

Paper #8 Arguments that the 10th/9th century kings of the “dynasty of E”
were vassals of the Kassite kings of the 3rd Dynasty.
(Arguments 4 & 5: The Campaigns of Tukulti-Ninurta II and
The Kin-Group of Arad-Ea


Argument #4: The Campaigns of Tukulti-Ninurta II

As the title of this paper suggests, we are primarily interested here in the military campaigns of the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884), with emphasis on his interaction with his southern neighbor Karduniash/Babylonia. Though some discussion on this topic can be found in our papers #3 and #4, we examine the subject again, in part because many of our readers may be unfamiliar with our earlier remarks, but moreso because we want to set the brief reign of this king in a broader context. In order to do the latter we backtrack slightly and briefly mention the Assyria/Karduniash conflicts which immediately preceded his reign.

In our previous paper we discussed the fact that Adad-Nirari II, the father of Tukulti-Ninurta II, fought two battles against the Babylonians, the first against the Kassite vassal king Shamash-mudammīq (ca 920-900) in the year 902 BC, the second against that king’s successor Nabu-shuma-ukin I (899-891 BC) in 894 BC. The first of these campaign was undertaken in order to prepare the Assyrian army for an upcoming series of battles against Hanigalbat. The second appears to have been motivated by an uprising in Karduniash which deposed and murdered the existing Kassite sovereign Kara-Hardash, paternal grandson of Burnaburiash II, and maternal grandson of Ashuruballit, an associate king of Adad-Nirari II. Details of these two campaigns were reviewed briefly at the beginning of our 6th paper. What we did not discuss in that 6th paper was the fact that Adad-Nirari II fought one more time with Karduniash, a battle that must have taken place only months before his death in 891 BC. That conflict is described briefly in a document called the Chronicle P, the source of much of our knowledge about happenings in this early 9th century time frame.

Before we look at the Chronicle P one last time we pause to recommend to readers new to this series that they download and print off the timeline shown in our Figure 1 on the following page. It will prove to be most helpful in understanding the remarks which follow. And for those same readers, newly introduced to this series of articles, we do recommend the reading of our papers #3 and #4, where many of the characters featured in this paper make their first appearance. There, for the first time, we determined that the Chronicle P is referencing the 9th century, not the middle of the 14th century as believed by scholars of the traditional history. And there, for the first time, we determined that an associate king of Assyria named Ashuruballit was a contemporary of the Assyrian king Adad-Nirari II.

**Figure 1: Timeline Showing the Reigns of the mid-10th/9th century kings of Egypt, Assyria, Hatti, Kassite Babylonia, and the early kings of the Babylonian composite “dynasty of E”.
(duplicate of Figure 2 on page 3 of Paper #6)**



The Chronicle P

This remarkable document, authored by an unknown Babylonian scribe late in the 8th century BC, is entirely concerned with happenings in Karduniash from the beginning years of the 9th century to the end of the 1st quarter of the 8th. What is equally as important as the dates involved is the fact that this scribe seems to have had access to original documents, which he copied faithfully, unlike many Assyrian scribes working in the same time frame, who were busy copying ancient documents, often themselves copies, and often replete with errors, some accidentally introduced, others intentionally inserted to make the text conform to a preconceived view of history. One of our objectives in reviewing the [Chronicle P](#) yet again is to buttress our previous argument concerning its overall reliability. It will also serve to introduce a few features omitted from our previous discussion. We review all four columns, one column at a time.

Column 1:

Table 1: Translation of Column 1 of the Chronicle P

Lacuna
2' [...] king of Karduniaš and [...]
3' king of Assyria between them made a treaty and together they fixed the boundary.
4' [...] he rebuilt and restored it.

5' Kadašman-harbe, son of Karaindaš, son of Muballitat-serua,
6' the daughter of Aššur-uballit, king of Assyria, ordered the overthrow of the Suteans
7' from the east to west, and annihilated their extensive forces.
8' He reinforced the fortresses in Mount Šaršar. He dug wells and
9' settled people on fertile lands to strengthen the guard. Afterwards
10' the Kassite people rebelled against him and killed him. Šuzigaš, a Kassite,
11' the son of a nobody, they appointed as sovereign over them. Aššur-uballit,
12' king of Assyria, marched to Karduniaš, to avenge Kadašman-harbe, his daughter's son, and
13' Šuzigaš, the Kassite,
14' he killed. Aššur-uballit put Kurigalzu, son of Kadašman-harbe, on his father's throne.


The Chronicle P begins (lines 2-4) with an account of a treaty forged between an unnamed king of Karduniash and an unnamed king of Assyria, presumably the result of negotiations or military action intended to establish boundaries between the two nations, a frequent cause of conflict. All we can say about this unknown situation is that it precedes the 894 battle between Adad-Nirari II and Nabu-shuma-ukin, which also resulted in a peace treaty (see paper #6). The Chronicler is careful to supply a horizontal line separating incidents which occurred in different time frames. And he is careful to preserve a chronological ordering of the events he describes, always moving forward in time.

The balance of the first column (lines 4-14) is clearly a description of a single event which, if we are correct, carries over into the second column. Apparently a king named Ashuruballit has accompanied an Assyrian army into Karduniash/Babylonia in order to avenge the death of a grandson. This grandson, named Kadašman-harbe (Kara-hardash in a parallel version in the *Synchronistic History*), was the offspring of a marital union between Ashuruballit's daughter Muballitat-serua and a Kassite prince named Karaindash, the son of the Kassite king Burnaburiash II. A short time prior Kadašman-harbe had inherited the Kassite throne at the death of his grandfather Burnaburiash II, which implies of course that Burnaburiash had outlived his son Karaindash. It should be pointed out that the name of Burnaburiash does not occur in the Chronicle P, but is supplied from the aforementioned parallel version of the same

incident. The *Synchronistic History*, not noted for its reliability, is in this instance almost certainly correct.

Apparently a segment of the Kassite population of Karduniash (including the Kassite army if the *Synchronistic History* is to be believed) objected to the grandson of an Assyrian king inheriting the Kassite throne, and rebelled, killing Kadašman-harbe, and replacing him with a surrogate named Šuzigaš (Nazi-bugash in the parallel version), a Kassite with little, if any, pedigree. Thus the intrusion of Ashuruballit, accompanied by an Assyrian army, who promptly had the pretender killed, and installed as king a son of Kadašman-harbe named Kurigalzu, the second Kassite king bearing this name. The genealogy of both great-grandfathers of Kurigalzu (II) is shown below in Figure 2. Birth and death dates have been added on the assumption that in royal families males married at around age 17 with first child at age 18 while females married around age 15 with first child at age 16. In this scenario Ashuruballit lived into his late 80's, Kurigalzu II was 37 when he became king, and his son Nazi-Maruttash was 22 when he assumed control of the army in 891. These dates are reasonably correct.

**Figure 2: The Ashuruballit connection to the Kassite family of Burnaburiash II according to the Chronicle P.
Copied from page 23 of our Paper #3.**



Column 2:

Table 2: Translation of Column 2 of the Chronicle P

1' Too broken
2' Too broken
3' upon them [...] and a shout/complaint [...]
4' The enemy seized him. Together [...] to the sword
5' he put all of them, and he did not leave a soul. Those who were fallen,
6' they put in distress. They colored the midst of the rolling sea with their blood.
7' They sent out their troops, fought zealously, and achieved victory.
8' They subdued the enemy troops. He gathered the possessions of the vast enemy and
9' made piles of them. Again the warriors said:
10' "We did not know, Kurigalzu, that you had conquered all peoples.
11' We had no rival among people. Now you [<i>have overcome us^{??}</i>]
12' We have set out, sought the place where you are and brought gifts.
13' We have helped you conquer [...]" Again he [...]
14' [...] them and [...]

The 14 lines of the second column are variously treated by scholars of the traditional history, and are generally regarded as text inserted from some other document. We believe otherwise, and suggest that the entire column contains the sequel to the first column induction of Kurigalzu. Apparently, soon after his “crowning”, Kurigalzu sought out the whereabouts of those who had very recently deposed and killed his father Kadašman-harbe, and he avenged his father’s death by slaughtering the instigators of the coup. By the time we get to the beginning of the third column we are clearly in a new section.

Column 3:

Verses 1-22 of the third column are concerned with a single prolonged incident, reasonably clear notwithstanding the badly damaged initial verses which make accurate translation all but impossible. It appears that an Elamite king named Hurbatila, otherwise unknown, has invaded Babylon, probably not long after Kurigalzu’s retributory attack on the Kassite loyalists. Attempting to capitalize on the turmoil in Karduniash, Hurbatila opportunistically raided the country, and quickly exited with pillage, avoiding a full scale conflict, though some damage to Babylon and Borsippa seems to be alluded to in verse 9. A war of words ensued between the two countries, ending in the Elamite issuing a verbal challenge to Kurigalzu, whence the neophyte Kassite king engaged him in battle near the city of Dur-Šulgi, location unknown, but presumably east of the Tigris and near the border between Elam and Karduniash. Here Kurigalzu defeated and captured Hurbatila, and followed up his victory by invading and receiving the tribute of “all of Elam”.

Table 3: Translation of Column 3, Lines 10-24 of the Chronicle P

1' [...]
2' N thousand [...]
3' N thousand [...]
4' one thousand piebald horses their gift [...]
5' He seized the spy and brought the knight [...]
6' He set a watch and [...]
7' the return, your path. Silver, gold, precious stones, [...]
8' I brought.
9' I [...] Babylon and Borsippa, upon/over me [...]
10' Hurbatila, king of Elam, wrote to Kurigalzu:
11' "Come! At Dur-Šulgi, I and you,
12' let us do battle together!" Kurigalzu heard [...]
13' He went to conquer Elam and Hurbatila,
14' king of Elam, did battle against him at Dur-Šulgi.
15' Hurbatila retreated before him and Kurigalzu brought about their defeat.
16' He captured the king of Elam. All of Elam [...]
17' Bowing down, Hurbatila, king of Elam, said:
18' "I know, king Kurigalzu, that this [...]
19' with the kings of all lands I have brought the tribute of Elam."
20' He went to conquer Adad-nirari, king of Assyria.
21' He did battle against him at Sugaga, which is on the Tigris, and brought about his defeat.
22' He slaughtered his soldiers and captured his officers.

23' Nazi-maruttaš, son of [...]
24' king of Assyria in [...].
Lacuna

The historicity of this Elamite campaign has never been in doubt. In the book *"Who's Who in the Ancient Near East"* by Gwendolyn Leick we read (s.v. Hurbatila) that "An inscription by king Kurigalzu II on a statue that he put up at Susa marks him as the 'tyrant of Susa and Elam', and quoting from the book *"Elam: Surveys of Political History and Archaeology"* authored by Elizabeth Carter and Matthew Stolper, on page 35 we read

The late Babylonian text called "Chronicle P" records that the Babylonian king Kurigalzu II (1132 (sic) - 1308 B.C.) fought an otherwise unknown Hurbatila, entitled "king of Elammat," defeated him, and conquered Elam. Votive inscriptions of Kurigalzu also record his conquest of Susa, Elam, and Marhashi. Dedicatory texts of Kurigalzu have been found at Susa itself. The extent and duration of Kassite

domination over Elam are unknown. Kassite control of Susiana seems to have been only a brief episode, followed quickly by the rise of the Middle Elamite state.

