

LINGERING OVER WORDS
Studies in Ancient Near Eastern
Literature in Honor
of William L. Moran

edited by

Tzvi Abusch
John Huehnergard
Piotr Steinkeller

Scholars Press
Atlanta, Georgia

= 1990 =

THE NEO-BABYLONIAN CHRONICLES¹ have been ranked among the finest examples of historical writing in Mesopotamia and the ancient Near East.² Slightly antedating the *Historiai* of Herodotus,³ these texts narrate major political, military, and religious events in Babylonia from at least 745 to 538 BC.⁴ These documents have been celebrated as paragons of detached and objective historiography. Assyriologists have tended to approach these chronicles in two principal ways, either as quarries for historical "facts" to be used in constructing modern histories of antiquity

*Abbreviations in this article will generally follow those in *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, vol. S (1984), pp. vii–xxiv, with the following additions or adjustments:

- ACF Assyrian Chronicle Fragment (in Grayson, *Chronicles*, pp. 184–89)
BCF Babylonian Chronicle Fragment (in Grayson, *Chronicles*, pp. 190–92, 289)
Chr. Grayson, *Chronicles* (cited by text number; plural: Chrs.)
N number (generic designation for a number in a calendrical formula).

¹Edited by A. K. Grayson, *Chronicles*, nos. 1–7. References to chronicles in Grayson's corpus within this article will generally be abbreviated in one of the following forms: Chr. 2, Chr. 7 iii 18, Chr. 20A:35, ACF 4, BCF 2:8; references to Chrs. 1A, 1B, and 1C will be to the major exemplars of Chronicle 1, cited as A, B, and C in Grayson, *Chronicles*, p. 69. Chronicle 25 is published by C. B. F. Walker, *Kraus AV*, pp. 398–417.

²Grayson, *Chronicles*, p. 8 calls these documents "the highest achievement of Babylonian historians with regard to the writing of history in a reliable and objective manner." John Van Seters (*In Search of History* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983], p. 354) denies that any ancient Mesopotamian or Egyptian texts reached the stage of what he terms "history writing." This conclusion Van Seters bases on a definition of history proposed by Johan Huizinga ("A Definition of the Concept of History," in Raymond Klibansky and H. J. Paton, eds., *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936], pp. 1–10), which Van Seters has taken out of context and misunderstood. This I hope to discuss in detail elsewhere.

³The only dated chronicle text is Chronicle 1A, which seems to have been copied (from an older original) in the twenty-second year of Darius I (500 BC)—about half a century before Herodotus wrote. For a discussion of the date of Chronicle 1A, see note 68 below.

Babylonian years in this study will be cited by a short Julian equivalent, e.g., "500 BC" (rather than the technically more correct "500/499 BC"); but it must be borne in mind that the last few months of the Babylonian year would have fallen in the next Julian year.

⁴Chronicle 1A begins its coverage with the year 745; Chronicle 1B seems to begin even earlier (see note 35 below). Chronicle 7 iii deals with events as late as the month Nisannu following Cyrus' capture of Babylon.

or as models of historical probity, reflecting Babylonians' ability to portray frankly their nation's political reverses.

Both these approaches offer functional, if limited, views of the documents. It is true that the chronicles provide an essential chronological backbone for much of Mesopotamian history between the eighth and sixth centuries. For the period from 745 to 668, these documents list rulers and exact dates of reign in Babylonia, Assyria, and Elam.⁵ Coverage thereafter is spotty, in part because of lacunae in the record; but these texts still furnish most of the precise chronological background for present knowledge of the downfall of the Late Assyrian Empire, the rise of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, the reign of Nabonidus, and the transition to Persian rule. These texts supplement and correct historical information in the voluminous corpus of Assyrian royal inscriptions of the eighth and seventh centuries. Without these chronicles, we would be hard put to reconstruct more than a crude royal chronology for Babylonian history over these two hundred years. This becomes painfully obvious for crucial times in this period when chronicle coverage is either lacking or poorly preserved, e.g., 647–628, 622–617, 594–558, 556–551, 544–540.

In appraising the factual reliability of the Neo-Babylonian chronicles, scholars have usually contrasted them with Assyrian chronicles and in particular with the Synchronistic History,⁶ the only full-scale survivor of that genre.⁷ The moral and historical superiority of the Babylonian documents has customarily been demonstrated by pointing out their authors' willingness to record Babylonian military and political setbacks, whereas Assyrian texts uniformly omit Assyrian losses or rewrite them as successes. These stereotypes of Babylonian "objectivity" versus Assyrian "chauvinism" (verging on recognition of national schools of historiography) offer useful—if caricaturing—constructs but only a limited perspective,⁸ without affording significant insight into the reasons underlying the differences in these traditions. It is surely relevant that the Synchronistic History was an official creation of an Assyrian court scribe writing to assert nationalist claims to a border region whose possession was contested with Babylonia.⁹ The scribe used royal records, made no effort to

⁵Chronicle 1A.

⁶Chr. 21.

⁷Assyrian chronicles are otherwise represented only by four fragments [ACF 1–4]. John Van Seters, *In Search of History*, pp. 82–84 expresses doubt that Assyria had an independent chronicle tradition comparable to the Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian materials [Chronicles 1–13b].

⁸This disjunction, for the moment, confines the comparison to Chronicles 1–13b (Babylonian) on the one hand and the Assyrian texts on the other. Some Babylonian chronicles, e.g., the Esarhaddon Chronicle [Chr. 14], have also been accused of bias and distortion (Grayson, *Chronicles*, pp. 30–31); this will be discussed further below.

⁹There is no direct information on the scribe; but it can be seen from the text that he had access to Assyrian court records and royal inscriptions, which were sometimes incorporated verbatim into his text without the verb being changed from the first to the third person singular, e.g. Chr. 21 iv 12.

conceal his partisanship in reweaving the centuries of border agreements and disputes, and concluded the document with the exhortation: "Let them proclaim the praises of Assyria for[ever]; let them declare the treachery of Sumer (and) Akkad¹⁰ to the whole world."¹¹ The surviving texts of the Synchronistic History come, not unexpectedly, from an official archive, the Library of Ashurbanipal.¹² By contrast, the milieu in which first-millennium Babylonian chronicles were composed and handed down has not been seriously studied. What little evidence there is suggests that known exemplars were copied by private scribes, whose connection with the Babylonian court—if any—is unknown.¹³ It should not be surprising if historians under royal patronage produced chronicles which could healthily be recited at court and if private scribes were able to indulge in the luxury of frankness. These would not be the only instances in which objectivity was conditioned by an author's *Sitz im Leben* as well as by national traditions of historiography. We would also add, parenthetically, that demonstrated authorial lack of nationalistic bias is not in itself an adequate criterion of factual accuracy¹⁴ and that labels such as "sober and objective" or "biased and unreliable," when applied without qualification to whole documents, are apt to spawn problems—especially if a significant amount of material in two such diversely characterized texts is verbally identical.¹⁵ We shall return to these subjects later in the presentation.

My main concern in this paper will be a few questions connected with the textual tradition of the "Babylonian Chronicle" [Chronicle 1], the longest and best preserved of the Neo-Babylonian chronicles, the earliest in its coverage, the first of these texts to be published a century ago,¹⁶ and—to use an archeological metaphor—the "type

For studies of Neo-Assyrian scribes working with different types of texts, see Oppenheim, *Centaurus* 14 (1969) 97–135 and Parpola, *LAS* 2.

¹⁰I.e., Babylonia.

¹¹*tanatti māt Aššur lidlulū ana umē [šāti] ša māt Šumeri māt Akkadī šilipi[asina] 'li'paššerā ana kališ kibrā[ti]* [Chr. 21 iv 28–30].

¹²K. 4401a+Rm. 854 (bearing part of an Ashurbanipal colophon), K. 4401b, and Sm. 2106.

¹³Chronicle 1A was copied by Ea-iddin of the Ur-Nanna family, who also appears in the private legal document VAS 3 229:7'–8' as the first witness. The colophon of Chronicle 15 states that it was the tablet of Nabū-kāšir of the Ea-ilūta-ibni family, who is known as a scribe of private legal documents from Borsippa and vicinity in the reign of Nabonidus (*TuM* 2–3 1:24–25, 84:12–13, 157:22–23, 227:18–19; *TCL* 12 97:18–19 [cf. *ibid.*, no. 85:20¹]; see Millard, *Iraq* 26 [1964] 32 and n. 97). Neither of these scribes lists an official title in the chronicle colophon. There is also no apparent connection between these scribes and temple institutions.

¹⁴Ideally, one should look for corroboration of data from two truly independent sources. In the absence of such confirmation, one should be careful in appraising and accepting the testimony of a single witness (*testis unus, testis nullus*), a fairly common situation in dealing with Mesopotamian history.

¹⁵E.g., Chr. 1A iv and Chr. 14.

¹⁶In the very year in which the main text of the Babylonian Chronicle [1A] was acquired by the

site" of the chronicle genre. The treatment here will not deal with literary theory; nor will it expatiate on literary structure, patterns, formulae, ideology, or narrative art as such.¹⁷ A significant drawback in this discussion will be that "chronicle" as a literary genre has yet to be properly defined.¹⁸ A wide range of documents, including some with poetic or fanciful passages,¹⁹ have been published in Grayson's corpus; yet no explicit criteria have been established for including or excluding documents.²⁰ Thus it is by no means clear that the present corpus can be regarded as uniform, definitive, or even the best possible grouping of available materials. On the contrary, one could

British Museum, its contents were summarized by Pinches in *PSBA* 6 (1884) 198–202. Three years later, the text was made available in two editions: (a) Winckler, *ZA* 2 (1887) 148–62, with a copy drawn by Strassmaier, *ibid.*, pp. 163–68; and (b) Pinches, *JRAS* 1887:655–81, including a printed cuneiform copy. Two years later, texts 1B and 1C were published by Bezold, *PSBA* 11 (1889) 131–38, followed by pls. I–II.

¹⁷Many of these topics deserve further investigation. Grayson's study of literary patterns—principally the word order and phrasing of selected date and regnal formulae—in the chronicles and comparable documents (*Chronicles*, pp. 5–7 and 193–201, with addenda on pp. 276 and 289) is of limited help for our present purposes since, in his scheme, the overwhelming majority of chronicle texts and fragments are undifferentiated either as part of his Category A (19 texts) or as "unclassified" (8 texts). There are only a few documents allocated to Category B (one text [Chronicle 18]—better interpreted as a kinglist than a chronicle [see note 21 below]), Category C (4 texts, all dealing with events in the third or early second millennium), and Category D (one text, that is the only more or less complete surviving Assyrian chronicle). A thoroughgoing study of the literary structure, vocabulary usage, and phrasing patterns of the chronicles is very much needed. It would also be useful to examine variations in basic date formulae within a document (such as in Chronicle 1A); see, for example, note 146 below.

¹⁸Van Seters (*In Search of History*, p. 80) states that "a chronicle is a narration of political or religious events in chronological order and is closely dated to the years of a king's reign." This description is at once too broad (because it could also cover significant portions of the Neo-Assyrian royal annals) and too narrow (because it would not fit most chronicles dealing with the third or second millennia and only some chronicles dealing with the first millennium).

Grayson, *Chronicles*, p. 4 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 276), carefully refrained from defining "chronicle" and preferred to classify these texts under a wider general term "chronographic" which covers "a group of texts which had, in the past, been called either king lists or chronicles." Chronographic he then defined as "documents which are composed along essentially chronological lines." This definition too is so broad that it could cover some of the Neo-Assyrian annals; yet it fails to define characteristics that would place such diverse documents as the Weidner Chronicle [Chr. 19], the Dynastic Chronicle [Chr. 18], the Chronicles of Early Kings [Chrs. 20A, 20B], the Chronicle of Market Prices [Chr. 23], the Synchronistic History [Chr. 21], Chronicle P [Chr. 22], and the Neo-Babylonian chronicles [Chrs. 1–7] in a single category... In *Or* 49 (1980) 172, Grayson describes a chronicle as "a prose narration, normally in the third person, of events arranged in chronological order"; this description is insufficiently specific in that it can also fit astronomical diaries, some kinglists, and other narrative texts.

This leaves a serious theoretical gap in the chronicle literature.

¹⁹Chr. 19.

²⁰As a general rule, traditional designation of documents as chronicles by earlier editors has been implicitly accepted.

argue that this collection should be pruned, divided into subsets, or rearranged to take cognizance of the rich variety of literary structures and patterns.²¹ Landsberger and Bauer some years ago plausibly suggested that the native term for chronicle was GIGAM.GIGAM²² or GIGAM.DIDLI²³ (Babylonian *tēšētu* or *ippirū*), with a meaning such as "battles," "strife," or "conflict."²⁴ If so, this could offer a criterion for delimiting the genre by content. Despite these uncertainties, it is obvious that the Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian chronicles [Chronicles 1–13b] have similarities in subject matter and structure that allow them to be compared profitably with one another and with other Babylonian chronicles covering equivalent material, especially Chronicles 14–16.²⁵

It will be plain in the following paragraphs how much this discussion is indebted to the basic corpus of texts edited and commented upon by A. K. Grayson in his book *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Even where interpretations will be suggested that differ from Grayson's, readers will appreciate that discrepant views will inevitably build on the materials he has assembled.

