dù-a-ni
    ^{giš}tukul-a-[ni]
23. giš [ ]
    ḫé-bí-in-r[a]
24. šen-šen-[na]
25. kur gú-ér[im-]
    gál-la-[šè]
26. ḫé-bí-i[n-]
    ḫúb
27. á-kala-ga-[ni]
28. nu-še-[ga]

"Hammurabi, the strong man, the king, the hero, the king who brings the four quarters into constant obedience, the favorite of An, who [makes] apparent the ...[...]... of Enlil. When [An] and Enlil made his destiny great (and) the great gods called him, he tied the enemy with his fetters. His weapon defeated the army that hated him. He slew the evil land in battle. His strength ... the disobedient ..."[29]

4) Material with unknown provenance

Another stone monument of Hammurabi was known in modern times before the Louvre stele. The earliest partial publication of the text appeared in 1875[30], and L. W. King copied it twice in its entirety around the turn of last century[31]. The inscription probably was carved on the bottom part of a statue, which may have represented King Hammurabi[32]. The fragment measures 24 by 46 cm, and its provenance is unknown. G. Smith stated that it came from Babylon[33], A. Amiaud wrote that it was found in Baghdad[34], and J. Reade thinks that it may come from Kish because that site was well-known in the 19th century[35]. A Late Babylonian copy of part of the inscription appears in the Persian period library at Sippar[36] on a tablet that is now fragmentary as well. The relationship between the two versions is intriguing and it is possible that the scribe

[29] Frayne, RIME 4, 337-339.

[30] G. Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries* (New York 1875) 233-235, gave a partial translation of the inscription. In 1879, A. Amiaud provided a transcription into neo-Assyrian sign forms of one column ("Une inscription bilingue de Hammourabi, roi de Babylone", *Recueil de Travaux* 1/iv [1879] 181-190), and in 1888, he rendered the entire inscription in that format ("L'inscription bilingue de Hammourabi", *RA* 2 [1888] 4-19).

[31] In *LIH* I (1898) as no. 60, which also provides a sketch of the layout of the columns, and in CT 21 (1905) as plates 40-42.

[32] N. Wasserman, "CT 21, 40-42 - A Bilingual Report of an Oracle with a Royal Hymn of Hammurabi", *RA* 86 (1992) 1-18, where the entire text is edited and studied. For photographs of the fragment, see J. Reade, "Early monuments in Gulf stone at the British Museum with observations on some Gudea statues and the location of Agade", *ZA* 92 (2002) 290, fig. 18 (which shows clearly how it is the base of a statue, also available on the website http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/), C. J. Ball, *Light from the East* (London 1899) 69, and Van De Mieroop, *King Hammurabi* 125. A recent translation can be found in B. Foster, *Before the Muses. An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (Bethesda ³2005) 136-137. See also W. Römer - K. Hecker, *Lieder und Gebete* I (TUAT II/5; Gütersloh 1989) 726-727 and Charpin, *Hammu-rabi* 125.

[33] Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries* 233.

[34] *Recueil de Travaux* 1/iv, 181; *RA* 2, 4.

[35] *ZA* 92, 290-291.

[36] A. Fadhil - G. Pettinato, "Inno ad Hammurabi da Sippar", *Orientis antiqui miscellanea* 2 (1995) 173-187.

saw the stone object we still have. Clearly he copied a damaged old inscription as he indicated the parts lost with the standard *ḫi-pí eš-šú*, "new break". Those twice coincide with what we can see on the stone (col. Ia lines 22′ and 24′). But the later scribe recorded more than is now preserved on *LIH* 60, which must have been at the top of LIH 60 columns IIa and IIb, as there was no space left below line 24′ of cols. Ia and Ib. He selected a coherent unit, however, the full call to arms to Hammurabi.

A = *LIH* 60 = CT 21, 40, cols. Ia and Ib = here lines 1′-24′
B = *Orientis antiqui miscellanea* 2 (1995) 175: obv. = lines 13′-34′

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	[ ]	[^{d}]En-[líl]
2′.	[ ]	[*me-*]*te-lu-t*[*am*]
3′.	[ ]	[*id-d*]*i-ik-kum*
4′.	[ ]	[*at-*]*ta ma-an-nam*
5′.	[ ]	[*t*]*u-qá-a*
6′.	[^{d}EN.]^{r}ZU^{1}	^{d}EN.ZU
7′.	[nam-sa]g-kal	*a-ša-ri-du-tam*
8′.	[mu-r]a-an-sum	*id-di-ik-kum*
9′.	[za-e] a-ba-a	*at-ta ma-an-nam*
10′.	[ì-g]ub-bé-en	*tu-qá-a*
11′.	[^{d}]Nin-urta	^{d}Nin-urta
12′.	[^{giš}]tukul-maḫ	^{giš}TUKUL *ṣi-ra-am*
13′.	[mu-]ra-an-sum	*id-di-ik-kum*
14′.	[za-e] a-ba-a	*at-ta ma-an-nam*
15′.	[ì-gu]b-bé-en	*tu-qá-a*
16′.	[^{d}I]nanna-ke$_4$	^{d}Inanna
17′.	[mè š]en-šen-na	ŠEN.ŠEN *ù* MÈ
18′.	[mu-r]a-an-sum	*id-di-ik-kum*
19′.	[za-e] a-ba-a	*at-ta ma-an-nam*
20′.	[ì-gu]b-bé-en	*tu-qá-a*
21′.	^{d}Utu ù ^{d}IM	^{d}Utu *ù* ^{d}IM
22′.	[maškim?]-zu-meš (B: *ḫi-pí eš-šú* zu-meš)	*ra-bi-ṣú-ka*
23′.	za-e a-ba-a	*at-ta ma-an-nam*
24′.	[ ]-bé-en (B: *ḫi-pí eš-šú* bé-en)	*tu-qá-a*
25′.	*ḫi-pí eš-šú*	^{d}Za-ba$_4$-ba$_4$

