

16. YEAR (DATE FORMULAE/YEAR-NAMES, DATE-LISTS/ YEAR-LISTS, REGNAL YEAR, ACCESSION YEAR)

General

16.1. Date formulae/Year-names, Date-lists/ Year-lists, Regnal year, Accession year

Throughout Mesopotamian history various methods for designating and memorizing specific years were employed. Year designations can be classified into two groups depending on their use in different geographic areas and at various times: (1) dating by number (of the regnal year of the king: MU x KÁM RN), and (2) dating by names (official/eponym in Assyria, or event, i.e. year-name, in Babylonia). The earliest system of counting was by year-names. These were chosen by the royal authority (“year in which ...” or “year following the one in which ...”). Each year was given a name which commemorated an important event, which usually took place in the year preceding that, in which the year-name was actually used.⁹⁷³ This system was first applied towards the end of the Early Dynastic period and officially in use during the Akkad, Ur III and (Early) Old Babylonian periods (24th to mid-14th cent. BC).⁹⁷⁴ The rulers of the Akkad dynasty were the first to introduce a centralized dating system by naming their years for the whole country in both Sumerian and Akkadian. In order to compile the year-names in their correct chronological sequence lists of year-names or date-lists were kept, which can be compared with **ELs**. These lists of year-names help place dated documents chronologically and provide a framework for events during a king’s reign. They often offer historical information for less well documented periods. In some cases a sequence of significant occurrences in a given reign can be reconstructed from them (e.g.

Ebla⁹⁷⁵). Date-lists were kept from the Ur III period until the end of the Babylon I dynasty.

In the late Early Dynastic III period (Lagaš, Umma, Zabalam) also appear the first known instances of dating by regnal years: year x of the reign of RN. At first, the year usually referred to the governor of Umma. But since governors frequently changed and their names were not included in the date, the system was soon abandoned and replaced by the year-name system. The so-called MU-ITI (“year-month”) dating system was also used at the end of the Early Dynastic and beginning of the Akkad periods. It apparently emerged from the numerical system of late Pre-Sargonic Lagaš and Umma. It was used to designate texts by the era of an ÉNSI (“ruler”). Hence, before the Sargonic period in the 24th cent., three dating systems were used side by side: regnal years, year-names and possibly **eponyms**. The best way of keeping track of the regnal years was to compile lists of kings with their respective length of reign. Dynastic date-lists also provided material for the **KLs** (SKL, **BKL**), which recorded the numbers of date formulas for each king (length of reign).⁹⁷⁶

The year-name describing an event was usually written in Sumerian, seldom in Akkadian. Usually several variations in the naming of one specific year (date formulae or year-name) are available, which sometimes makes its identification difficult.⁹⁷⁷ The system of naming years after events was used beyond the end of the Babylon I dynasty into the Dark Age (→ below sub 16.5.). It was followed, starting with the Kassite ruler Kadašman-Enlil I. in the 14th cent., by the numbering of years each king’s reign (regnal years).⁹⁷⁸

⁹⁷³ On the close relationship between year-names and royal inscriptions see HORSNELL (2003) 201–202.

⁹⁷⁴ KRECHER – MÜLLER (1975) 16, van de Mierop (1999) 20.

⁹⁷⁵ See BIGA (2003) 350–353 on the difficulty of chronologically organizing the year formulae attested in the texts from Ebla. She referred to TM 75.G.427 (=ARET 10, 100), which mentions a series of events in chronological order that took place within a period of seven years. This text parallels some long metal texts.

⁹⁷⁶ BRINKMAN (1970) 311, VAN SETERS (1997) 68–76.

⁹⁷⁷ Note HORSNELL (1999) vol. 2, 45f. The notation of month and day is often omitted.

⁹⁷⁸ See BRINKMAN, MSKH 397–414 on the different dating systems used in the Kassite period. Year-names are still known for Kurigalzu I (p. 402 and id., *JNES* 58 [1999] 54). For a list of “Doppeldatierungen” in unpublished late Kassite texts from Babylon see SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2006) 169. See HORSNELL (1999) 123ff. for a useful overview of the various ways in which years were designated in Ancient Mesopotamia.

We therefore do not possess a continuous list of years in their proper sequence such as the Assyrians must have had. The regnal year system was used until 280 BC, when dating by “eras” (Seleucid, Arsacid) became the standard system, which it continues to be today. The “era-system” was introduced at the beginning of the 18th cent. BC by Rim-Sin of Larsa after his conquest of Isin; but it was not in use long after him.

