

2. ASSYRIAN KING LIST

Sources and Textual Evidence, including Secondary Literature

Seven manuscripts of the AKL are known so far:
Three (almost) complete tablets: Nass., Chors. and SDAS.

– Four fragments: KAV 14, KAV 15, KAV 18, and BM 128059.

– Except for KAV 14 and 18 all these texts are copies of one canonical AKL, of which the exact date of compilation is unknown. The best summary of all the known exemplars including a transcription of the AKL can be found in GRAYSON (1980–1983) 101–115,¹²⁴ which has been generally used by recent authors working with Assyrian dynastic chronology (see for instance WALKER [1995] 230–233).

General editions

GELB (1954) 209–230 (= **Chors., SDAS**)

MILLARD (1970) 174–176 (= **BM 128059**)

NASSOUHI (1927) 1–11 (= **Nass.**)

POEBEL (1942–1943) 247–306, 460–492 and (1943) 56–90 (= **Chors.**)

SCHROEDER (1920) (**KAV 14, KAV 15, KAV 18**)

WEIDNER (1941–1944) 362–369 (**Chors., Nass.**)

Secondary literature on the various manuscripts of the AKL

HKL I 146 and II 80; GRAYSON (1969) 105–118 and (1980) 140–194; POMPONIO (1996) 159–165; RÖLLIG (1965). GRAYSON, ABC 269–271 and (1980–1983) 101 used designations A–E for the various copies of the AKL:

A = Nass.: Museum of the Ancient Orient, Istanbul: C. 8836, VAT 9812; photo and copy in NASSOUHI (1927); WEIDNER (1941–1944) 362–369. (Provenance: Assur.)

B = Chors.: Oriental Institute of Chicago; photo: GELB (1954) pls. XIV f. (no copy) and (1954) 209–230; CAVAINAC (1945–1946) 17–26 and (1955)

94–98, BRINKMAN – LARSON (1999) 32–33 (last collation from an excavation photograph); SCHMIDTKE (1952) 81–84 (rev. only). (Provenance: Chorsabad.)

C = SDAS: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington D.C., now in the Iraq Museum, Baghdad; photo: GELB (1954) 154, pls. XVII f. (no copy) and (1954) 209–230. (Provenance: unknown. According to its colophon and date and location of purchase its provenance is very likely Assur.)

D = KAV 15: Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin: VAT 11554; no photo; for editions and studies see bibliography of AKL fragments below. (Provenance: Assur.)

E = BM 128059: MILLARD (1970) 174–176. (Provenance: Nineveh.)

AKL fragments KAV 14, 15 and 18: GRAYSON (1969) 110–111; LANDSBERGER (1954) 31, 39, no. 48, p. 108, nos. 198 and 200; J. LEWY (1929) 95–107; POEBEL (1942–1943) 251; SCHROEDER (1918) 41–43 and ZA 33 (1921) 53–54; UNGNAD (1921) 15–17; WEIDNER (1917) 1–7, (1917a) 1–4 and (1921) 2–9. (Provenance: Assur.)

KAV 15 is the oldest version. Nass., Chors. and SDAS are younger, the oldest of the three being Nass. and the youngest SDAS. According to MILLARD (1970) 176, its paleographical features suggest BM 128059 is probably older than Chors. and SDAS. The line numbering generally follows Gelb based on the SDAS list.

RÖLLIG (1965) 22 has pointed out that the Nass. KL differs from the SDAS and Chors. KLs in (1) Aššur-rēm-nišēšu is cited as the father of Erība-Adad I instead of Aššur-bēl-nišēšu; (2) Adad-nūrāri I is named “son” instead of “brother” of Arik-dēn-ili; (3) Šalmaneser II is omitted; and (4) the regnal years of Puzur-Aššur, Aššur-nādin-apli and Ninurta-apil-ekur differ from the other exemplars. Thus he assumed that the Nass. KL had a slightly different tradition than the younger texts.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ For a recent German translation of the AKL see HECKER, TUAT N.F. 2 (2005) 27–30.

¹²⁵ A standard AKL is believed to have existed from the 13th cent., the reign of Tukultī-Ninurta I: LAMBERT (1976) 85–94. See lately READE (2001) 3.



Figure 1 GELB (1954) pls. XIV, XV (= Chors.)

Chronological order of manuscripts:

- KAV 15 (=D): middle of the 11th cent. or 10th cent. (?)¹²⁶
 Nass. (=A): Tiglath-pileser II
 BM 128059 (=E): ?
 Chors. (=B): Aššur-nīrārī V
 SDAS (=C): Šalmaneser V

General Features of the AKL

The shape and form of the AKL is shown best in GELB (1954) on plates XIV, XV (Chors.¹²⁷), XVI and XVII (SDAS), as shown in Figs.1–2. An image of the Nass. AKL, whose state of preservation is worse, can be found in its first publication by NASSOUHI (1927) tables 1 and 2.

Chors. and **SDAS** have four columns on each side, which are divided only by a single thin line. The column-pairs are separated by a double line. **Nass.** shows only two columns on each side separated by a double line. **SDAS** measures 17 × 13.5 × 2.3 cm. Only 5/6 of

the tablet is preserved. The protuberance at the head of the tablet is perforated lengthwise by holes of 4–5 mm diameter. Significant units within the columns are separated from each other by horizontal lines. **Chors.** has the same size and shape as **SDAS**, but differs in the number of lines in each column with horizontal lines that mark significant units. REINER (1960) 155 discussed the unusual shape of the Chors. and the **SDAS** lists, which differ from the other known versions with functional devices at the upper end (esp. **SDAS** with the perforation) “to be pierced so as to be hung up”.¹²⁸ She suggested that those lists had originally been used as house amulets. Both versions have a colophon at the end of the text stating its date of copying.

Nass., which consists of nine fragments, has two columns on each side and measures 18 × 25 cm. Only four horizontal lines divide the surviving part of its text. The obverse especially is badly damaged, most of its text being lost. The reverse is better preserved. In contrast to the exemplars above, this version, which

¹²⁶ GRAYSON (1980–1983) 101: “It is impossible to be certain about the date of the two fragments D and E.”

¹²⁷ First published in *The Sphere*, April 7th 1934. This photograph of the rev. was used by WEIDNER (1941–1944)

362–369 for his study. The photograph of the obverse is reproduced in LOUD – ALTMAN, OIP 40 (1938) pl. 74.

¹²⁸ See GELB (1954) 210.



Figure 2 GELB (1954) pls. XVI, XVII (= SDAS)

dates to the reign of Aššur-dān, does not have a colophon. BRINKMAN (1973) 307 collated the text, suggesting a different line numbering than Nassouhi: he urged a re-edition based on comparisons with the photos of the tablet.¹²⁹ Since 1954 chronological research has greatly benefited from the 8th century Ks (SDAS and Chors.), which are almost completely preserved. Previously only a few restorations were possible for the beginning of the AKL on the basis of its oldest version KAV 15 (D).

Fragments of the AKL

BM 128059 (= E) duplicates the first lines of Chors. and SDAS and is therefore likely to have consisted of four columns, of which two can be detected on the fragment. The upper left corner (seven lines) of the obv. is preserved. Unlike the other two tablets, the names listed are paired from the beginning onwards (columns I and II, of which the latter is barely preserved).¹³⁰

KAV 15 (= D) is the oldest known version of the AKL and consists of two fragments showing 12 lines arranged in two columns on the obverse. Only some

signs of the second column can be read. KAV 15 duplicates part of the Nass. and SDAS Ks and mentions Sargon I, Puzur-Aššur II and Narām-Sîn.¹³¹

KAV 18 (VAT 12058) begins with kings whose eponyms were previously unknown (→ below) and continues with the Old Assyrian king Ērišum I.¹³² It ends at some unknown point within the canonical AKL. This badly preserved tablet, which contains two columns, records only the names of the rulers, omitting filiation and reign lengths.

KAV 14 (VAT 9812), a badly preserved tablet, starts off with one column listing the three kings Puzur-Aššur, Narām-Sîn and Ērišum II and continues with Šamši-Adad I and his successors in two columns. Two horizontal lines divide the section containing kings nos. 39–40. Kings are listed up to Aššur-bēl-nišēšu, without filiations or reign lengths. Due to its arrangement, which differs from the other exemplars, this tablet is probably a school tablet originally containing only part of the list. → below sub 2.1.1. for rulers not contained in any of the other lists.

¹²⁹ On the poor state of preservation of the Nass. Ks see LANDSBERGER (1954) 108¹⁹⁷.

¹³⁰ MILLARD (1970) 175

¹³¹ GRAYSON (1969) 109–110.

¹³² One notices that the original Old Assyrian form of the personal name Irīšum was later changed to Ērišum. See HECKER, TUAT N.F. 2 (2005) 29⁹.

Besides these lists, some exemplars of the Assyrian **Synchronistic KL** mention Assyrian and Babylonian rulers.

Historical Relevance

Any chronological chart of Assyrian kings is ultimately based on the AKL, which has been called the “backbone” of Assyrian chronology. The AKL contains information on Assyrian rulers going back to the time before 2000 BC. The compilers of the lists aimed for completeness. The reign lengths of some of the earliest kings seem to have been unknown at the time of the composition of the AKL, as may be concluded from the beginning part, which is divided into three sections or groups.

The organization of the AKL is not uniform: the opening section is inconsistent and lists some of the kings in reverse order. This betrays differing and incomplete sources. It obviously was meant to trace the ancestors of Šamši-Adad I.¹³³ Three groups can be differentiated:

- 17 kings who lived in tents (“tent dwellers”)
- 10 kings whose fathers are known (= ancestors: PN₁ son of PN₂, PN₂ son of PN₃, etc.)
- 6 kings whose eponyms are unknown (?)

FREYDANK (1975) 173–175 discussed the first three sections of the AKL, especially lines I 24f./25f. of the third section, which uses the Akkadian term *līmāni* in connection with the Assyrian ruler Ērišum I (→ **KEL** sub **Eponyms**). If the proposed reading is correct, this is the first ruler in whose reign *līmū* (eponyms) are attested, which leads us to the assumption that his six predecessors did not have any *līmū* (proposed new reading by Freydank: *lā ú-du-ni*¹³⁴). According to another interpretation, the *līmū* of the six kings might not have been preserved. HECKER, TUAT N.F. 2

(2005) 28⁸, who reads with LANDSBERGER (1954) 108²⁰⁰ *la-ú-tu-ni*, translates the passage in question “deren Eponymate nicht auffindbar sind” (> *lātu* instead of *idūm* “to know” or *watūm* “to find”¹³⁵). Comparing the parallel AKL fragment VAT 12085 (= **KAV 18**; reading of *ú-še!-li-[ú-ni]*: derived as a Š-stem from *elū* with the meaning “to enter upon a tablet”; *lā* is to be restored in the preceding line and *šarrāni* possibly to be taken as the subject of the relative clause), Freydank concluded that ELs were used by the compilers of the AKL, as has been suggested before,¹³⁶ which means they did not possess any eponyms for the kings preceding Ērišum I. Consequently the lengths of their reigns were unknown to the compiler of the AKL. RÖLLIG (1965) §30, (1969) 275 and NA’AMAN (1984) 115–123 assumed instead that ELs were of no value for the calculation of throne tenure, since no lists of Old Assyrian kings were known then. This view is no longer tenable due to the identification of the **KEL**, listing eponyms for the Old Assyrian period: 40 eponyms are registered for Ērišum in agreement with the AKL, which assigns him a reign of 40 years.

The second group is marked by the renewal of the hereditary system of kingship. The ten kings of this section are listed in genealogical, but in reverse (!) chronological, order.¹³⁷ Two of them, Apiašal¹³⁸ and Ušpia, also appear in the tent dwellers section: thus, the first two sections of the AKL are linked. Section three begins with five names without genealogical information, though the first person in this section can possibly be connected with section two through the filiation Amīnu (sixth name of the third section). The grouping of some kings seems to be due to family affiliation.¹³⁹ Since no reign lengths are mentioned in the beginning sections of the AKL and no records exist for the mentioned rulers otherwise, this part is chronologically irrelevant.¹⁴⁰

¹³³ On the ancestors (“Ahnentafel”) see HALLO (1954) 221⁹, who reviewed the problem of the king order of the AKL and summarized the studies by Landsberger and Jacobsen. An important study on this issue was later published by KRAUS (1965). Additional material on the “ancestors” appeared with the publication of the **GHD** by Finkelstein in 1966 (→ **Genealogy**). For a different view on the function of the AKL see RÖLLIG (1969) 265–277. On the beginning of the AKL with references to the “Amorites” see GLASSNER (2004) 71–74.

¹³⁴ Stative of D-stem of *idā’um* instead of the proposal by LANDSBERGER (1954) 108²⁰⁰ *la-ú-tu-ni* from *lātu*. AHW 540: “(deren Eponyme) überdeckt sind (??)”; see GRAYSON (1980–1983) 105.

¹³⁵ On this passage of the AKL see VEENHOF (2003) 21, who suggested two alternatives based on the possible readings: “not identified, marked, registered as such” or “not found” (like FREYDANK [1975]). → **Eponyms**

¹³⁶ See LANDSBERGER (1954) 107 for further literature (Poebel, Albright and Rowton).

¹³⁷ This retrograde structure can be compared with that of the king list from Ugarit (UKL) and the ancestors’ list known from Ebla: see e.g. ARCHI (1996) 11 and (2001) 4.

¹³⁸ On the question of whether both attestations for Apiašal refer to the same man see LAMBERT (1976) 88.

