

**MEDEDEELINGEN**  
**DER**  
**KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSCHE**  
**AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN**

**NIEUWE REEKS, DEEL 9**  
**AFDEELING LETTERKUNDE**

Nos. 1—10

**UITGAVE VAN DE N.V. NOORD-HOLLANDSCHE**  
**UITGEVERS MAATSCHAPPIJ, AMSTERDAM 1946**



## INHOUD

	Blz.
1. GERARD BROM, Het Wilhelmus en de Bijbel . . .	1— 12
2. C. C. UHLENBECK, Gestaafde en vermeende affiniteiten van het Baskisch . . . . .	13— 24
3. W. B. KRISTENSEN, Het mysterie van Mithra . . .	25— 38
4. C. DE BOER, Is het Frans een „decrepite” taal? . .	39— 52
5. G. VAN DER LEEUW, De botsing tusschen heidendom en christendom in de eerste vier eeuwen . .	53— 79
6. GERARD BROM, Nietzsche's Antichrist . . . . .	81—252
7. C. W. VOLLGRAFF, G. VAN HOORN en J. H. JONGKEES, Proefgraving ten Oosten van het Domplein te Utrecht . . . . .	253—278
8. B. A. VAN GRONINGEN, The proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey . . . . .	279—294
9. A. G. VAN HAMEL †, Primitieve Ierse taalstudie .	295—339
10. F. M. TH. BÖHL, King Hammurabi of Babylon in the setting of his time (about 1700 b. C.) . . .	341—370





# KING HAMMURABI OF BABYLON IN THE SETTING OF HIS TIME (ABOUT 1700 B.C.)

BY

F. M. TH. BÖHL

For three periods of the ancient history of the Near East archival researches have become possible on the strength of letters and diplomatic documents: for the period of about 1700 B.C. by the archives of Māri, the modern *Tell Hariri*, of which the examination has only just started; for the 14th and 13th centuries by the „finds” at *El-Amarna*, *Bogazköy* and also at *Rās-eš-Šamra*; and for the second half of the eighth and the first part of the seventh century by the *corpus epistularum* from the library of Assurbanipal <sup>1)</sup>. The examination of the first of these archives has thrown new light on our knowledge of the person and the time of the great Babylonian king and legislator Hammurabi <sup>2)</sup>. This new light is by no means confined to the chronological problem, though the fact that Hammurabi has become two or three centuries younger to us than was formerly thought, is not without historical consequences. Besides this, the records from Māri have given us a new and better understanding of his person in the setting of his time.

In 1941 appeared the first extensive publication of letters in copied cuneiform characters from the archives of the last king of Māri, *Zimrilim* or *Zimrilim*, at one time — during a period of armed peace — Hammurabi's ally, and later on his embittered antagonist <sup>3)</sup>. Among these letters are also the reports of *Ibal-pi-el*, the representative and spy of

---

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. A. A. Kampman, *Archieven en bibliotheken in het oude Nabije Oosten*, Schoten-Antwerpen 1942.

<sup>2)</sup> Concerning the transcription of the name Hammurabi (not Hammurapi) see Th. Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer*, 1926, p. 53 f.; Ch.-F. Jean, *RÉS et Bab.* 1941/2, p. 77, note 3.

<sup>3)</sup> *Archives royales de Mari*, II: *Lettres*, publiées par Charles - F. Jean (TCL XXIII), Paris 1941; cf. Ch.-F. Jean, *Contenu général des „Lettres de Mari” du tome II des Archives royales*, *RÉS et Bab.* 1941/2, p. 77 — 132.

Zimrilim at the court of Babylon<sup>4</sup>). Such reports, one-sided though they naturally are, go a long way towards making a fuller delineation of the character of the great king possible.

One might be of opinion that the exposition here given may be somewhat premature, seeing the considerable increase of material which may soon be expected. The number of records excavated at Mārī amounts to more than 20.000, of which Jean has published only 141 letters in the *Textes cunéiformes* from the Louvre, while an analogous part, by the hand of Dossin has, according to his communications, already been printed and will appear as soon as possible. However, I am in this respect inclined to be optimistic. For one thing, the greater part by far of these records consists of contracts, receipts and inventories, for our purpose important only by their datings, which have already been examined by the said scholars. Only about one fourth of the whole bulk consists of letters and documents, found especially in room no 115, which is the record-room proper<sup>5</sup>).

Now these letters have in the first place been perused by Dossin and Jean in so far as the name of Ḫammurabi — whether the king of Babylon or his namesakes, the kings of Aleppo and Kurda — occurs in them, and many of the most important of these letters have been published in the volume of Jean. Of the others Jean has already, as far as Ḫammurabi is concerned, given a survey in the *Revue d'Assyriologie* of 1938 and in the *Revue des Etudes Sémitiques* of 1941, while Dossin has done the same in his survey of the *Archives épistolaires de Mārī* in the periodical *Syria* of 1938<sup>6</sup>). Startling discoveries, therefore, as far as Ḫammurabi is concerned, are not likely to come forth.

In speaking of the fresh material, we do not at the same time wish to overlook the old material. It was extensive enough already, but the information that could be obtained from it, was one-sided. Since the year 1902 the famous Code of Laws had been known, engraved on a large block of black diorite of about eight feet high, now in the Louvre, with its detailed prologue and epilogue and its 282 sections, in the beginning erroneously considered the oldest code of laws in existence.

Furthermore no less than 136 letters were known of Ḫammurabi to

---

<sup>4</sup>) Jean, l.c., No. 20 — 32.

<sup>5</sup>) See note 18, and on the „record-room” cf. A. Parrot, *Syria* XIX, 1938, p. 106; XX, 1939, pl. XI.

<sup>6</sup>) Ch.—F. Jean, „*Ḫammurabi*” *d'après des lettres inédites de Mari*, RA XXXV 2, 1938, p. 107 — 114 ; G. Dossin, *Les archives épistolaires du palais de Mari*, *Syria* XIX, 1938, p. 105 — 126.

his officials Sin-idinam and Šamaš-ḥašir of Larsa, letters by Ḥammurabi himself, of which the cultural importance, however, is greater than the historical. The number of these letters, of which the greater part is to be found in the museums of Paris, London and Oxford was in 1943 increased to 145 by J. B. Alexander in his edition of *Early Babylonian Letters and Economic Texts* from the collection of the late J. B. Nies 7).

In the third place a large number of records are known, immured in the foundations of his buildings, mostly in two languages, Sumerian and Accadian, of which the purely historical value is unfortunately also comparatively small. For, whereas the Assyrian kings were wont to enumerate all their campaigns and conquests in suchlike records, the Babylonian as well as the Sumerian kings confined themselves exclusively to the domain of religion. This does not mean, as was formerly sometimes believed, that they were of a more peaceful nature, but only -- as appears clearly from Ḥammurabi -- that they wished to make an essential difference between the affairs of the state and of public worship, between palace and temple; that they were of opinion that the affairs of the palace ought not to be introduced into the votive and building records of a temple.

If, therefore, one wished to arrange and sort out the scanty material in order to ascertain the actual development of the events during his long reign of 43 years, one was obliged to have recourse to the fourth source, which even now affords us the indispensable scheme of history in these centuries between the third dynasty of Ur and the rule of the Kassites: the dates of the contracts. For each year in this period was named after the most important event that had preceded it. By royal decree the name of the year was fixed (a decree about the 24th year of Samsuiluna, the son and successor of Ḥammurabi has been preserved in our Leyden collection) 8) and the lists of the years together with their names were arranged consecutively in special records. It is invariably one sentence, written in Sumerian, and, in accordance with the way of dating contracts, mostly rendered in an abbreviated form: "year when such and such a thing happened". The best compilation and elaboration of these lists of dates is given by Ungnad in the second volume of the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 9). The data are of course briefly worded and they should moreover be read critically. That a king should have had a year named after a defeat is hardly imaginable. Nevertheless,

7) Cf. J. B. Alexander, BIN VII, New Haven 1943, p. 3, note 1.

8) Collection Böhl, No. 800, cf. F. E. Peiser, OLZ 1910, col. 193 — 195.

9) A. Ungnad, *Datenlisten*, RLA II, p. 131 — 195 (Ḥammurabi: No. 103 — 145, p. 178 — 182).

this material is to a historian of inestimable value and a complete publication of the dates in the Māri documents is at present one of the most urgent requirements.

Such are the sources that hitherto afforded the material for a description of the history of Ḫammurabi and his time; exquisite descriptions, but necessarily one-sided: Ungnad, who wrote in the year 1919 the introduction to his translation of the letters; Campbell Thompson in the first volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* (1923); Meissner in his *Könige Babylonien und Assyrien* (1926). The character of the sources limited these descriptions for the greater part to the provinces of public worship and law. It was clearly realized that the great king appeared in both fields as the achiever of great reforms. The importance of these reforms, which I intend to touch upon towards the end of this paper, remains the same to us in its full compass, for on these things the diplomatic correspondence from Māri discovered since has as a matter of fact shed no new light.

It is otherwise with the political history of this period. Here the great king, owing to a false chronology, was placed in a remarkable isolation. He was placed in the twentieth century B.C., 1955—1913 according to Meissner and Weidner. He was succeeded by five insignificant kings of his dynasty; then came the sack of Babylon by the Hittite Muṣṣiliš I and then... the great gap in our knowledge of about two centuries, which, as far as Babylonia is concerned, was filled up with the names of the first Kassite kings from the King Lists and in general by the hypothesis of a migration of nations under Indo-Germanic leadership, or of a fantastic Hyksos-rule, which was supposed to have extended as far as Mesopotamia. Thus Ḫammurabi became an ideal, an almost legendary figure at the end of a historical development which suddenly breaks off. The "gap" has disappeared, the historical connection has been restored, we are now able to form an opinion about the results of his work.

