

5. BABYLONIA IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 2nd MILLENNIUM BC³⁹⁵

BABYLON I DYNASTY, THE EARLY KASSITE DYNASTY AND THE SEALAND I DYNASTY

Sources

BKL, chronicles, date-lists, documents, letters, literary texts, year-names, royal inscriptions, VT

General

The dates of the Babylon I and early Kassite dynasties are decisive for Mesopotamian chronology. Not only can the reigns of the Babylon I kings be safely linked to the Assyrian rulers (most notable is the synchronism between Šamši-Adad and Hammu-rāpi³⁹⁶); Ammišaduqa's reign has been absolutely dated with the help of the Venus cycles of the VT (→ **General and Astronomical Data**) in the past. Moreover, the rulers of the Sealand dynasty, who reigned parallel to the last rulers of the Babylon I dynasty and beyond (Ea-gāmil is a contemporary of Ulam-Buriaš), are mainly known from the **BKL B**. Whereas the dating of the Kassite

dynasty and the sequence of its rulers is still debated and for its early part highly uncertain, the rulers of the Babylon I dynasty and the length of their reigns are relatively well known. The chronology of each of these kings has been compiled and discussed by HORSNELL (1999) 3–93, who carefully studied the **date-lists** and **year-names** covering their reigns.³⁹⁶ Further evidence can be found in the kings' royal inscriptions compiled in RIMB. Besides important synchronisms with Assyrian kings, links to Elam help to reconstruct a chronological framework for the relative sequence of rulers of the Sukkalmah dynasty (Atta-hušu, Siwe-palar-huppak, Kudu-zuluš, Kuk-Našur II.).³⁹⁷ The rule of the eleven known kings of the Babylon I dynasty lasted a total of 300 years (Table 25).

RICHARDSON (2002) 2 argued that 300 years is slightly too high for the length of Babylon I: he assigned 19

<i>Sumuabum</i> ³⁹⁸	14 years	Atta-hušu
Sumulael	36 years	
Sēbium	14 years	Sin-iq ² ;am, Warad-Sin ³⁹⁹
Apil-Sin	18 years	
Sin-muballit	20 years	
Hammu-rāpi ⁴⁰⁰	43 years	R ² m-Sin I, Siwe-palar-huppak, Kudu-zuluš I
Samsuiluna	38 years	R ² m-Sin II, Iluma-AN, Agum I (?) ⁴⁰¹
Ab ² -e;uḫ	28 years	Iluma-AN
Ammiditana	37 years	Damiq-ilišu?
Ammišaduqa	21 years	Kuk-Našur II
Samsuditana	31 years	Muršili I

Table 25

³⁹⁵ → **Year** for the Ur III and Isin-Larsa dynasties. On the Old Babylonian period see CHARPIN (2004). All dates cited there follow the MC (see pp. 35–36).

³⁹⁶ HORSNELL (1999) 225–226. His table 31 compares the numbers of years attested in the **date-lists** and in **BKL B**. See also the tables by WALKER (1995).

³⁹⁷ Another synchronism is attested between Siruktuh and Šamši-Adad I. In 1995 Vallat presented an overview on 2nd millennium Elam and its civilization, with special emphasis on the history of Susa (which did not always belong to Elam). POTTS (1999) compiled the most important texts for the reconstruction of Elamite history and chronology.

³⁹⁸ CHARPIN (2004) 80–86 showed that Sumuabum presumably was not a king of Babylon, but ruled contemporaneously with Sumulael.

³⁹⁹ Indirect synchronism through **year-names**: EDZARD (1957) 21–22 and 169–170.

⁴⁰⁰ In their elaborate study CHARPIN – ZIEGLER (2003) 169ff. offered updated tables of synchronisms between Mari (Zimri-Līm), Ešnunna (Daduša, Ibāl-pi-El II), Babylon (Hammu-rāpi²) and Larsa (Rim-Sin I). → **Eponyms** sub 10.6. For the exact synchronism between Šamši-Adad I and Hammu-rāpi² → **Eponyms**.

⁴⁰¹ First ruler of the Sealand dynasty and second ruler of the Kassite dynasty (for this synchronism → below).

years instead of 21 (BKL B) to Ammišaduqa⁴⁰² and pointed out that only 26 or 27 year-names instead of 31 (BKL B) are attested for Samsuditana.⁴⁰³ His proposal will not go unchallenged.

Value for Absolute Chronology and Historical Relevance

The chronology of the Babylon I dynasty⁴⁰⁴ is interlocked with Assyrian chronology, which is mainly reconstructed on the basis of the **AKL** and **eponyms**. Many scholars have tried to draw an absolute date for the reign of the penultimate ruler of Babylon I Ammišaduqa from the **VT**. The best known synchronism between Assyria and Babylonia is that of Šamši-Adad I and Hammu-rāpi', the latter being also a contemporary of Rīm-Sîn I of Larsa, Siwe-palar-huppak and Kudu-zuluš of Elam (Sukkalmah dynasty). Hammu-rāpi' was the 6th ruler of the Babylon I dynasty,⁴⁰⁵ which traced its ancestors all the way back to the Gutian period (Gutium) and claimed common ancestry with the Amorite kings of Assyria (→ **GHD**). From his 30th year onwards Hammu-rāpi's power expanded rapidly to the

north and south over the main Mesopotamian cities. That year he broke with Rīm-Sîn I, defeated him and took Larsa. Two years later (in 1762, according to the MC) Hammu-rāpi' conquered Mari and advanced to the borders of Iamḥad/Ḥalab. Ešnunna and the trans-Tigridian city states also fell to Hammu-rāpi's army before the end of his reign. But his successors could not maintain control over his vast realm. Mari was lost 20 years after his death (emergence of the kingdom of Ḥana⁴⁰⁶), and during this time the **Sealand I dynasty** successfully established itself. According to recent studies on the end of the Babylon I dynasty that include archaeological evidence,⁴⁰⁷ Babylon's power did not decline as quickly as was believed some years ago. It still maintained its influence along the Euphrates: For example Terqa was ruled from Babylon as late as Ammišaduqa and Samsuditana.⁴⁰⁸ RICHARDSON (2002) 50 has linked the end of the Babylon I dynasty to Ammišaduqa's rather than Samsuditana's reign.⁴⁰⁹ He preferred to connect the fall of the Babylon I dynasty with "civil strife" – that is, internal Babylonian problems⁴¹⁰ – and the Kassites – rather than with the Hittite raid by Muršili I.⁴¹¹

