

Sp. 00 Kichler, Bib, 1350 7/6/81

Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim

MERODACH-BALADAN II¹

J. A. BRINKMAN
Toronto

I. INTRODUCTION

Merodach-Baladan² is one of the better known Babylonian monarchs of the early first millennium B.C. Originally prince of the powerful Bit-Jakin tribe in southern Babylonia, he appeared on the stage of history at a time when the political fortunes of Babylonia were at a low ebb. The Assyrians by then had become the dominant power in Western Asia, and it was largely the efforts of Merodach-Baladan which kept Babylonia from becoming altogether submerged during the last quarter of the eighth century B.C.

Merodach-Baladan's political sagacity earned him a deserved fame among later generations in antiquity. He was the first native Babylonian ruler to win mention by name in the Hebrew bible³ and also the only native Babylonian to become king of Babylonia twice according to the tradition enshrined in Kinglist A.⁴ Although militarily overshadowed for the most part by his great Assyrian contemporaries, Tiglath-Pileser III, Shalmaneser V, Sargon II, and Sennacherib, his name shines out among other coeval monarchs: Umbanigaš and Šutruk-Nahhunte of Elam and Ahaz and Hezekiah of Judah.

This essay is an attempt to present in summary form the present state of our

¹ The abbreviations throughout this article will conform to those of *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, with the following additions and alterations:

BR	San Nicolò, <i>Babylonische Rechtsurkunden</i>
CAH	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i>
Carnegie, Catalogue	Carnegie, <i>Catalogue of the Collection of Antique Gems Formed by James, Ninth Earl of Southesk</i> , K. T.
FG+H	Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i>
King, Cal. Suppl.	King, <i>Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum, Supplement</i>
Lie	Lie, <i>The Inscriptions of Sargon II, Part I: The Annals</i>
Lyon	Lyon, <i>Keilschrifttexte Sargons</i>
Steinmetzer	Steinmetzer, <i>Die babylonischen Kudurru (Grenzsteine) als Urkundenform</i>
Winckler	Winckler, <i>Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons</i>

² Babylonian: Marduk-apla-iddina II. A form of his name modelled on that found in the Hebrew bible has won general acceptance in modern English. The first Marduk-apla-iddina was the third-last ruler of the Kassite dynasty in Babylonia and ruled in the first half of the twelfth century (ca. 1173-1161 B.C.).

³ 2 Kings 20:12 (= Isaiah 39:1).

⁴ iv 10, 14. The Assyrian Sennacherib also occurs twice in this list.

MERODACH-BALADAN II

knowledge about Merodach-Baladan, to piece together what information can be garnered from the scattered ancient sources, and to survey the problems that these often ill-preserved and fragmentary documents raise for us. We shall begin by giving a chronologically arranged sketch of Merodach-Baladan's career and its antecedents: Part II will deal with his tribal ancestry and his rule as prince of the Sealand before his elevation to the throne of Babylon, Part III with his twelve-year reign over Babylonia, Part IV with his loss of power in Babylonia and his subsequent struggles with the Assyrians. In Part V, we shall discuss several items of information on Merodach-Baladan which do not readily lend themselves to precise chronological classification: his family, the embassy dispatched by him to Hezekiah of Judah, the mention of his name in undated letters to the Sargonid court, and sundry isolated references to him in various (chiefly minor) texts. After a few remarks by way of summary and conclusion (Part VI), a bibliography of the ancient sources dealing with Merodach-Baladan will be appended at the close of the article (Part VII).

II. MERODACH-BALADAN, KING OF THE SEALAND

To understand the complex political character of Merodach-Baladan in its proper perspective, we must understand that he was first and foremost a member of the Jakin tribe in southern Babylonia. The Jakin, the Dakūri, the Amukāni,⁵ and later the Ša'alli were the most powerful tribal units in southern Babylonia (or Chaldea) from the middle of the ninth down through most of the seventh century. Their origin is at best obscure. They are usually traced back to the Aramean raider tribes active on the Middle Euphrates from the days of Tiglath-Pileser I.⁶ Various marauding groups—described both as Arameans and as Sutians—continued to strike at western Babylonia during the succeeding centuries, usually attacking cities not far from the Euphrates.⁷ It is generally believed that in the course of the eleventh through the ninth centuries these West Semitic peoples gradually worked their way down into southern Babylonia, where Shalmaneser III found them in the year 850. By the time of Tiglath-Pileser III, some 120 years later, these tribes had spread all

⁵ The names of the Dakūri and Amukāni tribes should probably be spelled with a single *k*. Babylonian and Assyrian texts apparently use either one or two *k*'s in these names; but in all instances (save one) where two *k*'s are attested, the first of the two *k*'s is expressed by a *cvc* sign. Now, *cvc* signs in this period cannot be taken as an adequate indication of the spelling of a word, because the final consonant in such a cluster was often not pronounced. Therefore, to postulate a doubled consonant in these words, we should demand unequivocal evidence on the basis of a spelling such as *vc-cv* to substantiate the doubled consonant. The lone such spelling currently available (*Da-ak-ku-ri* in an inscription of Shalmaneser III [WO 1 468 ii 52]) seems to be an exception rather than the rule.

⁶ See most recently Kupper, *Les Nomades*, pp. 115 f.

⁷ These raids form the background for the story of the Erra Epic, especially Tablet IV (see Lambert, *AJO* 18 397 f.). See also the events narrated in *BBS* no. 36 i 1-iii 18 and in King's "Religious Chronicle," esp. iii 4-19.

over southern Mesopotamia; and their territory stretched from the Euphrates as far east as the Elamite frontier.

The earliest description of these Chaldean tribes is preserved in the annals of Shalmaneser III, describing the events of the year 850.⁸ After Shalmaneser had assisted Marduk-zākir-šumi I of Babylonia in quelling a revolt in the northern part of the country, he proceeded to southern Babylonia to clamp down on tribal disturbances that were apparently beyond the control of the weak Babylonian monarch.⁹ Shalmaneser mentions three kings of Chaldea who subsequently came to Babylon to offer him "tribute": Jakini, king of the Sealand, Mušallim-Marduk of the Amukāni tribe, and Adini of the Dakūri tribe.¹⁰ The Assyrians do not seem to have been well acquainted with these people, since in two of the three instances here recorded (Jakini and Adini) they probably speak of an eponymous ancestor as though he were a living person.¹¹

Between the mention of these tribes in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III and their recurrence in the annals of Tiglath-Pileser III over a century later, very little is known of them. Their depredations on the land of their more settled neighbors of northern Babylonia, especially the city dwellers of Babylon and Borsippa, would bespeak little law and order in the land.¹² One of their number, Eriba-Marduk, a member of the Jakin tribe, for a time succeeded in making himself king over the

⁸ The first mention of Chaldea itself occurs in the annals of Ashurnasirpal II after the description of his battle at the city of Sūru in the land of Suḫi in the year 878. The king states that fear of his military prowess overwhelmed even Chaldea (xur *Kal-du* [AKA 352 iii 2']). The possible relations of *Kaldu* to *Kēšed* (Gen. 22:22), to *Kaššim* (Gen. 11:28, etc.), and to *Kardu(niāš)* form too extensive a problem to be discussed conveniently here. Suffice it to say that there are vague hints of an earlier origin of the name *Kaldu*, none of them by any means certain.

⁹ The principal sources of Shalmaneser III touching on these events of his ninth campaign are edited in: *BA* 6/1 137 vi 5-8, 147:82-84, 152:19-20; *WO* 1 67 r. 3-5, 466 ii 50-54; *WO* 2 34 ii 42-44, 150:83-84; *Iraq* 25 56:47-49.

¹⁰ Mušallim-Marduk is referred to as *mār =U-ka(a)-ni* in these texts. The only account that preserves the names of all three rulers is that on the Bronze Gates of Balawat (*BA* 6/1 137 vi 5-8). As in the account of "tribute" proffered to Tiglath-Pileser III in 729, the only one of the chieftains who is designated by the personal title "king" is the representative of the Jakin tribe. For a pictorial representation of the bringing of "tribute" by Adini of the Dakūri tribe, see *BA* 6/1, *Schiene K. Obere Reihe* (inscription: *ibid.*, 61).

¹¹ Cf. a similar use of "Janzi" (the Kassite word for "king") as a personal name in the accounts of Shalmaneser's sixteenth campaign, e.g., *WO* 1 16 r. 10.

¹² New Babylonian Chronicle, r. 10-12; cf. *ibid.*, r. 7: "for 2 years there was no king in the land." This chaos is also the background for the events sketched in *BM* 33428 (= *Rm.* 3, 105; published by Strong in *JRAS* 1892 350-368). See also *Lie* 64:9-11, *Winckler* I 124:135-36, which allude back to these days from the standpoint of Sargon. . . . We might remark parenthetically that even in the supposedly more stable days of the later Sargonids the fields of the citizens of Babylon and Borsippa were still not free from the raids of the neighboring tribesmen (e.g., Borger, *Esarh.* 52:64-65).

whole of Babylonia.¹³ But, while we might expect that he would show preference towards his fellow tribesmen, Eriba-Marduk actually took the trouble during his reign to restore lands previously appropriated by the tribes to their rightful owners who lived in the cities.¹⁴

Eriba-Marduk was probably the grandfather of Merodach-Baladan,¹⁵ and the latter showed obvious pride in the accomplishments of his famous ancestor. In several of his inscriptions, he refers to himself as "the eldest legitimate son of Eriba-Marduk,"¹⁶ "offspring of Eriba-Marduk,"¹⁷ or "the eternal royal scion who makes illustrious the name of the father who begot him, the offspring of Eriba-Marduk."¹⁸ Eriba-Marduk himself he characterizes as "king of Babylon, who established the foundation(s) of the land."¹⁹ Certainly Eriba-Marduk did introduce an element of stability into the grievously debilitated government of Babylonia in the early eighth century,²⁰ and in this respect, Merodach-Baladan was to prove himself a worthy successor.

Merodach-Baladan himself first appears in written documents in the final years of the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III (717-727). In the troubled times which succeeded the assassination of Nabû-nādin-zēri of Babylonia in 732, Merodach-Bala-

¹³ That Eriba-Marduk belonged to the Jakin tribe is not explicitly attested. It may be inferred from the fact that his descendant Merodach-Baladan belonged to this group. This contention is strengthened by the inscription or a seal now in the British Museum, *BM* 129532 (published as *Q639* in *Carnegie Catalogue*, II, 82 f.), which possibly describes Eriba-Marduk's father as a member of the Jakin tribe. See *JCS* 16 98 f. sub 28-32 (b) and 36.1.3.

¹⁴ New Babylonian Chronicle, r. 12.

¹⁵ From chronological considerations, we know that the latest possible date for the last official regnal year of Eriba-Marduk's reign was 761 (a fact that follows from *BRM* 1 3, which is dated in the thirteenth year of his successor on the Babylonian throne; this successor's reign ended in 748). The year 761 would thus normally be the latest possible date for Eriba-Marduk's death. On the other hand, the first dated appearance of Merodach-Baladan is in 729; and, since his career lasted till at least 700, he was presumably still fairly young in 729. Thus an intervening generation should probably be posited between these two figures. (See also Leemans, *JEOL* 10 442-43.) The possibility, however, that Eriba-Marduk may have been the father of Merodach-Baladan cannot be categorically excluded on a chronological basis, especially since the latter was old enough to have a full-grown son act as witness to a kudurru in 715 (*VAS* 1 37 iv 57).

The documentary sources for the reign of Eriba-Marduk have been listed in *JCS* 16 99-100. To the references given there may be added: under 36.3.2: also *ibid.*, iii 52; under 36.3.3: all references included below under 44.2.2 (a); as 36.3.3': *BBSI* no. 35, obv. 16.

¹⁶ *Iraq* 15 133:13.

¹⁷ Text on bricks from Uruk (bibliography under 44.2.2[a] below), line 6.

¹⁸ *VAS* 1 37 ii 40-44. Cf. *BBSI* no. 35:15-16, which probably contained a shortened version of the same epithets. The Babylonian is even more ambiguous than the English translation and could be rendered in a variety of ways, including "who makes illustrious the name of the father of (the one) who begot him (and who was) the offspring of Eriba-Marduk."

¹⁹ *Iraq* 15 133:13, *VAS* 1 37 ii 44.

²⁰ See n. 14 above.

dan is mentioned both in the Nimrud Letters and in Tiglath-Pileser's royal inscriptions as a prominent chieftain in southern Babylonia. These documents describe the prevailing currents of power politics in Babylonia from 731 to 729, when Tiglath-Pileser was campaigning to remove Mukn-zēri, the head of the Amukāni tribe, from the kingship of Babylonia which the latter had usurped.

It is difficult to see from the Nimrud Letters what position Merodach-Baladan played in this struggle. These letters from the archives of the contemporary Assyrian capital at Kalḫu are unfortunately quite fragmentary, and their interpretation in any precise historical context is at best conjectural. Merodach-Baladan is mentioned by name in three of these letters and is perhaps the subject of discussion in obscure sections of two more. Nimrud Letter V speaks twice of a "letter concerning Merodach-Baladan";¹¹ and apparently, when this letter was read out in the presence of another southern tribal chieftain, Balāssu of the Dakūri tribe, it caused him to join forces with the Assyrians against his conniving fellow-chieftains of the south.¹² Nimrud Letter IX mentions Merodach-Baladan too; seemingly a statement made by him is quoted.¹³ Nimrud Letter LXV speaks of the capture of an unnamed city after the defeat of Mukn-zēri and his son Šuma-ukn and alludes to grain which either belonged to or should have been sent to Merodach-Baladan at that time.¹⁴ Nimrud Letter VI tells of a *mār Jakin*,¹⁵ which in this period might refer to the preeminent member of the Jakin tribe; but this cannot be demonstrated with certainty.¹⁶

These isolated pieces of detailed information are tantalizing but too fragile to essay any plausible large-scale historical reconstruction. But one item of historical significance can safely be derived from the Nimrud Letters: the tribal chieftains in southern Babylonia did not present a united front against the Assyrian invaders at this time. (This fact is also substantiated from the more formal accounts in the

¹¹ For the place of publication of the individual Nimrud Letters, see Part VII, A, 44.2.22. In Nimrud Letter V, we may read *e-gir-tum ša ina muḫḫi Marduk-apla-iddina* (9') and possibly *[e]-gir-(tum) ina muḫḫi Marduk-apla-iddina* (4').

¹² This seems to be the most plausible interpretation of the main point of this letter. See Saggs, *Iraq* 17 47-48.

¹³ Obv. 3'.

¹⁴ *muḫḫi še-u* (ŠE.FAD.MEŠ) *ša ana Marduk-apla-iddina ša šarru bēl iqbāni* (25-26). The phrase is ambiguous; and, unfortunately, the letter breaks off shortly afterwards.

For the present, I would prefer to translate *dēki* in lines 10 and 11 as "are defeated" rather than as "are killed." Deaths of ancient Near Eastern rulers in battle were comparatively rare, and the death of both a king and his son in the same battle would undoubtedly have attracted more notice than this bald statement in Letter LXV. (For *dēku* in the meaning "to defeat," see Tadmor in *JNES* 17 129-41 and *CAD* D 41-42.)

¹⁵ Face B: 18'.

¹⁶ The second doubtful reference in a Nimrud Letter (XXXIX) to Merodach-Baladan is treated below in n. 102.

Assyrian annals, as we shall see in the succeeding paragraph.) Later when Merodach-Baladan gained control of Babylonia, one of his distinctive contributions was to weld the vacillating Chaldean tribes to a common interest. This was undeniably a weighty factor in his long successful resistance of Assyrian might, with no fears of his fellow tribesmen dickering with the enemy behind his back.

The official records of Tiglath-Pileser's reign, aided where necessary by the chronological details of the Babylonian Chronicle, Kinglist A, and the Assyrian eponym canons, give us a fairly coherent picture of events in southern Babylonia during these years. In 731¹⁷ Tiglath-Pileser marched for the first time against the usurper king of Babylonia, Mukn-zēri, attacking his capital city of Šapīja.¹⁸ The assault proved unsuccessful, and the Assyrian king spent the next year (730) in his own land, renewing the offensive only in 729.¹⁹ This time he was able to besiege Mukn-zēri in his capital and to devastate the surrounding area. Tiglath-Pileser does not claim to have captured the king in his attack, and it appears that some regions of Babylonia continued to acknowledge the sovereignty of Mukn-zēri as late as 728.²⁰ But, while Tiglath-Pileser was conducting the siege at Šapīja, the heads of other tribes in Chaldea made their submission to him: Balāssu of the Dakūri, Nādinu of Larak, and Merodach-Baladan of the Jakin tribe.²¹

¹⁷ Eponym canon C¹ r. 43 (*RLA* 2 431) records under the year 731 (eponymy of Nergal-uballit): *a-na URU Ša-pi-ja*.

¹⁸ The Babylonian sources and the eponym canon reproduce the initial sibilant as š: *URU Ša-pi-(i)-ja* (canon C¹ r. 43; *YOS* 7 148:15; *YOS* 3 39:10; *UET* 4 70:10) and *Ša-pi-i* (Kinglist A iv 7; the statement in *JCS* 16 101 under 41.1.1 should be corrected accordingly). The Assyrian sources write it as s: *URU Sa-pi-ja* (2R 67:27; D.T. 3:16, Nimrud Letter II 6'), *URU Sa-pi-a* (Smith, *Senn.* 42), *URU Sa-pi-e* (2R 67:23; and possibly Nimrud Letter II 5'). This geographical name is probably a hypocoristic for a longer form of the type *URU Ša-pi-i-n* (cf. Šapt-Bēl in 5R 3:54, etc.; is it mere coincidence that the capital of Bit-Amukāni bore the name Šapīja and the capital of the later Assyrian province of Gambulu in approximately the same region was called Šapt-Bēl? The location of the city is unknown.

¹⁹ Bab. Chron. i 19. (The Babylonian Chronicle throughout this article will be cited according to the forthcoming edition by A. K. Grayson.) According to eponym canon C¹ r. 45, Tiglath-Pileser also "took the hand" of Bēl during the eponymy of 729. This would be during the month of Nisan subsequent to his defeat of Mukn-zēri. This Nisan would be the beginning of the Babylonian year 728/7, and Tiglath-Pileser is officially listed as king of Babylonia in both Kinglist A and in the Babylonian Chronicle, starting with his first official regnal year in 728. The same Nisan, however, would fall before the change of eponym officials in Assyria (which took place in Ajar) and so would be reckoned as part of the old Assyrian year 729/8. This would explain the apparent discrepancies in the statements of canon C¹ and the Babylonian tradition. (A similar problem is discussed below in connection with Sargon's accession in Babylonia at the beginning of the Babylonian year 709/8.)

²⁰ This interpretation is based on an economic text dated in the fourth year of Nabû-mukn-zēri: MLC 1805 (published as *BRM* 1 22), which may be explained in this fashion. See *JCS* 16 101 n. 31.

²¹ 2R 67:26-28; D.T. 3:18-19. The submission of the other tribal chiefs after the defeat of one of their number is reminiscent of the capitulation of the Jakin and Amukāni leaders after Shalmaneser III defeated the Dakūri head in 850 (*BA* 6/1 137 vi 5-8).

