

Excursus: Kingship after the Sumerians

The Evolution of Kingship: Continuity and Change

Medieval knights, in the Western imagination at least, possessed an overplus of libido. In the 14th century CE, when Geoffrey Chaucer wrote “The Knight’s Tale,” the king was already a well-worn literary type: the athletic youth who passes tests of courage and endurance, the one member of his peer group who rises to leadership, the warlord who, gaining fame, needs to learn to measure justice with mercy and to protect the vulnerable, especially widows and orphans. Medieval poetry turned that other side of the knight’s libido, lasciviousness, to love. What Chaucer planted in his more sensitive knight, *the loveris maladye / Of heroes* (“the lover’s malady of heroes,” with its pun on *hero* and *eros*), a form of melancholia,¹¹⁰⁷ was already a convention of many centuries.

Thanks to the extraordinarily patient and detailed work of archaeologists, anthropologists and philologists, the evolution of kingship in Mesopotamia is becoming clear. The king, literally the Big Man (*lú-gal*), was initially, at least in Uruk, not such a grand figure. Possibly he was the spokesperson in the Assembly for the *gurush*, the group of mainly young able-bodied workers who later in history would be organized into “militia men,” troops for battle.¹¹⁰⁸ The palace, the *é-gal* (fittingly, a Big House), was, early on, a rather inauspicious, fairly temporary dwelling on the outskirts of the city. It would later grow into the large, highly decorated complex of buildings that can be seen around the world. The palace originally had nothing to rival the temple. In the long event of Mesopotamian history, the temple would come to be required to give back some of its wealth to the palace, a striking reversal, since for centuries Mesopotamian kings were praised for their building of temples and their provision of the temples with precious objects. Kings early on are represented in the visual arts carrying baskets of clay and bricks for building temples, much as political officials today are photographed with hardhats and shovels, usually for secular buildings.

The earliest royal inscriptions, now conveniently collected and analyzed by Douglas R. Frayne, come from what archaeologists call the Early Dynastic Period, ca. 2700-2350 BCE, and textual scholars call the Presargonic Period, that is, the era before the Sumerian city-states were defeated by the Akkadian Sargon the Great, the world’s first empire-builder. “Early Dynastic” is an appropriate title, for royal inscriptions, almost as soon as they appear in history, identify dynastic lineages as a key part of Mesopotamian kingship.

The royal inscriptions confirm what William W. Hallo suggested,¹¹⁰⁹ that kingship in its new, largely secular form, seems to have emerged in the city of Ur. Oddly enough, arguably the most famous of the early kings—the First Dynasty of Uruk—do not appear in these royal inscriptions, although they do appear in early literature. Inscriptions from the time of Enmerkar, Lugalbanda, and especially Gilgamesh, are not to be found in Frayne’s collection. He suggests that the destruction caused by Sargon the Great to the great temple complex of Eanna in Uruk is responsible for the loss to us (or the removal) of such documents from Uruk.

A Note on the Language of Kingship

Since kings appear so often in stories, including and perhaps especially in children's stories, the *idea* of kingship seems simple enough. Typically the king is the ruler of a large or small society, and he is able to act in an arbitrary and capricious way. He is not so much above the law and he is the embodiment of law. At any rate although he may listen to an advisor—the wicked *wazir* of so many Arabic folktales—his decision is final. There is no social mechanism to overrule the king—short of deposing him. (To a lesser degree, perhaps, a queen can operate in the same way, so long as a king is not in the picture.)

Since we live in an age that is largely post-monarchical, such an image of the king is probably harmless. But it obscures an interesting distinction that is relevant to the development of kingship in the ancient Near East.

The ordinary word that translates Sumerian *lugal* is, as we have seen, Akkadian *sharru*. The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary devotes more than thirty pages to that single word (and more, if derivatives like *sharrūtu*, or kingship, are added to the count). Another Akkadian term for king, *malku*, on the other hand, deserves less than three pages. Derived from the root, *mlk*, which largely has to do with giving advice, *malku* is used only for *foreign* kings.¹¹¹⁰

A glance at some of the most influential ancient and medieval writings will illustrate why this is the case. The English word “king” is very old and is related to words in not only Germanic languages but most Indo-European languages as well. It relates, in ways that Hamlet suggests in a famous Shakespearean pun used by Hamlet to describe the despised king, his uncle as, “A little more than kin, and less than kind!” (I.ii.65), to *cynn*, both “kin” and “kind” (as in “humankind”). Our “kindness” develops for a supposed empathy for those who are closely related to us. This Indo-European root is less visible but still evident in Latin and Greek terms for “generation.”¹¹¹¹

The point is that our common term, “king,” is *not* related to Semitic roots for king. The three root letters, /mlk/, is common in Semitic languages. In West Semitic languages the root generates “king,” while in Akkadian, an East Semitic language, it is used for a “counselor” or a foreign king, as we have seen. Exactly opposite is the case with the most influential of ancient Semitic texts, the Hebrew Bible. There /mlk/ is used almost everywhere as *melek* and elsewhere as *malka*, *melukah*, *mamlakah* and the like.¹¹¹²

On the other hand, the root, /s-r-r/, is used only three times in the entire Hebrew Bible, in the form meaning “to be a prince.” (In Akkadian, /mlk/ often designates a prince in contrast to a king.)

Likewise, the Qur'an prefers *malik*. This frequently occurring term is even used on five occasions as a Divine Attribute, God as King. In the Qur'an the terms *malaka* “kingdom” and “rule,” is found in many places, usually in a very positive way.¹¹¹³ There are many terms for “chief,” especially *kabīr*, which is also a Divine Attribute, but none derived from the Semitic root /srr/.

It is worth noting that the New Testament also uses something other than the usual Indo-European terms for “king” and “kingdom.” Although the New Testament is written entirely in an Indo-European language, it employs the Greek *basileus* for “king” and *basileia* for “kingdom.” Since the Kingdom of God is an important term in the gospels (except for the Gospel of John), the choice of *basileia* points to a rather different notion than, say, an “empire” along the lines of the occupier Romans. Significantly, “Caesar” (*kaisar*) appears about twenty times in the New Testament—always in reference to the Roman emperor himself, never to a positive notion of “empire” or “kingdom.”

King and Lord?

While the modern English word “king” seems simple enough—a word that has flattened almost all of the nuances of its long past—the term “lord” seems unnecessarily complex. “Lord” has, like “king,” lost much of its ability to terrify. It reserves something of that potential in the religious use of the term. When used for God, Lord expresses power and ultimate authority; but even there, Christians often use the term for the softer side of the divine: Jesus as “Lord” as often as not suggests an intimacy and concern that stands in contrast to the wrathful God of Scripture.

There are good indications that even in the ancient Near East the terms usually translated “lord” had lost some of their awful grandeur and had become honorific. The “master” and “owner” of property or of people always have claims upon others, but the full power of the earliest Sumerian *en* seems to have been lost over the centuries.

Personal Names and Kingship

It is increasingly clear that the emerging ideology of kingship in Mesopotamia was a major, if not defining factor in Mesopotamian ideas of life after death. In her discussion of funerary inscriptions found at Ur, Denise Schmandt-Besserat claims that the first entirely phonetic texts in cuneiform occur on “artistic masterpieces” rather than on “mundane tablets.”¹¹¹⁴ The Royal Cemetery of Ur, dated to the 2nd quarter of the 3rd millennium BCE, included texts on gold and lapis lazuli that were inscribed mostly with a single personal name. (The longest inscription contains the name of a king of Ur, Akalamdug, and his wife Ashusikildingir.) These inscriptions, Schmandt-Besserat claims, added a new function for writing, namely, to preserve the sounds of speech and thereby secure eternal life for the individual who is named. If the Ur inscriptions can be dated as early as Early Dynastic II (ca. 2700-2500 BCE), they would be the earliest royal texts not only of Ur but also of Sumer.¹¹¹⁵ And they, like the earliest Gilgamesh text, “The Amaushungalanna Hymn” found at Abu Salabikh, would fall into the period of the historical Gilgamesh.

One of the earliest personal names recovered so far is of an elite woman buried in the Royal Cemetery of Ur, a certain Puabi.

Puabi of Ur

Holly Pittman noticed the similarity between what she sees as the date cluster on the upper register of “The Jeweler’s Seal” from Susa, mentioned earlier, and the famous

diadem of Puabi found in the Royal Cemetery of Ur.¹¹¹⁶ Since the earliest evidence of date palms in ancient Iraq was found at Ur, some forty miles from Uruk, the representation of both male and female branches of the date palm as ornaments in a gold diadem from the period approximately of Uruk's Gilgamesh reinforces the importance of the plant to Sumerian society.

Puabi, a *nin*, which may mean "queen" in the context of Ur politics of the period (ca. 2550-2400 BCE), or "lady" (i.e., the female counterpart to the *en*, as in Uruk), has been a famous figure since Sir Leonard Woolley discovered the Royal Cemetery at Ur in the 1920s. A cylinder seal showing a Banquet Scene includes an inscription of her name and a reference to her status as a *nin*.¹¹¹⁷ An archaeobotanist at the University of Pennsylvania's University Museum, Naomi F. Miller, discovered that the small ornaments on the diadem have been displayed upside down. When she reversed the ornaments, it appeared clearly that the ornaments represent flowering branches of the male date palm (removed from the spathes that covered the immature blossoms) and the fruiting branch of the female, heavy with dates some seven months after pollination.¹¹¹⁸

Miller also pointed to the probable symbolic significance of the date palm. Pollinating the female fruiting trees by hand from male trees allowed an association between the fertility of the date palm and human sexuality. Miller then made the connection between the "sacred marriage" and Inanna, who was considered "the one who makes the dates be full of abundance."¹¹¹⁹

The famous greenstone cylinder seal of a certain Adda, also discussed earlier, shows clearly the connection between Inanna/Ishtar and the date palm.¹¹²⁰ The seal impression shows Ishtar and her attendant, Ninshubur atop a mountain. A tree stands between Ishtar and Ninshubur. Enki and his attendant, Isimud, appear on the other side.¹¹²¹ Between the two peaks the Sun God Utu/Shamash rises. The meaning of the ensemble has been called into question, even the identification of the god rising between the peaks. But the identification of Inanna/Ishtar has not been questioned. As the god rises Ishtar holds above him a large fruiting branch of the date palm.

Presargonic Uruk: Royal Inscriptions

Douglas R. Frayne collected royal inscriptions regarding Uruk before the time of Sargon the Great, that is, the period roughly 2700-2350 BCE.¹¹²² According to Frayne, no royal inscriptions have yet been found for the first twelve rulers of Uruk mentioned in *The Sumerian King List*. That would include Gilgamesh and his successors and the earlier rulers who, like Gilgamesh, figured in literary texts, figures like Enmerkar, Lugalbanda, and Dumuzi.

It is clear that both Uruk and Kullab are mentioned in the early texts. One refers to them a "twins."¹¹²³

Inanna is, as expected, very important. An is also mentioned, especially in a *zà-mi* hymn of praise. (At one point his spouse is named Namma.¹¹²⁴) Enlil is quite important as well, reflecting the increasing importance of Nippur.

Kingship is clearly important. One text points out that Inanna combined *en*-ship with kingship for Lugal-kigine-dudu. As his name suggests, he was *lugal* in Ur, but he was *en* in Uruk.¹¹²⁵ Later, Lugal-KISAL-si has the title of king both of Uruk and of Ur.¹¹²⁶ An even later figure, En-shakush-Ana, carries the double title of *en* of Ki-en-gi, that is the Land of Sumer, and also King of the Nation (*lugal-kalam-ma*).¹¹²⁷

Heroes of Akkad and Uruk Debunked

A. Leo Oppenheim concluded that the defeat Sargon of Akkad inflicted upon the Urukean king, Lugal-zagesi, had, as we have seen earlier, already initiated a shift in power away from not just Uruk but the south generally. “Political power moved away from Uruk, the focus of classical Sumerian civilization, and from a new center a political structure began to evolve, different in kind from that customary among city-states.”¹¹²⁸ The first great empire under the kings of Akkad itself fell, eventually to be replaced by the upstarts in Babylon. Oppenheim noted that with the famous Babylonian king Hammurabi, the names of his dynasty change to foreign, Amorite names—i.e., non-Akkadian names.¹¹²⁹ (Although the king is commonly known as Hammurabi, an Amorite pronunciation would have been Hammurapi.) Everywhere but in the deepest south, with its inaccessible marshes, the old city-states became provincial cities ruled from Babylon. “The south became a backwater.”¹¹³⁰ Even paleography and the physical aspects of texts changed in the Old Babylonian period. Oppenheim was convinced that “an essential change in the schooling of scribes and the tradition of their craft” accompanied the shift from what we call the Old Akkadian to the Old Babylonian periods.

One very striking, and rather odd, shift that accompanied the others was the debunking of the old heroes. The royal inscriptions of the 3rd and 2nd millennia that we have been discussing are rarely just statements of historical fact, and some have argued that the ideological overlay so distorts the facts that they are useless for modern scholars to extract accurate historical data from them. That seems something of a stretch.¹¹³¹ But it is important to consider that even the simplest inscription may have served multiple purposes, often the least of which is to state facts in an objective way. The case of Sargon’s grandson, Naram-Sin, is the most remarkable, perhaps, in Mesopotamian history. A stele depicts an almost gigantic Naram-Sin ascending a mountain in triumph over his enemies. The stele has gained much attention over the years for, among other things, its depiction of the king wearing a helmet of horns—the visual recognition of the king’s status as a god. [Insert Fig. 50: Stele of Naram-Sin]

The claim of kings to godship was made more subtly, we have seen, in *The Sumerian King List* and in certain of the royal inscriptions. We think that it derives from the Urukean tradition of the *en*, the main reason that kingship in Mesopotamia always possesses a certain religious aspect to it. William W. Hallo, who considers the king’s participation in cultic activities to derive mainly from his participation in the sacred marriage, has traced the development of a deified kingship through the 3rd millennium and into the 2nd millennium.¹¹³² For our purposes, the development traced by Hallo is particularly important because the deification of Naram-Sin in his lifetime involved a significant

change. Before Naram-Sin, royal ancestors were worshipped (in the guise of their cult-statues) only after their death. With Sargon's grandson, the cult statue of the living king came to be worshipped as well.¹¹³³

The Amorites from the west who established Babylon as the center of an expanding empire did not share this most radical development of Sumero-Akkadian kingship. For one thing, the West Semitic term for king, *melekh*, has a different range of meaning from Sumerian *lugal* and Akkadian *sharru*.¹¹³⁴ It should come as no surprise that Babylon's Hammurapi restored, as Hallo terms it, "the secular status of royalty" in the 18th century.¹¹³⁵ Naram-Sin became the great object lesson, a king destroyed by the gods because of his *hubris*.

What is odd about this development is the intertwining of the Urukian hero, Enmerkar, in the fate of Naram-Sin.

The only proof that literary works were composed about contemporary historical events is found in a poorly executed fifteen-line student exercise in Old Akkadian.¹¹³⁶ The text celebrates Naram-Sin's victory over the king of Ur—the same Lugal-Anne who is so prominent in Enheduanna's "Exaltation of Inanna," that man who stripped her of her rank and her dignity—and Lugal-Anne's henchman, a king of Uruk. (Lugal-Anne may be throne name; the actual name may be Amar-Girid.¹¹³⁷) The brief inscription deals with the coronation of a king of Kiš(i) and his revolt against Naram-Sin, with the help of the two other rebels from the south. Notably, the king of Uruk is not named, but is considered merely *la malkum*, "that non(-entity of a) king" (8), the Urukian (*urkium*).¹¹³⁸

In a version of "The Great Revolt against Naram-Sin" from Mari, Naram-Sin is said to be thinking of his grandfather Sargon, who conquered Uruk and liberated the people of Kish(i), shaving off their slavemarks and removing the shackles their "despoiler," Lugal-zagesi of Uruk, had forced upon them.¹¹³⁹ In that text it is claimed that Ishtar and Annunitum, Ishtar's fellow-goddess in Uruk, directed Sargon's defeat of Uruk. In another version of the story, Lugal-Anna, identified as the king of Uruk, is named as one of the rebels against Naram-Sin, while Sargon is again praised for his victory over Uruk and the liberation of Kish(i). In that version Naram-Sin is "the great king, the king of Akkade/king of the four quarters of the world,/ who proclaims Ishtar and Annunitum," and the military commander of Enlil. Among his other titles, Naram-Sin is *pashish Anim* (5), "the anointed priest of Anum."¹¹⁴⁰ In other words, in different versions of "The Great Revolt against Naram-Sin," Uruk is regularly present, its kings as unsuccessful challengers to both Sargon and Naram-Sin. At best the kings of Uruk are non-entities, at worst oppressors of another city, whose people they enslave. Having conquered and then reconquered Uruk, the Akkadian king claims a special relationship to Ishtar/Inanna, in the historic syncretism that united the goddess of Akkad and the goddesses of Uruk—and also a priestly relationship with An/Anu.

That Naram-Sin claims to be the *pashish Anim* is significant. We have seen this cultic officiant before. In Sumerian he is the *gudu*, and he is one of the highest ranking officials. In very early lexical lists the *gudu/pashishum* either heads the list of high officials, with

en at the end of the short list, or it follows at the end of a list headed by the *en*.¹¹⁴¹ The title means literally “to anoint.”

Against this literary and historical background it is interesting to see the earliest of Uruk’s heroes, Enmerkar, figuring prominently in another Naram-Sin poem, “Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes.” (The poem is also known as “The Cuthean Legend.”¹¹⁴²) Of course the two figures were widely separated in history. Naram-Sin’s reign is rather surely dated to 2254-2218 BCE, while an historical Enmerkar would have to date from ca. 2600 BCE or earlier. Yet they come to be linked in a mainly negative way when Babylon and later Assyria gain hegemony over the older Akkadian empire and the south.

“Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” is known from fragments of Old Babylonian versions¹¹⁴³ that may have run to six hundred lines,¹¹⁴⁴ a Middle Babylonian version, and a Standard Babylonian version known from more than six copies in the Assyrian capital, Nineveh. The later text is significantly shorter, running to only 180 lines. The poem was known in antiquity from its incipit, “Open the Tablet Box.” (The opening of the poem is strikingly like a passage in the Prologue to the Akkadian *Gilgamesh*.) In short, “Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” was popular for over a thousand years.

The Akkadian hero is assailed by savage enemies created by one set of gods.¹¹⁴⁵ Naram-Sin has to determine if they are even human, since they appear with the bodies of partridges and raven faces. And he does the right thing when consults omens. But he makes a fatal mistake when he decides to act against the omens. In three waves he loses, in one count, 120,000, 90,000, and 60,700 men—more than a quarter of a million men if one were to believe the figures. For his hubris the Akkadian king is punished by the gods. For the once-deified figure, the defeat is indeed depressing.

Joan Goodnick Westenholz is surely correct in emphasizing the complexity of Naram-Sin as he is represented in the poem. Where before he had been largely one-dimensional man of action, in this context he is a “true hero, with the fatal flaw known from heroic epics of other nations.”¹¹⁴⁶ Mainly the added complexity derives from his introspection. In the first part of the Old Babylonian edition that has been preserved (I.iii.1-15) Naram-Sin laments the loss of—in this account—over a half million troops. In the third wave some 360,000—clearly a symbolic figure of “totality” based on the sexigesimal system employed in Mesopotamia—had been lost.

After he had slain my 360,000 troops,
 He inflicted a comprehensive slaughter.
 I became confused, bewildered.
 I was worried, depressed, sunk in gloom, reduced in spirit.
 Thus I thought: “What has god brought upon my reign?
 I am a king who has not protected his land
 And a shepherd who has not safeguarded his people
 What has my reign brought upon me? /What have I brought upon myself and the
 cycle of reigns?
 How shall I ever continue to act so that
 I can get myself out (of trouble)?” / “I can put myself out (in order to save the

country)?”¹¹⁴⁷

Uncertain as to the translation of the crucial lines (I.iii.14-15) at the end of Naram-Sin’s lament, *ki-i lu-ush-ta-ak-kan-ma / pa-ag-ri ù ra-ma-ni lu-she-tsi*, Westenholz provides the different possibilities, which offer different views of the king’s self-image.

Here and in later versions of the story Naram-Sin questions his own judgment. At least as early as a Middle Babylonian edition, he blames the ancient Urukian hero Enmerkar for his difficulties. “Enmerkar “did not inscribe a stela(?) for me. / [He] was not my brother and he did not guide me.”¹¹⁴⁸ Because he had not been advised by Enmerkar he did not know to pray before Shamash. As a result, Ea created a whole series of demonic forces to be sent against the king. While both Shamash and Ea had their ancient Sumerian equivalents, Utu and Enki, these two gods had a special importance for Babylon and its new cities like Sippar. When Ea creates this fearsome crew of barbarians with their demonic weapons, he specifically limits their area of action: they are not to annihilate humankind; and they are not to attack the “city of Shamash, the hero.”¹¹⁴⁹

The most complete form of the story is a 1st millennium composite of tablets found in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sites (296),¹¹⁵⁰ the majority of which were found in Nineveh. Most of the 180 lines have been recovered. It opens with a claim that Naram-Sin had left a stela in a tablet-box for later readers to recover—a motif that recalls *Gilgamesh* I.i.22-25. Like Gilgamesh but unlike that hero’s grandfather, Enmerkar, Naram-Sin is, then, a tradition that emphasizes wisdom that is gained through suffering. Immediately Naram-Sin turns to Enmerkar, who “sought refuge in the mountain” (301) at the time when Shamash was “commander of the land.” (The lines may refer to *The Sumerian King List*, where, we recall, Enmerkar’s father is said to have been the son of Utu/Shamash.)