In general, and with some oversimplification, current opinion on the Babylonian Chronicle [Chronicle 1] holds that the document has a generally uniform text surviving in three exemplars,²⁶ that it is the first component in a long series of chronicles [Chronicles 1–13b] covering Babylonian history from the eighth century down to at

²¹Grayson states, for example, that "it is not always possible in a particular instance to decide if a text should be classified as either a king list or a chronicle" (*Chronicles*, p. 4). In fact, in at least one instance, that of the "Dynastic Chronicle" [Chr. 18], one can make a much better case for viewing this as a kinglist, especially with the new materials now available (W. G. Lambert in M. A. Beek et alii, eds., *Symbolae biblicae et mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl dedicatae* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973], pp. 271–75 and *JCS* 26 [1974] 208–10; I. Finkel, *JCS* 32 [1980] 65–80). The parallels in style and even phraseology with the Sumerian Kinglist are too close; and it is clear, even from Grayson's own analysis of sentence patterns in kinglists and chronicles (see note 17 above), that the style "RN MU N predicate" (his Category B) is restricted to kinglists. The few variant phrases, additional notes, and occasional omissions in the "Dynastic Chronicle" do not alter its essential kinglist structure.

²²Chr. 14, left edge.

²³Chr. 20A: 38.

²⁴*ZA* 37 (1927) 62; Grayson has reservations about this proposal (*Chronicles*, p. 128). It is uncertain whether GIGAM, in context, is to be read *tēšētu* or *ippirū*; see *CAD* I/J 164–65, *AHW*. 384b (*ippirū*), 1352a.

²⁵Chronicle 14 is quite similar in form to Chronicle 1A iv, as we shall see below in more detail. Chronicle 15 is an extract chronicle, which includes material from the reigns of Ashur-nadin-shumi and Shamash-shum-ukin similar to that found in Chronicles 1A, 14, and 16. Chronicle 16 concentrates for the most part on the theme of the New Year's Festival, but also includes material on the civil wars of 652–648 and 626.

²⁶Grayson, *Chronicles*, p. 69. Grayson's edition combines all three tablets in a single transliteration and translation, but notes variants in the critical apparatus.

least the third century,²⁷ that part of its coverage (for the period from 680 to 668) substantially overlaps with that of a much less reliable document (the Esarhaddon Chronicle [Chr. 14]),²⁸ and that its contents—as well as those of other chronicles in the series—derive from Babylonian astronomical diaries as their source.²⁹ I would like to examine the evidence on each of these points in turn and, in some cases, to propose alternative hypotheses for consideration. In most of these matters, as might be expected in this sort of textual study, one can hardly hope to reach definitive conclusions; it will suffice to offer variant perspectives on a complex topic.

The first item then, for discussion, is the text of the document. The Babylonian Chronicle is the only Babylonian non-literary chronicle known in more than one copy.³⁰ It survives in an almost complete large tablet (BM 92502 = 84-2-11,356 [Chr. 1A], 198 x 159 x 42 mm) and two smaller fragments (BM 75976 [Chr. 1B], 83 x 69 x 31 mm; BM 75977 [Chr. 1C], 56 x 62 x 28 mm).³¹ Each of these is written in two columns per side. The large tablet, as related in its colophon, was copied in Babylon, probably in 500 BC.³² The smaller fragments (accession numbers AH 83-1-18,1338 and 1339) are recorded in the British Museum register as having come from Abu Habba (Sippar), though serious doubt attaches to that designation;³³ each of these fragments now lacks the beginning, end, and most edges of its original tablet.³⁴ The large tablet [Chr. 1A], which has sustained surface damage and no longer has its upper right corner, originally contained 186 lines of text—including 6 lines of colophon—spread over four columns. It begins with the third year of Nabonassar (745 BC) and concludes with the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin

²⁷Grayson, *Chronicles*, pp. 8–14, with earlier bibliography. Landsberger and Bauer in ZA 37 (1927) 63, 66 extended the various Babylonian chronicle series to cover earlier materials dealing with the first half of the second millennium.

²⁸Grayson, *Chronicles*, pp. 12, 30–32.

²⁹Grayson, *Chronicles*, pp. 13–14; cf. earlier remarks by Wiseman, *Chron.*, p. 4.

³⁰The literary Weidner Chronicle [Chr. 19], with its fanciful reconstruction of the divine machinery behind events of third-millennium history, survives in both Babylonian and Assyrian versions; see further Finkel, *JCS* 32 (1980) 72–80. The Synchronistic History [Chr. 21], an Assyrian chronicle, survives on three tablets or tablet fragments from Ashurbanipal's library.

³¹Dimensions, listed sequentially as maximum preserved length by width by thickness, were measured in the British Museum in June 1987. These should be regarded as approximate.

³²For this date, see note 68 below.

³³The provenience of these texts is uncertain, despite their designation as "A.H." (= coming from Abu Habba, that is Sippar). See the problems outlined by Julian E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection: The Excavations and the Archives," in Erle Leichty, *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, VI (London: British Museum Publications, 1986), pp. xxvii and xxxiv. Reade had kindly informed me, in a letter dated 20 July 1987, that neither of these two chronicle fragments "bears an original AH mark, and this means their provenience is 'probably Babylon.'"

³⁴Chronicle 1B preserves part of its right edge for ii 3'–13' and iii 6'–16'.

(668 BC). The first fragment [Chr. 1B] has 66 mostly partial lines of text spread over four columns. To judge from the extant portions, its coverage began at an undetermined date before 745 BC;³⁵ and its final preserved entry is for the fifth year of Esarhaddon (676 BC). The second fragment [Chr. 1C] preserves writing only on its reverse, in two columns containing parts of approximately 21 lines. This fragment covers the first year (680) and the tenth through twelfth years (671–669) of Esarhaddon. These two fragments [Chrs. 1B and 1C] do not join;³⁶ and, though there are significant similarities between them—compatible overall dimensions, like texture and color of clay, same physical format (two columns of writing per side, separated by a mostly blank³⁷ column about 5 mm. wide down the center), signs of approximately the same height (c. 3.0–3.2 mm), apparently the same individual scribal ductus,³⁸ common putative provenience—and their contents are complementary,³⁹ it is difficult to state categorically that they came from the same original tablet. For, even though these fragments have so much in common and it is tempting to view them as part of a single original, such an hypothesis poses serious difficulties;⁴⁰ and a thorough dis-

³⁵On the clay as presently preserved, there is room for at least eight lines of text before the beginning of the entry for 745 BC [Chr. 1B i 2]; cf. the photo in Grayson, *Chronicles*, pl. XIV and the copy in CT 34 44. This was confirmed by collation of the tablet in June 1987 and is discussed further below.

³⁶Chr. 1B iii 22' stops at a point roughly equivalent to Chr. 1A iii 22, and Chr. 1C iii 1' begins at about Chr. 1A iii 40. Similarly Chr. 1B iv ends approximately parallel with Chr. 1A iv 5, and Chr. 1C iv 1' picks up at about Chr. 1A iv 24. Thus, within each column, the gap between the end of 1B and the beginning of 1C on the reverse is equivalent to about 17–18 lines of coverage on 1A. Even when one allows for space where the surface of the fragments is worn away but subsurface unscrubbed clay remains, it seems unlikely that 1B and 1C could physically join.

³⁷The mostly blank center column contains only initial MU's from the beginning of entries in the right writing column, horizontal lines (entry dividers) extending from both the left and right writing columns, and rare runovers from the left writing column.

³⁸Especially discernible in such signs as MU, KÁM, LUGAL, and MEŠ which occur frequently in these fragments.

³⁹The obverse of Chronicle 1B covers events in the eighth century. The coverage of the reverse of Chronicles 1B–1C is: 693–689 [Chr. 1B iii], 680 [Chr. 1C iii], 679–676 [Chr. 1B iv], 671–669 [Chr. 1C iv].

⁴⁰The most notable of which—in the case of Chronicles 1B and 1C coming from a single original tablet—would be raised by the gap between the last preserved line on 1C iii 7' (//Chr. 1A iii 44) and the first readable line end preserved on 1B iv 3' (//Chr. 1A iv 1). Between these two points occur 6 lines of text in Chronicle 1A, which would be roughly equivalent in length to 8–9 lines in Chronicles 1B or 1C. But the preserved portions of subsurface clay at the end of Chr. 1C iii (when compared to 1C iv on CT 34 43 or the photo in Grayson, *Chronicles*, pl. XIV) show the column was originally at least 6 lines longer and similarly the beginning of Chr. 1B iv was at least 10 lines longer (even taking into account the slightly longer vertical spacing between lines in 1B iv as opposed to 1B iii). Thus, unless a putative version of Chronicles 1B + 1C would have had about twice as much text here as the main version [1A] (otherwise untrue on the reverse, see below), it is unlikely that Chrs. 1B and 1C would be part of the same original tablet. (The possibility of a sub-

cussion of it would disproportionately lengthen an already long article. For the present, we will continue to treat the three texts separately. Because of uncertainties both about provenience of these documents ("Babylon" vs. "Sippar")⁴¹ and about the relationship between the two fragments,⁴² we shall in the following analysis refer to these tablets simply as (Chronicles) 1A, 1B, and 1C.

Grayson in his principal edition combines the three texts of Chronicle 1 into a single version and gives a conflated transliteration based on all three. This arrangement, however, while duly noting variants, tends to obscure distinctive features especially of Chronicle 1B.⁴³ The editorial conflation presents little difficulty for the reverse of these texts, where events of the seventh century are dealt with and surviving portions of Chronicles 1B and 1C closely parallel the text of Chronicle 1A. But it poses serious problems for the obverse (surviving only in 1A and 1B), where events of the eighth century are narrated and the texts, especially in column i, diverge more often than they agree. It is particularly instructive to compare column i of Chronicle 1B with parallel materials in Chronicle 1A:

stantially longer version here in Chrs. 1B and 1C may, however, have to be considered at some point in the future.)

⁴¹I have been unable to detect internal textual indications in Chrs. 1A, 1B, or 1C that would provide a clue to place of origin. The use of ventive verb forms in the chronicles occasionally gives a sense of direction toward the scribal point of reference. Note the use of *ūrdam(ma)*, "he came down" (to Babylonia) [Chr. 1A i 3, 20, ii 27] vs. *ūrid(ma)*, "he went down" (to Elam) [Chr. 1A ii 37, iii 10], *išqā*, "he came upstream" [Chr. 1A iii 40, cf. *išqi*, "he went upstream," Chr. 3:3], *illikūnim(ma)*, "they came" (from Elam to Agade) [Chr. 1A iv 18], *ūšūnim(ma)* ... *iterbūni*, "they came out (from Assur) and entered (Babylon)" [Chr. 1A iv 36; cf. Chr. 14:36, Chr. 16:6-7]; cf. "Nabu and the gods of Borsippa came (*ittalkūni*) to Babylon" [Chr. 16:8]. Use of the ventive in Chronicle 15 is especially striking: *illikam*, "(it) came" [line 4], *ušēbilam*, "(he?) brought it" (to Babylon) [line 5], *iterba*, "he entered (here)" [line 6], *išbatamma* ... [*ib*]ukam [line 10], *ilqā*, "he took (it)" (to the king of Babylon) [line 18], *issanqa*, "(the enemy) pressed" [line 19]. Note also the third person plural ventive written as *-ānu* which occurs occasionally in Chr. 2: *ittardūnu*, "they came down" [line 10], *illikūnu*, "they came" [line 11], vs. *ittalkūni*, "they came" [line 19]; cf. *ūšū*, "they went out" (from Babylon) [Chr. 2:12] and also apparently similar writings in Chr. 3: *ihtabūnu* [line 7], *ištallūnu* [line 8], *itabkūnu* [line 8]. The frame of reference, however, sometimes seems to lie outside Babylon. Note that Nabu sometimes "goes" (*illiku*) from Borsippa to Babylon [Chr. 14:33; Chr. 15:22; Chr. 16:18, 20, 27; Chr. 17 iii 5, 8, 14, 15—is this final *-u* an unpronounced, overhanging vowel or the equivalent of any vowel for final *-a* at this time? it is unnecessary, but very commonly present], whereas Bel "comes out" (*ūšā*) from Babylon [Chr. 16:19, 21, 22, 23, 27; Chr. 17 iii 9, 14, 15]. The use of the ventive in the Babylonian chronicles is not consistent, but often fits in with older classical usage and can be translated as such. It might repay detailed study.

