

The Babylonian Problem and the Establishment of the Chaldaean Dynasty

SAMI AHMED

THE interest of the Assyrian kings from the time of Schalmaneser III (859-824) B.C. and particularly those of the Sargonid period (747-612 B.C.), in Babylonia, and the Babylonian desire for independence created a complex problem. From the time of Tiglath-pileser III (745-724), successive Assyrian kings tried different solutions. They all failed and Babylonia finally emerged as an independent state under the leadership of Nabupalosser. Here is an attempt to trace the Assyro-Babylonian relationship, the Babylonian opposition, and the different methods employed by Assyria to solve the problem. These methods were doomed to failure and resulted in the establishment of a "national" dynasty in the south.

The treaty Schalmaneser III concluded with Nabu-apal-iddina, king of Babylonia, marked the subjugation of Southern Mesopotamia to Assyria. The Assyrian potentate was allowed to offer sacrifices at the temples of Nergal, Marduk, and Nabu.¹ When Nabu-apal-iddina died, his younger brother, Marduk-bel-usate opposed the legitimate successor, Nabu-zakir-shumi, and seized part of Northern Babylonia. The Assyrian king found himself obliged to march south, crush the rebellion, and secure the throne for the dislodged

monarch. In a second advance, Shalmaneser III pursued the opposing leader to the mountains and slew him.² Afterwards, the Assyrian monarch made a tour in which he visited the shrine cities of Cutha, Babylon and Borsippa. His Annals are, no doubt, our first guide to the tribes of Southern Mesopotamia, namely, the Bit Dakkuri, Bit Ammukani, and Bit Iakin, who are now beginning to assert influence in Babylonian politics. During this period both the Bit Iakin and Bit Ammukani were loyal to the crown but in succeeding years they were no longer held in the favor by Assyria.

Marduk-zakir-shumi I reigned for about thirty years. During his term, he vigorously put down a revolt in Assyria directed against Shamshi-Adad V, son and successor of Shalmaneser III. Consequently, a treaty was signed between the two countries in which Assyrian power was restricted. Immediately after the death of Marduk-zakir-shumi in 813 B.C., Shamshi-Adad moved against Babylonia, defeated the newly seated king, Marduk-babatsu-iqbi and took him captive to Assyria. Evidently for the first time, Elam came to the aid of the Babylonian king. Prior to this incident, Elam and Babylon were bitter enemies and in constant struggle. Apparently, the enmity between the two neighbors started to decrease in order to meet the common foe, since both found themselves confronting a stronger enemy.³

¹ *Synchronistic History*, Cuneiform Texts (CT), XXX 40 iii 22-25; *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft* (MDOG), XXVIII, 24 ff.; A. T. Olmstead, "Shalmaneser III and the Establishment of the Assyrian Power," *Journal of American Oriental Society* (JAOS), 41 (1921), pp. 345 ff.; A. T. Olmstead, "Babylonia as an Assyrian Dependency," *American Journal of Semitic Languages* (AJSL), 37 (1921), p. 217.

SAMI AHMED is Assistant Professor of History at the University of Denver.

² D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (Chicago, 1926) (ARAB), 1, 565, 566, 622, 623, 624.

³ ARAB, 1, 725, 726; E. F. Weidner, "Die Feldzüge Samsi-Adad V gegen Babylonien" *Archiv für Orientforschung* (AOF), IX (1934), pp. 89-104.

In 812 B.C. Shamshi-Adad V once again descended upon Babylonia. He marched along the area East of the Tigris, crossed the Diyala River, and inflicted a defeat upon the Babylonian forces. Baba-aha-iddina, the successor of Marduk-balatsu-iqbi, was captured and sent to Assyria together with his gods and family. The Assyrian ruler then visited the temple cities of Cutha, Babylon, and Borsippa before continuing his march southward. Since the Assyrian king led a separate campaign against the south, it is probable that at that time the region, (currently termed Kaldi) was independent. Later in the same year he received the tribute of various Southern kinglets. However, in 811 Shamshi-Adad V directed his armies once more to attack the south.⁴ After Shamshi-Adad's death, his son and successor, Adad-nirari III, reported in his annals that the people of Kaldi became his vassals and paid him tribute. He also recorded that he had offered sacrifices at the southern cult centers.⁵

