Chronologies in Old World Archaeology

Archaeological Seminar at Columbia University*

1970-1971

Foreign Relations of Babylonia from 1600 to 625 B.C.: The Documentary Evidence[1]

J. A. BRINKMAN: SUMMARY

Brinkman began by defining his topic and explained that he intended to discuss the period from the sack of Babylon by the Hittites (ca. 1595 B.C.) through the reign of Kandalanu (d. 627 B.C.),[2] a time that is something of a dark age in Babylonian history. He would stress the foreign relations of Babylonia, particularly contacts with Assyria, Syria-Palestine, Anatolia, Egypt and Elam.

He next discussed the documentary evidence concerning this period, on which his treatment would be based. The Babylonians did not have the Assyrian bent for recording political affairs, and sparse documentation makes the reconstruction of Babylonian military and diplomatic history quite difficult. The major native sources for military history are the Babylonian chronicles, relatively incomplete, and listing only scattered battles between 1500 and 700 B.C. Brinkman pointed out that, although Assyrian chronicles and royal inscriptions are more helpful, their bias frequently makes it difficult to ascertain the actual course of events. Another problem in reconstructing Babylonian history is the disproportionate distribution of data, with clusters of evidence in the fourteenth, twelfth and seventh century B.C., but little in the intervening periods. He also noted that only some 900 of the Kassite tablets have been published to date, while more than 11,000 remain unedited, principally in the Archaeological Museum, Istanbul, and the University Museum, Philadelphia.

* "Chronologies," as before, was edited by Edith Porada.

[1] Excerpted from the author's book of the same title.

[2] This paper will be published in the *Report of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus*.

[3] The paper contained an expansion of the author's ideas published in *Kadmos* 9:1 (1970) 98-106.

[1] This paper is a summary of a talk delivered at Columbia University on November 12, 1970. With the exception of minor editing and expansion of the treatment given the years 1460-1340 B.C. (partially revised from a paper delivered at the Harvard meeting of the American Oriental Society in April 1971), the summary is largely based on minutes taken at the meeting. It should be emphasized that this is only a preliminary attempt to synthesize some of the available data; a more comprehensive view of at least the earlier periods discussed here, with full scholarly apparatus and necessary cautelary qualifications, will eventually appear in a volume of *Materials and Studies for Kassite History*. It may also be noted that the emphasis in treatment of the periods after 1158 is political, based on my *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia* (Rome, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum 1968); such cultural phenomena as the rise of the Nabu cult in Assyria ca. 800 B.C. and the heavy literary debt of 7th century Assyria to Babylonia have not been considered (J.A.B.).

[2] The chronology employed in this talk is outlined in Tables 1 and 2. The chronology for the Kassite dynasty can only be regarded as tentative and has been calculated independently from that of the following Second Dynasty of Isin (see *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 27 [1970] 305-307); despite the figures employed here, the question of overlap, coincidence, or hiatus between these two dynasties has hardly been solved. Further research can be expected to revise many of the late-second-millennium dates before 1150 B.C.

TABLE 1

	ASSYRIA		BABYLONIA		ELSEWHERE	
			?9. Agum II (Agum-kakrime)	c. 1570	Murshili I	
61.	Puzur-Ashur III		?11. Burna-Buriash I	c. 1510		
			?12. Kashtiliashu III	c. 1490	Ea-gamil	
			?13. Agum III	c. 1465	Thutmosis III	
					Amenophis II	NUZI
69.	Ashur-bel-nisheshu	1419-1411	?15. Kara-indash	c. 1415		
			?17. Kurigalzu I	c. 1390		
			?18. Kadashman-Enlil I	c. 1370	Amenophis III	
			?19. Burna-Buriash II	c. 1350	Akhnaton	Shuppi-luliuma I
73.	Ashur-uballit I	1365-1330	?20. Kara-hardash		Tutankhamon	
			?21. Nazi-Bugash			
			22. Kurigalzu II	c. 1335	Hurpatila	AHLAMU
74.	Enlil-nirari	1329-1320	23. Nazi-Maruttash	c. 1310		
75.	Arik-den-ili	1319-1308				
76.	Adad-nirari I	1307-1275			Urhi-Teshub	
			24. Kadashman-Turgu	c. 1290	Hattushili III	
77.	Shalmaneser I	1274-1245	25. Kadashman-Enlil II	c. 1275		
			27. Shagarakti-Shuriash	c. 1245		
78.	Tukulti-Ninurta I	1244-1208	28. Kashtiliashu IV	c. 1230		
			29. Enlil-nadin-shumi	c. 1226		
			30. Kadashman-Harbe II	c. 1225	Kidin-Hutrutash	
			31. Adad-shuma-iddina	c. 1222		
79.	Ashur-nadin-apli	1207-1204	32. Adad-shuma-usur	c. 1200		
80.	Ashur-nirari III	1203-1198				
81.	Enlil-kudurri-usur	1197-1193				
82.	Ninurta-apil-Ekur	1192-1180				
83.	Ashur-dan I	1179-1134	33. Meli-Shipak	c. 1178		
			34. Marduk-apla-iddina I	c. 1165		
			35. Zababa-shuma-iddina	c. 1157	Shutruk-Nahhunte	LURISTAN BRONZES
			36. Enlil-nadin-ahi	c. 1155	Kudur-Nahhunte	

