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A STATUE INSCRIPTION OF SAMSUILUNA
FROM THE PAPERS OF W. G. LAMBERT

BY
Wilfred G. LAMBERT and Mark WEEDEN

1. PRELIMINARIES

This article presents a provisional edition of a fragmentary statue inscription of Samsuiluna, which is apparently well known to a number of colleagues but has never been published, and was only occasionally referred to in print until very recently. With 289 preserved lines, the text contained on the statue is the longest Old Babylonian royal inscription with a military-political narrative yet published and provides new data for the understanding of an obscure episode in Babylonian history—the revolt of the south under Rim-Sîn II against Samsuiluna son of Hammurapi. The text suggests that the main focus of the revolt was much farther to the north than has been thought on the basis of currently available data and contains details of some ten battles, which introduce a number of chronological conundra when compared with the other data.

With strong echoes of Naram-Suen’s Great Revolt inscription, it also modifies our notions of the generic framework of Babylonian royal inscriptions, in that the preserved part of it consists entirely of a military narrative with no building inscription elements, although these may have been preserved elsewhere on the statue. The article gives a short overview of how we know about the object, what little we know about its history after its probably illicit excavation, before looking briefly at the historical context of its content and production, including a brief consideration of language, and then presents the text in transliteration, translation and commentary as well as composite cuneiform copy and photographs.

The current owner of the object is unknown, and their permission has not been sought prior to publication, nor is it necessary to ask for it. The documents on which this edition is based belong to the estate of the late Assyriologist W. G. Lambert, and permission to publish was granted to me by the academic executor of his will, A. R. George, during 2017. The edition is thus provisional, as it is only based on photos. The owner is herewith encouraged to do the decent thing and hand this object over to the police or otherwise ensure that it is returned to the Republic of Iraq, so that future Assyriologists can ascertain its historical content more accurately.

1. Abbreviations for ancient texts follow those of the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (CDLI http://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/abbreviations_for Assyriology, accessed 29.12.2019) while a name-date system of reference is used for modern scholarship and comment. The Statue inscription was read at the London Cuneiforum during the first term at SOAS, University of London, October to December 2018. Present were: Andrew George (ARG), Jana Matuszak (JM), David Wilson (DW), Claire Weir (CW), Janet Politi (JP), Sam Mirelman (SM), Jonathan Taylor (JIT), Muzahim al-Jallili (MJ), Klaus Wagenstonner (KW), Mark Geller (MJG), Junko Taniguchi (JT), Marie-Christine Ludwig (MCL) and Christopher Walker (CW). In Berlin the statue was read in an informal setting out of normal working hours while I was on research leave at Kollegschaftgruppe 2615 at the Freie Universität during March 2019. Present were: Christian Hess (CWH), Lisa Wilhelmi (LW), Franz Wiggermann (FAMZ), Nick Kraus (NLK). I am grateful to Seth Richardson, P. Steinkeller, D. Charpin and A.R. George for comments on a draft of this article. Any errors remain my responsibility.

2. Gibson (1997; 2008); Seminara (2004: 383); Charpin (2006: 133 fn. 11; 2014: 141 fn. 91); Richardson (2010: 16 fn. 60; 2019: 219-220); Vedeler (2015: 4-5 fn. 4); Guichard (2015: 44); Michalowski (2019: 672, 681 fn. 42, 683 fn. 49). I am grateful to Seth Richardson and Piotr Michalowski for sending me copies of their recent articles prior to publication.

3. The closest published Old Babylonian royal inscription stylistically speaking is the barrel of Sîn-iddinam of Larsa (Volk 2011), which consists of 286 lines in total, of which 58 detail military activities (iii 19-iii 77).

The article contains a few sections written by Lambert, which are taken from his papers, although most narrative parts as well as the commentary are written by M. Weeden. The first basis for the transliteration and translation was formed by the manuscripts found in Lambert’s documents, although these have been altered on the basis of high resolution scans of the photos, while Lambert’s original readings are noted in the commentary. The commentary has also benefited from the years of Assyriological research that have intervened since Lambert worked on this. Nevertheless, Lambert’s contribution to the decipherment of this document remains extraordinary. For these reasons a co-authorship, even if posthumous in Lambert’s case, was thought to be the best method of signaling authorship. In this article Lambert is referred to by his name, whereas “I/me/myself” refers to Mark Weeden.

A composite copy (fig. 1) was made by me to act as a guide through the inscription, different parts of which are visible only on certain photos, and at the same time updates were made to Lambert’s transliteration on the basis of magnified scans. The text of the statue inscription, using copy, scanned photos and transliteration, was then the subject of reading groups in London and Berlin, members of which have contributed a great deal of clarity to its understanding. Contributions by individuals to the comprehension of elements of grammar or signs are noted in the commentary to the best of my ability.

A transliteration of the statue’s text by Miguel Civil was then kindly sent to me by Piotr Steinkeller in October 2019, and described by him as an “improved” version of Lambert’s. The possibility arises that Civil may have had access to different photographs of the statue to those that Lambert saw. Some of Civil’s improvements were similar to those which we had managed to achieve by magnifying high resolution scans of the Lambert photos in London, others were different. However, in those places where the Lambert photos are lacking, particularly in column i, Civil’s transliteration usually follows Lambert’s. This leads me to think that Civil was working with similar photos to those seen by Lambert.

This edition thus relies in great part on the unpublished work of two giants of Assyriology. These were works that were never meant for publication in their current form, and were not corrected or reviewed by their authors in the same way as those they might have submitted to a journal. On the other hand, the transliterations were already circulated among colleagues on a limited basis, thus resulting in a restricted publication. The following edition tries to provide a provisional official version that can be referred to with fewer scholarly qualms than the unofficially circulated manuscripts, including whatever limited improvements might be entertained on the work already achieved by these two scholars.

2. THE STATUE IN LAMBERT’S PAPERS AND “ASSYRIOLOGICAL LORE”

There is no evidence that Lambert ever saw this object, and in fact those parts where his transliteration is lacking frequently coincide with gaps in the photographic coverage (e.g. in column i). The relevant documents which provide the basis for this edition were kept in a brown A4 envelope addressed to Professor W. G. Lambert at his home address and sent by the University of Birmingham on 26.4.94. On the address label, Lambert has written “Samsuiluna Statue” in red pen. There is no indication that the contents of the envelope have anything to do with the envelope itself, although some of them might do, but the date on the envelope provides a terminus post quem for the time that the documents found their way into it. There are further clues within the envelope that might also suggest a similar date for the period when Lambert worked on this text.

In his role of academic executor, Andrew George has labeled each sheet of paper from Lambert’s academic legacy with its own individual number, henceforth referred to as a Folio. On the brown envelope,
George has written 22057-22113, which refers to the numbers of the Folios therein, as well as appending a date for the time when he looked at this material: 16/5/2012. Inside there is a white A5 envelope containing 27 colour photos, printed on AGFA photographic paper, which George has given the numbers 22057-22083. The remaining sheets can be divided into three groups:

(i) Folios 22084-22113 consist of three sets of documents on A4 sheets of paper. 22084-22090 consist mainly of hand-written notes, observations and bibliography written on re-used paper, as well as a hand-written transliteration on lined note-paper.

(ii) Folios 22091-22109 are mostly re-used sheets of white paper containing a carbon-copy of a type-written manuscript entitled “Lower Portion of Statue in Black Stone with cuneiform inscription reported to weigh 160 kilos.” The pages are numbered through to p. 19 (which contains an Addendum), with p. 18 being signed (type-written) “Professor of Assyriology”. It consists of a description of the object, transliteration and translation of the cuneiform text, and finally a short commentary on some of the place and personal names in the text.

(iii) The final group of folios (22110-22113) has the title “Inscribed Pieces of Hard, Black Stone, reported to weigh 160 kilos” and consists of a carbon-copy of a type-written manuscript on coloured, re-used paper, containing a brief description of the object, a translation, and a still briefer commentary.

The first two documents can be considered as Lambert’s first steps towards an academic edition of the text on the basis of the photos, the last one is likely to be a version aimed at a broader public, for example antiquities dealers or collectors. The document contained in the folios listed under (ii) is largely identical with a copy of a manuscript kindly sent to me by Giovanna Biga, which additionally contains Lambert’s signature with the hand-written dates August 1994 for the main text (p. 18), and September 1994 for the addendum (p. 19).

The reverse sides of the re-used papers that served for the carbon copies and the notes offer further indications for the period during which Lambert was working on this inscription, leading to the conclusion that he started working on it in July 1994 at the latest and some time during 1992 at the earliest.8 The signed and dated copies of his transliteration kindly sent to me by Giovanna Biga further clarify that he must have finished working on it by September 1994 at the latest. It is unclear whether he received it earlier and worked on it over a long time, as consonant with the partially earlier dates in some of the lower-numbered folios, or whether he had simply used old paper for his carbon copies. The tone of his writing on this topic indicates that he was very excited by the work (for an example see below). One might tentatively assume in that case that he had in fact worked on the text quite soon after having received the photos, and perhaps during the period from mid-July to August/September of 1994.

We can mainly speculate how long it was before Lambert worked on the inscription that the statue-fragment was excavated. The only known clue here is that Lambert’s photos seem to stem from a situation in which the statue was being stored in quite primitive circumstances, as indicated by the surroundings apparently including a wooden pallet, carpet and what looks like either wood-patterned linoleum, or part of a wooden box. The most that we can surmise is that Lambert’s photos are likely to date quite close to the time of excavation, which is likely to have taken place some time between the 1st Gulf War ending in February 1991 and the first half of 1994. Its likely illicit removal is thus a consequence of the devastating economic climate which engulfed the country after the first US-led invasion and subsequent economic sanctions.

Further clues to the time when this inscription appeared can be found in what one might call “Assyriological lore”, i.e. documents that have been sent to colleagues informally, or that are remembered as having been sent, and are reported either in print or in conversation. In an exposition of how western scholars became aware of the looting of Iraqi archaeological sites after the first Gulf War in 1991, McGuire Gibson writes:

8. (a) A newsletter from a local Birmingham organization dated Aug. 1991 (Folio 22094) and minutes of a meeting of the same from May 1992 (22103-22106). (b) A set of proofs for a review of Sara Denning-Bolle’s book Wisdom in Akkadian Literature (1992), which appeared in Archiv für Orientforschung 40/41 (1993/1994), pp. 116-117 (Folio 22099). (c) Handouts from talks held at the 41st Rencontre Assyriologique in Berlin, 4th-8th July 1994 (Folios 22101-22102). (d) A letter dated 27th April 1994 (Folio 22107). (e) A description of a Cylinder Seal of Red Carnelian signed “Professor of Assyriology,” dated July 1994 (Folio 22109). (f) A prospective list of workshops from a certain organization dated to 1993 (Folio 22111). (g) An appendix to an official document concerning regulations of a public body dated 16.12.93 (Folio 22113). There is no point in making the identities of the particular organizations and individuals appearing in the documents mentioned above public, as they are entirely coincidental and do not bear on the history of the object in any way.
At a meeting of the Midwest Branch of the American Oriental Society in Madison, Wisconsin, in the early 1990s, there was general excitement caused by photographs of a large, black stone statue torso with a long cuneiform inscription. The photographs had been sent by a London dealer, who wanted $400,000 for the object… The object was said to have papers with it proving that it had been in a Swiss collection for many years… A year or so after the photographs first appeared, new prints were circulated again, but this time the price was down to $40,000, and the papers with the object now said that it had been found in Jordan and that it had been exported from that country with the permission of the Jordanian Department of Antiquities.9

Gibson further writes that neither of these alleged provenances was believable, the Jordanian one because one does not expect Old Babylonian antiquities to come from Jordan, and the Swiss one because any such collector would have shown it to a cuneiformist, who would have published it under the title “An important Historical Document in a Private Collection”.10 Indeed Lambert tried to persuade whoever he was writing these documents for that a publication would be extremely useful:

This inscription is previously completely unknown (no known duplicates, even of fragments), and is what historians have been waiting for years back, namely an account of the political and military events of years of this king Samsu-iluna. Its publication would be a major advance in knowledge of this reign (Lambert Folio 22113).

However, his appeal seems to have fallen on deaf ears, as the inscription remains unpublished, and its whereabouts largely unknown. An earlier report available in an internet publication by Gibson suggests that the statue was offered up for sale in 1997 and two years prior to that, which allows us to qualify his reference to the “early 1990s” cited above.11 Gibson also reports rumours that the statue was in New York in the late 1990s, but that he had since heard it was in Italy.12 This rumour may be complemented but not substantiated by a report from Giovanna Biga to the effect that the Italian conductor and collector Giuseppe Sinopoli (1946-2001) had been considering buying it at some time around the mid-1990’s, although Biga thinks it unlikely that the statue ever came to Italy, and Sinopoli in the end did not purchase it.13Taken together with the evidence from Lambert’s documents considered above, it seems likely that the earliest evidence for the statue’s existence comes in the form of Lambert’s work on it during 1994, while it may have gone on sale during late 1994 and 1995.

Some colleagues do seem to have known about its whereabouts, or had access to Lambert’s work, and a transliteration was sent round to various people by David Owen at some point, although it has not been possible to find out exactly when.14 Presumably this formed the basis for the only citation of part of the text of the inscription that had been published until very recently, namely that of col. vi 5’-24’ by Michäel Guichard, which was signaled as being the “not very detailed narrative of the events of year 19” (of Samsuiluna), translated into French with the transliteration being given in a footnote according to the “transcription of D. Owen.”15 There is also the “improved” version of Lambert’s transliteration that Miguel Civil had sent to Piotr Steinkeller (among others?), which was referred to above. It is to be hoped that a wider publication of the inscription primarily on the basis of the Lambert documents will allow it to play a more central role in historical research on this period.

3. THE OBJECT

It is unclear what kind of stone was used to make the statue, and thus how it might have either shattered or been cut to produce the fragment we have. The edges on the top and bottom sides seem remarkably smooth. It seems that some of the damage on the stone was there prior to inscription, as the signs have sometimes been inscribed around holes in the surface: a₂⁻n i - $e₃ ii 32; n a m - d a - 1 a₂⁻a $ i i 33; KI.SU iv 50; - i n - vi 11’. As

13. I am grateful to Giovanna Biga for having communicated this information to me via e-mail (18.09, 29.10, 6.11.2019), and to David Owen for suggesting that I contact her.
14. I am grateful to David Owen for discussing this matter with me.
15. “Des récits quelque peu détaillés des événements de l’an 19” Guichard (2015: 44). “Transcription de D. Owen” ibid. fn. 54, Claire Weir originally brought this citation to my attention. There are some minor differences in fn. 54 to the transliteration by Lambert.
remarked by Lambert below, the signs are sometimes squeezed around the wavy lines, indicating that these were incised first, with an estimated amount of room being left for the engraving of the body of the inscription. This is particularly visible in v 29’ nam - k a l a - g a - k a - n i.