⁴⁰² For details of his argument (equations of year-names) reviewing the recent studies of PIENKA (1998) and HORSNELL (1999) see pp. 202–206. In a personal communication van Koppen stated to me apropos Richardson's proposal for a shortened reign of Ammišaduqa (5.2.2004): "... I don't see how that is possible: the king lists have 21 years, there are 18 abundantly documented years, two more meagerly attested, but nonetheless obvious additional years, and enough obscure date formulae to assume the existence of one more, thus having 21 years. The last point is moot, but a reign shorter than 20 years is impossible."

⁴⁰³ Consequently Richardson dated the end of the Babylon dynasty to 1597 instead of 1595 (he uses the MC throughout his work). However, 1595 is based on the evaluation of the astronomical data of the VT and cannot be altered without consequences: Thus Richardson did not use the MC literally, but only for an approximate chronological orientation and all his dates have to be considered as relative.

⁴⁰⁴ Most of the documentation does not derive from Babylon, but from Sippar and Larsa: KUHRT (1995) 108.

⁴⁰⁵ Cornelius and Albright proposed 1728–1686 for Hammu-rāpi' (see also PRITCHARD, ANET [1950]) = LC. Hrozný following Smith and UNGNAD, proposed 1791 as the accession date for Hammu-rāpi' = MC. VAN DER MEER (1947) suggested a slightly shorter chronology, 1711 + x – 1660 + x, and in his later revised edition (1955): 1724–1682. Some of the chronological implications for the Old Babylonian period due to the discovery and publication of the tablets from Mari were summarized by Dhorme at the 2nd CRRAI, Paris (1951) 35ff. (for an attempt to synchronize the rulers of Mari with those of Assyria and Babylonia see p. 39). For evidence on synchronisms in texts from Larsa see LEMMANS (1955) 202–204. (→ **General** sub Chronological Systems and → **Astronomical Data**). Studies on

Hammu-rāpi' were presented by CHARPIN (2003) and VAN DE MIEROOP (2005).

⁴⁰⁶ On the influence of the Babylonian rulers Ammišaduqa and Samsuditana at Terqa ("Babylonian interregnum") see ROUAULT, MDAR 56. On Terqa note CHARPIN (2002) 61–92 (who comments on the studies by Podany and Rouault) and (2004) 391 as well as EDER (2004) 221–223, who attempts to integrate the rulers of Terqa from the Dark Age into his chronology discussion.

⁴⁰⁷ GASCHE, MHEM 1 (1989).

⁴⁰⁸ ROUAULT, MDAR 56 and VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 23⁸³ (referring to trade activity by the Babylonians in this area). The study on the end of the Babylon I dynasty by RICHARDSON (2002) examines the economic and political history of the late Babylon I dynasty in an effort to determine the causes for its collapse. For a summary of his results see pp. 53–56. On p. 12⁴⁹ Richardson pointed out the problems posed by the fact that Samsuditana lost Ḥarādum but retained Terqa.

⁴⁰⁹ Crucial for Richardson is the end of the documentation of Ḥarādum in Ammišaduqa's 18th year and the destruction of the Ur-Utu house in Sippar-Amnānum, which the author would like to connect with an overall destruction of Sippar-Amnānum.

⁴¹⁰ RICHARDSON (2002) 55–56 and 195. His chapter 7.5.0 is devoted to the situation in Babylonia before the end of the Babylon I dynasty focusing on internal problems rather than external threats. A "wider" view with special emphasis on the situation in Northern Mesopotamia (role of the Kassites and early Mittani) has been lately presented by VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 9–33. Sources referring to the fall of Babylon are the King Chronicle, the Edict of Telipinu, a prayer of Muršili II to the sun goddess of Arinna and KUB 26, 74. See SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2004a) 290.

More chronological information on the Babylon I dynasty can be drawn from the **BKL**, which listed the kings in successive order, neglecting synchronisms with rival rulers (such as the Larsa and Isin I dynasties; compare with the SKL → **Year**). As was mentioned in chapter 4.2., the BKL B provides reign lengths for each of the eleven kings of Babylon I. But these numbers have not proven reliable and must be corrected by the number of **year-names** known for each ruler (**date-lists**).⁴¹² Synchronisms with Assyrian kings are preserved in the **Synchronistic KL** (where is also preserved the Sealand I dynasty), which is not very reliable chronologically either. RICHARDSON (2002) 7–8 and 54–55 demonstrated a decrease in the number of surviving texts for the time after the revolt of Rim-Sin II of Larsa during the reign of Samsuiluna. This was due to the abandonment of cities in central and southern Babylonia. Most of our information of this area derives from texts from northern Babylonia.⁴¹³

An almost complete absence of texts can be noticed for the time after the fall of Babylon caused by the Hittites. This event, which was caused by Muršili I, is known from the Edict of Telipinu (CTH 19): “Now later he went to Babylon, he destroyed Babylon and fought the Hurrian [troops]. Babylon’s deportees (and) its goods he kept in Ḫat[tuša]...”⁴¹⁴ Other references to Muršili’s raid can also be found in the **Agum-kakrime inscription** (→ **Royal Inscription** and **below**) and the Babylonian **King Chronicle**. The latter reports:

“At the time of Samsuditana the Hittites marched against Akkad.” (rev. 11f.). Though the King Chronicle only states that “the Hittite” came to Babylonia, CTH 19, §9, some other Hittite texts (KBo 3, 45 and 57 as well as KUB 26, 74⁴¹⁵) make it clear that “the Hittite” is to be identified with Muršili I. As reported in CTH 19 Muršili I first campaigned against Ḫalab before turning to Babylonia against Samsuditana, who had reigned 31 years according to the BKL. The exact point of time within Muršili’s reign is unknown, but it is agreed that this attack brought down the Babylon I dynasty. This event is alluded to in the **Agum-kakrime inscription** and the **Marduk prophecy**: here it is reported that the statue of Marduk was returned from Ḫani to Babylon by Agum-kakrime after 24 years of exile.⁴¹⁶

Crucial for absolute Babylonian chronology and the length of the Dark Age is the date of the start of the **early Kassite dynasty**.⁴¹⁷ Besides the lack of information on the Kassites from the Old Babylonian period,⁴¹⁸ little on the transition of dynasties is known to us. Texts of the Kassite period only start with Kurigalzu II: We have no contemporary sources of the Kassites for the first 170 years (LC, and depending on the absolute dates of the Babylon I dynasty), and uncertainties concerning the succession of early Kassite rulers as well as their reign lengths exist. The **BKL A** says that the Kassite dynasty ruled 576 (years), 9 months and had 36 kings (→ **Distanzangaben**). The last Kassite ruler Enlil-nādin-aḫi is to be placed ca.

⁴¹¹ Textual evidence indicates that the Babylon I dynasty was struggling to survive. The last document from Ḫarādum (situated south of Mari) dates to the “17+b” year of Ammišaduqa: see JOANNÈS, in: KEMPINSKI-LECOMTE (ed.) (1992) 34. The other texts from Ḫarādum mainly date to the reigns of Samsuiluna and Samsuditana and testify to the considerable influence of the Babylonians on the Middle Euphrates region at that time. All towns and cities in southern Mesopotamia were abandoned during the reign of Samsuiluna. Texts from other sites from the reign of the last ruler Samsuditana (Kiš, Dilbat, Sippar, Sippar-Amnānum and Babylon) indicate that by the time the empire had shrunk to the size it had at the beginning of Hammu-rāpi’s reign. For an overview on Old Babylonian sites see GODDEERIS (2002). New textual finds from Terqa dated to the reigns of Ammišaduqa and Samsuditana may reveal new evidence for chronology (see PODANY [2002] 56).

⁴¹² This task has been undertaken by HORSNELL (1999). On their contents, especially those referring to the Late Old Babylonian period, see RICHARDSON (2002) 6–7. Fewer references to military events can be noted from the time of Samsuiluna onwards.

⁴¹³ RÖLLIG (1965) 110–115 has compiled all important evidence on the period of Rim-Sin II and Samsuiluna. According to the **Larsa KL**, as well as other sources, Samsuiluna’s 13th year marks the end of the rule of Rim-Sin II. But soon Babylon

seems to have lost power over Larsa (and southern Babylonia as a whole), probably because of threats by the Sealand. The decline in the number of surviving texts and its socioeconomic and historical implications is subject of van Koppen’s investigation based on (mainly unpublished) texts.

⁴¹⁴ A translation has been provided by VAN DEN HOUT, in: HALLO – YOUNGER (eds.), *The Context of Scripture I*, Leiden – New York – Köln (1997) 194–198 (on Muršili I see esp. p. 195). Later references to this event can be found in **royal inscriptions** or in the **Marduk prophecy**, etc. referring to the abduction of the Marduk statue. RICHARDSON (2002) 56–57²⁰⁹ considered this raid to have been “a minor military operation”.

⁴¹⁵ Referring to Šanḫara/Samḫarū instead of Babylon: on this term see VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 22⁷⁸.

⁴¹⁶ For the Agum-kakrime inscription as a possible hint of the importance of Ḫana see PODANY (2002) 58–59. For the passage of return in this inscription see STEIN (2000) 153.

⁴¹⁷ The earliest evidence on the Kassites derives from the Alalaḫ VII archives and from Babylon dating to the time of Samsuiluna year 9: DE SMET (1990) 8–12 (who also discusses the problem of the origin of the Kassites; eliminate de Smet’s reference to Mari, where the toponym Gaššu in Upper Mesopotamia is referred to).

⁴¹⁸ On a non-administrative document from this period, the literary text CBS 1422, referring to the Kassites see MICHALOWSKI (1981) 385–389.

1155. The dynasty's beginning therefore would be 1729 or 1730, suggesting a significant overlap with the Babylon I dynasty. But, since no further independent evidence exists, all the Babylonian time spans are generally limited in their usefulness. However, BKL A remains a starting point for the relative chronology of the Kassite dynasty, listing kings nos. 1–6 and 26–36 (regnal years only of kings nos. 22–25 are preserved). The **Synchronistic KL** parallels part of the sequence with the names of the first 13 rulers of this dynasty (see WEIDNER [1926] 70; the second column yielded no usable information on the latter part of the dynasty). Eight of the Kassite rulers, which must have ruled for a short period of time, are said to parallel the Assyrian king Šamši-Adad II.⁴¹⁹ The Synchronistic KL and BKL A give different names for kings nos. 4 and 5 (Abi-Rattaš). BRINKMAN, MSKH 26–27 attempted a detailed reconstruction of the sequence of monarchs for the whole Kassite dynasty (→ **BKL**) and his study remains basic for Kassite sources, history and chronology. But it is still unknown who was the Kassite king who established Kassite rule in Babylon after the reign of the last Babylon I ruler Samsuditana.

