THE YEAR-NAMES OF THE FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON

VOLUME I
CHRONOLOGICAL MATTERS
THE YEAR-NAME SYSTEM AND THE DATE-LISTS

by

Malcolm J. A. Horsnell

McMaster University Press
1999

3. THE BASIC PURPOSE OF THE USE OF YEAR-NAMES AND YEAR-FORMULAE

Some statistical data will help to clarify the purpose and use of the year-names and year-formulae. Over 7270 year-formula texts have been studied in this research. The majority of them have been published in copies but a few in transliteration only; some have not been published in any form until now, in the present project. The exemplars are located on various types of literature, namely, economic documents, legal documents, administrative documents, date-lists, promulgation documents, letters, literary and mythological texts, omen and extispicy texts and others. By far the most numerous type of literature bearing year-formulae are the economic, legal and administrative documents, which, not counting the many exemplars (990) from the twenty date-lists and the exemplars (23) from fourteen promulgation documents, account for 99.5% of the remaining year-formulae. Thirty-five exemplars in all are extant from the following types of texts: three letters (3 exemplars), four literary–mythological texts

(4 exemplars), fourteen extispicy texts (14 exemplars), one exercise tablet (4 exemplars), three edicts (6 exemplars), two royal inscriptions (2 exemplars), one astronomical text (1 exemplar), one itinerary (1 exemplar) and one record of death (1 exemplar);[51] the remainder are from economic, legal[52] and administrative documents.

These statistics indicate that the main use of the year-formulae was in the context of the day-to-day activities of commerce, law and administration. The intent of their use was to anchor these activities to a point in time, by dating documents with a final date which included a year-formula and often a month and day as well. In this way the activities described could, when necessary, be chronologically related to previous and subsequent activities, especially activities recorded on other documents.

The overriding theme that seems to unite economic, legal and administrative documents is the concept of "law," broadly defined. The transactions described on each of these types of documents have legal ramifications; this is true not only for legal documents themselves but also for economic and administrative documents. The content of the remaining types of texts, with the exception of the three edicts, are of a more general "non-legal" nature and do not describe any "legal" transactions. Edicts enact major royal legal decisions sporadically at significant moments in a society's history, whereas economic, legal and administrative documents document day-to-day "legal" activities; edicts did not usually have a final date but economic, legal and administrative documents often did.

Date-lists, being a list of year-formulae in chronological order, do not describe any "legal" transactions and so did not need to be dated in relationship to other transactions and documents by appending a final date. That one date-list (DL-A) bears a colophon with a final date is an exception, not the norm, and was not required by the nature of such texts. The text of a date-list itself would usually indicate the approximate date at which the scribe wrote it, namely, soon after the last year-formula recorded on it.

Promulgation documents,[53] which document only a single year-name, exemplified by one to three year-formulae, also do not describe any "legal" transactions. Consequently, a promulgation document contains no final date. However, the year-name documented on it indicates the point in time at which the document was written, namely, during the year commemorated by the year-name or towards the very end of the previous year.

That letters, with only very rare exceptions, bore no final date may appear a little surprising in the light of modern practice, but this is probably due to the fact that the content of letters do not usually presume a "legal" *Sitz im Leben*. Furthermore, the ancients did not have the same concern, as we moderns do, to date all types of written materials. Private letters were often of an ephemeral nature and so needed no date. Public and state letters relied on the authority of the central royal administration to determine the chronological context of the letter and any appropriate response to the letter's content. In contrast, most economic, legal and administrative documents did not rely on the authority of the central royal administration to determine the context or the response since they usually dealt with matters of little significance to the central royal administration. Consequently, the need arose, in view of their broadly defined "legal" context, to provide the latter types of documents with a point of chronological reference and with an anchor to a chronological context by placing a final date on the documents.

Literary-mythological texts and extispicy texts are of a transhistorical nature. Exercise tablets were ephemeral. None of these types of texts needed an anchorage in time in the form of a final date. Only rarely was a year-formula used to date such a text.

---

[51]The interesting adminstrative document Gordon *SCT* 45 (Ae 3 = Ae "d"; KF 2653) is a "Record of Death."

[52]One interesting legal document (VAS 7 118) is a "Steckbrief," i.e. "warrant of arrest" (see Pientka *Die spätaltbab. Zeit* 2, pp.421, 449).