⁴²And about the relationship between Chronicles 1A and 1C, which could theoretically represent a single recension. At present, as mentioned above, there are no parallel passages in the extant portions of Chronicles 1B and 1C.

⁴³Grayson is aware of the substantial differences between Chronicles 1A and 1B (CRA 17 162 n. 3), though he downplays this factor in the introduction to his primary edition (Chronicles, p. 69).

Chronicle 1BChronicle 1A

i	(lacuna of at least seven lines at beginning) ⁴⁴	not present
i 1'	(end of entry, apparently mentioning suspension of the New Year's festival)	not present
i 2'-6'	accession of Tiglath-pileser III in Assyria; his first campaign into Babylonia	i 1-5
—	not present	i 6-8 (Babylon's battle against Borsippa)
i 7'-8'	accession of Ummanigaš in Elam	i 9-10
i 9'-10'	further episode mentioning Tiglath-pileser III	not present
i 11'	broken entry ending in x KUR 'ur'-ra-du	not present
i 12'	broken entry ending in x x LU	not present
i 13'	broken entry ending in 'NAM' GAR/šá	not present
i 14'-15'(+)	broken entry, the first line of which ends in KI	not present

The difference between the 1B and 1A versions is especially striking here. 1B has at least eight lines of text before 1A begins and, of its 15 preserved lines in col. i, only 7 are paralleled in 1A.⁴⁵ If one includes in the statistics the lacuna (at least seven lines) before the first partially preserved line of 1B, only 7 of those 22 lines in 1B i would be shared with 1A i.⁴⁶ On the other hand, 1A has three lines (i 6-8) which are not in 1B.⁴⁷ Clearly these two recensions differ more than they coincide, and it is difficult to speak of a common text here in any meaningful sense.

Comparison of the second column of the two versions is more problematic, since the pertinent portions of both tablets are heavily damaged. Chronicle 1B seems to have had much more material in its first column, since—after a lacuna of at least seven lines at the beginning of column ii—its first partially preserved line corre-

⁴⁴The size of the lacuna can be gauged from the length of the subsurface clay preserved on the tablet before the beginning of the first preserved line in column ii. See the photo in Grayson, *Chronicles*, pl. XIV and King's copy in *CT* 34 44. I have estimated the size of the lacuna from the tablet itself (June 1987), based on the average height of lines in columns i-ii. See also note 60 below.

⁴⁵Note particularly the short entries in Chr. 1B i 9'-14'.

⁴⁶This percentage of shared lines would only be further decreased if it can be demonstrated that still more of the tablet is now lacking beyond the 7-line minimum estimated from surviving clay at the beginning of column ii.

⁴⁷Note the atypical form of this entry. It begins *ana tarši RN*, "at the time of RN" rather than with the precise date formula *MU.N(KAM) RN*, "Nth year of RN," used elsewhere in the chronicle. What is the implication of the phrase *ul šatir* "is not written" in the sentence *šaltu ša Nabû-ndšir ana libbi Barsip ipušu ul šatir*? Was the entry taken from oral tradition, or does the statement mean that there was no (detailed) written record of the hostilities?

sponds to 1A i 39.⁴⁸ Of the twenty-one lines in column ii of 1B, the following are the correspondences to 1A.

<u>Chronicle 1B</u>	<u>Chronicle 1A</u>
ii (lacuna of at least seven lines at beginning) ⁴⁹	?
ii 1'-2' (end of entry, corresponding to the death of Ummanigaš and the accession of his nephew)	i 39-40
ii 3' beginning of entry, mentioning the sixth year and Ass[yr]ia	not present
ii 4'-6' continuation of entry, summarizing length of hostilities between Babylonia and Assyria	i 41-42
ii 7'-8' tenth year of Merodach-baladan II	i 43-44 (?—very little actually preserved here)
ii 9'-14' twelfth year of Merodach-baladan II	ii 1-5 (very little preserved)
ii 15'-21' four entries covering the thirteenth through seventeenth years of Sargon II	too little preserved for comparison, but traces do not seem to match Chronicle 1B ⁵⁰

Thus the examination of column ii of Chronicle 1B must be considered inconclusive. But, if Sennacherib's second year is mentioned in Chronicle 1A ii 10, there would be only four lines available in that text (ii 6-9) to accommodate entries which would have to cover not only the material in eight lines of Chronicle 1B (ii 15'-22') but also the accession of Sennacherib. It therefore seems likely that the coverage of 1A and 1B again diverged at this point, with 1B providing fuller detail.

In the third and fourth columns on the reverse, the three texts match more closely. Chronicle 1B iii 1'-21' is almost a verbal parallel to Chronicle 1A iii 3-22. But there are various minor omissions in Chronicle 1A,⁵¹ the addition of a summary sentence about the length of reign of Nergal-ušēzib in Chronicle 1A iii 5-6,⁵² slightly longer wording describing the removal of Ḫallušu in Chronicle 1A iii 7 (vs. Chroni-

⁴⁸The average line in 1A contained somewhat more material than the average line in 1B, and a ratio of about 1.2:1 can be established on the basis of parallel passages.

⁴⁹See note 44 above.

⁵⁰Both texts are extensively damaged at this point.

⁵¹Chr. 1A omits: KUR before NIM (Chr. 1A iii 7 vs. Chr. 1B iii 4'), MEŠ after GAZ (Chr. 1A iii 8 vs. Chr. 1B iii 5'), masculine personal determinative before *Mušēzib-Marduk* (Chr. 1A iii 12 vs. Chr. 1B iii 10'), *u* between KUR NIM and KUR URLKI (Chr. 1A iii 16 vs. Chr. 1B iii 15'), ÉRIN before KUR *aš+šur* (Chr. 1A iii 17 vs. Chr. 1B iii 17'), the dividing line after the entry relating to the battle of Ḫalulē (Chr. 1A iii 18-19 vs. Chr. 1B iii 18'-19'), KÁM after MU.4 (Chr. A iii 19 vs. Chr. B iii 19').

⁵²MU 1 6 ITI.[MEŠ d]U.GUR-ú-še-zib LUGAL-ut TIN.TIR.KI DÙ-uš.

cle 1B iii 4', though the latter is heavily damaged),⁵³ varying days in Abu 692 for the death of the Elamite king Kudurru (Kudur-Nahhunte),⁵⁴ and orthographic variants. The beginning sections of the few lines preserved of the third column of Chronicle 1C also match the corresponding part of Chronicle 1A,⁵⁵ except for the omission of a determinative.⁵⁶

In the fourth column, just a few signs remain in Chronicle 1B; and the only apparent deviation from Chronicle 1A is an orthographic variant.⁵⁷ The fourth column of Chronicle 1C is better preserved; and there is only one significant difference, the insertion of a line (iv 3') that is not in Chronicle 1A: [šallas]su šallat ilānišu itabkū, "they took away its (Egypt's) [booty] and the booty of its gods" (which corresponds to a place just after line 25 in Chronicle 1A iv). There are also a series of mostly orthographic or other minor variants,⁵⁸ and one apparent deviation in the edited text is not supported by the original tablets.⁵⁹

Thus a reasonable case, based largely on the contents of the obverse of these tablets, can be made for distinguishing at least two major recensions of this chronicle, 1B and 1A, or perhaps Long and Short versions respectively. The coverage of 1B begins earlier than that of 1A, and it is possible that 1B extended before the beginning of the reign of Nabonassar.⁶⁰ It is also possible that the coverage of 1B may have

⁵³Where Chronicle 1B iii 3'-5' has 'hal'-[lu-šú] LUGAL KUR NIM UN.MEŠ'-šú is-ḫu-šú-'ma' x [] GAZ.MEŠ'-šú, Chronicle 1A iii 7-8 has hal-lu-šú LUGAL NIM UN.MEŠ'-šú is-'ḫu-šú' (...) K]Á ina IGI-šú «šú» ip-ḫu-ú GAZ-šú.

⁵⁴Day 17 (Chr. 1A iii 13), day 8 (Chr. 1B iii 11'); see Grayson's commentary in *Chronicles*, p. 80.

⁵⁵Chr. 1C iii 2'-7' = Chr. 1A iii 41-44.

⁵⁶KUR between LUGAL and NIM in iii 4' (vs. Chr. 1A iii 42). This variant should be added to the critical apparatus in Grayson, *Chronicles*, p. 82.

⁵⁷[di]-i-ku (Chr. 1B iv 5') for GAZ.MEŠ (Chr. 1A iv 2).

⁵⁸KUR inserted before *mí-šir* in Chr. 1A iv 25; *me-'em'-pi* (Chr. 1C iv 3') vs. *me-em-pí* (Chr. 1A iv 26); UN.MEŠ (Chr. 1C iv 7') vs. UN.'MEŠ-šú' (Chr. 1A iv 28); *ḫab-tu* (Chr. 1C iv 7') vs. *'ḫab'-ta* (Chr. 1A iv 28); *id-duk* (Chr. 1C iv 10') vs. *'id'-du-uk* (Chr. 1A iv 29); compare *ina* (Chr. 1A iv 25) for *šá* (Chr. 1C iv 2').

⁵⁹Chr. 1C iv 6': [DUMU].M'EŠ ŠEŠ-šú ina ŠU^{II} ša-ab-tu; Chr. 1A iv 27: DUMU.'MEŠ' [...] (collated). The traces following DUMU in Chr. 1A are not as clear as copied by King in *CT* 34 50; and Grayson's transliteration does not indicate the extent of the damage. The supposed bottom wedge in 'šú' (King) could well be a subcutaneous scratch. There is no reason to presume divergence here, although it cannot be excluded. Esarhaddon's Zenjirli inscription claims that many more members of the Egyptian royal family were captured (Taharqa's wives, crown prince, and other sons and daughters); neither brother nor nephews are mentioned (Borger, *Esarh.*, p. 99 §65 Mnm. A rev. 43-44).

⁶⁰Chr. 1B itself had at least eight lines at the beginning of column i before its entry for Nabonassar's third year, which raises the possibility that not all these lines (and their missing precursors) dealt with the beginning of Nabonassar's reign. There could also have been several more lines, if Chronicle 1B after the end of the preserved portion of column ii roughly corresponded with the text of Chronicle 1A; if Chronicle 1B had a fuller text than Chronicle 1A after that point, the lacuna at

ended before that of 1A.⁶¹ Should one classify Chronicle 1A and Chronicle 1B as two separate chronicles?⁶² One could make a strong case in favor of that alternative, if one wished to stress divergent rather than common features. It is plain that Chronicle 1A iv has much more in common with the Esarhaddon Chronicle [Chronicle 14]⁶³ than Chronicle 1A i has in common with Chronicle 1B i. It remains to be seen whether the contrast between Chronicles 1A and 1B reflects merely a difference of scribal schools or whether it could have had geographical or ideological significance.⁶⁴ As historiographic research on the chronicles proceeds, one should investigate the possible relevance of geographical particularism and varying ideologies even in chronicles for which only a single text is known.⁶⁵

The next topic for discussion is whether the Babylonian Chronicle belongs to a series and, if so, to which series.⁶⁶ The colophon of Chronicle 1A⁶⁷ raises the issue:

Chr. 1A

iv 39 *pir-su reš-tu-ú ki-ma* SUMUN-šú SAR-^rma ba-ru¹ ú up-pu-uš
40 *tup-pi^m a-na-^dEN-KÁM A-^ršú šá^m i-ib-lu-^rtu¹*

the beginning of Chronicle 1B i could be still larger. Either of these alternatives would make it still less likely that Chronicle 1B began only with the reign of Nabonassar.

⁶¹Unless the missing portions in Chronicle 1B at the end of column iii and at the beginning of column iv contain more material than is in the corresponding entries of Chronicle 1A (and the reverse sections of these texts elsewhere closely parallel each other), there should be only between 4 and 7 lines missing at the end of Chronicle 1B iv—hardly enough to parallel the remaining 33 lines of text and 6 lines of colophon in Chronicle 1A after the last preserved entry in Chronicle 1B.

⁶²Prescinding for the moment from the question how Chronicle 1C, of which very little is preserved, is related to these two documents.

⁶³Especially the better preserved portions, e.g., Chr. 14:10–39 with Chr. 1A iv 1–38. These texts are compared more fully below.

⁶⁴It is unfortunate that reexamination of the evidence for provenience of Chronicles 1A, 1B, and 1C (see note 33 above) does not support distinguishing a “Babylon” from a “Sippar” recension.

⁶⁵E.g., Chronicle 15 was written by a scribe known to have been active at Borsippa (see note 13 above). Note W. G. Lambert’s remarks on varying perspectives at Uruk and Babylon on first-millennium history in *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: Athlone Press, 1978), pp. 11–12 and n. 17.