In addition to this a second error must be mentioned, which is especially apparent with scholars such as Forrer, Weidner and also Lewy. I mean the theory of the great empires („Grossreiche"). They dreamt of a series of empires which succeeded each other and comprised the greater part of Western Asia, empires in which one conqueror succeeded another. According to this theory these conquerors must have been for our period: first the Assyrian king Sargon I, whose rule was supposed to have extended as far as Asia Minor, then the Elamite Kudur-Mabuk and his son Rîm-Sin of Larsa, who, as was believed, had not only ruled over Sumer but also over the Assyrian Empire, and lastly, by his overthrow of Rîm-Sin: Ḫammurabi. At one blow, it would seem, the ruler over a small provincial town came into the

possession of an empire<sup>10</sup>). This theory, reminiscent of the Book of Daniel, does certainly not hold good for this old period. From the Māri-letters we know how great the number of rival kingdoms and how unstable the political balance was. In the special case of Hammurabi, moreover, the whole theory was based on false conjectures. The fragment of the Assyrian King List contains the name, in a mutilated form, of a king who was identified with *Rim-Sin* of Larsa, the elder contemporary and antagonist of Hammurabi, and the former was now also supposed to have ruled over Assyria<sup>11</sup>). As appears from the new list of Chorsabad, however, the name ought to be read *Narām-Sin* and this correction disposes of the theory of the great empire which Hammurabi was supposed to have inherited from his defeated antagonist Rim-Sin<sup>12</sup>).

The Māri letters invite a comparison with the Amarna letters, the famous correspondence of Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV found in the residence of the latter. The material is larger. In Amarna not more than about 350 letters have been recovered, here about 5000. It is to be regretted that the writers in contradistinction to Amarna hardly ever mention their titles or the names of the towns and countries over which they rule. This modesty, however appealing a quality it may be, is to the historian a matter for regret. On the whole there is some resemblance between conditions during the Māri time and the Amarna time of three centuries later. But in Māri everything is on a larger scale. Whereas in Amarna we are chiefly concerned with the small city governors of Syria and Palestine, who are dependent on Egypt and already content if they can get auxiliary troops of 300 or 400 men at most, armies of 10.000 men are quite common in the Māri letters and even armies of 30.000 or 40.000 men are by no means exceptions.

The density of the population and the extent of the wars in these older periods should not be underrated. We are in the flourishing-period of the great kingdoms of Amurru. The unity of language — Accadian with West-Semitic influences — and of civilisation is more evident and more systematic than during the Amarna period. As

<sup>10</sup>) Cf. E. Forrer, RLA II, p. 228 ff.; E. F. Weidner, MVAcG 1921. 2, p. 43 ff.; J. Lewy, OLZ XXVI, 1929, col. 537 ff.; ZA XXXVI, 1925, p. 19 ff.

<sup>11</sup>) Cf. O. Schroeder, KAVI No. 14, 2; 15 Obv. 4; 18 col. I, 10; and E. F. Weidner, MVAcG 1921. 2, p. 42 — 46.

<sup>12</sup>) This king Narām-Sin of Assur must be identical with his contemporary of the same name, the ruler of Eshnunna and Sippar. See about Narām-Sin of Eshnunna, the son of Ibiq-Adad II, and his rule in Sippar: Th. Jacobsen, *Gimilsin Temple* (Chicago 1944), p. 128; and about the identity of Narām-Sin of Eshnunna and of Sippar cf. also: J. B. Alexander, BIN VII, p. 4.

regards the political relations, we can distinguish, as far as I can see, at least seven independent kingdoms in Syria and Mesopotamia between the Mediterranean and the mountains of Elam, besides the kingdom of Māri itself: viz. the kingdoms of *Assur*, *Larsa*, *Babylon*, *Eshnunna*, *Jamḥad* or *Aleppo*, and *Karkemiš*. To these should be added the numerous dependent provinces. The sphere of influence of Māri in the flourishing-period of Zimrilim seems to have extended from Qatānum in the West, the modern *Miṣrife* near the river Orontes, as far as *Jamutbal*, i.e. the district near the old town of *Dēr*, the modern *Badrah*, east of the river Tigris<sup>13</sup>). This applies to the thirty years of the reign of Zimrilim, which correspond to the 5th to the 34th regnal year of the great Ḥammurabi.

From the correspondence between the various courts we get some idea of the diplomatic interplay of these courts mutually with their representatives and secret spies and all their plotting. This view is one-sided only, in so far as Māri and the interests of this kingdom are as a matter of fact everywhere in the centre. Babylon with its brilliant king is beside Assur and Aleppo the most dangerous rival. This time was by no means so peaceful as was formerly thought. But Ḥammurabi succeeded, be it with some difficulty, in maintaining an armed peace for many long years notwithstanding the clash of arms and political scheming. This was not an easy affair, as appears time and again from the letters of the Māri archives. From the North, in Assyria, there was the constant threat of powerful Amorite usurpers, who had ensconced themselves there and had driven away the old native dynasty: *Šamši-Adad* I and his sons *Iṣme-Dagan* and *Jasmaḥ-Adad*, who had for a time even the domination of the two kingdoms North-West and North-East of Babylonia: Māri and Eshnunna. After this, Zimrilim of Mari and of course also Rīm-Sin, who had been on the throne of Larsa for half a century already, became his worst competitors.

This condition of armed peace, interrupted by minor campaigns, lasted till the thirtieth year of his rule. From this year Ḥammurabi at last began to attack the rival kingdoms which he had in long years of diplomatic activity so cleverly succeeded in splitting up; it marks the beginning of the great campaigns undertaken each of the nine years afresh. These are the years of the great expansion of his power, of which the datings inform us in detail. Then follow four more years of peace until his death. He has not lived to see the first invasion of the

<sup>13</sup>) *Qatānum* = *Qaṭna*, see G. Dossin, *Jamḥad et Qatānum*, RA XXXVI/1, 1939, p. 46 — 56; and about the location of Dēr at modern *Badrah* on the Gawi river (first proposed by E. Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches*, p. 135) also I. J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, Chicago 1944, p. 86, note 6.

Kassites in the ninth year of his son and successor Samsu-iluna. Soon his successors saw the empire of Babylon reduced again to its smallest compass.

The question arises when all these things happened. As is well-known, the records from the archives of Māri have given the decisive impulse to a revolution in chronology, by which the gap in our knowledge of the history of the Near East in the first half of the second millennium has disappeared. A large body of literature has appeared on this subject; I counted as many as eighteen treatises<sup>14)</sup> since 1939, in certain details partly antiquated again owing to the lack of contact between scholars during the war and because the exact contents of one of the most important documents remained too long inaccessible and unknown on the continent: the great and all but complete list of the Assyrian kings with the exact statement of the lengths of their reigns and other historical comment.

This tablet was dug up at Chorsabad as early as the winter campaign of 1932—1933 by the expedition of the University of Chicago under the direction of our foreign member Henri Frankfort, and it was not until more than ten years later that the contents were published and elucidated by Arno Poebel in three detailed contributions to the *Journal of Near East Studies* of 1942 and 1943. On these is based, as well as on a photo of the reverse of the tablet, the survey of Weidner in the *Archiv für Orientforschung* of 1944<sup>15)</sup>.

Owing to these publications it has become possible to calculate the time of the reign of the Assyrian kings Šamši-Adad I and Išme-Dagan I rather accurately. They are contemporaries of Hammurabi; as appears from a record from Sippar, Šamši-Adad must still have been alive in

---

<sup>14)</sup> Cf. W. F. Albright in *BASOR* No. 69, p. 18 — 21; No. 77, p. 20 — 32; No. 88, p. 28 — 36; A. Alt in: *Die Welt als Geschichte* VIII, 1942, p. 122 — 133; F. Cornelius in *Klio* XXXV, 1942, p. 1 — 16; *Id.*, in: *FuF* 20, 1944, p. 75 f.; R. Dussaud in *Syria* XXI, 1940, p. 238; *ibid.* p. 357 f., P. van der Meer, *JEOL* No. 9, 1944, p. 137 — 145; O. Neugebauer in *OLZ* XLII, 1939, col. 407 ff.; *JAOS* LXI, 1941, p. 58 — 61; D. Sidersky in *Mém. Ac.* XIII, 1936, p. 1 — 94; *RA* 1940, p. 45 — 54; S. Smith, *Alalakh and Chronology*, 1940; F. Thureau-Dangin in *Mém. Ac.* XLIII, 1942, p. 1 — 30; A. Ungnad in *AOF* XIII, 1939/41, p. 145 f.; *Id.*, *MAOG* XIII/3, 1940. R. Weill, *Le synchronisme Égypto-Babylonien du début du II<sup>e</sup> millénaire et l'évolution présente de la chronologie babylonienne*: *Chron. d'Ég.* XXI, Jan. 1946, p. 34 — 43; J. Capart, *Remarques sur l'article précédent*, *ibid.* p. 44 — 45.

<sup>15)</sup> A. Poebel, *JNES* I, 1942, p. 247 — 306; 460 — 492; II, 1943, p. 56 — 90; E. F. Weidner, *AOF* XIV, 1944, p. 362 — 369.

the tenth year of Hammurabi<sup>16</sup>). A starting-point is afforded by the sun eclipse of 15 June 763 in the ninth year of Assur-dān III, from which point one may count back.

