

10. EPONYMS (LĪMU)/EPONYM LISTS/EPONYM CHRONICLES

Sources, Textual Evidence

One basically distinguishes between *eponym lists* (ELs), which give the name of the eponym for each year in chronological order (Class A), and *Eponym Chronicles* or *Canons*, which add after the eponym an event that happened during each year (Class B):

- **Eponym Chronicles/Canons of the first millennium BC:** C^a, C^b and the prism C^d⁷²²
- **KAV 21–24 (EL)**⁷²³ (C^c)
- **KAV 19 (C^e), KUB 4, 93 (C^f) (EL)**
- **MEC:** Mari Eponym Chronicle: BIROT (1985) 219–242. (Five exemplars)
- **KEL:** Kültepe Eponym List: VEENHOF (2003) and GÜNBATTI (2008) 103–132. (Seven exemplars⁷²⁴)
- Further eponyms are known from documents from **Aššur, Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta, Boğazköy, Ališar, Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilān),⁷²⁵ Qaṭṭarā (Tell ar-Rimāḥ),⁷²⁶ Qal’at al-Ḥādī, Mari,⁷²⁷ Tell Taya, Tuttul (Tell Bi’a),⁷²⁸ Šaḡar Bāzār (Chagar Bazar)⁷²⁹ and Tigunānu.⁷³⁰** A useful compilation of these eponyms for chronological studies can be found in VEENHOF

(1985) 191ff., (1993) 63ff., (1998) 447f. and (2000). For a historical synopsis between ca. 1792–1775 see CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 75–169.

General Features

The system of dating by **eponym** (= name of an official: *līmu*) goes back to the 3rd millennium (Fara, Ebla). In upper Mesopotamia this system is attested from the 2nd millennium onwards and later became the standard Assyrian method of dating. Used parallel to the word *līmu* in the early period was the Sumerian BALA (“term of office”), employed from the end of the Early Dynastic period onwards (note the **BKL A**).⁷³¹ In Assyria/Northern Mesopotamia the dating system was based on *līmu* known from the reign of Ērišum I onwards.⁷³² In contrast the Babylonians named years after important events or kings (**year-names, regnal years**).⁷³³ For administrative chronological purposes the Assyrians compiled the names of eponyms in eponym lists (ELs) and probably used them parallel with genealogical lists of rulers (**AKL**). With the help of such lists it was possible to determine spans of time between one specific year and another

⁷²² Further information on their publication can be found in UNGNAD (1938) 413–414 and MILLARD (1994): B1–B10, id. (1995) 208–209. Complementary to Millard’s study is a chapter by Whiting on the post-canonical eponyms (pp. 72–78). For the post-canonical eponyms after 649, that is from 648 to 609, when the ELs/Canon end, the works by FINKEL – READE (1995) 167–172 and (1998) 248–254 as well as READE (1998) 255–265 have to be taken into account. For another order see PÄRPOLA in PNA I/1 (1998) XVIII–XX.

⁷²³ Clusters of stone stelae “Stelenreihen” discovered in Aššur carry the names of kings, queens, and men who served as eponyms (ANDRAE, WVD OG 24 [1913] and FREYDANK [2003] 29–32). For a new interpretation of the function of the Stelenreihen found at Aššur and a summary of previously suggested interpretations see MIGLUS, ZA 74 (1984) 133–140.

⁷²⁴ See GÜNBATTI (2008) 103–104 and MICHEL’s review of VEENHOF (2003) in *AJO* 51 (2007) 323 on KEL G from level Kārum Ib which lists 80 more eponyms after the end of Kārum Kaniš II and thus covers the reigns of Šamši-Adad I and Išme-Dagān I.

⁷²⁵ WHITING (1990) 167–218, VAN DE MIEROOP (1994) 306–308.

⁷²⁶ DALLEY *et al.* (1976) 278–335.

⁷²⁷ Note especially M. 5681: CHARPIN (1985) 249 (on the order of Mari eponyms in an economic text).

⁷²⁸ KREBERNIK (2001a) 7–10 (with a list of eponyms known from Mari and Šaḡar-Bāzār) and 190–200.

⁷²⁹ TALON, OBTCB 10–12, DURAND (1997) 45, VAN KOPPEN, *AJO* 46+47 (1999–2000) 336–341.

⁷³⁰ SALVINI (1996) 7–16, id. (1998) 305–311. More eponyms are known to have existed in Tigunānu, which appear in yet unpublished texts. It is not clear whether a local system of eponyms or Aššur *līmu* were used at Tigunānu.

⁷³¹ On BALA (*palū*) see TADMOR, *JCS* 12 (1958) 26–27 and FUCHS, SAAS 8 (1998) 81 (especially on its use in Assyria, structuring events in royal inscriptions of Sargon II: regnal years versus eponyms).

⁷³² On the significance of year eponyms see VEENHOF (1998) 421–422. Note however HECKER, TUAT N.F. 2 (2005) 32³⁶ who points out that the AKL hints at an earlier introduction of eponyms. Important is his point that the reign of a king obviously started with the first mention of an eponym (and not with his accession year!).

⁷³³ For general comments on methods of designating years in Mesopotamia see HORSNELL (1999) 123ff.

(→ **Distanzangaben**). Eponym Chronicles, which are known from the eponymate of Šalmaneser III in 857 down to 700, are not lists, but annual chronicles which contained the names of eponyms. Because eponyms were the main means of year identification in Assyria and because each entry of the Eponym Chronicle starts with *ina līme ...* “in the eponymate of ...”, such texts are, in contrast to the ELs, historically rather than chronologically oriented: more emphasis was given to the event (drawn from annals?), than to the eponym. MILLARD (1997) 208 suggested that such chronicles might have been in use as early as the time of Šamši-Adad I (note the **MEC**).

Every year a new official was appointed *līmu*.⁷³⁴ The origin of the eponym office and its duties remain obscure.⁷³⁵ GRAYSON (1980) 176–177 questioned whether the system of eponyms, which goes back to Old Assyrian times, was originally inspired by Mesopotamian **date-lists**; note also the reference to eponyms in the beginning sections of the AKL as well as the KEL.⁷³⁶ In Old Assyrian times the kings did not serve as eponym, whereas in the 1st millennium this was regularly the case (see GARELLI, in: *FS Veenhof* [2001] 149). During the Middle Assyrian period some of the leading men of the state appear as *līmū*,⁷³⁷ and the king, starting with Enlil-nīrārī (no. 74), is recorded to have held this post during one year of his reign. A certain pattern of succession can be observed from the reign of Šalmaneser III (no. 102) onwards.

Lists of *līmū* – eponym lists (ELs) – were established to keep records of their chronological sequence and to serve as a tool for determining time intervals in the history of the Assyrian empire (→ **Distanzangaben**). ELs are valuable chronological documents, since they are free of ideological bias. In contrast to Babylonia, eponyms provided Assyria with a continuous method of dating that lasted until the fall of Aššur in the late 7th cent. Some lists contain chronicle-like notes on military events, and the like: they

are the Eponym Chronicles/Canons and the MEC.⁷³⁸ Only one eponym for each year was recorded, even if there were other eponyms (local eponyms⁷³⁹) appointed elsewhere in the empire.

The earliest attestation of ELs is the KEL, which overlaps with the MEC. The KEL is also among the most recently discovered or identified of such lists and resolves many chronological problems and uncertainties concerning the **Old Assyrian period** before the reign of Šamši-Adad I because it records reign lengths not preserved in the AKL. A relationship between the AKL and the KEL of the Old Assyrian period has been shown by VEENHOF (2003) 57ff. The relationship between the EL and AKL for the Neo-Assyrian period (a complete list of the eponyms between **Adad-nīrārī II [no. 99]** and the year 648 is known) has been studied by MILLARD (1994) 13. Unfortunately, we do not possess an EL covering the entire 2nd millennium. However, a reconstruction of the sequence of the known Middle Assyrian eponyms has been attempted by SAPORETTI (1979) and FREYDANK (1991). Further research will be possible on the basis of yet unpublished evidence (see below).⁷⁴⁰

Another early 2nd millennium time unit is the *hamuštum* of Old Assyrian texts from Kültepe/Kaniš (LARSEN [1976] 354–365 and VEENHOF [1995–1996] 5–26). This was a week eponymy, each period of seven days was being designated by the name of an official.⁷⁴¹ The *līmū* and *hamuštum* officials of the Kārum were of quite different rank. The *līmū* were from important Assyrian families elected on a yearly basis in Aššur to hold an executive office (*līmu*) in Kārum⁷⁴² and its representatives. They were recruited from the colonial ranks of the *hamšātu* (pl.), who were mostly Assyrians, sometimes Anatolians, from the Kārum.⁷⁴³ Since this was a weekly office there were about 50 *hamšātu* during a year. However, this office was only a colonial innovation and did not survive Kārum Kaniš level II. Little is known about this office except that it worked in rotation.

⁷³⁴ GRAYSON, ABC 196–197. For general notes on eponyms see VEENHOF (2003) 20ff. in his publication of two manuscripts of the KEL.

⁷³⁵ See discussion in FREYDANK (1991) 15–17 (on Larsen contra Oppenheim).

⁷³⁶ Judging from the various manuscripts of the KEL, the reign lengths cited in the AKL depended on such ELs as the Old Assyrian KEL. It can be demonstrated that also the **Distanzangaben** correlate with the information in the AKL and ELs.

⁷³⁷ For a table of Middle Assyrian rulers who served as eponyms see CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM (1999) 211.

⁷³⁸ Of the MEC VEENHOF (2003) 17 states: “... He (the compil-

er) used an existing eponym list as a chronological skeleton, which he fleshed out by adding pieces of historical information, which he may have derived from existing royal inscriptions, chronicle-like texts and perhaps even chancery documents. ...” See MILLARD (1997) 208–209 on the source material of the MEC and its comparison with the Babylonian Chronicle.

