



# STATE ARCHIVES OF ASSYRIA STUDIES

Published by the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project  
of the Academy of Finland  
in co-operation with  
the Finnish Oriental Society

Project Director  
Simo Parpola

Managing Editor  
Robert M. Whiting

VOLUME II  
Alan Millard  
THE EPONYMS OF THE ASSYRIAN EMPIRE  
910–612 BC

THE NEO-ASSYRIAN TEXT CORPUS PROJECT

## PREFACE

The Assyrian Eponym Lists are basic to ancient Near Eastern chronology, so the aim of this study is to provide as clear and complete a presentation of the texts relating to the first millennium BC as possible.

After many interruptions, the liberal offer from Simo Parpola to include the work under the aegis of the SAA project has stimulated and made possible its completion. His team, Robert Whiting, Raija Mattila and Laura Kataja have toiled to edit and set the text under his direction, incorporating references from SAA publications and some other sources into my earlier typescript, converting the ms to electronic format, and checking the entire catalogue against the SAA database with the assistance of Kalle Fabritius. Robert Whiting has generously added observations on the post-canonical eponyms from his own research and has prepared the Index of Excavation, Museum and Publication Numbers. I am deeply grateful to these scholars for their friendly and efficient co-operation.

Collecting and collating the material presented has only been possible through the kindness of many scholars who have made available texts known to them; my thanks are expressed to A. Y. Ahmed, J. Black, J. A. Brinkman, S. Dalley, K. Deller, I. L. Finkel, W. G. Lambert, E. Lipiński, the late B. H. Parker (Lady Mallowan), S. Parpola, J. N. Postgate, C. B. F. Walker, D. J. Wiseman. Various authorities have permitted me to quote texts in collections under their charge, B. K. Ismail (Baghdad), D. Homès-Fredericq (Brussels) and L. Jakob-Rost (Berlin), who kindly supplied photographs of the Eponym Lists from Assur and checked the proposed joins of Eponym List A7. The Trustees of the British Museum have permitted the publication of my copies of tablets in the Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities and I am indebted to successive Keepers of that department, the late R. D. Barnett, the late E. Sollberger, T. C. Mitchell and J. E. Curtis and their staff, for giving access to many tablets in their care. The Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft, through J. Renger, freely gave permission for the reproduction of Otto Schroeder's copies of eponym lists from Assur and O. R. Gurney and the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara have willingly allowed me to include the published copies of the lists from Sultantepe. The whole task could only be done with the generous support of colleagues that characterizes Assyriology.

The University of Liverpool granted one term's study leave to begin the project and has covered continuing expenses.

The encouragement of Kenneth Kitchen and Donald Wiseman and the constancy of my wife, Margaret, have been my indispensable support.

The University of Liverpool, March 1994

Alan Millard

## CONTENTS

PREFACE .....	vii
ABBREVIATIONS .....	xi
INTRODUCTION .....	1
THE TEXTS .....	4
The Purpose of the Eponym Chronicles .....	5
The Sources of the Eponym Lists and Chronicles .....	6
The Office of Eponym .....	7
The Order of the Eponyms .....	9
The Stelae from Assur .....	11
The Eponym Lists and Chronology .....	12
The Horizontal Rulings .....	12
The Eponym Lists and Regnal Years .....	13
THE EPONYM CANON .....	15
THE MANUSCRIPTS .....	17
TEXT SCORE .....	23
THE EPONYM LISTS IN ENGLISH .....	55
CATALOGUE OF EPONYM DATES .....	63
NOTES ON THE CATALOGUE .....	65
VARIOUS OBSERVATIONS .....	66
Unusual Month Names .....	66
Intercalary Months .....	66
Second Eponymates .....	67
<i>ša arki</i> Dates .....	67
Unusual Writings .....	68
Variant Titles .....	69
Errors .....	69
Incomplete and Uncertain Eponym Dates .....	70
Double Datings .....	70
THE POST-CANONICAL AND EXTRA-CANONICAL EPONYMS .....	72
Post-canonical Eponyms .....	72
Extra-canonical Eponyms .....	78
CATALOGUE OF EPONYM-DATED TEXTS .....	79
INDICES .....	127
NOTES ON THE INDICES .....	128
INDEX OF NAMES, TITLES AND OTHER WORDS .....	129
INDEX OF EXCAVATION, MUSEUM AND PUBLICATION NUMBERS .....	135
PLATES .....	155

## INTRODUCTION

Three methods for distinguishing one year from another were used in the ancient Near East. From the start of the Early Dynastic Period in Egypt, *c.* 3000 BC, and from about 2400 BC in Babylonia come examples of years named after an important event.<sup>1</sup> This system, or a variation, continued until the end of the Old Kingdom in Egypt, *c.* 2150 BC, and until the end of the First Dynasty of Babylon in the east *c.* 1595 BC, then it gave way to a simple numbering of the years of each king's reign and, in Egypt, to other, cyclical, reckonings. When a king died, the remaining months of the current year were usually termed the 'accession year' of the next ruler, his first year commencing with the next new calendrical year. The third way of dating was by eponyms. Each year was named after a high officer of state, termed *līmu* (or *limmu*) in Akkadian. How and when this method began is uncertain, for although dating by officials is found in some Sumerian texts of the mid-third millennium BC, it is otherwise confined to Assyria from the nineteenth to the seventh centuries BC. From Assyria this system of naming years is believed to have passed to Greece in the archonship and to Rome in the consular dating.

Applications of all these systems are known from ancient Mesopotamia in dating records of royal campaigns, prestigious building projects, or diplomatic exchanges, but most widely on legal, administrative and business documents that required a date by their very nature. However, neither ancient secretaries nor modern scholars could set documents dated by year names or by eponyms in order without knowledge of the names in correct sequence. Accordingly, the scribes drew up lists and some of them, reaching into the third millennium BC, have survived, though incompletely.<sup>2</sup> With year-names distinction of one from another was relatively easy, while under the eponym system an official might hold the office more than once, or there might be two eponyms bearing the same name, so the men's titles could be added to distinguish between them.

Early in the history of Assyriology, Henry Rawlinson noticed lists of officials among the thousands of tablets and fragments recovered from Nineveh by Layard. After initially setting them aside as uninteresting, Rawlinson

---

<sup>1</sup> For the Egyptian material see P. Kaplony, *Die Inschriften der Ägyptischen Frühzeit* (Wiesbaden 1963); for the Babylonian see the collection made by A. Ungnad, RIA 2 (1938) 133-95; more recent lists for the line of Gudea at Lagash and for the Third Dynasty of Ur are given in M. Sigrist and T. Gomi, *The Comprehensive Catalog of Published Ur III Tablets*, (Bethesda, MD 1991) 317-29, and for the Dynasty of Akkad in H. Hirsch, AfO 20 (1963) 1-77 (augmented by yet more recent publications such as M. E. Cohen, JCS 34 [1976] 227-32); A. Archi in A. Archi (ed.), *Eblaite Personal Names and Semitic Name-Giving*, Archivi reali di Ebla, Studi 1 (Rome 1988) 205-206 mentions year names from Ebla, probably from the Early Dynastic III period, which also give the year number, like year names of that time from Lagash and other Babylonian cities.

<sup>2</sup> The basic collection of year name lists from Babylonia is given in RIA 2, 131-96.

realized their importance as lists of the eponym officials in order and issued his first description of them in 1862.<sup>3</sup> He announced more examples during the next five years, publishing some in collaboration with E. Norris in *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* II, in 1866. Various scholars immediately investigated and discussed these texts, especially because of their relevance for biblical chronology.

