

## A New Nippur Duplicate of the Sumerian Kinglist in the Brockmon Collection, University of Haifa\*

Jacob Klein

Bar Ilan University

Among the dozen tablets and fragments of the Brockmon collection of the University of Haifa, whose decipherment was interrupted by the sudden and untimely passing of Raphael Kutscher<sup>1</sup>, there is an interesting fragment, numbered BT 14, which turns out to be an atypical Nippur duplicate of the Sumerian King List<sup>2</sup>. The fragment under discussion constitutes the upper third of an 8 column tablet, originally inscribed with the greater part of the post-diluvian section of the Kinglist, beginning with the first king of the First Dynasty of Kiš, and ending with Ur-nigin<sub>3</sub>, the first king of the Fourth Dynasty of Uruk<sup>3</sup>. The obverse and reverse of our fragment are in different states of preservation. Whereas the

\* The present study is an extended and revised version of a paper, read before the XXXVIII<sup>ème</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, which took place in Paris, in July 1991. It is dedicated here to Miguel Civil, the "Treasurer of Sumerian Literature", with deep appreciation and friendly sentiments. At the same time, our paper ventures to add one more item to the innumerable "joins", included in Miguel's forthcoming catalogue of Sumerian literature.

Note the following special abbreviations, used below: Jacobsen, *AS* 11 = Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Sumerian Kinglist*, 1939 (= *Assyriological Studies* 11); Wilcke, "Die Sum. Königsliste" = Claus Wilcke, "Die Sumerische Königsliste und erzählte Vergangenheit", *Colloquium Ruricum 1: Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung*, ed. by J. von Unger-Sternberg and H. Reinau, 1988, pp. 113-140.

1. For the publication of five literary-historical texts from this collection, see Raphael Kutscher, *The Brockmon Tablets at the University of Haifa: Royal Inscriptions*, 1989. The remaining twelve tablets and fragments of this collection will be published by the present author, with the kind permission of the Haifa University authorities. These include, among others, two fragments of Sumerian royal hymns, a lexical fragment, two OB bilingual grammatical texts and a number of Sumerian (Ur III) and Akkadian (OB) economic tablets.

2. Editio princeps: Jacobsen, *AS* 11. Additional studies and reviews: F.R. Kraus, *ZA* 50 (1952), 129-152; M. Civil, *JCS* 15 (1961), 79-80; J. J. Finklestein, *JCS* 17 (1963), 39-51; W. W. Hallo, *ibid.*, 52-57, 112-118; A. Westenholz, *JCS* 25 (1974), 154-156; B. Lukács and L. Végső, *Alt-Orientalische Forschungen* 2 (1975), 25-45; A. Kammenhuber, *OrNS* 48 (1979), 1-25; D. O. Edzard, *RLI* 6, pp. 77-84; P. Michalowski, *JAOS* 103 (1983), 237-248; G. Steiner, *ASJ* 10 (1988), 129-152; C. Wilcke, "Inschriftenfunde der 7. und 8. Kampagnen", in B. Hrouda (ed.), *Isin Išān Balriyāt* 3 (1987), 90-93; idem, "Die Sumerische Königsliste und erzählte Vergangenheit", *Colloquium Ruricum 1: Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung*, ed. by J. von Unger-Sternberg and H. Reinau (1988), pp. 113-140 (esp. p. 114, n. 7); idem, "Genealogical Thought in the Sumerian Kinglist", *Dumu-e<sub>2</sub>-dub-ba-a: Studies ... Åke W. Sjöberg*, 1989, pp. 557-571; Claudine Vincente, "Tell Leilan Recension of the Sumerian Kinglist", *N.A.B.U.* 1990, no. 1, pp. 8ff.

