1. Introduction

Tukulti-Ninurta I’s conquest of Babylon, with its aftermath, is the most significant event in Assyro-Babylonian history during the second half of the thirteenth century B.C. Though a number of studies have discussed various historical and cultural aspects of this event, the political history of this intriguing period is still problematic. This article reviews the evidence and proposes a new historical reconstruction.

The discrepancy between two major sources of Babylonian origin, Chronicle P² and Babylonian King List A (hereafter BKL-A),³ is one of the most intensively disputed problems. As will be reviewed later in detail, Chronicle P narrates in one section (iv 1'-13') that Tukulti-Ninurta I, king of Assyria, defeated and captured Kashtiliashu, king of Babylon, conquered the city of Babylon, and ruled Babylonia by means of his governors for seven years, until the Kassite Adad-shuma-usur installed himself on the Babylonian throne. In the two subsequent sections (iv 14'-16' and 17'-22'), the chronicle records about two Elamite invasions of Babylonia during the reigns of the Babylonian kings Enlil-nadin-shumi and Adad-shuma-iddina. The text thus gives a sequence of the Babylonian rulers: Kashtiliashu -- Tukulti-Ninurta -- Adad-shuma-usur -- Enlil-nadin-shumi -- Adad-shuma-iddina. On the other hand, BKL-A (ii 7-11) offers a different sequence (see below, Table 1, right half).
Table 1:  Kings of Assyria and Babylonia in Assyrian King List and Babylonian King List-A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assyrian King List</th>
<th>Babylonian King List-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Length of reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukulti-Ninurta I</td>
<td>37 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nadin-apli</td>
<td>4 (variant 3) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nerari III</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enil-kudurri-usur</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninurta-apil-Ekur</td>
<td>13 (variant 3) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-dan I</td>
<td>46 (variant 367) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur</td>
<td>a short period (length unknown)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W. Röllig and J. A. Brinkman have already persuasively explained this discrepancy in the order of kings. Following their understanding, BKL-A preserves the royal names in genuine chronological order. Chronicle P, on the other hand, arranges the historical events by topics: The first section (iv 1'-13') deals with the Assyrian dominion and the exile of Marduk during a period of considerable length (c. 80-110 years); this long period should actually also cover the reigns of Enlil-nadin-shumi and Adad-shuma-iddina, which are dealt with separately in the next two sections. However, the nature of Tukulti-Ninurta's rule over Babylonia, as well as the reason for the omission of his name in BKL-A, is still in dispute. Some scholars consider that Tukulti-Ninurta's seven-year rule over Babylonia, mentioned in Chronicle P, was omitted in BKL-A, thus admitting that BKL-A has a seven-year chronological gap between Kashtiliashu and Enlil-nadin-shumi. Others suppose that Tukulti-Ninurta's rule was only indirect, and is represented in BKL-A by the reigns of the three successors of Kashtiliashu, i.e. Enlil-nadin-shumi (one year, six months), Kadashman-Harbe (one year, six months) and Adad-shuma-iddina (six years), who ruled Babylonia as Assyrian vassals or puppets.

In 1982, C. B. F. Walker published a fragmentary chronicle of extraordinary importance, naming it Chronicle 25: it includes more historical details about this period. The beginning of this text (obv. 1-10) appears to describe how Adad-shuma-usur fought with Enil-kudurri-usur, king of Assyria, defeated and arrested him, and then went off to conquer the city of Babylon (see below). Scholarly opinion had previously never doubted that Adad-shuma-usur ascended the throne in Babylon, thus liberating Babylonia, during the lifetime of...
Tukulti-Ninurta I. Now, however, Chronicle 25 forces us to synchronize the conquest of Babylon by Adad-shuma-usur with the end of Enlil-kudurri-usur’s reign, some 14/15 years after the assassination of Tukulti-Ninurta. Using this new source, which has rendered a number of previously proposed hypotheses untenable, Walker suggested a new reconstruction of Babylonian history in this period:

A) Tukulti-Ninurta defeated Kashtiliashu and took him as a captive to Assyria.
B) Three intervening kings (Enlil-nadin-shumi, Kadashman-Harbe and Adad-shuma-iddina) ruled in Babylon as Assyrian puppet kings under the sovereignty of Tukulti-Ninurta.
C) Adad-shuma-usur rebelled with the help of “Akkadian officers” (in the words of Chronicle P) and ascended the throne somewhere in southern Babylonia (though not in Babylon!) and ruled this region, including Nippur and Ur; however, the Assyrians continued to maintain control over the city of Babylon by means of Assyrian governors and/or nominees.
D) Adad-shuma-usur defeated the Assyrian king Enlil-kudurri-usur, who had launched an attack to restore Assyrian control over southern Babylonia.
E) Following his victory over the Assyrian forces, Adad-shuma-usur moved northwards to attack Babylon, where an unnamed person, probably an Assyrian nominee, resisted the attack. Adad-shuma-usur succeeded in gaining control of Babylon, which he then ruled.

In this reconstruction, Walker followed the chronological-historical understanding that the three kings who succeeded Kashtiliashu, as recorded in BKL-A, were Assyrian vassals whose reigns somehow overlap the seven-year rule of Tukulti-Ninurta mentioned in Chronicle P. However, several difficulties remain in this reconstruction: (1) If all these three kings were Assyrian vassals, it is hard to explain why the two Elamite invasions during in the reigns of Enlil-nadin-shumi and Adad-shuma-iddina, as noted in Chronicle P, did not cause any Assyrian response and/or the loss of Assyrian control over Babylonia. (2) Attempts have been made to reconcile the seven years of Tukulti-Ninurta’s control of Babylonia, mentioned in Chronicle P, with the total of the reigns of Enlil-nadin-shumi and Kadashman-Harbe (“one year, six months” [MU 1 ITI 6] for each) and that of Adad-shuma-iddina (6 years) recorded in BKL-A, but they are problematic. (3) There is an economic text from Nippur, which is dated to the accession year of Tukulti-Ninurta, implying that he was definitely recognized as king in southern Babylonia at one point, and did not just claim
indirect suzerainty over Babylonia. (4) Two of Tukulti-Ninurta’s royal inscriptions which include the title "king of Sippar and Babylon" suggest that he ruled these two metropolises directly (see below, Appendix). The last two pieces of evidence in particular lend support to the view that Assyrian rule over Babylonia, initiated by Tukulti-Ninurta, was maintained without local independent kings but by means of governors, as stated in Chronicle P.

