

ATATÜRK SUPREME COUNCIL FOR CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND HISTORY
PUBLICATIONS OF THE TURKISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Serial VI - No. 64

THE OLD ASSYRIAN LIST OF YEAR EPONYMS
FROM KARUM KANISH
AND ITS CHRONOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

KLAAS R. VEENHOF

PRINTED AT TURKISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
ANKARA 2003

set by the "Distanzangabe". Inserting (only) four eponyms between KEL A and MEC B still leaves room for three additional ones (§ 7.2 end). Since the discovery of three new and late eponyms, to be inserted in the gap alongside *e*, *i*, *j*, and *k*, in my opinion is very unlikely, I prefer to reserve them (and they are necessary to arrive at the total of 199 required by the 'Distanzangabe') for restoring MEC B *28-*30. This means three eponyms which we cannot expect to find in texts from level II of *kārum* Kanish, which had been deserted by then. I hence propose to equate MEC B *31 (and not *28) with the year of Šamši-Adad's conquest of Ekallatum. This is also attractive because the room available for the name of the eponym Ibni-Adad in MEC B *28 (after *i-na* and before ^dUTU-^dŠI-^dIŠKUR) is rather small,⁹⁷ although the space after the king's name seems sufficient for the words "he captured Ekallatum".⁹⁸

We reconstruct the sequence of eponyms of KEL A, before the end of level II of the *kārum*, by placing four eponyms of § 7.3 in the gap before MEC B, numbered A-D because their sequence is unknown. They are followed by MEC B *1-*5, known in their correct order:

(130)	A	Šu-Rama	s. Uzua
(131)	B	Iddin-Suen	s. Iddin-abum
(132)	C	Sin-išmeanni	s. ?
(133)	D	Ṭab-Aššur	s. Uzua
(134)	*1	Aššur-malik	s. Šu-Haniš
(135)	*2	Dan-Ea	s. Abu-(w)aqar
(136)	*3	Ennam-Suen	s. Iddin-abum
(137)	*4	Aššur-balaṭ	s. ?
(138)	*5	Ennam-Aššur	s. ?

This reconstruction of the chronology means that the end of level II of *kārum* Kanish came 138 years after the accession of Irišum I, in ca. 1836 B.C. Assyrian commercial presence in the *kārum*, already attested under Irišum I (see § 6.3.a), lasted at least 110 and possibly as much as 120 years. This is a long period which must have witnessed developments and evolutions, both in the material culture, in the social fabric, and in commercial practices, which archaeologists and historians must reconstruct.

⁹⁷ Only ca. 13 mms., while in S 24-2 rev. 4' the same name occupies ca. 17 mms.
⁹⁸ É.GAL-*la-tim*^{ki} *iš-ba-at*, as suggested by AKL and the Mari texts.

8. GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

8.1 Dating proposals

The results of the previous paragraph, within the terms of the 'middle chronology', can be summarized in the following table:

Irišum I	KEL 1-40	40	years	ca. 1974-1935
Ikūnum	KEL 41-54	14	years	ca. 1934-1921
Šarrukīn	KEL 55-94	40	years	ca. 1920-1881
Puzur-Aššur II	KEL 95-102	8	years	ca. 1880-1873
Naram-Suen	KEL 103-129	27	years	ca. 1872-1846
Naram-Suen	gap 1	4	years	ca. 1845-1842
Naram-Suen/Irišum II	MEC B *1-*27	27	years	ca. 1841-1815
Irišum II	MEC B 28*-*30	3	years	ca. 1814-1812
Šamši-Adad I	Ekallatum	3	years	ca. 1811-1809
Šamši-Adad I	Assur	33	years	ca. 1808-1776

The following chronological conclusions can be formulated:

a) the temporal distance between the accession of Irišum I and the death of Šamši-Adad I was 199 years, ca. 1974 - 1776 B.C.;

b) level II of *kārum* Kanish came to an end around 1836 B.C., during the second half of Naram-Suen's reign;

c) Old Assyrian traders worked and lived in *kārum* Kanish during its level II phase for a period of at least 110 years;

d) the interval between levels II and Ib of *kārum* Kanish probably lasted ca. 35 years;

e) the 'Mari Eponym Chronicle' covers a period of 97 years, from ca. 1872 to 1776 B.C.;

f) Šamši-Adad I was born in ca. 1850 B.C., became king around 1833 B.C. at the age of 18 years, and died in 1776 B.C. at the age of 75.

8.2 A shorter chronology?

These dates do not take into account the possibility of a shorter chronology than the middle one, defended by Gasche e.a. in *MHEM* IV. Since the whole of the Old Assyrian period precedes the so-called 'Dark Age' (which in Assyria starts with the death of Išme-Dagan) and synchronisms with Babylonia are lacking, the reconstruction of the internal Old Assyrian chronology in itself cannot be used as an argument pro or contra a shorter chronology. But the Old Assyrian evidence is relevant for the chronological problem, because it provides the historical setting for the increasingly detailed evidence from ancient Anatolian dendrochronology. Old Assyrian texts are the only dated historical sources which can be connected with dated timber from public buildings (mainly palaces) of the Anatolian Middle Bronze Age. A recent date of ca. 2033 B.C. for the building of the so-called 'old palace' of Kanish,⁹⁹ unfortunately is not helpful, because it is well before Assyrian commercial penetration there (and would even be more so with a shorter chronology). But the conclusion that the palatial building of Ačemhöyük, in which bullae with seals of Šamši-Adad I (and of Aplahanda of Karkemish) were found, was built in 1752 B.C.¹⁰⁰ has serious implications. If correct, it shows that the middle chronology dates for that king are much (at least thirty years, probably more) too high. But this is not the place to enter this discussion, because a shorter chronology has no direct impact on the reconstruction of the internal chronology of the Old Assyrian period.

