

 Library IAS, Shimla



00002330

# THE CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT WESTERN ASIA AND EGYPT

BY

P. VAN DER MEER

Ph.D., professor at the University of Amsterdam

WITH A SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE IN FOUR SHEETS

SECOND, REVISED EDITION



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL  
1955

932  
M 47C

350



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF  
ADVANCED STUDY  
SIMLA**

Old. AE

F80

A 41-25

# DOCUMENTA ET MONUMENTA ORIENTIS ANTIQUI

CO-OPERATIONE INTERCONTINENTALI EDITA AB

W. F. ALBRIGHT et A. DE BUCK  
Baltimore, U.S.A. Leiden, Ned.

CO-EDITORES FUERUNT

F. M. TH. DE LIAGRE	H. L. GINSBERG	J. SIMONS
BÖHL Leiden	New York	Leiden
W. COUVREUR	S. R. K. GLANVILLE	E. A. SPEISER
Gent	Cambridge	Philadelphia
A. FALKENSTEIN	L. KÖHLER	J. VANDIER
Heidelberg	Zürich	Paris
G. FURLANI	A. PARROT	J. A. WILSON
Roma	Paris	Chicago
	C. E. SANDER-HANSEN	
	København	

QUIBUS ACTUARIUS ADFUIT B. A. VAN PROOSDIJ, LEIDEN

VOLUMEN SECUNDUM

## THE CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT WESTERN ASIA AND EGYPT

DATA ENTERED



CATALOGUED



# THE CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT WESTERN ASIA AND EGYPT

BY

P. VAN DER MEER

Ph.D., professor at the University of Amsterdam

WITH A SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE IN FOUR SHEETS

SECOND, REVISED EDITION



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL  
1955



*Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands  
All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to reproduce  
this book or parts thereof in any form*

932  
M47C



PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

# CONTENTS



Preface . . . . .	vii
I. Introduction . . . . .	7
II. Assyria . . . . .	7
III. The Dynasty of the Kassites . . . . .	13
IV. Babylonia . . . . .	39
V. Iran . . . . .	50
VI. North Mesopotamia . . . . .	58
VII. Syria and Palestine . . . . .	64
VIII. Egypt . . . . .	81
IX. Asia Minor . . . . .	90
List of kingnames . . . . .	93
 Synchronistic table . . . . .	 at the end of the book
1. Prae- and proto-history . . . . .	
2. 2479 B.C.—1872 B.C. . . . .	
3. 1871 B.C.—1206 B.C. . . . .	
4. 1205 B.C.—538 B.C. . . . .	





## PREFACE

*This chronology of Western Asia owes its inception to the need which students had of it. For chronology is the very skeleton of history, around which the events affecting nations must be accurately grouped in their proper place in order to understand their mutual relationships. When this framework has given form and coherence to the ever-flowing stream of events, history, as a science, has reached its goal, and the efforts of a nation to reach its highest development can be fully comprehended and appreciated at their true worth. But, as the material necessary to construct a fixed chronology for so large a region lies scattered in so many books, preliminary reports and periodical publications, which are not always within easy reach of every student, most of them find it impossible to construct a fixed chronology, the framework into which the various happenings of antiquity may be fitted. It was in order to fashion this framework that I undertook the present essay.*

*In constructing such a fixed chronology, one may either utilise all the material available, and thus strengthen one's argument, or be content to set forth as much as is necessary to make clear the many synchronisms which exist between the various parts of this extensive region. I have chosen the latter method, in order not to blur the main line which runs through all these ages, and not to drown the reader in a formidable multiplicity of details. I have employed only so much material as is necessary for the construction of a fixed chronology of a people and to emphasise the many synchronisms with the peoples surrounding it, so that the student may not lose himself in the deluge of details. This method also prevents the book from becoming too large, the cost of printing consequently too great, and the work too highly priced and therefore out of the reach of many students. I hope that what I have written may be of some use to all those who study the history of the earliest times.*

*As the first edition is entirely sold out, it is thus shown to have supplied a want. In this second edition I have gratefully made use of all criticisms and all material published since the first was printed, in so far as it was of service. Further, I have extended the survey to regions which had been omitted in the earlier edition. I hope that this second imprint may also prove welcome and useful.*

*Amsterdam, March 18, 1954.*

P. VAN DER MEER

*My manuscript was ready and in the printer's hands when the information appeared in BASOR 133 (1954), p. 30, that a new king-list, closely related to that of Khorsabad, had been found. The tablet was sold in Mosul before the first world war and was found in a private collection, where it had lain until December 1953. Since then it has come on permanent loan into the Seventh Day Adventist Seminary. Here it was identified by Professor S. H. HORN as a king-list, and Professor I. J. GELB of the Oriental Institute of Chicago was given leave to publish it within the calendar year 1954. It is to appear in an early number of the Journal of Near-Eastern Studies. I waited until the second number of that periodical came out, but in it (JNES 13, 1954, p. 82) there appeared only the same announcement as in BASOR 133 (1954). On my requesting Professor GELB to let me have a copy of the list and permission to use it and quote some passages from it, although my chronology is to come out earlier, I received by return of post the permission I asked for. I therefore here and now express to Professor I. J. GELB my sincere and hearty thanks for his friendly goodwill, which testifies to a very broad spirit of cooperation between fellow specialists and a great-hearted readiness to be of service to his colleagues, so that here the motto sine invidia communico is confirmed in its fullest sense. The list will be referred to by the abbreviation SDAS, i.e., Seventh Day Adventist Seminary.*

•

•

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

Time-reckoning is something peculiar to man, for time is nothing but "the number of a movement according to former and latter" <sup>1)</sup>. It is the reckoning of a movement in accordance with the succession of the parts of that movement in space. Now, since the space in which material things move is a continuum which is infinitely divisible, the movement is likewise continuous and consequently time, being its measure, is a continuous measurement. It is a stream which ceaselessly flows onwards and never stops. This continuous measurement, however, could be of little use to man while he was not in a position to mark off equal units within it, which could be employed as a fixed standard of measure for the events which take place at a given moment in this uninterrupted stream.

Man soon observed that the succession of day and night was regular and of constant length, although he could not yet perceive the cause of it. Therefore a day and a night became his standard measure, and he called it "day". Furthermore, he observed that after a certain number of days the same phase of the moon recurred. By dint of fitting together this certain number of days between a phase of the moon and its recurrence, he obtained a larger unit which he styled "month", after the moon from which it was borrowed. The moment from which he began to count was the moment when the crescent of the new moon became visible in the sky in the evening. This happened every twenty-ninth or thirtieth day. The month therefore lasted on an average for twenty-nine days and a half. Therefore the months were alternately a month of twenty-nine and a month of thirty days.

His observation quickly went further, and thus he noticed that after a certain number of months and days the sun took up the same position on the heavens relatively to the place where the observer was. This was the vernal or the autumnal equinox, according as the sun was further away or nearer. Thus there came about a larger unit of time, the "year", in which he might set the events of the world. By means of this unity he could give events a place in the ever-flowing stream.

The unity of the year, arrived at by fitting together a number of months, was a lunar year. It contained twelve months, six of twenty-nine days each and six of thirty, and thus the year consisted of three hundred and fifty-four days. Such a lunar year involved a discrepancy with the solar year, and the difference became steadily greater as time went on; therefore the lunar year had from time to time to be adjusted to the solar year by inserting a month. This was done at first by order of the local authority, and later, when a larger political unity was created, by the central authority. This was the system of the Sumerians and the Babylonians. In Assyria it seems that there was no fixed rule for the insertion of months. The ancient practice appears to have been that the month whose beginning was nearest to the vernal equinox was the first month of the year. According to this method, the beginning of the year fell, after three years, or more rarely after two, in another month <sup>2)</sup>. Still in accordance with this, the month which had formerly been the second in the calendar was now the first, and the first month was now the last. Thus the Assyrians arrived every three years at the same result as the Babylonians with their intercalation of a month. The only difference was that the Assyrian system was more accurate and surer than that of the Babylonians, since with the Assyrians it took place automatically, while in Babylonia it

<sup>1)</sup> ARISTOTLE, *Physica*, 220a, 25.

<sup>2)</sup> E. WEIDNER, AFO 5, 1928-1929, p. 185; AFO 10, 1935-1936, pp. 127-129.

depended on the order of the government. If the government was strong enough, it took place regularly, no doubt, on the whole, but otherwise every city authority did its own intercalating, and this varied all over the country.

The Assyrian year was a lunar year consisting of six months of twenty-nine days each and six of thirty days, or in all three hundred and fifty-four days, so that the year was eleven days and six hours shorter than the solar year, and after the passage of three years, thirty-three days eighteen hours, or rather more than a month, behind. By moving up one month every three years, the difference was reduced to three days, eighteen hours. To make this up, it was necessary to move up a month after only two years the next time. As the Assyrians adjusted the lunar to the solar year every two or three years by moving it up one month, their year was equal to the Julian, which consisted of three hundred and sixty-five days, six hours. Thus no adjustment is necessary to equate the two chronologies, and the assertion of Sidney SMITH, "that Assyrian years can be equated with Julian years (is) probably an error" <sup>3)</sup>, is wrong, since the difference between the lunar and the solar year was made up every two or three years. That the Assyrians did move their year a month up every two or three years has been thoroughly demonstrated by WEIDNER <sup>4)</sup>. Tiglathpileser I introduced an alteration here. His reform did not consist in introducing the lunar year into Assyria, for that already existed before him, but in introducing the Babylonian method of inserting an intercalary month at fixed times, so that in future the year always began in the same month and no longer moved up from one month to another. Thus Sidney SMITH's doubts about the Assyrian year being lunar before Tiglathpileser I are unfounded <sup>5)</sup>.

After the reform of Tiglathpileser I, the year, as a result of inserting an intercalary month at fixed intervals, after the Babylonian fashion, always began, for official purposes, with the same month, namely Nisan, which corresponds to half of March and half of April in our reckoning. By inserting this intercalary month at fixed times the year was once more made equal to the solar year, and therefore was equal to the year of the Julian calendar. The same result had been achieved earlier by the biennial or triennial jump of a month, and thus it makes but little difference whether we date according to the Assyrian-Babylonian year or to the Julian calendar.

Having discovered and used the year as a unit, man was in a position to construct a calculation of time, a chronology, which is nothing more than a continuous series of years starting from a fixed point as its datum-line. Thus the method of dating forms the basis of a chronology. The first traces of dating have been found in Sumerian tablets, long after the introduction of writing. The Sumerian system of dating consisted of giving every year a name. They called the year after the most noteworthy event which had occurred in the last twelfth-month <sup>6)</sup>. Therefore the formula "year in which such-and-such a thing happened" in reality means nothing else than "the first year after that happening" <sup>7)</sup>. The Babylonians took over this system from the Sumerians, and it was not till the coming of the Cassites that the system came in force of dating the years from the first year after the beginning of a king's reign. If during that year no remarkable event had taken place which could serve as a new year-formula, they dated the following year as "the first year after such-and-such a happening", although it was really the second year, and so on, until something took place which was important enough to serve as a year-formula. Experience of actual life made it necessary to draw up lists of all the year-formulae during the period in which a prince had been on the throne. Then they had only to add up all the year-formulae in order to know how many years that prince had ruled. They are a great help towards constructing a chronology. A number of fragments of these lists have been published, and a large number of year-formulae have become known in course of time, and have been collected and put into the right sequence

<sup>3)</sup> Sydney SMITH, *Middle Minoan I-II and Babylonian Chronology*, AJA 47, 1943, p. 513.

<sup>4)</sup> E. WEIDNER, AFO 5, 1928-1929, p. 185; AFO 10, 1935-1936, pp. 127-129.

<sup>5)</sup> Sydney SMITH, *o.c.*, p. 514.

<sup>6)</sup> RA 3, 1893, p. 143.

<sup>7)</sup> F. THUREAU-DANGIN, *La Chronologie de la Première Dynastie Babylonienne*, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres 43, 1940, p. 220.

by UNGNAD and EBELING<sup>8</sup>). Longer periods were put together merely by mentioning the names of the kings and the number of years which they had reigned. They were put together according to the dynasty to which the king belonged. Thus arose the lists of kings. A further step was to assemble the dynasties, whereby the lists of dynasties came into being. In these lists all dynasties are set down one after another, even when they were in power simultaneously. This fashion was in force to the end of the Babylonian epoch, although other methods of dating arose in course of time. Various copies of these lists have come down to us, although they sometimes vary greatly from one another. The kings' names and their reigns differ in different copies, and the number of regnal years of sundry kings is not in accordance with the number of years which they really reigned. These lists therefore must be compared both with one another and with all the data at our command, in order to establish critically their value and thus to lay a solid foundation on which to reconstruct a fixed chronology.

The Assyrians dated differently from the Sumerians and the Babylonians. From the earliest times they dated, as was done in Greece and Rome, after a highly placed official, the eponym or *limmu*, who was chosen every year by casting lots. The person in office was named *limmu* after the period during which he held office. The king himself and the highest officials succeeded one another in a fixed order. It seems that the king in person completed his time as *limmu* in the second full year of his reign, so that in order to know how long a king had reigned it was necessary merely to compute the number of *limmu* between his period as *limmu* and that of his successor and so discover how many years this prince had worn the crown. And, to discover from what date to what date he had been king, one needed but to take two years earlier to find the right year. The length of a king's reign was reckoned from the first complete year in which he was on the throne to the first complete year of his successor. He ascended the throne immediately after the death of his predecessor, but the part of the year between that time and the first day of the new year still belonged to the reign of the departed monarch. We must therefore distinguish between a king's accession and his first full year, from which his reign began to be reckoned.

The Assyrians made lists of their eponymous magistrates. These lists may be divided into two classes, one in which nothing is recorded but the name of the *limmu*, and the other which not only mentions the name of the *limmu* but also his official position in the Assyrian Empire, with a brief account of the principal events of the year, in so far as these concerned the king. This latter class we may style an eponymous chronicle, whereas the former is nothing but a simple list of *limmu*. Various fragments of both classes, the list of eponyms and the eponymous chronicle, have come down to us, and despite minor variations in different copies there is great agreement between them, so that a complete list of *limmu* from 911 to 649 B.C. can be put together. This list has been constructed by UNGNAD<sup>9</sup>). Although the list when put together reaches no further back than 911, important data are furnished by the great list of Aššur, which goes back to shortly before 1200. This list, although badly damaged, contains before the name of each king the total of *limmu* and consequently of years elapsed between two kings. These *limmu*-lists are of the greatest importance for the reconstruction of a chronology, since thanks to them we are in a position to construct this chronology year by year. It is therefore desirable that we should be able to put together a complete *limmu*-list with all possible speed, which would thus rid us entirely of doubts concerning the length of the various kings' reigns. I therefore appeal to all my colleagues to search every collection, public or private, for fragments of *limmu*-lists or *limmu*-chronicles, and to publish them as quickly as they can. Even the smallest fragments are welcome, for they frequently are of great importance to fill up lacunae and to connect separate pieces with each other<sup>10</sup>).

Both the *limmu*-chronicles and the *limmu*-lists follow the same practice as regards the insertion of dividing lines. According to JEPSEN<sup>11</sup>) the *limmu*-chronicle puts a mark of

<sup>8</sup>) *Realexikon der Assyriologie*, Zweiter Band, 1935-1936, pp. 131-196.

<sup>10</sup>) KAV, No. 21-24.

<sup>9</sup>) A. UNGNAD, *Eponymen*, RLA 2, 1938, pp. 412-

<sup>11</sup>) A. JEPSEN, *Salmanasar III und Eponymenliste*, AFO 14, 1941, pp. 64-70.

division before the first full year of a king down to Aššurnirâri v, but from there on, that is from Tiglathpileser III, it puts it before the year in which he became king. But this seems to me wrong, for the *limmu*-list KAV 21-24, treating of Aššurnirâri v, reckons that king's *limmu*-period from his *limmu*-year to the last *limmu* before his successor at ten years. The eponymous chronicle informs us<sup>12)</sup> that Tiglathpileser III came to the throne in the second month of the year 745. But this year began under Aššurnirâri v, and consequently must be reckoned as one of the regnal years of the latter, from which it follows that his first full year was 754 and that the previous year, 755, was the year in which Aššurnirâri v ascended the throne. The dividing line is placed in the eponymous chronicle before the name of Aššurnirâri v in 753, his *limmu*-year and therefore his second full year, whence we see that it comes before a king's second full year, not his first full year.

The *limmu*-list Ca i, 2, 3 and KAV 21-24 put the dividing line before the year in which the king acted as *limmu* and therefore before the name of the king. Ca 4 inserts the king's name before the *limmu* of his first year, while the dividing line is put before the name of the king. After Tiglathpileser III, not a single king held the office of *limmu* in his second year any longer, and that office went out of use in the days of Aššurahiddinna. In the matter concerning the position of the dividing line of the royal *limmu*-ship before the new reign, there is but one exception: in the reign of Aššur-dân III, it is set before the year 763 B.C. This seems to indicate that during the revolt another king ascended the throne and was recognised in Aššur<sup>13)</sup>. The *limmu*-list, without taking into account the actual number of regnal years of a king, reckons the number of *limmu* from one king to the next. As long as the king held the office of *limmu* in the second year of his reign, the total of *limmu* was the same as the total of regnal years, so that in the long run it made no difference. Since the *limmu*-list comprises a continuous succession of *limmu*, it constitutes a solid foundation for the erection of a chronology.

Not only had the Assyrians their *limmu*-list, but like the Babylonians they also had their lists of kings, which contained the total regnal years of each king<sup>14)</sup>. The most extensive list is that of Khorsabad, containing a hundred and seven kings, the last being Aššurnirâri v. No regnal years are given for the first thirty-two kings, but beginning with the thirty-third, Irišum son of Ilušuma, the list gives us the regnal years of each, sometimes with short notes which explain the confusion connected with the succession to the throne. According to its colophon, the list was copied from a list of kings prepared by Kandalanu, scribe of the temple of Arbašilu, on the twentieth day of the month Ḫalube in the second *limmu* of Adad-bêla-ukîn, governor of Aššur<sup>15)</sup>. It makes no difference if we found our chronology on the actual duration of a king's reign or on the *limmu*-list and the list of kings based upon a *limmu*-list, provided that its author performed his task seriously and accurately<sup>16)</sup>. The *limmu*-list, giving as it does the name of the *limmu* year by year, is a trustworthy foundation for the construction of a sound chronology, and so also is the list of kings, being accurately founded on it, since it gives the same result in the numbers. Of late years serious doubts have been felt as to the credibility of the Khorsabad list, especially in its older parts, because some kings reigned, it is said, too early and it is thought that there is then a conflict with other data<sup>17)</sup>. These data are however derived from archaeology or based on the reigns of kings the length of

<sup>12)</sup> INES 2, 1943, p. 74.

<sup>13)</sup> JNES 2, 1943, p. 79; Sydney SMITH, *Early History of Assyria*, 1928, p. 346.

<sup>14)</sup> KAV, No. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18; Essad NASSOUHI, Grande Liste des Rois d'Assyrie, AFO 4, 1927, pp. 1-11; E. WEIDNER, Die Neue Königsliste aus Assur, AFO 4, 1927, pp. 11-17; A. POEBEL, The Assyrian Kinglist from Khorsabad, JNES 1, 1942, pp. 460-492; 2, 1943, pp. 56-99; E. WEIDNER, Die

aus Khorsabad, AFO 14, 1944, pp. 362-

1945-1951, pp. 85-102; Photo of the  
and Charles B. ALTMAN, *Khor-*

sabad, Part II, The citadel and town, pl. 57, No. 74; The text is illegible; Reproduced in J. H. BREASTED, *The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, 1935, fourth edition of the Handbook, p. 56, fig. 49; Photo of the Rev. in the *Sphere*, 7 April, 1934. The photo is very clear so that nearly the whole text is legible; reproduced in AFO 14, 1944, p. 362.

<sup>15)</sup> JNES 1, 1942, p. 250.

<sup>16)</sup> E. WEIDNER, Die Königsliste aus Khorsabad, AFO 14, 1944, p. 365.

<sup>17)</sup> *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 1951, pp. 38-39.

whose rule we are not told and to whom an arbitrary number of years is assigned. That is true especially of the Hittite kings, of whom more will be said later (p. 90-92).

However, it can be shown from the Khorsabad list itself that it is trustworthy, because really founded on *limmu*-lists. (1) The subscription to the third group of kings runs: *naphar 6 šarranimes ša li-mi-ni-šu-nu la'-tu-ni*<sup>18)</sup> i.e.: "in all, six kings ... whose *limmu* were destroyed". POEBEL argues as follows from this: "From it we gather the important information that there had existed a *limmu*-list covering the reigns of the six kings of the group, although at the time when the king-list was compiled, the *limmu* of these kings—probably in the only copy available to the compiler—were no longer preserved. The fact that the king-list mentions *limmu* for the first time in connection with the third group of kings proves, of course, that the compilers of the list did not know of any *limmu*-list covering the reigns of the kings prior to Šulili .... As already stated, the object of this classification of the kings in different groups was not the distinction of certain dynasties—in that case he would have counted the kings from Ušpia to Šulili in one group—but to show on which or what kind of historical sources his list was based"<sup>19)</sup>. (2) Another proof can be had from the assertion of the compiler with reference to Šamši-Adad I. Here we read: *ina lim-ne ib-ni-dAdad*, i.e.: "during the *limmu* of Ibni-Adad". From this it is evident that the compiler was using a *limmu*-list to reckon from one *limmu* to another, in order to establish the time during which Šamši-Adad remained in Babylon. Thus the Khorsabad list is beyond doubt founded upon a *limmu*-list and is therefore a trustworthy source on which to build up a sound chronology, always supposing of course that all the numbers have been correctly transferred to the list of kings. As regards this we cannot be certain unless each number can be checked by contemporary or approximately contemporary sources. (3) Now this can be done for that part for which *limmu*-lists have come down to us. From Šamši-Adad I to Aššurnirâri V, sixty-nine princes are mentioned in the Khorsabad list. For fourteen of these princes we possess data from *limmu* which agree with the figures given in the Khorsabad list. Since therefore, where we can check it, the Khorsabad list agrees with the *limmu*-lists, we may conclude that the Khorsabad list is trustworthy for the remaining portion also, because it is founded upon *limmu*-lists. We thus can safely use the Khorsabad list for constructing a chronology<sup>20)</sup>.

Those who have an objection to the short chronology have put forward the argument that the Khorsabad list is not complete and that, especially in the older parts, it may have omitted some kings, although they can adduce not one instance of this<sup>21)</sup>. This possibility is not altogether excluded, for there exists an inscription<sup>22)</sup> in which mention is made of Pu-zur-dSin iššak dAššur mâr dAššur-be-el-šamee. Here we are told that he built on to the city wall and his grandfather's palace. In I 6 Šamši-dAdad is named. In col. ii, 9, he appears again and the palace is named with the addition of *Abu abi* or *abu abi-šu*. Here the conclusion has been drawn that he must have ruled in Aššur and was a grandson of Šamši-Adad II or of Šamši-Adad III. Aššur-bel-šame manifestly never was king, or else he too would be included in the list of kings. Now no Puzur-Sin is known from the list of kings nor is he to be found among those who made restorations of the city wall. According to Aššurrimnišêšu<sup>23)</sup> work was done on the wall by Kikia, Puzur-Aššur I, Ikûnum, Šarrukên Puzur-Aššur II, and Aššurnirâri I; according to Salmanasser III, by Kikia, Puzur-Aššur I, Ikûnum and Enlilnâsir I<sup>24)</sup>. Puzur-Sin is nowhere mentioned. The inscription is badly damaged, and it is altogether uncertain if it is an inscription of a king. However that may be, we must no doubt keep in mind that

<sup>18)</sup> From a lantern-slide of the obv. of the Khorsabad list in the Allard Pierson Institute at Amsterdam. The text is very clear and generally easily legible.

<sup>19)</sup> A. POEBEL, *The Assyrian Kinglist from Khorsabad* I NES I, 1942, n. 270.

<sup>20)</sup> M. B. ROWTON, *Mesopotamian Chronology and the "Era of Menohres"*, Iraq VIII, 1946, pp. 94-110.

<sup>21)</sup> *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assy-*

*riologique Internationale*, 1951, p. 39.

<sup>22)</sup> Alabaster Tafel Assur 6266: Br. M. 112688. Photo of the text W. ANDRAE, *Hebräisch Inschriften auf Bleistreifen aus Assur*, WVDOG 46, Taf. I h-i; S. SMITH, *Early History of Assyria*, pp. 219 f., 286; WEIDNER, *Bemerkungen zur Königsliste aus Khorsabad*, AFO 15, 1945-1951, pp. 96-97.

<sup>23)</sup> AOB I, p. 34, XIV I, 5-7.

<sup>24)</sup> AOB I, p. 36, Note 3; Sumer 7, 1951, p. 13.



there is a possibility of the king-lists not being complete in their older parts <sup>25</sup>), since at least we cannot prove by other means that no princes are omitted.

A duplicate of the Khorsabad list is a long list of kings from Aššur <sup>26</sup>). NASS. obv. i, 34-43, is Khors. obv. i, 34-47; NASS. obv. ii, 16-43, is Khors. obv. ii, 20-47; NASS. rev. i, 9-46, is Khors. rev. i, 5-34; NASS. rev. ii, 1-28 is Khors. rev. i, 35-ii, 13. The Aššur list of NASSOUHI ends with Tiglathpileser II, whereas that of Khorsabad goes down to and ends with Aššurnirâri v. There exist sundry discrepancies between the two lists. The Aššur list of NASSOUHI mentions Aššurrimnišêšu as the father of Irêba-Adad I, while that of Khorsabad gives Aššurbêlnišêšu. The Khorsabad list states that Aššurnirâri I was the brother of Arikdê-nili; but the latter was his father. The Aššur list of NASSOUHI omits Salmanasser II. Taken as wholes, the lists agree in their figures, although now and then they differ in the assignment of a year to different sovereigns. Another duplicate of these two lists is KAV 15.

The new king-list <sup>26a</sup>) SDAS is, according to its colophon, a copy of an old copy. This list agrees entirely with that of Khorsabad, but whereas that ends with the reign of Aššurnirâri v, the new list, SDAS, adds two more kings and ends with the last year of Salmanasser v; it was therefore drawn up in the first year of Sargon II. While agreeing completely with the Khorsabad list, except where damaged, it assigns fifty years to Išmê-Dagan instead of forty. Unfortunately, even this list does not fill the gap in the reigns of the two kings Aššurrâbi and Aššurnâdinahhê I, for here again the numbers of the regnal years of these monarchs are broken away.

The *limmu*-list, the *limmu*-chronicle and the lists of kings can be checked by the Annals of the Assyrian kings, which furnish reliable information. Their material is arranged according to the *limmu* or the regnal years of the kings and provides an accurate survey of what took place during the reign of a given king or at least during part thereof. These annals confirm the reliability of the lists of kings. Supplementary information can be had from the chronicles and inscriptions on buildings. However, as regards the latter, one must be wary. Any statement by a king with regard to the number of years which have passed between the reign of some earlier king and his own can be used only when it is first shown that it is accurate, for sundry such statements can be proved to be false.

Although the *limmu*-lists, the source on which the Assyrian lists of kings depend, are uncommonly reliable for the construction of a fixed chronology, they still are useless to us if we do not possess an absolute and determined date from which we can reckon forwards and backwards. This date is furnished us by the *limmu*-chronicle, in which we read, "During the eponymous magistracy of Pûr-Šagale, governor of Guzana, rebellion in the city of Aššur. In Simânu there was an eclipse of the sun" <sup>27</sup>). This solar eclipse is astronomically fixed for reasons which have never been called in question. It took place on June 15, 763 B.C., by our modern reckoning of time. Therefore that year can be used as the basis of calculation of the Assyrian calendar. It is the sheet-anchor on which not only Assyrian chronology but at the same time that of all West Asia depends. Hence we must endeavour to construct Assyrian chronology backwards, with the help of our new material, as far as it is possible to arrive at a fixed chronology.

<sup>25</sup>) AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 97.

<sup>26</sup>) Essad NASSOUHI, *Grande Liste des Rois d'Assyrie*, AFO 4, 1927, pp. 1-11; E. WEIDNER, *Die neue Königsliste aus Assur*, AFO 4, 1927, pp. 11-16.

<sup>26a</sup>) See Note 1a.

<sup>27</sup>) Ch 1, K 51, II R pl. 52; Fr. DELITZSCH, *Ass. Lesestücke*<sup>2</sup>, 1878, pp. 192-194; G. SMITH, *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, 1878.

## CHAPTER TWO

### ASSYRIA

Pûr-Šagale was *limmu* in 763 B.C. The year began in Nisan (March-April in our calendar), hence his year of office ran from March-April 763 to March-April 762. For simplicity's sake the year will be given as 763 B.C., but must nevertheless be understood as 763/62, and so in all cases. Pûr-Šagale was the eighth *limmu* after Aššur-dân III. The following persons held that office between Pûr-Šagale and Aššur-dân III:

763/62, Pûr-Šagale,	768/67, Aplaja,
764/63, Šidqi-ili,	769/68, Bêl-Ilija,
765/64, Enurta-mukîn-niê,	770/69, Šamši-ili,
766/65, Mušallim-Enurta,	771/70, King Aššur-dân.
767/66, Qurdi-Aššur,	

Aššur-dân being *limmu* in 771, the question arises: is that year the first full year after his accession, or did he hold the office of *limmu* in a later year of his reign? How are we to make this out? We find assistance here in the *limmu*-year of Mannu-ki Aššur-le'i, which was 710. The *limmu*-chronicle informs us that "*ina limê Mannu-ki Aššur-le'i ša âltil-li-e šarru-ûkin qatâü dbêl iš-ša-bat*", i.e., in Mannu-ki Assur-le'i's or Tillu's year as *limmu*, Sargon grasped the hand of Bel<sup>28</sup>). This ceremony took place annually at the New Year celebrations in Babylon, in order that the king might be confirmed in his office for that year. The chronicle states that "in the twelfth year of Mardukapaliddin, Sargon went down to Babylon. He made war against Mardukapaliddin, and Mardukapaliddin fled before Sargon to Elam. Mardukapaliddin bore rule in Babylon for twelve years. Sargon set himself upon the throne of Babylon"<sup>29</sup>). Sargon's expedition against Babylon was in the twelfth year of Mardukapaliddin; this was at the same time the twelfth year of Sargon, for Mardukapaliddin became king of Babylon in Nisan of Sargon's first complete year. "In the fifth year Salmanasser died in the month Tebet. Salmanasser had exercised sovereignty for five years in Akkad and Aššur. In the month Tebet, on the twelfth day, Sargon set himself upon the throne of Aššur. In Nisan Mardukapaliddin set himself upon the throne of Akkad"<sup>30</sup>). Thus Sargon and Mardukapaliddin became kings in the same month of the same year. In the twelfth year of Mardukapaliddin Sargon marched against Akkad and set himself on the throne of that country. At the New Year festival he grasped the hand of Marduk in order to be confirmed in his kingship. This occurred in 709, therefore he ascended the throne in 710, the year in which he marched against Babylon. This is confirmed by the *limmu*-chronicle, which states under the *limmu*-year of Šamaš-bêla-ušur, ..... *a-na âlbit-zêri-i šarru ina Kiški bi-e-di*, i.e., in that year "... to *bit-zêri*. The king abode in Kish"<sup>31</sup>). This happened in 710, the twelfth year of Sargon and Mardukapaliddin, so that both began their reign in 721. The beginning of Sargon's reign was the previous year, 722, in which Salmanasser v died. Sargon's part of that year was reckoned to Salmanasser v, because the regnal years of a king of Assyria were not counted from the moment when he came to the throne, but from the first complete year. 722 was the last year of Salmanasser v, who reigned, according to the *limmu*-list, five years. 726-722<sup>32</sup>).

His father, Tiglathpileser III, reigned eighteen years. The *limmu*-chronicle states under

<sup>28</sup>) Cb 2, rev. 6-14.

<sup>29</sup>) CT 34, pl. 44, obv. II 9-14.

<sup>30</sup>) CT 34, pl. 47, 29-32.

<sup>31</sup>) Cb 4, rev. 13.

<sup>32</sup>) Ca 1, Cb 1, KAV No. 21-24 col. v and Ca 3 have however four years.

the year 745, "In the *limmu*-ship of Nabu-bêla-ušur of Arrapha, Tukulti-apal-ešarra set himself on the throne in the month Ayaru on the thirteenth day" <sup>33</sup>). This therefore was the year of Tiglathpileser III's accession, but also the year in which his predecessor Aššurnirâri v died. This year, as being the one in which Aššurnirâri v died, was therefore reckoned to the latter, so that the first year of Tiglathpileser III was the year 744. He therefore reigned for eighteen years, not nineteen. He was the son of Adadnirâri III but was preceded by his brother Aššurnirâri v. He reigned 744-727.

The *limmu*-list <sup>34</sup>) and the Khorsabad list give Aššurnirâri ten years. They reckon from the *limmu*-year of Aššurnirâri v to that of Tiglathpileser III, so that a year must be subtracted at the end. There remain only nine years, so we must conclude that Aššurnirâri held the *limmu*-ship in his second full year, and therefore we must add one *limmu* at the beginning. He thus was king from 754 to 745.

He was preceded by his brother Aššur-dân III, who according to the *limmu*-list, the *limmu*-chronicle and the Khorsabad list reigned for eighteen years. The *limmu*-list reckons eighteen *limmu* from his *limmu*-ship to that of Aššurnirâri v. Since Aššurnirâri v held the office of *limmu* in his second year, we must strike off one year at the end and add one at the beginning, because Aššur-dân also filled the office of *limmu* in his second year, and thus he reigned eighteen years, 772-755.

We have seen that Sargon II began his reign in 721. He reigned, according to the *limmu*-list and the *limmu*-chronicle, for seventeen years (721-705). His son Sanherib followed him and reigned, according to the same lists, for twenty-four years, *i.e.*, 704-681. He was succeeded by his son Assarhaddon, whose reign lasted twelve years according to the *limmu*-list, *i.e.*, 680-669. The *limmu*-list ends in the reign of his son Aššurbanipal, so that we do not know the reigns of the later kings with certainty.

We have now succeeded, with the help of the *limmu*-list, the *limmu*-chronicle and the Khorsabad list, in establishing a firm chronology from 669 back to 755, and must now examine how far back we can extend an absolutely fixed chronology. Aššur-dân III was preceded by his brother Salmanasser IV. The *limmu*-list, the *limmu*-chronicle and the Khorsabad list give him ten regnal years, so that he was king from 782 to 773.

His father Adadnirâri III preceded him on the throne. He states, in his stele from Saba'a, "In the fifth year of my reign I set myself on the royal throne" <sup>35</sup>). Now we know that after the death of Šamši-Adad V, Šammuramat, the Semiramis of legend, reigned for five years on behalf of her son during his minority, and that Adadnirâri himself took over the kingship when he came of age <sup>36</sup>). The *limmu*-list, the *limmu*-chronicle and the list of Khorsabad give him twenty-eight regnal years, hence his reign was 810-783. His predecessor was his father, Šamši-Adad V; the *limmu*-list and the list of Khorsabad give the length of his reign as thirteen years, therefore he was king from 823 to 811. He was preceded by his father Salmanasser III. The *limmu*-list, the *limmu*-chronicle and the Khorsabad list give him a reign of thirty-five years, therefore he was on the throne 858-824. His father Aššurnâširapli II sat on the throne before him. The *limmu*-list and the list of Khorsabad give the length of his reign as twenty-five years, so that he was king from 883 to 859.

His father Tukulti-Ninurta II preceded him on the throne. The *limmu*-list has six names of *limmu* between his *limmu*-year and his son's. As the last of these belongs to his son's reign, there remain five for Tukulti-Ninurta II. Since he probably held his office of *limmu* in his second year, one must be added at the beginning, making a reign of six years. The Khorsabad list makes him reign seven, but as we can reckon better from year to year with the *limmu*-list, we keep to it and put the length of his kingship at six years; he thus was king from 889 to 884.

<sup>33</sup>) Cb 1, rev. 26.

<sup>34</sup>) Ca 2, 3, Cb 1, KAV No. 21-24 give ten years, Ca Cb however eight years.

<sup>35</sup>) E. UNGER, *Reliefstele Adadniraris III Aus Saba'a und Semiramis*.

<sup>36</sup>) JNES 2, 1943, pp. 80-81.

He was preceded by his father Adadnirâri II. The Khorsabad list ascribes to him a reign of twenty years. We have the names of twenty *limmu* from his reign<sup>37)</sup>, the last of them belonging to the reign of his son, so that there remain nineteen. Since K 4329 b III R, Pl. I, 7-13 forms line 2, and the first line presumably should begin with the name of the king, we have thus twenty names of *limmu* from his reign. Add to this that he exercised the office of *limmu* in his second year and we must add yet another *limmu*, thus getting twenty-one. This agrees with the Khorsabad list, and therefore the number appears correct; Adadnirâri II therefore reigned for twenty-one years, 910-890.

His father Aššur-dân II, who preceded him, reigned for twenty-three years, *i.e.*, 933-911, according to the Khorsabad list, the only source we have for the number of years of his reign. According to the same authority, his father, Tiglathpileser II, was king before him for thirty-two years, but it was thirty-three according to the great *limmu*-list from Aššur, KAV 22. According to the great list of kings from Aššur, as reported by WEIDNER<sup>38)</sup>, thirty-two years is a possible number. The reason for the discrepancy between the two lists of kings and the great *limmu*-list cannot be arrived at for the present; since however we possess two lists of kings and they agree with one another, we follow these two witnesses and say that Tiglathpileser II reigned from 965 to 934.

His father Aššurrêšiši occupied the throne before him for five years according to the Khorsabad list, the only source we have for the moment, *i.e.*, 970-966. He was preceded by his father Aššurrâbi II, who according to the Khorsabad list reigned for forty-one years. However, the great list of kings from Aššur gives him forty years, but appears to allot six to his successor Aššurrêšiši, so that the two monarchs between them reigned for forty-six years, the same total as that given by the Khorsabad list for the pair. Following the Khorsabad list, we have allotted five regnal years to Aššurrêšiši, and therefore give Aššurrâbi II forty-one, according to the same authority, *i.e.*, 1011-971.

Aššurrâbi II was the son of Aššurnâširapli I and brother to Salmanasser II, whose son Aššurnirâri IV was king from 1017 to 1012, according to the Khorsabad list, the great list of kings from Aššur, and the great *limmu*-list from Aššur, KAV 21, obv. iv. Salmanasser II, the father of Aššurnirâri IV, was a brother of Aššurrâbi. He reigned for twelve years, according to the list from Khorsabad and the great *limmu*-list of Aššur, KAV 21, obv. iv. The great list of kings from Aššur omits this prince. His regnal dates are 1029-1013. His father Aššurnâširapli preceded him on the throne. He reigned for nineteen years, 1048-1030, according to the Khorsabad list, the great *limmu*-list from Aššur (KAV 21, obv. iv) and the great list of kings from Aššur.

His father Šamši-Adad IV must have already been advanced in years when he came to the throne, for his two brothers and his nephew reigned before him. It would appear that during the reign of his father, or of his two brothers, he had to flee to Babylon. The Khorsabad list and the great list of kings from Aššur inform us that "Šamši-Adad, son of Tiglathpileser, came up from Karduniaš ('returned home from the land of Kharduniaš', the great list of kings from Aššur). He put Irêba-Adad off the throne, took the throne and reigned for four years" (1052-1049)<sup>39)</sup>. According to the Khorsabad list and the great list of kings from Aššur, Irêba-Adad, who was put off his throne by him, reigned for two years, 1054-1053. Aššurbêlkala, his father and brother to Šamši-Adad IV, reigned before him, according to the Khorsabad list and the great list of kings from Aššur, for eighteen years, 1072-1055; and according to the same two authorities, his brother Ašarid-apal-ekur preceded him with a reign of two years, 1074-1073.

He was preceded on the throne by his father Tiglathpileser I, who according to the Khorsabad list and probably also the great list of kings from Aššur<sup>40)</sup> ruled for nineteen years, 1113-1075. Before him, his father Aššurrêšiši reigned for eighteen years, 1131-1114.

<sup>37)</sup> Ca 1.

<sup>38)</sup> AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 88, Note 16.

<sup>39)</sup> Khorsabad list rev. II, 1-4; List NASSOUHI, rev. II, 14-18.

<sup>40)</sup> AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 88, Note 16.

His father Mutakkil-Nusku occupied the throne for a length of time indicated by the word *tuppišu*. The Khorsabad list and probably also the great Aššur list of kings, so far as traces of this passage survive, state: *mu-tak-kil dnusku ahu-šu itti-šu i-duk a-na mât kar-du-ni-aš e-bu-uk-šu tup-pi-šu mu-tak-kil-dnuska iskussa uk-ta-il šada<sup>a</sup> e-mid* <sup>41</sup>), i.e., "Mutakkil-Nusku, his brother, fought against him <sup>42</sup>). He drove him to Karduniaš. Mutakkil-Nusku held the throne *tuppišu* and died" <sup>43</sup>). This Mutakkil-Nusku is the brother of his predecessor Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur. *Šu* in *ahu-šu* therefore stands for Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur and relates to him. In *itti-šu i-duk*, *šu* has the same reference to the same person and therefore stands for Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur; so also does *šu* in *e-buk-šu*. The verb *ebuk* seems to raise a difficulty, because the verb *abâku* signifies to remove, to take away. As he was fighting against Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur, the latter was "taken away" by violence, but he certainly did not himself bring him to Babylon, therefore the sense must be "he drove him away to Babylon", which may be a shade of meaning of the verb *abâku*. We need not therefore consider it a slip for *iṣrusu*, as POEBEL would do <sup>44</sup>). Since then *šu* generally expresses a reference to Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur, may that not be the case also for *šu* in *tuppu-šu*? In this expression, *šu* occasionally alternates with *a*, of which at least one example is known, *am-me-ni tup-pi ù tup-pi-a<sub>4</sub> ṭè-im-ka la aš-me*, "why have I heard no news from you for the whole period?" <sup>45</sup>). Here it is highly probable that we have to do with the Aramaic definite article *â*, which can be employed only when the whole expression may be considered a single word, something like *tuppuṭu*. This is possible, for in the late Babylonian period the endings were no longer pronounced <sup>46</sup>). Since then *a* is the Aramaic definite article, *šu* also, which alternates with it, may have a defining character, as it often has for instance in *ūmišu*, *šattišu* <sup>47</sup>). *Šu* therefore is a determinative pronoun, and *tuppišu* means nothing more than "the *tuppu* which was connected with the matter". Hence we have now to see what *tuppu* means. ROWTON, in his fundamental article which takes into consideration all the material hitherto known, has sufficiently demonstrated that the meaning of *tuppu* is "end, last portion", and that it has completely preserved this meaning in the list of kings as elsewhere <sup>48</sup>). It is the last portion which is needed in order to make up a full measure. How does this fit the list of kings? We have seen that the Khorsabad list is founded on *limmu*-lists. We also know that *limmu*-lists reckoned from the year in which a king held office as *limmu* to his successor's tenure of that office. This was a king's *limmu* period, which also gave the length of his reign, although it did not coincide with the actual regnal years, since we must always subtract one year at the end and add one year at the beginning to get the exact date of the reign. So on occasion, between the death of a king and the *limmu*-year of his successor, there was a space in which the former king was no longer alive, but which nevertheless was counted as part of his *limmu*-period and completed it. This was the *tuppu*, during which his successor occupied the throne. If he in turn died before he had held office as *limmu*, he was not mentioned in the *limmu*-list; in the list of kings, however, he was not omitted as a reigning prince, and consequently it was said of him that he had held the kingship *tuppišu*, "during the concluding period in question". Now Ninurta-tukul-Aššur and his brother Mutakkil-Nusku, who ruled before him, are said to have reigned *tuppišu*. This means that both these princes did indeed come to the throne after the death of their father Aššur-dân I, but never held the office of *limmu*. Since they did not hold that office, no year could be given in a list of kings which was based upon

<sup>41</sup>) Khorsabad list rev. I 34-36.

<sup>42</sup>) *dâku*, fight, WEIDNER, BoSt. 9, 1923, p. 117 n. 6.

<sup>43</sup>) E. WEIDNER, AFO 14, 1944, p. 366.

<sup>44</sup>) JNES 2, 1943, pp. 63-64.

<sup>45</sup>) U.E.T. IV, 189, pp. 18-20.

<sup>46</sup>) M. B. ROWTON, *Tuppu and the Date of Hammurabi*, JNES 10, 1951, pp. 186-187.

<sup>47</sup>) JNES 8, 1949, pp. 268, 288.

<sup>48</sup>) ROWTON, *o.c.*, 184-201. For *tuppu* see, Landsberger, ZA 39, 1930, p. 291; OPPENHEIM, RA 33,

1936, pp. 143-151; POEBEL, JNES 1, 1942, pp. 296-297, JNES 2, 1943, pp. 61-64; S. SMITH, AJA 49, 1945, pp. 18-29; GOETZE, JAOS LXV, 1945, pp. 223-224; ROWTON, Iraq VIII, 1946, pp. 98-99; V. D. MEER, *The Ancient Chronology of Western Asia*, 1947, pp. 9-10; LANDSBERGER, JNES 8, 1949, pp. 265-272; WEIDNER, *Bemerkungen zur Königsliste aus Khorsabad*, AFO 15, 1945-1951, pp. 85-87; ROWTON, JNES 10, 1951, pp. 184-201.

*limmu*-lists. Now WEIDNER<sup>49)</sup> has published an economic archive put out by Ninurta-tukul-Aššur, which extends over twelve months. These twelve months must have lasted through the time between the death of his father Aššur-dân I and his own first regnal year, before he held the post of *limmu*. However, we cannot ascribe a year to these two princes in constructing our chronology, firstly because we do not know exactly how long the time was, but secondly because we must not reckon the years twice over, for they are already included in the *limmu*-period of Aššur-dân I. If however we count the *limmu*-period from the year when Aššur-dân I was *limmu* to the year in which his successor held that office as the time during which Aššur-dân I reigned, the years of the two princes are included in this, and chronology is not endangered; there is no lacuna and no shortage. Thus our reckoning of dates remains undamaged.

Aššur-dân I, their father, reigned according to the Khorsabad list and the great list from Aššur<sup>50)</sup> for forty-six years, that is 1177-1132.

Before him there ruled his father Ninurta-apal-ekur, son of Nabu-dân and a descendant of Irêba-Adad. For some reason or other he had to retire to Babylon, according to the great list of kings from Aššur<sup>51)</sup>. According to this list he ruled 13 years, but according to the Khorsabad list and SDAS three years. It is impossible to make out which one is right. We take the higher number, so that his reign lasted from 1190 to 1179. In the other case all the numbers before him have to be lowered by ten. With him a new line of rulers from the royal house of Aššur came to the throne.

His predecessor Enlilkudurušur, son of Tukulti-Ninurta, reigned for five years, according to the Khorsabad list, the great Aššur list and its duplicate KAV 15, rev. 3-4, 1195-1191. He was preceded by Aššurnirâri III, his nephew, who according to the lists from Khorsabad and Aššur reigned for six years, 1201-1196. Aššurnirâri III was the son of Aššurnâdinapli, whose reign lasted for three years according to the Khorsabad list, but four according to that of Aššur. As no *limmu*-list is extant by which their correctness can be tested, we take the greater figure and suppose that he was king from 1205 to 1202. His father before him, Tukulti-Ninurta, reigned for thirty-seven years according to the list from Khorsabad, hence 1242-1206. Before him, according to the same authority, his father Salmanasser I occupied the throne for thirty years, 1272-1243, and his father, Adadnirâri I, for thirty-two years, still according to this list, which calls him the brother of Arikdênili; hence 1304-1273. Before him was his father Arikdênili, who reigned for twelve years, 1316-1305, while his father Enlilnirâri had a reign of ten years, 1326-1317, according to the Khorsabad list. Preceding him again was his father Aššuruballit, to whom the same list ascribes a reign of thirty-six years, 1362-1327. Still on the same authority, the king before him was his father Irêba-Adad I, who was the son of Aššurbêlnišêšu and ruled for twenty-seven years, or 1389-1363. Before him came his nephew Aššurnâdinahhê II, who according to the Khorsabad list had a reign of ten years, 1399-1390. The list names as his predecessor his father Aššurrimnišêšu and gives the length of his reign as eight years, 1407-1400. Before him the occupant of the throne was Aššurbêlnišêšu, his brother, and he reigned for nine years, says the Khorsabad list, *i.e.*, 1416-1408, while his father Aššurnirâri II was king for seven years, 1423-1417, according to the same list.

Preceding him was his brother Enlilnâšir II, whose reign according to the Khorsabad list lasted six years, 1429-1424. The list at this point notes, *Enlil-nâšir alu-šu iskussa iṣ-bat, i.e.* "Enlilnâšir, his brother, took the throne"<sup>52)</sup>. This expression is usually employed when a king was deposed, *cf.* Khorsabad list rev. i, 29; ii, 4. It therefore would seem that he had dethroned his brother Aššurnâdinahhê I. Consequently, Aššurnâdinahhê I cannot have been king for long, probably not so much as a year, since difficulties regarding the succession usually occur at the beginning of a reign. However, we do not know how long he reigned.

<sup>49)</sup> AFO 10, 1935-1936, pp. 9 ff.

<sup>50)</sup> AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 88, Note 16.

<sup>51)</sup> AFO 4, 1927, NASSOUHI, *Grande Liste des Rois d'Assur*, rev. I 38-39.

<sup>52)</sup> Khorsabad list, rev. I 1.

for the figure which gives the number of regnal years is broken away on the Khorsabad list, as is that of his predecessor and brother, Aššurrâbi 1. Thus at this point we find ourselves faced with a lacuna in the Khorsabad list, which we must try to fill. But in the Assyrian material we have not a single datum which provides us with absolute certainty regarding the length of reigns of these two kings. Therefore we must endeavour by the method of synchronism and making use of all material available to us to reach absolute certainty in this matter, or at least a probability approximating to certainty. Hence in the first place we must take note of the material from the Babylonian Empire.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DYNASTY OF THE KASSITES

In a work on synchronism <sup>53)</sup> we get the following information: II, m *den-lil-ku-dúr-ušur-šar* m *mâtaššur* m d[*adad-šumu-linnašir šar mâtkar-du-ni-aš*] *i-du-ku* m *den-lil-ku-dúr-ušur* m *dadad[-šumu-linnašir...]* <sup>5</sup>*ina qabli ti-du-ku-ma* m *dninurta-apal-e[-kur mâr dnabu-dânan]* <sup>6</sup>*ana mâti-šu itûr šabê meš-šu-me* [... id-ki] <sup>7</sup>*a-na âlîbbi-âli a-na ka-ša-di il[-lik.....]* <sup>8</sup>*i-na qi-rib-šu im-qut is-hur-ma* [a-na mâti-šu itûr]. "Enlilkudurušur of Aššur and Adadšumulinnašir of Babylon made war. When Enlilkudurušur and Adadšumulinnašir were killed, Ninurta-apal-ekur, the son of Nabudân, mobilised his troops ..... and set forth to conquer Aššur. He ..... therein, he turned about and went back to his country". This shows that Enlilkudurušur and Adadšumulinnašir were killed at the same time. This happened in 1191. Adadšumulinnašir was king, according to the Babylonian list of kings <sup>54)</sup>, for thirty years, 1221-1192. During this time the kings in Aššur were Enlilkudurušur, 1196-1192, Aššurnirâri III, 1202-1197, Assurnâdinapal, 1205-1203, and Tukulti-Ninurta, 1242-1206. Thus Adadšumulinnašir of Babylon came to the throne in the twenty-third year of Tukulti-Ninurta.

According to Chronicle P, Adadšumulinnašir was put on the throne by the nobles of Babylon who rebelled against Tukulti-Ninurta, who reigned in Babylon for seven years <sup>55)</sup>. IV <sup>1</sup>[.....a]-*bi-ik-ti* m *kas-til-[ia-šu]* <sup>2</sup>.....*ma-* *har dninurta id-di* ..... <sup>3</sup>..... m *tukul-ti-dninurta a-na babiliki i-tu-ra-am-na* <sup>4</sup>[.....i]-*qar-ri-bu dûr babiliki iq-qur mâr babiliki ina iskahkêmeš* <sup>5</sup>[*iq-*] *qur makkur é-sag-gil u babiliki ina sil-lat uš-te-ši dbêlu rabûu mdarduk* <sup>6</sup>[*ina*] *šub-ti-šu id-ki-e-ma a-na mâtaššurki u-ša-aš-bi har-ra-an amêšak-nu-ti-šu* <sup>7</sup>*ina mâtkar-ddun-iá-aš is-ku-un* <sup>7</sup> *sanatemeš* m *tukul-ti-dninurta kar-ddun-ia-aš* <sup>8</sup>*u-ma-'ir arki amêrabûtemeš* <sup>8</sup> *ša mâtakkadiki ša mâtkar-ddun-iá-aš ibbalkitumeš-ma* <sup>9</sup>m *dadad-šumu-linnašir ina kussi abi-šu ú-še-ši-bu*. "The defeat of Kastiliaš ... for Ninurta ... Tukulti-Ninurta turned back to Babylon ... he drew near, he wasted the wall of Babylon, he destroyed the Babylonians with weapons, he profaned the dwelling of Esaggil and Babylon and he brought the great lord Marduk out of his house and caused him to take the road to Aššur. He set his governors over Karduniaš. For seven years Tukulti-Ninurta ruled over Karduniaš, thereafter the great ones of Akkad and Karduniaš arose and made Adadšumulinnašir to sit upon his father's throne".

This shows that Tukulti-Ninurta was ruler of Babylon for seven years before Adadšumulinnašir, that is 1227-1221, from his sixteenth to his twenty-second year. It is also plain that Adadšumulinnašir was a son of Kaštiliaš, who was defeated and led away into captivity by Tukulti-Ninurta, as an inscription of Tukulti-Ninurta on a building informs us: <sup>56)</sup> obv. II, <sup>48</sup>*i-na tukul-ti ša daššur* <sup>49</sup>*denlil u dša-maš ilânimeš rabûtimeš* <sup>50</sup>*bêlê-ia i-na ri-šu-ti* <sup>51</sup>*ša dištar rubâtat šamêe iršititi* <sup>52</sup>*i-na pa-ni um-ma-ni-ia* III <sup>53</sup>*il-li-ku it-ti* <sup>54</sup>*kaš-til-a-šu šar mâtkar-du-ni-aš* <sup>55</sup>*a-na e-piš tuk-ma-ti* <sup>56</sup>*as-ni-iq a-bi-ik-ta-šu* <sup>57</sup>*um-ma-na-te-šu aš-ku-un* <sup>58</sup>*muq-tab-li-šu ú-še-im-qit* <sup>59</sup>*i-na qi-rib tam-ha-ri šu-a-tu* <sup>60</sup>*kaš-til-a-šu šar kaš-ši-i* <sup>61</sup>*qa-ti ik-šud kišad be-li-ti-šu* <sup>62</sup>*ki-ma gal-tap-pi i-na šêpêmeš-ia* <sup>63</sup>*ak-bu-uš šal-lu-su* <sup>64</sup>*ka-mu-su a-na mahar daššur* <sup>65</sup>*bêli-ia ú-bi-la u mâtšu-me-ri u ak-ka-di-i a-na pát gim-ri-ša* <sup>66</sup>*a-bil i-na tâmti šaplîtiti* <sup>67</sup>*ša ši-i dšamšiši mi-šir* <sup>68</sup>*mâti-ia aš-ku-un*: "With trust in Aššur, Enlil and Šamaš, the great gods, my lords, with the help of Ištar, the princess of heaven and earth, who

<sup>53)</sup> CT 34, 42, K 440 Ib; AFO 4, 1927, pp. 8-9; JNES 2, 1943, p. 57.

<sup>54)</sup> CT 36, pl. 44, obv. II 11.