After these campaigns, Babylonia appears to have fallen into a period of anarchy. Although Eriba-Marduk, one of the southern chieftains, was apparently able to achieve some order in the country, his successor, Nabu-shum-ishkun (d. 748 B.C.), was not even able to defend the people of Borsippa from local attackers. In an account of the building activities connected with the temple of Nabu at Borsippa, Nabu-shuma-imbi, governor of the city, reports a devastation and riot. The people of Borsippa apparently turned against each other and a certain Nabu-shum-iddin attacked the city at night and the inhabitants came to the defence of their governor.⁶

During this period in Babylonia there was recorded an increasing num-

ber of civil and temple administrators bearing Assyrian names. About half of the officials of Nabu temple who were called as witnesses in a certain document bore Assyrian names and are designated as *aplu asur*.⁷ The high priest of Nabu, Nabu-shuma-imbi, who was also chief administrator of Borsippa, was of Assyrian descent.⁸ This perhaps indicates the beginning of Assyrian infiltration into northern Babylonia, which probably explains Assyria's later strength in the region.

The successor of Nabu-shum-ishkun, Nabu-nasir (747-734 B.C.), ascended the throne during a period of unrest. The land was suffering from the violent Aramaeans, who surrounded northern Babylonia on every side. Besides, the government was weak and therefore not able to have the entire land under its authority. However, Nabu-nasir proved to be a capable leader who gave the country a period of peace, though not of prosperity.

In Nabu-nasir's third year, Tiglath-pileser III came to the throne of Assyria, a strong and far-sighted leader. He first went to the aid of his Babylonian contemporary against the Aramaic tribes. The initial two campaigns of Tiglath, dated to his accession year, were directed against the unsubmissive Aramaean tribes of Babylonia. However, the Assyrian monarch was evidently not motivated by altruism since he incorporated some Babylonian territories to Assyria. It is true that he left the central government of Babylonia unharmed, which may indicate that he intended to subjugate Babylonia in a manner that would not expose him as an aggressor. He finally withdrew to Assyria, probably having in mind that future events would place Babylonia, like a ripe fruit, in his hands. The campaign appears to have been quite effective, for nothing is

⁴ ARAB, 1, 725-726.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1, 741.

⁶ S. Strong, "Four Cuneiform Texts," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (JRAS)*, 1892, 337 ff.

⁷ Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmaler, (VAS), 1, 36 iii 6-19.

⁸ VAS, 1, 36 iii 6; JRAS (1892), 353: 15.

heard of the Aramaean tribes for about twelve years.

Nabu-nasir died after ruling in Babylon for 14 years. He was succeeded by his son Nabu-nadin-zeri (Nadinu), who was killed in a revolt led by Nabu-shuma-ukin, a political official. Only a month later the latter was overthrown by Nabu-mukin-zeri (Ukin-zir, 731-729 B.C.), chief of the Ammukani tribe. Assyria now forcefully interfered and deposed the new Babylonian leader since any unification in the south would endanger the interest of Assyria and constitute a direct threat to her. The people of Babylonia at this time were politically indecisive as to where their sympathies should lie. Many turned pro-Assyrian and others remained neutral. A few letters found in Nimrud provide information regarding the situation at about the time of Tiglath-pileser's intervention which resulted in Ukin-zir's dethronement. In one of the letters, we find Assyrian officials unable to enter Babylon, which implies that the city was controlled by Ukin-zir's supporters; it also reveals that the Assyrian attempted to use diplomacy with the Babylonians.⁹ Another letter reports that Ukin-zir had been unsuccessful in rallying support in Babylon except for a few temple servants, which indicates that he may have been obliged to withdraw; it reports also an attempt to influence the inhabitants of a certain city to render assistance against the Babylonian ruler.¹⁰ Letter VIII seems to imply that the Itu'a tribe provided protection for Assyria from rebel attacks, and that some of the Ru'a tribe were guarding the road to the Fort of Kar Shamash. Letter V may contain the explanation why Balasu, who supposedly was an uncle of Ukin-zir, became an Assyrian supporter (a letter sent by Ukin-zir to Merodach-Baladan in which he insin-

uated that Balasu was their rival, had apparently been acquired by the Assyrians who then read the letter to Balasu). Letter XI names Balasu as provider of troops to Assyria. Neither of these letters nor the Annals mention Merodach-baladan as opposed to Assyria at this time. The Annals simply report that Balasu submitted and paid tribute. The term used here for tribute is *mandattu*, which may indicate that Merodach-baladan assisted Assyria.¹¹