For reasons that are not entirely clear, Shamash changed his orders for the land. Enmerkar took what seems to be the right step toward understanding the god’s designs. He summons diviners who complete the right rituals directed at a series of gods. Ishtar is first in the list, along with Annunitum. Ilaba, the male counterpart to the great Ishtar of Akkad, is mentioned. And Shamash is at the end of the list. For whatever reason, as soon as the gods finish speaking, Enmerkar is punished severely. Shamash passes judgment on Enmerkar—and on the ghosts of Enmerkar’s family, including his offspring and his offspring’s offspring. They are condemned to a life in the underworld with only polluted, not pure water to drink. Exactly what his crime was is not entirely clear. The speech of the god is too fragmentary to be reconstructed. But Naram-Sin accuses him after the fact with particular vehemence.

He whose wisdom (and) whose weapons paralyzed,
 caught, and annihilated that army
 on a stela he did not write (and) did not leave (it) to me, myself,
 he did not make a name for himself so that I could not pray for him.¹¹⁵¹

The lines are highly ambiguous, possibly deliberately so, possibly because of scribal corruption. It is clear that Enmerkar is accused, as in the earlier edition, of failing to

preserve what he had learned in writing. Thus Naram-Sin would eventually stumble in much the same way Enmerkar had.

The details of this riveting story are beyond the scope of this study. But a few specifics are worth noting. When Naram-Sin is faced with the enemy hordes, he, too, summons the diviners, and they perform the rituals for Naram-Sin in the proper way. The same gods that Enmerkar had queried answer Naram-Sin. The great gods tell him not to act in the way he wishes. Immediately, Naram-Sin decided to ignore the gods.

Thus I said to my heart (i.e., to myself), these were my words:
 “What lion (ever) performed extispicy?
 What wolf (ever) consulted a dream-interpreter?
 I will go like a brigand according to my own inclination.
 And I will cast aside that (oracle) of the god(s); I will be in control of myself.”¹¹⁵²

That might work for a god, but for the very human Naram-Sin, the decision brings disaster. His troops are sent out, and all are slaughtered. In a passage much like the fragmentary Old Babylonian text, Naram-Sin speak of his bewilderment, gloom, and confusion. This time, though, Ea speaks to the gods about the Flood, and Naram-Sin correctly offers sacrifices to the gods and seeks omens. This time he follows the gods’ advice. When he wants to attack the enemy horde again, Ishtar herself persuades him that he should not do so. Ishtar as Dilbat, the Venus star, approaches Naram-Sin and counsels him. He should not attempt to destroy “the brood of destruction.” Enlil will one day “summon them for evil” and the enemy will be slaughtered. The lengthy description of the destruction of enemy’s city recalls the Sumerian City Laments, and it has an apocalyptic quality to it.

“Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” ends, not with a heroic battle in which Naram-Sin acts in the manner Akkadian literature and art represent. Instead, the narrative ends with the assurance that the gods will take care of the enemy. Naram-Sin’s last words are an admonition to a future ruler who would read the stele he has written. The person—governor, prince, or “anyone else” who is called by the gods “to perform kingship”—should open the tablet-box and read the stele. The wisdom offered by Naram-Sin appears to be what he gained from the terrible mistakes he made. He offers courage and clarity—but not heroic struggle. Indeed, the advice is notably quietistic. One should, it is true, strengthen the city walls, fills moats with water, and bring all valuables—chests, grain, money, and goods—into the stronghold.¹¹⁵³ But the good king should tie up his weapons and put them in the corner! The enemy should be allowed to roam freely outside the walls.

“Guard your courage! Take heed of your own person!
 Let him roam through your land! Go not out to him!
 Let him scatter the cattle! Do not go near him!
 Let him consume the flesh of your offspring!
 Let him murder, (and) let him return (unharmd)!
 (But) you be self-controlled, disciplined.
 Answer them, ‘Here I am, sir!’

Requite their wickedness with kindness.”¹¹⁵⁴

How many of the Mesopotamian kings followed Naram-Sin’s advice is hard to measure. One can hardly find an example from among the Babylonians or the Assyrians who might have known this advice. One thing seems certain, though: it is not the advice of the 3rd millennium heroes who gloried in victory over their enemies.

We have suggested earlier that the Urukian connection with the Akkadian empire established by Sargon of Akkad involved the northern conquerors’ adoption of southern ways. Naram-Sin, in whose reign the living king came to be worshipped along with the cult statues of the ancestors, took kingship into its extreme reaches. We think this means adopting Urukian *enship* in its fullest form, with the transformation of a human being, through his relationship with the gods, primarily through the sacred marriage with Inanna/Ishtar, into the kind of divinity Lugalbanda and Gilgamesh—and Dumuzi—had become. There is, it hardly means to be said, in “Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” not the slightest hint of the deified king, lover of Ishtar. Where Naram-Sin fails—and his model Enmerkar before him—is precisely in arrogating to himself the prerogatives of the gods. Naram-Sin, and Enmerkar, come to represent the ultimate challenge to the gods, the assertion of the self. What is left, though, and this goes back to the reputation of Enmerkar in the 3rd millennium, is a hard-won wisdom. In this poem the heroes are anything but divine.

“Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” only indirectly criticizes the once-deified king from a Babylonian perspective, but there is other evidence from the 2nd millennium that shows the Babylonian (originally Amorite?) ideology that informs the anti-Akkadian and anti-Urukian slant of the poem.

A document known as “The Weidner Chronicle” (from the tablet discovered at Assur by E. F. Weidner in 1926)¹¹⁵⁵ connects Naram-Sin and Enmerkar in a way that strips them even of the wisdom “Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes” grants them. Cast in the form of a letter in which the king of Babylon, probably Apil-Sin, gives advice to his counterpart in Isin, Damiq-ilishu, “The Weidner Chronicle” reshapes the vision of history in *The Sumerian King List* to admit the work of the King of the Gods, the city god of Babylon, Marduk. Indeed, rather than the unseen hand of the gods that brought the dynasties listed in *The Sumerian King List* to an end and redirected kingship to different cities, only a few of the high gods participate in “The Weidner Chronicle,” especially Marduk and Ea. Where Akkad had seen its ancient Sumerian connection in Uruk, the Babylonians, if this text is any indication of a larger ideological turn, traced a different axis: the upstart Babylon and ancient Eridu.

This particular Sumero-Babylonian axis will have its greatest and most influential expression in the magnificent “creation epic,” *Enuma Elish*, which has been discussed above, in a different context.¹¹⁵⁶ In one small way, though, “The Weidner Chronicle” goes *Enuma Elish* one better. Where the great mythological narrative identifies a specific lineage for Marduk—Anshar, Anu, and Ea—in which each succeeding generation is more

powerful than the previous one and identifies Babylon as a second Eridu, “The Weidner Chronicle” even connects Ea and Marduk through a third generation, Nabu.

“The Weidner Chronicle” follows the contours of *The Sumerian King List* and even extends beyond it by opening with the king of Babylon, wiser than his contemporary in Isin (where *The Sumerian King List* left off). For the most part the chronicle assigns praise or blame to the kings who bring or fail to bring offerings to Marduk in Babylon. The first deity mentioned, to whom the Babylonian king himself offers sacrifice, is Ninkarrak or Gula, a healing goddess who appear before the king at night and gives him advice. At stake appears to be the very establishment of, the justification of, the Babylonian empire that would unify Sumer, the people of the “Lower lands” and Akkad, the people of the “Upper lands.”¹¹⁵⁷ Where this will unify peoples on the earth, Marduk, “king of the gods,” will unify heaven and earth. Babylon thus becomes the center of the universe, seen in vertical and horizontal dimensions.

This is accomplished in a manner that recalls a ritual that has been attested at least as early as Early Dynastic times. Usually called “Ea-Marduk” rituals, a modern designation that highlights the very problem we raised above, the Babylon-centered orientation of Assyriologists, they should probably be called “Enki-Asalluhi” rituals—identifying the literary form by the older, Sumerian examples rather than the later Akkadian texts. These texts inevitably open with a problem or situation that is mythological in scale, how a person or a city is being oppressed by various demonic forces. The Son, Asalluhi, sees the problem and runs to the Father, Enki, who transfers his vast knowledge and problem-solving skills to the Son. The texts then go on to specify the ritual acts and the magical incantation needed to solve the particular problem. *Enuma Elish* repeats this well-known pattern on a grand scale. Here it is reduced to a few lines that summarize what is a momentous transformation of the universe.

Marduk goes “quickly to his father, Ea, the craftsman, the counsellor of heaven and earth. “[May Bab]ylon, the city chosen in my heart, be exalted among all people! May Esagila, the majestic shrine, be [] to the limits of heaven and earth!”¹¹⁵⁸ Ea, known by his epithet Nudimmud, accomplishes all that his son asks.

Then the great gods Anu and Enlil decree the Marduk will be leader of the Upper and Lower lands. Kingship is defined as offering daily, monthly and yearly purification. Whoever “sins against the gods” of a city will have his kingship ended, his scepter taken away, and his treasury reduced to rubble. Kingship on earth derives from the institution in heaven, as Marduk was exalted by the great gods.

With this mythological opening, the chronicle of earthly kings begins. While Uruk and Akkad are not the only cities mentioned in the list, they are the most prominent. And the first mention of Uruk comes with Enmerkar (written Enmekar), “who destroyed the people” (line 32). The text that specifies the people is broken, but is followed immediately by a striking and unusual twist. The wise Adapa, who is regularly associated with Enki’s Eridu (and in later tradition acts with Enmerkar), here curses Enmerkar. The suggestion

is that Enmerkar destroyed Eridu, and rule of the land then passed to Adapa because of the atrocity Enmerkar committed against the sacred city.

Enmerkar's action is paralleled later in the list by Naram-Sin, who is the only other king accused of "destroying the people" (lines 53-54). In that case we see why Babylon was particularly hostile to Naram-Sin: he destroyed the people of Babylon itself. The gods then twice sent the barbarians of Gutium against Naram-Sin and gave over kingship to the enemy hordes, who were "unhappy people unaware how to reverse the gods, ignorant of the right cultic practices. If, then, Enmerkar attacked Eridu and Naram-Sin Babylon, the historic parallel would help to explain the connection between kings of Uruk and Akkad.

It need hardly be said that the short "The Weidner Chronicle" is highly selective in its survey of kingship. It includes the remarkable story of a woman who was given kingship, one Kubaba, "the tavern-keeper." We are accustomed to thinking of kings as "shepherds," not only from Sumer and Akkad but from Greece and the Bible. "The Weidner Chronicle" introduces a less-frequently used metaphor, the king as fisherman. While this may seem more or less odd in Babylon (on the Euphrates), it is perfectly appropriate to the model of Babylon, Eridu, built over the Apsu, the abode of Enki/Ea. Marduk favors the tavern-keeper because she gave bread to the fishermen who were "catching fish for the meal of the great lord Marduk." She also gave water and made the fishermen offer the fish to Marduk. The epithet used in this context is Marduk, "prince of the Apsu." For her righteous deed, Marduk grants her "sovereignty over the whole world."

The story of Kubaba in "The Weidner Chronicle" is all the more remarkable when it is compared with its source, *The Sumerian King List*. "The Weidner Chronicle" is much shorter than the king list. It begins only with Akka of Kish, who in *The Sumerian King List* is said to have reigned until, through force of arms, kingship was transferred to Eanna.¹¹⁵⁹ Uruk makes its appearance with Enmerkar. Then Adapa, the first of the Seven Sages, is introduced. A figure known from an important myth for his connection with Ea and Eridu, Adapa is praised for cursing Enmerkar and gains a great reward, given "ruler over all lands and his rites." Something of Adapa's is beautified—the text is rather broken here—and Marduk appears to give him a reign of 3,020 years. (Again, the text is broken.) The elaboration of Adapa's rule and the corresponding reduction of Enmerkar are both remarkable, especially when we consider that Adapa was not even mentioned in *The Sumerian King List*. In the "Adapa" myth Adapa is certainly a sage and a *pashishu*-priest, "who always tends the rites,"¹¹⁶⁰ but he is not a king. On the short list of kings in "The Weidner Chronicle," where only thirteen kings—fourteen, if the "unhappy" Gutians are added to the list—are mentioned, Adapa and Kubaba are the only ones who are praised without exception. And they are the ones who maintain the proper rites of Babylon's Esagila. For her part, Kubaba, given sovereignty over the whole world, is given only three lines in *The Sumerian King List*. There she is identified as tavernkeeper—or "barmaid," as Jacobsen preferred to call her.¹¹⁶¹ There she is also credited with consolidating the foundation of Kish and reigning for 100 years. Nothing is said in *The Sumerian King List*

about her following the rites of Esagila properly—the reason highlighted in “The Weidner Chronicle.”

The pattern in “The Weidner Chronicle” is clear. Kingship is given by Marduk, king of the gods, to certain humans who either show the proper respect to Esagila, at the center of the universe, or are stripped of kingly rule. Only five cities figure in the list: Kish, Uruk, Eridu, Akshak, and Ur. Some kings initially do the right thing. Sargon of Akkad, for instance, refuses the order of *his* king, Ur-Zababa, when Ur-Zababa wanted to change the wine libations of Esagila. Marduk then makes Sargon ruler over the “four corners of the world.” All is well while Sargon brought tribute to Babylon. But then he slips up and ignores the command of Marduk. By digging soil from Babylon and building a city he names Babylon in front of Akkad—apparently symbolizing Akkad’s rule over Babylon¹¹⁶²—Sargon attracts the enmity of the gods. Enlil brings in enemies from east and west to oppose Sargon, who is deprived of sleep. Naram-Sin even goes further than Sargon. He destroys the people of Babylon, and twice Marduk sends the Gutians against him and finally gives kingship to those barbarous people, as we have seen.

The Ur III kings—Shulgi, Amar-Sin, Shu-Sin, and Ibbi-Sin—are treated summarily in “The Weidner Chronicle.” Each in turn violates certain rites, usually involving Esagila. If we add the narrative frame to the list, the Babylonian kings Sumu-la-El and Apil-Sin, the purported writer of “The Weidner Chronicle,” the revised king list in effect ends with the true inheritors of kingship. Where *The Sumerian King List* had ended with Sin-Magir of Isin, “The Weidner Chronicle” in effect picks up the survey at that point. Apil-Sin, who gives advice to Isin’s king Damiq-ilishu because the Isin king had not paid attention to the Babylonian’s advice, clearly speaks with authority. Not only is Apil-Sin doing the right thing in Babylon: he makes much of his offering sacrifice to the healing goddess Gula, the great goddess of Isin itself. While these names are obscure to most of us today, the reader of “The Weidner Chronicle” would not have missed to the obvious. Damiq-ilishu proved to be the *last* king of Isin. When Isin gave way to Babylon, the Babylonians would not have missed the irony in a letter supposedly addressed to the enemy. In *The Sumerian King List*, as we pointed out earlier, the name of the kings of Isin are all written with the divine determinative. The kings of Babylon clearly know their place in Marduk’s world, where the deified kings of Isin did not.¹¹⁶³

The ideological character of this truncated king list should be pretty clear from the point of view of the center of the universe. Just as kingship of the gods properly involved a move from the Father’s house in Eridu to the Son’s in Babylon, human kingship, granted by Marduk, moved through a succession of city-states until it, too, reached the center. The kings of Babylon do not claim to be gods. Rather, they know that maintaining the rites of the gods, especially Marduk’s, is the very definition of the true king. From Kish to Uruk, from Uruk to Eridu, Akshak, Kish, Akkad, the Gutians, Uruk again, Ur, and Isin, kingship moves under the hand of Marduk. Some of the kings are initially favored by Marduk and then commit a crime that causes the king’s removal. Two—Adapa and Kubaba—had it right and were given long reigns. Those who acted against the people of Eridu and Babylon were doomed to destruction.

We find even such a relatively short list of kings and cities confusing, but if we keep the important notion in mind, that Babylon was not just another, temporary place but the center of the universe, the theology of history informing “The Weidner Chronicle” includes an axis of righteousness that stretches from Eridu to Babylon, and another that traces a false understanding of kingship, from Enmerkar of Uruk through Naram-Sin, from Urukean *enship* through the first fully deified king in Akkad. If Akkad had looked to the early *en* of Uruk as a model of wise kingship, Babylon with equal force denied the claim and rather saw its fate bound tightly with Uruk’s equally ancient—even more primordial—rival, Eridu.

The debunking of Enmerkar and Naram-Sin, then, in two important 2nd millennium Babylonian texts, then, is a measure of how persistent the Urukean tradition had functioned as a model for other powerful cities, including the Sargonic empire itself.

Enter the Babylonians

For the prophet Ezekiel, living with his fellows in exile from Jerusalem in Babylonia, “Chaldea” in southern Mesopotamia was a land of merchants. Ezekiel’s characterization of the land dates from the 6th century BCE. He reminds us that cities like Uruk prospered early because of trade and that continued prosperity depended upon it as well.¹¹⁶⁴ In the 4th millennium such economic activity was clearly centered in the temple. Political upheavals frequently changed the leadership of the community, but it is not always clear if the economic basis of city life was changed as well. Uruk’s economy—and the temple—survived many political changes, and the city prospered, and the temples of the city even grew long after the Babylonian Exile. But in one important respect the city had changed early in the 2nd millennium.

While Uruk struggled with--and deeply influenced--its rivals through the 3rd millennium, it had largely maintained its independence. The striking symbiosis with nearby Ur during the Ur III period was, as we have seen, a conspicuous exception. The kings of Ur during that period were descended from Urukeans and with Ur-Namma and Shulgi especially saw themselves as sons of Ninsun, the goddess who was considered the mother of Gilgamesh, and therefore the kings of Ur were brothers of Gilgamesh. The deification of Ur kings derived from the Uruk’s *en*. With its defeat at the hands of a new rival from the north, Babylon, Uruk is, however, never again politically independent, and the centers of power—Babylon, then the Assyrians cities, and eventually the Greeks—are increasingly remote. Uruk protects itself by conserving its religious base.

So great is the pull of Babylon on the imagination of modern scholars that virtually all aspects of Mesopotamian culture for the two thousand years of Mesopotamia’s power and influence are routinely called “Babylonian.”¹¹⁶⁵ The Bible is greatly responsible for the image of Babylon in the West. The period of Exile in Mesopotamia so vividly described by the prophets ended as it had begun in the 6th century BCE, but a glance at the much later New Testament Book of Revelation shows us that Babylon had become the symbol of everything corrupt and oppressive. And well before the Greeks had entered the scene as conquerors (and Alexander the Great died in Babylon, already having had absorbed

much of Babylonian culture) the “East” had fascinated them, Babylon in particular. When modern Western adventurers, archaeologists and linguists began exploring the ancient ruins, they wanted especially to find Babylon, with its famous ruined Tower and the equally famous Hanging Gardens. The first texts they found dated to periods when either the Assyrians in the north or the Babylonians dominated the region. So it seemed inevitable that the entire area from Babylon south and the culture of the Babylonian Empire would be called “Babylonian.”

Even today the varied cities of the south are simply “Babylonian,” and all aspects of the culture are drawn to the political center (as the Babylonian rulers themselves had demanded).¹¹⁶⁶ Clay tablets and stones inscribed with the Semitic language we know as “Akkadian,” after Sargon’s city of Akkad (or Agade) and his dynasty’s powerful but short-lived reign, are still routinely called Babylonian no matter where in Mesopotamia they are found—with a few exceptions of texts written in an Assyrian *dialect*. (A vast number of Assyrian-held texts were written in the so-called “Standard Babylonian”¹¹⁶⁷ Akkadian.) Folded rather neatly into the concept of an imperial Babylonia, cities like Uruk largely retreat into the deep background of scholarly thought.

But as we shall see, Uruk more than held its own. The question is how the Urukeans managed to do it once they had lost kingship forever.

The dominance of Babylon in the Western imagination can be seen in the way written texts from the 2nd millennium are categorized by modern scholars. Ironically, most *Sumerian* literary texts, such as the ones we have been discussing, are known from “Old Babylonian” copies. “Old Babylonian” is the designation of the period, roughly 1900-1595 BCE,¹¹⁶⁸ when Babylon did dominate a large empire, one that would much later be challenged by the Assyrians. (Even that is something of a stretch. During that period a good part of Mesopotamia was dominated by other cities, Isin, Larsa, and even Uruk for a time.) The *Classical Period* of Mesopotamian literature, which corresponds to the political Old Babylonian Period included not only copies of Sumerian texts but a variety of new texts in Sumerian, just as, like Latin many centuries later, the language was dying out.

The Classical Period also saw the development of an extensive literature in *Akkadian*, the Semitic language that would come to dominate Mesopotamia for nearly fifteen hundred years, when another Semitic language, Aramaic, would replace it as an international language. (Our guide to Uruk in the Hellenistic Period, whom we had seen in the Introduction, would most likely have spoken Aramaic and would have had to have studied Akkadian just as he would have had to have learned the long-dead Sumerian still used in religious worship.)

