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In the following pages are published the texts of all that now remain in the British Museum of a particular kind of Babylonian historical records, the Chronicles, so called by modern scholars, their native name being uncertain. These are distinguished by their impersonal style, as written by detached observers, from our principal source of historical information, the inscriptions of Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian kings, which extend from before the middle of the third millennium until the sixth century B.C., and from a single detail commemorated on a tablet or a figure to the lengthy history of a whole reign, written in densely-packed columns upon a clay prism. The Chronicles too, although all now extant, were written in the latest periods of Babylonian antiquity, make reference in their manner of impersonal narration to events which occurred throughout a past of more than 2000 years, going back to figures among the earliest dynasties of Sumer and even to mythological stories of the gods. They find their first important subject in the reigns of Sargon of Agade and of Naram-Sin (about 2300 B.C.), and relate a number of striking and dramatic incidents connected with those national heroes. By comparison, the subsequent centuries, to judge from the available material, seem to have been ill-represented in the sources from which the chroniclers drew, for only a few facts, of no great interest, are recorded concerning even the more famous kings. From about the reign of Nabonassar in the eighth century B.C., when the Assyrian domination of Babylon began, the Chronicles become much more detailed, giving information of what happened in such years of the reigns as were marked by important events. Extant Chronicles prove that, from at least the first of Esarhaddon (680 B.C.), an entry was made for every year, even if nothing very notable occurred in it; but not all of the succeeding years are preserved.

This arrangement is exemplified in the material here published, which embraces (with one short and one long gap) the period 626 to 556 B.C., i.e. the greatest part of the Neo-Babylonian or Chaldaean Dynasty. In these eventful years the declining Assyrian power was finally expelled from Babylonia,
and extinguished in its centre by the fall of Nineveh (612 B.C.), leaving only a remnant to sustain the Assyrian name in the city of Harran, dependent upon aid from Egypt. In the last year of his father’s life (605 B.C.) Nebuchadrezzar won a famous victory over the Egyptians at Carchemish and pursued them to Hamath, where (so the Chronicle claims) he utterly destroyed their last remnant. But he was foiled in a subsequent encounter with them, in 601 B.C., from which he was forced into an ignominious retreat to his own land, where he spent the next year recruiting his strength. In the seventh year of his reign he laid siege to Jerusalem, and captured the city early in the year 597, appointing a new king to rule over it and carrying away great spoils. Late in 595 he was threatened by a dangerous mutiny of the army in Babylonia, but succeeded in quelling it with bloody retribution upon its leaders. The last tablet relates the events of a single and later year (557-556 B.C.), the third of Neriglissar, who is surprisingly found leading a military expedition, hitherto quite unknown, in the distant region of western Cilicia. A tabular summary of the years, reigns, and principal events recorded in these tablets is given in the Introduction.

Almost all of the Babylonian Chronicles are in the collections of the British Museum, from which individual pieces have been published at various times by different hands. But the most valuable and original work was done by the late Professor L. W. King, formerly Assistant Keeper in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, who not only furnished improved texts of Chronicles published before his time but made the most important addition to these with the documents which he revealed in his volumes entitled Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings (London, 1907). The other volumes promised to follow those would certainly have included the tablets published here for the first time. It is known that Professor King had arranged their texts for printing in the same form as his other Chronicles, and it may be assumed that he meant to give them the title of Chronicles concerning Late Babylonian Kings. His premature death in 1919 left this purpose unfulfilled, and as no manuscript which he may have prepared has been found, the work had to be taken up afresh. In the meanwhile one of the present Chronicles, No. 21901, was published separately as The Fall of Nineveh in 1923. Since this text occurs in the midst of the present series, and since its edition of 1923 is now out of print, it has been re-issued here with revisions taking account of subsequent criticism and study.
PREFACE

The Chronicles in this volume have been copied, translated, and provided with the appropriate introduction and commentary by Mr. D. J. Wiseman, O.B.E., M.A., Assistant Keeper in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities.

C. J. GADD.

British Museum,
August, 1955.
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INTRODUCTION

The Neo-Babylonian Chronicle Texts

The cuneiform texts belonging to the class long known as Babylonian Chronicles are a unique and reliable source of knowledge of the history of Babylonia. Unfortunately, however, only a few of these compilations have survived, but these show that a chronicle of the principal national events was kept at Babylon from at least as early as the Kassite period (c. sixteenth to fourteenth centuries B.C.) until the end of the Seleucid era.

The first text of this kind to be published (B.M. 92502) appeared in 1887 as The Babylonian Chronicle, so giving the title which has been adopted for all similar documents. This tablet outlines the history of Babylonia from the rule of Nabu-naṣir to Šamaš-sum-ukin (i.e. c. 747-648 B.C.). It is a copy made in the twenty-second year of Darius 2 from an older and damaged text and claims to be the first of a number of tablets, or chapter-extracts, of the same kind. A group of texts concerning early Babylonian kings was published in 1907 3 and it is known that the editor of these intended to follow them with the corresponding Neo-Babylonian chronicles. This was partly done by other scholars in the years 1923 and 1924 in two publications containing (1) B.M. 25091 (Esarhaddon Chronicle), 86379 (Chronicle of the Years 680-626 B.C.), 35382 (Nabonidus Chronicle, re-edited), and other relevant material, 4 and (2) B.M. 21901 of which the principal event is the Fall of

2 I.e. 500/499 B.C. if Darius I.
3 L. W. King, Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings.
4 Sidney Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts, 1924.
Nineveh. Apart from the two last-mentioned Chronicles, little historical intelligence, except for scanty references in what are otherwise building inscriptions or business documents, has been available for the Neo-Babylonian kingdom (626–539 B.C.). The four new texts which are the subject of this study and are here published for the first time happily fill a number of gaps in our knowledge of this period. The early days of the Neo-Babylonian or Chaldaean regime, the battles of Carchemish and Hamath and the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar II in 597 B.C. are among the great historical events now described by authentic Babylonian sources. Since one of the Chronicles already published (B.M. 21901—The Fall of Nineveh) forms part of this series, and is out of print, the opportunity has been taken to reproduce that text here.

The following table shows the new Chronicles in their chronological relation to previously published texts of the same type.

### NEO-BABYLONIAN CHRONICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Regnal Years</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Tablet No.</th>
<th>No. Lines</th>
<th>Published</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nabopolassar</td>
<td>acc.-3</td>
<td>626-623</td>
<td>B.M. 25127*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>p. 50</td>
<td>I &amp; VII-VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>622-617</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10-17</td>
<td>616-609</td>
<td>B.M. 21901†</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(a) FN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>608-606</td>
<td>B.M. 22047*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(b) p. 54</td>
<td>II-III &amp; IX-XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nabopolassar-</td>
<td>21-10</td>
<td>605-595</td>
<td>B.M. 21946†</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>p. 64</td>
<td>IV &amp; XIII-XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 66</td>
<td>V &amp; XIV-XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nebuchadrezzar II</td>
<td>11-43</td>
<td>594-561</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Amēl-Marduk</td>
<td>acc.-2</td>
<td>561-559</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Neriglissar</td>
<td>acc.-2</td>
<td>559-557</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>B.M. 25124*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>p. 74</td>
<td>VI &amp; XVII-XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Labāši-Marduk</td>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>556-555</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nabonidus</td>
<td>acc.-17</td>
<td>555-539</td>
<td>B.M. 33382</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>BHT, pp. 98-123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* † mark tablets apparently written by the same scribe.

The above table also clearly shows that the extant Chaldaean (or Neo-Babylonian) Chronicle tablets vary in the amount of historical detail given.

1 C. J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh*, printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1923.
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Fifteen years of Nabopolassar’s reign are covered in 152 lines (B.M. 25127; 21901; 220471 and part 21946) whereas the more summary ‘Babylonian Chronicle’ (B.M. 92502) records more than thirty years of earlier history in its 173 lines. In contrast the tablet B.M. 25124, which gives us the first historical detail of Neriglissar’s reign, takes a whole tablet of twenty-six lines for the events of a single year. Part of Nebuchadrezzar’s history (B.M. 21946) now comes to us for the first time but in less detail than is accorded to his predecessor Nabopolassar (49 lines for 11 years). The new text is more detailed than the ‘Nabonidus Chronicle’ (B.M. 35382) which is more closely allied to the ‘Babylonian Chronicle’, not only in the arrangement of subject matter but also in script and in the form of the two-columned tablet: the latter two tablets seem to have been written by the same scribe. Similarly the chronicles covering Nabopolassar’s early and later years and that of Neriglissar are written by the same scribe in small script on tablets which resemble the form usually taken by late Babylonian contracts (cf. above Table Nos. 1, 4, 9 and Plates I, IV, VI). The remaining tablets, B.M. 21901 and B.M. 21946, are larger and written by yet another hand (cf. Table Nos. 3, 5 and Plates II, III, V). It is all the more noteworthy that the shorter text B.M. 22047 comes between these two similar tablets and forms a continuous history, the order of these three being confirmed by their respective ‘catchlines’.

The late Babylonians had a deep interest in their own past and a number of texts reveal knowledge of their early history, both secular and religious. It has been suggested that the ‘Babylonian Chronicle’ tablet was but the first chapter of an official history of which the remaining Chronicles are recognisable extracts. It is, however, evident that some chronicle tablets bear fuller details than the ‘Babylonian Chronicle’ which cannot therefore be regarded as a specimen of their original. The diversity in form of the extant chronicle texts suggests rather that in each case we have summaries designed for different purposes. Thus the two-columned ‘Babylonian Chronicle’ type of texts concentrates on the major internal political events, especially the date of the king’s accession and death and the length of his reign. The consecutive outline of the king’s activities introduces external or foreign matters only if they mark a distinct change in the control of Babylonia or in its relations with its immediate neighbours such as Assyria and Elam.

1 The lines in all the tablets of this ‘Babylonian Chronicle’ class are of approximately the same length. Cf. dimensions of the tablets given on p. 100.
emphasis is political, and the style which is formal and brief betrays a long established practice. On the other hand, in the Chronicle of the relations of Babylonia with Assyria during the years 680-626 B.C. and in the earlier Religious Chronicle, data have been selected from a more detailed original for a particular purpose and period. While the purpose cannot be judged the 'Babylonian Chronicle' (B.M. 92502), at least, was copied in the Persian period and may have been compiled to aid some enquiry needing an historical background. The similarity of form and language, quite apart from the obvious chronological arrangement, may well show that in each case the Chronicle texts are themselves but extracts or selections from a full history which, like the better known Annals of the Assyrian Kings, may have been compiled annually. The Neriglissar chronicle B.M. 25124 supports this view. That detailed records were continuous at least from the time of Nebuchadrezzar, and almost certainly from the reign of Nabû-nasîr with whose reign the 'Babylonian Chronicle' commences, is shown by the chronicles themselves and by the later class of texts sometimes called astronomical historical diaries. In these, astronomers at Babylon recorded not merely their observation of the heavens but also relevant facts thought to be connected with them, such as the prevailing weather conditions, the river level, current prices of staple commodities, and finally the contemporary political events which were sometimes written down in great detail. If these latter observations were not themselves the basis of a progressive historiography they point to the availability of such material.

The Neo-Babylonian Chronicle texts are written in a small script of a type which does not of itself allow any precise dating but which can mean that they were written from any time almost contemporary with the events themselves to the end of the Achaemenid rule. Their provenance is Babylon so far as can be judged from the internal evidence of the texts themselves and from

1 Some of the phrases occur in lists of kings dated back to the Sumerian period (T. Jacobsen, The Sumerian King List) and were still used as late as the end of the Seleucid era (A. J. Sachs and D. J. Wiseman, Iraq, XVI (1954), pp. 202-212). A similar vocabulary is found in the Assyrian Annals.

2 B.M. 35968 published by L. W. King, op. cit. ii, pp. 70-86; 157-179.

3 Cf. Ezra v. 19.

4 For a recent discussion on the value of the Annals see E. A. Speiser in The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East, pp. 64-67.

5 B.M. 92689 (BHT, pp. 150-159; Pl. XVIII) is the historical part of one of this class of texts. See A. J. Sachs, JCS, 2 (1949), pp. 285-286; a text of this class dated in Nebuchadrezzar's thirty-eighth year is given in AfO, XVI (1953), Tf. XVII.
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other tablets acquired by the Museum at the same time. At least part of
the ‘Babylonian Chronicle’ or its original sources was, however, copied at
Sippar.¹ The discussion of their contents which follows shows that they are
both accurate and objective in their portrayal of historical facts.

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF CONTENTS

The Struggle Against Assyria

B.M. 25127 The Chronicle B.M. 25127 ² commences with the Assyrians under Sin-šar-ıškun seeking to subdue the Babylonians, who were striving to regain their
independence. If the previous tablet had survived, it would no doubt have
described the initial stages of this war which began in 651 B.C.,³ the death of
Ashurbanipal and the reigns of Assur-et-il-ilani and Sin-šar-ıškun, against whom
the Babylonians fought under Kandalanu, an erstwhile Assyrian governor.

The opening lines recording the events of this year are regrettably broken 626 B.C.
but sufficient of the tablet remains for it to be clear that one of the garrisons
placed within a certain Babylonian city by Sin-šar-ıškun had been forced to
flee to Assyria, presumably as a result of the activities of Nabopolassar. The
city is more likely to have been Nippur than the capital Babylon, for documents
written at the former city in the third year of Sin-šar-ıškun, king of Assyria,⁴
record that the Assyrian garrison there was closely besieged during the earlier
part of the year. The inhabitants were even reduced to selling their children
for a pittance with which to buy food.⁵ Moreover, Nippur was the main ob-
jective of the Assyrian counter-attack which was mounted in the late summer
of the same year.

The control of Nippur had particular military significance throughout this
period. Following the terms agreed in a treaty made by Esarhaddon, Šamaš-
šum-ukin had been appointed to rule at Babylon.⁶ After a sixteen-year rule

¹ B.M. 75976-75477 (CT, XXXIV, 43-45) duplicate part of the ‘Babylonian Chronicle’
(B.M. 92502); cf. ZA, XXXVII, pp. 63 ff.
² For full transliteration and translation see pp. 50-55. The copy is given on Plates
VII-VIII with photographs on Plate I.
³ B.M. 86379, 11 (BHT, pp. 24-25).
⁴ See pp. 90 if. for a discussion of the accession date of this king.
⁵ A. L. Oppenheim, Siege-documents from Nippur (Iraq, XVII (1955), pp. 71 ff.).
⁶ The Nimrud treaty tablet (ND. 4327) found in 1955 (to be published).
there he led a revolt against his brother Ashurbanipal with the result that Babylon was besieged in 651 B.C. and Šamaš-šum-ukin perished in the burning city in 648 B.C. He appears never to have controlled Nippur, for economic texts from this city continued to be dated by the regnal years of the Assyrian kings to whom Nippur, as a principal garrison city, directly owed allegiance. Similarly Kandalanu, who was appointed by Ashurbanipal to succeed at Babylon, does not appear to have been recognised as having authority at Nippur. Although contracts of his reign have been recovered only from Babylon, Borsippa, Erech, and Sippar there is no reason to suppose that his domain was less extensive than that of his predecessor. Before his death in 627 B.C. Kandalanu appears to have rebelled against his overlord during the period of uncertainty over the succession which followed the death of Aššur-etil-ilani, the successor of Ashurbanipal. After Kandalanu, in the accession year of Nabopolassar, there were rebellions in Assyria and Akkad (Babylonia). Throughout all this disturbed period the Assyrians maintained their hold on Nippur with a strong garrison which, by reason of its strategic location, was able to watch, if not to control, the southern marshes, the traffic on the rivers Euphrates and Tigris and even the recently vanquished Elamite lands. The garrison also constituted a threat to the central cities of Babylon, Kish, and Sippar. The maintenance of this much harassed outpost was no easy task and it is to the credit of the Assyrians that they managed to do so until 622 B.C. at least and possibly until 618 B.C.

When the record of the year 626 B.C. according to the new chronicle text becomes legible, Nabopolassar is already openly opposing Sin-šar-šikun and his troops. Berossus says that Sin-šar-šikun had appointed Nabopolassar as administrator of the sea-land, perhaps in designed opposition to Kandalanu, already in revolt, but it is certain that Nabopolassar took up the lead already given by Kandalanu in seeking to recover Babylonian independence from Assyria.

1 See p. 91.  
2 JNES, III, p. 39.  
3 See p. 89 f.  
4 Assuming that the brief reign of Sin-šum-lišir comes between Aššur-etil-ilānī and Sin-šar-šikun (as JNES, III, pp. 41-42).  
5 Babylonian Chronicle B.M. 86379 rev. 4-5 (cf. BHT, p. 24).  
7 It was still held in 623 B.C. (see B.M. 25127, 32 and p. 91).  
8 Offensive operations against Assyria were continued in 616 B.C. (p. 12 and FN, p. 5) and it is unlikely that an Assyrian garrison in S. Babylonia could have been supported thereafter.  
9 P. Schnabel, Berossus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur, p. 271.
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It was this movement which led to the siege of the city which it is suggested may have been Nippur, but the Babylonians were as yet neither strong enough nor sufficiently united to achieve their aim. As in the past, the Assyrian army struck back, and when it entered the Assyro-Babylonian border town of Saznaku on the twelfth of Elul and set fire to the temples, this was warning enough to the Babylonians to make defensive preparations. Three weeks later the gods of Kish, which lay on the direct line of march to Nippur, were removed for safety into Babylon. Nabopolassar did not oppose the Assyrian march but withdrew from Nippur, where he could not count on the whole-hearted support of the inhabitants who had long been pro-Assyrian, and moved back to Erech. An Assyrian detachment, reinforced by ‘the men of Nippur’ among whom would undoubtedly be survivors of the garrison troops, attacked Nabopolassar in Erech but then withdrew. Their withdrawal may have been occasioned by events farther north in the same month of Tisri. An Assyrian army, probably the main and slower moving force, had advanced on Babylon itself on the twelfth of the month (9/10th October 626 B.C.) only to be decisively beaten by the Babylonians who came out to meet them. This was the last attempt ever made by the Assyrians to gain control of Babylon whose rulers and people had asserted and striven for their independence throughout their long history.

The successful defence of Babylon encouraged its citizens to take a further step to make public their independent position, and six weeks later Nabopolassar ‘sat on the throne in Babylon’. While his official accession date of the twenty-sixth of Marcheswan (22/23rd November 626 B.C.) is thus specifically noted, there is possible evidence that he had been recognised by the citizens of Sippar as ‘king of Akkad’ two months earlier. Whether this be so or not, the Chronicle gives an exact date, hitherto lacking, within Babylonian history. The accession to the throne ended a period of one year when ‘there was no king in the land’. This period was reckoned as ‘after Kandalanu’ both by the Babylonian chronicler and by scribes dating documents during the interregnum which lasted from the death of Kandalanu in about the sixth

1 See p. 78.
2 The Julian dates given in this book follow the tables of R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein in Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.-A.D. 45, Oriental Institute, Chicago: Studies in Oriental Civilization, No. 24 (1943). An allowance of one day has been added since the Babylonian ‘day’ (as 24-hour period) was reckoned from dusk.
3 B.M. 25127, 14-15.
4 B.M. 49656 (Plate XXI); discussed on p. 93.
5 B.M. 86379 r. 4 (BHT, p. 24).
month of his twenty-first year (627 B.C.) until Nabopolassar's accession. The interregnum is sometimes more fully styled the 'twenty-second year after Kandalanu'.

The first recorded act of Nabopolassar was the restoration to Susa of the Elamite gods captured by the Assyrians during the campaigns of 642-639 B.C. To return the statues (deposited in Erech) was but a proper acknowledgement of help received from Elam, for it appears that when Nabopolassar captured

\[ \text{Evidence for this is given on pp. 89-90.} \]

\[ \text{Cf. Bab. Chron. (B.M. 92502) iv, 17-18.} \]
Erech sometime before 626 B.C., the Elamites had taken its temple library to their country for safe-keeping.\(^1\)

In the first year of his reign Nabopolassar’s position was far from secure.\(^{625/4\ B.C.}\) The fear of large-scale Assyrian reprisals following the loss of Babylon and Erech made defensive measures essential. First Shamash and other deities from the temple of the city of Šapazzu were brought into Babylon. This city, like Šaznaku which had been plundered by the Assyrians in the previous year, probably lay on the northern border of Babylonia.\(^2\)

A month later the Assyrian army had penetrated farther south and on the twenty-first of Iyyar entered and plundered the city of Sallat which lay on the Euphrates upstream from Sippar.\(^3\) On the previous day the gods of Sippar had been brought into Babylon, which itself expected to be attacked in due course. The Assyrians were either not strong enough or not determined enough to press home immediately the advantages already gained. Three months later Nabopolassar, having collected an assault force, made an unsuccessful attack on Sallat. The weakness of the Babylonian forces can be judged by their disengagement and withdrawal as soon as an Assyrian army moved south again.

The increasing weakness of Assyrian military power is emphasised by the brief entry in the Chronicle (B.M. 25127) for the second year of Nabopolassar. This shows that it was not until the beginning of the summer month of Elul that the Assyrian army advanced into Babylonia and encamped by the Banitu canal. This major irrigation channel ran eastwards from the Euphrates along the eastern outskirts of Babylon and past Kish towards the Tigris river, and a branch canal leading from it supplied the southerly city of Nippur. The object of the Assyrian advance may have been to safeguard this vital source of supply and to bring help to their garrison by taking the direct route to Nippur, for the army on this occasion seems to have followed the route taken by Sennacherib in 703 B.C., crossing the Tigris near Cutha and striking due south thus avoiding the defences of the city of Babylon.\(^4\) The Banitu canal provided a good tactical position, easily defensible, across the centre of the ‘land of Akkad’ or upper Babylonia. The Assyrian failure to press southward from this favourable position or to follow up their one unsuccessful raid on Nabopolassar’s camp shows their inability at this time to avenge the

---

\(^1\) AO. 6451, 16; F. Thureau-Dangin, *Rituels accadiens*, p. 65, ll. 45 ff.

\(^2\) See p. 78 and map on opposite page.

\(^3\) See p. 78.

loss of Babylon and to prevent the rise of Neo-Babylonian independence. It was, moreover, their last opportunity to do this for, apart from one further abortive incursion during the following year, the Assyrian army could henceforward fight only in defence of its own homeland.¹

Assuming that the chronicler devotes a single marked paragraph to the events of each year, as is the case in all the extant chronicles of Nabopolassar's reign,² the final section of B.M. 25127 relates to his third year. It commences with the bare statement that Dēr revolted from Assyria. This city, situated on the north-east frontier of Babylonia with Elam, must have been encouraged to this bold step both by the successful resistance of Nabopolassar's rebel forces against Assyria in the previous summer and by the new status of Elam which had also regained its independence of Assyria by this time. Since Dēr lay nearer the Assyrian borders than did the major Babylonian cities, its defection marks a change in what had hitherto been the purely defensive strategy of the Babylonians. Such open defiance could not pass unheeded and in the autumn, the Assyrian army, led by the king in person came down to Akkad. The text is broken but seems to suggest that the objective was again Nippur where the garrison needed strengthening or replacing. It is not clear whether it was the Babylonians or Assyrians who moved upstream on the west bank of the Euphrates to make an attack and later marched towards Nineveh. This mutilated section of the text would more naturally be an account of Babylonian successes under Nabopolassar than a detailed version of an Assyrian retreat. If this is so, we have the first mention of a Babylonian advance northwards up the Euphrates and Tigris valleys of a kind to be repeated after 616 and resulting at length in the fall of the Assyrian capital Nineveh in 612 B.C.³ This movement must have gathered momentum during the years after 622 B.C. for which information in the form of chronicles is still lacking.