<sup>55)</sup> L. W. KING, *Studies in Eastern History* I,

p. 157; H. WINCKLER, *Altor. Forsch.* I, pp. 302 f.; PINCHES, *Records of the Past, New Series*, Vol. I, p. 111.

<sup>56)</sup> KAH II 58, II 48, III 60.



goes before my troops, I made ready to do battle with Kaštiliaš, king of Karduniaš, and brought about the overthrow of his host. His warriors I slew. In that encounter I took Kaštiliaš, king of the Kassites, prisoner. I trod upon his royal neck as on a footstool, naked and in bonds brought I him before Aššur my lord. Šumer and Akkad in their whole extent I brought under my power. I made my boundaries extend to the lower sea from the sunrise". He took Kaštiliaš prisoner and brought him to Aššur in 1227, the sixteenth year of his reign. He appointed governors over the district of Babylon, as appears from the chronicle. He himself is not included in the Babylonian list of kings, but three names are mentioned between Kaštiliaš and Adadšumulinnašir, who was a son of Kaštiliaš. These names are, Enlilnâdinšumi<sup>57)</sup> with a reign of one year and six months, Kadašmanharbe<sup>58)</sup> with a reign of the same length, and Adadšumu-iddinna<sup>59)</sup>, who ruled for six years. According to the Babylonian list of kings, therefore, these three ruled for nine years. But the gap in time between Kaštiliaš and Adadšumulinnašir is but seven years, according to the passage from the chronicle cited above, hence the Babylonian list A of kings gives two years too many. Now we see that the last king, Adadšumu-iddinna, reigned for six years, while the other two were in power for a year and a half each. One of them has an Assyrian, the other a Kassite name; it therefore seems that these two princes reigned simultaneously. Enlilnâdinšumi was appointed governor by Tukulti-Ninurta, while Kadašmanharbe was Kaštiliaš' legitimate successor, acknowledged by a large section of the people of Babylon and above all by the nobility. The Babylonians seem to have sought aid from Kidin-Ĥutran, king of Elam, for Enlilnâdinšumi had to fight against him. Kidin-Ĥutran drove him off, and Tukulti-Ninurta came back from Aššur and appointed Adadšumu-iddinna. Nothing more is heard of Kadašmanharbe. He probably was killed in the fighting<sup>60)</sup>. Thus it would seem that Enlilnâdinšumi and Kadašmanharbe were reigning at the same time. In this way we can bring list A of the Babylonian kings into agreement with chronicle P. The half year which is assigned to these princes therefore either falls within the six years of Adadšumu-iddinna or goes to make up the last year of Kaštiliaš, and thus we get the seven years during which Tukulti-Ninurta was ruler of Babylon. The Babylonian list of kings, however, records them one after another and reckons their years separately, whereby we get nine years; but we must subtract two years which are counted twice in the chronological sequence.

Kaštiliaš was made prisoner by Tukulti-Ninurta. He reigned, according to the Babylonian list of kings (A) for eight years<sup>61)</sup>, 1235-1228, so that his entire reign is within the limits of that of Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria, from the latter's seventh year to his fifteenth. Kaštiliaš was preceded by Šagaraktišuriaš, who reigned for thirteen years<sup>62)</sup>, 1248-1236. He reigned five years contemporaneously with Tukulti-Ninurta I and eight contemporaneously with the latter's predecessor Salmanasser I's twenty-third to thirtieth years. Kaštiliaš' predecessor Kudurenlil reigned for eight years<sup>63)</sup>, 1256-1249, so that his whole reign fell within that of Salmanasser I of Assyria, from the latter's fifteenth to his twenty-third year. Kudurenlil's predecessor Kadašmanharbe had a reign of eleven years<sup>64)</sup>, 1267-1257. He also ruled contemporaneously with Salmanasser I of Assyria, from his fourth to his fourteenth year. Before him again came Kadašmanturgu, who was on the throne for eighteen years, 1285-1268<sup>65)</sup>. For four years he was contemporary with Salmanasser I of Assyria and for fourteen with Adadnirâri I, from the latter's nineteenth to his thirty-second year. He was preceded by Nazimaruttaš, whose reign lasted for twenty-six years<sup>66)</sup>, 1311-1286. For seventeen of these years he was contemporary with Adadnirâri I of Assyria and for nine with Arik-dên-ili, from the latter's fourth year to his

<sup>57)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 8.

<sup>58)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 9.

<sup>59)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 10.

<sup>60)</sup> Chronicle IV 14 ff. PINCHES, *Records of the Past* V, pp. 111 ff.; WINCKLER, *Allor. Forsch.* I, p. 124.

<sup>61)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 7.

<sup>62)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 6.

<sup>63)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 5; BE 14, I 23, 24, 8 years; I 23a, 2-3, 8 years; I 24, 18, 8 years.

<sup>64)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 4.

<sup>65)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 3.

<sup>66)</sup> CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 2.

twelfth. According to the synchronistic chronicle, Nazimaruttaš had a quarrel with Adad-nirari I (67): <sup>24</sup>mdadad-ni-râri šar mâtaššur m na-zi-marut-taš šar mâtkar-du-ni-âš <sup>25</sup>it-ti a-ħa-meš ina âlkar-dištar-a-qar-ša-al-lu i-duk <sup>26</sup>mdadad-nirâri a-bi-ik-tu ša m na-zi-marut-taš iš-kun <sup>27</sup>abikta-šu im-ħa-aš karas-su urigallêmeš-šui-bu-ka-šu <sup>28</sup>i-na âli mi-iš-ri ta-ħu-mu an-ni-mc <sup>29</sup>mi-šir-ri-šu-nu iš-tu tar-ši mâtpi-la-aš-qi <sup>30</sup>ša šêpê am-ma-ma-tc ša nâridiglat âlar-ma-an-a-qar-ša-li <sup>31</sup>a-di lu-lu-me-e iš-ku-nu-ma i-zu-zu, i.e., "Adadnirâri, the king of Aššur, and Nazimaruttaš, the king of Karduniaš, strove with each other at Kar-Ištar-aqaršallu. Adadnirâri brought about the defeat of Nazimaruttaš. He smote him annihilatingly. His host and his Urigallu priests he led away. As to the borders of this region, he established his borders from Pelasqi on the bank on the other side of the Tigris from Arman-aqaršallu to the Lullume and apportioned it". In chronicle P nothing is preserved except the names, "Nazimaruttaš son of Kurigalzu the king of Karduniaš and Adadnirâri the king of Aššur" (68). That Nazimaruttaš was son of Kurigalzu is plain from a kudurru of his (69), I, <sup>1</sup>na-zi-marut-taš <sup>2</sup>šar kiššati <sup>3</sup>mâr ku-ri-gal-zu <sup>4</sup>liblibbi <sup>5</sup>bur-na-bu-ri-aš, i.e., "Nazimaruttaš, king of the whole, the son of Kurigalzu, descendant of Burnaburiaš". This is further confirmed by other sources (70). Kurigalzu, Nazimaruttaš' father, was king for twenty-five years (71), 1336-1312. His reign was contemporaneous with the first four years of Arikdênili of Assyria, the whole reign of Enlilnirâri, and the last ten years of Aššuruballiṭ. According to the synchronistic history and chronicle P, Kurigalzu made war on Enlilnirâri (72). The account in the synchronistic history runs: <sup>18</sup>ina tar-ši m denlil-nirâri šar mâtaššur m ku-ri-gal-zu ši-ih-ru [ana mâtaššur il-lik] <sup>19</sup>m denlil-nirâri šar mâtaššur i-na âlsu-ga-gi ša êli nâr [idiglat] <sup>20</sup>it-ti-šu i-duk a-bi-ik-šu iš-kun šabê meš-šu [i-du]k <sup>21</sup>uš-ma-nu-šu e-bu-uk ul-tu ša si-li mâtsü-ba-ri <sup>22</sup>a-di kar-du-ni-aš eqlâtemeš ú-šam-ši-lu-ma i-zu-zu <sup>23</sup>mi-iš-ru ta-ħu-mu iš-kun-nu, that is, "In the days of Enlilnirâri, the king of Aššur, Kurigalzu the younger set forth against Assyria. Enlilnirâri, the king of Aššur, strove with him at Sugagi on the Tigris. He brought about his defeat, he slew his soldiers, he utterly destroyed his power. From Silu of Subari to Karduniaš they divided the fields into equal portions. They established the boundaries of the region".

The first ten years of the reign of Kurigalzu coincided with the last ten years of the reign of Aššuruballiṭ of Aššur, by whose assistance Kurigalzu succeeded to the throne of Babylon, according to the synchronistic history and chronicle P (73). The text of the former document runs as follows (74): *ina tar-ši maššur-uballiṭ šar mâtaššur m ka-ra-ħar-da-aš* <sup>9</sup>šar mâtkar-du-ni-âš mâr šalmu-bal-li-ta-at-dše-rú-ú-a <sup>10</sup>mârat maššur-uballiṭ šabêmeš kaš-ši-i <sup>11</sup>ib-bal-ki-tu-ma iduku-šu m na-zi-bu-ga-aš <sup>12</sup>[kaš-šu-ú]mâr l[a] [m]a-ma-na i-na šarru-ú-ti a-na êli-šu-nu iš-šu-ú <sup>13</sup>[.....maš]šur-[uballiṭ a-na tu-u]r-ri gi-mil-li <sup>14</sup>[ka-r]a-in-da-aš m[âr marti-šu] a-na mâtkar-du-ni-âš il-lik <sup>15</sup>m na-zi-bu-ga-aš šar mâtkar-du-ni-âš i-duk <sup>16</sup>[m ku-r]i-gal-zu ši-ih-ru mâr m bur-na-bur-ia-âš <sup>17</sup>[a]-na šarru-u-ti iš-kun-ma ina iskussi âbi-šu ú[še-šib]. "In the days of Aššuruballiṭ, the king of Aššur, the Kassite soldiers rose up against Karahardaš, the king of Karduniaš, the son of Muballiṭat-Šerua, the daughter of Aššuruballiṭ, and killed him. They exalted Nazibugaš, the son of a nobody, to the kingship over them. Therefore Aššuruballiṭ set out for Karduniaš, to avenge Karaindaš, the son of his daughter. He slew Nazibugaš, the king of Karduniaš, set up Kurigalzu the younger, the son of Burnaburiaš, in the kingship and caused him to sit on his father's throne". The

<sup>67</sup>) CT 34, pl. 38, 24-31; pl. 42, Sm 2106, 1-8.

<sup>68</sup>) Chronicle P III, 23 ff.; WINCKLER, *Allor. Forsch.*, I p. 301; DELITZSCH, *Babyl. Chronik*, p. 45.

<sup>69</sup>) Kudurru of Nazimaruttaš, MDP II, pl. 16, p. 86, I 1-4.

<sup>70</sup>) HILPRECHT, OBI I, pl. 22, No. 53, 55; pl. 23, No. 56, 57, 58; pl. 27, No. 78.

<sup>71</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II 1; Chronicle P, rev. III, 23-24.

<sup>72</sup>) CT 34, pl. 38, 18-23; Chronicle P III, 20-22.

<sup>73</sup>) WINCKLER, *Allor. Forsch.* I, pp. 115 ff.; ROST, MVAG, 1897, 2, pp. 53 ff.; RADAU, BEUP XVII, I, pp. 59 ff.; HÜSING, OLZ 1905, pp. 93 ff.; THUREAU-DANGIN, JA 1908, Janv., pp. 125 ff.; KNUDTZON, VAB II, pp. 34 ff.; UNGNAD, OLZ 1908, pp. 12 ff.; SCHNABEL, MVAG 1908, I, pp. 14 ff.; TOFFTEEN, Chronology I, p. 69; E. WEIDNER, MVAG 20, 1915, 4, pp. 53 ff.

<sup>74</sup>) CT 34, pl. 38, 8-17; WINCKLER, UAOG, p. 148; KING, *Annals*, p. XXVII, n. 1.

Babylonian chronicle P relates the affair thus <sup>75</sup>): <sup>5</sup>[ka-daš-man]-ḥar-be mâr ka-ra-in-da-aš mârû ša šalmu-bal-li-ta-at-dše-ru-a <sup>6</sup>marti ša aššur-uballiṭ šar mâtāššurki ka-ma-ri šu-ti-i rab-ba-a-ti <sup>7</sup>ša ši-it šamši adi e-ru-ub šamši iš-pur-ma adi la baši e-muq-šu-nu <sup>8</sup>âl qaš-ra-a-tu ina qî-rib mâtamurri ú-qaš-šir ku-up-ḫu ip-te-na <sup>9</sup>a-na maššar-tu du-un-nu-nu nišêmeš ina libbi-ši-na a-bur-riš ú-še-šib ar-ka-nu <sup>10</sup>nišê kaš-ši-i ibbalkitumeš šu idukumeš-šu šu-zi-ga-aš mâtkaš-šu-ú <sup>11</sup>mâr la ma-am-nu a-na šarru-ú-tu a-na êli-šu-nu iš-šu-ú maššur-uballiṭ <sup>12</sup>šar mâtāššurki a-na tur-tu gi-mil-li ša ka-daš-man-ḥar-be mâr marti-šu <sup>13</sup>a-na mâtkar-du-ni-aš il-lik šu-zi-ga-aš mâtkaš-šu-ú <sup>14</sup>idûk-ma ku-ri-gal-zu ši-ih-ru mârû ša ka-daš-man-ḥar-be ina iškussi abi-šu ú-še-šib, i.e., "Kadašmanḥarbe, the son of Karaindaš, the son of Muballiṭat-Šerua, the daughter of Aššuruballiṭ, the king of Aššur, brought about the conquest of the numerous Šutu from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun, so that their power no longer existed, he fortified strongholds in Amurru and opened wells, and to strengthen the guard he caused people to live together there. Later the Kassites rose against him and put him to death. They exalted Šuzigaš, a Kassite, a son of nobody, to the kingship over them. Aššuruballiṭ, the king of Aššur, went to Karduniaš to avenge Kadašmanḥarbe the son of his daughter; he slew Šuzigaš the Kassite and caused Kurigalzu the younger, the son of Kadašmanḥarbe, to sit on his father's throne". We thus possess two accounts of the same event, one from the Assyrian side in the synchronistic history and the other from the Babylonian side in chronicle P. They agree in substance with one another, but differ as regards the name. The son of Aššuruballiṭ's daughter is called Karahardaš once and the other time Karaindaš in the Assyrian synchronistic history; Karahardaš may be a miswriting of Karaindaš. The Babylonian chronicle P however calls the son of Aššuruballiṭ's daughter Kadašmanḥarbe both times and the husband of that daughter Karaindaš. Now since the Babylonian chronicle reproduces the Babylonian tradition and as regards the correctness of names is in a better position than the writer of the Assyrian synchronistic history, who reproduces the Assyrian point of view and was not so well informed as regards the names, since he had less easy access to the Babylonian archives, the Babylonian chronicle P inspires more confidence with reference to the correctness of the names. So we can reconstruct the run of events thus. Karaindaš of Babylon married the daughter of Aššuruballiṭ of Aššur. They had a son, Kadašmanḥarbe. He in turn had a son, Kurigalzu, as is clear from the Babylonian chronicle P. Instead of Kadašmanḥarbe, the Assyrian synchronising history names his father Karaindaš once and another time Karahardaš, which may be a miswriting of Karaindaš. The Assyrian synchroniser calls Kurigalzu a son of Burnaburiaš, who was really his great-grandfather. Kurigalzu was still a minor when he was set on the throne by Aššuruballiṭ. Thus we get the sequence Burnaburiaš, Karaindaš, Kadašmanḥarbe, Šuzigaš (who seems not to have been included in the list of kings), Kurigalzu. This is further confirmed by another source, which runs: iš-tu ku-ri-gal-zu mâr dka-da-aš-man-ḥar-be <sup>9</sup>a-di dna-zi-ma-ru-ut-ta-aš mâr dku-ri-gal-zu, "from Kurigalzu the son of Kadašmanḥarbe to Nazimaruttaš the son of Kurigalzu" <sup>76</sup>).

In the Tell el-Amarna correspondence there are two letters from Aššuruballiṭ of Aššur, one of which is directed to the king of Egypt <sup>77</sup>), and the other to Naphuria, king of Egypt <sup>78</sup>). Now Naphuria is the Babylonian transcription of *nfr.hprw.r'*, the name of Amenophis IV, otherwise Akhenaten <sup>79</sup>). He was king from 1373 to 1356, while Aššuruballiṭ, as we have already seen, reigned from 1362 to 1326, hence these letters must have been written between 1362 and 1356. Probably it was towards the end of Akhenaten's life, for Aššuruballiṭ had first to see to it that his position in his own land was well established and

<sup>75</sup>) Chronicle P, obv. I, 5-14; WINCKLER, *Altor. Forsch.* I, p. 298; DELITZSCH, *Die babyl. Chronik*, p. 43.

<sup>76</sup>) BE I.4, 37, p. 8-9.

<sup>77</sup>) V. SCHEIL, *Deux Nouvelles Lettres d'El-Amarna*, Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie orientale du Caire, Vol. II, Caire 1902, pp. 113 ff.;

KNUDTZON, *Die Amarnatafeln*, No. 15 f.

<sup>78</sup>) V. SCHEIL, *o.c.*, pp. 113 ff.; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 16.

<sup>79</sup>) ALBRIGHT, *Cuneiform Material for Egyptian Prosography 1500-1200 B.C.*, JNES 5, 1946, pp. 7-25, No. 34.

that Assyria enjoyed prestige before he could think of establishing relations with Egypt on an equal footing. This is clear furthermore from the fact that Burnaburiaš protested against the relations between Egypt and Assyria to Akhenaten's successor Tutankhamen. The beginning of his letter runs <sup>80</sup>), *a-na ni-ib-ḥu-ur-ri-ri-ia šar mātmi-iš-ri-i*, "to Nibḥurriria the king of Egypt". Nibḥurriria is the name of Tutankhamen, as Mr. EDEL has proved <sup>81</sup>). Burnaburiaš therefore must have been still on the throne later than 1356 and consequently Aššuruballiṭ must have written his letter at the end of Akhenaten's reign, for if it had been earlier, Burnaburiaš would have lodged his protest with Akhenaten, not with Tutankhamen.

Burnaburiaš seems to have come to power shortly before Akhenaten came to the throne, therefore shortly before 1373, for in a letter to Akhenaten he says that he has received a complaint from Akhenaten's father, Amenophis III<sup>82</sup>). If Amenophis III had been still alive, he would have written to him. Burnaburiaš wrote but one letter to Amenophis III, moreover there are three known letters of his to Akhenaten and one to Tutankhamen. The letter of Burnaburiaš to Amenophis III, which probably dates from that monarch's last year, runs <sup>83</sup>): <sup>1</sup>[*a-n*]a [*ni-ib-mu-wa-ri*]-ma [*šar mātmi-iš-ri-i*] <sup>2</sup>ḥi-ia qī-b[*i-ma*] <sup>3</sup>um-ma bur-na-bu-ri-ia-āš *šar mātka-ra-du-ni-ia-āš* <sup>4</sup>ḥu-ka-ma a-na ia-ši šu-ul-m[*u*] <sup>5</sup>a-na ka-ša aššati-ka mārê-[*ka*] <sup>6</sup>māti-ka amērabūti-ka sisê-[*ka*] <sup>7</sup>isnarkabati-ka lu šu-ul-m[*ù*] <sup>8</sup>ki ša pa-nu at-ta ù a-bu-ù-[*a*] <sup>9</sup>it-ti a-ha-mi-iš ṭa-ba-tu-[*nu*] <sup>10</sup>i-na-an-na a-na-ku ù ka-ša it-[*ti a ḥa-mi-iš*] lu-ṭa-ba-nu <sup>11</sup>i-na bi-ru-um-ni a-ma-tu-[*um-ma*] <sup>12</sup>ša-ni-tu-um-ma la iq-[*qa-ab-bi*], "To Nibmuria, the king of Egypt, say: thus Burnaburiaš, the king of Karduniaš, your brother. I am in health; to yourself, your wives, your sons, your land, your great ones, your horses, your chariots, truly health. As you and my father were formerly in friendly relations, so shall we now be with each other truly in friendly relations. Between us shall no other word be spoken". Nibmuria is the name of Amenophis III. This letter must have been written shortly after the accession of Burnaburiaš, to continue the good relations between Egypt and Babylonia. Thereafter it is probable that there came an answer with a complaint. In the meanwhile Amenophis deceased and Burnaburiaš thereupon wrote to Akhenaten. A twenty-fifth year of Burnaburiaš is known from contracts <sup>84</sup>). It is probable that he reigned for twenty-seven years, for of all the kings of whom contracts have been found and whose regnal years are known from the Babylonian list of kings (A), there is not one contract from the last two years of their reign. This may be accidental, but as it happens so often, one begins to doubt its accidental nature. It may also be that for the last two years they had a co-regent after whom the contracts were dated, but then again it is remarkable enough that they knew precisely two years ahead that they were going to die. Be this as it may, it is probable that we must ascribe to Burnaburiaš a reign of twenty-seven years. He will therefore have reigned from 1375 to 1349, which leaves thirteen years over for Karaindaš and Kadašmanḥarbe. So far no contracts of these princes have been found. They both therefore reigned contemporaneously with Aššuruballiṭ of Aššur, from the latter's fourteenth year to his twenty-seventh. Burnaburiaš reigned contemporaneously with Aššuruballiṭ from his first year to his fourteenth and during the last twelve years of Irêba-Adad, Aššuruballiṭ's predecessor.

The father of Burnaburiaš was Kurigalzu, according to the Tell el-Amarna letters. In a letter to Tutankhamen, Burnaburiaš says <sup>85</sup>), <sup>19</sup>i-na ku-ru-gal-zu a-bi-ia ki-na-ḥa-a-a-ù gab-bi-šu-nu <sup>20</sup>a-na mu-uh-ḥi-šu al-ta-aḥ-ru-ni um-ma-a a-na qa-an-ni māti <sup>21</sup>[*ku-uš-*]da-am-ma i ni-ba-al-ki-ta-am-ma <sup>22</sup>[*it-t*]i-ka i ni-ša-ki-in, "In the time of Kurigalzu my father, all the Canaanites wrote thus: Come to the border of the land and let us make a revolt, for we wish to come into alliance with you". This we can also deduce from a letter of Burnaburiaš to Akhenaten. It is directed to *na-aḥ-hu-ru-ri-a*, which is the transcription of *nfr.ḥprw.r'*, Akhenaten's name <sup>86</sup>), and says (rev. 19), *ki-i a-bu-ka a-na ku-ri-gal-zu huraša ma'-da u-še-bi-i-lu*,

<sup>80</sup>) L 29785, BB, 2; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 9.

<sup>81</sup>) Elmar EDEL, *Neue keilschriftliche Umschreibungen ägyptischer Namen aus den Bogasköytexten*, JNES 7, 1948, pp. 11-24, No. VII.

<sup>82</sup>) VAS XI, 6; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 11, 5.

<sup>83</sup>) VAS XI, 3; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 6.

<sup>84</sup>) BE I, 4, 0, 7-9.

<sup>85</sup>) L 29785, BB, 2; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 9, 19-22.

<sup>86</sup>) VAS XI, 6; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 11, rev. 19.

“because your father sent much gold to Kurigalzu”. The father of Akhenaten was Amenophis III, who reigned from 1409 to 1374. We have seen that Burnaburiaš came to the throne while Amenophis was still alive, therefore Kurigalzu must have reigned during the reign of Amenophis III. His reign however did not include the whole time when Amenophis III was on the throne, for among the Tell el-Amarna correspondence we find three letters from Kadašmanḥarbe to Amenophis III. They treat of a daughter of Kadašmanḥarbe whom Amenophis wishes to marry<sup>87</sup>). <sup>10</sup>*a-nu-um-ma aš-te-me a-wa-tu ša ta-aš-pu-ra muḥḥi-še a-na ia-ši* <sup>11</sup>*um-ma-a-mi a-nu-um-ma tu-ba-a marti-ia a-na aššutut-ti-ka* <sup>12</sup>*ù a-ḥa-ti-ia ša id-di-na-ku a-bi-ia aš-ra-nu it-ti-ka*, “Behold, I have heard the matter concerning which you have written to me, namely that you desire my daughter to be your wedded wife, although my sister, whom my father gave you, is with you”. It was not only, therefore, Kadašmanḥarbe himself who had relations with Amenophis III, but his father as well. That is plain from another passage in a letter from Kadašmanḥarbe<sup>88</sup>): <sup>9</sup>*i-na pa-na mâr ši-ip-ri a-bu-ù-a i-ša-ap-pa-ra-ku-um-ma* <sup>10</sup>*umê ma'-du-ti ul ta-ka-al-la-šu ḥa-mu-ut-ta* <sup>5</sup> <sup>11</sup>*tu-ka-ša-da-aš-šu ù šu-ul-ma-na ba-na-a* <sup>12</sup>*a-na a-bi-ia tu-še-ib-bi-la-am*, “formerly my father used to send you a messenger, and you did not detain him long, you were wont to send him away in haste and you were wont to send a handsome gift to my father”. The father of Kadašmanḥarbe was presumably Karaindaš, for in a letter of Burnaburiaš to Akhenaten the former says that ever since Karaindaš' time messengers have been coming from Egypt to Babylon<sup>89</sup>): <sup>9</sup>*iš-tu-ka-ra-in-da-aš iš-tu mârêmeš ši-ip-ri* <sup>10</sup>*ša ab-bi-ka a-na mu-uh-ḥi ab-bi-ia it-ta-al-la-ku-ni* <sup>11</sup>*a-di i-na-an-na ḥa-bu-tu-šu-nu* <sup>12</sup>*i-na-an-na a-na-ku ù ka-ša ḥa-bu-tu ni-nu*, “Since Karaindaš' days, since messengers came from your fathers to my fathers, they were good friends till now; now we, you and I, are good friends”. This Karaindaš must have been the father of Kadašmanḥarbe, for that is the only place in this part of the list of Kassite kings where he can be put, all the others being included in the sources we have mentioned above. Karaindaš must have lived at that time, for according to the Assyrian synchronistic history he concluded a treaty with Aššur-bêl-nišešu of Aššur<sup>90</sup>). <sup>1m</sup>*ka-ra-in-da-aš šar mâtkar-du-ni-áš* <sup>2</sup>*ù m aššur-bêl-niše-meš-šu šar mât-aššur rik-sa-a-ti* <sup>3</sup>*ina be-rit-šu-nu a-na a-ḥa-meš ú-ri-ki-su* <sup>4</sup>*ù ma-mi-ta ina êli mi-iš-ri an-nu-ma a-na a-ḥa-meš id-di-nu*, “Karaindaš, king of Karduniaš, and Aššur-bêlnišešu, king of Aššur, mutually concluded a treaty with each other and of their free will swore an oath to each other concerning the boundary”. Aššurbêlnišešu reigned from 1416 to 1408; Karaindaš must therefore have reigned during those years, but also beyond them, since he had relations with Amenophis III, whose reign began in 1409. Probably it was at the beginning of his reign that Amenophis took Karaindaš' sister to wife. Aššurnâdinaḥḥê II also, according to the Tell el-Amarna correspondence, had relations with Amenophis III, for we read in a letter from Aššuruballit to Akhenaten<sup>91</sup>): <sup>19</sup>*un-du m a-šur-na-din-aḥḥê a-bi* <sup>20</sup>*a-na mâtmi-iš-ri iš-pu-ru* <sup>21</sup>*20 bilat ḥu-râsi ul-te-bi-lu-ni-šu*, “when Aššurnâdinaḥḥê my father wrote to Egypt, he was sent twenty talents of gold”. Aššurnâdinaḥḥê II ruled from 1399 to 1390, hence his whole reign falls within that of Amenophis III.

We can now, with the help of these data, the Babylonian list A of kings and the synchronising list of kings from Aššur (14616 c<sup>92</sup>), reconstruct the Kassite dynasty, which included thirty-six kings, as follows:

- |                  |                   |                      |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Gandaš        | 8. Tiptakzi       | 15. Burnaburiaš II   |
| 2. Agum I        | 9. Agum II        | 16. Karaindaš I      |
| 3. Kaštiliaš I   | 10. Burnaburiaš I | 17. Kadašmanḥarbe I  |
| 4. Abirattaš     | 11. (broken away) | 18. Kurigalzu I      |
| 5. Kaštiliaš II  | 12. Kaštiliaš III | 19. Burnaburiaš III  |
| 6. Tazzigurummuš | 13. Ulamburiaš    | 20. Karaindaš II     |
| 7. Ḥarbašipak    | 14. Agum III      | 21. Kadašmanḥarbe II |

<sup>87</sup>) L 29786, BB, 3; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 1, 10-12.

<sup>88</sup>) C 4743, WA I; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 3, 9-12.

<sup>89</sup>) 29786, BB, 3; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 10, 8-10

<sup>90</sup>) CT 34, pl. 38, 1-4.

<sup>91</sup>) C 4746, WA 9; KNUDTZON, EA, No. 16, 19-21.

<sup>92</sup>) AFO 3, 1926, pp. 66-77.

- |                               |                      |                         |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 22. Kurigalzu II <i>šihru</i> | 27. Šagaraktišuriaš  | 32. Adadšumulinnašir    |
| 23. Nazimaruttaš              | 28. Kaštiliaš IV     | 33. Melišipak           |
| 24. Kadašmanturgu             | 29. Enlilnâdinšumi   | 34. Mardukapaliddinna I |
| 25. Kadašmanharbe III         | 30. Kadašmanharbe IV | 35. Zababašumiddinna    |
| 26. Kudur-Enlil               | 31. Adadšumiddinna   | 36. Enlilnâdinaḥḥê      |

That the reconstruction is correct for the series 18-22 is testified by the excavations at Aqar Qûf/Dûr-Kurigalzu, which was founded by Kurigalzu I, whose inscriptions have been discovered at Level IV. In Level III again inscriptions of a Kurigalzu were found, and he can be no other than Kurigalzu II *šihru*. In Level II, inscriptions were found of the time of Kudur-Enlil and Kaštiliaš, who can be none other than the twenty-sixth and twenty-eighth sovran of the Kassite dynasty and consequently Kaštiliaš IV. That in Level IC a doorsocket was found with an inscription of Kurigalzu, means simply that a stone bearing an inscription of Kurigalzu II *šihru* had been found and was re-used in that position. In Layer 1a inscriptions of Mardukapaliddina I were discovered<sup>93</sup>).

According to this reconstruction, which is based wholly upon written sources, the predecessor of Karaindaš I was Burnaburiaš II. The Assyrian synchronising history informs us that a certain Puzur-Aššur concluded a treaty with a Burnaburiaš<sup>94</sup>): *m pu-zur-aššur šar mât-aššur ù m bur-na-bu-ri-ià-àš šar 6mât-ka-ru-ni-àš it-mu-ma mi-iš-ri 7ta-hu-mu an-na-ma ú-ki-nu, i. e., "Puzur-Aššur, king of Aššur, and Burnaburiaš, king of Karduniaš, took oath, they established the border of that region". Burnaburiaš was the father of Karaindaš I, who in the neighbourhood of 1400 was still reigning for some years during the reign of Amenophis III. He concluded a treaty with Aššurbêlnišêšu. Between this sovran and Puzur-Aššur nine princes, including himself, bore rule in Aššur and the length of their reigns was sixty-three years + x years for the reign of the two kings the data concerning whose reigns are broken away. To this must be added some years for the remainder of the reigns of Karaindaš during which he still was in power after Aššurbêlnišêšu. This, then, would give a very long reign for two princes. Therefore the question arises whether the contemporary of Puzur-Aššur was Burnaburiaš I or II; so we must try if we can settle it.*

The predecessor of Burnaburiaš II was Agum III. According to a Babylonian chronicle<sup>95</sup>) he was the son of Kaštiliaš III. Still according to that chronicle he made an expedition against the "Sea-land": rev. 14m *a-gu-um mâr m kas-ti-li-ià-àš šabê-šu id-ki-e-ma 15a-na mât-tam-tim il-lik 16aldûr-ninni iksudud 17ê-gara-urumu bêt dea ša dûr-ninni ú-šal-pit*, "Agum the son of Kaštiliaš mobilised his host, marched against the Sea-land, conquered Dûr-Ninnu and ravaged *ê-gara-urumu*, the temple of Ea, in Dûr-Ninnu". How long Agum reigned we do not know. He was a nephew of Ulamburiaš, who was a brother of Kaštiliaš III, as is plain from the Babylonian chronicle<sup>96</sup>). rev 11m *dê-a-ga-mil šar mât tam-tim a-na mât elamti-ki il-li-ka-ma 12arki-šu m u-lam-bur-àš aḥ m kas-ti-li-ià-àš mâtkaš-šu-ú 13šabê-šu id-ki-e-ma mât tam-tim iksudud belûtût mâti i-pu-uš*, "Eagamil, king of the Sea-land, marched against Elam. Therefore Ulamburiaš, brother of Kaštiliaš the Kassite, mobilised his host and conquered the Sea-land. He exercised rule over that land." Ulamburiaš then held the kingship of the Sea-land in the time of his brother Kaštiliaš' reign in Babylon. In an inscription on a mace-head he gives himself the title of King of the Sea-land<sup>97</sup>) I, *1ḥi-in-qi abni šu-u 2šu u-la-bu-ra-ri-ià-àš 3mâr bur-na-bu-ra-ri-ià-àš šarri 4šar mât tamtim II, 1ša šu-ma an-na-a 2i-pa-aš-ši-tu-ma 3šu-um-šu i-ša-at-ṭa-ru 4an-nu denlil dea dmarduk 5ù dnin-maḥ 6šu-um-šu li-ip-ši-tu*, "This stone mace-head belongs to Ulamburiaš, son of Burnaburiaš the king, king of the Sea-land. Whoever erases this name and writes his name in place of it, may Anu, Enlil, Ea, Marduk and Ninmaḥ erase his name." Ulamburiaš is Ulamburiaš. He is a son of

<sup>93</sup>) Iraq, Supplement, 1944; Iraq, Supplement, 1945.

<sup>94</sup>) CT 34, pl. 38, 5-8.

<sup>95</sup>) No. 96152, KING, *Chronicles* II, p. 24, rev. 14-17.

<sup>96</sup>) No. 96152, KING, *Chronicles* II, pp. 22-23, rev. 11-13.

<sup>97</sup>) WEISSBACH, *Babylonische Miscellen*, pl. 3.

Burnaburiaš. This can be no other than Burnaburiaš I. If now we consult the list of the Kassite kings, we find the following succession: Burnaburiaš I, ....., Kaštiliaš III and Ulamburiaš. This last is the brother of Kaštiliaš, and consequently is also a son of Burnaburiaš I. We do not know if the king whose name is broken away was also a son of Burnaburiaš. Ulamburiaš therefore must have been quite old when he came to the throne as his brother's successor, probably because the latter's son was still a minor. Ulamburiaš and Kaštiliaš therefore cannot have reigned long, but how long we do not know, any more than we do for their two predecessors. The synchronising list of kings from Aššur 14616c names four Assyrian kings as contemporaries of Ulamburiaš, Puzur-Aššur, Enlilnâšir I, Nûr-ili and Aššursadûni. This list can hardly be correct, for the writer has left out of account that the kings of the Sea-land reigned simultaneously with those of the Kassite dynasty and of the first dynasty of Babylon and not after one another as he puts them<sup>98</sup>). According, then, to this list, Ulamburiaš must have reigned for forty-one years, which is very improbable. Another question is how long he was king of the Sea-land and if the years of this reign are counted in the list. These years should then be struck out, as they coincide with the years of Kaštiliaš III. At present, however, this cannot be made out.

Ulamburiaš conquered the Sea-land and dethroned Eagamil, the last king of the second dynasty of Larsa. The second dynasty of Larsa, or the dynasty of the Sea-land, is recorded in list A of the Babylonian kings<sup>99</sup>). This dynasty contains eleven kings who between them ruled for three hundred and sixty-eight years. There is a discrepancy of one year between the grand total given in the list and the separate regnal years of the various princes. The average reign of these eleven sovereigns, according to the Babylonian list of kings (A), was thirty-three years nine months. This in itself is not too high a number nor impossible, but if we look at the length of reigns of some kings it is very improbable. The sixth, seventh and eighth kings follow one another in succession from father to son, and their respective reigns lasted for fifty-five, fifty and twenty-eight years, a hundred and thirty-three years in all. That is a highly unlikely total for three generations<sup>100</sup>). The first king of this dynasty was Iluma-ilu. He had a quarrel with Šamšu-iluna, so far as can be made out from a Babylonian chronicle which is in a damaged condition<sup>101</sup>). Hence we must try to make out in what year of Šamšu-iluna Iluma-ilu came into power. The year-name of the tenth year of Šamšu-iluna runs "year in which Šamšu-iluna the king defeated the host of Idamaraz, Jamutbal, Uruk and Isin"<sup>102</sup>). There is a second copy extant of the contract in which this year-name occurs, but it has a different year-name which runs "year in which Rîm-Sin the king did not drive back the enemy, the wicked"<sup>103</sup>). These two year-names of Šamšu-iluna and Rîm-Sin indicate the same year and therefore date the same event. They are from Kutalla, the present Tell-Şifr, near Larsa. It looks as if the situation in Kutalla in the tenth year of Šamšu-iluna was still very unsettled, and therefore a contract was drawn up in two copies with different styles of dating. They were playing for safety and meant in the future to produce one or the other contract according to the turn of events. This Rîm-Sin cannot be Rîm-Sin I of Larsa, whom Ḫammurabi defeated, for he had already reigned for sixty years when Larsa was conquered. But a grandson was often named after his grandfather, so that this Rîm-Sin may have been a grandson of Rîm-Sin I. This Rîm-Sin also came from Jamutbal, for the armed forces of Jamutbal were involved in the war and were defeated. Thus he can very well have been a grandson of Rîm-Sin I who tried to restore the kingdom of Larsa and Jamutbal. After his first defeat he renewed his resistance, for the year-name of Šamšu-iluna's eleventh year runs "year in which Šamšu-iluna the king by command of Anu and Enlil destroyed the wall of

<sup>98</sup>) AFO 3, 1926, pp. 66-77; AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 92, Note 45; JNES 2, 1943, pp. 61-62, Note 236.

<sup>99</sup>) CT 34, pl. 24, I 4-15.

<sup>100</sup>) RA 24, 1927, p. 182.

<sup>101</sup>) BM 96152, rev. 1-6; KING, *Chronicles* II, pp. 19-20.

<sup>102</sup>) TCL 1, No. 130, 131; THUREAU-DANGIN,

*Chronologie de la Première Dynastie Babylonienne*, Mémoires de l'Institut de France, Tome XLIII, Deuxième partie, 1940, pp. 239-258, p. 236.

<sup>103</sup>) WALTHER, *Allbabylonische Gerichtsscesen*, pp. 111 ff.; ZA 23, p. 73; JA, Sept.-Oct. 1909, pp. 335 ff.

Ur and Uruk" 104). But this did not crush the revolt, for the name of the twelfth year of Šamšu-iluna runs "year in which Šamšu-iluna the king, with the exalted might which Marduk had lent him, (defeated) the united districts which had rebelled" 105). Even after this unrest persisted in the land of Šumer, for the name of Šamšu-iluna's thirteenth year is "year in which Šamšu-iluna the king by command of Enlil brought Sabum and Kissura to obedience" 106). It appears that it was not until the thirteenth year of his reign that Šamšu-iluna succeeded in temporarily crushing the revolt, for the formula for his fourteenth year runs "year in which Šamšu-iluna the king by his great power defeated with arms the kings, the usurpers, the enemies, who had caused the inhabitants of Ur to rebel" 107). Who this usurper was we can make out from a prism of Šamšu-iluna 108). Enlil the determiner of destiny has decided to surround the very old city of Kiš with a higher wall than formerly. He obliges Zababa and Innanna, the gods of the city of Kiš, to lend help to Šamšu-iluna against his enemies and informs them that Šamšu-iluna will build the city wall as a service in return. Zababa and Innanna inform Šamšu-iluna that they will help him if he builds the wall of Kiš higher than before. The text then continues: "Šamšu-iluna the able king, who harkens unto the great gods, trusted in the words which Zababa and Innanna had spoken to him; then he put his armed force in order to hew down his enemies, he caused an expedition to set forth to hew down his enemies. Before the year was half-way through he had defeated Rîm-Sin, the trouble-maker of the six-headed Šumer, who was exalted to the kingship of Larsa, and had brought him to defeat in the land of Kiš". Later, the building of the wall of Kiš is narrated, after which the twenty-fourth year of Šamšu-iluna is named, while the twenty-second year is named from the building of the temple-towers of Zababa and Innanna. The fifteenth year is named from the renovation of the wall of Isin. The sixteenth and eighteenth years are named from the constructions which he made in Sippar, and the seventeenth from the restoration of the wall of Emutbal, which had been destroyed. It seems then that this time the conflict ended in favour of Šamšu-iluna. We hear no more of Rîm-Sin II, who perhaps met his end in the fighting. This Rîm-Sin must have preceded Iluma-ilu, because he does not appear in the list of the kings of the Sea-land. After the death of Rîm-Sin it seems that Iluma-ilu took over Rîm-Sin's task and became king of the Sea-land. This cannot have been earlier than the fourteenth year of Šamšu-iluna. We can therefore put the beginning of the reign of Iluma-ilu and so the commencement of the dynasty of the Sea-land in Šamšu-iluna's fourteenth year. Iluma-ilu seems, according to the very battered Babylonian chronicle already mentioned, to have carried on the contest for a very long time with varying fortunes, but in the end to have defeated Šamšu-iluna, who thus lost the Sea-land once and for all. This naturally is not told us in Šamšu-iluna's year-names. Šamšu-iluna seems to have been still in Akkad in his thirty-sixth year, as is evident from the year-name of his thirty-seventh. Iluma-ilu was also at variance with the son and successor of Šamšu-iluna, Abi-esuh, as is plain from the above-mentioned Babylonian chronicle, rev. 7 *m a-bi-ši mâr m ša-am-šu-i-lu-na ka-šad m ilu-ma-ilu iš..... 8nârîdiglat a-na si-ki-ri lib-ba-šu ub-lam-ma 9nârîdiglat is-kir-ma m ilu-ma-il ul iš-bat*, "Abiši, son of Šamšu-iluna, in order to take Iluma-ilu prisoner..... His heart moved him to dam the Tigris. He dammed the Tigris but did not take Iluma-ilu prisoner" 109). Abiši is presumably Abi-esuh, the son of Šamšu-iluna. In which year of Abi-esuh's reign this took place we do not know, for there exists no continuous list of year-names. Iluma-ilu thus began to reign, in all probability, in the fourteenth year of Šamšu-iluna. The latter was king for thirty-eight years, so that he reigned for another twenty-four contemporaneously with Iluma-ilu. Abi-esuh reigned for twenty-eight years. His son and successor Ammiditana

104) BM 92702, CT 6, pl. 9, 10; KING, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, No. 101, Vol. II, pp. 217 ff.; BM 16924, KING, *o.c.*, pp. 228 ff.; VAS VIII, No. 105.

105) BM 42702; CT 6, pl. 9, 10.

106) BM 42702; CT 6, pl. 9, 10.

107) MERCER, *Sumero-Babylonian Year-formulae*, No. 564, p. 39.

108) YBT IX, 1930, No. 35; THUREAU-DANGIN, *Chronologie de la Première Dynastie Babylonienne*, pp. 238-242.

109) BM 90152, rev. 7-9; KING, *Chronicles II*, p. 21.



was on the throne for thirty-seven years, his successor Ammišaduqa for twenty-one and his successor Šamšiditana for thirty-one. This makes altogether a hundred and forty-one years in which the dynasty of the Sea-land ruled contemporaneously with the first dynasty of Babylon. Consequently, the dynasty of the Sea-land was still ruling contemporaneously with that of the Kassites during part of the reign of Agum II, the whole of that of Burnaburiaš I and of an unknown prince whose name is broken away in the list, and for part of the reign of Kaštiliaš III. According to the Babylonian list of kings (A), the Sea-land dynasty ruled for three hundred and sixty-eight years, so that there remain  $368-141 = 227$  years for the lengths of the reigns of the four princes of the Kassite dynasty. This gives these sovereigns a very long time on the throne, which is most unlikely if not impossible. We must therefore conclude that the data of the Babylonian list A of kings is not in order and may be set aside as inaccurate. Consequently, we must look out for other and more trustworthy data regarding this dynasty before we can use that of the Sea-land for constructing its chronology.

Burnaburiaš I was preceded by Agum II Kakrimme, who seems to have been the first king to rule in Babylon. He was the son of Tazzigurumuš<sup>110)</sup>, and the great-grandson of Abirattaš<sup>111)</sup>, heir of Agum I the Great<sup>112)</sup>. Between Tazzigurumuš and Agum II Ḫarba-Šipak and Tiptakzi reigned. Since Agum II was the son of Tazzigurumuš, these two princes cannot have reigned long. Agum calls himself "king of the Kassites and Akkadians, king of the wide land of Babylon, who causes Ešnunna to be inhabited by the wide-stretching peoples, king of Padan and Alman, king of the Quti"<sup>113)</sup>. According to the same inscription he restored Esagila and caused Marduk to enter into it<sup>114)</sup>. From another inscription we find that Agum brought Marduk back to Babylon after an absence of twenty-four years. The text refers to a journey of Marduk. It begins with an invocation of the gods (lines 1-6), then comes the enumeration of Marduk himself with all his epithets (7-12), next the narrative proper, in which we are informed that Marduk had remained in Hatti for twenty-four years in order to keep an eye on the trade relations between Hatti and Babylon. After this comes probably an account of conditions in Babylon during the absence of Marduk, for there follow expressions which recur in other texts in describing times of distress. These bad times come to an end, for Marduk decides to come back and orders the king of Babylon to get his temple ready for his return<sup>115)</sup>. From this portion two things are evident, *viz.*, that it was a time of distress in Babylon and that Marduk remained in the land of Hatti for twenty-four years. The cause of this time of distress was the capture of Babylon by Muršiliš I, concerning which the Babylonian chronicle states the following<sup>116)</sup>: *ana tar-šu m šam-ši-di-ta-na māḫat-tu-ú a-na mātakkadiki il-lik*, "in the time of Šamšiditana the Hittite came against the land of Akkad". According to a text of Telipinuš, Muršiliš I advanced on Babylon, took prisoners and booty with him to Hattušaš and captured Babylon. Among the booty were the figures of Marduk and Šarpanitum, which remained in Hattušaš for twenty-four years<sup>117)</sup>. In the inscription of Agum mentioned above he states that when the god Marduk, lord of Esagila, had decided to return to Babylon, he (Agum) went to the land of the Šuti, to Ḫana, in order to bring Marduk and Šarpanitum to Babylon, where he caused them to enter the restored Esagila<sup>118)</sup>. This took place twenty-four years after the sack of Babylon. How long Agum II had reigned we do not know, but he must have been on the throne in Babylon for some time to restore Esagila. The sack of Babylon however seems to have taken place some time before the beginning of his reign, for the chronicle says: *ana tar-šu šam-ši-di-ta-na*<sup>119)</sup>, "in the time of Šamšiditana". These words indicate that it happened in the reign of Šamšiditana and that

<sup>110)</sup> V R pl. 33, obv. I 2, 13.

<sup>111)</sup> V R pl. 33, obv. I 14-15.

<sup>112)</sup> V R pl. 33, obv. I 18-19.

<sup>113)</sup> V R pl. 33, obv. I 31-38.

<sup>114)</sup> V R pl. 33, rev. VI 45-VII 3.

<sup>115)</sup> K 3353, MARTIN, RT 24, pp. 100 ff. + K 8708, CT 13, pl. 45 + K 13678, CT 25, pl. 46; H. G. GÜTERBOCK, ZA 42, 1934, pp. 79-83, pl. III

and IV; C. J. GARD, *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 1951, pp. 70-91.

<sup>116)</sup> BM 96152, KING, *Chronicles II*, p. 22, rev. 10.

<sup>117)</sup> KBO III, 1, 67; KUB XI, 1, 2, 5, 6.

<sup>118)</sup> VR pl. 33, obv. I 44-II 17.

<sup>119)</sup> BM 96151, KING, *Chron. II*, pp. 70-71.

the latter continued to reign over Babylon. The plundering raid of Muršiliš was of a transitory nature, for he at once marched away again and did not hold Babylon under his sway. But Agum II had already become king in Babylon when he restored Esagila, the temple of Marduk there. When this was restored, he brought Marduk and Šarpanitum into it, who had been carried off twenty-four years earlier. Agum II was the ninth king of the Kassite dynasty, the preceding eight kings being contemporaneous with the last kings of the dynasty of Babylon. Hence we can reckon the duration of the reigns of these eight sovran accurately if we know under what prince and in what year of that prince's reign the Kassites arrived in Mesopotamia.

The Kassites cannot have entered Mesopotamia before or during the reign of Hammurabi, for there is no mention made of them whatever before or during his reign, Hammurabi having all Mesopotamia under his rule. But they are mentioned for the first time in the name of the ninth year of Šamšu-iluna, "year in which Šamšu-iluna the king (defeated) the host of the Kassites" <sup>120</sup>). This is the name of the ninth year, the event itself therefore took place in the eighth year of Šamšu-iluna. Whatever its significance may be, it is an established fact that the Kassites make their first appearance here. Even if Šamšu-iluna defeated them, that does not mean that they got no firm foothold in Mesopotamia. The only result is that Šamšu-iluna put a stop to their advance. Gandaš, their first king and founder of their dynasty, could put his trust in the future. From the fact that Šamšu-iluna was not able to drive them out although he checked their advance, Gandaš could conclude that there was a possibility of getting all Mesopotamia into his hands in time to come. There exists an inscription of which only a late Babylonian copy has come down to us <sup>121</sup>), in which Gandaš, the first king of the Kassite dynasty, speaks in the first person of the capture of Babylon. In texts of this class it is quite regular for the king to speak in the first person <sup>122</sup>). The authenticity of this piece has been often doubted and it is frequently considered a forgery <sup>123</sup>). Sidney SMITH, however, has proved that it is a genuine piece and that the term *babili* signifies the kingdom governed by Babylon; it does not always mean the city of Babylon, although it can do so. The confusion of kingdom and city is common enough and is to be found also in other countries at other times. No really serious difficulty can be founded on this. We must make a distinction, even if the terminology then in use does not do so <sup>124</sup>). It is manifest that in the eighth year of Šamšu-iluna all districts were in rebellion and all the territories which Hammurabi had gained along the Tigris north of Babylon were lost. The conflict of Šamšu-iluna with Rim-Sin II of Larsa and Jamutbal had nothing to do with it. The land north of Ešnunna was lost and the northern boundary of the Babylonian kingdom ran at that time through the confluence of the Diyala and the Tigris. The canal which Šamšu-iluna dug and the strong points he built served as defences <sup>125</sup>). From the name of Šamšu-iluna's thirty-third year it is evident that up to that time he still had the district of Mari in his hands <sup>126</sup>), for he was still building in Šaggaratum. Šaggaratum is consistently mentioned in the letters of Mari as belonging to the district of that name. But it is just in that region that the earliest traces of the Kassites are met with. The dynasty of Hana had among his members of West Semitic origin a prince with a pure Kassite name, Kaštiliaš. He cannot have reigned here, unless at the end of the reign of Šamšu-iluna or during that of Abi-esuḫ there were Kassites there. This prince with his Kassite name cannot have dropped from the clouds. His presence on the throne indicates that there was a group of Kassites in the district, who supported him and were strong enough to establish him in his sovereignty. From one of Abi-esuḫ's year-names it is plain that he too was at variance with

<sup>120</sup>) BM 16924, KING, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, Vol. II, pp. 228 ff., No. 102, II, 8.

<sup>121</sup>) BM 84, 2, 11, 178; H. WINCKLER, *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 34 and 156.

<sup>122</sup>) GÜTERBOCK, ZA 42, 1934, pp. 1 ff.

<sup>123</sup>) THUREAU-DANGIN, *La Chronologie de la Première Dynastie Babylonienne*, Académie des inscrip-

tions et belles lettres, Tome XLIII, 2e partie, 1910, p. 256.

<sup>124</sup>) Sydney SMITH, *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 1951, pp. 69-70.

<sup>125</sup>) Sydney SMITH, *o.c.*, p. 69.

<sup>126</sup>) BM 92702, col. IV, 28; VS XIII, No. 105, rev. 13.

the Kassites. The year-name is the same as that of Šamši-iluna, "year in which Abi-esuḫ the king (defeated) the host of the Kassites" <sup>127</sup>). The tablet on which this year-name appears was found among a collection of tablets which run from the twenty-seventh year of Šamši-iluna to the first half of Abi-esuḫ's reign. The Kassites therefore were then on the move again, and Abi-esuḫ had to fight them in the first half of his reign. Since Gandaš, the first Kassite king, came to Mesopotamia in Šamšu-iluna's eighth year and was king for sixteen years according to the Babylonian king-list A <sup>128</sup>), he reigned until Šamšu-iluna's twenty-fourth year. After him came his son, Agum I the Great, whose reign lasted twenty-two years according to the above-mentioned list <sup>129</sup>). He therefore ruled from the twenty-fifth year of Šamšu-iluna till the seventh of Abi-esuḫ. Now during the first half of the reign of Abi-esuḫ the Kassites were on the move. They conquered the district of Hana but were not yet strong enough to take Babylon and the provinces bordering on it. Kaštiliašu, who belonged to the royal Kassite family according to Sidney SMITH <sup>130</sup>), became king of the district of Hana.

This is the more probable because we find the same thing happening to Ulamburiaš, the thirteenth king of this dynasty, during the reign of Kaštiliaš III. He defeated Eagamil, the last king of the dynasty of the Sea-land. After the defeat of Eagamil, Ulamburiaš became king of the Sea-land in Kaštiliaš III's reign. When the latter died and his son was still too young to rule, Ulamburiaš became king of Babylon. The same thing probably occurred with Kaštiliaš I. He probably conquered the district of Hana and became king of that district during the time of his father, Agum I. After the death of Agum I, Kaštiliaš became king of the whole region which was in Kassite hands. He reigned for twenty-two years. Whether these years are reckoned from the time when he was king of Hana or from the moment when he became king of the entire region we do not know, but he ruled the whole region from the ninth year of Abi-esuḫ, whose reign lasted twenty-eight years. Therefore, if Kaštiliaš ruled the whole region for twenty-two years, his reign must have lasted throughout that of Abi-esuḫ and beyond it for two years contemporaneously with the latter's son Ammiditana.

In a collection of old Babylonian letters dating from the times of Ammiditana, Ammišaduqa and Šamšiditana we hear of *bitâtê Agum*, the residence of Agum <sup>131</sup>). This Agum can be no one but Agum I the Great, for Agum II was already king of Babylon and comes after Šamšiditana. This residence must have lain to the north-east of Babylon, as do the other places mentioned in the letters <sup>132</sup>).

From the eighth year of Šamšu-iluna down to and including the last king of the first dynasty we get the following regnal years. Šamšu-iluna reigned for thirty-eight years; subtract eight and we get thirty. His successor Abi-esuḫ reigned for twenty-eight years, Ammiditana for thirty-seven, Ammišaduqa for twenty-one and Šamšiditana for thirty-one. Therefore between them they ruled for a hundred and forty-seven years contemporaneously with the first eight sovereigns of the Kassite dynasty; always assuming that Šamšiditana ruled over Babylon for thirty-one years. We have seen that the princes of the Kassite dynasty, from Adadšumulinnašir back to and including Kurigalzu II, that is from the twenty-second to the thirty-second sovereign, ruled from 1336 to 1191, or fully a hundred and forty-five years. Of the last four princes, Melišipak reigned for fifteen years <sup>133</sup>), 1191-1176. He was a contemporary of Ninurta-apalekur and, in his last two years, of Aššur-dân I. His successor, Mardukapaliddinna I, reigned for thirteen years <sup>134</sup>), 1175-1163. His entire reign was contemporaneous with Aššur-dân of Assyria. His successor, Zababašumiddinna, reigned one year <sup>135</sup>), 1162. According to the synchronising chronicle, he was at variance with Aššur-dân I

<sup>127</sup>) This formula appears on an unpublished tablet quoted by JOHNS, PSBA, 1910, p. 273.