The literature in Akkadian tends to be called “Babylonian,” and its standard variety is routinely referred to as “Standard Babylonian,” even though much of it was written outside the city of Babylon and had little immediate relevance to that central city. A rough analogy would be the way U.S. citizens often call themselves Americans, sometimes including—but often excluding—Canadians and Mexicans in that designation. The most

conspicuous example in the modern world of the spread of a standard dialect of a language far beyond its original boundaries, Standard English, at least has the advantage of being designated by a language rather than as, say, Standard London, which would seem odd, if not offensive to English speakers in Hong Kong or Nairobi.¹¹⁶⁹

Uruk held its own economically and continued to prosper, though not on the scale of its size and achievements in the Archaic Uruk and Early Dynastic periods. It is often difficult to tell if something “Babylonian” originated in Uruk, but it is clear that Uruk’s arguably greatest export, Inanna/Ishtar and a goddess who is so closely linked to her, Nanaya, if anything expanded their influence during the periods of Babylonian hegemony.

Even with the great prestige of Inanna/Ishtar, though, one of the most hotly debated issues in ancient Near Eastern scholarship today is if the goddesses were, generally, becoming marginalized, and if so, was their eclipse reflected in a marginalization of women in Mesopotamia.¹¹⁷⁰ The persistence of a literary genre that celebrated the relationship of Inanna and her lover Dumuzi, called the *ershemma* and written by the temple official known as the *gala*, in whose company (in Old Babylonian times) numbered women, militates against the hypothesis.¹¹⁷¹ On the other hand, the overwriting of goddess literature in, e.g., a myth called “Enki and Ninmah,” which turned from a celebration of the creative power of the goddess into a contest between a god and a goddess—a contest clearly won by the male—seems to point in the opposite direction.¹¹⁷² Certain texts of the Old Babylonian period do show that the upstart Babylon sought to justify its emergence as a great power by linking its city god, Marduk, to the ancient god Enki, bridging the city of Babylon to the very old city of Eridu. Uruk and its heroes, especially Enmerkar, were downgraded, as in texts like “The Weidner Chronicle,”¹¹⁷³ which slams both Uruk and Ur, and “Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes.”¹¹⁷⁴

Royal Inscriptions: Kings of Isin and Larsa

The Sumerian King List ends with the defeat of Ur and the transfer of kingship to the city of Isin, where in 2073 BCE Ishbi-Erra became king.¹¹⁷⁵ Once independent of Ur, Isin governed the south for over two hundred years, when the city of Larsa, which had become powerful during this period, more and more came to dominate the scene. Uruk was under the control of Isin until the reign of Lipit-Eshar, when it may then have fallen under the control of Larsa.¹¹⁷⁶ During this, Uruk did regain a measure of independence very early in the 2nd millennium, when two persons, Alila-hadum and Sumu-kanasa, about whom little is known, but who were apparently of Amorite stock—that is, from the west, where the Babylonian kings came from—may have been kings of Uruk. Uruk was independent during the rule of Sin-Kashid and ÌR-ne-ne, whom we will see below. The period of independence came to an end when Rim-Sin I of Larsa defeated Uruk. Later Babylon seized control. Briefly, Uruk claimed independence in a revolt against the Babylonian king Samsu-iluna, but the rebellion was short-lived. Uruk’s history through the remainder of the Old Babylonian period is quite obscure, but its independence is doubtful.

What is known of Uruk during the Old Babylonian period has been pieced together largely through the royal inscriptions from many cities, including Uruk. The inscriptions are usually brief, often fragmentary and puzzling, but they do give us hints of continuities and

changes in Mesopotamia, especially in Uruk. Often the inscriptions from non-Urukean sources provide surprising glimpses of life in the city that was losing its political grip on the old Sumerian heartland.

The names of all kings of Isin, for example, are written with the DINGIR-sign, the silent determinative written before the names of gods and goddesses. *The Sumerian King List*, whose last revision corresponds with the last king on the list, Sin-magir of Isin, follows the practice that emerged with the Ur III king, Shulgi and continued in his successor, Amar-Sin (whose name used to be read Bur-Sin), identifying the kings as divine.¹¹⁷⁷ Beginning with Ishbi-Erra and continuing through the fifteen kings of Isin, all of the names are written with the DINGIR-sign. Although Uruk does not appear in the royal inscriptions of Isin until the fourth king, Ishme-Dagan, the deification of Isin kings, like their Ur III predecessors, may have derived from the special relationship they had with Inanna. Ishme-Dagan, like Shulgi before him, claimed to be, not king of Uruk but *en* of Uruk and spouse of Inanna.

Ishme-Dagan,
 provider of Nippur,
 constant (attendant) of Ur,
 who is daily at the service of Eridu,
en of Uruk,
 king of Isin,
 king of the land of Sumer and Akkad,
 beloved spouse of the goddess Inanna.¹¹⁷⁸

He was the first ruler after the Ur III kings to adopt the title, “spouse of Inanna.”¹¹⁷⁹

The intimate relationship between Ishme-Dagan and Inanna is celebrated in a love song of 26 lines. Inanna is taken by the “sweet-voiced cows” and the “gentle-voiced calves” as she approaches the cattle-pen. Her “spouse” will sound the churn. Cattle-pen and sheepfold will rejoice over Inanna’s entrance. The sheep will “spread out their wool” for her. An abundance of butter and cream will be given to her. If this sounds like the good shepherd Dumuzi, it is not an accident. The Ishme-Dagan song is a shorter version of a song in which Dumuzi is the lover, not Ishme-Dagan.¹¹⁸⁰

A different sort of song that involves Ishme-Dagan and praises Inanna reveals a theological shift that reflects the increasing political power of Nippur. Ostensibly a poem that exalts Inanna to the high authority Urukeans had traditionally believed she possessed (and would later raise her to the highest authority), the poem adds a subtle element that shows Inanna’s dependency on the high god of Nippur, Enlil, and his wife Ninlil.¹¹⁸¹

Inanna, as in other poems, has “the capacity to make the heavens shake,” to achieve anything. She has “seized the divine *me*” in heaven and taken them to earth (perhaps a version of her stealing Eanna and bringing it to Uruk). Her power to bring joy to the hearts of those who “revere her in their established residence” (but to treat those not in the “well-built houses” poorly) become blended into Inanna’s power to change a man into a woman, to have men dress like women and women dress like men (and one who wears

both at the same time), to put spindles in the hands of men and weapons in the hands of women. (Curiously, the poem also has women using the language of children and children using the language of women.)

The warlike Inanna is not ignored either. Like a wild bull she engages in battle and makes “the earth drink the blood of enemies like water.”

What makes this poem different is that it claims Inanna has received her great powers from Enlil and Ninlil. The connection with Ishme-Dagan also makes the same claim. “Enlil and Ninlil gave Ishme-Dagan” the authority to act as her “constant attendant” and her “spouse.” He has the duty to build temple and feed the gods. “All this was bestowed on Inanna and Ishme-Dagan by Enlil and Ninlil.”

The Ishme-Dagan inscriptions—three others have survived that identify him in the same way—agree with the role he played in a remarkable composition from the time of his reign, “The Uruk Lament.” In many ways “The Uruk Lament,” which tells of the terrible fall of that city and its restoration by Ishme-Dagan, is the most remarkable of the five Sumerian City Laments that have come down to us. The City Laments are works of the Isin-Larsa period.¹¹⁸² Divine disfavor is ultimately the cause of the terrible destruction of the cities. In this case the high god Enlil, often seen as angry and destructive, is joined by Uruk’s own god An (1.9) to fashion an irresistible monstrous or natural force that will take the city. Nomadic hordes of Gutu and Subarians are also mentioned as implements of destruction (4.11-22). The advance on the city is marked. The enemy destroys settlements (*mash-gán*) and villages (*á-dam*) around the city (4.25), enters the primordial section of the city, Kullab, seizes the wharf and borders, and creates havoc in the city. With battering rams and axes the enemy enters the city, sets fires and lets “the blood flow like that of a (sacrificial cow)” (5.22). They “tore out everything that had been built” (5.22).

The city is restored to grace by a “humble” (*lú-sun₅-na*) and “pious” man (12.22) who offers a lamentation (*ér-sizkur* 12-22-24) to Inanna (and An).¹¹⁸³ That can only be the king of Isin himself. The last part of the poem is set in Inanna’s *gipar* in Uruk, where the “humble man,” Ishme-Dagan, is presented in various guises, as lover (*dam ki-ág*), entertainer (playing the drums of the *gala* and singing as *nar*), steward (*ú-a*, who prepares the great bull sacrifices, makes offerings and brings beer, fat, oil, honey and wine to Inanna), *en*, and supplicant (lines 12.9-27). It has all the appearances, as M. W. Green notes, of a sacred marriage—of the sort known from the reigns of the Ur III kings.¹¹⁸⁴

One very striking difference between “The Uruk Lament” and the other city laments is that the fate of all humankind is at stake. In other cases, the city itself and the territory it holds are threatened. The monster created by the gods in “The Uruk Lament” is supposed to destroy all humans, not just Urukeans. The reason may be, as it is in the Flood Story, *Atrahasis*, overpopulation: the “noise” of so many humans has disturbed the “sleep” of the gods.¹¹⁸⁵

That makes the resolution even more striking. In line with “The Fashioning of the *Gala*,” Ishme-Dagan is to offer not just offerings of food to Inanna; he is to sing for her. To soothe the angry heart of Inanna and the Anunna-gods, he is to bring them a lament. If he and his best singers perform the song well, the Anunna-gods will “emerge tearfully” and restore the world to its original order. As in “The Fashioning of the *Gala*,” the performance will work because it induces empathy for suffering humanity.

Following Ishme-Dagan, all Isin kings claim to be *ens* of Uruk. With the kings of Larsa, on the other hand, the case is very different—until the very end of the dynasty. The first fourteen kings of Larsa, if the surviving inscriptions are representative of their reigns, do not mention Uruk. Inanna is occasionally mentioned, along with the goddesses Nanaya and Ninisina.¹¹⁸⁶ Where Inanna is related specifically to a location, is it Zabala, not Uruk.

Rim-Sin of Larsa

All that changes with king Rim-Sin I, king of Larsa (1822-1763 BCE). In the 14th year of his reign (1810) he attacked Uruk, while a certain ĪR-ne-ne (or Irdanene) was on the throne. The city held out that time, but in year 21 (1804 BCE) Rim-Sin I conquered the city.¹¹⁸⁷

The long reign of Rim-Sin coincides with the rule of other important rulers in the region, from Shamshi-Adad (1830-1776) of Assyria through three Babylonian kings, Apil-Sin, Sin-muballit and the one who finally defeated Larsa, the famous Hammurabi (1792-1750). Babylon annexed Larsa in the last year of Rim-Sin’s reign. For our purposes he was contemporary with Sin-kashid of Uruk, who arranged to have a daughter married to Babylon’s Sin-muballit, installed another as high priestess of Lugalbanda in Uruk, and he may have appointed still another as *nin-dingir* priestess of Meslamta-ea in the neighboring city of Durum.¹¹⁸⁸ Uruk’s coalition with Babylon was, however, unable to hold out against Rim-Sin.

The defeat of Uruk changed the way Rim-Sin was considered theologically and politically. Before this event, the king’s name was written without the DINGIR-sign. After the taking of Uruk, celebrated in several inscriptions, the name Rim-Sin is always written *with* the DINGIR-sign. As we shall see, the kings of Babylon, who come onto the scene soon after this, are conspicuous in *not* identifying themselves as divine.

1-6) For the god Ninshubur, great lord [*en-gal*], who measures out all the *mes*, who knows the essence of prayer, supreme messenger (and) adviser of great An, whose word goes at the fore, for his lord,

7-13) (I), Rim-Sin, shepherd who [b]ears tribute for Nippur, who perfectly executes the *mes* and rites of Eridu, provider of Ur, who reverences Ebabbar, king of Larsa, king of the land of Sumer and Akkad,

14-18) when the gods An, Enlil, (and) Enki, the great gods, entrusted Uruk, the ancient city [*unu-KI uru-ul*], into my hands,

19-24) for the god Ninshubur, my lord, as I said an ardent prayer, I built for him, for my own life, the Eaagasumu ('House which gives the commands'), his beloved residence.¹¹⁸⁹

Rim-Sin I of Larsa provides many other glimpses of Inanna and the deities associated with her (Nanaya, Ninshubur, Ninsianna, and Ningishzida, the high god An, and Inanna's lover Dumuzi), though not always in relation to Uruk. Note that the inscription claims that Uruk's An was one with Enlil and Enki as "entrusting" the city to the Larsa king. Another, a prayer to An, appears to mark the enthronement of Rim-Sin at Uruk, or more likely, Larsa.¹¹⁹⁰ In it An pronounces his destiny as king, shepherd and lord (*nun*). Most of the inscriptions (#1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 18, 20, 2001, 2002) note the king's pious building or restoration of temples in sites other than Uruk, especially in Ur. While Rim-Sin claims to be king of Uruk as well as Isin and Larsa, he does not claim the title of *en*.

That most exalted title, so deeply rooted in the history of Uruk, soon virtually disappears. The *en*, as we have seen, may be male or female; the Sumerian term does not differentiate gender. Its Akkadian equivalent, however, regularly distinguishes between the male *enu* and the female *entu*.¹¹⁹¹ An Old Babylonian list of cultic officials shows that the *en* was certainly remembered. The list, "Proto-Lu" (205-209) repeats the now-familiar Sumerian roles beginning with *en* (*en*, *lagar*, *nu-èsh-a*, *gudu* and *gudu₄-abzu*).¹¹⁹² And there are a few references to the *en* of Uruk in Kassite and Middle Babylonian times, that is, later in the 2nd millennium. But the sign EN was always read in Akkadian *bēlum*.¹¹⁹³ That title, which is best known to readers of the Bible as the "Lord" (Bel) who ruled Babylon, the god Marduk, continues as perhaps the most exalted of divine and royal titles, but it is largely honorific. Gradually its reference to what may be called priestly activities seems to disappear.

The female *en* continues as an important cultic official perhaps into Neo-Assyrian times (1st millennium), but the history is increasingly complicated. Certainly, as with Enheduanna earlier, she continues to be highly important in the cultic life of cities, increasingly in areas far beyond the southern Mesopotamian base. What complicates the matter is that the *entu* becomes difficult to distinguish from other specifically female roles, especially the *lukur*, *nin-dingir* and *nu-gig*,¹¹⁹⁴ about whom we have more to say later.¹¹⁹⁵

A remarkable text from the time of Rim-Sin I provides a unique glimpse of the *en* in Ur hundreds of years after Enheduanna.¹¹⁹⁶ Inscribed on a clay cone, the long text presents the activities of the twin sister of Rim-Sin I, En-ane-du, in as much detail as can be found for any temple official. In this text this Akkadian woman speaks like a Sumerian. Her major claims in the Sumerian inscription is that she restored and improved the residence of the *en*-priestesses, the "shining" *gipar*, laying tightly-fitted bricks on its old base, plastering its walls ("aligned to a finger"), and giving the house a new form.¹¹⁹⁷ Also, by her "great wisdom" (*géshtu-gal*) she found that the graveyard of former *en*-priestesses was badly in need of repair. The walls around it had collapsed. There was no guard

around it, and the place was no longer pure. En-ane-du (“*En* agreeable to An”) set about establishing a broad sacred area, surrounding the graveyard with a wall and setting a strong watch.

To proclaim my name chosen for the office of *en*, I restored this work. I inscribed my foundation inscription with the praise of my office of *en* (and) lai[d] it there for as long as it might be. I named tha[t] wall “Praise be the one who reverences me.”¹¹⁹⁸

In this text, that runs to forty-eight lines, En-ane-du, like Enheduanna before her, the *en* of Nanna/Sîn at Ur, reveals just how important her position was. Predestined from the “holy womb” for her position, touched by the hand of Nanna’s consort, Ningal, wearing the radiant ornaments of office, “truly chosen for the rites and lustration ceremonies [*shu-luh*] of divinity,” she is the “reverent princess” that stands at the “lofty *laver* of the palace.” Nanna and Ningal looked upon her with “shining faces,” and gave her “life” (*nam-ti-la*), a “joyful expression” (*igi-húl-la-bi*) and a supreme name.

To En-ane-du the gods gave a “supplication of life” in her “pure mouth.” Through her the life-span of Rim-Sin I (who reigned 60 years) was prolonged, and, she claims, all his enemies were delivered into her brother’s hand through her power.

Another remarkable document from the reign of Rim-Sin is a 600+ line ritual text that details seven days of offerings to a variety of deities in Rim-Sin’s Larsa. If, as is likely, the text dates from the second year of Rim-Sin’s reign,¹¹⁹⁹ the special treatment of Inanna, other Inanna-related goddesses, and female “keepers” of the sacred house in the complex rituals already shows a close connection between Larsa and Uruk, very likely an ancient tie.

The seven day ritual during the month of Shabāt□u¹²⁰⁰--the eleventh month in the Nippur calendar that became the standard calendar--involves sacrifices, offerings and prayers to seven gods (or pairs of gods): Ningunanna, Enki and Asarluhi (gods of Eridu), Utu/Shamash, Inanna/Ishtar, Nanaya, Ninegal, Mah and Panigingirra (deities of childbirth), and Nanna/Sîn (Ur’s chief deity). Since Larsa had been considered the city of the sun, Utu/Shamash, for centuries before this text, it is not surprising that the longest section of the text is dedicated to him. On the other hand, the lengthy section devoted to Inanna/Ishtar (lines 510-625) is worth noting. And if the two goddesses associated with her in Uruk—almost aspects or extensions of Inanna—are the ones who follow Inanna in the ritual text, Nanaya (632-755) and Ninegal (756-901), then the goddesses overshadow even Larsa’s sun god.

The rituals, which begin at dusk and carry through the night and into the following day, are far too complicated to discuss here. Much of the long text lists the ingredients for rituals—including something of a recipe for “waffles”--but a few details are worth a comment. The highest-ranking religious office is the *en*, as it would be in Uruk.¹²⁰¹ Generally, the lists reflect a hierarchical order. One part has a sequence of some twenty-five “keepers,” identified, of course, only by title. After an item, “1 dried meat for the

cupbearer (BI.LUL) before Inanna/Ishtar,” 1 sila (quart) of sesame oil is provided for the *en* and the following keepers of the temple:

Brewers (*lú-bappir*)
 Singers (*nar*)
 Lamentation priests (*gala*)
 Chief singer (*nar-gal*)
 Singers (again)
 neshakku-priest (*nisag*)
 Ecstatic (*lú-gub-ba*)
 Brewer (again)
 Messenger of Utu’s *en* (*rá-gaba en Utu*)
 Builder (*dím*)
 Ablution priest (*shita_x-ÛNU*)
 Assistant abluion priest (*egir shita_x-ÛNU*)¹²⁰²

The list changes at this point. Thirty quarts of barley is given as fodder for the saddle donkey. Then a group of keepers is given one bushel of barley each:

Dancers (*húb-bî*)
 Female singer/*lukur* (*mí-nar-lukur*)

Thirty quarts of barley are then given for barbers (*shu-î*) and male court-sweepers (*kisal-luh*). One quart is then given for the female court sweepers (*mí-kisal-luh*) and female singer/*lukur* (*mí-nar-lukur*). Sixty quarts is then assigned for the barbers, thirty for the porters (*i-duš*). Sixty more are given (again) for the barbers, and finally thirty quarts are assigned to the millers (*ararru*).¹²⁰³

Other religious specialists like the *gudu* appear in the text. But this sequence reflects important facets of life in the Sumerian temple-city even at this rather late date (when the Sumerian language itself was beginning to die out). The *en* heads a group of what appear to be very important functionaries, only a few of whom correspond to the modern Western notion of “religious.” The chief singer in this ritual from Larsa is responsible for sacrifices. Brewers are always important, as we know from even very late (Seleucid Period) texts. Singers who are also the elusive *lukurs* are important, as are barbers, court-sweepers, porters and millers—occupations we are likely to consider “secular.”

In one sense, if all the specialization that took place as the city-state formed a thousand or more years before this is a mark of the transformation of village life in Sumer, as a group they are all “elites.” Status differences among them do appear, though the differences are not always clear to us. Edwin Kingsbury noted a pattern that is partly evident in the list but can be seen elsewhere in the ritual text: female personnel are peculiar to the female deities. The female court-sweepers and the *lukur* who is also a singer are part of the entourage of Inanna and the other two goddesses. The gods receive male slaves; the goddesses receive female slaves. Since this is the period of the high status *naditus* in Sippar, Babylon, and Nippur (at least), and *en*-priestesses maintain their high status in the old Sumerian cities—not to mention the persistence of female authors—the phenomenon of women in the clergy remains a conspicuous feature of Sumerian life.

Since many of these offices are no longer attested after the Old Babylonian period, the question arises if religious institutions were beginning to change in significant ways. Kingsbury also noted that the clergy of Inanna/Ishtar generally receives double the rations that other offices receive.