Merodach-Baladan was obviously regarded by the Assyrians as the most important of these chiefs. Much more space in their official account is devoted to the recital of his submission, and his wealthy "tribute" is described in detail: gold ore in quantity,³² artifacts of gold, necklaces set in gold, precious stones native to the sea,³³ as well as wooden beams suitable for building, plants, bright-colored clothes, frankincense and cattle.³⁴ The statement is likewise appended that he had not submitted to previous Assyrian kings.³⁵ Furthermore, he is the only ruler (including even Muktn-zēri himself) who is dignified with the title "king" in the official Assyrian account.³⁶ Even at this early date Merodach-Baladan appears to have been a formidable prince.

For the years 728 and 727 Tiglath-Pileser III (under the name Pālu) was officially king of Babylonia, the first Assyrian ruler to hold the dual monarchy of both countries in his own name.³⁷ After his death, his son Shalmaneser V succeeded him on both thrones for a brief, five-year reign.

III. MERODACH-BALADAN, KING OF BABYLONIA

After the death of Shalmaneser V in Tebet 722,³⁸ there seems to have been some irregularity in the succession to the Assyrian throne. Sargon II was probably not directly in line for the kingship and may have maintained his position only precariously at first.³⁹ Occupied as the new ruler was with Assyrian affairs, he was unable to retain the control over Babylonia exercised by his immediate predecessors. Merodach-Baladan came up from his tribal lands in the south and in Nisan 722, less than three months after Shalmaneser's death, officially assumed the reins of government in Babylonia.⁴⁰

³² For the phrase *epir kadīšu* referring to metals in their natural state see CAD E 189a.

³³ *bindū tāmītim* might also mean "native to the Sealand."

³⁴ 2R 67:27-28. Cf. D.T. 3:19.

³⁵ Whether or not this statement should be interpreted as applying literally to Merodach-Baladan (and therefore implying that he personally had ruled before the reign of Tiglath-Pileser) is open to question. The way the phrase is worded it would seem to apply generically to Merodach-Baladan and his predecessors as well, even though this is not explicitly brought out in the telescoped phraseology.

³⁶ He is called *LUGAL Tam-tin*, which can be translated "king of the Sea(land)"; cf. Kinglist A iv 10. The absence of the determinative *KUR* before *Tāmītim* when referring to the Sealand is not unknown; cf. BBSI no. 11 i 6. It is worthy of note that the designation *mār Jakin* ("member of the Jakin tribe") precedes his other title in the Assyrian narrative.

³⁷ Tukulti-Ninurta I probably controlled both Babylonia and Assyria at one time, but he did not assume the Babylonian throne.

³⁸ Bab. Chron. i 29.

³⁹ Contrary to the custom of legitimate Assyrian monarchs, Sargon very rarely cites his ancestry in formal inscriptions; and this is rightly taken as an indication that he was a usurper. A possibility that he may have belonged to a junior branch of the royal house is proffered by an inscription found in Istanbul by Unger ("Altorientalische Könige als Kulturbrieger," *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 9 246; reproduced in *AJO* 9 79), in which Sargon calls himself a son of Tiglath-Pileser (III).

⁴⁰ Bab. Chron. i 32.

Assyria's temporary weakness did not escape the notice of other neighboring countries. In 720⁴¹ the Assyrian army was attacked at Dēr by an Elamite army led by Umbanigaš, king of Elam;⁴² and the Assyrian forces appear to have sustained a considerable defeat.⁴³ Though Merodach-Baladan had an alliance with the Elamite king, he did not arrive in time to render him assistance in this battle.⁴⁴ Nonetheless, following the Assyrian reverses, Babylonia enjoyed a ten-year respite from interference from the north.

It is difficult to assess this interlude of Chaldean rule in Babylonia. There are two divergent interpretations presented for our view by the contemporary documents. On the one hand, Sargon claims that Merodach-Baladan was a foreigner, a Chaldean,⁴⁵ who had unlawfully occupied the throne of Babylonia.⁴⁶ His reign had reputedly brought about oppression of the interests of the northern section of the country and an eclipse of the hereditary privileges enjoyed by the ancient cult centers of Babylon, Nippur, Sippar, and Borsippa.⁴⁷ Some consider the *Fürstenspiegel* to be a document written at this time to underline the theological implications of

⁴¹ For this date, see Bab. Chron. i 33 and Tadmor, *JCS* 12 94.

⁴² Bab. Chron. i 33-34. Despite the fact that Sargon later referred to this encounter as his first (var.: second) campaign, he is undoubtedly the one under attack. The phraseology of the Bab. Chron. makes this clear: *Umbanigaš šar Elamti ina pihāt Dēr⁴¹ šaltum ana libbi Šarru-kēn šar māt Aššur tpuš* (i 33-34). According to the usual idiom, Umbanigaš is the subject of the sentence and the aggressor in the action.

Confirmation of this interpretation comes from another consideration, viz., that Dēr at this time was part of regular Assyrian territory. An Assyrian governor of the city is attested in the third year of Shalmaneser V (724) in *VAS* 1 70 i 1-2; and, according to the same kudurru, the city was also under Assyrian control in the year 721 (ii 28), which would be just before the celebrated battle in 720, and in 711 (v 4). Also, probably under the reign of Sargon II, Šamaš-bēla-ušur was active in the city of Dēr, according to *ABL* 157:17 f., 799:2 ff., 800:2 ff. (The approximate date of these letters would be borne out if the Balāssu in *ABL* 537:8, 799 r. 29, is the same tribal chieftain mentioned by Tiglath-Pileser III (2R 67:26; D.T. 3:18) and in the Nimrud Letters (V:7, 10; XI r. 5').)

⁴³ *Umbanigaš . . . nabalkut māt Aššur illakan dabdāšunu ma'diš illakan* (Bab. Chron. i 35). For the official Assyrian version of Sargon's "victory," see the so-called Assur Charter, K. 1349:17 (published in Winckler *Sammlung* 2, no. 1) and Lie 6:20. For a further discussion of the battle, see n. 53 below.

⁴⁴ Bab. Chron. i 36-37. Merodach-Baladan exhibited a decided propensity during the reigns of both Sargon and Sennacherib to avoid any direct military conflict with the main Assyrian army. The Elamites did most of his fighting for him, and Sennacherib claims that this service on the part of the Elamites was rendered for payment (Smith, *Senn.* 7 ff.).

⁴⁵ Lie 54:9 seems to be the only instance where Sargon's inscriptions accord Merodach-Baladan the title of king of Babylonia (*Karduniaš*). Otherwise he is always described as either the king of Chaldaea (*māt Kaldī*) or as a member of the Jakin tribe (*mār Jakin*).

⁴⁶ Lie 42:267-68 and *passim*.

⁴⁷ Winckler I 96:5-8, etc. The neglect of these cities is also implied in the eagerness with which the chief citizens of Babylon and Borsippa invite Sargon to enter their towns once Merodach-Baladan had fled towards Elam in 710 (Lie 54:371; 56:375). On the question of the privileges of these towns, see W. F. Leemans, "*Kidinnu*, un symbole de droit divin babylonien," *Symbolae van Oven*, 36-61.

the conduct of a king who would maltreat these cities as Merodach-Baladan is supposed to have done.⁴⁸ The fact that at the fall of Dür-Jakin, Merodach-Baladan's southern capital, in 709 there were numerous hostages from these northern cities released from captivity⁴⁹ would seem to give substance to the charge that Merodach-Baladan's rule was opposed in the north and tolerated only because of his superior force. Earlier hints of north-south hostility in Babylonia during the eighth century⁵⁰ and accounts of plundering of merchant caravans within Babylonia at this time⁵¹ would lend credence to the situation as portrayed by Sargon.

On the other hand, Merodach-Baladan himself began his reign with a claim to being "handpicked" by the god Marduk, the national deity of Babylon, to rectify the evils caused by the years of Assyrian domination in the land. He portrayed himself as a savior of the country, the agent through whom Marduk defeated the enemies of the Babylonian people:

At that time the great lord Marduk had turned away in wrath from the land of Akkad, and the evil enemy, the Subarian,⁵² exercised lordship over the land of Akkad for [seven] years until the days were fulfilled and the appointed time had arrived and the great lord Marduk became reconciled with the land of Akkad, with which he had been angry. He looked graciously upon Marduk-apla-iddina, king of Babylon, a prince who revered him, his (Marduk's) personal appointee, the legitimate eldest son of Eriba-Marduk, king of Babylon, who had established the foundation(s) of the country. Asari, king of the gods, definitely named him to the shepherdship of Sumer and Akkad, saying: 'This is indeed the shepherd to gather the scattered (flock).' With the help of the great lord Marduk and the warrior of the gods, Pirigallu, he defeated the widespread horde of Subartu and shattered their weapons. He overthrew them and banished their steps from the soil of Akkad.⁵³

⁴⁸ E.g., F. M. Th. Böhl, *MAOG* 11/3 28-35; but see S. Smith, *BSOAS* 11 457 n. 6. Latest edition of the document in Lambert, *BWL* 110-15.

⁴⁹ *Lie* 64:8-11; Winckler I 122:134-36; *Iraq* 16 Pl. XLVIII v 63-74.

⁵⁰ See n. 12 above; cf. also Nimrud Letter I.

⁵¹ *Lie* 56:379-82.

⁵² I.e., Assyrian.

⁵³ *Iraq* 15 133:8-18. Cf. *VAS* 1 37 i 17 ff. Gadd believes that the closing lines translated above constitute a claim of victory for Merodach-Baladan at the battle of Dēr in 720 (*Iraq* 15 128). While the text does not literally go so far in direct statement, the inference is legitimate. When we consider that Merodach-Baladan on another occasion put a "hired" Elamite army in the field (Smith, *Senn.* 7 ff.), it is easy to see that he might have done something similar on this occasion, which would make his veiled claim less outlandish than would appear at first glance.

Can one unravel the truth behind these three apparently conflicting claims on the outcome of the battle? Sargon in his own inscriptions claimed victory; and, looked at from the Assyrian point of view, the battle might have appeared a qualified success. The Assyrians had been attacked at Dēr and, though suffering considerable reverses, probably retained possession of the area (see n. 42 above). Secondly, the Babylonian Chronicle claims a great victory for Umbarigaš, the Elamite king. He undoubtedly scored a significant triumph over the Assyrian army in the field and effectively stopped the Assyrians from being able to meddle in Babylonian affairs for another decade. It is nowhere stated that he gained any territory as a result of this battle. Finally, the account of Merodach-Baladan in his own cylinder inscription could be explained simply as a figurative state-

Besides the theological backing thus adduced for his reign, Merodach-Baladan often emphasized in his inscriptions, as we have seen, his descent from Eriba-Marduk, the earlier Babylonian king, presumably to exclude the charge of being merely a Chaldean interloper on the throne.⁵⁴ One of royal blood could scarcely be considered a foreigner, even if he did hale from the less civilized southern tribes. Merodach-Baladan also mentioned his preservation and extension of the ancient privileges of certain cities of Babylonia⁵⁵ and pledged himself to maintain and repair the cult places of Nippur, Babylon, and Sippar.⁵⁶ His own inscriptions give the reverse impression from that conveyed by Sargon's writings about him.

Babylonia does not seem to have suffered much from his reign. Temples were repaired, royal land grants made, the local provincial administration appears to have flourished, and business to have gone on as usual. His rule is attested in a number of cities of Babylonia over his twelve years in office, and he always seems to be enjoying the role of a typical Babylonian monarch. Besides his sway over the tribal settlements in the south, his rule is documented in the following major cities:

BABYLON. Merodach-Baladan probably participated in the New Year Festival here to inaugurate his first year of reign.⁵⁷ A small private inscription accompanying a personal gift, dated in the first year of the king, may originally have been drafted in Babylon.⁵⁸ Ptolemy mentions three lunar eclipses observed and recorded in Babylon in the first and second years of Merodach-Baladan.⁵⁹ The first certain contemporary attestation of the king's rule there is in an economic text in a private collection in Leiden, dated Addar 18, year 2.⁶⁰ A kuduru dated in Merodach-Baladan's seventh year comes from there; in it mention is made of the governor (*šakin šēmi*) of Babylon,⁶¹ the mayor (*ḫazannu*) of Babylon,⁶² and the *šatammu* of

ment regarding his agency in the battle of Dēr. No allusion to participation in a specific battle is made; and, if the royal Elamite army were fighting under hire to him as it did later in 703, the outcome of the battle—regardless of his physical presence—could technically be ascribed to him. (It is known that Assyrian kings certainly won more battles in their annals than they ever assisted at personally in the field.)

⁵⁴ *Iraq* 15 133:13; *VAS* 1 37 ii 40-44; *BBS* no. 35:16; *IR* 5 no. XVII:6 (and duplicates; see appendix sub 44.2.2[a]).

⁵⁵ *VAS* 1 37 iii 24-35.

⁵⁶ *VAS* 1 37 ii 8 ff.

⁵⁷ *Bab. Chron.* i 32. Nothing is said explicitly of the festival, but the mention of Nisan makes this interpretation highly probable.

⁵⁸ BM 98562 (= Th. 1905-4-9, 68; published in King, *Cat. Suppl.*, p. 57). The ninth line of the inscription mentions Babylon, but the designation of the place of writing is usually just before the date in such documents. Dr. Sollberger has kindly informed me that there is room for one large or two small signs in the chipped section immediately before *DIN.TIR.KI* in this line, but there are no traces extant.

⁵⁹ One eclipse in Merodach-Baladan's first year and two in his second year. See *Claudii Ptolemaei Opera quae exstant omnia*, Vol. I: *Syntaxis Mathematica*, ed. J. L. Heiberg, Pars I, pp. 302-4. [I am much obliged to Mr. G. Gragg, S.J., for verifying this reference for me.]

⁶⁰ Böhl, *Leiden Coll.*, III 7-8; transliteration in *MAOG* 11/3 31-32 n. 3.

⁶¹ *VAS* 1 37 iv 50-51.

⁶² *Ibid.*, v 5-6.

Esagila,⁶² all of them high officials of the city who took part in the signing of the document. As king, he claimed to have restored the fields previously lost by native Babylonians and to have protected the "exempt" citizens of the town from encroachments on their liberty.⁶³ Sargon found Merodach-Baladan's residence in Babylon on his campaign in 710;⁶⁴ and his capital was apparently there too when Sennacherib launched his campaign of 703.⁶⁵

BORSIPPA. The governor (*šakin šēmi*) of this area acted as witness to the kudurru drawn up in the seventh year of Merodach-Baladan's reign.⁶⁶ In the same kudurru, the king boasted of having made the privileged citizens of the city happy by expanding their land holdings and by protecting their interests.⁶⁷ Later, in Merodach-Baladan's second term as king, Borsippa was one of the cities that assisted him against the invading Sennacherib.⁶⁸

CUTHA. In one of the Harper letters, mention is made of a gift of money given to a temple here in the second year of Merodach-Baladan,⁶⁹ so it was under his control by 720. The governor (*šakin šēmi*) of Cutha is a witness to the kudurru of 715.⁷⁰ The city likewise assisted Merodach-Baladan against Sennacherib in 703.⁷¹

KISH. Repairs on the Eḫursagkalamma temple were made during the king's reign by Iddin-Nergal, governor (*šaknu*) of Kish.⁷² This city also seems to have been the principal camp of Merodach-Baladan's forces in the battle of 703.⁷³

NIPPUR. In the preface to the kudurru of 715, Merodach-Baladan pledged to support this city.⁷⁴ According to the Assyrian records, it aided him against Sennacherib's army in 703.⁷⁵ An economic text from his reign (year not preserved) was drawn up here.⁷⁶

SIPPAR. Merodach-Baladan likewise pledged to support Sippar in the kudurru preface.⁷⁷

UR. Two texts from here are dated during his reign. *UET* 4 206 (= *UET* 1 261) is dated 11-X, year 22 of [Mar]duk-apla-iddina, *mār ri-du-tu*.⁷⁸ *Mār (bi) rīdātu* in both Assyria and Babylonia ordinarily denotes the crown prince of the ruling monarch,⁷⁹ but there is no question of that meaning here.⁸⁰ The twenty-second year of Merodach-Baladan (if we count consecutively from his first official regnal year in 721) would fall in 700, the year of his last stand in the south against Sennacherib. A possible interpretation might be advanced that the people of Ur, though realizing that Merodach-Baladan no longer legitimately bore the title of king (since 703), still wished to append some royal title after the name of the individual for so long in charge of their city and chose this anomalous designation rather than that of king.⁸¹

⁶² *Ibid.*, v 8-9.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, iii 15-35.

⁶⁴ *Lie* 54:9.

⁶⁵ Smith, *Senn.* 30 (and parallels) speak of his palace there.

⁶⁶ *VAS* 1 37 v 10-11.

⁶⁷ Smith, *Senn.* 15.

⁶⁸ *VAS* 1 37 v 12-13.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, iii 24-35.

⁷⁰ *ABL* 527:14-19.

⁷¹ Smith, *Senn.* 15.

⁷² Langdon in Watelin, *Excavations at Kish*, III, 17-19 and Pl. XI.

⁷³ Smith, *Senn.* 21-25.

⁷⁴ Smith, *Senn.* 15.

⁷⁵ *VAS* 1 37 ii 8.

⁷⁶ *VAS* 1 37 ii 9.

⁷⁷ *TuM* 2-3 no. 8.

⁷⁸ r. 9'-10'.

⁷⁹ For Assyrian examples, see Wiseman, *Treaties* 11 and *passim*. Babylonian examples may be found in Wiseman, *Chronicles* 64:6, 66:1, etc.

⁸⁰ Merodach-Baladan had been an independent "king of the Sealand" (*2R* 57:26; D.T. 3:19) before coming to the Babylonian throne; cf. also Kinglist A iv 10: RN BAL Tam (abbreviation for Tam-tim). If he had been "crown prince" for twenty-two years before that, his active career would have extended from at least 751 to 700, which is highly unlikely. Furthermore, none of his six immediate predecessors on the Babylonian throne ruled long enough to have a crown prince for such an extended period of time.

⁸¹ For other roughly contemporary dating by years of local officials not kings at Ur, cf. *UET* 4 27 and 90.

