

11. GENEALOGY INCLUDING THE GENEALOGY OF THE HAMMU-RĀPI' DYNASTY (GHD)

Sources, Textual Evidence

AKL, BKL, Chronicles, HiKL, literary texts, SKL, UKL and archival texts, which provide us with information of the rulers' genealogy or prosopographical data relevant to the reconstruction of internal chronology (the absence of the father's name and homonyms often complicating genealogical reconstructions).

GHD (Genealogy of the Hammu-rāpi' Dynasty): BM 80328 published by FINKELSTEIN (1966) 95–118.

Further studies: ARNAUD (1998) 153–173, BRINKMAN (1973) 317, GARELLI (1985) 91–95, KRAUS (1965) 123–142, LAMBERT (1968) 1–2, LARSEN (1976) 34–43, MALAMAT (1968) 163–173, MILLARD (1970) 175, RÖLLIG (1969) 265–277, VAN SETERS (1997) 74, WILCKE (1982) 36–37 and (2001) 93–116, YAMADA (1994) 11–37.

General Features of the GHD

Tablet BM 80328, the GHD, is quite well preserved, only the lower right edge being broken away. The text on the obverse is well preserved; but the surface of the reverse, where the script is smaller and more cramped than in the rest, has been partly worn away.⁸³⁴ The GHD was composed on behalf of Ammišaduqa (l. 41) and opens with a list of the so-called “ancestors”, and concludes with the kings of the **Babylon I dynasty** from Sumuabum to Ammiditana (ll. 20–28). A total of 28 names appear. A horizontal line separates the list of rulers from the subse-

quent list of three BALA (akk. *palū*⁸³⁵), the Amorites, Ḫaneans and Gutī. The 28 personal names (without filiation) are believed to be linked to the three dynasties named in ll. 29–31. One of the chronological problems is when these three *palū* took place.

Structure of the GHD

1–19: names of ancestors
20–28: rulers of the Babylon I dyn.
29–31: BALA: Amorites, Ḫaneans, Gutī
32–43: text referring to *kispu*

The composition consists of a single sequence of **generations** spanning a period of many centuries. The text is the end-product of evolved and elaborated genealogical traditions of Semitic tribes situated west of the Euphrates and in the Upper Euphrates region (“Northern Mesopotamia”) at the turn to the 3rd millennium. Obviously the people living there believed in a series of early ancestors common to all of them. According to FINKELSTEIN, who published this text, the GHD might have served as a prototype for later genealogical traditions, even for Arab genealogies. It may be possible that the GHD is a recopied or reused and modified version to suit the needs of a particular occasion. Apart from its similarities with the beginning part of the AKL, the GHD also shows some resemblance to the extension of the UKL⁸³⁶ published by

⁸³⁴ On the thick marks opposite the names and their possible function see FINKELSTEIN (1966) 95.

⁸³⁵ This term has been given different interpretations by different scholars: TADMOR (1958) 26–27 “term of office (*turnus*)”; FINKELSTEIN (1966) 105–106 (“age, era”); LAMBERT (1968) 1–2 (“dynasties”); WILCKE (1982) 37 and 41 (“Amtszeiten” in the SKL). → **BKL** and **Year**. In Assyrian annals the term *palū* designates the individual regnal years of a king: FUCHS, SAAS 8 (1998) 81 (→ **Royal Inscription**).

⁸³⁶ Kings of Ugarit reaching back to the beginning of the 2nd millennium are known from the Ugarit King Lists (UKL) and other isolated sources which cannot be placed in a chronological framework. This UKL appears on the reverse of tablet RS 24.257 (= KTU 1.113), which is the first known exemplar in alphabetic script found in 1961 by Virolleaud and was initially identified as a ritual or prayer. The obverse

of the tablet is poorly preserved and seems to deal with music or contains some kind of religious text. The reverse has two columns, the left one almost entirely lost, the other containing the KL. The UKL has resemblances with the KL or ancestors' list from Ebla: the names of the kings are preceded by a divine lexeme and are listed in retrograde order. The last name of the right column is the name of the dynasty's founder Iaḳarum. Since most of the tablet is broken, the exact number of kings listed is not known (for several proposals see SINGER [1999] 611–612). Despite the deplorable scarcity of data on the earliest phases of Ugarit's history, the combined evidence of UKL and dynastic seals seems to indicate that the LBA kings of Ugarit traced their origins back to the beginning of the 2nd millennium. This means that the foundation of the Ugaritic kingdom was part of the Amorite expansion into Mesopotamia and Syria.