While it could be merely the luck of the spade that individuals with often surprising personal concerns breathe through even quite formal writings of the period, letters of the Old Babylonian period seem to reflect a greater sense of the individual—such as is found in the increasing interest in private property during the period. The defeat of an Urukean-Isin coalition by Rim-Sin in 1810 prompted a striking letter from a woman to Rim-Sin a decade after the defeat. The woman, a high-priestess (*nin-dingir*) of the god Meslamtaea at Durum, near Uruk, wrote to the king complaining about the poor treatment she was receiving in her exile from Durum. The complaint reminds us of a similar case with the daughter of Sargon of Akkad, Enheduanna, in her exile from Ur.

In this case the priestess identifies herself as a female scribe (*mi dub-sar*, line 16), *nin-dingir* of Meslamtaea, and a daughter of Sin-kashid, King of Uruk. Her name is Nin-shata-pada. Another of his daughters, Nin-inishu, was appointed high priestess of Uruk.¹²⁰⁴

The letter of Nin-shata-pada to the victorious Rim-Sin is clearly an appeal for his help. It describes in a vivid way how the priestess in her “old age” have been forced to live like a slave. Her catalog of woes includes her abandonment and exile.

Like a bird caught in a trap whose fledglings have fled from their nest
My children are scattered abroad (and) I have no man to do (my) work.¹²⁰⁵

She no longer takes pleasure in her “brickwork” (her home). The bread she eats fills her with weeping. She has been slandered. Her slave-girl refuses to fashion a garment for her. The populace needs to be directed aright. Rim-Sin’s silence on her behalf created the problem; his command will restore her.

Of course a good part of this fifty-eight line letter-prayer is devoted to praise for Rim-Sin. The king is called a “young protector who soothes the heart of Enlil,” Ninurta’s “faithful shepherd,” a wise counselor and judge, one who “loves the righteous man like Utu (himself).”¹²⁰⁶ A second section praises his might in battle, the prince and might one who avenges his city of Larsa.

For our purposes it is the treatment of the defeated Uruk that is worth emphasizing. Nin-shata-pada points out, significantly, that Uruk own An, along with Nippur’s Enlil, gave Rim-Sin the command to take Uruk (line 21). The defeat of her father’s city has brought about (unexpected) benefits for the city. The populace was largely spared: Rim-Sin defeated the king of Uruk in single combat (line 23). The horrors of war, especially pestilence and plague, did not overtake Uruk. Rather, the city rejoices. Even those inevitable victims of societies, widows and orphans, are prospering.

Of course the positive spin on the defeat is a careful and eloquent appeal to the best qualities of a Mesopotamian king. While he went into battle at the command of the high gods An and Enlil, Nin-shata-pada describes (hopes for?) a reign that reflects the high god of Larsa itself, the sun, Utu. Who from time immemorial has seen a king like Rim-Sin? He is Utu dwelling in his Shining House, Ebabbar.

Larsa, the city lofty like a mountain whose might none can attain,
Having taken the field at the command of An and Enlil, has seized the heaped-up earth(?).

The army of Uruk, bond of all the lands, (is) lowering the horns like an aurochs.
With your great might you have seized its king from them in single combat.

Having spared its populace, grant them sweet life!

Among slaves (and) children fed on milk pestilence not having emerged, a plague has not broken out.

Its populace whose collapse is like fish deprived (?) of water—they have left it to the daylight.

Its warriors are uprooted before you by the mace, it is your hand which overtakes them.

They were able to escape pestilence; they sang your praises.

The lament of Uruk has turned to rejoicing; its complaints have departed.

Orphan and widow one has placed in lush pastures; they let them repose in verdure.

Daily the people (and) all the lands eat from its surrounding.

Yours good years are merciful, all the lands dance(?).

From time immemorial, a king like you in battle who has seen?

It is thus Utu himself dwells in Ebabbar for a lifetime. (Lines 30-34, after Hallo)

Then follows Nin-shata-pada's personal lament. The poem ends with a fervent wish that she will be treated as Uruk has been treated. Rim-Sin will shine to the furthest reaches of distant lands.

Kings of Babylon

After Rim-Sin and En-ane-du, the inscriptions about Uruk itself seem mighty pale in comparison. Another person named Rim-Sin revolted after the long reign of his famous namesake, and he managed to conquer most of southern Mesopotamia. But his rule was brief. After less than two years, he was defeated by the king of Babylon, Samsu-iluna. Larsa's power was broken. A similar fate had already seized Uruk. Defeated by Rim-Sin I, Uruk managed a brief period of independence when Babylon's Samsu-iluna could not hold the south.¹²⁰⁷ Babylon itself maintained control of a large area until it was defeated in 1595 BCE by the Hittite king Murshili, the official end of the "Old Babylonian Period."

The Amorites who took over power in Mesopotamia mainly adopted Sumerian forms of kingship, but they kept some reminders of their tribal origins. In the earliest inscriptions of the kings of Uruk, for example, the title, "King of Amnanu" appears along with "King of Uruk."¹²⁰⁸ And they kept typical Amorite titles such as *rabiānu* ("chief"), especially in

rabiān amurrim (“chief of the Amorites”). They also continued to use the term “father” (*abu*) to refer to tribal rulers.¹²⁰⁹

The inscriptions of the Babylonian kings are not without interest for those who wish to keep Uruk in mind. In two ways, however, they differ from the inscriptions of the kings of Isin and Larsa. None of the Babylonian king names are written with the DINGIR sign.¹²¹⁰ While it is not certain that the earliest kings of Babylon already practiced what is evident in a later age, the 1st Millennium BCE, a text from the later period shows the king of Babylon subjected to a ritual humiliation before the King of the Gods, Bel (Marduk), even the great king was made to realize that he was not divine. On the fifth day of the annual Akitu festival, the high priest of Marduk stripped the king of his mace, loop, scepter and crown. The priest presented the symbols of kingship to Marduk. The priest then “strikes the king’s cheek. He places [the king] behind him and brings him before Bel. He drags him by his ears. He forces him to kneel down on the ground.”¹²¹¹ The king then pronounces his innocence before God.

I have not sinned, Lord of all Lands! I have not neglected your divinity!
 I have not caused the destruction of Babylon! I have not ordered its dissolution!
 [I have not...] the Esagil! I have not forgotten its rituals!
 I have not struck the cheek of those under my protection!
 ...I have not belittled them!
 [I have not...] *the walls of Babylon!* I have not destroyed its outer
 fortifications!¹²¹²

Once the ordeal is over, the symbols of his office are returned to the king. But even then his humiliation is not ended. The priest again strikes the king’s cheeks. The text adds a note of explanation: “If, as he strikes his cheek, tears flow, Bel is friendly. If tears do not flow, Bel is angry. The enemy will arise and bring about his downfall.” This practice would seem to go far beyond the laments of the “humble man” in Isin times who sought reconciliation of a defeated city with the deity of that city.

As kingship emerged in the 3rd millennium, the power of the palace increased dramatically, often at the expense of the temple. Assyrian kings of the 1st millennium will see an expansion of status and power even beyond the kings of Babylon, for they will combine kingship and the “high priesthood” again, as was the case in Archaic Uruk. For Uruk, doomed since the Old Babylonian Period to a succession of increasingly remote overlords—Isin, Larsa, Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Seleucid Greece—as political independence was lost, the city reinvested its resources in its rich past, centered on the temple.

The Babylonian kings of the Old Babylonian Period recognize a host of gods and goddesses, many of whom have—or gain—connections with Sumerian deities. Babylon’s claim to a special relationship with ancient Eridu and that city’s Father/Son gods, Enki and Asalluhi (or Asarluhi), will occupy us below. The royal inscriptions indicate the special relationship between Babylon and Eridu as early as the reign of Ammmi-ditana (1683-1647 BCE). Ammi-ditana takes great pride in constructing the wall around

Babylon, and states the name of the wall, “May Asarluhi turn into clay in the underworld the one who makes a breach in the clay (of the wall).”¹²¹³ Besides Marduk, god of the city of Babylon, who becomes mythically identified with Asalluhi, the Amorite kings regularly praise Shamash, the sun (Sumerian Utu), Nabû, Eshtar (Ishtar, Inanna),¹²¹⁴ Zababa, Ea (Sumerian Enki), and the consort of Marduk, Zarpanitum. The Urukian god An appears in his Sumerian name and his Akkadian equivalent, Anum.

More likely, the particular connection between Babylon and Eridu was evident by the reign of the most famous of the Babylonian kings, Hammurabi.¹²¹⁵ Hammurabi (1792-1750) conquered the south, but the inscriptions do not specify the Sumerian cities that had been taken. Two hymns refer to Hammurabi entering the temple Eunir in Eridu, where he was crowned. Another text addressed to Hammurabi’s successor, Samsu-iluna (1749-1712), mentions An, Enlil, and Inanna, but mainly shows the preeminence of Enki and Asarluhi/Marduk. It appears that Samsu-iluna was crowned in Eridu as well.¹²¹⁶

None of the texts that have survived mention Uruk. More importantly, no royal inscription identifies the king of Babylon as *en* of Uruk (or even as king of Uruk). On the other hand, the Prologue to the Laws of Hammurabi provides him with the Akkadian equivalent of the Sumerian *en*, that is, *bēlum*, in the passage that reflects his overlordship of Uruk. Hammurabi is

the lord who revitalizes the city of Uruk, who provides abundant waters for its people, who raises high the summit of the Eanna temple, who heaps up bountiful produce for the gods Anu and Ishtar.¹²¹⁷

Whether *bēlum* carried the same range of meaning as *en* is a good question, but it is worth noting that in the list of royal titles claimed for Hammurabi in the Prologue, *belum* is found only twice, here with Uruk and again with the city of Kesh.¹²¹⁸ Note that in the case of Uruk, but in no other city, Hammurabi is credited with providing abundant water for the city, a detail that agrees with other accounts of the city such as we have seen above. One of the surprising discoveries made by the modern excavators of Uruk only in recent days was that Urukians used water canals to move through the city, not wide streets, as had been expected.¹²¹⁹

Hammurabi certainly conquered the city, and Uruk revolted under Hammurabi’s successor, Samsu-iluna, but the revolt was quickly put down, and, as Douglas Frayne has noted, “The history of the city during the late Old Babylonian period is obscure.”¹²²⁰

Another sad note for Uruk finds Uruk’s clergy in exile in the city of Kish during the latter reigns of Babylonian kings through the 17th and early 16th centuries—up to the time of the Hittite defeat of Babylon. Three Urukian goddesses had been installed in Kish: Inanna (or the combination An-Inanna), Nanaya, and Kanisurra.¹²²¹ The reason for the exile may have been raids by the Elamite Kutir-Nahhunte I on Babylon and other cities. A statue of Nanaya was taken from Uruk to Susa (to be recovered nearly a thousand years later by Assurbanipal). Priests were in exile from Eridu as well.

In Kish the Uruk clergy lived in the quarter inhabited by the *ugbaptum*-priestesses of Zababa, and the clergy of Uruk was integrated into the clergy of Kish.¹²²²

One rather surprising result of the exile of clergy to other cities is the contrast in what must have been the most important offices in Uruk, Eridu, and Ur. The five categories of Inanna's clergy at Kish were:

- *sanga* of Inanna and *sanga* of Urkītum (i.e., Inanna of Uruk)
- *gala-mah*
- *shu-i*
- *nimgir* (*igisū*)
- *ishib*¹²²³

Similar offices were there for Nanaya: *sanga*, *gala-mah*, and *ērib bītim*. For the third goddess, Kanisurra, “daughter of Nanaya,” we find the *sanga*.

On the other hand, the exiled clergy of Enki were:

- *enkum/ninkum*
- *abgal*
- *abrig*
- *usuh*
- *emesh*
- EN...
- *gudu-abzu*
- *ishib*¹²²⁴

(At Ur a third set is recorded: *engiz*, *ensi*, *kishib-gal*, *enkum/ninkum*, and *abrig*.¹²²⁵) While there is some overlap, it is clear that the Sumerian cities had retained traditional religious offices, whose functions may have been similar to those in other cities, but whose titles retain differences among the cities.

Kings of Uruk

The names of several kings of Uruk during the Old Babylonian period are known. Figures like Alila-hadum and Sumû-kanasa from ca. the 1940s BCE are little known; they may have come, as did the Babylonian kings, from Amorite stock.¹²²⁶ Sîn-kashid is somewhat better known. Indeed, his construction work on the Eanna temple complex is the focus of the many inscriptions that bear his name. He reigned ca. 1900 BCE. The relationship between him and previous rulers of Uruk is unknown. According to the texts that have survived, Sîn-kashid's greatest achievement was the restoration of Eanna. He is called the “provider (*ú-a-é-an-na*) of Eanna” and he claims to be, like Gilgamesh, the son of the goddess Ninsun and king of the city.¹²²⁷ He is also the “mighty man” (*nita-kala-ga*), the king not only of Uruk but of Amnanum, and he takes credit for building a royal palace.¹²²⁸ He built a temple for Nanaya as well and cellas for An and Inanna.¹²²⁹

For the hero Lugalbanda, explicitly identified as Sîn-kashid's “personal god,” and Ninsun, the king's “mother,” Sîn-kashid built the temple Ekankal. Other constructions include a

“shining *gipar*” for his beloved daughter, Nishi-inishu, a *nin-dingir* priestess of Lugalbanda, a temple for Enki, and the temple Egal-mah for the goddess Ninisina.¹²³⁰ The goddess’ name suggests her origin in Isin, but she is considered a form of Inanna. Interestingly, she is called the incantation priestess of the numerous people (*shim-mú-un-shár-ra-ba*) and, rather unexpectedly, the chief physician (*a-zu-gal*) of the “black-headed” people (i.e., the Sumerians). Sîn-kashid calls himself the “supreme farmer” in that text. He built temples elsewhere, in Durum, for example, and in one text he calls himself not only the supreme farmer but also the “shepherd who makes everything abundant for Uruk.” Sîn-kashid’s “beloved wife” Shallurtum is mentioned in one inscription.¹²³¹ She was the daughter of the Babylonian king, Sumû-la-El. The text is a good example of a diplomatic marriage.

Sîn-kashid may have been the son of the Isin king, Lipit-Enlil (1873-1869), and possibly was intended to succeed him. Since Sîn-kashid claimed, like the Ur III kings Ur-Namma and Shulgi, to be the son of Ninsun and Lugalbanda, he may also have been claiming the thrones of Ur and Uruk. Marrying the daughter of Babylon’s Sumû-la-EL helped him keep a coalition of forces together.¹²³² For a good period Uruk maintained close relations to Babylon and to Isin.

Following Sîn-kashid were a series of Uruk kings whose reigns appear to have been quite brief. The few inscriptions that have survived indicate that, like Sîn-kashid, they constructed or reconstructed holy places. Sîn-gamil built Emeurur, “House which gathers the *me*,” for Nanaya. While Anam, who would become king, was archivist (*pisan-dub-ba*), he built a temple to Nergal in the nearby town of Usarpara. In the same capacity he built something, probably a temple, for the goddess Kanisura, “lady of the Iturungal canal.”¹²³³ Since Kanisura is an Urukean deity—mentioned along with Inanna and Nanaya in a text cited above—the location of the building may have been Uruk. When he became king, Anam restored the *gipar* of the *en* for Inanna.¹²³⁴ He restored the temple of An and Inanna, “the ancient work” of the Ur III kings, Ur-Namma and Shulgi. Among his other works Anam boasts of constructing the wall of Uruk “for the divine Gilgamesh” in baked bricks so that water could “roar” in its surrounding moat. In another text the moat is called “Roaring water.” He connects that project with renovating Inanna’s temple in the city.¹²³⁵

Anam was a contemporary of Hammurabi’s father, Sin-muballit (1812-1793 BCE). In a very long letter attributed to Anam, addressed to Sin-muballit, Uruk seems to have had—or wished to have—a peaceful relationship with Babylon. Even before Sin-muballit, the Babylonian king Sumu-la-El (1880-1845 BCE) had arranged a marriage between his daughter and the leader of Uruk, combining the two cities into “One House.”¹²³⁶ Later, Anam wrote to Sin-muballit about the connection between the Amorites in the north and his own family.

God knows that since we have come to know each other I have trusted in you as one would trust in Ishtar, and my head has rested on your very own lap. For these reasons, for us to be in harmony, my opinion and yours should be the same. You must certainly know that before there could be peace and goodwill, a sacred

oath must be taken, that until there is a “touching of the throat” ritual, there can be no mutual trust, and that any sacred oath must be renewed yearly. (You also know) that while for the past three to four years, soldiers from Amnan-Yakhrurum (tribes) have been constantly in this very House (dynasty), a sacred oath was never urged upon you by word of mouth or in writing. Under these circumstances, because this House is speaking frankly with you and respects your reputation, you must try to make things turn out well.¹²³⁷

Only a few very brief inscriptions have survived from the sad reign of the Uruk king who was defeated by Rim-Sin, ĪR-ne-ne (or Irdanene). They mention only certain servants of the king and do not indicate if he attempted the kind of building campaigns of his predecessors. The names—and little else—of two later kings of Uruk are known, but it seems clear that by the end of the Old Babylonian period Uruk’s independence had been lost.

The case of Anam, the last king to have left a number of reasonably detailed inscriptions, is instructive. He was, as we have seen, an “archivist” before he ascended the throne. The eight inscriptions that have survived identify him in a number of ways. He is the “true shepherd of Uruk,” an epithet that could conceivably point to Dumuzi, and may mean “king,” but he is not actually called “king” in the surviving texts. And rather than claiming to be the lover of Inanna, he is the “beloved son” (*dumu-ki-ág*) of the goddess. Even in the text where he takes credit for building the outer courtyard of the *gipar* of the *en*, he does not claim to be an *en*.¹²³⁸ The title may already have diminished in status to a priestly role that may not have involved a “sacred marriage” with Inanna. In other inscriptions he is the “disciplined steward” (*agrig shu-dim₄-ma*) and a “favorite” (*she-ga-an*) of An and Inanna—and her “son,” as above.¹²³⁹ As restorer of Gilgamesh’s wall, he is “chief of the army of Uruk” (*ab-ba-ugnim*).¹²⁴⁰ Neither *en* nor *lugal*, Anam seems not to have claimed the intimate relationship with Inanna his Ur III, Isin, and Larsa forebears had done. And, with the other late Uruk kings, he makes no claim to be divine—as the writing of his name, regularly *an-àm*, without the DINGIR-sign, indicates. (Two DINGIR signs in a row would mean “gods,” not *divine* An.)

By the Old Babylonian period, then, in Uruk, home of the exalted *en*, kingship had finally found a home, just as Uruk’s independence was disappearing—owing largely to foreign influences on the city.

Assyrian Kings

Surviving royal inscriptions of the early Assyrian kings have very little to say about Uruk and its leaders. In spite of the 4th millennium evidence that Uruk’s influence had extended far beyond the Assyrian north and was extensive in the city of Nineveh, Assyrian kings show little interest in what for them would have been the deep south. The situation was very different from the 1st Millennium, when Assyria often aligned itself with Uruk against Babylon.

As in earlier Akkadian times, Sumerian god names appear in Assyrian royal inscriptions. The cuneiform sign for Inanna is used for the Semitic Ishtar. The high gods Anu, Enlil,

and Ea are mentioned in the texts. The inscriptions give little indication of how extensive the Sumerian pantheon may have been folded into Assyrian religion even at the level of the society's elites. Assur and Ishtar, like Ilum and Eshtar before them, dominate the inscriptions. (From Old Akkadian times Eshtar was envisaged as a war goddess and possibly a sex goddess as well.¹²⁴¹) Simo Parpola has argued that the Assyrians considered Assur "the only, universal god" and the "totality of the gods," a god beyond human comprehension; and Ishtar was for the Assyrians Assur revealed in his "mother aspect," and at the same time a distinct entity in her own right, "a divine power working in man and thus bridging the gulf between man and god."¹²⁴² In early personal names Ishtar is called "the first *ashared*" and "the creator" (*bāni*), "maker of the king" (*sharra-ibni*) and the like. However close to monotheism this concept of divinity may have been, it seems clearly to have supported a view of Assyrian kingship that in many ways differed from Babylonian kingship.

The implications of an Assyrian/Babylonian difference in the concept of the high god and its reflection in the institution of kingship will become evident later in this study.¹²⁴³ For our purpose, a single text will suffice to suggest that the Assyrian king was in some ways closer to the Urukian *en* than was his counterpart in Babylon.