Connected with this text is another, *UET* 4 8, a private contract recording the sale of a house, in which Merodach-Baladan was still given the title of king.⁸² The document comes from approximately the same time as *UET* 4 206, since not only are two of the major witnesses identical—certainly Nabû-rēša-iši, governor (*šakin šēmi*) of Ur in *UET* 4 206 r. 3' and *UET* 4 8:28⁸³ and possibly [Balassu] the *sangu* of Ur in *UET* 4 206 r. [2'] and *UET* 4 8:29⁸⁴—but the scribe who wrote both documents is the same: Nabû-šuma/zēra-iddina, *UET* 4 206 r. 8' and *UET* 4 8:37.⁸⁵ Thus Merodach-Baladan, the *mār rīdātu*, must be connected with Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon.⁸⁶

Ur also supported him in his fight against Sennacherib in 703.⁸⁷

URUK. Extensive repairs on the Eanna complex, including the shrine to Ningišzida, were completed during his reign.⁸⁸ From his fourth year (718), long lists of foremen supervising crews working near Uruk on the canal named after the king⁸⁹ are also extant.⁹⁰

Considering the sparse information we have on most kings of Babylonia about this time, it looks as though Babylonia was in an approximately normal condition during Merodach-Baladan's term of office. The major cities seem to be under his control, and governors of five of them (Babylon, Borsippa, Cutha, Kish, and Ur) are functioning as provincial officials under his aegis. He had temples repaired in at least Kish and Uruk, and *BBS* no. 35 may record yet another temple as the beneficiary of royal endowments during his reign.⁹¹ Whatever Sargon's later propaganda stated, Merodach-Baladan did not neglect the cities of Babylonia, even though he

⁸² Line 1: [MU Z]KAM m²AMAR.UTU¹-DUMU.UŠ-S[UM.NA] Line 2: 'LUGAL' DIN.TIR.K[i].

⁸³ See also *UET* 4 169:1, a letter addressed to the same official. Ebeling (*Neubab. Briefe*, no. 305, n. to lines 1-4) remarks on the unusual character of the introduction of the letter, which is similar to that for MB letters. This should not be surprising, considering that it is one of the earliest strictly NB letters yet published.

⁸⁴ Though the title only is preserved in *UET* 4 206, this man occurs next to the *šakin šēmi* in both documents. The similarity of the governor and the scribe, however, are by themselves enough to establish the chronological continuity of the documents without the aid of this additional evidence.

⁸⁵ The names are obviously identical because of the patronymic involved: m²ŠEŠ-TUG-ŠI (*UET* 4 206 r. 8'), [m²ŠEŠ-TUG-ŠI] (*UET* 4 8:37). Unfortunately neither of the tablets could immediately be consulted in the Philadelphia or Baghdad museums to check which of the readings of the second element is correct. The signs MU and NUMUN can be easily confused in the script common to NB economic documents.

⁸⁶ A contrary opinion is expressed by San Nicolò in *Or* 19 219; but see his remarks in *BR* under no. 26.

⁸⁷ Smith, *Senn.* 10. Names of other southern cities such as Kullab and Eridu are also listed here. Cf. *Lie* 58:17.

⁸⁸ Gadd, *Iraq* 15 123-34; Lenzen, *Iraq* 19 146-50. There are also numerous bricks from the site which bear his name—from both his first and, apparently, his second reign (see sub 44.2.2 in the appended bibliography).

⁸⁹ In *harri ša Marduk-apla-iddina*. The same canal occurs in a letter dated over a century later (*YOS* 3 74:7-8), where a city near the locks of the canal is mentioned. *ABL* 747:8-9 and 942 r. 13 (and probably also *ABL* 1135:11-12) refer to the same waterway.

⁹⁰ *An. Or.* 9 no. 1; cf. *JCS* 1 352.

⁹¹ For the dating of this text, see M. J. Seux in *RA* 54 206-8.

may have taken the trouble to hold as hostages certain pro-Assyrian elements from the larger towns.⁹²

Probably neither Sargon's picture of Merodach-Baladan nor Merodach-Baladan's self-portrait is entirely correct. Merodach-Baladan was a Chaldean, but could hardly have been considered altogether a foreigner. There were undoubtedly disturbances from various tribes perpetrated in the north throughout his reign,⁹³ and the presence of prisoners from several northern cities in Dūr-Jakin in 709 indicates that not everyone was happy with his rule. He abandoned Babylon without a struggle in 710, and the leading men of the city invited Sargon to enter and, presumably, to take over the kingship. But he repaired temples in the major cities, claimed to have respected the rights of the people of Sippar, Nippur, and Babylon; and Babylonia made no spontaneous effort to revolt against him and later to a large extent even supported him against Sennacherib. There is without doubt truth on both sides of this picture—certain parties in northern Babylonia did not profit from his rule, but there can be little question of general disfavor throughout the north. Perhaps future uncovering of more detailed evidence will permit a finer revision of our present conclusions.

IV. MERODACH-BALADAN, MILITARY STRATEGIST⁹⁴

Between the battle of Dēr in 720 and Sargon's campaign in Babylonia in 710, we know very little of the foreign relations of Merodach-Baladan. The Babylonian Chronicle informs us of his conquest of a region of Bit-[.]-ri in 712, his tenth year, and of his despoiling of that area;⁹⁵ but we are still unable to restore the geographical name involved.⁹⁶

By the year 710, Sargon II felt in a sufficiently strong position as king of Assyria to test his prowess against Babylonia and Elam once more. Unfortunately, the campaigns of 710 and 709, in which Sargon finally succeeded in ousting Merodach-Baladan from the Babylonian throne, are known only from the Assyrian side. Both

⁹² Men of Assyrian extraction had infiltrated into high positions in Babylonia (at least in the ecclesiastical realm), as may be seen from the slightly earlier VAS 1 36 iii 6-19. This state of affairs will be discussed more fully in n. 103 below.

⁹³ Sargon had to remedy some internal lawlessness when he took over Babylonia (Lie 56:379-84, 64:10-11).

⁹⁴ This epithet may perhaps be justified by the consideration that Merodach-Baladan, even though seldom venturing an open battle, managed his tactic of strategic withdrawal so successfully that he hampered the advance of the powerful Assyrian military machine for many years. The charge of cowardice often laid at his door does not explain sufficiently his enduring negative attitude (and its concomitant actions) against Assyria any more than a similar label could amply describe perennial nomad raiding tactics.

⁹⁵ Bab. Chron. i 43-44, restored from 83-1-18,1338 (CT 34 44) ii 7'-8'. Another cryptic reference (badly broken) to an intervening year occurs in i 41-42 and in 83-1-18,1338 ii 3'-6'.

⁹⁶ Bit-Dakūri does come to mind, but there is hardly sufficient evidence to propose it seriously.

campaigns are described in detail in the Khorsabad edition of Sargon's annals, which undoubtedly underwent some retouching before being inscribed on the palace walls a few years later. This description is supplemented by various other inscriptions of Sargon, especially the detailed accounts of the events of 709 contained in the Display Inscription and in the Nimrud Prisms.⁹⁷

Sargon's account of these campaigns begins with the recounting of the past history of Merodach-Baladan and his offenses. Merodach-Baladan, king of Chaldea, lived on the shore of the Persian Gulf and trusted in his remote, swampy location to preserve him from the Assyrians. Consequently, on the death of Shalmaneser V, he withheld the *tamartu* ("tribute") that he had paid since the time of Tiglath-Pileser III.⁹⁸ He formed an alliance with the Elamite king (H)umbanigaš and incited the Sutian nomads to hostilities against Assyria. With the support of Elam and various tribes of southern Babylonia, he managed to govern Sumer and Akkad for twelve years against the will of the gods.⁹⁹

But then, the account continues, at the command of the gods, Sargon assembled his troops and marched to southeastern Babylonia to attack the town of Dūr-Athara, where Merodach-Baladan had assembled most of his forces and then flooded the surrounding terrain. Sargon conquered this city despite its watery defenses in a single day, renamed it Dūr-Nabû, and then proceeded to make a tour of the whole area, including Elam, defeating Arameans and other nomad tribes and driving the Elamite king, Šutruk-Nahhunte, into hiding in the mountains.¹⁰⁰ Merodach-Baladan heard with dismay of Sargon's successes and decided to seek sanctuary in the Elamite province of Jadbūr. He sent rich presents¹⁰¹ to Šutruk-Nahhunte to allow him this favor, but the Elamite forbade him to advance any further. Mero-

⁹⁷ For the complete bibliography of Sargon's inscriptions touching on the events of these two years, see Part VII, A, 44.2.20.

⁹⁸ We have no way of verifying this statement of Sargon, but cf. 2R 67:26-28 and D.T. 3:19.

⁹⁹ The summary of Merodach-Baladan's past history before 710 is contained in Lie 42:263-68, Winckler I 120:121-24, Iraq 16 Pl. XLVII vi 14-21. The short summaries in Winckler I 84:18, 150:46, and Lyon 14:31 likewise allege that Merodach-Baladan was ruling without the consent of the gods.

¹⁰⁰ Sargon was in possession of Nippur by Ulul of 710, as may be seen from the date of 2 NT 280: EN.LUL.KI [T]I KIN UD 29 KAM [MU SAG.N]AM.LUGAL "LUGAL-DU LUGAL KÁ.DIN[GIR.RA.KI]. That this document belongs to 710 rather than to 722 may be seen from the fact that Shalmaneser V did not die until Tebet of 722 and so Sargon's "accession year" then had no Ulul.

¹⁰¹ Merodach-Baladan seems to have been a rather wealthy chieftain. His extensive "tribute" to Tiglath-Pileser III in 729, the hereditary wealth of southern Babylonia as intimated in the descriptions of the "tribute" to Shalmaneser III in 850, the two instances of considerable sums paid to Elam in 710 and again in 703 for military assistance, the treasure taken from Merodach-Baladan's palace in Babylon by Sargon in 710 and by Sennacherib in 703, the extensive gold camp furniture captured at Dūr-Jakin in 709, the kudurrū grant in 715 from crown lands near Babylon all point to a generous view of Merodach-Baladan's financial status. See also Leemans, JEOL 10 443.

dach-Baladan was then forced to relinquish his plan of staying in Jadbūr and retired to the town of Iqbi-Bēl on the Elamite-Babylonian frontier.¹⁰²

After Merodach-Baladan's flight from Babylon, the chief citizens and especially the temple administration of Babylon and Borsippa eagerly invited Sargon to enter the land.¹⁰³ Sargon accepted the invitation, "took the hand" of Bēl at the New Year Festival in 709,¹⁰⁴ thereby officially becoming sovereign of Babylonia and re-

¹⁰² The principal events of 710 are narrated in Lie 42:268-54:371. The flight to Iqbi-Bēl is told also in Winckler I 120:125-26. See also Bab. Chron. ii 1-5. Further possible sources, not directly affecting Merodach-Baladan, are mentioned by Tadmor in JCS 12 96.

A variant tradition that Sargon received [tribute] from Merodach-Baladan at the end of 710 may be recorded in Lie 58:13. Substantiation for a theory that Merodach-Baladan submitted and was allowed to remain as prince of Bit-Jakin could also be adduced from Nimrud Letter XXXIX 66-70 (Saggs, *Iraq* 20 183 f., 207 f.). The passage speaks of an Apla-iddina who is to be sent to Sargon along with citizens of the leading cities of Babylonia (Babylon, Borsippa, Kish, Nippur, Uruk, Dēr), who are described as his people (*niššū*). Saggs makes an excellent case on other grounds for dating the letter around 710 or 709 B.C., and the possibility that we are here dealing with a shortened form of the name of Merodach-Baladan (Saggs, *Iraq* 20 207 and n. 5) seems quite plausible.

At present, however, it seems preferable to think that Merodach-Baladan did not submit to Sargon at this time (late 710). First of all, there is as yet no clear statement that he ever served as a subordinate to either Sargon or Sennacherib. Secondly, the usually reliable Babylonian Chronicle (ii 3) states explicitly that he retreated before Sargon and fled into Elam (*Marduk-apla-iddina ina pānīšu ibbalkilt ana Elamti iḥliq*). The flight to Iqbi-Bēl on the Elamite border is quite well established from other sources as well (Lie 54:370-71; Winckler I 120:125-26). Furthermore, in the second month of 709, Sargon found that Merodach-Baladan had already fortified Dūr-Jakin against him (Lie 58:404-60:408), a surprising action coming so shortly after his supposed submission. Since the evidence for such a submission comes from a broken and not altogether clear section of the Annals and since the passage in Nimrud Letter XXXIX does not certainly refer to (Marduk)-apla-iddina (even the writing of the name, 'dumu'uṣ-šum' is not incontestable in *Iraq* 20, Pl. XXXVII, and the orthography of the last element of his RN as sum alone would be unique), the weight of the evidence would seem to indicate that Merodach-Baladan retained full independence at this time.

¹⁰³ The pro-Assyrian character of the temple administration (especially the *ṣrib-bīti* class) in Babylon and Borsippa in the eighth century is well attested. As early as 753 (the document may be dated even slightly earlier), several of the high officials of Ezida in Borsippa were of Assyrian descent (*VAS* 1 36 iii 6 ff.). Another document from the same place and approximately the same time (*JRAS* 1892 350-68) depicts the active hostilities carried on against a governor of Borsippa (who happened to be of Assyrian descent and a temple official) during the reign of a Babylonian king from the Dakūri tribe. In 745, the officials of Esagila and Ezida welcomed Tiglath-Pileser during his campaign in Babylonia (Rost, *Tigl. III*, I 2:6-8). Then in 710, the *ṣrib-bīti* officials were conspicuously on hand to welcome Sargon to Babylon and Borsippa (Lie 54:371-56:374). On the other hand, the ecclesiastical lack of enthusiasm for Merodach-Baladan in Borsippa apparently did not prevent that city from fighting on his side in the campaign of 703 (Smith, *Senn.* 15).

On the Babylonian officials who came out to meet Sargon, see Sidney Smith's remarks in *BSOAS* 11 457-58. He classifies them as priests (*ṣrib-bīti*) and as civilian administrators (*ummdnī mudē šipri alikūl pāni mu'irāl māti*).

¹⁰⁴ The New Year Festival in Babylon marked the beginning of the first official regnal year of Sargon (709). Once again, the Assyrian change of *limmu's*, marking the start of their official year, did not take place until the following month; hence the Babylonian festival is still included in the account at the end of the *pālū* of 710 in the Assyrian reckoning (Lie 56:384-58:15).

uniting Babylonia and Assyria under the person of one king for the first time since the death of Shalmaneser V, some twelve years before. He restored order in the land by dispatching soldiers to deal with bandits interfering with caravans in the neighborhood of Sippar.¹⁰⁵ He bestowed gifts on the local temples and then prepared for the campaign of 709, which he commenced in Ajjār.¹⁰⁶

Merodach-Baladan had in the meantime collected his forces in the south for a stand at his old tribal capital of Dūr-Jakin.¹⁰⁷ He had strengthened the walls of the city and had dug a sizeable moat in front of the defenses. But the Assyrians crossed the moat, besieged and captured the city. The city itself was destroyed by fire and the surrounding countryside devastated.¹⁰⁸ Merodach-Baladan himself appears to have suffered a slight wound in battle, but escaped—even though most of his royal camp furniture was captured.¹⁰⁹ The captives from the northern cities of Babylonia detained in Dūr-Jakin were released from prison and returned to their homes, where their sequestered lands were restored.¹¹⁰ Many other cities in the area were captured and leveled, including Iqbi-Bēl, Merodach-Baladan's place of refuge in the preceding year.¹¹¹ Sargon also "restored" the ancient privileges of such cities as Ur, Uruk, and Eridu.¹¹² He built fortresses on the Elamite border to prevent Merodach-Baladan from returning to the land unhindered.¹¹³ The captured Babylonian territory was then divided and placed under the administration of two Assyrian provincial governors (*šaknu*, sg.), one of Babylon and one of Gambulu.¹¹⁴ Many

¹⁰⁵ Lie 56:379-84.

¹⁰⁶ Sargon's activities in Babylon at the end of 710 and the beginning of 709 are treated in Lie 54:371-58:15.

¹⁰⁷ For a possible identification of this site, see Saggs, "A Cylinder from Tell al-Lahm," *Sumer* 13 190-95. Another town in Bit-Jakin, present day Abu Ṣalābiḥ, has also recently been identified by a short NB inscription, IM 62777 (Georges Roux, *Sumer* 16 27).

¹⁰⁸ The fortification and subsequent capture of Dūr-Jakin is treated in Lie 58:17-64:8; Winckler I 120:126-122:134, *Iraq* 16 Pls. XLVII f. vi 27-62. See also Lyon 14:32-33, Bab. Chron. ii 1'-2'. The eponym canon C4 r. 17-18 (*RLA* 2 434) indicates that the final destruction of Dūr-Jakin under Sargon did not take place until 707; cf. also the mention of Dūr-Jakin in what seems to be a tribute list from Nimrud dated in that same year: ND 2451:26 (*Iraq* 23 Pl. XIV). By 703, however, it was again a strong city (Smith, *Senn.* 48).

Two Harper letters may probably be assigned to around the time of Sargon's campaign to Dūr-Jakin: see *AEL* 865 r. 6-8; 131 r. 4-5. They contain no information on the battles. É. Dhorme (*RB* 31 [1922] 403-6; reprinted in *Recueil Edouard Dhorme* [Paris, 1951], pp. 301-4) would see in the oracle in Isaiah 21 an allusion to the defeat of the Sealand and Babylonia in 710-709.

¹⁰⁹ The wound (in his hand) is mentioned in Lie 60:411. The capture of the camp furnishings is told in Lie 60:413-14; Winckler I 122:131-32. He himself doubtless escaped (Lie 62:12-13), though some recensions of the campaign claim that he was captured: Winckler I 122:133-34, *Iraq* 16 Pl. XLVIII vi 45; Winckler I 84:18-19 and 150:48-49, Lyon 14:31-32.

¹¹⁰ Lie 64:8-11, Winckler I 122:134-124:136, *Iraq* 16 Pl. XLVIII vi 63-74.

¹¹¹ Lie 64:13-15, Winckler I 124:137-38, *Iraq* 16 Pl. XLVIII vi 50-52.

¹¹² Lie 64:11-13, Winckler I 124:136-37, *Iraq* 16 Pl. XLVIII vi 75-79.

¹¹³ Lie 64:16-17, Winckler I 124:139, ostensibly to keep out the Elamites.

¹¹⁴ Lie 66:1, Winckler I 124:140, 84:19, and 150:49-53; *Iraq* 16 Pl. XLVIII vi 83.

people of Bit-Jakin were subsequently deported to Commagene (Kummuh);¹¹⁶ and their lands were in turn settled by deportees from Commagene, which Sargon captured in the following year.¹¹⁶

After the conquest of Dūr-Jakin in 709, we hear no more of Merodach-Baladan until after Sennacherib's accession to the Assyrian throne. Sargon ruled Babylonia as its official king¹¹⁷ from 709 till his death in battle in Iran in 705.¹¹⁸ Sennacherib then succeeded to the dual monarchy, but not without opposition.

We shall have to preface our consideration of Sennacherib's campaigns against Merodach-Baladan with some remarks on the chronology of the period. The problems surrounding the date of Sennacherib's accession and the date of his first campaign are complex and cannot hope to be settled here with any degree of finality. But several observations may be made which will help to clarify the present situation.

As Julius Lewy has pointed out,¹¹⁹ there are three separate traditions about the date of Sennacherib's first official regnal year. Various documents point to 705, 704, and 703 as possible contenders for that distinction.¹²⁰ With the evidence available, Lewy rightly concluded that 704 is the most likely date. This is supported by Kinglist A and probably by the Babylonian Chronicle,¹²¹ the most reliable general chronological documents dealing with the period.