26′.	*ḫi-pí eš-šú*	*ù Ìr-ra*
27′.	*ḫi-pí* meš	*re-ṣi-ka*
28′.	za-e a-ba-a	*at-ta* [*ma-an-nam*]
29′.	[ì-gub]-bé-en	*t*[*u*]-*qá*-[*a*]
30′.	^{d}AMAR.UD	[ ]
31′.	^{d}Mar-tu-bi-da ⌜sukkal⌝	[ ]
32′.	za-e a-ba-a	[ ]
33′.	ì-gub-bé-en	[ ]
34′.	è-mu-na-ab	[ ]

"Enlil gave you supremacy — you, whom are you waiting for?
Sin gave you pre-eminence — you, whom are you waiting for?
Ninurta gave you a splendid weapon — you, whom are you waiting for?
Eshtar gave you battle and combat — you, whom are you waiting for?
Shamash and Adad are your bailiffs — you, whom are you waiting for?
Zababa and Erra are your helpers — you, whom are you waiting for?
Marduk and Amurru are (your) ministers — you, whom are you waiting for?
Make them come out for him!"

Notes

The word *mētellūtum* of line **2′** appears also on the fragment OIM A3518 (see Appendix 2). For Zababa as "helper" (Akkadian *rēṣu*) in lines 25′-27′, see also TLB 2, 3 line 15 ^{d}Za-ba$_4$-ba$_4$ ur-sag-gal á-daḫ-mu ì-me-a.

The reverse of the Sippar tablet contains lines that have no parallel on *LIH* 60, but indicates that it is a copy as well. Perhaps the scribe worked with two unrelated originals. He could not have copied out the entire inscription that remains on *LIH* 60 as his tablet was too small. He wrote on the left edge in Sumerian and Akkadian, "Make your heroism shine", a phrase absent from the preserved parts of the monument but in character with its inscription. The relationship between the two manuscripts is thus unclear. It is possible that the scribe of the Sippar tablet saw *LIH* 60 and copied out part of its text, at least the first two columns as an independent hymn. But other manuscripts — on stone or clay — may have served as his inspiration as well.

LIH 60 = CT 21, 41 cols. IIa and IIb

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	é[rim]	[ ]
	érin[ ]	
2′.	ù érin x[x x]	[ ]
	lá-a-ni	
3′.	gar-ra-a	[ ]
4′.	nam-á-g[ál]-zu	*le-i*[*u-ut-ka*]
5′.	gub-bí-[í]b	*šu-zi-iz*
6′.	ub-da-limmu-ba	*i-na ki-ib-ra-at*
7′.	s[ag?] an-[šè?]	[*e*]*r-bé-tim*
	[ní]-íl-bi	*ut-li-li-ma*
8′.	mu-zu ḫé-pà-dè	*šum-ka li-iz-za-ki-ir*
9′.	un-dagal-la	*ni-šu ra-ap-ša-tum*
10′.	inim ḫa-ra-ab-	*li-iš-te-mi-*
	sa_6-sa_6-ge-ne	*qá-kum*
11′.	kìri šu ḫa-ra-ab-	*ap-pa-ši-na*
	tag-ge-ne	*li-il-bi-na-kum*
12′.	a-a-ar	*ta-na-da-ti-ka*
	gal-gal-zu	*ra-bi-a-tim*
13′.	me-téš ḫé-i-i-ne	*li-iš-ta-ni-da*
14′.	ka-tar-maḫ-zu	*da-li-li-ka ṣi-ru-tim*
15′.	ḫé-si-il-le-ne	*li-id-lu-la*

"... his [ ] troops are placed. Establish your power! Rise up in the four quarters, so that your name will be pronounced. May the widespread people supplicate you, may they flatten their nose in your honor. May they praise you in great ranges of praise. May they celebrate you in an exalted way."

Notes

The reconstruction of line **7′** is taken from Wasserman *RA* 86, 4, where ní!-íl-bi is based on collation. For *utlellû* "to raise oneself", see *AHw* 1444a and *CAD* U/W 334-5, here in the imperative.

LIH 60 col. IIIb is so badly damaged that no coherent text can be restored. Only the ends of lines in Akkadian are preserved. They often include the pronominal suffix *-šu*, which, if referring to Hammurabi, indi-

cates that the text addresses him in the third person, as is the case in col. IV.