Keeping these points in mind, we shall review the evidence, focusing special attention on relevant chronographical sources.

2. Chronicle 25, the Assyrian King List, and the Synchronistic History

Chronicle 25 describes Babylonian history at the end of the Kassite period and during the Isin II Dynasty from a Babylonian viewpoint. The first section, separated from the following part by a dividing line (obv. 1-10), is relevant here. Basically following Walker’s interpretation, I read the fragmentary text as follows, suggesting some conjectural restorations:

1. [m^Tukulti-d^Ninurta šar mât Aššur^ki. . . . ] x `DIB^ma KUR Kār-d^Dun-īa-āš ú-ma-a-a-er
2. [m^Adad-šuma-usur mahāzi ana idīšu ú-te] r `BĀD^NIBUR^ki DŪ-uš
3. [ . . . . ] x ú-kin m^En-līl-NÍG.DU-ŪRU šar KUR Aš-šur^ki
4. [iṭbiam m^Adad-šuma-usur ummānišu id-ke] r e^me-ma gisTUKUL iš-ši-ma BAD₃.BAD₄-šū im-haš
5. [niṣē mât Aššur^ki m^En-līl-NÍG.DJU-ŪRU EN-ššu-nu DIB^me-ma ana m^ISKUR-MU-ŪRU SUM-nu
6. [ . . . . . UN^m^e ša KUR Kar-dun-īa-āš ša ana KUR Aš-sur in-na-bi-tu
7. [ . . . . . ana m^Adad-MJU-ŪRU it-tan-nu m^ISKUR-MU-ŪRU ana ka-šad URU
8. [iṭlik . . . . ] a-a-um-ma DUMU la mam-ma-na-ma ša MU-ššu la za-kar
9. [ . . . . . m^Adad-šuma-ŪRJU ina bu-us-rat ú-bar-ma GĪŠ.MI DINGIR da-ru-ū eli-šu GAR-ma
10. [ . . . aḷa ikṣud mātāti mithāriṣ i]-be-el-ma ina gisGU.ZA LUGAL-ū-ti-ššu i-ku-un

"1. [Tukulti-Ninurta king of Assyria] seized [ . . . . . ] and controlled the land of Karduniash. 2. [Adad-shuma-usur recov]ered [sacred cities to his side.] He reconstructed the wall of Nippur. 3-4. He established [ . . . . . ]. Enlil-kudurrī-usur, king of Assyria, [came to attack. Adad-shuma-usur mobil]ized [his army], fought and defeated him. 5. [The people of Assyria] arrested [Enlil-
kudurri-usur, their lord, and handed (him) over to Adad-shuma-usur. 6. [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
noted that the terminology attested here is different from the standard accession formula employed in Babylonian chronicles, i.e. *ina kussī... wašābu* (Buccellati 1964, 54f.; cf. also Weissert 1992, 274-277). Since there is no room to restore the standard accession formula at the beginning of this line, Chronicle 25 appears to include no explicit reference to Adad-shuma-usur’s enthronement at Babylon, implying that the author views the beginning of his reign as preceding his conquest of Babylon.

The entire section obv.1-10 is evidently concerned with Adad-shuma-usur’s victory over the Assyrian king Enlil-kudurri-usur and his subsequent conquest of Babylon, as Walker understood. Walker’s restoration of the reference to Tukulti-Ninurta’s control over Babylon in the first line is plausible, despite some doubt raised recently by J. E. Reade, who suggests restoring the name of Adad-shuma-usur instead of that of Tukulti-Ninurta. One must note, again with Walker, that the verb *umā”er* attested in the first line is the term used to indicate the control of Babylonia specifically by a usurper or foreign conqueror, as shown by the use of the same verb in Chronicle P to describe Tukulti-Ninurta’s dominion over Babylonia, as well as in Chronicle 25, obv. 13, referring to the rule of a usurper at Mari. This strongly supports the restoration of the name of Tukulti-Ninurta in the first line of Chronicle 25, rather than that of Adad-shuma-usur. The text, therefore, appears to prove that Assyrian rule of Babylon, initiated by Tukulti-Ninurta, continued until Adad-shuma-usur’s conquest of the city, which is roughly correlated with the end of the reign of Enlil-kudurri-usur, king of Assyria. Adad-shuma-usur must have ruled only the southern part of Babylonia until the last moment.

If it is assumed that the Assyrians were ruling Babylon, and that Adad-shuma-usur had kept control of Nippur before the war, the conflict must have taken place in Babylonia, as Walker suggests. In order to break the status quo in Babylonia – in particular Assyrian domination of Babylon – Adad-shuma-usur seems to have co-operated with Ninurta-apil-Ekur, the Assyrian prince who seized the Assyrian throne, as suggested in the following passage of the Assyrian King List:

```
*Ninurta-apil-Ekur mār *Ili-ipadda liblibbi ša *Eriba-Adad ana māt Karduniāš ilik ullu māt Karduniāš ēlā giškussā išbat 13 (variant: 3) šanāṭi šarrūta ēpuš
```

“Nunurta-apil-Ekur, son of Ili-ipadda, offspring of Eriba-Adad (I), went to
Karduniash. He came up from Karduniash (and) seized the throne (for himself). He ruled for thirteen/three years.”

In this light, the fragmentary passage of the Synchronistic History, ii 3-8, can now be restored as follows:


“Enlil-kudurri-uṣur king of Assyria (and) [Adad-shuma-uṣur king of Karduniash] battled [with one another]. While Enlil-kudurri-uṣur (and) Adad-[shuma-uṣur] were engaged in battle [at GN], Ninurta-apil-E[kur came up from Karduniash], returned to his land. [He mustered] his numerous troops, marched to conquer the city of Ashur, and attacked [Enlil-kudurri-uṣur] at his fortress. (Then) he turned [to the city of Ashur and took the throne].”

Thus it appears from Chronicle 25, the Assyrian King List and the Synchronistic History that after the encounter between Enlil-kudurri-uṣur and Adad-shuma-uṣur, the army of Ninurta-apil-E[kur, who claimed the Assyrian throne, attacked Enlil-kudurri-uṣur, and captured him in order to hand him over to Adad-shuma-uṣur. Chronicle 25, obv. 7-9, must be concerned with the subsequent battle of Adad-shuma-uṣur to liberate the city of Babylon. “Someone, son of a nobody, whose name is not mentioned (ayyumma mār là mammānāma ša šumšu là zakar)” in obv. 8 must refer to an Assyrian governor in Babylon who resisted the attack, only to be removed by Adad-shuma-uṣur.

