THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE REIGNS OF ISHBI-ERRA AND SHU-ILISHU

The correct sequence of the majority of the date formulae of Ishbi-Erра and of Shu-Ilishu, the first two kings of the First Dynasty of Isin, has been established only recently. The first significant advance was the publication in *Semer* 4 105-113 of "A Date-List of Ishbi-Erра," by Taha Baqir. Although the text presented by Baqir is unfortunately broken, it nevertheless gives the order and identification of twenty-one of Ishbi-Erра’s thirty-three years of kingship. The tablet has a small break at the beginning and a greater one at the end. Since this document allots one line to each year name, two or three years may be lacking from the start of Ishbi-Erра’s reign. The remaining eight or nine years, of which the verb form is the only recognizable part of the last two formulae preserved, are lacking from the close of the list. Baqir has assigned the consecutive numbers 1-23 to the twenty-one identified years plus the two unidentified at the end of his text. For purposes of ready reference Baqir’s numbers have been adopted for use in the “Catalogue” of the present volume. It must be borne in mind, then, that the number given to a formula does not refer to the order of the years of Ishbi-Erра’s reign, but rather to the consecutive place of that particular formula in Baqir’s list. To determine the precise year to which any formula of Ishbi-Erра belongs, the length of the gap at the beginning of Baqir’s text must be ascertained. This cannot be done until additional chronological material from Ishbi-Erра’s time has been discovered and published.

The second important contribution was the publication of “The Date Formula of Shu-Ilushu of Isin” by Francis R. Steele in *RASOR* 122 43-49. This list will be considered under the Shu-Ilushu section of this discussion.

The lists of Ishbi-Erра, unassigned, and Shu-Ilushu date formulae which follow are presented with few exceptions in the most complete forms possible. This means that some of the formulae in the lists do not actually occur on any tablet known to the writer in the exact form given. Nothing has been added to a reconstructed form, however, which does not appear in an existing text.

The numbers 1-23 used by Baqir have been employed in the Ishbi-Erра list, as well as in the “Catalogue.” In some examples the formula cited will coincide with that given by Baqir; in others it will be more complete. In a few cases there will be major variants. The unassigned formulae, of course, are not included in any list published so far, and, indeed, only two among them can positively be assigned to any king’s reign. The small gap in Steele’s list of Shu-Ilushu date formulae will be closed, with the exception of the fourth year, by the formulae in the present volume.

No attempt has been made to present a complete list of variants for each formula, although this has been done in a few instances. The most complete form of any formula has normally been included in the lists. If this formula is not the one ordinarily employed, the most common form, and in a few examples the most abbreviated form, of a formula has been noted under the variants.

Although each individual reference may not be cited, the writer wishes to express his indebtedness to the previous publications especially of Stephens, Bohl, Baqir, and Steele. The references to these articles are given in the bibliography (see below, pp. 23-44). Without them the contributions of the present work to Early Isin chronology would not have been possible.

ISHBI-ERRA DATE FORMULAE

1. *mu nin-derig* ‘Nin-urta ba-il’ ‘Year: The high priestess of Ninurta was elevated (to office)’
   BIN IX 391

   This one tablet suggests rather clearly that ‘Nin-urta should be read instead of Baqir’s ‘Nin-il[i]. His copy of the fragmentary line would permit either *il* or *urta*. It is apparent, however, that these two signs were readily confused even by ancient scribes. Cf. No. 19.

2. *mu ur-usu Mar-ta ba-il’ ‘Year: The Martu city was destroyed’
   BIN IX 391, 398, 400, 522
   NBC 3051, 6356, 6414, 7186, 7801, 7806, 7899, 8463, 8466, 8475, 8492 (?)

3. *mu ur-sa ur[u] Mar-ta ba-il’ ‘Year: After the Martu city was destroyed’
   BIN IX 192, 189, 238, 328, 385, 441, 447, 533
   NBC 5688, 7175, 7638, 7670, 8428, 8445, 8454, 8497

4. *mu a-lā gibil-a-ta IM.SA du-a* ‘Year: The field was established anew’ (?)
   BIN IX 39, 48, 886, 462
   NBC 6387, 7800, 7437, 7506, 8139

   The most usual form, *mu a-lā gibil-a-ta du-a, is attested in the works of Stephens and Baqir. The following texts, however, show variants:
   BIN IX 492 *mu a-lā gibil a-lā IM.SA du-a
   BIN IX 398 *mu a-lā gibil IM.SA du-a
   NBC 7909 *mu a-lā gibil IM.SA du-a

From these variants IM.SA has been inserted in the present list. The additional a-lā
of BIN IX 492 has been rejected, rightly or wrongly, as an erroneous repetition on the part of the scribe. im.šà may qualify a-šà in some way.