Without a break the column 3 text (lines 20-22) tells us that following his Elamite conquest Kurigalzu “went to conquer Adad-nirari, king of Assyria,” at Sugaga on the Tigris, where he “slaughtered his soldiers and captured his officers”. The lack of a sectional line surprises us, and can only be explained on the assumption that this incident took place immediately upon the return of Kurigalzu from Elam, and was perceived by the Chronicle P author as part of the larger campaign. That assumption is confirmed by the timeline provided in our Figure 1. Kurigalzu was confirmed in office in 894 and Adad-Nirari II died sometime during the year 891 BC. In the interim we must fit Kurigalzu’s retributive attack(s) on the instigators of the coup that witnessed the death of his father; the Elamite campaign, which appears to have been far more extensive than hinted at in the column 3 description; and the battle at Sugaga against Adad-Nirari II. The latter must be dated extremely late in the reign of Adad-Nirari, probably in 892 BC, a year before the death of the Assyrian king. In the Synchronistic History this battle is recorded as a contest over “boundary lines” between the two nations, and we surmise that while Kurigalzu was busy fighting in Elam, Adad-nirari II was actively extending his southern border with Karduniash, this in spite of the peace treaty forged two years earlier. The Synchronistic History claims victory for the Assyrians; the Chronicle P records a resounding victory for Kurigalzu II. We continue to stand by the accuracy of the Chronicle P.

The next battle recounted by the Chronicle P, introduced in lines 23 and 24 of the third column, preceded by a sectional divider, took place in 891 BC, the year that Adad-Nirari II died, which would be the accession year of his son and successor Tukulti-Ninurta II. All that remains of the introduction to the battle is the name of Nazi-Maruttash, introduced as “the son of [Kurigalzu (II)]” and fact that he is fighting against an unnamed “king of Assyria”. In our interpretation of the Chronicle the description of this battle extends into the fourth column as far as line 13, where a sectional line indicates that this vignette ends. It is from that 4th column text that we determine that the opponent of Nazi-Maruttash was Tukulti-Ninurta II. We will return in a moment to discuss this battle, which at long last brings us into the time of Tukulti-Ninurta II, the main subject of this section of our paper. But first we must return momentarily to the time of Adad-Nirari II. As it turns out, the battle described in 3:22-4:13 of the Chronicle P is a sequel to another battle between Assyria and Karduniash, one not included in our Chronicle P. We need to interrupt our Chronicle P narrative to put both battles in their rightful context.

Though our purpose in this paper is to describe the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta from the point of view of the Chronicle P, we have several times already made reference to the Synchronistic History, if only to clarify several points of interest. For the most part we finished with our analysis of the Synchronistic History in papers #3 and #4. But there is one battle recorded in the online edition of that document that remains of interest to this paper, primarily because we do not believe that it was originally a part of that “History”. If the reader were to access the online version of the [Synchronistic History](#) he/she would discover that this is a composite document, where the inscriptions on three different tablets have been merged into a single fabricated text by 20th century scholars. The document has been “color-coded” to reflect the three sources, and a perusal of the document will quickly inform the reader that the small “fragment C” tablet (color-coded blue) consisted of less than twenty lines of text, which the editors have interspersed randomly throughout the four columns of the composite text. We are here concerned only with the eight lines positioned at the end of column one and labelled as lines C24'- C31', copied below in our Table 4.

**Table 4 – Border skirmish between Nazi-Marrutash and Adad-Nirari II, around the year 891 BC.
(Text from a tablet fragment assumed to belong to the Synchronistic History
and added to column one of that document)**

C24' Adad-nirari, king of Assyria, and Nazi-Marrutaš, king of Karduniaš,
C25' fought with one another at Kar-Ištar of Ugarsallu.
C26' Adad-nirari brought about the total defeat of Nazi-Marrutaš and
C27' conquered him. He took away from him his camp and his standards.
C28' As for this very boundary-line, they fixed a division of
C29' their confines from Pilasqu,
C30' which is on the other side of the Tigris, and Arman of Ugarsallu
C31' as far as Lullume.

Because we have been unable, thus far, to determine when, where, and by whom this tablet was analysed and inserted piecemeal into the original Synchronistic History, we cannot comment with any certainty on its likely authenticity, but judging from the content of all the blue coded text it appears that this fragment may well have originated from a Babylonian source and its content may actually reflect the 9th and 8th century context assumed by our revised chronology. Thus, in our opinion, the lines quoted in our Table 4 may be taken at face value, in which case they are describing a military conflict between the Assyrian king Adad-nirari II and Nazi-Maruttash, the latter leading a Kassite army on behalf of his father Kurigalzu II. This battle likely took place early in the year 891 B.C., only months before the death of Adad-Nirari II. Nazi-Maruttash would be 22 years old, assuming the accuracy of our Table 2. The claim that the Assyrians were victorious is clearly exaggerated, since, as noted by various authorities, including Brinkman, the boundaries appear to have been moved in favor of Karduniaš. Within a few months, if not mere weeks, Adad-Nirari II is dead, and his son and successor Tukulti-Ninurta II is in control of the Assyrian army. If we are correct, the new Assyrian king immediately resumed the unresolved conflict over border issues, and he and Nazi-Maruttash engaged in battle, a sequel to the one his father had fought with this same Nazi-Maruttash. This time the Assyrians were victorious. It is this second battle that is described in lines 3:22-4:13 of the Chronicle P, to which we now divert our attention.

Column 4:

We have previously commented extensively on the last two lines in column 3 and the whole of column four. The interested reader can find the synopsis on pages 2-10 of our paper #4. Our interest here is to add commentary not included in those pages. The details of the battle and its aftermath are rather straightforward, and the previous pages of this paper have helped to put this narrative in its proper historical context.

Table 5: Translation of Column 4, Lines 1-24 of the Chronicle P

1' [...]
2' [...] he threw iron bands and [...]
3' [...] Tukulti-Ninurta returned to Babylon and
4' brought [...] near. He destroyed the wall of Babylon and put the Babylonians to the sword.
5' He took out the property of the Esagila and Babylon amid the booty. The statue of the great lord Marduk
6' he removed from his dwelling-place and sent him to Assyria.
7' He put his governors in Karduniaš. For seven years, Tukulti-Ninurta
8' controlled Karduniaš. After the Akkadian officers of Karduniaš had rebelled and
9' put Adad-šuma-ušur on his father's throne,
10' Aššur-nasir-apli, son of that Tukulti-Ninurta who had carried criminal designs against Babylon, and the officers of Assyria rebelled against Tukulti-Ninurta,
11' removed him from the throne, shut him up in Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta and killed him.
12' For sixty ^[?] -six (until the time of Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur), Bel stayed in Assyria, in the time of Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur, Bel
13' went to Babylon.

14' At the time of Enlil-nadin-šumi, the king, ^[5] Kiden-Hutran, king of Elam, attacked.
15' He went into action against Nippur and scattered its people. Der and Edimgalkamma
16' he destroyed, carried off its people, drove them away and eliminated the suzerainty of Enlil-nadin-šumi, the king.

17' At the time of Adad-šuma-iddina, ^[6] Kiten-Hutran returned and attacked Akkad a second time.
18' [...] he destroyed Isin, crossed the Tigris, all of
19' [...] Maradda. A terrible defeat of an extensive people
20' he brought about. [...] and with oxen [...]
21' [...] he removed to wasteland [...]
22' [...]

23' [...] he dominated [...]
24' Too broken
Lacuna

The battle described in column 4 takes place in 891 BC, immediately following the death of Adad-Nirari II, thus in the accession year of Tukulti-Ninurta II. The details accord perfectly with what we know about the reign of this Assyrian king, so much so that we marvel at the unanimous opinion of scholars of the traditional history who place this battle in the 13th century BC, in the days of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207). Of course we know the reason. The


traditional history had no other choice but to identify the Assyrian king in question as Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207). The only alternative, Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884), was out of the question for one obvious reason. In the traditional history the reign of Kashtiliash IV (their choice for the opponent of Tukulti-Ninurta in column four, even though he is not mentioned in the narrative), is dated 1232—1225 BC. This king could not possibly have been a participant in a battle with a 9th century Tukulti-Ninurta II, even if the evidence for that identification was overwhelming. As we stated on pages 6 & 7 in our 4th paper:

Interpreting the Chronicle P at face value immediately causes the timelines of Babylonia, Hatti, and Egypt to implode. 14th-12th century events must move to the 10th-8th centuries. Tens of thousands of books and journal articles become instantly obsolete, careers and reputations are destroyed, damaged, or at minimum depreciated, not to mention the scores of bruised egos in the academic world.

In the opinion of this author the only details in column four which raise questions about dating the narrative are the mention of Adad-shuma-usur in line 9 and the mention of Ninurta-Tukulti-Asher in line 12. We expend a few pages discussing these two names, adding to what has already been mentioned in our paper #4. But our comments regarding these two names need to be made with the hypothetical 13th century timeline of the battle clearly in view. To date, while we have spent considerable time arguing for our 10th century placement of the events in column four of the Chronicle P, we have failed to adequately discuss the point of view of adherents of the traditional history. We remedy that deficiency here by adding our Figure 3 to the following page. The upper pair of timelines in the figure shows the sequence of Assyrian and Kassite kings who ruled during the time frame 1250-1155 BC, i.e. during the hypothetical final century of Kassite rule in Karduniash. The bottom of the chart merely isolates the portion of those timelines which encompass the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, providing space on which to diagram the assumed position of the “seven year occupation of Karduniash”, and add details relevant to our discussion. Our objective, of course, is to discount the viability of this positioning of the “occupation”.

There are multiple objections to dating the invasion and occupation of Karduniash in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, many of which have already been mentioned in earlier papers. If they are mentioned again here, that mention will be brief, and is intended only to provide new readers to this revised Babylonian history a more complete perspective. We begin with the two names alluded to earlier, namely 1) the Babylonian prince named Adad-shuma-usur who, according to lines 8 and 9 of column 4, was elected to replace his royal father at the instigation of “Akkadian officers of Karduniash”, this during a rebellion that took place seven years after Tukulti-Ninurta overran Karduniash, and 2) the Assyrian “king” named Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur, who, according to lines 12 and 13, returned the pilfered statue of Marduk to Babylon precisely “sixty?-six” years after its removal by Tukulti-Ninurta.

