

# A POLITICAL HISTORY OF POST-KASSITE BABYLONIA

1158-722 B. C.

J. A. BRINKMAN



N. Y. U. LIBRARIES

1 9 6 8

PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM BIBLICUM

I-00187 ROMA

PIAZZA PILOTTA 35

### 33. Nabonassar <sup>(1431)</sup>

The accession of Nabonassar to the throne marked the beginning of a new era in Babylonia. <sup>(1432)</sup> From this point on, chronologically precise records of his-

<sup>(1426)</sup> *JRAS* 1892 354-355 ii 1-8. The enemies are probably described as fugitives (from the law); LÚ *ha[<sup>1</sup>lqūti*] (ii 1). The hypothesis that some of these events may have represented civil war is proposed by Landsberger, *Bischof*, p. 58 n. 110, who interprets a broken passage as implying internal strife between Nabu-shuma-iddina, *šatammu* of Ezida, and Nabu-shuma-imbī.

<sup>(1427)</sup> *JRAS* 1892 355 ii 9-10.

<sup>(1428)</sup> See the chronicle published by Millard, *Iraq* XXVI (1964) 15:22.

<sup>(1429)</sup> *JRAS* 1892 350 ff., *passim*.

<sup>(1430)</sup> *CT* XXXIV 46 i 6-8 (Babylonian Chronicle).

<sup>(1431)</sup> *Nabū-nāšir*: "Nabu (is) protector." For the name type, see Stamm, *Namengebung*, p. 219. DN-nasir names begin in the Old Akkadian period (*MAD* III 207) and continue in Babylonia down through Persian times (Ranke, *EBPN*, p. 242; Clay, *CPN*, p. 189; Tallqvist, *NBN*, p. 325); the type is also popular in Assyria from the Old Assyrian period on (Stephens, *PNC*, p. 91; Tallqvist, *APN*, pp. 297-298; *ADD* 203 rev. 1 and *passim*). The name Nabu-nasir itself is attested from the Old Babylonian period on (Ranke, *EBPN*, p. 127; Clay, *CPN*, p. 109; Tallqvist, *NBN*, pp. 140-142), in later Assyria (Tallqvist, *APN*, p. 156), and at Nuzi (Gelb *et al.*, *NPN*, p. 104).

Writing of RN: in contemporary economic texts and in the Babylonian Chronicle as <sup>d</sup>AG-PAB (*BRM* I 4:15, 5:14, 6:12], 7:5, 8:8, 9:10, 10:8, 11:5, 12:7, 13:4, 14:6, 15:9, 16:7, 17:15, 18:7, 19:15., 20:12, 21:6; *CT* XXXIV 46 i 6, 7, 9, 11, 12), in contemporary private votive texts as <sup>d</sup>AG-ŠEŠ-ir (*BIN* II 31:19, *YOS* IX 74:14', BM 113205:19, all versions of the same text). In Kinglist A iv 3 the name is written <sup>md</sup>AG-[PAB], and it is partially preserved in the New Babylonian Chronicle, rev. 16 as [ n]a-šir. In Greek the name is written Ναβονασσάρου (gen.) in the "Ptolemaic Canon" (var.: Ναβονασάρου) and Ναβονασάρου in Pseudo-Berosos of Cos (*FGrH* III C/1 p. 395 lines 31-35; var.: Βαναςάρου [gen.]).

<sup>(1432)</sup> A new era from our point of view, not from that of the contemporary Babylonians. There is no evidence that a "Nabonassar Era" was in use in contemporary Babylonia (Kugler, *SSB* II 362-366),

torical events were kept systematically. The Babylonian Chronicle and the "Ptolemaic Canon" both commence their accounts with the beginning of this reign in 747. A Hellenistic tradition explained the dawn of the new historical epoch as follows:

From the time of Nabonassar, the Chaldeans accurately recorded the times of the motion of the stars. The polymaths among the Greeks learned from the Chaldeans that—as Alexander (Polyhistor) and Berossus, men versed in Chaldean antiquities, say—Nabonassar gathered together (the accounts of) the deeds of the kings before him and did away with them so that the reckoning of the Chaldean kings would begin with him. <sup>(1433)</sup>