The conclusions drawn also ignore the possibility, assumed in *MHEH* IV, that Assyria adopted the solar calendar only during the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.). This would mean that earlier Assyrian data, based on a lunar calendar, require a solar correction by subtracting three years per century in order to get in line with the chronology of Babylonia. For the period we are concerned with this would mean that the date of 1974 B.C., suggested for the accession of

⁹⁹ See the December 1999 Progress Report of 'The Malcom and Carolyn Wiener Laboratory for Aegean and Near Eastern Dendrochronology' at Cornell University.

¹⁰⁰ See for the evidence Kuniholm 1996. The absolute date rests on the convincing equation of the year of the most notable "major growth anomaly" of the 2nd millennium B.C. with the year 1628/7 B.C. Whether this latter date can be connected with the eruption of Thera/Santorini (a connection which causes problems for the Egyptian New Empire chronology) is another matter.

Irišum I, should be lowered to ca. 1948 B.C. and that of the end of level II of *kārum* Kanish would become ca. 1816 B.C. Absence of reliable synchronisms make it impossible to check this claim, but I consider it doubtful for lack of direct evidence. Advocates of this theory should anyhow explain how it fits the fact that 'successor eponyms' (see above note 46) are nearly always restricted to the first four, rarely five months of the calendar and do not move through the year. The likely assumption that dating by means of "successor eponyms" was due to the fact that the information on the new eponym (designated by casting lots, in autumn) had not reached Anatolia before the winter, implies that at least the eponymy year was correlated with the seasons and hence a kind of solar year. This is a difficult issue, which needs a special investigation, which does not fit in the framework of this text edition.¹⁰¹

8.3 Assur and its colonies

As for the history of Assur, this chronology implies that the temporal distance between the end of Ur III rule over Assur, presumably during the early years of Ibbi-Suen, shortly after ca. 2025 B.C., when also Eshnunna became independent, and the accession of Irišum I was only ca. 50 years. During this period Irišum's three immediate predecessors (nos. XXX-XXXII in the Kinglist), Puzur-Aššur I, the presumed founder of the dynasty, his son Šalim-ahum, and his grandson Ilušuma¹⁰² must have ruled, whose years of reign the Kinglist, due to the absence of year-eponyms, is unable to give. Adding Irišum's forty years to this period of ca. fifty years, we obtain an average of ca. 22 years per generation, which is an acceptable figure. When and how long Šalim-ahum's predecessors (according to the Kinglist) ruled, also in relation to Assur's governor Zariqum (ca. 2040 B.C., under Amar-Suen of Ur III),¹⁰³ is unknown. If Sulili (no. XXVII of the Kinglist), usually identified with *Ši-lu-lu*, son of Dakiki, *en₅.si A-šur^{ki}* (impressions of his seal, reused by a namesake, were found on Kültepe tablets),¹⁰⁴ indeed belongs in the period when Ur no longer controlled the north,¹⁰⁵ the time left for kings XXX-XXXII becomes rather short.

¹⁰¹ See for the time being M.T. Larsen, *RA* 68 (1974) 15-24, and Veenhof 1997, esp. 12ff., and now Veenhof 2001, § 2.

¹⁰² The family relationship is confirmed by their building and votive inscriptions, cf. *RIMA* 1 A.0.33.1:1-3 and 14:1-13.

¹⁰³ See for him R. Kutschler, *RA* 79 (19885) 81f. and T. Maeda, *ASJ* 14 (1992) 149f.

¹⁰⁴ See Balkan 1955, 54f. Sulili is mentioned in a later historiographic text, see above note 33. The man who reused this seal must be identical to eponym 98 of KEL.

¹⁰⁵ As suggested by Galter 1998, 33, with notes 169-171.

That Assyrians lived and worked in level II of *kārum* Kanish for more than hundred years, means that we must expect certain developments over the time. They probably affected the nature, the commercial and legal procedures,¹⁰⁶ and the geographical (and political?) range of action of the trade. We probably must envisage a gradual growth of the number of *kārums* and *wabartums*, from the first and oldest one at Kanish, which was and remained its administrative center, to the later network of nearly forty different colonies and trading stations. This in turn meant the need of involving more and different persons for covering a larger area and performing various tasks (especially transport, agency and representation), which much have affected the social fabric of the growing merchant communities. Tracing and mapping such developments is now on the agenda of Old Assyrian research.

The identification and dates of year eponyms provided by KEL show that a number of rare eponyms, thusfar considered either very early or very late (post level II) ones, have to be redated. To our surprise several of them prove to belong to the last phase of *kārum* level II. This raises the question (already touched upon in § 6.3.e, in connection with Naram-Suen) how to explain this scarcity of late records and also the fact that the archives of several prominent trading families stop ca. twenty-five years before the destruction and abandonment of the *kārum*. One of the results also is that the attestation of the eponymy of Hannanarum (115) in a text from Ališar/Amkuwa, shows that Assyrian commercial presence there preceded the level Ib period, as we now know also *kārum* Boğazköy did.¹⁰⁷ (although not yet confirmed by Boğazköy texts dated to level II year-eponyms). This raises the interesting possibility that these *kārums* survived the destruction of level II of *kārum* Kanish, if this was local event.