¹³⁹ HALLO (1983) 11.

¹⁴⁰ Therefore, and due to other uncertainties, RÖLLIG (1965) rejected Nagel’s identification in *A/O* 18 (1957/1958) 97–103 of Sulili with a ruler of Aššur named Šilulu. See also VEENHOF (2003) 59 in connection with the time span between the Ur III period and the early Assyrian kings nos. 30–32 of the AKL (→ **Distanzangaben**). According to him the period of Aššur’s independence from the Ur III dynasty (kings nos. 30–32) was very brief.

Beginning with its fourth section, the AKL follows a strict chronological order, giving each king's relationship with his predecessor and his reign length with the formula "PN₁, son of PN₂, ruled for x years", which is similar to the formula of date-lists. This structure is kept for the rest of the list. As was mentioned above, the reign lengths were obviously extracted from, or based on, the **ELs**, which – from the chronological point of view – are very reliable sources preserved from the early 2nd millennium down to 649 BC (→ **Eponyms**). The years that each king ruled according to the AKL were determined by the number of eponyms during his reign. Eponym dating does not differ from the year-name dating used in Babylonia, where year-names were compiled in date-lists and summarized in king lists. This means that the regnal years of the AKL are generally based on first-hand sources and therefore can be considered accurate. Indeed, considering that the AKL covers a period of over 1000 years, relatively few errors can be detected in it – it gives very few incorrect reign lengths, filiations and incorrect sequences¹⁴¹, and omits few kings. The first six kings listed are followed by a chronicle-like interruption concerning Šamši-Adad I (no. 39) son of Ilu-kabkabi (II¹⁴²). Chronicle-like passages appear later in the text in connection with Enlil-nāšir II (no. 67), Ninurta-apil-Ekur (no. 82), Mutakkil-Nusku (no. 85) and Šamši-Adad IV (no. 91).

The copies we have of the AKL are from the Neo-Assyrian period and were most probably written to reaffirm the continuity of the Assyrian royal line, to preserve and continue the record of reign lengths, and to serve commemorative rites. The more recent copies have more mistakes – probably the result of

scribal errors and politically motivated alterations. VAN SETERS (1997) 72–73 discussed the historiographical principles behind the AKL. In contrast to the SKL, which traces kingship back to the antediluvian dynasties, kingship is traced back to the ancestors, the tent-dwelling kings.¹⁴³ Furthermore, the list is Aššur-centered, associated with only one place, the capital of the Assyrian empire – or as RÖLLIG (1969) 276 pointed out demonstrating the "ungebrochene, oder doch nur selten gebrochene Tradition in der Geschlechterfolge". It was created specifically to depict the development of the Assyrian kingdom. In contrast to other KLs (such as the **BKL** and **SKL**) the Assyrian scribes constructed a **KL** for Assyria itself, suppressing the geographical or ethnic affiliation of certain kings (→ below).¹⁴⁴ In the past years scholars have debated the authorship of the AKL, which has usually been attributed to Šamši-Adad I. This is a crucial question for understanding the text's function and stages of development.¹⁴⁵

The second part of BRINKMAN's 1973 study was devoted to the AKL as an historical source (p. 310). Brinkman cited the important works by WEIDNER (1945–1951), KRAUS (1965), LANDSBERGER (1954) and FINKELSTEIN (1966) with the publication of the **GHD**, who all greatly contributed to our understanding of the text's origins and the completeness of its earlier portions. RÖLLIG (1969) 265–277 also presented an important study on the structure, the typology and development of the AKL (genealogical traditions, royal inscriptions, chronicles and **ELs**) in his Habilitationsschrift *Materialien zur Chronologie Vorderasiens im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (1965).¹⁴⁶ The idea that the legitimization of Šamši-Adad I was the original purpose of

¹⁴¹ For example YAMADA (1994) 31; for a list of discrepancies between the AKL and other historical sources see pp. 33–3477.

¹⁴² Another Ilu-kabkabi (I) is mentioned earlier with Sulili and Amīnu. For the distinction between two persons see AZIZE (1998) 1–27. However, VAN SETERS (1997) 73 believed that section two is directly connected with Šamši-Adad I. and therefore the first three sections are pure fabrications.

¹⁴³ Note the parallel section in the **GHD** (→ **Genealogy**).

¹⁴⁴ HALLO (1983) 11: "One cannot simply speak of two traditions, a northern employing eponyms leading to king lists organized on strictly genealogical lines; and a southern one employing date-formulas (and, later, regnal years) and leading to king lists organized on strictly geographic or ethnic lines. Rather, we should perhaps regard the use of eponyms as at home in both north and (at least originally) south, and the preference for king lists organized on a 'geographical' basis as a legacy of the Sumerian or core-tradition while genealogical preferences represented the Akkadian and more particularly the Amorite tradition which took firmest hold on the periphery of Mesopotamian culture."

¹⁴⁵ This subject has been extensively dealt with by KRAUS (1965) 123–142 referring to LANDSBERGER (1954) (who believed it had been composed during the reign of Šamši-Adad I), RÖLLIG (1969) 265–277, YUHONG (1990) 25–37 (favoring the date of composition in the Middle Assyrian period, questioning the theory that it was an attempt to legitimize Šamši-Adad I), YAMADA (1994) 11–37 (creation in the Middle Assyrian period from an original of the time of Šamši-Adad I) and AZIZE (1998) 1–27 (Middle Assyrian period, Aššurnāširpal I).

¹⁴⁶ The latest definition of the AKL as a chronicle was put forward by GLASSNER, *ChrMés* 87–92 ("chronique royale") and 146f. (note the criticism on the terminology by BRINKMAN [1995] 668 and VAN DER SPEK in *RBL* 9 [2005]). On the general problem of defining chronicles and lists with and without information on chronography see pp. 52f. Note VAN DER SPEK's review in *RBL* 9 (2005), where he prefers the term "chronographic text" for the AKL. RÖLLIG (1965) §30 (pp. 86–92) discussed the possible source material of the AKL (chronicles, royal inscriptions) rejecting **ELs** as its main source material.

the AKL has been criticized by HALLO (1978) 1*–7*, who pointed out that Šamši-Adad I did not rule from Aššur, but from Šubat-Enlil and did not even maintain Aššur as the capital city.¹⁴⁷ Therefore the **genealogy** in the AKL represents the ancestry of Hammu-rāpi' rather than that of Šamši-Adad I.¹⁴⁸ It has also been suggested that this genealogical part came from a separate source and was inserted into the original version of the AKL.¹⁴⁹ HALLO (following LANDSBERGER [1954] 35²⁴) further claimed that the ruler Narām-Sîn was not a son of Puzur-Aššur II (as might be indicated by the AKL) but an invader from Ešnunna. However, due to information from the **KEL** it became evident that Narām-Sîn mentioned in the AKL cannot be equated with his namesake from Ešnunna.¹⁵⁰

The AKL suppressed all evidence of foreign rule in Aššur by making a fictional genealogy. Political instability of the period after Išme-Dagān I is hinted at by unclear passages within the AKL (→ below sub **2.1.1.**) or chronicle-like insertions. In “Assyrian” terms the (first) Dark Age starts with the period succeeding Išme-Dagān I. Unfortunately the **KEL G**, which has crucial chronological information on the Old Assyrian period (Kārum Kaniš levels II and Ib), does not provide material for an absolute Mesopotamian chronology because, although it covers part of the the ambiguous section of the AKL, it does not link its eponyms with the kings' reigns. Still, the Old Assyrian informa-

tion can contribute to chronological questions and may be supplemented by the evidence of Anatolian **dendrochronological data**.¹⁵¹ (→ **Eponyms** sub **10.4.**).

Sources such as **chronicles** and (royal) **inscriptions** with genealogical information might have been used for the compilation of the AKL as well.¹⁵² It seems that we have here a compilation from many sources (as is implied by the first parts of the AKL) – or even a “*product of research*”, as described by VAN SETERS (1997) 76. Evidently one of the crucial criteria of the compilation was to demonstrate that Assyria had never been under foreign domination, since in several cases the AKL clearly conceals the foreign origins of an Assyrian ruler (for example of Šamši-Adad I).¹⁵³ The AKL was designed to demonstrate the continuity of Assyrian monarchy. With the help of the AKL, whose patronage was royal, the king's legitimacy was shown (HALLO [1983] 11–12). Whereas KLs were written to serve ideological purposes, ELs served chronological issues. In order to verify the data provided by KLs, one needs to check their regnal years with the numbers recorded in other sources, and to look for their completeness and the reliability of filiations.¹⁵⁴ In contrast to the **Synchronistic KL**, the **Synchronistic History** and other **chronicles**, the AKL does not report synchronisms with other rulers. For sections within the AKL which may mention synchronistic rulers → below sub **2.1.1.** on periods of political instability.

Overview of the beginning of the AKL

No.	Name	Reign lengths, additional remarks
1–2	‡ u dia – Adamu	
3–4	I ang i – Su @ am u	
5–6	ı ar @ ar u – Mandaru	
7–8	Im, u – ı ar, u	
9–10	Did @ nu – ı an u	
11–12	Zuabu – Nuabu	
13–14	Abazu – B @ u	
15–16	Azara @ – U š pi a	
17	Apia š al	17 tent-dwellers

Table 17a

¹⁴⁷ See RÖLLIG (1969) 273³⁴ rejecting Landsberger's and Kraus' view that Šamši-Adad I made an effort to disguise his origin.

¹⁴⁸ For his Old Assyrian ancestors see GRAYSON, RIMA 1, 47f.

¹⁴⁹ VAN SETERS (1997) 75.

¹⁵⁰ See VEENHOF (2003) 45. → **Eponyms**

¹⁵¹ For important remarks see READE (2001) 10 (referring to the dates by KUNIHOLM *et al.* of 1996).

¹⁵² See RÖLLIG (1969) 274–277. LANDSBERGER (1954) regarded **chronicles** as the main source for the compilation of the

AKL. But the reign lengths were primarily known from the ELs, as was shown above. Note the observations on the **KEL A** in connection with the Assyrian **Distanzangaben**: PRUZSINSZKY (2006) 73–79.

¹⁵³ Note the royal **inscription of Puzur-Sin I** (BM 115688 = RIMA 1, 77–78, GRAYSON, ARRIM 3 [1985] 9–14) revealing Šamši-Adad I to be non-Assyrian. → **2.1.1.** On a possible identification of Puzur-Sîn with IB.TAR-Sîn see READE (2001) 6–7.

¹⁵⁴ RÖLLIG (1965) 18.

No.	Name	Reign lengths, additional remarks	
18	ġ ale		
19	Samani		
20	ġ aiani		
21	Ilu-M		
22	Iakmesi		
23	Iakmeni		
24	Iazkur-El		
25	Ilu-kabkabi		
26	Aminu	Ten kings who are ancestors	(nos. 17–26)
27	Sulili		
28	Kikia		
29	Akia		(ca. end of the Ur III period)
30	Puzur-Aššur I		
31	Šalim-a		
32	Ilušuma	Six kings whose eponyms are not ...	
33	rišum I	40 years	(beginning of the EL)
34	Ikunum I	[15 years]	
35	Sargon I	[40 years]	
36	Puzur-Aššur II	[8 years]	
37	Nar-Sin	[44 or 55 years]	
38	rišum II	[10 or 20 years]	
39	Šamš-Adad I	33 years	
40	Išme-Dagān I	40 years	
41	Aššur-dugul	6 years	
42–47	Six kings/usurpers	<i>bāb tuppišu</i>	
48	Bu-bāni	10 years	

The numbers in brackets are known from the KEL (→ 10.4.). See VEENHOF (2007) 60 and (2008) 29

Table 17a continued

Reign lengths of Assyrian kings nos. 49–109 according to the AKL

49	Libaya	17	67	Enlil-nāšir II	6
50	Šarma-Adad I	12	68	Aššur-nīrārī II	7
51	IB.TAR-Sin	12	69	Aššur-bēl-nišēšu	9
52	Bazaya	28	70	Aššur-rā'im-nišēšu	8
53	Lullaia	6	71	Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē II	10
54	Kidin-Ninua	14	72	Eriša-Adad I	27
55	Šarma-Adad II	3	73	Aššur-uballiḫ	36
56	Ērišum III	13	74	Enlil-nīrārī	10
57	Šamšī-Adad II	6	75	Arik-dēn-ili	12
58	Išme-Dagān II	16	76	Adad-nīrārī I	32
59	Šamšī-Adad III	16	77	Šalmaneser	30
60	Aššur-nīrārī I	26	78	Tukultī-Ninurta I	37
61	Puzur-Aššur III	14/24	79	Aššur-nādin-apli	3/4
62	Enlil-nāšir I	13	80	Aššur-nīrārī III	6
63	Nūr-ili	12	81	Enlil-kudurrī-ušur	5
64	Aššur-šadūni	1 month	82	Ninurta-apil-Ekur	3/13
65	Aššur-rabi I	[x]	83	Aššur-dān I	36/46
66	Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē I	[x]	84	Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur	<i>tuppišu</i>

Table 17b

85	Mutakkil-Nusku	<i>tuppišu</i>	98	Aššur-dān II	23
86	Aššur-rēša-iši I	18	99	Adad-nīrārī II	21
87	Tiglath-pileser I	39	100	Tukultī-Ninurta II	7
88	Ašarēd-apil-Ekur	2	101	Aššurnaširpal II	25
89	Aššur-bēl-kala	18	102	Šalmaneser III	35
90	Eriša-Adad II	2	103	Šamši-Adad V	13
91	Šamši-Adad IV	4	104	Adad-nīrārī III	28
92	Aššurnaširpal I	19	105	Šalmaneser IV	10
93	Šalmaneser II	12	106	Aššur-dān III	18
94	Aššur-nīrārī IV	6	107	Aššur-nīrārī V	10
95	Aššur-rabī II	41	108	Tiglath-pileser III	18
96	Aššur-rēša-iši II	5	109	Šalmaneser V	5
97	Tiglath-pileser II	32/3			

Table 17b continued

Value for Absolute Chronology

Since the publication of the SDAS and Chors. KL in 1954 by Gelb, historians have based their chronologies of Assyria directly on the AKL. Chronological problems have centered on conflicts or lacunae within the Assyrian tradition. Despite some gaps, omissions and conflicting numbers, the AKL is generally considered the “backbone” of Assyrian chronology. The AKL together with the dates for the **Babylon I dynasty** based on the **astronomical data** of the **VT** attributed to the reign of Ammišaduqa, can securely establish Mesopotamian chronology for the 2nd millennium BC. Some problems still remain as to the type of a **calendar** in use in Assyria during the 2nd millennium.