This is clearly part of a statue, and Lambert’s documents indicate that it reportedly weighs 160 kg (see above). He describes it as follows: 16 “The statue was clothed in a long robe reaching to the ankles, and the part surviving is from the legs, above the ankles but below the buttocks. The garment is represented in two ways. First, it is made of flounces, of which much of two and a little of a third remain. Each flounce is marked by undercutting at the top and bottom. Secondly, on the one side there is a decoration consisting of vertical wavy lines, presumably representing crinkly wool hanging down from the leather behind. These lines extend around from the one side to the other, but are not continued all around. At one side there is a carefully shaped protruding ridge in vertical alignment. Its intention is not clear, since garments in flounces have no such vertical extension. Garments not in flounces often have a thickened edge hanging down somewhere. There was obviously some clear function for the ridge, but in the incomplete state of the statue it is not now apparent what it was. The inscription is engraved on one side only, and it begins, as is normal for the period, at the right hand side of either front or back of the statue (the matter is not clear) and proceeds in short vertical lines to the left. The intention of the mason putting on the vertical wavy lines was clearly to cover the garment all round, but the inscription engraver would seem to have stopped him, since the last wavy lines have inscription cut over and around them (dodging where necessary), and the very last wavy line covers one flounce only.”

To my knowledge, this is the only part of an Old Babylonian royal statue in the round made out of stone that is known, so that there is little to compare. It is therefore unclear with what Lambert is contrasting this when he makes his statement above concerning the unusualness of the vertical ridge on the flounced robe. Part of the lower half of an inscribed clay statuette with an inscription of Samsuiluna was apparently found at Sippar, and was for a long time mistaken for a cone, but this is not flounced. 17 Similarly not flounced is a copper statuette of a worshipper also from Sippar which has a vertical ridge indicating the opening of the garment at the front.18

The inscription is inscribed sideways across the flounces, starting from the vertical ridge. This makes it unlikely that the ridge was directly in the front of the statue, as on the statuette from Sippar. More likely one needs to compare statues of Gudea which frequently have, whether seated or standing, one or two vertical ridges running down the side of the robe emanating from a fold in the robe, which is held over the left arm. 19

However, not only do Gudea’s statues not wear flounced robes and belong to a different period, but this vertical ridge (fig. 20) is much larger and protrudes much further from the garment, possibly functioning as a stand of some kind or perhaps even representing a staff the figure is supposed to be holding. There is also what looks like a tenon-hole in one side of the statue (fig. 18), perhaps for attaching another block of statue above, which would imply a sort of modular construction for the whole statue. The tenon-hole does seem to be above rather than below, due to the direction of the one visible flounce, which is pleated downwards, contracting in at the turn to the next flounce. The vertical ridge also seems to become further separated from the dress the higher it climbs, thus fitting the image of a semi-conical robe that widens from the waist. These observations, if correct, make it likely that the inscription started at the left-hand side of the standing figure and continued round sideways, with the columns of writing running horizontally left to right, col. i being uppermost, and col. vii being at the bottom. Judging from the presence of a human hand in one of the Lambert photos (fig. 19), at a very rough estimate the preserved height of the garment and thus of the remaining statue is approximately 50 cm.

4. COMMENTS ON LANGUAGE

It should be clear that Old Babylonian Sumerian was heavily influenced by Akkadian, although the precise nature of the relationship has yet to emerge. 20 Was this a matter of simply writing Akkadian using Sumerian words, or

16. Lambert Folio 22091.
are we dealing rather with an inter-language that has developed its own rules under the influence of each, but is to be described separately from both? Furthermore, how is the linguistic register of this inscription to be evaluated by comparison to others from the wider period? This inscription presents a great opportunity to study Old Babylonian Sumerian grammar extensively, particularly verbs, due to the reasonably standardized syntactic structures of the narrative, but the current presentation will be limited to a general overview. In the following the account of what is referred to as “classical Sumerian” largely follows the grammatical presentations of Attinger (1993) and Jagersma (2010), with reference to special studies of Old Babylonian Sumerian. As a gesture towards analytical transparency, morphological analysis is here marked with +, by contrast to the transliteration using -, even if a full grammatical parsing is not pursued due to space considerations.

4.1. Nouns

4.1.1. Gender: the disruption of the gender distinction of personal/animate vs impersonal/inanimate has been held to be a major factor in changes between third millennium and OB Sumerian. There is some disruption of the distinction between personal and impersonal nouns in this inscription. A human can be put in the locative, whereas this is not usual in third millennium Sumerian (i 3, [lugal] kiengir+ak+a ii 16, iii 47; šul kalaa+ati iii 42; iii 63, cf. Jagersma 2010: 172). However, the distinction between the possessive pronouns –ani (personal, singular) and –bi (impersonal/plural) is upheld with only one clear exception. –ani: iii 31, iv 36, v 16; nam+kala+gi+ani (v 29); ša+g+a+ani+e (vi 9); zi+bi (iii 55, iv 11 plural) min+a+bi iv 40 (refers to town), nam+en+bi (plural), lu+kar+a+bi (v 14 refers to town); klib+bi+ia vi 4 (plural). Exception: bad+ani iii 59 (refers to a town); –anene “theirs” for the P3 personal possessive is used correctly agu+(a)nen+e+ a v 17; lu+erin+gal+anene+(a)k v 24. The use of the verbal prefixes mu– and ba– also may preserve a distinction in use between personal and impersonal nouns (see below).

4.1.2. Locative may be used meaning “place in which” at gu₂-ba (ii 2), although this could also be a phrasal misunderstanding (see comments ad loc.); a+aš+a (ii 11), where this could be a frozen expression rather than an active use. me₁-ba (me₂+bi+a) (ii 34, iv 55); a+gu₂-ne-ne-a (–anene+a v 17); GANA₃ur-ba-ri-a (iv 34); urim+ma (iv 35) seems to be used in a terminative function closer to Akkadian anat, as does harran+ma (iv 33). The locative is primarily used in this inscription to express the logical object of compound verbs (see below).

4.1.3. Directive –e is sparingly used:ugal urim+ak+e (iv 54); possibly ša+g+aš+a+e in vi 9.

4.1.4. Ablatives seems to be used primarily in place of the locative: du–ri₂-k₄-ta (ii 1), a+gar₂ ull₁-ul₁-ta (ii 35, iii 24, iii 37, iv 44) although it is not always possible to tell: [x e]lam ki-ma-ta (i 11?). The ablative is also used in a separative function, but less often: za Gutium+ak+ta (vi 14) although it is not always possible to tell: za Gutium+ak+ta (vi 14).

4.1.5. The terminative –anene is sometimes used where a locative would be usual in third millennium Sumerian, see comments to [BA]D₁,DINGIR (Der)₃-šₑ₁ ba–ši–k₄-u₁ (i 9); but is also used in a directive sense corresponding to the use range of Akkadian anat: mešše (i 6, 38) a+(a)ši+š-e (ii 32) nam+da+ši+š-e (ii 33) nam+da+ši+š-e (ii 20); (dijir galgal) i₄+ši+ši+š-e (i 31); galaš+ši+š-e (iv 1) and adverbially: lušš(e) (iii 48) ul+šš(e) (iii 55) za+šša(e) (iv 4) bar+š-e (v 15); ša+šša+šš(e) (iv 21).

4.1.6. Dative seems to be used sparingly on nouns, where it is also sometimes unclear if it is indicating an indirect object (corresponding to Akkadian anat) or possibly a functional equivalent of a locative (corresponding to Akkadian inat): lugal+ene+e (ii 9); lu+gu–du+ak+ene+e (v 9); ur+šši+ši+š-e (v 12).

4.1.7. Genitive can be expressed as normally in Sumerian inak, with no indication of the final consonant: unug+ak (i 13, ii 29); e₄amš₄-ma (i i 18) ri–ka[b]₄–a for rikab+ak (i 10) ŠE₃: A B (ur₁₃)₃₄-ma (iv 43) ugnim–ma (iv 50); za gutium+ak+ta (vi 14), tabanak (vi 20); or it can be written with –ke₃ standing in for the genitive with no

21. Kürki (1967); Wilcke (1998); Zólyomi (2000); Brisch (2007); Delnero (2007, 2010, 2012). Forms are not included in the following overview if they are not entirely securely attested.


24. Possible exception at iv 31.

25. GAG §114 (c). See Rubio (2008: 120) for a slightly different view, namely that ablative uses that seem like locatives are matters of idiom.

26. ba-k₄ is usually construed with the locative in 3rd millennium inscriptions, where a case can be seen. Shulgi year-name 36: mu ḏanna kar–zi–da e₂–ba–k₄ “year (the statue of) Nanna was brought into the temple Karzida” (interpretation courtesy D. Charpin). Contrast the Old Babylonian construction with terminative –šₑ₁; Shulgi A (“Decad no. 01”), 50: ć-kīš-nu–š₃ ha–ba–ku₄-re–en “may I enter into the Ekišnuugal” (ETCSL 2.04.02.01). See further Zólyomi (2000: 341).
indication of directive meaning, i.e. as a purely graphic, iconic indication of the genitive case: un-ra-lu₃⁻ke₄ (ii 13), ki-tu₄š ri-im₃ ZU/EN-na-ke₄ (iv 1), lugal umma⁻₄⁻a-ke₄ (v 20), uguim i-da-ma-ra-₃⁻aš₄⁻ke₄ (vi 13) all of which are absolute noun-phrases;²² –ke₄ is also written wherever a further nominal suffix begins with –e: lugal ŠEŠ A B (ur₁₃)⁻ma⁻ke₄ (lugal urim+ak+ke₄) (iv 54); lu+umma+ak+ene iv 58; –ka– can be used to indicate a double genitive: ri⁻i-pi⁻I1⁻er₂⁻ra₃⁻ka⁻ta Lichterra+ak+ka+ta (ii 24); in some cases the sign –ka– is used to indicate a simple genitive instead of a double one, in other cases it is unclear: duri⁻ak(ak)+ta (ii 1); pu₃₋₃₋₄₋₄₋ka⁻ta (iv 44); gu₁ eliktum+ak+ta (ii 14); a-gary₂ dan-i-a-um₃⁻ka⁻ta (vi 23). –ka– can also indicate genitive+locative kur elam₄⁻ma⁻ka⁻ (iii 53) zar⁻b₂⁻lum₃⁻ka⁻ (iii 63). A double genitive is reduced to a single genitive at za kur elam+ak+ke₄ (vi 15).²⁸ The genitive may be placed erroneously in lu+gu+du+(a)+ene+n+ak(ak), although this is also a matter of interpretation (see comments on ii 20). The genitive is presumably regular in lu+erim+gal+ene+n+ak(ak) (v 24)

4.1.8. Ergative case-marker –e is used corresponding to pre-radical –n– indicating the 3rd person agent on a perfective verb Rim-Sîn+e… ma₃+n+a+si+ma (ii 23-26). ninta kalag+a+e [sa₃] mu+rene₃+n+tuk+tuk+am (ii 40-41). It is unclear if the ergative subject of na+mu+n+tum (vi 10) is expressed in sa₃+an(i)+e (vi 9), or lugal Al₃+un₃+ak+e (vi 6).

4.1.9. Plural: the personal plural is used: –ene. lugal+ene+r(a) ii 9; lu+gu₂+du+ene+(a)k+ene (ii 20); lu+umma+ak+ene (iv 58).

4.1.10. It is unclear whether the so-called nominalizing –a is used in its function, or whether its appearance is a function of habits of writing or frozen spellings: ninta kala+ga ii 8; lugal kala+ga (v 23). The writing kala+ga in ii 40 suggests the latter for this lexeme.²⁹ See further bad+a+min+i+av iv 40, lu+kar+a+bi (v 14), zig+a (vi 8), ni³₂+bala+a (vi 11).

With verbs the suffix –a indicates subordination (see below).

4.2. Pronouns and connectives

–bi as demonstrative me+b(i)+a (iii 44, iv 55).

–bi as connective: Daghamma₃₄₅₆+bi (v 32).

–bi+ta is used as a connective, presumably a re-interpretation of –bi+(da): ii 12-13; iii 35, iv 48.³⁰

–bi+da is also used in ii 31; ene+bi+da in iii 17.

–u used as connective: ii 1, ii 18, ii 27, 28, iii 42, 44, iii 61, iv 57, v 19.

–ma as connective: iii 22, iii 54, iv 45, iv 59, iv 60. Other cases are less easily explainable with the translation “and”, seem to be using –ma as a focus marker as also sometimes in Akkadian it is used for backgrounding or foregrounding information:³¹ ii 26; iii 1.

4.3. Verb

4.3.1 Preformatives/Modal Prefixes

inga⁻₂⁻: inga+b+im+a (ii 22)³²

la⁻₃⁻: la+h₃+ra+tub₄+ulu₃ (v 15)

na⁻₃⁻ is used consistently in its “non-negative” sense, never apparently as a prohibitive, even if the form that is used frequently involves a reduplication of the nasal with a following one and thus looks very much like the prohibitive na(n)⁻:³³ na(n)+mu+n+i+tum (ii 23-26). ninta kalag+a+e [sa₃] mu+rene₃+n+tuk+tuk+am (ii 40-41). It is unclear if the genitive may be placed erroneously in lu+gu₂+du+ene+n+ak(ak), although this is also a matter of interpretation (see comments on ii 20). The genitive is presumably regular in lu+erim+gal+ene+n+ak(ak) (v 24).
4.3.2. Verbal Prefixes

\(\text{a–:} \ a+n+da+b+du+(e) \) (v 33) \(\) prefix used primarily for describing a state in subordinate clauses.\(^{35}\)

ba–: with non-personal absolutive object: \(\text{me}+\text{se}+\text{ba}+\text{da}+(n)+\text{gub} \) (iii 27);\(^{36}\) passive: \(\text{ba}+\text{du}+(e)+\text{ma} \) (iv 59); separative: \(\text{ba}+\text{si}+\text{ku} \) (i 97);\(^{37}\) \(\text{ba}+\text{ni}+\text{b}+\text{us}+\text{us} \) (iv 34); \(\text{ba}+\text{ba}+\text{ru}+\text{sub}+\text{us} \) (v 15).\(^{37}\)

bi–: used as equivalent to causative: \(^{38}\)

\(\text{bi}+\text{b}+\text{sub} \) (ii 21, = \(\text{ul}\text{am}q\text{issu}n\text{atu} \)); \(\text{inga}+\text{bi}+\text{n}+\text{im}+\text{a} \) (ii 22); \(\text{bi}+\text{n}+\text{gub} \) (v 18’).\(^{39}\) Other cases are more difficult to assess.\(^{40}\)

The verbal prefix bi– is used with a locative, dative, terminative expression in the same context in 22 cases apart from the following 5 exceptions: ii 21-22 (which may correspond to Akkadian causatives); iv 41; v 25; vi 11’.