The date of Sennacherib's first campaign (primarily directed against Merodach-Baladan) is equally obscure. The documentary evidence may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Kinglist A iv 12-15—Sennacherib is assigned 704 and 703 as his official reign; then Marduk-zākīr-šumi II and Merodach-Baladan II are given 1 month and 9

¹¹⁶ Lie 72:9-10, Winckler I 118:116.

¹¹⁷ Lie 64:15-16, Winckler I 124:138-39.

¹¹⁸ Kinglist A iv 11; but Sargon prefers to use the older title *šakkanakku* rather than "king" of Babylonia in his inscriptions.

¹¹⁹ Eponym canon C^b6 r. 10 (RLA 2 435), discussed by Tadmor in *JCS* 12 97. See also the general comments of Lehmann-Haupt, "Zum Tode Sargons von Assyrien," *Klio* 16 340-42.

¹²⁰ "The Chronology of Sennacherib's Accession," *An. Or.* 12 225-31.

¹²¹ For 705: K. 2856 + K. 6406 (partly published in *AJSL* 35 136-37), Rm. 167 (= *ADD* 230), K. 2670 (= *3R* 2 no. XXII), 82-5-22, 34 (= *ADD* 447); for 704: three unpublished tablets cited in Smith, *The Assyrian Canon*, p. 88, K. 398 (Bezold, *Cat.*, I, 99), and K. 75 + K. 237 (Bezold, *Cat.*, I, 20-21); for 703: Walters Art Gallery, no. 41109 iv 126 (see Grayson, *AfO* 20 Taf. IV). These are all inscriptions dating from the reign of Sennacherib which bear double dating, i.e., both in terms of a named eponym year and a numbered regnal year.

¹²² The Kinglist A (iv 12) assigns the years 704-703 as official regnal years to Sennacherib, while the Ptolemaic Canon describes these same years as *ἀπασλευρα* (sc. *ἐτη*)—presumably because Sennacherib did not undergo the formal installation ceremonies as king at the New Year and thus was not reckoned as monarch according to one school of thought. The Babylonian Chronicle (ii 12) preserves a cryptic reference to the second year of a king between Sargon II and Bēl-ibni, which can only be Sennacherib.

months respectively (no official regnal year for either);¹²² Bēl-ibni receives the next three official years, 702-700;

2. Babylonian Chronicle ii 12-23—the campaign is apparently ascribed to the second year of Sennacherib, since no horizontal line in the text divides the events described in lines 19-23 from the date in 12;

3. Eponym canon C^b6 r. 11-12 (RLA 2 435)—mentions [the capture of] the cities of Larak and Sarabanu¹²³ under the eponym of Nabû-dīnī-ēpuš (704);

4. Sennacherib in his various inscriptions recounting the first campaign alludes to it as taking place either *ina rēš šarrūtiya* (*ša ina kussi šarrūti rabiš āšibuma*)¹²⁴ or *ina mahrt girrija*,¹²⁵ these phrases, which may be translated as "at the beginning of my kingship"¹²⁶ and "in my first campaign," have no absolute chronological significance.

Except for the evidence of the eponym canon C^b6, all the rest of these data may be fitted into the coherent schema shown at the top of page 24.

The only difficulty in this arrangement is that Sennacherib must have been able to complete his rout of Merodach-Baladan within about forty days. But even this is decidedly within the realm of possibility. The march down the Tigris from Assur to Cutha need have taken only a few days at the outside, towards the end of which Merodach-Baladan left Babylon and routed the advance guard of the army which

¹²³ Hence they are omitted from the Ptolemaic Canon, which only recorded reigns of at least one official year.

¹²⁴ Cf. Bab. Chron. i 22.

¹²⁵ Smith, *Senn.* 5; *OIP* 2 56:5.

¹²⁶ *OIP* 2 24:20 and *passim*.

¹²⁷ *Rēš šarrūtiya* does not mean "accession year" in the context of Assyrian annals. The longer phrase *ina rēš šarrūtiya ša ina kussi šarrūti rabiš āšibuma*, which occurs in Sennacherib, is a direct descendant of the older lapidary formula used in the annals of Shalmaneser III: *ina šurrūt šarrūtiya ša ina kussi šarrūti rabiš āšibu* (*3R* 7 i 14-15)—the two phrases being too similar (save for the interchange of *rēš* and *šurrūt*) to admit of any other explanation. Almost identical phrases occur earlier in Ashurnasirpal II, Adad-nirari II, Aššur-dan II, and Aššur-bēl-kala (for references, see Tadmor, *JCS* 12 28 nn. 46-49 and *AKA* 269 i 44), where the older *šurrūt* sometimes alternates with *šurrūt*. Here, as Tadmor has pointed out, *šurrūt/di šarrūtiya* may refer to an event in the accession year or the first year of the king. But once it is likewise used of an event in Shalmaneser III's second official year: *ina šurrūt šarrūtiya ina limme katti kumiya* (*3R* 8 ii 66-67). *Rēš šarrūtiya* replaces *šurrūt/di šarrūtiya* in these phrases and without doubt takes on the same general chronological significance.

Why *rēš šarrūtiya* came to be substituted for *šurrūt/di šarrūtiya* in the eighth century is unknown, though it may simply have been a result of Babylonizing influences. The first occurrence of *rēš* in this usage in Assyria may be in line 10 of Sargon's annals (as restored by Tadmor in *JCS* 12 34). Before this time, *rēš šarrūtiya* is as yet unattested in the phrase *ina rēš šarrūtiya* in Assyrian inscriptions, though the phrase *ultu rēš šarrūtiya* does occur as early as the time of Tiglath-Pileser I (*AKA* 83 vi 44). For other references of *ultu rēš šarrūtiya* with the meaning "from the beginning of my reign" in Assyria before Sennacherib, see Tadmor, *JCS* 12 27 n. 44. References to *rēš šarrūtiya* in Assyria after Sennacherib are listed in *JCS* 12 28 nn. 50-51.

Year ¹⁹⁷	Month	Day	
703	I		Sennacherib in possession of Babylon ¹²⁸
	I/II		accession of Marduk-zākir-šumi II ¹²⁹
	II/III		accession of Merodach-Baladan
	XI	20	Sennacherib leaves Assur to go to Babylon on his first campaign ¹³⁰
	XI/XII		Merodach-Baladan flees from Kish; Sennacherib wins battle there and proceeds to Babylon ¹³¹
702	I		Bēl-ibni installed as king in Babylon ¹³²

had been sent ahead to Kish.¹³³ Sennacherib made short work of resistance at Cutha;¹³⁴ and, by the time he reached Kish, Merodach-Baladan appears to have fled.¹³⁵ The whole campaign could certainly have occupied less than a month.¹³⁶

Several interesting facts emerge from a more detailed study of this first campaign. Despite the fact that Merodach-Baladan had been king for just a few months—immediately following the disappearance of the almost unknown Marduk-zākir-šumi II¹³⁷—he once again enjoyed a large following. Troops were gathered for him from

¹²⁷ As is the custom in most historical articles, the year 703/702 is called simply 703, even though events occurring from the end of the ninth month on in the Babylonian year might fall into the early months of what would be 702 according to our reckoning.

¹²⁸ Kinglist A iv 12 officially assigns him the regnal year 703 (as his second regnal year) so that he should have been in control of Babylon for the Near Year Festival of that year. Presumably he lost control there soon after.

¹²⁹ Since the year 703 was officially assigned to Sennacherib and the year 702 to Bēl-ibni, the ten-month period in which Marduk-zākir-šumi II and Merodach-Baladan controlled Babylon should fall between the Nisans of these two years. Thus Merodach-Baladan, at the latest, must have been expelled toward the close of Addar 703 and Marduk-zākir-šumi, at the earliest, should have come to the throne towards the end of Nisan 703, when the New Year Festival was over.

¹³⁰ Smith, *Senn.* 19.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 25–33.

¹³² Bab. Chron. ii 24 and Kinglist A iv 15 list the year 702 as the first official year of his reign.

¹³³ Smith, *Senn.* 20–22. For the Gate of Zababa, from which Merodach-Baladan left Babylon for Kish, see Unger, *Babylon*, pp. 74–75.

¹³⁴ Smith, *Senn.* 23–24.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 25–26.

¹³⁶ I.e., from the departure from Assur on XI-20 to the strategic withdrawal of Merodach-Baladan before an imminent battle at Kish. According to the Bab. Chron. ii 24–25, Sennacherib finished the rest of his first campaign (especially against Hirimma and Hārastum) in the early months of 702.

The eponym chronicle C⁶ would seemingly try to present a picture of Sennacherib beginning his first campaign in late 704 (and then continuing for more than thirteen months into early 702?). This would be belied by the fact that Sennacherib was still officially king of Babylon at the beginning of 703 before being challenged for that position by the two native Babylonian rulers. It is definitely contradicted by the statement of the Babylonian Chronicle ii 12–23, as explained above on p. 23.

¹³⁷ He is attested in Kinglist A iv 13: *ṛṛ 1 ṁḫḫ-za-kir-MU A ṁḫḫ*. The only other probable contemporary reference to Marduk-zākir-šumi II known to me at present is contained in the kudurru of Merodach-Baladan's seventh year, where a *ṁḫḫ-AMAR-UTU-za-kir-MU A ṁḫḫ-BAD LÓ EN-NAM*

Ur, Eridu, Kullab, Bit-Jakin, Bit-Amukāni, Bit-Šaalli, Bit-Dakūri, Nippur, Borsippa, and Cutha, to mention the most important places.¹³⁸ Elamite troops, according to Sennacherib's account were also hired; and it was these who bore the brunt of the defeat after Merodach-Baladan's defection at Kish.¹³⁹ In this same battle, Merodach-Baladan's nephew was captured.¹⁴⁰ Sennacherib was then free to enter Babylon and to loot the palace that Merodach-Baladan had inhabited there.¹⁴¹ From here, Sennacherib dispatched a pursuit party to retrieve Merodach-Baladan from his refuge in the swamps, but it proved unsuccessful in its quest.¹⁴² An Assyrian army then proceeded to tour many of the villages and towns belonging to the larger tribes in southern Babylonia and to weed out the rebellious elements there; a similar process was also launched in Nippur, Sippar, Kish, and Hursagkalamma further north.¹⁴³ Apparently Merodach-Baladan had such widespread support

occurs as a witness among other high officers of the realm, just twelve years before this king ascended the throne (*VAS* 1 37 v 2–3). The probability of two men with the same name and such similar patronymics occurring in high official circles within these two ill-documented decades is minimal; so we may reasonably assume that king Marduk-zākir-šumi II was the son of this Arad-Enlil. Consequently, the tendency to translate the *A ṁḫḫ* in Kinglist A as "son of a slave" (e.g., Meissner, *Könige Babylonien und Assyrien*, p. 193; Luckenbill, *OIP* 2, p. 10; Moortgat in *Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum*, p. 418; Schmökel, *Geschichte des alten Vorderasien*, p. 272) should be allowed to die out.

A later and less clear allusion occurs in Berossus, who says that the predecessor of Merodach-Baladan ruled less than thirty days (rounded off to a month in Kinglist A) and was slain by Merodach-Baladan. The time intervals in this section of Berossus—6 months for Merodach-Baladan, 3 years for Bēl-ibni, 6 years for Aššur-nādin-šumi—are relatively reliable, but other factual information, e.g., that Merodach-Baladan was in turn slain by Bēl-ibni, is manifestly untrustworthy.

Although the seal with the short votive inscription bearing the name of Marduk-zākir-šumi (see *JCS* 16 96 sub 25.2.1) might strictly speaking be assigned to this king, the likelihood of such an assignation is small since Marduk-zākir-šumi I ruled ca. 25–35 years, as contrasted with the few weeks of Marduk-zākir-šumi II.

¹³⁸ Smith, *Senn.* 10–15.

¹³⁹ Smith, *Senn.* 7–9, 27. Cf. also *OIP* 2 56:5, 24:21, 66–67:4, 76:10, 85:7; *Sumer* 9 118:25. It would be more accurate to say that the services of the Elamite army and of various high Elamite officials were purchased rather than that mercenaries were hired.

¹⁴⁰ Smith, *Senn.* 28. Reading *DUMU NIN! RN* would seem to be preferable to reading the passage as *DUMU DAM RN*, as though Merodach-Baladan's wife had had children by a previous marriage. (Dr. Sollberger has kindly collated the line in question in the British Museum and remarks that while the sign as it stands is clearly *DAM*, it is not impossible that the *Winkelhaken* before the final upright is just accidental.) Other evidence of scribal confusion in signs may be seen in the text: *A* for *ṁ* (line 17), *RU* for *TA* (line 23).

¹⁴¹ Smith, *Senn.* 30–33; *OIP* 2 56:8–10, 24:27–35, 67:5–6; *Sumer* 9 120:32–41.

¹⁴² Smith, *Senn.* 34; *OIP* 2 56:10. Guzummanu, Merodach-Baladan's place of refuge, is otherwise unknown.

¹⁴³ Smith, *Senn.* 36–52; *OIP* 2 56:11–57:12, 24:35–25:50, 67:6–7, 77:13, 85:7; *Sumer* 9 120:42–122:63. Possibly *ARU* 13 (= *ADD* 620 = *ABL* 1452) and *OIP* 2 157 no. XXX date from either this or the fourth campaign.

throughout Babylonia that Sennacherib felt that a thorough housecleaning was in order before he could reign peacefully.

Very little is known about Merodach-Baladan's brief, nine-month term as king of Babylonia. Any inscription connected with him that bears no specific date might conceivably be linked to this second period of rule.¹⁴⁴ But the only documents probably to be assigned here in preference to the first reign are those brick inscriptions from Uruk which bear the line *nam.lugal.la.ta.min.kam*, plausibly translated as "in his second kingship."¹⁴⁵

After his rout of Merodach-Baladan in 703, Sennacherib did not attempt to ascend the Babylonian throne at that time.¹⁴⁶ Instead he installed Bēl-ibni, a man of Babylonian descent who had been educated at the Assyrian court.¹⁴⁷ Bēl-ibni, a member of the *rab-bāni* class in Babylonia,¹⁴⁸ apparently remained loyal to the Assyrians for at least the beginning of his reign. But, in 700, when Sennacherib once again undertook a campaign against Babylonia, either his abilities or his sympathies were in question; for he was removed as king and deported to Assyria.¹⁴⁹ In his stead Sennacherib then installed his own crown prince, Aššur-nādin-šumi, on the Babylonian throne.¹⁵⁰

The campaign of 700 was directed primarily against Bit-Jakin, the homeland of Merodach-Baladan. On his way to the extreme south of Babylonia, Sennacherib

¹⁴⁴ E.g., *UET* 4 8, *BBSI* no. 35, etc.

¹⁴⁵ The translation of this line of late Sumerian is open to question: see A. Schott in *UVB* 1 55. It should be noted that in these later brick inscriptions Merodach-Baladan no longer feels it necessary to allude to his Erība-Marduk pedigree.

¹⁴⁶ A recently excavated economic text from Nippur is dated "the ninth day of Nisan, year 3 of Sennacherib, king of Assyria" (2 NT 285). This tablet is probably to be assigned to the year 686 (Sennacherib's second official reign as king of Babylonia, according to Kinglist A iv 19) since another economic text dated from the same city in Addar 703 (2 NT 284; 13-XII, accession year of Bēl-ibni) shows clearly that Bēl-ibni was already reckoned as king there at the end of what was originally Sennacherib's second regnal year.

¹⁴⁷ Smith, *Senn.* 54; cf. *OIP* 2 57:13. Bēl-ibni is graphically described as *piri> Bābili* (šv.an.na.xi) *ka kima mirāni qahri qirib ekallija irbā*: "a scion of Babylon who had grown up like a young puppy in my palace."

¹⁴⁸ The exact function of the class is uncertain. In slightly later texts, the word seems to be *rabbānu*—cf. the writing *lū gal-ba-a-a-ni-e* (*BRM* 1 73:36).

¹⁴⁹ Bab. Chron. ii 26-28; Berossus in *FGH* III C/1 p. 386:12-13. Olmstead's claim that Bēl-ibni was living in Assyria as late as 682 (*AJSL* 38 78; *History of Assyria*, p. 290) is based on the fact that a Bēl-ibni (no patronymic given) occurs as a witness in *ADD* 222 and possibly *ADD* 101. This and a similar assertion that Bēl-ibni witnessed a document in Kalbu in 707 B.C. (*ADD* 292; *AJSL* 38 76) are hardly well grounded. Bēl-ibni was a relatively common name (Tallqvist, *APN*, pp. 57-58), and there is no indication whatsoever that the Bēl-ibni(s) in *ADD* and the sometime Babylonian monarch are to be identified.

¹⁵⁰ Bab. Chron. ii 30-31.

stopped off at Bittūtū to subdue one of the rising local chieftains, Šūzubu, who some seven years later reappeared on the scene as king of Babylonia under his full name of Mušēzib-Marduk.¹⁵¹ After the defeat of Šūzubu, Sennacherib headed directly for the territory of Merodach-Baladan. The Chaldean prince once more fled in the wake of the Assyrian army to the city of Nagite, which the official Assyrian versions of the campaign usually describe as being on an island (*ša qabal tāmtim*) but, as one inscription indicates, was probably swampy land in the region of Elam reached by crossing the Persian Gulf.¹⁵²

This is the last that we hear of Merodach-Baladan. He had fled to Elam with his national gods and the bones of his ancestors¹⁵³ sometime in the year 700, abandoning even members of his family, if Sennacherib can be believed.¹⁵⁴ Before the next campaign of Sennacherib against the refugees of Bit-Jakin in Elam, which took place in 694, Merodach-Baladan had apparently died,¹⁵⁵ since he is not mentioned in the account of that campaign. His son, Nabū-šuma-iškun, subsequently replaced him as the leading man of the Jakin tribe.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵¹ *OIP* 2 34:52-57, 71:33-34; *Sumer* 9 142:14-18. Since Šūzubu is also used as a hypocoristic for Nergal-ušēzib (e.g., *OIP* 2 38:46), we must distinguish carefully between Šūzubu the Chaldean (*lū Kal-dū-aa*, *OIP* 2 34:53, 41:17, 43:54, etc.) and Šūzubu the Babylonian (*nuṣu ka.dinim*, *RAKI*, *OIP* 2 38:47). The former was Mušēzib-Marduk, king of Babylonia from 692 to 689; the latter was Nergal-ušēzib, king in 693. Olmstead (*History of Assyria*, pp. 289-90; *AJSL* 38 77) wrongly identifies the Šūzubu defeated by Sennacherib in 700 as Nergal-ušēzib, and Sidney Smith in *CAH* 3 65 calls him "Marduk-ushezib." Both should be corrected to Mušēzib-Marduk.

¹⁵² *OIP* 2 35:59-65, 71:34-35, 77:25-78:27, 85:7-10; *Sumer* 9 142:25-34; cf. *OIP* 2 87:27, 89:4-6. The true location of the city is indicated by *OIP* 2 85:10 *ana uru Na-gi-ti ša ebertān fu Marrat* (i.e., on the other side of the Persian Gulf); cf. *OIP* 2 78:30. The prism inscription published by Heidel spells the GN: *xur Na-gi-a-te*; the other versions all prefix the determinative *uru* rather than *xur* and spell the name variously as *Na-gi-le*, *Na-gi-i-ti*, *Na-gi-ti*, *Na-gi-a-ti*. The modifier *raqqi*, as pointed out by Ungnad in *ZA* 38 197, should not be read as part of the GN, as was done in some instances by Luckenbill.