5. mu nin-dingir Uškur ba-ìl 'Year: The high priestess of Ishkur was elevated (to office)'
BIN IX 51, 80, 118, 399, 508, 511
NBC 6430, 7002, 7104, 7412, 7350, 7539, 8442

6. mu 'Iš-bi-Erra lu-gal mu-da-na-ke, ba-gal I-ti-il-pá-šu-nu mu-bá-du 'Year: Ishbi-Erra, (now) master of his (outlying) lands, built the great fortification, Itil-pashhunu' 
BIN IX 41, 49, 69, 60, 68, 71, 74, 318, 340, 353, 374, 387, 435, 457, 469, 478, 494
NBC 5669, 7085, 7255, 7558, 7658, 7672

What is probably the complete formula for this particular year, found in BIN IX 82, is quoted above. Only in this document does Ishbi-Erra’s name appear; and only in it is he given the title “king of his land” in the formula for this year. The addition of gid after bád occurs in several of the references quoted.

The writing most commonly used for this formula is mu bád I-ti-il/ti-pá-šu-nu ba-šú. The use of ti-il and ti is evenly divided.

The most abbreviated form possible, mu bád I, occurs in BIN IX 340.

7. mu en-gas Inanna 'Iš-bi-Erra máš-e in-pá(d) 'Year: Ishbi-Erra chose by means of the omens the gab-high priest of Inanna'
NBC 6358, 6374, 6461, 6476, 6477, 7094, 7155, 7158, 7250, 7387, 7548, 7557, 7648, 8025, 8156, 8448, 8444

For the date formula mu en-gas Inanna ba-il in Baqš’s list, there is no exact equivalent among the BIN IX texts. The formulae being proposed for this position all have iš-in-pá(d) for the verb form instead of ba-il (see below, p. 19). While most of the formulae mention only en, three, BIN IX 35, 319, and 337, have en-gas. Only three of the many BIN IX texts, Nos. 31, 44, and 244, and none of the unpublished NBC tablets, containing this formula include the name of Ishbi-Erra.

BIN IX 460 provides the evidence that the BIN IX formula belongs in this position. It contains two year dates which are with little doubt consecutive: itu ab-3 ud 7 ba-gal mu bád I-ti-il-pá-šu-nu ba-šú ta itu kin Inanna mu en Inanna máš-e i-pá(d)-[šì]. If these two years are not consecutive, one would have to suppose that a long period of time is covered by No. 460 and that our date really belongs to the lacuna at the end of Baqš’s list. This is quite improbable.
known mu ú-sa formula referring to year 11a is provided by BIN IX 170. Among the examples of 11b is one certainly dated as early in the year as the twenty-sixth day of the second month of the Nippur calendar. All seventeen are dated on, or before, the twelfth day of the twelfth month. In spite of these facts, the one instance of 11a (used temporarily for the year which finally came to be known by the name given in 11b) is dated on the first day of the intercalary month. These facts seem to indicate the impossible situation that a tablet was dated by means of the temporary name of the year some eleven months after the permanent name had come into use. A possible explanation is provided by the following hypothesis. The tablet, BIN IX 170, really was written on the first day of the intercalary month in the year 10; and the scribe should have used the date formula 10b. He erroneously prefixed the word ú-sa to this formula because at the end of the twelfth month he had expected that the first day of the next month would be the new year. When the first day of the month arrived he was informed that the month was to be an intercalary month, and so indicated it on the tablet; but he allowed his previous inclination to prevail concerning the use of the date formula for a new year. The hypothesis is supported by the fact that year 10 is known to have had an intercalary month (Text Nos. 159, 804), as did also year 12 (Text Nos. 79, 179). It is somewhat improbable that year 11 would also have had an intercalary month.

The dilemma may also possibly be resolved by assigning the intercalary month to the beginning of year 11 instead of to the end of that year. This would make the date presented by 11a earlier than that of 11b. Thus the problem of the use of a mu ú-sa formula months after the permanent name for the year had been chosen would be removed. If the intercalary month is considered as belonging to the beginning of year 11, however, the intercalary months for years 10 and 12 must be placed in the same manner. Otherwise year 11 would have an intercalary month both at the beginning and at the end of the year. While it is true that three years in succession do not ordinarily have an intercalary month, it does sometimes happen. In the case of the years Amar-Shuma 9 through Shu-Shin 3 there are even four consecutive years having an intercalary month (cf. Nikolaus Schneider, Die Zeitbestimmungen der Wirtschaftsurkunden von Ur III, Anör XIII 78, 85). Although this lack of systematic intercalation creates a serious chronological problem, it must be remembered that “the rule of 7 intercalations in 19 years at fixed intervals” (cf. O. Neugebauer, The Exact Sciences in Antiquity, p. 87) was not put into use until about 400 n. c.

11b. mu bád Es-tar-tá-ra-am-ê-hi-Êr-ra ba-dû ‘Year: The fortification, Eshtar-taram-Ishbi-Er-ra, was built’
BIN IX 158, 171, 175, 176, 196, 225, 305, 482, 493, 495, 506
NBC 3630, 5654, 6473, 7070, 7073, 7252

ISIBI-ERRA DATE FORMULAE

Falkenstein’s remarks—ZA 15 (1949) 75-79—concerning the substitution of another formula for the present one in UET II 292 1-3 should be noted.