Assyrian chronology is also established with the help of **eponyms** (*limū*). Each civil year was named after an official called *limu*. Eponym lists (ELs) seem to have been one of the most important sources for the compilation of the AKL. This can be proven for the period between 911 and 722, where the AKL can

be directly checked against the eponym lists.¹⁵⁵ Before 911 we possess only fragmentary lists of eponyms (KAV 21 and 22) reaching back to Aššur-nīrārī II.¹⁵⁶ Other sources that complement the information of the AKL are the **BKL**, **chronicles**, the **Synchronistic KL**, **Distanzangaben**,¹⁵⁷ etc.¹⁵⁸ The AKL covers the entire 2nd millennium and continues to the reign of Šalmaneser V (726–722).¹⁵⁹

With the help of the sequence of Assyrian kings in the AKL and the eponyms one can clearly identify years covering the time span 910–649. A **solar eclipse** during the reign of Aššur-dān III in 763 mentioned in the **EL** provides a reliable absolute date.¹⁶⁰ Prior to 910, there are large gaps in our knowledge of eponyms. By extending the list of kings further back, Assyrian chronology can go as far as the 13th century (namely Šalmaneser I, whose reign began in 1273 or 1263) with an uncertainty of ten years (→ below sub Aššur-dān I)¹⁶¹ and further to 1430/20 and Enlil-nāšir II. Beyond that the list of reigns becomes more unreliable and the dates less exact, especially because of

¹⁵⁵ MILLARD (1994) 1–14. For ELs reaching back to the beginning of the 2nd millennium see now VEENHOF (2003) and (2007) and GÜNBATTI (2008) on the **KEL**.

¹⁵⁶ The only discrepancy between the EL and AKL within this period is the reign length for Tiglath-pileser II: The AKL gives 32 years and KAV 21 and 22 33 years.

¹⁵⁷ According to NA'AMAN (1984) 116, KLs contain all chronological data necessary for the calculation of time spans of past events. He believes they were the main sources for all **Distanzangaben**, which means that these are of no separate value for the establishment of an exact chronological scheme or for the confirmation of a given chronological system.

¹⁵⁸ A useful presentation of the information of the AKL, supplemented with external information, can be found in WALKER (1995) 231–233.

¹⁵⁹ See GRAYSON (1980–1983) 115

¹⁶⁰ MILLARD (1994) 2.

¹⁶¹ According to the table of BRINKMAN (1977) 345 Šalmaneser's I reign began in 1273. The reduced Middle Assyrian chronology has been proposed by BOESE – WILHELM (1979) 19–38, who arrive at the date of 1263 for Šalmaneser. A different calculation has been proposed by GASCHÉ *et al.* (1998a) 3: 1269. → **Calendar**

the unknown reign lengths of Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē I and Aššur-rabī I and the **DUB-pi-šu** lengths of the successors of Išme-Dagān I. Unfortunately, the various versions of the AKL do not provide us with the necessary data to fill those gaps.

The information in the opening section of the AKL is chronologically less reliable than the rest of the text. It is divided into three sections and contains information on the presumed genealogical line of Šamši-Adad I (the list of ancestors can be compared with the **GHD**) without mentioning the exact number of years that can be assigned to the persons (rulers?) cited. Ērišum I (no. 33) is the first king to be assigned a number of years of reign, 40, which agrees with the Old Assyrian version of the EL (**KEL**). For the period after Šamši-Adad I, further discrepancies appear within the various copies of the AKL. The crucial point is that in these cases we do not have any other evidence that could confirm the reign lengths we recalculate or assume to be correct. Apart from building inscriptions, there is a gap in documentation for Assyria between the end of Šamši-Adad's I reign and the beginning of the reign of Aššur-nīrārī II in last third of the 15th century.¹⁶² (→ **Royal Inscriptions**)

2.1. Gaps and Omissions

The AKL has some gaps and omissions. These may be explained as a consequence of political confusion during those periods (LANDSBERGER [1954] 31–33 and 36–37).

2.1.1. KAV 14 (VAT 9812)¹⁶³

KAV 14, an important fragment of the AKL, lists rulers from Puzur-Aššur II to Aššur-bēl-nišēšu (ca. 1879–1417/07), some of whom are otherwise unattested in the AKL. On the other hand it omits some other rulers in the AKL, adding up to ca. 91 years (→

Table 18 below). Due to the contents of this text, it can be formally separated from the other AKL versions. The first three lines, which are broken, may have furnished more information on the nature of this list. The fragment is divided into different sections by horizontal lines. These dividing lines have been interpreted as marking a) dynastic changes (Weidner) b) the omission of names (Schroeder) or c) political confusion and a change in the royal line (GRAYSON).

KAV 14 contains three names not preserved in the AKL: Mūt-Aškur, Rīmuš (*Re-mu-[x]*¹⁶⁴) and possibly *Asinu* (→ below).¹⁶⁵ These names are found in place of 13 kings of the AKL and the Synchronistic KL (col. I, lines 1–7). Due to many uncertainties concerning the period succeeding the reigns of Šamši-Adad I and Išme-Dagān, it is also referred to the first Assyrian Dark Age (in contrast to the Mesopotamian Dark Age proper, which refers to the time after the end of the Babylon I dynasty.). According to the texts from Mari, Mūt-Aškur was the son of Išme-Dagān (see ARM 16/1, p. 156). However, his accession to the throne is unattested. On the other hand KAV 14 omits names which are connected with the “Bēlu-bāni dynasty” (YAMADA [1994] 27). SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2006) 164–165 therefore considers the text unreliable.

The kings between Išme-Dagān I (no. 40) and Aššur-dugul (no. 41) were omitted in the AKL (Chors. and SDAS), but reported in KAV 14. As stated above, this part coincides with a troubled period in Assyria following the reign of Šamši-Adad I. According to KAV 14, Mūt-Aškur,¹⁶⁶ son of Išme-Dagān I, succeeded as king, initiating the line of kings nos. 40a–c.¹⁶⁷ The other two names omitted in the AKL are Rīmuš (*Re-mu-[x]*) and possibly [*Asinu*]. The AKL itself alludes to this as a troubled period, stating that the successor of Išme-Dagān I, Aššur-dugul (no. 41), was a “son of

¹⁶² For the descendants of Aššur-nīrārī II see CANKIR-KIRSCHBAUM (1999) 210–222.

¹⁶³ See GRAYSON (1969) 110–111 (with earlier bibliography) and (1980–1983) 115 (sub KL 10).

¹⁶⁴ See GRAYSON (1969) 111, LANDSBERGER (1954) 31–42 and POEBEL (1942–1943) 465. For the reading ¹*Ri-mu-u[š]* see RADNER, RIA 11 (2007) 371.

¹⁶⁵ *Asinu* is also interpreted as a noun, which is juxtaposed to Mūt-Aškur and Rīmuš: READE (2001) 6. Note LANDSBERGER (1954) 31.

¹⁶⁶ This person is documented in Mari letters: for a summary see GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 52. Išme-Dagān I is known to have been based first at Ekallātum. His reign may have overlapped that of his father. Mari letters show that after

his father's death he ruled 11 years as an independent king (CHARPIN – DURAND, *MARI 8* [1997] 372–373). There is evidence that he was succeeded by his son Mūt-Aškur (ARM 26 [1988] pp. 176–177), which is confirmed by KAV 14. It has been sometimes assumed that the earliest parts of the AKL probably incorporate information from both Aššur and Ekallātum (for instance GLASSNER, *ChrMés* 91). GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 52, even proposed that Mūt-Aškur and his successors ruled at Ekallātum only.

¹⁶⁷ According to GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 52 this line runs parallel to the one represented by Aššur-dugul and his successors (nos. 41–53). Shorter chronologies are often defended by the argument that certain dynastic lines in the KLs ran concurrently rather than sequentially.

Kings succeeding Šamši-Adad according to the AKL, KAV 14 and the Synchronistic KL

AKL		KAV 14		Synchr. KL	
	39. Šamši-Adad I 33 years		Šamši-Adad I		
	40. Išme-Dagān I 40 years		Išme-Dagān I		
			a. Mūt-Aškur		
			b. Rīmuš		
	41. Aššur-dugul 6 years		(c. Asinu)		
	<i>ina tarši</i> Aššur-dugul 6 kings, <i>bāb tuppišu</i> :				
	42. Aššur-apla-idi				
	43. Našir-Sîn				
	44. Sîn-nāmir				
	45. Ipqi-Ištar				
	46. Adad-šalulu				
	47. Adasi				Adasi
	48. Bēlu-bāni 10 years				Bēlu-bāni
	49. Libaya 17 years				Libaya
	50. Šarma-Adad I 12 years				Šarma-Adad I
	51. IB.TAR-Sîn 12 years				IB.TAR-Sîn
	52. Bazaya 28 years				Bazaya
	53. Lullaia 6 years				Lullaia
	54. Kidin-Ninua 14 years		Kidin-Ninua ¹⁶⁸		Kidin-Ninua

Table 18

nobody, who had no right to the throne” (see GRAYSON [1980–1983] 106).¹⁶⁹

Using KAV 14, LANDSBERGER (1954) 31–33 attempted to show that the AKL in its known full version had already been altered at an earlier stage. NA’AMAN (1984) 115–123 agreed with Landsberger that there was a chronological gap in the AKL tradition following Išme-Dagān I and doubted that the Assyrian scribes had any idea as to the length of this period. He concluded that this gap was due to the lack of information available to the Assyrian compilers for a politically turbulent period. According to him only KAV 14 seems to manifest knowledge of this obscure gap, though it lacks chronological data concerning the length of throne tenures during this period. In his genealogical table of Assyrian rulers, RÖLLIG (1965) 93 shows kings nos. 40 a-c running parallel to Aššur-dugul and the rulers described as ruling *bāb tuppišu* (nos. 42–47), a term which he cautiously translates “*Endabschnitt (einer Eponymenperiode)*” (p. 87).¹⁷⁰

In his 2001 article Reade presents evidence identifying Puzur-Sîn with the king written IB.TAR-Sîn (no.

51).¹⁷¹ According to Reade’s interpretation the reigns of all the kings between Išme-Dagān I and IB.TAR-Sîn in the standard AKL are dispensable: between Išme-Dagān and Kidin-Ninua one is then left with only five reigns, those of Mūt-Aškur, Rīmuš, Puzur-Sîn and his son Bazaya, and the usurper Lullaia. Puzur-Sîn is known only from an inscription from Aššur as the son of Aššur-bēl-šamē: it states that Puzur-Sîn deposed *A-sīnim* (Asinu?), whose “grandfather” (or rather ancestor) was Šamši-Adad I. The **Puzur-Sîn inscription**, which states that Puzur-Sîn, ruler (ENSI₂) of Aššur, destroyed the evil offspring of Šamši-Adad I, who was not a native Assyrian, might support the theory that the AKL originally was compiled to support Šamši-Adad’s I legitimization (AZIZE [1998] 5ff.).¹⁷² So far the identification of the AKL’s IB.TAR-Sîn with Puzur-Sîn by Reade has not been confirmed nor widely adopted, and must be treated with caution. It was accepted by WILHELM, MDAR 71¹, but it is not clear whether Wilhelm agreed with Reade’s further conclusions as well. **KEL G** continuing after Šamši-Adad’s reign for ca. 60 years combined with the Distanzanga-

¹⁶⁸ On the reading of his name see BRINKMAN (1973) 318–319 (Šū-Ninua). On basis of a new collation of KAV 14, HEESSEL, *N.A.B.U.* 2002/62, 60–61 proposed the reading Kidin-Ninua (as did Gelb and Landsberger previously).

¹⁶⁹ I.e. usurper (POEBEL [1942–1943] 460f. This designation is also used later in the list for Lullaia (no. 53; last usurper). Note also the **Puzur-Sîn inscription**, in which Šamši-Adad I is labeled as a non-Assyrian Amorite usurper.

¹⁷⁰ See JANSSEN (2007) 104–105 for a similar view. → 2.5.

¹⁷¹ For references to IB.TAR-Sîn see BRINKMAN (1976–1980) 23–24.