⁷³⁹ MILLARD (1994) 73.

⁷⁴⁰ FREYDANK (2000) 67–72.

⁷⁴¹ See KRYSZAT (2004) 159–197.

⁷⁴² LARSEN (1976); for a list of datings see BALKAN (1955).

⁷⁴³ VEENHOF (1995–1996) 5–26.

The documents from Kārum were traditionally dated by Aššur eponymies, but some also by local Kārum eponymies or *Kārum līmū*. These were eponyms of the Kārum itself and thus useless for Assyrian chronology (VEENHOF [1998] 445). It is not always easy to differentiate between local and Assyrian *līmū*: for instance in MATOUŠ's *ArOr* 46 (1978) list of collected eponyms, *Kārum-līmū* are intermingled with Assyrian *līmū*.

Sometimes during the early winter months, Anatolia would be cut off from Aššur by deep snow in the passes of the Taurus and the name of the new eponym would not be known by the start of the new eponym year at winter solstice.⁷⁴⁴ As a stop-gap were used the so-called *ša qāti* PN-eponyms – literally “from the hand of PN”, in the sense of “the eponym who took over from PN” or *līmu ša warki* PN “the eponym which is (used) after PN”. These are usually attested during the first four months of the eponym year.⁷⁴⁵ The break-off of communication coinciding with the beginning of the new eponym year might be an indication that a **solar year** correlated with the seasons was in use in Assyria at the beginning of the 2nd millennium (VEENHOF [2000] 144 with reference to LARSEN's [1976] observations on Kārum level II, when some coordination between the month-year and the eponym year can be observed). VEENHOF (2000) 146–147 sorted the Old Assyrian year eponyms according the months of the year and concluded that intercalary months might have already existed at this time (in the form of a second 12th month to restore the correlation of the beginning of the year with the autumnal equinox).⁷⁴⁶ However, this has not been verified and we have no idea as to how this coordination worked (→ **Calendar**). On p. 144 he stated: “... But in a system based on a lunar year without intercalation the start of the eponym's period of office in the first month over the years would have moved backwards through the solar year and this would exclude the ‘climatic’ explanation of regular occurrences of ‘successor eponyms’ during the same first months of the year. ...” Therefore, VEENHOF (2000) 147 rejected a climatic explanation for the *ša qāti* eponyms during the first

months of the year, instead attributing the breakdown in communication that resulted in “successor eponymies” to political disorders or similar factors.⁷⁴⁷

10.1. KAV 21–24

KAV 21–24 reaches back to the Middle Assyrian period (ca. 1200) and in its original state listed eponyms for a period of ca. 600 years. It is the longest known EL continuing onto the post-canonical era (648–609). It was clearly composed for calculating elapsed time because it sums up “years” instead of “eponyms”. Unlike other ELs, it has a horizontal line drawn after the statement of each king's reign length. These ELs show the same pattern as date-list summaries, with the shortened structure “Name – MU (Year)”. A similar summary appears at the end of **BKL C** (GRAYSON, ABC 197). For this reason WEIDNER (1941–1944) believed that ELs served as a basis for KLs.⁷⁴⁸ This may now be proven by means of the **KEL**, which covers the Old Assyrian part of the **AKL**. KAV 21–24 gives the total number (“Summierungszahlen”) of eponym years (MU.MEŠ) that passed between each king's eponym year and that of his predecessor. This total coincides with the reign lengths only when each king's eponym year (*līmu šarri/līmu ša šarri/līme šarri*) coincided with his first regnal year. Usually, the sum of all reigns is correct. Most importantly the “Summierungszahlen” show one eponym equals one year.

Since KAV 21–24 consists of fragments which do not join, we do not know the exact number of eponyms that were recorded here. However, UNGNAD, *RLA* 2, 414, assumed the texts originally contained about 542 eponyms. Unfortunately, the recovered portions of KAV 21–24 do not contain the *līmū* of Aššur-nādin-apli (no. 79), whose number of reign length varies in the different manuscripts of the **AKL** (see esp. POEBEL [1943] 56–90 on this problem).

Chors. KL gives different reign lengths than KAV 21–24 for two 1st millennium kings: 33 years for Tiglath-pileser II in KAV 22 V, 24 versus 32 years and 24 years for Aššurnaširpal II (no. 97) in KAV 22 VI, 16 versus 25 years (together they add up to 57 years).

⁷⁴⁴ In Kārum Kaniš level Ib month I of the Šamši-Adad calendar was synchronous with Month VI of the Mari calendar. In level II the eponym year started with the winter solstice. It is still unknown why this shift took place. → **Calendar** sub 6.2.

⁷⁴⁵ LARSEN, *RA* 68 (1974) 21–24, VEENHOF (2000) 143–144 and (2003) 29. See also YUHONG (1994) 155 (Kaniš, Mari and Qaṭṭara) and KREBERNIK (2001) 2–4 as well as HEIMPEL (2003) 314–316 (on the new evidence from Tuttul).

⁷⁴⁶ See YUHONG (1994) 155 for a list of *ša qāti līmū*. On intercalary months and the use of a **lunar calendar** by the Assyrians see WEIDNER, *AJO* 5 (1928–1929) 184–185.

⁷⁴⁷ See also HEIMPEL (2003) 316–317, who tried to show that neither the distance from Aššur, nor disruption of communications, nor an unstable political situation was the cause for *warki*-datings.

⁷⁴⁸ RÖLLIG (1969) 265–277 disagreed. → **AKL**

The reign lengths of the kings from Adad-nīrārī II are known from other sources, such as ELs from Nineveh and royal inscriptions. For earlier kings one has to rely on the AKL, although one can not prove the correctness of numbers given (i.e. first regnal year (?) = king's eponym year⁷⁴⁹). However, the KEL provides us with exact figures on the reigns of rulers preceding Šamši-Adad I, which have not been preserved or reported in the AKL.

10.2. KUB 4, 93 and KAV 19⁷⁵⁰

The ELs KUB 4, 93 and KAV 19 were both composed during the reign of **Aššur-uballiṭ I (no. 73)**. Both cover only parts of the **Middle Assyrian period**. KAV 19 lists eponyms with their fathers' names. It has two columns on the obverse and three on the reverse. The upper and lower edges are lost. Of KUB 4, 93 only a small fragment of nine damaged lines is preserved. (→ below sub 10.8.)

10.3. MEC (Mari Eponym Chronicle⁷⁵¹)

During the period of Šamši-Adad's I rule the tablets of Mari were dated by eponyms, later, during Zimri-Lim, the year-name system was again used.⁷⁵² The MEC, preserved in seven fragments (MEC A-G), covers eponyms dating to Kārūm Kaniš levels II and Ib (VEENHOF [2003] 17ff. and 47ff.). Its chronicle-like entries provide important historical information on political events during the lifetime of Ilu-kabkabi, Aminum and Šamši-Adad I. The MEC overlaps with the KEL: together they give a continuous sequence of eponyms covering 253 years from the beginning of Ērišum's reign (KEL A) to the death of Šamši-Adad I (KEL G) and beyond.⁷⁵³ It provides reign lengths for the early Assyrian kings which can be compared with information known from the Distanzangaben. The MEC is a valuable source correlating year eponyms with historical events from the time of Narām-Sin to Šamši-Adad's death.

BIROT (1985) 219–242 published the manuscripts of the MEC consisting of two larger tablets (A.1288 and S. 24–1 + S. 24–2 + A.1614b) and several small tablet fragments (M.7481 + 11250, S. 115–26, M.5911 and M.8566). The term *limu* is mentioned only on fragment M.7481, line 1; but it is clear from the style

and references to events, that all the other fragments belong to this text. When a chronicle-like entry occurs the eponym is preceded by the Akk. preposition *ina* “when ..., in the (eponymy) of ...”. The main text A.1288 consists of two columns. The rev. is mostly destroyed, only part of the 4th column being preserved. The tablets originally measured ca. 18–20 cm in height – though in some cases the size of the original tablet is uncertain since the upper and lower edges of the fragments are lost. The text of columns I and II is also preserved on fragments M.5911 (col. I), M.8566 (col. II), obv. of M.7481 + 11250 (col. I) and S.115–26 and S.24–1 (col. II). Col. IV is not preserved on any of the small fragments. Up to five eponyms can be listed in one line. Of M.7481 + 11250 the obverse is only partly preserved (both edges are preserved): it ends with the same *limu* as A.1288. On the lower edge of the reverse the total number of eponyms is recorded before the colophon and the scribe's name, but it is badly preserved: it had been something between 70 and 99. This tablet began with the start of a reign or a dynasty; but the name of the ruler in the first line is lost. This period is referred to as “victory of the port of Saggaratum”. The ensemble of joined fragments S.24–1 (obv. and rev. inscribed), S.24–2 (rev.) and A.1614 b (rev.) has a total height of 11 cm. S.24–3 certainly belongs to the same tablet but does not join with any of the other fragments. However, it does not seem that all these fragments belong with M.7481 + 11250 in one single tablet. Only the lower half of S.115–26 (obv. and rev.) is preserved. Since this tablet probably originally was 10 cm high, ca. 50 eponyms must have been recorded on it. M.5911 and M.8566 reproduce certain parts of A.1288 I and II.

Birot divides the MEC into two main parts: A and B, which correspond to A.1288 I and II, M.7481 obv., S.115–26 and S.24–1 (obv.). They are separated by the first lacuna: some eponyms are missing before S.115–26 and after A.1288 I, 27'. The second lacuna interrupts the series of eponyms of the fragmentary S.24+ ensemble. It can only be affirmed that it contained parts of the fourth column of A.1288 as well as S.24–3 (the order remains undetermined). The rest of the tablet of this ensemble joins A.1614c. MEC A,

⁷⁴⁹ For an overview of Middle Assyrian kings attested as eponyms starting with Aššur-nīrārī II (no. 68) see CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM (1999) 211. She pointed out that it is not known exactly when during their reign the Middle Assyrian kings held this office. During the 1st millennium it was the first, second or even the third regnal year.