<sup>128</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. I 16.

<sup>129</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. I 17.

<sup>130</sup>) Sidney SMITH, *Alalakh and Archeology*, 1940, p. 20.

<sup>131</sup>) VS XVI, 24; P. KRAUS, MVAG 35, 2, p. 37; F. M. Th. BÖHL, BiOr I, 1944, pp. 56-57.

<sup>132</sup>) P. KRAUS, MVAG 35, 2, 1931, pp. 31-37 ff.

<sup>133</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II, 12.

<sup>134</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II, 13.

<sup>135</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II, 14.

of Assyria<sup>136</sup>): *9i-na tar-si m dza-má-má-šum-iddin šar m[âtkar-du-ni-aš]* <sup>10m</sup> *aššur-dânan šar mâtaššur a-na mâtkar-du-n[i-aš il-lik]* <sup>11âlza-ban âlir-ri-ia âla-qar-sa-à [lu.....]</sup> <sup>12.....</sup> *ma'-du a-na mâtaššur.....* "In the time of Zababašumiddinna king of Karduniaš, Aššur-dân king of Aššur marched to Karduniaš. Zaban, Irriia, Aqarsallu..... to Aššur". His successor Enlilnâdinahhê reigned for three years<sup>137</sup>), 1161-1159. These four princes between them reigned for thirty-two years. If we add these to the hundred and forty-five years of the preceding sovrans, the last fourteen princes of the Kassite dynasty ruled for a hundred and seventy-seven years. For the first eight, we have a total length of reign amounting to a hundred and forty-seven years, which gives, for twenty-two sovrans,  $177 + 147 = 324$  years, with an average reign of fourteen years, seven months for each. The Babylonian king-list A gives a figure which has always been read as "nine times sixty and thirty-six", in other words five hundred and seventy-six years, so that the remaining thirteen princes will have ruled for two hundred and fifty-two years, with an average reign of nineteen years, two and a half months. This in itself is not too much and not impossible, but we must see if it can be brought into agreement with the contemporary events in the surrounding countries and of course especially with Assyria. For this purpose we have four sources available. 1. The Khorsabad list. 2. The great Assyrian list of kings. 3. The synchronising list of kings from Aššur. 4. The data in the royal annals.

As regards the Khorsabad list, the difficulties, especially those regarding to the earlier parts, have been thus summarised by Mr. GOETZE: "La liste de Khorsabad est-elle complète, c'est à dire 'additionable', ou renferme-t-elle des lacunes, des cotations énigmatiques? Les sept rois qui y sont nommés après Šamši-Addu ne se succèdent pas, selon moi, en moins d'une année, mais les chronographes de Ninive ne connaissent plus les limmu correspondants. En un mot, cette liste ne m'apparaît pas comme la solution du problème qui nous intéresse, mais comme une source que nous devons soumettre à la critique, ainsi que cela ressort, d'ailleurs, d'autres passages. Il n'y a plus de raison pour rejeter a priori les 576 ans de la dynastie cassite, au nom de la liste assyrienne, que de rejeter a priori cette liste, au nom des 576 ans cassites"<sup>138</sup>). Mr. PARROT accepts Mr. GOETZE's remark without reserve. "Il juge qu'il faut, avec lui, élargir la recherche aux domaines voisins: hittite, syrien, égyptien, égéen. Le débat demeure ouvert. J'ai longtemps été sceptique sur les résultats possibles, et j'ai longtemps freiné la raccourcissement de la chronologie. Je considère maintenant qu'il faut prendre en considération toutes les données"<sup>139</sup>). Mr. FRANKFORT indicates that Mr. JACOBSEN "qui a eu connaissance, le premier, de la liste de Khorsabad est convaincu, comme MM. GOETZE et PARROT, que des limmu ont été perdus et que cette liste est incomplète"<sup>140</sup>).

Thus the difficulties regarding the Khorsabad list reduce to this, that *limmu*-lists were wanting and that there are lacunae and mistakes. We have already pointed out above, pp. 5 and 6, that the Khorsabad list clearly indicates the period for which the *limmu*-lists were lost. This was the third section of six kings, from Šulili on. They therefore did not know anything of the existence of *limmu*-lists for the kings preceding these six. For these six kings the author informs us that the *limmu*-lists had been lost, but afterwards he constantly has made use of such lists, as is clear from the notice concerning Šamši-Adad 1. Therefore the assertion that from Šamši-Adad on the *limmu*-lists either had been lost or never existed will not hold. As regards the lacunae, we can prove that they do not exist. The great list of kings from Aššur, so far as it is preserved, gives the same kings in the same order and the same number of them with the same number of regnal years as the Khorsabad list. The list from Aššur was prepared independently of that from Khorsabad. Both were constructed with the help of *limmu*-lists, which again shows that these were to be had. That there are no lacunae is further attested by the synchronistic list of kings from Aššur, which also gives the same

<sup>136</sup>) CT 34, pl. 42, K 4401 b II, 9-12.

<sup>137</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II, 15.

<sup>138</sup>) *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 1951, p. 38.

<sup>139</sup>) *o.c.*, p. 39.

<sup>140</sup>) *o.c.*, p. 39.

Assyrian kings in the same order and the same number. Thus from the fact that the three independent lists give the same number of kings in the same sequence, we may conclude that they are constructed from the same material, the *limmu*-lists, and that there are no gaps in them. There are indeed little discrepancies and mistakes, but these can be emended by comparing the lists with one another. Thus we may safely use these data to establish the duration of the first half of the Kassite dynasty. But first we must discover in which year of which Assyrian king the Kassite dynasty came into power.

In a list of the year-names of Ibal-pi-el king of Ešnunna, we see that that prince's fifth year was named from the death of Šamši-Adad I of Aššur<sup>141</sup>). The name runs *m u dšamši-adad ba-u g<sub>4</sub>*, "year in which Šamši-Adad died". Hence Šamši-Adad of Aššur died in the fourth regnal year of Ibal-pi-el II of Ešnunna. It is a remarkable fact that the death of a king of Aššur should be mentioned in the list of year-names of Ešnunna, for usually the years of a reign were named after the most important event which had taken place in the king's own country during the preceding year. We find no such information concerning another kingdom given in any year-name whatever. Therefore Ešnunna must have regarded this event as having taken place within his own sphere of influence, and this consequently calls for an explanation. In the Khorsabad list and the great list of kings from Aššur<sup>142</sup>) and the new king list SDAS, we read against the name of Šamši-Adad the following statement: "Šamši-Adad, the son of Ilukabkabu, went in the days of Narâm-Sin to Karduniaš. During the *limmu* of Ibni-Adad, Šamši-Adad came from Karduniaš. The city of Ekallâte he took, in Ekallâte he lived for three? years. During the *limmu* of Atamar-Ištas, Šamši-Adad went up from Ekallâte. He did Erišu, the son of Puzur-Aššur, rise from his throne. He took the throne. For thirty-three years he exercised royal authority". Thus we see that Šamši-Adad I went to Babylon in the time of Narâm-Sin, which can mean nothing but that he was fleeing before Narâm-Sin; but who was this Narâm-Sin?

A Narâm-Sin is mentioned in the Khorsabad list two places before Šamši-Adad. He was a king of Aššur; his name however is strange among all the names of Assyrian kings. It is one which was very wide-spread in the south, the land of Akkad, but hardly known in Assyria. The Aššur lists of kings know of no other king with this name. This is indeed no proof that no such name existed in Aššur, for there are other names in the list of kings which occur only once. But we know of a king Narâm-Sin of Ešnunna in those days, who must have been very powerful, for his name was divinised, which in Babylonia and Assyria appears to have meant that he was sovran of a widely extended territory. We know that he even was ruler of Sippar for some time<sup>143</sup>), but that he lost that city at the beginning of his reign. To make good this loss perhaps, he took steps to expand northwards. It is probable that he captured Ekallâte and Aššur at this time and reigned there for a while. That Ešnunna was powerful in Aššur is further established by a letter from Mari, in which mention is made of the submission of Išmê-Dagan to Hammurabi and we hear of a position of subordination with regard to Ešnunna. The letter is much damaged, the names both of the writer and the addressee being broken off, but probably it was addressed to Zimrilim. The passage we are now concerned with runs<sup>144</sup>): *6m iš-me-da-gan wu-ur-du-tam a-na se-er 7m ha-am-mu-ra-bi iš-ta-na-ap-ḫar eḫ-še-et a-bi-šu 8ša ḫa-na-nu-um a-bu-šu a-na awil eš-nun-naki wu-ur-du-tam 9iš-ta-na-ap-ḫar wa-ar-ka-nu-um iš-tu i-na e-še-im 10awil eš-nun-naki ma-a-tamki ..... du 11a-lu-tam iš-ta-ḫa-ar-šu*, "Išmê-Dagan repeatedly sends submission with regard to Hammurabi. It is the tactics of his father, for his father used formerly to send submission repeatedly to the man of Ešnunna. Later, when as a result of a rising the man of Ešnunna ..... the land, he sent him brotherhood". From this consequently it is evident that Ešnunna regarded itself as the overlord of Aššur, to which Šamši-Adad must be obedient. This can all be explained

<sup>141</sup>) IM 52062, 5; IM 53955, 6, Sumer v, 1948, pp. 12-16 82-86.

<sup>142</sup>) INES I, 1942, pp. 285-286; AFO 4, 1927, p. 4, col. I 37 ff.

<sup>143</sup>) OLZ 12, 1909, pp. 478-479.

<sup>144</sup>) TC XXIII, 49, 6-11.

if Ešnunna had conquered Aššur, and that can have happened only in the time of Narâm-Sin. Ešnunna seems never to have renounced this overlordship over Aššur, and thus it is explicable why the year following the death of Šamši-Adad is named after that event. The people of Ešnunna regarded it as a relief to be rid of so troublesome a prince. Also, the presence of a stone weight in the form of a duck, which was found at Aššur with an inscription on it of Daduša, the brother of Narâm-Sin, can serve to show that Narâm-Sin of Ešnunna ruled in Aššur. The inscription runs <sup>145)</sup>: *da-du-ša mar di-bi-iq-dadad šar èš-nun-naki a-na i-ni-ib-ši-na* DUMU-MI-A-NI *iš-ru-uq*, "Daduša, son of Ibiq-Adad, king of Ešnunna, presented this to Inibšina his daughter". The supplementing of the name of Daduša is justified by the year-names and by an inscription of Ibal-pi-el II <sup>146)</sup>. We do not know how or when this inscription got to Aššur. It has been supposed that a daughter of Daduša, the brother and successor of Narâm-Sin, was married to an Assyrian prince, or perhaps at the conquest of Rapiqu, where according to one of Daduša's year-names a daughter of his was married. In this last case, we have to do with the conquest of Rapiqu by Ibal-pi-el II in his eighth year. It is more likely that it happened in the time of Daduša on the occasion of negotiations for peace, for we know that Daduša, according to his year-names, certainly moved north twice. One year-name runs <sup>147)</sup> *m u um-ma-na-at é-kál-la-tumki da-du-ša is-ki-pu-u* with a variant *m u c-gal-la-tumki*, "year in which Daduša threw back the troops of Ekallâtîm." This came before another event after which Daduša's last year is named. The year-name runs <sup>148)</sup> *m u qa-ba-raki m da-du-ša in-dí b*, or in a shortened form *m u qa-ba-raki* <sup>149)</sup>, "year in which Daduša conquered Qabara". It is possible that on one of these occasions a daughter of Daduša to whom the object was given really came to Aššur. However that may be, Šamši-Adad fled before Narâm-Sin. Narâm-Sin according to the great list of kings from Aššur ruled in that city for four years <sup>150)</sup>. Therefore Šamši-Adad remained for four years in Babylon. When Narâm-Sin died, a son of the old royal house, Irišum II, ascended the throne in Aššur. Šamši-Adad returned from Babylon to Ekallâte where he stayed for three? years and captured Aššur, deposed Irišum, who consequently reigned for probably three years, and ascended the throne himself. Against this suggestion it may be urged that in the Khorsabad list Narâm-Sin is called a son of Puzur-Aššur II, while Irišum II is given as a son of Narâm-Sin. But we must not forget that the Khorsabad list was drawn up in 728 B.C., and that anachronisms occur in it, as is plain from the fact that Šamši-Adad is said to go to Karduniaš and to return from it; now Karduniaš is the Kassite name for Babylon, and no such name existed as yet in the time of Šamši-Adad. It often happens in this list that a king is styled the son of his immediate predecessor, e.g., Aššurrîmnišêšu is called the son of the king immediately before him, whereas he was in reality a son of Aššurnirâri II. In the case of Narâm-Sin and Irišum, the writer may have erred through ignorance or acted from national pride, so as not to let it appear that a foreigner from Ešnunna had ruled over Aššur.

Šamši-Adad is given as the son of Ilukabkabu in the Khorsabad list. This is confirmed by the great list of kings from Aššur and an architectural inscription of Šamši-Adad <sup>151)</sup>, *ša-am-ši-dadad en-si dašur<sub>4</sub> mâr i-la-ka-ab-ka-bu ba-ni é da-šur*, "Šamši-Adad, prince of Aššur, son of Ilukabkabu, builder of the temples of Aššur". That the Khorsabad list gives the name of his father shows that he was of kingly blood and that his father had himself been a king somewhere. It is confirmed by the archives of Mari that he was a king, for he concluded a treaty with the king of Mari, Iagidlim <sup>152)</sup>: <sup>5</sup>*iš-tu ši-ti-ia ma-am-ma-an* <sup>6</sup>*ša a-na ilim ú-qa-al-li-lu ú-ul i-ba-aš-ši* <sup>7</sup>*ka-lu šu-me-e ša ilim-ma ú-ka-al* <sup>8</sup>*pa-na-nu-um i-la-kab-ka-bu* <sup>9</sup>*ia-gi-id-li-im ni-iš ilim dan-na-am* <sup>10</sup>*[i]-na bi-ri-ti-šu-nu iz-ku-ru-ma* <sup>11</sup>*i-la-kab-ka-bu-ú a-na ia-gi-id-li-im* <sup>12</sup>*[u]-ul ù-qa-al-li-cl* <sup>13</sup>*[ia-gi]-id-li-im-ma a-na i-la-kab-ka-bu-ú* <sup>14</sup>*ù-qa-al-li-cl te-el-qé-e-ma ta-ša-al-šu* <sup>15</sup>*[ù a-na] i-di i-la-kab-ka-bu-ú ta-al-li-ik-ma* <sup>16</sup>*[i-la-ka] b-ka-bu-ú*

<sup>145)</sup> KAH. II, 3; SCHRÖDER, O.L.Z. 1914, p. 246.

<sup>146)</sup> LUTZ, *Legal and Economic Documents from Ashialv*, No. 61.

<sup>147)</sup> Sumer v, 1948, No. 10, p. 56.

<sup>148)</sup> Sumer v, 1948, No. 13, pp. 58, 78.

<sup>149)</sup> Sumer v, 1948, No. 16, pp. 84-86.

<sup>150)</sup> AFO 4, 1927, p. 2, col. I 33-34.

<sup>151)</sup> RA 20, 1923, p. 7.

<sup>152)</sup> TC XXII No. 3; W. v. SODEN, *Orient*, 21, 1952, p. 76.

*dūr-šu iq-qu-ur* <sup>17</sup>[*ma-a-at*] *ia-aḥ-du-li-im ik-šu-ud* <sup>18</sup>[*aš-šum*] *qū-ul-lu-ul-ti ia-gi-id-l[i-i]m*  
<sup>19</sup>[*ša-a-na i-l*]-*a-kab-ka-bu-u ú-[qa-al-li-lu]* <sup>20</sup>.....*dšamšiši-dadad i*..... <sup>21</sup>.....*ia-gi-id-li-im*  
 rev. <sup>1</sup>.....*bi*..... <sup>2</sup>*qu-ul-lu-ul-ti š*]-*a a-na dšamšiši-dadad* <sup>3</sup>*ú-[qá-al-li-lu]* <sup>4</sup>*ù*.....*na-š[u]* *ša ilim*  
*ú-ka-al-lu* <sup>5</sup>[*a-nu-um m šu*]-*mu-ia-ma-am ia-aḥ-du-li-im* <sup>6</sup>*i[š-t]u ma-riki ú(?)*-*ši(?)*-*šu* <sup>7</sup>*m šu-*  
*mu-ia-ma-am qa-tam ik-li-šu-ma* <sup>8</sup>*ia-aḥ-du-un-li-im er-ḥu(?)*-*tam(?)*-*ma i-pu-ša-am* <sup>9</sup>*ù la ši-*  
*na-li i-na qa-ti-š[u ik-]la* <sup>10</sup>*bêti-ka ša šarrânimeš pa-nu-ut-t[um i-pu-šu] iq-q[u-u]r* *ù bêti*  
*ḥi-la-ni i-pu-uš* <sup>11</sup>*ta-al-li-ik-ma ta-ša-al-[š]u* *ù war-dumeš-šu-ma* <sup>12</sup>*i-du-ku-šu* <sup>13</sup>*te-el-qí-ma*  
*a-aḥ nârpuratti na-gi-šu* <sup>14</sup>[*i*]-*na qa-at dšamšiši-dadad l[i]-ka(?)*-*in(?)* <sup>15</sup>*i-nu-me a-na qū-ul-*  
*lu-ul-ti ia(?)*-*aḥ-du-li-im* <sup>16</sup>[*ša a-na d*]-*šamšiši-dadad u-qa-al-li-l[u]* <sup>17</sup>*al-lik a-ša-al-šu el-qí*  
*a-aḥ nârpuratti* <sup>18</sup>*a-na qât dšamšiši-dadad ú-ka-in ma-riki ki-li-ma* <sup>19</sup>.....*iš-ku-na-ku* <sup>20</sup>.....*ma-*  
*riki iš-ku-na-an-na* <sup>21</sup>.....*da-ri-e-im* <sup>22</sup>.....*bi*]-*it a-we-lu-tim* <sup>23</sup>.....*ak-ku* <sup>24</sup>.....*a-n*]-*a-ku*  
*it-ti-ia mi-nam* <sup>25</sup>[*šarânumeš*] *pa-nu-ut-tum ma-tam ma-at-tam* <sup>26</sup>[*i-te-er-]ri-šu i-na-an-na*  
*a-na-ku* <sup>27</sup>.....*na*]-*pi-iš-tam* *ù i-ir-ḥa-am e-ri-iš* <sup>28</sup>[*la-ma a-ba*]-*al-lu-tú i-ni-ka la ta-na-aš-ši*  
<sup>29</sup>*ia*.....*ka-a-šu(?)*..... <sup>30</sup>*i-na-an-n[a*.....] <sup>31</sup>*i-na e* ..... "Of my line there is none that  
 has sinned against god. All have revered the name of god. Formerly Ilukabkabu and  
 Iagidlim swore a solemn oath to one another. Ilukabkabu did not sin against God, but  
 Iagidlim sinned against Ilukabkabu. You attacked him and called him to give satisfaction and  
 you came on the side of Ilukabkabu, and Ilukabkabu laid waste his strongholds and conquered  
 the land of Iagidlim. As regards the sin of Iagidlim, which he sinned against Ilukabkabu.....  
 Šamši-Adad ..... Iagidlim ..... The sin which he sinned against Šamši-Adad ..... he held from  
 the god. Behold, Šumuianam caused Iaḥdunlim to depart from Mari. Šumuianam refused him  
 support. Iaḥdunlim was presumptuous, although he had but unimportant things in his hands.  
 Your house, which formerly kings built, he tore down and built a *bêt-ḥilani*. You came and  
 called him to account and his servants slew him. You took the bank of the Euphrates and  
 granted the region to the power of Šamši-Adad. Behold, because of the sin of Iaḥdunlim  
 which he sinned against Šamši-Adad, I came and called him to account. I took the bank of  
 the Euphrates and established it in the power of Šamši-Adad. Retain Mari ..... he established  
 you ..... he established me in Mari ..... The earlier kings commonly required much land,  
 now I require life and posterity. Before I was alive you did not lift your eyes....." From this  
 letter, which is what is known as a god's letter, it is clear that Ilukabkabu and Iagidlim swore  
 as equals. Iagidlim was king of Mari, therefore Ilukabkabu must have been king of some  
 place. Iagidlim sinned against Ilukabkabu, but also against Šamši-Adad, consequently he must  
 have reigned contemporaneously with both these princes. Iaḥdunlim was king of Mari after  
 Iagidlim. He also sinned against Šamši-Adad. Ilukabkabu, according to the data in the letters  
 from Mari, ruled in Ekallâte. Ekallâte is distinguished from Aššur, for in one letter we hear  
 of soldiers of Ekallâte and Assyrians whom Mutasqur, the son of Išmê-Dagan, commanded <sup>153</sup>).  
 In the same letters we are told that Mutasqur sent grain from Rasamâ to Ekallâte, which was  
 his residence, after Išmê-Dagan became king in Aššur. Išmê-Dagan called up people from  
 Ekallâte and Iaḥrura for military service <sup>154</sup>). Iašmaḥ-Adad writes to Ḥammurabi <sup>155</sup>),  
*a-ḥu-ka iš-me-d-da-gan ša-lim* *ù a-lum é-kál-la-tumki ša-lim a-na-ku ša-al-ma-ku a-lum ma-riki*  
*ša-lim*, "It is well with your brother Išmê-Dagan and it is well Ekallâtum. It is well  
 with myself and it is well with Mari". Iašmaḥ-Adad has a house in Aššur and in Ekallâte <sup>156</sup>).  
 From these data we may rightly conclude that the country which the family of Ilukabkabu  
 then belonged to was Ekallâte and that Ilukabkabu was king there, which is confirmed by  
 the new king list SDAS. Šamši-Adad succeeded him there and was king there until he was  
 obliged to flee. He fled before Narâm-Sin to Babylon and returned from there to Ekallâte  
 after Narâm-Sin's death, till he captured Aššur and there mounted the throne.

Šamši-Adad died in the fourth year of Ibal-pi-el II of Ešnunna. Before him Daduša, who  
 succeeded his brother Narâm-Sin, was king of Ešnunna. We know five of his regnal year-

<sup>153</sup>) TC XXIII, 39, 33-34.

<sup>154</sup>) TC XXIII, 18, 4-6.

<sup>155</sup>) TC XXVI, 14, rev. 11'-12'.

<sup>156</sup>) TC XXII, 61, 14-15.

names but it is not certain that these are all the year-names of his reign<sup>157</sup>), Šamši-Adad was king in Aššur and it is said in the Khorsabad list that his reign lasted thirty-three years, during which he was king in Ekallâte for a certain number of years until he captured Aššur. As we have seen, both Iagidlim and Iaḥdunlim of Mari sinned against him. Among the year-names which are ascribed to Iaḥdunlim there is one which runs *šanat ia-aḥ-du-li-im e-bu-ur ma-at m ša-am-ši-daddu ú-qa-al-lu-ú*, "year in which Iaḥdunlim burned the harvest of the country of Šamši-Addu"<sup>158</sup>). This is probably Iaḥdunlim's last year-name. Šamši-Adad thereupon took action and captured the land of Mari, after his own people had put Iaḥdunlim to death and Šumuiamam gave him no support, as is narrated in the "god's letter". Šumuiamam was probably king of Šagaratum, whose wall he built according to a year-name of Iaḥdunlim, which runs<sup>159</sup>), *šanat šu-mu-ia-ma-am dūr ša-ga-ra-timki i-pu-šu*, "year in which Šumuiamam built the wall of Šagaratum". His accession also is mentioned in Iaḥdunlim's year-names<sup>160</sup>), *šanat šu-mu-ia-ma-am a-na bêt a-bi-šu i-ru-bu ù ḥa-la-bi-itki i-pu-šu*, "year in which Šumuiamam entered into the house of his father and built Ḥalibit".

After Iaḥdunlim was killed by his subjects, Šamši-Adad I took the country of Mari. He appointed his son Iašmaḥ-Adad king. After Šamši-Adad had ascended the throne of Aššur, his son Išmê-Dagan became king of Ekallâte, as we may conclude from a letter of Iašmaḥ-Adad to Ḥammurabi<sup>161</sup>). This letter states that all is well with Išmê-Dagan and all is well with Ekallâte. If Išmê-Dagan was already king of Aššur, Iašmaḥ-Adad should have said that all was well with Šubat-Enlil, for that was the city over which he ruled when he succeeded his father Šamši-Adad. This letter therefore must date from the time when Šamši-Adad was still alive and Išmê-Dagan was king of Ekallâte. Šamši-Adad, as we have seen, reigned over Aššur for ten or twenty years, so that Išmê-Dagan ruled over Ekallâte for the same number of years before succeeding his father on the throne of Aššur. According to the Khorsabad list he reigned for forty years, but fifty years according to the new list SDAS, and it is not possible to settle for the moment which one is right, although the presumption is for the Khorsabad list since the other is a copy and the copyist may easily have made a mistake. After his death there must have been great disturbances, for six persons not of the blood royal contested the throne with each other for six years. Only a very serious happening can explain this disturbance. If we examine all the facts known to us, we find but one which can explain such serious unrest, namely the capture of Šubartu by Ḥammurabi in his thirty-second year. The year-name of his thirty-third year runs<sup>162</sup>), "year in which Ḥammurabi dug his canal. Ḥammurabi is the richest of his people and the darling of Anu and Enlil; year wherein he continually provided water in abundance for Nippur, Eridu, Ur, Larsa, Uruk and Isin; wherein he brought the scattered Šumer back again to its place; wherein he smote in battle the host of Mari and Malgu and peacefully and in friendly wise brought Mari and [Malgu] and also the cities of Šubartu under his authority". All this therefore happened in the thirty-second year of Ḥammurabi. Šubartu was then the name of Assyria. This struggle between Ḥammurabi and Assyria had already begun in his twenty-ninth year and it lasted three years. The year-name of his thirtieth year runs<sup>163</sup>), "year in which Ḥammurabi, the mighty, the darling of Marduk, by the exalted power of the great gods, overthrew the host of Elam from Marḥaši, Šubartu, Gutium, Ešnunna and Malgu, which had come against him in great numbers, and laid the foundation of Šumer and Akkad". In his thirty-first year he

<sup>157</sup>) Sumer v, 1948, No. 9-13, pp. 40; 77-78.

<sup>158</sup>) G. G. DOSSIN, *Les Noms d'Années et d'Épogrammes dans les Archives de Mari*, Studia Mariana, pp. 51-61, No. 7, p. 52.

<sup>159</sup>) DOSSIN, *o.c.*, No. 9, p. 53.

<sup>160</sup>) DOSSIN, *o.c.*, No. 8, p. 52.

<sup>161</sup>) TC xxvi, 14, rev. 11'-12'.

<sup>162</sup>) CT 6, pl. 9, 10; KING, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, No. 101, Vol. II, pp. 217 ff., rev. III, 32; YBC 2140; A. T. CLAY, YOS I, No. 33, pp. 44 ff., obv. 2; V. SCHEIL, *La Chronologie*

*Rectifiée du Règne de Hammourabi*, Mém. de l'Acad. XXXIX, 1914, pp. 111 ff.; RT XXXIV, p. 105, rev. 7-8; A. BOISSIER, RA 11, pp. 161 ff. 33; OECT II, pl. v, p. 33; RLA 2, p. 180, No. 135.

<sup>163</sup>) CT 6, pl. 9-10, rev. III, 30; KING, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, vol. II, No. 101; idem, No. 102; YBC 2140; A. T. CLAY, YOS I, No. 33; V. SCHEIL, *La Chronologie Rectifiée du Règne de Hammourabi*, p. 111 ff.; RT XXXIV, p. 105; RA 11, 1914, pp. 161 ff., 163 f.; OECT II, pl. v; VS XIII, No. 20.



again did battle against Assyria, for the year-name of the thirty-second runs <sup>164</sup>) "year in which Hammurabi, the hero, the proclaimer of the blessings of Marduk, with mighty weapons overcame in war the host of Ešnunna, Šubartu and Gutium and conquered the land of Man-kizum and the region of the banks of the Tigris as far as Šubartu". In his thirty-second year Hammurabi finally conquered Assyria and incorporated it in his empire. But from the beginning of the conflict he had looked upon Assyria as his country and we find an echo of this in a letter from Mari, in which it is said <sup>165</sup>), <sup>6m</sup> *iš-me-dda-gan wu-ur-du-tam a-na še-er* <sup>7m</sup> *ḥa-am-mu-ra-bi iš-ta-na-ap-ḥa-ar ep-še-et abi-šu* <sup>8ša</sup> *pa-na-nu-um a-bu-šu a-na awil eš-nun-naki wu-ur-du-tam* <sup>9i</sup> *iš-ta-na-ap-ḥa-ar wa-ar-ka-nu-um iš-tu i-na e-še-im* <sup>10awil</sup> *eš-nun-naki ma-a-tamki* ..... <sup>du</sup> <sup>11a</sup> *ḥu-tam iš-ta-ḥa-ar-šu i-na-an-na pi-qa-at* <sup>m</sup> *iš-me-dda-gan an-ni-tam ṣa-bi-it* <sup>ù</sup> <sup>m</sup> *ḥa-am-mu-ra-bi i-na* ..... <sup>ú</sup> <sup>na</sup> *aḥ-ḥa-aš*, "Išmê-Dagan repeatedly sends submission regarding Hammurabi. It was the tactics of his father, for his father used formerly to send submission repeatedly to the man of Ešnunna. Later, when by reason of a rebellion the man of Ešnunna ..... the land, he sent him brotherhood. Now note: Išmê-Dagan behaves thus, and he flees from Hammurabi through .....". Išmê-Dagan appears in the Mari correspondence as a warlike man. Šamši-Adad writes as follows to Iašmaḥ-Adad <sup>166</sup>), <sup>46a</sup> *ḥa-ka-a u-ul ta-na-aḥ-ḫa-al* <sup>47ša</sup> *um-ma-na-tim ra-ap-ša-tim u-wa-a-ru*, "Do you not look towards your brother who leads on great hosts?" In another letter, after having spoken to him about military operations, he writes as follows <sup>167</sup>), rev. <sup>14ki</sup> *ma a-ḥu-ka šu-ma-am ra-bé-e-em* <sup>15i</sup> *iš-ta-ak-nu* <sup>ù</sup> <sup>at</sup> <sup>ta</sup> <sup>i</sup> <sup>na</sup> <sup>ma</sup> <sup>ti</sup> <sup>ka</sup> <sup>šu</sup> <sup>ma</sup> <sup>am</sup> <sup>ra</sup> <sup>bé</sup> <sup>e</sup> <sup>em</sup> <sup>ši</sup> <sup>it</sup> <sup>ka</sup> <sup>an</sup>, "Even as your brother has established a great name for himself, do you also establish a great name in your land". Further on, mention is made of his great preparations for war. It therefore seems that he resisted Hammurabi to the end, but had finally to yield. After this we hear no more of him <sup>168</sup>). After the death of Išmê-Dagan someone not of royal blood, Aššurdugul, came to the throne in Aššur. According to the Khorsabad list he reigned for six years. This notice ends as follows <sup>169</sup>): *i-na tar-ši maššur-du-gul-ma mâr la-a ma-ma-na maš-šur-apla-i-di* <sup>m</sup> <sup>naširir-dsin</sup> <sup>m</sup> <sup>dsin-na-mir</sup> <sup>m</sup> <sup>ip-qi</sup> <sup>dištar</sup> <sup>m</sup> <sup>dadad-ša-lu-lu</sup> <sup>ma</sup> <sup>da</sup> <sup>si</sup> <sup>ó</sup> <sup>šarrâni</sup> <sup>mâr</sup> <sup>la</sup> <sup>ma</sup> <sup>na</sup> <sup>bâb</sup> <sup>ṭup</sup> <sup>pi</sup> <sup>šu</sup> <sup>šarru</sup> <sup>tu</sup> <sup>epu</sup> <sup>šuš</sup>, "In the days of this Aššurdugul, the son of nobody, Aššur-apla-idi, Našir-Sin, Sin-namir, Ipqi-Ištar, Adadšalulu and Adasi, six kings, the sons of nobody, exercised sovereignty for a *bâb ṭuppišu*". We have seen above that *ṭuppu* is the time which lies between the death of a prince and the eponymous magistracy of the next king. It was counted as part of the *limmu*-period of the dead king. Rowton has sufficiently proved what the meaning of *bâb* is, namely "on the threshold of something, just as something is going to begin". Hence *bâb ṭuppi* just before the beginning of the *ṭuppu*, because it happened on the end of the life of Aššurdugul, who perhaps met his death in the fighting. Thus it happened while he was still alive and so *ina tarši*, in the time of (him) <sup>170</sup>). Thus we cannot assign any year to these princes, for they fall within the duration of Aššurdugul's reign and consequently are included in the latter's six years. This was exactly contemporaneous with the last campaign which Hammurabi made against Šubartu in his thirty-eighth year, exactly six years after he had incorporated Šubartu in his empire. The year-name of this thirty-ninth year runs <sup>171</sup>): "year in which Hammurabi with the mighty power bestowed on him by Anu and Enlil smote the heads of all his enemies to Šubartu". It was therefore during this unquiet period in Aššur that Hammurabi intervened for the last time. As Hammurabi incorporated Šubartu in his empire in his thirty-second year and Išmê-Dagan died in his thirty-first, then Hammurabi came to the throne in Babylon one year before Išmê-Dagan and reigned for one year contemporaneously with Šamši-Adad. That Hammurabi was on the throne before Šamši-

<sup>164</sup>) o.c. in Note 163 and UP v, No. 94; VS IX, No. 45.

<sup>165</sup>) TC xxiii, 49, 6-13.

<sup>166</sup>) TC xxii, 73, 46-47.

<sup>167</sup>) TC xxii, 69, rev. 14'-16'.

<sup>168</sup>) P. v. d. MÈRE, *A Propos de l'Expédition de Dadusa à Qabra*, RA 47, 1953, pp. 16-22.

<sup>169</sup>) JNES I, 1942, p. 162, Note 155; obv. II 6-11.

<sup>170</sup>) ROWTON, *Tuppi and the Date of Hammurabi*, JNES 10, 1951, p. 108; WEIDNER, *Bemerkungen zur Königliste aus Chorsabad*, AFO 15, 1943-1951, pp. 285-287.

<sup>171</sup>) RA 15, 1918, p. 57; OCT II, pl. v.

Adad's time was ended is clear from the Mari correspondence <sup>172</sup>): *1a-na ia-áš-ma-aḫ-dadad 2qí-bi-ma 3um-ma dšamšiši-dadad 4a-bu-ka-a-ma 5a-nu-um-ma tuḫ-pa-tim ša ia-ri-im-dadad 6ù ḫa-ma-nim ša a-na ḫa-mu-ra-bi 7awil babiliki šu-uṭ-ṭu-ru 8uš-ta-bi-la-kum*, "To Iašmaḫ-Adad say; thus (says) Šamši-Adad your father, behold I have caused to be brought to you letters from Iârim-Adad and Ḥammanum, which were written to Ḥammurabi the man of Babylon". This letter therefore must be dated in the last year of Šamši-Adad.

A contemporary of Ḥammurabi was Iašmaḫ-Adad, who was still on the throne in Mari when Ḥammurabi was king in Babylon <sup>173</sup>). *1a-na ḫa-mu-ra-bi 2qí-bi-ma 3um-ma ia-áš-ma-aḫ-dadad-ma*, "To Ḥammurabi say; thus says Iašmaḫ-Adad". This Ḥammurabi is surely of Babylon, for the letter deals with a caravan which is coming from Tilmun and has got into difficulties. Iašmaḫ-Adad asks Ḥammurabi to admit this caravan. Probably the letter was written but never sent, since it was found in the archives of Mari, for otherwise it must have been in those of Ḥammurabi. Another contemporary of Ḥammurabi was Zimrilim of Mari. Zimrilim was a son of Iaḫdunlim, as is shown by an inscription from Tirqa <sup>174</sup>). Ḥammurabi is mentioned in a number of his letters <sup>175</sup>), and there are also letters from Ḥammurabi to him <sup>176</sup>). Zimrilim had his ambassador at Ḥammurabi's court, as we see from letters of Ibal-pi-el, in which the latter tells of an interview with Ḥammurabi <sup>177</sup>). A letter of Iarim-Adad to Zimrilim mentions a defensive alliance between Ḥammurabi of Babylon and Rim-Sin of Larsa <sup>178</sup>). There are also letters from Ḥammurabi to servants of Zimrilim, including one to Baḫdilim in which mention is made of troops which Ḥammurabi has sent to Zimrilim <sup>179</sup>). In other letters dispatches from Ḥammurabi to Zimrilim are spoken of <sup>180</sup>). Zimrilim did not immediately succeed his father Iaḫdunlim, but there was another king between Iaḫdunlim and him, so that Zimrilim was obliged to fight for his father's throne, as it is shown by a letter from Mari <sup>181</sup>), "Now my lord's hand has captured the city of Mari..... My father triumphed over his foes and he ascended the throne of his father's house, while I have not yet ascended the throne of my father". The king who came between Iaḫdunlim and Zimrilim in Mari was Iašmaḫ-Adad, as we see from letters from Mari, in which it is said that "we have no other king than king Iašmaḫ-Adad our lord" <sup>182</sup>). Besides this there have been sundry letters of Šamši-Adad and Išmê-Dagan to Iašmaḫ-Adad found in the archives of Mari <sup>183</sup>). We know seventeen *limmu*-names and four year-names from his reign in Mari <sup>184</sup>). These four year-names may be included in the seventeen *limmu*-names if we assume that during the first years of Iašmaḫ-Adad the old custom of Mari was kept up by which the years were named after the most important events, while the Assyrian government introduced its own system of dating by *limmu*-names. Iašmaḫ-Adad therefore certainly reigned for seventeen years in Mari. A part of these fall within the reign of Šamši-Adad and a part within that of Išmê-Dagan. Iaḫdunlim's children remained in the region of Mari, as we learn from a letter from the archives of Mari <sup>185</sup>), in which Šamši-Adad writes to Iašmaḫ-Adad: *7šeḫherêtmeš ia-aḫ-du-ul-li-im 8ša ad-di-na-kum 9šehherêtummeš-ši-na ir-ta-bé-e ..... 12ši-na sí-in-ni-ša*, "the little daughters of Iaḫdunlim whom I gave you, these little daughters are grown up ..... they are (become) his wives". Zimrilim also remained in the district and commanded troops under Šamši-Adad and Iašmaḫ-Adad. *1a-na ia-áš-ma-aḫ-dadad 2qí-bi-ma 3um-ma dšamšiši-dadad 4a-bu-ka-a-ma 5 aš-šum 5mctim ša-bi-im ša a-aḫ nârpurattim 6ša it-ti zi-im-ri-i-lu-ma 7a-na qa-tà-nimki 8a-ra-di-im aš-ḫu-ra-kum 9ta-aṭ-ru-ud šum-ma la ta-aṭ-ru-ud 9tuḫ-ḫi an-ni-e-em i-na še-mc-e ša-ba-am ša-a-ti*

<sup>172</sup>) TC xxii, 93, 1-7; A. A. PARROT, *Archéologie Mésopotamienne, Technique et Problèmes*, 1953, p. 344.

<sup>173</sup>) TC xxvi, 14, 1-3.

<sup>174</sup>) RA II, 1914, p. 134.

<sup>175</sup>) TC xxiii, No. 73, and others.

<sup>176</sup>) TC xxiii, No. 12, 22, etc.

<sup>177</sup>) RA 33, 1936, pp. 172 f.; TC xxiii, No. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, etc.

<sup>178</sup>) TC xxiii, No. 73.

<sup>179</sup>) Syria 19, 1938, pp. 118-119.

<sup>180</sup>) Syria 19, 1938, p. 119.

<sup>181</sup>) RA 33, 1936, pp. 49-54.

<sup>182</sup>) Syria 19, 1938, p. 112.

<sup>183</sup>) TC xxii, No. 4-107; TC xxiii, 1-10; 15-19; TC xxv, No. 1-15.

<sup>184</sup>) DASSIN, *Les Noms d'Années et d'Éponymes dans les Archives de Mari*, Studia Mariana, pp. 53-54.

<sup>185</sup>) Syria 19, 1938, p. 112.

*tu-ur-dam*, "Say to Iašmaḫ-Adad; thus says Šamši-Adad your father. Concerning the five hundred soldiers of the banks of the Euphrate, that are with Zimrilim, I have written to send them to Qatanum. Have you sent them? If you have not sent them, send these people upon hearing this letter" <sup>186</sup>). Another time Zimrilim is sent by Šamši-Adad to Qatanum with 100 men of Ḫanê, *1a-na ia-áš-ma-aḫ-dadad 2qí-bi-ma 3um-ma dšamšiši-dadad 4a-bu-ka-a-ma 5ḫa-ra-nam ... ša-ba-am I me awíl ḫanê 6šu-ta-aš-bi-it-ma 7iti-ti zi-im-ri-i-la 8a-na qa-tá-nimki 9tu-ru-ud-ma*, "Say to Iašmaḫ-Adad; thus says Šamši-Adad, your father. Let 100 soldiers of Ḫanê march. Send them with Zimrilim to Qatanum" <sup>187</sup>). Therefore Zimrilim was in the neighbourhood of Mari and was in the army, commanding troops. At a given moment he saw his chance to seize power and to get part of the district of Mari on his side to exercise royal authority over it. This we may conclude from a letter of Iašmaḫ-Adad to his "lord"; whether this "lord" means Šamši-Adad or Išmê-Dagan is not certain <sup>188</sup>). *1a-na be-li-ia 2qí-bi-ma 3um-ma ia-áš-ma-aḫ-dadad 4warad-ka-a-ma 5i-na pa-ni-tim-ma aš-šum 6ša-bi-im a-na be-li-ia aš-pu-ra-am 7i be-li ki-a-am iš-pu-ra-am um-ma be-li 8 iscleppêtimhá 9ša la-ḫu-un-dā-gan ri-ik-ba-am-ma 10a-wílumeš ia-ri-ḫa-i-aki 11šu-ga-gu 12ša benêmeš-ia-mi-naki 13i-na za-al-pa-aḫki ip-ḫu-ru-ma 14a-na a-ḫu-na-aki il-li-ku-ma 15m šu-ra-ha-am-mu-ú ia-ri-im-li-im 16úš-bu-ma a-na.....im 17id-bu-bu awílumeš 18šu-ga-gu 19ša ḫa-na 20it-bu-ma a-na ia-ri-im-li-im 21a-la-ka-ma 22a-la-ne-ne er-ša 23šum-ma la-ḫu-un-dā-gan 24i-il-la-ak ú-lu ne-da-ak-šu 25a-wílumeš 26šu-ga-gu 27ša benêmeš-ia-mi-naki i-da-ab-bu-bu 28i-na-an-na a-nu-um-ma ia-ri-im-lim 29a-wílumeš 30šu-ra-ha-am-mu-ú awílumeš 31šu-ga-gu 32a-na se-er be-li-ia i-il-la-ku-nim ma-li i-ri-šu 33be-li la i-ka-al-la-šu-nu-ši-im 34a-na-ku 35wa-ar-ki-šu-nu-ma a-ka-aš-ša-dam*, "Say to my lord; thus says Iašmaḫ-Adad. Formerly I wrote to my lord concerning the troops and my lord wrote thus; thus said my lord; go aboard the ships of Iaḫun-Dagan. Now it was my intention to come, but the people of Iariḫa and the sheiks of the Ḫanites came and prevented me. Thereafter the sheiks of the Benjamites gathered together in Zalpaḫ and came to Aḫuna. Šuraḫammu and Iarimlim were there and ..... they complained. The sheiks of the Ḫanites rose up and said thus to Iarimlim and Šuraḫammu, 'Go to Zimrilim and demand our cities. If Laḫun-Dagan will not go, we will either put him to death or drive him from his throne'. The sheiks of the Benjamites opposed this. Behold, now Iarimlim, Šuraḫamma and the sheiks are coming to you. Let my lord refuse nothing of all that they ask, and I will come after them". Probably Zimrilim began by styling himself king of Mari and capturing various cities. This we may conclude from the names of his years. Thirty-two year-names of Zimrilim's reign are known <sup>189</sup>), and in all probability the whole duration of his reign. As we have already seen, Ḫammurabi in his thirty-second year incorporated Mari in his empire. We find a proof of this in the fact that a label on a basket of tablets in the archives of Mari has been found with the following dating <sup>190</sup>), *m u u g n i m è š - n u n - n a*, "year of (the defeat of) the host of Ešnunna". This is the name of Ḫammurabi's thirty-second year and shows that in that year he had Mari in his possession. It does not, however, prove that that was the end of Zimrilim's reign. That may have come two years later, for the year-name of Ḫammurabi's thirty-fifth year runs <sup>191</sup>), "year in which Ḫammurabi by command of Anu and Enlil utterly destroyed the wall of Mari and Malgu". This event therefore happened in Ḫammurabi's thirty-fourth year. Probably Zimrilim survived the first conquest of Mari and tried to get a firm footing there again, whereupon Ḫammurabi marched against Mari once more and dismantled it. Thus the end of his reign would

<sup>186</sup>) TC XXII, 23, 1-9.

<sup>187</sup>) TC XIII, 5, 1-R.

<sup>188</sup>) TC XXIII, No. 53.

<sup>189</sup>) DOSSIN, *o.c.*, pp. 54-59.

<sup>190</sup>) DOSSIN, *o.c.*, p. 59; Syria 19, 1938, p. 107, Note 1; THUREAU-DANGIN, *Symbolae Paulo Koscha-*

*ker dedicatae*, Leyde, 1939, pp. 119-120; RA 36, 1939, p. 24.

<sup>191</sup>) ML XI, No. 151; ML XI, No. 150; YBC 2140, A. T. CLAY, YOS I, No. 33; V. SCHEIL, *La Chronologie rectifiée du règne de Hammourabi*, pp. 111 ff.; RT 34, p. 105; RA 11, pp. 161 ff.

be the thirty-fourth year of Ḥammurabi. Therefore Zimrilim began to reign in Ḥammurabi's second year, the year in which Šamši-Adad died. Zimrilim made use of this event to capture his father's throne, although probably he did not have Mari directly under his authority, since Iašmaḥ-Adad was still there under Išmê-Dagan, as is shown by a letter from the latter to the former<sup>192</sup>). It is not until after some years' conflict during the reign of Išmê-Dagan that Iašmaḥ-Adad vanishes from the scene. Zimrilim therefore ascended the throne of his father a short time after Iaḥdunlim was killed. That no great while can have elapsed between the death of Iaḥdunlim and the accession of Zimrilim we may conclude also from a letter of Ribilim to Zimrilim. In this letter an officer named Nûrilišu is mentioned, who has said to Ribilim, "You know that I have long been a servant of the house of Iaḥdunlim. I have fled to the house of Šamši-Adad". He now wishes to become again a servant of Zimrilim<sup>193</sup>). If this person had served a long time under Iaḥdunlim, the time between Iaḥdunlim and Zimrilim cannot have been very long, or else he would be much too old.

We have seen that Aššurdugul ended his reign in the thirty-eighth year of Ḥammurabi. He was followed by Bêlbâni, who reigned ten years. Ḥammurabi reigned for forty-three years, so that he died in the fifth year of Bêlbâni. The latter reigned for another five years, contemporaneously with Šamšu-iluna. Bêlbâni was succeeded by Libaju, whose reign lasted seventeen years according to the Khorsabad list. Therefore his whole reign was contemporaneous with Šamšu-iluna's. In the latter's eighth year the Kassites entered Mesopotamia, that being Libaju's third year, so that for fourteen years he was contemporary with the Kassites. He was succeeded by Šarma-Adad I, who reigned twelve years, still falling wholly within the years of Šamšu-iluna. He again was succeeded by LI-TAR-sin, who also had a reign of twelve years, according to the Khorsabad list. Of these twelve years he reigned for four contemporaneously with Šamšu-iluna, who was on the throne for thirty-eight, and eight along with his successor Abi-ešuḥ. LI-TAR-sin was succeeded by Bazaju, whose reign, according to the Khorsabad list, lasted twenty-eight years, while the great king-list from Aššur puts it at twenty plus x<sup>194</sup>). Of these twenty-eight years he reigned for twenty contemporaneously with Abi-ešuḥ, whose reign lasted for twenty-eight, and for eight, with Abi-ešuḥ's successor Ammiditana. The successor of LI-TAR-sin was Lullaju, whose reign lasted six years, all falling within the years of Ammiditana. After him came Šu-Ninua, who remained on the throne for fourteen years, according to the Khorsabad list; these too all fall within Ammiditana's time. Next succeeded Šarma-Adad II, whose reign, three years, according to the same list, also falls entirely within Ammiditana's reign. His successor was Irišum III, the length of whose reign, still according to the same list, was thirteen years. Of these, six years were contemporaneous with Ammiditana, whose reign lasted thirty-seven years, and seven contemporaneous with the latter's successor Ammišaduqa. Irišum III was succeeded by Šamši-Adad II, whose reign lasted, according to the Khorsabad list, six years, all falling within the reign of Ammišaduqa. The next king, Išmê-Dagan II, reigned for sixteen years, according to the same list and the great king-list of Aššur. His reign also was wholly contemporaneous with Ammišaduqa's. He was succeeded by Šamši-Adad III, to whom the same two authorities give sixteen years, of which two were contemporaneous with Ammišaduqa, whose reign lasted for thirty-one, and fourteen with Šamšiditana. His successor was Aššurnirâri I, who remained twenty-six years on the throne, still according to the same authorities, whereof he reigned for seventeen contemporaneously with Šamšiditana, who was in power for thirty-one years, and for nine with Agum II. Puzur-Aššur III ruled for twenty-four years, according to the new king-list SDAS II 29. The Assyrian synchronistic chronicle makes him a contemporary of Burnaburiaš I, with whom he made a treaty<sup>195</sup>): *5m pu-zur-aššur šar mât-aššur u m bur-na-bu-ri-iá-áš 6šar mât-ka-du-ni-áš it-mu-ma mi-iš-ri 7ta-ḥu-mu an-na-ma ú-ki-nu*, "Puzur-Aššur king of Aššur and Burnaburiaš king of Karduniaš swore. They established the boundaries of the region". Puzur-Aššur III was succeeded by Enlilnâšir I, who reigned, according to the Khorsabad

<sup>192</sup>) TC xxv, No. 20.

<sup>193</sup>) RA 34, 1937, p. 138.

<sup>194</sup>) AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 88, Note 10.

<sup>195</sup>) CT 34, pl. 38, 5-8.

list and the great king-list from Aššur, for thirteen years. Nûrili, his successor, reigned for twelve years according to both lists. He was succeeded by Aššuršaduni, who according to the Khorsabad list was king for one month, according to the great list from Aššur, for  $x$  days. Neither of these lists uses the term *tuppišu*, which we should expect for so short a time. But as that term signifies the period which elapsed between the death of a king and the time when the next king held the office of *limmu*, we may conclude here that Aššuršaduni did hold the position of *limmu* but did not complete the year, hence the mention of the time during that year when he held the office. Since however the year which was begun was credited wholly to the reigning king, this year belongs to Aššuršaduni. And since a king always held the office of *limmu* in his second year, it follows that Aššuršaduni was king for two years. He was dethroned by Aššurrabi I, who was the son of Enlilnâšir I and the brother of Nûrili, Aššuršaduni's father. Aššurrabi I was thus the uncle of Aššuršaduni and so must have already been advanced in years when he ascended the throne, for his brother Nûrili had already reigned for twelve years before him. The number of regnal years for both has been broken off in both lists, but the fact that Aššuršaduni was deposed is stated in the great king-list of Aššur<sup>196</sup>): 42[*aššur-ra-bi mar*] *denlil-nâširir* 43[*aš-šur-ša-du-ni ina iškusse ú-šat-]bi iškussa [iš-bat]* 44 $x$  *šanâtemeš sarru-ta epusuš*, "Aššurrabi, the son of Enlilnâšir, caused Aššuršaduni to rise from his throne. He took the throne and for  $x$  years he exercised the office of king". He was succeeded by his son Aššurnâdinaḥḥê I. His regnal years also are broken off in both lists. We must in consequence indicate the length of reign of these two princes by  $x$  and try to calculate how many years this  $x$  represents. Now if we reckon the total number of regnal years from the fourth year of Libaju, which was the eighth year of Šamšu-iluna, when the Kassites arrived in Mesopotamia, down to the break, we find they amount to two hundred and seventeen. Aššurnâdinaḥḥê I was succeeded by his brother Enlilnâšir II in 1429. From that year to 1159, which is the last year of the last king of the Kassite dynasty, is two hundred and seventy years. Adding these figures together, we get  $217 + 270 + x$ , and thus we have, for the length of the rule of the Kassite dynasty, 487 years plus  $x$ . This  $x$  is the duration of the reigns of two kings, which we must determine. And we can determine it if we subtract the four hundred and seventy-seven years from the total length of the Kassite dynasty's rule. This is usually calculated at nine times sixty plus thirty-six years, which is five hundred and seventy-six years for thirty-six sovereigns. Now we have already seen that two kings reigned simultaneously, and that we must therefore subtract one king and two years. The remainder then is five hundred and seventy-four years. If from this we subtract four hundred and eighty-seven, we leave eighty-seven years over for our  $x$ , the length of the reigns of two kings. This certainly is very long and certainly too long for these two kings, of whom Aššurrabi I must have been no longer young when he came to the throne. Moreover, the times were very unsettled, wherefore it is as good as excluded that two kings should rule so long. These two should even fall well within the average length of reign of Assyrian kings, which for seventy-three monarchs comes to fourteen years and a half each. Now if we look at the final number in the Babylonian king-list A, we find that it consists of three wedges set perpendicularly under one another. These cannot represent three units of sixty each, for in that case they are written in this list alongside one another. It therefore gives a value of more than three times sixty, but less than ten times sixty, for then a different sign would have been used. It is also more than four times, for then three wedges would have been written above and one beneath. Nor can it be five or six times, for then we should have had three wedges alongside one another above with two or three underneath. Thus it can be nothing but seven, eight or nine times. Nine is excluded, as we have already seen. Thus only seven and eight remain. Seven times sixty plus thirty-six is four hundred and fifty-six. This comes to thirty-three +  $x$  years less than the Assyrian kings. Now this would be possible if we could prove that three princes were kings before they came to Mesopotamia and ruled for some time simultaneously with other kings. Gandaš must

<sup>196</sup>) *Grande Liste des Rois d'Assyrie*, AFO 4, 1927, pl. I, col. II 42-44 and p. 6.

thus have been king for a certain number of years before he arrived in Mesopotamia; Kaštiliaš I must have ruled in Ḫana for some years, which were contemporaneous with Agum I; and Ulamburiaš for a certain number of years in the Sealand, contemporaneously with Kaštiliaš III. But we cannot prove this, no date being available for it. The only remaining possibility is therefore to take the sign as representing eight times sixty, to which must then be added thirty-six years, so that we get a total of five hundred and sixteen years. From this we must subtract two years for the two kings who ruled simultaneously, so that we have five hundred and fourteen years for the duration of the reigns of thirty-five kings. If from this we proceed to subtract the four hundred and eighty-seven years, we are left with twenty-seven remaining as the value of  $x$ , the duration of the reigns of Aššurrabi I and Aššurnâdinaḫḫe I. Therefore Aššurnâdinaḫḫe I and Aššurrabi I reigned 1430-1456; Aššuršaduni 1457-1458; Nûrili, 1459-1470; Enlilnâšir I, 1471-1483; Puzur-Aššur III, 1484-1507; Aššurnirâri I, 1508-1533; Šamši-Adad III, 1534-1549; Išmê-Dagan II, 1550-1565; Šamši-Adad II, 1566-1571; Irišum III, 1572-1584; Šarma-Adad II, 1585-1587; Šu-Ninua, 1588-1601; Lullaju, 1602-1607; Bazaju, 1608-1635; LI-TAR-sin, 1636-1647; Šarma-Adad I, 1648-1659; Libaju, 1660-1676; Bêlbâni, 1677-1686; Adasi, Adad-šululu, Iḫqi-Ištar, Sin-Nâmir, Nâšir-Sin, Aššur-apla-idi and Aššurdugul, 1687-1692; Išmê-Dagan I, 1693-1723; and, as stated above, p. 28, Šamši-Adad I, 1724-1734 or 1744; Išmê-Dagan ruled fifty years according to SDAS II, 7. Ḫammurabi came to the throne in the last year of Šamši-Adad. He therefore reigned from 1724 to 1682; Šamšu-iluna, 1681-1644; Abi-esuh, 1643-1616; Ammiditana, 1615-1579; Ammišaduqa, 1578-1558; Šamšiditana, 1557-1527. In 1526, Agum II became king of all Babylonia.