Figure 3: The seven-year Assyrian occupation of Karduniash in the days of Tukulti-Ninurta I (as understood by adherents of the traditional history)



Adad-shuma-usur

This name in this position in Figure 3 is clearly one of the most compelling arguments favoring the accuracy of the 13th century dating of the invasion and occupation of Karduniash by Tukulti-Ninurta I. As diagrammed, that occupation lasted from 1225-1217 BC, and the accession year of the Kassite king Adad-shuma-usur is dated precisely to the year 1217, the year of death of his predecessor Adad-shuma-iddina (1222-1217). What is equally compelling is the fact that the invasion of Karduniash coincided with the death of a Kassite king named Kashtiliash (IV), whose demise during the attack on Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta I is supposedly independently confirmed via the content of a lengthy Assyrian document entitled the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic. These two dates bracket the beginning and ending of the seven year occupation so perfectly, that we are unable to argue that they arise merely by chance. In fact, we argue precisely the opposite. The fact that the reign of the Kassite king Adad-shuma-usur began precisely at the end of the occupation of Karduniash is definitely not a coincidence. Chance had nothing to do with it. The Chronicle P was purchased on the antiquities market in the latter years of the 19th century. Immediately scholars recognized, from the fourth column of that inscription, that the beginning of the reign of a king named Adad-shuma-usur must begin at the end of a seven year

occupation of Karduniash in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. Additionally, they knew that Tukulti-Ninurta I ruled sometime in the 13th century, contemporary with the 3rd (Kassite) dynasty of kings of Babylon, and there did exist a Kassite king by the name Adad-shuma-usur, whose absolute dates were not yet precisely determined, but whose reign could conceivably overlap that of Tukulti-Ninurta I. He was also the only other known Babylonian king bearing that name. Ergo, at long last scholars had found a long sought for and very precise synchronism, The absolute dates for the Kassite kings at that time in history were in flux, and this synchronism provided a much needed means by which to assign absolute dates not only to that 3rd dynasty of Babylon, but also to both prior and subsequent Babylonian dynasties as well. What they needed was some way of positioning the “seven year occupation” within the 36 year long reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. Had they followed the wording of the fourth column closely, they might have positioned the occupation at the very end of that king’s reign, since the Chronicle P clearly states that Tukulti-Ninurta was assassinated very soon following the rebellion that put Adad-shuma-usur on the throne in Babylon. That, at least, is the opinion of this author. The reader is encouraged to read again the relevant lines of the fourth column, this time following [Grayson’s translation](#) of the Chronicle P:

- | | |
|----|---|
| 7 | For seven years, Tukulti-ninurta Karduniash |
| 8 | controlled. After the Akkadian officers of Karduniash had rebelled and |
| 9 | Adad-shuma-usur on his father's throne put, against Tukulti-ninurta, who criminal |
| | designs on Babylon |
| 10 | had carried out - him , Assur-na-sir-apli, his son (mar-īshu) and the officers of Assyria |
| | rebelled, |
| 11 | removed him from his throne, shut him up in a room and killed him. |

Instead, 20th century scholars chose to synchronize the date when the reign of Kashtiliash ended and the date when Babylon was invaded by Tukulti-Ninurta I, relying entirely on their understanding of the data contained in the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic. When the reader looks at the timelines in our Figure 3, and marvels at the precise correspondence of dates, he/she needs to recognize that the timelines of Assyria and Kassite Babylonia were set in place by 19th and early 20th century scholars precisely to achieve this precision. Our Figure three is the result of two absolutely unproven assumptions, namely, 1) that the Kassite king Adad-shuma-usur must be identified as the prince by that name in the fourth column of the Chronicle P, and 2) that the invasion of Babylon which resulted in the “seven year occupation” took place at the end of the reign of Kashtiliashu IV. The timelines are the result of scholars assuming the accuracy of those assumptions, therefore they cannot be used in any shape or form to argue for the accuracy of those assumptions, which would amount to a blatant use of [circular reasoning](#).

Having argued above that the relative positioning of the Assyrian and Kassite timelines in Figure 3 derived from two faulty assumptions and are contrived in such a way as to reflect those assumptions, we go on to outline two entirely independent arguments which combine to prove that those assumptions are simply not true.

1) Several facts need to be established regarding the Chronicle P fourth column mention of a prince named Adad-shuma-usur before we can identify this individual. In the first place we need to determine the ethnicity of this prince, now being elected to occupy his father's throne. It would also be advantageous if we could identify his father, and perhaps even establish when his father died and how long his throne has been lying vacant. Finally, we need to identify the party or parties against whom the "Akkadian officers of Karduniash" are rebelling. Only then can it be determined if Adad-shuma-usur, newly crowned as the successor to his father, should be identified as Adad-shuma-usur, the Kassite king in our Figure 3. Answering the first and last of these questions is not difficult. In fact an answer to both can be proposed in a few brief sentences. We note first of all that it is a group of Babylonian officers dwelling in Akkad, the northern section of Karduniash, that are instigating the rebellion. Rather than continuing to serve in the administration of a foreign government (the Kassites), in a country presently overrun by Assyrians, with Assyrian governors at the helm, they apparently want a native prince to lead them. And the name of the prince whom they desire to elevate to kingship is decidedly Babylonian, a fact disputed by absolutely no-one. These facts combine to argue persuasively that Adad-shuma-usur was a Babylonian prince and that the Akkadian officers are rebelling against both the *de lecto* Kassite king - who has apparently been taken captive, or has been driven from Karduniash and is awaiting the opportune time to regain control of his vassal state - and the Assyrian governor(s) who are presently misgoverning the state. As for the query concerning the parentage of this Adad-shuma-usur and how long his father's throne has been vacant we can at least venture an opinion. The fact that Adad-shuma-usur was a native Babylonian implies that his father was a Babylonian king, deposed and likely killed by the Assyrians, who seven years prior invaded Karduniash, defeated the existing Kassite king, and likely drove the Kassites from Karduniash. This scenario cannot possibly fit any historical context in the 13th century BC. In fact it fits no situation known to have existed in the entire course of Babylonian history, as that history is outlined in the traditional history. Only in the revised history, with the Kassites moved into the first millennium, overlapping the native 4th to 9th dynasties of "kings of Babylon", did there exist native Babylonian kings and Kassite kings jointly ruling Babylonia, and only during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta II did an Assyrian invasion of Karduniash end the life of a native "king of Babylon" and drive out the Kassites, governing the vassal state for seven years.

A glance at our Figure 1 will quickly inform the reader concerning the answers to our remaining questions. The father of Adad-shuma-usur, the prince elevated to "his father's throne" by "the Akkadian officers of Karduniash" can now be positively identified. His name was Nabu-shuma-ukin I, as is evident in our Figure 1. Of this we are certain. The critic will certainly object, arguing that Babylonian history has no record of the existence of a king Adad-shuma-usur, son of Nabu-shuma-ukin. But that is not surprising. The legitimacy of the uprising which purposed to install Adad-shuma-user as king may well be questioned. After all, it was not the nation as a whole that sanctioned this coup-d'etat on the part of some small section of a country occupied by foreigners. And we have previously argued the case, from the point of view of the revised

history, that the “kings of Babylon” in dynasties 4 through to the “dynasty of E” served at the pleasure of the Kassite overlords of Karduniash. Within months, if not days or weeks, of the rebellion in Akkad, the Assyrian rebellion by the army and son of Tukulti-Ninurta II, deposed and murdered that king. Without doubt the Kassites returned to Karduniash. And they, not the Akkadian officers, determined the succession question, installing Nabu-apla-iddina on his father’s throne. We have no proof that this is what happened. But we are dealing here with a very poorly documented time in Babylonian history. And there is absolutely no record of how, when, or why Nabu-apla-iddina succeeded his father. We know only that he did.

2) In column four of the Chronicle P, beyond the narrative running from 3:22 to 4:13, there exist two separate vignettes, one (4:14-16) related to the Kassite king Enlil-nadin-shumi, and a second (4:17-22) related to the Kassite king Adad-shuma-iddina. Assuming that the chronicler is following protocol, and that the three vignettes are listed in chronological order, it follows that the coup which placed the Babylonian prince Adad-shuma-usur on the throne of his father must have preceded in time the reigns of both Enlil-nadin-shumi and Adad-shuma-usur. But according to the traditional history the reverse situation prevailed. The reign of Adad-shuma-usur (1216-1187) followed that of both Enlil-nadin-shumi (1224) and Adad-shuma-iddina (1222-1217) (see Figure 3). The only possible explanation is that Adad-shuma-usur the prince and Adad-shuma-usur the Kassite king, are two different persons. That fact is patently obvious in the revised history where the Babylonian Adad-shuma-usur lived at the end of the seven year long Assyrian occupation dated 890-884 BC, and the reign of the Kassite kings Enlil-nadin-shumi and Adad-shuma-iddina have moved forward in time 440 years. Their reigns are now dated 783 and 781-776 respectively. And the reign of Adad-shuma-usur (775-745) followed theirs without interruption. Once again the Chronicle P author is vindicated.

While we are on the subject of the Kassite kings Enlil-nadin-shumi and Adad-shuma-iddina we should at least mention the fact, obvious in our Figure 3, that these two kings supposedly ruled during the Assyrian occupation that supposedly took place in the time frame 1225-1217 (see Figure 3). And the two vignettes at the end of column four of the Chronicle P stress the fact that both kings had their reigns cut short when Karduniash was invaded twice by an Elamite king named Kidin-Hutran. Of course, both of these facts are an embarrassment to traditional historians, who are at a loss to explain how Karduniash, only recently conquered by the powerful Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I, and presumably governed throughout the seven years following by Assyrian governors, can at the same time be ruled by Kassite kings and conquered twice by an Elamite king, with devastating results for the country, yet with no visible response by the Assyrian monarch Tukulti-Ninurta I. Assyrian scholars have for the last century expended countless thousands of hours, and filled volumes of journal pages attempting to explain this situation, all to no avail. That situation simply defies explanation, other than the one which traditional scholars will not even contemplate, to wit, the admission that the Kassite timeline is positioned incorrectly in the Figure 3 diagram. The dates for every Kassite king named on both Kassite timelines in that figure need to be lowered by 440 years, moving them from the 13th/12th centuries into the 8th century. In our 4th paper we made that adjustment, and in

papers #5 and #6 we demonstrated that the Kassite kings fit perfectly in their new surroundings. We leave it to readers new to this series of papers to double back and read our arguments.

Both of our previous points have demonstrated, using only the content of the fourth column of the Chronicle P, that the Kassite king named Adad-shuma-usur and the Chronicle P Babylonian prince named Adad-shuma-usur are not the same person. The first was a Kassite king, a son of Kashtiliash IV, who was apparently given a Babylonian name simply because he ruled in the 8th century BC, at a time when the names of Babylonian gods were increasingly incorporated into personal names of both Assyrian and Kassite kings. Particularly popular were the names of Marduk, his son Nabu, and Adad. The second Adad-shuma-usur was a native Babylonian, son of the Babylonian king Nabu-shuma-ukin I, the latter a casualty of the conquest of Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta II in the year 891 BC, the accession year of that Assyrian king.

We turn our attention now to the second of the problematic names documented in the fourth column of the Chronicle P, the king named Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur.

Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur.

We examine this name not because the analysis will appreciably advance our argument against the Figure 3 timelines proposed by scholars of the traditional history, but because our revised timeline, which dates the invasion and occupation of Karduniash to the reign of the 9th century king Tukulti-Ninurta II, needs to explain the presence of this name in the fourth column of the Chronicle P. The explanation will not take long since it involves the transliteration and translation of a single line of cuneiform text. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we discuss the name.

We set the stage by quoting the problematic line in the fourth column of the Chronicle P, first from our Figure 5 Livius translation

12'	For sixty ^[?] -six (until the time of Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur)[4], Bêl stayed in Assyria, in the time of Ninurta-tukulti-Aššur, Bel
13'	went to Babylon.

and then from the translation provided by [A. Kirk Grayson](#):

12	For sixty?-six years - until (the time of) (Ninurta)-tukulti-assur, Bel stayed in Assyria. In the time of Tukulti-assur, Bel
13	Went to Babylon.

The context of these two verses is clearly spelled out in the earlier verses of the fourth column inscription. In the initial assault on the city of Babylon, Tukulti-Ninurta not only breached the

wall of the city, but also confiscated/pilfered the statue of the god Marduk. In the revised history this would be in the year 891 BC, the accession year of Tukulti-Ninurta. The Assyrian king proceeded to install governors to regulate the affairs of the country, and he then returned to Assyria, carrying with him the image of Marduk/Bel. Depending on precisely when the death of Adad-Nirari II occurred in the Babylonian year, Tukulti-Ninurta's assault on the city of Babylon may well have lasted into his first official year, i.e. 890 BC. Assuming this to be the case, the removal of the god's statue should be dated in the year 890 BC.