¹⁷² See LANDSBERGER (1954) 31ff. and above. RÖLLIG (1965) 80–81 tentatively placed him after Išme-Dagān and synchronous with Abī-ešuh of the Babylon I dynasty, who had lost most of the north, thus enabling Puzur-Sîn and Aššur to regain power.

ben does not shed more light on this troubled period. Besides the identification of Puzur-Sîn with IB.TAR-Sîn, READE (2001) 6 identified *Re-mu-[x]* with Asinu and Lullaia with Aššur-dugul, whose six “eponyms” (DUB-*pi-šu*¹⁷³) are known. Reade considered Bêlu-bāni (no. 48 of the AKL), Libaya (no. 49) and Šarma-Adad I (no. 50), whose reigns totaled 39 years, to have ruled simultaneously with Puzur-Sîn and Bazaya.

The following shortened scheme was proposed by READE (2001) 8:

Šamši-Adad I 33 y.
 Išme-Dagān I 11 y. (instead of 40 y.)
 Mūt-Aškur
Re-mu-[x] (= Asinu) 29 y. together
 Puzur-Sîn (= IB.TAR-Sîn) 12 y.
 Bazaya 28 y.
 Lullaia (= Aššur-dugul? with *tuppišu-reigns* being understood as eponyms) 6 y.
 Šū-Ninua (= Kidin-Ninua) 14 y.
 etc.¹⁷⁴

As READE (2001) 3 pointed out, the dates of Kidin-Ninua (no. 54) in the AKL must remain unclear: the reign lengths of two of his successors, Aššur-rabî I and Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē (nos. 65 and 66), are missing (→ below). Their reigns may be bridged with the help of the **Distanzangaben** known from building inscriptions of various Assyrian kings. Some scholars like Gasche *et al.* reject the Distanzangaben as useful for Mesopotamian chronology. On the other hand Assyrian Distanzangaben seem to correlate well with the AKL, as the KEL proves.¹⁷⁵ By equating one ruler with another and thus telescoping regnal years (of

Išme-Dagān; → 2.2.1.1.), Reade achieved as low a chronology as Gasche *et al.*, who based their chronology mainly upon archaeological and **astromonomical data**.

2.1.2. The Nass. KL omits Šalmaneser II (no. 93)

Lit.: GRAYSON (1969) 110–111 and (1980–1983) 115.

2.2. Divergences

Minor variants can be detected for the period from Šamši-Adad I onwards, due to which one cannot be entirely confident of the exact dates of most Middle Assyrian kings. Fortunately, most of the data can be checked by external criteria (see BRINKMAN [1970] 301–314).

2.2.1. Regnal years

	Nass.	Chors.	SDAS	conv. use
Išme-Dagān I (no. 40)	—	40	50/40 ¹⁷⁶	40
Puzur-Aššur III (no. 61)	14	[14/24]	24	24
Tukult ² -Ninurta I (no. 78)	30 + [x]	⌈37⌋	37	37
Aššur-nādin-apli (no. 79)	4	3	3	4
Ninurta-apil-Ekur (no. 82)	13	3	3	13
Aššur-dān I (no. 83)	26/36	46	46	36 ¹⁷⁷ /46
Aššur-rabî II (no. 95)	20 + [x] (40) ¹⁷⁸	41	—	41
Tiglath-pileser II (no. 97) ¹⁷⁹	33	32		32

Table 19

For the results of BRINKMAN’s (1973) collation (regnal lengths, names, etc.) of the Nass. KL with the

¹⁷³ So far, the term *tāb tuppišu* is neither understood nor clearly determined by chronological means. Rival kings might have co-existed towards the end of Aššur-dugul’s reign as they did near the end of the reign of Aššurbanipal in the first millennium BC. Unfortunately we have no other records from Aššur-dugul’s reign which could provide more insight into the political situation of that time. → 2.5.

¹⁷⁴ On the **genealogy** of the successors of Kidin-Ninua see POMPONIO (1996) 160.

¹⁷⁵ EDER (2004) 191–236 proposed on the basis of his interpretation of the **Distanzangaben** that the period between Išme-Dagān (no. 40) and the end of Aššur-dugul (no. 41), which is reported in the **Puzur-Sîn inscription** and **KAV 14**, lasted 125 years (4 + x kings, which are *not* to be understood as rulers of Ekallātum as GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating ...* 52 proposed; usually this period is presumed to have lasted ca. one quarter of a century). 125 years are proposed between the reigns of Išme-Dagān I and Bêlu-bāni (no. 48, reckoning 0 years for DUB-*pi-šu* kings nos. 41–47 of the AKL). It is to be noted though, that Eder’s understanding of the Assyrian Distanzangaben differs in many points from the ones

proposed so far. Furthermore, his very high chronology (higher than the HC) is to be considered extremely unlikely from the historical point of view. For the possible reason of *damnatio memoriae*, the omission of some rulers succeeding Išme-Dagān I, see EDER (2004) 211. Eder’s belief that the Assyrian kings were dependent on the Hurrian sovereignty cannot be historically confirmed: the existence of Hurrian political power or even of a Hurrian state before the fall of Babylon is highly disputed and lacks any evidence. See WILHELM (1982) 28 and DE MARTINO, MDAR 36 for Hurrian politics during the reigns of Ḫattušili I and Muršili I, and VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 23, who suggested the existence of a “*unified Hurrian polity*” before the end of the Babylon I dynasty.

¹⁷⁶ EDER (2004) 207⁴⁴ stated that the number 50 was a printing mistake.

¹⁷⁷ This 36 results in the lowered Middle Assyrian chronology proposed by BOESE – WILHELM (1979).

¹⁷⁸ Note WEIDNER (1945–1951) 88¹⁶.

¹⁷⁹ BRINKMAN (1973) 310 and MSKH 7 favors the lower number.

help of the Chors. and SDAS KL, see pp. 307–310 (col. I-IV). The different totals for the reign lengths of kings nos. 83, 82, 79 and 61 are: Chors. KL 66 or 76 years, SDAS 76 years, and Nass. KL 77 years. BRINKMAN (1977) gives 87 years. (See GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating ...* 55.)

The chronological discrepancies among the various versions of the AKL, mostly concerning the latter half of the 2nd millennium BC, are:

- involving one year: Aššur-nādin-apli (no. 79) and Tiglath-pileser II (no. 87): 12th/13th cent.
- involving ten years: Išme-Dagān I (no. 40): 17th cent., Puzur-Aššur III (no. 61): 15th cent., Ninurta-apil-Ekur (no. 82) and Aššur-dān I (no. 83): 12th cent. Note that the differences in the reign lengths of Puzur-Aššur III and Ninurta-apil-Ekur between the Chors./SDAS and Nass. KLs could cancel each other.

2.2.1.1. Išme-Dagān I (no. 40)

With Šamši-Adad I a new era began in Northern Mesopotamia. He ruled from Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilān) over Northern Syria and its neighboring regions. His sons Iasmaḥ-Addu and Išme-Dagān reigned in Mari and Ekallātum respectively (“Išme-Dagān from Ekallātum”). After Šamši-Adad’s death in Hammu-rāpi’s 18th year the empire disintegrated. An important question for chronological and historical research is how long Išme-Dagān I ruled after the death of his father Šamši-Adad I. The reign length discussion of Išme-Dagān I is also crucial for computations concerning the chronological gap in the AKL after his reign discussed above sub 2.1.1.

According to the AKL Išme-Dagān’s reign lasted for either 40 (Chors. KL) or 50 years (SDAS KL).¹⁸⁰ Others like GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating ...* 52–53 propose that Išme-Dagān I in fact reigned only eleven years after the death of his father.¹⁸¹ Thus only 11 years were counted for his reign (reduction of 29 years for Mūt-Aškur and Rīmuš). LANDSBERGER (1954) 36 and also VEENHOF (1985) 212 had already suggested that the 40 years included Išme-Dagān’s period as viceroy in Ekallātum, where he had been installed by his father Šamši-Adad I before his conquest of Mari. Thus although in the AKL Išme-Dagān is said to have ruled

40 years, he only resided eleven years in Aššur. On the other hand the AKL omits the three Išme-Dagān successors mentioned in KAV 14 (→ above). Unfortunately, we possess only scanty information about these events. The normal succession of kings seems to have been interrupted by Hammu-rāpi’s expansion, as suggested by the sequence Aššur-dugul, “son of nobody”, Mūt-Aškur of KAV 14 and the Mari texts.¹⁸² As was mentioned above, there exists evidence that Išme-Dagān I was succeeded by his son Mūt-Aškur: New material from Mari indicates that Išme-Dagān I was forced to vacate the throne of Ekallātum after the invasion of the Turukkeans (dated to Zimri-Līm year 12 [= Hammu-rāpi’ year 30]) and to seek asylum at Hammu-rāpi’s court.¹⁸³ According to KAV 14 his son and successor Mūt-Aškur initiated a new line of kings nos. 40a-c, who might have been contemporary with the rulers from Aššur-dugul to Lullaia (nos. 41–53). KAV 14 lists only two kings between Išme-Dagān I and Adasi, whose names were previously unknown (see above). CORNELIUS (1954–1956) 298, postulating the LC, suggested that the AKL cannot be regarded as reliable as usually thought. He believed that the 40th year of Išme-Dagān I is to be understood as the date when Puzur-Sin (only named in the **Puzur-Sin inscription**, → above sub 2.1.1.) was overthrown which coincided with Samsuiluna’s year 9 (this explanation is similar to Reade’s reconstruction of the beginning of the AKL).

According to LANDSBERGER (1954) 36–39, a supporter of the UHC, Išme-Dagān I ruled 40 years and was succeeded by Mūt-Aškur, Remu... and Asinu, who are missing in the AKL but counted as three generations. The next ruler was Puzur-Sin (also missing in the AKL), who was succeeded by two (?) more unknown rulers (son and grandson?).¹⁸⁴ Then finally (see the AKL) Aššur-dugul reigned six years, after whom five (six are reported in the AKL) kings are listed (**DUB-pi-šu**-reigns, see fn. 38 on p. 37). Landsberger suggested that for the periods of Puzur-Sin and his successors little chronographic material was available to the editor of the AKL, which resulted in some inconsistencies. According to him the addition to Adasi (“son of nobody”) is incorrect: the reign lengths of those six kings after Aššur-dugul were

¹⁸⁰ But note GRAYSON (1980–1983) who suggested that 40 years be read here also; note the comment by EDER (2004) 207⁴⁴.

¹⁸¹ CHARPIN – DURAND, *MARI* 8 (1997) 372–373 on Išme-Dagān’s independent reign after Šamši-Adad’s death.

¹⁸² VEENHOF (1985) 213f. See EDER (2004) 209–211 for a high-

ly speculative reconstruction of the historical situation of that time.

¹⁸³ CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 236–237.

¹⁸⁴ Note Reade’s earlier mentioned identification (IB.TAR-Sin with Puzur-Sin). EDER (2004) 209–211 reckoned 125 years for the reigns from Mūt-Aškur to Bēlu-bāni.

unknown and could not be placed properly. He considered them to be rival rulers during Aššur-dugul's reign, a view which seems to be generally accepted now. On pp. 38–39 Landsberger concluded that the contemporary rulers of the Babylon I dynasty and the known reigns lengths do not help to restore this part of Assyrian history, which he attempted to reconstruct with the help of **generations**.

NA'AMAN (1984) 122–23, attempting a solution between the MC and LC based on his evaluation of the Assyrian **Distanzangaben**, believed that the reign lengths of the successors of Išme-Dagān I were included within his 40 years, which were marked by political turbulence. These rulers are synchronous with the rulers of the Babylon I dynasty (Hammurāpi' [year 11] with Išme-Dagān I [year 1]¹⁸⁵) and the early Kassite rulers.¹⁸⁶ NA'AMAN (1984) 123 reckoned a quarter century for the gap in the AKL between the fall of Šamši-Adad's I dynasty and Bēlu-bāni.

READE (2000) also assigned 40 years to Išme-Dagān's reign alone: To 1639 (Puzur-Sîn = IB.TAR-Sîn, year 1 according to the NC) he added 40 (= Išme-Dagān I) and 1 (= year of death) and obtained 1680 for Šamši-Adad's I death. Reade believed that the kings preceding Puzur-Sîn (= IB.TAR-Sîn) in the AKL belonged to the same group, which long afterwards were grouped together by a Middle Assyrian scholar. Between Išme-Dagān I and Kidin-Ninua (nos. 48–50) there were two usurpers with six year-reigns, Aššur-dugul and Lullaia: Reade considered them to be the same person. Then there were the six DUB-*pi-šu* kings who ruled in Aššur-dugul's *tarši*, and to whom READE [2001] 7 referred to as eponyms. He suggested the kings Bēlu-bāni, Libaya and Šarma-Adad I ruled between 1638–1600 (according to the NC). A scheme by READE (2001) 8 demonstrates a possible reconstruction from which the standard AKL may have been derived, amalgamating various traditions. Reade suggested that Išme-Dagān reigned only 11 years independently (compare with GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 60), more than one ruler following him in

the AKL shared in those 11 years, and a couple of those rulers were the same person.¹⁸⁷

EDER (2004) 207 assigned 40 years to Išme-Dagān, and due to his evaluation of the **Distanzangaben** achieved a very high chronology, dating Šamši-Adad I between 1878–1846. Furthermore, he allowed another 125 years for the obscure rulers between Išme-Dagān I and Bēlu-bāni.

In conclusion: One might carefully assign 40 years to Išme-Dagān's reign given the agreement among the AKL, the **EL** or **Distanzangaben** (though in the end they are dependent on each other). None of these "official" sources hint at the lower number of regnal years for Išme-Dagān although his coregency with Šamši-Adad I clearly indicated by the texts from Mari.¹⁸⁸ Even more uncertain is the poorly documented period, called the "chronological gap" by YAMADA (1994) 23, which succeeded Išme-Dagān's reign and has been interpreted in different ways by various authorities.