Perhaps because he was aware that his assumption of the throne would be opposed in Babylon, Ukin-zir seems to have made his capital at Sapia and merely maintained a representative at Babylon. Early in Tiglath-pileser III's campaign, he sent his messengers to Babylon to request the surrender of the city and to insure the inhabitants that their privileges would be respected. Ukin-zir's representative was apparently able to keep the Babylonians from surrendering at this time, but the northern part of Babylonia seems to have submitted to the Assyrians easily.¹² Although Tiglath-pileser II conquered Babylon and Borsippa and other cities in northern Babylonia, he never mentioned the fact anywhere. This may indicate that he met little or no resistance in these areas. The supporters of Ukin-zir seemingly escaped to the south.¹³

On his march southward Tiglath-pileser III apparently destroyed the area of Bit-shaialli and Bit-shilani, and then moved south to besiege Sapia.¹⁴ The Assyrian king moved against Babylonia once more in 730 B.C. and met less resistance. Ukin-zir withdrew before the advance of the Assyrian army and the fall of his city. Balasu of the Dakkuri tribe, Nadinu of the city of Larak, and Merodach-baladan, submitted to the Assyrian

¹¹ Saggs, *op. cit.* letter V, p. 32, VIII, p. 39; XI, p. 43 and the commentary on the letters on p. 45 ff.

¹² Nimrud Letters, *op. cit.*, no. i, p. 23.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Letter II, p. 26.

¹⁴ ARAB, I, 790.

⁹ H. W. F. Saggs, "The Nimrud Tablets" (1952) Iraq, XVI (Spring, 1955), part 1, letter 1, p. 23.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, letter II, p. 26.

king with a rich gift (**mandattu**).¹⁵

Then Tiglath-pileser III took the hand of Marduk at the New Year festival of the Nisannu (729-728 B.C.), and became king of Babylonia; at this time he assumed the name Pulu. Many scholars, however, had doubted the fact that Pulu was the same as Tiglath-pileser III. Enough evidence exists, however, to prove that the two were actually one and the same person. The Eponym Chronicle says merely that the king "seized the hands of Bel."¹⁶ Later Annal editions mention that in addition to his other titles, Tiglath-pileser was called king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad.¹⁷ The Babylonian Chronicle mentions the same title, and reports that "for three years Ukin-zir ruled over Babylon, Tiglath-pileser sat on the throne of Babylon."¹⁸ The verse in the Bible states: "and the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul the king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria and carried it away."¹⁹ The Hebrew verb "carried" is in the singular, implying that Pul and Tiglath-pileser are one. The correct translation of the **waw** introducing the exegetical phrase concerning Tiglath-pileser should be "even."²⁰ Business documents dated after Tiglath-pileser have been preserved from his last years in Babylonia.²¹ In Tebetu of his second year as king of Babylon, Tiglath-pileser III died and was succeeded by his son Shalmaneser IV. The new monarch claimed rule over both Assyria and

Babylonia, and in the south assumed the name Ululaia.²² That the south, however, was in reality not a part of a joint kingdom becomes apparent from the fact that when Sargon II succeeded Shalmaneser IV in 722 B.C., Merodach-baladan formally became king of Babylonian at the following New Year festival and held the hands of Marduk.²³

In an effort to strengthen his position, Merodach-baladan enlisted the aid of Elam, which now began to intervene actively in Babylonian politics and was ready to grant assistance to any anti-Assyrian leader. Merodach-baladan successfully gained the support of Humbanigash, king of Elam, and in 720 B.C. an Elamite army clashed with Sargon's forces near Der. Although the Assyrians were apparently defeated, Sargon continued to hold Der; however, Merodach-baladan remained on the Babylonian throne for twelve years.²⁴ An inscribed cylinder of Merodach-baladan discovered at Nimrud records his building of the Ishtar temple at Uruk and also mentions victories over Assyria. The finding of the cylinder in Nimrud would imply that it had been transported to Assyria at a later date.²⁵

Sargon advanced into Babylonia in 710 B.C. and captured a fort belonging to Gambuli tribe, Dur-Athara, which had been fortified by a Babylonian force consisting of about 600 cavalry and 4,000 infantry. The area became an Assyrian province, with Dur-Athara, called Dur-Nabu, as its local capital.²⁶

Attempting to extend the province of Dur-nabu, Sargon fell upon the tribes of Ru'a, Puqudu, Iatburu and the Hindaru, thus bringing Assyrian forces into the home region of Merodach-bala-

¹⁵ ARAB, I, 793.

