

## Further Light upon Early Babylonian History.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April last (pp. 305 ff.), I gave a description and rendering in English of the tablet (recently published by Father Scheil) inscribed with the early list of Babylonian kings, and apparently an old copy of a portion of the now fragmentary, but originally complete list treated of by George Smith in 1874. Professor Scheil having succeeded in cleaning out the characters on the broken upper edge of the reverse of the copy published by him, has found there traces of the characters *Šar-ga* . . . , which, he decided, 'without hesitation,' to be part of the name of the well-known king of Agadé, Šargani-šarri (as it is now read). This completion he has published in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, vol. ix. No. II. p. 69, with a fresh photographic facsimile of the text.

The tablet therefore has Šarru-kin immediately before the gap, and Šargani after it, so that these two rulers were, as supposed by Menant, different persons. Narâm-Sin was therefore not the son of Šargani, but, as stated by Nabonidus, of Šarru-ukin, the Šarru-kin of the new list. This correction has naturally attracted the attention of M. F. Thureau-Dangin, who, in the same part of the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, p. 81 ff., makes some exceedingly important remarks upon this subject.

He shows how, from the occurrence of the name *Šarru-kin-ili*, 'Šarru-kin is my god,' on the obelisk of Maništu-su, Šarru-kin was probably the immediate predecessor of that king, and argues, from a similar name (*Īli-Uru-muš*, 'My god is Uru-muš'), that Uru-muš preceded Šargani-šarri and Naram-Sin (*Revue d'Assyriologie*, ix. p. 36).

From the obelisk in question and other documents (*ibid.* p. 82), M. F. Thureau-Dangin comes to the conclusion that the kings of Agadé to be

inserted in the gap in the chronological list are as follow:—

Šarru-kin.

Man-īštu-su, his son.

Uru-muš.

Narâm-Sin.

Šargani-šarri, grandson of Narâm-Sin.

It remains to find the lengths of their reigns, and therewith the confirmation of this order and relationship.

This to all appearance sunders Šargani from Sargôn (סַרְגֹן), the correct form of the latter being *Šarru-kin* or *Šarru-ukin*—not *Šarganu*, as the analogy of *lišānu*, Heb. *lāshôn*, 'tongue,' might lead one to expect. A popular etymology which regarded the old pronunciation as having been *Šar-gani*, may have derived the first element of *Šargani-šarri* from *Šar-gina*, but even if we admit the possibility that *šar*, 'king,' was used in Sumerian, the terminal *i* would be unexplained—*Šar-gina* (for *Lugalgina*) would suggest that the form should be *Šargana*, not *Šargani*.

Time alone will decide this question of etymology, which I am unable to discuss in all its aspects at present. Perhaps we have to admit, in the Hebrew form, a scribal error of *ı* for *ı̄*, which, with the proper vocalization, would make *Sargén* or *Sargin* instead of Sargôn. The rendering of Š as S in the Hebrew form follows the rule, and implies that the Hebrews first heard the name from Assyrian, and not from Babylonian, lips.<sup>1</sup>

I see that I have allowed two slips of the pen to pass in my article 'Light on Early Babylonian History.' On p. 306<sup>a</sup>, line 35, the '(ii.)' after Ba-ša-Ensu should be deleted; and on p. 307<sup>b</sup>, line 37, Sur-Bau should be Sur-Engur.

THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES.

London.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. T. G. Pinches, 'Notes upon the Assyro-Babylonian Aramaic Dockets,' in *Florilegium Melchior de Vogüé*, 1909, pp. 485 ff.