

Near Eastern Kings Named in the Amarna Letters – A Preamble

We assume that the reader of this article will have some familiarity with the documents known to historians as the Amarna Letters, but if not, a brief perusal of the Wikipedia article on this topic is available online at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amarna_letters. This treasure trove of correspondence, consisting of well over 350 tablets, written exclusively in cuneiform Akkadian, consists for the most part of letters sent from dignitaries in surrounding nations to a reigning Egyptian pharaoh, and in rare instances, copies of responses from the Egyptian king. Most originate from Canaan and Syria, but several dozen were authored by kings of Assyria, Mitanni, Hatti, and Kassite Babylonia. The most frequent recipient of this correspondence was the Egyptian king Amenhotep IV (Akhenaton) though there are letters addressed to and authored by Akhenaton's father Amenhotep III, and a few letters probably intended for Akhenaton's immediate successors. It is probably fair to say that most (but not all) of the archived letters date in the time frame 930-910 (which we have elsewhere termed the "Amarna period").

Though the majority of the letters originate from minor kingdoms governed by Egypt, we are here concerned only with those authored by kings further afield, outside Egypt's field of influence – specifically, the Near Eastern countries of Assyria, Mitanni, Hatti, and Kassite Babylonia, the latter sometimes referred to as the "3rd dynasty of Babylon". Twenty-four letters bear the names of six kings who ruled these four nations. The breakdown of these letters is as follows:

Two letters are addressed to Akhenaton from the Assyrian king Ashuruballit (#15 & 16)

Five letters name the king of Babylonia Kadeshman-Enlil, three addressed to Amenhotep III (#2, 3, & 4) and two addressed by Amenhotep III (#1 & 5).

Seven letters name Burnaburiash, the son and successor of Kadeshman-Enlil. One is addressed to Amenhotep III (#6), five are addressed to Akhenaton (#7-11), and one is a reply to Burnaburiash from Akhenaton (#14).

Six letters are from the Mitanni king Tushratta, two to Amenhotep III (#23 & 24) and four to Akhenaton (#25-29). There is also a letter from Tushratta to Tiye, the widow of Amenhotep III (#26).

Three letters are authored by the Mitanni king Shuttarna and are addressed simply to "Pharaoh" (#182-184)

A single letter (#41) is addressed from the Hittite king Suppiluliuma to an unspecified pharaoh. Most scholars assume the recipient was Akhenaton, but we believe it is a late addition to the Amarna archive, and the addressee was probably Tutankhamon.

Some, but not all of these twenty-four letters are available for reading online. We include the following links for the interested reader:

- [Kadeshman Enlil I of Babylon](#) complaining about not being given a royal wife and proposing the exchange of one of his daughters for gold. (EA 3)
- [Burnaburiash](#) to Akhenaten complaining about the treatment of his merchants (EA 8)
- [Burnaburiash](#) trying to get more gold from Akhenaten (EA 7)
- [Burnaburiash](#) asking for more gold (EA 9)
- [Letter from the king of Cyprus](#) (EA 35)
- [Letter from Tushratta](#), king of Mitanni (EA 17)
- [Tushratta](#) loaning a statue of the goddess Ishtar to Amenhotep III (EA 23)

- [Tushratta](#) sending a letter to Tiye (EA 26)
- [Tushratta](#) wishing Akhenaten good health
- [Ashuruballit](#) exchanging gifts (EA 16)
- [Suppiluliuma](#) to Akhenaten (EA 41)

It goes without saying that none of these letters bears a dateline, such as would be included in modern day correspondence. Approximate dates for the letters must come from at least one of two sources - 1) The dates for Amenhotep III and Akhenaten might be determined via a lengthy and careful analysis of the reign lengths of all the kings who followed them in time, thus constructing a timeline for each dynasty following the 18th until we arrive at a dynasty or king whose absolute dates can be securely determined, or 2) Alternatively we could hope to independently determine an absolute date or range of dates for one of the other kings named in the Amarna documents, and from that determination roughly estimate the dates for the other kings, including the two 18th dynasty Egyptian kings.

Egyptologists make the extravagant claim that the Amarna letters date to around the middle of the 14th century B.C., and further, it is stated that this claim is based on their having successfully fulfilled both conditions mentioned above. On the one hand, based solely on their analysis of thousands of Egyptian documents, and numerous hieroglyphic and papyrus king lists, they date Amenhotep III's 38 year reign to the years 1391-1353 and Akhenaten's 17 year reign to the years ca 1353-1336 B.C. On the other hand, they maintain that the Amarna king named Ashuruballit, who authored the Amarna letters EA15 and EA16, is securely dated by Assyrian documentation to the years 1353-1318 B.C. Case closed - *if* we accept the traditional historians at their word.

We have already dealt with the first of the two claims by Egyptologists. Our lengthy analysis of Egyptian documents, with emphasis on the Berlin Stele of the Memphite priests of Ptah, has demonstrated that neither Amenhotep III nor his son Akhenaten could possibly have reigned anywhere near as early as the 14th century B.C. Our chronology is a vast improvement on the timeline on which the traditional history of Egypt is constructed. With precision we have positioned Akhenaten's reign in the years 940-923 B.C., supported by literally hundreds of arguments distributed through 800 pages of Volumes 1 & 2 and the first two chapters of Volume 3. On the other hand, we have argued at length against the equation Ashuruballit, son of Eriba-Adad I, the second king of the Middle Assyrian Period = Ashuruballit, son of Assur-nadin-ahhe, author of Amarna letter EA16. That equation is seriously flawed, and we have hypothesized a perfectly reasonable circumstance and location to explain the existence of an Ashuruballit, son of Assur-nadin-ahhe, king of Assyria, living in the late 10th century, precisely where we have positioned the Amarna age (see Volume 3, chapter 4, pp. 85-93). We cannot improve on that proposal, and recommend that the reader of this essay become familiar with those few pages.

What we lack in our revised history is a specific mention of an Assyrian king named Ashuruballit, living and functioning in the western provinces of the Assyrian kingdom in the final decades of the 10th century B.C., the time of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. This essay is in part intended to overcome that deficiency. But before we examine the documents which

actually name our 10th century Ashuruballit, we mention, in passing, a site which summarizes the many arguments refuting the traditional history's identification of the Amarna king Ashuruballit and his 14th century Assyrian namesake.

The reader of this essay will no doubt be aware that in 1952 the famed revisionist Immanuel Velikovsky, in his epic historical treatise *"Ages in Chaos"*, argued that the 18th dynasty must be moved forward in time to the 10th-9th centuries B.C., with the Amarna letters dating in the time frame 870-840 B.C. (*Ages in Chaos*, p. 229). It follows that Velikovsky faced the identical criticisms endured by all revisionists of Egyptian dynastic history, in particular the argument that equates the Middle Kingdom Ashuruballit I with the Ashuruballit of the Amarna letters. Reference to this errant equation is ubiquitous in scholarly circles, so much so that Velikovsky, in a variety of sources, penned 10 pages of counter-argument which is recommended reading for those perusing this essay. Fortunately the summary of those counter-arguments, entitled simply "Ashuruballit", has been placed online in the Velikovsky Archives, and can be read at <http://www.varchive.org/ce/assuruballit.htm> .

Before moving on we should also mention the fact that, while the traditional history has proposed two major positive identifications as lynchpins for its chronology - namely, the aforementioned Ashuruballit equation and the equally erroneous "Shishak=Sheshonk" identity (not otherwise mentioned in this article) - the Displaced Dynasties chronology can boast of ten times that number, of which upwards of a dozen will be mentioned in the discussion which concludes this essay. We also need to remind the reader, one last time, that our revised chronology of the Amarna age has already been "pegged" to the years 930-910, via an equation much more secure than the two utilized by the traditional history.

We refer in our previous statement to the equation "Labaya = Jeroboam I", an identification demonstrated in an argument over a dozen pages in length (see Vol. 3, chapter 2, pp 29-43) which purposed to prove that Labaya, who authored three Amarna letters (EA252-254) and is referenced in a dozen others (and whose name occurs a total of 32 times in those letters) must be identified as Jeroboam II (930-908 B.C.), successor of Solomon in the north of Israel. We demonstrated at length that their names, properly transcribed, are essentially the same, their actions uncannily parallel to one another, and their biblical and Displaced Dynasties time frames precisely equal. As we review other synchronisms in the pages to follow, we are merely adding to the archive of materials which demonstrate conclusively that Amenhotep III and his son belong to the late 10th century B.C.