BKL A gives the number of reign lengths of Kassite kings nos. 1–4 (Gandaš, Agum I, Kaštiliašu and x-šī) and 23–36, while the **Synchronistic KL** reports the names of Kassite kings 1–13. Kings 7–14 are only preserved in the Synchronistic KL, but only the names Harba-x (no. 7, contemporary with Šamši-Adad II) and Burna-Burīaš I (no. 10, contemporary with Išme-Dagān II) can be safely reconstructed – though BRINKMAN, MSKH 11 restores king no. 9 as Agum (II). SASSMANNSHAUSEN, MDAR 63 (following Brinkman) placed Burna-Burīaš I after Išme-Dagān II (leaving aside the idea that there might have been two different Burna-Burīaš). Unfortunately, we lack sources confirming this part of the Synchronistic KL: other parts of it have proven to be incorrect. Another text sheds light on this period: The **Synchronistic History I**, 5'–7' reports on a treaty between Burna-Burīaš I and Puzur-Aššur III concerning the borders between

Assyria and Babylonia. Burna-Burīaš I is succeeded by Kaštiliašu III and Ulam-Burīaš. Further, the **King Chronicle** rev. 11–17 mentions campaigns against the Sealand I dynasty⁴²⁰ by Ulam-Burīaš, brother of Kaštiliašu III and Agum, son of Kaštiliašu (usually assumed to refer to Agum III, since Agum II was contemporary with Šamši-Adad II). A knob (macehead?; VA Bab. 645 = BE 6405) mentions Ulam-Burīaš as king of the Sealand I dynasty and son of Burna-Burīaš. Agum III might also be mentioned in the year-names of the texts from Qal'at al-Baḥrain⁴²¹ (after his conquest of the Sealand).

The **Agum-kakrime inscription** is possibly written in the name of Agum II referred to as Agum-kakrime who claimed to have brought back the statues of Marduk and Šarpanitum from Ḫani to Babylon which had been stolen by the Hittites, presumably during Muršili's I raid (→ **Royal Inscriptions**). According to the **Marduk prophecy**, the statues had been gone 24 years. If the above Burna-Burīaš is identified with the 10th Kassite king, who is also mentioned in the **Synchronistic KL** (→ above), Kaštiliašu, Ulam-Burīaš and Agum may be regarded as three of his successors, perhaps kings nos. 11–13 or 12–14. Kaštiliašu and Agum, however, are not given any royal titles, and Ulam-Burīaš is only called “king of the Sealand”. Apart from the fact that their reign lengths are unknown, it has to be kept in mind that the sequence of the Early Kassite kings nos. 4–14 is far from secure. Thus a chronological conclusion from this Babylonian Distanzangabe is considered to be problematic.

Invasions by Kassites are first mentioned during the reign of Samsuiluna (year 9)⁴²² and later in a date formula of Abī-ešuḫ, possibly from his third year.⁴²³ The **year-names** imply military conflicts in the corelands of Babylonia caused by Kassite aggression.⁴²⁴ VAN LERBERGHE (1995) 379–393 compiled (new) evidence on the beginning of the Kassites in Babylon during the Old Babylonian period, specifically referring to a group of texts including the letter AbB 1, 2 dating to the reign of Ammišaduqa (p. 384) possibly

⁴¹⁹ According to the AKL Šamši-Adad II ended the reign 58 years before the accession of Puzur-Aššur III.

⁴²⁰ More details on the links between the Sealand I dynasty and the Kassites are to be expected from the yet unpublished “Sealand” archive in the Schøyen collection. According to GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 34ff., this period, which lasted only ca. 24 years, is marked by instability and dislocation. It coincides with the ceramic sequence of Nippur and Tell ed-Dēr (ancient Sippar-Amnānum). It was at this point, according to the NC, that Babylon was resettled by the Kassites.

⁴²¹ See SASSMANNSHAUSEN, MDAR 63 (with further literature). See *id.* (2006) 167: here he rescinds some of his ideas in MDAR due to the uncertain reading of the date of the document found in Baḥrain.

⁴²² DE SMET (1990) 1–6 and SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2004a) 288 and 292.

⁴²³ HORSNELL (1999) 245.

⁴²⁴ PIENKA (1998) 258. See also DE GRAEF, *Akkadica* 111 (1999) 1–48 on the period between Abī-ešuḫ and Samsuditana. For another list of attestations of Kassites in Old Babylonian texts see SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2004a) 296–301.

referring to a Kassite (?) tribe named Samḥarî⁴²⁵ under the control of a certain Kaštil, who might be identified as the Kassite king Kaštiliašu.⁴²⁶ According to VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 22⁷⁸, the Kassite community along the Middle Euphrates was known by the name Samḥarû/î. Only later, when the Kassites actually controlled Babylon, was this term used for the whole kingdom of Babylon. The occurrences of Kassites identified by means of Kassite names in Old Babylonian texts have been compiled by SASSMANNSHAUSEN in OLA 96 (1999) 409–424, where he stressed that no Kassite personal names appear in documents from Mari, Tell Leilân, Šaġar Bāzār, Tuttul or Kaniš.

Another Old Babylonian letter AbB 6, 24 (the so-called “Agum letter”), states that Agum housed messengers from Ḥalab.⁴²⁷ This letter presumably dates to the reign of Samsuiluna. Consequently this Kassite ruler or prince (*bukāšum*) may be identified with Agum I, the second known Kassite king according to all chronologies. His synchronism with Samsuiluna is established on the basis of this very text. The “Agum letter” offers further evidence for Agum’s (and the Kassites’) domination of the Middle Euphrates during the Old Babylonian period. However, BRINKMAN, MSKH 97 (sub Agum I) emphasizes that the identification of the Agum of this letter with any of the previously mentioned Agums remains uncertain.