LIH 60 = CT 21, 42 cols. IVa and IVb

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1.	bí-in-gub	*uš-zi-iz*
2.	nam-maḫ nam-kala-ga-ni	*na-ar-bí du-ni-šu*
3.	a-ga-u_4-da-šè	*a-na aḫ-ri-a-at*
4.	pa bí-in-è	*u_4-mi ú-še-pí*
5.	*Ḫa-am-mu-ra-bi*	*Ḫa-am-mu-ra-bi*
6.	lugal ur-sag	*šar-ru-um qar-ra-du-um*
	kala-ga	*da-an-nu-um*
7.	érim ^{giš}ḫaš ak-ak	*ša-ki-iš a-a-bi*
8.	mar-uru_5 ^{giš}giš-lá	*a-bu-ub tu-qu-ma-tim*
9.	gú-dù-a sì-sì-ki	*sà-pi-in* KALAM *za-i-ri*
10.	^{giš}giš-lá	*mu-bi-il-li*
	te-en-te-en	*tu-uq-ma-tim*
11.	sùḫ-saḫ$_4$	*mu-še-ep-pí*
	si-si-a	*sà-aḫ-ma-ša-tim*
12.	[ ]-ak	*mu-'a_4-ab-bi-it*
13.	[alan i]m-gim	*mu-uq-tab-li*
14.	[gul]-gul-la	*ki-ma ṣa-lam ṭi-ṭi-im*
15.	[g]a	*mu-pé-et-ti*
16.	[ ]	*pu-uš-qí*
17.	[ ]	[ ]x [*w*]*a-aš-ṭú-tim*

"... he established. The greatness of his strength he made appear for all future time. Hammurabi, king, mighty warrior, slayer of enemies, flood-storm in battles, who leveled the foes' land, who extinguished battles, who silenced turmoils, who destroyed warriors like a figurine of clay, who opened up constricted straits."

Note

For lines **15-17**, compare CH XLVII 19-20 *pušqī wašṭūtim upetti*. It seems that there should not be a sign before [*w*]*a*- in line 17, but the photograph and the copy show that there is space for one. Was there an inadvertent dittography of *wa*-?

3. Hammurabi's messages

With barely 170 brief lines of text, many of them incomplete and hard to understand, it is not easy to determine all the nuances of the messages these monuments conveyed when they were intact. It is clear, however, that Hammurabi's military prowess received much attention. The places where he used his military skills are not specified and there are no preserved references to the conquests we know through other sources, especially his year names. His great victories over Larsa (year 30), Mari (year 32), and Eshnunna (year 37) are not commemorated[37]. The opponents are identified in more general terms, such as the lands that do not obey Marduk and that Enlil ordered to be destroyed (UET 1, 146 fragment b // TLB 2, 3). One passage only refers to specific places: in UET 1, 146 columns III and IV the god, possibly Marduk, claims to have given directions to the rulers or people of Elam, Gutium, Subartu, and Tukrish. This calls to mind his 30th year name, where Hammurabi "overthrew the army of Elam, which had mobilized Subartu, Gutium, Eshnunna and Malgium *en masse* from the border of Marhashi"[38]. The year name commemorates the defeat of an eastern alliance including people from the Zagros Mountains (Elam and Gutium), the Diyala basin (Eshnunna), and the vicinity of the Tigris (Malgium[39]). The absence of Eshnunna and Malgium in UET 1, 146 columns III and IV may indicate that these regions were firmly in Hammurabi's hands when the inscription was carved, thus after year 37. The mention of Tukrish is unparalleled in Hammurabi's texts. The region seems to have been very distant from Babylonia, and most scholars locate it to the east of the Tigris[40], but recently a western location near Mount Amanus has been suggested[41]. In any case, the Ur inscription does not claim that Hammurabi occupied these regions, but only that his god set straight the inhabitants' confused minds.

The general military prowess of Hammurabi is perhaps most explicit in *LIH* 60 column IV, "mighty warrior, slayer of enemies, flood-storm in battles, who leveled the foes' land, who extinguished battles, who silenced turmoils, who destroyed warriors like a figurine of clay, who opened up

[37] Wasserman, *RA* 86, 16 argued that *LIH* 60 referred to Hammurabi's capture of Larsa, but there is no explicit mention of that opponent in the text. A few of Hammurabi's building inscriptions celebrate specific victories over Larsa (Frayne, RIME 4, 339), Eshnunna (Frayne, RIME 4, 339-340), and Mari (Frayne, RIME 4, 346).

[38] M. J. A. Horsnell, *The Year-Names of the First Dynasty of Babylon*, vol. 2 (Hamilton, Ont. 1999) 139.

[39] See Charpin, OBO 160/4, 31 n. 19 for Malgium's location.

[40] Cf. M. Van De Mieroop, "Sargon of Agade and his Successors in Anatolia", *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 42 (2000) 152.

[41] Charpin, OBO 160/4, 191, M. Guichard, *La vaisselle de luxe des rois de Mari* (ARM XXXI; Paris 2005) 320-324.

constricted straits". Wasserman has shown that some of the epithets have parallels in Hammurabi's "code". Most telling is the simile of figurines of clay: in *LIH* 60 Hammurabi's enemies are compared to them, whereas in the code's epilogue Nergal is urged to shatter the limbs of the stele's despoiler "like a clay figurine" (CH LI 37-39). Wasserman argued a possible sequence of inspiration: the bilingual inscription on *LIH* 60 inspired a monolingual Akkadian composition on a tablet, which in turn inspired the wording of the "code" on the Louvre stele[42]. It seems more likely that the two monuments drew on the same body of epithets when they wanted to emphasize martial characteristics.

The language used to praise Hammurabi can become metaphorical. Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 175, Ash 1931-988 columns II-III compares his splendor (*melemmū*) to a blinding lightening bolt in heaven. Splendor is also invoked in UET 1, 146 columns I-II as surrounding Hammurabi's seat of kingship. The message of that passage comes close to that of the "code" and refers even more explicitly than the Louvre monument to Hammurabi's inquiring into legal cases. Wisdom rather than military skills are praised, something also paralleled in the epilogue of the "code"[43].