3. I.e. the section covered in Jacobsen's edition by WB i 41-vii 16. A portion of ca. 5 lines at the bottom of rev. col. viii of BT 14 is uninscribed.

surface of the obverse is almost entirely preserved, it is extremely eroded and hardly legible; the reverse, on the other hand, is completely defaced in its greater part, with the few lines preserved clearly legible<sup>4</sup>. Upon a careful examination of the contents and structure of BT 14, and its comparison with the Nippur duplicate, designated by Jacobsen as P<sub>3</sub> (= CBS 13994), these two fragments turn out to belong to the same tablet<sup>5</sup>. Below we indicate the contents and structure of the two fragments, correlated to the basic Ashmolean Museum duplicate (WB), which will demonstrate that P<sub>3</sub> joins BT 14 at the end of cols. i and ii of the obverse, and at the top of cols. vii and viii of the reverse<sup>6</sup>.

BT 14/P <sub>3</sub>	WB	"Dynasty"
BT i	i 42-ii 5	Kiš I
P <sub>3</sub> i	ii 5/6-18	Kiš I
BT ii	ii 26-37	Kiš I
P <sub>3</sub> ii	ii 37-iii 1 <sup>7</sup>	Kiš I - Uruk I
BT iii	iii 11-20	Uruk I
BT iv	iv 1-6	Ur I - Awan
BT v	iv 40 <sup>2</sup> -48	Ḫamazi - Uruk II
BT vi	vi 10-14	Kiš IV
P <sub>3</sub> vii	vi 16 <sup>3</sup> -18 <sup>2</sup>	Kiš IV <sup>2</sup>
BT vii	vi 23-32	Uruk III - Agade
P <sub>3</sub> viii	vi 45-vii 9	Agade
BT viii	vii 14-16	Uruk IV

That BT 14 and P<sub>3</sub> belong to the same tablet is supported by two further considerations: Firstly, BT 14 shares with P<sub>3</sub> and all other Nippur duplicates the formula for introducing individual rulers: "RN x mu

4. A copy and a photograph of BT 14 will be published together with the rest of the unpublished part of the Brockmon Collection.

5. These two fragments may constitute a physical join, a probability which at present cannot be verified.

6. A full and annotated transliteration of BT 14 + P<sub>3</sub> will be offered in the final publication of the Brockmon tablets. Presently, we will point out only a few problems, related to the joining of the two fragments. The last two lines of BT 14 i are probably to be restored as follows: [Ba<sup>2</sup>-b]u<sup>2</sup>-um<sup>2</sup>-e/ [300<sup>2</sup> mu] i<sub>3</sub>-ak (= WB II 5); the restoration and placing of the first two lines of P<sub>3</sub> i are problematic: [Pu<sup>2</sup>-An<sup>2</sup>-n]u<sup>2</sup>-um/ [x] [mu] i<sub>3</sub>-ak (= WB II 6), cf. Hallo, JCS 17, 53.

The last line of BT 14 II and P<sub>3</sub> II 1<sup>7</sup> join to read: <sup>65</sup>tukul<sup>3</sup>-bi<sup>3</sup> ib<sub>2</sub>-ta<sup>3</sup>-[an]-gur<sub>2</sub><sup>3</sup> (= WB II 37).

P<sub>3</sub> II 13<sup>2</sup>-14<sup>2</sup> (last two lines) seem to read: e<sub>2</sub>-a[n-na-ka]/ meš<sup>2</sup>-[ki-in-ga-še-er] (= WB II 47-III 1).

The first two lines of BT 14 v are nearly illegible; 11. 3<sup>2</sup>-4<sup>2</sup> seem to read [nam-lu]gal a-ra<sub>2</sub>-2-kam-ma-še<sub>3</sub>/ [unu]<sup>ki</sup>-še<sub>3</sub><sup>2</sup> ba<sup>2</sup>-e<sup>2</sup>-gur<sup>2</sup> (= WB iv 44<sup>2</sup>).

