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PREFACE.

The fortunate discovery of the entire chronological tables of early Sumerian and Babylonian history provides ample reason for a separate volume of the Weld-Blundell Series, and the immediate publication of this instructive inscription is imperative. It constitutes the most important historical document of its kind ever recovered among cuneiform records. The Collection of the Ashmolean Museum contains other historical records which I expected to include in this volume, notably the building inscriptions of Kish, excavated during the first year’s work of the Oxford and Field Museum Expedition. Mr. Weld-Blundell who supports this expedition on behalf of The University of Oxford rightly expressed the desire to have his dynastic prism prepared for publication before the writer leaves Oxford to take charge of the excavations at Obeinor (Kish) the coming winter. This circumstance necessitates the omission of a considerable number of historical texts, which must be left over for a future volume. I wish also that many of the far-reaching problems raised by the new dynastic prism might have received more mature discussion.

The most vital problem, concerning which I am at present unable to decide, namely the date of the first Babylonian dynasty, demands at least special notice some-where in this book. The reader is earnestly requested to remember that the dates given for the entire chronology of ancient Sumer and Accad necessarily rest upon the point from which the calculations begin, namely the year of the foundation of the first dynasty by Sumu-abu. In this book I have accepted the year 2225 for the beginning of the reign of Sumu-abu and 2357 for the beginning of the Isin dynasty. This date was taken from the astronomical calculations of Father Kugler, S.J., in his astonishingly brilliant interpretation of the tablet of observations of the morning and evening appearances and disappearances of the planet Venus for the 21 years of the reign of Ammizaduga, tenth king of the first dynasty 1. The tablet actually preserves observations for 21 years of the reign of Ammizaduga. Now in this text after the observation, “In Adar (12th month) Venus disappeared in the east on the 25th day, [two months and 16 days she delayed in heaven and in the month Sivan, on the eleventh day, she was seen in the west],” the tablet has the year date for the eighth year of Ammizaduga. Therefore, Kugler was able to assign each of the observations above and below this date to the year of Ammizaduga in which it occurred. One of these observations namely that of the sixth year offered the best data for an astronomical calculation. Here (in lines 14-15 of Virolleaud, Ishtar, XII) the tablet has, “In the month Arahsamnu (8th month) on the 28th day Venus disappeared in the west, three days she delayed in heaven and rose in the east on the first of Kislev.” Kugler’s fine astronomical training shewed him at once that this observation would enable him to determine the years of the period

1 F. X. Kugler, S. J., Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel, Vol. II 257-311. The text (K. 160) of these astronomical observations was first published in III Raw. 63 and a partial duplicate (K. 2321) was published by J. A. Craig, Astrological and Astronomical Texts, Pt. 46. These two texts were then combined and published by Chas. Virolleaud, L’Astrologie Chaldéenne, Ishtar, Nos. XII-XV. For a criticism of Virolleaud’s re-arrangement of these texts, see Kugler, ibid. p. 266 n. 1.

2 See the restoration by Kugler, ibid., p. 272.
within which Ammizaduga must have reigned, for this observation implies the occurrence of a new moon between the western setting and eastern rising of Venus, and the short period of three days darkness also confined the possibilities of a similar situation to few chances.

Now I am convinced after long study of the texts and repeated discussion with the Oxford astronomer Dr. Fotheringham, that any date assigned to the first dynasty must satisfy the astronomical calculations based upon this tablet. It is worth more than all the vague general reckonings of the Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions. Until we find chronological lists, which give the lengths of all the missing reigns between the end of the first dynasty and the fourth dynasty, dogmatic statements on dating Hammurabi and Sumu-abu are worthless. Kugler found by calculating from the observation of the 3 days' darkness of Venus at the time of the new moon in the sixth year of Ammizaduga that, in 1972-1 BC., the conjunction of the Moon and Sun occurred only a few hours before the inferior conjunction of the Sun and Venus. Fotheringham tells me that Kugler did not use the best values for the acceleration of the Sun and Moon and consequently Kugler's estimate of +0.16 should be turned into a small minus value on page 285 of Sternkunde. This means that the new moon was actually seen about two days after the inferior conjunction of Venus. The calculation resulted in fixing the beginning of the reign of Ammizaduga in 1977 and the beginning of the first dynasty in 2225. This calculation made that particular year begin April 18th (Gregorian). Kugler found several other dates in this period when the inferior conjunction of Venus occurred at the time of the new moon, and among these he thought 2036-5 or 1852-1 most probable. The former date which is 64 years earlier is obviously out of consideration for it not only brings the beginning of the year too late, well into May (Gregorian calendar), but it is too high for even the Babylonian inter-periodic dead reckonings of Nabonidus and the Cassite inscriptions. This leaves only the year 1852-1 or 119 years later for a choice which would bring the beginning of the year about March 22nd.

Kugler decided for 1972-71, in his original study but in 1922 in his book Von Moses bis Paulus, p. 497 he accepts the date 1796-5 for the occurrence of this observation, which places the beginning of the year about March 5. He has thus lowered the entire chronology by 176 years, thus agreeing approximately with Weidner's low dates, 2057-1758, for the first dynasty, Kugler 2049-1750. Kugler has made his latest choice because he finds that the gathering of dates in this period occurs regularly in Tešrit (seventh month) or Aralušānu (eight month); or at any rate renter and owner divided the dates then. This season would be much too late for the date harvest in August-September unless the year began in March. He also felt the difficulty presented by certain contracts for renting fields in the 7th-8th months which would be in Nov.-Dec., if the year began late in April as presumed by the choice of the year 1972-1 for the 6th year of Ammizaduga.

1 He chose 2090-1740, and the choice is in fact even more restricted by the resulting dates for the beginning of the New Year. The choice of dates for the observation must in any case yield a date for the beginning of the year between March 1st and May 1st. In fact any date below 1795 would bring the beginning of the year before March 5th.


3 In his Von Moses bis Paulus, (1922) Kugler on page 497 states that an inscription of Nabonidus, first noticed by Professor Scheil, places Rim-Shi's sister 1500 years before Nabonidus. But this inscription now published by Professor Clay, Miscellaneous Inscriptions, No. 45, makes no mention of the number 1500. In fact Scheil did not say that this number stands in the text.
It seems to me hazardous to shift the entire chronology 176 years on the basis of these contracts, for surely the division of a crop might take place some time after the harvest and the contracts for renting fields may not depend on the autumn ploughing and sowing season at all. At any rate the year 1796-5 now preferred by KUGLER must be given up, for DR. FOTHERINGHAM’s calculations make this date impossible astronomically. He says that in 1796-5 B.C. the latitude of Venus was too small (2-3 degrees) to permit of a period of only 3 days of darkness for this planet. KUGLER’s calculations for 1972-1 make the latitude 8 degrees and this agrees admirably with the period of three days of darkness. In the presence of these authoritative calculations there seems to be no reason at present for disturbing the chronological system adopted in my book. The other choice 1852-1 for the 6th year of Ammizaduga is ruled out by FOTHERINGHAM for the following reasons. In the first place his calculations for the accelerations of Sun and Moon make the conjunction of the Moon on December 19.45 (Greenwich time), and the visible new moon on Dec. 21.1. Venus then was seen in the east on Dec. 21.6 and her western setting took place Dec. 18.1 which is too close to her inferior conjunction to allow of her being seen at all in the west in the evening, with her latitude of only 4 degrees. FOTHERINGHAM believes, however, that the reckoning C 1 in KUGLER’s table, p. 285, or the year 1916-15 is possible and this would reduce the chronology by 56 years.

There is, therefore, every reason for leaving this problem in suspense at present. According to the most authoritative chronological mathematician in England the low dates adopted by KUGLER are untenable. The dates accepted in this volume are now regarded by FOTHERINGHAM as 56 years too high, and the reader is requested to bear in mind that a reduction of a half century may be necessary. The dates adopted here are in any case the maximum but a little reduction may be expected.

At the moment of going to press I learn from DR. WEIDNER that he has discovered in the Berlin Collection another dynastic tablet which begins in the earliest period and ends with Dungi. On this tablet certain famous rulers are especially noticed on the Reverse. It says that Ur-Ilbaba ordered his cup-bearer Sargon to bring the wine of libation from Esagila. From this WEIDNER argues that Ur-Ilbaba was a contemporary of Sargon. But legendary notices of this kind are not very trustworthy. WEIDNER wishes to make the Aksak dynasty, Kish IV and Lugalzaggisi all contemporary, thus reducing the pre-Sargonic dates by about 100 years.

S. LANGDON, Oxford, Nov. 14th 1923.

1 FOTHERINGHAM after calculations now maintains that only the year 1916-15 is possible for the sixth year of Ammizaduga. He says that by introducing his values for the apparent acceleration of the Sun and assuming a proportionate acceleration for Venus, Venus was not visible in the evening of the 3rd day before the new moon on the first of Kislev, 1972-1. In other words in the evening of Jan. 5th (Gregorian) Venus was not visible, if the new moon were seen Jan. 8th. He finds that only the astronomical year – 1914 (1915 BC.) is possible. « The moon was first visible Dec. 21st and Venus was still visible in the west Dec. 18th and visible again in the east Dec. 22nd, reckoning the days from midnight to midnight, i.e., four nights of invisibility, fo by three days’ darkness, the Babylonians meant three days reckoning from sun-set to sun-set for one day » The quotation is taken from the statement of this able astronomer. He now states definitely that 1922-1 alone satisfies the astronomical tablet, and makes that year begin about March 31st (Gregorian). His calculations are of very great importance, for they prove that the recent tendency to lower the chronology by 168 or 176 years is not possible.
THE SUMERO-ACCADIAN SYSTEM OF LEGENDARY AND
HISTORICAL CHRONOLOGY.
(W-B., 1923, 444.)

In the Cuneiform Collection founded and supported by Mr. H. WELD-BLUNDELL for the Ashmolean Museum I have found a large perforated prism which carries two columns of closely written text on each of its four faces. It purports to give the dynastic lists of the kings of Sumer and Accad from the ante-diluvian period to the end of the reign of Sin-magir, thirteenth king of Isin. It is in reality a complete duplicate of the same chronological scheme written on one huge tablet (in 12 columns) from Nippur, which PROFESSOR ARNO POEBEL published in *Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University Museum*, Philadelphia, Vol. V No. 2. The Nippur tablet was fragmentary, and although DR. LEON LEGRAIN succeeded in joining a large fragment to the Poebel fragment (PBS. Vol. 13, No. 1), the real nature of the document could not be detected. Undoubtedly this Nippur tablet also carried the entire chronological system preserved on W. B. 1923, 444. P. No. 2 was written immediately after the 150th year of the dynasty of Isin; that tablet agrees with P. No. 5 in that it did not omit the 10th king of Isin who reigned only 6 months. For the summary at the end says that it was written in the reign of the 11th king, which must be Enlil-bani; for if the 24 years of Enlil-bani be included as the 10th king, the total to the end of his reign is 179 years. On W-B. 444, Enlil-bani is the 10th king, for this text omits the short reign of the 10th king on P. No. 5.

The Nippur tablet P. No. 2 was, therefore, written in the 4th or 5th year of Enlil-bani or about 42 years before W-B. 444. Small fragments of three other large tablets with similar complete chronological records were discovered in the Nippur Collection and published by Poebel, *ibid.*, Nos. 3, 4, 5. The Reverse of No. 5 was first published by Hilprecht, B. E. 20, No. 47. From the summaries on P. Nos. 2 and 4 it is evident that these four huge Nippur tablets began immediately after the Flood and did not include the pre-diluvian kings. For these tablets state that the list contained the names of eleven cities, and in fact eleven different cities were the capitol of Sumer and Accad after the Flood, beginning with Kish. But W-B. 444 and W-B. 62, published in JRAS. 1923, 256, both begin the system of chronology with the pre-diluvian kings and both were written at Ellasar. These include 5 and 6 other cities which never became the seat of an historical dynasty and hence the Nippurian chronology probably did not have the pre-diluvian kings. The Nippurian theologians regarded the pre-diluvian period as an Utopian age, and their views are represented in the epical poems on the Flood and Paradise published by Poebel, PBS. V, No. 1, and by myself in *Le Poème Sumérien du Paradis*. On the other hand the Ellasar texts regard the pre-diluvian period as profane history. W. B. 62 is a small tablet containing only the period before the Flood and agrees with Berossus and Hebrew tradition in the number of 10 kings or patriarchs who lived before the Deluge. W-B. 444 has only 8 ante-diluvian kings, the two last kings, Aradgin and his son Ziûsuddu who reigned at Suruppak, are omitted, and in their place this prism has only a brief reference to the Flood. This would seem to imply that at Ellasar the Flood was regarded as a long geological period equal to 22,800 years (Aradgin) + 36,000 years (Ziûsuddu) = 58,800 years.
At any rate it is difficult to understand why the Blundell Prism omits all reference to the well known Babylonian Noah, Ziusuddu (Sisythes), who built his boat at Šuruppak and escaped destruction in this manner. A comparative table of these three sources now known will present the problem in clear light.