The commencing of more accurate astronomical observations and records in this reign fits in well with what we know of the period, <sup>(1434)</sup> though the story of the destruction of earlier documents seems contrived. <sup>(1435)</sup> From our point of view, a more likely explanation for the survival of historical documentation from this time on would be the greater stability of the country achieved under this king and the consequent likelihood of more systematic keeping of records and of their greater chance for survival. The Hellenistic tale presumably represents an attempt to explain why the ages before Nabonassar loomed so dark for later historians. <sup>(1436)</sup>

though later ages would often begin their reckoning with this time because of the abundant astronomical observations available. According to the later Ptolemaic reckoning, the era began at midday on February 26, 747 B.C. (Ptolemy, *Syntaxis Mathematica*, ed. Heiberg, I, 257:6-7, 325:20-22, 462:2-5, II, 293:25-294:1, 315:14-15, 357:19-20, 391:16-17, 425:5-6 = K. Manitius, *Ptolemäus: Handbuch der Astronomie* [corrected edition by O. Neugebauer; Leipzig: Teubner, 1963], I, 185:2-3, 236:1-3, 338:21-22, II, 155:9-11, 171:2-3, 203:8-9, 227:13-14, 251:7-8).

<sup>(1433)</sup> *FGrH* III C/1 p. 395 no. 16 ([Pseudo-Berossos of Cos]).

<sup>(1434)</sup> The eighteen-year cycle texts (*ZA* VII [1892] 197-204, VIII [1893] 106-113) may be calculated to have begun their first eighteen-year cycle in 747, the first year of Nabonassar's reign. The astronomical observations available to Ptolemy also began at this time (*Syntaxis Mathematica*, ed. Heiberg, I, 254:8-13 = Manitius, *Ptolemäus: Handbuch der Astronomie* [rev. ed., 1963], I, 183:3-8; see Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, 2nd ed., p. 98). *LBAT* 1413 is a report of lunar eclipses which could be dated to about this time (748-746 B.C.). Kugler (*SSB* II 368-371) suggested that a possible reason why the Babylonians may have been motivated to begin keeping astronomical records now was the spectacular conjunction of the moon and the planets in the first regnal year of Nabonassar (747 B.C.).

We also note greater precision in synchronisms between Babylonia, Assyria, and Elam as listed in the Babylonian Chronicle. Kugler (*SSB* II 362-363) thought that the Babylonian Chronicle chose for its starting point the rise of Assyria to world power in 745 (rather than any native "Nabonassar Era"); but he failed to take into consideration that events before 745 are recorded in the variant A.H. 83-1-18, 1338 i 1' (*CT* XXXIV 44), before which several lines are damaged beyond restoration. But Kugler rightly stressed the beginning of more accurate astronomical observation in this period (*SSB* II 366-371).

<sup>(1435)</sup> It is difficult to hypothesize a reaction of Nabonassar against the records of his Chaldean predecessors, when we are uncertain of Nabonassar's own origin.

<sup>(1436)</sup> For the historical unlikelihood of the Hellenistic tradition, see already Weidner, *MVAG* XX/4 (1915) 105 and the literature cited there.

Weissbach, *Pauly-Wissowa*, XVI 1490 sub voce *Ναβονάσσαρος*, attempted to explain the tradition in a different way. He interpreted the verb *ἠφάνισεν*, usually translated as "destroyed" or "did away with," as meaning "concealed" and explained that Polyhistor meant that Nabonassar preserved only the names of his royal predecessors but not their deeds (which he did not consider worthy of mention). This interpretation is supported by the Armenian version of Eusebius' chronicle (*FGrH* III C/1 p. 374:13-18).

Nabonassar inherited from his predecessor, Nabu-shuma-ishkun, <sup>(1437)</sup> a kingdom torn by internal and external strife and little under the control of the central government. By virtue of a timely understanding with his Assyrian contemporary, Tiglath-Pileser III, who came to the throne in Assyria in Nabonassar's third year (745), Nabonassar was able to achieve relative stability in Babylonia for almost a decade and a half and to hand on his kingdom intact to his son. Though the central government in his time could hardly be considered strong, the land was more peaceful than it had been for many years.

The opening years of Nabonassar's reign were not auspicious. The Aramean and Chaldean tribes, which between them now hemmed in northern Babylonia on almost every side, were probably causing severe trouble to the more settled population of the region. <sup>(1438)</sup> Soon after his accession early in 745, Tiglath-Pileser, who had gained his throne as the result of a revolution in Assyria, <sup>(1439)</sup> undertook the restoration of order to his southern neighbor. <sup>(1440)</sup> For an Assyrian who nurtured grandiose ambitions in Syria and in Urartu, the first condition for tactically safe movement in those spheres was the securing of the frontiers to his south and east. Doubtless too, keeping the trade routes open was an important factor in Tiglath-Pileser's interest in the south, since the Arameans and Chaldeans controlled territory through which many of the key routes passed: through the Diyala from Iran, along the lower and middle Euphrates, and along the Tigris towards the head of the Persian Gulf. Accordingly, Tiglath-Pileser's first two campaigns, dating to his accession year (745) and to his first year (744), were directed against Babylonia and Namri. <sup>(1441)</sup>

<sup>(1437)</sup> No family relationship is attested between the two kings; Nabonassar's antecedents are as yet completely unknown.

