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About a decade ago, the ARCANE project was launched to investigate the chronology of the Early Bronze Age, which corresponds largely to the 3rd millennium BC. Pierre de Miroschedji and Marc Lebeau were successful in obtaining funding from the European Science Foundation (ESF) so that the project could start in 2006. Walther Sallaberger was entrusted by the ARCANE group to deal with the area of history and philology, and maintained a constant discussion with the archaeologists within the project.

Although ARCANE is basically interested in the archaeological chronology, based on a study of the material remains and radiocarbon dating, cuneiform sources exist for the second half of the 3rd millennium and thus allow one to correlate archaeological phases with historical data. This volume is devoted to the establishment of a historical chronology which is substantially a relative chronology, based on various sets of arguments: palaeography and tablet format, orthography and grammar, prosopography, and for more exact data on historical events and synchronisms, on king lists and date lists, the dates of tablets or the number of generations. The regional links between history and archaeological phases are discussed in the regional volumes of the ARCANE series for the Jezirah (Walther Sallaberger), Northern Levant/Syria (Alfonso Archi), Western Iran (Ingo Schrakamp), Tigridian Region (Massimo Maiocchi), and Middle Euphrates (Gianni Marchesi).

While 3rd millennium chronology has not been debated much in the 1980s and 1990s, this situation has changed substantially during the last decade, due to the involvement of cuneiform philologists and historians in the ARCANE project. Recently, the discussion was fuelled, in particular, by the publication of new texts mainly from Adab and Umma stemming from illicit excavations in Iraq.

A conference was organized at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich from July 13-15, 2006 by Walther Sallaberger. The contributions touched aspects dating from the Late Uruk period down to the end of the Ur III Empire, and they have proved so substantial an evaluation of the chronology that they form the core of this book. They were written by Gianni Marchesi, Horst Steible, Alfonso Archi, Vanna Biga, Francesco Pomponio, Ingo Schrakamp, Walter Sommerfeld, Piotr Steinkeller, and Katrien De Graef, who sent their reviewed articles between 2008 and 2011. We are very grateful for the patience of the authors to wait for the completion of this book. Other speakers at the Munich 2006 conference included Bob Englund, Manfred Krebernik, and Aage Westenholz, who thereby contributed to a better understanding of 3rd millennium historical and philological chronology. Walther Sallaberger published his results elsewhere within the ARCANE project (Sallaberger 2011).

Ingo Schrakamp, with a short term grant from the Gerda Henkel Foundation in 2008-2009, cared for the edition of the volume, and Sallaberger and Schrakamp began writing the introductory part, an overview of the philological data for a historical chronology of the 3rd millennium. A first version of this book was basically finished in April 2011, at which time the publication of new texts from Adab and Umma, and new research, called for constant revisions. We are aware of the fact that new texts and research will soon disprove or prove some of our assumptions, but hope that the textual and bibliographical data presented here may contribute to any discussion of the chronology and history of the 3rd millennium.

In the long period of direct and indirect work on this book, we have largely profited from discussions with many colleagues, among whom we would like to mention Alfonso Archi, Gojko Barjamovic, Vanna Biga, Elisabetta Boaretto, Marco Bonechi, Giorgio Bucellati, Pascal Butterlin, Antoine Cavigneaux, Laurent Colonna d’Istria, Bob Englund, Harumi Horioka, Peter J. Huber, Manfred Krebernik, Marc Lebeau, Camille Lecompte, Nicolò Marchetti, Vera Meyer-Laurin, Lucio Milano, Salvatore Monaco, Adelheid Otto, David Owen, Holly Pittman, Francesco Pomponio, Alexander Pruß, Lauren Ristvet, Michael Roaf, Karin Rohn, Emanuelle Salgues, Stephan Seidlmayr, Gebhard Selz, Walter Sommerfeld, Piotr Steinkeller, Giuseppe Visicato, Aage Westenholz, Claus Wilcke, Kamran Zand. We would like to thank, especially, Gianni Marchesi, who commented on an advanced version of our introductory chapter and thus helped to reduce the number of errors.

Martin Sauvage, with all his experience and skill, has accepted the task of producing a series of maps reflecting both the available documentation and historical development; we are very grateful for this fruitful cooperation. We heartily thank Hilary Meeks, who with the utmost care edited the English of the book and harmonized the bibliographical references. At Brepols, Chris VandenBorre kept up his good spirits even when we constantly moved our closing date.
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Part I: Philological Data for a Historical Chronology of Mesopotamia in the 3rd Millennium

Walther Sallaberger & Ingo Schrakamp
1. Introduction

1.1. Written Sources for a Chronology of the 3rd Millennium

Chronology remains one of the central fields of research for archaeologists and historians of the ancient Near East. Only the correct temporal sequence of facts discovered in the archaeological, or written, record allows one to think about cause and consequence and about historical developments. The archaeological discoveries of the last decades pertaining to the 3rd millennium, a convenient term for the Early Bronze Age, have drastically increased the material basis for this early period of human history.

Cuneiform writing was invented late in the 4th millennium, the Chalcolithic Period, in Southern Mesopotamia, most probably at the centre of Uruk itself, which lends its name to the entire period. History, in the narrow sense, begins with writing. However, the Mesopotamian written record does not readily satisfy the needs of the historian, because writing was developed in the context of the administration and remained within this field in the early periods. In this regard the primordial use of writing differed markedly from other ancient civilizations, where writing was employed more in the centre of power, if one considers Egyptian hieroglyphs used for the early pharaohs and cities in Egypt, or the monumental character and calendrical relevance of Mesoamerican inscriptions. Throughout the 3rd millennium administrative documents remain the most numerous genre, and here historical and chronologically relevant information is mostly circumstantial – by establishing sequences by palaeography, by the mention of rulers and their places, the use of year dates, or the mention of historically relevant events. Narrative sources pertaining to the political history are relatively rare. Royal inscriptions start in the so-called Early Dynastic I-II period, but most of them are short dedications. Historical narrations appear first in the Presargonic period, corresponding archaeologically to Early Dynastic IIIb, and are then well represented in the Sargonic period, becoming rare again in the late 3rd millennium. Then, late in the 3rd millennium, formulae used to name years by important deeds of the ruler convey much historical information, whereas earlier only the years were counted (see the overview in Section 3). Although administrative documents and royal texts often allow the reconstruction of the relative sequence of rulers and of certain events, the actual time spans involved frequently remain unclear, and only in well-documented periods can the length of a given ruler’s reign be determined exactly with the help of these sources; this is only true for the archives of Ebla, some rulers from Presargonic Umma and Lagash and the Ur III period. In this regard, king lists that indicate the names of rulers and the duration of their reigns represent a central source, especially for the Sargonic period, less so for the Gutean period (see the discussion in Section 2 below). Otherwise one has to rely on estimates based on some year dates and the number of generations of rulers, as in the case of Presargonic Lagash or Lagash II as part of the Gutean period.

This introduction to the chronology of the 3rd millennium presents itself as part of the large archaeological ARCANE project, “Synchronizing Cultures and Civilizations of the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean in the 3rd Millennium BC.” The archaeological project features a regional approach, meaning that regional archaeological sequences are ultimately synchronized. This methodological perspective has heavily influenced the present historical overview, where we tried to also give some information on the regional aspects of history, local developments, or interregional contacts. Eventually this may help to harmonize the archaeological and historical evidence, e.g. understanding factors like homogeneity or regionalization in artistic developments.

The aim of this introduction is to present substantial data from cuneiform documents for a chronology of the 3rd millennium, basically for a relative chronology. This includes:

1) a presentation of the most relevant sources and scholarly debate of the chronology, and
2) a reconstructed sequence of reigns and historical events that form the reference point for the 3rd millennium chronology.

Written sources allow a sequence from the Presargonic to the beginning of the Old Babylonian period, i.e. for the latter half of the 3rd millennium. Much attention has been paid a) to review critically the arguments presented in the scholarly literature, and b) to reconstruct the duration of certain periods. Within this period, our research has often confirmed previously accepted results, has led to more plausible reconstructions, or has excluded other proposals. However, we have not been entirely successful in solving the problem of the duration of the so-called Gutean period, so for the larger part of the historical chronology a variation of +/- 30
years still remains possible. Furthermore, the chronology before the middle of the 2nd millennium can neither be fixed in absolute terms, nor can it easily be correlated to the archaeological chronology based on radiocarbon dates (see below 1.3 and the summary chapter Part II, 10.). So we concentrate on the presentation and critical evaluation of the evidence, on which further discussions and, we hope, solutions for the chronological problems can be based.

1.2. Terminology: “Periods” and “Dynasties”

Any division into phases depends on the data on which it is based. So the archaeologist, who draws his conclusions from assemblages of well stratified contexts, may propose a phase division that differs from that of the historian, who studies lengths of reigns and dynasties, while the art historian may propose yet another, different division of phases.

The evidence of written documents allows various sets of arguments:

1) palaeography
2) linguistic development
3) historical periods

Historical terminology is mainly based on political entities, while linguistic terminology derives from the diachronic development of the main languages, Sumerian and Akkadian, and their sub-branches. Both the historical and linguistic terminology can be applied to other aspects of cuneiform writing, such as, tablet formats or styles of writing. Historical terminology, in the strict sense, can only be applied to the later part of the millennium.

The basic unit for the late 3rd millennium phases are the so-called dynasties that executed hegemony in Lower Mesopotamia, a division that agrees with the basic concept of the Sumerian King List (SKL) of dominant cities and their kings. The reign of a dynasty corresponds to the total of the reigns of all of its kings. For example, the rule of the Third Dynasty of Ur (Ur III) lasted for 108 (or 109) years, from the first year of Urnamma to the last of Ibbisuen. The founder of the dynasty, Urnamma, built up the empire within his 18 year rule. Historical information, the development of the titulary and the spread of building inscriptions seem to indicate that he won Babylonia around the middle of his reign. Ibbisuen, the last king of Ur, ruled for 24 or 25 years, but after his 8th year he controlled little more than a small region around Ur, having lost Northern and Middle Babylonia to Ishbierra of Isin. The time of the Ur III dynasty is thus partly contemporary with Gudea’s Lagash “II” dynasty and with the Isin dynasty. The term “Ur III period” is defined by the execution of Ur III rule at a certain place; hence it ends earlier at Isin than at Ur. The same problem of exact definition pertains to the Sargonic period/Akkad dynasty or the Gutian period/Gutium dynasty.

Therefore, we propose to distinguish carefully between:

1) the time of the NN dynasty = the total of regnal years of kings from a city (based on SKL and/or year names, but not on family relationships)
2) the NN Period = the rule of the NN dynasty at a given place

This definition of the term “period” points to the central importance of the territorial aspect of historical phases. The epigraphic and historical terminology used here can only be applied to Central and Southern Mesopotamia. Any use of these terms for other regions has to be understood as a short expression for contemporary periods. This is especially relevant for the term “Sargonic”, since as a historical term it is defined by Akkadian rule. If one talks about the “Sargonic” or “Late Akkad” period of sites in Upper Mesopotamia or Syria, it most often means nothing more than “the period contemporary to the Sargonic/Late Sargonic period in Babylonia”, since Sargonic rule did not apparently extend much beyond the Habur region and the Euphrates valley at Mari and perhaps Tuttul.

The fact has to be stressed that this traditional division into periods is based on the textual record. Considering the historical facts and the results of excavations, this periodization can be largely translated into the chronology of the archaeologist which rests on the sequence of architectural layers, or into the chronology of the art historian, who may divide the Early Dynastic period into two phases, an Earlier and a Later one (e.g. Braun-Holzinger 2008), or propose a finer segmentation, for example, by reintroducing a “proto-imperial” phase for the time from Enshakushana of Uruk, to Sargon of Akkad (Marchetti 2006).

\[\text{We acknowledge the impact of Nicolò Marchetti’s contribution at the ARCANE meeting at Brussels in December 2008, which voted for a strict separation of the chronological terminology of historian, archaeologist and art historian.}\]
Introduction

Table 1: Terminology used in this contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical phases</th>
<th>sub-phases</th>
<th>defined by</th>
<th>Linguistic phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Uruk Period</td>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
<td>writing phase linked to archaeological phase Uruk IV</td>
<td>Uruk IV (writing phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uruk III/</td>
<td>writing phase linked to archaeological phase Uruk III and contemporary Djemdet Nasr</td>
<td>Uruk III (writing phase)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Djemdet Nasr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Dynastic Period</td>
<td>traditional term for period between Uruk IV/III and Akkad/Sargonic, originally defined by Diyala stratigraphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Archaic Ur)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Archaic Ur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fara Period</td>
<td>palaeography of tablets from Fara (corresponding to ED IIIa)</td>
<td>(Sumerian of the Fara Period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presargonic Period</td>
<td>Lagash &quot;I&quot; (Urnamsha) dynasty and Lugalzagesi until the beginning of Sargon’s reign in Babylonia (corresponding to “ED IIIb”)</td>
<td>Old Sumerian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad dynasty</td>
<td>Sargon year 1 to Shudurul year 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rule of the Akkad dynasty over Babylonia between Sargon and Shudurul</td>
<td>(Sargonic) Old Sumerian Old Akkadian (dialects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>until the early years of Naramsuen</td>
<td>(last phase of Old Sumerian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic Sargonic</td>
<td>later part of Naramsuen’s reign and Sharkalisharri, terminology mainly used for palaeography</td>
<td>Sargonic (Neo-) Sumerian Old Akkadian (dialects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Akkad</td>
<td>period of “confusion”, reigns of Dudu and Shudurul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutean Period</td>
<td>dominion of the dynasty of Gutium between Akkad and Ur III; including Lagash “II”</td>
<td>Neo-Sumerian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur III dynasty</td>
<td>Urnamma year 1 to Ibbisuen year 24/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rule of the Ur III dynasty over Babylonia between Urnamma and Ibbisuen</td>
<td>Neo-Sumerian Ur III Akkadian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3. Relative and Absolute Chronology

Although the argument of this contribution is mainly on relative chronology, the very term “3rd millennium” in the title already refers to an absolute date. Whereas it is perhaps not so important whether the exact end of the 3rd millennium is placed during or after the Ur III dynasty, the absolute chronology deserves more attention for a correlation of the historical chronology with the radiocarbon dates obtained for the archaeological record, especially within the ARCANE project, whose chronology is based on radiocarbon and not on historical dates or estimates.6

The general situation of the absolute chronology for the 3rd millennium is well known:

a) The relative chronology from the beginning of the Ur III dynasty (Urnamma year 1, MC 2110) to the end of the Babylon I dynasty (Samsuditana year 31, MC 1595/1597) is well established for the dynasties of Ur III, Isin, Larsa and Babylon I; uncertainties are considered to be in the range of ± 1 year for a period of 515 years, as demonstrated by the independent, but identical, reconstructions of Charpin (2004: 385-387) and Sallaberger (2004: 40).

b) The end of Babylon I cannot be linked exactly to the later Mesopotamian chronology from the 14th century onwards.

4 On the differentiation of the writing phases at Uruk (which are mostly not directly linked to the archaeologically defined phases) see Nissen, in Green & Nissen 1987: 21-51.

5 For a palaeographically defined term “Middle Sargonic”, that has recently been applied to tablets from the reigns of Manishtushu and Rimush and the earlier reign of Naramsuen, see below p. 108.

6 Sallaberger 2011: 332 refers to this chapter, but at that time the results differed substantially from this presentation. Much has been discussed on 2nd millennium chronology in recent years, but this did not necessitate a reformulation of our short presentation; a summary of the discussion is now given in Roaf 2012 (with a slightly different focus). Final corrections were inserted after the session on chronology, organized by Gojko Barjamovic and Klaas Veenhof at the 59th Rencontre Assyriologique internationale at Ghent in July 2013.
The absolute dating of Babylon I itself is a huge topic related to the chronology of the 2nd millennium and clearly lies outside the range of this contribution, especially since the arguments for 2nd millennium chronology are carefully presented in the monographs of Pruzsinszky (2009) and Mebert (2011). However, important new data has become recently available that leads to a preferred choice of an absolute chronology, as will be argued below.

Traditionally the dating of Babylon I was based on the Venus dates of the first 8 years of Ammisaduqa of Babylon that appear in Tablet LXIII in the astronomical series Enuma Anu Enlil, which is known from manuscripts from the 1st millennium. Astronomical calculations and historical reasoning have led to three chronologies (the Middle Chronology II is hardly considered in the chronological models):7

- **High Chronology (HC)**: Hammurapi of Babylon 1848-1806, end of Babylon I 1651
- **Middle Chronology (I) (MC)**: Hammurapi of Babylon 1792-1750, end of Babylon I 1595
- **Middle Chronology II (MC II)**: Hammurapi of Babylon 1784-1742, end of Babylon I 1587
- **Low Chronology (LC)**: Hammurapi of Babylon 1728-1686, end of Babylon I 1531

The Middle Chronology (MC) (I) remains the traditional reference point in literature on Mesopotamia. An ultra-short “New Chronology” was proposed by Gasche et al. (1998), which was based mainly on the evidence of Babylonian pottery:

- **New Chronology (NC)**: Hammurapi of Babylon 1696-1654, end of Babylon I 1499

The Ammisaduqa Venus dates are still considered the basic source for the chronology of Early Mesopotamia, although each reconstruction has to use some emendations of the text.8 The most recent and slightly different reevaluation of the Venus dates by Mebert (2011) is informed by a specific interpretation of astronomical terms which was soon disproven by Huber.9

Unfortunately, no supporting astronomical data could be identified, since various proposals were rejected after a critical evaluation. The so-called “Ur and Akkad lunar eclipses” from Enuma Anu Enlil Tablet XX-XXI, which were partly used to confirm chronological proposals, cannot be considered as pertaining to historical periods.10 Possible allusions to eclipses in legends and other literary texts allow calculations,11 but cannot be used as basis for a chronology, as long as the historical setting remains unknown. Finally, the rhythm of months of 29 and 30 days depending on the visibility of the new moon on the evening sky was thought to provide a basis for absolute chronology.12 Old Babylonian dates, however, are too rare, and in the Ur III evidence the substantial mismatch between the lengths of the months of two local calendars seems to exclude that these dates are based on a direct observation of the moon.13

A definite chronology incorporating all key elements is not currently possible, so each reconstruction has to evaluate its arguments. Reconstructions of the chronology, based on historical sources suggest a chronology in the range of the Middle to Low Chronologies, so the High Chronology (HC) now seems improbable.14 In the main, historical arguments have invalidated the New Chronology (NC), and both HC and NC are excluded by dendro-chronological data from Anatolia (see below).15

---

7 See especially Huber 1982 on an evaluation of the Venus chronologies; for summaries on the history of research Pruzsinszky 2009: 69-72; Mebert 2011 (and see Huber 2011).
8 Huber 1982.
9 See the critical review of Mebert 2011 by Huber 2011.
10 Hunger 2002; see also Pruzsinszky 2009: 78-79. These eclipse descriptions are used as historical evidence by Huber 2011.
11 See Huber 2011.
12 Huber 1982; further literature is presented by Pruzsinszky 2009: 72-73.
13 On the text types involved to indicate 29 or 30 days see Sallaberger 1993: 12-14; many more documents are available today. In an unpublished correlation of the Umma and Drehem calendars (of 1998) by Sallaberger there proved to be more mismatches than agreements between 29- and 30-day-months of the two calendars. Before any chronological calculation the reasons for this mismatch have to be elucidated.
14 See e.g. the contributions in Hunger & Pruzsinszky 2004; Boese 2008; Pruzsinszky 2009.
15 See Boese 2008 with earlier literature. However, E. van Koppen 2010 provides historical arguments for a chronology close to the one proposed by Gasche et al. 1998. Van Koppen & Radner 2009: 117-118, argue for a lower chronology because of the Late Old Babylonian (Ammisaduqa to Samsudutana) palaeography of a Babylonian letter found in Egypt in 15th Dynasty context; the fragment, however, is extremely small.
Thanks to the discovery, publication and study of Old Assyrian Eponym Lists from Kültepe/Kaneš (KEL = Kültepe Eponym List), it has become possible to correlate historical dates with the Anatolian dendrochronological dates obtained from the Old Assyrian palaces at Acemhöyük and Kültepe. Furthermore, the reference to a solar eclipse, for the first time, an astronomical calculation of a historical date stemming from a document written before the fall of Babylon. Since dendrochronology by its very method is directly connected with radiocarbon dating, these Old Assyrian dates are especially important for the ARCANE project, which aims to correlate an archaeological chronology based on radiocarbon dates with the historical chronology.

The Old Assyrian eponym lists were first identified and studied by Veenhof and, a few years later, were substantially extended by the publication of Kültepe Eponym List G (KEL G) by Günbattı. An improved discussion of the Old Assyrian eponyms, taking into account the total documentation, is presented by Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen, who succeeded to compile a Revised Eponym List (REL) of 255 years from MC 1972 to MC 1718. This Assyrian chronology is linked to the Babylonian one, first of all by the synchronism of Shamshiyad, the dominant king of Upper Mesopotamia in the 18th century, with Hammurapi of Babylon, as reconstructed by Charpin and Ziegler. The death of Shamshiyad (MC 1775) is dated to the last month of the eponymy of Tāb-šili-Assur, who is listed in year 197 in the Revised Eponym List (REL), by the synchronism with Eshnuna established by Charpin & Ziegler (2003:163) this corresponds to Hammurapi 18 = 1775 BC.

Dendrochronological dates were obtained from Anatolian palaces by the team of P.J. Kuniholm. The Warshama palace at Kültepe, mainly contemporaneous to Karum Kanesh period Ib, was built with beams of trees felled in cal. 1835-1832 BC and repaired 17 and 61 years later (cal. 1774-1771 BC). At Acemhöyük, the Sarıkaya palace was built from timber felled 58 years after the Warshama palace, i.e. in cal. 1777-1774 BC. Within the Acemhöyük palace were found sealings of Shamshiyad as king of Assur, i.e. dating from MC 1808-1776/75, and of Aplahanda of Karkemish; the latter’s rule was parallel to Yasmahaddu (since MC 1787 at Mari) and lasted until Zimrilim 11 = MC 1764. As the beginning of the reign of Aplahanda cannot firmly be dated, we allow a somewhat longer reign than the beginning of Yasmahaddu (MC 1787), namely starting around MC 1790, thus assuming hypothetically for Aplahanda a reign of 27 years until MC 1764. Sealed clay envelopes or bullae are fragile objects used in everyday administrative contexts that were not kept and stored, and they refer to the actual ruler and thus become rapidly outdated after his death, so the most plausible reconstruction is that they basically stem from the period of these two kings, thus from MC ca. 1790-1776/75. The close temporal relationship between sealings and archaeological layer is corroborated by the very fact that the sealings identify two contemporaneous rulers.

Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen use the evidence of the Warshama Palace at Kültepe for narrowing the correlation of relative historical with absolute dates. Discussing the destruction of the Old Palace at Kültepe (i.e. before cal. 1835-1832 BC) and the end of Kültepe Karum level II in REL 138 (MC 1835), which are usually seen as caused by the same historical event, they present evidence that the destruction of the Old Palace could have predated the end of Kültepe Karum II. The evidence comes from tablets found in the Old Palace below the destruction layer; according to the authors they all should be dated before ca. REL 120; prosopographical information dates the tablets to the years REL 80 to 110, and the ḫamúittum dating used once was given up around REL 120/125.

---

16 Veenhof 2003; Barjamovic et al. 2012.
17 Veenhof 2003; Veenhof 2007; Günbattı 2008b; see on the latter the remarks of Kryszat 2008 and Lacambre 2009; this discussion is now superseded by Barjamovic et al. 2012.
18 Barjamovic et al. 2012, generously made available to us before the publication by Gojko Barjamovic, whom we thank very much for his helpful remarks and his discussions.
20 After Kryszat 2008 and Lacambre 2009; before the publication of KEL G this period was estimated at 199 years by Veenhof 2003; so e.g. Shamshiyad died at 71 years according to revised KEL G, but at 74 years according to Michel 2002 and Veenhof 2007.
21 In our opinion, the exact correlation between Iulian or Middle Chronology years and the dates of Eshnuna, Babylon and the Eponym years deserves some further study. Note, e.g. that Barjamovic et al. 2012 take Hammurapi 18 as year of the death of Hammurapi (= MC 1775), but designate Shamshiyad's last year as MC 1776.
25 For the correlation see Charpin & Ziegler 2003: 145, 264 with lit.
In fact the evidence presented by Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen allows one to narrow down the possible correlations between absolute dates based on dendrochronology and historical chronology. The sequence is as follows:

Table 2a: Sequence of dates based on dendrochronology and historical chronology at Anatolian palaces in the Old Assyrian period, using Middle Chronology (MC) for historical dates.

| REL 80-120 (= MC 1893-1853): Tablets from Old Palace at Kültepe |
| cal. 1835-1832 BC: Trees felled for (later) Warshama palace at Kültepe |
| (distance of 58 years) |
| cal. 1777-1774 BC: Trees felled for Sarıkaya palace at Acemhöyük |
| REL ca. 183-197 (= MC ca. 1790-1776/75): Seals of Shamshiadad and Aplahanda found within Acemhöyük palace |

As can easily be seen, the (relative) distance of the written sources as defined by REL does not contradict the distance of the building events which is determined by dendrochronology. Furthermore, as noted by Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen the so-called “New Chronology” (NC) cannot be fitted in this sequence, since according to that model REL 80-120 would correspond to NC 1797-1757 BC and thus post-date the later building of the Warshama palace; also the traditional Low Chronology (LC) cannot be supported by this dating (REL 80-120 = LC 1829-1789).29 On the other hand, as shown by the Middle Chronology (MC) dates given in Table 2a, any chronology significantly higher than the (main) MC can also not be reconciled with the dendrochronological datings, first of all, from the Sarıkaya palace at Acemhöyük.

The most important data for an exact absolute chronology comes from the Mari Eponym Chronicle, an exemplar of the Old Assyrian eponym list with additions of historical notes, thus comparable both in substance and format to the Neo-Assyrian eponym chronicles. The Mari Eponym Chronicle reports the “darkening of the sun” ([n]a’dur Šamaš)30 in the eponyмя of Puzureshtar, REL 127 (MC 1846).31

In the Mari Eponym Chronicle the solar eclipse is mentioned in the same year as the death of Aminum, whose relations with Ipiqadad are dealt with in the preceding lines, and one year after the birth of the later king Shamsiadaad of Assur.32 This eclipse date deserves privileged treatment in any study on chronology for two reasons related to the textual transmission: first, it consists of one line of not more than three words (“[in Puzureshtar: darkening of the sun”); and secondly, the note is preserved in a text written relatively shortly after the event and in the same historical period within the same tradition, the royal courts in Upper Mesopotamia in the Old Assyrian/Babylonian period. Both factors reduce the probability of mistakes.

In this context we should recall that the absolute chronology of the later history of the ancient Near East is based on an absolutely parallel entry in a chronicle, namely the mention of a sun eclipse as an outstanding event in the Neo-Assyrian Eponym Chronicle, which has been identified as the sun eclipse of 15 June 763 BC: “(Eponym) Bursaggile, of Guzana, revolt in the citadel; in Siwan the sun had an eclipse (attalû).33 Exactly as in the Mari Eponym Chronicle, the sun eclipse is the only one mentioned in the Neo-Assyrian chronicle.34 Both the Old Assyrian and the Neo-Assyrian sources show the same close textual interrelation between eponym lists, eponym chronicles and king lists. For the Old Assyrian period this became evident when the newly discovered Kültepe Eponym Lists confirmed the reliability of the Assyrian King List as the backbone for historical chronology.35 This background of the textual tradition adds to the great importance of the sun eclipse date in the Mari Eponym Chronicle.

---

30 The use of the word nādurum instead of the usual namtalā was repeatedly discussed; see Barjamovic et al. 2012: 33 n. 106 with further literature. Note, however, that nam/ntali appears only in the technical language of Old Babylonian omen texts according to the dictionaries (CAD A 505-509 s.v. attalû, AHw. 729 s.v. nam/ntalā); a different terminology in the Old Assyrian eponym chronicle thus poses no serious problem.
31 See the summary in Pružinský 2009: 75-78 on the collation of the chronicle by Durand and Guichard and the subsequent discussions.
32 The birth of a prince was of great importance, as indicated by the sending of gifts from allied courts to the queen who gave birth to a prince (cf. Charpin 2004: 255); thus the birth of a prince was a notable historical fact, it could plausibly have been added to the eponym list, and so it is unnecessary to assume a later addition of this historical note.
34 See the overview of Michel & Rocher 2000 on eclipses in chronicles. Therefore the observations of less spectacular eclipses by specialists (e.g. as reported in letters of Neo-Assyrian scholars to the king) cannot be used as an analogy to the notation of a solar eclipse in a chronicle.
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Michel & Rocher (2000) calculated the following historically plausible dates for the eclipse between -1850 and -1740: 1833 BC, 1795 BC and 1743 BC. The historical data, the calculated solar eclipse date and the dendrochronological evidence were combined by C. Michel (2002), who proposed a lowering of the MC by 16 years. Veenhof (2007) pointed to the problems in correlating the dendrochronological dates for the Warshama palace with the history of Karum Kanesh. The model presented here follows the arguments of these scholars and is based on the Revised Eponym List (REL) of Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen (2012) and new calculations of sun eclipses at Assur and at Tikrit between 2000 and 1700 BC, kindly provided by Peter J. Huber. The choice of the places Assur and Tikrit is dictated by the contents of the list: Assur is the centre of any chronicle that is based on its eponyms; and Tikrit may have been close to the home city of Shamshiadad’s family which figures prominently in the entries of the list, perhaps Akkad. In the subsequent pages we present first the Assur dates. Huber “listed all eclipses that either reach a magnitude of at least 0.95, irrespective of altitude above horizon, or a magnitude of at least 0.60, if the sun rises or sets eclipsed”. The list also includes a large margin in the “clock-time correction from default (ΔT) from -60 to 60 minutes” in order to balance possible deviations caused by the differences in the rotation of the Earth.

Although the resulting chronology need not necessarily be correct, it is based on the best sets of data available today and may thus serve as the reference point for our chronology of the 3rd millennium. The correlation between the sun eclipse and the historical chronology and the historical chronology itself, may be modified by a few years, but it is relevant for the future discussion of absolute chronology that a solution exists that agrees with dendrochronology, astronomy (ranking the Mari Eponym Chronicle sun eclipse above the Venus dates of Enuma Anu Enlil LXIII – but see on this below), radiocarbon datings (of the 3rd millennium) and historical chronology (acknowledging, however, dissenting voices).

The correlation of REL with the dendrochronology presented above (Table 2a) allows one to consider only eclipses between the MC and the LC, i.e. between MC 1845 BC and LC 1782 BC. According to the calculations provided by Peter J. Huber, various partial eclipses occurred either shortly before sunset or early after sunrise and thus were hardly impressive enough to be considered in a historical chronicle:

- 1837 March 24 and -1831 June 14, partial eclipses (magnitude of 0.934 and 0.861 at dΔT = 0) early in the morning, both beginning below the horizon before sunrise and ending ca. 1-and-a-half to almost 2 hours after sunrise;
- 1844 August 5, a partial eclipse (magnitude of 0.615 to 0.718) late in the evening, which was only visible for half an hour to an hour and whose very existence depends on an assumption of a large deviation of clock-time correction from default of 36 to 60 minutes.

Although the date -1844 August 5 (= 1845 BC) would almost exactly fit the MC, it is not the eclipse one expects for a historical chronicle written a millennium before the more sophisticated observation methods under the Neo-Assyrian kings.

At first sight the eclipse of -1790 September 7 looks more impressive, since it started 2 hours before sunset and could have been an annular eclipse of some minutes. If we accept -1790 = 1791 BC as the date for the sun eclipse mentioned in the Mari Eponym Chronicle for REL 127 (= MC 1845), we arrive at a chronology 54 years lower than the MC, called here a “MC reduced by 54 years” (rMC54). A reduction of the MC by ca. 50 years corresponds well with recent proposals for a historical chronology. Applied to the sequence presented above this results in the following reconstruction:

Table 2b: Sequence of dates based on dendrochronology and historical chronology at Anatolian palaces in the Old Assyrian period, using a Middle Chronology reduced by 54 years based on the sun eclipse of REL 127 = -1790 (rMC54).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rMC54 1839-1799 (REL 80-120): Tablets from Old Palace at Kültepe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cal. 1835-1832:</td>
<td>Tablets from Warshama palace at Kültepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(distance of 58 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cal. 1777-1774:</td>
<td>Trees felled for Sarikaya palace at Acemhöyük</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rMC54 ca. 1736-1722 (REL ca. 183-197): Sealings of Shamshiadad and Aplahanda found within Acemhöyük palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 Charpin 2004: 147-150 on the home of the family of Shamshiadad, most probably Akkad (or at least another city in the region); here we follow Reade 2002 in the localisation of Akkad near the confluence of the Adhem and Tigris, i.e. close to modern Tikrit.

37 Huber 2006 has dealt with the problem of the unknown rotation of the Earth for periods before ca. 500 BC; these are the background for his introduction of various dΔT values.

38 The introduction of this terminology in the spirit of Michel & Rocher 2000 is simply dictated by practical considerations, namely not to introduce another chronology; of course it implies giving up the Venus dates as firm basis of the chronologies, as outlined above.

39 See for example Boese 2008, Barjamovic et al. 2012: 32, both with further literature.
As can easily be seen, the evidence of the tablet(s) from the Old Palace at Kültepe does not totally exclude this reconstruction, but at least makes it more unlikely and thus cannot serve as a basis for a plausible chronology.\textsuperscript{40}

There remains one sun eclipse seen at Assur and at Tikrit, the eclipse of -1832Jun24, \textit{i.e.} of 1833 BC. This eclipse was total at Tikrit for 5(!) minutes,\textsuperscript{41} it was total at Mari and almost total at Assur, where it reached a magnitude of more than 99\% (0.997).\textsuperscript{42} Directly after the summer solstice it started shortly after noon with the sun exceptionally high and it ended about 2-and-a-half hours later; it must have been a most impressive event and thus one considers this an eclipse to be noted in a historical chronicle.\textsuperscript{43} Regarding the region of visibility Michel and Rocher summarized it as follows when considering eclipses from -1850 to -1740:

\begin{quote}
Si l’on ne considère que les données astronomiques, l’éclipse totale de soleil de 1833 avant J.-C. s’impose par sa durée et par le tracé de sa ligne de centralité sur la zone concernée.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}

Also, the allowance of time variation due to the variation in the rotation of the earth in the models of Peter J. Huber does not change the appearance largely. The identification of the eclipse of \textit{REL} 127 mentioned in the \textit{Mari Eponym Chronicle} with the one of 1833 BC, which stands out on account of all its features, leads to the following reconstruction:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Table 2c: Sequence of dates based on dendrochronology and historical chronology at Anatolian palaces in the Old Assyrian period, using a Middle Chronology reduced by 12 years based on the sun eclipse of REL 127 = -1832Jun24 (rMC\textsubscript{12})} \\
\hline
\textbf{rMC\textsubscript{12}} 1880-1840 (REL 80-120): Tablets from Old Palace at Kültepe \\
cal. 1835-1832 BC: Trees felled for Warshama palace at Kültepe \\
\hspace{1cm} (distance of 58 years) \\
cal. 1777-1774 BC: Trees felled for Sarikaya palace at Acemhöyük \\
\textbf{rMC\textsubscript{12}} ca. 1778-1764 (REL ca. 183-197): Sealings of Shamshiadad (rMC\textsubscript{12} 1796-1764) and Aplahanda (rMC\textsubscript{12} ca. 1778-1752) found within Acemhöyük palace \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

The date of the most impressive eclipse of -1832Jun24 thus allows the reconstruction of a chronology which agrees with the dendrochronological and the historical data from the Old Assyrian palaces at Kültepe and Acemhöyük: contrary to the other models (Tables 2a-2b) this chronological model (Table 2c) results in a plausible sequence of building phases and tablet finds. The absolute date of \textit{REL} 127 = 1833 BC also fits the sequence of dated texts from Kültepe presented by Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen: around \textit{REL} 125 the number of preserved texts falls to a minimum, with an "increase of dated texts after the lowest point around REL 127."\textsuperscript{45} This short revival before the end of Karum Kanesh II in \textit{REL} 138 (rMC\textsubscript{12} 1822) represents an unusual situation, since usually texts from the last years before a destruction predominate in the archaeological record. The total decline of dated tablets coincides with the construction of the Warshama palace and thus the destruction of the Old Palace, if the sun eclipse date of 1833 BC (for \textit{REL} 127) is applied.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The wood may have been some years old before being used for the palace building. In such a chronology the destruction of the Old Palace (perhaps \textit{ca. REL} 80-90) would have taken place \textit{ca.} half a century before the end of Karum Kanesh II (in \textit{REL} 138).
\item At standard default clock-time correction (d\textit{ΔT} = 0) the duration is 5’ 15’’; the eclipse is total in all models from d\textit{ΔT} = -40’ to d\textit{ΔT} = 40’; according to the two models presented by Huber 2006: 298, th. 3, an extrapolation of the variation of the rotation of the Earth to 2000 BC has to account for a standard extrapolation error of \textit{ΔT} of 23 minutes or under pessimistic assumptions to 61 minutes, so even here the probability that the -1832 eclipse was not visible is reduced to a minimum, a minimum that seems negligible if one accounts for all the uncertainties in our historical reconstructions.
\item Magnitude 0.997 with the standard default clock-time correction (d\textit{ΔT} = 0); note that the value remains above 0.99 with a correction of -24/+20 minutes; the duration does not change substantially.
\item The period to select eclipses from the lists provided by Huber was set by the evidence of dendrochronology combined with the historical data; within this period the -1832 eclipse is by far the most spectacular one. So although there is no proof that this reconstruction is correct, any deviating proposal would have to use more implausible assumptions and to exclude this impressive eclipse.
\item Michel & Rocher 2002:124; they, however, did not yet dispose of the dendrochronological data of Newton & Kuniholm 2004, and therefore could not propose the interpretation of the eclipse mentioned in the \textit{Mari Eponym Chronicle}.
\item Barjamovic et al. 2012: 54-56; quote on p. 70.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Table 2d: Eponym years after REL (Barjamovic et al. 2012); historical dates of Shamshiadad, Aplahanda and correlation between Eponym years and Babylonian calendar after Charpin & Ziegler 2003; solar eclipse date after lists provided by Peter J. Huber.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eponym Year (REL)</th>
<th>Middle Chronology (MC)</th>
<th>1833 eclipse (rMC(_{12}))</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>birth of Shamshiadad</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eclipse</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of Karum Kanesh II</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning of Karum Kanesh Ib</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death of Shamshiadad</td>
<td>*197</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of Karum Kanesh Ib</td>
<td>after *266 (255+11)</td>
<td>after 1707</td>
<td>after 1699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sun eclipse of the *Mari Eponym Chronicle* leads to a chronology 12 years below the MC, 4 years below the lower Middle Chronology (MC II). It is highly probable that in fact these two astronomical calculations point to the same chronology. The Venus tablets indicate that the 1st year of Ammisaduqa was 1638 BC, whereas the sun eclipse of 1833 BC refers to the eponym REL 127. The link between the Old Assyrian eponyms of REL and the Babylonian chronology is still based on historical and textual reconstructions and interpretations: some lines of *REL G* are not preserved, problems exist with the interpretation of attested names of eponyms, and the correlation between Shamshiadad and Hammurapi will probably need to be adjusted. Hammurapi 18 = MC 1775 is the last year of Shamshiadad, which is calculated as MC 1776 by Barjamovic et al. 2012 (whose REL forms the basis for our chronology). This saves one year, but the historical chronology between REL 127 (1833 BC) and Ammisaduqa year 1 (1638 BC) still remains 3 years “too long.” As long as the textual and historical reconstruction of REL and the link between Assyrian and Babylonian dates is not fully accomplished, the two astronomical dates may actually refer to the same chronology.

Which of the two chronologies, the lower Middle Chronology (MC II = rMC\(_{12}\)) or a chronology based on the sun eclipse of 1833 BC (rMC\(_{12}\)) should be used for our calculations? The Ammisaduqa date is linked to the Babylonian king lists which allow a continuous reconstruction from the beginning of the Ur III dynasty down to the end of Babylon I. Therefore, we have chosen the MC II (rMC\(_{12}\)) as our reference point, although we assume that the sun eclipse is decisive for selecting the correct chronology.

In this study dates are usually indicated in the MC, only in the conclusions and the summary chapter will we return to the more plausible lower Middle Chronology (MC II) reduced by 8 years (rMC\(_{8}\); these chronologies have to be kept apart from the archaeological chronology based on radiocarbon dates (indicated as “cal.”). To summarize: the rMC\(_{8}\) (MC II) chronology used here is based on the following sequence of arguments, which does not exclude other options although they are considered less plausible:

- Historical considerations argue for a chronology around MC and LC (e.g. Pruzsinszky 2009; 2010; Mebert 2011).
- Radiocarbon dates for the 3rd millennium used in the ARCANE project tend to fall in the MC range, are very difficult to align with the LC and seem impossible for the NC.
- The Old Assyrian textual finds and dendrochronological data allow a reduction to the time frame between MC and LC.
- The date of pharaoh Pepy I does not contradict this proposal (see below Section 6.4.)
- Within this time frame the total sun eclipse of 24 June 1833 BC is by far the most impressive one and visible at the relevant places, and thus an identification with the eclipse mentioned in the *Mari Eponym Chronicle* allows a proposal of an exact chronology (MC reduced by 12 years, rMC\(_{12}\) for the Kültepe chronology).
- The lower Middle Chronology (MC II) according to the *Venus Tablets* of Ammisaduqa, 8 years below the Middle Chronology (i.e. rMC\(_{8}\)), most probably represents the same chronology; the historical or textual reconstructions needed for an exact correlation are still to be studied. The date of Ammisaduqa is fixed in the Babylonian chronology, which forms the basis for the third-millennium chronologies.
2. Sources I: King Lists and Related Texts

This section presents an overview of the most important sources for a historical chronology of the 3rd millennium, the *Sumerian King List* and other king lists, as well as the year dates down to the end of the Third Dynasty of Ur.

2.1. The Sumerian King List

The *Sumerian King List* (henceforth *SKL*) can be considered the key document for the history of early Mesopotamia, since much of our modern historical terminology is based on its format. Terms like the “Third Dynasty of Ur” or the “Akkad dynasty” are borrowed almost directly from the *SKL*. Therefore, the sources of the *SKL* and relevant chronological information are presented in the following pages, without providing a scholarly edition and without discussing the ideological background of the *SKL* or dealing with the earlier sections, which are of little or no relevance for the history as it is known today.

2.1.1 Contents of the *SKL*

The *SKL* is a continuous sequence of “dynasties” and kings, from mythical beginnings down to the time of the composers of the preserved manuscripts between Ur III and the period after the fall of Isin. The earliest version of the king list, the *Ur III Sumerian King List* (henceforth *USKL*), starts as follows:

When kingship descended from heaven, (the city of) Kish was king.

In Kish, Gushur was king; he made 2160 years (*USKL* i 1-4; Steinkeller 2003a: 269, 274)

Further kings of the city of Kish follow until the change of the dynasty is expressed by a formula such as:

CITY 1 (e.g. Kish) was smitten with weapons, its kingdom was brought to CITY 2 (e.g. Uruk) (thus *USKL*; see Steinkeller 2003a: 276).

All ruling cities are arranged in a continuous sequence. This basic principle of composition is based on the fiction that only one single city exercised kingship over Babylonia at any given time. The *SKL* is, therefore, also known as *Chronicle of the One Monarchy*. The ruling “cities” of the *SKL* are called “dynasties” by modern historians, although the modern concept of “dynasty” as a ruling family does not agree with the ancient standard terminology. *USKL* and earlier versions of the *SKL* start with the time after the deluge, later a passage on the ante-diluvian kings was added.

2.1.2 The Historical Value of the *SKL*

The first dynasties of the *SKL*, whose kings were attributed reigns of mythical length of hundreds of years, cannot be correlated with dynasties known from contemporary records. Furthermore, the sequence of dynasties and kings given for the time prior to the Dynasty of Akkad differs considerably between the various manuscripts of the text. Not all dynasties known from contemporary records are included. Most notably, both the Lagash I rulers of the Presargonic period and the Lagash II dynasty of the Gutian/Ur III periods or the Presargonic rulers of Umma, are missing. Current scholarly consensus suggests that the *SKL* was composed to legitimate the political positions of contemporary rulers. The real historical value of the composition has been generally doubted by several scholars though some supposed a “historical kernel” even for those reigns of mythical length attributed to the early kings.

Since the later dynasties in the *SKL* provide data (e.g. Akkad, Ur III kings) that are proven correct by contemporary inscriptions, the historical value of parts of the list cannot be denied. Starting with the last kings before the Dynasty of Akkad, different manuscripts provide similar figures for the sequence of cities, for the order and names of their rulers and for the lengths of their reigns. This shift from impossible to plausible can reasonably be correlated with the appearance of historical reports in royal inscriptions, or year dates in administrative documents of

---

49 Steiner 1988.
the same period. In this regard, the \textit{SKL} can also be seen in a wider context with other king lists and related texts from the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennium, or those referring to that period (see below). C. Willeke states:

Sargon scheint (…) in der Königliste an der Stelle in der Vergangenheitsüberlieferung zu stehen, an der das Wissen über wirkliches Geschehen aufhört und das Fabulieren beginnt. (Willeke 1988: 127)

Similarly, W. Sallaberger concludes:

Die Akkade-Könige überliefern als erste umfassende Taten und Daten ihrer Herrschaft; diese Berichte werden im Frühen Mesopotamien rezipiert und tradiert. Aufgrund der historischen Tradition der politischen Geschichte schätze ich deshalb die sie betreffenden Daten der \textit{SKL} und das den Aufstieg Sargons bestimmende Ende Lugalzagesis als ernst-zunehmende historische Daten ein (im Gegensatz zum frühdynastischen Teil der \textit{SKL}). (Sallaberger 2004: 17-18)\textsuperscript{50}

An even higher historical value is ascribed to the oldest version of the \textit{SKL} hitherto known, the Ur III version (\textit{USKL}) which is considered to be an Ur III redaction of a composition compiled originally during the Sargonic period.\textsuperscript{51} In cases where the \textit{SKL} and \textit{USKL} provide differing information, the older version may, in fact, offer more reliable figures. This seems at least plausible for the different figures given for the length of the reign of Sargon of Akkad, and is also possible for the sequence attributed to his sons Manishtushu and Rimush, who succeeded their father to the throne. The same holds true for the Gutian period; the Old Babylonian version remembers only one Gutium dynasty of considerable length, however, the various manuscripts differ with regard to both the sequence and names of kings and the duration of their reigns.

The \textit{SKL} describes history as a continuous sequence of the hegemony of various cities. However, as several dynasties ruled simultaneously, the data given by the \textit{SKL} must be properly interpreted. The clearest example is the transition from Ur III to Isin. \textit{SKL} ascribes 24 (or 25) years of rule to the last ruler of Ur, Ibbisuen, a number shown to be correct by the year dates known from contemporary administrative documents,\textsuperscript{52} and also found in the Erlenmeyer lists of the Ur III and Isin I kings regarding their respective reigns.\textsuperscript{53} According to the \textit{SKL}, Ur is defeated and kingship brought to Isin, where Ishbierra ruled for 33 years. Date lists and administrative documents also confirm this number. However, it is known that Ibbisuen and Ishbierra ruled simultaneously for 17 years (Ishbierra 1 = Ibbisuen year 8).\textsuperscript{54} Their combined reigns thus lasted not 24 + 33 = 57 years, as the \textit{SKL} suggests, but only 40 years. The same principle applies to other transitions, although we do not know of sources that inform us about the exact sequence.

This example also illustrates an important lesson about the use of figures in the \textit{SKL}. The list indicates the total duration of a king’s reign, not simply the period of his supremacy in Sumer and Akkad. This method of calculation must have been based on the sources used for the compilation of the \textit{SKL}, since the historical parts of the \textit{SKL} were probably compiled from the information contained in lists of year dates or other lists of years.\textsuperscript{55} The close link between the counting of years and lists of rulers has very recently been corroborated for a parallel case, the sources of the \textit{Assyrian King List}. The unexpected discovery of the Old Assyrian eponym lists at Kültepe, which simply list the annual eponyms in their correct order, has shed new light on this matter. The Kültepe eponym lists start with king Erishum, and the \textit{Assyrian King List} carefully notes that Erishum’s immediate predecessors are considered rulers “whose eponyms are not known” while Erishum himself is the first king attributed a specific number of year dates before the year date Ishbierra “7” is still unknown.\textsuperscript{56} Although the direct connection between eponym lists, eponym chronicles which add historical information and the \textit{Assyrian King List} cannot be disputed, the exact redactional history is more complex, as the reconstruction by Klaas Veenhof demonstrates:

M[ari] E[ponym] C[chronicle] is a scholarly, ‘historical’ document, preserved in several copies and editions (…). Its ‘reader’ created what we would call an eponym chronicle. He used an existing eponym list as a chronological skeleton, which he fleshed out by adding selected pieces of historical information, which he may have derived from existing royal

\textsuperscript{50} Jacobsen 1939: 165-190 was the first to assign the \textit{SKL} a high historical value.


\textsuperscript{53} Sollberger 1954; cf. the list in \textit{RIME} 3/2: 361-366; see now the lists of Ur III and Isin I year names \textit{CUS/AS} 17, 100-101 and the list of Rimsin year names \textit{CUS/AS} 17, 102.

\textsuperscript{54} Note that Steinkeller 2008b, tried to refine this synchronism. He assumes that military operations attested in Isin texts from the subsequent years Ishbierra 15-16 are directly connected with Kindattu’s conquest of Ur in the 25\textsuperscript{th} and last year of Ibbisuen, and considers the possibility of a synchronism Ibbisuen 24 = Ishbierra “15”. This would fit the assumption that the military operations directed against Amorites in the year dates Ibbisuen 15 and Ishbierra 7 would refer to the same event, but the number of year dates before the year date Ishbierra “7” is still unknown.

\textsuperscript{55} For an Ur III date list see for example \textit{CUS/AS} 17, 101. An instructive type are texts that list the year dates used at a specific place such as \textit{UET} 1, 292 from Ur, listing the Ur III and Isin year dates used there in sequence; see Sallaberger 2004: 37 n. 55; for comparable lists of later date, see Lieberman 1982; George 2011: 209.

Sources I: King Lists and Related Texts

inscriptions, chronicle-like texts and perhaps even chancery documents (...) to treat the period during which the dynasty culminating in king Sami-Adad I arose (...) It is less easy to define the contribution of the 'reader' in the case of the K[ü]le[te] [E]ponym L[ists] A, if we assume that he could make use of an eponym list (...) to correlate this list with data on the reigns of the rulers of Assur, thereby turning it from an a-historical chronological skeleton into a basic source of the sequence and lengths of reign of Assur's early kings, since the time the eponymy institution was introduced. This resulted in an elementary historical tool (...) useful before a true Kinglist was composed. Such a list must have served as the basis for documents such as the 'Mari Eponym Chronicle,' which in turn were used by the scholar(s) who composed the Assyrian Kinglist (...). (Veenhof 2003: 17-18)

The historical information written down since the last years of the Presargonic period allows a similar scenario for the respective segments of the SKL. Independent lists of rulers and their respective reigns are known for the Ur III and Isin I dynasties (Sollberger 1954; Friberg 2007: 233-234; George 2011: 206-209).

2.1.3 Sources of the SKL

A critical edition of the sources known then was given by Jacobsen 1939; recent re-editions are Black et al. 1998-2006: no. 2.1.1. and Glassner 2004: 117-127. For known manuscripts, see the lists of Edzard 1976-1980b: 77-78; Vincente 1995: 236-238. To these one has to add the manuscripts published by Steinkeller 2003a: 231-246 (USKL), Klein 2008a, and a few manuscripts preserving the early sections not relevant in our context (Black et al. 1998-2006: UET 6/3, 504-505, TIM 9, 36; Friberg 2007: 236-243; Peterson 2008; George 2011: 199-205: CUSAS 17, 96-99; cf. also the extensive bibliography of Frayne 2007: 5-6). A careful re-edition of the text of the SKL is a desideratum, which, obviously, cannot be fulfilled in this volume. Though not considered true manuscripts of the SKL, lists of the kings of Ur III and Isin I and their respective reigns published by Sollberger 1954 (Erlenmeyer A, B, whereby A = Friberg 2007: 233-234, 491 = CUSAS 17, 100, B = Fales 1989: 144-145) must be taken into account. We decided to give the sections relevant to the late 3rd millennium chronology in a tabulation that clearly separates the manuscripts and thus indicates variant spellings of names and the different numbers given for the reigns.

The following manuscripts are relevant for the period under consideration (for descriptions, see Jacobsen 1939: 5-13; Vincente 1995; Glassner 2004 and the respective editions):

WB
Copy: Langdon, OECT 2, pl. I-IV. Edition: Jacobsen 1939; Black et al. 1998-2006; Glassner 2004: 117-127, with collations of Hallo. Four-sided prism from Larsa preserving the entire composition; includes dynasties from antediluvian times to the Larsa dynasty. A photograph has recently been made available in the CDLI database.

BT 14+P
Copy, photograph and edition: PBS 5, 3, Klein 2008a; collations: Marchesi 2010. Early Old Babylonian, from Nippur. Preserves portions beginning with antediluvian to the Uruk IV dynasties.

G
Copy: de Genouillac 1925 II: pl. 21, C. 112. Small fragment from Kish, datable to the latter half of the Babylon I dynasty. Two columns preserving portions of Akshak and Gutium dynasties.

Ha+P

IB

J
Copy and edition: Jacobsen 1939: 12 n. 29, pl. 217. Fragment datable to the Babylon I dynasty. Obv. preserves the transition from Gutium to Uruk V dynasty, rev. includes the transition from the Ur III to the Isin I dynasty.

57 CDLI no. P384786, see http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P384786.jpg.
58 Thus the dating by Jacobsen 1939: 5 because manuscript ends with Sinmagir who is attributed a reign of 11 years. See now Richter 2009-2011.
L₁+N₁


Mi


P₂(⁺*)L₂


P₅

Copy: *PBS* 5, 5. Fragment datable to the Babylon I dynasty (time of Samsuiluna?), from Nippur. Obv. partially preserves Kish I, rev. includes portions of the Ur III and Isin I dynasties.

P₆


S

Copy and edition: Gadd 1921. From Sippar, datable to the latter half of the Babylon I dynasty. Preserves the Akshak, Kish III, Uruk III, Akkad, Uruk IV and the transition to the Gutium dynasty.

Su₁

Copy and edition: Scheil 1939: 16-29. Fragment of an Old Babylonian clay cylinder from Susa, datable to the time of Babylon I. Preserves portions of Kish I, Uruk I, Ur II, Mari, Akshak, Kish IV, Uruk IV, Ur III and Isin I.

Su₁+Su₄

Copy and edition: Scheil 1934: 161-166 Fragment B and C. Old Babylonian fragments of a clay cylinder from Susa, datable to the time of Babylon I. Includes portions of Uruk II, Kish III and IV, Uruk III, Akkad, Uruk IV, Gutium, Uruk V and Ur III.

TL


USKL

Photograph and edition: Steinkeller 2003a; cf. the remarks in Glassner 2005b. Ur III manuscript attributed to Adab, according to the colophon copied during the reign of Shulgi. Presumably compiled on the basis of a Sargonic recension. Preserves Kish III, Akkad, Uruk IV, Ummanum, Gutium, Uruk V and the beginning of Ur III. *USKL* differs from the Old Babylonian manuscripts in reversing the order of succession of Sargon’s sons and the insertion of a discrete Adab dynasty of Gutean rulers.

Erlenmeyer A-B

Edition: Sollberger 1954; A = MS 1686 = Friberg 2007: 233-234 = *CUSAS* 17, 100; B = Fales 1989: 144-145. Two Old Babylonian duplicates listing the kings of the Ur III and Isin I dynasties with the lengths of their respective reigns. No manuscripts of the SKL.

2.1.4 The SKL in Tabulation

The various manuscripts of the SKL show, in some places, surprising harmony, whilst in others there are significant deviations in the spelling of rulers’ names, lengths of reigns and even the names themselves. Furthermore, the available modern transliterations and translations of the SKL (Black et al. 1998-2006: no. 2.1.1; Glassner 2004: 117-127) do not indicate properly the number of manuscripts available for any one reconstruction. Any historical consideration of the period, however, has to start with the evidence of the manuscripts; this is presented in tables 3 to 10, which indicate the names of rulers and their regnal years. Individual rulers and dynasties included in SKL will be referred to below in the respective sections.
Table 3: The Kish III/IV Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>BT 14+P₁</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>L₁+N₁</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S₁₁</th>
<th>Su₁₁</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>broken</td>
<td>[ku₃;ba-û₂]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ku₃;ba-û₂</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ku₃;ba-û₂</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>[ku₃;ba-û₂]</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu₃ur₄;EN.ZU</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>[pu₃ur₄;EN.ZU]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>pu₃ur₄;EN.ZU</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>pu₃ur₄;EN.ZU</td>
<td>[pu₃ur₄;EN.ZU]</td>
<td>[21] +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur₄;za-û₂,û₂</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>[ur₄;za-û₂,û₂]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ur₄;za-û₂,û₂</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ur₄;za-û₂,û₂</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bala ku₃;ba-û₂</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u₂-sî-wa-tar₂</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[u₂-sî-wa-tar₂]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>u₂-sî-wa-tar₂</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td></td>
<td>u₂-sî-wa-tar₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eš₄-tar₂;mu-ti</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>eš₄-ta[r₂;mu-ti]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>eš₄-tar₁;mu-ti</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13+ [x]</td>
<td>(no break)</td>
<td>eš₄-tar₁;mu-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[iš-me/]UTU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[iš-me/]UTU</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>iš-me/UTU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>iš-me/UTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-an-ni-ia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[beⁿ;liⁿ;...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>na-ni-ia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[no break]</td>
<td>na-an-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of kings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(no break)</td>
<td>na-an-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of years</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>480+</td>
<td>(no break)</td>
<td>(x³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent dynasty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Akkak</td>
<td>Uruk III</td>
<td>Uruk III</td>
<td>Uruk III</td>
<td>Uruk III</td>
<td>Uruk III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: The Uruk III Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>BT 14+P₃</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>L₁</th>
<th>Mi</th>
<th>L₂+P₂</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Sₜ₁</th>
<th>Sₜ₄+</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The Akkad Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>BT 14+P₃</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>L₁</th>
<th>Mi</th>
<th>L₂+P₂</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Sₜ₁</th>
<th>Sₜ₄+</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ri₂-mu-uš</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ri₂-mu-[uš]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[ri₂-mu-uš]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-ni-kiš-tiš-tu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ma-an-ši-[tiš-tu]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[broken] [ma]-ni-ši-šuₜₜₜ</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-ra-am-[šuₜₜₜ]</td>
<td>[37]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>na-ra-am-[šuₜₜₜ]</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[na-ra-amšuₜₜₜ]</td>
<td>[na-ra-amšuₜₜₜ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the reign (bala) of Sargon [120]+37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>BT 14+P₃</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>L₁</th>
<th>Mi</th>
<th>L₂+P₂</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Sₜ₁</th>
<th>Sₜ₄+</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iₜₜₜ-gₜₜₜgeₜ</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ-gₜₜₜgeₜ</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ-gₜₜₜgeₜ</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ-gₜₜₜgeₜ</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ-gₜₜₜgeₜ</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ-gₜₜₜgeₜ</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-nu-um</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ</td>
<td>na-nu [um]</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ</td>
<td>na-nu-um</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>na-nu-um</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iₜₜₜ</td>
<td>na-ni</td>
<td>na-ni</td>
<td>na₂-anₜₜₜni</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ</td>
<td>na-nu-um</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ</td>
<td>na-nu-um</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eₜₜₜ-luₜₜₜ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>eₜₜₜ-luₜₜₜ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>eₜₜₜ-luₜₜₜ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ-luₜₜₜ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>iₜₜₜ-luₜₜₜ</td>
<td>eₜₜₜ-luₜₜₜ</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duₜₜₜ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>duₜₜₜ</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>duₜₜₜ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šuₜₜₜ-dur-ulₜₜₜ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>šuₜₜₜ-dur-ulₜₜₜ</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>šuₜₜₜ-dur-ulₜₜₜ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>šuₜₜₜ-dur-ulₜₜₜ</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

kings | 11 [broken] | 11 | [x]+3 | 12 | [x]+3 |             |
years  | 181        | iₜₜₜ        | [181] | [60]+137 | 197+160 | [x]+160 | [x] | [x] | [x] | [x] |
Table 6: The Uruk IV Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>BT</th>
<th>Ha+P₄</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>Mi</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Su₁</th>
<th>Su₁+Su₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ur-ši</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ur-ši</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ur-ši</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ur-ši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur₆šigir₂</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>ur₆šigir₂</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ur₆šigir₂</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ur₆šigir₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku₃-da</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ku₃-da</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>ku₃-da</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>lugal-me-lim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puzur₁-i₁-li₂</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>puzur₁-i₁-li₂</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>puzur₁-i₁-li₂</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur₄-lu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ur₄-lu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ur₄-lu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ur₄-lu</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23+3</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1. King Lists and Related Texts
Table 7: The Gutium Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Ha+P₁</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>L₁+N₁</th>
<th>L₁+P₂</th>
<th>Mi</th>
<th>P₆</th>
<th>Su₄,₄</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lugal mu nu-tuku</td>
<td>lugal nu-tuku</td>
<td></td>
<td>lugal nu ub-tuku</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lugal nu-tuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni₂-bi-a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>ni₂-bi-a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>ni₂-bi-še₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-ki-su</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>in-ki-[...]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni₂-lagal₁-wb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>ni₂-lagal₁-wb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šul-me-DAG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>šul-me-DAG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šul-me-DAG-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si-lulu-me-eš</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>si-lulu-me-eš</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e-dam-kii-ki-zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ni-ma-ba-ki-eš</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>i-ni-ma-ba-ki-eš</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ar-an-da-gaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-gi-e₁-a-šu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>i-gi-e₁-a-šu</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>i-lu-an</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i-gi-e₁-ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia-ar-la-gaba</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>ia-ar-la-gaba</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ia-ar-la-gaba</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ar-an-da-gaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ba-te</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[i-b]a-ti</td>
<td>i-ba-te</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ku-ru-um</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>si₂-lu-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-bi-ki-in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>ha-bi-ki-in</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[la₃₁₈₂]-ra-bu-um</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>[la₃₁₈₂]-ra-bu-um</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ra-ru-um</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-ra-ru-um</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ib-ra-nu-um</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ib-ra-nu-um</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-ab-lum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ha-ab-lum</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puzur₁₂₅₂₇₇₏₅</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>puzur₁₂₅₂₇₇₆</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>puzur₁₂₅₂₇₇₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x₃₂₄]-ar-la-ga-an-da</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x₃₂₄]-ar-la-ga-an-da</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sa₃₂₄-du₃₂₄KI₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s₁₃₄]-u₄</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[s₁₃₄]-u₄</td>
<td>[10]+11</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti₁₃₄-g₂-a-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ti₂₃₄]-g₃a</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[ti₂₃₄]-g₃a</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti₂₃₄-g₂-a-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kings</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>kings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>124,40</td>
<td>125,40</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(45+1,40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Summations in brackets (WB, USKL) are calculated from the sections extant. P₆ and P₇ provide only summaries of dynasties; the attribution of the figures of P₇ to the Gutium dynasty is almost probable not preserved in the extant text. On the Gutium section of USKL, see also Glassner 2005b.
### Table 8: The Uruk V Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ātu-he₂-ĝ[al₂]</td>
<td>420 7 days</td>
<td>ātu-en-ĝ[al₂]</td>
<td>26 [x]+2 days</td>
<td>ātu-he₂-ĝ[al₂] x'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>420 7 days</td>
<td>26 [x]+2 days</td>
<td>7½ 15 days</td>
<td>7½ 5 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: The Ur III Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>P₃</th>
<th>Su₁</th>
<th>Su₁-₄</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
<th>Erlenmeyer A = CUSAS 17 100</th>
<th>Erlenmeyer B = Fales 1989: 144-145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d[amar⁻¹EN.ZU]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>a[mar⁻¹EN.ZU]-na</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>a[mar⁻¹EN.ZU]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>a[mar⁻¹EN.ZU]</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu⁻¹EN.ZU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>šu⁻¹EN.ZU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[…] 20+[x]</td>
<td>šu⁻¹EN.ZU</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>šu⁻¹EN.ZU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-bi⁻¹EN.ZU</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>[i-bi]⁻¹[EN.ZU]</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>i-bi⁻¹EN.ZU</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>[…] 25</td>
<td>i-bi⁻¹EN.ZU</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>108⁺</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>120+[x]</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: USKL (or the source it was copied from) was compiled during the (later) reign of Shulgi since its ends with the [š]ul-gi lugal-ĝu₂₁₄ u₄ sud-še₂₁₄ ḫa₂₁₄-ṭi-il “Shulgi, my lord, may he live a long time!”
Table 10: The Isin I Section of the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>L₁+</th>
<th>L₂+P₂</th>
<th>Mi</th>
<th>P₅</th>
<th>Su₁</th>
<th>Su₄</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>Erlenmeyer A = CUSAS 17100</th>
<th>Erlenmeyer B = Fales 1989: 144-145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iš-bi-er₃-ra</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iš-bi-er₃-ra</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>iš-bi-er₃-ra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>[iš-bi-er₃-ra]</td>
<td>[iš-bi-er₃-ra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂su-₁-li₃-su</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>₂su-₁-li₃-su</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>₂su-₁-li₃-su</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[su-₁-li₃-su]</td>
<td>[su-₁-li₃-su]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂is-me-₃-da-gan[₃]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[x]+3  ₂is-me-₃-da-gan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>₂is-me-₃-da-gan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>₂is-me-₃-da-gan</td>
<td>₂is-me-₃-da-gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂ur₃-nin-urta</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[x] ₂ur₃-nin-urta</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂bur₄-₅En₃-uzu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[x] ₂bur₄-₅En₃-uzu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂li₃-p₃-it₃-en₃-lil₃</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[x] ₂li₃-p₃-it₃-en₃-lil₃</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er₃-ra-i-mi-ti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>er₃-ra-i-mi-ti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>er₃-ra-i-mi-ti</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂en₃-lil₃-ba-ni</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>₂en₃-lil₃-ba-ni</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>₂en₃-lil₃-ba-ni</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂za₃-am-bi-ia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>₂za₃-am-bi-ia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>₂za₃-am-bi-ia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂i₃-te₃-er₃-p₃-ia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>₂i₃-te₃-er₃-p₃-ia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>₂i₃-te₃-er₃-p₃-ia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂ur₃-du₃-ku₃-ga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>₂ur₃-du₃-ku₃-ga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>₂ur₃-du₃-ku₃-ga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
<td>[broken]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₂En₃-uzu-ma₃-gir</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>₂En₃-uzu-ma₃-gir</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>₂En₃-uzu-ma₃-gir</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13!</td>
<td>13!</td>
<td>13!</td>
<td>13!</td>
<td>13!</td>
<td>13!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225½</td>
<td></td>
<td>225½</td>
<td></td>
<td>225½</td>
<td>225½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Total from Urnamma to Damiq-ilšu": 313
2.2. The Awan King List (AwKL)

At Susa, a small Old Babylonian tablet containing two lists of twelve names, with the subscripts "12 kings of Awan" and "12 kings of Shimashki", respectively, was found (copy: Scheil 1931: 2, reproduced in D.T. Potts 1999: 144; photo of obverse in T.F. Potts 1994: 31 fig. 4.). The edition by Gelb & Kienast 1990: 317-320, has recently been improved by Glassner 1996b (collation).

Lines 1-13 provide 12 names of "kings of Awan".

no.1 pi/we-e-te/li
no.2 ta-a-šar
no.3 uk-ku-ta-bi-eš
no.4 ḫi-i-su
no.5 lu-la-un-ta-ra-na
no.6 na-šu-il-bu-šu
no.7 kiki-kur-si/tan-me-te-em-ti
no.8 lu-ub-bi-il-la-an
no.9 ḫi-ši-eb-ra-te-eb
no.10 ḫe-e-li
no.11 ḫi-ta-a
no.12 puzur₂(man)-ši-šun-šin-ak

Subscript: 12lugal.meš 3a-wa-an "12 kings of Awan"

According to the SKL, the First Dynasty of Kish was followed by a Dynasty of Awan, with 3 kings and a duration of 356 years (Jacobsen 1939: 94-95). This Dynasty of Awan cannot be linked with any historical information.


AwKL no. 8: A Luhishan, son of a certain Hisibrasini, is mentioned in an inscription of Sargon (Gelb & Kienast 1990: 317; Glassner 1996b: 26); an identification with AwKL no.8 is probable:

FAOS 7 Sargon C 7 Beischrift (c) = RIME 2.1.1.8 caption 5:
lu-ub-bi-an dumu bisi-ib-ra-si-ni lugal elam
"Luhishan, son of Hisibrasini, king of Elam".

FAOS 7 Sargon C 13 Beischrift (g) = RIME 2.1.1.9 caption 4:
lu-ub-bi-an dumu bisi-ši-ši-[ra-si-ni] lugal elam

FAOS 7 Sargon C 13 Beischrift (j) = RIME 2.1.19 caption 7:
ḫi-si-ib-ra-si-ni lugal elam "Hisibrasini, king of Elam"

AwKL no. 9: The identification of Hisibrasini, known from the above-mentioned Sargon inscriptions as the father of Luhishan, with Hishebrateb, remains doubtful both for the form of the name and the reversed order of filiation Luhishan-Hisibrasini (Gelb & Kienast 1990: 317; Glassner 1996b: 26; D.T. Potts 1999: 102); cf. below AwKL no. 12.

AwKL no. 11: It has been suggested that the unnamed king of Elam, of the Naramsuen treaty, can be identified with Hita (Hinz 1967: 66, 75, 96 and esp. 79 on the alleged reading bi-t₂₃ as the ruler's name in MDP 11, fig. 1 vi 22; cf. Carter & Stolper 1984: 66 n. 75, Glassner 1996b: 26, Westenholz 1999: 92; Koch 2005: 283 with references). This, however, remains a guess (of Hinz) based on counting generations.

AwKL no. 12: The Akkadian form of the name Puzurinšušinak was read in Elamite as Kutikinšušinak by Hinz (1962: 2-8) after his decipherment of the linear Elamite script used by Puzurinšušinak. This important Elamite king is known from his own inscriptions (FAOS 7 Elam 2-13, Puzurinšušinak 1-12) and a copy of an inscription referring to Urnamma (see below Section 8.6).