¹⁶ *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (RLA), II, 31:45.

¹⁷ P. Rost, *Keilinschriften Tiglath-pileser III*, pl. XXXIV, 1; ARAB, I, 808.

¹⁸ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (ZA), II, p. 23, col. 1, 1s, 17-23.

¹⁹ Chronicles 5: 26.

²⁰ E. R. Theile, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (Chicago, 1951), pp. 76 ff.

²¹ John Brinkman's Unpublished Dissertation, *The Political History of Post Kassite Babylonia*, (University of Chicago, 1962).

²² Babylonian Chronicles, i 27-30; ARAB, I, 827 f.

²³ Babylonian Chronicle, i, 31-32.

²⁴ ARAB, II, 4, 55.

²⁵ C. J. Gadd, *Inscribed Barrel Cylinder of Marduk-apla-iddina Iraq*, XV, pls. IX-X, pp. 133-134.

²⁶ ARAB, II, 31; A. T. Olmstead, *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria* (Lancaster, 1908), p.p. 130-131.

dan.²⁷ Sargon continued his advance and took fourteen cities located along the Uknu river, in addition to the fortresses of Sam'una and Bab-duri, which had been fortified by the king of Elam against the Iatburu.²⁸ This campaign resulted in the fall of Babylon and Borsippa, and Merodach-baladan apparently escaped south.²⁹

In the following year Sargon again moved into Southern Babylonia and, as his records relate, easily captured Dur-Iakin. There he freed prisoners, taken from the cities of Sippar, Nippur, Babylon and Borsippa who had been detained by Merodach-baladan, no doubt because of their pro-Assyrian tendencies. All Babylonia once again came under Assyrian domination, and at the following New Year festival 709-708, Sargon formally ascended the Babylonian throne.³⁰ A letter was sent to Sargon in which the sender addresses him as king of Babylon, but not as king of Assyria. Perhaps Sargon never claimed the title king of Babylon and Assyria. He may have been known in the north as king of Assyria, king of Sumer and Akkad, viceroy of Babylon, and the south as king of Babylon, and king of the lands; the two sets of titles may never have been combined.³¹

Sargon proudly recorded the costly gifts he presented to the Babylonian temples, probably to gain the support of the Babylonian priests and people.³² He also granted the cities of Nippur, Sippar, Babylon and Borsippa exemption from encumbrances, exemptions which had very likely been denied by both Shalmaneser IV and Merodach-baladan.³³

²⁷ ARAB, II, 32.

²⁸ ARAB, II, 32, 33.

²⁹ ARAB, II, 34-37.

³⁰ Babylonian Chronicle, ii, 1, 1. ARAB, II, 184.

³¹ R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters* (ABL) (Chicago, 1894-1914), No. 1016.

³² ARAB, II, 184; A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria* (HA) (Chicago, 1923).

³³ ARAB, II, 117.

For the remaining years of Sargon there is no information about Assyro-Babylonian relationships; presumably the situation was peaceful, only to deteriorate in the time of his successor, Sennacherib.

Berossos, the Babylonian priest of the late fourth and early third centuries B.C., told that a brother of Sennacherib sat on the Babylonian throne and was succeeded by a certain Akises who ruled for only thirty days and was killed by Merodach-baladan, who again assumed the throne for six months.³⁴ In any event, it is clear that Merodach-baladan once again sought allies to help him establish a firm position against Assyria. The Annals record that Merodach-baladan had Arab and Elamite support during his subsequent wars with Assyria. It was probably at this time that he sent his ambassadors to Heskia.³⁵ Since Isaiah was angered at the outcome of the meeting, we can assume that the mission was successful.³⁶ In spite of all these obstacles, Sennacherib advanced southward along the Tharthara river as far as Dur-Kurigalzu and Sippar. To meet the threat Merodach-baladan sent to Dutha a division of cavalry and light armed troops, under the leadership of Nergal-nasir the Sutean, who in turn was assisted by ten Elamite generals. A contingent of heavy armed forces under Tannanu, helped by the Elamite Imbappa, was also directed to Kish.³⁷ Sennacherib sent a force to Kish while he himself led an army against Nergal-nasir. When the Babylonian forces at Cutha were obliged to surrender, the Assyrian monarch was able to assist his troops at Kish, where he successfully defeated Merodach-baladan's armies, thus opening the way to Babylon, which was

³⁴ D. D. Luckenbill, *Annals of Sennacherib* (AS) (Chicago, 1924), p. 162 IIa.