<sup>(1438)</sup> It is possible that political disorders within Babylonia had already disrupted the celebration of the New Year's festival in at least one of the first three years of Nabonassar's reign. Cf. the restoration of A.H. 83-1-18, 1338 i 1' suggested by Landsberger and Bauer (*ZA* XXXVII [1927] 63 n. 2): [<sup>d</sup>Bēl] lā uš[ā], though *ul* is the more expected rendering of the negative here. The traces do indeed favor a reading [<sup>d</sup>Bē]N NU [ē].

It should be noted that there is no direct evidence for any Chaldean-Babylonian or Aramean-Babylonian conflict during this reign.

<sup>(1439)</sup> Eponym list: *RLA* II 430 rev. 25-26.

<sup>(1440)</sup> A. Anspacher, *Tiglath Pileser III*, p. 20, stated that Tiglath-Pileser legitimized his usurpation of the Assyrian throne by winning the acceptance of the principal priesthoods in Babylonia.

<sup>(1441)</sup> *RLA* II 430 rev. 26-29. The campaign against Babylonia is described tersely as *ana birīt nāri ittalak*; the meaning of the phrase *birīt nāri* has been discussed at length by Finkelstein in *JNES* XXI (1962) 73-92.

The texts of Tiglath-Pileser III are here cited according to the edition of Rost, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglath-Pileasers III* (1893). Annals: Rost, *TP III*, pls. I-XXIII (= *ARAB* I 762-779). Nimrud Slab no. 1: Rost, *TP III*, pls. XXXII-XXXIII (= *ARAB* I 781-785). Nimrud Slab no. 2: Rost, *TP III*, pls. XXIX-XXXI (= *ARAB* I 808-814). Nimrud Tablet no. 1: Rost, *TP III*, pls. XXXV-XXXVIII (= *ARAB* I 787-804; cited here chiefly as II R 67). Nimrud Tablet no. 2: Rost, *TP III*, pl. XXXIV (= *ARAB* I 805-807; cited here chiefly as D.T. 3). Texts published since Rost's edition will be cited by their individual publications.

In his campaign which began in Tashrit 745, <sup>(1442)</sup> Tiglath-Pileser did not come to subjugate Babylonia to the Assyrian yoke; and there is no record of hostilities with the Babylonian administration. Rather, he came chiefly to aid the Babylonian king, who was unable to keep order in his own land, in repressing the Aramean and Chaldean tribesmen. <sup>(1443)</sup> The Assyrian campaign attacked many areas in northern, southern, and eastern Babylonia. Tiglath-Pileser claimed to have gained mastery over Aramean tribes over a wide area, ranging from the cities of Dur-Kurigalzu, Sippar (of Shamash), and Pazitu (of the Dunanu tribe) in the north to Nippur in central Babylonia and extending along the Tigris and Surappi rivers in the east as far as the place where the Uknu (Kerkha) reached the swamps at the head of the Persian Gulf. <sup>(1444)</sup> The Aramean tribes brought under control were the Itu', Rubu', Puqudu, Ru'a, and Li'tau (Litamu), <sup>(1445)</sup> plus the cities of Hamranu and

<sup>(1442)</sup> Attempting to isolate sources pertaining to the first campaign of Tiglath-Pileser is difficult, especially in the absence of any good edition of Tiglath-Pileser's annals. The arrangement of the annals fragments set forth by Rost is far from certain; and there is no guarantee that plate I (lines 1-7) in Rost's edition refers to the campaign of 745. (Prof. Tadmor has kindly informed me now by letter [July 1967] that plate I should be placed at the end of the annals rather than the beginning). Plate XII (lines 20-31) obviously alludes to some events in 745, because activities occurring in "my second year of reign" (i.e., 744) begin in line 26. It is possible that plate XI, because it alludes to the building and settling of Kar-Ashur (lines 8-11), which took place in or shortly after 745 (Nimrud Slab no. 1:6-7), refers to a time relatively early in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser.