\(\text{bi–:} \) alternates with prefix i–: when a plural infixed personal indirect object \(\text{(-mne)} \) is present:

\(\text{sa}+\text{g}+\text{e}+\text{u}+\text{ra} \) (with collective object in loc.); iv 39 (with collective object in loc.); v 13’ (with pl. object in dat.); i+\(\text{n}+\text{ne}+\text{n}+\text{ra} \) iii 43 (with pl. object in loc.).

\(\text{za}+\text{a}+\text{bi}+\text{n}+\text{ta} \) (i 17 with sg. object in loc.); iii 41 with pl. object in dat.; 47 with sg. object in locative; iv 56 with sg. object in directive, v 10’ with pl. object in dat.) vs i+\(\text{n}+\text{ne}+\text{n}+\text{ta} \) iii 54 (the three governors of the land of Elam).\(^{41}\)

All cases except v 10’ have a locative expression in the sentence. The prefix bi– therefore does not seem compatible with a dative (plural) personal infix in this inscription, as also observed by Delnero for the texts of the “Decad.”\(^{39}\)

i–: \(\text{i}+\text{n}+\text{ni}+\text{dim}+\text{nu} \) (iv 45). There are no cases of i– which may well be a different prefix.\(^{35}\)

The prefix i– stands in for bi– in this context in cases where dimensional infixes are used (see above).

\(\text{im}+\text{mi}– \) (iii 56); \(\text{im}+\text{mi}+\text{nu}+\text{sub} \) (iv 52, “of the army”, cf. also ii 56).

ma–: 1st person dative.\(^{42}\) “Against me”: \(\text{ma}+(n)+\text{ma}+\text{ta}+(n)+\text{ni} \) (v 17).

\(\text{mi}– \) with \(\text{mi}+\text{ni}+\text{en} \) (iv 42).

\(\text{mu–:} \) as argued by Woods, and backed up by Delnero, the primary use of the prefix \(\text{mu–} \) is with transitive verbs.\(^{43}\)

\(\text{mu}+\text{n}+\text{da}+(\text{m}+\text{a}) \) (iii 34); \(\text{mu}+(\text{n})+\text{ma}+\text{da}+(n)+\text{gub} \) (ii 38) are used with animate/personal nouns as direct objects (Rim-Anum and Dagamma-ilum), whereas precisely the same construction in iii 27, but taking an impersonal/collective direct object \(\text{em}-\text{ri}-\text{n} \), is expressed with the prefix ba–: \(\text{ba}+\text{da}+(n)+\text{gub} \). This preserves a distinction known from Gudea and other third millennium texts.\(^{43}\)

4.3.3 Infixes

\(\text{-(n)ma}– : \) \(\text{mu}+(n)+\text{ma}+(n)+\text{ni}+\text{si} \) (ii 26, iii 22) \(\text{mu}+(n)+\text{ma}+(n)+\text{si}+\text{ma} \) (iv 60)

\(\text{-(n)ma}+\text{da}– : \) the combination of dative (Personal Indirect Object) and Comitative indicates an encounter between two participants directly facing each other.\(^{44}\)

\(\text{sa}+\text{g}+\text{e}+\text{u}+\text{ma} \) (ii 38) are used with animate/personal nouns as direct objects (Rim-Anum and Dagamma-ilum), whereas precisely the same construction in iii 27, but taking an impersonal/collective direct object \(\text{em}-\text{ri}-\text{n} \), is expressed with the prefix ba–: \(\text{ba}+\text{da}+(n)+\text{gub} \). This preserves a distinction known from Gudea and other third millennium texts.\(^{43}\)

through the emphatic form is clearly an element of style. Samsuiluna is apparently using a different emphatic to mark his narrative in this inscription, but also knew the style that uses ha–: RIME 4.03.07.03 (Sippar): 34, 36, 39, 42 (also a narrative after u\(\text{bi}-\text{a} \), with all main verbs in ha–).\(^{35}\)


38. See Zólyomi (2000) on the causative use of bi– and -ni– after their correlative functions in the sentence had been lost and their animacy misinterpreted, leaving them open for re-interpretation according to Akkadian morpho-syntactic categories.

39. Delnero (2010): 548-550). That i– may alternate with bi– in such cases may also be of interest for his further suggestions concerning the sequencing aspect of this prefix (loc. cit. 555). See also for example (sa\(\text{g}–\text{ge}+\text{bi}–\)h) \(\text{je}+\text{ni}+\text{ra} \) (CUSAS 17.37 iii 25 – Sin-iddinam) where the presence of a dimensional infix also excludes bi–. This rule evidently does not seem to hold for all Sumerian in the Old Babylonian period: note bi– in – ni– en – en – l\(\text{a}+\text{a} \) Contratti Ojeil 86 rev. 1.


41. Delnero (2010) establishes a similar distribution for i m – mi – in the collection of Sumerian literary texts known as the Decad as for bi–.


44. Attinger (1993: 251 §160). See also particularly in cases of speaking, fighting or praying: mu – na – da – ab – be \(\text{e}+\text{z} \) “spoke directly to him” Enki and Ninhursag (ETCSL 4.1.1) 233; Iddin-Dagan A (ETCSL 2.05.03.1), 31; \(\text{mu}+(\text{n})+\text{da}+(\text{n}+\text{a}) \) \(\text{k}+\text{u}+\text{i}+\text{ku} \) “entered (to fight)” Marriage of Martu (ETCSL 1.7.1) 63 (“into the wrestling house”-terminative); “enter before (gods)” Lugalbanda in the Mountain Cave (ETCSL 1.8.2.1) 443; Shulgi A (ETCSL 2.4.2.4) 381; Nanía A (ETCSL 4.14.01) 102; \(\text{mu}+(\text{n})+\text{da}+(\text{n})+\text{gub} \) “standing before (god)” Išme-Dagan A+V (ETCSL 2.05.04.01) 379. Compare Akkadian \textit{ana malar}.\(^{41}\)
Pre-radical -e always indicates 3rd sg. or pl. agent of transitive verb, but is sometimes omitted where it might be expected: ba+da+(n+)gub (ii 27, see verbal prefix mu–, and comments ad loc.); mu+(n)na+da+(n+)gub (ii 38); mu+(n)na+da+(n+)gub (ii 6).

Pre-radical -b irregularly indicating direct object in perfective verb: ba+n+us-ub (ii 21).

Pre-radical -b indicating direct object in imperfective verb: ba+n+bi-ub-us.

Pre-radical -da: comitative infix corresponding to coordinated direct objects mu+n+da+n+AK+am (ii 34), cf. -bi+da (ii 31); mu+n+da+n+ni (ii 21), cf. ene+bi+da (iii 17). Used with a plural or collective object: ba+da+(n+)gub (ii 27), na(n)+mu+n+da+n-? (iv 32) (object “massive army”?).

Plural object with reduplicated verb: bi+n+dag-dag (iv 41, 2 walls).

4.3.4. Suffixes

-eš with intransitive, perfective verbs: en-i-ni-šub-bu-uš-a (ii 25); ba+da+n+ma (iv 60) (transitive element of compound verb, but with intransitive overall meaning, subject in -ene); bi+n+i-en-še (iv 63).

-l-eš is used where one might use the Akkadian ana + infinitive construction. sag-ge-de (iv 4, 36, iii 25), sag-šag-ge-de (iv 65); ha-lami-ed-še (iv 59); AK+(e)d-še (iv 62)

Subordinating –a: inga+ni+im+a (ii 22), en-ni-šub-bu-uš-a (ii 25), i+n+AK+eš+aš (iii 31); bi+n+šar-a (ii 27); bi+n+AK+a+a (iii 30).

Participial imperfective –i: i+n+en+da+n+šal+a+e (iii 32); bi-n-nil+il+a+e (v 25), note the apparent preservation of the subordinating –a before the addition of the –e.

–am as copula seems to be being used in a subordinating function in ii 34, and possibly as a means of expressing background or contrastive information to the subsequent statement (victory of Samsuiluna) in ii 34.

4.3.5. Compound verbs used with logical object expressed grammatically in a dimensional case: za₃ – ta₃ + locative (ii 17) + dative iii 40–41 (according to interpretation), v 10³; with dative plural infix but locative object iii 53–54; +dative (iv 54); gu₂ – si + locative (ii 25–26). sag-šal – ra with locative object "zar"-bi₂-lum⁴-ma iii 58; Urim+a iv 38; with dative infix, but locative object: šal kal-a+a i+n+en+ra; with dative object: ur-sag-bi-ne-er (v 12), kiengir+a gu-šal bi+n+šar-a (v 27), pa-e bi+n+ak+a+a (v 30) seems to take two absolute objects (v 28–29), unless one of them is nam+kal₂-ga+ak+anti+še in the directive.

4.4. The language of the inscription thus mostly pays attention to grammatical gender (personal vs impersonal nouns and their interaction with the verbal system), and appears to write double genitives occasionally, although not consistently, both of which have been signaled as datable phenomena in the development of Sumerian after the third millennium. These aspects may indicate that the text was composed by scribes who were well versed in third millennium writing traditions and are affecting a conservative style compared, for example, to the Sumerian of the Larsa-kings Warad-Sîn and Rim-Sîn from a generation or two previously. A very hypothetical location for scribes who might have composed such a text is Nippur, although one should remember that this city was lost to Samsuiluna after his 29th year. At the same time, the presence of innovation in the iconic representation of the genitive through the sign –ke₄, while attested already in the 19th century BC (Sîn-iddinam), is also noticable, perhaps being more typical for Samsuiluna Sumerian rather than specifically for Nippur,
although further research would be needed to establish this. Furthermore, the frequent use of the “non-negative” na– as a narrative marker should be remarked upon, as an indication of possibly local style, but more work is needed to elucidate this. If Nippur, then one is left with two main possibilities. Either this is a text composed in Nippur before Samsuiluna year 30, or it is one composed by Nippurite exiles after that year.\textsuperscript{50} One could also consider that the text was composed in Nippur and the statue set up elsewhere.

5. CONTENTS

5.1. Summary of text

Col. iii: Samsuiluna destroys Keš (“Ninhursag’s Gate”), the residence of Rim-Sîn, perhaps executes\textsuperscript{52} Rim-Anum and Daganma-ilum in (?) Der and then probably executes Rim-Sîn, most likely in Keš.\textsuperscript{53} Ingur-Sîn’, the king of Larsa, is arrested, and by the grace of Marduk and Ninsiana the city of Ur is smashed, its two walls torn down, and its king Puzur-Sîn is arrested at a further unidentified location. The men of Umma raise Rim-Šara to rule over them…

Col. v: the forces of Umma are slain, and Rim-Šara is taken prisoner. A partial recapitulation of the achievements of Samsuiluna from the previous column is celebrated.

Col. vi: rebellion of Iluni king of Ešnuna, who mobilizes the army of Idamaras from Gutium to the border of Elam. These are [defeated] between the Diyala (= Durul) and the Taban rivers in the region of Huruhala, in the meadow of Damnium.

Col. vii: fragmentary mention of some of the place-names ([Durul], Taban, Ubari) from the immediately preceding episode.

5.2. Geographical structure of text

Table 1 shows the geographical and onomastic data. The size of the battles is also indicated by numbers of victims, who are also divided, when relevant, into presumed totals of those that are “defeated” (za₃ – ta₃) and those “mighty heroes” (šul kala-a) or “warriors” (ur-sa₃) that are “slain” (sa₃-ge₃ – ra).\textsuperscript{54} Furthermore, we list the gods who helped Samsuiluna win. The initial action mostly appears to have taken place to the north of Larsa. Der, [Maškan-šapir], Zarbilum, Keš. Table 1 makes it clear that the largest military encounter of the campaign took place in the area of an otherwise unknown town called Lipit-Erra and involved troops belonging not only to Rim-Sîn II but also to his allies Rim-Anum of Uruk and Daganma-ilum (of ?) Kazalu along with the three “Elamite” governors, Tanene, Werriri, Kalumatum. Zarbilum, if the correct reading, also seems to be involved in this specific conflagration, as the capture of its governor and the destruction of its wall are mentioned in the same context. Possibly Lipit-Erra town was somewhere in the region of Zarbilum, which we have further reason to locate somewhere near Maškan-šapir.\textsuperscript{55}

51. For doubts concerning this reading, see commentary.
52. As the verb is in a lacuna, it is conceivable that Samsuiluna “spared” (kar, gub, gi₃) their lives (zi-bi) rather than “cut” (ku₃) their throats (also zi-bi). See the treatment of Warassa (of Ešnuna?) by Sin-iddinam also in connection with Der, although the phraseology is quite different: CUSAS 17.37 iii 66-75, discussion Volk (2011: 64-65, 83-85).
53. This supposition, which is based on a probable restoration, needs to be reconciled with the account in which Rim-Sîn II is buried under a mound at Kiš (RIME 4.03.07.07, 98-100). It is also possible to read the statue text as indicating a reversed order for the order of the fates of Rim-Sîn and those of his supporters: iv 18-19 may signal that Rim-Sîn had already been killed as soon as he was captured, despite the fact that his fate is mentioned after theirs in the narrative succession.
54. The Sumerian verb za₃ – ta₃ literally means “push back, aside” (Karahashi 2000: 176), but is here translated as “defeat”. Discussing Sin-iddinam’s conflict with Warassa (of Ešnuna?), Volk (2011: 66) indicates that he does not think this verb means “defeat”: “lediglich „zurückschlägt“, nicht besiegt”. It is true that a final defeat is also not clearly expressed by this verb in the Samsuiluna statue-inscription, but these are to be understood as provisional defeats that lead up to the final victory over the enemies. It is difficult to think that the verb is not well translated by “defeat” here.
55. See commentary for the location of Zarbilum somewhere near to Maškan-šapir, and thus in the north of Larsa’s area of influence (contra Volk 2011: 78, who locates it more centrally due to associations with Kisura). S. Richardson points
The victory in the region of Lipit-Erra(-town) and the capture of Zarbilum then seems to allow Samsuiluna access to Rim-Sîn’s capital, Keš, which is likely to have been on the eastern alluvium, and presumably from there further on to Der, where Rim-Anum and Daganma-ilum are either killed or spared. Der was a location that had a special place in the history of both Larsa and Babylon. It appears to be an important ally for both sides, due to its contact with Ešnuna and Elam, as well as a role it may have played in mediating Mesopotamian disputes as the home of the divine judge Ishtar. Some activity at Der is attested in column i as well as in column v. However, before Ešnuna comes into play in the inscription, we return to southern Iraq for engagements with Larsa (apparently ruled by a completely different king to Rim-Sîn II). Ur and Umma. The conflict with Ešnuna seems to belong to a different section of the narrative. Unfortunately, we cannot tell from the broken text how it ended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enemy</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Gods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i 1</td>
<td>--ad Der</td>
<td>--ti</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>saĝ-geš-ra dab₅</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 11-22</td>
<td>Eliktum canal</td>
<td>Rim-Sîn</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>za₃-t₃</td>
<td>Marduk šakkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 33-43</td>
<td>Lipit-Erra(-town)</td>
<td>Rim-Sîn</td>
<td>52,043</td>
<td>za₃-t₃</td>
<td>Marduk Annunitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 65-iv 5</td>
<td>Keš (Ninhursag’s Gate)</td>
<td>Rim-Sîn</td>
<td>11,460</td>
<td>za₃-t₃</td>
<td>Marduk Nergal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 6-11</td>
<td>Der</td>
<td>Rim-Anum Daganma-ilum</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>šub</td>
<td>Marduk Ninsiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 23-34</td>
<td>Larsa</td>
<td>Imgur-Sîn</td>
<td>9,032</td>
<td>za₃-t₃</td>
<td>Gibil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 58-v 21’</td>
<td>Umma</td>
<td>Rim-Shara</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>za₃-t₃</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi 5’-24’</td>
<td>Huruhala/Ešnuna</td>
<td>Iluni</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>za₃-t₃</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Overview of action in Samsuiluna Statue inscription

### 6. THE STATUE INSCRIPTION AND THE OTHER HISTORICAL SOURCES

The purpose of the following paragraphs is to set the stage briefly for the presentation of the inscription’s text against the background of the other sources available. The evidence for the revolt against Samsuiluna consists of royal inscriptions of Samsuiluna with fragments of narrative found at Sippar-Yahrurum, Kiš and Khafaje; the year-names of Samsuiluna, year-names of Rim-Sîn II on documents from Larsa, Isin, Ashduba, Bad-tibira, Kutalla, Lagaš, Nippur and Ur, and the year-names and documents of Rim-Anum either found at Uruk in regular excavations at the palace of Sin-kašid or recovered from the antiquities market, especially those associated with the bitāšīr, or house of prisoners. There are also a number of letters involving figures who appear in this inscription: a letter in the British Museum concerning Rim-Sîn’s apparent confirmation by the great gods in Keš and patronage out (e-mail 22.01.2020) that place-names of the type Âl-PN are typical of the Larsa administrative region, and that there is a Larsa administrator called Lipit-Erra attested in AbB 12.265 and 14.210.