ARNAUD (1998) 153–173.⁸³⁷ This might indicate the existence of some kind of proto-genealogical list of semi-nomads with a uniform tribal tradition (ARNAUD [1998] 158–159).⁸³⁸ As FINKELSTEIN (1966) 99 put it: “Genealogical traditions of the Hammurapi dynasty and those of the Assyrian king list [...] are one and the same insofar as they represent a consciousness of tribal origins.” The function of these lists, their *Sitz im Leben* and textual origins, have been summarized by BRINKMAN (1973) 317–318: “... when one has gained some appreciation of the textual tradition and what it stands for in terms of ‘literary truth’, one should also attempt to assess the tradition as a ‘historical truth’ preferably by means of reliable contemporary documents.”⁸³⁹

The latter portion of the GHD indicates that the tablet may have served in a *kispu*-ceremony for the dead ancestors, a tradition known from Pre-Sargonic Sumer continuing to the Neo-Babylonian period.⁸⁴⁰ Evidence from Mari suggests that the recitation of the complete pedigree of reigning monarchs must have occurred regularly.⁸⁴¹ An indication for the cultic or religious use of the UKL is the appearance of the divine determinative before the kings’ names. Arnaud considered the UKL to be an extension of the GHD: therefore part of the so-called “Ahnentafel” of the AKL may have originally served a similar purpose as the GHD. YAMADA (1994) 11–37, however, postulated that the AKL is not to be connected with a prototype text (as proposed by Finkelstein and others), since in its present form the AKL is not compatible with use in such a cult (*kispu*).⁸⁴² he interpreted the amulet-form of the AKL (REINER [1960] 55) to be a sec-

ondary development introduced after its canonization. YUHONG (1990) 34–35 likewise believed in the chronological and historical purposes of the earlier king lists (BKL, GHD, SKL, etc.).

Historical Relevance and Value for Absolute Chronology

Genealogy in the form of a long list of predecessors was an important tool for legitimizing a dynasty or royal line.⁸⁴³ It aimed to draw up an uninterrupted line of rulers. As early as the middle of the 3rd millennium BC the rulers of Lagaš and Umma attempted to justify their rule on the basis of family history. Royal genealogies aim to trace a single royal line of descent.⁸⁴⁴ Errors in the recorded genealogy are signaled either by incorrect reign lengths (see STEINER [1988] 11–12 and 129–152) or by demonstrably false filiations. HALLO (1983) 11 believed that genealogical KLs represent an Akkadian, and more particularly an Amorite, tradition written down for ideological purposes.⁸⁴⁵

Besides various inscriptions and other official texts of historiographical value that cite the genealogy of rulers, the most important sources for genealogical lists are the AKL, the early parts of which can be thought of as the genealogy of Šamšī-Adad I, and the GHD, Amorite genealogical list of Sumuabum.⁸⁴⁶ The first nine to eleven names of the AKL, the section on the “tent dwellers”, include the first six names of the GHD (see FINKELSTEIN (1966) 98ff. and in fig. 1 of WILCKE [2001] 96). Divergences are perhaps due to textual variants and a faulty transmission. Different to the AKL, the GHD lists the generations in an uninterrupted sequence (ending with the list of three BALA, the Guteans, the Haneans and

⁸³⁷ Note the genealogical lists from Ebla: ARCHI (2001) 9–13. For similar Hittite genealogical traditions see OTTEN (1968) 103.