The chronological statements in the inscriptions of Salmanassar I, Tiglatpileser I and Asarhaddon can only serve to check calculations, as they can only with difficulty be made to tally. I may be permitted here to refer to the exposition of Poebel. Notwithstanding some small gaps and obscurities the margin of uncertainty is probably not greater than four or five years. According to Poebel Šamši-Adad I rules from 1726 to 1694, according to Weidner from 1729 to 1697 B.C. Within these years, accordingly, the years of the reign of Hammurabi have to be placed<sup>17</sup>).

The length of the period of the records from the archives of Māri can be calculated on the strength of the dates of the economical records, which were compiled by Dossin<sup>18</sup>). It is a period of 58 years, of which the last thirty years contain the reign of king Zimrilim; before these seem to lie twenty years of Assyrian domination and previous to these, eight regnal years of Jaḥdunlim, Zimrilim's father, who had been dispossessed by Šamši-Adad.

The *terminus ad quem* is the destruction of Māri in the 35th year of the reign of Hammurabi; as a *terminus a quo* for this whole period one might take the end of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom under the twelfth dynasty. The *argumentum e silentio* that in the Māri-letters hitherto known no mention is made of Egypt is in our case not without importance. The rise and subsequent flourishing period of Amurru in Syria and Mesopotamia was only possible in a time of political weakness of Egypt and before the consolidation of the other foreign powers: Hatti, Mitanni and also Elam. The beginning of the domination of the older Hyksos over the whole of Egypt was fixed about the years 1720—1710 B.C. by Hanns Stock in 1942<sup>19</sup>).

These historical considerations, on the strength of which the time of Māri and Hammurabi must be later than the fall of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom is fully confirmed by stratigraphic evidence. Of course only those excavations come in for consideration, where Egyptian and

<sup>16</sup>) H. Rankc, BE VI/1, 1906, No. 26 ; cf. Kohler and Ungnad, *Hammurabi's Gesetz*, III No. 710; Schorr, VAB V, No. 284.

<sup>17</sup>) More probable indeed is the calculation of I. J. Gelb *op. cit.* 42, 66: Šamši-Adad 1748—1716, Išme-Dagan 1715—1676. Then all chronological difficulties would be removed.

<sup>18</sup>) G. Dossin, *Les archives économiques*, Syria XX, p. 97—113.

<sup>19</sup>) H. Stock, *Studien zur Geschichte und Archäologie der 13. bis 17. Dynastie Ägyptens* (Ägyptologische Forschungen, Heft 12), Glückstadt-Hamburg 1942; cf. Bea, Or. 13, 1944, p. 185; S. Smith, *Alalakh*, p. 2 note.



Mesopotamian influences meet, consequently North-Syria and Mesopotamia. In Ras Shamra, as the excavator Schaeffer has observed, the objects dating from the period of the dynasty of Hammurabi lie on a higher level than those of the flourishing period of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom, and cylinder seals of the type of the dynasty of Hammurabi are found in tombs which on the strength of ceramics and scarabs should be dated in the 18th and 17th centuries B.C.<sup>20</sup>). Sidney Smith had the same experience, even on a larger scale, during the excavations carried on at Atchana, the ancient Alalakh. His treatise *Alalakh and Chronology*, still independent of the material of the Māri-letters, was in this respect quite a surprise<sup>21</sup>).

On the other hand the excavations in Southern Babylonia, such as those of Ur and Uruk, show hardly any difference between the ceramics of the time of Rīm-Sin and Hammurabi on one side with those of the Kassites on the other. The strata lie immediately over each other and there is no break whatever. Indeed, the first invasion of the Kassites into the borderland of Babylonia must have occurred ten years after Hammurabi's death already. A Babylonian place named after, and consequently founded by, the ancient Kassite king *Agum* is already mentioned in records from the time of Hammurabi's great-grandson Ammišadūqa<sup>22</sup>). So we find between the successors of Hammurabi and the older Kassite kings the phenomenon of *overlapping*, though in the lists they are mentioned consecutively.

Attempts have been made to determine more accurately the time of Hammurabi and the kings of his dynasty on the evidence of the famous „V e n u s - t a b l e t s": a collection of omina connected with the risings and settings of the planet Venus during the 21 years of the reign of the abovementioned king Ammišadūqa, the last king but one of the dynasty, with the exception of the 18th year. That this king is really meant appears from the name of his 8th year, which is expressly mentioned. The text can be recovered from seven copies preserved fragmentarily<sup>23</sup>). The beginning (the passage about the first year) may serve as an example of the whole: „If on the 15th of the month of Shebat the planet Venus disappeared in the West, remained invisible for

<sup>20</sup>) F. A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica* (Mission de Ras Shamra, tome III, Paris 1939), p. 18 note 2.

<sup>21</sup>) Cf. S. Smith, *Alalakh and Chronology*, p. 3 — 10.

<sup>22</sup>) O. Schroeder, VS XVI No. 24, cf. P. Kraus, MVAeG 35/2, 1931, p. 37 f. See Böhl in BiOr I/4, 1944, p. 56 f.

<sup>23</sup>) S. Langdon and J. K. Fotheringham, *The Venus Tablets of Ammizaduga*, Oxford 1928, p. 7 and 14; B. L. van der Waerden, *Die Berechnung der ersten und letzten Sichtbarkeit von Mond und Planeten und die Uenustafeln des Ammišaduqa* (BVS AW, mathem.-phys. Klasse, XCIV/1, 1942, p. 23 ff.

three days and appeared again in the East on the 18th of Adar — the meaning is, as was the case in the first year of the reign of king Ammišadūqa — then kings shall be defeated: the god Adad, however, shall bring his rain and the god Ea his floods and one king shall bring greetings to the other.”

Accordingly: *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. Because under Ammišadūqa these occurrences succeeded these observations, this might also be the case in the future. If, therefore, we can calculate the reign of Ammišadūqa on the ground of astronomical observations, we shall also be able to obtain that of Ḥammurabi, for the duration of the reigns is fixed, thanks to the date-lists.

Here it is the Assyriologist who can furnish the data. The complicated calculations, again and again verified and corrected, were made by astronomers and mathematicians such as Kugler, Fotheringham, Schoch, Sewell, Schaumberger and Van der Waerden. It stands to reason that the phenomena are cyclic. The synodic time of revolution of the whole cyclūs according to Sewell amounts to 275 tropical years minus eight days<sup>24</sup>). Moreover, the most important phenomenon recurs within a distance of 56 or 64 years (or at most two times within a distance of 8 years): the conjunction of Venus with the new moon during the sun's altitude in winter as mentioned for the sixth regnal year.

Neugebauer has rightly observed that a choice between the various astronomically equivalent fixations is possible only on the strength of historical evidence<sup>25</sup>). The calculations of Langdon and Fotheringham in their standard work about *The Venus Tablets of Ammizaduga* (Oxford 1928) offer for those centuries only one of eight different possibilities: Ammišadūqa from 1921 to 1901, Ḥammurabi from 2067 to 2025<sup>26</sup>).

On the strength of historical evidence Sewell and Ungnad have independently of each other reduced these figures by 275 years (in 1940): Ammišadūqa from 1646 to 1626 and Ḥammurabi from 1792 to 1750 B.C.<sup>27</sup>). But this reduction proved to be insufficient, especially with a view to the synchronism with Šamši-Adad, whose time is determined by the Chorsabad-list. Therefore Albright in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* of December 1942 proposed on the strength of the smaller cyclūs a further reduction by

<sup>24</sup>) J. W. S. Sewell in: S. Smith, *Alalakh and Chronology*, p. 26.

<sup>25</sup>) O. Neugebauer, *JAOS* LXI/1, March 1941, p. 59; cf. *OLZ* XLII, 1939, col. 408.

<sup>26</sup>) See A. Ungnad, *Or.* 13, 1944, p. 84.

<sup>27</sup>) J. W. S. Sewell in: S. Smith, *Alalakh and Chronology*, p. 26 f.; A. Ungnad, *Die Venustafeln und das neunte Jahr Samsuilunas*, *MAOG* XIII/3, p. 17 (cf. *OLZ* XII, 1943, p. 393, note 2).

64 years, thus assigning the years 1728—1686 B.C. for Ḫammurabi<sup>28</sup>).

Exactly the same result was obtained by Friedrich Cornelius in the periodical *Klio* of the same year on the strength of quite a different set of data: the King Lists of Berossos, to which in his opinion, notwithstanding much misunderstanding and many misspellings much greater historical value should be attached than has hitherto been done<sup>29</sup>).

In this same year 1942 the Dutch mathematician B. L. van der Waerden (then at Leipsic) took the trouble to calculate the positions of the planet Venus in connection with the various suggestions, and to compare them with the statements of the cuneiform texts. The correspondences with the lastmentioned computation of time (the one of Cornelius and Albright) amount to 58 per cent., with the others even less. On the strength of these results he gives to Cornelius, who, as was said, starts from other considerations, the preference<sup>30</sup>).

This result is disappointing. It is also the reason why I made an attempt in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (November 1944) to approach the problem from a purely historical point of view<sup>31</sup>). As appears from the above-mentioned record from Sippar, Šamši-adad was still alive in the tenth year of Ḫammurabi. If, furthermore, we consider, by way of hypothesis, the calculations of Albright and Cornelius for Ḫammurabi 1728 — 1686 and those of Weidner for Šamši-adad 1729 — 1697 as being correct, then the year of the death of the latter corresponds with the 32nd year of the reign of Ḫammurabi. In this same year Ḫammurabi inflicted, according to the dates of the contracts, the second and this time the decisive defeat on the Assyrians and their allies, thus subjecting the whole northern region along the banks of the river Tigris. It would seem, therefore, that Šamši-adad was killed in this decisive battle. Even in the state of Eshnunna or Tupliash (one of the allies) this year was named after the death of the great Assyrian king. This appears from dates in records from Ashjâli, the ancient Dûr-Rimuš, a town which belonged to this kingdom<sup>32</sup>).