Date-lists covering reigns or dynasties served as the sources for the reign lengths in KLs. Date-lists usually covered two dynasties only, while the Nippur recension of the SKL, for instance, listed all the dynasties thought to have ruled in lower Mesopotamia from the flood to the fall of Isin. In contrast to the date-lists, the SKL was organized by cities (and therefore also referred to as a “city list”) and listed in succession dynasties that had been in part or wholly synchronous.⁹⁷⁹ Date-lists or year-lists (YLS) compiled year-names in chronological order and were composed as an aid for the identification of the chronological position of any particular year-name in relation to other year-names. They also provided such historical information as the sequence of significant occurrences within a reign.⁹⁸⁰ YLS contain the name of the king and the number of regnal years (counted until the king died). These lists are considered one of the most reliable chronological sources for the period before 1600 BC and help clarify some of the problems with the KLs. YLS are known from the 3rd millennium BC onwards, though incompletely. Of course, many problems remain due to broken passages, contradictions between lists, and year-names unattested in them but known from other sources. Furthermore, no YLS exist for most of the dynasties of local petty rulers (one of the exceptions is Ešnunna⁹⁸¹). This means that in many cases the order of year-names may be established only by the reconstruction of archives and prosopographical observations.

⁹⁷⁹ The SKL had a specific historiographic and ideological purpose: the list was to demonstrate the existence of a divine “kingship” that moved from city to city. It was created from individual KLs from various cities, which were “pasted” together in one long, seemingly continuous list – but this resulted in the separation, sometimes by centuries. A truly linear sequence was followed by the newly published USKL (STEINKELLER [2003] 267–292) from the second half of the Ur III period, which contains a single list of the rulers of Kiš followed by at least three other dynasties. According to the USKL, kingship, after it descended from heaven, stayed in Kiš until Sargon I. Other dynasties mentioned in the SKL were not acknowledged by the USKL (STEINKELLER [2003] 276).

The SKL is the main source for Mesopotamian chronology prior to the Ur III period. The lengths of its earliest dynasties are clearly mythological. In general the numbers starting with the Uruk III dynasty seem to be “real” and therefore probably should be considered “historical”: see STEINER (1988) 129ff., who nevertheless believed that some “legendary” numbers were calculated according to a certain scheme. According to YOUNG, *JNES* 47 (1988) 123–129, some of the numbers, because they are sums, multiples or squares of 60, appear to be artificial. EDZARD (1980–1983) 81 believed that all numbers in the SKL up to 60 can be considered real (for instance the 60-year rule of Rim-Sin of Larsa). Still, these “real” numbers need to be confirmed by other sources.

Because date-lists and category A chronicles of the first millennium BC have identical literary patterns, GRAYSON, ABC 6 suggested that after the replacement of year-names (and date-lists) by regnal years the scribes still continued to compile such texts. However, he stressed that this is purely hypothetical since no such texts are known from the transitional period coinciding with the Dark Age. Perhaps other factors, such as divination, general interest in history or the traditionally conservative attitude of the Babylonians may have played some role in the preservation of “outdated” modes of dating. KLs are considered to be a further stage of date-lists, in which the number of year-names or regnal years for each king was added (summaries of date-lists; GRAYSON [1980] 172–177). Category A is defined by the characteristic phrase “*the year when ...*” and “*x were/are the years of the king*”.⁹⁸² The first independent KLs of category A are the Larsa KL and the Ur-Isin KL (→ **BKL**).

The main source of error were the so-called MU Ú.S.A year-names (“the year following the year” or “double-dating” according to EDZARD [1957] 27.

⁹⁸⁰ See SCHMIDTKE (1952) 14–16 or PIENKA (1998) 24: problems arise when date formulae were not noted within those date-lists; further, so-called MU Ú.S.A dates (“Doppel-datierungen” according to EDZARD [1957] 27–28) complicate the situation (→ below). See also GODDEERIS (2002) 25.

⁹⁸¹ See SAPORETTI (2000) 913–920 dealing with the year-names published by BAQIR, *Sumer* 5 (1949) 34–84 and 136–143 (Narām-Sin, Daduša and Ibāl-pi-El II: two date-lists are shown in photograph on pp. 85–86). For a historical assessment of Ešnunna see YUHONG (1994) and more recently CHARPIN (2004) 64–68, *passim*.

⁹⁸² For a list of texts belonging to this category see GRAYSON, ABC 5. On such lists of the Babylon I and the Larsa dynasties see GRAYSON, ABC, Appendix A.

HORSNELL [1999] 139–147 proposed the translation “provisional years” for this term).⁹⁸³ MU.Ú.SA year-names were used up to the point the official name of the new year was known (ROWTON [1970] 198).⁹⁸⁴ This “renaming” clearly bears the seeds of confusion and errors, the more so since YLs omit most of the Ú.SA years. Another potential source of confusion is the numerous abbreviated forms of year-names.