⁷⁵⁰ FREYDANK (1991) 11ff., Saporetti (1979) 8–10.

⁷⁵¹ BRINKMAN (1995) 670 favored the term “Northern Mesopotamian” or another geographical label.

⁷⁵² For eponyms during the first 9 years of Zimri-Lim's reign see CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 166–168.

⁷⁵³ KEL G continues 60 years beyond Šamši-Adad's death.

which started with the reign of Narām-Sin, parallels the last part of **KEL A**. On the basis of **KEL A**, VEENHOF (2003) 47ff. restored four eponyms in the gap between parts A and B. However, on the basis of **KEL G**, which dates to level Kārum Kaniš Ib, and MEC MICHEL, *AfO* 51 (2007) 323 believed that the gap had held only 3 eponyms (see also VEENHOF [2007] 60).⁷⁵⁴

According to BIROT (1985), the MEC contains a total of 71 + x (= gaps) eponyms. VEENHOF (1998) 446, on the basis of his studies on Old Assyrian eponyms collected from other sources and the AKL, concluded that the MEC covered a period of at least 90 years. In his publication of 2003 on p. 56 he suggested a period of ca. 97 years (ca. 1872–1776 according to the MC). According to Günbatti's latest study of 2008 (p. 117) based on **KEL G** the MEC covered 92 years. It is important to note that the MEC covers several decades of the Kārum Kaniš level II, the gap between II and Ib and the eponym years of Šamši-Adad⁷⁵⁵, who is to be linked with the revival of Kārum Kaniš level Ib.⁷⁵⁶ VEENHOF (1998) placed the first eponym of MEC at ca. 1866 (MC). The historical content of the MEC can be roughly divided into four parts:

- 1) Period preceding Šamši-Adad I (**A.1–B.7**⁷⁵⁷): starts in the reign of Narām-Sin: ca. 22 + x years: text A
1st lacuna – ca. 28 + x years: text B
- 2) Period of the first part of Šamši-Adad's I reign (**B.8–B.30**): text B complemented with texts **C and D**
- 3) Period when the conquests of Aššur and Mari take place
2nd lacuna
- 4) The Mari period (**E.1–11**): Mari eponyms

Gaps can be found within all parts of the text, as

shown by BIROT (1985) 233–235. With the help of the **KEL VEENHOF** (2000) 139 established that there was a total of 191 or 194 + x (finally 199)⁷⁵⁸ eponym years which have passed between the accession of **Ērišum I** (= beginning of **KEL A**) and the death of Šamši-Adad I (MEC C-E). This agrees with the **Distanzangaben** of Šalmaneser I and Esarhaddon.

The following Table 32 is from VEENHOF (2003a) which was refined by the same author in 2007:

Kings (years)	KEL A (129 eponyms)	MEC (97 eponyms)
rišum I (40)	1–40	
Iknum (14)	41–54	
Šarru-kīn (40)	55–94	
Puzur-Ajūr II (8)	95–102	
Narām-Sin and rišum II (64)	103–129 end	MEC A 1–30
		MEC B 1–34
Šamši-Adad I (33)		MEC C–E 1–33

Table 32

VEENHOF (2000) 140 and (2003) 57 suggested that the MEC must have covered a period of 97 years while according to Günbatti's edition and study of **KEL G** in 2008 the MEC covered the period of 92 years.⁷⁵⁹ The MEC has helped to establish the order of eponyms during the reign of Šamši-Adad I and his predecessors, although there still remain some problems with a few eponyms.⁷⁶⁰ The most interesting point for absolute chronology could be the possible reference to a **solar eclipse** (*na'dur Šamaš*) in the year succeeding Šamši-Adad's birth (= **KEL** no. 126), in the eponymy of Puzur-Ištar, the year when Amīnum (Šamši-Adad's brother?), son of Ilu-kabkabi,⁷⁶¹ died (→ below sub **10.5**).⁷⁶² The gap in the MEC after ca.

⁷⁵⁴ In her publication Michel quotes **KEL G** as **KEL F**. See GÜN-BATTI (2008) 103–104 for clarification.

⁷⁵⁵ See CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 157.

⁷⁵⁶ On Kārum Kaniš levels II and Ib see VEENHOF (2003a) 83f. and (in more detail) id. (2003) as well as GÜN-BATTI (2008) 116–117. On the seal impressions from Acem-Höyük dating to Kārum level Ib note VEENHOF (1993) 645 and → **Dendrochronology**. In his publication of 2003 Veenhof still made use of the older results by KUNIHOLM *et al.* (1996), indicating a reduced MC of at least 30 years. According to MICHEL (2002) 17–18 a reduction of 15 years is more likely today because of the more recent results presented by MANNING *et al.* (2001) and the solar eclipse which is historically tied to Šamši-Adad I.

⁷⁵⁷ For the designations A–G and its attributed exemplars see BIROT (1985) 220.

⁷⁵⁸ x corresponds to a small gap of four to five eponyms between the end of **KEL A** and the beginning of **MEC B** during the reigns of Narām-Sin and Ērišum II.

⁷⁵⁹ GÜN-BATTI (2008) 118. Note that **KEL G** differs in some ways from the so far known list of eponyms: for instance, it omits the eponym year in which Šamši-Adad I conquered Mari (see CHARPIN – ZIEGLER [2003] 145).

⁷⁶⁰ On the eponyms of Iasmaḥ-Addu, son of Šamši-Adad I see KREBERNIK (2001) 1–7 based on textual evidence from Tutul. Note also CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 145–155 with a synoptic table.

⁷⁶¹ According to the second section of the AKL, kings nos. 25–26. One has to stress though that here no direct filiation is explicitly stated.

⁷⁶² See MICHEL – ROCHER (1997–2000) 113. Since this observation could refer to some other astronomical event, the chronological value of this “solar eclipse” is very limited.

1815 (last eponym of MEC B; according to MC) has caused some problems for the placement of eponyms: only three complete names of eponyms are mentioned in fragments C and D. Two more, connected with Šamši-Adad's conquest of Ekallātum and Aššur, are known from the AKL. For the time between 1860 and 1835 the MEC (A + B, 1–6) correlates well with the eponyms known from Kārum Kaniš. However, none of the parallels goes beyond MEC B, 6, since the eponyms listed do not occur in the texts from the Kārum, including those of Boğazköy and Ališar (→ below).⁷⁶³ This fact complicates the reconstruction of the time of destruction of level II. Therefore the MEC did not help to calculate the chronologically important length of the gap between II and Ib, which is now established on behalf of KEL G with 2–3 years.⁷⁶⁴ While the last eponym mentioned in the MEC is the one dating to the death of Šamši-Adad (1776), level Ib lasted until at least 1760 (all according to the MC),⁷⁶⁵ since a specific eponym attested at **Tell ar-Rimāḥ** (no later than 1760), who can be dated to Hammu-rāpi's conquest of Mari, occurs on a level Ib tablet as well (VEENHOF [1998] 442). The **Tell Leilān** tablets, covering the period between ca. 1790 and 1775, do not help solve these chronological issues.⁷⁶⁶ Further, the information on the local rulers of Kaniš is far too limited and vague to be used as a check on chronology (VEENHOF [1998] 442–443). KEL G shows that Kārum Kaniš Ib eponyms continued at least until 1719 BC (and beyond).

10.4. KEL (Kültepe Eponym List)

“An eponyms list from kārum Kanish itself is badly needed.”
VEENHOF (1998) 438

One of the great discoveries of the past few years has certainly been the EL covering the period of the early 2nd millennium. On this period we find only scanty information in the AKL. Freydank, Veenhof and others, who have dealt with the reconstruction of the eponym sequences, have expressed the longing for an EL stretching back to the first half of the 2nd millennium in order to verify the chronological data of the KLs, the building-inscriptions, and other texts

containing information on time spans. So far the reconstruction of the eponym sequence has been based mainly on eponyms collected from records, who were arranged in a chronological sequence on the basis of prosopographical observations, archival studies, frequency, and their occurrences in the “Sammelmemoranda” (= lists of outstanding dated debts).⁷⁶⁷

Presently seven versions have been identified as belonging to the Kültepe Eponym List (KEL)⁷⁶⁸ containing eponyms of Kārum Kaniš levels Ib and II (→ below sub **10.5.**): **KEL A** (kt 92/k 193), **B** (kt 91/k 555), **C** (Ka 306 = ICK 2, 345), **D** (kt n/k 517 + 1571), **E** (kt 94/k 836), **F** (kt p/k 9) and **G** (kt 01/k 287). The KEL was first presented by Veenhof at the RAI in 1998 (KEL A and B). KEL C, a fragment which contains only 20 eponym-names, was previously published as ICK 2, 345, but not recognized as an eponym list. Originally it might have contained ca. 75–80 eponyms and seems to have been written during the reign of Šarru-kīn. KEL A lists 129 eponyms and KEL B contains 107. In 2003 KEL A and B were published by VEENHOF (with references to KEL E discovered by Larsen; see p. 69 sub 10. addendum). The identification of **KEL G**, that contains Kārum Kaniš level II and Ib eponyms was first announced by Gūnbatti at the congress of Hittitology at Çorum in Sept. 2002 after its discovery in 2001. The list which adds more information on the time succeeding Šamši-Adad's death was finally published in 2008. Since not all eponym data has been fully evaluated so far, the data presented below is to be regarded as a work-in-progress.

The evaluation of the KEL is crucial for the determination of the length of Kārum Kaniš levels II and Ib, the unknown length of the gap between both levels, and the date of their destruction. Linked with other data (such as **dendrochronology** and the possible **solar eclipse**), it may help establish absolute dates for the Old Assyrian rulers, thus allowing a better chronological correlation between Anatolia, Aššur and Mari.