3. Chronicle P

We shall now examine Chronicle P, iv 1'-23'. The contents of the pertinent lines may be summarized as follows:

(Section 1)
A) Tukulti-Ninurta defeated and captured Kashtiliashu (1'-2').
B) Tukulti-Ninurta returned to the city of Babylon (ana Bābili itūramma), attacked it, destroyed its wall, killed the citizens and took away the statue of
Marduk (3'-6'a).

C) Appointing governors (šaknûtišu), Tukulti-Ninurta ruled Karduniash for seven years (7 MU.MEŠ ... māt Karduniaš uma’er) (6'b-8'a).

D) Later (EGIR), the noblemen of Babylonia rebelled and put Adad-shuma-usur on his father’s throne (ina ḫiškussi abišu ušēšibû) (8'b-9'a).

E) Ashur-nadin (text: našir)-apli,22 son of Tukulti-Ninurta, and the noblemen of Assyria killed Tukulti-Ninurta (9'b-11').

F) Marduk came back to Babylon in the time of Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur (text erroneously omits Ninurta-) (12'-13').

(Section 2)

G) In the time of the king Enlil-nadin-shumi, Kitin-Hutran king of Elam invaded Babylonia, attacked Nippur and Der, carried off the people, removed Enlil-nadin-shumi the king, and eliminated his rulership (iṯrudma Enlil-nādin-šumi šarra ukkiš bēlussu)23 (14'-16').

(Section 3)

H) In the time of Adad-shuma-iddina, Kitin-Hutran invaded Babylonia again, destroyed Isin, Marad ..... (break) ..... (17'-22').

As stated at the beginning of this article, Chronicle P describes the events in three sections, arranging them topic by topic, i.e. the Assyrian capture of Babylonia and the exile of Marduk (Section 1), and then two Elamite invasions of Babylonia (Sections 2 and 3). Section 1 covers a long period (c. 80-110 years), during which the incidents described in Sections 2 and 3 must have taken place. Thus, accepting the sequence of Babylonian kings given in BKL-A (i.e. Kashtiliashu – Enlil-nadin-shumi – Kadashman-Harbe – Adad-shuma-iddina – Adad-shuma-usur) as chronological, Enlil-nadin-shumi and Adad-shuma-iddina, mentioned in Sections 2 and 3 of Chronicle P, should chronologically be placed before the reign of Adad-shuma-usur mentioned in Section 1.

We must now proceed to a more detailed consideration of chronology. Tukulti-Ninurta’s conquest of Babylon (B in Chronicle P, see above) obviously inaugurated his seven-year rule of Karduniash (C). It is also evident that a considerable period of time elapsed between the assassination of Tukulti-Ninurta (E) and the return of the statue of Marduk by Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur (F), since these events were separated by the reigns of five Assyrian kings (see above, Table 1). Aside from these cases, however, it remains unclear how much time passed between the events mentioned in Section 1, and how to synchronize the incidents of B-E with those of G-H.

Following the fragmentary lines dealing with the capture of Kashtiliashu
(A), Chronicle P records that Tukulti-Ninurta “came back” to Babylon to conquer it (B). It has often been assumed that Tukulti-Ninurta’s conquest of Babylon immediately followed the battle in which Kashtiliashu was captured. However, as suggested by several scholars, the two incidents may have occurred in two separate campaigns, with a considerable time lapse between them.24

The administrative document KAJ 103, ll.12-16 refers to “food for Kassite people, captives of Karduniash, of the two campaigns (kurummat šābē Kaššē hubtē ša māt Karduniāš ša šitte harrānāte).” This shows that there were at least two Babylonian campaigns. Another administrative document, VAT 17999,25 mentions “captives of Karduniash (hubtē ša māt Karduniāš)” (i 44’) and “mules, oxen and donkeys, which went for the army with the king to Karduniash (kūdīnī alpē u imērī ša ana hurādī ḫuṣṭu šarri ana māt Karduniāš illikīnī)” (iv 37f.).” This may also suggest, as H. Freydank points out, the existence of two Babylonian campaigns; one that had been completed and during which the Babylonian deportees had been brought to Assyria, and another, which was still in progress. One of these two campaigns may have been that during which Kashtiliashu was captured, while the other ended with the conquest of Babylon.26

If it is assumed that a considerable amount of time elapsed between the capture of Kashtiliashu and the conquest of Babylon, it must be asked how late the latter event took place. E. Weidner and M. J. Munn-Rankin suggested that Tukulti-Ninurta marched against the city of Babylon two years after the capture of Kashtiliashu, during the reign of Kadashman-Harbe.27 They would thus synchronize Tukulti-Ninurta’s subsequent seven-year rule over Babylonia with the last year of Kadashman-Harbe’s reign and the six years of the reign of Adad-shuma-iddina. However, as already stated, the economic text from Nippur which is dated by the name of Tukulti-Ninurta, the latter’s title of “king of Sippar and Babylon” in his royal inscriptions, as well as the contents of Chronicle P, all suggest that Tukulti-Ninurta ruled Babylonia directly as king, not just by keeping local Babylonian kings as his vassals. Therefore, an alternative solution must be suggested. Since Adad-shuma-uṣur is described explicitly in Chronicle P as the liberator of Babylonia from the hand of Tukulti-Ninurta, the latter’s conquest of Babylon and his subsequent rule over Babylonia can only be placed after the reign of Adad-shuma-iddina. Thus, the fragmentary line of Chronicle P, iv 3 (Section 1-B) may be restored as [ina tarṣī Adad-šuma-iddina Tukulti]-dNinurta ana Bābīl[kī] ū-ra-ram[l]m[a] “[during the time of Adad-shuma-iddina, Tukulti]-Ninurta returned to Babylon.” In accordance with this, the first line of Chronicle 25 can perhaps be restored as: [Tukulti-Ninurta šā rāt māt Aššur ... dAdad-šuma-SUM-n]a(!) /XMLSchema-ma Karduniāš ūmā’er “[Tukulti-Ninurta,
king of Assyria, arrested [Adad-shuma-iddin]a and controlled Karduniash.”