Early in the decipherment of cuneiform inscriptions, scholars were able to identify some Assyrian and Babylonian kings with those named in Hebrew and Greek texts. They constructed tentative chronological schemes using those sources and the rapidly increasing information from Mesopotamia. Especially valuable were the names and lengths of reign of rulers of Babylon which Ptolemy recorded in the second century AD. Some of them are associated with lunar eclipses, the most useful being years one and two of 'Mardokempados' of Babylon, which can be set in 721 and 720 BC through Ptolemy's chronology. After a twelve-year rule that king gave place to 'Arkeanos' ('Αρκεανος) who reigned for five years, commencing in 709/8 BC. He can be identified with the Assyrian king Sargon,<sup>4</sup> and Assyrian tablets from his reign sometimes bear a double date (see below, pp. 70-71): 'Eponymate of X, year Y of Sargon king of Assyria, year Z king of Babylon.' These dates agree with the length of reign given by Ptolemy, just as the names of the kings before and after Sargon agree sufficiently with Akkadian sources (Mardokempados is Merodach-baladan).<sup>5</sup> The note of a solar eclipse in the eponymate of Bur-Saggilê during the reign of Aššur-dân III, fixed astronomically at 15th/16th June, 763 BC (Julian date), locks the chronology of these independent sources into place.<sup>6</sup>

In 1875, George Smith issued *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, a monograph containing translations of all the known lists of eponyms and the references to them in date-lines on Assyrian texts of all sorts. Important manuscripts came to light after Smith's publication, both from Nineveh and from Assur, provoking more discussion. Friedrich Delitzsch gave copies of the major texts in his *Assyrische Lesestücke*,<sup>7</sup> and translations of the major texts appeared in several works.<sup>8</sup> No standard, collected edition was published until 1938, when Arthur Ungnad's compilation 'Eponymen' appeared in the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, edited by E. Ebeling and B. Meissner.<sup>9</sup> Smith had given the texts in English only, Ungnad set them out in transliteration, putting the lists of names side by side in synoptic form. Following Smith's lead, Ungnad listed texts dated by eponyms, for their date-lines could help to restore broken names and titles in the Lists; Smith gave every text known to him, Ungnad only a selection. The article by Ungnad, with some corrections from Ernst Weidner,<sup>10</sup> has remained the basic edition of the Eponym lists.

<sup>3</sup> 'Assyrian history,' *The Athenaeum* 1805 (31 May, 1862) 724-25.

<sup>4</sup> Note the spelling of his name in the Septuagint at Isaiah 20:1, similarly without the initial sibilant: Arna (Αρνα).

<sup>5</sup> See G. Smith, *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, ch. V; A. Ungnad, 'Eponymen,' RIA 2, 414.

<sup>6</sup> The discovery of this vital datum was announced by H. C. Rawlinson in *The Athenaeum* 2064 (18 May, 1867) 660-61.

<sup>7</sup> 2nd edition, Leipzig (1878) 87-94.

<sup>8</sup> Notably E. Schrader, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (Giessen 1872) 308-31, 3rd ed. (1883) 470-89, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* I (Berlin 1889) 208-15, III 2. 142-47; H. Winckler, *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig 1903) 73-82; R. W. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (New York 1912) 219-38; the most widely used is in D. D. Luckenbill ARAB II §§ 1197-98; the most recent is in J.-J. Glassner, *Chroniques mésopotamiens* (Paris 1993) 161-70 (Eponym Chronicles only).

<sup>9</sup> Vol. 2, 412-57.

<sup>10</sup> AfO 13 (1939-41) 308-18.

## INTRODUCTION

The present work gives all the texts from Nineveh in cuneiform copy, with reproductions of copies of texts from Assur made by Otto Schroeder and published in 1920, and O. R. Gurney's copies of two lists found at Sultantepe (ancient Huzirina) in 1952 and published first in 1953, finally in 1957 and 1964. Helpful as Ungnad's synoptic layout is, a year by year arrangement has been preferred, gathering into one entry the information given for a single year by every List.

The date-lines from Assyrian texts have long been recognized as an important supplement to the Eponym Lists, so, following Smith's example, a catalogue of as many examples as could be collected is added. Comparison of the writings of the same dates underlines the variety permitted within the cuneiform writing system and sometimes helps in the understanding of historical spellings.

## THE TEXTS

The last three hundred years of Assyria's existence are well documented so far as the eponyms are concerned. Numerous tablets and inscriptions bear dates by the system, and nineteen manuscripts list the officials in order for some part of the period, although none now extend beyond 649 BC. The lists were found in the ruins of Nineveh (Kuyunjik), at Assur, and at Sultantepe near Harran. Apparently all were copied in the seventh century BC (the fact that A8, from Sultantepe, ends with 750 BC does not prove it was copied half a century before the tablets found with it). Each list started with the eponymate of a king, several beginning with Adad-nērārī II (910 BC), for reasons unknown. One list, A7 from Assur, did begin much earlier, but the continuity is broken, so that 910 stands as the most convenient starting point.

Nine of the manuscripts give lists of names, ten give the names with historical notes. Accordingly, they are divided into two classes, A and B, and each copy is given a separate index number, a scheme Friedrich Delitzsch introduced in his presentation.

**Class A** 'Eponym Lists' — Beside simple lists of names in order, with 'king' after the royal names, one text from Assur (A7) also states the number of years from the eponymate of one king to his successor's. In the other text from Assur (A9) the titles of the eponyms are added. Insofar as the extra information is merely an extension of the eponyms' names, comparable with the title 'king', this list does not need to be classed separately.

The obvious needs of government and law account for the lists of this class which enable spans of years to be calculated precisely. Some of the Ninevite texts are well written, others (A3, A5) show by their format and less-even script that they may have been made for individual use, or for a single set of calculations. The Sultantepe copy A8 was evidently an exercise, for a series of entries is repeated, and the reverse is occupied by mathematical work. Although these lists survive from three sites only, others are likely to have existed wherever Assyrian administration operated.

**Class B** 'Eponym Chronicles' — The pattern of entry in all copies is: 'In the eponymate of : name : title : event.' The opening phrase, *ina lime*, points to the event as the significant part of the entry, hence the current name for these texts, 'Eponym Chronicles'. It is noteworthy that the date-lines of inscriptions and tablets may include the titles of the eponyms, but never contain the extra information given in the lists of this class. The 'event' is usually in the form 'to a place'. With this basic pattern there is an unsolved problem: the subject is not expressed in most cases. Where a specific city is named, this 'indicates ... the actual location of the king and his camp at the turn of the year', the time when, supposedly, a report on military activity was

sent to the capital. The entries referring more generally to names of lands and peoples are held to represent years 'when the report was delayed or not dispatched'.<sup>1</sup> However, this does not explain adequately the purpose of those latter entries; they obviously denote a goal (*ana* place X) or a position (*ina* place X). The suggestion may be preferred that they describe the situation of the royal army. These entries are then seen to agree with the royal inscriptions which state that one king did not accompany his army on two campaigns, entrusting it to a high officer instead (830 'to Urartu', 829 'in Unqi', cf. the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III, 141-156<sup>2</sup>). Regrettably, the Eponym Chronicle does not survive for the years 698 and 695 BC when Sennacherib acted in the same way. Entries stating 'in the land', 'plague', or 'revolt' imply that the army was occupied at home.

In addition to military affairs, the events column reports movements of the god of Der (leaving his city in 831, returning in 814 and 785), the re-founding of the Nabû temple at Nineveh and the subsequent entry of the god (788, 787), the solar eclipse (763), the accessions of Tiglath-pileser III and Shalmaneser III (745, 727) and building activities of Sargon and Sennacherib (707-700). How these items qualified for entry is not clear. The later entries and the eclipse aside, it is hard for us to see any outstanding significance in the affairs of the god of Der, a border town constantly changing hands,<sup>3</sup> or of Nabû of Nineveh, that could single them out from all other religious occurrences. Moreover, the god of Der returned twice to his temple, according to these texts, but left only once!