The eponym list also allows us to obtain a much better idea of the activities of the various traders and their families, when they first appeared, when they acquired their *naruqqu*-capital, how long their active career was, when they officiated as week-eponyms for the *kārum*, when the next generation took over, etc. This requires a renewed study of the archives, which is one of the issues to be treated by Guido Kryszat in his forthcoming book. Also more detailed observations become possible. To mention just one example, kt n/k/ 1429:13'f.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ See for the time being my observations in: Silver and Credit in Old Assyrian Trade, in: J.G. Dercksen (ed.), *Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia (MOS Studies 1, Istanbul 1999)* 55-84.

¹⁰⁷ On the basis of an official letter of *kārum* Kanish, kt 92/k 203, addressed to i.a. the *kārums* of Durhumit, Hattuš, Tamnia (Tawinia), and Tuḫpia; see S. Çeçen, *Bellethen* 61/231 (1997) 219-232.

¹⁰⁸ S. Çeçen, *Archivum Anatolicum* 1 (1995) 60f.

mentions "the hostilities (*nukurātum*) in Kanish" as the date (year or month?) from which interest has to be paid on a copper debt between Assyrians. Since this memorandum also lists debts dated to eponymies 81-84, it gives us an approximate date for this apparently memorable event and we can start looking for evidence of its impact on the trade.

8.4 Šamši-Adad I

Damage of MEC makes it difficult to link the career of king Šamši-Adad I (ŠA), as summarized in the Assyrian Kinglist (AKL), with the data preserved in MEC. AKL states: "In the time of Naram-Suen ŠA went to Babylonia ("Karduniaš"). During the eponymy of Ibni-Adad ŠA came up from Babylonia and seized Ekallatum, three years he resided in Ekallatum. During the eponymy of Atamar-Ištar ŠA came up from Ekallatum and removed Irišum, the son of Naram-Suen, from the throne and seized the throne. He ruled as king for 33 years".¹⁰⁹

In § 7.4 we concluded that Ekallatum probably was conquered during eponymy MEC B *31, but the year of ŠA's departure for Babylonia is unknown, because "during the time of (*ina tarši*) Naram-Suen" is too vague. The chronology proposed here implies that Naram-Suen and Irišum II of Assur together ruled for ca. 63 years, ca. 1872 - 1809 B.C., and Naram-Suen (see § 6.2) probably 44 or 54 years, hence until ca. 1828 or 1818 B.C. Because ŠA's departure for Babylonia occurred after the accession of Irišum II, the Naram-Suen linked with this event in AKL must be Naram-Suen of Eshnunna.¹¹⁰ Since a reference to a king of Eshnunna purely as a chronological indicator is unlikely, "in the time of Naram-Suen" may be understood as indicating that Šamši-Adad's departure was due to the military pressure exerted by Naram-Suen of Eshnunna. This synchronism fits the chronology, because Naram-Suen's reign of perhaps ten to fifteen years, as successor of Ipiq-Adad II, apparently fell in the last two decades of the 19th century B.C.¹¹¹ ŠA probably stayed a few years in Babylonia, before returning to conquer Ekallatum in ca. 1811 B.C. The new data, including the text of Naram-

¹⁰⁹ RIA 6, 105f. § 11.

¹¹⁰ This need not surprise in view of the large amount of attention which conflicts between Šamši-Adad's dynasty and Eshnunna receive in the (official) 'Mari Eponym Chronicle' too.

¹¹¹ In my chronology after ca. 1818 B.C. See for this king most recently D. Charpin, *Données nouvelles sur la chronologie des souverains d'Eshnunna*, in: *Miscellanea Babilonica. Mélanges Maurice Birot* (Paris 1985) 51-66, together with his observations in *Florilegium marianum (Mémoires de NABU I, Paris 1992)* 37f.

Suen's official seal (see § 6.3.e), prove that AKL's "Naram-Suen, son of Puzur-Assur" is indeed the native Assyrian ruler and not his namesake of Eshnunna, who ruled much later.

As for Šamši-Adad I himself, the chronology advocated here implies that he was born in ca. 1850 B.C., became successor to the throne of his family (*ana bēt abišu īrub*)¹¹² in ca. 1833 B.C., 18 years old, and after having ruled Assur and Upper Mesopotamia for 33 years, died in ca. 1776 B.C., 75 years old. His active career hence spanned a period of 58 years. It does not surprise that his sons, some years after 1800 B.C. were old enough to rule parts of his realm, but it makes it very unlikely that his eldest son, Išme-Dagan, occupied the throne as his father's successor for no less than forty years, as AKL states. This long reign, if at all correct (the evidence from Mari documents only twelve or thirteen years of independent reign, at the end of which he is severely ill), must include the years during his father's lifetime when he occupied the throne of Ekallatum.

The combination between KEL and MEC makes it possible (within the framework of the middle chronology) to provide more fixed dates for events and rulers mentioned in the historical information added to the eponymies in MEC. Here I only mention that Ipiq-Adad II of Eshnunna, the enemy of Šamši-Adad's dynasty, succeeded his father during the eponymy KEL 113 = MEC A 11, or in ca. 1862 B.C. Since he is last mentioned (his death?) in MEC B *25, or in ca. 1818 B.C., this means a political career of ca. 45 years. Around that time he must have been succeeded by his son Naram-Suen, which suits the reference in the Assyrian Kinglist to the latter's rule and the pressure he apparently exerted on Šamši-Adad I, a few years before 1812 B.C.