The lower edge of B.M. 25127 is badly preserved and allows us to know with certainty only that after some person had been killed a usurper ruled for one hundred days. Insufficient text remains to determine who he was or where he held sway, but it is most likely that this was some attempt to displace Nabopolassar either at Babylon or Nippur, if the latter was then held by him. The Babylonian Chronicle would be more likely to refer to this than to a dynastic event within Assyria proper. If, however, the allusion is in fact to

¹ Unless the siege of Erech in 621 B.C. was by Assyrian forces, see p. 91.  
² I.e. B.M. 21901; 21946.  
³ See p. 16.
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Assyrian internal politics there is a possibility, though perhaps a remote one, that the usurper was the little known Assyrian Sin-šum-lišir. Since the one text relating to his reign as 'king of Assyria' is a contract dated at Nippur in his accession year it is possible that that city had begun to date its documents by a usurper who seized the Assyrian throne during the absence of Sin-šar-iškun in Babylonia. The news of the Assyrian defeat or withdrawal in October 623 B.C. may have occasioned the revolt. The events in the chronicle could then be interpreted as a rising in which the usurper in Nineveh won popular support at Nippur for one hundred days before Sin-šar-iškun's supporters regained control.¹

The last line written on the left edge of B.M. 25127 is not marked by any dividing line but may be a 'catch-phrase' to link this tablet with one that followed. That tablet would have given the sequel to the revolt and carried the summary history through the years 622-617 B.C. after which the fortunes of Babylonia can be followed anew in the tablet (B.M. 21901) recounting the events of 616-609 B.C.

The gap in the sources between 623-616 B.C. can be filled to some extent with events presupposed by the historical narrative when it is available again. By 622 B.C. at the latest, Nabopolassar appears to have gained control of Nippur.² Erech did not fall to him until that year or soon after, and the Assyrian garrison may even have abandoned Nippur in favour of Erech which was often independent and therefore subject to external pressures at varying times during this troubled period.³

B.M. 21901  
The Chronicle tablet, B.M. 21901, takes up the history of Nabopolassar 616 B.C. in his tenth year.⁴ In the late spring he marched up the Euphrates through

¹ The problem of Sin-šum-lišir's reign is discussed in *JNES*, III, p. 41 and n. 30.
² The earliest known dated text of Nabopolassar at Nippur was, however, written in his twelfth year (614 B.C.). See A. T. Clay, *BE*, VIII/I, 9.
³ See p. 91.
the well populated districts of Suḫu and Ḫindanu which bordered the river from about Hit almost to the junction with the river Ḥabur. This region, being on a natural route between Syria and Babylonia, had long been subject to Assyría. The inhabitants did not oppose Nabopolassar, however, but brought tribute to signify their submission. The inability of the Assyrians to maintain garrison troops in the area may have encouraged the Aramaean tribes to act in this way, but the Assyrians themselves did not acquiesce in the loss of rich territory and set out to retaliate. Three months after Nabopolassar’s advance Assyrian forces reached Qablinu, and twelve days after hearing of their arrival Nabopolassar, who must have remained in Ḫindanu, himself approached the same city. The Assyrians, who were not commanded by the king in person but had been reinforced by a contingent of their former enemies the Mannai, did not await the Babylonian attack. They broke off contact, only to be heavily defeated as they withdrew in the vicinity of Qablinu, which fell to the Babylonians on the same day. As the Assyrians withdrew towards Harran, Nabopolassar moved upstream after them. He contented himself with the plunder of three towns in the Balikh area south of Harran before returning to Babylon with spoil which included many captives from Ḫindanu. The Assyrians made a belated and unsuccessful attempt to follow up the Babylonian forces on their way home, but though they reached Qablinu they failed to overtake them and once again withdrew.

During the next five months Assyria found a new ally—although once an opponent—in Egypt. Psammetichus I had broken free from the Assyrian yoke by 654 B.C., and it had by now become increasingly difficult for Egypt to ignore the threatened Medo-Lyden conflict. Her influence, if not her existence was threatened by the impending Medo-Babylonian alliance so that it is not surprising that Egypt should seek to maintain her position by supporting Assyría and her Mannaean allies who were similarly placed. Egypt was therefore led into the alliance with Assyría which was to involve her in defeat at Carchemish in 605 B.C. and in the subsequent prolonged struggle with the Babylonians.

The chronicler gives the impression that Nabopolassar was unwilling as yet even to attempt to meet the new allies, for the Chronicle for this year makes

1 S. Horn, ZA, XXXIV, pp. 123 ff.
2 Balihu lay within the Assyrian province of Harran (E. Forrer, Provinz., p. 24).
3 H. von Zeissl, Αθηναῖοι καὶ Ασσύριοι έν Αίγυπτω, pp. 49-50.
4 On the downfall of the Urartian and Mannaean kingdoms see G. A. Melikishvili, Na'iri-Urartu, Tiflis (Georgian Academy), 1954, pp. 317 ff.
5 See pp. 21 ff.
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no further reference to Egypt, but is confined to a battle between the Babylonians and Assyrians east of the Tigris. The respective kings played no part in this operation which was perhaps little more than a raid by Babylonian troops against the otherwise unknown town of Badanu in the province of Arraphu (modern Kirkuk). The Assyrians seem to have shown no desire for battle, for they withdrew, losing their pack animals and many prisoners to the Babylonians, who pursued them as far as the lesser Zab river. The victors chose the route down the western bank of the Tigris river for their return march to Babylon.

Within two months of the Babylonian army’s victorious return from the Zab, Nabopolassar called it out for a further campaign in the same general region. The ancient capital city of Aššur was besieged in the month of Iyyar, the final assault being launched a month later, the army having probably followed the direct route from Babylon to Aššur up the west Tigris bank. News of the mobilisation of the Assyrian army caused Nabopolassar to withdraw hastily down the Tigris to Takrit which was a natural rallying point.¹ The Assyrians laid siege to the citadel for ten days, but their efforts were unsuccessful, for the Babylonians were able to fight their way out and even claim to have defeated the Assyrian forces before both armies withdrew. The Assyrian withdrawal may have been hastened by the need to strengthen the defences of Nineveh, for in the month of Marcheswan (October-November) the Medes came down on the province of Arraphu. Since the same area had been overrun by the Babylonians in the previous year it seems likely that these operations by the Medes were independent of any Babylonian plan or knowledge. The final entry for this year is broken, but it is reasonable to suppose that the siege or fall of Arraphu was recorded and that this manoeuvre was preliminary to the advance by the Medes on Nineveh itself in the following year.

The Fall of Nineveh

The record of Nabopolassar’s twelfth year is obscured by the broken nature of the text. In the summer the Medes appear to have moved against Nineveh via Arraphu and Kalhu² but for some reason, obscured by the lacunae in

¹ It had been occupied previously by the Itu’a as an Assyrian police-post (ZA, XXXIV, p. 126; cf. Iraq, XVII, p. 46).
² So Levy, MVAG, 1924, p. 14; possibly now confirmed by the results of excavations at Nimrud in 1955 (to be published).
the text, did not press the siege of the capital itself but moved north-west to capture the neighbouring city of Tarbišu. They then turned south down the Tigris to besiege Aššur. In a successful assault the walls were breached and the city was captured and looted, the majority of the principal inhabitants being massacred and others taken prisoner. The chronicler, perhaps in reaction against this barbarous behaviour, emphasises that Nabopolassar and the Babylonian army who 'had marched to the help of the Medes' did not reach the battlefield until after the city had fallen. Near the ruined city Nabopolassar met the Median king, Kyaxares, here named for the first time in the Chronicle. A treaty was made reconciling both parties and establishing mutual good relations, both armies then returning to their respective countries. Henceforth this Medo-Babylonian alliance, which may have been confirmed by a marriage linking the families of the contracting parties, was to influence all Babylonian foreign policy.

The events of the year 614 B.C. are not easily interpreted. Although no siege of Nineveh is expressly mentioned it is possible that the approach to Nineveh, recorded in the first line of the text, marked the beginning of the three years siege recorded by Diodorus which, according to this Chronicle, ended in 612 B.C. The attack, if such it was, in this year was not, however, the first to have been made by the Medes on the renowned Assyrian capital. Herodotus writes of an unsuccessful assault led by Phraortes, a predecessor of Kyaxares, who was slain in the attempt. This must have taken place in the period for which historical records are at present lacking, that is, before 627 B.C. and possibly about 630 B.C., in the period of confusion following the death of Ashurbanipal. Moreover, if Diodorus is right in claiming that Nineveh was relieved by a Scythian or 'Bactrian' army at some date after the series of battles in which the Medes were defeated and before the final successful siege of 612 B.C., this, too, may have occurred in the same obscure period. Certainly 614 B.C. can hardly have been the year in which Kyaxares was defeated by the Scythians, for there is no place for or mention of such an important event in this chronicle, nor would Kyaxares have continued his campaign by attacking Tarbišu if he had just suffered a major reverse. The raising

1 Modern Sherif Khan; FN, p. 10 and n. 1.
2 See note p. 81.
3 See p. 81.
4 FN, pp. 10-11.
5 Book i, 102.
7 See p. 17.
8 L. Piotrowicz, L’Invasion des Scythes (Eos, XXXII, 1929), pp. 499 ff.
9 Book ii, 26, 1-4.
of the siege of Nineveh in this year may, however, have been brought about by some form of intervention by the Scythians.

The chronicle makes no further reference to Nineveh in the thirteenth year of Nabopolassar. It seems that he had no treaty obligation to fulfil there, and it is, in any case, improbable that the city was under siege in this year since the Assyrian army was operating in the central Euphrates valley. This may support the suggestion, previously made, that Nineveh had been reprieved by some skirmish between the Medes and Assyrians who were, perhaps, supported by the Scythians.\(^1\)

The district of Suḫu, which had submitted to Babylon in 616 B.C., revolted in the month of Iyyar, doubtless at the instigation of Assyria, and committed acts hostile to Babylonia. Nabopolassar immediately called out his army and marched to the island-town of Raḥilu situated on the Euphrates below ʿĀna in the southern territory of the Suḫu.\(^2\) Raḥilu was captured on the fourth of Sivan and the Babylonians then moved upstream to besiege another heavily defended town, namely, Anatu (the modern ʿĀna) also situated on an island in the same river.\(^3\) The broken text which follows gives the details of this siege. The approach to the walls was made by means of a stone causeway and ramp built out from the western bank of the Euphrates and along this was dragged a wooden siege-tower to give the attackers a vantage-point against the defenders on the wall. Despite these extensive preparations the assault failed, one reason for this being the approach of the Assyrian king (presumably Sin-šar-īškun) with his army. Once again the Babylonians seem not to have desired, or to have been unable, to engage in a set battle, for they made a speedy withdrawal and returned home.

It is clear that Nabopolassar again called out his army early in his fourteenth year and at a certain place, the name of which is lost by a break in the text, met the king of the Umman-manda. The Chronicle (ll. 11, 47) also shows that Kyaxares, the king of the Medes, was a major ally in this year. Unfortunately, the text is much broken and therefore obscure, and this has led to a divergence of interpretation concerning the participants in the final siege of Nineveh. The reading of the broken signs before 'king of the Umman-manda' (l. 38) is practically impossible and the restoration of the name of Kyaxares ([Umakiš]tar) as proposed by some scholars is by no means certain.\(^4\) In

---

1. FN, p. 12.
2. See note on p. 81.
3. See note on p. 81.
4. See p. 81.
accordance with this suggested restoration many historians\textsuperscript{1} equate the Umman-manda with the Medes and explain that at this time the term was used of the Median confederacy\textsuperscript{2} and not of the Scythians alone,\textsuperscript{3} although it may include those Scythians whose presence at the fall of Nineveh is implied by Diodorus.\textsuperscript{4} This view is supported by the absence of any further reference to the Umman-manda in the Chronicle for this year when the Medes were unquestionably the leaders. Moreover, the allies approached Nineveh from the south and after the sack of the city appear to have divided the spoils only between the armies of Medes and Babylonians before returning, each to their own country.\textsuperscript{5} According to this same chronicle the Umman-manda appeared again in 610 B.C. attacking Harran in co-operation with Babylonian forces,\textsuperscript{6} and yet at that time a letter from the crown prince, Nebuchadrezzar, refers to his father Nabopolassar as marching to Harran with a large force of Medes.\textsuperscript{7} Josephus also implies that the Harran expedition was an undertaking by both Medes and Babylonians.\textsuperscript{8} Herodotus, who emphasises the contribution of the Medes to the fall of Nineveh,\textsuperscript{9} favours the proposed identification of the Umman-manda with the Medes.

Nevertheless, other historians,\textsuperscript{10} unconvinced that Kyaxares is himself named ‘king of the Umman-manda’ or that his name really appears as such in the chronicle, see in the Umman-manda an allusion to the Scythian or ’Bactrian’ army which was won over from support of the Assyrians to make common cause with the Medes and their allies who had earlier defeated them.\textsuperscript{11}

Although the broken text does not permit a definite statement on this controversial issue, sufficient remains for the main course of the campaign to be followed. The allies marched up the Tigris against Nineveh which was besieged for the months Sivan-Ab (c. June-August 612 B.C.) during which

\textsuperscript{3} Who elsewhere appear only as I/Alquzai (L. Piotrowicz, \textit{loc. cit.} p. 477).
\textsuperscript{4} Book ii, 26.
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{RA}, XXII, pp. 27-29.
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Antiq. jud.} X, 5, 1 (74).
\textsuperscript{7} See p. 18.
\textsuperscript{10} See above.
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only slight progress was made. The final assault took place in Ab when the city fell and was heavily punished, the city and temple being looted and the whole turned into the desolate hillocks of ruins and debris which still characterise most of the site. No details of the assault are given, a fact which might support the classical tradition that the final breach in the walls resulted from an abnormally high flood, such as might occur on the river Tigris. A broken line in the chronicle seems to relate the fate of Sin-šar-iškun and thus may have given an account of a famous Assyrian event which led to the later story of Sardanapallus who cast himself into the flames which consumed his stricken city.

Despite the overwhelming destruction of Nineveh which the chronicler describes he acknowledges that some Assyrians, probably led by Aššur-uballit, escaped westwards where the Babylonians followed them as far as Nisibin. Kyaxares and the Medes turned homewards in the following month and, as the strongest of the allies, would have carried off the principal treasures of Nineveh. The Babylonians were left to ravage the surrounding countryside and collect their share of the loot. The Chronicle does not clearly support the theory that the retreat of the Medes followed their defeat by the Scyths who thus robbed them of the fruits of their victory. Subsequent Babylonian action appears to make it most unlikely that the ‘Bactrian’ intervention took place at this late date, although such an intervention might well explain the failure of the Medes to appear in Assyria again for some time.

The action of Nabopolassar in sending troops to the north-west of Nineveh and to Nisibin had the effect of inducing the inhabitants of Ruşapu in the Sinjar to bring tribute to him at Nineveh. Meanwhile, in the autumn, Aššur-uballit rallied Assyrian supporters at the provincial capital of Harran and claimed sovereignty over Assyria. The remaining text of this section is too fragmentary to be followed in detail. It appears to have given the duration

---

1 See note to l. 42 on p. 82.
2 The terms used to describe this are paralleled in l. 27 (the fall of Aššur).
3 I.e. Kuyunjik, last excavated by R. C. Thompson in 1931-32 (Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology, XX, pp. 71 ff.). Part of the site, covered by the village of Nabi Yunus, has been recently excavated by the Iraq Department of Antiquities (Sumer, X (1954), pp. 110-111).
4 Xenophon, Anabasis, iii, 4, 7-12; Diodorus ii. 27. 1; Nahum i. 8.
5 FN, p. 17.
6 FN, p. 18-19.
8 Ferner, Provinz., pp. 15, 105.
9 The name is restored in l. 49 (cf. l. 61). A. Poebel thinks that another nobleman may have intervened in the succession to the throne of Assyria (JNES, II, p. 90, n. 37).
of the stay of Nabopolassar in the Nineveh area and the time and place at which his return journey to Babylon began.

The Chronicle for the following year refers to the activities of the Babylonian forces alone. A long summer campaign in the Upper Euphrates region was concerned with plundering in ‘Assyria’, a geographical term correctly used by the Chronicler to denote the district of Harran. This province still retained the name of the kingdom of which it had once formed only a part. Several place-names, discernible in the broken text, show that the Babylonians at this time raided the borders of Harran between the Euphrates and Izalla, but without attacking any areas actually defended. One object of this manoeuvre would have been to dominate the area west of Nisibin which was the farthest point reached in the operations based on Nineveh in the previous year. Much spoil and many prisoners were taken. Four months later, in the month of Marcheswan (October-November), Nabopolassar took personal command of his army for the assault on Rugguliti. This city, which had been originally won for Assyria by Shalmaneser III in 856 B.C., lay near Til-Barsip, east of the Euphrates. These operations may have been intended as the first stage only in a campaign against Harran itself whose defenders, as the Babylonians knew, were expecting help from the Egyptians. The events of subsequent years, however, show that the Babylonians were still unable and unwilling to do battle alone with the main enemy, and after the capture of Rugguliti and all its inhabitants they returned home.

Early in the next year Nabopolassar directed a further campaign in 610 B.C. ‘Assyria’ where, for at least five months, he claims to have marched ‘victoriously’, a term which usually implies an unopposed martial progress through territory already subservient. This certainly reveals an unwillingness to close in on Harran, the capital and largest city of the remnant ‘Assyria’ occupied by Assur-uballit. The assault did not in fact develop until the Babylonians had been joined by the Umman-manda. The chronicler is at pains to point out that they were an auxiliary force more numerous than the reinforcements which might have been supplied from any garrison troops left by the Medes at the cities they had captured. These included Nineveh, Assur and Arraplu, and at Harran, as at Nineveh, the term Umman-manda could have included both Scythians and Medes. The approach of the combined armies was

---

1 ‘Assyria’ continued to be used by some writers to denote the whole area formerly covered by the Assyrian empire (e.g. Ezra vi. 22).
2 ll. 53-55.
3 Monolith inscription, ii, 35.
4 See p. 82.
5 ll. 59, 65; cf. l. 28.
6 See discussion, pp. 15 ff. above.
sufficiently impressive to cause Aššur-uballit and the Egyptian troops who had come to his aid to withdraw west of the Euphrates, so allowing Nabopolassar and his supporters to move in and plunder the undefended city. Nabonidus, who restored the Sin temple at Harran fifty-four years later, puts the major blame for the sack of the temples on the Umman-manda. A Babylonian garrison was established in Harran to take the first shock of any counter-attack by the Egyptian-Assyrian forces, and the Babylonians and the Umman-manda then withdrew to their respective countries.

Although the chronological note giving the regnal year is inadvertently omitted there is no doubt that the final section of the tablet relates the events of Nabopolassar's seventeenth year. Aššur-uballit, supported by a large Egyptian force, recrossed the Euphrates in an attempt to recapture Harran. The main effort seems to have been directed against the garrison left there by Nabopolassar, but this part of the text is broken and uncertain. For almost two months, until Elul, Aššur-uballit maintained the siege but without success. Meanwhile Nabopolassar marched to help his beleaguered troops. It seems that no attack was necessary for he turned his attention immediately to the hilly districts of Izalla to the north-east of the city. This change in the objective of the Babylonian march may imply that the siege had been raised before the arrival of Nabopolassar and that the new aim was to follow up Aššur-uballit who may have escaped towards Urartu. It is at least certain that the Chronicle makes no further mention of this last king of Assyria. On the other hand, if it is assumed that the Umman-manda constituted the main force in the garrison of Harran which, with Babylonian support, faced the last Assyrian attack, it must be supposed that Nabopolassar moved into the open country since his help was not required and continued the general raids which had characterised his expeditions of the previous two years.

The aim of the Babylonian thrust towards the Urartian border via Izalla is clear from the following year's events (recorded in B.M. 22047) which show that this was part of a well-planned expedition to keep the hill-folks from

1 Following restoration proposed by Lewy, op. cit. p. 85. Note the omission of any specific reference to the king of Egypt.
2 I.e. 556 B.C. RA, XXII, p. 29; FN, p. 22.
3 S. Langdon, Neubab., p. 218, i. 11-13.
4 FN, p. 23.
5 The restoration of the catchline (l. 76) now possible from B.M. 22047, i further assures this.
6 This is based on a restoration, cf. FN, p. 36.
7 So FN, pp. 23-24.
8 This assumes that (d)uraštu is a general designation for a border town (cf. FN, p. 24, n. 1). The Babylonians could hardly have penetrated as far as the capital Ṭuššpa (mod. Van), since Uraštu must have been an active ally of the Medes by this time (see p. 12, n. 4).
coming down into the fertile Assyrian plains, and in this Nabopolassar was but following the former Assyrian military policy. After placing garrisons in a few of the larger hill towns the Babylonians once more returned to their own land.

B.M. 22047

The Chronicle which records the events of the years 616-609 B.C. including the activities of the Median confederation and the fall of Nineveh is now followed directly by another tablet which gives a summary of the main historical events for the years 608-606 B.C. (B.M. 22047).¹ The first line of this tablet corresponds with the catchline of that previously described (B.M. 21901).² The narrative of the Babylonian expeditions to the Urartian border and to the upper Euphrates is continued and in turn leads to the history of the battle of Carchemish (B.M. 21946).

In the autumn of his eighteenth year (608 B.C.) Nabopolassar continued 608/7 B.C. his campaign of the previous year by marching up the Tigris to the southern Urartian border. The route taken makes it probable that Bit-Hanunia, his first objective, lay farther east than the scene of the earlier operations. The aim was clearly to contain the hill-folks who would otherwise raid the Assyrian plains, now devoid of a strong provincial administration, and deprive the Babylonians of the fruits of their recent conquests. It was, moreover, important to protect the main route by which aid to the northerly Babylonian garrisons would have to pass. A claim is made, in general terms, that some unnamed towns were plundered and destroyed. It is not impossible that this brief Babylonian campaign was co-ordinated with an advance by the Medes towards the Halys river.

Nabopolassar undertook a further expedition in the same mountainous 607/6 B.C. area the following spring—so far as the broken text can be read. On this occasion the chronicler specially mentions the force which was under the command of Nebuchadrezzar the crown-prince. This part of the Babylonian army operated independently of the king’s forces and remained in the area although Nabopolassar withdrew after less than one month in the field. The return to Babylon may have been hastened not only by the king’s old age or ill-health, as implied by Berossus,³ but also by the necessity, for political reasons, for one of the ruling house to be in the capital. It was Nabopolassar’s later custom to remain in Babylon while Nebuchadrezzar was absent with

¹ Text in transliteration and translation on pp. 64 ff. See copy on Plates XIII-XIV and photograph on Plate IV (scale 1:1).
² See p. 82, note, 1. ¹
³ In Josephus, Contra Apionem, I, 19(136)—referring to 605 B.C.
the army, and to go far afield himself only when the crown-prince had returned.\(^1\)
Nebuchadrezzar’s swift return to Babylon on the death of his father in 605 B.C.\(^2\)
and the revolt in 595/4 B.C.\(^3\) indicate that neither Nabopolassar nor his son
occupied the throne without opposition.

When Nabopolassar left in the month of Tammuz Nebuchadrezzar used
his troops to capture and plunder a number of mountain strongholds \(^4\)
and to devastate the whole region. After a four months’ campaign he marched back
to Babylon with the spoil. His victorious return enabled Nabopolassar to
set out, with his own forces, to meet the renewed threat of an Egyptian attack
down the Euphrates valley. He marched direct to the town of Kimuḫu
on the west bank of the river Euphrates a little way south of Carchemish,\(^5\)
and having crossed the river captured and plundered the town in the month of
Kislev (607 B.C.). Nabopolassar placed a garrison there as a check on the
Egyptian forces based on Carchemish and two months later returned to Babylon
(c. February 606 B.C.).