On rare occasions two events were recorded for the same year, e.g. 788 'to Media; foundation of Nabû's temple at Nineveh laid,' 763 'rebellion in Assur; in Siwan there was an eclipse of the sun' (others are at 831, 814, 802, 787, 785, 765, 759, 754, 745, 743). In their entries for the last years of the eighth century, 714-700 BC, the extant texts become even more detailed.<sup>4</sup>

### *The Purpose of the Eponym Chronicles*

This class of texts, while setting out the names in order, clearly had a very different purpose from class A, being centred on the event, rather than the eponym. The concept of recording at least one notable event for each year is ancient, being attested already at Mari during the eighteenth century BC, in the fragments published by M. Birot as 'Assyrian Chronicles'.<sup>5</sup> Those manuscripts cover the years before and during the reign of Šamši-Adad I (c. 1813-1781 BC), who made himself king of Assur and then took control of Mari. They are clearly relics from the time of Assyrian rule, for the local kings of Mari used the Babylonian year-name system for dating their texts. The Mari pieces list the eponyms' names without titles, followed by a report

<sup>1</sup> A. R. Millard and H. Tadmor, *Iraq* 35 (1973) 62.

<sup>2</sup> A. H. Layard, *ICC* pls. 95, 96; O. Michel, *WdO* 2,3 (1956) 224-27; D. D. Luckenbill, *ARAB I* §§ 584, 585.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Iraq* 26 (1964) 17.

<sup>4</sup> As observed by J. A. Brinkman, *NABU* 1989, no. 3, p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> M. Birot, 'Les chroniques "Assyriennes" de Mari,' *MARI* 4 (1985) 219-42; translation also in J.-J. Glassner, *Chroniques mésopotamiens* (Paris 1993) 157-60.



of one or more events, in most cases; a few names have no report beside them. Those with reports are phrased 'In eponym name, event', which can only mean 'In the eponymate of', as *ina līme* does in the later texts. Although no Eponym Chronicles survive between the time of those Mari texts and the Neo-Assyrian ones, the tradition continued. The entries in the Mari chronicles, so far as they can be understood, concern the affairs of various states and rulers associated with, or hostile to Assur. In editing these texts, M. Birot asserted the chronicler was setting out the tale of the rise to power of Šamši-Adad and his family, a chequered history of defeats and successes, both reported openly.<sup>6</sup> Without more texts, that remains a possible explanation; the Eponym Chronicles may have begun in Šamši-Adad's time, the heading of the Mari manuscript is damaged. In the Neo-Assyrian period the texts begin with the accession of Shalmaneser III, 858 BC. The single copy extant for the first years has a heading which, again, is broken (B5). If it was intended to celebrate the achievements of Shalmaneser and his successors, then it was equally honest, recording 'revolt' for each of the last four years of his reign (B4, B10), and in various years of later kings. Indeed, in some years the Eponym Chronicles note events which did not reflect well on the king, rather than successes claimed in the royal inscriptions (e.g. in the reign of Sargon, 712 BC has the entry 'in the land', yet in that year, his inscriptions announce, Ashdod and Melid fell to Assyria<sup>7</sup>). In this respect these chronicles deserve more attention than they have usually received, for they attest the existence in Assyria of that 'unbiased' attitude which the Babylonian Chronicles allegedly display, representing a style in recording history independent of the imperial image cultivated in the king's courts.<sup>8</sup> The purpose of both types of chronicle remains unknown.<sup>9</sup> While the possibility that they were intended as sources for creating omen apodoses cannot be discounted,<sup>10</sup> supplying 'good' or 'bad' information about the years of the kings, the entries in the Eponym Chronicles frequently give less specific information than the 'historical' references found in omen texts.

### *Sources of the Eponym Lists and Chronicles*

None of the Eponym Lists names a source. A master copy was surely kept up-to-date in the capital by the annual addition of the eponym, then each scribal centre might keep its own list *à jour*. The Sultantepe copies show what deviations could arise in a provincial school (see *The Manuscripts*, A8, B10). From close correspondences between the Eponym Lists and the Assyrian King List, some have supposed the King List to be derived from the Eponym Lists. While they were connected, and an early section of the King List

<sup>6</sup> Birot, *loc. cit.* 223.

<sup>7</sup> See H. Tadmor, JCS 12 (1958) 95.

<sup>8</sup> For discussion of the question of bias in the Babylonian Chronicles, see J. A. Brinkman in T. Abusch, J. Huehnergard, P. Steinkeller (eds.), *Lingering over Words. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran* (Atlanta 1990) 73-104.

<sup>9</sup> For the Babylonian chronicles, see A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (New York 1975) 10, 11 and the review in JAOS 100 (1980) 364-68.

<sup>10</sup> I. Starr has shown that military events in Aššurbanipal's reign were incorporated into omen texts almost contemporaneously, AfO 32 (1985) 60-67.

apparently relied on lists of eponyms (see below, pp. 8-9), the King List had other sources, for it relates each king to his predecessor, which the Eponym Lists do not.

The Eponym Lists (Class A) give the names alone, only marking the kings by title until the time of Tiglath-pileser III, as set out above, the change bringing them a little closer to Class B, warning against rigid distinctions on formal grounds. The change may hint at a time of editorial activity in Nineveh or Kalah — it is not found in the Assur list (A7) — about the time when the Khorsabad King List was copied (738 BC) and the Babylonian Chronicle commences.<sup>11</sup> In the following decades, too, occur the longer entries of some Eponym Chronicle texts from Nineveh, dealing with the reigns of Sargon and Sennacherib (B6, B7).

The Eponym Chronicles as a whole obviously drew upon fuller sources and, again, their nature cannot be discerned; were they the sources that fed the Class A lists and the King Lists? Whatever they were, they had wide authority, for the entry at 704 BC claims two cities were conquered in Babylonia, Larak and Sarrabanu, and those two only are included in the Babylonian Chronicle entry for that year (Bēl-ibni 3).<sup>12</sup> Note, also, that the Babylonian Chronicle reports 'plague was in Assyria' for 706 BC (ii 5'), whereas the Eponym Chronicle merely states that the king stayed in the land and various other events took place. Furthermore, the Eponym Chronicle's entry for 700 (B7), concerning materials for building a palace, in particular specifying the quarry whence the stone was obtained as Kapar-dagila, has clear affinities with the lengthy reports of Sennacherib's 'Annals'.<sup>13</sup> There seem to be hints here of fuller sources covering a variety of events, good and bad, that were available to scribes for their different purposes.

### *The Office of Eponym*

Eponym dates appear as a regular feature in the earliest Assyrian texts, but the duties of the office are obscure (see below). In the Middle Assyrian period, the titles of the eponyms sometimes follow their names in date-lines, showing that it was the leading men of the state who held the office, the *turtānu*, *rab šāqê*, *masennu*,<sup>14</sup> *šakin māti* and governors of various cities.<sup>15</sup> The king held the office at some point of his reign, although at present the evidence for the Middle Assyrian period is too scanty to indicate which year was given to him. The first king known to have been eponym is Enlil-nērārī (c. 1327-1318 BC).<sup>16</sup> Kings appear regularly at the commencement of their

<sup>11</sup> See Grayson, *op. cit.* 10ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 77, cf. *ibid.* 11, n.23.

<sup>13</sup> Edition E vi 45-75, I i 33-ii 13, D. D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib* (Chicago 1924) 107-8, 120-2.