A final accomplishment of Hammurabi is his celebration of festivals. If YOS 9, 45 indeed refers to him, he claims to make the New Year's festival annually a success. The exact actions are unclear: Hammurabi professes to hand out bread and pure water, but it is not known whether to the gods, his people, or someone else.

Although the messages contained in these inscriptions share elements with Hammurabi's "code" and other official statements about the king, such as the few preserved hymns[44] and his royal inscriptions[45], they are much more explicit on his control over all who oppose the will of Babylon's gods. King Hammurabi dominates the entire world. That idea is also expressed through the bilingual form of these texts. Most, if not all, of the inscriptions studied here were carved in parallel columns in Sumerian and Akkadian. Since the days of the kings of Agade, some 500 years before Hammurabi, no bilingual inscriptions had appeared on the same monument in Babylonia. The sole possible exception is an enigmatic inscription for King Shulgi of the Ur III dynasty only known from an Old Babylonian copy that seems to have added one of the versions[46]. Hammurabi renewed

[42] Wasserman, *RA* 86, 50.
[43] Roth, *Law Collections* 133 XLVII 9-58.
[44] See http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=c.2.8.2*#
[45] Frayne, RIME 4, 332-357.
[46] TIM 9, 35; cf. D. Frayne, *Ur III Period (2112-2004 BC)* (RIME 3/2; Toronto 1997) 144-146. The inscription appears on an Old Babylonian tablet from Tell Harmal, which seems

the practice of using both written languages of Sumer and Akkad on public monuments and did so throughout his kingdom, in the north at Kish and in the south at Ur. When he conquered the city of Nippur in his 30th year (1763), he likely visited the Ekur where statues of Old Akkadian kings stood on exhibit with their bilingual inscriptions still visible, as we know from Old Babylonian copies on clay. The respect Old Akkadian kings commanded in the early part of the second millennium is well known[47], and although Old Babylonian rulers have left no explicit evidence of it, the conquest of the south put Hammurabi in direct contact with that tradition. That he revived the use of bilingual monumental inscriptions to commemorate his military feats, and placed the monuments in the various major cities of his state, suggests that he sought to emulate his long-dead Old Akkadian predecessors. Although the substance of his inscriptions does not sound Old Akkadian, the form he gave them does. The fragments discussed here display the same archaizing characteristics as the Louvre stele: the ductus is archaic and the direction of the inscriptions with vertical cases refers to the past[48]. It may be that Hammurabi did not want to allude just to the past in general, but specifically to the time of his Old Akkadian predecessors by using a bilingual format. This would strengthen the message of many of these inscriptions: like the kings of Agade Hammurabi claimed a universal dominion, not just one over Babylonia.

Because of the very fragmentary nature of the remains, the shape of the monuments unto which Hammurabi had his messages carved is mostly unclear. Only of *LIH* 60 enough is preserved to suggest it was the bottom part of an anthropomorphic statue. The remaining fragments display a variety of shapes of the surface — some are flat, others curved — and seem to derive from obelisks, rounded steles, and perhaps monuments shaped otherwise. Also the direction and the size of the inscriptions are not always uniform, even on a single fragment. The cases and the individual signs of BM 1927-5-27-24A, for example, are not of the same size: those of the left-hand column are twice as large as those of the right-hand column. On fragment f of UET 1, 146, columns with inscribed text appear

to be a school copy of a monumental inscription. It is unusual in several ways, however. It provides the Sumerian in a syllabic version, and it writes passages of Sumerian over several lines followed by a translation in Akkadian over several lines. This would not reproduce the format of a standing monument. These atypical elements lead to the suspicion that the original text was in Akkadian only and that the syllabic Sumerian was added in Old Babylonian times. Shulgi's original inscription was thus probably monolingual.

[47] Cf. M. Van De Mieroop, *Cuneiform Texts and the Writing of History* (London 1999) 62-66. In Old Babylonian times several stories about kings Sargon and Naram-Sîn were in circulation; see, e.g., J. Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade* (Winona Lake 1997) texts 6-8, 12-14, and 16.

[48] Roth, *Law Collections* 73.

at oblique angles. We should not imagine thus that all of these monuments were as regular and neatly organized as Hammurabi's stele in the Louvre Museum.

4. Stone Monuments and Clay Tablets

In 1970, William W. Hallo argued that monumental dedicatory inscriptions could find their way into what he called the canonical literary corpus, that is texts written out on tablets and copied for several generations. In his opinion, hymns to kings were originally carved on stone and then reproduced onto tablets, just as quotes from the "code" of Hammurabi were written out on tablets[49]. He suggested that an important deed by a king was commemorated in three forms: as a date formula, as a royal inscription, and as a royal hymn. Sometimes even a fourth form existed, a visual representation as a statue or relief[50]. There was thus a close connection between monumental inscriptions and royal hymns that are preserved on tablets. Using references in the hymns themselves Marie-Christine Ludwig further developed the idea that royal hymns were originally inscribed on stone[51]. These scholars suggest that many kings commissioned statues and steles with royal hymns carved on them, which later became copied unto clay tablets, the common format in which hymns are found.

The only published example where the two formats are attested is UET 1, 146 fragment b, which parallels a passage from a hymn to Hammurabi (TLB 2, 3) and a few lines of which appear on the tablet VS 24, 41. A large stone statue fragment with a version of the royal hymn Lipit-Eshtar A reportedly exists in the Iraq Museum, Baghdad[52], but the monument remains unpublished and contains more than the hymn (including a dedication inscription and curses[53], and perhaps some of Lipit-Eshtar's laws[54]). As it remains unpublished, we cannot take that monument into consideration here.