⁶⁶The prevailing opinion, that Chronicles 1–13b belong to a single series, has been mentioned above. Sixty years ago, Landsberger and Bauer, with somewhat less chronicle material available to them, advanced a more sweeping, but more nuanced hypothesis (ZA 37 [1927] 61–65, with a table on p. 66). Pointing out the canonical character of Babylonian learned texts, they suggested that many known Babylonian chronicles belonged to a single official series. There were three different types of texts in the series: (1) double-columned Section (*pirsu*) tablets [Chrs. 1A, 1B, 1C, 7]; (2) single-columned tablets, known by catchline to be part of a continuing series [Chrs. 14, 3]; (3) excerpt tablets (*nishu*) [Chrs. 20A, 20B, 24, 16]. Landsberger and Bauer did not attempt to integrate such documents as Chronicle P [Chr. 22] or the Religious Chronicle [Chr. 17] into their scheme. Their distinction of types, though in need of updating and revision, still has merit.

⁶⁷No colophons are preserved in Chronicles 1B and 1C.

- 41 DUMU ^mr^wl^dŠEŠ.KI qa-^rai^mrd^lé-a-MU A-šú šá
 42 ^ma-na-^rdEN^r-KÁM DUMU ^mw-d^rŠEŠ.KI TIN^r.TIR.^rKI^r
 43 ^rTTI^r[x U₄(x+)]^r6(+)^r.KÁM MU.22.KÁM ^mda(?)^r-x-(x)-muš(?)^r LUGAL
 E.KI
 44 [(x) KUR.KUR

Translation:

"First section, written, collated, and 'made' according to its original (tablet). Tablet of Ana-Bēl-ēreš, son of Libluṭu, descendant of Ur-Nanna. Written by Ea-iddin, son of Ana-Bēl-ēreš, descendant of Ur-Nanna. Babylon, month [...], day (x+)6, year 22 of 'Darius(?)', king of Babylon [and/, king of] (all) the lands."⁶⁸

Though the opening words of the colophon, *pirsu rēštū*, "first section," designate this tablet [Chr. 1A] as the beginning of a series, it is by no means obvious to which series the tablet belonged and whether other tablets are known that form part of the same series. Among the rest of the Neo-Babylonian chronicles [Chrs. 2–7], four have reasonably preserved final sections. Three [Chrs. 3–5] of these four have catchlines; and it seems reasonably clear that, since the catchlines in Chronicles 3 and 4 are matched by the opening lines of Chronicles 4 and 5 respectively, one may view these three documents as constituting a series or at least a running text spread over more than one tablet. But none of these chronicles indicates, by way of a colophon, that it is a numbered tablet in a series;⁶⁹ nor does Chronicle 1A have a catchline to reveal the opening line of its "second section." Also relevant are the contrasting styles of Chronicle 1A and its supposed successors [Chrs. 2–7]. The latter chronicles deal

⁶⁸This colophon has also been edited by Hunger, *Kolophone*, pp. 56–57 no. 145.

Notes on the text. (Line 40) The PN is probably to be read Ana-Bēl-ēreš rather than Ana-Bēl-erešti; cf. the writing ^ma-na-^dEN-ere(URU)-eš for a homophonous individual in VAS 5 90:17 and Peiser, *Verträge*, p. 150 no. CVII: 1 (84-2-11, 164 = BM 77424, kindly collated by Irving Finkel). (Line 41) Ea-iddin of the Ur-Nanna family is also attested in VAS 3 229:7'. (Line 43) The royal name is very heavily damaged, as can be seen from the photograph in Grayson, *Chronicles*, pl. XIII; none of the signs can be read with certainty ('da' would fit the traces and 'muš' is possible, but the other two signs are quite illegible). The dating of the text depends then in large part on the titulary, which has commonly been regarded as being in general use until the early years of Xerxes I. It is, however, now known in isolated instances at least as late as the fourth and twenty-fourth years of the reign of Artaxerxes I, i.e., 461 and 441 BC (*OECT* 9 191, W. 19164a in *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 15 [1984] 268, where it occurs as part of the titulary LUGAL *par-su ma-da-a-a* [TIN].TIR.KI KUR.KUR.MEŠ; see Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire* [Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1985], p. 9 n. 25 and Kessler, *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 15 [1984] 262–63). Thus, while the text may still probably be dated in the reign of Darius I (the only Persian ruler of Babylon before Artaxerxes I to have reigned at least twenty-two years), the attribution is not altogether certain. (Line 44) Note that this is not a part of line 43, but a separate line, even if indented. The surface is damaged before KUR.KUR, and it may be possible to restore [LUGA]L^r (rather than read 'u (?)').

⁶⁹In fact, only Chronicle 3 has end material distinct from a catchline: an appeal to one who loves Marduk and Nabu to keep the tablet safe.

with each year in turn, without skipping an entry,⁷⁰ whereas Chronicle 1A is selective and omits more years than it treats.⁷¹ When one considers also the large size, two-columned format, neat script, and scribal colophon of Chronicle 1A, it is plain that the text was a carefully made archival copy; in fact, it is explicitly said to have been drawn up by a scribe for his father.⁷² Most of the other Neo-Babylonian chronicles are of considerably smaller dimensions,⁷³ all but one in single-column format,⁷⁴ and none has even half as many lines as Chronicle 1A.⁷⁵ There is also considerable variety in detail of coverage, with Chronicle 6 taking 27 lines to cover a single year and the reverse of Chronicle 5 covering eight years in 23 lines (an average of 2.88 lines per year); Chronicle 1A is located towards the lighter end of this spectrum (34 years spread over a reasonably preserved 169(+) lines, an average of about 5 lines per year). Although an argument was advanced by Wiseman⁷⁶ and repeated by Grayson⁷⁷ that Chronicles 1A and 7 were written by the same scribe, physical comparison of the tablets shows that such is not the case: the individual scribal ductus of each text is quite different (the writing in Chronicle 7 is more cursive); and com-

⁷⁰Even in the case of the eighth year of Nabonidus, where content was lacking, the heading "MU.8.KĀM" was entered and a space left blank [Chr. 7 ii 9].

⁷¹Especially before the reign of Esarhaddon, when the coverage becomes annual (except for his lost ninth year). Note that in Chr. 1A i, covering the years 745–712, only 10 years out of 34 are dealt with (in addition to a paragraph without date, i 6–8). In columns ii–iv, the following years are also skipped: 701, 698–695, 690, 688–682, and 672. If one excludes the final section beginning with Esarhaddon's first year, out of a total of 59 years which could have been mentioned in the preserved text, 21 are treated and 38 are skipped; if one includes the final section, 34 are treated and 39 are skipped—still less than half being included. It is difficult to see how Chronicle 6 (27 lines devoted to a single year, with circumstantial embellishments of detail) could belong to the same series as Chronicles 1–7.

⁷²I.e., by Ea-iddin for Ana-Bēl-ēreš. See note 68 above.

⁷³Chronicles 2 (52 x 62 x 19 mm), 4 (46 x 54 x 17), and 6 (47 x 60 x 23) are about the same size as sixth-century Neo-Babylonian business documents, with width exceeding length; and Chronicle 15 is of comparable dimensions (45 x 58 x 21). Tablets with length surpassing width are Chronicle 5 (83 x 62 x 28, but its full length is not preserved) and Chronicle 3 (135 x 71 x 24). The only tablet which may originally have been comparable in size to Chronicle 1A is Chronicle 7, for which the maximum preserved dimensions are 142 x 140 x 38 (but only the thickness is likely to be close to its original size).

⁷⁴Chronicle 7 also has two columns per side. BCF 3 (*Chronicles*, pls. XI, XXVI) also has two columns on its surviving side and it progresses from MU. 8 (ii 4') to MU. 10 (ii 7') to [MU. 11 (ii 8)]; but, other than the use of these consecutive date formulae, it is difficult to detect other chronicle elements in this text.

⁷⁵Chronicles 2, 4, and 6 have 41, 28, and 27 lines respectively; tablets 3 and 5 have 78 and 49 (+) lines respectively. Chronicle 7 has fragments of 84 lines preserved; it presumably had more than 100 lines when intact.

⁷⁶*Chronicles*, p. 3.

⁷⁷*Chronicles*, p. 9 n. 7, pp. 14, 21.

mon signs such as MU, KÁM, LUGAL, and MEŠ exhibit distinctive forms on each tablet.⁷⁸ When one considers the lack of colophon or catchline link between Chronicle 1A and Chronicles 2–7, as well as obvious variations in style and format, there is no clear evidence that they are part of a single series.⁷⁹ Chronicle 1A is labelled the opening tablet in a series, but it has yet to be established what this series was and whether there are other surviving tablets.⁸⁰

⁷⁸One should also compare carefully the handwriting on Chrs. 2–6 to see whether Wiseman's observations on their similarity (Chronicles 2, 4, and 6 written by one scribe and Chronicles 3 and 5 by another), again repeated by Grayson, are accurate.

⁷⁹Grayson (*Chronicles*, p. 8) argues that one of the reasons that Chronicles 1–7 belong to or are extracts from the same series is that "Chronicle 1 and Chronicles 2–7 have similar characteristic phrases for battle, defeat, retreat, and death...." The actual evidence, however, is quite weak. The phrase for "defeat" cited by Grayson (KI.)BAL(-tum) šakānu, occurs just in Chronicle 1A (i 35, iii 18; ii 45: doubtful [signs heavily damaged and phrase, in context, not preceded by reference to a battle]) and not in Chronicles 2–7 (Grayson, *Chronicles*, p.74). The phrase for "retreat," ina pāni...nabalkutu, occurs in Chronicles 2, 3, 5; but an alleged occurrence in Chronicle 1B ii 11'—ii 3 in Grayson's composite text—is so badly damaged that the main logogram is completely missing and the reading of what little is left of the end of the phonetic complement is ambiguous (Grayson, *Chronicles*, p. 75 transcribes: [ibbalkitⁱ]). Thus neither of these two phrases demonstrates a link between Chronicle 1A and Chronicles 2–7. Grayson's distinctive word for "death," šimāti (NAM. MEŠ), serving in place of "he died," occurs six times in Chronicle 1, but only once in the other chronicles under discussion [Chr.5:10]; but the common word for "death" (or "die") occurs six times in this chronicle group [Chr. 1A iii 31, iv 11, 22; Chr. 7 ii 14, iii 22, 23]—so neither use seems distinctive. The phrase for "battle" (or, more aptly, "to fight") šaltā ana libbi...epēšu is attested in a good many chronicles [Chrs. 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 7, 20B, 22]; and šalti ana libbi x or ana libbi x šalti is a fairly common seventh-century expression for "battle with" (OIP 2 140:6.12, 141 r. 10; ABL 521 r. 20, 1105:24, 1456:8). This idiom alone is hardly sufficient to create a phrasing link—and demonstrate a series connection—between Chronicle 1 and Chronicles 2–7, especially since the phrase is shared with other non-series chronicles as well. Thus, on closer examination, the cited evidence based on phraseology is exiguous.

Chronological complementarity of Chronicles 1–7, in default of other evidence, does not appear to be a strong argument for a series connection.

⁸⁰Other series connections within the chronicle corpus should also be examined. With the exception of Chronicles 3–5 (linked by catchlines), the evidence is nowhere clear. Even the connection between Chronicles 20A and 20B, which were treated by Grayson as the text of a single chronicle spread over two tablets, is doubtful. Those two chronicles have a single entry in common (20A: 31–36 = 20B: 1–7); but the catchline at the end of 20A not only does not match the beginning of 20B—it does not correspond to any part of the contents of 20B. It is difficult to see why these texts need to be grouped together.

It is difficult in many instances, because of the tablets' state of preservation, to determine which chronicles may originally have had catchlines or colophons. Catchlines survive on Chronicles 3, 4, 5, and 20A; Chronicles 1A, 6, 9, 15, 16, 20B, 21, and 25 definitely did not have catchlines; and the rest are uncertain. Colophons are preserved on Chronicles 1A, 15, and 21 (mostly broken [Ashurbanipal] colophon); brief comments survive at the end of Chronicles 3 (admonition only), 14 (GIGAM.GIGAM, on left edge), and 20A (GIGAM.DIDLI); there are definitely no colophons on Chronicles 4–6, 16, 20B, and 25; and the rest are uncertain. Thus catchlines and chronicles are helpful for establishing that Chronicles 1A, 3, 4, 5, and 20A were parts of series and that Chronicle

The next subject for consideration is the relationship between the Babylonian Chronicle and the Esarhaddon Chronicle [Chronicles 1A and 14] in covering their common subject matter: the reign of Esarhaddon and the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin (i.e., 680–668). The comprehensiveness of coverage in Chronicle 1A⁸¹ increases markedly at this point, as noted above.⁸² Instead of treating approximately one year in three (as it does from 745 to 681)⁸³ Chronicle 1A here deals with twelve years out of thirteen; and the only omission may have been occasioned by a defective source.⁸⁴ The passages for comparison are Chronicle 1A iii 39–iv 38 (fifty lines in all) and Chronicle 14:1–39 (in which individual lines are usually longer than in Chronicle 1A). The coverage of the first and second years of Esarhaddon is damaged in both chronicles; so the detailed comparison begins with Esarhaddon's third year (678). For the most part, the entries in Chronicles 1A and 14 are the same or very similar for the years 678–668. They sketch in detail—and often in the same words—a series of episodes in common:

Esarhaddon

- year 3: the removal and execution of the governor of Nippur and the chief of the Bit-Dakkūri tribe
- year 4: the capture and plunder of Sidon, a levy(?)⁸⁵ in Akkad
- year 5: the capture of Bazzu and the decapitation of the king of Sidon
- year 6: the campaign to Milidu, the change of kings in Elam, the deportation of another governor of Nippur and another chief of the Bit-Dakkūri
- year 7: the return of Ishtar and other gods of Agade from Elam
- year 8: the death of Esarhaddon's wife, the capture and spoliation of Shubria
- year 9: [omitted in both texts]
- year 10: the Assyrian campaign to Egypt
- year 11: the execution of high officials in Assyria
- year 12: Esarhaddon's death on the way to Egypt, summary of his regnal years

15 was definitely⁴ not part of a series; but this is just a small percentage of the corpus as presently defined.