¹¹² AKL suggests that he was the successor of his brother Aminum, whose death most probably is recorded in MEC A during eponymy 126 (Durand, quoted in footnote 6). But note that ŠA was born ca. 20 years after his brother had begun to rule (during eponymy 107?), while his father Ilakabkabuhu is still active during MEC B:7. I leave it to the Mari specialists to solve this puzzle.

9. POST-LEVEL II YEAR EPONYMS FROM KANISH, BOĞAZKÖY AND ALIŞAR

For easy reference and for future studies of the chronology of the younger period of Assyrian commercial involvement in Anatolia, I present here a list of all year-eponyms thusfar attested in texts from Kanish, Boğazköy and Alişar, which is an update and correction of Veenhof 1998, 447f. It can be used to estimate the minimal length of that period, but the series of eponyms obviously is not complete, because they are collected from a relatively small number of tablets¹¹³ and most thusfar are attested only once or twice. Note, for example, that of the by now twenty-one eponyms known from Mari¹¹⁴ during the period when also *kārum* Kanish level Ib flourished, only ten¹¹⁵ are thusfar attested at Kanish and that in a random distribution. Nevertheless, the three sites treated here already provide us with forty different year eponyms.

In the following lists *q* means a *ša qātē* or 'successor eponymy'; month *Xa* = *ITI Sū-in*, the new level Ib name of the month called *ITI Ti'inātim* in level II texts. In the column "elsewhere" the following abbreviations are used: A = Alişar (§ 9.3), B = Boğazköy (§ 9.2), K = Kültepe, L = Tell Leilan¹¹⁶, M = Mari,¹¹⁴ R = Tell ar-Rimah.¹¹⁷ Those attested on texts from Tell Bi^ca and Chagar Bazar¹¹⁸ are not mentioned separately, since they all fall within the range of the series known from Mari.

¹¹³ See for a short survey of the various groups and little archives which yielded eponyms, Veenhof 1998, 440f.

¹¹⁴ See Charpin 1985, 243ff., with note 84 above. Apart from the continuous series running from Aššur-taklaku and Hayamalik until *warki* Ṭab-šilli-Aššur, there are isolated references to Ahiyaya and Pussanum (Charpin 250). Note also *MARI* 5 (1987) 157, 2: *limu* Adad-bani, son of *l-l-na-*[]; 3: the name of the father of Sin-muballit is ^dAš-gi-i-din-nam.

¹¹⁵ There is some uncertainty in the case of very common names without patronyms (e.g. Adad-bani and Ennam-Aššur).

¹¹⁶ See Whiting 1990, 184ff. and 215f.; J. Eidem, *AAAS* 38/39 (1988) 110-127; idem *RA* 85 (1991) 109-135, esp. 112ff.; M. van de Mieroop, *Orientalia* 63 (1994) 306-308.

¹¹⁷ See Veenhof 1985, 196ff.; Whiting 1990, 189ff.

¹¹⁸ Tell Bi^ca: M. Krebernik, *MDOG* 122 (1990), 67ff., 125 (1993) 51ff., and 126 (1994) 33ff.; Chagar Bazar: Veenhof 1985, 196:2.

9.1 *Kārum Kanish level Ib*

no.	name	son of	month	source	elsewhere
1	A-ba-a-a	Kà-ri-a		s/k 1:16f.	
2	Áb-ša-gi ₅ -iš	Šál-ma-A-šūr	V	98/k 123:17	
3	^d Adad-ba-ni	[]		98/k 115::3 ⁷	A,B,M
	"	Pu-zu-ur- ^d A-a ¹		n/k 1566:14 ^a	
4	A-hi-a-a	Ta-ki-ki	Xa	n/k 27:22f.	C,M,R
5	^a A-hi-a-a	A-du-na-a	III	98/k 105:19ff.	R ⁷
6	A-hu-qar	DAM.GÀR	VI	n/k 10:38	L
7	^a A-šūr-mì-tí		IX	98/k 113:21	M
8	A-šūr-kà-ší-id	ZI-lá-mu (ŠEŠ ³)		s/k 10:28f.	L
9	A-šūr-ni-šu	Ì-lí-ILLAT-tí	XI	n/k 19:12f.	
10	A-šūr-AN.DÛL	[]-A-šūr	VII	f/k 190:11f.	
11	A-šūr-ták-lá-ku	^d EN.LÍL-na-da	VII	k/k 18:21f. ^b	L (<i>warki</i>)
	"	---		kt 98/k 122:19	L, R ⁷
12	^a A-ta-a	Ša-ma-a	VI	n/k 9:42f.	R ⁷¹¹⁹
13	A-tal-LUGAL	Ì-lí-a-LIM	VI	kt n/k 22:17f.	
14	A-wi-li-a		Xa	EL 276:21	M
15	Be-li-a-a	E/I-na-Sú-in	XI	n/k 6:22f.	
	"		XII	AKT 3, 1:14f.	
16	Da-dí-a	I-din-Sú-in	Xa	n/k 7:20f.	B
	"	"	XII	n/k 30:22f.	
	"	---	VI	g/k 6:10	
17	E-na-a	Hur-ma-a	VIII	f/k 181:16f.	
	^a E-na-a	Hur-ma-a	Xa	f/k 17811f.	
18	E-nam-A-šūr	A-šūr-ták-lá-ku	IX	n/k 33:15f.	B(q),L,M
19	^a En-na-Sú-in	A-šūr-ṭāb (DUG)	IV	n/k 8:12f.;	
	"			n/k 9:13f.	
20	Ha-dí-ú		V	O 3684:27	
	^a Ha-dí-e-em	A-hi-a-a	VII	AKT 3, 2:17	

¹¹⁹ Perhaps = *A-at-ta* and/or (the successor of) *A-at-ta-ra*, in *OBTR* 18, 215, and 263.