With the adoption of this proposal, the history of Babylonia in this period can be understood as follows. After Kashtiliashu had been exiled by the Assyrians, Babylonia experienced two Elamite invasions during the reigns of his three successors (Chronicle P, iv 14-22). In the first invasion, the Elamite king Kidin-Hutran sacked Nippur and Der and, probably in the course of this war, captured and removed the king Enlil-nadin-shumi. This Babylonian king had probably remained in power as an Assyrian vassal, since he ascended the throne following Kashtiliashu’s capture by the Assyrians. Whether the next king, Kadashman-Harbe, was pro-Elamite or not, the Elamite invasion must have stirred up serious turmoil among Babylonian elites, who were forced to make difficult political decisions between the two aggressive powers, Assyria and Elam. The short reign of Kadashman-Harbe (“one year, six months”) implies the instability of the Babylonian kingship in this period.

The Elamites invaded again during the reign of the next king, Adad-shuma-iddina. Although they are recorded as having destroyed Isin and Marad, the aftermath of this second Elamite invasion remains unclear because of the break in Chronicle P, iv 22ff. M. B. Rowton assumed that Adad-shuma-iddina was dethroned by the Elamites, who then ruled Babylonia for a short time.28 Indeed the Elamite invasion must have influenced Babylonian political attitudes, possibly in a pro-Elamite direction. However, the insertion of an Elamite interregnum seems unnecessary. The penultimate line in the pertinent section of Chronicle P (iv 21) tells of the Elamite devastation, and the last line (iv 22) is illegible. In the very fragmentary first line of the next section, after a dividing line, (iv 23), Rowton reads [u]-šum-ša-ir “he ruled,” interpreting this as relating to the Elamite interregnum. However, as Walker has suggested,29 this line can be understood as the beginning of a section on the reign of Adad-shuma-usur, starting with a restatement of Tukulti-Ninurta’s control over Babylonia in a manner similar to the beginning of Chronicle 25.

Following his victory over Kashtiliashu, Tukulti-Ninurta must have planned to keep Babylonia as a faithful vassal state. This aim, however, was disturbed twice by the Elamites. Thereupon, it appears, Tukulti-Ninurta, pursuing a new method of government, captured Babylon, removed the local, independent king, and initiated direct rule of Babylonia by placing his own governors at Babylon and other cities in Babylonia. The Assyrian governors, šaknûte in terms of Chronicle P, must have ruled Babylon until the later reconquest of the city by Adad-shuma-usur. It is not surprising that BKL-A entirely neglects this episode of Assyrian rule, since the Babylonians despised it,
TUKULTI-NINURTA I’S RULE OVER BABYLONIA AND ITS AFTERMATH

as suggested by Chronicle P’s description of Tukulti-Ninurta as a malefactor against Babylon (see below). One may find an analogy to this reconstructed historical process in the Babylonian policy of Sennacherib during 703-689 B.C. He first attempted to control Babylonia, placing Bel-ibni, a local puppet king, in Babylon, and then setting his own son, Ashur-nadin-shumi, on the Babylonian throne. Thereafter, when an Elamite armed intervention into Babylonia removed his beloved son from the Babylonian throne and exiled him to Elam, Sennacherib marched off to destroy the rebellious city of Babylon in order to rule it directly by himself.30

We now need to discuss the end of Tukulti-Ninurta’s seven-year rule, mentioned in Chronicle P. The pertinent passage (iv 7b-11’) reads:

“For seven years, Tukulti-Ninurta ruled Karduniash. Later, the noblemen of Akkad (and) Karduniash rebelled and seated Adad-shuma-usur on his father’s throne. As for Tukulti-Ninurta, who had laid his hands sinfully on Babylon, Ashur-nadin-apli, his son, and the noblemen of Assyria rebelled against him, removed him [from] the throne, shut him up in a house in Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta and killed him.”

It is difficult to imagine that this enthronement of Adad-shuma-usur is that at Babylon, which took place much later than the death of Tukulti-Ninurta (see above). If this were the case, nothing but the death of Tukulti-Ninurta could have ended his seven-year rule over Babylonia. This is unlikely, however, implying that the order of the events within the single section is not chronological, with Adad-shuma-usur’s enthronement at Babylon being mentioned before Tukulti-Ninurta’s death.

The mention of Adad-shuma-usur’s enthronement here probably means that he ruled the southern part of Babylonia during the lifetime of Tukulti-Ninurta. Thus, ina kussi abišu ušēšibu “they seated (him) on his father’s throne” just describes the revival of the dynasty of Kashtiliashu by his son Adad-shuma-usur.32 One might read, with M. B. Rowton and A. K. Grayson,33 a temporal
clause in “arki(EGIR) ... ibbalkitūma” and translate the lines “After the noblemen of Akkad (and) Karduniash had rebelled and had seated Adad-shuma-ūṣur on his father’s throne, Ashur-naṣir-apli, his son, and the noblemen of Assyria rebelled against Tukulti-Ninurta ... and killed him,” instead of the translation given above.

An additional detail of Assyro-Babylonian synchronism supports this conclusion. If Tukulti-Ninurta’s seven-year rule had ended with his death, according to the hypothesis rejected here, the time lapse between the final defeat of Kashtiliashu and the end of Tukulti-Ninurta’s reign should be 15/16 years (total length of the reigns of Enlil-nadin-shumi and Kadashman-Harbe: 2 or 3 years + the reign of Adad-shuma-iddina: 6 years + Tukulti-Ninurta’s Babylonian dominion until his death: 7 years); thus, the end of Kashtiliashu’s reign would be dated to the 21st/22nd year of Tukulti-Ninurta, who reigned for 37 years. This matches none of the Assyro-Babylonian synchronisms suggested so far, which unanimously place the end of Kashtiliashu’s reign before Tukulti-Ninurta’s 20th year, whether the seven-year Assyrian interregnum is included in the scheme or not.34 On the other hand, assuming that Tukulti-Ninurta’s seven-year rule ended with Adad-shuma-ūṣur’s enthronement in southern Babylonia, the end of Kashtiliashu’s reign would be dated a number of years earlier than the 21st/22nd year of Tukulti-Ninurta, thus avoiding the problem in synchronism.