Kimuḫu was a strategic site commanding a river crossing. Its capture \(606/5\) B.C.
by the Babylonians guarded against any Egyptian thrust down the river and
gave a base from which the Egyptian line of communication from Hamath
to Carchemish might be threatened. The importance of Kimuḫu is further
attested by the swift reaction of the Egyptians to its capture, for after
Nabopolassar’s departure, they marched to besiege the town. The Babylonian
garrison would be limited in numbers, and as the siege lasted four months
it is clear that the besiegers did not represent the full strength of the Egyptian
army. At last the town fell, the Babylonian garrison being slain by the
Egyptians. Nabopolassar at once called out his army and marched up the
east bank of the Euphrates to camp at Quramati. He then sent detachments
across the river \(^6\) to seize the towns of Šūnadiri, Elammu and Daḫammu.
These places are otherwise unknown \(^7\) and were perhaps only small villages
whose capture gave the Babylonians a bridgehead which served both to guard
the river ford and also to hinder any possible outflanking movement by the
Egyptians were they to try joining up with dissident forces in the Hindanu and
Suḫu regions down the river. The location of Quramati depends on that

---

\(^1\) Il. 12, 23; B.M. 21946, 1.  
\(^3\) See p. 36.  
\(^4\) Il. 9-10. The broken text may name only one town later described, or named, Biranātu.  
\(^5\) See p. 83.  
\(^6\) (midd)ebir nāri might, however, be interpreted as the proper name of the whole province west of the Euphrates (cf. B.M. 25127, 33 and note p. 79).  
\(^7\) See p. 84.
of Kimuḫu which lay south of Carchemish and above Meskeneh, where the river bears eastward. Quramati being south of Kimuḫu may have lain on the bank opposite the narrow strip of land between the river and the Jabbūl salt lake. In this case, Nabopolassar’s aim might have been to contain

1 See p. 83.
the Egyptians at this point (see Map No. 2 opposite). Possible alternative locations for Quramati are in the vicinity of the modern Raqqa, by the junction of the Euphrates and Balikh\(^1\) rivers where lay the ford which served the trade route to Damascus via Palmyra, or, if farther south, where the river passes through a defile north-east of the Jabal al Bishri.\(^2\) Having disposed his troops in a defensive position, Nabopolassar returned to Babylon in Sebat (January/February 605 B.C.). This was the last time he was destined to lead his army in battle. Very soon afterwards, the Egyptian forces took the initiative, for they crossed the Euphrates at Carchemish and marched down the left bank towards the Babylonians at Quramati. The latter had already displayed their weakness by failing to advance upstream in order to recapture Kimùhu, and they now moved off before the enemy made contact with them. Their retreat may have been due, in part, to lack of leadership, for there is no record that the crown-prince remained with the army after Nabopolassar’s return to Babylon.

The events of the following year are recounted in the Chronicle tablet B.M. 21946.\(^3\) This tablet, according to the catch-lines linking it with B.M. 22047, already described, commences with the twenty-first year of Nabopolassar.

*The Battle of Carchemish*

In the light of the Babylonian withdrawal before the Egyptian advance\(^605/4\) B.C. on Quramati the events of the following year are particularly significant. Nabopolassar himself stayed in Babylonia for the same reasons, perhaps of age or health, which had prompted his earlier withdrawal from the field.\(^4\) Nebuchadrezzar, the crown-prince, therefore replaced him as commander-in-chief and led the undivided army in person on the march up the Euphrates to Carchemish itself. The Egyptians must have withdrawn from the towns of Kimùhu and Quramati which they had but recently captured for there is no record of further engagements at these two places and it is unlikely that so large a Babylonian force would have allowed any enemy garrison to remain on its line of march. The initiative and surprise of the attack is consistent with the high military reputation of Nebuchadrezzar. The Babylonian army crossed to the west bank of the Euphrates, apparently near Carchemish itself, and

---

\(^1\) E.g. Tell Belani or Tell Melâb (5.17 m. W. of Raqqa).

\(^2\) See p. 84.

\(^3\) See Plates V, XIV-XVI. A transliteration and translation is given on pp. 66 ff.

\(^4\) See p. 20.
engaged the Egyptians in hand-to-hand fighting first of all within the city, and later, perhaps, in the open country. Excavations at Carchemish show how stubbornly the city was defended until it was finally set on fire. The Egyptian defeat was decisive, their troops being annihilated save for a remnant that early in the fray had escaped so quickly that 'no weapon could reach them'. Nebuchadrezzar's swift pursuit overtook these fugitives in the province of Hamath where they too were so utterly defeated, according to the chronicler who writes of these events with unusual feeling, that 'not a man escaped to his own country'. Since the latter action is rather generally located 'in the province of Hamath' this may well imply attacks on scattered groups rather than on a compact force and include pursuit operations all down the Egyptians' homeward road towards the Mediterranean coast.

Of the historic battle at Carchemish Josephus wrote:

Now in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, one whose name was Nebuchadnezzar took the government over the Babylonians, who at the same time went up with a great army to the city Carchemish, which was at Euphrates, upon a resolution he had taken to fight with Neco, king of Egypt, under whom all Syria then was. And when Neco understood the intention of the king of Babylon, and that this expedition was made against him, he did not despise his attempt, but made haste with a great band of men to Euphrates to defend himself from Nebuchadnezzar; and when they had joined battle, he was beaten, and lost many ten thousands [of his soldiers] in the battle. So the king of Babylon passed over Euphrates and took all Syria, as far as Pelusium, excepting Judea.

There is no direct indication in the Chronicle that Necho II was himself with the Egyptian army. Indeed the apparent ease with which the Babylonians reached Carchemish through territory where they had been defeated by the Egyptians in the previous year makes it more likely that the Egyptian force consisted in the main of garrison troops. However, the chronicler's silence may mean little because Necho is known to have been in the field in person at Harran in 609 B.C. although then, as perhaps on this occasion, no special mention is made of him. Berossus has a somewhat different description

---

1 Objects discovered in the city show that the Egyptian garrison included Greek mercenaries (C. L. Woolley, *Carchemish*, II, pp. 125-129).
2 The text is broken but may be restored to give this meaning (see p. 84).
3 *Antiq. Jud.* X, 6 (84-86). Whiston's translation of Josephus is followed throughout this book, the numbers of his paragraphs are given in parenthesis.
4 Cf. p. 84.
5 See p. 63 (B.M. 21901, 61); cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 29 ff.; Jeremiah xlvi. 2; 2 Chronicles xxxv. 20.
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of the enemy: 'When Nabolassar, father of Nabucodrosor, heard that the
governor whom he had set over Egypt and over the parts of Coelesyria and
Phenicia, had revolted from him, not being able to bear fatigues himself,
committed certain parts of his army to his son Nabucodrosor, who was then
but young, and sent him against the rebel. Nabucodrosor joined battle
with him and conquered him, and reduced the country under his domination
again.' 1 While Josephus and the Old Testament both name Necho it is only
possible here, in the absence of any particular description of the enemy in the
Babylonian Chronicle, to note how all sources agree that the battle of Carche-
mish was a deliberate clash between the two nations during the prolonged
struggle to gain control of Syria after the collapse of the Assyrian regime.
The Chronicle certainly places this famous battle in its true perspective. It
was hardly the deathblow to Assyria, for Assur-uballit had already disappeared
by 609 B.C. Even had the Egyptians won at Carchemish they could never
have resuscitated the Assyrian empire in its old form, for greater forces than
those of Egypt and Babylon were now massing not far away.

The year in which the battle of Carchemish took place is certain (605 B.C.)
though no date is expressly given in the text. Nebuchadrezzar’s victorious
troops had marched through Syria and reached Egypt early in the month
of Ab in the same year (August 605 B.C.). The battle took place between
the commencement of Nabopolassar’s twenty-first year in Nisan (April) and his
death in Ab. Assuming that the advance to Carchemish was the Babylonian’s
swift response to the Egyptian retreat from Quramati at the end of the previous
year (Sebat-Adar) 2 it is most likely that the operations at Carchemish took
place about May-June of 605 B.C.

The effects of the Babylonian victory were immediate and far-reaching.
'At that time', recorded the chronicler, 'Nebuchadrezzar conquered the whole
area of Ḫatti ', the geographical term Ḫatti including, at this period, the whole
of Syria and Palestine. 3 The ease with which Syria was taken over indicates
that Egyptian sovereignty there was titular rather than actual. As in earlier
attempts at domination in Asia the Egyptians, in common with other invaders,
had to rely upon garrisons placed in the larger cities or at strategic centres,
while life in the intervening areas proceeded unchanged. No Egyptian
historical records of this period have been recovered and it is therefore possible

1 In Josephus, Contra Apionem, I, 19(135).
2 B.M. 22047, 26.
3 Note especially Il.r.11-12 of this Chronicle.
that the defeat at Carchemish and the subsequent humiliating loss of territory were unrecorded. According to both the Old Testament and Josephus, Nebuchadrezzar took all Syria from the Euphrates to the Egyptian border without entering the hilly terrain of Judah itself.\(^1\) The effect on Judah was that king Jehoiakim, a vassal of Necho, submitted voluntarily to Nebuchadrezzar, and some Jews, including the prophet Daniel, were taken as captives or hostages to Babylon.\(^2\) None of the sources implies that Nebuchadrezzar himself moved far south at this time. During later campaigns in the west he established his headquarters at Riblah, on the Orontes near Hamath,\(^3\) and it was from this base that his troops moved against the more southerly cities and even crossed the Egyptian border to reach Pelusium.\(^4\) It is likely that after the victory near Hamath Nebuchadrezzar occupied Riblah, formerly held by the Egyptians as a command post,\(^5\) without any immediate intention of following up his success by an invasion of their country, for he undertook no siege of Tyre or Jerusalem\(^6\) which would have been a necessary preliminary, so far as can be judged from his later strategy, to any large-scale offensive against Egypt. The immediate aim may have been to control the Egyptian frontier and thus, in some degree, perhaps to prevent the Egyptians from fomenting trouble in the newly conquered districts.

It is uncertain exactly where Nebuchadrezzar himself was at the time of the death of Nabopolassar on the eighth of Ab (15/16th August, 605 B.C.). The transmission of this news from Babylon to Syria and Palestine by signal\(^7\) through hostile and partly uninhabited territory would have been impossible. Time must therefore be allowed for the intelligence to reach Nebuchadrezzar by fast courier as well as for him to settle local affairs before his return journey with a small mounted party by the shortest desert route to Babylon.\(^8\) Since the crown-prince reached the capital twenty-three days after his father's death the Chronicle supports the tradition of a swift return to Babylon so vividly preserved by Berossus:

Now it so fell out, that his father Nabolassar fell into a distemper at this time, and died in the city of Babylon, after he had reigned twenty-nine years. But as Nabucodrosor understood in a little time, that his father Nabolassar was dead,

\(^1\) 2 Kings xxiv. 7; *Antiq. Jud.* X. 6. (86).  
\(^2\) Daniel i. 1.  
\(^3\) Jeremiah xxxix. 5.  
\(^4\) Josephus, *op. cit.* x. 6 (p. 24).  
\(^5\) Jeremiah xxxix. 5-6; lii. 26-27.  
\(^6\) The only possible evidence for a siege of Jerusalem in this year is Daniel i. 1, but the exegesis of this verse is difficult and uncertain.  
\(^7\) Cf. *RA*, XXXV, pp. 174-186.  
\(^8\) Possibly by Damascus-Hit which normally took about a fortnight.
he set the affairs of Egypt and the other countries in order, and committed the
captives he had taken from the Jews and Phenicians, and Syrians, and of the nations
belonging to Egypt, to some of his friends, that they might conduct that part of the
forces that had on heavy armour, with the rest of his baggage, to Babylonia; while
he went in haste, having but few with him, over the desert to Babylon; whither
when he was come, he found the public affairs had been managed by the Chaldaeans,
and that the principal person among them had preserved the kingdom for him.
Accordingly he now entirely obtained all his father's dominions. He then came and
ordered the captives to be placed in colonies in the most proper places of Babylonia.

Nebuchadrezzar ascended the throne on the same day as he reached
the capital (1st of Elul, i.e. 6/7th September 605 B.C.) and was immediately
recognised as king at Sippar and at other cities in Babylonia. Even if
his speedy return to Babylon was to forestall any opposition to his succession
Nebuchadrezzar's position was sufficiently secure for him to return to Syria
in the autumn and to join the army for a lengthy campaign which lasted into
the month of Sebat (February, 604 B.C.). This expedition, the first of many
similar incursions, was an unopposed display of the military might of Babylon,
no doubt intended to facilitate the collection of the heavy tribute which
Nebuchadrezzar brought back to the capital.

The Chronicle treats the events following the day that Nebuchadrezzar
' sat on the royal throne at Babylon ' until the celebration of the New Year
Festival eight months later as a distinct period—' the accession year '—
marked off from the events leading up to the accession and from those of the
first full calendar year of his reign. This is particularly significant because
the celebration of the New Year Festival (isinnu akitu) in the month of Nisan
is included as the culminating event of Nebuchadrezzar's accession year
rather than as the first public occasion of the following year. It would seem
that the first official regnal year commenced only after the point in the cele-
brations where the king ' took the hands of Marduk and Nabu ' to lead them
in the procession to the akitu-temple.

The special reference to the annual religious ceremony does not imply
that the festival had not taken place in Nabopolassar's reign, for the Neo-
Babylonian chronicles sometimes note those years in which the celebrations

1 In Josephus, Contra Apionem, I, 19(136-138).
2 See p. 85.
3 E.g. The contract tablet in the Nies Babylonian Collection No. 4746 dated 12th of
Elul, accession year Nebuchadrezzar (provenance uncertain), quoted by A. Goetze, JNES,
III, p. 44.
4 This would be sometime in the middle of the month of Nisan, see p. 85.
were omitted; the intention here is rather to emphasise the peaceful conditions prevailing at the time which enabled the king to take his part in the lengthy rites.

In the spring of his first full year of reign Nebuchadrezzar called out his army for an expedition to Syria where for six months they marched about unopposed. During this time the heads of the various small states of Syria and Palestine, which at this time are included in the term (māt)Ḫatti, were forced to submit to Babylonian rule and to bring in their tribute. The chronicler claims that 'all the kings of Ḫatti' came before Nebuchadrezzar. This statement probably exaggerates, even if only slightly, the reaction to the Battle of Carchemish, for more active steps soon had to be taken against one city at least. Nevertheless, it is likely that among the kings who submitted at this time were the rulers of Damascus, Tyre, and Sidon and Jehoiakim of Judah, who was to be a faithful vassal for three years.1 Thereafter, he, like others who had hastened to pay this initial respect to the great conqueror, was to revolt.2 In the month of Kislev Nebuchadrezzar marched against Askelon 3 which he captured. Spoil and prisoners, including the king, had been taken from the city and noblemen and sailors from it are specifically mentioned in a list of prisoners held in Babylon in 592 B.C.4 The length of this campaign and the severe measures taken against Askelon imply a strong resistance to the Babylonians which may have resulted from the expectation of assistance from Egypt against the invaders. An Aramaic letter addressed to a Pharaoh requesting help against the approaching Babylonian king may have come from Askelon at this time.5 The city was reduced to rubble before Nebuchadrezzar marched back to Babylon in the month of Sebat (c. Feb. 603 B.C.).

The broken account of the events recorded for the second year of Nebuchad- 603 B.C. rezzar shows that in the spring (Iyyar) he collected a large army. This expression is used only when a more determined undertaking was envisaged than that which could be managed by the forces readily at the king's disposal and 'called out' annually.6 Siege-towers and other heavy equipment are

---

1 Kings xxiv. 1. 2 Ibid; Tyre revolted later and was besieged c. 586-573 B.C.
3 The reading of this name is doubtful because of an erasure in the text (see p. 85).
4 E. F. Weidner, Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. R. Dussaud, ii, pp. 925, 928.
mentioned in the text, a fact which implies that the Babylonian troops were in the field for some months and were presumably engaged in the siege of a city. The name of the objective is lost but since Nebuchadrezzar marched to Syria in the preceding and following years it is likely that Syria was his goal in this year also.

The following section, written on the upper reverse of the tablet (B.M. 21946), is badly broken but must refer to Nebuchadrezzar’s third year since the next entry is marked as his fourth. Few details remain but the name of Nabû-šuma-lišir, the younger brother of Nebuchadrezzar, is mentioned with a specific, though broken, date. The text of the record can only be guessed at; nevertheless it is unlikely to have been concerned with a revolt led by Nabû-šuma-lišir in view of the subsequent call-up of the army for yet another campaign in Syria which brought in much tribute to Babylon. By this time these annual expeditions seem to have had as their primary aim the maintenance of political pressure with the economic gains resulting from the collection of dues.

Following the precedent of the previous five years the Babylonian army was called out in 601 B.C. and sent to Syria where it once more moved about unopposed in fulfilling its mission of maintaining Babylonian prestige and control. Its presence helped the district-governors to collect and dispatch to Babylon the annual tribute which it was their duty to exact. Later in the year Nebuchadrezzar took over command of the army in person and marched to Egypt. On hearing of his approach the Egyptian king, Necho II, called out his army and both forces met in open battle. With characteristic frankness the chronicler states that both sides suffered heavy losses. Nebuchadrezzar and his army withdrew immediately afterwards and returned to Babylon. No date or place for this clash between the major powers is given in this text, and there are no references in Egyptian sources with which the Babylonian record may be compared. It can be judged from the entry for the following year that the outcome of the battle was a severe set-back to the Babylonians. The fact that Nebuchadrezzar was forced to re-equip his army with chariots

1 Cf. B.M. 21946, 4-5.
2 The battle took place after the month of Kislev (l. 6).
and horses may indicate that it was deficiency in these which had been a primary cause of the Babylonian defeat. It is significant that the Egyptians were sufficiently strong to deter Nebuchadrezzar from attacking them for some time.

The Old Testament implies that Apries, the successor of Necho, invaded Phoenicia and captured Gaza. Also the approach of Egyptian forces caused the Babylonians to raise the siege of Jerusalem for a time in 588-586 B.C. The only non-Biblical evidence for the eventual Babylonian invasion of Egypt is a fragmentary text, B.M. 33041, which is a religious rather than a 'Chronicle' version of historical events in the thirty-seventh year of Nebuchadrezzar (568/7 B.C.). According to this the Babylonian king did battle with Amasis and penetrated Egypt as far as Putu-Iaman. Because of its importance this text has been republished on Plates XX-XXI (see pages 94 f. below).

The vigour of the Egyptian defence in 601 B.C. agrees with what little is known of that country's history and policies during this period. It would show that the defeat at Carchemish was but a temporary loss of military strength perhaps mainly affecting garrison troops. Nebcho must have realised both from Nebuchadrezzar's swift incursion into Hatti after the battle of Carchemish and from his annual expeditions to the west, that Egypt could not recover her control of Syria by direct action; he therefore remained within his own borders.

He did not, however, cease to exercise a wide influence notably over the Judaean court where Jehoiakim, contrary to the warnings of the prophet Jeremiah, turned to him for assistance. Jehoiakim had previously submitted to Nebuchadrezzar in the year 605/4 B.C., although Judah itself does not appear to have been invaded, so ending a period in which Necho had directly controlled Judah. After a submission lasting three full years Jehoiakim, no doubt at the renewed instigation of Egypt, appears to have changed his loyalties once again, or perhaps he was also moved by a wish to reassert his independence, and so Babylonian intervention followed.

But when Nebuchadrezzar had already reigned four years, which were the eight of Jehoiakim's government over the Hebrews, the king of Babylon made an expedition with mighty forces against the Jews, and required tribute of Jehoiakim, and threatened on his refusal to make war against him. He was affrighted at his threatening, and bought his peace with money, and brought the tribute he was ordered to bring for three years.

1 Jeremiah xlvii. 1. 2 Jeremiah xxxvii. 5. 3 See p. 24. 4 2 Kings xxiv. 7. 5 e.g. Jeremiah xxvii. 9-11. 6 See p. 26. 7 2 Kings xxiii. 33-36. 8 Josephus, Antiq. Jud. X, 6 (87).
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The mention of the presence of strong Babylonian forces in the vicinity of Judah agrees with the Chronicle account of Nebuchadrezzar’s fourth year. The submission of Jehoiakim as recorded by Josephus may be implicit in the general reference to successful and unopposed operations in Ḥatti (Syro-Palestine) in this year. Nebuchadrezzar would doubtless have sought to follow the Assyrian practice and to neutralise Judah and the main Phoenician-Philistian coastal cities with a view to safeguarding his line of march before marching down into Egypt itself. It is probable that as the brief Chronicle is mainly concerned with the details of the battle with the Egyptians it would not mention the secondary incident in Judah.

The great battle in this year must also have served to check any desires by Necho to march into Syria again although he may still have hoped to use his fleet, which included Corinthian triremes, against the Palestinian coast as, according to Herodotus, he had done in 609 B.C. Any such plans that Necho may have fostered were, however, thwarted by the capture of Jerusalem in 597 B.C. and died with him in 594 B.C. An expedition by Psammetichus II to Kharu (Phoenicia) about 590 B.C. and an attack by Apries (588-568 B.C.) against Sidon by land and Tyre by sea show, however, that Egypt still aimed to expand towards Syria whenever the Babylonian hold there became weak. We also know that when Nebuchadrezzar made his final attack on Judah and Jerusalem in 588-586 B.C. the Egyptians were still considered to be the potential allies of Judah.

Nebuchadrezzar spent his fifth regnal year in Babylon following his defeat at the hands of the Egyptians, and his main energies were devoted to reviving his military forces. Chariots and horses were amassed, an operation which would involve the manufacture of the war vehicles, the importation of suitable horses and the training of both men and steeds.

In the month of Kislev (December 599 B.C.) Nebuchadrezzar called up his army and marched to Syria. Then from one of the cities under his control, Hamath, Riblah or possibly Kadesh, he sent raiding parties into the adjacent desert, so collecting much spoil from the Arab tribes. By removing their

---

1 Book ii. 159; E. Drioton and J. Vandier, L’Égypte (1952), pp. 583-584, 594.
2 Drioton and Vandier, op. cit. p. 596; F. K. Kienitz, op. cit. p. 27, considers that Psammetichus II did not intrigue with Judah during his reign.
3 Jeremiah xxxvii. 7, 11.
4 See pp. 85, 96.
6 (dl)Kidis was later the seat of a district-governor (B.M. 40546 dated 564 B.C.—unpublished). For its strategic position at this time see Herodotus ii, 159. Cf. M. Noth, Die Welt des Orients, III (1948), p. 233 (cf. n. 57); M. B. Rowton, JNES, X (1951), p. 129.
protective deities he sought to keep a hold of these nomads much as the Assyrian kings had done earlier in the same area. Sargon, Sennacherib and Esarhaddon had all used their capture of the gods of the Arabs to bargain for more effective control over the desert tribesmen who constantly harassed the western Assyrian provinces. Soon after his accession, Ashurbanipal had gained a firm hold over the Qedar and neighbouring tribes, but by 641-638 B.C. three of the larger tribes entered into alliance with his rebel brother Šamaš-šumu-uki. The effect of Ashurbanipal’s punitive expedition on this occasion was short-lived for after his death Assyrian control of the desert borders gradually weakened and was not replaced by any major power. The Egyptians in support of the Assyrians would have garrisoned only a few of the cities bordering the desert. The bedouin, east of Syria and Judah, regained their independence, and thereafter any alliance they formed was with Necho of Egypt. Nebuchadrezzar, therefore, had a two-fold aim in undertaking the campaign of his sixth year; firstly, to regain control of the western Syrian desert as part of the Assyrian empire he now sought to inherit and secondly, to guard those areas, such as Hamath and Riblah, he already held, and from which he could thrust south-westwards towards Egypt. There is an indication in the writings of Jeremiah that the tribe of Qedar and others east of Hazor were the object of Nebuchadrezzar’s attack, which deprived the Arabs of much of their livestock and other property. Other tribesmen, moreover, may have been induced to co-operate with Babylonian garrison troops in raids on those districts, including Judah, which were not loyal to Nebuchadrezzar. It may be significant that the chronicler mentions the personal return of the king to Babylon, after this campaign, in the month of Adar (c. March 598 B.C.), but omits any reference to the homeward march of the troops. Some at least may have been kept in Syria to strengthen the garrisons against retaliatory raids from the desert during the following spring and summer.