Assuming that the traditional history is correct in dating the attack on Babylon and the occupation of Karduniash to the years 1225-1217 (see Figure 3 above), the date of the removal of the statue must be dated ca 1225, and scholars scrambled to interpret the reference in the 12th line of column four to the return of the statue during the abbreviated reign of the only Assyrian king bearing the name [Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur](#). Assuming that the 12th line referred to the return of the statue sixty-six years after its removal, this king should be ruling Assyria around the year 1159 BC (1225 - 66). In fact, the king Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur actually ruled for only months, in the approximate year 1133, not quite what scholars were hoping for, but assuming a small error on the part of the scribe who manufactured or copied the Chronicle P, or an incorrect reading of the damaged section of the tablet from which the number sixty?-six was transliterated, this number was (and still is) considered to be sufficiently close to the required figure, enabling traditional scholars such as the Livius translator and Grayson, to continue believing that the statue was returned to Babylon in the reign of Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur, 92 years (1225 - 1133) after it was removed. But there are problems with this dating, seldom mentioned in the academic community. We list them here.

1) The importance of the god's statue in the cult ceremonial and devotional life of the people of Babylon cannot be overestimated. In times of warfare, when the yearly procession of the god's statue within and without the city was interrupted, the event was "front page news". In times of famine, when it is recorded that the population were starving to the extent that cannibalism was rampant, the god enjoyed his daily meal. Kings were judged and punished, oft-times by removal from office, if the god was deemed to be displeased or mistreated, and what greater injustice could possibly befall the god than his removal from the Babylon temple. And to argue that the population (and army) of Karduniash would tolerate the absence of the god for 92 years, all the while the absent god resided in Assur, at most twenty kilometers north of the border between Assyria and Karduniash, is utterly absurd. There is no other word it. This situation did not happen, no matter how strenuously Assyrian scholars argue that it did.

2) Once again the scribe who inscribed the Chronicle P comes to our rescue. We have said repeatedly in the course of writing this paper that this scribe was extremely accurate, careful to follow all the protocols required of these historiographical texts. Each individual vignette is carefully separated from others by a horizontal stroke of the stylus, and all events within those inscriptional boundaries are deemed to have taken place within a few years, if not months, of one another. Our critical 12th line lies in the [pericope](#) concerned with the invasion and

occupation of Karduniash (3:22-4:13), in fact at the very end of that narrative. If it is describing the return of the statue of Marduk, then there is a presumption that the return of the statue took place near the end of the occupational time frame, 1225-1217 in the traditional history or 890-884 in the revised history. The framework of these chronicles does not permit the inclusion of incidents that lie 92 years distant from the subject being discussed.

3) In the final analysis we are compelled to examine the 12th line of the Chronicle P for ourselves, much as we did in our 4th paper when we argued that the final two lines of the third column belonged to the narrative completed in the first 13 lines of the fourth column. We were fortunate then to find online a close-up photograph of the reverse of the relevant tablet BM 92701, as well as a detailed line drawing of the 4th column inscription. We duplicated both in our 4th paper and reproduce them below as our Figures 4, & 5. And we separate for examination the 12th line from Hugo Winklers line art diagram as our Figure 6, adding to it both a transliteration and a translation. Comment follows.

Figure 4: British Museum online photograph of the reverse of tablet BM 92701.




Figure 5: Hugo Winkler's line art diagram of the cuneiform text of the 4th column of the Chronicle P tablet, BM 92701.

Copied from Hugo Winckler (1895). "Text der Chronik P".

Altorientalische Forschungen: 297–303.





Figure 6: Transliteration and translation of column 4, line 12, of the Chronicle P



ÀŠ MU MEŠ a-di 𐎶tukul-ti 𐎶AN 𐎶EN AŠ 𐎶matAššur^{ki} a-šib ana tar-ši 𐎶tukul-ti 𐎶AN 𐎶EN a-na
 Six years until Tukulti-Aššur Bēl in Assyria dwelt. At (the) Tukulti-Aššur Bēl to
 direction of
 Babylon went. (words added from line 13)

We make the following points concerning our Figures 4, 5, & 6.

1) Although line 12 of the fourth column is reasonably free from damage, it is admittedly difficult to read the sign on the extreme left in the photograph of the reverse of the tablet. We know that the sign is intended to represent the number six, in cuneiform simply six vertical half strokes. We can see only four. But Winkler actually held the tablet, and was able to clearly discern the number six as we see in his line drawing. That sign hugs the left margin of the tablet. There is absolutely no room for another cuneiform sign before this ÀŠ logogram, which represents the Assyrian word šeššu = “six”. It is clearly wishful thinking on the part of scholars to hypothesize the possible existence of a single vertical stroke in this position, the cuneiform sign requiring the least amount of space. Conveniently that stroke in this position would represent the logogram GÍŠ meaning “sixty”. Scholars have consistently conjectured the existence of that sign in front of the ÀŠ logogram in order to at least come close to the 92 years required to reach the year 1133, the time of Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur. Thus the number “sixty” remains in all translations, but always followed by a question mark. Any other numerical sign in that position would occupy too much space and is clearly ruled out of consideration. But even a millimeter of space is not available, and Winkler, viewing the tablet from inches away, clearly saw that the ÀŠ sign reached the left margin of the tablet.

2) The second correction noted by our translation is that the name of the king Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur appears nowhere on line 12, though it is twice included in the Livius translation. The name Tukulti-Ashur appears instead. The Livius translation is defective in that regard. Believing that the name Tukulti-Ashur is an epithet of Ninurta-Tukulti-Ashur is one thing; actually substituting the full name for the epithet is yet another. Even Grayson cannot resist the temptation to prefix the name Ninurta to one of the two occurrences of the name Tukulti-Ashur in line 12, albeit in brackets, but clearly revealing his opinion.

3) We have translated the Assyrian word tarši in the second half of line 12 as “at the direction of” rather than “in the time of”, as do both the Livius site and Grayson who read “At the time of Tukulti-Ashur, Bel went to Babylon. There is clearly a difference. In the first translation Tukulti-Ashur actually issues the “return” order. In the second, the time when Tukulti-Ashur came into office is used as a temporal marker indicating when the “return” took place. The order could have originated, and likely did originate, elsewhere. We defer to the two scholars, partly because they are specialists in the language, and this author is a rank amateur, and partly because their translation agrees more completely with the author’s thinking, as expressed in point 5 below. We leave the alternative in the above diagram, should there be need to rely on it as details emerge regarding the incident in question.

4) Assuming we are correct in our comments regarding the reading “six years” at the beginning of the line 12 translation, we are able to assign a date to the return of the Bēl statue to Babylon. We have previously argued that the statue was removed from Babylon to Assyria in the year 890 BC, the first official year of Tukulti-Ninurta II. It follows that Bēl must have been returned to Babylon in the year 885, the sixth official year of the Assyrian king. This was not a peaceful time in Assyria. Tukulti-Ninurta II was constantly at war. The Assyrian army was

discontented. Ashurnasirpal, the son of Tukulti-Ninurta II, was apparently displeased with his father's treatment of Assyria's southern neighbor. The Chronicle P refers to the king as one "who had carried (out) criminal designs against Babylon". We assume that that opinion was voiced by Ashurnasirpal. And we can be sure that this displeasure extended to his father's confiscation of the statue of Bel. Within a year Assyria would rebel against Tukulti-Ninurta's leadership. Ashuruballit and the Assyrian army would depose, imprison and murder the king. Perhaps sensing the coming storm, in 885 BC Tukulti-Ninurta mellowed somewhat in his treatment of Babylon. On the one hand he appointed a new government official to oversee affairs in Babylon, and on the other hand he ordered the return of the Bel statue to that city. Alternatively he ordered the new governor to order the return of the statue. We have no concrete evidence that this sequence of events took place, but we are nevertheless certain that the two actions did take place that year.

5) It is the opinion of this paper that Tukulti-Ashur was the name of the governor newly appointed to oversee affairs in Karduniash in the year 885 BC. He was likely appointed to govern the province of Babylon in part because he had superior conciliatory skills, but also because Babylon was the residence of the statue of Bel, newly returned to the city after a six year absence, and because that city's inhabitants would be those most affected by its absence and thus those most resentful. And we have already suggested the probable reasons why these two changes were made. Unfortunately this was a case of "too little, too late". Within a year Tukulti-Ninurta was dead.

Having commented on the names Adad-shuma-usur and Tukulti-Ashur in the narrative 3:22-4:13, there remains one more name that requires explanation. According to verses 10 and 11, at the end of the seven years of occupation

10' Aššur-nasir-apli, son of that Tukulti-Ninurta who had carried criminal designs against Babylon, and the officers of Assyria rebelled against Tukulti-Ninurta, **11'** removed him from the throne, shut him up in Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta and killed him.

We need to add commentary both to the mention of the city named Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta and to Tukulti-Ninurta's confinement and execution therein.

Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta.

We have yet to comment on the apparent disconnect between the traditional history's positioning of the Assyrian occupation of Karduniash (1225-1217) - which, if we are correct in our analysis of the Chronicle P lines 4:10-11 quoted above, implies that Tukulti-Ninurta I died in 1217 BC, immediately after the end of the occupation of Karduniash - and the fact that he actually died in 1207 BC. Apparently the same scholars who determined that the conquest of Babylon took place in 1225, the 19th official year of Tukulti-Ninurta, were of the opinion that the Chronicle P interpretation of events was unreliable, or that the language employed was

open to interpretation. We disagree on both counts. The Chronicle P has proved to be accurate in all respects in its recounting of history, and no amount of argument could convince this author that the language employed in the fourth column cuneiform text could be interpreted as saying that Tukulti-Ninurta was removed from the throne, confined for ten years, and then executed. That second option, once accepted by scholars, has been entirely ruled out by excavations at the site of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta.

The city of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta was built by Tukulti-Ninurta I. It is located approximately two kilometers north-east of Assur, bordering the Tigris River on the east. According to the majority of scholars, construction of the city began soon *after* the conquest of Babylon by the king, and was quickly concluded, although a contrary opinion has recently been expressed by Alessandro Gilibert, the author of a brief article entitled [*On Kar Tukulti-Ninurta: Chronology and Politics of a Middle Assyrian Ville Neuve*](#). She begins her article by reviewing the archaeological work done at the site during the 20th century, stating that

“the site was excavated by a German team led by Walter Bachmann from October, 1913 to March 1914. Fieldwork then resumed in 1986 and again in 1989 by a team of the Berlin Freie Universitat under the direction of Reinhard Dittmann”.