<sup>14</sup> The reading (*amēl*)*masennu* for (LÜ)IGI.DUB is preferred over (*amēl*)*abarakku* for the Neo-Assyrian period. There is no doubt, both from syllabic writings and Aramaic correspondences, that *masennu* was the correct reading in the seventh century. Since a syllabic writing of *masennu* appears already in the Nuzi texts and, apart from literary sources, there are no syllabic writings of *abarakku* after the Old Babylonian period (see CAD s.v. *abarakku* and *mašennu*), it is extrapolated that *masennu* was correct for the ninth and eighth centuries and probably for the Middle Assyrian period as well. [RMW]

<sup>15</sup> See C. Saporetti, *Gli eponimi medio-assiri*, *Bibliotheca Mesopotamica* 9 (Malibu 1979) 20f.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.* 18, 56; for the possibility that Eriba-Adad, named as eponym in one text, was a royal eponym, see *ibid.* 43.

reigns in the badly damaged list (A7) covering the period from Tiglath-pileser I to Aššur-dān II (c. 1186-932 BC). The practice continued into the time of the Assyrian Empire, when centuries of tradition may have overlain the original concept. A pattern of succession can be traced through the century from Shalmaneser III (see Table 1). A new king acted as eponym in his second year of reign (see p. 13), then followed four ministers of state: the *turtānu*, or commander-in-chief, the *rab šāqê*, 'chief cupbearer', *nāgir ekalli*, 'palace herald', and the *masennu*, the chamberlain. Governors of major cities came after them, some taking precedence over others as the empire grew. The sequence was not rigid, except for the *turtānu* following the king. A chance discovery seems to reveal the reason for that: lots were cast to determine the order. The Yale Babylonian Collection owns a clay cube, 2.8 × 2.7 cm, inscribed for the *masennu* Yaḥalu who served as eponym three times, in 833, 824 and 821 BC. The text reads:

i aš-šur bēlu rab[ū]	ii šá <sup>md</sup> šul-	iii mā <sup>t</sup> me-eh-ra-ni	iv ebūr mā <sup>t</sup> aš-šur
<sup>d</sup> adad bēlu rabū	ma-nu-ašarēd	mā <sup>t</sup> ú-q[i]	lišir <sup>lid</sup> lidmiq
pu-ú-ru	šar <sub>4</sub> mā <sup>t</sup> aš-šur	šad <sup>e</sup> e-ri-ni[m]	ina pāni aš-šur
šá <sup>m</sup> ia-ḥa-li	amēl šá-kìn	ráb ka-a-ri	<sup>d</sup> adad
[m]asenni rabī	ā <sup>l</sup> kip-šu-ni	ina li-mi-šú	pu-ur-šu
	mā <sup>t</sup> qu-me-[n]i	pu-ri-šú	li-l[i]-a <sup>17</sup>

O Aššur, great lord! O Adad, great lord! (This is) the lot of Yaḥalu, the great chamberlain of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, the governor of Kipshuni, of Qumeni, Mehrani, Uqi, the Cedar Mountain, customs officer. In his eponymate, his lot, may the crops of Assyria grow well and soundly. Before Aššur and Adad may his lot come up (*or fall out*).<sup>18</sup>

We assume such dice were prepared for the next two or three men in line for the office, shaken together in a jug and one thrown out, perhaps by a priest. The choice was probably made a year in advance, perhaps at the New Year ceremonies. The result of the draw may have settled the order for more than one year, according to the sequence of the lots. Occasionally the system was disrupted by civil war or an eponym-designate's death. If the scribe dating a document did not know the name of the current eponym, he might use the form 'eponymate after PN,' (see below, pp. 67-68). The death of an eponym prior to assuming office is one explanation for the name Balaṭu, entered in list A3 for 786 BC, which is not found in any other manuscript.<sup>19</sup> Other possibilities are, on one hand, that the text is corrupt, or, on the other, that it is the only correct record.

The office of eponym already existed at the beginning of Assyrian history as known today. When the Assyrian King List was compiled, lists of eponyms supplied some of its information, for a group of six kings near its beginning (nos. 27-32) were given without lengths of reigns because, a note advises,

<sup>17</sup> Hallo, *Biblical Archaeologist* 46 p. 20 reads *liddā*.

<sup>18</sup> F. J. Stephens, YOS 9 (1937), Pls. XXVII, XLV, no. 73 (YBC 7058); E. F. Weidner, AfO 13 (1939) 30; E. Michel, WdO 1,4 (1949) 261-64; M. T. Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies* (Copenhagen 1976) 211-12; W. W. Hallo, *Biblical Archaeologist* 46 (1983) 19-27; for photographs of the piece, see the frontispiece.

<sup>19</sup> E. Forrer, MVAG 20 (1915) 3.

THE TEXTS

Table 1 Regnal years in which the kings and court officials held the eponymate

	Š III	Š III(2)	Š-A v	Adn III	Š IV	Ad III	Ašn v	T-P III	Š v	Sg
<i>šarru</i>	2	32	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
<i>turtānu</i>	3,6	33	10	3	3	3	3	3		
<i>rab šāqê</i>	4	34	8	5	4		5	5		
<i>nāgir ekalli</i>	5,9	36	4	4	5		4	4		
<i>masennu</i>	26	35	3	6	6		6	6		4
<i>šakin māti</i>				7	7		7	7		5

The *turtānu* always followed the royal eponym except in the reign of Šamši-Adad v when, probably because of internal dissension, he does not appear until the tenth year. The variations between the next three officers may result from the fall of the dice, but it is notable that the sequence *masennu* — *šakin māti* is invariable from Adad-nērārī III to Sargon.

they were kings ‘whose eponymies are destroyed’.<sup>20</sup> The successors of those kings in the List were those in whose reigns Assyrian merchants trading in Anatolian towns wrote numerous documents dated by eponyms.<sup>21</sup> Tablets from the eighteenth century BC, found at Mari and other sites, show the dating method in use wherever kings of Assyria held sway, notably under Šamši-Adad I.<sup>22</sup>

The origin of the office is unknown; a cultic role, ‘care for the sanctuary and the cult’ at Assur ‘seems to have been the basis for the *limmu* institution,’ perhaps even among tribesmen before they settled there, A. Poebel surmised.<sup>23</sup> If an etymological connection with the base *lwy* is accepted, then the word itself would denote ‘turn (of office),’ as A. Ungnad proposed.<sup>24</sup> An alternative explanation of the word associates it with *limu*, ‘thousand,’ and Ugaritic and Hebrew *l'm* seeing a semantic shift between ‘group of people,’ ‘thousand,’ and ‘leader of a thousand,’ comparable with the range of *ʿlp* in West Semitic.<sup>25</sup>

### The Order of the Eponyms

In describing the provincial organisation of the Assyrian Empire, Emil Forrer showed from the titles that many of the eponyms held office in a recognized sequence.<sup>26</sup> The fact that there are variations can be attributed to the method

<sup>20</sup> I. J. Gelb, JNES 13 (1954) 209-30, line 26/25; A. K. Grayson, ‘Königslisten,’ RIA 6, 105; P. Garelli in J.-M. Durand, J.-R. Kupper (eds.), *Miscellanea babilonica: Mélanges offerts à Maurice Birot* (Paris 1985) 91-95.

<sup>21</sup> See M. T. Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies*, Mesopotamia 4 (Copenhagen 1976) 80-84, 192-223, 375-82.

<sup>22</sup> For a catalogue and discussion, see K. R. Veenhof, ‘Eponyms of the “Later Old Assyrian Period” and Mari Chronology,’ MARI 4 (1985) 191-218; for a reconstruction of the eponymates of the reign of Šamši-Adad I, see R. M. Whiting, ‘Tell Leilan / Šubat Enlil: Chronological Problems and Perspectives,’ in S. Eichler, M. Wäfler and D. Warburton (eds.), *Tall al-Ḥamīdiya 2*, Orbis biblicus et orientalis: Series archaeologica 6 (Freiburg 1990) 167-218.