Competent handwriting analyses of chronicle tablets might help further to clarify groupings. In the chronicles, there are frequent overlaps in time coverage, great variety in format and in type and detail of coverage, and a surprising lack of standardization. See also note 145 below.

⁸¹Coverage in Chronicles 1B and 1C, where preserved, is roughly parallel to that in Chronicle 1A.

⁸²See note 71 above. Were fuller records available at this point?

⁸³Actually 21 out of 59 (35.6%).

⁸⁴See pp. 94–95 below.

⁸⁵The meaning of the word *bihirtu* is not clear; see Brinkman, *Prelude to Empire* (Philadelphia: University Museum, 1984), p. 77 n. 375.

Shamash-shum-ukin

accession year: the return of Bel and the gods of Akkad from Assur to Babylon, the conquest of Kirbitu, the execution of a Babylonian judge

It is plain that these sections of the two chronicles shared the majority of their material and that it was frequently expressed in identical wording.

Nonetheless, there are also divergences, both minor and substantive, between the two accounts. The principal differences are:

- (a) minor orthographic variants, such as GAZ.MEŠ [Chr. 1A iv 2] for *di-i-ku* [Chr. 14:11]; KUR NIM [Chr. 1A iv 13] for KUR NIM.MA.[K]I [Chr. 14:18]; AŠ.TE [Chr. 1A iv 13] for GIŠ.GU.ZA [Chr. 14:18]; *di-ik-tum* [Chr. 1A iv 26] for *di-ik-tú* [Chr. 14:25]; these are common in the texts;
- (b) more substantive orthographic variants, such as KUR *ša-a²-i-du-^rnu¹* [Chr. 14:14] for URU *ši-du-nu* [Chr. 1A iv 6]; these are rare in the texts;
- (c) minor insertions/omissions, such as *ab-ku-ma* [Chr. 1A iv 2] for *ab-ku* [Chr. 14:11]; the insertion of URU before *ba-az-za* in Chr. 14:13 but not in Chr. 1A iv 5; KUR *mi-li-du* <DU>.ME [Chr. 1A iv 10, haplography] for KUR *mi-li-du^r* [D]U.MEŠ [Chr. 14:15]; *ina* ITI.GU₄ [Chr. 1A iv 36] for GU₄ [Chr. 14:36]; the insertion of a divine determinative before the name *Ḫumbašaldašu* in Chr. 14:17, but not in Chr. 1A iv 12; the insertion of the masculine personal determinative before the name of Ashurbanipal [Chr. 14:30, vs. Chr. 1A iv 32]; KASKAL^{II} [Chr. 14:29] for KASKAL [Chr. 1A iv 31];⁸⁶ these are common in the texts;
- (d) more substantive insertions/omissions of words or short phrases, such as 'ÉRIN.ME³ KUR *aš+šur* [Chr. 14:15] vs. KUR *aš+šur* [Chr. 1A iv 10]; TI-su (in Chr. 14:16, but not in Chr. 1A iv 11); ITI NU ZU (in Chr. 1A iv 14, but not in Chr. 14:19); the personal name Bēl-ēḫir given for the Babylonian judge in Chr. 1A iv 38, but missing in Chr. 14:39; *ina* KUR *aš+šur* [Chr. 1A iv 29] vs. 'KUR³ *aš+šur* [Chr. 14:27];⁸⁷
- (e) longer insertions/omissions:⁸⁸ (1) at the end of the entry for year 5, Chr. 1A iv 7–8 adds "*ina* ITI.ŠE SAG.DU *šá* LUGAL *šá* KUR *kun-du u* KUR *si-su-ú* TAR-*is-ma ana* KUR *aš+šur na-ši*"; (2) at the beginning of the entry for year 6 (just after the year number), Chr. 1A iv 9–10 adds "LUGAL NIM *ana* UD.KIB.NUN.KI TU GAZ GAZ ^dUTU ^rul¹-*tu* É.BABBAR.RA NU É"; (3) in the entry for year 6 after mention of the journey to Milidu, Chr. 14:15 adds "*ina* UGU ^mmu-*gal(?)*-*lu* ŠUB³.MEŠ"; (4) in the entry for the tenth year, after U₄.3.KÁM, Chr. 1A iv 24–25 adds "U₄.16.KÁM U₄.18.KÁM ^r3-*šú*"; (5) in the entry for the tenth year after *diktu ina* KUR ^rmi-*šir di³-kát*, Chrs. 1A and 1C add a passage about the taking of Memphis, the escape of its king, the capture of his nephews(?), and the taking of booty and prisoners

⁸⁶This might be considered an orthographic variant.

⁸⁷Causing a difference in sense: "The king of Assyria" (Chr. 14) versus "the king in Assyria" (Chr. 1A). Collation (June 1987) shows that Sidney Smith's edition of Chr. 14:27 (*BHT*) is correct and that Grayson's transliteration has a non-existent *ina* here.

⁸⁸Insertions/omissions for years 8 and 9 will, for the most part, be treated separately below.

- [Chr. 1A iv 26–28, Chr. 1C iv 3–8]; (6) after the listing of the total number of years in Esarhaddon's reign [Chr. 1A iv 32, Chr. 1C iv 13'(+)], Chr. 14:30], Chr. 14 adds three additional lines summarizing the twenty years' interruption of the *akitu* festival under Sennacherib and Esarhaddon;
- (f) factual contradictions: (1) Chr. 1A iv 10 lists the day of the death of Īumbahaldāšu II as KIN 7, Chr. 14:6 as ITI.KIN U₄.5.KĀM; (2) Chr. 1A iv 12 gives "5" as the total number of regnal years for Īumbahaldāšu II, Chr. 14:17 gives "6"; (3) Chr. 1A iv 22 states that the wife of Esarhaddon died on XII-5 in year 8, whereas Chr. 14:23 puts her death on XII-6; (4) in the entry for the tenth year, the defeat (victory?) in Egypt is dated in the month Dumuzu (ŠU) in Chr. 1A iv 24, but in the month Tašritu (DU₆) in Chr. 14:26;⁸⁹ (5) another possible textual disagreement, in the entry for the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin, in which day 25 [Chr. 14:36] is supposedly contrasted with day 24 (or 14) [Chr. 1A iv 36] for the return of Marduk and the gods of Akkad to Babylon, is not certain on the tablets;⁹⁰
- (g) textual disagreement (possibly reconcilable): as the first item in the entry for year 7, Chr. 1A iv 16 records that on XII-5 the Assyrian army (ĒRIN) was defeated in Egypt, while Chr. 14:20 notes that on XII-8 the Assyrian army (ĒRIN.MEŠ) "[...] to the city šá LÚ.MEŠ";⁹¹
- (h) use of different phrases (perhaps with difference in meaning/emphasis): (1) after giving the summary of regnal years for Esarhaddon, Chr. 1A iv 33 has an entry "his two sons sat upon the throne: Shamash-shum-ukin in Babylon, Ashurbanipal in Assyria" but Chr. 14:34—after the intervening lines noted in e:6 above—gives "in the month Kislimu, Ashurbanipal [his s]on sat upon the throne in Assyria"; (2) in the entry for the seventh year, in the item dealing with the return of Ishtar of Agade and the other gods of that city, Chr. 1A iv 17 begins *ina* ITI.ŠE, "in the month of Addaru," while Chr. 14:21 begins simply MU.BI, "(in) that (same) year."⁹²

The striking similarities and occasional divergences of the two chronicles raise at least two questions. First, what is the significance of the substantial amount of shared material and common phraseology? Second, what does the non-shared material tell us about the origins, intent, and relative reliability of the two chronicles? The two questions are intertwined, and here we can hope only to make a few observations towards

⁸⁹The same event seems to be involved in the two documents because it is recorded in the same place in the entries for the tenth year, the month names are written by easily confusable signs, and the month name in each case is followed by U₄.3.KĀM.

⁹⁰Collation (June 1987) shows the reading of both numbers is not quite certain, and it may be possible to read either or both as 25 or 24.

⁹¹Efforts have been made to reconcile the two entries (note the remarks of Landsberger and Bauer, *ZA* 37 [1927] 78; Sidney Smith, *BHT*, pp. 10–11; and G. Fecht, *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 16 [1958] 116–19); but it has now become more common to see the place names as referring to Egypt [Chr. 1] and Chaldea [Chr. 14], respectively. Whether there were two distinct simultaneous campaigns by Assyrian armies against widely separated regions needs further discussion.

⁹²The two phrases are not necessarily contradictory.

solving the intricate problems involved.

As regards the shared material, the common features of Chronicles 1A and 14 fit into a wider context in that no fewer than ten⁹³ chronicles have one or more passages in common with other chronicles. The passages shared between chronicles deal with events as early as the nineteenth century BC (the Erra-imitti—Enlil-bāni episode)⁹⁴ and as late as the time of Shamash-shum-ukin (withdrawal of the king into Babylon in 652).⁹⁵ There are passages shared between Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles⁹⁶ and even one passage common to three chronicles.⁹⁷ Chronicles sharing materials may be divided into three broad groups, depending on whether the events they discuss in common date to the early second, late second, or early first millennium.⁹⁸ From the first group come Chronicles 20A and 20B, which share the Erra-imitti—Enlil-bāni incident noted above. To the second group belong four chronicles: Chronicle 22 shares material with Chronicle 21,⁹⁹ which has material in common with Chronicle 24,¹⁰⁰ which in turn shares material with Chronicle 25.¹⁰¹ Covering the early first millennium are four related chronicles: Chronicle 1A shares material with both Chronicles 14 and 16,¹⁰² which also have material in common with each other.¹⁰³ Chronicle 16 in addition shares material with Chronicle 15.¹⁰⁴ Thus chronicles writing about the same second-millennium event have a marked tendency to describe it in the same words;¹⁰⁵ but chronicles reporting on a single year in the

⁹³Here, for statistical purposes, Chronicles 20A and 20B have been counted as separate chronicles (see note 80 above); and Chronicles 1A, 1B, and 1C have been counted as a single chronicle.

⁹⁴Chr. 20A:31–36 = Chr. 20B:1–7.

⁹⁵Chr.15:6 (damaged, but preserving a month-day date) = Chr. 16:12.

⁹⁶Usually with some rearrangement of phrases in context, e.g., Chr. 21 i 8'–17' = Chr. 22 i 5'–6', 10'–14' (with confusion of some personal names in the Babylonian chronicle); cf. Chr. 21 ii 27'–28' = Chr. 24:6. See also Chr. 21 i 19'–20' and Chr. 22 iii 21–22, which obviously deal with the same episode, but have very few phrases in common (*ina URU su-ga-gil-ga ša eli Idiqlat...šābēšu idūk*) and do not agree on the name of the Assyrian king involved (Adad-nirari vs. Enlil-nirari).

⁹⁷Chr. 1A iv 34–36 = Chr. 14:35–36 = Chr. 16:5–7.

⁹⁸In so far as can be judged at present, all surviving tablets of Babylonian chronicles were copied in the first millennium, as was the Synchronistic History. There is reason in most cases for believing that the texts were also composed in the first millennium.

⁹⁹Chr. 21 i 8'–17' = Chr. 22 i 5'–6', 10'–14'. See also note 96 above.

¹⁰⁰Chr. 21 ii 27'–28' = Chr. 24:6. See also note 96 above.

¹⁰¹Chr. 24:4'–5' = Chr. 25:27–28; Chr. 24:8'–11' = Chr. 25:29–34. For collations of these portions of Chr. 24, see Walker, *Kraus AV*, p. 416.

¹⁰²Chr. 1A iv 34–36 = Chr. 14:35–36 = Chr. 16:5–7. Chr. 1A iv 1–38 is in large part parallel to Chr. 14:10–39, as discussed in detail above.

¹⁰³Chr. 14:31–32, 35–37 = Chr. 16:1–8.

¹⁰⁴Chr. 16:12 = Chr.15:6 (partly restored).