The distance of four generations from Sargon to Sharkalisharri and the distance of four generations between Luhishan (AwKL no. 8) and Puzurinšušinak (AwKL no. 12) agrees, more or less, with the order of succession for the kings of Awan provided by the AwKL. Whereas Luhishan and Puzurinšušinak are also known from contemporary sources, neither the Elamite ruler in the Naramsuen treaty, nor Hisibrasini of Sargon's inscriptions, can be identified with certainty with AwKL no. 11 and AwKL no. 8. Moreover, the AwKL omits an Elamite ruler known to have been taken captive by Rimush (Glassner 1996b: 26).
2.3. The Shimashki King List (ShKL)


no. 1 4gi-ir-na-am-me
no. 2 ta-zi-it-ta
no. 3 e-ba-ar-ti
no. 4 ta-zi-it-ta
no. 5 lu₄-5-x-ra’-ak₃-šu-ub-ša-an
no. 6 ki-in-da-at-tu
no. 7 i-da-ad-du
no. 8 tan-ra-hu-ra-te-er
no. 9 e-[ba]-ar-ti
no. 10 i-da-at-tu
no. 11 i-da-at-tu-na-pi-ir
no. 12 i-da-at-tu-te-em-ti
Subscript: 12 lugal.meš si-maš-ku-u,”12 Shimashkian kings”

The historical value and reliability of the ShKL has been debated. The earliest assessment was provided by Stolper 1982 who considered it to be a historical source.61 Gelb & Kienast underscored its higher historical value when compared to the AwKL.62 Glassner and De Graef denied the reliability of the list and instead relied on the so-called “Genealogy of Shilhakinshushinak” from the middle-Elamite period.63 However, recent discoveries have proved that a considerable number of rulers mentioned in the ShKL are also attested in contemporary sources that agree with the ShKL, even in the relative sequence of the rulers. Among the names attested in the ShKL, Kirname, Tazitta, Kindattu, and Idattu are also attested in contemporary sources.64

The Shimashki dynasty has been interpreted as the direct successor of the Awan dynasty that executed hegemony in larger Elam. Accordingly, Puzurinshushinak was more or less directly followed by Kirname (ShKL no. 1), Tazitta (ShKL no. 2) and Ebarat (ShKL no. 3).

ShKL no. 1: A certain Kirname is attested in Ur III texts dating from the years Shusuen 3 and 6 (written ki-ir-na-me). His envoys always occur with those of Ebarat (here no. 3),65 which points to a lower status of Kirname and excludes identification with the ruler of the ShKL. No further arguments can be cited for identification with a

59 See the list in Gelb & Kienast 1990: 318-319; Glassner 1996b: 26.
60 Cf. also Vallat 1996; Quintana 1998.
61 Stolper 1982 (esp. 43-45).
63 Glassner 1996b; De Graef 2006: 52-55, 68.
person called gu-ri-na-me attested in the year Shulgi 46.\textsuperscript{66} Thus the divine Kirname of the ShKL cannot be identified in Ur III administrative documents.

ShKL nos. 2 and 4: A certain Tazitta is attested in Ur III sources by mention of his envoys in texts from the years Amarna 8 and Shusuen 2. His envoys always occur together with those of Ebarat.\textsuperscript{67} With regard to identification, ShKL no. 4 is the more likely candidate, since the earliest attestations follow those of Ebarat (no. 3).

ShKL no. 3: Ebarat (Yabrat) is attested in Ur III administrative texts dating from the years § 44 to §§ 8.\textsuperscript{68} Ebarat is also attested in two, possibly three, likely dates found on 18 tablets from Susa post-dating the year Ibbisuen 3.\textsuperscript{69}

ShKL no. 5: Read lu-x-(x)[r]-a-[k]-lu-[u]-hu-ba-an after collation by Sollberger 1970: 17, lu-[x]-n]-a-ak-lu-ub-ha-an by Steinkeller 1988a: 200 n. 27, lu-[x]-[r]-a-ak-lu-ub-[ba-an] by Gelb & Kienast 1991: 317, lu-x-x-ak-2-lu-ub-ba-an by Glassner 1996b, lu-x-x-ak-2-lu-ub-ba-an by Steinkeller 2007: 230 n. 5. Steinkeller 1988a: 200 n. 27; 2007: 205 n. 52; in press, had tentatively identified this ruler with the Ur III Shimashkian (Š1, Su(\textsuperscript{A})) NT-\textsuperscript{a}-ša-na-a₂, son of me-ša-nu-\textsuperscript{u} (TENS 480: 8, ŠS 1/iii/9; and other references from ŠS 2 to ŠS 6/ix/14). Steinkeller proposes a reading lu,(\textit{lu}_2), lu-[a]-nu-a₂ for the name of the son of Meshanu and considers that this could be an abbreviation for \textit{lu}_2-[a(\textsuperscript{t})]-n]-a-ak-lu-ub-ba-an. As long as no additional evidence turns up (note restoration of broken name and differences in spelling), the identification remains very doubtful.

ShKL nos. 6-7: Kindattu (ShKL no. 6), son of Ebarat (ShKL no. 3), is known as the destroyer of Ur (van Dijk 1978) and is thus a contemporary of the last king of the Third Dynasty of Ur, Ibbisuen. He is attested, along with Idattu (ShKL no. 7), in an administrative text dated to the year IE 19 (= “13”) and ruled as a contemporary of Ibbisuen and Ishbierra.\textsuperscript{70}

BIN 9, 382 obv. 8-rev. 2

\textit{lu}_2-[k]-\textit{g}_2-g_e, a ki-in-da-at-tu \textit{lu}_2-[u]-\textit{s}_2-sa-ni 5-bi (…) \textit{lu}_2-[k]-\textit{g}_2-g_e, a i-da-[du] \textit{lu}_2-[u]-\textit{s}_2-sa-ni [1-bi] \textit{lu}_2-[k]-\textit{g}_2-g_e, a [n الشمس] \textsuperscript{11}

“the envoy of Kindattu (and) his five followers (…) the envoy of Idattu and his one follower, the envoys of Anshan.”

An inscription of Idattu I informs us of the genealogy of ShKL no. 3 and ShKL nos. 6-7 (Steinkeller 2007: 221 with n. 28):


4-[i]-da-du \textit{dumu.dumu} 4-[i]-ba-ra-at \textit{dumu} 4-[i]-i-[d]-a-da \textit{sipa} 4-[u]TU \textit{klag₂} 4-[n]ANA \textit{lugal an-ša-an} \textit{lugal si-ma-ši-ki} \textit{u}_2 \textit{elam.mā}

“For Idattu, the grandson of Ebarat, the son of Kindattu, the shepherd of the Sungod, the beloved one of Inana, king of Anshan, king of Shimashki and Elam.”

ShKL nos. 7-8: Idattu I is known as the father of Tanruhurater from a royal inscription and a seal inscription (Glassner 1996b: 28):

Brick inscription Malbran-Labat 1995: no. 9:

\textit{i}-da-du \textit{klag}\textsubscript{2}, \textit{muš}, \textit{eren} \textit{lugal si-ma-ši-ki} \textit{u}_3 \textit{elam.mā} \textit{tan-ru-šu-ra-ʃi-[i]-i[r]} \textit{dumu} \textit{kī}[^{\text{A}}][i-\text{a}].\text{\textit{ni}}

Amiet 1972: no. 1675:

\textit{tan}-\textit{ru-šu-ra-i]i [es]-ṣi}, \textit{muš}, \textit{eren}[^{\text{vi}}]”4 […] \textit{dumu} \textit{i-da-du} [\textit{urdu}_3-zu]

“Tanruhurater, governor of Susa, […] son of Idattu, […] is his servant.”

ShKL no. 8: Tanruhurater is known as the father of Idattu II from inscriptions of the latter (Malbran-Labat 1995: 26-20 n. 6-9; Steinkeller 2007: 229 with n. 50).

ShKL no. 10: Idattu II, the son of Tanruhurater, is known from inscriptions (De Graef 2006: 47-48; Steinkeller 2007: 229 n. 50)


In conclusion, the kings of the ShKL, beginning with Ebarat (ShKL no. 3), are attested in contemporary textual evidence and therefore the list of kings of Shimashki can be considered a document of utmost importance and can be provided with a reliable chronology.

\textsuperscript{66} Thus Steinkeller 2007: 220.

\textsuperscript{67} Steinkeller 2007: 220-221 with n. 25.

\textsuperscript{68} For references, see Steinkeller 2007: 230-232.


\textsuperscript{70} D.T. Potts 1999: 145; Steinkeller 2007: 221 n. 26 corrected by Steinkeller 2008a, differently Steinkeller 1988a: 200 n. 27.
2.4. The Shakkanakku List from Mari (MShakL)

The rulers of Mari (Hariri) on the Euphrates were entitled “šakkanakkum (written Kiš. Nita₂[,] of Mari”, in the long period after the Akkadian destruction and before kings Yagidlim and Yahdunlim (MC 1801-1794). The so-called Shakkanakku List, identified and published by Durand 1985, remains the basic source for the chronology of this period at Mari. More rulers with the title šakkanakkum, translated as “general” or “governor”, appear in inscriptions, especially of seals, but their names are not preserved on the list. Despite its fragmentary state the list remains the basic source for reconstructing the chronology of this period at Mari.

The Shakkanakku List (MShakL) consists of two partly broken Old Babylonian tablets found in the Palace of Mari (text A: ARM 22, 333; text B: T.343). The basic edition is provided by Durand 1985. Both tablets provide lists of names, giving the duration of their respective reigns and sometimes add information on family relationship. Unfortunately, both tablets are broken, cannot be joined directly, and the missing portions do not overlap. Both texts are given in transliteration and translation.

Table 11: The Mari Shakkanakku List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MShakL A (T.343)</th>
<th>MShakL B (ARM 22, 333)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obv.</td>
<td>rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>{1}lu-ši MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 MU i-du-šu-dā-gan DUMU-su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45 MU i-ma-ab-šu-dā-gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 MU mu₃-[ur₃]-me₂-[šu₂] DUMU-su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 MU iš-du-ab-šu-ši […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 MU iš-ma₃-[ši₃]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35 MU [Š]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>101 [MU] […]-da-gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 [MU] [x₃]-[…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2+[MU] […]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 11 | 35 years: Apilkin, | 11 | 7 years: Hitlalerra |
| 12 | 3 years: Ishtupel, his brother, | 12 | 8 years: Hanundagan |
| 13 | 5 years: Ishtupel, his brother, | 14 | 8 years: Hanundagan |
| 15 | 5 years: [PN], his son, | 16 | 8 years: Hanundagan |
| 17 | 6 years: 11 years: Shudagan, his son | 18 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 19 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 20 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 21 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 22 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 23 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 24 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 25 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 26 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 27 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 28 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 29 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 30 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 31 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 32 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 33 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 34 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 35 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 36 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 37 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 38 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 39 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 40 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 41 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 42 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 43 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 44 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 45 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 46 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 47 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 48 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 49 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 50 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 51 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 52 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 53 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 54 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 55 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 56 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 57 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 58 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 59 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 60 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 61 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 62 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 63 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 64 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 65 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 66 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 67 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 68 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 69 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 70 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 71 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 72 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 73 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 74 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 75 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 76 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 77 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 78 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 79 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 80 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 81 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 82 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 83 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 84 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 85 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 86 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 87 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 88 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 89 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 90 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 91 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 92 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 93 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 94 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 95 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 96 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 97 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 98 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |
| 99 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son | 100 | 6 years: 5 years: Shudagan, his son |

---

Sources I: King Lists and Related Texts

Textual commentary:

A obv. 10: The reading of [10] ⸢mu⸣ is based on the photo, where one can also recognize the right end of the division line. This entry is missing in the reconstruction of Durand 1985 and all subsequent discussions.

A rev. 1′: The partly broken number could be 3, 6 or 7 years.

Text A rev. 1″-2″ are read by Durand:

1′-⸢a-me⸣-[er-nu-nu] 2′-[er-da-gan]

Durand’s reconstruction is informed by the names of two Shakkanakkum’s known from seal inscriptions. Durand’s restoration is integrated into the reconstruction of the Mari Shakkanakku List by Marchetti 2008.

B beginning: Two of the five preserved entries cover two lines; therefore the first ca. 8 lines could be filled by 4 to 8 names.

B 1′ is restored as [il]-⸢um-i-ša-a-r by Durand 1985. Although this reading is difficult to reconcile with the preserved traces, it is generally accepted (e.g. by Marchetti 2008).

B 8′ Marchetti 2008: 16 n. 2 proposes to read [a]-ḫu-šu.

Historical discussion:

Some rulers of MShakL A are attested in contemporary sources,73 so the MShakL has become a fundamental source for reconstructing the history and chronology of the shakkanakku period. One anchorage point is provided by the synchronism between Urnamma of Ur III and Apilkin (Apil-ki-n) of Mari (MShakL A no. 7): An Old Babylonian copy of an inscription informs us that a daughter of Apilkin married Urnamma’s son, Shulgi.74 According to the figures of the MShakL A, the maximum distance between Apilkin//Urmamma and Ididish, i.e. between Apilkin year 0 and Ididish year 1, is 134 (= 60 + 5 + 45 + 5 + 11 + 8) years. The end of the rulers known as šakkanakkum has to occur before Yagidlim and Yahdunlim in the late 19th century (MC).

The following 3rd millennium rulers are also attested in contemporary sources:75

MShakL A no. 1: Durand suggested an identity between Ididish (MShakL A 1) and Ititi of Assur who defected from Akkadian rule under Sharkalisharri and reigned at Assur (RIME 2.4.1.1 = RIMA 1.0.1001).76 As long as further evidence is not available, this proposal must remain doubtful.

MShakL A no. 4: Nurmer (Nūr-Mēr, nu-ur-²-me-er) is probably the same as Niwarmer (Niwar-Mēr; ni-wa-ar-me-er) whose inscription is known from a bronze tablet found at Mari: FAOS 7 MŠ 8 = RIME 2.3.4.1 ni-wa-ar-me-er ²-kiš.nita ²-ma-ri ²-ki dumu ²-ša-ḫu-ri ²

MShakL A no. 5: Ishupel (Išṭ-up-El) is known from two inscriptions (FAOS 7 MŠ 5-6 [Išṭupilum 1-2]) and an inscribed statue (FAOS 7 MŠ 7 [Išṭupilum 3]) that has been dated, on stylistic grounds, to the time of Gudea by Otto (2008: 564) and Marchetti (2008: 15).

MShakL A no. 7: Apilkin (Apil-ki-n) is attested by his votive inscription from Mari and an Old Babylonian copy of an inscription:

FAOS 7 MŠ 2 = RIME 3/2.4.1.1 a-pi-li-gi-da-num ²-kiš.nita ²-ma-ri ²-dim ²-sa-ṣu-rī

“Apilkin, šakkanakku of Mari, who built the Shahuru.”


Although the restoration of Mari after the destruction by Sargon is of limited value in solving the thorniest problem of 3rd millennium chronology, the gap between the Sargonic and Ur III dynasties.

2.5. Gudea’s Dynasty: The Maeda Tablet

The “Rulers of Lagash” is the modern name of an Old Babylonian list, which pretends to list early rulers of Lagash (Sollberger 1967); it is, in fact, a scholarly document of the Old Babylonian period without historical value for the chronology of Lagash. Whereas the sequence of the Presargonic rulers is well established, there is more debate about the dynasty of Gudea, the so-called Lagash II dynasty, in office between the disintegration of the Sargonic empire and the final establishment of the kingdom of Ur III under Shulgi.

The most important document is an undated Ur III offering list from Girsu, published by Maeda (1988) (henceforth: MT, “Maeda Tablet”), which enumerates the expenditure of sheep as “festival contributions of the Lisin-month (= month iii)” (niĝ; izim-ma iti ʾlisinʾu), a festival related to the cult of the ancestors.

One sheep each is attributed to the deity Lugalsukudra (obv. 1), then to the former rulers of Lagash and some women (obv. 2-rev. 4) at their “libation place” (ki-a-na-ĝ, rev. 5), the place of offerings for the dead at their burial place. Lugalsukudra is a minor netherworld deity of Girsu, who rarely appears together with Meslamtaea, lord of the netherworld. Three more sheep are devoted to the “great” goddess Lisin (i.e. probably at her “old” cult-place) and at the Ibgal temple oval (ʾlisinʾu; gu-lā, ib-gal) and to the “old place” of the god Ningshzhida (ki-gu-lā ʾnin-geš-zī-da).

Most of the rulers names appear again in a tablet published by Perlov (1980) (henceforth: PT, “Perlov Tablet”), an expenditure of oil in the month of Dumuzi (= month vi) by the official named Dingirgaisa. Month vi is, like month iii, devoted to offerings to the dead ancestors. First, the palace (of Girsu), various

79 Marchesi (2008) suggested to differentiate between two rulers at Mari named Iddinilum: the first one is known from his inscribed statue, the other from seal inscriptions; the “earlier” Iddinilum would then belong to the end of the 3rd millennium. However, the detailed study of the orthography and language of the shakkanakkhu period by Colonna d’Istria (2009) has demonstrated archaizing features during its later phase; therefore, the “old” elements of the Iddinilum statue, which appear besides younger elements, fit well with a later date for the statue and, thus, one is not forced to assume a “first” Iddinilum.
80 For an overview of reconstructions see Durand 2006-2008; Colonna d’Istria 2009.
Sources I: King Lists and Related Texts

Table 12: The rulers of Lagash II according to the Maeda Tablet and Perlov Tablet (MT and PT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>PT rev. 18-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 udu ur₇nin-₇gîr₇-su gu-la</td>
<td>½ sîl₃i₆₇-nun du₀₁₀-ga / ki-a-nãg gu₁₂-de₂-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 udu pi₇rîg-me₁</td>
<td>½ sîl₃i₆₇-pïrîg-me₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 udu ur₇ba-u₂</td>
<td>½ sîl₃i₆₇- Bá-u₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 udu gu₁₁-de₂-a</td>
<td>(see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 udu ur₇nin-₇gîr₇-su dumu gu₁₁-de₂-a</td>
<td>½ sîl₃i₆₇- nin-₇gîr₇-su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 udu ur-Nît₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 udu ur-ab-ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 udu ur-₇ma-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 udu nam-₇ha-ni</td>
<td>½ sîl₃i₆₇-nam-mâl-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 udu nam-₇nin-₇E.NI.KAM(?)</td>
<td>½ sîl₃i₆₇-gu-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ki-a-nãg</td>
<td>½ sîl₃i₆₇-geme[z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>½ sîl₃sa₆-sat₇-ga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deities and persons, housed most probably in the palace, receive consignments of oil. Lines 18 to 25 list Gudea and other rulers of Lagash; the list closes with three women (Ningula, Gemezu, Sasaga). The "libation place of Gudea" (ki-a-nãg gu₁₁-de₂-a) is separated from the other ensi’s, because he receives "half litre of quality perfumed oil" (½ sîl₃i₆₇-nun du₀₁₀-ga, lines 18-19), whereas the following rulers are attributed "half litre normal sheep fat" (½ sîl₃i₆₇-udu us₂, lines 20-25); the groupings derive from the practice of ancient bookkeeping.⁸⁴

Essentially, the two lists follow the same order of rulers, both are situated in the cult of the local dynasty. In the transliteration in Table 12 female names are in italics.

The sequence of ancestors who receive offerings during the festivals for the dead is most probably a chronological one: both lists basically agree. However, R. de Maaijer argued that:

- individuals may be listed according to the sequence in which their statues or libation places were situated in the temples, for instance, or according to some other principle.⁸⁵
- He refers to the large list of offerings MVN 9, 87, where some of our rulers appear again as recipients of gifts of fruit. The names of the rulers appear in the context shown in Table 13.⁸⁶

In MVN 9, 87, the Lagash rulers not only appear in a different order, but they do not even show up as a homogenous group as they do both in MT and PT. The order of MVN 9, 87 most probably follows the administration of the fruit offerings, the topic of the tablet. The deviating order of MVN 9, 87 is a further strong argument that MT and PT actually follow the chronological sequence, as this is generally the case of offerings for the royal predecessors. The dead kings of Ur III, for instance, always receive offerings in the chronological sequence Urumma, Shulgi, Amarsuena, Shusuen.⁸⁷ The reason why MT nos. 6-8, Urnit₂, Urabba and Urmama, are not included in PT, may simply lie in their inferior relevance: these three governors are only attested by one year name each and a very few dedicatory inscriptions by other persons.

---

⁸⁴ Maeda 1988: 22 assumes that "Gudea had already been given a special position in this period”. A glance at the tablet shows that this is basically correct, but that the reason for the separation of Gudea is due to bookkeeping practice. This is overlooked by Nagel et al. (2005: 31-33), whose reconstruction is thus shown to be incorrect.

⁸⁵ de Maaijer 2008: 49.

⁸⁶ For a more complete listing, including Shulgi and perhaps Shusuen or Amarsuena in v’ 19’ [or Urningirsu with de Maaijer], and some more female names, see de Maaijer 2008: 50 th. 2.

⁸⁷ Cf. e.g. Boese & Sallaberger 1996.
As has repeatedly been argued, the sequence of MT and PT agrees well with known family relationships (no. 2 Pirigme, son of no. 1 Urningirsu I; no. 3 Urbawu, is father in law of no. 4 Gudea and no. 9 Namhani, his daughter dedicates a statue to no. 6 Ur

| (rev. iv) | ur-damma ensi₂ | Urulamma, governor (under Shulgi and Amarsuena of Ur III) |
| (rev. v) | ṣu-ni₃na | (godess) Inama |
| (rev. vi) | ur-ni₃is₂u, ensi₂ | Urmi₃is₂u, governor (MT no. 6) |
| (rev. vii) | gu₃-de₂-re₃ | Gudea (MT no. 4) |
| (rev. viii) | lu₃-giri₁₂-zal ensi₁ | Lugrizal, governor (under Shulgi of Ur III) |
| (rev. i) | ḫa-la₃-lamma | Halalamma (wife of Lugrizal, Ur III) |
| (rev. vii) | ṣu-sul-pa₃-e₁, e₁₃-gal | (god) Sulpae of the palace |
| (rev. vii) | an-ta-sur-ra | (temple) Antasura |
| (rev. vii) | e₁₂-babar₁ | (temple) |
| (rev. vii) | e₁₂-ḫuš | (temple) |
| (rev. vii) | ge₃me₂₄-sul-pa-e | Gemesulpae (later wife of Gudea, cf. PT ge₃me₂₄-zu/su) |
| (rev. vii) | ur-ba₃-te₂ | Urbawa (governor, MT no. 3) |
| (rev. v) | ur-nin-ge₂-su gu-la | Urningirsu "the old one" (governor, MT no. 1) |
| (rev. vii) | iškur | (god) Ishkur |
| (rev. i) | nin-sub₁₁ | Ninsubi (woman) |
| (rev. i) | e₁₂-ḫiš-te₂ | (temple) |
| (rev. i) | ge₃me₂₄-zu₂-te₂ | Gemesulpae (later wife of Gudea, cf. PT ge₃me₂₄-zu/su) |
| (rev. i) | ger-[piri]₃k-em₂ | Pirigme (governor, MT no. 2) |

As has repeatedly been argued, the sequence of MT and PT agrees well with known family relationships (no. 2 Pirigme, son of no. 1 Urningirsu I; no. 3 Urbawu, is father in law of no. 4 Gudea and no. 9 Namhani, his daughter dedicates a statue to no. 6 Ur

| (rev. iv) | ur-damma ensi₂ | Urulamma, governor (under Shulgi and Amarsuena of Ur III) |
| (rev. v) | ṣu-ni₃na | (godess) Inama |
| (rev. vi) | ur-ni₃is₂u, ensi₂ | Urmi₃is₂u, governor (MT no. 6) |
| (rev. vii) | gu₃-de₂-re₃ | Gudea (MT no. 4) |
| (rev. vii) | lu₃-giri₁₂-zal ensi₁ | Lugrizal, governor (under Shulgi of Ur III) |
| (rev. i) | ḫa-la₃-lamma | Halalamma (wife of Lugrizal, Ur III) |
| (rev. vii) | ṣu-sul-pa₃-e₁, e₁₃-gal | (god) Sulpae of the palace |
| (rev. vii) | an-ta-sur-ra | (temple) Antasura |
| (rev. vii) | e₁₂-babar₁ | (temple) |
| (rev. vii) | e₁₂-ḫuš | (temple) |
| (rev. vii) | ge₃me₂₄-sul-pa-e | Gemesulpae (later wife of Gudea, cf. PT ge₃me₂₄-zu/su) |
| (rev. vii) | ur-ba₃-te₂ | Urbawa (governor, MT no. 3) |
| (rev. v) | ur-nin-ge₂-su gu-la | Urningirsu "the old one" (governor, MT no. 1) |
| (rev. vii) | iškur | (god) Ishkur |
| (rev. i) | nin-sub₁₁ | Ninsubi (woman) |
| (rev. i) | e₁₂-ḫiš-te₂ | (temple) |
| (rev. i) | ge₃me₂₄-zu₂-te₂ | Gemesulpae (later wife of Gudea, cf. PT ge₃me₂₄-zu/su) |

Taking into account all the evidence, the following sequence of the Lagash II rulers seems, according to MT and PT, to be well established:

- MT no. 1 Urningirsu I
- MT no. 2 Pirigme
- MT no. 3 Urbawu
- MT no. 4 Gudea
- MT no. 5 Urningirsu II
- MT no. 6 Urni₃is₂ (also read Urgar, Urgar)
- MT no. 7 Urba₃
- MT no. 8 Urmama
- MT no. 9 Namhani / Nammahni

However, additional rulers are known to have ruled at Lagash between the Sargonic and the Ur III period. After Puzururama, one has to include (in alphabetical order) Kaku, Lubawu, Lugula, Lumma and Urma₃ma (see on these Section 8.5.1). The evidence for the whole Lagash II dynasty is as follows (Table 14).

---


89 A different reconstruction of the Gudea dynasty has now been proposed by Wileke (2011, 35-37), who starts his arguments from the testimony of an Old Babylonian bilingual text which, according to Wileke, reflects a genuine, albeit unique inscription of Gudea. Here, the contemporary sources are privileged in the historical evaluation, especially since the general pattern of offerings for early rulers grouped in chronological sequence is well established.

90 C.f. on the Lagash II rulers e.g. Lafont 1993: 678, 681; Flückiger-Hawker 1999: 2-4; Suter 2000; Sallaberger 2004: 31.
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Table 14: The Lagash II dynasty: Rulers, number of year dates and inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>(MT, cf. PT)</th>
<th>Year Dates (mainly after Sollberger 1954-1956)</th>
<th>Inscriptions (RIME 3/1-nos.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaku</td>
<td>1 (K. ensi₂, RTC 188)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubawu</td>
<td>1 (L. ensi₁)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugula</td>
<td>1 (L. ensi₁)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumma</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(see note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urningirsu I</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>[1]+4</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirigme, son of Urningirsu</td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>[1]+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbawu, father in law of Gudea and Namhani</td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>[1]+5(?)</td>
<td>1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudea</td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>14?</td>
<td>Sta-AA, 1-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urningirsu II, son of Gudea</td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1-10 (small buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urniĝ₂</td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>1 (U. ensi₁)</td>
<td>1-3 (only dedications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urabella</td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>1 (U. ensi₁)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urnamma</td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>1 (U. ensi₁, RTC 184)</td>
<td>1 (dedication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nammahni (nam-ḥa-ni)</td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>1 (mu nam-ḥa-ni us₁-sa)</td>
<td>1-17 (1-3 buildings, 14/15 dedications; nam-ḥa-ni)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Festival contributions for a governor named Lumma (nig₂-izim-ma lum-ma ensi₂) appears in a text dated to the year Amarsuena 7 (ITT 3, 6590). This text parallels an offering list that mentions oil for an otherwise unknown lugal-an-na-ab-tum₁, ensi₁, and al-la ensi₁, umma(AS 5789=Farber & Farber 2001).

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that until now it has not been possible to propose a convincing reconstruction for the rulers of Lagash II which can explain all the known data. The most problematic case is no. 9 Nammahni, who is attested as son in law of no. 3 Urbawu (RIIME 3/1.1.12.05) and together with "the mother who bore (him)" Ninakagina, wife of no. 6 Urniĝ₂, daughter of Kaku. Kaku, although never called governor (ensi₂) in the inscriptions of Ninakagina, is considered to be the city ruler known from Girsu. Prosopographically, the governor Kaku can be linked with the group Lubawu, Lugula, and Urabella, dated to the period of Urnamma (see below 8.4.), and he would thus be Nammahni’s grandfather. More intriguingly, the name of Nammahni (written na m-maḥ-ni) is often erased in the inscriptions; what was the historical situation? Given this state of research, we adhere to the proposed sequence, as long as no convincing new reconstruction has been proposed.

2.6. The Beginning of the Assyrian King List (AKL)

The so-called Assyrian King List (AKL), extant in copies from the 11th to 8th centuries BC, provides a list of Assyrian rulers from the beginning of Assyrian rule in the late 3rd millennium, down to Shalmaneser V, son of Tiglathpileser III (8th century) (edition: Glassner 2004: 136-155 with further literature). Different from the Kültepe Eponym List (KEL, see above Section 1.3), it includes the earliest rulers who declared independence from Akkadian and Ur III rule, probably called those "whose names were written on bricks". The AKL begins with "17 kings who dwelt in tents" and "10 kings who are ancestors". The direct successor of the group listed below, Erishum, is the first king mentioned by KEL and attributed a reign of 40 years.

91 Marchesi 2006a: 126-127.
92 Marchesi 2006a: 130 suggests an identification with Lugalanatum who was ensi₁ of Umma during the Gutean overrule, see below 8.6.2.
93 Wilcke 2011: 36f.
94 Veenhof 2008: 31-32 states that "if the reign of Erishum started in ca. 1974 BC, there are only ca. thirty years after the end of Ur III in which we have to fit the rulers preceding him. They are in the first place his direct predecessors, nos. 30-32 of AKL, the last two known from original inscriptions, in which Puzur-Aššur I, presumably the founder of a new dynasty, is mentioned as their ancestor. These three rulers, father, son, and grandson, are enough to fill these thirty years and it is very uncertain whether we have to fit in here also nos. 27-29, about whom almost nothing is known, neither their genealogy, nor the length of their reigns, nor their chronological position. Only Kikkiya is mentioned in a later inscription as builder of the city-wall, but Akiya and Sulili are completely unknown outside the AKL and texts which use or reflect it, unless one identifies Sulili with an ensi of Assur called Shulu, who is known only from a later seal impression (...). If so, he can be inserted before Puzur-Aššur I, possibly the first ruler of an independent Assur, with only a short rule, if he had begun his career as the last governor of Assur under the Ur III empire. But there is no proof for this solution."
The Eponym Lists from Kültepe corroborate the historical beginning of the Assyrian King List with king Erishum. This is in accordance with the statement from the Assyrian King List that the first eponyms known date from Erishum's reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sulili (var. Sulê), son of Aminu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kikkiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Akiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>[Puzu]rassur (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>[I]lashuma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 17 kings who dwelt in tents (names of 17 rulers)
Total: 10 kings who were ancestors (names of 10 rulers)

(27) Sulili (var. Sulê), son of Aminu
(28) Kikkiya
(29) Akiya
(30) [Puzu]rassur (I)
(31) Shalimahum
(32) [I]lashuma.

Total: 6 kings whose names were written on (?) bricks (but) whose eponyms are not known (?)
(33) Erishum (I), son of Ilushuma, [whose eponyms] are numbered 40, reigned
(34) Igunum, son of Irishum, reigned [... years (...)

The kings from this section (AKL no. 27 to 32) most probably ruled after the end of the Ur III period at Assur. Assur was the northernmost provincial capital of the empire of Ur, its governor Zarríqum is known as “general” (šakkanakkum) of Assur from an inscription dedicated to his overlord Amarsuena of Ur (RIME 3/2.1.3.2001) and as “governor” (ensi) or “man” (lu) of Assur from Š 47 to AS 5. Since the court of Ur kept good relations with its northern vassal, Shimanum, until Ibbisuen year 1, there is no reason to assume that Assur defected from the rule of Ur before then. Assur may have become independent, along with other distant provinces like Eshnuna or Susa, after the year Ibbisuen 3 (≈ MC 2024).

The KEL corroborates the figure of 40 years attributed to Erishum (no. 33) by the AKL. This allows us to place Erishum in the Middle Chronology (MC 1972-1993); the six rulers nos. 27-32 belong to the 52 years MC 2023(?)-1971. Aminu (father of no. 27) is named without title, as overlord, in a seal inscription (RIMA A.0.26.2001). Kikkiya, Puzurassur (I), Ilushuma and Erishum are also attested by inscriptions, whereas Sulili can possibly be identified with Silulu (RIMA A.0.27.1). Four or five out of six “kings who were ancestor” are thus independently attested as historical persons. Here we cite only the Silulu inscription, since the format of the god city as divine “king” and the ruler as his “governor” (ensi) represents the local development of the former relationship between the divine Ur III king and his governor, which is known at Assur and Eshnuna.

RIMA 1 A.0.27.1 1-5:

ašur ašur, ḫalgal, ušu lu, ensi, ašur, ḫalgal da-ki-ki šeši ašur, ḫalgal

“(City = god) Assur is king, Silulu is governor of (the city/land of) Assur, son of Dakiki, city-herald of Assur”

Kikkiya (no. 28) is mentioned preceding Igunum (no. 34, inscriptions RIMA 1 A.0.34.1-4) as the builder of Assur in a Middle Assyrian inscription of Assurreminisheshu (Akkadian Aššur-rēmi-nīṭētē; RIMA 1 A.0.70.1). Puzurassur, Shalimahum, Ilushuma and Erishum always represent father-to-son successions according to their inscriptions (RIMA 1 A.0.31.1, A.0.32.1-2, A.0.33.1-15). Erishum I (no. 33), who ruled for 40 years according to AKL and KEL, has left 17 inscriptions (RIMA A.0.33.1-17); this can be taken as one clear example that for less well attested periods within a series of rulers, an ambitious building program correlates with a long reign.

---

95 The assumption of Michalowski 2009 that Assur was not a province of Ur III was corrected by Barjamovic 2011: 4-5 n. 11.
96 Sallaberger 2007: 441 tb. 4, and 443-444.
98 The date for Erishum is given according to the new evidence of KEL G (see above Section 1.3), which results in a span of 196 years between Erishum year 1 and Shamshi-Adad’s last year, whereas Veenhof’s reconstruction led to 199 years (now 197 years in the REL after Barjamovic et al. 2012).
3. Sources II: Year Dates

3.1. Counting and Naming Years

The textual corpus of the 3rd millennium consists mainly of administrative and legal texts. These archival texts become a primary historical source by the notation of a year date, which refers to a specific ruler. Firstly, this directly indicates the political affiliation of the place where the document was written, and secondly, the full range of year dates indicates not only the duration of reigns, but year formulae also inform us about the most important deeds of a ruler. Timekeeping in cuneiform sources is already attested in archaic texts from Uruk. The counting of years becomes a source for historical chronology in the Presargonic period. While most cities of Sumer were part of a pan-Babylonian organization during the Fara period, Presargonic sources testify to political particularism and continuous struggles between rival city-states. Given that the counting of years is first attested in the Presargonic period, characterized by political fragmentation, methods of counting usually differ from one city state to another.

Two modes of year dates were used in Mesopotamia in the 3rd millennium, namely counting the years of a ruler, or naming a year by a remarkable deed of the ruler. The relative amount of dated tablets varies considerably. Whereas Presargonic tablets from Girsu are frequently dated by referring to the regnal year and, in many cases, to the respective name of the ruler, Sargonic texts, with the exception of the counting of years and months at Umma, rarely bear a year date. During the Late Akkad, Lagash II and early Ur III periods, year dates were much rarer than during the peak-time of the Ur III empire, when a year date became common usage.

Besides year names, administrative texts sometimes include occasional datings. These can refer, for example, to royal journeys, military events, or other unusual circumstances, but they should not be mixed up with “true” year or month names.

3.1.1 The Beginnings of Dating Systems

Evidence for timekeeping can be traced back as far as the archaic texts from Uruk. Third millennium timekeeping methods have been outlined by Englund (1988). In archaic texts from Uruk, the growing complexity of the economy necessitated the invention of precise methods of timekeeping, by year, month and day. Though these methods of timekeeping are found in texts dealing with the administration of large-scale households, e.g. in accounts of barley allotments for a certain number of days, they may be regarded as the earliest precursors of methods for recording the date; from this eventually developed the later practice of dating by regnal years. This is demonstrated by the fact that the cuneiform signs employed in Presargonic and later timekeeping can be traced back to their archaic precursors.

Dating is attested from the Fara period onwards (see below Section 4.5). Texts could be dated by reference to year, month and day, though it is not clear on which year count the date was based. The so-called bala formula, often found in the subscripts of sale documents, has frequently been interpreted as a reference to the era of an official, but it may rather denote an official involved in the legal act documented. Consequently, the dating practice in the texts from the Fara period cannot, as yet, be considered a source for chronology.

The following dated texts are known: an administrative text from Fara dated by counting month or day (TSŠ 150), one account from Abu Salabikh written in Akkadian dated by counting years and a month name (IAS 508), and another administrative account from Abu Salabikh with a subscript preserving an (Akkadian) month name only (IAS 513).

99 For a general survey see Englund 1988.
100 Powell 1978: 13; on the palaeographic differences, see Englund 1988: 183.
102 See Englund 1988: 183 for the palaeography of time notations in texts from the Uruk IV and Djemdet Nasr to Old Babylonian periods.
In the royal archives of Palace G at Ebla (Mardikh) some documents are provided with a subscript indicating the most important event of that year. Up to now, some 30 dates of this kind are attested. These formulae can refer to important political events, e.g. a military expedition, or the destruction of a certain city, and they provide valuable information for a chronology. These subscripts occur irregularly and are, in most cases, found on one tablet only; furthermore they often seem to be related to the contents of the tablet, especially in the case of the annual summary accounts where many expenditures were conditioned by the event that was addressed in the subscript. These occasional indications of the year cannot be regarded as year formulae proper, which were used independently of the text’s content and on texts of various genres. The Ebla year names were certainly intended to determine the time of the administrative account through reference to an outstanding event; the same intention can be detected in the roughly contemporary Presargonic texts from Lagash, where besides the standard set of month names some documents refer to single outstanding events (like a falling star, Nik. 1, 2 = Selz 1989a: no. 2). The reference to a unique, memorable event – which could actually only be recalled by contemporaries – thus precedes the standardized order of month names or of obligatory year names, which were documented and thus preserved for future generations.

The second case demonstrates that the occasion of the subscript justifies the contents of the tablet and thus cannot be labelled a ‘year date’.

In administrative accounts year dates can precede the final summary:

Contrary to Babylonian year names that usually occur in the subscript of a tablet, Eblaite year names are occasionally found at the beginning of a tablet, e.g. a treaty:

Sometimes, a year following a certain event appears:

The occasions mentioned in the “datings” of Ebla refer to the political events and activities of the royal court. Military expeditions (Ni(g₂, KAS₃)₃, defeats and conquests of cities feature prominently in more than a third of the year dates; but successful wars always saw a major exchange of goods from the royal treasury, the income of

---

106 For a provisional list of Eblaite year names, see Pettinato 1979: xxxii-xxiii, with some additions found in Archi 1996a: 11-13; Biga 2008.

107 For a provisional list of texts see Pettinato 1979: XXXIV.
Sources II: Year Dates

booty and the expenditure of gifts for the victorious general and his army, so the occasion may explain part of the transactions listed in the document. The conclusion of a treaty (called "oil offering") is only exceptionally mentioned (Pettinato 1979: xxxiii no. 18 = Archi 1996a: 12, 74.102, with Mari). Much rarer are references to interdynastic royal marriages (e.g. Pettinato 1979: no. 3, 1 mu du.du ma-lik-tum na-gar, i.e. "year when the queen went to Nagar").

The death of the ruler appears more often, and here the rulers from Syrian or Upper Mesopotamian states (e.g. Mari, Kakmium) are named, as well as the king of Ebla (Irakbadamu) or his mighty "chancellor" Ilium (cf. the examples above). Once, one encounters the birth of the crown-prince Iraqdamu (Pettinato 1979: no. 27, ARET 1, 40). The formulation of a handful of year dates is still difficult to understand.

3.1.3 Mari

The slightly later administrative texts from the Presargonic palace of Mari (Charpin 1987a; 1989; Horioka 2009; Charpin 2009) often count the year and indicate the Semitic month name. Counting days is attested in the list sections of some texts (Charpin 1987a: 90-91).

The texts can be grouped chronologically into two. The first group consists of texts found at Chantier B that bear year datings ranging from the 18th to 35th year. These texts have been attributed either to the reign of Hidar, the last king of Mari known from the texts of Ebla (Charpin 2005) or to the earlier king Iplu(s)il (Marchesi, in this volume).

The second group (Charpin 1987a: groups C and D) is dated from the 2nd to 8th year; these dates should be attributed to his successor Ishqimari (Charpin 2005) or to an alleged later king (Marchesi & Marchetti 2011: 139; Marchesi, this volume).

The format of the dates is explained by these examples:

Charpin 1987a: no. 5: itti za-lul 6 mu "month Zalul, year 6" (Ishqimari? 6)
Charpin 1989: no. 38: itti gi-ni 18 mu "month Gi-ni, year 18" (Hidar? 18)
Charpin 1987a: no. 33: itti ha-li 35 mu "month Hali, year 35" (Hidar? 35)

3.1.4 Lagash/Girsu

In texts from Babylonia proper dating from the Presargonic period, dating texts by years was more common. At Girsu (Tello) and Lagash (al Hiba) administrative and legal texts were dated by counting years and an occasional reference to a ruler from the time of Enentarzi, at the latest. The few earlier texts, which can be traced back to Enanatum I, perhaps Eanatum, omit the ruler’s name. The earliest text dated by year only stems from the time of Enanatum I: it can be ascribed to his reign by the occurrence of the ruler’s son:

BiMes. 3, 10 = OIP 104, 23 rev. iv 1-7:


“When Shunialdugud, his son, bought the Gelugal field from Lummatur, its territory was divided. (Year) 4.”

Earlier texts, dated by year only, are perhaps as early as Eanatum, but due to the omission of the ruler’s name in these early accounts, their precise attribution remains uncertain.


The earliest legal text that mentions the name of the ruling governor stems from the time of Enmetena and is dated to his 19th year; it also names Enentarzi as temple administrator of Ningirsu:

RTC 16 rev. ii 3-iii 3:

u₂₄ ba en-mete-na ensi₁₄ lagas₄₃-kam en-en₄₉ tar-zi sa₃₂₃ nin-gir₄ su-ka-kam 20c la₂₃ lc

“At this time, Enmetena was governor of Lagash. Enentarzi was temple administrator of Ningirsu. (Year) 19.”

During the reigns of Enentarzi, Lugalanda and Urukagina, reference to the regnal year of a given ruler becomes standard procedure. In addition, the subscripts often also contain the month name, as the following example of an early ration list demonstrates:

Likewise, an administrative text is dated to Ent. 19 (NFT 181 AO 4156).
In the notation of the year, figures higher than 10 are simply indicated by numerical signs. Figures from 1 to 9 are indicated by cuneiform numericals divided by a long horizontal stroke. Perhaps, this horizontal stroke represents a simplified sign MU "year", or it can be deduced from archaic precursors.

Year names are not attested at Lagash, but a few, so-called, occasional month names that refer to outstanding occurrences do mention political events (e.g. Nik. 1, 2 = Selz 1989a: no. 2; Nik. 1, 227 = Selz 1989a: no. 227; DP 545, see below 6.1.).

3.1.5 Umma and Zabalam

Counting regnal years, months and days is also attested at Presargonic Umma and Zabalam. Numbers are usually given in cuneiform numerical signs; the figures for the years lower than 10 are often designated by a ligature of cuneiform numbers and the sign MU "year".

The oldest attestations for counting years are attested in land sale documents dated to the 8th regnal year of Enakale and the 1st regnal year of Urlumma:

Bauer 2012: 58-59, no. 1 vii (= rev. iii) 1-5:
\[ \text{u₄-ba  en-a₃-kal-ē  ensi₃  u₄-ma₃} \text{(} \text{geš₃-kuš₃} \text{)} \text{ 8c  mu  iti 10c  la₂ 1c} \]
"At this time Enakale was governor of Umma. Year 8, month 9."

Arnaud 2007: 6-12, 69 no. 1 rev. ii 1-3 (see also Bauer 2012: 59-60 no. 2):
\[ \text{u₄-ba  ur₄-lum-ma  ensi₃  u₄-ma₃} \text{(} \text{geš₃-kuš₃} \text{)} \text{ (...)} \text{ 9c  mu} \]
"At this time Urlumma was governor of Umma. (...) Year 1."

His successor Il is also referred to in the date formula of a land-sale document, his regnal year, however, is not referred to (TCBI 2, 1; see below Section 5.2).

There are a total of ca. 460 administrative and legal texts encompassing a time-span beginning with, at least, Urlumma's successor Il, down to the reign of Lugalzagesi, the last independent ruler of Presargonic Umma. They can be divided into four chronologically discrete groups:

1) The earliest significant group from Zabalam includes ca. 50 administrative texts (TCBI 2, I-1 to I-48); ca. 75 % of these texts are dated after the regnal year of an unnamed ruler and the current month, and attest dates from years 1 to 15. The figures for year, month and day are designated by the usual cuneiform numbers and the signs MU and ITT, "year" and "month", respectively, e.g.:

\[ \text{TCBI 2, I-12:} \]
\[ 1;0.0 \text{ še  gur  il₁}  \text{ dumu  } \text{eš₃-n₃-da } \text{x₁l₄u₂  adab₄} 12c  \text{ mu } 6c  \text{ iti} \]
"1 kor barley: Il, son of eš₃-n₃-da, the man from Adab. Year 12, month 6."

\[ \text{TCBI 2, I-14:} \]
\[ 5;0.0 \text{ še  gur } 13c  \text{ iti } 11c \]
"5 gur of barley. Year 13, month 11"

More texts belonging to this group have recently been published by Monaco 2011b.

It is reasonable to assume that as with Presargonic Girsu/Lagash, the mu-itti dates at Umma refer to the regnal years of the city-state’s ruler. So, a new count beginning with "year 1" most probably marks the succession of a new ruler (see below 5.3.2. sub no. 4.).

---

112 For the archival context and additional texts belonging to this archive see Schrakamp 2008: 670-673.
2) A group of 20 administrative texts, dealing with grain and harvest, is dated to the reign of Ushurdu, one of Lugalzagesi’s predecessors. Texts belonging to this group can include the ruler’s name and his regnal year:

\[ u\text{-}su\text{-}ru, (lal₂\text{-}tu₂g₂)\text{-}du₁₀ \text{ ud.mud.nun} \ 7 \text{c mu } \]

"Ushurdu (was) ud.mud.nun. Year 7."

More texts belonging to this group have recently been published by Monaco 2011b.

3) A later group of ca 110 texts comes from the temple of Inana of Zabalam, from the time of Lugalzagesi (see more in detail below 3.3). These documents are dated by counting year, month, and day and reference to the ruler’s name. The year-dates include a time-span from the 6th to 8th years.

A single text dated to the 16th year (\textit{Santag} 7, 5; see below) can be ascribed to this archive on prosopographical grounds. As each element can be omitted, four types of dating occur: 1) by year alone, 2) by day alone (\textit{e.g.} \textit{Steinkeller} 1992a: no. 3; \textit{BIN} 8, 82), 3) by year and month, 4) by year, month and day (only \textit{BIN} 8, 116 rev. i 1-2: "year 7, month 1, day 7").

Dated by year alone with mention of the ruler’s name:

\[ \text{\textit{BIN}} 8, 86 \text{ rev. (similarly \textit{e.g.} \textit{Powell} 1978: no. 1 rev. iii):} \]

\[ a\text{-}s₃₃ \text{ gid}_2 \text{-}[da] \text{ še\text{-}ud} \ u₄ \text{ da } \text{ śp}esz₃ \text{ ama\text{-}para}_{₁₀\text{-}śi} \text{ gu\text{-}sur} \text{ lugal\text{-}za₃\text{-}ge\text{-}si} \text{ ensi} \ _{10} \text{c.} \]

"Field measured (...) (in the domain) ‘Side of the Figs’. Amaparagesi, the \textit{surveyor}. Lugalzagesi, governor. Year 7."

The ruler’s name can be omitted (\textit{e.g.} \textit{Powell} 1978: no. 4); sometimes a month was added, and a unique reference to a later year probably assigned to Lugalzagesi (or a local successor?) writes the word \textit{mu} "year"

\[ \textit{Santag} 7, 5 \text{ rev. ii:} \]

\[ \text{i₃} \text{ ištaran\text{-}ta} \ _{16} \text{c mu } \text{i₃} \text{ c iti } \]

"expended from the temple of Ishtaran. Year 16, month 13."

But also a simple reference to the ruler with omission of the year was possible:

\[ \text{\textit{BIN}} 8, 82 \text{ rev. iii:} \]

\[ a\text{-}s₃₃ \text{ gid}_2 \text{-}[da] \text{ še\text{-}ud} \ u₄ \text{ da } \text{ śp}esz₃ \text{ ama\text{-}para}_{₁₀\text{-}śi} \text{ gu\text{-}sur} \text{ lugal\text{-}za₃\text{-}ge\text{-}si} \text{ ensi} \ _{10} \text{c.} \]

"Field measured (...) (in the domain) kar\text{-}na₄. Amaparagesi, the \textit{surveyor}. Lugalzagesi, governor."

A full date using ligatures consisting of a horizontal stroke and cuneiform numerals for year, month and day runs as follows:

\[ \text{\textit{BIN}} 8, 116 \text{ rev. ii 1:} \]

\[ 7 \text{c (mu) i₃ (iti) 7 (u₄) } \]

"year 7, month 1, day 7"

4) Four records are dated to the 24th, 28th-30th year of an unnamed ruler. As Lugalzagesi reigned for 25 years according to the \textit{SKL}, a dating to his reign is precluded for the texts dated to the 28th to 30th year; these texts are, therefore, attributed to one of his predecessors. The tablet dated to the 24th year could theoretically date from Lugalzagesi’s penultimate year (see below 5.3.2. no. 8 and no. 12).

The texts are dated by year and month, omitting the ruler’s name (\textit{TCBI} 2, I-48: “year 24 month 9”; \textit{Powell} 1978: no. 6: “year 29 month 13”), or by year alone (\textit{SAKF} 3: “year 28”; \textit{BIN} 8, 63: “year 30”).

---

113 Milone 2005.
114 G. Marchesi has drawn our attention to the fact that the alleged month name "i₃ iti mu d-nun", as read by Milone, is a phantom, taking into account the fact that the month would follow the year name and that ud.mud.nun is always written after Ushurdu’s name.
116 The attribution of the text to the archive is ascertained by the occurrence of \textit{ur₃₃\text{-}nin\text{-}dulum₃ (nagar\text{-}bu) i₃\text{-}du₄} "Urninduluma, the gate-keeper" in \textit{Santag} 7, 5 obv. i 2-i 1, who is also attested in \textit{BIN} 8, 86 obv. iv 1-2 and \textit{Steinkeller} 1992a: no. 3 obv. i 6; note that the typical year notations known from Zabalam pertain only to numbers below 10 (see above the introduction to this section).
117 Powell 1978: 11-12; \textit{Steinkeller} 1992a: 5 n. 18; \textit{Sallaberger} 2004: 25 n. 26; \textit{Schrakamp} 2008: 708; \textit{Monaco} 2010; 2011a; see in detail Section 5.2 below.
Two recently published sale documents from Zabalam refer to a ruler named Meanedu, who ruled for at least for 27 years (Ozaki 2008: no. 1-2; see below in Section 5.2). It is reasonable to ascribe the fourth group of the Zabalam documents to Meanedu.118

3.1.6 Year Names from Other Presargonic Texts

Presargonic year names are attested in texts from Nippur stemming from the time of Enshakushana of Uruk, Lugalzagesi of Uruk and Umma after his victory over Nippur, Meskigala of Adab, and Sargon of Akkad. They refer to important political events, e.g. the siege or defeat of a certain city, or to building activities, and provide an important source for chronology. Occasionally one finds dates referring to important officials, e.g. an ensi and a temple administrator, or, the so-called occasional date formulae. These date formulae are a most reliable source for chronology.

It should be noted in passing that a Lugalzagesi year date exists at Nippur (TMH 5, 82; see below), but that at Umma/Zabalam his years were counted (see Section 3.1.5); was it a local Nippur habit to date by events, or, was the proclamation of a year date considered a prerogative of the dominant king of Sumer? However, even e.g. at Nippur one finds an exceptional example of the count of months rather than the naming of them (OSP 1, 80: u₄ 11 iti 2 “day 11, month 2”).

3.1.7 Sargonic Period

While year names only rarely appear during the last years of the Presargonic period, they tend to become more common in administrative texts from the Sargonic period. The scarcity of year names from the time of Sargon and his sons is probably due to the small number of Early Sargonic administrative texts; year names are found on some tablets from Nippur and Adab. There are more cities that contribute date formulae for Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri, but still only a small percentage of the ca. 7,000 Sargonic administrative texts bears a year name. The Sargonic year names mostly refer to the military undertakings of the kings of Akkad and they can often be related to events reported in royal inscriptions.

The chronological order of the events memorized in inscriptions and year dates remains unknown. Neither do the royal inscriptions note the correct chronological order, nor are any date lists preserved. Finally, the evidence of year names from Classic Sargonic administrative and legal texts is still too meagre to reconstruct the relative order of the date formulae.

Most dates appear in administrative texts from Umma, where years (mu), months (iti), and days (u₄) are counted in the so-called “mu-iti texts”.119 This applies to both Early Sargonic (Umma A) and Classic Sargonic (Umma B and C) texts from official archives.120 At times, the figures of year, month, or day can be omitted (e.g. USP 15: “Month 1”). An example for the full dating is:

USP 9 (Umma A):
680 ḡurūš, 60 ḡurūs ensî-ka, sur, a-ra: 40c-kam-ma, [niĝ₂] gu-₄-a, kiĝ₂ aka 10c: iti 16c: u₄,
5c mu 3c iti 10c: la₃: 1c u₄.

“680 workers, 60 workers of the governor, corvée troops supplied for the 40th time, work done: 10 months, 16 days.
Year 5, month 3, day 9”

The ratio behind the dating system at Umma is not yet fully understood. It has been suggested that the years refer to the regnal years of a local governor of Umma, or to the regnal years of the Akkadian king. The year dates available are as follows:

- mu-iti Archive A (Early Sargonic, time of Sargon): year 1-6
- mu-iti Archive B (Middle/Classic Sargonic): year 1-25
- mu-iti Archive C (Classic Sargonic): year 1-15

Until now methods like prosopography have not yet allowed a reconstruction of a sequence of administrative tablets that would put a tablet with year date 1 directly after a higher number, thus it has not been possible to detect the start of a new year count (see above 3.1.5 on the probable sequence, year 15-year 1 in Presargonic Umma). Such a sequence would be a great help in correlating the count of years, either for the reigns of Akkadian kings (and to test the Sumerian King List) or for the governors of Umma. In any case the question is still debated as to whether the mu-iti dates count the regnal years of the Sargonic king (e.g. Foster) or the dates of the local governor (Marchesi).121

118 See also Marchesi this volume.
119 On dating methods in Sargonic texts from Umma, see Powell 1978: 9-13; Foster 1982a: 1; Englund 1988: 144-145 nn. 17-18; for earlier literature on the mu-iti datings, see Foster 1979.
120 These archives have been dealt with by Foster 1982a.
121 On the chronology and documentation of the Sargonic governors of Umma, see Foster 1982a: 152-156 with additions and corrections in Carroué 1985; Frayne et al. 1989; Frayne 1993: 261; Salgues 2011; Marchesi 2011a.
Steinkeller assumes that the year count in the later mu-iti archive refers to the king’s, namely Sharkalisharri’s, regnal years. A reference to a royal trip to Sumer is found on a tablet dated to year 1:

CT 50, 52 rev. ii 7-11 (cf. BRM 1, 26; MCS 9, 247 = Cripps 2010: no. 42; Steinkeller 1992a: no. 27)

lugal ki-en-gi-še, i₁-gēn-na-a zabalam,₁₀ a i₁,gid₁,da-am₁, Jr mu 2č erti
“When the king went to Sumer, it was deducted in Zabalam. Year 1, Month 2.”

This interpretation seems to be corroborated by a year name found on a tablet from Nippur, which seems to imply that the journey to Sumer was undertaken in Sharkalisharri’s beginning year.

PBS 5, 38 = OSP 2, 100 (Nippur) (see above Section 3.2.2)

mu sar-ga₂₅,lugal-ri₂₅, ki-en-gi₁₄,šē₂₅, im-ta-e₁₅, da [dub]-sāg-gā₂₅, mu us₂₂,bi₁₄
“Year when Sharkalisharri came down to Sumer; following year of the first.”

Or does the formulation refer not to the “first, foremost” (dub-sāg) year but to the first trip to Sumer (see below Section 3.2.2)? Be that as it may, the evidence of the administrative text from Umma leaves no doubt that Sharkalisharri undertook a trip to Sumer in the first year of the mu-iti dating system. This can be interpreted as a goodwill action of the Sargonic ruler to ascertain the loyalty of the Sumerian governors, an urgently needed royal initiative after the upheavals during his predecessors’ reigns; there are no indications that the king needed a (second?) coronation at Sumer or Nippur. The king’s journey to Sumer was thus not necessarily conditioned by his taking up office.

In contrast, Foster prefers to correlate the year count with the regnal year of the Umma governor since Presargonic mu-iti datings evidently only refer to the years of the local ensi (see above 3.1.5). Along the same line, Steinkeller suggests that both Sharkalisharri and the respective ensi of Umma assumed their offices during the same year, but relates the dating to the first year of Sharkalisharri.

The figures of years attested in the Umma mu-iti system (see above) do not help to solve the puzzle. High numbers are missing, something we would expect if the end of Naramsuen’s reign (who probably ruled for more than 50 years) was covered by the mu-iti texts. However, the possibility that the later mu-iti group only started with Sharkalisharri and that all years refer to his reign or to that of his successors, cannot be excluded.

A re-evaluation of the evidence shows that there are no clear indications that the figures of years refer to the regnal years of Sargonic kings. This is also indicated by the absence of an over-regional system of dating and the lack of higher figures of years for the Classic Sargonic mu-iti archive (mu-iti C) that we would expect given the long reign of Naramsuen, and by the fact that the mu-iti datings originated as a means of dating years of the ensi of Umma.

The mu-iti A tablets are dated to years 1 to 6. These figures cannot refer to the regnal years of Sargonic kings: prosopographical links with the earlier Umma tablets dated to Lugalzagesi show that the archive is a Sargonic continuation of Presargonic administrative practice. Several officials are attested from the 6th year of Lugalzagesi to the 5th year of the mu-iti A archive. As Lugalzagesi was defeated by Sargon in his 25th year, the time-span between Luzag 6 and mu-iti A 5 is at least 23 years. Because Sargon defeated Lugalzagesi around his 25th year, the figure of 5 years cannot refer to his reign. Likewise, a reference to the regnal years of Sargon’s immediate successor can be ruled out as this would imply an unrealistically long period of activity for the officials mentioned in both archives. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the mu-iti A figures refer to the regnal year of the local ruler of Umma (see above 3.1.5, 5.2. no. 4). The officials mentioned in both archives would then have been in office for at least 23 years. On that basis, probably all mu-iti A datings that include years 1 to 6 can be attributed to

---

122 Steinkeller 1992a: 56-57; Cripps 2010: 11.
124 On the different restorations [men[ sar-ga₂₅,ga₂₅, [2]₅,sa₅,g₅a₂₅, [dub]-sāg-g₅a₂₅, see Section 3.2.2.
126 Foster 1982a: 7; 1993c: 443-444.
127 Steinkeller 1992a: 57; Cripps 2010: 11.
129 I.e., 19 + 5 years (= Luzag 6 to Luzag 25 + mu-iti A 1 to 5).
130 I.e., ca. 24 + 15 + 5 years (= Luzag 6 to 25 + Sargon’s defeat of Lugalzagesi in Luzag 25 + mu-iti A 1 to 5).
131 For a dating of mu-iti A to Sargon, see A. Westenholz 1984: 76-78; P. Steinkeller 1987b: 183; A. Westenholz 1999: 39 with n. 118; Visicato 2000: 88-89; for a later dating, see Foster 1982a: 8-10; Foster 1993d: 175.
The tablets of the mu-iti B archive include dates from years 1 to 25 and could thus be dated to the first half of the reign of Naramsuen. A Sharkalisharri date is hardly possible for reasons of their Middle/Classic Sargonic tablet shape and palaeography that characterizes both earlier and later tablets of this archive (e.g. MAD 4, 24: year 5; MAD 4, 19: year 10; MAD 4, 56: year 15; MAD 4, 156: year 19; Steinkeller 1992a: no. 18: year 4; Steinkeller 1992a: no. 19: year 23), as well as attestations of the so-called vowel harmony (e.g. MAD 4, 19 rev. 4; year 10; MAD 4, 31 obv. 6; MAD 4, 33 rev. 3; 6; MAD 4, 75 rev. 5; year 15). Though clear indications for precise dating are lacking, the mu-iti B archive must pre-date the mu-iti C archive.

The mu-iti C archive includes dates from year 1 to 15. Dating to the Classic Sargonic period, i.e. the time of Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri, is indicated by their Classic Sargonic shape and palaeography; so dating to the early reign of Naramsuen can be excluded on palaeographic grounds. If the number of years refers to the regnal years of the kings of Akkad, the texts would therefore have to be dated to the time of Sharkalisharri. The occurrence of an "ešrum" (or possibly 7th, see below) year of Mesag, governor of Umma, make this possibility rather unlikely; provided one does not assume that two governors were successively in office during the same year. Foster ascribes the mu-iti C archive to the reign of Sharkalisharri. His argument is as follows: the high Akkadian official Eritbmer (ešrum-me-ir, Akkadian Yešib-Mēr) had holdings of land when Mesag was governor (USP 18). Eritbmer already held an influential position at the court of Akkad under Naramsuen and succeeded Shuashatakel as "prime minister" (šabra eši); he occurs in administrative texts from Giru, along with the king and queen and (the crown-prince) Sharkalisharri. Consequently, Foster argues that all the texts from the governorship of Mesag date to the lifetime of Sharkalisharri, i.e. the reign of Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri. Recently published Naramsuen year names could indicate that the mu-iti C archive also included the (later) reign of Naramsuen; these year names stem from tablets of the so-called Mesag estate that included the (later) reign of Naramsuen, i.e. the reign of Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri. Foster argues that all the texts from the governorship of Mesag date to the lifetime of Sharkalisharri, and Sharkalisharri. The mu-iti C archive refers to the office of the king and queen, and (the crown-prince) Sharkalisharri. Consequently, Foster argues that all the texts from the governorship of Mesag date to the lifetime of Sharkalisharri, i.e. the reign of Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri. Foster has recently argued, to Su'ushkin/Shurushken. The texts from the temple of Inana at Zabalam dated to Lugalzagesi mention the same officials as the Early Sargonic mu-iti A tablets, and administrative texts from the temple of Inana at Zabalam dated to Lugalzagesi mention the same officials as the Early Sargonic mu-iti A tablets.

132 Foster 1982a: 154; Marchesi 2011a: esp. n. 19-20; Marchesi in this volume, at n. 101. Note that Visicato 2010b: 260; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 7, argue that Ennalum was preceeded by a governor of Umma Su'ushkin (or Shurushken). The texts from the temple of Inana at Zabalam dated to Lugalzagesi mention the same officials as the Early Sargonic mu-iti A tablets, see preceding notes. Marchesi proposes that Shurushken was Ennalum’s successor; he cannot be identified with the namesake, an official's subordinate, mentioned in the Manishtushu Obelisk.

133 Foster 1982a: 4-5.

134 Foster 1982a: 53 (including some misquotations).


137 Foster 1982a: 3-6.

138 USP 58 = Foster 1982a: 129-130 rev. 5'-8', 12': šu-dumi₃₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇, ešrum-u₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇, ešrum-mu₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇, ešrum-dub-sar₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇. This reading has been assured by collation according to E. Salgues, pers. comm.
3.1.8 From Late Sargonic to Ur III

During the Late Akkad period, occasional date formulae are attested in administrative texts and inscriptions from Umma. The dates refer to political events or circumstances, e.g. they name the Gutian overlord of Umma, or mention the attack of a Late Akkadian ruler against enemy cities (administrative text: Wilcke 1974-1977: 84-85 i 7-9; FAOS 7 Gutium 2 = RIME 2.11.12.1; FAOS 7 Gutium 3 = RIME 2.11.13.1, see below Section 8.4.2).

Administrative texts from Gudea's Lagash II dynasty at times bear year dates referring to the governors (ensi) of Lagash; instead of political deeds, they pertain to building programmes and cultic matters. For the Ur III dynasty, the few dates from Urnammu and some early year dates from Shulgi lack the standardized, obligatory form and may even refer to local events. Only the date formulae from the later reign of Shulgi onwards are characterized by an obligatory wording referring to the most important events of the state.\(^{148}\)

Historical evaluation of year dates has to account for the time span between the event recorded and the year date, and for the hierarchy of royal deeds when dating years. In the first instance, a name-giving event usually took place in the year before, which is especially true for the first regnal year, “NN king (lugal)”. If no royal deed considered important enough for a year name had occurred, the following (Sumerian us) year continued with the previous year name. Sometimes, after a few months of such a year suddenly the dates change to a new year name; a clear sign that this event took place early in the year (e.g. Shusuen’s Shimanum campaign early in his third year).\(^{149}\) Secondly, the hierarchy of royal deeds considered relevant for dating a year does not meet a modern historian’s expectations. In this regard a view on the year names of Amarsuena is instructive: Years 2, 6, 7 are named after military expeditions; although such a successful expedition was also undertaken in year 4, year 4 was named after the installment of a high priest.\(^{150}\) Years 5, 8, and 9 are also named after the installment of high priests; another one took place in year 2, but year 3 was named after the dedication of a throne to the god Enlil. Thus, the dedication of a throne to a god was considered more important than the installment of a priest, and the installation of a priest was more important than a military expedition.\(^{151}\)

The more or less obligatory use of year names throughout the empire makes these statements the most widespread royal proclamations within the country. Their contents become, therefore, strongly fixed during the Ur III period. Furthermore, it implies that only one year-name is possible at any one time within the empire; therefore, two different year names can never be used at the same time and reconstructions of a “coregency” of Amarsuena and his successor Shusuen with the contemporary use of two year dates can be safely excluded.

3.2. Presargonic to Sargonic Year Dates from Babylonia

3.2.1 Presargonic and Early Sargonic Year Dates

**Enshakushana of Uruk: 3 dates;** see Westenholz 1975b: 115; RIME 1: 429

\[\text{mu } \text{en-ša₃-ku₃₂-an-\text{-c}na} \text{ kiši}_³ \text{ab-da-tuš-a}\]

“Year when Enshakushana laid siege to Kish”

Nippur: TMH 5, 158 = ECTJ 158 rev. 2-4 (= RIME 1.14.17, 1a)

\[\text{mu } \text{lu₂ unu}_³ \text{kiši}_³ \text{da i₃-da-tuš-a}\]

“Year when the man of Uruk laid siege to Kish”

Nippur: OSP 1, 101 rev. 3-6

\[\text{mu } \text{en-š[₃-ku₃₂-an-na]} \text{ ag-\{g\}a-\text{de₃}[₃]} \text{ aga₃-kara₃ bi₃-se₃-\{g\}a}\]

“Year when Enshakushana defeated Akkad”

Nippur: TMH 5, 81 = ECTJ 81

\[\text{[mu] e[n-ša₃-k]u₃₂-an-na-ke₄ sa\text{g}ga iri-sa\text{g}-\text{rig}_{γ} i₃-dab₃-ba-a}\]

“[Year] when En[shak]ushana seized the temple administrator of Irisangrig”

Nippur: TMH 5, 222 = ECTJ 222 (Nippur). FAOS 7 D-58 Anonym 16b. The reading of the date follows Wilcke 1982: 47 n. 4.\(^{152}\)

---


\(^{149}\) Sallaberger 2007: 443-444 n. 128.

\(^{150}\) On AS 4, see now Wu 2010.

\(^{151}\) See Sallaberger 1999: 164.

\(^{152}\) The proposal of Wilcke l.c. to identify Il with the homonymous governor of Umma (thus also Selz 2003: 506 n. 32) has now become impossible chronologically (see on the placement of II sections 5.2 and 5.3). An attribution of this date to Sargon was still considered possible by Sommerfeld 2009-2011: 46.
W. Sallaberger & I. Schrakamp

mu l, sağğa iri-sağ-rig, al-dab,-a
“Year when II, the temple administrator of Irisangrig, was seized”
Nippur: OSP 1, 110. Pre- or Early Sargonic. FAOS 7 D-57 Anonym 16b

Lugalzagesi of Uruk: 2 (or 1) date(s)
mu lugal-za,-g[e-si] nam-[lugal] šu ba-ti
“Year Lugalzagesi assumed kingship”
Nippur: TMH 5, 82 = ECTJ 82, see Westenholz 1975b: 115 (4)

mu adab ki ḫulu-a
“Year Adab was destroyed”

Sargon (3 dates)
For the dates, all attested in Nippur texts, see Westenholz 1975b: 115; FAOS 7: 49-61; RIME 2: 8.

m[u sar-um]-gi-ne₂ [elamki²] mu-ḫulu-a
“Year when Sargon destroyed Elam”
Nippur: TMH 5, 85 = ECTJ 85. FAOS 7 D-4 Sargon 3 = RIME 2.1.1 Sargon (b)

mu sar-um-gi si-mur-umki²-šec₁ [i₁,šen-na-a³]
“Year when Sargon went to Simurrum”
Nippur: TMH 5, 151 = ECTJ 151; OSP 1, 145. FAOS 7 D-1 Sargon 1 = RIME 2.1.1 Sargon (d)

mu URUXA² mu-ḫulu-a
“Year when Sargon destroyed URUXA²”
Nippur: TMH 5, 181 = ECTJ 181; FAOS 7 D-2 Sargon 2a = RIME 2.1.1 Sargon (a)

mu URUXA² ḫulu-a
“Year when URUXA² was destroyed”
Nippur: TMH 5, 86 = ECTJ 86. FAOS 7 D-3 Sargon 2b = RIME 2.1.1. Sargon (a’)

Attributed to Sargon: 1 date
mu ma-ri₂ ki ḫulu-a
“Year when Mari was destroyed”
Nippur: ECTJ 80 obv. ii 6.rev. i 1; OSP 1, 102 rev. ii 6-7 (mu ma-ri₂ ki² ḫulu-a). FAOS 7 D-5 Sargon 4 = RIME 2.1.1 Sargon (iii c). For the attribution to Sargon, see below Section 6.5.

Meskigala of Adab: 2 dates; see Visicato 2010b; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 4-8. For anonymous year dates from Adab attributed to Meskigala see below.

mes-ki-ga[l-la], en[s₁₂], adabki², kur še²eren-t[a], im-[šen-na-am₃] / mes-ki-gal-la ensi₂ adabki² kur-še²eren-ku₃-ta im-šen-na-am₃
“(Year) when Meskigala, governor of Adab, [came] from the cedar mountains / from the mountains where cedar is cut”


Meskigala’s trip to the cedar mountains is also referred to in an inscription found on a statue (RIME 1.1.9.2001; see Cooper 1986: 17 Ad 6).

\[
\text{mu } i \text{, mes-ki-gal-la al-dun-na}
\]

“Year when the Meskigala canal was dug”

Adab: Visicato 2010b: 266–267 no. 2b rev. i 3–4

Anonymous Presargonic or Early Sargonic year dates from Nippur (7, 8 or 9 dates) and Adab (2 dates)

\[
\text{mu aš₂-na-<ak>₃ al-ḫul-la}
\]

“Year when Ashnak was destroyed”

Nippur: TMH 5, 100 = ECTJ 100 (FAOS 7 D-48 Anonym 7). For the reading aš₂-na-<ak>₃ see FAOS 7, 58; Steinkeller 1986: 34. For an attribution to Sargon, see Sommerfeld 2009-2011: 46.

\[
\text{mu umma(geškuš₂,kaskal₂)₃ hušu-a₃m₃}
\]

“Year when Umma was destroyed”

Adab: TCBI 1 no. 47 obv. ii 6–rev. i 1. Dated to the Presargonic or Early Sargonic period because of the occurrence of ur-nu ušgal e₁₁, also attested in OIP 14, 71 rev. ii 2 and CUSAS 11, 182 (Schrakamp 2008: 669, 687–688).