<sup>23</sup> JNES 1 (1942) 280.

<sup>24</sup> RIA 2, 412.

<sup>25</sup> See P. Fronzaroli, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 45 (1960) 42-44.

<sup>26</sup> E. Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches* (Leipzig 1920).

Table 2 Regnal years in which provincial governors held the eponymate

Place	Asn II	Š III	Š-A v	Adn III	Š IV	Ašn v	T-P III	Sg
Aḫizuḫina		20/18* 22/20*		10	14		14	11/14*
Amedi				12	19		19	16/19*
Arbail				24	22			19/22*
Arrapḫa		30/27*	13	9	12	10	10	7/10*
Guzana	[18?]			18	18		18	15/18*
Ḫabruri		24/22*	11	15	16		16	13/16*
Ḫalziadbar								23/26*
Isana			7?	21	23			21/24*
Kalḫi	11	8/7*		14	11	11	11	8/11*
	20	29/26*						
Kilizi		27/24*		23	21		21	18/21*
Kurbail				27	24			22/25*
Mazamua		31/28*	14	28	13		12	9/12*
Nairi		21/19*						
Našibina		7/6*	9	11	9	9	9	6/9*
		28/25*		29				
Nemed-Ištar		17/15*						
Ninua		25/23*		22	20		20	17/20*
Raḫmat	12	23/21*	12	16	10			
Rašappa				8	8	8	8	3
Ši'me							13	10/13*
Šibḫiniš				20	26			
Talmusi				25	27			25/28*
Tamnuna				26	25			24/27*
Til Barsip								20/23*
Tille				19	15		15	12/15*
Tušḫan	17	10/8*		17	17		17	14/17*

1. Very few titles are known for the eponyms of Aššurnāširpal II. The eponym for year 18 (866 BC) was Šamaš-nūri. The fact that governors of Guzana held the eponymate in the 18th years of later kings makes it very tempting to suppose that Šamaš-nūri, governor of Guzana, commemorated by the Tell Fekheriyeh statue, was the eponym for 866.<sup>27</sup>

2. The seats of eponyms of Shalmaneser III are listed with the regnal years followed by the theoretical year (asterisked) in which they would have fallen had a new *turtānu* not been inserted for year 6, a new *nāgir ekalli* for year 9 and a new *masennu* for year 26.

3. The eponymates of Aššur-dān III and his *turtānu* (771, 770 BC) merely interrupt the sequence which began with the eponymate of Shalmaneser IV, and so are not counted here.

4. There was no interruption to the sequence at the death of Sargon in 705 BC, Sennacherib not taking the eponymate until 687, when he was followed by Bēl-ēmuranni, the *turtānu*, but not by the other high officers who had previously succeeded the king. The reason for Sennacherib's delay in taking the office is not explained; the death of his father in battle, a matter which obviously troubled him,<sup>28</sup> may have been the cause, and the reason for his taking the office later might have been to celebrate his triumph over Babylon in 689.

5. The seats of eponyms of Sargon II are listed with the regnal years followed by the theoretical year (asterisked) in which they would have fallen had the *turtānu*, *nāgir ekalli* and *rab šāqê* held office at the start of the reign. Their absence from the list may be due to the apparently abnormal circumstances in which Sargon came to the throne.

6. The latter part of the List, from 696 BC, includes many places which were not previously part of the empire, showing the sequence was no longer followed.

<sup>27</sup> See A. Abou-Assaf, P. Bordreuil, A. R. Millard, *La Statue de Tell Fekheriyeh et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne* (Paris 1982) 103-105.

<sup>28</sup> See H. Tadmor, B. Landsberger, S. Parpola, SAAB 3 (1989) 3-51.

Table 3 The basic sequence of eponym holders for the ninth and eighth centuries BC

The king	Ḫabruri
<i>turtānu</i>	Tille
<i>rab šāqê</i>	Tušḫan
<i>nāgir ekalli</i>	Guzana
<i>masennu</i>	Amedi
<i>šakin māti</i>	Ninua
Rašappa	Isana
Našibina	Kilizi
Arrapḫa	Arbail
Kalḫi	Tamnuna
Raqmat	Talmusi
Māzamua	Kurbail
Aḫizuḫina	Šibḫiniš

of selecting the eponym for a particular year and to changes among the highest officials of the court which could lead to the new man exercising a prerogative to the position in spite of the sequence. Thus the herald, Abi-ina-ekalli-lilbur, was eponym in 854, then, after three years, Bēl-būnāya, the herald, held the position, interrupting the pattern, taking it again in 823, in his proper turn, after Shalmaneser III had started the second round of eponymates in his reign. As the chart (Table 2) displays, certain groupings can be observed among the provincial governors serving as eponyms. Rašappa, Našibina and Arrapḫa filled the eighth, ninth and tenth, eleventh or twelfth years from Adad-nērārī III to Tiglath-pileser III, and the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh years of Shalmaneser III, Našibina and Arrapḫa occur in years six and seven of Sargon. Māzamua follows Arrapḫa in three reigns. Ḫabruri, Tušḫan, Guzana and Amedi form clusters in the reigns of Shalmaneser IV, Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon, the first three standing in succession under Adad-nērārī III. Nineveh and Kilizi marked the twenty-third and twenty-fourth years of Shalmaneser III, the twentieth and twenty-first of Tiglath-pileser III, and occupy similar positions in the reigns of Adad-nērārī III, Shalmaneser IV and the continuation of Sargon, accompanied by Arbail and Isana.

### *The Stelae from Assur*

The German excavations at Assur found clusters of stone stelae in the southern part of the city, by the wall of Shalmaneser III. They lay in four groups at different levels, with stone bases for some in a group of their own.<sup>29</sup> Altogether, ninety-eight stones were recovered bearing inscriptions. Most are squared blocks, of greater width than thickness, with rounded tops, the inscriptions being engraved in a rectangular recess near the top of the stele. Three are re-used pillars and there is one statue. Some are so badly preserved that the inscriptions are illegible or obliterated. (There were thirty-nine unscrubbed stelae or fragments of stelae and some stone sockets for the

<sup>29</sup> W. Andrae, *Die Stelenreihen in Assur*, WVDOG 24 (Leipzig 1913).

stelae.) Each monument represents an individual, an Assyrian king or person of high rank, ranging in date from the reign of Eriba-Adad I (c. 1390-1364 BC) to that of Aššurbanipal (668-627 BC). Apart from three royal ladies (Semiramis, a queen of Sennacherib and a queen of Aššurbanipal), all the stelae carry the names and titles of men who served as eponyms, but they do not mention that office. The excavator, W. Andrae, supposed that the stelae had originally been set in chronological order, creating a calendar for reckoning the years. Had that been so, there should be about 700 stelae, and, while it is possible that the majority were smashed in antiquity, or await recovery, the absence of any mention of their holding the eponymate in the men's titles, and the presence of stelae for three women, speak against it. It is clear that some stelae were already buried when others were deposited, some actually lying under the wall of Shalmaneser III, although all the royal stelae were kept together.<sup>30</sup> There was no time when all were visible at this site. It is likely, therefore, as Miglus has argued, that the place was a depository for monuments removed from a shrine or other building from time to time and placed respectfully in this position. Since, apart from Aššurbanipal's lady, the latest stelae belong to the mid-eighth century BC, that could have happened during the renovations carried out in Assur by the Sargonid kings during the last century of Assyria's life. The stones would have stood in a shrine as substitutes for the persons named, possibly commemorating them after their lifetimes, as well as during them, as did stelae of similar shape in the west.<sup>31</sup>

The names and titles add to the information about the eponyms given by the Lists and so the texts of the stelae for the Neo-Assyrian period are included in the Catalogue of Eponym Dates.<sup>32</sup>

### *The Eponym Lists and Chronology*

From the first, the value of the Eponym Lists for historical research has been obvious, although the fragmentary state of the texts and a few small uncertainties have resulted in considerable debate over details. One significant matter arises from the layout of the texts.