The Capture of Jerusalem

It was not until the month of Kislev (December 598 B.C.), late in his seventh year, that Nebuchadrezzar called out his army once again for the march to the west. There can be no doubt that this expedition was occasioned by

2 *Cambridge Ancient History*, iii. 121.
3 Cf. B.M.21946, r. 10; Jeremiah xlix. 28-33.
4 2 Kings xxiv. 2.
Jehoiakim who, encouraged perhaps by the Egyptians, had ceased to pay tribute and seemed to believe in the ability of Egypt to withstand a Babylonian attack. This belief must have been strong for Jehoiakim to break with his Babylonian master especially in the face of a forceful pro-Babylonian group in Judah led by Jeremiah. According to Josephus, Jehoiakim assumed that Egypt would be the object of this year's Babylonian expedition:

on the third year, upon hearing that the king of the Babylonians made an expedition against the Egyptians, he did not pay his tribute, yet was he disappointed of his hope, for the Egyptians durst not fight at this time. And indeed the prophet Jeremiah foretold every day, how vainly they relied on their hopes from Egypt, and how the city would be overthrown by the king of Babylon, and Jehoiakim the king would be subdued by him.  

The Babylonian Chronicle gives but a brief reference to operations in this year against Judah. It simply states that Nebuchadrezzar, after marching to Hatti-territory (Syria-Palestine),

‘besieged Jerusalem (literally: the city of Judah) and seized it on the second day of the month Adar. He then captured its king and appointed a king of his own choice, having received heavy tribute from the city, which he sent back to Babylon.’

It is thus clear that Judah was the primary objective for this year’s expedition, which was led by Nebuchadrezzar in person. The date of this conquest of Jerusalem is now known precisely for the first time, namely, the second of Adar (15/16th March 597 B.C.). The siege cannot have lasted more than two months, for it is unlikely that it began earlier than a month after the main Babylonian forces had left their homes in Kislev. Since Jehoiakim’s death took place three months and ten days before the city’s fall, that is, on the twenty-second of Marcheswan (6/7th December 598 B.C.) he must have died and have been succeeded by Jehoiachin before the main forces had left Babylonia.

Although no details of the siege are given, the Chronicle clearly expresses the result. The king of Jerusalem was captured, a substitute chosen by Nebuchadrezzar was placed on the throne and considerable tribute collected and sent back to Babylon. Jehoiachin’s place was taken by a Babylonian nominee, the young uncle of Jehoiachin named Mattaniah whose official name was designated or changed to Zedekiah. This change also served as a
public testimony to the subservient position held by Zedekiah on oath to Nebuchadrezzar that he would certainly keep the kingdom for him and make no innovation, nor have any league of friendship with the Egyptians.\footnote{1}

Having personally settled the future administration Nebuchadrezzar collected a heavy tribute\footnote{2} from Jerusalem which was otherwise spared. This booty included such parts of the treasures of Solomon’s temple and the royal palace as were easily transportable.\footnote{3} Jehoiachin, his mother, wives, family and the leading state and military officials were taken as hostages to the court at Babylon. Josephus gives the total of these as three thousand\footnote{4} while the Hebrew records add at least one thousand skilled craftsmen and seven thousand trained soldiers and give a general total or estimate of the captives at this time as ten thousand.\footnote{5} The Babylonians do not seem to have collected this large group quickly and the Jewish captives only moved off to their exile home some weeks after the city itself had fallen. Thus their exile began at ‘the turn of the year’\footnote{6} in the month following the capture of the city, which month also marked the commencement of Nebuchadrezzar’s eighth year.\footnote{7}

Tables listing the rations given to Jehoiachin, king of Judah, and other Jews and fellow-captives have been found in the royal quarters at Babylon. These texts afford a glimpse of the royal exiles during their long captivity there.\footnote{8}

The account in Josephus of the events leading to the fall of Jerusalem and to the capture of Jehoiachin differs from the above exposition. It implies that Nebuchadrezzar himself came to Jerusalem, slew Jehoiakim and placed Jehoiachin on the throne which he occupied until Babylonian suspicion of his possible defection led to the capture of the city and his exile. The account by Josephus is as follows:

Now a little time after [the revolt of Jehoiakim], the king of Babylon made an expedition against Jehoiakim, whom he received [into the city], and this out of fear of the foregoing predictions of this prophet, as supposing that he should suffer nothing that was terrible, because he neither shut the gates, nor fought against him; yet when the Babylonian was come into the city, he did not observe the covenant he had made, but he slew such as were in the flower of their age, and such as were of the greatest dignity, together with their king Jehoiakim, whom he commanded to be thrown before the walls, without any burial; and made his son Jehoiachin king

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{1}{Josephus, \textit{Antiq. Jud.} X. 7 (102).}
\item \footnote{2}{2 Kings xxiv. 13.}
\item \footnote{3}{Op. cit. X. 6 (98).}
\item \footnote{4}{2 Kings xxiv. 14-16.}
\item \footnote{5}{2 Chronicles xxxvi. 10.}
\item \footnote{6}{2 Kings xxiv. 12.}
\item \footnote{7}{E. F. Weidner, \textit{Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud}, II, pp. 923-935. The tablets are dated in the tenth to thirty-fifth years of Nebuchadrezzar II (595/4-570/69 B.C.).}
\end{itemize}}
of the country, and of the city: he also took of the principal persons in dignity for captives, three thousand in number, and led them away to Babylon; among which was the prophet Ezekiel, who was then but young. And this was the end of king Jehoiakim, when he had lived thirty-six years, and of them reigned eleven: but Jehoiachin succeeded him in the kingdom, whose mother's name was Nehushta: she was a citizen of Jerusalem. He reigned three months and ten days.

But a terror seized on the king of Babylon, who had given the kingdom to Jehoiachin, and that immediately: he was afraid that he should bear him a grudge, because of his killing his father, and thereupon should make the country revolt from him; wherefore he sent an army, and besieged Jehoiachin in Jerusalem; but because he was of a gentle and just disposition, he did not desire to see the city endangered on his account, but he took his mother, and kindred, and delivered them to the commanders sent by the king of Babylon, and accepted of their oaths, that neither should they suffer any harm, nor the city; which agreement they did not observe for a single year, for the king of Babylon did not keep it, but gave orders to his generals to take all that were in the city captives both the youth and the craftsmen, and bring them bound to him; their number was ten thousand eight hundred and thirty-two; as also Jehoiachin and his mother and friends. And when these were brought to him, he kept them in custody, and appointed Jehoiachin's uncle Zedekiah to be king; . . .

While this record agrees with the chronicle in so far as it refers to the attack on Jerusalem in 597 B.C., it raises difficulties, for the reasons given above, where it postulates a prior march on Jerusalem leading to Jehoiakim's death early in Nebuchadrezzar's seventh year. However, the story of Josephus has some support in the account of this period given by the Old Testament chronicler ²; although no details of the death of this king are given in the Chronicle his fate might be linked with some initial Babylonian approach to the city.³ Any apparent difficulty is probably due to the brevity of both the Babylonian and Biblical accounts which give insufficient detail to allow of an exact reconciliation with the history of Josephus at this point.

In his eighth year Nebuchadrezzar did not venture so far afield as in the 596 B.C. previous year's campaign against Judah. The broken and brief entry in the Chronicle makes no mention of any use of the army but simply states that in the month of Tebet (c. January 596 B.C.) the king went to Syria, travelling as far as Carchemish, and then returned to Babylonia in the next month. The

¹ Antiq. Jud. X. 6 (96)—7 (102). ² 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 6. ³ Jeremiah xxii. 24-30; cf. 2 Kings xxiv. 6-7. It should be noted that the latter implies that the Babylonian hold of Judah and the consequent curtailment of Egyptian activity there follows the accession of Jehoiachin.
purpose of this journey is now lost to us but it was probably to receive homage and to collect tribute from those Syrian vassals who formerly would not have made these payments without the presence of the Babylonian army to enforce them. If this is so it would show that the Babylonian hold over these territories was now firm and the administration settled. The army might, however, have been detained by some trouble on the eastern frontiers or by a clash of internal rivalries, both of which were soon to disturb the neo-Babylonian regime and to demand the king’s constant presence in the capital.

In his ninth year Nebuchadrezzar was threatened with a new enemy and is found with his army marching along the river Tigris and then pitching camp at a place the name of which is now lost in the broken text. The name of his opponent is also regrettably lost although the signs which remain may point to the (unnamed) king of Elam. If this interpretation should be correct it would be the only indication of Babylonian relations with this eastern neighbour between 625 B.C. when Nabopolassar returned its exiled gods to Susa and c. 540 B.C. when, taking advantage of the weak rule of Nabonidus, the hill-folk appear to have threatened Erech once again. Three short inscriptions naming Nebuchadrezzar have been found at Susa and one at Persepolis, but these are votive objects which could have found their way there with any other spoils at a later date. Moreover, the power of the Medes at this time was so great that the Babylonians did not have their attention diverted to their northern or eastern borders and were usually free, therefore, to concentrate on the west. This Chronicle implies that the enemy, whether Elamite or not, took fright and turned back to his own country when a day’s march from the Babylonian forces.

Nebuchadrezzar remained at home for the greater part of his tenth year, for during the month of Kislev and Tebet (c. December 595-January 594 B.C.) there was a revolt in the country which was only suppressed by the slaughter of many of his troops(?) and by the capture of the rebel leader. Order must soon have been restored, for the king was able to go in person to Syria before the end of the year to receive the tribute brought by the vassal kings and other officials and to bring it back to the capital. This journey was apparently made, as two years earlier, without the presence of the army, for the latter is not specifically mentioned. It seems, therefore, that the west remained undisturbed.

2 Langdon, Neubab. p. 47.
3 E. F. Schmidt, Persepolis, I, pp. 174, 179.
INTRODUCTION

There is no direct indication of the internal dissension in this year apart from that given in this Chronicle. Its brief duration and suppression probably place it among those frequent intrigues which any Babylonian or oriental monarch had to face. The opponent does not appear to have claimed the royal title in Babylonia as did a number of later rebels who, ironically enough, proclaimed themselves king with the very name of Nebuchadrezzar.\(^1\) The strain put on the standing army by the frequent and lengthy campaigns in the west may have been a factor contributing to the disturbances.\(^2\) What may be an indirect indication of the revolt is given by a contract tablet from Babylon dated in the eleventh year of Nebuchadrezzar. This tells of the confiscation and disposal of the property of Baba-aḫu-iddina, son of Nabū-aḫḫe-bullīt, who had been tried by court-martial and, on being found guilty of breaking the royal oath and of insurrection, had been condemned to death and executed.\(^3\) Since Nabū-aḫḫe-bullīt had received these lands as a special favour from Nabopolassar it may well be that his son was of sufficient status to be the leader of the revolt mentioned in the Chronicle for this year.

The catchline which ends the text of B.M. 21946 gives us but a brief glimpse of Nebuchadrezzar’s activity at the beginning of his eleventh year (594/3 B.C.), by recording that he called out his army in the month of Kislev (c. December 594 B.C.) for a further expedition into Syria. We can but hope that some fortunate discovery will one day reveal the tablets listing the events of the whole of this year as well as of the remaining thirty-three years of Nebuchadrezzar.\(^4\) Other Chronicle tablets must certainly have filled the gap which now extends to the third year of Neriglissar (557/6 B.C.).\(^5\)

A Babylonian Campaign in Western Cilicia

B.M. 25124

The long gap in the Babylonian Chronicle between the eleventh year of Nebuchadrezzar II (594 B.C.) and the record of the reign of Nabonidus (556-539 B.C.) \(^6\) is filled for a single year only by the tablet B.M. 25124. This text,

\(^{1}\) Nebuchadrezzar III (Nidintu-Bêl) in Oct.-Dec. 522 B.C. and Nebuchadrezzar IV (Araka) in Sept.-Nov. 521 B.C. Compare also the revolts by Bêl-šîmanni and Šamaš-eriba in the fourth year of Xerxes.

\(^2\) See pp. 95-96. If Elam was in open opposition to Babylon in 596/5 B.C. (see p. 36 above) it is possible that that country instigated the revolt of this year.

\(^3\) AJA, XVII, pp. 1-5.

\(^4\) For one fragmentary inscription dated to Nebuchadrezzar’s thirty-seventh year (568/7 B.C. see pp. 90, 94 ff.

\(^5\) See list on p. 2.

\(^6\) The Nabonidus Chronicle (B.M. 35382) was last published by Sidney Smith, BHT, pp. 98-123. For a recent translation see A. L. Oppenheim, ANET, pp. 305-307.
giving details of the third year of Neriglissar (Nergal-šar-uṣur, 559-555 B.C.), is the only strictly historical text extant for his reign. Hitherto the record of his rule has had to be reconstructed from the scanty references to him in contemporary contracts and building inscriptions.1 These give no hint that Neriglissar ever moved outside Babylonia during his reign except, perhaps, to bring the goddess Anunit back to Sippar from exile in Gutium whither she had been taken in some earlier reign. Thus the general impression conveyed by these sources is of little except domestic activity by a ruler who seemed perhaps even less vigorous in character than Amēl-Marduk (Evil-Merodach), the son and successor of Nebuchadrezzar II. According to Josephus, Amēl-Marduk was a harsh ruler,² though the Old Testament pictures him as generous towards the royal Judaean captives.³ In August 559 B.C. Neriglissar seized the throne.⁴ It is not yet clear whether this followed a revolution, probably led by the army though with some priestly support,⁵ or whether he succeeded to the throne on the death of his brother-in-law as the next male in the royal line of succession. Neriglissar, the son of a private citizen, Bēl-šum-iṣkun,⁶ had been an army commander under Nebuchadrezzar⁷ and was married to a daughter of the same king. He is probably to be identified with Nergal-sharezer who held the office of rab mag at the siege of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.⁸ If, as seems likely, the Neriglissar who is named in contracts of the ninth year of Nebuchadrezzar (596/5 B.C.) is also the same man, he was already middle-aged on his accession. He appears from the contracts to have been a rich landowner with properties at Babylon and Opis,⁹ and had also been appointed by the king to control the business affairs of the Sun-god temple (Ē.BABBAR.RA) at Sippar.¹⁰ Hitherto, the only known activities of the early years of his reign have been the restoration of the Esagila and Ezida temples in Babylon and Borsippa, a pious duty which fell to each of the Neo-Babylonian kings. In addition, we have known that

---

3 Jeremiah lii. 31-34; 2 Kings xxv. 27-30.  
4 Parker and Dubberstein, *op. cit.* p. 10.  
6 Entitled rubū engā, ‘noble and wise’ in the Neriglissar Cylinder (Langdon, *op. cit.* p. 214.)  
7 *RA,* XI, p. 174.  
8 Jeremiah xxxix. 3, 13. Cf. the expression rab mu(n)gu, p. 94, n. 3.  
9 B.M. 33117; 30414; 33142, published by J. Strassmaier, *Nabuchodonosor,* as Nos. 369, 411, 419.  
10 B.M. 55920 (unpublished). Neriglissar is styled amēl ḫā Ē. BABBAR.RA. By comparing this text with B. T. Evetts, *Inscriptions of the Reigns of Evil-Merodach,* etc., Lab. I, 3 where the personal name Nabū-nipšari also occurs it can be dated to the reign of Nebuchadrezzar.
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Neriglissar restored the ‘chapel of destiny’ used in the annual New Year festival, the eastern bank of the Euphrates river and numerous canals round Babylon. Within the city he repaired an old palace on the river bank for his personal occupation.¹

The new Chronicle tablet now gives us a very different picture of Neriglissar. ⁵⁵⁷/⁶ B.C. The text is entirely devoted to the details of one campaign late in his third year when he led his army into Cilicia against Appuašu, king of Pirindu (W. Cilicia-Cilicia Tracheia) who had crossed into the coastal plain of Ḫume (E. Cilicia) to plunder and to take captives.² This fertile country had long attracted the Assyrian rulers who, since Shalmaneser III, had sought to control the trade routes leading into Syria through the Amanus mountains.³ When the Assyrian hold over such distant parts of the empire was weakened with the death of Ashurbanipal (c. 633 B.C.) Cilicia appears to have regained her independence only to become tributary to Nebuchadrezzar II sometime between 595 and 570 B.C. by which time prisoners from Pirindu and Ḫume were held in Babylon.⁴ While Nebuchadrezzar had been consolidating his hold over the former Assyrian dependencies in Syria, Kyaxares the Mede had fought his way across the more northerly mountain terrain towards the Halys river. It is possible that the operations by Nebuchadrezzar were arranged, by agreement, to guard the southern flank of the Median advance. The bitter struggle between the Medes and the powerful Lydian state under Alyattes ended in the famous ‘eclipse-battle’, and an armistice was concluded in 585 B.C. The mediators who helped to fix the Halys river as the main boundary between the rival states were, according to Herodotus, the Babylonian Labyntus and Syennesis of Cilicia acting for the Medes and Lydians respectively.⁵ It is possible that Labyntus was Nabonidus acting on behalf of Nebuchadrezzar,⁶ or was Nebuchadrezzar himself,⁷ and that Syennesis was the ruler of western Cilicia (Pirindu), but it is, in any case, clear that at that time at least part of Cilicia was independent of, though friendly disposed towards, Lydia. While the treaty held good Cilicia’s importance as a friendly state on that Babylonian frontier

must certainly have been recognised by the successors of Nebuchadrezzar. It is not surprising, therefore, to find Neriglissar acting swiftly to counter a hostile move by Appuasu, king of Pirindu, whose mountainous homeland bordered to the west on the state, later called Pamphylia, which was under Lydian control.1

Appuasu mustered his forces for a raid across the river into eastern Cilicia, whereupon Neriglissar called out his army and marched straight for the principal city of Humē which lay in that coastal plain of Cilicia.2 Appuasu then deployed his own troops, reinforced by local detachments of mounted security police, defensively to watch the narrow defiles which led into the hills of Western Cilicia. The Babylonians, however, engaged the defenders and inflicted so heavy a defeat and captured so many men and horses that they were able to pursue Appuasu at once as he fled across the mountains which separated the plain and his capital city of Ura', west of the Lamos river (see Map 3 opposite 3). So difficult was the mountain track that the Babylonians claim that they had to march in single file for about one hundred miles (fifteen bēru)4! Ura' fell and was plundered, but the chase continued to Kıršu a former royal capital which probably lay in the heart of the mountains about forty miles north-west of Ura’. The Babylonian troops caught up with the fugitive Appuasu but he succeeded in evading capture. After traversing the narrow defiles and scaling mountain ridges the Babylonians, obviously far from effete, captured and set fire to the city, many of its inhabitants dying in the flames. Neriglissar appears to have made no attempt to move on up the Calycadnus river or towards Laranda (Karaman) and the Lydian border, but contented himself with laying waste the immediate neighbourhood of Kıršu. Moving off southwards along the river valley the Babylonian army then attacked Pitusu, a rocky island with a garrison of six thousand men, two miles off the coast.5 A sea-borne assault was a rare form of operation for the Babylonians, but they carried it out successfully and over-ran the island. The capture of Pitusu ensured control of the coast road along the cliffs leading to Sallune, the westernmost city in Pirindu.6 The Babylonians claim to have laid waste the whole of the territory as far as the boundary of Pirindu with Lydia, but Appuasu himself escaped and Neriglissar returned to Babylonia in the month of Adar (February-March 556 B.C.).

1 Herodotus, Book I, 28.  
2 For a discussion of these locations see pp. 87 ff. It is, of course, possible that the Chronicler uses the term bēru strictly as a time measurement (double hour).  
3 Mod. Kargincik Adası.

Herodotus, Book I, 28.  
I.e. Adana or Tarsus; see p. 87.  
See note on p. 87; it is, of course, possible that the Chronicler uses the term bēru strictly as a time measurement (double hour).  
See p. 88.
The campaign in Cilicia had, however, a limited success for two years later Nabonidus had to send the Babylonian army to Ḫume once again, either to deal with a revolt, perhaps inspired by Appušu, or else to defend it against another attack from Pirindu.\(^1\) Within a few years, however, it became impossible for the Babylonians to control E. Cilicia because Cyrus had annexed ‘Assyria’ by 548/7 B.C. and with it, probably, all those territories in North Syria and Cilicia previously under Babylonian domination. Thus he had already secured the support of the major part of Cilicia when he met Croesus of Lydia in the fateful battle of 547 B.C.\(^2\) Meanwhile, Nabonidus, in a desperate bid to re-establish his dwindling power, had allied himself to Croesus of Lydia and Amasis of Egypt and by so doing decided Babylonia’s impending fate at the hand of the Persians.\(^3\) For the part the Cilicians played in helping him against Croesus, Cyrus granted special privileges to the now re-united country \(^4\) and, although a Persian garrison was maintained there,\(^5\) also allowed them to have local autonomy under their own rulers who continued to bear the dynastic title of Syennesis. It was only to be expected, therefore, that Cilicia would be hostile to Babylon in 539 B.C.\(^6\)

The glimpse of Neriglissar’s military activity given by this Chronicle shows him following a policy consistent with that of his predecessors, namely, to maintain a hold on East Cilicia which at that time was a buffer state between Lydia and the massing forces of the Medes. All too soon the same forces were to be the instrument whereby Babylonia herself was to pass from history as an independent power.

\(^{1}\) B.M. 35382 (BHT, p. 111, i. 7, Pl. XI); A. L. Oppenheim, \textit{ANET}, p. 305, n. 2; W. F. Albright, \textit{BASOR}, 120, pp. 22-23.
\(^{2}\) BHT, pp. 101-102, 112 (col. ii, 15-18).
\(^{3}\) Herodotus, Book I, 77; Xenophon, \textit{Cyropaedia}, II, 1. 5; VI, 2. 10.
\(^{4}\) Xenophon, \textit{op. cit.} I, 1.4; VIII, 6, 8 (see also A. T. Olmstead, \textit{History of the Persian Empire}, p. 39; W. F. Albright, BASOR, 120, p. 25, n. 16). The explanation given here obviates some of the difficulties raised by these passages which are fully discussed by Erzen, \textit{op. cit.} pp. 92-96.
\(^{5}\) B.M. 35382 (Nabonidus Chronicle), ii. 18. Since the Nabonidus Chronicle tablet has been republished by Sidney Smith in \textit{BHT}, pp. 92-123 it is not reproduced here.
\(^{6}\) Xenophon, \textit{op. cit.} VIII, 6, 8.
## SUMMARY OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Year B.C.</th>
<th>Babylonian Date</th>
<th>Events recorded by B.M. 25127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>'22nd year after Kandalanu' 12th Elul</td>
<td>Assyrian garrison at . . . withdraws. Sin-šar-iškun. Assyrian attack on Šaznaku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tisri</td>
<td>Gods of Kish taken to Babylon. Assyrian army comes to Nippur and is opposed by Nabopolassar at Erech. Assyrians attack Babylon. Defeated by sortie from city. No king in the land for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th Tisri</td>
<td>Nabopolassar ascends throne in Babylon. Official commencement of his reign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nabopolassar 'accession year' 26th Marcheswan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>Babylonians return exiled gods to Susa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624(?)</td>
<td>Nabopolassar 2 Elul</td>
<td>Assyrian army camps at the Banitu-canal then retreats when opposed by Babylonians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 See R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology* 626 B.C.-A.D. 45 for tables giving the correspondence with Babylonian dates. The Julian year as marked in this column commences with 1st Nisan.