According to the history of Adab (see Pomponio, this volume) the date should most probably be ascribed to Sargon; this would coincide with the sequence of events whereby Adab was already part of Sargon’s empire when Umma was destroyed. On the basis of the occurrence of Meskigala’s well-known “captain” (nu-banda₃) di-₂₉u-tu, see Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 7 n. 41. For an attribution of the destruction to Sargon, see Sommerfeld 2009-2011: 46.

\[
\text{mu ġir₂-su₃ki hušu-a₃m₃ ensi₂₃ a-ga-de₃,še₃ i₁₇,še-a₃m₃}
\]

“Year when Girsu was destroyed and the governor (i.e. of Girsu) went to Akkad”


\[
\text{mu [...] e₃₅-su₅-gur-ra an-si-ga}
\]

“Year when the [foundation?] of Eshugur was inserted”

Nippur: OSP 1, 100 (FAOS 7 D-51 Anonym 10). Possibly Sargon (Sommerfeld 2009-2011: 46).

\[
\text{mu [...] e₅₃-gal gana₂.uz₂ in-du₂₈-a}
\]

“Year when [...] erected the palace of gana₂.uz₂”


*\[m]u zur-zur [...] \[x*]\[x₇\] e₃₅-gal lugal in-du₈₃-a

“Year when Zurzur [...] erected (the ... of?) the royal palace”

Nippur: TMH 5, 76 = ECTJ 76 (FAOS 7 D-53 Anonym 12). Cf. perhaps the preceding date; possibly Sargon (Sommerfeld 2009-2011: 46).

\[
\text{mu \[x\*\]...] ala[n ...] al-[x]-na-a}
\]

“Year when [...] the statue [...] was made(?)”


---

153 On this important person, see Such-Gutiérrez 2005–2006: 3, 35–36; TCBI 1, 73; Visicato 2010b: 263; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 2. On possible readings di-₉u-tu and sili₉u-tu, see e.g. Selz 1993a: 101; Marchesi 2006b: 206 n. 1; Sommerfeld 2007: 4 n. 8, 15 n. 53 (Diitu), citing earlier references.
mu a.sia.a.ab al-a₃
"Year: […] was made"

mu ₄₃a₃ akšak₃₄ nibru₃₅ i₃₆-dar-a
"Year when the (canal) River of Akshak … Nippur"

mu ₄₃i₃₄-am-si-Ḫ₃₅ar₃₆-dun-a
"year when the (canal) River of Amsi Ḫar was dug"

[...] uruda, […] du-na( ? )

Rimush: no year dates attributable; on OSP 1, 76 ("Adab destroyed") see above sub Lugalzagesi.
Manishtushu: no year dates attributable.

3.2.2 Sargonic Year Dates: Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri

Naramsuen
For the year dates, see FAOS 7: 50-53; RIME 2: 85-87; Sommerfeld 1999: 108-109, 124-125; Frayne 1992b: 623-625; 2001: 170-174; Salgues 2011. It is not absolutely clear if the absence of the divine determinative can be used as a decisive mark for chronological differentiation; in any case the divine determinative could only be used after a certain moment during Naramsuen’s reign (see below 7.2).

(A) 7 year dates without divine determinative

[mu] na-ra-am-₄₃Enзу [a-ab-b] a [i]gi-ni-m-še₂₄ i₃₅-gen-na-a kasšudul(REC169) ba-ɡar
"[Year]: When Naramsuen went to the U[p[er Sea]], he fought a battle"

in 1 μu na-ra-am-₄₃Enзу ar-ma-nam₃₅s₃₅a₃ [gē-š.R₃₅]i₃₅ B₃₅d₃₅,₃u-n₃₅-[gi-ir]
"Year Naramsuen defeated Armanum (and) razed its walls"

154 Without relevance is: FAOS 7 D-21 Naramsîn 14 = RIME 2.1.4 Naram-Sîn: in 1 μu […], "the year when …", Mugdan: AIA 8 = Foster 1982b: 42 no. 8 ii 9-10. Probably no year dates are the following references: Nippur: N 49 FAOS 7 D-17 Naramsîn 10: [mu] na-ra-am₃₅Enзу "year (when) Naramsuen (became king?)"; Nippur: N 182 (transliteration Gelb) = FAOS 7 D-18 Naramsîn 11, [mu n]a-ra-am₃₅Enзу-ič₃₅, "for Naramsuen".
Sources II: Year Dates

The fragmentary tablet CUXAS 13, 182 obv. 1’-3’ [...] ’[n]ir l-ensi, mu na-ra-am-[2]EN.ZU, lugal [x+]’, rev. 1’ [x’, ‘l-ensi, l-bal’] is certainly no year name since the ruler’s name is never followed by lugal in Sargonic year names and since the reading ur-wa-numi=ki”Armanum” proposed by Maiocchi 2009: 217 remains doubtful.155

“Year when Naramsuon destroyed Maribadan”

en-lil-ta tukul(2.1.4 Nârâm-Sîn (g). See Frayne 1998-2001: 170 § 4.1. The interpretation of the date is uncertain.
Nippur: NBC 10920 = Cohen 1976: 228. FAOS 7 D-11 Naramsîn 5a = RIME 2.1.4 Nârâm-Sîn (h). For the reading, see Westenholz 1999: 48 n. 152; Westenholz 1996: 119 (“on the published photograph, there is no room for [”] before na.”).

mu na-ra-am-[2]EN.ZU [si] a-ab-bu-nu-um[i] mu-ḫulu-a
“Year when Naramsuon destroyed Shabunum”

[i]š-ina-a-ne-[mu] na-ra-am-[2]EN.ZU c₂ [en-lil₂-ta tukul(ku)] an-na šu ba-ti
“Year: Naramsuon received the heavenly weapon from the temple of Enlil”

[...]

(B) 6 (or 7?) dates with divine determinative

“Year when the en priestess of Nanna, daughter of Naramsuan, was appointed by oracle”
Nippur: OIP 97, 82 no. 10. FAOS 7 D-60 Anonym 18 = RIME 2.1.4 Nârâm-Sîn (II)

“in the year when Naramsuon went on the expedition to Simurrum”
Nippur: FAOS 7 D-11 Naramsîn 5a = RIME 2.1.4 Nârâm-Sîn (h). For the reading, see Westenholz 1999: 48 n. 152; Westenholz 1996: 119 (“on the published photograph, there is no room for [”] before na.”).

“Year when Naramsuon destroyed Maribadan”

mu na-ra-am-[4]EN.ZU c₂ [en-lil₂-ta tukul(ku)] an-na šu ba-ti
“Year: Naramsuon received the heavenly weapon from the temple of Enlil”

[...]

Adab: Adab 404 = MAD 2, 201 no. 6. FAOS 7 D-7 Naramsîn 1 = RIME 2.1.4 Nârâm-Sîn (y)

ba-ba ensi₂ si-mu-ur₂ ri₂-im[i]k₂ mesu dug ensi₂ [a-ri]-a-me₂ ik-mi-ME
“in the year when Naramsuon defeated Simurrum at Kirasheniwe and captured Baba, the governor of Simurrum, (and) mesubudg, the governor of Arame”
Tutub: MAD 1, 217 = Sommerfeld 1999: 50 (ii)

Tutub: MAD 1, 220 = Sommerfeld 1999: no. 65 (cf. ibid. p. 11)

On the reading of the name of the rulers of Simurrum and Arame, see A. Westenholz 1999: 48 n. 152; Sommerfeld 1999: 109. Note that the addendum na-bi₂-ul₂-mai in tu-tu₂ ib₂-iš₂ “Nabiuma made an inspection at Tutub” in Sommerfeld 1999: no. 65 is not part of the year date proper, cf. already Kienast & Sommerfeld 1994: 330. FAOS 7 D-12 Naramsîn 5b = RIME 2.1.4 Nârâm-Sîn (ii).

[i]š-[mu] na-ra-am-[4]EN.ZU na-gab₂ idigna’ u₃ buranunuk₂ ik-[iš₂]-tu₂ [u₃] k[asahk decoded] iš₂-nam₁-[in]-da-[d₂] [iš₂]-a-[ru]

155 For a possible interpretation as a fragmentary oath formula see Schrakamp 2013b: 288 and compare Foster 1996 on a "phantom year name" from Gasur. Cf. A. Westenholz 1999: 56 n. 214.
“In the year when Naramsuen reached the sources of Tigris and Euphrates and was victorious against
Shenaminda in battle”
Tutub: MAD 1, 231 = Sommerfeld 1999: no. 46; MAD 1, 236 = Sommerfeld 1999: no. 22 (Var. IDIG-NA[4], iš-ti-ru, see Sommerfeld 1999: 79). FAOS 7 D-14 Narāmsin 7 = RIME 2.1.4 Narām-Sin (t) = FAOS 8 *D-14


“In the year when Naramsuen was victorious in battle against Subir at Azuhinnum (and) captured
Tahshatilil”
Umm-el-Jir/Mugdan: AIA 8 = Foster 1982b: 42 no. 8 iii-iv. FAOS 7 D-13 Narāmsin 6 = RIME 2.1.4 Narām-

[ in 1 MU *(i)na-ra]-am-[t]E]N.ZU SAĜ.ŠEŠ.RA
“in the year Naramsuen defeated Subir”
Sangub/Mesag archive: RBC 2631. See Salgues 2011, quoted in Cripps 2010: 11. Variant of preceding date?

“In the year when Naramsuen laid the foundation of the temple of Enlil in Nippur and the temple of Inana
in Zabalam”
Girsu: RTC 86, RTC 106, RTC 144. FAOS 7 D-15 Narāmsin 8 = RIME 2.1.4 Narām-Sin (n)
mu *na-ra-am-EN.ZU i₃, erš-er-in-na-ka nibru-ša₃, si im-mi-sa₃-a
“Year when Naramsuen directed uptake of the Egerina canal straight to Nippur”
Nippur: PBS 9/1, 25. FAOS 7 D 16 Narāmsin 9 = RIME 2.1.4 Narām-Sin (ee)

(C) Other Naramsuen date

[ in 1 MU *(i)na-ra-am-EN.ZU KAS.ŠUDUL(REC 169) [...]-at[4] [...]-G][AL-at[4] [iš₁₁]-a-ru [u₃, su₃,Ma₃] in [kur...].

“in the year when Naramsuen defeated [...] at in battle at [...] G]al (and) (personally?) felled cedars in the [...]”
Nippur: OSP 2, 16 rev. i 1-8. FAOS 8 *D-66 Narāmsin 15 = RIME 2.1.4 Narām-Sin (z)
Westenholz 1987: 41 reads [in 1 MU *(i)na-ra-am-EN.ZU KAS.ŠUDUL(REC 169) [...]-at[4] [kA₆,GAL]-at[4] [iš₁₁]-a-ru [u₃, su₃,Ma₃] in [kur...].

“in the year when Naramsuen conquered [...] at and Abullat and personally (?) felled cedars in Mount Lebanon.” The reading [kur a-m]a-na-an/[KUR a-m-na-an (= Amanus)] suggested by Glassner 1990b: 76; Frayne 1993: 86; 2001: 172 § 4.6.10 does not agree with the traces on the photograph according to Westenholz 1999: 119.

Sharkalisharrī (11 dates)

“in the year when Sharkalisharrī fought a battle against Elam and Zahara in front of Akshak and ... was victorious”
Girsu: ITT 1, 1097; RA 4, pl. VI no. 16 = RTC 130. FAOS 7 D-25 Šarkalisharrī 2a = RIME 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (m)


“the year when Sharkalisharrī was victorious in battle against Elam and Zahara”
Girsu: ITT 1, 1115. FAOS 7 D-26 Šarkalisharrī 2b = RIME 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (m’)

in 1 MU sar-ga-li₂,LUGAL-ri₂, iš₂, li₃-an-nu-ni-im u₅, E₂, il₃-a-h₃ in ka₆,DIĜIR[3] iš-su-nu u₃ 1 SAR-la-ag
LUGAL ku-ti-im₃ ik-mi-u₅,

“the year when Sharkalisharrī laid the foundations of the Annunitum temple and the Ilaba temple in
Babylon and captured Sarlag, king of Gutium”
Adab: Adab 405 (transcription: MAD 2, 204 no. 4c)
Girsu: RTC 118; RA 4, pl. v no. 13. FAOS 7 D-27 Šarkalisharrī 3 = RIME 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (k). See below 8.3.

in 1 MU sar-ga-li₂,LUGAL-ri₂, KAS.ŠUDUL MAR.TU iš₁₁-a-ru
“in the year Sharkalisharrī was victorious against the Amorites in battle.”
Agrab: MAD 1, 268. FAOS 7 D-22 Šarkalisharrī 1a = RIME 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (l). Reading according to the collation by Sommerfeld 2000: 435 with n. 43.
Sources II: Year Dates

in 1 MU sar-ga-li₂ LUGAL-ri₂ KAS<šUDDUL> MAR.TU-am in ba-sa-ar KUR
Girsu: RTC 124. FAOS 7 D-23 Šarkališarrī 1b = RIME 2.15 Šar-kali-šarrī (l'). The copy provides no room for the restoration [iš₂₃ n-a-ru] suggested by FAOS 7 and RIME 2, see Sommerfeld 2000: 435 n. 42.

in 1 MU sar-ga-li₂ LUGAL-ri₂ MAR.TU-am
Girsu: RTC 85. FAOS 7 D-24 Šarkališarrī 1c = RIME 2.15 Šar-kali-šarrī (l')
mu sar-ga-li₂ LUGAL-ri₂ ki-e-n-gi₁š-še₁ im-ta-e₂-ða [dub]-sa₇-ga₂ mu-us₂-bi
“Year when Sharkalisharrī put in office; following year of the first”
Nippur: PBS 5, 38. OSP 2, 100. FAOS 7 D-35 Šarkališarrī 11 = RIME 2.15 Šar-kali-šarrī (c) = FAOS 8 *D-35. See Foster 1980: 36-40; Frayne 1992b: 624-625; Steinkeller 1992a: 56-57; Volk 1992: 24 n. 14; Sallaberger 1997: 150-151 with n. 12; Cripps 2010: 11 with n. 8; see Section 3.1.7.
The reading [me n]-sₗ-a-gₙ-a proposed in FAOS 7: 56 is certainly wrong, cf. Frayne 1992b: 624-625; Steinkeller 1992a: 56-57. Most scholars assume that the journey was related to the coronation of Sharkalisharrī, but see the reservations of Volk 1992: 24 n. 14 and cf. the year-date mu lugal a-₇ₕ-a-de₂ ba-tₕ-aₗ-uₗ-a attributed to Sharkalisharrī. For a reading [me n]-sₗ-a-gₙ-a “(and) the crown upon (his) head,” see Foster 1980: 39; against this reading see Volk 1992: 24 n. 14 and A. Westenholz 1975a: 23; 1987: 89 with n. 89, 120, 203 for a reading [dub]-sa₇-gₙ-a “following year of the first.” Sallaberger 1997: 150-151 with n. 12 proposes [dub]-sa₇-gₙ-a.

mu sar-ga-li₂ LUGAL-ri₂ puzur-e₂-š-dar šagana kiš.nita e₂ ‘en-lil₂ du₁₂-da bi₂₂-gub-ba-a mu ab-ₖₗ-sₗ-a
“Year, following the year when Sharkalisharrī put in office the general Puzureshtar to build the temple of Enlil”
Nippur: 6 N T 112; 6 N T 662 = Goetze 1968: 56, 58; Var. CBS 6182+ = A. Westenholz 1978: 98. FAOS 7 D-29 Šarkališarrī 5 = RIME 2.15 Šar-kali-šarrī (c)
in 1 MU sar-ga-li₂ LUGAL-ri₂ [ur₁₂-cl₁] e₂ ‘en-lil₂ in nibruₗ₃ iₗ-ku-nu
Girsu: RTC 87. FAOS 7 D-30 Šarkališarrī 6 = RIME 2.15 Šar-kali-šarrī (f)
[mu] uš₂ e₂ ‘en-lil₂ ka ki ab-ₖₗ-gar
“Year: the foundation of the temple of Enlil was laid”
Nippur: OSP 2, 94. See Frayne 1992b: 624. FAOS 7 D-30 Šarkališarrī 6 = RIME 2.15 Šar-kali-šarrī (f') = FAOS 8 *D-30
mu uš₂ e₂ ‘en-lil₂ nibruₗ₃-a ki ab-ₖₗ-gar-ra mu ab-ₖₗ-sₗ-a
“The year when the foundation of the temple of Enlil was laid. Following year.”
Nippur: OSP 2, 96 rev. iv 5-7
mu lugal sar-ga-li₂ LUGAL-ri₂ [x₁] e₂ ‘en-lil₂ ke₂ [x₁]₁₂-[x]
“Year when (they) king Sharkalisharrī [……] to the temple of Enlil”
Girsu: ITT 1, 1114. FAOS 7 D-32 Šarkališarrī 8 = RIME 2.15 Šar-kali-šarrī (h)

“In the year when Sharkalisharrī cast a golden […] for pouring (of the) […] of the temple of Enil.”
Adab: OIP 14, 117; Adab 177 = MAD 2, 204 no. 8. FAOS 7 D-33 Šarkališarrī 9 = RIME 2.15 Šarkališarrī (j) = FAOS 8 *D-33. See for a [less plausible] restoration Frayne 1992b: 624: (…) [x₁] ZUGAL [ES₂₃] DE₂₃ A KU₉₂₃ GI GESER EN E₂ ‘en-lil₂ [ib]-tu-ku “(In the year, when Sharkalisharrī,) the great […] (fashioned) a golden [esh]dea vessel (and) [cut down [cc]dar [timber] (for) the temple of Enil”
in 1 MU sar-ga-li₂ LUGAL-ri₂ [x₁]₁₉₃ nₗ-a-ga-de₂₃
“In the year (when) Sharkalisharrī […] Akkad”
Year dates where more than the royal name is preserved stem from:156
Girsu: *ITT* 2, 3078;157 *CT* 50, 50;158 *CT* 50, 51.159

Shudurul

*in 1 μu ša-du-rul, sar-ru-i-dam i-šu-zu*160

“In the year when Shudurul assumed kingship”

Adab: *TCBI* 1, 235; see Pomponio 2011: 246; Zand 2012b; A. Westenholz 2010: 460 n. 22; also Steinkeller in this volume (Section 8.5), Pomponio in this volume (Section 3.2) and below Section 5.3.

Anonymous Sargonic dates of the time of Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri

*in 1 μu šu-di lu-ga-lu in 𒊏mar-ru-um i-šu-ga-am*

“in the year of the battle, (when) the king came to *Amarna*”


mu kas.šudul gu-ti-u m163 ba-ga-ra-a

“Year when the battle of *Gutium* took place”

Girsu: *ITT* 1, 1048, *ITT* 1, 1052, *RTC* 88; Var. *ITT* 1, 1053 gu-ti-u m. *FAOS* 7 D-42 Anonym 1 = *RIME* 2.1.5. Śar-kali-šarrī (n)164

[in 1 μu ... ti ... ili ... bi ... en-a-ru u, kas.šudul (REC169) sa-tuh-a-tim] in ba-zi-mar-nu a-[ši]-a-ru

“In the year when [...] defeated Bibi[...], and was victorious in the battle in the mountains at *Hashimar*”

Girsu: *ITT* 5, 9265. *FAOS* 7 D-44 Anonym 3 = *RIME* 2.1.4 Naram-Sîn (jj)

mu kas.šudul (REC169) u n u g165 a kāb (NAG) - su165 a ba-ga-ra-a

“Year when the battles of *Uruk* and *Kabsu (NAGSU)* took place”

Girsu: *RTC* 99; *RTC* 136; *RTC* 176; BM 86299; *CT* 50, 49 (Var. kāb-su-su-a). *FAOS* 7 D-43 Anonym 2 = *RIME* 2.1.4 Naram-Sîn (i); on the reading kāb-su instead of NAG-su see Yoshikawa 1995; see also below Section 8.4.1.

mu bād1 a-ga-de1

“Year the wall of Akkad (or Dur-Akkad) (was erected)”


156 *FAOS* 7 D-40 Šarkališarrī 16 = *RIME* 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (q), mu sar-g[a]-ri1 lu-ga-lu a-ga-ši [deški ...], “The year (when) Sharkalisharri, the king of Akkad [...], region of Isin or Nippur: NBC 10097, is to be deleted. Probably not a year name but part of an oath; see Foster 1996: 4; A. Westenholz 1999: 56 n. 214.

*FAOS* 7 D-41 Šarkališarrī 17 = *RIME* 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (r); [in 1 μu [sar-ga-li-t]-lu-ga-lu-rij su x] = *Gass* HSS 10, 40. To be deleted. After collation of P. Steinkeller, the proposed restoration is impossible, see Foster 1996: 5; Westenholz 1999: 56 n. 214 and cf. Frayne 1993: 183.

157 *FAOS* 7 D-36 Šarkališarrī 12 = *RIME* 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (o); (in 1 μu) sar-ga-li-t-lu-ga-ri1 x3 saŋ [ ...], “The year when Sharkalisharri [...]

158 *FAOS* 7 D-38 Šarkališarrī 14 = *RIME* 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (q); [in 1 μu] en-il-lil1 [sar-ga-li-t]-lu-ga-ri1 su x] = “The year when Endil [...], Sharkalisharri [...]

159 *FAOS* 7 D-39 Šarkališarrī 15 = *RIME* 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (q), (in 1 μu) en-il-lil1 sar-ga-li-t-lu-ga-ri1 su x x x3 su, “The year when Endil [...]. Sharkalisharri [...]

160 *TCBI* 1, 235 rev. 13 read sar-ru-i-dam, but the photo does not show the line in question. Since a value ru-i in *zarratum* “kingship” is otherwise not attested, one would expect a writing sar-ru-i-dam or sar-ru-i-sam, see Schrakamp 2008: 700.

161 *FAOS* 7 D-65 Anonym 23; mu dumu-mun-us lugal e4 en-nil1 -iši īm-ge-n na-a “year when the king’s daughter went to the temple of Enlil”; Nippur: *OSP* 2, 170; no year date, see J. G. Westenholz 1992: 304; Frayne 1992b: 625; Kienast & Sommerfeld 1999: 331.

Sources II: Year Dates

mu lugal a-ga-de₃ ba-tuš-a
“Year when the king of Akkad sat down”

[i]mu e₂ inana₂ a-ga-de₃ al-du₅-a
“Year when the temple of Inana of Akkad was erected”

mu en₂ en-lil₂ maš₂ ib₂-dab₂-ba
“Year when the en priestess of Enlil was appointed by the oracle”

in₁ mu ereš-diĝir₁ en-lil₁-la₁₃ <la₁₃> / in₁ mu nin₄ en-lil₁₃ <la₁₃>
“In the year the en priestess of Enlil”
Umm-el-Jir/Mugdan: AIA 8 = Foster 1982b: 42 no. 8 ii 9-10. FAOS 7 D-20 Narāmsin 13 = RIME 2.1.4 Narām-Sīn (o’)

mu lugal-e₃ gu₂-du₄-a₄ diĝir₁-e₂-a [in?] -D[u-...
“Year when the king in Kutha brought the god (i.e. of the netherworld) in his temple.”
Nippur: OSP 2, 98 rev. iii 3-6. FAOS 8 D-69 Anonym 25 (with different reading).

[i]mu₁ [...] in-du mu ab-us₂-sa
“Year when [...] he brought. Following year”

in₁ mu₄ e₅ en-na al ba-du₅-a
“In the year when the (canal) River of the Steppe was dug with the hoe”
Sangub/Mesag Archive: BIN 8, 117. FAOS 7 D-54 Anonym 13

mu aš₄ u₃-de₃ ba-de₆
“Year the wind carried away the new field”
Nippur: OSP 2, 8. FAOS 8 D-67 Anonym 23(?)

mu lugal-[e] nam-[…]
“Year (when) the king …”
Nippur: OSP 2, 7. FAOS 8 D-68 Anonym 24

[… en-a-su
“[Year when …] defeated […]
Gasur: HSS 10, 37+38 rev. iii 1’ (?), interpreted as a year name by Markina 2011: 205 n. 23.

3.3. On the Year Dates of the Lagash II and Ur III Dynasties

Whereas late Presargonic and Sargonic year dates most often refer to military expeditions and can therefore be considered historical sources by themselves, the situation changes with the dynasty of Gudea, the so-called “Lagash II” dynasty. Section 2.5, above, provides an overview of these “governors” that is based on their appearance in the list of deceased rulers of the ancestor cult.164

163 The use of Sumerian and the prefix a l- indicates an origin at the area of Adab or Nippur.
164 The list available on the internet compiled by Damerow & Sigrist 2001 is not only very fragmentary for the period concerned (many references are not listed at all), but also includes, e.g. for Urnamma, “year names” that were reconstructed (by Frayne 1997a) according to various known historical incidents. The data for Lagash are now summarized by Huh 2008: 293-310. A new careful study of the chronology and prosopography of the Lagash II dynasty is a desideratum.
The year dates of the Lagash II dynasty refer exclusively to internal matters of the city-state, such as the governorship of a ruler, the building of temples, the dedication of cult objects, the installation of priests, the digging of canals, or the erection of various buildings. Often these year dates do not name the governor who should be credited for the date, e.g.: “Year the fifty-headed divine weapon was fashioned”, known in multiple variants. As Sollberger has noted, this year follows after “Year: The temple of Nindara was built” in RTC 199, and the year date referring to Nindara’s temple appears in a text (RTC 195) which names “governor Gudea” directly before the year date. This allows a plausible attribution of these two dates to Gudea.

The situation becomes even more complicated since year names referring to local affairs of Girsu and previously taken as dates referring to the Lagash II dynasty could be assigned to Shulgi of Ur III, under whose rule, apparently, local variants of year dates were used.

The founder of the mighty dynasty that would rule Mesopotamia for a century, Urnammu of Ur (MC 2110-2093), left only a handful of year dates for his 18 year rule which refer to construction projects, among these the road system of Sumer, and the installation of a high priest. These date formulae are found on Girsu tablets, thus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MC year</th>
<th>Regnal year</th>
<th>Foreign policy event mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2088</td>
<td>Š 5</td>
<td>Der restored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>Š 11</td>
<td>God Ishtaran installed at Der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075</td>
<td>Š 18</td>
<td>Daughter of Shulgi becomes queen of Marhashi (Jiroft/Kerman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074</td>
<td>Š 19</td>
<td>Der restored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>Š 21</td>
<td>Der defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2069</td>
<td>Š 24</td>
<td>Karahar (or: Karakin) defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2068</td>
<td>Š 25</td>
<td>Simurrum defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2067</td>
<td>Š 26</td>
<td>Simurrum defeated for the second time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>Š 27</td>
<td>Harshi defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2063</td>
<td>Š 30</td>
<td>Daughter of Shulgi married by ruler of Anshan (Tall-e Malyan, Fars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>Š 31</td>
<td>Karahar defeated for the second time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2061</td>
<td>Š 32</td>
<td>Simurrum defeated for the third time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>Š 33</td>
<td>Karahar defeated for the third time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2059</td>
<td>Š 34</td>
<td>Anshan defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>Š 42</td>
<td>Shashrum defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>Š 44</td>
<td>Simurrum and Lullubum defeated for the ninth time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>Š 45</td>
<td>Urbilum, Simurrum, Lullubum, Karahar defeated “on one day”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>Š 46</td>
<td>Kimash and Hurti defeated on one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>Š 48</td>
<td>Harshi, Kimash, Hurti and their lands defeated on one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>AS 1</td>
<td>Urbilum defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>AS 6</td>
<td>Shashrum defeated (for the second time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>AS 7</td>
<td>Huhnuri defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>ŠS 3</td>
<td>Shimanum defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>ŠS 7</td>
<td>Zabshali defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>IS 3</td>
<td>Simurrum defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>IS 5</td>
<td>Royal daughter married by ruler of Zabshali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>IS 9</td>
<td>War against Huhnuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IS 14</td>
<td>War against Susa and Adamsul (or Adamsul)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The year dates of the Lagash II dynasty refer exclusively to internal matters of the city-state, such as the governorship of a ruler, the building of temples, the dedication of cult objects, the installation of priests, the digging of canals, or the erection of various buildings. Often these year dates do not name the governor who should be credited for the date, e.g.: “Year the fifty-headed divine weapon was fashioned”, known in multiple variants. As Sollberger has noted, this year follows after “Year: The temple of Nindara was built” in RTC 199, and the year date referring to Nindara’s temple appears in a text (RTC 195) which names “governor Gudea” directly before the year date. This allows a plausible attribution of these two dates to Gudea. The situation becomes even more complicated since year names referring to local affairs of Girsu and previously taken as dates referring to the Lagash II dynasty could be assigned to Shulgi of Ur III, under whose rule, apparently, local variants of year dates were used.

The founder of the mighty dynasty that would rule Mesopotamia for a century, Urnammu of Ur (MC 2110-2093), left only a handful of year dates for his 18 year rule which refer to construction projects, among these the road system of Sumer, and the installation of a high priest. These date formulae are found on Girsu tablets, thus

---

165 Sollberger 1954-1956: 34.
166 The text is broken and the line preceding “Gudea” is missing; it would be a strange coincidence, however, if the text would refer to offerings to the defunct ruler Gudea.
167 de Maaijer 2008; Carroué 2000; Sigrist 2010.
Sources II: Year Dates

apparently stemming from the latter half of his reign when he was able to control this important city state. Girsu’s governor Urabba (*MT* no. 7, see above Section 2.5) appears in texts dating to Urnamma (*RTC* 261, 263, 264).168

The 48 years of Urnamma’s son and successor Shulgi (MC 2092-2045) are known from date lists, and whereas the early years appear only rarely in documents, the later years are amply attested.169 From now on the sequence of Ur III years is fixed, thanks to the testimony of tens of thousands of administrative texts.170

With Shulgi, year names referring to foreign policy appear more often.171 His reign can be divided into three phases (Sallaberger 2012), the consolidation of the empire in the first two decades, the years of the internal restructuring of the empire (*Š* 20-39) and the final years with repeated military campaigns (*Š* 40-48).

Shulgi managed to gain control of the Tigridian town Der, which allowed direct access to the Zagros mountains and the Eastern regions. Foreign policy included dynastic marriages of Shulgi’s daughters to foreign rulers, some of which were included in the year dates: Marhashi, the region of Iranian Jiroft (province Kerman, *Š* 18), and Anshan (Tall-e Malyan in Fars province, *Š* 30) which, however, led to a military campaign (*Š* 34-35).

Military expeditions were directed against Simurrum on the upper Diyala/Sirwan (*Š* 25-26, 32, 44, 45), against Karahar (or: Karakin), situated to the Southeast (*Š* 24-25, 31, 33, 45) and against Harshi, probably in the Iranina province Ilam (*Š* 27, 48). Subsequently campaigns were led further to the North, to Lullubum (around Sulaimaniyah), the northern neighbour of Simurrum (*Š* 44, 45), to Urbilum, modern Erbil (*Š* 45), Shashrum (Shemshara in the Raniya plain, *Š* 42), and to Kimash and Hurti in the Zagros mountains (*Š* 46-47, 48), which opened the way to Shimashki.

Shulgi’s successor, Amarsuena (MC 2044-36), had to campaign again against Urbilum (AS 2) and Shashrum (AS 5) as well as against Huhnuri (in eastern Khuzistan, AS 7). Shusuen (MC 2035-27) secured the rule of the governor of Shimanum (SS 3) and fought a war against Zabshali in the Zagros mountains (SS 7). Ibbisuen (MC 2026-2003) first lost provinces after his third year and soon the former empire of Ur was reduced to the size of a city state (cf. De Graef, this volume).

In Ibbisuen year 8 (MC 2019) Ishbierra of Isin claimed kingship over northern Babylonia and with him a new dynasty, the Dynasty of Isin, started. With the ending of Ur III rule at Susa, the texts were dated according to Elamite rulers (see De Graef, this volume).

---

168 Waetzoldt 1990.
170 Nevertheless, scholars such as Pomponio 1990b and Lafont 1994 have voted for a coregency of Amarsuena and Shusuen and even a partial overlap. However, such a reconstruction is impossible if one considers the role of the king and the function of year dates; see already Sallaberger 1999.
171 See generally Sallaberger 1999: 141-143; Sigrist 2010.
4. On the Chronology of the Early Cuneiform Evidence

4.1. The Archaic Texts of the Late Uruk Period

The earliest written records in cuneiform are the so-called archaic or 'proto-cuneiform' texts: first only from Uruk, but later also from Djemdet Nasr and other sites. They are conventionally dated to ca. 3500-2800 BC. A general survey is provided by Englund (1998).

Englund’s 1998 count included 5820 so-called archaic texts from Warka/Uruk, Djemdet Nasr/Ni.ru, Uqair/Urum, Senkere/Larsa, Asmar, and al-Muqayyur/Ur, with some smaller groups of texts from the antiquities market whose provenience cannot be determined with certainty. Of these, 5410 date to the Late Uruk/Uruk IV (i.e. ca. 3500-3200? BC) and Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III periods (i.e. ca. 3200?-2900 BC). Of all archaic texts, 85% are administrative accounts, 11% are lexical lists and school exercises. The classification of an archaic text as the oldest piece of literature is disputed. Since 1998, several larger groups of archaic texts from Late Uruk/Uruk IV to Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III periods, tentatively attributed to Uruk and Djemdet Nasr, have been published, and the CDLI database now (2009) enumerates 6692 text numbers (accessed 2009/03/17).

Though the archaic texts are written at an early stage of cuneiform, the pictographic nature of the script hinders an easy determination of the language of these texts. Nowadays most researchers assume that the language of the archaic texts was Sumerian.

4.1.1 Warka/Uruk

The texts from Uruk provide the largest group of archaic texts. About 5000 texts were excavated in the district Eana of Uruk. Of these, 1835 are dated to the Uruk IV, 3245 to the Uruk III period (CDLI database, accessed 2009/03/17). The division between Uruk IV and Uruk III is basically a palaeographic one. The texts mostly consist of administrative accounts and deal with all the economic aspects of large households, including records concerning the administration of land, the harvest, storage and distribution of grain, cereal products, accounts dealing with fishery, domesticated animals and their products, and the administration and organization of work forces. The second group is provided by lexical texts and school exercises. These texts do not provide any direct historical information.

4.1.2 Djemdet Nasr/Ni.ru

At Djemdet Nasr, ancient Ni.ru, located ca. 30 km to the northeast of Kish, ca. 245 archaic tablets dating from the Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III period were excavated during both regular and illicit excavations. This text group consists of administrative accounts dealing with field management, harvest, storage, and distribution of grain, as well as records dealing with other commodities, lists of personnel and accounts of animals, and a few lexical texts and possibly two school texts. The texts have been found in a large secular building. Additional material from illicit excavations probably stemming from Djemdet Nasr has been published recently.

4.1.3 Other Sites

Uqair, ancient Urum, has provided 39 tablets that belonged to the archive of a single household of modest size. They can be dated to the Uruk III period. Twenty-seven tablets bought at the antiquities market are assumed to have originated at Larsa. There are seven administrative accounts and one lexical text in which Larsa is referred to, along

---

3 E.g., Klein 2004; Monaco 2007.
9 Englund & Grégoire 1996.
with other first-rank urban centres from Uruk. It is therefore supposed that Larsa was an important urban centre during the Late Uruk and Djemdet Nasr periods.\textsuperscript{13} Two administrative texts from Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III date were excavated at Tell Asmar, ancient Eshnuna.\textsuperscript{14} An archive of 85 well-preserved tablets from the Erlenmeyer collection document the activities of a brewery including a grain depot. An attribution to Uruk or Djemdet Nasr is reasonable.\textsuperscript{15}

Some archaic stone tablets ("early kudurrus") dealing with land parcels and of varying provenance may belong to the Late Uruk/Uruk IV and Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III, but these datings are disputed.\textsuperscript{16}

4.2. Dating the Texts of the Late Uruk Period

The vast majority of archaic Uruk texts was unearthed at the so-called "Roter Temple" located in the Eana district of Uruk.\textsuperscript{17} To solve the problem of dating the archaic texts, approaches using stratigraphy, radiocarbon dating and palaeography have been undertaken.

4.2.1 Stratigraphy and Palaeography

Excavations at Uruk have yielded 18 stratigraphic layers within the Eana precinct for the time prior to the Ur III period, with IIIa being contemporary to the archaic finds of Djemdet Nasr, and IV to VIII designated as Late Uruk. In his editio princeps of the archaic texts of Uruk, Falkenstein (1936: 13-15) attempted to correlate assemblages of texts to specific architectural layers. A re-evaluation of the stratigraphy demonstrated that the layers were heavily disturbed in most places, meaning that Falkenstein's approach resulted in incorrect correlations between architectural layers and stages of palaeographic development.\textsuperscript{18}

The majority of the archaic texts found in the Eana precinct, namely 80\%, stem from an area called "Roter Temple".\textsuperscript{19} This area provided the first continuous sequence of stratigraphic layers. The architectural phases were correlated with stages of palaeographic development, however, problems with the stratigraphy led to a misleading terminology and dating of the archaic texts unearthed in this area.\textsuperscript{20} Uruk III level buildings were built on razed Uruk IV constructions and the levelling of the many pits implied significant movements of earth. Discarded tablets used to fill holes and pits were mixed with earlier debris. The archaeological context does not, therefore, allow for a dating of the archaic texts. According to Nissen, only seven tablets were found on stratified Uruk IV layers, namely the floor of "Temple C".\textsuperscript{21}

Recently Sürenhagen placed the "Red Temple" in architectural context with the Pillar Hall, to the southwest, of Uruk V date. A resulting chronology would place the numerical tablets in Uruk V, and the earliest proto-cuneiform tablets in Uruk IVb.\textsuperscript{22} In 1963/64, during excavations at the "Red Temple" a small group of Uruk IV texts were found in clear association with that Uruk IVa/IVb building.\textsuperscript{23}

A problem related to the dating of the so-called archaic texts is the dating of the earliest stage of proto-cuneiform as represented by the so-called numerical tablets.\textsuperscript{24} Since numerical tablets were without exception found in secondary locations, it is, as yet, impossible to ascribe them to strata preceding the ideographic texts.\textsuperscript{25}

Numerical tablets developed out of pre-literate accounting tools, the earliest stage of which is represented by tokens and, later, by sealed clay envelopes with impressions on the surface of the tokens enclosed within. Impressions of similar tokens are found on the earliest clay "tablets", perhaps coterminus with the clay envelopes. On flattened lumps of clay, tokens were impressed, and the whole tablet was sealed. The shape of the impressions soon took the shape of early proto-cuneiform pictograms. Numerical tablets of similar shape were found at sites

\textsuperscript{14} MSVO 4: no. 79-80, see Englund 1998: 31.
\textsuperscript{15} Englund 1998: 31-32; Englund & Grégoire 1996: 19.
\textsuperscript{17} For convenient descriptions of the findspots and stratigraphy of the texts excavated at Eana, see Green & Nissen 1987: 21-53; Englund 1998: 34-41.
\textsuperscript{19} Englund 1998: 36 fig. 6.
\textsuperscript{20} See the comments of Nissen 1987: 26-28.
\textsuperscript{21} Green & Nissen 1987: 50, tb. 1-3; Englund 2006b.
\textsuperscript{23} W 21300, 1-7, see Green & Nissen 1987: tb. 1-3; Englund 2006b.
\textsuperscript{24} Englund 1998: 50-56.
\textsuperscript{25} Englund 1998: 56.
as widespread as Djebel Aruda, Brak, Mari, Nineveh, Khafaje, Godin Tepe, Choga Mish and Susa. The earliest examples of such numerical tablets do have a rectangular, regular shape, just as Uruk IV tablets, but look rather clumsy. These tablets are considered as the immediate precursor of the earliest proto-cuneiform tablets dated to Uruk IV. As for the difficulties in dating the archaic texts from Uruk, it is unclear, as yet, whether the numerical tablets are immediately predating or coterminus with the earliest pictographic or Uruk IV texts.

4.2.2 Radiocarbon Datings

Three samples from Uruk IVa layers at Temple C in the district of Eana are available. For these samples, a combined range of cal. 3510-3370 BC centred around cal. 3450 BC and cal. 3500-3390 BC are quoted. The radiocarbon date of 2815± BC for Uruk IVa, often quoted in earlier literature, is certainly based on uncalibrated and otherwise incorrect radiocarbon dates. The value of these radiocarbon dates for Uruk IVa has been considered limited as it was assumed that the wood samples were from roofbeams of cedared wood, an extremely durable wood that could have been reused, meaning that the time span between the felling of the cedar and the building of Temple C could not be determined. In fact, the samples were from pine wood. According to M. van Ess, an extended time-span between the felling and the use of the wood can therefore be excluded: current re-evaluations of the samples point to a date of ca. 3300 BC.

Since little archaeological material associated with Temple C was recovered, the radiocarbon dates would not be very helpful for dating specific cultural assemblages. Comparison with \(^{14}\)C dates from levels corresponding to Uruk IV and Uruk III layers at Abydos, suggests a lowering by ca. 150-100 years.

4.2.3 Uruk and Susa

The parallels in tablet format, numerical notations, seals and logograms found between the earliest proto-cuneiform tablets from Uruk and Susa, indicate that proto-cuneiform writing at Susa depended on Uruk. A schematic comparison of the stratigraphy of Uruk and Susa, based on the paper given by R.K. Englund at Munich 2006, is presented in the following table.

Table 16: Correlation of Archaic Uruk and Susa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uruk chronology</th>
<th>date approx.</th>
<th>Susa chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stage of writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uruk Eana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple tokens</td>
<td>Ubaid</td>
<td>5000-4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early/Middle</td>
<td>4200-3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uruk II</td>
<td>XIX-IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex tokens, bullae, numerical tablets</td>
<td>Late Uruk</td>
<td>3800-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-cuneiform</td>
<td>Uruk IVa</td>
<td>VIII-III V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uruk III</td>
<td>IV III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susa chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susa Acr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 For references, see Englund 1998: 50 n. 98.
27 For an example from Jebel Aruda, see Englund 1998: 51 fig. 13.
31 Thus R.K. Englund according to a personal communication by H.J. Nissen.
33 Engel & Kürschner 1993: 129, tb. 41.
34 Pers. comm.
36 Boehmer et al. 1993: 68. Also Nissen (pers. comm. to Englund) votes for a lower date of ca. 3200 BC for Uruk IV and 3000 BC for Uruk III.
37 See the summary in D.T. Potts 1999: 52-79.
4.3. The Geographical Horizon of the Archaic Texts

Since the archaic texts do not provide direct historical information, the geographical names attested there give a vague indication of cultural contact. According to Nissen 1985, who analysed ca. 4500 archaic texts, their geographical horizon included Babylonia, to Kish and Eshnuna in the North and Northeast and to Ur in the South.

The distribution of references indicates the relative importance of these cities for Uruk during this period: Uruk (67), Shuruppag (31), Zabalam (31), Ur (17), Adab (16), Umma (8), Kish (7), Larsa (3), Eshnuna (1) and Nippur (1). Outside Babylonia, Susa and perhaps Elam appear in the East, and probably Delmun in the South. The 250 texts from Djemdet Nasr display a comparable, but more regional geographical horizon.

During the Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III period the city of Uruk must have exercised political control over Northern Babylonia, since similar documents from both Djemdet Nasr/Ni.ru (MSVO 1, 161-174, 176, 178, 180) and Uqair/Urum (MSVO 4, 15) have been issued on special deliveries that were owed to the goddess Inana at Uruk. Some of these tablets are sealed with so-called city seals. Their inscription consists of an estimated number of some 20 city names, of which 11 can be reconstructed with certainty. Among them, the following cities can be identified: Ur, Larsa, Zabalam, Urum, Bu.Bu.Na, probably Kutha or Kish and Ni.ru = Djemdet Nasr.

The homogeneity of the archaic texts from Uruk, Djemdet Nasr and other Late Uruk sites can, apparently, be explained by a kind of political unification of Babylonia.

4.4. Archaic Texts from Ur

Excavations at Ur have yielded 410 archaic tablets, mainly administrative texts, some lexical texts and school exercises, and uninscribed tablets with seal impressions. The tablets were found in layers beneath the ED IIIa Royal Cemetery, which is considered largely contemporary to the Fara period. As they also revealed numerous seal impressions they were designated as "Seal Impression Strata" (SIS), divided into eight layers, SIS 1-8, by the excavators. The majority of the tablets stem from SIS 4-5, i.e. the stratum directly below the cemetery.

According to their palaeography most of the texts form one group, while a few tablets date to the Djemdet Nasr and to the Fara periods, respectively. The archaic tablets from SIS 4-5 form a homogenous group in terms of terminology and prosopography, and the reappearance of the same names in various contexts suggests that most tablets stem from a relatively short period of time. A few tablets from another section of the excavation, attributed to SIS 7-8, do not differ in palaeography, terminology and name-giving. The archaic tablets of Ur represent the remains of a single archive, and the seal impressions found together with the tablets must have belonged to the same institutional context. These are the earliest Sumerian texts that can be read in a similar way to Fara period or later texts.
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Map 1: Archaic Uruk and Djemdet Nasr
According to every aspect, such as palaeography, language or the institutions mentioned, the archaic texts from Ur represent a stage between Djemdet Nasr and Fara, although it is impossible to estimate the gap separating these texts corpora. Concerning the date of the Ur corpus, Burrows noted: "... the only other mention of a lugal is that of the lugal-lagāš. Thus, if history may be extracted from these casual data, there was at this time no king of Ur; the king of Lagash was suzerain; and the sāngu was his regent. It is noteworthy that just such a regime existed many centuries later when, according to Royal Inscriptions (= UET I) 103, 104, 297, the priest Enannatum was regent for foreign kings [i.e. the daughter of Ishmedagan of Isin, W.S.]." 53 Although Burrows’ reference to the situation in the later Isin period does not explain the distribution of power in the time of the archaic texts, the reference to the “king of Lagash” may receive a short comment. Fragment UET 2, 205B contains nothing else but this phrase “king of Lagash” ([G][A][L][L][L][U], L.A.BU.RU.NU, i.e. the daughter of Ishmedagan of Isin, W.S.). The archaic tablets rarely mention people or places outside of Ur and its direct environment. The appearance of a king of Lagash, however, agrees well with the fact that in the period of the Ur tablets, the earlier part of the Early Dynastic period, Lagash (modern al-Ḫiba), the largest site in Southern Mesopotamia, was at its peak and more important than the city state’s later, Presargonic, capital Girsu (modern Tello). 54

The dating of the archaic texts from Ur is intrinsically linked to the dating of the SIS 8–4 seal impressions. Nowadays these are considered a regional glyptic style of the “ED II” period, 55 but the lowering of their date has recently been met with scepticism: from the art historian’s point of view, Otto regards them as the “missing link” between the Late Uruk and ED I-II glyptic styles, but closer to Late Uruk. 56 Noting, similarly, that the SIS 8–4 seal impressions form a homogeneous group, Marchetti likewise argued for an ED I dating on the basis of ceramics. 57

For dating the SIS, Zettler reviewed the archaeological context of the SIS sealings by reconstructing pottery profiles from the SIS sealings. 58 The profiles reconstructed could be correlated with ceramics from stratified context of the Inanna Temple at Nippur. In the late 1970s, Biggs re-evaluated the tablets from Levels IX-VII and suggested a slightly earlier date: he noted that the script of most of the IT VIIB tablets was very similar to the standard script of the Abu Salabikh tablets. The script of several tablets appeared to be somewhat later and resembled the Abu Salabikh tablets from Area A and from the fill of graves from the Southern Unit Area E. Postgate and Moorey suggested a stratigraphically and palaeographically later date for the tablets from Area E. 59 This leads to the following chronological sequence:

Nippur Inanna Temple VIIa: ED IIIa (“middle of ED III”, “script most of the VIIB tablets was close to the the Standard Abu Salabikh script”, e.g. 7 NT 5-6 and 14-16, see Zettler 1992: 37 n. 15)

Nippur Inanna Temple VIIA: ED IIIb (“later half of ED III”)

Nippur Inanna Temple VI-V: Sargonic and Early Ur III period (Sargonic tablets with year dates of Naramsuen: 6 NT 112, 6 NT 662; Goetze 1968, see above Section 3.2.2)

Nippur Inanna Temple IV: Ur III period: IT built by Shulgi

Zettler points out that “none of these tablets are of any particular value for chronological purposes outside their archaeological contexts and I am not at all certain the Fara tablets are in primary contexts. They are all from a street and not on a floor in the temple. I would be particularly concerned about having anyone make palaeographic pronouncements about the tablets and then using those assessments to date the Inanna temple’s building levels, without being aware of the totality of archaeological data.” 60

Sürenhagen 61 reviewed the stratigraphy of the SIS. On the basis of his re-evaluation, which also included comparison of ceramics, he attributed SIS 7–4 to an elongated ED II period at Ur of ca. 300 years. SIS 5–4 which

53 Burrows 1935: 17, s.v. (66) sāngu.
54 Cf. Matthews 1997, 408f.
55 Karg 1984: 84-85. Karg’s dating has been accepted by most philologists, see the references in Sommerfeld 2006a: 59 n. 92.
56 According to Otto 2010: 25, the “signs of continuous development imply that the SIS 8-4 glyptic may be perceived as a sort of ‘missing link’ between Late Uruk creations and the fully fledged style of ED I-II,” concerning the history of art. Also concerning “style, the SIS 8-4 seals are far closer to Late Uruk than to ED II times.”
57 Marchesi & Marchetti 2011: 54: “The corpus of seal impressions from the lower SIS is sufficiently homogeneous in terms of both style and stratigraphy that the pieces can be regarded as forming a coherent and coeval whole. Despite some interesting attempts to lower the date of the glyptics from the SIS from Early Dynastic I to II, the dating to Early Dynastic I is confirmed by comparison with the stratified glyptics from the Diyala sites. (...) In the absence of any indication provided by the pottery horizons, which (...) are virtually unpublished, here we can only note that in SIS 8, undoubtedly dating from Early Dynastic I given the presence of the solid-footed goblets, we not only find sealings that are similar in style to those from SIS 5-4 but also an archaic cuneiform tablet again similar to those from SIS 5-4”
58 Zettler 1989.
60 Pers. comm.
61 Sürenhagen 1999: 180-187, 244-250.
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yielded most of the archaic texts can be dated to the transition of the ED II to ED IIIa/Fara period. However, more recent work has pointed to the homogeneity of tablets and seal impressions from SIS 4 to 8.

Dittmann proposed an archaeological correlation of SIS strata 8–4 with the stratigraphy of Nippur and Uruk based on palaeographic arguments:

Nippur Inanna Temple IXA // Ur, SIS 6–4 (palaeographic similarity)
Nippur Inanna Temple VIII: Fara type tablet
Nippur Inanna Temple VIIIb: Fara type tablets

Furthermore onomastics can be reviewed for the dating of the Ur archaic texts. The fact that they lack Semitic personal names, abundantly attested in the later texts from Abu Salabikh, need not be taken as a chronological indicator considering the location of Ur in the Sumerian south and of Abu Salabikh in middle Babylonia. The onomastic in the archaic Texts from Ur is demonstrably Sumerian, which differs from the personal names of the Uruk IV–III tablets, while features common to the names of the Fara period might indicate a date closer to the Fara period.44

The political organization of Babylonia seemingly transpires in the so-called “city seals”, of which many impressions were found in the SIS. Eridu, Ur, Larsa/Ararma, Uruk, Adab, Nippur, and Kesh are identified among the ten toponyms attested. Umma (UB) can, perhaps, be added. Toponyms attested in administrative texts include Adab, Andul (wr. a-n-dul), Anšara, Deimun (?), Elam (?), Gaesh (?), Kiabrig, Kiengi or Engi (wr. [g]-en-ki).9 Kišara (wr. AÎ, Ê.A), Kalaba, Lagash (see above), LAK159a, Larsa, MABU, PA-PUR (?), Nippur (?), Taibbar, UD.NINTAk1, Ur, and X-Erin.26, 68

The main political institutions that appear in the texts separate the Ur archaic texts from both Djemdet Nasr and Fara. In the Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III period, the political leader was the en who resided in the c.s (AB), at Djemdet Nasr one also notes the important title sa.gga “(temple/palace) administrator”. A close study of the archaic Texts of Ur shows various substantial changes: now the title lu.gal “king” appears for the first time in Mesopotamian history. The lu.gal, “king”, resides in the “palace”, called e₂-gal, in later periods; therefore, the appearance of the term e₂-gal at Ur69 seemingly corroborates the impression of a new political system that emerged at Ur. Another title, written PA.SI or even PA, once in its full form PA.TESI, was considered less important by Burrows (1935), and so he booked most references as personal names. Hallo argued convincingly, that the title is equivalent to later Fara period PA.TESI.GAR = e₃s₁ “city ruler; governor”.70 In archaic Ur, however, the title e₃s₁ was not yet restricted to the ruler of a city state, but was also used for representatives of other settlements of lower rank and thus corresponded somewhat to a “mayor”.71

The “precinct” (AB) that appears in the texts from Ur must denote the organization which once produced the seals and tablets. It may be regarded as a larger organization which included the seat of the king (lu.gal) and perhaps temples, and the phrase ab ur im “precinct and Ur” (UET 2, 95, cf. UET 2, 93), apparently corresponds – mutatis mutandis – to the pair S.AA, IB-laH “palace and Ebla” at Presargonic Ebla. The “precinct” (AB) of Ur was managed by a sa.gga “administrator”; the same terms are already found in Djemdet Nasr, where, however, the political leader was called en as in earlier Uruk IV, not lu.gal as at Ur.

63 Sommerfeld 2006a; cf. also Biggs 1974: 27.
66 Zadok 1994: 37 (referring to UET 2, 274 and 279).
67 On the interpretation see Schrakamp Section 6.1.3.
70 UET 2, 112; references UET 2, 235 and 349 are doubtful.
71 Hallo 1957: 35.
72 The best example is the case of the settlement ma₃bu. ma₃bu is a settlement in the vicinity of Ur which depended on the administration that produced the archaic tablets, since two texts deal with fields that are said to be “within ma₃bu” (IA, ma₃bu; UET 2, 168, 365). The “mayor of ma₃bu” (PA.SI ma₃bu) appears in one of these texts in a special position (UET 2, 168 iv), but is also attested to in other contexts (UET 2, 191, 348, 349).
Map 2: Archaic Ur
The differences in terminology notwithstanding, Steinkeller proposed a continuation of the political unification of Babylonia from the Djemdet Nasr period. He points to the fact that many of the Ur city seals were countersigned by a stamp seal representing a rosette. “Since the rosette can confidently be identified as a symbol of the goddess Inana ..., the consistent association of this symbol with the Ur city sealings offers a strong indication that the administrative operations these artifacts were part of likewise had to do with Inana’s cult. Most probably, the impressing of Inana’s rosette over a city seal was meant to indicate that the goods so sealed were specifically designated as her cultic offerings.” This proposal, however, finds no support in the data from the Ur archaic texts that pertain to the same administrative context as the seal impressions: in the texts the place name Uruk never appears. Also it is difficult to assume a strict attribution of a wide-spread symbol like the rosette, which appears in varying contexts in Early Mesopotamian art, exclusively to Inana. Finally, most of the Ur city seal impressions stem from door sealings, so it is even more difficult to reconstruct a plausible administrative procedure behind that. The geographical perspective between the texts and the city seals differs so much that it is hard to see how one can find a common explanation. We even tend to think that the seals represent the inhabitants’ “homeland” Sumer, by symbols of the gods and their cult places, very much along the lines of Michalowski and Yoffee.33

In conclusion, both the terminology for rulers and officials, and political organisation separates archaic Ur from Djemdet Nasr, though without allowing an estimate for the time gap between them. Palaeography, tablet form, language, or the appearance of places or institutions do not indicate the distance between the archaic Ur tablets and those from the Fara period, but the time gap corresponds by and large to the archaeological evidence at Ur, where the layers of the Ur archaic texts and sealings (SIS) were terminated by the Royal Graves of Ur.

4.5. The Fara Period

4.5.1 Texts from Fara and Tell Abu Salabikh

The term “Fara period” – largely corresponding to the archaeological term “ED IIIa” – is derived from the rich finds at Fara (Fāra), ancient Shuruppak, especially of ca. 1000 cuneiform tablets, of which ca. 600 of have been published.34 They consist mainly of administrative and lexical texts written in the Sumerian language. Though most texts date to the same period, some texts of the Djemdet Nasr, Sargonic and Ur III periods were also found.35

About 550 texts have been excavated at Abu Salabikh (Abū Ṣalābīkh), for which an identification with ancient Kesh, Eresh, or Geshgi has been suggested.36 The texts from Abu Salabikh consist mainly of literary texts, though some lexical texts and a small group of ca. 60 administrative texts have also been found.37 Compared to the texts from Fara, there are more traces of an early dialect of Akkadian in the Abu Salabikh corpus.38

A general survey of the texts from Fara and Abu Salabikh has been provided by Krebernik (1998). Some finds of single Fara type tablets stem from various Babylonian sites including Adab, Girsu, Isin, Kish, Nippur, Ur and Uruk.39

4.5.2 Dating the Texts from Fara and Abu Salabikh

Palaeographically, the Fara texts appear to be later than the Archaic texts from Ur and earlier than the Presargonic texts from Lagash that form a link between the Early Dynastic and Sargonic periods.41 The dating of the Fara Period itself is a matter of controversy and commonly based on palaeography. Most scholars date the end of the Fara period just prior to Urnanshe (cf. below 4.5.3).42 Based on the formation of personal names (and the arbitrary arrangement of signs within a single case or line that was given up under Eanatum), Hallo proposed to extend the Fara/ED IIIa period into the reign of Eanatum;43 this proposal, however, has not found wide

---

33 Steinkeller 2002b.
34 Michalowski 1991; Yoffee 1993.
35 For a catalogue of texts see Krebernik 1998: 245-246, 253, 337-361 to which the texts edited in Martin et al. 2001 and those cited in Martin et al. 2001: xxv-xxvii, 139-162; Molina & Sanchiz 2007: 1; Vukosavovic 2008: 39-40 are to be added. For unpublished texts housed in Istanbul, see also Steible in this volume.
38 For the administrative texts IAS 490-515 see Biggs 1974; for IAS 516-532 see Biggs & Postgate 1978; for IAS 533-556 see Krebernik & Postgate 2009.
41 On the palaeography of texts from the Fara period, see the references collected by Krebernik 1998: 272 n. 441.
acceptance: both the archaeological and palaeographic differences militate for some gap between the end of Fara and Urnanshe of Lagash.

The texts are usually not dated by year or month with the exception of one Fara administrative text counting months (TSŠ 150 rev. vii: iti 7 “7th month”). The slightly later texts from Abu Salabikh, however, know month names. The formula b a l a PN “PN’s turn of office”, often attested in sale contracts, most probably does not represent a date as often assumed, but rather refers to a juridical act related to the purchase.84

The earliest layers of stratigraphy at Fara date to the Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III Period.85 S.N. Kramer proposed a chronology subdividing the texts from Fara into four phases, ranging from the Djemdet Nasr period to the time of Urukagina of Lagash. Recent research, using archaeological and philological arguments, has demonstrated that the majority of the texts from the DOG excavations date to the ED IIIa period. They were probably written within a short period of time, ca. 10-15 years,86 or ca. one generation,87 attributing them all to one single year seems too extreme a proposal.88 The destruction of Fara could perhaps be correlated with the end of Palace A at Kish.89 The texts from the Schmidt excavations89 appear to be of slightly younger date, but still predate Mesilim.90

The texts from Abu Salabikh show palaeographic features similar to those from Fara. Some palaeographic peculiarities, i.e. simplified sign forms, point to a somewhat later date. This applies as well for the more developed use of syllabograms, the dates of administrative texts (IAS 508, 513) by Semitic month-names attested at Presargonic Mari and Ebla, and the rendering of closed syllables of the type CVC by CV-VC spellings, not yet attested in the texts from Fara.

The Fara period, features a relatively homogenous palaeographic appearance of cuneiform texts in various regions. This is in marked contrast to the subsequent Presargonic period (ED IIIb), when regional differences become sensible: then the contemporary tablets from Nippur, Umma or Girsu display marked differences.92 The homogeneity of the Fara period tablets thus reflects the political unification attested to in the city league and the hegemony of the king of Kish (see Steible this volume). The general impression that the Fara period was of considerable duration cannot be substantiated by historical data.

4.5.3 Historical Dating of the Texts from Fara and Abu Salabikh

The texts from Fara and Abu Salabikh do not provide any reliable synchronisms.93 The proposed identity of a certain Lumma, well attested in the Fara texts, with Eanatum of Lagash, is highly improbable due to the numerous attestations of the anthroponym (and for chronological reasons).94 Chances are better for an identification of Lumma, e n s i₁-Niغاز of Adab (see Pomponio and Marchesi in this volume), with an unnamed p a t e-Niغاز (TSŠ 430 iii 2’ 2’3’),95 and the e n s i₂-Niغاز of an unnamed locality called Lumma (TSŠ 302 rev. v 4).96 Some early rulers are dated to the Fara period on palaeographic grounds, most importantly Mesilim of Kish, who is known

---

86 H. Steible (pers. comm.).
90 Martin et al. 2001.
93 But see Marchesi in this volume Table 1.1 and § 1.3 sub B.02.
94 Marchesi 2006a: 62, citing earlier proposals on an identity.
95 Thus Yang 1989: 101 n. 59; Pomponio & Visicato 1994: 14, 19; Krebernik 1998: 258; see also Pomponio in this volume.
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as a contemporary of Lugalshaengur,97 governor (ensi₂) of Lagash (FAOS 5/2 Mesilim 1 = RIME 1.8.1.1), and Ninkisalsi, governor of Adab (FAOS 5/2 Mesilim 2 = RIME 1.8.1.2, see Pomponio in this volume). A similar date could be possible, from the palaeographic point of view, for Abzukidu and Nammah of Nippur.98

Fara/Shuruppak was a member of a supra-regional organization named ki-en-gi that was formerly referred to as "Kiengi league" and more recently named "Hexapolis of Shuruppak" or "Regio". According to administrative texts, this organisation included Kish, Zimibir/Sippar, Nippur, Adab, Kesh, Ahutti, Umma, Lagash and Uruk-Kulaba (see Steible in this volume). This league may have been subject to the authority of Kish, where probably Mesilim, or one of his predecessors, held power.99 Mesilim’s role as sovereign of ki-en-gi explains why he arbitrated a border dispute between Lagash and Umma. Within this organisation, the circulation of goods and persons was common. Besides economic interest, the organization also had a defensive function: administrative texts attest that contingents of some hundred men, levied by the members of the organization, were rallied at Fara/Shuruppak in order to confront an enemy that is, unfortunately, never named. Since the city of Ur was not a member of the city league and was practically never mentioned in the Fara documents, it may be identified as one adversary of the Fara league led by Kish.100 The competition between Ur and the city league may constitute the political background for the outstanding feature of the Royal Graves at Early Dynastic Ur.101

That the supra-regional organization was led by Kish is also suggested by an allotment of land by Menunsi, king of Kish, which demonstrates that the ruler could dispose of land in other cities (NTSS 154 obv. i 1-2 15.0.0 gana₂ me-nun-si lugal kiši aia₁₃-kigal gar “Menunsi, king of Kish, allotted 15 bur of land to Ayakigal”).102 Though administrative texts from Abu Salabikh cannot be linked to the Fara corpus by synchronisms, palaeography indicates a date very close to the Fara texts. That the texts from Abu Salabikh roughly date from the time when Shuruppak was a member of a city-league is indicated, first of all, by an exercise tablet that enumerates the names of the cities of Adab, Nippur, Lagash, Shuruppak and Umma. The same sequence of cities is also referred to in several troop lists from Shuruppak (WF 92, 94; 5 768, 935, see Steible in this volume) and a tablet from Abu Salabikh (LAS 463).103 The possible occurrence of an unnamed ens₁ in Uruk in a land allotment document from Abu Salabikh might corroborate this assumption,104 as does the occurrence of an unnamed lugal in an administrative text from Abu Salabikh who might be interpreted as the sovereign ruler of the "Regio" (LAS 518 = Krebernik & Postgate 2009: 7, 12). A possible reference to Kiengi (LAS 518) could point in the same direction (see below 4.5.4).

An inscription from Urnanshe of Lagash states that Urnanshe went to war against Ur and Umma and therewith testifies to a different political constellation, with Umma and Lagash being adversaries (FAOS 5/1 Urn. 51 = RIME 1.9.1.6b). The dating of Fara prior to Urnanshe, accords well with the palaeographic and stratigraphic date for the earliest tablets, known so far, from Giru (RTC 1-8).105

As for the lack of firmly established synchronisms, the dating of texts from Fara and the younger corpus from Abu Salabikh depends on palaeography; their distance from the earlier archaic texts from Ur and the later Presargonic Texts from Lagash can only be estimated. Considering the palaeography, the Fara tablets seem to be closer to the archaic tablets of Ur (on these, see above 4.4.).

4.5.4 The Geographical Horizon of the Texts from Fara and Abu Salabikh

Fara texts mention Kish and Ebih (i.e. the Djebel Hamrin) to the North, Zimibir/Sippar to the West, Greater Elam with the cities of uru-xa106 and uru-az-za  to the East, and Delmnu in the South; Mari is not attested.

---

97 Thus the traditional reading of the name as lugal₁-ɪ₄₃-EN.GUR, on the name see below 5.1.2.
98 Krebernik 1998: 259; Marchesi 2006a: 260; cf. above Section 4.4 on the find-spots of the tablets from the Temple of Inana at Nippur.
100 The suggestion that Ur might have been the opponent of the “Hexapolis” has already been put forward by Steible & Yıldız 1993; Pomponio & Visicato 1994: 19-20; Marchesi 2006b: 221 n. 82; on the distribution of toponyms in texts from Fara see Steible, this volume.
101 E.g., Charvát 1982.
102 Thus the recent interpretation of Marchesi & Marchetti 2011: 101 with n. 38; Zand in print a.
103 In the first line, Uruk can be restored according to the troop lists from Fara, see Pomponio & Visicato 1994: 13; Krebernik 1998: 242 n. 54. Note that Biggs 1974: 23-24 instead considers a restoration [kes₁₃,]. The same sequence of cities is also attested at Ebla in the lexical list MEE 3, 44 obv. s 5-10, see Pomponio & Visicato 1994: 13; Krebernik 1998: 242 n. 55.
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Map 3: Fara period
The distribution of toponyms clearly reflects the political background of the supra-regional organization (see 4.5.3. and see Steible in this volume).

From Abu Salabikh stem fragments of a list of cities, known as "Atlante Geografico" or "Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names" (LGN), that can be reconstructed on the basis of a completely preserved duplicate from Ebla and recently published duplicates of unknown provenance. Only a tiny fraction of the 289 toponyms mentioned can be identified and related to places attested in administrative texts from other archives. The toponyms mentioned belong to two groups. The first consists of places located in the north of Babylonia, the toponyms of the second group refer, perhaps, to the Transtigridian region, the Zagros and Khuzistan. Since the list includes mainly places from Northern Babylonia while toponyms of the south are lacking, it has been interpreted as a "cadastre" of an assumed kingdom of Kish, the first group of place names from Northern Babylonia representing Kish’s sphere of influence, the second group its trade routes. Although D. Frayne’s identifications of mostly Northern Babylonian toponyms with place names attested in contemporary administrative texts from Abu Salabikh are probably wrong, the lack of southern place names is striking.

The ca. 60 administrative texts from Abu Salabikh include places that are located within the geographical horizon of the texts from Fara, namely Eresh, Kunkulaba, Umma and Uruk (besides some toponyms that most probably refer to small settlements); references to the ensi of Uruk are especially noteworthy (IAS 528, see above). The spelling E.N.GI.KI is usually interpreted as writing for the city of Enegi, but could also refer to Kiengi “Sumer” (IAS 518).

An important literary source for the geographical horizon of the Fara period is extant in the so-called za₃-me hymns. This composition is known from 20 fragments from Abu Salabikh (IAS 257-277) and consists of 70 strophes following the scheme “in the city NN, praise to god NN”. Though not all place names can be identified with certainty, the composition displays a geographical horizon of remarkable extent that includes the whole of Babylonia proper, including Nippur, Kulaba/Uruk, Ur, Larsa, Zabalam, Urumm, Guabba, Sippar, Kutha, Kish, Adab(?), Umma, Lagash, Ningen-Sirara, Girsu, Shuruppag, Isin and Der, thus being delimited by Sippar and Kish to the North, Der to the East, and Ur and Larsa to the South. This pan-Babylonian geographical scope clearly reflects a shared cultural identity based on a common religion, with Enlil of Nippur as its head.

A shared religious identity – though focused on the cult of Inana – was also attested by the pan-Babylonian organization reflected by the city seals from the Djemdet Nasr/Uruk III period.

---

108 On Frayne 1992a: 90-93 (cf. Frayne 2007: 11-12), see Postgate (1995-1996) who demonstrates that most of the identifications between toponyms in the LGN and place names attested in administrative texts from IAS are based on misreadings and equations of place names written in different orthography, the identity of which is highly speculative.
109 For a complete list of toponyms, see Krebernik & Postgate 2009: 15. Since toponyms from outside Babylonia proper are otherwise unattested, SUBUR probably does not refer to Subartu, but rather to a place in the vicinity of Abu Salabikh, as is also indicated by the context (field text).
110 According to Viscacito & Pomponio 1994: 11; Postgate & Krebernik 2009: 7, 15 E.N.GI.KI rather refers to Enegi instead of ki-en-gi “Sumer”. For an interpretation as ki-en-gi “Sumer”, Zand in print a prefers an interpretation as Kiengi: the literary texts SF 18 obv. ii 4-6 and IAS 132 ii 8-9 refer to Inana as lady of E.N.GI.KI, who is not linked to the city of Enegi, so from what is known, an interpretation as Kiengi seems inevitable.
5. The Presargonic Period

5.1. The First Dynasty of Lagash

5.1.1 Texts Dating to the First Dynasty of Lagash

The rulers of the state of Lagash (modern al-Hiba) resided at its capital Girsu (modern Tello). A continuous line of regents is known from Urnanshe down to Urukagina, who was defeated by Lugalzagesi, Sargon’s adversary in the South. This continuous line of rulers, for the first time in the Mesopotamian record, offers a reliable historical chronology with, not only, a relative sequence of names, but also information on the duration of their reigns. The chronology of the First Dynasty of Lagash, as the rulers from Urnanshe to Urukagina are labelled, forms the backbone of the chronology of the Presargonic period.