Now there remains another source which we must examine to see if it is capable of deciding whether the results we have so far arrived at are correct. This is the account of the distance in time between the various princes in the architectural inscriptions of sundry kings<sup>197</sup>). We find a space of time indicated in the inscriptions of Nabonaid<sup>198</sup>). Here it is said that 3200 years have elapsed between Nabonaid and Narâm-Sin. This is reckoned from the year  $x$  of Nabonaid's reign to the year  $y$  of Narâm-Sin's. Nabonaid reigned 555-538. From the year  $x$  of his reign to the year  $y$  of Narâm-Sin's, 3200 years had elapsed. The latter reign must therefore come between 3755 and 3738. But in the course of years it has become apparent that Narâm-Sin of Agade cannot have lived in those times, therefore the statement is untrue. In the same inscription<sup>199</sup>) mention is made of the restoration by É-ul-maš of Sippar-Annunit, which was performed eight hundred years earlier by Šagaraktišuriaš. From the year  $x$  of the reign of Nabonaid to the year  $y$  of Šagaraktišuriaš we thus get  $555-538 + 800 = 1355-1338$ . But Šagaraktišuriaš reigned from 1248 to 1236, so that this statement again is incorrect. In another inscription concerning the restoration of Ebarra in Larsa<sup>200</sup>) we read the statement that he found an inscription of Ḫammurabi, who had built at the temple seven hundred years before Burnaburiaš. This Burnaburiaš can be no other than Burnaburiaš III, who was a contemporary of Akhenaten and Tutankhamen. His reign was about 1371-1345. If we add seven hundred years to this, we arrive at a date between 2071 and 2045. As we have seen, this is much too early for Ḫammurabi. Hence all the statements which we have from Nabonaid are incorrect.

A seal of Šagaraktišuriaš was plundered by Tukulti-Ninurta I. He had his inscription carved on it, and this seal was brought back to Babylon by the enemy. Sinaḫerib states that he has taken this seal back from Babylon after six hundred years<sup>201</sup>). Now Sinaḫerib reigned 704-681. If we add six hundred years to this, we get 1306-1281. But Tukulti-Ninurta I reigned 1242-1206, so that this statement again is not correct. There exists yet another state-

<sup>197</sup>) AFO 15, 1945-1951, pp. 87-95; JNES 1, 1942, pp. 288-306.

<sup>198</sup>) BM 82-7-14, 1025, col. II, 57-58, VR 64; ABEL-WINCKLER, *Keilschrifttexte*, pp. 40-43; PEISER, *Keilschriftliche Bibliothek*, III, pp. 2 ff.; S. LANGDON, *Neubabylonische Königsinschriften*, pp. 218-229.

<sup>199</sup>) *o.c.*, col. III 27.

<sup>200</sup>) BM 85-4-30, 2 col. II 21, PSBA, 1880, pl. III-V.

<sup>201</sup>) K 2673, III R 4 No. 2; KING, *Chronicles I*, pl. 163-164, pp. 107-108.

ment in chronicle P, which gives the distance of time between Tukulti-Ninurta I and Ninurta-Tukul-Aššur<sup>202</sup>), but as the figure is partly broken off it is of no use to us.

In an inscription of Asserhaddon<sup>203</sup>) we find the statement that five hundred and eighty years before him Salmanasser built at the temple Eḫursagkurkurra in Aššur and that Šamši-Adad I, son of Ilukabkabu, built at it four hundred and thirty-four years before Salmanasser, and Irišum I a hundred and twenty-six years before him. Asserhaddon reigned 680-669. If we add to this the five hundred and eighty years which had elapsed between Asserhaddon and Salmanasser I, we get 1260-1249. Salmanasser I's reign was 1272-1243; this account therefore falls entirely within the reign of Salmanasser I, who must have restored this temple between the years 1260 and 1249. If we add to the dates of Salmanasser I the four hundred and thirty-four years which had elapsed between him and Šamši-Adad I, the result is 1706-1677. According to the reconstruction made with the help of the Kassite dynasty, Šamši-Adad I reigned from 1724 to 1731, so that this statement is not correct. The difference in time between Šamši-Adad I and Irišum I amounts to a hundred and twenty-six years. The numbers of regnal years of the Assyrian kings between these two princes are broken away, so that we must try to determine by another route the space of time which elapsed between them. According to the subscription in the great Assyrian king-list<sup>204</sup>), Irišum I is a contemporary of Šumulael. We have seen that Ḫammurabi came to the throne in 1724. His father Sinmuballiṭ reigned for twenty years, 1744-1725; his predecessor Awêl-Sin for fourteen, 1762-1745; his predecessor Sâbum for fourteen, 1774-1763. Sâbum's predecessor Šumulael reigned for thirty-six years, 1812-1775. From the first year of Šumulael to the first year of Ḫammurabi, therefore, eighty-eight years elapsed. If Irišum was a contemporary of Šumulael, he must then have reigned for at least one year simultaneously with him. This therefore should be 1812. Irišum, according to the Khorsabad list, reigned for forty years, so that we get eighty-eight and forty, making a hundred and twenty-eight years. This agrees well with the difference given by Asserhaddon. But if we assume this, we get into difficulties with another synchronism, provided by the Babylonian chronicle P<sup>205</sup>): 14 m ilu-šum-ma šar mātaš-šur a-na tar-ši m šu-a-bu, "Ilu-šuma king of Aššur in the days of Šuabu". Šuabu is certainly Šumuabu, the founder of the first Babylonian dynasty. He was the father of Irišum I. Šumuabu reigned for fourteen years. Between his first year and that of Ḫammurabi therefore a hundred and two years elapsed. According to the results obtained above, the reign of Ilušuma, which comes before Irišum I, must be more than a hundred and twenty-eight years earlier than the first year of Ḫammurabi. But then he cannot have been contemporaneous with Šumuabu, and therefore Asserhaddon's statement must be wrong. But still other figures are given in an inscription of Salmanasser I<sup>206</sup>). He alleges that from the reign of Irišum I to his own five hundred and eighty years have passed. Salmanasser I reigned from 1272 to 1243. Now if we add five hundred and eighty years to this, we arrive at 1852-1823. Between these dates the year in which Irišum built the temple must lie. We have seen that Irišum was a contemporary of Šumulael, and his father Ilušuma a contemporary of Šumuabu. The latter was king from 1826 to 1813, therefore Ilušuma must have come at the beginning, Irišum in the last part of the reign of Šumuabu and the reign of Šumulael. Therefore Salmanasser's account cannot be correct. He likewise asserts that a hundred and fifty-nine years passed between Irišum and Šamši-Adad I. Šamši-Adad I reigned 1732-1724. If we add a hundred and fifty-nine to this date we get 1891-1883 as the years between which the building of the temple must lie. If this is correct, Irišum cannot have been a contemporary of Šumulael, nor Ilušuma of Šumuabu. Consequently this statement also cannot be correct. The statements of Asserhaddon and Salmanasser also fail to agree with one another.

<sup>202</sup>) 82-7-4, 38, IV 12-13, KING, *Chronicles* I, pp. 100-101.

<sup>203</sup>) KAH I, No. 51, 17'-27'; KAH II, No. 126, III, 1-13; JNES I, 1942, p. 301; AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 89; PARROT, *Archéologie Mésopotamienne, Technique et Problèmes*, pp. 363-364.

<sup>204</sup>) BM 26972, rev. 14, KING, *Chron.* II, p. 14.

<sup>205</sup>) KING, AKA, p. 95 ff.; 60-75; JNES I, 1942, pp. 302-304; PARROT, *o.c.*, p. 363.

<sup>206</sup>) KING, AKA, p. 95, 60-65; AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 93.

Another chronological datum is to be found on a prism of Tiglathpileser I<sup>207</sup>). In this it is stated that the temple of Anu and Adad, built by Šamši-Adad, son of Išmê-Dagan, was pulled down by Aššur-dân six hundred and forty-one years later, and that it had to wait sixty years till his reign to be rebuilt. Thus sixty years lie between year x of his reign and year y of the reign of Aššur-dân I. Tiglathpileser I was king from 1113 to 1075 and Aššur-dân I from 1177 to 1132, therefore this statement is correct. The son of Išmê-Dagan can be no one but Šamši-Adad III. He reigned 1549-1534. Now Tiglathpileser says that since his day six hundred and forty years have elapsed; for that the reckoning must start from Tiglathpileser is clear from the statement he makes, "In this time the temple of Anu and Adad, the great gods, my lords, which aforesime Šamši-Adad, the son of Išmê-Dagan, prince also of Aššur, had built, six hundred and forty-one years before, had become ruinous"<sup>208</sup>). Now if we add six hundred and forty years to the reign of Tiglathpileser I, we reach 1754-1716. Thus it is clear that the mention of Šamši-Adad III, the son of Išmê-Dagan, cannot be correct, for he reigned 1534-1549. Between the years 1754-1716 comes the reign of Šamši-Adad I, who therefore must be meant. This agrees with the data which we have from inscriptions<sup>209</sup>). The building of the temple of Adad was begun by Irišum I<sup>210</sup>) and completed by his son Ikūnum<sup>211</sup>). It is not stated if the temple of Anu was already connected with it. In an inscription of which only part has been published<sup>212</sup>), mention is made of two *zikkuratu* which were built by Šamši-Adad the son of Ilukabkabu. This can refer only to the temple of Anu and Adad.

In an inscription of Tukulti-Ninurta I<sup>213</sup>) the building of the temple of Ištar at Aššur is mentioned. From the foundation of this temple to Tukulti-Ninurta I seven hundred and twenty years have passed. Tukulti-Ninurta reigned from 1242 to 1206. If we add to this seven hundred and twenty years, we find 1962-1926 as the time within which the temple must have been built. This comes long before the days of Ilušuma, who is stated as having also done some building on the temple. We do not know who founded this temple of Ištar in Aššur.

In addition, there is another indication of date from Šamši-Adad I<sup>214</sup>), who says that seven men's lifetimes have elapsed between himself and Maništusu, the builder of É-ME-NU-E in Niniveh. The question now arises how high Šamši-Adad's estimate of a man's lifetime was, and until that is made out, we can do nothing with this information.

From all this information it is evident that the statements which the kings make must first be proved true before we can use them to construct or to check a chronology. We cannot simply accept these figures and construct a chronological system with them, and then prove by that system that the statements are correct; that is reasoning in a circle and leads to nothing. Therefore, the statements made by kings in their inscriptions concerning the interval of time between various sovereigns are not available for the construction of a sound chronology.

To get an absolutely fixed chronology attempts have been made to get a settled date for the reign of Hammurabi through astronomical calculations, dated in accordance with the old Babylonian calendars<sup>215</sup>). The leading position is held by Ammišaduqa's table of the planet

<sup>207</sup>) JNES I, 1942, p. 303; AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 94.

<sup>208</sup>) AOB I, pp. 16-19, No. 9-11.

<sup>209</sup>) AOB I, pp. 20 f., VI, No. 1.

<sup>210</sup>) AFO 15, 1945-1951, p. 94, Note 57; RA 31, 1934, p. 170.

<sup>211</sup>) KAH I, 13; III, 37-41; JNES I, 1942, pp. 294-296; AFO 15, 1945-1951, pp. 91-92; PARROT, *o.c.*, p. 363; AOB I, pp. 120 ff., p. 126, No. 2, 8-11.

<sup>212</sup>) KAH II, No. 48-59; AFO 15, 1945-1951, pp. 94-95; JNES I, 1942, pp. 297-299; PARROT, *o.c.*, p. 363.

<sup>213</sup>) AAA XIX, pl. LXXXI-LXXXIV, p. 105.

<sup>214</sup>) KING, *Records of the Reign of Tukulti-Ninib*, I, p. 100.

<sup>215</sup>) F. X. KUGLER, *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, II, I, pp. 257 ff.; idem, *Von Meses bis Paulus*; E. WEIDNER, *Studien zur assyrisch-babylonischen Chronologie und Geschichte*, MVAG XX, 1915, Heft 4, p. 24; MVAG XXVI, 1921, Heft 2, p. 41; P. SCHNABEL, *Zur astronomischen Fixierung der altbabylonischen Chronologie mittels der Venustafel der Ammisaduga-Zeit*, ZA 36, 1925, pp. 109-122; S. LANGDON, J. K. FORTHERINGHAM, C. SCHOCO, *The Venus Tablet of Ammisaduga, A Solution of Babylonian Chronology by Means of the Venus-observations of the First Dynasty*, 1928; O. SVEDERSKY, *Etude sur la Chronologie Assyro-Babylonienne*, Mém. de l'acad. des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres XIII, 1916; idem, *Etude sur la Chronologie*



Venus. The importance of this for Babylonian chronology was first recognised by KUGLER in 1912. Repeated testing and improvements of KUGLER's results, conjoined with fresh finds, have made it clear that the observations in question merely provide a series of possible dates. It is a phenomenon which recurs at regular intervals, so that it must first be discovered by other methods when something took place in order to put it in a certain period of that phenomenon. It varies between two hundred and seventy-five to two hundred and seventy-five, or from fifty-six or sixty-four to fifty-six or sixty-four years, between which we must choose as GOOSSENS has rightly pointed out. Hence O. NEUGEBAUER, according to a communication from Mr. GOETZE, has said, "Dans la question chronologique, l'astronomie n'a pas la parole. Elle rapporte des spéculations, non des observations. Si un historien s'accommode d'une autre date, il a toute autorité" <sup>210</sup>). A fixed chronology must be founded upon real historical facts, and astronomical observations can be used only when by another method the date of the observed astronomical fact can be established. This is relevant also for the dated Babylonian contracts which have to do with the delivery of dates by date-growers.

*de la Première Dynastie Babylonienne*, Dissertationes in honorem E. MAHLER, 1937, pp. 253-262; idem, *Nouvelle Etude sur la Chronologie de la Dynastie Hammurapienne*, RA 37, 1940-1941, pp. 45-54; J. W. S. SEWELL, *The Observations of Venus, Alalakh and Chronology*, pp. 26-27; A. UNGNAD, *Die Venus-tafeln und das neunte Jahr Samsuilunas*, MAOG XIII, 1940; id., *Eine neue Grundlage für die altorientalische Chronologie*, AFO 13, 1940, pp. 145-146; B. L. v. D. WAARDEN, *On Babylonian Astronomy, I, The Venus tablets of Ammisaduga*, JEOL x, 1945-1948, pp. 414-424; O. NEUGEBAUER, *Zur Chronologie der Hammurabizeit*, OLZ XLII, 1939, pp. 407-411; idem, *The Chronology of the Hammurabi Age*, JAOS LXI,

1941, pp. 58-61; idem, *Zur Frage der Astronomische Fixierung der babylonischen Chronologie*, OLZ XXXII, 1929, pp. 913-921; J. SCHAUENBERGER, *Die Chronologie der Hammurabi-Zeit nach neueren Forschungen*, Biblica, 10, 1939, pp. 332-360; Ch. SCHOCH, *Ammisaduga*, 1925; A. G. SHORTT, *Journal of the British Astronomical Association*, LVII, 1947, p. 208; A. PARROT, *Archéologie Mésopotamienne, Technique et Problèmes*, pp. 335-341.

<sup>210</sup>) *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 1951, p. 43; G. GOOSSENS, *La Revision de la Chronologie Mésopotamienne et ses Conséquences pour l'Histoire Orientale*, Muséon, LXI, 1948, p. 9.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### BABYLONIA

Starting from the results obtained above we must now try to build up a chronology for the remainder of western Asia. The first place to be dealt with is Babylonia, because that country was very closely connected with the history of Assyria. As with Assyria, so also for the reconstruction of the chronology of Babylonia we have at our disposal lists of year-names which give us a continuous series from the beginning of the third dynasty of Ur to the end of the first Babylonian dynasty; also lists of kings and synchronising lists which give on one side the names of Assyrian kings with those of Babylonian monarchs whose reigns were contemporaneous over against them, or the other way about; we have royal inscriptions, synchronising inscriptions of kings which look at history from the Assyrian or the Babylonian point of view; chronicles, and many data from contracts and other cuneiform texts, which can throw light on the length of the reigns of kings, their order of succession or that of the succession of dynasties; and Greek authors such as Berossos, Ktesias, Diodoros, Strabo, Abydenos, Kastor, Eusebios, Synkellos, and the Bible.

After the last king of the Kassite dynasty came Marduk-šapikzêri, who reigned for seventeen years <sup>217</sup>), 1168-1142. His reign fell within that of Aššur-dân I of Aššur. He was succeeded by Ninurta-nâdin-šumi, who reigned for six years, 1141-1136 <sup>218</sup>). His reign also fell entirely within that of Aššur-dân of Aššur. He was succeeded by Nabukudururšur I. He reigned for seven years, contemporaneously with Aššur-dân I of Aššur, and was a contemporary of Aššurrêšiši, according to the synchronising chronicle <sup>219</sup>): 1.....tu-ub..... 2is-  
hur-ma a-na mâti-šu itûr ar-ki-šu m d[nabu-ku-dûr-ušur] 3ni-pi-še-šu iš-ša-a a-na za-an-qi  
bir-ti ša mât[aššur] 4a-na ka-ša-di il-li-ka maššur-rêš-i-ši šar mâtaššur 5išnarkabâtemeš-šu  
id-ka-a a-na cli-šu a-na a-la-ki 6m dnabu-ku-dûr-ušur aš-šu ni-pi-še la-a-bu a-gi-šu ina išati  
iš-ru-up 7is-hur-ma a-na mâti-šu i-tur 8m dnabu-ku-dûr-ušur-ma išnarkabtu u zû-ki a-na i-di  
bir-ti 9ša mâtaššur a-na ka-ša-di il-li-ka maššur-rêš-i-ši 10išnarkabâtemeš zu-ki a-na ni-ra-ru-te  
iš-pu-ur 11it-ti-šu i-duk a-bi-ik-tû-šu is-kun ummanâtemeš-šu i-duk 12uš-ma-an-šu i-bu-uk 40  
išnarkabâte meš-šu hal-lu-up-tum ú-te-ru-ni 13m karaš-tu a-lik pa-an ummanâte-šu is-ba-tu-ni,  
“..... he turned about and returned to his land. After him Nabukudururšur took his siege  
engines, advanced to capture Zanu, a fortress of Aššur. Aššurrêšiši, king of Aššur, mobilised  
his war-chariots to go forth against him. Nabukudururšur, furious because of his siege engines,  
burned them with fire, turned about and returned to his land. But Nabukudururšur came with  
chariots and infantry beside the stronghold of the land of Aššur, to capture it. Aššurrêšiši  
sent chariots and infantry to help; he fought against him, brought him to defeat, smote his  
troops, carried away his host. Forty of his chariots, besides the equipment, turned back.  
Karaštu, the leader of his troops, they took prisoner”. The number of his regnal years is  
broken away, so that we do not know how long Nabukudururšur (Nebuchadnezzar) I reigned.  
He was succeeded by Enlilnâdinapli <sup>220</sup>). The number of years of his reign is also unknown.  
His successor was Marduknâdinahhê <sup>221</sup>). The length of his reign is unknown, but according  
to the synchronising chronicle he was a contemporary of Tiglathpileser I (1113-1075) <sup>222</sup>):  
II, 14 m tukulti-apal-é-kur šar mâtaššur m darduk-nâdin-ahhêmeš šar mâtkar-du-ni-aš 152 šu

<sup>217</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II, 17.

<sup>218</sup>) CT 36, pl. 24, obv. II, 18.

<sup>219</sup>) CT 34, pl. 30, obv. II, 1-0.

<sup>220</sup>) Die grosse Königsliste aus Assur. AFO 3,

p. 70, col. II, 16.

<sup>221</sup>) AFO 3, o.c., col. II, 17.

<sup>222</sup>) CT 34, pl. 39, obv. II, 14-24; III, R 43 c,  
l. 17.

*si-dir-tu ša isnarkâbatemeš ma-la ina eli za-ban* <sup>16</sup>*šu-pá-li-e ina tar-si ar-zu-ḫi-na iš-kun* <sup>17</sup>*ina šanitate šatti ina mar-ri-ti ša e-liš mâtakkadiki i-duk* <sup>18</sup>*dur-ku-ri-gal-zu si-ip-par ša ša-mas* <sup>19</sup>*si-ip-par ša da-nu-ni-t[um]* <sup>20</sup>*babiliiki ú-pi-e ma-ha-zi rabûteti* <sup>21</sup>*a-di hal-zi-šu-nu ik-šu-[ud]* <sup>22</sup>*i-na ûmimi-šu âla-qar-sa-a[l-lu]* <sup>23</sup>*a-di âllu-ub-di iḫ-but* <sup>24</sup>*mâtsu-ḫi a-di ra-pi-qi a-na pat gim-ri-[šu ušikniš]*, “Tukulti-apal-ekur, king of Aššur, and Marduknâdinaḫḫê, king of Karduniaš, for the second time brought the war-chariots, as many as were above the Lower Zab, in battle array against Arzuhina. In the second year they strove in Maritti, which lies above Akkad. Durkurigalzu, Sippar of Šamaš, Sippar of Anunitum, Babylon and Upe, those great cities with all their strongholds he captured. In that time he spoiled Aqarzallu besides Lubdu; Suḫu together with Rapiqu he conquered with all their territory”. He was succeeded by Itti-Marduk-balaṭu <sup>223</sup>), the number of whose regnal years is broken away. His successor was Mardukšâpikzêrmâti, who according to the synchronising chronicle was a contemporary of Aššurbêlkala (1072-1055) <sup>224</sup>): II, <sup>25</sup>*ina tar-ši m aššur-bêl-ka-la šar [mâtaššur]* <sup>26</sup>*m d marduk-ša-pi-ik-zêr-mâti šar mât-ka-du-[ni-âš]* <sup>27</sup>*tu-ub-ta su-lu-um-ma-a ga-am-[ma-ra]* <sup>28</sup>*it-ti a-ha-meš iš-ku-[nu]* <sup>29</sup>*ina tar-ši m aššur-bêl-ka-la šar mât[aššur]* <sup>30</sup>*m d marduk-ša-pi-ik-zêr-mâti šar mât-ka-du-ni-âš šada-šu e-[mid]* <sup>31</sup>*m dadad-apal-iddin-na apal é-sag-gil-šad-ú-ni apal la ma-ma-n[a]* <sup>32</sup>*a-na šarru-u-te ina eli-šu-nu iš-kun* <sup>33</sup>*m aššur-bêl-ka-la šar mâtaššur* <sup>34</sup>*mârat m dadad-apal-iddin-na šar mât-ka-du-ni-âš e-ḫu-z[u]* <sup>35</sup>*iš-tu nu-du-ni-ša ma'-di ana mâtaššur il-qa-[ša]* <sup>36</sup>*nišêmeš mâtaššur mât-ka-du-ni-âš* <sup>37</sup>*it-ti a-ḫa-meš ib-ba-[ru]*, “In the time of Aššurbêlkala, king of Aššur, Mardukšâpikzêrmâti was king of Karduniaš. They confirmed friendship and perfect peace with one another. In the time of Aššurbêlkala, Mardukšâpikzêrmâti, king of Karduniaš, died. He set up Adadapaliddinna, the son of Esaggilšaduni, son of a nobody, to be king over them. Aššurbêlkala, the king of Aššur, married the daughter of Adadapaliddinna, king of Karduniaš, and brought her to Aššur with rich gifts. The peoples of Aššur and Karduniaš were friends with each other”. Adadapaliddinna is by this account the son of “a nobody”. According to another chronicle he is the son of Itti-Marduk-balaṭu, an Aramaean usurper <sup>225</sup>). Adadapaliddinna reigned twenty-three years during the reign of Aššurbêlkala. The year of his accession we can determine in the following manner. This dynasty consisted of eleven kings with a total reign of a hundred and thirty-two years <sup>226</sup>). Six kings reigned for sixty-seven years, therefore Nebuchadnezzar I, Enlilnâdinapli, Marduknâdinaḫḫê, Itti-Marduk-balaṭu and Mardukšâpikzêrmâti together reigned for sixty-five years. Nebuchadnezzar I began his reign in 1135; if we subtract sixty-five years from this, the first regnal year of Adadapaliddinna was 1070. Aššurbêlkala reigned from 1072 to 1055. Adadapaliddinna reigned for twenty-two years <sup>227</sup>), 1070-1049. He was thus a contemporary of Aššurbêlkala, Irêba-Adad (1055-1054) and Šamsi-Adad IV (1053-1050). He was succeeded by Marduk-aḫḫê-eriba, whose reign lasted one year and six months <sup>228</sup>), so that he was on the throne 1048-1047, and was contemporary with Aššurnâširapli I (1048-1030). His successor was Marduk-zêr... who reigned for twelve years <sup>229</sup>). His dates being 1046-1035, he was also a contemporary of Aššurnâširapli I. He was succeeded by Nabu-šum-libur, whose reign lasted eight years <sup>230</sup>), or from 1034 to 1027, and who was contemporary with Aššurnâširapli I and Salmanasser II, 1029-1018. After him a new dynasty came into power, its first king being Šimmaššipak, who was on the throne for eighteen years, 1026-1009 <sup>231</sup>). He was contemporaneous with Salmanasser II, Aššurnirâri IV (1017-1012) and Aššurrâbi II (1011-971). His successor, Ea-mukîn-šumi, ruled for five months, 1008 <sup>232</sup>), and his successor again, Kaššu-nâdin-aḫḫe, reigned for three years, 1007-1005 <sup>233</sup>). Both were contemporaries of Aššurrâbi II. Next came another new dynasty, the first king of which was Ê-ulmaš-šâkin-

<sup>223</sup>) AFO 3, o.c., col. II, 18.

<sup>224</sup>) KING, *Chron.* II, p. 57; CT 34, pl. 39, obv. II, 25-37.

<sup>225</sup>) KING, *Chron.* II, p. 59.

<sup>226</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 5.

<sup>227</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 1.

<sup>228</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 2.

<sup>229</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 3.

<sup>230</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 4.

<sup>231</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 6; KING, *Chron.* II, pp. 51 ff.

<sup>232</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 7.

<sup>233</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 8.

šumi, whose reign lasted seventeen years, 1004-988<sup>234</sup>). He was contemporaneous with Aššurrâbi II. He was succeeded by Ninurta-kudurri-ušur, who reigned for three years, 987-985<sup>235</sup>), and was also a contemporary of Aššurrâbi II, as was his successor, Širiqu-tu-šugamuna, who reigned but three months in 984<sup>236</sup>). After him came yet another new dynasty, consisting of but one sovran, Mâr-bîti-apla-ušur, who reigned six years, 983-978<sup>237</sup>). He too fell within the reign of Aššurrâbi II. The next dynasty began with Nabu-mukîn-apli, whose reign lasted thirty-six years, 977-942<sup>238</sup>). He was contemporary with Aššurrâbi II, Aššurrêšîši II (970-966) and Tiglathpileser II (965-934). His successor Ninurta-kudurri-ušur, who was king for eight months and twelve days in 941<sup>239</sup>), was also contemporary with Tiglathpileser II. After him comes Mâr-bîti-aḥḥê-iddin<sup>240</sup>), the number of whose regnal years we do not know. He was succeeded by Šamašmudammiq and Nabu-šum-iškun, whose regnal years again we do not know, but who according to the synchronising chronicle<sup>241</sup>) were contemporaries of Adadnirâri II, 910-890: III, <sup>1</sup>ina tar-ši m dadad-nirâri šar mâtaš[šur] <sup>2</sup>m dšamaš-mu-dammiq šar mâtkar-du-ni-áš <sup>3</sup>i-na šêpšad ia-al-man si-dir-tu lu iš-ku[n] <sup>4</sup>m dadad-nirâri šar mâtaššur a-bi-ik-tu ša m dšamaš-mu-da[mmiq] <sup>5</sup>šar mâtkar-du-ni-áš i[š]-ku[n] <sup>6</sup>abikta-šu im-ḥa-as isnarkabâtemeš [šise sindat] <sup>7</sup>ni-ri-šu [e-bu-uk-šu] <sup>8</sup>m dšamaš-mu-dammiq šar mât[kar-du-ni-áš šada-šu] e-mid <sup>9</sup>m dnabu-šum iškunun i-..... <sup>10</sup>m dadad-nirâri šar m[âtaššur it-tim] dnabu-šum-iškunun <sup>11</sup>šar mâtk[ar-du-ni-áš im-da]-ḥi-iš abikta-šu iš-kun, "In the time of Adadnirâri, king of Aššur, Šamašmudammiq, king of Karduniaš, verily drew up his line of battle. Adadnirâri, king of Aššur, inflicted defeat on Šamašmudammiq, king of Karduniaš. He smote him in the defeat, his chariots and horses, the span of his yoke, he led away. Šamašmudammiq, king of Karduniaš, died. Nabu-šum-iškun ..... Adadnirâri, the king of Aššur, strove with Nabu-šum-iškun, the king of Karduniaš, and inflicted defeat on him". The Babylonian chronicle BM 27859 speaks of him as Šamaš-šum-ukin<sup>242</sup>). In KAV 10 and Ass. 14616c rev. III, 16 the last portion is broken off, so that it cannot be made out which reading is the correct one. He came to the throne during the reign of Adadnirâri II, but it is not known in what year. There is however a contract which seems to belong to this period and in this the thirteenth year is mentioned<sup>243</sup>).

Successors of Nabu-šum-iškun were Nabu-apla-iddinna, Mardukzâkiršumi and Marduk-bêlusâte, who were contemporaries of Salmanasser II (858-824), according to the synchronising chronicle<sup>244</sup>). III, <sup>22</sup>[i-na tar-]ši m dšul-ma-nu-ašarid šar mâtaššur <sup>23</sup>[m nabu-ap]la-iddin-na šar mâtkar-du-ni-áš <sup>24</sup>[tu-u]b-ta su-lu-um-ma gam-am[-ma-ra] <sup>25</sup>[it-t]i a-ha-meš iš-ku-nu ina tar-ši m dšul-ma-nu-ašarid šar [mâtaššur] <sup>26</sup>[m dnabu-]apla-iddin-na šar mâtkar-du-ni-áš šada-šu e-[mid] <sup>27</sup>[m dmarduk-]zâkir-šumi ina iškussi abi-šu u-[šib] <sup>28</sup>[m dmarduk-bêl-ú-sa-a-te aḥi-šu itti-šu ib-bal-[kit] <sup>29</sup>.....da-ban lu iš-bat mâtak-ka-di-i <sup>30</sup>ma[l-ma-l]iš i-zu-zu m dšul-ma-nu-ašarid šar mât[aššur] <sup>31</sup>a-na ni-ra-ru-ti ša m dmarduk-zakir-[šumi] <sup>32</sup>šar mâtkar-du-ni-áš il-[lik] <sup>33</sup>m dmarduk-bêl-ú-sa-a-ti šar ḥamma'i <sup>34</sup>[a-]di šabêmeš bêl ḥi-ti ša it-ti-šu i-duk..., "In the time of Salmanasser, king of Aššur, Nabu-apla-iddinna was king of Karduniaš. They concluded friendship and perfect peace with each other. In the time of Salmanasser, king of Aššur, Nabu-apla-iddinna, the king of Karduniaš, died. Mardukzâkiršumi set himself on his father's throne. Mardukbêlusâte, his brother, rose up against him .....daban he verily took, Akkad they divided into equal portions. Salmanasser, king of Aššur, came to the help of Mardukzâkiršumi, king of Karduniaš. Mardukbêlusâte, the usurper, together with the hordes of rebels who sided with him, he put to death". The war

<sup>234</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 10; KING, *Chron.* II, p. 54.

<sup>235</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 11.

<sup>236</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 12.

<sup>237</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 14; KING, *Chron.* II, pp. 55 ff.

<sup>238</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 15; Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, p. 70, rev. III, 9.

<sup>239</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. I, 16; Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, p. 70, rev. III, 10.

<sup>240</sup>) Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, p. 70, rev. III, 11.

<sup>241</sup>) Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, p. 70, rev. III, 13; CT 34, pl. 40, rev. III, 1-11.

<sup>242</sup>) KING, *Chron.*, II, p. 64, rev. 2.

<sup>243</sup>) CLAY, *Pierpont Morgan*, I, pl. 1, No. 8; JOHN. PSBA, 1912, pp. 25 ff.

<sup>244</sup>) CT 34, pl. 40, rev. III, 21-34.

between Mardukzâkiršumi and Mardukbêlusâte lasted a year, according to a list which ascribes a reign of one year to the latter <sup>245</sup>). Mardukzâkiršumi called in Salmanasser III to help him, and the latter defeated Mardukbêlusâte in his ninth year, 850 <sup>246</sup>), therefore Mardukbêlusâte was king 851-850. How long Mardukzâkiršumi reigned we do not know, but a deed of gift is dated in his eleventh year <sup>247</sup>), so he must have reigned eleven years at least. Mardukzâkiršumi was succeeded by Mardukbalatsuiqbi, who according to the synchronising chronicle was a contemporary of Šamši-Adad V (823-811 <sup>248</sup>). Rev. *6ina tar-si m dšamši-d-adad šar mâtaš-šur m darduk-balaš-su-iq-bi šar mâtka-ru-ni-áš 7it-ti a-ħa-meš i-du-ku m dšamši-d-adad šar mâtaššur 8a-bi-ik-ta ša m darduk-balaš-su-iq-bi iš-kun*, "In the time of Šamši-Adad, king of Aššur, Mardukbalatsuiqbi was king of Karduniaš. They strove with one another. Šamši-Adad, king of Aššur, inflicted defeat on Mardukbalatsuiqbi". After this came a time of anarchy, of which we do not know how long it lasted <sup>249</sup>). ..... *šânatemeš šarru ina mâti la baši*, "..... years there was no king in the land". A contract of this time is dated "the fourth year in which there was no king in the land" <sup>250</sup>). From this time Baba-aħhê-iddin <sup>251</sup>), Mardukbêlzêri and Mardukapalušur and Mardukapaliddinna II are known <sup>252</sup>). After this gap we once more get a continuous succession of princes beginning with Eriša-Marduk and his successor Nabu-šum-iškun. But the length of these two sovereigns' reigns is not known. The first prince whose regnal years we do know is the successor of Nabu-šum-iškun, Nabunâšir, who reigned for fourteen years <sup>253</sup>). In this king's third year, Tiglathpileser III (744-727) ascended the throne of Aššur <sup>254</sup>), consequently Nabunâšir began his reign in 745 and ended it in 732. His son Nabunâdinzêri succeeded him <sup>255</sup>). In the Babylonian chronicle he is called Nadinu <sup>256</sup>). He reigned for two years and died during a rebellion (731-730) <sup>257</sup>). The raiser of the revolt, Nabušumukin, called Šumu-ukin in the Babylonian chronicle, ascended the throne and occupied it for only two months and some days in 730 <sup>258</sup>). He was succeeded by Ukinzêr, who reigned for three years and was taken prisoner by Tiglathpileser III (727-726) <sup>259</sup>). The Babylonian chronicle names Pûlu in his place and gives him a reign of two years (728-727) <sup>260</sup>). The *limmu*-chronicle states, "In the *limmu*-year of Liphurili of Kurruri, the king clasped the hand of Marduk; in the *limmu*-year of Duri-Aššur of Tušhan the king clasped the hand of Marduk" <sup>261</sup>). These two persons held the office of *limmu* in 728 and 729, consequently in those years Tiglathpileser was ruling in Babylon. Putting all these data together, we see that in Babylon Tiglathpileser was referred to as Pûlu. His successor in Aššur and Babylon was his son Salmanasser V, who reigned for five years, 726-722 <sup>262</sup>). In the Babylonian king-list he is styled Ululaju <sup>263</sup>). In Babylon, after the death of Salmanasser V, Mardukapaliddinna II set himself on the throne in the month of Nisan <sup>264</sup>). He reigned for twelve years. In his twelfth year, according to the new Babylonian chronicle, Sargon descended upon Babylon; Mardukapaliddinna II fled to Elam and Sargon set himself on the throne of Babylon <sup>265</sup>). This is confirmed by the Babylonian king-list A, and the *limmu*-chronicle states, "In the *limmu*-year of Manu-ki-Aššur-le'i of Tillu, Sargon grasped the hand of Marduk" <sup>266</sup>). This happened in 709. Sargon, according to the Babylonian

<sup>245</sup>) KAV 10, II, 9.

<sup>246</sup>) LAYARD, *Inscriptions*, pl. 22 f. and 46 f.; BA VI, pp. 144 f.

<sup>247</sup>) VA 208, 23; PEISER, *Aktenstücke*, pp. 2 ff., pl. I; KB IV, pp. 96 f.

<sup>248</sup>) CT 34, pl. 42, SM 2106, rev. 6-8.

<sup>249</sup>) KING, *Chron.* II, p. 66, rev. 7. pl. p. 153, rev. 7.

<sup>250</sup>) CLAY, *Pierpont Morgan*, I, pl. 9, No. 23.

<sup>251</sup>) ASSUR 4128a KAV 182. WEIDNER, *Die Könige von Assur*, MVAG, 1921, Heft 2, p. 11, No. 14.

<sup>252</sup>) *Chron.* S 81-7-27. 117, 1-3; JOHNS, *Deeds and Documents*, No. 88; PSBA 1918, pp. 125-130.

<sup>253</sup>) CT 34, pl. 46, 1-12.

<sup>254</sup>) CT 34, pl. 46, 1-12.

<sup>255</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 4.

<sup>250</sup>) CT 34, pl. 46, obv. I, 13-15.

<sup>257</sup>) CT 34, pl. 46, obv. I, 13.

<sup>258</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 5; CT 34, pl. 46, obv. I, 16-17.

<sup>259</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 7.

<sup>260</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 8; CT 34, pl. 47, obv. I, 10-27.

<sup>261</sup>) *Eponym Chronicle* Ch I, K 51, II R, 52; DE-LITZSCH, AL 2, pp. 72-94; Cb 3, K 3202, SCHRADER, *Jhrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1875, 324; UNGNAD, RLA II, 7.

<sup>262</sup>) CT 34, pl. 47, obv. I, 29-32.

<sup>263</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 9.

<sup>264</sup>) CT 34, pl. 47, obv. I, 32.

<sup>265</sup>) CT 34, pl. 47, obv. II, 1-5.

<sup>266</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 10; *Eponym Chronicle* Cb 4, RM 2, 97, PSBA XI, 1889, p. 287, pl. III.

king-list A, reigned for five years, 709-705<sup>267</sup>). According to the same authority, he was succeeded by his son Sinaḥêrib for two years, 704-703<sup>268</sup>). The Babylonians revolted<sup>269</sup>), and Mardukzâkiršumi II was king for a month<sup>270</sup>). Mardukapaliddinna II returned and reigned for nine months<sup>271</sup>). He was succeeded by Bêlibni. The new Babylonian chronicle states: "In the third year of Bêlibni, Sinaḥêrib descended upon Akkad and plundered Akkad. Bêlibni and his magnates were caused to abide in Aššur as captives. Bêlibni exercised the kingly authority for three years in Babylon. Sinaḥêrib set his son Aššurnâdinšumi on the throne of Babylon"<sup>272</sup>). This took place, according to the *limmu*-chronicle, in the year when Metunu held office of *limmu*, which he did in 700<sup>273</sup>). Bêlibni therefore was king from 702 to 700. Aššurnâdinšumi reigned for six years, till the king of Elam took him prisoner and set Nergalušêzib on the throne<sup>274</sup>). Aššurnâdinšumi's reign was 699-694. Nergalušêzib reigned for a year and a half 693, until he was captured by the Assyrians<sup>275</sup>). Mušezib-Marduk set himself on the throne and was captured by Sinaḥêrib four years later<sup>276</sup>); the dates of his reign are 692-689. The new Babylonian chronicle says, "For eight years there was no king in Babylon"<sup>277</sup>). The Babylonian king-list A names Sinaḥêrib as reigning for eight years<sup>278</sup>). He therefore reigned in Babylon 688-681. He was killed in a revolt, and his son Assarhaddon followed him, reigning for twelve years<sup>279</sup>), 680-669. His two sons, Šamašsumukîn and Aššurbânipal, succeeded him, the former in Babylon and the latter in Aššur<sup>280</sup>). After sixteen years on the throne, Šamašsumukîn began a war with his brother. After four years of war he was taken prisoner. He therefore reigned in Babylon for twenty years, 668-649. Aššurbânipal took over the kingship of Babylon and ruled there for twenty-four years, 648-627. After that, Nabu-apal-ušur came to the throne<sup>281</sup>); his reign lasted twenty-two years, 626-605. His successor was Nabukudurusušur II, who reigned for forty-three years, 604-562<sup>282</sup>). After him came Awêl-Marduk, who ruled for two years, 561-560<sup>283</sup>). His successor was Nergal-šar-ušur, who occupied the throne for four years, 559-556<sup>284</sup>). Labaši-Marduk reigned for but nine months of 556<sup>285</sup>), and the last king was Nabun'id, who reigned for seventeen years, 555-539<sup>286</sup>).

We have already seen that the first dynasty of Babylon began to rule under Šumuabu in 1826, so that Hammurabi reigned from 1724 to 1682. Hammurabi defeated Rim-Sin, the last king of the dynasty of Larsa, in his thirtieth year, for his thirty-first is named after this event<sup>287</sup>). This is confirmed by a list of year-names from Larsa, which gives Hammurabi fourteen years. As Hammurabi was on the throne for forty-three years, his thirtieth year was the first in which he ruled in Larsa. Therefore the defeat of Rim-Sin happened in 1693.

The dynasty of Larsa ruled for two hundred and sixty-three years, beginning therefore in 1956, with Naplânium. By reckoning back from the time when the fall of the dynasty of Isin is mentioned in the year-names of Larsa and Babylon, we can fit this dynasty into the chronological framework. During the period in question, Isin is mentioned four times, *viz.*, the twenty-sixth year of Rim-Sin, the seventeenth year of Sinmuballit, the thirtieth year of Rim-Sin and the seventh year of Hammurabi. Now JACOBSEN has proved that Isin is

<sup>267</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 11.

<sup>268</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 12.

<sup>269</sup>) Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, p. 71, rev. 1-5.

<sup>270</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 13.

<sup>271</sup>) Ass. 14616c, AFO 3, p. 73, rev. IV, 2; CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 14.

<sup>272</sup>) CT 34, pl. 47, 25-30; Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, 71, rev. IV, 6.

<sup>273</sup>) *Eponym Chronicle*, Cb 7, I, 3.

<sup>274</sup>) CT 34, pl. 48, 38-44; CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 14; Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, 1026, p. 71, rev. IV, 7.

<sup>275</sup>) CT 34, pl. 48, rev. III, 5; CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 15.

<sup>276</sup>) CT 34, pl. 49, rev. III, 12; Ass. 14616 c, AFO 3, 1926, p. 71, rev. IV, 8.

<sup>277</sup>) CT 34, pl. 49, rev. III, 28.

<sup>278</sup>) CT 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 19.

<sup>279</sup>) CT 34, pl. 50, rev. IV, 32.

<sup>280</sup>) CT 34, pl. 50, rev. IV, 33.

<sup>281</sup>) R. A. PARKER and W. H. DUBBERSTEIN, *Babylonian Chronology, 626 B.C.-A.D. 45*.

<sup>282</sup>) PARKER and DUBBERSTEIN, *o.c.*

<sup>283</sup>) PARKER and DUBBERSTEIN, *o.c.*

<sup>284</sup>) PARKER and DUBBERSTEIN, *o.c.*

<sup>285</sup>) PARKER and DUBBERSTEIN, *o.c.*

<sup>286</sup>) PARKER and DUBBERSTEIN, *o.c.*

<sup>287</sup>) UNGNAD, *Datenlisten*, RLA, Bd. 11, p. 180; THUREAU-DANGIN, *La Chronologie des Dynasties de Sumer et Akkad*, pp. 40-42; JACOBSEN, *The Sumerian Kinglist*, p. 177.

mentioned in the twenty-fifth year of Rim-Sin, but not as being captured; a frontier fortress was taken, nothing more<sup>288</sup>). The first real capture of Isin took place in the sixteenth year of Sinmuballit, 1720. The capture of Isin by Rim-Sin is mentioned in the name of his thirtieth year, so that it actually happened in his twenty-ninth. Rim-Sin was defeated by Hammurabi in his sixty-first year, according to a list of year-names from Larsa<sup>289</sup>), but in his sixtieth according to a great prism from the same place<sup>290</sup>). This divergency is readily explained by assuming that the writer of the list of year-names from Larsa counted the year-name of Rim-Sin in the year in which Hammurabi defeated him. That year had one name from Rim-Sin and one from Hammurabi. The author of this prism, however, ceased to reckon the year-names of Rim-Sin from Hammurabi, and thus Rim-Sin had only sixty year-names. The defeat of Rim-Sin is mentioned in the name of Hammurabi's thirty-first year, so that it really took place in his thirtieth, 1695. As Rim-Sin reigned for sixty years and captured Isin in his twenty-ninth, Isin was taken in 1726. The capture of Isin by Hammurabi is mentioned in the name of his seventh year, and consequently must actually have taken place in his sixth, 1719. That is ten years after the conquest of Isin by Sinmuballit and eight after its capture by Rim-Sin. This is confirmed by a tablet which has a double dating, "the eight and tenth year since Isin was captured"<sup>291</sup>). This dating can be explained if when Isin fell to Hammurabi the Babylonian era was re-adopted since its capture, because that was the eighth year of the Larsa era of Isin. Since the first mention of the capture of a city by a foreign power probably gives the date at which the independence of the city of Isin came to an end<sup>292</sup>), the dynasty of Isin ended in 1729, having ruled for two hundred and twenty-six years. The list which registers the names of the kings is to be found in W.B. 1923, 444<sup>293</sup>), P<sub>2</sub><sup>294</sup>), P<sub>5</sub><sup>295</sup>), L<sup>296</sup>), and Su<sub>1</sub><sup>297</sup>). Its total for the reigns of fourteen kings, omitting Damiqilišu, the last king, is two hundred and three years. Actually the list gives two hundred and thirteen, but the correct number is two hundred and three, if the number of the regnal years of Šu-ilišu is emended to ten. P<sub>5</sub> gives ten, S<sub>1</sub> fifteen, WB 1923, 444 twenty, but probably this is secondary, the result of a dittography of the hook. That W.B. 1923, 444 is derived from a list which, like P<sub>5</sub>, had ten here, is evident from the total in W.B. 1923, 444, which is two hundred and three. This squares with a reign of ten years for Šu-ilišu<sup>298</sup>). Also, a tablet of the names of the kings of the dynasty of Isin and their regnal years, now in the possession of a dealer in antiquities at Bagdad, gives ten years for Šu-ilišu. The total of two hundred and three seems therefore to be correct. P<sub>5</sub>, which was written later than W.B. 1923, 444, gives the name and length of reign of the successor of Sinmâgir, viz., Damiqilišu, his son, who ruled for twenty-three years. The entire dynasty therefore consisted of fifteen kings with a total length of reigns of two hundred and twenty-six years. Since it ended in 1725, it must have begun in 1950. The dynasty of Larsa lasted for two hundred and sixty-three years, and they continued to rule for twenty-nine after that of Isin. If then we subtract twenty-nine years from two hundred and sixty-three, we get two hundred and thirty-four, that is to say eight years more than the dynasty of Isin, therefore the dynasty of Larsa began to rule eight years earlier than that of Isin.

The first king of the dynasty of Isin was Išbi-Irra. He succeeded Ibi-Sin, the last king of the dynasty of Ur. But we must first make sure whether he followed on Ibi-Sin's last year or ruled for a while simultaneously with that prince. Išbi-Irra ruled over Isin for thirty-three years. He was not of Sumerian descent, but a "man of Mari", as is shown by a letter from Ibi-Sin to Puzurnumušda<sup>299</sup>). He appears to have risen to his high estate as a mere official,

<sup>288</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, pp. 198-199; J. Tylor MOLY-NEUX, ISOR 4, 1920, pp. 87-90.

<sup>289</sup>) YOS I, No. 33; E. M. GRICE, *Chronology of the Larsa Dynasty*, YOSR IV, 1, New Haven, 1919.

<sup>290</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 198; UNGNAD, ZDMG 74, 1920, p. 424 and RLA 2, p. 155.

<sup>291</sup>) RA 27, 1930, pp. 23-25; JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 197, Note 21.

<sup>292</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 198; pp. 8-21.

<sup>293</sup>) OECT 11, pl. 1-iv.

<sup>294</sup>) PBS v, No. 2; PBS IV, pp. 73-78.

<sup>295</sup>) PBS v, No. 5; PBS IV, pp. 82 ff.

<sup>296</sup>) PBS XIII, No. I.

<sup>297</sup>) RA 31, 1934, pp. 150 f.

<sup>298</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 125, Note 343.

<sup>299</sup>) A. FALKENSTEIN, *Ibbi-sin-Išbi'erra*, ZA 49, 1949, pp. 59-79, 19-23, p. 61.

for we learn from a badly damaged letter from Išbi-Irra to Ibi-Sin that he was employed in buying grain. He states that the Amorites have broken through the frontier defences, and that he is bringing the grain to Isin. He petitions Ibi-Sin to be appointed defender of Isin and Nippur<sup>300</sup>). This break-through of the Amorites through the fortification-wall on the border of the country, which was built by Šu-Sin<sup>301</sup>) to keep them off, can be no other than the one which resulted in Ibi-Sin having repairs of the walls of Nippur and Ur undertaken. That is mentioned in the name of the sixth year of Ibi-Sin<sup>302</sup>). In the first two years of Ibi-Sin we still find numerous tablets from his whole kingdom which deal with economic matters. After that they begin to be fewer in various parts of the kingdom, in which Ibi-Sin's authority was no longer recognised<sup>303</sup>). Thus dates of Ibi-Sin cease in his second year at Ešnunna<sup>304</sup>), in his third at Šuša<sup>305</sup>), in his fifth at Lagaš<sup>306</sup>), in his sixth at Umma<sup>307</sup>), and in his seventh at Nippur<sup>308</sup>). This last may result from the fact that Išbi-Irra had been appointed there, and that he, although he had not yet completely broken away from Ibi-Sin, yet was ceasing to send him any more deliveries. We perhaps can catch an echo of this in a letter of Ibi-Sin to Išbi-Irra from the collection of the Griffith Institute, which is shortly to be published in OECT v, *Miscellaneous Texts*. It runs thus: <sup>1</sup>diš-bi-ir-ra-ra ù-na-du<sub>11</sub>, <sup>2</sup>di-bí-zu-en lugal-zu na-ab-bé-a <sup>3</sup>en-na en-lil-le erin šu-i im-gub-be-en <sup>4</sup>za-e ḥar-gim sag i-bal-e <sup>5</sup>u<sub>4</sub>-da en-lil-lé gá-a-ra ḥul ba-an-gil<sub>7</sub> <sup>6</sup>i-bè-zu-en-na-ra ḥul ba-an-gil<sub>7</sub> <sup>7</sup>uríki lú kur-ua bé-in-sì-mu <sup>8</sup>ki-tuš-ba nu-me-a lú kúr im-zi-zi kur-kur im-súḥ-súḥ <sup>9</sup>u<sub>4</sub> en-lil-lé i-bè-sú-en-na-ra im-me-gur <sup>10</sup>za-e sag-zu lí-ra ní ba-an-tuku <sup>11</sup>20 gú kù-babbar še-sà mar-tu-šè ba-e-ti <sup>12</sup>še gur ta-àm kù-babbar 1 uru-e bé-in-sà-sà-mà-am (?) <sup>13</sup>gá-a-ra 1 še-gur ta-àm za-e mu-un-gi <sup>14</sup>puzur-nu-muš-da sagub ezen igi-im-zalag-gá <sup>15</sup>mar-tu lú kúr-ra sà kalama-mu-šè <sup>16</sup>a-gim im-da-tu-ré-en <sup>17</sup>en-na gišma sig-gi-dè man-mu-un-si-in-gi <sup>18</sup>1ú SAG-DU-nu-tuku kalam-ma í-gál-la <sup>19</sup>a-gim mar-tu-e an-ta nam-mu-si-in-gi, "To Išbi-Irra say what Ibi-Sin your king says. So long as Enlil provided us a host, you overwhelmed like a deluge. Now that Enlil has caused misfortune to overtake me, misfortune to overtake Ibi-Sin, has given Ur over to the enemy, has been no more in his dwelling, the enemy has advanced and brought the land to confusion; when Enlil cast Ibi-Sin down, you took care to get your portion. Twenty talents of silver you have taken to get grain from the Amorites. For one shekel of silver two gur of grain used to be sold in the city; for me you have fixed it at one gur. Puzurnumušda the governor, who had charge of the feasts, had likewise let the Amorite, the enemy, enter into my country. So long as he really came to pluck figs, he was weak in the land; in this manner the Amorite has got the upper hand". From this piece it is clear that Išbi-Irra was to begin with a faithful servant, but that later he began to think more and more of himself, just as Puzurnumušda did. We can calculate with great probability when Išbi-Irra began to reign and to date by year-names on his own account by means of a list of his year-names which we possess<sup>309</sup>). It is likely that two year-names are broken away from the beginning of this list, so that we must add three years at the start. Now the tenth year-name in the list runs "year in which he smote the host of Elam and Šua"<sup>310</sup>). We must add two years to this, therefore the event took place in the twelfth year of Išbi-Irra. According to a lament for the fall of Ur, Ibi-Sin was taken prisoner by the

<sup>300</sup>) PBS XIII, No. 9; JACOBSEN, *The Reign of Ibbi-Suen*, JCS 7, 1953, pp. 39-40.

<sup>301</sup>) ITT II, No. 3772; BE I, No. 127, rev. I.

<sup>302</sup>) JACOBSEN, *The Sumerian Kinglist*, Assyriological Studies II, p. 201.

<sup>303</sup>) JACOBSEN, *The Reign of Ibbi-Suen*, JCS 7, 1953, pp. 36-47.

<sup>304</sup>) OIP XLIII, p. 170.

<sup>305</sup>) MDP x, No. 121; MDP XVIII, No. 79; CAMERON, *History of Early Iran*, p. 57.

<sup>306</sup>) REISNER, TU, No. 50, 75.

<sup>307</sup>) KEISER, STD, No. 311.

<sup>308</sup>) BE 3, p. 133; PBS VIII, p. 157.

<sup>309</sup>) Taha BAQIR, *Date-list of Ishbi-Irra*, Sumer IV, 1948, pp. 103-113.

<sup>310</sup>) Taha BAQIR, *o.c.*, IM 11794, 10.