Year-names relating to the time after the fall of the Babylon I dynasty, the Dark Age, are known from texts from Terqa in Syria and Tell Muḥammad. The year-names from Tell Muḥammad might be especially important for Mesopotamian chronology since they may contain some important information on the resettlement of Babylon by the Kassites. These year-names, which also refer to a lunar eclipse, have been included by GASCHE *et al.* in *Dating ...* 83–89 (→ below sub 16.5.). The Kassites, according to the evidence from Terqa⁹⁸⁵ ruled the kingdom of Ḫana along the Euphrates, also employed the traditional year-name system. In the year-name of an unpublished text conflicts between Kuwari and Ḫattum (written Ḫattu/Ḫatte), perhaps Ḫatti (?), are reported, which possibly date to the beginning of the 17th cent. according to the MC (ROUAULT, MDAR 55). Rouault consequently argued that Terqa was under Kassite control before Muṣili I, who caused the fall of Babylon, by identifying the name Iauša with the Kassite king Ušše, who is attested in **BKL A** (BRINKMAN, MSKH 173–175), and identifying Kaštīliāšu of Terqa with the well known Kassite king Kaštīliāšu II, probably a contemporary of Ammišaduqa.⁹⁸⁶ For the rulers of Terqa → **Babylonia**. The year-name system was abandoned sometime after the fall of Babylon I dynasty and replaced by regnal years.

An extensive study on issues pertaining to the chronological order of year-names, the year-name sys-

tem (purpose and function, problem of the term “promulgation document,”⁹⁸⁷ identification of their “Sitz im Leben”⁹⁸⁸) and the transliteration of 20 date-lists (including description of their characteristics, publication history, attempted reconstruction of original line arrangement and size, chronological succession) of the kings of the Babylon I dynasty, covering ca. 300 years, has been published by HORSNELL (1999; see p. 175ff., see pp. 215–218 for the time spans each date-list covers). The length of each king’s reign is established by Horsnell, followed by a discussion on the chronological order of year-names. On p. 233 Horsnell summarized: “... They function as primary sources for significant historical information presented in a chronological framework. Their chronological reliability is attested by their contemporaneity with the period in question and by their close agreement with each other regarding the number of years for a king’s reign. ...”⁹⁸⁹

Value for Absolute Chronology

Like eponyms, year-names are an important source for chronology. Due to their content they also help establish synchronisms or links to specific events that allow some further chronological conclusions. The kings of the ancient world usually reckoned their regnal years according to the calendar year.⁹⁹⁰ As it was rare that a king would actually become king on the first day of the year, the fraction of a year between the actual accession and the beginning of the first full year was dealt with the following way: The remainder of the current year, after the death of the old king, was called the “accession year” (year zero) of the succeeding ruler.⁹⁹¹ His first regnal year (or “official accession” year according to Horsnell [1999] 136⁹³) started with the next calendar year in spring (Babylonia) or fall (Assyria, but some exceptions are attested⁹⁹²) after his

⁹⁸³ Variant: MU GIBIL₍₄₎ (ša EGIR) in combination with the preceding year-name: PIENKA (1998) 23–24.

⁹⁸⁴ According to Widell, *JAC* 17 (2002) 107–108 after the beginning of a year a period of discussion on how that year should be named often followed, causing a delayed proclamation. The Ú.SA year was used in parallel with the official “new” year-name.

⁹⁸⁵ PODANY (2002) 38–39.

⁹⁸⁶ For another identification with Kaštīliāšu I see PODANY (2002) 43ff. and esp. p. 48 with respect to the proposed chronologies (note that she proposes another line of Terqa-kings). It is unfortunate that so little is known about the Kassite kings named Kaštīliāšu.

⁹⁸⁷ See vol. I, 149ff. Promulgation documents are tablets containing only one year-name recorded for its own sake. Year-names were officially promulgated each year. Several such

documents from the reign of Hammu-rāpi’ onwards have been found. They give the year-name in Sumerian on the obverse and Akkadian on the reverse. Such documents with the Akkadian version only are rare.

⁹⁸⁸ PIENKA (1998) 23–25

⁹⁸⁹ Similarly Goddeeris (2002) 317–319.

⁹⁹⁰ A synchronistic tie or co-regency is attested when two kings are named side by side in an oath in a legal document: Goddeeris (2002) 27.

⁹⁹¹ See BRINKMAN, MSKH 403 on the term MU.SAG NAM. LUGAL.LA, which is known from the reign of Kadašman-Enlil II onwards.

⁹⁹² TADMOR, *JCS* 12 (1958) 22–40, 77–100 (on the dating methods during Sargon’s II reign), see esp. pp. 27–33. See FUCHS, SAAS 8 (1998) 81ff.

enthronement (→ **Calendar**). The term “accession year” is therefore used for the year in which a new king ascended the throne. It corresponds to the last regnal year of the preceding king.