[53]"Promulgation Documents" will be discussed in Chapter XIII.

4. IMPORTANCE OF THE DATE-LISTS

The date-lists are important for the chronology and history of Babylon I because they allow us to reconstruct what may be called the chronogical "backbone" for the history of the dynasty. They function as primary sources for significant historical information presented in a chronological framework. Their chronological reliability is attested by their contemporaneity with the period in question and by their close agreement with each other regarding the number of years for a king's reign.[25] They are, therefore, to be preferred over the chronology of King-List B (hereafter abbreviated as KL-B)[26] when they conflict with the latter. F. Thureau-Dangin has shown that the text AO 5429 (the record of a court decision from the 18th year of Samsuiluna) provides independent evidence of the reliability of the date-lists' chronology.[27] This text states that there were 52 years from Ha 9 to Si 18 (lines 8-11). The chronology of the date-lists supports this statement in contrast to KL-B which allows 64 years for the same period.[28] The date-lists taken as a whole and used critically can, therefore, be accepted as reliable evidence for the calculation of the number of years each king of the dynasty reigned.[29]

---

[25]See Table 31, where all apparent differences are shown to be readily explicable.

[26]KL-B is the only King-List to have been preserved with its figures intact for the lengths of the reigns in the First Dynasty of Babylon. See Paul Rost, "Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte" (*MVAG* 2/II), p.240 (reproduced in Friedrich Schmidtke, *Der Aufbau der babylonischen Chronologie*, plate 4) for the cuneiform of KL-B and Arno Poebel, *Miscellaneous Studies* (AS 14), p.110f, for a transliteration of the section dealing with the First Dynasty of Babylon (obv. lines 1-12). Michael B. Rowton gives a brief description of KL-B in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd. edition, Vol. I/1, p.199.

[27]F. Thureau-Dangin *RA* 9 (1912), p.22.

[28]KL-B has 55 years for Hammurapi, 12 more than allowed by the date-lists.

[29]See Pientka for a similar evaluation (*Die spätaltbabylonische Zeit* 1, p.24).

Let us consider the date-lists' coverage of the reigns of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Table 31 tabulates the number of years ascribed by the date-lists and KL-B to each king of Babylon I. This information can be obtained from the date-lists in three ways: (i) from the totals of the number of years for each king given immediately following the year-formulae for each reign, (ii) from the totals for each king given at the end of the tablet, or (iii) by counting the number of year-formulae recorded on the tablet for each king. For some date-lists none of the three methods is applicable with certainty, due to the lack of totals and/or the bad preservation of the text, e.g. date-lists C, N, P, Q, R, S, T and U.[30] But, one or more of these methods have been used for the other date-lists. The column headed "Actual Years" represents the accepted scholarly conclusions as to the actual number of years for each reign.

The following principles have been used in arriving at these conclusions. (i) That in reliability the date-lists are to be preferred over KL-B. This is strongly supported by the fact that the totals of the date-lists agree whenever they were intended to cover the whole of a reign. (ii) That for the reigns of Sumuabum to Sinmuballit the totals derived from DL-A can be taken as correct. The totals for Sabium and Apilsin are supported by DL-U; the total for Sinmuballit is supported by DL-U if we remember that the scribe omitted the formula for Sm 4 and may have intended to record 20 formulae. We can assume the reliability of DL-A for the reigns from Sumuabum to Sinmuballit because for those other reigns where the accuracy of DL-A can be checked by comparison with other date-lists, i.e. the reigns of Hammurapi to Ammiditana, DL-A can be shown to agree with those other date-lists and, therefore, to be free of error. (iii) That for Ammizaduqa and Samsuditana the totals given by KL-B are correct. A. Poebel has attempted to prove this point[31] by showing that the divergences of KL-B from the date-lists with respect to the other reigns of the dynasty were due to the fact that the scribe of KL-B copied from a tablet whose numbers were partially destroyed. The scribe replaced the destroyed figures by mean values. S. I. Feigin and B. Landsberger presented a modified version of Poebel's point of view.[32] The conclusions of these three scholars for the reigns of Ammizaduqa and Samsuditana are acceptable; there is no good reason to reject the King-List totals of 21 and 31. However, the possibility of an error of up to four years for the dynasty[33] should be kept in mind, even though it is highly unlikely. These three principles allow us to conclude, by summing up the lengths of the reigns of the eleven kings, that the First Dynasty of Babylon lasted 300 years.