Elamites and the people of Šua, and taken away to Elam<sup>311</sup>). On this is founded the later tradition according to which Ibi-Sin was taken to Elam, which finds expression especially in the historical references in the texts concerning omens<sup>312</sup>). The despoiling of Ur by the Elamites is set forth particularly in the text from Mari dealing with the liver: *1a-mu-ut 2i-bi-sin 3ša ú-ra-am 4elamtunki a-na ti-li 5ú kar-me<sub>5</sub> iš-ku-um*, "presages of Ibi-Sin when Elam made Ur a tell and a ruin"<sup>313</sup>). The Elamites and the people of Šua, therefore, took Ur and laid it waste, took away Ibi-Sin as prisoner and probably advanced farther. Išbi-Irra, when his country was threatened, rose up and defeated them. But he could not capture Ur and the Elamites left a garrison behind there. It was not till ten years later that, according to a year-name, he captured this garrison and conquered Ur; the name is *m u n i m u r í - k i - m a b a - d í b*, "year in which he captured the Elamites in Ur"<sup>314</sup>). Ibi-Sin therefore was taken away prisoner in the twelfth year of Išbi-Irra. The twelfth year of Išbi-Irra was thus the last year of Ibi-Sin. Išbi-Irra came to the throne in 1948, so that his twelfth year fell in 1936. This then was the year in which the third dynasty of Ur came to an end. That dynasty of which Ibi-Sin was the last king, was in power for a hundred and eight years, therefore its rule began in 2044.

Ur-Nammu was the first king of the third dynasty of Ur, and he lived at the end of the overlordship of the Quti. This overlordship was not so powerful that local princedoms could not flourish and develop, especially in the south of Mesopotamia. That seems to have been the case with Ur also, and Ur-Nammu appears to have aimed at restoring the power of Šumer to its ancient glories. To arouse the national sentiment of the people and to inspire the population he took the proud title of "Ur-Nammu the mighty man, lord of Uruk, king of Šumer and Akkad"<sup>315</sup>). His ambition however went further, and the restoration of the great empire of Sargon and Narâm-Sin haunted his thoughts, as he himself expresses it in some of his inscriptions, "Ur-Nammu the mighty prince, the king of Ur, the king of the quarters of the four winds"<sup>316</sup>). That however was merely pious wishes or loud swagger, for another sovran, Utuḫegal of Uruk, exercised authority over all Šumer, for whose life he built the Ekišširgal of Nergal in Ur<sup>317</sup>). In a chronicle from Aššur we read: "The fisherman Utuḫegal in his wickedness raised his hand against his city, and the stream carried away his dead corpse. He (Marduk) gave Šulgi, the son of Ur-Nammu, the kingship over all lands"<sup>318</sup>). According to this datum, Šulgi succeeded Utuḫegal as prince "over all lands". This Assyrian chronicle, despite its literary adaptations, reflects good ancient tradition and cannot be thrust aside without more ado, but the facts must be taken as they stand until it is proved that the opposite is true. We possess therefore the following facts. 1. Utuḫegal drove out the Quti and became king "over all lands". 2. Šulgi took over the kingship of "all lands" from Utuḫegal. 3. Ur-Nammu had a long reign, and was very active in building in Mesopotamia. 4. Ur-Nammu assumed the title of "king over all lands". 5. Ur-Nammu ruled in Ur under Utuḫegal. Since according to the historical tradition the son of Ur-Nammu, Šulgi, succeeded Utuḫegal as prince "over all lands", it follows from this that Ur-Nammu, who had been on the throne for eighteen years before Utuḫegal, whose reign according to the list of kings lasted seven years, must have begun to widen his domains. But he did not succeed in realising his goal and becoming king over all Šumer. That he did however markedly increase his dominions and made Ur great even before the overlordship of the Quti ended is not impossible, because their actual power was

<sup>311</sup>) BE 31, 3; STVC 27; GÜTERNOCK, ZA, NF VIII, pp. 38 ff.; FALKENSTEIN, *Die Welt des Orients* I, pp. 377-384.

<sup>312</sup>) BE 31, 3 rev. 5; UNGNAD, OLZ, 1922, p. 257; E. WEIDNER, *Historisches Material in den babylonischen Omenliteratur*, MAOG IV, 1929, p. 226; Ch. VIROLLEAUD, *Astrologie Chaldéenne*, 1903, Suppl. LXVII, rev. II, 10-15, Sin, XIX, 4 ff.; Istar, XXI, 12 ff.; JCS I, pp. 253-265, Disaster of Ibi-Sin, No. 34-37; annihilation of Ibi-Sin, No. 38.

<sup>313</sup>) RA 35, 1938, No. 8, pl. IV, p. 43.

<sup>314</sup>) Taha BAQIR, *o.c.*, rev. 20, p. 107; J. J. STEPHENS, RA 33, 1936, p. 16, No. 25; FALKENSTEIN, ZA NF 15, 1949, pp. 75-76.

<sup>315</sup>) CT 21, pl. 7; THUREAU-DANGIN, 1907, SAK, p. 186; G. A. NARTON, RISA, 1929, pp. 270-271.

<sup>316</sup>) BARTON, RISA, pp. 274-275.

<sup>317</sup>) GADD-LEGRAIN, *Ur Excavations*, Royal Texts I, No. 30.

<sup>318</sup>) Ass. 13955gv, rev. 29-30, ZA 42, 1942, p. 49.

very limited. Other cities, for instance Lagaš, became very prosperous during their overlordship. Little by little, however, Uruk came to the fore and Utuḫegal became the leading figure in Šumer.

JACOBSEN comments with regard to the king-list, "as we have seen, the king-list can be dated to the reign of Utuḫegal. If it was written under him, it seems highly probable, however, that the figure which it gives, seven years and six months and fifteen days, represents not his full reign, but only his reign up to the date, that is, to the day on which the scribe finished his work. The very exactness of the figures supports such an assumption"<sup>319</sup>). To begin with, it is not certain that the list was completed in the reign of Utuḫegal; it may have been done shortly after it. But *dato non concessio*, even so the argument is not cogent, for later compilers extended the list. They would surely have given the full number of Utuḫegal's regnal years, as they have done for other dynasties, and therefore we may assume that seven years was the entire period of his rule. Thus we have to enquire in which year of his reign Šulgi took over the sovereignty of "all lands". For this we have a pointer in the year-names. Those of them which deal with religious events and refer, not to the whole country, but solely to Ur, certainly belong to the time when Šulgi was king of Ur only. Now we see that the names from his fifth year onwards refer to events which concern the entire country. We may therefore assume that Šulgi was ruler over the whole country from his fifth year. The third dynasty of Ur began to rule, as we have seen, in 2044. Ur-Nammu reigned eighteen years, to which we must add five years of Šulgi, therefore his fifth year came in 2026. Thus 2022 was the last year of Utuḫegal, who reigned for seven years and therefore began his reign in 2028.

Utuḫegal put an end to the overlordship of the Quti, but we do not know exactly in which of his seven regnal years he achieved this. It is very unlikely, however, that it occurred at the very beginning of his reign, since it is plain from an inscription of Utuḫegal<sup>320</sup>) that when the call came from Enlil he controlled Uruk so completely that he could put an army on foot and start a campaign without stating its object. As sovereign, therefore, he was sitting firmly in the saddle. If we put his victory over the Quti in his third or even his fourth year, the possibility of error is very small<sup>321</sup>). We therefore put the end of the overlordship of the Quti in 2025.

The dynasty of the Quti comprised twenty-one kings. The regnal years of only twenty are given, for the first king is not named at all and also the number of years he reigned is not mentioned. If we reckon up the regnal years of these twenty kings, they amount to ninety-three<sup>322</sup>). It looks as if the rule of the Quti must be dated from immediately after the death of Narâm-Sin. A Sumerian text speaks of omens of ill success and divine decisions to bring about the downfall of Narâm-Sin's government<sup>323</sup>). The same tradition is met with in another long document of Narâm-Sin, in which the gods decide to overthrow his rule and give his kingship to another<sup>324</sup>). The tradition appears in its most concise form in a chronicle from Aššur<sup>325</sup>): "He (Marduk) summoned the hordes of the Quti a second time against him (Narâm-Sin) and gave his kingship to the hordes of the Quti". This chronicle therefore makes the rule of the Quti commence immediately upon the death of Narâm-Sin, so that the remainder of the dynasty of Aššur ruled contemporaneously with the Quti. That the dynasty of the Quti really did rule contemporaneously with a part of that of Agade can be seen from the year-names of Šarkališarri, which mention the defeat of the Quti king Šarlag<sup>326</sup>). Now Šarlagab is the fourth king of the Quti dynasty. Šarlag can easily be a shortening of Šarlagab, so that this king was a contemporary of Šarkališarri. Šarkališarri fought against him in the vicinity of Uruk, defeated him and took him prisoner. Therefore the Quti in the days of

<sup>319</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 202.

<sup>320</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 204.

<sup>321</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, pp. 116-121.

<sup>322</sup>) W.B. 1923, 444, col. VII, 29-51, OECT 11, pl. IV; JACOBSEN, *Kinglist*, p. 120.

<sup>323</sup>) ZA 42, 1934, pp. 28, 31-33.

<sup>324</sup>) TLC xvi, No. 64; No. 66; Um XIII 15, 43.

<sup>325</sup>) ZA 42, 1934, pp. 24-35.

<sup>326</sup>) Ass. 13955gv rev. 21, ZA 42, 1934, pp. 49, 20-22.

<sup>320</sup>) RTC No. 118; SAK 225c.

Šarkališarri had forced their way into a part of South Babylonia. In a letter which probably comes from South Babylonia an oath is taken by the life of Šarkališarri. The letter says, "the Quti so far are not cultivating the land" <sup>327</sup>). They rather bred cattle, and the man to whom this letter is addressed is urged to deliver the cattle which the Quti were breeding for themselves on receipt of payment. The cattle which the Quti were breeding cannot have been delivered by anyone else unless the Quti were absent. Thus it seems that this letter was written in a time immediately after Šarkališarri had defeated them and taken their king prisoner. If this is so, it follows that there was no independent sovran ruling in Uruk in that period of Šarkališarri's reign and that the fourth dynasty of Uruk must have come into power later. In a lament which probably belongs to the end of the period of Agade <sup>328</sup>), women and girls of various classes are called upon to mourn for no religious mishaps but for secular ones. Two groups of cities are mentioned, one in the north, the other in the south. The principal city of the northern group was Agade, that of the southern, Uruk. The two groups centre around these principal cities and give a correct picture of the situation immediately after the death of Šarkališarri. At the end of the lament only, more cities in the south are mentioned and mourned for as being laid waste. The omission of the cities in the north is significant, and seems to confirm the fact that Agade was not yet conquered at the date when the lamentation was composed <sup>329</sup>). Uruk therefore was devastated before Agade, and it seems that the fourth dynasty of Uruk must be placed immediately after that of Agade, as the list of kings does, because the dynasty of the Quti ruled simultaneously with them both.

The fourth dynasty of Uruk consisted of five kings whose reigns lasted for thirty years. JACOBSEN has made it probable that the dynasty of the Quti, which ruled contemporaneously with that of Agade and the fourth dynasty of Uruk, is inserted in a series of princes of Uruk, taken from a local king-list of that city, in which Utuḫegal follows immediately on Ur-Utu, the last king of the fourth dynasty of Uruk <sup>330</sup>). If this is so, then the fourth dynasty immediately preceded Utuḫegal and ruled from 2058 to 2029. The years of Šarkališarri and his successors to the end of the dynasty of Agade amount to sixty-four, therefore Šarkališarri began to reign in 2122. The dynasty of the Quti therefore ruled from 2122 to 2025, so that the entire duration of the Quti overlordship was ninety-eight years. The total for the kings in the king-list is ninety-three years, so that the first sovran reigned for five years.

The dynasty of Agade consisted of eleven kings whose reigns lasted a hundred and eighty-one years. If now we subtract the sixty-four years of the later kings of the dynasty, there remain a hundred and seventeen for the first five, hence the dynasty began to rule in 2242. Sargon ruled from 2242 to 2186 in this period, his son Rimuš from 2185 to 2175, his brother Maništušu 2175-2160 and the latter's son Narâm-Sin from 2159 to 2123. Sargon was the founder of the dynasty of Agade. The period was preceded, on archaeological evidence, by that of Lagaš, which can be divided into Lagaš I, II and III. The predecessor of Sargon of Agade therefore reigned at the end of the period Lagaš III. Rimuš, the son of Sargon, defeated Kaku of Ur and took him prisoner <sup>331</sup>). Since this exploit of Rimuš is mentioned immediately after he has declared that Enlil had bestowed the kingship upon him, it seems that it took place at the beginning of his reign. Rimuš conquered Elam in the second year after Enlil gave him the kingship <sup>332</sup>). But he cannot have conquered Elam until Babylon was solidly in his power, therefore the capture of Kaku of Ur happened in his first year, 2185 <sup>333</sup>).

Kaku was king of Ur and can be placed, according to indications in the king-list, as the

<sup>327</sup>) BM 121205, obv. 7-10, JRAS, 1932, pp. 195-201.

<sup>328</sup>) PINCHES, PSBA 1901, May; Th. G. PINCHES, *Old Testament in the Light of Historical Records*, p. 477; St. LANGDON, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, Paris, 1909, No. xxv.

<sup>329</sup>) Sidney SMITH, *Notes on the Guti Period*, JRAS, 1932, pp. 293-328.

<sup>330</sup>) JACOBSEN, *King List*, p. 205.

<sup>331</sup>) MDP x, pl. 2, No. 374; NASSOUHI, RA 21, 1924, pp. 66 and 70; BARTON, RISA, p. 118.

<sup>332</sup>) JACOBSEN, *King List*, p. 178.

<sup>333</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, pp. 141-164.

last king of the second dynasty of that city<sup>334</sup>). The capture of Kaku brought that dynasty to an end in 2185, after it had been in power for a hundred and sixteen years, therefore it began in 2301. This second dynasty of Ur was preceded, as JACOBSEN has made probable, by the first dynasty of Ur<sup>335</sup>), and that dynasty ruled for a hundred and seventy seven years<sup>336</sup>), consequently its first king, Mešannipadda, began his reign in 2479.

According to the data given by the stratification, the first dynasty of Ur must be placed in the Lagaš III period. This phase, then, of the period of Lagaš can be embodied in an absolute chronology. Before it, no absolute and fixed chronology is possible at the moment, only a relative one, by which the material remains of antiquity are dated in accordance with the sequence of the levels at which they were found. For these no fixed date can be given, for we do not know how much time was needed to form a particular layer, and the archaeological material in itself contains not a single measure of time to date it exactly. A statue or a vase or other object may be one of two thousand or fifteen hundred with no difference in their value or quality. We must have other means in order to date material objects. Every date which is put forward for a layer is *a priori* wrong; it is therefore better and more prudent to refrain from any dating at all. It is much to be desired that everyone would refrain from giving a number of years when no such number can be given, for this makes only for confusion. Archaeological finds can in themselves never provide us with an accurate date. They can be accurately dated only if they are discovered along with inscriptions which contain indications of time such as can be included in an absolute chronology. But though archaeology can give us no absolute dating, it can at least provide a relative one, in so far as an object, found in the right stratigraphic context, can be set down as earlier or later than another. Further than that archaeology cannot go.

The Lagaš period was preceded in the south by that of Jemdet Našr, which in turn was preceded by that of Uruk, discovered at Uruk and represented at Eridu by Temples I to V. Before this period comes that of Obeid, named from the place where it was first discovered and represented at Eridu by Temples VI to VIII<sup>337</sup>). Preceding this again comes the Hadj Mohammed culture, represented by Temples IX to XV at Eridu<sup>338</sup>), and preceding this the period of Eridu (Temples XVI to XVIII)<sup>339</sup>). This is as far back as we can go in the southern part of Mesopotamia with any chronology, absolute or relative.

<sup>334</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 94.

<sup>335</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, p. 192.

<sup>336</sup>) JACOBSEN, *o.c.*, pp. 184-190; LANDSBERGER, OLZ 34, 1931, pp. 117-126; GADD, *Ur Excavations, Royal Inscriptions*, I, pp. 128-137.

<sup>337</sup>) Sumer III, 1947, pp. 43-44; 84-111; 219-269; Sumer IV, 1948, pp. 115-125; 276-284; Sumer V, 1949, p. 97; Sumer VI, 1950, pp. 27-33; A. L. PER-

KINS, *The Comparative Archeology of Early Mesopotamia*, SAOC, 25, pp. 74-76; Levels VI-VIII.

<sup>338</sup>) Qala'a Hadj Mohammed, UVB IX, pp. 37-38; pl. 36-40; XI, pl. 20; PARROT, *Archéologie Mésopotamienne, Technique et Problèmes*, p. 160; PERKINS, *o.c.*, p. 80-71; Eridu, Levels IX-XIV.

<sup>339</sup>) PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 161-165; PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 74-76; Levels XV-XVIII.

CHAPTER FIVE

IRAN

Having now constructed the chronology of Assyria and Babylonia, we must try to connect their eastern neighbours Iran and India with it. In the Babylonian chronicle we read: *šattu 6kam šar elamti ana sipparki erib tidukta iduk dšamaš ul-tu 10é-bar-ra la aši <šab> mātāššur ana mātmi-sir (?) illiku 11hum-ma-hal-da-šú šar mātēlamti la mārīš ina ekalli-šu imūt 125 šanātemeš hum-ma-hal-da-šú šarru-ut mātēlamti epušuš 13ur-ta-ku ahi-šú ina mātēlamti ina iškussi itta-šabšab 14araḥ ul idi m šum-iddin amēlšaddabakku 15ū m kudur mār m da-ku-ri ana mātāššur illikuku*, "in the sixth year the king of Elam moved into Sippur and made great slaughter. Šamaš did not move from Ebarra. The troops of Aššur moved against Egypt. Hummaḥaldašu the king of Elam died without being ill in his palace. Hummaḥaldašu reigned five years. Urtaku, his brother, set himself on the throne in Elam. In a unknown month Šum-Iddim, governor of a province, and Kudur, the son of Dakuri, moved against Aššur" <sup>340</sup>). The sixth year is the sixth year of Asserhaddon, 675. Hummaḥaldašu is Hubanḥaltaš II. He reigned for five years, 679-675, and was succeeded by his brother Urtaku. The later behaved loyally during the reign of Asserhaddon, who however did not trust him. When after Asserhaddon's death Assyria and Babylonia were separated, he regarded that as a weakness in Assyria and devised a conspiracy against Aššurbanipal. Under the influence of the king of Šuša, Teptiḥuban-Inšušinak, son of Šilhak-Inšušinak II, called Te-umman in the inscriptions of Aššurbanipal, there arose an alliance which was reinforced by a diplomatic wedding. At last it was decided to move against Babylonia, but sickness and death overtook Urtaku. He had been king for twelve years, 674-663 <sup>341</sup>). Hubanḥaltaš II was preceded by Hubanḥaltaš I: III <sup>28</sup>šattu 8kam šarru ina babiliki la išū araḥ dūzu ūmu 3kam 29ilānimeš šu-ut urukki ištu eridu ana urukki érēbumeš 30ina araḥtašritu ūmu 23kam hum-ma-hal-da-šu šar mātēlamti ina išāti 31ma-ḥi-iš-ma ina rābe-e išāti imūtut 8 šanātemeš hum-ma-hal-da-šu 32šarru-ut mātēlamti epušuš 33hum-ma-hal-da-šu šanu-u aḥu-šu ina kussi ittašabab 34araḥtebetu ūmu 3okam dsin-aḥemeš-erba šar mātāššur 35māru-šú ina ši-ḥi idūk-šú 23 šanātemeš dsin-aḥemeš-erba 36šarru-ut mātāššur epušuš-ma, "For eight years there was no king in Babylon. In the month of Duzu on the third day the gods of Uruk moved out of Eridu into Uruk. In the month Tešrit on the twenty-third day Hummuḥaldašu the king of Elam was smitten with a fever and died in the cold fits of the fever. For eight years Hummaḥaldašu exercised royal authority in Elam. Hummaḥaldašu the second, his brother, set himself on the throne of Elam. In the month Tebet on the twentieth day his son killed Sanḥerib, king of Aššur, in a revolt. Sanḥerib exercised royal authority in Aššur for twenty-three years" <sup>342</sup>). Hummuḥaldašu I reigned eight years in Elam and died in the same year as Sanḥerib of Aššur. He therefore was on the throne from 687 to 680. His predecessor was Hubanimmena, who was called Ummanmenanu by the Assyrians and Menanu in the Babylonian chronicle. III <sup>13</sup>šattu 1kam mu-še-zib-dmarduk araḥabu ūmu 28kam 14kudur šar mātēlamti ina ši-ḥi ša-bit-ma dik 10 arḥemeš 15ku-dur šarru-ut mātēlamti epušuš me-na-nu ina mātēlamti 16ina kussi ittašabab šattu ul idi m me-na-nu šab mātēlamti akkadiki 17id-ki-i-ma ina aḥa-lu-li-e šal-tum ana lib mātāššur 18epušuš-ma nabalkatum mātāššur išakkanan 19šattu 4 mu-še-zib-dmarduk araḥnišan ūmu 15kam 20me-na-nu šar mātēlamti mi-šit-tum i-mi-šid-su-ma 21pa-šú ša-bit-ma at-ma-a la le-' 22ina araḥkišilimū ūmu 1kam āla ša-bit

<sup>340</sup>) CT 34, pl. 43, col. iv, 9-15.

<sup>341</sup>) Assarhaddon Chronicle, obv. 16-18, Sidney SMITH, *Babylonian Historical Texts*, 1924, pp. 12 f.;

A. C. PIEPKORN, *Assurbanipal I*, AS 5, 1933, pp. 58 ff.

<sup>342</sup>) CT 34, pl. 50, col. III, 28-36.

*mu-šc-zib-dmarduk* <sup>23</sup>*ša-bit-ma ana mātāššur a-bi-ik* <sup>24</sup>*šanātemeš mu-še-zib-dmarduk šarru-ut mātobiliki epušuš* <sup>25</sup>*ina arahađar ūnu 17kam me-na-nu šar mātēlamti šimāti* <sup>26</sup>*šanātemeš me-na-nu šarru-ut mātēlamti epušuš* <sup>27</sup>*hum-ma-ḥal-da-šú ina mātēlamti ina kussi ittašabab*, "In the first year of Mušezib-Marduk in the month of Ab on the twenty-eighth day Kudur the king of Elam was taken and put to death. For ten months Kudur exercised royal power over Elam. Menanu set himself on the throne in Elam. In an unknown year Menanu mobilised the troops of Elam and Akkad and gave battle at Ḥulalu in Aššur and brought about a disturbance in Aššur. In the fourth year of Mušezib-Marduk in the month Nišan on the fifteenth day a stroke seized Menanu the king of Elam; his mouth was caught and he could not speak. In the month Kišilimu on the first day the city was taken, Mušezib-Marduk was made prisoner and taken away to Aššur. For four years Mušezib-Marduk exercised royal authority over Babylonia. In the month Adad on the seventeenth day Menanu the king of Elam died. For four years Menanu exercised royal authority over Elam. Ḥummuḥaldašu set himself on the throne in Elam" <sup>343</sup>). Thus Ḥubanimmena reigned for four years, 691-688. He was preceded by Kutirnaḥhunte, who is called Kudur in the Babylonian chronicle. He had a reign of ten months in 692. His predecessor was Ḥallušu-Inšušinak, who is called simply Ḥallušu in the Babylonian chronicle. III <sup>6</sup>.....[*ina arahađar ūnu 26kam 7ḥa[l-lu-šu šar]* mātēlamti nišemeš-šu iš-[*ši-ḥu-ma bābu*] *ina pa-ni-šu* <sup>8</sup>*p-ḥu-ú idūku-šú* <sup>6</sup> *šanātemeš ḥal-lu-šu [šarru-ut]* mātēlamti epušuš <sup>9</sup>*kudur ina mātēlamti ina kussi itta-šabab*, "In the month Tašrit on the twenty-sixth day his people rose up against Ḥallušu the king of Elam and killed him. Six years Ḥallušu exercised the royal power in Elam. Kudur set himself on the throne of Elam" <sup>344</sup>). He therefore was king 698-693. He was preceded by his brother Ištārḥundu, that is the Elamitish Šutruknaḥhunte. II <sup>31</sup>*šattu 1kam aššur-nadin-šumu iš-tar-ḥu-un-du šar elamti* <sup>32</sup>*ḥal-lu-šu aḥi-šu iš-bat-su-ma bāba ina pa-ni-šu ip-ḥi* <sup>33</sup>*18 šanātemeš iš-tar-ḥu-un-du šarru-ut mātēlamti epušuš* <sup>34</sup>*ḥal-lu-šu aḥi-šú ina mātēlamti ina kussi ittašabab*, "In the first year of Aššurnadin-šumu, Ḥallušu his brother took Ištārḥundu prisoner and put him to death. For eighteen years Ištārḥundu exercised royal power in Elam. Ḥallušu his brother set himself on the throne in Elam" <sup>345</sup>). He thus was king from 716 to 699. Before him came his uncle Ḥubannugaš, son of Ḥubantahraḥ. This king is called Ummanigaš son of Umbudar in the Babylonian chronicle <sup>346</sup>). He came to the throne in the fifth year of Nabunâšir, I <sup>9</sup>*šattu 5 nabu-nâšir um-ma-ni-ga-aš* <sup>10</sup>*ina mātēlamti ina kussi ittašabab*, "In the fifth year of Nabunâšir Ummanigaš set himself on the throne of Elam" <sup>347</sup>). I <sup>38</sup>*šattu 5 dmarduk-apal-iddinna um-ma-ni-ga-aš šar elamti šimātimeš*, "in the fifth year of Mardukapaliddinna Ummanigaš died" <sup>348</sup>). Thus he reigned for twenty-seven years, 741-713. Before him comes a great lacuna of several centuries in which, except for a few names of local kings in the inscriptions of Assyrian and Babylonian monarchs, we hear nothing of Elam.

After this the first king of whom we have any information is Šilḥina-ḥamru-lagamar, who was a brother of Kutuluduš-Inšušinak and succeeded him on the throne <sup>349</sup>). His predecessor Kutuluduš-Inšušinak was a contemporary of Nabukudururšur I of Babylon, who decided to avenge the victories of Kutirnaḥhunte and his brother Šilḥak-Inšušinak. At first the Babylonians were defeated <sup>350</sup>), but when peoples conquered by the Elamites ranged themselves on the side of Nabukudururšur <sup>351</sup>), the Elamites had the worst of it, and he brought Marduk back to Babylon <sup>352</sup>). Before Kutuluduš-Inšušinak came his father Šilḥak-Inšušinak, who by the success of his arms founded a great empire <sup>353</sup>). Before him the throne was occupied by Kutirnaḥhunte, who was placed by his father Šutruknaḥhunte on

<sup>343</sup>) CT 34, pl. 49, col. III, 13-27.

<sup>344</sup>) CT 34, pl. 48, col. III, 6-9.

<sup>345</sup>) CT 34, pl. 47, col. II, 31-34.

<sup>346</sup>) G. CAMERON, *History of Early Iran*, p. 157;

CT 34, pl. 46, 9; STRECK, *Assurbanipal*, p. 547.

<sup>347</sup>) CT 34 pl. 46, 9.

<sup>348</sup>) CT 34, pl. 48, col. I, 38.

<sup>349</sup>) MDP V, 1904, No. 84, 62 f.

<sup>350</sup>) CT 13, 1912, pl. 48; WINCKLER, AOF I, pp. 512 f.

<sup>351</sup>) L. W. KING, *Babylonian Boundary Stones*, 1912, No. 6, pp. 20-36; No. 21, pp. 06-08.

<sup>352</sup>) III R, pl. 20, No. 1.

<sup>353</sup>) MDP XI, 1911, No. 92, pp. 21 ff.

the throne of Babylon<sup>354</sup>). He fought for three years against Enlilnâdinaḥḥe, who the Kassite resistance supported. After three years he overthrew the Kassite dynasty, in 1159. His father and predecessor Šutruknaḥunte was at war with Zababašumiddin and thrust him from the throne of Babylon<sup>355</sup>). Before him came Ḥalluduš-Inšušinak, of whom nothing is known, and before him again Kidinḥutran, who supported the Kassite candidate for the throne, made an unexpected attack upon Babylon, and put an end to the rule of Enlilnâdin-šumi, Tukulti-Ninurta I's governor of Babylon. The last campaign he made against Babylon was under Adadšumiddin<sup>356</sup>). His predecessor was Untašhuban, who was at war with Kaštiliaš IV<sup>357</sup>). Kuknâšir I was a contemporary of Ammišaduqa<sup>358</sup>). From economic texts from Mari it is known that Kuduzuluš I of Šuša was contemporaneous with Zimrilim and consequently with Ḥammurabi also<sup>359</sup>). Ibi-Sin mentions the taking of Enbilua<sup>360</sup>), king of Šimaš, prisoner; in the list from Šimaš he appears as Enbiluḥḥa, the fifth on that list. Puzur-Inšušinak was a contemporary of Nâram-Sin<sup>361</sup>). Contemporaneous with Sargon of Agade was Luḥišan, king of Awan, in which he appears in a list as Luḥi-iššan<sup>362</sup>).

Immediately under that level at Šuša in which constructions of the third dynasty of Ur with inscriptions of Sulgi and Šu-Sin were found, a level was brought to light in which was pottery having a decoration which was either polychrome or monochrome, sometimes black on a red ground and sometimes black on a light ground. The motifs are a combination of naturalistic and geometrical, representing men, beasts and plants. These vases, known as "scarlet ware", were discovered also in Khafaje, Agrab and Ešnunna in the level belonging to the first phase of the Lagaš period. At Šuša it was at this level that the inscriptions of Puzur-Inšušinak, a contemporary of Nâram-Sin, and tablets in the script of the period of Agade were met with. The cylinder-seals of this level also had the style and representations of the periods of Lagaš and Agade. In general, we may suppose that this level runs from the beginning of the Lagaš period to the third dynasty of Ur. Under this level at Šuša was an intermediate layer ten metres thick<sup>363</sup>). This layer may be split into two divisions, A and B, of which B forms the upper portion of the layer and consequently is the later. In this level B vases with small ears were found, also little alabaster vases, some of them in animal shapes, and decorated earthenware, including a vase with a large open spout in the shape of a duck's beak, a large tall vase with a narrow neck and a vase with a cylindrical spout having a decoration of a few bands. The earthenware is greyish red with a white slip. In this same layer B a sherd was found with the forepart of an ibex's head. The style is that of Šuša II pottery, but the quality of the earthenware is that of the earthenware in the intermediate level B. Here also the inscriptions in proto-Elamite writing were found, also impressions of cylinder-seals in the Jemdet Našr style. The whole reflects the character of the Jemdet Našr period, with which therefore we may equate the intermediate layer B. Underneath this layer was intermediate layer A, characterised by earthenware the resemblance of which to the Uruk period could not be mistaken; red vases with very developed ears, jugs with the spout set at an angle or curved with the point downwards, bottles and coarse dishes. This pottery was undecorated. Because of its resemblance to that of the Uruk period we must equate intermediate layer A with that period. Under this intermediate layer was found the level containing Šuša I pottery. This is a very fine earthenware with thin walls, a very clear colour and black decoration, which sometimes has a glaze with a metallic effect which sometimes has entirely flaked away. The shapes

<sup>354</sup>) III R, pl. 38, No. 2; WINCKLER, AOF I, p. 535.

<sup>355</sup>) III R, pl. 38, No. 2; WINCKLER, AOF I, p. 53.

<sup>356</sup>) MDP X, p. 85.

<sup>357</sup>) Chronicle P, IV, 14 ff.; WINCKLER, AOF I, p. 124.

<sup>358</sup>) VAS VII, No. 67; UNGNAD, BA VI, H 5, 1909, pp. 1-5; MDP XXIII, 1923, No. 282.

<sup>359</sup>) G. DOSSIN, Syria XIX, *Textes Economiques de Mari*.

<sup>360</sup>) GADD-LEGRAIN, *Ur Excavations, Royal Texts I*, Nos. 210 f. and 219.

<sup>361</sup>) MDP IV, pp. 4 ff.

<sup>362</sup>) LEGRAIN, PBS XIII, No. 41 and pp. 12 ff.; POEBEL, PBS IV, pp. 184 ff.; PBS V, No. 34; BARTON, RISA, pp. 110 ff.

<sup>363</sup>) LE BRETON, *Note sur la Céramique Peinte aux Environs de Suse et à Suse, Mission archéologique en Iran*, xxx, p. 211; PARROT, *Archéologie Mésopotamienne, Technique et Problèmes*, p. 296.

are, phialae with interior decoration, goblets sometimes with straight sides, basins, pots, mixing-bowls, and egg-shaped or spherical vases with necks and sometimes spouts. The decorations are geometrical and naturalistic, with figures of plants, beasts and men. Alongside of the painted ware was unpainted pottery, red or black with a slip the colour of red ochre, smooth and sometimes burnished. With these were found signets having a ring, or bored right through their length. The shape is an oval stone with one side flat, in which are irregular lines or schematised figures, including the ibex, while the top is convex. Associated with these, various tools of stone and bone were discovered, a small earthenware horn to hold face-paint, and primitive representations of men and beasts. This same pottery was discovered at Tepe Jafferabad, seven kilometres [about four and one-third miles] to the north of Šuša, in the uppermost layer, from two metres deep to the surface<sup>364</sup>). Underneath at Jafferabad, in a layer from 3.50 to 2 metres deep, pottery of the type Šuša I bis was met with. This also was found at Tepe Jowi, about ten kilometres [about six miles and a quarter] to the north of Šuša, and at Tepe Bendebal, 11 kilometres [about six and four-fifth miles] in the same direction<sup>365</sup>). Underneath, at Tepe Jafferabad, was a still older phase of Šuša I bis, lying from 6 to 3.50 metres below the natural level of the ground<sup>366</sup>). Šuša I bis ware is analogous to Šuša I, but its quality is poorer, its slip not so fine and its decoration, especially the geometric, is heavier. This earliest archaic phase at Jafferabad is an archaic variety of Šuša I bis ware. It has not the general characteristics nor the quality the forms of the vases, the decoration nor the style of the Tell Halaf or the Tell Obeid ware. The best analogy to this pottery is that of Sialk I<sup>367</sup>). Here, as at Jafferabad, there was found hand-made earthenware, black or red, rough or covered with a fine slip, and with it a ware which was delicately covered with a pale slip, to which the decoration is applied<sup>368</sup>). These two types of pottery are already found in Haššuna I b, so that this level, Sialk I, must be equated with Haššuna I b and has the closest analogy with Jafferabad (level 6-3.50 metres). With this the pottery from Talli Jarri B in the plain of Marv Dasht agrees<sup>369</sup>), also that of Bakun B I, although this seems to have been produced somewhat earlier. The following period, Sialk II, is a continuation and development of Sialk I, for many traits of Sialk I are found again in Sialk II, although new elements appear, for instance in the sundried, hand-made clay tiles, whorls with a concave base, and a new repertoire of vase-pictures<sup>370</sup>). The pottery is hand-made. The clay is finer than before and straw-tempered. The slip is generally red, rarely pink or buff-coloured. The vases are in general smaller; little goblets, bowls with flat bottoms, and plates. They develop the shapes of the Sialk I red ware. Besides the geometric decorations there are also plant and animal motifs, for instance birds and ibexes. There is no doubt that there was a contemporaneous development of Sialk I to II. Analogies to this ware have been found at Giyan v a<sup>371</sup>), Jafferabad 3.50-2 metre level<sup>372</sup>), Tepe Jowi<sup>373</sup>), Bendebal<sup>374</sup>), Bakun B II, Ray I a, Anau I a, north of the Elburz in the Turkoman steppe<sup>375</sup>). On this, at Sialk, followed layer III, which is divided into seven levels. In levels III, 1-3, new elements were met with, side by side with elements from Sialk II. The pottery is still hand-made, prin-

<sup>364</sup>) MAI xxx, p. 126, pp. 143-145.

<sup>365</sup>) MAI xxx, p. 126, pp. 141-143; Tépé Djowi, o.c., pp. 147-172.

<sup>366</sup>) MAI xxx, pp. 132-140.

<sup>367</sup>) MAI xxx, p. 140.

<sup>368</sup>) MAI xxx, pp. 132-140.

<sup>369</sup>) L. VANDEN BERGHE, *Archaeologische onderzoekingen in de Marv Dashtvlakte*, JEOL 12, 1951-1952, pp. 211-220.

<sup>370</sup>) McCOWN, *The Comparative Stratigraphy of Early Iran*, SAOC 23, 1942, p. 2; PARROT, o.c., pp. 168-169.

<sup>371</sup>) Compare CONTENEAU-GHIRSHMAN, *Fouilles de Tépé Giyan*, 1935, pl. 41, 13 with GHIRSHMAN, *Fouilles de Sialk I*, 1938, pl. LI, A 1; CONTENEAU-GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. 42, 12 and 41, 1 with GHIRSH-

MAN, o.c., pl. LXVII C 13; CONTENEAU-GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. 41, 13 with GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. 41 D 16.

<sup>372</sup>) MAI xxx, pp. 141-143.

<sup>373</sup>) MAI xxx, pp. 147-172.

<sup>374</sup>) MAI xxx, pp. 175-191.

<sup>375</sup>) R. PUMPELLY, *Excavations in Turkestan, Prehistoric Civilization of Anau*, 1908; Compare PUMPELLY, o.c., fig. 67 with GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. XII A 14; PUMPELLY, o.c., fig. 85 with GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. XL, D 5; PUMPELLY, o.c., fig. 97 with GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. XL, C 5; PUMPELLY, o.c., fig. 108 with GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. XI, B 6; PUMPELLY, o.c., fig. 112 with GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. XL, A 10; PUMPELLY, o.c., pl. XI, C 383, 381 with GHIRSHMAN, o.c., pl. 27, No. 8.



cipally red ware with red slip. There are deep bowls<sup>376</sup>), shallow bowls with a foot<sup>377</sup>), and bowls with inverted rims<sup>378</sup>). New traits are its buff-coloured slip, a form of cup<sup>379</sup>), a type of jug<sup>380</sup>), a high-footed pot<sup>381</sup>). New designs appear, very different from Sialk II, combined with vertical elements, usually curling plants, snakes and connected lozenges with horned apexes. External influence is unmistakable, probably that of Tell Halaf. To this Giyan vb corresponds; it runs from the end of Sialk II to the beginning of Sialk III, 1-2. After that comes Giyan vc, which runs parallel to Sialk III, 2. On that follows Giyan vd, which includes Šuša I ware and runs simultaneously with Sialk III, 3. To this corresponds Jafferabad, from 2 metres to the surface, Šuša I and Bakun A I. In Sialk III, 4-5, a number of new features appear. For the first time, the houses were built on a low foundation of unhewn stones. On them lay a stratum of stamped clay and then the brick walls. They were built with niches. Various stone and bone tools are replaced by metal ones. There appears also a change in the working of metal. Up till now, it was hammered, but now they begin to run it into moulds. This indicates a highly perfected furnace. The potter's wheel makes its appearance, and hand-made pottery becomes scarcer. New shapes make their entry, a cylindrical goblet<sup>382</sup>) and a cauldron<sup>383</sup>). The red slip is replaced by buff. Buildings on stone foundations, niches, the casting of metal and the potter's wheel are all novelties which appear in Mesopotamia during the Uruk period. Although the influence of that period cannot be traced in the pottery, still it seems to have had its effect on Sialk during the time represented by sublevels 4 and 5, so that we can equate these levels with it. Corresponding to this is intermediate layer B at Šuša, a part of Giyan vc and a part of Giyan vd. The preceding layers, Sialk III, 6-7, were clearly separated from those mentioned above, Sialk III, 4-5, although forms of earthenware and its decoration long continued together with new elements of the Jemdet Našr style. In level III, 6, the colour is usually greyish and the pots have no slip. The decoration is more realistic, fights between beasts; division into panels<sup>384</sup>). Vases have the shape of beaks<sup>385</sup>); other vases grow smaller towards the top and have a rim<sup>386</sup>). These are all characteristic features of the Jemdet Našr period. Therefore we can equate Sialk III, 6-7, and Jemdet Našr. Corresponding to this is intermediate layer A at Šuša, and here also begins level IV at Giyan which runs into the Agade period.

We have now to bring in Tepe Hissar on the south side of the Elburz near Damghan. The *tepe* divides into three periods, I, II and III. I lies immediately upon virgin soil and III is the latest and uppermost layer, which marks the end of the existence of the city<sup>387</sup>). Each period is subdivided into two or three levels, thus: I A, B, C; II A, B; III A, B, C. Thus I A is the oldest and lowest level, III C the uppermost and latest. Layer I A contains decorated hand-made pottery. Various forms of it are analogous to Sialk III, 1-2<sup>388</sup>). The material from Hissar and Sialk has been compared by McCOWN<sup>389</sup>). The Hissar decoration is geometric and vertical in its position on the vase, in contrast to that of Sialk where it is applied horizontally. The decoration of Hissar I A resembles most closely that of Anau I. In Hissar I A we find no deep phialae; in Sialk they were a further development of Sialk I and II. Owing to the close relationship in the forms we must put Hissar I A contemporaneous with Sialk III, 1-2. A closer relationship with Sialk began at Hissar I B. Here hand-made and wheel-made earthenware were found together. The ground colour of the pottery at Hissar was brown, light brown or buff, whereas at Sialk a buff-coloured slip was used. The shapes of

376) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXII, S 415.

377) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIII, S 369.

378) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXII, S 394.

379) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXII, S 395.

380) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXII, S 160,3.

381) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIII, S 1817, pl. LXXVII, B II.

382) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIV, S 5258.

383) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. XIV, I, 3.

384) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXXI, S 1800.

385) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIII, S 1696 and 1697.

386) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIX, S 5258.

387) E. F. SCHMIDT, *Excavations at Tepe Hissar*.

388) SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. III, H 1522 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIII, S 412, Sialk III, 2; pl. LXXVII, B II, Sialk III, 2; SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. III, H 2046 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIV; S 227 is Sialk III, 3; SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. III, H 3446 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIII, S 369 is Sialk III, 2.

389) McCOWN, *o.c.*, fig. 2, 3, 4.

Hissar I B are found also in Sialk III, 3-4<sup>390</sup>). Also the decorative motifs of Hissar I B are found at Sialk, not all the Sialk motifs occur at Hissar. In layer I B they include curling plants and animals, birds and ibexes. Plant and animal motifs appear for the first time in Tepe Giyan vc, which is contemporaneous with Šuša I. This close relationship to Sialk continues in Hissar I C, where cast metal tools were found, such as occur at Sialk in III, 5. In the same level at Sialk representations of leopards are very often found. These do not appear at Hissar till the end of I C. In Hissar I C many decorations of I B and Sialk III, 3-4 continue, while in Sialk III, 5, 6 and 7 they are dropped. Although some likenesses exist between the pottery and decorative motifs of Hissar I C and Sialk III, 7<sup>391</sup>), still most of the new shapes and motifs of Sialk III, 6-7 are lacking in Hissar I C<sup>392</sup>). As in Sialk III, 6, so also in Hissar I C, the pottery is greyish. It is evident that Hissar I C corresponds to Sialk III, 5-6 and ends before the end of Sialk III, 6. We have seen that III, 6 already belongs to the Jemdet Našr period, so that Hissar I C ended as that period was beginning. Hissar II A is a transitional layer in which elements of the old layer, Hissar I, are found alongside of those of Hissar II B, which include grey pottery. The peculiarity of Hissar II B is that the painted earthenware which survived from I C included schematised motifs<sup>393</sup>); the shapes of the pottery are not influenced by that of the grey pottery culture. The grey ware on the other hand took over some shapes from the painted ware<sup>394</sup>). As the culture of Hissar I was found together with elements of Hissar II in Hissar II A, no interruption in the habitation of the spot can have taken place, any more than happened at the transition from phase II to III, for certain traits of II B appear in III A alongside of new elements belonging to Hissar III. Objects from Sialk IV find their parallels in Hissar II B and Hissar III A<sup>395</sup>), hence Sialk IV began at the end of the Jemdet Našr period and ran on into the Lagaš and Agade periods.

No excavations have been carried out in Makran and Baluchistan. All the material that is known comes from trial diggings, such as Babar-Koth, Sur-Jurgal, Periano-Ghundar, Kuli Mehi Dump, Bampur, Nardar and various other places<sup>396</sup>). There is much resemblance between this ware and that of Šuša I and II. Pottery has been found with incising in the shape of the façades of buildings, as in Mesopotamia during the Lagaš period<sup>397</sup>). Systematic excavations in these regions are much to be desired, to give us a correct idea concerning the cultural relationships. This ware was accompanied by many pieces from the India culture of Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa. Although very much remains to be done and great revision of opinions must take place before we can come out to a final and unanimous conclusion<sup>398</sup>), yet various pieces from the Lagaš and Agade periods have been found at Ešnunna which show no Mesopotamian character but point towards India, where the same kind of pieces has been found in the Indus valley at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa<sup>399</sup>). The most cogent

<sup>390</sup>) SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. IV, H 2001 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIV, S 1782 is Sialk III, 3; SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. V, H 21646 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*; pl. LXXVI, B 21, is Sialk III, 1.

<sup>391</sup>) SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. VIII, H 4478 resembles GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXX, S 118 is Sialk III, 7; SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. IX, H 2527 resembles GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXVII, S 137 is Sialk III, 6; SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. IX, H 3046 and H 3385 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXVII, S 69, and S 152 is Sialk III, 7.

<sup>392</sup>) GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. LXIX, S 158 is Sialk III, 6; pl. LXXIII, S 97 is Sialk III, 7.

<sup>393</sup>) SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pp. 108-112.

<sup>394</sup>) SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. XXIII, H 2000, H 3060.

<sup>395</sup>) SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. XXIX, H 2856 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. XCV, S 1602 e; SCHMIDT, *Museum Journal* XXII, 1932-1933, pl. CXXV B, H 8 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. XCV, S 1602 a; SCHMIDT, *Excavations at Tepe Hissar*, pl. LXVIII, H 210 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, pl. XXX, 1; SCHMIDT, *o.c.*, pl. XXXII, H 2187 is GHIRSHMAN, *o.c.*, fig. 9.

<sup>396</sup>) Sir Aurel STEIN, *Archaeological Reconnaissance in South-Western India and South-Eastern Iran*, 1937; *Archaeological Reconnaissance in Southern Persia*, *The Geographical Journal* cxv, 1934, pp. 110-134; *Archaeological Tour in Weciristan and Northern-Baluchistan*, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India* 37, 1920, pp. 93 ff.; *An archaeological Tour in the Ancient Persia*, Iraq 3, 1936, pp. 111-230; *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 64, 1934, pp. 179-204; *An Archaeological Tour in Geodresia*, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 43, 1941, pp. 201 ff.

<sup>397</sup>) Sir Aurel STEIN, *An Archaeological Tour in Geodresia*, pl. VI, A 165.

<sup>398</sup>) D. H. and M. B. GORDON, *Mohenjo Daro. Some Observations on Indian Prehistory*, Iraq, 1940, p. 12.

<sup>399</sup>) H. FRANKFORT, *OIC* 17, pp. 80-85; FRANKFORT, *The Indus Civilization and the Near East*, *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*, 1932-VII, 1934, pp. 1-12.

proof is provided by the cylinder-seals, the representations on which are not Mesopotamian and no parallel to them can be found in Mesopotamia. They were found in houses at a level belonging to the Agade period. The animals shown on them are not Mesopotamian and were carved by seal-engravers to whom they were native. Furthermore, the special way in which the ears of the rhinoceros, the feet, ears, and the creases in the hide of the elephant are represented on the seals from Ešnunna gives us a large proportion of details which are identical with those on seals from Mohenjo-Daro. To this may be added the naturalistic representation of the hide of the rhinoceros and the steep back and bulging head of the elephant. At Mohenjo-Daro and also at Ešnunna there has been found a seal-impression showing a procession of animals in which the elephant and the rhinoceros take part together, while a crocodile is shown above. Some of the liver-shaped insets in the Ešnunna pictures are identical with the mother-of-pearl pieces from Mohenjo-Daro. So far they have been found nowhere else. A piece of a limestone tablet has been found at Ešnunna on which were engraved the head, horns and forepart of an Indian zebu. A parallel to it exists at Mohenjo-Daro.

On the other hand, various pieces have been found at Mohenjo-Daro which past all doubt betray Mesopotamian influence of the time of the Lagaš period. Three cylinder-seals were discovered there which are of undoubted Sumerian origin<sup>400</sup>). These three pieces were certainly not imported and their motifs do not on the whole agree with those of Babylonia; that they were made in India is undeniable. They are imitations which owe their existence to Babylonian motifs, Babylonia being the native place of cylinder-seals. These seals became known in India through trade relations. They did not however suit Indian taste, the square seal being native there from beginning to end. The cylinder-seal was apparently not very practicable with Indian writing materials. So far no clay tablets have ever been found in India<sup>401</sup>). Since no cylinder-seals have come to light at Mohenjo-Daro below the level of 5 metres from the surface, and the Ešnunna cylinder-seals must be dated in the Agade period, it is in that period that we must put the latest stage of the Indus valley culture of Mohenjo-Daro.

An older period of this culture can be dated by means of a grey-green steatite vase, the outside of which is decorated with a pattern of network. It was found at Mohenjo-Daro 9-10 metres from the surface<sup>402</sup>). It was a fragment of a double vase such as has been found at Šuša<sup>403</sup>) and Kiš<sup>404</sup>) in the stratum of the Lagaš period. All these vases were made of the same material and ornamented with the same pattern. Since Šuša II agrees with and is contemporaneous with the period of Lagaš, this layer at Mohenjo-Daro must be assigned to the same date as the Lagaš period in Mesopotamia.

At the level of 10 to 12 metres below the surface at Mohenjo-Daro earthenware was found having the so-called "reserved slip", *i.e.*, parts were left uncovered<sup>405</sup>). That is not a usual pattern at Mohenjo-Daro, as it is in Mesopotamia at the end of the Jemdet Našr period, in which it is found at all the excavated sites. This "reserved slip" ware was accompanied by a cylinder-seal having a pattern of animals *couchant regardant*. They were represented as having their hindquarters turned towards one another<sup>406</sup>). Because of the material as well as the motifs and the technical skill shown (the work was done with a drill, the marks of which may be seen on the paws), this piece must be regarded as an import, for this motif and this technique are in regular use in Mesopotamia at the end of the Jemdet Našr period. Sundry other points of resemblance between the Indus valley culture and Mesopotamia might be adduced, but I think that these are enough to prove that the Indus valley culture, as found at Mohenjo-Daro, Harappa and in other places from Heyderabad to Jacobabad in the north, lasted from the Jemdet Našr to the Agade period. At a level below

<sup>400</sup>) F. I. MACKAY, *Further Excavations of Mohenjo Daro*, pp. 344-356, pl. CXXXIV, 78; pl. CXXXIX, 37 b; pl. XCVI, 188.

<sup>401</sup>) MACKAY, *o.c.*, p. 345.

<sup>402</sup>) MACKAY, *o.c.*, pp. 321-322, p. 139, pl. CXLII, 45.

<sup>403</sup>) G. CONTENAU, *Manuel d'Archéologie Orientale* I, 1927, p. 270, fig. 169.

<sup>404</sup>) *Antiquity*, March 1933, p. 84, 85, pl. II.

<sup>405</sup>) MACKAY, *o.c.*, p. 184; p. 652.

<sup>406</sup>) MACKAY, *o.c.*, pl. C b, c, p. 332; p. 639.

that of 10-12 metres, both at Harappa and at Mohenjo-Daro and Anri, a red earthenware and also decorated, buff-coloured pottery were met with; they are comparable to the red pottery of the Uruk period in Mesopotamia. Thus we can connect the Indus valley culture with that of Mesopotamia from the Uruk period to that of Agade.

Since pieces from the Indus valley and also from Mesopotamia have been found in Baluchistan, the country lying between the two, and specimens of the Indus culture have been met with in Mesopotamia and Mesopotamian objects in India, it becomes evident that both countries were in continuous trade relations with one another from the Uruk period to that of Agade. Although the pieces of evidence are still very scanty, yet they are enough to bring the Indus valley into mutual contact with Mesopotamia and to admit it to the chronology of western Asia.

## CHAPTER SIX

### NORTH MESOPOTAMIA

The most ancient culture which has so far been met with in North Mesopotamia is that of Barda-Balka in the district of Kirkuk. It is a culture of hand-axes, pebble-tools and flake-tools of Acheulean type<sup>407</sup>). It comes from the older palaeolithic epoch. This is the oldest culture hitherto discovered, but doubtless others preceded it here. The next-oldest culture that has been found comes from Hazar Merd, near Sullamaniyah. It is Levallois-Mousterian and therefore Upper Palaeolithic in origin<sup>408</sup>). Between this and the preceding culture there must certainly lie others, although so far they have not been met with. The next culture that has been discovered is that of Palegavra in the Kirkuk district and of Zarzi near Sullamaniyah, somewhat farther off. It is a culture of La Gravette type and so is also of the Upper Palaeolithic, though of the very end of that period<sup>409</sup>). Again, there must have been various phases intervening between this and the former culture, although they have not yet been come across. The following phase is mesolithic and was met with at Karim Shahr in the Kirkuk district<sup>410</sup>). It does not immediately succeed the preceding one, but other, still undiscovered phases must have intervened here, as is also the case with the phases which follow it and lie between Karim Shahr and the next culture which has been discovered, that of Jarmo in the Kirkuk district<sup>411</sup>). Here again it is probable that one or more phases intervene between Jarmo and the following culture, that of Ḥaššuna, which is some thirty-five kilometres [about 21¾ miles] south of Mossul. In layer I a, which lies on virgin soil, no remains of houses were found, but traces of tented encampments. The pottery was rough earthenware mixed with straw, and consisted of large coarse vases with a carinated outline, sometimes with small ears to lift or hang them by, a few rare specimens being polished. This earthenware was still found in layer II also<sup>412</sup>). In layer I b clay buildings, constructed of blocks of clay, begin to make their appearance. At first they are modest one-roomed dwellings, but from layer III upwards a regular house-plan begins to appear, consisting of rooms around an open courtyard. The pottery also is different. Alongside the earthenware of layer I a, which lasts to the end of layer II, a new kind of pottery appears, which is either merely glossy or decorated, varying between a glossy surface with a matt background, a glossy surface with a polished background or matt on a polished background. The decoration is simple, stripes, cross-stripes and rectangles, all in red. The pottery is hand-made in simple forms, jugs and dishes<sup>413</sup>). This is the archaic period of Ḥaššuna, in contrast to the standard Ḥaššuna ware, which appears from layer I b to the end of level VI, while the archaic ware stops after level III. This pottery likewise is hand-made, the same forms are met with, but the decoration

<sup>407</sup>) BASOR 124, 1951, pp. 15-17.

<sup>408</sup>) Bull. Am. Arch. Prehist. Res. VI, 1930, pp. 13-24; Carleton S. COON, *The Eastern Cave at Hazard Merd*, Sumer VI, 1950, pp. 91-105.

<sup>409</sup>) BASOR 124, 1951, pp. 13-14; Bull. Am. Arch. Prehist. Res., VI, 1930, pp. 13-23.

<sup>410</sup>) BASOR 124, 1951, pp. 12-18; R. J. BRAIDWOOD and L. BRAIDWOOD, *Jarmo, A Village of Early Farmers in Iraq*, Antiquity, 96, pp. 189-195; AJA 53, 1948, pp. 49-51.

<sup>411</sup>) R. J. BRAIDWOOD and L. BRAIDWOOD, *Jarmo, A Village of Early Farmers in Iraq*, Antiquity 96, pp. 189-195; AJA 53, 1948, pp. 49-51; F. BASMACHI,

*Supplementary Report on the Excavations at Tell Mattarah and Qal'at Jarmo*; Sumer IV, 1948, pp. 133-136; R. J. BRAIDWOOD, L. BRAIDWOOD, J. G. SMITH, Ch. LESLIE, *Mattarah, A Southern Variant of the Hassuna Assemblage excavated in 1948*, JNES 11, 1952, pp. 1-75; BASOR 124, 1951, pp. 12-18; ILN, 15 December, 1951, pp. 992-995.