The success of Adad-shuma-ūṣur’s revolt in southern Babylonia was apparently aided by the decline of the two strong neighbors, Assyria and Elam, which had been deeply involved in Babylonian politico-military affairs. Following the disappearance of Kidin-Hutran, Elam appears to have entered a period of internal disturbance, which resulted in dynastic change.35 This must have led to a decline in Elamite activity in Babylonia. Tukulti-Ninurta’s bilingual prayer KAR 128 suggests the decline of his over-extended empire on several fronts, probably including southern Babylonia, toward the end of his reign.36 This state of affairs must have hampered Tukulti-Ninurta from reacting effectively to the revolt in southern Babylonia.

The site of Adad-shuma-ūṣur’s enthronement in southern Babylonia, which would have served as his capital, was probably one of the major cities such as Ur, Uruk or Nippur. Economic documents dated to his earlier regnal years (third year onwards) are known from Ur.37 Taking this and the location of Ur, far from Assyria, into consideration, it seems probable that Ur was recaptured by Adad-shuma-ūṣur at the time of his enthronement in southern Babylonia. Chronicle 25,
relating his construction of the wall of Nippur, shows that he also ruled Nippur before his conquest of Babylon. His recognition as king in Nippur is confirmed by additional pieces of evidence. His stamped bricks are found at Nippur, and he is referred to as king in the kudurru BM 90827, in the context of a legal dispute in the province of Nippur (i 39).

Additional pieces of evidence, noted by Walker, are helpful in considering Adad-shuma-usur’s reign. His letter, surviving as a later copy (K 3045), addressed both to Ashur-nerari III, king of Assyria, and Ili-ipadda, the influential Assyrian governor of Hanigalbat, probably reflects the situation following Adad-shuma-usur’s enthronment and subsequent military successes in Babylonia. It must have been written before his conquest of Babylon, in an attempt to provoke the Assyrians into waging war by insulting them. A royal inscription of Adad-shuma-usur, preserved as a later copy (BM 36042), tells of the nomination of Adad-shuma-usur by Marduk and his return of the gods of Sumer and Akkad to their own temples, reflecting his capture of Babylon. A fragmentary historical epic, in which Adad-shuma-usur is described as the protagonist, appears to tell of his liberation of Babylon, including his restoration of the cults in Babylon, Borsippa and Cutha (cols. ii-iii). A fragmentary kudurru (AS 3326) found at Susa records a land grant in the Diyala region made by Adad-shuma-usur, with the title “king of Babylon (sar Bābili)”. This also proves that Adad-shuma-usur recovered the northern part of Babylonia, including the city of Babylon, as well as the Diyala region.

5. Concluding Remarks

As already concluded, Chronicle P appears to regard Adad-shuma-usur’s enthronement in southern Babylonia, preceding his conquest of Babylon, as the start of his reign. The composer of Chronicle 25 seems to take the same view, describing the establishment of Adad-shuma-usur’s extended rule and stable kingship after the liberation of Babylon, while not explicitly referring to his enthronement there (see above). It is reasonable to think that this view is also adopted in BKL-A, a text of Babylonian origin like the chronicles. Thus, the 30 years assigned to Adad-shuma-usur in BKL-A should be counted from his enthronement in southern Babylonia, as Walker has suggested.

Theoretically, there is room to count the 30 years from his capture of Babylon. This implies, however, that he reigned longer than 44/45 years (an unknown period overlapping the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta + 14/15 years [for the total regnal years of the three Assyrian kings following Tukulti-Ninurta] + 30 years [for Adad-shuma-usur’s reign at Babylon]). Such a long reign is not
supported by the dates appearing in economic documents, and seems unlikely. The chronological gap in BKL-A, therefore, appears to consist only of the seven years between Adad-shuma-iddina and Adad-shuma-uṣur, that is from the start of Tukulti-Ninurta’s direct rule over Babylonia until Adad-shuma-uṣur’s enthronement in southern Babylonia (see below, Table 2).

Some supplementary chronological notes should be added. Dates found in economic texts from Babylon suggest that Adad-shuma-uṣur ruled Babylon at least from his 27th regnal year; thus, he ruled Babylon for no less than four years. Since the period of 14/15 years, during which the three Assyrian kings reigned following Tukulti-Ninurta, must overlap Adad-shuma-uṣur’s 30-year reign, preceding his conquest of Babylon, his rule over Babylon can have lasted no more than 15/16 years. Hence, he ruled Babylon for between 4 and 15/16 years. Accordingly, the overlap between the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta and that of Adad-shuma-uṣur should be 0-11/12 years, and the beginning of Kashtiliashu’s reign should be 1-14 years later than Tukulti-Ninurta’s accession.

Table 2: Assyro-Babylonian Synchronism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assyria</th>
<th>Babylon</th>
<th>Southern Babylonia</th>
<th>BKL-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tukulti-Ninurta (37 years)</td>
<td>(1-14 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kashtiliashu IV (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enlil-nadin-shumi (1/1.5)</td>
<td>(1, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadashman-Harbe II (1/1.5)</td>
<td>(1, 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adad-shuma-iddina (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tukulti-Ninurta (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. of Tukulti-Ninurta’s rule (0-11/12 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nadin-apli (3/4)</td>
<td>Continued Assyrian rule (14/15 years)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nerari III (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adad-shuma-uṣur (30)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlil-kudurri-uṣur (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninurta-apil-Ekur (13/3)</td>
<td>(4-15/16 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally the historical-chronological reconstruction proposed here can be summarized thus:
1) Tukulti-Ninurta plundered the territories of Kashtiliashu and finally
captured him (= the end of Kashtiliashu’s reign). The Babylonians avoided the conquest of Babylon by recognizing the indirect sovereignty of Tukulti-Ninurta.

2) Enlil-nadin-shumi ascended the empty throne of Babylon and reigned “one year, six months.” He was probably an Assyrian vassal but still held his direct rulership over the principal Babylonian cities.

3) The Elamite king Kitin-Hutran invaded southern Babylonia and destroyed Nippur and Der. This invasion ended the reign of Enlil-nadin-shumi; he was probably captured or killed by the Elamites.

4) Kadashman-Harbe ascended the empty throne of Babylon. He reigned “one year, six months,” holding his direct rulership over the principal Babylonian cities.

5) Kadashman-Harbe was presumably dethroned in an internal conflict between pro-Assyrian and pro-Elamite parties in Babylon; Adad-shuma-iddina ascended the throne in Babylon, and ruled Babylonia for six years.