A crucial **year-name** discussed by Cole in *Dating ...*, 84 from a **Tell Muḥammad** text refers to the resettlement of Babylon. Cole believes this to be an allusion to the Kassite take-over.⁴²⁸ Linking the lunar eclipse mentioned in two of the year-names with pottery sequences⁴²⁹ and textual/historical evidence, GASCHE *et al.* found more evidence for the NC. (→ **Astronomical Data** sub 3.4.) The texts from Tell Muḥammad date to the early Kassite period and are still mostly unpublished.⁴³⁰ Some of the Tell Muḥammad texts include a year-name reading: MU.x.KĀM(.MA) ša KĀ.DINGIR.RA.KI *uš-bu* “year x that Babylon was (re)settled”. “x” of these year-names, which are of a

type otherwise unknown, is a number from 36 to 41. These year-names appear in texts of level II of Tell Muḥammad.⁴³¹ The resettlement of Babylon to which they refer is most probably that following the attack of Muršili I. SASSMANNSHAUSEN, MDAR 64 concluded that Babylon was rebuilt provisionally soon after the Hittite raid and that the Tell Muḥammad texts belong to the beginning of the Kassite period. However, RICHARDSON (2002) 9 stated that “it is not in fact clear precisely when this resettlement happened” and that the link to the Kassites is nowhere explicitly stated.

The Ḥana kings were contemporary with at least part of the Babylon I dynasty, as well as with other such kingdoms as Iamḥad, Ešnunna, Susa and the Sealand. Depending on the amount of time covered by the texts, late Ḥana kings may have been neighbors of the Kassite rulers in Mesopotamia. Earlier archives of Terqa record a ruler with a well known Kassite name: Kaštiliašu, who ruled before the Babylonians Ammišaduqa and Samsuditana controlled Terqa.⁴³² Kaštiliašu of Terqa may be identified with Kaštiliašu I or II of Babylon depending on the chronology applied (see PODANY [2002] 48). Still, we lack evidence supporting this identification, and the Kassites’ role in Terqa and along the Middle Euphrates is still unclear since the texts are still unpublished. PODANY (2002) 50 pointed out: “... Kassite princes with an aggressive military were settled perhaps on the Euphrates, probably north of Terqa, by the end of the reign of Samsuiluna or the beginning of Abiešuḥ. This is approximately the time that the Babylonians must have lost control over the region of Ḥana.” She believed that Terqa was the base from which the Kassites launched attacks against Babylonia (p. 51). Rouault, whose reconstruction of the line of Terqa rulers differs from that of Podany and Charpin, placed Kaštiliašu of Terqa just after or just before Ḥanaya and Iauša (= Ušše?) – that is before the beginning of the Kassite dynasty in Babylonia and synchronous with the end of the reign of Samsuiluna.⁴³³

⁴²⁵ VAN LERBERGHE (1995) 384–385. More details on this term can now be found in VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 22⁷⁸ and SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2004a) 289–290¹⁷.

⁴²⁶ See VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 22–23, especially on independent Kassites from the reign of Abī-ešuḥ onwards, based primarily on observations of the slave trade in the Late Old Babylonian period.

⁴²⁷ See LANDSBERGER (1954) 62–63, BRINKMAN, MSKH 96–97 or PODANY (2002) 49.

⁴²⁸ Difficulties with the translation of the year-name were recognized by SEAL (2001) 169 and SASSMANNSHAUSEN, OLA 96 (1999) 413–414: → **Year-names** and **Astronomical Data**. A

list of the Tell Muḥammad year-names appears in SASSMANNSHAUSEN (2004a) 302–305.

⁴²⁹ The Tell Muḥammad material which partly dates to the Late Old Babylonian period (phases III and II) shows strong resemblances to that from Tell ed-Dēr.

⁴³⁰ 30 texts were published by AL-UBAID in her MA thesis, Baghdad (1983).

⁴³¹ GASCHE *et al.*, *Dating ...* 86–87.

⁴³² ROUAULT (1992) 253–254, PODANY (2002) 43ff. (on Kaštiliašu of Terqa and his chronological setting).

⁴³³ ROUAULT, MDAR 55–56.

List of Late Old Babylonian rulers of Terqa⁴³⁴

Archives	Rulers	Synchronisms
		Fall of Mari (Hammu-rāpi ³ 35) ? Abba-AN/El (ġ alab)
Puzurum ⁴³⁵ Sin-imguranni (s.o. I ₁ tar-i ₁ me ₁ u)	Iapa ³ -Sumu-[abu] ³ I ₁ si-Sumu-abu Iadi³-abu Zimri-L²m*	Samsuiluna year 28 Zimri-L ² m
Sin-imguranni Gimil-Ninkarrak ⁴³⁶ (s.o. I ₁ tar-i ₁ me ₁ u)	Kasapan / Kasap-ili* Kuari / Kuwari* ġ anaya* Ka ₁ tilia ₁ u Šunu³ru-Ammu Ammi-madar	under the control of Iau ₁ a (=U ₁ i ₁ e ₂ ?) Ab ² -e ₁ u ³
	Ammišaduqa (Babylon) Samsuditana (Babylon)	Ammišaduqa (“ Bab. Interregnum ”) Samsuditana (“ Bab. Interregnum ”)
	Iddin-Kakka Išar-L²m Iggid-L ² m I ₁ si ³ -Dag ³ n / I ₁ ssi-Dag ³ n A³uni ⁴³⁷ Hammu-rāpi³ ⁴³⁸	“Early Middle Babylonian Period” “kings of ġ ana”
	Q ² -Addu (Mittanian control) Pagiru	Parattarna (Mittani) and Sausadatra (Sau ₁ tatar ³ of Mittani)
	Tukult ² -Ninurta I / Šalmaneser I Ilu-iq²ša Tukulti-Mer	<i>līmu Libur-zanin-Aššur</i>