<sup>412</sup>) Seton LLOYD and Fuad SUFAR, *Tell Hassuna, Excavations by the Iraq Government Directorate general of Antiquities in 1943 and 1944*, JNES 4, 1945, pp. 285-289, pl. 1-XXI; PARROT, *o.c.*, 113-126; A. L. PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 1-5.

<sup>413</sup>) JNES 4, 1945, p. 277.

is different. It is either brownish-red or black painting, matt on a matt background, consisting of lines, cross lines, lozenge patterns, wavy lines, lozenges and triangles, or else it is incisions made with a graving tool on the surface while it was still wet, and again consisting of lines, cross lines, triangles filled with cross lines, and herringbone motifs; or finally, it may include both engraving and painting. That is the most characteristic aspect of standard Ḥaššuna ware<sup>414</sup>). Level I at Niniveh agrees with this<sup>415</sup>). From level III at Ḥaššuna, reaching its full development in layers IV, V and VI and some few examples occurring in levels VII and VIII, we find Samarra ware, so named from the place where it was first found. With a few curious variations, Samarra ware is found also at Baghouz on the middle Euphrates, about two hundred and seventy-five kilometres west of the Tigris, on which Samarra lay. The pottery of Baghouz and that of Samarra bear witness to the same technique and inspiration<sup>416</sup>). It is hand-made; the clay is well purified, the walls are often not smoothed and sometimes are even rough; no instance of burnishing has been found. The forms are the two essential ones with sundry variations, namely plates, more or less deep phialae, goblets, basins and jugs. They are painted with a colour varying from bright red to brownish violet. The decoration is geometric, evolved from naturalistic through schematisation. But it is this decoration which is the outstanding characteristic of Samarra ware; the style, however, belongs to the same tradition of painted pottery as that of Ḥaššuna, for the characteristic elements of the decoration in the Ḥaššuna standard ware are also those characteristic of the style of Samarra. The combination of painting and engraving also is found in both. Both avoid broad expanses of paint and use lines and small geometric figures; on bands the decoration is continuous rather than broken up into panels or groups. The style of Samarra departs somewhat from that in vogue as the standard of living rose, whence some of the special stylistic traits of the structural development of this pottery were stimulated owing to their cultural function as fine ware<sup>417</sup>). This is also the reason why Samarra ware never displaced other wares but is simply found alongside of and contemporary with that of Ḥaššuna and of Ḥalaf. At Ḥaššuna it occurs along with Ḥaššuna ware from level III to VI, and it accompanies Ḥalaf ware from level VI to VIII. At level VI Ḥalaf ware begins to make its appearance at Ḥaššuna. It gets its name from Tell Ḥalaf in the district of Ḥabur, where it was first met with. At Ḥaššuna, Tell Ḥalaf ware was found from level VI up to level XII. This ware was spread from the Mediterranean coast to the Zagros range. At Arpaḥiyyah it occurs in levels X to VI, at Tepe Gawra from level XXV to XV. Some pieces have been found at Samarra, and it has been met with at Niniveh 2 c, at Tell Brak, at Chager Bazar levels 15 to 6, and at Tell Ḥalaf itself. Arpaḥiyyah gives us the best stratification, by which it can be divided into three phases<sup>418</sup>). The levels before TT 10, which lie outside the *tell*, constitute the earliest phase, the middle phase runs from TT 10 to 7 and the latest is TT 6. The shapes are still very simple and squat. They are shallow phialae with concave sides and a flat bottom, jugs with round bellies and necks which may stand high or be short. The pottery is light in colour, buff, cream or pink. Sometimes the vessels have a slip, either cream or apricot. Sometimes they are polished, but most of them have been left in their natural state. The painting is monochrome, red or black. It too is simple, lozenges with cross-hatching in a continuous zone, zones with linear designs divided into panels, curving lines, zigzags or rows of dots. There are also representations of animals, which are more numerous in this than in the

<sup>414</sup>) JNES 4, 1945, pp. 278-280.

<sup>415</sup>) AAA 20, 1923, p. 150.

<sup>416</sup>) A. J. BRAIDWOOD, *New Chalcolithic Material of Samarra Type and its Implications*, JNES 3, 1944, pp. 47-72; PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 126-136; A. L. PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 5-10; R. J. BRAIDWOOD, Linda BRAIDWOOD, James G. SMITH and Charles LESLIE, *Matarra*, JNES 11, 1952, pp. 1-75.

<sup>417</sup>) E. HERZFELD, *Die vorgeschichtliche Topfereien von Samarra*, *Die Ausgrabungen von Samarra* v; A. J. BRAIDWOOD, *New Chalcolithic Ma-*

*terial of Samarra type and its Implications*, JNES 3, 1944, pp. 47-72; JNES 11, 1952, pp. 1-75; Seton LLOYD and Fuad SUFAR, *Tell Hassuna*, JNES 4, 1945, pp. 255-289; PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 126-136; A. L. PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 5-8.

<sup>418</sup>) M. E. L. MALLOWAN and J. C. ROSE, *Excavations at Arpaḥiyyah*, Iraq 2, 1935, pp. 1-178; PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 136-158; A. L. PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 10, 12-13; 29-31, 41; Max Freiherr von OPPENHEIM, *Tell Halaf. I: Die prähistorischen Funde*, Berlin, 1943.

later periods, friezes of leopards moving to the right, birds on the ground or just about to fly away, bands of scorpions or fish, coiled snakes with their tongues protruding, friezes of ibexes, ducks, birds on the wing, sometimes with very long necks, and the bucranium. In the middle phase a manifest evolution is taking place. The shapes become finer and more elegant, and the carinate outline suggests a metal prototype. The pots are better fired and have a slip which holds better. They are more burnished. Representations of animals have entirely disappeared, but there is a rich assortment of geometrical decorations in which stiff straight lines alternate with curves. The subjects on one and the same vase are marked by a superabundance of varying subjects, joined bands, lattice-work, squares filled with cross-hatching, lozenges, flowers, chequer-patterns, and suns, garlands, bows, ellipses and so forth. In the last phase we see the final flowering of this period with clearly observable improvements in technique. The earthenware is hard and well fired, with a slip which sits solidly on the vase and is usually polished. The vessels have thin walls. The painting is polychrome, black and red with an apricot slip and use made of white. There is a rich array of geometrical patterns which fill the entire upper surface of the vase, with a feeling for architecture coming clearly to the fore <sup>419</sup>). In this period the people continued to build their houses of clay blocks or sun-dried bricks. In this connection there are found buildings with a circular groundplan, on stone foundations, which were the prototypes of the later *tholoi*. At the same time seals begin to appear, plaquettes of clay with engraved geometrical patterns or animal motifs. As may be seen from the collections in the Iraqi Museum at Bagdad, the pottery of Eridu XVIII to XV has much in common with that of the Ḥalaf period and is different from that of Obeid. The bowls, phialae, platters, plates and pots are fashioned from well purified clay and well fired. They display great skill on the part of the potter. They are provided with a yellowish slip which omits some parts (reserved slip ware). The painting is wholly monochrome. The decoration is compact and leaves but little space vacant. It is a geometrical decoration which makes use of simple elements, straight and curved lines, lattice-work and lozenge-patterns, circles, star- and cross-motifs, which are found also in the Ḥalaf vase-painting. Thus there can be hardly any doubt that we have to do here with a ware influenced by the Halaf culture, even if people from the north, where that culture was dominant, had not forced their way to the south. I am convinced by my own observation that M. PARROT is completely right, in opposition to Miss A. L. PERKINS <sup>420</sup>). In levels IX to XIV at Eridu earthenware is found which has been named Ḥaj Mohammed after the spot where it was first discovered <sup>421</sup>). The shapes remind one of those of Arpaḥiyah. The pottery has a yellowish or greenish surface which is painted in monochrome, dark brown, dark purple, dark green or light red. This monochrome painting betrays an early stage in which the motifs are purely geometrical and the mimetic element wholly absent. This stage also we must put in the Ḥalaf period. Many unusual motifs in the Ḥaj Mohammed ware agree with Tall-i-Bakun A, where direct parallels were found, therefore we must equate the two <sup>422</sup>).

In level VIII at Eridu another sort of pottery begins to make its appearance; it is different from that in the earlier levels and is called Obeid pottery, so named from a spot close by Ur at which it was first discovered. This pottery runs from level VIII to VI in Eridu. The shapes of the earthenware are as follows: large dishes, large deep phialae, bowls, platters, pots with circular foot and a curved or carinate profile, goblets, flasks, jugs with a broad opening and projecting belly, with four small ears on the shoulder, large drinking-cups with an ear on the side, ewers with a flat bottom and spout and one ear on the shoulder, egg-shaped vases with a spout and an ear above the opening. The earthenware is of well purified clay, hand-made,

<sup>419</sup>) PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 138-148; PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 16-21.

<sup>420</sup>) PARROT, *o.c.*, p. 160; PERKINS, *o.c.*, p. 31. Note 161.

<sup>421</sup>) Eridu, Sumer III, 1947, p. 3; pp. 43-44; pp. 84-111; Sumer IV, 1948, pp. 115-125; Sumer V, 1949, p. 97; Sumer VI, 1950, pp. 27-33.

<sup>422</sup>) E. HERZFELD, *Iranische Denkmäler*, I, i, 2, *Steinzeitlicher Hügel bei Persepolis*, Berlin, 1932; A. LANGSDORFF, *Eine prähistorische Siedlung bei Persepolis*, Chicago, 1934; A. LANGSDORFF and D. E. McCOWN, *Tall-i-Bakun, A Season of 1932*, OIP LIX, Chicago, 1942; D. E. McCOWN, *The Comparative Stratigraphy of Early Iran*, pp. 23-42.

well fired and of great fineness. It has a greenish colour or a yellow slip. The painting is monochrome, varying from black to dark brown, matt or shining. The patterns are geometrical and of the simplest kind, devoid of all naturalism. They are horizontal bands marking out a zone, sometimes divided by vertical strokes into metopes filled with curving or zig-zag lines, placed horizontally or vertically, lozenges and lattice-work, chevrons, and ladders. These decorations sometimes cover a part of the vase and sometimes the whole. The development of the Obeid pottery can be best studied on the basis of the levels at Ur. In the level immediately over the natural surface of the ground, pottery of level VIII of Eridu was found, which is Obeid I. Over this lay a layer of sand carried there by the flood. In this were found graves which belonged to two distinct levels. The lowest level of graves is Obeid II and the uppermost Obeid III<sup>423</sup>). The development of the Obeid ware appears to have gone in the direction of simplification. The subjects are lighter, with wide zones left empty, while the painting of Obeid I ware is close-set, one theme following upon another. The motifs of Obeid pottery at Ur have certain traits which remind us of Ḫalaf ware or of that of Samarra, chequer-patterns, imbricated motifs, rosettes, curvilinear triangles, four-bladed screws with rosettes between the blades, cruciform motifs and braids. Naturalistic motifs from plant-life, which in course of time were avoided, are not entirely excluded here. Here, also, much use of the "reserved slip" technique is met with. This points to a partial combination of Obeid with the Ḫalaf styles, as is to be found in the levels of various tells. At Ḫaššuna, the Ḫalaf ware runs from level VI to XII, while Obeid ware is met with already at levels XI and XII. At Arpaḫiyyah, Ḫalaf and Obeid ware are found together at level V and at Tepe Gawra Ḫalaf ware is met with at levels XXV to XV, while Obeid ware appears at levels XIX to XII. From all this it is evident that the Obeid period follows that of Ḫalaf. Eridu VII equals Tepe Gawra XIX-XVII. At Tepe Gawra the *tholoi* have disappeared and have given way to a temple with a long central hall and a row of little chambers on both sides, exactly as at Eridu, levels VIII to VI. The pottery is technically on a lower level than Ḫalaf ware. It is hand-made, with monochrome painting, like that of Ubeid in the south. It is well fired and the tint is usually a light green. The painting is black, brown or red, usually matt. The motifs are very simple, chevrons, darts, curved lines, circles, bands with hatching, rows of triangles, ladders, vertical zigzags and butterflies are the favourites. They are confined to small areas, large portions of the vase remaining unpainted. This earthenware was found at Nuzi (XII-X). Ḫaššuna (XI-XIII), Grai Resh (IX-VI), Arpaḫiyyah (5-1) and Niniveh (3). At Chager Bazar polychrome Obeid ware was discovered in levels 7 and 6, as also at Tell Ḫalaf.

At Tepe Gawra XI *a* a great alteration took place in the pottery. The painting ceases and no other decoration replaces it. Great alterations have taken place in the shapes as well, and also in the manufacture. The pottery of this period is decidedly on a lower level. Nearly all the shapes of the Obeid period have disappeared. Vases with slip continue, also carinate dishes with a rounded bottom and attached rims; ring-footed vessels are rare, but vases with spouts increase in number. They are rudely shaped and have irregular outlines. They are hand-made and are usually brown, reddish-brown or the colour of buff. The earthenware is softer and mixed with straw, rough sand and pebbles; the upper surfaces are rough. In levels XI to IX the pottery remains for the most part unchanged. The potter's wheel is introduced, although most of the pots are not yet made on it. The colour is predominantly brown or buff, red, reddish-brown, grey and black. There is a remarkably large number of vases with a slip, usually of a light colour. Various kinds of decoration are introduced, incisions and ornaments consisting of incisions, deep hollows made by the application of punches, and simple painting consisting of lines, dots, brushes and triangles with crossways hatching. The shapes were flat-bottomed phialae with sides slanting outwards which are still quite angular; some of these have a ring-foot, but those with a rounded bottom are typical; also round-bottomed goblets, carinated just above the bottom and slightly concave. There are simple cups with a shallow hollow and a slender, slanting foot, and pots with an

<sup>423</sup>) PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 178-186; A. L. PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 73-96.



opening as wide as the vessel itself <sup>424</sup>). At Tepe Gawra this earthenware runs through levels VIII *c* and *d*, and therefore it too must be ascribed to the Uruk period. At Niniveh 4 pottery was found having a red slip, in all respects like Uruk ware, therefore that level can be equated with it <sup>425</sup>). With this Nuzu IX and VIII agree <sup>426</sup>).

At the top of level 4 at Niniveh, along with red Uruk ware, elements of the Jemdet Naşr period were found. At the top of this layer "reserved slip" vases were found and also seal impressions related to those of Jemdet Naşr <sup>427</sup>). Vases with spouts also came to light, flat bottomed phialae and jugs with a ring-foot. They have a light grey slip and a cream slip when the pottery is unpainted. The earthenware is fired well and hard, so that it is almost glazed. All these are characteristics of the Jemdet Naşr period, and therefore we must put the beginning of that period here. It continues in level 5. At that level we first find painted (later incised) pottery. The incisions take the form of cutting out small portions of clay, so that bands and panels are left in relief. The deeper parts are usually undecorated, those in relief adorned with linear incisions or hollowed points. But this technique belongs to the Lagaş period, into which therefore Niniveh 5 must run. Also in Niniveh 5 we meet for the first time with a chalice, at first painted, later with incisions. Tell Billa gives us a clearer picture, for there, in level VII, immediately on virgin soil, painted chalices appear, but in level VI chalices with incisions; hence we can put level VII in the Jemdet Naşr period and level VI in that of Lagaş. A typical form of the Jemdet Naşr period is a squat pot with sharply marked shoulders and an overhanging rim <sup>428</sup>). This continues in the south until the period of Lagaş I. This type of vase was found at Tell Billa in layer VI, so that we can put layer VII in the Jemdet Naşr period, layer VI in the Lagaş period. With this level VII at Nuzu agrees. Tepe Gawra VIIA agrees with Tell Billa VII and therefore belongs to the Jemdet Naşr period, while level VII matches level VI of Tell Billa, so that this belongs to the Lagaş period. At Chager Bazar, 4 and 5 compose a homogeneous period. They include painted earthenware, and other pottery which is incised, such as was found in Niniveh, level V, and Tell Billa, level VII. At Chager Bazar there was found among this pottery a cylinder-seal in brocade style which belongs to the period of Lagaş I <sup>429</sup>). Seals from the periods of Jemdet Naşr and of Lagaş were found also in Niniveh 5 <sup>430</sup>).

At Chager Bazar, levels 2 and 3 are shown by their pottery and the construction of their walls to form together a single period <sup>431</sup>). They contrast sharply with level I in stratification and the general character of the finds. The pottery consists of polished monochrome ware, black and grey, with rounded bottoms <sup>432</sup>). The same pottery was found at Tell Brak in levels 3 and 4. These levels can be dated at Tell Brak because they include a palace with tiles of Narâm-Sin <sup>433</sup>). Hence these levels cover the Agade period and that of the third dynasty of Ur, for level I at Chager Bazar <sup>434</sup>) and level 2 at Tell Brak <sup>435</sup>) contain Ḫabur pottery. Ḫabur ware consists of vases with a wide mouth, high neck and flat bottom <sup>436</sup>), or a more rounded belly and short neck <sup>437</sup>). The commonest shape and the one oftenest met with is the phiala <sup>438</sup>). Ḫabur ware is earthenware made on the wheel, varying in colour from very coarse buff to very refined pink or cream ware with a carefully prepared surface. The

<sup>424</sup>) A. J. TOBLER, *Excavations at Tepe Gawra* II, Levels IV-XX; PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 192-202; 279-295; PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 46-52; 162-163.

<sup>425</sup>) A. J. TOBLER, *Excavations at Tepe Gawra* II, Levels IV-XX, PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 279-295; A. L. PERKINS, *o.c.*, pp. 162-165.

<sup>426</sup>) R. F. S. STARR, *Nuzi* I, II.

<sup>427</sup>) AAA 20, 1923, p. 168.

<sup>428</sup>) Museum Journal 21, 2, pl. XI, fig. 32.

<sup>429</sup>) Iraq 4, 1937, pl. XII, No. 2, p. 166, Fig. 14, No. 2.

<sup>430</sup>) AAA 20, 1923, pp. 138-142.

<sup>431</sup>) Iraq IV, 1937, p. 95.

<sup>432</sup>) Iraq IV, 1937, Fig. 21.

<sup>433</sup>) British Museum Quarterly 12, 1938, pp. 114-115; 13, 1939, pp. 22-23; Iraq IX, 1947, pp. 26-29.

<sup>434</sup>) M. E. MALLOWAN, *The Excavations at Tell Chager Bazar*, Iraq III, 1936, pp. 9, 35-37; p. 55, Fig. 16, No. 5; Iraq IV, 1937, p. 95, 98-99; pp. 102-104, Fig. 21; ILN, Jan. 15, 1938, pp. 92-95; Iraq IX, 1947, pp. 81-87, 23-25.

<sup>435</sup>) The British Museum Quarterly 12, 1938, pp. 114-115; Vol. 13, 1939, pp. 22-23; ILN 1938, Jan. 15, pp. 92-95; Oct. 15, 1938, pp. 697-701.

<sup>436</sup>) Iraq IV, 1937, Fig. 21.

<sup>437</sup>) Iraq IV, 1937, Fig. 22, 14; Fig. 23, 24.

<sup>438</sup>) Iraq IV, 1937, Fig. 22, No. 2; 23, No. 1.

painting is carried out in monochrome, red to reddish brown or black to greenish black in colour. Although the colour is shaded it is not deliberately intended to be polychrome. The decoration is entirely in straight lines and consists of very simple geometrical elements, such as plain bands, triangles, shaded or cross-hatched, sometimes with dots, zigzags and V-shapes added. It is usually applied to the upper part of the vase, but sometimes runs down to the bottom <sup>439</sup>). Since tablets written during a certain number of years of the reign of Šamši-Adad (1740-1732) were found with this pottery, we may date this level, Chager Bazar 1, and Tell Brak 2 as belonging to the time of the first Babylonian dynasty <sup>440</sup>). Above this at Tell Brak lay level 1, containing the Hurrite ware which was met also in level IV of Dûr-Kurkgalzu in Aqar Quf <sup>441</sup>). That falls in the middle of the fifteenth century, and thus we have reached the period of absolute chronology.

<sup>439</sup>) Iraq IV, 1937, p. 102.

<sup>441</sup>) Iraq IX, 1947, pp. 19-21; Iraq, Supplement,

<sup>440</sup>) C. J. GADD, *Tablets from Chager Bazar and Tell Brak*, Iraq VII, 1940, pp. 12-23. 1945, p. 11.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### SYRIA AND PALESTINE

Having now embodied northern Mesopotamia in the chronology of Western Asia, we must endeavour to fit the coastal strip of this region into our chronological framework. Of these two countries, Palestine has been, as regards antiquity, the better investigated, so much so that we can follow the development of human culture there from palaeolithic times. The most ancient human culture so far met with in Palestine is Lower Palaeolithic. It consists of two cultures which differ consistently in their technique. One uses the *coup de poing*, made of the core of a flint-nodule, while the other employs the flakes detached therefrom. Each has influenced the other, so that they mix and terminate in a simple form of Mousterian. The most ancient culture is the Tajacean, found in Umm Qatafa F-G, and for the *coups de poing*, the Chellean implements discovered in the Beqa'a. After this come, for the flake technique, the Lavalloisian specimens from Erq el-Ahmar J-H, and, for the cores, the Acheulean culture from Umm Qatafa E-D 1, 2. After this we find a mixed culture, Lavalloiso-Mousterian, from Et-Taban C and Umm Naquš C. The Upper Palaeolithic is Aurignacian, divided into early, middle and late. Neuville divides it into six phases<sup>442</sup>), I-VI. Early Aurignacian is Neuville's I and II, characterised by the Emireh point, found at Mugharet el-Emireh<sup>443</sup>), el-Wad F<sup>444</sup>), and Gebel Qafzeh B 3. This phase is found in the same form at Tabalbalat in the western Sahara desert and in South Abyssinia. Middle Aurignacian, Neuville's III and IV, was found at el-Wad E-D 1, 2. Erq el-Ahmar D-B, Mugharet el-Kebarah E-D 1, 2, Anteliaš near Beyruth and el-Hiyam H. It is related to the industries of southern Europe, Egypt and northern Africa. Late Aurignacian, Neuville's V and VI, was found at el-Wad C. Upper Palaeolithic is well known for the great alterations which took place in it with relation to the greater variety of forms of the simple implements. The *coup de poing* and the flakes which formed the basis of these implements disappear and give way to blades, which as a general rule are long and narrow, very often with secondary chipping at the margin, a very different scraper and a large number of graving tools. The *coup de poing* is no longer, as was the case in the Lower Palaeolithic, two-sided or rounded, but prism-shaped and lengthened by the removal of flakes. It forms a kind of point.

Upper Palaeolithic is followed by Mesolithic, which is characterised by microliths. Typical of its first phase is a little known style found at Kebarah C 4<sup>445</sup>) in the south part of Carmel, 15 kilometres [roughly nine and one-third miles] from Mugharet el-Wad. Here the first examples of sculpture in West Asia came to light; several carved handles of reaping-hooks were discovered. This indicates that a start had been made at harvesting grain, probably wild grain, which was very common in Palestine. Karim Shahir in the Kirkuk district of North Mesopotamia was probably contemporary with this<sup>446</sup>). After the Kebarian came the Natufian culture, which is divided into four phases. It was first found in the cave of Shukbah at Wady en-Natuf<sup>447</sup>). This industry approximates to the Capsian in North Africa

<sup>442</sup>) R. NEUVILLE, *La Préhistoire de Palestine*, RB 43, 1943, pp. 247-248, pl. xv.

<sup>443</sup>) F. TURNVILLE PETRE, *Recherches in Prehistoric Gallilea*, 1927.

<sup>444</sup>) D. GARROD, *Stone Age of Mount Carmel*, I, pp. 50-52.

<sup>445</sup>) F. TURNVILLE PETRE, *Excavations in the Mugharet el-Kebarah*, *Journal of the Royal Anthr. Inst.* 62, 1932, pp. 271-276; R. NEUVILLE, *Les Débuts*

*de l'Agriculture et de la Faucille Préhistorique de Palestine*, *Recueil de la société Hébraïque de l'Exploration et d'Archéologie Palestinienne* 1934, 21 pages with 8 pl.

<sup>446</sup>) BASOR 124, 1951, pp. 12-18.

<sup>447</sup>) D. A. E. GARROD, *A New Mesolithic Industry, The Natufian of Palestine*, *Journal Royal Anthr. Inst.* 42, 1932, pp. 257-269; GARROD, *The Stone Age of Mount Carmel*, I, pp. 33-39.

and is undoubtedly related to the Tardenoisian. The first phase was met with in el-Wad B 2, Umm el Qala'a, ez-Zueituna at Wady Jahar, in the desert of Judah, and at Helwan in Egypt. In this phase the first discovery of a rude sculpture in stone was made. It represented a beast<sup>448</sup>) and a man's head<sup>449</sup>). The second phase of the Natufian culture was much the same. Some new implements appeared, but in other respects there was a regression. The technique was altered and the implements became smaller. It was met with in el-Wad B 2, Shukbah B, Tôr Abû Sif B, and at El-Omari near Helwan in Egypt. The same development takes place in the third phase of Natufian. The implements become still scarcer and smaller, while their shape becomes more triangular. The material of this period was found at Jericho (level xvii) and at El-Hiyam. During the fourth phase the material remains much the same. There are new implements and weapons, for instance the pointed adze, used for hoeing and pointing to a beginning of agriculture. Other novelties were the adze-like blades and arrow-heads. These were found at Jericho in level xvi, at El-Hiyam C and el-Wad B 1.

Following on the Natufian culture came the Tahunian, divided into two phases. The first of these has so far been found only at a site in the open air with no stratification. Phase II was discovered at Jericho in level xv, which was separated from the preceding level by a thick layer of clay. This culture continues in the next levels, so as to embrace level x to xv. It has also been found at Ḥama in level M<sup>450</sup>). At Ḥaššuna 1 a pottery has been found which agrees with the vase in Jericho ix, 2, with Megiddo xx and with sherds from level v at Ugarit and Tell el-Jedeide xv. With Jericho ix, which has a polished incised earthenware and also pottery painted in black and red in the manner of the archaic Ḥaššuna pottery, we may compare Ḥaššuna 1 b-III, Tell el-Jedeide xiv, specimens in the Neolithic layer at Sakje Geuzi<sup>451</sup>), Chager Bazar xv<sup>452</sup>), level M at Ḥama<sup>453</sup>, Niniveh 1<sup>454</sup>) and Tell eš-šeiḥ xii<sup>455</sup>).

Level L at Ḥama includes Tahunian and Canaanite industries together<sup>456</sup>). At Jericho these were found at the transition between levels ix and viii, therefore level L at Ḥama must have begun as level ix at Jericho was ending. At level L in Ḥama, pottery was discovered having the characteristic traits of Obeid ware from northern Mesopotamia. This ware was associated, at Ḥama, with Ḥalaf ware, which was not found by itself. There were parallels to Chager Bazar<sup>457</sup>), Arpaḥiyyah<sup>458</sup>), and the lower portion of level III at Ugarit<sup>459</sup>), while in level iv at Ugarit pure Ḥalaf ware was found, corresponding to Chager Bazar vi-xii, Arpaḥiyyah x-vi, Tepe Gawra xxv-xx and Ḥaššuna vi-xiii. In level xi at Tell eš-šeiḥ, Ḥalaf ware was found at first and an Obeid ware at the end<sup>460</sup>). Obeid and Ḥalaf ware is also represented in the miscellaneous series, called provincial and really Tell Ḥalaf, at Tell Judeideh<sup>461</sup>). It includes Ḥalaf ware, badly made Ḥalaf ware and Samarra shards<sup>462</sup>). Level xii at Judeideh contained also straw-tempered ware, orange-buff ware painted with vertical red lines, phialae with red slip, which left some parts uncovered, and a series of rough hand-made votive phialae with rims turned down, simple signets with geometrical motifs, and amulets, also numerous implements of bone and flint<sup>463</sup>). These

<sup>448</sup>) R. NEUVILLE, *Statuette Animale du Mésolithique Palestinien*, L'Anthropologie 42, 1932.

<sup>449</sup>) GARROD, *The Stone Age of Mount Carmel*, I, p. 37.

<sup>450</sup>) H. INGOLT, *Rapport Préliminaire sur Sept Campagnes de Fouilles à Hama en Syrie*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>451</sup>) J. DU PLAT TAYLOR, M. V. SETON WILLIAMS and J. WAECHTER, *The Excavations at Saka Gözü*, Iraq XII, 1950, pp. 53-138.

<sup>452</sup>) Iraq III, 1936; Iraq IV, 1937.

<sup>453</sup>) INGOLT, *o.c.*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>454</sup>) AAA 20, 1923, pl. xxxv, 21; xxxvii, 15.

<sup>455</sup>) L. WOOLLEY, *A Forgotten Kingdom*, pp. 25-26.

<sup>456</sup>) INGOLT, *o.c.*, p. 11 and Note 5; p. 14 Note 7.

<sup>457</sup>) INGOLT, *o.c.*, pl. III, No. 1 has the motive shown in Iraq III, 1936, Fig. 26, No. 18.

<sup>458</sup>) INGOLT, *o.c.*, p. 13 gives the description of 3 A, 320 which has parallels with Arpaḥiyyah, Iraq II, 1935, Fig. 28, 4; Fig. 30, 5 while Ḥama 3 A, 303 has a parallel at Arpaḥiyyah, Iraq II, 1935, Fig. 26-27; Ḥama 7 A 651 is Arpaḥiyyah, Iraq III, p. 936, Fig. 41, 20.

<sup>459</sup>) INGOLT, *o.c.*, p. 13; Ḥama 3 A 320 is Ugarit, Syria 15, 1934, p. 110, Fig. 2; *Ugaritica*, p. 12, Fig. 80.

<sup>460</sup>) WOOLLEY, *o.c.*, pp. 25-28.

<sup>461</sup>) AJA 41, 1937, pp. 10-11.

<sup>462</sup>) AJA 41, 1937, pp. 10-11.

<sup>463</sup>) AJA 41, 1937, pp. 10-11.

votive phialae have parallels at Niniveh, beginning from level 3. That level at Niniveh starts at the end of the Obeid period of North Mesopotamia and runs through to the Uruk period. In it were found rough cooking-pots which find their parallel at Ḥama in the lowest portion of level K <sup>464</sup>). Therefore the lowest part of level K at Ḥama must be equated with the uppermost part of level XIII at Tell Judeideh.

Level L at Ḥama, which was contemporaneous with the Ḥalaf-Obeid period in North Mesopotamia, was contemporary also with level VIII at Jericho. Various parallels with pieces from level VIII on that site were found in Megiddo XX <sup>465</sup>). This last-named level had parallels likewise with Teleilat Ghassul <sup>466</sup>), therefore Teleilat Ghassul also, which with its polychrome painted frescos must be reckoned as belonging to the full bloom of the Ḥalaf period, is contemporary with Megiddo XX. Bethshan XVIII-XVI again furnished parallels to Megiddo XX <sup>467</sup>), therefore these levels also must be included as contemporaneous. To this must also be added the chalcolithic settlement at Byblos. Levels XVIII-XVI at Bethshan contained a grey and black burnished pottery which continued in existence down to the beginning of the early Bronze Age. In level XVI at Bethshan there was found a type of house having a nearly rectangular ground plan with an apse. This house with an apse was met with at Jericho also in layers VII and VI, at Megiddo in stage IV on the east side of the *tell*, which corresponded to level XIX <sup>468</sup>), and at Ḥama in the upper portion of level K <sup>469</sup>). Now since the undermost part of level K at Ḥama corresponded to the uppermost part of level XIII at Judeideh, which is contemporary with the Uruk period in North Mesopotamia, we can equate levels XVIII-XVI at Bethshan with it.

In level XIX at Megiddo, various types of vase continue from level XX. The characteristic feature of this level is that practically every vase is varnished in red on its outside. Level XIX corresponds to the undermost portion of stage IV and to stage V, on the eastward slope of the *tell* <sup>470</sup>). Various vases have their parallels at Jericho <sup>471</sup>), Tell Fara H <sup>472</sup>), and Bethshan XVI. In stage V, which corresponds to the undermost portion of level XIX, earthenware was found bearing the impressions of cylinder-seals representing animals and flowers. Similar impressions come from the lowest level at Byblos. These seals have the motifs and style of the cylinder-seals of Jemdet Naṣr <sup>473</sup>). Pottery and cylinder-seals of the Jemdet Naṣr period were found also at Tell Judeideh in level XII, so that we can put Megiddo XIX as contemporaneous with that.

Levels XVI-XVIII at Megiddo have in general the same traits so far as the pottery is concerned. Many parallels were found with Jericho VII-IV <sup>474</sup>), Bethshan XV-XI <sup>475</sup>), <sup>c</sup>Ai <sup>476</sup>), and Beth-Yerah II-III. It began in the north of Palestine with band-slip, in which the vases are covered with parallel lines or network formed of bands of slip applied to the burnished surface of the earthenware. The best examples of this come from Beth-Yerah II. In the south there existed a painted pottery, the decoration consisting of bands of parallel or curving lines in red or brown, covering the whole vase. This was met with at Jericho, levels VII-VI. At that period the pottery was covered with a polished red slip. Combing patterns and varnishes in very complicated designs were much sought after at that time. It occurs also at Bethshan XIII, Jericho IV, Beth-Yerah III. After this a new kind of pottery began to appear, with very graceful shapes, grooved and ribbed, with geometrical motifs, spirals and plastic curves. It was usually highly burnished red inside, with a highly burnished black outside. This was named *Herbet Kerak* ware from *Herbet Kerak* south of the Sea of Gallilee, the ancient Beth-

<sup>464</sup>) INGHOLT, *o.c.*, pl. IV, No. 3, p. 14, Note 7.

<sup>465</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XX, pp. 44-46, pl. 18-20;

ALBRIGHT, *The Archaeology of Palestine*, pp. 65-66.

<sup>466</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XX, pp. 44-46, pl. 18-20;

ALBRIGHT, *o.c.*, pp. 66-70.

<sup>467</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XX, pp. 44-46, pl. 18-20;

ALBRIGHT, *o.c.*, p. 70.

<sup>468</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XX, p. 47, No. 145.

<sup>469</sup>) INGHOLT, *o.c.*, p. 16.

<sup>470</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XX, p. 47, No. 160.

<sup>471</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XIX, pp. 41-44, pl. 15-17.

<sup>472</sup>) *Beth Pelet*, II, pl. XXV, No. 62.

<sup>473</sup>) SAOC 17, pp. 31-39; PEFQS 60, 1934, pp. 90-93, pl. VI, B, F; SAOC 10, Fig. 10A, 12A, 12B; ALBRIGHT, *o.c.*, p. 71.

<sup>474</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XVI-XVIII, pp. 35-41, pl. 10-14.

<sup>475</sup>) MJ 24, 1935, pl. VII, No. 6; pl. VIII, No. 6; pl. X, No. 17, 22; pl. IV, No. 27; pl. VI, No. 15, 16; pl. XII, No. 8, 11.

<sup>476</sup>) Syria 16, 1935, pl. LVIII, No. 20, No. 46.

Yerah, where it was first met with. A sherd was found in levels XVIII-XVI at Megiddo; at Beth-Shan it appeared in levels XII-XI; at Jericho it was discovered in grave A; it was met with at Hama in the upper part of level K<sup>477</sup>), together with many resemblances to levels XVI-XVII at Megiddo<sup>478</sup>), Beth-Shan XVI-XI<sup>479</sup>), 'Ai I and Jericho. This ware has also been found in level XI of Tell Judeideh, which corresponds to the uppermost part of level K at Hama; level XII of Tell Judeideh is not represented at Hama<sup>480</sup>). It occurs also at Tabara, levels IV-I<sup>481</sup>), and likewise in the upper part of level III at Ugarit<sup>482</sup>). In level XI at Tell Judeideh, together with Herbet Kerak ware, cylinder-seals of the style of the Lagaš period were met with. In level J at Hama various vases were found which have their parallels in levels XVII-XVI at Megiddo<sup>483</sup>) and grave A at Jericho which, as we have seen, belongs to this period<sup>484</sup>), also with pieces from level IX at Tell Judeideh. Therefore levels XI-IX at Judeideh be long to the early Bronze Age, as do the uppermost parts of level K and level J at Hama.

The transition from Early to Middle Bronze I formed level XV at Megiddo. This contained types of Early and Middle Bronze ware side by side. Red varnished pottery is the earmark of that time, and this ware continues at Megiddo from level XV to XIII. One of the oldest shapes of this red varnished ware is a small pear-shaped jug<sup>485</sup>). An early ewer of this shape with a carinated rim, and a small jug with hand-varnishing applied at intervals vertically above a red slip<sup>486</sup>), have numerous parallels at Ugarit in level II, where they were found along with monuments of the twelfth and thirteenth dynasties of Egypt<sup>487</sup>). This red ware has been met with in Egypt also, in well-dated deposits of the twelfth dynasty<sup>488</sup>). The same type which was found at Megiddo in level XV was met with also at Beth-Mirsim in levels H and I<sup>489</sup>). Another important type during this period is a large ewer finished on the potter's wheel, having a dull white varnish on the upper shoulder, over which is applied a decoration in blue, black and yellow<sup>490</sup>). It has parallels at Beth-Mirsim, levels G-F<sup>491</sup>), and the best parallel to the Beth-Mirsim jug (G-F) as regards the painted decoration is a foundation-ewer from Byblos<sup>492</sup>). In level XIII a pear-shaped jug was found, to which the typical punctuated technique of Yahudiyyah had been applied<sup>493</sup>). The Yahudiyyah ware has been met with in Egypt together with pieces from the twelfth dynasty<sup>494</sup>). In level XIII a buff-coloured jug was found, irregularly hand-varnished underneath the decoration of red spirals enclosed in black circles on the belly and alternating red and black bands on the neck. The only analogies come from graves in Ugarit II<sup>495</sup>). In the lower part of level II at Ugarit the following pieces from the twelfth Egyptian dynasty were found: a necklace of amulets with beads which bore the cartouche of Sesostri I; a statue in basalt of Chnoumet Nofr Hedjet, the queen of Sesostri II; a sphinx of Amenemhet III<sup>496</sup>). Pieces from the first dynasty of Babylon which were found in this level were discovered higher up than that in which the Sesostri I piece was found and probably even than that containing Amenemhet III's sphinx<sup>497</sup>). The cylinders, which are ascribed to Hammurabi, were found on a level with the graves of Middle Bronze II and not in those of Middle Bronze I<sup>498</sup>).

<sup>477</sup>) INGHOLT, *o.c.*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>478</sup>) SAOC 17, pp. 35-40.

<sup>479</sup>) MJ 24, pl. VII.

<sup>480</sup>) INGHOLT, *o.c.*, p. 28, No. 4.

<sup>481</sup>) WOOLLEY, *A Forgotten Kingdom*, pp. 31-37.

<sup>482</sup>) Syria 17, 1936, pp. 123-133.

<sup>483</sup>) INGHOLT, *o.c.*, pp. 29-49.

<sup>484</sup>) AAA 19, 1932, pl. IV, No. 1-2 is INGHOLT, *o.c.*, p. 30, No. 4.

<sup>485</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XIII, p. 42.

<sup>486</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XV, p. 4.

<sup>487</sup>) Syria 13, 1932, pl. XII, No. 3 and p. 23; Beit Mirsim, AASOR 12, 1932, pl. 22, 7 is Syria 13, 1932, pl. XII, No. 2; SCHAEFFER, *Ugaritica*, 1939, pp. 20 ff.

<sup>488</sup>) E. R. AYRTON and C. T. CURRELLEY and A.

E. P. WEIGALL, *Abydos* III, 1904, pl. XXXIX, 17-22 and 30.

<sup>489</sup>) SAOC 17, pp. 33-35.

<sup>490</sup>) SAOC 17, Str. XIII, p. 42; SAOC 17, pp. 28-33.

<sup>491</sup>) AASOR 13, p. 70 and pl. 22, 1-10.

<sup>492</sup>) MONTET, *Byblos et l'Égypte*, pl. LX; R. DUS- SAUD in Syria 11, 1930, Fig. 2.

<sup>493</sup>) SAOC 17, p. 29, No. 103.

<sup>494</sup>) R. RANDALL-MACIVER and C. L. WOOLLEY, *Buhen*, 1911, pl. 49 k, 9-10, p. 185.

<sup>495</sup>) SAOC 17, p. 32, No. 113; Syria 13, Fig. 12-13 and p. 23.

<sup>496</sup>) SCHAEFFER, *Ugaritica*, 1939, pp. 20 f.

<sup>497</sup>) SCHAEFFER, *o.c.*, p. 18, Note 2.

<sup>498</sup>) SCHAEFFER, *Stratigraphic Comparée*, pp. 20-33; PARROT, *o.c.*, pp. 300-396.

From this time, when the Middle Kingdom was at its best in Egypt, come a number of curse-texts. There have been two kinds of these published. The first and perhaps also the oldest were written on potsherds<sup>499</sup>); the second were alabaster plaques and terracotta statuettes<sup>500</sup>). They were written in very cursive hieratic script and contained the names of actual or potential rebels in Egypt or belonging to the neighbouring countries. These people were thus counted as being at the prince's mercy. In case of a rebellion, he had simply to break the object bearing the name of the person and that of the place, and the rebel was supposed to be "broken" thereby. The first texts published date from the beginning of the twelfth dynasty, while the second group came from its last years, hence they fall between about 1850 and 1785. Now in this last group we find a prince of Upper Šwtw named Šmwibw<sup>501</sup>). This prince of Upper Šutu therefore was called Šumuabu. The Šutu are Amorites, and the Amorites were already occupied in trying to widen their domains under Šu-Sin, who built the west wall Muriq-Tidnim in his fourth year to keep them out<sup>502</sup>). After the fall of the third dynasty of Ur, we find Amorite states arising everywhere. Šamši-Adad himself was an Amorite. The Šutu lived along the Euphrates up to the level of Babylon; thus it is perfectly possible and even probable that this Šumuabu of the Šutu saw at a given moment a chance of capturing Babylon and founded the first Amorite dynasty there. The dates of his reign, as we have seen, were 1834-1820. This falls precisely within the last portion of the twelfth Egyptian dynasty and in the time during which the second collection of curse-texts was put there.

The period of Middle Bronze II was represented at Megiddo by levels XII-IX. Level XII forms the transition from Middle Bronze I to Middle Bronze II. The great mass of its pottery is still the red-varnished earthenware; however, in level XII the majority of the pottery began to be of Middle Bronze II style. That is still more clearly to be remarked in Beth-Mirsim, where at level E the lowest section is characterised by vases with a rich red varnished slip, while the uppermost section contained typical Middle Bronze II vases; hence level E 1 at Beth-Mirsim coincides with level XII at Megiddo and E 2 with level XI. Level D at Beth-Mirsim corresponds to level X Megiddo, but then Beth-Mirsim breaks off for a period. The pottery consisted of carinate phialae, pear-shaped and flat-bottomed jugs with one or two handles, amphorae, long pointed small jugs and fine goblets<sup>503</sup>). It is found all over Palestine and Syria. In Palestine it occurs in Megiddo XII-IX, Beth-Mirsim E-D, Jericho, and at Beth-Shan in the pre-Amenophis level; in Syria, at Byblos and the uppermost portion of layer II at Ugarit, so that that layer covered the whole of Middle Bronze. In level X at Megiddo a fine earthenware begins to appear. It is finely tempered, the colour is pink or buff, and it is well, but irregularly, hand-varnished. The painting is in two colours, black and red. It reached its perfection in level IX and degenerated in level VIII. The decorative elements are very diverse, varying from birds, fish and revolving waggon-wheels through a twisted wheel to numerous geometrical patterns (they include the Union Jack, the Maltese cross and wheels with spokes). It extended all over Palestine and Syria and has been found in Egypt, while various motifs occurred in Mesopotamia also<sup>504</sup>).

At Alalah in level VII the palace walls were decorated with fresco's, the designs of which were executed on a white background in broad bands of blue and yellow with the figures in

<sup>499</sup>) K. SETHE, *Die Achtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf Altägyptischen Tongefässchen des Mittleren Reichs*, APAW, 1926, philos. hist. Klasse, No. 5; R. DUSSAUD, *Nouveaux Renseignements sur la Palestine et la Syrie vers 2000 avant Notre Ère*, Syria 8, 1927, pp. 216-233; W. F. ALBRIGHT, JPOS, 1928, pp. 223-256.

<sup>500</sup>) G. POSENER, CRA 1939, pp. 70-74; *Princes et Pays d'Asie et de Nubie*, 1940; *Nouveaux Textes Hiératiques de Proscription*, Mélanges Syriens, I, pp. 313-317; *Chronique d'Égypte* No. 27, 1939, pp. 39-

46; R. DUSSAUD, *Nouveaux Textes Égyptiens d'Exécration contre les Peuples Syriens*, Syria 21, 1940, pp. 170-182; W. F. ALBRIGHT, *New Egyptian Data on Palestine in the Patriarchal Age*; BASOR 81, 1941, pp. 16-21; *The Land of Damascus between 1850 and 1750 B.C.*, BASOR 83, 1941, pp. 30-36; A. ALT, ZDPV 1941, pp. 21-39.

<sup>501</sup>) POSENER, *o.c.*, E 52, p. 89.

<sup>502</sup>) RLA 2, No. 80, p. 144.

<sup>503</sup>) SAOC 17, pp. 17-28.

<sup>504</sup>) SAOC 17, pp. 10-17.

black<sup>505</sup>). We have seen that at Megiddo in levels XIV-XIII, at Beth-Mirsim in levels G-F, at Byblos and other places a kind of pottery was found in which there was a decoration in blue, black and yellow over a matt white varnish on the shoulders. Now we find that the same kind of decoration in the same colours was applied to walls as was usually applied to the sides of vases. We must therefore put level VII at Alalah contemporaneous with levels XIV-XIII at Megiddo. In this palace tablets were found dating from the reigns of three kings, Ḥammurabi, Yarim-Lim and Niqme-epuḥ. But the overwhelming majority belonged to the time of Yarim-Lim<sup>506</sup>). From the date of these tablets we know that Hammurabi was king of Jamḥad<sup>507</sup>). Jamḥad was in the neighbourhood of that region which had Ḥalab (Aleppo) for its capital<sup>508</sup>). Ḥammurabi, as we know from the archives of Mari, was a contemporary of Zimrilim of Mari and consequently also of Ḥammurabi of Babylon<sup>509</sup>). Hence we must put level VII at Alalah about the time of Hammurabi of Babylon and do the same for levels XIV-XIII at Megiddo and levels G-F at Beth-Mirsim. In the uppermost part of level V and the lowest part of level IV there came to light a pottery with a painted background, black or brown, on which was executed a decoration in opaque white paint. This ware grew commoner in the uppermost portion of level IV. It is common at level III and extremely common at level II, but of local manufacture<sup>510</sup>). It has been called Nuzu ware after the place at which it was first found. It is met with accompanied by inscriptions of Šauššatar, a Hurrite king, hence its name "Hurrite pottery". It was found at Tell Billa in level III, at Dûr-Kurigalzu in level IV, in level I at Tell Brak, while at Megiddo it began to appear in level X, became plentiful in level IX and was degenerating in level VIII. Thus we can equate the highest part of level V and the lowest portion of level IV with level X at Megiddo. In level I at Alalah was found a statue with an inscription, which must however have belonged to the date of level IV. The inscription is an autobiography of King Idrimi, who lived in the time when level IV was flourishing<sup>511</sup>). Idrimi was the son of Ilim-ilimma<sup>512</sup>). He handed the kingship over to his son Adadnirâri<sup>513</sup>). He concluded a treaty with Barattarna king of the Hurrites<sup>514</sup>). The name must past all doubt be Barattarna, for the cuneiform character which indicates that a proper name follows stands before *bara*. The character which follows *ra* is *at* rather than *su*. We thus get two phonetic writings of the same name, *ba-ra-at-tar-na* and *ba-ra-at-ar-na*, making the name of a known Hurrite king. King Barattarna is mentioned in the Nuzu tablets<sup>515</sup>). He is also mentioned (as "Paratarna") in a treaty of Idrimi with Pillia, king of Kizzuwadna, from which it would seem that he was Niqmepa's suzerain: *40i-na a-i-i im-me ûmimi m pa-ra-tar-na 41it-ti m id-ri-mi ni-iš ilânimeš 42iz-ku-ur ù iš-tu ûm:mi šu-wa-ti 43mu-un-na-ab-tú qa-bi a-na tu-ur-ri*, "on whatsoever day Paratarna shall swear an oath by the gods with Idrimi, from that day it shall be decided to send back the captives"<sup>516</sup>). Although Idrimi says in his autobiography that he transferred responsibility to his son Adadnirâri, it is not certain that the latter succeeded him, and if that was the case, it is certain that he did not reign long. Niqmepa, a son of Idrimi, did succeed him, as is plain from the fact that he used Idrimi's seal by way of showing the continuance of the royal power and the legitimacy of the succession<sup>517</sup>). Šauššatar is Niqmepa's suzerain, for the latter brings two cases before him for decision<sup>518</sup>). Šauššatar seals with his father's signet, to indicate his lawful succession. The motto on it runs, "Šuttarna, son of Kirta, king of Maitani"<sup>519</sup>). Šuttarna also seems to

<sup>505</sup>) WOOLLEY, *A Forgotten Kingdom*, pp. 66-85.

<sup>506</sup>) Sidney SMITH, *A Preliminary Account of the Tablets from Atchana*, *Antiquaries Journal* 10, 1930, pp. 38-48; D. J. WISEMAN, *The Alalakh Tablets*, pp. 2-5.

<sup>507</sup>) D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, *Date Formulae*, I, p. 4.

<sup>508</sup>) Syria 19, 1938, pp. 117 ff.; RA 36, 19, 1930, pp. 46 ff.

<sup>509</sup>) Syria 19, 1938, pp. 17 ff.

<sup>510</sup>) WOOLLEY, *o.c.*, pp. 86-161.

<sup>511</sup>) Sidney SMITH and L. WOOLLEY, *The Statue of Idrimi*, 1949, pp. 1-12.

<sup>512</sup>) Sidney SMITH, *The Statue of Idrimi*, I, 1, p. 14.

<sup>513</sup>) Sidney SMITH, *o.c.*, I, 90-91, p. 20.

<sup>514</sup>) Sidney SMITH, *o.c.*, I, 42-46, n. 16; BASOR 118, 1950, p. 17 and Note 27; JAOS LXXI, 1951, p. 152.

<sup>515</sup>) HSS XIII, No. 165, obv. 3.

<sup>516</sup>) D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, No. 3, rev. 40-43.

<sup>517</sup>) D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, p. 6, No. 85, 104; Sidney SMITH, AJ 10, 1930, pp. 38-48.

<sup>518</sup>) D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, No. 13.

<sup>519</sup>) D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, No. 13, 14.



have had but a short reign, for Paratarna was still on the throne during the reign of Idrimi, the father of Niqmepa, and Šauššatar occupied it during the reign of Niqmepa. Niqmepa asks Šauššatar to give a decision in a lawsuit between himself and Šunaššura concerning a city called Alawari<sup>520</sup>). There exists a treaty between Šauššatar and a certain Šanuššura of Kizzuwadna, which is earlier than the one between Muršiliš II and Šanuššura of Kizzuwadna<sup>521</sup>). The other party to the treaty with Šauššatar must therefore be Šanuššura I and probably the same one who is named in the lawsuit which Niqmepa lays before Šauššatar. He probably is the successor of Pillia. The successor of Niqmepa was his son Ilimilimma II<sup>522</sup>). Šauššatar was succeeded by Artatama I, who was a contemporary of Thutmose III, who asks for his daughter to wife<sup>523</sup>). Artatama was succeeded by Šuttarna I, who was contemporary with Amenophis III, for the latter sought a daughter of his in marriage<sup>524</sup>). After Artatama came Šuttarna II. On the death of Šuttarna II the Mittani kingdom fell apart into two halves, the Hurrite kingdom in Armenia, where Artatama II ascended the throne, and the Mittani kingdom proper in North Mesopotamia, where Artasura mounted the throne of his father. He was murdered, and his brother Tušratta succeeded him. He was still alive in the time of Akhenaten, for he wrote a letter to him<sup>525</sup>). He was assassinated by one of his sons and Mattiwaza his son succeeded him. In the meantime, Artatama II was succeeded in Hurri by Šuttarna III, or Šutatarna. He tried to murder Mattiwaza, but Mattiwaza fled to Šuppiliuma, whose daughter he married, and concluded a treaty with him by which Mitanni became a vassal state of the Hittite empire<sup>526</sup>).

Level II at Alalah corresponds, as we have seen, to level VIII at Megiddo. In level II at Alalah Mycenaean vases begin for the first time to be imported. At this level, shapes belonging to the Late Bronze Age are met with for the first time. This is found at Jericho<sup>527</sup>), and at Beth-Mirsim, level C I<sup>528</sup>). In level I at Alalah, imported Mycenaean pottery was prevalent. In level VII at Megiddo there was earthenware of mediocre make and but moderately fired, with red painting on a pinkish buff background. Here again Mycenaean pottery was discovered. With this goes level C 2 and level B 1. At Ugarit the whole of level I is composed of the Late Bronze period. In level VI at Megiddo we meet with the same earthenware as in level VII, save that more vases occur which are of well-fired and well-tempered clay. Among them are vases of orange or buff colour with little black and white grains in them which produce a pepper-and-salt effect. In level V a totally different pottery is found. It is hand-burnished and varnished in red. Parallel to this level runs level B 2 at Beth-Mirsim. This level was devastated in 926 by Sheshonq. With this we reach the age of the kings in Palestine, so that we can erect an absolute chronology for that country if we can find an absolutely determined point of contact between the kings of Judah and Israel on the one side and those of Assyria, for whom we possess an absolute chronology for this period, on the other. Such a point of contact we find in the Battle of Qarqar during the reign of Salmanasser III<sup>529</sup>). This action was fought in the *limmu*-year of Daiâh-Aššur, who was *limmu* in the sixth year of Salmanasser III<sup>530</sup>). Salmanasser III came to the throne in 858 B.C., therefore his sixth year was 853. In that year he set out against the west, and among his enemies is mentioned Ahab of Israel<sup>531</sup>). Salmanasser III states that in his eighteenth year he received tribute from Jehu during an expedition to the west<sup>532</sup>). The time which elapsed between the Battle of Qarqar and the payment by Jehu of this tribute is therefore twelve years, for the eigh-

<sup>520</sup>) D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, No. 14.

<sup>521</sup>) Reported by Dr. G. R. MEYER at the III<sup>ème</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Leiden, 1952, *Orientalia* 21, 1952, p. 501; D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, p. 7 and Note 2.

<sup>522</sup>) D. J. WISEMAN, *o.c.*, No. 15; BASOR 118, 1950, pp. 14-20.

<sup>523</sup>) VAS II, 12, 16.

<sup>524</sup>) VAS XI, 12, 19-20; VAS XI, 200, 1, 47.

<sup>525</sup>) VAS XI, 11.

<sup>526</sup>) KBo I, 1; KBo I, 2; KUB III, 1a and b and

c and d; KBo I, 3; KUB III, 17; WEIDNER, *Politische Dokumente aus Klein-Asien*, Boghazöi-Studien 8, pp. 2-57.

<sup>527</sup>) AAA 21, 1934, pl. xxxi, No. 8, 9, 13; pl. xxxvi, 20.

<sup>528</sup>) AASOR 13, 1933, pp. 26-27, p. 89, No. 51.

<sup>529</sup>) III R, pl. 7 and 8, col. II, 78-102.

<sup>530</sup>) III R, *o.c.*, II, 78; RLA II, 1938, p. 320.

<sup>531</sup>) III R, II, 91.