She then proceeds to outline the contents of two royal inscriptions found *in situ* in these excavations and four others which, based on internal textual evidence, makes it “beyond doubt” that they came from foundation deposits in Kar Tukulti-Ninurta. All six inscriptions are similarly worded and all provide “a relatively detailed account of the foundation of the city”, a narrative that is “always preceded by a mention of the military triumph of Tukulti-Ninurta I over a king Kashtiliash, king of the Kassites”. In the words of Gilibert:

This historical event, which sets a [*terminus ante quem non*](#) for the composition of the inscriptions, culminated in the sack of Babylon, to be dated to between the 13th and the 19th years of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta, perhaps to 1225 BCE. Following the pattern suggested by the inscriptions, the scholarly consensus tends to view the foundation of Kar Tukulti-Ninurta as a form of consummation of that military enterprise, and allows for its building only a comparatively short period of time (until 1197 BCE (sic), when the king dies). (p. 178) (hyperlink added)

Having discussed these six royal inscriptions, from which the majority opinion derives (i.e. the opinion that the building of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta began after the conquest of Babylon), Gilibert proceeds to detail evidence that the building of Kar Tukulti-Ninurta actually began very early in the reign of the Assyrian king and continued throughout his reign and beyond. She is almost certainly correct in her appraisal of the evidence. Regardless, the content of the six royal inscriptions demands the conclusion that a great deal, if not the majority of the construction of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta took place in the years *following* the conquest of Babylon, and this construction is credited to Tukulti-Ninurta I, who continued to work on the project until his death, when the work would have been continued by his son Ashur-nadin-apli. If so, it should follow that the Assyrian king was never removed from his throne, never confined to a room in Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, and never murdered by his son. Gilibert herself, in the concluding section of her essay, argues that “the ‘Chronicle P’, a Babylonian chronicle written at the end of the 7th

century BCE, transfigures Kar Tukulti-Ninurta into a death trap for the king after whom it was named”, and she adds a footnote which states that

The chronicle is a work of literature and should not be taken as a reliable account of facts: see in particular Rollig 1967 and Mayer 1988.”

We understand completely her position. It is not only difficult to reconcile the archaeological evidence describing the construction of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta with the Chronicle account of the confinement and murder of Tukulti-Ninurta I – it is impossible. But Gilibert should not defame the chronicler in consequence. The Chronicle P narrative is absolutely accurate. But it has been applied to the wrong king. As we have already observed, its details fit perfectly when applied to the seven year reign of Tukulti-Ninurta II.

Before moving on to examine two other campaigns of Tukulti-Ninurta II, we should clarify one aspect of Gilibert’s analysis of the construction of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta that may be problematic for readers. When she summarized the content of the six royal inscriptions, noting that they describe the construction of the city after first mentioning the defeat of Kashtiliash and the sack of Babylon, we suspect that many readers might wrongly equate that battle with the one described in the fourth column of the Chronicle P, and continue to believe in the traditional history’s interpretation of that fourth column, in spite of the evidence cited to the contrary. After all, the fact that two kings named Tukulti-Ninurta attacked and defeated Babylon, and removed the statue of the city god in the process, is simply too much of a coincidence. Or is it? A few explanatory comments are in order.

We have always believed that Tukulti I fought and defeated a Babylonian king named Kashtilashu. What we argued at the end of our 4th paper is the fact that the lowering of dates for the Kassite kings by 440 years applied to all Kassite kings throughout that dynasty’s 576 year history. Thus all the Kassites named in our Figure 3 ought to be deleted, since they have been moved to the 8th century (see paper #5). In their place we should diagram the sequence of Kassite kings who governed 440 years earlier, and have thus been moved forward into the 13th century. These king must have lived near the very beginning of the dynasty, which existed for only 576 years. Among these early Kassite kings are three named Kashtiliashu. With the forward translation into the late 13th century, the first two kings bearing this name were likely contemporaries of Tukulti-Ninurta I. Were we to make the suggested change to our Figure 3, absolutely every problem we have addressed in the previous pages would disappear. There was a conflict between Tukulti-Ninurta I and one of the earlier Kassite kings named Kashtiliashu, probably Kashtiliashu I, but there was no seven year occupation of Assyria; there were no kings named Enlil-nadin-shumi, Adad-shuma-iddina and Adad-shuma-usur; there was no son named Ashurbanipal to displace, imprison and murder his father. Tukulti-Ninurta I lived a long life, most of which was consumed with a variety of military campaigns, one of which was directed against Babylon, following which he was able to apply his newly confiscated treasure to enhancing the beauty of his namesake city. And his building of his city continued uninterrupted until his death.

Our readers should not make the same mistake made by Gilibert, interpreting the building activity related to Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta as if it casts doubt on the reliability of the Chronicle P. As mentioned, that document, properly interpreted, and applied to the right king, is an absolutely credible source of historical data. As for the battle between Tukulti-Ninurta I and Kashtilashu (I) we need to add only a few more remarks in passing. A multitude of online sites outline the chronology of the early Kassite kings. One of the best can be found [here](#), where a table is provided listing all the known kings of the dynasty together with suggested dates. In that table Kashtilashu I is assigned the dates 1681-1660. The dates follow from a number of considerations, but primarily from the data on the Babylonian King List A, which does provide the reign lengths of the first three kings (though heavily damaged and open to interpretation) and also the combined reign lengths of all the kings of the dynasty. Working back from the assumed date when the dynasty ends (ca 1155 BC), traditional scholars can easily date its beginning and from there determine dates for, at minimum, the first three kings. The author of the recommended article is not guessing. He is applying grade three arithmetic to well known and generally accepted data from the Babylonian king list. And when the traditional history dates for Kashtilashu I (1681-1660) are reduced by 440 years, this king's reign is now dated (1241-1220), thus in general agreement with our hypothesis that he fought a losing battle against Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207).

Only one final detail needs to be mentioned. According to the traditional history, when Tukulti-Ninurta I fought against Kashtilashu IV (who now turns out to have been Kashtilashu I) and in the process conquered the city of Babylon, he removed the statue of the god Bel, yet one more reason why the traditional history initially embraced the Chronicle P as a secondary source of knowledge on this historic battle, the primary source being the previously mentioned Tukulti-Ninurta Epic (see pages 11 & 12 above). Both the Chronicle P and the Epic mention a battle fought by an Assyrian king named Tukulti-Ninurta against a Babylonian opponent. In both the city of Babylon was sacked and the statue of the god Marduk (= Bel) was confiscated and removed to Assyria. In the Epic the opponent of Tukulti-Ninurta was a king named Kashtilashu and in the other an unnamed king (assumed to be the same Kashtilashu). This multiple correspondence of names and actions needs to be explained, other than by simply referring to them as "coincidental". We do not believe that this replication of names and actions was a "coincidence". With respect to the name Kashtilashu, there is clearly no coincidence, since the name was never present in the Chronicle P. It was supplied, errantly, by scholars of the traditional history, and we have argued strenuously that the narrative which continued in 4:1-13 actually began in 3:22-23, and that Nazi-Maruttash was leading the army of his father Kurigalzu I against Tukulti-Ninurta II. As for the fact that both the Chronicle P king Tukulti-Ninurta and the 13th century king Tukulti-Ninurta I attacked and conquered the city of Babylon, we argue that this duplication of military campaigns by namesake kings was common practice. A case in point can be found in our discussion of the Broken Obelisk in our paper #7. That document features four columns of text describing multiple military battles that for decades at the beginning of the 20th century, were conceived as a summary of those fought by Tiglath-

Pileser I. Later in the 20th century traditional scholars came to the conclusion that they were actually battles fought by Ashur-bel-kala, the son of Tiglath-Pileser I. And in our last paper, we proved that annals of the Broken Obelisk describe the battles fought by a namesake king Tiglath-Pileser II. Like named kings in the ancient world seemed to have been possessed with a desire to replicate the actions of their namesake ancestor(s). And should the opportunity present itself, invariably they appear to have acted on that impulse. And in the case of Assyria and her southern neighbor opportunities for conflict abounded, usually resulting from border disputes. In our next section we will add further evidence that Tukulti-Ninurta II did in fact invade Karduniash and conquer the city of Babylon, thus replicating the actions of his late 13th century ancestor.

That leaves only the removal of the Bel statue to consider, and that action may already have been explained. On the one hand, if both kings named Tukulti-Ninurta did invade and sack Babylon in campaigns separated by three centuries, it should surprise no-one that they both removed the statue of the god of that city. That action is typical of conquests throughout the Ancient Near East and in virtually all centuries BC. This removal appropriately signified victory and suzerainty over the city. On the other hand, Tukulti-Ninurta almost certainly was familiar with the Tukulti-Ninurta epic, and the central role played by the removal of the statue of Bel in that drama, and would be inclined to replicate that feat. There is also the remote possibility that the first Tukulti-Ninurta did not actually remove the god's image, in spite of mention of the fact in the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic. Lengthy epics are notorious for being the work of story-tellers, and for being transmitted orally, with the addition of fictional elements added in the telling. There is a possibility that in the final century of the growth of the Epic, that document began to telescope the first and second invasions of Babylon, incorporating into the story the actions of Tukulti-Ninurta II. When we read the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic we are reading a late 8th or early 7th century scribal copy, undoubtedly edited many times over the intervening six centuries.

We leave behind our discussion of Tukulti-Ninurta II's accession year campaign, and his ensuing seven year occupation of Karduniash, and briefly look at his campaigns from year 1 to year 6. One of the two tablets on which he recorded his annals has survived to the present. Unfortunately this is not the tablet that records his campaigns in his official first and second years, the one we would be most interested in. But a brief record of campaigns during years three through 6 is accessible on a large tablet, a photo of which is pictured in our Figure 7 below.


Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II

We leave behind the accession year/1st year campaign of Tukulti-Ninurta II and turn briefly to the document which describes several of his later campaigns, specifically those conducted in his 4th, 5th and 6th years. Tablet AO 4655 was purchased on the open market by the Louvre early in the 20th century, and apart from a few tablet fragments of little significance is the sum total of

all we know about his activities between the conquest of Babylon and his assassination sometime during his seventh year. We include below in Figure 10 two photographs of the tablet, one of the obverse and one of the reverse.

We actually have very little to say about the first five of the six campaigns described on the existing tablet, save for the fact that they occurred in rapid succession and very little text is given over to their description. Lukenbill fills two full pages of his *Ancient Records* (pp. 126-27) translating the sparse details of campaigns 1-5, and almost five full pages (pp. 128-132) translating the sixth campaign, which according to him are described “in the minutest detail.” A final section of the tablet, recording miscellaneous “hunting and building activities of the king” occupies but a single full page (p. 133). Two features alone in this translation occupy our attention in this paper. The first is the sixth campaign, viewed in its entirety. The second is one specific building enterprise of the king recorded near the end of the tablet. We examine them separated and in that order.

Figure 7: The annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II



Obverse



Reverse

The sixth year campaign – its purpose.

We let Brinkman provide the bare outline of this campaign:

The Assyrian kings of this time occasionally toured the lands of the Habur and the middle Euphrates with their armies to collect tribute in person. One such tour which took place towards the close of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta II probably fell during the early years of the reign of Nabu-apla-iddina. The Assyrian king left Assur on the twenty-sixth of Nisan in the year 885 and proceeded along the Wadi Tharthar until he reached its southern end. Then he turned east to the Tigris, descended to the region of Dur-Kurigalzu, and crossed over to Sippar of Shamash before beginning his tour up the Euphrates. It should be noted that Tukulti-Ninurta travelled for over a week within territory that was Babylonian, apparently presuming on the earlier treaty of friendship between Babylonia and Assyria. The Assyrian king's itinerary was recorded in detail throughout the journey; and it is obvious that Tukulti-Ninurta was journeying in foreign or non-subject territory at least as far as the city of Anat, which was the first place at which he received tribute. Even there the official, Ilu-ibni, who was called the governor (shaknu) of the land of Suhi and who offered the king "tribute" (namurtu), was a vassal in an isolated outpost, the loyalty of which was vacillating. It was four more days' journey before the king reached the next place for exacting tribute on his triumphal march, which then continued up the Euphrates and the Habur. PKB 183-4

It is curious how scholars are forced to conjecture reasons for this strange tour of the north of Karduniash. It is true that tribute was collected, but only from remote outposts, which has led Brinkman to assume that Tukulti-Ninurta II was not suzerain over the heart of Karduniash. And he speculates that the Assyrian army could tour the country without fear of reprisal because of an existing treaty between Assyria and Karduniash, a reference to the 894 BC peace treaty forged between Adad-Ninurta II and Nabu-shuma-ukin I, which we reviewed earlier in this paper. Brinkman assumes that this "peace treaty" would have permitted a foreign army to journey at will within the land of Karduniash, coming dangerously close to the Kassite fortress of Dur-Kurigalzu, with apparently no response.