The Assyrian source most pertinent to our reconstruction of the events of 745 is Nimrud Slab no. 1. This inscription, whose composition has often been dated in 734 or later (e.g., Rost, *TP III*, p. III; Luckenbill, *ARAB I* 780), should actually be dated in 743 or shortly thereafter (as seen already by Olmstead, *Assyrian Historiography*, p. 34). This slab tells only of the campaigns of 745 (lines 4-16), 744 (lines 17-20), and 743 (lines 20-36), as may be seen by comparing the destinations of these campaigns (Babylonia, the Namri-Habban area, and Urartu) with the entries for 745-743 in the eponym chronicle (*RLA II* 430 rev. 28-31). This is the only Assyrian source which can definitely be established as narrating the military campaign of 745 in Babylonia without also mixing in events from the 731-729 Babylonian campaigns (the Nimrud tablets and Nimrud Slab no. 2 describe Tiglath-Pileser's Babylonian campaigns geographically, without making chronological distinctions).

The Babylonian Chronicle i 1-5 (*CT XXXIV* 46) also tells of the events of 745.

Thus, our principal sources for Tiglath-Pileser's Babylonian campaign of 745 will be Nimrud Slab no. 1 and the Babylonian Chronicle. Parallels from the annals (Rost, *TP III*, pl. XI) will be shown in note 1457 below, but will not be used in the text because of the chronological uncertainty of their reference.

<sup>(1443)</sup> Anspacher, *Tiglath-Pileser III*, p. 19, suggested that Nabonassar invited the help of Tiglath-Pileser against the Arameans and Chaldeans. Though there is no direct proof for such a contention, it fits well with the later pattern of events.

The possibility has been raised that Arameans of southern Babylonia aligned themselves with Arameans of Syria against Assyria around this time. This is based on a proposed identification of KTK (mentioned in contemporary Aramaic treaties) with Kissik in southern Babylonia (Donner-Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, II, 273, with earlier bibliography). This possibility is strengthened by the fact that Babylonian gods such as Marduk, Sarpanitum, Nabu, and Nergal are invoked in a treaty between Barga'ja of KTK and Mat'el (Donner-Röllig, *op. cit.*, no. 222 A 8-9). Difficulties with this position have been summarized by J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (1967), pp. 131-132.

<sup>(1444)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:4-6. The last part of the phrase reads literally "all the Arameans of the bank(s) of the Tigris and Surappi as far as the Uknu of the shore of the lower sea." For the location and spelling of the Surappi, see notes 1731 and 1729 below.

<sup>(1445)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:5, 12.

Rabbilu in Aramean territory. <sup>(1446)</sup> Some of these Arameans were deported and possibly resettled in the newly constructed city of Kar-Ashur. <sup>(1447)</sup> Tiglath-Pileser was able to boast: "I made the Arameans, as many as there were, submit at my feet; and I assumed kingship over their kings." <sup>(1448)</sup> The Chaldean tribe of Bit-Shilani was also vanquished: Sarrabanu, its capital, <sup>(1449)</sup> was destroyed and Nabu-ushabshi, its "king," was impaled. <sup>(1450)</sup> The rest of the ruling family of Bit-Shilani and much property was carried off. <sup>(1451)</sup> The tribe of Bit-Amukani was also attacked, and some of its people and goods was brought away to Assyria. <sup>(1452)</sup> Tribute was levied by Tiglath-Pileser upon the sheikhs of Chaldea. <sup>(1453)</sup> At this time, too, the gods of the city of Shapazzu were deported to Assyria; <sup>(1454)</sup> and in Hursagkamma near Kish <sup>(1455)</sup> Tiglath-Pileser had sacrifices offered to the principal Babylonian

<sup>(1446)</sup> Babylonian Chronicle i 4. These names bear as Aramean tribes in II R 67:5 (Nimrud Tablet no. 1). The location of these cities is uncertain. On the basis of the occurrence of Hamranu among the cities taken on one of Sennacherib's Elamite campaigns (*AJO* XX [1963] 90:28, *OIP* II 40:69, etc.), Grayson has suggested that the city be located somewhere east of the Tigris on the Diyala along the route followed by Sennacherib to Elam. Elsewhere it is mentioned that the Hamranu tribe, noted plunderers of Babylonian caravans, fled to Sippar to escape the armies of Sargon (*Lie, Sargon, 379-381*, written LÚ *Ha-mar-a-na-a+a*); and it is possible that a branch of the tribe operated west of the Tigris as well.