Our agenda from this point on is as follows. We begin by reproducing individual kings lists for the nations of Assyria, Hatti, Mitanni, and Kassite Babylonia, in the approximate time frame 950-760 B.C. For three of these nations (Hatti, Mitanni, and Babylonia) this will require our listing the 14th-13th century king lists and then reducing dates by roughly 425-450 years, since the chronologies of these nations were fixed in a time frame over four hundred years too early via an errant Egyptian history and in part thanks to the faulty Ashuruballit equation. We will then incorporate these lists into a single table (Table 7, p. 15) which also reproduces our revised chronology of Egypt, enabling the reader to see at a glance the many synchronisms that exist

between the kings of the five nations. Then, in order to explain the early portion of the 10th/9th century Kassite Babylonian timeline, we will examine two critical documents which position the Amarna king Ashurballit, and the early Kassite kings Burnaburiash II and his father Kadashman-Enlil I, in the second half of the 10th century B.C., with their reigns overlapping the last few years of Amenhotep III and the few years following when Akhenaton was the sole ruler of Egypt. And we will conclude this section by explaining how it is that Ashurballit, in his Amarna letter EA16, could refer to himself as the “king of the land of Ashur”, in spite of his not being named in the Assyrian king lists, and at a time when his “rule” overlapped the reign of the Assyrian kings Asher-Dan II (935-912) and the early years of Adad-Nirari II (912-891). The essay will end with a few remarks concerning synchronisms, where we will make clear to the reader that our Displaced Dynasties timeline produces several dozen “lynchpins”, confirming the dates we have assigned to the Egyptian kings of the 18th and 19th dynasties. We proceed in that order.

King Lists for Assyria, Hatti, Mitanni & Babylonia in the time frame 950-760 B.C.

Assyria

Although our interest in Assyria is here confined to the time frame 950-760 B.C., we will have cause to refer occasionally to earlier kings. For that reason we have included, in the next several pages, a table of the kings of both the Middle Assyrian and the Neo-Assyrian Periods. The interested reader can peruse these king lists at the webpage listed below.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Assyrian_kings.

Several aspects of the two lists of king names need to be noted in passing.

In the first place we repeat what we have mentioned often, in other papers, namely, that the Assyrian chronology, unlike that of the other three nations we are concerned with, is based entirely on Assyrian documentation, not on synchronisms with the histories of the other nations mentioned, including Egypt. It is therefore not subject to the over 400 year displacement we apply to the chronologies of Hatti, Mitanni, and Kassite Babylonia. Having said that, there is one important caveat that must be mentioned. The Assyrian king lists, at least for the Middle and Neo-Assyrian periods, correctly establish the ordering of the kings as presented below, but while some of those lists also cite the reign lengths of the respective kings, those numbers have, from time to time, been adjusted by traditional historians in order to maintain a degree of consistency, not only with other Assyrian historical documents, but also with the incorrectly positioned chronologies of the other nations. It follows that periodically the dates of some Assyrian kings, especially in the Middle Kingdom Period and earlier, may be in error by as much as several decades.

Secondly, and relatedly, the traditional histories of Hatti, Mitanni, Babylonia and Egypt, in the time frame of the 14th and 13th centuries, as they are discussed in the pages of thousands of books and journal articles, will be grossly in error ***if and to the extent which*** they incorporate into their discussion any documentation from Assyria, since those discussions will incorrectly assume the accuracy of the chronologies of the four nations cited above. If Assyrian documentation is not involved, the historical research is possibly, or even probably, reliable. For example, if a traditional historian is discussing some aspect of the reign of the Hittite king Hattusili III (1267-1237), the details discussed are probably accurate, if the author is referring to Hattusili's communications with the Egyptian king Ramses II (1290-1224), or with the Babylonian king Kadashman-Enlil II (1263-1255), but not if he/she assumes correspondence with Adad-Nirari I (1295-1264) or Shalmanezar I (1263-1234). Once we have drastically lowered the chronologies of Hatti and Babylon, to match the time difference between the Displaced Dynasties chronology of 19th dynasty Egypt and the traditional history of that dynasty, Hattusili III (825-800), Kadashman-Enlil II (822-814) and Ramses II (840-774) will still be contemporaries, albeit in a markedly different time frame, but Adad-Nirari I and Shalmanezar I will no longer be on the scene. They died four centuries earlier! If a text should surface stating that Hattusili communicated with an Assyrian king Shalmanezar, that king must be Shalmanezar III (858-824), not Shalmanezar I (1263-1234) and the letter probably was dispatched at the very outset of the reign of Hattusili III, and during the last year or two of the reign of Shalmanezar III. And God alone knows what kings were ruling Hatti, Mitanni, and Babylon in the days of Adad-Nirari I and Shalmanezar I. That history remains to be written.

Table 1: Assyrian Kings of the Middle and Neo-Assyrian Periods

Middle Assyrian Period		
All of the dates in this table follow the Near Eastern "short" chronology.		
King Name	Reign	Notes
Eriba-Adad I	1380-1353	"son of Ashur-bel-nisheshu"
Ashur-uballit I	1353-1318	"son of Eriba-Adad (I)"
Enlil-nirari	1317-1308	"son of Ashur-uballit"
Arik-den-ili	1307-1296	"son of Enlil-nirari"
Adad-nirari I	1295-1264	"son of Arik-den-ili"
Shalmanezar I	1263-1234	"son of Adad-nirari (I)"
Tukulti-Ninurta I	1233-1197	"son of Shalmanezar (I)"

Ashur-nadin-apli	1196-1194	"during the lifetime of Tukulti-ninurta (I), Ashur-nadin-apli, his son, seized the throne"
Ashur-nirari III	1193-1188	"son of Ashur-nadin-apli"
Enlil-kudurri-user	1187-1183	"son of Tukulti-Ninurta (I)"
Ninurta-apal-Ekur	1182-1180	"son of Ila-Hadda, a descendant of Eriba-Adad (I), went to Karduniash. He came up from Karduniash (and) seized the throne."
Beginning with Ashur-Dan I, dates are consistent and not subject to middle/short chronology distinctions.		
Ashur-Dan I	1179-1133	"son of Ashur-nadin-apli"
Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur	1133	"son of Ashur-Dan (I), briefly"
Mutakkil-nusku	1133	"his (Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur's) brother, fought him and took him to Karduniash. Mutakkil-Nusku held the throne briefly, then died."
Ashur-resh-ishi I	1133-1115	"son of Mutakkil-Nusku"
Tiglath-Pileser I	1115-1076	"son of Ashur-resh-ishi (I)"
Asharid-apal-Ekur	1076-1074	"son of Tiglath-pileser (I)"
Ashur-bel-kala	1074-1056	"son of Tiglath-pileser (I)"
Eriba-Adad II	1056-1054	"son of Ashur-bel-kala"
Shamshi-Adad IV	1054-1050	"son of Tiglath-pileser (I), came up from Karduniash. He ousted Eriba-Adad (II), son of Ashur-bel-kala, (and seized the throne"
Ashur-nasir-pal I	1050-1031	"son of Shamshi-Adad (IV)"
Shalmaneser II	1031-1019	"son of Ashur-nasir-pal (I)"
Ashur-nirari IV	1019-1013	"son of Shalmaneser (II)"
Ashur-rabi II	1013-972	"son of Ashur-nasir-pal (I)"
Ashur-resh-ishi II	972-967	"son of Ashur-rabi (II)"
Tiglath-Pileser II	967-935	"son of Ashur-resh-ishi (II)"
Ashur-Dan II	935-912	"son of Tiglath-Pileser (II)"
Neo-Assyrian Period		
Adad-nirari II	912-891	"son of Ashur-Dan (II)"
Tukulti-Ninurta II	891-884	"son of Adad-nirari (II)"

Ashur-nasir-pal II	884-859	“son of Tukulti-Ninurta (II)”
Shalmaneser III	859-824	“son of Ashur-nasir-pal (II)”
Shamshi-Adad V	824-811	“son of Shalmaneser (III)”
Shammu-ramat, regent, 811-808 B.C.		
Adad-nirari III	811-783	“son of Shamshi-Adad (V)”
Shalmaneser IV	783-773	“son of Adad-nirari (III)”
Ashur-Dan III	773-755	“son of Shalmaneser (IV)”, solar eclipse 763 BC
Ashur-nirari V	755-745	“son of Adad-nirari (III)”
Tiglath-Pileser III	745-727	“son of Ashur-nirari (V)”
Shalmaneser V	727-722	“son of Tiglath-Pileser (III)”

The reader will notice, immediately following the mention of Ninurta-apal-Ekur (1182-1180), the 6th king of the Middle Period, that the chart follows the Near Eastern “short” chronology. It is probably a good idea to become acquainted with that term, since the chronologies listed on the *Wikipedia* sites for the kings of Hatti and Kassite Babylon also follow the short chronology. The meaning of the term is not complicated and is explained in a few sentences at the Wikipedia site http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Short_chronology_timeline .

Since the meaning of the term is explained very briefly at that site, we include the definition here for ease of reference.

The **short chronology** is one of the [chronologies of the Near Eastern Bronze and Early Iron Age](#), which fixes the reign of [Hammurabi](#) to 1728–1686 BC and the [sack of Babylon](#) to 1531 BC. The absolute [2nd millennium BC](#) dates resulting from this decision have very little support in academia, particularly after more recent research. The [middle chronology](#) (reign of Hammurabi 1792–1750 BC) is still commonly encountered in literature and the most recent work has essentially disproved the short chronology.^[1] For much of the period in question, middle chronology dates can be calculated by adding 64 years to the corresponding short chronology date (e.g. 1728 BC in short chronology corresponds to 1792 in middle chronology). After the so-called "dark age" between the fall of Babylon and the rise of the Kassite dynasty in Babylonia, absolute dating becomes less uncertain.^[2] While exact dates are still not agreed upon, *the 64-year middle/short chronology dichotomy no longer applies from the beginning of the Third Babylon Dynasty onward.* (emphasis added)

Since we only utilize in this essay dates from the “3rd dynasty of Babylon” (= Kassite Babylonia), and its contemporaries in Hatti and Egypt, we are not concerned about the “middle/short

chronology dichotomy”. Besides, the dates for the Kassite kings Kadashman-Enlil II and Burnaburiash II and for the Hittite king Suppiluliuma I are fixed in relation to the dating of the Egyptian kings Amenhotep III and Akhenaton. From that time forward absolute dates are not determined in reference to when the respective dynasties began. Thus the final comment in our short quotation. Moving the dates of the 14th/13th century Hittite and Kassite Babylonian kings back in time could only happen if the dates of the Egyptian 18th dynasty also moved back in time. And that eventuality would change nothing of significance in this essay. It would only increase the number of years we would be required to subtract from the traditional dates of all three kingdoms to bring them in line with our Displaced Dynasties chronology.

