

5'. Until now the earliest attestation of the epithet *šar šarrāni* “king of kings” dates back to Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207 BCE), cf. WEIDNER 1959, 18 l. 3. Although it could be suggested that this fragment might be related to the well-known Tukulti-Ninurta epic, this can be excluded based on the palaeographic evidence mentioned above, which suggests that KUB 37.139 is of an earlier date.

**Bibliography**

DURHAM, J.W. 1976: *Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian*, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.  
 LAMBERT, W.G. 1973: “Studies in Nergal”, *BiOr* 30, 355-363.  
 SASSMANNSHAUSEN, L. 2008: “Babylonische Schriftkultur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. in den Nachbarländern und im östlichen Mittelmeerraum”, *AuOr* 26, 263-293.  
 WEIDNER, E. 1959: *Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I. und seiner Nachfolger*, AfO beiheft 12, Graz.  
 WESTENHOLZ, J.G., 1997: *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, Mesopotamian Civilizations 7, Winona Lake.

Elyze ZOMER, <elyse.zomer@uni-leipzig.de>  
 Universität Leipzig, GERMANY

**21) <sup>m</sup>MU.PAP and [m.....]-ḫa-a-a\*)** — The personal name written as “<sup>m</sup>MU.PAP” appears in KAV 182, iii 12', a fragment of Synchronistic King List<sup>1)</sup>, and “[<sup>m</sup>.....]-ḫa-a-a” in KAV 216, iii 21', the main exemplar of that king list:

KAV 182 (Column iii)			
... ..			
12. <sup>md</sup> MEZ-za-kir-MU	<sup>m</sup> MU-PAP-[... ..]		
... ..			
KAV 216 (Column iii)			
... ..		... ..	
20. <sup>m</sup> [ <sup>d</sup> ]Šùl-ma-nu-MAŠ	min	<sup>md</sup> [... ..	min]
21. [ <sup>m</sup> ... ..]-ḫa-a-a um-[... ..]			
... ..			

It was once suggested by A. K. Grayson (AOAT 1 [1969], 114.) that the two names were identical, referring to the same *ummānu*, the (chief) royal scribe<sup>2)</sup> of the Babylonian king, Marduk-zākir-šumi I (ca. 855–819 BC). However, the identification for the two names might remain open to question.

According to Grayson, “[<sup>m</sup>.....]-ḫa-a-a”, which was also restored by him as [<sup>m</sup>]MU?-ḫa-a-a (RLA 6 [1980-83], 119, iii, 21'), would be a partly syllabic writing of “<sup>m</sup>MU.PAP”. However, there seems to be no any ground to construct the syllabic connection between “ḫa-a-a” and “PAP”. Besides, the heading signs before “ḫa-a-a” in KAV 216, iii 21' were partly damaged, but it is almost certain that here must be an original “LUḫ”, since three vertical wedges and a slant wedge (which could be the right part of LUḫ) can be seen and there will be no space left for another sign between the personal name determinative and LUḫ<sup>3)</sup>. Most importantly, to be judged by the format of Synchronistic King List (KAV 216), the name of a certain king's *ummānu* will be inscribed directly below the royal name of that king<sup>4)</sup>. Accordingly, “[.....]-ḫa-a-a” below the name of the Assyrian king Šalmaneser III (859–824 BC) in KAV 216, iii 20'-21' (the left half-lines) must be an Assyrian *ummānu*, but not a Babylonian one.

Actually, “<sup>m</sup>MU.PAP” in KAV 182, iii 12' must be identical with “<sup>m</sup>MU-[.....]” in KAV 10 (another fragment of Synchronistic King List), ii 10', since in the two fragments, this name appears in the similar position: directly below or after the name of Marduk-zākir-šumi I, as the *ummānu* of this king:

KAV 10 (Column ii)

... ..

9. <sup>m</sup>MEZ- [...]

10. <sup>m</sup>MU- [...]

... ..

Furthermore, Brinkman (JCS 16 [1962], 99, 25.1.3.) suggested that a “MU.ŠEŠ” (or “MU. ŪRU”), the *kalû*-priest of Marduk and scribe appearing in a Babylonian *kudurru* (F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 16 [1919], 126, iv 23’; S. Paulus, AOAT 51 [2014], 669, Rs.IV23) dated to the second year of Marduk-zākīr-šumi I was also identical with “MU.PAP” in KAV 182 and KAV 10.