This coincidence of events speaks well for the correctness of the computation of the time. And yet I am hesitant in this matter. In the

<sup>28</sup>) W. F. Albright, *A third Revision of the early Chronology of Western Asia*, BASOR, Dec. 1942, p. 30.

<sup>29</sup>) F. Cornelius, *Berosos und die altorientalische Chronologie*, *Klio* XXXV, 1942, p. 7.

<sup>30</sup>) B. L. van der Waerden, BVSAB, math.-phys. Kl., XCIV/1 (see note 23), p. 23 — 28.

<sup>31</sup>) Cf. Böhl, *BiOr* I/6, Nov. 1944, p. 102 f.

<sup>32</sup>) See H. L. Lutz, *Legal and Economic Documents from Ashjâli*, UCP X/1, 1931, p. 51, No. 11; cf. Ungnad, *Datenlisten*, RLA II, p. 195, No. 9; P. Koschaker, *ZA* XLIII, p. 210 ff.; Th. Jacobsen, *Gimilsin Temple*, p. 129 f.

first place the destruction of Māri would have to be put only four years later, in 1694, and the time would be too short for the 58 years which according to the Māri-records must precede this destruction. I have tried to solve this difficulty by assuming that also during the first half of the reign of Zimrilim certain records may have been dated after Assyrian eponymous officers so that the sixteen years dated after these officers may be eliminated. This is possible but not probable.

In the second place there is among the Māri-records a letter which is said to show that Jasmaḥ-Adad, who was driven away from Māri by Zimrilim must have witnessed the death of his father Šamši-Adad, while still king of Māri. But this letter, of which the address is missing, may have been addressed to one of the kings of the friendly courts, who, according to the style of that time, is addressed by Išme-Dagan as „brother”<sup>33</sup>).

And last but not least there is the third objection: the great part which according to the Māri-letters this same Ishme-Dagan himself played, apparently after his accession to the throne, but still as a contemporary of Ḥammurabi and Zimrilim. Though the title is missing, it is even for reasons of chronology — he rules no less than forty years — improbable that he should have done all this already as crown-prince and as governor of the town of Ekallāti.

Moreover, the time fixed for Šamši-Adad by Poebel with its difference of four years seems preferable to that fixed by Weidner. A solution seems only possible by fixing the reign of Ḥammurabi at a still somewhat later time. A shift of 64 years on the strength of the Venus tablets, however, is impossible seeing the synchronism of the tenth year of his reign. If, therefore, we leave the Venus data for what they are, and assume that the tenth year of the reign of Ḥammurabi is at the same time the year of the death of Šamši-Adad — hence the year 1694 according to Poebel — we obtain for the reign of Ḥammurabi the years 1704—1662 B.C. For the present we shall have to be content with stating that the greater part of the 42 years of the reign of Ḥammurabi is to be placed after rather than before the year 1700<sup>34</sup>).

Zimrilim, the son and grandson of the first Amorite kings of Māri, has in a probably short but fierce struggle fought his country free from the Assyrian yoke. After this the kings of Māri, Babylon, Larsa, Eshnunna and in the West those of Qaṭānum and Aleppo were for many long years the mighty rivals round whom the lesser kings grouped themselves as vassals and allies. We get an idea om their relative power from a letter addressed to king Zimrilim: "...There is no king who

<sup>33</sup>) See F. Thureau-Dangin, RA XXXIV, 1937, p. 136.

<sup>34</sup>) If Gelb's calculation (see note 17) is right, we can maintain the date of Albright and Cornelius.

is of himself powerful. Ten or fifteen kings have joined Ḥammurabi, king of Babylon, a like number Rîm-Sin, king of Larsa, a like number Ibal-pî-el, king of Eshnunna, a like number Amût-pî-el, king of Qaṭānum, while twenty kings have joined Jarim-lim, king of Jamḥad (i.e. Aleppo)" <sup>35</sup>). Jarim-lim — here the mightiest king beside Māri itself — was the son of Ḥammurabi's namesake, king of Aleppo during the early part of the latter's reign. So this letter must belong to the years before the great issues.

In those years Assyria tried to compensate for what it had lost West of the river Euphrates by a steady increase of its sphere of influence to the East of the river Tigris and by forming a coalition there, which was especially directed against Māri, Babylon and Larsa. We read of a marriage of a son of Iṣme-Dagan with the daughter of the sheik of Turukki; further — after an initial defeat suffered by Assyria at the hands of Eshnunna — of an alliance between these two countries, which was afterwards joined by Elam, Gutium and Malgūm (all of them in the East) <sup>36</sup>). Zimrilim seems to have been a spendthrift, who wasted the powers of his kingdom, a.o. by the erection of an enormous palace of more than 800 apartments, and Rîm-Sin was in his dotage. Thus continued a condition of unstable political balance, minor expeditions and mutual distrust, until at last Ḥammurabi considered himself sufficiently strong in military affairs to throw off the diplomatic mask and attack the opponents, whom he had so carefully isolated from each other, one by one.

First he turns to the North and defeats the coalition headed by Assyria. In the name for the 30th year stress is laid on the large number of enemies, and on the fact that Ḥammurabi has by this conquest laid the foundations of Sumer and Akkad <sup>37</sup>). For by this conquest he was secured against attacks from behind when in the next year he put an end to Rîm-Sin and the state of Larsa and thus completed the successes of his seventh and eighth years (the conquest of Uruk, Isin and the country of Jamutbalum) by establishing his royal power over the whole of Sumer. But while being engaged upon these expeditions in the South, bellicose Assyria at the head of its allies once more rose to arms. Ḥammurabi had been marching too quickly against the South and had left them time to rally their forces.

But in the next or thirty-second year of his reign he turns to the North again and now the decisive battle follows, which I associated

<sup>35</sup>) See G. Dossin, *Syria XIX*, p. 117 f.

<sup>36</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 40 (Turukki); No. 43, 40 ff.; Ungnad, *Datenlisten*, No. 132 (Eshnunna). On the history of the land of Eshnunna (Tupliaš) during that period see Th. Jacobsen, *Gimilsin Temple*, p. 118 ff.

<sup>37</sup>) Ungnad, *Datenlisten*, No. 132, p. 180.

with the death of Šamši-Adad. The next year was Māri's turn, but it appeared too powerful for the time being. Not until two years later did he settle accounts with his former ally Zimrilim of Māri, destroyed his capital and razed the magnificent palace, which was his pride, to the ground<sup>38</sup>). That was the end of the state of Māri. Younger strata than those dating from the time of Zimrilim, the expedition conducted by Parrot has not found in Tell Harfiri.

The last wars of Ḫammurabi are once more directed against the last remnants of the alliance in the North and North-East. It was on that same occasion that Eshnunna was by a wilful inundation changed into a wilderness. Nor has the expedition conducted by Frankfort found anything in *Tell Asmar* that points to anything younger than this last and definitive destruction<sup>39</sup>).

In Larsa, the modern *Senkere*, things are much the same, as the excavations of the French expedition, likewise conducted by Parrot, have shown<sup>40</sup>). Scholars were inclined, formerly, to praise Ḫammurabi as the prince of peace. In this respect he is disappointing. For there is no denying the fact that by the overthrow and destruction of the ancient states with their culture and civilisation he has paved the way to the Kassite hordes. A golden age, as Thompson described it in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, his time can hardly be called<sup>41</sup>).

These conquests did not last longer than half a dozen years: the last four years of Ḫammurabi himself and the first eight years of his successor Samsu-iluna. We should not exaggerate the extent of this kingdom, even at its culmination-point. In the prologue to the *Codex*, which was not put on record in this form until towards the end of his reign, one finds an enumeration of towns and sanctuaries, among which Māri and Assur are also mentioned already<sup>42</sup>). From this enumeration and with the help of the dates, one can form an idea as to the extent. To the North certainly not farther than Diarbekr near the Tigris, where a relief with a portrait of the king has been found; to the West not farther than the desert, where the boundary was the ancient district

---

<sup>38</sup>) The conquest of Mari and Malgūm in the 32th year of Ḫammurabi was followed by a treaty of peace and a new arrangement of the archives, two years before the definite destruction; see Ungnad, *Datenlisten*, No. 135 and 137; Thureau-Dangin, *Sur des étiquettes de paniers à tablettes provenant de Mari*, in: *Symbolae Koschaker*, Leiden 1939, p. 119 f.

<sup>39</sup>) H. Frankfort c.s., *OIC* No. 13 (1932), 16 (1933), 17 (1934), 18 (1935), 20 (1937); Th. Jacobsen, *Philological notes on Eshnunna and its inscriptions*, Chicago 1934.

<sup>40</sup>) A. Parrot, *RA* XXX, p. 175 ff.

<sup>41</sup>) R. C. Thompson, *CAH* II, 1923, p. 494 ff.

<sup>42</sup>) *CH*, col. I 50 — IV 63.

near the Chabūr, the tributary of the Euphrates; in the East the Zagros mountains formed an insuperable barrier, from which soon afterwards the enemies, the Kassites, were to descend to reduce the kingdom of his son and successor to a smaller compass. But even Susa in the Elamic plain cannot have been conquered by Hammurabi; otherwise this fact would have been mentioned in the dates, similarly the town itself with its temple in the prologue to the Codex<sup>43</sup>). Only in the South did his kingdom extend as far as the Persian Gulf and the boundary of the so-called Sea-Country, which, however, soon made itself independent.