* These rulers who cannot be placed securely (ROUAULT [2001] 16 versus PODANY [2002] 10 and 12 and especially CHARPIN [2002] 68–71 and [2004] 391): The dating of the rulers **Iadi³-abum II**, **Zimri-Līm**, son of **Iadi³-abum**, **Kasapan/Kasap-ili**, **Kuari** and **Iauša/Ĥanaya** remains uncertain; maybe they can be placed after Samsuditana, that is according to Podany the “Middle Period.” Bold type marks father-son pairs.

Table 26

Close to the larger cities of Babylonia, especially in the area of Sippar, were Kassite camps and houses⁴³⁹ that seem to have been integrated into Babylonian society peacefully.⁴⁴⁰ This means that the Kassites had

settled in Babylonian territory during Samsuiluna’s reign long before the Hittite raid, as had been pointed out by SMITH (1940) 24.⁴⁴¹ PODANY (2002) 43–51, in connection with the identification of Kaštiliašu of

⁴³⁴ Based on ROUAULT, MDAR 54. For a different view in the succession of Terqa rulers see PODANY (1997) 428–429 and CHARPIN, *N.A.B.U.* 1995/23, 19–20, (2002) 61–91 and (2004) 391.

⁴³⁵ Puzurum is one of the major protagonists in the archives (“House of Puzurum”).

⁴³⁶ Gimil-Ninkarrak’s scribe was Pagiru, another member of a well known family from Terqa. Gimil-Ninkarrak was a servant of Kaštiliašu: PODANY (2002) 22.

⁴³⁷ Previously read Azilia: see ROUAULT, MDAR 54.

⁴³⁸ On the later chronological placement of Ĥammu-rāpi³ see PODANY (1991–1993) 62 (in connection with a *līmu*-date of

Tukulti-Ninurta I). She proposed the existence of two different rulers with the name Hammu-rāpi³. EDER (2004) 223⁹⁶ states that Podany’s placement of Hammu-rāpi³ after Qjš-Addu is due to her preference for the MC. For a different reconstruction see ROUAULT, MDAR 56.

⁴³⁹ For an explanation of the meaning of “Kassite houses” as seats of a semi-independent Kassite polity see VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 22⁷⁵.

⁴⁴⁰ PIENKA (1998) 258–259 with further references. See also SASSMANNSHAUSEN, OLA 96 (1999) 411.

⁴⁴¹ See also VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 22 on the location of the Kassites to the northwest of the Babylonian heartland.

Terqa, proposed the existence of a Kassite state from the reign of Abī-ešūḫ onwards.⁴⁴² Also hostile hordes associated with the Hurrians attacked Babylonia towards the end of the Babylon I dynasty (Ammišaduqa). It has been archaeologically proven that Tell ed-Dēr was destroyed by the end of Ammišaduqa's reign, most probably by the Kassites.⁴⁴³ Unfortunately, none of these attacks can be linked with a specific Kassite ruler known from the BKL.

On the Middle and Late Kassite period starting with Kurigalzu II → **BKL (A)**, which provides the crucial data for the kings' reigns.⁴⁴⁴

Gandaš	?, 26 years	Samsuiluna (?) ⁴⁴⁵
Agum I (<i>mahrū/rabū</i>)	?, 22 years	Samsuiluna (?) ⁴⁴⁶
Kaštiliaš I	?, 22 years	
Uije?	?	
Ab ² -Rattaš?	?	
Kaštiliaš II?	?	
Urzigurumaš	?	
šarba-x	?	
Tiptakzi?	?	
Agum II?	?	
Burna-Buriaš I ⁴⁴⁷	?	Puzur-Aššur III
Kaštiliaš III?	?	
Ulam-Buriaš?	?	Ea-gāmil
Agum III?	?	
Kara-indaš ⁴⁴⁸	?	Aššur-bēl-nišešū
Kadašman-šarbe I	?	
Kurigalzu I	?	
Kadašman-Enlil I	min. 15 years	
Burna-Buriaš II	min. 27 years	
Kara-šardaš	(1 year) 1133	Aššur-uballiš
Nazi-Bugaš	(1 year) 1133	Aššur-uballiš
Kurigalzu II	25 years	Aššur-uballiš

Table 27

The **Sealand I dynasty** ruled lower Mesopotamia, which was called *māt tāmti(m)/KUR A.AB.BA*. According to the BKL A and B Sealand had at least three dynasties and maintained its importance as long as Babylon remained independent (until 539). According to the **BKL A** the Sealand I dynasty lasted 368 years (ca. 1740–1475 according to the MC), which is also mentioned in the **BKL B** (which only provides a list of its kings), the **Synchronistic KL**,⁴⁴⁹ and the **Dynastic Chronicle**. BRINKMAN (1993–1997) 7 offered a table of rulers based on those texts after collation.⁴⁵⁰ Reign lengths in the BKL A are unconfirmed by other sources.