Shamshi-Adad (1813-1781 BCE),¹²⁴⁴ a contemporary, as we have seen, of Larsa's Rim-Sin, was considered "king of the universe" (LUGAL KISH), pacifier (*mushtemki*) of the land between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, beloved of Assur, and "called by name for greatness among the kings who went before."¹²⁴⁵ In one text found at Nineveh in Ishtar's temple, Emashmash, the king records his rebuilding of a shrine, Emenue, within the Emashmash complex. The text also credits Shamshi-Adad with a military victory, as with most kings from the 3rd millennium on a key function of his rule. In the text he tells of rebuilding the "old temple" built originally by Man-ishtushu, son of Sargon of Akkad. The temple had become dilapidated in the intervening generations. Shamshi-Adad rebuilt it and its ziqqurat, erecting doorframes "the equal of which for perfection no king had ever built for the goddess Ishtar in Nineveh" (53). He swears that he did not remove the original monumental inscriptions and clay inscriptions of Man-ishtushu, but restored them to their proper places; and he added his inscriptions as well. For that Ishtar has rewarded him with "a term of rule which is constantly renewed." (He also adds a healthy curse directed to anyone who would discontinue or discard his inscriptions. Shamash, judge of heaven and the underworld, and Ishtar will see to it that the criminal is punished.)¹²⁴⁶

For us, though, the six lines that sum up Shamshi-Adad's position are particularly worthy of note. There Shamshi-Adad is considered "the strong one" (*danum*), king of the universe, appointee (*shaknu*) of the god Enlil and "vice-regent" (ÉNSI) of Assur. To that is added his relationship to Ishtar. He is her *narāmu*, an Akkadian term that is roughly equivalent of Sumerian *ki-ág*. (The Sumerian sign often covers this Akkadian term;¹²⁴⁷ here it is written out.) Where the Sumerian designates the *en*'s spousal relationship in the "sacred marriage" texts, it is not clear if the Akkadian term here carries the same force. It is used for Ishtar and her lover Dumuzi (whose equivalent in Akkadian is Tammuz);

but as often as not *narāmu* is the loving relationship between parent and child, gods of both genders and humans of both sexes, and even the “love” the gods have for cities, temples, and ritual objects. We will see later that Assyrian kings are seen rather as children nurtured by Ishtar than as the objects of her erotic gaze. The kings are supported by her war-like qualities. And the “sacred marriage” itself is reconceived as the bond between a god and his consort, whose love guarantees the stability of the city, rather than the intimate relationship that transforms a mere mortal into the special (and dangerous) status of the deified *en*.

The complex development of kingship has been mapped by William W. Hallo. He points out that the leadership roles of the ancient Near Eastern king were political, military, judicial, and economic, but Hallo considers kingship “fundamentally a religious conception.”¹²⁴⁸ The birth, coronation, and death of the king he considers “the sacraments of a royal lifetime.” To view that sacramental view of kingship, Hallo interprets sacred marriage texts involving the *ens* we have discussed, sometimes in the role of the “priest-king” himself, sometimes as the female partner in the sacred marriage. Stories of Dumuzi and Gilgamesh are prominent, especially in evaluating the death of the heroes. (Hallo considers Gilgamesh’s decision an Hobson’s choice of immortality by becoming ruler of the netherworld.)

According to Hallo, the Old Babylonian period was particularly important in the evolution of the royal cult-statue, and with it, a rather different turn in the concept of kingship. In Old Babylonian times a certain ritual, the *kispu*, developed. It involved a ritual meal eaten by the living in memory of the royal ancestors, by then thought to be divine. Hallo traces the evolution of the cult-statue from the 3rd millennium, when royal ancestors were worshipped through the statues, to the *kispu* of the kings of Babylon, Mari, and Assyria. The key turn came when the Akkadian kings Naram-Sin and Shar-kali-sharri were deified in their lifetimes. At that time the “living” god-kings and their statues were worshipped. The practice was reinstated halfway through the reign of Ur III’s Shulgi. As we have seen, the kings of Babylon, from Hammurabi on, refused that deification.¹²⁴⁹

Hallo considers Hammurabi to have restored “the secular status of royalty” (208). Even he—or his supporters—succumbed, if only very briefly, to the temptation of being considered divine. Nearly thirty years into his long, forty-three year reign, his name came to be spelled with the DINGIR-sign on occasion, and a few of his people took on names that, translated, mean “Hammurabi is a creator” and “Hammurabi is my god.” Since such names appear just after Hammurabi defeated Larsa, it may be that the concept of the divine king was inspired by the kings of Larsa, the last ones to support that concept. Such Hammurabi names become rare soon after that point.¹²⁵⁰

With or without the concept of a deified king, Hammurabi’s power and prestige were evident throughout the southern and northern Mesopotamia.

Hammurabi and the Goddess

The law codes are also useful as a reflection of attitudes toward Inanna and her Akkadian equivalent, Ishtar. We have seen that Enheduanna described Inanna temples not only in Uruk and Zabalam, but also in Sargon's capital, Akkad. The syncretism of Inanna with Old Akkadian Ashtar helped to justify the imperial rule of north and south. A similar case could be made for the later kings, as Ur, Isin, Larsa, and then Babylon established empires that sought to hold both Kiengi and Kiuri—or in the Akkadian texts, “Sumer and Akkad.” We have seen that Shulgi of Ur considered his father, Ur-Namma, the “son born of the goddess Ninsun” of Uruk. But the prologue to Shulgi's law code does not extend the Uruk connection to include Inanna. An, Enlil, and Nanna are conspicuous in the prologue, but the great goddess is not. With Lipit-Ishtar of Isin, Utu is added to the list of Sumerian high gods—and so is Inanna, whose heart desires the *en* of her city. (And as we have noted above, the healing goddess of Isin, Ninisina, whose name simply means “goddess of the city Isin,” is characterized as the child of An, perhaps identifying her with Inanna.)

It is in Hammurabi's law code, though, that Ishtar gains even greater respect. We have seen already that Hammurabi claimed, as a royal title, the Akkadian equivalent of *en* for himself. But Ishtar is also associated with Kish and Zabala, Akkad, and Nineveh—and Babylon itself. The list is more extensive even than Enheduanna's in the Temple Hymns, which does not associate Inanna with Kish and does not include Nineveh. In yet another passage in the Prologue Ishtar appears to be the goddess of Sumer and Akkad, the “four regions”—that is, the world.¹²⁵¹

In Kish, Ishtar's “great rites” (*partsu*, roughly equivalent to the Sumerian *me*) are celebrated in the temple Hursagkalamma. In Zabala Hammurabi “perfects the oracles of the city” and “gladdens the heart” of Ishtar. He is the shepherd of the people in Akkad. There his deeds are pleasing to Ishtar in the Eulmash temple. The list of cities ends with northern sites, Mari, Tuttul, Babylon, Akkad, Assur and Nineveh. With the last of these, Nineveh, where Hammurabi proclaims the rites for Ishtar in her Emesmes temple, the reader detects strong hints of opposition: in that city Hammurabi is the one “who quells the rebellious.” Babylon and its god Marduk frame the Prologue, as would be expected, since that city had now become the center of the “four regions.” It is worth noting that Ishtar's presence in so many southern and northern Mesopotamian cities is conspicuous, while Marduk's consort, Zarpanitu, is not even mentioned in the Prologue.

Zarpanitu, Hammurabi's “lady” (*bēltu*, as Marduk is his “lord,” *bēl*), is mentioned in passing in the Epilogue to Hammurabi's Code (135). The Epilogue covers much of the same ground as the Prologue but in a very different format. Many of Hammurabi's royal titles are repeated, and many of the deities are cited for their support of his reign, particularly as they relate to justice. Once again Zababa and Ishtar are linked together. Anu is called “father of the gods.” Enlil and his consort Ninlil are prominent, as are other high gods, Ea, Sîn, Adad, Zababa, Nergal, Nintu and Ninkarrak (the healing goddess we have seen before, Gula), and especially Shamash. The tribute to Ishtar is one of, if not the, longest passage. The context is an extended curse upon any man (*lu sharrum lu bēlum lu ishshiakum*, “whether he is a king, a lord, or a governor”) who tries to change

the laws inscribed on the stele. The context calls, then, for the most terrifying aspects of the gods and goddesses as they would punish such a man.¹²⁵² Hammurabi gives a good account of Ishtar's power in such a situation.

May the goddess Ishtar, mistress of battle and warfare, who bares my weapon, my benevolent protective spirit (*lamassu*), who loves my reign, curse his kingship with her angry heart and great fury; may she turn his auspicious omens into calamities; may she smash his weapon on the field of war and battle, plunge him into confusion and rebellion, strike down his warriors, drench the earth with their blood, make a heap of the corpses of his soldiers upon the plain, and may she show his soldiers no mercy; as for him, may she deliver him into the hand of his enemies, and may she lead him bound captive to the land of his enemy.¹²⁵³

One is tempted to see in this portrait the essential Ishtar for the Babylonians. At a time when, as we will see, the "sacred marriage" largely disappears, the kings of Babylon recognize the awesome power of Ishtar and her personal concern for Hammurabi. But she is not his wife or lover.¹²⁵⁴

Uruk After Collapse

Uruk is mentioned only once in the collection of essays on the regeneration of complex societies after they collapse.¹²⁵⁵ The reference appears in Norman Yoffee's overview, "Notes on Regeneration," where he notes that Uruk and Nippur were abandoned and then reoccupied in late Old Babylonian times. The famous walls of Uruk (as well as the walls of Ur) were destroyed during the campaign of the Babylonian king Samsuiluna late in the 18th century BCE.¹²⁵⁶ The southern city-states rose up against Babylonian rule, 1741-1739 BCE, and were suppressed, with, as Elizabeth C. Stone writes, "at least a partial abandonment of all major cities in southern Babylonia." Nippur was not reoccupied for at least three centuries.¹²⁵⁷

The Sumerian city-states collectively are mentioned from time to time since they provide models for complex societies. Yoffee notes that most of the cities flourished for three thousand years; Uruk and Nippur are mentioned only because they are apparently unusual cases. It is worth noting that the volume includes two essays on the ancient Near East, both of them focusing on Bronze Age Syria rather than the Sumerian south of Mesopotamia. The majority of essays in the collection deal with South America, Southeast and East Asia.

The essays on ancient Syria do, however, provide a glimpse of factors that probably influenced the collapse of Uruk during the Old Babylonian period. Lisa Cooper, in "The Demise and Regeneration of Bronze Age Urban Centers in the Euphrates Valley of Syria," and John J. Nichols and Jill A. Weber in "Amorites, Onagers, and Social Reorganization in Middle Bronze Age Syria,"¹²⁵⁸ consider responses to the loss of urban networks

dominated by elites. Alan L. Kolata distinguishes between hegemony and sovereignty, on the one hand, and orthodoxy and orthopraxy on the other hand, to account for different responses to urban collapse.¹²⁵⁹ What he calls orthodoxy, appropriate to an urban center marked by hegemony and sovereignty, which I take is the form of the Sumerian city-states, “defines what, where, when, how, and why certain social actions are valued, as well as who may have access to the material and social benefits generated by the state”—and who can be excluded from those benefits.¹²⁶⁰ The abandonment of sites like Nippur and Uruk could, from this perspective, reflect the depth to which the population of those cities had internalized the state orthodoxy. Unlike the Syrian sites, where the population could turn to local patterns of production and cultural values that had persisted even as urbanization had occurred, the stressed population of Nippur and Uruk abandoned the cities. Later, they regrouped under the old orthodoxy.

Both Lisa Cooper and Nichols and Weber point to the same movement that led to the collapse of the Syrian cities and may well have caused the collapse of Uruk and Nippur. The Old Babylonian period in Mesopotamia was marked by the increasing presence and influence of Amorites moving from west to east. Cooper mentions Mari and Babylon, but also Larsa in the south as prime examples.¹²⁶¹ As we have noted already, the upstart Babylon made much use of the ideology that drove the sacred city of Sippar. Like Sippar, whose major god was the Sun God Shamash, Larsa, which was close enough to Uruk that its tallest structures could be seen from there, had as its patron deity the Sumerian Sun God, Utu. The assimilation of Sumerian deities into the Akkadian pantheon under Sargon the Great and his successors no doubt provided a basis for comparing Shamash and Utu. (Recall that the Temple Hymns included both the Utu temple in Larsa, #13, and the Sun God's temple in Sippar, #38.) But Utu, though prominent in some ways, was never close to the highest gods in the Sumerian pantheon. Shamash and Sippar, on the other hand, continued to gain in importance as the Amorites increasingly influenced the south.

We might also consider that the “patrimonialism,” so marked in Amorite culture, also grew in the ideology of the Sun God of Sippar.¹²⁶² The Babylonian adoption of Eridu and “Father” Enki as the earlier model for Babylon and its “Son” Marduk—and its corresponding diminution of both Nippur and Uruk—may well be part of the ideological shift. The most conspicuous reflection of this turn is the exaltation of Marduk in *Enuma Elish*, but, as we have seen, there is other written evidence of changes introduced by the Amorites. The employment of Shamash in the Divine Dialogues that had earlier emphasized Enki and his Son *and* had included Nippur's Enlil is another reflection of the ideological shift.

The Collapse in Myth

Elizabeth Carter interprets the Babylonian story of the Flood, *Atrahasis*, in the context of archaeological evidence for a sequence of disasters early in the 2nd millennium BCE: plague, two periods of drought, then Flood.¹²⁶³ This is the sequence found in the Old Babylonian account of the Flood. The myth, of course, presents the disasters as attempts by the king of the gods, Enlil (Ellil), to destroy a “noisy” humanity. The story tells of a

rebellion of lesser gods, who had been pressed into service to dig out canals and clear channels on the earth so that the higher gods would have food to eat.¹²⁶⁴ In an ingenious move to deal with the rebellion, the crafty god Enki proposes the formation of a new creature, humanity. Following Ann D. Kilmer's interpretation that the "noise" of humanity reflected the overpopulation of cities,¹²⁶⁵ Carter makes the point that the rise and fall of population in the cities depended upon managing the flow of water in the face of shifting watercourses and the problem of siltation of the soil. Exactly the sequence found in *Atrahasis* lead the highly populated and prosperous regions of Uruk and the Diyala into decline.¹²⁶⁶ The myth finds a solution to overpopulation as ingenious as Enki's earlier proposal: certain creatures are formed to seize human infants, and some women will remain barren, but humans would continue to life, albeit in a modified mortal state.

Rulers of "Babylonia"

Ishtar was still the most powerful deity in Late Babylonian Uruk. The rise of the Anu cult, which in some ways challenged the overlordship of Ishtar, did not take place until late 5th century Achaemenid times.¹²⁶⁷ During the reign of the Babylonian king Nabonidus, who exalted the Moon God Sîn to the head of the pantheon (over Marduk and Nabû), Ishtar was brought into the triad of high gods, Sîn-Shamash-Ishtar, symbolized by their astronomical emblems, the moon-sun-star. According to Erica Ehrenberg, deities in 6th century Eanna impressions appear only as symbols; they are never anthropomorphized.¹²⁶⁸

Ishtar's Eanna had, by the 7th century BCE, thanks to Assurbanipal, become even more powerful in Uruk than it had been before. As in past ages, Uruk derived its power from the wealth of agricultural resources. Assurbanipal had transferred land from private hands to Eanna, making it the largest landowner in the region.¹²⁶⁹

Later, Babylonian kings, especially Neriglissar and Nabonidas reorganized Eanna. Neriglissar dismissed temple officials and replaced them with his own bureaucrats; Nabonidas reorganized it once more, announcing a return to an older order. Darius I, the Persian king, reorganized the temple once again.¹²⁷⁰

For reasons that are still obscure, two relatively low-level officials gain considerable stature in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods, especially in Uruk, and especially in dealings with Eanna.¹²⁷¹ The two are the *shatammu* and the *bēl piqitti*. The first may have been more or less "secular," and the second the highest priestly and administrative officer of Eanna, something like a bishop. For our purposes it is worth noting that the *bēl* in *bēl piqitti* is an Akkadian reading of the EN sign.

Assyrian Rule

Thorkild Jacobsen noted a tendency in the 1st millennium BCE to consolidate divine powers in a single deity, much as had been seen in the 3rd millennium when Enheduanna wrote "The Exaltation of Inanna."¹²⁷² Ishtar was similarly treated in a bilingual "Elevation of Inanna," in which An, Enlil, and Ea delegate their powers to Inanna. (In the myth of "Inanna and An," recall, An was at first angry that Inanna had stolen away Eanna and

taken it to earth, but relented and recognized that the “daughter” was now superior to even the highest of the gods, her “father.”) But even Assurbanipal, who was so great a promoter of Ishtar, is credited with exalting Babylon’s Marduk over the gods Anu, Enlil, and Ea. (The poet employs the traditional language of “lordship” and “kingship,” as Marduk is *en* and *lugal* of the gods.) And the high god of Assyria, Assur, was at times identified with Marduk, as Marduk, the old “Enlil of the Gods,” delegated his power to the “father of the gods” Assur, in an inscription of Sargon II of Assyria.¹²⁷³

When faced with rebellion from the south, Sennacherib marched as far as Uruk. He claimed to have taken all the gods dwelling in Uruk, their “countless effects and belongings,” away as spoils—especially Ishtar and Nanaya, but also Nergal.¹²⁷⁴ Sennacherib’s son, Esarhaddon, and grandson, Assurbanipal, though, rebuilt Uruk’s temples and restored the worship of many of its gods.¹²⁷⁵ And when Assurbanipal was victorious in Elam, he is said to have returned the statue of the goddess Nanaya to Uruk after it had been in the city of Susa for 1635 years.¹²⁷⁶

Babylonian Proper (Neo-Babylonian Rule)

The great complexity of the temple organization and economy has been detailed for the Neo-Babylonian period by Paul-Alain Beaulieu.¹²⁷⁷

The epic of “Erra and Ishum” has a somewhat shorter list of Ishtar’s temple officiants than we find in *Gilgamesh* (1:226-31). The 1st millennium BCE poem describes an Uruk thrown into chaos from the outside—nomadic Suteans—and from the inside, where an “arrogant, pitiless governor” acted in a hostile manner toward Ishtar. Ishtar in turn angrily allowed the enemy of the city to “sweep away” the country “like grain on the surface of the water.”¹²⁷⁸ The city is identified as the “dwelling place of Anu and Ishtar,” the way it is in the *Old Babylonian Gilgamesh* texts, but there is little of Anu in the treatment of Uruk in this poem. (In contrast, the story largely pits the terrible underworld god Erra, or Nergal, against Babylon’s Marduk. Marduk plays a major role in the story. His abandonment of the city allows Erra to turn it upside down.)

Uruk is described as a place dominated by Ishtar and her people. The women mentioned in *Gilgamesh* are prominent there: *kezrēti*, *shamhātu* and *harimīmāti* (I.3.53). The men are mentioned also, *kurgarrû* and *assinnu*, whose “manhood” Ishtar turned into females “to strike people with religious awe.”¹²⁷⁹ There are also bearers of daggers, razors, pruning-knives and flint blades who, as Stephanie Dalley translates the line, “frequently do abominable acts to please the heart of Ishtar.”¹²⁸⁰ (305).

“Erra and Ishum” is so filled with violence that Thorkild Jacobsen uses it to illustrate the growing brutalization and rise of the powers of death in 1st millennium BCE Mesopotamia.¹²⁸¹ The Greeks (and the Bible) also lamented the destructive power of Iron Age warfare, but it would be difficult to match “Erra and Ishum,” where force from the outside is matched by predators from within the cities. The brutalization of society extends to representation of even the highest gods of the pantheon fighting among themselves. Jacobsen contrasts the 1st millennium image of the warrior with the idealized

heroic images from the 3rd millennium. “[W]here the the third millennium had idealized the heroic image as protector and ruler, the first millennium does almost the opposite: it sees the warrior not as a protector but as a threat, a wild man, a killer, dangerous to friend and foe alike, part and parcel of the turmoil, even a prime cause of it.”¹²⁸² He considers Erra as the “god of riot and indiscriminate slaughter.”

The poem does end with a placated Erra who ends the slaughter, takes his rightful place in the cosmos, and even looks to the rebuilding of Babylonia. Erra praises the counselor, Ishum, would finally calmed him down enough that he left a remnant to restore order to the earth.

An epilogue identifies the author of “Erra and Ishum,” a certain Kabti-ilani-Marduk. The name suggests a Babylonian, and while Marduk and Babylon were particularly brutalized in the wrath of Erra, Babylon is the one city that is singled out for restoration. Indeed, the governors of all the Mesopotamian cities, “every one of them,”¹²⁸³ is expected to contribute to the rebuilding of Babylon and Marduk’s Esagila temple.

The epilogue is striking in the detail it gives about the composition of “Erra and Ishum.” Kabti-ilani-Marduk claims that a god revealed the poem to him in the middle of the night (much as the *en*-priestess Enheduanna had claimed in “The Exaltation of Inanna” in the 3rd millennium BCE), and when he recited the poem in the morning, not a single word was missing. Erra and Ishum themselves approved the poem. Erra goes on to bless those who praise the poem and curse anyone who discards it. In this he is warning the gods. He then offers benefits to the humans who praise his deeds: kings, princes, musicians, scribes, and even craftsmen, who will be made “wise.” Erra commands that the song will endure forever.

A colophon adds another twist to this unusual poem. It claims that the last great king of Assyria, Assurbanipal himself, “wrote, checked, and collated” the text “in the company of scholars.” He notes that the clay tablets and wooden writing boards from all over Mesopotamia had gone into the preparation of the edition. Whether there is any truth to this claim, it accords well with the practice of Assurbanipal, who was one of the few Mesopotamian kings that tradition claimed—like Gilgamesh (!)—could read and write. And while texts of Gilgamesh stories have been found in many places in Mesopotamia and outside Mesopotamia, the key texts of *Gilgamesh* were discovered in the libraries of Assurbanipal, as we have seen. If “Erra and Ishum” is largely a Babylon-centered work, and the dating of the composition is such a matter of controversy,¹²⁸⁴ it is not impossible that an Assyrian king would show interest in it. The final line of the colophon invokes the greatest scribe of them all, the god Nabu, who could be equally at home in Babylon or Assyria.