21	Ib-ni- ^d Adad	A-šūr-du-gul	VII	n/k 20:19f.	M
	Ib-na- ^d [Adad]	A-šūr-du-gu ₅ -ul	VII	n/k 40:21f.	
22	Ì-lí-am-gur ₁₆ (KUR)		XI	k/k 19:16f.	
23	^a I-ší-im-Sú-in	Id-na-Ašūr	X	k/k 15:12f.	
24	Ištar-tù-li-id	Ša-gi-iš-ke-nim		s/k 9:13f.	
25	Ku-ur-ku-da-nim	Šamaš-SIPAD	XI	n/k 12:24f.	
				UgFo 7 no 2:19	L, M
26	Ni-mar-Ku-be		II	98/k 111:9	L
	^a Ni-mar-Ku-be	[Ú-šur]-pì-a		k/k 127:10'	Q ¹²⁰
27	Pí-lá-ah-Sú-in	I-k[u-n]im		k/k 11:16f.	B, L
28	Pu-sà-num	[^d Adad-rabi]		n/k 12:8 ¹²¹	M, L ^c
29	^a Sí-in-mu-ba-lí-iṭ	A.ÀŠ.KI-i-dí-nam	VIII	n/k 15:19f.	L, M
30	Ša-áb-ri-im	Puzur ₂ -Sú-in	VII	n/k 13:13f.	R
	"	"	XI	n/k 4:45f.	
	"	Puzur ₄ -Sú-in(?)	VIII	b/k 21:22f.	
31	Ṭāb-ší-lá-A-šūr	Be-lí-a-a		k/k 16:14f.	M
32	Za-a-a	Be-li-a-a		89/k 362:19f.	B
33	Za-za-bu-um	A-šūr-ma-lik	Xa	n/k 21:24f.	B, L ^d
34	[x x]-ru-um	A-za-a	[]	90/k 363 r.3'	

^aDifficult, coll. Günbattu. ^bDifferent from A., son of Ennam-Aššur, attested at Leilan and Assur (A 1574:5'f., from Assur, Donbaz *JCS* 26 [1974] 86). ^cAlso at Mari, but outside the series (*MARI* 4, 250) and probably identical to Pussaya in Leilan. ^dWritten Zabzabu and Zazzabu.

¹²⁰ The *limum warki* Nimar-Kubi occurs on a single text found at Qal'at al-Hādī (see *NABU* 1987/37), perhaps to be identified with the ancient town of Šurnat, southeast of Tell Leilan, see Eidem 1991, 119.

¹²¹ The text deals with a debt of 6 shekels of silver at 20% interest, due since the eponymy of Pussanum. The creditor is quit by a payment of 24 shekels in month XI of the eponymy of Kurkudanum (no. 24 above). Debt and rate of interest (disregarding possible compound interest) imply that it was paid after sixteen years!

9.2 Boğazköy^a

no.	name	son of	month	source	elsewhere
1	^a Adad-ba-ni	A-zu ⁷ -me-a ^b	VIII	KBo 28, 156:7	A,L,M
2	Da-dí-a	Iddin-Suin	XI	KBo 9, 20:26f. ^c	K
3	E-dí-nim	Be- ¹ x- y ¹		KBo 9, 20:10	
4	^a E-nam-A-šur	A-šur-ták-lá-ku	IX	KBo 9, 40:17f.	K,M,L
5	Id ⁷ -x-[x]	B/Ma-x-x-a-y	V	KBo 28, 173:9f.	
6	Pí-lá-ah-Sú-in	---	IX	KBo 9, 5:28	KL
7	^a Pí-lá-ah-Sú-in	Ikūnim	Xa	KBo 9, 4:9f.	
8	^a Tū-ta-i-a	Ú-šú ¹ -ur-pi-a	Xa	KBo 9, 37: 11f.	R
9	^a Za-a-a	---	XI	KBo 9, 3:10 ^d	K
	"	Be-ru ⁷ -[]	XII	KBo 28, 183: 27	
10	Za-za-bu-um	Aššur-mālik	XI	KBo 9, 27: r.10f.	KL
	"	"	VII	KBo 9, 35:16f.	

^aBalkan 1955, 100; Veenhof 1985, 199f. ^bDifficult, not the same as § 9.1 no. 3, Tell Leilan's Adad-bani son of Pussaya (L 79-183, with seals of servants of Šamši-Adad), or Mari's Adad-bani, son of Puzur-ili (see Whiting 1990, 184ff.).^cIn lines 25f. the date of an agreement, in line 10 that of the earlier debt-note. ^dEL no. 34.

Eponyms 1, 7 and 9 are on texts from the archive of Daya, son of Ilbani.