M. Dietrich in *WO* IV/1 (1967) 77 attempts to connect the Hamuru (K. 1172:2, etc.) with the people of Hamranu; this is very unlikely since the *-ānu* ending in the latter name was an essential part of the form and Hamranu (*OIP* II 40:69, etc.) and Hamuru (*Camb.* 394:4) were different cities.

<sup>(1447)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:13 (referring to the Puqudu, Ru'a, and Li'tau). Were some of the Itu' and Rubu' among the conquered peoples sent to Kar-Ashur (*ibid.*, 7)?

Olmstead (*AJSL* XXXVII [1920-21] 225-226 and *History of Assyria*, pp. 176-177) attempted to place Tiglath-Pileser's newly founded cities of Kar-Ashur and Dur-Tukulti-apil-Esharra near Babylonia, but there is little evidence for the location of these cities. Unger in *RLA* II 253-254 suggested that Dur-Tukulti-apil-Esharra might be identified with Arslan Tash; but see Thureau-Dangin *et al.*, *Arslan-Tash (Texte)*, p. 7.

<sup>(1448)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:13-14. The last part of the phrase should be read *šarrūt šarrišunu ašbat* (the LUGAL and MEŠ have become transposed in the text).

<sup>(1449)</sup> Note, however, that in Sennacherib's first campaign Sarrabanu is listed as belonging to Bit-Amukani (*OIP* II 53:42), while a similar-sounding Sarrabatu belongs to Bit-Sa'alli. Sarrabanu is also mentioned in the eponym chronicle C<sup>96</sup> rev. for the year 704(?): *RLA* II 435.

<sup>(1450)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:8-10. Since this text was written late in 743 or shortly thereafter (i.e., before Tiglath-Pileser's fourth campaign was completed), there can be no question of dating the defeat of Nabu-ushabshi and the capture of Sarrabanu to the period 731-729, as have Anspacher (*Tiglath Pileser III*, p. 66), Olmstead (*AJSL* XXXVII [1920-21] 227), and Labat (*Die altorientalischen Reiche III [=Fischer Weltgeschichte IV]* 55).

<sup>(1451)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:10-11.

<sup>(1452)</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-12.

<sup>(1453)</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-15. *Ra'sāni* ("headmen") has sometimes been translated as the proper name of a tribe; its meaning is discussed in note 1705 below.

<sup>(1454)</sup> Babylonian Chronicle i 5, where the name of the city is written as URU *Šá-pa-az-za* (var.: *-zu*). The gods of Shapazzu are also mentioned in Wiseman, *Chronicles*, 52 rev. 19 (referring to the year 625). It occurs also in the later Babylonian family name (*mār*) LÚ *šangú* URU *Šá-pa-za* (*UET* IV 56:14; *VAS* VI 248:15, the following line in the same text may contain a gentilic referring to the same GN: URU *Šá-pa-zu-ú-a*).

<sup>(1455)</sup> Hursagkamma was the name of the eastern section of Kish (perhaps reckoned as a separate city in this period); see the tablets and bricks found there which are discussed by Langdon, *Excavations at Kish*, III, 17-20.

and Assyrian gods. <sup>(1456)</sup> According to this account of Tiglath-Pileser's deeds, he must have affected a wide area of Babylonia at this time. <sup>(1457)</sup>

We have no explicit statement from either the Babylonian or the Assyrian side concerning Tiglath-Pileser's relations with Nabonassar. It seems that the Assyrian king did not visit Babylon itself at this time, <sup>(1458)</sup> nor did he attempt to depose the Babylonian king. Yet, if we can believe the official Assyrian accounts of his campaign of 745, Tiglath-Pileser must have travelled through much territory that nominally belonged to Nabonassar. Furthermore, the Assyrian king claimed to have become master of the land of Karduniash and of all the Arameans who lived along the Tigris and Surappi rivers as far south as the Uknu and the Persian Gulf; <sup>(1459)</sup> and, shortly after his first campaign, he adopted the title "King of Sumer and Akkad," <sup>(1460)</sup> implying some claim to suzerainty over Babylonia. What such suzerainty actually involved is uncertain, since it is clear that Nippur, mentioned as

<sup>(1456)</sup> Labat's statement in *Die altorientalischen Reiche* III (= *Fischer Weltgeschichte* IV) 51 that Tiglath-Pileser at this time visited all the great shrines from Sippar to Uruk is based on II R 67:11-12, a narrative which combines the events of 745 and 731-729 in topical rather than chronological order; it is more likely that Tiglath-Pileser's homage to these shrines should be dated to the later time, since it is mentioned only in the later text.