Alltogether the preserved parts of the KEL A contain 129 year eponyms,⁷⁶⁹ the oldest dating to the first year of **Ērišum I** (= eponym year 1). The KEL A com-

⁷⁶³ On the problem of the number of texts found dating to the period before the destruction of level II see VEENHOF (1998) 437–438.

⁷⁶⁴ GÜNBATTI (2008) 117. → below sub **10.4.**

⁷⁶⁵ In 1998 Veenhof proposed 1800–1740 or 1810–1750 (according to the MC) for level Ib. In 2003 (p. 67) he suggested that level Ib lasted beyond 1740 → below sub **10.5.**

⁷⁶⁶ VEENHOF (2003) 64–65.

⁷⁶⁷ VEENHOF (2003) 20ff.

⁷⁶⁸ For a short overview see MICHEL, *A/O* 51 (2007) 321 and GÜNBATTI (2008) 103–104.

⁷⁶⁹ VEENHOF (2000) 138 and (2003) 6–10.

plements the MEC and our knowledge of the Kārum Kaniš level II eponyms. The KEL can be correlated with five Old Assyrian rulers whose reign lengths (except for Ērišum I and Šamši-Adad I) are not preserved in the AKL: Ērišum I, Ikunum, Sargon I, Puzur-Aššur II, Narām-Sîn, Ērišum II and Šamši-Adad I. As VEENHOF (2003) 107 stated: "... Thanks to the list, we now also know all the names and, but for four or five, the sequence of the last fifteen year-eponyms before the end of *kārum* Level II, which falls about ten years after the end of the eponym list, c. 35–40 years after the accession of Narām-Sîn. ..."770

List of rulers and their reign lengths according to the KEL according to VEENHOF (2007) 60:

33. Ērišum I	40 years	1974–1935
34. Ikunum	15 years	1934–1920
35. Sargon I	40 years	1919–1880
36. Puzur-Aššur II	8 years	1879–1872
37. Narām-Sîn	54 or 44 years	1871–1829/19
38. Ērišum II	20 or 10 years	1828/18–1809
39. Šamši-Adad I	33 years	1808–1776
Total	199 years	

The main part of the KEL correlates with the kings nos. 33–37 of Aššur (see **AKL**). KEL A ends after the eponym 129, which is to be placed in the 27th year of Narām-Sîn.⁷⁷¹ It is important to keep in mind that this Narām-Sîn is the son and successor of Puzur-Aššur II, as stated in the AKL (contra Hallo),⁷⁷² and not his namesake from Ešnunna.⁷⁷³ Narām-Sîn and his successor Ērišum II reigned for about 65 years together. The latter was succeeded by Šamši-Adad I, who ruled at Ekallātum for three years before he conquered Aššur, where he ruled 33 years.⁷⁷⁴ According to the KEL Kārum Kaniš level II started much earlier than previously assumed (VEENHOF [2000] 138: "... certainly more than hundred years ..."775) and included the

reign of Narām-Sîn son of Puzur-Aššur II, who, on the basis of the AKL, had been usually assigned a short reign (see GRAYSON [1980–1983] 105, who gives 14 (+ ?) years). According to VEENHOF (2003) 45 and (2008) 29, which includes the new evidence from the KEL, Narām-Sîn must have ruled for either 44 or 54 years.⁷⁷⁶

VEENHOF (2000) 139 concluded: "... The first gap in MEC can be filled by eponyms attested in texts from *kārum* Kaniš level II which are not contained in and hence must be later than the end of KEL. The last eponym listed in MEC, which is still attested in texts from level II of *kārum* Kaniš, is MEC text B no. 5. which must belong to the year when level II of the *kārum* came to an end, since none of the next 22 year eponyms listed in MEC B occurs in texts from the *kārum*. ..." (→ table above). As pointed out before, the MEC came to an end with Šamši-Adad's I death. The time span between Ērišum I and Šamši-Adad's I death lasted 199 years, which coincides with the information drawn from the Assyrian **Distanzangaben** (see below).⁷⁷⁷

Historical Relevance and Value for Absolute Chronology

ELs are considered to be the most reliable chronological sources because they primarily served administrative purposes, not ideological ones like some of the KLs and chronicles. These lists were not composed for a certain purpose or event (like building inscriptions) and were without any political or ideological background. They were among the primary sources for the compilation of the AKL, which in turn enhances the AKL's reliability (→ **Distanzangaben**⁷⁷⁸). Unlike the KLs, ELs give the actual number of years unaffected by gaps between reigns or by parallel reigns. Kings are usually mentioned in ELs only when they served as eponym – except for KEL A, where they are listed before the eponyms of their reigns (VEENHOF [2003]

⁷⁷⁰ For more details on the Old Assyrian rulers see VEENHOF (2003) 38–46.

⁷⁷¹ KEL B ends with Narām-Sîn, C with Ērišum I, D with Narām-Sîn and E with Puzur-Aššur II. KEL G goes beyond Šamši-Adad I.

⁷⁷² See also BLOCHER (2003) 377, who discusses the seal which names Narām-Sîn (no. 37 of the AKL) and Puzur-Aššur II (no. 36) published by ÖZKAN in 1993, in: *FS N. Özgüç*, pl. 92, 2b.

⁷⁷³ RÖLLIG (1965) 86 had already questioned the identification of this Narām-Sîn with the ruler of Ešnunna.

⁷⁷⁴ In total Šamši-Adad I ruled 57 years as king: HECKER, TUAT N.F. 2 (2005) 28. KEL G hints at 35 years of reign (instead of 33 years) which is not in accordance with the rest of the Assyrian tradition.

⁷⁷⁵ For previous views see for example VEENHOF (1998) 446: around 1920–1925 or even 5–10 eponyms earlier (ca. 1935).

⁷⁷⁶ VEENHOF (2003) 45, using the evidence from the KEL and the **Distanzangaben**, proposed to restore the AKL reign length for Narām-Sîn as 44 or 54 years. According to YAMADA (2003a) 265*–275*, who reviewed the discussion on the identification of Narām-Sîn based on a sealing published by S. ÖZKAN, in: *FS N. Özgüç* (1993) pl. 92, 2b, the KEL implies this ruler reigned more than 27 years. M. Liebig (priv. comm.) kindly informed me that the reign length of 54 years is to be preferred since Narām-Sîn seems to have been still alive in MEC B. 14, which corresponds to his 45th year of reign. Ērišum II would have then ruled 10 years before Šamši-Adad succeeded the throne. Unfortunately KEL G does not provide any further evidence since it does not name rulers in its enumeration of eponyms.

⁷⁷⁷ VEENHOF (2003) 51–52.

⁷⁷⁸ They were useful for the calculation of time spans.

6–11). Especially for periods of instability, for which KLs are less precise, ELs can help to clear up problems concerning reign lengths, the continuity and development within administrative sections, etc. (FREYDANK [1991] 223–227).

The historical and chronological evaluation of the Old Assyrian Period marked by Kārum levels II and Ib was, and is, dependent on the knowledge of eponyms. Some of these eponyms first appeared in BALKAN (1955), who used hitherto unpublished texts. The list of eponyms was supplemented by MATOUŠ (1978),⁷⁷⁹ who included some from Boğazköy and Ališar.⁷⁸⁰ The MEC and the KEL supplemented by eponyms in texts from other sites in northern Mesopotamia have increased our knowledge considerably and have helped to provide better dating for events and kings (VEENHOF [2003] 62, 137–150). Determining the duration of levels II and Ib depends on knowledge of eponyms, supplemented by royal genealogies and reign lengths from the AKL. The AKL also provides information on historical events, such as Šamši-Adad's I conquest of Ekallātum and Aššur which can be synchronized with eponyms. Additional eponyms come from such Assyrian-dominated northern Mesopotamian sites as Tell Leilān, Tell ar-Rimāh, Šaġar Bāzār, Tuttul⁷⁸¹ and Mari. In working with eponyms it is important to keep in mind that one needs to differentiate between eponyms used at the Kārum sites for commercial administration and those from northern Mesopotamian sites used for central administration.⁷⁸²

Apart from that between Šamši-Adad I and Hammu-rāpi,⁷⁸³ synchronisms between Assyria and

Babylonia are lacking for the Old Assyrian period before the first Dark Age of Assyrian chronology (→ **AKL** sub 2.1.1.). As VEENHOF (2003) 58 pointed out, the KEL cannot be used as an argument pro or contra one of the chronological systems. One could attribute more of the *limu*-datings of the KEL to Kārum Kaniš level II, thus enhancing its duration.⁷⁸³ Eponyms for more than 60 years beyond Šamši-Adad's death, and therefore synchronous with the Kārum Kaniš level Ib eponyms, comes from KEL G⁷⁸⁴.⁷⁸⁵ Between the MEC, which contains eponyms of the reign of Šamši-Adad I (it does not go beyond Šamši-Adad's death in 1776 [MC]), and the newly identified KEL, the sequence of attested eponyms covers ca. 253 eponym years. The Distanzangaben, the AKL and the eponyms are all correlated, thus implying Assyrian chronological data are homogenous and reliable (but see GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating ...* 57ff.).

A chronological link may now be established via Šamši-Adad I with the contemporary settlement of **Acem-Höyük**, from where “historically linked” Anatolian dendrochronological material derives (→ **Dendrochronology**). The locus of the discovered timbers, the Sarıkaya palace, can possibly be linked with Šamši-Adad I due to seal-impressions on bullae also found at this site.⁷⁸⁶ Dendrochronological tests gave the date 1774 BC (+4/–7 years) for the construction date of the Sarıkaya palace (or, to be precise, when the wood used in it had been cut).⁷⁸⁷

Šamši-Adad I is known to have died in Hammu-rāpi's year 18. A **solar eclipse** in the year after his birth is mentioned in the **MEC**.⁷⁸⁸ MICHEL (2002) 17–18 has proposed 1833 as the most probable date

⁷⁷⁹ VEENHOF (1998) 421ff.