2 Babylonian months in this column are written: Nisan (c. March-April); Iyyar (c. April-May); Sivan (c. May-June); Tanimuz (c. June-July); Ab (c. July-August); Elul (c. August-September); Tisri (c. September-October); Marcheswan (c. October-November); Kislev (c. November-December); Tebet (c. December-January); Sebat (c. January-February); Adar (c. February-March). These English forms are used throughout this work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Year B.C.</th>
<th>Babylonian Date</th>
<th>Events recorded by B.M. 25127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>623(?)</td>
<td>Nabopolassar 3</td>
<td>Dēr revolts against Assyria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Tisri</td>
<td>Nabopolassar opposes Assyrians who took Nippur(?)</td>
<td>Assyrians retreat to Nineveh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Usurper rules for 100 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Year B.C.</th>
<th>Babylonian Date</th>
<th>Events recorded by B.M. 21901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Nabopolassar 10</td>
<td>Suḫu and Ḫindanu submit to Nabopolassar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyyar</td>
<td>Assyrian army reported in Qablinu.</td>
<td>Assyrian army reported in Qablinu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Assyrians withdraw and are beaten by Babylonians.</td>
<td>Assyrians withdraw and are beaten by Babylonians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elul</td>
<td>Mannaean auxiliaries and Assyrian nobles captured. Babylonian expedition against Mane, Salḫiru and Balḫu.</td>
<td>Mannaean auxiliaries and Assyrian nobles captured. Babylonian expedition against Mane, Salḫiru and Balḫu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisri</td>
<td>Return to Babylon. Ḫindanu plundered on way.</td>
<td>Return to Babylon. Ḫindanu plundered on way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Iyyar           | Unsuccessful attack on the city which is relieved by Assyrian mobilisation. Babylonians retreat down Tigris to Takrit. Assyrian unsuccessful siege of Takrit for 10 days. Assyrians withdraw after retreat. Nabopolassar returns home. Medes raid Arraphu. | Unsuccessful attack on the city which is relieved by Assyrian mobilisation. Babylonians retreat down Tigris to Takrit. Assyrian unsuccessful siege of Takrit for 10 days. Assyrians withdraw after retreat. Nabopolassar returns home. Medes raid Arraphu. |
| Marcheswan      |                              |                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Year B.C.</th>
<th>Babylonian Date</th>
<th>Events recorded by B.M. 21901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julian Year B.C.</td>
<td>Babylonian Date</td>
<td>Events recorded by B.M. 22047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Nabopolassar 18 Elul</td>
<td>Army called out. Expedition against Bit-Hanunia (Urartu). Nabopolassar returns to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tebet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Nabopolassar 19 Sivan</td>
<td>Nabopolassar with Crown-Prince (Nebuchadrezzar) leads armies to mountains. Nabopolassar returns. Nebuchadrezzar continues operations in Za. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elul</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar returns to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tisri</td>
<td>Nabopolassar goes to Kimušu (on Euphrates). Nabopolassar captures Kimušu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kislev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sebat</td>
<td>Nabopolassar returns to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Nabopolassar 20 (?</td>
<td>Egyptians (re)capture Kimušu after four-month siege. Nabopolassar with army to Quramati. Captures Sunadiri, Elammu and Daḫammu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tisri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Sebat</td>
<td>Nabopolassar returns to Babylon. Egyptians from Carchemish defeat Babylonians at Quramati.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Year B.C.</th>
<th>Babylonian Date</th>
<th>Events recorded by B.M. 21946</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th Ab</td>
<td>Elul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Elul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Year B.C.</td>
<td>Babylonian Date</td>
<td>Events recorded by B.M. 21946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 'Accession year' Sebat</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar returns to Syria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar returns to Babylon with tribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 1 Sivan Kislev</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar and Babylonian army in Syria. Reception of tribute. Sack of Askelon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sebat</td>
<td>Return to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 2 Iyyar</td>
<td>Army called out. In Syria (Ḫatti)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 3 13th (?)</td>
<td>Babylonian army unopposed in Syria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 4 Kislev</td>
<td>Babylonian army in Syria-Palestine (Ḫatti). Egyptian army called up. Babylonians meet Egyptians in inconclusive open battle, then return to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 3</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar in Babylon mustering a large force of chariots and horses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Year B.C.</td>
<td>Babylonian Date</td>
<td>Events recorded by B.M. 21946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 6 Kislev</td>
<td>Army operations in Syria. Detachments sent to plunder Arabs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>Babylonian army returns to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 7 Kislev</td>
<td>Babylonian operations in Ḫatti. Siege of Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>2nd Adar</td>
<td>Capture of Jerusalem. New king (Zedekiah) appointed. Much tribute taken back to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 8 Tebet Sebat</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar and army march as far as Carchemish in Syria (Ḫatti). Returns to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 9 (?)</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar and army march up the Tigris bank. Encamp on river bank. Opposing Elamites (?) retreat and Nebuchadrezzar returns to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 10 Kislev</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar remains in Babylonia, where rebellion breaks out. Leader captured and rebels slaughtered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tebet</td>
<td>Campaign in Syria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Nebuchadrezzar 11 (?)</td>
<td>Army operations in Syria. (Catchline only; year incomplete.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Year</td>
<td>Babylonian Date</td>
<td>Events recorded by B.M. 25124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557 B.C.</td>
<td>Neriglissar 3</td>
<td>Babylonian army in W. Cilicia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Neriglissar defeats Appuašu of Pirindu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Pursuit to Ura‘ and to Kirsu. After capture of Kiršu assault with boats on Pitusu island. Babylonians devastate area from Sallune to Lydian border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556 B.C.</td>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>Appuašu escapes. Neriglissar returns to Babylonia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSLITERATION

B.M. 25127

Obv.
1. [. . . . . . . . . . . .] ana bābili(KI) ki-i iš-šu-ru ina mūši (G1G)
2. [. . . . . . . . . . . .] (KI) kal u₄-mu šal-tu ina libbi āli ēpušū(MES)
3. [. . . . . . . . . . . . -šu-lu]ștu ša (m.d)sin-šar-iškun(un) ana (māt)āš-šur ištiriqū(ME)
4. [. . . . . . . . . . . .] ina libbi āli īp-te-gid ina (araḫ)utulī ūmu XII-KĀM umman (māt) āš-šur
5. [. . . . . . . . . . . .] (āl)šá-az-na-kū ērūbū(MES) išātu anā ṣkurri iddū(ME)
6. [. . . . . . . . . . . .] ḫu? ina (araḫ)tisriti ilāni(ME) ša kīš(KI) ana bābili(KI) illusū(ME)
7. [ERIM.M]ES (māt)āš-šur ana nimur(KI) illusū(ME)-nim-ma (m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur ina pāni-sū-nu ittabalkit-ma
8. [ummmūn (māt)āš-šur u nippurātu(KI.ME) adi libbi uruk(KI) arki-šū it-tal-ku
9. ina uruk(KI) šal-tū ana libbi (m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur ēpušū(MES)-ma ina maḫar
(m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur ittabalkitu(MES)
10. ina (araḫ)aiari ummūn (māt)āš-šur ana (māt)akkadī(KI) it-tar-du-nu ina
(araḫ)tisriti ūmu XII-KĀM umman (māt)āš-šur
11. ana muḫḫi bābili(KI) ki-i il-lik-ū-nu ina ūmmūnu (amēl)bābiliāa(KI.ME)
12. ultu bābili(KI) ki-i ú-šu-ū šal-tū ana libbi umman (māt)āš-šur ēpušū(MES)-ma
13. tāpdi ummūn (māt)āš-šur ma-a-diš iškurū(MES) ṭu-bu-ut-su-nu 蒴-tab-tu
14. īṣṭēti[GU.MU.AN.NA šarru ina māti āl-šā (araḫ)araḥsamma ūmu XXVI-KĀM
(m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur
15. ina bābili(KI) ina kussā ṣṭṭašab(ab) reš šarru-tū ša (m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur ina
(araḫ)addari
16. ilāni(ME) šá (māt)šu-ša-an šá (māt)āš-šur i-bu-ku-nim-ma ina uruk(KI)
ū-še-ši-bu
17. ilāni(ME)-šu-nu (m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur ina (āl)šu-ša-an ul-tāḫ-ḫi-is
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TRANSLATION

B.M. 25127

Obv.
1. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . had sent to Babylon, by night
2. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . in the late afternoon they did battle in the city
3. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . the garrison placed by Sin-šar-īškun fled to Assyria
4. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . he appointed in the city. In the month of Elul, on the
twelfth day, the Assyrian army
5. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . entered the city of Šaznaku and set fire to the temple
6. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . in the month of Tisri the gods of Kish came to Babylon.
7. The Assyrian army came to Nippur and Nabopolassar retreated before
them;
8. [the Assyrian troops] and men of Nippur came after him as far as Erech.
9. In Erech they did battle against Nabopolassar and then retreated before
Nabopolassar.
10. In the month of Iyyar the Assyrian army had come down into Babylonia.
On the 12th of the month of Tisri the Assyrian troops
11. when they came against Babylon, on that same day the Babylonians,
12. when they had gone out from Babylon, did battle against the Assyrian
army
13. and heavily defeated the Assyrian army, captured their spoil.
14. For one year there was no king in the land. On the twenty-sixth day of
the month of Marcheswan, Nabopolassar
15. sat upon the throne in Babylon. (This was) the ‘beginning of reign’ of
Nabopolassar. In the month of Adar
16. the gods of the land of Susa which the Assyrians had carried off and
settled in Erech
17. those gods Nabopolassar let return to the city of Susa.
18. śattu I-KÁM (m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur (araḫ)nisanni ūmu XVII-KÁM ḫat-ti anā āli imquṭ(ut)
19. (d)šamaš u ilāni(ME) šá (āl)šá-ṣa-az-zu a-na bābili(KI) it-tal-ku-ni
20. (araḫ)aiaru ūmu XXI-KÁMummān(ME) (māt)aš-ṣur a-na (āl)sal-[lat i-te]-ru-bu
makkūra ušēšū(ME)
21. ūmu XX-KÁM ilāni(ME) šá sippar(KI) ana bābili(KI) it-tal-[ku-nim-ma]
22. (araḫ)abi ūmu IX-KÁM (m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur u ummān(ME)-šū ana (āl)sal-lat
[ittalkū-nim]-ma
23. šal-tū ana (āl)sal-lat ṣpuš-ma āla āl is-bat ummān(ME) (māt)aš-ṣur ik-šu-du-
nim-ma
24. ina maḥār-šū-nu ittabalkit-ma ana arki-šū ihhīs(is)

25. [śattu II-KÁ]M (m.d)nabū-apal-uṣur rēš (araḫ)ulūli ummān(MES) (māt)aš-ṣur
26. (araḫ)akadī(KI)] ú-ri-du-nim-ma ina muḫḫī (nār.d)ba-ni-tu iddū(ME)
27. [šal-tū ana libbi (m.d)nabšš-apal-uṣur ṣpušū(MES)-ma minma ūl il-qu-u
28. ummān (māt)aš-ṣur karas-su šēš-ma ana arki-šū-nu ih-hi-su

29. [śattu III-KÁM (araḫ) ... ūmu VIII dēr(KI) itti (māt)aš-ṣur it-te-kir
(araḫ)tašriti ūmu XV
30. [.....][MU]. BI šār (māt)aš-ṣur u ummān(ME)-šū ana (māt)
akkadī(KI) ur-dam-ma
31. [.....].-ma ana nippur(KI) ul-te-rib arki-šū i-ti-il?
32. [...].-ma (amēl)šu-lu-tu ana nippur(KI) ul-te-li
33. [.....]. e-bir nārī iš-qa-am-ma ina muḫḫī
34. [.....].-nu ih-te-pi u ana muḫḫī ninua(KI) pānī-šū iš-ta-kan

35. [.....]. šā ana šal-tū ana pa-ni-šū ittalku(ku)
36. [.....]. ki]-i i-mur-uš ana pa-ni-šū in-daqtu
37. [.....]. SES

38. šarru ḥammā(ū) [.....]
18. The first year of Nabopolassar, on the seventeenth day of Nisan panic fell on the city of Sallat and removed property.

19. Shamash and the gods of Šapazzu came to Babylon.

20. In the month of Iyyar, the twenty-first day, the Assyrian army entered the city of Sallat and

21. On the twentieth the gods of Sippar came to Babylon.

22. On the ninth of the month of Ab, Nabopolassar and his army came to the city of Sallat and

23. made an attack on the city of Sallat but did not capture the city. When the Assyrian army arrived

24. he withdrew before them and went back.

25. The second year of Nabopolassar, in the beginning of the month of Elul, the Assyrian army

26. came down to Akkad and camped on (the bank of) the Banitu-canal.

27. They made an attack on Nabopolassar but gained (lit. took) nothing.

28. [The Assyrian army struck camp?] and went back.

29. [The third year, month . . . . ], eighth day, Dēr revolted from Assyria.

30. [. . . . . . in that year the king of Assyria and his army came down to Akkad

31. . . . . . and made to enter Nippur after . . he went up (?)

32. . . . . . heard? and set up a garrison in Nippur

33. . . . . . went up against (the land) across the river and against

34. . . . . . he destroyed and set his face towards Nineveh

35. . . . . . who came to battle against him

36. . . . . . when they saw him they fell down before him

37. . . . . . ?

38. a king, a usurper . . .
39. \( ME \, \text{umu}(ME) \) [ . . . ]
40. [ . . . . ] ki-i [ . . . . ]
41. [sarru] hammā H[? . . .]

B.M. 21901 (96-4-9, 6)

Obv.
1. šattu X-KĀM (m.d)nahū-apal-ūsur ina (ara[h]a)iai umman (māt)akkādi(KI) id-ki-e-ma kisād (nār)puratti illsik
2. (māt)su-ša-a-a (māt)hi-in-da-na-a-a šal-tū ana libbi-šu āl ṕepušu(šu) man-da-
3. (ara[h])abi umman (māt)as-šur ina (āl)qab-li-ni iq-ši-šu ma-a-diš
4. (ara[h])abi ūmu XII-KĀM šal-tū ana libbi umman (māt)as-šur ṕepuš-ma umman
5. ṕu-ūt-su-nu ma-a-diš ṕ̄ī-šu-tu (māt)man-na-a-a ša ana ri-ṣu-ṭi-šu-nu
6. us-ša-bi-tu ina us-su ša-ša-ṭu (āl)qab-li-ni iš-ša-bat ina (ara[h])abi-ma šār
7. (ala)ma-ni-e (ala)ša-ri-ri u (ala)ba-li-šu iš-[q]-i-[m]a ṕu-ūt-su-nu ṕi-
8. šil-lat-su-nu ma-at-tū ša-tal-lu-nu ilāni(ME)-šu-nu ṕi-tab-ku-nu ina (ara[h])ululu
9. ana arki-šu itur-am-ma ina ḫarran-šu (āl)hi-in-da-nu u ilāni(ME)-šu ana
10. ina (ara[h])tāṣriti umman(ni) (māt)mi-šir u umman(ni) (māt)as-šur arki šār
11. šār akkādi(KI) adī (āl)ṭab-li-ni illsik(ME)-nim-ma
12. ina (ara[h])ma-da-nu ša (ala)raḥ-šu šal-tū ana libbi a-ha-meš ṕepušu(ME)-ma
13. ina ṕan umman (māt)akkādi(KI) ṕitabalkutu(ME)-ma ṕaṭa-ta-su-nu ma-a-diš
4. BM 21901 (CCK no.2)16: ina libbi BAL.TIL.KI. Expect anā libbi.

5. BM 21901 (CCK no.2)22: Are there any traces supporting [is-hur]-ma a-na māti-su i-tur' at the end of the line? SAC/KA? Clearly an upright.

6. BM 21901 (CCK no.2)25: [is-šab]-tu One expects a singular. But it is not.

7. BM 21901 (CCK no.2)42: adi itiAbi 3 X Can the sign here designated "x" be the beginning of ITI? Inclusive reckoning would mean three months from Simanu to Abu. (Not uš!)

8. BM 21901 (CCK no.2)43: ana libbi anī Dū-šu. Verb should be singular. Can the sign read "šu" be "ma". No. Clearly šu

9. BM 21901 (CCK no.2)46: la-pan [šarri] is-hi-šam-ma Instead can one read ina qāti-šú-[u u]1 is-šam-ma? No. la-šer
B.M. 21901

1. (In) the tenth year, in the month of Iyyar, Nabopolassar called out the Babylonian army and marched up the bank of the river Euphrates.
2. The men of Suḫu and Hindanu made no attack against him, their tribute they placed before him.
3. In the month of Ab they reported that the Assyrian army was in the city of Qablinu; so Nabopolassar went upstream against them and
4. on the 12th day of the month of Ab made an attack on the Assyrian army, the Assyrian army then broke off contact from him and he inflicted a great defeat on Assyria.
5. They took much spoil; the Mannaeans who had come to their aid and the chief men of Assyria
6. were captured. On that day the town of Qablinu was captured. In the same month of Ab the king of Akkad and his troops
7. went upstream against the towns of Mane, Saḫiru and Balīḫu, and took spoil from them,
8. and carried off many of them as prisoners, and led away their gods. In the month of Elul the king of Akkad and his army
9. turned back and in his march the (men of the) town of Hindanu and its gods he took to Babylon.
10. In the month of Tisri the Egyptian army and the Assyrian army marched after the king of Akkad as far as the town of Qablinu but
11. did not overtake the king of Akkad and then went back. In the month of Adar the Assyrian army and the Babylonian army
12. attacked each other in the town of Badanu which is in the territory of the city of Arraphu and the Assyrian army
13. broke off contact from the Babylonian army which defeated them heavily and threw them (back) to the river Zab.
14. Their chariots and horses were captured and they took much spoil from them.
15. [ . . . . ]-šū ma-du-tu itti-šā-nu (nār)i-dīq-lat ā-šē-bi-ru-nim-ma ana babili(KI) ulteribu(ME)-ni

16. [šattu XI-ḪĀM šār] akkadi(KI) umman(MES)-šū id-ki-e-ma-kiššād (nār)i-dīq-lat illik-ma ina (araḫ)aiari ina libbi aššur(KI) iddi(di)

17. [ina ūmi . . . K]ĀM šā (araḫ)simani šal-tū ana libbi āli epuš-ma āla āl is-bat šār (māṭ)aš-šūr umman(ME)-šū id-kām-ma

18. šār akkadi(KI) ultu aš-šur(KI) si-kīp-ma adi (āl) tak-ri-i-ta-in ū(māṭ).[aš]-šūr kiššād i-dīq-lat arki-šū illik(ik)[. . .]

19. šār akkadi(KI) umman(me)-šū tana’à bir-tū šā (āl)tak-ri-i-ta-in ul-te-li šār? (māṭ)aš-šūr u ummani[(ni)]=šū[. . .]

20. ina muḫḫī umman(ni) šār akkadi(KI) šā tana’à l(āl)tak₂-i-ta-[n š]u-lu-ū id-di-ma

21. X ūme(me) šal-tū ana lib-bi-šū-nu epuš(us)-ma āla [ul] is-bat ummani(ni)

22. šār akkadi(KI) šā ana bir-tū šu-lu-ū

23. šēr (māṭ)aš-šūr ma-a-diš iltakan(an) šār (māṭ)aš-šūr u umman(ME)-[šū . .

24. [šattu] XII-ḪĀM ina (araḫ)abi (māṭ)ma-da-a-a ana muḫḫī ninua(KI) ki-i [. . . . . .]

25. [. . . . . -m]a i-ḫi-šam-ma (āl) tar-bi-šu ālu šā pi-ḫat ninua(KI)

26. kiššād (nār)i-dīq-lat irdi-ma ina muḫḫī aššur(KI) it-ta-di šal-tū ana libbi āli [epuš-ma] [. . . . . . .]

27. [. . . . . .] it-ta-gar šār akkadi(KI) u umman(ME)-šū šā ana ri-šu-ut (māṭ)ma-da-a-a illiku(ku) šal-tū l(āš)udu(du) āl[u ki-i iššabtu?]

28. [. . šār akkadi(KI) u umman(ME)-šū šā ana ri-šu-ut (māṭ)ma-da-a-a illiku(ku) šal-tū l(āš)udu(du) āl[u ki-i iššabtu?]

3 Written ri.
15. Many of his (prisoners) they made to cross the river Tigris with them and (so) they brought them into Babylon.

16. [In the eleventh year the king of] Akkad called out his troops and marched up the bank of the river Tigris, and in the month of Iyyar encamped against Aššur.

17. On the [. . th] day of the month of Sivan he made an attack upon the city but did not capture it. The Assyrian king called out his troops and

18. the king of Akkad moved away from Aššur and withdrew as far as the town of Takrit (in) Assyria, on the bank of the Tigris.

19. The king of Akkad sent his troops up into the citadel of the town of Takrit. The Assyrian king and his army

20. encamped against the army of the king of Akkad which was stationed in the town of Takrit and

21. for ten days he made an attack upon them but did not capture the city. The army of the king of Akkad which was stationed in the citadel

22. inflicted a heavily defeat on Assyria. The Assyrian king and his army [withdrew] and returned to his land.

23. In the month of Marcheswan the Mede came down upon the territory of Arraphu and . . . . . . . . . .

24. In the twelfth year in the month of Ab when the Mede . . . . . against Nineveh.

25. . . . . . . . and he hastened but they captured the town of Tarbišu, a city in the province of Nineveh . . . . . .

26. he pursued [down the bank of the river] Tigris and encamped against Aššur. He made an attack upon the town . . . . , and . .

27. [the city-wall?] he destroyed. He inflicted a terrible massacre upon the greater part of the people, plundering it (the city) and carrying off [prisoners from it].

28. [The king of Ak]kad and his troops, who had come to the help of the Medes, did not reach the (scene of) the attack (until) the city [was (already) taken].
29. [šarrakkad]i(KI) u (m) ū-[ma-ki]š-tar inamuḫḫi ʾašša-meš itamru(MEŠ) ūš-tū u su-lum-mu-u itti ʾašša-meš ʾiskunu(MEŠ)

30. [. . . (m)u-ma-ki?-i]š-tar u umman(ME)-šū ana mātī-šū it-tur šār akkadi(KI) u umman(ME)-šū ana mātī-šū itururu(ru)

31. [šattu XIII-KĀM ina (araḫ)aia]ri (māt)šu-ḥa-a šār akkadi(KI) ibbalkitu(ME)-ma nukurtu i-te-ēp-šū

32. [šār akkadi(KI) um]man(MEŠ)-šū id-ki-e-ma ana (māt)šu-ū-ḫu il-lik ina (araḫ)simani ūnu IV-KĀM

33. [šal-tū ana libbi (āl)ra-ḫi-i-lu ʾālī šā qabli-tū pu-rat-tū epusša ma ina ʾumi-šū-ma ʾālī ʾaš-ša-bat

34. [. . . . . .]-šū ib-ni abna ʾālī kisšād (nār)pu-rat-tū a-na pānī-šū it-tar-du-ni

35. [. . . . . . . . . . . ana muḫḫi] (āl)a-na-ti it-ta-di ʾaš-pī-tū [TA? bal]-ri erīb šamsī

36. [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]-kīr ša-pī-tū ana ṣūrī uq-tar-rib šal-tū ana libbi [ālī] epusša ma ʾālīa ʾālī ʾašbat?

37. [. . . . . . šār (māt)]aš-šur u umman(ME)-šū ur-dam-ma šār akkadi(KI) u umman(me)-šū is-[ki-pī? . . . . .]-ma ana mātī-šū itur

Rev. 38. [šattu XIV-KĀM] šār akkadi(KI) umman(ME)-šū id-ki-[e-ma ana(māt) . . . illik(i)[k]?] šār umman-man-da ana ṣar-šī šār akk[ad[i(KI)]]

39. [. . . . . . . . . . . .]-u ʾašša-meš i-ta-am-ru

40. [š]ār akkadi(KI) [. . . . . (m)ū-m][a-kiš-tar u[. . . . . . . . . . . . .]-a-ni ʿu-šē-bir-ma

41. [. . . . šād (nār)i-ālq-lat illiku(ME)-ma [. . . . . . . . i]na muḫḫi ninu[a(KI) . . . . . . ittad[u(?)](MEŠ)

42. ultu (araḫ)simani adī (araḫ)abi III US[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]-ū

43. šal-tū dan-na-tū ana libbi ʾālī epusušu(šū)[araḫ]abi [ūnu . . -KĀM ʾālī ṣṣabat . . . . . tapdi nišš[M(E)] rabûte(ME) ma-a-diš iltakan(an)
29. [The king of Akkad and Kyaxares met one another by the city. They established (an alliance) of mutual friendship and peace (i.e. were reconciled).
30. [Kyaxares and his army returned to his land; the king of Akkad and his army returned to his land.