9.3 Ališar^a

no.	name	son of	month	source	elsewhere
1	^a Adad-ba-ni		III	OIP 27, 29:x+3f.	L,M
2	[I]-ku-pí-a	Šalim-Aššur	VI	OIP 27, 39:13	L,M
3	Ri-iš-[^a Šamaš]	A-nu-pí-š[a]	[]	OIP 27, 20:14	M
4	Sí-sá-a-a	A-bi ₄ -na-ra	III	OIP 27, 18a:23 ^b	

^aSee Balkan, 1955, 101; Veenhof 1985, 199,5. Not included is Hanna-narum (OIP 27 no. 8), a level II eponym on a tablet discovered at the same spot (P 27) as (and hence part of?) the little archive of Iddin-Kubum, with texts dated to eponyms 1-3 above. ^bSee MARI 3 (1984) 265.

9.4 Approximate dates for *kārum* Kanish level Ib

Thusfar neither the year when *kārum* Kanish level Ib began, nor when it came to an end are known. It seems likely that it started during the reign of Šamši-Adad I, since bullae with impressions of his seal were found in a palatial building at Acemhoyük, together with bullae with the seal of the "city-house" (*bēt ālim*) of Assur and addressed to *kārum* Kanish.¹²² But probably not before he had secured control over Northern Mesopotamia, presumably after having eliminated his rival Jahdun-Lim of Mari,¹²³ which means not before ca. 1800 B.C. How long level Ib lasted is equally uncertain, but at least beyond 1740 B.C., since the total number of post level II year-eponyms known (those listed in § 9.1-3 plus those known from Mari, Tell Rimah, Tell Leilan, MEC, Tell Taya¹²⁴), hardly a series without gaps, is now at least sixty-five. Such a date is supported by the iconographic analysis of level Ib seals.¹²⁵ It also agrees with the approximate dates of the few eponyms which can be placed in a historical context. The best evidence thusfar is the eponym Nimar-Kube (§ 9.1 no. 26), attested at Tell Leilan (as Niw/mer-Kubi) in association with Šehna's last ruler Jakun-Ašar.¹²⁶ His reign ended in ca. 1728 B.C., in consequence of an attack on the city by Samsuiluna of Babylon, recorded in the name of the latter's 23rd year. This leaves a certain margin, since we do not know the length of his reign nor to which year of his reign the eponymy of Nimer-Kubi belongs, but it anyhow brings us further down than 1740 B.C.

As with the end of *kārum* Kanish level II, both a purely Anatolian cause and one connected with developments in Northern Mesopotamia is possible. The former is a matter of speculation, since the period between the end of *kārum* level Ib and the beginning of the Hittite Old Empire, less than a century later, is badly known. We are not informed about the fate of the dynasty of Pithana and Anitta,

¹²² See Ö. Tunca, in: *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç* (Ankara 1989) 481ff, and K.R. Veenhof, in: M.J. Mellink e.a. (eds.), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbours. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç* (Ankara 1993) 645ff., esp. notes 3 and 4.

¹²³ See for this conflict the remarks in Veenhof 1998, 439 with footnote 31. If the eponym Aššur-taklaku of MEC D:8' is indeed the direct predecessor of Haya-malik in Mari (see note 84), the final battle with Jahdun-Lim, dated to the preceding eponymy (D:5', [A]tanum?), might have taken place around 1795 B.C.

¹²⁴ The eponym *Id-na-dA-šur*, son of Abi-šalim, on a single text from Tell Taya, with a seal of a servant of Šamši-Adad I (see MARI 4, 201. 8.c), is thusfar without parallel elsewhere, but might be identical to the eponymy []-^dA-šur, listed in MEC D (S. 24-3 f) line 3'.

¹²⁵ See N. Özgüç, *Seals and Seal Impressions of Level Ib from Karum Kanish* (Ankara 1968), 59ff., with conclusions to be adapted to the new *limum*-chronology.

¹²⁶ See Eidem 1991, 115, on room 2.

after the latter had acquired the status of "great ruler" (*rubā'um rabium*) of Central Anatolia.¹²⁷ The destruction of level Ib anyhow shows that the direct cause was Anatolian. As for the Mesopotamian scene, trade on Kanish is still documented in texts from Mari during Zimrilim's reign (ARMT 26/1 nos. 315 and 316, from ca. 1765 B.C.) and by the treaty between one of the later rulers of Šehna (Tell Leilan) and Assur, dating from ca. 1750-1740 B.C.¹²⁸ Charpin's proposal (*NABU* 1988/20) to link the end of Assyrian trade with Samsu-iluna's conquest of Šehna in ca. 1728 B.C. is possible, but perhaps makes too much of the king's raid into the Chabur region. We should not forget Jamchad (Aleppo), which extended its influence into Northern Mesopotamia after 1760 B.C. under king Hammurabi (since ca. 1765) and his son Abban, who is attested in documents from Tell Leilan.¹²⁹ Finally, the breakdown of Assyrian trade has been attributed to the fact that tin no longer reached the Assyrian market, due to events in Iran and/or Northern Babylonia.

We can draw some conclusions on the sequence and approximate dates of level Ib eponyms which are also attested at Mari, where they occur in a fixed sequence which spans the period between ca. 1794 and 1776 B.C.¹³⁰ But the fact that only two of the first six eponyms of the Mari series are attested at Kanish, reveals how limited our information from level Ib still is and how urgent the full publication of all relevant texts from that period. Once this is done we also can try to assign better dates to (and fix the sequence of) the local rulers of Kanish on the basis of topographical studies, and find genealogical links between Assyrian and Anatolian traders attested during the end of level II and the beginning of level Ib, as was already attempted in Hecker 1998. Discovery of additional eponyms at Kanish (note the recent discovery of § 9.1 nos. 2, 5 and 7 by Veysel Donbaz on tablets excavated in 1998) or Tell Leilan will certainly reduce our problems and provide indications for the length and the end of level Ib.