The Kassite Dynasty:

the pre-Babylon years	1740-1595
formative years (unification of lower Mesopotamia).	1595-1460
the Kassites as an international power, I: Egyptian phase	1460-1340
II: Assyrian-Hittite phase	1340-1230
III: Assyrian-Elamite phase	1230-1155

TABLE 2

	ASSYRIA		BABYLONIA		ELSEWHERE
83.	Ashur-dan I	1179-1134	Second Dynasty of Isin (1158-1027)		
			39. Ninurta-nadin-shumi	1132-1127	Shilhak-Inshushinak
86.	Ashur-resha-ishi I	1133-1116	40. Nebuchadnezzar I	1126-1105	Hulteludush-Inshushinak
87.	Tiglath-Pileser I	1115-1077	42. Marduk-nadin-ahhe	1100-1083	
			43. Marduk-shapik-zeri	1082-1070	
89.	Ashur-bel-kala	1074-1057	44. Adad-apla-iddina	1069-1048	
91.	Shamshi-Adad IV	1054-1051			
			Second Sealand Dynasty (1026-1006)		
			Bazi Dynasty (1004-986)		
			Elamite Dynasty (985-980)		
			Undetermined Dynasties		
			55. Nabu-mukin-apli	979-944	
99.	Adad-nirari II	911-891	58. Shamash-mudammiq	c. 905	
100.	Tukulti-Ninurta II	890-884	59. Nabu-shuma-ukin I	c. 895	
101.	Ashurnasirpal II	883-859	60. Nabu-apla-iddina	c. 870	
102.	Shalmaneser III	858-824	61. Marduk-zakir-shumi I	c. 854-819	
103.	Shamshi-Adad V	823-811	62. Marduk-balassu-iqbi	c. 818-813	
104.	Adad-nirari III	810-783	63. Baba-aha-iddina	812	
105.	Ashur-dan III	772-755	67. Eriba-Marduk	c. 770	
108.	Tiglath-Pileser III	744-727	69. Nabonassar	747-734	
			72. (Nabu)-mukin-zeri	731-729	
			=73. Tiglath-Pileser III	728-727	
109.	Shalmaneser V	726-722	=74. Shalmaneser V	726-722	
110.	Sargon II	721-705	75. Merodach-Baladan II	721-710	Umbanigash
					Shutruk-Nahhunte
			=76. Sargon II	709-705	
111.	Sennacherib	704-681	=77. Sennacherib	704-703	
			79. Merodach-Baladan II	703	Hezekiah
			80. Bel-ibni	702-700	
			81. Ashur-nadin-shumi	699-694	Hallushu
			82. Nergal-ushezib	693	
			83. Mushezib-Marduk	692-689	Umman-menanu
			=84. Sennacherib	688-681	
112.	Esarhaddon	680-669	=85. Esarhaddon	680-669	
113.	Ashurbanipal	668-627	86. Shamash-shuma-ukin	667-648	Ummanigash, Tammaritu
			87. Kandalanu	647-627	

THE KASSITE DYNASTY

1. *The Pre-Babylon Years: ca. 1740-1595 B.C.*

Preceding the collapse of the First Dynasty of Babylon, several Kassite kings are mentioned in Kinglist A who may have been local or peripheral rulers before the dynasty was firmly established in Babylon, after the Hittite capture of the city ca. 1595 B.C. Before that time the Kassites appear principally as foreigners on the western outskirts of Babylonia—as armies in the year dates of Samsuiluna and Abi-eshuh, as agricultural workers in Dilbat, in encampments near Sippar, and as princes ruling on the middle Euphrates in or around Hana. In Syria, a lone Kassite appears in an economic text from Alalakh level VII.

2. *The Formative Years: ca. 1595-1460 B.C.*

In this period the Kassites gradually won control over all of Babylonia. The documentation is extremely scarce, and even the exact sequence and dates of the early kings are quite uncertain. The first king who emerges as a tangible figure and who is known to have ruled in Babylon is Agum II (Agum-kakrime, ca. 1570). While he reigned over the northern part of lower Mesopotamia, the southern section continued to be ruled separately by the first dynasty of the Sealand. Agum II apparently had some relations with the west, since he managed to obtain the release of the statue of Marduk from Hani (Hatti), where it had been taken by the Hittites after the sack of Babylon.

Before 1460 B.C. the Kassite kings seem to have won control over most of what was later known as Babylonia. By about 1510 they had consolidated their northern border with Assyria; and a formal treaty was concluded between Burna-Buriash I and Puzur-Ashur III concerning their common frontier. The Kassite conquest of the Sealand followed shortly thereafter, during the reigns of Kashtiliashu III (ca. 1490) and his son Agum III (ca. 1465). Thus the whole of lower Mesopotamia was united under Kassite rule. Henceforward "Babylonia" was to function as a political unit, and the centrifugal and politically separatist tendencies of the various city states were negligible. During this period there is also evidence of Kassite and Babylonian contacts with Nuzi. Texts from Nuzi tell of a local king and prince visiting Babylonia (Akkad) and of Nuzi receiving fugitives from Babylonia. Natives of a Kassite land (*māt Kuššuḫi*, location uncertain) lived in Nuzi; and a small percentage of the Nuzi population bore Kassite names.