Persian (Achaemenid) Rule

Four years after Cyrus the Great (Cyrus II, who reigned 559-530 BCE) ended the Babylonian Exile, he repaired Eanna.¹²⁸⁵ He had captured Babylon in 538 BCE. His successors, especially Darius I (522-486) and Xerxes I (485-465) struggled to keep

Babylon in the empire. (In 476 Xerxes sacked Babylon and went so far as to burn the most sacred sites, Esagila and Etemenanki.)

It has been claimed that Darius I destroyed Eanna, but that claim has been challenged.¹²⁸⁶ The temple, for whatever reason, was mostly desolate at that time, but Darius I apparently did not cause the decline. There are many economic documents involving especially dates and barley and mentioning the Lady of Uruk after the date (the second year of Darius's reign) when Darius purportedly had destroyed the temple.

Sometime during the Persian period a great reorganization of the pantheon in Uruk took place.¹²⁸⁷ However much antagonism this caused among the keepers of the different sanctuaries, the worship of the Sky God Anu and his wife Antum was introduced (or reintroduced) at this time. The great temple-building projects, which maintained Eanna but involved a new temple for Ishtar, the Irigal, and a temple and ziggurat for Anu, were carried out later, in Seleucid times.

Greek (Seleucid) Rule

Alexander the Great defeated the Persians in 331 BCE. Upon entering Babylon, he commanded the rebuilding of Esagila. He died, however, in 323, before the rebuilding of Marduk's temple. The Hellenistic period did see the rebuilding of Esagila under Seleucus the Victor (Nikator), whose kingship of Babylon gave its name to the Seleucid Era. When he entered Babylon in 312 there was apparently general rejoicing in the city. Seleucus was, however, responsible for building up a new city across the Tigris, Seleucia, which was established as the capital of Babylonia. Mass emigrations largely depopulated Babylon itself.

The Greek impact on Uruk is best seen in the massive constructions of temples and a ziggurat under Seleucus's successor, Antiochus I (Soter), who reigned from 281 to 261 BCE. Like Hellenistic architecture in the West, the sacred places in Uruk dwarfed anything seen before in Mesopotamia.

The Seleucid Dynasty lasted until the Zoroastrian Arsacid Dynasty, known as "Parthians," under Mithridates II captured Babylon in 122 BCE. Within the next hundred and fifty years Babylon itself declined, its temples in ruins. Seleucia was much larger than Babylon, and the last recorded service in Esagila is dated 93 BCE. The last dated cuneiform text, however, is a work on astronomy from 74 or 75 CE—that is, a few years after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem.

It is not surprising that the last cuneiform text is a compendium of astronomical information useful for the calendar and making predictions of planetary positions. Babylon and Uruk remained until their demise the two centers of astronomical/astrological work. Scholars who studied the massive *Enūma Anu Enlil* documents were considered the most important scholars of Mesopotamia.

The building of Bīt Rēsh and Irigal in Uruk under the Seleucids diminished the importance but did not close down Eanna. The two new temples illustrate the tension

that must have existed between the age-old service to Inanna/Ishtar and the new order of Anu and Antum, which claimed descent from the ancients. The Great Goddess had a new and grand temple, Irigal, and the old Eanna, but Anu was established in the great Bīt Rēsh and its ziggurat.¹²⁸⁸ The ancient Eanna finally ceased to be a sanctuary sometime in late Seleucid times or early Parthian times, when poor houses and workshops are built into the ruins.

The relative importance of Anu (versus Ishtar) in this period can be seen in the ritual texts, where the Anu-pantheon dominates the Ishtar-pantheon of the Neo-Babylonian period.¹²⁸⁹

The Uruk Prophecy Text

The most important documents regarding Uruk in the 1st millennium BCE describe destruction and desecration. One that has received considerable attention is “The Uruk Prophecy Text.” Interest in the text has been aroused, quite naturally, by the prophets and prophecy texts in the Bible. Little is known about prophets before Assyrian times, but a corpus of Assyrian prophecies is now available, and they shed considerable light on Assyrian religion.¹²⁹⁰ For *Gilgamesh* there is the added interest in that one of the prophets, Dunnasha-amur, a woman from Arbela, incorporates a line from *Gilgamesh* in her words of encouragement to Assurbanipal.¹²⁹¹ Arbela was one of the centers of Assyrian worship of Ishtar, and Ishtar is the one who inspires Assyrian prophets (both male and female).

The Uruk Prophecy Text, however, is important for other reasons. Like many prophecies that appear to foretell events in the future, this one was certainly written centuries after the events that are “predicted.” It is more an interpretation of historical events than a prediction of the future.

At the center of it is a desecration of Eanna (and Uruk) when Ishtar was removed from the city. Her return is a matter of great importance, of course, but the restoration of Ishtar is accompanied by the reestablishment of Anu in the city.

The Uruk Prophecy Text refers to the sacrilege caused by the Babylonian king Nabu-shuma-ishkun (ca. 750-747 BCE) and the restoration by Nebuchadnezzar II in the early decades of the 6th century (ca. 604-562).¹²⁹² (Nebuchadnezzar is well known to the West as the Babylonian king who captured Jerusalem in 587, thus initiating the Babylonian Exile.) The text itself, however, dates from a much later time. Paul-Alain Beaulieu argues that “the Uruk priesthood was soliciting the active support of the Seleucid monarchy for its ambitious religious and architectural program of renewal.”¹²⁹³ In other words, they were hoping for a second Nebuchadnezzar II. (If so, they were rewarded, since Antiochus I (Soter) (281-261 CE) did initiate the building of the great temples of Uruk. This would make The Uruk Prophecy Text contemporary with *The Babyloniaca* of Berossus.¹²⁹⁴

The Uruk Prophecy Text “predicts” that an unjust king will arise who will take the “old protective goddess” of Uruk away from Uruk and force her to dwell in Babylon. Further, he will install in Uruk a “protective goddess not belonging to Uruk” along with, of course,

the officiants of the new goddess.¹²⁹⁵ In addition, this king, from the “Sealand,” will impose heavy tribute on the Urukeans—and destroy the place, filling canals with silt and abandoning the cultivated fields.

Several other unjust kings will rule until, eventually, king will arise in Uruk and provide justice for the land. This is where the text becomes most interesting. This later king, surely Nebuchadnezzar II, will bring back “the old protective goddess” to Uruk, rededicate her priesthood there and restore her sanctuaries. Not only will he fill the canals and return prosperity to the fields: he will “rebuild the gates of Uruk with lapis-lazuli.” This seems all to the good. But there is a catch. Before even mentioning the old goddess—Ishtar’s name is not mentioned in The Uruk Prophecy Text—the document indicates that the new king will “establish the rites” of Anu in Uruk.

Such a transformation did take place, but not in the time of Nebuchadnezzar II. Apparently it happened under the Persian kings.

The great building of a temple and ziggurat for Anu and his wife Antum came later, in Seleucid times. The point is, The Uruk Prophecy Text harks back to events in the 8th century, leaps ahead to the 6th century, and reflects the hopes of the 3rd century. (The Uruk Prophecy Text would be contemporary not only with Berossus but with the biblical Book of Daniel.)

The five hundred years provided more than one account, i.e., interpretation, of these events. Beaulieu makes a good case for The Uruk Prophecy Text reflecting the acts of destruction committed against Uruk and other Mesopotamian cities narrated in “Erra and Ishum” and other texts. “Erra and Ishum,” recall, is a story known from ca. 700 BCE, about two generations from the events.¹²⁹⁶

Beaulieu also cites an inscription by Nebuchadnezzar II in which the king claims to have reinstated the rites of Ishtar. He also excavated and established a new foundation for the perimeter of Eanna. He does mention Ishtar by name. (Actually “Ishtar of Uruk” is followed by her epithet, *bēlet* [“Lady”] of Uruk.) This is followed by a claim that he returned to Uruk its “protective genius” and to Eanna her “protective genius.” The Uruk Prophecy Text speaks of an old and a new protective genius, using the term *lamassu*. Here the two protective figures are distinguished by gender. Uruk gets its *shēdu* back while the temple has its *lamassu* returned to it. The Uruk Prophecy Text appears to be avoiding the name Ishtar by calling her, as she is elsewhere called, a protective *lamassu*. Nebuchadnezzar separates the goddess from the protectors of, first, the city and second Ishtar’s temple.¹²⁹⁷

Some years after Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidas repeats in a rather different way the sacrilege and restoration of Ishtar of Uruk, “who dwells in a golden shrine, to whom are harnessed seven lions.” The Nabonidas inscription blames Eriba-Marduk for the atrocity, and sees Ishtar leaving Uruk in anger. In her sacred place the citizens of Uruk “introduced a divine representation not belonging to Eanna.”¹²⁹⁸ The inscription does not name the king who reestablished the temple and returned Ishtar to Eanna (removing the

“inappropriate” goddess), but it is clear that he is referring to Nebuchadnezzar. (Note that Nabonidas refers to Ishtar in one place as ^d15 (as the name appears in the First Prologue of *Gilgamesh*), and then to the “inappropriate” goddess as the ^d15 who is *la simātu*. This is another instance of the name approximating *the* goddess.

Beaulieu’s aim in following the case of atrocity and restoration of Ishtar is to demonstrate that all four versions of the story have their particular historiographic (mainly political) slants. When he evaluates the different versions, Beaulieu comes to the conclusion that the mythical composition, “Erra and Ishum,” possibly offers a “more balanced and accurate version of a historical event” than the inscriptions that purport to be factual.

Ishtar of Uruk

Thanks to the large number of documents from the Neo-Babylonian period recovered from the Eanna archive in Uruk, Paul-Alain Beaulieu has been able to take a new approach to the study of Mesopotamian religion. He estimates that there were more than 8,000 documents in the Eanna archive, and that allows researchers to “privilege the local history of religion” over other approaches, which had to depend on political and literary sources.¹²⁹⁹ *Gilgamesh*, for example, mentions Ishtar many times and two other goddesses who may actually be extensions of or avatars of Ishtar. The mother and father of Gilgamesh, the goddess Ninsun and the deified Lugalbanda, are also said to dwell somewhere in Uruk. Beaulieu, on the other hand, has found some thirty-one deities and their cultic locations named in the texts he has examined. Ishtar and four other goddesses, who may be considered her companions, are clearly the most important of these deities. A good measure of their importance is the sheer number of offerings made regularly to their sanctuaries. (Dates and barley are always significant part of the offerings.)

Beaulieu knows the clothing the statues wore, the jewelry the deities possessed, and the persons who attended to the upkeep of the different figures—again, especially Ishtar and her four companions. The 1st millennium archive Beaulieu studies ends before the most decisive change took place in Uruk, when the cult of Anu and his wife Antu gained great prominence in the city. That change took place during the Persian period, and the visual record—massive building of new temples and an Anu ziggurat—is clear in the Hellenistic period. The change is evident in texts from Hellenistic Uruk and Babylon, especially temple ritual texts studied by Marc J. H. Linssen. The texts were found mainly in the Rēsh temple—the major temple of Anu in that period—and in private living quarters.¹³⁰⁰ The texts come largely from four Uruk families that traced their ancestry to famous figures, including Sîn-lēqi-unninnī, who is named as the author of *Gilgamesh*. Even though the Uruk ritual texts are slanted toward Anu, they present much evidence that Ishtar remained a powerful force in Uruk. Eanna may have been in the decline, but another very large temple was built for Ishtar and her companions, the Irigal.

Before the great change happened, Anu has a presence in Uruk, but a minor one at best. The Eanna archive Beaulieu has studied provides very important evidence for what may still be the most puzzling question in the history of Uruk. Inanna/Ishtar is known from

texts going back into the 4th millennium. Beaulieu spends a good deal of time surveying the records of three thousands years of the Great Goddess in Uruk, and he tries to find Anu wherever the god appears. One problem is that the name An-Inanna appears, for example, in Old Babylonian times, but it is not clear if it is a combination of the two deities or a complex name of just Inanna/Ishtar herself.¹³⁰¹ The survey offers considerable insight into, for example, relations between Uruk and Eridu in the Archaic period, when Uruk appears to have been the center of a league of cities and to have eclipsed in power the city of Enki/Ea. The situation may be reflected in the Sumerian myth, “Inanna and Enki: The Transfer of the Arts of Civilization from Eridu to Erech.”¹³⁰² As is usual, there are many gaps in the historical record, but Beaulieu makes it clear that, even when Anu is mentioned along with Inanna/Ishtar, she continued to dominate the scene—until the balance of power was changed in mid-1st millennium.

The Neo-Babylonian Eanna archive does include the names not only of Anu, but also other gods found in *Gilgamesh*: Ea, Nergal, Enlil and Sîn, even Marduk. Lugalbanda is mentioned, but not Ninsun, though we know that in the later period she was present with Lugalbanda in a ritual text. Assyria’s Assur is at least as important as Babylon’s Marduk. Next in importance to Ishtar herself is Nanaya, who dwelt with Ishtar in the Eanna. The other companions of Ishtar in this period are Bêltu-sh-Rêsh, Uşur-amāssu, and Urkayîtu (whose name is a form of Uruk). There is strong syncretism in this period, and it is not always easy to separate Ishtar from, e.g., Urkayîtu, who may have been another manifestation of Ishtar.¹³⁰³

In addition to the ample information the Eanna archives provide about foodstuffs, clothing, and jewelry possessed by the sanctuaries—information that sheds much light on the temple as the economic center through which flowed much of the city’s capital—the documents reflect important historical events in the 1st millennium. Ishtar was abducted from Uruk twice in the 1st millennium. The first case was caused by a Babylonian king, either Erîba-Marduk or Nabû-shuma-ishkun. (Beaulieu, who has studied the case for some time, prefers the latter.) Ishtar was removed and returned two centuries later by Nebuchadnezzar II, whose reputation as a model king persisted into Hellenistic times. The second time was when Sennacherib and his allies among the Elamites abducted the goddess, only to have her returned either at the end of Sennacherib’s reign or the beginning of his son Esarhaddon’s reign.¹³⁰⁴

In the first case, a “foreign goddess” replaced Ishtar, perhaps Ishtar of Babylon or Zarpanîtu, the wife of Marduk. In Middle Babylonian times, Ishtar had been exalted to the rank of the highest deity when she was identified with Antu, the wife of Anu, given “kingship” of the gods and became “Ishtar the Star.” Beaulieu has been able to trace the different names for Ishtar, syncretisms, and even changes in the spelling of the name Ishtar to follow the changing fate of the goddess as Babylonians and Assyrians compete for domination of the southern cities. If Ishtar could be equated with Antu, perhaps the Babylonians could see her identified with Marduk’s wife—in an attempt to unify the pantheon and the ideology of empire. Whatever the reasons and whoever the “foreign

goddess” may have been, the Urukeans found the abduction of their goddess an outrage and an atrocity.¹³⁰⁵

“Babylonian” Royal Inscriptions Regarding Uruk

Royal inscriptions from a period perhaps of (or just after) the supposed lifetime of Sîn-leqi-unninnī are very scant. At best royal inscriptions are highly formulaic and thus not necessarily factual. But that very characteristic gives such inscriptions high value in a different way: they provide an insight into the ideology that produced them.

Nebuchadnezzar I, king at the end of the 12th century (1125-1104 BCE), for example, claimed to be the offspring of a king of Sippar, Enmeduranki, and that the Sun God Shamash gave him kingship, an eternal throne and a long reign. The god also ordered him to plunder Elam. The account of his attack and triumph over a king of Elam credits Ishtar and Adad, gods who are “lords (EN) of battle.”¹³⁰⁶

King Marduk-shāpik-zēri half a century later refers in passing to both the goddess Ishtar and the goddess Innina. Later Adad-apla-iddina twice refers to the goddess Ninisina, though not identifying her with Ishtar.¹³⁰⁷ The kings of Babylon, then, respected Ishtar, but there is not much evidence in the few royal inscriptions of the period that the kings played much of a role in Uruk.

Rulers of Babylon in the Second Dynasty of the Sealand have left few references as well. The founder of the dynasty, a certain Simbar-Shipak (1025-1008 BCE), recognized Enlil as his “supreme lord” but also points out that he correctly administered the rites of gods Anu and Dagan. What is interesting about the inscription is that a colophon states that a copy of the original was made by a person named Marduk-sharrani, who claimed to be a descendent of the famous Sîn-leqi-unninnī. The original tablet was written by the father of Marduk-sharrani, Rīmūt-Nabû. (The names of the scribes include the names of the high gods of Babylon, Marduk and Nabû.) Both men identify Sîn-leqi-unninnī as the *gala* or lamentation-priest of Ishtar of Uruk and Nanaya.¹³⁰⁸

Just after this, an unidentified king dedicates a field to the goddess Ušur-amāssu, who dwells in Uruk. A colophon indicates that the text was written on a seal on a necklace of that goddess.¹³⁰⁹

From the year 979 BCE for some three and one-half centuries, the rule of Babylon shifted from one group to another. Several Assyrian kings ruled Babylonia. At least six rulers were “Chaldeans” from tribes in the south. Among the six were the two kings thought to be responsible for the atrocities to Ishtar and Uruk that prompted The Uruk Prophecy. Erība-Marduk (mid-8th century) is one possibility.¹³¹⁰ While there is no royal inscription from him boasting about making radical changes in Uruk, the Assyrian king Esarhaddon wrote about him, claiming that he had restored a part of the Eanna complex; and a fragment of a document found in Uruk refers to a palace there.

Erība-Marduk belonged to one tribe; Nabû-shuma-ishkun, who followed him, was from another. While there is nothing from him either, a historical-literary work attacking him

has survived. He is accused of plundering Marduk's temple, Esagila, and of introducing gods of the Sealand and the Chaldeans into that most sacred of Babylon's temple. Among other crimes are breaking treaties, seizing private property—and even burning alive sixteen people.¹³¹¹

The document does refer to Ishtar, but the text is very broken at that point, and so it is difficult to tell what Nabû-shuma-ishkun might have done with her. Among desecrations to Babylonian temples, though, he brought a statue of the goddess Nanaya into the sacred workshop of the temple, and held back the statue of the god Nabû and, apparently related to that, changed the rituals of a certain festival. He even introduced the leek into the temple and forced people to eat it. The leek is said to have been taboo in the temple Ezida. Whatever these acts may have amounted to, the document considers them desecrations that changed sacred rites. Nanaya is considered the “beloved” of Nabû. Both of these gods gained wide popularity in Mesopotamia, and the worship of Nanaya extended as far as Palmyra, in what is now Syria. Nabû, further, was considered the son of Marduk. On the analogy we have noticed before, that Marduk was considered the “son” of Enki/Ea, who passed his esoteric secrets to his son, Nabû was thought to be as great a magician as his father Marduk (perhaps greater than the father). So it is not immediately apparent how Nabû-shuma-ishkun had changed the religion of Babylon.

Nanaya came to be regularly paired with Ishtar in Uruk. She was especially seen as a goddess of sexuality, like Aphrodite. That she is seen in this document as the consort of Nabû may be significant.¹³¹² It appears that both of them were involved in Nabû-shuma-ishkun's changing of sacred rites.

Nabû-shuma-ishkun is also accused to humiliating the Enki/Ea by forcing the god out of his dwelling and making him “sit in the gate.”

The king who followed Nabû-shuma-ishkun, Nabû-nāšir, is known to have campaigned against Borsippa in the conflict between Babylon and Nabû's Borsippa. An Akkadian inscription from the time of this king details the restoration of the Akitu temple in Uruk, the sanctuary outside the city walls, said to have been in ruins. Two men restored the sanctuary for the goddess Ušur-amāssu in Uruk.¹³¹³

A later king, Marduk-apla-iddina II, in a long inscription, claims to be rebuilding Uruk's Eanna temple and a shrine in the complex to the god Ningizzida.¹³¹⁴ The king, who claimed to be the eldest son of Erība-Marduk, described a situation where Marduk turned away from the south and the “evil enemy,” the Assyrians, ruled the area for seven years. (He was defeated by the Assyrian king Sennacherib.) The inscription about Uruk is interesting in that Ishtar is called Nineanna (“The *nin* of Eanna”) and, among other things, supreme among the gods and possessor of all the divine *me* (*parsti* in Akkadian). The inscription also recalls King Shulgi (from the Ur III dynasty in the 3rd millennium) and Anam (the last king of Uruk, early in the 2nd millennium). Shulgi is credited with building Eanna; Anam with building the shrine of Ningizzida. Otherwise the inscription follows the formula: the walls of the temple had buckled, its bonding disintegrated, and its parapet collapsed. Thus the king restored it to its original grandeur. He even boasts

of using “pure” bricks, which he made “bright as daylight.” Numerous bricks in Uruk also mention the king’s name.

The kings of Babylon, then, tended to mention Uruk from time to time, and some like Marduk-apla-iddina II apparently took pride in his work in Ishtar’s Eanna.

The Assyrian kings who ruled Babylonia also claimed to have restored Eanna. Sargon II (721-705 BC), who expelled Marduk-apla-iddina II in 710 and ruled Babylonia for about five years, also referred to King Shulgi. Like Marduk-apla-iddina II Sargon II renovated the enclosure wall around Eanna.¹³¹⁵ He refers to the craftsmen who completed the construction, and he asks Ishtar not only for a long life (a standard feature of such inscriptions) but also to help him in battle.