<sup>(1457)</sup> Later editions of Tiglath-Pileser's inscriptions, i.e., K. 3751 (=II R 67; Rost, *TP III*, pls. XXXV-XXXVIII) and D.T. 3 (=Rost, *TP III*, pl. XXXIV), which combine the king's earlier (745) and later (731-729) campaigns against southern Babylonia, offer additional details which may pertain to the earlier campaign. Nabu-ushabshi was defeated outside his city (K. 3751:15), Sarrabanu fell only after an earthen ramp was built up to its walls (K. 3751:16), fifty-five thousand people and various gods were deported from the region (K. 3751:16-17). The cities of Tarbasu and Jaballu may also have been captured at this time and their people, property, and gods carried off (K. 3751:18, D.T. 3:13-14); and some cities east of the Tigris—Lahiru, Hilimmu, Pillutu—may likewise have been taken in 745 rather than later (K. 3751:13-14). If the text in pl. XI of Rost's edition of the annals were eventually to be assigned here as referring to 745 [the correctness of this attribution has been kindly confirmed for me now (July 1967) by Prof. Tadmor in a letter], further details of the campaign would become known (contact with the Nakri, Tane, Adile[?] tribes and with the land of Budu and the city of Pahhaz). The section of the annals (pl. I), which Rost interpreted as its earliest preserved portion, does not agree well with what we know of the 745 campaign (since no religious contact with Babylon, Borsippa, or Cutha is mentioned in Nimrud Slab no. 1, but only relations with Hursagkalamma [see now also note 1442 above]).

Barnett in *The Sculptures of TP III*, pp. xvi-xvii, identifies and interprets Assyrian reliefs which he believes portray some of the events of this first campaign of Tiglath-Pileser III. (The reliefs themselves appear *ibid.*, pls. I-XII). The reliefs depict Assyrian officials and soldiers (pls. I-XII), siege engines (pls. III-IV), the siege of Babylonian cities (pls. X-XII), prisoners and cattle being tallied and led away (pls. III-VI), and statues of gods being carried away into captivity (pl. VII); plates III-VI are published as a composite in *ANEP* no. 367. Barnett's suggestion (pp. xvi-xvii) that the gods being led off include Marduk and Nabu from Babylon is unlikely, since there is no mention of Assyrian dealings with Babylon or Borsippa at this time. In fact, the only gods mentioned in the texts as being carried off now are the gods of the city of Shapazzu (note 1454); and it is probable, if the relief does refer to events of 745, that the gods pictured are from Shapazzu or from some other minor city—not the famous statue of Marduk from Babylon.

<sup>(1458)</sup> Anspacher in *Tiglath Pileser III*, p. 23, is wrong in claiming that the Assyrians took cities like Babylon, Borsippa, and Uruk in this campaign. Nimrud Tablet no. 1 (K. 3751=II R 67) draws a composite picture of the campaigns of 745 and 731 and cannot be used to pinpoint incidents confined to the campaign of 745.

<sup>(1459)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:5-6, 13-14.

<sup>(1460)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:1 (written in or shortly after 743).

terminus of one of his thrusts into Babylonia, continued under at least nominal Babylonian administration. <sup>(1461)</sup>

Before his next long campaign in Babylonia, which began in 731, Tiglath-Pileser seems to have fought several times in outlying regions which had been nominally Babylonian early in the preceding century. In 744, in his campaign against Namri, he subdued the old Kassite tribal area of Bit-Hamban. <sup>(1462)</sup> Sometime around 738 <sup>(1463)</sup> the Assyrians deported 600 captives from the city Amlatu of the Aramean tribe of Damunu and 5400 captives from Der <sup>(1464)</sup> and settled them in cities in Syria (*Unqi*). <sup>(1465)</sup> In an undated encounter, which Rost also placed around this time, Assyrian armies crossed the Lower Zab and fought against Ahlamu and Arameans. <sup>(1466)</sup> In 737, Tiglath-Pileser once more marched against areas east of the Tigris, including the land of the Medes and also the land of Tupliash. <sup>(1467)</sup> In another undated section of the annals, assigned by Rost to approximately this time, the towns of Silhazi and Niqqu, <sup>(1468)</sup> formerly part of northeastern Babylonia, were taken by the Assyrians. <sup>(1469)</sup>

<sup>(1461)</sup> A transaction referring to Nippur in late 745 is dated early in 744 under Nabonassar (*BRM I* 6:3, 11-12). Nippur, however, was to prove clearly on the Assyrian side in the subsequent Mukin-zeri troubles (see note 1517 below).