Hatti

Our procedure for determining 10th/9th century dates for the Hittite kings is the same as that followed in chapter 3 of our Volume 3 (pp. 53-59). We begin with traditional 14th/13th dates for those kings, obtained from some reliable source, then subtract the over 400 years necessary to bring those dates down to the 10th/9th centuries. Then we fine tune those reduced dates, adjusting them slightly on the basis of information contained in source documents. In this essay the traditional dates for the Hittites, and later for the kings of Kassite Babylonia, are reduced by the identical 435 years, that number being roughly the time difference between the traditional dating of Amenhotep III and the Displaced Dynasties dating of that same king. *As a result, the chronologies of the three nations in relation to one another in the 10th/9th centuries, remains essentially the same as it existed in the 14th/13th centuries.*

For additional information about the Hittite kings, and to retrieve the chart reproduced below in Table 2, we refer the reader to

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Hittite_kings.

Table 2: Traditional Dates for Hittite Kings of the Empire Period
(downloaded from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Hittite_kings)

Suppiluliuma I	ca. 1344–1322 BC (short)	Son of Tudhaliya II (or Hattusili II?); expanded the empire; mentioned in the Amarna letters
Arnuwanda II	ca. 1322–1321 BC (short)	Son of Suppiluliuma

Mursili II	ca. 1321–1295 BC (short)	Son of Suppiluliuma
Muwatalli II	ca. 1295–1272 BC (short)	Son of Mursili II; Battle of Kadesh , ca. 1274
Mursili III a.k.a. Urhi- Teshub	ca. 1272–1267 BC (short)	Son of Muwatalli II
Hattusili III	ca. 1267–1237 BC (short)	Brother of Muwatalli II; treaty with Egypt ca. 1258
Tudhaliya IV	ca. 1237–1209 BC (short)	Son of Hattusili III; Battle of Nihriya
Kurunta	ca. 1228–1227 BC (short)	Son of Muwatalli II; his reign is uncertain; may have ruled for a very brief time in the middle of Tudhaliya's reign.
Arnuwanda III	ca. 1209–1207 BC (short)	Son of Tudhaliya IV
Suppiluliuma II	ca. 1207–1178 BC (short)	Son of Tudhaliya IV; fall of Hattusa , ca. 1178

In Table 3 below, using the traditional dates from Table 2 and reducing those dates by 435 years, we obtain approximate late 10th – mid 8th century dates for the Empire Hittites (otherwise known by confused scholars as the Neo-Hittites). Those dates are adjusted further, following the analysis in our Volume 3 (see discussion above). These adjusted dates represent our best estimate of the true dates of the Empire Hittites. The astute reader will recognize these dates as identical to those assigned to the Neo-Hittites, wrongly identified by traditional

historians as a renaissance or re-birth of this ethnic group after the extinction of their Empire over 400 years prior. At the conclusion of this article, having proved the dating assigned to the Hittite Empire kings in our Table 3, we can delete the “Neo-Hittites” entirely from the textbooks. The equation “Empire Hittites = Neo-Hittites” argued vociferously in our Volume 3 will have been proved correct! And by the way, the reader may be interested in a recent archaeological find of an enormous 11-13 foot high statue of the “Neo-Hittite” king Suppiluliuma. If he or she wants to see this image of the “Empire” king Suppiluliuma I, it can be found online at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2182072/Royal-discovery-Canadian-student-digs-3-000-year-old-sculpture-King-Suppiluliuma.html>

We should perhaps point out that in our Volume 3 analysis we concluded that the reigns of Mursilis II and his son Muwatallis overlapped for ten years and that the reign of Muwatallis (including the 10 year joint rule with his father) lasted only 14 years. Thus, while the combined reigns of the two kings lasted 49 years according to the traditional history, that figure is reduced to 25 years in the Displaced Dynasties chronology, a 24 year difference. Those 24 years belong to Suppiluliuma I, increasing his regnal years to 46 from the 22 assigned to him by the Wikipedia website. He actually ruled for 50 years, as discussed in chapter 4 of Volume 3, pp. 66-77, a chapter entitled “Hittite Synchronisms with the 9th/8th Centuries”.

Table 3: Hittite Kings of the Empire Period

Name	Traditional Dates	Dates Reduced 435 yrs.	Dates Further Adjusted
Suppiluliumas	1344-1322	909-887	908-858
Arnuwandas III	1322-1321	887-886	858-857
Mursilis II	1321-1295	886-860	857-836
Muwatallis	1295-1272	860-837	846-832
Urhi-Teshub (Mursilis III)	1272-1267	837-832	832-825
Hattusilis III	1267-1237	832-802	825-800
Tudhaliyas IV	1237-1209	802-774	800-775
Arnuwandas IV	1209-1207	774-772	775-765
Suppiluliumas II	1207-1178	772-743	765-760

Mitanni

The kings of the kingdom of Mitanni are documented online at

<http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mitanni>

For reference purposes we duplicate in Table 4 the list of Mitanni kings listed on the Wikipedia site. Comment will follow.

Table 4: A listing of all known Mitanni kings
(Downloaded from <http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mitanni>)

Rulers	Reigned	Comments
Kirta	ca. 1500 BC (short)	
Shuttarna I		Son of Kirta
Parshatatar or Parrattarna		Son of Kirta
Shaushtatar		Contemporary of Idrimi of Alalakh , Sacks Ashur
Artatama I		Treaty with Pharaoh Thutmose IV of Egypt , Contemporary of Pharaoh Amenhotep II of Egypt
Shuttarna II		Daughter marries Pharaoh Amenhotep III of Egypt in his year 10
Artashumara		Son of Shutarna II, brief reign
Tushratta	ca. 1350 BC (short)	Contemporary of Suppiluliuma I of the Hittites and Pharaohs Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV of Egypt , Amarna letters
Artatama II		Treaty with Suppiluliuma I of the Hittites , ruled same time as Tushratta
Shuttarna III		Contemporary of Suppiluliuma I of the Hittites
Shattiwaza or Kurtiwaza		Mitanni becomes vassal of the Hittite Empire
Shattuara		Mittani becomes vassal of Assyria under Adad-nirari I
Wasashatta		Son of Shattuara
Shattuara II		Last king of Mitanni before the Assyrian conquest
*All dates must be taken with caution since they are worked out only by comparison with the chronology of other ancient Near Eastern nations .		

We are not surprised that the table of Mitanni kings contains but a single specific date in the 14th/13th century time frame we are focusing on in this essay. As stated in the footnote at the bottom of the table, any dates supplied to the Mitanni kings must be deduced from secondary sources. The absence of any internally documented relative chronology for the kingdom of

Mitanni is a consequence of the fact that the named kings who preceded and followed Tushratta are not generally well attested in the literature, and their reign lengths, not to mention their relative dates (and by extension their absolute dates) remain seriously in doubt. Even the one dated king, Tushratta, is no exception to the rule, since his single date (ca. 1350) is clearly derived from the fact that he authored six Amarna letters EA23-29, two to Amenhotep III and four to Akhenaton. But that fact at least provides us with a range of dates for this king, rather than the single date provided in the downloaded chart. Based on the fact that he was ruling during the last few years of Amenhotep III (1391-1353) and the initial few years of Akhenaton's independent reign, we can safely assign to him the years 1355-1350 B.C. Reducing these dates by 425 years suggests that he actually reigned, minimally, in the time frame 930-925 B.C. And those dates could easily be extended were we interested in doing so.

It follows from the discussion thus far that, at least for the duration of this essay, we are leaving the Mitanni out of much of our timeline analysis. Without dates, the Mitanni kings (other than Tushratta) can contribute little to our analysis of the king lists, where our interest is largely concerned with synchronisms. Thus we have omitted the Mitanni from our all-inclusive Table 7 (page 15) and from our concluding timeline (Figure 3, page 26). At a later date we hope to complete an essay on the Mitanni.

Before we move on we should stress one point. The Mitanni are not an insignificant nation, and they do figure prominently in the early part of our 950-760 B.C. time frame. As such the Mitanni play an important role in the brief discussion which precedes our final comments, where we attempt to explain the circumstances and context in which our elusive king Ashuruballit ruled "the land of Ashur". In this discussion the Mitanni must play a part, since the Mitanni are the dominant nation in the Ancient Near East in the last decades of the 10th century. They control the far north of Syria, including the city states of Carchemish and Aleppo. Their territory encompasses the whole of present day northern Iraq including the territory north and east of the western bend of the Euphrates, and most significantly, they rule over the central region of present day Iraq, both west and east of the Khabur River, i.e. the whole of the "land of Ashur". It follows that "*Assyria in the days of Ashur-Dan II was a tributary of the Mitanni nation.*"

Kassite Babylon (3rd Dynasty of Babylon)

The reader can follow the traditional dates for the kings of Babylonia at the following link:

<http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kassites>

By now it should have become obvious to the reader that this article is primarily concerned with the Babylonian kings of the 14th and 13th centuries B.C., whence will come, following their transference to the 10th and 9th centuries, the promised references to our late 10th century Ashuruballit.