### The Horizontal Rulings

Apart from showing the end of a text, some scribes divided the entries by horizontal rulings at selected points. Texts A5, A6, B5, B7, B9 are not ruled in this way; all other copies usually have a ruling before the eponymate of a

<sup>30</sup> See the study by P. A. Miglus, ZA 74 (1984) 133-40.

<sup>31</sup> J. V. Canby had made this case in Iraq 38 (1976) 113-28, although Miglus had rejected it on the grounds that the stelae were neither posthumous nor beside burials and there is little evidence for western influences in Assur. The information about religious stelae at Mari in the Old Babylonian period (J.-M. Durand, J.-R. Kupper [eds.], *Miscellanea babilonica: Mélanges offerts à Maurice Birot* [Paris 1985] 79-84) suggests that related practices existed nearer to Assur and could have reached the city in the time of Šamši-Adad I, for whose reign the Mari texts supply the oldest Eponym Lists.

<sup>32</sup> Abbreviated as St. For the Middle Assyrian stelae see C. Saporetti, *Gli eponimi medio-assiri*, *Bibliotheca Mesopotamica* 9 (Malibu 1979) and *Some Considerations on the Stelae of Assur*, Assur 1,2 (1974).

king. A8 adds a ruling after each royal name except one (at 772), A3 adds this once (after 781) and B10 once (after 827). Thus each section presents a list starting with a king, a sequence which A7 and B10 close with the number of years contained.

From 746 onwards the manuscripts vary.<sup>33</sup> The sections of A1, B1, B2 contain eponyms from one king's accession, which is specified, to the next. A2, A3, A7 continue to divide by royal eponymates, except for A2 at 706, where the accession of Sennacherib follows, and A7 at 669, where the accession of Aššurbanipal followed, but is not mentioned. A4 has rulings after 745, noting Tiglath-pileser, and after 705, noting Sennacherib, that is, marking the first year of each reign by ruling off the previous one and heading the new one. (The text of B1 is unique in dividing 763, the year of the solar eclipse, from 764; in ruling off 734, the copyist may be accused of an error, for the same eponym, Bēl-dān, should have had a ruling after his previous term, 744, not here.) The rulings in A7 offer a further explanation, for each section concludes with a sum of years in it, that is, the years from the eponymate of one king to the year prior to the eponymate of the next.

### The Eponym Lists and Regnal Years

The number of years contained within each of the sections commencing with a royal eponym in A1, B1, B2 should give the length of each reign. That this is the case was proved when the Assyrian King List was restored completely for the period.<sup>34</sup> There the length of each reign is stated and the figures agree with the years allotted by the Eponym Lists as described above in every case. Although the King Lists and the Eponym Lists may be generically related, that still serves to confirm the figures as handed down from one generation of scribes to another, and so indicates the reliability of these sources for the Neo-Assyrian period, when correctly understood. In presenting information from the Khorsabad copy of the Assyrian King List, Arno Poebel discussed the divisions of the Eponym Lists in detail.<sup>35</sup> He reinforced the understanding, already argued by George Smith, that a king held office as eponym in the second full year of his reign, until Shalmaneser V and his successors broke the pattern. This position gains support if the suggestions about the selection of eponyms (p. 8) are correct. Thus the specific record for Tiglath-pileser III supplies the model for the previous reigns as far back as Adad-nērārī II, 910 BC: 745 accession noted, 744 last eponym of the predecessor's reign, 743 eponymate of Tiglath-pileser III. No alternative interpretation seems to be so well founded. Nevertheless, although occasional claims for a royal eponymate in a king's first year lack supporting evidence at present, the possibility of undetectable changes in the pattern cannot be excluded completely.

---

<sup>33</sup> S. Zawadzki, SAAB 7 (1993), has argued that placing the line before the year of accession for Tiglath-pileser III, Shalmaneser V, Sargon II and Sennacherib, or after the accession year (only in A4, after 745 and 705) were innovations introduced to stress the rule of Tiglath-pileser III in the first place. The variations between the lists and the poor state of preservation of several leave the significance of the differences in ruling practice open to discussion.

<sup>34</sup> I. J. Gelb, *loc. cit.*

<sup>35</sup> A. Poebel, JNES 2 (1943) 71-78, 88, 89.



The alteration in the method of reckoning used by some texts from Tiglath-pileser III onwards (A1, B1, B2), counting the king's accession year as his first, was employed also in the date-lines of some documents of Sennacherib's reign (see below, p. 71).

When a reign reached thirty years, the king was eligible to become eponym for a second time, with the officers of state following in order as if the reign had begun again. Thus Shalmaneser III held the office for 857 and for 827, the king explaining *ina 31 palê-ia šá-nu-te-šú pu-ú-r[u] ina pān aš-šur<sup>d</sup> adad ak-ru-ru* 'In my thirty-first regnal year, I cast the lot for the second time before Aššur and Adad.' The practice is likely to have applied earlier, in the reign of Tiglath-pileser II. A reference in a royal letter to what may be the eponymate of Aššurbanipal could indicate that, although he had not been eponym at the start of his rule, he likewise might have held the office late in his reign (*ina lim-me<sup>md</sup> aššur-bāni-apli abi-ka* ABL 469 r.1).<sup>36</sup> Thirty years evidently marked a cycle, which we may, speculatively, consider a generation, requiring some renewal or reaffirmation of the old king's authority. Egypt presents a striking parallel with the *heb-sed* festival which was celebrated, theoretically, on the thirtieth anniversary of a king's accession.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> It is equally likely, however, that *ina* IGI.ME in this letter is to be interpreted as *ina pāni* 'in the presence' of Aššurbanipal, rather than *ina lim-me* 'in the *limu*' of Aššurbanipal. Although this writing of *ina pāni* is without parallels, the normal form being IGI rather than IGI.ME, an eponymate of Aššurbanipal is otherwise unattested. [RMW]

<sup>37</sup> See D. J. Wiseman, CAH<sup>2</sup> II 477; E. Hornung, E. Staehelin, *Studien zum Sedfest*, Aegyptiaca helvetica 1 (1974).

# THE EPONYM CANON

## THE MANUSCRIPTS

The original content of each text has been calculated wherever possible, although closing dates remain uncertain when the final entries are missing, for there can be no assurance that a tablet was filled.