P<sub>3</sub> vii is nearly illegible; tentative restoration: u<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup>-[si<sub>2</sub>-wa-tar<sub>2</sub>]<sup>7</sup>/ 7<sup>2</sup> [mu i<sub>3</sub>-ak]/ eš<sub>4</sub><sup>2</sup>-[tar<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup>-mu<sup>2</sup>-ti<sup>2</sup>] (= WB vi 16-18<sup>2</sup>).

$i_5$ -ak"<sup>7</sup>. Secondly, and this is more important, BT 14 shares with  $P_3$  a unique formula, giving the total of the regnal years of a hereditary dynasty, i.e. of a royal line, a formula which is absent in all other duplicates of the King List. This formula ("n are the years of the dynasty of RN") is attested three times in BT 14, and twice in  $P_3$ <sup>8</sup>:

BT 14 ii 1	1560 mu-bala-en-me-nun-na-kam (Kiš I)
$P_3$ ii 5-6	1525 <sup>9</sup> m[u-bala]/-en-me-b[ara <sub>2</sub> -ge <sub>4</sub> -e-si] <sup>9</sup> (Kiš I)
BT 14 iii 2-3	745 mu <sup>2</sup> -[bala]/-mes-ki-in-ga <sup>2</sup> -še <sub>7</sub> -[er] (Uruk I)
BT 14 vi 6 <sup>2</sup> -7 <sup>2</sup>	121 <sup>2</sup> mu-bal[a] <sup>2</sup> -/ku <sub>3</sub> -ba <sub>6</sub> -ba <sub>6</sub> -k[am] <sup>2</sup> (Kiš IV)
$P^3$ viii 5-6	[120]+37 mu-[bala]/-[ša]r-ru-ki <sub>2</sub> -nim (Agade).

It is interesting to note that a royal line (i.e. a hereditary dynasty) is designated in our text by the term bala "turn (of office)". In text S (=BM 108857), the same term appears in the so called "formula for change of Dynasty"<sup>9</sup>, designating an era, in the course of which various kings of a certain city dominated Mesopotamia: "GN<sub>1</sub> bala-bi ba-kur<sub>2</sub> nam-lugal-bi GN<sub>2</sub>-še<sub>3</sub> ba-tum<sub>2</sub>" "GN<sub>1</sub> - its turn (of domination) has been changed, its kingship was carried to GN<sub>2</sub>"<sup>10</sup>.

A full edition and a detailed study of the old-new SKL duplicate BT 14+ $P_3$ , will be offered in the final publication of the Brockmon collection. In the second part of this study, I only wish to draw attention to a hitherto unknown historical "note", which BT 14 adds to the standard version of the SKL, and which contains a rather interesting synchronization between the last kings of Kiš I and the first kings of Uruk I. The section corresponding to the reign of Dumuzi of the Uruk I era ("dynasty") (WB iii 14-16), reads in BT 14 iii 6-10 as follows:

dumu-zi šu-ḥa<sub>6</sub>  
 uru-ni ku<sub>6</sub>-a<sup>ki</sup>  
 100 mu  $i_3$ -ak  
 šu-aš en<sup>2</sup>-me-bara<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>4</sub><sup>2</sup>-e-si  
 nam-ra  $i_3$ <sup>7</sup>-ak<sup>7</sup>  
 "Dumuzi, a shepherd -

7. Jacobsen, *AS* 11, pp. 31ff.

8. Note that the two royal line totals, attested in  $P_3$ , were noted already by Jacobsen, but were reconstructed differently (cf. *AS* 11, p. 84, n. 104; p. 113, n. 255).

9. Since Jacobsen's "classical" edition of the Kinglist, the loose English term "dynasty" is generally used to refer to all the kings of a city, belonging to the same era of domination, whether these kings descended from one family or from several different families (as is the case in most periods of reign). We propose to use in this last context the term "era" (e.g. the "Era of Kiš I", the "Era of Ur I" and so on), and preserve the term "dynasty" for actual hereditary royal lines, such as e.g. the "Ur III Dynasty" (cf. already the pertinent remarks by Kraus, *ZA* 50, 30, n. 2; and Wileke, "Die Sum. Königsliste, pp. 114ff.).

