

Differences in Reckoning Eras in Assyria

King Aššur-aha-iddina (680-669 B.C.) correctly reckoned 126 years from Érišu I (1822-1783) to the ^{33-year} reign of Šamši-Adad I (1696-1664). But earlier, the scribe of Šulmanu-ašared I (1262-1233) reckoned this same time period as 159 years - a difference of 33 years. That is, he included the length of the reign of Šamši-Adad I. No real chronological difference, only a difference in how one reckoned time.

Aššur-aha-iddina reckoned correctly 434 years from the beginning of the reign of Šamši-Adad I (1696) to the beginning of the reign of Šulmanu-ašared I (1262). But the scribe of Šulmanu-ašared said the temple of Érišu stood 580 years and was once repaired by Šamši-Adad I. How did the scribe arrive at 580 years, when the time was only 560 years - 1822-1262? Answer: the scribe counted the reign of Pušur-Aššur III as ^(as in SDAŠ king list) 24 years ^{counted} (of which 10 years were jointly with his father) and 20 years for Šamši-Dagan, of which 10 years were jointly with his father. The scribe merely included joint reigns and failed to note the matter. Even the surviving king lists regularly include parallel reigns when they occurred in the case of Šamši-Dagan, though they vary in the cases of Pušur Aššur III, Aššur-nādin-apli and Ninurta-apil-Ekur.

Tiglath-pileser I (1114-1076) reckoned that the temple of Anu and Adad - built by Šamši-Adad, the son of Tšme-Dagan - "during the course of 641 years had fallen into decay" in the reign of Aššur-dan. The latter tore it down. But it was not rebuilt until another 60 years, in the beginning of Tiglath-pileser's reign (in 1114/3). Tiglath-pileser I seems to have followed the custom of allowing 7 or, if longer, 14 daru (=50 years) to elapse before rebuilding sacred buildings. $641 + 60 = 700 + 1$. (Apparently the Mesopotamians saw 50 year periods as important). So this temple was first built in 1827 B.C. Historians assume the Šamši-Adad who built it was Šamši-Adad I, whose son was Tšme-Dagan, but whose father was a Ilu-kap-kapi. This false assumption is a basis of the so-called "long chronology". It also requires textual alteration. The correct explanation is that the king mentioned by Tiglath-pileser is not found in the king list, but was an ancestor of the Ilu-kap-kapi line that once ruled as kings under the primary line of Puzur-Aššur I (#30).

Iukulti-ninurta refers to a temple built by Ilušumma that fell into decay and was repaired in the beginning of his reign (1232). The length of time is not clear in the cuneiform. Dr. Luckenbill incorrectly translated the figure as 780 years. Prof. Paebel wanted to believe it was 620 years (J.N.E.S. vol I). The majority would read the figure as intending 720 years. Since we don't know how long Ilušumma (#32) in the king list reigned, we cannot know if the king is this Ilušumma or an earlier one not mentioned in the list. The temple in any case was built in 1952 B.C.

dynasty II of Isin

Marduk - balit - akhesku 18	'63 / 1162 - 1144
Isti - Marduk - balatu 8	'45 / 1144 - 1136
Minurta - nadin - shum 6	'37 / 1136 - 1130
<small>(contemporary of Assur-res-ishi 1132-1115)</small>	
Nebuchadrezzar I 22	'31 / 1130 - 1108
Enlil - nadin - apli 4	'09 / 1108 - 1104
Marduk - nadin - akhe 18	'05 / 1104 - 1086
Marduk - shapik - zeri 13	'87 / 1086 - 1073
Adad - apla - iddina 22	'74 / 1073 - 1051
Marduk - akhe - eriba 1	'52 / 1051 - 1050
<small>(6 months reckoned as calendar year)</small>	
Marduk - zer - [x] 12	'51 / 1050 - 1038
Nabu - shum - libur 8	'39 / 1038 - 1030

Note that above list includes accession years, since last years of kings are often incomplete, as, for example, '05 for Marduk-nadin akhe. It was in that accession year that an event occurred recorded by Sennacherib as 418 years prior to an event in his reign after he destroyed Babylon. The event was the return to Assyria of a god's statue. This occurred in 687 BC., so dates of Isin II cannot be lower. Cambridge Ancient History admittedly errs here.