¹⁵³ Merodach-Baladan's removal of the bones of his ancestors from their graves (*OIP* 2 85:8-9) and his transporting them to Nagite is a significant instance of respect for the remains of the ancestral dead in Mesopotamia—here even at the cost of leaving some of the living representatives of the royal family behind. This attitude becomes more intelligible when we remember that the burial places of earlier monarchs who came from the tribal regions in southern Babylonia were faithfully recorded in the so-called Dynastic Chronicle (King, *Chronicles*, 2 52 ff. r. ii 4-11) and that Aššur-etel-ilāni respected the local custom by graciously permitting a safe burial to Šamaš-ibni in his southern homeland of Bit-Dakūri (*YOS* 1 43). That the bones of the dead were not always similarly respected is shown by the vaunted actions of Ashurbanipal (*Streck, Ass.* 38 iv 83 ff., 126 vi 85 ff.).

¹⁵⁴ *OIP* 2 35:63-66, 71:36, 85:7-10.

¹⁵⁵ The only reference to that event is the laconic *imid šaddū* of *OIP* 2 86:11.

¹⁵⁶ He is mentioned by Sennacherib in *OIP* 2 46:17, 82:37, 89:50, 92:16, *AJO* 20 94:102, and probably in *OIP* 2 43:46. Other descendants of Merodach-Baladan who continued the family tradition of Assyrian harassment are treated below in Part V, Section A.

V. PARALIFOMENA

A. THE FAMILY OF MERODACH-BALADAN

The family of Merodach-Baladan has been reconstructed by both Streck¹⁵⁷ and Leemans,¹⁵⁸ and we do little more than to review their conclusions here. From "Jakin" in the time of Shalmaneser III (850 B.C.) down to the death of Nabû-bêl-šumâte in the time of Ashurbanipal (ca. 640 B.C.), we can identify seven separate generations of the royal family of the Sealand. Our information about them may be summed up in the following genealogical table:

(a) "Jakin"	850	king of the Sealand
(b) Marduk-zêra-uballiṭ	n.d.	possibly father of Marduk-šakin-šumi ¹⁵⁹
(c) Marduk-šakin-šumi	n.d.	father of Eriša-Marduk ¹⁶⁰
(d) Eriša-Marduk	761	king of Babylonia; his reign ended in this year at the latest; ancestor of Merodach-Baladan (probably grandfather)
(e) Merodach-Baladan	729	king of the Sealand
	721-710, 703	king of Babylonia
	715	full-grown son acts as witness to kudurru
	700	last recorded fight against the Assyrians
(f) sons of Merodach-Baladan		
1 Iqīša-Marduk	715	witness to kudurru ¹⁶¹
2 Nabû-šuma-iškun	691	captured after battle of Halulê during Sennacherib's eighth campaign ¹⁶²
3 Nabû-zêr-kitti-līšir	680	governor (<i>šaknu</i>) of the Sealand; took advantage of revolt in Assyria to attack Ningal-iddina, the loyal governor of Ur; subsequently murdered in Elam ¹⁶³
4 Na'id-Marduk	680	brother of Nabû-zêr-kitti-līšir; after death of his brother, he flees from Elam to Assyria, where he is received with favor and placed in charge of the Sealand for the Assyrians ¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁷ Streck, *Asb.*, p. CDLXXI (for descendants of Merodach-Baladan).

¹⁵⁸ *JEOL* 10 443.

¹⁵⁹ See *JCS* 16 98 sub 28-32 (b). The reading of the last element of the PN is uncertain, but Dr. Sollberger has kindly collated the seal for me and reports that a queried *mu(?)* is preferable to a queried *mu(?)*.

¹⁶⁰ New Babylonian Chronicle, r. 8.

¹⁶¹ *VAS* 1 37 iv 57.

¹⁶² See Part VII, A, 44.3.1 for references.

¹⁶³ See Part VII, A, 44.3.2, Bab. Chron. iii 39-42. Cf. *ABL* 589:3, r. 3; 965 r. 27 ff.; 1248:4 ff.; and possibly 1107:2.

¹⁶⁴ He is not called "son of Merodach-Baladan" in any published inscription.

¹⁶⁵ Borger, *Esarh.* 47:58-63; also *ibid.*, 47:35-38, 48; K. 8542:7 ff., 111:Fr. C:8. Cf. *ABL* 223 r. 5; 576:15; 839:15; 1114:13 ff.; 1131; and possibly 971:2 and 958:3, r. 17 f. For a suggested reading of *BHT* 12:2, see Borger, *Esarh.*, p. 121.

5 Nabû-ušallim ¹⁶⁶	n.d.	little known, save as father of Aplāju; there was some talk of his succeeding Na'id-Marduk as ruler of the Sealand; he is supposed to have fled the country in the time of Sennacherib ¹⁶⁷
(g) grandsons of Merodach-Baladan		
1 Aplāju ¹⁶⁸	ca. 653	approximate date of his execution in Assyria after extradition from Elam ¹⁶⁹
2 Nabû-bêl-šumâte	652	recruited by Šamaš-šum-ukīn to assist in the latter's rebellion
	650	dispossessed of his territory in the Sealand by the second month of this year ¹⁷⁰
	ca. 640	dies in Elam after eluding Assyrian attempts at extradition for about a decade ¹⁷¹

After Nabû-bêl-šumâte, trace is lost of the royal family, though Olmstead was of the opinion that the dynasty of Nabopolassar was directly descended from the stock of Merodach-Baladan.¹⁷² Unfortunately, there is no proof as yet for this assertion.

We do not know, however, whether the generations enumerated above were in every instance consecutive. Places where uncertainty arises are between "Jakin" (a) and Marduk-šakin-šumi (c) and between Eriša-Marduk (d) and Merodach-Baladan (e). In the first case, we do not know: (1) whether Marduk-zêra-uballiṭ [(b)] was really the name of the grandfather of Eriša-Marduk; nor (2) how many generations must be interposed between "Jakin" and Marduk-šakin-šumi. No decisive evidence can be brought to bear on either question, though the greater probability lies with the identity of the two Marduk-šakin-šumi's and with only one generation intervening between "Jakin" and Marduk-šakin-šumi.¹⁷⁴ In the second case, as we

¹⁶⁶ Last element of PN also written *sa-lim* (Streck, *Asb.* 126 vi 61).

¹⁶⁷ *ABL* 1114. Cf. *ABL* 576:12, 1011 r. 4, and possibly 258:2, 336:4 ff.

¹⁶⁸ Streck, *Asb.* 126 vi 62-63.

¹⁶⁹ The possibility of this reading was already recognized by Streck (*Asb.* 124 y, etc.), but his alternate of *Šumāja* has generally been preferred (e.g., Leemans, *JEOL* 10 443). But the writing of the name clearly makes *Aplāju* the more likely reading: *ḫummu.ūš-a-a* (Streck, *Asb.* 124 ff. vi 61, 65, 82; 420:Sm. 1350, r. 4), *ḫummu.ūš-ja* (126 vi 65 [var.]; 332: K. 2764 r. 21), *ḫa-a-a* (322: K. 2637:10).

¹⁷⁰ Streck, *Asb.* 124 vi 61-126 vi 83, etc.

¹⁷¹ *ABL* 289, which notes this fact, is dated 5-II-650 B.C.

¹⁷² For references, see Part VII, A, 44.3.3 (b). A full list of passages referring to both Aplāju and Nabû-bêl-šumâte may be found in the indices of the third volume of Streck, *Asb.*

¹⁷³ E.g., *History of Assyria*, pp. 633-34.

¹⁷⁴ This depends on whether the Marduk-šakin-šumi of the seal (BM 129532) is identical with the Marduk-šakin-šumi who was Eriša-Marduk's father.

¹⁷⁵ The Marduk-šakin-šumi of the seal seems to have been an important person of the Jakin tribe (cf. the depiction on the seal itself: "a royal or princely personage with a long curved staff

have seen above,¹⁷⁵ Eriša-Marduk was probably grandfather to Merodach-Baladan, though the possibility of his being father cannot be excluded altogether.

With these considerations in mind, then, the most likely scheme of generations would be:

1	a
2	[b]
3	c
4	d
5	[unknown]
6	e
7	f
8	g

Less likely, but possible schemes would be:

1	a	a
2	[unknown]	[b]
3	[b]	c
4	c	d
5	d	e
6	[unknown]	f
7	e	g
8	f	h
9	g	i

Unfortunately, the family of Merodach-Baladan is known chiefly from Assyrian sources, where they are naturally depicted as trouble-makers who disrupt the peace in southern Babylonia. Despite instances of "tribute" paid by "Jakin" and by Merodach-Baladan in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III and Tiglath-Pileser III respectively, we meet the members of the Jakin tribe almost exclusively in a context of hostility against Assyria. From the time of Merodach-Baladan on, the fate of the royal family of Jakin is closely linked with that of the royal house of Elam. Merodach-Baladan supports his claim to the Babylonian throne with Elamite troops in 720 and in 703 and retreats rapidly when he is denied Elamite asylum in 710; his final stand after 700 is in Elam. Nabû-šuma-iškun is captured when fighting with the Elamites against Sennacherib in 691. Nabû-zēr-kitti-līšir flees to Elam after his revolt against Esarhaddon and meets his death there through Elamite treachery. Only when Elam thus appears disloyal, does Na'id-Marduk present a rare instance

in his hand," Carnegie, *Catalogue*, II, 82), and Eriša-Marduk's father undoubtedly belonged to the same tribe and should have been a prominent member. . . . Considering the average throne tenure for three generations to be approximately 80 years (see Rowton, *CAH* 1 (rev. ed.), chap. vi, 37), the generations here described as [b], c, d would have occupied the throne ca. 840-ca. 760, still allowing for "Jakin" to rule for some years after 850.

¹⁷⁵ See nn. 15 and 18 above.

of a member of the Jakin tribe working peacefully for Assyria.¹⁷⁶ When King Teumman of Elam falls prey to Ashurbanipal, Aplāju, a grandson of Merodach-Baladan, is forced to share the same fate. And, lastly, after Nabû-bēl-šumâte has evaded extradition from Elam for so long, he too is forced to commit suicide¹⁷⁷ when King Ummanaldaš is about to betray him. Ironically enough, Elam as a royal power did not long survive the death of Nabû-bēl-šumâte.

In keeping with the nomad tradition, the Jakin tribe, despite its supposed wealth, never did much of its own fighting. Though Merodach-Baladan, Nabû-zēr-kitti-līšir, and Nabû-bēl-šumâte successfully organized resistance in southern Babylonia against Sargon, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal, their chief tactic in the advance of an Assyrian army was flight to Elam. Their policy, in general, worked well; and it was only later in the seventh century when Elam itself turned treacherous that Nabû-zēr-kitti-līšir and Nabû-bēl-šumâte met their downfall.

B. MERODACH-BALADAN'S EMBASSY TO HEZEKIAH

We will consider here four ancient sources (all in the Hebrew tradition) which touch on Merodach-Baladan's embassy to Hezekiah: (1) 2 Kings 20:12-21, (2) Isaiah 39:1-8, (3) 2 Chronicles 32:31, (4) Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, X, ii, 2.

According to the first two of these passages, which are almost verbally identical in the Massoretic text,¹⁷⁸ Merodach-Baladan¹⁷⁹ sent letters and gifts to Hezekiah to congratulate him on recovering from a near-fatal illness. Hezekiah was pleased with the embassy and showed the Babylonians the treasures of his house and kingdom. After the departure of the ambassadors, the prophet Isaiah voiced strong disapproval of Hezekiah's action and predicted that the treasures of the palace would one day be carried away to Babylon and that the king's descendants would serve as eunuchs in the Babylonian palace. The scene ended with Hezekiah accepting the

¹⁷⁸ Another rare instance must be inferred from the conduct of Nabû-zēr-kitti-līšir, who was probably serving as governor of the Sealand under Assyria since it is explicitly stated in Borger, *Esarh.* 46:40-42 that he had violated his previous oaths of fealty.

¹⁷⁷ He had a servant run him through with a dagger.

¹⁷⁸ The LXX versions of 2 Kings 20 and Isaiah are not nearly so verbally identical, but the variations are of little historical significance. Thus in LXX Kings, Merodach-Baladan sends *biblia kai manaa* to Hezekiah, while in LXX Isaiah it is *epistolai kai presbeis kai dōra*. It is probable that the divergences in the LXX are simply due to different translators, since most of the variations are synonyms. It is hardly necessary to postulate that the MT later brought two divergent Hebrew texts into line.

¹⁷⁹ The names given to Merodach-Baladan vary somewhat between the texts. 2 Kings 20:12 has *B'rōdak-Bal'dān ben-Bal'dān* (MT), *Marōdachbaladan huioi Baladan* (LXX). Isaiah 39:1 has *M'rōdak-Bal'dān ben-Bal'dān* (MT), *Marōdach huioi tou Laadan* (LXX). Josephus has *Balada*. The initial *bēth* in the MT text of 2 Kings is to be explained on the basis of the similarity of the two letters in pre-Christian Hebrew epigraphy rather than by a phonological hypothesis. (See the table of Hebrew scripts by Frank Moore Cross, Jr., in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest Wright [Garden City, 1961], p. 137.)

decree of the Lord as good, content that at least his own reign would remain undisturbed.

The passage in 2 Chronicles is considerably abbreviated and does not mention Merodach-Baladan by name. "However, in the case of the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon who were sent to inquire about what was being done in the land, God forgot him [Hezekiah] in order to test him, that He might find out all that was in his heart." The context of this passage, following shortly after Sennacherib's campaign to Judea and Hezekiah's dangerous illness,¹⁸⁰ parallels the order of the narratives in 2 Kings and Isaiah; so there can be no question but that the same embassy is meant. But differences in the tradition in Chronicles can be noted: ambassadors (*m'ltšē*) are sent rather than letters and gifts (*špārtm ūmināh*); these are dispatched by princes of Babylon (*šarē bābel*) rather than by the king of Babylon (*melek bābel*); the embassy was sent to investigate what was being done in the land rather than on the occasion of Hezekiah's recovery from grave illness. Likewise, the divine purpose in permitting the event is noted in Chronicles rather than the divine condemnation *post factum*.

The account of Josephus differs again. Although the ambassadors bearing gifts (*presbeis dōra komizontas*) are sent to make Hezekiah an ally and friend (*summachon t[e] . . . kai philon*), they are shown through the palace treasures. Hezekiah gives them presents to take back to the Babylonian king. Isaiah comes to Hezekiah afterwards and utters the same gloomy prophecy as in the 2 Kings-Isaiah tradition. The ending is slightly altered, as Hezekiah prays that there may be peace in his time (rather than taking for granted that the disaster will not occur until after his reign).

Turning now to an attempted historical reconstruction of the events, we may ask first: when is the Babylonian mission to Hezekiah to be dated? Although the narrative order in the 2 Kings-Isaiah tradition is not strictly chronological,¹⁸¹ most modern commentators treat 2 Kings 20 and Isaiah 38-39 as a chronological unit and say that both the illness of Hezekiah and the subsequent sending of the mission are to be dated around fifteen years before Hezekiah's death.¹⁸² Hence, since the work of Thiele,¹⁸³ which placed the end of Hezekiah's reign about 687, it has been customary to date the embassy to shortly before the campaign of Sennacherib in Judea,

¹⁸⁰ The parallel order of the texts is as follows:

	2 Kings	Isaiah	2 Chronicles
Sennacherib's campaign	18:1-19:37	36:1-37:38	32:1-23
Hezekiah's illness	20:1-11	38:1-9	32:24
Merodach-Baladan's embassy	20:12-21	39:1-8	32:31

¹⁸¹ E.g., Hezekiah's illness and Isaiah's promise of deliverance from the Assyrian king follow the account of the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib.

¹⁸² Because of the fifteen years of additional life promised to Hezekiah in his illness: 2 Kings 20:6, Isaiah 38:5.

¹⁸³ *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (1951), supplemented by several articles since in VT 4 185-95, BASOR 143 22-27, W. Irwin Anniversary Volume 39-52.

i.e., to sometime between 704 and 702.¹⁸⁴ This fits in well with the theory that the outbreak of troubles in Babylonia in 703 and similar events in Palestine shortly thereafter were part of a concerted effort to throw off the yoke of Assyria in western Asia.

Granted the probability of the chronological part of this hypothesis, the rest of the details may be filled in with some degree of plausibility. First of all, did the king or did princes of Babylonia send the embassy? If Merodach-Baladan was not actually king of Babylonia when the embassy was dispatched, the 2 Chronicles statement might mean that more than one ruler in the east was interested in securing Palestinian support.¹⁸⁵ As Sidney Smith thought,¹⁸⁶ the revolts in Babylonia and in Palestine might have been planned before Merodach-Baladan's coup of 703; in this case, the embassy might have been sent in the name of several lesser officials. The point is not crucial at any rate.

Why the embassy? The 2 Kings-Isaiah tradition links the embassy with the sickness of Hezekiah narrated in the immediately preceding section: and that might have formed the pretext for the mission. But the Chronicles tradition, which states that the ambassadors came to see what was being done in the land, probably comes closer to the truth. Merodach-Baladan naturally would have wished to find out how much support could be relied on from Hezekiah. Josephus confirms our suspicions, for in his account the ambassadors are sent to cement an alliance with Hezekiah—which would be much closer to the exigencies of our chronological reconstruction. The bestowal of gifts by Merodach-Baladan fits in well with his known monetary benefactions to Elam to insure support. And, on the other side, Hezekiah's display of the treasures of his house and kingdom substantiates the theory that the ambassadors came to assess his strength.

The alliance, of course, did not prove of lasting advantage to either party. Sennacherib crushed their revolts separately and remained master of the situation in both lands. Later tradition in Israel preserved the story primarily as an illustration of Isaiah's denunciation of foreign entanglements, in keeping with the isolationist policy necessary to guard the purity of the divine cult.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁴ Thus Bright (*A History of Israel* [1959], p. 267), Noth (*The History of Israel* [rev. trans., 1960], p. 267), Schmökel (*Geschichte des alten Vorderasien* [1957], pp. 271-72), and Leemans (*JBOL* 10 452-53). When the end of Hezekiah's reign was commonly reputed to be about 698 or 697, the common tendency was to date the embassy around 714 or 713, e.g., Weissbach (*RLA* 1 378), Dhorme (*RB* 31 [1922] 405). One scholar who long ago recognized the connection between the embassy and the Palestinian revolt around 702 was Sidney Smith (e.g., Smith, *Senn.*, p. 11; *CAH* 3 63).

¹⁸⁵ Elam was likewise interested in the Babylonian cause, as we know from the military aid lent to Merodach-Baladan in 703.

¹⁸⁶ See references in n. 184 above.