¹⁰⁵A notable exception to this is the Sugagu episode in Chrs. 21 and 22. See note 96 above.

seventh century may narrate substantially different events¹⁰⁶ or contain only partially overlapping materials.¹⁰⁷ Chroniclers writing in the first millennium about events in the late second or early first millennium may have had a limited range of sources available, to judge from the number of repetitious passages and verbal similarities. They sometimes reworked phrasing—or even details¹⁰⁸—to suit their purposes. The seventh century seems to have offered a greater range of materials—or perhaps more imaginative editors—since entries concerning years from 694 to 648 BC exhibit significant variations.¹⁰⁹

The second question deals with selectivity. Why, in the passages noted above, did Chronicle 14 omit some episodes narrated in Chronicle 1A? Why did Chronicle 1A leave out some of the material in Chronicle 14? Thus phrased, these questions presume access of the chroniclers to a proximate common source or to at least a common and restricted body of material—which may or may not have been true for the compilers of the surviving documents. Can one say that Chronicle 14 has a pro-Assyrian or pro-Esarhaddon bias because it does not contain references to the Elamite attack on Sippar in 675 and to an Assyrian defeat in Egypt in 674?¹¹⁰ It would be difficult in these cases to establish that we are dealing with omissions by one chronicler rather than additions by the other.¹¹¹ We cannot be sure whether we are dealing with pro-Assyrian bias, anti-Assyrian bias, or endeavors by an ancient chronicler to augment his defective/broken primary material by introducing extraneous anecdotes (e.g., to make his account more comprehensive or to fill in damaged sections). It should be noted that neither of the two passages involved is supported by independent evidence. In addition, it has been pointed out that the Elamite attack description is suspect on other grounds: it largely repeats for the sixth year of Esarhaddon an entry already given for the sixth year of Ashur-nadin-shumi (a royal name almost identical in spelling to Esarhaddon in the ancient writing system),¹¹² and strikes an anomalous note in the general tenor of Babylonian–Elamite relations between 690 and 665. The defeat of the Assyrian army in Egypt raises other problems. It has not been estab-

¹⁰⁶Compare the entries for the year 694 in Chr. 1A ii 36–45 and Chr. 15:1 and for the years 651 and 650 in Chr. 15:7–19 and Chr. 16:17–21.

¹⁰⁷Chrs. 15:6, 16:9–12.

¹⁰⁸Contrast the use of “Bel and son of Bel” [Chr. 25:33] with “Marduk” [Chr. 24:11], perhaps giving an indication as to date of origin or reworking.

¹⁰⁹The fact that the events described were much closer in time to the chronicle compilers or editors may also have been a significant factor.

¹¹⁰In addition, is there any detectable pattern which would also cover the other longer insertions or omissions (e.1, 3, 5, 6 on pp. 89–90 above)? It may be difficult to infer bias in these cases.

¹¹¹Or some combination of the two.

¹¹²AN.ŠĀR-MU-MU vs. AN.ŠĀR-ŠEŠ-MU. Neo-Babylonian ŠEŠ and MU are not always readily distinguishable.

lished, beyond reasonable doubt, that the two statements in Chronicles 1A and 14 about the activity of the/an Assyrian army in early Addaru 674 are mutually exclusive; and attempts have been made to reconcile the two.¹¹³ If one were forced to choose between various alternatives, it is not clear which would be preferable: separate invasions of Egypt and Chaldea by two Assyrian armies, an error in time or destination in one of the chronicles (and, if so, in which chronicle—since again neither alternative—Egypt or Chaldea—is supported by directly pertinent independent evidence), or differently worded descriptions of the same campaign. Thus evidence in favor of a pro-Esarhaddon bias in Chronicle 14 is not more obvious than evidence for an anti-Assyrian or a pro-Marduk bias in the corresponding part of Chronicle 1A.¹¹⁴ If anything, the evidence might point more toward seeing in Chronicle 1A a scribal attempt to introduce outside material.¹¹⁵ As for relative reliability, Chronicles 1A and 14 share about 85% of their material; so most of their statements mesh and are thus equally accurate or inaccurate in either document. Where Chronicles 1A and 14 disagree, it would have to be established in each case which testimony is to be preferred—e.g., on month or day dates for specific events.¹¹⁶ In fact, in one instance of factual discrepancy, it is obvious that Chronicle 1A is wrong;¹¹⁷ and elsewhere it can be seen that Chronicle 1A was copied from a source that was damaged¹¹⁸ or otherwise defective,¹¹⁹ and that material has been added to that source, sometimes with insufficient precision.¹²⁰ We are still far from understanding the intricacies of these chronicles, and our guesses about their composition and origin are just tentative efforts at comprehension. The two texts obviously share a common tradition, and we are still looking for ways to explain their divergences. Simple pro-Assyrian historical bias on the part of Chronicle 14 (the Esarhaddon Chronicle) may be viewed as one possible explanation, but it is hardly the only solution and not necessarily the most

¹¹³See note 91 above.

¹¹⁴Or is it possible that items reflecting poorly on Marduk were not included in Chronicle 1A? Grayson, *CRRA* 17, pp. 161–62 points out the curious omission in Chronicle 1A of both the theft of the Marduk statue in 689 and the subsequent non-celebration of the New Year's Festival.

¹¹⁵For which a case could be made in Chr. 1A i 6–8, where lack of written material (therefore an oral source?) is alleged.

¹¹⁶Without independent evidence, it may be difficult to prove which of two contested day dates may be right. In the case of disagreement over months, e.g., for the Assyrian invasion of Egypt in 671, considerations of climate and logistics may also eventually be invoked in search of a solution.

¹¹⁷Chr. 1A iv 12, where it totals the regnal years of Humban-ḫaltaš II as “five” (rather than six, as given correctly in Chr. 14:17); this figure may be calculated from the king's date of accession as listed in Chr. 1A iii 33.

¹¹⁸Chr. 1A iv 19, 23.

¹¹⁹Note the imprecise designation of year and month (MU NU ZU, ITI NU ZU) in Chr. 1A iii 16, iv 14.

¹²⁰Cf. the less precise chronological formula *ana tarṣi RN* in Chr. 1A i 6; see note 139 below.

likely. The problem needs further study and, if possible, additional evidence.

There is a different set of problems affecting the entries for Esarhaddon's eighth year in these two chronicles. At first glance, it may seem as though the discrepancies are of the same types outlined above: Esarhaddon's wife dies on XII-5 [Chr. 1A iv 22] vs. XII-6 [Chr. 14:23],¹²¹ and the [conquest] of Shubria takes place on X-(day broken) [Chr. 1A iv 19] vs. XII-18 [Chr. 14:24]. But, if one looks again at the account in Chronicle 1A, there are further anomalies: the name of Shubria is misspelled KUR *šub-ri-«za»-a-a*, and the booty from Shubria is said to enter Uruk in month IX (supposedly a month before Shubria is captured). The use of the verb "enter" here is peculiar, since otherwise in this chronicle the only subjects of the verb *erēbu* are gods,¹²² kings,¹²³ and an army.¹²⁴ Also why would Assyrian booty have been sent to Uruk, a Babylonian city, which is, moreover, on the far side of Assyria from Shubria?

A closer examination of the immediate context in Chronicle 1A sheds light on these difficulties and suggests an alternate hypothesis. In this section of the tablet, at the beginning of the entries for the eighth and tenth years, there are two scribal notes—occurring nowhere else in this text—which indicate *he-pl*, "break" (iv 19, 23), i.e., that the source from which the chronicle was copied had been damaged at these points. If damage in this section was extensive, it could explain why the entry for the ninth year—the only missing portion of Esarhaddon's reign—is lacking.¹²⁵ It might also account for the strange KUR *šub-ri-«za»-a-a* and raise the possibility that the damaged date in Chronicle 1A iv 19 was not originally connected with what now immediately follows *he-pl*, namely the conquest of Shubria. It raises the possibility that the date Kislimu (month IX) and booty were originally dissociated from the phrase "entered Uruk," which would more likely have had some subject such as "gods of Uruk" (who in any case seem to have been frequent travellers).¹²⁶ The sequence of month names X-IX raises the possibility that the heading for the missing ninth year might have intervened at some point in the damaged section.¹²⁷ In so far as I am aware, there is no independent non-chronicle evidence that the wife of Esarhaddon died in his eighth rather than his ninth year; and we may have to reckon with events recorded between these two indications of "damage" eventually being assigned

¹²¹Already listed as f.3 on p. 90 above.

¹²²iii 29; iv 18, 36.

¹²³ii 40, iv 9.

¹²⁴ii 48.

¹²⁵Also the calendrical formula at the beginning of the entry for the eighth year differs slightly from that used for the other years of Esarhaddon (see note 146 below).

¹²⁶Chr. 1A iii 2-3, 29; cf. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 58; Aynard, *Asb.*, p. 58.

¹²⁷Though month names do not always occur in chronological sequence in the chronicles.

to the ninth year.¹²⁸ These are possibilities for interpreting a troublesome section of text that is bracketed by indications of "break" just before and after the problem area. I would stress the designation "possibilities," since arguments from silence are elusive and can offer a wide range of options without fear of contradiction.

We shall next consider the relationship of the Neo-Babylonian chronicles to the astronomical diaries. Wiseman was the first to suggest a connection between the two groups of texts, adducing that (Babylonian) chronicles were "but extracts or selections from a full history which, like the better known Annals of the Assyrian Kings, may have been compiled annually."¹²⁹ He described in detail the contents of the astronomical diaries and suggested that, if the diaries themselves were not those annual full compilations ("the basis of a progressive historiography"), they at least indicated that such material was readily available.¹³⁰ Grayson took this suggestion a step further and argued on several grounds—phraseology, typology, content, and chronology—that the astronomical diaries were the source from which the Neo- and Late Babylonian chronicles¹³¹ were extracted.¹³² But no one has yet compared the only known entry shared between an astronomical diary and a chronicle, namely the ac-

¹²⁸There is a further problem in that the reading of the numbers in "seventh year" [Chr. 14:20] and "eighth year" [Chr. 14:23] are not entirely certain. My examination of the tablet, confirmed also by Irving Finkel and Mark Geller, suggests that "eighth year" and "ninth year" would be possible readings for these two numbers, respectively.

¹²⁹*Chron.*, p. 4. Wiseman believed that "a chronicle of the principal national events was kept at Babylon from at least as early as the Kassite period (c. sixteenth to fourteenth centuries BC) until the end of the Seleucid era" (*ibid.*, p. 1). The various chronicle texts known to us, with their diverse formats, should then be viewed as "summaries designed for different purposes" (*ibid.*, p. 3). Grayson, to a large degree, followed Wiseman in these views; see note 132 below.

¹³⁰*Chron.*, p. 4. This would hold true especially for events dealing with times before Nabonassar.

¹³¹Namely Chrs. 1–13b, 14–17, and the latter portion of Chr. 23.

¹³²Grayson, *Chronicles*, pp. 13–14 and *Or. NS* 49 (1980) 174. Grayson also advanced a source view similar to Wiseman's (see note 129 above) in that many of the Babylonian chronicles [Chrs. 1–17, 23] were extracts from a running account of Babylonian history kept from at least the twelfth century on. Like all chronicles of Grayson's "category A," these chronicles were probably "résumés or extracts made from running accounts" of Babylonian history (*Chronicles*, p. 14; cf. *Or. NS* 49 [1980] 174). These running accounts, for at least texts dealing with the mid-eighth century on [Chrs. 1–16], were "probably identical with astronomical diaries" (*Chronicles*, p. 14). Striking similarities of material in the Religious Chronicle [Chr. 17] and the Chronicle of Market Prices [Chr. 23] indicate that "information of the kind found in late astronomical diaries was available in written form well before the seventh century BC" (*Chronicles*, p. 61; cf. *ibid.*, p. 38). Thus, for Grayson, the evidence indicates that "as early as the reign of Merodach-baladan I (1173–1161 BC) an account of events similar to, if not identical with, astronomical diaries was being compiled" (*ibid.*, p. 61). This running account is endowed with exceptional qualities of reliability ("unimpeachable source," *ibid.*, p. 34). Unfortunately no examples of either Wiseman's "full history" or Grayson's "running account" have as yet been found; their existence remains hypothetical, as does their relevance as source material for the chronicles. (If such accounts were kept conveniently on temporary writing-boards, this could explain their apparent negative survival rate [cf. Chr. 15:23].)

count of the battle between the Assyrians and Babylonians at Hirītu on XII-27-652 BC.¹³³ We juxtapose the two accounts below.