57. RIME 4.07.03, 39-54 (Tell Abu Habba, Sippar-Yahrurum); RIME 4.03.07.07, 80-110 (Tell Uhaimir, Kiš); RIME 4.03.07.08 (Khafaje, Tutub).
60. Rositani (2003; 2010); Seri (2013); Charpin (2014); Abed (2018).
from the mother-goddess, also claimed in his year-name (b), and letters from the correspondence of Iluni of Ešnuna, some of which have been published, while others await a scholarly treatment. Additionally, the focus of the action in the first and last parts of the statue inscription is rather more eastward-oriented (Maškan-šapir, Zarbilum, Keš, Der, Ešnuna), this may have repercussions for consideration of where the statue might have originated, given that the content of royal inscriptions can sometimes be related to their immediate contextual function and rhetorical structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-name</th>
<th>Regnal year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si 9</td>
<td>Si 8&lt;sup&gt;66&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Samsuiluna the king ripped out the foundation of the army of the Kassites at/of Kikal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 10</td>
<td>Si 9</td>
<td>Samsuiluna the king…did battle against army of Idamaraš, army of Ešnuna, land of Yamutbalum, Uruk, Isin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 11</td>
<td>Si 10</td>
<td>Samsuiluna the king…destroyed the (great) walls of Ur, Uruk (and) did battle with the army of Akkad for the xth time.&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 12</td>
<td>Si 11</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king, against whom all the countries had again revolted, …did battle against the army of Sumer and Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 13</td>
<td>Si 12</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king, brought (the field of) Kisura and Sabûm into submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 14</td>
<td>Si 13</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king, slew the rebellious enemy kings who had caused Akkad to revolt with their own weapons…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 15</td>
<td>Si 14</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king, (made firm again) the wall of Isin, which had been destroyed…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 17</td>
<td>Si 16</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king, (restored and rebuilt) the great fortresses of Enumbalum which had been destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 20</td>
<td>Si 19</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king, foremost king, attacked the foreign country which was disobedient to him and slaughtered the entire army of the land of Ešnuna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 24</td>
<td>Si 23</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king, …built the wall of Kish on the bank of the Euphrates… and constructed Dur-Samsuiluna (king) in the land of Warûm on the bank of the Durul (Diyala)&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 32a</td>
<td>Si 31</td>
<td>Samsuiluna king dug the banks of the Durul and the Taban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Relevant year names of Samsuiluna for the statue-inscription.

61. Rim-Sîn letter: AbB 13.53: 4-9 (see Vedeler 2015; Michalowski 2019: 678). Iluni: 5 letters published in Guichard (2016; 5) further letters currently in Cornell are being prepared for publication by Jared Miller (Guichard 2016: 19 fn. 6); 4 letters of Iluni are to be published by Jacob Jawdat (Guichard 2016: 19 fn. 7). Another letter of Iluni is found in the Ahmed Saeedi collection in London and has been worked on by SOAS student Claire Weir. Further Iluni letters are reputedly kept in this and other private collections (information courtesy Andrew George).

65. Rositani (2003: 24) already postulated the involvement of Elamites in the rebellion due to their appearance in the Rim-Anum texts from Uruk. See also Seri 2013: 241.
66. Stol (1976: 45) attributes the action of year-name 9 to regnal year 9, instead of to regnal year 8, as is normally done.
67. Source: Archibab unique ID 42733594. The Larsa entry on UET 5.268 is likely to be a mistake, as Uruk (UNUG) is not mentioned, while Larsa is UD.UNUG. There is thus no secure evidence for the destruction of the walls of Larsa in this year (contra Seri 2013: 33). See further Charpin (in press).
68. Inscriptions (RIME 4.03.07.08, ex. 1-2) celebrating the building of Dur-Samsuiluna have been found at Khafaje, mounds B and C of which are thought to correspond to this place (Speiser 1938: 7-10; Freyne 1990: 389).
The number of year-names that Rim-Sin II had and just how they overlapped with those of Samsuiluna and Rim-Anum of Uruk is debated. The difficulties are compounded by the fact that the Sumerian of these year-names is hard to read. For Rim-Sin, it appears that there are year-names for between two and three years, with one of them being only attested at Ur, and whether there were in fact two further ones. This debate cannot be pursued profitably here, but a further table (3) can help to visualize the time-periods within which the absence of documentation with Samsuiluna year-names, and thus the likely lacunae in Babylonian rule, are to be conceived at various sites in southern Mesopotamia. In the case of Uruk, there is no clear evidence for a resumption of power by Samsuiluna or anyone else before the palace of Sin-kašid was destroyed. In the case of the rest of the south, with the exception of Isin and Nippur, any return to Babylonian rule is likely to have been short-lived, not more than a couple of years.

Table 3. The maximum length of the revolt according to southern Mesopotamian data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Larsa</th>
<th>Ur</th>
<th>Kutalla</th>
<th>Ur</th>
<th>Bad-Tibira</th>
<th>Nippur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>last Si date</td>
<td>27.x Si 8</td>
<td>11.viii Si 8</td>
<td>–.vi Si 8</td>
<td>28.i Si 8</td>
<td>–.iii Si 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first Si date</td>
<td>1.i Si 10</td>
<td>10.xi Si 10</td>
<td>15.viii Si 10</td>
<td>3.x Si 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The maximum length of the revolt according to southern Mesopotamian data

Around two years thus seems to be the maximum time allowed for the initial phase of the revolt, according to local data from southern Mesopotamia, although this varies from place to place, and one needs to factor in that there are likely to have been further rebellions that are hidden beneath Samsuiluna’s increasingly vague as well as temporary year-names. For Rim-Anum of Uruk, there appear to be three year-names, spread over 18 months, of which the third seems to exclude that he could have been in alliance with Rim-Sin, as he wins a victory against Yammutbalum, Ešunnna, Isin and Kazalu, although it must be admitted that the Sumerian is not entirely transparent here. This list of enemies being similar to that of Samsuiluna year 10 leads Annunziata Rositani to hypothesize that Rim-Anum had changed sides to Babylon and participated in the final defeat of the revolt.

The statue inscription may have an entirely different narrative, where Rim-Anum of Uruk is paired up with Daganma-ilum of (?) Kazalu in support of Rim-Sin, right until what seems to be the end of Rim-Sin’s career, at least in the understanding of the narrative that is advanced here. Messengers and slaves sent from Daganma-ilum are attested in the Rim-Anum documents from Uruk, and he himself had been thought to be a grandee of Muti-abal, the main city of which seems to be Kazalu.
The alternatives are that the statue inscription is either to be understood differently, or it is forming its narrative in retrospect according to rhetorical principles and telling the story differently to the way events are currently reconstructed from the documentary evidence. If the statue inscription is in fact to be understood in such a way that Rim-Anum and Daganma-ilum are not executed in col. iv 8-11, unlike the three governors of Elam, and in fact Rim-Anum changes sides at least for a short time once Rim-Sîn is dealt with, then there is a specific period into which this event would need to be fitted. A document from Larsa dated to the very end of Rim-Sîn’s second year (RS II 2b 26.xii) details flour for a troop from Uruk under one Šuritak (?), the UGULA MAR.TU, “general”, of Uruk, which has been thought to be evidence for supporters of Rim-Sîn II coming from Uruk to Larsa to help defend against Babylon.79 Only 14 days later, a document from Larsa is dated to Samsuiluna, during which time there would have to have been a change of allegiance on the side of the Urukuan army.80 This seems an overly tight timeframe to which to date events happening over a large area, and the reality of rebellion may have been far more decentralised and fluid on the ground, with constantly shifting alliances, than a narrative of changing sides or opposing blocks might accommodate.

There are various limits on the usefulness of royal inscriptions as historical sources, not least the ideological lenses through which their narratives are filtered, which tend not to take cognizance of failures and defeats.81 This is also the case with the previously available Samsuiluna royal inscriptions that mention the revolt, which may have presented a telescoped and selective narrative, quite possibly ranging over many years. As with the statue inscription, there is likely to have been some conditioning at work from the genre conventions with which the text aligns itself, most clearly with the trope of winning multiple victories in one year known from Naram-Suen’s Great Revolt, a third-millennium Akkadian text that was copied at Nippur in the Old Babylonian period, as well as forming the inspiration for Old Babylonian compositions on the same topic.82 However, this does not mean that the contents of royal inscriptions are entirely fictitious. They are merely to be understood within the context of certain conventional expectations, including those of the circumstances which motivated their composition.

In one inscription from Sippar-Yahrurum, Samsuiluna counts his victories, presumably against the rebellion, as 8 in one year.83 However, the Akkadian version of Samsuiluna’s Kiš inscription tops Naram-Suen’s achievement of 9 victories in one year: “The year was not half over, he slew Rim-Sîn, who had caused Yamuthal to rebel, who had been raised to the kingship of Larsa, and he heaped up a burial mound over him in the territory of Kiš. Twenty-six rebel kings, his enemies, he slew, he slaughtered them all.”84 The less than half a year period has been held to fit to the documentary evidence, given that tablets dated to Samsuiluna resume so quickly at Larsa during his tenth regnal year.85 This fits with the chronology of Rim-Anum texts from Uruk, on the basis of which the text aligns itself, most clearly with the trope of winning multiple victories in one year known from Naram-Suen’s Great Revolt, a third-millennium Akkadian text that was copied at Nippur in the Old Babylonian period, as well as forming the inspiration for Old Babylonian compositions on the same topic.82 However, this does not mean that the contents of royal inscriptions are entirely fictitious. They are merely to be understood within the context of certain conventional expectations, including those of the circumstances which motivated their composition.

In one inscription from Sippar-Yahrurum, Samsuiluna counts his victories, presumably against the rebellion, as 8 in one year.83 However, the Akkadian version of Samsuiluna’s Kiš inscription tops Naram-Suen’s achievement of 9 victories in one year: “The year was not half over, he slew Rim-Sîn, who had caused Yamuthal to rebel, who had been raised to the kingship of Larsa, and he heaped up a burial mound over him in the territory of Kiš. Twenty-six rebel kings, his enemies, he slew, he slaughtered them all.”84 The less than half a year period has been held to fit to the documentary evidence, given that tablets dated to Samsuiluna resume so quickly at Larsa during his tenth regnal year.85 This fits with the chronology of Rim-Anum texts from Uruk, on the basis

79. PSBA 39.21; Stol (1976: 51). Földi (2011: 100). Seri (2013: 45) thinks that this might be an enemy Uruk army being fed by the defeated city before the local scribes had a chance to change the year-name. This is not impossible, but requires a number of assumptions. The name Šuritak, if this is the correct reading (šur-it-a-a-uk), is not otherwise attested to my knowledge, but it looks Elamite (“fortune has been sent”, see šuru “Glück” Hinz & Koch (1987: 1182), ša-ta- “deposit, put, send”, ša a a-na ša-a-uk, + passive participle), which is of interest given the involvement of the three Elamite governors in the decisive battle, and the presence of Elamites in the Rim-Anum documentation from Uruk (Rositani 2003: 234). Not listed in Zadok (1984), presumably due to being broken, but compare ibid. 4 on Elamite names in Larsa and PN šur-ri-ri built on a root šur-at Zadok (1983: 105 fn. 307).
80. YOS 12.314.
81. On methodological questions relating to the reliability of Royal Inscriptions for historical reconstruction, see Charpin (2012: 21-32).
83. RIME 4.03.07.03, 40-51.
84. RIME 4.03.07.07, 92-103: ša-at-ta-um la im-ša-lam (93) ri-im-ZU:EN (94) mu-aš-be-al-ki-it (95) ki-e-n-ša-sag (96) ša a-na šar-ru-at UD.UNUG(larsa); (97) in-na-šî-šu, (98) i-na-ar-ma (99) in er-se-et kiš, (100) dam-tam e-li-ša ši-pu-uk (101) 26 lugal ša-am-maš i (102) za-i-ri-ša i-na-ar (103) gis-e-er-ša-xu iš-ki-iš. The killing of Rim-Sîn II contradicts the version in the “Early Babylonian Chronicle”, which has him being taken into the palace alive according to Stol (1976: 53), but see the translation by Glassner (2004: 272-273), which leaves this more open. S. Richardson points out to me via e-mail that 12 enemies are mentioned in the statue inscription alone, so the figure of 26 may be approaching reality in some sense.
85. 1 i Si 10 (YOS 12.314); 12.ii Si 10 (TCL 11.219); Stol (1976: 50).
of which Andrea Seri has also reconstructed that Larsa fell near the end of Samsuiluna’s ninth or the beginning of his tenth year, with Rim-Sîn possibly resisting elsewhere in the south for a few months after that.\textsuperscript{86} The statue inscription, however, presents a very different picture, with Larsa only being attacked after the destruction of Keš and various other battles, which appear to have taken place towards the east, and it being ruled by an otherwise unheard of king, Imgur-Sîn.\textsuperscript{90} Furthermore, the statue inscription seems to have Rim-Sîn being killed at Keš, although the text is not entirely secure. That he was buried under a mound at Kiš, possibly as a victory monument in the place that had spawned the Great Revolt against Naram-Suen, is not excluded by this narrative, and allows us to understand better the motivation for the inclusion of this episode in Samsuiluna’s Akkadian-language Kiš inscription. It is thus necessary to posit his being killed in one place and buried (as a trophy) in another place to make the narratives of the royal inscriptions fit with each other.\textsuperscript{87}