⁸³⁸ ARNAUD (1998) 168 pointed out that these genealogical lists (the early part of the AKL, the GHD, the UKL as well as the list of ancestors from Ebla) were not used as chronological-historical sources, but written for religious or cultic purposes and are therefore of limited use for chronological issues. A relationship between the rulers mentioned in the AKL and the “sacred trees” of the Northwest palace at Kalḫu built by Aššurnāširpal II has been proposed by RICHARDSON, *SAAB* 13 (1999–2001) 145–216.

⁸³⁹ The list of ancestors is believed to have been transmitted orally (mnemotechnic). FINKELSTEIN (1966) 112 even suggested that it might have been preserved in desert chants. For oral transmission of genealogies see also ARCHI (2001) 4 in connection with the reverse order of the KLs (Ebla, UKL, AKL).

⁸⁴⁰ On *kispu* see TSUKIMOTO, *AOAT* 216 (1985). The royal tombs of Qaṭna are possibly connected with *kispu*-rites: AL-MAQDISSI *et al.*, *MDOG* 135 (2003) 204–206.

⁸⁴¹ See DURAND – GUICHARD, *FM* 3 (1997) 63–70. For the function of a *kispu*-tablet see also LAMBERT (1968) 1.

⁸⁴² This purpose of KLs has also been proposed by BECKMAN (2000) 20 in connection with the so-called HiKL which are in fact sacrifice lists and not chronographic tools.

⁸⁴³ J. EBACH, *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe* 2 (1990) 486–491. C.K. MAISELS, *Early Civilizations of the Old World*, London (1999) 360–364.

⁸⁴⁴ By contrast, the SKL does not show this linear presentation: see WILCKE (1982) 41 and (1988) 115. The mid–3rd millennium dynasty of Lagaš is omitted in the SKL.

⁸⁴⁵ For a provisional list of “Amorites” throughout the end of the 3rd millennium see fig. 14 in HALLO – SIMPSON (1998) 64 (MC). Tudia, the first name in the AKL, is set between 2160 and 2150 BC (according to the MC).

⁸⁴⁶ LANDSBERGER (1954) 35–37, MALAMAT (1968) 163–173, WILCKE (1982) 36–37, id. (2001) 95–99.

Amorites⁸⁴⁷), thus providing an unbroken string of “generations”.⁸⁴⁸

The “kings who are ancestors” of the **AKL** has been interpreted meaning the “official” ancestors of Šamši-Adad I in his effort to legitimize his rule. Because the tribal names of the second section of the AKL are connected with the names listed in the GHD and are therefore obviously not part of Šamši-Adad's tribal genealogy, this section of the AKL seems to come from a second source. Finkelstein proposed this part⁸⁴⁹ to be a later interpolation originating in the region of Mari and Terqa.⁸⁵⁰ GRAYSON (1980) 179 suggested that the conflation of these two sources most likely took place during the reign of Šamši-Adad I. Interestingly the list of *palû* in ll. 29–31 is quoted in inverted chronological order (compare this with parts of the AKL!). It is debated whether these *palû* are a summary of the named ancestors of Ammišaduqa or whether only the first *palû* is to be connected with the rulers of the Babylon I dynasty. FINKELSTEIN (1966) believed that the ancestors called *Gu-ti-um* are to be identified with the dynasty of Gutium and traced the line of ancestors further back (for the Guteans see FRAYNE, RIME 2 [1993]).⁸⁵¹ LAMBERT (1968) 1–2 offered an alternative solution: Since the names of the Babylon I dynasty fit perfectly with the Amorite *palû*, the two others should be understood as contemporary dynasties in this area (comparable to the parallel dynasties of the SKL). The GHD should therefore not be considered as a genealogical list, but is rather understood to have religious purposes. Similarly RÖLLIG (1969) 265–277 (following KRAUS [1965]) proposed that some of the dynasties mentioned ruled simultaneously, not consecutively, and that the text presented a summary with some sort of geographical division. According to Röllig, only those BALA were used for the AKL which seemed to

have had some relevance for Assyrian history and which may have still been known by the time of the compilation of the AKL (Šamši-Adad I).