³⁵ II King, 20:12-19.

³⁶ S. Smith, *The First Campaign of Sennacherib, King of Assyria B.C. 705-681* (London, 1921).

³⁷ AS, p. 49, col. 1, 1.8.

entered and sacked. After its fall, Sennacherib apparently continued his march south into the territories of Bit-Dakkuri, Bit-Sha'li, and Bit Iakin.³⁸

The Assyrian monarch then designated, as king of Babylon, one Bel-Ibni, a Babylonian who may have been a relative of Merodach-baladan but who had seemingly lived for some time in Assyria.³⁹ On his homeward march to Assyria, Sennacherib claims to have defeated certain tribes which he had not been able to on his advance, namely, the Tu'muna, Rihihu, and others.⁴⁰ In 700 B.C. Sennacherib descended upon Addad, removed Bel-Ibni from the throne, and returned him to Assyria together with his retinue. His forces then moved south, and in the battle of Bituti defeated Nergal-Ushezib, who evidently had been scheming to gain the Babylonian throne. The Assyrian went on to the Bit-Iakin area, but Merodach-baladan had fled to Elam.

The policy of placing natives on the Babylonian throne was doomed to failure and Sennacherib, in 699, named his son, Ashur-nadin-shum, as king of Babylon.⁴¹ The continued residence of Merodach-baladan in Elam, however, presented a real danger to Assyria and indeed caused disturbance for the newly appointed king of Babylon. We can safely assume that Merodach-baladan led raids upon the southern Babylonian border territories, for which reason Sennacherib in 695 mustered an army and fleet and prepared to move against the fugitive and his Elamite ally. The fleet sailed down the Tigris as far as Opis, then transferred to the Euphrates, and continued its course to the Nar marrati.⁴² During the campaign in Tishriti, 694, B.C., the Elamite king, Hallushu-Inshushinak (699-693 B.C.) invaded northern Babylonia and

entered Sippar. Earlier the statue of Nabu was sent from Der to Assyria, a fact which may testify that the Assyrians feared an Elamite attack via the usual road from Der.⁴³ He then descended upon Babylon, took Ashur-nadin-shum captive, and installed Nergal-ushezib on the throne. The latter apparently grew stronger, for in Tam-muzu, 693 B.C., he possessed Nippur.⁴⁴

In Tishriti, 693 B.C. the Assyrian forces entered and plundered Uruk. They then moved north, met the Babylonian armies at Nippur, and captured Nergal-ushezib as king of Babylon, and after a revolt in Elam, Kudur-Nahunte (692-688).⁴⁵ The combined forces of Huban-immenna and Ushezib-Marduk met an Assyrian army at Haluli and both sides claimed a victory.⁴⁷

Sennacherib apparently decided to put an end to the problem arising from Babylonia and swept southward to Babylon in 689 B.C. He completely devastated the city, tore down the walls and temples, threw their debris into the Arahtu canal, burned Babylon to its foundation and flooded the entire area. The statues of Marduk and other Babylonian gods were carried off to Assyria.⁴⁸

It has been suggested that, after the destruction of Babylon, Sennacherib had a change of heart toward the Babylonians. It has also been postulated that during the Sargonid period there was a pro-Babylonian party in Assyria which had considerable influence on royal policies, that during the reign of Sennacherib it was in the ascendancy, and that, consequently, Sennacherib appointed as governor of Babylon his son Esarhaddon, who re-

³⁸ Babylonian Chronicle, ii, ls. 39-40; A, p. 290-291.

³⁹ Babylonian Chronicle, ii, 1.40; A, p. 292.

⁴⁰ AS, col. IV, 1.46-51.

⁴¹ Babylonian Chronicle, ii, 1.7-15; AS col. IV, 1. 81-col. V ls. 1-14.