The reign of Urnanshe marks the beginning of the Presargonic period, corresponding archaeologically to the ED IIIb period.\(^\text{113}\) Urnanshe and his successors have left a continuous sequence of royal inscriptions.\(^\text{114}\) Thanks to genealogical information found in these inscriptions, the order of their succession is firmly established. Moreover, as the texts provide a considerable number of synchronisms with rulers of other urban centres, the Lagash I royal inscriptions also provide the frame for a Presargonic chronology. The inscriptions are complemented by ca. 1700 administrative texts and ca. 40 legal texts, providing the most extensive corpus of administrative texts before Ur III, except for Adab and Ebla.\(^\text{115}\) The vast majority stem from early French excavations and illicit digging at the capital Girsu, ca. 20 texts were unearthed by an American expedition at al-Hiba/Lagash.\(^\text{116}\) These texts, which are often dated by referring to a given ruler and his regnal year (see above Section 3.1.4), allow estimates on the length of the reigns of the Lagash I rulers and thus on the duration of the Presargonic period.

Although a reasonable estimate for the total length of the Lagash I dynasty will be presented here, a precise calculation is hampered by the following facts:

1) No administrative or legal texts can be attributed to the reigns of the first three rulers with certainty.
2) Only the length of Enentarzir’s and Lugalanda’s reigns can be determined precisely. Though administrative texts are often dated by regnal years of a given ruler, early texts often omit the rulers name and cannot be attributed to a specific ruler with certainty.
3) Administrative texts dated by year and ruler’s name only provide information regarding the minimal duration of a given ruler’s reign.

As will be argued below (Section 5.3.3.) the synchronisms with Umma and the data available for both dynasties allows for a more precise evaluation of the length of the Presargonic period.

5.1.2 A Chronological List of the Presargonic rulers of Lagash

5.1.2.1 Before Urnanshe: Lugalshaengur

The earliest attested ruler of Lagash is Lugalshaengur,\(^\text{117}\) mentioned in an inscription of Mesilim, king of Kish (see above Section 4.5.3).\(^\text{118}\) A certain Enhengal, mentioned on a stone tablet (\textit{OIP} 104, 20), who has been included in earlier treatments of ED III history, is not a ruler at all.\(^\text{119}\)

---
\(^{113}\) Cf. 4.5.1. above on the transition from the Fara/ED IIIa to Presargonic/ED IIIb periods.
\(^{115}\) For a list of extant texts, see Selz 1995a: 9-11; Beld 2002: 5-36. To these, ca. 20 texts housed in the Hermitage Museum St. Petersburg (to be published by Selz) and the texts published and cited by Foxvog 1994; Selz 1994; Marzahn & Neumann 1995; Foster 1997; Balke 2011b; Foxvog 2011: 59 n. 2; Steinkeller 2011a: no. 4-5 are to be added.
\(^{116}\) Biggs 1978.
\(^{117}\) See Bauer 1998a: 445-447 for a reading \textit{lugal-ša₃-engur(ENGUR)}, for a different reading Lugasha(g)dangal (\textit{lugal-ša₃-da₃-gal}) due to an assumed identification of the signs as \textit{lugal-ša₃-ama}, see Marchesi 2006b: 216 n. 59, 260 and this volume (his Section 5.1.2.1). The conventional reading is kept here.
5.1.2.2 Before Urnanshe: GuNL.DU

Urnanshe was the son of a certain GuNL.DU (gu-NL.DU). He is qualified as du mu GUR.SAR "son of GUR.SAR" which could be interpreted as another filiation, thus referring to the grandfather of Urnanshe, or – more likely – to a toponym as GuNL.DU’s place of origin.120

(1) Urnanshe, son of GuNL.DU (generation 1)

As no administrative or legal text can be dated with certainty to the reign of Urnanshe, the length of his reign cannot be determined precisely. He left 40 inscriptions documenting a large-scale building programme (FAOS 5/1 Urn. 1-52 = RIME 1.9.1.1-33) and is known to have had eight children (FAOS 5/1 Urn. 21 = RIME 1.9.1.3),121 which points to a long-lasting reign. Marchesi discusses Urnanshe as the son of a certain Lumma in the so-called Lagash King List, a pseudo-historiographic text of the Old Babylonian period;122

BM 21103 (Sollberger 1967; Glassner 2004: 146-149): 153-156:

ur-naše du mu lum-ka-ke, e₂₁-sirara₂₁, e₂₃ ḫul₁-1a-ni [n]iĝen,₂₁ iri ki-ia₂₁-ga₂₁-ni mu-du₁-a [m]u 1080 i₁-a

"Urnanshe, the son of Lumma, who built the Sirara temple, her house that makes (her) heart rejoice, and Ningen, her beloved city, ruled for 1080 years."

Since this composition has little historical value in this regard,123 Urnanshe is generally taken as the son of GuNL.DU.

(2) Akurgal,124 son of Urnanshe (generation 2)

No administrative or legal texts bearing a year date of Akurgal are known, which could indicate the length of his reign. The small number of inscriptions (FAOS 5/1 Akurgal 1-3 = RIME 1.9.2.1-3) points to a short reign.125 A short reign is also indicated by the fact that only two sons of Akurgal are known and that Akurgal’s contemporary, Ninta (Uš) of Umma, must also have been a contemporary of both his predecessor Urnanshe and his successor Eanatum (see below no. 3). Note that Akurgal always bears the title en si₃₁₁₁, "governor" in his own inscriptions while he is designated as lugal "king" in Eanatum’s Stela of Vultures (FAOS 5/1 Ean. 1 = RIME 1.9.3.1 obv. ii 30-32).

(3) Eanatum, son of Akurgal (generation 3)

No administrative or legal text can be dated with any certainty to the reign of Eanatum. The sheer number of deeds, especially his far-reaching military campaigns, documented in 14 inscriptions (FAOS 5/1 Ean. 1-69 = RIME 1.9.3.1-14), indicate a long reign. The fragment of an inscription of Eanatum found at Kish has been taken as evidence that Eanatum extended his reign far to the north (AAICAB 1/2 Pl. 170 Ashm. 1930-204).126 A possible relative chronology of Eanatum’s inscriptions has been reconstructed by Cooper and Selz.127

An administrative text about the expenditure of beer dates to the third year of an unnamed ruler, possibly Eanatum or another early ruler like Enanatum I.128

(4) Enanatum I, son of Akurgal (generation 3)

Eanatum was succeeded by his (younger) brother, Enanatum I. A land sale document, dated to the fourth year of an unnamed ruler, can be dated to the reign of Enanatum I due to the occurrence of his son Lummatur:

120 Note the “lamentation singers of GUR.SAR” (gala GUR.SAR) in an administrative text, so that GUR.SAR (also?) denotes a place (DP 159 obv. ii 1, see Edzard et al. 1977: 64; Selz 1995a: 184; Bauer 1998a: 447; Beld 2002: 165 with n. 163; Selz 2003: 501; Marchesi 2006a: 20 n. 80; Huh 2008: 275).
121 See recently Selz 2010.
122 Marchesi 2006a: 20 n. 80. 128-129.
124 On the name see Bauer 1998a: 456; Marchesi 2004: 180, 194 n. 237; 2006a: 210 n. 24; 2006b: 62 n. 289; Selz 2010: 188 n. 5 who argue for aya₂₃-kur-gal "the father (is/has) a great mountain" or a · k u r · g a l "the father (is/has) a great house", respectively.
125 An unpublished inscription attributed to Adab is reported by Marchesi 2006a: 210 n. 24, 2006b: 62 n. 289. Note that Akurgal bears the title nɪ₃₂₁₁₁, -ensi₁₁,
126 Meyer-Laurin 2011: 29 n. 3.
128 Crawford 1977: 198-199, 219-222 4H-T38 (4H 90) rev. iv’ 4, 3⁻³⁻ (year)" (for a date to Eanatum or Enanatum I see Crawford 1977: 199. Marchesi 2006b: 258 n. 200). - NFT 180b = Bauer 1996: 43-44 rev. 30 la₂₁, 3, has been understood by Marchesi 2006b: 258 n. 199 as pertaining to a "27th (year)" of Eanatum; but see now the correction in n. 83 of his contribution to this volume.
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BiMes. 3, 10 = OIP 104, Appendix to nos. 22-23 obv. i-ii 1. rev iv 7:
0;2.4 ½ GAN.a₂, ĝE₂, SAM₂,MA-ta AS₂, GE LUGAL-la IB-MUD DUMU A₂,NI-KUR-RA ÊE₂, IB-ZI-KA-SÉ₂, LUM-
MA-UR DUMU EN-AN-NA-TUM₂, ĖNSI₂, LAGAS₄¹-KA-KE₂, Ė-ŠE₂,SAT₂ (…) 4C.

“0;2.4 ½ iku of land, according to the measuring rope for sales, in the ‘Royal Reed’ field – Lummatur, the son of
Enanatum, the governor of Lagash, bought it from Ibmud, the son of Anikura of Eibzi. (...) 4th (year).”

The suggestion to identify the unnamed NĪ₂-ENS₂, IBI₂, OB. i 1 with a ruler of Adab cannot yet be
substantiated.130

(5) Enmetena, son of Enanatum I (generation 4)

Enanata has left a considerable number of inscriptions that indicate a long reign (FAOS 5/1 Ent. 1-96 =
RIME 1.95.1-29).131 A slave sale document is dated to the 17th year of an unnamed ruler. As the date formula also
refers to the office of Enentarzi as temple administrator (sāg̣a), the text can be dated to the reign of Enmetena:

BIN 8, 352 = SRU 35 rev. iv 11-12:
EN-EN-TAR-ZI SĀG̣A 17C

“Enentarzi was temple administrator. 17th (year).”

Enmetena's 19th year appears in a slave sale document that equally refers to the Enentarzi's office of temple admin-
istrator and in an administrative account with a date formula referring to the administrator (AGRIG) Enanatumsipazi:

RTC 16 = SRU 43 rev. ii 3-iii 3:
U₂-Ba En-EN-TE-na ĖNSI₂, LAGAS₄¹-KA-KAM EN-EN-TAR-ZI SĀG̣A² 6NIN-ŠIR₂-SU-KA-KAM 20: LA₂ LÉ

“In this time, Enmetena was governor of Lagash, Enentarzi was temple administrator at Ningirsu. 19th (year).”

NFT 181 AO 4156 obv. ii 2-rev. i 2:
EN-EN-TE-na ĖNSI₂, LAGAS₄¹ [N-AN-N]A-TUM₂, SIPA-ZI AGRIG 20: LA₂ LÉ.

“Enentarzi was governor of Lagash, Enanatumsipazi was administrator. 19th (year).”

Two administrative texts dated to the 20th year (ITT 5, 9241 rev. i 1)132 and to the 17th or (more probably to the)
27th year of an unnamed ruler (ITT 5, 9236)133 have been attributed to Enmetena.134

The brewer Kiang (ki-a-g₂) mentioned in the first text ITT 5, 9241 also appears in a document from Lugalanda
year 5 (Nik. 1, 94):135

ITT 5, 9241 obv. i 1-2-rev. i 1:
[NÉ₂-GU₂-SAR₂-[K]U₂-[SAR₂-][TA₂] SĀG̣A₂ 4BA₂-UR₂-KA-ŠE₂-GAR₂ KI₂-A₂, LU₂-BABIR₂, 20:

“[x kor of barley] from the temple administrator of GU₂-SAR₂, [x (kor of barley)] from the temple admin-
istrator of Bauw. Delivery of Kiang, the brewer. 20th (year).”

Nik. 1, 94 = Selz 1989: no. 94 obv. i-ii, rev. ii 5-iii 4:
6SILA₂, KAS-GE-GGE LUGAL-I[G]-GAL 6SILA₂, UR-SU-GA-LAM-MA 6SILA₂, KI₂-A₂, 6SILA₂, UR-SUBUR₂ 6SILA₂,
ŠU-MAḪ₂ (…) LU₂-BABIR₂-NE (…) SUBUR NU₂-BANDA₂, UR-SU₂-GAL₂-UĜ₂, MAV.NA₂-SUM₂ 5C

“6 litres of black beer: Lugaliggal, 6 litres: Urshugalama, 6 litres: Kiang, 6 sila: Ursubur, 6 litres: Shumah (…) they are
brewers (…) Subur, the captain, has given to Ursang, the commander. 5th (year of Lugalanda).”

Since a dating of ITT 5, 9241 (“20th year”) to the reign of Lugalanda is excluded and an attribution to the reign
of Enentarzi is unlikely, the text should belong to the reign of Enmetena (rather than to Enanatum II). The reign

129 Cf. Marchesi 2006b: 258 n. 200; cf. Powell 1978: 9 n. 16 for the date.
130 Suggested by Pomponio & Visicato 1994: 19. On the title NĪ₂-ENS₂, see Pomponio and Marchesi in this volume. To G.
Marchesi we owe the following observation: “The spelling NĪ₂-ENS₂, PA.TESI₂ for /ENS₂/ is peculiar to the cities of Adab, Gehekullaba,
Isin, Shuruppak, and Uruk (see Marchesi & Marchetti 2011: 173); I think that the line in question may read: urdu₂ PA.TESI₂ A ( Ki-tak₂); cf. the
writing of Aškâk, IBI₂, OB. i 3.”
131 For a relative chronology of the events reported see Cooper 1983b: 30-33.
133 Cf. Mackaev 1973-1974: 138, 139 n. 88; Marchesi 2006b: 258 n. 201; Monaco 2010; 2011a; Marchesi in this volume.
134 Marchesi 2006b: 258 n. 201.
135 The reference to the NU₂-BANDA₂, Subur ascertains a dating to the year (Lug) 5. On the dating of Subur, see Visicato 1996: 104 n. 2.
136 Cf. the CDLI database under the CDLI-no. P227604.
of Enmetena can therefore be estimated at a minimum of 19 years, although in view of the long reigns attested for the rulers of Umma\textsuperscript{137} datings for a 20\textsuperscript{th} and perhaps a 27\textsuperscript{th} year may well belong to Enmetena as well.

(6) **Enanatum II, son of Enmetena** (generation 5)

Only one inscription is known from the reign of Enanatum II stating his filiation (\textit{FAOS} 5/1 En. II 1 = \textit{RIME} 1.9.6.1).

Various scholars\textsuperscript{138} attributed a reign of five years to him, based on the interpretation of the so-called Enentarzi letter (\textit{CIRPL} Enz. 1 = \textit{FAOS} 19 asGir 1), dated to the 5\textsuperscript{th} year of an unnamed ruler. The text deals with the raid of an Elamite army against Lagash and is addressed to Enentarzi, the temple administrator of Ningirsu and thus a plausible candidate to become the next city ruler. Although the name of the letter’s addressee En-e-tar-zi is established as an orthographic variant of the name En-e-tar-zi,\textsuperscript{139} prosopography points to a substantially later date in the reign of Urukagina: the blacksmith Niglunudu (\textit{ibid}. iv 4) appears only in texts of Ukg L 4-6.\textsuperscript{140}

**Engisa**

According to a theory of Powell, Enanatum II was succeeded by a certain Engisa (or Engilsa, written En-gi-le-sa, read also En-gi-lil-sa) who is mentioned as the father of Urukagina on the Manishtushu Obelisk (\textit{OIP} 104, 40 A xiv 7-10) and, together with Sasa, wife of Urukagina, as dedicating votive objects to Ninmar.ki (\textit{DP} 69, Ukg L 2).\textsuperscript{141} Powell’s theory has not found wide acceptance, first, because no royal inscriptions can be ascribed to Engisa and, secondly, because his son Urukagina could also be an Early Sargonic namesake of the last Presargonic ruler of Lagash (no. 9 below). As very few administrative and legal texts pre-dating Enentarzi and very few royal inscriptions post-dating Enmetena are known, the lack of contemporary sources is no decisive counter-argument against Powell’s theory.\textsuperscript{142}

Furthermore, the Engisa in a list of sheep for offerings, which includes deceased ancestors (\textit{DP} 218), has been identified as a deceased governor.\textsuperscript{143} However, this reference does not refer to a recipient of offerings, but to a steward (sagî) well known as a provider of sheep in the Girsu administration in the time of Lugalanda and employed in the organisation of the princess Gemenanshe.\textsuperscript{144} The Engisa of \textit{DP} 69 (see above) was most probably the same steward (sagî), since a steward took an active part in donations at festivals at Presargonic Lagash (\textit{e.g.} \textit{DP} 73, 74). Finally, if Engisa had ruled before Enentarzi, he surely would not appear listed as being alive under Urukagina, since normally the office of a governor ends only with his death. Therefore, no Engisa can be included in the list of Lagash governors.

(7) **Enentarzi, son of Enmetena** (B) (generation 5)

A considerable corpus of administrative texts dated to the reign of Enentarzi are available, there are no royal inscriptions. Therefore, the relationship between Enentarzi and his predecessors is unknown.\textsuperscript{145} Sale documents\textsuperscript{146} inform us that Enentarzi was the temple administrator (sagâ) of Ningirsu during the reign of Enmetena, but this does not necessarily indicate that Enentarzi was Enmetena’s son.\textsuperscript{147} However, it demonstrates that Enentarzi cannot be assigned to a later generation than Enanatum II.

\textsuperscript{137} Monaco 2010; 2011a; below 5.2.


\textsuperscript{139} \textit{DP} 39 obv. ii 4-rev. i 1.


\textsuperscript{141} Powell 1996.

\textsuperscript{142} Note that only three different royal inscriptions dating from the time Enanatum II, Enentarzi and Lugalanda are known (\textit{i.e.} the duplicates \textit{FAOS} 5/1 En. II 1-4, \textit{FAOS} 5/1 Enz. 1 = \textit{RIME} 1.9.7.1; \textit{FAOS} 5/1 Lug. 15 = \textit{RIME} 1.9.8.1) and that the large corpus of administrative texts dates from the reigns of Enentarzi, Lugalanda and Urukagina; cf. e.g. the complete lack of royal inscriptions attributable to Manedu of Umma who reigned for 32 years.

\textsuperscript{143} Thus de Genouillac 1909: xiv, and Deimel 1920: 3, 50; 1930: 75-76; Selz 2003: 500-502; Steinkeller 2003a: 279.

\textsuperscript{144} He appears to be the same Engisa who is also dealing with sheep, \textit{e.g.} in \textit{DP} 43 rev. i 6-rev. ii 3; \textit{HSS} 3, 30 = Selz 1993a: no. 30 viii 12-14. An identity with the alleged ruler of Lagash can be ruled out with certainty, see already Chiodi 1997, vol. 1: 56 n. 102. [A note by Schrakamp & Sallaberger on this matter is in preparation].


\textsuperscript{146} \textit{BIN} 8, 352 = \textit{SRU} 35; \textit{DP} 31 = \textit{SRU} 31; \textit{RTC} 16 = \textit{SRU} 43.

\textsuperscript{147} The statement in Bauer 1998a: 473, ”Im Amt des Stadtfürsten folgte ihm Enentarzid. Dieser war zur Zeit seines Vaters Enmetena zur Würde des höchsten Ningirsu-Priester aufgestiegen” is apparently a misprint, cf. Bauer 1998a: 474, “Worauf sich die in CAD/Š/1, 382b geäußerte Gewißheit gründet, daß der sanga des Ningirsu normalerweise der Sohn des amtierenden Ensi war, und in diesem Falle Enentarzi ein Sohn Enmetenas gewesen sei, ist mir unbekannt. Aus den Quellen ist dergleichen nicht herauszulesen, auch nicht aus der dort zitierte Rechtsurkunde \textit{RTC} 16 [ \textit{i.e.} dated to the ensiship of Enmetena and the sangaship of Enentarzi].” Note, however, that II of Umma held the sangaship of Zabalam during the reign of his uncle Urlluma, see below 5.3.2.
Many administrative texts are dated to the 5th year of Enentarzi.148 A single document can perhaps be attributed to the 6th year of Enentarzi:

Likhachew 1 = Shileico 1914: 61-62 no. 1 = CDLI P247593 rev. ii-iii:

“Of Enentarzi, governor of Lagash; the cowherds have returned them to the palace. Subur, the scribe, has taken (them) away. 16th (year).”149

Two more texts dated to the 6th year of an unnamed ruler can perhaps be ascribed to Enentarzi’s reign on prosopographical grounds.150 A third document (DP 40) dated to the 7th year of an unnamed ruler has also been ascribed to Enentarzi by Wu.151 However, the text in question should rather be attributed to either Lugulanda or Urukagina, as several officials mentioned in this text also co-occur in an offering list from the 4th year of Urukagina’s reign (TXA7).152

The reign of Enentarzi can, therefore, be calculated at a minimum of 5 or, perhaps, 6 years. In view of the comparatively large number of administrative texts from this last year, a longer reign seems improbable.

(8) Lugulanda, son of Enentarzi (generation 6)

Lugulanda153 was, according to DP 31, the son of Enentarzi.154 Only one royal inscription is preserved from his reign.

The reign of Lugulanda can precisely be calculated at 6 years and 1 month. At Lagash, low-ranking work forces, employed by the temple, were issued remunerations of barley and emmer (še-ĝar ziz še-ĝar) once a month; the expenditure of which was counted from 1 to 12 according to the month during which the rations were issued. The last document of this series from Lugulanda’s reign is dated to the 1st month of his 7th regnal year:

HSS 3, 30 = Selz 1993a: no. 29 rev. v-vi:

šu-niĝen2, 1.40.2.2 še-gur-sa-ĝal 41.2.0 la 2c.sila ziz še-ĝar ziz še-ĝar sa-du du iti-da para 19 nam-sa ra dam lugal-an-da ensi 1 lagas 41.2.0 iti še-KIN-ku-ra, 2a eni-gal NU-ban-da, 2e-KILAM-ka-ta e-ta-ĝar 5. li ba-am

“Total: 100;2.0 guršaggal-kor of barley, 41;2.0 guršaggal-kor minus 2 sila of emmer, regular monthly delivery. Paramantara, the wife of Lugulanda, the governor of Lagash. In the month the barley is harvested Eniggal, the captain delivered (it) from the Ekilama. 7th year. 1st allocation.”

The subsequent expenditure of barley and emmer bears a date relating to the 2nd month of Urukagina’s reign:

IV 14, 9 = Bauer 1972: no. 43 rev. v-vi:

šu-niĝen2, 1,40.0.0 la 23.2 še-gur-sa-ĝal 41.3.0 ziz še-ĝar ziz še-ĝar sa-du du iti-da ba-uži iri-ni-nim-ge-na ensi 1 lagas 41.3.0 en-i-gal NU-ban-da, 2e-ki-sal 19-la-ta e-ta-ĝar 1. 2r ba-am

“Total: 100;0.0 minus 23.2 guršaggal-kor of barley, 41;2.0 guršaggal-kor of emmer, regular monthly delivery of Baru. Lugulanda, governor of Lagash. Eniggal, the captain delivered (it) from the Ekisala. 1st year. 2nd allocation.”

Another administrative account, dated to the 7th year of an unnamed ruler, dealing with goods for a funeral has been correlated with the burial of Lugulanda by Selz.155 The length of Lugulanda’s reign can, therefore, be precisely determined as 6 years and 1 month,156 given that the power was being transferred to Urukagina between the 1st and 2nd month of Lugulanda’s 7th regnal year.157

148 E.g., DP 93, DP 94, DP 237, DP 248, DP 274, DP 275, Nk. 1, 99, Nk. 1, 193, IV 14, 188.

149 The date is not well preserved and only 3 years are certain; the long horizontal wedge suggests a number 5 (written 3+2) or 6 (3+3). According to the photo in CDLI some damage has occurred since Shileico copied the text.

150 Yoshikawa 1987: 314; Sollberger 1948: no. 5.

151 DP 40; see Wu 2001: 101. The document mentions a certain administrator Dudu (du-du sağğa). One Dudu, sağğa (lagas190), also occurs in DP 41, see Foxvog 2001-2002: 176 (Lugulanda 3) // Ginara 26 no. 1.

152 Selz 1993b.

153 Other documents dated to the 7th year of Lugulanda are DP 381; DP 384; RTC 55; TSA 41; IV 25, 39; see Bauer 1973-1974: 14 n. 27a.


155 The full form is written lugal-AN-da nu-ğuš-ğa:; for the name see Bauer 1998a: 475; Marchesi 2006b: 217-218 n. 64, 263 n. 258 argues for a reading lugal-di-gitir-da.

156 = SRU 31; Deimel 1920: 50; Bauer 1987-1990a; 1998a: 474-475; Beld 2002: 70. The text mentions Enentarzi as the temple administrator (sağğa) of Ningirsu in col. i and Lugulanda du mu sağğa “son of the temple administrator” as witness.

157 Selz 1995b.
(9) Urukagina (generation 7)\textsuperscript{158}

After Lugalanda’s death, it was not one of his sons, but Urukagina who succeeded him as governor of Lagash. Urukagina has long been regarded as a usurper,\textsuperscript{159} but nowadays it is assumed that his succession was legitimated through a familiar relationship to the dynasty of Urnanshe or Enentarzi, or his marriage with Sasa.\textsuperscript{160} Moreover, Urukagina is attested as a high-ranking commander (\textit{gāl-u₂₃}) from the early years of Lugalanda.\textsuperscript{161} Since he once issued barley himself, he must have been part of the inner circle at the court of Lugalanda.\textsuperscript{162} Urukagina had four or five children,\textsuperscript{163} so he was at least 25-30 years old, when he came to power. His predecessor Lugalanda was the son of Enentarzi, who, in turn, held the office of the temple administrator of Ningirsu as early as Enmetena, therefore, Urukagina is assigned to a subsequent generation.

As Urukagina’s inscriptions do not contain genealogical information, his origin is disputed.

1) Several scholars identify Urukagina with the son of Engisa who occurs in the list of witnesses on the \textit{Manishtushu Obelisk}.\textsuperscript{164}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{OIP} 104, 40 A xiv 7-10:
\[\text{1 iri-enim-ge-na, DUMU en-gi₁₆-sa, ensi₁, lagas₃}^\text{31}\]
“Urukagina, son of Engisa, governor of Lagash.”
\end{itemize}

The filiation given on the \textit{Manishtushu Obelisk} indicates that Engisa bears the title \textit{ensi₁}, not Urukagina.\textsuperscript{165} Although an Engisa is attested under Lugalanda and Urukagina (and especially as donator of jewels in \textit{DP 69}), this person did not serve as a ruler of Lagash, as argued above (Section 5.1.2).

Therefore neither the chronological nor prosopographical arguments used to identify the Urukagina of the \textit{Manishtushu Obelisk} with the Presargonic ruler of Lagash apply, and since the name Urukagina is otherwise untested in 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennium sources,\textsuperscript{166} papponymy remains an option.\textsuperscript{167}

2) Urukagina is believed to have been the son of a certain Urutu (written \textit{ur-ud}) who appears in lists of offerings for the deceased ancestors dating from the time of Urukagina’s reign.\textsuperscript{168} The best-preserved offering-list dates from the year Ukg. I 3 and includes offerings of sheep for the deceased ancestors, beginning with Enentarzi:

\[\text{\textit{OIP} 104, 40 A xiv 7-10:}\
\[\text{1 iri-enim-ge-na, DUMU en-gi₁₆-sa, ensi₁, lagas₃}^\text{31}\]
“Urukagina, son of Engisa, governor of Lagash.”


\textsuperscript{158} E. g., Deimel 1930: 75; Kobayashi 1985: 10; recently Magid 2001: 313-314 n. 3.


\textsuperscript{161} VS 27, 33, see Selz 1992b.


\textsuperscript{164} For an interpretation of \textit{ensi₁}, as title of Engisa, see the critical remarks of Selz 2003: 502-504, cf. Foster 1982a: 155; Milone 1998; Foster 2000: 312-313. For the sequence \textit{PN₁} (– title) – son of \textit{PN₂} (– title) in the Manishtushu Obelisk see e.g. \textit{OIP} 104, no. 40 A vi 11-14 and vi 8-12, \textit{Ennalum, ABRA, URU of Dursuen}, appearing as \textit{PN₁}, and as \textit{PN₂}.

\textsuperscript{165} The only other reference for the name is found in the early Old Babylonian administrative text \textit{BIN 7}, 97 obv. 2 (written \textit{iri₁₄-enim-ge-na}), see, e.g. Selz 1992b; Bauer 1998a: 476.

\textsuperscript{166} The reigns of Urukagina, Lugalzagesi and Sargon overlapped (see below 6.1.-3.), and the sequence of the \textit{USKL}, with Manishtushu before Rimush, would still allow for the identification of Urukagina as a contemporary of Manishtushu from a chronological point of view. Formerly, it has been argued that Urukagina’s identity with the contemporary of Manishtushu is impossible since the time-span between Urukagina – Sargon – Rimush – Manishtushu is much too long; cf. Weissbach 1938; Sollberger 1954-1956: 29; Cooper 1983b: 36; Chiodi 1997: 56 n. 102, 82-86 n. 140, 141-143; Bauer 1998a: 476.
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**VS 27, 85 = Beld 2002: 75-76 obv. i 1-ii 4, iii 5-iv 7:**

1 udu en-en-tar-zi 1 udu lugal-an-da 1 udu para-nam-tar-ra 1 udu du-du saşqa *lc ur*[sila]1, sir1, sir2, [ra]-bi 1 udu *lc ur-ud* lc *geš-ri* lc *gan-uba*₂, lc lugal-u₁-de₃, lc *gan-girid*₄, *šc-ne-ne-kam* (...) 

1 udu ⁷*lugal-urub*⁵(urukkar)⁶, 1 maš ᵵ-a-da-na 1 udu lc ur-ud lc *geš-ri* lc *gan*-ba₂-uba₂ lc lugal-u₁-de₃, lc *gan-girid*₄, *šc-ne-ne-kam* u₂, 2-kam

"1 sheep: Enentarzi, 1 sheep: Lugalanda, 1 sheep: Paranamtara, 1 sheep: temple administrator Dudu, 1 (sheep): Usrilasirsira, 1 sheep: Urtur, Geshri, Ganbawu, Lugalude, Gangirid. It is for the 5 of them (...)"

1 sheep: Urugalurb, 1 he-goat: Adana, 1 sheep: Ururu, Geshri, Ganbawu, Lugalude, Gangirid. It is for the 5 of them, it is the 2nd day."

Of the five persons named, Geshri is identified as "mother of the governor" (ama ensi₂-ka) and Ganbawu as "sister of the governor" (nin ensi₂-ka₃) in VS 14, 164.²⁴ In a parallel list there is "the father of the governor" preceding the "mother of the governor" (i.e. Geshri) and thus corresponding to the position of the name Urutu in the above cited list VS 27, 85.

**DP 224 rev. iv 2’5’ (obv. i’ 1’-4’ is a parallel):**

*ab-ba ensi₃, ama ensi₃, ab-ba munus nin munus*

"the father of the governor, the mother of the governor, the father of the lady, the sister of the lady" ²⁳

Since Urutu, Geshri, Ganbawu, Lugalude, and Gangirid do not occur in offering-lists predating Urukagina’s reign, an interpretation of these individuals as relatives of Urukagina and his wife is highly plausible; Urukagina himself would then have included them in the ancestry cult.²⁴ However, these persons have also tentatively been interpreted as relatives of Enentarzi, whose family ties are unknown,²⁵ and it is never stated explicitly that they were relatives of Urukagina and Sasa, respectively. G. Selz, however, regards the fact that Enentarzi is explicitly mentioned in the offering lists VS 27, 85 and DP 224 as an argument against an identification with the unnamed governor.²⁶

While Urukagina’s origins are a matter of debate, the chronology of Urukagina’s early years is well established. After the 1st month of Lugalanda’s reign, i.e. after the death of the latter, Urukagina succeeded to the throne. This is demonstrated by two subsequent expenditures of barley and emmer that are dated to 1st month of Lug 7 and the 2nd month of Ukg E 1. The year Lug 7 is, therefore, the same as the year Ukg E 1 (see above *sub* no. 8).

During his first regnal year, which corresponds to a ruler’s accession year, Urukagina held the title “governor of Lagash” (ensi₁ lagas²), changing to “king of Lagash” (lugal lagas³) in the 1st month of the subsequent year.²⁷ The majority of administrative texts date to years 1 to 6 of his kingship (Ukg L 1-6). The first year as king is Urukagina’s first complete year of rule, and according to the standard usage we count only these as his years of rule.

During the 4th to 6th year as king of Lagash, Lagash was laid siege by Uruk three times (see below 6.1.). Only two administrative texts are dated to the 7th year of his kingship.²⁸

During his late 7th or early 8th year as king of Lagash, Urukagina was defeated by Lugalzagesi. The title “king of Lagash” is not attested anymore in texts dated after his 7th year of his kingship; instead, from now on, he bore the title “king of Girsu” in royal inscriptions.

**FAOS 5/1 Ukg. 16 (Urakagina Lament) = RIME 1.99.5 viii 6-10:**

*nam-ta, iri-enim-ge-na lugal gir₂-su⁴-ka nu-ğal₂*

“a sin of Urukagina, the king of Girsu, does not exist”²⁹

---

²⁴ VS 14, 164 = Bauer 1972: no. 168; similar lists are DP 57; DP 223; DP 224; Nik. 1, 25 = Selz 1989a: no. 25; VS 14, 172 = Bauer 1972: no. 165.
²⁵ Selz 2004: 238.
²⁷ Selz 2004: 238.
²⁸ Bauer 1998a: 477-478. Occurrences of an unnamed ensi₁ in administrative documents from Urukagina’s reign as king have led Bauer 1977: 1-3; Cooper 1983: 9 n. 17; 35 n. 44 to consider the installation of a dependent ensi₁, but an interpretation of the title as the traditional form of address is most probably preferable, see Powell 1978: 28-29.
³⁰ Cf. also *EAOS* 5/1 Ukg. 1 i 1-9; *EAOS* 5/1 Ukg. 58 = RIME 1.99.9.13.
Only a few administrative texts postdate Urukagina’s defeat by Lugalzagesi, namely from his 8th and 9th year.\footnote{84\textsuperscript{th} year: \textit{Nik.} 1, 66 = Selz 1989a: no. 66; \textit{NFT} 181 AO 4155; 9\textsuperscript{th} year: \textit{Nik.} 1, 137 = Selz 1989a: no. 137. See Sollberger 1957; Bauer 1972; 30; Selz 1989a: 279; Bauer 1998a: 478-480, 492-493; Sallaberger 2004: 19-20, \textit{BiMes.} 3, 18. an administrative text dated to the 9\textsuperscript{th} year of an unnamed ruler, dealing with cattle, can possibly be attributed to Urukagina’s reign, but, according to the copy, palaeography would also allow a date before Enentarzi.} The latest administrative document, an olive shaped clay docket, is dated to his 10\textsuperscript{th} year as king:

\textit{FAOS} 5/1 Ukg. 38 (see Bauer 1985: 10 no. 21; Selz 1989a: 279; Bauer 1998a: 478 for the restoration):

\begin{equation}
1,20 \text{\textsuperscript{th}} \text{mes} 3\text{-} \text{kam}\text{-} \text{ma} \text{u}\text{š} \text{-} \text{bi}, \text{ki}\text{r} \text{ir} \text{i}, \text{e} \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{-} \text{ša}, \text{-} \text{ga}\text{-} \text{ta} \text{fi} \text{ri}\text{-} \text{enim}\text{-} \text{ge}\text{-} \text{na} [\text{lugal} \text{gi} \text{r} \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{-} \text{su} \text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{-} \text{ke}, \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{ša}, \text{es}, \text{ka}] \text{\textsuperscript{1}} \text{n\text{\textit{k}}u} \text{-} \text{mu}(\text{\textit{du}}) 10.
\end{equation}

"\textit{80 mes} trees (of) third class has Urukagina, [the king of Girsu], from the garden of the inner temple, brought into the sanctum. 10\textsuperscript{th} (year)."

5.2. The Presargonic Rulers of Umma

Texts from Presargonic Umma include royal inscriptions\footnote{Sallaberger 2004: 201, 204-205; George 2011: 33, 50; Marchesi & Marchetti 2012: 27.} and, thanks to recent publications, nearly 200, mostly administrative texts including some legal documents. These texts date from the reigns of Enakale (no. 3 below) to Lugalzagesi (12), their largest groups being ascribed to reigns of Urukaginreddi (12), II (5), Meanedu (8) and Ushurdu (9).\footnote{The reading as Ninta (Sumerian meaning "man") is plausible for semantic reasons.} These texts include genealogical information and dates of years and months (Sumerian \textmu\textit{, iti}) that complement the synchronisms found in Presargonic inscriptions from Lagash and genealogical information contained in royal inscriptions of the rulers of Umma, thus they provide a basis for a reassessment of their chronology. Since ca. 400 administrative and legal tablets from Presargonic Umma and Zabalam emanating from illicit excavations have been reported,\footnote{Mostly reports by Cooper 1983b; 23; Bauer 1998a: 451-452; for the reading Pabilgagaltuku, see Marchesi 2004: 196; Marchesi in this volume.} but are, as yet, partially unpublished, the chronology offered below can probably be developed further in future studies.

(1) **Pabilgagaltuku (Pabilgaltuku)** (generation 1)\footnote{Visicato & Westenholz 2010: no. 347-351 (?); the tablets published in Monaco 2011b and cited ibid. p. 2; Bauer 2012: no. 1-3. Future prosopographical studies will certainly allow for attributions to the remaining rulers as well; cf. Monaco 2010: 2011a: 181 AO 4155; 9.}  

Pabilgagaltuku, governor of Umma, is known from an inscription of Urnanshe. Urnanshe defeated Umma and captured Pabilgagaltuku:

\textit{FAOS} 5/1 Urn. 51 = \textit{RIME} 1.9.1.6. b rev. iv 5-8:

\begin{equation}
p\text{\textit{a}bil-ga})(\text{\textit{g}}e\text{\textit{s}})-\text{gal-tuku} \text{\textit{ens}}i, \text{\textit{u}mma(\textit{g}e\text{\textit{s}},\textit{ku}\text{\textit{u}})}\text{-} \text{mu}\text{-} \text{dab}.
\end{equation}

"He seized Pabilgagaltuku, the governor of Umma."

(2) **Ninta ("US")**\footnote{The reading as Ninta (Sumerian meaning "man") is plausible for semantic reasons.} (generation 2)

Enmetena’s account of the Lagash-Umma border conflict reports that Ninta ("US") invaded the territory of Lagash. His invasion was repelled by an unnamed ruler of Lagash:\footnote{Future prosopographical studies will certainly allow for attributions to the remaining rulers as well; cf. Monaco 2010: 2011a: 181 AO 4155; 9.}

\textit{FAOS} 5/1 Ent. 28/29 = \textit{RIME} 1.9.5.1 i 13-31:

\begin{equation}
n\text{\textit{n}in-ta(\text{\textit{u}ss})} \text{\textit{ens}}i, \text{\textit{u}mma(\textit{\textit{g}}e\text{\textit{s}},\text{\textit{k}}u\text{\textit{u}}\text{\textit{u}})}\text{-} \text{mu}\text{-} \text{dab}.
\end{equation}

"Ninta ("US"), the governor of Umma, turned the \textit{matter} into something that exceeds (any) word. He smashed that stela and marched on the plain of Lagash. Ningirsu, the warrior of Enlil, at his just command, did battle with Umma. At Enlil’s command, he spread the great throwing-net over it, and set up burial mounds for it on the plains."
After a break following a narrative that possibly refers to Urnanshe’s victory over Pabilgaltuku, Eanatum’s Stela of Vultures refers to a conflict between Akurgal and an unnamed ruler of Umma:

FAOS 5/1 Ean. 1 = RIME 1.9.3.1 obv. ii 22-24:

[... iḫt-a-ka lugal ummāki kanšu du-ra, e-ma-da-du, lagaski gaba-bi šu e-ma-usi, a-kur-gal lugal lagaski dumu ur-aššu [...]

“Because of [...] the man of Umma spoke arrogantly with him and defied Lagash. Akurgal, king of Lagash, son of Urnanshe [...].”

Cooper and Bauer suggest identifying Ninta (“Uš”) with the unnamed “man of Umma” who, according to the Stela of Vultures was first defeated by Eanatum and then killed by the people of his own city:

FAOS 5/1 Ean. 1 = RIME 1.9.3.1 obv. vii 20-viii 3:

[... gēš mu-ni-ra adī bi 3600 ĝir-ganū, șu e-nazī ša, ummāki-ka nezi-gaz [...]

“(Eanatum) defeated him. Its [= Umma’s] 3600 corpses reached the base of heaven [...] raised (their) hands against him and killed him in Umma.”

Since Ninta (“Uš”) was a contemporary of Eanatum, he is assigned to a generation subsequent to Pabilgaltuku.

(3) Enakale (generation 3)

Enmetena’s account of the Umma-Lagash border conflict indicates that Ninta (“Uš”) was succeeded by Enakale and reports that Eanatum demarcated the border with Enakale:

FAOS 5/1 Ent. 28/29 = RIME 1.9.5.1 i 32-42:

e-n-a-tum ensi lagasši-pa-bil, ga en-mete-na ensi lagasši-ka-ke, en-aš-kal-le ensi ummāši-da ki e-da-sur

“Eanatum, the governor of Lagash, the uncle of Enmetena, the governor of Lagash, demarcated the border with Enakale, the governor of Umma.”

According to Cooper and Selz, Eanatum’s designation as ensi “governor” instead of lugal “king” dates this event to early in his reign. No administrative texts can be attributed to Enakale’s reign and thus the length of his reign remains unknown. Since Ninta (“Uš”) probably had a long reign (see above no. 2), Enakale is assigned to a later generation than Ninta (“Uš”). According to a legal document, Enakale ruled for 8 years, at least:

Bauer 2012: no. 1 rev. iii:

u11,ba en-aš-kal-le ensi ummāši(gēš,<kušuški>) šte mu iti 10la, še

“At this time, Enakale was governor of Umma. Year 8 month 9.”

(4) Urlumma, son of Enakale (generation 4)

Enakale was succeeded by his son Urlumma, who left two votive inscriptions (FAOS 5/2 Urlumma 1-2 = RIME 1.12.4.1-2). Urlumma did not repay the barley loans imposed on Umma by Eanatum and invaded the territory of Lagash. Enanatum I reports that he drove “Urlumma, governor of Umma” back to the border (FAOS 5/1 En. I 29 = RIME 1.9.4.2 vii 1-viii 4, x 6-xi 2).

The same events are reported in greater detail in Enmetena’s account of the Umma-Lagash border conflict. According to this text, it was not Enanatum I, but Enmetena who finally defeated Urlumma and who was then killed in Umma. Since Enmetena’s name is not followed by the ruler’s title, it has been suggested that he defeated Urlumma while his father was still in office.

Note that Akurgal bears the title lugal lagasši “king of Lagash” instead of ensi, lagasši, as in his own inscriptions; this event might therefore have taken place in Akurgal’s early reign, and the alleged attack of Ninta might have been successful.

Another reference for Akurgal as niĝensi is found in an unpublished inscription probably from Adab, see above 5.1. no. 2.

185 Cooper 1983b: 24; Bauer 1998a: 467, 472.
The leader of Umma could exploit 1 kuru, of the barley of Nanshe and the barley of Ningirsu as an interest-bearing loan (...)

Since he was unable to repay that barley, Urlumma, the governor of Umma, diverted the water from the boundary channel of Ningirsu (and) the boundary channel of Nanshe. He set fire to their stelae and smashed them. He destroyed the dedicated(?) daises of the gods that were erected at Namnundakigara. He recruited all the hostile lands, and transgressed the boundary channel of Ningirsu.

Enanatum, the governor of Lagash, fought with him in the Uliga field, the field of Ningirsu. Enmetena, the beloved son of Enanatum, defeated him.

Urlumma escaped, but he (= Enanatum) forced him back to Umma. He abandoned his asses – they were 60 teams – at the bank of the Lummagirnunta canal, and left the bones of their men scattered in the plain. He (Enmetena) made burial mounds in five places for them.

These events are also reported in Urukagina’s “reforms” (FAOS 5/1 Ulg. 6 = RIME 1.9.9.3 iv 1′-28”).

Upon his defeat, Urlumma was succeeded by his cousin Il, who had held the office of temple administrator (saĝ̣a) of Zabalam during Urlumma’s reign.163a

A few administrative and legal texts bearing mu-iti dates stem from the time of Urlumma. A sale document is dated to his accession year (Arnaud 2007: no. 1; see Section 3.1.5). The same year is also referred to in another sale document:

Bauer 2012: no. 2 rev. ii;

At this time, Urlumma was governor of Umma (Year 1) ... Year 6.

The 2nd year of Urlumma and the 9th and 12th regnal year of an unnamed ruler are attested in the date formulae of several unpublished texts. Since these texts also inform us that Il held the office of “minister” (sağ̣al) or “temple administrator” (saĝ̣a), they can be attributed to the reign of Urlumma:163c

CUNES 52-10-002: dated to Urlumma year 2, Lugaldu sağ̣a
CUNES 52-17-021: dated to year 9, month 5, Il sagal;
CUNES 52-17-028: dated to year 9, month 9, Il sagal;
CUNES 52-04-001: dated to year 12, Il sagal

Urlumma’s reign can, therefore, be estimated at, at least, 12 years, but 15 years is equally possible. An expenditure of weapons dated to the 4th year of an unnamed ruler, refers to Mesûnī as temple administrator (sağ̣a), Mesûnī is known to have held this post at Zabalam during the reign of Il (TCBI 2, nos. I-1, I-46; see below no. 5): this document is part of a group dated to years 1-15. Two expenditures of flour at the festival of (Nin-) Nagar.Bu156 mention the PN’s Usubur and Emah, and are dated to year 15 and year 1, respectively:

Texts from TCBI 2:
1-23: 6.0.0 zi, gur ur-subur izim ‘Nagar.Bu Is; mu iti 2r’
1-24: 3.0.0 zi, gur ur-subur 4.0.0 nin-hi-li-su, izim ‘nin-Nagar.Bu Is; mu iti 12r’

156 Cooper 1983b: 32; Bauer 1998a: 473 and see below.
157 Monaco 2010; 2011a; 2011b: 7; Marchesi in this volume.
158 Note that “Nagar.Bu” has plausibly been interpreted as an abbreviation of “nin-Nagar.Bu” by the editors; cf. the remarks of Schrakamp 2008: 706, but note the objections of Such-Gutiérrez 2005-2006: 26-27 n. 268.
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I-32: 4.0.0 zi1 sur e2 mah kir13-bil sum12-ma i60 mu-a 16e iti1 izim 4 nin-nagar.bu
I-26: 6.0.0 zi1 sur e2 mah izim 4 nin-nagar.bu ke mu 4e iti
I-27: 6.0.0 zi1 sur e2 mah kir13-bil izim 4 nin-nagar.bu ke mu 4e iti

Datings to year 15 and year 1 in these homogenous groups apparently refer to the reigns of two subsequent rulers. Since the lower year dates can be attributed to the time of MesUlu nu, who was temple administrator during the reign of II, it is plausible to ascribe the texts dated to the 15th year to the reign of Urumma. The reign of II lasted 12 years at least; however, it cannot be excluded that the year numbers 12, 13, and 14 refer to the reign of Urumma’s successor.

($) II, son Eandamu, grandson of Enakale (generation 5)

Il, king of Umma, is known, from an inscription of his own and one of Geshshakidu, as the son of a certain Eandamu and the grandson of Enakale:

FAOS 5/2 111 = RIME 1.12.5.1 2-6 (FAOS 5/2 Giš. 1 = RIME 1.12.6.1. 2-5):
il1 lugal umma (šar.ŠAR.GIš) dumu e2-an-da-mu2 dumu-ka en-a2-kal-le lugal umma (šar.ŠAR.GIš)
“II, king of Umma, son of Eandamu, grandson of Enakale, king of Umma”

He was the temple administrator of Zabalam at the time of Urumma and acquired the governorship of Umma after the latter was defeated by Enmetena. II invaded Lagash during the time of Enmetena, probably early in the latter’s reign:

FAOS 5/1 Ent. 28/29 = RIME 1.9.5.1 iii 38-iv 10:
eg2, ki sur-ra 4 nin-gi2-su-ka eg2, ki sur-ra 4 naše im dub-ba 4 nin-gi2-su-ka (…) 4 en-ki-ka
d4 nin-hur-sag-ka a-e i1-mi-e1,
en-mete-na ensi1 lagast1-ke1 bar eg3-ba-ka il2-še1 lu2 ḫe2-śi-gi1-gi4(-a) il2 ensi1 umma1-
a1 4 iš1-aša1 kar-ka niš-šiam du1 du2-ge
eq2, ki sur-ra 4 nin-gi2-su-ka eg2, ki sur-ra 4 naše ga2-kam i2-mi-du1 an-ta-sur-ra-ta e2
dimgal-abzu-ka-še1 im ba-ni-e1 de3 i2-mi-du1 4 en-lil-e1 4 nin-hur-sag-ke1 nu-na-šum2
“He (= II) diverted water from the boundary-channel of Ningirsu and the boundary-channel of Nanshe (...).
When because of those channels, Enmetena, the governor of Lagash, sent envoys to II, the governor of Umma, who steals fields (and) speaks evil, declared:
“The boundary-channel of Ningirsu (and) the boundary-channel of Nanshe are mine! I will shift the boundary-levee from Antasura to Edimgalabzu! But Enlil (and) Ninhursang did not give it to him.”

II’s ensiship is referred to in the date formula of a sale document and an administrative text dated to his 5th year. These texts also inform us that a certain MesUlu nu held the office of temple administrator (sağga) during II’s reign.

TCBI 2, no. 1-1 rev. ii:
[u₃]-ba i1 ensi1 umma (geš.kušu),i1 mes-ul-nu, sağga zabalam (muš,ab) ses-pa1 maškim
“At this time, II was governor of Umma. MesUlu nu was temple administrator of Zabalam. Sespa (was) commissioner (of the transaction).

CUNES 52-17-024 = CUSAS 14, 56:
il1 ensi1 mes-ul-nu, sağga zabalam, 5 mu 8 iti
“II, governor, MesUlu nu, temple administrator of Zabalam. Year 5 month 8.”

Therefore, the following texts, dated to early years of an unnamed governor and the sangaship of MesUlu nu, should also be attributed to his reign:

---

196 Note in this regard the occurrence of the “minister” Ursaman (ur-sağ-ka) in a list of workers; TCBI 2, I-2; “minister” Ursaman also occurs in an unpublished administrative text dated to the 4th year of Ushurdu (CUNES 48-09-111, Monaco 2010). But since the list of workers is not linked to the main text group text by prosopography (cf. Schrakamp 2008: 670), it may possibly be a single scattered text of a younger date. For an attribution of an administrative text dated to the 16th year of an unnamed ruler to Lugalzagesi, see below.
An administrative text (CUNES 53-01-007), dated to the 12th year of an unnamed ruler, mentions Geshshakidu as the son of the governor, so II can be attributed a reign of 12 years, at least. On the possibility that II reigned for 13 or 14 years, see above no. (4).

(6) Geshshakidu, son of II (generation 6)

Geshshakidu, king of Umma and son of II, is known from a votive inscription of his wife:

FAOS 5/2 Giš. 1 = RIME 1.12.6.1. 2-9:
\[
\text{Parairnun, the wife of Geshshakidu, the king of Umma, daughter of Urlumma, the king of Umma, granddaughter of Enakale, king of Umma, daughter-in-law of II, king of Umma.}
\]

An inscription formerly ascribed to Lugalzagesi can now be attributed to Geshshakidu (FAOS 5/2 Giššakidug 2 = RIME 1.12.6.2). The length of his reign can be estimated at, at least, 4 years.

Geshshakidu was probably a contemporary of the late Enmetena.

(7?) Edin(?) (generation 6?)

One single text seems to mention a ruler of Umma called Edin. Due to the poor preservation of the text, the reading of the personal name as Edin remains uncertain, although it is hard to recognize any other known name in the preserved traces.

Within the sequence of the Umma rulers, two positions are possible for Edin, namely either after the sequence Enakale – Urlumma – Geshshakidu, or after Meanedu – Ushurdu and before U₂₁.₅ – Lugalzagesi.

(8) Meanedu (generation 7)

Meanedu is known as "governor" (ensi₂) from two sale documents dated to his 5th and 27th regnal year:

Ozaki 2008: no. 1 rev. i-3: ₅₇₄ mu me-an-ne₂-du₂₁ ensi₂ "Year 5, Meanedu, governor"
Ozaki 2008: no. 2 rev. ii 1-3: me-an-ne₂-du₁₈ ensi₂ ₃₀₁₈₄, ₅₇₄ mu "Meanedu, governor, year 27"

His governorship is also referred to in several unpublished administrative texts dated to the 26th or 28th year of Meanedu, these texts also inform us that a certain Diutu held the sangaship of Zabalam.

CDLI P271237; dated to year 28 month 8, Meanedu ensi₂
MS 2824 (photo courtesy A. Westenholz, CDLI P251871); dated to Meanedu ensi₂, Diutu ságga
MS 3791/28 (CDLI P252822); dated to year 28, Diutu ságga

---

200 Monaco 2010; 2011a; 2011b: 5.
201 Monaco 2010; 2011a refers to CUNES 51-07-016 (dated to Geshshakidu ensi₂ year 3 month 12) and CUSAS 14, 252 (dated to Geshshakidu ensi₂ year 4); see also Marchesi, this volume: 5 years.
204 The clay of the surface is misformed (due to an improper handling of the tablet when it was still soft); a reading Ǧešša₂₁-ki-d₁₀ seems hardly possible, other known names cannot be reconciled with the traces (we owe thanks to G. Visicato for a better photograph of the text).
205 Marchesi 2006b: 227 n. 122; Monaco 2010; 2011a; 2011b: 7-8; Marchesi in this volume.
These new texts allow the dating of some tablets from Zabalam, previously tentatively ascribed to one of Lugalzagesi’s predecessors, to be dated to the 28th to 30th regnal year of Meanedu.\footnote{Powell 1978: 11-13, 16; Steinkeller 1992a: 5 n. 18; Sallabarger 2004: 25 n. 26; Monaco 2011b: 7 n. 48.}

A land text from a year 28: Oberhuber 1958: no. 3 rev. i 1: 30\(c\) la\(\times\) 2\(c\) mu

An account of grain from a year 29: Powell 1978: no. 6 rev. i 1: 30\(c\) la\(\times\) 1\(c\) mu

A note on interest-bearing barley loans from a year 30: \textit{BIN} 8, 63 rev. i 1: 30\(c\) mu

A dating prior to Lugalzagesi is also indicated by the occurrence of a “surveyor” (\textit{gu}-\textit{sur}u\(t\)) unknown from the time of Lugalzagesi in Oberhuber 1958: no. 3 rev. ii 2. The attribution of these texts to the period of Meanedu is corroborated by, on the one hand, shared palaeographic features\footnote{Engarzi occurs in Powell 1978: no. 6 obv. ii 4 and \textit{BIN} 8, 63 obv. i 2; a-\textit{ba}-\textit{mu}-\textit{na} Oberhuber 1958: no. 3 obv. v 3 could be a shorthand form for a-\textit{ba}-\textit{mu}-\textit{na}-\textit{ab}-\textit{dim} 3, in \textit{BIN} 8, 63 obv. ii 2, as lugal-\textit{gan}, i.e.lugal-\textit{he} 3; in Powell 1978: no. 6 obv. i 5 could likewise be an abbreviation for lugal-\textit{he} 3; \textit{gan}, lugal-\textit{he} 3; in Oberhuber 1958: no. 3 obv. iv 4.} and on the other, by prosopography.\footnote{Cf. Monaco 2011b: 7 n. 48.} Seen in this light several unpublished texts dated to the 28th to 32nd year of an unnamed ruler may belong to Meanedu as well.\footnote{Cf. Monaco 2011b: 7 n. 48.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item CUNES 52-04-142 = \textit{CUSAS} 14, 226, dated to year 28 month 4
  \item CUNES 52-04-141 = \textit{CUSAS} 14, 225, dated to year 31 month 7
  \item CUNES 52-04-149, dated to year 31 month 7
  \item CUNES 48-09-111, dated to year 32 month 5
  \item CUNES 51-07-032, dated to year 32
\end{itemize}

Finally, a recently published text from Umma/Zabalam (\textit{TCBI} 2, I-48) dated to the 24th year of an unnamed ruler might belong here, or to Lugalzagesi.\footnote{On the name, see Milone 2005: 340 n. 4; Marchesi & Marchetti 2011: 126 n. 278; Monaco 2011b: 4 n. 36; Marchesi in this volume p. 150.}

As Meanedu reigned for ca. 30 years, he must be assigned to a generation subsequent to that of Geshshakidu and Edin. The restoration me-e-a-n-ne, -du 8, 63 obv. ii 2, as lugal-\textit{he} 3; \textit{gan}, lugal-\textit{he} 3; in Oberhuber 1958: no. 3 rev. i 2; a-ba-mu-na Oberhuber 1958: no. 3 obv. v 3 could be attributed to Ushurdu’s reign on the basis of prosopography [Milone 2005: no. 9].

\textbf{9) Ushurdu} (generation 8)\footnote{Pomponio & Stol & Westenholz 2006: 15, 43 date this tablet to the (Early) Sargonic period, but palaeography and the number of years (see 3.1.7 on the dates attested for mu-\textit{iti} A) indicate a Presargonic date, cf. Schrakamp 2008: 674 n. 66, 708; cf. above Section 3.1.5 on the dating of Early Sargonic texts from Umma.} His reign can be estimated at, at least, 9 years. His 7\(\frac{1}{3}\) year is attested in two unpublished administrative texts.\footnote{Behrens & Steible 1983: 40.} His reign can be estimated at, at least, 9 years. His 7\(\frac{1}{3}\) year is attested in two unpublished administrative texts.\footnote{Cf. Monaco 2011b: 7 n. 48.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Milone 2005: no. 10 (see also Milone 2005: no. 11)
  \item gu-\textit{an-še}, 20.0.0 0 0 0 3\textit{gana}, 0 0 0 0 3\textit{gana}, 0 0 0 0 3\textit{gana}, 0 0 0 0 3\textit{gana}, 0 0 0 0 3\textit{gana}, 0 0 0 0 3\textit{gana}, 0 0 0 0 3\textit{gana}
  \item ušur,(\textit{lugal}\textit{-}\textit{mu}),-\textit{du} 8, \textit{UD.MUD.NUN} 7\(\frac{1}{3}\) \textit{mu}
  \item “(amounts of grain and PNs) Total: 20 kor of barley, (the respective field is) 3 iku, barley for threshing of the 4\(\frac{1}{4}\) day, ...
  \item A similar account of cereals, dated to the 7\(\frac{1}{3}\) year of an unnamed ruler, can be attributed to Ushurdu’s reign on the basis of prosopography (Milone 2005: no. 9).
  \item An unprovenienced sale document is dated to his 8\(\frac{1}{3}\) regnal year:
  \item Foster 1994: 440-452 rev. ii:
  \item ut,\textit{-ba} ušur,(\textit{lugal}\textit{-}\textit{mu}),-\textit{du} 10, \textit{UD.MUD.NUN} & \textit{mu}
  \item “At this time, Ushurdu was \textit{ud.mud.nun}, 8\(\frac{1}{3}\) year.”
\end{itemize}
The sequence ud.mud.nun has been interpreted differently. Foster proposed that ud.mud.nun was a variant spelling for the name of the city of Adab (otherwise written ud.nun.ki) and thus argued for an attribution to that city.\(^{215}\) Marchesi, however, proposes that it is a special title for Ummaite rulers, as indicated by the formula of the colophon, and opts for a translation “on this day, Ushurdu is the ruler. 8th year.”\(^{216}\) Milone’s interpretation as month name iti mud-nun can, thus, be excluded. An attribution of the Ushurdu texts to Umma/Zabalam is excluded. An attribution of the Ushurdu texts to Umma/Zabalam is confirmed by the tablet’s palaeography (e.g. the sign form lalxtug), format and formula (cf. the occurrence of a gu-sur “land surveyor” obligatory in land texts from the time of Lugalzagesi).

A recently published sale document demonstrates that Ushurdu ruled for 9 years, at least:

Bauer 2012: no. 3 obv. iv 3-5 ušur, (lalxtug,)-du₄₀ ensi₂,[pa.kar,si] Ito₄ lu₂₁ le mu
“Ushurdu, governor. Year 9”\(^{217}\)

Due to the lack of inscriptions from Ushurdu or other genealogical information, it is impossible to place Ushurdu exactly. One argument is based on the writing of the toponym Umma: it is written šar₃₄x₄š₈k in royal inscriptions and legal texts during the time of Pabilgagaltuku, Urumma, Il, Geshshakidu and Meanedu, but ĝeš₈k. kuš₈₄₃ during the reign of Ushurdu; this favours a date after Meanedu.

More important is the prosopography. The unpublished document CUNES 48-09-111 from Ushurdu’s 4th year informs us that a certain Ursaman held the office of the “minister” (s u g a l un) during the 4th year of Ushurdu; this favours a date after Meanedu.

To sum up, Ushurdu was the successor of Meanedu and reigned for, at least, nine years. Since Meanedu is known to have ruled for more than 30 years and their combined reigns correspond to the duration of a two generation interval, Ushurdu is assigned to a generation subsequent to that of Meanedu.

(10) U₃₄, U₄₃ (generation 8)\(^{221}\)

U₃₄, U₄₃ is known as ruler of Umma and father and predecessor of Lugalzagesi from the famous vase inscription of Lugalzagesi.\(^{222}\)


\(^{216}\) ud.mud.nun is otherwise only attested in the literary text from Abu Salabikh IAS 282 iv’ 3, viii’ 5 cited by Foster 1994: 449 where an interpretation as a personal name (of a ruler?) has been suggested by Alster 1976: 123.

\(^{217}\) Cf. Marchesi p. 150 n. 117 in this volume. The reading lalxtug, ušur kar-si suggested by Bauer 2012: 61 is unconvincing.

\(^{218}\) Monaco 2010.

\(^{219}\) Monaco 2010; 2011a; 2011b: 7.

\(^{220}\) Milone 2005: 340 n. 4; Monaco 2010; 2011a; 2011b: 7.

\(^{221}\) On the name, see Bauer 1998a: 493; Marchesi 2002: 171 n. 105; Steinkeller 2003c: 621 n. 3; Marchesi in this volume, p. 151.

\(^{222}\) See e.g. Bauer 1998a: 493-494; Frayne 2007: 375; for another inscription of Lugalzagesi with the same filiation see RIME 1.12.7.1, cited already by Marchesi 2006b: 227 n. 122.
The fact that neither U, U, nor Lugalzagesi give any information about U, U, ’s family indicate that they were not direct descendants of the previous rulers. Also unexpected is their qualification as lu- , maš “nisaba “lumab- priest of the goddess Nisaba”. Since Lugalzagesi emphasizes his ties to the goddess Nisaba, it has been suggested that both originally came from Eresh. Bauer’s idea that U, U, had been installed by Enshakushana remains unsubstantiated. Since neither inscriptions, nor dated tablets can be attributed to U, U, he was probably a short-lived ruler.

(11) Lugalzagesi, son of U, U, (generation 9)
Lugalzagesi was the son of U, U, governor of Umma, and apparently his immediate successor. He is referred to as en si, “governor” of Umma in Urukagina’s lament over the destruction of Lagash (EAOs 5/1 Ukg. 16 = RIME 1.9.9.5). He is attributed a reign of 25 years by the SKL (Section 2.1). A recently published inscription appears to date to before his conquest of Sumer, commemorated in his famous triumphal inscription (EAOs 5/2 Luzag. 1, cited above):

RIME 1.12.7.1 i 3-8:
lugal-za- e n si e n maš “nisaba-ke4, dumu u, u, en si, umma(geš.kušu)
“Lugalzagesi, governor of Umma, lumab-priest of Nisaba, son of U, U, governor of Umma, lumab-priest of Nisaba”

An archive of ca. 110 administrative texts can be dated around Lugalzagesi’s 6th to 8th regnal year (see above, Section 3.1.5). An administrative text dated to the 16th year of an unnamed ruler can be attributed to Lugalzagesi on the basis of prosopography, since the doorkeeper, Urnindulum(a), also occurs in texts dated to the 7th year of Lugalzagesi’s reign (BIN 8, 57: 5; BIN 8, 86: 53, 91; Steinkeller 1992a: no. 3 obv. i 16). Therefore, the figure of 25 years given by the SKL for Lugalzagesi’s reign remains plausible.

Ozaki 2002: no. 5 obv. i 1-rev. ii 1:
3 geš-kin, geš-ab ur- rin-dumul-(nagar.bu) i1-du4, e2-gal-še, de2-a 16c mu 3c iti e2- ištar-an-ta e2, 16c mu 3c iti
“3 wooden frames(?) of kitakatu-wood, Urninduluma, the doorkeeper, delivered to the palace. Year 16, month 3. Issued from the temple of Ištaran. Year 16 month 3.”

Whether the administrative text TCBI 2, I-48, dated to the 24th year of an unnamed ruler (see above Section 3.1.5 and (8) Meanedu), may be dated to Lugalzagesi and thus one year before his defeat by Sargon of Akkad remains uncertain; the reign of Meanedu may be another option. Lugalzagesi defeated Urukagina of Lagash, as argued above, probably during his 7th or 8th year; 18 years later, if we accept the 25 years of the SKL, he was defeated by Sargon of Akkad (see below Section 6.1-6.3 passim).

5.3. The Duration of the Presargonic Period (Lagash I and Umma)

5.3.1 Urnanshe Dynasty (Lagash I)

Administrative texts dated by regnal year and name are only preserved for Enannatum, Enmetena, Enentarzi, Lugalkanda and Urukagina. They attest to a duration of at least 46 years combined for the reigns of Enannatum I to Urukagina, or of 43 years from the time of Enannatum I to Urukagina’s defeat by Lugalzagesi in his 8th year; no data is available for Enannatum II. As only the minimal duration of their reigns can be established on the basis of these figures, except for Lugalkanda, generation count seems a more appropriate means by which to estimate the total length of the Lagash I dynasty.

By calculating a generation interval of 20 years, the duration of the Lagash I dynasty can be estimated at ca. 140 years from Urnanshe to Urukagina; a generation of 25 years would lead to 175 years. The long reigns attested for the Presargonic rulers of Umma (see below 5.3.2), do however, argue for a long duration for the Lagash I dynasty.

223 Steinkeller 2003c.
225 For a generation also figures of 21.1, 21.5, 29, 30, and 31.7 respectively are established; see Wilhelm 2004.
227 For a generation also figures of 21.1, 21.5, 29, 30, and 31.7 respectively are established; see Wilhelm 2004.
228 For a generation also figures of 21.1, 21.5, 29, 30, and 31.7 respectively are established; see Wilhelm 2004.

Marchesi 2006b: 259 proposes a total length of ca. 110-120 years, based only on attested dates; some of Marchesi’s attributions of year dates that omit the ruler’s name are not included in our list given below.
5.3.2 Presargonic Rulers of Umma

Administrative and legal texts dated to the regnal years are known for Urlumma, Il, Geshshakidu, Edin, Meanedu, Ushurdu, and Lugalzagesi. They attest a duration of 85 years from the beginning of the reign of Urlumma down to Lugalzagesi’s defeat of Urukagina in his 8th regnal year, compared to a minimum duration of 46 + x years for Lagash I from the time of Enanatum I to Lugalzagesi’s defeat of Urukagina, or an estimate of 9 generations. The evaluation of the sources referred to above leads to the following chronology:

This sequence of about 9 generations could roughly correspond to the 7 generations, ca. 140 years, for Lagash I. The Umma sequence can possibly be reduced by 1 or 2 generations, corresponding to 20 to 40 years, as it is possible that some of the rulers, no. 1-2 and 7-8 were succeeded by their brothers, and because Geshshakidu(? ) probably ruled for only a short time. The result of 9, minus perhaps 1-2 generations for Umma, in turn, agrees well with the 7 generations at Lagash I. This corresponds to 140-160 years if one generation equals 20 years.

5.3.3 The Duration of the Presargonic Period

On the basis of sources from Presargonic Lagash and Umma, the duration of the Presargonic period – which corresponds by and large to the conventional archaeological period ED IIIb – can be calculated at ca. 175 years.²³⁰ This is demonstrated by the synchronisms between the Presargonic rulers of Lagash and Umma illustrated in the following table:

²³⁰ Cf. earlier proposals of a duration of ca. 150 years by Bauer 1998a: 432 and ca. 140 years by Marchesi 2006a: 260.
Map 4: Presargonic period
The Presargonic period from the 1st year of Urnanshe to the 1st year of Urukagina, which roughly corresponds to Lugalzagesi year 1 and probably Sargon year 1 (see below), represents at least six to seven generations, whereby the well-known Lagash sequence is now confirmed by Umma. Depending on the duration of a generation (see n. 228) this corresponds to 120 to 180 years; thus 150 years seems to be a moderately low estimate given the high number of Umma rulers. For the duration of the Presargonic period in southern Babylonia until Sargon’s conquest, one should add the reign of Lugalzagesi, so one reaches a total of about 175 years (as lower estimate) between Urnanshe 1 and Lugalzagesi 25.

The continuous sequence of Presargonic inscriptions from Lagash provides many synchronisms with rulers of other urban centres, whose order of succession can be ascertained by inscriptions of their respective dynasties. Current knowledge on these dynasties is aptly summarized in the contribution by Marchesi in this volume.

References for synchronisms:

A FAOS 5/1 Urn. 51 = RIME 1.9.1.6.b rev. iv 5-8
B FAOS 5/1 Ean. 1 = RIME 1.9.3.1 obv. vii 12-22, viii 1-3
C FAOS 5/1 Ent. 28/29 = RIME 1.9.5.1 i 32-41
D FAOS 5/1 En. I 29 = RIME 1.9.4.2 vii 1-viii 4, x 9-xi; FAOS 5/1 Ent. 28/29 = RIME 1.9.5.1 ii 27-iii 27; FAOS 5/1 Ukg. 6 = RIME 1.9.9.3 iv 1’-28’
E FAOS 5/1 Ent 28/29 = RIME 1.9.5.1 iii 28-37
F FAOS 5/1 Ent. 28/29 = RIME 1.9.5.1 iii 38-iv 36
G see below Section 6.2 to 6.4 passim.
6. Transition from the Presargonic to the Sargon Period

The decades covering the last Presargonic rulers and the rise of Sargon of Akkad constitute a decisive phase in the history of ancient Mesopotamia. With the establishment of the empire of Akkad the former far-reaching system of city states had come to an end and the close connections between Babylonia, Upper Mesopotamia and Syria were cut off, Mari and Ebla having temporarily lost their importance. The advent of Sargon was prepared by the ambitions of rulers like Enshakushana of Uruk, Lugalzagesi of Umma and Uruk, Ishshadumu of Ebla, or Ishqimari of Mari. They all extended their rule over the former territory of their city states and thus brought to an end the lines of local rulers (e.g. at Adab). It seems that the unprecedented wars at the end of the Presargonic period led to exhaustion, perhaps even partial devastation of the country and paved the way for Sargon to collect the poor remains of the former and more glorious states. An unprecedented wealth of sources for these decades asks for a detailed chronological scheme. Since historical texts and information are rare, the evidence for a chronology is mostly circumstantial. With the advent of Sargon the picture changes rapidly: numerous Presargonic archives have come to an end, an indication of the economic disaster. Sargon’s monumental inscriptions of his deeds become the main source.

6.1. The End of Lagash under Urukagina

Under Urukagina²³¹ the line of the rulers of Lagash came to an end. He had changed his title from “governor of Lagash” (ensi lagas²³²) to “king of Lagash” (lugal lagas²³²) after his first year (see above). He ruled at the same time as Enshakushana of Uruk and Lugalzagesi of Umma.