Year-names also offer information on military conquests, building activities and oaths, and reflect hegemonies and co-regencies, etc. The year-names from the Akkad to the end of the Old Babylonian period were first compiled in 1938 by UNGNAD in RIA 2 sub “Datenlisten” with additions by EBELING in RIA 2, pp. 194–195 and 256–257. A list of year-names from the Early Dynastic period onwards is published online by SIGRIST and DAMEROW.⁹⁹³ An updated list of year-names of the Babylon I dynasty with an historical evaluation has been published by PIENKA (1998)⁹⁹⁴ and HORSNELL (1999; including discussions on chronological problems for each king of the Babylon I dynasty). The order of other local rulers during the Babylon I dynasty still remains uncertain (no YLs have been recovered).⁹⁹⁵ Almost complete lists exist for the Larsa dynasty and the Babylon I dynasty up to Samsuiluna, and fragments are known for Isin and Ešnunna. In general date-lists are chronologically more reliable than KLs. In his useful chart WALKER (1995) 233ff. paralleled the reign lengths of the Babylonian rulers attested in KLs with date-lists (columns 4 and 5). In *Dating ...* 80–81 COLE pointed out that discrepancies and uncertainties exist for the reconstruction of an accurate relative chronology due to the numerous differences among sources for the reign lengths of the individual Babylonian kings. Sometimes the number of year-names exceeds or falls short of the reign length found in KLs by one year:⁹⁹⁶

Ibbi-Sîn: 15/24/25 (**SKL**) or 24 years (**Ur-Isin KL** and year-names)

Gungunum: 27 (**Larsa KL**) or 28 years (year-names)

Warad-Sîn: 13 years (year-names) rather than 12 years (**Larsa KL**)

Rim-Sîn I: 61 (**Larsa KL**) or 60 years (year-names)

⁹⁹³ http://cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/yn_index.html (Aug. 2007). An individual study on year-names of the **Ur III period** is by SIGRIST – GOMI (1991) and on the **Isin-Larsa period** by SIGRIST (– KROMHOLZ), IAPAS 1, 2 and 3 (1986–1990).

⁹⁹⁴ Pientka specialized on the period between the rulers Abi-ešuh and Samsuditana.

⁹⁹⁵ On the year-names from Mari see now CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003).

⁹⁹⁶ The synchronisms between the Babylonian rulers have been worked out by EDZARD (1957) and STOL (1976) before (→ Synchronisms sub **General**). Note also CHARPIN (2004).

⁹⁹⁷ See SALLABERGER (2004) 38 (Tabelle 6) on all the variants in KLs.

Būr-Sîn: 22 (**Ur-Isin KL**) or 21 years (**SKL** and year-names)

Erra-imitti: 8 (**Ur-Isin KL**) vs. 7 years (year-names)

Itēr-piša: 3 (**Ur-Isin KL**) vs. 4 years (**SKL** and year-names)

Urdukuḡa: 3 (**Ur-Isin KL**) vs. 4 years (**SKL** and year-names)

Damiq-ilišu: his reign length is only preserved in the **SKL**

Ammišaduqa: his reign length is only preserved in **BKL B**

Samsuditana: his reign length is only preserved in **BKL B**

16.2. Ur III Period⁹⁹⁷

Ur-Nammu	18 years	
Šulgi	48 years	
Amar-Sîn	9 years	
Š ¹ -Sîn	9 years	
Ibbi-Sîn	24 years ⁹⁹⁸	Išbi-Erra

COLE’s primary goal in *Dating ...* 77–83 was to determine the time span between the fall of the Ur III dynasty (established by a lunar eclipse mentioned in EAE)⁹⁹⁹ and Ammišaduqa’s first year. He calculated this to be 359 or 358 years. This had to be subtracted from 1912 or 1911, the computed date of the lunar eclipse at the time of the fall of the Ur III dynasty, to find the first regnal year of Ammišaduqa. But the 8-year Venus cycle also had to be taken into account. The two options turned out to be 1550 or 1558 (→ **Astronomical data**). The authors of *Dating ...*, 80–83 opted for 1550 (separation of 362 or 361 years), which resulted in the synchronism of Ibbi-Sîn year 24 with Išbi-Erra year 11 (→ below for the corrected synchronism according to van de Mierop). The syn-

⁹⁹⁸ According to SALLABERGER (2004) 37 the 25 years attested in the SKL could be also be accepted.