⁷⁸⁰ VEENHOF (2003) 63–65.

⁷⁸¹ KREBERNIK (2001) 1–7 and (2001a) 8–10, 190–194.

⁷⁸² See VEENHOF (1998) 437 on the frequency of attested eponyms.

⁷⁸³ On Kārum Kaniš II and Ib see the table by STARKE in the catalogue “*Die Hethiter und ihr Reich, Das Volk der 1000 Götter*”, Bonn (2002) 310, VEENHOF (2000) 137–150, and the overview by BLOCHER (2003) 378–382. The length of the gap between levels II and Ib is also relevant for the discussion. On the uncertainties concerning level Ib eponyms, which is mainly due to the limited information from Ib level texts, see VEENHOF (2003) 67–68.

⁷⁸⁴ MICHEL in her review of VEENHOF (2003) in *AfO* 51 (2007) and published by GÜNBATTI in 2008.

⁷⁸⁵ Kārum Kaniš level Ib is widely believed to have continued for a significant period following Šamši-Adad's death. VEENHOF (2003) 63ff. stated that a minimum of 64 years have to be reckoned for level Ib, and proposed that level Ib lasted at least beyond 1740 according to the MC (p. 67 in connection

with the *limu* Nimar-Kūbe attested at **Tell Leilān**, who can be connected with Iakūn-Ašar, the last ruler of Šeḡna). According to Gūnbattu level Ib lasted at least 113 years (ca. 1833/32–1719 BC according to the MC).

⁷⁸⁶ No material which predates the reign of Šamši-Adad I has been found there.

⁷⁸⁷ MANNING *et al.* (2001) 2532–2535. Note that in his discussion on absolute chronology VEENHOF (2003) applied “older” dendrochronological dates taken from KUNIHOLM *et al.* (1996) 780–783, implying an at least 30-year reduction in the MC (see p. 58: “... a shorter chronology has no direct impact on the reconstruction of the internal chronology of the Old Assyrian period.”). For an updated discussion see VEENHOF (2007) 61. → **Dendrochronology**

⁷⁸⁸ MANNING *et al.* (2001) 2532–2535; MICHEL (2002) 17–18, WARBURTON (2002) 108–114. On Šamši-Adad I see CHARPIN (1985) 243–268 and Villard, CANE (1995) 873–883. On his kingdom in Upper or Northern Mesopotamia see the map in “*Dictionnaire de la civilisation mésopotamienne*”, Paris (2001) 751.

of the solar eclipse (MC lowered by 15 years).⁷⁸⁹ All this implies Šamši-Adad I was born in 1834, conquered Aššur in 1792 and died in 1760. However, VEENHOF (2000) among others, which is based on CHARPIN and DURAND (1985), suggests a date for Šamši-Adad's I death of 1776⁷⁹⁰ (= year 17 of Hammurāpi', MC), now a commonly used date.

10.5. Old Assyrian Period⁷⁹¹

The discovery of the KEL shed new chronological light onto the Old Assyrian period. Before the results of collations of the MEC had been presented by DURAND and GUICHARD in FM 3 (1997) 42–43, according to which a **solar eclipse** took place one year after the birth of Šamši-Adad I⁷⁹² (→ **Astronomical Data**). As demonstrated above, the end of the KEL overlaps with the MEC and allows the reconstruction of the order and number of eponyms mentioned at the beginning of the MEC. The first gap in the MEC can be filled by eponyms mentioned in the texts from **Kārum Kaniš level II**,⁷⁹³ which are “not contained in and hence must be later than the end of the KEL” (VEENHOF [2000] 139).⁷⁹⁴

MEC B no. 5 is the last eponym mentioned in Kārum Kaniš II texts. It is therefore believed to belong to the year when level II came to an end, since none of the following eponyms is attested in the texts of this level (VEENHOF [2000] 139 and GÜNBATTI [2008] 111–112: MEC B 5 corresponds to KEL G 28 which marks the end of level II). Now, the KEL indicates that the period of Kārum Kaniš II started earlier and lasted much longer (ca. 110 years: ca.

1945²–1835 according to Veenhof; 91 years: ca. 1927–1836 BC according to Günbatti) than had been assumed. The reign of Narām-Sîn must have been during Kārum Kaniš level II. For his successor Ērišum II (no. 38), we unfortunately lack textual evidence and do not know the exact length of his reign. The same is true for Ērišum's successor, Šamši-Adad I (no. 39; though no texts from Kaniš can be assigned to Šamši-Adad I, bullae with his sealing were found at Acem-Höyük; → above and **Dendrochronology**).

In 1998 HECKER (pp. 297–308) published an article on the internal chronology of Kārum Kaniš based on KRYSZAT's dissertation (Münster 1995, published in 2004). Kryszat (without the assistance of the yet unknown KEL) reconstructed the order of eponyms of Kārum Kaniš level II, which ends with the beginning of MEC B (time of Šamši-Adad I⁷⁹⁵). According to Hecker (p. 303f.) eponym no. 17 is still level II (= Šamši-Adad I year 11), whereas eponym no. 27 belongs to level Ib (= Šamši-Adad I year 20).⁷⁹⁶ Hecker therefore assumed that the interval between the levels could not have been longer than eight years,⁷⁹⁷ in contrast to the generally accepted 30 or more years. VEENHOF (2000) 140, who did not mention the Hecker – Kryszat work, calculated 35 years between the levels – a view obviously maintained in his 2003 study on the KEL A (on p. 67f. of which he does allude to HECKER [1998]) and 2008 study (p. 33) before KEL G was published. His number was mainly based on the MEC (for details see VEENHOF [2003] 49f. proposing a minimum of 22 years: MEC B *6–*27⁷⁹⁸). One of the major prob-

⁷⁸⁹ See also WARBURTON (2002) 110. A reduction of the MC by 15 years is closely tied to a date for Šamši-Adad's death of 1775, as proposed by CHARPIN and ZIEGLER (2003) 262 (→ above sub fn. 106). Sometimes a reduced MC of 16 years is used (e.g. VEENHOF [2008] 30 and others): then the older “conventional” year for his death, 1776, follows: the difference is dependent on the synchronism between Hammurāpi' and Šamši-Adad's death. Since, based on the VT, one usually makes use of the MC dates for the Babylonian kings, the 17th year of Hammurāpi' is equal to 1776 and his 18th year to 1775.

⁷⁹⁰ Compare also with VEENHOF (2008) 30: “a reduction of the middle chronology by ca. 16 years”.

⁷⁹¹ See VEENHOF (2008). For an introduction and reconstruction on the basis of seals, see Teissier (1994).

⁷⁹² A.1228, 25' (for its publication see BIROT [1985] 228 and 237), VEENHOF [2000] 149, MICHEL – ROCHER [1997–2000] 111–126). A new publication of the collated MEC, with the inclusion of the new reading, is planned by Durand (reference by VEENHOF [2003] 17¹⁹).

⁷⁹³ For Kārum Kaniš II eponyms see BALKAN (1955), MATOUŠ, *ArOr* 46 (1978) 217–231, LARSEN (1976) 381 and KRYSZAT (2004). On Kārum Kaniš Ib and II levels see FISCHER (1965)

1–16, VEENHOF (1998) 421–450 and GÜNBATTI (2008) 123–129.

⁷⁹⁴ See GÜNBATTI (2008) 126 for an overview.

⁷⁹⁵ Compare the older results by WHITING (1990) 213, who places the end of level II between MEC B no. 8 and no. 21.

⁷⁹⁶ Level Ib is marked by substantial changes in trade: in particular the Assyrians played a less important role than previously (note that Šamši-Adad I is not explicitly mentioned at Kültepe). Furthermore, level Ib lacks large archives. On the transition of level II to Ib, and the gradual abandonment of the archives, see VEENHOF (1998) 427 and 436ff. and (2003a) 106f. → **Calendar**.

⁷⁹⁷ For an interval of even fewer years see HECKER (1998) 306. See also BLOCHER (2003) 378, who agreed with HECKER (1998) citing a value of five years. Note that KRYSZAT (2004) 5 agreed with VEENHOF (2000 and 2003). KEL G proves that the gap between II and Ib lasted 2–3 years only: GÜNBATTI (2008) 117.

⁷⁹⁸ While Veenhof stated that level II must have come to an end during eponym year *5 (the interval reckoned at least 22 years [MEC B *6–*26], Hecker still attributed eponym no. *17 (Abu-šalim) to level II. Compare these preliminary results with GÜNBATTI (2008).

lems is the fact that thousands of the level Ib texts are still unpublished. It is expected that further evidence from Kültepe or Tell Leilān will resolve problems of the dating and length of level Ib (at least beyond 1740 according to the MC).

Both HECKER (1998) and VEENHOF (1998) reviewed past studies of Kārum Kaniš levels II and Ib, beginning with BALKAN (1955). Depending upon the total time represented by the two levels, most researches proposed a gap between them of around 50 years (BALKAN [1955], GARELLI [1963], LARSEN [1976]), which mainly relied on estimates of **generation** lengths, Assyrian rulers and the archaeological evidence (VEENHOF [1998] 422). However, the length of generations can be hardly fixed for such a short period of time (id., p. 426): Therefore, it was crucial to find out how long level Ib lasted, and especially when it began. As VEENHOF (1998) 426–427 pointed out, it is difficult to set up a useful statistical calculation of generation lengths for a period of three to four generations, since we are left in the end with a margin of two decades, almost one generation. Our knowledge of the eponyms of both levels is somewhat unbalanced due to many unpublished Kültepe texts. Unfortunately, there is no stratigraphic evidence for the length of time of the gap between the levels II and Ib, because it is not an occupational level. This (and the textual evidence) implies that level II ended gradually, not abruptly (VEENHOF [1998] 437–438).