A first sign of the emergence of mightier rulers in Sumer is reflected in the reduction of Lagash’s international relations. In only his first two years as king (Ukg L 1-2), Urukagina kept ample commercial, diplomatic and cultic relations with all neighbours, but in his third royal year his connections were reduced to Elam (Ukg L 3). Later, Lagash was cut off from its trade routes and lost its diplomatic and cultic relations with other Sumerian cities (see Schrakamp, this volume).

Documents from Lagash from the 4th and 6th years of Urukagina’s kingship (Ukg L 4-6) testify that a “man of Uruk” besieged Lagash three times.²³² This “man of Uruk” must have been Enshakushana; Lugalzagesi became the “man of Uruk” a few years later (in or after Ukg L 8).

²³¹ On the name, see n. 158 above.
²³² For a different reading, translation and historical interpretation see Marchesi p. 146 n. 58 in this volume.
In two administrative texts dated to Urukagina’s 7th year as king (Ukg L 7) the ruler still appears as “king of Lagash”, which implies that he had successfully defended Lagash against Enshakushana.  

Finally, in his 7th or 8th year, Urukagina was defeated by Lugalzagesi, “the man of Umma”, as is testified by his “lament” over the destruction of Lagash and “the sin of Lugalzagesi” (*FAOS* 5/1 Ukg. 16 = *RIME* 1.9.9.5). The defeat must have resulted in a substantial reduction of Urukagina’s territory, since he later changed his title to “king of Girsu” (*lugal ĝir-su-kū*) in his inscriptions.

The previous title “king of Lagash” is never attested in administrative texts dated after the 7th year of Urukagina’s kingship (Ukg L 7). This statement is, however, inconclusive as the few administrative texts dated to the years 8-10 (Ukg L 8-10) name neither the ruler, nor the title, although the attribution to Urukagina is certain: both Enentarzi and Lugulanda ruled less than 8 years (see above 5.2.1). The “man from Uruk” who received flour in an administrative text dated to Urukagina year 8 (Ukg L 8) was most probably an envoy of Lugalzagesi, who at this time had gained control of Lagash.  

We thus arrive at the following sequence of events:

| Urukagina L 3 | end of contacts with cities in Sumer, last contacts with Elam |
| Urukagina L 4 | Enshakushana of Uruk lays first siege to Girsu |
| Urukagina L 5 | Enshakushana of Uruk lays second siege to Girsu |
| Urukagina L 6 | last dated attestation of Lagash in Girsu documents (Schrakamp this volume 6.1.3) |
| Urukagina L 7 | Urukagina still “king of Lagash” |
| Urukagina L 7/8 | Urukagina defeated by Lugalzagesi, Lagash conquered by Lugalzagesi, Urukagina “king of Girsu” |
| Urukagina L 10 | Last dated document from Girsu |

6.2. Lugalzagesi’s Kingdom

Lugalzagesi began as a governor of Umma (see 5.2. sub (11)), later became king of Uruk and as such was entered in the *Sumerian King List* as the only ruler of the Uruk III dynasty with a reign of 25 years. The defeat of Lugalzagesi meant the decisive victory for Sargon in Babylonia, according to the latter’s own inscriptions.

A reconstruction of the chronology of Lugalzagesi’s reign allows a link between the last Presargonic rulers and Sargon’s rule.

6.2.1. Umma, Adab, Nippur, and Uruk in the land texts from Zabalam

An archive of administrative texts from the Umma region, probably from Zabalam, records the attribution of allotments of arable land. So-called “large land-texts” dated to the 7th year of Lugalzagesi, “governor (*ensi₂*) of Umma”, include as recipients (see Schrakamp this volume, Section 6.1.5):  

- the governor (*ensi₂*) of Adab (*BIN* 8, 86 obv. v 11; *Ellis* 1979: no. 6 obv. iv 17)
- the governor (*ensi₂*) of Nippur (*BIN* 8, 82 obv. iii 13. v 11’ 14’ 14’ 14’ 14’ vi 2’ 17’, written n i b r u, Luzag (7); *BIN* 8, 86 obv. i 1. ii 5. Luzag 7; *Ellis* 1979: no. 7 obv. iv 9. v 16. 17. vi 7’, Luzag 7; *Powell* 1978: no. 1 obv. vi 5. 13. 15, Luzag 7; *Brinkman* 1976: 41, pl. III-IV obv. i 2, Luzag 7)
- the n u-eš priest (of Enlil) of Nippur (*BIN* 8, 61 obv. i 4)
- a high priest (*lu₂-maḫ*) of Uruk (*Powell* 1978: no. 1 rev. i 5. 13. 15, Luzag 7)
- and a temple administrator (*sağa*) of Uruk (*BIN* 8, 114 obv. ii 7)

235 *Bauer* 1998a: 489-492.
236 *FAOS* 5/1 Ukg. 1 = *RIME* 1.9.9.2 i 3-5; *FAOS* 5/1 Ukg. 16 = *RIME* 1.9.9.5 vii 7-9; in the administrative text *FAOS* 5/1 Ukg. 38, dated to Ukg L 10 where the title is not preserved but probably to be restored according to *Bauer* 1985: 10; *Selz* 1989-1990: 179; *Bauer* 1998a: 478; *FAOS* 5/1 Ukg 58.
237 *Nik.* 1, 135 = *Selz* 1989a: no. 135; cf. *Bauer* 1989-1990: 86; *Selz* 1989a: 353; 1994: 221; *Bauer* 1998a: 493. The occasional month name referring to the siege of Girsu by Uruk *Nik.* 1, 227 and the reference to “the man of Uruk” in *Nik.* 1, 135 are the only attestations of foreign toponyms in texts postdating Ukg L 5, a fact that corroborates the interpretation proposed above.
238 This figure certainly includes both his reign as governor of Umma and as king of Uruk; cf. A. Westenholz 1999: 35 on the figure of 18 years given for the total reign of Urnamma by the *SKL*.
239 For references to Adab and Nippur in unpublished land texts from the year Luzag 7, see I. Finkel *apud* *Selz* 1992a: 206 n. 88.
Apparently, the cities Adab, Nippur, and Uruk belonged to the same state at this time, the 7th year of Lugalzagesi, either to Enshakushana of Uruk (see 6.2.2) or to Lugalzagesi of Umma (6.2.3).

6.2.2. Lugalzagesi’s achievements

Lugalzagesi’s rise by conquering an unprecedented empire in Babylonia can be sketched with the help of some important documents:

In Urukagina years 4 to 6 (Ukg L 4 to 6) the “man of Uruk”, apparently Enshakushana, laid siege to Girsu according to administrative documents (see 6.1. above). Urukagina was subsequently, in his 7th or 8th year, defeated by “the man of Umma”, i.e. Lugalzagesi, and lost Lagash (Urukagina Lament Ukg 16, see 6.1.). Lugalzagesi entered the state of Lagash by the common border, and passing by Girsu through the open land reached the city of Lagash and its region in the southeast of the city state. 240

Lugalzagesi then succeeded Enshakushana as king of Uruk, and inherited the latter’s state, which also included Nippur. 241 This important step in the construction of his kingdom is reflected in his famous vase inscription from Nippur (FAOS 5/2 Luzag 1 = RIME 1.14.20.1). According to this text, Lugalzagesi, “king of Uruk, king of the land (kalam)”, ruled Umma with its cultic centres Zabalam and Ki.an and the Sumerian cult centres Uruk, Larsa, Ur, and Nippur. His titles also indicate that he was recognized by Eresh, Eridu and Kesh. 242 Furthermore, he boasts that the rulers of Sumer (Kienqi) were obedient to him, and claims that “Enlil gave him no rival from the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea” (ibid. i 36-ii 1).

This rise of Lugalzagesi to become overlord of Babylonia is reflected in a year name, in a Nippur document “when Lugalzagesi assumed the kingship” (TMH 5, 82 = ECTJ 82, see p. 42). 243

The most important data for Lugalzagesi can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lugalzagesi, “governor (ensi,) of Umma”</th>
<th>Campaign against Urukagina, destruction of Lagash (Urukagina Lament Ukg 16)</th>
<th>Urukagina year 7/8 (Ukg L 7/8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lugalzagesi, “governor (ensi,) of Umma”, year 7:</td>
<td>Zabalam land texts (6.2.1) with high officials from Adab, Nippur, Uruk</td>
<td>Lugalzagesi year 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalzagesi, “king (lugal) of Uruk”</td>
<td>Nippur vase inscription (RIME 1.14.20.1), Lugalzagesi ruling Umma, Nippur, Ur, and Uruk; Girsu and Adab are not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lugalzagesi)</td>
<td>Lugalzagesi’s conquest of Girsu</td>
<td>in or after Urukagina year 10 (Ukg L 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various chronological and historical reconstructions can be built on these data and other information. Thus, for example, Marchesi (this volume sub B.14) regards the designation of Lugalzagesi as “governor of Umma” in the Zabalam texts as the most important data in considering him as a governor under the rule of Enshakushana of Uruk in his seventh year. Lugalzagesi campaigned as “governor of Umma” against Urukagina in the latter’s year 7 or 8 (Urukagina Lament), and must have conquered Girsu in or after Urukagina 10. The omission of Girsu and Lagash in the Nippur vase inscription strongly suggests that Lugalzagesi did not yet rule the state of Lagash, i.e. the southeastern region of Sumer at this time. So, according to this reconstruction, the kingship of Lugalzagesi started probably after Urukagina year 7 or 8, when he was the “governor of Umma”, and before Urukagina 10, the end of dated documents at Girsu. This reconstruction does not change the chronological relationship between Sargon, Lugalzagesi, and Urukagina, since in each calculation the total reign of Lugalzagesi is 25 years (according to the SKL), whenever he may have acquired kingship over Sumer; and the Urukagina Lament (Ukg 16) is, in any case, the earliest mention of Lugalzagesi, thus fixing the correlation between Urukagina and Lugalzagesi chronologically. A conquest of Adab, which allows a link between Babylonia and Ebla (see 6.4 below), however, is hardly possible under Enshakushana (see below).

6.2.3. Adab and Lugalzagesi’s kingdom

According to the Zabalam land texts (6.2.1), the cities Adab, Nippur, and Uruk belonged to the same state at this time, the 7th year of Lugalzagesi. 244 Given the close relationship between political control and the management

---

240 On the topography of Lugalzagesi’s campain see Bauer 1998a: 489-490.
241 Enshakushana’s rule is testified by year dates (TMH 5, 158 = ECTJ 158 etc.); see p. 41. Note, however, that the circumstances of Enshakushana’s end are unknown.
243 Westenholz 1987-1990: 156 pointed to the fact that Lugalzagesi’s coronation as king of Uruk predated his victory over Lagash: “However, it was not until after he was acknowledged as ‘King of the Land’ in Nippur that the conflict with Lagash came to a head”.
of agricultural land, field allotments could probably only be distributed within a single state, in this case the state of Lagash, who is named in the subscript of the texts.\(^{246}\) The apparent discrepancy between the title lu g a l borne by Lugalzagesi in his official inscription at Nippur (and in connection with the local governor Meskigala in the Adab document BIN 8, 26 etc.), and his use of the title ensi, in the Zabalam documents, is not without parallels: note that at Girsu, Urakagina is called lu g a l of Lagash in the "official" subscripts of the Emunus archive but is still referred to as ensi within the texts themselves. The subscripts of the Emunus documents express the relationship of the head of the organization, namely Sasa, to the ruler, and similarly in an (undated, and thus possibly later) document from Adab, which refers to Meskigala, the governor of Adab, and to Lugalzagesi, who bears the title "king", a testimony for the latter's dominion of Adab.\(^{247}\)

\[\text{BIN 8, 26 rev. ii 4-8 (Adab):} \]
\[\text{mes-ki-gal-la ensi; adab}^{11} \text{lugal-za-}^{1} \text{ge-si lugal} \]
\[\text{"Meskigala, governor of Adab; Lugalzagesi, king"} \]

The dates in the Zabalam documents, however, can be considered a kind of internal note and are thus comparable to the use of the title ensi, for Urakagina, even after his assumption of the title lu g a l.\(^{248}\)

Lugalzagesi's dominion of Adab could also be referred to indirectly by an administrative text from Adab. It mentions a shipment of sheep to Uruk for an unnamed king on the occasion of Meskigala's return from a trip to Girsu, a trip that is only conceivable at a time after Urukagina's end (in or after Urukagina 10) and thus, most probably, after Lugalzagesi's ascension to kingship:

\[\text{CUSAS 11, 124 = CUNES 48-06-223 = Visicato 2010b: 264-265 obv. i 1–rev. i 3 (Adab):} \]
\[\text{[u ud]u niga ur-sa}^{n} \text{na uu}^{n} \text{-šē, lugal i,}^{n} \text{na-tum, udu zi-ga} \text{utu-teš,}^{d} \text{gu,}^{d} \text{e,}^{d} \text{gal mes-ki-gal-la ensi;} \]
\[\text{adab}^{11} \text{gir,-su}^{n} \text{-ta im-šen-na-am,} \text{iti mu-ter} \]
\[\text{"a fattened sheep: the singer Ursang brought (them) to Uruk to the king. Expended sheep of Ututeshgu (in) the palace.} \]
\[\text{It was when Meskigala, the governor of Adab, came back from Girsu. Month Muter."} \]

An unnamed king also occurs in an expenditure of fodder to a "king's Amorite"\(^{249}\) and an expenditure of a kid to a "man of the king" (lu g a l) in an agreement between Meskigala and Shurushken of Umma.\(^{250}\) Visicato and A. Westenholz conclude that Sargon installed Shurushken as governor of Umma after he had defeated Lugalzagesi and Meszi of Umma\(^{251}\) and thus interpret this "man of the king" as a subordinate of Sargon who was present at the agreement between Meskigala and Shurushken. This interpretation fits into the picture of Meskigala's good relations with Akkad as reflected in texts from Adab, e.g. Meskigala's journey to Akkad at the occasion of the destruction of Girsu attributed to Sargon,\(^{252}\) or Meskigala's return from Girsu that could be related to this destruction. Moreover both the delivery to the unnamed king at Uruk (CUSAS 11, 124) and the expenditure to "the man of the king" (CUSAS 11, 122) were conducted by Ututeshgu, so Visicato and Westenholz identify the unnamed king stationed at Uruk with Sargon of Akkad.\(^{253}\) However, one expects that donations to Sargon were sent to Akkad (or to Nippur, see TMH 5, 84 = ECTJ 84), so the unnamed king of CUSAS 11, 124 could likewise be identified with Lugalzagesi of Uruk. In this case the document dates to the period shortly before Meskigala broke his alliance with Lugalzagesi.

When was Adab conquered? Adab had still been an independent city state at the time of Urakagina’s predecessor, Lugalanda, when the wives of the rulers of Lagash and Adab exchanged diplomatic gifts in Lugalanda’s 5th year.\(^{254}\) Many of the Presargonic rulers of Adab are known from their inscriptions (see above Section 3.2., see Pomponio and Marchesi in this volume).

---

\(^{245}\) A state is characterized by its independent foreign policy, whereas a province contributes to the foreign policy of a sovereign state; see Sallaberger 2006-2008a.

\(^{246}\) On this interpretation, see Powell 1978: 27-29; Charvát 1978; A. Westenholz 1984: 77 n. 4; Selz 1992a: 205; Edzard 1993-1997b; Pomponio & Visicato & Westenholz 2006, 53; Visicato 2010b: 264; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 6; Pomponio in this volume and also A. Westenholz 1984: 77 n. 4 for a palaeographical attribution to Adab.

\(^{247}\) See also Powell 1978: 28-29.


\(^{249}\) CUNES 50-06-017 = Visicato 2010b: 265-266 = CUSAS 11, 122 obv. ii 4-6.

\(^{250}\) EASOS 7 Sargon C 2 Beischrift e = RIME 2.1.1.12 caption 6; see Visicato 2010b: 269, 271; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 7.

\(^{251}\) Commemorated in an anonymous year name from Adab: CUNES 49-14-005 = Visicato 2010b: 267 = CUSAS 11, 234, see above; see in detail Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 6-8.


According to the above-mentioned land documents from Zabalam (Section 6.2.1), in Lugalzagesi year 7, Umma, Adab, Nippur and Uruk were part of the same state. One may add the observation that Adab, Nippur and Uruk are lacking in similar land texts documenting allocations of land from the same domains dated to Lugalzagesi’s 6th year,254 meaning that the presence of high officials from these cities reflects a very recent development in the extension of Lugalzagesi’s kingdom. More to the point, the geographical horizon of land texts from Lugalzagesi’s 6th year may be compared to the one displayed by a recently published inscription of Lugalzagesi, where he holds the title “governor of Umma”, documenting building activities at Umma and Kī.ān (RIME 1.12.7.1).255

The year Lugalzagesi 7, Lugalzagesi being in control of Uruk according to the Zabalam land texts, must follow after Urukagina year 6 (Ukg L 6), when Enshakushana laid siege to Giršu (see Section 6.1 above): during this year Uruk was still ruled by Enshakushana. Urukagina was, subsequently, in his year 7 or 8 (Ukg L 7 or 8) substantially defeated by Lugalzagesi, the “governor of Umma”, who entered from the Umma border and did not enter the region of Uruk (according to the Urukagina Lament Ukg 16). Later Lugalzagesi, already king of Uruk and in the possession of Adab and Nippur, destroyed Lagash and subdued Urukagina (see above Section 6.1).

So, the (late) 6th or 7th full year of Urukagina’s rule (Ukg L 6/7) would most probably have seen the decisive battles of Lugalzagesi: he defeated Enshakushana as king of Uruk, and won the latter’s state, which also included Nippur.256 According to his vase inscription from Nippur (FAOS 5/2 Luzag 1 = RIME 1.14.20.1), Lugalzagesi ruled Umma with Zabalam and Kī.ān, the Sumerian cult centres Uruk, Larsa, Ur and Nippur, and he also controlled Eresh, Eridu and Kesh. The absence of toponyms from the Lagash region, both in the administrative land documents and in Lugalzagesi’s inscription, is remarkable; therefore these sources probably predate Lugalzagesi’s fatal attack on Giršu and Lagash, although the absence of Lagashites in the administrative text can reasonably be conditioned by many different facts.

Lugalzagesi’s role as king is also referred to by reference to “royal” land (ki lugal) in a text from the Zabalam archive dated to his 7th year (Powell 1978: 34 no. 1 ii 14).257

As outlined above, the appearance of Adab in the land allotment texts of Lugalzagesi 7 dates the conquest of Adab similarly to the 6th/7th year. Adab does not appear among the cities listed in the vase inscription from Nippur. Two conclusions are possible: either Adab did not belong to the first rank of Sumerian cities listed in the document or Lugalzagesi had not yet conquered Adab. It is even conceivable that the Nippur year name “year when Adab was destroyed” (mu a ḏa b41 ḥulu-a, OSP 1, 76, see Section 3.2.1), which is usually ascribed to Rimuš,258 in fact stems from Lugalzagesi.259

During his later 7th or early 8th year, Lugalzagesi, already king of Uruk and in the possession of Adab and Nippur, destroyed Lagash and defeated Urukagina (see above 6.1.). Lugalzagesi’s conquest of Uruk can be dated quite precisely to a date before his 7th year, when Uruk was under his rule according to the Zabalam land documents (6.2.1), after Urukagina 6, when Enshakushana was still king of Uruk (6.1.), and before Urukagina 10, based on the fact that neither Giršu nor Lagash appear in the vase inscription (6.2.2).

On his way to power Lugalzagesi, without doubt, profited from the year-long war between Enshakushana and Urukagina, which had exhausted the military and economic resources of both Uruk and Lagash. The Bawu temple at Giršu has left a considerable number of records dealing with the production and administration of military equipment. Here, in the course of Urukagina’s war against Uruk, corvée soldiers had sometimes been replaced by their fathers, without doubt men too old for military service. Moreover, the decline in economic production led to a reduction of rations at Giršu. Corvée people received rations the whole year in Urukagina 6, which means that they had to stay in state service and could not work on their allotted fields; these are clear signs that the society and economy of Lagash must have been close to collapse.260

255 Quoted by Marchesi 2006b: 227 n. 122 as CDLI no. P235681.
256 Enshakushana’s rule of Nippur is testified by year dates (TMH 5, 158 = ECTJ 158 etc.); see on this above 6.2.2. Note, however, that the circumstances of Enshakushana’s end are unknown.
257 This term is unattested in texts pre-dating Luzag 7, but it is also used in land texts from Sargonic Umma to denote (a fund of) royal land; see Powell 1978: 27 n. 33; Foster 1982a: 86; 1982b: 80-82; A. Westenholt 1984: 78; Sallaberger 2004: 19 n. 6; Cripps 2010: 32.
258 An attribution to Lugalzagesi instead of Rimuš (e.g. by Frayne 1993: 40; Frahm & Payne 2003-2004: 54; Pomponio in this volume, Section 5.2.) is also preferred by Sommerfeld 2006-2008: 374.
259 The idea that Adab could have been conquered by Enshakushana in the 10 to 15 years between Lugalanda of Lagash year 5 (last attestation of independent state, see above p. 88 with n. 253) and Lugalzagesi 7 (land texts) – with the synchronism between Lagash and Umma given by the Urukagina Lament (Ukg 16, Urukagina 7 ≤ Lugalzagesi 1) – is most implausible given the regional pattern: Enshakushana’s empire stretched along the Euphrates in the South (Ur, Uruk, Nippur, until Kish, Iršagirgī, and, in the North, also conflicts with Akkad and Akkākū). Furthermore, if Adab were part of Enshakushana’s empire, like Umma, as an ally (thus following Marchesi, this volume sub B.14), no conquest of the city would have taken place as was noted at Ebla.
260 On the documentation see Lambert 1966; Bauer 1998a: 478-493; Schrakamp 2014; Schrakamp in print
The combined evidence of Sections 6.1.-2. leads to the sequence of events represented in Table 21.

An exact correlation between the reigns of Urukagina and Lugalzagesi is not yet possible. Lugalzagesi 7 (control of Adab, Nippur, Uruk) is at the earliest Urukagina 7 (year after Enshakushana); and Lugalzagesi’s first full regnal year was at the latest in Urukagina 7 (victory over Lagash in Urukagina 8):

Urukagina 7 = Lugalzagesi 1-7 or Lugalzagesi 4 ±3

6.3. The Rise of Sargon

Sargon, the founder of the empire of Akkad, has become one of the most prominent rulers of ancient Mesopotamia. His own inscriptions report his conquests and in later periods he counted as an exemplary successful ruler. He is credited a reign of 40 years by the Ur III version of the *Sumerian King List*, and according to his own inscriptions he defeated Lugalzagesi of Uruk and thus became the only king of Sumer and Akkad. How the reign of Sargon is chronologically related to the reigns of Enshakushana, Urukagina and Lugalzagesi, if his triumph dates to late or early in his reign, cannot yet be fully answered.

The growth of Sargon’s empire and the whole history of the Akkad dynasty has also to be viewed in geographical perspective. The land Uri/Warium, i.e. the land of Akkad, is located near the confluence of the Diyala with the Tigris. Therefore, J. Reade’s proposal for the localization of Akkad near the confluence of the Adhem and Tigris rivers has been largely accepted.

It agrees well with the specific dialect of the Old Akkadian royal inscriptions and administrative texts from state-run archives, the dynasty’s close relations with the Diyala region, the fact that Akkad was part of Puzurinshushinak’s reign, along with the Diyala and Adhem regions, and the placement of Akkad between Eshnuna and Assur in the prologue of the *Hammurapi Code*.

This localization explains the extent of the Akkadian empire throughout its history, especially its long control of Upper Mesopotamia. However, any historical development is much more difficult to be evaluated under these circumstances: firstly, the events in Middle and Southern Babylonia did not at all affect Akkad in her early days; and secondly, it was possible to conduct military expeditions from Akkad directly to Elam (passing the Diyala region) or to Upper Mesopotamia and Syria without any interference with Babylonia. The assumed location of Akkad may also be one of the reasons why it is still impossible to establish a chronological order for Sargon’s conquests as reported in his inscriptions, mainly based on an assumed sequence of the epitheta used there.

This geographical situation also impacts on our standard chronological framework. Whereas, as the terminology of this contribution is defined (see Section 1.2), the Akkad dynasty started with Sargon’s first regnal year, the beginning of the Sargonic period, defined as the period of Akkad’s rule, is more difficult to grasp: Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region may have been under Sargon’s rule decennia before the South, Elam or Mari.

---

Table 21: Correlation of the reigns of Urukagina and Lugalzagesi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>Lagash</th>
<th>Umma</th>
<th>Uruk</th>
<th>year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urukagina 4-6 (Ukg L 4-6)</td>
<td>Girash besieged by Enshakushana of Uruk</td>
<td>Lugalzagesi ensi of Umma</td>
<td>Enshakushana king of Uruk</td>
<td>Lugalzagesi 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urukagina 7 (Ukg L 7)</td>
<td>Urukagina still king of Lagash</td>
<td>Lugalzagesi, king of Uruk, controls Adab, Nippur, Uruk (Zabalam land documents); Uruk, Ur, Nippur, Umma mentioned in his vase inscription</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lugalzagesi 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urukagina 7/8 (Ukg L 7/8)</td>
<td>Urukagina defeated by Lugalzagesi, loss of Lagash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urukagina 10 (Ukg L 10)</td>
<td>Urukagina’s last (documented) year</td>
<td>Lugalzagesi defeats Urukagina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lugalzagesi (Sumerian King List), defeated by Sargon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lugalzagesi 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exact correlation between the reigns of Urukagina and Lugalzagesi is not yet possible. Lugalzagesi 7 (control of Adab, Nippur, Uruk) is at the earliest Urukagina 7 (year after Enshakushana); and Lugalzagesi’s first full regnal year was at the latest in Urukagina 7 (victory over Lagash in Urukagina 8):

Urukagina 7 = Lugalzagesi 1-7 or Lugalzagesi 4 ±3

---

265 More precisely, Eshnuna’s patron deity Tishpak is mentioned, see Wall-Romana 1990: 213-214; A. Westenholz 1999: 32 with n. 77.
266 Sallaberger 2007.
Map 5: Growth of Lugalzagesi's empire until the years Urukagina 2 and Lugalzagesi 6
Map 6: Growth of Lugalzagesi’s empire between the years Urukagina 2/Lugalzagesi 6 and Lugalzagesi 8
Transition from the Prepalmyrenean to the Sargon Period

Within the 40 years of Sargon’s reign, a gap of a quarter of a century is easily possible. Therefore, in this study we are less interested in the beginning of “the” Sargon Period during Sargon’s reign, rather we start with the premise that his last year is the first secure date of Akkadian dominion.

A year name demonstrates that Enshakushana fought against Akkad:

\[
\text{“year when Enshakushana defeated Akkad”}
\]

Before Sargon, Akkad was not known as a city, so this can be taken as the first indirect proof for the existence of Sargon as a contemporary of Enshakushana. Although this document does not bear a direct reference to king Sargon, prosopography demonstrates that Sargon must have ruled at Nippur not too many years later (see below). This fact supports the impression that the reference to Akkad in the Enshakushana year date, in fact, points to a mighty ruler there, namely Sargon.

The administrative note \( \text{TMH} 5, 81 \) bearing this year date includes a person named Urani who deals with cattle. The same official is attested later in an administrative text dealing with offerings for Sargon of Akkad:

\[
\text{“2 oxen from Urani, 1 sheep from Ayadgal, consumed as offerings (for) Sargon (at the) new moon festival (of) the month Duku.”}
\]

Such offerings could be delivered to the living king (cf. \( \text{TMH} 5, 86 = \text{ECTJ} 86 \), the year name “destruction of \( \text{urux} \text{a} \)” can be attributed to Sargon). Since the year name of \( \text{TMH} 5, 81 = \text{ECTJ} 81 \) is found on a tablet from Nippur, it must predate the 7th year (or alternatively the 10th year) of Lugalzagesi, when the latter had, at the latest, seized control of Nippur (see 6.2.2. and 6.2.3). Accordingly, Sargon must have ruled for at least 18+X years before he defeated Lugalzagesi of Uruk, i.e. 18 years for the distance between the 7th year of Lugalzagesi and his end in year 25 (according to the \textit{Sumerian King List}), and X years, as an estimated length for the period of Sargon’s rise in Northern Babylonia. A model calculation runs as follows:

- **Lugalzagesi 2**: estimated latest date for Sargon’s rise at Akkad
- **Lugalzagesi 7(10)**: \* \textit{terminus ante quem} for Enshakushana’s siege of Akkad
- **Lugalzagesi 25**: Sargon defeats Lugalzagesi

The time span necessary for the rise of Lugalzagesi makes it difficult to think of even a longer period of Lugalzagesi’s dominion over Nippur. Unfortunately it is not possible to correlate the campaigns of Enshakushana: he laid siege to Girzu in Urukagina years 4 to 6 (Ukg L 4-6). Would he have been able to conduct a successful campaign against Akkad in the same years?

Any calculation of the relationship between Lugalzagesi and Sargon has to rely on the dates of the \textit{Sumerian King List} (\textit{SKL}, see Section 2.1). In this undertaking we do not blindly trust the \textit{SKL}, but we accept the dates as a model for a plausible chronological reconstruction. The \textit{SKL} attributes 56 (WB), 55 (L1, IB), and 54 (TL) years to Sargon, \textit{USKL} 40 years. Furthermore the \textit{USKL} takes Manishtushu as the direct successor of his father before Rimush, contrary to the standard \textit{SKL} with Rimush as first successor.

The dating of Sargon in relation to Urukagina and Lugalzagesi can be correlated with the prosopography of Umma, the attestations for Meskigala of Adab and the sequence of the \textit{en} priestesses of Ut.

---

270 See the notes on his Nippur inscription above.
271 Though administrative texts dated to Lugalzagesi only include datings to his 6th to 8th year, the figure of 25 years given by \textit{SKL} seems to be corroborated by an administrative text dated to year 16 of an unnamed ruler that can be attributed to Lugalzagesi on the basis of prosopography, and perhaps the dating to the 24th year of an unnamed ruler, see above Section 5.2.
272 On the arguments against an identification of Manishtushu’s contemporaries Urukagina with the last independent ruler of Lagash, see above 5.1. sub (9).
Table 22: Prosopographic links at Umma between the reigns of Lugalzagesi and Sargon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lugalzagesi 7</th>
<th>ma₄₂, gur₄, dub-sar</th>
<th>BIN 8, 116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ter-ku₁, um-mi-a</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr 7; cf. BIN 8, 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ 18 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lugalzagesi 25</th>
<th>Sargon defeats Lugalzagesi (see below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma₄₂, gur₄, dub-sar</td>
<td>Mu-iti A (Foster 1982c: 311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ter-ku₁, dub-sar (maḥ)</td>
<td>Mu-iti A (Foster 1982c: 312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ 9(+x) years</td>
<td>Combined reigns of Ennatum (min. 6) and Shurushken (min. 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te[er-ku₁,]um-mi-[i]-a</td>
<td>Ozaki 2008: no. 3 rev. i 3 (Shurushken year 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Documents from Umma to the reign of Lugalzagesi and to Sargon can be linked by prosopography.²⁷³ The archive from Sargon’s reign, traditionally labeled “mu-iti A”, can be linked to two governors (ensi) at Umma, Ennatum and Shurushken,²⁴ the (highest) year dates attested for Ennatum being six, for Shurushken three years.²⁷⁵

The most important prosopographic evidence for Umma is shown in Table 22.²⁷⁶

Shurushken’s link to the reign of Sargon is based on the evidence for Egalesi, temple administrator of Zabalam: he appears in the document Ozaki 2008: no. 3 rev. i 3 (Shurushken year 3) and in copies or drafts of two inscriptions dedicated “for the life of Sargon”.²⁷⁷ Furthermore, a document from Adab, unfortunately only published provisionally in transliteration, provides a precious synchronism of Shurushken with Meskigala, the governor of Adab, who is attested under Lugalzagesi and under Sargon’s son Rimush (see next paragraph):

[CUSAS 11, 90 rev. i 1-ii 1:²⁷⁸]

[...] tu₄₂;[...] mes-ki-gal-la ensi₂ adab²⁴ su-um-gi ensi₂ umma( geopolitical) [...]-dab₁

“(...) Meskigala, governor of Adab, Shurushken, governor of Umma (...)”

In conclusion, the prosopographic evidence shows that the period between Lugalzagesi year 7 and the reign of Sargon (or his successor) at Umma cannot exceed the active time of an official. Our proposal for the chronology of the Presargonic to Sargonic transition (see below Table 30) agrees also with this evidence.

2) A governor of Adab named Meskigala is said to have been captured when Rimush suppressed a revolt of several Sumerian cities immediately after he had ascended the throne (either after his father Sargon, thus the SKL, or after his brother Manishtushu, thus the CUSKL). Rimush campaigned against Elam in his 3rd year, and the capture of Meskigala can be dated to his 1st or 2nd reignal year:²⁷⁹

[FAOS 7 Rim C 1 = RIME 2.1.2.4: 4-10, FAOS 7 Rim C 4 = RIME 2.1.2.1: 14-18; su-r₄₂-sa₄-sar₄₂,dat₄₄ en-lil₂ ti-nu-[i] [um] ka₄₂.sudul₄ ls₄₂-me ri-im ad ma₄₂-ti-i₄ 3 i₄₂-ar₄₂ mes-ki-gal-la ensi₂ adab²⁴ su₄₂.du₄₂-A]

“Immediately after Enlil had bestowed kingship upon him, he was victorious in the battle of Sumer three times and he captured Meskigala, governor of Adab.”

²⁷³ See above Section 3.1.7.
²⁷⁴ Written sur₄₂-um-gi, Ozaki 2008: no. 3 rev. iii (dated year 3); reading after Marchesi 2011a.
²⁷⁵ Marchesi 2011a.
²⁷⁶ See for this and further prosopographic links Foster 1979: 156-157; Foster 1982a: 43; Pomponio 1983: 528; A. Westenholz 1984: 76; and the references in Visicato 2000: 85-87 (Magur, Terku), 94-95 (Magur, Terku). Monaco 2010; 2011a also refers to the occurrence of a certain Lugalka as a witness; since this is a very common name that occurs in combination with a least five different titles, it is insufficient as prosopographic evidence; cf. lugal-ka₁₄₂, eṣṣ₄₂-gid₄, BIN 8, 82 obv. v 19; lugal-ka₁₄₂ u₄₂-band₄₂, diṯ₄₂ BIN 8, 108 obv. ii 1; Powell 1978: no. 19 obv. i 6; no. 21 obv. ii 4; no. 22 obv. ii 1; lugal-ka₁₄₂ sagi₁₂ BIN 8, 120 obv. i’ 2; lugal-ka₁₄₂ sipa₁₂ BIN 8, 62 obv. i 8; BIN 8, 86 obv. iii 1; lugal-ka₁₄₂ tu₄₂-du₄₂, Powell 1978: no. 2 obv. ii 10; Ellis 1979: no. 6 obv. ii 1.
²⁷⁷ CUNES 51-09-004, edited and discussed by Marchesi 2011a.
²⁷⁸ See Visicato 2010b: 268; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 2
²⁷⁹ Though edited as discrete inscriptions by Gelb & Kienast 1990 and Frayne 1993, Rimush’s inscriptions about the rebellion were in fact part of a single monument. On its reconstruction, the reading and meaning of the passage and the dating of the revolt see Bucchellati 1993; A. Westenholz 1999: 128; Sommerfeld 2008: 225 n. 12; Sommerfeld 2006-2008: 372-373, citing earlier literature.
Table 23a: Meskigala of Adab appears under Lugalzagesi and at the time of Rimush. Sequence of Sargonic kings and length of reign of Sargon according to USKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lugalzagesi 7</th>
<th>Umma, Adab, Nippur, Uruk in one state (Lugalzagesi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓ 18 years</td>
<td>x years Meskigala in office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalzagesi 25</td>
<td>Sargon defeats Lugalzagesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ ca. 15 years</td>
<td>+ 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargon 40</td>
<td>end of Sargon’s reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ 15 years</td>
<td>+ 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manishtushu 15</td>
<td>end of Manishtushu’s reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ 1-2 years</td>
<td>+ y years (y &lt; 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimush</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capture of Meskigala by Rimush</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23b: Meskigala of Adab appears under Lugalzagesi and at the time of Rimush. Sequence of Sargonic kings and length of reign of Sargon according to SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lugalzagesi 7</th>
<th>Umma, Adab, Nippur, Uruk in one state (Lugalzagesi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓ 18 years</td>
<td>x years Meskigala in office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalzagesi 25</td>
<td>Sargon defeats Lugalzagesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ ca. 30 years</td>
<td>+ 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargon 55</td>
<td>end of Sargon’s reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ 1-2 years</td>
<td>+ y years (y &lt; 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimush</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capture of Meskigala by Rimush</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meskigala, the governor (ensi) of Adab, was a contemporary of Lugalzagesi (BIN 8, 26, see above). This synchronism cannot be dated exactly within Lugalzagesi’s reign, so one can only state that Meskigala was at least 30 years older under Rimush.⁸²⁰

Given the social context of the persons in our documentation, it is most plausible to identify the Meskigala of Adab attested under Sargon’s son Rimush, as the same person as the Presargonic city ruler. A strong argument in favour of this identifications is the fact that the name Meskigala is not attested elsewhere in thousands of contemporary 3rd millennium sources.⁸²¹

3) The sequence of the ēn priestesses of Nanna at Ur and the chronology of Sargon’s daughter Enheduana agree with our reconstruction of the chronology and the dating of Lugalzagesi’s defeat in Sargon’s late reign.⁸²² It is assumed that Sargon installed his daughter Enheduana as ēn priestess of Nanna at Ur, which must have occurred after his conquest of Sumer, although the exact date remains unknown.⁸²³ As Franke and Westenholz have convincingly argued, Sargon’s early inscriptions use a variety of religious titles, whereas the later ones only apply the

---


⁸²¹ The order of succession Manishtushu – Rimush may also be corroborated by the “ED style” of the votive inscription on the statue dedicated to Manishtushu by Eshpum FAOS 7 Maništūšu B 2 = RIME 2.1.3.2001, on the stylistic dating, see also Pons & De Meyer 2002: 131-135. For a similar argument in favour of the reversed order of succession concerning the so-called “Rimush Stela”, see also Huh 2008: 290. Note that Manishtushu also appears as Sargon’s direct successor in the so-called “Cruciform Monument”, see Steinkeller 2003a: 278; Frahm & Payne 2003-2004: 54.

⁸²² A. Westenholz 1999: 35, 47 was the first to argue that Enheduana’s career indicates that Sargon must have conquered Sumer late in his reign. On Enheduana, see Weiershäuser 2008: 249-254, citing previous literature.

⁸²³ Hallo 1976: 29; Glassner 1986: 12; Steinkeller 1999: 124; A. Westenholz 1999: 35, 38, 54; Weiershäuser 2008: 254. Note, however, that it cannot be ruled out that Enheduana was installed by Sargon’s successors, and the lack of Sargon’s title in Enheduana’s seal inscriptions has been taken as indication that Sargon was already succeeded by on of his sons when the seal was cut, cf. Steinkeller 1999: 124 n. 77; Weiershäuser 2008: 250-251.
The next en priestess we know of was Enmenana who was installed by her father Naramsuen. Her appointment is commemorated in a Naramsuen year date that omits the divine classifier, whereas it appears in inscriptions of members of her household; Enmenana thus was still in office during Naramsuen’s later reign. According to the literary composition Ninmeshara, Enmenana still lived at the time of the “Great Revolt”, perhaps in the middle period of Naramsuen’s reign. A hypothetical reconstruction of Enmenana’s age, assuming that she was installed by her father shortly after his defeat of Lugalzagesi, renders an early date for Sargon’s conquest of Sumer implausible.

Although the individual dates remain speculative, the often-quoted sequence of the en priestesses at Ur can be fitted into our historical reconstruction, especially with the USKL date for Sargon.

Compelling contemporary evidence for the rise of Sargon at Akkad is not available in Mesopotamian sources. Urzababa of Kish, master of Sargon in the Sumerian Sargon Legend and duly listed in the Sumerian King List, is sometimes accepted as a historical figure. The mention of officials from Akkad in two early administrative texts from Tutub indicates Akkad’s role as capital, but palaeography and findspot of the tablets allow for both a Presargonic and Early Sargonic dating. In this regard the documents from Ebla may offer an unexpected perspective on the rise of Sargon, as will be discussed in the next paragraph.

6.4. The Chronology of Ebla and Babylonian History

In order to date the destruction of Mari, the internal chronology of the documents from the Early Bronze Palace G at Ebla, must be correlated with Babylonian historical chronology.

The internal chronology of Ebla has been established on the basis of a continuous sequence of annual documents, such as the deliveries (mu.du-texts), or annual accounts of metal. This has allowed Archi and Biga to reconstruct a chronological framework for the last ca. 45 years of Ebla, prior to its end. This is the period of the last two Eblaite kings, Irkabdamu and Ishbardamu, and their “ministers” Arrukum, Ibirum and Ibbizikir.

Political events in Babylonia were reported to the court of Ebla, and the messenger was rewarded with a gift, duly noted in the annual documents. The few events from Babylonia reported within the practically complete documentation of the last 35 years of the archives, must, thus, have been of outstanding importance. Therefore,
these reports can probably be related to the decisive victories and defeats in Babylonia as memorialized in royal inscriptions. The correlations proposed by Sallaberger are summarised in Table 5.\(^{293}\)

The defeats of Akshak and Kish, reported in the years Ibrium 3, 5, 10 and 13, can probably be correlated to successful campaigns led by Enshakushana, who became the first ruler of Babylonia to conquer a larger kingdom. He even led a campaign against Akkad, the newly emerging northern centre of Sargon (see above 6.3. on TMH 5, 81). The destruction of Adab, reported to Ebla in the year Ibribizikir 2, is attributed to Lugalzagesi, who probably controlled Umma, Adab, Nippur and Uruk by his 7th year. No other conquest of Adab can be reconstructed from Presargonic texts despite the wealth of sources from that town,\(^{294}\) while Adab is known to have been an independent city state about 10 years (or even less) earlier during Lugalanda’s reign.\(^{295}\)

Meskigala, governor of Adab under Lugalzagesi (BIN 8, 26; see above) and apparently installed by the latter, later changed sides and had good relations with Akkad, until he fought against Rimush (see above Section 6.3. with Table 23). This demonstrates that Adab saw no conquest after Lugalzagesi’s. Furthermore, a recently published reference to an expedition of Meskigala of Adab to the Cedar Mountain, i.e., to the Ebla region,\(^{296}\) is a most welcome confirmation from the Babylonian side, of the close contacts between Babylonia and Syria in the Presargonic and Sargonic periods. The conquest of Adab must have been an outstanding royal deed, since a Presargonic or Early Sargonic year name from Nippur refers to the destruction of Adab (OSP 1, 76; see 6.2.3 above). Palaeographically this tablet would fit equally well to Lugalzagesi and to Rimush, to whom this date is usually attributed.

In conclusion, everything points to the fact that Adab was conquered only by Lugalzagesi in the late Presargonic and Early Sargonic period. This must have happened before or early in his 7th regnal year, which thus corresponds to Ibribizikir 5.\(^{297}\) The synchronism based on the destruction of Adab has thus been corroborated by further evaluations and newly published evidence and may be seen as the corner stone of the correlation between Ebla, the Presargonic rulers and Sargon. Furthermore, this correlation agrees well with the success of Enshakushana as ruler of Uruk, before Lugalzagesi’s arrival, as all other Babylonian conquests reported to Ebla are dated before the capture of Adab (cf. Table 25).


\(^{294}\) See Pomponio and Schrakamp in this volume.

\(^{295}\) RTC 19, Nbk. 1, 282 = Selz 1989a: no. 282, see 6.2.3.

\(^{296}\) On Meskigala, see most recently Visicato 2010b; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 4-8.

\(^{297}\) The alternative solution presented above Section 6.2.2., that the Zabalam land texts of year Lugalzagesi 7 reflect the situation of Enshakushana’s reign need not change the situation: the conquest of Adab before year Lugalzagesi 7 would remain the only conquest of Adab before the state of Uruk was taken over by Lugalzagesi.

\(^{298}\) First proposed by Sallaberger 2004: 20-22.
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Table 25: Military defeats in Babylonia reported at Ebla.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Cfr. Below at Ibrium 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibrium 3</td>
<td>Adab defeated (rit), MEE 7, 47 rev. xii 21-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrium 5</td>
<td>Akshak destroyed by Enshakushana of Uruk, RIME 1.14.17.1 (FAOS 5/2 Enšak. 1 = RIME 1.14.17.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrium 10</td>
<td>Adab defeated (rit), 75, 10144 rev. v-11 = PPET 2374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrium 12</td>
<td>Kish defeated (rit), 75, 1464 = Archi 1996b: 84; PPET 0511, 0516. 0528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibribizikir 5</td>
<td>Adab conquered (šu BA₂₂, T₁), MEE 10, 29 e. iii 22-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibribizikir 17</td>
<td>Ebla destroyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documents from the final three, four years of Ebla before its destruction mention gifts from the court of Ebla for a “king of Kish”. This ruler can only be identified with Sargon of Akkad if one applies the here established synchronisms of the late Pre-Sargonic period. As the publication of all the relevant passages by Archi (this volume Section 3.7) has now made clear, the “king of Kish”, referred to as EN I LUGAL according to Eblaite or Mesopotamian tradition, appears often together with his “father” (A.MU, a-biš) as recipient of gifts. For example TM.75.G.2277 rev. ix 4-10 lists textiles for “the king (En) of Kish” and to “his father and his brother” (A.MU-IŠ, uš šeš-suš). In the enormous documentation of royal gifts known from the palace of Ebla, that in an uninterrupted series lists every substantial gift for more than forty years, this is (according to published sources) an absolutely unique situation. Regularly the family of a ruler including his wife and sometimes his mother, his brothers and children received gifts, but never the father. The father of a ruler does not appear as recipient of gifts simply because he was the predecessor as a ruler and died before his son ascended to the throne. The unique reference to a “father” of the “king of Kish”, however, exactly fits the situation of the newcomer Sargon, whose main royal title was “king of Kish”, and who neither in his own inscriptions nor in the Mesopotamian tradition appears as the successor of a preceding ruler, but who has become a remarkable figure in history, in historiography and in legends precisely because he ascended to the throne without royal background and who later successfully conquered an empire. The Sumerian King List in its Old Babylonian recension notes: “In Akkad, Sargon – his father was a gar” e.g. a.mu-±25-±25-±25, which the father of a ruling king was alive is rare, but not without parallels, in Mesopotamian history: Waradsin and Rimsin, kings of Larsa, regularly mention their father Kudurmabuk in their royal inscriptions.

Most importantly the destruction of Ebla can be linked to the Egyptian chronology, since a vase lid with the cartouche of the Egyptian pharaoh Pepy I of the sixth Dynasty, dating to first thirty years of this pharaoh’s reign, was found in the destruction layer of Palace G. The date of Pepy I (2310-2260) in the authoritative chronological list of pharaohs by J. von Beckerath (1997) agrees basically with other proposals (e.g. 2321-2287 after Shaw 2000); this was seen as an important indicator for lowering the Mesopotamian chronology. The seemingly firm Egyptian chronology, however, has been dispute by both historical arguments and radiocarbon datings. The radiocarbon samples are taken from historically dated objects, and the series of dates allows estimates for the sequence of pharaohs. In this radiocarbon-based chronology, the first year of Pepy I is fixed at 2389-2349 (68% probability) or 2399-2310 (95% probability); the accession date 2369 ± 20/2355 ± 24 is 45 to 50 years higher than the historical chronology. The absolute dates for Old Kingdom dynasties, however, depend on a chronological evaluation of the subsequent First Intermediate period. Cogent arguments for a substantial extension of the First Intermediate period were presented by S. Seidlmayer, who has based his reconstruction on the prosopography of officials in Egypt, since it is precisely the feature of an intermediate period that pharaohs are less well represented. Therefore Seidlmayer argues that the Heracleopolitan Dynasties 9 and 10 preceded the Theban Dynasty 11, the last dynasty of the First Intermediate Period, not only by 38 years, as assumed by the current chronologies, but by 74 to 97 years or 71 to 98 years. Ignoring the uncertainties concerning the extension of
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299 Archi this volume, Section 3.7.
301 Sallaberger 2004: 24 had assumed that the term “father” referred to the king of Kish himself; the more complete citations of the relevant passages by Archi, this volume (Section 3.7), show without any doubt that they refer to the father of the king of Kish.
302 Archi this volume.
303 “King of Kish” (lUGAL kiši) is the standard royal title of Sargon; see Franke 1995: 94-96.
304 Jacobsen 1939: 111 lines vi 31-36.
305 It hardly needs to be mentioned that we are aware of the problems concerning a historical background for the notes in the Sumerian King List and the legends about Sargon. However, it is less plausible to “invent” another coherent interpretation if one respects the chronological data and the uniqueness of the gift recipients in the Ebla documents.
306 Date after Shaw 2000: 482.
307 Scandone Matthiae 1979: 37-43 and fig. 13; ibid. p. 38 she points to the abundance of vases and plates inscribed with the name of Pepy I and found at Byblos; after the Sed festival, his thirtieth year, Pepy changed his name to Mry-Rˁ ibid. p.40).
309 Bronk Ramsey et al. 2010
311 Seidlmayer 1997: 88, i.e. 86-87 years.
312 Seidlmayer 2006: 167-168, i.e. 85-86 years.
Map 7: Coalitions at the end of the Presargonic period
Dynasty 8, which is taken to last for a generation, this well-founded proposal lifts the first year of Pepy I for 47\(^{14}\) years, or in absolute dates, to 2361-2334 BC or 2336-2309 BC. This historical argumentation\(^{313}\) can be reconciled with the radiocarbon dates\(^{314}\) and thus a date of Pepy I’s first year can possibly be estimated around 2360-2350. Of course this estimate does not imply that the correct date must by any way be included within this decennium.

In any case the review of some Egyptological studies on chronology helps to see the find of Pepy’s lid at Ebla in a different light: it does not force us to lower drastically the Mesopotamian chronology. With his first 30 years between 2360/50 and 2330/20 BC, the destruction of Ebla’s Royal Palace G could have taken place at any date after around 2350 BC, with later dates down to ca. 2300 BC being more and more plausible.

### 6.5. The Destruction of Mari

The destruction of the Presargonic city of Mari, ville II as it is called by J.-C. Margueron (2004), was a major event in the early years of Sargon’s rule. This historical event, recorded in the written record, is also archaeologically attested by the destruction of the Presargonic palace. Currently two facts seem certain:

1) Mari was destroyed after the end of Ebla
2) The destruction can be attributed to Sargon

Ad 1) The last king known from the final years of Ebla (year Ishardamu 32) was Hīdār,\(^{315}\) but in the destruction layer of the Presargonic palace of Mari appeared seals of king Ishqimari, who must have ruled after Hīdār.\(^{316}\) The Presargonic tablets from Mari are dated only by numbers of years, and these numbers have been used for a reconstruction of the sequence by D. Charpin.\(^{317}\) The years 18 to 35\(^{318}\) on tablets from Chantier B (La résidence aux Installations artisanales) are correlated to the reign of Hīdār, those dated to year 3-8 of groups C (from Le quartier du Grand Prêtre) and D (from Palace P.1) to Ishqimari’s reign.\(^{319}\) The three tablet series from group C and the tablets from group D (Charpin 1987a: no. 17) all end with the 2\(^{nd}\) month of year 8; therefore the destruction must have occurred during the following month(s) of early summer of year 8.\(^{320}\)

The publication of the seals (Beyer 2007) has confirmed the presence of Ishqimari as king of Mari after the end of Ebla, but it has cast some doubt on the placement of Hīdār, since his name could not be identified. Instead, two other kings could be identified on sealings from the destruction layer:

\[\text{\textit{ii}₂₆₂₅\textit{LAGAB}-\textit{da-ar}} \text{ Beyer 2007: 248-250 nos. 14 and 15; reading proposed by M. Jaques and A. Cavigneaux} \]

\[\text{i-ku-} [... \text{ Beyer 2007: 255 no. 18 (TH 00.161)} \]

Table 26a: Mari years and attributions to kings after Charpin 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year dates in Tablets</th>
<th>Attribution to king</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 35 (Chantier B)</td>
<td>Hīdār (attested at Ebla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 8 (Groups C+D)</td>
<td>Ishqimari (attested in seal inscriptions at Mari)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of Mari Ville II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

313 Seidlmayer 1997; 2006.

314 Of Bronk Ramsey et al. 2010.

315 Marchesi (2006b: 263 n. 266; also this volume sub G.07) proposes to read the name as Šabdayar (\textit{du₂₃₂₅-du-ar}). Although this interpretation remains possible, the alleged “orthographic variants” \textit{dab₆-dar} and \textit{da-da-ar} of Marchesi l.c. refer to (a) different person(s). According to Archi & Biga 2003: 5-8, the ruler Hīdār appeared only in the last years of Ebla.


319 The designation of the findspots follows Margueron 2004. Marchesi (this volume sub G.07) thinks the reconstruction of Charpin is implausible; but note that the time spans involved in Marchesi’s proposal are not impossible; it would simply add another 7 years after the 35 years of Hīdār and thus lead to a destruction of Mari 7 years later (see below); this would raise the date of Ebla for 7 years in relation to Babylonia (and thus raise e.g. the date of Tell Beydar). The palaeography of the Chantier B tablets, however, agrees much better with the reconstruction of Charpin 2005: Following Marchesi, the Mari tablets would have been contemporary with those from Tell Beydar, which can roughly be dated to the time of Iplu(s)i’il (Sallaberger 2011 with earlier literature); a glance at the tablets makes such an assumption improbable. However, concerning the new Mari texts found in another archaeological context (courtesy A. Cavigneaux), the date “40 years” may well refer to Iplu(s)i’il.

320 See on the Presargonic tablets at Mari also Sallaberger in print.
Transition from the Presargonic to the Sargonic Period

The latter king could be Ikunishar, a king of Mari attested at Ebla in the first year of Ibrium, i.e. 34 years before Ebla’s destruction, or Ikunshamash, as proposed by Marchesi (this volume sub G.09).

Two main problems remain that do not allow a convincing reconstruction of the sequence and duration of the last Mari rulers and thus of the distance between the destructions of Mari and Ebla.

a) Nothing is known about the sequence of rulers of Mari for more than 30 years, i.e. from Ishardamu of Ebla year 1 to the last 3(+x) years

b) It is impossible to correlate the year dates in the Mari documents with the names of kings. Palaeography and distribution of texts indicate that the texts with higher dates, now reaching even to year 40 with new texts found at Mari, are earlier; but it is unknown whether they should be attributed to the final years of Iplu(s)il (who ruled until ca. 43 years before the end of Ebla) or to an unspectacular, but long reign of Hidar.

This allows various reconstructions of the sequence of the rulers of Mari.

Year “8” in the Mari documents was probably the last year of Mari’s Ville II and it may refer to the city’s last king, Ishqimari, who is known from his sealings and his statue, or Ishkurdar (cf. Archi and Marchesi this volume). If Hidar had died in the same year as the destruction of Ebla and was followed by Ishqimari and Ishkurdar, this would make a minimum of 10 years distance between the destructions of Mari and Ebla; if the “40 years” in Mari documents are attributed to him, 15 years are the minimum.

On the other hand Sargon of Akkad probably appeared in Ebla documents of the last three years, where a “king of Kish” is attested as a mighty ally (see 6.4.); and Sargon of Akkad was responsible for the destruction of Mari (see below). To fit these data into his 40 years reign, not much more than 20 years can plausibly be admitted for the distance between these two destructions. The fact that Sargon’s campaign against Mari and Syria could be seen as a revenge of his former ally Ebla may argue for a shorter distance, but this of course remains speculative.

So the available evidence favours a distance of 15 to 20 years between the destructions of first Ebla and then Mari.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date relative to end of Ebla</th>
<th>Years of duration</th>
<th>Mari kings according to Ebla texts</th>
<th>Attestation of rulers at Mari in destruction layer (year dates in documents; sealings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>until -43</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Iplu(s)il</td>
<td>cf. year “40” (Cavigneaux in print nos. 1; 7)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42-40(?)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ntzi</td>
<td>Hidar already attested (Archi &amp; Biga 2003: 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-39-36(?)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ennadagan</td>
<td>Corresponds to last years of Irkabdamu (minister Arrukum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ikunishar</td>
<td>cf. sealings of Ikun[…][?], or read Ikun[shamash]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-34-ca. 3/5(?)</td>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>no king of Mari attested</td>
<td>cf. sealings of Ishkurdar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3/5-1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Hidar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td>destruction of Ebla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+x</td>
<td>15-20?</td>
<td></td>
<td>cf. year “40” (Cavigneaux in print nos. 1; 7; if attributed to Hidar: year +6)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td>sealings of Ishqimari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sealings of Ishkurdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cf. year “8” as final year of Groupes C &amp; D texts (Charpin 1987a; 2005; year of Ishkurdar?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

321 This king’s seal appears on a bulla sealed by a “general” (kiš.nita₂) Iddinashtar (Akk. Yiddin-Aštar, written i-ti-aš₁₁-dar); reading after M. Jaques apud Beyer 2007: 253. The appearance of a “general” does not come as a surprise at the royal court. His title is simply “general”, which has to be strictly kept apart from the title “General of Mari” used by the later rulers of Mari (“Ville III”; pace Beyer 2007: 255).

322 Cavigneaux in print. We are very grateful to Antoine Cavigneaux that he has made available this important publication of new texts in advance.

323 It is not possible to correlate the date of “40 years” in documents from Mari (Cavigneaux in print nos. 1 and 7) with a king of Mari; it may be either Iplu(s)il or Hidar. The rulers Ishkurdar and Ikun[ishar] or Ikun[shamash] may be attributed to the thirty years under Ebla’s Ishardamu, when no name of a king of Mari is attested (in this case the “40 years” of course could only refer to Iplu(s)il). It is plausible that Ishqimari was the last king of Mari, since his sealings come from the destruction layer; and it is furthermore probable that the years 5 to 8, that appear on tablets of Groupes C-D in the publication of Charpin 1987a, refer to Ishqimari.
Ad 2) Sargon mentions Mari as part of his empire:

FAOS 7 Sargon C.1 = RIME 2.1.1.1, Sumerian 81-87:
lu₂₉ ma-[ri₈₈]₄₉ lu₂₉ elam[⁻¹⁻¹]₄₆ igi sar-[m-g]₄₉₄ₙ₄₉ lugal kalam-ma-ka-šē₂₉, i₉₉-s₉₉₉-ge-c₉₉₉₉, // Akkadian 86-93:
ma-r₃₃ ki₉₄ elam₃₉₃₄₉₉₃₉₉₃₉₉₃₉₉₌₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉portion: the king of the land"

FAOS 7 Sargon C.6 = RIME 2.1.1.11, Sumerian 20-28:
kal₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉portion: the king of the land"

"He (the god Dagan) gave him the Upper Land: Mari, Iarmuti, and Ebla as far as the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountains".

The destruction is also commemorated in an Early Sargonic year-name from Nippur (TMH 5, 80 = ECTJ 80 obv. ii 6-rev. i 1; OSP 1, 102, see 3.2.1.). The attribution to Sargon is corroborated by finds of inscriptions of
Transition from the Presargonic to the Sargonic Period

According to the historical chronology of Ebla and Mari, Mari was destroyed 13 + ca. 15-20 = 28-33 years after the conquest of Adab was reported to Ebla. According to our understanding (6.2.3), Lugalzagesi conquered Adab between his 2nd and 7th year which leads to the two reconstructions represented in Tables 29 and 30.

Naramsuen, without the divine classifier above the destruction layer (FAOS 7 Narāmsīn A 5, Narāmsīn B 10 = RIME 2.1.4.51-52).324

According to the historical chronology of Ebla and Mari, Mari was destroyed 13 + ca. 15-20 = 28-33 years after the conquest of Adab was reported to Ebla. According to our understanding (6.2.3), Lugalzagesi conquered Adab between his 2nd and 7th year which leads to the two reconstructions represented in Tables 29 and 30.

When in his reign did Sargon destroy Mari? The earliest reference to Akkad (but not explicitly to Sargon) was in Enshakushana’s year name, dated before Lugalzagesi 7 (when Lugalzagesi was in control of Nippur), at the latest in Lugalzagesi 6 (last year of Enshakushana); on the other hand, Lugalzagesi ruled at least 18 years in Nippur (using the 25 years of SKL). So Sargon must have been a contemporary of Lugalzagesi for at least 18 years.

The Ur III version of the Sumerian King List (USKL) ascribes to Sargon a reign of 40 years. After the first appearance of Akkad on the political stage in the conflict with Enshakushana it took Sargon probably a minimum of (18 + 5 =) 23 years to defeat Lugalzagesi and to destroy Mari. Therefore, this must have happened ca. 17 years (or less) before the end of his reign. A later date for Sargon’s destruction of Mari, for example ca. 3 to 15 years before his last year, would allow for a more realistic scenario.

A late date would also account for the fact that Meskigala of Adab led an expedition to the Cedar Forest. This would hardly have been possible when Meskigala was still governor under Lugalzagesi. But Meskigala apparently changed sides, he followed Sargon and accompanied him on his campaigns against Uruk and later to Upper Mesopotamia.325

324 On the chronological implications of the absence/presence of the divine classifier, see 7.2.; Sallaberger 2007: 424 with n. 38 on the findspot.
325 On Meskigala’s alliance with Sargon, see Visicato 2010b: 259; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 6-7; see above.
In conclusion it should be emphasized that the calculations presented in this section are only a model based on currently available evidence. The model may be out by a few years and some evidence could be interpreted differently; but at least the model presents a frame to fit in the (chronological) sources we have at our disposal. Needless to say, each step in such an argument should be critically evaluated, but any future discussion also should be aware of the wider implications of any change for the historical reconstruction of the chronology.

Finally, it is necessary to reiterate the uncertainties of the model: whereas the Ebla sequence is confirmed by the textual sources from Ebla itself (see Archi this volume), the lengths of the reigns of Sargon (40 years, USKL) and Lugalzagesi (25 years, SKL) stem from the Sumerian King List; these dates are very plausible, but not confirmed by contemporary evidence. The distance of 15 to 20 years between the destructions of Ebla and Mari has been discussed above; the sequence is certain, and a time span under 15 years is more difficult to defend at the moment, so we have chosen a distance of 20 years for our chronological table. This historical reconstruction, however, does not permit an unlimited extension of this time span: Lugalzagesi is linked both to the chronology of Ebla (by the destruction of Adab mentioned there) and to Mari (by the synchronism with Sargon who destroyed Mari), and a further argument has been presented that Sargon was the king of Kish mentioned in the last years of Ebla. Finally, prosopography demonstrates that at Nippur Enshakushana, Lugalzagesi and Sargon ruled within one generation, and at Adab Lugalzagesi, Sargon and his son Rimush (6.3).
7. Sargonic Rule in Mesopotamia

7.1. Early Sargonic Period: Sargon, Rimush and Manishtushu

Sargon set out to conquer Babylonia and parts of Upper Mesopotamia from his capital Akkad (plausibly located near modern Samarra; see above 6.3.). In his victorious expeditions he surely profited from the earlier destruction caused by the large, unprecedented wars at the end of the Presargonic period involving Ebla, Mari and Nagar in the north, to Uruk, Umma and Lagash in the south. These earlier conflicts undoubtedly produced political instability, depopulation and economic crises. According to the evidence presented in the preceding section, Sargon’s reign may, plausibly, as indicated by the USKL, have lasted 40 years. He should have won his decisive victories against Mari and Lugalzagesi of Uruk around his 25th to 30th year of rule. A much later date would hardly allow any time for a thorough organization of his empire. A date before his 22nd year would be in conflict with the battle of Enshakushana against Akkad (TMHS 5, 81; Section 6.3.), and a much earlier date (e.g. year 15) can hardly be reconciled with the evidence for Meskigala of Adab and the Adab prosopography (Section 6.3.). The (at least) four different year dates of Sargon found on tablets from Nippur, are of little help for a more precise chronology; they merely exclude the fact that he conquered Nippur, i.e. Babylonia, after his 36th year (calculating with a reign of 40 years). The proposed date of Sargon, ca. year 25 to 30, may therefore be regarded as the true beginning of a “Sargonic period” in Babylonia and perhaps even in Upper Mesopotamia (see Section 1.2. for the terminology).

According to the SKL Sargon was succeeded by his sons, first Rimush (Akkadian Rimuš) and then Manishtushu (Akkadian Man-is-ti-ištu), who ruled for 22 or 24 years combined; here we use the value of 23 years. The older USKL orders the reverse, with Manishtushu following Sargon and reigning for 15 years, while his brother Rimush exercised a rule of 8 years. A figure of 8 and 15 years for Rimush and Manishtushu is apparently preserved in SKL source L., Note that Manishtushu also appears as Sargon’s direct successor in the so-called Cruciform Monument.

Independent contemporary evidence for the duration of the reigns of the Sargonic rulers is lacking. Besides the deeds recorded in the inscriptions, which mainly survived in Old Babylonian copies, Sargon himself left relatively few traces beyond Babylonia. The presence of Akkadian kings in Upper Mesopotamia only starts with his sons Manishtushu and Rimush. Rimush led successful campaigns as far as Elam. The find, at Brak and at Tutul, of vessels from the booty of Elam testifies to an Akkadian presence in Upper Mesopotamia.

Palaeographically, it is possible to differentiate “Early Sargonic” texts from both the preceding Presargonic evidence and the later “Classic Sargonic” style tablets, especially at Nippur and Adab. The palaeography of the Presargonic period has to consider the regional variation relevant for sign forms, layout and format of tablets – a cultural diversification that reflects the political situation. Nevertheless, the documentation of Nippur allows a grouping of the tablets from the time of Enshakushana, Lugalzagesi and Sargon: the tablets are of a slightly oblong format, replacing the former round or square format, and are divided in lines instead of cases. Tablets of the Early Sargonic type stem from the time of Sargon and his sons, but it is unclear if, or how far, they extend into the early years of Naramsuen. The Early Sargonic style has been defined, e.g. for the tablets from Adab or for...
Table 31: Rimush and Manishtushu in the SKL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rimush</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manishtushu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 8: Early Sargonic empire: Sargon, Manishtushu, Rimush I
the Umma mu-iti archive group A.334 The “Presargonic” palaeography of texts from Adab is borne out, for example by an administrative text referring to a royal visit of Sargon at Adab, probably to be dated after his defeat of Lugalzagesi.335

This relative dating is also corroborated by linguistic evidence: the Early Sargonic texts from Adab still use verbal prefixes in e- like the Old Sumerian texts from Southern Babylonia; the Classic Sargonic texts, in contrast, provide only a few attestations.336

The Classic Sargonic tablets belong to the later part of Naramsuen’s reign and to the time of Sharkalisharri. It is more difficult to define a transitional style that includes features of both Early and Classic Sargonic, but tends to be closer to the Classic Sargonic. This style is often called “Middle Sargonic”.337 Furthermore, as Sommerfeld has observed, no archive bridges the gap between Early Sargonic and Classic Sargonic type tablets.338 According to him, the missing correlation may be explained by the distance between Pre-/Early Sargonic and Classic Sargonic texts, or alternatively, by the assumption that Rimush killed most of the Sumerian elite when he suppressed a southern revolt,339 documented in an inscription on a stela (FAOS 7 Rimuṣ C 1-5 = RIME 2.2.1-5).340

7.2. Classic Sargonic Period: Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri

The long reign of Naramsuen (Akkadian Narām-Su’ēn) of Akkad shaped the Sargonic period in various ways. Politically, the deification of Naramsuen after the Great Revolt became a model for future generations. Under his rule a “classic” Sargonic style developed that is identified, not only for works of art, especially glyptics, but also for the style of writing cuneiform tablets (see above).

The duration of Naramsuen’s reign has been a problem for every chronology, since the SKL apparently indicates a reign of both 56 and 37 years.341 Now, with the testimony of 54 ½ years by the USKL, the higher number has been confirmed. Here, we calculate 55 years for Naramsuen. Furthermore, the sheer number of Naramsuen’s achievements commemorated in his inscriptions and year-names, reminds us of long-lived rulers like Shulgi, Rimšin or Hammurapi with 48, 60 and 43 years, respectively, and therefore points to a longer reign. The fact that Lugalsumungal who is known as the governor (ensi) of Girsu under Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri had two different seals could, perhaps, also indicate a longer reign of Naramsuen.342 Probably the later tradition of the SKL rewarded the glorious founder of the Sargon dynasty with the same long reign as the unfortunate Naramsuen.

An Adab text, recently published by Pomponio and re-published by Steinkeller, seemed to add further evidence for Naramsuen’s long reign. It lists four persons, interpreted as governors of Adab by Pomponio, Visicato and Westenholz:343

MS 2818 = CUSAS 17, 10:

335 TCBI 1, 63, see Schrakamp 2008: 687; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 7; Sommerfeld 2009-2011: 46; Visicato 2010b.
336 Schrakamp 2008: 666-668; cf. CUSAS 13, 29; Milone 2001. Note that the Classic Sargonic texts from Adab published in CUSAS 13 do not attest to prefixes in e-.
337 See Foster 1982a: 2-7 for Umma mu-iti group B; for the term “Middle Sargonic” cf. Milone 2001: 3-5; Pomponio & Visicato 2002: 7-8; Pomponio & Stol & Westenholz 2006: 72; Maiochi 2009; for an application to textual finds from the Jezirah, there referring to tablets from the early reign of Naramsuen, see Sallaberger 2011.
338 Contribution to ARCANE meeting 2006 at München and personal communication. Note, however, that at Adab prosopographical links between Early Sargonic and Middle Sargonic texts on the one hand (e.g. di-iši-šu nu-banda), and Middle Sargonic and Classic Sargonic texts on the other (see provisionally Pomponio & Visicato & Westenholz 2006: 75; Schrakamp 2008: 668) can be observed.
340 Though edited as five discrete texts, they belonged to a single inscription on a stela, see Buccellati 1993; Sommerfeld 2006-2008: 372-373.
342 Felli 2006: 36-37.
343 MS 2818, Pomponio & Stol & Westenholz 2006: 55 with n. 164; Visicato & Westenholz 2010: 6 n. 34; Steinkeller 2011a: 11; see also Pomponio’s contribution in this volume.
The last two lines read "ra-am-ra-zu-en-zu, nam-lugal i, d u _10 " (When) Naramsuen exercised (d u , for d u _10) kingship", or even "nam-lugal i, d u _10 "his kingship is good", respectively, with "ra-am-ra-zu-en-zu" taken as an awkward misspelling of the king's name and an unorthographic writing for the verb.\(^{346}\) As the script would date palaeographically before the Classic Sargonic period, Pomponio suggests a date in the earlier part of Naramsuen's reign and thus concludes that Adab had seen four governors during Naramsuen's early years. However, this argumentation has its weak points: of the four names, only one, with the not too rare name Lugalnirgal, is actually attested as governor of Adab (\textit{TCBF} I, 66: 6-8), while Mugesi could also refer to the Presargonic ruler of Adab by the same name (\textit{OIP} 14, 52).\(^{347}\) As P. Steinkeller noted (pers. comm.): "Given the fact that this text is a school exercise [cf. the photograph in George 2011: pl. IX], its value for history and chronology is questionable. In particular, this document hardly constitutes evidence that the four ensis named in it were contemporaries of Narāmsû'en (as concluded by Pomponio 2006: 55)."\(^{348}\) Note, however, that the alleged ruler's name is written without the divine classifier that is usually written in text post-dating the so-called "Great Revolt".