So his greatest acts of war have been the conquest of the ancient highlands of Gutium; the conquest of Larsa, by which the whole of Sumer and Akkad came under his rule; the total destruction of Māri and of Eshnunna; and the conquest of Assyria, which on account of the defection of Māri and other calamities had, notwithstanding all sorts of aspirations and coalitions, already been reduced in its extent. In the names for the thirtieth to the thirty-ninth year Assyria is always called *Subartu*. As was shown by Gelb in 1944 this geographical and ethnological term originally indicated the country to the East of Assyria proper, later on the whole of Upper-Mesopotamia with Assyria as its centre<sup>44</sup>).

Some further particulars about the subjugation of the Eastern highlands are furnished by the inscription on fragments of a large stele of diorite, which Hammurabi had caused to be erected in the porch of the Moon-temple at Ur to replace a limestone stele of Rîm-Sin, of which unfortunately only few fragments have been recovered by Woolley during his excavations<sup>45</sup>). In the most important passages that have been preserved Hammurabi seems to speak about the conversion of the subdued mountain-tribes to god Marduk. He was — and we should not forget this — besides other things, above all a religious reformer, who wanted to make Marduk supreme god of all Babylonia. "I subdued to Him (i.e. to Marduk, litt.: I entrusted to his hand) the men of Elam(?), Gutium, Subartu and Tukriš, whose mountainous regions are remote and whose languages are complicated, and I have set their confused minds right"<sup>46</sup>).

At all events, towards the end of his reign Hammurabi could call

<sup>43</sup>) Cf. C. Huart and L. Delaporte, *L'Iran antique*, Paris 1943, p. 114 — 122.

<sup>44</sup>) I. J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, Chicago 1944., p. 23 — 49.

<sup>45</sup>) See C. J. Gadd and L. Legrain, UETRI, No. 146 (the name of the king: pl. XXXIV, fragm.d, 1. 9); cf. Sir L. Woolley, AJ VI, p. 372. The stele of Rim-Sin: UETRI No. 137, cf. Böhl, in: *Symbolae Koschaker*, p. 176.

<sup>46</sup>) Col. III 1 — 13 : ....*awēli* [Elamtim]<sup>kl</sup> *Gutium*<sup>kl</sup> *Subartim*<sup>kl</sup> *Tu-uk-ri-iš*<sup>kl</sup> *ša ša-du-šu-nu ne-su-ú li-ša-an-šu-nu e-eg-ru a-na ri-it-ti-šu lu-wa-di-am ʔe 4-em-šu-nu e-še-a-am a-na-ku-ma uš-te-še-er....*

himself with pride: "King of the four quarters" and "King of the universe" — a universe, however, which did not extend far enough towards the West to come into touch or into collision with the Egyptian sphere of influence.

Here in the West the leading power at that time was Aleppo. The opinion that in the enumeration of the temples and towns of the empire this famous town in Northern Syria is also mentioned — and that as the seat of the goddess Ištar — is due to a mistake. The fact is that a place is meant (at the same time a sanctuary) between Uruk and Lagaš<sup>47</sup>). The only thing that may give rise to confusion is that the king of Aleppo was also called Hammurabi, just as the king of the land of Kurda, which has not yet been identified with certainty<sup>48</sup>). It is impossible to melt these three Hammurabi's into one person, as they are clearly distinguished from each other in the Māri-letters. The state of Aleppo has in point of fact existed as long as the dynasty of our Hammurabi, while in a limited extent. It was not until 150 years after the latter's death that the Hittite Muršiliš I made an end of the independence of the state of Aleppo, after which he put an end to the weak government of Hammurabi's fifth successor in a plundering expedition to Babylon.

There was a special reason why the expeditions of Hammurabi were supposed to extend as far West as possible, even as far as Transjordan: the well-known 14th chapter of Genesis, in which an expedition is described of the kings Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer and Tidal against the land beyond the Jordan. Whatever one may think of the details of the story — that these names are not fictitious is beyond all doubt. Moreover, the investigations in Transjordan, conducted by Nelson Glueck and continued even during the war, have shown out that after the end of the first bronze period, i.e. in the period under discussion, a complete destruction of all Transjordanian cities has taken place: a catastrophe which Glueck and Kirk wish to associate with the story of Genesis XIV<sup>49</sup>). As regards the computation of the time, the necessity of a considerable reduction, which I have always

---

<sup>47</sup>) CH col. IV 52. The name of this sanctuary of the goddess Inanna is *Zabalum* or *Supalu*, cf. A. Falkenstein, AOF XIV, 1942, p. 115.

<sup>48</sup>) The reading *Kurda* is uncertain, alternative readings being *Madda*, *šadda* or *Kinda*. The capital of the country was *Kasapā*.

<sup>49</sup>) N. Glueck, *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*, I, 1934; II, 1935; III, 1939; Id., *Further Explorations in Eastern Palestine*, BASOR 86, Apr. 1942, p. 14 — 24; M. E. Kirk, *An outline of the ancient cultural History of Transjordan*, PEQ 1944, p. 180 — 198.



advocated <sup>50</sup>), is confirmed by the new chronology. And also with respect to the problem of the names the new material has helped us on considerably.

The starting-point for the identifications remains the last of the four: Tid'al, king of nations, who is beyond all doubt to be identified with the Hittite king *Tud'alia* or *Tudhalias*, and that — on the strength of the new chronology — with the first of that name, and not, as I formerly thought, with the second. We know the names of the Hittite kings, also those of the so-called Old and Middle Kingdom, completely, but the dates we can supply only on the strength of synchronisms and further of a rough estimate of the duration of the reigns. In my estimation Tudhalias I reigns from about 1720 to 1680 B.C., and so he is a contemporary of Hammurabi <sup>51</sup>).

The second of these kings, A r i o c h or A r i o k has been found back at last. His name is *Arriwuk* and he is a son of King Zimrilim of Māri <sup>52</sup>).

The first, A m r a p h e l (or A m a r p h a l according to the Septuaginta) was as early as 1886 identified by Schrader with Hammurabi himself and his country with Babylonia <sup>53</sup>). But this country, Sin'ar, is in this old period distinguished from Babylon, as is clearly shown by a passage in the texts from Bogazköy <sup>54</sup>). Scholars thought of the mountains of *Singār*, the ancient *Sangar* to the West of Mosul, which is from purely phonetic reasons more than doubtful. The American scholar Gelb in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* of 1937 wanted to go still further West and suggested the land of Aleppo; this district, however, is called *Jamḥad* in the Māri-texts <sup>55</sup>). If, therefore, there is, notwithstanding all difficulties, question of a certain Hammurabi, it is at any rate the Hammurabi of Aleppo. Properly speaking the two names bear little resemblance to

<sup>50</sup>) Cf. ZAW XXXVI, 1916, p. 65 f.; I (N.F.), 1924, p. 148 ff.; *Genesis* (Tekst en Uitleg), vol. I, 2nd. ed., 1925, p. 128 ff.; *Het tijdperk der aartsvaders*, Groningen 1925; art. *Abram, Abraham* in Enc. Brit., 14th. ed., I p. 59 f.; *Das Zeitalter Abrahams* (AO XXIX, 1931). The traditional chronology: J. H. Kroeze, *Genesis Veertien*, Kampen 1934.

<sup>51</sup>) Cf. H. Bossert, *Altanatolien*, 1942, p. 32: „Dass der Genesis 14, 1 und 9 als ein Zeitgenosse Chammurabis (?) genannte 'Heidenkönig' Thideal mit Tudchalijaš I identisch sein kann, ergibt eine Berechnung der Generationen zwanglos“.

<sup>52</sup>) Jean, TCL XXIII No. 63 and 64; see about Arioch = \* *Arriwok*: Böhl, BiOr II/4, 1945, p. 66.

<sup>53</sup>) E. Schrader, SPAW XLV, 1887, p. 600 f.

<sup>54</sup>) KUB XV No. 34, col. I 52 ff.

<sup>55</sup>) I. J. Gelb, *Shanhar*, AJSL LIII, 1937, p. 253 — 255.

each other. The consonants of Amraphel had better be read and pronounced as *Amur-pi-el*, on the analogy of names from the Māri-letters such as *Ibal-pi-el*. Can it be a corruption of *Amūt-pi-el*, the above-mentioned king of Qatānum on the Orontes? If so, the identification would require the change of one consonant only (*r* into *t*). The absence of the *aleph* in 'el need not be an objection, as is shown by the Hebrew spelling of the name of the town of *Babel*. As a matter of fact, Abram does not pursue the enemy to the East, but straight to the North (vs 15), as far as Coele-Syria, which is in the direction of Qatānum-Mišrife. And *Amūt-pi-el*, as appears from the letter just mentioned, has been with his fifteen dependent kings just as mighty as Hammurabi himself and Rim-Sin <sup>56</sup>).

An enigmatical figure is and remains the third of these kings: K e d o r - l a ' o m e r. The difficulty is not in the name, which is genuinely Elamitic, but in the identification in connection with the question how Elam could take action so far in the West. It seems impossible, notwithstanding Albright, to identify him with *Kutir-Nahhunte*, who is his junior by some decades; but I think it can be proved that the latter is the hero of the so-called Spartoli-texts <sup>57</sup>). However this may be: our Hammurabi of Babylon is out of the question here and has nothing to do with Genesis 14.