⁹⁹⁹ GLASSNER (2000) 386–391 presented a study on the end of dynasties, especially the fall of the Ur III dynasty involving Ibbi-Sîn, Kindattu of Elam and Išbi-Erra of the Isin I dynasty. On the fall of Ur III, its textual evidence and cause(s) see WILCKE, ZA 60 (1979) 54–69, sub Ibbi-Suen and Ishbi-Erra in RIA 5 (1976–1980) and SALLABERGER (1999) 174–178 (on the use of year-names). On the fall of the Ur III dynasty see also POTTS (1999) 142–144 (p. 142: “the relationship between Ibbi-Sîn, Ishbi-Erra and Kindattu is far from transparent and speculation on it has been great”).

chronism between the rulers of the Ur III and the Isin I dynasty is vital. It was assumed that the lunar eclipse associated with Ibbi-Sîn's downfall took place in his penultimate year which accordingly resulted in a gap of 362 years. They calculated for year 1 of Ammišaduqa the year 1550 BC. The penultimate year of Ibbi-Sîn was dated to 1912 BC and Šulgi's penultimate year to 1945 BC.

Considering the difficulties with the computation of the lunar eclipse of the end of the Ur III dynasty, one might decide for the data presented in date-lists¹⁰⁰⁰ rather than rely upon the doubtful astronomical data. SALLABERGER (2004) 15–43 presented the chronology for the Babylonian dynasties starting with the Akkad period, and showed that based on the information provided by the date-list UET 1, 292 from Ur, Išbi-Erra year 1 corresponded to Ibbi-Sîn year 8.¹⁰⁰¹ This provides us with a link to the partly contemporary first ruler of the succeeding Isin I dynasty. For linking the Ur III dynasty with Old Assyrian rulers → **Eponyms** sub 10.5.

16.3. Early Old Babylonian Period: Isin-Larsa Period¹⁰⁰²

The succeeding Isin-Larsa period of two and a half centuries came to an end with Hammu-rāpi's defeat of Rīm-Sîn in the latter's 60th year. In his treatment of the "Zwischenzeit", EDZARD (1957) 10–13 summarized the main sources for its history including year-names ("Jahresdaten") belonging to the primary sources.¹⁰⁰³ On pp. 26–29 he presented the use of year-names and the irregular intercalation (control of seasons, lunar year). He listed and discussed synchronisms concerning the so-called "Zwischenzeit" dynasties on pp. 18–25 (based on studies by KRAUS, *JCS* 3 [1951] 21–24 and MATOUŠ, *ArOr* 20 [1952] 292–298; the numbers of the Isin list were preferred). The interconnections between the Isin, Larsa and Babylon I dynasties have been dealt with and presented in a table by SIGRIST (1988) 8¹⁰⁰⁴ and SALLABERGER (2004) table 7, who summarized the differences between the KLs and various date-lists. The year-names of Larsa kings were treated separately

by SIGRIST – KROMHOLZ (1986), where he provided a list of kings with the reign lengths as well (p. 3). GODDEERIS (2002) offered an introduction to studies of the early Old Babylonian Period (2000–1800 BC) and mainly concentrated on the textual evidence from Sippar, Dilbat and Kiš (on the dating system see esp. pp. 24–26). She emphasized that the kings' names (Babylonian and local) are mainly known from year-names and oaths as well as clauses referring to *mišārum* acts.¹⁰⁰⁵ According to the date-lists and lists of the reign lengths of the kings of Ur and Isin (→ **BKL**) the Isin-Larsa period lasted 254 years. The end of the Ur III dynasty took place 224 ±1 years before Hammu-rāpi's accession (→ below for the synchronism between Rīm-Sîn and Hammu-rāpi').

Synchronisms between Isin I and Larsa dynasty
(EDZARD [1957] 20–21):

Išbi-Erra year 1 & Naplānum year 9
Lipit-Ištar year 11 & Gungunum year 9
Ur-Ninurta accession year & Gungunum year 9
Zambīya year 1 & Sîn-iqīšam year 5
Damiq-ilišu year 23 & Rīm-Sîn I year 19

Synchronisms between Larsa and Babylon dynasty
(EDZARD [1957] 22–24):¹⁰⁰⁶

Warad-Sîn year 2 & Sābium year 12
Rīm-Sîn I year 60 & Hammu-rāpi' year 30

Overlapping of Ur III dynasty and Isin I dynasty:

Išbi-Erra & Ibbi-Sîn (to EDZARD [1957] 24–25 the exact synchronism was still unknown; for that reason a synchronistic history between Ur III and Isin I was not possible: see UET 1, 292) → above sub 16.2.

Sigrist collected and published the Isin year-names as well as the Larsa year-names (starting with Gungunum) using MC dates. The **BKL** and the **SKL** offer additional evidence on the relation between the Isin I kings and the beginning of the Old Babylonian period. For an updated list of synchronisms between the rulers of the Ur III, the Isin, the Larsa and the Babylon I dynasties see CHARPIN (2004) 384–387.

¹⁰⁰⁰ See also Cole in GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 81³²⁷.