### W-B. 444

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alulim</td>
<td>Eridu</td>
<td>28800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alagar</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>36000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enmenluanna</td>
<td>Badtibira</td>
<td>43200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enmengalanna</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>28800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dumuzi-sib</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>36000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensibzianna</td>
<td>Larak</td>
<td>28800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enmenduranna</td>
<td>Sippar</td>
<td>21000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ubardudu</td>
<td>Šuruppak</td>
<td>18600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| YEARS | 241200 |

### W-B. 62.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A-lulim</td>
<td>Ḥabur</td>
<td>67200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alagar</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>72000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ....kidunnu-šakinīkin</td>
<td>Ellasar</td>
<td>72000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ....uk ? ku ?</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>21600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dumuzi-sib</td>
<td>Badtibira</td>
<td>28800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enmenluanna</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>21600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ensibzianna</td>
<td>Larak</td>
<td>36000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enmenduranna</td>
<td>Sippar</td>
<td>72000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Arad-gin</td>
<td>Šuruppak</td>
<td>28800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ziusuddu</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>36000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| YEARS | 456000 |

### Berossus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alorus</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>36000. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alaparos</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>10800. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amēlōn</td>
<td>Pantibiblus</td>
<td>46800. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ammenōn</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>43200. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Megalaros</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>64800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Daōnos</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>36000. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Euedōrachos</td>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>64800. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amempisinos</td>
<td>Larak</td>
<td>36000. (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| YEARS | 432000 |

Berossus and the Blundell Prism do not mention Ellasar, and this city is also not among the ante-diluvian cities of the Nippurian Epic of Creation. Moreover the two kings assigned to Ellasar on W-B. 62 cannot be identified with any of those in the other lists. Ḥabur is only an epithet of Eridu, and Berossus, writing under Babylonian tradition, substituted Babylon for Eridu. It is certain that the original tradition had Alulim and Alagar as the first two kings at Eridu and these are Alorus and Alaparos of the Greek. In Alagar the gamma was corrupted to pe in the text of Berossus. It is also certain that Badtibira was the second city, that Ensibzianna belongs to Larak and that his name was corrupted to Amempisinos. Larak was clearly the third city. Sippar was...

---

1 See JRAS. 1923, 253. Poebel, PBS. V, No. 1.
obviously the fourth city falsely replaced by Pantibiblus (Badtibira) in Berossus, and its king Euedorachus is Enmenduranna of the two Sumerian sources. Dumuzi-sib was the last of three kings at Badtibira and corresponds to Daōnus of Berossus. Now Daōnos is called a shepherd in the Greek text and Dumuzi-sib means "Tammuz the shepherd". A variant of the Greek is Daos and this is probably a corruption of Damu-zi.

Enmenluanna was the first king at Badtibira and W-B. 62 has transposed Dumuzi-sib and Enmenluanna. He corresponds to the very corrupt name Amelōn of the Greek. Less corrupt is Almomon of Eusebius (Aramean) and Amilleros of Abydenus. Enmengalanna the second king of Badtibira was corrupted to Ammenōn by omission of the element gal. Enmenanna is Ammenōn. This name is omitted in W-B. 62 whose two kings at Ellasar are an insertion by the scribes of that city. This leaves Megalaros of Pantibiblus unexplained. It cannot correspond to either of the two names inserted on W-B. 62 for Ellasar, and since Berossus obviously utilized a list current at Babylon, the name must depend upon some other corrupt tradition. The original list was, therefore;

1. Alulim
2. Alagar
3. Enmenluanna
4. Enmen(gal)anna
5. Dumuzi-sib
6. Ensibzianna
7. Enmenduranna
8. Ubardudu
9. Aradgin
10. Ziúsuddu
11. Alorus
12. Alaparos
13. Amēlōn
14. Ammenōn
15. Daōs
16. Amempsinos
17. Euedorachos
18. Opartes
19. Ardates
20. Sisythes
21. Amelōn
22. Ziusud-da
23. Sisythes

Of the 23 kings of Kish who reigned after the Flood all but two are preserved with the exception of the 5th and 6th names which are partially preserved. The lengths of their reigns are naturally mythical, and the huge total of 24,510 years 3 months and 3 days is probably due to an astronomical calculation of the so called "World-year", or period of 25,920 years of the sun's apparent revolution through the 12 signs of the zodiac. The precession of the equinoxes, or slow motion of the earth's axis, in consequence of which the intersection of the equator with the ecliptic travels along the latter at the rate of 1 degree in 72 years, causes this apparent revolution of the sun. It is difficult to discover any similar computation in the figures given

---

1 See Poème du Paradis, 129.
2 Tammuz is reduced to Du'-us already in late Babylonian and was pronounced Taâs by the Ssabeans of Harran in the Middle Ages. See Tammuz and Ishtar, p. 2 n. 3. See also E. Burrows, Orientalia, VII, 55. SaYCE suggests that the original Greek was ΔΑΞΩΣ, corrupted to ΔΑΞΩΝΣ which is very probable.
3 WEINNER has discovered the names of the ante-diluvian kings on an Assur tablet, and I understand that this name appears as Am-me-lu-an-na there. This removes the last suggestion of any Semitic name in the list. Amēlōn is not the Semitic amēlu. In the Assur list Zi-ā-sud-du is written Zi-ēud-da.
4 Preserved only by Alexander Polyhistor. See JRAS. 1923, 259 n. 1.
5 See JRAS. 1923, 259 n. 2.
6 Sir Robert Ball, A Popular Guide to the Heavens, p. 56. If this period assigned to the first historical dynasty be based upon the great solar cycle it must be assumed that the Sumerians discovered the precession of the equinoxes, an extremely doubtful assumption. KUGLER, Sternkunde II 24-32 denies that this discovery was known even in the age of the best Babylonian astronomy.
for the pre-diluvian period. The 66 *sars* of years or 241,200 years assigned to this period by W-B. 444 corresponds roughly to 12 « World-years »; the 120 *sars* of Berossus and the 126 \( \frac{2}{3} \) *sars* of W-B. 62 correspond roughly to 24 « World-years », and this may conceivably be the original calculation.

There is no reference at all in the two Sumerian sources to the four or five mythical beings who arose from the sea to reveal mysteries and wisdom to man during the long pre-diluvian period. Berossus at any rate knew of this Babylonian tradition, and he gave the following account of it. In the time of Ammenôn (= Enmengalanna), the second king of Badtibira, appeared from the Erythraean sea, the impure (\( \mu \omega \gamma \pi \rho \nu \sigma \) sic !) Ôannes, the Annêđōtus, after about 40 *sars*. On W-B. 444 the first four kings include 38 *sars* and the first four of Berossus also include exactly 38 *sars*. But Alexander Polyhistor reports Berossus to have placed this appearance in the « first year » and Abydenus places the second appearance of Annêđōtos in the time of Ammēhôn. According to Apollodorus the fourth Annêđōtos appeared in the time of Daños the sixth king, in reality the fifth king, and again « another personage » appeared in the time of the seventh king Euedôrachos, and his name was Ôdakôn. Apollodorus then reports five mythical monsters who appeared during the times of the 4-7 kings.

Abydenus 4 who obviously agreed with Alexander Polyhistor in placing the first appearance of Ôannēs-Annêđōtos in the first year of Alulim (Alorus) says that a second Annêđōtos appeared in the time of Amillaros (= Amelon) or the third king. In the time of Daños (Daños, Dumuzi-sib) the sixth king (correct to fifth) appeared four similar monsters from the sea, Euedôkos, Eneugamos, Eneuboulos, and Anēśmentos. The fourth appearance of a monster came in the age of the seventh king and his name was Anôdaphos.

Alexander Polyhistor who places the first appearance of Ôannēs, « the Annêđōtos » of the other sources, at the beginning of the era, summarizes the three or four later appearances in the words: « After this there appeared other creatures like this (Ôannēs) ». The monster is consistently described in the three sources of Berossus as a creature having the shape of a fish blended with that of a man. « The body was that of a fish and under the fish's head he had another head and feet below like those of a man. He came up out of the sea by day and taught men letters, sciences and art of every kind. He revealed to man the origin of the universe and wrote concerning politics. Since the times of his revelations nothing has been discovered worth knowing ». Since the original sources make no mention of Ôannēs nor of any of his epithets, Annêđōtus, Ôdakôn, Euedôkos, etc., and since it is totally impossible to reconstruct the ante-diluvian figures into any intelligible scheme, we must be content with the one fact which emerges from these discoveries. The beginning of history is placed at Eridu, the city of the water god Ea (Enki), god of wisdom and mysteries. He is clearly identical with Ôannēs-Annêđōtos, and his symbol on monuments is the composite creature the *suhurmasu* or goat fish. 6 Sumerian tradition traced the origins of civilisation to Eridu and its patron deity.

1 See the text of Berossus in Apollodorus, *ibid.*, *Ancient Fragments*, 30-31 and Zimmer's discussion in *KLT* 530-539 ; Berossus in Alexander Polyhistor, *ibid.*, 21-23.
2 The « red sea »; here the Persian Gulf. See my *Babylonian Epic of Creation*, p. 146 n. 3.
3 The *sar* is 3600.
4 Text in *ibid.*, 32-4.
5 Apollodorus has here Ôdakôn ; obviously the texts are hopelessly corrupt. Zimmer, *KAT*, 536 corrects Anôdaphos to *Anošachos* and identifies him with Ôdakôn and Euedôkos.
6 See Schel, *Délégation en Perse* II p. 90, 1. 5; *ibid.*, I 168 and Frank, *LSS.* II, p. 11\(\). This is the
The length of the second dynasty at Eanna and Erech is given as 2310 years and 11 kings; a legend of Enmerkar who founded Erech is preserved to the effect that he came from Dér east of the Euphrates, bringing with him the cult of the goddess Innini. The reference in Col. II 35-8 to the subjection of Elam by the king of Kish also indicates close contact with the lands to the eastward in the early period. The third dynasty at Ur has the moderate total of 177 years for 4 kings, and the fourth at Awan the improbable total 356 years for 3 kings. The fifth dynasty ruled at Kish, 8 kings and 3195 years. In my reconstruction of these lists, *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. I 667, I erroneously assigned the fifth dynasty to Ur, but my list was not otherwise seriously misarranged. The sixth dynasty is assigned to Ḫamaṣi, one king with the high figure 360 years for his reign. It is probable as in the case of the entry concerning Adab, that the Ḫamaṣi dynasty really comprised several names. The seventh dynasty is assigned to Erech, but here the meaning of the text is obscure and the continuation at the top of Col. V is broken away. The scribe apparently did not know the names of more than one king here, namely Enugduanna, but knew that the kingdom endured 420 years.

We come now to the only serious break in the text, and here the eighth dynasty must be assigned to the second kingdom of Ur, with a possible total of 108 years for 4 kings. This estimate is based on the summary of P. No. 2, Rev. XI 11-15, where the total of the three Ur dynasties is given as 396 years. This Nippur list gives 171 years for the first kingdom of Ur and 117 for the third, hence the total on that list for the second dynasty of Ur would be 108. W-B. 1923, 444 has 177 + 108 for the 1st and 3rd Ur dynasties, but we have here no total from which to reckon. P. No. 2 has 13 or 14 as the total number of kings of the three Ur dynasties, and we know that the 1st and 3rd comprised 9, leaving 4 or 5 names to be supplied in the break, Col. V 1-11. A summary of the Blundell Prism gives the following reconstruction.

### A. ANTE-DILUVIAN PERIOD.

8 Kings 241,200 years.

### B. POST-DILUVIAN PERIOD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Length of Dynasties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First dynasty of Kish</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24510.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. First dynasty of Erech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2310.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. First dynasty of Ur</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>177.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Awan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>356.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Second dynasty of Kish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3195.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ḫamaṣi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>360.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Second dynasty of Erech</td>
<td>1 (?)</td>
<td>420.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Second dynasty of Ur</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>108. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Symbol and name of the zodiacal constellation Capricorn; see my edition of the *Epic of Creation*, p. 89, n. 7; *U. E. Z., Sternwarte*, I 27; *Vincoliakd*, *Ishtar*, VI 22; ZA. VI 293, 13.

* The *Weld-Blundell Collection*, Vol. I, 1-10. In the same manner the cult of Isir of Dér was transported to Kish. See the Introduction to Colonel W. N. Lane's, *Babylonian Problems*. 
In this list there are 11 cities of the post-diluvian period, and 125 kings. It contains 39 kings in the four dynasties of Kish; P. No. 2 XI 1 has also 39. The total of the figures actually given for these four dynasties is 28,296. For the five kingdoms of Erech the list has 20 names but the entry concerning the second Erech dynasty is defective. P. No. 2 XI 7 has 22 kings for 5 Erech kingdoms, and consequently that tablet contained three names for the second dynasty of Erech. It is extremely probable that Enųğduanna, the only name preserved here, is an error for Enąağkụůanna who in his vase inscription of Nippur claims to have devastated Kish and to have captured Enbi-Ashtar, king of Kish and of Akšak. This may mean that the last king of the second kingdom of Kish whose name is given “Lugal-mu” or “A king by name”, is a substitute for a name which our late compiler did not know. The intervening kingdom of Ĥamași is probably contemporary with the second kingdom of Erech.