- A1 from Kuyunjik K 4329 (+) 4329a (+) 4329b  
 Smith Canon I Ungnad C<sup>a</sup>1  
 Text: II R 68 no. 1 (K4329); II R 69 no. 4 (K4329a); III R 1 (whole text)  
 Copy: Plates 1-2  
 Six column tablet, ruled and written with care. 17.1 × 10.4 cm, bears Aššurbanipal palace mark.  
 Commenced 910 BC, ended 659 BC.  
 Scribal errors: 885 entry omitted; 874 <sup>md</sup>*šamaš-ub-la* against A2 [ ]-ú-*pa-ḫír*; 814 <sup>m</sup>*bēl-ba-laṭ* for <sup>m</sup>*bēl-lu-ba-laṭ* as A8 and St.
- A2 from Kuyunjik K 4388  
 Smith Canon II Ungnad C<sup>a</sup>2  
 Text: II R 68 no. 2  
 Copy: Plate 3  
 Six column tablet, ruled. 10.5 × 10 cm.  
 Commenced 910 BC, ended 690-670 BC.  
 Scribal errors: 840 <sup>md</sup>*bēl-abūya* for <sup>md</sup>*šamaš-abūya*; 738 <sup>md</sup>*adad-ukīn<sub>2</sub>*<sup>in</sup> for <sup>md</sup>*adad-bēlu-ukīn<sub>2</sub>*; 736 <sup>md</sup>*ninurta<sub>2</sub>-aya* for <sup>md</sup>*ninurta<sub>2</sub>-ila-aya*.
- A3 from Kuyunjik K 4389  
 Smith Canon III Ungnad C<sup>a</sup>3  
 Text: II R 69 nos. 3, 5  
 Copy: Plate 4  
 Roughly written tablet, 7.85 × 7.75 cm. The scribe began by ruling two columns on the obverse, then found his material was too extensive for four columns, so squeezed three on to the reverse. Apparently he made the vertical wedges of the masculine determinative for all the entries on the reverse before inscribing any names, in order to ensure that he could include all the names. When he entered the names he failed to align them exactly with the determinatives.<sup>1</sup>  
 Commenced c. 810 BC, ends 649 BC.  
 Scribal errors: 687 <sup>maš</sup>*-šur-aḫḫē*-[ ] for <sup>md</sup>*sīn-aḫḫē-erība*; 678 <sup>md</sup>*nabū* left unerased before the correct name, <sup>md</sup>*nergal-šarru<sub>2</sub>-ušur<sub>2</sub>*.
- A4 from Kuyunjik K 4390  
 Smith Canon IV Ungnad C<sup>a</sup>4

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. H. W. Johns, PSBA 25 (1903) 83.

Text: II R 69 no. 4

Copy: Plate 5

Flake from the obverse of a three column tablet, containing parts of columns ii, iii. 6.1 × 5.8 cm.

Present coverage 753-744, 718-702 BC.

Scribal errors: 748 <sup>m</sup>*aš-šur-bēlu-ukīn*<sub>2</sub> for <sup>m</sup>*adad-bēlu-ukīn*<sub>2</sub>; 706 [ *m*]*u-tak-lak-aš-šur* for <sup>m</sup>*mu-tak-kil-aš-šur*.

Where other texts have 'Royal name, king', A4 has 'Royal name, king of Assyria'.

A5 from Kuyunjik 82-5-22,121

Ungnad C<sup>a5</sup>

Text: C. H. W. Johns, PSBA 18 (1896) 206; ADD 1098

Copy: Plate 5

Upper half of a small four column tablet, without rulings, surfaces badly worn. The tablet has the appearance of a Neo-Assyrian letter. Traces in column iv may be part of a colophon. 4.5 × 4.6 cm.

Commences 743 BC, end uncertain; present coverage 743-737, 722-713, 691-682 BC.

Unexplained variant at 718: <sup>m</sup>*aš-šur-mātu-ú-paḥ-ḥir*<sup>2</sup> for <sup>m</sup>*zēru-ibni*.

A6 from Kuyunjik

Rm 580

Ungnad C<sup>a6</sup>

Text mentioned by F. Delitzsch, ZK 2 (1885) 175, n. 1 and C. Bezold, PSBA 11 (1889) 287; copy by J. A. Brinkman, NABU 1989, no. 3, p. 51

Copy: Plate 6

Upper right portion of a six column tablet, parts of columns ii, iii, iv remain, columns v, vi were probably blank. 5.8 × 5.5 cm. Each column had about 57 lines, so the list began with 911 BC. Present coverage 855-840, 798-782, 710-697 BC.

Scribal errors: 852 entry omitted.

A7 from Assur

VAT 11254+11257+11276, 11258+11259B,

11260, 11255, 11256

Ungnad C<sup>c</sup>

Text: KAV 21-24

Copy: Plate 7 (Copy by O. Schroeder. Schroeder copied the fragments separately, but the order of the eponyms shows that they can be arranged to form parts of a single tablet. L. Jakob-Rost kindly checked the arrangement proposed here but had reservations about the placing of the lower left piece.)

Ten column tablet, badly broken, columns i, ii lost. Approximately 16.5 × 12.5 cm.

The list began about 1200 BC, and ended with the post-canonical eponym Aššur-gimillī-tirri, according to the colophon.<sup>2</sup> Present coverage, excluding the Middle Assyrian section (see above, pp. 7-8), col. vi 872-860, 858-849, 846-836, col. vii 801-775, col. viii 751-719, col. ix 691-659.

<sup>2</sup> S. Zawadzki (SAAB 7 [1993]) has argued that the colophon refers only to the entries from Sennacherib's eponymate (687 BC) to the end of the text, reconstructing the number of years as 52, placing Aššur-gimillī-tirri in 636 BC. This has to remain a speculation; it would be unusual for a colophon to relate to the final part of the text only.

THE MANUSCRIPTS

Scribal errors: 861 <sup>md</sup>ninurta<sub>2</sub>-a' [ ] for A1 <sup>maššur-ila-aya</sup> (but cf. A8); 842 <sup>mtak-lak-ana-aš-šur</sup> for <sup>mtak-lak-ana-šarri</sup>; 783 <sup>mdmarduk<sub>3</sub>-nāšir<sub>2</sub></sup> for <sup>mdninurta-nāšir<sub>2</sub></sup>; 777 <sup>mdšamaš-išdēya-ukīn<sub>2</sub></sup> for <sup>mdnabû-išdēya-ukīn<sub>2</sub></sup>; 738 <sup>mdadad-bē[l]u-KUR</sup> for <sup>mdadad-bēlu-ka''in<sub>2</sub></sup>.

The total number of years is given for each reign.

- A8 from Sultantepe SU 52/150  
Text: STT I pl. LXIV, 47, obverse only  
Copy: Plate 8 (copy by O. R. Gurney)  
Four column exercise tablet (the reverse bears mathematical calculations); col. iv.9 to end repeats entries of ii.47 to iii.40 (i.e. 809-764 BC). Commenced 910 BC, ends 750 BC.  
Scribal errors: 864 <sup>maš-šur-bēlu-ušur<sub>2</sub></sup> for <sup>mašamaš-bēlu-ušur<sub>2</sub></sup>; 861 <sup>mdninurta<sub>3</sub>-ila-aya</sup> for <sup>maš-šur-ila-aya</sup> (but cf. A7); 835 <sup>mašep-<sup>a</sup>[šam]aš</sup> for <sup>mašep-šarri</sup>; 825 <sup>maššur-būna-aya</sup> for <sup>maššur-būna-aya-ušur<sub>2</sub></sup>; 823 <sup>marabulūl-aya</sup> for <sup>mbēl-būna-aya</sup>; 785 <sup>mdnergal-ū-bal-ū-liṭ</sup> for <sup>mdadad-ū-bal-liṭ</sup>; 784 <sup>mdnergal-šarru<sub>2</sub>-ušur<sub>2</sub></sup> for <sup>mdmarduk-šarru<sub>2</sub>-ušur<sub>2</sub></sup>; 780 <sup>mdšam-si-ušur<sub>2</sub></sup> for <sup>mdšam-si-ilu</sup>; 771 <sup>maš-šur-šID[ ]</sup> for <sup>maš-šur-dān<sup>an</sup></sup>; 761 <sup>mdninurta<sub>2</sub>-mu[kīn<sub>2</sub>-a]ḫi</sup> for <sup>mdnabû-mukīn<sub>2</sub>-aḫi</sup>; 757 entry omitted.
- A9 from Assur VAT 8249  
Ungnad C<sup>d</sup>  
Text: KAV 20  
Copy: Plates 9-10 (copy by O. Schroeder)  
Five-sided prism, pierced vertically, listing eponyms by name, faces i, iii, and office, faces ii, iv, while on face v the office follows the name, indented, on the next line. 7.9 cm high, 3.8 cm wide.  
Commences 719 BC, ends 662 BC; entries for 698, 697 BC lost.  
Scribal errors: 693, 688 <sup>mididin-abḫē</sup> is titled governor of Šimirma, whereas the documents seem to style him governor of Dur-Šarruken for 693. There is variation in the titles for 677 and 676, here both are *sukkallu dannu*, but *sukkallu rabû* and *sukkallu šanû* in the documents.
- B1 from Kuyunjik K 51  
Smith Canon V Ungnad C<sup>b1</sup>  
Text: II R 52 no. 1  
Copy: Plates 11-12  
Bottom and lower right portion of a carefully ruled and written tablet, baked in antiquity. 15.2 × 15.25 cm.  
Covers 817-727 BC.  
Scribal errors: the ruling after the entry for 734 BC is probably erroneous.
- B2 from Kuyunjik K 3403 + 81-2-4,187 + 95-4-6,4  
Ungnad C<sup>b2</sup>  
Text: C. Bezold, PSBA 11 (1889) 286, pls. I, II (K 3403 + 81-2-4,187 only<sup>3</sup>)  
Copy: Plates 13-14