It is widely believed that Šamši-Adad I had to prove himself as a legitimate ruler and to obscure his non-Assyrian antecedents by appropriating a native genealogy (“Ahnentafel”) and tracing it back to **Puzur-Aššur I** (no. 30).⁸⁵² MALAMAT (1968) believed these genealogies to be fictional compositions linking historical personages to earlier eponyms by means of artificial tribes or geographical sites. He studied the differences and similarities between the various sources and concluded that there was a common genealogical tradition (note his comparative table on royal genealogies) based on a **ten-generation** table (as in the “ten kings who are ancestors” of the AKL) that was adjusted to the specific situation by transitional links. Malamat thought the difference of three generations between the AKL (5) and the GHD (2) corresponded to the “true chronological gap between the foundations of the two West Semitic dynasties” in Assyria (AKL), and Babylon (GHD) during the 19th cent. (MC). Thus Malamat, following Finkelstein, attempted to show that both lists rely on chronological-historical tradition and contain reliable calculations of generations following a “genealogical pattern” of ten generations. This is considered highly speculative.⁸⁵³ There are simply too many uncertainties and too few confirmed facts.⁸⁵⁴ Because of the missing filiations in the GHD and the beginning section of the AKL, no precise chronology can be deduced from them.

A radical reinterpretation of Assyrian genealogies has been applied to Assyrian rulers of the 10th cent. by the NC group of Rohl. Two parallel ruling dynasties (Assyrian and “Hanigalbatean”) starting with Aššur-rabi II and Šalmaneser III were hypothesized in order to reach a drastic shortening of the Mesopo-

⁸⁴⁷ According to FINKELSTEIN (1966) 106 this may be understood as “three successive ‘ages’ or ‘eras’ or ‘dynasties’” of the history of the West Semitic tribes starting with the Gutian invasion that toppled the Mesopotamian Akkad dynasty.

⁸⁴⁸ MALAMAT (1968) 192–194 discussed these names and their order

⁸⁴⁹ See LANDSBERGER (1954) 34²² who assumed that Šamši-Adad I belonged to this “Mesopotamian” dynasty. However, note LAMBERT (1968) 1–2, who interpreted this tablet differently.

⁸⁵⁰ FINKELSTEIN (1966) 117 labeled this section as a piece of propaganda.

⁸⁵¹ Similarly MALAMAT (1968) 163–173.

⁸⁵² See RÖLLIG (1969) 266 and GRAYSON (1980–1983) 102. In his important study on the ancestors of the non-Assyrian

usurper Šamši-Adad I, KRAUS (1965) already suspected that the beginning of the AKL was taken from somewhere else. FINKELSTEIN (1966) 95–118 also believed in a prototype document (a truly genealogical list which could have served cultic purposes) which had been added to the AKL.

⁸⁵³ Malamat also pointed out that Šamši-Adad I and his contemporary Šin-muballit both are number 27 in the lists.

⁸⁵⁴ On the concept of the past in Mesopotamia see WILCKE (1982, 1988, 1998, 2001). See WILCKE (2001) 97–99 on Malamat's ideas: “... Bei den amurritischen Dynastien sind wir so in der glücklichen Lage, die genealogische Legitimation von Herrschaft in mündlichen Stammestradiationen schriftloser Nomaden in die Schriftlichkeit einfließen und in und mit ihr weiter überliefert zu sehen. ...” (WILCKE [2001] 99). Similarly RÖLLIG (1969) for the AKL.

tamian chronology.⁸⁵⁵ But POSTGATE (1991) 244–246 and Whiting⁸⁵⁶ had already proved that the method used by Newgrosh, James and Rohl (esp. in connection with the understanding of ELs) is untenable.⁸⁵⁷ Moreover, such drastic reductions are incompatible with known synchronisms.⁸⁵⁸