It is altogether obvious that the dynastic lists for the early period are totally inadequate. The early inscriptions of Lagash make frequent mention of an ancient king Mesilim, a powerful ruler of Kish; from his own inscriptions left at Lagash and Adab it is evident that he belonged to an early dynasty whose power was recognized in Sumer and Accad. The epigraphy of these two inscriptions indicates a period long before Ur-Niná and his successors at Lagash. Moreover it is clear from the inscriptions of Eannatum that Mesilim lived before his period. Since Ur-Niná, Eannatum and their successors are about contemporary with Kug-Bau and her son Gimil-Sín who actually formed one dynasty at Kish, obviously Mesilim should belong to the second dynasty of Kish. His name does not appear at all in this dynasty! And what about Ur-zag-ed king of Kish who dedicated a vase to Enlil and Ninlil to Nippur? “Lugal-tarsi king of Kish”, whose lapis lazuli tablet has been preserved, is no-where mentioned in any Kish dynasty. Another king of Kish by name Lugal-?-?-? is mentioned on a huge spear-head. In the case of Lugaltarsi and Lugal-?-?-? the title may mean simply šar kiššati, “king of universal dominion”.

1 See note on Col. VI 21, where 491 is corrected to 97 2/3.
2 See photograph, P1. 90.
3 See also Col. VII 38 SAK. 160, No. 2 and AJSL. 30, 221. 4 OBI. 93.
5 CT. III 1, BM. 12155. The epigraphy of the last two mentioned inscriptions seems to indicate a period immediately before Sargon of Agade.
6 KIȘ without determinative as on BM. 12155.
7 RA. IV 111.
It is, therefore, probable, when these kings call themselves kings of Kish(ki) or Kish, they mean that they had obtained possession of this ancient city. That would have been especially true of the northern cities Awan, Maer and Akšak. Lugal-tar-si is probably identical with the second king of Maer whose name ends in si on L. No. 1 V. 13. The defaced name on the spear-head is probably identical with the fourth king of Maer and to be read Lugal-ap-lu-gal. Mesilim may be in reality one of the three lost names of the dynasty of Awan, and Ur-zag-ed possibly be one of the lost names of a longer kingdom of Ḫamaši.

When Enannatum says that he waged war with Zu-zu king of Akšak, and in the contemporary kingdom of Akšak Zu-zu does not appear, the scholar must suppose that patesi at Akšak in the preceding dynasty of Maer called themselves kings; hence Ur-Ninā and Enannatum clearly belong to a period before Unzi of Akšak and Kug-Bau of Kish. And again what is to be said of Ṭu-(?)-Šamaš who calls himself king of Maer on a seated statue of the archaic period? He has no place in the list of the kings of Maer in Col. V 22-31. He was in fact only a patesi who lived perhaps in the age of the kings of Adab or earlier.

It is obvious that in the inscriptions before the time of Sargon no confidence can be placed on records of local scribes unless they are confirmed by the dynastic lists. Ur-Ninā calls himself king of Lagash, but there was no recognized kingdom at Lagash; Ennatum does the same, and these two rulers of Lagash were apparently contemporaries of the kings of Maer. We cannot be certain that even Enšagkušanna, Lugalkugubnilaš and Lugalkisalsi actually belonged to recognized dynasties at Erech or Ur as the two latter claim.

The lists all give 3 kingdoms at Ur, 13 kings whose total on W-B. 444 is $177 + 108 (?) + 108 = 393$ years. P. No. 2 XI 13 has the total 396 made up of $171 + [108] + 117$.

The most useful information obtainable from these lists is the fact that the chronology is definitely fixed back to the period of the Akšak dynasty. The hundred years assigned to Kug-Bau at Kish is only a subterfuge to account for the contemporary kingdom of Akšak. It is probable that her 100 years may be entirely disregarded. This would afford fairly certain reckoning to the beginning of the second Ur dynasty. The only problem is that of the, therefore, supposed certain dates for the dynasties of Isin and the third dynasty of Ur. If we accept the current figures for the beginning of the Isin dynasty, 2357 B. C., Ur-Nammu began his reign in 2465 B. C. Accepting this as a fixed point of departure the chronology will be as follows.


1 SAK. 20 V 4. 2 CT. V 2, BM. 12146 and Kan, History of Sumer and Akkad, Plate opp. p. 102.
3 It is possible that the length of the 3rd dynasty on P. No. 2 was 108 not 117 as on P. No. 5. In that case 115 years was given for the second dynasty of Ur.
4 This date is regarded by those who depend upon Assyrian chronological data, as against the Babylonian date, as about 170 years too high. See Weidner, Die Könige von Assyrien, pp. 40 ff. A discussion of this problem would fill an entire brochure and I must be satisfied with remaining non-committal at the time of writing. Weidner's thesis seems to me unproved, but Kugler has also joined in the movement to lower the dates of the First Babylonian Dynasty and consequently the beginning of the dynasty of Isin. [See now the Preface].

1. [nam-]ugal an-ta é-dé-a-ba ·
2. [Eri]-du-(ki) nam-ugal-la.
3. Eri-du-(ki) Á-lu-lim¹ lugal
4. mu 28800 ni-ag
5. Á-la(t)-gar mu 36000 ni-ag
6. 2 lugal
7. mu 64800 ù-ag
8. Eri-du-(ki) ba-šub
9. nam-ugal-bi Bad-tibira̱-(ki)-šú
10. ba-gín
11. Bad-tibira̱-(ki) En-me-en-lú-an-na
12. mu 43200 ni-ag
13. En-me-en-gal-an-na
14. mu 28800 ni-ag
15. dDumu-zi-sib mu 36000 ni-ag
16. 3 lugal
17. mu-bi 108000 ù-ag
18. Bad-tibira̱-(ki) ba-šub-bi-en
19. nam-ugal-bi La-ra-aḵ(ki) ba-gub.
20. La-ra-aḵ-(ki) En-si zi-an-na
21. mu 28800 ni-ag
22. 1 lugal
23. mu-bi 28800 ù-ag
24. La-ra-aḵ-(ki) ba-šub-bi-en
25. nam-ugal-bi Zimbar-šú ba-gín
26. Zimbi̱ṟ(ki)-En-us-en-dú-an-na

1. Rulership which from heaven descended.
2. At Eridu rulership (began).
3. At Eridu Alulim was king.
4. He ruled 28800 years.
5. Alagar ruled 36000 years.
6. Two kings.
7. 64800 years they ruled.
8. Eridu was overthrown.
9. The rulership to Badtibira passed.
10. At Badtibira Enmenluanna ruled 43200 years.
11. Enmengalanna ruled 28800 years.
12. d'Dumuzisib ruled 36000 years.
13. Three kings.
14. They ruled 108000 years.
15. Badtibira was overthrown.
16. The rulership was established at Larak.
17. At Larak Ensibianna ruled 28800 years.
18. One king.
19. He ruled 28800 years.
20. Larak was overthrown.
21. The rulership passed to Sippar.
22. At Sippar Enmenduranna

¹ Var. W. B. 62 [d]-lu-lim. The curious sign on the variant is thus proved to be a form of REC. 229 which varies with lu-lim. Cf. māš- R, with māš-lu-lim, Gudea, Cyl. B 7, 5 and RADA, Miscel. 5, 6. An abbreviated form is māš-ANšU = bālu. In this common ideogram for bālu, ANšU is surely a corruption for ANšU + LIM, and māš + REC. 229 is for bālu. lulim = lulimu means the male leader of any flock of animals either domestic or wild, and hence may be rendered stag, hind, or ram. Cf. lu-nitaš pa-ni = lu-lim = immer panī, “leading sheep”. ZA. 11, 55, 8 = BA II, 481, 8 = ZA. 11, 39, 8 = KAR. 156, 8. lulim then obtained the meaning “leader, champion”. See lulimu, MESS ANNOLS, Lexicon, 482 and RA. 10, 71, 42. Note that lulim is a title of a pastoral deity (Girra, Nergal), in En-lulim sib māš-lulim, Lord lulim shepherd of the cattle, Gudea, Cyl. B 10, 7. dGirra māš-lulim igi-bar, Girra who beholds the cattle, KL. 8 IV 12, and dLulim-lulim a door-keeper of Nergal, CT. 24, 24, 59. The star maulu-lim is identified with Enmešarra (Nergal), V R. 46 a 21. It is, therefore, probable that lulim in this name refers to the god of the flocks, Girra, and means “Hand (help) of the pastoral deity (the leader)”.

² tibira, metal worker, (see JRAS. 1923, 258 n. 2) is probably the explanation of the name Tūbal-Cain in the Hebrew legend of the Ten Patriarchs, Genesis IV 22, Source J. The original Sumerian tibira, loan-word šabiru, was transmitted to the Hebrews as tūbaš, tūbaš, and then explained by the Hebrew-Arabic word Kā'in, metal worker. This combination was discovered by SAYCE and communicated to me orally.

27. lugal-dm mu 21000 ni-ag
28. 1 lugal
29. mu-bi 21000 ib-ag
30. Zimbar-(ki) ba-sub-bi-en
31. nam-lugal-bi Šuruppak-(ki) 1 ba-gub
32. Šuruppak-(ki) Ubardudu 2
33. lugal-dm mu 18600 ni-ag
34. 1 lugal
35. mu-bi 18600 ib-ag
36. 5 eri-ki-me-eš
37. 8 lugal
38. mu sar-1-gal 3 + 3600 X 7 ib-ag
39. a-ma-ru ba-úr-ra-ta 4
40. egir a-ma-ru ba-úr-ra-ta
41. nam-lugal an-ta è-de-a-ab
42. Kiš-(ki) nam-lugal-la
43. Kiš-(ki) Gà-ur 5
44. lugal-dm
45. mu 1200 ni-ag
46. Gulla-Šnidaba-an-na..... EL 6
47. mu 600 + 360 ni-ag

27. was king and ruled 21000 years.
28. One king
29. He ruled 21000 years.
30. Sippar was overthrown.
31. The rulership was established at Shuruppak.
32. At Shuruppak Ubardudu
33. was king and ruled 18600 years.
34. One king
35. He ruled 18600 years.
36. Five cities
37. Eight kings.
38. They ruled 241,200 years.
39. The Deluge came up (upon the Land).
40. After the Deluge had come,
41. The rulership which descended from heaven.
(Sic !)
42. At Kish there was the rulership.
43. At Kish Gà-ur
44. became king.
45. He ruled 1200 years.
46. Gulla-Šnidaba-anna.....
47. reigned 960 years

1 Written SU + KUR + RU. Var. 62 SU + KUR + LAM an unusual form midway between the old sign
REC. 190bis and the form BRÜNNOW, 9049.
2 The Var. W-B. 62 has Ubardudu, and the Semitic legend, Epic of Gilgamesh, XI 23 Ubardudu. Ubar,
woman’s breast, is clearly a cognate of Ubar, protege, mercy, protection, “ The protege or protected of Tutu”.
3 sar-1-gal or sar-gal:1 occurs in CT. 12, 24 II 6 after sar-šuš (3600 X 60 = 216,000) and seems to be a
higher order in the numerical system. Here it is identical with the sar-šuš = 216,000. The sar-gal is also equal to
21,600 in the Hilprecht mathematical tablets. THUREAU-DANGIN, RA. 18, 125 on the basis of CT. 12, 24,
supposed that the sar-gal = 60 or 12,960,000 but this is no longer tenable. Undoubtedly the sar-gal 2 of CT,
12, 24 II 7 is the same as the sar-gal-in-úra-tag = 60 4 of the Hilprecht tablets. See Sum. Grammar, p. 120 n. 1.
4 This was the established Sumerian phrase to describe the “ entering ” of the Deluge. See PBS. V 1
Col. V 4, a-ma-ru kalam-ma ba-an-úr-ra, The Deluge entered on the Land (for seven days and seven nights).
(Enlil) a-ma-ru ba-an-úr = abû-ba úlêbû, caused the Deluge to enter, SBP. 260, 19; Ninurta is ordinarily
regarded as the god who sent the Flood, a-ma-ru úr-ra = mušḫû abûû, SBP, 232, 8 ; cf. Hrozny, Ninrâg,
p. 8, 9-11 and Ebeling, KAR, No. 12, 10 f. For úr = ba’û, cf. IV R. 19 No. 3, Obv. 7, ba-an-úr = ib-la’a.
5 Possibly a small sign gone before ga(MAL). The name should correspond to Euvexius of Alexander
Polyhistor, Conv. Ancient Fragments, 59 and Euvexius of Sycellus, p. 67, which GUTSCHMIDT corrected to
Euβêkhoς; v. Zimmern, KAT’, 565 n. 3. In any case ga-úr proves that , χόρος is right. I can see no traces in the
slight break before MAL, and do not believe that any thing is missing. Polyhistor after Berossus gave his
reign at 2400 years.
6 The name has little resemblance to Χωμάσηδης, Comosbelus, second king after the Flood in Sycellus
and Polyhistor, who assigned 2700 years to this reign. Sayce suggests that Kûlla or κόλλα was corrupted to
ωμα in the Greek script. A reading Gulla-eve-an-na-..... is possible.
1. Baba(?)...? reigned? years.
2. Bu-Sin (?) reigned? years.
3. Galibum reigned 960 years.
4. Kalummum reigned 840 years.
5. Duggagib reigned 900 years.
6. Atab reigned 600 years.
7. Atabba reigned 840 years.
8. Arpium son of a poor man, reigned 720 years.
9. Etana the shepherd who to heaven ascended,
10. who made the foreign lands faithful,
11. became king and reigned 1500 years
12. Balih son of Etana reigned 400 years.
13. Enmenunna reigned 660 years.
14. Melam-Kish son of Enmenunna ruled 900 years.
15. Barsalnunna son of Enmenunna reigned 1200 years.
16. Tupzah son of Barsalnunna

Syncellus gave five names for the 3-7 kings after the Flood, and then an Arabian dynasty of 6 kings. They are all fictitious. See Poebel, PBS. IV 87; Coar, ibid. 67-8.