10. Cf. Jacobsen, *AS* 11, p. 33, *sub S*; p. 37, *sub c*. The term bala (= *palū*), in itself, means "term (of office)"; and it can refer to the reign of a single king or ruler (cf. Hallo, *HUCA* 29 [1958], 94f.; *JCS* 14 [1960], 103ff.); to the term of a hereditary dynasty (as in the formula for totals of royal line, recurring in BT 14+ $P_3$  above); and to the political domination of a city, during a certain period of time (such as attested in text S of the SKL). At times, the term is used in an ambiguous context. Thus, e.g., in the Second Ur Lament, Enlil says to his "firstborn" Nanna: uri<sub>2</sub><sup>ki</sup>-ma nam-lugal ḥa-ba-sum bala-da-ri<sub>2</sub> la-ba-an-sum "be that Ur was given kingship, it was not given an eternal reign" (P. Michalowski, *Lamentation* 58:366; cf. *ibid.*, ll. 368f.; p. 66:461ff.). Here bala could refer to "dynasty" proper, but most probably refers to "era of domination", just as text S of the SKL. For bala in this context, see now *PSD* 2:65ff., *sub* bala B. When bala is related to individual kings, it seems to denote simply "reign". However, when it is qualified as "long-lasting" (cf. *PSD* *ibid.*, p. 68, *sub* 2.2.2), it is not clear whether it refers to the reign of the particular king, or to the term of his whole dynasty. Thus, e.g., bala-da-ri may mean either "enduring reign" or "enduring dynasty!". For the expression bala kur<sub>2</sub>, attested in text S, see e.g. *TRS* 73:8 (*JAOS* 103, 74) nam-lugal-la-na bala-bi šu kur<sub>2</sub>-ru-de<sub>3</sub>; see further M. E. Cohen, *Eršemma* 70:21; *CAD* *sub* nakāru 2c.

his city (was) Ku'ara<sup>11</sup>;  
 he exercised kingship for 100 years;  
 single handed he captured  
 Enmebaragesi<sup>12</sup>.

This new synchronization<sup>13</sup> between Enmebaragesi of Kiš I and Dumuzi of Uruk I, who ruled between Lugalbanda and Gilgameš, is rather interesting, if not absolutely surprising. For if the epic of Gilgameš and Agga reflects a real historical struggle between these two rulers, we would expect Dumuzi, Gilgameš's predecessor, to be contemporaneous with Enmebaragesi, the parent of Agga.

With this new information, provided by BT 14, we have now three different, and partly contradicting, traditions as to the historical conflict between the royal houses of Kiš and Uruk in the ED II period:

a) According to the epic of Gilgameš and Agga<sup>14</sup>, Gilgameš captured Agga, the son of Enmebaragesi, who was probably his senior, during a siege of the army of Kiš on Uruk. This victory probably brought an end to the political and military supremacy of Kiš in Mesopotamia, although the title "King of Kiš" remained prestigious and coveted for several centuries more<sup>15</sup>.

b) In the royal hymn Šulgi O, ll. 54-60, Šulgi praises Gilgameš for having captured Enmebaragesi of Kiš I, whereby he "brought over the kingship from Kiš to Uruk"<sup>16</sup>.

c) The new SKL fragment BT 14 ascribes the capture of Enmebaragesi to Dumuzi, the predecessor of Gilgameš in Uruk<sup>17</sup>.