To sum up, in this formative phase, while the Kassites were consolidating their position within Babylonia, we know little about their foreign relations except for isolated contacts with Hatti, Assyria and Nuzi.

3. *The Kassites as an International Power, I: Egyptian Phase, ca. 1460-1340 B.C.*

During this period Babylon seems to have developed a widespread and complex network of foreign relations, including direct contacts with Egypt, Hatti and Assyria. There were international alliances, diplomatic marriages and a direct messenger service between Egypt and Babylonia. Babylonian came to be used as the diplomatic language throughout Western Asia, including Asia Minor; and Babylonian literature penetrated as far as Amarna and Boghazköy. Babylonian merchants were active in Syria and Palestine. Because of the extent of the gold trade with Egypt, Babylon adopted the gold standard for the first and only time in its history (the silver standard was employed earlier and later). The best documented years of this century are those of the Amarna age, when direct contacts between the Egyptian and Babylonian courts are highlighted in the official royal correspondence. It may be observed, however, that the letters reflect only the final declining phase of what must have been a truly international age in Western Asia.

The beginning of this Egyptian phase of Babylonian foreign relations seems to have been occasioned by the vigorous campaigning of Thutmosis III in Syria. Around the year 1457 he reached the east bank of the Euphrates and there set up a stele next to that erected by his grandfather two generations earlier. But, unlike the days of Thutmosis I when the Kassites were still embroiled in local difficulties, Babylon had by this time asserted its supremacy over the Sealand and so sent an embassy with gifts of various kinds of lapis lazuli to the Egyptian king. Exchanges of gifts between the two courts soon became the pattern. Amenophis II recorded further gifts from Babylonia following one of his campaigns ca. 1431, and later in his reign apparently twitted his vizier for dalliance with "[a lady] from Babylonia, a servant girl from Byblos, a young maiden from Alalakh, and an old lady from Arrapha." In the last quarter of the fif-

teenth century, in the time of Kara-indash, a regular messenger service was instituted between Egypt and Babylonia. Some sort of treaty or formal agreement may also have been drawn up at this time, since the later Amarna letters describe the period of Babylonian-Egyptian friendship as dating back to this reign.

In the time of Kurigalzu I, perhaps the greatest builder among the Kassites, large amounts of gold poured in from Egypt to assist in his projects—especially for decoration of the new capital at Dur-Kurigalzu. This inflow of gold affected the Babylonian economy; and the country went on the gold standard, citing prices in gold in economic texts instead of the customary silver. That Kurigalzu may have had Egyptian workmen—or at least men familiar with Egyptian ways—working on his various projects is suggested by Egyptian carvings on an inscribed brick from Der in eastern Babylonia. Kurigalzu himself also enjoyed something of a military reputation, since the distant Canaanites invited him to join in a campaign to plunder Egyptian territory—an invitation he declined on the grounds that he was bound to Egypt by treaty.

In the best documented phase of Egyptian-Babylonian relations, the Amarna age under Kadashman-Enlil I and Burna-Buriash II, the courts were linked by the marriage of Kadashman-Enlil's sister to Amenophis III and there were plans for another marriage—of Kadashman-Enlil's daughter. Babylonia sent frequent presents of horses, chariots, and lapis lazuli and occasional gifts of other precious stones (probably in the form of jewelry), bronze, silver and oil. Egypt sent mostly gold, but occasionally silver, bronze, ivory, furniture made of precious woods (including ebony), garments and oil. Relatively few of these objects have been found on Mesopotamian soil. Egyptian or Egyptian-type scarabs have been found in second-millennial levels at Babylon, also pendants in the form of lotus blossoms and other decorations of possible Egyptian derivation. Egyptian jewelry (*ḳilīlu miṣrî*) is mentioned in a Middle Babylonian inventory from Nippur. Babylonian merchants were also actively trading at this time in Egyptian territory in Canaan.

But, despite the wealth of documentation and the great flurry of activity in Amarna times, it is quite clear that Egyptian-Babylonian relations had declined since the days of Kara-indash and Kurigalzu I. The Babylonians were perpetually complaining that their messengers were unduly detained at the Egyptian court, that their merchants were robbed and even murdered in Canaan, and that the gifts from the Egyptian king were few and of dubious quality. Kadashman-Enlil hesitated to send his daughter in marriage because he was uncertain how his sister had been treated at the Egyptian court. The frequent harking back in the letters to the halcyon days of former kings as a standard to be imitated bespeaks the deterioration of relations, undoubtedly hastened by the declining interest of Amenophis III and Akhenaton in the affairs of Western Asia. One should also note that much of the Egyptian documentation on Egyptian-Babylonian relations is written in fulsome court style, i.e., the gifts of Babylonia are classified as tribute, etc. This rhetoric reached its height when Amenophis III, in an age when Egypt was relatively weak, was given the improbable title "Capturer of Babylonia" in a brief scarab inscription.