1. Lines 1-4 contained two names and correspond to P. No. 5 I 1-3.
2. Corresponds to P. No. 5 I 10; No. 2 I 9; No. 3 I 9. Poem reads zu-ga-gi-ib-(e). The sign KA has also the value zu, but it is probable that KA is the correct reading and the “Scorpion King” must be regarded as an erroneous reading.
3. Corresponds to P. No. 5 I 7; No. 3 I 3-6; No. 1 I 3-6.
4. The order of these names in the Nippur variants is Galibum, Atab, Atabba, Kalummum, Duggagib, Arpium.
5. For this name, King, Chronicles, II 47 read A-lam-kiś-šu, certainly a scribal error.
6. P. No. 5 I 17 omits dumu Enmenunna.
7. Not MES, KIȘIB.
29. mu 140 ni-ag
30. Ti-iz-kár dumu Tup-za-aḫ
31. mu 5 šu-ši + 6 ni-ag
32. Il-ku-u¹ mu 600 + 300² ni-ag
33. Il-ta-sa-du-um
34. mu 600 + 600 ni-ag
35. En-me-en-ba-ra-gi-gur
galu ma-da Elam-(ki)-ma
36. šušu-bi še-ta-an-gam
37. lugal-dīm mu 600 + 300³ ni-ag
38. Ag-ga
39. dīm En-me-en-ba-ra-gi-gur-ge
40. mu 600 + 25⁴ ni-ag
41. 23 lugal
42. mu-bi 24510 ita 3
43. ud 3 ud-maš še-ag
44. Kiš(ki) šušu ba-an-sig
45. nam-lugal-bi É-an-na-šu
46. ba-gin
47. É-an-na-ka

Col. III.

1. [Mes]-ki-em-ga-[še-ir]⁹
2. [dum]-ba-bar em-[ám]
3. [lug]-dám mu 300 + 2[5 ni-ag]
4. [Mes]-ki-em-ga-[še-ir]
5. ab-ba ba-an-tur
6. gar-sagšu ba-šu
7. En-me-kar¹¹ dumu Mes-ki-em-[ga-še-ir-ge]
8. lugal Unug-(ki)-ga lum Unug-(ki)-ga
9. mu-un-¹² dū-a
10. lugal-dám

1. Meskemgašer
2. son of Shamash was high priest
3. and became king. He reigned 325 years.
4. Meskemgašer
5. penetrated to the sea¹⁰
6. and went up unto the mountains.
7. Enmekar, son of Meskemgašer,
8. king of Erech, who built Erech
9. became king.
10. kingdom.

¹ P. No. 5 I 20 Il-ku-um? ² Written 60 + 15 ! by wrong spacing of the figures.
³ For ta instrumental infix, v. Sum. Grammar, § 103. This line corresponds to P. No. 3 II 1.
⁴ P. No. 3 II 2 has 600 + 300 (?).
⁵ P. No. 3 II 3, Ag dumu En-me-ba-ra-... .
⁶ Same figure in P. No. 3 II 4.
⁷ P. No. 3 II 5-6 has an insertion giving the total of the years of Enmenbaragigur and his son.
⁸ The actual sum of the 19 reigns preserved is 12491, which leaves over 12,000 years to be distributed among 4 reigns. The scribe's addition cannot be correct. But Polyhistor's figures for the first two are twice and three times larger. Consequently the total here may have been taken from some other mathematical scheme.
⁹ P. No. 2 II 4, Mes-ki-in-ga-še-ir.
¹⁰ Here obviously the Persian Gulf.
¹¹ P. No. 2 II 12. En-me-ir-ki. This is the form on a prism of the Weld-Blundell Collection.
¹² P. No. 2 II 16, mu-un-da-du-a.
11. He reigned 420 years.
12. The deified Lugalbanda, a shepherd, reigned 1200 years.
13. The deified Dumuzi, a fisherman, whose city was Habur.
14. The deified Gilgames, whose father was a fool, the lord of Kullab, reigned 126 years.
15. Ur-d.Nungal, son of Gilgames, reigned 30 years.
17. Labasher, reigned 9 years.
18. Ennunnadanna, reigned 8 years.
19. ..... he-de reigned 36 years.
20. Melamanna, reigned 6 years.
21. Lugal-kiaga reigned 36 years.
22. They reigned 2310 years.
23. Erech was smitten by weapons.

1 Identified with an older deity Ab-šu, the dying god of Sumerian religion.
2 A title of Eridu.
3 Lit-la means "the fool, imbecile, cripple". This explains the story in Aelian, De Natura Animalium XII 21. Here it is said that Suschoros, king of the Babylonians, heard how the Chaldeans (i.e. Astrologers) prophesied that his daughter would bear a child and that this child would seize the kingdom from his grandfather. Suschoros played the part of Acrisius in the Greek myth. He locked his daughter in the citadel but she secretly bore a son by an obscure man, and the king's guards in terror threw the child from the tower. An eagle perceived his fall and seized him by the back before he reached the earth. The bird carried the babe to a garden where the gardener loved him and reared him. This child was Gilgamos and he became king. Suschoros, as SAYCE observes, is a corruption for En-me-(r)-kar. It is obvious that the name of the father of Gilgamiš Lilit, the fool, reveals the origin of the story in Aelian. In the Gilgamiš Epic his mother is reputed to have been the mother goddess Ninsun. It is possible that lilit-la is really a title of Tammuz who in the Louvre hymn, RA. 19, 175-185 is called mu-lu-lit, "the fool god", and that Tammuz is really the father of Gilgamiš here. The story in Aelian may have been concocted to explain the word lilit-la, but the connection of Enmekar with this tale rather proves the historical veracity of the tale.
4 This name is written [Ur-d.Nun]-lugal, PBS. V No. 6, 5.
5 The name is common among Sumerians; v. HUNEN, Per. Namen, 81-2.
6 One sign us + ūul; cf. u-ūul, shepherd, GUCX, Yale V 4 X 7.
7 Cf. EBEN, KAR 132 I, 8-9; ina muḫḫi ki-aga-zi-da ana imittī d.inim uššab.
8 This addition is correct.
38. nam-lugal-bi Uri-(ki)-šú
    ba-gin
39. Uri-(ki)-ma
40. Mes-an-ni-pad-da
41. iugal-ám mu 80 ni-ag
42. Mes-ki-em-² Nannar³
43. dumu Mes-an-ni-pad-da
44. iugal-ám
45. mu 36⁴ ni-ag

38. The rulership passed to Ur.
39. At Ur.
40. Mesannipadda
41. reigned 80 years.
42. Meskem-⁴ Nannar
43. son of Mesannipadda
44. became king.
45. He ruled 36 years.

Col. IV.

1. [E-lu-lu mu 25 ni-ag]
2. [Ba-lu-lu mu 36 ni-ag]
3. [4 lugal]
4. [mu-bi 177¹ ib-ag]
5. [Uri-(ki)-ma ûšku ba-sig]
6. [nam-lugal-bi A-va-an-(ki)-šú]
7. [ba-gin]
8. [A-va-an-(ki)]
9. ...........
10. [iugal-ám mu ..... ni-ag]
11. ...........
12. mu [. ... ni-ag]
13. Ku-ul (?)
14. mu 36 ni-ag
15. 3 [iugal]
17. A-va-an-(ki) ûšku ba-sig
18. nam- lugal-bi
19. Kiš-(ki)-šú [ba-gin]
20. Kiš-(ki) Lab (?)
21. iugal-ám
22. mu 180 + 21 + ? [ni-ag]
23. Da-da-sig mu [..... ni-ag]
24. Má-má-gal

1. Elulu reigned 25 years.
2. Balulu reigned 36 years.
3. 4 kings
4. They reigned 177 years.
5. Ur by weapons was smitten.
6. The rulership passed to Awan.
8. At Awan
9. ...........
10. became king. He reigned ..... years.
11. ...........
12. reigned ..... years.
13. Ku-ul (?)
14. reigned 36 years.
15. Three kings.
16. They reigned 356 years.
17. Awan by weapons was smitten.
18. The rulership
19. passed to Kish.
20. At Kish Lab (?)
21. became king.
22. He reigned 201 + ? years.
23. Dadasig reigned ..... years.
24. Mamagal

¹ The sign MES is clearly the sign DÜP, REC. 385, and not REC. 363. Also in Meskemgašer the sign is DÜP. For this confusion, v. CT. 12, 14 a 18 = K. 10072, 4, DÜP(me-is) = ḫlu.
² P. No. 2 III 6.
³ Not nun-na as POEBEL (No. 2 III 7) copied.⁴ P. No. 2 III 9 has 30 years.
⁵ Restored from P. 2 III 11 + LEGRAIN, PBS. XIII, No. 1, III 3.
⁶ Restored from P. 2 III 12 + LEGRAIN, No. 1, III 4.
⁷ P. No. 2 III 15 + L. No. 1 III 7 has 171. See line 45 above.
⁸ The number 356 is given on P. No. 2 Rev. XI 16.
25. mu 6 šu-ši [ni-ag]
26. Ka-al-bu [un]
27. dumu Md-gal-gal
28. mu 180² + 15 ni-ag
29. Umas-e mu 360 ni-ag
30. ? mun-ka mu 180 ni-ag
31. I-bi- ni-iš (?)
32. mu 240 + 50 ni-ag
33. lugal-mu mu 360 ni-ag
34. 8 lugal
35. mu-bi 3000 + 180 + 15 ib-ag
36. Kiš-(ki) wišku ba-an-sig
37. nam-lugal-bi
38. Ha-ma-ši-(ki)-ši ba-gin
39. Ha-ma-ši⁶ Ha-da-ni-iš³
40. mu 6 šu-ši ni-ag
41. 1 lugal
42. mu-bi 6 šu-ši⁶ ib-ag
43. Ha-ma-ši-(ki) wišku ba-an-sig
44. nam-lugal-bi Unug-(ki)-ši ba-gin
45. Unug-(ki)-qa En-ug-du-an-na
46. lugal-dm mu 1 šu-ši ni-ag
47. nam-lugal-bi mu 2 šu-ši ni-ag
48. mu 480 ni-ag

25. reigned 360 years.
26. Kalbum
27. son of Magalgal ....
28. reigned 195 years (1215 ?).
29. Umuse reigned 360 years.
30. ... -nunna reigned 180 years.
31. Ibinis (?)
32. reigned 290 years.
33. Lugalmu (?) reigned 360 years.
34. 8 kings.
35. They reigned 3195 years.⁴
36. Kish was smitten by weapons.
37. The rulership passed to Ḥamaši.⁵
38. At Ḥamaši ḫadaniš
39. ruled 360 years.
40. 1 king
41. He reigned 360 years.
42. Hamaši by weapons was smitten.
43. The rulership passed to Erech.
44. At Erech Enugduanna
45. became king. He ruled 60 years.
46. The kingship for 120 years was exercised
47. For 420 years they ruled.⁹

Col. V.