To facilitate our eventual discussion, we list the traditional dates of all of the Babylonian Kassite kings precisely as they are presented on the Wikipedia site in the link provided above. The results are shown in our Table 5 below. Following that table we select only the relevant 14th and 13th century Babylonian kings, itemizing them in the first column of yet another table (our Table 6). Then, as we did for the Hittite kings in Table 3 earlier, we reduce these dates by over 400 years (in this case precisely 430 years) and list them in column two. Finally, we fine tune the results in column three in order to reflect some well-known synchronisms between the Kassite kings and the pharaohs of the Egyptian 18th and 19th dynasties. The critical portion of our discussion will then follow.

Table 5: Kassite Kings for the Entire 3rd Dynasty of Babylon
(copied directly from the online Wikipedia site)

Ruler	Reigned	Comments
Agum II or Agum-Kakrime		Returns Marduk statue to Babylon
Burnaburiash I	ca. 1500 BC (short)	Treaty with Puzur-Ashur III of Assyria
Kashtiliash III		
Ulamburiash	ca. 1480 BC (short)	Conquers the first Sealand Dynasty
Agum III	ca. 1470 BC (short)	possible campaigns Against "The Sealand" and "in Dilmun"
Karaindash	ca. 1410 BC (short)	Treaty with Ashur-bel-nisheshu of Assyria
Kadashman-harbe I	ca. 1400 BC (short)	Campaign against the Sutû
Kurigalzu I	ca. x-1375 BC (short)	Founder of Dur-Kurigalzu and contemporary of Thutmose IV
Kadashman-Enlil I	ca. 1374—1360 BC (short)	Contemporary of Amenophis III of the Egyptian Amarna letters
Burnaburiash II	ca. 1359—1333 BC (short)	Contemporary of Akhenaten and Ashur-uballit I
Kara-hardash	ca. 1333 BC (short)	Grandson of Ashur-uballit I of Assyria
Nazi-Bugash or Shuzigash	ca. 1333 BC (short)	Usurper "son of a nobody"
Kurigalzu II	ca. 1332—1308 BC (short)	Son of Burnaburiash II, Lost ? Battle of Sugagi with Enlil-nirari of Assyria
Nazi-Maruttash	ca. 1307—1282 BC (short)	Lost territory to Adad-nirari I of Assyria
Kadashman-Turgu	ca. 1281—1264 BC (short)	Contemporary of Hattusili III of the Hittites
Kadashman-Enlil II	ca. 1263—1255 BC (short)	Contemporary of Hattusili III of the Hittites
Kudur-Enlil	ca. 1254—1246 BC (short)	Time of Nippur renaissance
Shagarakti-Shuriash	ca. 1245—1233 BC (short)	"Non-son of Kudur-Enlil " according to Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria
Kashtiliashu IV	ca. 1232—1225 BC (short)	Deposed by Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria

Enlil-nadin-shumi	ca. 1224 BC (short)	Assyrian vassal king
Kadashman-Harbe II	ca. 1223 BC (short)	Assyrian vassal king
Adad-shuma-iddina	ca. 1222—1217 BC (short)	Assyrian vassal king
Adad-shuma-usur	ca. 1216—1187 BC (short)	Sender of <i>rude letter</i> to Aššur-nirari and Ilī-ḫaddâ, the kings of Assyria
Meli-Shipak II	ca. 1186—1172 BC (short)	Correspondence with Ninurta-apal-Ekur confirming foundation of Near East chronology
Marduk-apla-iddina I	ca. 1171—1159 BC (short)	
Zababa-shuma-iddin	ca. 1158 BC (short)	Defeated by Shutruk-Nahhunte of Elam
Enlil-nadin-ahi	ca. 1157—1155 BC (short)	Defeated by Kutir-Nahhunte II of Elam

From this table we must select kings who, with the appropriate reduction of dates, actually belong in our designated 10th/9th century time frame. But before we do that we need to make clear to the reader one of the unique features of the Babylonian chronology presented in Table 4. The Kassite kingdom, like that of the Mitanni cited earlier, has preserved very little internal documentation in support of its timeline. The ordering of its kings, and in many cases the reign lengths of those kings, are derived from two primary sources – Assyrian and Egyptian documentation. And therein lies a major difficulty in our attempt to determine our 10th and 9th century king list for this nation. Where the existence and/or the dates of a particular Kassite king are determined via a *reliable* reference to a *known* Assyrian king, the Kassite king must remain fixed in the time frame allocated to him in Table 3. The dates of the Assyrian kings are written in stone, so to speak. But where the position of a Kassite king in Table 3 was determined by scholars via a synchronism with a named Egyptian king, we are free to lower the dates for the Kassite king sufficiently to maintain that synchronism, assuming that the dates of the Egyptian king in question have been lowered, as in the case of the Displaced Dynasties chronology. Fortunately for our discussion, all of the Kassite kings from Kurigalzu I (x-1375) to Kadashman-Enlil II (1263-1255) can be linked to one another, and in turn to the 14th/13th century Egyptian timetable, with remarkable precision. And for that to happen in the new 10th/9th century context their 14th/13th century dates need to be lowered by approximately 435 years, the identical figure applied to the traditional dates for the Hittite kings. There may be yet other Kassite kings whose dates need to be lowered by that amount, but the nine Kassite kings mentioned are the ones whose conventional dates, lowered by 435 years, place them firmly in our designated 10th/9th century time frame. They are therefore the kings of most interest to this article. We have not bothered to examine the documentation related to Kassite kings earlier than Kurigalzu I or later than Kadashman-Enlil II.

We proceed to determine the 10th/9th century dates of the nine kings from Kurigalzu I to Kadashman-Enlil II.

Table 6: Kassite Kings ruling in the Late 10th through the 9th centuries B.C.

Name	Traditional Dates	Dates Reduced 430 yrs.	Dates Further Adjusted
Kurigalzu I	x-1375	x-945	x-945
Kadashman-Enlil I	1374-1360	944-930	944-930
Burnaburiash II	1359-1333	929-903	929-903
Kara-hardash	1333	903	902-897
Nazi-Bugash (or Shuzigash)	1333	903	896-895
Kurigalzu II	1332-1308	902-878	894-869
Nazi-Maruttash	1307-1282	877-852	868-843
Kadashman-Turgu	1281-1264	851-834	842-823
Kadashman-Enlil II	1263-1255	833-825	822-814

And now we itemize, in Table form, the kings ruling the five nations of concern to this essay.

Table 7: A Comparison of the King Lists for Babylon, Hatti, Mitanni, Assyria and Egypt in the time frame 950-800 B.C.

	Kassite Babylon	Hatti	Mitanni	Assyria	Egypt
960-940	Kurigalau I x-1375 B.C. x-944 B.C . Kadashman-Enlil I 1374-1360 944-930				Amenhotep III 966-928 Amenhotep IV 940-923
940-920	Kadashman-Enlil I Burnaburiash II 1359-1333 929-903	Tudhaliya II x-1344 B.C. x-908 B.C.	Tushratta x-1350 x-930-925	Ashur-Dan II 935-912	Amenhotep III Amenhotep IV 940-923
920-900	<i>Burnaburiash II</i> <i>Kara-hardash</i> 1333 902-897	Tudhaliya II Suppiluliumas 1344-1322 908-858		Ashur-Dan II Adad-Nirari II 912-891	

900-880	Kara-Hardash Nazi-Bugash or Shuzi 1333 896-895 Kurigalzu II 1332-1308 894-869	Suppiluliumas		Adad-Nirari II Tukulti Ninurta II 891-884 Ashurnasirpal II 884-859	Haremheb 897-870
880-860	Kurigalzu II Nazi-Maruttash 1307-1282 868-843	Suppiluliumas		Ashurnasirpal II Shalmanezzer III 858-824	Haremheb Ramses I 870-869 Seti 869-840
860-840	Nazi-Maruttash Kadashman-Turgu 1281-1264 842-823	Suppiluliumas Mursilis II 1321-1295 857-836 Muwatallis II 1295-1272 846-832		Shalmanezzer III	Seti
840-820	Kadashman-Turgu Kadashman-Enlil II 1263-1255 822-814	Muwatallis II Urhi-Teshub a.k.a. Mursilis III 1272-1267 832-825 Hattusilis III 1267-1237 825-800		Shalmanezzer III Shamshi Adad V 823-810	Ramses II 840-774
820-800	Kadashman-Enlil II	Hattusilis III		Shamshi Adad V Shammuramat 809-792	Ramses II
800-780		Tudhaliyas IV 1237-1209 800-775		Shammuramat Adad-Nirari III 791-782 Shalmanezzer IV 781-772	Ramses II
780-760		Tudhaliyas IV Suppiluliuma II 1207-1178 765-760		Ashur Dan III 771-764	Ramses II Merenptah 774-764

It is now time to position Ashurballit on our Displaced Dynasties timeline.