31. [In the thirteenth year in the month of Iyyar the men of Suhu revolted against the king of Akkad and committed hostilities.
32. [The king of Akkad called out his army and marched to Suhu. In the month of Sivan, the fourth day,
33. he made an attack against Rahilu, a town which is (situated on an island) in the middle of the Euphrates, and the city was captured on that same day.
34. ... its... he built; stone from the Euphrates river-bank they piled up in front of it
35. .................. he encamped against the town of 'Ana; siege-towers from the west
36. ........ siege-towers he brought close to the wall and made an attack on the city but did not capture it
37. [... the Assyrian] king and his army came down (whereupon) the king of Akkad and his army moved away and returned to his land.

Rev.
38. [In the fourteenth year] the king of Akkad called out his army [and marched to . . . . . . ] the king of the Umman-manda with the king of Akkad
39. .................. they met each other
40. The king of Akkad .......... [Kyaxares . . . . he made to cross and
41. they marched along the bank of the river Tigris and . . . . . against Nineveh . . . . . they encamped?
42. From the month of Sivan to the month of Ab three oun[measures . . . . . . . they advanced ?]
43. A strong attack they made against the city, and in the month of Ab, [the . . . th day the city was captured . . . . . . ] a great defeat of the chief [people] was made.
44. ina u, mi-šu-ma (m.d)Sin-šar-iskun(un) šār (māt)aš-š[ur . . . . . . .]n
45. šil-lat āli u ekurri kabit(τ)ā iš-tal-šu ā[la ana] tili u ka[r-me utirru . . . . . ]
46. šā (māt)aš-š[ur] la-pan ê房间里*iš-š[am]-ma e[mug?] šār akkadi(KI) [. . . . . . ]
47. (araḥ)ululi ūmu XX-KĀM (m) ū-ma-kiš-tar ū umman(ME)-šu ana māti-šu it-tur arki-šū šār akka[di(KI) . . . . . . ]
48. a-di (āl)na-ši-bi-ni il-li-šu ū[lu-ti ū ga-šu-tu ka[. . . . . . ]
49. u (māt)ru-ša-pu ana pa-ni šār akkadi(KI) ana nin(ua(KI) ū-bil-lu-ni ina (ar[aḥ)
(. . . . . . ) (m.d) aš-šūr-uballīṭ . . . . . . . ]
50. ina (āl)har-ra-nu ana šarru-ut (māt)aš-šūr ina kussī ittaš(ab) adi (araḥ)
( . . . . . . . . . . . . ]
51. ina nin(ua(KI) . . . . . . . u)ltu ūmu XX-KĀM šā (araḥ) [. . ] šār
[akkadi(KI) . . . . . . ]
52. is-suḥ-ma ina (āl) [ . . . . . . . . . . ]

53. šattu XV-I-KĀM ina (araḥ)du'[uzi šā]r akkadi(KI) [umman(Μe)-šu id-ki-e-ma
( . . . . . . . . . . )]
54. ana (māt)aš-šur illik[ma ultu (araḥ) . . ] šal-ša-niš [ittallak . . . (ΜE)ES]
šā (māt)ha-[za? ṣa?] u? ha-an-[tiš . . . . . . ]
55. u(māt)š[u . . . . . . ]-a ik-šu-ud šu-b[u-ut-su-nu] iḥ-tab-lu šil-lat-su-nu
u[l? . . . . . . . ]
56. ina (araḥ)araḥsamna šār akkadi(KI) pa-ni umman(ME)-šu i[z-bat-ma ina
muḥḥī (āl)ru-ug-gu-[t-ti illik-ma]
57. šal-tū ana libbi āli epuš-ma (araḥ)araḥsama ūmu XXVIII āla išbat [. . . ]
e-du amēlu ul [e-zibl] šār akkadi(KI) ana māti-šu itura(ra)

58. šattu XVI-KĀM ina (araḥ)aiari šār akkadi(KI) umman(ME)-šu id-ki-e-ma ana
(māt)aš-šur illik(ik) ult[u (araḥ)simani?] adi (araḥ) araḥsamna
59. ina (māt)aš-šur šal-ša-niš ittallaku(ME) ina (araḥ)araḥsamna (māt)umman-man-
da [šā? ana ri-šu-ut šār akkadi(KI) illiku(ME)-nim-ma
44. On that day Sin-šar-iskun, the Assyrian king.

45. The great spoil of the city and temple they carried off and [turned] the city into a ruin-mound and heaps of debris.

46. of Assyria moved off before [the defeat?] and the forces(? of the king of Akkad.

47. In the month of Elul, the twentieth day, Kyaxares and his army returned to his land; the king of Akkad [and his army]

48. marched as far as Nisibin. Booty and slaves(?)

49. and of the land of Rusapu they brought to the presence of the king of Akkad to Nineveh. In the month [of . . . Aššur-uballit] . . . .

50. in the city of Harran sat on the throne as king of Assyria. Until the month of [ . . . . . . . . . . the king of Akkad stayed]

51. In Nineveh; . . . from the twentieth day of the month [of Elul?] the king of Akkad.

52. he removed and from the city [of . . . . returned to his own land?]

53. In the fifteenth year, the month of Tammuz, . . . the king of Akkad called out his army and . .

54. marched to Assyria where [from the month of . . he marched about] victoriously . . . . of the land of Ḫazazu? quickly . . . .

55. and the land of Šu[ppa] he conquered, plundering from them and [taking] spoil [and prisoners] from them.

56. In the month of Marcheswan the king of Akkad took personal command of his army and [marched] against the town of Ruggul[iti] and

57. made an attack on the town, capturing it on the twenty-eighth day of the month of Marcheswan, not a man escaped. [The king of Akkad] returned [to his land].

58. In the sixteenth year, in the month of Iyyar, the king of Akkad called out his army and marched to Assyria. From [the month of Sivan?] to the month of Marcheswan

59. they marched about victoriously in Assyria. In the month of Marcheswan the Umman-manda [who had come to the help of the king of Akkad and
60. umman(ME)-šú-nu ana libbi a-ḫa-meš is-mu-ḫu-ma ana (āl) ẖar-ra-nu [ana arki], ẖar-ra-nu [ana arki].
   (m.d)āš-su-[uballit] (iš) šá ina(mät)āš-su-[uballit] ina kissi ū-ši-bi
61. illiku(ME)-ma (m.d)āš-su-šu-bi-liš ina umman(ME) (mät)ma-sir šá [ana ri-su-ti-šu] illiku(ME)-ni
62. ṭat-tū (amēl)nakri im-qttu-su-nu-ti-ma āla ū-maš-[še-ru-ma] . . . . . . . (nār)purati?] i-bi-ru
63. šār akkadi(KI) a-na (āl) ẖar-ra-ni ik-šu-dam-ma [. . . . . . . . a]la iš-ša-bat
64. šīl-lat āli u ekurri ẖabitu(tū) iš-ta-laš ina (araḫ)addari šār akkadi(KI) [ . . . . . . . . . . ]-šu-nu ū-maš-šēr-ma
65. šu-ū ana mātšū šu-ura(ra) u umman-man-da šā ana ri-su-tu šār akkadi(KI) in[ik]ana mātšū-nu šā ṭe-ḫ-su
66. ina (araḫ)du-uži (m.d)āš-su-uballit(iš) šār (mät)āš-su umman (mät)ma-sir ma-at-tū [. . . . . . . .]
67. nāra ehir-ma ana muḫḫi (āl) ẖar-ra-nu ana ka-shā-[di] ẖall [. . . . . . . . i]s-šab ū-tu
68. šu-lu-tu šā šār akkadi(KI) ana libbi ū-šē-lu-ū id-du[-šu] ūšu? ku? ina muḫḫi (āl) ẖar-ra-nu it-ta-[do]
69. adi (araḫ)ulul šal-tū ana libbi āli epuš(uš) mimma uš-i[-gi-ma] ana arki-šū ül ibb.iš(u)
70. šār akkadi(KI) ana ri-su-tu umman(ME)-šū illik-mašal-[tū] [āl epuš]ana (mät) i-Za-al-la [iš]-ma
71. ālāni(ME) šā šadāni(ME) ma-a-[tū] [. . . . . . . . . . . . . .] šu-nu ina išāti iš-ru-up
72. ina u₄-mi-šu-ma umman(ME) [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .] adi pi-ḥat (āl) ū-ra-āš-tu
73. [illik-ma] ina māti ad[i?] (araḫ) [. . . . . . . . ālāni](ME)-šu-nu ih-tab-tu
74. [šu]-lu-tu šā šār [akkadi(KI) ina libbi-šū ū-šē-lu ]-ḫu-nim-ma (erasure)
75. ana (āl)[. . . . . . . i]-lu-[u][. . . . ] šār akkadi(KI) ana māti-šu itura(ra)
76. ina šat[ti XVIII-KĀM ina (araḫ)ul]uši šār akkadi(KI) umman(ME)-šū id-ki-e-ma
60. united their armies and to the city of Harran [after] Aššur-[uballit] who had sat upon the throne in Assyria

61. they marched. As for Aššur-uballit and the army of Eg[ypt(?)] which had come [to his help,]

62. fear of the enemy fell upon them; they abandoned the city and .......

63. The king of Akkad reached Harran ............... the city was captured

64. they carried off much spoil from the city and temple. In the month of Adar, the king of Akkad ... their ........ he left behind and

65. he himself returned to his land and the Umman-manda who had come to the help of the king of Akkad withdraw[w] to their country.

66. In the month of Tammuz Aššur-uballit, king of Assyria, a great Egyptian army .........

67. crossed the river marched against the city of Harran to conquer it .........

68. The garrison which the king of Akkad had stationed in it they ... slew ....... and he encamped against the city of Harran,

69. until the month of Elul he made an attack upon the city and took nothing but did not withdraw.

70. The king of Akkad came to the help of his troops [but made no] attack and went up [to the land of] Izalla and

71. many of the cities in the mountains [he captured] ............... their ........ he burnt with fire.

72. At that time the army .............. as far as the district of Urartu

73. [marched and stayed] in the land until [the month of ...] plundered their [cities(?)]

74. The garrison which the king of Akkad had set up within it] they ...... and

75. to the city of ... they went up ........ the king of Akkad returned to his land.

76. (Catch-line). In the [eighteenth] year [in the month of Elul] the king of Akkad called out his army.
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77. . . . . . . . . . ? (erased or uninscribed?)

Left edge

78. [šā (d)na]bū u (d)marduk i-ra-a[m-mu] li-iš-su-ur ana gatā(II) īl ušeṣṣi

B.M. 22047

Obv.

1. šattuXVIII-KĀM (d)na-bū-apal-uṣurina (araḥ)ululišār akkadi(KI) umman(ME)-šā id-ki-e-ma
2. kišād (nār)idiqlat irtedi-ma ana šadi(i) šā bit-(m)ḥa-nu-ni-ia
3. pi-ḥat (māt)ū-ra-āš-ṭu i-li-ma ālāni(ME) ina išātī iš-ru-up
4. ħu-bu-ut-su-nu ma-diš ih-tab-ta ina (araḥ)ṭebiti šār akkadi(KI) ana māti-šū itura(ra)

5. šattu XIX-KĀM ina (araḥ)simani šār akkadi(KI) umman(ME)-šā id-ki-e-ma

6. (m.d)na-bū-kudur-ū-su-ur mār-šū rabū(ū) mār šarri šā bit ri-e-du-tū
7. umman(ME)-šā id-ki-e-ma a-na šadē(MES) šā (māt)za-[. . . . . . ] illiku(ku)-ma
8. šār akkadi(KI) mār šarri u umman(ME)-šū ina māti ū-maš-šil[r u šu-ū] ina (araḥ)duʿuzi? ana babili(KI) itura(ra)
9. arki-šū (m.d)na-bū-kudur-uṣur a-na (āl)[/išātī iš-ru-u] p ħu-bu-ut šadi(i)
10. ma-a-diš ih-[tab]-ta adi pi-ḥat (māt) . . . . gi-m[ir šadē(ME) šal-tū epuš-ma
12. ina(araḥ)ululi mār šarri ana babili(KI) itur-am-ma ina (araḥ)ṭašriti šār akkadi(KI) umman-šū id-ki-ma
13. ana (āl)ki-mu-hu šā kisāt (nār)puratti il-lik
14. šanāra i-bir-ma [šal]-tū ana libbi ālī epuš-ma ina (araḥ)kislimi ālā iš-ṣa-bat

Rev.

15. [šal-lat-s]u iš-ta-lal (amēl)šu-lu-ti-šū ana libbi ul-te-li ina (araḥ)šabaṭi ana māti-šū itura
77. ... (possibly uninscribed).

78. (left edge). ‘Let him that loveth [Nab]ū and Marduk preserve this and not let it leave his hands’.

B.M. 22047

Obv.
1. In the eighteenth year of Nabopolassar, in the month of Elul, the king of Akkad mustered his army
2. and following the bank of the river Tigris went up to the mountainous terrain of Bit-Ḥanunia
3. which is a district of Urartu; he burned the cities with fire
4. and took booty in great quantity. In the month of Tebet the king of Akkad returned to his own land.

5. In the nineteenth year, in the month of Sivan, the king of Akkad mustered his army
6. and Nebuchadrezzar, his eldest son, the crown-prince
7. mustered his army and went to the mountains of Za . . . . . . .

8. The king of Akkad left the prince and his army in the land while in the month of Tammuz? he himself returned to Babylon.
9. After him (i.e. his departure) Nebuchadrezzar made an assault on the (fortified?) cities of the mountains and
10. seized the fortified cities, set them on fire, took much
11. spoil from the mountain-terrain; as far as . . . . he conquered all the mountain-areas.
12. In the month of Elul the prince returned to Babylon and in the month of Tisri the king of Akkad mustered his army
13. and went to Kimuḫu which is on the bank of the River Euphrates.
14. He crossed the river and did battle against the city, and seized the city in the month of Kislev.

Rev.
15. He carried off (prisoners) from it and set within (it) his garrison troops; in the month of Sebat he returned to his own land.
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16. šattu XX-KÂM ummani(ni) (māt)mi-sir ana (āl)ki-mu-ḫu ana muḫḫi šu-šu-tū

17. ša šarr akkadi(KT) a-na šib-bi ū-šu-šu-ū illsiku(ME)-nim-ma IV arḫē(ME)

18. šal-tū ana šibbi ālī epuš(ME)-ma āla īš-šab-tū šu-šu-tū ša šarr akkadi(KT)
   id-du-ku

19. ina (araḫ)tašriti šār akkadi(KT) umman(ME)-šu id-ki-e-ma illsiku(ME)
   pu-rat-tū

20. ina (āl)qu-rama-ši šā-šarr pu-rat-tū karas-su id-di

21. umman(ME)-šu pu-rat-tū ū-šē-šir-ma (āl)šu-na-di-ri (āl)ē-lam-ma

22. u (āl)da-ḫa-am-mu ālāni(ME) ša (māt)ē-bir nāri īš-šab-tu

23. ū-bu-ut-su-nu ihtabtu(ME)-ni ina (araḫ)šabati šār akkadi(KT) ana māti-šū
   itura(ra)

24. umman (māti)mi-sir ša ina (āl)gal-ga-meš pu-rat-tū i-bi-ru-nim-ma

25. ana muḫḫi umman (māt)akkadi(KT) ša ina (āl)qu-ra-ma-ši na-du-u

26. illsiku(ME)-nim-ma umman (māt)akkadi(KT) īš-ki-pu u ana arki-šu-du i-ḫu-ru

27. šattu XXI-KÂM šār akkadi(KT) ina māti-šū (m.d)nabū-kudurri-uṣur mār-šū
   rabū(u)

28. mār šarrī ša bit ridu-ū-tu umman (māt)akkadi(KT) id-ki-e-ma

B.M. 21946 (56-4-9, 51)

Obv.

1. [šattu XXI-KÂ]M šār akkadi(KT) ina māti-šū (m.d)nabū-kudurri-uṣur mār-šū
   rabū(u) [mār] šarri šā bit ri-e-du-tū

2. [umman (māt)akkadi(KT), i]d-ki-e-ma pa-ni umman(ME)-šu īš-bat-ma ana
   (āl)gal-[ga]-meš ša šarrī pu-rat-tū illsiku(ME)

3. [ana muḫḫi umman] (māti)mi-ši]r ša ina (āl)gal-ga-meš na-du-ū nāra i-bir-ma

4. [a]-ha-meš im-ḫa-su-ma umman (māt)mi-sir ina pani-
   šū ittabalkit-ma

5. [ŠL.SI]-šu-nu iš-kun adī la ba-šē-e-[i...].-šu-nu-tū šit-ta-a-tū umman (māti)
   [mi-sir]
16. In the twentieth year the army of Egypt came to the city of Kimuḥu against the garrison
which the king of Akkad had set up within (it) and for four months
they did battle against the city and then captured the city. They slew
the garrison of (set there by) the king of Akkad.
19. In the month of Tisri the king of Akkad mustered his army, marched along
the bank of the Euphrates
and pitched his camp at Quramati which is on the bank of the Euphrates.
21. He sent his troops across the Euphrates and they seized the towns of Šunadiri, Elammu
22. and Daḫammu which are in the country across the river.
23. Spoil from them they took. In the month of Sebat, the king of Akkad
returned to his own country.
24. The Egyptian army which had crossed the Euphrates at Carchemish
came against the Babylonian army which was stationed in Quramati
but the Babylonian army withdrew quickly and retreated.
27. In the twenty-first year the king of Akkad (stayed) in his own land.
Nebuchadrezzar his eldest son,
28. the crown prince, mustered the Babylonian army and . . .

B.M. 21946

Obv.
1. In the twenty-first year the king of Akkad stayed in his own land,
Nebuchadrezzar his eldest son, the crown-prince,
2. mustered (the Babylonian army) and took command of his troops; he
marched to Carchemish which is on the bank of the Euphrates,
3. and crossed the river (to go) against the Egyptian army which lay in
Carchemish,
4. . . . . fought with each other and the Egyptian army withdrew before
him.
5. He accomplished their defeat and to non-existence [beat?] them. As for
the rest of the Egyptian army
(māt)ḫa-ma-a-t[u]
7. umman(ME) (māt)akkadi(KT) iš-šu-du-šu-nu-ti-m[a ŠI.]Šī-šū-nu iš-ku-nu e-du
amēšu ana māt-i-šū [ul itur]
8. ina u₄-mi-šu-ma (m.d)nabū-kudurri-uṣur (māt)ḫa-[at]-tū a-na paṭ gium-ri-šū
iš-šu-u[ū]
9. XXI MU.AN.NA.MEŠ (m.d)nabū-apal-[uš]ur šarru-ut babili(KI) epuš(uš)
10. ina (araḫ)abi ūmu VIII-KĀM šimāt(MEŠ) ina (araḫ)ululi (m.d)nabū-
kudurri-uṣur ana babili(KI) itur-am-ma
11. ina (araḫ)ululi ūmu I-KĀM ina babili(KI) ina kussi šarru-ū-tu u-ši-ib

12. ina MU.SAG (m.d)nabū-kudurri-ū-su-ur ana (māt)ḫat-tū ana arki-šū itur-ma
adi (araḫ)šabaṭi ina (māt)ḫat-ti
13. šal-ṭa-niš īttallak(ME) ina (araḫ)šabaṭi bilat (māt)ḫat-tū kabittu(tū) ana
babili(KI) il-qa-a
14. ina (araḫ)nisanni qatā(II) (d)bēl u mār (d)bēl iš-bat isinnu a-ki-tū i-pu-uš

15. šattu I-KĀM (m.d)nabū-kudurri-ū-su-ur ina (araḫ)simani ummanni(ni.MEŠ)-šū
id-ki-e-ma
16. a-na (māt)ḫat-tū illik-ma adi (araḫ)kislimi ina (māt)ḫat-ti šal-ṭa-niš īttallak(ME)
17. šarrānī(MEŠ) šā (māt)ḫat-tū ka-li-šū-nu a-na pani-šū illiku(ME)-nim-ma
bi-lat-su-nu kabittu(tū) im-ḫur
18. a-na (āl)iš-qi-il-lu-ni illik-ma ina (araḫ)kislimi [erasure?] iš-ša-bat-su
19. šarrā-šū ik-ta-šad ḫu-bu-ut-su iḫ-lab-ta šil-lat-sa [iš-ta-lal ... .] 
20. ʾāla ana tili u kar-me ut-tir ina (araḫ)šabaṭi illik-ma ana bab[li(KI) itur(ra)]

1 Over erasure see note, p. 85.
6. which had escaped from the defeat (so quickly that) no weapon had reached them, in the district of Hamath
7. the Babylonian troops overtook and defeated them so that not a single man [escaped] to his own country.
8. At that time Nebuchadrezzar conquered the whole area of the Hatti-country.
9. For twenty-one years Nabopolassar had been king of Babylon.
10. On the 8th of the month of Ab he died (lit. 'the fates'); in the month of Elul Nebuchadrezzar returned to Babylon
11. and on the first day of the month of Elul he sat on the royal throne in Babylon.

12. In the 'accession year' Nebuchadrezzar went back again to the Hatti-land and until the month of Sebat
13. marched unopposed through the Hatti-land; in the month of Sebat he took the heavy tribute of the Hatti-territory to Babylon.
14. In the month of Nisan he took the hands of Bel and the son of Bel and celebrated the *akitū* (New Year) festival.

15. In the first year of Nebuchadrezzar in the month of Sivan he mustered his army
16. and went to the Hatti-territory, he marched about unopposed in the Hatti-territory until the month of Kislev.
17. All the kings of the Hatti-land came before him and he received their heavy tribute.
18. He marched to the city of Askelon and captured it in the month of Kislev.
19. He captured its king and plundered it and carried off [spoil from it . . . .]
20. He turned the city into a mound and heaps of ruins and then in the month of Sebat he marched back to Babylon.
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21. [šattu] II-KĀM (araḥ) aia ir šār akkādi(KI) umman-šū kabittu(tū) ik-šur-ma
[ana (māt) hat-tū illik]

22. [. . . . . . . ] id-dī ṣa-па-a-tī rabāṭi(MES) uš-bal-[kit? . . . . . . .

23. [. . . . . . . ultu (araḥ)] aia ir (a[raḥ] . . ina (māt) hat-tū šal-ṭa-niš
ittallak(ME)]

about 4 lines missing

Upper lines missing

Rev.

1. [. . . . . . . . . ū-maš]-šīr-ma e[? . . . . . . . . .]

2. [ina (araḥ) . ūmu] XIII-KĀM (m.d)nabū-šuma-lišī[. . . . .

3. [ina (araḥ) . šār akkādi(KI) umman(ME)-šū id-ki-e-ma a-na (māt) hat-tū
[illik(ik) . . . . .]

4. [. . . . . . . ] ma-a-du-tū šā (māt) hat-tū ana (māt) akkādi(KI) ul-te-
ri-[ib . . . . . .]

5. [š]attu IV-KĀM šār akkādi(KI) umman(ME)-šū id-ki-e-ma ana (māt) hat-tū
illik(ik) ina (māt) hat-tū šal-[a-niš ittallak(ME)]

6. ina (araḥ) kislimi pa-ni umman(ME)-šū iš-bat-ma ana (māt) mi-sir illik(ik)
šār (māt) mi-sir iš-me-e-ma umman(ME)-šū [id-ki-e]-[ma]

7. ina taḥaz seri irti a-ḥa-meš im-ḥa-ṣu-ma taptopi a-ḥa-meš ma-a-diš iškumu(MES)
šār akkādi(KI) u umman(ME)-šū itur-am-ma a-na babili(KI) [iturā]

8. šattu V-KĀM šār akkādi(KI) ina mātī-šū (iš)narkābāti(MES) u sisē-šū
ma-a-du-tū ik-ta-sar

9. šattu VI-KĀM (araḥ) kislimi šār akkādi(KI) umman(ME)-šū id-ki-ma ana
(māt) hat-tū illik(ik) ultu (māt) hat-tū ummani(ni.ME)-šū iš-pur-ma

10. mad-ba-ri irtedu-ma (amēl)1 a-ra-bi ma-du-tu buši-šū-nu bu-li-šū-nu u ilānī(ME)-
šū-nu ma-diš iḥ-tab-tu-nu ina (araḥ) addari šarru ana mātī-šū itur

1 Or KUR over erasure.
21. In the second [year] in the month of Iyyar the king of Akkad gathered together a powerful army and [marched to the land of Hatti].