¹⁸⁷ The result of a foreign alliance with Assyria is seen in the case of Hezekiah's father, Ahaz, who was forced to alter existing customs in the temple "on account of the king of Assyria" (2 Kings 16:17-18).

C. THE SARGONID LETTERS

One of the most difficult source types to utilize in writing Mesopotamian history is the letter. Written almost always without date and for a particular context to which the modern reader seldom has a clue, letters from this period present information and insights that are valuable, but cannot be fitted into a tight chronological scheme. For this reason, we present most letters dealing with Merodach-Baladan here as a separate section.¹¹⁸

The situation is further complicated by the fact that there are at least two different individuals in the Harper Letter corpus who bear the name Marduk-apla-iddina. The first is the king, the second an official working for the Assyrians in the neighborhood of Uruk during the reign of Ashurbanipal. Unless the context of an individual letter makes it clear which Marduk-apla-iddina is meant, such texts can hardly be employed for historical purposes.

The letter K. 4740¹¹⁹ apparently mentions [Tiglath]-Pileser III,¹²⁰ but the reference might be to a past event rather than strictly contemporary. Another name, qualified by the epithet "king," occurs in line 24, but only the end is legible [DN-z-id]dina. Two kings could qualify for this honor: either Esarhaddon or Merodach-Baladan; but neither of them seem to have had a son named Zākīru, which would be called for by the text.¹²¹ The subject of *kidinnūtu*, brought up in line 19, favors Merodach-Baladan, since he and Sargon are often associated with this word in the historical context in Babylonia.¹²²

Three letters mention both Sargon and Merodach-Baladan. Two of these are badly broken, and only enough survives to enable us to read the royal names with certainty and to assign the letters to this time.¹²³ The third letter is addressed to Sargon by name and mentions the activities of Bit-Jakin, Bit-Dakūri, and the Arameans.¹²⁴ Merodach-Baladan is reported to be in the process of repairing fortifications at Larak,¹²⁵ probably in anticipation of some trouble from Assyria. Sar-

¹¹⁸ Some letters concerning Merodach-Baladan are treated elsewhere: e.g., the Nimrud Letters chiefly under the events of 729, letters mentioning him as an ancestor in the section on his family, letters speaking of his reign or of the canal named after him in the section dealing with his kingship over Babylonia, etc. For a complete list of all letters touching on Merodach-Baladan, see Part VII, A, under 44.2.22, 44.2.23, 44.3.4.

¹¹⁹ Published by Winckler in AOF 2 24-25 (*Nachträge*, p. 578).

¹²⁰ Line 13.

¹²¹ Line 24: [z-z-s]UM.NA LUGAL u Za-ki-ru DUMU-ku. On explaining this line later, Winckler (AOF 2 678) thinks that Merodach-Baladan is a likely candidate and that Zākīru would then refer to the prince of the Ša'alli tribe of that name under Tiglath-Pileser III.

¹²² See the studies cited of Leemans and Böhl in nn. 47-48 above.

¹²³ ABL 30:2 (Sargon), r. 5 (Merodach-Baladan); ABL 1029:6 (Sargon), 13 (Merodach-Baladan).

¹²⁴ ABL 542:8-20. These people are no longer siding with the Assyrians.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, r. 5-6.

gon's correspondent does not think that Assyria's hold over Babylonia is any longer very strong.¹²⁶ The date of the letter is unknown.¹²⁷

In other letters mentioning Merodach-Baladan, we cannot identify the Assyrian king involved, though it would presumably be either Sargon or Sennacherib. One is from Ištar-dūri, an official working in the region between Arrappā and the Diyala,¹²⁸ and presages a forthcoming defeat of Merodach-Baladan.¹²⁹ Ilu-iada³ also writes from the same region¹³⁰ and sends news of the movements of Merodach-Baladan¹³¹ and of another Babylonian nobleman and his army near Kish and Babylon.¹³² He also mentions a water shortage in the area,¹³³ a situation echoed in a reported statement of one Marduk-šarrāni to Merodach-Baladan.¹³⁴ It seems as though Merodach-Baladan was looked upon as the one to remedy the difficulties.¹³⁵

The second and later Merodach-Baladan is apparently a native Babylonian acting as an Assyrian agent around Uruk in the time of Ashurbanipal. He addresses ABL 1339 to that king and occurs in at least three other letters written at the time.¹³⁶

Finally there is a large group of doubtful references in letters where there is insufficient information to determine which Merodach-Baladan is meant. A list of these letters (often fragmentary) is given below in Part VII, A, 44.2.23 j-p.

D. SUNDRY DOCUMENTS

1. *Kinglist A*.—Merodach-Baladan's name occurs twice in Kinglist A. The first time (iv 10) he is assigned a reign of twelve years and designated as belonging to

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, r. 23-24, cf. obv. 19-20. Merodach-Baladan is definitely in the ascendancy.

¹²⁷ The letter might be dated just after Sargon's accession to the throne or, more likely, sometime early in the last decade of the eighth century.

¹²⁸ He mentions Dēr (ABL 157:18), Mēturna (ABL 158 r. 16), and Arrappā (ABL 159:5) in his letters. He is almost certainly to be identified with the Ištar-dūri who was governor of Arrappā and held the eponym office in 714 B.C.

¹²⁹ ABL 158:22.

¹³⁰ He mentions Dūr-Šarrukīn (ABL 503 r. 17; 505 r. 8), Kish (ABL 502 r. 12), Babylon (ABL 502 r. 13; 506 r. 9), the Diyala (ABL 503 r. 16), and Arrappā (ABL 505 r. 9). This Ilu-iada³ is presumably to be identified with the man of the same name who was governor of Dēr in 724 B.C. (VAS 1 70 i 2).

For Dūr-Šarrukīn in northern Babylonia, see RLA 2 249; to the references there might be added the gentilic PN form in the Caillou Michaux (IR 70) i 14: 'URU-BAD-LUGAL-GI.NA-a-a-i-ti, who was a daughter of a member of the Habbān tribe in northern Babylonia in the early eleventh century.

¹³¹ ABL 503 r. 21 f. and probably 504:7-9.

¹³² ABL 502 r. 11-13.

¹³³ Probably behind the remarks in ABL 503 r. 11-18.

¹³⁴ ABL 1024. He asks Merodach-Baladan to assume control of the water supply in the area.

¹³⁵ Cf. Merodach-Baladan's similar work on the water supply at Uruk, where a canal was named after him, p. 17 and nn. 89-90.

¹³⁶ ABL 222 r. 18, 20; ABL 1030:5; ABL 1095:8, r. 4. The name Marduk-apla-iddina might possibly be restored in K. 11239 (= ADD 910), but the Dūr-Ja[kin] mentioned in Bezold, *Cat.*, III, 1149 turns out to be Dūr-Šarrukīn in Johns' copy.

BAL KUR *Tam*, which is to be translated "dynasty of the Sealand" (i.e., *Tam* < *tim* >).²⁰⁷ The second reference (iv 14) allots him nine months²⁰⁸ and appends a different designation, *erfn* *Ha-bi*.

To my knowledge, the epithet *šabu* (*erfn*) applied to a king occurs in only one other instance. In the Dynastic Chronicle,²⁰⁹ Simbar-Šipak, the founder of the Second Dynasty of the Sealand, is described as *erfn* BAL SIG₆-DINGIR-ŠU, "an *erfn* of the dynasty of Damiq-ilišu."²¹⁰ It may not be significant that both of these kings, Simbar-Šipak and Merodach-Baladan, came from the Sealand; but the fact that they were both upstarts whose fathers had not sat upon the Babylonian throne is more likely to prove of weight. Hence it would not be surprising to see their lowly origin stressed; and, for this reason, I would tentatively translate *šabu* in this context as "soldier."²¹¹

Ha-bi, on the other hand, is one of the many abbreviations employed by Kinglist A. It is probably identical with the longer *Ha-bi-gal* used in the same list of Sennacherib (iv 12) and Aššur-nādin-šumi (iv 16). Gelb has suggested that it also be identified with *Īnanigalbat*,²¹² and this interpretation is accepted here. It is worth observing that the gentilic *Īnanigalbatā* is used elsewhere to describe a type of soldier.²¹³ I cannot explain why the redactor of Kinglist A chose to call Merodach-Baladan a "Īnanigalbat soldier" here, especially since he had used a different epithet for the same king four lines earlier.²¹⁴ Nor can I clarify the precise contemporary

²⁰⁷ An inscription of Tiglath-Pileser III describes him as *šar* *Tamtim* even before his accession (2R 67:26; cf. D.T. 3:19). The GN is written out in an unabbreviated form in Kinglist A iii 9': BAL KUR *Tam-tim* (referring to the Second Dynasty of the Sealand). Other instances of simple *tāmtu* for *māt tāmī* are noted by Weissbach in ZA 43 278.

²⁰⁸ Pinches (PSBA 6 193-198) read 6 months in his copy, but his transliteration had the correct 9.

²⁰⁹ King, *Chronicles* 2 53 r. ii 3.

²¹⁰ Probably referring to the Damiq-ilišu of the First Sealand Dynasty rather than to the ruler of the same name who reigned as last king of the First Dynasty of Isin.

²¹¹ A common meaning of the word as a collective (CAD § 46-55).

²¹² *Hurrians and Subarians*, p. 72, n. 184. Gelb noted such spellings as KUR *Ha-na-ka-bal* (EA 255:10) KUR *Ha-li-gal-bal* (BASOR 78 20), *Ha-li-gal-ba-tu-i* (MDP 2 95:2), the *Ha-bi-gal* of Kinglist A, and *Ha-bi-gal-ba-tu-i* (Clay, PNC, 78). We might add now the occurrence of *Ī[a]-bi-gal-ba-tu-u* as a gentilic following a PN in an unpublished MB economic text from Ur (UET 7 51 + 52:18; kindly collated for me by Dr. Gurney, who has graciously allowed me to cite it here) and possibly *Ī Ha-bi-gal-bal(?)* in VAT 8903 iii 1 (= Köcher, *Pflanzenkunde* no. 36).

²¹³ BE 14 164:2 has 3 *Ha-bi-gal-ba-tu-i* in a list of soldiers (*erfn*.gi.A). To this may be compared Hg. BVI 145 l d . k i . s u . ā = *taš-li-ku(!)* = *ba-bi-gal-tum* (see CAD B 80a sub *Īnanigalbatu*, adj., for a slightly different reading).

²¹⁴ We might presume that the compiler of the kinglist no longer knew that the RN's in iv 10 and 14 referred to only one person. The epithet in iv 14 is the sole example in Kinglist A of a designation after an RN which does not relate either blood relationship to another individual or the dynasty to which the ruler reputedly belonged.

connotation of Dynasty of *Ha-bi-gal* as applied to Sennacherib and his son. More evidence is needed on these points before a definitive solution can be ventured.

2. *Colophons*.—The name of Merodach-Baladan also occurs in the colophon to a late copy of a list of 67 plants (and various gardening utensils and personnel), which are described as *gannati ša* ndAMAR.UTU-A-MU LUGAL: "the garden(?) of King Merodach-Baladan."²¹⁵ It is of interest that several of the plant names are Aramaic;²¹⁶ this would lend credence to an origin of the list in the southern Babylonia of Merodach-Baladan's time. It is likewise striking that among the exotic plants and trees planted in the great gardens laid out in Nineveh shortly after this time Sennacherib gave a prominent place to flora native to Chaldea.²¹⁷ So the alleged gardening fame of Merodach-Baladan is not wholly without context.²¹⁸

Two other supposed occurrences of Merodach-Baladan's name in colophons are connected with the editing of the *sa.gig* series. The first occurs in a partially broken colophon to a copy of the twelfth tablet of the series, which is dated on "the 17th day of Arašamnu, year [x of x-ap]a-iddina, king of Babylon."²¹⁹ I have remarked elsewhere that the RN here might more plausibly be restored as [Nabū-ap]a-iddina,²²⁰ but this cannot be proven definitely.²²¹ The second occurrence, likewise in broken context, is in a colophon to a catalogue of the *sa.gig* series recently unearthed at Nimrud.²²² Here reference is made to editing of the series done in the reign of 'DN'-apla-iddina, king of Babylon.²²³ Lambert has suggested that *Nabū-apla-iddina* fits the traces better than the *Marduk-apla-iddina* originally proposed and has cited other allusions to editing done in Nabū-apla-iddina's reign.²²⁴

3. "Slave documents."—A curious type of text is preserved for us in the so-called

²¹⁵ CT 14 50:74-75.

²¹⁶ Meissner, ZA 6 292-98. Cf. I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden*, II, 88 f. and *passim*.

²¹⁷ OIP 2 101:57, 111:55, 124:41.

²¹⁸ Leemans suggests too that this list might provide a precedent for the "hanging gardens" of Nebuchadnezzar II slightly more than a century later (*JEOL* 10 443).

²¹⁹ ITI APIN UD 17 KAM [MU x KAM ndx-DUMU.Ū]Š-SUM.NA LUGAL KĀ.DINGIR.RA.KI. See Labat, *TDP*, I 110 and II Pl. XXXI: B 34-35. The MN in line 34 should be corrected in the transcription. (I have collated the text A 3442 in the Oriental Institute Museum, and the RN cannot be read more clearly.)

²²⁰ JCS 16 96 sub 24.3.3.

²²¹ The other dated colophons in the *TDP* corpus are all later than Merodach-Baladan: (a) Šamaš-šum-ukin (*TDP*, I 110 C), (b) Artaxerxes (abbreviated in *TDP*, I 212:118; largely restored in *TDP*, I 16:89).

²²² ND 4358, published by Kinnier Wilson in "Two Medical Texts from Nimrud," *Iraq* 18 130-46.

²²³ ND 4358 r. 10 (*Iraq* 18, Pl. XXIV).

²²⁴ JCS 11 6; see also *ibid.*, 5 and n. 21.

"slave documents."²²⁵ These are short inscriptions of four or five lines written on small ovoid pieces of clay, roughly in the shape of olives, and pierced, presumably for wearing. Six of these inscriptions have been published:²²⁶ four by Oppert in 1870 (A, B, C, D),²²⁷ one by Strassmaier in 1893 (E),²²⁸ and one by Gadd in 1928 (F).²²⁹ The formula of these inscriptions is strikingly similar:

šd²³⁰ PN²³¹ šd²³² qātē (šūⁿ) PN₂

ITI zīz MU z²³³ KAM²³⁴ AMAR.UTU-DUMU.UŠ-SUM.NA²³⁵ LUGAL DIN.TIR.KI

PN ša qātē PN₂ is usually taken to designate some sort of possession as of a slave, but it could also imply simply jurisdictional primacy of PN₂. I am unconvinced by the current explanation of these documents as slave tags, but have no plausible alternative to suggest at present. Several questions must be solved first. Why were the documents (except the Ur specimen) sufficiently important to be carried all the way to Assyria? Why is their time range so restricted, i.e., from the ninth to the eleventh (or possibly twelfth) years of Merodach-Baladan? Why are they all dated in the same month of these years, without any day indicated? I do not see how these questions are answered by the popular suggestion of "slave tags."

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It is a hazardous enterprise to assess an individual's impact on history on the basis of scattered and fragmentary evidence. Such an interpretation runs two risks:

²²⁵ The designation is found as early as 1870: Oppert, *Les Inscriptions de Dour-Sarkayan*, p. 27. See also Oppert and Ménant, *Documents juridiques de l'Assyrie et de la Chaldée* (Paris, 1877), p. 168, and Meissner, *BuA*, I, 382. Strassmaier in *Actes du 8^e Congrès International* I/2 281 remarked that the document he published "diente wahrscheinlich als eine Art Amulet für die Frau Hīā von Sin-ereš."

²²⁶ A greater number, largely illegible, remain unpublished (Oppert and Ménant, *Documents juridiques*, p. 168). [While this article was in press (March, 1964), I discovered another of these "slave tags" among the unpublished tablets from the Khorsabad excavations in the Oriental Institute, Chicago, where it bears the number DŠ 32-11. I hope to edit this text soon in a separate publication. It is catalogued below in Part VII, A, as 44.2.14'.]

²²⁷ Bibliography in Part VII, A, 44.2.12.

²²⁸ Bibliography in Part VII, A, 44.2.13.

²²⁹ Bibliography in Part VII, A, 44.2.14. This document, I believe, has not previously been identified as belonging to this class. Mr. A. R. Millard has kindly confirmed my suspicions regarding its character by checking the field catalogue of the Ur expedition, in which the document is said to be ovoid, pierced toward the left end.

²³⁰ BCDF omit.

²³¹ ABCE: PN; DF: PN. (The PN₂ are all PN.)

²³² F: apparently ana; but the NB ana can easily be amended to NB šd, which often consists of only two wedges superimposed vertically.

²³³ A: 9; BDF: 10; CE: 11. Oppert stated in *Les Inscriptions de Dour-Sarkayan*, p. 27 n. 1, that Lencrant reported a similar inscription at Orleans dated in Merodach-Baladan's twelfth year.

²³⁴ The masculine personal determinative is omitted by E and F at the beginning of the RN. Otherwise the orthography is uniform.

(a) of representing merely the historian's peculiar slant on his material by focusing the scanty facts according to his own—albeit unconsciously—preconceived notions; or (b) of forming a synthesis by extensive interpolation and extrapolation that will be found untenable in the light of future evidence. It is only fair to call to the reader's attention that the present section of our discussion will be more than usually subject to these failings. But it is expedient that these hypotheses be advanced if the history of the period is ever to progress beyond the realm of disjointed and discrete data.

Merodach-Baladan represents but one stage of a recurring movement in Babylonia to retain political autonomy in the face of perennial invasions from her more powerful northern neighbor, Assyria. In the eighth and seventh centuries before Christ, the impetus for Babylonian independence came most effectively from the southern, tribal regions of the country. The kings Eriba-Marduk, Nabû-šuma-iškun II, Mukin-zēri, Merodach-Baladan, Mušēzib-Marduk, and the chieftains Nabû-ušabši, Zākuru, Nabû-zēr-kitti-lišir, Šamaš-ibni, Aplāju, and Nabû-bēl-šumāte exemplified the same indomitable spirit of the southland that would culminate in the founding of the Chaldean dynasty under Nabopolassar in 626 and the subsequent annihilation of Assyria as a political power. The attitude of northern Babylonia at this time was not univalent. The presence of a small pro-Assyrian faction among the temple administration of the large cities and among some high-ranking officials of the civil government was counterbalanced by a less vocal group in the north which permitted southern tribesmen to rule as king in the northern capital without revolt. This same quiet faction supported Merodach-Baladan against Sennacherib in 703 and would later allow such kings as Nergal-ušēzib and Mušēzib-Marduk to defy the Assyrians in 693 and the following years. It was this group in the north (and not just a small minority of rebels explicitly named in the official Assyrian inscriptions) that would be the object of the wrath of Sennacherib in the destruction of Babylon and which would permit Šamaš-šum-ukin to utilize the reconstructed city as a headquarters for his revolt from 652 to 648. These northern Babylonians acquiesced in the rebellions led by outsiders and often proved a bulwark of these causes, but during this time they themselves seldom ventured to take the initiative in rebelling against the Assyrians.²³⁵

Though Merodach-Baladan stands out as one of the more significant tribal figures who mustered Babylonian opposition to Assyria during these years, his endeavor was not ultimately crowned with success. Despite the fact that he was a

²³⁵ Possible exceptions are Marduk-zākiri-šumi II and Nergal-ušēzib, who seem to have been northern Babylonians and in revolt against Assyria; but their ineffectual stands were quashed within a few months. Bēl-ibni might represent another case in point, but we are as yet unaware of the nature of the offense that prompted his removal to Assyria in 700.

wealthy prince and a diplomat capable of channeling the concerted efforts of inter-tribal and international forces,²³⁸ his career from his first coming to terms with Tiglath-Pileser III in 729 down to his death in exile after enforced flight from his native Sealand in 700 reveals him in the light of a second-rank monarch who usually managed to keep just one step ahead of the Assyrians. This in itself, considering the massive military organization of contemporary Assyria, may be regarded as no mean achievement. The fact that he could rule relatively unmolested for twelve consecutive years in a country contiguous to Sargonid Assyria is ample testimony to his political ability. His singular adroitness at avoiding direct contact with the overwhelming forces of a main Assyrian army may not induce modern accolades for bravery, but it was just such nomadic astuteness that enabled him to harry the Assyrians for better than two decades. A more direct approach under the circumstances would not only have been foolhardy, but would have deprived the Assyrians of several further identical entries in the campaign section of their eponym chronicles.