Chronicle 16

- 13 ŠE 27 ÉRIN-ni KUR aš+šur u ÉRIN KUR.URI.KI
 14 šal-tum ina ħi-rit DÙ.MEŠ-ma ÉRIN KUR.URI.KI
 15 ina MÈ EDIN BAL.ME-ma ŠI.ŠI-šú-nu ma-a-diš GAR-in
 16 SAL.KÚR GAR-at šal-tum sad-rat

BM 32312, astronomical diary for 652 BC, column iv¹³⁴

- 18' [x x x x] ħi-ri-tum NAM UD.KIB.NUN.KI ÉRIN KUR.URI.KI u KUR aš-šur
 19' [šal-tú KI a-ħa]-meš DÙ.MEŠ-ma ÉRIN KUR.URI.KI BAL.ME ma-a²-diš GAZ

There is no doubt that these sources are describing the same battle, since the date, place, identities of the combatants, and name of the winner match. But differences in information and phraseology are also worthy of note: (a) the chronicle describes the circumstances of the encounter as *ina tāħaz šēri*, "in a battle in the countryside," which the diary does not, and also appends at the end of the passage a statement about continuing hostilities *nukurtu šaknat šaltu sadrat*; (b) the diary adds the information that Hirītu was located in "the province of Sippar" (NAM UD.KIB.NUN.KI) and the minor phrase *itti aħāmeš*, "with each other"; (c) the order of the contestants (Assyria/Akkad; Akkad/Assyria) varies in the two descriptions, as does the place at which the name *Hirītu* (Chronicle: *Īirit*) occurs; (d) different phrases are used to describe the defeat: *ŠI.ŠI-šunu ma²-diš šakin* vs. *ma²-diš dākū* (though the adverb is common to both). These differences are not substantial, but the chronicle contains minor information that the diary does not; and it would be difficult—despite similarities in phrasing—to prove verbal dependence of the chronicle on the diary. While it would be premature to state categorically on the basis of this comparison that astronomical diaries were not the source of the Neo-Babylonian chronicles, the differences between the two accounts do not provide clear evidence in favor of the "astronomical diary as source?" theory. Furthermore, in the case of the chronicle narrative concerning

¹³³Corresponding to an undetermined date in March or April 651, according to the Julian calendar.

¹³⁴The day date "27" is contained in the line preceding the passage here (iv 17), with day "28" following in iv 20'. Neither year nor month names are preserved in this diary, but these are confirmed by astronomical phenomena recorded. The text has been partially published by A. J. Sachs, "Babylonian Observational Astronomy," in F. R. Hodson, ed., *The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 48 and pl. 3 (photo) and is now edited in full in A. J. Sachs and Hermann Hunger, *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*, vol. 1: *Diaries from 652 B.C. to 262 B.C.* (Vienna: Österreichische Akad. der Wiss., 1988), pp. 42–47.

the campaign of Neriglissar's third year [Chr. 6], the text gives much more detail than is found in any known astronomical diary entry;¹³⁵ it is highly unlikely that a chronicle of this sort would derive its information from a diary.¹³⁶ It is advisable, therefore, to suspend judgment on the question until more corresponding treatments of the same events can be found in diaries and chronicles. Though diaries and chronicles employ a similar hackneyed vocabulary to describe military and political occurrences, this is unlikely by itself to indicate derivation of the chronicles from the diaries.¹³⁷

This concludes the discussion of the proposed topics dealing with the Babylonian Chronicle [Chronicle 1]: its textual tradition, its participation in a series, its relationship with the Esarhaddon Chronicle [Chronicle 14] in the form of shared passages, and its putative source material in the astronomical diaries. We have seen that the textual tradition is complex, with at least two substantially differing versions [Chronicles 1A and 1B] covering the eighth century, and that, depending on one's viewpoint, a case can be made for treating these two documents as separate chronicles rather than as varieties of a single chronicle. We have learned that, while Chronicle 1A is marked by its colophon as belonging to a series, there is no explicit evidence that other tablets are known which belong to the same series. We have observed that Chronicles 1A and 14 probably had at least one source in common and that Chronicle 1A is not necessarily more reliable or less biased than Chronicle 14. Finally, we have seen that the astronomical diaries have yet to be established as the source from which the Neo- and Late Babylonian Chronicles were derived; the only passages in which a

¹³⁵Note especially the terrain descriptions in Chr. 6:7, 11, 16–17.

¹³⁶It would also have been difficult to derive Chronicle 1A directly from astronomical diaries. To survey a period of seventy-eight years (745–668), would one have to read through 156 six-month diaries? How much purely Assyrian material (Esarhaddon's campaigns from Assyria) would have been recorded in the daily entries of Babylonian diaries?

¹³⁷Nonetheless the vocabulary/phraseology of the diaries and chronicles should be compared carefully and statistically—and contrasted with usage in other text types—when a representative corpus of diaries has been made readily available. As seen above in note 79, preliminary analyses and detailed studies of such evidence do not always yield similar results.

The other points in Grayson's argumentation (typology, content, and chronology) are not particularly convincing. He places both Neo-Babylonian chronicles and astronomical diaries in his documentary Category A, a very broad range which also includes date lists and early kinglists; but not all documents in this category are *ipso facto* related. The content of the chronicles and diaries may be the same in that both are interested in recording political and religious events, but only the single incident cited here is known at present to have been recorded in both types of source. The chronological argument is largely hypothetical, since it is based on the assertion that both types of document (astronomical diary and Neo-Babylonian chronicle) begin their coverage in 747, the first year of Nabonassar. In point of fact, it is difficult to establish that either of these types begins at that date. Chr. 1A begins in 745 BC (not 747), Chr. 1B/C may begin earlier (see note 60 above), and the earliest known astronomical diary deals with the year 652 BC. The chronological argument thus lacks confirmation from primary sources and must still be regarded as hypothetical, based as it is for the most part on later Hellenistic assessments of the situation.

diary and a chronicle narrate the same event do not provide evidence for verbal dependence of the latter on the former, and at least one of the Neo-Babylonian chronicles [Chronicle 6] presents much more detail than is available in any known astronomical diary.

There can be little doubt that the Babylonian Chronicle [Chronicle 1] marks the beginning of a new tradition. From this point on,¹³⁸ chronicles are more concerned with precise chronology and regularly list events, dated by Babylonian regnal years, in close chronological series.¹³⁹ Those chronicles which are not simply extracts¹⁴⁰ or theme-oriented¹⁴¹ deal fairly comprehensively with reigns and do not list just one or other isolated occurrences during the tenure of a monarch. The Babylonian Chronicle itself marks a transitional phase in these developments, being selective in its recording of years between 745 and 681 (covering an average of about one year in three) and then, after the accession of Esarhaddon, making an entry for each year with the exception of his ninth (where there was defective source material).¹⁴² The later Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian chronicles [Chronicles 2–13b] record events for each year or leave a space with the heading for the year marked.¹⁴³ Occasionally in Chronicle 1A, month and day dates begin to be noted, especially for the beginning and end of reigns.¹⁴⁴ Battles, changes of reign, civil disturbances, and religious events (especially movements of cult statues) continue to be the focus of chronicle

¹³⁸I.e., beginning with chronicles that commence their coverage from the mid-eighth century on. Contrast, for example, Chronicle 24, which ends its old-style coverage at some point in the latter half of the eighth century.

¹³⁹There are later exceptions as in Chronicle 1A i 6–8, which may have been adapted from an old-style source (note the formula *ana tarši RN*).

Chronicles written in the first millennium which begin their coverage before the eighth century occasionally use regnal years. Chronicle 23, after employing the formula *ana tarši* for (H)ammurapi and Kurigalzu, dates by regnal year (MU.N RN, without KÁM) for Marduk-apla-iddina (I?) and later. Chronicle 24 dates a few entries between 1000 and 978 BC by regnal year [lines 14–17, without KÁM] and then records a regnal year in the middle of an early-eighth-century entry [rev. 10, with KÁM]. In Chronicle 17, MU.N.KÁM (RN) is regularly used to record events in the early tenth century—though there are not systematic individual year entries and the text does not always proceed in chronological order.

¹⁴⁰E.g., Chronicle 15.

¹⁴¹E.g., Chronicle 16.

¹⁴²Did this type of coverage continue for the reigns of Shamash-shum-ukin and Kandalanu? If so, known chronicles do not provide it. Can one distinguish different sources for Chr. 1A in the pre-Esarhaddon section and Esarhaddon—Shamash-shum-ukin section? It might pay to make a closer study of date formulae (cf. note 146 below), entry and vocabulary styles, etc. Note, for instance, in descriptions of plundering, the decided preference for *ḫabātu* and cognates in the pre-Esarhaddon section (except for ii 47) and for *šallatu* and cognates (except for iv 28; cf. 1C iv 7) thereafter.

¹⁴³E.g., the eighth year of Nabonidus as covered in Chronicle 7 ii 9.

¹⁴⁴Starting with the Assyrians Shalmaneser V [Chronicle 1A i 27] and Sargon II [*ibid.*, i 31] and their accession dates in Assyria.

coverage; and the greater chronological precision is often matched by fuller reporting. Thus the Babylonian Chronicle can be seen to inaugurate a new style of coverage, adding a further dimension to the claim of its colophon to be the first in a series of texts.¹⁴⁵

Mesopotamian chronicles continue to be a fascinating subject for study, and there remain many essential questions yet to be addressed. First and foremost, the genre "chronicle" should be defined and a suitable typology established. Then the documents themselves should be carefully analyzed: physical features (including layout), scribal handwriting, literary and calendrical patterns and formulae,¹⁴⁶ style of composition, and differences between chronicles and between sections of a single document should be considered (among other topics). What clues can be obtained from these documents bearing on the nature of their sources and on the purposes, predilections, and idiosyncrasies of their scribes? Can one with profit indulge in more sophisticated literary analysis, including such current fashions as deconstruction, semiotics, possible oral sources, or the like? What can we learn about non-formulaic as well as formulaic stylistic affinities—if any—between chronicles and kinglists,

¹⁴⁵Another conclusion that could be drawn from this study concerns the relative non-canonicity of the non-literary Babylonian chronicles [Chronicles 1–17, 20A–20B, 22–25]. With the exception of the colophon to Chronicle 1A, there is no mention of a series; and even Chronicle 1A does not give a name for the series to which it belongs. Chronicles 3, 4, and 5, though linked by catchlines, list no series name or title. The GIGAM.GIGAM and GIGAM.DIDLI texts [Chronicles 20A, 14] have no connection other than the generic designation. The almost total lack of true duplicates (here excluding Chronicles 1A and 1B because of their manifest dissimilarities)—Chronicle 1C being the only possible exception—and the many parallel passages between those texts which deal with times before the Neo-Babylonian Empire (75% of these texts share passages with at least one other chronicle) indicate a fluidity of compositional options and an access to a body of common material that may have impeded the development of a fixed canonical tradition.

¹⁴⁶In some instances, calendrical formulae might reveal something about sources and are worthy of more detailed study. In Chronicle 1A, for example, the atypical beginning *ana tarši RN* (i 6) probably indicates that this section was taken from a different source than the rest of the document (cf. the notation *ul šaṭir* in i 8). But within the rest of the text, other calendrical-formula patterns can be detected: MU.N RN beginning all formulae from Nabonassar through Merodach-baladan II (i 9, 11, 14, 19, 24, 29, 33, 38, 43), MU.N.KĀM RN for the sections from Bēl-ibni through 681 (ii 24, 26, 32, 36, 46, iii 13, 28 ["kingless"]); only in iii 19 is the KĀM omitted, but it is present in the parallel in Chr. 1B iii 19), then MU.N.KĀM RN for the initial year of Esarhaddon and Shamash-shum-ukin followed by MU.N.KĀM without RN for subsequent years of these kings (iii 39, 48, iv 5, 9, 16, 23, 29, 30, with only the problematic year 8 reverting atypically to MU.8.KĀM RN in iv 19).

The few calendrical formulae surviving in Chronicle 1B exhibit a similar pattern: MU.N (RN) for Merodach-baladan II and Sargon II (ii 3', 7', 9', 15', 17', 18') and MU.N.KĀM RN for Mušēzib-Marduk (iii 11', 19').

The month and day formulae may be less revealing, but still striking is the omission of the ITI determinative before months [Chr. 1A i 32, iv 10; Chr. 15:6, 7; Chr. 16:13] and the U₄ and KĀM determinatives for days [Chr. 1A iv 10; Chr. 15:6; Chr. 16:13]. Dates recorded simply as KIN 7, ZĪZ 8, ŠE 27 [Chrs. 1A iv 10, 15:6, 16:13] seem stark and similar to the abbreviated formulae in astronomical texts.

datelists, diaries, interval texts, or similar chronological documents; and what are these likely to reveal about topics other than stylistic preferences of authors? Can one view an Assyrian chronicle tradition—if such existed¹⁴⁷—as a court-dominated propaganda tool, potentially useful for such key information as names of places and participants, but only occasionally and accidentally veracious in dealing with the outcome of military ventures or with royal reputations? Can one view the Babylonian chronicle tradition as private—or at least non-official—, usually unchauvinist, but not necessarily reliable in detail?¹⁴⁸ We are still groping for basic perspectives on many of these issues, and the field promises to be fertile and challenging for further investigation.