New chronological parameters based on the KEL and MEC based on VEENHOF (2000) 139–140 and (2003) 57:

- 1) 199 years must have passed between the accession of Ērišum I (reign of 40 years) and the death of Šamši-Adad I (ca. 1974–1776 according to the MC). This number is in accordance with the Distanzangaben: 159 years between Šamši-Adad I year 1 and Ērišum I year 1, who ruled 40 years according to the AKL.
- 2) Kārum Kaniš level II came to an end during the 2nd half of Narām-Sîn's reign (1836 according to the MC)
- 3) Kārum Kaniš II lasted at least 110 years
- 4) The interval between levels II and Ib lasted about 35 years (contra HECKER [1998])
- 5) The MEC covers a period of 97 years (ca. 1872–1776 according to the MC!)
- 6) MC dates for Šamši-Adad I: Born ca. 1850; became king around 1833 at the age of 18; died 1776 at the age of 75.

The KEL may also help to tie the Ur III period to the Assyrian chronology. The last ruler of Ur III was **Ibbi-Sîn**, a contemporary of Išbi-Erra of the Isin I dynasty.⁷⁹⁹ The accession of **Ērišum I** took place about 50 years after the end of the Ur III dynasty. The kings preceding Ērišum I are subsumed under the heading “altogether six kings whose eponyms are not ...” (→ **AKL**). At least three of these kings (Puzur-Aššur I, Šalim-aḫum and Ilušuma = nos. 30–32) must have ruled within the time span of Aššur's independence from Ur.⁸⁰⁰

According to Veenhof and Michel, who studied the MEC in combination with other results of the past years (esp. **dendrochronology** and the **solar eclipse date**), the KEL information demands a lowering of the MC. As VEENHOF (2000) pointed out, the reduced chronologies do not affect the period before Šamši-Adad I, since synchronisms with Babylonia are lacking and the Old Assyrian chronology cannot be used as an argument against or for any certain chronology, due to the fact that the length of the interval between the end of the Ur III period and the death of Šamši-Adad I stays the same (the same goes for the corrected solar dates before Tiglath-pileser I, which result in a reduction of only three years per century; → **Calendar**). Veenhof proposed a MC lowered by ca. 50 years:⁸⁰¹ he still used the “old” dendrochronological data of the Sarikaya palace (where Šamši-Adad's seal impressions were found dating to Kārum Kaniš level Ib) by KUNIHOLM *et al.* (1996), which imply a cutting-building date of 1752.⁸⁰² This result may have to be adjusted in the future to the new dates published by MANNING *et al.* (2001), as has been done by MICHEL (2002) 17–18 in connection with the solar eclipse which reportedly took place one year after Šamši-Adad's birth. It has to be kept in mind that the dendrochronological dates also rely on ¹⁴C data and by no means can be considered absolute.

As to the **solar eclipse** mentioned in the MEC, it needs to be stressed that we do not know anything

⁷⁹⁹ VEENHOF (2003) 59–61 and SALLABERGER (2004) 40–42: here the synchronism is dated to 2019 (according to the MC). → **Year**.

⁸⁰⁰ For a possible identification of Sulili (no. 27) see VEENHOF (2000) 140 and (2003) 59. (→ **AKL**)

⁸⁰¹ Only in his unpublished “corrections” to his 2003 study did he incorporate the dates by MICHEL (2002).

⁸⁰² Note in VEENHOF (2003) 58: a reduction of “at least thirty years, probably more”.

about the nature of the eclipse nor even from where (Mari or possibly Aššur) it was observed. Therefore one should treat the result by MICHEL – ROCHER about this solar eclipse with reserve. In response to the latest studies on this eclipse and its chronological implication WARBURTON (2002) published a very critical but perspicacious paper on the use of **astronomical data** (eclipses and Venus cycles) in chronological studies. In this case we have an astronomical observation linked to a specific historical event (i.e. the year after Šamši-Adad's birth), but are confronted with difficulties of defining the nature of the observation and its parameters – including the time span within which it occurred. WARBURTON (2002) 109 warned: “This means that subjective assumptions excluding certain eclipses or preferring a certain time range because of a preferred chronology are not the best points of departure.”

MICHEL (2002) 17–18 combined the eclipse data with the dendrochronological data from Acem-Höyük, where seal impressions of Šamši-Adad I and his officials have been found. Ignoring for the moment the broader problems of the chronological value of dendrochronological data⁸⁰³, in this particular case the choice of candidates for the solar eclipse date heavily depends on the dendrochronological one.⁸⁰⁴ In a period of ca. one year a change of opinion and results can be observed: what seemed impossible before (MICHEL – ROCHER [1997–2000]) became possible with the new data presented by MANNING *et al.* (2001): a lowering of the MC dates (on the implication of this “slight change” see WARBURTON [2002] 113), which were neglected before by forcing the dates into an LC scheme.⁸⁰⁵

In light of such rapid changes, one perhaps should refrain from using the solar eclipse evidence until other (astronomical) material shows up (or “*hard evidence*” according to HUBER [1999–2000] 68),

which can be placed within some archaeological or historical context. Moreover Michel relied on an assumption “that the ‘Middle Chronology’ can be reduced by two eight-year Venus cycles” (WARBURTON [2002] 111). But by denying the 56/64-year cycles on which the MC depends, a reduction of the MC is made meaningless and the selection of dates for the solar eclipse referring to HC, MC and LC turns out to be invalid.⁸⁰⁶ A chronological framework other than the 56/64-year cycles has to be sought for.⁸⁰⁷ Note Warburton's important comment on p. 112: “... By contrast, it is remarkable – even using the most limited possible range of variables (a single solar eclipse and a single dendrochronological date) – neither the ‘Middle’ nor the ‘Low Chronology’ can be saved. ...”

10.6. Eponyms and the reign of Šamši-Adad I⁸⁰⁸

Due to the fact that Šamši-Adad I (like his predecessor) is not mentioned in the texts of Kültepe, discussion arose on the chronological placement and sequence of eponyms of the time of Šamši-Adad I as well as the dating of Kārum Kaniš level Ib. Before the publication of KEL G the order and number of eponyms for the middle of Šamši-Adad's reign were unknown due to gaps in the MEC (VEENHOF [1998] 430f.). The MEC however offered a good correlation of year eponyms and historical events during the time of Šamši-Adad with a margin of ± 5 years (for further discussion on the attribution of eponyms to Kārum Kaniš level II and Ib → above). Further evidence and the most recent summary of the most important results of the “Mari studies” of the past 20 years have been lately presented by CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 161–168.

WHITING (1990) 167–220 presented a chronological framework for the time of Šamši-Adad I on the basis of the still unpublished *limū* from Tell Leilan/Šubat-Enlil, which stretch from the reign of Šamši-Adad to that of Išme-Dagān.⁸⁰⁹ Whiting's reconstruc-

⁸⁰³ COLLON (2000) 6–9 and note MICHEL – ROCHER (1997–2000) 119: “... Les nombreuses bullae retrouvées appartiennent logiquement à la dernière phase d'occupation du bâtiment qui a vraisemblablement été détruit au cours de règne de Šamši-Addu ...”

⁸⁰⁴ See especially MICHEL – ROCHER (1997–2000) 120–121.

⁸⁰⁵ See also BLOCHER (2003) 379–380 for a “lowered MC”.

⁸⁰⁶ For a description of the procedure of selecting a date see WARBURTON (2002) 111–112.

⁸⁰⁷ It is questionable whether the approach by GASCHÉ *et al.* was successful and reliable. They attempted to find evidence from various sources (the interdisciplinary approach best described by ZEEB [2001] 71, 84ff.) that sup-

ported their ceramic evidence for the duration of the transition from the end of the Old Babylonian to the Kassite period. Unfortunately, contradicting material was mostly left out of their discussion. They often ignored evidence that conflicted with their premise. Moreover substantial criticism of their astronomical approach for Babylonian chronology, to which the Assyrian one is linked to, has been published by Huber, Hunger and Koch.

⁸⁰⁸ For the most recent reassessment of the eponyms attested at Mari see CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 156–168.

⁸⁰⁹ See also VAN DE MIEROOP (1994) 306–308 (synchronism between Qarni-Lim of Andariq with Zimri-Lim year 4–8, ca. 1770–1766, or soon thereafter according to the MC).

tion also utilized four articles in *MARI* 4 (1985) on the *līmū* from Kārum Kaniš Ib, on the MEC, on the “Šamši-Adad I calendar” (based on administrative tablets from Mari), and on documents relating to the final years of Šamši-Adad I and the collapse of his dynasty. The following material adds significantly to the reconstruction of a detailed chronology of the reign of Šamši-Adad I: The *līmū* from Anatolia starting with Ērišum I, from Šubat-Enlil which help fill the gaps of the MEC,⁸¹⁰ the Post-Šamši-Adad *līmū* from Tell Leilān, and the *līmū* found at Šaġar Bāzār which correspond to those found at Mari (see TALON, OBTCB 8–9) and to new material from Tuttul, first presented by KREBERNIK (2001).⁸¹¹ CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 168 and 260–262 offered updated tables of synchronisms between Mari (Zimri-Līm), Ešnunna (Daduša, Ibāl-pi-El II), Babylon (Hammu-rāpi’) and Larsa (Rīm-Sin I) and presented a thorough synthesis of the results achieved within the past 20 years.