12a. mu ú-sa bád Es-tar-tá-ra-am-ê-hi-Êr-ra ba-dû ‘Year: After the fortification, Eshtar-taram-Ishbi-Er-ra, was built’
BIN IX 54, 305, 543
NBC 5629, 6492

The shortest form, mu ú-sa bád Es-tar, appears in BIN IX 305.

12b. mu ê-hi-Êr-ra lagal-e ê-su-nir-gal ‘En-êl ú ‘Nin-urtâ-ra mu-ne-dim’ ‘Year: Ishbi-Er-ra, the king, made the great emblem for Enil and Ninurta’
BIN IX 15, 70, 79, 179, 288, 292, 348, 503, 504

Stephens was rightly puzzled by the fact that the verb form in his No. 9 (BIN IX 504) was mu-ne-dim, when the name of only one deity appeared, -ne- being the infixed for the dative singular and -ne- for the plural. The -ne-, however, is proper when the formula is abbreviated as above. The preservation of the -ra after *Ninurta makes the formula even more correct grammatically. Baqui rightly suggested that Stephens’ No. 9 might correspond to this date.

The most cursory form of this year date is mu ê-su-nir-gal mu-ne-dim of BIN IX 70.

13. mu bád ê-hi-Êr-ra-ri-im-ê ‘En-êl ba-dû ‘Year: The fortification, Ishbi-Er-ra-rim-Enil, was built’
BIN IX 19, 30, 40, 49, 53, 64, 84, 103, 114, 126, 128, 129, 174, 177, 178, 216, 244, 249, 251, 344-347, 350, 351, 356, 357, 361, 362, 368, 384, 397, 398, 403, 404, 410, 422, 426 (?), 492, 494, 445, 455, 474
NBC 3645, 6417, 7450, 7473, 7597
In all of the references listed, with the exception of a few which are abbreviated and contain no verb, the verb is always ba-dû and never the ba-dim found in Baqui’s formula (see below, p. 19).

Various abbreviations are written for this date, but mu bád ê-hi-bi of BIN IX 350 qualifies as the most brief.

14a. mu ú-sa bád ê-hi-Êr-ra-ri-im-ê ‘En-êl ba-dû ‘Year: After the fortification, Ishbi-Er-ra-rim-Enil, was built’
BIN IX 6, 455
Since both of these examples lacked *En-êl, it has been supplied on the basis of the previous formula.

14b. mu ê-hi-Êr-ra lagal-e ‘Nin-me-an-ki ê-su-nir-gal ‘Inanna mu-dim‘ ‘Year: Ishbi-Er-ra, the king, made Ninmeanki, the great emblem of Inanna’
BIN IX 5, 17, 180, 245, 252, 406, 428, 446, 507, 510, 512
NBC 7063, 8435, 8888 (?)
The above form has been reconstructed upon the evidence furnished by BIN IX 468 and 594, and 597. Often "Ti-bi-Erra lugal-e is omitted. It is once (BIN IX 5) reduced to mu in-nir-gal "Inanna ba-dim.

15. mu us-su "Ti-bi-Erra lugal-e "Nin-an-ki "Inanna ba-dim "Year: After Ishbi-Erra, the king, made Ninmanki, the great emblem of Inanna."

BIN IX 3, 4, 7-10, 14, 33, 38, 38, 38, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 45, 45, 48, 49, 49, 49, 49, 48, 48, 48, 48, 535

16. mu Nin-an-na dumu sat-lugal maak-e in-pa (d) 'Year: He chose by means of the omens Ninzianna, the daughter of the king.'

BIN IX 1, 2, 11, 15, 29, 29, 29, 29, 72, 113, 117, 198, 200, 311, 314, 363, 376, 377, 396, 446, 446, 451, 485, 518

NBC 5689, 5695, 5670, 6424, 6454, 6479, 7045, 7049, 7065, 7077, 7180, 7182, 7190, 7205, 7417, 7418, 7519, 7565, 7578, 7598, 7609, 8043, 8459

The addition of dumu sat-lugal to this formula in BIN IX 211 makes possible a writing for this formula more complete than any published so far. This phrase states that Nin-an-na was "the daughter of the king." Probably the same "daughter of the king" is referred to in 435:14. Concerning the choice of the king's daughter as a priestess, see Bold, Symbolae Paoloe Kochcheler Dedicateae, Studia et Documenta II 151-178.

This formula is usually written mu Nin-an-na maak-e i-pa (d). Three times, BIN IX 318, NBC 6370 (already mentioned by Stephens), and NBC 7065, it is abbreviated as mu Nin-al.

17a. mu us-su Nin-an-na dumu sat-lugal maak-e in-pa (d) 'Year: After he chose by means of the omens Ninzianna, the daughter of the king.'