1-10. . . . . . . . . . . .
11. [ . . . . . . . . . - ] LU?
12. [mu ? ni-ag ]
13. [ ? lugal ]
14. [mu-bi ? ib-ag]
15. [Ur(ki) wišku ba-an-sig ]

¹ This name is written Md-ma-gal... in l. 24. Which is right?
² Perhaps error for 600 + 600.
³ PISAN + RU?
⁴ L. No. 1, IV 3 has 3600 + 180 + 12 = 3792. The length of the second reign is missing here, but it is difficult to account for the high figure in the total unless the numbers be corrected.
⁵ L. No. 1 IV 7, Ḥa-ma-ši.⁶ L. No. 1 IV 8, Ḥa-ma-ši-(ki)-a.
⁶ Here L. No. 1 IV 10 adds lugal-dm.
⁷ In the total on P. No. 2 XI 22 for Ḥamaši the text has the figure 7 which Poebel took for 7 units but it may be 7(60) = 420.
⁸ P. No. 2 had three names here, see p. 6. En-ug-du-an-na is probably an error for En-šag-kuš-an-na, whose inscription on a vase of Nippur has been restored by Porsiel, PBS. IV 151. The other two names are probably Lugal-ki-pub-nu-taš and Lugal-kisal-si, SAK. 157; Cambridge Ancient History, 369.
[nam-lugal-bi] Adab-(ki)-šú-ba-gin
7. [Adab-(ki)-a] Lugal-an-ni-mu-un-dû
8. [lugal-ám] mu 90 ni-ag
9. [1] lugal
10. [mu-bi 90] ib-ag
11. [Adab-(ki)] višku ka-an-sig
12. [nam-lugal-bi] Ma-er-(ki)-šú ba-gin
13. [Ma-er-(ki)-šú] An-sir
14. [lugal-ám] mu 30 ni-ag
15. [Lugal-lar]-zi dumu An-sir-ge
16. [mu- 25 (?) ni-ag
17. . . . . -lugal mu 30 ni-ag
18. . . . . -lù-gal mu 20 ni-ag
19. . . . . -bi-im mu 30 ni-ag
20. . . . . -bi mu 9 ni-ag
21. 6 lugal
22. [mu-bi ] 120 + 16 ni-ag
23. [Ma-er-(ki) višku] ba-an-sig
24. [nam-lugal-] bi
25. [Kiš-(ki)-šú] ba-gin
26. [Kiš-(ki) Kug-dû] Bau
27. [munus-galu-kasha-tin-na
28. [sujuš Kiš-(ki)] mu-un-gi-na
29. [lugal-ám] mu 100 ni-ag
30. 1 lugal
31. [mu-bi] 100 ni-ag
32. Kiš-ki višku ba-an-sig
33. nam-lugal-bi 4 Akšak-(ki) ba-gub
34. Akšak-šú Un-zi
35. lugal-ám mu 30 ni-ag
36. Un-álu-lu mu 6 ni-ag
37. Ur-ur mu 6 ni-ag

Col. VI.
2. [Išu-il] mu 24 ni-ag 2. Ishu-il reigned 24 years.

1 Lines 16 ff. are restored from L. No. 1 V 1 ff.
3 L. No. 1 V 10 Ma-er-(ki)-a. An-bu; An-sud possible.
4 Restored from total in l. 32.
6 Scheil Tablet, 12 years. The number is doubled there.
3. Gimil-Sin son of Ishu-il reigned 7 years.

4. 6 kings.

5. They reigned 93 years.

6. Akšak with weapons was smitten.

7. The rulership

8. passed to Kish. ²

9. At Kish Gimil-Sin, son of Kug-d'Bau, became king. He ruled 25 years

10. Ur-dIlbaba

11. son of Gimil-Sin

12. Ur-dIlbaba

13. 3. Gimil-Sin son of Ishu-il reigned 7 years.

14. 4. 6 kings.

15. They reigned 93 years.

16. Akšak with weapons was smitten.

17. The rulership

18. passed to Kish. ²

19. At Kish Gimil-Sin, son of Kug-d'Bau, became king. He ruled 25 years

20. Ur-dIlbaba

21. son of Gimil-Sin

22. At Kish Gimil-Sin, son of Kug-d'Bau, became king. He ruled 25 years

23. Ur-dIlbaba

24. seven kings.

25. They reigned 491 years. ¹⁰

26. Kish was smitten with weapons.

27. The rulership passed to Erech.

28. At Erech Lugalzaggisi became king.

29. He ruled 25 years.

30. passed to Agade.

¹ S. Obv. 7 has 99 years, and the verb is correctly written in the plural in-ag-meS.

² Here the Scheil Tablet enters the earlier reign of Kug-Bau at Kish. This queen's reign is almost exactly the same length as that of the entire intervening Akšak dynasty and she cannot possibly be regarded as the mother of Gimil-Sin, unless she reigned as contemporary of the Akšak kings. Moreover the Scheil Tablet makes the two kingdoms of Kish continuous.

³ The Scheil Tablet has the figure 6 which is, therefore, taken as 6(60) or 360 in the reckoning. With Kug-Bau this dynasty totals exactly 540 years instead of the figures 540 + 40 + 6 in line 18. LÈGRAIN, No 1 VI also 360 + 40 (?).

¹ Son of Zimu-dar on the Scheil Tablet. Cf. P. No. 3 R. I 4-5 etc.

² S. Obv. 14 has 6 years.

³ S. Obv. 16. I-mu. The variant is difficult to explain. i-mu is probably a Sumerian verbal form, i prefix and mu = muš, giš = ŋemâ; cf. giš-lug, muš-lug = ŋemâ.

⁷ S. Obv. 17. Na-ni-ja-ac.

⁸ Here Var. S. has 8 kings by combining the two Kish dynasties. Obviously they belong together and the Akšak dynasty was contemporary with Kug-d'Bau.

⁹ 586 on S. Obv. 18.

¹⁰ The total is correct. For the reign of Ur-dIlbaba the original had probably 6 ⁴⁰⁄₆₀ or 6 ²⁄₃ which the scribe misunderstood. This yields 97 ²⁄₃ years for the entire dynasty.
W-B. 1923, 444. THE SUMERO-ACCADIAN SYSTEM OF LEGENDARY AND HISTORICAL CHRONOLOGY

31. A-ga-de šar-ru-ki-in-
32. i-lu-ba-ni nu-giš-šar
33. ka-šu-duš Ur-d Il-ba-ba
34. lugal A-ga-de (ki) galu A-ga-de-(ki)
35. mu- un- dū- a
36. lugal-ām mu 56 ni- ag
37. Ri-mu-šu dumu šar-ru-ki-in
38. mu 9 ni-ag
39. Ma-ni-ši-iš-šu
40. šeš-gal Ri-mu-šu-uš
41. dumu šar-ru-ki-in
42. mu 15 ni-ag
43. Na-ra-am-[4 En-zu]
44. dumu Ma-[ni-ši-iš-šu]
45. mu [38 (?) ni-ag]
46. ša[ru]-ga-lišar-rī ]
47. [dumu Na-ra-am-4 En-zu]
48. [mu 24 (?) ni-ag]

31. At Agade Sharrukin-ilubani
32. a gardener,
33. a cup-bearer of Ur-Ilbaba,
34. the king of Agade, who built Agade,
36. became king. He ruled 56 years. 2
37. Rimush son of Sharrukin
38. reigned 9 years. 3
39. Maništiššu
40. elder brother of Rimuššu 5
41. son of Sharrukin
42. reigned 15 years. 6
43. Narām-Sin
44. son of Maništiššu 7
45. reigned 38 (?) years 8
46. Shargališarrī
47. son of Narām-Sin
48. reigned 24 (?) years.

Col. VII.

1. [a-ba-ām lugal] a-ba-ām nu lugal 11
2. [I-gi] 10 gi lugal
3. [I-mi] 10 lugal
4. [Na-ni] 13 lugal
5. [E-lu-lu] 14 lugal
6. $ lugal 15

1. Who was king? Who was not king?
2. Igigi, king,
3. Imi, king,
4. Nani, king,
5. Elulu, king,
6. 4 kings.

1 Here begins LEGRAIN, No. 1 VII. 2 L. No. 1 VII 6, has 55.
3 L. No. 1 VII 15 years.
4 Sic! Error for Ri-mu-šu. For the name in line 39, L. No. 1 has Ma-ni-ši-te-šu. Other readings are Manišdelu, Manišdāsusu, and the ordinary reading in his inscriptions is Maništipšu; v. SCHEIL, Del. Per. III 42; HOSCHANDER, ZA. 20, 246. SCHEIL derived the name from man-isdu-su, and HOSCHANDER from man-isdud-su, "Who has drawn him from the womb". Both views are not convincing. Cf. UNGNAD, MVAG. 1915, No. 2, 66.
5 Hence Maništiššu was also the son of Sargon and the "Cruciform Monument", belongs to him. See Cambridge Ancient History, p. 410.
6 L. No. 1 VII 11 has the figure 7 here. See the photograph, Pl. II.
7 Babylonian tradition, which asserted Narām-Sin to have been the son of Sargon, is therefore erroneous. For this tradition, see my Neubabylonische Königsinschriften, 229, 64; Kino, Chronicles, II 9, Rev. 1. The Nippur Text, L. No. 1 VII 13, agrees with W-B. 444.
8 L. No. 1 VII 14 has 56 years and P. No. 3, 1 must have had the same number.
9 Here P. No. 3, Rev. II 2, and S. Rev. I. Restorations from L. No. 1 VII 15.
10 So clearly L. No. 1 VII 17. Poezel, No. 3, R. II 4, has 24.
11 So also S. Rev. 2. But P. No. 3 Rev. II 7 has Semitic, ma-nu-um šarru ma-nu-um la šarru; also L. No. 1 VII 18 f.
12 P. No. 3 R. II 9; S. Rev. 3, i-gi-gi; L. No. 1 VII 20, i-ki-ki, photograph iki-ki an error of the scribe.
14 S. Rev. 4 and L. No. 1 VII 22, i-lu-lu.
15 For lines 6-7, P. No. 3 Rev. 13 and S. Rev. 5 have 4 bi 3 mu ib(in)-ag.
7. Three years they reigned.
8. Dudu reigned 21 years.
10. 11 kings.
11. They reigned 181 years.
12. Agade was smitten with weapons.
13. The rulership passed to Erech.
14. At Erech Ur-nigin became king.
15. He reigned 7 years.
16. Ur-gigir son of Ur-nigin ruled 6 years.
17. Kudda reigned 6 years.
18. Gimil-ili reigned 5 years.
19. Ur-Babbar reigned 6 years.
20. 5 kings.
21. They reigned 30 years.
22. Erech was smitten with weapons.
23. The rulership passed to the Gutemen hordes.
24. The hordes of Gutum had not a king by name.
25. Imta became king. He ruled 3 years.
26. Inkisu reigned 6 years.
27. Nikillagab reigned 6 years.
28. Sulumé reigned 6 years.
29. Elulumé reigned 6 years.
30. Inimabaké reigned 5 years.
31. Igegas reigned 6 years.


2 S. Rev. 8 has 12 kings, which includes the period of anarchy in line 1 above.

3 P. 2 Rev. III 2 and S. Rev. 8 have 197 years. The figures on these variants actually yield 197; 55 + 15 + 7 + 56 + 25 + 3 + 21 + 15 = 197. Since the total here is only 181 and only the figures for Naram-Sin and SargaliSarri are missing (beside the length of the period of the four kings Igigi to Elulu) it is obvious that one or both must be reduced. Assuming 24 for SargaliSarri we are bound to assume 38 for Naram-Sin.

4 A vase recently found at Warka (?) mentions Kudda as a ṣangu priest of Innini and Babbar, and is dedicated to Ningal of Ur. Possibly filched from the excavations at U.

5 S. Rev. 11-16 has the figures 3 + 6 + 5 + 6 and the total 26.

6 S. Rev. 18, Gu-ti-um-(ki)-ṣut.

7 L. No. 1 VIII 2, lagal mu-ub-tuk, had not a king.

8 L. No. 1 VIII 3, Im-bi-ā. Which is right. The signs are so similar that a scribal error has occurred.

9 L. No. 1 R. VIII 3 has 5 years. Var. gi.

10 Var. L. No. 1 VIII 5 has 7 years.

11 Var. L. No. 1 VIII 5 has 7 years.

12 Here perhaps L. No. 1 VIII 19 an-gab.
I-ba-te 2
la-ar-la 
Ku-ru-um 
brub um
I-ra-rau-um
Ib-ra-nu-um
iHa-ab-lum
...
mu
6 nz 
Ibate reigned 3 years.
Jarla(gas) reigned 3 years.
Kurum reigned 1 year.
.... nedin reigned 3 years.
.... rabum reigned 2 years.
Irarum reigned 2 years.
Ibranum reigned 1 year.
Hablum reigned 2 years.
Gimil-Sin, son of Hablum, reigned 7 years.
Jarlaganda reigned 7 years.
... . reigned 7 years.
Tiriga reigned 40 days.

36. Jarlagab reigned 15 years.
37. Ibate reigned 3 years.
38. Jarla(gas) reigned 3 years.
39. Kurum reigned 1 year.
40. .... nedin reigned 3 years.
41. .... rabum reigned 2 years.
42. Irarum reigned 2 years.
43. Ibranum reigned 1 year.
44. Hablum reigned 2 years.
45. Gimil-Sin, son of Hablum, reigned 7 years.

Col. VIII.