22. [. . . . . . .] he threw down, great siege-towers he [. . . . . . .]

23. [. . . . . . .] from the month of Iyyar until the mon[th of . . . he marched about unopposed in the land of Hatti.

About 4 lines missing

Upper lines missing

Rev.

1. In the third year [. . . he l]eft and [. . . . . .]

2. [in the month of . . . on the] thirteenth day, Nabû-šuma-lišir . . . . . . .

3. . . . the king of Akkad mustered his troops and [marched] to the Hatti-land

4. and brought (back) much [spoil] from the Hatti-land into Akkad.

5. In the fourth year the king of Akkad mustered his army and marched to the Hatti-land. In the Hatti-land they marched unopposed.

6. In the month of Kislev he took the lead of his army and marched to Egypt. The king of Egypt heard (it) and mustered his army.

7. In open battle they smote the breast (of) each other and inflicted great havoc on each other. The king of Akkad and his troops turned back and returned to Babylon.

8. In the fifth year the king of Akkad (stayed) in his own land and gathered together his chariots and horses in great numbers.

9. In the sixth year in the month of Kislev the king of Akkad mustered his army and marched to the Hatti-land. From the Hatti-land he sent out his companies,

10. and scouring the desert they took much plunder from the Arabs, their possessions, animals and gods. In the month of Adar the king returned to his own land.
CHRONICLES OF CHALDAEAN KINGS

11. šattu VII-KÂM (arah)kislimi šâr akkadi(KI) umman(ME)-šú id-ki-ma a-na (mät)ḫat-tú illik-ma
12. ina muḫḫi āl ia-šu-du iddi-ma ina (arah)addari umu II-KÂM āla is-ša-bat šarra ik-ta-šad
13. šarra šâ libbi-šu ina lib-bi ʾp-te-qid bi-lat-sa kabittu(tú) il-[qa-am-m]a ana babili(KI) ulterib(īb)

14. šattu VIII-[KÂM (ar)ah]ṭebeti šâr akkadi(KI) a-na (mät)ḫat-tú adi (āl)gal-
15. ul-tuṭ[. . . . . . . . . . .].ma ina (arah)šabâṭī šarru ana mātī-šū it[ur]

16. šattu IX-KÂM (arah) . . šâr akka]di(KI) u umman(ME)-[šú k]išṭad ʾdiq-
17. šâr (mät)el[amti(KI) ?? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ]l-mu-ṭ [. . . . . . ]
18. šâr akkadi(KI) [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . ] -iš- [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . ]
19. šâ kišād ʾdiq-lat karas-su id-di ma-lak umu I-KÂM ina bi-ri-šū-nu [. . . . . ]
20. [š]âr (mät)el[amti(KI) ʾp-lâh-ma ḭat-tú imtaqut-su-ma ana mātī-šū i-t[u[r(ra)]

21. [šattu] X-KÂM [šâr akk]adi(KI) ina mātī-šū ultu (arah)kislimi adi (arah) ʾṭebeti bar-tú ina (mät)akkadi(KI)[. . . . . ]
22. [. . . . . . . . . . um]man(ME)-šú ma-du-tú ina (iš)kakki id-duška a-a-bi-šú qāš(II)-su iḫšud(ud) ?
23. [(arah) . . . . . . . ana] (mät)ḫat-tú illik-ma šarrāni(ME) u amēl [. . . . . . . ]
24. [ana pani-šu illiku](ME)-nim-ma bi-lat-su-nu kabittu(tú) [im-ḫur-ma ana babili(KI)]itura(ra)
In the seventh year, the month of Kislev, the king of Akkad mustered his troops, marched to the Ḫatti-land, and encamped against (i.e. besieged) the city of Judah and on the second day of the month of Adar he seized the city and captured the king. He appointed there a king of his own choice (lit. heart), received its heavy tribute and sent (them) to Babylon.

In the eighth year, the month of Tebet, the king of Akkad [marched] to the Ḫatti-land as far as Carchemish.

In the ninth year, the month of ..., the king of Akkad and his troops [marched along] the bank of the Tigris.

The king of El[am] was afraid and, panic falling on him, he returned to his own land.

In the tenth year the king of Akkad (was) in his own land; from the month of Kislev to the month of Tebet there was rebellion in Akkad.

With arms he slew many of his own army. His own hand captured his enemy.

[In the month of ...] he marched to the Ḫatti-land, where kings and [ ... ]-officials

[came before him] and he [received] their heavy tribute and then returned [to Babylon.]
25. [šattu] XI-KĀM ina (araḫ) kislimi šár akkadi(KI) umman(ME)-[šu id-ki-e-ma]
[a-na (māl) ḫat-tū] illik(ik)

B.M. 25124

Obv.
1. šattu III-K[ĀM ina (araḫ) . . ] (m)ap-pu-ū-a-šū šarru šá (māl)pi-rin-d[u]

2. um-ma-ni-š[u ma-du-tū id]-kám-ma a-na ḫa-ba-tu₄ u šá-[la-lu]
3. [a-n]a e-bir nārī [pāni-sū iš]-ta-kan (m.d)nergal-šar-šur
4. ummani(ni.MEŠ)-šū id-[k][i-ē-ma] ana (āl)ḫu-me-e ana muḫ-ḫi-šū il-li[k¹]
5. aš-šu-mi-šá (m)ap-[p[u-]a-šū (erasure)
6. ummani(ME) u kal-li-i šá sišē(ME) šá ik-šu-ru
7. ina na-ah-la šá šade(MEŠ) a-na šu-šu-ba-a-tū uš-e-šib-ra
8. (m.d)nergal-šar-šur ik-šu-ud-su-nu-ti-ma iš-kun taḫda-šū-[nu]
9. ummani(ni) ma-a-du-tū i²-duk ummani(ni)-šú u sisi-šū³
10. ma-a-du-tū uš-saḥ-bi-ta ar-ki (m)ap-pu-ū-a-šú
11. XV bēr qaq-qar šadu(ū) mar-šu šá amēlu ār-ki amēli il-la-ku
12. a-di (āl)ū-ra-qa-āl šarru-ū-ti-šú ir-dīp-ma
13. [.. . ] ik-šu-ud-su (āl)ū-ra-qa-āl iš-sa-bat šil-lat-su iš-ta-lal

14. (line erased)
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15. ul-tu (āl)ū-ra-qa-āl a-di (āl)ki-ir-ši
16. aš šarru-ū-tu šá abbē(ME)-šū VI bēr qaq-qar šadu(ū) dan-nu

17. ni-ri-bi mar-šu ki-i il-li-ku
18. (āl)ki-ir-ši ălu dan-nu aš šarru-ū-ti-šú iš-sa-bat
19. dūr-šú ekallī-šú u nišē(ME)-šú ina iš-ša-tu iqi-ta-li
20. (āl)pi-tu-su šadu(ū) šá ina gabši-tu (nār)mar-rat

21. u VI lim ummani(ni) e-piš šal-tu šá ana libbi i-lu-ū
22. ina (iš)sa-pi-na-a-tu iš-sa-bat ūla-ši it-tap-lu
23. u nišē(ME)-šu uš-sa-bi-ta šattu ši'ati ul-tu ni-ri-[bi]

¹ or i[k²? cf. 1. 6.- s[s[k³ .² Written over another sign (id?).
³ šu followed by nu erased.
25. [In the] eleventh [year] in the month of Kislev the king of Akkad [mustered

B.M. 25124

Obu.
1. In the third year [in the month of . . . . .] Appuasu the king of Pirindu
2. mustered his [numerous] army and in order to rob and plunder
3. set (forth?) across the river. Neriglissar
4. mustered his army and marched to the city of Hume to oppose him.
5. Because of this Appuasu (erasure)
6. stationed the troops and mounted police which he had collected
7. in a mountain valley for an ambush.
8. Neriglissar caught up with them and accomplished their defeat.
9. He slew many troops and many of his troops and
10. horses he seized.
11. For a distance of 15 leagues over mountainous terrain (so) difficult that
   one man must go behind another
12. he pursued Appuasu as far as his royal (capital-)city of Ura'
13. and caught (up with) him. He seized the city of Ura' and carried off
   spoil from it.
14. (line erased)
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15. From the city of Ura' to the city of Kiršu,
16. the royal city of his ancestors, for a distance of 6 leagues (over) mighty
   mountains,
17. when he had marched (by) a steep pass,
18. he captured his fortified royal city of Kiršu;
19. its walls, palace and peoples he burned with fire.
20. The city of Pitusu, a mount which is in the midst of the ocean, (i.e.
    an island),
21. and 6,000 fighting men who had set (themselves) up within it
22. from boats he captured. He demolished that city
23. and captured its people. In that year from the pass leading to
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24. šā (āl)sa-al-lu-ni-e a-di muḫḫi mi-šir
25. šā (āl)lu-ú-du ina i-šá-tú iš-ta-raḥ (m)ap-pu-ú-a-šú
26. ih-liq-ma qatā(II) la [ik-š]u-ud-su ina (araḫ)addari šār akkadi(KI)
27. a-n[a māṭī]-šū i-tu-ra
24. the city of Sallune as far as the boundary of the city
25. of Ludu he burned with fire. Appuašu
26. fled and his hand did not capture him. In the month of Adar the king of Akkad
27. returned to his own land.
ADDITIONAL NOTES

B.M. 25127


1. 4. [. . . . *ina līḫi bī dī iṣpuqid*. The expression is used (with object) for the appointment of a king (B.M. 21946, r. 13) or of any subordinate official.

1. 5. *(āl)ṣaznaku*. A tablet dated at Ṣaznaku in the third year of Cyrus (B.M. 75534; Strassmaier, *Cyrus*, No. 126) bears the names of witnesses who are priests. This may confirm that a temple cult was maintained there. A location in the Diyala region is suggested on the grounds that this city was captured three weeks before Kish was threatened, implying a site at a considerable distance to the north-east of that city. Cf. Sallat, l. 20 below.

1. 9. *uruk(KI)*. The city was frequently changing its loyalty between Assyria (Sin-šar-iskun) and Babylonia (Nabopolassar), see p. 91. Early in Nabopolassar’s first year his rule was recognised there (*TCL*, XII, 17; E. W. Moore, *Neo-Babylonian Business and Administrative Documents*, pp. 20, 22).

1. 10. *(araḫ)aiari* appears to refer back to the beginning of the year in which the Assyrian victory is recorded (l. 4).

1. 11. *(anūt)habilaša*, i.e. the city had no recognised king at this time.


1. 19. *(āl)ṣapazzu*. Possibly located on the northern border of Babylonia since defensive measures were taken there a month earlier than at Sippar (cf. Saznaku, l. 5). This would agree with Bab. Chron. (B.M. 92502), i. 5, which describes how Tiglath-pileser III carried off the gods of Ṣapazzu during his campaign of 745 B.C. when he plundered the Ḥamrin district. The city is also mentioned in *Ur Excavation Texts*, IV, 56, 14. See also M. San Nicolo, *Babylonische Rechtsurkunden des ausgehenden 8. und des 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, p. 107, n. 14 ((āl)gar/ša-pa-š/za).


1. 21. That is, Sippar after acknowledging Sin-šar-iskun at least until the 25th of Sivan of his second year must have revolted from Assyria by this time (B.M. 92718; B. T. Evetts, *Inscriptions of Evil-Merodach*, p. 90; Strassmaier, *Babylonische Texte*, VI, B, 174).

1. 24. *ittaballkit(BAL)-ma*. *nabalkutu* must therefore be an act prior to withdrawal *(ana arkišu iḫḫī)*. Its military use with *ina IGI* (ll. 7, 9; B.M. 21901, 4, 13; 21946, 4) supports an interpretation of ‘to break off contact’. *nabalkutu* marks an action that is more deliberate than ‘to fall back (before)’, as Oppenheim (*ANET*, p. 304), or ‘verrutschen’ as Landsberger-Bauer (*ZA*, XXXVII, p. 85). The word used for the actual
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retreat is nihesu (LAL) while sakdpu covers the manoeuvre of pulling or becoming out of contact. Cf. B.M. 21901, 18, 37; B.M. 22047, 26; (B.M. 25091, obv. 5 (BHT, p. 16) is doubtful). So for sakdpu, Oppenheim ‘disengage oneself from’ (ANE7, p. 304) is better than Landsberger-Bauer (op. cit.) ‘verrutschen’.  

1. 26. ina muḫḫi . . . iddu. ‘to encamp by’ as opposed to ina libbi . . . naddi to encamp against’, i.e. besiege (Landsberger-Bauer, op. cit. p. 85). Cf. B.M. 92502, iii. 40; 33382, i. 17; 25127, 27. 

(nār d) Banitu. At this period a major canal of this name flowed by the Ilbaba gate of Babylon and alongside the royal road to Kish (Unger, Babylon, pp. 97 f.). Both of these cities were concerned in the earlier Assyrian invasion (II. 6, 11). The canal started from the river Euphrates (B.M. 32849, 3; 30338, 3; 31496, 5; 41594, 3; published by J. Strassmaier, Nabonidus, Nos. 116, 165, 760 and Nabuchodonosor, No. 251). In two later contracts a town Nār-Banitu, which presumably lay on this same canal, is mentioned (B.M. 77353, 13; 77355, 15, published by Strassmaier, Cambyses, Nos. 55, 56). This is probably the same as the city of the men of Banitu captured by Tiglath-pileser III in 736 B.C. (III R, 3, 47; Rost, Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-pileser III, I, 24, 147) and by Sennacherib during his advance southwards through Bit-Dakkuri in 702 B.C. (B.M. 119203, 37; S. Smith, The First Campaign of Sennacherib, pp. 38, 64, 80). Although Sidney Smith thinks it improbable that the cities are listed by Sennacherib in any geographical order there is other evidence to show that the border of Bit-Dakkuri extended to the vicinity of Kish (S. Smith, op. cit. pp. 19-20). This would make it probable that the Banitu of Sennacherib’s account lay on the canal mentioned here. A letter, probably addressed to Ashurbanipal during the defection of Babylon after 646 B.C. (K. 517), implies that Babylon controlled the main Banitu canal from which a subsidiary canal (silihtu) carried water to Nippur. It is likely that a number of rivers and canals in Babylonia were named Banitu and one, the later nahr batt canal which connected the Jabal Ḥamrin dams with the Nahrwan canal opposite Opis (Felix Jones, Map of the Ancient Nahrwan Canal, 1849), would have been a good defence line along the Assyro-Babylonian frontier. It is, however, most likely that the Babylon—Kish canal, discussed above, is the Banitu referred to here. 

1. 27. mimma ū ṭlqū . . . . Cf. B.M. 21901, 69 which is a parallel though broken passage. 

1. 28. [umman (mdt)as-sur i]s-suh-ma. Cf. B.M. 21901, 52. This restoration is uncertain since a plural verb would be expected, cf. ll. 26-27. The sign suh seems clear. 

1. 29. išmū VIII. The omission of KĀM after the numeral is unusual. BĀD.AN.KI—Dēr is usually identified with Tall Badra (Sidney Smith, JEA, XVIII, pp. 28-32; cf. Afr, IX, p. 97; XVI, p. 15; RLA, I, p. 293). 

1. 30. MI.]BI. Cf. B.M. 92502, iv. 37; 25091, 7. 12. 21. r. 15. The name of the Assyrian king, as often in the Chronicles, is not given. 

1. 32. The subject is lost. It could either be Sin-šar-iskun in Nippur or Nabopolassar taking action against the approaching Assyrians. 

1. 33. possibly (mdt)ebir nārī, i.e. the territory on the west bank of the Euphrates. Cf. 22047, 22. Cf. S. Smith, Isaiah Chapters XL-LV, pp. 145, 147. 

1. 34. ihtepi is used of city ruins in Bab. Chron. (B.M. 92502), i. 8. 

B.M. 21901 

For other detailed notes on this text see FVN, pp. 31-36. 

1. 2. (mdt)suḫu (mdt)hindanu. For location see Maps 1 and 2 based on S. Horn, ZA, XXXIV, pp. 129 f., 142 ff.; Forrer, Provinz., pp. 13 ff.
1. 3. iqbiuma. The word, with the sign -bi, is written clearly. J. Lewy, MVAG, 1924, p. 82 reads ik-kassam-ma (after FN, p. 31, n. 4). Landsberger-Bauer (ZA, XXXVII (N.F.3), p. 85) object to both readings and propose ik-sur(!)-u-ma, "they took up battle positions" (so Oppenheim, ANET, p. 304). There are difficulties in all these readings. For the use of kasāru in the Babylonian chronicles see B.M. 21946, r. 8 and p. 96.

(al)gablinu. The place is otherwise unknown but the context demands a location north of Hindanu (possibly later Gidan, S. Horn in ZA, XXXIV, p. 143; cf. FN, p. 5). Cf. also l. 13, 22. The form, whether read Gablinu (Lewy, op. cit. p. 68) or Kaplinu, is possibly Hurrian like many other place names on the middle-Euphrates.

1. 4. tapdi . . . GAR-an. This is usually taken as active (cf. l. 23, and contrast Oppenheim, ANET, p. 304). The interpretative reading itukan (or itukan ? but cf. B.M. 25127, 34) is made by comparison with l. 6.

1. 5. (mad)manma. The Scyths had attacked these people during the reign of Esarhaddon and it may be that a common danger now made them allies of Assyria, their former enemy.

1. 6. šār akkadi(KI). See J. Lewy, op. cit. p. 93 for this change of style after citing the personal name of Nabopolassar (cf. l. 1); B.M. 22047, 1.

1. 7. (al)baliku is probably to be located on the river of the same name south of Harran. It lay within the Assyrian province of Harran (Forrer, Provinz., pp. 8, 24, suggests 'Tell Djigle' the Roman Dabana, c. 12 miles south of Harran).

1. 8. ummani (mad)misir. The omission of any royal name may imply that these were small forces (perhaps based on Carchemish).

1. 11. ana arkiSunu ihhisu. -su (not ih-hi-is, FN, p. 32) is clear. Cf. l. 69; B.M. 25127, 24.

1. 12. (al)badanu. For the initial Ba- cf. Balihu (l. 7). FN, p. 7 reads Madanu. In either case the location is unknown except that it was within the district of Arrephi (modern Kirkuk). For the name (al)Badanu see P. Rost, Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-pileser III, I, p. 82.


1. 14. na[rb]ātī(KE)-ī-n-[u]. This restoration is suggested by Oppenheim, ANET, p. 304, n. 5.

1. 16. ina libbi . . . iddi. See p. 79.

1. 18. sikipma. For discussion of this military term see p. 79.


1. 22. [ . . . ]-ma. Gadd suggested [ip?-par?-ku]-ma—'ceased?' or ip-dam-ma (FN, p. 32). Cf. [i-di]-ku-ma, Lewy (op. cit. p. 83). The line is too broken for any certain restoration to be possible but some expression to state that the Assyrian king and army withdrew or turned back is normal in the Chronicle between the subject (šār . . . a umman(KE)-ši) and the stereotyped phrase ana māštu itur (cf. l. 37 ši[kipma] or is[burna] and l. 18).

1. 23. The end of the line was read by Gadd (FN, p. 33) ur-dam-ma šal-tam ana libbi ali and Lewy (op. cit. p. 70) ur-du-[u]-im-[a] šal-ta ana libbi al [ . . . . . . . im[u]] but the present traces support the reading ur-dam-ma only.

1. 24. The traces at the end are uncertain. Gadd (FN, p. 33, n. 2) suggested ki-i [iš-qī . . . . .] which would imply an approach to Nineveh up the Tigris valley.
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1. 26. irdi(US)-ma. Cf. ll. 23, 34; B.M. 25127, 26 (uridunimma); this does not necessarily imply pursuit of fugitives (cf. FN, p. 10).

1. 27. limniš . . . . Chron. ‘ P ’, Col. iv, 19, implies that this is another way of expressing a heavy defeat.

1. 28. al[u ki issabtu] might also be rendered as commencing a new sentence, ‘When (the city had been taken . . .)’ thus giving the timing of the treaty.

1. 29. (m)z-ma-kis-tar. Cf. ll. 40, 47 and Behistum, ll. 43, 61, 93 (z-ma-ku-is-tar). With this form of the name of Kyaxares (Kiahkarpis) compare 0. Pers. Xuaxstra-; Elam. ma-ak-iš-tar-ra and see discussion by W. Eilers, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Bd. 90 (1936), p. 174 n.; R. G. Kent, Old Persian Grammar (1950), p. 77.

1. 30. [(m)z-ma-ki?-i]s-tar. This restoration is required since the end of -iš rather than -kiš is visible. See note l. 29 above.

1. 31. For nabalkutu governing a direct accusative (itti not required) see Lewy, op. cit. p. 84; see also B.M. 25127, 24 and p. 74.

1. 33. (al)rašitu. Probably the same as (al)ra-ilu (FN, p. 33, n. 10) in the southern part of Suhu (A. Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 212). A number of towns along the Middle Euphrates stood upon islands (ZA, XXXIV, pp. 135 f).

1. 34. ištarduni. So Lewy, op. cit. p. 84.

1. 35. (al)anaš. The modern ‘Ana on the right bank of the Euphrates, but from Assyrian to medieval days built, at least in part, on an island. (V. Scheil, Annales de Tukulti-Ninip II, obv. 69, p. 18; A. Musil, op. cit. pp. 345-349). The ancient city was the capital of Suhu (ZA, XXXIV, pp. 130, 136) and the centre of the worship of Dhu ‘Anat (Syria, XXVI, p. 82). The name is written also as ana-tu (Iraq, XVI, p. 39, n. 12.)

1. 36. sapitu. A (wooden) tower used in the siege of a walled place (A. L. Oppenheim, ANET, p. 304, n. 8). For its use see RA, XLII, p. 139 and for illustrations, Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum—Ashur-našir-pal, Plate XXIV.


1. 38. . . . šar umman-manda. Those who would equate the term umman-manda with the Medes (and their allies) follow the reading proposed by Landsberger-Bauer (loc. cit. p. 87) and restore [u-ma-kiš]-tar(l). They draw attention to l. 44, Sin-kar-iskun šar (maš)atšar but the inclusion of the personal name is usual in the Chronicle only when the initial or final reference is made to a ruler as in l. 44; cf. B.M. 21946, r. 6 (p. 70). The restoration of this line is very uncertain. The phrase šar akkadi(KT) umman(ME)-šu irdamma is elsewhere followed only by the direction or objective of the expedition (cf. ll. 1, 16, 32; B.M. 21946, 2, r. 5). The name of the place where the Babylonians joined the Medes would be expected here. See discussion on pp. 15 ff. For a possible early reference to the umman-manda see quotation in Sidney Smith, The Statue of Idrimi, p. 58.

1. 41. [. . .]ittadu?] (MES). Restoration suggested by Lewy, op. cit. p. 84, but only the final MES is legible (so FN, p. 34, Pl. IV).
1. 42. 3 US [.....]. This could be taken as an estimate of the distance advanced by the besiegers. The sign US (now cleaned) is clear; cf. FN, p. 34 (also pp. 18, 29), 3 to-ša?-zu?

1. 44. This line must have recorded the death of Sin-šar-isšu in either battle or by self-immolation (FN, p. 18-19 for classical references).

1. 45. šili-at šili u ekurri kabbitu(tu). Cf. l. 64. kabbitu(tu) is preferable to mina (Lewy, op. cit. p. 84) or ešš mina 'beyond counting' (FN, p. 34, n. 5; ANET, p. 304).

1. 46. e[mug?]. The sign is broken and partly illegible. It does not look like G[IR(II) ... 0?-na?-si?q?], so Lewy, op. cit. p. 84.