The **King Chronicle** presents a chronological framework for the beginning and the end of the dynasty (ABC no. 20 B, rev. 1ff.). Iluma-AN, the first ruler of the dynasty, was contemporary with Samsuiluna⁴⁵¹ and Abī-ešūḫ of Babylon (for year-names in Nippur documents during Iluma-AN see LANDSBER-

GER [1954] 68¹⁷⁴ and BRINKMAN [1993–1997] 6). Iluma-AN successfully resisted the Babylonian kings. Ea-gāmil, the last ruler of the dynasty fled to Elam before the invasion of the Kassite Ulam-Buriaš (brother of Kaštiliaš III), who then became the overlord of the Sealand. Furthermore, it is stated that Agum (III), son of Kaštiliaš III marched against the Sealand and destroyed the Enlil-temple in Dūr Enlil. All these synchronisms between the Early Kassite and Sealand dynasties are not as useful chronologically as they may seem because the absolute chronology of neither dynasty can be fixed and thus the precise dates of the synchronisms cannot be determined. The synchronisms of the Early Kassite

⁴⁴² PODANY (2002) 47, referring to the Kaštiliaš attested at Terqa, whose identification is under discussion depending on which chronology is applied, stressed: "It is clear, no matter which chronology is correct, that the Kassite dynasty overlapped that of the Late Old Babylonian kings."

⁴⁴³ CHARPIN, *RA* 82 (1998) 26³⁴. On different Kassite groups in Babylonia see PIENKA (1998) 262.

⁴⁴⁴ A summary was presented by SASSMANNSHAUSEN, MDAR 61–70. For a detailed study see BRINKMAN, MSKH and id. (1983) 67–74.

⁴⁴⁵ GASCHÉ *et al.*, *Dating ...* (chart with note 27). The synchronism is based on the fact that the Kassites are first mentioned during the reign of Samsuiluna (year 9). EDER (2004) 214–217 synchronized Gandaš and Samsuditana based on the **Gandaš inscription** (BM 77438 → **Distanzangaben** and **Royal Inscriptions**). He assumed that the Kassite dynasty beginning with Gandaš starts after or with the fall of Babylon dated to 1665 (linear succession). However, his conclusions are based mainly on his interpretation of the highly disputed Agum-kakrime inscription. Between Agum I and Agum II he reconstructed five generations, and from Gandaš to Burna-Buriaš I (a contemporary of Puzur-Aššur III) seven generations covering 170 years. (Eder's dates are based on a very high chronology reconstructed mainly on the basis of the Assyrian Distanzangaben).

⁴⁴⁶ Synchronism based on the interpretation of the Agum letter (→ above).

⁴⁴⁷ Mentioned with his Assyrian counterpart in the **Synchronistic History**.

⁴⁴⁸ He is recorded together with the contemporary Assyrian ruler Aššur-bēl-nišešū in the **Synchronistic History**. (See SASSMANNSHAUSEN, MDAR 62.) Perhaps he was also contemporary with Tutmosis III.

⁴⁴⁹ See GRAYSON (1980–1983) 116–125. For references to the end of the Sealand I dynasty (Ea-gāmil and Ulam-Buriaš) see esp. lines 19–22.

⁴⁵⁰ Previous chronological studies on the Sealand I dynasty were by LANDSBERGER (1954) 68–70 and RÖLLIG (1965) 115–119.

⁴⁵¹ Iluma-AN year 1 = Samsuiluna year 9

rulers with the Assyrians in the Synchronistic KL have proven to be very unreliable.

Later texts – with a few exceptions (KLs, chronicles, etc.) – seldom mention the Sealand dynasty.⁴⁵² Gulkišar appears in a colophon dating;⁴⁵³ and a Distanzangabe (BE 1, 83, 6–8) reports that 696 years elapsed between him and Nebuchadnezzar I (1125–1104; → **Distanzangaben** sub 9.6.). The first king of the Sealand II dynasty Simbar-šipak (1025–1008) is referred to in the **Dynastic Chronicle V**, 3 as “man/soldier of the dynasty of Damiq-ilišu”. During the period between ca. 1475 and 1026 the Sealand was under control of the Kassites and the Isin II dynasty. Since no genealogical ties are known for the Sealand I rulers, no **generation** count is possible.

In total twelve kings of the Sealand I dynasty are known (Table 28):

Iluma-AN	^a x + 1 ⁷	Samsuiluna, Ab ² e;u ⁰
Itti-ili-n ² b ²	^a 40 (+ 10) + 5 ⁷	
Damiq-ili;u	^a 10 (+) + 6 ⁷	Ammiditana?
I; kibal	^a 15 ⁷	
Šu; i	^a 24 ⁷	
Gulki; ar	55	
'DIŠ+U-EN or 'GIŠ-EN ⁴⁵⁵	– (12?) ⁴⁵⁴	
Pe; galdarama; i	50	
Adarakalama	28	
Akurduana	26	
Melamkurkura	7	
Ea-g ² mil	^a 9 ⁷	Ulam-Buria; i

Table 28

According to the **BKL A** the Babylon I dynasty ruled 300 years and Sealand I 368 years, which is inconsistent with the reported reign lengths. Since the first year of Iluma-AN synchronizes with the ninth year of Samsuiluna, the two dynasties coexisted for about 147 years. Another important synchronism is that of Ea-gāmil, who was called “king of the Sealand” and dethroned by Ulam-Buriaš (= 13th ruler of the Kassite dynasty).

Hurrians⁴⁵⁶ as well as Kassites are mentioned in the Late Old Babylonian period as well. A Hurrian population existed to the west of the Euphrates in Ḫalab, Uršum, Ḫaššum and Karkemiš⁴⁵⁷ and to the east from the Zagros mountains, the mountainous areas of Northern Mesopotamia to the Ḫabūr basin. Apparently the formation of the **Ḫanigalbat/Mittani** state falls in this period,⁴⁵⁸ or shortly after the fall of Babylon. Further evidence on early Mittani comes from Old Hittite sources (esp. **Ḫattušili I**), which refer to a “king of the people from Hurri”, who were then strong enemies of the Hittites (“Hurrian enemy” or “enemy of the country of Ḫanigalbat”).⁴⁵⁹ Another important source of information is the statue of Idrimi in which a treaty between Idrimi and Parattarna is mentioned. This treaty refers to the existence of “earlier Hurrian kings”. The dating of Idrimi (in the 15th century after the conquest of Ḫalab by Muršili I) is relevant for the historical role of Mittani, whose dominance over Ḫalab could have been either during the reign of Samsuditana or after the fall of Babylon.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵² See LAMBERT (1990) 28.