Nor did Merodach-Baladan's name live on in Mesopotamian history solely as a protagonist for Babylonian independence and as a temporary but tiresomely persistent obstruction in the path of Assyrian imperial expansion. His fame was also preserved in connection with more pacific domestic pursuits. He kept the provincial administration of Babylonia functioning smoothly. He repaired and endowed temples of the ancient gods of the land. He respected the rights of the traditionally favored citizens of the oldest sacred cities, Babylon, Borsippa, and Sippar. He saw to the maintenance of the vital canal and irrigation systems; and one of the more important waterways near Uruk came to be named after him. Records of private business transactions from his reign seem to indicate a stable economy. While there is as yet no well substantiated evidence of the fostering of the literary arts at this time, later tradition does mention a garden of Merodach-Baladan filled with exotic plants and tells also of the functioning of an astronomical observatory in the land during his reign. The few years in which Merodach-Baladan was able to fend off the Assyrians from despoiling and subjugating Babylonia seem to have been a singularly fruitful time.

²³⁸ During the campaigns of Tiglath-Pileser III in southern Babylonia from 731 to 729, the various tribes were sometimes at odds with one another: the Nimrud Letters (especially IX) and the rapid capitulations of the tribal chieftains after the initial successes of Tiglath-Pileser show that the tribes did not present a solid front. There is no evidence for lack of accord among the tribes in the time of Merodach-Baladan. Except for the final campaign of 700 when Šuzubu was attacked separately by the Assyrians, the tribes always appear to be working in conjunction with Merodach-Baladan and not as distinct bargaining agents.

Merodach-Baladan's alliance with Elam in 720 and 703 provided military forces other than Babylonian which sustained the brunt of the battles. (His embassy might be construed as an attempt in the same vein, but this is considerably less likely.)

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ANCIENT SOURCES

A. CATALOGUE OF DOCUMENTS²³⁷44.1, 48.1 Chronological material²³⁸

44.1.1 Kinglist A iv 10—12 (years) plus RN and designation BAL KUR *Tam* (= "dynasty of the Sealand," i.e., *Tam*-<*tim*>).

48.1.1 Kinglist A iv 14—ITI '9¹²³ plus RN and designation ERIN *Ha-bi*.

44.1.2 Babylonian Chronicle i 32—ii 11—(a) RN arrives too late for the battle of Dēr, 720 B.C.; (b) Umbanigaš of Elam dies and is succeeded by his nephew, Ištarhundu, 717 B.C.; (c) RN conquers Bit-*l*. *J*-ri, 712 B.C.; (d) Sargon removes RN from the Babylonian throne and forces him to flee to Elam, 710 B.C.; (e) Sargon's capture of Bit-Jakin and a brief summary of the rest of Sargon's activities down to 705 B.C.

48.1.2 Babylonian Chronicle ii 17—22(?)—fragmentary section dealing with Sennacherib's first campaign in Babylonia; beginning of RN probably preserved in line 17.

44.1.3 Ptolemaic Canon, 6—RN is assigned a reign of 12 (years).²⁴⁰

44.2 Contemporary material

44.2.1 ND 2090. Royal inscription on barrel cylinder, commemorating repairs on parts of the Eanna complex at Uruk by RN. Found at Nimrud in April 1952. Published by Gadd in *Iraq* 15 123—34 (copy, transliteration, translation, commentary). Further discussed by R. Follet in *Biblica* 35 413—28 (where it is compared in detail with YOS 1 38, the inscription Sargon had written to replace it at Uruk). Some emendations proposed by von Soden in *Or* 26 136—37. Archeological aspects of the inscription discussed by H. Lenzen in *Iraq* 19 146—50. Photo of one side of the cylinder published in *The Illustrated London News*, vol. 221, no. 5914 (Aug. 23, 1952), p. 294, fig. 4.

²³⁷ This catalogue is a continuation of the source list begun in *JCS* 16 83—109 and will be numbered accordingly. The abbreviations are approximately the same, save that the editorial *YBT* is now replaced by the *YOS* of the original MS. We should further note that it is not our purpose in these catalogues to give an exhaustive list of all minor translations or comments on each and every document; only the most significant can be included. We would be grateful once again if readers would call to our attention any lacunae in the documentation in these catalogues.

²³⁸ Bibliography in *JCS* 16 83—85. Since Merodach-Baladan was both the forty-fourth and the forty-eighth ruler in our Post-Kassite sequence, we make a corresponding distinction in the numbering of our chronological material. This practice is not viable for the contemporary and later materials, especially since it would be difficult to assign an inscription to precisely the nine months of his second reign. Thus all materials other than chronological (in our strict sense) are prefixed with the number 44 for the sake of simplicity.

²³⁹ Pinches' edition (*PSBA* 6 193—198) read *rrr* *θ* in the copy (but *θ* in the transliteration).

²⁴⁰ Greek: *Μαροδοχμωδωτορ*. Because RN's second reign did not reach an official year, it is omitted in the Canon. (See also 44.3.12 below for further documentation from Ptolemy.)

- 44.2.2 Numerous bricks from Uruk with Sumerian inscriptions commemorating RN's repairs on Eanna. The texts represented fall into two chief classes:
- (a) UVB 1 p. 55 nr. 18 (Taf. 27e). Slight variants to this text are found in bricks published in *WVDOG* 51 Taf. 101c, 107d and in the brick(s) published as 1R 5 XVII (= Fr. Lenormant, *Choix de textes cunéiformes*, no. 8; see also transliteration and translation by Peiser and Winckler in *ZA* 7 184 and n. 1 and by Langdon in *Excavations at Kish*, III, 17 and n. 4).
- (b) UVB 1 p. 54 nr. 16 (Taf. 27d) = *ibid.*, p. 55 nr. 17.
- 44.2.3 W. 1929, 136. Private inscription on brick found at Kish, commemorating repairs on Ehursagkalamma by Iddin-Nergal, governor (*šaknu*) of Kish in the reign of RN. Published by Langdon in *Excavations at Kish*, III, 17–19 and Pl. XI.
- 44.2.4 VA 2663 (published as VAS 137)—royal land grant made to the *šakin* *tēmi* of Babylon at Babylon on 23-IV, year 7 of RN. For bibliography, see Steinmetzer no. 72, B 5, and Leemans, *JEOL* 10 442, 1°. A detailed study is presented by Leemans, *ibid.*, 444–49.²⁴¹ This kudurru contains the only known pictorial representation of Merodach-Baladan (reproduced in W. J. Hinke, *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar I from Nippur* [Philadelphia, 1907], p. 72), who is portrayed receiving the staff of kingship from Marduk.
- 44.2.5 BM 40006 (published as *BBS* no. 35)—fragmentary inscription dealing with royal endowment of a temple. The dating of the text has been established by M. J. Seux, *RA* 54 206–8.
- 44.2.6 BM 98562 (= Th. 1905-4-9, 63; published in King, *Cat. Suppl.*, 57)—nine-line private economic inscription to accompany the gift of a festival garment. Dated 17-VIII, year 1 of RN.
- 44.2.7 Economic tablet in private possession in Leiden. Transliteration by Böhl in *MAOG* 11/3 31 n. 3 and (Dutch) translation in Böhl, *Leiden Coll.*, III, 7–8. Dated in Babylon, 18-XII, year 2 of RN.
- 44.2.8 VAT 8498 (published as *AnOr* 9 1)—list of 91 foremen engaged in canal work. Dated in year 4 of RN.
- 44.2.9 NBC 4848 (partially published in *JCS* 1 352)—later copy of a similar list of 91 canal foremen. The original was dated at Uruk, 4-VIII, year 4 of RN.
- 44.2.10 Crozer Theological Seminary 201 (partially published in *JCS* 1 352)—duplicate of 44.2.9.
- 44.2.11 [YBC 7422 (mentioned by Goetze in *JNES* 3 43)—tablet dated at Uruk (?) on 1-VIII, year 8 of RN.]

²⁴¹ The legend that this stone was found originally on Cyprus has been thoroughly investigated by C. J. Gadd (*Iraq* 15 129 n. 1), who has found no more substantiation for it than a chance statement made by F. X. Steinmetzer in a footnote in 1922.

- 44.2.12 Inscriptions on four small pierced cylinders published by Oppert in Place, *Ninive et l'Assyrie*, II, 307–8 (= Oppert, *Les Inscriptions de Dour-Sarkayan [Khorsabad] provenant des fouilles de M. Victor Place*, pp. 27–28).²⁴² Formula: (*ša*) PN *ša qātē* PN₂, date. All dated in XI month (no day), year 9, 10, or 11 of RN.
- 44.2.13 K. 3787 (published by Strassmaier in *Actes du 8^e Congrès*, suppl., p. 2, no. 1)—text on small pierced ovoid similar to those mentioned in 44.2.12 and 44.2.14. Dated XI, year 11 of RN. See also Bezold, *Cat.*, II, 564 and KB 4 166–67.
- 44.2.14 UET 1 262 (field catalogue no.: U.2662)—inscribed ovoid pierced toward the left end. Text type similar to 44.2.12 and 44.2.13. Dated XI, year 10 of RN. (Earlier publication of copy, together with transliteration and translation by Legrain in *MJ* 17 [1926] 392, no. 58.)
- 44.2.14' [DŠ 32-11 (found at Khorsabad in 1932; mentioned briefly in catalogue in Gordon Loud and Charles B. Altman, *Khorsabad*, Part II: *The Citadel and the Town* [OIP 40], p. 105, no. 38)—inscribed ovoid pierced at one end. Text type similar to 44.2.12, 44.2.13, 44.2.14. Unpublished, but see n. 226 above.]
- 44.2.15 [YBC 11383, 11386 (mentioned by Goetze in *JNES* 3 43)—tablets dated at Babylon, 22-I, year 11 of RN.]
- 44.2.16 HS 452 (published as *TuM* 2–3 no. 8)—tablet recording private purchase of a field. Dated at Nippur, 23-XI (year not preserved), in reign of RN. Transliteration, translation, and notes by San Nicolò, *BR*, no. 3.
- 44.2.17 UET 4 206 (last two lines published previously by Legrain in *MJ* 17 [1926] 392, no. 57, and by Gadd as UET 1 261; field catalogue number: U.2616)—fragmentary economic text with little more than list of witnesses and date preserved. Dated at [U]r, 11-IX, MU 22 KAM [d⁴AMAR.U]TU-IBILA-MU DUMU *ri-du-tu*.
- 44.2.18 UET 4 8—economic text from the reign of d⁴AMAR.U]TU-IBILA-s[UM.NA]. Transliteration, translation, and notes by San Nicolò, *BR*, no. 26.
- 44.2.19 Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III mentioning Merodach-Baladan:
- (a) K. 3751 (published as 2R 67 and in Rost, *Tigl. III*, I, 60–62, and II, Pls. 35–38) 26–28—mention of RN, son of Jakin, king of the Sea(land), paying tribute to Tiglath-Pileser III after the latter's Chaldean campaign of 729;
- (b) D.T. 3 (Rost, *Tigl. III*, II, Pl. 34) 19—fragment of tribute list of Merodach-Baladan; RN not preserved.

²⁴² Also discussed later (with transliteration and translation) in J. Oppert and J. Ménant, *Documents juridiques de l'Assyrie et de la Chaldée* (Paris, 1877), pp. 168–69.

44.2.20 Inscriptions of Sargon II dealing with Merodach-Baladan:

- (a) Annals from Khorsabad
- i) 1st *palû* (= 720)—restored reference to Merodach-Baladan occurs in Lie 6:[21] (= Winckler I 6:[21]);²⁴³
 - ii) 12th *palû* (= 710)—campaign against Merodach-Baladan covered in Lie 40:262–58:14 (= Winckler I 38:228–54:316);
 - iii) 13th *palû* (= 709)—section against Merodach-Baladan in Babylonia given in Lie 58:15–67:1 (= Winckler I 54:317–80:369). In these texts, Merodach-Baladan's name occurs in the following places: Lie 42:263 (= Winckler I 38:228), 42:273 (= Winckler I 40:245), 50:333 and 49 n. 5 (= Winckler I 46:271), 54:9 (= Winckler I 50:289), 58:13 (= Winckler I 54:315). This last reference may be partially restored from a duplicate text published by Jacobsen in Loud, *Khorsabad*, I (= *OIP* 38), 129, no. 1, where the name of Merodach-Baladan occurs in line 1; for the relief accompanying the text see *ibid.*, 60, Fig. 72.
- (b) Annals from Nineveh: 81-7-27, 3 (published in *AJO* 14 49): col. B 12 ff. contains the beginning of the campaign of 710; col. C 1 ff. describes the gifts given to the gods in Babylon by Sargon at the conclusion of the campaign in 709; fragmentary.
- (c) Non-chronological accounts of the campaigns:
- i) Display Inscription from Khorsabad, 121–44 (Winckler I 120–26)—summary of Sargon's campaigns against Babylonia, with detailed description of the events of 709;
 - ii) Nimrud Prisms D and E²⁴⁴ vi 14–85 (published in *Iraq* 16 Pls. XLVII f.; transliteration, etc., *ibid.*, pp. 185–91)—summary of Sargon's campaigns against Babylonia, with detailed description of the campaign of 709;
 - iii) Inscription from "Saln XIV" at Khorsabad, 18–20 (Winckler I 84)—brief summary of Sargon's conquest of Merodach-Baladan;
 - iv) Khorsabad pavement inscription (Winckler I 148:45–150:54)—same as preceding;
 - v) Bull Inscription, 30–34 (Lyon, p. 14)—short summary of Sargon's conquest of Merodach-Baladan, with slight variations from (iii) and (iv) above;
 - vi) K. 4471 (published in *JCS* 12 99–100, Winckler *Sammlung* 2 4)—very fragmentary, poetic description of the campaign of 710 (and 709?); Merodach-Baladan's name does not appear in the

²⁴³ For the correctness of the restoration, compare similar passages in Winckler I 84:19, *AJO* 14 49 B 13, *Iraq* 16 Pl. XLVII vi 15.

²⁴⁴ For the nomenclature, see Gadd, *Iraq* 16 174–75.

extant section; the complete document must have given a detailed description comparable to that of the annals.²⁴⁵

44.2.21 Inscriptions of Sennacherib treating of Merodach-Baladan:

- (a) detailed accounts of the first campaign, section against Merodach-Baladan, written in 702 B.C.:
- i) BM 113203 (Smith, *Senn.*; *OIP* 2 48–55) 1–56;
 - ii) K. 1680 (Bellino Cylinder; *OIP* 2 55–60) 1–16;
- (b) shorter accounts of the first and fourth campaigns, sections against Merodach-Baladan, contained in chronological accounts of the individual campaigns:
- i) official edition of the annals:
1st campaign: *OIP* 2 24:20–25:53,
4th campaign: *OIP* 2 34:50–35:74;
 - ii) bull inscription from Nineveh:
1st campaign: *OIP* 2 66:3–67:7,
4th campaign: *OIP* 2 71:33–37;
 - iii) IM 56578 (*Sumer* 9 117–188):
1st campaign: 118:23–122:63,
4th campaign: 140:10–144:48;
- (c) brief summary of campaigns against Merodach-Baladan, not chronologically divided:
- i) another bull inscription: *OIP* 2 76:7–13, 76:25–77:27;
 - ii) Nebi Yunus inscription: *OIP* 2 85:6–86:12;
 - iii) BM 121025 (published in *Iraq* 7 94 no. 7): 1–5;
 - iv) epigraph: *OIP* 2 156 no. XXIV: 11–13;
 - v) Jerwan inscription(s): *OIP* 24 27: nos. 103 + 123 + 110 + 61
—probably short summary of campaigns against Merodach-Baladan; it may be doubted whether nos. 143 + 144 + 152 form part of the same section; many other fragments in *OIP* 24 may belong to the same description: 71 + 59, 74 + 73, and possibly also 57, 62, 63, 79, and 162;
- (d) mention of Merodach-Baladan as uncle (or stepfather) of Adinu, captured in Sennacherib's first campaign: Smith, *Senn.* 28;
- (e) unclassified: [K. 6109 (Bezold, *Cat.*, II, 763)—inscription of Sennacherib referring to his war with Merodach-Baladan].

44.2.22 Nimrud Letters mentioning Merodach-Baladan (pertinent letters published by H. W. F. Saggs in *Iraq* 17 21–50, *Iraq* 20 182–212, *Iraq* 25 70–80):

²⁴⁵ It is impossible to tell whether the events were arranged chronologically in this document. Tadmor has suggested that it may be written in a style similar to the "letter to a god" type (*JCS* 12 99 and 82); but many portions of Sargon's annals and other longer inscriptions contain poetic passages (e.g., Lie 44:282, 54:369–70, 60:408–12). The fragmentary character of the document does not permit closer analysis at present.

- (a) ND 2603 (Nimrud Letter V): 4', 9'—mention of a letter (*egirtum*) concerning Merodach-Baladan;
- (b) ND 2779 (Nimrud Letter IX): 3'—citation of a statement made by RN;
- *(c) ND 2674 (Nimrud Letter VI) face B: 18'—a possible allusion to *mār Jakin*, a description sometimes applied to Merodach-Baladan (cf. 2R 67:26);²⁴⁶
- *(d) ND 2759 (Nimrud Letter XXXIX): 66—mention of an Aplā-iddina, which could perhaps be identified with RN;
- (e) ND 2385 (Nimrud Letter LXV): 25—Merodach-Baladan referred to in connection with food supplies.