⁴² Babylonian Chronicle, iii, ls. 16-18; AS p. 82, ls. 35-36; G. G. Cameron, *History of Early Iran* (Chicago, 1936), p. 166-167.

⁴³ AS, pp. 83-84, ls. 44-54; ARAB, II, 341.

³⁸ AS, pp. 50-53, ls. 29-49.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 54, 1.54.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56, 1.60.

⁴¹ ARAB II, 243, 315, 324.

⁴² AS, 73, ls. 59-70.

mained at the post until after his father's death.⁴⁹ However, little is known of Esarhaddon's governorship which could indeed prove such a supposition. At the time of Sennacherib's death, Esarhaddon was north of Hani-galbat undertaking some warlike exploits.⁵⁰ Berossos contains the evidence which supported the assumption that Esarhaddon was governor of Babylon for eight years.⁵¹ Olmstead, upon this authority, assumed that Esarhaddon was the governor of Babylon, who at the death of Sennacherib, was at the frontier city of Zaqqap.⁵² The same author suggests that Esarhaddon was appointed as king over Babylon and that the city of Zaqqap witnessed his installation.⁵³ It seems improbable that Esarhaddon was at the city of Zaqqap if he was a governor of Babylonia, for a governor of the south would reside somewhere near the middle of his province rather than in a frontier city. Also there is no evidence to prove that Esarhaddon was at Zaqqap when his father died.

It was assumed by Winckler that Zaquti, wife of Sennacherib and mother of Esarhaddon, held a regency over Babylonia.⁵⁴ M. Streck finds no direct evidence to prove such a theory.⁵⁵ Recently, however, H. Lewy, has adopted the same view as Winckler and supported her view with evidence.⁵⁶ It

appears that Zaquti enjoyed a strong influence in Babylonia, but it is very difficult to agree that she held such a regency.

Sennacherib was murdered at Nineveh by his elder sons who were apparently assisted by certain army officers. It has been assumed by some that Sennacherib was assassinated in Babylon.⁵⁷ Their theory is based upon the data that Sennacherib was slain while worshipping in Assyria.⁵⁸

While Esarhaddon was occupied in stabilizing his throne, Nabu-zer-kitti-lishir, who apparently was the governor of the Sea Land, rebelled and besieged Ur, then governed by Ningaliddina. At the advance of the Assyrian army Nabu-zer-kitti-lishir withdrew and fled to Elam together with his brother, Naid-Marduk who made his way to Assyria and paid homage to Esarhaddon, who subsequently appointed him to the governorship of the Sea Land, probably about 680 B.C.⁵⁹

The sources dealing with Esarhaddon reveal him as a kindly figure who followed a mild policy towards Babylonia. The motives which induced him so to act have been variously conceived. He himself ascribes it to the compassion of the gods—a claim which is difficult to accept since in antiquity oracles were usually given in accordance with royal or priestly policy. A clue may be found in the personal interest taken by the king in Babylonia. His mother Zaquti had her own family ties with Babylonia, maintained properties in Lahiru, and naturally was attached to the Babylonian gods. Esarhaddon had acquired an interest in magic, and the reports received from the magicians and astrologers of the main cities in

⁴⁹ F. Schmidtke, *Asarhaddons Stadthalterschaft in Babylonien*, p. 9.

⁵⁰ B. Meissner, "Wo Befand sich Esarhaddon zur Zeit der Ermordung Sennacheribs," *Miscellanea Orientalia*, Deimel Festschrift (*Analecto Orientalia*) (Rome, 1935), pp. 232-34; cf. Winckler, "Die Politische Entwicklung Babylonien und Assyrien," *Der Alte Orient* (AO), 1, 11.

⁵¹ Eusebius, Chr. 27, 12 and in 28.

⁵² HA, p. 338.

⁵³ "The Rise and Fall of Babylon," *AJSL* (1922), p. 84.

⁵⁴ H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen* (AF), Zweite Reihe, 1 (Leipzig, 1898) p. 189.

⁵⁵ Streck, *Assurbanipal and die Letzten Assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Nineveh's* (Leipzig, 1916), pp. CCXXVI-CCXXVII.

⁵⁶ "Nitokris-Naqua," *JNES*, XI (1952), pp. 264-86.