2.2.1.2. Puzur-Aššur III (no. 61)

Following the SDAS one usually assigns 24 years to the reign of Puzur-Aššur III¹⁸⁹ (BRINKMAN [1977], WALKER [1995], GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...*), but this cannot be confirmed due to difficulties within the AKL for both its preceding (→ above) and following sections.¹⁹⁰ READE (2001) 5 and 8 in his treatment of the **Distanzangaben** derived only 14 years for Puzur-Aššur's reign, as reported in the Chors. and Nass. KL, but still considered the higher number possible as well (in the light of the lowered Middle Assyrian chronology of Boese – Wilhelm).

The **Synchronistic History I**, 5'–7', which depicts Assyro-Babylonian relations from a pro-Assyrian view, presents the early Kassite king **Burna-Buriaš I (no. 10)** and Puzur-Aššur III as contemporaries (BRINKMAN, MSKH 28, GALTER [2000] 30). Burna-Buriaš I and Puzur-Aššur III, who wanted to free himself from Mittanian bonds in the immediate aftermath of the collapse of the **Babylon I dynasty**, negotiated an Assyro-Babylonian border.¹⁹¹ The instability

¹⁸⁵ Based on BE VI 1, no. 26, in which Šamši-Adad is attested in the 10th year of Hammurāpi'. Šamši-Adad I is known to have died in the 18th year of Hammurāpi'. (→ 1.7.1.) Some believe that Šamši-Adad died during Hammurāpi' year 12 or 13, well before Zimri-Lim's conquest of Mari, while Iasmah-Addu retained the throne for some years after his father's death → **Eponyms** sub 10.6. and note GASCHE *et al.* (1998a) 1–4 correcting their dates of *Dating ...* From the point of view of chronology the synchronism used by Na'aman and LANDSBERGER (1954) 39 is worthless.

¹⁸⁶ → **Distanzangaben** sub 9.6.

¹⁸⁷ For records on Išme-Dagān offering new details on the end of his reign see CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 235–237 and 256. His reign ended at the latest when Hammurāpi' conquered Mari and Karana, thus probably interrupting the normal succession of kings in Aššur.

¹⁸⁸ CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 81⁴³.

¹⁸⁹ Differently before POEBEL (1943) 86 and WEIDNER (1945–1951) 100.

¹⁹⁰ Usually the first king whose absolute regnal dates are presented in charts is Enlil-nāšir II (ca. 1430).

¹⁹¹ See GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 89 and KÜHNE (1999) 216.

and dislocation subsequent to the fall of Babylon is believed to have been of short duration only: the fall of Babylon instead marked the end of a gradual breakdown and the beginning of a new era.¹⁹² KÜHNE (1982) 209–212 pointed out that the treaty of Burna-Buriaš I and Puzur-Aššur III coincides with the withdrawal of the Hittites from North Syria, which must have taken place during Ammuna's¹⁹³ rather unsuccessful reign at the beginning of the 15th cent. (according to the LC). At this point also the conflict over Syria between Hurri-Mittani and Egypt began. Thus the alliance between Puzur-Aššur III and Burna-Buriaš I with the view of securing borders fits the historical setting perfectly.

ROWTON (1970) 203–204, who stressed the importance of synchronistic chronicles for comparative chronology, stated that from Puzur-Aššur III onwards there is a gap of five generations until Aššur-uballiš I (no. 73, dated by Rowton to 1365, which is not in agreement with the lowered Middle Assyrian chronology described below in 2.2.1.5.¹⁹⁴). Rowton allowed 135 years of throne tenure for these five generations and thus dated the death of Puzur-Aššur III at about 1500, reckoning kings nos. 65 and 66 (→ below sub 2.6.) with 20 years of rule each.¹⁹⁵

2.2.1.3. Tukultī-Ninurta I (no. 78)¹⁹⁶

Two versions of the AKL, the Chors. and SDAS KL, give Tukultī-Ninurta's I reign as 37 years. According to Boese and WILHELM (1979), using a Middle Assyrian chronology lowered by ten years,¹⁹⁷ this ruler reigned from 1233 to 1197. The AKL col. III, 10 reports that Tukultī-Ninurta I was deposed by his son

Aššur-nādin-apli (POEBEL [1942–1943] 482–483 and → below sub 2.2.1.4.).

The relative order of **eponyms** can be established in only a few cases, since no complete EL of the Middle Assyrian period is known.¹⁹⁸ A further difficulty for establishing dates within the reign of Tukultī-Ninurta I arises because only two of his royal inscriptions contain dates, which means that the chronological order of events has to be reconstructed from the contents or on a textual-historical basis (see BORGER, EAK 71–97).¹⁹⁹ The synchronisms, which are crucial for this period, are only known from secondary (external) sources. Crucial for the structure of the ruler's reign is the synchronism with Babylonia, i. e. the subjugation of **Kaštīliašu IV** (BRINKMAN, MSKH 184): **Synchronistic History II**, 1'–2', **Chronicle P** IV, 1–8²⁰⁰ and the **Tukultī-Ninurta epic**²⁰¹, in which the battle between the Assyrians and Babylonians is treated as well. After the defeat of Kaštīliašu IV, Tukultī-Ninurta I carried off the statue of Marduk (for the duration of the exile → **Distanzangabe** and **Chronicle P**) and Assyria ruled Babylon for seven or eight years. According to the **BKL A**, II, 7ff., Kaštīliašu IV was succeeded by Enlil-nādin-šumi (1 year 6 months),²⁰² Kadašman-Ḫarbe II²⁰³ (1 year 6 months) and Adad-šuma-iddina (6 years). After a revolution Adad-šuma-ušur, son of Kaštīliašu IV ascended the Babylonian throne. He ruled Babylonia for 30 years and was succeeded by Meli-Šipak. For the successors of Tukultī-Ninurta I the numbers given can be checked against the synchronisms with Babylonia and Ḫatti (Tudḫalia IV and Šuppiluliuma II).

¹⁹² See CORNELIUS (1954–1956) 300 (LC) on the contemporary rulers of the Babylon I and the Kassite dynasty. On the fall of Babylon see CHARPIN (2004) 382–383.

¹⁹³ Ammuna is the eighth king of the Hittite line: see the chart in WILHELM, MDAR 76.

¹⁹⁴ Summarized by BOESE (1982) 15 with reference to BRINKMAN, MSKH 32. For a criticism of WILHELM – BOESE'S (1987) LC see HOFFNER (1993) 50, who refers to Brinkman's statement that Wilhelm and Boese restored the Nass. KL so that it fits their "desired scheme".

¹⁹⁵ ROWTON (1970) 204 pointed out that "during the interval of five generations on four occasions the royal line was continued by a younger brother". For details see also POMONIO (1996) 162–165.

¹⁹⁶ The bilingual inscription by Tukultī-Ninurta I published by LAMBERT (1976) 85–94 and discussed by YUHONG (1990) 28, correctly states that 77 kings ruled before Tukultī-Ninurta.

¹⁹⁷ All these calculations are mainly based upon the **Distanzangaben** and a certain interpretation of DUB-*pi-šu* (→ 2.5.).

¹⁹⁸ With the help of royal inscriptions, which name some of the eponym officials, connections to historical events can be established. Fragments of the EL for the Middle Assyrian period can help to reconstruct their sequence (FREYDANK [1991] 50–51). See CANKIR-KIRSCHBAUM (1996) 9–18 (on texts from Dūr Katlimmu). All royal campaigns of Tukultī-Ninurta I fall within his first 16 years and the eponyms attested in texts do not add up to 37 years of reign reported for him in the AKL. Further eponyms from the second part of Tukultī-Ninurta's reign are now attested in the texts from Tell Chuēra (Ḫarbe): KÜHNE (1995) 206 and (1996) 3–7: The reference to the Babylonians fits the historical setting, since it is known that Tukultī-Ninurta I defeated Kaštīliašu IV in a battle (*terminus post quem*).

¹⁹⁹ FREYDANK (1991) 51

²⁰⁰ See also RÖLLIG (1967) 182–183. → **Chronicle** sub 7.3.

²⁰¹ → Historical Epic

²⁰² See SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2006) 168.

²⁰³ Kadašman-Ḫarbe III according to SASSMANNSHAUSEN, MDAR 61.

Tukultī-Ninurta I & Kaštīliašu IV and Adad-šuma-ušur

The insertion of Tukultī-Ninurta I in the line of Babylonian rulers is supported by a text from Nippur (see text no. 13 in MSKH), which is dated to his accession year.²⁰⁴ On the other hand, the BKL A, II, 11ff. and the *kudurru* of Meli-Šipak BBSt no. 3 recorded the conventional sequence of Babylonian/Kassite kings (Adad-šuma-iddina, Adad-šuma-ušur and Meli-Šipak) without the addition of Tukultī-Ninurta I.

BRINKMAN, MSKH 19 noted that **Chronicle P** does not arrange every detail in strict chronological order and that certain events that occurred closely together in time were inserted (Assyrian rule, Elamite invasions): after Kaštīliašu IV (no. 28) was removed from power, Tukultī-Ninurta I became suzerain of Babylonia for some seven or eight years until a Babylonian revolt took place, after which Adad-šuma-ušur (no. 32) ascended the throne (according to **Chronicle P**; the BKL A gives the reigns of the three vassal kings as 9 years). While Tukultī-Ninurta I was the overlord of Babylonia, texts were dated, except for Tukultī-Ninurta's accession year, in the names of the vassal kings Enlil-nādin-šumi, Kadašman-Ḫarbe II and Adad-šuma-iddina (nos. 29–31). According to BRINKMAN, MSKH 18–21 and 31, Kaštīliašu's IV imprisonment dates to the 18th year of Tukultī-Ninurta I (= 1225 or 1215 according to the generally accepted lowered chronology of BOESE – WILHELM [1979], who assumed that the end of Kaštīliašu's reign has to be the same as the year of his imprisonment by Tukultī-Ninurta I). BOESE (1982) 20–21 reviewed the textual evidence (especially the **Distanzangabe** attested in **Chronicle P**) and concluded that Kaštīliašu IV lost the throne no earlier than 1222. Boese's lowered dates for the Kassite kings was adopted by GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...*, whose chart sets the end of Kaštīliašu's IV reign 1220 (with an uncertainty of 5 years [+2/–3 years]).²⁰⁵ In his summary of Kassite chronology, SASSMANNSHAUSEN, MDAR 62¹⁵ pointed out that due to the problems of Egyptian chronology of the New Kingdom, the attempt of BOESE (1982) 15–26

to arrive at a more precise Middle Babylonian chronology through links with Egypt is quite problematic. For more details → **Chronicles (Chronicle P, Chronicle BM 27796)** and **Historical Epic (Adad-šuma-ušur Epic)**.

*Tukultī-Ninurta I & Tudḫalia IV*²⁰⁶

Besides that between Muršili I and the end of the reign of Samsuditana of Babylon I, another synchronism between Mesopotamia and Ḫatti is between Tudḫalia IV and Tukultī-Ninurta I (KUB 3, 74 [CTH 177.1] and RIMA 1, A.0.78.23+24).²⁰⁷ This Hittite ruler, whose length of reign is unknown (probably 15–20 years), is reported to have fought Tukultī-Ninurta in the latter's first or second year²⁰⁸ in the battle of the Nairi lands (= Niḫria?, north or north-east of Diyarbakır).²⁰⁹ Tukultī-Ninurta I negotiated with the king of the land to the north, trying to hasten the downfall of the Hittite empire.²¹⁰ Tudḫalia IV was defeated by the Assyrians and news of their victory was spread throughout Syria, as is shown by the letter RS 34.165 (= RSO 7, 46 of the Urtenu archive) sent to Ibirānu of Ugarit describing the details of the battle. If the sender of this letter was Tukultī-Ninurta I, this would provide an important synchronism between Ugarit, Ḫatti and Aššur. The battle most likely took place in the first year of Tukultī-Ninurta I, which thus may also provide a *terminus ante quem* for Ibirānu's ascent to the throne. No further conflicts between Ḫatti and Assyria are reported.

2.2.1.4. Aššur-nādin-apli (no. 79)

In the AKL III, 10 it is reported that Tukultī-Ninurta I was deposed by his son Aššur-nādin-apli. A variation in the spelling of the royal name of king no. 79 is given in the SDAS list, which refers to Aššur-nāšir-apli (= Aššurnaširpal). The Nass. KL correctly names Aššur-nādin-apli. The Chors. KL calls the usurper Aššur-nādin-apli, but the father of Aššur-nīrārī III Aššur-nāšir-apli. Moreover, this king's length of reign is different in the Nass., SDAS and Chors. KL.

²⁰⁴ See SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2006) 168–169.

²⁰⁵ However, as pointed out by WILHELM, MDAR 72⁹, Boese's results were not referred to by GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...*. For another view on the period of the rulers succeeding Tukultī-Ninurta's reign see HAGENS (2005) 37–41, who postulated co-regencies and a lowering of the Amarna period by 80–100 years.

²⁰⁶ BECKMAN (2000) 23–24, BRYCE (1999) 347–254, DE MARTINO (1993) 218–240, KLENGEL (1999) 294–297, MORA, *Athenaeum* 46 (1988) 553–554, SINGER (1999) 689–690.

²⁰⁷ For further synchronisms see BECKMAN (2000) 23–24.

²⁰⁸ Depending on the dating of Tukultī-Ninurta: WALKER

(1995) and BRINKMAN (1977): 1243–1207; BOESE – WILHELM (1979): 1233–1197 (“lowered Middle Assyrian chronology”), and GASCHE *et al.* (1998): 1240–1205 (chronology corrected for solar years).