[49] W. Hallo, "The Cultic Setting of Sumerian Poetry", in: A. Finet (ed.), *Actes de la XVII^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Ham-sur-Heure 1970) 116-134, esp. 120-122.

[50] W. Hallo, "Texts, Statues and the Cult of the Divine King", in: J. A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Jerusalem 1986* (VT Supplement 40; Leiden 1988) 61.

[51] M.-C. Ludwig, *Untersuchungen zu den Hymnen des Ishme-Dagan von Isin* (SANTAK 1; Wiesbaden 1990) 67-69.

[52] Jeremy Black mentioned this inscription to me. S. Tinney, "On the Curricular Setting of Sumerian Literature", *Iraq* 61 (1999) 170 also refers to it.

[53] Cf. Tinney, *Iraq* 61, 170.

[54] According to J. Black.

The connection between UET 1, 146 fragment b and its parallels on clay tablets is less clear than has been suggested. The short extract on VS 24, 41, selecting only a few lines from the middle of the composition, seems to be a school copy, which reproduces the original in both Sumerian and Akkadian. The scribe copied out lines in a different order from their appearance on the monument, however, by turning a columnar format into an interlinear one and by combining two lines of the monument's version into one. It is doubtful that he saw the monument in Ur, as the tablet was excavated in Babylon[55]. Perhaps another copy on clay was the intermediary. The relationship between UET 1, 146 fragment b and TLB 2, 3 is also not straightforward. The obvious major difference between the two versions is that the stone is bilingual while the tablet only has a Sumerian text. Why would only the Sumerian version have entered the so-called canonical corpus of literature? It is also not clear that the entire hymn, as preserved in TLB 2, 3, was carved onto the stele, and it is very likely that the stele contained Sumerian text that does not appear in TLB 2, 3. We cannot really call the clay tablet a copy of the text on a standing monument. The inspiration could have been in the opposite direction and TLB 2, 3 could have been a draft of the stone inscription[56]. It is also possible that the hymn to Hammurabi predated the Ur stele by several years and that a passage of it was integrated into the inscription because its contents suited the purpose of the author, who also added an Akkadian translation. That hymn, rather than the monument at Ur, could also have been at the basis of the school tablet from Babylon, which added an Akkadian translation independently. The connection between the two media, stone and clay, is thus far from clear, and this example does not allow us to conclude that royal hymns were regularly carved on steles or statues.

The Late Babylonian Sippar copy of *LIH* 60, cols. Ia and Ib is a different matter. The later scribe acknowledged that a damaged original existed, and the position of the breaks he reported suggests that that original was *LIH* 60. The copyist did not reproduce all the available text, but chose a coherent unit from *LIH* 60, the call to arms of different gods. On the reverse of the tablet he reproduced another original, otherwise unknown to us. His activity was not unusual; many later copies of monumental inscriptions exist, and another scribe from Persian Sippar copied

[55] J. van Dijk, *Literarische Texte aus Babylon* (VS 24; Berlin 1987) Introduction. The script on the tablet is of Old Babylonian date, but could easily be later than the end of Babylon's control over Ur.

[56] As Sjöberg suggests, *ZA* 54, 70. Ludwig, *Untersuchungen* 69 acknowledges the possibility as well.

the prologue of Hammurabi's "law code", which he saw in Susa[57]. Striking, however, is the fact that the broken fragment of Hammurabi's statue may have been preserved and accessible, which leads to the question of the display of these monuments, both in Hammurabi's time and later on.

4. Display and Destruction

It is possible that a Persian period scribe copied the inscription from a stone statue (*LIH* 60) that was some 1250 years old and fragmentary. The preservation of this object would not have been unique, and we know the existence of several collections of antiquities, which scholars usually assign to Neo-Babylonian times. One such collection was in the Giparu at Ur, rebuilt by Nabonidus in the fifth century. It contained a copy of an Amar-Suen inscription of the twenty-first century with a colophon stating that the lamentation priest Nabû-shuma-iddin made it after finding an original brick in the ruins of the Ekishnugal and that he put the copy on display[58]. The Ur collection contained other items from the Ur III to Kassite periods, some of them fragmentary, for example, a piece of a diorite statue of Shulgi trimmed down so that only the inscription was preserved[59]. Also in the Neo-Babylonian period the Shamash temple at Sippar contained a collection of inscribed monuments, some as old as Old Akkadian times[60]. The collection survived into the Persian period as its most recent item was of that date[61], and it is possible that the Hammurabi fragment *LIH* 60 was part of this so-called museum. The fact that a Persian period scribe copied it is thus no real surprise.

The fate of the Hammurabi monuments in Old Babylonian times is actually more enigmatic. Woolley's excavations at Ur in the 1920s yielded detailed information on their placement and context, but, although he was a more careful archaeologist than many of his contemporaries, there remain uncertainties that make any interpretation tentative. Woolley found the fragments of UET 1, 146 in court C7 of the Giparu, in the southern

[57] A. Fadhil, "Der Prolog des Codex Hammurapi in einer Abschrift aus Sippar", *XXXIV. International Assyriology Congress* (Ankara 1998) 717-729.

[58] Frayne, RIME 3/2, 256-257.

[59] M. Roaf, "Survivals and Revivals in the Art of Ancient Mesopotamia", in: P. Matthiae (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East* (Rome 2000) 1450. For the inscription, see Frayne, RIME 3/2, 159-160.