Ibāl-pi-El II year –1	year of conquest of Qabrā by Šamši-Adad I and Daduša = <i>līmu</i> Asqudum/Aššur-malik
Ibāl-pi-El II year 0	Daduša’s death = <i>līmu</i> Aššur-malik/Awiliya
Ibāl-pi-El II year 1	Hammu-rāpi’ year 15
Ibāl-pi-El II year 4	Šamši-Adad’s death = Hammu-rāpi’ year 18 ⁸¹² = end of <i>līmu</i> Ṭab-šilli-Aššur/ <i>warki</i> Ṭab-šilli-Aššur/Zimri-Līm year 0

Šamši-Adad’s I birth was believed to be mentioned in section A of the MEC (A.1288 I, 22’–24’) due to calculations by WHITING (1990). At first VEENHOF (1985)

213⁸⁷ disagreed, but in 2000, p. 149, he changed his mind due to the note of a collation by DURAND – GUICHARD in FM 3 (1997) 42–43. MEC places Šamši-Adad’s birth during eponym Dadia. According to the **AKL**, Šamši-Adad I conquered Ekallātum in the *līmu* of Ibni-Adad. He ruled there for three years and then defeated Ērišum II in the eponymy of Atamar-Ištar and ruled Aššur for 33 years.⁸¹³ Already GÜNBATTI (2008) 116 noticed that some eponyms are not present in **KEL G**, which again omits some of the known eponyms (Ḫaya-malik: year when Šamši-Adad conquered Mari and two more successive ones).⁸¹⁴ **KEL G** also notes 35 years for Šamši-Adad’s reign instead of the 33 years of the **AKL**.

The accession of Šamši-Adad took place in the *līmu* Šarrum-Adad. He died in the 4th year of Ibāl-pi-El II of Ešnunna. Ibāl-pi-El’s II predecessor, Daduša died in the year following the conquest of Qabrā (Ibāl-pi-El II year 0). Šamši-Adad and Daduša had campaigned together against Qabrā (Ibāl-pi-El II year –1).⁸¹⁵

The *līmu* of Šamši-Adad’s death is not explicitly preserved in the MEC. CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 136–138 showed that the year of Šamši-Adad’s death remains unknown: because the month of Šamši-Adad’s death is identified with month xii and *kispu*m (funerary) ceremonies are attested since 16–xii-Ṭab-šilli-Aššur, they cautiously postulated that the death occurred in month xii of the *līmu* Ṭab-šilli-Aššur, which corresponds to year 18 of Hammu-rāpi’ (= 1775 BC according to the MC).⁸¹⁶

Until the publication of Charpin and Ziegler in 2003 the death of Šamši-Adad was placed some-

⁸¹⁰ See CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 166–168 (on the eponyms attested in the Tell Leilān tablets, some of which Whiting dated differently). For Zimri-Līm’s year-names see p. 257ff.

⁸¹¹ The ten eponyms attested in texts from Tuttul start shortly after Iasmaḫ-Addu’s installation at Mari and end with the eponym Ṭab-šilli-Aššur. Slight alterations (such as the change of Nimer-Sin and Adad-bāni, and overlaps of *warki*-dates with other eponymies: p. 190) were due to the inclusion of the data from Mari and Šaġar-Bāzār: see KREBERNIK (2001a) 194 and compare his results with the previous list on p. 8 based on CHARPIN (1985) 256–266; esp. 261–262 and see also Anbar (1991) 50–51. See now also the supplementary notes by CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 157–160. Eponyms continued to be used during Zimri-Līm’s first nine years, despite the fact that he adopted the Babylonian year-name dating system.

⁸¹² Others suggested years 11 to 13 (WHITING [1990] 210²⁰⁵: year 12 or 13; see below). Note that most charts (Brinkman, Walker, Starke, etc.) do not incorporate this synchronism. However, for a correction of dates including this synchronism see GASCHE *et al.* (1998a) 1–4 (→ **Calendar**). CHARPIN

– ZIEGLER (2003) apply dates according to the MC for Hammurāpi’ (1792–1750) and synchronize other rulers accordingly. Thus the death of Šamši-Adad is dated to 1775 instead of 1776 BC. The death of Šamši-Adad I is commemorated in Ibāl-pi-El’s 5th year: VEENHOF (2008)⁵⁶ with reference to the study of CHARPIN AND ZIEGLER (2003).

⁸¹³ CHARPIN (1985a) 60–61. It is still unknown how long Ērišum II reigned: VEENHOF (2003) 39, 45 and 61.

⁸¹⁴ GÜNBATTI (2008) 116–117 and 127: compare with CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 145.

⁸¹⁵ On the stele of Daduša describing the conquest of Qabrā see ISMAIL – CAVIGNEAUX, *BaM* 34 (2003) 129–163 and the review by CHARPIN, *RA* 98 (2004) 151–178. Note also CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 92 (this event is dated to month viii (spring). Note that the texts from Šemšāra can be dated to this period, Šamši-Adad’s year 28–30: EIDEM (1992) 16ff. See EIDEM – LÆSSØE (2001) 16–18 for an overview of events.

⁸¹⁶ On synchronisms with Ešnunna see CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 163. On the year of death of Šamši-Adad I according to the different **chronological systems** see WARBURTON (2000) 60–61.

where between Hammu-rāpi' year 10 and 18, the latter year marking the accession of Zimri-Lim. For instance, WHITING (1990) 210²⁰⁵, accepting a gap of a few years between Šamši-Adad I and Zimri-Lim, placed the death of Šamši-Adad I in Hammu-rāpi' year 12, therefore in 1781 (MC), arguing for a five-year reign of Iasmaḥ-Addu after Šamši-Adad's death.⁸¹⁷ However, his main argument was based on the wrong dating of the letter ARM 5, 20 edited by Dossin as has been shown by CHARPIN, *MARI* 7 [1993] 173 and summarized by CHARPIN – ZIEGLER [2003] 161–168. ARM 5, 20 does not belong to Išme-Dagān's correspondence as assumed by Whiting, but to the one of Išme-Addu of Ašnakkum, and is therefore of no use for Šamši-Adad's chronology. Thus all evidence of Iasmaḥ-Addu's rule after Šamši-Adad's death including the synchronism with Ešnunna in Ibāl-pī-El's tenth year, which was erroneously connected with Iasmaḥ-Addu, has been ruled out by CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 162.⁸¹⁸ On pp. 162–166 Charpin and Ziegler discussed eponyms (Aḫiyaya and Pussanum), which cannot be placed securely, but have been used by Whiting as an argument for a gap between Šamši-Adad's and Zimri-Lim's reign since they were dated to the period after Šamši-Adad's death and before Zimri-Lim's reign. The main question is how many eponyms are to be placed between the death of Šamši-Adad and Zimri-Lim. Charpin and Ziegler bring up various evidence for the dating of the eponym Aḫiyaya during Iasmaḥ-Addu's reign which ended during the eponym *warki* Ṭāb-šilli-Aššur, but find it impossible to place it chronologically in the series of known eponymies. Thus they consider that certain years were named by two eponyms at the same time (p. 165). According to the scholars' new evaluation (pp. 166 and 174) Iasmaḥ-Addu left Mari after the fifth month of the eponym *warki* Ṭāb-šilli-Aššur, while Zimri-Lim ascended the throne in the sixth month of the same eponym year (this implies that only 14 days passed between both rulers).

⁸¹⁷ See CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 166–168 for a detailed discussion on eponyms which are contemporary with the first four years of Zimri-Lim's reign. Five eponyms attested in the texts of Tell Leilān, which were dated by WHITING (1990) 185–186 after Šamši-Adad's conquest of Mari (dated to Hammu-rāpi's 12th year), were placed by Charpin and Ziegler after Šamši-Adad's death and Iasmaḥ-Addu's disappearance. Their results concerning their placement is confirmed by KEL G: iii 84–88.

⁸¹⁸ Nowadays the event of the tenth year of Ibāl-pī-El II can be correlated with Zimri-Lim's fifth year.

VEENHOF (2000) 139f. and (2003) 61f. also refined his solution because of the new data derived from the KEL: according to him Šamši-Adad was born ca. 1850 (MC), became king in 1833 at the age of 18, and died in 1776 at the age of 75 after 57 years of reign.⁸¹⁹ New material points towards a lowered MC (→ above and **Astronomical Data** sub solar eclipse and **Dendrochronology**). The synchronism between Šamši-Adad's death and Hammu-rāpi's 18th year depends on the correlation of the calendars (the Assyrian eponym years start in fall, the Babylonian calendar starts in spring⁸²⁰).

After Iasmaḥ-Addu's reign ended with or shortly after Šamši-Adad's I death (eponym *warki* Ṭāb-šilli-Aššur), the Assyrian period in Mari came to an end and Zimri-Lim ascended the throne in Mari in Hammu-rāpi's year 18 and ruled 13 years and at least 3 months until year 32 of Hammu-rāpi' (CHARPIN – ZIEGLER [2003] 175).

Kārum Kaniš level Ib ended with another disastrous fire, which is usually dated to Išme-Dagān's reign. According to VEENHOF's study of 2003, in which he listed at least 65 post level II eponyms, Kārum Kaniš level Ib lasted until at least 1740. Level II ended by fire during Narām-Sîn's reign or early years of Erišum II, therefore before Šamši-Adad I conquered Aššur. GÜNBATTI (2008) could obtain improved results for the chronology of levels II and Ib: According to KEL G level II started at least from Idua (= 7th year of Ikūnum) and ended 91 years later during the late reign of Narām-Sîn. After an interval of 2 to 3 years level Ib started around Šamši-Adad's accession date.

10.7. Eponyms from the Late Old Babylonian Period

Newly translated tablets acquired on the antiquities market have revealed the existence of a little late Old Babylonian kingdom called Tigunānu.⁸²¹ The Mari archives date ca. 150 years before the Tigunānu texts. This kingdom was ruled by the previously unknown king Tunip-Teššup. A letter which

⁸¹⁹ Veenhof uses the synchronism proposed by CHARPIN – DURAND (1985) according to whom Šamši-Adad's death took place in year 17 of Hammu-rāpi'.

⁸²⁰ See CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 160–161.