<sup>3</sup> The fragment 95-4-6,4, the upper right corner of the reverse, belonged to C. J. Rich, see L. W. King, ZA 10 (1895) 97, and was copied by Bellino. Smith and Ungnad wrongly treated it as the reverse of B8, see E. F. Weidner, AfO 13 (1939-41) 310.

Lower two-thirds of a carefully ruled and written tablet, almost an exact duplicate of B1.

Covers 810-746 BC.

- B3 from Kuyunjik K 3202  
Smith Canon VIII Ungnad C<sup>b3</sup>  
Text: incorporated in F. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 94; copy by J. A. Brinkman, NABU 1989, no. 3, p. 51  
Copy: Plate 15  
Flake from one face. 4.3 × 4.7 cm.  
Covers 732-722 BC.
- B4 from Kuyunjik Rm 2,97  
Ungnad C<sup>b4</sup>  
Text: C. Bezold, PSBA 11 (1889) 287, pl. III  
Copy: Plates 15-16  
Part of the right side of a carefully ruled and written tablet, baked in antiquity, possibly part of B1 (Bezold and Ungnad). 7.9 × 9.2 cm.  
Covers 841-815, 721-706 BC.  
The entry for 820 has an extra, illegible, word.
- B5 from Kuyunjik 82-5-22,526  
Ungnad C<sup>b5</sup>  
Text: C. Bezold, PSBA 11 (1889) 287, pl. III  
Copy: Plate 16  
Flake from the upper part of one face of a tablet, the first line is a heading. 8.6 × 5.9 cm.  
Commences 858 BC, ends 847 BC.
- B6 from Kuyunjik K 4446  
Smith Canon VI Ungnad C<sup>b6</sup>  
Text: II R 69 no. 6  
Copy: Plate 17  
Lower left corner of a tablet, badly abraded, with small, slightly uneven writing, the longer entries cross vertical rulings. 6.7 × 7.5 cm.  
Present coverage 818-803, 708-703 BC, implying that there were two main columns on each face.
- B7 from Kuyunjik K 10017  
Ungnad C<sup>b7</sup>  
Copy: Plate 18  
Translated by Smith, Canon, 55; transliteration by Ungnad, 435.  
Fragment from left side of a tablet, one face only, probably part of B6. 4.0 × 5.6 cm.  
Covers 701-699 BC.
- B8 from Kuyunjik K 14183  
Smith Canon VII Ungnad C<sup>b8</sup>  
Text: Copy by J. A. Brinkman, NABU 1989, no. 3, p. 51<sup>4</sup>  
Copy: Plate 18

<sup>4</sup> As J. A. Brinkman has observed (*loc. cit.*, p. 49), this flake could be from a list of type A.

THE MANUSCRIPTS

Translated by Smith, Canon 43, 47f.

Flake, probably from the obverse of a tablet. 2.6 × 2.75 cm.

Covers 828-821 BC.

B9 from Kuyunjik K 14304  
Ungnad C<sup>b</sup>10

Copy: Plate 18

Flake from one face, no rulings. 3.1 × 4.3 cm. Ungnad gave readings from this text for 787, 786, 785 BC, but they do not correspond with the signs visible now. While the fragment may cover 786-776 BC, the traces are too uncertain to permit identification, so the text has not been included in this edition.

B10 from Sultantepe SU 52/18 + 18A + 21 + 333 + 337

Text: STT I pls. LXII, LXIII, 46 + STT II pl. CCLI, 348

Copy: Plates 19-20 (copy by O. R. Gurney; the fragment STT 348 has been included in the copy given here, although made at a slightly different scale)

Badly damaged tablet with horizontal rulings only. 16.2 × 9.5 cm.

Covers 840-765 BC. This tablet is remarkable for its variant readings and orthographic peculiarities, some perhaps being colloquialisms.<sup>5</sup> Where other texts have terminal *a-Cv*, B10 has *āC*: 780, 770 *tur-ta-an* for *tur-ta-nu*, 791 [ ]-*iqiṣ-a-an* for <sup>m</sup>*bēl-iqiṣ-a-ni/-an-ni*, 779 [ *r*]-*ém-a-an* for <sup>m</sup>*marduk-rém-a-ni*, 799 [ ]-*a-an* for <sup>m</sup>*marduk-iṣme-a-ni/-iṣme-ni*; 794, however, has [ ]-*ḥa-[n]a* for *tuṣ-ḥa-an*. Other variants include: *si-ḥi* for *si-ḥu* (823-820); [ ]-*ḥa-li* for *ia-ḥa-lu* (821); [*bē*]-*ka-ṣa-bat* for <sup>m</sup>*bēl-qātē-ṣabat* (810); [ ]-*ri-qa* for *ḥa-ta-ri-ka* (765). Where other texts have *ana* place, B10 has *ina* place at 835, 803, 800-795, 790-787, 785, 783-778, 774-769, 767-765. For 802 B10 has *ina tā[mti]* as against *ana muḥḥi tāmti*. At 835 and 765 it has the determinative *āl* instead of *māt*. Scribal errors are: 797 [ *ki*]-*li-zi* for <sup>al</sup>*kal-ḥi*; 788 *uṣ-še ṣa' bīt* <sup>a</sup>*nabû a-na* <sup>a</sup>*ninua* for *uṣṣu ṣa bīt* <sup>a</sup>*nabû ṣa ninua*; 787 <sup>al</sup>*še-bi-su* for <sup>al</sup>*arba-ilu*; 784 <sup>m</sup>*adad<sub>2</sub>-mu-ṣá-mer* for <sup>m</sup>*marduk-šarru<sub>2</sub>-uṣur<sub>2</sub>*; 770 *ina mar-ra-ti* for *ana* <sup>al</sup>*ma-ra-ad*. Other variants are: 820 *si-ḥi* against B4 [ ]-*x-ri-iṣ*; 818 [ ]-*x si'-mat* against B4 [ ]-*šum-me*; 778 [*nāg*]-*ir* for *nāgir ekalli*; 775 *GIŠ.A* for <sup>sad</sup>*e-re-ni*; 773 city name uncertain, but not *raq-mat*. At 831 BC the notice about the god of Der is omitted, while the note for 814 is set a year earlier.

Ungnad listed DT 142 as C<sup>b</sup>9, but this fragment is vitrified and illegible, so cannot be included here, although it appears to have been a tablet of this type.

<sup>5</sup> For this feature of the Sultantepe texts see W. G. Lambert, RA 53 (1959) 124f.