[60] I. J. Winter, "Babylonian Archaeologists of the(ir) Mesopotamian Past", in: Matthiae, *Proceedings of the First International Congress* 1792-1793.

[61] C. B. F. Walker and D. Collon, "Hormuzd Rassam's Excavations for the British Museum at Sippar in 1881-1182", in: L. de Meyer (ed.), *Tell ed-Dēr* III. *Soundings at Abū Habbah (Sippar)* (Louvain 1980) 111.

area of that building that served as the temple for the goddess Ningal. They were placed on top of a square platform, with sides 2.20 meters long, that was made of bricks and still stood 90 cm high when excavated. Woolley thought he uncovered the entire platform as he found a thick layer of bitumen on its top, which showed no impressions of bricks laid over it. The top had a socket three bricks deep and measuring 1 by .90 meters. Beside the platform were two low box-lined compartments, the function of which was unclear[62].

Woolley's reconstruction of the history of the stele is clear-cut, but raises important questions. According to him, Hammurabi set up a war memorial in the Giparu upon his conquest of Ur in his 30th year[63]. Some 20 years later, in the 8th year of Hammurabi's successor, Samsu-iluna, the people of the south rebelled[64], and smashed this symbol of Babylonian oppression. In less than two years Samsu-iluna recaptured Ur with great force, a feat commemorated in his 11th year name with the statement that he tore down the city's walls. The archaeological record shows the violence in reality. Samsu-iluna's troops ransacked the Giparu: countless monuments that had been on display there — too many to illustrate or even describe, Woolley writes — were shattered into lumps and splinters strewn all over the floors. They then burned the building down and a layer of ashes covered the destroyed objects[65]. The entire city suffered: all public buildings disappeared and the residential areas were damaged. Despite the massive destruction Ur survived, however, and people reoccupied the houses[66]. They rebuilt the Giparu in a patchwork manner on their own initiative. No royal building inscription survives for the new construction, which gradually decayed and disappeared. When around 1400 the Kassite king Kurigalzu commissioned a new Giparu, his architects had no earlier remains to guide them in their plans[67].

Woolley gave little importance to the position of the stele and the structures that surrounded it. Hammurabi seems to have chosen those carefully, however, to make a clear statement about his power. The base stood in the center of the temple court, which was already filled with other

[62] C. L. Woolley – M. Mallowan, *The Old Babylonian Period* (UE 7; London/Philadelphia 1976) 6 and 54. In an earlier report ("The Excavations at Ur, 1925-6", AJ 6 [1926] 372), Woolley stated that some of the fragments were found on the floor of the court.

[63] UE 7, 6. The similarity between UET 1, 146 columns III and IV and Hammurabi's 30th year name suggests that the he did so immediately after he took the city.

[64] See Charpin, OBO 160/4, 337-339 for an account of the rebellion under Rīm-Sîn II.

[65] *AJ* 6, 375-377, C. L. Woolley, *Ur 'of the Chaldees'*, revised edition by P. R. S. Moorey (London 1982) 188-191.

[66] C. L. Woolley, *The Kassite Period and the Period of the Assyrian Kings* (UE 8; London 1965) 1.

[67] *AJ* 6, 377, P. N. Weadock, "The Giparu at Ur", *Iraq* 37 (1975) 110-111.

monuments lined along the walls, and it blocked the view from the entrance of the court to the altar[68]. Next to the base were two brick box-like compartments that were not lined with bitumen, and therefore probably not intended for liquids[69]. They bring to mind the basin attached to the metal Lu-Nanna figurine, dedicated to Hammurabi[70], and could have been used for food offerings, the burning of incense, or the like. In the north corner of the court stood a bitumen-lined basin and a limestone shaft the top of which was hollowed out, possibly to contain a pitcher. The base in the center of the court was connected by a strip of smaller bricks to an enigmatic structure in the pavement. Woolley describes it as a rectangular gap lined on one side with a single layer of bricks above the pavement level and a bitumen lined hole[71]. Perhaps this was a channel for liquids running from the platform to the altar on the other side of the rectangular unpaved area. All indications are that whatever stood on the base was the focus of ritual activity in the center of a court that commemorated prominent figures in the history of the Giparu when Ur was independent from Babylon, such as the *entu*-priestess Enanedu, sister of Warad-Sîn[72].

Important questions remain and shed doubt on Woolley's reconstruction. It makes much sense that people smashed Hammurabi's stele during Rīm-Sîn II's rebellion, but what happened to the fragments afterwards? As Woolley described it, the base seems actually more suited to hold a collection of fragments than an intact stele. Its surface of 2.2 by 2.2 meters is large and the socket at the top, three bricks deep, seems more like a container than a platform. At 90 centimeters — compared to 60 centimeters for the other bases in the court — it seems also very high to bear a large stele on top. If the fragments were indeed piled on top of the base, as Woolley claims they were found, it seems more likely that Samsu-iluna's troops would have collected them than rebels under Rīm-Sîn II. But how could they have smashed all other standing monuments and burned down the Giparu at that time?

[68] For a photograph of both the platform and the altar, see UE 7, pl. 7b.

[69] UE 7, 54; they appear in the photograph UE 7, pl. 7a.

[70] See, for example, E. Strommenger, *5000 Years of the Art of Mesopotamia* (New York 1964) pl. XXX for a photograph of the statuette. Börker-Klähn, *Altvorderasiatische Bildstelen* 48 points out the resemblance.

[71] UE 7, 54.