<sup>532</sup>) III R, pl. 5, No. 6, 64-65.

teenth year of Salmanasser III was 841. Between Ahab and Jehu two kings reigned, Ahaziah with a reign of two years<sup>533</sup>) and Jehoram with a reign of twelve<sup>534</sup>). The sum of these is fourteen years, which according to the Bible lie between the Battle of Qarqar and the payment of the tribute by Jehu, whereas it is but twelve according to the Assyrian source. One of the two therefore is incorrect. Which is true and which is false, or can they both be brought into agreement with each other owing to the difference being due merely to a different system of dating? Since the dating of that part of Assyrian chronology rests upon the *limmu*-lists, which reckon meticulously from year to year, and therefore is exact, we must examine where the discrepancy of the kings of Israel arises. Now since we have to do with a difference of two years and with two kings, the possibility exists that we are faced with the double dating of two years, which arises from reckoning the year in which a king dies as belonging to the deceased king but also as the first year of his successor. Jehoram reigned twelve years. His first year was at the same time the last year of his predecessor Ahaziah, so that that year is reckoned twice. Ahaziah succeeded his father Ahab and reigned two years. His first year however was also the last year of Ahab, so that that year also was reckoned twice. If therefore we wish to arrive at the real length of these kings' reigns, we must subtract a year from each, that is to say two years altogether, and then we get twelve years for this period, exactly as in the Assyrians' account<sup>535</sup>). Now since the time which elapsed between Ahab and Jehu is twelve years, it follows from this that 853 was the last year of Ahab and 841 the year in which Jehu ascended the throne. No other year is possible, for if we must put the Battle of Qarqar earlier, then we must also put Jehu's payment of tribute earlier, but then it will come before the reign of Jehu. On the other hand, if we put the payment of tribute by Jehu later, then we must also put the Battle of Qarqar later, but then Ahab cannot have taken part in it, so the correct dating is, the last year of Ahab for the Battle of Qarqar and the year in which Jehu came to the throne for the payment of the tribute.

From this instance it is clear that in Israel the year in which a king came to the throne is reckoned in the number of his regnal years. We must therefore, in the case of the earlier kings of Israel, subtract a year in each case to get the real duration of the reigns of these princes. This principle, which was discovered by E. R. THIELE<sup>536</sup>) and V. COUCKE<sup>537</sup>), lies at the base of the chronology of Israel. Jehoram of Israel reigned twelve years<sup>538</sup>), 852-841. His predecessor Ahaziah reigned for two<sup>539</sup>), 853-852. Ahab was king for twenty-two years<sup>540</sup>), 874-853. Omri, who preceded him, reigned twelve years<sup>541</sup>), from 885 to 874. At the beginning of his reign he ruled for a little while simultaneously with Tibni<sup>542</sup>), but as they reigned at the same time, we must not reckon in the regnal years of Tibni, for they are already included in those of Omri. Zimri was king for seven days<sup>543</sup>) in 885. Elah reigned two years<sup>544</sup>), 886-885. Baasha was king for twenty-four<sup>545</sup>), 909-886, Nadab for two<sup>546</sup>), 910-909. Jeroboam I reigned for twenty-two years<sup>547</sup>), that is 931 to 910.

Now that we have settled the chronology of Israel, we must try to establish that of Judah with the help of the synchronisms with Israel. Ahaziah of Judah died in the same year as Jehoram of Israel, since both were killed by Jehu<sup>548</sup>). He reigned for one year<sup>549</sup>). According to 2 Kings, 8, 25 he became king in the twelfth year of Jehoram of Israel, but according to 2 Kings, 9, 29 it was in the eleventh year of Jehoram (or Joram). These two accounts seem to contradict each other. But this is mere appearance, for in reality they may both be true. We

<sup>533</sup>) II Kings, 8, 26; II Chron., 22, 2.

<sup>534</sup>) II Kings, 8, 17; II Chron., 21, 5, 20.

<sup>535</sup>) E. R. THIELE, *The Chronology of the Kings of Juda and Israel*, INES 3, 1944, pp. 137-186; E. R. THIELE, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, 1951, p. 63.

<sup>536</sup>) THIELE, *o.c.*, pp. 14-11.

<sup>537</sup>) V. COUCKE, *Chronologie Biblique*, Dictionnaire de la Bible, ed. Vigouroux, Supplément Vol. I, 1928.

<sup>538</sup>) II Kings, 3, 1.

<sup>539</sup>) I Kings, 22, 51.

<sup>540</sup>) I Kings, 16, 20.

<sup>541</sup>) I Kings, 16, 23.

<sup>542</sup>) I Kings, 16, 21-22.

<sup>543</sup>) I Kings, 16, 10, 15.

<sup>544</sup>) I Kings, 16, 8.

<sup>545</sup>) I Kings, 15, 28, 33.

<sup>546</sup>) I Kings, 15, 25.

<sup>547</sup>) I Kings, 14, 20.

<sup>548</sup>) II Kings, 9, 27.

<sup>549</sup>) II Kings, 8, 25, 26; II Chron. 22, 2.

have seen that in Israel they counted from the moment when a king ascended the throne, and by that reckoning Jehoram reigned in Israel for twelve years. But with this reckoning we must subtract a year because it is counted twice, and therefore he really was king for eleven years. This result is arrived at if we keep to a reckoning by which we do not begin to count till the first full year of a king's reign and do not count the year in which he ascended the throne. Therefore we have here the accounts of two different sources, one of which reckons in the year of accession and the other not. Now since Israel reckoned in the year of accession, the other source must come from Judah and they must there have used the system by which the reckoning did not begin until the first full year of a king's reign and the year of accession was not counted. That is the system which was in force in Assyria also <sup>550</sup>). Ahaziah therefore reigned in 841. His predecessor was Jehoram, son of Jehošaphat king of Judah. He reigned for eight years <sup>551</sup>), and became king in the fifth year of Jehoram of Judah, in 848. Ahaziah reigned for one year, 841, and thus came to the throne in 842. That was the last year of Jehoram of Judah, who reigned for eight years and therefore had his first full year in 849 and came to the throne in 850. He began however to rule independently in the fifth year of Jehoram of Israel, 848, and therefore before that was coregent with Jehošaphat, who came to the throne in the fourth year of Ahab, 870 <sup>552</sup>). Jehošaphat was king for twenty-five years <sup>553</sup>), his last year being 849, as the first year of Jehoram was 848. Therefore Jehošaphat of Judah began his reign in 873; but he began in 870, therefore he was coregent with his predecessor for three years. He was preceded by Aša, who came to the throne in the twentieth year of Jeroboam of Israel, 911, and reigned for forty-one years <sup>554</sup>), 911-871. Before him came Abijam, who acceded in Jeroboam's eighteenth year, 913, and reigned for three years <sup>555</sup>), from 914 to 912. His predecessor was Rehoboam, who reigned seventeen years <sup>556</sup>), 931-915. He therefore came to the throne in 932. The previous occupant was Solomon, with a reign of forty years <sup>557</sup>), 971-932. It is impossible to make out whether these forty years are reckoned from the moment when his father David died or from the moment when he became coregent. In either case David, who also reigned forty years <sup>558</sup>), was already king before the year 1000. Now that we have constructed the chronology before Jehu, we must try to construct it for the time after Jehu to the end for Israel and to bring that into harmony with the kings of Judah and Assyria.

Jehu began to reign in 841, as we have seen, and ruled for twenty-eight years, 841-814 <sup>559</sup>). We have seen that Jehu put to death Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah at the same time, so that a new king came to the throne in Israel and Judah in the same year. Jehu was ruling in Israel when Athaliah put herself on the throne of Judah, reigned for seven years <sup>560</sup>), 841-835, and was succeeded by Joaš in the seventh year of Jehu. He reigned forty years <sup>561</sup>), 835-796. In Israel, Jehu was succeeded by Jehoahaz in the twenty-third year of Joaš of Judah, *i.e.*, 813. Jehoahaz reigned for seventeen years <sup>562</sup>). His son Jehoāš succeeded him in the thirty-seventh year of Joaš of Judah, *i.e.*, in 798, for 796 is Joaš of Judah's last year. This year, 798, was the date of Jehoāš's accession in Israel and of the death of his father Jehoahaz. Jehoāš reigned sixteen years <sup>563</sup>), 797-782. In the second year of his reign Amaziah mounted the throne of Judah <sup>564</sup>); he therefore succeeded his father in 796. His reign lasted twenty-nine years <sup>565</sup>), and he was therefore on the throne from 795 to 767. He lived for fifteen years after Jehoāš's death <sup>566</sup>). As the latter died in 782, this makes exactly fifteen years, so that the chronology fits. Jeroboam II came to the

<sup>550</sup>) E. R. THIELE, JNES 3, 1943, p. 143; *o.c.*, pp. 13-54.

<sup>551</sup>) II Kings, 8, 16, 17; II Chron., 21, 5, 20.

<sup>552</sup>) I Kings, 22, 41; II Chron., 20, 31.

<sup>553</sup>) I Kings, 22, 42.

<sup>554</sup>) I Kings, 15, 9, 10; II Chron., 16, 13.

<sup>555</sup>) I Kings, 15, 1, 2; II Chron., 13, 1, 2.

<sup>556</sup>) I Kings, 14, 21; II Chron., 12, 13.

<sup>557</sup>) I Kings, 11, 42.

<sup>558</sup>) I Kings, 2, 11.

<sup>559</sup>) II Kings, 10, 36.

<sup>560</sup>) II Kings, 11, 3, 4; II Chron., 22, 12.

<sup>561</sup>) II Kings, 12, 1; II Chron., 24, 1.

<sup>562</sup>) II Kings, 13, 1.

<sup>563</sup>) II Kings, 13, 10.

<sup>564</sup>) II Kings, 14, 1.

<sup>565</sup>) II Kings, 14, 2; II Chron., 25, 1.

<sup>566</sup>) II Kings, 14, 17.

throne of Israel in the fifteenth year of Amaziah of Judah<sup>567</sup>), therefore in 781. He was king over Israel for forty-one years<sup>568</sup>). In 767 Amaziah of Judah died and was succeeded by Azariah in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam II of Israel. As we have seen, Jeroboam ascended the throne of Israel in 781, but when Azariah succeeded his father on the throne in 767 he had been king for twenty-seven years. In reality it is only fifteen years. If Jeroboam had been reigning for twenty-seven years at that date, the only possibility is that he had been coregent with his father for twelve years. He reigned alone therefore no more than twenty-nine years, 781-753, and was coregent with his father 793-782. The successor of Jeroboam II was Zakariah. He acceded to the throne of Israel in Azariah of Judah's thirty-eighth year<sup>569</sup>). Azariah of Judah however came to the throne on the death of his father in 767, and from 767 to 753 is fourteen years. Yet it is Azariah's thirty-eighth year, therefore he must have been coregent with his father for twenty-four. Consequently he must have become coregent very shortly after his father's accession. An occasion for this was probably the causeless war which Amaziah waged against Israel, in which he was taken prisoner, the treasures of the Temple and the palace were plundered and part of the wall of Jerusalem was broken down; hostages were taken, which set the people against him, and the people of Judah made Azariah, who was sixteen years old, king in place of Amaziah. Then, since he was coregent with his father for twenty-four years and the latter died in 767, all this must have happened in 791. Azariah was king for fifty-two years<sup>570</sup>) in all, but only twenty-eight alone, from 766 to 739. Zakariah of Israel came to the throne in the thirty-eighth year of Azariah of Judah<sup>571</sup>) and reigned for six months<sup>572</sup>). He was succeeded by Šallum in Azariah of Judah's thirty-ninth year<sup>573</sup>), from which it is evident that Zakariah of Israel came to the throne in the last part of the thirty-eighth year of Azariah of Judah, 753. Šallum reigned for one month only<sup>574</sup>), in 752. He was followed by Menahem in Azariah of Judah's thirty-ninth year<sup>575</sup>), 752. He reigned for ten years<sup>576</sup>), 752-742.

Here we get a piece of information from without, namely from the Assyrian side, to test the correctness of the chronology of the kings of Judah and Israel. According to 2 Kings, 15, 19-20, Menahem paid tribute to Pul. This Pul is, according to the Babylonian king-list A<sup>577</sup>) and the Babylonian chronicle<sup>578</sup>), no other than Tiglathpileser III, who when he conquered Babylon took the name of Pul there<sup>579</sup>). According to the Chronicle of Eponyms, Tiglathpileser III was in Arpad in 743 during his campaign against Urartu and the west<sup>580</sup>). The same account as that in the Chronicle of Eponyms is given in the Annals of Tiglathpileser<sup>581</sup>). The other inscriptions agree in mentioning the same places in the north-west. Among the kings who paid tribute is Azariah of Jerusalem. The information is given in a section which begins "In the course of my campaign". Although the text is in a very bad state, there is no mention made of a new campaign, so that we must assume that the same one is meant. Tiglathpileser III received the tribute in Arpad. He was at Arpad in 743, 742, 741 and 740, so that it must have been in one of these years that Azariah and Menahem paid him tribute. Hence the chronology as we have so far constructed it squares with the established chronology of Assyria.

After the death of Menahem, Pekahiah became king of Israel in the fiftieth year of Azariah of Judah<sup>582</sup>). Azariah's fiftieth year was 742. Pekahiah reigned for two years<sup>583</sup>), 741-740. He was followed by Pekah in the fifty-second year of Azariah of Judah<sup>584</sup>); he

<sup>567</sup>) II Kings, 14, 23.

<sup>568</sup>) II Kings, 14, 23.

<sup>569</sup>) II Kings, 15, 8.

<sup>570</sup>) II Kings, 15, 1, 2; II Chron., 26, 3.

<sup>571</sup>) II Kings, 15, 8.

<sup>572</sup>) II Kings, 15, 8.

<sup>573</sup>) II Kings, 15, 13.

<sup>574</sup>) II Kings, 15, 13.

<sup>575</sup>) II Kings, 15, 17.

<sup>576</sup>) II Kings, 15, 17.

<sup>577</sup>) Ct 36, pl. 25, rev. II, 8.

<sup>578</sup>) RLA 2, 1938, p. 430, 26-46.

<sup>579</sup>) I Chron., 5, 26; J. HORNER, *Biblical Chronology*, PSBA XX, 1898, p. 237; THIELE, *o.c.*, pp. 76-79.

<sup>580</sup>) RLA 2, 1938, p. 430, 34.

<sup>581</sup>) ROST, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileser's III. The Annals in his Third Year.*

<sup>582</sup>) II Kings, 15, 23.

<sup>583</sup>) II Kings, 15, 23.

<sup>584</sup>) II Kings, 15, 27.

reigned for twenty years<sup>585</sup>). During his reign Tiglathpileser III moved against the west. In the Chronicle of Eponyms three invasions of Tiglathpileser III are mentioned, one in 734 against Philistia, others in 733 and 732 against Damascus<sup>586</sup>). Tiglathpileser tells us that Mitinti of Askalon rebelled against his arrangements, which he must have made in 734<sup>587</sup>). At the same time Rezin of Damascus and Pekah made a combined attack on Ahaz, who called on Tiglathpileser III for help; therefore Ahaz was a contemporary of Tiglathpileser III and was already king of Judah in 734-732. Ahaz succeeded Jotham, who had become king after the death of Azariah in the second year of Pekah<sup>588</sup>). But Jotham had taken over the government from his father Azariah when the latter became leprous<sup>589</sup>). He was therefore coregent with his father for some time. Pekah became king in the fifty-second year of Azariah of Judah<sup>590</sup>), which was Azariah's last year and the year in which Jotham came to the throne. Pekah and Jotham therefore became kings in the same year. But it was the second year of Pekah when Jotham became king<sup>591</sup>). Pekah therefore must have reigned earlier. We have seen that Azariah of Judah came into contact with Tiglathpileser III in the years 743-740. That gives us a fixed synchronism between Tiglathpileser III and Azariah. The latter's grandson also came into contact with the same Tiglathpileser III in the years 733-732, when Rezin and Pekah attacked him and he called upon Tiglathpileser III for help. Ahaz was then already king of Judah and had succeeded his father Jotham. He reigned sixteen years<sup>592</sup>), and had come to the throne in the second year of Pekah<sup>593</sup>). Tiglathpileser informs us that he had put Ausi (Hoshea) on the throne after the death of Pekah<sup>594</sup>). 2 Kings, 15, 37-38 mentions the death of Jotham and informs us that "in those days the LORD began to send against Judah Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah". This then happened at the time when the crown passed from Jotham to Ahaz. Tiglathpileser came to Damascus in the years 733-732<sup>595</sup>), and set Hoshea on the throne<sup>596</sup>). That occurred in 732, which is therefore the last year of Pekah; Pekah reigned twenty years<sup>597</sup>), and therefore occupied the throne from 751 to 732. Jotham came to the throne in the second year of Pekah<sup>598</sup>), and reigned for sixteen years<sup>599</sup>). Ahaz acceded in the seventeenth year of Pekah<sup>600</sup>) and reigned for sixteen years<sup>601</sup>). Hosheah became king in 732 and reigned for nine years<sup>602</sup>); consequently his first full year on the throne was 731. This, according to 2 Kings, 15, 30, was the twentieth year of Jotham of Judah. To examine the correctness of this we must have recourse to another fixed datum from contemporary events, and it takes us once more to Aššur. According to 2 Kings, 18, 13, Sanherib "did ... come up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them" in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. This campaign of Sanherib was his third, as recorded in the annals<sup>603</sup>). It was the expedition of 701. The campaign began in the new year, after Nisan, in the spring, when kings usually went on the war-path. But in Judah the year began in Tisri (October), as is plain from 2 Kings, 22, 3 and 23, 3 and Nehemiah, 1, 1 and 2, 1<sup>603a</sup>). From this it follows that when Sanherib began

<sup>585</sup>) II Kings, 15, 27.

<sup>586</sup>) Ch I, 30-34, RLA 2, 1938, p. 430.

<sup>587</sup>) H. WINCKLER, *Textbuch für Keilschriftvorlesungen*, pp. 31 ff.

<sup>588</sup>) II Kings, 15, 32.

<sup>589</sup>) II Chron., 26, 21; II Kings, 15, 5.

<sup>590</sup>) II Kings, 15, 27.

<sup>591</sup>) II Kings, 15, 32.

<sup>592</sup>) II Kings, 15, 33.

<sup>593</sup>) II Kings, 15, 32.

<sup>594</sup>) III R, 10, No. 2.

<sup>595</sup>) Ch I, 41-42, RLA 2, 1938, p. 431.

<sup>596</sup>) III R, 10, No. 2.

<sup>597</sup>) II Kings, 15, 27.

<sup>598</sup>) II Kings, 15, 32.

<sup>599</sup>) II Kings, 15, 33.

<sup>600</sup>) II Kings, 16, 1.

<sup>601</sup>) II Kings, 16, 2.

<sup>602</sup>) II Kings, 17, 1.

<sup>603</sup>) I R 37-42; D. D. LUCKENBILL, *The Annals of Sennacherib*, OIP II, 1924.

<sup>603a</sup>) "That Judah almost at the close of its history was still counting its regnal years from Tishri to Tishri is indicated by II Kings, 22, 3 and 23, 23, for it was in the eighteenth year of Josiah that the work of repair was begun on the temple, and it was still in the same eighteenth year, after the first of Nisan had passed, that the Passover was celebrated on Nisan fourteen. It is true that in all the events narrated between II Kings, 22, 3 and 23, 23, the delivering of the funds for the repair of the temple to the carpenters, builders, and masons who were to perform this work, the accomplishment of the work of repair, the finding of the book of the law, the reading of the book by Shaphan, the scribe, and before the king, the con-

his campaign in 701 it was still 702 in Judah. Thus the fourteenth year of Hezekiah fell in 702. Consequently his second year was 715 and the year of his accession 716. This was the year in which Ahaz died. Ahaz, according to 2 Kings, 16, 2 reigned sixteen years, 731-716. In his reign came the attack of Rezin and Pekah by reason of which Ahaz called in the help of Tiglathpileser III<sup>604</sup>), who thus came to Damascus in 733-732<sup>605</sup>), where Ahaz waited upon him<sup>606</sup>). Therefore in those years Ahaz was fully in power and must have been coregent with Jotham. This he must have become in 735, for Ahaz became king in the seventeenth year of Pekah<sup>607</sup>), Pekah's seventeenth year was 735. Jotham came into power in Pekah's second year<sup>608</sup>) and reigned for sixteen years<sup>609</sup>). He was then sole ruler because his father Ahaziah, although still alive, was cut off from society, owing to his leprosy. The second year of Pekah was 750, so Jotham reigned from 750 to 735. But he still had a share in sovereignty after that, because Hoshea came into power in the twentieth year of Jotham<sup>610</sup>), that is, in 732. If we collate 2 Kings, 16, 5-10 with Is. 7, 1-16 and Is. 8, 1-4, the data of the Assyrian Chronicle of Eponyms<sup>611</sup>) and the annals of Tiglathpileser III<sup>612</sup>), we again reach the year 735 for Ahaz. But we have the reign of Ahaz given as sixteen years, of which the last year was 716; therefore Ahaz began to be sole ruler in 731, the years 735-731 being the time of a coregency which the author has not reckoned in with Ahaz' years. Therefore the total of Ahaz' regnal years was not sixteen, but twenty. Jotham reigned for twelve years during the lifetime of his father Azariah (750-739), four years alone (739-735) and four years together with Ahaz (735-732). An indication of the fact that Jotham was sole king for at least three years is found in 2 Chron., 27, 5, where we are told that he won a victory over the Ammonites and that they paid him tribute. The Ammonites had already been paying tribute to his father Azariah<sup>612a</sup>). It is possible that they rebelled at Azariah's death and ceased to pay tribute, but Jotham reconquered them and forced them to pay it at the beginning of his sole kingship. The fact that Jotham is described as a strong ruler<sup>613</sup>) but that the Ammonites are said to have paid him tribute for three years only indicates that he ruled only three or four years and that Ahaz was then called to the throne. If Jotham followed the political measures of his father Azariah, as was probably the case, then he was not favourably disposed towards Assyria. Tiglathpileser was in the north-west again in the years 736-735 in the neighbourhood of Mt. Nal and Urartu and constituted a threat to Syria and Palestine. Pressure on King Jotham from a pro-Assyrian group in Judah to create friendly relations and the threat from Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel may have given occasion for Jotham to retire in favour of Ahaz, who was for cooperation with Assyria<sup>614</sup>).

sultation with Huldah the prophetess, the gathering of the elders of Judah to Jerusalem to hear the reading of the law, the destruction of the vessels of Baal, the putting-down of the idolatrous priests, the breaking down of the houses of the sodomites, the defilement of the high places from Geba to Beer-sheba, the destruction of the emblems of the sun-god, the desolation of the altar and high places at Bethel, the doing-away with all the houses of the high places in the cities of Samaria, and the slaying of the idolatrous priests—if all this could have been performed in the short period of two weeks between the first and the fourteenth of Nisan, then there would be no evidence here for the beginning of the regnal year with Tishri I. But since it is quite clear that all the above events could not have taken place in a two-week period, it is evident that Josiah's eighteenth year of reign must have commenced before the first of Nisan and carried over beyond Nisan I, and that Tishri I must thus have been the beginning of the regnal year. Furthermore, it is clear from Neh., 1, 1 and 2, 1 that Nehemiah reckoned the years of the Persian King Artaxerxes

from Tishri to Tishri, for a certain month Kislev fell within the twentieth year of the king, and the following Nisan was still in the same twentieth year. But why would Nehemiah do this, when it was the custom in Persia to reckon the year from Nisan to Nisan? Is it not reasonable to suppose that Nehemiah was acquainted with the custom formerly followed by the king of Judah to begin their regnal years with Tishri and, in a spirit of intense nationalism, applied the customary Jewish practice even to a Persian King?" (THEILE, *o.c.*, p. 32).

<sup>604</sup>) II Kings, 16, 7-9.

<sup>605</sup>) II R, 67.

<sup>606</sup>) II Kings, 16, 10-13.

<sup>607</sup>) II Kings, 16, 1.

<sup>608</sup>) II Kings, 15, 32.

<sup>609</sup>) II Kings, 15, 33.

<sup>610</sup>) II Kings, 15, 30.

<sup>611</sup>) Ch I, 26-46.

<sup>612</sup>) WINCKLER, *Textbuch*, pp. 31 ff.

<sup>612a</sup>) II Chron., 26, 8.

<sup>613</sup>) II Chron., 27, 6.

<sup>614</sup>) II Kings, 16, 5-20.

Hoshea came to the throne of Israel in the twentieth year of Jotham of Judah <sup>615</sup>). Jotham's twentieth year was 732, consequently Hoshea's first full year was 731. He reigned nine years <sup>616</sup>), 731-723. In his ninth year Samaria was taken by Salmanasser v <sup>617</sup>). Salmanasser went against Samaria in Hoshea's seventh year <sup>618</sup>). He began the siege of Samaria, and though it is not expressly stated that he took it, still the narrative gives the impression that the same king who began the siege continued it to the end and until the fall of the city. This is further confirmed by the Babylonian chronicle, which says, "On the twenty-first of Tebet Salmanasser set himself on the throne; he laid Samaria waste" <sup>619</sup>). But Sargon his brother also claims the devastation of Samaria for himself <sup>620</sup>). The Chronicle of Eponyms is in bad condition here, but can none the less be brought into agreement with the other data <sup>621</sup>). The year of the accession of Salmanasser v is 727, when Tiglathpileser III died. In his first full year, 726, he stayed at home. In the three years following, 725, 724 and 723, he made an expedition against a place the name of which is broken away, but which in agreement with the rest of the data can be supplied as being Samaria. It thus is certain that Salmanasser v took Samaria and that was no doubt in 723. But it is possible that his brother Sargon also took the city, though not as king but as his brother's officer. If Sargon had really taken Samaria and ended the war, he would assuredly have mentioned it at the beginning of his reign and not merely at the end, as in fact happened. The Chronicle of Eponyms has under 722, the first year of Sargon, "*limmu* of Urta-ilia", with a note which is broken away but can be restored with a large measure of certainty as referring to the demolition of the temple of Nabu previous to its restoration. In 721 Nabu-tariš was *limmu*, with a broken note which also can be restored as referring to the entrance of Nabu into the reconstructed temple <sup>622</sup>). Furthermore, in Sargon's *limmu*-chronicle there is not a word about any expedition against Samaria. If he had taken Samaria, he certainly would have mentioned it in the first years. Again in the annals of his first years nothing is said about it, but only in the Khorsabad text under the fifteenth and sixteenth years of his reign, that is at the very end of it <sup>623</sup>). Therefore we may conclude that the claim of Sargon to have taken Samaria is probably right in this sense, that he took Samaria in that part of his accession year that is still attributed to his brother Salmanasser v, who was then king and in this way the conqueror of Samaria, while his brother Sargon was his general.

Thus we have arrived at a continuous and consistent chronology for Israel and Judah which is in agreement with the contemporary history of the surrounding countries and especially of Assyria, for which we have an absolutely fixed chronology for this period, in which nothing needs adjustment, thanks to the *limmu*-lists which have been preserved to us and by which we are in a position to fix the reigns of the kings year by year <sup>624</sup>). The three outstanding points in this contemporary history are, the campaign and siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701, the siege of Samaria by Salmanasser v in 723 and the expedition of Tiglathpileser III against Philistia and Damascus in 734-732. The point of departure is the third campaign of Sennacherib and the siege of Jerusalem in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah <sup>625</sup>). By this we are in a position to reckon the year of Hezekiah's accession as 716, which is Ahaz's last year. He reigned sixteen years and therefore came to the throne in 732 <sup>626</sup>). The siege of Samaria and its fall to Salmanasser v was in 723 and made an end of the reign of Hoshea <sup>627</sup>). He reigned for nine years <sup>628</sup>), and therefore came to the throne in 732, the last year of Pekah. This agrees with the statement of Tiglathpileser that he had put Hoshea

<sup>615</sup>) II Kings, 15, 30.

<sup>616</sup>) II Kings, 17, 2.

<sup>617</sup>) II Kings, 17, 3-6; 18, 9-11.

<sup>618</sup>) II Kings, 18, 9.

<sup>619</sup>) CT 34, pl. 47, col. I, 27-28.

<sup>620</sup>) WINKLER, *Textbuch*, pp. 37 ff.

<sup>621</sup>) Ch 3, 6-10, RLA 2, 1938, p. 432.

<sup>622</sup>) Rm 2, 97, PSBA XI 268; LUCKENMILL, *Ancient Records* II, p. 137.

<sup>623</sup>) A. G. LIE, *The Inscriptions of Sargon II,*

*King of Assyria*, I, p. 5; LUCKENMILL, *o.c.*, II, pp. 45-47; A. T. OLMSTEAD, *The Text of Sargon's Annals*, American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures XLVII, 1931, p. 263.

<sup>624</sup>) RLA 2, 1938, pp. 412-457.

<sup>625</sup>) I R, 37-42; D. D. LUCKENMILL, *The Annals of Sennacherib*, OIP 2, 1924; II Kings, 18, 13.

<sup>626</sup>) II Kings, 16, 2.

<sup>627</sup>) II Kings, 17, 1-6.

<sup>628</sup>) II Kings, 17, 2.

on the throne in Samaria <sup>629</sup>), and thus we get the date of Pekaḥ's last year and can reckon the year of his accession, since he reigned twenty years <sup>630</sup>). He therefore came to the throne in 752. This was also the year in which Menaḥem came to the throne, and thus we can establish the fact that Pekaḥ began to reckon his regnal years from the moment at which the house of Menaḥem acceded. Probably he wanted to put Šallum out of the way himself, but Menaḥem was beforehand with him, so that in his own mind he fancied himself king of Israel from that time on. This also puts us in a position, however, to calculate the accession of Jotham, for he came to the throne in the second year of Pekaḥ, 751 <sup>631</sup>). Officially, he reigned for sixteen years <sup>632</sup>), *i.e.*, till 735, but he was still alive in 732, for Hoshea of Israel came to the throne of that country in Jotham's twentieth year <sup>633</sup>). In this way we can also calculate the beginning of the reign of Aḥaz, for he came to the throne in the seventeenth year of Pekaḥ <sup>634</sup>), therefore in 735, which, as we have seen, was the sixteenth year of Jotham. Aḥaz's reign therefore was officially reckoned from the time when he became sole king, and Jotham's sixteen years from the moment when he came to the throne as coregent to the moment when Aḥaz became coregent with him.

In constructing this chronological system, four synchronisms have been left out of sight, which we must now examine. These synchronisms are 2 Kings, 17, 1; 18, 1, 9, 10. In the first of these passages we are told that Hoshea became king of Israel in the twelfth year of Aḥaz of Judah. The twelfth year of Aḥaz was 719, so that Hoshea came to the throne in 719, when Samaria had lain waste for four whole years. Hoshea, according to the Assyrian chronicles, was placed on the throne by Tiglathpileser, and was also a contemporary of Salmanasser v. These data, as we have seen, are absolutely fixed and must be assigned to their true date. Thus we find Hoshea, who was a contemporary of these two princes, put at a date after the deaths of both. The reason for this statement is that the author who produced this notice had not understood the real bearings of the reckoning of Pekaḥ's twenty years, but began to calculate them from the death of Pekahiah in 739, with the result that the twentieth year of Pekaḥ was put at 719. It is manifest that this cannot have happened to a chronicler of the time at which these kings lived, who consequently was their contemporary, but only to someone living much later, who no longer comprehended the real state of affairs and so admitted the above statement. The contemporary of these kings gave the true datum regarding Hoshea in 2 Kings, 15, 30. Once that was done it followed that Hezekiah, concerning whom official information was perhaps still to be had, was set down as coming to the throne in the third year of Hoshea <sup>635</sup>), so that the year in which Hezekiah acceded was 716, Hoshea's third year. From this it follows that Hezekiah's fourth year coincided with Hoshea's seventh, when Salmanasser v marched against Samaria <sup>636</sup>). The sixth year of Hezekiah was contemporaneous with the ninth of Hoshea, the year in which Samaria was conquered and an end made of the kingdom of Israel <sup>637</sup>). It is plain that this cannot be the account of a contemporary who have lived through the events, but the calculation of someone who lived much later, after the northern kingdom had long disappeared and nothing more was known of the exact relationships between Judah and Israel. We know from the Assyrian accounts, the exactness of which we have seen, that the third campaign of Sanherib and the siege of Jerusalem in Hezekiah's fourteenth year happened in 701. Thus the accession of Hezekiah occurred in 716 and his first complete year was 715. Owing to the fact that Samaria was taken in 723, Hezekiah can never have been a contemporary of Hoshea. The Old Testament is then remarkably silent as to relations between these two kings, which is the more noteworthy in view of the continual accounts of contacts between the two countries. Had there been any such contact in the days of Hezekiah, assuredly the Old Testament would have mentioned it. But also, the conditions which prevailed in the time of Hezekiah exclude the existence of Israel. One of Hezekiah's first actions when he

<sup>629</sup>) III R, 10, No. 2.

<sup>630</sup>) II Kings, 15, 27.

<sup>631</sup>) II Kings, 15, 32.

<sup>632</sup>) II Kings, 15, 33.

<sup>633</sup>) II Kings, 15, 30.

<sup>634</sup>) II Kings, 16, 1.

<sup>635</sup>) II Kings, 18, 1.

<sup>636</sup>) II Kings, 18, 9.

<sup>637</sup>) II Kings, 18, 10.



came to the throne was to open and restore the Temple in the first month of the first year <sup>638</sup>), and to announce a solemn celebration of the Passover <sup>639</sup>). This was held in the second month instead of in the first because there were not yet enough priests purified and the people had not yet been able to assemble at Jerusalem <sup>640</sup>). The decree for the celebration of the Passover was sent not only to places in Judah but also to Israel, namely to Ephraim, Manasseh and even Zebulun <sup>641</sup>). This district belonged to the northern kingdom, and it is unthinkable that messengers from the southern kingdom should have had free access to call up the people of the northern realm for the celebration of the Passover at Jerusalem. That is clear from what happened at the restoration of the Temple under Joaš, when Israel still existed. Joaš sent decrees only to places in Judah <sup>642</sup>), whereas Hezekiah sent his from Beersheba to Dan <sup>643</sup>), which was the boundary of the kingdom in the time of David and Solomon, before the northern kingdom split off <sup>644</sup>). The letters which Hezekiah sent were sent to the remnant of the people who had escaped the hands of the Assyrians. He urged them to repent and come to the sanctuary in Jerusalem, because Yahweh would turn his face towards them and cause their brethren to find compassion from the Assyrians <sup>645</sup>). There was a great attendance from Asher, Manasseh, Ephraim, Issachar and Zebulun, so that there never had been such a Passover celebrated, not even in the days of Solomon. After it was over, they went around the whole country of Judah and Benjamin, Manasseh and Ephraim to break the idols in pieces <sup>646</sup>). Such a thing could occur only at a time when there was no longer any political separation. No king of Israel would have allowed anything of the sort to happen, and certainly not the last king of Israel. The reason alleged for the fall of Israel was that the people had gone over to idolatry. This reason would have been totally out of place had there been such an enthusiastic outburst of piety in Israel with the consent of its king. But when the kingdom of Israel had disappeared and thus all hindrances were removed, it is perfectly explicable. It can therefore be perfectly well put in the first year of Hezekiah if he reigned after the fall of the northern kingdom. Moreover, traces should be found of anti-Assyrian sentiment on the part of Hezekiah if he was king at a date when the Assyrians were already in the country, at the time of the siege of Samaria and its fall. That Judah at that time was left in peace when the Assyrians were at its gates shows that a pro-Assyrian policy was pursued there, for otherwise the Assyrians, who wanted to get the whole of the east in their power, would have taken the little country while they were there. This pro-Assyrian king can be no one but Ahaz, who, together with the high priest, adopted a conciliatory attitude <sup>647</sup>). Thus the whole situation is distorted by the introduction of this datum, which must therefore be rejected as false <sup>648</sup>). But if we start from the fixed point, the year 701, all can be straightforwardly explained.

We have seen that Hezekiah came to the throne in 716. He reigned twenty-nine years <sup>649</sup>), from 715 to 687. Since Israel was no longer in existence we no longer possess any synchronism for these two countries, which has been of such great assistance to us in constructing a sound absolute Biblical chronology. The only synchronism that still remains is that between Assyria and Babylonia. Therefore we must try if we can find a synchronism with one of these two countries, or with both. The first synchronism that we find is that between the fourth year of Jehoiakim and the first year of Nabukudururşur (Nebuchadnezzar) <sup>650</sup>). The first full year of Jehoiakim was therefore 607 and the year of his accession was 608. He was installed by Pharaoh Nekao, who reigned from 609 to 594. In the year of his accession he made an expedition to the Euphrates to restore the old Asiatic empire of Egypt <sup>651</sup>). Josiah,

<sup>638</sup>) II Kings, 18, 1-8; II Chron., 29, 3-17.

<sup>639</sup>) II Chron., 30, 1-27.

<sup>640</sup>) II Chron., 30, 2.

<sup>641</sup>) II Chron., 30, 1-14.

<sup>642</sup>) II Chron., 24, 1-14.

<sup>643</sup>) II Chron., 30, 5.

<sup>644</sup>) I Chron., 21, 2.

<sup>645</sup>) II Chron., 30, 6-10.

<sup>640</sup>) II Chron., 31, 1.

<sup>647</sup>) II Kings, 16, 10-16.

<sup>648</sup>) E. R. THIELE, *o.c.*, pp. 90-152.

<sup>649</sup>) II Kings, 18, 2; II Chron., 29, 1.

<sup>650</sup>) Jer., 25, 1; R. A. PARKER and W. H. DUBBERSTEIN, *Babylonian Chronology, 626 B.C.-A.D. 45*, 1942, p. 9.

<sup>651</sup>) II Kings, 30, 29.

king of Judah, chose the Assyrian side and marched out against him. He was defeated at Megiddo in 608<sup>652</sup>). The people of Judah appointed his son Jehoahaz king. Aššurballit, who after the death of the second son and successor of Aššurbanipal had got together the remnants of the defeated Assyrian force and had been in conflict with the Babylonians for over three years, came into contact with the Egyptian army at Harran<sup>653</sup>). The siege of Harran lasted three months. On his return after these three months, Pharaoh Necho deposed Jehoahaz, probably because he had been appointed by the people and he preferred to have someone on the throne whom he could trust and whom he had himself appointed. He put Eliakim, another son of Jošiah, on the throne and altered his name to Jehoiakim<sup>654</sup>). All this took place in 608, the first full year of Necho. The conflict remained indecisive and it seems that both the Babylonians and the Egyptians exercised authority in Palestine, for in the third year of Jehoiakim Nabukudurūšur made an expedition into that country<sup>655</sup>). This campaign therefore took place in 605. In this connection there exists an important piece of evidence from Berossos, which is preserved for us by Josephus<sup>656</sup>). Nabu-apal-ušur heard that a governor whom he had appointed over the west was in rebellion. He sent his son Nabukudurūšur to put down the revolt and bring the west under his power again. Nabukudurūšur quelled the rebellion, took the rebel prisoner and brought him back to Babylon. In the middle of the campaign he heard that his father had died and went back to Babylon to take possession of the throne. The prisoners he had taken were Jews, Syrians, Phoenicians and Egyptians. This happened in 605, for the latest tablets of Nabu-apal-ušur are of 11/6/21, that is May 16, 605, v/1/21 (Aug. 8, 605), and the first two tablets of Nabukudurūšur are of 1v/-/accession (the fourth month ended on Aug. 7, 605) and vi/12/acc. (Sept. 18, 605)<sup>657</sup>). Hence 605 is the year in which Nabukudurūšur came to the throne, while 604 was the first complete year of his reign. After the expedition of Necho II in 608 no immediate pursuit of the Egyptians took place, as is clear from Necho having still time to depose Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim. But later on the Babylonians must again have got the power into their hands, since they appointed a governor. Necho tried a second time to become definitely the master of Palestine and Syria. He was totally defeated and Nabukudurūšur established his power over the west once and for all, from the river of Egypt to the Euphrates<sup>658</sup>). The fourth year of Jehoiakim was the twenty-third since Jeremiah was called to be prophet in the thirteenth year of Jošiah, 626<sup>659</sup>). Jošiah was king for thirty-one years, 637-608.

From the death of Hezekiah in 687 to the first year of Nabukudurūšur in 604 is eighty-three years. Between the death of Hezekiah and the fourth year of Jehoiakim the following princes ruled in Judah: Manaššeh, fifty-five years, Amon, two years, Jošiah, thirty-one years, Jehoahaz, three months, Jehoiakim, four years; in all ninety-two years and three months. This is nine years and three months more than the real interval between Hezekiah's death and Nabukudurūšur's first year. So a coregency of one of the kings of Judah must have taken place somewhere. A coregency of Jehoiakim and Jehoahaz is out of the question, because the latter was deposed by the Pharaoh and Jehoiakim installed. Again, there can be no question of a coregency of Jošiah and Jehoahaz, for Jošiah died on the battlefield and the people elected Jehoahaz. The predecessor of Jošiah was Amon, who reigned but two years<sup>660</sup>). If Jošiah had been coregent with Amon, this would have been for two years only, since that was the entire length of the reign. Jošiah however was not set on the throne by his father but by the people, after his father had been murdered by a conspiracy; so we may safely assume that Jošiah never occupied the post of coregent. His father Amon reigned for two years<sup>661</sup>). 639-638; had he been a coregent, that would have been for two years at most, for that is the

<sup>652</sup>) II Kings, 30, 29.

<sup>653</sup>) C. J. GADD, *The Fall of Nineveh*, 1923, p. 41.

<sup>654</sup>) II Kings, 23, 34.

<sup>655</sup>) *Dan.*, 1, 1.

<sup>656</sup>) FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Contra Appion*, I, 132-139; *Antiquitates*, X, 219-223.

<sup>657</sup>) R. PARKER and W. H. DUBBERSTEIN, *Baby-*

*lonian Chronology*, 1941, p. 9; A. GOETZE, *Additions to Parker and Dubberstein's Babylonian Chronology*, JNES 3, 1944, pp. 43 ff.

<sup>658</sup>) *Jer.*, 46, 2; II Kings, 24, 7.

<sup>659</sup>) *Jer.*, 25, 1-3.

<sup>660</sup>) II Kings, 21, 19; II Chron., 33, 21.

<sup>661</sup>) II Kings, 21, 19; II Chron., 33, 21.

whole duration of his reign, and then he would have had no independent kingship at all. The only person remaining is Manaššeh, who reigned for fifty-five years<sup>662</sup>). His last year was 640, therefore he came to the throne in 694. The last year of Ḥezekiah was 687, so that Manaššeh was coregent for eight years and reigned alone from 686 to 640.

Jehoiakim reigned for eleven years<sup>663</sup>), 607-597. He was succeeded by Jehoiakin, who reigned but three months, when Nabukudurušur in his eighth year took him to Babylon 597<sup>664</sup>). He was succeeded by Zedekiah, who reigned for eleven years<sup>665</sup>). His reign began in 597; the next year, 596, was therefore his first full year. He rose in rebellion against Nabukudurušur, and the latter moved against Zedekiah in that prince's ninth year<sup>666</sup>). In the following year, Zedekiah's tenth therefore, Jeremiah was imprisoned by the king in Nabukudurušur's eighteenth year<sup>667</sup>). In his nineteenth year, Nabukudurušur took Jerusalem. That was Zedekiah's eleventh year. The nineteenth year of Nabukudurušur was 586, therefore Jerusalem fell in 586 and Zedekiah was king from 596 to 586<sup>668</sup>). We now possess a fixed, closed and absolute chronology for the kings of Judah and Israel, and for this result we have to thank E. R. THIELE, who in his masterly work, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, has found the key to the riddle of the Biblical figures.

<sup>662</sup>) II Kings, 21, 1; II Chron., 33, 1.

<sup>663</sup>) II Kings, 23, 36; II Chron., 36, 5.

<sup>664</sup>) II Kings, 24, 8; II Chron. 36, 9.

<sup>665</sup>) II Kings 24, 18; II Chron. 36, 11; Jer. 52 1.

<sup>666</sup>) II Kings, 25, 1; Jer. 39, 1; 52, 4; Hezekiel, 24, 1-2.

<sup>667</sup>) Jer., 32, 1.

<sup>668</sup>) II Kings, 25, 2-13; Jer., 39, 2; 52, 5-12.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### EGYPT

Although Egypt does not belong to West Asia but entirely to Africa, both geographically and culturally, yet there are so many synchronistic points of contact from both sides that it was closely associated with West Asia. We must therefore investigate these points of contact if we are to construct a synchronistic history, for the princes who came into contact with one another must have been contemporaneous. By doing so we automatically get the difference in time intervening between various kings of Egypt. It is no part of my purpose to investigate the enormous mass of literature in order to establish the length of the reign of each sovran, nor to examine the intricate question of the length of their coregencies. That is the Egyptologists' business. The only task we have at present is to give the lapse of time between the kings who came into contact with Asia. To do that, we must start from a fixed point.

The first fixed datum which we meet with is, as we have seen, the relations between Nekaö and Jošiah, Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim of Judah. As regards Jehoiakim of Judah, we know that his fourth year coincided with the first year of Nabukuduruşur<sup>669</sup>). That year was 604, hence the first year of Jehoiakim was 607. He came to the throne in 608, the year in which Jehoahaz was deposed by Nekaö<sup>670</sup>). Jehoahaz had reigned but three months after his father Jošiah fell on the battlefield of Megiddo<sup>671</sup>). All this happened during one and the same campaign of Nekaö, which he undertook in the first year after he had ascended the throne. Since he undertook this expedition in 608, he came to the throne in 609. That was also the year in which his predecessor died. Now, thanks to the Apis stelae, we can calculate the length of his predecessor Psammeticus I's reign. An Apis-bull died on the sixth day of the second month of the sixteenth year of Nekaö. This Apis died at the age of sixteen years, seven months and seventeen days. Nekaö had reigned fifteen years, one month and six days when this Apis died. If now we subtract that figure from the length of the Apis' life, we have one year, six months and eleven days over. That is the length of time that it lived under Psammeticus I. It was born in the fifty-third year of Psammeticus I and installed in his fifty-fourth year<sup>672</sup>). This gives us exactly the year and a half which the Apis lived under Psammeticus I, therefore Psammeticus I reigned for fifty-four years, 663-609. Another Apis stele states that an Apis was born in the twenty-sixth year of Taharqa and died in the twentieth year of Psammeticus<sup>673</sup>). This Apis therefore lived more than twenty-one years, of which twenty were under the reign of Psammeticus I and one year under Taharqa. Taharqa died in 664. Another Apis stele mentions the death of an Apis in the twenty-fourth year of Taharqa, so that from these two stelae we may conclude that Taharqa reigned twenty-six years, 689-664. According to 2 Kings, 19, 8, Taharqa (Tirhakah) made war on Sanherib<sup>674</sup>). We know that Sanherib besieged Jerusalem in his campaign of 701<sup>675</sup>). Can Taharqa have been in command when he clashed with Sanherib, or was it not till later that he set out against him? The predecessor of Taharqa was Šabataqa, who reigned fourteen years. Now the date at which he began to reign depends on the date at which he died. Taharqa states in his stele of the sixth year that he was crowned king after the Hawk, *i.e.*, Šabataqa.

<sup>669</sup>) *Jer.*, 25, 1.

<sup>670</sup>) *II Kings*, 23, 31-34.

<sup>671</sup>) *II Kings*, 23, 29-33.

<sup>672</sup>) PIEHL, *Inscriptions Hiéroglyphiques*, I, XXI A ;  
CHASSINAT, *Rec. Trav.* 22, 1900, p. 21.

<sup>673</sup>) MARIETTE, *Le Sérapéum de Memphis*, III,

pl. 36; CHASSINAT, *Rec. Trav.* 22, 1900, p. 19;  
BREASTED, *Anc. Rec.*, IV, 959-962.

<sup>674</sup>) *II Kings*, 19, 9.

<sup>675</sup>) LUCKENBILL, *The Annals of Sennacherib*.  
OIP 2, 1924; *II Kings*, 18, 13; *Isa.*, 36, 1.

had flown away to heaven<sup>676</sup>). He states that four marvels occurred in his sixth year, one of which was that he was crowned king, although there were several others who apparently had better claims to the throne. He was still young when he and his royal brothers were summoned to the north by his brother, King Šabataqa, who exalted him above them all. He was twenty years old when he came to Egypt<sup>677</sup>). That he was crowned king at Memphis in his sixth year can mean nothing else than that he had been for six years coregent with his brother Šabataqa. If we subtract from his reign therefore the six years during which he was coregent, Šabataqa must have died in 684, and this is the year in which Taḥarqa came to the throne. Šabataqa reigned for fourteen years and therefore his accession was in 697. Taḥarqa became coregent in 689, and was twenty years old when he left his mother and moved to Lower Egypt with the king. Now the question is, when did Taḥarqa remove to Egypt? Was it in the year when he became coregent, or when his brother Šabataqa became king? The latter came to the throne in 697 and occupied it for fourteen years. Now he was crowned in his third year, hence he was coregent with Šabaqa for two years and therefore began to be sole ruler in 695<sup>678</sup>). If Taḥarqa came to Egypt in that year, he was born in 715; but if he did not arrive there till he became coregent with his brother Šabataqa, then he was born in 710. That is the year in which his father Piankhi died. Šabaqa reigned fifteen years<sup>679</sup>), consequently, as he died in 696, his accession was in 710. Be this as it may, whether Taḥarqa was born in 715 or 710, in either case he must have been too young to have been general in 701 of the Egyptian army against Sanḥerib. But he is definitely named as having acted against Sanḥerib. This therefore must have been during the time when he was coregent, for it must have occurred while Ḥezekiah was still alive, and he died in 687. So we must assume a second campaign of Sanḥerib against Ḥezekiah.

Šabaqa was determined to bring all Egypt, which was nominally subject to him, under his real control. He marched to Egypt and established himself at Memphis. He captured Bocchoris, who according to Manetho and the documents had reigned for six years, and burned him alive, according to Manetho. Bocchoris was king for six years, 714-709. In his sixth year an Apis-bull died<sup>680</sup>). The length of its life is not given, but can be reckoned with probability. No Apis is mentioned under his predecessor Tefnakht. The first one to be mentioned before Bocchoris is of the thirty-seventh year of Sheshonq v. Tefnakht reigned for ten years, 724-715. When he came to the throne he resolved to subdue all Egypt under himself. He began by conquering the western Delta, then the eastern Delta. He deposed Sheshonq v, the last prince of the twenty-second dynasty, who had ruled all Egypt; this was probably in 724. He reigned, according to the monuments, thirty-seven years, and it is possible that he reigned a year longer, hence we can date him at 761-724. Thus his thirty-seventh year, in which an Apis-bull died, is 725. The death of the following Apis, which had lived therefore sixteen years, was 709. The Apis which died in Sheshonq v's thirty-seventh year was twenty-six years old and so was born in Sheshonq v's eleventh year. It was the second Apis-bull after the one which died in the second year of Pami; the Apis after that one was buried in the eleventh year of Sheshonq v<sup>681</sup>). Pami reigned, according to the monuments, six years, 767-762. That Apis therefore was sixteen years old, and the one which died in the second year of Pami was twenty-six<sup>682</sup>). Consequently it had lived twenty-four years under Pami's predecessor, Sheshonq III. The predecessor of this Apis died in the twenty-eighth year of Sheshonq III, therefore the latter was king for fifty-two years, 819-768. This was the first Apis-stele, and thus we are now at the end of our auxiliary for establishing a fixed chronology. Therefore we must look about for another auxiliary, and we find it in the *hb-šd* festival.

<sup>676</sup>) M. F. LAMING MACADAM, *The Temples of Kawa. I The Inscriptions*. Text, 1949 v, 15; J. M. A. JANSSEN, *Que Sait-on Actuellement du Pharaon Taḥarqa?*, *Biblica* 35, 1953, p. 29.

<sup>677</sup>) LAMING MACADAM, *o.c.*, p. 17; JANSSEN, *o.c.*, p. 20.

<sup>678</sup>) JANSSEN, *o.c.*, pp. 23-40; DRIOTON-VANDIER,

*Les Peuples de l'Orient Méditerranéen*, II, *L'Égypte*, pp. 540-542.

<sup>679</sup>) DRIOTON-VANDIER, *o.c.*, p. 541.

<sup>680</sup>) MARIETTE, *o.c.*, pl. 34.

<sup>681</sup>) La Stèle d'Harpésou, DRIOTON-VANDIER, *o.c.*, p. 540.

<sup>682</sup>) DRIOTON-VANDIER, *o.c.*, p. 540.

Whatever the origin and significance of the *hb-šd* festival may have been, this much is certain, that it was celebrated every thirty years. It is however not the jubilee for the thirtieth year of a prince's reign, although as it happens some princes who celebrated a *hb-šd* festival did so in their thirtieth years. That it was not a jubilee for the thirtieth regnal year is plain from the fact that even sovrans who ruled for more than thirty years yet celebrated that festival before their thirtieth, while others who did not reign for thirty years nevertheless also celebrated a *hb-šd* festival, because thirty years had elapsed since the former one was held. It is a festival celebrated every thirty years, as the Jewish jubilee was every fifty. Among the Jews, nothing might be sown nor reaped that year, but they might eat anything which grew of itself. Furthermore, all land and houses which had been alienated or pledged reverted to the original owners; all Israelitish slaves were set free, and debts were cancelled. These regulations were based on the idea that Yahweh was the owner of the land and its inhabitants<sup>683</sup>). Whether this was the case with the *hb-šd* festival is for Egyptologists to investigate. But it is a festival which was held every thirty years and had nothing to do with the thirtieth regnal year of any king. The protective character which seems to mark this festival comes out in the words of the inhabitants of Hermopolis to Piankhi, "Celebrate a *hb-šd* festival for us, even as you have protected the Hare nome"<sup>684</sup>). However this may be, it is a festival which was held every thirty years from the oldest times of the Middle Kingdom down to the days of the Ptolemies, as is clear from its Greek name, τριακονταετηρίς<sup>685</sup>). The Rosetta stone calls the king κύριος τριακονταετηρίδων, because he had celebrated a *hb-šd* festival. If therefore we can find a fixed date for a *hb-šd* festival in later times, we can by reckoning thirty years at a time back from it construct a settled chronology on the base of it. A fixed date is given us in the twenty-first year of Piankhi, when the inhabitants of Hermopolis petitioned him to hold a *hb-šd* feast. That happened in 720<sup>686</sup>). The next celebration of a *hb-šd* festival which is known to us comes in the twenty-second year of Osorkon II<sup>687</sup>). He was a contemporary of Ahab, for in his palace at Samaria an alabaster vase bearing the name of Osorkon II was found. Ahab reigned from 874 to 853; we must therefore seek a *hb-šd* festival of about the time within which the twenty-second year of Osorkon II can fall. As a fixed date for a *hb-šd* festival we have the twenty-first year of Piankhi, 720; thus we get the following series of *hb-šd* festivals: 720, 750, 780, 810, 840. That was Osorkon's twenty-second year, and therefore he began his reign in 861. His reign therefore falls partly within the reign of Ahab. The walls of the Jubilee house are decorated with reliefs. Under the throne of Osorkon II is written, "All lands, all regions, Upper Retenu, Lower Retenu, all inaccessible districts are under the feet of the good god"<sup>688</sup>). We find another synchronism in the fifth year of Rehoboam, when Sheshonq I (Shishak) marched against Palestine. Unfortunately, the year in which he did so is not known. Rehoboam came to the throne in 932, so that 931 was his first complete year and 927 his fifth year. Sheshonq I, according to Manetho's account, the calculation of ROWTON<sup>689</sup>) and that of ALBRIGHT<sup>690</sup>), began to reign in 935, so that his reign is partly contemporaneous with Rehoboam's. The next *hb-šd* festival known to us is in the twenty-ninth year of Ramses III<sup>691</sup>). We now get, reckoning from the twenty-second year of Osorkon II, the following series: 870, 900, 930, 960, 990, 1020, 1050, 1080, 1110, 1140. That is the twenty-ninth year of Ramses III, therefore the beginning of his reign came in 1168.