¹⁰⁰¹ For this synchronism see VAN DE MIEROOP, *OLA* 24 (1987) 125–126 and his publication *BIN* 10 (1987). See also SIGRIST (1988) 4 (with further lit.) and CHARPIN (2004) 384 (with table). In contrast GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 82.

¹⁰⁰² Like LANDSBERGER (1954) 120, Edzard warned about absolute dating for this period. EDZARD (1957) 25 decided to follow the MC throughout his study, although this was applied arbitrarily. The main purpose of quoting numbers was to facilitate cross checking with other tables.

¹⁰⁰³ See also STOL (1976). Towards the end of this period the letters of Mari with their political correspondence becomes important as well; CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003).

¹⁰⁰⁴ For more synchronistic ties → below sub **Babylon I dynasty**.

¹⁰⁰⁵ CAD M₂ 116 "redress: legislative act to remedy certain economic malfunctions"

¹⁰⁰⁶ For a shift of 2 years for the dates of the Isin I rulers and its consequences see CHARPIN (2004) 384–387.

16.3.1. Isin I Dynasty

Ijbi-Erra	33 years	Ibbi-Sin
Š ¹ -iliju	10 years	
Iddin-Dag ^{an}	21 years	
Ijme-Dag ^{an}	19 years ¹⁰⁰⁷	
Lipit-Ijtar	11 years	Gungunum
Ur-Ninurta	28 years	Gungunum
B ¹ r-Sin	21 or 22 ¹⁰⁰⁸	Sumuel ¹⁰⁰⁹
Lipit-Enlil	5 years	
Erra-imitt ²	8 years ¹⁰¹⁰	
Iddin-Ijtar (?)	6 months ¹⁰¹¹	
Enlil-b ^{an} i	24 years	
Zab ² ya	3 years	Sin-iq ² am
It ² -p ² a	4 years ¹⁰¹²	
Urdukuga	4 years	
Sin-m ² gir	11 years	
Damiq-iliju	23 years	R ² m-Sin I

16.3.2. Larsa Dynasty

Napl ^{an} um	21 years	
Emi, um	28 years	
Samium	35 years	
Zab ² ya	9 years	
Gungunum	27 years	Lipit-Ijtar, Ur-Ninurta
Ab ² -sar ²	11 years	
Sumuel	29 years	B ¹ r-Sin
N ¹ r-Adad	16 years	
Sin-iddinam	7 years	
Sin-er ² bam	2 years	
Sin-iq ² am	5 years	Zab ² ya, S ² bium
fill ² -Adad	1 year	
Warad-Sin	13 years ¹⁰¹³	S ² bium ¹⁰¹⁴
R ² m-Sin I	60 years ¹⁰¹⁵	Damiq-iliju

¹⁰⁰⁷ So in the Ur-Isin KL; only 18 year-names are attested: SIGRIST (1988) 2.

¹⁰⁰⁸ SKL: 21 years; SIGRIST (1988) 2: 22 year-names attested.

¹⁰⁰⁹ CHARPIN (2004) 77 referring to Stol and van de Mieroop.

¹⁰¹⁰ SKL: 7 years

¹⁰¹¹ SKL P₅ from Nippur adds this name (of uncertain reading) with a six-month reign.

¹⁰¹² SKL: 4 years; only three year-names are known from the Ur-Isin KL.

¹⁰¹³ Larsa KL: 12 years

¹⁰¹⁴ Indirect synchronism: S²bium year 12 & Warad-Sin year 2: EDZARD (1957) 22–23.

¹⁰¹⁵ Larsa KL: 61 years

Schematic overview of synchronisms¹⁰¹⁶

			Babylon I dynasty: 1499, 1531, 1595, 1651
	Isin I dynasty	Larsa dynasty	Samsuditana
	Damiq-ilīu	R ² m-Sin	Ammi, aduqa
	Sin-m ² gir		Ammiditana
	Urdukuga	Warad-Sin	Ab ² -e ₁ u ²
	It ² -p ² īa		Samsuiluna
	Zab ² ya		Hammu-r ² pi ² ī
			Sin-muballi ²
			Apil-Sin
	Enlil-b ² ni	fill ² -Adad	
		Sin-iq ² am	
	Erra-imitt ²	Sin-er ² bam	S ² bium
	Lipit-Enlil	Sin-iddinam	
		N ¹ r-Adad	
	B ¹ r-Sin	Sumuel	Sumulael (<i>Sumuabum</i>)
	Ur-Ninurta	Ab ² -sar ²	
		Gungunum	
	Lipit-I ₁ tar	Zab ² ya	
	I ₁ me-Dag ² n		
	Iddin-Dag ² n	Samium	
	Š ¹ -ili ₁ u	Emi ₁ um	
		Napl ² num	
Ur III dynasty ¹¹¹⁷	I ₁ bi-Erra		
Ibbi-Sin			
Šu-Sin			
Amar-Sin			
Šulgi			
Ur-Nammu			