The main overlap between Samsuiluna year-names, previously published royal inscriptions and this statue inscription is the rebellion of Ešnuna under its king Iluni. The narrative in the Akkadian version of Samsuiluna’s Kiš inscription proceeds directly to the defeat of Iluni of Ešnuna, whom Samsuiluna led away in a neck-stock and “devoured” his life.\textsuperscript{88} The Sumerian version of the same inscription only has the Iluni episode, specifies that he has his throat cut with a knife, and mentions neither Rim-Sîn nor any of the other cities of the south.\textsuperscript{89} Iluni was clearly a significant opponent, as may be shown by the fact that someone with this name at some stage seems to have had control over an important person in Ur, Sîn-ibbišu, even if the tablet with the seal-impression signaling his servitude to Iluni is dated to Samsuiluna regnal year eight.\textsuperscript{90} Sîn-ibbišu, son of an official who served at Ur under Hammurapi, is called the servant of Rim-Sîn II in his seal on two further documents from Ur.\textsuperscript{91} This example demonstrates how complicated and fragmented the situation in southern Mesopotamia was, but it is nothing to be surprised about, given the context of Mesopotamian history in this period. A coalition of Larsa, Uruk and Ešnuna against Babylon 100 years previously was explicitly formalized in a treaty, and the Rim-Anum documents from Uruk also attest close contacts between the three.\textsuperscript{92}

Iluni ends as Samsuiluna informs us in his Kiš inscription, but it is unclear precisely when. One might argue that he met his end in the conflagration of Samsuiluna’s year nine as consonant with the occasional mention of Ešnuna alongside Yamuthbalum and Idamara as narrated in the tenth year-name.\textsuperscript{93} However, the statue inscription follows the victory against Rim-Sîn with the destruction of Zarbilum, Keš, the demise of Rim-Sîn, some sort of action in Der, and three separate campaigns against southern Mesopotamian cities, before Iluni makes an appearance. This may be too much to accommodate within a year. On the other hand, armies may be operating without the direct leadership of the king himself on the spot, and events may be being summarized sequentially which happened at the same time.\textsuperscript{94} However, the appearance of a new king at Larsa in the statue inscription also suggests a later date for this particular attack.

It is possible that this king of Ešnuna, for whom we have six separate year-names, survived the defeat of Idamaras (and Ešnuna) referred to in Samsuiluna regnal year nine, and then finally succumbed in regnal year 19. This would mean that both Samsuiluna’s Kiš inscription, which mentions Rim-Sîn and Iluni one after the other, and the statue inscription, are presenting selective narratives in historical retrospect.\textsuperscript{95} Of course we have no clear idea how much narrative was left after the text trails off on the statue. If the Iluni narrative is in fact the

\textsuperscript{87}. It is sometimes assumed that the victory over Rim-Sîn must have occurred near Kiš, e.g., Rositani (2003: 22 fn. 61). I do not think this needs to be the case.
\textsuperscript{88}. RIME 4.03.07.07, 104-111.
\textsuperscript{89}. RIME 4.03.07.07, 60’-65’.
\textsuperscript{90}. 28.ix Si 8 (JCS 24, 95 no. 11).
\textsuperscript{91}. 26.iii RS 21 (JCS 24, 95 no. 9); 27.viii RS II 2 (JCS 24, 97 no. 21). Seri (2013: 49-51). Iluni year-name in Ur at HE 167 (Charpin 1986: 174-175). Guichard (2016: 28 fn. 40) disputes that this is the same Iluni, somewhat aporetically.
\textsuperscript{92}. Guichard (2014); Rositani (2003); Seri (2013).
\textsuperscript{94}. There is no suggestion, for example, that Rim-Anum led the troops from Uruk who went with Šuritak (?) to aid Larsa, if that is the correct interpretation of PSBA 39.21.
\textsuperscript{95}. Guichard (2016: 28 fn. 40) “rappel historique tardif”.
last one before the apparent recapitulation of events that seems to occur in the fragmentarily preserved column vii, then it is possible that the use of the Iluni story has some relevance for the statue’s functional context. One example of a suitable context for the mention of both Iluni and of more extended revolts in the south would be that provided by year-name 23, which refers to the building of the wall in Kiš (where Rim-Sîn was buried), as well as the building of Dur-Samsuiluna on the Diyala, in the heartland of Iluni’s sphere of influence. A location of the statue somewhere in the Diyala area would explain both the Iluni episode and the focus on Keš and other places to the north of Larsa and east of Babylon in the statue’s narrative.

The major obstacle to placing the statue-inscription in year 23 is the fact that Rim-Anum, whether he changed sides and survived Rim-Sîn or not, had clearly been removed from power by someone in the intervening period, and in fact quite likely in the year after the death of Rim-Sîn. This is not referred to in the text as we have it, unless Rim-Anum’s demise is in fact narrated in column iv 8-11. In that case, we have a conflict with the documentary evidence, which suggests he survived Rim-Sîn for a brief period. The alternative is that the composition of this statue inscription is in fact to be dated to the same time as Samsuiluna year-name 11, and describes the events of year 9 and 10 of Samsuiluna’s reign plain and simple. This is only conceivable if widespread Babylonian forces were operating simultaneously over a large area stretching from Larsa to Keš in the very least, and if Larsa was defeated twice in one year: once as suggested by the documentary evidence while Rim-Sîn was ruling it, which must have been at the very end of year 9, and once a little later during year 10, when it was ruled by Imgur-Sîn. This too is difficult to fit with the documentary evidence, as Samsuiluna year-names are attested from Larsa during year 10, and the year-name of that year no longer mentions a defeat of Yamutbalum.

The historical placement of the statue-inscription is thus of course extremely speculative, but a later placement provides an explanation for a number of the differences between the history reconstructed from year-names and documents and the narrative of the statue, which would present a retrospective and rhetorically stylized summary of a number of years of rebellion. Possibly, Rim-Sîn’s revolt stretches over most of Samsuiluna’s regnal years 8 and 9, and was primarily based in Keš, but spread over most of the south, allowing him to have his year-name used at various cities, including Larsa. Larsa, despite what we are told in the Kiš inscription, is not the centre of the revolt, although clearly key as the historical capital of Yamutbalum, nor is it the first place that Samsuiluna attacks, as some have thought on the basis of the evidence of the year-names. On the contrary, the defeat of Larsa, Ur and Umma referred to in the statue inscription may belong to the following 10th regnal year of Samsuiluna, or indeed a later one, after Rim-Sîn had stopped having his year-name used in those places, and there had presumably been further rebellions, now led by Imgur-Sîn, Puzur-Sîn and Rim-Šara. There remain a number of aspects which are uncomfortable under this account, not least the difficulties in reconciling the statue narrative and that reconstructed from documents, the fact that Yamutbalum is not mentioned in the year names after the tenth, as well as the fact that Rim-Sîn is called in the statue the king of Sumer (Kiengir) rather than of Yamutbalum, thus with an explicitly southern focus as opposed to the more northeasterly centre of activities that his rebellion and its defeat seem to have in this presentation of events. These problems cannot be solved here, where the main purpose of the presentation is to prepare for the edition of the text.

7. THE TEXT IN TRANSLITERATION AND TRANSLATION

In the following transliteration I have tried to keep to the system of transliterations of Sumerian signs recommended by P. Attinger and C. Mittermayer, due to the fact that most colleagues are now presenting Sumerian texts according to these phonetic values and not to do so at this stage would cause more confusion...
than is already available. Lambert’s document from 1994, on the other hand, does no such thing. Where the commentary cites Lambert’s or Civil’s versions, in as far as they differ from the readings in the text below, it keeps their original transliterations.

### Column i:

| 1  | [sa₃g-geš b]i₂-in-ra | 26' | [x]-me-en |
| 2  | [x]-ti KIS₇₃, ARAD (ṣagana') | 27' | [x]-KI-ma |
| 3  | [x]-ad ki₂₃, ka | 28' | xx-ta |
| 4  | [x]-bi₂₃-in-dab₅ | 29' | -nje-ši-in-[(...)]-gi²-in |
| 5  | [x]-xx-na | 30' | [ze-]e-2-en |
| 6  | | 31' | []-ta |
| 7  | | 32' | []-xa |
| 8  | [x]-x-ab-ta-x-ma | 33' | [x]-da-e-[(...)]-ze-2-en |
| 9  | [BA][D₃, DIN]GIR(Der)ki₃-še₃ ba-ši-ku₄ | 34' | [-]šen |
| 10 | [r]i-im₄[ZU:EN]-e | 35' | [-ka/sa]-g |
| 11 | [x]e[lam]ki₂₃-ma-ta | 36' | [-gi [...] -en'] |
| 12 | [r]i-im-A[N]-um | 37' | [...]-ti |
| 13 | [l]ugal unu ki₃-ga | 38' | [[(...)]-ri-im-m³[ZU:EN [...]]-še₃ |
| 14 | [x]-ma-[a]-[n]-x-x | 39' | [...]-(u)u₃ |

**Translation:** (i 1-15) …slew …captured [PN]-ti, governor of [GN]-ad. He …ed the… from… and entered into Der. Rim-Sin …ed Rim-Anum king of Uruk from the [land?] of Elam. (i 26-42) “I am (the)… of… ( -place?). From the/At the… x- ed to/against them… you (pl.) are from… you are?… battle/shining (?)”, Rim-Sin to… and…

### Column ii

| 1  | u₃-idu-ri₂-k₃-ta | 24' | eri₃²-da gi²tukul-ta |
| 2  | gu₂-na[m]-mu-un-ne-en-gar | 25' | en-nišub-bu-uš-a |
| 3  | gu₂-id₂-lik-tum-k₃-ta | 26' | gu₂ mu-na-ni-in-si-ma |
| 4  | gi³tukul sag₃-ge-de₃ | 27' | ri-im-A[N]-um |
| 5  | nam-mi-in-lah₄ | 28' | u₃ šul kala |
| 6  | me₃-še₃ mu-na-da-gub | 29' | unu₃-ga |
| 7  | sa-am-su-i-lu-na | 30' | da-gan-ma-DINGIR(ilmum) |
| 8  | ninta kala-ga | 31' | eri₃² ka-zal-lu₃-bi-da |
| 9  | lugal-e-ne-er | 32' | a₃-ni-še₃ |
| 10 | SAG SAD DUR in-na-an-X₃-ma | 33' | Nam-da-la₂-aš |
| 11 | a₂-ｑ₃₂-g₃₂ | 34' | mu-un-da-an-AK-am₃ |
| 12 | a₃amar-utu | 35' | a-gar₂₃ ul₁₃-la-ta |
| 13 | ²ṣag₂₃-bi-ta | 36' | ²štukul sag₃-ge-de₃ |
| 14 | [gu₂]³e-li₃k-tum-k₃-ta | 37' | nam-mi₃-in-de₆ |
| 15 | [ri]-im₄[ZU:EN] | 38' | me₃-še₃ mu-na-da-gub |
| 17 | [za₃]b₃₂-in-ta₃ | 40' | ninta kala-ga-e |
| 18 | ²š₃₁₃₁₀x₆₀+1₀x₆₀+7₆₀+5 | 41' | ³š₃₃ mu-un-ne-ši-[i]n-tuku-am₃ |
| 19 | u₃gniḥ | 42' | [a₂a₂]-g₂-ša₂ |
| 20 | ²š₂-g₂-du₃₂-a-ke₄-ne | 43' | ³[a]₃mar-utu |
| 21 | bi₂₂-ib₂₂-sh₂₂ | 44' | [a]n-nu-ni-tum-bi-ta |
| 22 | in-ga-bi₂₂-in-im₃₂-ma | 45' | ri-im₄[ZU:EN] |
| 23 | ri-im₄[ZU:EN]-e | 46' | [l]ugal ki-em-gi-ra |

---

100. The so-called “Attinger readings” are to be found in Mittermayer (2006), with some corrections in Attinger (2007). For readers who wish to gain a quick overview, the main alternatives used here are: za₃₃ = za₃, ta₃₃ = ta₃, i₃ = irt = uru = i₃ = id₃, šaq₃₃ = (KIS) = šak₃₃, ta₄ = tak₄, ta₃ = ta₂, ta = dah, sa₃₃ = šig₃, ša₃ = ša₃. Signs written in capitals are merely identifying the signs, and do not need to follow any transcription conventions other than what is needed to identify them, e.g. DINGIR not DIGIR, ARAD not URDU₃. 
And from/at the... of the Durik-canal he gathered them all (and) at the bank of the Eliktum-canal he brought them to fight (and) set them up for battle against him (i.e. Samsuiluna). Samsuiluna, the strong man,...ed to him (and) the kings and by the command of Marduk and...caused 1665 (men), an army of enemies, to fall, even while making them run away. Yet Rim-Sîn gathered together with (his) troops against him, as many as had escaped from battle. Having made Rim-Anum and the mighty heroes of Uruk (and) Daganna-ilum together with the troops of Kazalu into an auxiliary force at his side, he brought (them) to fight in the meadow of haste/prosperity (and) set them up for battle against him (Samsuiluna). Samsuiluna, the strong man, took courage against them. By the command of Marduk and Annunitum he defeated...swiftly Rim-Sîn, Rim-Anum king of Uruk and Daganna-ilum, together with [the troops] they had raised, their...es...he made fall, ...in [Maškan-ša]pir he slew...