Albert Kirk Grayson, in his *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* is equally perplexed by this "tour" by the Assyrian army:

It is known that Tukulti-Ninurta II made some kind of an expedition to Babylonia. Since no encounters or battles with the Babylonians are mentioned, the nature of this expedition remains a mystery.

Let us solve the mystery. There was no longer a peace treaty between Assyria and Karduniash/Babylonia in 885 BC. In our review at the beginning of this paper we documented two battles between Assyria and Karduniash following the forging of the peace treaty between Adad-Nirari II and Nabu-shuma-ukin I in 894 BC. That peace treaty lasted for only a few years and was now "off the table". And a third battle had taken place in 891 BC, the accession year of Tukulti-Ninurta II, during which the Kassites were driven from Karduniash, Nabu-shuma-ukin I taken captive or killed, and Assyrian governors installed "to govern the country", a position

which would have allowed them “to collect tribute”. It follows that the Assyrian army did not need to collect tribute in the heart of Karduniash, but only in remote areas where Assyrian officials in charge of the country were reluctant or unable to venture. And the Assyrian army could journey without fear of reprisal because Assyrian forces were probably stationed throughout Karduniash, including in the fortress city of Dur-Kurigalzu, to safeguard the resident Assyrian officials.

And we conjecture one other purpose of this 6th year journey by Tukulti-Ninurta. The reader will recall from earlier in this paper that this was the year the “statue of Marduk/Bel” was returned to Babylon. And we had mentioned in that context, that the return of this artifact was likely motivated by the growing discontent of the Assyrian army. The six year campaign thus afforded the opportunity to give the Assyrian army some needed “rest and relaxation”, while escorting the replacement governor of Babylon named Tukulti-Ashur to his new office, bearing the long-lost statue. All to no avail. The next year, his seventh, Tukulti-Ninurta II was captured, imprisoned and killed by his son Ashurnasirpal and this same army.

The sixth year reference to Ashuruballit

The single building action to which we referred earlier was actually considered important enough to almost completely fill the building section at the end of the tablet. We quote below about half of the text devoted to its description, and in this instance we quote the relevant section from two sources, the first from Luckenbill’s *Ancient Records*, written in 1926, and the second from A. Kirk Grayson’s 1991 publication *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114-859 BC)*.

When the wall of the great terrace, which [belonged to the time before] my reign, and which aforetime the earlier kings, who lived before me, had built, became weak, patesi of Ashur, [Assur-uballit] viceroy of Assur, rebuilt it. Again it became weak and Tukulti-Urta, viceroy of Assur, son of Adad=nirari, viceroy of Assur, cleared its site, went down to its foundation, and laid its foundation walls upon mighty blocks of mountain stone. 300 [tipku, layers of brick (?), with 20 bricks for the width, from the kidi (perhaps, the outside), over its former (height) I added to it, I made it thick. From [its foundation] to its top I constructed, I completed it. I made it more beautiful than it was before, I made it (more) magnificent. (Luckenbill, *Ancient Records*, p. 133) (emphasis added)

At that time the wall of the large terrace of my lordly palace which previously earlier kings who preceded me had built – (when) it became dilapidated Ašš[ur-bel-k]ala vice-regent of Ashur had rebuilt (it) – had again become dilapidated and I, Tukulti-Ninurta, vice-regent of Aššur, son of Adad-narari (ii) [(who was) also] vice-[regent of Aššur], delineated its area (and) dug down to the bottom of its foundation pit. I laid its foundation in bedrock. I made it wider by adding from the outside 300[ayers of brick] to the (wall which was already) 20 broad bricks (wide). I reconstructed it from top to bottom and completed (it). I made its decoration more splendid than before. (Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers*, p. 178) (emphasis added)

In the course of doing major repairs on the terrace of the palace complex in the city of Ashur, Tukulti-Ninurta contrasts the (re)construction/repairs of the terrace credited to generations of unnamed “*earlier kings*”, *who lived before him*, with the rebuilding (recently) done by himself and a king named Assuruballit (Luckenbill) or Ashurbelkala (Grayson). The language of the text seems to imply that this Assuruballit (or Ashurbelkala) was not one of these earlier kings, but instead a contemporary of Tukulti-Ninurta himself. That is not to say that the reign of this named king overlapped that of Tukulti-Ninurta, but that the live-spans of the two individuals overlapped. That would definitely eliminate Ashurbelkala (1073-1056) from consideration, and argue persuasively that our late 10th century Ashuruballit (935-894) was the king being referenced. We assume that Tukulti-Ninurta was born around 930, since his son Ashurnasirpal was an adult in 884, when he led a coup to displace his father. Growing up in the court of Adad-Nirari, three-quarters of his life was lived in association with Ashuruballit, until the death of the latter a decade earlier (894 BC). Apparently Ashuruballit, early in his tenure as “associate king” had made superficial repairs to the terrace, but Tukulti-Ninurta had made it “more splendid” than ever some 45 years later.

As for the translation by Grayson, the careful reader will note that he probably could not tolerate Luckenbill’s translation, not on textual grounds, but because the presence of the name Ashuruballit (1352-1318) simply does not fit the context, leaving him but one alternative, namely, determining if a more acceptable alternative was available. Thus his reexamination of this section of the tablet. After all, how can a king in 885 BC be crediting a king who lived 470 years earlier with the last minor repairs to the terrace, and at the same time distinguish him from all the other unnamed kings from before his time who worked on repairs to this same terrace. Perhaps sensing this, Grayson welcomes the opportunity to replace Luckenbill’s reference to Ashuruballit I with the name of a much later king. And he has every right to do so, because what remains of the name in the cuneiform text *could conceivably be translated either way*, depending on the interpretation of the barely legible remains of the end of single cuneiform sign. An explanation of that last remark is clearly in order.

While we were unable to locate online either a close up photo of the relevant section of the tablet, or a line drawing of the same, this in order to examine the text for ourselves, we can describe what we would be looking for. Grayson does provide a normalization of the cuneiform text of the entire tablet AO 4655, and he cites the name as “Aš-š[ur-bel-k]a-la” It follows that the name on the tablet was composed of five cuneiform signs aš, šur, EN (=bel), ka, and la. *The “aš” sign at the beginning and the la at the end are the only two signs that are completely legible. The “En” in the middle plus the end of the “šur” and the beginning of the “ka” are sufficiently damaged as to be illegible.* On the other hand, Luckenbill does not supply the cuneiform text nor the transcription thereof, but we do know that the name Ashuruballit is commonly transliterated as “Aš-šur ú TI-LA”, the TI and the LA being logograms that together represent the Assyrian word “balātu”. The cuneiform sign transcribed phonetically by Grayson as “la” is transcribed as a logogram (LA) by Luckenbill. *Thus the “aš” sign at the beginning and the “la” at the end are the only two signs completely legible. The ú in the middle plus the end of*

the “šur” and the beginning of the “TI” are sufficiently damaged as to be illegible. Comparing the italicized summaries of the visible and elided signs and their transcription/normalization by the two scholars we see that the few legible marks at the end of a single cuneiform sign determine and distinguish the translations of the two scholars. Luckenbill interprets that sign as “TI” and Grayson reads it as “ka”. And we are denied the privilege of reading it ourselves, though on other grounds, expressed above, we prefer Luckenbill’s reading of the tablet. And the reader needs to keep in mind two things as they reflect on this situation. On the one hand, almost three generations of scholars followed Luckenbill’s interpretation of the text until Grayson introduced his variant. On the other hand the condition of the tablet did not improved over that lengthy interval, as this popular exhibit at the Louvre was frequently handled by museum staff.

Time to move on to the second section of this paper.

Argument #5: The Kin-Group of Arad-Ea

The upper echelon of the government of Karduniash in the 1st millennium was entrusted to families of Babylonians that had functioned in administrative capacities for centuries. Many of these family groups bore as a type of sir-name the name of the ancestral figure recognized as the progenitor of the clan. In the traditional history descent from these “kin-group” founders is often traced back for over five hundred years, or in some instances much longer, giving rise to the opinion, expressed by Brinkman and others, that the proverbial founders of some of the family dynasties were mythical or fictitious figures. That, of course, is possible, unlikely as it appears to this author, and that consideration must always be borne in mind. But not only are most of these ancestral connections traceable back to actual historic figures, most of them, including Arad-EA kin-group, the one highlighted in this paper, lasted for only several hundred years, not the half millennium or more assigned it in the traditional history. Thus we are able to diagram and discuss his named ancestors and descendants with a modicum of effort.


The excessive (and incorrect) length of these family dynasties results from the fact that some of the members were part of the late Kassite administration and are thus dated by the traditional history to the early 14th - 12th centuries BC, while their descendents are dated in the late 10th through to the end of the 8th centuries. When the Kassite dates are lowered by 440 years the situation changes dramatically. The officials once dated to the 14th – 12th centuries are now located in the late 10th through 8th centuries, thus in the same time frame as their supposed descendants. The length of the kin-group genealogy reduces from six hundred to two hundred years, this of course assuming the accuracy of our displaced dynasties thesis.

In the following few pages we comment on the descendants of the individual bearing the name Arad-Ea, identified in one inscription as the son of a shandabakku (governor of Nippur) named Ushshur-ana-Marduk. Why Arad-Ea, and not his influential father, is cited as the progenitor of the clan is not known, but the fact that he is cannot be denied. For reference purposes, in Figure 8 on the following page we produce a chart showing six distinct lines of ancestors who

can be identified as “sons of Arad-Ea”. In the traditional history this Arad-Ea must be dated to the early decades of the 14th century B.C., approximately the time of Eriba-Adad I (1380-1353), the father of Ashuruballit I (1353-1318), thus at the very beginning of the Middle Assyrian Period. In the revised history, he belongs approximately 440 years later, the time our late 10th century Ashuruballit (ca 930-894), co-ruler of Assyria along with Adad-Nirari II (911-891), whose reign marks the beginning of the Neo-Assyrian Period. The task at hand is determining which of these time frames is correct. But first we need to peruse the documents which produce these separate strings of descendency.

We begin with the line of descendants of Uballisu-Marduk, son of Arad-Ea, and an administrative assistant of Kurigalzu II (894-869). This line stretches forward in time to the tenure of a *bel pihati* (provincial governor) by the name of Marduk-zakir-shumi, a contemporary of the Kassite king Marduk-apla-iddina I (Merodach Baladan) (730-718) and possibly beyond, to the year 703 BC, when, for only a single month, this individual became king of Babylon.

Figure 8: Genealogical chart listing some of the descendants of the influential kin group “founder” named Arad-Ea.