Table 34 on the basis of www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronology/mesopotamia.html with adaptations

16.4. Babylon I Dynasty (→ Babylonia)

Year-names form the primary source for the history of the Babylon I dynasty. Therefore it was an important task to provide a handy reference list for the

chronological placement of documents with date formulae. The latest assessment of year-names of the complete Babylon I dynasty was published in 1999 by HORSNELL.¹⁰¹⁸ PIENKA (1998) concentrated on the decline of the Babylon I dynasty, during the reign of

¹⁰¹⁶ Useful synchronistic lists of rulers of the Larsa, Isin and Babylon I dynasties can be found in MATOUŠ, *ArOr* 20 (1952) 295–296, EDZARD (1957) Anhang A (MC [Smith] and LC [Albright – Cornelius]); the exact synchronism between Ibbi-Sin and Išbi-Erra was then unknown), SIGRIST (1988) 8 (year synchronisms), WHITTAKER (1989) 79 (MC), FRAYNE, *RIME* 4 (1990) xxx–xxxi (HC), HALLO

– SIMPSON (1998) 94 (MC) and CHARPIN (2004) 385–390 (MC).

¹⁰¹⁷ Note the lunar eclipse that is mentioned in **EAE 21** for the end of the Ur III dynasty. → sub **Astronomy**.

¹⁰¹⁸ He offered a description of earlier compendia on pp. 18–32, beginning with King's publication of date-lists A and B in 1900.

Samsuiluna, and provided an assessment of the texts from Babylonia and their distribution.¹⁰¹⁹ Another study on the year-names of the Babylon I dynasty is in preparation by Sigrist. The reign lengths of Ammišaduqa and Samsuditana are only preserved in **BKL B**, which, however, contains errors and is therefore considered an unreliable chronological source. RICHARDSON (2002) 2 proposed a reign length of only 19 for Ammišaduqa (→ **Babylonia**), which has not been generally accepted.¹⁰²⁰ A table of the different reign lengths among the date-lists and **BKL B** was published by HORSNELL (1999) vol. 1, 225–226 (see pp. 86–87 for discussion). He summarized that due to their internal total of known year-names the numbers recorded in the date-lists usually prove to be correct.

The decline of this dynasty is especially evident from the destruction and abandonment of several important cities in Southern Babylonia during its later part. They were not resettled until the start of the Middle Babylonian period, which means that archaeological evidence for the transition period is basically non-existent.¹⁰²¹ Still, PIENKA (1998) 21 stressed that the picture presented here is far from complete and might easily be altered by new or still unpublished texts dealing with this and the succeeding period. FINKELSTEIN, *JCS* 13 (1958) 39–49 suggested new year-names from near the end of the Babylon I dynasty may also be found on unpublished tablets from the Yale and the British Museum collections.¹⁰²² In particular the still-missing texts from Southern Babylonia could potentially alter the picture of decline towards the end of the Babylon I dynasty (PIENKA [1998] 7).¹⁰²³

<i>Sumuabum</i>	14 years ¹⁰²⁴	Atta-hu;u (Elam)
Sumulael	36 years ¹⁰²⁵	
S̄bium	14 years	Sin-iq ² ;am, Warad-Sîn
Apil-Sîn	18 years	
Sîn-muballiḫ	20 years ¹⁰²⁶	
Hammu-r̄piŸ	43 years ¹⁰²⁷	R ² m-Sîn I, Kudu-zulu; and Siwe-palar-huppak (Elam)
Samsuiluna	38 years ¹⁰²⁸	R ² m-Sîn II, ¹⁰²⁹ Iluma-AN, Agum I and perhaps Kutir-Nahhunte ¹⁰³⁰
Ab ² -e;u©	28 years ¹⁰³¹	Iluma-AN
Ammiditana	37 years ¹⁰³²	
Ammi, aduqa	21 years	Kuk-Na;ur II (Elam)
Samsuditana	31 years	
Total	300 years	

¹⁰¹⁹ For remarks on Pientka's work see HORSNELL (1999) vol. 2, 29–31.

¹⁰²⁰ See CHARPIN (2004) 390 for the reign lengths of the kings of the Babylon I dynasty (dates according to the MC).

¹⁰²¹ Note the attempt from the archaeological side by GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating ...* based on pottery from Tell ed-Dêr (Sippar-Amnânum) in Northern Babylonia and comparisons from other sites (see map on p. 23). No reaction to this evaluation with the implication for a NC has been published yet.

¹⁰²² An extensive study on the period of the decline of the Babylon I dynasty focusing on the reign of Samsuiluna including unpublished material is being prepared by F. van Koppen.