In addition to the problem, raised by these contradicting traditions, there are two further unanswered questions concerning Enmebaragesi: Is our Enmebaragesi identical to "me-bara<sub>2</sub>-si, king of Kiš", appearing in the OS inscriptions from Khafaji?<sup>18</sup> And further: Was Enmebaragesi of Kiš a woman, identical with Gilgameš's, elder sister, whom he offered as a wife to Ĥuwawa, according to one of the versions of the Gilgameš and Ĥuwawa epic?<sup>19</sup>

Due to limitations of time and space, we cannot discuss here all the abovementioned prob-

11. For the GN Ku'ara(HA.A<sup>K1</sup>), see Jacobsen, *AS* 11:88, n. 126; Sjöberg, *TCS* 3:81; P. Michalowski, *Lamentation* 48:214-218; Heimpel, *RLA* 6:256f.; M. E. Cohen, *The Canonical Lamentations of Ancient Mesopotamia*, 684:a+34-35 et passim; *RGTC* 1:95-96, sub Ku'ara.

12. BT 14 seems to spell the name of Baragesi of Kiš I as en-me-bara<sub>2</sub>-ga-e-si. This unique spelling is clearly attested in the Susa text Su<sub>2</sub>, if Scheil's copy can be trusted. According to Jacobsen (*AS* 11, 88, n. 93), *UMBS* 10/2, 5 rev. 9 (Gilgameš and Agga 49) also has en-me-bara<sub>2</sub>-ga<sup>2</sup>-e<sup>2</sup>-si. However, Römer (*AOAT* 209/1, 30) reads the same as en-me-b[a]ra<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>4</sub>-e-si. The possibility cannot be excluded that the bizarre orthography en-me-bara<sub>2</sub>-ga-e-si is nonexistent, and in all the above mentioned three texts we should read en-me-bara<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>4</sub>-e-si, following Römer. The same spelling is attested in four OB text witnesses of Gilgameš and Agga 2 (Texts A and F) and in four OB text witnesses of Gilgameš and Ĥuwawa 168 (cf. Shaffer, *JAOS* 103:311, n. 34).

Accordingly, also P<sub>3</sub> ii 3 should perhaps be restored: en-me-[b<sub>2</sub>ra<sub>2</sub>]-g[e<sub>4</sub>-e-si-ke<sub>4</sub>]. In fact, this is also the spelling of the name in Šulgi O 58.

13. The only other "internal" synchronization, attested in the SKL, is between Sargon of Agade and Urzababa of Kiš IV (cf. *AS* 11:110, vi 31-35; *ibid.*, p. 143).

14. Revised edition: Römer, *AOAT* 209/1, 23ff. See further J. S. Cooper, *JCS*, 33 (1981), 224ff.; Heimpel, *ibid.*, 242f.; Klein, *JAOS* 103 (1983), 201ff.; H. L. Vanstiphout, *Aula Orientalis* 5 (1985), 129ff.; *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 17 (1986), 23ff.; Dina Katz, *RA* 81 (1987), 105-114.

15. C. W. W. Hallo, *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles* (*AOS* 43), 21-29; J.S. Cooper, *SARI* I 18.

16. Klein, *AOAT* 25:278; Wilcke, *Studies Sjöberg*, 561 f.; *idem*, "Die Sum. Königsliste", p. 118.

17. BT 14 iii 6-10, quoted above.

18. This is now the opinion of the majority of the historians; cf. Edzard, *ZA* 53 (1959), 10ff.; Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos* 41, n. 96; J. S. Cooper, *SARI* I 18. See further Steible-Behrens, *FAOS* 5 II 213. For a dissenting opinion, see A. Kammenhuber, *OrNS* 48 (1979), 4ff.

19. So argued persuasively by A. Shaffer (cf. *JAOS* 103 [1983], 309-313), and accepted by Wilcke (cf. "Die Sum. Königsliste", pp. 118f.; *Studies Sjöberg*, p. 562).

lems, concerning Enmebaragesi of the SKL. Presently we will discuss only the question raised by the new synchronization, attested in BT 14: Is the tradition of BT 14 about Dumuzi's military feat authentic and reliable, or perhaps a bizarre and late addition to the standard version of this composition?