We begin by examining the genealogy of Uballisu-Marduk (second column from the left in Figure 8). But first we need to briefly comment on the office of the *bel pihati*, (lit. “lord of the province”) since this office is one of the hallmarks of this family group. Four individuals in our chart alone are identified as holding this office and another half dozen, not mentioned, bear the dual titles *bel pihati* and “son of Arad-Ea”. One of these, Marduk-balassu-iqbi, a *bel pihati* while acting as a witness in a legal matter during the reign of his grandfather Nabu-apla-iddina (883-851), was later elevated to king, as was Marduk-zakir-shumi, whose inscription provides the genealogy we are about to examine. The importance of this office cannot be overestimated. Along with the king and the shandabakku they were clearly among the *noblesse oblige* of Babylonian aristocracy.

One of the key scholarly works on kin-groups in Babylonian society is Jon P. Neilson’s “[Sons and Descendants: A Social History of Kin Groups and Family Names in the Early Neo-Babylonian Period, 747-626 BC](#)”. On page 36 of that book we read concerning the *bel pihati* :

By the Kassite and post-Kassite periods, holders of the office often acted on the part of the king in royal transactions that involved the acquisition or granting of land. In the early Neo-Babylonian corpus from Babylon the title appears simply as *bel pihati* or is qualified either as the *bel pihati* of Babylon or the *bel pihati* of the Esagil. As early as the Kassite period, the men who filled the office of *bel-pihati* frequently had the family name Arad-Ea. At least one member of this kin group who was a *bel pihati* was able to trace a lengthy, if broken, lineage back to the scribe Arad-Ea, segments of which appear on a cylinder seal. The frequent appearance of *bel pihatis* with the family name Arad-Ea and the awareness displayed by some members of their lineage indicate a remarkable degree of continuity among the Arad-Ea kin group. This continuity continued on into the early Neo-Babylonian period: Marduk-zakir-shumi, perhaps the same man as the later king, had the title *bel pihati* in 715; Aplaya was the *bel pihati* during the reign of Ashur-nadin-shumi [700-694], and Marduk-shuma-ibni was the *bel-pihati* of the Esagil in 626. Though the longer title used by Marduk-shuma-ibni may represent an innovation, it is notable that a member of the Arad-Ea kin group still held the position. (Neilson, *Sons & Descendants*, p. 36).

We will return to this quotation momentarily. But it is now time to discuss the origins of the second and first columns of our Figure 8 chart, both filled with the names of officials who supposedly held office in the 14th – 12th centuries BC.

1. Genealogy of Uballisu-Marduk, son of Arad-Ea.

The reference to a *bel pihati* named Marduk-zakir-shumi, with family name Arad-Ea, is found on a clay tablet BM 90850, translated by L.W. King in the volume entitled *Babylonian Boundary Stones and Memorial-Tablets in the British Museum* (BBSt 5 i 27 – ii 3). The source is a kudurru (boundary stone) of the time of Marduk-apla-iddina I (Merodach Baladan), who, according to the traditional history, dates ca 1171-1159 BC, but who, according to our revised chronology, actually dates to the years 731-719 BC. King’s translation of the appropriate section of the kudurru is provided below. The inscription records the transfer of land by Marduk-apla-iddina (I) [the son of M]eli-Shipak, king of Babylon to -

Marduk-zakir-shumi, the provincial governor (*bel pihati*), [the inspector (?)] of temple and land, [the controller(?)] of forced labour for the upper and lower [country], the son of Nabu-nadin-akhe, whose grandfather was Rimeni-Marduk, the fourth descendant of Uballisu-Marduk, the descendant (lip lipi) of Arad-Ea, (column I line 27 - column II, line 3 in BBSt, page 26))

There exists some ambiguity in this translation. The first problem is to determine whether the phrase “whose grandfather was Rimeni-Marduk” applies to Nabu-nadin-akhe or Marduk-zakir-shumi. We have interpreted the text as saying that Rimeni-Marduk was the grandfather of Marduk-zakir-shumi. If that is incorrect we ought to introduce a missing generation between Nabu-nadin-akhe and his grandfather Rimeni-Marduk. A second problem is to determine to whom the phrase “the descendant (lip-lipi) of Arad-Ea” should be applied. Applying it to Uballisu-Marduk is problematic because, as the diagram shows, we believe that king was the son (*mar*) of Arad-Ea, not merely a descendant. Momentarily we will show that to be the case. Applying it to Marduk-zakir-shumi, would make perfect sense, leaving the genealogy as we have constructed it, but the syntax is awkward, at least in English translation.

We also need to be clear on the fact that the tablet BM 90850 is referencing the Kassite era, with dates supplied as understood by the traditional history. Thus all of the characters in the second column genealogy ought to be assigned dates in the 2nd millennium. But as yet we have no specific dates for these officials, and have decided to assign dates for the two kings mentioned, Kurigalzu II and Marduk-apla-iddina (I), as those kings appear in the revised history once their traditional dates are lowered by 440 years. Later we will have to justify that reduction of dates. In the genealogy we have mentioned the fact that Uballisu-Marduk was a *sanqu* official serving Kurigalzu II. Clearly that title derives from some other source, to which we now turn our attention.

A Wikipedia search reveals the fact that an official named [Uballissu-Marduk](#), who began his working life as an accountant, “rose to the rank of administrator (*sanqu*) in the Kassite government of Kurigalzu II, ca. 1332-1308 BC short chronology. The principal sources for our knowledge of this individual are his two cylinder seals, which detail his religious affiliations and his illustrious genealogy”. The second of these seals (BM 122696) is the source of this “illustrious genealogy”. Uballissu-Marduk was the son of Arad-Ea, “scholar of accounting”, the grandson of Ushshur-ana-Marduk, “governor of Nippur”, otherwise known as the *shandabakku*, and the great-grandson of Usi-ana-nuri-?, regent or viceroy of Dilmun, ancient Bahrain.

It is the opinion of the author of the Wikipedia article that this Uballissu-Marduk must be identified as the ancestor by that name in the genealogy of Marduk-zakir-Marduk on the tablet BM 90850, quoted on the previous page. Thus he writes in the “Biography” section at the very end of his brief Wikipedia entry:

Uballissu-Marduk’s descendants were recorded in the genealogy of Marduk-zâkir-šumi, the bēl pīḫati, “person responsible” or provincial governor, who was the beneficiary of a royal gift of corn-land on a [kudurru](#)^[i 5] in the time of [Marduk-apla-iddina I](#), ca. 1171–1159 BC. These give Rimeni-Marduk as Uballissu-Marduk’s son, Nabû-nâdin-aḫē, his grandson, and Marduk-zâkir-šumi, his great-grandson.^[4]

We agree with this identification, though the stated genealogy of Marduk-zakir-shumi is wrong. We also agree with his comment that “there was a rift in this family, with Marduk-nadin-ahhe, the cousin of Uballissu-Marduk, moving to Ashur to take up an appointment as royal scribe to the Assyrian king Ashuruballit”. Our agreement is conditional however, since the dates of Ashuruballit are wrong. This is not Ashuruballit I, as he claims. It is the late 10th century Ashuruballit, great-grandfather of Kurigalzu II. And this move by Marduk-nadin-ahhe to Assyria to assist Ashuruballit is apparently causing a rift in the extended family.

So much for the 2nd column genealogy. It is time to examine our first column genealogy as outlined in the Memorial tablet BM 96947.

2. Genealogy of Marduk-nadin-ahhe.

This time we quote from the book “*Annals of the Kings of Assyria*” jointly authored by E.A. Wallis Budge and L.W. King, where, in an appendix on pages 388-391, Budge provides a translation of the British Museum tablet BM 96947

Obverse	Reverse
1. I, Marduk-nadin-akhe, the Scribe of the King, 2. the son of Marduk-uballit, the son of Ushshur-ana-Marduk 3. blessed by god and king, humble though exalted, 4. who maketh glad the heart of his lord, 5. a house in the shadow of the temple of Marduk, 6. my lord, have I founded. 7. And a well for fresh water 8. have I opened therein. 9. Through the supreme wisdom 10 of Marduk, my lord, the storehouse thereof 11. have I gloriously furnished, 12. and chambers of brickwork beneath it, 13. of which no man knoweth, 14. through the cunning contrivance of wisdom 15. have I added in great quantity. 16. The house in its entirety, 17. its enclosures and its . . . , 18. have I built and completed	1. [.] I have not [.] 2. May Marduk behold that house, 3. and may he grant that it may be my resting-place, 4. and for my sons, and for my sons' sons, 5. and for my seed, and for the seed of my seed 6. in the future may he stablish it fast, 7. [.] Marduk, my lord, and Sarpanitu, my lady, 8. [.] and my family 9.. [.] . . was made 10. [.] and the houses of my fathers 11. [.] . . . may they offer 12. [.] and through the command of Marduk, my lord, 13. [.] may he restore 14. [And upon] my lord, upon Ashur-uballit, 15. [who lo]veth me, the king of hosts, my lord, 16. a long life 17 may the lord of fullness and abundance 18. bestow.

One of the classic descriptions of this family group, and of the tablet BM 96947 inscription, is Franz Wiggermann, whose essay on the topic, entitled “[A Babylonian Scholar in Assur](#)” is found in R. van der Spik (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society*, pp 203-34. We let this scholar introduce us to the genealogy and the rift in the family.

Babylonian scholars are not normally thought of as politically relevant. One of them, however, got caught up in the power plays of his day, and chose exile in Assur above the company of his peers at home. His new employer, the Assyrian king, took pride in his Babylonian subject, and showed him off to the citizens of Assur by granting him a home in the shadow of the newly built temple of Marduk. The scholar had no choice but to be grateful, and made his loyalty public by erecting a monument of his own. This monument and its copy are the subject of the present paper.

In the days of king Assur-uballit (1353-1318) there was a Babylonian quarter in the city of Assur, with a temple of Marduk, and "in its shadow" a house owned and operated by a new arrival from Babylonia, the scribe Marduk-nadin-ahhe, son of Marduk-uballit, grandson of Ussur-ana-Marduk (Text 1). (*Babylonian Scholar*, p. 203)

The mention of a "Text 1" at the end of this quote informs us that at the end of his essay, Wiggermann provides us with a translation of BM 96947. He also provides translations of the two seals of Uballissu-Marduk mentioned earlier, BM 114704 and BM 122696, his Text 2 and Text 3 respectively.

Wiggermann goes on to describe the assumed history of this Babylonian quarter and then resumes with genealogical matters:

That Marduk-nadin-ahhe was of Babylonian descent can be deduced from the name of his grandfather, Ushshur-ana-Marduk ([Marduk] restored in Text 3). The latter "governor of E[kur]" and a son of the Kassite regent in Dilumn (Text 3, cf. Potts 2006:115f.), was apparently the founder of a Babylonian scribal house and the father not only of the otherwise unknown Marduk-uballit, Marduk-nadin-ahhe's father, but also of Ile'e-bulta-Marduk of Babylon, the author of a recipe for glass (Text 4), and of Arad-Ea, the "expert accountant" who was to become more famous than his father (Lambert 1957:11f, 2005:XIII f.). Arad-Ea's son, the Uballissu-Marduk who left us two of the seals (Texts 2 and 3), was an official in the service of Kurigalzu II. The offices held at the Kassite court and the concentration of Marduk names in this family place its origin firmly in Babylonia.