Column iii

1. mu-ni-in-BAD-ma
2. lu₂ us₂-sa₃-a
3. nu-mu-ni-in-taka₄
4. ri-im-AN-um
5. u₃ da-gan-ma-DINGIR(ilm)₄-a
6. da'₃-ni-še₃
7. mu-un-ne-en-ku₄-ma
8. ta-ne-ne
9. šagana
10. ri-kab₅-a
11. we-er-ri-ri
12. šagana
13. un-ra-lu₅-ke₄
14. ka-lu-ma-tum
15. šagana
16. ar-ru-ak₄
17. e-ne-bi-da
18. erin₂ elam₅-ma
19. nam-dugud-bi-ta
20. nam-da-la₂-ni-še₃
21. mu-un-da-an-ri
22. gu₂ mu-na-an-si-ma
23. ki-in-DU
24. li₂-it-ery₅-ra₅-ka-ta
25. š₄tkul sag₅-ge-de₃
26. nam-mi-in-lah₄
27. me₃-še₅ bu-da-gub
28. sa-am-su-i-lu-na
29. lugal a₂-gal₂
30. digir gal-gal
31. nam-a₂-tah-a-ni in-AK-e₄-a₅
32. nir in-ne-da-an-gal₂-la-e
33. a₂-āg₂-ga₂
34. d₅mar-utu
35. nergal₆-bi-ta
36. ki-in-DU¹(GIŠ)
37. li₂-it-ery₅-ra₅-ka-ta
38. 36,000+(4x3600)+600+(7x60)+20+3
39. u₅ğnim
40. lu₂-gu₂-du₅-a-ke₄-ne-er
41. za₃ bi₂-im-ta₃
42. u₃ 3600+3600+2400+(7x60)+40+2 šul ka₅-a-a
43. sa₃-g-e₅s in-ne-en-ra
44. u₃ me₅-ba
45. ri-im⁻ZU:EN
46. lugal ki-en-gi-ra-ka
47. za₃ bi₂-in-ta₃
48. u₃ lu₂-a-aš bi₂-in-dab₅
49. ta-ne-ne
50. we-er-ri-ri
51. u₃ ka-lu-ma-tum
52. šagana-šagana
53. kur elam₅-ma-ka
54. za₃ in-ne-en-ta₃-ma
55. zi-bi u₅-le-e₅
56. im-mi-in-ku₅
57. z₅r-bi₂-lum₅-ma
58. sa₃-g-e₅s bi₂-in-ra
59. bad₅-da-ni
60. im-mi-in-dag
61. u₃ ši-li₂-utu
62. šagana
63. zar-bi₂-lum₅-ka
64. šu bi₂-in-ud₃
65. ka₂-nin-hur-sag₅-ga₂⁶b

101. Or: “and placed [...] for them on the bank of the Durik-canal.”
...he let them die\textsuperscript{102} but did not leave behind (his) supporters, he made Rim-Anum and Daganma-ilum enter onto his side and he mobilized as his auxiliaries Tanene governor of Rikab, Werri governor of Unrau, Kalumatum governor of Arrua, with them the troops of Elam in their masses. They gathered for him and he brought them to fight and set them up for battle in the region of Lipit-Erra-town). Samsuiluna, the strong king, put his trust in the great gods who had supported him. By the command of Mardu and Nergal in the region of Lipit-Erra-town) he defeated an army of 52,043 enemies and he slew 10,062 mighty heroes. And in that battle he defeated Rim-Sin king of Sumer and he took him prisoner. He defeated Tanene, Werri and Kalumatum, the three governors of the land of Elam, and swiftly cut their throats. He smashed Zarbilum, pulled down its wall and arrested Silli-Šamaš, the governor of Zarbilum.

Column iv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ki-tuš ri-im-\textsuperscript{4}ZU:EN-na-ke₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>gal₃-ša₃-ge₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mu-ni-in-ku₄ bad₃-u₃-ge₃(-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>za₃-ga-aš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>bi₁₂-in-ha-la[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>igi sa-am-su-i-lu-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ninta kāla-ga-[še₃]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ri-im-AN-[um]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>da-gan-ma-DIN[Gir(ilm)-bi]³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BAD₃-DINGIR(Der)[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>zi-bi x[-…]-an-[ku₅]³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>sa-am-s[u-i-lu-na]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>lugal ka[laغازا]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>lu₂-kur₂ [... ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>bi₁₂-in-[-…]-ha-la[m…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ri-im-[\textsuperscript{4}ZU:EN]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>lugal ki-[en-gi-ra-…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>[u₄]-šu b₁₂-in-du₁₁-a¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>[sa₃-g₃]-ge₃ b⟩₁₂-in-ra⟩²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>lugal ki-[en-gi-ra-…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>lu₂-gu₂-du₃-a₄-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>mi-ni-in-[ku₅]-a₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>sa-am-su-i-lu-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>u₃-[x]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>lu₂-gu₂-du₃-[-…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>UD.UNUG(ararma)\textsuperscript{ki}[-ta³]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>nom-ta-a-\textsuperscript{n-e₃}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>[i₃]-gur-[\textsuperscript{4}ZU:EN]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>lugal UD.UNUG(ararma)\textsuperscript{ki}-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>šu bi₁₂-in-du₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>u₃-šu-[…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>nom-mu-un-da-an-D[U]³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He turned the town of “Ninhursag’s Gate”, the residence of Rim-Sin, into a hole, on walls and wood he perpetrated destruction utterly. In front of Samsuiluna, the strong man, Rim-Anum and Daganma-ilum had their throats cut\textsuperscript{102} in Der. Samsuiluna, the strong king, destroyed the enemies... [When] he arrested Rim-[\textsuperscript{n}], king of Sumer he had him killed. He turned “Ninhursag’s Gate” into a rubble heap (like one after) a flood. He brought out the enemies [like a storm... from Larsa. He arrested Imgor-Sin, the king of Larsa, he dispersed his massive army, sending them each on (their) way. He turned his shining forehead towards Ur. He smashed Ur, he demolished its two walls. He caught up with Puṣur-Sin, the king of Ur, at the spring of Menimeratum. By the command of Mardu and Ninsianna he felled 691 of the army of enemies. He defeated Puṣur-Sin the king of Ur in that battle and arrested him. The men of Unuma had been nominated for destruction and they gathered together and elevated Rim-Šara to exercise lordship over them. On the Urbani field he did battle...\textsuperscript{102}

Column v

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sa²-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

102. Alternatively “finished”, or “opened”.
...listened to him. By the command of Gibil and others he defeated an 11,460-strong army and slew 9,032 of their warriors. Their fugitives were unable to escape out of there, he established his victory over them, and took Rim-Šara the king of Umma as a prisoner. Samsuiluna, strong king, who had been in the process of exterminating the seed of the wrong-doers, having subjugated Sumer, as a means of making his strength resplendent (in the form of) great deeds, [he ...-ed] Rim-Anum and Daganna-ilum, who had been his enemies,…

Column vi
1' i x...
2' gu₂ [an-da-ab]-du₂-[uš₇]
3' nam-mu-um-[n-ne]-ib₂-us₂-[us₂₇]
4' kilib₂-ba šu bi₂-[i[n]-du₃-a-aš₇]
5' DINGIR(i lum)-ni
6' lugal aš₂-nun-na₃-ke₄
7' ni₆₂₄-erim₂
8' ni₈₂₂-zi-ga
9' ša₂-ga-ne₂
10' na-mu-un-tum₂
11' ni₆₂₂-bala-a bi₂-in-ak
12' u₁₇₅im

...the [ones who had been his] enemies, he directed against them in order to arrest them all. Iluni, the king of Ešnunna, his heart carried (i.e. he wanted) hatred (and) violence, he made a rebellion. The army of Idamara from the border of Gutium as far as the border of Elam, he raised against me in their masses. Between the Durul and the Taban rivers in the region of Huruthala, in the meadow of Danniatum, to do battle…

Column vii
1' i x...
2' x x...
3' ki₇ x...
4' gu₂-[d₃₅ur-ul₃]
5' [₁₇₇] ta-b[a-an-ka-ta]

On the bank of the [Durul (and)] the Taban,…[in] the Urbiri field…Samsuiluna

8. TEXTUAL COMMENTARY
i 2 Civil read the second preserved sign as bal. Lambert (Folio 22092) saw: …ti a šir. The third sign seems to have a diamond element on its left. The sign formed of the components KIŠ-ARAD (otherwise rendered in transliteration

103. Or: “Iluni the king of Ešnunna brought hatred (and) violence into his heart”.
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as KIŠ. NINTA₂, GIR₂. NINTA₂), and transliterated as šага/ина (or more recently šакканак, Keetman 2019), is the most likely reading in my view. See further comment on ii 9.

Lambert read the last two signs as sa₂-du₁₁, but close inspection suggests there is a third horizontal in the body of the diamond-shaped sign. Civil read ar₂₃ k-a (using the Sumerian name for Larsa), although the sign before the KI is more clearly AD than UNUG. Theoretically [in²] ur₁₃ b-ša₂₃-k-a would be possible (suggestion courtesy JJJT), see the writing dal-ba₂₃ found at Naram-Suen: “Great Revolt” BT iv 15° (Wickler 1997). However, the traces before the sign AD, do not correspond to BA. Possibilities are [jib-r]a-at₃ (suggestion courtesy S. Richardson), which may be associated with Der in the Sîn-iddinam barrel (iii 47-73; Volk 2011: 71-72, 80-82): [zib-n]a-at₃ (suggestion courtesy D. Charpin), a by-form of Zibnatum that is in the region of Karkar (IM₄) and Dur-Sin-muballit (according to Abb 1.67, 11) and which is clearly an important settlement, due to being mentioned in the 17th year-name of Rim-Sin I.

Lambert read the first preserved sign as [lu₂-a]-a₃, for which see iii 48, v²1⁴. However, a grammatical object is needed for a compound verb taking a logical object in a dimensional case. șu₂-dab₃ may be a possibility, but does not fit well with the traces in the photograph.

Lambert read ad-bi x x. Civil omits this line. Close inspection (fig. 2, fig. 21) suggests the reading adopted here, which looks like a verb with an ablative dimensional infix on an impersonal pronominal base, followed by the connective –ma.

Lambert separated this line into two, while Civil read them as one. The latter is followed here due to there being no clear dividing line. Lambert and Civil both read an - k₁ - še₃, "to heaven (and) earth". The traces of the preceding sign suit BAI₃ much better, thus Der, which occurs later at iv 10.

One might expect to find [larsa₂]mki-ma₄-ta here, but UD.UNUG (larsam) does not correspond to the traces on the photographs. Civil read [ur₂³]ma₄-ta, but the same objections apply to SÈŠ.AB as to UD.UNUG. On close inspection, the traces of the place-name look like NIM, and would require a small sign to be missing beforehand, perhaps [ku₁] (see iii 53, vi 15°). Thus we have Eliam.

Lambert reads the traces of the second and third signs in i 14 as - ma₄-n-, which could fit a transitive verb with a ventive sense, and the reading is also adopted here. Rim-Sin is presumably doing something (e.g., “rallying”) from “Elam”, here possibly including the border territory of Der, and is involving Rim-Anum, king of Uruk.

The use of the first or second person singular copula –men₃ “I am, you are” strongly suggests that the narrative has moved to direct speech, as also suggested by the 2nd plural copula –[en]zen “you are” in line i 32, 35. A close parallel, also with a plural 2nd person, is found at RIME 4.03.07.07, 28°-33°, where Enilij enjoins both Zababa and Štar to encourage Samsuiluna to rebuild the wall of Kiš, a direct speech which then leads directly into campaign narrative. One might speculate that here, Rim-Sin is asserting himself as king of Sumer/Yamutbal, and calling on others to join him, possibly even Rim-Anum and Egunna-ilum. If so, then we are likely to be near the beginning of the narrative part of the inscription.

Lambert read -gi⁻iⁿ, which would have to mean “confirm”, but NLK points out to me that the sign looks more like ZI. ZI does not give a great deal of sense as a verb here. A mistake of ZI for GI would be the other option (see also vi 17°).

JM suggests the A could be ZA, which would bring us back to 2nd sg.

Lambert read this as belonging to separate lines, and preferred ZI to GI.

Lambert read the traces as x-e₂.

Lambert reads the first preserved sign as [lu₂-a]-a₃, for which see iii 48, v²1⁴. However, a grammatical object is needed for a compound verb taking a logical object in a dimensional case. șu₂-dab₃ may be a possibility, but does not fit well with the traces in the photograph.

Lambert reads the first preserved sign as [lu₂-a]-a₃, for which see iii 48, v²1⁴. However, a grammatical object is needed for a compound verb taking a logical object in a dimensional case. șu₂-dab₃ may be a possibility, but does not fit well with the traces in the photograph.

Lambert reads the first preserved sign as [lu₂-a]-a₃, for which see iii 48, v²1⁴. However, a grammatical object is needed for a compound verb taking a logical object in a dimensional case. șu₂-dab₃ may be a possibility, but does not fit well with the traces in the photograph.
etymological play on the Sumerian for Tigris: idigānam = id↓-ēn-a = “flowing (river)”, an etymology which goes back as far as Delitzsch (1914: IV 6, 21). This account is unlikely to be correct due to advances that have been made since then in understanding Sumerian (for example the separation of g and ŋ). The Elilkitu is presumably a different canal or river, but an eastern location is likely.

ii 4 gē↓-š-tuk↓1 - saŋ, is usually translated “defeat”, for example in year-names. In this inscription it cannot mean that, as the enemy is doing it, so “do battle” is preferred. Whether this less transitive translation can be applied to other attestations, with the resulting change in historical nuance, is a question for further research.

ii 6 Lambert: mu-na-da-gin “he advanced”, which is the form in a similar context in ii 38. Here the sign is quite different, so a mistake would have to be assumed if they are in fact the same. To read us₂ would give us a meaning like “he lined up against him”. However, the signs DU and US are very similar in this inscription, and the content must be the same as ii 38, where the sign is clearer. Thus we read -gub following Civil.

ii 9 Lambert: “among kings”, following on from the previous line.

ii 10 basic structure is clear but the meaning is obscure. The sign designating the verbal action looks a little like SIG-gar, but no obvious sense. CWH suggests tuš, but this is difficult to reconcile with the traces. Civil read it as -sum-, a reading also suggested by ARG in London, but this also looks quite different to what we have. A collocation saŋ ur is also not attested as far as I can find, a “knotrow broid”? Civil read inim-du-ga, but on close inspection the final sign is clearly DUR, as in vi 19, not GA, and KA is usually kept distinct from SAG in this inscription. A meaning for the whole phrase such as “turned his attention to him” would fit the context.

ii 16 Rim-Sin II is charged with having instigated the rebellion of the region of ki-en-gi-sa…

ii 21 see comments on language. See 4.3.2, 3, fn. 48.

ii 22…

ii 25…

ii 28…

ii 29…

ii 30…

ii 31…

ii 32…

ii 33…

ii 34…

ii 35…

ii 36…

ii 37…

ii 38…

ii 39…

ii 40…

ii 41…

ii 42…

ii 43…

ii 44…

ii 45…

ii 46…

ii 47…

ii 48…

ii 49…

ii 50…

ii 51…

ii 52…

ii 53…

ii 54…

ii 55…

ii 56…

ii 57…

ii 58…

ii 59…

ii 60…

ii 61…

ii 62…

ii 63…

ii 64…

ii 65…

ii 66…

ii 67…

ii 68…

ii 69…

ii 70…

ii 71…

ii 72…

ii 73…

ii 74…

ii 75…

ii 76…

ii 77…

ii 78…

ii 79…

ii 80…

ii 81…

ii 82…

ii 83…

ii 84…

ii 85…

ii 86…

ii 87…

ii 88…

ii 89…

ii 90…

ii 91…

ii 92…

ii 93…

ii 94…

ii 95…

ii 96…

ii 97…

ii 98…

ii 99…

ii 100…

ii 101…

ii 102…

ii 103…

ii 104…

ii 105…

ii 106…

ii 107…

ii 108…

ii 109…

ii 110…

ii 111…

ii 112…

ii 113…

ii 114…
although somewhat earlier than the rest of the evidence suggests that this form was current. D. Charpin suggests (e-mail 20.05.2020) that one could read da-ša₁₄l₁₁, which could be derived through a regular voicing process for the dental 〈TLL〉, the root of Akkadian tilatum “auxiliary”.