The "Great Revolt" was the outstanding event during the reign of Naramsuen when the Babylonian cities, under Iphurkishi of Kish and Amargirid of Uruk, rose up against Akkad.\(^{349}\) Upper Mesopotamia, however, remained loyal to Akkadian rule.\(^{350}\) After the successful suppression of the revolt, according to the testimony of the Bassetki inscription (\textit{FAOS} Nārāmsîn 1 = \textit{RIME} 2.1.4.10), Naramsuen was built a temple. The temple was the most prominent expression of the role of the king as a god, and is usually shown by the writing of the royal name with the divine classifier\(^{40}/41\) (the \textit{DINGIR} sign). The presence of \textit{DINGIR} before the royal name can, therefore, be taken as a chronological indicator for a later date for a given inscription.\(^{351}\) This is a reasonable assumption insofar as the divine classifier is an element of the royal titulary and, as such, obligatory in official documents. All brick stamps bearing the king's name from Nippur, Lagash, Ur, Adab and Brak show the divinized name, which leads to the assumption that the king envisaged a large-scale building programme after he had successfully survived the rebellion.\(^{352}\) In addition, an administrative text, apparently from Adab, belonging to the "Middle Sargonic" palaeographic style (i.e. early years of Naramsuen) bears a seal impression with a dedicatory formula devoted to Naramsuen. Unlike seal inscriptions known so far, the ruler's name is written without the divine classifier.\(^{353}\)

The actual date of the "Great Revolt" cannot be fixed within the long reign of Naramsuen. Wilcke saw a connection between Naramsuen's titulary in the "Great Revolt" narrative and the royal inscription that tells about the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, an inscription that also occurs with the name of his successor Sharkalisharri.\(^{354}\) However, the assumed Sharkalisharri inscription is a copy, based on a Naramsuen inscription and reused by Sharkalisharri.\(^{355}\) Westenholz proposed a late date because of calculations concerning the age of Naramsuen;\(^{356}\) this would also agree with a date for the "Great Revolt" occurring during the twenties of Naramsuen's rule.\(^{357}\) Given the number of activities attributed to Naramsuen during the periods before and after the divinization, this earlier date is a much better fit.

---

Footnotes:

\(^{346}\) Or even "when Naramsuen made the kingship good", perhaps after the Great Revolt?

\(^{347}\) \textit{du} _10 would have to be understood as an unorthographic spelling for \textit{du} _11, Steinkeller 2011a: 11 objects that we should expect \textit{a} instead of \textit{du} _11.

\(^{348}\) Whether the co-occurrence of a dike named \textit{eg} _1, \textit{lugal-nu} -\textit{du} _11, \textit{ga} "dike of Lugalnuduga" along with a dike \textit{eg} _2, \textit{dumu} \textit{ens} _1\_\textit{ki} _c\_\textit{en} \_\textit{ne} "dike of the governor's sons" in an Early Sargonic tablet from Adab \textit{CUSAS} 11, 333 points to the historicity of Lugalnuduga remains uncertain.

\(^{349}\) See now also the critical remarks in Steinkeller 2011a: 11. Note also that the alleged palaeographical dating to the "Middle Sargonic period" is uncertain since a different handwriting does not necessarily indicate a different date; see Sommerfeld 1999: 7-13; 2003: 582-586.

\(^{350}\) \textit{FAOS} 7 Nārāmsîn C 2; \textit{FAOS} 8 Nar C 20-20; \textit{RIME} E.2.1.4.2-3, 6; see the improved, partial re-editions of Wilcke 1997; Sommerfeld 1999: 3 n. 8; Sommerfeld 2000; for a historical evaluation Sallaberger 2007: 426-428.

\(^{351}\) Sallaberger 2007: 425-431.

\(^{352}\) Cf. e.g. Glassner 1986: 14-16; Frayne 1991: 381-383; id. 1993: 84-86; Westenholz 2000: 553 with n. 19. Note A. Westenholz's statement: "At most, the presence of the \textit{dingir}-sign may date an inscription to the time after the Great Rebellion; from its absence nothing can be concluded." Foster 2000: 672: "Scribes in Akkad did not make much use of the \textit{dingir}-sign, while scribes in Sumer often did."


\(^{354}\) Pomponio & Visicato 2002: 5-8 no. 1 sealing: \textit{na-ra-am-\textit{zu} LUGAL}. On the dating on the basis of Middle Sargonic palaeography and omission of the divine classifier, see Pomponio & Visicato 2002: 7-8 who refer to a total of 12 comparable seal inscriptions that include the classifier in the name.

\(^{355}\) Wilcke 1997: 15-16.

\(^{356}\) Pers. comm. of P. Steinkeller, who has meanwhile published the original document from the Schøyen collection as \textit{CUSAS} 17, 11.

\(^{357}\) Westenholz 2000: 553, 556 ("Naramsûn cannot have ruled for 56 years, but quite possibly 37, and that the Great Rebellion happened within his last seven years or so"). Cf. the critical remarks of Steinkeller 2003a: 279.
The length of Naramsuen’s reign, despite the enormous number of contemporary royal inscriptions, year names and administrative texts, cannot be determined independently of the SKL. The building activity after the deification and the renewal of the country’s administration following the revolt may have supported the spread and acceptance of the Classic Sargonic style in writing and art. The (perhaps more than) 30 years of Naramsuen’s later reign and the (maximum) 25 years of Sharkalisharri add up to more than half a century that can be considered primarily as the “Classic Sargonic” period.

According to the SKL, Sharkalisharri (Akkadian Šar-kali-šarrē) ruled for 25 (or 24) years. To a fair extent this is confirmed by the 15 or 16 year names attributed to his reign.357 Source P+BT 14 of the SKL adds the note that the dynasty (ba la) of Sargon ends with Sharkalisharri. Trips of the king, his entourage and close connections within the empire are attested by administrative texts from various places (see Schrakamp this volume). The focus of his foreign policy is largely directed towards the East, which can hardly be separated from the troubles caused by invaders from Gutium during his reign (see below Section 8.3). His year names commemorate battles against Amorites, Guteans and Elamites (see above Section 3.2.2).

Towards the end of Sharkalisharri’s reign, the more distant provinces were defecting from Akkad’s rule: Iitti attacked Gasur, while Epirmubi, the former governor of Susa, declared his independence, and Lagash became independent at the latest, under Puzur-mama, but perhaps at the time of Sharkalisharri’s death, or during the time of anarchy.

At Girsu at least 12 year-names of Sharkalisharri are attested, demonstrating that he controlled the state of Lagash until late in his reign.358 Lugalushumgal was governor of Lagash under Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri.359 A later ruler, possibly before the Dynasty of Urningirsu I, was Puzur-mama, who is attested as “governor of Lagash” (ensi lagas)360 in an archival document361 and a seal inscription of his servant (RIME 2.12.5.2001). Later Puzur-mama claimed the title “king of Lagash” (lugal lagas) as attested by his inscription extant on two stone bowls (FAOS 9/2 Puzur-Mama 1 = Volk 1992 = RIME 2.12.5.1) and in a fragmentary economic text (ITT 5, 6758 rev. ii 1’-3’).362

Lugalushumgal is attested frequently in archival documents363 and had two different seals under the reigns of Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri.364 The independence of Puzur-mama as governor of Lagash may thus have happened during, or after, the time of anarchy following Sharkalisharri’s death. However, contrary to common opinion, the synchronism between Puzur-mama of Lagash with Sharkalisharri of Akkad seems highly improbable.365

7.3. Late Akkad Period

After Sharkalisharri’s reign, the Sumerian King List notes a period of confusion during which four ephemeral rulers reigned for three years. They were followed by Dudu, with 21 years, and Shudurul (Akk. Šu-Tur’ul),366 the last king of Akkad with 15 years; these 39 years are usually labelled as the reign of the “Late Akkad” dynasty.

Under Shudurul, “the mighty one, king of Akkad” (RIME 2.1.11.1-2003), the Late Akkad state seems, to a certain extent, to have consolidated its power, since references to this king have been found from Adab in the South, to Brak and Tiriš Höyük in the Northwest. A document dated to his first year stems from Adab (TCBI 1, 235),367 although the prosopography could also point to a northern provenience, the tablet came, together with

---

357 Gelb & Kienast 1990: 53-57; cf. Frayne 1993: 182-184, which, however, includes “reconstructed” and “phantom” year names to be deleted; see Foster 1996; Westenholz 2009-2011b: 64.

358 A. Westenholz 1999: 56 n. 217.

359 Glassner 1986: 44; Bauer 1987-1990b; see Felli 2006: esp. 36-37 n. 5, for earlier literature on Lugalushumgal.

360 RTC 181.


362 See, e. g., Edzard et al. 1977: 105-106 with a (incomplete) list of at least 15 references including the title “governor of Lagash” (ensi lagas), and Kienast & Volk 1995: 207 with (further) 10 references, to which more attestations could be added; cf. Bauer 1987-1990b.

363 Felli 2006: 36-37.

364 RTC 83 = FAOS 19 Gir 26; see Volk 1992; 2006. After collation of A. Cavigneaux, Volk 1992 and Kienast & Volk 1995: 102 read Gir 26 (RTC 83) obv. 3-4 “puzur, ”[ma-ma], [ens i lagas], Sommerfeld, this volume, Section 7.3.1 (citing earlier references) convincingly argues against this reading, pointing out that the divine name ma-ma is otherwise always written without the divine classifier, so Puzur-mama cannot be linked with Sharkalisharri.

365 On the name, see Zand 2012b.

366 On this text, see Pomponio 2011: 246; A. Westenholz 2010: 460 n. 22 also attributes the letter CUSÁS 13, 216 to Late Sargonic Adab.
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other clandestine finds, from Adab (and sites as Umma), so the southern origin can be taken as granted. Palaeographically, the tablet is definitely different from the cuneiform tablets of the Classic Sargonic period. Sealed bullae were found at Kish (RIME 2.1.11.2001), Asmar (RIME 2.1.11.2002) and Brak. An unpublished stone weight stems from Titriş Höyük (cited in Frayne 1993: 214). The tablets from Area FS at Brak (Eidem et al. 2001) may be dated to the Classic Sargonic period of late Naram-suen and Sharkalisharri. Late Sargonic tablets also come from Mozan/Urkesh. A few Late Sargonic tablets from the time of Irgigi and Dudu stem from Umma (see below 8.4.2).

368 Cf. A. Westenholz 2010: 460 n. 22.
369 D.M. Matthews 1997: no. 313, pl. XXVI, LI. The inscription cannot be read on the copy and photo in D.M. Matthews 1997: no. 313, but is ascertained according to collation by C. Rohn (pers. comm.); see also Rohn 2011: 41, 116, 260, tb. 27, no. 240.
370 Michalowski 1993b: 84 still doubted that this find indicates Sargonic occupation.
371 A “Late Sargonic” date was proposed by Illingworth 1988: 88; Eidem et al. 2001: 103, but see the reevaluation by Sallaberger 2011: 339-340.
372 Sallaberger 2011: 340 on the Late Sargonic text finds from the Jezirah at Brak and Mozan. On Leilan/Shehna see p. 295 n. 5.
8. The Gutean Period: A Problem of 3rd Millennium Chronology

The term “Gutium” (or “Gutean” or “Guti”) period is derived from the terminology of the Sumerian King List, which places the dynasty of Gutium after Akkad. Generally, the term “Gutean period” is understood as covering the time span from the death of Sharkalisharri to the beginning of Urnamma’s reign (MC 2110), since the Late Akkad rulers, Dudu and Shudurul, are generally thought to have ruled over a very restricted region around Akkad in Northern Babylonia. Here we adopt this use of the term. Prior to Urnamma of the Third Dynasty of Ur, the SKL lists the dynasties of Uruk IV, Gutium and Uruk V with Utuhengal as its last ruler. The manuscripts of the SKL show considerable variations regarding the length of these dynasties, indicating a length of ca. 170-200 years for the Gutean period, with durations of 91-125 years for the Gutium dynasty itself. As some of these dynasties evidently co-ruled at the same time, the time-span given by the SKL is, in any case, too long. Its end is determined by the victory of Utuhengal of Uruk over Tirigan (around MC 2110) and Urnamma’s accession to the throne (MC 2110), but the beginning, length and geographical extension of Gutian overrule are debated.

The Ur III recension of the Sumerian King List (USKL) differs considerably in the arrangement of dynasties: The dynasties of Akkad, Late Akkad and Uruk IV are followed by two discrete dynasties, an “Ummanum” (Akk. ʾummanum “army”) dynasty and a Dynasty of Adab with Tirigan as its last ruler, matching the last entry of the Gutium section of the Standard SKL and the testimony of Utuhengal’s inscription. Due to the scarcity of contemporary sources and the unclear tradition of the SKL, the chronology of the Gutean period is a matter of dispute. The article by Steinkeller in this volume presents one solution; this section intends to provide the factual background for Steinkeller’s discussion.

8.1. The Dynasty of Gutium in the SKL

Concerning the evidence of the SKL, Piotr Michalowski wrote:

The only manuscript which contains a complete list of rulers of this dynasty is WB. The other exemplars which have partially preserved fragments of this section do not agree with the names, their order, or length of reign, which are attested in WB. Moreover, the summaries preserved on some of the Nippur tablets of the King List indicate that the actual number of kings was different in each text (...) The variations of entries in these early sections may have originated in a variety of ideological and perceptual influences which cannot presently be recovered. Whatever these may have been, one thing is clear: there is absolutely no reason to trust the data contained in the King List. The unreliable nature of the early sections of the text may be most dramatically demonstrated in the case of the Dynasty of Gutium. It is well-known that almost everything we know of that ‘dynasty’ comes from the King List. (...) Suffice it to say that of the four known manuscripts which preserve this section, no two agree on the names, order, regnal years, or number of the Gutian Kings. (Michalowski 1983: 239-240).

The USKL differs significantly from the Old Babylonian recensions of the SKL as the following overview indicates:

---

373 On the Gutium section of the SKL, see e.g. Hallo 1957-1971: 711; Edzard 1976-1980b: 266b; Michalowski 1983: 247-249; Steinkeller 2003a: 275-276, 280-281; Glassner 2004: 153-154 with n. 21; 2006; Pomponio 2011; Steinkeller, this volume (Sections 8.2 and 8.4).

374 Jacobsen 1939: 120-121 n. 309 notes that the figure of 201 years, based on the summary of 124/125 years in L and P, is probably due to a misreading of the entries *si-lu-lu-me-eš* 5 mu and *i-ni-ma-ba-ke-eš* 6 mu i₃-a₃ by the ancient copyist as *si-lu-lu-me* 35 and *i-ni-ma-ba-ke* 36 mu i₃-a₃.
Recent approaches differ significantly in assigning the Gutean period durations of between ca. 40 to 150 years. Some scholars assume an autonomous Gutean dominion of considerable length and geographical extension, assuming a scribal error in WB vii 27-28 uĝ n im  g u-t u-um kīl ug a l  mu-t u ku  “the army of Gutium: a king that has no name” instead of correct uĝ n im  g u-t u-um kīl ug a l  nu-mu-t u ku  “the army of Gutium had for itself no king”. See the variants USKL v 21′ um-ma-num 2 ki lugal nu-tuku; L 1 rev. ii′3′ lugal nu-ub-tuku; G rev. 2′[...] nu-tuku.

Though the name of the dynasty is not preserved, lines rev. ii′1′-5′ could read šu-ni ĝ in 2 x lug al, mu-bi 125, ib2-a2, [a-r]a, 6-kam, [ša] un]u 45-a and could enumerate the Dynasty of Gutium with 125 years according to P2, followed by Uruk V which possibly could be a scribal error (Uruk V instead of Uruk IV).

Perhaps due to the addition of all single entries preserved in the original which were available to the scribe; see Jacobsen 1939: 120-121 n. 309.

According to tablet format and text structure, probably five entries can be reconstructed in the Ummanum-Adab section of USKL; the point of transition from Ummanum to Adab cannot be fixed within the five missing entries. On the Gutean section of USKL, see the remarks of Glassner 2005b.

Table 32: The Gutean period according to the SKL (as far as preserved).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKL manuscripts</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WB, Su34 fragmentary:</td>
<td>BT14+P3, Ha+P4, IB, J, L1+N1, Mi, P2, P6, Su1, TL, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad</td>
<td>Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad</td>
<td>Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad</td>
<td>Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad</td>
<td>Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad</td>
<td>Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad</td>
<td>Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>Ummānum / Adab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk V</td>
<td>Uruk V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk V</td>
<td>Uruk V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk V</td>
<td>Uruk V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur III</td>
<td>Ur III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur III</td>
<td>Ur III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur III</td>
<td>Ur III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33: Kings of Gutium and their reign according to the SKL (only completely preserved mss.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Number of kings</th>
<th>Number of years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKL</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>19 kings375</td>
<td>91 years 40 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha+P4</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>23 kings</td>
<td>99 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1+N1</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>21 kings</td>
<td>124 years 40 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>21 kings</td>
<td>125 years 40 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>125 years376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su1</td>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>25 years377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USKL</td>
<td>ummānum + Adab</td>
<td>9+[5] kings378</td>
<td>40+[5+x] years 40 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ummānum</td>
<td>6+[5-]a kings</td>
<td>33+[x] years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adab</td>
<td>3+[a] kings</td>
<td>7 years 40 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Variants in the length of the Gutean Period and the Dynasties concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>Ha+P4</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>L1+N1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Su1+4</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>USKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Akkad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk IV</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23+[3]</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk V</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in round brackets (...) are calculated, figures in square brackets [...] are broken.

8.2. State of Research

Recent approaches differ significantly in assigning the Gutean period durations of between ca. 40 to 150 years. Some scholars assume an autonomous Gutean dominion of considerable length and geographical extension,

375 Note that the first entry refers to the time when “they [i.e. the Guteans] had no king and ruled by themselves for 3 years”; assuming a scribal error in WB vii 27-28 uğin-im-gu-tu-um11 lugal mu nu-tuku “the army of Gutium: a king that has no name” instead of correct uğin-im-gu-tu-um11 lugal nu-mu-tuku “the army of Gutium had for itself no king”. See the variants USKL v 21’um-ma-num,sumlugal nu-tuku; L rev. ii’3’lugal nu-ub-tuku; G rev. 2’[...] nu-tuku.

376 Though the name of the dynasty is not preserved, lines rev. ii’1’-5’ could read [su-ni ĝ in x lug a l, [mu-b] 125, ib2-a2, [a-r]a, 6-kam, [ša] un]u 45-a and could enumerate the Dynasty of Gutium with 125 years according to P2, followed by Uruk V which possibly could be a scribal error (Uruk V instead of Uruk IV).

377 Perhaps due to the addition of all single entries preserved in the original which were available to the scribe; see Jacobsen 1939: 120-121 n. 309.

378 According to tablet format and text structure, probably five entries can be reconstructed in the Ummanum-Adab section of USKL; the point of transition from Ummanum to Adab cannot be fixed within the five missing entries. On the Gutean section of USKL, see the remarks of Glassner 2005b.
others see the Dynasty of Gutium as an ephemeral phenomenon of insignificant duration, as reflected by the label “Gutean interregnum”. The chronology of the Gutean period has been considered at length by, Hallo, Boese, Dittmann, Glassner, Nagel, Strommenger and Eder, Pomponio and Steinkeller (this volume).

8.2.1 Hallo’s Short Gutean Chronology

Hallo assigned the Gutean period, i.e. the period between the last year of Sharkalisharrī of Akkad and the first year of Urnammu of Ur III, a length of ca. 40 years for two reasons.

Firstly, Hallo could identify only a few kings of Gutium as attested by contemporary inscriptions with rulers mentioned in the SKL. Without any firmly established synchronism he denied the historical value of the SKL. Secondly, none of the other contemporary dynasties of Late Akkad, Umma, Lagash, and Uruk can, on the basis of contemporary inscriptions and the SKL, be attributed a duration of more than ca. 40 years. Hallo’s third argument was based on the assumption that the sequence of en priestesses of Nanna at Ur was “apparently all known”. Enheduana held the office for a very long time from the late years of Sargon until the (early) reign of Naramsuen. Hallo assumed that Naramsuen’s daughter Enmenana served through a part or even the total of Sharkalisharrī’s reign, basing his argument on an average tenure of office for more than 38 years calculated from later firmly dated evidence. Therefore he did not doubt that Urbawu’s daughter Enanepada was in office for a similar time span that almost exactly corresponds to the 39 years assigned to Late Akkad by the SKL. Therefore, Hallo interpreted the figure of 201 years (see above), given for the time span from Sharkalisharrī to Urnammu, as much too long;

Thus there is a remarkable unanimity in the records of the five major city-states [i.e. Akkad, Umma, Lagash, Uruk, and Ur], all pointing to an interval of about 40 years between the death of Šarkališarri and the emergence of Urnammu as overlord of Sumer and Akkad. It may therefore be proposed that the last five rulers of Akkad were contemporary with the 4th and 5th dynasties of Uruk, the Ur-Bau dynasty at Lagāsi, and the high priestess Enannepada at Ur, as well with the ‘Gutian Era’ of 25-35 years at Umma or some other site. In the same span of time, we may accommodate the last dozen Gutian rulers (Nos. 10-21) who, according to the King List, ruled 38 years altogether. The earlier Gutian rulers (Nos. 1-9), with their much more outlandish names, must have been conceived as reaching back to the very beginning of Nāramšēn’s reign. For chronological purposes, then, the ‘Gutian period’ may have been an interval of no more than four or five decades of petty statism between the imperiums of Šarkališarri of Akkad and Urnammu of Ur. (...) In the Susian versions, indeed, the King List itself may preserve the memory of a minimal Gutian interregnum, for it has room for only a few rulers, and apparently gives their total span as only 25 years. (Hallo 1957-1971: 714)

Additional evidence in favour of a short Gutean period was provided, firstly, by an Old Babylonian copy of a royal inscription of Urnammu of Ur III which mentioned Puzurinshushinak of Elam (RIME 3/2.1.1.29) and secondly, by an inscription of Puzurumma of Lagash, that may also refer to Puzurinshushinak (FAOS 9/1 Puzur Mama 2 = Volk 1992: 28-29 = RIME 2.12.5.1). The resulting synchronisms of Puzurinshushinak with both Puzurumma of Lagash and Urnammu of Ur would point to a short Gutean period. However, the last reference and the dating of Puzurumma to the Sargonic period rest on improbable restorations that cannot be substantiated by collation and parallels (see Sommerfeld, this volume).

383 The chronology for the late 3rd millennium proposed by Nagel et al. 2005 will not be dealt with in detail here, since it is based on several unproven assumptions that have critically been re-evaluated by Suter 2008 and Huh 2008: 296-301, e.g. the proposition of three rulers by the name Gudea ("Gudea I", "Great Gudea": represented by the vast majority of Gudea monuments, "Gudea II": represented by a single monument of doubtful provenience bearing a fragmentary inscription, "Gudea III": represented by Neo-Sumerian theophoric personal names from the time of Shulgi to Shusuen who is considered a deified reincarnation of "Gudea I/Great Gudea"), an uncritical usage of the data provided by the SKL and USKL, the subdivision of "Neo Sumerian" art in several sub-phases based on observations assumed different styles, and the use of the so-called "ultra-long chronology" etc., which is most unlikely (see above).
384 Pomponio 2011.
386 On the chronology of Enheduana, see A. Westenholz 2000: 554; Sallaberger 2003: 29 n. 30, Sections 6.3 above and 8.2.2 below.
388 See Wilcke 1987.
8.2.2 Steinkeller’s Long Gutean Chronology

Piotr Steinkeller (see the contribution in this volume) argues for a Gutean period with a duration of about 100 years, noting that the name of Gutium has left its imprint in the written tradition of Mesopotamia and should, therefore, be credited a longer lasting rule. Steinkeller bases his arguments mainly on the recently published USKL (Steinkeller 2003), not available to Hallo (1957–1971; 2005), that differs from SKL in the following points (for details, see Steinkeller in this volume):

1) Late Akkad is followed by at least six kings of Gutium, with a 33-year reign under the rubric Ummanum (Akkadian ummanum "army").

2) After a break of probably five entries, Ummanum is followed by a hitherto unattested Dynasty of Adab with at least four kings. The last entry mentioning Tirigan, with a reign of 40 days, matches the last entry of SKL’s Dynasty of Gutium. The overall length of both dynasties can be calculated as at least 45+X years, assuming a minimal reign of one year for each of the rulers lost in the missing entries.

3) Only very few names can be correlated to those mentioned in the SKL. Since a recently discovered year name from Adab demonstrates that Shudurul, the last ruler of Late Akkad, was in control of Adab at least at the beginning of his reign (TCBI I, 235, see above Section 3.2.2.), Steinkeller concludes that the Dynasty of Gutium cannot have been contemporary with Late Akkad and, accordingly, estimates the duration of the Gutean period at ca. 100 years, i.e. 39 years (Late Akkad: Dudu and Shudurul; parallel to 30 years Uruk IV) + 45 years (Ummanum and Adab) + ca. 10 years (estimated length of rule of the kings of Ummanum and Adab lost in the missing entries) + 7 years (Uruk V).

4) Hallo’s sequence of en priestesses of Nanna at Ur is based on the unproven assumption that the office of en of Nanna was continuously occupied during the Gutian period and that the names of all priestesses before Ur III are known (see Steinkeller, this volume Section 8.1). Already Sollberger argued for the insertion of two undocumented en priestesses between Naramsuen’s daughter Enmenana and Urbawu’s daughter Enanepada. Sollberger’s model calculation assumed that Enheduana was inaugurated 6 years before the end of Sargon’s reign and was succeeded by Enmenana in the year Naramsuen 6. Calculating with an average tenure of 36 years, Sollberger assumed that two still undocumented en priestesses must be inserted between Enmenana and Enanepada, who would have been inaugurated in the years Sharkalisharri 5 and Dudu 13, respectively (Sollberger 1954-1956: 23-28). Although Sollberger’s Lagash II chronology could not yet draw on the evidence provided by the Meda and Perlo Tablets (MT and PT), his reconstruction remains possible with a distance of 3(-4?) generations between Sharkalisharri and Urbawu (see below Sections 8.5.1 and 8.8).

8.3. Gutean Presence during the Time of Sharkalisharri

At the time of Sharkalisharri Gutians are already attested in administrative texts from Girsu, Umma, Adab, Kish (MAD 5, 9), Agrab (MAD 1, 269, cf. Schrakamp in this volume Section 6.2), and perhaps Umm al-Hafriyat (MS 4267, see below). Moreover, their presence in Mesopotamia is attested in an anonymous year-name “year contemporary of Sharkalisharri. An unpublished text, palaeographically dated to the Classic Sargonic period, the among them at least one “governor”, on their way to Akkad:

Although the proposed identity with the fourth king of Gutium mentioned in the SKL zar,3 nin-lagab,3-zab3, for Akkadian ikikum-la-qab “oil of unspeakable stench” (OECT 2, M 444 vii 31) is against the copy, but perhaps supported by the collation of Hallo (see Glassner 2004: 124). The linguistic affiliation of the name is uncertain (Edzard 1976-1980b: vii 31). The reservations of Steinkeller (his Section 8.2 in this volume) regarding the use of these personal names are justified, but the rendering of foreign personal names in cuneiform script may lead to previously unexpected differences.

A date to the later reign of Naramsuen could be indicated by the occurrence of ma-gà-an3, ni-dingir-a-ga-de3, with dingir a-ga-de, referring to the deified Naramsuen (pers. comm. A. Westenholz). For the king’s name as a theophoric element in Akkadian personal names, see e.g., Westenholz 1999: 47, 54 with reference to a personal name 4na-a-ra-am3 en-zi-li, “(divine) Naramsuen is my god”. Gutian presence during the reign of Naramsuen is also attested by occurrences of a “Gutean general” (kiš. ní-ta) in Yang 1989 A.959 from Adab and CT 50, 172 obv. i 9-10 from Girsu.

390 Jacobsen 1939: 118 n. 291, 207-208; accepted, e.g. by Gelb & Kienast 1990: 54 and Kuhrt 1995: 45-46, pl. 3i, 3ii.
391 See Hallo 1957-1971: 711; Edzard 1976-1980b: 266; Hilgert 2009-2011 and Steinkeller in this volume. Hallo 1957-1971: 711 prefers a differing reading la,3(n)-lagal,3-zab and la-ar-la-ga-ba, respectively. The reading offered by Glassner 2004: 98, 124, 131,3 a-ba,4-lagal,3-zab for Akkadian ikikum-la-gab “oil of unspeakable stench” (OECT 2, W-B 444 vii 31) is against the copy, but perhaps supported by the collation of Hallo (see Glassner 2004: 124). The linguistic affiliation of the name is uncertain (Edzard 1976-1980b: 266; Hallo 1957-1971: 711). The reservations of Steinkeller (his Section 8.2 in this volume) regarding the use of different sibilants “(sar- vs. zar-/za-alc-)” as a theophoric element in Akkadian personal names, see e.g., Westenholz 1999: 47, 54 with reference to a personal name 4na-a-ra-am3 en-zi-li, “(divine) Naramsuen is my god”. Gutian presence during the reign of Naramsuen is also attested by occurrences of a “Gutean general” (kiš. ní-ta) in Yang 1989 A.959 from Adab and CT 50, 172 obv. i 9-10 from Girsu.
The occurrence of “chieftains” (rabiānum) could belong to a time, recalled in the SKL and USKL, when the Guteans had no king (references in Sections 8.1 and 8.7). This would suggest a date a few years before Sharkalisharri’s defeat of king Sarlag, i.e. shortly before a Gutean “state formation”. But a “chieftain” (rabiānum) may, equally plausibly, serve under a king, so at the very least the text demonstrates that Gutean leaders co-operated with the Sargonic kings. It is possible that a loose organization, under several co-ruling chieftains, is reflected by the high number of inconsistencies in the enumerations of Gutean rulers in the various manuscripts of the SKL, but this remains guesswork.

An administrative text possibly deals with cattle plundered by Gutean marauders, but a dating to Sharkalisharri is by no means certain:

Amherst 4 rev. 5\(^{27}\):

gud udu lugal-kam gu-ti-um-e mu-a ba-ge₄

“Oxen (and) sheep of the king, the Gutean turned them away during a year” (cf. Hallo 1957–1971: 713).

Gutean marauders are also referred to in the so-called “Gutean letter” from the Classic Sargonic period (JRAS 1932: 296 = FAOS 19 Gir 19).\(^{394}\)

8.4. Uruk and Umma

The evidence for the Late Akkad period demonstrates that various city states co-existed in Babylonia. Umma showed a strong affinity to Gutium, which was apparently centred at Adab. Girsu on the other hand featured, after Puzurulama, an independent dynasty that became known as the “Lagash II” dynasty; its most prominent ruler was Gudea, who may have been an early contemporary of Urnamma (around MC 2110). Here we present the textual evidence most relevant for a chronological evaluation.

8.4.1 Uruk

Uruk had become a leading power following the end of Akkadian dominion in the south. This is reflected by the insertion, in the SKL, of the Uruk IV dynasty after Akkad. The various sources credit it with between 26 and 43 years; it consists of five names Urnigar, Urgigir, Kuda, Puzurili and Urutu (see above 2.1.4.). All of these rulers except Puzurilu are also known from contemporary inscriptions (FAOS 9/2: 321-323 = RIME 2.13.1-6).

Uruk left the state of Akkad before Girsu, i.e. probably in the late years of Sharkalisharri, or slightly later (cf. above Sections 7.2 and 7.3), since an inventory from Girsu (ITT 2, 4690 obv. i 4) mentions registrations of “booty of Uruk” at the same time as expenditures “for the persons of Akkad” or deliveries to Akkad, the capital. Along the same lines a year date on a Classic Sargonic tablet from Girsu commemorates a “battle of Uruk (and) Kabsu”:

FAOS 7 D-43 = RTC 99 rev. 6-8:

mu kasšudul unu₄-a, kab₄-su₄-a, [ba-ĝar-ra-a]

“You, the battle with Uruk and Kabsu [was fought].”\(^{395}\)

Contemporary archival evidence thus demonstrates that Uruk was already an independent city state in the south at a time when Girsu was still part of the Akkadian empire, which is at least true for the major part of Sharkalisharri’s rule. Therefore, a dynasty at Uruk, which can only be the Uruk IV dynasty of the SKL, ruled (for 26 to 43 years) at the time of the Late Akkad rulers, Dudu and Shudurul (total of 39 years). This basically corresponds to the position of Hallo (1957–1971). Steinkeller (this volume) on the other hand follows (for 26 to 43 years) at the time of the Late Akkad rulers, Dudu and Shudurul (total of 39 years). This basically corresponds to the position of Hallo (1957–1971). Steinkeller (this volume) on the other hand follows

Although the SKL separates the Uruk IV and V dynasties, there is no sign of Gutean dominion at Uruk; the 7 years of Utuengal, who alone formed the “Uruk V” dynasty, may thus be regarded as directly following the

394 Note that according to later tradition, Naramsuen is also ascribed as having defeated a Gutean named ‘gu-la-an, see J.G. Westenholz 1997: no. 17; Gelb & Kienast 1990: 294; Grayson & Sollberger 1976: 117: 14’.

395 According to A. Westenholz (pers. comm.), the “Gutean letter does not stem from Girsu”, but from “an outfit somewhere in the Lagash region similar to Susan Bridges’ Mesag settlement near Umma, and to Umm al-Hafriyat near Nippur”; see also A. Westenholz 1999: 56 n. 216 for a dating to the reign of Sharkalisharri.

Uruk IV rulers. As Carroué has observed, the king (lugal) of Uruk must have been the mightiest ruler in Sumer at the time of the dynasty of Gudea.

8.4.2 Umma

The chronology of Sargonic Umma remains poorly understood and will remain so until the code of the multi-dating system of Umma has been cracked (see above Section 3.1.7.). The largest part of these texts belongs to the Classic Sargonic period of Naramsuen and Sharkalisharri.

A letter from Umma addresses the loyalty with Akkad:

MCS 9, 252 = Cripps 2010: no. 39 = FAOS 19 Um 5

ur-du-tu-ke-₃, na-be₂-a, ses-ses-ĝu₁₀, u₃-na-du₁₁, [a]-ga-de₇, ki₇ lugal-₇am₁₀, lu₂ a-ga-de₇, na-ne-gaz-ec, ki irₗ-ge₇, e₇, lu₇ heₗ-ge₇, e₇.

“Tell my Sesses what Urutu says: Akkad is king! He should not kill men of Akkad, he should send them to Irgigi!”

As the personal name Irgigi is not otherwise attested in Sargonic sources, Irgigi can, reasonably, be identified with the first Late Akkadian ruler during the period of confusion after Sharkalisharri’s death. Though the precise implications of the letter remain uncertain, it clearly demonstrates that the authority of Irgigi was still recognized at Umma. Urutu, probably the ruler (ensi₂) of Ur (RTC 83 = FAOS 19: Gir 26), also occurs in an unpublished tablet of the Mesag archive. A Naramsuen date for the archive is further corroborated by the presence of the governor (ensi₂) Urutu in one of the unpublished texts (RBC 2676a).

An administrative text contains the note that the Akkadian king Dudu, who ruled after the “period of confusion”, attacked Umma and Elam:

Wilcke 1974-1977: 84-85 i 7-9:

du-du umma₅ el[am] da ḫulu-a

“when Dudu destroyed Umma with Elam”

This year-name refers to an independent city state, Umma, under Dudu, which is known to have existed in the period before Ur III under the rulers Nammahni and Lugalanatum:

FAOS 7 Gutium 2 = RIME 2.11.2.1:

nam-maḥ-ni, ensi₂, umma₅ (…) u₅-ba ia₂-ar-la-ga-an, lugal gu-ti-um-kam

“Nammahni, governor of Umma (…). At this time, Yağlagan was king of Gutium”

FAOS 7 Gutium 3 = RIME 2.11.13.1:

lugal-an-na-tum₂, ensi₅, umma₅, ba-ba₂-a, 35 mu, zal-la-ba, e₂ ĝeṭru umma₅ i₅-du₃, temen-bi, ki-a, i₅-si-si, me-ḥi ša₂, ba si-ri-sa₂, u₂-ba si-e₅-um, lugal gu-ti-um-kam

“Lugalanatum, governor of Umma – after Umma was given as gift/divided(!) and 35 years had passed, he built the Egdru of Umma, filled its foundations into the ground, and installed its numinous power therein. At this time, Sium was king of Gutium”.

Although the exact sense of the period of 35 years remains enigmatic, it most probably refers to the beginning of Umma’s independence once it had left the state of Akkad. The documents cited above suggest that this happened later, in the “period of confusion”, or during the time of Dudu himself. The name of the Gutium king, Sium, is not found in the SKZ, but the name of the dynasty’s penultimate ruler before Tirigan was restored as [si]₃-u₄ by Jacobsen on the basis of this reference. 404

Note that from Uruk itself no (Late) Sargonic texts are known.


Salgues 2011: 254 n. 8.


Jacobsen 1939: 120 n. 306.
Shudurul controlled Adab at the beginning of his reign (see year name TCBI 1, 235 in Section 3.2.2), but his power may not have reached as far to the south as neighbouring Umma. A sealed bulla from Dudu, found at Adab, indicates that the city was under Akkadian control earlier, too (RIME 2.10.2001).

Both Nammahni and Lugalanatum recognized the king of Gutium as overlord (RIME 2.11.12.1, RIME 2.11.13.1, see above). Additional evidence for the Gutean dominion at Umma may be found in an administrative text from the Lagash region, it mentions a delivery of sheep by the son of a certain "Lugalanatum, the Gutean". It is tempting to identify him as the Lugalanatum of Umma, the Gutean vassal:

Foster 1989: no. 3:
1 udu, 1 maš, dumu lugal-an-na-tum₂, gu-ti-um, mu-de₆
"1 sheep, 1 goat, the son of Lugalanatum, the Gutean, delivered"

Lugalanatum is possibly also mentioned in an administrative text from Umma which deals with offerings of oil from the first year of Amarsuena:

ÄS 5879 = Farber & Farber 2001: 224 ii 23:
2 giĝ₄, lugal-an-na-ab-tum₂, ensi₂
"2 shekels of oil: Lugalanatum, governor"

The same text also mentions a certain Alla and a certain Lumma; these might have been deceased governors of Umma who pre-dated Ur III and therefore ruled during the Gutean period.

In conclusion, after its Akkadian period Umma was a city state under the dominion of the Dynasty of Gutium and, at a time before Tirigan, it had apparently enjoyed 35 years of independence. These 35 years correspond, more or less, to the 36 years of Dudu and Shudurul, so that the whole period of Umma's independence, or Gutean rule, could be covered by the Late Akkad period. Such a plausible reconstruction corresponds to Hallo's position, but neither does it contradict Steinkeller's proposal.

The fact that Yarlagan, overlord of Lugalanatum, placed his inscription beside an earlier one of Shudurul (Hallo 2005: 147-148), is of little help in the chronology, since the provenience of the stone bowl is unknown. Furthermore, given the 21 years of Shudurul and the short reigns of Gutean rulers, as indicated by SKL and USKL, this does not contribute to unravelling the chronology.

8.5. Lagash II: Gudea's Dynasty

After Lugalushumgal, who was Girsu's governor under Sharkalisharri, Puzurumama was the first independent ruler of the city state of Lagash with its capital Girsu. It is possible to date the beginning of independence to the period of confusion, especially as no evidence points to the dependence of Girsu at the time of the Late Akkad rulers.

The royal inscription RIME 2.1.10.2 has been attributed to Dudu by Frayne (1993: 211). The inscription says that the king of Akkad had defeated Girsu, which therefore was already independent at Dudu's time: "D[udu] (⸢du-⸣-du), ki[ng] of Akka[ad], when he (= Dudu) defeat[ed] Gir[su], he dedicated (this) from the booty of Girsu" (EAOS 7 Dudu C 2 = RIME 2.1.10.2: 3-10).

---

405 Pomponio 2011: 246 n. 8; Westenholz 1999: 57 n. 222 does not consider the bulla as evidence for Akkadian control since it could have been sent from anywhere.
408 Marchesi 2006a: 130.
409 Hallo 2005: 147-148, 159-160; see below 8.7 and see Steinkeller in this volume (his Section 8.7) who points out that Yarlagan's inscription is palaeographically of later date than Shudurul's that still uses Sargonic writing.
410 The inscription commemorates a dedication to E₂-ki-du₁-ga which is of little help in establishing the provenience of the bowl; Hallo 2005: 148 considers that ki-du₁-ga, a temple located at Ur, is meant, while Steinkeller p. 279 n. 46, in this volume, emphasizes that this shrine is otherwise unattested.
411 See also Pomponio 2011: 246; for an extensive documentation see Sommerfeld in this volume (Section 7.3.2), who excluded the reading of the royal name as Dudu; the photograph provided by him (Fig. 7.1, p. 267), however, clearly confirms the reading of the first sign as du.
8.5.1 The Lagash II Dynasty

Puzurdamma was followed by the rulers of the Lagash II dynasty, although the succession remains unknown, it is hardly conceivable that there was a large gap inbetween. The Lagash II rulers have left a considerable number of inscriptions. Although their chronology has recently been dealt with, in detail, by several scholars its beginning, duration and end are a matter of dispute.

The reconstruction of the chronology of Lagash II is hampered by the following:

1) Lagash II is neither mentioned in the SKL, nor does any reliable list of rulers, or dates, refer to this period
2) as for the lack of filiations in inscriptions of most rulers, their order of succession remains uncertain
3) the attribution of many year names remains uncertain due to the omission of the ruler’s name
4) the only political event referred to in the inscriptions of Lagash, is the defeat of Elam by Gudea (FAOS 9/1 Gudea Statue B = RIME 3/1.1.7 StB vi 64-69)

In order to solve the problem of the chronology of the Gutian period, it is essential to estimate the duration of the Lagash II dynasty. The following facts are most relevant:

1) Here the sequence of rulers of Lagash follows the “Maeda Tablet” (MT), as discussed in Section 2.5. Without doubt the most important ruler after Urmingirsu (I.) (MT no. 1) was Gudea (MT no. 4), to whom more than 10 year dates are attributed and whose intensive building programme demands a reasonably long reign; 20 or 25 years can be taken as the more conservative estimate.

In addition to the rulers of the Maeda Tablet, a few other Lagash governors are attested by year names (see Table 12 above): Kaku, Lubawu and Lugula. Interestingly, the year formulae regularly mention only the nomination of an ensi, and not any deeds and other events, so apparently only the governor’s nomination was considered worth a special year date. This is corroborated for Urabba (MT no. 7), whose year date for the election is grouped with year dates of Urnamma of Ur. This practice reminds us of Namhani’s (MT no. 9) status (see below). It would appear, therefore, that a special event, the nomination of the local governor, was commemorated in a local year name, as other events pertaining to the province of Lagash were recorded in local dates even under Shulgi of Ur. The three governors, Kaku, Lubawu and Lugula appear in prosopographically closely related tablets, and can be linked to Ururama (MT no. 8) and thus dated to the time of Urnamma of Ur. So, the later rulers MT no. 7-9 (Urabba, Ururama, Namhani) and the three extra rulers, Kaku, Lubawu and Lugula, are closely related to Ururama and may, thus, belong to the latter half of his reign and to the first years of his son, and successor, Shulgi. In any case, the evidence points to a remarkably frequent exchange of governors of Lagash in these years.

2) Namhani (MT no. 9), the son-in-law of Urbawu, is mentioned as a contemporary in the Urnamma Code. Due to the bad preservation and grammatical difficulties, various interpretations have been suggested. Currently, we favour the following interpretation:

\[
\text{RIME 3/2.1.1.20: 75-79} \\
\text{nam-}h\text{-a-ni, } <\text{ nam}>-\text{ensi, lagas}^{-1}\text{-e}_{2}, \text{ } h\text{e}_{2}^{-1}\text{-mi-us}_{1} \\
\text{“I had Namhani to follow in the governorship of Lagas”}
\]

415 RTC 264, cf. e.g. Renner 1987: 468; Maeda 1988; Waetzoldt 1990.
417 Evidence for a close archival relationship between texts dated to Lugula, Lubawu and Urabba, and texts dated to Urnamma, has been presented by Renner 1987: 468-469 ad DCS 40. Concerning Kaku, note the link to Lugula by the appearance of the captain (SU-bi-nā-du₂₃) Alm in RTC 190 and MVN 10, 94.
418 For us₃ see Sallaberger 2004: 30-37 with n. 42; the insertion of < nam >-ensi is explained as haplography caused by the preceding line, but in this way the directive case -e is justified. Welse 2011: 33 n. 18 deletes {ke₂} and reads hē₂-mi-zē₂ “habe ich enthronet”, however without references for this use of zē₂. Frayne 1997a, RIME 3/2 1.1.20: 75-79, reads hē₂-mi-î₂,î₂³ “I promoted Namhani (to be) governor of Lagas”. Note also that nam-ma₃-ni and nam-ha-ni are interpreted as two orthographic variants of the same name.
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(cf. RIME 3/2.1.2.20: 75-78: I promoted Namhani (to be) governor of Lagaš; cf. Sallaberger 2004: 34 n. 42; Wilcke 2002: 305 with n. 49; Wilcke 2011: 33)

This reading can perhaps be correlated to the only preserved Nammahni year date:

RTC 187 (Sollberger 1954-1956: 35)
mu nam-maḫ-ni us₂-sa
"Year, Nammahni followed"

This year date has always been understood as a “2nd year” of Nammahni, which, however, should have been formulated as “mu u s₂-sa n a m-maḫ-ni (ensi₂). The wording of the Nammahni year date is unique and may relate to his role as governor of Lagash acting on Urnamma’s grace.

3) On the basis of the extant year names, the absolute minimum duration of the Lagash II dynasty can be estimated at ca. 35 years (for the year names and their attribution, see the literature cited above), but a much longer duration seems more plausible, especially given the many building projects reported by the rulers.

4) The date of Gudea (MT no. 4), the dominant ruler of the dynasty, who should be credited a reign of not less than 20 years (see 1) above), seemed to be solved by the prosopographical study of Steinkeller who argued that the reigns of Gudea and Urnamma overlapped. Their temporal vicinity is also borne out by the stylistic affinity of the stelae of Urnamma and Gudea. Furthermore, Steinkeller pointed to the fact that both Gudea and Urnamma defeated Elam which may be interpreted as a common campaign conducted by both rulers, although, of course, other reconstructions remain possible. However, a new critical evaluation of the archival evidence provided by Steinkeller (1988b) based on current knowledge, revealed that the dating was not as clear as had been assumed. Steinkeller (1988b: 48-49) lists the evidence for five officials, who seem to be attested under Gudea and the Ur III rulers Urnamma and Shulgi:

“Gudea 11”, as u g u l a
“Urnamma 18”, Shulgi 5-23 (after Carroué 2000) as delivering official
The references dated “Gudea’s reign” and “Urningirsu 5” do not belong here (official named Bazi, not Bazige)

“Gudea 11” as recipient
Shulgi 8 to 14 as delivering official
Dating “Gudea’s reign from context” (MVN 6, 377) could not be verified.

C. Lugalegide (lu g a l-e₂-gi d₂-e):
Gudea “11” as recipient
Shulgi 7, 10 as delivering official
Dating “Gudea’s reign from context” (MVN 6, 377) could not be verified.
The text dated to Gudea “8-11” (RTC 199) names another person, namely lu g a l-e₂-gi d₂-da.

D. Urnigar (“Ur-nigingar”):
“Urningirsu 5”
Nammahni “2”
Shulgi 9, 11

E. Ureshlila:
Urnamma “18”
Šulgi 8 to 11

Taking all the evidence together, Ureshlila (E) is irrelevant for Gudea; Urnigar (D) dates to Urningirsu (MT no. 5), Nammahni (MT no. 9) and Shulgi, but not to Gudea. For A to C the situation is the same: apart from

419 Steinkeller 1988b.
421 “Urnamma 15” has now been interpreted as year Shulgi 14 (Š 14) by Carroué 2000; for the critical review see Sallaberger 2004: 34-35.
one Urnamma date, generally assumed to represent his last year, and a series of Shulgi dates, all officials appear (in a different function) in the same year, called “Gudea 11”. Its attribution to Gudea appears certain by the evidence of RTC 199 (see sub C). However, it seems suspicious that only one single year, a year that is especially well represented in the Girsu corpus, should represent Gudea’s reign for three officials. Given the habit of local Girsu year names being dated to the kings of Ur III, as argued by Carroué, it seems much more reasonable to assume that the formula known as “Gudea 11” does in fact represent two different years, one in the reign of Gudea, the other in the earliest years of Shulgi.

Gudea year “11” = Shulgi year $x$?

mu tukul mi-tum saĝ ninnu ba-dim, ma (e.g. RTC 198)

“Year the divine weapon with 50 heads was fashioned”

Recently, a hitherto unknown Shulgi year date referring to a 50-headed divine weapon was published:

6 NT 175 = Zettler & Sallaberger 2011: 40:

[$\text{mu (d?)sul]}-\text{[gi], [ugal]} \text{ ur}im, \text{ma-ke}, \text{[\text{n}in]-ur}ta-ra \text{ṣīta₂ saĝ ninnu, tukul ki-\text{ağ₂,ni ka₂,maḥ, i₂(A):lu₂,ru·da-na, in-na·du₂,a, [\text{mu i}]}b₂,\text{us₂,ša₂}\text{]}$

“Year: Shulgi, the king of Ur, erected a fifty-headed mace, his (= Ninurta’s) beloved weapon, for Ninurta at the august gate (of) his ordeal river, – its subsequent year”.

Could this Shulgi year date be referred to at Lagash by some attestations of “Gudea 11”, perhaps as a dedication to Ningirsu? In any case, the prosopographic evidence for the dating of Gudea as provided by Steinkeller has today lost much of its conviction. The successors of Gudea (MT no. 6 to 9) date close to, or even in the time of Urnamma, so Gudea has to be dated earlier; perhaps his last year(s) overlapped with the beginning of Urnamma’s reign. We leave the discussion at this point, before entering into more speculative matters.

5) As in the case of the Presargonic period, a count of generations for Lagash II reveals the time span of the Lagash II rulers (Table 35). We have considered Urbawu as belonging to a generation other than Pirigme, since his building activities (cf. 2.5. Table 14) suggest a considerable length of rule and the series of sons-in-law following him shows that he cannot have been very old as a ruler.

### 8.6. Puzurinshushinak

The Elamite king Puzurinshushinak (AwKL no. 12, see Section 2.2.) plays an important role in the history of the Gutean period. Akkad had, at least, held Susa, after Sargon claimed supremacy over Elam.426 Manishtushu conquered Anshan and Sherihum and crossed the Lower Sea. From the latter’s reign, two Akkadian governors (ensi) of Elam and Pashime testify to permanent Akkadian control. Rimush fought against Elam, Parahshum, [425] So the alleged campaign by Urnamma and Gudea to Elam has to be seen in another light. A completely different solution for the chronology of the Lagash II dynasty was proposed by Wilcke 2011, based on a restored Old Babylonian text. Wilcke 2011 excludes the evidence of the Maeda Tablet, which, after a critical discussion, provided our point of departure (see 2.5. above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 35: Generations of the Lagash II dynasty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puzurmama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably after Sharkalisharri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudu (21 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urningirsu gula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shudurul (15 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son Pirigme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbawu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(-4?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sons-in-law from Gudea to Nammahni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(-5?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successors of Gudea // Urnamma of Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 4 generations = ca. 80 years between the end of Sharkalisharri and before Urnamma, i.e. the ”Gutean period”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

422 Sollberger 1954-1956: 34.
423 Carroué 2000.
424 Steinkeller 1988b.
Zahara and Gupin (and Meluhha). Naramsuenn called himself “conqueror of Elam”. From the time of Naramsuenn, we know of two dependent governors of Susa and Elam, respectively. Akkadian domination at Susa is also documented by the finds of a Classic Sargonic archive dating from the time of Naramsuenn/Sharkalisharril that came from official organizations, including a military garrison.

When power diminished during the reign of Sharkalisharril, Akkad was no longer the aggressor but the defender (see above Section 7.2). At Susa, this probably happened during the career of Epirmubi. Epirmubi is known as “governor” (ensi₂) of Susa in an account of land belonging to the Classic Sargonic archive from Susa (MDP 14, 17). In his seal inscription and those of his servants, he bears the title “shakkanakku (i.e. ‘general’) of the land of Elam” (kiš.nita₂ ma-ti elam⁶): the lack of mention of any overlord and the title “the mighty (da-num) indicate independence.⁴⁰⁹

A Sharkalisharril year name on tablets from Girsu testifies to a battle against Elam and Zahara fought near Akshk, close to the Akkadian heartland (FAOS 7 D-25 Sarkanširi 2a = RIME 2.1.5 Šar-kali-šarrī (m)). This illustrates how Elam won influence as soon as Akkadian power diminished towards the end of Sharkalisharril’s reign (see above Section 7.2).

Frayne proposed to restore the name, Puzurrinshushinak of Elam, in an inscription of Puzuramama, the king of Lagash (8.5. above):


\( \text{“puzur,} \) \( \text{“insulina\kern-.5emkern.5em} \) \( \text{kiš.nita₂ enšušinak, [g]} \) \( \text{[\text{muš,er}]} \) \( \text{kiš.nita₂ [g]} \) \( \text{ara₂ ne.n[k]} \) \( \text{kiš} \) \( \text{-da-[u] ... k[...]} \) \( \text{puzur,} \) \( \text{-ma-ma lugal lagas [i’...]} \)


The entry in which Puzurrinshushinak is restored is followed by two more entries of the type PN GN “PN of GN”. The toponym of the second entry can be restored in accordance with the copy as [g]ara₂ ne.n[k]. Garāne is attested several times in Sargonic and Ur III sources: A Sargonic delivery of salt and other foodstuffs refers to a “man from Susa” lu₂ garā₂ ne.n[k] (Amherst 7). An expenditure of oil mentions a “man from Garāne” along with a “man from Kimash” (lu₂ ki-maš [k]).⁴³¹ The toponym also occurs in an Old Babylonian copy, in an inscription of Sargon, along with other toponyms located in Iran, e.g. Elam, Parahshum, Awan and Susa (NI₂,LA+IB garā₂ ne.n[k] “booty of Garāne”).⁴³²

However, the traces of the copy do not exactly meet the expected forms of the sign ša of the element puzur, of the sign ेṇ of the element insulina or of the sign े PNG of the element ensi₂, as Steinkeller (pers. comm.) and Sommerfeld (this volume) have convincingly argued. Such a synchronism would have been the only element to delimitate the duration of the Gutean period, since Puzurrinshushinak appears in an inscription mentioning his deeds before Urnamma, so he could, feasibly, have been the ruler whom Urnamma defeated when he conquered Susa.

Puzurrinshushinak is known as the 12th “king of Awan” from the AwKL (see above Section 2.2). In his 12 extant inscriptions, he bears different titles:

\( \text{pu} \text{zur,} \text{išulina} \text{k} \text{ensi₂,} \text{julus [h]} \text{“Puzurrinshushinak, governor of Susa” (FAOS 7 Elam 10, 12)} \)

\( \text{pu} \text{zur,} \text{išulina} \text{k} \text{ensi₂,} \text{julus [h]} \text{kiš.nita₂ ma-ti elam}[\text{dum} \text{ši-im-pi}-\text{iš-lu-uk “Puzurrinshushinak, governor of Susa, shakkanakku the land of Elam, son of Shimpi’shuk” (FAOS 7 Elam 2-6)} \)

\( \text{pu} \text{zur,} \text{išulina} \text{da-num, lugal a-wa-an[t] dumu ši-im-pi}-\text{iš-lu-uk “Puzurrinshushinak, the mighty, king of Awan, son of Shimpi’shuk” (FAOS 7 Elam 7-8).} \)

The change of titles in Puzurrinshushinak’s inscriptions reflect the chronology of his cursus honorum, i.e. his rise from local ruler of Susa (ensi₂, julus [h]) to overlord of Elam and beyond (da-num, lugal a-wa-an[t]). The first

⁴²⁹ Note that the alleged Naramsuenn brick stamps referred to by D.T. Potts 1999: 107 do not belong to the fourth ruler of Akkad as is shown by the photograph in Malbran-Labat 1995 (pers. comm. M. Roaf). A dating to the reign of Sharkalisharril could be indicated by MDP 14, 19 mentioning lu₂ [šara₂ enšušinak ummā], an alleged successor of Mesag, see Foster 1982a: 154-155.
⁴³¹ ITT 4, 7964 = MVP 7, 361, cf. also RA 19, 44 10543; on the toponym, see Edzard et al. 1977: 54; Edzard & Farber 1974: 51. Another possible reference is found in RTC 224 rev. 5; for more references see Owen 1981: 251.
⁴³³ See D.T. Potts 1999: 122; André-Salvini 2006-2008: 130 for an overview.
title would be the one in Puzururnama’s inscription and could nicely be correlated with the information that Dudu of Akkad won booty from Girsu and fought against Umma and Elam (see above Section 8.4.2). However, as already said, the basis for the synchronism is too weak to bear this conclusion.

Puzurinshushinak is also referred to in an Old Babylonian copy of an inscription of Urnamma. Though the context is uncertain, a historical narrative apparently refers to events during which Urnamma defeated Elam and Anshan. Puzurinshushinak may have been the ruler against whom Urnamma proved to be successful, but this must remain speculative.

RIME 3/2.1.1.29:

(v’) [break] Ur’nماما, the mighty, king of Ur, king of Sumer and Akkad, dedicated [...] for his life.
At that time, Enlil had given [...] to the Elamites. The land Elam came to battle by itself.
Its(?!) king Puzurinshushinak [...] Awal, Kismar, Mashkansharrim, the land Eshnuna, the land Tutub, the land Zimudar, the land Akkad [...] (v’) [break] its donkeys I took as booty. To Enlil, my lord, I really drove them to Nippur and I marked them. The remainder I presented as a gift to my army!

Two points are difficult to understand: firstly, the (partly restored) name Urnamma is not written at the beginning of the line; and secondly, the historical narrative starts after the dedication. However, the narrative in the Urnamma inscription may well deal with the historical background regarding how eastern Mesopotamia had come under Elamite influence.

Puzurinshushinak’s military operation was directed against the eastern alluvium, the Diyala region and the land Akkad. As we have seen above (Section 7.3), this region was still under Akkadian dominion even under Shudurul; therefore, Puzurinshushinak must have gained control of Akkad later. This is also borne out by the strong Gutean presence in Babylonia, but note that Umma and Adab, the stronghold of the last rulers of Gutium in Babylonia, are missing from the description of Puzurinshushinak’s kingdom – this allows for various historical interpretations.

As is well known, the “liberation” of this region from “Anshan” and Elam formed the background for Urnamma’s legal decrees, his reforms and laws (Wilcke 2002) and the order of the provinces of Northern Babylonia (in the Cadastre of Urnamma RIME 3/2.1.1.21, CUSAS 17, 20-21).

The conclusion that Urnamma successfully fought against Puzurinshushinak can now be corroborated by two fragments of alabaster vessel commemorating the destruction of Susa and hitherto unattributed (RIME 3/2.1.6.1021-1022).

According to a recent collation one of them explicitly mentions Urnamma of Ur:

CBS 14934 = RIME 3/2.1.6.1021 = Marchesi 2013: no. 1: 1’-8’535

[ur-’nماما], [lugal urim] [.m-a-ke-], [u š] ušin([mu]š, eru)š, [mu]-ų-hu-lo-a, ’nam-ra-[...] (rest broken)

“when [Urnamma, the king of Ur, destroyed Susa, booty [...].”

CBS 14935 = RIME 3/2.1.6.1022 = Marchesi 2013: no. 2: 1’-5’

[en-im ma-h(?)] š’nanna [lugal-na(?)-]ta, u š susinš, mu-ų-hu-lo-a, nam-’ra-aš, [mu-na-aka-a] (rest broken)

“[according to the great word of] Nanna, [his master], when he smote Susa and [turned it] into booty [...].”

On the basis of the parallels between these and other inscriptions, Marchesi 2012 convincingly proposes the following restoration for CBS 14394:

536 Note that a direct route of communication between the Diyala region and Susa is also attested by the distribution of toponyms in Sargonic archives from Susa, Eshnuna and Awal (see Schrakamp in this volume).
537 See Marchesi 2013 for this reconstruction according to UET 1, 18, CBS 9592, and CBS 14395.
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[... (one or two lines broken) [...]

According to the use of the early title “king of Ur” for Urnamma this deed belonged to the earlier half of his reign.439 The destruction of Susa might have marked the end of the Dynasty of Awan and the beginning of the Dynasty of Shamashki in Elam. The military conflict between Urnamma and an unnamed Elamite (text: “Anshan (ite)”) enemy is referred to in the prologue of the Urnamma Code:438

Urnamma Code, prologue = Wilcke 2002: 308: A 125-134 // C 1-10

“[To DN, (...), his lord/lady, Urnamma, king of Ur, [when] he smote Susa and [turned it into] booty, [dedicated (this vase) for his own life].”

A defeat of Anshan is, moreover, the only political event reported in the inscriptions of Gudea of Lagash II.439

Evidence for Gudea's control of parts of Susiana is provided by an inscription of Gudea from Shushhtar.440 Additional evidence could possibly be found in two administrative texts from Lagash dealing with the expenditure of barley to foreigners, including persons from Huhnuri, Simurrum and Lullubum, and four men designated as "sons of Shimpishhu" (du mu š i-i m-bi...). Steinkeller tentatively proposed identifying Shimpishhu with Shimpishshuk whom Puzurinshushinak names as his father in his titulary (see above).441 If not mere coincidence, then these men could perhaps be prisoners, taken captive after Puzurinshushinak’s defeat.

These facts allow various reconstructions. According to Steinkeller (2013) Urnamma had led his military campaign against Puzurinshushinak of Anshan together with Gudea; so Susa became a province of Ur and Gudea built a temple in its region. However, the building inscription of Gudea from Shushtar and the possible reference to Shimpishshuk's men at Girsu, together with a dating of Gudea shortly before Urnamma (see above 8.5.) could lead to another narrative, namely that Gudea's victory preceded that of Urnamma and that Puzurinshushinak's rise was made possible by his alliance with Girsu. The incompleteness of the data allows for various potential historical reconstructions; as yet no one chronological sequence is favoured above another. To conclude, Puzurinshushinak’s exact relationship with Mesopotamia, before the reign of Urnamma, still has to be clarified.

The dating of Puzurinshushinak (AwKL no. 12) to the time-span of the Lagash II dynasty does not directly contradict the information of the somewhat problematic Awan King List (AwKL, see Section 2.2), which gives a distance of four generations to Luhishan (AwKL no. 8), a contemporary of Sargon; this would make Puzurinshushinak a contemporary of Dudu and/or Shudurul. The Shimashki King List (ShKL) probably listed the direct successors of the AwKL, including Kirname (ShKL no. 1), Tazitta (ShKL no. 2) and Ebarat (ShKL no. 3). Ebarat/Yabrat appears in Ur III sources from Shulgi 444 through to Ibbisuen’s early years (see above p. 25), so Kirname and Tazitta could have been contemporaries of Urnamma and Shulgi, and Puzurinshushinak would have preceded them. Such a reconstruction would agree, more or less, with Hallo’s proposal for the duration of the Gutean period, namely that AwKL no. 8-12 corresponds to the five generations following Sargon, i.e. until the time of Shudurul. If Puzurinshushinak (AwKL no. 12) was defeated by Urnamma according to RIME 3/2.1.1.29 (see above), this generation count would leave no room for a more extended Gutean period, except that Puzurinshushinak must have controlled Akkad after its last ruler Shudurul, even if for a very short period (again implied by RIME 3/2.1.1.29, cited above). However, as repeatedly pointed out above, too many uncertainties remain to exclude any of the various different historical reconstructions for this period.

440 Steve 2001; D.T. Potts 2010: 246-247; Steinkeller 2014: 289 n. 20 for a reading different from that proposed by Steve. Gudea’s activities in regions to the east are possibly also indicated by his statement that Elamites and Suseans came to his temple building in RIME 3/2.1.7.Cyla xiv 7-xv 7. Since large portions of these passages are broken, this remains uncertain.
441 Steinkeller 1988b: 53. RTC 249 ii 25-5; 3 guruš 1.[0.0 gur], 1 guruš 1.23 gur, še-bi 4.23 gur, dumu šim-bi-iš-mec; identically MVN 10,92 obv. ii 1-4.
Map 13: Gutium, Uruk V, Puzurinshushinak, Lagash II
8.7. The Gutean Rulers

According to contemporary records the Gutean dynasty overlapped, at least in part, with the Late Akkad period. In order to harmonize this proposal with Steinkeller’s interpretation of the new evidence given by the USKL (see Steinkeller in this volume), we would suggest dividing the Gutean period into two parts. At the beginning of “Gutean history”, the Guteans had no king, as recalled in both the USKL and SKL; the latter part of their history is characterized by the installation of true kings.

The visit of Gutean “chieftains” to the royal court at Akkad could plausibly be dated to the first period as this accords well with what is known about Sargonic palaeography. A text from Kish, belonging to the Kish 1930 texts, which are dated to the time of Sharkalisharri and mention Sharatigubisin, probably Sharkalisharri’s son, may possibly refer to the “horde of Gutium” and thus place Sharatigubisin in the time of Gutean overrule:445

MAD 5, 9 rev. ii 18-21:
[i]-ṭum, [um]-ma-ná-at, [ma-ti]-gur-ú-m, [i]-tu-ru/[ip]-ḫu-ra]-nīm

“after the army (plur.) of the land of Gutium returned/gathered hither”

The “horde of Gutium” is referred to in an administrative tablet recording an expenditure of figs for Ummanum, URU.SÁ.G.RIG. 4, Adab, and the governor of Umma:

AAICAB 1/3 Bod. A 42 (see Steinkeller, this volume):

₂₈ ᵇ₂₂₆ ᵇ₂₂₇ ᵇ₂₂₈ ᵇ₂₂₉ ᵇ₂₃₀ ᵇ₂₃₁ ᵇ₂₃₂ ᵇ₂₃₃ ᵇ₂₃₄ ᵇ₂₃₅ ᵇ₂₃₆ ᵇ₂₃₇ ᵇ₂₃₈ ᵇ₂₃₉ ᵇ₂₄₀ ᵇ₂₄₁ ᵇ₂₄₂ ᵇ₂₄₃ ᵇ₂₄₄ ᵇ₂₄₅ ᵇ₂₄₆ ᵇ₂₄₇ ᵇ₂₄₈ ᵇ₂₄₉ ᵇ₂₅₀ ᵇ₂₅₁ ᵇ₂₅₂ ᵇ₂₅₃ ᵇ₂₅₄ ᵇ₂₅₅ ᵇ₂₅₆ ᵇ₂₅₇ ᵇ₂₅₈ ᵇ₂₅₉ ᵇ₂₆₀ ᵇ₂₆₁ ᵇ₂₆₂ ᵇ₂₆₃ ᵇ₂₆₄ ᵇ₂₆₅ ᵇ₂₆₆ ᵇ₂₆₇ ᵇ₂₆₈ ᵇ₂₆₉ ᵇ₂₇₀ ᵇ₂₇₁ ᵇ₂₇₂ ᵇ₂₇₃ ᵇ₂₇₄ ᵇ₂₇₅ ᵇ₂₇₆ ᵇ₂₇₇ ᵇ₂₇₈ ᵇ₂₇₉ ᵇ₂₈₀ ᵇ₂₈₁ ᵇ₂₈₂ ᵇ₂₈₃ ᵇ₂₈₄ ᵇ₂₈₅ ᵇ₂₈₆ ᵇ₂₈₇ ᵇ₂₈₈ ᵇ₂₈₉ ᵇ₂₉₀ ᵇ₂₉₁ ᵇ₂₉₂ ᵇ₂₉₃ ᵇ₂₉₄ ᵇ₂₉₅ ᵇ₂₉₆ ᵇ₂₉₇ ᵇ₂₉₈ ᵇ₂₉₉ ᵇ₃₀₀

“... container of figs (for) Ummanum, conveyor; URLI, the adjutant, 5 ... containers: URU.SÁ.G.RIG. 4, 1 bundle/basket (of) 5 sīla: the governor of Umma, 2 bundles/baskets (of) 5 sīla: Adab, [...] month, 5th day. Expenditure”

Note that the term ummānum also occurs in the Old Babylonian copy of an inscription of Erridupizir:

FAOS 7 Gutium C 2 (Erridupizir C 2) 58-66 = RIME 2.2.1.2 v 6-11:

in a-ga-de₂, EREN-uri na-ti-ku-an ip-hur-šum um-ma-num, ga-la-as-as-a-na si-mu-ur, ri-zi-im₃ ε₄, ṣu-ṣu₄

“In Akkad, the whole ‘army’ (ummānum) assembled for him and marched against Simurrum.”

Later Gutean kings appear, but had not, yet, established a permanent presence in Babylonia proper. The time of these early Gutean rulers was recalled as Ummanum in the USKL, by the notion that “the Guteans had not king for themselves (yet)” in the SKL (see above 8.1), and apparently by the mention of Gutean “chieftains” in an administrative text (MS 4267B, see above 8.3.). Year names dating from the time of Sharkalisharri testify to their first military ventures directed westwards, down to the alluvium, and their presence in the regions of Adab, Umma, Girsu and Kish is well-documented in administrative texts.

The rulers mentioned in the first part, recalled as Ummanum in the USKL, were already present at the foot-hills of the Zagros during the time of Sharkalisharri, who captured one of the early Gutean kings. At this time, Gutean raids may have been undertaken from their homeland somewhere in the eastern mountains, which may be indicated by the fact that the early rulers mentioned in the SKL all bear non-Mesopotamian names.

After Akkadian power disintegrated and Shudurul lost control of Adab, Guteans finally filled the vacuum and made Adab their capital. This time is recalled in the USKL, as the second half of the Gutean period – Gutean overrule proper. Working with this supposition, the fact that the SKL attributes the Gutean dynasty/dynasties an overall length of about 100 years, can be explained by the assumption that the total of 91, 99 or 124/125 years of the SKL, and also the tentatively reconstructed duration for the Gutean dynasties of the USKL, include both

445 Sharatigubisin is described as “son of the king” (dumu lugal) and “temple administrator of Kesh” (saĝga keš) in the document MS 3267 (now CUSAS 17, 14). He occurs as judge in the document to be published by A. Westenholz, Forbidden Fruits, Early Dynastic and Sargonic Texts from the Antiquities Market (forthcoming) no. 72. In the votive inscription RIME 2 p. 250, 2001 he is mentioned as master of a functionary from URU.SÁ.G.RIG. and occurs a third time in MAD 5, 22 from Kish (though without title). Since he can be dated to the Classic Sargonic period by ducatus and style of his seals, he is considered the son of Naramsuen or, more probably, Sharkalisharri, and, according to A. Westenholz, was probably the crown-prince of the latter. On Sharatigubisin, see Frayne 1993: 250; A. Westenholz 2009-2011a; Pomponio 2011: 25 with n. 30; Steinkeller 2011a: 18 and Steinkeller p. 276, in this volume.