6) The Elamite king Kitin-Hutran invaded southern Babylonia again and destroyed Isin and Marad. There is no evidence as to what happened on the Babylonian political scene after the Elamite invasion. One may speculate that a pro-Elamite party gained power in Babylon and that this spurred the Assyrian campaign against Babylon.

7) Tukulti-Ninurta invaded to Babylonia, conquered Babylon, took the statue of Marduk to Assyria, and initiated his direct rule over Babylonia by appointing governors. It can be assumed that Adad-shuma-iddina’s reign was now brought to the end by the Assyrians.

8) After seven years of direct Assyrian rule over Babylonia, Adad-shuma-uṣur, son of Kashtiliashu, rebelled with the help of Babylonian elites in southern Babylonia, ascended the throne, and began to rule the southern part of Babylonia, probably from Ur or another major city. (The 30 years assigned to his reign in BKL-A are counted from this moment.) On the other hand, the northern part of Babylonia, including Babylon, Sippar, Borsippa and Cutha, was left under Assyrian control.

9) After the assassination of Tukulti-Ninurta, northern Babylonia still continued to be ruled by Assyrian governors during the reigns of Tukulti-Ninurta’s three successors, i.e. Ashur-nadin-apli (3/4 years), Ashur-nenari III (6 years), and Enlil-kudurri-uṣur (5 years). On the other hand, Adad-shuma-uṣur ruled over the southern part of Babylonia, and gradually extended his control northward, fortifying Nippur and waiting for an opportunity to recover the remaining part of Babylonia.
10) Enlil-kudurri-uṣur, king of Assyria, campaigned against Adad-shuma-uṣur. They waged war with each other somewhere in Babylonia, and Adad-shuma-uṣur defeated Enlil-kudurri-uṣur. While this war was taking place, Ninurta-apil-Ekur, the Assyrian prince who had stayed in Babylonia, probably as a political refugee, went into action to win the Assyrian throne. He attacked Enlil-kudurri-uṣur, who had been defeated by the Babylonians, in the latter’s fort, arrested him and delivered him to Adad-shuma-uṣur. (Ninurta-apil-Ekur eventually won the Assyrian throne.)

11) Having defeated Enlil-kudurri-uṣur, Adad-shuma-uṣur moved up to attack Babylon, stirred up rebellion there against an Assyrian governor who resisted the attack, and succeeded in gaining control of Babylon. Probably at the same time, Adad-shuma-uṣur recovered control of other northern Babylonian cities such as Sippar, Borsippa, and Cutha, as well as of the Diyala region, thus establishing his dominion over the entire region of Babylonia.

APPENDIX

Notes on the Royal Inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta I Relating to his Babylonian Expedition

This appendix reviews Tukulti-Ninurta’s royal inscriptions, in particular those referring to his Babylonian expeditions. Examining their textual features and considering their dates of composition, we shall scrutinize their historical implications for different stages of Tukulti-Ninurta’s Babylonian expeditions.

There are eight versions of inscriptions recording his Babylonian campaign (Grayson 1987, A.0.78.5, 6, 22, 23, 24 and 25; Deller et al. 1994, IM 57821 and IM 76787). Two of them (Grayson 1987, A.0.78.5 and 6) are texts on the inscriptions from Ashur, and the others stem from Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta.

In A.0.78.6 alone, the reference to the Babylonian campaign is made in a nominal phrase of a royal epithet within the introduction (ll. 1-26), which directly precedes a building account. The pertinent part (ll. 21-24) reads:

ša (l. 17) ... dabdū māti Šumeri u Akkadī iltakanūma lissu ana ahriti ušāpū mKaštiliašu šar kašši qāssu ikšūdu

“(Tukulti-Ninurta is) the one who ... brought out the defeat of Sumer and
Akkad, made manifest his power forever, and whose hand captured Kashtiliashu, king of the Kassites.”

The other seven texts mention the Babylonian campaign, not in a nominal phrase in epithets, but in a narrative included at the end of the account, dealing with the king’s military achievement in different regions. The same group of texts also includes royal titles claiming Tukulti-Ninurta’s rule over Babylonia, which will be discussed later. The accounts of the Babylonian campaign can be categorized into three versions. The account attested in parallel in A.0.78.5 (ll. 48-69), A.0.78.22 (line numbers not detectable) and IM 57821 (ll. 33-44a) is taken up here as the standard account (Type 1), which is divided into seven parts (A-F) for the convenience of subsequent discussion.

“(A) With the support of Ashur, Enlil, and Shamash, the great gods, my lords, (and) with the aid of Ishtar, mistress of heaven (and) underworld, (who) marches at the head of my army, (B) I approached Kashtiliashu, king of Karduniash, to do battle. (C) I brought about the defeat of his army (and) felled his warriors. (D) In the midst of that battle I captured Kashtiliashu, king of the Kassites, (and) trod with my feet upon his lordly neck as though it were a footstool. (E) Bound I brought him as a captive into the presence of Ashur, my lord. (F) (Thus) I became the lord of Sumer and Akkad in its entirety (and) (G) fixed the boundary of my land as the Lower Sea in the east.”

Another version (Type 2), found in A.0.78.23 (ll. 56b-68), is roughly similar to this standard account, except for the following variants: (1) the description of the capture of Kashtiliashu is shorter than that of the standard account (D), lacking kišad bēlūtišu kima galtappi ina šēpiya akbus. (2) The concluding statement (G) is replaced by a list of 38 lands along the middle Euphrates and in the mountain region east of the Tigris, followed by the
statement: “I brought them under one command; (and) they regularly brought the tribute of their lands and the products of their mountains to my presence, I am the prince who accepts their gifts, the shepherd who has charge over them, and the herdsman who properly judged them.”

A.0.78.24 (ll. 34-40), A.0.78.25 (r. 1-8) and IM 76787 (ll. 37b-45) contain the third version (Type 3), similar to the standard account, with the following variants: (1) The statement of divine help (A) is replaced by the introductory formula ina umēšuma “at that time”.51 (2) The concluding statement of the standard account (G) is replaced by: “I stood over them with joy and excellence.”