And now I would like to tell something about Hammurabi as we know him from the new records during the time of armed peace and of the beginning of the great wars. I can only make a selection here and there from the copious material; in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* I am giving a survey of the contents of the most important letters edited by Jean in cuneiform script, among which there are the confidential reports of *Ibal-pi-el* and *Ibal-el* <sup>57a</sup>). They are the representatives of Zimrilim at the Babylonian court, who report even the minutest details from there to Māri.

*Ibal-pi-el*, for example, tells us of an audience he had of Hammurabi, where he heard from the king's own mouth information about impor-

<sup>56</sup>) See note 35.

<sup>57</sup>) W. F. Albright, BASOR 88, Dec. 1942, p. 33 ff.; cf. G. G. Cameron, *History of early Iran*, Chicago 1936, Chronol. tables p. 228 ff. (ca. 1625 — 1610 B.C.). The name in the Spartoli-texts (cf. A. Jeremias, *Die sogenannten Kederlaomor-Texte*, MVAG XXI p. 82) „*KU-KU-KU-(KU-)MAL*” should be read: *Ku-dúr-ḥun- g á*. As *ḥun- (ḥun) - g á* = *nāḥu* (partic. pass.), the name can be interpreted as *Ku-dúr-nāḥ (ḥ) ūte*.

<sup>57a</sup>) Böhl, BiOr I/4, p. 55 — 58; I/5, p. 76 — 79; I/6, p. 101 — 105; II/3, p. 31 — 32; II/4, p. 63—67.

tant transports of troops<sup>58</sup>). On another occasion he writes that Hammurabi had asked him to accompany his men on an expedition, but that the object of this expedition was not yet known<sup>59</sup>); he reports about messengers sent by the king of Kurda, whom he first draws out in the palace-gate, before they are admitted to Hammurabi; he boasts that he knows the innermost thoughts of the adversaries<sup>60</sup>), sends reports about intended troop movements, of which he has heard, though not yet from mouth of Hammurabi himself, yet in an aside, and asks each time the decision of his lord and master<sup>61</sup>). He also boasts that he has somebody in the immediate surroundings of the king who informs him of all that is in the heart of Hammurabi<sup>62</sup>).

His colleague *Ibal-el* reports about a personal meeting between the kings of Babylon and Larsa, Hammurabi and Rīm-Sin; about an agreement which was made there and about the wish of Hammurabi that this fact should also be made known to the sheiks of the tribes that are dependent on Māri<sup>63</sup>). Another ambassador feels himself offended in his diplomatic honour. He has appeared at the court of Babylon at the head of a deputation from Māri for some ceremony or levee, together with a similar deputation from Jamḥad (i.e. Aleppo); but whereas the others received the customary festive attire, it was refused to him and his people. To his complaint Hammurabi gave the haughty answer: "As to the festive attire, I bestow it on those I will<sup>64</sup>).

Many of these reports are of a more important content. We hear of enormous troop transports by land and on water, for example on the occasion of 10.000 men being sent from the state of Aleppo (= Jamḥad) and of 10.000 from the district of Ḥarran (= Zalmākum), who are already operating near Tutul, the precent *Hīt* on the Euphrates<sup>65</sup>); we hear of fights and of large contingents of auxiliary troops which are sent to and fro, and even of an unsuccessive attempt to attack Babylon itself<sup>66</sup>).

---

<sup>58</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 21. In this letter the king of Kurda seems to go by the hypocoristic name of *Ḥammānum* (Rev. 17<sup>1</sup>), in contradistinction to his namesake, the king of Babylon.

<sup>59</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 20, 5 — 10.

<sup>60</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 23, Obv. 7 ff.; Rev. 8 ff.

<sup>61</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 26, Obv. 5 ff.; Rev. 14 f.

<sup>62</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 31, 5 ff.

<sup>63</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 33; cf. RA XXXV p. 111; BiOr. II/4, p. 64.

<sup>64</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 76; cf. RA XXXV, p. 111 f.

<sup>65</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 21, 19 ff.; cf. BiOr I/6, p. 103 f.

<sup>66</sup>) Jean, *l.c.*, No. 25, 4 ff.; 30 Rev. 4<sup>1</sup> f. etc.; cf. Jean, RA XXXV, p. 110.

In all these things Hammurabi obviously stands out as the most powerful personality; as compared with his rivals he is far superior to them. He is also their superior in diplomatic art. He knows how to apply the maxim: *divide et impera* and to strike the iron when it is hot.

From his own letters to his governors in Larsa as well as from his Law, we still get another impression of the great king. For these letters, written to *Sin-idinnam* and *Šamaš-nāšir* form by themselves a large collection. To the number of 136 letters, of which the greater part is to be found in the museums of London, Paris and Oxford, nine more were added by J. B. Alexander in his edition of *Early Babylonian Letters and Economic Texts* from the collection of the late J. B. Nies (1943)<sup>67</sup>. The form of all these letters is clear, concise and resolute. That they were dictated by the king himself and did not take their origin in the chancellery seems pretty sure. He shows a special interest for those who belong to the standing army and were rewarded for their military services with the possession of land from the royal demesne. But also in other respects these letters testify to the many-sidedness of his activities and interest.

An important part of this correspondence deals with irrigation: the digging and the care of canals, on which the welfare of the country depends. All this is well-known material and even the letters edited by Alexander could add little that was not already known<sup>68</sup>.

Above all, however, the king stands out as a religious and social reformer, as appears specially from his legislation. In concluding this paper, a few words upon this important point will be regarded as appropriate.

Throughout his reign king Hammurabi has, whether consciously or not, been bent on establishing a *synthesis*, a higher unity between the ancient civilisation of the Sumerians and the younger people of the Amorites who had penetrated into the country and settled among the cognate Akkadians, whose language they had adopted. There existed a great contrast as regards religion and general outlook on life, form of government, economic life, race and mental character. The synthesis that grew out of it, though in many respects little more than

<sup>67</sup> L. W. King, *LIH* (55 letters); F. Thureau-Dangin, *TCL VII* (cf *RA XXI*, 1924, p. 1 — 58: 42 [43] letters); *TCL I*, No. 1—3 (3 letters); C. R. Driver, *OECT III* (31 letters); G. Dossin, *TCL XVII*, No. 63 (1 letter); H. F. Lutz, *YBT II*, No. 32 (1 letter); W. Schileico, *OLZ XVII*, 1914, col. 112 (1 letter); H. F. Lutz, *Old Babylonian Letters*, *UCP*, vol. IX, No. 4 (2 letters); J. B. Alexander, *BIN VII*, No. 1—9 (9 letters).

<sup>68</sup> J. B. Alexander, *Early Babylonian Letters and Economic Texts* (*BIN VII*, New Haven 1943), No. 1 — 9.

a crude syncretism, is in itself sufficient reason to cause him the surname of "the Great". He had a precursor, eight centuries before: Sargon of Akkad; but the latter worked on a smaller scale and among a population which had lived in the country for centuries already<sup>69)</sup>, whereas Hammurabi, though the sixth of his dynasty, belonged himself to the invading peoples.

I may be permitted here to elaborate the points of contrast, at the same time laying stress on the position that Hammurabi took up in these affairs and on the part of reconciler which he fulfilled. In the first place the contrast in the domain of religion and cult. This contrast appears already from the older Akkadian version of the Epic of Gilgamesh, the poet of which — as I have tried to prove — must have lived as a partisan of Hammurabi at the court of Rim-Sin at the very beginning of Hammurabi's reign before the conflict of the latter with Rim-Sin<sup>70)</sup>. On one side there was the Sun-worship of the Western Semites, the strongly ethical service of Shamash, the god of truth and justice, the conqueror of the powers of darkness and the maintainer of morality and justice<sup>71)</sup>; and on the other side the worship of the old Sumerian gods of chthonic nature-life characterized by the names of Tammuz and Ishtar, who are associated with that form of life which is hidden in the depths of death and with magical practices or, in the days of moral decadence, with sexual licentiousness. Among the gods of the older Sumerian groups special mention should be made of Ea, the god of the waters and of spells and incantations, the "divine deceiver", as Kristensen has characterized him, with his set of lesser gods<sup>72)</sup>.

The contrast seemed irreconcilable; I need only remind of the character of Ishtar in the sixth canto of the epic even in its younger form, and of the way in which Shamash comes to the fore again and again. Notwithstanding this, Hammurabi succeeded in bringing about the synthesis. The cult of Eridu, then already destroyed and deserted,

<sup>69)</sup> Cf. Th. Jacobsen, *The assumed conflict between Sumerian and Semites in early Mesopotamian History*, JAOS LIX, 1939, p. 485—495.

<sup>70)</sup> Cf. F. M. Th. Böhl, *Het Gilgamesj-epos*, Amsterdam 1941, p. 108 f.

<sup>71)</sup> Cf. A. van Selms, *Opmerkingen over het religieuze taalgebruik der Samaš-teksten*, MVEOL I, 1934, p. 21 ff.; Id., *De Babylonische termini voor Zonde*, Wageningen 1933, p. 99 ff.; Böhl, *De Zonnegod als beschermder der nooddrufstigen*, JEOL No. 8, 1942, p. 665—680; Madeleine David, *Le Code de Hammurabi et la notion babylonienne de Destin*, ArO XV 3/4, June 1946, p. 341 — 351.