The Ashurballit History

Two critical Assyrian and Babylonian Tablets

This section and the one to follow are both concerned with confirming the fact that the Ashurballit who authored the two Amarna letters (EA15 & EA16) lived during the last third of the 10th century B.C. The two source documents which establish that fact are known to scholars as the *Synchronistic History* and the *Chronicle P* history. The clay tablets which furnish these two histories are each inscribed on both sides with cuneiform Akkadian text, two columns on each side. The four columns of text which thus make up each document can be perused online at the sources listed below. Though we are primarily concerned with the first column of the Synchronistic History and the 1st, 3rd and 4th columns of Chronicle P, the reader may wish to skim through the whole of each document.

Online sources of the Synchronistic History (tablet ABC21), an Assyrian tablet plus two fragments, and the Chronicle P history (a single Babylonian tablet, ABC22).

<http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/abc21/synchronistic1.html>
<http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/abc21/synchronistic2.html>

<http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/abc22/p1.html>
<http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/abc22/p2.html>

Table 8: The “Ashurballit History” as presented on the source documents.

Synchronistic History – tablet ABC21	Chronicle P – tablet ABC22
Introduction	Introduction
<p>The Synchronistic Chronicle (ABC 21) is one of the historiographical texts from ancient <u>Assyria</u>. It deals with the relations between Assyria and its southern neighbor <u>Babylonia</u> (which is called Karduniaš), and is an important source for those who want to study the chronology of this period, as it offers many synchronisms.</p> <p>For a very brief introduction to the literary genre of chronicles, go here. The translation on this webpage was adapted from A.K. Grayson, <i>Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles</i> (1975) and Jean-Jacques Glassner, <i>Mesopotamian Chronicles</i> (Atlanta, 2004).</p>	<p>[Chronicle P (ABC 22) is one of the historiographical texts from ancient <u>Babylonia</u>. It deals with several conflicts between <u>Assyria</u>, Babylonia, and Elam in the fourteenth to twelfth century BCE. It may be a Babylonian adaptation of the Assyrian <u>Synchronistic History</u>.</p> <p>For a very brief introduction to the literary genre of chronicles, go here. The translation on this webpage was adapted from A.K. Grayson, <i>Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles</i> (1975) and Jean-Jacques Glassner, <i>Mesopotamian Chronicles</i> (Atlanta, 2004).</p> <p>The tablet, BM 92701 (82-7-4, 38), upon which Chronicle P is inscribed is in very poor condition. The</p>

<p>The text, which has a strong pro-Assyrian bias, is preserved on three tablets from the library of king Aššurbanipal in Nineveh, and purports to render the text of a boundary stone between Assyria and Babylonia that stood somewhere on the east bank of the <u>Tigris</u>. This may be a literary fiction.</p> <p>The text must have been composed after the accession of Adad-nirari III in 810, but not much later, because there are no references to later troubles.</p> <p>Colors</p> <p>Of the three tablets, tablet A (yellow) is the main text; B (pink) and C (blue) are fragments.</p>	<p>fragment is 180 mm wide and 120 mm long and represents only about one third of the original tablet. The fragment comes from the bottom portion of the chronicle.]</p>
<p>Relevant Lines</p>	<p>Relevant Lines</p>
<p>Column 1 (lines 8-23)</p> <p>A8' In the time of Aššur-uballit,[2] king of Assyria, Kassite troops[10]</p> <p>A11' rebelled against and killed Karahardaš,[8]</p> <p>A9' king of Karduniaš, son of Muballit-šerua, A10' the daughter of Aššur-uballit.</p> <p>A12' They appointed Nazibugaš,[11] a Kassite, son of a nobody, as sovereign over them.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>A13' To avenge Karaindaš, his grandson,[14] Aššur-uballit</p> <p>A14' marched to Karduniaš.</p> <p>A15' He killed Nazibugaš, king of Karduniaš.</p> <p>A16' Kurigalzu the Younger, son of Burnaburiaš, A17' he appointed as king and put him on his father's throne.[3]</p> <p>-----</p> <p>A18' In the time of Enlil-nirari,[4] king of Assyria, Kurigalzu the Younger, was king of Karduniaš.</p> <p>A19' At Sugagi, which is on the Tigris, Enlil-nirari, king of Assyria,</p> <p>A20' fought with Kurigalzu. He brought about his total defeat, slaughtered his troops and</p> <p>A21' carried off his camp. They divided the districts[22] from Šasili of Subartu,</p> <p>A22' to Karduniaš into two and</p> <p>A23' fixed the boundary-line.</p> <p>From one of the fragments (tablet C) the Synchronistic Chronicle has added the following lines:</p> <p>C24' Adad-nirari, king of Assyria, and Nazi-Marrutaš, king of Karduniaš,[5]</p> <p>C25' fought with one another at Kar-Ištar of Ugarsallu.</p>	<p>Column 1 (lines 5-14)</p> <p>5' Kadašman-harbe, son of Karaindaš, son of Muballit-serua,</p> <p>6' the daughter of Aššur-uballit,[1] king of Assyria, ordered[7] the overthrow of the Suteans</p> <p>7' from the east to west, and annihilated their extensive forces.</p> <p>8' He reinforced the fortresses in Mount Šaršar.[2] He dug wells and</p> <p>9' settled people on fertile lands to strengthen the guard. Afterwards</p> <p>10' the Kassite people rebelled against him and killed him. Šuzigaš, a Kassite,</p> <p>11' the son of a nobody,[3] they appointed as sovereign over them. Aššur-uballit,</p> <p>12' king of Assyria, marched to Karduniaš[13], to avenge Kadašman-harbe, his daughter's son, and</p> <p>13' Šuzigaš, the Kassite,</p> <p>14' he killed. Aššur-uballit put Kurigalzu, son of Kadašman-harbe, on his father's throne.</p> <p>End of Column 3 (lines 20-24)</p> <p>20' He went to conquer Adad-nirari, king of Assyria.</p> <p>21' He did battle against him at Sugaga, which is on the Tigris, and brought about his defeat.</p> <p>22' He slaughtered his soldiers and captured his officers.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>23' Nazi-maruttaš, son of [...] [2]</p> <p>24' king of Assyria in [...].</p> <p>Lacuna</p> <p>Beginning of Column 4 (lines 1-11)</p>

<p>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[31] C29' their confines from Pilasqu, C30' which is on the other side of the Tigris, and Arman of Ugarsallu C31' as far as Lullume.</p>	<p>1' [...] 2' [...] he threw iron bands and [...] [3] 3' [...] Tukulti-Ninurta returned to Babylon and 4' brought [...] near. He destroyed the wall of Babylon and put[5] 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[6] in Karduniaš. For seven years, Tukulti-Ninurta 8' controlled Karduniaš[7]. 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[9] 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.</p>
--	---

We begin our analysis of these two historical source documents by pointing out the obvious. The two tablets being referenced, at least in the sections at issue here, treat essentially the same subject matter, one from an Assyrian perspective, the other - Babylonian. The Babylonian tablet, at least in its description of this portion of history, is not only slightly more detailed, but also appears to be, by far, the most reliable, as we might have expected *a priori*. Both documents appear to be knowledgeable about the sequence of events described, but both appear to be biased in their reporting. But since most of the activity being referenced in these particular sections took place within Babylon, or in the disputed boundary area between the two countries, we would expect that the Babylonian historian/scribe, as opposed to an Assyrian copyist, would have the best access to original source document(s). In the sections under consideration the Chronicle P author appears to have copied the names on his source document, just as he viewed them, even if he was otherwise totally unfamiliar with these names and the historical context in which the events took place. The author(s) of the Synchronistic History, on the other hand, are clearly cognizant of the multiple Assyrian king lists, and are willing and able to make name changes in documents in order to make them conform to the norm. Elsewhere in the Chronicle P document, particularly where the described activity is taking place in Assyria, or is cross referenced to a particular Assyrian king, the Chronicler appears to be copying from Assyrian source documents, especially so in the final dozen verses of column four where all of the named kings are Assyrian. We should not fault him therefore if he has replicated the mistakes made by the Assyrian scribes in these few verses.

Additionally, we note that the Assyrian Synchronistic History surfaced during the 19th century excavation of Ashurbanipal's massive library in Nineveh. Since Ashurbanipal ruled roughly in the time frame 669 to sometime between 631 and 627 B.C., his scribes were distanced from the

event they write about by approximately 250-300 years in our Displaced Dynasties chronology or 675-725 years in the conventional history. Ashurbanipal is well known as one of the world's first bibliophiles, and his extensive library was well stocked with literary and historical documents copied from a wide variety of sources. We wonder how accurate that copying was.