BIN IX 185, 539, 534

The dumu sat-lugal is taken from the previous formula. An abbreviation, mu us-su Nin-an, comparable to those for the preceding formula, occurs in BIN IX 592.

17b. mu nin-dingir "Lugal-Mard-da" ba-il 'Year: The high priestess of Lugal-Mard-da was elevated (to office).'

BIN IX 16, 47, 61, 89, 91, 96, 98, 101, 105, 107, 109, 114, 184, 281, 365, 378, 394, 468, 498, 497

NBC 7131, 7142, 7178

The determinative ki is usually lacking after "Lugal-Mard-da." In addition to Stephens' No. 97 (BIN IX 468), however, the ki does appear in BIN IX 365, 394, and NBC 7178.

18a. mu us-su nin-dingir "Lugal-Mard-da" ba-il 'Year: After the high priestess of Lugal-Mard-da was elevated (to office).'

BIN IX 89.

The determinative after "Lugal-Mard-da is taken from the preceding formula.

18b. mu en "En-lil-li ba-il 'Year: The high priestess of Enlil was elevated (to office).'

BIN IX 50, 90, 92-93, 108, 131, 415, 417, 479

NBC 5632

19. mu "Ti-bi-Erra lugal-e "guz-ba "Nin-urta-ra/Nin-lil-lá mu-na-dim 'Year: Ishbi-Erra, the king, made the throne of the sanctuary for Ninurta/Ninlil.'


NBC 5606, 5649, 6372, 6382, 6447, 7091, 7140, 7197, 7218, 7429, 7534, 7598, 8454

The formula, as given, is based upon evidence supplied by BIN IX 445, 485, 111, and 413. The king's name is usually omitted; in fact, it is found only in BIN IX 418 (Stephens' No. 97), 445, NBC 7197, and 7218.

The orthography of the formula shows vacillation on the part of the ancient scribes. Baqr has suggested that his formula containing "Nin-lá may be a variant of Stephens' No. 3 which has "Nin-urta. Baqr had already pointed out that his formula corresponded to Stephens' No. 97 which has "Nin-lil-lá for the name of the deity. Stephens' Nos. 3 and 27 are, in all probability, variants of one and the same formula. Apparently, there was confusion in the minds of the scribes between "Nin-urta, which is much more common, and "Nin-lil-lá, which occurs less frequently. Due to the similarity of the signs for " and urta such an interchange is not difficult to understand. While the majority of the texts have "Nin-urta, ten do have "Nin-lil-lá, namely, BIN IX 28, 111, 246, 253, 255, 265, 266, 303, NBC 5608, and 5649. BIN IX 399 and 500 contain simply "Nin-lil. In four tablets, BIN IX 268, 544, NBC 7140, and 7429, the formula is so abbreviated or mutilated that the name of a deity either does not appear or cannot be determined. There is no conflated form that contains the names of both "Nin-urta and "Nin-lil-á. The verbal infix, whenever it occurs in this formula, is always the -as- of the dative singular and never the -en- of the dative plural (cf. No. 12b above).
Two possible variants of this date formula must be mentioned. The first, mu "gu-za 'Nanna (I) 'Nin-u-ru-ta/[i]li] ba-dim, is found in BIN IX 409. Here the scribe has either written 'Nanna erroneously where bārī usually appears or the formula is entirely separate from the one under discussion. The second, mu "gu-za ba-dim, occurs in BIN IX 524. The usual determinative for gu-za is gīš, 'wood;' urudus, 'copper,' is also a possibility, especially if the gu-za is for a divine personage. In ten of the references cited for this formula no determinative at all is written before gu-za.

Another detail should be noticed. When the subject is unexpressed in any date formula, the passive prefix ba- is normally used with the verb. In a number of the formulae already discussed, and particularly in this one, the active prefix mu- is used with the verb even when the subject is not written. Examples of this use of mu- in this formula may be observed in BIN IX 42, 57, 97, 104, 112, 425, 429, 483, 501, and NBC 7938.

20a. mu tā-sa 'Iš-bi-Ér-ralugul-e "gu-za bāra 'Nin-u-rt-aa/[i]Nin-ll-lā mu-na-dim 'Year: After Isibhi-Era, the king, made the throne of the sanctuary for Ninurta/Ninil'
BIN IX 870
Since the single example is abbreviated to mu tā-za "gu-za bāra, the more complete form given depends upon date formula No. 19 for the additional elements.