44.2.23 Kouyunjik Letters mentioning Merodach-Baladan

- (a) K. 4740 (published in Winckler, *AOF* 2 24–25; see also *ibid.*, 578)—fragmentary letter. [Tiglath]-Pileser is referred to in line 13, [*Marduk-apla-id*]dina šarru in line 24. Babylon is mentioned in lines 11, 18, 20, and 26. Also the subject of *kidinnūtu* is brought up in line 19;
- (b) K. 7426 (published as *ABL* 30)—letter to Sargon; broken context; Merodach-Baladan occurs in r. 5;
- (c) K. 530 (published as *ABL* 158)—letter to Sargon or Sennacherib; the defeat (*a-pi-ik-te*) of Merodach-Baladan is alluded to in line 22 of the obverse;
- (d) K. 667 (published as *ABL* 503)—letter to Sargon or Sennacherib; r. 21–22: "[ne]ws of Merodach-Baladan: he has returned and is in his land";
- *(e) K. 1176 (published as *ABL* 504)—letter between the same two people as preceding; obv. 7–9 may be restored: "news [of the man of Bit-Jakin: he is [in Babylon], probably refers to Merodach-Baladan; see also (g) below;
- (f) K. 114 (published as *ABL* 542)—letter to Sargon describing the activities of Bit-Dakūri, Bit-Jakin, and the Arameans; Larak is apparently being fortified by Merodach-Baladan, whose name occurs in 10, r. 5;
- (g) K. 5333b (published as *ABL* 1024)—mentioning lack of water in northern Babylonia near Dūr-Šarrukīn; note the equivalating of Merodach-Baladan (line 1) with the *mār Jakin* of r. 9;
- (h) K. 5550 + K. 5614 (published as *ABL* 1029)—the Seal and Sargon are spoken of (obv. 6), as is Merodach-Baladan (obv. 13); very broken;
- *(j) K. 1980 (published as *ABL* 1005)—name of a Merodach-Baladan occurs in obv. 4;

²⁴⁶ Cf. also 44.2.23 (e) and (g).

- *(k) [K. 1159 + K. 4683 (Bezold, *Cat.*, I, 235)—mention of a Merodach-Baladan];
- *(l) K. 4670 (published in Winckler *Sammlung* 2 57)—a Merodach-Baladan occurs in 8, 12; context uncertain;
- *(m) [K. 5434a (Bezold, *Cat.*, II, 719)—a Merodach-Baladan is spoken of];
- *(n) [Rm. 2,495 (Bezold, *Cat.*, IV, 1678)—reference to a Merodach-Baladan];
- *(o) [79-7-8, 257 (Bezold, *Cat.*, IV, 1720)—allusion to a Merodach-Baladan];
- *(p) [restored references to a Merodach-Baladan in three unpublished letters:
 - i) K. 8403 (Bezold, *Cat.*, III, 924)—^mdAMAR.UTU-IBILA-[SUM.NA];
 - ii) K. 13080 (Bezold, *Cat.*, III, 1287)—^mdAMAR.UTU-IBILA-[SUM.NA];
 - iii) 79-7-8, 312 (Bezold, *Cat.*, IV, 1724)—^mdAMAR.UTU-A-[SUM.NA]]²⁴⁷

44.3 Later material

- 44.3.1 References to Merodach-Baladan as ancestor of individual(s) fighting against Sennacherib:
 - (a) as father of Nabû-šuma-iškun, captured in Sennacherib's eighth campaign: *OIP* 2 46:17, 82:37, 89:50, 92:16; *AfO* 20 94:102;
 - (b) as father of unnamed individual in Sennacherib's eighth campaign (probably Nabû-šuma-iškun): *OIP* 2 43:46.
- 44.3.2 References to Merodach-Baladan as father of Nabû-zēr-kitti-līšir in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon:
 - (a) Borger, *Esarh.* 33:21;
 - (b) *ibid.*, 46 ii 40;
 - (c) *ibid.*, 47 ii 32;
 - (d) *ibid.*, 110, Frt. A: [7].
- 44.3.3 References to Merodach-Baladan as ancestor of contemporary Babylonians in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal:
 - (a) reference to Merodach-Baladan as father of Nabû-salim and grandfather of Aplāju: Streck, *Asb.* 126 vi 61;
 - (b) references to Merodach-Baladan as (grand)fater of Nabû-bēl-šumāte: Streck, *Asb.* 60 vii 17, 28 (DUMU DUMU); 130 vii 78 (A); 142 viii 47 (DUMU); 198 ii 30 (DUMU DUMU).
- 44.3.4 Later references to Merodach-Baladan in letters:

²⁴⁷ The Merodach-Baladan(s) mentioned in K. 186 (= *ABL* 222), K. 5594 (= *ABL* 1030), K. 8379 (= *ABL* 1339), 81-2-4, 76 (= *ABL* 1095) and K. 11239 (= *ADD* 910) are not to be identified with this king. The reading of Marduk-apla-iddina in Rm. 67:2 (= *ABL* 348) should be corrected to Marduk-šakin-šumi (see Waterman, *RCAB*, IV, 180).

- (a) as father of Nabû-ušallim: 83-1-18, 65 (published as *ABL* 1114): 10 and 83-1-18, 124 (published as *ABL* 1131): 5;
- (b) [as father of individual, name not available: Sm. 740 (Bezold, *Cat.*, IV, 1431)];
- (c) occurrences of the canal near Uruk named after him:
- i) YBC 3552 (published as *YOS* 3 74): 7-8;
 - ii) K. 923 (published as *ABL* 747): 8-9;
 - iii) 83-1-18, 71 (published as *ABL* 942): r. 13;
 - *iv) 83-1-18, 131 (published as *ABL* 1135): 11-12;
- (d) K. 830 (published as *ABL* 542): 15—money given to a temple (in Cutha?) in the second year of Merodach-Baladan's reign;
- *e) 83-1-18, 4 (published as *ABL* 521): 10—letter of Bel-ibni to Ashurbanipal mentioning the gift of a statue (ša-¹lam¹) of Merodach-Baladan.
- 44.3.5 BM 46226 (= 81-7-6, 688; published in *CT* 14 50)—later copy of a list of plant names, many of them Aramaic, concluding with the following subscript: *gannati ša Marduk-apla-iddina šarri* (74-75). Study by Meissner, *ZA* 6 289-98.
- 44.3.6 *A 3442 (Labat, *TDP* I 110 and II, Pl. XXXI) iv 35—part of twelfth tablet of *enūma ana bīl marši āšipu illiku* with a royal name occurring in the colophon. No trace of the theophoric element of the RN (based on personal collation of the text). I would prefer to read [*Nabū*]-*apla-iddina* here; see *JCS* 16 96 sub 24.3.3 for another alternative.
- 44.3.7 *ND 4358 (published by Kinnier Wilson in *Iraq* 18 130 ff.) r. 10—possible mention of RN in a *sa.gi.g* catalogue from Nimrud; but see *JCS* 16 96 n. 19 and above, p. 40.
- 44.3.8 *D.T. 1 (latest edition, with bibliography, in Lambert, *BWL* 110-15)—the so-called *Fürstenspiegel*, describing what will happen to Babylonia if the king neglects the rights of the citizens of Sippar, Nippur, and Babylon; Böhl in *MAOG* 11/3 has plausibly argued for dating this document to this time.
- 44.3.9 Hebrew Bible:
- (a) 2 Kings 20:12-19—embassy of Berodach-Baladan to Hezekiah;
 - (b) Isaiah 39:1-8—embassy of Merodach-Baladan to Hezekiah;
 - (c) 2 Chronicles 32:31—reference to the same embassy, but the name of the Babylonian ruler is not given.
- 44.3.10 Berossus: *FGrH* III C/1 p. 386:5-9—Marudach-Baldan kills his predecessor and reigns for six months before being assassinated by his successor, elibos. The embassy to Hezekiah seems to be treated on p. 385:12-13. (All these references are from Eusebius' *Armenian Chron.*)
- 44.3.11 Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book X, chap. ii, no. 2—embassy of Baladan, king of Babylonia, to Hezekiah.

- 44.3.12 Cl. Ptolemy, *ΜΑΘΗΜΑΤΙΚΗΣ ΣΥΝΤΑΞΕΩΣ*, Δ' s' (ed. Heiberg, I, 302-4)—mention of three lunar eclipses observed and recorded at Babylon in the reign of Merodach-Baladan (Gk.: *Μαροδόκευτος*, var.: *Μαροδόκευτος*): one in his first year, two in his second.²⁴³

B. INDEX OF PUBLICATIONS

<i>ABL</i> 30	= 44.2.23 (b)
<i>ABL</i> 158	= 44.2.23 (c)
<i>ABL</i> 222	= n. 247
<i>ABL</i> 503	= 44.2.23 (d)
<i>ABL</i> 504	= 44.2.23 (e)
<i>ABL</i> 521	= 44.3.4 (e)
<i>ABL</i> 527	= 44.3.4 (d)
<i>ABL</i> 542	= 44.2.23 (f)
<i>ABL</i> 747	= 44.3.4 (c) ii
<i>ABL</i> 942	= 44.3.4 (c) iii
<i>ABL</i> 1005	= 44.2.23 (j)
<i>ABL</i> 1024	= 44.2.23 (g)
<i>ABL</i> 1029	= 44.2.23 (h)
<i>ABL</i> 1030	= n. 247
<i>ABL</i> 1095	= n. 247
<i>ABL</i> 1114	= 44.3.4 (a)
<i>ABL</i> 1131	= 44.3.4 (a)
<i>ABL</i> 1339	= n. 247
<i>Actes du 8^e Congrès</i> , suppl., no. 1	= 44.2.13
<i>ADD</i> 910	= n. 247
<i>AJO</i> 14 49	= 44.2.20 (b)
<i>AJO</i> 20 94:102	= 44.3.1 (a)
<i>AnOr</i> 9 1	= 44.2.8
<i>ACF</i> 2 24-25	= 44.2.23 (a)
Babylonian Chronicle i 32-ii 11	= 44.1.2
ii 17-22	= 48.1.2
<i>BSt</i> no. 35	= 44.2.5
Berossus	= 44.3.10
<i>Biblica</i> 35 413-28	= 44.2.1
Böhl, <i>Leiden Coll.</i> , III, 7-8	= 44.2.7
Borger, <i>Esarh.</i>	= 44.3.2
<i>BR</i> , no. 3	= 44.2.16
<i>BR</i> , no. 26	= 44.2.18
<i>BWL</i> 110-15	= 44.3.8
2 Chron. 32:31	= 44.3.9 (c)

²⁴³ See also F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, I (1906), 143-44.

CT 14 50	= 44.3.5
CT 34 44-48	= 44.1.2, 48.1.2
CT 36 25 iv 10, 14	= 44.1.1, 48.1.1
FGrH III C/1 pp. 385-86	= 44.3.10
ILN, Aug. 23, 1952, p. 294	= 44.2.1
Iraq 7 94, no. 7	= 44.2.21 (c) iii
Iraq 15 123-34	= 44.2.1
Iraq 16 Pls. XLVII f.	= 44.2.20 (c) ii
Iraq 17 21-50	= 44.2.22 (a-c)
Iraq 18 136	= 44.3.7
Iraq 20 182-212	= 44.2.22 (d)
Iraq 25 70-73	= 44.2.22 (e)
Isaiah 39:1-8	= 44.3.9 (b)
JCS 1 352	= 44.2.9, 44.2.10
JCS 12 99-100	= 44.2.20 (c) vi
JEOL 10 444-49	= 44.2.4
Josephus, <i>Antiquities</i> , X, ii, no. 2	= 44.3.11
KB 4 166-67	= 44.2.13
King, <i>Cat. Suppl.</i> , p. 57	= 44.2.6
Kinglist A iv 10, 14	= 44.1.1, 48.1.1
2 Kings 20:12-19	= 44.3.9 (a)
Labat, <i>TDP</i> , I 110, II Pl. XXXI	= 44.3.6
Lambert, <i>BWL</i> 110-15	= 44.3.8
Langdon, <i>Excavations at Kish</i> , III, 17, n. 4	= 44.2.2 (a)
<i>Ibid.</i> , III, 17-19 and Pl. XI	= 44.2.3
Lenormant, <i>Choix de textes cunéiformes</i> , no. 8	= 44.2.2 (a)
Lie 6:21	= 44.2.20 (a) i
Lie 40:262-58:14	= 44.2.20 (a) ii
Lie 58:15-67:1	= 44.2.20 (a) iii
Lyon p. 14	= 44.2.20 (c) v
MAOG 11/3 31 n. 3	= 44.2.7
MJ 17 392 no. 57	= 44.2.17
no. 58	= 44.2.14
Nimrud Letter V	= 44.2.22 (a)
VI	= 44.2.22 (c)
IX	= 44.2.22 (b)
XXXIX	= 44.2.22 (d)
LXV	= 44.2.22 (e)
OIP 2 24-25	= 44.2.21 (b) i
34-35	= 44.2.21 (b) i
43	= 44.3.1 (b)
46	= 44.3.1 (a)
48-55	= 44.2.21 (a) i

55-60	= 44.2.21 (a) ii
63-67	= 44.2.21 (b) ii
71	= 44.2.21 (b) ii
76-77	= 44.2.21 (c) i
82	= 44.3.1 (a)
85-86	= 44.2.21 (c) ii
89	= 44.3.1 (a)
92	= 44.3.1 (a)
156 no. 24	= 44.2.21 (c) iv
OIP 24	= 44.2.21 (c) v
OIP 38 129 no. 1	= 44.2.20 (a) iii
Oppert in Place, <i>Ninive et l'Assyrie</i> , II, 307-8 ¹¹⁹	= 44.2.12
Ptolemaic Canon, 6	= 44.1.3
Ptolemy, <i>Almagest</i> , IV, 5	= 44.3.12
IR 5 XVII	= 44.2.2 (a)
2R 67	= 44.2.19 (a)
Rost, <i>Tigl. III</i> , I, 60-62	= 44.2.19 (a)
II, Pl. 34	= 44.2.19 (b)
II, Pls. 35-38	= 44.2.19 (a)
Smith, <i>Senn.</i>	= 44.2.21 (a)
Smith, <i>Senn.</i> , 28	= 44.2.21 (d)
Steinmetzer, no. 34	= 44.2.5
Steinmetzer, no. 72	= 44.2.4
Streck, <i>Asb.</i>	= 44.3.3
<i>Sumer</i> 9 117-88	= 44.2.21 (b) iii
TDP I 110 and II, Pl. XXXI	= 44.3.6
TuM 2-3 no. 8	= 44.2.16
UET I 261	= 44.2.17
UET I 262	= 44.2.14
UET I 8	= 44.2.18
UET 4 8	= 44.2.17
UET 4 206	= 44.2.2 (b)
UVB I p. 54 nr. 16 (Taf. 27d)	= 44.2.2 (b)
UVB I p. 55 nr. 17	= 44.2.2 (b)
UVB I p. 55 nr. 18 (Taf. 27e)	= 44.2.2 (a)
VAS I 37	= 44.2.4
Winckler I 6:21	= 44.2.20 (a) i
38:228-54:316	= 44.2.20 (a) ii
54:317-60:369	= 44.2.20 (a) iii
84	= 44.2.20 (c) iii
120-26	= 44.2.20 (c) i
148:45-150:45	= 44.2.20 (c) iv

¹¹⁹ Reprinted separately as Oppert, *Les Inscriptions de Dour-Sarkayan [Khorsabad] provenant des fouilles de M. Victor Place; inscriptions on pp. 27-28.*

Winckler, <i>AOF</i> 2 24-25	= 44.2.23 (a)
Winckler <i>Sammlung</i> 2 4	= 44.2.20 (c) vi
2 57	= 44.2.23 (l)
<i>WVDOG</i> 51 Taf. 101c, 107d	= 44.2.2 (a)
<i>YOS</i> 3 74	= 44.3.4 (c) i
<i>ZA</i> 6 289-98	= 44.3.5
<i>ZA</i> 7 184	= 44.2.2 (a)

C. INDEX OF MUSEUM EXCAVATION NUMBERS

79-7-8, 257	= 44.2.23 (o)
79-7-8, 312	= 44.2.23 (p) iii
81-7-6, 688	= 44.3.5
81-7-27, 3	= 44.2.20 (b)
83-1-18, 4	= 44.3.4 (e)
83-1-18, 65	= 44.3.4 (a)
83-1-18, 71	= 44.3.4 (c) iii
83-1-18, 124	= 44.3.4 (a)
83-1-18, 131	= 44.3.4 (c) iv
83-1-18, 1338	= 44.1.2, 48.1.2
1905-4-9, 68	= 44.2.6
A 3442	= 44.3.6
BM 33332	= 44.1.1, 48.1.1
BM 40006	= 44.2.5
BM 46226	= 44.3.5
BM 92502	= 44.1.2, 48.1.2
BM 98562	= 44.2.6
BM 113203	= 44.2.21 (a) i
BM 121025	= 44.2.21 (c) iii
Crozer Theological Seminary, 201	= 44.2.10
DS 32-11	= 44.2.14'
D.T. 1	= 44.3.8
D.T. 3	= 44.2.19 (b)
HS 452	= 44.2.16
IM 56578	= 44.2.21 (b) iii
K. 114	= 44.2.23 (f)
K. 186	= n. 247
K. 530	= 44.2.23 (c)
K. 667	= 44.2.23 (d)
K. 830	= 44.3.4 (d)
K. 923	= 44.3.4 (c) ii
K. 1159 + K. 4683	= 44.2.23 (k)
K. 1176	= 44.2.23 (e)
K. 1680	= 44.2.21 (a) ii

K. 1980	= 44.2.23 (j)
K. 3751	= 44.2.19 (a)
K. 3787	= 44.2.13
K. 4471	= 44.2.20 (c) vi
K. 4670	= 44.2.23 (l)
K. 4683	= 44.2.23 (k)
K. 4740	= 44.2.23 (a)
K. 5333b	= 44.2.23 (g)
K. 5434a	= 44.2.23 (m)
K. 5550 + K. 5614	= 44.2.23 (h)
K. 5594	= n. 247
K. 5614	= 44.2.23 (h)
K. 6109	= 44.2.21 (e)
K. 7426	= 44.2.23 (b)
K. 8379	= n. 247
K. 8403	= 44.2.23 (p) i
K. 11239	= n. 247
K. 13080	= 44.2.23 (p) ii
NBC 4848	= 44.2.9
ND 2090	= 44.2.1
ND 2385	= 44.2.22 (e)
ND 2601	= 44.2.20 (c) ii
ND 2603	= 44.2.22 (a)
ND 2674	= 44.2.22 (c)
ND 2759	= 44.2.22 (d)
ND 2779	= 44.2.22 (b)
ND 3400-03	= 44.2.20 (c) ii
ND 3408-09	= 44.2.20 (c) ii
ND 3417	= 44.2.20 (c) ii
ND 4358	= 44.3.7
Rm. 67	= n. 247
Rm. 2, 495	= 44.2.23 (n)
Sm. 740	= 44.3.4 (b)
U.2616	= 44.2.17
U.2662	= 44.2.14
VA 2563	= 44.2.4
VAT 8498	= 44.2.8
W. 1929, 136	= 44.2.3
YBC 3552	= 44.3.4 (c) i
YBC 7422	= 44.2.11
YBC 11383	= 44.2.15
YBC 11386	= 44.2.15