During this "Egyptian Phase" there is evidence of Babylonian contact with other countries also. In Hatti, the third and final queen of Shuppiluliuma I, called Tawananna, was a Babylonian princess. In or around Bahrein (Dilmun), in the middle of the fourteenth century, was stationed a Babylonian official who sent back concerned messages about local Ahlamû tribes who were menacing the date crop.

Relations with Assyria are more complex. During most of the fifteenth century, Assyria was probably under the domination of Mitanni. With the decline of Nuzi and Mitannian interest there late in the century, Babylonia seems to have expanded its horizon northward; under most of the later Kassite rulers we find Arrapha reckoned as part of Babylonian territory. How strong Babylonian influence was in Assyria at this time is uncertain. Kara-indash made a treaty with Ashur-bel-nisheshu just before 1400 B.C. During the next generations appears the earliest evidence for the rise of the Marduk cult in Assyria—a Marduk shrine at Assur and "Marduk" coming to be used as a divine element in proper names. That Assyria may have been politically subordinate to Babylonia at this time is suggested by a statement of Burna-Buriash II in the Amarna letters: he complains to Tutankhamen that Assyrians—who were his subjects—are being received without his permission at the Egyptian court. Be that as it may, the Assyrians were rising to prominence in Western Asia; and, with the total collapse of Mitanni about the middle

of the fourteenth century, Ashur-uballit claimed the title of "Great King" and inaugurated his own direct correspondence with the Egyptian court. Babylonia was eventually forced to recognize—however reluctantly—the improving status of Assyria, and one of the Babylonian princes, perhaps Burna-Buriash himself, married a daughter of Ashur-uballit.

In summary, the "Egyptian Phase" was probably the high point of Kassite foreign contact, when Babylonia and the Kassite "Great King" were at the height of their international power and prestige, both politically and culturally.

4. *The Kassites as an International Power, II: Assyrian-Hittite Phase, ca. 1340-1230 B.C.*

After the close of the Amarna period, Babylonian ties with Egypt declined. The principal foreign relations of the following century were with Hatti and Assyria.

Though frequent and direct relations between Babylonia and Egypt were no longer maintained, the two lands continued to affect each other at least indirectly. Babylonia remained on the gold standard for another century down to the time of Shagarakti-Shuriash ca. 1245 B.C. Another diplomatic marriage between the two courts probably took place in the time of Ramesses II. Egyptian texts of the nineteenth dynasty still mention Babylonia as the source of imports, notably horse teams, fine young steeds and an unguent (*nḫḥtr*), also silver and precious stones.

In the early part of this period there was a revolt in Babylonia against King Kara-hardash, a grandson of Ashur-uballit of Assyria. Ashur-uballit avenged the death of his grandson by deposing his revolutionary successor and by placing Kurigalzu II, a member of the old royal house of Babylonia, on the throne. Though Kurigalzu owed his throne to Assyrian interference, he demonstrated no overwhelming or lasting gratitude to his sponsors. After the death of Ashur-uballit, Kurigalzu twice fought against the new Assyrian king, Enlil-nirari (1329-1320), in Assyrian territory.

According to a later chronicle, Kurigalzu also fought with the Elamite king, Hurpatila, defeated him and took away booty from Susa. But known Elamite contacts with Babylonia in this period are restricted to this single incident.

Babylonian-Assyrian hostilities in the form of minor border raids continued through the reign of Nazi-Maruttash (ca. 1310) and on into the thirteenth century. What is significant at this time is that Babylonia managed to hold its own against Assyria, despite the strong military power of the latter under Adad-nirari I and Shalmaneser I.

In the early thirteenth century B.C., the Kassites enjoyed close relations with the Hittite Empire under Hattushili III. The Kassite king, Kadashman-Turgu (ca. 1290), offered to send infantry and chariots to help the Hittites against Egypt. A conjuration expert and a physician were also sent to the Hittite court. Friendly relations continued until the reign of Kadashman-Enlil II (ca. 1275), who received a letter from Hattushili describing the past cordiality of Hittite-Babylonian relations and urging continued closeness. The Hittite king requested lapis lazuli, fine horses, and a carver of stone reliefs from Babylon. We also learn from this letter that Babylonian merchants were active in Syria as far away as Ugarit, but were not faring well. After the death of Kadashman-Enlil II, relations between the two countries seem to have faded, probably because Aramean tribesmen were threatening Babylonian lines of communication to the west and because the Hittite Empire itself soon declined.

5. *The Kassites as an International Power, III: Assyrian-Elamite phase, ca. 1230-1155 B.C.*

This period began with a decisive defeat of Babylonia at the hands of Assyria. Kashtiliashu IV (ca. 1230) had incurred the wrath of Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria (1244-1208) for making border raids and perhaps also for receiving fugitives from Hanigalbat. The Assyrian king campaigned twice against Babylonia; he eventually sacked Babylon and took the statue of Marduk to Assyria. Tukulti-Ninurta then adopted new titles, styling himself King of Sumer and Akkad and even King of Dilmun and Meluhha. It has often been thought that this latter title was merely poetic exaggeration; but the result of Danish excavations at Failaka and Bahrein (coupled with known Babylonian interests in Dilmun in the preceding century) suggests that Tukulti-Ninurta may simply have been stating Assyria's claim to earlier Babylonian rights in this area.