There are good reasons to regard A.0.78.6 as earlier than the other inscriptions. Fortunately, this text bears the eponym Ina-Ashur-shumi-ašbat, by which a number of letters from Tell Sheikh-Hamad are also dated.52 Investigating this group of letters, in particular those referring to Kassite captives, a Kassite king apparently equated with Kashtiliashu, and the land of Karduniash (nos. 2, 9 and 10), E. C. Cancik-Kirschbaum postulated that the capture of Kashtiliashu took place in this very eponym year.53 This conclusion may be supported by textual analysis. The introduction of A.0.78.6 (ll.1-26) is identical to that of an earlier inscription, A.0.78.18 (ll.1-28), the latter only lacking the passage on the Babylonian campaign included in the former as a part of the king’s epithets (ll. 21-24). Furthermore, A.0.78.6 includes none of the royal titles claiming dominion over Babylonia, which appear consistently in the other inscriptions (see below, with Table 3). Thus it seems that the introduction of A.0.78.6 was largely borrowed from an earlier inscription composed before the Babylonian campaign, but that a reference to this new event, which occurred in the very year of the composition, was added to the strings of royal epithets. The composer(s) of the later versions apparently abandoned this old style and included references to Babylonia in the titles and the military account, not in the epithets.

It is still not easy to establish an unambiguous chronological sequence of all the later inscriptions.54 These inscriptions, recording the capture of Kashtiliashu, do not give any elaborate statement about Tukulti-Ninurta’s subsequent military achievements in Babylonia, including the conquest of the city of Babylon. The common statement in these inscriptions – “ruled the land of Sumer and Akkad in its entirety (and fixed the boundary of my land in the Lower Sea of the east)” (= F and G of Type 1 [see above]; Types 2 and 3 include F alone omitting G in the parentheses) – no doubt reflects suzerainty over Babylonia. This is also the case with the royal titles, šar māt Karduniāš “king of
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Karduniash” (in A.0.78.5, 22, 24 and IM 76787), šar māt Šumeri u Akkādī “king of Sumer and Akkad” (in A.0.78.5, 22, 23, 24, IM 57821 and IM 76787) and šar tāmtim elīti (u) šupālīti “king of the upper (and) lower sea(s)” (A.0.78.5, 22, 24, IM 57821 and IM 76787). The basis of these claims is not entirely clear, however – in particular, whether they were included only after the conquest of Babylon or not, and whether they imply direct rule over Babylonia or just suzerainty over a king of Babylon.

The title šar māt Karduniaš is assumed by only three Assyrian kings: Tukulti-Ninurta I, Shamshi-Adad V and Esarhaddon.55 The title šar māt Šumeri u Akkādī, a traditional title attested as early as the Ur III period, is assumed by six Assyrian kings: Tukulti-Ninurta I, Shamshi-Adad V, Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II, Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.56 No doubt all these kings exerted some degree of control over Babylonia, but putting the case of Tukulti-Ninurta I aside, there is no evidence that Shamshi-Adad V ruled Babylonia directly and/or was accepted as the king of Babylon. Furthermore, the title šar māt Šumeri [u Akkādī] was assumed by Tiglath-pileser III, in his stele from Iran,57 which was apparently edited before his accession to the Babylonian throne in 729 B.C.

Another question is the historical background behind the curious list of subjugated lands in A.0.78.23 (Type 2, variant of G). Here too, it remains uncertain whether this political achievement may have been accomplished when

Table 3: Accounts and Titles in the Inscriptions Relating to Rule over Babylonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text name</th>
<th>Type of account</th>
<th>Titles concerning Babylonian rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.0.78.6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.0.78.5</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>... šar kibrat arba'ī ... šar māt Karduniāš, šar tāmtim elīti šupālīti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.0.78.22</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>... šar kibrat arba'ī ... šar māt Karduniāš, šar tāmtim elīti šupālīti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 57821</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>... šar kibrat arba'ī ... šar Šumeri u Akkādī, šar tāmtim elīti u šupālīti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.0.78.23</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>... šar Šumeri u Akkādī, šar kibrat arba'ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.0.78.24</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>... šar māt Karduniāš, šar Šumeri u Akkādī, šar Sippar u Bābili, šar Tilmun u Meluhhi, šar tāmtim elīti u šupālīti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.0.78.25</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 76787</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>... šar māt Karduniāš, šar Šumeri u Akkādī, šar Sippar u Bābili, šar Tilmun u Meluhhi, šar tāmtim elīti u šupālīti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Assyrians defeated and captured Kashtiliashu, or whether this was a result of a later Babylonian campaign.\(^{58}\)