Genealogical studies are necessary to understand and verify the succession and order of rulers, especially for areas, regions and dynasties which did not keep or produce KLS nor left us with any other chronological guideposts. Particularly this is true for peripheral regions, from where only a few of which have survived are anything like true KLS or ELs, among them the UKL and the ancestors' lists or so-called HiKL.⁸⁵⁹ In case of the Hittite chronology, one lacks true KLS and therefore can only establish the order of kings from genealogies in official texts, lists of sacrificial offerings, seals, etc. With the help of the **generation** count, based on genealogical data, only a relative chronology can be provided which is almost always spuriously high or low.⁸⁶⁰ In MDAR 74–75 WILHELM demonstrated the necessity of exact genealogies

for reliable chronological results. He also proved with the help of the Hittite genealogy, that generation intervals are quite unhelpful in establishing an absolute chronology: with the Hittite data only the ULC can be ruled out. Within the past few years the genealogy of the Hittite royal line has been refined considerably, which helps historical and chronological studies. Studies before the 1980s are now obsolete. A short review on the changes concerning the line of Hittite rulers can be found in BECKMAN (2000) 24, with more refinements by WILHELM, MDAR (table). (→ **Generation**).

Since they cover the period of the Mesopotamian Dark Age, the Hittite royal lines are important to the determination of Mesopotamian chronology: absolute dating may be established by linking those rulers via synchronisms to other rulers or to specific events. So far, however, we are mostly dealing with relative dates.

Links

AKL, BKL, Generation, Old Babylonian Period, Middle Assyrian Period

⁸⁵⁵ NEWGROSH, *JACF* 8 (1999) 78ff.

⁸⁵⁶ <https://listhost.uchicago.edu/pipermail/ane/2003-March/007236.html> (note his comment on the 3rd of March 2003 regarding the AKL in conjunction with the EL). All of Whiting's postings in this forum regarding this issue have been compiled on www.caeno.org (Aug. 2007).

⁸⁵⁷ POSTGATE (1991) 244–246 stressed that, in spite of its erroneous genealogical statement, the AKL otherwise contains only minor discrepancies and inconsistencies, which can be corrected by the EL.

⁸⁵⁸ For observations on genealogical ties of the successors of Kidin-Ninua see POMONIO (1996) 169–165. He also collected the faulty genealogical entries of the AKL: Royal inscriptions prove that the successors of Enlil-nāšir I (no. 62) were related differently than is documented in the AKL, which aimed at a linear succession of kings. Aššur-nirāri II (no. 68) and Aššur-rē'im-nišēšu (no. 70) are listed incorrectly as sons of their predecessors, while they were in fact their brothers. See YAMADA (1994) 31 as well.

⁸⁵⁹ CTH 661: The HiKL was published by Otten, Die hethitischen "Königslisten" und die altorientalische Chronologie, *MDOG* 83 (1951) 47–71: KUB 36, 120, 2 BoTU 27+2 BoTU

28, KUB 11, 7+KUB 36, 121+KUB 36, 122, KUB 11, 10. The texts were re-edited (transliteration and translation) by RÖLLIG (1965) 175–183. But due to the royal sealings and bullae-impressions on "Landschenkungsurkunden" found within the past few years, better information on the succession of kings, their causes of death and their genealogical ties is now available: An useful updated table of Hittite kings, including their genealogical ties, has been published by WILHELM, MDAR 76.

⁸⁶⁰ CORNELIUS (1958) 104 (with reference to the Alalah rulers): "... Kurz, wir wissen nicht, wie die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse waren, und deswegen hat alles Rechnen mit Generationen nur den Wert von Vermutungen. ..." Also N. Ziegler (priv. comm.) points out that an interesting research topic would be to find out whether kings, who are named as "sons" of their predecessors in order to express their dynastic right of succession, in fact really were their children: she refers to an example from Mari: Zimri-Lim, termed as "son of Iahdun-Lim" was in fact his nephew or grandson. Also brothers are known to have succeeded one another (e.g. Larsa and Ešnunna).