¹²⁷ See for the history of this "dark period", H. Klengel, *Geschichte de Hethitischen Reiches* (HdO Abt. 1, Band 34, Leiden 1999) 27-32.

¹²⁸ Published and analysed by J. Eidem, in: D. Charpin - F. Joannès (eds.), *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs. Études sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli* (Paris 1991) 185-207.

¹²⁹ See Eidem 1991. Mercenaries called *habbātum*, which in his sources pose a military threat, are also mentioned in a late level Ib text (see Dercksen en Donbaz, in *JEOL* 35/36, in the press); they endanger roads and caravan traffic. The letter *AbB* 7,1 documents commercial contacts between Jamchad under Abban and Babylon under Samsu-iluna.

¹³⁰ See for Mari, Charpin 1985, for the dating of the level Ib archives kt n/k and kt k/k on the basis of the Mari evidence, Veenhof 1998, 441, and for an attempt to reconstruct the sequence and dates of the local kings of Kanish, Forlanini 1995.

10. ADDENDUM

In August 2001 Professor M. T. Larsen, in Ankara, discovered a fifth manuscript of the Kültepe Eponym List (= KEL E), the tablet kt 94/k 836, listing eponyms 1 to 95. He kindly gave me a transliteration of the text, which he will publish in due time, allowing me to list its main features here. The complete tablet lists the names on 44 lines, without introduction, summary and word dividers. Mistakes and omissions suggest a not too careful scribe, but in some cases one hesitates between mistake or variant. The main features of KEL E are (numbers refer to the edition of KEL A on pp. 5ff.):

a) *omission of eponyms*: 4, 34a, 40B, and 43b-44a;

b) *omission of patronyms etc.*, in addition to those of KEL A: 3, 6, 18, 21, 22, 31, 36, 38-40, 45, 47, 48, 52-54, 58-62, 65-72, and 75-95;

c) *differences in names* of eponyms and/or patronyms etc.: 6a: *Bu-zu-ta-a*; 21a: *KI.MAŠ*; 24b: *DUMU RA* (for *SANGA?*); 29: *En-um-A-šūr*; 41b: *a-hu-šu* (as KEL D); 48a: *Hi-lu-ga*; 52b: *ša a[t] ra*; 56b: *A-ta*; 74b: as KEL B and D;

d) *differences in spelling*, apart from those already mentioned in §§ 2.3 and 4.2 (KEL E usually writes *Sū-in* and *A-šūr*): 10a: *Za-ku-za*; 12a: *Qú-qú-dum*; 13b: *Bi-ta-a*; 15b: *Kur-bi-Ištar*; 23b: *A-ba-a*; 26a: as 12a; 28a: *I-ri-šum*; 38a: *En-na-ZU*; 43a: *Da-we-er*; 46a: *Šu-Hu-bur*; 60a: *Pi-ša-hi-lam*; 65a: *A-ku-a*; 70a and 84a: as KEL B. In some OA hands he signs BA, KU and MA can be very similar, hence the variants of 23b and 65a could be real ones or less careful writings.

(October 2001)

- TPK C. Michel - P. Garelli, *Tablettes paléo-assyriennes de Kültepe, vol. 1 (kt 90/k)* Istanbul 1997).
- UAR H. Hirsch, *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion (AfO Beiheft 13/14²;* Osnabrück 1972).

Bibliography

- Balkan 1955 K. Balkan, *Observations on the Chronological Problems of the kārūm Kaniš* (TTKY VII/28, Ankara 1955).
- Balkan 1957 K. Balkan, *Letter of King Anum-Hirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish* (TTKY VII/31, Ankara 1957).
- Birot 1985 Maurice Birot, Les chroniques "assyriennes" de Mari, *MARI 4* (1985) 219-242.
- Charpin 1985 Dominique Charpin, Les archives d'époque "assyrienne" dans le palais de Mari, *MARI 4* (1985) 243-268.
- Eidem 1991 J. Eidem, The Tell Leilan Archives 1987, *RA 85* (1991) 109-135.
- Forlanini 1995 M. Forlanini, The Kings of Kanish, in: O. Carruba e.a. (eds.) *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia, Studi Mediterranea 9* (Pavia 1995) 123-132.
- Freydank 1975 H. Freydank, Zur assyrischen Königsliste, *AoF 3* (1975) 173-175.
- Freydank 1991 H. Freydank, *Beiträge zur mittelassyrischen Chronologie und Geschichte* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 21, Berlin 1991).
- Garelli 1963 Paul Garelli, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce* (Paris 1963), ch. I: Le problème chronologique.
- Galter 1998 H.D. Galter, Textanalyse assyrischer Königs-inschriften: die Puzur-Aššur-Dynastie, *SAA Bulletin 12* (1998) 1-38.
- Günbatti 1995 C. Günbatti, More examples of correspondences between kārūm's, *Archivum Anatolicum 1* (1995) 107-115.
- Hecker 1998 K. Hecker, Zur Dauer des Intervalls zwischen den Schichten kārūm II und Ib am Kültepe, in: S. Alp - S. Süel (eds.), *Uluslararası 3. Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 1996* (Ankara 1998) 297-308.