1. ugnim [Gu- lu-um-ki ṣa₄ku ba-an-sig] 1. The hordes of Gutium were smitten by the sword.
2. nam-lugal-bi Unug-(ki)-ši 2. The rulership passed to Erech.
[ba-gín] 3. At Erech Utu-hegal became king.
3. Unug-(ki)-ga 3. He reigned 7 1/6 years and 7 days.
[Udu-ga-da] 4. He reigned 7 1/6 years and 7 days.
[legal-dam] 5. One king.
4. mu 7 šu-ši 7 ud [ni-ag] 6. He reigned 7 1/6 years and 7 days.
5. 1 legal 7. Erech was smitten by the sword.
6. mu-bi 7 šu-ši 7 ud [ni-ag] 8. The rulership passed to Ur.
7. Ur-(ki)-ma Ur-d-Nammu 8. He ruled 18 years.
10. mu 18 ni-ag 11. The divine Dungi son of the divine
11. d Dungi dumu dUrd-Nammu-ge

1 L. No. 1 VIII 6 has Warlagaba and makes him the third king and 6 years.
2 Cf. L. No. 1 VIII 17, ......... ti.
4 Here L. No. 1 VIII 15, ......... da.
5 In the list only 20 names appear. The period when the Guteans had no king by name is counted as 1 king. The total is taken from P. No. 2 Rev. III 7, but is naturally uncertain. The actual total is only 86 years. L. No. 1 IX 3 has 124 years and 40 days. A name ending in ga, L. No. 1 VIII 21, does not appear on W-B. 444.
6 In the inscription, RA. 9, 120, Ti-ri-ga-an. L. No. 1 IX 1 has also 40 days.
7 For šuš employed indiscriminately for 60 and 1/6, v. Sum. Grammar, § 173.
8 For this reading, v. GADD, JRAS. 1922, 390.
9 Here begins P. No. 5, Reverse.
12. mu 46 ni-ag
14. mu 9 ni-ag
15. 'Gimil-d.Sin dumu d.Bur-d.Sin
16. mu 9 ni-ag
17. I-be-d.Sin dumu Gimil-d.Sina-ge
18. mu 24 (26) ni-ag
19. 5 (4) lugal
20. mu-bi 108 ib-ag
21. Uri-(ki)-ma gitk ba-an-sig
22. nan-lugal-bi I-si-in-(ki)-šu ba-šin
23. I-si-in-(ki)-na Iš-bi- Gir*-raš lugal
24. mu 33 ni-ag
25. d.Gimil-il-šu dumu Iš-bi-Gir*-ra-ge
26. mu 20 (10) ni-ag
27. Iš-in-d.Da-gan dumu Gimil-il-šu
28. mu 21 ni-ag
29. Iš-me-d.Da-gan [dumu Iš-in-d.Da-gan]
30. mu [20 ni-ag]
31. d.Li-[bi-it-ASdar dumu Iš-me-d.Da-gan]
32. mu [11 ni-ag]
33. d.Ur-d.Ninurta [mu 28 ni-] ag

12. reigned 46 years.
14. reigned 9 years.
16. reigned 9 years.
18. reigned 24 years.
19. 5 (4) kings.
20. They ruled 108 years.
21. Ur was smitten by weapons.
22. The kingship passed to Isin.
23. At Isin Ishbi-Girra was king.
24. He reigned 33 years.
25. The divine Gimil-ilishu, son of Ishbi-Girra.
26. reigned 10 (20) years.
28. reigned 21 years.
30. reigned 20 years.
32. reigned 11 years.
33. The divine Ur-d.Ninurta reigned 28 years.

---

1 This number is undoubtedly correct against the number 58 in P. No. 3 R. 2. In fact 47 full dates of Dungi are known from OBI. No. 125 and MIO. 623, published in transcription by GENOUILLAC, Inventaire, II p. 6; v. SAK. 229 note b. Obviously only one line in OBI. No. 125, Obv, is entirely missing at the top, [mu Dun-gi lugal-cdm]. The last year date, “Year when Harši was destroyed”, is erroneously not included in the scribes figures for this reign.

2 P. No. 5 R. 4 has 7 years, but there are nine year dates known for this reign, and hence W-B. 444 is correct.

3 P. No. 5 Rev. 5 has 25 years. Sic! The text has 4!

4 The actual total is 106, hence Ibi-Sin’s figure is probably to be corrected to 26; or read 47 for Dungi and 25 for Ibi-Sin. The total on P. No. 5 is 117, or difference of 9 years in the length of a well known dynasty not far removed from the period of the chronologist!

5 P. No. 5 R. 8, d.Gir*-ra. The same writing without dingir in BARTON, Miscel. 9, 3; this text (Ni 7772) is a duplicate of LERAGAN, PBS. 13, No. 6 and a continuation of PBS. 13 No. 3. The three texts constitute a letter of Ibi-Sin to Gimil-Numusda, patesi of Kazallu concerning Ishbi-Girra “a man of Maer ”.

6 P. No. 5 Rev. 8 has 32 years, but this number must raised to 33 to obtain 225 on P. No. 5 Rev. 24.

7 P. No. 5 R. omits dingir.

8 P. No. 5 R. 9 has 10 years, which is obviously correct for the total in line 45 is 203, which should be 213 if 20 be read here.

9 So P. No. 5 Rev. 11, and P. No. 2 X 5 is so rendered by POEBEL, PBS IV p. 76, although his copy and photograph have 19 (?).

10 So P. No. 5 Rev. 12, but No. 2 X 7 has “son of Idin-Dagan. 

11 So P. No. 5 Rev. 12, but No. 2 X 7 has “son of Idin-Dagan. 

12 So P. No. 2 X 8 and No. 5 R. 12.

13 So P. No. 5 R. 13. On P. No. 2 X 10 his father was d.Adad .......; hence he was not a descendant of his predecessors. d.Ninurta is only partially preserved; P. No. 5 has IB and No. 2 X 9 preserves NIN. A king of this name is preserved on two contracts from Nippur (unpublished) now in Constantinople, BE. 20, p. 49 and BE. Ser. D V 38. A liturgy to Ur-Ninurta is Ni. 13979 (unpublished). The name is restored from P. No. 5 R. 14.
The divine Bur-\textsuperscript{d}Sin, son of \textsuperscript{d}Ur-\textsuperscript{d}Ninurta, reigned 21 years.

The divine Lipit-\textsuperscript{d}Enlil, son of Bur-\textsuperscript{d}Sin reigned 5 years.

Girra-imiti reigned 8 years.

\textsuperscript{d}Enlilbani reigned 24 years.

The divine Zambija reigned 3 years.

The divine Iterpisha reigned 4 years.

The divine Ur-dukugga reigned 4 years.

Sin-magir reigned 11 years.

14 kings reigned 203 years.

By the hand of Nur-Ninsubur.
TABLE OF KINGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KISH (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ERECH (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gà-ur</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1. Meskemgašer</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gulla-Nidaba(ezen)-an-na...</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>2. Enme(r)kar</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lugalbanda</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dumuzi</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ba-ba(?)</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>5. Gilgameš</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gallibum</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>7. Utulkalamma</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kalumumu</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>8. Labašer</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Atab</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>10. ..... ḫede</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Atabba</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>11. Melamanna</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Arpium</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>12. Lugalkiaga</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Etana</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Balīḥ</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Enmenunna</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Melam-Kish</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Barsalmunna</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tuzzaḫ</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tizkar</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ilkū</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Itasadam</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Enmenbaragigur</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Agga</td>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 23 kings</td>
<td>24510 years, 3 months, 3 days</td>
<td>Total 12 kings</td>
<td>2310 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ur (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mesannipatta</td>
<td>80 (circa 4000)</td>
<td>1. Mesannipatta</td>
<td>80 (circa 4000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 4 kings</td>
<td>177 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contemporary Rulers, etc.

TABLE OF KINGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Contempory Rulers, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hadaniš</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Enbi-Ashtar, conquered by Enšagkūšanna, is said to have been the last king of Kish in this period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaši</td>
<td>circa</td>
<td>3560</td>
<td>Urzaged called king of Kiš, possibly belongs to Hamaši.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Enugduanna (Enšagkušanna)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>Lugalkigubnilaḫ, Lugalkisalsi, at Ereh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3. 4. lu</td>
<td>108 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. [Lugal]zi</td>
<td>25 ?</td>
<td>Akurgal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. lugal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Eannatum</td>
<td>Lagash Zuzu at Akšak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. [Lugal-?-]lu-gal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. bi-im</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. bi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Entemena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6 kings.</td>
<td>136 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ansir</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Enhegal at Lagash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. [Lugal]zi</td>
<td>25 ?</td>
<td>Akurgal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. lugal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Eannatum</td>
<td>Lagash Zuzu at Akšak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. [Lugal-?-]lu-gal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. bi-im</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6 kings.</td>
<td>136 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kiš (3) 3023 Enannatum II | Ukuš at Umma. |
| Kug-d-Bau (contemporary with next dynasty). | 100 | Enetarzi | Lagash |
| | | Urukagina | Lugalzaggisi (son), Umna. |
### TABLE OF KINGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Contemporary rulers, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AKiAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Unzi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undalulu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Urur</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Išu-il</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gimil-dŠin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total six kings</strong></td>
<td><strong>93 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>KISH (4)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gimil-dŠin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ur-d-Ilbaba</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>(read 6²/₃)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zimudar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uši-watar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ashdar-muti</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ishme-d-Shamash</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nannijaḥ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 7 kings</strong></td>
<td><strong>491 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly contemporary with the Akšak dynasty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ERECH (3)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lugalzaggisi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AGADE</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Patesis of Lagash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Šharrukín-ilubani</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>Engilsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rimush</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2752</td>
<td>Ur-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manishtiššu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2743</td>
<td>Lugal-ušumgal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Narâm-dŠin</td>
<td>38 (?)</td>
<td>2728</td>
<td>Ügme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shargalisharri</td>
<td>24 (?)</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Period of anarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Igigi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Imi</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dudu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2663</td>
<td>Ur-Bau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gimil-durul</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 11 kings</strong></td>
<td><strong>181 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ERECH (4)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Urnigin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE OF KINGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contemporary Rulers, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ur-gigir</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kudda</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gimil-li</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ur-Babbar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total 5 kings</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gutium</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intâ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inkišu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gudea (2550)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nikillagab</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Šulmê</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Elulumeš</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inimabakeš</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Igešauš</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jarlagab</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ibat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jarla(gaš)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ur-Ningirsu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kurum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. . . . . . . nedin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. . . . . . . rabum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Irarum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ibranum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ţalbûm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gimil-Sin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Jarlaganda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. . . . . . .</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tiriga(n)</td>
<td>40 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 21 (20) kings</td>
<td>125 years, 40 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erech (5)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utuḫegal</td>
<td>7 1/6</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ur (3)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ur-Nammû</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>Patesis of Lagash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dungi</td>
<td>46 (47)</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>Urabba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bur-Sin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gimil-Sin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>Ur-lama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ibi-Sin</td>
<td>26 (24)(25)</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 5 kings</td>
<td></td>
<td>108 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Text has 420 years and seven days on the more natural rendering of the figures. That is clearly impossible and consequently šu-ši must be taken as an error or read one sixth.
TABLE OF KINGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>CONTEMPORARY RULERS, ETC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ishbi-Girra</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>Kingdom of Ellasar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gimil-ilishu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>Naplanum (2357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Idin-Dagan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>Emişum (2336)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ishme-Dagan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>Samum (2308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lipit-Ashdar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ur-Ninurta</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>Zabaja (2273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bur-Sin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lipit-Enil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>Gungunum (2264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Girra-imiti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>Sumu-ilum (2226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Enil-bani</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>Sumu-la-ilu (2211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Zambija</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2176</td>
<td>Nur-Adad (2197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Iter-pi-sha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Urdukugga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sin-magir</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 14 kings</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Damik-il-shu  | 23    | 2154   | End of Isin dynasty 2131  |
| (Fotheringham's corrected chronology 2076)   |

In the foregoing table I have subjected the actual figures of the prism to severe reduction anterior to the date of the beginning of the second Kingdom of Ur, 3357, which is reached by dead reckoning, assuming that Kug-Bau was contemporary with the Akšak Kingdom, and allowing for some obvious mathematical inaccuracies. If we accept the actual figures of the prism the first king after the Flood ruled 34.685 BC. The first ruler of Erech began to reign 10.175 BC. The second Kingdom of Kish began in 7332 and Ḫamaši seized the hegemony in 4137 BC. It is impossible to give credence to these figures, at any rate before 4137 for Ḫamaši, and I have assigned dates to the period before 3357 entirely on grounds of epigraphy and archaeology. If we allow for the omission of the last two kings before the Flood by accepting the figures on W-B. 62, and add 64.800 for these two kings, the Prism, W-B. 444, places the first ruler of mankind 340.685 BC. W-B. 62 would yield 490.685 for the beginning of mankind, and Berossus's figures would be 466.685, BC. Are these figures mere tradition or is the early Sumerian civilisation to be assigned to such remote periods before 10,000 BC? Chinese and Indian tradition used the figures of Berossus for the prehistoric age of man. From a Chinese source of the 8th century AD., Edward Chavannes cites a passage which assigns 432,000 years to the age of the 13 kings of heaven and the 11 kings of earth. The Indian period Kali-yuga corresponds exactly to the figures of Berossus. See Ed. Chavannes, Les Mémoires Historiques de Se-ma Ts'ien, Vol. I, page 18. (The reference I owe to Professor Soothill.) At any rate we now know that, by consensus of all their traditions, the Sumerians believed the Flood to have occurred about 35,000 BC., and that great kingdoms flourished long before 6000 BC. The Hindu notion is that

Page 26, for Twenty-third (year of Sin-muballit), read twelfth year.
a great cosmic age lasted 12,000 divine years, a divine year being 360 human years, which gives 4,320,000 human years. This was divided into four cycles (yuga), the krita, treta, dvapara and kali cycles, in the proportion, 4-3-2-1, i.e., 1,440,000; 1,080,000; 720,000; 360,000. The krita age consisted of unblemished righteousness, the treta age of 3/4 righteousness, the dvapara age of 1/2 righteousness, and the kali-yuga of only 1/4 righteousness. Each age began and ended in a twilight period containing as many hundreds of divine years as the age had thousands. Hence the kali-yuga, or "age of discord" has 36,000 + 360,000 + 36,000 = 432,000 human years. It is difficult to understand how this can have any connection with the Sumerian system and the 432,000 years of the ante-diluvian period. Mr. F. E. Pargiter, MA. of Exeter College, has supplied me with this accurate information. He refers to the following literature. Fitz Edward Hall's edition of Wilson's Vishna Purana, Vol. I, 49-50, and Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, article Puranas by F. E. Pargiter.