⁴⁵³ OPPENHEIM *et al.*, *Glass and Glassmaking in Ancient Mesopotamia*, Chicago (1970) 63–64.

⁴⁵⁴ BRINKMAN (1977) 347⁸.

⁴⁵⁵ Only preserved in the Synchronistic KL. → **BKL A**

⁴⁵⁶ Note especially persons which carry Hurrian names: WILHELM (1982) 18, CHARPIN, CRRAI 38 (1992) 207–218 and SALVINI, PdP 55 (2000) 55ff. (esp. Tigunānu) and 103ff. (esp. Alalah and Ḫalab).

⁴⁵⁷ Mittani or Ḫanigalbat is not even mentioned in the texts of Tunip-Teššup, a contemporary of Ḫattušili I (see DE MARTINO, MDAR 35). See also VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 23, who suggests there was some kind of a strong Hurrian entity in the Ḫabūr basin at least 50 years before the breakdown of the Babylon I dynasty.

⁴⁵⁸ WILHELM (1993–1997) 291–293, DE MARTINO, PdP 55 (2000) 68ff. and MDAR 35–42, KÜHNE (1999) 203ff. Since some excellent summaries and reviews on the early Hurrians and Mittani have been published, nothing further need be said here. (See DE MARTINO, MDAR 35–42 and FREU [2003].)

⁴⁵⁹ An earlier conflict between the Hurrians and Hittites is possibly attested in a yet unpublished text from Terqa with

a year-name which mentions conflicts between Kuwari, ruler of Terqa, and Ḫattum (written Ḫattu/Ḫatte), possibly Ḫatti (?), that seem to have occurred near the beginning of the 17th cent. (MC; see ROUAULT, MDAR 55).

⁴⁶⁰ Idrimi, a contemporary of Parattarna I and Tutmosis III, may be dated to the transition between Alalah level V and level IV (around 1500). On the statue of Idrimi (AIT 3) see DIETRICH – LORETZ, *UF* 13 (1981) 201–269, KLENGEL, *UF* 13 (1981) 269–278, MAYER-OPFICIUS, *UF* 13 (1981) 279–290, MÁRQUEZ ROWE (1997) 177–205 and VON DASSOW (2008) 23–45. For various chronological schemes that put his reign somewhere in the interval ca. 1525–1460 see McCLELLAN, in: *FS Kantor* (1989) 183. A summary on the chronology of Alalah can be found in BERGOFFEN (2003) 395–410. Since few texts have been found in Idrimi's palace BERGOFFEN (2003) 400 assumed that he is to be dated to Alalah level V(B). However, VON DASSOW (2008) 36 observes some evidence for Idrimi's rule during Alalah IV (with an extended discussion on Bergoffen's results of 2005). For Idrimi's importance in the formation of the Mittani state during or shortly after the end of the Babylon I dynasty, note VAN KOPPEN, MDAR 20.

Overview of the Dark Age of Mesopotamia (dates according to the MC)⁴⁶¹

Babylonia	Kassites	Sealand I dynasty	Assyria
Hammu-rāpiš (1792–1750)			Šamī ² -Adad I (39) (1807–1775 ⁴⁶²)
Samsuiluna (1749–1712)	Ganda ₃ (1)	Iluma-AN	I ₁ me-Dag ^{an} I (40) (1775–1761 ⁴⁶²)
Ab ² -e ₂ u ² (1711–1684)	Agum I (2)		A ₁ jjur-dugul (41) 6 years
Ammiditana (1683–1647)	Ka ₃ tilia ₃ u I (3)	Damiq-ili ₃ u	kings 42–47 ca. 1 year?
Ammi, aduqa (1646–1626)			kings 48–55 ca. 115 years
Samsuditana (1625–1595)			ri ₃ um III (56) 13 years
Mur ₃ ili's I raid: end of the Babylon I dynasty	kings 4–9	Gulki ₃ ar (6)	Šamī ² -Adad II (57) 15 years
			I ₁ me-Dag ^{an} II (58) 6 years
			Šamī ² -Adad III (59) 15 years
			A ₁ jjur-n ² r ² r ² (60) 25 years
	Burna-Buria ₃ (10)		Puzur-A ₁ jjur III (61) 14/24 years
	Ulam-Buria ₃ (12)	Ea-g ² mil (11)	
			kings 62–66 42 years
			Enlil-n ² ,ir II (67) 1422/20–1417/1415
			A ₁ jjur-n ² r ² r ² II (68) 1415–1409
	Kara-inda ₃		A ₁ jjur-b ² l-ni ₃ i ₃ u (69) 1409–1402

Table 29

Links

Astronomical Data, BKL, Chronicles, Date-lists, Dynastic Chronicle, Eponyms, Historical Epic, Isin I dynasty, King Chronicle, Larsa dynasty, Royal Inscriptions, Synchronistic KL, Year-names

⁴⁶¹ See VEENHOF (2001) 311 (table 6). EDER (2004) 218–221, using a chronology higher even than the HC, gives much earlier dates than those in this table for the beginnings of the Kassite and Sealand dynasties. Due to his interpretation of the **Distanzangaben** the duration of the Dark Age is

stretched to 160 years). Furthermore he makes use of the Babylonian time spans, which are generally rejected for chronological purposes by other scholars.

⁴⁶² → General sub 1.7.1.