<sup>72)</sup> W. B. Kristensen, *De goddelijke bedrieger*, MKAW 66, ser. B. No. 3, Amsterdam 1928.

which used to be the seat of Ea (or Enki), was moved to the young capital of Babylon, and the son of Ea, the god Asaru — whose peculiar relationship to the Egyptian Osiris must remain undiscussed here — was identified with Marduk, the god of Babylon. Thus Marduk — henceforth the chief god of the empire — became the god of magic, of the art of healing and of spells and incantations, quite in the spirit of the old Sumerians. Now this Marduk was originally a god of the young vernal sun, and consequently related to the sun-god of the Western Semites. The double character which henceforth he bears is expressed by his being represented and described as a Janus-figure with two faces. He is the "Child of the Sun", but at the same time also the son of Ea.

It is in this form and from that time that the cult of Marduk has impressed its stamp from the great temple of Esagila on the religious belief and worship of the ancient East. It is in this form, too, that Hammurabi made his city-god Marduk the supreme god of the Babylonian Pantheon and Lord of the World; in his heart, however, he continued to adhere to Shamash, whose sun-worship he transferred from Larsa — which was likewise destroyed — to the North-Babylonian city of Sippar. It was in Sippar that Hammurabi preferred to reside in the second half of his reign. The Code of Law was formulated here, to which he knows himself authorized by Šamaš, as appears from the relief sculptured on the upper part of the obverse; and though he calls himself nowhere "god", yet in the introduction to the Code he calls himself emphatically the Sun of Babylon, he who sends forth light for the land of Sumer and Akkad<sup>73</sup>). Likewise it appears from the representations on the cylinder-seals that his time, as also that of his whole dynasty, was characterized by a most intensive sun-worship<sup>74</sup>). This is, indeed, the reason why in his Law the magic and even the cultic elements have been entirely eliminated. For Shamash is only the god of worldly justice, the god who, in his daily journeyings along the heavenly road, sees every crime and unrighteous deed.

But for the rest Hammurabi nowhere shows his preference of juridical moralism to magical sacramentalism. His Marduk is no jealous god who claims unity in the sense of uniqueness. The aim of Hammurabi or of his theological advisers must have been to realize their synthesis in the form of assigning the parts to each of the deities in the pantheon. In the prologue to the Code, where the king boasts that he is the one who restores and supports the seats of worship all over the country —

<sup>73</sup>) See CHJ, col. V 3 — 9. An epitheton such as *ilu sārri*, col. III 16, is to be translated „the divine among the kings”; cf. personal names such as *Iluma-el* „El is verily divine”; *Ilu-pi-el* „the commandment of El is divine”.

<sup>74</sup>) Cf. H. Frankfort, *Cylinder Seals*, London 1939, p. 95 and 160 f.

above all the old Sumerian ones, which are, together with their gods, mentioned by name — one may infer that the powers and attributes of the various gods and the place of the priesthoods were henceforth defined more accurately than had ever been the case during the Sumerian dynasties, to say nothing of the City-states of the early Sumerian period <sup>75</sup>).

So much about Hammurabi as a reformer of religion and philosophy of life. The tenor of these reforms is tolerant and even more than that: the old values are not lost, but they are consciously made to harmonize with the spirit of the young nation and the new time. The same holds good for the old Sumerian epics, hymns and religious poetry. Instead of being laid aside they are revised, not only in the other language but also in another spirit. The poet of the Epic of Gilgamesh was one of these revisers, who borrowed his material from the Sumerians, perhaps one of the oldest. His tolerance still leaves to be desired: even the name of Marduk is suppressed; no wonder that from the canonization of the holy books his work was excluded. The poet of the Epic of the Creation understood his task better, with the result that on the occasion of the New Year Festival in the temple of Babylon his work was recited every year.

In the second place there is the contrast in the forms of government. Among the Western Semites the form of government was purely patriarchal. In the New-Sumerian states, on the other hand, the kings were regarded as gods even during their lives, an indication of the most extreme form of state-absolutism. For such had been the political development of Sumer, which had since the third year of the reign of King Dungi of Ur started as a form of sacral communism. The divine theocracy becomes a human one, because the king becomes god, the real owner of all movable and immovable goods. The consequence was a bureaucracy or officialdom of an extent unheard of, one which bore in it the germ of its downfall <sup>76</sup>).

Here, too, there lay before Hammurabi the task of establishing a synthesis. He rules absolute, with a powerful hand, with a sort of enlightened despotism which — as indeed the whole of his period — reminds one of our West-European history of the eighteenth century. Everything has his personal consideration, as is shown by his Letters and Dispatches; but nowhere is there a trace to be found of royal deification in the sense of a divine prefix before his name. On the contrary, there was an essential separation between the secular and the

---

<sup>75</sup>) 24 towns with their sanctuaries and their gods are enumerated in the prologue to the Law (CH., col. I 50—IV 63).

<sup>76</sup>) Cf. A. Schneider, *Die sumerische Tempelstadt*, Essen 1920; P. A. Deimel, *Sumerische Tempelwirtschaft* (Anal. Or. 2, 1931), p. 71 ff.

religious sphere, between the temple and the palace or, as we should say, between the church and the state. Considering these things objectively, one might even ask if he has not gone too far in this policy. If he, the representative of the "palace", practically forwent his power and influence over the „temple", the result would be the supremacy of the clergy as soon as the temporal power should collapse under his weak successors. And if he bestows on free citizens private property and on military colonists large pieces of the royal demesne<sup>77)</sup>, this means a weakening of the royal power which must needs lead to ruinous consequences, however appealing this deed in itself may be.

We now come to the contrast in economic life. The Western Semites, who had penetrated peacefully into the country and did not at first act as conquerors, had of course left the nomadic stage far behind them and even that of the village communities, though traces of them were still found. For Hammurabi, who himself belonged to this group, was already the fifth descendant of the Amorite sheik Sumu-abum, the founder of the dynasty, who had taken possession of the then still small and insignificant town of Babylon. In those circles, who acted by preference as traders at first, private property — though in the beginning perhaps especially in the form of family property — was a matter of course.

In strong contrast to this form of property and almost irreconcilable to it was the Sumerian economic system. Originally a form of state-socialism and finally of state-absolutism, it leaves in neither case much liberty or freedom of action. Hammurabi succeeds in finding a synthesis. Besides the slaves — in this old society of course indispensable — he recognizes two classes of "free men" in his Code: the *mār awēlim*, i.e. the free citizens, who had free disposal of their property, also in a hereditary sense, and the *muškēni*, i.e. those who are subordinate to the powers of temple and palace. This, too, is a form of synthesis. The second group, that of the *muškēni* really reflects the old Sumerian social organization. A *muškēnu* might even be much richer than a *mār awēlim*, but he had no free disposal of his property; it was only feudal possession. Only among the military colonists this property was, under certain restrictions, hereditary.

It is to the first group, that of the free citizens, that the Code of Hammurabi gives decided and undivided preference. It is they only that bear the honorary title of "son of man", for that is the meaning of *mār awēlim*, and they form a sort of patriciate that might perhaps best be translated by Freemen or Burghers. Hammurabi will be remembered in the history of his country as the creator of free citizenship.

---

<sup>77)</sup> Cf. C. Koehne, *Die Bevölkerungspolitik in der Gesetzgebung König Hammurabis*, in: *Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft* 1918, p. 46 ff.



In the fourth place something about the differences of race. These differences were great and it stands to reason that the Sumerians, by reason of their older and higher culture, looked down upon the Akkadians, and, of course to a still much higher extent on the people from the steppes, which the Amorites originally were. But the king himself and his circle belonged to the latter group, and the temptation must have been great to confer all sorts of privileges on his own people and their kinsmen. However, the king has not yielded to this temptation. He makes no difference; his object is a fusion, all races being equal to the law.

Here, too, there is a synthesis, and that one of language. The language of his empire is not the vernacular of his Amorite forefathers, which had not yet attained the stage of a written language, nor is it the language of the Sumerians, which was preserved in cult and ritual, but Akkadian, the language which had since the days of the Dynasty of Akkad reached such a high level and was now, during the reign of Hammurabi, becoming the language in which all branches of literature were written. In the Prologue to the code he states emphatically that he has given this law "in the language of the land" <sup>78</sup>). The lucidity and conciseness with which these laws are written is admirable. It is the first great and classical period of Akkadian literature. The king's personal correspondence, too, is written in Akkadian. Only the records immured in the foundations of the temples are for cultic reasons provided with Sumerian translations <sup>79</sup>).

It remains to say a few words about the profound difference of mental character between the two races. The Sumerians were essentially a people of order, regularity and symmetry, as is also shown by their poetry with its parallelisms and endless repetitions; in contradistinction to them the Semites strive after realism and have a talent for assimilation. The result of the fusion was the type known as the Babylonian, who even in times of political weakness impressed his stamp on this old Western Asiatic world.

It goes without saying that not all these forms of synthesis can be attributed to the conscious initiative of the king himself. In more than one of these cases, e.g. as regards the language and the equality of the various races to the law, he is only an exponent of the spirit of his time. From the Māri letters it appears that even at that time Akkadian, just as in the time of Amarna, more than two centuries later, was the universal language and the language of the civilized people in their mutual intercourse, all over the West, wherever the Amorites were dominant, and also that there were no privileges for certain races. It

<sup>78</sup>) CH, col. V 20 — 23: *kittam u mišāram ina pī mātim aškun*.

<sup>79</sup>) Cf. Böhl, MKAW 78, ser. B, No. 2, 1934, p. 10 f.

is a peculiar international society with one world-language that presents itself here. In these things, Hammurabi was only an exponent or representative.