The next Babylonian kings seem to have been puppets of Assyria; and the Elamites took advantage of the situation by raiding Babylonia in the reigns of Enlil-nadin-shumi (ca. 1226), whom they

deposed, and Adad-shuma-iddina (ca. 1222). This low point in Babylonian prestige, however, was not long lasting.

Revolts against Tukulti-Ninurta eventually broke out in both Assyria and Babylonia. In Babylon, Adad-shuma-usur (ca. 1200), son of Kashtiliashu IV, came to the throne. He was able to reassert Babylonian supremacy over Assyria and was instrumental in putting Ninurta-apil-Ekur (1192-1180) on the throne.

The extent of the Kassite realm to the northeast in the early twelfth century is shown by a kudurru recently found near Sarpol-e Zohab, in a region named Halman in ancient times.

The collapse of Kassite rule resulted from almost simultaneous attacks on Babylonia by Assyria and Elam. A raid by Ashur-dan I of Assyria was followed by an Elamite attack by Shutruk-Nahhunte, during which the Kassite king, Zababa-shuma-iddina (ca. 1157), was removed. The Kassite dynasty soon came to an end with the Elamite plundering of Babylon and the removal of the Marduk statue to Susa.

Brinkman then gave a summary of intrusive or not precisely dated Middle Babylonian objects found at various places in Western Asia. He pointed out that, although many of them are ascribed to particular Babylonian kings, it is difficult to know when or how these objects reached their destinations. Quite a few Kassite objects have been found in Assyria. A votive eye-stone of a Kurigalzu, and a Kadashman-Enlil seal impression were found in various levels at Assur. Were these a result of later trade or were they booty? The macehead of a Kadashman-Enlil and a votive bead of Shagarakti-Shuriash (ca. 1245) were excavated at Nineveh and Calah respectively.

Many inscribed objects of the Kassite and following dynasties have been found in Iran. A scepter and a scaraboid of a Kurigalzu were found at Susa. The scaraboid was dedicated to the deity Ishtaran and so may have come from Der. There were also many Kassite kudurrus, especially from the reigns of Nazi-Maruttash, Kashtiliashu IV, Adad-shuma-usur, Meli-Shipak and Marduk-apla-iddina I, which were presumably taken to Susa by Shutruk-Nahhunte and Kudur-Nahhunte after their raids on Babylonia toward the end of the Kassite dynasty. A vessel of Kadashman-Enlil (I or II) was unearthed in level IV at Hasanlu. Several Kassite objects came from Sorkh-dum-e, Luristan in an early first-millennial context. These included cylinder seal(s) of a Kurigalzu and of one of his officials, and also an eye-stone. Brinkman also referred to a series of inscribed bronzes, mostly weapons, which have come from Luristan. These bear inscriptions of kings and princes ranging from the Kassite ruler Adad-shuma-usur (ca. 1200 B.C.) down to Nabu-mukin-apli (979-944 B.C.), almost 200 years after the fall of the Kassite Dynasty. Brinkman said he would not go into the many controversial theories regarding the presence of these objects in Luristan (which include suggestions that they were brought there as booty from Mesopotamian raids, or that they were given to mercenaries for faithful service by contemporary kings). Brinkman, however, did make the point that the objects date to a time when Babylonia had strong relations to the northeast and particularly with Namri.

In summing up the foreign relations of Babylon during the Kassite period, Brinkman emphasized the use of the title Great King (*šarru rabû*) in the Amarna correspondence, indicating that the Kassite rulers were considered equal to the kings of the other great powers: Egypt, Hatti and Mitanni. Moreover, although the military power of Babylon was probably not as strong as that of Assyria, the Kassites managed to maintain their position against their northern neighbor. Close examination of the records shows that the Assyrians never managed to push extensively into Babylonia, except in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. Even after this devastating attack, the Kassites seem to have recovered quickly; they soon gained a position superior to the Assyrians. Thus, in spite of the apparent reticence of the Kassites in publicizing military matters, Babylonian military power under their reign can hardly be considered negligible.

Although there is as yet little documentary evidence concerning trade in the Kassite period, it must have been extensive, particularly during the late fifteenth and early fourteenth centuries when Babylon had widespread foreign relations and regular close contacts with the major courts of Western Asia. At that time Babylonian caravans journeyed as far away as Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Hatti. Further trade relations at various periods are only hinted at by such finds as the Kassite cylinder seals from Boeotian Thebes, Kassite-style pottery on Bahrein, and the Aegean-type oxhide ingot found at Dur-Kurigalzu. Brinkman

noted that the dearth of documents for the late Kassite period renders a reconstruction of the history of that era quite tenuous.

BABYLONIA FOR THE BABYLONIANS (?), 1158-812 B.C.