Following is an explanation of the symbols used in Table 31:

( ) Totals for the reign were not originally recorded on the date-list. The number within round brackets is the number ascertainable by counting the number of year-formulae originally recorded on the date-list. This number is ascertained on the basis of the number of preserved formulae and of a reconstruction of the original line arrangement of the date-list (for which see Chapter XIV).

[ ] Totals for the reign are completely or partially unpreserved but the number can be reconstructed by counting the number of preserved year-formulae written on the tablet.

---

[30]For DL-C only the first seven year-formulae of Hammurapi are preserved and the scribe did not intend to record all the year-formulae for Samsuiluna. For DL-N we cannot be absolutely certain how many year-formulae were recorded after the formula for Sd 22. The total of 20 years given on DL-P sums up the total number of year-formulae recorded for the reigns of the two kings represented on it (Hammurapi and Samsuiluna) and does not intend to be a total for the number of years that the two kings reigned. The scribes of DL-Q, R, S and T did not intend to record year-formulae for all the years of the kings represented. DL-U is a sloppily written school text.

[31]A. Poebel, *Miscellaneous Studies*, p.110-122.

[32]S. I. Feigin and B. Landsberger, *JNES* 14 (1955), p.139-141.

[33]The difference between the number of years for the dynasty according to KL-B (i.e. 304) and the number according to the date-lists (i.e. 300).

B Totals for some or all reigns are preserved in the **B**ody of the date-list text.
E Totals for some or all reigns are preserved at the **E**nd of the date-list text.
X Totals are absent because they were not originally inscribed either in the body of the text or at the end.
Bold numbers indicate those numbers which accurately reflect the actual lengths of reigns.

TABLE 31. YEARS PER KING ACCORDING TO DATE-LISTS AND KING-LIST B
(continued on following page)

KINGS ↓ / DATE-LISTS ——>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L
Sa	**14**										
Sl	[36][34]										
Sb	**14**										
AS	**18**										
Sm	**20**										
Ha	**43**[35]	**43**	(43?)[36]			**43**			(14)[37]	**43**	(43)[38]
Si	**38**	**38**	(8)[39]			[x]18[40]	**38**		(7)		
Ae		[2]8[41]				**28**					
Ad		**37**		[3]7[42]		**37**		(30)[43]			
Az		10[44]		(16)[45]	13[46]	17[47]					
Sd											
	B	BE	X	B	E	BE	E	X	X	E	X

[34]The total for Sumulael's reign is unpreserved. However, by observing the number of mu's and final verbs it is clear that the text had 36 year-names recorded for Sumulael.

[35]The total for Hammurapi at the end of the tablet is unpreserved. The total at the end of his reign is sufficiently preserved so that parts of all tens and digits of the number 43 are readable. Also, the text clearly had 43 year-names recorded for Hammurapi, one per line.

[36]The scribe of DL-C intended to record all of Hammurapi's year-formulae but only the first seven are preserved; that he originally recorded 43 is assumed based on the evidence of other date-lists; however, it is impossible to be sure that the lacuna did contain all the other 36 formulae.

[37]DL-I, said to be from Larsa, records year-formulae for Ha 30-Si 7, i.e. the last 14 of Hammurapi and the first 7 of Samsuiluna, representing most of the period of Babylon's rule over Larsa and not the number of years Hammurapi and Samsuiluna ruled in Babylon.

[38]43 preserved year-formulae can be counted.

[39]The scribe intended to write only the year-formulae for Si 1-9 and not for the whole of the reign. He mistakenly omitted the year-formula for Si 7, and so wrote only eight formulae.

[40]The total immediately following Samsuiluna's reign is unpreserved. The total at the end of the tablet is partially preserved as [XX]XVIII so that [x] in Table 31 probably represents 20.

[41]The total immediately following Abieshuh's reign is unpreserved. The total at the end of the tablet is preserved as [ ]VIII. The lacuna [ ] can be restored as 20 because the size of the lacunae at the end of column III and beginning of column IV of DL-B allow for more than 18 but less than 38 year-formulae altogether.

[42]Preserved as [XXXVI]I. That 37 was the original number is evident from the fact that the tablet preserved all the year-formulae that the scribe had written for Ammiditana and there are 37 of them.

[43]DL-H was composed before the end of Ammiditana's reign.