The Chronicle P, on the other hand, is of unknown provenance, and is likely a one of a kind original document, written around the year 800 B.C. according to many scholars, or slightly later, during the reign of Nabonassar (747-732), king of Babylon. It may suit the reader to become familiar with the Babylonian Chronicles via the link shown below:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Babylonian_Chronicles

For convenience we quote only the brief introduction to this online article:

The **Babylonian Chronicles** are many series of [tablets](#) recording major events in [Babylonian](#) history. They are thus one of the first steps in the development of [ancient historiography](#). The Babylonian Chronicles were written from the reign of [Nabonassar](#) up to the [Parthian Period](#), by Babylonian astronomers ("Chaldaeans"), who probably used the *[Astronomical Diaries](#)* as their source. Almost all of the tablets were identified as chronicles once in the collection of the British Museum, having been acquired via antiquities dealers from unknown excavations in the 19th century. All but three of the chronicles are [unprovenanced](#).

We begin our construction of the "Ashuruballit history" by creating a timetable of events as they are described in the first column of the each of the documents and the relevant verses of the 3rd and 4th columns of the Chronicle P. In the course of this analysis we will venture our opinion on the reliability of the two versions.

The Synchronistic History

From lines 8-12 of column one of the Synchronistic History (Henceforth cited as SH) we read that an Assyrian king named Ashuruballit gave one of his daughters, Muballit-Sherua, in marriage to a yet unspecified Kassite king. A male child named Karahardash resulted from that union, and this individual became king at the death of his father (or of his paternal grandfather). Karahardash was subsequently killed in a rebellion of loyalist Kassite troops, who possibly resented his ethnicity, if not his leadership of the Kassite army. Those troops then installed as king a native Kassite "son of nobody" named Nazi-bugash.

From SH lines 13-17 we learn that Ashuruballit responded to the death of his grandson by invading Babylon (Karduniash in the text is the Kassites name for the country of Babylonia), deposing and killing Nazi-bugash, and installing in his stead Kurigalzu, probably another son of Muballit-Sherua, or perhaps a half-brother of Karahardash. The reference to Kurigalzu as "the Younger" possibly serves to distinguish this king from his great-great grandfather Kurigalzu I,

much as scholars today affix a different number to king's with identical names in order to distinguish them.

And for the first time we are informed that Ashuruballit's appointments to the Kassite throne are drawn from the family of Burnaburiash. Once again it is not clear if Kurigalzu is a son or a grandson of Burnaburiash (since Akkadian "son" can mean "grandson" or even "descendant"). The two most probable interpretations of the language are diagrammed below (Figure 1).

From SH lines 18-23 we are informed that sometime after he became king, Kurigalzu led the Kassite army in battle against an Assyrian king named Enlil-Nirari, presumably a son of Ashuruballit. The battle took place at Sugagi on the Tigris River, somewhere near the border separating the two countries. Assyria prevailed. Kassite troops were slaughtered. And the borders between the two countries, apparently the issue that caused the war, were re-aligned in favor of Assyria.

From SH lines 24-31 (supplied by fragment C) we learn that Nazi-Maruttash, a king of Karduniash, apparently the successor of Kurigalzu, fought yet another battle with Assyria over border issues, this time with Adad-nirari, king of Assyria. The battle took place at Kar-Ishtar of Ugarsallu. Adad-nirari was victorious and the border was once again moved to the benefit of Assyria.

What do we make of this Assyrian version of events? Or better still, what do scholars make of it? We restrict our answer to three points.

1. Clearly two possibilities for the genealogy of Kurigalzu exist, and they are diagrammed in Figure 1 below. The academic community generally, and certainly the Wikipedia source we followed in our Tables 4 and 5, appear to favor the one on the left, where Burnaburiash is succeeded directly by Kara-hardash, though that scenario is clearly possible in the genealogy depicted on the right, assuming the unnamed son died while Burnaburiash was still alive. Our reason for even discussing the matter will become clear momentarily, when we examine the Chronicle P version of events. That document insists on the genealogy on the right, and even supplies the name of "the unnamed son". Of the two documents Assyriologists clearly favor the Synchronistic History and are biased against the Chronicle P history. We will understand that sentiment once we finish analyzing the Chronicle P.

Figure 1: The Ashuruballit connection to the Kassite family of Burnaburiash (according to the Synchronistic Chronicle)



2. Without exception, scholars identify the Ashuruballit mentioned in this historical vignette with the 2nd king of the Assyrian Middle Kingdom. We would expect nothing else, even if the document said nothing about Kurigalzu fighting a battle with an Assyrian king named Enlil-nirari at Sugagi on the Tigris River. But clearly that reference strengthens their case, since the Ashuruballit of the Assyrian king lists was succeeded by a son named Enlil-nirari. Everything seems to fit. Case closed? Hardly. The reader will recall that this Synchronistic History was copied by Assyrian scribes about two hundred years after the death of Ashuruballit, assuming our late 10th century provenance for these events. Those scribes would certainly be familiar with the king lists, and in particular they would know that those lists contained the name of only one king Ashuruballit. They would also know that the son who succeeded this king was named Enlil-nirari. Assuming that the document(s) from which they copied this "Ashuruballit History" spoke of a battle at Sugagi following the death of Ashuruballit, it is not a stretch to surmise that a well-intentioned but sadly mistaken scribe might supply the name Enlil-nirari, especially if the document only spoke of a battle in which "the son" of Ashuruballit took part. Even if the document being copied supplied some other name for the opponent of Kurigalzu, an Assyrian scribe might well assume an error and correct the error. And we are not guessing, since the Chronicle P account of the Sugagi incident does in fact supply another name. And the accuracy of that name can be verified from other details in the document.


3. If we were to remove the name of Enlil-nirari from the Synchronistic History scholars would be left with nothing but the name of Ashuruballit to argue the 14th century positioning of this sequence of events. Apart from these two documents the 14th century king is almost totally unknown. It is because scholars attribute this "Ashuruballit History" to Ashuruballit, son of Eriba-Adad, that the 14th century king is reckoned as one of the most powerful of the Assyrian monarchs, when in fact he was possibly an extremely weak ruler. This state of affairs reminds this author of the similar situation that took place regarding the Egyptian 18th dynasty king named Menkheperre Thutmose. The annals of a king by this name, inscribed on the Karnak temple walls in Thebes, have been mistakenly attributed to the 18th dynasty king bearing that name, rather than the 7th century Nubian king of Egypt, an extremely successful military leader, whose Nubian name was Piankhi. As a result, the 18th dynasty king, a rather pathetic, anemic individual who died an early and painful death, is still today reckoned as the greatest military figure in Egyptian history. Hopefully we can eventually set the record straight on both the Assyrian king Ashuruballit, son of Eriba-Adad and the 18th dynasty pharaoh Menkheperre Thutmose III.

The Chronicle P Version of Events

From lines 5 and 6 of column 1 we learn that the chronology depicted on the right in our Figure 1 is correct, and that the scribe who copied the Synchronistic history has probably misnamed the grandson of Burnaburiash. Here, rather than Kara-hardash, we find the grandson of Burnaburiash identified as Kadashman-harbe, a familiar name in the Kassite king list. It is possible, of course, that the king had two names, perhaps a birth name and a throne name, as did many kings in the Near East of the 10th century B.C.

This Kadashman-harbe was the son of Karaindash (his father) and the son of Muballitat-sherua (his mother), who in turn is identified again as the daughter of Ashuruballit. Thus we can depict his genealogical connections by simply reproducing the right hand diagram from our Figure 1 and supplying the name of “the unnamed son” of Burnaburiash. This revised genealogy is shown below as our Figure 2.

Figure 2: The Ashuruballit connection to the Kassite family of Burnaburiash (according to the Chronicle P)



We note at the tail end of verse 6 and continuing through verse 9 that this Kadashman-harbe was very active during his reign, successfully stopping the present intrusion into Babylonia, from east to west, of nomadic, warlike rebels called “Suteans”, and restructuring his country to better stave off future attacks. We will say more about these nomadic rebels later. Ethnically they are identified as Arameans by many scholars.

Verses 10-14 complete the story essentially as we read it in the Synchronistic History, except for the fact that the Kassite “son of a nobody” installed on the throne of Karduniash is named Shuzigash, not Nazi-bugash, and that it was the “Kassite people”, not the army, that killed the grandson of Burnaburiash. Both changes are incidental to the story, though they do inform us that the scribe who authored the Synchronistic History must not have been copying Chronicle P. If he were we would not expect the story to have so many variants.

To this point in the story, in spite of the variants, we have no major disagreements with what is written in the two source documents. Our objection to identifying Ashuruballit, father of

Muballitat-sherua, as the Middle Assyrian king Ashurballit, son of Ariba-Adad, comes from the final few verses of the 3rd column and the first eleven verses of the 4th column of Chronicle P.

Verses 20-22 in column three tell essentially the same story as we found in lines 18-23 of the Synchronistic history. They describe a battle between Kassite Babylonia and Assyria. But where the Synchronistic history pits Kurigalzu against Enlil-nirari, Chronicle P states clearly that the Assyrian opponent of Kurigalzu was Adad-nirari, king of Assyria. The battle still takes place at Shugaga (=Shugagi) on the Tigris, but this time Kurigalzu is cited as the victor, and it was Kurigalzu (or Nazi Maruttash who we think was leading his army) who slaughtered the soldiers and captured the officers of the Assyrian king. Clearly, if we accept this version of the battle, the link with Ashurballit, son of Eriba-Adad has been broken. Needless to say, not a single scholar accepts the Chronicle P version of events. But we are not finished the story.