30b. mu Elam ša Uri-im-ma du-rum-a ba-dib 'Year: The Elamite who was dwelling in the midst of Ur was captured'
BIN IX 40, 65, 125, 271, 275, 290, 501, 539, 303
Three abbreviated formulae may be variants either of this, or of unassigned formula E which is to be considered below. In certain abbreviated forms only the verb can distinguish between the two. Indeed, if verbal roots which are synonymous in meaning are interchangeable between the passive with ba- and the active with the i- prefix, this formula and the one for year E might possibly be the same. The interchange between ba-il of Baqir's seventh year and the i-im-pā (d) of year seven of the BIN IX texts suggests such a possibility. In these three abbreviated formulae the verb has been omitted:
BIN IX 40 mu Elam ša Uri-im-ma
275 mu Elam Uri-im-ma
291 mu (Elam (?)) ša šakšakša'=ma du-rum-a

In addition to the confused writing of BIN IX 201, the scribe has omitted the šakš part of the ideogram šakšarki (Uri'im) in BIN IX 65.

This formula is a little less abbreviated than Baqir's No. 20. The ša . . . du-rum-a elements represent the increase.

ISHIBI-ERRA DATE FORMULAE

21. mu ša-za Elam ša Uri-im-ma du-rum-a ba-dib 'Year: After the Elamite who was dwelling in the midst of Ur was captured'
BIN IX 119, 146, 382, 391, 407, 409, 411, 414
NBC 8441
While this date formula is usually written mu ša-za Elam Uri-im-ma du-rum-a, BIN IX 391 does contain the ša of the form presented above. The addition of du-rum-a, however, is based upon formula No. 20. BIN IX 409 is so mutilated that it may belong here or under year E below.

UNASSIGNED DATE FORMULAE

Since only the verb form is preserved with any certainty in Baqir's Nos. 22 and 23, these particular years cannot yet be identified. This brings our attention, therefore, to the unassigned date formulae in this volume. Some of these may belong to the small break at the beginning of Baqir's list, perhaps from one to three years, and others to the larger lacuna at the end of the tablet which may have contained from nine to eleven years. This calculation is designed to fill out Ishibi-Erra's complete reign of thirty-three years.

The unassigned years are twelve in number. Of these one is a mu ša-za formula which, in all probability, served only as an interim name for a certain year. This leaves eleven of the twelve years which are necessary to finish Ishibi-Erra's reign, but the filling of the gap is not so simple as the number of formulae would indicate. As will be shown, five of this number occur only once, and it is quite likely that some of these do not belong to Ishibi-Erra's reign at all.

An attempt has been made to show which of the unassigned Ishibi-Erra date formulae belong to the gap at the beginning of Baqir's list and which to the break at the end. The method of procedure was to list all the personal names occurring in the unassigned years and to put down the identified years in which these names appear in all other BIN IX texts. Unfortunately, however, there are only a few individuals whose names occur very many times and these are indecisive. The following examples may be given:

1. Lā-Nanna (47 occurrences) is found in I (ishbi-Erra) 1-7, 9-10, 15-17; years E, G, I. 1 or year G, year H; seals A and J; Sh (ū-lishu) 1.
2. Šu-Eš-tar (70 times) I. 2-10, 13-20; year E, I. 1 or year G, year J; Sh. 1-2.
3. Šu-Nin-har-ak and its variants (127 times) I. 3-19; years A and B.
4. *Nanna-ki-ag (140 times) I. 4-21; years A, D, E, H, L; seal K; Sh. 2-3.

Since their names occur steadily throughout an extended period of years, it seems
probable that Lī-unnanna, Sū-Ekur, tarī, Sū-Nin-kar-ak, and "Nanna-ki-úg are only four individuals and not many people who happened to have the same names. When the occurrences of a personal name are sporadic over an extended time, however, there is less probability that only one person, and not several of the same name, is actually indicated. As it can be seen from looking at the years in which these four names occur, each is found in years which come so near both to the beginning and the end of Baqi's list that it may be only an accident that the names do not appear in years both at the very beginning and at the very end of his list. For this reason any assistance gained from the occurrences of personal names must come from less frequent names which appear only in the early or only in the late years recorded in Baqi's list.

An examination of the frequency of the occurrences of the individual years in Baqi's list both in BIN IX and the related unpublished NBC texts reveals no steady curve of rising and of gradual falling. After a rather slow start during years 1-6, the graph suddenly rockets to its highest point in year 7. This zenith is followed by alternating rising and falling with the low points coming in years 9, 12, 14, 18, and 20 and the peaks in years 10, 13, 16, and 19. This does not suggest a single large archive embracing the whole of the "leather" texts, but rather a series of small archives. Indeed, it seems that a temple economy rather than private enterprise is represented; if so, the temple economy is simply continued from the Third Dynasty of Ur. The archive, if it may be called such, of Sū-Nin-kar-ak seems to bear out the truth of this statement. Sixty-one times he is represented as the subject of Sū-bā-(an)-tí. Sixty-three times he is involved in the ki-xu-ta clause. This appears to present both sides of his relationship with the temple storehouse. First, he receives (Sū-ba-an-tí) principally hides/skins or leather from the warehouse. Second, he was given credit (ki-xu-ta) for finished products turned back into the storehouse.