[44]DL-B was drawn up in the middle of Ammizaduqa's reign.

[45]DL-D was drawn up in the middle of Ammizaduqa's reign.

[46]DL-E was drawn up in the middle of Ammizaduqa's reign.

[47]DL-F was drawn up in the middle of Ammizaduqa's reign.

TABLE 31. YEARS PER KING ACCORDING TO DATE-LISTS AND KING-LIST B
(continued from preceding page)

KINGS ↓ / DATE-LISTS ——>	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U[49]	King List[48] B	Actual Years
Sa										15	14
Si										35	36
Sb									⌜14⌝	14	14
AS									18	18	18
Sm							(6)[50]		19[51]	30	20
Ha	(43)[52]		18[53]	(14)[54]						55	43
Si				(6)	(8)[55]			(6)[56]		35	38
Ae										25	28
Ad										25	37
Az						(16)[57]				21	21
Sd		(31?)[58]								31	31
	X	X	E	E	X	X	X	X	B	304	300

[48]On King List B, any number ending in 5 or 0 is a mean value and does not reflect the actual length of a king's reign. See discussion in Chapter X, 3, 1. "How Many Years Did Ammizaduqa and Samsuditana Reign?"

[49]The scribe of DL-U recorded totals for Sabium's and Apilsin's reigns but not for Sinmuballit's reign. He made many errors and wrote rather sloppily, so that DL-U is probably a school exercise text. It is consequently unreliable in many ways but the two totals for Sb and AS are correct. See the discussion in Chapter XIV.

[50]DL-S originally recorded year-formulae for only Sm 7-12. The scribe did not intend to cover the whole reign.

[51]No total for Sinmuballit's reign is recorded. However, the scribe wrote 19 formulae, unless he intended lines 52-53 (Al-Rawi line 41') to represent two formulae rather than one; Al-Rawi suggests that lines 52-53 represent a single formula (*ZA* 83, p.25 and 29) and his tentative conclusions are adopted in this study. That the scribe of DL-U omitted the formula for Sm 4 suggests he may have intended to record 20 formulae for Sinmuballit.

[52]39 preserved year-formulae can be counted and there is a lacuna with room for exactly 4 more formulae.

[53]DL-O was not intended to cover the whole reign of Hammurapi. The number 18 merely represents the number of year-formulae the scribe wrote on the tablet for his annalistic purpose.

[54]DL-P gives the total 20 at the end to indicate the number of year-formulae on the tablet, i.e. the last 14 of Hammurapi and the first 6 of Samsuiluna. The scribe did not intend to cover the whole of either reign or to provide totals for the whole of either reign.

[55]The scribe of DL-Q intended to record only year-formulae for Si 1-8.

[56]DL-T records year-formulae for Si 1, 3-7. The scribe mistakenly omitted the formula for Si 2. He did not intend to cover the whole reign.

[57]The scribe intended to record year-formulae for only Az 1-16, not for the whole reign; 13 can be counted and there is a lacuna at the beginning of the tablet for exactly three more formulae.

[58]Not less than 28 and not more than 32, according to Feigin and Landsberger (*JNES* 14, p.159). They argue that the actual number should be 31, in accordance with KL-B, and that a smaller number is most improbable (*ibid.*). See the discussion of DL-N in Chapter XIV and of the reign of Samsuditana in Chapter XI.

5. DEFICIENCEIS OF THE DATE-LISTS

In spite of their considerable value we should be aware of the deficiencies of the date-lists which are as follows:

1) Incomplete Coverage and Incomplete Preservation of the Date-Lists.—None of the date-lists originally covered the entire period of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Also, most of the date-lists are damaged to a lesser or greater degree. Due to these two facts, incomplete coverage and incomplete preservation, we have a number of lacunae in our knowledge of the chronological sequence of the year-names of the First Dynasty of Babylon. From Sumuabum through Sumulael we have evidence only from DL-A but, with the exception of Sb 3-7, enough is preserved to enable us to organize the year-names for their reigns. The reigns of Sabium, Apilsin and Sinmuballit are attested on DL-A and DL-U, supported by some partially preserved formulae from DL-S for Sm 7, 8, 9 and 12. Hammurapi's reign is abundantly attested on the date-lists as, to a lesser degree, is Samsuiluna's reign. For Abieshuh's reign we have only the total number of years, i.e. 28, from DL-F (VI:11), and a few very badly preserved remnants of year-formulae for Abieshuh's initial years on DL-B. Ammiditana's reign is sufficiently covered by date-lists B, D, F and H for us to establish a firm sequence for his reign. The sequence for Ammizaduqa's reign is firm for Az 1-17 but unknown for Az 18-21. The sequence for Samsuditana's reign is established for Sd 1-22 but is uncertain for Sd 23-31.