²⁰⁹ GRAYSON, RIMA 1, 272 (l. 46). See also SINGER, ZA 75 (1985) 100–101 and id. (1999) 689 (on RS 34.165). For a general description see BRYCE (1999) 349–354. The identification of the Nairi lands with Niḫria is doubted by GALTER, JCS 40 (1988) 232.

²¹⁰ OTTEN (1983) 15 pointed out, that due to this synchronism, the one between Tudḫalia IV and Merenptah established by Goetze is incorrect.

The variant names of Assyrian king no. 79 have been discussed by YAMADA (1998) 26–27 and PEDERSEN (1999) 369–373. The oldest copy of the AKL noted that Aššur-nādin-apli was the successor of Tukulti-Ninurta I and the father of the following king. The two later versions seem to have a split tradition or a different one. Royal inscriptions are attested only for Aššur-nādin-apli, who is also reported to have held an eponym office during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (SAPORETTI [1979] 116–117 and FREYDANK [1991] 121). The name Aššur-nādin-apli is also found in the Synchronistic KL. The only syllabic writing (for the logogram PAP = *na-šir*) for the name Aššur-nāšir-apli can be found in **Chronicle P**, where he is said to have killed his father, but not mentioned as successor. GRAYSON, ABC no. 22 noted some scribal errors in Chronicle P. Pedersen speculated that the confusion might be due to the reading of the logogram PAP. WEIDNER and POEBEL (1943) 56–90²¹¹ suggested Tukulti-Ninurta I had two sons: Aššur-nāšir-apli the murderer and Aššur-nādin-apli the successor. Pedersen discussed the spellings of logograms in Middle Assyrian personal names and concluded that confusion in the historical tradition in Neo-Assyrian times resulted in the different spellings: he ruled out the existence of a second son of Tukulti-Ninurta I.

YAMADA (1998) 26–27 pointed out that only later sources name Aššur-nāšir-apli (Chronicle P and Chors. as well as SDAS from the 8th cent.) and demonstrated that this name was due to a scribal confusion. He concluded that the murderer as well as the son was Aššur-nādin-apli, as had been recorded correctly by the scribe of the Nass. KL (nothing is said on the number of reigns), which is generally considered to be the better tradition. This error may have occurred due to confusion with kings Tukulti-Ninurta II and his son Aššur-nāšir-apli II. The pair of names may have influenced the diverging and erroneous entries in the AKL, since it was edited about 100 years after Aššur-nāšir-apli II. The latest version (SDAS) even omits Aššur-nādin-apli completely, designating Aššur-nāšir-apli as Tukulti-Ninurta's I successor. As Yamada noted, following BRINKMAN (1973), a number

of close affinities can be found between Chors. and SDAS, as opposed to the Nass. KL (→ below). It may be possible that the error which occurred in the AKL also infiltrated Babylonian texts (e.g. Chronicle P: other incorrect information of this text has been pointed out before).²¹²

The Nass. AKL notes that Aššur-nādin-apli reigned four years, which is considered to be the correct number in view of the more reliable tradition of this older manuscript (see also GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating...* 62–63). The other two lists, which also confused the names, say three years. BRINKMAN, MSKH 32⁸⁹ and BOESE (1982) 15–26 both pointed out the consequences for Assyrian and Kassite chronology (= lowered by one year with the variation of +5/–6 years), if the lower number of three years is regarded to be correct (→ 9.1.).

2.2.1.5. Ninurta-apil-Ekur (no. 82) and Aššur-dān I (no. 83)²¹³

As READE (2001) 3 demonstrated, the discrepancy between the two texts, Nass. and Chors./SDAS, concerning the regnal length of Aššur-dān I²¹⁴ (36 or 46 years) implies that the reign of Šalmaneser I could have begun either in 1263 or 1273. BOESE – WILHELM (1979) 23–24 devoted a paragraph to the reigns of Aššur-dān I (no. 83) and his father Ninurta-apil-Ekur in their important study on Middle Assyrian chronology. These reigns are very problematic in view of the Assyrian chronology for the second half of the 2nd millennium BC, mainly due to the variations in the existing copies of the AKL, since a difference of up to 20 years of reign is theoretically possible.

Chors. and SDAS KLS report 46 years for the reign of Aššur-dān I, the Nass. KL offers only 36 (Nassouhi read this number correctly, while WEIDNER (1945–1951) 88, no. 16 incorrectly read 46). BRINKMAN (1973) 309¹⁵ reviewed the original photos and read 26[(+ x)] without noting whether the rest is uninscribed or destroyed. SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2006) 165 agrees that only 26 is visible but considers 46 the most likely restoration according to the remaining traces. Boese and Wilhelm adopted 36

²¹¹ It has often been assumed that the revolt led to the partition of Assyria into several small kingdoms or principalities, an interpretation adopted by James *et al.* in their studies on chronology. See also Newgrosh in van der VEEN – ZERBST (2002) 181–183 (table 4a and 4b). Note however POSTGATE (1991) 244–246, who states that no evidence exists for the fragmentation of the Assyrian empire. See the postings by Whiting sampled on www.caeno.org with special emphasis

on the **ELs** KAV 21–24, which do not allow the proposed overlapping of Assyrian kings.

²¹² This is another indication that Chronicle P must have been composed at the end of the 9th cent.: YAMADA (1998) 26–27.

²¹³ These kings serve as a base line for Middle Assyrian chronology: see for example FREU (1997) 36 on Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian dates.

²¹⁴ See BRINKMAN (1973) 309.

years, which has been generally accepted within the past years, on the basis of two inscriptions and the prism inscription RIMA 2, A.0.87.1, which includes a **Distanzangabe** of 60 years by Aššur-dān's I grandson Tiglath-pileser I (→ 9.2.) and was written in the 6th year of the latter's reign. If Tiglath-pileser's reign began in 1114, the 60-year span of the Distanzangabe implies that Aššur-dān's reign began, or ended, in 1174 – or in 1169, taking in account that date of the composition of this prism is Tiglath-pileser's 6th year. Given Aššur-dān's long reign, it was assumed that the Distanzangabe referred to his reign's beginning (see their table on p. 25): Thus the 36 years probably given in the Nass. KL for the reign of Aššur-dān must be the correct value.²¹⁵ This dictates a lowering of ten years in Middle Assyrian chronology (see p. 26 of BOESE – WILHELM).

Another discrepancy can be observed in the KL for Ninurta-apil-Ekur, son of Ili-padī,²¹⁶ who, as reported in a chronicle-like section of the AKL,²¹⁷ came up from Babylon and seized the Assyrian throne. The Nass. KL cites 13 years for this king, while Chors. and SDAS both report three years only. So far the higher number has been generally accepted due to the synchronisms with Babylonia and Egypt, which has then been combined with the 46

years of reign of Aššur-dān I. This calculation goes back to POEBEL (1943) 87, whose proposal has been followed by most scholars.²¹⁸ (→ **Distanzangaben** sub 9.1.) New evidence for supporting the Nass. KL's longer reign for Ninurta-apil-Ekur comes from eponyms, of which more than three are attributed to this ruler, as was pointed out by CANCEK-KIRSCHBAUM (1999) 217 (referring to FREYDANK [1991] 195), who opted for the dates 1182/1–1169 according to the shortened chronology of Boese – Wilhelm. Other Middle Assyrian documents from Aššur and Kār-Tukulti-Ninurta containing eponyms studied by Freydank also seem to support the “shortened/lowered Middle Assyrian chronology” proposed by Boese – Wilhelm.²¹⁹ Thus the Nass. KL once again proves more trustworthy than the other AKL texts (FREYDANK [1991] 34). However, as BOESE – WILHELM stressed, no conclusive evidence for either 3 or 13 years yet exists.²²⁰ Because a reign length of 36 years for Aššur-dān I seems correct, Poebel's 46 plus 13 years is too much. The correct sum is 46 + 3 – or just possibly 36 + 13 = 49 years.²²¹ Basically the ancient scribes had the sum of the two reigns correct, but became confused over how the 49 years had been distributed between them. Thus Boese and Wilhelm's lower chronology of the period seems to be the right one.²²²

²¹⁵ See FREYDANK (1991) 32–33 for another Distanzangabe of Tiglath-pileser I, which also hints at the lower reign length for Aššur-dān I. Freydank agreed with the lowered Middle Assyrian chronology, suggesting 36 and 13 years for Aššur-dān I and Ninurta-apil-Ekur respectively.

²¹⁶ For the new reading of the father's name see CANCEK-KIRSCHBAUM (1999) 216–217 (previously read inter alia Ili-ihadda, now usually read Ili-pada: see BRINKMAN [1976–1980] 50–51 and POMPONIO [1996] 161). Cancik-Kirschbaum evaluated the relevant Middle Assyrian texts published by FREYDANK, MARV IV, WVDOG 99 (2001), which provided decisive information on the **genealogy** of Middle Assyrian kings succeeding Tukulti-Ninurta I. See also GRAYSON, RIA 9 (2001) 534. On the reconstruction of the eponyms' succession during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I see FREYDANK (1991) 43–51. On the attestations for Ili-padī, the *sukallu rabū* of the *dunnu* Sabi Abyad and “king of Ḫanigalbat”, the western province, see CANCEK-KIRSCHBAUM (1999) 220–221 and WIGGERMANN (2000) 172. Ili-padī's father Qibi-Aššur must have ruled Ḫanigalbat directly after Šattuara II, during the reign of Šalmaneser I. Ili-padī's reign lasted until Aššur-nirāri III.

²¹⁷ This usurpation is also recorded in the **Synchronistic History**: During the conflict between the Assyrian ruler Enlil-kudurri-ušur (name restored) and the Babylonian Adad-šuma-ušur, Ninurta-apil-Ekur returned to Aššur. → below.

²¹⁸ ROWTON (1966) 240–258 compared the sum of regnal years between the Babylonian rulers Adad-šuma-ušur (Kassite

dynasty) and Marduk-šāpik-zēri (Isin II dynasty) and the known regnal lengths of the contemporary Assyrian kings including the reports of the Synchronistic History. For the reign of Marduk-šāpik-zēri see id. (1959) 6–7. Rowton correctly stated that Egyptian chronology depends on whether the higher or lower number for Ninurta-apil-Ekur is chosen (p. 257), and that the BKL should not be brought into the discussion on Egyptian chronology. However, TADMOR (1958) 135 assigned 13 years according to the Nass. KL and referred to the synchronism Tiglath-pileser I & Marduk-nādin-aḫḫē and WEIDNER (1949–1951) and ITN 49–50.

²¹⁹ Accordingly year 1 of Šalmaneser I (no. 77) is dated to 1263 instead of 1273 (BRINKMAN [1977] or WALKER [1995]). For GASCHÉ *et al.*'s date in their table in *Dating ...* see the summary by WILHELM, MDAR 72⁹.

²²⁰ Accordingly BRINKMAN (1973) 313 stated that before the date of 1181 an inaccuracy of ten years must be reckoned with. Another point of uncertainty, as it had been mentioned, is the meaning of **DUB-pi-šu** (kings nos. 84 and 85). For an entirely different historical interpretation of the AKL (especially for the period after Tukulti-Ninurta I by suggesting co-regencies) with a resultant lowering of the Amarna period by 80–100 years see HAGENS (2005) 23–41.

²²¹ Followed by NA'AMAN (1984).

²²² The **Distanzangaben** were reviewed by the authors in order to confirm the reign of 49 years for both kings. → sub 9.1. and 9.2.

2.3. Different genealogies

For a summary on the conflicting information from the KLS and royal inscriptions starting with Aššur-nīrārī II (no. 68) see BRINKMAN (1973) 312, POMPONIO (1996) 159–165 and YAMADA (1994) 33–34⁷⁷.

2.4. Variations in royal names

King no. 79, successor of Tukulti-Ninurta I: Aššur-nādin-apli in Nass. and Chors.; and Aššur-nāšir-apli in SDAS (→ above sub 2.2.1.4.). For details see BRINKMAN (1973) 311, GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 55, GELB (1954) 209–230 and READE (2001) 3–4.

2.5. DUB-*pi-šu*

The term DUB-*pi-šu* appears three times in the AKL, being used in place of the number of regnal years for the predecessors of Aššur-rēša-iši I (no. 86) and for the kings succeeding Aššur-dugul (no. 41; → 2.1.1.).

- **Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur** (no. 84): “... reigned *tuppišu*.”
- **Mutakkil-Nusku** (no. 85): “Mutakkil-Nusku, his brother, fought with him (and) carried him off to Karduniaš. Mutakkil-Nusku held the throne for *tuppišu* (and then) passed away.”²²³
- A similar formulation can be found after **Aššur-dugul’s** reign (namely *ina tarši* Aššur-dugul, i.e. within his reign) for kings nos. 42–47:²²⁴ “... 6 kings, son(s) of nobody, exercised for *bāb tuppišu* kingship.”²²⁵

The meaning of DUB-*pi-šu* (Akk. *tuppišu*,²²⁶ “his tablet”), which is also frequently mentioned in documents, has been widely discussed in the past. Its meaning is still not clear and depends on the overall reliability of the data presented in the AKL. Generally a difference of from none to two years is possible,

as has been demonstrated by BOESE – WILHELM (1979) 21–23.²²⁷ Only READE (2001) 4–5 suggested that 16 years should be reckoned for the kings’ reigns termed as (*bāb*) DUB-*pi-šu* (→ sub 9.5.). Some scholars believe that this term simply indicates that the exact reign length is unknown or lost (x years). Due to the fact that the known ELs do not cover the respective periods, we can not reconstruct the number of years of the kings mentioned above. It has also been suggested that their reign did not cover a whole eponym year and therefore was reckoned as 0 years.