The unassigned dates, that is dates whose correct relative positions are not shown in Baqi's publication, appear in the following list. Two of these most certainly belong to Išbi-Erra's reign because his name is given in the formulae. The second of these two, however, is a mu ús-sa of the first. The evidence from the study of the personal names suggests very strongly that still others also belong to Išbi-Erra's time. A few of the unassigned dates, however, cannot be attached even with probability to the reign of any particular king.

A. mu bād-gal 1-si-in-na6(u) mu-dú 'Year: He built the great fortification on Isin.'

B. mu 360 1-una 'Inanna ba-dim 'Year: The bed of Inanna was made.'

C. mu nin-dingir 'Iugal-ēra ba-či 'Year: The high priestess of Iugal-erra was elevated (to office)'.

While it is probably accidental, it is unusual that there are only four occurrences of this formula when there are thirty-seven of the corresponding mu ús-sa date. It may be, as Stephens suggests under his No. 36, that this formula is the same as one published by Scheil in RA 23:44: mu nin-dingir 'Iugal-gir (<ir) -ra ma-e in-pad. Cf. the remarks of both Stephens and Scheil. Stephens, however, had only the mu ús-sa of this particular year.

Of the four tablets containing this date formula, only one, BIN IX 151, has any proper names. The name ḫi-Bi-ēra-či-in occurs only in this text; ḫi-Bi-ēra-mi-gir-či-in only in this document and year D (which is the mu ús-sa of this formula);
SUMERIAN ECONOMIC TEXTS

*Ib-bi-Ér-ra-mu-úr-úr-ma-ži-di-su* appears also in L. 16 and 18. These years, L. 16 and 18, may indicate that this date belongs after the end of Baqûr's list.

Since one of the personal names, *Ib-bi-Ér-ra-mu-úr-úr-ma-ži-di-su*, occurs only here and in the 16th and 18th years of Ishbi-Er-ra and since all three names contain Ishbi-Er-ra as one element, this formula very probably belongs to Ishbi-Er-ra's reign.

D. *mu ús-ra nin-dingir *Lugal-é-ru ba-é-ê 'Year: After the high priestess of Lugal-é-ru was elevated (to office)'
BIN IX 37, 199, 197, 195, 199, 219, 224, 225-228, 311, 339, 349, 367, 470, 472, 490, 528-531
NBC 6377, 7110, 7118, 7187, 7284, 7452, 7465, 7471, 7480, 7602, 7621, 7694, 7695, 7659, 8414

This formula was first published by Stephens as his No. 36 (BIN IX 199) under formulae probably belonging to the Isin Dynasty. Since many personal names occur in the thirty-seven references listed (although some of the tablets have no names of individuals), no detailed analysis will be given here. It seems probable, however, from the personal names involved that this formula belongs to Ishbi-Er-ra and that it comes somewhere after the conclusion of Baqûr's list.

The abbreviation, *mu ús-ra nin *Lugal A, found in BIN IX 331, is worthy of notice.

E. *mu *Ib-bi-Ér-ra lugal-é Elam išurma-ka durun-á *tukul kali-ga-ni-ta im-ta-ê. 'Year: Ishbi-Er-ra, the king, brought down by his mighty weapon the Elamite who was dwelling in the midst of Ur'
BIN IX 81, 100, 392, 370, 373, 395, 399, 400

This formula was discussed in detail in JCS 2 (1948) 15-19. Since the article was written, however, the date lists of Baqûr in Sumer 4 (September 1948) 103-113 and of Steele in BASOR 192 (April 1951) 45-49, establishing the order of many of the years of the two Early Isin kings, and important articles by Falkenstein in ZA 15 (1948) 75-79 and Jacobson in JCS 7 (1955) 36-47 have been published.

Since Ishbi-Er-ra's name appears in three of the eight occurrences of the formula, it is established as an Ishbi-Er-ra date. Stephens gave a variant without Ishbi-Er-ra's name in his No. 25 (BIN IX 100). A study of the numerous personal names leaves no doubt in the assertion that the formula must assume its place with others after the close of Baqûr's list. It is quite significant to note, therefore, that Ishbi-Er-ra was fighting Elam well past the twentieth year of his reign, a fact which was also pointed out by Baqûr's Nos. 29 and 41. Cf. No. 26b, where it was suggested that year E and No. 26b might possibly be one and the same date formula. Some abbreviated formulae given under No. 20, namely, BIN IX 49, 375, and 301, may belong here.

UNASSIGNED DATE FORMULAE

F. *mu ús-ra *Ib-bi-Ér-ra lugal-é Elam išurma-ka durun-á *tukul kali-ga-ni-ta im-ta-ê. 'Year: After Ishbi-Er-ra, the king, brought down by his mighty weapon the Elamite who was dwelling in the midst of Ur'
BIN IX 370

This text contains the date for year E as well as this formula which served as a temporary designation for year F. Since this is the only occurrence of a *mu ús-ra* formula based on year E, year F may soon have assumed a permanent name for itself. The completeness of formula F in our list depends upon formula E.