- Kuniholm 1996 P.I. Kuniholm, Anatolian Tree Rings and the Absolute Chronology of the Eastern Mediterranean, 2220-718 BC, *Nature 381* (27 June 1996) 780-783.
- Kuniholm 1999 P. I. Kuniholm, Aegean Dendrochronology Project December 1999 Progress Report (Cornell University 1999).
- Landsberger 1954 B. Landsberger, Assyrische Königsliste und "Dunkles Zeitalter", *JCS 8* (1954) 31-45, 47-73, and 106-133.
- Larsen 1976 M. Trolle Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies* (Mesopotamia 4, Copenhagen 1976).
- Lewy 1957 J. Lewy, Apropos of a Recent Study in Old Assyrian Chronology, *Orientalia 26* (1957) 12-36 (review of Balkan 1955).
- Matouš 1978 L. Matouš, Zum System der Datierung in der Handelskolonie Kaneš, *Archív Orientální 46* (1978) 217-231.
- Özkan 1993 S. Özkan, The Seal Impressions of Two Old Assyrian Kings, in: M.J. Mellink e.a. (eds.), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbours. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç* (Ankara 1993) 501-502 + pl. 90.
- Sever 1990 H. Sever, Yeni Belgelerin ışığında Asur Ticerat Kolonileri çağı kronolojisinin yeniden değerlendirilmesi, in: *Uluslararası 1. Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 1990* (Çorum 1991) 134-139.
- Teissier 1994 Béatrice Teissier, *Sealing and Seals on Texts from Kültepe Karum Level 2* (PIHANS 70, Istanbul 1994), 85-89, Appendix B: Eponym List.
- Veenhof 1985 K.R. Veenhof, Eponyms of the 'Later Old Assyrian Period' and Mari Chronology, *MARI 4* (1985) 191-218.
- Veenhof 1997 K.R. Veenhof, The Old Assyrian *hamuštum* Period: A Seven-day Week, *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux 34* (1995-1996, publ. 1997) 5-26.
- Veenhof 1998 K.R. Veenhof, The Chronology of kārūm Kanish. Some New Observations, in: XXXIV. *Uluslararası Assirioloji Kongresi, 1987-Istanbul* (Ankara 1998) 421-450.

Šu-Ištar	Am(m)aya	23	Šu-Nirah	Az(z)uzaya	120
Šu-Ištar	Ikunum	74	Šu-Rama	Uzua	A
Šu-Ištar	Šukutum	72	Šu-Suen	Pap(p)ilum	103
Šu-Ištar	Enna(m)-Suen	114	Šu-Suen	Šillia	36
Šu-Ištar	Nab(i)-Suen	17	Ṭab-Aššur	Šuharum	90
Šu-Kubum	Ahu ² ahi	53	Ṭab-Aššur	Uzua	D
Šu-Kubum	Susaya	69	(tamkārum)	= Abu-šalim	128
Šukutum	Išuhum	2	Uku	Be/ila	50
Šukutum	Šu-Ištar	72	Uku	Šilulu	98
Šu-Laban	Kurub-Ištar	15	Uphakum	Šūli	32
Šuli	Šalmah	40A	Uphakum	Ennanum	39
Šuli	Šu-Hubur	46	Uzua	Šu-Rama	A
Šuli	Uphakum	32	Uzua	Ṭab-Aššur	D
Šuli	Aššur-idi	94	Zukua	Laqip	33
Šuli	Buzutaya	101			

12. ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

References to editions of Old Assyrian cuneiform texts use the current abbreviations listed in the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (*CAD*). Sigla for still unpublished texts excavated at Kültepe-Kanish are of the type *kt a/k* and *kt 73/k* followed by a number, where *kt* stand for Kültepe, *a* (etc.) and *73* (etc.) for the year of excavation (*a-z* = 1948-1972; 73-98 = 1973-98), and *k* means *kārum*, the commercial quarter in the lower city.

- AKL** The Assyrian Kinglist, according to the edition in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 6 (Berlin 1980-1983) 101-116.
- AKT 1** Emin Bilgiç, e.a., *Ankara Kültepe Tabletleri (Ankaraner Kültepe-Tafeln)* (TTKY VI/33, Ankara 1990).
- AKT 2** Emin Bilgiç - Sabahattin Bayram, *Ankara Kültepe Tabletleri II* (TTKY VI/33a, Ankara 1995).
- AKT 3** Emin Bilgiç - Cahit Günbattı, *Ankaraner Kültepe-Texte III* (FAOS Beiheft 3, Stuttgart 1995).
- GKT** K. Hecker, *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte* (AnOr. 44, Roma 1968).
- Kaniş II** Tahsin Özgüç, *Kültepe-Kaniş II. New Researches at the Trading Center of the Ancient Near East* (TTKY V/41, Ankara 1986).
- MEC** 'Mari Eponym Chronicle', the text published in Birot 1985.
- MHEM IV** H. Gasche, e.a., *Dating the Fall of Babylon. A Reappraisal of Second-Millennium Chronology* (Mesopotamian History and Environment, Series II, Memoir IV, Ghent/Chicago 1998).
- POAT** W.C. Gwaltney, *The Pennsylvania Old Assyrian Texts* (HUCA Supplement 3, Cincinnati 1983).
- RIMA 1** A.K. Grayson, *Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods, 1. Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia B.C. (to 1115 B.C.)* (Toronto 1987).
- SAAB** *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* (Padova).