An overall treatment of DUB-*pi-šu* was presented by BOESE – WILHELM (1979) 21–23 (including extensive bibliographical notes).²²⁸ The following options of calculation were discussed in the past:²²⁹

- Reign of unknown length (count **x years**): **Cornelius, Landsberger** and **Tadmor**. Since it is now assumed that king lists served for the reconstruction of time spans (→ **Distanzangaben**), this opinion is no longer acceptable. It can be assumed that such historical material as complete ELs were at the disposal of the scribes or compilers, which would have helped reconstruct reign lengths for relatively late rulers (BOESE – WILHELM [1979] 22).
- Time span of 12 months, starting in the accession year and lasting to the first regnal year (count **1 year**): **Weidner**
- Time span of less than two years including the accession year and first regnal year (count **0–1 year**): **Cavaignac**
- Unknown time span (usually less than two years) at the end of an eponym’s period of a king whose successor does not appear in the ELs (no eponym).

²²³ His grandson Tiglath-pileser I also refers to Mutakkil-Nusku’s usurpation, but omits Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur from his genealogy. Nothing is known of the causes of Mutakkil-Nusku’s death mentioned within this passage of the AKL.

²²⁴ GRAYSON (1980–1983) 106 (sub §15).

²²⁵ For another translation “(at the) beginning of his *tuppu*” see GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 53, where *tuppu* is reckoned as 0 years. Note however that it is not clear to whom the *-šu* refers (most probably their predecessor) since the group of kings is designated only as DUMU (singular!). A possible relation to their own *tuppu* therefore cannot be excluded. Note that the 8th century inscription of Ninurta-kudurrī-ušur (GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 53) also shows a *-šu* which does not have an apparent antecedent in the text. This could imply that *tuppu* might relate to the speaker of the text and means that the synthesis by GASCHE *et al.* of overlapping of reigns cannot be based on this passage.

²²⁶ AHw 1394b: “in (End-)Zeitraum v, während”; JANSSEN (2007) 104 (he misspelled *tuppišu* instead of *tuppišu*) understands this term – following Rowton (“end-bit”) – as “*coda*”

(Latin): “Faktisch war mit *tuppišu* demnach in der AKL generell die Zeit vom Beginn des letzten Jahres bis zu Herrschaftende des älteren Königs gemeint. Dieser über den Jahreswechsel hinausgehende Teil der Herrschaft ist der Schlussabschnitt, der die Herrschaft (über)voll macht.” (Compare the term’s derivation from *tapāpu* “to become full, sated” [CAD T 48].) Note CAD T 129 sub 3’d (sub *tuppi*) “*mng. uncert., with ref. to terms of office*”. In response to CAD see FREYDANK (2007) 225–227. RADNER, SAAS 6 (1997) 53–54²⁷¹ has shown, that in Neo-Assyrian service contracts the term *tuppu* denotes a period not exceeding 10 months.

²²⁷ Note following comment by BRINKMAN (1973) 313: “... we are still not sure of the meaning of the phrase ‘he ruled/held the throne *tuppišu*’.”

²²⁸ Further important studies: FREYDANK (1991) 32–34, GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 53–54, NA’AMAN (1984) 115–123, READE (2001) 3–8 and JANSSEN (2006) 65–67.

²²⁹ For a more recent detailed overview see JANSSEN (2007) 99–103.

The length of the reign is added to the last king's years (count **0 years**): **Rowton, Hornung** and **van der Meer**. This interpretation has been widely accepted in general historical works (probably due to Rowton's CAH article), although we do not have any definitive proof as yet.

- The period between the death of a king and the end of the calendar year (count **0 years**): **Poebel**

In order to establish a chronology the authors propose a maximum of 2 years and a minimum of 0 years. The calculation uses the value ± 1 year, which means that both kings can be dated in 1133 (± 1 year). "Um den Fehler bei den folgenden Berechnungen so klein wie möglich zu halten, gehen wir von einer Regierungszeit von einem Jahr (± 1) für beide Könige (nos. 84 and 85) zusammen aus. Sie fällt demnach in das Jahr 1133 (± 1), d.h. der Tod des Aššur-dān I. erfolgte im Jahr 1134 (± 1)."²³⁰

The correct understanding of DUB-*pi-šu* is necessary for reconstructing Assyrian chronology (→ **Distanzangaben** sub **9.1.**) following Šamši-Adad I and in the Middle Assyrian period following Aššur-dān I. In general, the term is used in association with times of political instability (which therefore are not well documented. GARELLI (1985) 92 suspects violent takeover is the case for kings who only ruled DUB-*pi-šu*, as is attested in the AKL for Mutakkil-Nusku. Due to minor variants one cannot be entirely confident of the exact dates of most Middle Assyrian kings' reigns. However, the data can be checked against other sources for most of the period (BRINKMAN [1970] 301–314): Note the discrepancy between two texts which report different reign lengths (36 or 46 years) for Aššur-dān I, and the lowered Middle Assyrian chronology proposed by BOESE – WILHELM (1979) 19–38 (→ above sub **2.2.1.5**). JANSSEN (2006) 66–67 proposed counting 2 years for both of the *tuppišu*, based on his evaluation of the Distanzangabe on the

clay cone Assur 12572 of Aššur-rēša-iši I. He allowed 36 years of reign for Tukulti-Ninurta I.

FREYDANK (1991) 32–34 briefly discussed DUB-*pi-šu* in connection with the length of the reign of Aššur-dān I (no. 83). According to him (p. 33) the chronology of this period is far from being determined unless we gain more information on the sequence of **eponyms**.²³¹ For a long time it was assumed that the Assyrian rulers Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur and Mutakkil-Nusku (who was less active) together reigned only one year within the reign of their father Aššur-dān I (around 1133). Later it was suggested that there might have existed a co-regency, which lasted longer than one year and is to be placed towards the end of Aššur-dān's reign.²³² This means that both rulers may have exercised their office during the formal reign of Aššur-dān I (36 years; see FREYDANK [1991] 34) and that their reigns are then to be reckoned at 0 years.²³³ Lately this view has been followed by GRAYSON in RIA 9 (2001) 527 in his treatment of Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur.²³⁴

Cole in GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating ...* 53–54 also calculated *tuppišu* as 0 years, the same as POEBEL (1942–1943) 289–296 and (1943) 86. He understood the term (in light of the AKL's description of kings nos. 42–47) "to refer, respectively, to the last regnal years of kings 41 (Aššur-dugul) and 83 (Aššur-dān I)." (p. 53). Citing further evidence for this term, he concluded that it was "the portion of a deceased ruler's final regnal year that was completed by his successor (in chronological terms = 0 years)". Also JANSSEN (2007) understood *tuppišu* as the end of the previous ruler's kingship, which is identical with the *rēš šarrūti* of the successor.²³⁵

Though the few years' uncertainty caused by the DUB-*pi-šu*-reigns do have an impact on the choice of absolute chronological systems for Mesopotamia, the missing reign lengths in the AKL for kings nos. 65 and 66 do cause an uncertainty in the dates of the kings who preceded Enlil-nāšir II. → below for details. Generally – as in the charts of BRINKMAN

²³⁰ BOESE – WILHELM (1979) 23. NA'AMAN (1984) 117 and VON BECKERATH (1997) 60 agreed with their view, and Walker's 1995 table reckons 0 years for the DUB-*pi-šu*-reigns and 1133 for Aššur-dān's last year. → below.

²³¹ See FREYDANK (2000) 67–72.

²³² Note for instance FINE (1955) 92–93 (co-regency of Aššur-dān I and his oldest son Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur).

²³³ See also FREYDANK (2007) 27: "Wo dieses *tuppu* in der AKL auftritt, besagt es nicht mehr und nicht weniger, als dass innerhalb eines nach Jahren gezählten und mit einem Herrscher verbundenen Zeitabschnitt "außerdem" andere Personen die Königsherrschaft in Assyrien ausgeübt haben."

²³⁴ For a reign lasting more than one year see Donbaz (1992) 119–125. Earlier, one year of reign has been proposed due

to attestations in a Middle Assyrian archive from Aššur (PEDERSEN, ALA I [1985] 56–68 [M 6]): see LANDSBERGER (1954) 140–159 or RÖLLIG (1965) 47–49. But it has been shown that this archive cannot be directly linked to Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur's reign: POEBEL (1943) 65–66. RÖLLIG (1965) 49 concluded that this archive does not contain decisive chronological arguments, since here the tablets of only one economic year were collected and deposited in a jar.

²³⁵ Janssen proposes the concept of a tripartition of a king's rule: *rēš šarrūti* – reign – *tuppu* and concludes (p. 104): "Diese Erklärung steht im Einklang ..., dass *tuppišu* ein endlicher Zeitraum sein muß, der aber nicht einfach mit dem Anfang, der Mitte oder dem Ende des Jahres identisch sein kann."

(1977) and WALKER (1995) – DUB-*pi-šu*-reigns have been assumed to be 0 years.

For Aššur-dugul and his successors note Reade's comment of 2001, 4–5 offering a radical new interpretation of the AKL (→ above sub 2.1.1.). Here, the question is how the term *bāb* is to be understood: either as the “sum” of (unknown) regnal years or as “the beginning” of a certain period.²³⁶ Reade assigned 96 years to these kings (6 × 16 years: → just below and **Generation**). However, on p. 7 he stated that the six named kings “look suspiciously like Aššur-dugul's eponyms” adding up to six years as stated in the AKL (Aššur-dugul is equated with Lullaya!). Reade “shortened” the AKL by equating the names Puzur-Sin and IB.TAR-Sin and minimizing the number of reigns between Išme-Dagān I and IB.TAR-Sin by setting up parallel and independently ruling governors at Aššur and Ekallātum.²³⁷ It has been assumed before (GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 52, GLASSNER, *ChrMés* 91) that the early part of the AKL contained information on Aššur and Ekallātum. For one *tuppišu* Reade calculated 16 years in accordance with his interpretation of **Distanzangaben**, in which the average regnal length of a king adds up to 16 years. However, it should be noted that in the case of Esarhaddon's Distanzangabe of 580 or 586 years (see p. 5), the 32 years (2 × 16 years) for the *tuppišu*-kings Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur and Mutakkil-Nusku cannot have been included (the same goes for the earlier six *tuppišu* starting with Aššur-dugul, which READE [2001] 8 considers being eponyms).

JANSSEN (2007) 105–106 took up Reade's idea that the six kings nos. 42–47 might have been Aššur-dugul's (no. 41) eponyms, who functioned as co-regents and

together reigned 6 years. He concludes “Als Aššur-dugul ... nach kurzer Regierung starb, blieb demnach der Schattenkönig Adasi übrig, der seinen Sohn Belbani als Herrscher inthronisiert haben dürfte.”

2.6. Missing reign lengths: Aššur-rabī I (no. 65) and Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē I (no. 66)

The reign lengths of kings nos. 65 and 66 are missing in all known versions of the AKL. Charts listing Assyrian kings usually start citing absolute dates with the succeeding king, Enlil-nāšir II (no. 67), now usually dated to 1420–1415 according to the lowered Middle Assyrian chronology.²³⁸ This period, a politically unstable period and reigns of the kings cannot have been too long (though proposals range between 0 and ca. 70 years): Aššur-rabī I (no. 65: x years) deposed his nephew Aššur-šadūni (no. 64: 1 month),²³⁹ son of Nūr-ili (no. 63: 12 years) and grandson of Enlil-nāšir I (no. 62: 13 years) and was succeeded by his son Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē I (no. 66: x years). This means that Aššur-rabī I was the brother of Nūr-ili. Notice that Enlil-nāšir II (no. 67: 6 years) was also the brother of Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē I (no. 68: 7 years), a relation recorded incorrectly in the AKL,²⁴⁰ which states: “Enlil-nāšir, son of Puzur-Aššur reigned 13 years, Nūr-ili son of Enlil-nāšir reigned 12 years, Aššur-šadūni son of Nūr-ili reigned one month, Aššur-rabī I son of Enlil-nāšir (removed Aššur-šadūni from the throne), he took the throne (for himself and ruled for x years). Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē son of Aššur-rabī (ruled for x years), Enlil-nāšir, his brother, (removed him) from the throne (and) ruled for six years, Aššur-nīrārī, son of Enlil-nāšir (!) reigned for 7 years.” (GRAYSON [1980–1983] 108). (Table 20)



Table 20

²³⁶ RÖLLIG (1965) 46. He could not offer a decisive argument for either of the proposals since too little is known about the rulers following *bāb tuppišu*.

²³⁷ p. 6: “If Puzur-Sin and IB.TAR-Sin are indeed one man, the reigns of all the kings between Išme-Dagān I and IB.TAR-Sin in the standard king-list are dispensable. Between Išme-Dagan I and Šu-Ninua we are left with a minimum of five reigns, those of Mut-Aškur, Re-mu-[x], Puzur-Sin (1639–1628), his ‘son’ Bazaya (1627–1600), and a ‘usurper’ Lullaya (1599–1594).” and p. 7: “So we can be ruthless: In the period between Išme-Dagan I and Šu-Ninua there are two usurpers, both with 6-year reigns: Aššur-dugul has a

grand name and Lullaya a hypocoristic name; perhaps they are the same person. The six *tuppišu* kings, who reigned *ina tarši* Aššur-dugul, look suspiciously like Aššur-dugul's eponyms ...”. → above sub 2.1.1.