⁵⁷ H. Winckler, *Keiliaschriften und des Alte Testament* (KAT), III, 85; F. Schmidtke, *Asarhaddons Stadthalterschaft in Babylonien und seine Thronbesteigung in Assyrien* (Leiden, 1916), pp. 83, 109.

⁵⁸ E. Kraeling, "The death of Sennacherib," *JAOS* (1933), 53, pp. 334-16.

⁵⁹ Campbell-Thompson, *A Prism of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal* (London, 1931), col. II, ls. RO-64; Cameron, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

Babylonia would certainly keep him in touch with them and make him admire the country. His interest in the past and his reverence for the culture of Babylonia may account for his attachment to the South and for his sympathy with the people's political demands. But since the king was Assyrian, he no doubt sought foremost the welfare of Assyria, which he probably conceived of as involving a fully united Mesopotamia. He probably saw no reason for the two adjacent lands to be on bad terms, since both countries spoke, on the whole, the same language, used nearly the same script, worshipped the same gods (with some preference either way to particular deities), and had the same cultural background. Thus, his policy toward Babylonia was to meet their demands halfway but to keep them attached to Assyria. He probably thought that a mild policy would enable the Babylonians to form a good opinion of their Assyrian rulers and subsequently to be ready for a second step in his long-range plan: to have an Assyrian-installed king in Babylon who would hold the hand of Marduk.

Esarhaddon relates that he renewed the Babylonian's exemptions from encumbrances, assisted the merchants, returned the plundered territories to their original owners, and encouraged business and building activities.⁶⁰ When Iddina-Sharru and his son Zakiru wrote to remind Esarhaddon of the manner in which Tiglath-pileser III and his successors had guarded the inherited rights of Babylonia, and had firmly establish the income of E-sagila and Ezida, Esarhaddon listened to their petition.⁶¹ Not long after his ascended by the Dakkuri tribe after the destruction of Babylon by Sennacherib,

he returned to their rightful owners. The usurpers, seemingly disobeying his orders, brought accusations against the real owners, and called themselves the original possessors. The king moved south, forcefully dispossessed the tribe, which retreated to its former location, captured its chief, Shamash-ibni, and claimed to have appointed as their chieftain Nabu-ushallim, son of Balasu, who had been the Dakkuri chief in the time of Tiglath-pileser III.⁶² Shamash-ibni was carried north and killed in Assyria.⁶³ Bel-iqisha, chief of the Gambuli, rose in revolt, but soon submitted and resumed his tribute and gifts.⁶⁴

After the defeat of the Dakkuri and the submission of the Gambuli in 678, Esarhaddon ordered the restoration of Babylon and appointed as a new governor over the city, Ubaru, whom the Babylonians received with welcoming arms.⁶⁵

Later in the reign of Esarhaddon, Ummanaldas, the king of Elam, attacked Babylonia. He fell upon Sippar and made such a great massacre that the usual procession of Shamash could not go out that year.⁶⁶ Probably at the same time men of the Puqudu tribe invaded the territory of Bit-Ammu-kani, slew many of their men and violated their women; while the invaders were crossing the king's canal, Nabushar-usur, an Assyrian captain, seized them.⁶⁷

Esarhaddon, in all probability, was quite sincere in his kindly attitude toward Babylon. In 672 B.C. he officially appointed his younger son, Ashurbanipal, to be the crown prince of Assyria, and his elder son, Shamash-shum-ukin, the son of a Babylonian wife, to the principality of Babylonia. Thus, the as-

⁶⁰ *Beitrag zur Assyriologie*, III, p. 325, col. VII, ls. 14-42; ARAB, II, 659 E, 655, 668.

⁶¹ Winckler, AF, II, 24.

ancy, he ordered that Babylonian lands, which had apparently been appropri-

⁶² ABL, 403.

⁶³ S. Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts* (London, 1924), p. 12, lns. pp. 10-12.

⁶⁴ ARAB, II, 539, 544.

⁶⁵ ARAB, II.

⁶⁶ Babylonian Chronicles, col. IV, ls. 9-10.

⁶⁷ ABL, 275.

sumed second step of his plan for Babylonia's future was set forth.