G. *mu nin *Nin-urta ba-ê-al 'Year: The priestess of Ninurta was installed '*
BIN IX 110, 130, 510 (as instead of ë-al?)
NBC 5643, 6442, 7183, 7293, 7217, 7454, 7465, 7475, 7483, 7484, 7653, 8478
*mu nin *Nin-urta ba
BIN IX 513, 514, 515 (as instead of ba?)
NBC 7888, 8946
*mu nin *Nin-urta
NBC 6390 (?), 7177

Stephens has mentioned this formula as his No. 14 (BIN IX 110). He then believed it to be a variant of a formula belonging to Isin-Dagan. Since, however, it has been learned that in all probability the formula belongs to Ishbi-Er-ra. The personal names in the texts listed are very common in other Ishbi-Er-ra documents. In fact, a detailed study of the names tends to indicate that this formula ought to come at the beginning of Baqûr's list and not after it, as seems to be the case with the other unassigned formulae. This statement is based on the fact that a number of the personal names concerned occur only in the early and not in the late years of Ishbi-Er-ra. The striking resemblance between the formula and Baqûr's No. 1 may be significant. Indeed, it is not impossible that this formula might be a variant of No. 1 in Baqûr's list. Under No. 1, it is true, the verb form was ba-ê-al while this formula has ba-ê-un. These two verbal roots, however, are very similar in meaning. Whether a priestess "is elevated (ba-ê-al)" or "is installed (ba-ê-un)" makes only a small difference. It must be remembered in relation to any possible interchange between the roots ë-al and ë-un that the single BIN IX example of Baqûr's No. 1, i.e. BIN IX 331, had ë-al as its verbal root also. In Ishbi-Er-ra formulae Nos. 7 and 13 Baqûr's list always contained one root while BIN IX uniformly had another. It was ë-al versus ë-un in No. 7 and ë-un versus ë-un in No. 13. The whole solution to the problem may lie in the provenience of the individual tablets concerned. Scribes in one area of Ishbi-Er-ra's realm may have written the same formula in a slightly different way from those in another part.
H. mu nin-dingir 'Nin-gi-li-ki-in ba-êl 'Year: The high priestess of Ningilin was elevated (to office)'
BIN IX 19, 21, 22, 24

This formula was first published and discussed by Stephens as his No. 21 (BIN IX 19). He listed it as probably belonging to the Isin Dynasty.

In the four texts in which it occurs the names of only five different individuals appear, although some of these five names are found several times. Two of them are the very familiar Lú-na-na-na and 'Na-na-na-ki-ê-g. The three others, Kú-'Na-na-na, Šú-Samaš and Šú-Ma-mi-tum are lesser characters. These familiar names make it almost certain that this formula belongs to Ishbî-Era. Four of the names, according to the years in which they occur, could conceivably belong to either the beginning or the end of Baqîr's list. The fifth, however, namely, Šú-Ma-mi-tum, occurs only in I. 15, 17–19 and year H. This, therefore, offers some evidence for placing this formula at the end of Baqîr's list.

I. mu ākat-tabû bâ-hul 'Year: Aktab was destroyed'
BIN IX 127

Stephens published this formula as No. 30 in his list. For the change in the reading of the name of the later material, see Poebel, JAOS 57 359–367.

This text contains only one personal name, to wit, Nu-ê-ê-bû, a very common name. It (and several different persons may be involved) occurs in I. 2–3, year G, I. 1 or year G, and years I and J. Nothing can be said, therefore, as to whether this name should assume its place before or after Baqîr's list. In fact, the month name on the tablet, itô di-e ame-mi-ê-gul (month 11a in the Drehem calendar), sets this text apart as one of two (the other is a mu ús-su of this very formula) in all of the BIN IX texts which does not use the Nippur calendar. This may mean one of two things in regard to the present date. First, it does not belong to the Ishbî-Era dates because they employ the Nippur calendar. Second, the tablets containing it come from a site under Ishbî-Era's domination which did not use the Nippur calendar.

The subject matter of the tablets, that is of years I and J, shows that they belong among the "leather" texts. More examples of this formula are needed, however, before any valid conclusion can be reached as to whether or not this is an Ishbî-Era year date.

J. mu ús-su ākat-tabû bû-ê(h)ul 'Year: After Aktab was destroyed'
BIN IX 145

This formula first appeared as Stephens' No. 31. No other examples of this or the previous formula have been found since. Six personal names occur in this text. If one supposes both that these six names refer to only six individuals throughout the whole of the BIN IX documents and that this is an Ishbî-Era year date (and there is no certainty about either of these assumptions), five of the names give little indication as to whether this date should belong before or after Baqîr's list. The sixth name, Lu-'Na-nu-um, appears only twice. Once it is found in this text and the second time in another, dated I. 19. These two occurrences, however, may not refer to the same individual.