²³⁸ BRINKMAN (1977) 345 and WALKER (1995) 232: 1430–1425. Their slightly different numbers (+2 years) are due to different interpretations of *tuppišu*-reigns.

²³⁹ Due to the fact that his 1-month reign is listed in the AKL, the dependency of the AKL on the EL was doubted by RÖLLIG (1965) 89.

²⁴⁰ For a graphic depiction see GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 55.

²⁴¹ The Middle Assyrian EL starts with Aššur-nīrārī II.

Several proposals have been made concerning the reign lengths of kings nos. 65 and 66. RÖLLIG (1965) 58 suggested that a solution has to come from non-Assyrian sources. However, the proposals mainly depended on the interpretation of the **Distanzangaben** (→ 9.3.) and the estimate of an average **generation** interval on throne tenure.²⁴² Basically, two options exist for the length of their reigns: one either calculates 0 years for both reigns assuming that both kings did not reign a complete year, or one proposes a certain number of years to be determined. POEBEL (1942–1943) 289–296 and 479–482 attempted to calculate their reign lengths on the basis of Distanzangaben mentioned in building inscriptions and determined their reigns had both been zero years. Interestingly, no inscriptions are known for both kings. WEIDNER (1945–1951) 100 suggested one year of reign for both kings together. However, Cavaignac (1955) 97 based on hints concerning the relationships in the royal family, proposed a maximum reign length of 73 years for both kings and a minimum of 0 years (p. 96). ALBRIGHT, *BASOR* 88 (1942) 28–33 reckoned 22 years for both kings. RÖLLIG (1965) 249, who supported the LC, also suggested a length of ca. 22 years for both reigns by attributing a longer reign to Aššur-rabi I since his son was removed from the throne by his brother. On the basis of his interpretation of the Distanzangaben NA'AMAN (1984) totaled their reigns at 31 years (1451–1421); while GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 54, based on the average reign lengths (generation) of kings nos. 55–64 and 67–76, totaled the two reigns to 14 + 15 = 29 years. The Assyrian kings nos. 63–68 accordingly reigned 54 years (25 + x [= 29]).²⁴³ On pp. 55–56 Cole in GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* illustrated that, using the

MC, the reign length of these kings would total from 76 to 97 years (depending on the variants of the AKL manuscripts). READE (2001) 5 proposed 30 years in his re-interpretation of the AKL dates as did EDER (2004) in his table. ROWTON (1970) 33 proposed 20 years for each king's reign, assuming an orderly succession (→ **Generation** for various approaches to define an average throne-tenure). Opting for a high chronology, LANDSBERGER (1954) 43 suggested 40 years for both kings. VAN DER MEER (1955) 35, on the basis of the **BKL A**, gave 26 years for the two kings: his calculations were said to have been "*recht gewagt*" by RÖLLIG (1965) 59.

The total of 29 years for Aššur-rabi I and Aššur-nādin-aḥḥē I given by GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 54 comes from their calculation that the average throne tenure of kings nos. 55–64 and 67–76 was either 14.4 or 14.9 years, depending on the reign length of Puzur-Aššur III. But this also depends on which of the absolute dates is "selected" for Šamši-Adad I and whether one accepts the validity of the Assyrian time spans.²⁴⁴ In their latest table in *Akkadica* 108 (1998) 4, they reduced the dates for the reigns of kings nos. 66 and 65 by another nine years (18 years were suggested for both reigns) because of the corrected synchronism between Hammu-rāpi' and Šamši-Adad I: in their table in *Dating ...*, the year of death of Šamši-Adad I was assumed to be year 8 of Hammu-rāpi', but it was in fact year 17 of Hammu-rāpi' (or year 18 according to the more recent research of CHARPIN – ZIEGLER [2003]). They shifted the Assyrian reigns by nine years, which were subsequently subtracted from the unknown regnal years of king nos. 65 and 66, "which are hypothetical reconstructions anyway, and therefore elastic" (p. 2). Of course, the more problematic

²⁴² Rowton proposed 20 years each for reigns of orderly succession, READE [2000] 4–5 16 years as the average throne tenure.

²⁴³ They pointed out that the MC would naturally require a longer reign length for the two kings (up to ca. 1000 years), which they considered unlikely due to the short reigns of the preceding and succeeding kings (pp. 54 and 56).

²⁴⁴ See PRUZSINSZKY (2006) 73–79, who tries to show the concurrence of AKL and Distanzangaben data on the basis of the proposed date 1792–1760 for Šamši-Adad's reign (= MC lowered by 16 years, a 15-year reduction according to the dates proposed by CHARPIN – ZIEGLER [2003]). This solution would require a higher number of regnal years for kings nos. 65 and 66 without providing any further evidence. However, by reckoning 40 years for the reign of Išme-Dagān I (including within his those of Mūt-Aškur and Rimuš) and 0 years (?) for kings nos. 42–47, a considerably high number of 66 years is left for kings nos. 65 and 66, whose reigns are said to have taken place during a politically instable

period. Theoretically such a high number for average throne tenure is possible, but according to the Assyrian King List data unlikely (→ **Generation**). What seems evident, though, is that according to Assyrian tradition 40 years are to be reckoned for Išme-Dagān even though he did not actually rule that long. Due to further uncertainties concerning rulers nos. 42–47 and the fact that we do not know how these reigns were understood by the Assyrian chronographers, the calculation is still tentative and will require further modifications (compare READE [2001]). In summary, there are two major uncertainties: the reign lengths of kings nos. 65 and 66 and the actual length of the reigns of kings nos. 42–47. Taken the known reign lengths between Šamši-Adad I (no. 33) and Enlil-nāšir II (1430–1425 or 1420–1415) into account, which add up to 274 years, any chronology between MC and lower solutions is possible. Without further evidence that is consistent with the AKL-data it is difficult to offer new solutions.

parts in the beginning of the AKL (especially concerning the first Assyrian Dark Age), which might be interpreted differently add to the uncertainty of the calculation of the reign lengths for these kings.

Concluding remarks

The AKL along with the ELs and astronomically anchored eponym chronicles provide the only firm basis for Mesopotamian absolute chronology, as can be demonstrated especially for the 1st millennium BC between 910–649. The accuracy of the AKL and EL has been confirmed by the **KEL**. Though FREYDANK (1991) 15 wrote, “Obwohl also der assyrischen Königsliste zufolge seit Erišum I. prinzipiell jedes Regierungsjahr einem Eponymat entsprechen sollte und damit, wenigstens in der Theorie, die Kenntnis der Beamtennamen bzw. der Jahre ohne *limu* zum mindesten die assyrische Chronologie bis ins 19. Jh. v.u.Z. sichern könnte, bleibt diese Möglichkeit in der Praxis vorerst ohne Bedeutung.”, it seems that we might be approaching a more exact chronology for the time succeeding Šamši-Adad I (and especially the period after Išme-Dagān I, which is less well documented in the AKL) thanks to the KEL covering Kaniš levels II and Ib. The KEL shows that the AKL as well as the Distanzangaben are ultimately based on ELs²⁴⁵ – a dependence especially obvious for the period between Erišum and Šamši-Adad I. The first eponyms are known for Erišum, whose regnal length is cited 40 years.

In trying to adapt the AKL data to a lower chronological scheme, GASCHE *et al.* used the following assumptions (listed by Cole in *Dating ...* 61).

- higher variants for Puzur-Aššur III, Aššur-nādin-apli, Ninurta-apil-Ekur and Aššur-dān I
- Išme-Dagān’s reign was reckoned at only eleven years instead of 40 (AKL)
- DUB-*pi-šu*-reigns were reckoned at 0 years
- the combined reigns of Aššur-rabi I (no. 65) and

Aššur-nādin-aḥḫē (no. 66) was 29/28 years, later reduced by another nine years

- rejection of the Assyrian **Distanzangaben** data
- this base chronology was corrected against solar dates (starting with Tiglath-pileser I [1114–1076]: –18 years until the reign of Šamši-Adad I) → **Calendar**.

The over-all result was a lowering of ca. 100 years for Šamši-Adad I compared to the MC. Also the dates of Enlil-nāšir II (no. 67) are dropped 8 years from the generally accepted 1430–1425²⁴⁶ to 1422–1417 (reduction of one year every 33 years for a total of 8 years²⁴⁷). GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 64 also indicate that their so-called “corrected base chronology” may require be further shortening. In order to fit their dates to agree with known Assyro-Babylonian synchronisms, the dates of the Babylonian kings as suggested by Brinkman were lowered by five years.²⁴⁸

GASCHE *et al.* also supported their reduced chronology by new evaluations and computations of **astromonomical data**, which allow a solution for the dating of Ammišaduqa every eight years (instead of 56/64 years). But the NC results of the Gasche group may be challenged in many ways, as has been shown above (especially by cross-checks with the Distanzangaben and the ELs). Further, new **dendrochronological** data from Anatolia possibly connected with Šamši-Adad I may date this ruler to 1792–1760,²⁴⁹ which is consistent with a **solar eclipse** mentioned in the **MEC**.

The synchronisms between the Babylonian and the Assyrian line of rulers show that between Puzur-Aššur III and Burna-Buriaš four generations (47 + x years) had passed between Puzur-Aššur and Aššur-bēlnišēšu, and three or four generations between Burna-Buriaš and Kara-indaš (depending on the placement of Kadašman-Ḫarbe I). This means that the time span between those rulers could have been as much as 100 years.²⁵⁰ Unfortunately, so far no decisive information has come from the chronology of peripheral areas (Syria, Anatolia, the Levant, or Elam) or from the

²⁴⁵ This was doubted by RÖLLIG (1965) §30, who hypothesized that some kind of “Reichschronik” formed the basis of the AKL and other chronicles, such as the Synchronistic History (pp. 90–91). On p. 87 of his study he listed arguments that had been brought up in favor of ELs being the source material for the AKL. However, at that time the KEL and the overlapping MEC were unknown. The oldest EL known then was the badly preserved list from Boğazköy KUB 4, 93 (= CTH 817). Of course Röllig was right that ELs list the king always without filiation, but some of the fragments of the AKL also list kings without parentage. For genealogical information additional source material such as chronicles

and royal inscriptions may well have been used – as was the case for the narrative chronicle-like parts of the AKL.

²⁴⁶ Compare the list on p. 62 with WALKER’s chart (1995) 232 and BRINKMAN (1977) 345.

²⁴⁷ The lowered Middle Assyrian chronology proposed by BOESE – WILHELM in 1979, because it is based mainly on a re-evaluation of the Distanzangaben, is rejected by Gasche *et al.*

²⁴⁸ See BRINKMAN, MSKH 32⁸⁹ and BOESE (1982) 15–26.

²⁴⁹ MICHEL (2002) 17–18, PRUZSINSZKY (2006) 73–79. → **Distanzangaben** and **Eponyms**.

²⁵⁰ RÖLLIG (1965) 319.

generation counts. The lost reigns of kings nos. 65 and 66 can only be bridged by the Distanzangaben, which certainly cannot furnish any more information as to the exact length of their reigns.

Despite the late dates for the redaction of the various versions of AKL, this Assyrian list remains the most reliable source for chronological issues of the Ancient Near East, as the ELs, Distanzangaben, royal inscriptions, etc. have proven. Whether the tradition and redaction of the AKL can be traced back to the

Old Babylonian period (note the ancestors' list) is still unknown. Despite its long textual tradition it has few mistakes. Most of the unsolved problems concern the earlier part of the list. As for the period after Išme-Dagān, the “first Assyrian Dark Age”, none of the AKL-exemplars provides decisive information. But all in all the AKL can be considered a reliable source and gains even more importance when synchronisms are fit into its historical and chronological framework.

Parts of the AKL Discussed with Respect to the Absolute Chronology of the 2nd millennium BC

Šamī²-Adad I (no. 39)

I₁me-Dagān (no. 40)

Kings succeeding I₁me-Dagān: Variation of AKL, KAV 14 and the Synchronistic KL

ina tar, i A₁ur-dugul (no. 41): *bāb ḫuppiju*: nos. 42–47

Identification of IB-TAR-Sîn with Puzur-Sîn (who is not mentioned in the AKL)?

B₁u-bāni (no. 48)

Puzur-A₁ur III (no. 61) Variation of reign lengths

A₁ur-*adûni* (no. 64)

A₁ur-rabî I (no. 65) Lost reign length

A₁ur-n₁din-a₁ (no. 66) Lost reign length

Enlil-n₁ir II (no. 67)

Difficulties with the genealogical information provided for kings nos. 68–74

A son of A₁ur-n₁r₁ II (no. 68), namely B₁-n₁din-a₁ is omitted in the AKL

Adad-n₁r₁ I (no. 78) Slight variation of reign lengths between the Synchronistic KL and the AKL

Incorrect genealogy except for the Nass. KL

A₁ur-n₁din-apli (no. 79) Slight variation of reign length and incorrect filiation

Enlil-kudurr²-u, ur (no. 81)

Ninurta-apil-Ekur (no. 82) Variation of reign length

A₁ur-dān (no. 83) Variation of reign length:
difference up to 10 years is possible

Ninurta-tukulti-A₁ur (no. 84) *ḫuppiju*-reign

Mutakkil-Nusku (no. 85) *ḫuppiju*-reign

Table 21

Links

Astronomical Data, Calendar, Chronicles, Dendrochronology, Distanzangaben, Eponyms, Genealogy, Generation, GHD, Synchronistic KL, Year.