This is not the case in respect of religious worship. In the Māri-texts it is the gods Dagon, Samaš and Hadad who are dominant; but Hammurabi made Marduk, the god of his young capital, the god of the world. Nor is this the case in economic or constitutional affairs. The Māri of king Zimrilim was a country that might be compared, as regards power and extent, with Hammurabi's Babylonia. Now the brilliant palace of Māri which Zimrilim had erected was an enormous building. The 230 apartments which have hitherto been excavated, are only one fourth of the whole. Of Hammurabi's more modest palace not a trace has been found, neither at the excavations of Babylon, nor at those of Sippar. It stands to reason that Zimrilim has summoned all the forces in the country to serve his Kingship, whereas Hammurabi gave The Law, in which the rights of the free citizens were defined with painful accuracy.

Even his outward appearance — hair-dress and costume — are suggestive of an attempt towards synthesis. The short round beard and the clean-shaven upper-lip are typically Amorite, the costume — the mantle and also the head-gear — are decidedly Sumerian. We know three representations of Hammurabi: the relief at the top of the stele with the laws; the relief at Diarbekr, more distinct and better designed; and an exquisitely designed head, found at Susa and now preserved in the Louvre<sup>80</sup>). Unfortunately, the inscription is missing, so that the identification is not absolutely certain. Lunsingh Scheurleer in his posthumous work about the *Kunstgeschichte van Voor-Azië* rightly calls the last-mentioned portrait "splendid of expression..... in which grief and disappointment, the part of so many a reformer, are expressed in a masterful way. Thus one would like to picture oneself the great king in his later life"<sup>81</sup>).

Disappointment: it appears perhaps from a hymn sung to the king when he was in the zenith of his power and glory. The song was inscribed on a statue of the king made of black basalt, of which only some fragments have been preserved in the British Museum<sup>82</sup>). It was

<sup>80</sup>) Cf. *Encyclopaedie photographique de l'art*, p. 274 B; V. Christian, *Altertumskunde des Zweistromlandes*, Leipzig 1940, vol. I, plate 420, No. 2.

<sup>81</sup>) C. W. Lunsingh Scheurleer, *Kunstgeschichte van Voor-Azië, Egypte en Griekenland*, Utrecht 1941, p. 26 (cf. plate 9,2).

<sup>82</sup>) L. W. King, *LIH* I, No. 60; cf. vol. III, p. 172 — 176. In col. II 35 (col. II b, 11) *utililima*  II/2 „to be cheered from all sides”, „to be surrounded amid jubilant shouts”, in Sumerian *l-i l* ; (cf. K. Tallquist, *Der assyrische Gott*, p. 27: *mutlellû* „der Umjubelte”).

written in both languages, Sumerian and Akkadian. In the beginning the gods are enumerated who have bestowed the sovereignty, the princely rank, the exalted sword and the victory on the king. But ever and again the refrain returns: "For whom, then, dost thou wait?" The last two stanzas run as follows:

"Confirm Thy lordship —  
May Thy name be praised  
to the ends of the world.  
May the multitudes adore Thee  
and bend their faces to earth.  
May they proclaim Thy glory  
and know Thy majesty.

He hath gained the victory.  
He hath made the greatness of his power  
to shine until far away days:  
Hammurabi, the king, the strong hero,  
who destroyeth his enemies  
like a whirlwind in the combat,  
who bringeth to nought the land of his foe  
and putteth down all opposition,  
destroyeth the warriors like an image of clay  
and maketh his way to inaccessible mountains" <sup>83</sup>).

"The inaccessible mountains": these are the same mountain districts whose inhabitants Hammurabi — according to the inscription on his statute at Ur — had wanted to convert to Marduk. That was the region from which danger threatened. Through the attack of the Kassites and their allies the kingdom would ere long be reduced to a smaller compass again. Of his glory, his conquests, his social reforms only little has been left in later centuries. For the result of his reforms was a gradual weakening of secular power, because Babylonian royalty had divested itself of its theocratic character, whereas the clergy of Esagila, the temple of Marduk — ere long the most famous sanctuary of the civilised world — could assert their influence more and more.

Even of his famous Code, the reforming tendency of which appears even from the choice of the subjects, it must be admitted that it is doubtful whether the reforms have ever been put into practice <sup>84</sup>). The countless

<sup>83</sup>) Col. II and IV.

<sup>84</sup>) Cf. W. Eilers, *Die Gesetzesstele Chammurabis* (AO XXXI/1, 1932), p. 8: „....Es hat beinahe den Anschein, als ob das grosse Gesetzeswerk des Königs nur Repräsentation geblieben und niemals Rechtswirklichkeit geworden sei. Auch hat, so hoch die literarische Wertschätzung des Denkmals um seiner

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

AJ	= Antiquaries Journal.
An. Or.	= <i>Analecta orientalia</i> (Rome).
AO	= <i>Der Alte Orient</i> (Leipzig).
AOF	= <i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i> .
ArO	= <i>Archiv Orientalný</i> (Prague).
Bab.	= <i>Babyloniaca</i> (Paris).
BASOR	= <i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i> .
BE	= <i>Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A</i> (Philadelphia).
BIN	= <i>Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies, Yale University</i> (New Haven).
BiOr	= <i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i> (Leiden).
BVSAW	= <i>Berichte und Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> .
CAH	= <i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> .
CH	= <i>Codex Hammurabi</i> (the Law).
Chron. d'Ég.	= <i>Chronique d'Égypte</i> (Brussels).
Enc. Brit.	= <i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i> , 14th edition.
FuF	= <i>Forschungen und Fortschritte</i> .
JAOS	= <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> .
JEOL	= <i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap Ex Oriente Lux</i> (Leiden).
JNES	= <i>Journal of Near East Studies</i> (Chicago).
KAVI	= O. Schroeder, <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts</i> .
KUB	= <i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi</i> (Berlin, Staatliche Museen).
LIH	= L. W. King, <i>Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi</i> , vol. I—III.
MAOG	= <i>Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft</i> (Berlin).
Mém. Ac.	= <i>Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles lettres</i> (Paris).
MVAG	= <i>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft</i> .
MVAeG	= <i>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft</i> .
MKAU	= <i>Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, afdeling Letterkunde</i> (Amsterdam).

contracts and other legal records, at any rate, found especially at Sippar, Dilbat and Larsa, show no radical changes that would be indicative of the new rules of law being put into practice. From the dates we know that immediately after his accession to the throne the king "established justice". In its present form, however, the codification cannot have taken place until after the great conquests, that is towards the close of his reign of forty-two-years. The mechanical way in which older and newer elements in the Code are joined together, to which especially Koschaker has drawn attention, must be explained by assuming a double version<sup>85</sup>).

It is only as a literary work of art that this law seems to have been handed down and copied in later centuries. The Kassite kings preferred to seek their examples, as is shown already by their titles, among the kings of Isin and Larsa, the New-Sumerian precursors and antagonists of the Amorite dynasty. The few inscriptions left by kings such as Burnaburiaš or Kurigalzu are written in Sumerian, be it that even in this time of the Amarna letters Akkadian continued to be the language of trade and commerce.

Only after their fall did a king like Nebuchadnezzar I consciously follow the example of Hammurabi in his language, writing and style, thereby acknowledging him, notwithstanding his Amorite descent, as the champion of pure Babylonian nationalism and particularism. More than five centuries later, after the fall of the New-Assyrian empire, the same ideals were brought to the fore by the Chaldean dynasty, whose great king Nebuchadnezzar II may be characterized as a second Hammurabi or Hammurabi redivivus. Also from a historical point of view he is the only one of the Babylonian kings that can be compared with Hammurabi.

---

kunstvollen Form und seines erbaulichen Inhalts willen stets gewesen ist, doch kaum juristische Tradition die Pflege des Gesetzes in die Hand genommen...."; and B. Landsberger, *Die babylonischen Termini für Gesetz und Recht*, in Symbolae Koschaker, Leiden 1939, p. 233: „.... Die Frage nach der Geltung des CH nach dem Tode seines Schöpfers, die wir nach unserem Befunde verneinen müssen, reduziert sich somit auf eine beschränkte Anzahl von Rechtsneuerungen Hammurabis....".

<sup>85</sup>) P. Koschaker, *Rechtsvergleichende Studien zur Gesetzgebung Hammurapis*, Leipzig 1923; cf. A. L. Oppenheim, WZKM XL, 1933, p. 181 — 220 ; W. Eilers, *Gesellschaftsformen im altbabylonischen Recht*, Leipzig 1931; P. Cruveilhier, *Introduction au Code de Hammurabi*, Paris 1937; Id., *Commentaire du Code d'Hammurabi*, Paris 1938.

MVEOL	= Mededeelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptische Gezelschap Ex Oriente Lux.
OECT	= Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts.
OLZ	= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
Or.	= Orientalia, Nova Series (Rome).
PEQ	= Palestine Exploration Quarterly.
RA	= Revue d'Assyriologie (Paris).
RÉS	= Revue des Études Sémitiques.
RLA	= Reallexikon der Assyriologie, hrsg. von E. Ebeling und B. Meissner.
SPAW	= Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Syr.	= Syria, Revue d'Art oriental et d'Archéologie.
TCL	= Textes Cunéiformes, Musée du Louvre (Paris).
UCP	= University of California, Publications in Semitic Philology.
UETRI	= Ur Excavations, Texts, I: Royal Inscriptions, by C. J. Gadd and L. Legrain.
VAB	= Vorderasiatische Bibliothek.
VS	= Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler (Berlin).
WZKM	= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes (Vienna)
YBT	= Yale Oriental Series: Babylonian Texts (New Haven).
ZA	= Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
ZAW	= Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.