Regrettably the final two verses of column three, and the initial three verses of column four are damaged on the tablet, and we can only guess at the missing text. It is probable, but not certain, that the missing text described the same incident we read about in lines 24-31 of column 1 in the Synchronistic History.” But if so, it is clear that the Synchronistic History has once again supplied an incorrect name for the Assyrian king. It has also wrongly identified Nazi-Marrutash as king and falsely declared victory for Assyria. Thus, in the Synchronistic History it was Adad-Nirari defeating Nazi-Maruttash, king of Karduniash at Kar-Ishtar of Ugarsallu; in the Chronicle P damaged text it is Nazi Maruttash (not identified as a king) defeating Tukulti-Ninurta, presumably at the same location.

It is the considered opinion of this author that Nazi-Maruttash actually fought both battles described thus far. At the beginning of the reign of Kurigalzu, this son of Kurigalzu was given control of the army, and in that capacity fought and won a battle against Adad-Nirari at Shugaga. Later, Nazi-Maruttash, still in control of the army, fought and defeated Tukulti-Ninurta. Victory for Babylon in this battle is a certainty, otherwise there is no explanation why Tukulti-Ninurta would attack and defeat Babylonia twice in succession, in battles possibly only months apart. Assuming he lost the first battle, we understand why soon after he would attempt to reverse his losses. We cannot prove our assumption that Nazi-Maruttash was not king when he fought both battles, first with Adad-Nirari, and then with Tukulti-Ninurta, but momentarily, when we place the “Ashurballit History” in its proper historical context, that assumption will prove correct.

Verses 4-7a of the Chronicle P continues by describing Tukulti-Ninurta’s assault of and victory over Babylonia, and his removal to Assyria of a statue of Marduk, a Babylonian deity, apparently a symbolic act to underscore his victory. Verses 7 and 8a state clearly that Tukulti-Ninurta subsequently governed Babylon for seven years, and verses 10 and 11 state that at the end of the seven years his son Ashur-nasir-apli (Ashurnasirpal) and the officers of Assyria “rebelled against Tukulti-Ninurta, removed him from the throne, shut him up in Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta and killed him. So far, so good. But what do we make of verses 8b-9?

We are not told in the preceding verses who the king of Karduniash was when Tukulti-Ninurta invaded Babylonia. If we are correct in our assumption that it was still Kurigalzu, and that Nazi-

Maruttash was still his army general, then Kurigalzu remained nominally the “king of Karduniash” throughout the seven years duration, though perhaps confined in Assyria. *The de facto* ruler of Karduniash was the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta via the governors he placed in the country. Apparently this state of affairs came to a head after seven years when officers of Kurigalzu in Akkad, the traditional name for the northernmost part of Babylonia, rebelled against Assyrian rule and declared one of their own, an individual named Adad-shuma-user, to be king. This rebellion in Karduniash in turn seems to have inspired Assyrian officers, in co-operation with Ashernasirpal, son of Tukulti-Ninurta, to stage their own coup. Tukulti-Ninurta was killed, Ashernasirpal became king, and Kurigalzu was likely released to continue governing Karduniash. Admittedly some of this supplied history is mere conjecture, but momentarily we will supply proof that we are right.

While the preceding comments regarding happenings in Kassite Babylon may be conjecture, not so with the situation in Assyria. The entire text of columns 3 and 4 of Chronicle P make it absolutely certain that three Assyrian kings by the names Adad-Nirari, Tukulti-Ninurta, and his son Ashurbanipal, ruled Assyria consecutively and in that order, and all, apparently, during the twenty-five year reign of Kurigalzu, king of Karduniash. It should be a relatively simple exercise to locate this sequence of kings on the Assyrian king list we reproduced earlier.

There is indeed a king Adad-Nirari I whose reign spanned the years 1295-1264, who might, at first glance, qualify as the first king named in the Chronicle P document, except for the fact that this king was not succeeded by a king Tukulti Ninurta. The first Tukulti-Ninurta we encounter on the Assyrian king list began his rule thirty years later (in 1233), and this king did not have a son named Ashurnasirpal. The first king Ashur-nasir-pal in Assyria did not begin ruling until 1050 B.C., all this according to a list which scholars regard as extremely accurate. It follows that we can discount entirely the possibility that the “Ashuruballit history” belongs in an Assyrian Middle Kingdom context. But what about the second kings bearing those three names.

It will come as no surprise to students of the history of the Ancient Near East that three kings bearing the names Adad-Nirari II (912-891), Tukulti-Ninurta II (891-884) and Ashurnasirpal II (884-859) were the first kings to rule Assyria in the Neo-Assyrian period. As their dates indicate, they ruled consecutively and in the order indicated. There is therefore no legitimate reason to doubt that they are the kings named in columns 3 and 4 of the Chronicle P. And since the reign of the 9th century Tukulti-Ninurta II lasted only seven years – precise as described in the text of Chronicle P, assuming of course, that he began his battle with Nazi-Maruttash and his subsequent assault on Karduniash only months after beginning his reign - there is absolutely no problem situating the twenty-five year reign of Kurigalzu so that it overlaps the reigns of all three Assyrian kings. In fact, this situation is already suggested by the chronology we have determined in our Tables 6 & 7 and our Figure 3 below.

Before moving on we should pause to provide here some support for the assumption we have just made in the previous paragraph concerning the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta. If we are to identify the Tukulti-Ninurta mentioned in the Chronicle P with our 9th century Tukulta-Ninurta

II, it is imperative that his conquest of Babylon be dated in the first few months of his reign. In the Kassite “accession year” system of dating, when a king dies mid-year, that partial year is credited to the deceased king, The balance of the year is deemed to be the “accession year” of the new king, and the numbering of the replacement king’s years only begins at the outset of the following year. It is therefore imperative that the “sack of Babylon” by the Chronicle P’s Tukulti-Ninurta took place in his “accession year”. We are therefore gratified to read in J.A. Brinkman’s “Materials and Studies for Kassite History Vol. I”, p. 19, that “Chronicle P’s insertion of Tukulti-Ninurta as a ruler of Babylonia is supported by the evidence of an economic text found at Nippur, which is dated in the month Addaru of Tukulti-Ninurta’s accession year.” We will mention this text again in our next paper, when we criticize the traditional history’s treatment of the Tukulti-Ninurta conquest of Babylon.


When we reduced the dates of the Kassite Babylonia kings by 435 years, in order to maintain the synchronism between Burnaburiash and Amenhotep IV of Egypt, we decided to slightly increase the reign length of Kara-hardash (=Kadashman-Harbe) from “less than one”, to five years. This increase of five years in the reign of Kadashman-Harbe, and thus the resulting five year lowering of the dates for his successor Kurigalzu, was entirely justified, considering the fact that Karahardash waged what must have been an extensive and time consuming battle against the infiltration of the nomadic, warlike Suteans, this activity ranging from the east to the west of the country. And in order to increase the defensive capacity of Babylonia this same king also reinforced the fortresses in Mount Sarshar, and dug wells and re-settled part of the population on the newly irrigated border lands to strengthen the guard (Chronicle P, column 1, lines 7-9). All of this took time. Kadashman-Harbe certainly did not die within months of his coronation as indicated in our downloaded Kassite king list.

The result of this lowering of dates placed the reign of Kurigalzu in the time slot 894-869. Is it just a coincidence that this necessary modest lowering of dates for Kurigalzu positions this king’s reign overlapping the last few years of the reign of Adad-Nirari II (912-891), the entire seven year reign of his son Tukulti-Ninurta II (891-884), and the first fifteen years of Tukulti-Ninurta’s son Ashurnasirpal II (884-859)?

Considering what we have recorded in the preceding paragraphs, the Chronicle P version of the “Ashurballit History” appears on all counts to be an accurate and thus believable summary of the history of Assyria and Babylonia in the late 10th and early 9th centuries.

It is time to put all of this information in a time line, considering that “a picture is worth a thousand words.” Note that we have maintained the names Kara-hardash and Nazi-Bugash from the Synchronistic History, simply because those are the names that appeared on our downloaded Kassite king list, and appear also in our Tables 4 & 5. The reader is advised to download and print this chart/timeline for future reference. In our estimation it is a completely reliable record of the reigns of the kings of Egypt, Hatti, Assyria and Kassite Babylonia from the middle of the 10th century to the end of the 9th. At the end of this essay we will return to this chart once again in our discussion of synchronisms.

Figure 3: Timeline Showing the Reigns of the kings of Egypt, Assyria, Hatti, and Kassite Babylonia, from the year 950 B.C. to the year 800 B.C.