The next *hb-šd* festival is that of Ramses II. He celebrated a whole series of *hb-šd*

<sup>683</sup>) *Leviticus*, 25, 8-55; *Numeri*, 36, 4.

<sup>684</sup>) The Piankhi stela, BREASTED, *Ancient Records, Egypt*, IV, p. 429, No. 848.

<sup>685</sup>) ZÄS XXXVI, p. 64, Note 3.

<sup>686</sup>) The Piankhi stela, *o.c.*, p. 429, No. 816, Note b.

<sup>687</sup>) ED. NAVILLE, *The Festival Hall of Osorkon II, in the Great Temple of Bubastis*, 1887-1889, London, 1892, pl. 8: Serie: Tenth Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund.

<sup>688</sup>) BREASTED, *Ancient Records*, IV, p. 372.

<sup>689</sup>) M. B. ROWTON, *Journal Egyptian Archaeology* 34, 1948, pp. 57-74; M. B. ROWTON, *The Date of the Founding of Solomon's temple*, BASOR 119, 1950, pp. 20-22.

<sup>690</sup>) W. F. ALBRIGHT, *New Light from Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah*, BASOR 130, 1953, pp. 4-8.

<sup>691</sup>) *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 5, 1918, pp. 192-193.

festivals. The first of them which he held was that of his thirtieth year<sup>692</sup>). The others were repetitions of this, except that of his sixtieth year, which was again a feast of obligation. What the reason for these repetitions was is for Egyptologists to investigate. We will now see when these two *hb-šd* festivals came. There was a *hb-šd* festival in 1170, 1200, 1230; this must have been the *hb-šd* festival of his sixtieth year. The next was that of his thirtieth year, 1260, consequently he came to the throne in 1289. This is also about the year which Manetho gives and that computed by ROWTON<sup>693</sup>). The next *hb-šd* festival which is known to us is that of the thirtieth year of Amenophis III, with a repetition in his thirty-sixth year<sup>694</sup>). We must now see when this festival can be placed. The next *hb-šd* festival was in 1290, then follow 1320, 1350, 1380; this last must be the thirtieth year of Amenophis III, for we cannot put him further back nor later. Therefore he began to reign in 1409. The next *hb-šd* festival we have is that of Thoutmoses III in his thirty-third year<sup>695</sup>). The next *hb-šd* festivals were in 1410, 1440. This last must have been the thirty-third year of Thoutmoses III, so that he began his reign in 1473. The next *hb-šd* festival we have is that of Hatshepsut in his sixteenth year<sup>696</sup>). The next *hb-šd* festival was in 1470. This must have been the sixteenth year of Hatshepsut. After that we have to go back to Sesostris I of the twelfth dynasty for our first mention of a *hb-šd* festival<sup>697</sup>). In the interval comes the Hyksos period. Now the question arises when the Hyksos invasion occurred. We possess a stele of Ramses II in which mention is made of the four hundredth year from Opehtiset-Nubti, a Hyksos prince. But we do not know in which year of Ramses II this stele erected<sup>698</sup>). Ramses II began his reign in 1289, therefore this Hyksos prince must have lived after 1689.

We perhaps have a synchronism in a monument from Byblos of Khasekhemre'-Neferhotep of the thirteenth dynasty. He seems to have been a contemporary of Hammurabi, at least if Yantin, the prince of Byblos, can be identified with the Yantin-hammu of the Mari correspondence<sup>699</sup>). Neferhotep must thus have reigned about 1732. Before him the twelfth dynasty was in power, and pieces of that time have been found in the Syrian excavations, among other places at Ugarit, in the lowest part of level II, before Hammurabi's time. From this dynasty we probably have another synchronism, if at least Šumuabu of Babylon may be identified with Shmwibw of the Upper Šutu in the cursing-texts of the collection at Brussels. These belong to the time of Amenemhet III, as the cursing-texts on potsherds in the Berlin collection do to the days of Amenemhet I. Šumuabu, prince of the Upper Šutu, will then have seen his opportunity to capture Babylon in 1834. He was the founder of the Amorite dynasty. There was at that time a great Amorite movement which founded one Amorite state after another in Mesopotamia. They were also active in the west, where they gave the twelfth Egyptian dynasty much trouble, as is clear from the cursing-tablets which were made by sovereigns of that dynasty through fear, as they dreaded an Amorite rising. However, it was not till the time of the thirteenth dynasty that the Amorites succeeded in driving the Egyptians back and invading Egypt, where they are known under the name of Hyksos.

Sesostris celebrated the *hb-šd* festival in his thirty-first year. It was celebrated by Amenemhet; this must have been Amenemhet II. Since the latter celebrated the *hb-šd* festival for Sesostris I, he must at that time have had a share in Sesostris I's government, as coregent. We know that Sesostris reigned forty-four years. Sesostris I celebrated his *hb-šd* festival in the thirty-first year of his reign, and Amenemhet II was in charge of it as coregent. The last *hb-šd* festival which we have seen took place in 1470; consequently the following ones in ascending order must have been in 1500, 1530, 1560, 1590, 1620, 1650, 1680, 1710, 1740,

<sup>692</sup>) H. GAUTHIER, *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte*, Le Caire, 3, 1914, pp. 42-46.

<sup>693</sup>) M. B. ROWTON, *Manetho's Date for Rameses II*, The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 34, 1948, pp. 57-74.

<sup>694</sup>) H. GAUTHIER, *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte*, Le Caire, 2, 1912, pp. 310-312.

<sup>695</sup>) K. SETHE, *Urkunden*, IV, pp. 587-597.

<sup>696</sup>) K. SETHE, *Urkunden*, IV, p. 355.

<sup>697</sup>) H. GAUTHIER, *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte*, I, 1908, p. 278.

<sup>698</sup>) MONTET, *Kemi I*, p. 180.

<sup>699</sup>) BASOR 99, 1945, pp. 9-18.

1770, 1800, 1830, 1860, 1890 and 1920. 1920 must have been the year in which Sesostris I celebrated the *hb-šd* festival. The next *hb-šd* festival happened in 1950. This must have been the *hb-šd* festival of Amenemhet I<sup>700</sup>). The *hb-šd* festival before this one was celebrated in 1980 by Neb-tawi-re' = Mentuhotep V<sup>701</sup>) in his second year, which was in the same sense his last year. Amenemhet I followed him immediately with a reign of thirty years, so that he celebrated his *hb-šd* festival in his last year. It is therefore clear that Sesostris I was his coregent for one or two years and Amenemhet II was coregent of Sesostris I for a much longer time. Neb-tawi-re' therefore began his reign in 1981. The next *hb-šd* festival was celebrated in the thirty-ninth year of Neb-hepet-re'-Mentuhotep II<sup>702</sup>). He reigned for fifty-one years and therefore twelve years remain after the *hb-šd* festival. His successor Sa-Ankh-ka-re'-Mentuhotep III reigned for twelve years. This then makes twenty-four years. After this came a revolution which lasted for seven years, but after five years Neb-tawi-re'-Mentuhotep IV came to the throne. He had a troubled rule for two years longer, so there was unrest in Egypt for seven years altogether. But there are only five years between Mentuhotep III and Mentuhotep IV. Twenty-four and five make twenty-nine years. Add to this one year of Mentuhotep IV, which makes thirty; thus the *hb-šd* festival of Mentuhotep II preceded that of Mentuhotep IV and consequently was celebrated in 2010. That was Mentuhotep II's thirty-ninth year. In his ninth year he won the crowns of both parts of Egypt and united them under his rule after defeating Khety of the tenth dynasty. The *hb-šd* festival which preceded that of his thirty-ninth year must consequently have taken place in his ninth year, or the last year of Khety of the tenth dynasty, that is in 2040. Four princes of that dynasty, who ruled over a small territory, preceded him. These must have been contemporaneous with those of the ninth dynasty, for the Saqqara table mentions, after Pepi II, the last king of the sixth dynasty, the sovereigns of the eleventh. Thus the kings of the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth are omitted. According to another tradition, which has left its deposit in the Turin papyrus, the Old Kingdom ended with Pepi II and the Middle Kingdom began with the revolt of Meribre'-Khety I, the first king of the ninth dynasty. These two traditions can be brought into agreement with each other if the ninth and tenth dynasties ruled simultaneously with the beginning of the eleventh. It is an established fact that at the end of the sixth dynasty a part of Egypt was occupied by Asiatics. This was probably the eighth dynasty, for the seventh probably never existed<sup>703</sup>). This eighth dynasty then must have reigned contemporaneously with the ninth, the tenth and the first part of the eleventh. Its rule was in the western Delta, whereas the ninth and tenth bore sway in the north and the eleventh in the south. This period cannot have lasted long, for it included only four princes of the ninth and tenth dynasties and four of the eleventh. We have seen that there was a *hb-šd* festival in the last year of Khety III, or the ninth year of Nebhepetre'-Mentuhotep II, in 2040. The next *hb-šd* festival therefore came in 2070, under one of the kings of the tenth dynasty, and the one before that in 2100. The next *hb-šd* festival then came in 2130. That may have been the second *hb-šd* festival of Pepi II; his first therefore came in 2160<sup>704</sup>). Before him, Pepi I celebrated a *hb-šd* festival<sup>705</sup>), which therefore may have been in 2190. There are also various *hb-šd* festivals of the princes of the earlier dynasties known, but as we have no accurate account of the length of the various sovereigns' reigns, it is impossible to say in what year their *hb-šd* festival was held. But we see that calculation by the *hb-šd* festival gives a very good result. It is thus the business of Egypto-

<sup>700</sup>) H. GAUTHIER, *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte*, I, 1908, p. 253.

<sup>701</sup>) JEA 26, 1940, p. 118; JNES 2, 1943, p. 282; H. E. WINLOCK, *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes*, New York, 1947, p. 55.

<sup>702</sup>) JEA 26, 1940, p. 118; E. NAVILLE, *The XIth Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari*, London, I, 1907, p. 40; H. E. WINLOCK, *The Rise and Fall*

*of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes*, New York, 1947, pl. 37; A<sup>1</sup>SL 57, 1940, pp. 137-161.

<sup>703</sup>) DRIOTON-VANDIER, *o.c.*, p. 215.

<sup>704</sup>) H. GAUTHIER, *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte*, Le Caire, I, 1908, p. 171; SETHE, *Urkunden*, I, pp. 114-115.

<sup>705</sup>) H. GAUTHIER, *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte*, Le Caire, I, 1908, pp. 151-154; SETHE, *Urkunden*, I, pp. 96-97.



logists to search in public and private collections to see if any more *hb-šd* festivals are recorded with a mention of the regnal year in which a king celebrated them, in order to get a complete list of these festivals and be in a position to construct a fixed chronology of the Egyptian kings.

As we have no further chronological data at our disposal, we must see if archaeology can take us any further. If there are found in Egypt and in a particular archaeological context objects which are not native to the country but can be proved to belong to the culture of West Asia, where they can be set in their own archaeological environment and probably at a definite point in the scheme of relative chronology, then we are in a position to bring the archaeological context in which they were found into a relation of contemporaneity with the West Asian scheme of time. At all events, these objects which are at home in West Asia cannot occur in Egypt earlier than in West Asia, the district of their origin. But also they cannot occur much later, because the same people who made the objects also used and exported them, hence they generally were distributed during the same generation.

The earliest synchronism of Egypt with West Asia was in the Late Palaeolithic period, when instruments of the middle Aurignacian from the stone industry of Palestine were related to the Egyptian industry <sup>706</sup>). A second synchronism can be established during the Mesolithic epoch, when the industry of Wady En-Natuf in Palestine was found at Helwan in Egypt <sup>707</sup>).

For the following period, Miss KANTOR has collected the material in so far as it relates to pottery <sup>708</sup>). Some traits of the culture of Merimde Benê Salâme resemble those of Teleilat Ghassul. But these are merely accidental resemblances, such as for instance decorations, either a row of little impressions around the edge or applied half-moons and knobs, which are found in Merimde Benê Salâme and at Teleilat Ghassul alike. But these are found everywhere in primitive pottery and they are of too general a character to be used as characteristic marks for correlation <sup>709</sup>). A possible connection might perhaps be seen in the tall hollow foot of a phiala, considering the rarity of types having a foot in Egypt and their commonness in Palestine <sup>710</sup>). Although this might be a point of contact, yet generally speaking they are too general and too few to prove a direct connection. More and better points of contact are met with during the Naqada II period and during the Old Kingdom.

From S.D. 63 in the Naqada II period down to the middle of the Old Kingdom, a limited number of shapes of vases, decorations, objects and techniques are met with which have a foreign character and are not at home in the Egyptian culture. They usually continue for but a short time, which indicates their foreign origin, by reason of which they were not received into Egyptian culture. To this group belongs first of all the pottery. In the Naqada II culture vases were found with curved handles. These curved handles constitute the characteristic criterion of their shape. They were the starting-point from which Flinders PETRIE began to construct his S.D. series and by so doing was in a position to frame a relative chronology, because they form a typological development from wide, paunchy jugs with markedly curved handles at the greatest width of the jug to gradually smaller jugs whose handle becomes an ornament, until it ends in a miserable row of knobs <sup>711</sup>). The latest types are of almost cylindrical shape, with or without knobs; they are met with in some datable graves of the first dynasty <sup>712</sup>). As the Egyptians, for some reason unknown to us, rejected all handles on their earthenware, these handles are unknown in that country. This is the impression which the whole conspectus of the pottery from the beginning of prehistory to

<sup>706</sup>) D. A. E. GARROD, *The Stone Age of Mount Carmel*, I, pp. 44-49.

<sup>707</sup>) GARROD, *o.c.*, p. 91.

<sup>708</sup>) H. J. KANTOR, *The Early Relations of Egypt with Asia*, JNES I, 1942, pp. 174-213; II, 1952, pp. 230-250.

<sup>709</sup>) KANTOR, *o.c.*, p. 175, Note 7.

<sup>710</sup>) KANTOR, *o.c.*, p. 175; JUNKER, *Vorläufiger*

*Bericht über die Grabung auf der neolithischen Siedlung von Merimde Beni Salâme*, I, 1953, Fig. 8 g, f; Ghassul I, 5 b, 13, 15.

<sup>711</sup>) Flinders PETRIE, *Diospolis Parva*, 1901, pp. 4 ff.

<sup>712</sup>) A. SCHARFF, *Die Frühkulturen Ägyptens und Mesopotamiens*, AO 41, 1941, p. 63.

the middle dynastic period produces <sup>713</sup>). The handled jugs which were found in this period were small, wide and paunchy, with flat bottom and a decoration of red-painted network on a white background. They were completely foreign among Egyptian pottery, but native to Palestine and Syria, where they were found in Megiddo XIX-XVII, in the upper portion of level III at Ras Shamra, in level K at Hama and elsewhere. Another foreign element in Egyptian pottery was spouts, generally curved, seldom straight. This kind of vases was scarce in Egypt; only five have been found in the tombs at Abusir el-Meleq, which number nearly a thousand <sup>714</sup>). In Mesopotamia they are met with as early as the Ubaid period, but become more abundant in the Jemdet Naşr epoch, and in Palestine in levels XIX-XVII at Megiddo <sup>715</sup>). We may therefore assume that the habit of affixing spouts to vases came from Mesopotamia and found its way gradually to Syria, Palestine and Egypt. This is even clearer in the case of the stone vases with spouts during the Jemdet Naşr epoch and afterwards, for only one of them has been found in Egypt, at Abusir el-Meleq in the latest part of the Naqada II culture <sup>716</sup>).

Vases in animal shapes were native to both Egypt and Mesopotamia. But there is a great difference between them. From time immemorial, if an Egyptian made a vase in animal shape, his intention was to make a vase, whereas the Babylonian aimed at forming an animal, which became a vase by hollowing it out and supplying some sort of opening, more or less skilfully. Now such vases have been found in Egypt during the last part of the Naqada II culture. They were shaped into figures of animals and then hollowed out, in accordance with the Babylonian technique. In a grave at Abusir el-Meleq a vase was found with three compartments <sup>717</sup>). In Egypt only a few parallels have been met with, but they are very common in Mesopotamia. They are decorated with a cord-pattern around the shoulders, and are precisely parallel to those which were found in Egypt. From their numerous occurrences in Mesopotamia throughout the Jemdet Naşr and Lagaş periods it may be concluded that they are native there, whereas their rare occurrence in Egypt points to importation.

The same account can be given of the stone vases with decorations in relief, which did not appeal to Egyptian taste. In contrast to the Babylonian stone-cutters, their Egyptian colleagues tried to please by the beauty of the material itself, the colour and veining being that of the marble and granite in combination with the shape, and nothing else. The Babylonian stone-cutter on the contrary attempted really to produce a work of art. He tried to embellish his material, which usually was of less good quality than that in Egypt, by inlaying it with lapis lazuli, sandstone, mother-of-pearl, or with reliefs or even sculptured decorations. This sort of vases was found in Mesopotamia during the Jemdet Naşr period and Lagaş I, which constituted a transitional phase. This kind of work was strange to Egypt and must therefore have been imported from Mesopotamia <sup>718</sup>). The same can be said of the pear-shaped mace-heads with knobs <sup>719</sup>) and with a frieze in relief consisting of lions and dogs <sup>720</sup>), which belong to the end of the Naqada II period. Although these objects were probably manufactured in Egypt, they are none the less un-Egyptian and simply imitations of Babylonian models <sup>721</sup>). Relief work in general could find but little favour in Egypt, except on slate palattes and the bone handles of knives. These are Egyptian products, but betray a strong Mesopotamian influence, especially the knife-handle from Gebel el Arak <sup>722</sup>), in which the lion-slayer is completely non-Egyptian but looks Mesopotamian. He wears a long beard and a thick coiffure with a turban on it, and is dressed in a long robe open in front. These are all characteristic Mesopotamian traits, but strange to Egypt. They are to be found in the lion-hunt on the basalt stele from the Jemdet Naşr period and on sundry cylinder seals, especially of the Lagaş

<sup>713</sup>) SCHARFF, *o.c.*, p. 43, No. 39.

<sup>714</sup>) SCHARFF, *o.c.*, p. 18.

<sup>715</sup>) ENGBERG-SHIPTON, *Notes on the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age Pottery of Megiddo*, SAOC 10, Table group 23.

<sup>716</sup>) *Abusir el-Meleq*, v. 39, pl. 23, No. 207.

<sup>717</sup>) *Abusir el-Meleq*, p. 41, pl. 20, 210.

<sup>718</sup>) *Hierakonpolis* I, pl. 19, 1.

<sup>719</sup>) SCHARFF, *Alttertumskunde Vor- und Frühgeschichte*, I, pl. 8, No. 152; SCHARFF, *Frühkulturen*, AO, Bd. 41, 1941, p. 22.

<sup>720</sup>) *Hierakonpolis*, II, pl. 23.

<sup>721</sup>) SCHARFF, *Frühkulturen*, p. 23.

<sup>722</sup>) SCHARFF, *Frühkulturen*, pl. VI a-b.

epoch. Also, the motif of a man attacked by two lions is typically Mesopotamian, indeed a very favourite subject there, whereas it is seldom met with in Egypt. It belongs to the antithetic group in which a man is fighting two lions, or two beasts with their tails turned towards one another are held together in one way or another. In these, a divine beast may take the place of the man, as is the case with the Imdugud motif. In contrast with the numerous representations of him in Mesopotamia, there is but one example of Imdugud in Egypt. It is the hieroglyph of the city of Cusae, where a man takes the place of Imdugud. The two beasts are giraffes, turned tail to tail <sup>723</sup>). This representation is of Egyptian workmanship, but shows unmistakable Mesopotamian influence. A second antithetic group consists of two beasts one on either side of a tree. This group is very commonly portrayed on the backs of palettes, where two giraffes are set right and left of a palmtree <sup>724</sup>). The combination of giraffes and palmtree, with its typically African fauna, is beyond all doubt an Egyptian product. In Egypt it is shown only in this form, while in Mesopotamia the form varies, and the beasts are always goats or sheep <sup>725</sup>). The series of palettes is closed by that from Narmer, which past all doubt is of Egyptian origin, although the motifs were unmistakably Mesopotamian. The motif is the intertwined necks of snakes, and it is found on various palettes <sup>726</sup>) at the end of the Naqada II culture. It was very frequent throughout the Jemdet Naşr and Lagaş periods.

The use of cylinder-seals is undoubtedly of Mesopotamian origin, they being in use there from the Jemdet Naşr period on. The Jemdet Naşr cylinder-seals were short and thick. In Egypt they do not occur till the end of the Naqada II culture, in which one was discovered in a tomb <sup>727</sup>). It is a pure Jemdet Naşr type with the eye-motif. Another combined the same motif with that of a fish <sup>728</sup>). It too is found in the Jemdet Naşr period. The material was a grey limestone, which is rare in Egypt but common in Mesopotamia. Another had a deep blue glaze, which does not occur in Egypt <sup>729</sup>). The design found a parallel among the seals from Fara, belonging to the Lagaş epoch <sup>730</sup>). This cylinder-seal also was short and thick, a kind which was no longer found in Mesopotamia after the Jemdet Naşr epoch. In Egypt no seal can be proved to have been made before the first dynastic period, hence these cylinder-seals must have been made in Egypt during the first dynasty on the analogy of Mesopotamian models of the Jemdet Naşr period which had made their way into Egypt. The Egyptian adaptation however consisted in no mere imitation of foreign objects, but they simply made use of some hints to express their own ideas and to attain a technical skill which had been previously undeveloped <sup>731</sup>). That is clear from the impresses of various cylinder-seals.

In the realm of architecture there probably is a contact in the building of niches with sundried clay bricks. In Egypt, this fashion of building came into force in the days of the first dynasty, but it disappeared again after Djezer. In Mesopotamia, on the contrary, it was already in favour during the Uruk period and remained so. Mats were often used between the pillars, as is clear from the marks of them in the tomb of Djezer <sup>732</sup>). WOOLEY has proved that the pattern of the mats is Syrian, not Egyptian <sup>733</sup>). This strengthens the supposition of foreign influences.

The second contact in the realm of architecture is the use of the corbel arch, which is first found in Egypt during the reign of Djezer. It is first found in Palestine at Megiddo in level XVIII, Beth-Shan in level XVI and in Syria in the upper parts of level K at Ĥama. It is therefore more than the accidental coincidence of a passing phenomenon in one place with a regular usage in another. It can be explained only by Mesopotamian influence upon Egypt,

<sup>723</sup>) BLACKMANN, *Meir*, II, pl. 17,2-6; IV, pl. 19.

<sup>724</sup>) JEA 2, 1916, pl. 15; SCHARFF, *Allertümer der Vor- und Frühzeit*, I, p. 74, pl. 22, No. 107; p. 26, Fig. 38; p. 78, Fig. 54.

<sup>725</sup>) SCHARFF, *Frühkulturen*, pl. VII, 38.

<sup>726</sup>) *Hierakonpolis* II, pl. 28.

<sup>727</sup>) FRANKFORT, *Cylinderseals*, 1939, pl. XLVI a.

<sup>728</sup>) FRANKFORT, *o.c.*, pl. XLVI b.

<sup>729</sup>) SCHARFF, *Allertümer der Vor- und Frühzeit Ägyptens*, II, 99, No. 137.

<sup>730</sup>) DE GENOUILLAC, *Fouilles de Tellah*, pl. 39; HEINRICH, *Fara*, pl. 69 b.

<sup>731</sup>) FRANKFORT, *o.c.*, p. 294; AJSL 58, 1941, pp. 323-358.

<sup>732</sup>) *Ill. London News*, 1928, 7 Nov.

<sup>733</sup>) Sir L. WOOLLEY, *Al-Ubaid*, p. 68.

where it suited their taste only for a time but did not get a firm footing in the development of Egyptian culture <sup>734</sup>).

There exists still another point of contact from the first period of the Old Kingdom. Up to the time of Djezer, secondary graves lay around the royal tomb and in them courtiers and servants were buried according to the time when they died. In Djezer's day, the king's tomb was prepared before his death and steps were built leading to the tomb for the introduction of the corpse. During the reign of the last two kings of the third dynasty, the tombs of the courtiers and servants were built against the royal tomb and lay under the same roof, so that they made a whole with it. The bodies could not be brought in except by the steps which led to the king's sepulchre. Since that tomb was closed after the king's burial, the courtiers and servants must have been buried at the same time as the king, therefore they must have been put to death when the king died. These tombs with their mass burials find their parallel in Mesopotamia at the end of the Lagaš period and the beginning of that of Agade. All these elements of similarity are more than accidental and point to influence. The series of phenomena during the Naqada II period and the Old Kingdom bear a non-Egyptian character which cannot be explained except either by influence from Mesopotamia and the intervening countries, or else by adoption. Thus it is clear that during that period Egypt was the recipient, not the giver. The borrowed objects and those which were made under foreign influence cannot be older in the land in which they were adopted than in that in which they originated. Since these objects and these techniques came into existence in Mesopotamia during the Jemdet Našr and the Lagaš period, we are obliged to put the end of the Naqada II culture and of the first dynasty during the Jemdet Našr period. This is supported by the fact that various typical vases of the first dynasty were found at Beth-Shan, level XVI, Jericho VII and Megiddo, level XVIII, which as we have seen belong to the Jemdet Našr period. The third Egyptian dynasty must, from the resemblances in construction and in burial rites, come at the end of the Lagaš period.

Vases bearing the names of Pepi I and Pepi II, the last kings of the sixth dynasty of the Old Kingdom, have been found at Byblos in a level containing pottery and other objects belonging to the end of the Early Bronze epoch; consequently Pepi and the end of the sixth dynasty were contemporaneous with the end of the Early Bronze period and with Megiddo XVI. This, as we have already seen, lasted till 2130.

<sup>734</sup>) H. FRANKFORT, *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East*, I, 1924, pp. 124-125; FRANKFORT, *Frage der ältesten Egyptischen-babylonischen Kulturbeziehungen*, ZÄS 91, 1925, p. 92, Note 4. CYLINDERSEALS, pl. 92, No. 1; SCHARFF, *Neues zum*

## CHAPTER NINE

### ASIA MINOR

There now remains only one district to be fitted into the chronological scheme of West Asia; this is Asia Minor, the country of the Hittites. But as there exists no list of the Hittite kings which gives the number of their regnal years, we can only look about for points of contact of some of the Hittite monarchs with their contemporaries in West Asia and Egypt.

The Phrygian deposit which was found in level IV at Alishar was preceded by the Hittite kingdom <sup>735</sup>). Ḫattušiliš III concluded a treaty with Ramses II in the latter's twenty-first year <sup>736</sup>). Ramses II began to reign in 1289, therefore his twenty-first year was 1269. Ḫattušiliš III wrote a letter to Kadašmanḫarbe III of Babylon to wish him good fortune on his accession <sup>737</sup>). He mentions in this letter that he had concluded a treaty with Kadašmanḫarbe's father Kadašmanturgu. The latter was king from 1285 to 1268, and Kadašmanḫarbe his successor reigned from 1267 to 1257; consequently Ḫattušiliš III must have reigned between these dates. Before Ḫattušiliš III Arḫi-Tešup was on the throne for seven years <sup>738</sup>). Before him came Muwattalliš, who fought the Battle of Qadeš with Ramses II in the latter's fifth year, 1285 <sup>739</sup>). These three princes therefore were contemporaries of Ramses II. Muwattalliš was preceded by Muršiliš II, a son of Šuppiluliuma, after his brother Arnuwandaš, another son of Šuppiluliuma, had died of plague after a reign of a few months, as his father had died before him. Šuppiluliuma was still living at the death of Tutankhamon, for almost certainly the latter's widow Ankhesenamun wrote to him proposing marriage with one of his sons <sup>740</sup>). He had a long reign and began it about 1380.

The next point of contact is the raid of Muršiliš I against Babylon. We have seen that this took place during the reign of Šamšiditana, who was on the throne from 1564 to 1534. Consequently Šamšiditana's reign was not then ended. If we put the raid on Babylon at about 1550, a hundred and seventy years intervene between that event and the beginning of the reign of Šuppiluliuma. Muršiliš was murdered not long after his return from the raid. Between him and Šuppiluliuma the following princes occupied the throne:

Ḫantiliš, husband of Ḫarapšiliš the sister of Muršiliš I <sup>741</sup> ).	
Zidantiš, son-in-law of Ḫantiliš <sup>742</sup> ).	
Ammunaš, Zidantiš' son <sup>743</sup> ).	Ḫuzzijaš I <sup>744</sup> ).
Telepinuš, husband of Ḫuzzijaš' sister <sup>745</sup> ).	
Alluwamnaš, husband of (probably) Telepinuš' daughter <sup>746</sup> ).	
Ḫantiliš II <sup>747</sup> ).	Zidantaš <sup>748</sup> ).
Tudḫaliyaš II <sup>750</sup> ).	Ḫuzzijaš II <sup>749</sup> ).
Ḫattušiliš II <sup>752</sup> ).	Arnuwandaš I <sup>751</sup> ).
Arnuwandaš II <sup>754</sup> ).	Tudḫaliyaš III <sup>753</sup> ).
	Šuppiluliuma <sup>755</sup> ).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><sup>735</sup>) OIP 29, pp. 287 ff.<br/> <sup>736</sup>) BREASTED, <i>Ancient Records</i>, III, p. 165, No. 370.<br/> <sup>737</sup>) KBo I, 10.<br/> <sup>738</sup>) KUB I, 6, III, 9.<br/> <sup>739</sup>) BREASTED, <i>Ancient Records</i>, III, p. 143, No. 317.<br/> <sup>740</sup>) ZA 35, 1924, pp. 37-42.<br/> <sup>741</sup>) Telepinuštext, No. 10-18; KBo I, 27; KUB IV, p. 50 b; KUB III, 85; Bo 223/g, MDOG 76, 43.<br/> <sup>742</sup>) Telepinuštext, No. 19; KUB XI, I, 1, 32.<br/> <sup>743</sup>) Telepinuštext, No. 20-21.<br/> <sup>744</sup>) Telepinuštext, No. 8.<br/> <sup>745</sup>) Telepinuštext, No. 8 ff.<br/> <sup>746</sup>) KUB xxxi, 81, 82.</p> | <p><sup>747</sup>) 2 BoTU 24, 11, 5; 27, 7.<br/> <sup>748</sup>) 2 BoTU 24, 11, 7 ff.<br/> <sup>749</sup>) 2 BoTU 24, 11, 11 ff.<br/> <sup>750</sup>) KBo I, 6.<br/> <sup>751</sup>) KBo III, 4, 13 ff.<br/> <sup>752</sup>) KBo II, 30, 1, 12 ff.<br/> <sup>753</sup>) KUB XXI, 7, III, 9 ff.<br/> <sup>754</sup>) KUB XXI, 7, III, 9 ff.<br/> <sup>755</sup>) KUB XIX, 28, IV, 15; GOETZE, <i>The Problem of Chronology and Early Hittite History</i>, BASOR 122, 1951, pp. 18-25; OTTEN, <i>Die hethitischen Königslisten und die altorientalische Chronologie</i>, MDOG 83, 1951, pp. 47-71; GOETZE, <i>The Predecessors of Suppiluliumas of Hatti</i>, JAOS 72, 1952, pp. 67-72.</p> |
|--|---|

This last prince concluded a treaty with Šunaššura II of Kizzuwatna<sup>756</sup>). That occurred after Tušratta of Mitanni, who had concluded a treaty with Šunaššura, was killed. It was a renewal of relations with Kizzuwatna after it had gone over to the Mitanni and after Kizzuwatna under Išputahšu had concluded a treaty with Telepinuš<sup>757</sup>). This renewal of the treaty with Kizzuwatna took place in order to reopen the friendly relations which had been broken off since Šunaššura I of Kizzuwatna had concluded a treaty with the Mitanni under Šauššatar, thereby breaking off the friendly relations with the Hatti which had existed since the treaty which Zidantaš I had concluded with Pilija of Kizzuwatna<sup>758</sup>). Pilija was a predecessor of Šunaššura, who concluded a treaty with Šauššatar. The predecessor of Šauššatar was, as we have seen, Parattarna, who concluded a treaty with Idrimi of Alalah, in which a treaty of Idrimi with Pilija is mentioned. He must have lived somewhere about 1500; consequently there are 120 years, more or less, between Šuppiluliuma and Zidantaš, during which time twelve sovrans must have reigned. We cannot here give any lengths of the reigns of the various princes, for our documents provide us with no figures. Anyone who attempts to do so is indulging in wholly arbitrary statements and mere imagination. We must keep to our documents, as they alone give us these points of contact. Before the treaty of Idrimi then, and down to the raid on Babylon between 1564 and 1534, comes the reign of Zidantiš and part of the reign of Muršiliš I.

At the beginning of the Hittite empire came a period of local kings, during which Assyrian merchants had their trading-places all over Asia Minor. The archives of these traders have been discovered at Kaneš-Kültépe in levels II and III. In these tablets we find the names of local princes, Pithaniaš and his son Anitaš. These names come from tablets in level II. These traders' tablets have been found also at Alishar. In one of the Alishar tablets we find a mention of *Puzur-a-šur mera ru-ba-ini*, "Puzur-Aššur the prince's son"<sup>759</sup>). This Puzur-Aššur can be no one but the son of Šarru-kên, of whose signet two impressions have been found on tablets from Kaneš<sup>760</sup>). Pithaniaš and Anitaš therefore were contemporaries of Puzur-Aššur and his father Šarru-kên, who lived in the first half of the eighteenth century. In the three uppermost levels at Kaneš, in which also the "Cappadocian tablets", as they are called, came to light, painted pottery of Hittite type was found, whereas in the preceding level "Cappadocian" pottery, as it is called, was met with<sup>761</sup>). The ware which was discovered at Kaneš agrees in both shapes and motifs alike with Minyan ware and with the matt painted pottery of the Middle Helladic, and is represented in western Asia Minor in level Troy VI<sup>762</sup>), also in levels III and II at Alishar.

Under level II at Alishar was found a level which was styled by the name of "Copper Age"<sup>763</sup>). This layer was divided into two portions, A and B. The difference between them is that 1 B was spread over a larger portion of the Hüyük than 1 A. In 1 A red pottery was found alongside black ware, while in 1 B the black earthenware disappeared. Towards the end of this period, small goblets with tall handles made their appearance<sup>764</sup>). They have their parallels in Troy II. This ware is accompanied by idols of the form characteristic of the western districts of Asia Minor.

Pottery of the character of Alishar 1 B and Troy II was found also at Gözli Küle near Taršuš in the Cilician Plain. Here, goblets with two tall handles were met with, of the shape called *amphikypellon*. The outside was red or black to grey. A shallow phiala with a spiral foot and a cylindrical cover with roughly painted criss-cross decorations, and furnished with

<sup>756</sup>) KBo I, 5, KUB III, 4; WEIDNER, *Politische Dokumenten aus Klein-Asien*, pp. 88-110.

<sup>757</sup>) KUB xxx, 42; KUB xxxi, 81; KUB IV, 76.

<sup>758</sup>) *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 1951, p. 45.

<sup>759</sup>) GELB, *Inscriptions from Alishar and Vicinity*, No. 58, 24; *Compte Rendu de la Seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, 1951, p. 52.

<sup>760</sup>) *o.c.*, p. 51.

<sup>761</sup>) *o.c.*, pp. 50-51; HALET CAMBÉL, *Proceedings of the Twenty Second Congress of Orientalists*, 1951, p. 150.

<sup>762</sup>) F. SCHACHERMEYER, *Alishar und Kültepe in ihren Beziehungen zu Troia und zum ägäischen Bereich*, AFO 16, 1952, pp. 91-92.

<sup>763</sup>) OIP 28, Fig. 30.

<sup>764</sup>) OIP 28, Fig. 168.

knobs to serve as a foot if the vessel was turned upside down, has a parallel in Troy II <sup>765</sup>). Some of these cups are decorated with red cross-bands, as in Troy II. Daggers of the Troy II type were also found <sup>766</sup>). During the epoch of Troy II the potter's wheel was introduced; it had long been known in Cilicia and West Asia <sup>767</sup>). There are many links which connect Troy II with Cilicia, hence the closest relations are those with the coastal district, while up country so far no signs of relationship have been met with <sup>768</sup>). The pottery also of Troy III-V belongs to the red pottery of the rest of Asia Minor <sup>769</sup>), with Kussura, Karaoglan, Bitik, Polatli, Alishar and Kültépé <sup>770</sup>). Though there is no gap between Troy I and Troy II, yet the former is harder to date and to fit into the framework of the hinterland of Asia Minor. The culture of Troy I is connected with that of Thermi in Lesbos, levels I-V. If we can make connections at all, they are with the chalcolithic level at Alishar, which lies under levels I A and B, where a hand-made, polished, reddish-brown or black earthenware was found, decorated with incisions filled with white paste, as in Troy I. The gate of the city was flanked with two small towers, as in Troy I. This city was probably laid waste at the same time as Troy I. Its houses were built of sundried bricks on stone foundations. The gate was L-shaped. So far as its pottery is concerned, Troy I probably was also related to the earthenware, with its light-on-dark painting, of Mersin XII A <sup>771</sup>), and with the black burnished ware, with incisions filled with white pigment, of Gözli Kule near Tarsus <sup>772</sup>), also probably with certain traits of the Kherbet Kerak ware of Judeideh XII <sup>773</sup>), of Tabara al-Akrad east of Allalah, Tell Atchana <sup>774</sup>). Troy I-V therefore covered the whole Early Bronze period (Bronze I). Now, as this black ware with incisions filled with white was found in Crete in Early Minoan I, that period in Crete also began in the Early Bronze epoch. In the west it corresponds to the Early Helladic period.

As early as Mersin XII B, the Uruk and Jemdet Nasr culture is met with in conjunction with objects of the Ubeid period, hence that phase must be accounted as beginning in the Uruk period <sup>775</sup>). The layers beneath it, XIII-XVI, belong to the Ubeid period and link up with Mesopotamia and north Syria <sup>776</sup>). Levels XVII-XIX represent the Halaf period <sup>777</sup>), and levels XX-XXXII that of Haššuna <sup>778</sup>). The preceding levels run parallel with the Neolithic settlement of the Kirkuk district <sup>779</sup>). Thus Asia Minor can be connected with the framework of West Asian chronology, absolute and relative.

Thus I have firstly constructed an absolute chronology of Assyria and then been in a position to connect the rest of West Asia firmly with it. Although I have omitted a great part of the material, so as not to make my publication too large under present circumstances, yet I have fitted in all the necessary material at our disposal for the construction of a complete running chronology. The material now at our disposal of such a kind that we can reconstruct a complete chronology, which in the future may, I hope, prove correct in its main outlines, although it will have to undergo many changes of detail. Through this chronology it is clear enough that in West Asia the same cultural elements arose at more or less the same time. Consequently it is likewise clear that very many excavations must still be made to complete our material in order to put us in a position to construct a complete and stable chronology for all parts of West Asia. I hope that this chronology with its table may prove of some assistance for students and perhaps also for experts in the investigation of the history and culture of West Asia.

<sup>765</sup>) AJA 44, 1940, Fig. 36, p. 78, Fig. 35, p. 73; SCHMIDT, *Trojanische Allertümer*, No. 1789, 1740.

<sup>766</sup>) AJA 44, 1940, Fig. 19, p. 72.

<sup>767</sup>) SCHACHERMEYER, *o.c.*, p. 86, Machteld MELLINK, *BiOr* X, 1953, p. 58.

<sup>768</sup>) SCHACHERMEYER, *o.c.*, p. 86; MELLINK, *o.c.*, p. 58.

<sup>769</sup>) MELLINK, *o.c.*, p. 59.

<sup>770</sup>) MELLINK, *o.c.*, p. 59.

<sup>771</sup>) MELLINK, *o.c.*, p. 58; GARSTANG, *Prehistoric Mersin*, 1953, Fig. 118.

<sup>772</sup>) AJA 51, 1947, pl. xc, 6-8; AJA 53, 1949, p. 47, pl. XIII D; M. MELLINK, *o.c.*, p. 58.

<sup>773</sup>) AJA 41, 1947, pp. 10-11.

<sup>774</sup>) WOOLLEY, *A Forgotten Kingdom*, pp. 31-37.

<sup>775</sup>) J. GARSTANG, *Prehistoric Mersin*, pp. 167-176.

<sup>776</sup>) GARSTANG, *o.c.*, pp. 141-166.

<sup>777</sup>) GARSTANG, *o.c.*, pp. 103-141.

<sup>778</sup>) GARSTANG, *o.c.*, pp. 76-112.

<sup>779</sup>) GARSTANG, *o.c.*, pp. 1-75.

## LIST OF KINGNAMES

- A
- Abi-ešuḫ 21, 23, 24, 33, 35  
 Abijam 72  
 Abirattaš 18, 22  
 Abiši Abi-ešuḫ  
 Adadapaliddinna 40  
 Adadnirāri (of Alalah) 69  
 Adadnirāri (of Assur) I 11, 14, 15  
 Adadnirāri (of Assur) II 9, 41  
 Adadnirāri (of Assur) III 8  
 Adadšalulu 30, 35  
 Adadšumiddinna 14, 19, 52  
 Adadšumlinnašir 13, 19, 24  
 Adasi 30, 35  
 Agum I 18, 24, 35  
 " II 18, 22, 24, 33, 35  
 " III 18, 19  
 Aḫab 70, 71, 72, 83  
 Aḫaz 74, 75, 76, 77, 78  
 Aḫziah (of Israel) 71  
 Aḫziah (of Juda) 71  
 Akhenaten Amenophis IV  
 Alluwannaš 90  
 Amaziah 72, 73  
 Amenemḫet I 84, 85  
 " II 84, 85  
 " III 67, 84  
 Amenophis III 17, 18, 70, 84  
 " IV 16, 17, 18, 35, 70  
 Ammiditana 21, 22, 24, 33, 35  
 Ammišaduqa 22, 24, 33, 35, 37, 52  
 Ammunaš 90  
 Amon 79  
 Anitaš 91  
 Arḫi-Tešub 90  
 Arikdēnili 6, 11, 14, 15  
 Arnuwandaš I 90  
 " II 90  
 Artašura 70  
 Artatama I 70  
 " II 70  
 Assarhaddon 8, 36, 43, 50  
 Asserḫaddon Assarhaddon  
 Aša 72  
 Ašarid-apal-ekur 9  
 Aššuraḫidinna 4  
 Aššur-apla-idi 30, 35  
 Aššurbanipal 8, 43, 50, 79  
 Aššurbēlkala 9, 40  
 Aššurbēlnišešu 6, 11, 18, 19  
 Aššur-dān I 11, 24, 25, 37, 39  
 " II 9  
 " III 4, 7, 8
- Aššurdugul 30, 33, 35  
 Aššurnādinahḫē I 6, 11, 34, 35  
 " II 11, 18  
 Aššurnādinapli 11, 13  
 Aššurnādinšumi 43, 51  
 Aššurnāširapli I 9, 40  
 " II 8  
 Aššurnirāri I 5, 6, 33, 35  
 " II 11, 27  
 " III 11, 13  
 " IV 9, 40  
 " V 4, 5, 6, 8  
 Aššurrābi I 6, 12, 34, 35  
 " II 9, 40, 41  
 Aššurreši I 9, 39  
 " II 9, 41  
 Aššurrimnišešu 5, 6, 11, 27  
 Aššursadūni 20, 34, 35  
 Aššuruballi I 11, 15, 16, 17, 18  
 " II 79  
 Athaliah 72  
 Awēl-Marduk 43  
 Awēl-Sin 36  
 Ausi Hošea  
 Azariah 73, 74, 75
- B
- Baašia 71  
 Baba-aḫḫē-iddin 42  
 Barattarna 69, 70, 91  
 Bazaju 33, 35  
 Bēlbāni 33, 35  
 Bēlibni 43  
 Bocchoris 82  
 Burnaburiaš I 18, 20, 22, 33  
 " II 18, 19  
 " III 15, 16, 17, 18, 35
- D
- Daduša 27, 28  
 Dāmiqilišu 44  
 David 72, 78
- E
- Eagāmil 20, 24  
 Eamukinšumi 40  
 Elah 71  
 Eliakim Jehojakim  
 Enbilua Enbiluḫḫa  
 Enbiluḫḫa 52  
 Enlilkudurušur 11, 13  
 Enlilnādinahḫē 19, 25, 52  
 Enlilnādinapli 39, 40
- Enlilnādinšumi 14, 19, 52  
 Enlilnāšir I 5, 20, 33, 34, 35  
 " II 11, 34  
 Enlilnirāri 11, 15  
 Eribo-Marduk 42  
 E-ulmaš-sākin-šumi 41
- G
- Gandaš 18, 23, 24, 34
- H
- Hathshepsut 84  
 Hošea 74, 75, 76, 77
- Ḫ
- Ḫalluduš-Inšušinak 52  
 Ḫallušu(-Inšušinak) 51  
 Ḫammanum 31  
 Ḫammurabi (of Babylon) 23, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 43, 44, 52, 67, 69, 84  
 Ḫammurabi (of Jamḫad) 69  
 Ḫantiliš I 90  
 " II 90  
 Ḫarbašipak 18, 22  
 Ḫattušiliš II 90  
 " III 90  
 Ḫezekiah 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82  
 Ḫubanḫaltas I 50  
 " II 50  
 Ḫubannugaš  
 Ḫubanimmena 50, 51  
 Ḫubantaḫraḫ 51  
 Ḫummahaldašu Ḫubanḫaltas (II)  
 Ḫuzziaš I 90  
 " II 90
- I
- Ibal-pi-el II 26, 27, 28  
 Ibiq-Adad 27  
 Ibi-Sin 44, 45, 46, 52  
 Idrimi 69, 91  
 Ikūnum 5, 37  
 Ilim-ilimma I 69  
 " II 70  
 Ilukabkabu 26, 27, 28, 37  
 Iluma-ilu 20, 21  
 Ilušuma 4, 36, 37  
 Iḫqi-Istar 30, 35  
 Irēba-Adad I 6, 11, 17  
 " II 9, 40  
 Irišum I 4, 36, 37  
 " II 26, 27  
 " III 33, 35



Išbi-Irra 44, 45, 46  
 Išmê-Dagan I 6, 26, 28, 29, 30,  
 31, 33, 35  
 Išmê-Dagan II 33, 35, 37  
 Išputaššu 91  
 Ištarhundu Sutruknašhunte  
 Itti-Marduk-balašu 40

## J

Jagid-Lim 27, 28, 29  
 Jaḥdun-Lim 28, 29, 31, 33  
 Jantim-Hammu 84  
 Jarim-Adad 31  
 Jarim-Lim 69  
 Jašmaš-Adad 28, 29, 30, 31, 32,  
 33  
 Jehoahaz I 72  
 " II 79, 81  
 Jehošaš 72  
 Jehojakim 78, 79, 80, 81  
 Jehojakin 80  
 Jehoram (of Juda) 72  
 Jehoram (of Israel) 71  
 Jehošephat 72  
 Jehu 70, 71, 72  
 Jeroboam I 71, 72  
 " II 73  
 Jošaš 72, 78  
 Joram Jehoram  
 Josiak 78, 79, 81  
 Jotham 74, 75, 76, 77

## K

Kadašmanharbe I 18, 19  
 " II 16, 17, 18  
 " III 14, 19, 90  
 " IV 14, 19  
 Kadašmanturgu 14, 19, 90  
 Kaku 48, 49  
 Kandalānu Aššurbanipal (43)  
 Karaḥardas Kadašmanharbe (I)  
 Karaindaš I 18  
 " II 15, 16, 17, 18  
 Kaš u-nâdin-ašhê 40  
 Kaštiliaš I 18, 23, 24, 35  
 " II 18  
 " III 18, 19, 20, 24, 35  
 " IV 13, 14, 19, 22, 52  
 Khasekhemre' Neferhotep  
 Khety I 85  
 " III 85  
 Kidinḥutran 14, 52  
 Kikia 5  
 Kudur Kutirnašhunte (II)  
 Kudurenlil 14, 19  
 Kuduzuluš 52  
 Kuknâšir I 52  
 Kurigalzu I 17, 18, 19  
 " II 15, 16, 19, 24  
 Kutirnašhunte I 51, 52  
 " II 51  
 Kutuluduš-Inšušinak 51

## L

Labasi-Marduk 43  
 Libaju 33, 35  
 LI-TAR-sin 33, 35  
 Luḥhi-iššan 52  
 Luḥi-an Luḥhi-iššan  
 Lullāju 33, 35

## M

Manaššeh 79, 80  
 Maništušu 37, 48  
 Mâr-bitî-ašhê-iddin 41  
 Mâr-bitî-apla-ušur 41  
 Marduk-ašhê-eriba 40  
 Mardukapaliddinna I 19, 24  
 " II 7, 42, 43.  
 51  
 Mardukapalušur 42  
 Marduk-balašsu-iqbi 42  
 Mardukbêlûšate 41, 42  
 Mardukbêlzêri 42  
 Marduknâdinahhê 39, 40  
 Mardukšâpikzêri 39  
 Mardukšâpikzêrmâti 40  
 Mardukzâkiršumi I 41, 42  
 " II 43  
 Mardukzêr 40  
 Mattiwaza 70  
 Melišipak 19, 24  
 Menahem 73, 77  
 Mentuhotep II 85  
 " III 85  
 " IV 85  
 " V 85  
 Meribre' Khety (I)  
 Me'annipadda 49  
 Mitinti 74  
 Muršiliš I 22, 90, 91  
 " II 70, 90  
 Mušezib-Marduk 43, 51  
 Mutakkilnusu 10  
 Muwatalliš 90

## N

Nabu-apla-iddinna 41  
 Nabu-apal-ušur 43, 79  
 Nabukudurušur I 39, 40, 51  
 " II 43, 78, 79, 80,  
 81  
 Nabumukinapli 41  
 Nabunâdinzêri 42  
 Nabunâid 35, 43  
 Nabunâšir 42, 51  
 Nabušumiškun I 41  
 " II 42  
 Nabušumlibur 40  
 Nabušumukin 42  
 Nadab 71  
 Nadinu Nabunâdinzêri  
 Napḥururia Amenophis IV (16)  
 Naplānum 43  
 Našir-Sin 30, 35

Narām-Sin (of Agade) 35, 47,  
 48, 52, 62  
 Narām-Sin (of Ešnunna-Aššur)  
 26, 27, 28  
 Nazibugaš Šuzigaš (15, 16)  
 Nazimaruttaš 14, 19  
 Neb-hepet-re' Mentuhotep II  
 Neb-tawi-re' Mentuhotep V  
 Neb-towi-re' Mentuhotep IV  
 Nebuchadnezzar Nabukudurušur  
 Neferhotep 84  
 Nekao 78, 79, 81  
 Nergalšarušur 43  
 Nergalu'ezib 43  
 Nibḥurriria Tutankhamen  
 Nibmuriā Amenophis III  
 Ninurta-apal-ekur 11, 13, 24  
 Ninurta-kudurri-ušur I 41  
 " II 41  
 Ninurtanâdinšumi 39  
 Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur 10, 36  
 Niqmepa 69, 70  
 Niqme-epuḥ 69  
 Nûr-ili 20, 34, 35

## O

Omri 71  
 Opehtiset-Nubti 84  
 Osorkon II 83

## P

Pemi 82  
 Paratarna Barattarna  
 Pekaḥ 73, 74, 75, 76, 77  
 Pekaḥiah 73, 77  
 Pepi I 85, 89  
 " II 85, 89  
 Piankhi 82, 83  
 Pillia (= Pilija) 69, 70, 91  
 Pitḥaniaš 91  
 Pšanmetichus I 81  
 Pûlu Tiglathpileser III (42, 73)  
 Puzur-Aššur I 5  
 " II 5, 26, 27, 91  
 " III 19, 20, 33, 35  
 Puzur-Inšušinak 52

## R

Ramses II 83, 84, 90  
 " III 83  
 Rehoboam 72, 83  
 Rezin 74, 75  
 Rim Sin I 31, 43, 44  
 " " II (?) 20, 21, 23  
 Rimuš 48

## S.

Sābum 36  
 Sa-ankh-ka-re' Mentuhotep III  
 Salmanasser I 11, 14, 36  
 " II 6, 9, 40  
 " III 5, 8, 41, 70  
 " IV 8  
 " V 6, 7, 42, 76, 77

- Sanherib 8, 35, 43, 50, 74, 76, 77, 81, 82  
 Sargon (of Agade) 48, 52  
 Sargon (of Aššur) I 5, 91  
 " " II 6, 7, 42, 76  
 Sesostris I 67, 84, 85  
 Sinaherib Sanherib  
 Sinmâgir 44  
 Sinmuballiṯ 36, 43, 44  
 Sinnâmir 30, 35  
 Solomon 72, 78  
 §  
 Šulili 5, 25  
 §  
 Šabaqa 82  
 Šabataqa 81, 82  
 Šagaraktišuriaš 14, 19, 35  
 Šallum 73, 77  
 Šamašmudammiq 41  
 Šamaššumukin Nabušumiškun (I)  
 Šamaššumukin 43  
 Šamši-Adad I 5, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 63, 68  
 Šamši-Adad II 5, 33, 35  
 " III 5, 33, 35, 37  
 " IV 9, 40  
 " V 8, 42  
 Šamšiditana 22, 24, 33, 35, 90  
 Šamšu-iluna 20, 21, 23, 24, 33, 34, 35  
 Šarkališarri 47, 48  
 Šarlag(ab) 47  
 Šarma-Adad I 33, 35  
 " II 33, 35  
 Šarru-ken Sargon  
 Šauššatar 69, 70, 91  
 Sheshonq I 70, 83  
 " III 82  
 " V 82  
 Šilhak-Inšušinak I 51  
 " " II 50  
 Šilhina-Ĥamru-lagamar 51  
 Šimmaššipak 40  
 Širiqtušuqamuna 41  
 Šu-ilišu 44  
 Šulgi 46, 47, 52  
 Šumuabu 36, 43, 68, 84  
 Šumulael 36  
 Šumujamam 28, 29  
 Šumu-ukin Nabušumukin (42)  
 Šunaššura I 70, 91  
 " II 70, 91  
 Šu-Ninua 33, 35  
 Šuppiliumma 70, 90, 91  
 Šu-Sin 45, 52, 68  
 Šutarna Šuttarna (III)  
 ŠutruknaĤhunte I 51, 52  
 " " II 51  
 Šuttarna I 69  
 " II 70  
 " III 70  
 Šuzigaš 15, 16  
 T  
 TaĤarqa 81, 82  
 Tazzigurummuš 18, 22  
 Tefnakht 82  
 Telepinuš 90, 91  
 TeptiĤhuban-Inšušinak 50  
 Te-um-man TeptiĤhuban Inšušinak  
 Thutmosis III 70, 84  
 Tibni 71  
 Tiglathpileser I 2, 9, 37, 39  
 Tiglathpileser II 6, 9, 41  
 " " III 4, 7, 42, 73, 74, 75, 76  
 Tiptakzi 18, 22  
 TudĤaliaš II 90  
 " III 90  
 Tukulti-apal-ekur Ašarid-apal-ekur  
 Tukulti-Ninurta I 11, 13, 14, 35, 37, 52  
 Tukulti-Ninurta II 8  
 Tušratta 70, 91  
 Tutankhamen 17, 35, 90  
 U  
 Ukinzêr 42  
 Ulaburariaš Ulamburariaš  
 Ulamburariaš 18, 19, 24, 35  
 Ululaju Salmanasser V (42)  
 Umbudar ĤubantahraĤ  
 Ummanigaš Ĥubannugaš  
 Ummanmenanu Ĥubanimmena  
 UntašĤuban 52  
 Ur-Nammu 46, 47  
 Urtaku 50  
 Ur-Utu 48  
 Ušpia 5  
 UtuĤegal 46, 47, 48  
 Z  
 Zababašumiddinna 19, 24, 25, 52  
 Zakariah 73  
 Zedekiah 80  
 Zidantaš I 90, 91  
 " II 90, 91  
 Zimri 71  
 Zimrilim 26, 31, 32, 33, 52, 60