ii 34 Lambert read mu-uni-da-an-gal-eʔ-ām. However, the sign AK is quite clear by contrast to gal/e on closer inspection. Civil also read AK. Compare a₂-ni-še₃ ba-an-AK-eš “joined him at his side” Gilgamesh and Hawawä A (ETCSL 1.8.1.s) 53.

ii 35 There is late bilingual evidence for ni₂-šu₄ being the equivalent of Akkadian piritu “terror” (CAD s.v.), but the overwhelming use of reduplicated u₁₁-šu₄ in Sumerian literary texts of the earlier 2nd millennium BC is to indicate “haste”. Note that the battle-front has moved from the river/canal-banks of the Ellikum to the fields beside a canal or river (a-gar₂), Naram-Suen during the “Great Revolt” also fights battles against the Kišite coalition in a “meadow”, most likely using the same concept ugārum (expressed by SIG₂; Marchesi 2001) as here indicated by a-gar₂. BT 1 25” in ba-ri₂-ti (27) A HA₂ (28) u₁₂ (29) ur₃₃₃ U₁₁₃U₂₉ (30) in SIG₂-r₂₂ (31) ṢEN.ZU (32) i₃₂-[d]Ur₂₂-ul₃₃₃ (33) REC 169 (34) u₂-gar-e “Between Tiwa and Urum he (phur-Kiš) drew up (list of allies) in the meadow of Suen and awaited battle” (Haul 2009: 79);¹⁰⁴ BT ii 8” ud₁₁u-a (9) in SIG₂-r₂₂ (10) ṢEN.ZU (11) REC 169 (12) i₃₂-ku₃₃₃-nu₃₃₃ (13) i₃₂-šu₄-za₃₃₃-ma “At that time they joined battle (and) fought with each other in the meadow of Suen.” This passage was re-worked in the Old Babylonian compositions concerning Naram-Suen and the Great Revolt (Haul 2009: 78). The conceit of a rebel leader drawing up allied troops in an ugārum and fighting a battle there is quite similar.

ii 41 restoration [ṣa₂₃] courtesy JJT.


ii 57 Lambert read -a₁₁₄-ra. However, the suggestion (courtesy ARG) to restore ŠA BRA (=PA.AL) here is convincing and of significance, as this would be likely to be the name Maṣkan-Saqir (Tell Abu Durwa), a major city in the north of the territory of Yamutbal/Larsa (Stone & Zimansky 2004), on the way to Ešnunna and a border with Babylon.

iii 1 the verb can either be b₃a₃ “to open” or ti₃-la “to finish”, as Civil seems to have understood it, or indeed the plural u₂₄, here likely to be used causatively.

iii 2 the photographs are poor here and the surface may also be worn. Lambert saw ir₁₃u instead of n₁₃u₃₃₃. The list of allies in BT i 14...iii 5 the –a at the end of Daganma-ilum’s name is obscure, and throws some doubt on the identification of the verb in line iii 6 reading follows Lambert, Civil has a better sense. The traces could also support a reading taka₁₃₄, which should by rights take an absolutive object.

iii 6 the –a at the end of Daganma-ilum’s name is obscure, and throws some doubt on the identification of the verb in line iii 7, which should by rights take an absolutive object.

iii 8 reading follows Lambert, Civil has a₂₃-t₃₃₃-ku₃₃₃-ux. The final sign is not clearly –še₃ on close inspection, but it is also not clear that it is anything else. The first sign DA may have some traces inside the body of the sign, thus A₃₂, but it is not clear, and the inscription does not clearly distinguish between DA and A₂. Cf. “Great Revolt” BT i 1:34 DA-[i₃₂-su₄] (35) ig₃-[r-ux]-i₃₂-m[a] “hurried to his side” (Wilké 1997).

iii 9 the verb was read as ku₃₃₃₃ by Lambert. The form of TU, which has by this time merged with ku₃₃₃₃ in the inscription looks very much like Sêšu, the first with the distinctive form that the Winkelhaken cluster takes in this inscription. That could be the sign that is found here, but it is not at all clear.


iii 11 the writing for Akkadian šakkanakūk₃₃₃₃ (ša-ga₃₃₃₃, KiS:ARAD, also transliterated șagnina) is discussed recently at Schrakamp (2010: 199-208) and Keetman (2019: 8-10), who suggests a Sumerian reading ša₃₃₃₃kan₃₃₃₃ (ku₃₃₃₃). Keetman’s evidence for this depends to some extent on Ur III writings (e.g. ša₃₃₃₃-ga₃₃₃₃-na₃₃₃₃-ku₃₃₃₃), which are unlikely to refer to an office at all, and sometimes denote a personal name (see critique of the equation by Sallaberger apud Attinger 2007; and further Schrakamp 2010: 200). It is therefore wisest to stay with the albeit imperfect rendition of the sign as ša-ga₃₃₃₃. The listing of captured ša-ga₃₃₃₃ who took part in the rebellion and their captains (nu-banda₃₃₃₃)

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Haul (2009: 79). However, I do not restore a verb (idki₂₃-assassintu) in the break at BT i i [22] as does Haul (2009: 70), also Fryane (1993: 386). The list of allies in BT i i 14'-25' is all the object of the verb isad₃: “and he drew up (the forces of) Kiš, Kutha, Tiwa, Sippur, Girtab, Apia… [and] the Amorite highlanders in the field of Suen and awaited battle.” The partially comparable context at BT i i 21// PBS 5.36 iii does have this verb (idki₂₃-assassintu) and forms the grounds for the restoration, even if the context is not identical.
is a feature of Naram-Suen’s Great Revolt inscription: BT 1 ii 25’, HS 1954+ iv 28, vi 22, vii 8 (Wilcke 1997; Sommerfeld 2000: 426). Precisely what office the term referred to is unclear. Shrakamp observes that the military meaning “general” is chronologically secondary, only arising in the Sargonic and Ur III periods (Shrakamp 2010: 203). Here the Elamite sāgāna are being summoned to participate in battles, certainly, but in other attestations in the statue-inscription (2 ii 62) the sāgāna are in all likelihood simply the highest military/political representative in a city.

iii 10 Rikab (SZm imperative of rakābūm “ride!”) sounds like a station on a route, otherwise unattested. Civil read šuṣim$k^1$-a.

iii 11 Werriri (or indeed Pirriri) could be Elamite, compare RAE ur$ri-ri$, or MBE $pi$-$ri$-$ri$ to root pīr-. Zadok (1983: 104 fnn. 259, 106 fn. 348).

iii 12 Lambert read kur NIM ki-ma, but on closer inspection, the first sign is more likely to be erin.

iii 13 Unralu is unknown.


iii 15 Rikab (SZm imperative of rakābūm “ride!”) sounds like a station on a route, otherwise unattested. Civil read šuṣim$k^1$-a.

iii 16 Arrua(+ak) is possibly to be compared with Urua/Arawa, a border area with Elam usually written URUXA$^k$.

iii 17 Lambert read nam-$a^{-ni}$-šēṣ, but the traces correspond more closely to the word elucidated in iii 33.

iii 18 Lambert read kur NIM ki-ma, but on closer inspection, the first sign is more likely to be erin$^2$.

iii 19 Lambert read nam-$a$-$a$-$n$-šēṣ, but the traces correspond more closely to the word elucidated in iii 33.

iii 20 Lambert read nam-$a$-$a$-$n$-šēṣ, but the traces correspond more closely to the word elucidated in iii 33.

iii 21 The sign DU seems to have been incised mistakenly with the broken horizontal on the top rather than on the bottom. The word ki-in-DU can mean earth (as opposed to heaven), earth as ground or territory. A Susa manuscript of Urmanna A provides it as a variant for in-d1 in the meaning of “route”, most likely a mistake based on similarity of sound (Ur-Namanna A [ETCSL 2.04.01.01] 73, Fluckiger-Hawker 1999: 114, 144, 152). In one variant manuscript of the Song of the Hoe, the final sign is likely to be read du: ki-in-du-uš (ETCSL 5.05.04, 17, ex. 24 obv. Z7-Foxvog 1976: 105). Possibly a different word, the final sign can be resumed in a following syllable with -ba: Hammurapi, RIME 4.06.03.02, 63, has a doubtful case referring to the land around a canal at Sippar, but in the Akkadian parallel text, this seems to correspond to aua eresitu, where the -ba is the equivalent of the Akkadian possessive pronoun (JNES 7 269 B iii 9); more solidly, in Samsuiluna’s third year-name ki-in-gub-ba (=ki-in+gub+a) also refers to the land of a watercourse is dug (Horsnell 1999: 278-279). In a year-name of Abšu, the word is attested with a place-name, giving the location of a defeat of the troops of Ešnunna: ki-in-DUTA-ši-il$^1$-ka-ta (MHET 2/6, 889 rev. 13), which is the closest to its use in this inscription. The bilingual and contextual evidence thus seems to indicate that eresitu in the meaning “territory” (CAD E 311-12, meaning 3) is the best correspondence for this word, while the question of the reading of the final sign is not significantly advanced by this new evidence.

iii 22 ša-da-gub is usually intransitive in the expression bar-ta ba-da-gub used for example in city-laments, where the god stands outside the forsaken city, “like an enemy”: ETCSL c.2.2.6 (Eridu), B6; c 2.2.2 (Ur), 254. However, the verb is likely to be transitive here given the parallel with iii 38 (see comments on language).

iii 23 The identification of the first sign is problematic. Lambert read ur$^{-1}$-bi$^{-1}$-lum, but the sign is not ur$^3$ (compare the sign-form in iv 42). ARG suggests that the first sign is ZAR, given that it is essentially a square with something inside and Zarbilum fits the geography better, being associated with Larsa. A document from Larsa dated to Rim-Sin I details the provision of 92 pigs under the authority of the overseer of the merchants of Zarbilum for messengers of the god stands outside the forsaken city, “like an enemy” (JNES 7 269 B iii 9). Possibly a different word, the final sign can be resumed in a following syllable with -ba: Hammurapi, RIME 4.06.03.02, 63, has a doubtful case referring to the land around a canal at Sippar, but in the Akkadian parallel text, this seems to correspond to aua eresitu, where the -ba is the equivalent of the Akkadian possessive pronoun (JNES 7 269 B iii 9); more solidly, in Samsuiluna’s third year-name ki-in-gub-ba (=ki-in+gub+a) also refers to the land of a watercourse is dug (Horsnell 1999: 278-279). In a year-name of Abšu, the word is attested with a place-name, giving the location of a defeat of the troops of Ešnunna: ki-in-DUTA-ši-il$^1$-ka-ta (MHET 2/6, 889 rev. 13), which is the closest to its use in this inscription. The bilingual and contextual evidence thus seems to indicate that eresitu in the meaning “territory” (CAD E 311-12, meaning 3) is the best correspondence for this word, while the question of the reading of the final sign is not significantly advanced by this new evidence.

iii 24 The identification of the first sign is problematic. Lambert read ur$^{-1}$-bi$^{-1}$-lum, but the sign is not ur$^3$ (compare the sign-form in iv 42). ARG suggests that the first sign is ZAR, given that it is essentially a square with something inside and Zarbilum fits the geography better, being associated with Larsa. A document from Larsa dated to Rim-Sin I details the provision of 92 pigs under the authority of the overseer of the merchants of Zarbilum for messengers of the god stands outside the forsaken city, “like an enemy” (JNES 7 269 B iii 9). Possibly a different word, the final sign can be resumed in a following syllable with -ba: Hammurapi, RIME 4.06.03.02, 63, has a doubtful case referring to the land around a canal at Sippar, but in the Akkadian parallel text, this seems to correspond to aua eresitu, where the -ba is the equivalent of the Akkadian possessive pronoun (JNES 7 269 B iii 9); more solidly, in Samsuiluna’s third year-name ki-in-gub-ba (=ki-in+gub+a) also refers to the land of a watercourse is dug (Horsnell 1999: 278-279). In a year-name of Abšu, the word is attested with a place-name, giving the location of a defeat of the troops of Ešnunna: ki-in-DUTA-ši-il$^1$-ka-ta (MHET 2/6, 889 rev. 13), which is the closest to its use in this inscription. The bilingual and contextual evidence thus seems to indicate that eresitu in the meaning “territory” (CAD E 311-12, meaning 3) is the best correspondence for this word, while the question of the reading of the final sign is not significantly advanced by this new evidence.

iii 25 The identification of the first sign is problematic. Lambert read ur$^{-1}$-bi$^{-1}$-lum, but the sign is not ur$^3$ (compare the sign-form in iv 42). ARG suggests that the first sign is ZAR, given that it is essentially a square with something inside and Zarbilum fits the geography better, being associated with Larsa. A document from Larsa dated to Rim-Sin I details the provision of 92 pigs under the authority of the overseer of the merchants of Zarbilum for messengers of the god stands outside the forsaken city, “like an enemy” (JNES 7 269 B iii 9). Possibly a different word, the final sign can be resumed in a following syllable with -ba: Hammurapi, RIME 4.06.03.02, 63, has a doubtful case referring to the land around a canal at Sippar, but in the Akkadian parallel text, this seems to correspond to aua eresitu, where the -ba is the equivalent of the Akkadian possessive pronoun (JNES 7 269 B iii 9); more solidly, in Samsuiluna’s third year-name ki-in-gub-ba (=ki-in+gub+a) also refers to the land of a watercourse is dug (Horsnell 1999: 278-279). In a year-name of Abšu, the word is attested with a place-name, giving the location of a defeat of the troops of Ešnunna: ki-in-DUTA-ši-il$^1$-ka-ta (MHET 2/6, 889 rev. 13), which is the closest to its use in this inscription. The bilingual and contextual evidence thus seems to indicate that eresitu in the meaning “territory” (CAD E 311-12, meaning 3) is the best correspondence for this word, while the question of the reading of the final sign is not significantly advanced by this new evidence.

iii 26 a $š$illi-Šamaš as governor of Zarbilum is otherwise unknown. There are many individuals with this name in Old Babylonian documents, according to the Archišab files (accessed 28.11.2019). Probably to be excluded is the $š$illi-Šamaš who has a subaltern relationship to the merchant Balmanamhe (Van De Mieroop 1987: 18; ABB 14.55-64) who dates a little earlier in Larsan history. The name is associated with Larsa in documents from later in the reign of Hammurapi: ABB 5.137, 6; ABB 13.38, 7 (UGOLA MAR.TU); in documents dated to Samsuiluna year 1 (YOS 12.13, 3); year 3 (RA 69.8, 28 - father of a witness); year 7 (YOS 12.557, 34 - UGOLA DAG.GI$^A$; cf. also TCL 11.174R, 34); year 5 (YOS 12.290, 42 - DAM.GAR$^A$). It does not seem likely that any of these are secure candidates for the governor of Zarbilum during the revolt of Rim-Sin II, but neither can they be completely excluded.
Civil thought there were two obscured lines before this, which is unlikely on close inspection. He also read the first two signs as ša-₃-dab₅. Close inspection supports Lambert’s reading.