<sup>(1462)</sup> Nimrud Slab Inscription no. 1:17, *RLA II* 430 rev. 29; cf. *Annals*, 49. Bit-Hamban is the Bit-Habban of earlier periods, e.g., *BBSI* no. 6 ii 50. In the description of an occurrence dated by Rost to the same campaign, *mār Bābili* (DUMU KÁ.DINGIR.R[A.(KI)]) is mentioned in broken context (*Annals*, 57 = Rost, *TP III*, pl. XXIVB); but the placing of this fragment of the annals is still open to question.

<sup>(1463)</sup> These events, according to the most likely arrangement of the annals, would occur in the campaign immediately preceding the ninth *palú* (=737). That plate XV (lines 142-152) in Rost should go just before plate XVI (lines 153-164) seems reasonably certain because plates IV (lines 148-154) and V (lines 149-155) overlap the juncture between those two plates (lines 152-153) and show the overall continuity of the section. Since line 157 on plate XVI begins the narrative of the ninth *palú*, the events in lines 142-156 should presumably be dated to the eighth *palú* (=738).

<sup>(1464)</sup> Written URU BĀD (Rost, *TP III*, pl. XV 3) and [URU/LÚ] *Di-ra-a+a* (*ibid.*, pl. III 2).

<sup>(1465)</sup> *Annals*, 143-145.

<sup>(1466)</sup> *Annals*, 134-140 (pl. XXI). This poorly preserved section of the annals cannot definitely be dated, nor can one say with certainty that the deportations to Syria (*Hatti*) and the imposing of Assyrian provincial administration refer to the Ahlamu and Arameans.

<sup>(1467)</sup> *Annals*, 157-158.

<sup>(1468)</sup> The spelling of this town as Niqqu is assured by the writing URU *Ni-ig-qu* in *BOR I* (1886-87) 76:6 and elsewhere. The location of Niqqu has been discussed by Albright, *JAOS XLV* (1925) 215-217, S. I. Feigin, *JAOS LIX* (1939) 107-108, and Weidner, *Afo XVI* (1952-53) 14-15.

<sup>(1469)</sup> *Annals*, 175-176 (pl. XVII). The town of Til-Ashuri (line 176, here called a country), which had a temple of Marduk, was either taken at this time or earlier; it too is called a "fortress of the Babylonians" (Nimrud Slab no. 2:24), as was Silhazi. The city of Niqqu of Tupliash had been brought under Assyrian control already in 744 (Nimrud Slab no. 1:17-18) and had presumably become free in the meantime. The date to be assigned to the conquests of Til-Ashuri and Niqqu is not yet certain. *Annals*, 178-179, may also refer to Niqqu (the context is broken so the reference is dubious); if so, Tiglath-Pileser resettled part of the Diyala region at this time (see Adams, *Land behind Baghdad*, p. 175 n. 2).

Barnett in his *The Sculptures of TP III*, p. xviii, suggests that some reliefs of Tiglath-Pileser III from Nimrud (pls. XXXI-XXXIV) refer to a second Babylonian campaign (after 745); if so, it is more likely that they deal with events taking place in 731 or later, since this is the earliest certain evidence for an attack on Babylonia proper (i.e., the date-palm country of the reliefs) after 745.



We know little about the activities of Nabonassar himself. <sup>(1470)</sup> The Babylonian Chronicle informs us that he waged a fight against Borsippa after that city had revolted; but no account of the battle was preserved for the later chronicler. <sup>(1471)</sup> Although we hear of no Aramean disturbances during Nabonassar's reign after Tiglath-Pileser III's campaign in 745, we know that Uruk in the south was not very firmly under his control. There two local officials, after castigating the king and other administrators for neglecting the repair of an *akītu* temple, restored the edifice in their own name. They acknowledged the nominal sovereignty of the king by dating the document in his fifth year, but showed little respect for or allegiance to the central government. <sup>(1472)</sup>