In 669 B.C. Esarhaddon died while on his way to conquer Egypt and Ashurbanipal immediately assumed the kingship. At the new year festival of 668 B.C. Shamash-shum-ukin was installed as king of Babylonia and sent to the south, accompanied by the statues of Marduk and other Babylonian gods, which were kept in Assyria since the time of Sennacherib.⁶⁸ Eighteen years later, the two brothers were at open war against each other. Many reasons may be given for the armed clash; the rivalry between the two brothers which has its roots in the period preceding their accessions to the thrones might be one. The frequent intervention of Ashurbanipal in the affairs of the south, which was supposedly under his brother's jurisdiction, may be another. The great support Shamash-shum-ukin received from the southern cities may indicate that the half Babylonian king decided to lead the liberation movement of the south and have an independent Babylonia. Shamash-shum-ukin was able to acquire the help of Elam and the Arabian tribes.⁶⁹

After the final victory of Assyria and the death of Shamash-shum-ukin, Ashurbanipal appointed Kandalanu, who in all probability was another brother of his to the vacant throne of Babylonia. Thus Kandalanu may be that "brother" of Sammuges, to whom Berossos refers. Furthermore, the treaty between Esarhaddon and Ramataia which the Mede signed in 673 B.C. contains the clause: "(You swear) that you will (if necessary) await the woman pregnant by Esarhaddon king of Assyria."⁷⁰ The woman here referred to as being pregnant may have given birth to a son in 672, and it is possible that this son was Kandalanu.

While the war between Ashurbanipal and Shamash-shum-ukin was going on, Ashurbanipal in 650 B.C. appointed a certain Bel-ibni, a Chaldean, governor of the Sea Land.⁷¹ The newly appointed governor distinguished himself in the military defense of Assyria against Elam and the frequent attack on southern tribes.

As shown by business documents, Kandalanu continued to rule in Babylon until 631 B.C.⁷² Ashurbanipal probably died sometime after Simanu (June) 631, for the last known document dates to his 38th year.⁷³ He was succeeded after an attempt by a certain general to usurp the kingship, by his weak son, Ashur-etil-ilani. We know that Bel-ibni continued over the Sea Land through the early years of Ashur-etil-ilani's reign. His fate, however, is not known and he may have died or been deposed.

Southern Babylonia apparently, due probably to the weakness of the Assyrian king, fell under the full authority of Sin-shar-ishkun, another son of Ashurbanipal. Berossos reports that Nabopalasser was appointed governor of the Sea Land by Sin-shar-ishkun.⁷⁴ A text from the Seleucid era, doubtless a copy of an earlier tablet, states that Nabopalasser, who is called king of the Sea Land, returned to Elam a number of ritual tablets which had been kept at Uruk.⁷⁵ The use of this title may indicate that Nabopalasser declared his independence in the Sea Land and probably took advantage of the divisive influence within the land. Soon he raised his arms against Assyria, who desperately fought him and tried in vain to hold the South. In 626

⁷¹ ABL, 289.

⁷² S. Langdon, *JRAS* (1928), p. 322 cf. 4.

⁷³ D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of the Chaldaean Kings* (London, 1956), p. 92.

⁷⁴ P. Schnabel, *Berossos und die Babylonische-Hellenistische Literatur* (Leipzig, 1923), p. 271.

⁷⁵ Thureau Dangin, *Rituels Accadiens* (Paris, 1921), p. 65, 80, 86, AO 64, 51 rev. ls. 46 II.

⁶⁸ ARAB, II, 989; HA, 405-06.

⁶⁹ ABL, 1309; ARAB, II, 867, 821; Streck, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁷⁰ D. J. Wiseman, *IRAQ*, XX (1957), ls. 249-250.

B.C. Babylon fell into Nabopalasser's hands, and in Marcheswan (December) of this year, he ascended the throne of Babylon and thus began the era of the Chaldean Dynasty.⁷⁶ The newly seated king carried the war of liberation and, with the fall of Nippur at the end of 623 B.C. or early 622, the South was

completely freed from Assyria. Until this year Nabopalasser's policy had been to gain the whole south Mesopotamia to defend it against Assyria. The subsequent years, until the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C., witnessed a change from a defensive policy to an aggressive one. During these years he sought allies, assaulted Assyrian territories, and finally participated in the sack of Ninevah.

⁷⁶ Parker R.A. and Dubberstem, *Babylonian Chronology* 621 B.C.-45 A.D. (Chicago, 1942), p. 9.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.