HISTORICAL INSCRIPTION OF SIN-IDINNAM.

This finely executed monument which has been placed at my disposal by the present owner, E. S. David, a dealer in antiquities, is one of those rare objects which represent the best scribal craft of the Sumerians. It is a hollow barrel shaped object similar to the beautiful hollow cylinder of Entemena in the private collection of the late Dr. J. B. Nies of New-York, published by the owner in his Historical, Religious and Economic Texts, No. 1, with photographs on plate LVII. The Entemena cylinder has the orifice at the narrower end, whereas the Sin-idinnam cylinder is open at the larger end. The Entemena cylinder has the appearance of a huge mace head which Dr. Nies compared with the mace head of Shargalisharri now in the British Museum, dedicated to Shamash at Sippar. On the oval closed end of Entemena's monument there is a curious design of concentric circles intersected by lines drawn from the circumference to the inner circle, which produces a resemblance to a net. This design does not occur on Sin-idinnam's cylinder. The objects are unique, and although Sin-idinnam belongs to the 22nd century and Entemena approximately to the 29th century, there can be no doubt but that the later object represents an unbroken style of craftsmanship. The dealer maintains that the object was found at Bismya.

Sin-idinnam, ninth king of the Ellasar dynasty, ruled 2181-2176, and in his short reign of six years he seems to have accomplished more for his kingdom than any of the Kings of Ellasar before the last two kings Arad-Sin and his more famous brother Rim-Sin. Three inscribed clay pegs and a long brick inscription of Sin-idinnam were previously known, and editions of them will be found in Thureau-Dangin's Alt-sumerische und akkadische Königsinschriften 208-211. I have consequently designated this new monument as Sin-idinnam E, and the other monuments are cited as A, B, C, D after the notation in SAK.

Only two of his year dates are known beside the formula for his first year which can of course be restored according to the Sumerian method of promulgating the date of the first year for any reign. A contract published in Lettres et Contrats No. 231 by Thureau-Dangin, has an oath in the name of Sin-idinnam and the date "Year when he built the great wall of
Mašgan-šabrû. This city is supposed to have been near Adab. The contemporary kingdom of Isin whose capitol Isin is now identified with Tell Bahri 17 miles south of Nippur, lay in the vicinity of Adab, and it is difficult to understand how the kings of Ellasar could have retained a city in this region within their jurisdiction. The contemporary king at Isin was Zambija and another date of Sin-idinnam is, “Year when he smote with weapons Elam and Za-am-bi-ja king of Isin”, GRICE, Yale Series, V, No. 3, and Nos. 2; 36 (where Zambija is not mentioned). It is, therefore, probable that although the king of Isin retained his throne at this time, the rival kingdom at Ellasar under Sin-idinnam actually obtained mastery of the greater part of Sumer.

Sumu-ilum the seventh king of Ellasar waged war with Kish near Babylon, and both Kish and Babylon then had independent kings. In fact it is becoming increasingly evident that Babylon remained a small local kingdom until the age of Sin-muballit (predecessor of Hammurabi) in whose reign Isin finally fell to the growing power of this northern city, only to be retaken by Rim-Sin of Ellasar a few years later. In fact an unplaced date of one of these earlier Ellasar kings, probably Sumu-ilum, refers to the defeat of the army of Babylon', and another date mentions the defeat of the army of Malgh, a land on the central Tigris.

Before the rapid extension of the authority of Babylon by the conquests of Hammurabi who finally recaptured Isin and also subdued Ellasar, the kingdom of Ellasar clearly controlled the greater part of Sumer and Accad. It is difficult to understand the position of the seemingly powerful kingdom of Isin in the vicinity of Adab and only 70 miles distant from Ellasar. In this new inscription, the longest and most important yet recovered from the reign of Sin-idinnam, he calls himself king of Sumer and Accad, a title which the kings of Isin Ishme-Dagan, Lipit-Ishtar, Ur-Ninurta and Sin-magir, also appropriate, and Sin-magir reigned later than Sin-idinnam. These contemporary kings both claim to be protectors of the great southern city Ur. Nur-Immer of Ellasar, “shepherd of Ur”, must have exercised control of that city for his inscription was found there. And Bur-Sin, Ur-Ninurta, Lipit-Ishtar and Ishme-Dagan of Isin all claim to have possessed Ur. Enannatum, son of Ishme-Dagan, was a priest of Nannar at Ur and he built there a temple for Gungunu (king of Ellasar and contemporary of Lipit-Ishtar and Ur-Ninurta) who is called “king of Ur” in Enannatum’s own inscription. The confusion introduced by the inscriptions of the period concerning the spheres of influence of Ellasar and Isin is inexplicable. Certainly this must have been a good-natured sort of arrangement, a kind of dual monarchy without much emphasis upon the reality of titles.

The new inscription (E) was written to commemorate the excavation of the river Tigris whereby he supplied Ellasar with water. Inscriptions A and D also mention this event. This raises another inexplicable topographical problem. The year date 33 of Hammurabi (see p. 33) says that he dug a canal which supplied Nippur, Erech, Isin, Ellasar, Ur and Eridu. This obviously refers to the Euphrates, on which Nippur, Erech, Ur and Eridu were certainly located. Sin-idinnam seems to have been placed in a political situation similar to that of Entemena at Lagash. This patesi of Lagash dug a canal from the Tigris to the “River of the Prince”, i.e., to the Euphrates, which is located on the same monument that served as a pattern for the cylinder of Sin-idinnam. The water supply of Lagash came originally from the

1 GRICE, No. 38. 2 See AJSL. 35, 227 and GRICE, No. 17. 3 SAK. 40 V 9.
north by canals which tapped the Euphrates near Nippur. But this water supply had been so frequently damaged by the rival city Umma, which lay between Lagash and the Euphrates, that Entemena resolved to rid himself forever of this menace by tapping the Tigris on the east. His new canal is probably represented by the modern Shatt-el-Hai. Sin-idinnam’s city and province lay on the old bed of the Euphrates and from this source it had always obtained water. In his time the river had changed its main bed to a more westerly course, and Erech, Isin and Ellasar now depended upon a river reduced to a canal and easily regulated by engineering works. Possibly the northern neighbor Isin, with which Sin-idinnam is known to have waged war, interfered with the water supply of Ellasar, and the king resorted to the expedient of Entemena. But the inscription says that he dug the Tigris the broad river of Shamash and “restored it to its place”. The Tigris certainly never ran anywhere near Ellasar. The words cannot possibly convey their natural meaning. Undoubtedly Ellasar could be supplied by a canal which tapped the old Entemena canal, or perhaps Entemena’s canal actually reached the Euphrates at Ellasar and became the southern reach of the Tigris.

HOLLOW BARREL SHAPED CYLINDER
IN POSSESSION OF E. S. DAVID.

COL. I.

1. “Sin-i-din-na-am (2) gurus-kalag qa
3. U (4) lugal Irar(ki)-ma
5. lugal ki-en-gi-(ki) Uru
6. lugal di-babar é “Babbar-ge
7. mu-un-dí-a (8) giš-gar é dingir-ri-e-ne
9. ki-bi-sú bo-gi-a me-en

10. ud An-ni “Enlil “Nannar “Babbar-bi
11. bal dug-gar st-di (12) ud-bi sud-sud-è
13. mà-ra sag-eš X
14. ma-ni-in-PA + KAB + DU-eš-a
15. giš-túg (gišlug) dagal-la-mu (16) maš-bi-sú
gar (17) sag-bi-sú è-a-ta
18. eri-ki ma-da-mu-sú (19) a-dug mà-mà-de
20. a-rá-zug-sal

1. Sin-idinnam, (2) the valiant,
3. the care-taker of Ur, (4) the king of Ellasar,
5. the king of Sumer and Accad,
6-7. the king who built Ebabbar, the temple of Babbar, (8) who the plans of the temples of the gods (9) restored to their places, am I.
10. When Anu, Enlil, Nannar and Babbar
11. to reduce to order the revolt of rebellion,
12. to cause days to go forth unto great length (13) to me as a gift . . . . (14) gave,
15. my understanding,
16. which has been created in far fame
17. to cause to rise above all others,
18. for the city of my land (19) to provide sweet waters, (20) the glorious career

1 See Cambridge Ancient History, I 383.
2 Clay peg A has me giš-gar = parši usurat, NIES, HRET. 22, 82.
3 The sign seems to be REC. 92.
4 Cf. CT. 16, 25, 6, sud-sud ga-ba-ra-e, May he go forth far-away.
21. nam-ur-sag-ga-mu (22) ud-da egir-bi-dú
23. pa-e ma-g ag-dé
26. a-ra-su-gi-mu-sú (27) gu-mu-ši-in-še-gi-
28. eš-a (28) id Idigna ba-al-la-a-da (29) ki-bi-sú
gi-a-da
30. ud-ti-la sú-ud-du-sú (31) mu-mu mà-mà-dé
32. inim nu-kúr-ru-bi-a (33) á-bí gu-mu-
da-an-ág-ès
34. ud-ba di-g-ga di-g-ga (35) An [Innini-ta
36. (36) še-ga [Enil (36) Nin-li-lá-la-ta

21. of my valour (22) unto the days of hereafter
23. to make illustrious splendidly,
24. unto Anu and Enlil (25) I offered prayers.
26. (When) unto my steadfast intercession they
were propitious, (28) to dig the Tigris,
29. and to restore it to its place,
30. to lengthen days of life, (31) to establish
my name, (32) with their unchangeable
word (33) they proclaimed their oracle.
34. Then by the commands of Anu and Innini,
(36) by the grace of Enlil and Ninlil.

1. Immer dingir-mu [še-ga-ni?]
2. dá-ma-g mà-lá ta (3) á-kalag-ma-g dEn-ki d...
ta (4) id Idigna
5. id gal-la [Babbar-ge (6) ú-ma-mu-ta
7. gal-bi je-im-mi-ba-al (8) ki-sur-ra in-dub-
*ur? (9) ka-bi um-mi-tum
10. a-gam-ma-bi-sú (11) sì gal je-im-mi-dí
12. á dá-eri (13) je-gal su-g mu-túm-mu
14. Ilrar(ki) kalam-ma-mu-sú (15) je-im-mi-gar
(16) ud id Idigna id gu-la
17. mu-ba-al-la-a (18) á galu áš-e
19. ë śe ? gur-la (20) ninda 2 ka-la
21. kas 4 ka-ta (22) id 2 gín-ta-dám
23. ud-aš-a (24) úr-ginšu-ba-an-ti (25) galu
á-lal (26) galu á-tag
27. ba-ra-ne-tuk (28) á-kalag ma-ša-mu-ta
(29) kin-bi je-im-mi-tí
30. inim ka-ás-bar (31) dingir-gal-e-ne-ta (32) id
Idigna id dagal-la (33) ki-bi-sú je-im-mi-ši.
(34) ud-ul-du-eri šišu
35. mu-mu je-im-mi-gin

1 Sic! But Clay Peg. A, 13. íá-dagalla, hence gál is either an error by omission for da-gál, or gál has
also the meaning ra-pšu.
2 For kisurra = kisurrá, Syn. bératí, v. SBP. 64. 14 and cf. (sur) brtú, Syn. kišírú,
grave, V R. 81, 25, and brtú, Syn. kišírú, spring. See also Gudea, Cyl. A. 10, 20.
3 Indub-ur was restored to its place by Sin-idinnam, SAK. 210 d) 6. It is certainly the same word as
im-dub-ba, SAK. 38 IV 4, where it is associated with e kisurra, the boundary canal. 4Niná is nin-in-dub-ba
mistress of reservoirs (?), SAK. 142 v) 3; 74 VIII 52; 190 h) 3.
4 Agam = agammu.
5 The sign is REC. 386; du-eri seems to be a variant of da-eri. But note ud-ul-du-a, Br. 7939, and ud-
ul-ha-aš, Sin-idinnam, Clay Peg II 5, possibly error of for ŋa.
ANNALS OF THE REIGN OF HAMMURABI
W-B (1923), 373.