This formula, as was stated under year I, appears on a tablet which also uses the Drehem calendar, the month being itô ëšu e-ê-gul (Drehem 8). The two tablets dated in the years I and J are the only two in BIN IX employing this calendar. All other texts having a month name use the Nippur calendar. To whose reign do these formulae belong? Only more tablets can give the answer.

K. mu ù-ê-ê bû-ê-â-ne-x-an 'Year: In Ur a dwelling place was established (?) for them'
BIN IX 593

The only personal name in this single text is Lu-ê-ê-ê-ê-ê-ê-ê (Su-na-su-ê). BIN IX texts contain occurrences of this name in I. 19 and year E besides the present formula. Probably a name containing the element ê-ê-ê (Sa-ra-su) refers to Sa-ra-su of the Third Dynasty of Ur rather than to the much later Bur-Sin of the First Dynasty of Isin. If it refers to the former, and the orthography indicates that it should, this tablet may well be dated in the reign of some earlier king than Ishbî-Era. One of the problems is how the next to the last sign in the formula should be read. Is it ëûm (?), or (1) or what?
So far no reasonable likeness to this date has been found. A very faint resemblance is contained in Laghâm, UET III 50 and 296 (Plates). This formula is provisionally listed by Le Strange as Ishbî-Sin 21 on p. 478 in UET III (Indexes, etc.).

L. mu ūs-su 'Na-na-na [ êšû ë-mul (?) ] 'Year: The throne of Nanna...'
BIN IX 269

This fragmentary formula suggests No. 19 in Baqîr's list, because that is the only other date discussed, except the mu ús-su of the same formula in 80a, which contains ūs-su. Any likeness seems to end there, however, and there is little possibility that the two formulae are the same. The poor state of preservation of the text in which this formula occurs may be quite misleading for its proper identification.

SHU-ILISHU DATE FORMULAE

Except for three fragmentary formulas for years two through four, the completion of the date list of Shu-ilishu was made possible both in content and sequence by Steele's article in BASOR 122 (April 1951). Unlike Baqîr's Ishbî-Era date list,
which was broken both at the beginning and the end, the Shu-ilishu document gives the proper chronological position for each formula which it contains instead of the relative place only, as was the case with the Ishbi-Erra dates.

The BIN IX texts come to an abrupt halt after the third year of Shu-ilishu. The one possible exception to this statement is year A which was discussed above. It may be a variant of the sixth year of Shu-ilishu.

1. *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ *Year: Shu-ilishu became king *
BIN IX 260 (Stephens’ No. 10)

Variants:
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ BIN IX 182, 191, 201, 202
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal NBC 7095, 7096, 7097
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e BIN IX 305, 329, 284, 289, 310, 341, 416, 418, 432 (7), 407
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e BIN IX 210, 329, 284, 289, 310, 341, 416, 418, 432 (7), 407
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e (plus -gal from texts listed below)
BIN IX 317 (plus -gal from texts listed below)

Variants:
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e (plus -gal from texts listed below)
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e (plus -gal from texts listed below)

This date formula and its variants show that the traces in Steele’s copy in BASOR 122, p. 47, Col. I 12 should actually be *AN[N]Nanna, that is, *Nanna. This seems to be sufficient evidence to cite this formula as Sh. 2. Steele’s Note 10 on p. 48 in BASOR 122 actually refers to this year and not to Sh. 3. The broken NBC 5665 (BIN IX 230), which Stephens first published and which was later included in RLA in the place which Steele cites, is clearly Sh. 2 when one has the advantage of knowing what to expect.

2. *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e šu-ili₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ *Year: Shu-ilishu, the king, made the great emblem for Nanna *
BIN IX 317 (plus -gal from texts listed below)

Variants:
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e šu-ili₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ BIN IX 240
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e šu-ili₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ BIN IX 240
  *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e šu-ili₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ BIN IX 240

This date formula and its variants show that the traces in Steele’s copy in BASOR 122, p. 47, Col. I 12 should actually be *AN[N]Nanna, that is, *Nanna. This seems to be sufficient evidence to cite this formula as Sh. 2. Steele’s Note 10 on p. 48 in BASOR 122 actually refers to this year and not to Sh. 3. The broken NBC 5665 (BIN IX 230), which Stephens first published and which was later included in RLA in the place which Steele cites, is clearly Sh. 2 when one has the advantage of knowing what to expect.

3a. *mu šu-ili₃₄₃₅₃₆₃₇₃₈₃₉₄₀₄₁₄₂₄₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ lugal-e šu-ili₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₉₀ *Year: After Shu-ilishu, the king, made the great emblem for Nanna *
BIN IX 419 (plus -gal and -na from the preceding formula)

This tablet is dated on the thirteenth day of the first month of the Nippur calendar. Another text, BIN IX 379, dated on the ninth day of the first month
Francis Rue Steele, "The Date Formula of Shu-ilishu of Isin," *BASOR* 128 (1951) 45-49.