446 Gelb 1970: xviii; for the restoration, cf. Edzard et al. 1977: 65; Steinkeller, this volume. The subscript cited above is found on a fragment not directly joined to the other two fragments, apparently a ration list that displays prosopographical links with the Sharatigubisin dossier. In this respect it has to be pointed out that Westenholz 1972: 382 doubts that the subscript belongs to the same tablet as the fragments preserving the ration list.
the early Gutean rulers, who were contemporaries of Akkad and Late Akkad and the later rulers, who did indeed exercise their rule over Babylonia.

In contrast to the abundantly rich documentation of both monumental and administrative texts from the periods preceding and following the Gutean period, texts dating to the time between Sharkalisharri and Urnamma are very rare. Apparently, the Guteans themselves have not left us a corpus of administrative texts. The lack of any administrative documentation has been interpreted, by Hallo, as indicative of the short duration of the Gutean period, but it could also, according to Steinkeller (in this volume, his section 8.1), be due to a collapse of Sargonic central administration.

Note that in addition to the USKL and the literary Lamentation on the Destruction of Ur that located the seat of the Dynasty of Gutium in that city, Sargonic administrative texts from Adab show a very high percentage of references to Guteans (and easterners, in general) compared to other Classic Sargonic archives (see Schrakamp in this volume).

Moreover, only seven Gutean rulers are known from contemporary texts (cf. Steinkeller in this volume):

1) A Sharkalisharri year name (FAOS 7 D-27 = RIME 2.1.5. (k) see 3.2.2) found on tablets from Girsu and Adab commemorates the capture of a certain Sarlag (Sa-ra-lag), king of Gutium. For the suggested identification with the fourth Gutean ruler mentioned in the SKL, see above p. 46.

2) The Gutean king, La’arab (cf. SKL Gutium no. 14), is known by his own inscription on a stone mace-head from Sippar. In order to have a dedication in this Northern Babylonian city he must have ruled after Shudurul of Akkad.

FAOS 7 Gutium 1 = RIME 2.2.14.1:
la-ša-ra-ab da-num; LU.GAL gu-ti-im
“La’arab, the mighty, the king of Gutium.”

3) A Gutean king named Yarlagan, probably the same as SKL no. 19 with a reign of 3 years, is referred to in a date formula in an inscription of Nammahni, governor of Umma (see 8.4.2. above), and on a stone bowl with a dedicatory inscription of Shudurul and secondary inscription of Arlagan, king of Gutium. Yarlagan’s secondary inscriptions clearly show features palaeographically younger than Shudurul’s (see Steinkeller in this volume):

Hallo 2005: 147-148, 159-160:
ar-la-ga-an, da-num, LU.GAL gu-ti-im ki–iu-dar-ul, da-num, LU.GAL a-ga-dr4
“Arlagan, the mighty one, king of Gutium” – “Shudurul, the mighty one, king of Akkad”

4) Sium of Gutium is referred to in an inscription of Lugalanatum, governor of Umma (RIME 2.11.13.1; see 8.4.2 above). Giving credit to this very inscription, Jacobsen444 restored the name of Gutium king no. 20 in the SKL as [Si]-u. As long as no SKL duplicate corroborates the restoration, the equation must remain, at the least, doubtful.445

5) Tirigan, the last king of Gutium (SKL Gutium no. 21) with a reign of 40 days according to SKL and USKL, is said, according an inscription of Utuhengal of Uruk (see RIME 2.13.6.4), to have been defeated.

6) The last ruler of Gutium attested by contemporary inscriptions is a certain Gutarlâ, “son of Gutium” (gu₂-ta-ra-la₂ du mu gu-ti-um-ma-ra), who is attested as an opponent of Urnamma of Ur III (RIME 3.2.1.30 iii 1’-6’). Reference to Gutans is also found in an Ur III manuscript of the Urnamma Code, referring to a sale “in the period of the Guteans” (ba la gu-du-ma-ka, CUSAS 17: 245, 251 §E3a).

7) Erridupizir, king of Gutium, is known from Old Babylonian copies of his inscriptions from Nippur, according to which he dedicated offerings to Enlil at Nippur446 and Akkad.447 Control of Nippur must have been possible, most probably after the first year of Shudurul, when he was still in control of Adab (see above p. 48). This

445 Note that none of the manuscripts of the SKL completely preserves the name of the 14th ruler; SKL WB vii 42 [la-ša]-ra-bu-um is commonly restored according this inscription (see Hallo 1957-1971: 711, 712). On the assured provenience from that city, see Hallo 2005: 151.
446 Jacobsen 1939: 120 n. 306.
448 FAOS 7 Gutium C 1 (Erridupizir C 1) = RIME 2.2.1.1.
449 FAOS 7 Gutium C 2 (Erridupizir C 2) = RIME 2.2.2. v 14-18.
is also corroborated by Erridupizir’s military operations undertaken in regions adjacent to the east and northeast (i.e. Lullubum, Simurrum, Madga). Erridupizir is missing in the extant manuscripts of the SKL, which in any case displays considerable differences in the list of Gutean rulers (see above p. 20). Erridupizir has to be dated before the latter part of Urnammes’ reign, when the king of Ur began building Enlil’s ziggurat at Nippur.

Later allusions to Guteans in literary historical tradition may be unreliable as regards their historical value and need not concern us here.\footnote{Hallo 1957-1971: 716-719; 2005; see Steinkeller in this volume.}

8.8. Conclusion

Hallo’s short Gutean period has been positively received by recent re-evaluations of the stylistic development in glyptic and statuary from the Akkadian to the Neo-Sumerian period. In his discussion of the development of glyptic styles based on earlier work by Boehmer\footnote{Boehmer 1966; similarly as Dittmann 1994 now also di Ludovico 2008: 334.} Dittmann writes:


\footnote{Hallo 1957-1971: 716-719; 2005; see Steinkeller in this volume.}

\footnote{Boehmer 1966; similarly as Dittmann 1994 now also di Ludovico 2008: 334.}
Suter, re-evaluating the development of Akkadian to Neo-Sumerian royal statues, concludes, with regard to those of Puzurinshushinak, that:


Despite the wide acceptance of Hallo’s model of a 40 year Gutean period, Steinkeller (this volume) has proposed 100 years for the same time span. Given the available evidence it is impossible to conclusively prove or disprove either of these suggestions.

Steinkeller’s reconstruction is mainly based on his interpretation of the *USKL* which stems from the time of Shulgi, only two generations after the end of Gutean rule. The focus of *USKL* on Adab, introducing the Dynasty of Gutium as “Dynasty of Adab”, may be due to the origins of the text: the tablet appeared on the market at the same time as many Adab tablets. 452 This local history may then have been the reason for dividing the Gutean period into two sections, the Guteans as Ummanum (“army”) and later as established at Adab. As shown above, contemporary sources suggest that the part of the Ummanum may have been parallel to Akkad/Late Akkad, leaving only a few years for the Adab rulers. Given the breaks in the text, any reconstruction remains inconclusive. Furthermore, Steinkeller’s placement of the Uruk IV dynasty after Akkad cannot be corroborated by contemporary evidence (see 8.4.1. above).

Elements of our discussion of the evidence are summarized in Table 36, which also illustrates that figures for the duration of rulers and reliable synchronisms are missing.

Although it still seems impossible to disprove Hallo’s short Gutean period of 40 years, it demands an extreme reduction of reigns and a tight sequence of historical events, for example, in the sequence of Umma rulers, or the rule of Puzurinshushinak at Akkad, or the sequence at Adab. It becomes almost impossible to insert the rulers of Lagash into this short period, especially if the arguments regarding the dating of Gudea before Urnamma of Ur, as presented above, stand the test of the time. An estimate based on generations of 20 years credits the independent Lagash II dynasty, between Sharkalisharri and Urnamma, with around 80 years (see 8.5. above).

Although no convincing arguments can be found to sustain the extreme chronologies of 40 years (Hallo) and 100 years (Steinkeller) respectively, these extreme values cannot be excluded. Our own deliberations came up with an estimate of ca. 80 years for the Gutean period. So long as only provisional solutions for a historical chronology can be proposed, we suggest accepting a mean value of 70 years (+/- 10 years according to our most plausible estimate or +/- 30 years regarding the extreme values) for the Gutean period; this should allow future adjustments of the chronology without major difficulties.

---

452 Cf. Westenholz 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akkad</th>
<th>Adab</th>
<th>Umma</th>
<th>Lagash</th>
<th>Uruk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharkalisharri: 25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girsu under Akkad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confusion:       3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uruk independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duddu:           21 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shudurul:        15 years</td>
<td>Adab under Akkad in Shudurul</td>
<td>Umma part of Akkad</td>
<td>(35 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzurinshushinak in Akkad</td>
<td>2+[0 to 5] Gutean rulers of Adab: 7 [+x] years (<em>USKL</em>)</td>
<td>Lugalatarum // Sium Urnigiru I Pirigme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tirigan: 40 days Utuhengal of Uruk</td>
<td>Nammamhi // Yarlagan (after Shudurul) Urbawu Gudea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Babylonia part of Ur(?)</td>
<td>Urnamm of Ur (later part of reign)</td>
<td>Urnamm of Ur</td>
<td>Urabba, Urbama, Namhani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36: Overview of some important sequences in the Gutean period. Periods of dominion by Akkad and Ur are indicated by the respective background; rulers of Gutium in bold; time spans are not to scale.
9. The Third Dynasty of Ur and Other Late 3rd Millennium Dynasties

According to the SKL, Ur was the seat of three dynasties. The Third Dynasty followed Uruk V, its five kings ruled for 109 years combined. The length of the respective reigns of the Ur III kings can be reconstructed by the extant year names and the figures given by the various manuscripts of the SKL. Among the dynasties represented in this book, the Ur III dynasty is the only one whose dates depend solely on the general problem of an absolute chronology before ca. 1400.

Urnamma 18 years MC 2110-2093
Shulgi 48 years MC 2092-2045
Amarsuena 9 years MC 2044-2036
Shusuen 9 years MC 2035-2027
Ibbisuen 24 years MC 2026-2003

The rule of Urnamma (Sumerian ur-nam-ma) can be divided into two parts, as evidenced by the change of his title. As "king of Ur" (lugal ur-im-sa-ma-k) he is known from building inscriptions from Ur and its surroundings, whereas as "king of Sumer and Akkad" (lugal ki-en-gi ki-ur-i-k) he commissioned building projects at places like Nippur, Larsa or Kesh. He defeated Susa and Elam (see above 8.6.), probably during the campaigns that formed the Ur III empire. His son Shulgi (Sumerian sul-ge-r) consolidated the rule of Ur in Mesopotamia and in the latter half of his reign conquered regions to the northeast of the alluvium that secured the control of the great Khorassan road. His empire included Mesopotamia up to Assur in the north (see above 2.6.), to the Shemshara plain in the northeast, and to Susiana in the southeast.

Foreign policy included dynastic marriages, starting with Shulgi's marriage to Taramuram, daughter of the ruler Apilkin of Mari, marking the beginning of a century of good relations with Mari. Furthermore, a daughter was married to Marhashi, localized in the region of Iranian Jiroft in the province of Kerman (Shulgi year 18), and Shulgi's own, later, wife, Shulgisimti, may have come from Eshnuna (Shulgi year 28 at the latest). Other daughters were married to Anshan (Tall-e Malyan in Fars province, Shulgi year 30) which led to a military campaign (Shulgi year 34-35), to Pashime on the northeast coast of the Persian Gulf of that time, nowadays situated at Abu Sheeja at the northern edge of the Band-i Buzurgan, and to northern Shimanum at Tur Abdin.

Diplomatic exchange is amply documented in the rich archival record from the time of the Third Dynasty of Ur, especially from the late years of Shulgi down to the early years of Ibbisuen. Outstanding are the good relations with Ebarat/Yabrat of Shimashki/Elam, which largely secured the east border, and with Mari in the west. The other most important centres in the west were Ebla in Syria, Urshu, probably at or in the wider region of Gaziantep, and Shimanum, probably in the Upper Tigris valley, at the slopes of Tur Abdin.

A summary of the Ur III period at Susa, including a critical discussion of the evidence and the presentation of new data, is given by Katrien De Graef in this volume.

In the late 3rd millennium the rulers of Mari were called "shakkanakku", literally "general", the highest rank in the military hierarchy and directly responsible to the king (see Section 2.4 above). A correlation of dates from the early part of the Mari Shakkanakku List (MShakL, Section 2.4.) with the mean value of 70 years for the Gutean period, leads to the results presented in Table 37. The correlation is based on the Apilkin–Urnamma synchronism, whose exact dating remains unknown (the extreme values are Apilkin year 35 = Urnamma year 10, thus Apilkin year 1 = MC 2137, and Apilkin year 1 = Urnamma year 18, thus Apilkin year 1 = MC 2095).

Some years after the accession of the last ruler of Ur, Ibbisuen (MC 2026-2003), the disintegration of the empire started. There are several potential reasons. The presence of nomadic Amorites must have changed the socioeconomic system, probably involving various conflicts. More seriously, Ibbisuen lacked grain in the central provinces of Southern Mesopotamia and hunger must have dramatically affected the inhabitants. Hunger was less severe in Northern Babylonia, so the general Ishbierra of Isin claimed independence from Ur and declared himself king of Isin (MC 2019) and, as such, successor of the kingship of Ur. By that time a series of provinces had already left the state: in Ibbisuen year 3 (MC 2024) provinces in the east and north, including Eshnuna and Susa, in Ibbisuen years 4 and 5 (MC 2023-22) Umma and Girsu, and in Ibbisuen 6, Nippur (MC 2019). For his final 16

453 On Shulgi see the overview of Sallaberger 2012 with further literature.
454 Steinkeller 2007; De Graef in this volume.
455 Sallaberger 2007.
Map 14: Ur III empire
years Ibbisuen only controlled the region of the city of Ur, before the city was devastated by an army from Elam, led by Kindattu of Shimashki (MC 2003).

From a chronological perspective, the long period from Urnamma down to the end of the First Dynasty of Babylon (MC 2110-1595/1597), represents a firm block of 515 years. Two independent recent reconstructions⁴⁵⁶ have come to almost the same conclusions; only a difference of +/- 1 year seems possible for the Isin period (Table 38).

Table 37: Estimate of a correlation of the first half of the Mari rulers according to MŠakL with the contemporary dynasties of Akkad and Ur based on the Apilkin-Urnamma synchronism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mari rulers</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>MC dates</th>
<th>Mesopotamian rulers</th>
<th>MC dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ididish</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2249-2190</td>
<td>Naramsuen</td>
<td>2261-2206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shudagan “his son”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2189-2185</td>
<td>Sharkalisharrt</td>
<td>2205-2181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmahdagan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2184-2140</td>
<td>“confusion”</td>
<td>2180-2178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurmer (= Niwarmer)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2139-2136</td>
<td>Dudu</td>
<td>2177-2157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishitupel “his brother”</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2135-2125</td>
<td>Shudurul</td>
<td>2156-2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkunadad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2124-2117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apilkin</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2116-2082</td>
<td>Urnamma of Ur</td>
<td>2110-2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]dagan</td>
<td>10¹</td>
<td>2081-2072</td>
<td>Shulgi of Ur</td>
<td>2092-2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] “his son”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2071-2067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] “his brother”</td>
<td>2+[x]</td>
<td>2067-2060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Follows break)

Table 38: MC dates for the most important rulers and dynasties of the subsequent Old Babylonian period.⁴⁵⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isin</th>
<th>Larsa</th>
<th>Babylon</th>
<th>Assur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ishbierra</td>
<td>1920-1987</td>
<td>Našlamu 2025-2055</td>
<td>Ilushuma ca. 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iddindagan</td>
<td>1976-1956</td>
<td>Samišu 1976-1942</td>
<td>Ikušum 1932-1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmedagan</td>
<td>1955-1937</td>
<td>Zabaya 1941-1933</td>
<td>Sargiš 1917-1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipitštar</td>
<td>1936-1926</td>
<td>Gungumumu 1932-1907</td>
<td>Puzurarišum 1877-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urninurta</td>
<td>1925-1898</td>
<td>Abišašmu 1906-1896</td>
<td>Narsamuš 1869-1836/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursin</td>
<td>1987-1876</td>
<td>Samušum 1895-1867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipitšilid</td>
<td>1875-1871</td>
<td>Nūradšu 1866-1851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erāramiti</td>
<td>1870-1863</td>
<td>Sinidinnum 1850-1844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlilšaari</td>
<td>1862-1839</td>
<td>Šniribušumu 1843-1842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambiyi</td>
<td>1838-1836</td>
<td>Šniripšišumu 1841-1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iṭeryšuma</td>
<td>1835-1832</td>
<td>Silidišumu 1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udrukugua</td>
<td>1831-1828</td>
<td>Waradšin 1835-1823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinimagir</td>
<td>1827-1817</td>
<td>Šummāššišim 1832-1763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damiššilušu</td>
<td>1816-1794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38: MC dates for the most important rulers and dynasties of the subsequent Old Babylonian period.³⁵⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Babylon</th>
<th>Assur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Našlamu 2025-2055</td>
<td>Ilushuma ca. 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamsimu 2004-1977</td>
<td>Erishum I 1972-1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samišu 1976-1942</td>
<td>Ikušum 1932-1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabaya 1941-1933</td>
<td>Sargiš 1917-1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gungumumu 1932-1907</td>
<td>Puzurarišum 1877-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abišašmu 1906-1896</td>
<td>Narsamuš 1869-1836/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samušum 1895-1867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūradšu 1866-1851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinidinnum 1850-1844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šniribušumu 1843-1842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šniripšišumu 1841-1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silidišumu 1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waradšin 1835-1823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šummāššišim 1832-1763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damiššišim 1816-1794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shušlišu 1986-1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erishum I 1972-1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikušum 1932-1918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³⁵⁶ Charpin 2004: 385-387 and Sallaberger 2004: 40, both with further literature.
10. Concluding Table

Textual sources and arguments from the scholarly literature pertaining to the relative chronology of the time from the Presargonic to the Ur III periods have been discussed in the preceding pages, the results are summarized in Table 39 below. The critical revision has confirmed various previous suggestions or corrected others, especially for the passage from the Presargonic to the Sargonic period and the Sargonic period itself. In one important case the extant sources do not allow a firm conclusion, namely for the Gutean period. As argued above (8.8.) we have therefore opted to indicate a mean value of 70 years and allow a variation of maximally ±30 years; the mean value is, incidentally, close to our own estimate of 70 to 80 years for the duration of this period. The duration of the Presargonic period is an estimate based on generations, which may be wrong for ca. ±20 years. The date indicated for the Fara period in Table 39 is rather impressionistic and not based on hard historical evidence.

As outlined in Section 1.3. above, we have chosen the traditional “Middle Chronology” (MC) for the argumentation of the relative chronology of the 3rd millennium, but the lower MC (MC II) appears to be more plausible given the current understanding of the link between history, dendrochronology and the date of the sun eclipse of 1833 BC (Section 1.3. above). So in Table 39 the dates of the right column are to be taken as the best calculations and estimates based on historical and philological argumentations we were able to achieve; therefore we have also taken our proposal of the duration of the Gutean period of 70 years, which is based on various arguments, especially generation counts.

The MC II reduced by 8 years (rMC_{8}) is relatively “high” for a historical chronology as compared against the lowering of ca. 50 years by Boese or ca. 100 years by van Koppen. However, this chronology allows quite a good agreement between archaeological layers dated by radiocarbon and the dates estimated for textual finds, mostly based on palaeography (see Sallaberger & Schrakamp below, Part II, Chapter 10). This is a further indication to take the MC II (rMC_{8}) as the most plausible chronology to be achieved with various sets of data. Also, the find of an inscription by the Egyptian pharaoh Pepy I (year 1 in the range of ca. 2360-2350 or even 2360-2310) at Ebla can be reconciled with this chronology, acknowledging the redating of the Egyptian pharaohs by radiocarbon and the proposals of Seidlmayer for a longer duration of the first intermediate period.

---

458 Boese 2008; van Koppen 2010.
459 Bronk Ramsey et al. 2010.
460 Seidlmayer 1997; 2006.
Table 39: Synopsis of main dynasties, rulers and events of the 3rd millennium in MC and MC II (rMC₈, i.e. 8 years lower than the MC; adopted to round numbers in case of estimated dates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Ruler</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>MC dates</th>
<th>MC II dates (rMC₈ adapted to rMC₅/10 for estimated dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fara period</td>
<td>ca. 2575-2475±30</td>
<td>ca. 2570-2470±30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presargonic period Lagash I // Umma</td>
<td>ca. 175 years</td>
<td>ca. 2475-2300±30</td>
<td>ca. 2470-2290±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urukagina of Lagash</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>ca. 2324-2315±30</td>
<td>ca. 2316-2307±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalzagesi of Uruk</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>ca. 2324-2300±30</td>
<td>ca. 2316-2292±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargon of Akkad</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>2324-2285±30</td>
<td>2316-2277±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargonic period beginning in Babylonia</td>
<td>ca. 2300</td>
<td>ca. 2300-2292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destruction of Ebla</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 2310±30</td>
<td>ca. 2302±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destruction of Mari</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 2295±30</td>
<td>ca. 2287±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimush &amp; Manishtushu</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>2284-2262±30</td>
<td>2276-2254±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naramsuen</td>
<td>56 years</td>
<td>2261-2206±30</td>
<td>2253-2198±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkalisharri</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>2205-2181±30</td>
<td>2197-2173±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudu</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>2177-2157±30</td>
<td>2169-2149±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadurul</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>2156-2142±30</td>
<td>2148-2134±30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutean Period</td>
<td>70±10-30 years</td>
<td>2180-2111</td>
<td>2172-2103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudea of Lagash</td>
<td>ca. 20 years?</td>
<td>ca. 2130-2110?</td>
<td>ca. 2112-2102?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urnammu of Ur III</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>2110-2093</td>
<td>2102-2085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shulgi</td>
<td>48 years</td>
<td>2092-2045</td>
<td>2084-2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarsuca</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>2044-2036</td>
<td>2036-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shusuen</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>2035-2027</td>
<td>2027-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishbuesen</td>
<td>24 years</td>
<td>2026-2003</td>
<td>2018-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishbierra of Isin</td>
<td>33 years</td>
<td>2019-1987</td>
<td>2011-1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammurapi of Babylon</td>
<td>43 years</td>
<td>1792-1750</td>
<td>1784-1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of Babylon I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1595/1597</td>
<td>1587/89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Index of Geographical Names

The index includes ancient place names and modern sites as well as some references to regions.

Variants of the same name both in ancient and in modern spelling are grouped under one main entry. This should allow to compare easily various traditions of rendering names.

For the alphabetisation note that – mostly in transliterations –
– aleph (א), index numbers, hyphens or other diacritics (like ×) are not considered
– syllables written Cv-vC are taken as representing CvC (e.g. ba-ab- as bab...)
– ū = sh, ĝ = g
– → cross references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.A.KI</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-a-uₙKI</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABₙKI</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ababi</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-ba-biₙKI</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abarnium</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abarsal</td>
<td>163, 165, 166, 171-175, 181, 182, 184, 185, 187, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-bar-salₙKI</td>
<td>171, 172, 173, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Khuera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abartum (?)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-bar-tim (?)</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbar</td>
<td>203, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– abbarₙKI</td>
<td>205, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → ašte (AMBAR)ₙKI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbarkuda</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– abbar-kuₙ-daₙKI</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbarlagash</td>
<td>203, 238, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– abbar-lagasₙKI</td>
<td>205, 239, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbarningen</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– abbar-niĝenₑₙKI</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdani</td>
<td>260, 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ab-da-niₙKI</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abikum</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-[h]iₙ-kum[KI]</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB.KID.KID</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab-sa-anₙKI</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB.ŠEŠₙKI</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Ur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Habba</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Sippar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Ḥaṭab</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abulim</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Salabikh</td>
<td>33, 58, 59, 61-65, 80, 157, 158, 160, 192, 193, 198, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Sheeja</td>
<td>131, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abullat</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ademhöyük</td>
<td>7, 8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adambig</td>
<td>184, 187, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamik</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adah</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdamDUN</td>
<td>132, 202, 237, 238, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamdu</td>
<td>290, 293, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdamDUN/sul</td>
<td>50, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-dam-DUN</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-dam-DUN²</td>
<td>239, 290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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– a-dam-ša₂₂
– a-dam-sul
– → Edamsul
– → Surkhegan, Tepe
Adhem 9, 90, 159
Adu 183, 184, 298
a-du₁-a → AGAGA
AeaninTU (?) 238
– a-e₁₆₄nīn-TU (?) 239
Aeagizi (?) 238
– a-e₁₆₄-gi-zī (?) 239
Afis 181
a-ga-de₂, a-ga-ti-um etc. → Akkad
AGAGA 203
– a-du₁-a 203
Agagalish 189, 299
AGAZU 231, 260
– a-gaz-u₂₂ 231
– a-GAZ-u₂₂ 231, 232
Agrab 47, 64, 83, 111, 116, 153
– Tell Agrab 260, 299
Agzia 260
– ag-zi-a₂ 231, 261
A.HA 59, 106, 111, 132
– a.HA 159, 198, 199, 212, 213, 219, 236, 255, 256
– a.HA₂ 159, 198
– KI.A.HA(A) 218, 219
– KI.A.HA.KI 219
– → Kuara, Tuba
a-ḥa-da-mu₂ 186
A.HA.GAM.GAM/BAN'-₄nin-f₄x(s)₂ 238, 239
Ahush 203
– a-ḥuʃ 205
– → Ehush
AhūTI 161, 297
– a-ḥu-TRI 63, 157
– a-ḥu-TRI 161
– a-gu₃-du₃ 157
Akakgilu 187, 298
– a-KAK-gi-LUM 186
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- a-ga-de(3\ki) 43, 47-49, 118, 124, 127, 128, 154, 199, 222, 224, 229, 232, 235, 236, 239, 254, 256, 257, 261, 264, 267, 283

- a-ga-de/\ti-um 232
- ag-ga-de(3\ki) 41, 93
- a-kà-de(3\ki) 273, 274

Ak[N] 212, 216
- ak-ne(3\ki) 213

Akshak 15, 16, 17, 44, 46, 83, 89, 91, 97, 111, 123, 125, 126, 132, 198, 199, 202, 203, 205, 212, 213, 218, 260, 261, 263, 299

- Akšak 69, 142, 147, 154, 261
- ak-sa-gu(3\ki) 97, 147
- akšak(3\ki) 44, 46, 69, 97, 125, 200, 205, 261
- akšak(3\ki)-im 264
- akšak,(itti.kušu(2))ki 212, 213
- akšu-(wa)-ak 147

Akuzum 249
- a-ku-zum(3\ki) 249

Alalah 189
- Alalakh 189

Aldara 212, 213
- al-dar-ra(3\ki) 213

Aldarana 212, 264
- al-dar-ra-na(3\ki) 213, 264

Aleppo 228
- → Halab 277

al-Hayyad, Tell 35, 58, 67, 304

al-Hiba 148
- → Lagash

al-Madā’in, Tall 148
- → Badtibira

al-Muqayyar 53
- → Ur 157

a-lu(3\ki) 157
- i, i-lu(3\ki) 157

Alumidatum 295
- a-lu-mi-da-tim(3\ki) 295

al-Wilaya, Tell 111, 132
- al-Willaya, Tell 285
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- Tell al-Wilayah 198
- → Dabrum, → Kesh

’āmī 172
Amanus 46
- KUR a-ma-na-an 46
- KUR am-na-an 46
Amaparagesi 212
- ama-paragi-ge-sî 213
Amarnum 48
- ’ām-ru-num 48
- iš-me-nu-um 48
’ām-za → e₂-mar-za
Ambar-... → Abbar-...

’ām-šum → e₂-me-šum
Amimi 212
- a-mi-mi 213
A.m.i.R.Z.A 266
- → Aza

Ammashu 182
Amorites → Mardu

AmsiHAR 44
- ë₂-am-si-HAR 44
Amurrum
- a-mur-rum₂ 257
- a-mu-ru-um 232
- a-mu-ru-um 256
- → Mardu

A(N[KI]) 219
A(N[ār])um 188
Andul 59
- an-dul,ki 59

A.N[KI] 206, 208, 218, 219
- → Kidingira

A.N[KI].KAR₂ 219
Anshan 25, 50, 51, 107, 122, 124-126, 131, 198, 203, 224, 237, 258, 290, 293, 295, 296
- an-sa-an 125
- an-sa-an,ki 25, 259, 290, 295, 296
- an-sa-na,ki 240
- an-sa-æ-an,ki 125
- an-saxan,ki 259
- → Malyan

A.N[š]ARA₂,ki 59
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antasura</td>
<td>77, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– an-ta-sur-ra</td>
<td>77, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubu</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anzagarduga</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– an-za-gar-(_1)du(_1)-ga</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN.ZA.GAR,(_1) LUGAL</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiak</td>
<td>111, 132, 231, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-pi,(_2)-a-ak(_ki)</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apisal</td>
<td>218, 238, 258, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-bi-sal(_ki)</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-pi,(_4)-sal(_4)(ki)</td>
<td>218, 239, 259, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Muhallaqiya</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apua</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a,(_3)-pu,(_3)-a(_ki)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqar</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Der</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arag</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a,(_2)-ra-ak(_ki)</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragazu</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-ra-ga-zu(_ki)</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arahir</td>
<td>295, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-ra-hi-ir(_ki)</td>
<td>295, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arahtum</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arame</td>
<td>45, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-ra-me(_ki)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ararma(_ki) → Larsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aratta</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Arata</td>
<td>56, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a,(<em>1)-ra-tim(</em>(_{ki)))</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arawa</td>
<td>203, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– /arawa/, /uruwa/, /urua/</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– URUXA(_ki)</td>
<td>201, 203, 206, 210, 211, 218, 221, 223, 237, 238, 258, 259, 259, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– URUXA(_ki)(.A)</td>
<td>203, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardanan</td>
<td>228, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ar-da-na-an(_ki)</td>
<td>229, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arduligi</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ar-du-li-gr(_ki)</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arhadu</td>
<td>183, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ar-ḥa-du(_ki)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arikdin</td>
<td>228, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a-ri,(_1)-i-k-ti-in(_ki)</td>
<td>229, 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Armanum 44, 45, 183
  – ar-ma-nam\textsuperscript{ki} 44
  – ar-wa-num\textsuperscript{ki} 45
  – \(\rightarrow\) Armi(um), Bazi, Banat, Samsat
Armenia 231
Armi(um) 83, 172
  – Armi 99, 107, 170, 171, 173, 175, 183, 185, 188, 190, 298, 299
  – Armium 99, 172
  – ar-mi\textsuperscript{ki} 173
  – \(\rightarrow\) Armanum, Bazi, Banat, Samsat
Arugadu 184, 298
Arzani 231
  – ar-za-n[\textsuperscript{i}] 232
Asarantila 266
  – a-sar-an-ti-la 266
Ashamhul 251
  – a-ša-am-ḫu-ul\textsuperscript{ki} 251
Ashnab 43
  – aš-\textsuperscript{na} 212
  – aš-\textsuperscript{na}-ak\textsuperscript{ki} 43, 212
  – aš-\textsuperscript{na}-na-ak\textsuperscript{ki} 212
Ashnun(\textsuperscript{na}) (?) 264
Ashnuna \(\rightarrow\) Eshnuna
  aš\textsuperscript{te}(AMBAR)\textsuperscript{ki} 157
  – a-sa-ti\textsuperscript{ki} 157
  – ambar\textsuperscript{ki} 157
  – ambar-a\textsuperscript{ki} 157
  a-šu\textsuperscript{ki} 171
Asmar 53, 54, 112
  – \(\rightarrow\) Eshnuna
Assur 7-10, 15, 27, 31, 32, 90, 106, 107, 111, 131, 133
  – Ashur 231, 270
  – a-šur\textsuperscript{ki} 32, 232
Aswad 251
  – Tell Aswad 251
a-ta-am-ḫu-ul\textsuperscript{ki} 251
Atenat 187
  – a-te-na-ar\textsuperscript{ki} 186
a-tu-a\textsuperscript{ki} 249
Atue 260
  – a-tu-e\textsuperscript{ki} 261
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Atume 249
- a-tu-[e] 249
a-ul(ΓIR₂;gunû)(k) 157
- a-ul,(ΓIR₂;gunû)-gal 157
- UL₁,(ΓIR₂;gunû) 157
Awal 111, 124, 126, 132, 231, 232, 258, 260, 261, 263
- a-wa-al(k) 124, 232, 259, 261
- → Suleimah
Awan 15, 16, 23, 24, 106, 107, 111, 123, 125, 126, 237, 285, 290, 293
- a-wa-an(k) 23, 123, 290
Aza 266
- 'aza,(MIR)²(k) 266
Azabum 198, 199, 257
- a-za-bum(k) 199
- a-za-KA(k) 198
- → Azameum
Azahar 295, 296
- a-za-ḥa-arr(k) 295, 296
a-za-la 231
Azameum 257
- a-za-me-um(k) 198, 257
- → Azabum
Azara 257
- a-za-ra 257
Azu 249
- a-za(k) 249
Azuhinum 46, 111
- a-zu-ḥi-nim(k) 46
a-x-kum(k) 251
Babaz 231
- ba-ba-az(k) 232
Babylon 5, 6, 7, 11, 14-16, 46, 132, 133, 136, 195, 249, 302, 303
- KA₂;DIGIR(k) 46
BAD₃(k) 198, 223, 237, 254, 260, 261, 262, 263
- BAD₃(k) 212, 213, 232, 240, 262, 263
- bad₃(k) 198, 225
- bad₃(k) 254
BAD₃(k) 212
- BAD₃(EZEN)(k) 212, 213
Badachshan 181
Badani 262
BAD₃-da-mu-na→ Durdamuna
bad₃-gara/ga-ra 200
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BAD₃, HUGAN → Durhugan
BAD₃, LUGAL → Dursharrim
BAD₃, LUGAL, GAL → Dursharrimrabium

Badlugalzi 238
  – bad₃, lugal-zi ki 240
BAD₃, EN, ZU ki → Dursuen

Badtribira 91, 92, 106, 132, 148, 159, 198-200, 202-204, 210, 211, 218, 223, 237, 264
  – Patibira 148
  – Tibira 218
  – bad₃, dab₃, ra 200, 205
  – bad₃, ti-bi₃, ra 200
  – (bad₃/pa₃), ti-bi₃, ra ki 198, 200, 218, 220
  – ba₃, ti-bi₃, ra ki 220, 265
  – ib bad₃, dab₃, ra 204
  – pa₃, ti-bi₃, ra ki 223, 237, 246, 264, 265
  → al-Madā’in, Tall

Badurab 223
  – bad₃, ur-AB ki 225
Badurenlil 212
  – bad₃, ur-EN, LIL (?), 213
Bagar (?) 236
  – ba-ga-ar 236
  – ba-ga-ra 236
Bagara 189, 299
Bahrain 202
  → Delmum
Bahunia 187, 298
  – Bahunu 189, 299
  – ba-ḫu-ni₃, a ki 186
ba-ḫu-zumu ki 251
Balabat 231
  – ba-la-ba-at ki 232
Balari 260
  – ba-la-r₂, ki 262
Baluchistan 224
ba-na-a-za-NI 231
Banat 83, 99, 111, 183, 185, 298
  → Armī(um), Armanum, Bazi
ban-ga ki → Terga
Banir 221
  – ba-nir/NIR ki 222
Baradan, Tell 111
Barahshum 121, 123, 224, 258, 259
  – Parahshum 107
  – ba-ra-al-si-u, 259
  – → Marhashi, → Jiroft
ba-ra-mu 231
BAR ki 236
Barme(um) 231, 233
  – bar-me-um(ki) 233
Barran 231
  – bar-ra-an(ki) 233
Barzi 260
  – bar-zi(ki) 262
Basar 111
  – → Djebel Bishri
Bashin 258
  – ba-si-in(ki) 259
Bashime → Pashime
Bassetki 96, 109, 111
Bazari
  – Tell Bazari 251
Bazi 83, 99, 111, 183, 185, 298
  – → Armi(um), Armanum, Banat
Batiri 260
  – ba-ti-ri, 262
Bealgullani 260
  – be-al-gul-(la)-ni(ki) 262
Beydar, Tell 100, 175, 176, 251, 304
  – → Nabada
Bi’a 83, 111, 298
  – → Tuttul
Bibara 260, 262
  – bi-ba-ra(ki) 262
BillumGAL 249
  – bil, lum-GAL(ka) 249
BillumTUR 249
  – bil, lum-TUR(ka) 249
Bilzum 260
  – bil, zum(ka) 262
  =bi-ni-im(ka) 261
Biniza-x-x 231
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bi-ni-za-x-x³</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binum</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šINIG³</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biruqt</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-ru-a-at³</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishri → Djebel Bishri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishshum</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-iš-šum³</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismaya</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Adab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitbinim (?)</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂,GEŠ,ŠINIG (?)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitirshum</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-ti-ir-sum³</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitimi’illum</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₁,i-imi-DIGIR³</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bormi, Tappe</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tappeh Bormi</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Huhnuri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brak</td>
<td>55, 105, 106, 109, 110, 112, 298, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Tell Brak</td>
<td>251, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Nagar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU.BU.NA₂</td>
<td>56, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budan</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhza</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu-uḫ₂-za</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulma</td>
<td>295, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu-ul-ma³</td>
<td>295, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgullum</td>
<td>260, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bur-gul-lum³</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burman</td>
<td>171, 182, 183, 188, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bur-ma-an³</td>
<td>171, 182, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busu</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar forest/mountain</td>
<td>42-43, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kur tête-ren</td>
<td>42, 198, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagar Bazar</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choga Mish</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dabal</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-ba-al&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabrum</td>
<td>198, 285, 287, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Tell al-Wilaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daga</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-ga</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalbat</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dal-ba-ad&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalugal</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-lugal&lt;sup&gt;[k]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-na-āš&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniḥ (?&lt;sup&gt;?&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-ni-iḫ (?&lt;sup&gt;?&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darab</td>
<td>171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dar-ab,&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darhati</td>
<td>189, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dašemḫuḫga</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-šemḫuḫga</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-tum&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; → Tadum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delmun</td>
<td>56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 83, 91, 107, 157, 160, 202, 203-204, 205, 211, 212, 223, 237, 253, 254, 258, 264, 267, 267, 297, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Dilmun</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Delmunite</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– delmun</td>
<td>203, 225, 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– delmun&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>203, 205, 225, 240, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– kur delmun&lt;sup&gt;(k)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>203, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delmun-dar-ra-na&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der (ancient city)</td>
<td>50, 51, 65, 91, 132, 191, 202, 203, 211, 228, 258, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– BAD₁,AN&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>202, 205, 212, 228, 229, 259, 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Aşar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der, Tell ed- → ed-Der</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der-ez-Zor</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilbat</td>
<td>83, 111, 132, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dal-ba-ad&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilmun → Delmun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dim-ti-bi-iz-ki-lum</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diyala</td>
<td>51, 57, 58, 60, 83, 90-92, 99, 112, 199, 224, 228, 230, 231, 232, 253, 258, 260, 263, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djebel Aruda</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djebel Bishri</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Jebel Bishri</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djebel Hamrin</td>
<td>63, 64, 157, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Hamrin</td>
<td>224, 232, 238, 261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Jebel Hamrin  224, 231, 238
- → Ebih
Djebel Kawkab
- Jebel Kawkab  251
Djemdet Nasr  53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61, 161
- → NI.RU
Drehem  132, 194
- → Puzrishdagan
DU  187, 298
- DU<sub>ki</sub>  171, 186
Du  222, 223
- du<sub>ki</sub>  222, 223, 225
- du<sub>6</sub>  213, 222
DUAB  203, 266
- du<sub>6</sub>-AB/eš,<sub>3</sub>  206, 266
DUAN.BUGAG.NE  238
- du<sub>6</sub>-AN.BUGAG.NE-ka  240
Dub → Tub(a)
Dubbar  212, 255
- du<sub>6</sub>-babbar,<sub>ki</sub>  213, 256
- du<sub>6</sub>-babbar<sup>3</sup>(-ra)  213
Dubilgamesh  223
- du<sub>6</sub>-bil<sub>1</sub>-ga-mes,<sub>ki</sub>  225
du-bi₂-šum  172
Dudulu → Tuttul
DUGAG  212
- du<sub>6</sub>-GAG<sub>ki</sub>  214
Duka/Dulul  212
- du<sub>6</sub>-ka₂/LUL<sub>ki</sub>  214
dul₁-la<sup>ki</sup>  214
Dulu  168, 172, 183, 185, 299
du<sub>6</sub>/dul-lu<sub>6</sub>,<sub>ki</sub>  214
Dulugalua  238
- du<sub>6</sub>-lugal-u₆-a<sub>ki</sub>  240
Dulik  111
- → Talhadum
(Du-)Mekulaba  203
- (du<sub>6</sub>)me-kul-aba₆(-ta)  203, 206
DUN₃.GAL  232, 236
Dunnnum  214
Dur-Akkad  48
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Durdamuna 236
- BAD₁-dau-mu-naₖᵢ 236
Durdu 189
Durebla 264
- dur-eb-laₖᵢ 265
Durhugan 257
- BAD₂,HU,GANₖᵢ 257
Durliakkade 229, 258
- Dur-liakkkade 279
- BAD₁,DINGIR,a-ga-de₁ 258, 259, 287
Durrabiluma 264
- BAD₂-ra-bi₄-lum 264
Dursharrim (?) 228, 228, 231, 235
- BAD₁,LUGALₖᵢ 228, 229, 231, 232, 235
- BAD₁,LUGAL(GAL)ₖᵢ 232
- BAD₁,LUGAL(GAL) 232
Dursharrimrabium 231
- BAD₁,LUGAL,GAL 231
Dursuen 72, 236
- BAD₁,EN.ZIₖᵢ 236
Durum 198, 225
Durum → BAD₃ₙₖᵢ + Der
- durum?₁[(s)]ₖᵢ 225
Durza(n)ze/i 231, 232
- BAD₁,za-zi/za-an-zeₖᵢ 232
Dusi 188
- du-siₖᵢ 186
Dusira 203, 238
- du₆-sir₄-taₖᵢ 206, 240
Duteme 266
- du₆-teme₃(NAGA-inversum)ₚᵢ (?) 266

E₁[...]
- e₁≤ 223
- e₁≥ 213
- e₁[...]
215
c₂(ₚ)ab-ba-siₖᵢ 225
Eabzusi (?) 223, 235
- e₁-abzu-siₖᵢ 225, 235
- e₁-ab-zu-siₖᵢ 225
E₁,Akashdar 212
- E₁,AK-aš-darₖᵢ 214
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Eammeme (?) 238
- c₂-am-me-me₃ (?) 240, 241

Eandulu 212
- c₁-an-dul-lu₂ 214

c₂-A.NE-ka 206
- → Edurugibil (?)

Eanshe 223
- c₂-anše₃ 225

Eapin 238
- e₃-šapin₃ 240

E.ash/išdamail 212
- e₁-aš/iš-da-ma-il₃ 214

Easterner → sa-ti-um

Ebian 63, 64, 157, 161, 297
- E.TI 161
- → Djebel Hamrin

Ebabar 238
- c₂-babbar₃ 238

Ebarbad 198
- c₁-bar-bad₃ 200

- Ibla 168
- eb-la₃ 225, 241
- eb-la-i₃-tim³ 229
- ib-la₃ 59, 102, 165, 169, 172, 173, 177
- → Mardikh

Edada 212, 223, 278
- e₁-da-da₃ 212, 214, 225

Edamsul 202, 211
- c₁-dam-sul(cla) 202, 206
- → Adam DUN

Edanun 212
- c₂-da-nun 214

Edari 249
- e-dar-ri₃ 249

Ed-Der, Tell 132
- → Sippar

Eden 212, 214, 215, 217, 264
- Edin 214
- eden₄ 158, 214, 215, 265
- TIN₄ 158
Index of Geographical Names

- c₂-eden 158
Edennazagin 237
- eden-na-za-gin₃ 241
Edin → Eden
Edinnu 59
Edimgalabzu 77
- c₂-dimgal-abzu 77
EDU₃pu (?) 258
- c₂-DU₃-pu₃ki 259
c₂-dur-me-me ki 240
c₂-duru₃ki 158, 206
Eduruadda 238
- c₂-duru₃-ad-da₃ki 240
Eduruena 238
- c₂-duru₃-en-na 240
Eduruensi(ka) 223, 238
- c₂-duru₃-ensi₂(ka)₃ki 225, 241
Edurugeshbare 238
- c₂-duru₃-ĝeš-bar-e₃ki 241
Edurugibil(?) 203
- c₂-duru₃-gibil/(gibil'(NE)?) 206
EduruGIRI₂ 238
- c₂-duru₃-GIRI₂(HAL,NI)₃ki 241
EduruiduLUL 238
- c₂-duru₃-i-du-LUL₃ki 241
c₂-duru₃-kab-bi 212
Edurulugaldingira 238
- c₂-duru₃-lugal-diĝir-ra 241
Edurulupada 238
- c₂-duru₃-lu₂-pa₂-da₃ki 241
Edurumah 212
- c₂-duru₃-maḥ₃ki 214
Edurumanu 238
- c₂-duru₃-ma-nu 241
Edurumashzu 266
- c₂-duru₃-maš-zu 266
EdurUNIT₂ensī 198, 238
- c₂-duru₃-NI₂-ensī₂ 200
Edurushabra 238
- c₂-duru₃-sabra₃ki 241
Edurushemush 238
- c₂-duru₃-še-muš 236
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Edurusu/ina 266
- c₂-duru₃-st₄/su₄-na 266
Eduruur-
LAGAB×₁-ka 238
- c₂-duru₃-ur₃-LAGAB×₂-h₂-ka 241
Eduruurpara 238
- c₂-duru₃-ur-para₁₀ 241
Esagna 212
- c₂-c₂-saḡ-na₂
Egaleden(a) 254, 266
- c₂-gal-eden(-na)₃,ki 214, 254, 266
c₂-gal-bahar₃ 266
EgalGANA_uz 212
- c₂-gal-GANA₂-uz₃
EGAM.GAM 212
- c₂-GAM₃,ki 214
- c₂-GAM.GAM₃,ki 214
Egerina 46
- i: cg₂-erin-na 46
EĞES.NAČ 238
- c₂-GEŠ.NAG 241
E₂,GEŠ.SINIG 228, 229
- → Bitbinim
Egypt 3, 6, 98, 135, 181
Egirini 223
- c₂-giri₂-mi₃,ki 225
Egudmeme (?) 238
- c₂-gu₃-me-me₃,(?) 241
EgX₃ 223
- cg₂-X₃,ki 225
EHUB/EKAB 212, 223
- c₂-HUB/KEBA(?)[...] 214, 214, 223, 235
- c₂-kab(-ba)₃,ki 212
Ehush/EHUŠ 212, 238, 254
- c₂-ḫu₃,(ki) 203, 214, 241, 254
- → Ahush
Eigil 203, 238, 255
- c₂-igi-il₃,ki 241, 256
Eigil(eden) 203
- c₂-igi-il₂-edin-na 206
Eiginim 223
- c₂-igi-nim₃,(?) 225
Eil 212
- c₂-il₂ 214
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E₂,imiil 223
- E₂-i-mi-DIĜIRbi 225
- → Bitimí'ilum
E₂,ishdamail → E₂,ash/ishdamail

Ekab → Ehub

c₁(₃)ki-sal,la 208
c₂-kiši 225


- Elamite 206, 206, 225-228, 235, 241, 259, 264, 267
- elam 118, 206, 215, 226, 241, 265, 287
- elambi 23, 24, 42, 46, 102, 123, 124, 125, 146, 206, 241, 259, 267
- c-lam 229, 235
- c-la-me-tum 229
- ELAMbi 146
- ELAM.MA 25
- nim 206, 215, 267

Elanir 238
- c/c₂-la-NIRbi 242
c₁-(lu₂)-a-kum₂-ka 206

Eluqa₂ 223
- c₁-lugal-A₂bi 225

Elugalmeslam 212
- c₁-lugal-mes-lambi 214

Elubu 212, 254
- c₁-lu₂-bu/bubi 214, 254

EluHu 198, 212
ELUH.HU 198, 212
- c₁-LUH-HUBi 200, 215

Emama 212
- E₃-ma-ma₂bi 215

Emar 171, 174
- Imar 182, 183, 190
- i₃-marbi 182, 183, 186
c₂-mar-za/a₃-mar-za 266

E₂,mash tum 212
- E₂-maš-tum(-ma)bi 215
c₂-mesbi 159

E₂,mes hum 249
- E₂-mešum 250
- E₂(KA₂)/a₃-mešum 249, 250

Emluru₃ 235
- c₂,MLURUBi-a 235
EnamDU.DU
- Ena-m-DU.DUki
EN.E/KID₂ → Nippur
Enegi
- ki-en-gi₃
→ Kiengi
en-gi₃
→ Enegi, Karkar, Murum
Eninana
- Enin-an-₃-na₃
Eninmah
- Enin-ma₃-h₃
EninMAR.KI
- Enin-MAR.KI₂
→ Guabba
Enisaba
- En-isaba₂
Enlilegara
- En-lil₂-le-₃-gar-ra₃ iri ki lagas₃
Enlilepada
- En-lil₂-le-pa₃-da₂
EN.LIL₂.KUM₃
En-x-kum
- En-x-kum₃
E₃-pu₃-a₃
Erbil
→ Urbilum
Eren
- E-rë₂(A.KI)
ERE₂₂₂.KI
Eresh
- E-rek₃
→ Abu Salabikh
Eridu
- E-ridu₃
Erim
- Erim₂[NE.RU]₃
E₃-riza.ne
- E₃-riz-a-ne[NE]₃
Erum
- E₃-ru-um₃
E₃.SAG.KI
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esanglu (?)</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₂-saḫ-lu₂-u/x²²</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ešē+ku/nam₂</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₂-šē+ku/nam₂³¹</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esīṭatum</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– E₂-šī-ta-tum⁴¹</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshnuna</td>
<td>7, 32, 54, 56, 57, 83, 90, 111, 112, 124, 126, 131, 132, 212, 228-231, 237, 257, 263, 264, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ashnuna</td>
<td>212, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Eshnunna</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– aš₂-nun⁴¹</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– aš₂-nun-na⁴¹</td>
<td>212, 213, 223, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– aš₂-nun⁴¹/na-ka-ke₄</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– eš₂-nun-na⁴¹</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– iš-nun⁴¹</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– iš-nun⁴¹-im</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– iš-nun-na⁴¹</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Asmar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esīṭummalī</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– e-šīr₂-um-ma-li</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esīsa</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₁-si-sa₂-(a²)</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₂-suḥkal.hu²</td>
<td>200, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₂-sumun.ki</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etilamah</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₂-ti₃₃₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₂₁₃₁₄</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etukuna</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₂-tuk₂-na⁴¹</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etutu</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₂-(d)tu-tu[kt₃]</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphrates</td>
<td>4, 26, 46, 57, 60, 64, 83, 89, 91, 92, 99, 109, 129, 171, 172, 181-189, 298, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– buranun²⁰</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurisin</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₁-ur-isin₂⁴¹</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutu</td>
<td>198, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₁-[d]utu²⁴¹</td>
<td>198, 200, 238, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₂-[x]-du₃⁴¹</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c₂-[x]-g]i</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c₂-[x]-[...]²⁴¹</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₂-x₂⁴¹</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ezēnxsig-[gal]</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– kisig⁴¹</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ezēnxsig²⁴¹/ezēnxu₃⁴¹-gunu²⁴¹ (?)</td>
<td>203, 206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ezurzur 198
  - c₂-zur-zur²ki 200

Fara 5, 33, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 140, 144, 157-161, 191, 206, 210, 213, 218, 221, 222, 277, 297, 299
  - Fāra 61
  - → Shuruppag

Fars 198, 224

GABA²ki 260, 262, 263

Gablul 224
  - gab₂-lu₂-li₂-um 226
  - → Kablul

Gabula 251
  - ūga’₁-bu-la 252
  ţa₂-daggan 216

Gaesh 59
g-a-ga-ba-an²ki → Kakkaban

Gaganishum 237
  - g-a-ga-ni-šum²ki 242
  - → Kanesh

Gagaran 260
  - g-a-ga-ra-an²ki 262

Gahar 267
  - ga-HAR²ki 267

GA₂,KI.ĠEŠGAL 212, 216

GAM.GAM²ki 159

GANₐ₁-rig₀ 218, 219

GANₐ₁-rig₀-GANAₐ₂² (?) 218, 219

GANₐ₂(u)X₁₉₀ba 212
  - GANAₐ₂-u₂⁻X₀-ba²ki 215

GANₐ₂.ÚZ²ki 43

GANₐ₂-x-ra²ki 212, 215

Garaman 184, 298

Garane.ne 123, 238
  - gara₂-ne,ne²ki 123, 242
  - kar₂-de₁,de₁ 123, 242

Garmu 182, 183, 188, 298
  - gar₂-mu²ki 182, 188

Garshana 132, 212

Garta 295, 296
  - ga-ar-ta²ki 295, 296
  - ga-ar-ta²ki 295
– ga-sur₂(ki) 200, 233, 242, 256, 267
– ga-sur₂,šAG(ki) 233
Gaziantep 131, 171, 299
– → Urshu 222
– → Gizuna 222
GēNēsum 177
ĜeS.BAD₂ → Nishbe 2
ĜeS.DU₂,DU₁lugalabzu 254
– ĜeS.DU₂,DU₁-lugal-abzu-a 254
Geshe 61, 212
– ĜeS-ge 159, 216
Geshgedula 212
– ĜeS-ge-dul₁-la(ki) 216
– ĜeS.KIC₂,TI²(ki) 249, 250
– → Kishkattum 2
Geshkulaba, Geshkullab 69, 198
– Škul-aba₂/Ŝkul-kullab₂(ki) 201
– ĜIŠ.KUL₂,AB²(ki) 159
– ĜIŠ.UNU²(ki) 159
– → Kulaba 69
– ĜeS.KUS₂ 201
– ĜeS.MAšene 238
– ĜeS.MAš-e-ne²(ki) 243
Geshme 212
– ĜeS.ME²(ki)/Ŝeš-me²(ki) 216
Ghdairife 106, 111, 132
– → Kuara, Tiwe 2
gi₃-gi/zi₁-NT²(ki) 236
gi₃-ma-ni-e 258
GIN₂-ish 231
– GIN₂-ti²(ki) 233
GIN₂.KI 159
gi₄(ki) 222
Girgilu 212, 254
– gir-gi₂,lu₁/lu₂(mien)(ki) 215
– GIRID₂(KIŠ×KAR₂) 159
Girigesh 238
– gir₁₁,Ŝeš 243
Giritab 111, 132, 218, 221, 222
– gir₁₁-tab²(ki) 222
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Geographical Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- giri,(šid.nun)-tabki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girikal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ĝiri,-kalki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girim,(a.bu.ja.du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ĝirsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ĝir,-su,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ĝir,-su,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- → Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gish-/ğiš-/giš → Gesh-...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gizaza (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gi-za-za (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gi-zi-li,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gizuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- → gaz2,-nun,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gi,-ur,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin Tepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gu,-a,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu,-a,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a-gu,-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guabba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gu,-ab-ba,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- → EninMAR,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guab-x-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gu,-ab-x,-a,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudadanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudamishum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gu,-da-mi-šum,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu,-eb-la,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guedena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gu,-eden-na,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinun (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gu,-i,-nun (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guipiriggendu (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gu,-i,-piriţ-gen,-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu,-iš,dt,ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf (region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu,-ne-sag,-g,ga,ki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gupin</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurgi</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gur-gi</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUR-SAR</td>
<td>68, 69, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUR-SAR&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68, 69, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gur-SAR</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gushur</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gushura</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gušur-ra&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gušin/sušun&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutium, Gutean</td>
<td>4, 5, 14-16, 20, 46, 48, 110, 113-119, 124, 126-130, 194, 204, 224, 226, 228, 229, 236, 237, 238, 242, 267, 268, 281-283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutu</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qūtû</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu-du</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu-ti&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu-ti-e</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu-ti-im</td>
<td>117, 127, 128, 236, 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu-ti-um&lt;sup&gt;(ki)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48, 117, 118, 128, 194, 226, 242, 268, 282, 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu-tu-um&lt;sup&gt;(ki)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>114, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku-ti-im&lt;sup&gt;(ki)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>46, 229, 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guzana</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ḪA.A → Kuara

Ḫa-bu-la              | 252     |
Habiram (?)           | 251     |
ha-bi-ra-am (?)      | 252     |
Habur                | 4, 185, 300 |
Khabur               | 183     |
Haddu                | 175     |
Âa-di<sup>ki</sup>    | 175     |
Hahhum               | 237, 237 |
ha-ah-hu-um<sup>ki</sup> | 243     |
Halab                |         |
Halam                | 228     |
ha-la-am<sup>ki</sup> | 229     |
ha-la-b<sub>(LAM)</sub><sup>ki</sup> | 229     |
→ Aleppo             |         |
Halam → Halab        |         |
Halhawish            | 251     |
ha-ha-wi-iš<sup>[ki]</sup> | 252     |
Halsum               | 185-188, 298 |
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- ḥal-sum 186
- ḥal-sumₖi 186
Hamazi 15, 16, 164, 165, 181, 231, 233, 260, 298
- ḥa-ma-ziₖi 233
- ḥa-ma-zi-tim 262
Hamidi
- Tell Hamidi 251
Hammam al-Turkman 106
Hamrin → Djebel Hamrin
Ḥarbatum 170
Hariri 26
- → Mari
Harran 171, 172, 181, 183, 187, 188, 298
- ḥa-ra-anₖi 171, 176, 186
Harrān-ɐnɪm 233
Harshi 50, 132
Harzu 189, 299
Hashimar 48
- ḥa-si-ma-az₄uₜ 48
Hashshuwa 267
Hashuanum 267, 268
- ḥa-su-a-num₂ 268
- ḥa-su-a-num₂ₖi 268
Hassuwan 171, 172
- Hassuan 183
Ḥazaman 170
Hazuwan(nu) 267
Hidar 251
- ḥi-darₖi 252
Hilazum 251
- ḥi-la-zumₖi 252
- ḥi-la-zī (“GEMₑ”) 252
- ḥi-la-zi-umₖi 252
Hubnum 231
- ḥub₂-nimₖi 233
Hubida/τim 231
- ḥu-b₁₂-da-ni-imₖi 233
- ḥu-b₁₂-ti-nu-umₖi 233
Huburum 203, 238, 258, 267
- girım, 160
- ḥu-bu₄ₙₜ(-rum₂) (?) 268
- [ḥu-bu₄ₙₜ-r]um₂ₖi 259
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– ḫu-bu₂-hu₃-rum₂ 207, 243
– HU.DUR₂, BU 160
HU.DUR₂, BU → Huburum

Huhnuri 50, 125, 126, 132, 237, 290, 293, 296
– ḫu-ḫu-nu-ri₃ 243
– ḫu-uḫ₂-nu-ri₃ 300
– → Bormi, Tappe

Huri 238
– ḫu-ri₃ 243

Hurri 50, 132
– Hurttum 126

Hutim 183, 298

Huzazum (?) 231
– ḫu-za-zum (?) 233

Ḥi₂-am-si-HAR → AmsīHAR

Iarmuti 102
– ia₂-ar-mu-ti₃ 102

Ibal 34, 170, 183, 184, 189, 291, 298
– ib-al₃ 34

Ibbuhila 267
– ib-bu-ḫi-la₃ 268

ib₂-da-gal-la 231

Ibia 198, 221
– i-bi₂-a₃⁴ 200, 222

Ibrat 260
– ib-ra-at₃ 262

Ibrime 228, 229
– ib-ri₂-me₃ 229
– ib-me-ri₂₃ 229

Ibubu 171, 172

Idabalilaba 238
– i₃-da-ba-al-il₂-a-ba₄ 243

Idatukul 238
– i₃-da₃-tukul₃ 243

IG[-] 249, 250

IG₂A 260, 262

IG₂U₃ 293

i₃-i₃-ḫu₃ → a-lu₃ 261

Ilansura 251
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lilanzura</td>
<td>249, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-lib</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-l-lu₃·lu₂·b₃</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i₃·lu₂·N1·lu₂·k₁</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il₂·k₁</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilwum</td>
<td>170, 189, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilptum</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>il₂·p₁·um</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM₃·k₁</td>
<td>159, 198, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karkar</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imarum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ma·ru·um</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imar → Emar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN₃·AN·U·AN</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus</td>
<td>224, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inibu</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ni·bu₃·k₁</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir₃·ba₃·k₁</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irian·k₁</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·AN·k₁</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iriaza</td>
<td>202, 203, 211, 224, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·aza₃·k₁</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·bar·abul·tur·ra(?)</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irigibil</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·gibil</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irigurushne</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·guruš·ne₃·k₁</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iriku</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·ku₃·ga·še₃</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·ku₃·k₁</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·ku₃·u₃·sa₃·na·k₁·(?)·di·k₁</td>
<td>198, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irininurta</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·u₃·nin·urta</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irisag</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·sa₃·k₁</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irisangrig</td>
<td>41, 42, 89, 111, 129, 132, 198, 212, 218, 224, 229, 236, 238, 255, 256, 257, 258, 267, 268, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrakum</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šarrākum</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urusangrig</td>
<td>283-285, 287, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·sa₃·rig₃·</td>
<td>41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·rig₃·rig₃·(DU·HUB₃)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i·ri·sa₃·rig₃·</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- iri-su-gi
  - Uru.sag.rig
  - sa-ra-gum
  - iri-ku

Irritum
- Iritum
- Irrite
- ir-i-tum
- ir-i-tum

Ishan Mizyad
Ishbabum
- iši-ba-bu-um

Ishduba
- iš-dub-ba

Ishim-Shulgi
Ishkarum
- iši-ga-ru-um

Iš-nun(-na/-im) → Eshnuna

Isin
- isin
- i-si-nu
- i-zi-nu

iš-me-nu-um → Amarnum

Itgurda
- it-gur-da

Iturungal

Jebel → Djebel
Jidr
- Tall Jidr
- Karkar

Jiroft
- Marhashi, Parahshum

Jūdī Dagh
- Nīpur

Kablul
- Gablul

Kabsu
- kab-su
- NAG-su
- NAG-su


48, 117, 129, 212, 238
48, 117, 160, 212, 216
48, 216
160
Index of Geographical Names

- NAĜ-su 48, 216
Kabtarenimanizi 266
- kab-ter-enim-ma-ni-zi-da 266
KA.DIMki 238, 243
KA3-Kish- [...] 249
KA3 KIŠ.BI.MU.UT 250
KA3-kiši [...] PU1 [...] (?) 250
Kakkaban 251
- ga-ga-ba-an(â) 252
KA1.meshum 249
- KA2-me-šum 250
Kakmium 34, 35, 175, 183, 184, 187, 188, 298
- kak-mi-um(â) 34, 165, 169, 173, 186, 188
kal-da-aš 2 252
Kalam 202-203
- kalam 207, 211
Kanesh 7, 9-11, 237, 238
- → Kültepe
kar [...] fx(â) 216
Karhar 50
- Karakin 50, 132
kar-,de-,de, → Garane.ne
Kargeshtin(a) 212
- kar-ĝeštin-ta 216
Karkar 64, 129, 159, 194, 197, 198, 224, 226, 285, 301
- IM(â) 198, 226
- Karkar(a) 159
- → Jidr
Karkemish 7, 185, 187, 188
- Karkamish 171, 172
- gar-,ga-mi-î(â) 186
Karkheh 57, 60, 64, 129
kar-KIŠI/UG(â) 202
KarPEŠ2(ê) 202
- kar-PES2(ê)(â) 202
KarsIG4 267
- kar-SIG4(â) 267, 268
kar-UG(â) 202
Karun 57, 60, 64, 129
KAS(â) 257
- KAS(â) 257
KASKAL.NI.UD/NA4(â) 231, 233
# Index of Geographical Names

- → Harranabnim

Kawkab → Djebel Kawkab

(Ka-)Zabum 264

Kazallu 106, 111, 125, 126, 132, 193, 195, 212, 249, 250

- ga-za-lu²ki 250
- ka-zal-ku²ki 125
- ka-zal-lu²ki 216

Kazane 172

Kerman 224

Kermanshah 238

Kesh 56, 59, 61, 63, 87, 89, 127, 131, 157, 161, 192, 193, 197, 198, 203, 284, 285, 297, 300

- Keš 151
- keš_i 159, 200
- keš²ki 127, 200, 284

- → Abu Salabikh, → Tell al-Wilaya

Khafaje 55, 152

- → Tutub

Khuera, Tell 171, 172, 298

- → Abarsal

Khuzistan 198, 202, 203

Ki abrig 59, 203

KLAN 87, 89, 193, 203, 204, 208, 217, 218, 222, 265, 267

- Kidingira 218
- KLAN²ki 203, 208, 219, 226, 266, 268
- ki-diĝir(AN:KI) 219

ki-An.DIŠAN 238, 244

Kibabbar(a) 218, 224
- ki-babbar-ra²ki 226
- ki-UD 219

Kidingira → KLAN

Kiengi 59, 63, 65, 87, 161, 202, 203, 204, 211, 218, 238, 258, 267, 297, 299

- EN.GI.KI 65
- gi-en-ki 59
- ki-en-gi 63, 65, 140, 147, 203, 208, 244, 259, 268
- ki-en-gi²ki 202, 208
- → Enegi

Kies 203

- ki-es³ki 208, 244

Kiessag 238

- ki-es³ki-sağ 244

Kiguru 238

- ki-guru²ki 244
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ki̇har</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-har</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki̇kal</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Rabija</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki̇kal-eden</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇kal-eden</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-mȧri̇</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimash</td>
<td>50, 123, 126, 132, 238, 238, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-mȧš</td>
<td>123, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-mȧš₂</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ki̇-)Nakum</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-na-kum</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṟ-[...n]im</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinunir</td>
<td>203, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-nu-nir</td>
<td>208, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki̇rȧš</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirasheniwe</td>
<td>45, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-rȧše-ni-wė</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkuk</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Gasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirmusu</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– kir-mu-su̇</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisala</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-sal-la</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kis̱ar</td>
<td>212, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-sar</td>
<td>216, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ki̇š</td>
<td>139-145, 147-149, 151-154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇ši</td>
<td>63, 98, 139, 140, 144, 145, 152, 153, 161, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇ši₂</td>
<td>41, 97, 139, 145, 161, 172, 174, 178, 179, 191, 201, 216, 219-220, 236, 244, 254, 262, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ki̇š₂</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇š₂i</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki̇šṯda</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ki̇šṯ₂-da</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishkattum</td>
<td>158, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ĜES.KİT₂,TI</td>
<td>249, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kismar</td>
<td>124, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ki̇-is-ma-aṟ</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisurra</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- → Abu Ḥaṭab

Kīti 228
- gi-tim 229
- ki-te$	extsuperscript{ki}$ 229

Kūd → Kibabbar, Kiuru

Kuṭtu 203, 203, 211, 218
- ki-$	extsuperscript{ki}$utu 203, 208
Kuara 59, 159, 198, 218, 219, 255
- ḤA.A$^\text{ki}$ 59, 159, 198, 212, 219
- kuara$^\text{ki}$ 212

- → A.HA, Tiwe, Ghdairife

KU.KI.NI.GUB$^\text{ki}$ 238, 238, 244
Kulaba 59, 63, 65, 161, 198, 223, 260, 297
- Kulab 158
- gu$_1$-la-ab 260, 26
- $^\text{bu}$kul-aba$^\text{ki}$ 158
- $^\text{bu}$kul-aba$_4$ 158
- $^\text{bu}$ku-la-ba$^\text{ki}$ 158
- GIŠ.KUL$_1$.AB$^\text{ki}$ 159
- → Geshkulaba, → Kunkulaba
kul-ba-an$^\text{ki}$ 163

Kültepe 7-11, 14, 15, 31
- → Kanesh

Kunkulaba 65
- kun-kul-ab 168
- KUN-kul-aba$^\text{ki}$ 158
- KUN-$^\text{bu}$kul-aba$_{4}$$^\text{ki}$ 158
- GI-ku-la-ba$_4$$_{ki}$ 158

Kunshalim 251
- ku-un-sa$_2$.lim 252
kur 203
- KUR bu-u$h_2$.za 251
- kur $^\text{bu}$eren 199, 201
- kur’ ga-ga-ba-an$^\text{ki}$ 252
Kurban 172
KUR.GES.GI$^\text{ki}$ 212
- → Abu Salabikh

Kussiat 231
- Kussi’ār 233
- gu-zi-ad$^\text{ki}$ 233
- ku$_p$.si$_r$.at$^\text{ki}$ 233

Kut el-Imara 152
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Names</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kutha</td>
<td>49, 56, 57, 65, 106, 111, 132, 159, 198, 199, 224, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu₂-du₁-a₃ki</td>
<td>49, 200, 226, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu₂-da-im₂ki</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labanae</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-ba-na-₃ki</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagaš</td>
<td>87, 115, 120, 121, 140-143, 145-151, 154, 271-273, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laga₂ki</td>
<td>35, 36, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 85, 110, 120, 123, 208, 222, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.BUR.NU₁₁</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– lagas₃(NU₁₁.BUR)₃ki</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ al-Ḫiba</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahrum</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-ah-ru-um₂ki</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAK159₃ki</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAK501/RÉC314₃ki</td>
<td>238, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalabum</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laluri</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– la-.lu-ri₂ki</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamashum</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– la-ma-šum</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larak</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ararma₂ki</td>
<td>200, 203, 213, 225, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Senkere</td>
<td>251, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late/ihi</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– la-te-[ḫi₂ki]</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-x₂ki</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>46, 106, 107, 111, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– KUR la-ab-na-an</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leilan</td>
<td>16, 106, 111, 112, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Tell Leilan</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Shehna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilabshinum</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– li-la-ab-si-num₂ki</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilanzura</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– li-la-an⁻zu⁻¹⁻r[a₂ki]</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.I.I.I.KI</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Zab</td>
<td>231, 231, 234, 238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Luatum
   - lu,[a]-rum
   LUGAL-[a]EN.ZU
   LUL ¦ Lullubum
Lullubum, Lullubean
   - lu-lu-bi-im
   - lu(?)-lu-bu
   - lu-lu-bu
   - lu-lu-bu-um
   - lu-lu-bu
   - lu-lu-bu-um
   - lu-lu-bu
   - lul
   Luluha(?)
   - lu-lul-a/ha
Lummagirnunta
   - lum-ma-gir,-nun-ta
Lumnan
   - lum-na-an
   Lumnan
   - lum-na-an
   Lurim
   - lu-ri-im
   LU,[SU ¦ Shimashki