More economic texts have survived from Nabonassar's reign than from any other reign in the period between Kashtiliash IV and Shamash-shuma-ukin. A collection of eighteen documents explicitly dated to Nabonassar's tenure in office, ranging from the twenty-third of Siman in his first year to the seventeenth of Tebet in his fourteenth (and last) year, has been published by A. T. Clay. <sup>(1473)</sup> Clay stated that these texts were supposed to have been found at a single site; <sup>(1474)</sup> but their exact provenience is unknown and their contents are such that it cannot definitely be settled whether or not they come from the same site. The majority of the texts are short: eighty percent are less than fifteen lines long. They are administrative in character, chiefly records of supplies coming in or out. <sup>(1475)</sup> The geographical names occurring in the texts are few <sup>(1476)</sup> and do not shed much light on the extent of the realm governed by Nabonassar. Some Aramean names are mentioned in the documents, e.g., <sup>m</sup>*Ba-ru-qa-a'*; <sup>(1477)</sup> but this is only to be expected when we consider the number of tribesmen supposedly residing in and around Babylonia who were objects of Tiglath-Pileser's campaigns. <sup>(1478)</sup> A fragmen-

<sup>(1470)</sup> No royal inscriptions of his have survived.

<sup>(1471)</sup> "In the time of Nabonassar, Borsippa fought with Babylon. The battle, which Nabonassar waged against Borsippa is not recorded": Babylonian Chronicle i 6-8. Borsippa had also during the preceding reign been the scene of civil disturbances.

King, *A History of Babylon*, p. 268, refers to a revolt of Sippar in the time of Nabonassar. Since no revolt of Sippar is mentioned in the texts currently available, "Sippar" is presumably a slip of the pen for "Borsippa."

<sup>(1472)</sup> YOS IX 74; duplicates: BIN II 31 and BM 113205 (unpublished). Traces of this building have not yet been unearthed at Warka, though a *bit akītu* probably to be dated to the Seleucid period has been excavated there (UVB XIII 35-42 and pl. 7; see also the remarks by North, *Orientalia N.S.* XXVI [1957] 245).

<sup>(1473)</sup> BRM I 4-21.

<sup>(1474)</sup> BRM I, p. 9.

<sup>(1475)</sup> The texts deal with sheep ("sheep of the king" [BRM I 6], sheep shearing [4], wool of several kinds [5, 7], including wool belonging to the goddess Nana [21]), other cattle (19), dates (11, 14), millet (13), barley (8, 9, 15, 20), oil (16), and are records of various types (goods dispensed, goods received, sales, etc.).

<sup>(1476)</sup> Babylon (BRM I 15:7), Uruk (19:4, 9), Nippur (6:3).

<sup>(1477)</sup> BRM I 12:4. These names are discussed on p. 272 below.

<sup>(1478)</sup> The percentage of Aramean names in the texts may run as high as forty percent, though many of the names are imperfectly preserved or difficult to classify. This might indicate that the tablets came from a peripheral area, possibly somewhere in the south or east.

tary legal text dated in Babylon in the second year of Nabonassar also survives. <sup>(1479)</sup>

Nabonassar was a contemporary of Ashur-nirari V and Tiglath-Pileser III in Assyria and of Ummanigash and his predecessor in Elam. The Babylonian Chronicle records the simple fact that in the fifth year of Nabonassar (743) Ummanigash came to the throne in Elam, <sup>(1480)</sup> where he was to reign until 717. <sup>(1481)</sup>

In summary, Nabonassar's reign in Babylonia was overshadowed by the more powerful figure of Tiglath-Pileser III. The Assyrian king campaigned extensively in regions under nominal Babylonian control and, with his assumption of the title of "King of Sumer and Akkad," claimed some form of suzerainty over Babylonia. Borsippa, long a center of disturbances under Nabonassar's predecessor, revolted from Babylon in the time of Nabonassar. Officials in Uruk, though acknowledging nominal allegiance to the Babylonian king, complained that he neglected his royal functions there; and so they repaired the *akitu* temple in their own names. Nabonassar's weak reign, under the partial peace ensured by Assyria, lasted until its fourteenth year, when Nabonassar died in his palace following an illness. <sup>(1482)</sup> He was succeeded by his son, Nabu-nadin-zeri. <sup>(1483)</sup>

<sup>(1479)</sup> BM 38114, kindly called to my attention by Prof. Wiseman. Too much is missing from the text for one to make any statement about its contents other than it is a legal document (with witnesses and with finger-nail marks in lieu of seals) and that the item which changed hands was worth 24 shekels of silver.

<sup>(1480)</sup> Babylonian Chronicle i 9-10.

<sup>(1481)</sup> *Ibid.*, i 38.

<sup>(1482)</sup> *Ibid.*, i 11.

<sup>(1483)</sup> Saggs, *Iraq* XVII (1955) 44, says that upon the death of Nabonassar in 734 a revolt broke out in Babylonia. The revolt in question actually began two years later at the time of the death of Nabu-nadin-zeri, the son of Nabonassar.