¹⁰²³ Note the latest study on the end of the Babylon I dynasty by RICHARDSON (2002) → **Babylonia**.

¹⁰²⁴ **BKL B**: 15 years; note that according to the observations by CHARPIN (2004) 80–86 Sumuabum was not a ruler of

Babylon and presumably ruled contemporaneously with Sumulael.

¹⁰²⁵ **BKL B**: 35 years.

¹⁰²⁶ **BKL B**: 30 years.

¹⁰²⁷ **BKL B**: 55 years.

¹⁰²⁸ **BKL B**: 35 years.

¹⁰²⁹ On Kassite threats in his and Samsuiluna's time see PIENKA (1998) 17 and 258 (with further literature). Conflicts between Babylonians and Kassites are first reported in the date formula of the 9th year of Samsuiluna. Another reference late appears in one of the year-names of Abi-ešuh. → **Babylonia**.

¹⁰³⁰ PIENKA (1998) 16 (later tradition, no contemporary sources).

¹⁰³¹ **BKL B**: 25 years.

¹⁰³² **BKL B**: 25 years.

16.5. Tell Muḥammad

In their introduction of *Dating ...*, GASCHE *et al.* pointed out that no lists are known for the period between the end of Babylon I and Burna-Buriaš II of the Kassite dynasty, and therefore Babylonian chronology is ultimately based on synchronisms with the Assyrians. A gap exists for the transition period from the Old Babylonian to the Middle Babylonian period. Internal as well as external synchronisms of rulers of the first and second half of the 2nd millennium BC can be established, as shown above (EDZARD [1957] and Stol [1976]). However, the lack of sources for the beginning of the Kassite dynasty results in an incomplete sequence of rulers.

Most interesting in chronological terms are the year-names of the texts from Tell Muḥammad,¹⁰³³ which date from shortly after the reign of Samsuditana and report that the Babylonian capital was abandoned for a certain amount of time following the reign of this king.¹⁰³⁴ Tell Muḥammad has yielded the only texts from Babylonia which allude to the period after the end of the Babylon I dynasty and to Babylon's resettlement.¹⁰³⁵ Old Babylonian economic tablets in levels II and III¹⁰³⁶ contain date formulas saying: "year x (30–41) that Babylon was resettled". According to the authors of *Dating ...* this year-name

can only refer to a time after the reign of Samsuditana and therefore falls within the gap between the end of the Old Babylonian period and 1400. The abandonment and resettlement of Babylon referred to presumably alludes to the Hittite attack during the reign of Muršili I and the site's later occupation by the Kassites. Two others of these year-names refer to a lunar eclipse said to have taken place 38 years after Babylon was resettled (→ **Astronomical Data**): MU.38.KÁM.MA ša KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{KI} ušbu "year 38 that Babylon was resettled" (COLE, *Dating ...*, 83–89: testimony for the first 170 years [LC] of Kassite rule in Babylonia). SASSMANNSHAUSEN, OLA 96 (1999) 413–414 translates the phrase, "38th year after x sat down in Babylon" (referring to the installation of the Kassite dynasty in Babylon?),¹⁰³⁷ but later accepted Cole's translation (see MDAR 64 and → **Babylonia**). However, RICHARDSON (2002) 9 believes this year-name did not specifically refer to Babylon's resettlement so soon after its destruction, but just verifies that Babylon was resettled.¹⁰³⁸

Links

AKL, Astronomical Data, Babylonia, BKL, Calendar, Chronicle, Distanzangaben, Eponym, (Early) Kassite Dynasty

¹⁰³³ AL-UBAID, MA thesis, University of Baghdad (1983, unpublished): see GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 84³³⁸. Level I of the site is dated to the beginning of Kassite Period. Levels II–VII date to the Old Babylonian Period and include a temple and houses. The pottery assemblage from levels II–III has been associated with the material from Tell ed-Dēr, which dates 30 years before the fall of Babylon.

¹⁰³⁴ GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 83

¹⁰³⁵ In works on Mesopotamian history the absence of texts dating to the century and a half after Samsuiluna's final year is generally emphasized (see e.g. VAN DIJK [1986] 159ff.). Note the mostly unpublished texts from Tell Muḥammad and Terqa.

¹⁰³⁶ The existence of two different dating systems for levels II and III can be observed: The texts from level III, which are older, were dated by an indigenous system, whereas those from level II use both indigenous and the Babylonian systems. This is generally interpreted as indication of allegiance to the Kassite king (or to the king of the Sealand I dynasty) in Babylon.

¹⁰³⁷ His translation was based on the shortened year-names of the Old Babylonian period, where the subject is usually missing.

¹⁰³⁸ See also SEAL (2001) 169.