Mabarra
   - ma,-bar-ra
   MABU
   - ma,bu
   Madga
   - ma-ad-ga
   Magan
   - ma,-gan
   Malgash
   - ma-al-ga-aš
   Malyan, Tall-e
   - Anshan
   Manishtishu
   - ma-an-iš-[i-s]u
   MANU,[[...
   - ma,NUN,[[...
   MANU,BUR,MUŠEN
   - ma,NUN,BUR,MUŠEN
   Manuwat
   - ma-nu-wa-ad
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Marada
- mara\(\text{ki}\)
- mara\(\text{-da}\text{ki}\)
Marda
- mar-da\(\text{ki}\)
Mardaman → Maribadan
Mardikh
- → Ebla
Mardu
- mar-da-tum (?)
- MAR.\(\text{Du}_{3}/\text{TU}\)
- mar-du\(\text{2}\)
- MAR.\(\text{TU}\)-am
- mar-tum
- → Amurrum
Marhashi
- mar-\(\text{ḫa-ši}\text{ki}\)
- mar-\(\text{ḫa-ši-ne}\)
- → Barahshum, → Jiroft
Mari
- ma-ri\(\text{2}\text{ki}\)
- → Hariri
Maribadan
- Mardaman
- ma-ri-ba-da-an\(\text{ki}\)
MAR.KI
Marrut
- mar-ru-ut\(\text{ki}\)
Martu → Mardu
Maru (ma-uru\(\text{x4a}\text{ki}\))
- ma-ru\(\text{4}(\text{uru}\text{x4a})\text{ki}\)
- ma-ru-um\(\text{ki}\)
maš-bar-ra\(\text{ki}\)
Mašeg\(\text{9}\)
- ma-šeg\(\text{9}\text{ki}\)
MA.SIR.BUR.MUŠEN\(\text{9}\text{ki}\)
Mashkan
- → Ebla
Mashkandurebla
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- maš-gan₂-BAD₁-cb-la 234
Mashkanensi₂
- maš-ga-ni-ensi₂ 245
Mashkanga'im 228
- maš-gan-ga-im 230
Mashkangal 231
- maš-gan₂-GAL/-gan₂-GAL ki 234
Mashkangibil 231
- maš-gan₁(GIBIL) ki 234
- maš-ga-nim-GIBIL ki 234
Mashkaniliakkade 287
- Maskan-ili-Akkad 117
- Mashkan-iliakkade 287
- Mashkan-ili-Akkade 287
- maš-gan₁,ni-DINGIR-a-ga-de,ki 116, 117, 287
Mashkanpusha 238
- maš-gan₂-pu₁-[ša₁] (? ) 245
Mashkanshapir 132, 254
- maš-ga-niš-SABRA 255
Mashkansharrim 124, 126, 132
- maš-gan₁-LUGAL ki 124
Mashkantur 231
- maš-gan₁,TUR 234
- maš-gan₂-TUR ki 234
Mashkanum 228-230
- maš-ga-niš 230
- maš-gan/ga-an ki 262
- maš-gan₁ ki 234
Mashpada 212
- maš-pa₁-da ki 216
Mashepada 235, 255
- maš-e-pa₁-da ki 235
Masiga 238
- ma₁-sig-ga ki 245
ma-ta URUXA ki 201
ma-tu ELITU 199
ma-URUXA ki-ta 201
ma-ši ki 201
Maza 261, 262
- ma-za ki 262
Mediterranean 218
Meluhha 107, 123, 227, 237, 238, 245, 254, 258, 267, 300
- me-luḫ-ḫa 227, 245, 259, 268
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesemu(a)</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-e-mu₂ki</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-si-mu₂a₃ki</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min/tab.ab.ki</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishime → Pashime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Diyab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Tell Mohammed Diyab</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozan</td>
<td>106, 111, 112, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Urkesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubi/nikura</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mu-bi-kur-ra</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUG₃ki</td>
<td>212, 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → ZADIM₃ki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugdan</td>
<td>48, 49, 111, 203, 249, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mug-da-an₃ki</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Umm-el-Jir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhallaqiya</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Apisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munbaqa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Tell Munbaqa</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNUS.NEMUR₂ki</td>
<td>212, 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mur</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Muur</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mu-ur₃ki</td>
<td>173, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murum</td>
<td>159, 198, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUŞ₃ki</td>
<td>228, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUŞ₃ki</td>
<td>203, 208, 210, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Zabalam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushbiedena</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– muš-bi-eden-na</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUŞ₃,KUR₃ki</td>
<td>238, 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MutURU×A.ŠE₃[...]</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mu-URU×A.ŠE₃[...]</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabada</td>
<td>83, 163, 175, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– na-ba₂₂₂da₃ki</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– na-ba-ti-um₃ki</td>
<td>175, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– nu-ba-ti-um₃ki</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Beydar, Tell</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabu</td>
<td>189, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naeshdua</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– na-eš-du₂₂₂a₃ki</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagar</td>
<td>35, 83, 99, 105-107, 112, 163, 168, 175-177, 179, 181, 183, 185, 190, 232, 251, 257, 298-301, 304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- na-gar\textsuperscript{ki} 35, 175, 177, 252
- → Brak

NAGAR\textsuperscript{ki} 257

NA\textsuperscript{gsu} → Kabsu

NA\textsuperscript{gsudurgenna} 212
- NA\textsuperscript{gsu}-dur-gen-nu\textsubscript{2}-a 216
NA\textsuperscript{gsukargeshtin} 212
- NA\textsuperscript{gsu} kar-ĝeštin 217
- → Kargeština

Nahi 171
- na-ḫi\textsuperscript{ki} 171
na-ḫur\textsuperscript{ki} 252
Nakum 231
- na-kum\textsuperscript{ki} 234
Namari 261
- na-ma-ri\textsuperscript{ki} 262
Namezi(ga)na 249, 250
- na-me-zi-(ga-)na\textsuperscript{ki} 251
Namiri 238
- nam-iri\textsuperscript{ki} 245
NAMMAR.NI 224
- nam-MAR.NI\textsuperscript{ki} 227
Namzium 263
- nam-zi-im\textsuperscript{ki} 264
Nangnashshe 224
- na\textsuperscript{ḏ}-našč\textsuperscript{ki} 227
na-x-x 252
na-zi-ga-na\textsuperscript{ki} 250
- → Namezi(ga)na

NEN\textsuperscript{aš} 168
Nerebtum 228
Neria 186
- NE-ri\textsubscript{2}-a\textsuperscript{ki} 186
Nibūde 231
- ni-BU-de\textsubscript{1}-um\textsuperscript{ki} 234
Nibulmat 295
- ni-bu-ul-ma-at\textsuperscript{ki} 295
Nihisha 258
- ni-ḫi-ša\textsuperscript{ki} 259
Niligau 189, 299
NIM → Elam
NIM ensi\textsubscript{2} 267
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N[IM]-x 215
Ningen 65, 68, 91, 92, 126, 132, 203, 204, 207, 208-209, 211, 238, 239
  – ningenki 68, 208, 246
  – nina 246
Nineveh 55, 106, 111
  NIN 238, 245
Ninibshinum 251
  → Lilabshinum
NL.Nili 261
  – NL.Nili 263
Nippur 15, 16, 38, 39, 41-49, 56-65, 83, 86-93, 95, 97, 99, 102-107, 109,
   111-113, 117, 124, 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 140, 145-149, 151,
   157, 159, 161, 191, 193, 199, 201, 202-204, 208, 211-212, 217,
   218, 220, 223, 224, 228, 228, 235, 238, 240, 244, 245, 246, 253,
   254, 255, 256, 264, 265, 266, 267, 258, 273, 277, 283, 285, 297,
   299-304
  – EN.E2/KID  56
  – nibruki 42, 44, 47, 124, 158, 201, 208, 217, 235, 255, 267, 269
  –  nibruki 227
  – nibr 46, 86, 220
Nipur 158
  → Jūdi Dagh
Nirar 181, 298
  – NIRA  169
  → Tuqan
NIRI  186
  → Djemdet Nasr
Nishbe 231
  – ČEŠ.BAD  231, 233
  – nišš-bad/be  233
NITZA  172, 174
Nushganelum 293, 294
  → Nushganelnum  296
  – nu-us-ga-ne-lum  295
Nushshmar 295, 296
  – nu-su-us-ma-ak  295
  – nu-us-ma-ak  296
Nutur 83, 132
  → Obeid
Obeid 83, 132
  → Ubaid  198
  → Nutur
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orontes</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad.an.muš (?</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paenku</td>
<td>203, 208, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-lugal</td>
<td>267, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-lugal.ki</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-piriği</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-nu</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-piriği.ki</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashemush</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashime</td>
<td>91, 106, 122, 131, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashime.ki</td>
<td>240, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashime.ki</td>
<td>240, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashime.ki</td>
<td>240, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashime.ki</td>
<td>240, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashime.ki</td>
<td>240, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parahshum</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasiga</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashemush</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pašemush</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pašemush</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasir</td>
<td>203, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patibira</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patibira.ki</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauza</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauza.ki</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauza.ki</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pir Hüssein</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugdan</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugdan.ki</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursitan</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursitan.ki</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursitan.ki</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pus</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzrishdagan</td>
<td>132, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzrishdagan.ki</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatna</td>
<td>228, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra’a’ak</td>
<td>171, 182, 183, 188, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra’a’ak.ki</td>
<td>169, 171, 172, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabija</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramhormoz</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]i-da-an-na</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru.La</td>
<td>199, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’aru</td>
<td>187, 189, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ša-a,-ru</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabue</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– sa-bu-e</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabum</td>
<td>231, 237, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa₃-du</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– sa-dam</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadur</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– sa-du-ur</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saG-[*]</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saG-ri,g,-ne</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Irisangrig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saG-ub → Sangub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahardutaka</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– sah-ar-du,-tak,-a</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.Pirig.Tur</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarra</td>
<td>105, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsat</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Armanum, Arm(i)um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanabzugum</td>
<td>171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Šanapzugum</td>
<td>183, 187, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– sa-nap-zu-gum</td>
<td>171, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangub</td>
<td>44, 46, 49, 111, 203, 212, 232, 238, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– saG-ub</td>
<td>217, 246, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– saG-ub₂/ub₁/ub₂(EZENXHAL)</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguburuxud</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– saG-ub-uruxud</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– saG-ub-uru</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar'anum</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– za-ar',num₂</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → zar₃,ar'-ne/ni-um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarhu</td>
<td>183, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpol-i-Zohab</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-ti-um</td>
<td>224, 227, 228, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senkere</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Larsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabunum</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ša-ab-bu-nu-um</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Shadab 183, 187, 298
  – ša-dah₄ki 186
Shadan 257
  – ša-da-an 258
Shaguab-x-a 251
  – ša-gu₃-ab-x-a₃ki 253
ŠAH₄ki 230
Sharhu 186

Sharrakum → Irisangrig

Shashrum 50, 132
  → Shemshara

Shatazala 231
  – ša-at-a-za-la 234
Shatilu 295, 296
  – ša-ti-lu₃ki 295, 296
Shatmarim 249
  – ša-at-DUMU.NINTA₃ki 249, 250
(Shat-)Sharratum (?) 257
  – (ša-at-)šar-ra-tum 258
  – sa-at-NIN 258
Shattutu 249
  – ša-at-₄tu-tu 250
Shat-x-x-AN 228
  – ša-at-[x-x]-AN₄ki 228, 230
Shaumu 174
ša-[x-g]u₄-ab-x₃ki 253
ŠEG₉da 257
  – ŠEG₉-da₃ki 258

Shehna 106, 107, 111, 112, 251, 253, 304
  – še₃-eh-na₃ki 253
  → Leilan
ŠEM.SAR₃ki 257, 258, 258
  – šim-sat₃ki 258
Shemshara 51, 131, 132, 228
  → Shashrum

ShenAMi(n)da 46, 111, 238, 238, 263
  – še₃-NAM-i₁-da₄ki 264
  – še₃-NAM-in-da⁻₁(a)₃ki 45, 246
Sheneglugalabzu 254
  – ṃŠeneg-lugal-abzu₃ki 255
Sherihum 107, 122
ši-ba-la-ba-at₃ki 232
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šid-bar</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šid-bar(-)ib&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šID.NIR[(NUN+NUN)&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;]</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šID.NUN&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>218, 220, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– gaz₂-nun&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šID.NUN.TAB&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Girtab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ši-G1N₂-i&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šILUM</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimanum</td>
<td>32, 41, 50, 51, 131, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimashki</td>
<td>23-26, 51, 125, 126, 131-133, 160, 289-291, 293, 294, 296, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Šimaški</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– si-maš-ku-u&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– si-ma-aš-ki</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– si-maš-šu-u&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– si-maš-ki-u&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ši-maš-ki-im&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ši₂-maš-ki-im&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– LU₂.SU</td>
<td>294, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– LU₂.SU&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>295, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– LU₂.SU(a)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šim-sar&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>224, 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shitulnishe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– si/ši-tu-ul-ni-še&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>227, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuala</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– šu-a-la&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuashtakal</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– su₂-a-aš₂-da-gal&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-{(x)}-ENGUR</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu'-be-lum</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shubur, ŠUBUR&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt; → Subir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-ID₂</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠUKU.INANNA</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šUL&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šul-lum&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumu</td>
<td>261, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– šu-mu&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuragarru</td>
<td>183, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuruppag</td>
<td>56, 57, 61, 63-65, 69, 83, 106, 111, 132, 157, 160, 161, 191, 198, 199, 202, 212, 218, 221, 224, 238, 244, 246, 258, 267, 297, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Šuruppak</td>
<td>140, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Šuruppag&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>198-202, 217, 220-227, 246, 259, 269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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– → Fara
šušin\textsuperscript{ki} → Susa
Shushtar 125
Shu-x-x 253
– šu-x-[x]-x\textsuperscript{ki} 253
Siba\textit{NI} 236
– [\textit{s}]-ba-NI\textsuperscript{ki} 237
Sidalu 34
– si-da-\textit{lu}\textsuperscript{ki} 34
Sidarin 186, 187
– si-da-\textit{ri}-\textit{in}\textsuperscript{ki} 186
Sidau 189
SI.GA.KI 160
SIG\textsubscript{4} akšak (\textit{ti}) 212
– SIG\textsubscript{4} akšak,\textit{ki} 212, 213, 217
Sigrish 293, 294
– si-ig-\textit{ri}-\textit{iš}\textsuperscript{ki} 295
– si-ig-\langle\textit{ri}\rangle-\textit{iš}\textsuperscript{ki} 296
sila\textsubscript{4} TUR\textsuperscript{ki} 160
Simurrrum 42, 45, 50, 51, 106, 107, 111, 125-127, 129, 132, 154, 231, 238, 240
– si-mu-ru-um\textsuperscript{ki} 246
– si-mur-um\textsuperscript{ki} 42
– si-mu-ur\textsubscript{4} 45
– si-mu-ur\textsubscript{4}-\textit{ri}-\textit{im}\textsuperscript{ki} 45, 127
– si-mu-ur\textsubscript{4}-\textit{ri}-\textit{im}\textsuperscript{ki} 45
– si-mu-ur\textsubscript{4}-\textit{ri}-\textit{u}\textsuperscript{ki} 234
– Sippar-Amnanum 132
– Sippar Jahrurum 132
– Zimbir 63, 157, 161
– zimbi\textsuperscript{ki} 255, 258, 263
– → ed-Der, Tell; Abu Habba
Sirim 229
– si-ir-im\textsuperscript{ki} 230
Sirwan 51
si/ši-tu-ul-ni-še\textsuperscript{ki} → Shitulnishe
Siwan 8
Subarean → Subartu
Subartu 56, 111, 199
– Subarean 199, 217, 224, 224, 227, 230, 246, 250
Subir 46, 106, 107, 199, 203, 211, 212, 224, 228, 238, 249, 254, 299
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Names</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shubur</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su-bir</td>
<td>217, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su-bir₂-a, SU.BIR₄-A</td>
<td>201, 227, 227, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su-ba-ri₁-u₃/im/tum/um</td>
<td>230, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣubur</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣUBUR₃</td>
<td>46, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudad</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sud-ağ₂</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU.KI</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaimaniyah</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suleimah</td>
<td>111, 126, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Suleimah</td>
<td>198, 228, 231, 238, 260, 261, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Awal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulum</td>
<td>203, 231, 238, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su₃-lum</td>
<td>209, 231, 234, 246, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Zulum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumer</td>
<td>197, 199, 202-203, 204, 207, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ kalam, → ki-en-gi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su-mu-na-an-um</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ su-mu-na-ni-um</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surbabu</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ sur-ba-bu₃ki</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surbu</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ su-ur-bu₃ ki</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgal</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ su-ur-gal₃ ki</td>
<td>250, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sur₃-gal</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ utul₂-gal₃ ki</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgula</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ sur-gu-la</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surkhegan, Tepe</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ AdamDUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MUŠ₃,EREN₃ | 25, 266 |
- šušin(MUŠ₃,EREN)₃, šušun₃ | 123-125, 209, 238, 247, 290 |
- susin(MUŠ₃,EREN)₃ | 209 |
- su-sin₂ ki | 258, 259, 265 |
- su-si-num₂ ki | 267, 269 |
- su-ti-ig ki | 186 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tab. Ab&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab+Ab/Ab.Bar.Tab</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta(?)-bu-la</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadum</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-tum&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talhadum</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Dülük</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallani</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– tal-la-ni&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall-i Malyan → Malyan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Jdr → Jdr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmush</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tappeh Bormi → Bormi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taqdash</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– taq-da-aš&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrishuha</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– tar-ri₃(Uru×Tar).šu-ḫa&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell... → see name without “Tell”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tello</td>
<td>35, 58, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Girsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terga</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ter-ga&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>230, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terbabil</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ter-ba-bil₄(la)&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiabbar</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibira → Badtibira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiginau</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-gi-na-ur&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigris</td>
<td>9, 46, 57, 60, 64, 83, 90-92, 99, 109, 129, 131, 152, 159, 240, 284, 297, 299, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– IDIGNA&lt;sup&gt;ri&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– IDIGNA&lt;sup&gt;as/sx&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikrit</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilbeshar</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-me&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timti</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-im-ti&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirash</td>
<td>203, 209, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-ra-ša&lt;sup&gt;½&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirabban</td>
<td>228, 230, 231, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-ra-ba-an&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-ra-ba-ni-um</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Name</td>
<td>Page Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirmium</td>
<td>295, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ti-ir-mi-umki</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titris</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titris Höyük</td>
<td>110, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwe</td>
<td>106, 111, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Kuara, Ghdairfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transtigridian</td>
<td>199, 228, 231, 238, 249, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tub(a)</td>
<td>173, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Dub</td>
<td>182, 183, 188, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du-ubki</td>
<td>173, 182, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Umm el-Marra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuba</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ A.HA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuqan</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Nirar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur Abdin</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttul</td>
<td>4, 83, 105, 107, 111, 163, 171, 174-176, 237, 238, 240, 257, 298, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Dudulu</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du-du-a^i</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du-du-la^ki</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du-du-la-a^ki</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du-du-la-lu^ki</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du-du-lu^ki</td>
<td>171, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du-du-ul^ki</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du11-du11-ul^ki</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu-tu-l^i[23]</td>
<td>175, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Bi’a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutub</td>
<td>45, 46, 64, 83, 96, 106, 111, 124, 126, 132, 152, 212, 228, 231, 260, 263, 268, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu-tu^i</td>
<td>45, 230, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu-tu-ub^ki</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu-tu-ub1^i</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Khafaje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTUR.MUŠEN</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.ad.u^ki</td>
<td>238, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB → Umma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubaid → Obeid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubium</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u₁-bi₂-um^ki</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uda</td>
<td>261, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u₂-da^ki</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UD.AB 158
UD.NINTA\(ki\) 59
U₃.dupu/tul 238
  – u₃.du₃-pu₃/tul₂ 247
U₃.dutura 238
  – u₃.du₃-tur-ra 247
Uga 218
  – u₃-ga\(ki\) 220
UM\(ki\) 203, 210
  – UM-ra 210
U₃.mardu(ne) 203, 238
  – u₃.mar-du₂(ne\(ki\)) 209, 247
Umma
  – UB 59
    – ub-me\(ki\) 146
    – umma\(ki\) (\(\text{GEŠ.KUŠU}_2\)\(ki\)) 31, 36, 40, 74-77, 79-81, 94, 118, 123, 127, 146, 206, 210, 217, 220, 227, 247, 255, 256, 259, 266, 267, 269, 287
    – umma\(ki\) 201
    – umma(\(\text{GEŠ.(KUŠU}_2\)\(ki\)) 36, 75
    – umma(\(\text{GEŠ.KUŠU}_2.KASKAL\)\(ki\)) 43
    – umma₂(\(\text{GIŠ.KUŠU}_2.KASKAL\)\(ki\)) 154
    – umma₂(\(\text{ŠAR}_3×\text{DIŠ}\)) 77, 78, 80
    – umma₂(UB.ME)\(ki\) 202
Umm al-Aqarib 64
Umm al-Hafriyat 111, 116, 117, 287
Umm al-Wawiyya 198
Umm el-Jir 48, 49, 111
  – → Mugdan
Umm el-Marra 182
  – → Tub(a)
UNKEN\(ki\) 158
unu\(ki\) → Uruk
Unubu 188
  – u₃.nu-bu\(ki\) 188
unug\(ki\) → Uruk
Uqair 53, 56, 57
  – → Urum
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- urim₁₃ (\(= \text{ŠEŠ.UNUG}^{13}\)) 121, 146, 217, 224, 227, 248, 290, 295
- urim₂₁₀ (\(= \text{ŠEŠ.AB}^{13}\)) 28, 59, 124, 125, 131, 145, 158, 160, 248, 255, 267, 269
- \(\rightarrow\) al-Muqayyar

Ura’(um) (?) 228
- u-ra-ni/i₁⁻im ki 230

Urbilum 50, 129, 132
- \(\rightarrow\) Erbil

Uri 89, 238
- Warium 89
- uri 247
- \(\rightarrow\) Akkad

Uri 261
- u₂-ri₂ ki 263

Urig 261, 263
- u-ri₂-ig₂ ki 263

Urkeš 106, 107, 111, 112, 228, 251
- ur-keš₂ ki 253
- \(\rightarrow\) Mozan

UR-na-ŠAR₂×GAD (?) 253

Uršaum 183, 298
ur-ša 253

Uršu 131, 298
- Urshaum 171
- \(\rightarrow\) Gaziantep

Urtur 203
- ur-tur₂ ki 210

ur₂ \(\rightarrow\) URU₂×UD₂ ki

Urua(z’a) 160, 297
- URU₂-az-za 63
- uru₂-az-za 158, 160
- iri₂-az-za 158, 160
- uru₂-aš₂ ki 158
- \(\rightarrow\) Iriaz

URU₂×A 160, 269
- uru₂’a 154
- URU₂×A₂ ki 42, 63, 91, 93, 106, 297
- uru₂š₈ 158
- uru₂š₈ ki 158
- ar-u₂ ki 158

URU₂×A/lu₂-AN₂×AN₂ ki 158

Urub 203, 210, 238
- urub(URU₂×GAN₂-tenû)₂ ki 207, 210, 248
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URUDUKI 257, 258
URUKI 159
– unuKI 41, 48, 63, 81, 85, 88, 114, 117, 159, 161, 198, 201-203, 210, 217, 221, 222, 224, 227, 228, 230, 238, 247, 255, 256, 264, 265, 267, 269
– unug 140
– unugKI 145-147, 247, 255, 284, 291
– UNUGKI 146
→ Warka
URUKI (?) 238, 248
uru-kun-sa-naKI 200
Ururn 53, 56, 57, 65, 132, 161, 198
→ Uqair
Ururasangrig → Irisangrig
URU+TAR.HAR.S[1...] 237
URUXTILKI 224, 227
URUXUDKI 212, 212, 217, 253, 253, 255, 258, 260, 267, 269
– uru2(URUXUD) 158
Ušarum 125, 132
– uš-ša-ru-unKI 125
Utigu 183, 298
– Utik 187
– uš-ti-ikKI 186
utulu-galKI → Surgal
Uzla 231
– uz-laKI 234
Wagalat 261
– wa-ga-la-adKI 263
Warium → Uri
Warka 53
→ Uruk
Wazarum 261, 263
– wa-zA-ru-unKI 263
Wilaya → al-Wilaya
XII. ABKI 222
XII.inana 212
– XI.inana 217
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x-bu-la</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x-stu</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmutti</td>
<td>106, 107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zab → Lower Zab**

**Zabalam**

- *Zabala(m)* 147, 148, 150
- zabalam 80
  - zabalam,\(^{ki}\) (= MUŠ,\(^{unug}\)) 46, 201, 221
  - zabalam,\(^{ki}\) (= MUŠ,\(^{unug}\)) 38, 39, 77, 221, 248, 255
  - AB.MUŠ,\(^{la}\)\(^{ki}\) 221, 256, 265, 266, 269
  - AB.MUŠ,\(^{ki}\) 265
  - zabalam,\(^{MUŠ}\)\(^{ki}\) 208, 210
  - za-ba-rum\(^{ki}\) 186
  - za-ba-rum\(^{2}\) 186

Zabshali 50, 132, 293-296

- za-ab-ša-li\(^{ki}\) 293, 295

Zabu 189

Zabum 232, 234, 261, 264, 265

- za-bi-im 234
- za-bum\(^{2}\) 265

Zabum 234, 261, 265

(Ka-)Zabum 265

ZADIM\(^{ki}\) 212, 216

- → MUG\(^{ki}\)

Zagros 199, 224, 224, 228, 231, 237, 238, 240, 258, 260, 264, 267

Zahara 46, 123

- za-ḫa-ra\(^{ki}\) 46

Zahiran 171, 186-188, 298

- za-ḫi-ra-an\(^{ki}\) 171, 186

za-NE-zu (مادة) 253

Zaran 261

- za-ra-an\(^{ki}\) 283
  - zar,\(^{3}\)-a,-ne-um 176
  - zar,\(^{3}\)-a,-ni-um 176

Zaratum 249

- za-ra-tim 250

zar,\(^{3}\)-ba-\(^{3}\) 157

- za-ra-ba-ad\(^{ki}\) 157

- ASAL₅(TUGABA.LIS)\(^{ki}\) 157
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zi-ba-na-ba₁, 172
– zi-ba-na-baᵻ, 174
Zibanum, Zibanum 228
– zi-ba-nim 230
Zidana 296
– zi-da-na 296
Zimani 258
– zi-ma-niᵻ 260
Zimanu 187, 298
– zi-ma-nuᵻ 186
zimbiᵻ → Sippar
Zimudar 124, 126, 132
– zi-mu-daᵻ 124
Zinae 237
– zi-na-eᵻ 237
Zizirtum 295, 296
– zi-zi-ri-tumᵻ 295
Zuburi 249
– zu-bu-riᵻ 250
Zugulu 188
– zu-guᵻ-lu 188
Zulum 249, 258
– zu-lumᵻ 246, 250, 260
– → Sulum
Zumuhdur 251
– zu-mu-u-hᵻ-ruᵻ-durᵻ 253
Zumunan 171
– zu-mu-na-anᵻ 171
zu-wa-riᵻ 171
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The index includes references to rulers, but also to persons that play a role in prosopography, such as key figures of archives of dossiers. For gentilizia and names possibly interpreted as geographical names see the Index of Geographical names.

Variants of the same name both in ancient and in modern spelling are grouped under one main entry. This should allow to compare easily various traditions of rendering names.

For the alphabetisation note that – mostly in transliterations –
– aleph (א), index numbers, hyphens or other diacritics (like ×) are not considered
– syllables written Cv-vC are taken as representing CvC (e.g. ba-ab- as bab...)
– š = sh, ĝ = g
– → cross references

A'anepada 142, 144
– Aya'anepadda 142, 144
– aya₂-an-ne₂-pad₂-da 142
A'anzu 142, 153
– Aya'anzud 142, 153
– aya₂-An₂Zu₂, M₁mien 142
Abaelnil 193, 299
a-ba-mu-na-ab-dim₁ 79
– a-ba-mu-na 79
Abba 292
Abieshuh 133
a-bil₂₃-ki-in → ḫa-bil-ki-in
Abisare 133
a-bu₁-gar₁ 164
a-bur-li-im 163
– a-bur-GIM 163
Abzukidu 63
Adana 73
– a-da-na 73
Adubdamu 165
– a-dub-da-mu 163
a-gur-li-im 163
Ahuwaqar 292
– Aḫu-waqqar 292
Akalamdu 142, 144
– Aya'uĝedug 142, 144
– aya₂-uḡ₃-dug₃ 142
Akiya 31, 32
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akka</td>
<td>141, 149, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aka</td>
<td>141, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AK</td>
<td>141, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ak-a</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ak-ka</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ak-ka₃</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akka’ın’anakak</td>
<td>141, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ak-ın-anak₃(MUŠ)</td>
<td>141, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AK’nts’tar</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akurgal</td>
<td>68, 75, 82, 84, 142, 148, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ayakurgal</td>
<td>68, 142, 144, 148, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a-kur-gal</td>
<td>68, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a-kur-gal</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- aia₂-kur-gal</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- aya₂-kur-gal</td>
<td>142, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alla</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- al-la</td>
<td>31, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-mu</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amae</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘a₁₃-ma-na → en-ma-nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaparagesi</td>
<td>37, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ama-par₁₀-si</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAR.AN → Mara’il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amargirid</td>
<td>109, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Amar-Girid</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarsuena</td>
<td>25, 29-32, 41, 51, 119, 131, 132, 136, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Amarsuen</td>
<td>291, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- amar⁻²EN.ZU</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- amar⁻²EN.ZU</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- amar⁻²EN.ZU-na</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a-mar⁻²EN.ZU-na</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-me-er-nu-nu</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aminu</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammiditana</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammisaduqa</td>
<td>6, 11, 133, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amura</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a-mu-ra</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-N₁-za-nu</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN.KI(ʔ)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN.KI-ki-du₃₀</td>
<td>206, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-ma</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Apilkin 26, 27, 28, 131, 133
- Apil-kin 27
- a-pil-ki-in 26, 28
- a-pil- gi 27
- → see also ḫa-bi-l-ki-in
Apilsin 133
Aplahanda 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
ARAD(?)šar-ru-um 18
- ARAD(?)sar-ru-um 279
ar-an-da-gaba 20, 283, 286
Arlagan → Yarlagan
Arrukum 96, 101, 164-167, 169, 171-177, 184, 298
- ar-EN-LUM 165
- ar-ru₂-gum₂ 165, 167, 173
- ar-en-num₂ 165
Arshiaha 172
- ar-si-a-ḫa 172
A-sa₆ 277
aš-sa-nu 164
Assurreminisheshu 32
- Aššur-rēmi-nišēšu 32
Atiasdar 173
- a-ti-aš-dar 173
Attahushu 291
A-UL₁-gal 276
Aya₂→ A...
Ayadiğergu 145
Ayağestin 140
- aya₂-ğestin 140
Ayakīgal 63, 140
- aia₂-ki:gal 63
- aya₂-ki-gal 140
- GAL.A.KI 140
Aya'uğedug → Akalamdu
Baba 45
- ba-ba 45
Baba (Ebla) 176, 177
- ba-ba₆ 176, 177
- → Paba
ba-ga-da-mu 163
- ba-ga-da-mu 163
Bagama 188
Ba-ta-e₁-de/c 277
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ba-(u_2)-ama</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazi</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazige</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Bazigi</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliariq</td>
<td>290, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Bēlī-ariq</td>
<td>290, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belitab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– be-li_2-DU_10</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibi...</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– bi_2-bi_2...</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilgames → Gilgamesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billala</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bir(_i_1)-la-nu</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubu → U_2.U_2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumani</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursaggile</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursin</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– (\text{bur}^{\text{EN.ZU}})</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu_1,šu-sum</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chefren</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da-da</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakiki</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-ki-ki</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damiqilishu</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-NE-nu</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-ra-am-URIM,(^{\text{du}})-am → Taramuram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dar_1,kab-du-lum</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmia</td>
<td>165-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Darmilu</td>
<td>165, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dar-mi-a</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dar-mi-lu</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datitu</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawu/du</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– da-wu-du</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimtur</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dim_1, tur</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diutu</td>
<td>43, 78, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Di’utuk</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– di-(\text{du})utu</td>
<td>43, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– di-utu</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– silim-(\text{du})utu</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- du-du 18, 118, 119, 274
Dudu saĝğa 71, 73
- du-du 71, 73
du₂₉-ga 20
- dug₉-ga 283
du-mu-dar 164
dumu-st₁/su₃-uruₓa 269
Dusigu 167

Eabzu 141, 149
- E’abzuk 140, 141, 149
- e₂-abzu 141, 149
Eanatum 35, 61, 62, 68, 75, 82, 84, 139, 142, 148, 203
- Eannatum 178
- E’annabrum 139, 142, 148, 149, 150, 154
- e₁-an-na-tum₂ 75, 142, 148
Eandamu 77
- e₁-an-da-mu₂ 77
Ebarat 24-26, 125, 131, 289-291, 293, 296, 301
- Ebarti 294
- Yabrat 25, 125, 131
- e-ba-ra-at 25, 294
- e-ba-ar-ti 24, 289
- i₂-a-ba-ra-at 294
- “i₂-a-ba-ra-at 294
e-dam-kiš-ki-zu 20, 283, 286
Edin 78, 79, 82, 84, 142, 150
- Eden 142, 150, 217
- cdin 78
- eden 142
E-DU 152
- e₁-DU 152
Egalesi 94
Eiginimpaec 142, 192, 197, 199, 200, 201, 299
- E’iginimpa’e 142, 151, 152
- e₁-igi-nim-pa-e₂ 142, 192
e-lam (?) 229, 235
Elili 143, 144, 147
- e₂-li-li 143, 147
e-lu-lu 18, 287
- i-lu-lu 18, 287
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elumer → Etibmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emah</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– e₃-maḥ</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emahsini</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– e₃-maḥ-si-ni</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → e₃-sip-ra-si-ni</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enakale</td>
<td>36, 74, 75, 77, 78, 82, 142, 150, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– En’ākale</td>
<td>142, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en₂-a₃-kal-le</td>
<td>36, 75, 77, 78, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enanatum I</td>
<td>35, 68, 69, 75, 76, 81, 82, 84, 142, 148, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– En’nannabtum I</td>
<td>142, 148, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-an-na-tum₂</td>
<td>69, 76, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enanatum II</td>
<td>69, 70, 81, 82, 84, 142, 148, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– En’nannabtum II</td>
<td>142, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-an-na-tum₂</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enanatumisipazi</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-an-na-tum₂-sipa-zi</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enanepada</td>
<td>115, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Enannepada</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-ar₁-da-mu</td>
<td>163, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– “en-ar₁-da-mu</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbieshtar</td>
<td>97, 143, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ‘Inbi’aštar</td>
<td>143, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-bi₁-aš₁₁-dar</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-bi₁-eš₁₂-dar</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enentarzi</td>
<td>35, 36, 67, 69-74, 81, 82, 84, 86, 142, 148, 202, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– En’entarzid</td>
<td>142, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Enentarzid</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-en₁₄-tar-zi</td>
<td>35, 36, 69-71, 73, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-e-tar-zi</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enheduana</td>
<td>95, 96, 115, 116, 192, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhengal</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engarzi</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engisa</td>
<td>70, 72, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Engilsa</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-gi₁₂-sa</td>
<td>70, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-gil-sa</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eniggal</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-ig-gal</td>
<td>71, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlilbani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– “en-lil₁₂-ba-ni</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlilemaba</td>
<td>253, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Name</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-ma-nu</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– EN-ma-nu</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a₃,ma-na</td>
<td>163, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENmar</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– EN-mar</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enmeanu</td>
<td>142, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Enme‘annu</td>
<td>142, 145, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– EN×MENU</td>
<td>142, 152, 192, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– EN×ME-nu₂</td>
<td>142, 152, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enmenana</td>
<td>96, 115, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enmeparagesi</td>
<td>149, 152, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– me-para₃,ge-si</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Meparagesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enmetena</td>
<td>35, 69, 70, 72, 75-78, 81, 82, 84, 142, 148, 191, 192, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Enmetén nak</td>
<td>142, 145, 148, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-met-ɛn-na</td>
<td>35, 69, 75-77, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennadagan</td>
<td>101, 103, 142, 155, 165, 171, 177, 181, 183, 186, 187, 189, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ḥinnadagān</td>
<td>142, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-na₃-da-gan</td>
<td>142, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-na₃-i</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennail</td>
<td>140, 142, 153, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ḥinna‘il</td>
<td>140, 142, 153, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-na₃-il</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnnalUM</td>
<td>40, 72, 94, 143, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ḥinnānum</td>
<td>143, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-na₃-num₂</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enshakushana</td>
<td>4, 38, 41, 42, 81, 85-87, 89, 90, 93, 97, 102-105, 140, 143, 144, 147, 192, 204, 212, 221-223, 297, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Enšagkušu‘anak</td>
<td>140, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-ša₃-kuš₂-an-na</td>
<td>41, 93, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– en-ša₃-kuš₂-an-na</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḪEN.ZU-ma-gir → Sinmagir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epaɛ</td>
<td>141, 191, 192, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Epa‘ɛ</td>
<td>140, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– c₂-pa₂-c₁</td>
<td>141, 151, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirmubi</td>
<td>110, 123, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERE.NDA</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ereshgeshgemti</td>
<td>192, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ereshkisali → Ninkisali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ereš-zabalam₂⁺,c₁-si</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ereš-zabalam₂⁺-e₁-si</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eri(e)nimgennak → Urukagina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erishum</td>
<td>14, 31, 32, 133, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erraimitti</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– er₁-ra-i-mi-ti</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– “er₁-ra-i-mi-ti”</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erridupizir</td>
<td>127-129, 194, 283, 285, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– e-er₁-du-pi-zi-ir</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshpum</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-sip-ra-si-ni → Emahsini, Hisibrasini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₁₅-tar₁₅-mu-ti</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a₁₃-dar-mu-ti</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eribmer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Elumer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yeṭib-Mēr</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– e₃-dib-me-ir</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganbawu</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– gan₁-ba-u₂</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangirid</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– gan-gir₁₂₂</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemeguena</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– geme₂-gu₂-en-na</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemenanshe</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemesulpae</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– geme₂-sul-pa-e₃</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geemu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– geme₂-zu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĝeš₁ → Ninta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geshr₁</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ĝeš₁-r₁</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geshshakidu</td>
<td>77-79, 80, 82, 84, 142, 150, 194, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ėgešakidug</td>
<td>142, 148, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ĝeš₁-ša₂-ki-du₁₀</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ĝeš₁-ša₂-ki-dug₅</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĝeš₁-ša₂-ki-du₁₀</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgamesh</td>
<td>141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Bilgames</td>
<td>141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Gilgameš</td>
<td>141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Pabilgames</td>
<td>141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– pabil₂,(“ĝiš”.PAP.NE)-mes</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girimesi</td>
<td>143, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Girimsi</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– girim₃-si</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĝir₁₃-ne₂-ba-tuš dam-gara₁</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'gi-ir-na-am-me → Kirname</td>
<td>4, 27, 31, 41, 49, 50, 115, 117-122, 125, 130, 136, 202, 231, 238, 273, 276, 278, 301, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudea</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`gu-de₂-a</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`gu-la-an</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gununum</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunl.DU</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunum → Hunum</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gu-ra-nu</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutarl.a</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gu₂/gu₂-tar-la₂</td>
<td>128, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habaluge</td>
<td>194, 195, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡa-bil-ki-in</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡa-bil-ki-in</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥa-ab-lum</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥa-ab-lum</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halalamma</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥa-la-4lamma</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammurapi</td>
<td>6, 7, 11, 90, 108, 133, 136, 195, 283, 302, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanundagan</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥa-nu-un₄da-gan</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harani</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAR.TUashgi</td>
<td>143, 152, 192, 197, 201, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḤAR.TU-āšgi,(ḪIXDIŠ)⁴</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḤAR.TU-āš-ḡ1</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur₆-du₆⁻ḪIXDIŠ.G₁</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣe-c-lu</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidar</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥi-da’ar</td>
<td>55, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥi-da’ar</td>
<td>177, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥi-ṭabdayar</td>
<td>100, 143, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU₁₀-da-ar</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUG₁-da-ar</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḤI-da-ar</td>
<td>176-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥab(DUG₁)-da-ar</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥinnadagan → Ennadagan</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥina’il → Ennail</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hishebrateb</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣi-se-č-ra-te-čb</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ḫi-i-šu-ur 23
Hisibrasini 23, 24
  – ḫi-si-ib-ra-si-ni 23
  – → Emahsini
Hita 23
  – ḫi-ta₂ 23
  – ḫi-ta-a 23
Hitlalerra 26, 28
  – ḫi-it-lal₁, er₁-ra 26
Hunum 292
  – Gunum 292
ia-ar-la-gaba 20
  – ia-ar-la-ga-ab 20
  – ia-ar-la-gab₂ 20
  – ia-ar-la-an-gab 20
ia₁, ar-la-gan → Yarlagan
ia-ar-la-ga-aš 20
Ibál-El 182
i-ba-te 20
  – i-ba-ti 20
Ibbininshubur 195
Ibbisuen 4, 5, 14, 25, 32, 51, 125, 131-133, 136, 195, 289-293, 295, 296, 299, 301, 303
  – i-bi₂, en.zu 21
  – .Chrome 21, 290
Ibbizikir 96, 97, 102, 103, 165-167, 169-179, 184-189, 298
  – i-bi₂-zii-kir 173
i-bi₂-da-mu 163
Ibidulum 185
i-bi₂-ni-li-im 163
ib-la 163, 164
Ibmud 69
  – ib-mud 69
ib-ra-nu-um 20, 288
Ibrium 35, 96, 97, 101-103, 164-179, 182, 184-189, 298
  – ib-ri₁-um 168, 169, 173, 174, 188
Idattu 24, 25, 289, 296, 301
  – Idadu 289
  – i-da-ad-du 24
  – i-da-at-tu₁ 289
  – i-da-at-tu 24
  – i-da-du 25
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i-da-at-tu-na-pi-ir</td>
<td>24, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-da-at-tu-te-em-ti</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iddinashtar</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yiddin-Aštar</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-ti-ašši-dar</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iddindagan</td>
<td>133, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-din-i₄-da-gan</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-din-i₄-da-gan</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iddinilum</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ididish</td>
<td>26-28, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-di-di-iš</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-din-eš₄-car₂</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ge₄-eš₄-ir₄-ge₄-ge₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ge₄-eš₄-a-ush</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igibuni</td>
<td>289-293, 295, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igrishhalab</td>
<td>103, 165, 167, 172, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yigrishšalab</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ig-ri₂-iš-ḫa-lab₂</td>
<td>163, 165, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ig-su-ud</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikunishar</td>
<td>101, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Iku(n)ishar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikunmari</td>
<td>142, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yiqūmmari</td>
<td>142, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-kum-ma-rious</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikunshamagan</td>
<td>142, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yikūnšamkan</td>
<td>142, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-ku-ša-ma-gan</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikunshamash</td>
<td>101, 143, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yikūnšamaš</td>
<td>143, 155, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-ku₄-UTU</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikunum</td>
<td>32, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il</td>
<td>36, 42, 70, 74, 76-78, 80, 82, 142, 148, 150, 194, 217, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ila</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– il₂</td>
<td>36, 42, 76, 77, 142, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilelim</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– il₂-e-li-im</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-lu-AN</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– I-lu-DINGIR</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-lu-u₄ + e-lu-lu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilum-iša-ar</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilushuma</td>
<td>32, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM₄₄-ki-du₁₀</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i-mi</td>
<td>18, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-mu-šUTU</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-mi-šUTU</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– iš-me-šUTU</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Inbi’aštar → Enbieshtar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indasu</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– in-da-su</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– in-da-su₂</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ni-ma-ba-ki-eš</td>
<td>20, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-ni-ma-ba-ke</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-ki-šuš</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– in-ge₂-šuš</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmalik</td>
<td>178, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphurkishi</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipiqadad</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iplu(s)il</td>
<td>34, 35, 100, 101, 103, 142, 155, 165, 171, 172, 174-177, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Iplulil</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yiplus’il</td>
<td>142, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ib-lu₃-il</td>
<td>34, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ib-lul-il</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqdamu</td>
<td>35, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir’ammalik</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ir₃-am-ša-mlik</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ra-ru-um</td>
<td>20, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irgigi</td>
<td>112, 118, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-ge₂-ge₄</td>
<td>18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– I-gi₂, gi₄</td>
<td>283, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ir₂-ge₂-ge₄</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ir₂-gi₂, gi₄</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ir₂-ki-ki</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irishum</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-ri₂-šum</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir₃-ri₂-šum</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Erishum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irkabdamu</td>
<td>34, 35, 96, 101, 103, 163-169, 172, 174-177, 184, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Yirkabdamu(m)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ir₃-kab-da-mu</td>
<td>34, 163, 167, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishar</td>
<td>172, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– i-šar</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishardamu</td>
<td>85, 96, 97, 100, 101, 103, 163, 164, 167, 169, 175-179, 182, 184, 186, 189, 192, 298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Index of Personal Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yiš’ardāmu(m)</td>
<td>147, 154, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iš’ar-Damu</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ar-da-mu</td>
<td>163, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ar-ma-lik</td>
<td>163, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ar-ma-lik</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishbierra</td>
<td>4, 14, 25, 51, 131, 133, 136, 195, 299, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-bi-er, ra</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-bi-er, ra</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-bi-er, ra</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishbiragesi → Meparagesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishbibrada → Medurba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkunadad</td>
<td>26, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-kun, iškur</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkundagan</td>
<td>193, 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkunnunu → Ushkunnunu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkurdar</td>
<td>101, 143, 156, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iškurdar</td>
<td>143, 155, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isškur-dār</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>išškur-dār</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>išškur-dār</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>išškur-dār</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmahdagan</td>
<td>26, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ma-ah, da-gan</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ma-ah, da-gan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmail</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ma, iš-mu₃</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmedagan (Isin)</td>
<td>58, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmedagan I (Assur)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-me₄, da-gan</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-me₄, da-gan</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-me₄, UTU → i-me₄ UTU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishqimari</td>
<td>35, 85, 100, 101, 103, 143, 155, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>išqimari</td>
<td>143, 155, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iššqimari</td>
<td>143, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iššqimari</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ru₁₂-ud-da-mu</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ru₁₂-ud-da-mu</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-ru₁₂-ud-ḥa-la₃₁₂</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishtrupel</td>
<td>26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Išṭup-El</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš-du-ub-el</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**– iš-dub-DIĜIR**  
Ishtupishar 171
– Išţup-Išar 171
– Ishtupishar 142, 155
– Yišţupsārrum 142, 155
– is₂-dub-SAR 142, 155

**Isibdurba → Medurba**

i-si-du 155
Itbelaba 252
Iterpisha 133
– i-te-er-pi₁,ša 22
– ğu-te-er-pi₂,ša 22

i-ti-aš₃,ša → 1ddinashtar  
Ititi 27, 110
'Izzaya 155
'Iżzi → Nüzü

**Kaku**  
KA-ša-NE-bir 173
Keshdut 178, 179
– Keshdud 167
– keš-du-ut 178

Kiang 69
– ki-ağ₂ 69

Kikkiya 31, 32
ki-ik-ku-si/tan-me-te-em-ti 23

Kindattu 14, 24, 25, 133, 195, 289, 296
– ki-in-da-at-tu 24, 25, 289
– ki-in-da-du 25

Kirname 24, 25, 125
– tiği-ir-na-am-me 24, 289
– ki-ir-na-me 25

Kitushi 143, 149
– Kituš’id 143, 149
– ki-tuš-id₂ 143
ku₁₂-ba-u₂ 17

Kuda 117
– ku₁₂-da 19
kun-ab-ki-du₁₀ 206
kun-ba-nu 163, 164

Kundamu 165, 172
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- kun₁-da-mu 163
- ku-un-sa₂-lim (?i) 252
Kurigalzu II 195
- ku-ru-um 20, 288
Kutikinshushinak → Puzurinshushinak

La’arab 128, 283, 285, 301
- la’₂₆-ra-ab 128, 283
- la’₂₆-ra-bu-um 20, 128
la-da-₃₂ 164
Lipitenlil 133
- ‘li-pi₂-it’en-lil₂ 22
Lipiteshtar 133
- li-pi₂-it-eš₂-tar₂ 22
- ‘li-pi₂-it-eš₂-tar₂ 22
- li-pi₂-it-eš₂-tar₂ 22
li₁-₃₂-na-aĝ₂ → ni₁-₃₂-na-aĝ₂
Lubawu 30, 31, 120
Lugalanatum 31, 118, 119, 128, 130, 284
- lugal-an-na-ab-tum₂ 31, 119
- lugal-an-na-tum₂ 118, 119
Lugalanda 35, 67, 69-73, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 89, 97, 142, 148, 192, 202-205, 299
- Lugaldigir-da 142, 148, 149
- lugal-AN-da 71, 73
- lugal-AN-da-nu-hu₂-ga₂ 71
- lugal-diğir-da 71, 142
Lugalane 193
Lugalanemundu 191, 201
lugal-₃₂-sum₂-ma 144
Lugalayangu 193, 194, 223, 299
- lugal-₃₂-ɡu₁₀ 193
Lugalaldu 142, 151, 191, 192, 299
- lugal-da-lu 142, 191
LugalDU 76
Lugalegide 121
- lugal-e₂-ɡi₂-dᵄ 121
lugal-GAN → lugal->Please note that the text contains some technical or specialized terminology that may require specific knowledge to fully comprehend.
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- lugal-GAN 79
lugal-iti-da 272
LugalKA 94
- lugal-KA 94
Lugalkineshdudu 142, 144, 145, 198, 201
- Lugalkigenedudu 144, 145
- Lugalkišareshüdu 142, 144-146, 148, 152
- lugal-ki-DU.NI-du,0-du, 142
- lugal-ki-DU.NI-du,0(-de) 145
- lugal-ki-NI(šE₃)-du,-du, 142
- lugal-ki-NI(šE₃)-du,-du, 146
- lugal-kišare,0NI-du,-du, 146
- lugal-kišare,0NI(-eš₂)-du,-du, 146
Lugalkisalesi 142, 144-147
- Lugalgeparsi 142, 144
- Lugalkisalši 142, 144, 146, 212, 217, 222
- lugal-kisal-si 142, 145, 146
Lugalkiši 153
- lu₂-gal kiši 153
- lugal-kiši 153
lugal-me-lim₄ 19
Lugalmen 141
- lugal-men 141, 153
Lugalnamnirshum 142, 144
- Lugalnamniršumma 142, 144, 145
- lugal-nam-nir-sum₃ 142, 144
- lugal-nam-nir-sum₃-ma 144
- LUGAL.SUM.NAM.NIR 144
- nu-gal-nam-ri₂-su-ma 144
Lugalnirgal 109, 194, 299
- lugal-nir-gal₂ 108, 194
Lugalnuduga 109, 194, 299
- lugal-nu-du₁₀,ga 108, 109, 194
lugal-piriḡ 153
Lugalshaengur 62, 63, 67, 141, 148, 191
- Lugalshadagal 191
- Lugalša(g)dangal 67
- Lugalšagdašalak 141, 148
- lugal-sh₃₄-AMA 67
- lugal-sh₃₄-dašal 67, 148
- lugal-sh₃₄-ENGUR 63, 67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lugal-šaₕ /šaₕ-engur</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-šaₕ-daₜal</td>
<td>141, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalsi</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-si</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalsilā(si)</td>
<td>143, 145, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LugalTAR</td>
<td>143, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-sila</td>
<td>143, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalsilasi</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalsilāsi (I)</td>
<td>142, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugaltarsi</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-silā-si</td>
<td>142, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugal-TAR-si</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalude</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-uₕ-deₜ</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalushumgal</td>
<td>108, 110, 119, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalutu</td>
<td>141, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugal'utu</td>
<td>141, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-uₕ-ud</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugal-uₕ-uₕ</td>
<td>141, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-ud</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-[η]-uₕ[η]-uₕ</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalzagesi</td>
<td>5, 14, 36, 37-40, 42, 67, 72, 74, 77-82, 84-97, 102-105, 108, 136, 140, 143, 144, 146-149, 151, 152, 154, 179, 191, 192, 197, 199, 201, 204, 212, 217, 218, 222, 223, 297, 299, 300, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-zaₕ-ge-si</td>
<td>18, 37, 42, 80, 88, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-zaₕ-geₕ-si</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-zag-ge-si</td>
<td>143, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-[η]-uₕ[η]-uₕ</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugirizal</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luₕ-giriₕ-zal</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugula</td>
<td>30, 31, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhishan</td>
<td>23, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhsan</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luₕ-uh-ḫi-iₕ-ṣaₕ-an</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luₕ-uh-iₕ-an</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumma*</td>
<td>30, 31, 62, 68, 119, 141, 144, 151, 153, 191, 194, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lum-ma</td>
<td>31, 67, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUM-ma</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lummatur</td>
<td>35, 68, 69, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lum-ma-tur</td>
<td>35, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunanna</td>
<td>143, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunannak</td>
<td>143, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu₂⁻nanna</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luninshuburka</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luparagesi</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu₂-parag-si</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lushara</td>
<td>258, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu₂⁻šara₂</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu₁⁻ša-na-aḡ₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu₁-x-ra-ak-ḡ-ḥa-an</td>
<td>24, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma₂⁻gur₈</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhau</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manishtushu</td>
<td>5, 14, 40, 44, 70, 72, 93-96, 105-107, 122, 136, 149, 193, 302, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man-iššūšu</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man'iššūšu</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-ni-iš-te-šu</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-ni-iš-ti-iš-šu</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-ni-iš-ti-šu</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marā’il</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-ra-AN</td>
<td>175, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAR.___AN</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meandesu</td>
<td>38, 70, 74, 77-82, 84, 142, 150, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me’anedug</td>
<td>142, 148, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-an-ne₂-du₁₀</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-an-ne₂-dug₃</td>
<td>142, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medurba</td>
<td>141, 151, 191, 192, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishibdurba</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isibdurba</td>
<td>141, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isibdurbā</td>
<td>140, 141, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isib-dur-ba</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isib-dur-ba</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.BA.DUR</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME-ba-RÉC 355b×TA</td>
<td>191, 192, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekubi</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menunsi</td>
<td>63, 141, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menunesi</td>
<td>140, 141, 144, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-nun-si</td>
<td>63, 140, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-nun-ne₂-si</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⁴me-nun-e-si</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⁴mi-nun-e-si</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meparagesi</td>
<td>141, 152, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Meparasi</td>
<td>141, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Isibbaragesi</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– me-parag-si</td>
<td>141, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Enmeparagesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesag</td>
<td>40, 117, 118, 123, 255, 256, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– me-sag,</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesanepada</td>
<td>142, 145, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mes’anepadda</td>
<td>142, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-an-ne-pad-da</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mese</td>
<td>143, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mes’e</td>
<td>143, 148, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-e,</td>
<td>143, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshanu</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– me-ša-nu</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meslim</td>
<td>62, 63, 67, 140, 153, 191, 195, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mesalim</td>
<td>140, 141, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Méšalim</td>
<td>140, 141, 145, 148, 151, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ME.DI</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– me-silim</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– me-silim</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meskalamsi</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meskalamdu</td>
<td>142, 144, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mes’uğedug</td>
<td>142, 144, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-uğ-duty</td>
<td>142, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meskishamis</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-kalam-si</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meskiangnun → Mesnunkiang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meskigala</td>
<td>38, 43, 88, 93-95, 97, 103, 105, 143, 152, 192, 193, 197-201, 218, 297, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Meskigalla</td>
<td>143, 147, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-ki-gal-la</td>
<td>43, 88, 94, 143, 147, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mes-me-a-nu&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mes-nun-ne&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesnunkiang</td>
<td>140, 141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Meskiangnun</td>
<td>140, 141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mesnuneki’ağ</td>
<td>140, 141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-nun-ki-ağ&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES.U.DUG</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes’uğedug → Meskalamsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesului</td>
<td>76, 77, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– mes-ul-nu&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>77, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meszi</td>
<td>88, 143, 149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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– Meszid 143, 149
– mes-zi 143
Mry-R 98
– → Pepy I
Mu-ga-an 287
Mugesi 109, 142, 151, 194, 197, 299
– Mugi 142, 151, 192, 299
– mug(-si) 142, 192
– mug(-ge)-si 108, 151
– mug-ge-si 194
Munus'adgal 141, 153
– Munusushumgal 141, 153
– munus-ad-gal 141, 153
– gal.munus.ul 153

Nabienlil 283
Nabiulmash 45, 263
– na-bi-ül, maš 45
na-ma-nu 163
Namhāni → Nammahni
Nammah 63
Nammah(ţebu) 255
Nammahni 30, 31, 118, 119, 121, 122, 128, 130, 282, 284
– Namhāni 30, 31, 120, 121, 130
– Namhāni 120
– nam-ţa-ni 29, 31, 120
– nam-ţa-ni 29, 31, 118, 120, 121
nam-nin-E.NL.KAM 29
Nanatum 175
na-an-ni-a 17
– na-an-ni-a 17
– na-an-ne 17
na-nu-um 18, 287
– na-ţi 18
– na-an-ţi 18
– na-ţum 18
– Na-ţum 287
na-pi-ţu-us 23
Naplum 133
Naramsuen (Akkad) 5, 23, 24, 38-40, 44-46, 48, 49, 58, 96, 104, 105, 108-112,
115-118, 123, 127, 128, 136, 183, 193, 194, 212, 223,
228, 231, 232, 235, 237, 249, 251, 253, 255, 258, 263, 284,
287, 299, 301, 302, 304
– Naramsin 109
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- Naram-Sin 276
- Narām-Sin 158
- Narāmsu’en 115
- Narām-Su’en 108, 109
- na-ra-am-\textsuperscript{\textit{EN.ZU}} 18, 44, 45, 109
- \textsuperscript{\textit{a}}na-ra-am-\textsuperscript{\textit{EN.ZU}} 45, 46
- ra-am-ra-\textsuperscript{\textit{EN.ZU}} 108, 109
- ra-am-ra-\textsuperscript{\textit{EN.ZU}} 194
- Naramsuen (Assur) 133
- Nēsi 177
- Nibakutu 178
- ni\textsubscript{\textit{1}}-ba-ku-tu 178
- ni\textsubscript{\textit{1}}-bi-a 20
- ni\textsubscript{\textit{1}}-bi-šε\textsubscript{\textit{3}} 20
- ni\textsubscript{\textit{2}}-bi-šε\textsubscript{\textit{3}} 206
- Niğlunudu 70
- Ni\textsubscript{\textit{1}}-lagab\textsubscript{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{a}}}}} 20
- Ni\textsubscript{\textit{1}}-lagab\textsubscript{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{b}}}}} 274
- Ikūkum-lā-qabā 116
- \textit{HAB}-lagab\textsubscript{\textit{\textit{\textit{a}}}} 116
- ia-ar-la-ga-ba 116
- ia\textsubscript{\textit{3}},(Ni\textsubscript{\textit{1}})-lagab\textsubscript{\textit{\textit{\textit{a}}}} 116
- zal-lagab\textsubscript{\textit{\textit{\textit{a}}}} 274
- zar\textsubscript{\textit{1}},-la-ga-ba 20, 116, 282
- zar\textsubscript{\textit{2}}-lagab\textsubscript{\textit{\textit{\textit{a}}}} 116
- Ningula 29, 30
- nin\textsubscript{\textit{3}}-gu-la 29, 30
- Nink\textsubscript{\textit{Agina}} 31
- Ninkisalsi 62, 63, 141, 151, 191
- Ereshkisalsi 141, 151, 299
- Ereshkisalesi 141, 151
- ereš-kisal-si 141, 191
- Ninsubi 30
- nin-subi\textsubscript{\textit{3}} 30
- Ninta 68, 74, 75, 82, 84
- Uš 68, 74, 75, 82, 84, 142, 149
- ġε\textsubscript{\textit{3}} 149
- ninta, ni(n)ta(\textit{h}) 74, 149
- uš 142, 149
- nin-\textit{URU×A}-i\textsubscript{\textit{3}},-du\textsubscript{\textit{10}} 206
- ni\textsubscript{\textit{1}}-ša-na-ağ\textsubscript{\textit{2}} 25
- lu\textsubscript{\textit{4}}/li\textsubscript{\textit{2}}-u\textsubscript{\textit{1}}-ša-na-ağ\textsubscript{\textit{2}} 25
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Niwarmer → Nurmer

Ntzi
- ‘Izzî 142, 155
- Nizi 142, 155, 165, 176, 177, 298
- bu₃-zi 155
- i₃-zi 142
- Nï-zi 155
- ni-zi 177

Nurmer
- Niwarmer 27, 133
- Niwar-Mêr 27
- Nûr-Mêr 27
- ni-wa-ar-me-er 27
- nu-ur₂-me-er 26

Paba 176
- pa₂₃-ba₄ 176
- → Baba

Pabilgagalruku
- Pabilgaltuku 74, 149
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puzur-Assur I</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzurassur II</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puzur,ŠEN.ZU</td>
<td>17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Puzur,Šen-Suen</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzureshtar (general, Sargonic period)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– puzur,ŠŠŠ-dar</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzureshtar (Mari)</td>
<td>26, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Puzur-Eštar</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– puzur,ŠŠŠ-dar</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzureshtar (Old Assyrian eponym)</td>
<td>8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzurili</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– puzur,Š-li</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzurinshushinak</td>
<td>23, 90, 115, 122-126, 129, 130, 285, 300, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Kutikinshushinak</td>
<td>23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Kutik-Inshushinak</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Puzur-Inššinak</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Puzur-Inshushinak</td>
<td>274, 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– puzur,ŠŠŠ-inššinak</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– puzur,ŠŠŠ-inššinak</td>
<td>123, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Puzur,ŠŠŠ-MŠŠ.ERIN</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzur-Mama</td>
<td>30, 110, 115, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 130, 237, 287, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Puzur-Mama</td>
<td>272-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Pu,Šza-Ma-Ma</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Pu,Šša-Ma-ma</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– puzur,Ššš-ma-ma</td>
<td>110, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzurnumushda</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzur,Šen-Suen → puzur,ŠEN.ZU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzuruzzu</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– puzur,Šzu-zu</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Puzur,Šzu-zu</td>
<td>283, 286, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quradum</td>
<td>257, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-am-ra-ŠEN.ZU → Naramsuen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimsin</td>
<td>14, 98, 108, 133, 195, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimsin II</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimush</td>
<td>5, 14, 24, 42, 44, 72, 89, 93-97, 104-108, 122, 136, 149, 193, 299, 302, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Rimuş</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Rimuś</td>
<td>149, 151, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Rimush</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ri,Š-mu-uš</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Rī-mu-uš</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sangduashki 194
- saĝ-DU₂.kI.6 20
- Saĝ-du.kI.6 283, 286
Sabium 133
Sagdamu 167
- saĝ-da-mu 167
sa-gi-su 163
- sa-gi-iš 163
Samium 133
sa-mi-u₅ 164
- ‘sa-mi-u₅ 164
Samsuditana 5, 6, 133
Samsuiluna 11, 15, 133, 195
Sargon 4, 5, 14, 16, 18, 23, 24, 28, 38, 39, 42-44, 67, 72, 81, 84-88, 90, 93-98, 100-108, 110, 115, 116, 122, 123, 125, 133, 136, 139, 140, 143, 149, 154, 178, 179, 192-194, 197, 199, 201, 212, 218, 222, 264, 271, 297, 299, 300, 302, 304
- Šarrumkēn 139, 140, 143, 144, 146, 147, 149, 151, 152, 154
- sar-ru-GI 42, 93, 102
- sar-ru-um-GI 102
- sar-ru(-um)-GI 143
- sar-um-GI-ne₂ 42
- šar-ru-gen₂ 18
- šar-ru-GI 18
- šar-ru-ki-in 18
- šar-ru-um-ki-in 18
Sarlag 46, 116, 117, 128
- Sharlag 282, 283
- SAR-la-ag 46, 128
- sar-la-ak 274
Sasa 70, 72, 73, 88
Sasaga 29
- sa₃-sa₃-ga 29
Šā‘umum 154
ša-kun₁,Є 164
Shalimahum 32
Shamshiadad 7-11, 14-15, 32, 133
- Šamši-Adad I 15
Sharatigubishin 127, 236, 284, 285
- sar-a-ti-gu-bi-si-in 284
- Šarkališarri 115, 130, 271, 276
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šar-kali-šarri</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sar-ga-li₂-LUGAL-ri₂</td>
<td>39, 46-48, 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šar-ga-li₂-šar-ri</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šar-rum-šar-ri</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharlag → Sarlag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šarrā'ilumma</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠAR-i₂-lum-ma</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharru(m)ali</td>
<td>193, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrumali</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šarrum-ǎli</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šar-ru-URU.KI-li₂</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šar-rum-šar-ri → Sharkalisharri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatninshubur</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeg₂₃-kur</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilhaha</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilhakinsonshushinak</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilhak-Inshushinak</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimpishhu</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimpishhuk</td>
<td>123, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ši-im-bi₂-iš-ḫu</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ši-im-pi₂-iš-ḫu-uk</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šim-bi₂-iš-me</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuashtakal</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shubau</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shubaba</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-³ba-ba₄</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shudagan</td>
<td>26, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-³da-gan</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShUDUNi³le</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šUDUNI⁻³-li</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šUDUNI⁻³-li</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šu-Durul</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šu-Tur'u</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-dur-ul₁</td>
<td>18, 48, 128, 194, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuilishu</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-i₁-li₂-šu</td>
<td>17, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ššu-i₁-li₂-šu</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuishtar</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šu-Ištar</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Šulgi</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sul-ge-r</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sul-gi</td>
<td>21, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- šul-gi</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shulgisimti</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumama</td>
<td>290, 292, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Šu-Mama</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šul-me-DAG</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- šul-me-DAG-e</td>
<td>20, 283, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumda’ar</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- šum-da-ar</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunanaya</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Šu-Nanaya</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunialdugud</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- šu-ni-al-dugud</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurushken</td>
<td>40, 88, 94, 143, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Su(r)ushkin</td>
<td>199, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Šuruškēn</td>
<td>143, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- su-uš-GI</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sur,-uš-gen,-</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- su,-ru-us,-GI</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-su-un-ta-ra-na</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- šu-EN.ZU</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- šu-EN.ZU</td>
<td>21, 294, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- šu-EN.ZU-na</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shusuendan</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Šu-Sín-dân</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA-um</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG₄,KUR</td>
<td>194, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siku</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- si₄-ku₃</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silim,₃(₄)uru → Diuru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silliadad</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sílulu</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Šílulu</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ši-šu-šu</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si-šu-šu-me-cš</td>
<td>20, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- si₄,šu-šu</td>
<td>20, 283, 286, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- si₄-šu-šu</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- si-lu-lu-e</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- si-lu-lu-me</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣi-mu-dar-ra</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- zi-mu-dar</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sineribam</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siniddinam</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siniqisham</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinmagir</td>
<td>15, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 𒈗𒆠menzu-ma-gir</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinmuballit</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sišum</td>
<td>118, 128, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- si-u₄</td>
<td>20, 118, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- si-u₃-um</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subur</td>
<td>69, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- subur</td>
<td>69, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subur(tur)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulili</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sulē</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumuabum</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumuel</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumulael</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suṣṭushkin → Shurushken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭābdayar → Hidar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabsilliassur</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ṭābdilli-Assur</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taburdamu</td>
<td>167, 169, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagrīšdamu</td>
<td>175, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahishattili</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- da-ḫi-ša-ti-li</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tal-da-li-im</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanruhurater</td>
<td>25, 289, 296, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- tan-ru-ḫu-ra-te-er</td>
<td>24, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- tan-uru-ḫu-ra-ti-ir</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- tan-uru-ḫu-ra-te-er</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-ark/i</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taramuram</td>
<td>28, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- da-ra-am-urim,i₄-am</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazitta</td>
<td>24, 25, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ta-zi-it-ta</td>
<td>24, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te-erk₄-da-gan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ter-ku₃</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tir</td>
<td>165-167, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-ir</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirigan</td>
<td>113, 116, 118, 119, 128-130, 194, 283, 286, 299, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-ri₂-ga-a-an</td>
<td>20, 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ti-ri₂-ga</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubbuhuhadda</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Tubbuḫu-Ḫadda</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukinhattimigrisha</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Tukin-ḫaṭṭi-migriša</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– tu-ki-in-ḫaṭṭi-mi-ig-ri₂-ša</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turamdagan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– tu-ra-am₂-da-gan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutanapshum</td>
<td>228, 232, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutasharlibbish(α)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uk-ku-taḫ-eš</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulli</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ul-li</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultumhuhu</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urabba</td>
<td>29, 31, 50, 120, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-ab-ba</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urani</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Uranne</td>
<td>147, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-ra-ni</td>
<td>93, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-ra-ne₂</td>
<td>146, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urashgi</td>
<td>194, 195, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-ba</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-ba aşgab</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-Bagara</td>
<td>276, 277, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbawu</td>
<td>30, 31, 115, 116, 120, 122, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ur-Bau</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-ba-u₂</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdukuga</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-du₂-ku₂-ga</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-du₂-ku₂-ga</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur’e</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-e₂</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-e₂-maḥ</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uremush</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urenlil</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ureshliša</td>
<td>121, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urga</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-ɡa₂</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urgar</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Urgigir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^3$gigir$_2$</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uriri</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urlamma</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$lama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urlumma</td>
<td>36, 70, 75-78, 80, 82, 84, 142, 150, 194, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Urlummak</td>
<td>142, 148, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^2$lum-ma</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$lum-ma</td>
<td>36, 76, 78, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urnirama</td>
<td>29, 31, 120, 122, 123, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^5$ama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Urnammu</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ur-$^4$-Nammu</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ur-Namma</td>
<td>130, 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$namma</td>
<td>21, 28, 124, 125, 131, 275, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urnanshe</td>
<td>5, 61-63, 67, 68, 72, 74, 75, 81, 82, 84, 142, 148, 191, 208, 209, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Urnanšek</td>
<td>142, 144, 145, 148, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$nanše</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$našše</td>
<td>67, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urni</td>
<td>85, 143, 146, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$ni</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^2$ne$_2$</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Ur-$^5$NI.$^2$TI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-$^5$NI.$^2$TI</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– UrNIL.NITI</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– taš-ni,$^1$-til$_1$</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^5$NI.$^2$TI</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^5$NI-ti</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^2$ne$_5$-ti</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^2$ni$_5$-ti</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– → Urni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrNi.$^2$</td>
<td>29, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Urgar</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– UrGAR</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$Nî.$^2$</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urniggar</td>
<td>117, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Urmigingar</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$ggar</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ur-$^4$ggar,$^3$(NÎGÎN$_3$$^2$(p))</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ur-niĝar</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urninazu</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urninduluma</td>
<td>37, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urningirsu</td>
<td>29-31, 110, 120-122, 130, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-Ningirsu</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-nin-ĝir-su</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urninurta</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-nin-urta</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-nin-urta</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urpabilang</td>
<td>140, 141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urpabilṣagak</td>
<td>140, 141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-pa-bil(NEKPAP)-ṣag</td>
<td>141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-pa-bil-ṣag-ka</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-ṣag-me:a-nu</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursaman</td>
<td>77, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-ṣaman</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursangkesh</td>
<td>142, 152, 192, 197, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-ṣagkeš</td>
<td>142, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-ṣag-keš</td>
<td>142, 152, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursangpae</td>
<td>141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-ṣagpa'e</td>
<td>141, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-ṣag-pa-e</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursara</td>
<td>193, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-sila-sir-sir-ra</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursurbur</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-subur</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UtUR</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-TUR</td>
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