[72] UET 1, 137; Frayne, RIME 4, 224-231. Woolley calls it a white calcite stele of Rīm-Sîn (UE 7, 6 and 55, with question mark). The hypothetical restoration of the room in the drawing on p. 5 of UE 7 seems to show this stele on its base and the altar. It does not show Hammurabi's stele or its platform.

It seems too speculative to suggest a connection between the ritual structures and the text of YOS 9, 45.

Tablets found in the Giparu suggest that the building survived the reconquest of Ur. The two most recent tablets of Old Babylonian date excavated at Ur derive from that building, UET 5, 242 and 868[73]. UET 5, 242 dated to Samsu-iluna 10 records the lease of a house by the *gudapsûm*. More indicative of business as usual is UET 5, 868, dated in the 8th month of Samsu-iluna 12: it organizes the prebends of sweeper and doorman in the Ningal temple, that is, the Giparu. Each of the three men recorded in the text is held responsible for 10 days a month to the palace[74]. Related to UET 5, 868 are the undated duplicate tablets UET 5, 870 and 871, which also deal with the organization of prebends. That record divides an office among five men, and it is possible that the office was that of $gudu_4$-priest in the Ningal temple[75]. Samsu-iluna's administration showed thus concern for the Giparu and its cult, two years after the reconquest of Ur, and it seems unlikely that the building had been burned down before his 12th year.

Thus, perhaps we have to imagine an alternative history for the Hammurabi stele. When Samsu-iluna recaptured Ur the victorious troops gathered fragments of his father's monuments — possibly more than one stele or statue — and put them on display in the Giparu, placing them on the base Woolley excavated. They were then not responsible for the sack of the building. That could have happened during the subsequent rebellion against Samsu-iluna, or more likely its suppression, reported in that king's 14th year name "Samsu-iluna, the king by is great power slaughtered the rebellious enemy kings who had caused Akkad to revolt with their own weapons"[76], even if Ur is not mentioned as a participant. The severity of the destruction as noticed in the archaeological record may signal the frustration this king felt after dealing with repeated revolts in his southern territories[77]. Soon afterwards Ur and other cities of that region seem to have been mostly abandoned[78] and the patchwork restoration of the Giparu may have been the work of a few remaining residents.

[73] T. C. Mitchell, the editor of UE 7, remarked that the field number provided by Figulla for UET 5, 868, U.6393, must be wrong as the tablet is described on the field card as dated to Sumuel 14 (UE 7, 223). The actual number written on the tablet is U.6398 (IM 57604, collated January 1987), which was found in the Giparu (UE 7, 224), so this is not a problem.

[74] D. Charpin, *Le Clergé d'Ur au siècle d'Hammurabi* (Geneva 1986) 209-210.

[75] Charpin, *Clergé* 264-265.

[76] Horsnell, *Year-Names* 199.

[77] Gadd, *History and Monuments of Ur* 189 thought the stele's destruction happened when Babylon lost full control over the south after Samsu-iluna's 30th year, and that the rebel was Iluma-ilum (nowadays scholars waver between Ilima-ilum, Iliman, and Ilī-ma-AN for the reading of this name [Charpin, OBO 160/4, 360 n. 1884]). That seems unlikely as by then Ur probably had not been under Babylon's control for at least 15 years.

[78] H. Gasche, *La Babylonie au 17e siècle avant notre ère* (MHE Memoirs 1; Ghent 1989) 130-131.

The situation at Kish is even more difficult to reconstruct. Langdon's excavations found the fragments "willfully shattered ... into small bits and scattered over the entire ruins"[79] of the Emeteursag temple at Tell Uhaimir. Hammurabi restored that temple to the god Zababa in his 35th year[80] and it is possible he set up one or more stone monuments at that time. Langdon makes no suggestion about when the destruction would have taken place. Samsu-iluna's war against Rīm-Sîn II seems to have covered a large region including the territory of Kish, only 15 kilometers east of Babylon. In his bilingual inscription C, which commemorates the rebuilding of the city's walls, he states that he killed Rīm-Sîn and "heaped up a burial mound over him in the land of Kish"[81]. The city may thus have been involved in the revolt and monuments to Hammurabi may have been defaced at that time.

One thing is clear: several of Hammurabi's monuments were violently attacked and smashed into pieces. As they were of hard stone this was not an easy task and required determination. The destruction shows that the monuments were considered to be clear expressions of the king's power and a source of resentment. It seems possible that the Babylonians who reasserted control over Ur picked up the small pieces of UET 1, 146, displayed them, and made them an object of ritual activity. Elsewhere fragments of Hammurabi monuments were preserved as well: *LIH* 60 was possibly kept in Sippar until Persian times and MDP 2, 82-85 stood somewhere in Babylonia until the 12th century, when it was taken to Susa. Likewise fragmentary copies of Hammurabi's "law code" ended up there. As with several other of the monuments that Shutruk-Nahhunte looted, we need not think that he was responsible for the destruction. They could have been fragments when he found them on display in Babylonia.

In these days when Mesopotamian rulers are all too often seen as prototypes of "Oriental despots" and when military history still dominates our reconstruction of the past, it is valuable that we honor such kings as Hammurabi for their non-violent contributions to history. This should not blind us, however, to the fact that he himself *also* wanted to be known for his military accomplishments. He did not shy away from proclaiming that message loud and clear in inscribed monuments he set up throughout his kingdom, using both written languages of the newly unified realm, Sumerian and Akkadian. At Ur he set up a glorification of his military might in the temple of Ningal, dominating a court lined with monuments of that city's earlier elites. His subjects understood the message and some resented

[79] *Excavations at Kish* 15-16.
[80] See year name 36 and the building inscriptions RIME 4, 342-344.
[81] RIME 4, 387.

it; when they had a chance they shattered these symbols of power. Hammurabi was a multi-faceted character, and it is this combination of qualities that makes him one of the most interesting rulers of early Babylonian history.