In view of the great antiquity of the protagonists involved in these prehistoric and semi-legendary tales, and the scarcity and the nature of the relevant sources, we cannot give definite answers to the above questions. We can only speculate about the actual course of the events and the history of the various traditions, which circulated about them in later generations<sup>20</sup>.

On the basis of Šulgi O 54ff. and the note in BT 14, synchronizing between Dumuzi and Enmebaragesi, we may reasonably assume that the struggle in the ED period between Kiš and Uruk for hegemony, lasted at least for two generations, having started in the reign of Dumuzi, and resolved only in the reign of Gilgameš. Apriori, one cannot exclude the possibility that both Dumuzi and Gilgameš fought Enmebaragesi. However, if we consider the historical note in BT 14 as authentic, then Enmebaragesi must have been eliminated already by Dumuzi, and it is hardly conceivable that he/she could still have fought against Gilgameš<sup>21</sup>. That the historical note, furnished by BT 14, originates in Old Sumerian reliable epic tradition is indicated by two further considerations: the relatively archaic nature of this particular manuscript of the SKL<sup>22</sup>; and its basic agreement with the tradition reflected in the Gilgameš and Agga epic, which also seems to have originated in Old Sumerian times<sup>23</sup>.

Accordingly, we may assume that the political struggle between Kiš and Uruk began in the reign of Dumuzi, as reported by the new SKL manuscript. In spite of the military achievements of Enmebaragesi, who undertook the first recorded successful military campaign against Elam<sup>24</sup>, Dumuzi succeeded to capture Enmebaragesi, but was not able to conquer Kiš, and eliminate his/her dynasty. Subsequently, it was the task of Gilgameš to fight Agga, Enmebaragesi's son and put an end to the hegemony of Kiš. As to the hymnal tradition, which originates in the Ur III royal circles, it seems to be biased and interested in the unreserved glorification of Gilgameš. This tradition aspired to rewrite history and, therefore it ascribed to Gilgameš the vanquishing of Enmebaragesi<sup>25</sup>. It may, perhaps, be further assumed that the royal scribes and poets of Šulgi were responsible also for the omission of the above mentioned historical note about Dumuzi, from all other OB copies of the Kingslist.

20. The actual value of the Sumerian Kinglist as a source for reconstructing history in prehistoric times, is a matter of dispute among Sumerologists. While, e.g., Jacobsen believes that a careful and critical analysis of the literary and ideological tendency of the Kinglist allows a reasonably reliable reconstruction of history from Etana of Kiš I on (see *AS* 11, 165ff.), Michalowski (*JAOS* 103, 243ff.) is of the opinion that "there is absolutely no reason to trust the data contained in the Kinglist", and that "it is at present impossible to produce a composite text of this composition, which would reflect any historical 'reality'". See also Edzard's sceptical remarks, in this connection, in *RIA* 6, p. 81, par. 1.5 "*Historischer Wert*". We are of the opinion that whatever the sources of the compiler of this list, for his sequence of "dynasties", as well as for his special "notes", were, these sources were relatively "objective", and "reliable", albeit selected and arranged on the basis of a certain tendentious ideology. Therefore, we agree with Jacobsen that after a critical evaluation of the text, it is possible to unravel some "real" facts about the history of Mesopotamia in the ED period (cf. also Jacobsen's categorical statements, *ibid.*, p. 243).

21. It would be idle speculation to assume that Dumuzi, after having captured Enmebaragesi, released him/her, and allowed him/her to return to Kiš, just as did Gilgameš to Agga, one generation thereafter.

22. This manuscript exhibits, among others, archaic orthography, by omitting divine determinatives from the names of the deified kings of Uruk I. A full orthographical study of this text will be undertaken in our final publication.