Thus, “<sup>m</sup>MU.PAP” and “[<sup>m</sup>.....]-ḫa-a-a” are two personal names. Besides, the readings of the two names are also noteworthy. If “LUḪ” can be accepted, i.e. the name in KAV 216 is written as “[<sup>m</sup>luḫ]-ḫa-a-a”, then it might be read as “Luhḫaja” (or “Lahḫaja”), which would come from a month-name “*Lahḫum*”, usually written as “*La-aḫ-ḫu-um*”, “*La-ḫu-um*”, “*La-aḫ-ḫi-im*” or “*La-ḫi-im*” (AHw, 528; CAD 9, 41.) and mainly used in Mari and Susa in Ur III and Old Babylonian Periods<sup>5)</sup>. As for “MU.ŠEŠ”, another writing form of “MU.PAP”, it was once read as “Šum(a)-uṣur” (F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 16 [1919], 126, iv 23’; S. Paulus, AOAT 51 [2014], 669, Rs.IV23). Nevertheless, since “Šum(a)-uṣur” is not popular for personal names, the more appropriate reading may be “Nādin-aḫi”<sup>6)</sup>.

\*) The writer wishes to thank Prof. Sallaberger for his suggestions for this note. The writer is also grateful to the Graduate School of Distant Worlds at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, by which the writer was financed to do a visiting post-doctoral study. This note was written at that Graduate School.

1) The Synchronistic King List is a special king list in ancient Mesopotamia, in which the Assyrian kings and the Babylonian kings (perhaps mainly from 18<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> Century BC) are recorded together in one list, roughly with contemporary pairs being parallel in right and left sides of each column. One main exemplar (KAV 216; for the full copy, see also E. F. Weidner, AfO 3 [1926], 70-71) and several fragments of this list (KAV 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 182) have been found. For transliterations of the exemplar and fragments, see Grayson, RLA 6 (1980-83), 116-117.

2) The exact function of listing those *ummânû* immediately after their kings is not clear. For meanings of this post, see CAD 20, 108-115; for more implications, see Parpola, LAS IIA (1971), 6-7.

3) Prof. Sallaberger, who kindly discussed the readings of the two names with the writer, also thought that LUḪ could be determined here.

4) This can be seen from KAV 216, iii 2’, 12’, 15’, 17’, 19’, where the names of those *ummânû* are inscribed under the names of the Babylonian kings in the right half-lines of that column.

5) W. Hinz identified it as the Elamite month “ITU <sup>4</sup>MAḪ” (August), but E. Reiner excluded it from the Elamite month-names, since it could also be found in Mari. See Hinz, Or 32 (1963), 18; Reiner, AfO 24 (1973), 99, n.20.

6) “Šum(a)-uṣur” is absent from the personal name collections of PNA, while an individual named “Nādin-aḫi” from Assur in the late reign of Assurbanipal can be convinced. See PNA 2, 919.

Fei CHEN <cf001126@126.com>

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Distant Worlds, Schellingstraße 3, 80799 München

**22) Die Unterwerfung Ba’alus im Jahre 671 v.Chr.** — Zwar stellt Asarhaddon in AsBbE. 7’-8’ (Leichty 2011: 135) die Behauptung auf, dass er bei der Eroberung von Tyros sämtliche Städte des Ba’alus geraubt habe, allerdings wird gemeinhin angenommen, dass diese Aussage nicht den historischen Tatsachen entspreche (GRAYSON 1991: 126). Schaut man sich lediglich AsBbE.7’-8’ sowie Frt. F. 12’-14’ (LEICHTY 2011:87) zur Betrachtung des Beispiels von Tyros an, so bleibt völlig unklar, wie die Folgen dieser Belagerung tatsächlich ausgefallen sind. Beispielsweise kann diesbezüglich folgende Beschreibung von Graysons angeführt werden: „The result of the sieges is not recorded, apart from Esarhaddon’s grandiose claim that he conquered Tyros and deprived Baal of his all cities and possessions. Tyre probably did not actually fall but the sieges may have been continued by an Assyrian contingent, while the bulk of the troops proceeded to Egypt” (GRAYSON 1991: 126). Neben Grayson verweisen viele weitere Forscher bei der Analyse von Tyros ausschließlich auf AsBbE.7’-8’ und Frt.F.12’-14’, ohne in diesem Zusammenhang auch Frt.A.Rs.1’-11’ (LEICHTY 2011: 76) mit in den Blick zu nehmen (KATZENSTEIN 1997<sup>2</sup>: 279; LIPIŃSKI 1999: 242-243; FUCHS 2008: 94). Ausgehend davon