After the collapse of the Kassites, native dynasts held sway over Babylonia for much of the next three centuries. Brinkman tentatively suggested that this era could be called "Babylonia for the Babylonians." This seems to be the only period when native Babylonians dominated the scene. By contrast, the greatest periods of Babylonian history were controlled by foreign dynasties: the Amorites in the Old Babylonian period, the Kassites in Middle Babylonian times, and the Chaldeans in the Neo-Babylonian Empire. The native dynasties in the late second and early first millennia were rather weak militarily; but in a time of military feebleness throughout Western Asia, Babylonia kept pace with its immediate neighbors.

1. *The Second Dynasty of Isin, 1158-1027 B.C.*

The Elamites, who had been primarily responsible for the downfall of the Kassite dynasty, continued to overshadow Babylonia during the early days of the Isin dynasty. They held the statue of Marduk captive in their homeland and continued to harass the eastern regions of Babylonia with minor raids until Nebuchadnezzar I (1126-1105 B.C.) launched a successful surprise invasion during the summer months and recovered the Marduk statue. With the disappearance of Hulteludush-Inshushinak, the Elamite king, Elam itself entered into a period of eclipse, from which it emerged only three centuries later. On the other hand, Nebuchadnezzar's triumph restored morale in Babylonia and gave rise to a poetic tradition eulogizing the king.

There were a few skirmishes with Assyria in the early eleventh century. Marduk-nadin-ahhe (1100-1083) carried off the gods Adad and Shala from Ekallate in Assyria; and Tiglath-Pileser I (1115-1077) sacked Babylon and burnt the royal palace. These hostilities were followed in the reign of Marduk-shapik-zeri (1082-1070) by a peace treaty: Assyria and Babylon forgot their differences in the face of a common menace, the invading hordes of Arameans, pressing in from the west. This invasion of semi-nomadic tribes continued for the next two hundred years, restricting the territories of the two countries and cutting off their trade with the west. There were crop failures and famine in Babylonia, and even temple offerings and religious festivals were discontinued.

2. *Three Brief Dynasties, 1026-980 B.C.*

Over the next half century, three brief and relatively ineffectual dynasties came and went in Babylonia. The Second Sealand Dynasty (1026-1006) supposedly came from southern Babylonia; but the first and third rulers bore names with Kassite overtones and the second ruler, a usurper, came from a Kassite area. The Bazi dynasty (1005-986) was composed of three Kassite tribal rulers. The final king of this period, Mar-biti-apla-usur (985-980), was of Elamite descent and comprised a dynasty by himself (the "Elamite dynasty"). During this time, Arameans continued to disrupt settled life in the land.

3. *Undetermined Dynasties, 979-812 B.C.*

At the accession of Nabu-mukin-apli (979-944) Babylonia was still weak after the quick succession of rulers of the previous half century, and the country was still menaced by the Arameans. There were border conflicts between Assyria and Babylonia in the reign of Shamash-mudammiq (ca. 905); but his successor, Nabu-shuma-ukin I (ca. 895), concluded an effective treaty with Adad-nirari II of Assyria (911-891) by means of a double diplomatic marriage. The resultant peace, thanks perhaps to the presence of foreign queens at both courts, was to last for the next eighty years, with each side helping the other subdue serious rebellions. Shalmaneser III of Assyria (858-824) came in with his army to regain the territories in eastern and southern Babylonia which had rebelled against Marduk-zakir-shumi I (ca. 854-819). Marduk-zakir-shumi I later returned the favor by assisting Shamshi-Adad V of Assyria (823-811) in suppressing a revolt which had spread to practically every major city of his realm. When the Assyrian finally succeeded in making his rule firm, Marduk-zakir-shumi I imposed a treaty on Assyria, the humiliating terms of which were to have dire consequences for the future of Babylonia.

Shamshi-Adad V waited until after the death of the Babylonian monarch to take his revenge. He defeated the next Babylonian ruler, Marduk-balassu-iqbi (ca. 818-813) and his alliance of Elamites, Chaldeans, Kassites and Arameans. Both Marduk-balassu-iqbi and his unfortunate successor,

Baba-aha-iddina (ca. 812), were carried off to Assyria. Babylonia was reduced to the point of anarchy. A Babylonian chronicle records that "there was no king in the land" for at least the next twelve years, and Shamshi-Adad V laid claim to the area under the title "King of Sumer and Akkad."

THE RISE OF THE CHALDEANS, 811-627 B.C.

The Chaldeans had begun to appear in force in southern Babylonia about the middle of the ninth century B.C. They were not roving tribes but rather a settled people with flourishing date plantations. To judge from items of "tribute" paid to the Assyrians—ivory, elephant hides, gold, silver, and precious woods—the Chaldeans must have controlled the trade routes of the Persian Gulf area. After Assyria's decisive weakening of northern Babylonia toward the end of the ninth century, the Chaldeans began to take political control of the north. One of the earliest Chaldean kings of Babylonia was Eriba-Marduk (ca. 770), "who reestablished the foundations of the land." He restored political stability in the north by ejecting the rapacious Arameans who had dispossessed the inhabitants of Babylon and Borsippa.