The readings are very uncertain. Lambert considered reading Ša₂ instead of še₃, without suggesting a translation. Furthermore, Lambert saw a further line-divider here, where it is not possible for me to see one.

Lambert (Folio 22112) translated the verb as “[routed]”, but made no suggestion for its identification in the transliteration. Lambert transliterated: har-ra-an-an₃, but no gloss-wedges are visible. Moreover, Lambert saw a further line-divider here, where it is not possible for me to see one.

Lambert and Civil both read the first sign as u₃. Civil read ki-₃ a₃? ib. Lambert’s restoration is not precisely paralleled, but is likely to be correct (du₃ a₃še₃). The sign before the break could be im₃, (thus i₃m₅ ma₅-an-x), but this does not fit the traces well. The sign b₃ does fit the traces more or less, but it is difficult to see how a sign this large could lead on to an infix written with -an₃. A restoration b₁-d₃-a₁-an-x seems grammatically unlikely, due to the differing functions of prefix b₁- and infix -da-.

Lambert (Folio 22097) read i₃l₃u₃g₃a₁ x here. However, the first sign is markedly shorter than the lugal in the line above and is likely to be l₃u₃. The recognition on the basis of a close-up scan of the photo that the following sign is kur₂ is owed to JT in London. This was also the reading of Civil reached independently.

One would wish for lugal ki-₃ e₃g₃i-₃ r₃a-₃ k₃a-₁, but there does not appear to be enough space.

[u₄₁] (suggestion courtesy MCL) is needed, due to the paratactic placement of the two verbs with the first one conveying information that is already known. The reading may correspond to the visible traces. ki would also be a possibility.

Lambert was more prudent and read: [x₃] x n₃[e]. There does not seem at first sight to be enough room under the damage for the sign SAG, but in fact the sign needs to be only a fraction smaller than that in iv 36 after copying and pasting the sign-form from there. More problematic is the sign read here as še₃, which is too short for the regular form in this inscription. The precise reading of this line is therefore doubtful, but it is likely that Rim-Sîn here meets his end, as we then pass on to other victims.

Lambert and Civil both read the first sign as u₃, but iri is more likely given ii₃ 65, and is not excluded by the traces. Civil also read DAG instead of KA₂.

Civil read ki’₁ a’₁ ib. Lambert’s restoration is not precisely paralleled, but is likely to be correct (du₃₆ a₃mar₃ u₃₃(a₃) k₃ₑ₃). The destructive force of the flood is a simile in Sumerian city-laments, cf. Lament over Sumer and Ur (ETCSL c.2.2.3) 107; Lament for Umug (ETCSL c.2.2.5) 13.

The restoration -e₃ is very likely, given that the prefix chain n₃₃m₃₃-t₃u₃₃-a₃₋₃an₃ is rarely construed with any other verb in Old Babylonian Sumerian.

A king of Larsa named Imgur-Sîn is not attested previously, but the name is common at Larsa and Ur (UET 5 p. 44b-44a). Alternatively, D. Charpin suggests to me that one could read Ǝ[N.KI], then Imgur-Ua, or Ǝ[N.LIL₂], then Imgur-Elil.

Lambert restored du₃g₃d₃-a₃-bi. Civil [ni₁], both reasonable, given that the verb is unclear. du₃g₃d₃-a₃-bi is quite frequently attested (ETCSL 1.2.2, 127; 1.6.2, 60). An u₃gni₃ in du₃g₃d₃ (or uru₃m₃₃₃₃ k₃a₃b₃t₃₃u₃₃ kém₃₃) does not seem to be attested, but armies do things in their masses, n₃₃m₃₃ du₃g₃d₃-ba (Abieššu year-name MHET 2/6, 889 rev. 13, cf. here iii₃ 19, vi₁₆). A transfer of meaning seems natural. du₃g₃d₃-a₃-border₃ (e₃g₃₅) may also fit the traces, to give an adverbial meaning.

Lambert (Folio 22112) translated the verb as “[routed]”, but made no suggestion for its identification in the transliteration (Folio 22097).

Lambert transliterated: h₃r₃-ra-an-n₃₃a, but no gloss-wedges are visible.

Civil transliterated -DU-DU, but the signs are more clearly U₃S, although there are some problems differentiating the two in this inscription. Lambert (Folio 22097) translated “and gave them the order to march.”

The suggested interpretation, using še₃n as an equivalent of ku₃, is owed to KW. Lambert translated “he pushed his battle-front to Ur” (Folio 22112). For še₃n = el₃-l₃um₃, e₃eb₃-bu₃-un in OB Aa, see CBS 11001+ (MSL 14.87A) rii₂ 26-27 (DCCLT). The doubling of še₃n is likely to be intensive.
iv 40 the two walls of Ur are not attested as a specific phenomenon to my knowledge elsewhere. However, it is unlikely that this is anything more than a reference to the walls of the inner and outer towns that most larger ancient cities possessed, thus another way of indicating complete destruction through a merism. Recent work at Ur has shown that the city was much larger than previously thought, and could well have had two walls (Hammer 2019).

iv 42 the reading Puzur-Sin, an otherwise untested king of Uruk, was suggested by Lambert in his commentary (Folio 22107) with no explanation, and the remark that it would be an unparalleled writing. He also identified the first sign as SAG, which may be suggested by the photo of the preserved sign in iv 53, although the traces can be interpreted differently: rather than one single upright, they are the parallel heads of a stack of horizontals. Possibly KA is being used here for puzur₃, due to the fact that puzur₃ consists of KA-SA (suggestion correctly ARG). puzur₄ (= KA) is attested only once in Old Babylonian according to the files of CDLI (accessed 27.10.19), at UET 6.150 rev. 10: puzur₅:puzur₆ "secrets".

iv 44 Lambert transliterated the first sign more cautiously as HAB. It could be pu₂, and thus another geographical feature.

Lambert also saw the second sign of the place-name as IR, while Civil read the line as x maš K A K maš-ra-tum-ka-ta.

iv 45 dim₃ is a difficult verb to translate, corresponding to Akkadian sanāqqu, but taking an absolute object. Lambert translated it as "shut in" (Folio 22112).

iv 57 u₃ šu bi₂- and in-d₃u₃ are separated by a line divider, that has not been taken into account in the line-numbering on the assumption that it is erroneous.

v 6 the evidence for 4BIL.GI being a writing for Girra in addition to Gibil (WGI l 7, Zaia 2017) dates to after the Old Babylonian period, so Gibil is understood here for the sake of caution. It is interesting that Gibil (or Girra!) appears on his own here, when all other instructing deities in this inscription appeared in a pair. There was possibly room for writing of Girra’s name in the second half of the line.

vi 3’ –ke₄ is used as marker simply of genitive.

v 21’ here the sign is clearly šag₂a, otherwise read as še₂₉, i.e. LU₂ x ES₂ (man with rope), whereas in another occurrence in this inscription (iii 48) it is less clearly the correct reading. For discussion of šag₂a/še₂₉, see Steinkeller (1991: 230-231; id. 2013: 136); Attinger (1993: 596 §616); Volk (2011: 82). For šag₂a instead of šag₂a, see Mittermayer (2006: 104 no. 258). We may here have more evidence that there was also a value šag₂a, for LU₂, which was the form of the sign in iv 48, but direct collation should be awaited before further comment (see Mittermayer 2006: 102 no. 253). Lambert (Folio 22111) translated the occurrence of lu₂-a-a in iii 48 as "seized him as an (ordinary) X? man", and also here (Folio 22112). One should also note that šag₂a/še₂₉ appears in the Old Babylonian copies of Naram-Suen’s Great Revolt inscription: BT iii l0’, iv 22’ / PBS 5.36 iii ‘H 1954+ vi 19 (Wilcke 1997), as well as in Samsuiluna RIME 4.03.07.08, 46.

v 3’-32’ it is somewhat surprising that Rim-Anum and Dagumma-ilum re-appear at this juncture if they were fatally dealt with in iv 11. Possibly we are now crossing over into a recapitulation of what has been achieved so far before the narrative moves geographically further afield. The recapitulation of events including those narrated in the next section seems to be resumed in column vii. The succession of imperfective (v 25’) and non-final forms (v 27’, 30’, 33’) suggests a movement towards a crescendo, although we cannot be sure how this continued. When the text resumes, the location of the action is further north.

vi there are c. 40 lines of text missing at the beginning of the column.

vi 5’ for Iluni, see RIME 4.03.07.07, 104-110, 61’-65’ and above fn. 61 and pp. 30-31.

vi 6’ –ke₄ may indicate genitive -(a)-, with genitive suffix, with ša₂₉-ga-ne₂ in a dimensional case (directive), although the Akkadian construction is grammatically different due to having the "heart" as subject of the verb "to carry" (CAD A 21 abalu r. A3d). Cf. also cases where "heart" is in the genitive in this phrase: ša₂₉-ga-ne₂ nīg₂-erim₃, mu₂-e-ti₁₁-b₂-tum₃ Šuši B 297; RIME 4.02.13.15 (Warad-Sin) 202’-204’; Falkenstein (1957: 68).

vi 7’-8’ nīg₂-erim₃, nīg₂-a₂-z₉₇ Sulgi E 77, 80; Iddin-Dagan D 84; Eme-Dagan A+V 98, 192; Martu A 26; CUSAS 17.37 ii 25; RIME 4.01.05 add 10 (Laws of Lipit-Îmar) 29, 496; RIME 4.01.10.1001 (Emil-bani) 149.

vi 11’ nīg₂-baḷa only seems to be attested in lexical lists in the OB period: lu₂₂ nīg₂-baḷa-baḷa = ša-na-ba-al-kas-tum, OB Lu 122, MSL 12.161; OB Lu Recension D = [mu₂-aš-tab-la]-ki-tum. The usual word for "revolution" is ki₃-baḷa.
vi 12'-17' –ke₄ makes no sense here on Idamaras. By contrast in the parallel Samsuiluna passage to this one (RIME 4.03.07.08, 25-30), –ke₄ makes sense as a genitive + directive dependent on gu₂ と言って bɪ₂₃ in - ɡaʳ - ɡaʳ ra “having subjected” (with the subject being Samsuiluna). For the two areas called Idamaras, this one in the Zagros piedmont, another one in the Habur region, see Guichard (2015).

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This is an extraordinary inscription, which can in no way be edited in full detail by means of a publication in article format, but one which it is also unjustifiable in my view to withhold from the scholarly community so long as would be necessary to compile a monograph on the topic. This presentation has only scraped at the surface, and was unable to resolve with any certainty the question of the precise dating of the text’s composition or the precise location of the object’s installation. On the one hand such are among the problems of working with unprovenanced antiquities. On the other there is still no consensus concerning the dating of other royal inscriptions of Samsuiluna that deal with the rebellion. It is to be hoped that more extensive investigations of factors such as language, briefly broached above, might yet bring some clarification. Nothing has been said here about palaeography, even though the inscription has a number of peculiarities, which cannot be properly investigated on the basis of photos.

Much more is also to be said about the political and religious ideology behind the narrative, the apparent positioning of the events in the tradition of Naram-Suen’s suppression of the Great Revolt 500 years previously, as well as the motivation for the selections of the different deities who act in partnership with Marduk in instructing Samsuiluna to attack particular places. The reasons for this extended story in the context of a Babylonian royal inscription also need to be investigated. What was it supposed to achieve in the context of a genre of inscription writing that so rarely focused on the warlike?

An in-depth study of the historical geography, which presents us with a number of new names and new clues for localisations, would likely bring interesting results concerning power relations over space during this period that saw the beginnings of the end of the rule of the First Dynasty of Babylon in southern Iraq, especially as the geographical focus of the narrative appears to be quite different to that known from other sources concerning the rebellion. It is to be hoped that advances that are being made by scholars such as Jaafar Jotheri in understanding watercourses and the ancient landscape in Iraq might also play an enhanced role in understanding the watercourses that seem so important in this inscription. Added to this of course are the ongoing excavations and the publication of the finds from past excavations in precisely the region where we now expect Rim-Sîn’s city of Keš to have been (see commentary above).

Although there remain archives to be published in museum collections around the world that will also help to illuminate the events of this period, the circumstances under which this text is being made public should also not be forgotten when assessing its value: it is published on the basis of photographs that have survived mainly among the papers of one man and could easily have been lost completely if it were not for the diligence of Lambert’s academic executor. The situation that produces this insecurity for the historian’s source material is obviously the volatility and suffering in Iraq since the first Gulf War combined with a global antiquities trade—which is essentially destructive and inimical to historical inquiry, but without which of course this publication would not have come about at all. For this reason, it is to be hoped that the wave of regular excavations taking place over much of Iraq during the last 15 years is able to continue and to produce further and better data from secure contexts, without historians having to rely on whispers and rumours, as has been the case with this inscription perhaps more than most others.
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ABSTRACT

Among the papers of the late Assyriologist W.G. Lambert were found photographs and a preliminary edition of part of a statue inscription of Samsuiluna king of Babylon (1750-1712 BC) that was probably looted from Iraq in the early 1990s in the context of the worsening security situation resulting from the first Gulf War and the international sanctions regime. Knowledge of this artefact and its current whereabouts mostly equates to little more than rumour. The current article presents a provisional edition of the inscription based on Lambert’s materials, as well as other sources that have been contributed by colleagues after inquiries during the course of research. The text provides new data for the history of the revolts against Samsuiluna in southern Iraq indicating that the rebellions had a more widespread extension to the north and east and possibly lasted longer than thus far suggested by available sources. It is also hoped that this preliminary publication will bring about some movement in the fortunes of this artefact, so that it may be made available to be studied more reliably than can be done on the basis of photos after repatriation to its country of origin, Iraq.

RÉSUMÉ

Parmi les documents de feu l’assyriologue W. G. Lambert, on a trouvé des photographies et une édition préliminaire d’une inscription gravée sur une statue mutilée de Samsuiluna, roi de Babylone (1750-1712 av. J.-C.), qui a probablement été pillée en Irak au début des années 1990 dans le contexte de l’aggravation de la situation sécuritaire résultant de la première guerre du Golfe et du régime des sanctions internationales. La connaissance de cet objet et de son emplacement actuel ne repose sur guère plus que des rumeurs. Le présent article offre une édition provisoire de l’inscription basée sur les documents de Lambert, ainsi que d’autres sources qui ont été fournies par des collègues après enquêtes dans le cours de la recherche. Le texte fournit de nouvelles données pour l’histoire des révoltes contre Samsuiluna dans le sud de l’Irak, indiquant que les rebellions ont eu une extension plus étendue au nord et à l’est et ont peut-être duré plus longtemps que les sources disponibles ne le laissaient entendre jusqu’à présent. On peut également espérer que cette publication préliminaire contribuera à modifier le sort de cet objet, afin qu’il puisse être disponible pour une étude plus fiable que ce qui peut être fait sur la base de photos, après rapatriement dans son pays d’origine, l’Irak.
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