Appendix 1: List of stone fragments with inscriptions of Hammurabi

Provenience	Publication	language(s)
Kish	Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 175, Ash 1931-988	Sumerian-Akkadian
Kish	Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 176, Ash 1928-424	Sumerian-Akkadian
Kish	Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 176, Ash 1930-203	Sumerian
Kish	Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 176, Ash 1931-989	Sumerian(?)
Kish	Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 176, Ash 1931-990	unclear
Kish	Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 176, Ash 1933-1280	Sumerian
Kish	Grégoire, *Contribution* I/2, pl. 176, Ash 1933-1329	unclear
Kish	*LIH* 67	Sumerian
Susa	MDP 2, 82-85	Sumerian
Ur	UET 1, 146	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	UET 1, 146, fragment a	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	UET 1, 146, fragment b	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	UET 1, 146, fragment c	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	UET 1, 146, fragment d	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	UET 1, 146, fragment e	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	UET 1, 146, fragment f	Sumerian-Akkadian(?)
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 1	Sumerian(?)
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 2	unclear
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 3	unclear
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 4	unclear
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 5	unclear
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 6	unclear
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 7	Sumerian(?)
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 8	unclear
Ur	UET 1, pl. 34 fragment 9	Sumerian(?)
Ur	U.11677, see plate XXXI here	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 39	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 40	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 41	Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 42	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 43	Sumerian

Ur	YOS 9, 44	Sumerian-Akkadian(?)
Ur	YOS 9, 45	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 46	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 47	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 48	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 49	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 50	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 51	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 52	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 53	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 54	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 55	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 56	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 57	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur	YOS 9, 58	Sumerian
Ur	YOS 9, 59	Sumerian
Ur?	YOS 9, 60	Sumerian-Akkadian(?)
Ur?	YOS 9, 61	Sumerian-Akkadian
Ur?	A3518, see plate XXXI here	Sumerian-Akkadian
unknown	CT 21, 40-2 = LIH 60	Sumerian-Akkadian

Appendix 2: Previously unpublished fragments

1) BM 1927-5-27-24A

The piece measures 5.9 x 4.2 cm. The two columns of this bilingual fragment are not related in contents. Col. I, is the Akkadian version of a Sumerian column to its left now fully lost; col. II contains a Sumerian text whose Akkadian counterpart is lost. The cases of the Akkadian column are twice as high as those of the Sumerian one.

Col. I

Akkadian

1′. [ ]x *ba a ri*
2′. [ ]x–*ni–šu*
3′. [ ]x[ ]

Col. II

Sumerian

1′. AN [ ]
2′. lugal na[m]
3′. níg–nam [ ]
4′. dù–a–b[i]

Possibly the fragment contains the words níg-nam "whatever" and dù-a-bi = *kalāma* "all, everything".

2) OIM A3518

The piece measures 10 × 5.2 × 2.3 cm. Only parts of five lines of a Sumerian-Akkadian bilingual text are preserved.

	Sumerian	Akkadian
1′.	[mar-uru$_5$ l]ú-kúr-ba	*a-bu-ub na-k*[*i-ri-šu*]
2′.	[n]am-nir-ra	*šu-um-ḫa-am me-t*[*e-lu-tam*]
3′.	[kala]m-ma	*pí-i ma-*⌜*tim*⌝
4′.	[gá-g]á	*a-na iš-te-en ša-ka-n*[*am*]
5′.	[ ]	[x *m*]*a*$^{?}$-⌞*tim*⌟ GA x[ ]

"flood-storm over his enemies, (the god gave him?) abundance, supremacy, to make the country act in unison, ..."

A transliteration of lines 1′ to 4′ appears in *CAD* Š/3 274a. The basis of the suggested Sumerian restoration kir$_4$-zal there for Akkadian *šu-um-ḫa-am* is unclear.

Notes

Line **1′**: Cf. mar-uru$_5$ ^{giš}giš-lá *a-bu-ub tu-qu-ma-tim* in *LIH* 60 = CT 21, 42 cols. IVa and IVb l. 8, used as an epithet for Hammurabi.

Line **2′**. Cf. *LIH* 60 = CT 21, 40 col. Ib l. 2′, "Enlil gave [*me-*]*te-lu-t*[*am*] supremacy"; for nam-nir as equivalent of *mētellūtu*, see YOS 9, 36 and dupls. (Samsuiluna inscription) as quoted in RIME 4, 378: 85//105. *šumḫum* "abundance" is used interchangeably with *nuḫšum* in the canal name ^{iD}*Ḫammurabi-šumuḫ-nišī* reported in Hammurabi's year name 33 (variant ^{iD}*Ḫammurabi-nuḫuš-nišī*). *AHw* 1272a and *CAD* Š/3 273-274 list no Sumerian equivalent. Perhaps ḫi-li should be expected; cf. *AHw* 1153 and *CAD* Š/1 288-289 s.v. *šamāḫu*.

Line **4′**. For *pâm ištēn šuškunum* "to make act in unison" as a euphemism for "to subject", see *AHw* 873a sub D1c and *CAD* Š/1 141a.

History Department
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
USA

U.11677 = BM 1927-0527-24A

OIM A3518