This fragment forms the upper half of a large tablet 5 3/4 inches wide and originally about 12 inches long. It contained according to the colophon 18 year dates of Hammurabi, most of which are more detailed and contain much more historical information than the ordinary formulae employed in dating documents. Most curiously the dates do not follow each other in chronological order as they are recorded in the other lists. The authoritative lists, Scheil, *La Chronologic Rectifie du Regne de Hammurabi*, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, XXXIX 111-122; King, LIII. No. 101 (= CT. VI 10), Col. III 1-43; Boissier, RA. XI 161-164; King, Chronicles, II 98-102; all agree in assigning 43 years to this reign. The dynastic list B, Winckler, *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte* 145 has 55 years for this reign and the figures for the other reigns disagree with the contemporary date lists, so as to render that tablet of little value for exact chronology.

W-B. 373 begins with the date formula of the 30th year, mentioning events which actually occurred in the 29th year of his reign. The date for the 31st year then follows, but there is here a long gap with space for at least two sections and the beginning of the section for the 32nd year which ends on Col. II (1-6). Obviously Col. I after the second section contained at least two years between the years 31-32! Reverse I carries the dates for years 36-37-39; the date for the 38th year is omitted! It is, therefore, wholly impossible to restore the lacunae. The last date on the tablet is the year 43, and consequently the entire document probably contained a selection of the annals of Hammurabi, arranged in groups, by which method military campaigns in certain areas were brought together. Note that the events mentioned in the formulae for the 37th and 39th years both concern military operations against the lands on the upper Tigris, which accounts for the order here.

The colophon states that the tablet contained 18 years of the reign of Hammurabi. But the period from year 30 to year 43 contains only 14 dates, and consequently the tablet included annals before the year 30. The text even in its fragmentary condition is a new and valuable addition to the records of this illustrious ruler. The scribe has attempted to write annals in a real historical method and he composed his material in the spirit of a thoughtful historian.

The obverse of the tablet is badly weather worn and the decipherment difficult.

**YEAR DATE 30.**


"Year when Hammurabi, the wise, the beloved of Marduk, the far famed might of the great gods, the troops of Elam, beginning with the borders of Marhaši, Subartu, Gutium, Ešunnak, and Malgu, who calamitously had come up, — their defeat accomplished «.

**Notes:** For kar-dār (1. 9), see SAK. 38 III 32; 56, 23; I Raw. 5, No. 20, 11.
YEAR DATE 31.


Year when Hammurabi, the king, by the help of Anu and Enlil, who go before his troops, and to whom heroic strength by the great gods was given, Jamutbal and the king Rim-Sin by his hand conquered; ... he caused to be set up; and the ... of Sumer and Accad he caused to accept his commands.

Notes: For variants see POEBEL, BE. VI 63; BOISSIER, RA. XI 162; SCHEIL, RT. 34, 117; CHIERA, PBS. VIII 81, date; 125 date. The verb dūg-ga-dib is restored from PBS. VIII 81, and the reading is important for it proves that ka-dib was an erroneous rendering. Cf. dūg-mu-un-dib-ba = amātum ušaḫ-as, IV R. 18 a 38. See SAK. 40 V 30; PSEA. 1918, 49, 40 and dūg-dib-ba = pirištu, RA. XI 148, 21. Here belongs the official amēlu dūg-dib (mušalḫiz amāti), RA. XVI 125, II 23; KING, Boundary Stones, 105, 21; 126, 19; cf. CT. 24, 31, 94; PBS. II 51, 5 etc. In l. 9, ba-ed probably refers to the erection of a stele, possibly the law code. Cf. year date d) of Abi-ešuḫ. Line 4 is restored from year date 23 of Samsuiluna.

YEAR DATE 32.


Year when H. the king, the heroic, bearer of the glory of Marduk overthrew in battle with a mighty weapon the host of Esnunnak, Subartu and Gutium; Malgu and the banks of the Tigris as far as Subartu his hand conquered.

Notes: Malgū in line 4 is written MA-AN-KI-? (KI). The same form occurs in CLAY, Miscel. 33, 3, but the sign after KI is uncertain in both texts. In CT. 12, 32, a 21 the sign M is a variant of Ma-al-gi-a-(ki) = Malgu and in Voc. SCHEIL, R (muš-gu) = ma-al-[gu-u], l. 74. It is probable then that the sign is MURGU and that the form of writing this name is a kind of doublet. AN has apparently the value al here and Malki is a gloss on MURGU. AN with value al probably occurs in SCHROEDER, KAV. 46 I 7. AN-MAL, title of the god ZA-MAL-MAL, with gloss al'-ba. The values ili, al for AN are probably Semitic from ili, alu, god, and in this case the determinative is pronounced (as Semitic). For the occasional pronunciation of determinatives, see SUMERIAN GRAMMAR § 66, and for determinative mulu star, always pronounced, see UNGNAD, ZDMG. 74, 209 and the loan-word gišparu, net, trap from gišpar. It is certain, however, that the determinative for "god ", Sum. dingir, Semitic ili, (West Semitic ala) was not generally pronounced. See the transcriptions of the names of gods in Aramaic docket, DELAPORTE, Épigraphes Araméens, p. 19, et passim; in Aramaic Papyri the divine names are transcribed without the determinative, COWLEY, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century, passim; note especially p. 215, 92, the god Shamash with no determinative. See also G. A. Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 186, inscription of Nērab (6th century),

1 Restored from W-B. 1923, 311, a contract. For Malgū, Var. 311 has MA-AN-KI.
with the names of several Assyrian gods transcribed without determinative, Šakar, Šamaš, Ningal (Nikal), Nusku. Although al-ba, il-ba in the Assur vocabulary undoubtedly indicate a Semitic rendering of dingir-MAL(ba) as Alba, Ilba, there is no doubt but that the gloss il-ba-ba on the name dZA-MAL-MAL, KAV. 46 I 9, really shews that ZA has the value il here. WEIDNER has collated this tablet and finds that the gloss in line 6 is ZA-ba-bu which in the light of the gloss in 1. 9 is to be read il-ba-bu. Note also POEBEL, PBS. V 129, 2, AN glossed ZA and i-lum. Therefore ZA has the value il or ila, ila and the determinative in dIlaba was not read. This confirms my reading of the Sumerian for Ellasar, il-ra-ar or ila-ra-ar, JRAS. 1920, 515. The value il for ZA is Sumerian.

The date formula for the 32nd year of Hammurabi is usually abbreviated to mu ugnim Éš-nun-na-(ki), see POEBEL, BE. VI 63; BOISSIER, RA. XI 162; SCHEIL, ibid. 7; SCHÖRER, VAB. V 592. But mu ma-da Malgu(ki), RANKE, BE. VI 37, 26, is clearly the same year. Malgu on the evidence of this text lay on the Tigris and its constant association with Elam, Gutium, ©šannak, proves that it must have been somewhere in the region of the Diyala river. Its previous location near Sippar was erroneous. See SCHROEDER, ZA. 31, 95. The name first appears in the Isin period, date of a king of Ellasar, AJSL. 35, 227; GRICE, Yale Series V, No. 17 and before the reign of Hammurabi it was an independent Semitic kingdom, and two of its kings Ibik-Istar and Takil-ili-šu are known, SCHEL, RT. 34, 104; VS. I 32 = ZA. 31, 92. The name is last heard of in the Cassite period, when it formed an administrative district under Melishipak, Del. Per. X 87 and is there associated with the Sea Land, Col. II 20.

**Year 33.**


"Year when Hammurabi, the king, dug the canal « Hammurabi is the abundance of the people », the loved of Anu and Enil, and everlasting waters of plentifulness created for Nippur, Eridu, Ur, Ellasar, Erech and Isin; when he restored disturbed Sumer and Accad to their places, and in battle overthrew Maer and Malgū; when Maer and . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . the cities of Subartû he caused to accept his commands in friendship . . . . . .

**Notes:** For ṣaggira l. 3 = bibil lūbū, v. KAR. 8, 7; GADD, Early Dynasties, 33, 17 = CT. 21, 19, 12. The canal here referred to is clearly the southern course of the old bed of the Euphrates which had now changed its main bed above Babylon and ran southward past Babylon reaching the sea at Eridu. The old bed cannot be the Shatt el Khar, which lies too far eastward of a canal which could have passed from Nippur to Eridu via Isin, Erech, Ellasar and Ur. The scribe here gives the northern and southern ends of the canal, « Hammurabi is the abundance of the people », and then names the great cities which it supplied, beginning from the south. Isin is now known to be Tell Bahri, 17 miles south of Nippur, according to the map of the War Office, Geographical Section, General Staff. Rim-Sin king of Ellasar in his 22nd year, or 42 years previously, dug the Euphrates (which then supplied Nippur) from Erech to the sea and « made a river for Ur », JRAS. 1921, 582. Clearly Hammurabi’s canal
is the same stream which Rim-Sin refers to. It is no longer called the Euphrates by Hammurabi. Rim-Sin seems to have found the course of the old river in process of cutting a new bed away from Ur. These statements seem to permit of but one conclusion. The old Euphrates and the new canal of Hammurabi passed from Nippur to Eridu where it reached the sea. Ur and Ellasar were fed by this stream. On the other hand the relative positions of Ur and Eridu and the topography of the land between them make it difficult to believe that both lay on the course of Euphrates. The most recent information obtainable on the topography will be found in R. C. Thompson’s article, *The British Museum Excavations at Abu Sharhein*, Archaeologia, 1920. Another new sketch of this area is given by Dr. H. R. Hall, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, VIII 242. Eridu lies SW. of Ur, eight miles on the new map of the General Staff, but Thompson says that the distance is 12 miles and Dr. Hall tells me that it is fourteen. Dr. Hall has informed me that Eridu lies in fact SSW. of Ur and hence it is possible that the old course of the Euphrates actually passed by Ur to reach the sea at Eridu. At any rate Thompson states that the level of the plain rises slightly from Ur to Eridu, and his map shews a low sandstone ridge about halfway between these sites. He argues on the evidence of freshwater mussels found in different strata at Eridu, that the city stood on a lagoon (at the mouth of the Euphrates). It is clear that a river could hardly run from Ur to Eridu, but that its old bed may have reached the sea from Ellasar *via* Eridu leaving Ur several miles eastward. Ur then could have been supplied not from the main river but from a canal, or perhaps a branch, and the old mouth of the river may have formed a delta with Ur and Eridu at the southern corners of the delta.

**Year Date 36.**


"Year when Hammurabi, the king, rebuilt Emeteursag and built the head of the stage-tower Kidurmaḫ, raised on high like heaven, for Ibbabā and Innīni; when to make pre-eminent the glory of Ibbabā and Innīni by means of them he caused them excel in grandeur."

**Year Date 37.**

1) *mu* Ḥa-am-mu-[ra-bi lugal-e] 2) d-kalag-gal *d*-Marduk-ka-ta 3) ugnu[m Tu-ru-uk-ki-um 4) *Ka-ag-mu-[um-(ki)] 5) kur Su-bīr-"(ki)-bi-ta 6) me-ta be-tib-šub-ša.

"Year when Hammurabi, the king, by the great might of Marduk overthrew in battle the armies of Turukku, Kagnmum and Subartu.*

Turukku is written Tu-ru-ku-um, VS. IX 60, Tu-ru-ki-um, *ibid.*, 64; 68; Clay, *Miscel.*, 33, 8; Tu-ru-uk-ki-um, Poebel, BE. VI 14. It appears again in the inscription of Adad-Nirari I (14th century), IV R. 39, 16 = KB. I 4 and OLZ. 1915, 170, as *mat* Tu-ru-ki-i with Nigimti and Kutti, Gutium. A letter of the Hammurabi period refers to amēl Kakhmā and amēl Arāpēhm(ki) who were foreign invaders quartered on Babylonian gardeners. See Ungnad, OLZ. 1915, 170. Arrapha is identified with modern Kerkuk, near Arbela south of the Lower Zab. Therefore the lands mentioned in this date refer to the region of Gutium and northern Mesopotamia. *mat* Ka-ak-ni-e is mentioned with the Mannai (Sargon, end of 8th century), KB. II 36, 9 and cf. 42, 28.
Year Date 39.

1) mu Ḫa-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e 2) á kalag-kalag-ga An 3) En-lil 4) mu-un-na-sum-na-am 5) kilib gu-di-a-(ki) 6) kur Su-bi-r-bi-ia [sug giš-be-in-ra].

"Year when Hammurabi by the powers which Anu and Enlil gave him smote the totality of the enemies and the land Subartu."

The text omits the date of the 38th year, "year when Ašnunnak was destroyed by a flood.

The date of the 39th year is restored from the colophon date of the Ellasar dynastic prism, RA. 15, 10. For gu-di-a, Scheil, La Chronologie Rectifiée, has gu-di-bi.

After a long break.

1) [mu sajār UD-KIB]-NUN-NA-(ki) 2) be-in-gar-ra.

This is clearly the last year of Hammurabi; the Semitic translation is given on the Nippur tablet, Ranke, BE. VI, No. 32, mu epir Sippar(ki) išša-pku, "year when the earth of Sippar was heaped up". This refers to the construction of an earth wall of Sippar. See the inscription of Hammurabi, cited by Poebel, BE. VI p. 68 n. 2.

Colophon.

18 (?) years of Hammurabi the king.
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