23. For arguments in favour of the great antiquity and authenticity of the epic of Gilgameš and Agga, see Klein, *JAOS* 103:204 n. 19. Cf. also the most recent discussion of the historicity of this epic tale by Dina Katz, in *RA* 81 (1987), 105ff. Although Katz dates the composition of the epic to the Ur III period, finding in it an anachronistic idealization of Gilgameš, she admits that the early tale, on which the epic is based, may have originated "prior to Utuḫegal's war against the Gutians, perhaps in Gilgameš's own time" (*ibid.*, p. 114).

24. SKL ii 36-37.

25. See my pertinent remarks and bibliography in *AOAT* 25, 217ff.

Should the above hypothesis, as to the literary history of the Kinglist be correct, it will have a bearing on the question of the authorship of this composition<sup>26</sup>. Jacobsen, on the basis of a source-critical analysis of the text, came to the conclusion that the Sumerian King List is of pre-Ur III authorship and that it was composed in the time of Utuḫēgal of Uruk<sup>27</sup>. Jacobsen's hypothesis was challenged by Kraus, who argued that the Kinglist as a whole was composed in the Isin period as a "Tendenzschrift", which sought to legitimize Isin's sole domination of Babylonia, as the heir of the Ur III empire, in the face of the challenge of this claim by the rival kingdom of Larsa<sup>28</sup>. According to Kraus, the old idioms and orthographies in some manuscripts of this composition are mere archaisms, created by the late Isin scribes, and do not represent authentic ancient written tradition<sup>29</sup>. P. Michalowski basically agrees with Kraus, in that the kinglist was composed in the time, and for the Isin Dynasty. In his opinion, the document is intended to substitute for a genuine "genealogical charter", which the Isin kings did not have, in their aspiration to legitimize their kingship over southern Mesopotamia, as the heirs of the Ur III Empire<sup>30</sup>. Most recently, Claus Wilcke availed himself to the problem of the authorship of the SKL, and concluded that it was the "man for every season", Šulgi, who was responsible for the authorship of the Kinglist<sup>31</sup>. This he concludes both from the geographical horizon of the kinglist, which is identical to the area of the Ur III empire, and the fact that the Ur III kings were the first ones to assume the title "King of Sumer and Akkad". In addition, Wilcke sees in Šulgi's praise of Gilgameš, in Šulgi O 60, "you brought over the kingship from Kiš to Uruk (var. Ur)", a clear allusion to the kinglist, which describes a periodical shift of power in a north to south direction, from Kiš through Uruk to Ur<sup>32</sup>.

In view of the discovery of the new SKL duplicate, BT 14, with its surprising historical note about Dumuzi, it seems now that the truth about the authorship of this composition lies somewhere between the hypotheses of Jacobsen and Wilcke. It stands to reason that there existed an early version of the Kinglist, from the time of Utuḫēgal, which correctly and objectively gave Dumuzi the credit for defeating Enmebaragesi of Kiš. For otherwise, such a note would not have been inserted in the List, during the time of the Ur III Dynasty or thereafter<sup>33</sup>.

Apparently, the old version of the Kinglist did not satisfy Šulgi and his court poets, and these corrected and reedited the composition, so as to conform to their peculiar political and ideological aspirations. It is this redaction which is responsible for the deletion of the historical note about Dumuzi, whose purpose was to prevent Dumuzi from superseding Gilgameš, the divine brother and patron of the Ur III

26. For a general summary and evaluation of this problem, see now Edzard, *RIA* 6, p. 80, par. 1.4, "Die Frage der Datierung".

27. *AS* 11, 135-141.

28. *ZA* 50 (1952), 46-49.

29. *Ibid.*, 49-51.

30. *JAO* 103, 240-243. The principle that the SKL asserts the notion of divinely ordained kingship, as against hereditary legitimation, was also pointed by W.G. Lambert (cf. "The Seed of Kingship", in *CRRAI* 19, p. 434).

31. Cf. his "Die Sum. Königsliste", pp. 116ff.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 118; *Studies Sjöberg*, pp. 559ff.