While nothing has survived of Sennacherib’s inscriptions, the son of Sargon II who controlled Babylonia from 704-703 and 688-681, his famous son and grandson had much to say about Uruk.

Esarhaddon, who ruled over Assyria and Babylonian for twelve years (680-669) and who, unlike Sennacherib, called himself King of Babylon, claimed massive rebuilding projects. For Marduk he retouched Etemenankia and for Enlil, the Ekur. Several clay cylinders describe the restoration of Eanna.¹³¹⁶ He tends to use a different term for the intimate relationship he had with Ishtar. He was her *migru*, a person endowed with divine favor or grace.¹³¹⁷ This is a loving relationship often paired with terms related to lovers and spouses.

For Esarhaddon, Ishtar is ^dINANNA and the “Lady of Uruk” (GASHAN). He is the king chosen by Assur to be of help, selected by Enlil, chosen by Marduk and, as we have seen, the “favorite” (*migru*) of Ishtar. The gods provided him protection “in order to appease their divine heart(s) (*ana nuhhu libbi DINGIR-utishunu*) and “set their mind(s) at rest” (*ana nuppush kabattishunu*).¹³¹⁸ As before, he claims to have rebuilt Eanna, which had become old and its walls had buckled.

Thus far the god Anu has not been the concern of the Babylonian kings. He is mentioned in Esarhaddon’s inscription, though. Just after mentioning that Marduk had become reconciled to Babylon during his reign, Esarhaddon mentions “Great-Anu.” Where Marduk had taken up residence once again in Esagila, Anu was made to enter his city and to sit on his eternal dais. The city is, however, not Uruk, but Dēr, and the temple is named Edimgalkalama (line 20).

Another long Esarhaddon inscription credits the king with rebuilding a cella within Eanna, again for Ishtar.¹³¹⁹ The cella, inside Eanna, was called Enirgalana, and it, too, is described as having becoming old and dilapidated. The bricks used to repair the sanctuary were not only baked (rather than merely sun dried), but baked in a “pure” kiln. The king offers “splendid sacrifices” as Ishtar took up residence in her special sanctuary.

Nanaya was also given special treatment by Esarhaddon. In two inscriptions that have survived, Esarhaddon praises Nanaya, “the veiled one,” daughter of Anu, spouse of the

god Muzibsâ (i.e., wife of Nabû), not in Borsippa but in her cella within Eanna. The sanctuary was called Ehilianna. (The name of the sanctuary is appropriate, given the sexuality of the goddess: it is the House of *hili*, that is, *kuzbu*, “of Heaven.”) As with other royal inscriptions, there is no claim that this is a new sanctuary. Ehilianna is said to be old and dilapidated.¹³²⁰ A second inscription, however, does credit an earlier king, Nazimaruttash, for having built Ehilianna; and Esarhaddon indicates that Erība-Marduk for having shored it up before he, Esarhaddon added his restoration to the sanctuary.¹³²¹

Several shorter inscriptions speak of the restoration of Ishtar’s Eanna. One that boasts of Esarhaddon as the king who builds Eanna includes the interesting detail that 60,000 sheep and goats and 6,000 cows among the herds of Ishtar and Nanaya had been returned to the goddesses.¹³²² The text is too fragmented to account for the scattering of such a large number of animals. (The animals are said to have been a present of King Sargon II.)

Many royal inscriptions of Esarhaddon’s famous successor, Assurbanipal (669-ca. 627) have survived. Among them are documents that indicate extensive temple restorations, for Marduk, Ea, Shamash, and Enlil—and Ishtar and Nanaya. One lengthy text gives a good overview of Assurbanipal’s many projects, but is especially focused on the restoration of Eanna and Ishtar’s quarters, the Enirgalanim.¹³²³ Ishtar of Uruk is praised as the “sovereign of heaven (AN) and the underworld (KI). She holds the *me*, as we have seen before. If there is a special twist, it is the emphasis on Ishtar as the “fierce goddess of battle,” who goes at the side of her favorite (*migru*) and slays Assurbanipal’s foes.

The document even gives warm regards to Assurbanipal’s brother, Shamash-shuma-ukīn, calling him the “favorite” brother and wishing him long life and good fortune. Esarhaddon set it up that Assurbanipal would become king of Assyria while brother Shamash-shuma-ukīn would be king of Babylon. The document then comes from a time before the brothers began fighting.

Shamash-shuma-ukīn was king of Babylon (667-648 BCE). There is some question if he was a vassal of the Assyrian king, but in any event he rebelled against Assurbanipal in 652 and kept up the fight for some ten years. A few inscriptions from his reign have survived. One bilingual text indicates that he dedicated land to Ishtar and Nanaya.¹³²⁴ Otherwise he seems to have been more concerned with Shamash of Sippar and Nabû of Borsippa.

The kings of Babylonia in the last days before Assyria fell to the Babylonians in 612 BCE have left a few royal inscriptions, but none of them seem concerned with Uruk.

Babylon and Uruk

Paul-Alain Beaulieu discovered an ideological link, weak though it may have been, between 1st millennium BCE Babylon and the ancient Sumerian cities.¹³²⁵ Beaulieu noticed that when Babylon had defeated the Assyrians and had expanded its rule far beyond earlier kingdoms to become, in effect, a world capital, it retained some features of the Sumerian city-states but added clearly un-Sumerian features in Nebuchadnezzar’s “grandiose imperial project,” his rebuilding of Babylon.

The untraditional features of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon can be seen in the eccentric location of the palaces and the square plan of the city.¹³²⁶ The features turn out to be imitations of Assyrian capital cities. The new design was influenced by cities like Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin—and Nineveh. The Assyrian design reflected its ideology of kingship and, with it, the importance of grand, fortress-like palaces, designed to exalt the monarch and astonish the people.

The key difference was that the Assyrian king was the center of political and religious life of the community. The palace, not the temple, predominated. Quite unlike the Sumerian city-states, where a large temple complex, such as we see in the Uruk of *Gilgamesh*, stands at the center of the city. Palaces, in the very early days of the emerging kingship, were largely temporary structures on the periphery. Although a strong kingship developed, it was always clear where the power of the city rested: with the great gods who dwelt there. In Babylon the ziggurat Etemenanki and the Esagil temple of Marduk showed that the king stood in the shadow of the gods. Beaulieu cites a stone inscription in which Nebuchadnezzar explained that he located his palace in such a way as not to encroach on Marduk's temple complex. As Beaulieu explains, "This rhetoric of self-effacement is common in the inscriptions of Neo-Babylonian kings, where the bombast of the Assyrians has given way to titles proclaiming the ruler's meekness, devotion, and obedience to the gods."¹³²⁷

Nebuchadnezzar produced a hybrid city, with elements of both the Sumerian city-states and Assyrian rule. In an important way, the reverence for Sumerian tradition eventually preserved Babylon while Assyria's ideology fell with its kings. Beaulieu suggests that the city with its two symbolic centers, the palace and the temple, where Marduk ruled both the kingdom and the universe, reflects *Enuma Elish*. Even when the Neo-Babylonian empire fell to Cyrus the Great less than twenty-five years after Nebuchadnezzar's death, there was "no traumatic disruption." The situation in Assyria was very different. "The collapse of Assyria had meant the abandonment of its cities and the end of cuneiform documentation" once the monarchy fell. "But there was no collapse of Babylon, or for that matter of any of the old Sumerian city states. The monarchy disappeared but the gods went on. Cuneiform documentation continued without interruption."¹³²⁸

After Independence was Lost

The epic of "Erra and Ishum," which is no earlier than the 8th century BCE, refers in passing to the *en* (*ēnu*) who would normally make food offerings of the type known as *taklīmu*.¹³²⁹ The story tells of the vast devastation caused by the warrior god Erra, who is also the plague god and underworld figure Nergal. Four cities turn chaotic when Erra strikes them. Of the four, Babylon, Uruk, and apparently Der are treated at considerable length, while Sippar, "the eternal city," which had been spared in the Flood, warrants only a few lines. Reference to the *en* and his food offering (disrupted in the chaos) does not specify the city or cities involved.

The *idea* of the *en* persisted into the 1st millennium BCE, then, but there is not much non-literary evidence for the *ēnu* or the female *ēntu* after the Isin-Larsa period. Both largely

disappear during the Old Babylonian period early in the 2nd millennium BCE.¹³³⁰ Except in Uruk, where the *ēnu* persisted.¹³³¹ Where the female *en* had served male deities in Ur, Kiabrig, Eridu and Larsa, the high status *ēnu* maintained something of his position for Ishtar in Uruk.

Uruk Disappears in the West

From the floodplain that is the Mesopotamian south, the land rises to the East. So we find a scene on a cylinder seal—the famous Seal of Adda—with the Sun God Shamash rising, saw in hand, between twin peaks with deities on either side. We are unlikely to find a scene looking West. As far as the eye can see it is rocky and sandy desert. Even today people take a bus from Baghdad to Amman through an interminable landscape where, in places, a bus driver could let the wheels move in autopilot through

the ruts caused by decades of dulling travel. It is easy to lose sight of Uruk.

In one sense the West forgot Uruk because the Romans were unable to defeat the Parthians who took over Uruk as its great temples were beginning to fall into ruins. Russell E. Gmirkin has, however, suggested another reason. The Bible we now have does not entirely ignore Uruk. It is there, in Genesis, as Erech. Sumer (“Shinar”) is the locus of the emergence of civilized life. Most, if not all, episodes in the first eleven chapters of Genesis have parallels in Mesopotamian literary and religious texts, and the Mesopotamian texts are thought to be earlier than the biblical parallels. Influence flowed in one direction. The question that has plagued scholars is how Mesopotamia impacted Israel—and that depends on when the impact happened.

Gmirkin has come up with answers that happen to exclude almost everything Urukean. Or rather a remarkably simple solution to a host of problems: Berossus.¹³³²

Gmirkin wrestles with questions about the composition of the Pentateuch that have occupied biblical scholars for nearly two hundred years. There is still nothing like a consensus, but Gmirkin opts for a very late date, during the Hellenistic period, for the Pentateuch, the Hebrew version virtually simultaneous with the Greek translation, the Septuagint. He accounts for Mesopotamian elements in Genesis not by a knowledge of Sumerian or Akkadian texts but by the Greek of Berossus’s *Babyloniaca*. If Berossus were known at the great library in Alexandria, Jewish scholars working there in Hebrew and Greek would have been able to compose Genesis 1-11 as a prologue to the first written Torah. (Gmirkin sees the sequence from Abraham through Joseph, that is, the remainder of Genesis, constituting a prologue to Exodus through Deuteronomy.)

If Gmirkin is correct, one could consider the two prologues of the Pentateuch as analogous to the two prologues of *Gilgamesh*. (The theory that the first creation story in Genesis, the Priestly version, was written later than the second, a Yahwist version, is even closer to the composition of *Gilgamesh*.)

Berossus as the conduit of Mesopotamian materials to the Bible is an attractive theory. It would account, among other things, for the exclusion of Uruk. Berossus was a priest of

Marduk in Babylon, and on all points where Babylon and Uruk disagree, Berossus presents the Babylonian version.¹³³³

Notes to Excursus on Kingship

¹¹⁰⁷ “The Knight’s Tale,” *The Complete Poetry and Prose of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. John H. Fisher (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977), 32 (ll. 1373-4). The condition is likened to the feeble spirits engendered of “humour malencolik” in the “celle fantastic” of the lover’s brain (ll. 1375-76).

¹¹⁰⁸ Douglas R. Frayne, *Presargonic Period*, 9-10; note the comment by Charvat, 10.

¹¹⁰⁹ William W. Hallo, “Kingship,” *Origins*, 188-211.

¹¹¹⁰ CAD 17.ii.2, 76-114, 10.i.1,166-69.

¹¹¹¹ Eric Partridge, *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, 329.

¹¹¹² Wm. B. Stevenson, ed., *Young’s Analytical Concordance to the Bible*, 565-74.

¹¹¹³ Hanna E. Kassis, *A Concordance of the Qur’an*, 565-72.

¹¹¹⁴ Denise Schmandt-Besserat, *When Writing Met Art*, 68.

¹¹¹⁵ Schmandt-Besserat, *When Writing Met Art*, 70.

¹¹¹⁶ Holly Pittman, “The ‘Jeweler’s’ Seal from Susa and Art of Awan,” 229.

¹¹¹⁷ For the cylinder seal impression see www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights and “Art of the First Cities” at www.metmuseum.org/explore/FIRST_Cities, and discussion of Puabi in P. R. S. Moorey, “What Do We Know about the People Buried in the Royal Cemetery?” *Expedition* (1977), 27 ff.

¹¹¹⁸ Naomi F. Miller, “Date Sex in Mesopotamia,” *Expedition* 41 (1999), 237-65. See also Miller, “Plant Forms in Jewelry from the Royal Cemetery at Ur,” *Iraq* 62 (2000), 149-55. The Sumerian term for an item of jewelry in the shape of a spadix is *a₂-an-šu-ša-la₂*, 152. See *The Sumerian Dictionary* (Philadelphia: University Museum, 1994), 1.ii.39-41. The Akkadian equivalent is *sissinnu* (CAD 15.325-28). Miller argues that the leaves on Puabi’s head-dress represent willow and poplar, 149, not beech, as Woolley had suggested. The ornaments and photos of the flowering branch of the male date palm and the fruiting branch of the female date palm can be seen at www.museum.upenn.edu/new/research.

¹¹¹⁹ For Inanna as the “one who fills the date spadices with abundance,” see *The Sumerian Dictionary* 1.ii.40. A bilingual text identifies Inanna/Ishtar as the one “whom dates envelop like a cluster,” i.ii.40. CAD 15.325 translates the phrase in Akkadian as the one who “envelopes him (her lover) as the *sissinnu* the dates.”

¹¹²⁰ See Kramer and Maier, *Myths of Enki, The Crafty God*, 121-23, for the controversy surrounding the god who rises between the two peaks. The seal, dated ca. 2300-2200 BCE, can be seen at www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights.

¹¹²¹ The two attendant figures present the ambiguity that extends to the “character” of the deities they attend. Ninshubur, whose very name beginning with *nin* leads to the early naming of both males and females (frequently mother goddesses) as Nin-x, is regularly depicted with characteristics of both male and female. Enki’s attendant, Isimud, is usually depicted, as on the Adda seal, with two faces, which I take to

represent the ability of Enki in his “wisdom” to exploit the deep ambiguity in language. For Isimud (also called Izzummi and Usmu), see Kramer and Maier, 58-65 and *passim*.

1122 Frayne, *Presargonic Period*, 409-440.

1123 Frayne, *Presargonic Period*, 409.

1124 Frayne, *Presargonic Period*, 423.

1125 Frayne, *Presargonic Period*, 414.

1126 Frayne, *Presargonic Period*, 423.

1127 Frayne, *Presargonic Period*, 430.

1128 Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 154.

1129 Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 156.

1130 Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 157.

1131 See the discussion and refutation of these views in Timothy Potts, “Reading the Sargonic ‘Historical-Literary’ Tradition: Is There a Middle Course? (Thoughts on *The Great Revolt against Naram-Sin*),” *Historiography in the Cuneiform World*, eds. Tzvi Abusch, et al. (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2001), 391-408.

1132 William W. Hallo, *Origins*, 208. See also his earlier *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles*, and “Royal Ancestor Worship in the Biblical World,” *Sh’arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East*, 381-402.

1133 Hallo, “Kingship,” *Origins*, 208.

1134 Hallo, “Kingship,” 193.

1135 Hallo, “Kingship,” 208.

1136 Joan Goodnick Westernholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkad*, 223-229.

1137 Potts, 398.

1138 Westenholz points out the connection between the unnamed king of Uruk and Amar-girida, *Legends*, 228. The possibility exists that the Lugal-Anne of this text, king of Ur, was actually Amar-girida, king of Uruk. That they were one and the same person can be explained by the conquest of Uruk by the king of Ur, who took on the title, “An’s king,” according to Potts (398-99).

1139 Westenholz, *Legends*, 235.

1140 Westenholz, *Legends*, 241.

1141 Henshaw, 28-32.

1142 Westenholz, *Legends*, 263-368.

1143 The second tablet of the Old Babylonian edition is signed by Iddatum, “the junior scribe,” and dated precisely to the 26th day of Addar in the year King Ammitsaduqa “presented a very large high copper platform.” The text was copied in Sippar during the reign of the Babylonian king (i.e., 1646-1626 BCE).

1144 Westenholz, *Legends*, 263.

1145 Westenholz surveys opinion about the enemy hordes, *Legends*, 265-66.

1146 Westenholz, *Legends*, 264.

1147 Westenholz, *Legends*, 273.

1148 Westenholz, *Legends*, 285.

1149 Westenholz, *Legends*, 287.

1150 Westenholz, *Legends*, 296.

1151 Westenholz carefully considers the grammatical ambiguities in the key lines, *Legends*, 306-307. Westenholz, in another article, discusses the irony of Enmerkar, who had been credited with the invention of writing itself, accused of not writing his experiences on a stele for Naram-Sin to read. It is clear that Enmerkar would not have written a standing stone memorial of any sort (a practice that was common in the West) because that was not Sumerian practice. His invention involved writing on clay, not stone. On the other hand, this poem envisions that the stone tablet Naram-Sin writes is small enough to fit into a tablet box, "Writing for Posterity: Naram-Sin and Enmerkar," *kinattutu ša darāti: Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*, ed. A. F. Rainey (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1993), 205-218.

1152 Westenholz, *Legends*, 317.

1153 Westenholz, *Legends*, 329.

1154 Westenholz, *Legends*, 329.

1155 A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1975), #19 (145-51); see now Alan Millard's translation of "The Weidner Chronicle" in William W. Hallo, ed. *The Context of Scripture*, I (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 468-70.

1156 See "Excursus: 'Sacred' and Other Marriages," and Kramer and Maier, *Myths of Enki, The Crafty God*, 99-114.

1157 Millard, "The Weidner Chronicle," 468-69.

1158 Millard, "The Weidner Chronicle," 469.

1159 Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 84-85.

1160 "Adapa," Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 184.

1161 Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 105.

1162 Millard, "The Weidner Chronicle," 469.

1163 One, later, text actually extends the list of Isin kings to include Damiq-ilishu, whose name there is written without the divine determinative (where his father's name is written with the determinative, in itself not surprising because it is a theophoric names), Jacobsen, *Sumerian King List*, 127.

1164 Of course, the biblical name for Uruk, Erech, does not appear in Ezekiel, and, in fact, the mention of Chaldeans in 1.1 and 11.24—and despite the reference to the wailing for Tammuz in 8.14, the rest of the

book has references only to West Semitic places. The merchants in chapter 27 were all from West Semitic countries, western Anatolia, and northwest Arabia. The reference in 23.15 may be to ritual.

¹¹⁶⁵ See Maier, "The Ancient Near East in Modern Thought," *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Sasson, 107-20.

¹¹⁶⁶ For example, see H. W. F. Saggs, *Babylonians* (Norman, Oklahoma: University Press, 1995).

¹¹⁶⁷ Akkadian is considered an East Semitic language. The chief dialects are Old Akkadian (ca. 2400-2000 BCE), Old Babylonian (1950-1595), Old Assyrian (1950-1750), Middle Babylonian (1595-1000), Middle Assyrian (1500-1000), Neo-Babylonian (1000-625), Neo-Assyrian (1000-600). One might have guessed that modern scholars would have called the standard written dialect Standard Akkadian, or Standard Written Akkadian rather than "Babylonian." And Standard Babylonian is not quite the same as Old Babylonian. Assyriologists (rather than Akkadianologists) also vary somewhat even their use of the terms. The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary prefers Standard Babylonian, while another dictionary, *Akkadische Handwörterbuch*, uses a more nuanced designation, a/jb, that is, Old and New Babylonian. For an overview, see David Marcus, *A Manual of Akkadian* (Lanham, NY: University Press of America, 1978), esp. "Introduction."

¹¹⁶⁸ Dates here follow Jack M. Sasson, "King Hammurabi of Babylon," *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Sasson, 904.

¹¹⁶⁹ For the sociolinguistic process of standardizing dialects, see Peter Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*, 4th Ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000), 135-36. The somewhat confusing terminology used for the Semitic language and dialects of Mesopotamia is discussed by I. J. Gelb in the Introduction to the English-language dictionary of Akkadian, the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (Chicago: University Press, 1964), A/1, vii-xi. For the impact of standardization in Ur III under Shulgi, see Piotr Michalowski, "Charisma and Control: On Continuity and Change in Early Mesopotamian Bureaucratic Systems," *The Organization of Power*, 60-62.

¹¹⁷⁰ For the view that sees in the marginalization of certain goddesses the ideological marginalization of women, see Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *In the Wake of the Goddesses*, especially ch. 7; for a rebuttal to that view, see Rivkah Harris, "Independent Women in Ancient Mesopotamia?" 145-66.