Trouble flared up in Babylonia during the reign of Nabonassar (747-734 B.C.), who was unable to control the Arameans or the Chaldeans. Tiglath-Pileser III of Assyria intervened on the side of Nabonassar in 745 and restored order; but after a time minor revolts broke out once again. The Assyrian king returned in 731, and it took him until 729 to subdue the Chaldeans and to gain control over all Babylonia. After deposing Mukinzeri of the Amukanu tribe, he assumed the crown of Babylon himself. His son Shalmaneser V inherited the dual monarchy of Assyria and Babylonia (726-722). In the confusion following Shalmaneser's death, however, Merodach-Baladan II (721-710), a member of the Jakin tribe, was able to seize the Babylonian throne. He set the tone of Babylonian policy for the next 70 years, by welding the previously discordant Chaldean tribes into an anti-Assyrian alliance and by utilizing his wealth to secure a military alliance with Elam.

For the next hundred years the Assyrians tried many solutions to the Babylonian problem, which continued to drain their energy and resources. Sargon II ousted Merodach-Baladan II and became king of Babylonia, 709-705. His successor, Sennacherib, continued to be plagued by troubles with Babylonia. At one point he put his eldest son, Ashur-nadin-shumi, on the throne; but the young ruler was deported to Elam and subsequently murdered. Sennacherib took his revenge by annihilating Babylon in 689. He sacked the city, removed the statue of Marduk and took over the crown of Babylonia until the end of his reign. His successor, Esarhaddon (680-669) maintained the dual monarchy but made provisions for division of the empire between two of his sons after his death; Ashurbanipal became king of Assyria (668-627), and his younger brother Shamash-shuma-ukin took over the crown of Babylonia (667-648). Although the kingdoms were supposed to be relatively equal, Ashurbanipal had the power of the Assyrian army behind him and made life difficult for his brother. Shamash-shuma-ukin eventually retaliated by entering into an anti-Assyrian coalition with Chaldeans, Arameans, Elam, Guti, Amurru, Meluhha, and even Arabia. It took the Assyrians four years to quell the revolt; and, although Ashurbanipal was successful, Assyria was seriously weakened.

The last major Assyrian campaign after 648 B.C. resulted in the destruction of Elam. By the end of the reign of Kandalanu (647-627), the government in Babylon was relatively weak. The Chaldeans, however, had remained strong and, together with the Medes (the successors of Elam in western Iran), were able to bring the Assyrian Empire to an end within the next two decades.

In summary, the volatile, wealthy and politically astute Chaldeans wore down the Assyrians by their continual rebellions and eventually, with the Neo-Babylonian Empire, replaced Assyria as the principal power in Western Asia.

DISCUSSION

In the following discussion, E. Porada asked Brinkman for his dating of the Nuzi tablets. He answered that the date was not really well established, but that they fit within the range of the late sixteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. The tablets, covering several generations, extend over a longer timespan than previously thought. He commented on the fact that the reason for considering the contacts between Nuzi and Babylonia close is that no other foreign relations of Babylonia are so well documented at this time.

T. C. Young asked about Namri and its relations to the Second Dynasty of Isin. Brinkman answered

that although the exact location of Namri is not known, it was adjacent to Halman, perhaps to the southwest (there are too few references to be sure). It had been part of Babylonia, but became an independent entity by the middle of the ninth century B.C. when the Assyrians campaigned there. Young then brought up the question of the Kassite homeland and asked about the latest opinions concerning its location. The answer was that although it is usually thought to have been in the eastern, Zagros section, this was strange as the earliest appearances of the Kassites were in western Babylonia, near the Euphrates. Brinkman recalled that the Kassites had been in contact with Babylonia near Sippar and Dilbat in the Old Babylonian period. He did not consider the present evidence sufficient to prove that they were from the east or the west. He referred to the campaign of Nazi-Maruttash against Namri and wondered whether that king would have campaigned against the Kassite homeland. The fact that the Kassites are thought to have withdrawn from Babylonia into western Iran does not necessarily link that area with their original home. R. Ellis asked whether there had been a mass withdrawal of Kassites from Babylonia and whether there were indications that the people living in the Zagros in the first millennium B.C. had formerly lived in Babylonia. Brinkman mentioned some traces of Babylonian culture among the northeast Kassites, e.g. the name of Marduk-mudammiq, the ninth century ruler of Namri. There is no evidence, however, of mass withdrawal of Kassites from Babylonia. He assumes that some Kassites remained in Babylonia, as persons there continued to claim descent from Kassite ancestors. He pointed out that one of the problems of Babylonian history is that nothing is known as to what happened to the peoples who poured into Babylonia. Were they all absorbed, or were they eventually thrown out? Was the population a great amalgam? The Kassites, for example, were accepted; there is little evidence that they were thought of as foreigners after their arrival. At this time, there does not seem to have been any favoritism on the part of the kings of Babylon toward people of their own stock—either Chaldeans, Kassites, or Babylonians; and although the Assyrians sometimes claimed that the Babylonians regarded the Chaldeans as foreigners and plunderers, there is no evidence for this on the Babylonian side.