33. C. Wilcke points out (*ibid.*, p. 119) that just as Urnammu and Šulgi "adopted" Gilgameš as their brother, on the political-genealogical level, they identified themselves with Dumuzi of Uruk, on the cultic level. One could argue, therefore, that Šulgi's scribes and poets would not have been interested in depriving Dumuzi of a military feat, ascribing it instead to his successor Gilgameš. One could further hypothesize that the original and authentic manuscripts of the Kinglist did not mention the capture of Enmebaragesi at all, and that the note which ascribes this achievement to Dumuzi, in BT 14, is a late tradition, invented by an Isin scribe, as a counter propaganda to the Ur III royal ideology, which in turn invented the tradition about Gilgameš, and is reflected in Šulgi O. While one cannot rule out entirely such a hypothesis, it is less likely, in view of the archaic nature of BT 14+P<sub>3</sub>, and its preoccupation with the duration of hereditary dynasties. If, indeed, this represents a more ancient and authentic version of the Kinglist than the other OB Nippur duplicates, then we may perhaps assume a double revision of the Kinglist: one in the time of Šulgi, when the historical note about Dumuzi was deleted; and a second – in the time of the Isin Dynasty, when the formulas giving the totals of hereditary dynasties were deleted.

Kings, in fame and glory. In other words, the same circles, who composed Šulgi O, and falsely praised in it Gilgameš as the vanquisher of Enmebaragesi, were probably responsible for the elimination of those two lines from the manuscripts of the kinglist, which correctly ascribed this achievement to Dumuzi<sup>34</sup>. In this their aspiration, they were quite successful, but not totally successful. For at least one ancient and authentic version of the Kinglist, escaped their editorial scissors, due to which we were perhaps able to correct a minor detail in Mesopotamian history<sup>35</sup>.

34. Note, however, that on the other hand all major recensions of the Kinglist (WB, P<sub>2</sub>, Su<sub>1</sub> and BT 14) preserved the note about Gilgameš, according to which "his father was a *lillû*-demon" (Sum. ab-ba-ni lil<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub>; WB iii 18; cf. Jacobsen, *AS* 11, p. 90, n. 131). This genealogical note seems to contradict and, therefore, antedate the Ur III tradition, (attested already in the Utuḫegal inscription) that Gilgameš was sired by Lugalbanda. Falkenstein (*RLA* 3, p. 358, par. 2 "Genealogie") sees in this Kinglist note a late tradition, which is also reflected in the Akkadian Gilgameš epic statement that Gilgameš was "two third god and one third man" (*GE* I ii 1). Dina Katz, on the other hand, assumes that this note is the addition of an Ur III redactor of the SKL, who wanted to harmonize the early tradition, according to which Gilgameš was an usurper of common descent, with a later tradition, which presented him as the divine offspring of Lugalbanda and Ninsun (cf. *RA* 81, 114). Most interesting is C. Wilke's recent suggestion (cf. *Studies Sjöberg*, pp. 562f.) that this note reflects an old and authentic tradition about the unusual circumstances of the birth and upbringing of Gilgameš. According to Wilcke, Gilgameš's mother, Ninsun, bore him to Lugalbanda secretly, and he had to find asylum in Kiš, under the patronage of his nephew, Agga, before ascending the throne of Uruk.

35. These conflicting traditions recall the similarly conflicting traditions about the slaying of the Philistine warrior Goliath, in the historical books of the Bible. While according to 1Sam 17:45-51, Goliath was killed by David, according to 2Sam 21:19, it was one of his heroes, Elhanan, the son of Ya'ari, who killed him. Cf. 1Ch 20, 5, which is an attempt to reconcile the two contradicting sources. Note, however, that the last case resembles more those types of conflicting traditions, which can be found in the Neo-Assyrian annals, pointed and discussed recently by M. Cogan (cf. *Ah, Assyria: Studies ... Haim Tadmor*, 1991, pp. 121-128).