The question now raised, and answered, is why Marduk-nadin-ahhe has left his home country to serve a foreign king. Wiggermann's opinion is shared by almost every scholar who examines the tablet BM 96947.

In spite of his emphatically professed veneration for Marduk and Sarpanitu, Marduk-nadin-ahhe's shift of allegiance from the Babylonian to the Assyrian king could well be construed as treason. In fact, if the passage is understood correctly, the scribe alludes to this possibility, but, in denial, inverts the indictment. In his view it is not he who has strayed by moving to Assur, but his family by staying at home; he expresses the hope that someone among his future progeny will "set [stra]ight [the relatives] and clans of my ancestors that have embraced [tre]achery". A closer look at the contemporary Assyro-Babylonian relations suggests a reason for Marduk-nadin-ahhe's righteous attitude, as well as a date for his arrival in Assur.

The only incident that the chronicles consider worthy of note during the long reign of Ashur-uballit (1353-1318) is this king's blitz to Babylon in 1328 BC. According to the Synchronistic History the Kassites had rebelled against Karahardash (1328), the son of Burnaburiash II (1354-1328) and Ashur-uballit's daughter Muballit-Sheru'a, had killed him and put Nazibugash, the "son of a nobody," on the throne. Ashur-uballit reacted within the year, marched to Babylonia, executed Nazibugash, and appointed as king Kurigalzu II (1327-1303), another son of Burnaburiash II.

This incident, which features prominently in our Figure 1, provides the explanation of and justification for Marduk-nadin-ahhe's flight to Assyria. While he had been a loyal supporter of Karahardash, apparently his rebellious relatives had viewed the grandson of both Burnaburiash and Ashurbanipal with disfavor and supported the rebellious Kassites who killed him and who installed Nazibugash in his stead. Thus his flight to Assyria accompanying the Assyrian king. And according to Wiggermann

The reason for Marduk-nadin-ahhe's move to Assur also establishes its date: the accession year of Kurigalzu II.

Wiggermann's suggested date is thus 1327, his date for the installation of Kurigalzu II. A more traditional date for that event is the year 1332. And in the revised history that date must be reduced by 440 years to 892 BC. We are sufficient close to that date in our Figure 1 that we stand by our 894 BC estimate.

It follows from this rather lengthy summary, that column 1 is based on a single tablet inscription on BM 96947 and column two results from a combination of a Babylonian kudurru BM 90850 and a cylinder seal BM 122696. All three of these documents, and thus the individuals named in them, are dated by the traditional history to the late Kassite period, i.e. to the 2nd millennium BC. But we have repeatedly argued that all Kassite dates need to be reduced by approximately 440 years, and we have written three papers (#4, #5, and #6) proving that the late Kassite kings fit perfectly in their new surroundings. We have already applied this reduction in dates to the genealogies in columns one and two of our Figure 8, determining that the royal scribe Marduk-nadin-ahhe began serving Ashuruballit in Assyria in 894 BC (our conjectured date for the death of Ashuruballit) and Uballisu-Marduk, the sangu administrator served Kurigalzu II during his reign sometime in the time frame 894-869 BC. While we could simply "rest on our laurels" at this point and leave the revised dates "as is", we prefer to provide some proof that these dates are correct, thereby further confirming the accuracy of our 440 year reduction of dates. Our argument relies on a single name, that of Marduk-zakir-shumi on the bottom of the second column.

Proof that columns 1 and 2 belong to the late 10th – late 8th centuries

According to our prior analysis of column two, the *bel-pilati* (provincial governor) named Marduk-zakir-shumi received a grant of land from the late Kassite king Marduk-apla-iddina I, whose dates in the traditional history were 1171-1159 BC. This land grant was recorded in the inscription on tablet BM 90850, and provided the context in which the genealogy of Marduk-zakir-shumi was spelled out, providing the names of three of his ancestors, plus the information that he was also a "descendant" of the kin-group founder Arad-Ea. When we subtracted the 440 years from the dates of Marduk-apla-iddina we determined that he ruled Karduniash in the approximate years 731-719 BC.

What we did not mention earlier was the fact that the name Marduk-zakir-shumi also occurs on the Babylonian King List A, dating his reign to a single month in the year 703 BC. Of significance is the fact that on both the tablet BM 90850, and on the King List, it is recorded that he is the “son of Arad-Ea”, with the qualification that the King List is defective, since the “Ea” is elided. In a moment we will quote Brinkman in his opinion of the King List text.

What we also did not mention earlier is that the name Marduk-zakir-shumi also occurs in another land grant kudurru, this time as a witness. This witness is clearly identified both as a *bel-pilati* and as a “son = descendant” of Arad-Ea. This particular kudurru (VA 2663) is dated specifically to the 7th year of the reign of Marduk-apla-iddina II, whose official dates both in the traditional and revised histories are 721-710 BC. It follows that this kudurru, and the king Marduk-zakir-shumi named in its inscription, can be firmly dated to the year 715 B.C. The reader can find the name and date mentioned in our earlier quote from Neilson’s book “Sons and Descendants” on page 28 above. We thus have the situation where the *bel-pilati*, son of Arad-Ea, named Marduk-zakir-shumi is mentioned three times in succession, once in the kudurru BM 90850 sometime in the time frame 731-719, once in the year 715, and once (as king) briefly in 703 B.C. And the orthography of the name Marduk-zakir-shumi is identical on all the documents. Add to that the fact that this is not a common name, and we can safely identify all three of these individuals as the same person. *This not only argues that the entire column two needs to be dated in the time frame 894-703, but it also serves to confirm that our reduction of Kassite dates by 440 years is absolutely reliable.*

We spent some time in our paper #4 (pages 27-31) discussing the names Marduk-apla-iddina I (731-719), the penultimate Kassite king, and Marduk-apla-iddina II (721-710), “king of Babylon” in the 10th dynasty of Babylon. We demonstrated at the time that Marduk-apla-iddina II must be identified as the “Merodach Baladan, son of Baladan” who sent an emissary to visit Hezekiah of Israel as described in 2 Kings 20:12 and Isaiah 39:1. The event took place during the 721-710 reign of that king. We identified Marduk-apla-iddina I as the “Baladan” in the biblical text, father of Merodach-Baladan. It is therefore no surprise that this father/son duo would both be involved with the *bel-pilati* official named Marduk-zakir-shumi, son of Arad-Ea.


When J.A. Brinkman wrote his essay entitled “*Merodach-Baladan II*” on pages 6-53 in the volume “*Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim*”, he commented in footnote 137 on pages 24-25 concerning the dual references to Marduk-zakir-shumi, witness on the 715 BC land-grant kudurru VA 2662 and the king by that name who ruled Babylonia briefly in 703 BC. His conclusion was that they were the same person. What he did not do was include the reference to that same “son of Arad-Ea” who received a gift of land in the kudurru BM 90850 dated by the traditional history to the reign of the 12th century king Marduk-apla-iddina I. His reasons are transparent. Under no circumstance could a 12th century BC *bel-pilati* named Marduk-zakir-shumi, son of Arad-Ea be identified with two 8th century, identically named individuals. But we are under no such constraints. When history is re-ordered correctly, it is amazing what we discover. For reference purposes we reproduce below Brinkman’s footnote comment. Referring to the king Marduk-zakir-shumi he states:

He is attested in Kinglist A iv 13: ITI 1 ^{md}ŠÚ-za-kir-MU A ^mIR. The only other **probable contemporary reference** to Marduk-zakir-shumi II known to me at present is contained in the kudurru of Merodach-Baladan's seventh year, where an ^{md}AMAR UTU-za-kir-MU A ^mIR-^dBAD LÚ EN.NAM occurs as a witness among other high officers of the realm, just twelve years before this king ascended the throne (VAS 1 37 v 2-3). The probability of two (*different*) men with the same name and such similar patronymics occurring in high official circles within these two ill-documented decades is minimal; so we may reasonably assume that king Marduk-zakir-shumi II was the son of this Arad Enlil (=Arad-Ea). Consequently, the tendency to translate the "A ^mIR in Kinglist A as "son of a slave" ... should be allowed to die out. (emphasis and italicized words added)

The last comment in the quoted footnote is a reference to the fact that the King List identifies the king Marduk-zakir-shumi as "A" (the son of) "^mIR" (arad = servant/slave), where Brinkman is arguing that the king's name should be followed by the phrase "A ^mIR-^dBAD" and translated "son of Arad-Ea". Regardless, he is convinced that the two named officials refer to the same person. And while Brinkman omits mentioning our third reference we are not surprised, since the recipient of the land-grant from Marduk-apla-iddina I supposedly belonged to the 12th century. Only in the context of the revised history can we argue that he is a contemporary of the other two officials.

For interest sake alone we include below a copy of the kudurru which names Marduk-zakir-shumi as a witness. Note that this stele/kudurru contains one of the few existing images of the king Marduk-apla-iddina I (= the biblical Merodach-Baladan").

Figure 9: Image of Marduk-apla-iddina II on the kudurru VA 2663



Analysis of columns 3-6 in Figure 8.

These final columns in our Figure 8 are provided to lend support to our late 10th-late 8th century dating of column 1 and 2, and partly to further confirm the synchronisms that exist between the Kassite and “dynasty of E” kings in Figure 1. Clearly we do not have to prove the dates listed in these four columns. They are correct from the standpoint of both the traditional and revised histories.

Columns 3-5 contain the names of three officials, one named Nabu-etir, son of Arad-Ea, a temple official during the reign of Nabu-shuma ukin I (899-891), and the other two, Eriba-Marduk and Marduk-balassu iqbi, are both identified as *bel-pilati* (provincial administrator) and “son of Arad-Ea”, both holding office during the reign of Nabu-apla-iddina (883-851). From the dates cited it is conceivable that at least Nabu-etir and Eriba-Marduk might be two of the missing descendants of Uballisu-Marduk in the column 2 genealogy.

We do not include with the last two officials the name of Marduk-balassu-iqbi, the *bel-pilati* and “son of Arad-Ea” in the 31st year of Nabu-apla-iddina, simply because we believe that he was also a prince, and that he became king very briefly at the end of the column 6 succession of four father/son “dynasty of E” kings. The only evidence we have for this conjecture is the fact that another Marduk-balassu-iqbi is mentioned in an inscription dated to the 25th year of the reign of Nabu-apla-iddina. This individual is identified only as a “king’s son” and not as a *bel-pilati* or a “son of Arad Ea”. But two high ranking individuals bearing the same name, and functioning as witnesses in documents only six years apart, argues in favor of identifying them as one and the same person.

If that is not the case, and thus none of the four named “dynasty of E” kings refers to himself as a “son of Arad-Ea”, then we must leave open the question whether this mini-dynasty is descended from Arad-Ea. On the other hand, if it is true that Marduk-balassu-iqbi, the 5th column *bel-pilati* and son of Arad-Ea did eventually become king, then we must assume that all four of the column 6 kings descended from Arad-Ea since Marduk-balassu-iqbi’s parentage is well established. He is the son of Marduk-zakir-shumi I, the grandson of Nabu-apla-iddina, and the great-grandson of Nabu-shuma-ukin I, whose parentage is unknown. And since the dates on the chart are approximately correct, we would be remiss not to conjecture the fact that Arad-Ea is the unknown father of Nabu-shuma-ukin I.

Regardless of whether or not the sixth column remains attached to the kin-group of Arad-Ea, it certainly remains in this relative position, and the last four columns of our Figure 8 confirm absolutely the reliability of our Figure 1.

Case closed.