2) Ending in the Middle of Kings' Reigns.—Because a number of date-lists end in the middle of a king's reign they are not, in such cases, evidence of the length of the reign. DL-B ends with Az 10; DL-C with Si 9; DL-D with Az 16; DL-E with Az 13; DL-F with Az 17; DL-H with Ad 30; DL-I with Si 7; DL-P with Si 6; DL-Q with Si 8; DL-R with Az 16; DL-S with Sm 12; and DL-T with Si 8. Such evidence must be weighed against the evidence of the rest of the date-lists and of King List B.

3) Year-Formulae Out of Sequence.—Occasionally year-formulae are out of sequence for two reasons: (i) a scribe may have erroneously omitted a year-formula in the sequence of formulae recorded or (ii) he may have placed them in a wrong chronological order. DL-C omits the formula for Si 7 and DL-G omits Si 14. DL-O omits Ha 38 from between Ha 37 and 39; it also omits Ha 40-42 from between Ha 39 and 43; these "omitted" formulae may originally have been present in the unpreserved part of DL-O, but in that case they would have been out of chronological sequence. DL-O originally had one or more year-formulae out of sequence separating Ha 31 and Ha 32. DL-H reverses the order of the formulae for Ad 28 and 29. DL-T omits the year-formula for Si 2 and inserts the formula for Si 5 (line 5) between two parts of the formula for Si 6 (lines 4 and 6). DL-U omits the formulae for AS 7 and Sm 4; it reverses the order of the formulae for AS 10 and 11 and for AS 14 and 15; it also splits the formula for AS 12 into two separate, but immediately successive, formulae.

4) Very Abbreviated Forms of the Year-Names.—Another defect of the date-lists is that, with the exception of DL-O and DL-Q, they record only very abbreviated forms of the year-names. The fullest forms of the year-names must usually be reconstructed on the basis of more complete exemplars extant on other types of texts. This deficiency means that (i) divergent abbreviations, apparently unrelated but actually stemming from the same full form, may exist, and (ii) not all the possible abbreviations can be known from the date-lists.

Compare Pientka's assertion that very abbreviated formulae may be difficult to organize chronologically when such a formula does does not appear in a date-list.[59]

5) All Possible Abbreviations Are Not Known from the Date-Lists.—The date-lists may not attest all the possible abbreviations that a year-name may have. This means that, unless the fullest form of the year-name is reconstructible, some abbreviated exemplars will remain unidentified until a better knowledge of the full form is available.

6) Divergent Abbreviations for the Same Year.—Occasionally different date-lists record abbreviations with completely different content for the same year, as indicated in the following list:[60]

Ha 32 mu ugnim *mankisum* (DL-A and I)
mu ugnim ešnunna (DL-K, L, M, P)
Si 1 mu nam-en-bi kur-kur-ra pa-è (DL-B, F, I)
mu du_{11}-ga zi-da (DL-P, T)
Si 2 mu ama-ar-gi ki-en-gi ki-uri i-ni-in-gar-ra (DL-A, B, C, F, G, I)
mu še-ga dingir gal-gal-e-ne (DL-P)
Si 6 mu alan šùd-šùd-dè ^{d}lamma kù-sig_{17}-didli-bi-ta é-babbar-ra-šè i-in-in-ku_4-ra (DL-B, C, F, G, I, P)
mu ^{d}utu ^{d}marduk-e-ni-bi-da-ki + mu é-sag-íl (DL-T)
Ad 18 mu gá-gi-a tùr dagal-la ^{d}utu-ke_4 (DL-D)
mu du_{11}-ga gu-la ^{d}utu (DL-H)
Az 16 mu $^{i7-da}$*am-mi-ṣa-du-qá-nu-ḫu-uš-ni-ši* (DL-A, D)
mu du_{11}-ga maḫ-a ^{d}utu lugal-a-ni-ta (DL-R)

7) Same Abbreviation for Different Years.—Occasionally the same abbreviation may occur on different date-lists for different years; Ad 16 (DL-H) and Ad 35 (DL-B and F) both have mu bàd *am-mi-di-ta-na*^{ki}; Ha 13 (DL-K) and Si 8 (DL-F) both have mu $^{(urudu)}$ki-lugal-gub-ba.[61] In one instance the same abbreviation occurs on the same date-list for different years; DL-B has mu bàd *am-mi-di-ta-na*^{ki} for both Ad 16 and 35. This shows that two different year-names could contain the same element or phrase which enabled them to be abbreviated to an identical form. This can sometimes lead to confusion in identifying the regnal year of the pertinent year-formulae.