C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky asked whether there was any archaeological or linguistic evidence connecting the Kassites with the Elamites, particularly whether there was any way to see the Kassites as part of a major tribal confederation which also comprised the Elamites in the earlier part of the second millennium B.C. Brinkman noted that there was little evidence of relations between Kassites and Elamites in the earlier phases of the Kassite period. Ea-gamil, the last ruler of the first dynasty of the Sealand (ca. 1490 B.C.), had fled to Elam; and, later, Kurigalzu II (ca. 1335) had fought against Hurpatila of Elam. Brinkman said that there were some similarities between the Kassites and the Elamites and pointed to minor aspects of their respective languages and to their fratriarchal systems. He suggested that a study of their tribal and family structures might provide some further insights. In discussing the archaeological evidence, he noted that the lack of a well-dated ceramic sequence in Babylonia makes it difficult to date and evaluate recent discoveries of similar pottery elsewhere. He felt that the discovery of chalice-footed vessels, perhaps of Kassite date, from Khuzistan and also pottery of Kassite type found in Bahrein and Luristan were highly suggestive of possible Babylonian-Iranian relations in the Kassite period.

In response to J. M. Muhly's question about the location of the Bazi capital, Brinkman mentioned that Kar-Marduk may have been the capital, but that there was very little information regarding the Bazi tribe. It is reasonably certain, however, that they were located just to the east of the Tigris.

M. J. Mellink asked when Kassite had died out as a language. Brinkman commented that we are not yet sure when it flourished. He referred to bilingual texts of the eleventh century B.C. which give Kassite-Akkadian equivalents and to the use of Kassite names until at least the ninth century. He noted that, although Kurigalzu occurred as a personal name even in the Neo-Babylonian period, this was a relatively isolated phenomenon. Mellink also enquired whether Kassite would have been used in their cult. Brinkman replied that our only real sources of information for the Kassite language were Kassite personal names, the bilingual documents, and various technical terms referring to horses and chariotry.

Mellink also asked how Brinkman would reconstruct the early relations between the Hittites and the Kassites at the time of the destruction of Baby-

lon, ca. 1595, and later, at the time when the Marduk statue was returned. Brinkman replied that we can assume that the Kassites profited from the Hittite sack of Babylon as they were able to take over when the Hittites withdrew. He mentioned the Kassite camps outside of Sippar and thought that there might have been an understanding between the Kassites and the Hittites, as the latter may have had to have come through Kassite territory on their way to Babylon from the west. He said it was difficult to reconstruct the political situation behind these events and the return of the Marduk statue twenty-four years later. An inscription of Agum-kakrime (ca. 1570 B.C.) tells how the statue was brought back from the land of Hani and how the shrine had to be restored and new clothes made for the statue which had lost its gold finery. In a later text, the god Marduk tells of his journey and how he had set up Babylonian caravan routes in Hittite lands. Brinkman felt that Hatti, rather than Hana (as sometimes thought) was the correct interpretation of Hani.

E. Yar-Shater asked about the role of the Medes in addition to the Babylonians in weakening the Assyrian Empire. Brinkman noted that when the last cities fell—Ashur, Nineveh and Harran—the Babylonians did not always arrive in time to support the Medes. He also suggested that the Medes had a greater role, as they were in control of Harran and most of Assyria after the collapse of the Assyrian Empire. He felt, however, that the Medes had not been as much of a drain on Assyrian energy and resources as the Babylonians in the preceding centuries. Although the Medes were sometimes named as the objects of Assyrian campaigns in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., these campaigns seem to have been carried out largely for the economic benefit of the Assyrians and were not due to any particular threat from the Medes at that time.

Aegean Bronze Age Relations with Egypt

R. S. MERRILLEES

There are three basic dimensions to our study of ancient civilizations and their interconnections. The first is archaeological, which is here used in the restricted sense of material culture or small finds, comprising essentially artefacts, such as pottery. The second, which I have called for convenience art history, takes in conceptual creations such as pictorial representations, and is confined for the purposes of this study to the portrayal of Aegean peoples and their works. The third dimension consists of the information supplied by written records. For analytical purposes these aspects cover the full range of human achievements as reflected in remains from the past, even though they make no allowance for the study of the natural sciences insofar as they had an impact on the average life of the ancients. So, if we wish to draw conclusions on the nature and historical significance of Minoan and Mycenaean relations with Egypt, our assemblage of the extant data should be comprehensive and all-embracing, as only a multidimensional approach will be able to minimize the uncertainty factor inherent in all empirical deductions.

Having said this, I would not wish it thought that the following review of evidence from the Nile Valley is exhaustive, as that is not the essential aim of this paper, or that it will automatically lend itself to a ready understanding, let alone resolution, of the many problems that emerge from correlating archaeological, graphic and textual evidence for Aegean Bronze Age connections with Egypt. But by revealing the gaps and inconsistencies in our present factual record, it should point the way to a more constructive line of research that would seek to reconcile the apparent omissions and contradictions in the available data, and make the history of Minoan and Mycenaean relations with Egypt more intelligent and more intelligible.

Let me first introduce the subject against its historical and cultural background. At the end of this paper is a list of the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty, with their dates, following for convenience the chronology adopted by the revised *CAH*. It must be understood that this choice is quite arbitrary on my part, as I lay no claim to expertise in this field. With dates as widely divergent as about 1580 and 1530 B.C. for the beginning of the XVIIIth Dynasty, it becomes impossible for an external student of Egyptian archaeology to do more than opt for the chronology of greatest