APPENDIX A

The Text of Chronicles 1B and 1C

Since there is no separate modern transliteration available for Chronicles 1B and 1C, I append the following edition made from the originals in the British Museum.

CHRONICLE 1B

1B i

(Lacuna of at least seven lines)

- 1' [] x nu (x) du
-
- 2' [] x TIN.TIR.KI TUKUL-ti-A-É.ŠÁR.RA
- 3' [K]U-ab MU.BI
- 4' [-d]ʿam-ma!¹ URU rab-bi-lu
- 5' [-n]u iḫ-ta-bat
- 6' [-a]z-ʿzu¹ i-ta-bak
-

¹⁴⁷Van Seters' qualifications on this subject (see note 7 above) are salutary.

¹⁴⁸Once again, it should be observed that lack of nationalistic prejudice does not insure factual reliability; and the Babylonian chronicles have their share of proven errors. Contrast the views of Grayson, who sees the Babylonian Chronicle Series [Chrons. 1–13b] as containing "a reasonably reliable and representative record," which is to be regarded as closer to the truth than conflicting testimony, especially when the latter is provided by Assyrian sources (*Or* 49 [1980] 175 and n. 167), and Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982), pp. 53–54, who points out likely chronological errors in the chronicles (when contrasted with independent Assyrian and Babylonian evidence).

As for most information contained in the chronicles, modern historians of ancient Mesopotamia have long since learned to live with unsupported documentary evidence (*testis unus*). But we should not forget the fragile nature of hypotheses built on such foundations, no matter how long they have been in place.

7' [-m]a-ni-^rga¹-dš LUGAL8' [A]Š.TE KU-^rab¹9' [-i]^ri-A¹-É.ŠÁR.RA

10' [] KUR

11' []x (x) KUR ^rur¹-ra-du

12' []x x LU

13' []x ^rnam¹ gar/šá

14' []x ki

15' [] (x)

(Lacuna)

IB ii

(Lacuna)

1' LUGAL-ut KUR¹ [

2' DUMU NI[N

3' MU.6 KUR aš+š[ur

4' TA SAG LUGAL¹[

5' a-di MU.(x)[

6' it-ti ^rdAM¹[AR.UTU-]x7' MU.10 ^dAMAR.UTU-A-MU x x (x) []x8' iḫ-te-pi ^rhu-bu-ut-su iḫ¹-[ta-]bat9' MU.^r11¹[(+?)] ^dAMAR.UTU-A-MU LUGAL-^rDU¹ x x (x) KI10' ur-dam-ma šal-^rtum¹ ana ŠĀ ^mrd²[]-^rMU¹11' DÛ-uš-^rma¹ ^dAMAR.UTU-A-MU ^rina IGI¹ []x

12' ana KUR NIM.MA ZÁḪ 12 MU.MEŠ []x

13' LUGAL-ut TIN.TIR.KI x[]x

14' LUGAL-DU ina TIN.TIR.KI ina AŠ.TE ^rKU¹-[ab]15' MU.13 LUGAL-DU ŠU ^dEN iṣ-ša-[bat]

16' BĀD-ia-a-ki-nu ik-ta-[šad]

17' MU.14 LUGAL ina [KUR]

18' [M]U.^r15¹ ITL.^rDU⁶ U₄.22.^rKĀM¹ DINGIR.MEŠ šá KUR tam-t[im]

19' []x-šá-nu GUR.MEŠ BAD.MEŠ ina KUR aš-šur GAR []

20' []x x KUR ta-ba-lu []

21' []x x x (x) []

(Lacuna)

IB iii

- (Lacuna)
- 1' [] .KI *šal-^rtum ana^r ŠÀ* []
- 2' 'DÛ-*uš-ma^r ina MÈ EDIN ša-bi*[*t*] []
- 3' *a-bi-ik* 'ITI.DU₆^r U₄.26.KÁM 'hal^r-[] []
- 4' LUGAL KUR NIM 'UN.MEŠ^r-šú *is-šu-šú-^rma^r x* []
- 5' GAZ.MEŠ-šú 6 MU.MEŠ 'hal-*lu^r-šú LUGAL-ut* 'KUR^r[] []
- 6' DÛ-*uš NÍG.DU ina KUR NIM ina AŠ.TE KU-^rab^r*
- 7' EGIR ^d30-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-SU *ana KUR 'NIM^r ú-^rrid^r-ma*
- 8' TA KUR *ra-a-ši EN É bu-na-ak-ku*
- 9' *iḫ-te-pi ḫu-bu-ut-su iḫ-ta-bat*
- 10' ^m*mu-še-zib-^d AMAR.UTU ina TIN.TIR.KI ina AŠ.TE KU-ab*
-
- 11' MÛ.1.'KÁM *mu-še^r-zib-^d AMAR.UTU ITI.NE U₄.8.KÁM*
- 12' (x) [] 'KUR NIM^r *ina 'si-ḫi^r ša-^rbit^r-ma* GAZ
- 13' x (x) x NÍG.DU LUGAL-*ut* KUR NIM DÛ-*uš*
- 14' '*me-na^r-nu ina KUR NIM ina 'AŠ^r.TE KU-ab*
- 15' 'MU(?) NU(?) ZU^r *me-na-nu ÉRIN KUR NIM u KUR UR1.KI*
- 16' *id-ki-e-ma ina URU ḫa-lu-li-^re^r*
- 17' *šal-tum ana ŠÀ ÉRIN KUR aš+šur DÛ-uš-^rm^r[a]*
- 18' BALA-ti KUR *aš+šur* 'GAR^r [x]
-
- 19' 'MU^r.4.KÁM *mu-še-zib-^d AMAR.UTU ITI.BÁR U₄.x []*
- 20' *me-na-nu* 'LUGAL NIM *mí(?)*-šit-tum(?)^r [] []
- 21' 'KA^r-x (x)[] []
- 22' []ITI x [] []

(Lacuna)

IB iv

- (Lacuna)
- 1' [] x
- 2' [] x(=kát?)
-
- 3' [] LÚ.GÚ.EJN.NA
- 4' [] 'KUR^r *aš+šur*
- 5' [] -i-ku
-
- 6' [] x *šal-lat*
- 7' [] ; -i]e-ḫir
-
- 8' [] -z]a
- (Lacuna)

CHRONICLE 1C

1C iii

- (Lacuna)
- 1' x []
- 2' *ina IGI (x) []*

3' ana KUR NI[M]
 4' LUGAL N[IM]
 5' GAZ (x) []
 6' LÚ.ĜÚ.ĠEN.NA]
 7' 𐎠 DI[NGIR]
 (Lacuna)

IC iv

(Lacuna)
 1' [] (x) []
 2' [d]i-ik-tum ṣá mi-šir di-k[á(?)]
 3' [s]u šal-lat DINGIR.MEŠ-šú i-tab-ku
 4' [U₄(x+)]¹.KÁM me-em¹-pi URU LUGAL-tú
 5' []x LUGAL-šú ul-te-zib
 6' [].MEŠ ŠEŠ-šú ina ŠU^{II} ša-ab-tu
 7' [s]u šal-lat UN.MEŠ hab-tu NĠG.ŠU-šú
 8' []-tal-lu-ni

9' [K]UR aš+šur¹ LÚ.GAL.MEŠ-šú
 10' []x-tú ina GIŠ.TUKUL id-duk

11' [K]UR aš+šur ana KUR mi-šir DU-a[k]
 12' [G]IG-ma ina ITI.APIN U₄.10.KÁ[M]
 13' [.ME]Š '12 MU¹.MEŠ AN.ŠÁR-ŠEŠ-M[U]
 14' [] D(Ú?)]
 (Lacuna)

APPENDIX B

Miscellaneous Chronicle Comments, Addenda, and Corrigenda

The following observations are arranged in order according to the sequence of documents in Grayson, *Chronicles*. Changes based on collation of the originals are so indicated.

Chr. 1A i 21. It is better to translate *iktašad* as “he defeated,” especially if one identifies Mukin-zēri with Nabū-mukin-zēri (since there is a text dated in the latter’s fourth year).

Chr. 1A ii 48. Part of the end of [KUR] before *aš+šur* is clearly visible (collation).

Chr. 1A iii 1. The sign *ša* (which might also be read as *šu-ur*) occurs usually just between DINGIR.MEŠ and a following GN in Chronicles 1, 14, and 16. Here it is glossed *šá*.

Chr. 1A iii 3. *ina piḫat Nippuri*: “in the province of Nippur.”

Chr. 1A iii 5–10. These lines are written in a smaller script than what precedes and what follows (collation). Were they inserted into a space left blank earlier?

Chr. 1A iii 29. The name of the country (“[Elá]miki”) is far from clear. Only part of the final vertical and a cross trace are preserved (collated). Note that Elam is not followed by the determinative KI elsewhere in this text, except once in the title “King of Elam” in i 37 (vs. more than twenty occurrences without the determinative). A reading [aš+šur] would be graphically possible; but KUR aš+šur is never followed by KI in this text.

Chr. IA iii 37. The line begins U₄.2.K[ÁM š]d ITI.ŠE' (collated).

Chr. IA iii 42. The critical apparatus (*Chronicles*, p. 82) should have noted that the determinative KUR before the second *Elámti* is omitted in Chronicle 1C.

Chr. IA iv 2. At the beginning of the preserved section, a reading [...]ri is more likely.

Chr. IA iv 27. In view of the parallel in Chr. 1C iv 6', a reading DUMU.ŠEŠ' is preferable. See note 59 above.

Chr. IA iv 39-43/44. See pp. 84-85 above and note 68.

Chr. 1C iii 4'. There is a KUR between LUGAL and NIM (collated).

Chr. 2:14. Translate: "(In) the first year in which there was no king in the land, (in) the month Arahšamnu, day 26" For this type of date, compare Chronicle 1A iii 28. For *išti* as "first," see CAD I/J 278.

Chr. 2:38, 41. Usurper is *šar ḥammad*²i (construct plus genitive); also in Chr. 21 iii 33, Chr. 24:8, Chr. 25:29.

Chr. 7. For comments on the ductus of the tablet, see p. 86 above.

Chr. 10. BM 34660 has been joined to BM 36313 (effected by Irving Finkel).

Chr. 10:12. The line contains the name of the city wall of Borsippa. Read *dalāti*(GIŠ.IG.MEŠ) šá DÜG.GA-AMASŠ-šú! BĀD 'bár-x' , "the gates of Ṭab(i)-supūršu, the wall of Bors[ippa(!)]." Cf. VAB 4 74 ii 22, etc.; 2 R 50 i-ii 27; RLA 1 407; CAD S 398a.

Chr. 14:7. The end of the first [ša]- sign is visible on the tablet (collation).

Chr. 14:8. The top of the 'šú' sign is partially visible on the tablet (collation).

Chr. 14:27. There is no *ina* on the tablet between LUGAL and KUR *aš+šur* (collation); Sidney Smith's edition is correct. Read LÚ.GAL.MEŠŠ-šú (not -šú).

Chr. 14:33. The tablet has *ul*, not *u-ul* (collation); Smith's edition is correct.

Chr. 14:35. Collation shows that there is probably room only for 'ša URI.KI' here (no KUR).

Chr. 14:36. Day "25"; see note 90 above.

Chr. 14:45. To judge from the traces, this line definitely could not begin MU.2.KÁM (collation).

Chr. 15:23. One could also translate "diverse years (MU.MU)"; cf. one of the suggestions by Millard in *Iraq* 26 (1964) 31.

Chr. 16. The accession number of this text is 99-6-10,109 (information courtesy of C. B. F. Walker).

Chr. 16:1. Part of the number at the beginning of the line seems to be preserved (collation).

Chr. 21 iii 33. See the entry for Chr. 2:38, 41 above.

Chr. 24:8. See the entry for Chr. 2:38, 41 above.

Chr. 24:14. For the writing *ina* BĀR, compare Chronicle 1A i 32. For month names preceding year dates, compare Chr. 17 ii 15, 18, iii 10, though here šá precedes the year.

Chr. 24 r. 7. Emend to *ana tar-ši* ^{md}AMAR.UTU-DIN-su -'E' <DUMU/A> ^{md}AMAR.UTU-*zākir*-MU, "At the time of Marduk-balāssu-iqbi <son> of Marduk-zākir-šumi"? Marduk-balāssu-iqbi is known to be the son of Marduk-zākir-šumi I (RA 16 [1919]126 iv 17.). The preceding entries in the chronicle begin with Babylonian genealogies in the form "RN, son of RN₂." (rev. 4, 5); and a few earlier entries in the chronicle are also abbreviated, indicating only a time (obv. 15-17, rev. '1'), without a following event.

Chr. 25:29. Published by Walker, *Kraus AV*, pp. 399-401. See the entry for Chr. 2:38, 41 above.

ACF 4:3,11. The *būdūi* of the Arameans should probably be translated as "tribes."