8) The Practice of "Double-Dating."—"Double-dating", the situation in which a year had two year-names, a regular year-name and a provisional (ús-sa/gibil) year-name can create a problem.[62] Normal "double-dating" (in which a regular year-name was officially promulgated not at the beginning of the year but in the course of the year, thus necessitating the use of a provisional formula for that part of the year before the promulgation of the regular year-name) differs from pseudo "double-dating" (in which a regular year-name was officially promulgated

---

[59]*Die spätaltbabylonische Zeit* 1, p.24.

[60]The following list includes all the years for which I am aware that this situation occurs. The date-lists indicated may contain all or only a part of the formula beside which they are listed.

[61]Until now it has been considered that Sm 18 (DL-A) and Ha 21 (DL-B, F, K, L and M) each had the same abbreviation, namely, mu bàd ^{uru}*ba-zum*^{ki}. However, collation shows that the YN for Sm 18 on DL-A should now be read mu bàd ⌜*a*⌝-[*ku-súm*^{ki} ba-dù]. See Chapters XVI (under DL-A, Sm 18) and V for further discussion.

[62]See M. B. Rowton, "Chronology. II. Ancient Western Asia" in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., vol. I/1, p.198, for a brief statement of this problem. See Chapter XII, 4. "The Event" and 7. "Provisional (ús-sa/gibil) Years," for a more detailed discussion of "double-dating."

at the beginning of the year, so that any provisional formulae used were used not of necessity but for some other reason).

In both normal and pseudo "double-dating" the date-lists record a regular year-formula. When normal "double-dating" existed, the event recorded in the regular year-formulae on the date-lists for a particular year occurred in the current year and not the preceding year. This is in contrast to pseudo "double-dating" in which the event recorded in the regular year-formulae occurred in the preceding year. This means that the events referred to in the regular formulae on the date-lists occurred in the current or the preceding year depending on whether or not normal "double-dating" or pseudo "double-dating", respectively, was in effect for the year in question. We should be aware that there may be years which had normal "double-dating" but for which we have no evidence of the ús-sa/gibil formula due to the scarcity of documents.

The rule holds true that date-lists always incorporate an abbreviation of a regular year-name if such had been promulgated at any point in a year, even if normal or pseudo "double-dating" existed. When date-lists incorporate a provisional (ús-sa/gibil) formula, it means that a regular year-name was never promulgated and the provisional formula was used throughout the year on all dated documents; it follows that in this situation the date-lists will agree in recording a provisional formula. Only one exception to these two principles exists, i.e. DL-C:51 (Si 9) which incorporates an ús-sa formula, in spite of the fact that a regular formula had been promulgated and was incorporated by the other date-lists (B, F and G; DL-A for Si 9 is unpreserved). The best explanation for this anomaly is as follows. Si 9 was the last year-name recorded on DL-C. The scribe must have composed DL-C at the very beginning of the year before he became aware of the regular formula that had also been promulgated at the beginning of the year. That the regular year-name for Si 9 was promulgated at, or near, the very beginning of the year is demonstrated by the fact that the earliest regular year-formula is on a document dated to i.4 (first month, fourth day; BM 81137).[63]

The problem created by the two types of "double-dating" is significant when considering the synchronous relationship of other dynasties with the First Dynasty of Babylon. It should also be borne in mind when assigning an event's actual occurrence to the preceding year or the current year; we cannot assume that the events recorded in all regular year-formulae belong to the preceding year, as is often assumed.[64]

---

[63]This document is published as de Smet, *Akkadica* 68, pp.4 and 12 BM 81137 (in transliteration only but collated by myself, KF 6095).

[64]For further discussion of the year in which the event occurred see Chapter XII, 4. "THE EVENT."