The Location and Function of Ashurballit, king of the land of Ashur


There remains for us one objective. We know from this timeline the approximate dates of the Amarna king Ashurballit (930-894 B.C.). But these dates place him on the throne of Assyria at precisely the same time as Ashur-Dan II (935-912), the terminal king of the Assyrian Middle Period, and Adad-Nirari II (912-891), the first Neo-Assyrian king. How is it possible that Assyria has two kings during this time frame? And why is only one of them mentioned in the many king lists which include the Middle and Neo-Assyrian Periods? Both questions have a simple explanation, much of which has already been presented in our Volume 3 discussion of possible objections to our Displaced Dynasties chronology (see the section entitled "Aramean States" in chapter 4 of Volume 3, pp. 89-93). There we quoted Hugo Winckler from his book "The History of Babylonia and Assyria" (1911), p 127 where this early Assyrian scholar discussed the geopolitical landscape that confronted the first three kings of the Neo-Assyrian Period, a situation which likely extended further back in time, at minimum through the reign of Ashur-Dan II. We repeat that quote here:

Each of these three kings bore the titles “king of the world, king of Ashur,” which henceforth were constantly assumed. Harran and Ashur are the chief cities of the two parts of the land. But one part is held entirely by an Aramean population who in the old cities caused the old population the same troubles that the Chaldeans prepared for the Babylonians, and it contained besides a number of Aramean cities whose princes seized every opportunity to strike for independence or even the reins of government. Near to Harran there stood an Aramean state, Bit-Adini ...” (The History of Babylonia and Assyria (1911) p. 127)

We concluded in the end of our Volume 3 argument that Ashurballit was an Assyrian “prince”, domiciled in Harran, in the heart of the Aramean section of the country, whose function was to control the sometimes hostile Aramean population, and by virtue of his governance of that area of the country he adopted the title “king of Assyria”. He was, in his own mind at least, “a king of Assyria” though not “**the** king of Assyria”. The Mitanni were not mentioned in that section of Volume 3, though they were discussed briefly in the few pages following (see the Volume 3 discussion of the “Mitanni”, pp 93-95). At the time I was not familiar with either the “Synchronistic History”, nor the “Chronicle P” version of Assyrian history, and though I was aware that the Mitanni were a dominant force in the north of Syria, and in the extreme north of present day Iraq, I was not aware of one fact pertinent to our discussion of Ashurballit. Sometime near the beginning of the 10th century B.C., Mitanni became so powerful a nation that it invaded and conquered Assyria. And it continued to govern Assyria as a vassal state throughout the 10th century, that domination ending only when Suppiluliuma drove the Mitanni from northern Syria and invaded and conquered its capital city Washuganni, on the upper Tigris River. The fact that Assyria was a vassal state during the 10th century is seldom mentioned by scholars today because the histories of all the Near Eastern nations which contribute to our knowledge of that fact - excepting, of course, that of the Assyrian kings themselves - have been displaced from their rightful 10th century context and moved back in time well over 400 years, where they have been used to create a geopolitical map of the 14th century. And even in the case of Assyria, data that ought to inform 10th century history, such as that contained in the Synchronistic history and the Chronicle P history, has been mistakenly applied to a 14th century context. As a result, if we want to know the geopolitical situation in Assyria in the 10th century B.C., we need to read the “scholarly” literature supposedly describing the 14th century B.C.

Below the reader will find a map of the Near East in the 14th century, furnished for us online at the Wikipedia site <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mitanni>. In view of our discussion in the previous paragraph, we know that it actually describes the Near East in the 10th century B.C.

Figure 4: Map of the Near East as it existed in the 10th century B.C.
(not the beginning of the 14th century as advertised)



We have only one correction to make to the map shown in Figure 4. In view of the “Ashurballit History”, the territory controlled by Mitanni should include, at minimum, the northern part of Kassite Babylonia, including the city of Dur-Kurigalzu, the home city of the Kassite kings, located approximately 19 miles west of present day Baghdad. How else can we explain how Ashurballit wielded such power that he was able to depose, kill, and install at will, the kings of Kassite Babylon. Clearly he was acting as a representative of the Mitanni overlords, an opinion we detail in the following paragraph.

The Figure 4 map, and the details of the “Ashurballit History”, lead this author to slightly modify his previous understanding of Ashurballit’s office and function. We continue to stand by our opinion that his home base lay to the west of the Khabur River, the River which runs north to south, emptying into the Eupharates, and is located on the map in Figure 4 immediately to the right of the final “i” in the word Mitanni. This River divides Assyria into two parts, with Harran to the west, and Ashur to the east as the chief cities in those regions. Ashurballit’s home city was almost certainly Harran and part of his reason for being there was to ensure that the Arameans in the extreme west of Assyria were contained. So far, no change in our understanding from that expressed in Volume 3. But we no longer consider Ashurballit to be an Assyrian prince subordinate to Ashur-Dan. Since Assyria in the days of Ashurballit was a vassal state of the Mitanni, it is almost certain that this king functioned as a subordinate of Tushratta, the Mitanni king. He may well have been an Assyrian prince, but if so it is likely that he had ties to the Mitanni, probably through a marriage alliance. It may well be that Muballitat-sherua was a daughter by his Hurrian wife. Time alone will tell. In his Amarna letter EA16, addressed to Akhenaton, he is able to recall the specific amount of gold a contemporary Khanigalbatan (ie Mitanni) king had received from Amenhotep III.

When my father, Ashur-nadin-ahe, ordered his messengers to go to Egypt, they sent him twenty gold talents. And when the king of Khanigalbat sent his messengers to your father [3] in Egypt, they sent twenty gold talents to him. See, to the king of Khanigalbat [4] I am ..., but to me you have sent only a little gold...

We wonder whence Ashurballit received this knowledge if he was not somehow privy to the workings of the Mitanni kings. Regardless, Ashurballit’s army almost certainly functioned on behalf of Mitanni. It was probably extremely large, and composed of both Hurrian and Assyrian troops. And as a representative of the Mitanni overlords of Assyria and of the north of Kassite Babylonia, Ashurballit wielded extreme power.

There is no need to speculate on why Asheruballit’s name is missing from the Assyrian king lists. He is a representative of the Mitanni, whose job was to control the Aramean area of Assyria. As was customary in the Ancient Near East, countries conquered by other nations usually retained their existing leadership, but governors and garrisons were set up by the conquerors, to ensure stability and monitor the collection of tribute. Those governors may well assign to themselves grandiose titles, but mention of their existence is studiously avoided in official local documents.

So record of the existence of Ashurballit was rarely, if ever, produced in the conquered country, and only by chance was knowledge of his activity recorded by the Kassite Babylonians via the Chronicle P history, whence it was passed on to future generations thanks to the scribal activity sponsored by kings such as Ashurbanipal, writing centuries after the fact. We are most fortunate that this document was preserved, almost intact.

Synchronisms

I trust that the reader of this essay has grasped the significance of the discussion in the last 10 pages. For the first time our Displaced Dynasties chronology, at least from the 18th dynasty king

Amenhotep III forward in time, has been confirmed to be accurate via a link to Assyrian history, particularly since this “link” is with Neo-Assyrian kings, whose dates are completely reliable according to 21st century scholars. The fact that the three Neo-Assyrian kings are synchronized with the Kassite Babylonian king Kurigalzu, and not directly with Egypt, cannot be used to argue against our claim that the whole of our Figure 3 is proven correct by that single synchronism. Those readers who have followed our reasoning in the preceding pages will know that our Figure 3 diagram accurately portrays the “*relative* chronology” of the kings of Kassite Babylon, of the Empire Hittites, and of Egypt beginning with the time of Amenhotep III, as those kings are presented in the “traditional history”. We could create a timeline extremely close to the 14th/13th century traditional timeline, that which is studiously followed in thousands of scholarly books and journal articles, by simply changing the numbers on the time scale at the top of the diagram, and of course the corresponding dates of each of the kings on the individual timelines. All regnal dates would have to be increased by approximately 435 years, including those of Ashuruballit. Only one major identity change would have to be made in the Figure 3 chart. The Assyrian timeline second from the bottom of the page would have to be deleted, Ashuruballit would have to be identified as Ashuruballit I, son of Eriba-Adad, the second king of the Assyrian Middle kingdom, and that king’s timeline would have to be extended, filled with the names of all his known successors as found on our downloaded Assyrian king list.

It follows from the previous discussion that our kings Burnaburiash (grandfather of Kurigalzu II), his father Kadashman-Enlil II, Ashuruballit, (the Assyrian prince who served Mitanni overlords) and Suppiluliuma I (the first king of the Hittite Empire) , were the pharaohs named on the Amarna tablets. Additionally, since the Hittite Empire kings in our chart occupy the precise time frame scholars assigned to the neo-Hittites, we have proved our claim that the Neo-Hittites and the Empire Hittites are the same group of kings. Thus the synchronisms we proposed in our Volume 3, chapter 4, pp. 66-76, in a section entitled “Hittite Synchronisms with the 9th/8th Centuries” have all proved to be correct. Particularly pertinent is our former claim that the supposed “neo-Hittite” king Supalulme, encountered by Shalmanezar III in his first year raid on the Hatti land, was the Hittite Empire’s first king Suppiluliumas I in the last year of his reign. This identity is yet another important one, featuring as it does an Assyrian king. Literally dozens of synchronisms named in the traditional history remain true in our Figure 3 diagram. Historians tell us that Seti I fought a battle against the Hittite king Muwatallis, that Muwatallis fought the “Battle of Kadesh” against Ramses II in that king’s 5th year, that Ramses II signed a peace treaty with Hattusilis III in his 21st year, that in his 34th year Ramses II married one of the daughters of Hattusilis III, and Hattusilis is also known to have signed a treaty of alliance with Kadashman Turgu and corresponded with Kadashman-Enlil II. All of these synchronisms in the traditional history exist also in our Displaced Dynasties history, only now it has been confirmed that they took place in the 10th/ 9th centuries, not in the 14th/ 13th centuries.

Let the reader decide if we are right.