In spite of these uncertainties, A.0.78.24 and IM 76787 may be regarded as inscriptions composed after the capture of Babylon, with greater certainty, since there is a unique royal title, šar Sippur u Bābili "king of Sippar and Babylon," which evidently illustrates direct rule over these Babylonian metropolises.\(^{59}\) The title šar Sippur u Bābili is not found in Assyrian royal inscriptions before Tukulti-Ninurta I, and similar titles do not appear before Tiglath-pileser III, who seized the throne of Babylon as the first Neo-Assyrian king. Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II assumed šar Bābili, and were followed by Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, who assumed the titles šar māt Aššur u Bābili and šar Bābili respectively.\(^{60}\) These kings are known to have ruled Babylon, being officially accepted there as king. Thus, the title šar Sippur u Bābili seems to confirm Tukulti-Ninurta's kingship over Babylon and Sippar. W. Mayer argued that this title is only propaganda, based on no more than indirect suzerainty over the region, like the bombastic title "king of Tilmun and Meluhha" that appears in the same inscriptions. He also totally rejected the historicity of Chronicle P's reference to Tukulti-Ninurta I's conquest of Babylon and the removal of the statue of Marduk.\(^{61}\) Considering the cumulative weight of the evidence discussed above, I find Mayer's argument farfetched. The absence of an account of the conquest of Babylon in the later inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta cannot serve as evidence to deny that Tukulti-Ninurta did indeed conquer and rule Babylon. The military accounts in the inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta I are terse, lacking elaborate reports on his campaigns. One may assume that the scribes of the later inscriptions just maintained much of the historical section found in the Vorlage written before the conquest of Babylon as it was, not adding further concrete details about later campaign(s). It is also conceivable that they may have hesitated to record blatantly the king's aggression against the long-respected religious metropolis of Babylon.
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34 Brinkman 1976, 31: T(tukulti-Ninurta): 1243-1207, K(ashtiliashu): 1232-1225; Boese 1982, 15-26: T: 1233-1197, K: 1227-1220; Rowton 1975, 1040f.: T: 1244-1235; Tadmor 1970, 94 and 96: T: 1243-1207, K: 1244-1237; Gasche et al. 1998, 66: T: 1240-1205, K: 1227-1220. The eponym Ina-Ashur-shumi-ašbat, the date given in one of Tukulti-Ninurta’s inscriptions referring to the capture of Kasshtiliashu, is an important chronological datum (see below, Appendix). It is also significant that some of Tukulti-Ninurta’s inscriptions suggest that the establishment of the new city Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta was after the capture of Kasshtiliashu. Thus, an analysis of the number of Assyrian eponyms dated after these events might enable us to conduct a more detailed discussion of Assyro-Babylonian synchronism. Cf. Freydank 1991, 51 and n. 132; Freydank 1974, 76; Harrak 1987, 256f. This is out of the scope of this article, however.
35 Labat 1975, 482; Hinz 1972, 121; Carter and Stolper 1984, 39.
36 Ebeling 1918, 62-73. A new translation is given in Foster 1993, 230-235. For example, the troubles on several fronts are alluded to in the following lines in Akkadian (line numbers follow those of Ebeling): kippat lemutti mātāti alka Āšur mitharīš lamāššuma “the evil circle of the countries are surrounding your city, Ashur, everywhere” (I. 17), kullat kibrāti ša usāt damiqtī tabnāṣ[i]nāṣ[i] išētakhkāma “all the regions, which you provided with good help, disregard you” (II. 19f.), ana šalpuṭti alāniqa elīš u šalpiš usarrāma “to destroy your cities, they (the countries) strive above and below” (I. 29).
37 The economic texts from Ur show that Adad-shuma-usur ruled Ur for at least 11 years, from his third regnal year to the thirteenth (Brinkman 1976, 91f. [C.2.7] and 410f.). The problematic dating MU 6 KAM 3 KAM is also attested. Concerning the formula MU X KAM Y KAM, Brinkman discusses three possible interpretations (ibid.): (1) Xth year (after) year Y (when) RN (became) king; thus, Y represents the period of co-regency; (2) the date means X × Yth year (for example MU 6.KAM.3.KAM means 6 × 3 = the 18th year); (3) the date is an alternative system organized by ten-year cycle and means Xth year in Yth decade. The first interpretation should be rejected, since a coregency preceding the accession is unlikely in the case of Adad-shuma-usur, who ascended the throne as the result of a rebellion against the Assyrians (so Brinkman, ibid., 410). It is also hard to believe that a system of dating like that suggested in the second interpretation, which can indicate only one of every two or three years, was in use. The most likely is the last interpretation (with Walker 1982, 408), according to which MU 6 KAM 3 KAM is to be interpreted as the 6th year in the third decade, i.e. the 26th year.
38 Brinkman 1976, 90 (C.2).
41 III R, no. 4; Weidner 1959, no. 42; Grayson 1972, nos. 888-891.
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43 Grayson 1975b, 56-77. In the light of the new evidence of Chronicle 25, the rebellion described in the epic should be interpreted as being launched against an Assyrian nominee or governor and in favor of Adad-shuma-usur, not against him (A. K. Grayson apud Walker 1982, 407).

44 Scheil 1900, 97f. Cf. the bibliography given by Brinkman 1976, 91 (C.2.6). Lines 8-10 of the text read: ša mišKUR-MU-ÙRU LUGAL ŠAR [...] LUGAL unuKA.DINGIR.RAki mŠAG.G [A [...] IR-sù i-ri-mu ... "(the lands) which Adad-shuma-usur, king of the universe [...] king of Babylon, granted to Sag[...] his servant,...]."

45 The geographical names found in the surviving portion of the text are ȗnȗti-lúm (l. 2), idRa-ki-bi (l. 5), URU-ša-ha-neki (alu-sa-Hane) (l.6), idŢa-ba-an (l. 7). The river Taban is identified with Nahr Kanan in the Diyala region. Though the location of the other places remains unclear, they are probably to be located along the river (Nashef 1982, 21, 261, 315 and 322).


47 See above, n. 37, for the economic documents from Ur. There are documents dated to his reign from Babylon, with dates such as MU 7? KAM 3 KAM3 and MU 9 KAM 3 KAM (Brinkman 1976, 91f. [C.2.7] and 410f.). These dates should probably be interpreted as the 7th and 9th years of the third decade of his reign, i.e. the 27th and 29th years (see above, n. 37). Thus, according to my understanding, he must have ruled Babylon for no less than 4 years, from his 27th regnal year onwards.

48 See above, n. 47.

49 Two other fragmentary texts, A.0.78.20 and 21, were discussed by H. D. Galter, who claimed that they originally mentioned the Babylonian campaign in their epithet section (Galter 1988, 222 with n. 27). These texts are excluded from consideration here because of the ambiguity of their restoration.

50 The list includes Mari, Hana and Rapiqu in the Middle Euphrates region, and Arrapha from the Trans-Tigris. The location of the other places is in dispute. See Nashef 1982, 184f. (under Mari).

51 The fragmentary lines of A.0.78.25, r. 1-3 must be restored by A.0.78.24, ll. 34-36 and IM 76787, ll. 37-40. Thus, the restoration “with the support of the gods” in Grayson 1987 (translation) should be corrected.


53 Cancik-Kirschbaum 1996, 16.

54 R. Borger considered A.0.78.5 (his Nr. 5) to have been composed earlier than A.0.78.22 (Nr. 15) and that the latter is older than A.0.78.23 and 24 (Nr. 16 and Nr. 17) (Borger 1961, 84). H. D. Galter proposed the order A.0.78.6 - A.0.78.24 - A.0.78.5/A.0.78.22 - A.0.78.23/ A.0.78.25. (Galter 1988, 221). However, the close relationship between A.0.78.23 and A.0.78.25 discussed by Galter has no basis, since the restoration of A.0.78.25 in RIMA 1, which he followed, must be abandoned (see above, n. 51).

55 Seux 1967, 302.

56 Seux 1967, 302f.

57 Tadmor 1994, 26f.

58 A. Harrak supports the latter possibility (Harrak 1987, 256f. n. 95). H. D. Galter, on the other hand, considers that A.0.78.23 reflects the period of the decline of Assyrian power after the end of direct rule over Babylonia (Galter 1988, 221).

59 Cf. Grayson 1972, 120. Though the obv. of A.0.78.25, including the royal titles, is broken off, the text may also be regarded as a later inscription, its account being parallel to that of A.0.78.24 and IM 76787.

60 For references, see Seux 1967, 301f.
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