⁸²¹ Most of the Tigunānu texts still are unpublished. SALVINI (1996) 306–307 locates Tigunānu east of the Tigris close to Ḥaḫḫum, CHARPIN, *N.A.B.U.* 2000/58 and MILLER, *StBoT* 45 (2001) 410–429 on the upper Tigris in the area of Bismil.

was addressed to a certain Tunia (hypocoristic form of Tunip-Teššup) by Labarna (II = Ḫattušili I) dealing with military operations in the 6th year of Ḫattušili I against the city Ḫaḫḫum⁸²² (situated most probably along the upper Euphrates; previously identified with Samsat or Lidar-Höyük) was published by SALVINI (1996). Obviously Tunia was a vassal of Ḫattušili I considered essential to this campaign. The synchronism between Ḫattušili I and Ammišaduqa⁸²³ as well as the ductus of the letter date this event towards the end of the Babylon I dynasty. An overlap between the ELs and the eponyms mentioned in the yet unpublished Tigonānu texts might resolve many chronological issues (like the dating of Ḫattušili I) and contribute to the dating of the start of the Dark Age.⁸²⁴ Therefore the exact dating of Kārūm Kaniš level Ib is crucial for the dating of the subsequent period, the Hittite Old Kingdom.

The most prominent document from Tigonānu is the Ḫabiru prism, which lists 438 *ḫabiru* troops of Tunip-Teššup and is dated by an eponym. It is debated whether Tigonānu came in contact with Assyrian caravans, or some sort of an unusual double eponym-system existed. The latter could be due to local traditions with local functionaries. The date formula on the prism uses a Babylonian month name and mentions two heretofore unknown *līmu*-officers, Tamkāru and Aššur-iddin (thus Tigonānu had contacts with both Babylonian and Assyrian calendar traditions). We lack a contemporary Assyrian EL which could help us to identify those two *līmu*; but both were probably local officers, which could be taken as an indication that Tigonānu used an indigenous system of eponyms. However, the **calendar** of the Tigonānu texts seems to correspond with the one used in Šaġar Bāzār, Karana and in the letters of Šamši-Adad I from Mari (SALVINI [1996] 13). The Tigonānu texts show some affinity with the era of Šamši-Adad I, which again implies their importance for linking the Old Assyrian with the late Old

Babylonian period. The yet unpublished Tigonānu texts with eponym-dating will hopefully give us more insight into this poorly documented period.

10.8. Middle Assyrian eponyms

Only parts of the Middle Assyrian EL (KUB 4, 93 and KAV 19) are known. The Middle Assyrian EL was studied by Saporetti (1979), who listed eponyms starting with Aššur-nīrārī II. Freydank (1991⁸²⁵) compiled all known Middle Assyrian eponyms on tablets from Kār-Tukulti-Ninurta (see esp. pp. 43–51) and Aššur (in the Vorderasiatische Museum, Berlin),⁸²⁶ and included texts from Dūr Katlimmu⁸²⁷ (see pp. 40–43: about 50 years are attested). Especially for the reigns succeeding Tukulti-Ninurta I the AKL still offers some problems. For that reason one primarily has to rely on dated documents (earlier studies on Middle Assyrian eponyms are by Fine [1955] and Saporetti [1979]). Freydank (1991) could not provide a complete EL for the period in question, but he collated and collected all old and new data of dated documents stored in the Berlin Museum. He grouped texts according to their find spot (“Fundort”) and context, discussed their internal connection in order to establish synchronisms, and drew chronological conclusions. The dating of Middle Assyrian literary texts was also used. Freydank gathered and studied 300 eponyms for the period between **Aššur-nīrārī II (no. 68)** and **Aššur-bēl-kala (no. 89)**. Only eight years within this time span remain unattested. Almost all the eponyms of the 13th cent. are known, although their sequence between Šalmaneser I and Tukulti-Ninurta I remains uncertain. There are some large eponym gaps in the 12th cent., during the reigns of Ninurta-apil-Ekur, Aššur-dān I, Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur, and Mutakkil-Nusku.⁸²⁸ The current Assur project in Berlin, which aims at publishing all the remaining Middle Assyrian documents stored in the VAM, should help fill the remaining eponym gaps (Freydank [2003]). Further evidence is coming

⁸²² See also SALVINI, *SMEA* 34 (1994) 61–80.

⁸²³ Via the destruction of Alalah VII: see e.g. VAN SOLDT (2000) 108 and 113.

⁸²⁴ See HUNGER – PRUZSINSZKY (eds.), MDAR and VEENHOF (2003) 67f.

⁸²⁵ See also FREYDANK (2000) 67–72.

⁸²⁶ For an updated list of Middle Assyrian eponyms see FREYDANK (1991) 28–29 and 192–196.

⁸²⁷ CANKIK-KIRSCHBAUM (1996) 9–18: The texts starts with Adad-nīrārī I (no. 76). See RÖLLIG (2004) 18–51 for a provisional list of 44 eponyms dating to the second half of Šalmaneser’s reign and part of the rule of Tukulti-Ninurta I.

⁸²⁸ FREYDANK (1991), id. (2000) 68 and HARRAK (1987) 27ff.; 157ff. and 232ff. For an example of on-going changes due to new textual evidence see for instance DONBAZ, *N.A.B.U.* 2001/ 55, 54–55 who dates the eponymy of Urad-Šerūa, son of Aššur-bāni, to the late 17th or early 16th cent.

from current excavations in the western part of the Middle Assyrian Empire at Tell Chuēra (Ḫarbe),⁸²⁹ Giricano Tepe (Dunnu-ša-uzibi)⁸³⁰ and Tell Sabi Abyad, where numerous texts containing additional *līmu* have been unearthed.⁸³¹ More Middle Assyrian eponyms from the time of Tiglath-pileser I are documented in the texts from Tell Bderi (Dūr Aššur-kettī-lēšir) published by MAUL in BBVOT 2 (1992).

Value for Absolute Chronology

ELs served as records to document the time between one eponymate and another and have been used for economic practices (debts, length of ownership, etc.). As can be shown, the Distanzangaben and the AKL were based on ELs, whereas the AKL not only recorded the number of years, but also how many **generations**⁸³² had passed. So ELs are one of the

most important and reliable chronological sources to complement the AKL. Unfortunately, our knowledge of the order of eponyms in the Middle Assyrian period (LBA) is incomplete. If we knew the proper sequence of eponyms from the reign of Šamši-Adad I to ca. 1420/30, we could solve the problem of the Assyrian **calendar** before Tiglath-pileser I. We lack of decisive evidence yet; but ELs remain the most promising lines of research in the quest for an absolute chronology of 2nd millennium BC Mesopotamia.⁸³³

Links

AKL, Astronomical Data, Date-lists, Dendrochronology, Distanzangaben, Calendar, Chronicle, Middle Assyrian period, Old Assyrian period, Regnal year, Solar eclipse, Ur III period, Year-names

⁸²⁹ Documents of the Middle Assyrian period from Tell Chuēra will be published by St. Jakob in 2009. Some texts have already been cited in JAKOB (2003). For a preliminary report see KÜHNE (1995) 203–225 and (1996) 3–7, where he discusses the tablets excavated in 1992 at Ḫarbe. These tablets are from the Middle Assyrian Period, and present the provincial point of view on the historical, social and economic situation of this period. Twenty letters and 31 economic texts have been found in the palatial structures of Ḫarbe, dating to the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. But only a relative date can be given for them, since the exact order of the Middle Assyrian *līmu* is still unknown. Seven eponyms are preserved, two of which can be dated to the second part of Tukulti-Ninurta's reign. The reference to the Babylonians fits the historical scenery. The battle between Tukulti-Ninurta I and Kaštiliašu IV is to be understood as a *terminus post quem*. The mention of three high Assyrian officials known from other archives, will help date the texts with more precision (as compared with Dūr Katlimmu: see KÜHNE [1995] 208). Two fragments of letters may belong to an earlier archive (from an earlier building phase of the palace?). References to Ḫarbe are also to be found in the archives of Dūr Katlimmu. Aššur-iddin, the SUKKAL GAL, is mentioned in both archives and is known to have been an important (highest?) official for six or seven years in the middle of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta (p. 209. Both archives mention the official Sīn-mudammīq.). Resemblances to the Ḫarbe texts are also found in the texts from Tell Sabi Abyad dating to Ili-padi

(toponyms mentioned). The historical setting of the Ḫarbe archive is set by the reference to diplomats from the Levant (Sidon and Amurru), to a Hittite messenger named Tili-Šarruma in connection with exchange of gifts for Tudḫalia IV, and to tablets originating from the Egyptian king being brought by that diplomat from Sidon. Kühne concluded that Sidonite-Assyrian relations could demonstrate the commercial relations and the need for diplomats from the Levant by the Egyptians (Merenptah or Seti II). On this topic see also FAIST (2001) 202–205. Interestingly Amurru, which was dependent on the Hittites, also had relations with Assyria during this period. This indicates that such relations, which had been forbidden by Tudḫalia IV, were now resumed (also from Ḫatti's side).

⁸³⁰ RADNER (2004) 52–53.

⁸³¹ On the texts from Tell Sabi Abyad see WIGGERMANN (2000) 171–231. Note the paper “Archives and Text Collections in Tell Sabi Abyad” presented by the field epigraphist F.A.M. Wiggermann at the RAI at Leiden in 2002, where he also presented 23 attested *līmu*. Many of the tablets found indicate a close chronological relationship with Ili-padi (→ AKL sub 2.2.1.5.), who owned the *dunnu* Sabi Abyad (see also CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM [1999] 220–221). This Ili-padi can be identified as the well known Assyrian prince, grand vizier, and king of Ḫanigalbat from the reign Šalmaneser I to the reign of Aššur-nirāri III.

⁸³² POMPONIO (1996) 159–165.

⁸³³ FREYDANK (1991) 17.