¹¹⁷¹ Jeremy A. Black, "Eme-sal Cult Songs and Prayers," *Aula Orientalis* 9 (1991), 26. See Henshaw, 88. Whether goddesses, on the one hand, and women, on the other hand, were increasingly marginalized in Mesopotamia are hotly debated questions. Frymer-Kensky argued for such marginalization of both goddesses and women in *In the Wake of the Goddesses*, Ch. 7; reprinted in Maier, *Gilgamesh, A Reader*, 95-108. Not all scholars agree with Frymer-Kensky. Susan Pollock and Reinhard Bernbeck see that gender ideology favoring males already existed in Archaic Uruk, "Gendered Ideologies in Ancient Mesopotamia," 163. Rivkah Harris, whose study of the best-known of the cloistered women, the *naditu*, in *Ancient Sippar: A Demographic Study of an Old Babylonian City*, and in "The *Naditu* Woman," *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1964), 106-35, is skeptical. An extensive debate followed each of the papers in the Proceedings of the Conference on Women in the Ancient Near East (Brown University, 1987), published as *Women's Earliest Records: From Ancient Egypt and Western Asia*. Families in the Old Babylonian period manipulated the religious institution to protect property as private property became more common; once a simpler system of inheritance was established, the institution dwindled. See Harris, "Independent Women in Ancient Mesopotamia?" 145-57, and discussion, 157-65. Elizabeth C. Stone notes the importance of the *naditu* in Old Babylonian Nippur, and notes that the cloistered women may have been prominent in that city as early as Ur III times, but as in Sippar and Babylona, the *naditu* declined when she was no longer useful for keeping private property within the extended family, *Nippur Neighborhoods*, 26.

¹¹⁷² Herbert Sauren, "Nammu and Enki," 198-208. See Maier, "Sacred Marriage(s) in Mesopotamian Literature," 17-34.

- 1173 A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 145-51; Alan Millard, "The Weidner Chronicle," *The Context of Scripture*, 468-70.
- 1174 Westenholz, *Legends*, 294-368.
- 1175 Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 125.
- 1176 Douglas R. Frayne, *Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595 BC)*, 5, 439.
- 1177 Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, translates the names of the two Ur III kings and all of the Isin kings as "divine," 124-27. The meaning of kings who were deified remains problematic.
- 1178 After Frayne, *Old Babylonian Period*, 27.
- 1179 M. W. Green, "The Uruk Lament," 255.
- 1180 Black, *The Literature of Ancient Sumer*, 205-206.
- 1181 *The Literature of Ancient Sumer*, 90-92.
- 1182 M. W. Green, "The Eridu Lament," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 30 (1978), 127.
- 1183 M. W. Green, "The Eridu Lament," suggests that the lament is the most important part of the ritual that restores the city; a similar action, carried out by a humble man—clearly the king—occurs in that lament as well, 156-57.
- 1184 The text is now available as "The lament for Unug: composite text" in the Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature. Interestingly, no mention is made of Uruk's commercial and trade capabilities in the lament; but perhaps nothing is to be made of this argument from silence. For Ishme-Dagan's conscious imitation of the Ur III king Šulgi, including his participation in the Sacred Marriage with Inanna, see Jacob Klein, "Šulgi and Išmedagan: Runners in the Service of the Gods (*SRT* 13)," 7-38, and "Šulgi and Išmedagan: Originality and Dependence in Sumerian Royal Hymnology," *Bar-Ilan Studies in Assyriology*, ed. Jacob Klein and Aaron Skaist (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1990), 65-136.
- 1185 Green, "The Uruk Lament," 254.
- 1186 Frayne, *Old Babylonian Period*, Sumu-El #1, #2, #2001; Warad-Sin, #11, #12, #27.
- 1187 William W. Hallo, "Royal Correspondence at Larsa: III. The Princess and the Plea," *Marchands, diplomats, et empereurs*, ed. D. Charpin and F. Joannès (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1991), 380.
- 1188 Hallo, "Royal Correspondence," 380.
- 1189 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 288.
- 1190 UET VI 102. Where Steible thinks it refers to Uruk, D. Charpin argues for Larsa in *Le clergé d'Ur au siècle d'Hammurabi* (Geneva and Paris: Librairie Droz, 1986), 275-76.
- 1191 Henshaw, 44.
- 1192 Whether these titles were actually used or were carryovers from past lists is a difficult question to answer. For instance, *nu-èš-a* and *lagar* are rare in Old Babylonian, *Female and Male*, and CAD 11.ii under *nešakku*.

1193 While EN was read *bēlum*, the term did not designate an office, cultic or otherwise (Henshaw, personal communication).

1194 Henshaw, 191-218.

1195 As SAL.EN, it is read *bēltu*, which is only applied to goddesses or queens or mistresses, the counterpart of a “lord,” as of an estate. Read in Akkadian as *e-nu-um*, it was the title of a high cultic official, but note that confusion in CAD 4.177 1.b over the reading of EN. And, confusedly, Akkadian *enu* is never given as EN. (The lexical section just equates all of these together.) As for *entu*, CAD only reads NIN.DINGIR as *entu*, but it finds difficulty separating the reading *ugbaltu* from *entu*. The term *ēnu* is a reading of EN, but CAD refers mainly to Ur III and OB periods. For years names EN is read *ēnu*, yet for the Sumerogram equivalences, CAD does not give EN.

1196 Henshaw 48; Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 299. For an interpretation of the role from the time of Enheduanna to Enanedu, see Betty De Shong Meador, *Inanna, Lady of Largest Heart*, 49-67.

1197 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 300.

1198 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 300-301.

1199 Edwin C. Kingsbury, “A Seven Day Ritual in the Old Babylonian Cult at Larsa,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 34 (1963), 1-34. If it dates from the second year (1820) of Rim-Sin, it would come long before Uruk fell; if, on the other hand, it dates from the twenty-eighth year, it might reflect conditions a decade after the fall of Uruk; Kingsbury favors the earlier day, 2-3.

1200 Joan Goodnick Westenholz, *Eight Days in the Temples of Larsa* (Jerusalem: R. Sirkis, 1994), accepts the earlier date (though citing 1821 B.C.E.) of the text, and, as her title suggests, she considers it an *eight*-day ritual, with the final day devoted to the divine king Sin-Iddinam. The third day was devoted to Inanna; the fourth to Nanaya (and Nergal), and the fifth to Ninegal), 20-25.

1201 For the *en*, see Henshaw, 45.

1202 After Kingsbury, 10-11. See Henshaw, 21, 116.

1203 See Henshaw, 19, 21, 37.

1204 Hallo, “Royal Correspondence,” 380.

1205 Hallo, “Royal Correspondence,” 388.

1206 Hallo, “Royal Correspondence,” 387.

1207 For the successors of Hammurabi, see Jack M. Sasson, “King Hammurabi,” *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Sasson, 911-13.

1208 Robert M. Whiting, “Tribes and Nations of Second-Millennium Western Asia,” *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Sasson, 1239.

1209 Whiting, 1239.

1210 A few exceptions with Hammurabi occur after the defeat of Larsa, according to Sasson, “King Hammurabi of Babylon,” 913, who also notes that for a time the name of the king replaced the name of gods in personal names, e.g., Hammurabi-ilī, “Hammurabi-is-my-god,” but the practice quickly lost currency.

1211 Mark E. Cohen, *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East*, 446-47. For an analysis of the complicated (and only partly reconstructed) ritual, see Benjamin D. Sommer, “The Babylonian Akitu

Festival: Rectifying the King or Renewing the Cosmos?" *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 27 (2000), 81-95.

1212 Cohen, *The Cultic Calendars*, 447.

1213 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 412.

1214 The inscriptions do mention Inanna, but it is Inanna of Zabala that is specified (Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 353). More than other royal inscriptions from the period that are strictly related to Babylon refer to cultic officials like the *kezretu*, *išippu*, *gala*, and the *ugala*; see, e.g., Ammī-sīaduqa (Frayne 425-26).

1215 Evidence for a reading of the name as Hammurabi or Hammurapi is summarized in Sasson, "King Hammurabi of Babylon," 902.

1216 Charpin, 278-79.

1217 Martha T. Roth, ed. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 77-78.

1218 Roth, *Law Collections*, 78-79.

1219 Charles Recknagel, "Iraq: Archaeological Expedition Mapping Ancient City of Uruk" (Prague, May 3, 2002), www.rferl.org/nca/features/2002/05/0305202101632.asp. German excavators under the direction of Margarite Van Ess, Joerg Fassbinder and Helmut Becker, used a magnetometer to map the city. Among their other findings was a man-made construction in the ancient riverbed that could possibly be the tomb of Gilgamesh as described in the Sumerian "Death of Bilgames."

1220 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 439.

1221 Charpin, 403.

1222 Charpin, 415.

1223 Charpin, 405-406. For these offices, see Henshaw 20-24, 88-96, 317-319, 41, 66.

1224 See Henshaw 56, 153-55, 54-55, 53-54.

1225 See Henshaw 54-57.

1226 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 439.

1227 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 440-41.

1228 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 444.

1229 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 451-52.

1230 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 454-57.

1231 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 463-64.

1232 Hallo, "Royal Correspondence," 380.

1233 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 466-68.

-
- 1234 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 471-73.
- 1235 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 474-75.
- 1236 Sasson, "King Hammurabi of Babylon," 905.
- 1237 Quoted in Sasson, "King Hammurabi of Babylon," 905.
- 1238 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 471-72.
- 1239 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 472.
- 1240 Frayne, *Old Babylonian*, 474.
- 1241 J. J. M. Roberts, *The Earliest Semitic Pantheon: A Study of the Semitic Deities Attested in Mesopotamia before Ur III* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), 39. The name Eshtar is frequently seen in personal names from Presargonic and Sargonic times.
- 1242 Simo Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, xxi-xxvi.
- 1243 From late in the 2nd and 1st Millennium Assyrian inscriptions, it is clear that kings paid particular homage to Ishtar. Tiglath-pileser I rebuilt the temple of Ishtar-Assur-ite (Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the 3rd and 2nd Millennia BC*, 26, 86); not very often but sometimes, Assur and Ishtar listen to prayers (T.P. 1 57, 25). And in the battle annals, in a list Ashshur, Sin, Marduk, Ninurta, Nergal, Ninlil, and Ishtar (A.n. II, last) appear; but not last on the list of Shal. III: Assur, Adad, Enlil, Ninurta, Ishtar, Ea, Sin, and Marduk (Grant Frame, *Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination [1157-612 BC]* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995], 51, 5). Shalmaneser III brought his booty to Ishtar (Frame, 57, 62).
- 1244 One of the few Assyrian kings whose dates can be determined; see J. A. Brinkman, "Appendix: Mesopotamian Chronology of the Historical Period," 345.
- 1245 A. Kirk Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the 3rd and 2nd Millennia BC (to 1115 BC)*, 48.
- 1246 For an overview of his remarkable reign, see Pierre Villard, "Shamshi-Adad and Sons: The Rise and Fall of an Upper Mesopotamian Empire," *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Sasson, 873-83.
- 1247 See CAD 11.i.343-46.
- 1248 William W. Hallo, *Origins*, 196.
- 1249 The frequent use of Akkadian *narāmu* in as a royal title, "beloved," does not necessarily mean that it carries the meaning of special intimacy, as in the "sacred marriage," since it has a range of meanings, often simply "favorite" (CAD 11.i.343-46). Gilgamesh is the *narām* of Marduk, for example.
- 1250 Sasson, "King Hammurabi of Babylon," 913.
- 1251 Roth, *Law Collections*, 80.
- 1252 Roth, *Law Collections*, 133-36.
- 1253 Roth, *Law Collections*, 139.
- 1254 The decline of the "sacred marriage" in Mesopotamia can be seen in the virtual disappearance of the famous lover of Inanna, Dumuzi/Tammuz from temple worship. According to Raphael Kutscher, the

Dumuzi cult was carried on, largely by women, into the 1st millennium as “popular” (as opposed to a temple-based) ritual lamentations, “The Cult of Dumuzi/Tammuz,” 29-44.

1255 *After Collapse: The Regeneration of Complex Societies*, ed. Glenn M. Schwartz and John J. Nichols (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 226.

1256 See Elizabeth C. Stone, “Economic Crisis and Social Upheaval in Old Babylonian Nippur,” *Mountains and Lowlands: Essays in the Archaeology of Greater Mesopotamia*, ed. Louis D. Levine and T. Cuyler Young, Jr. (Malibu: Undena, 1977), 280.

1257 Stone, “Economic Crisis and Social Upheaval,” 270.

1258 Lisa Cooper, “The Demise and Regeneration of Bronze Age Urban Centers in the Euphrates Valley of Syria,” 18-37; John J. Nichols and Jill A. Weber, “Amorites, Onagers, and Social Reorganization in Bronze Age Syria,” 38-57.

1259 Alan L. Kolata, “Before and After Collapse: Reflections on the Regeneration of Social Complexity,” 208-221.

1260 Kolata, 214.

1261 Lisa Cooper, 36.

1262 See Nichols and Weber, 41-42, for the importance ethnic Amorites placed on Amorite ancestry as a way of legitimizing dynastic rule.

1263 Elizabeth Carter, “The Babylonian Story of the Flood: An Archaeological Interpretation,” *Mountains and Lowlands*, 9-16.

1264 For a translation, see Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 9-38.

1265 Anne D. Kilmer, “The Mesopotamian Concept of Overpopulation and Its Solution as Reflected in Mythology,” *Orientalia* 41 (1972), 160-77.

1266 Carter, “The Babylonian Story of the Flood,” 13.

1267 Erica Ehrenberg and Donald P. Hansen, ed. *Leaving No Stone Unturned* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001), 5, following M. W. Stolper, “Late Achaemenid Legal Texts from Uruk and Larsa,” *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 21 (1990), 559-624.

1268 Ehrenberg, 6.

1269 Ehrenberg, 10.

1270 Ehrenberg, 11-12.

1271 David B. Weisberg, *Guild Structure and Political Allegiance in Early Achaemenid Mesopotamia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 5-28. See Henshaw, 325 and CAD 12.391-93 and 17.ii.191-92.

1272 Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness*, 127, 234. For “The Exaltation of Inanna,” see Betty De Shong Meador, *Inanna, Lady of Largest Heart*, 168-192.

1273 Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness*, 234.

1274 Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness*, 232.

- 1275 Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "The Abduction of Ištar from the Eanna Temple: The Changing Memories of an Event," *Historiography in the Cuneiform World*, ed. Tzvi Abusch, et al. (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2001), 37.
- 1276 Beaulieu, "The Abduction of Ištar from the Eanna Temple: The Changing Memories of an Event," 37. For details of the Assyrian kings, see Grant Frame, *Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157-612 BC)* (Toronto: University Press, 1995), esp., 181-93, 224-27.
- 1277 Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk during the Neo-Babylonian Period*, details the many major and minor gods besides Ishtar for whom offerings were made. For Ishtar and her companions (like Nanaya), see especially Ch. 3, 103-78; Marduk, Šin, Nergal and Ereshkigal, Ninurta, and Shamash of Larsa are among the major deities. Gilgamesh, Lugalbanda, and Dumuzi are a few of the many minor gods considered in Ch. 7
- 1278 Luigi Cagni, *The Poem of Erra* (Malibu: Undena, 1977), 52-53. Stephanie Dalley translates the poem as "Erra and Ishum," *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 282-315.
- 1279 Cagni calls the women "courtesans," "hierodules" and "(sacred) prostitutes," where Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, prefers "prostitutes, courtesans, and call-girls." The men are, for Cagni, "cultic actors and singers," while Dalley calls them "party-boys and festival people," 305.
- 1280 Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 305.
- 1281 Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness*, 227-29.
- 1282 Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness*, 227.
- 1283 Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 311.
- 1284 See Cagni, 20-21, for the controversies over dating the poem.
- 1285 Weisberg, 46-49.
- 1286 Muhammad Dandamayev, "Was Eanna Destroyed by Darius I?" *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 24 (1992), 169-72; G. Van Driel, "The 'Eanna Archive,'" *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 55 (1998), 66, 68. As for Persian influence on Uruk, the seal with date palm, kneeling figure, and serpent was found in Eanna (above). An apsidal temple may have been a temple to Iranian Mitra. A scholar from Uruk went to Elam (possibly Susa) in the Seleucid period. But there is otherwise few traces of Iranian influence. See Stephanie Dalley, et al., ed. *The Legacy of Mesopotamia* (Oxford: University Press, 1998), 39-41.
- 1287 Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "The Historical Background of the Uruk Prophecy," *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, ed. Mark E. Cohen, Daniel C. Snell, and David B. Weisberg (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993), 48. See also Beaulieu, "The Abduction of Ištar from the Eanna Temple: The Changing Memories of an Event," 29-40. It appears that Nabû-šuma-iškun is responsible for the outrage against Uruk rather than Eriba-Marduk, who had been suspected.
- 1288 Susan B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture: Alexander through the Parthians* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 32-35. The newcomers buried their dead differently than had the Urukeans; i.e., they were clearly foreigners.
- 1289 Marc J. H. Linssen, *The Cults of Uruk and Babylon*, 11. For the plans of the great Seleucid temples in Uruk, see Susan B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture: Alexander through the Parthians* (Princeton: University Press, 1988), Figs. 3-8.
- 1290 Simo Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, xlv-lxxii.

-
- 1291 Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, 40-41.
- 1292 Beaulieu, "The Abduction of Ištar," 31. Beaulieu argues that the author of the sacrilege was Nabu-šuma-iškun rather than his father, Eriba-Marduk, as has been often claimed, 36.
- 1293 Beaulieu, "The Historical Background of the Uruk Prophecy," 71.
- 1294 See Stanley Mayer Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*.
- 1295 This may be interpreted in a different way in a 1st millennium BCE addition to a Canonical Lamentation in which Inanna punishes "The Mother of Sin" who had usurped Inanna's throne and bed. See Maier, "Gender Differences in the First Millennium: Additions to a Canonical Lamentation," 345-54.
- 1296 Beaulieu, "The Abduction of Ishtar," 30.
- 1297 Beaulieu is careful to distinguish the different names of Ishtar, noticing that a change took place early in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in the way scribes spelled her name, "The Abduction of Ishtar," 32. The distinctions are important, but not crucial to our interest here.
- 1298 Beaulieu, "The Abduction of Ishtar," 32-33.
- 1299 Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk*, 1-4.
- 1300 Marc J. H. Linssen, *The Cults of Uruk and Babylon*, 3-9.
- 1301 Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk*, 109-11.
- 1302 Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk*, 104. For a translation, see Kramer and Maier, *Myths of Enki, The Crafty God*, 57-68.
- 1303 Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk*, 179.
- 1304 Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk*, 118-119, 129-34.
- 1305 It is possible that a 1st millennium addition to an earlier canonical lamentation, *Uru Amirabi*, reflected the crisis in Uruk in a myth and ritual involving the punishment of the "Mother of Sin" by Ishtar and the community for usurping Ishtar's bed and throne. See Maier, "Gender Differences in the First Millennium: Additions to a Canonical Lamentation," 345-54.
- 1306 Grant Frame, *Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination*, 35. Spelling of the name is ^diš-tar.
- 1307 Frame, 46, 58, 61.
- 1308 Frame, 73.
- 1309 Frame, 85. The inscription mentions the Royal Canal in the province of Sealand and canals of Gula and Ea in connection with the dedication of the field to the goddess of Uruk.
- 1310 Frame, 114, continues to think he was the culprit, though he notes Beaulieu's preference for Nabū-šuma-iškun.
- 1311 Frame, 117.

- ¹³¹² See also the inscription of Nabû-šuma-imbi, a governor of Borsippa during the reign of Nabû-šuma-iškun, 123-126. The inscription refers to Nanaya and Nabû in what was the god's city at a time of great conflict in the city. The inscription mentions Ninshiku, another name for Enki/Ea, one used in *Gilgamesh*, 123. The god Erra is considered the son of Enlil, 126.
- ¹³¹³ Frame, 127-29. The inscription carries two colophons, one by a *gala* of Ishtar of Uruk, who made a copy of the text, and a *shangû* of Uruk, who made it public, 129.
- ¹³¹⁴ Frame, 135-42.
- ¹³¹⁵ Frame, 147-48.
- ¹³¹⁶ Frame, 181-84.
- ¹³¹⁷ CAD 10.ii.48-49. In the puzzling "Letter of Gilgamesh" Gilgamesh calls himself a *migru* of Shamash. See Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, 821-24.
- ¹³¹⁸ Frame, 183 (line 12).
- ¹³¹⁹ Frame, 185-86.
- ¹³²⁰ Frame, 186-88.
- ¹³²¹ Frame, 188-89.
- ¹³²² Frame, 192-93.
- ¹³²³ Frame, 225-27.
- ¹³²⁴ Frame, 258-59.
- ¹³²⁵ Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon as World Capital," *The Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies Journal* 3 (2008), 5-12.
- ¹³²⁶ Beaulieu, "Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon," 8.
- ¹³²⁷ Beaulieu, "Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon," 9.
- ¹³²⁸ Beaulieu, "Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon, 11.
- ¹³²⁹ "Erra and Ishum," trans. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 307. On the *taklîmu*, see CAD 18.81, for offerings to Ishtar and other deities, sometimes offered by the king.
- ¹³³⁰ CAD 4.172-73, 177-80.
- ¹³³¹ The unusual Babylonian king Nabonidus revived both titles, CAD 4.173, 179. See Henshaw, 44-51, for details. The title of *en* of Uruk was held by kings from Ur III times through (in some instances) the Middle Babylonian period.
- ¹³³² Gmirkin, *Berosus and Genesis*, 89-91.
- ¹³³³ Gmirkin draws heavily on the translation and notes by Stanley Mayer Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berosus*.