1. 48. u galutu. The reading is clear but the interpretation very doubtful. Possibly for qallutu? (FN, p. 35, n. 1).

1. 49. (m.d)aš-šar-uballit. The name, as restored by Gadd (FN, p. 35, n. 2), must have occurred in this line.


1. 52. (mā)ta-[zau]-zu? u (mā)ta-[zau]-zu, FN, p. 35, n. 3; Lewy, op. cit. p. 75. Hazazu was captured by Shalmaneser III (Bronze Gates of Balawat, Band III, low. reg. and by Tiglath-pileser III (III. R. 10, No. 3, 20). It is identified with ‘Azāz near Killiz (Forrer, Provinz., p. 56).

1. 55. (mā)ta-[u- ..... ]-a. Cf. Lewy, op. cit. p. 85 who reads [u- up-a-a]. Šuppa, near Harran (Broken obelisk of Adad-nirari II, B.M. 11898, iii, 20). The traces before the final -a do not, however, support this reading.

1. 56. (āl)rugguliti. Located near Til-Barsip (Tall Āḫmar) by R. C. Thompson (PSBA, 1912, pp. 66 ff.).

1. 60. (mā)m śi-[sir id ana rištına]mu]. Restoration suggested by Lewy, op. cit. pp. 85, 76.


1. 65. The number of the year has been omitted by the scribe (FN, p. 36, n. 1).

1. 66. id-du-[u- ... ]i-du?-ku? The text is too broken for any certain restoration (see Pl. XII). Suggested readings include (i) id-du-um?-ma? (FN, p. 36); (ii) id-du-[d]-ma (Lewy, op. cit. p. 85); (iii) id-du-[uk]-nušu-šu-ti! (Landsberger-Bauer, loc. cit. p. 88). For iduku, cf. B.M. 22047, 18.

1. 69. [. . .](mā)ti[zalla]. The hill district of Izalla lay east-north-east of Harran. This accords with the subsequent mention of the Urartian border (l. 72, cf. B.M. 22047, 3, below); for full discussion of location see J. Lewy, Orientalia, 21 (1952), pp. 2-12; cf. Forrer, Provinz., pp. 22-27.

1. 67. ilima. So B.M. 22047, 3.

1. 71. The space is probably insufficient to restore ana(āl)[bit-(m)hanunia] (cf. B.M. 22047, 2) as a city which is located across the Urartian border.

1. 75. The restoration of the catch-line by comparison with B.M. 22047, 1 is rendered certain by the correspondence of the month name (Elul) part of which remains in this line.

1. 77. It is doubtful whether this line was inscribed (see Pl. XII).

B.M. 22047

1. 1. This corresponds with B.M. 21901, 76 except that the initial ina is omitted to conform with the general Babylonian Chronicle style whereby each paragraph is introduced directly by the year number. Also the name of the king is inserted since this line introduces a new tablet.

1. 2. irtedi[Uš]-ma. Cf. B.M. 21901, 23, 26, 34. Bit-(m)Hanunia. The exact location across the south Urartian border, probably north-east of Izalla, is unknown. The personal name element also occurs in a place
name near Nippur—Bu-(m)Hanana’ (BE, X, 127, 4). It is most improbable that the place-name would reflect any dealing with Hanunu of Egypt by Tiglath-pileser III (cf. *Iraq*, XIII, p. 29) although prisoners taken from Syria and Palestine were sometimes settled on the Urartian frontier by the Assyrians (cf. 2 Kings, xvii. 6; 1 Chron. v. 26).

1. 6. māštu rabā with the sense of first-born or eldest surviving son. ṣa bit rēdūtu. That is, as next in the line of succession to the throne (Schmidtke, Asarhaddon, p. 92, n. 3; Landsberger, *Der Kultische Kalender*, p. 145; Thompson, Prisms of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, p. 9, ll. 8, 12, 21.

1. 7. (māt)za-[. . .]. The name is partly illegible but the place would seem to be in the hills north-north-west of Nineveh.


1. 9. ana (āl)[. . . . . . .] ā? Perhaps to be restored p[i]-h[a]-t[-̣] ā. There is insufficient space for [bīranat] ā. Cf. ll. 10-11.


1. 13. (āl)kimūlu must be located on the west bank of the Euphrates south of Carchemish (cf. ll. 16, 24). It may be the same as the city Kumūlu of the time of Ashurbanipal (e.g. K. 298, 41; K. 3199, Rom. 171, 41; K. 321, 37). Although Kumūlu is equated by some scholars with the more northerly city of Kummu (Commagene), there is positive evidence for its separate identity. Ašurnaṣirpal II differentiates (māt)kumūluša from (māt)kumūl (Annals, iii. 96; cf. i. 74; ii. 87; Forrer, *Provinz.*, p. 17; Lewy, loc. cit. p. 11). K. 4384 (II R. 53, 1), which lists Assyrian provincial cities in general areas rather than in any strict geographical order, places (āl)ku-mu-[hu] between (āl)gar-gamī and (āl)ku-un-nu-[hu], and thus recognises them as distinct towns. The military implications of this Chronicle show that Kimūlu, whether equated with the earlier Kumūlu or not, must be south of Carchemish, for the weak Babylonian forces would scarcely have marched past the Egyptian garrison there into a hill-area at least sympathetic to the Umman-manda. The location of a garrison in the city to counter that of Carchemish, and harass its supply routes through Syria, implies a site north of the Balīḫu but south of Carchemish. There are a number of possible sites guarding river crossings, e.g. (i) Qala‘at Najīm (west bank), (ii) Qara Membij, (iii) Khirbet es-Soudeh (Arinara). Srēšat (Gaecliana) probably lies too near to Carchemish itself (see R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie*, II, pp. 451 ff. and map XIII; Woolley, *Carchemish*, II, p. 37, Fig. 5). Any of these locations would agree with (āl)ku-un-me, mentioned by Adad-nirari II and in the Boghazkői texts and which lay not far from Tuttul (J. Friedrich, *Orientalia*, IX, p. 206, n. 2).

1. 20. (āl) quramāti. This town is otherwise unknown. It lay on the left bank of the Euphrates (cf. ll. 21, 23, 24) and south of Kimūlu, on the location of which depends any identification of this site, since Quramāti was occupied as a substitute when the former town had been lost to the Egyptians. It may have been a place not easily defensible (l. 26) and for this reason villages on the opposite bank were captured to serve as a bridgehead from which the route between Hamath and Carchemish could be attacked. On the map (p. 22) Quramāti has been tentatively located at Qala‘at Ja‘bar (later Dausara). Another favourable defence line would lie between the Jabal al Bishri (Bisrun) and the Halabi-Chalabi defile (the hinqi of the Euphrates). For the many possible old sites in both these areas see A. Musil, *The Middle Euphrates*, pp. 197-213 and for sites farther north see C. L. Woolley, *Carchemish*, II, p. 37, Fig. 5.
1. 21. (āl)šunadīrī (āl)elammu (āl)dahammu. These sites are unknown and their location depends on the position of Quramati. They must have been on the west of the Euphrates between Raqqa and Qara Membij. The map (p. 22) suggests that they may have been captured to form a defensive locality between the Euphrates and the Jabbūl salt lake. The forms of these three names (and Quramati) may be Hurrian and fit the geographical nomenclature of the upper Euphrates. (For geographical names of this district in O. Bab. period see ARM, XV, pp. 120-138; III, p. 112. An (āl)e-lu-mu is mentioned in a tablet found at Carchemish (R. C. Thompson in Carchemish II, p. 136, l. 19).

1. 24. (āl)galgameš. For the more common gargamis. Cf. B.M. 21946, 2; W. von Soden, Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, § 96, i; the form of the name thus resembles the writing of Gilgamesh as Ga-l-ga-mi-šu (Ungnad, ZA, I (N.F.), p. 135).


II. 27-28 are a catchline repeated as the first line of B.M. 21946 which is thus restored.

B.M. 21946

II. 1 and 2 duplicate, and in part are restored by B.M. 22047, 27-28 (see note in loc.). For similar catch- lines see B.M. 21901, 76; 22047, 1.

1. 2. pani Erim ME-šu īshatma means ‘to take the van of his troops’ i.e. to take the lead or to command in person (so r. 6; B.M. 21901, 56). It implies the personal presence of Nebuchadrezzar with his army. Cf. meḫrit ummanatāt īshatma (Ashurbanipal, Annals, ix, 89); pān qurtāq āšat (Tiglath-pileser III, Annals, ii, 75).

(āl)galgameš. For this form of the place-name Carchemish, see above, l. 24. The ruins of Carchemish are at Jerablus, on the right bank of the Euphrates, sixty-three miles north-east of Aleppo and fourteen miles due south of Birejik. For arguments for this, and for the details of excavations undertaken there by the British Museum in 1911-20, see especially D. G. Hogarth, Carchemish, I. Details of the occupation of the city in Neo-Babylonian times are given by C. L. Woolley, Carchemish, II, pp. 125-129.

1. 3. [ana muḫḫī umman (māt)mis]ýr. This is only one of several possible restorations and assumes that Necho II was not with his army at the battle (cf. p. 24). If Necho was present restore šar for umman. There would seem to be insufficient space for šulatu šd šar (cf. B.M. 22047, 16-17, 16).

1. 4. [. . . . . . . . a]hames ūmāšuma. The traces are difficult to interpret but are perhaps closest to [ina taḥaṣ šēri irtī a]hames (cf. r. 7). The only complete sign remaining does not appear to be KI (itti) and is, in any case, separated from the following aḫames by a single sign.

1. 5. adī la bašē[. . Ḥ]AR. The phrase adī lā bašē (implying a gradual reduction to non-existence) is usually governed by an active verb denoting a method of destruction (e.g. ušalikšu, Sennacherib, Annals, ii, 18; ušalpi, V R 6, 63; ušărib, Ashurbanipal Sm. 133, 35), which must be covered here by . . [Ḥ]AR? For the total annihilation of an enemy, cf. ARM, IV, 33.


1. 6. iššētu. Cf. B.M. 21901, 46, i.e. ‘to move quickly over (the ground, etc.)’; šahētu implies a more hasty movement than sakābru (see p. 79).

(māt)ho-ма-[u]. For this spelling of Hamath see Nabonidus, i. 9 (BHT, p. 111).

1. 7. edu amyētu . . . ul ezib. The same expression as B.M. 21901, 57.
1. 9. The length of reign is worded according to the usual manner in the Babylonian Chronicle (B.M. 92502), i. 12, 15, 22, 39; ii. 4, 29, 34, 43; iii. 8, 24, 31-32; iv. 12, 32.

1. 10. The date given for the death of Nabopolassar (8. v. 21st year) may be compared with the latest known dated contracts from his reign, e.g. 1. v. 21st year (at Babylon) published by E. W. Moore, *Neo-Babylonian Documents in the University of Michigan Collection*, No. 35. An unpublished tablet (Oriental Institute, Chicago, A. 5302) bears the same date (Parker and Dubberstein, *op. cit.* p. 9). Compare also the first attested dates for the reign of Nebuchadrezzar given in the following note.

1. 11. Nebuchadrezzar’s accession date—the first of Elul—compares with the dated contracts:

(i) Sippar, 18. vi. access. (B.M. 49524); 5. vii. access. (B.M. 92472; AH. 83-1-18, 32 in Strassmaier, *Nabuchodonosor*, No. 2). The dates given by Strassmaier in *ZA*, IV, pp. 145 ff. (AH, 82-9-18, 519 = B.M. 92742) and in his *Nabuchodonosor*, No. 1 (B.M. 75321), where he reads *ITU.SU*, are wrong for in each case *ITU.DU₆* is written clearly. This error has resulted in the latter text being wrongly assigned to Nebuchadrezzar III (*AJSL*, LVIII, pp. 317 ff.).

1. 14. *ina (araḫ)nisanni*. It appears that Nisan could not be included in the first year of the reign because Nebuchadrezzar was not formally king until the festival made him so. The *akitu*-festival at Babylon was celebrated at this time during the first twelve days of Nisan (Nabonidus Chronicle (B.M. 35382), ii. 5-6, 10-11, 19-20, 23; *BHT*, pp. 111 ff.).

*qatā (II) . . . šabādu*. This idiom is used in the general sense of ‘to conduct or lead’. For the meanings (i) to ‘seize the hand of a person, to help or assist’; (ii) ‘to seize the hand of a person while asking for his help’; (iii) ‘to seize the hand of someone or something unable to move; to conduct, convey’; see A. L. Oppenheim, *JAOS*, LXI (1941), p. 270. In relation to deities the idiom is used in the general sense of to conduct or lead (in procession) even where no special ceremony is involved as at the New Year Festival (AO 7439, r. 9; V R 64, ii. 18-21). There is therefore no support for the view that this phrase of itself implies that the king was invested with royal authority by this act (A. Pallis, *The Babylonian Akitu-festival*, p. 179; A. L. Oppenheim *ANET*, p. 315, n. 3).

(d)Bel u mar (d)Bel. So B.M. 27859, r. 9 (L. W. King, *Chronicles of Early Babylonian Kings*, II, p. 153); Sargon, *Annals*, ii. 309-311; cf. ‘Prunkinschrift’, 41. At different times during the Neo-Babylonian festival the king took the hand of Marduk and Nabû who figure prominently in the ceremonies of the fifth to the twelfth days of Nisan.

*isinnu akitu epus*. So Ashurbanipal (K. 2674 r. 18; CT. XXV. 12) and Nabonidus, Chronicle iii, 8 (*BHT*, p. 113).


1. 22. *sapāti*. See note on B.M. 21901, 36 (p. 81).

r. 1. 2. *Nabû-isna-la-šir*. The brother of Nebuchadrezzar is mentioned in B.M. 7810, iii. 6 (S. Langdon, *Neubab.*, p. 62; *ZA*, IV, 106) and the duplicates B.M. 91090, iii. 6; *BE*, I, 84, iii, 16.
CHRONICLES OF CHALDAEAN KINGS

r. 1. 6. sar (mdt)misir. Royal personal names of established dynasties are omitted in these chronicles unless they are required for clarity when relative chronology is involved, e.g. B.M. 21901, 38 (note, p. 81).

r. 1. 9. ultu (mdt)hattu, i.e. from an established base there (see p. 31).

r. 1. 10. madbaru describes the territory where seasonal grazing is possible on the borders of the desert proper. It is a loan-word, cf. Heb. midhbdr (Sidney Smith, Isaiah, Chapters XL-LV, p. 138). Cf. Sennacherib (using Babylonian form) . . . šarru (amēl)arabi ina kirib madbari (VA 3310 r. 22 = VS, l. 77).

bultšunu. bultu includes camels, donkeys, sheep and goats (Ashurbanipal, Annals, ix. 5). Cf. Jeremiah, xlix, 28-33.

ilānītšunu. For the significance of the removal of these protecting deities, see pp. 31-32 and Streck, Assurbanipal, CCCXL, 3. Esarhaddon restored to Hazael six gods captured by Sennacherib from the Arab city of Adumutu (R. C. Thompson, The Prisons of Esarhaddon and of Ashurbanipal, iv. 3, p. 20).

r. 1. 12. (dl)iahudu. The city of Judah, i.e. Jerusalem. The name of the land of Judah is written in a similar way ia-a-hu-du in the Neo-Babylonian texts VAT I6283, ii. 39; 28232, 20-21 (E. F. Weidner, Melanges syriens offerts d M. Rene Dussaud, II, pp. 925-6). Texts from the same group, also dated in the reign of Nebuchadrezzar II, give the alternative writings ia-4-du (common in the Assyrian Royal Annals) and ia-ku-du.

r. 1. 13. šarru ša libbišu. Cf. 2 Kings, xxiv. 17.

ina libbi ipteqid implies that the city was not destroyed. Cf. B.M. 25127, 3 (p. 78).

r. 1. 17. (mēte)lamti(ki)]. The restoration here, and in l. 20, is very uncertain.

B.M. 25124

l. 1. MU.III-K[ĀM]. i.e. 557/6 b.C. The events of the preceding two years may well have been the subject of a whole tablet since this text shows that the historical chronicle of Neriglissar goes into detail.

(m)oppusašu. This name is found in a number of texts referring to the S. Anatolia—N. Syria area from at least the fifteenth to third centuries B.C., e.g. Ha-ap-pu-va-aš-šu (Keilshrifturkunden aus Boghazköl, XXXIV, 45, 8, 10) discussed by B. Landsberger in Journal of Cuneiform Studies (JCS), 8, p. 123, n. 277; J. Lewy, Orientalia, 21, p. 403, n. 3; cf. also a possible Old Babylonian feminine form of the same name in A-ba-šu-la (JCS, 9, p. 3). The name Afguš occurs in Caria in the fourth century B.C. (H. Röhl, Inscriptiones Graecae antiquissimae praeter Atticas in Attica repertas (Berlin, 1882)), No. 500; Enwašu. (Cilicia, c. 400 B.C. in Xenophon, Anabasis, I, ii, 12); Arqoas (Pisidia, c. 210 B.C.; J. Sundwall, Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier, p. 52).

(mēt)pirindu. The context shows that this is to be located between Ḫume (E. Cilicia, —see note, l. 4, below) and the Lydian border. That is, its eastern border lay about the Lamus which was formerly the western boundary of Kizzuwatna (A. Goetze, Kizzawatna, TOS, XXII, 58) and its western border was contiguous with the eastern border of Pamphylia between Coracesium and Sellinus. The latter was also the western boundary of Cilicia proper according to the Periplus of Ps. Scylax (quoted in A. Erzen, Kilikien bis zum Ende der Perserherrschaft, pp. 76 f.; cf. G. A. Wainwright, Anatolian Studies, IV, p. 42). Pirindu will therefore approximately correspond with the later Cilicia Tracheia/Aspera. The form of name fits in with this location (Perinthos? cf. Laranda, Buranda); it cannot possibly be the Samian colony of Perinthos west of Byzantium on the coast of the Propontis.
founded c. 600 B.C. (W. F. Albright, BASOR, 120, p. 25), but no local Perinthos seems to exist.

\[\text{māt} \text{pri-in-du} \]
is given as the place of origin of some prisoners held at Babylon in the thirteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar II (592/1 B.C.) according to an unpublished tablet Babylon 28178 = VAT 16283, rev. ii. 2-3. I am indebted to Professor E. F. Weidner for this reference; see also his statement in Mélanges syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud, II (1939), p. 935. Prisoners from \(\text{māt} \text{hume} \) are listed in the same group of texts. \((\text{dl}) \text{pri-in-du} \) occurs between \(\text{(dl)} \text{hu-me-e} \) and \(\text{(al)} \text{lu-ú-du} \) in another Neo-Babylonian text (B.M. 45690; to be published later). See also notes on ll. 4, 25 below.

1. 2. *um-ma-ni-[u?] must be interpreted as ‘men’ rather than ‘army’ which is always written ideographically (i.e. ERIM. (ME)) in these chronicles. Cf. Bab. Chron. i. 36 where it seems to refer to the ‘gang’ which joined Marduk-apal-iddina against Elam.

\[\text{idkamma} \]
For this form cf. B.M. 21901, 17; I. R. 69, ii, 42.

\[\text{habatum u ša[. . .]} \]
could be restored šalašu or šagašu (‘murder’).

\[\text{madutu} \]
is restored by comparison with B.M. 21946, r. 10. There is insufficient room for the fuller form as given in l. 10.

1. 3. *ebir nārī . . . .* The absence of the determinative \(\text{māt} \) and the context (e.g. l. 4) make it unlikely that Appuasu planned to penetrate as far as Syria west of the Euphrates (cf. B.M. 22047, 22). The frontier between Cilicia and northern Ḥattu (\(\text{māt} \text{ebir nārī} \)) was Posidéon (Herodotus, iii. 91) which lay as far off as the Orontes (Sidney Smith, Antiquaries Journal, XXII, 97, cf. Erzen, op. cit. p. 73). There is space for only two or three signs after nārī which would seem to cover the object of šakanu rather than the name of the river (Lamos or Cydnus?) which Appuasu would have to cross to enter Babylonian territory.

1. 4. \((\text{dl}) \text{hume}. \) The territory of Ḥume was the E. Cilician plain—the Assyrian Que (W. F. Albright, BASOR, 120, p. 23). Is \((\text{dl}) \text{hume} \) Tarsus on the river Cydnus a crossing likely to have been guarded as it had been during the campaigns of Shalmaneser III (832 B.C.) and Sennacherib (696 B.C.)? See also Erzen, op. cit. p. 73. Excavations have shown that Tarsus was occupied in late Assyrian times (JAOS, 59 (1939), p. 9).

\[\text{hu-me-e} \]
is mentioned (without any determinative) in the Nabonidus Chronicle (B.M. 35382), i. 7.

5. \(\text{aššumušu}. \) ‘Because of him’ or perhaps lamitu. lam is only used of time, i.e. ‘before him (his arrival)’.

6. \(\text{kallū} \)
were officials responsible either to the king (V R, 55-51) or to local officials (K. 79) for security on rivers or frontiers (\(\text{kallū nārī kallū tabali} \)) and were used for special duties such as escort to prisoners or aliens (G. Dossin, Symbolae . . . P. Koschaker dedicatae, p. 117). They frequently appear as fast messengers (B. Meissner, MAOG, XIII, pp. 22 ff; Iraq, XVI, p. 47 (ND 2347)) ina lišbi (amēl) kal-li-i aršiš ana mūḫḫaša šāliša (RCAA, p. 500, No. 434, r. 16) would be better translated ‘. . . with (in) a (security) escort . . . .’ (cf. Meissner, loc. cit.). In this chronicle the kallū are mounted and used to supplement the army defence forces. It would seem that the kallū is an armed policeman or security official who would naturally be used for any of the above escort, messenger or army reserve functions.

11. \textit{XV bēru}. That is c. 160 kms. (100 miles) if the reckoning of F. Thureau-Dangin (\(\text{t bēru} = 10692 \) kms. in early period—AfO, XVI, p. 20, n. 138) is followed. This would be about the distance from Ḥume (Adana, see note above) to Ura’ (see below) by winding mountain track.
1. (āl)ura' is probably to be identified with the ruins of Olba, the native name of which was Ourba or Ourwa (W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, pp. 23, 364; J. G. C. Anderson, *Classical Map of Asia Minor*—marked as Ura). This situation 25 km. north of Seleucia accords with the description by Strabo (XIV, 650). As early as the fourteenth century B.C. Ura' was an important caravan centre and, as such, is mentioned in the tablets from Ras Shamra and Boghazkoi (J. Nougayrol, *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions*, 1954, p. 242, n. 2) and is referred to in the 'Aṣṭhana texts (D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets*, Nos. 142, 13; 154, 10). The city (if Ḥarrua is the same) was later captured and restored by Sargon II.


1. 15. (āl)kirsu. This former capital of Pirindu lay 6 bērē (c. 65 kms.; see note l. 11 above) from Ura'. Appuasu would naturally flee farther into the mountains and away from the general direction of the enemy approach. The distance marched from Ura' to Kiršu, being greater than that from Ura' to the coast, would support this. The most likely location is to be sought at the site of the later Claudipolis (Mut) or Coropissus, once linked with Olba by a Roman road which itself probably followed the line of an ancient track (see most recently *Anatolian Studies*, IV, p. 45).

Hesychius as quoted by C. A. Lobeck, *Pathologiae sermonis graeci prologomena*, p. 314, knew of a place-name *kopara* in Cilicia (also quoted by Pape-Benseler, *Das Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, III, 700). The form of the place-name—'cherry'—in this district of fruit trees can be compared with Elaioussa and Pityussa (see following note). Xenophon (*Anabasis*, i. 4) mentions a river named *kēρpōs* or *kāρpōs* by the 'Cilician Gates'.

1. 20. (āl)pitusu. Probably to be identified with the island Pityussa (*Πετυόωσα*); mod., Karguçık Adası (Erzen, *op. cit.* 11). J. Anderson gives the modern name of the same island as Manavat (*Classical Map of Asia Minor*).


(dā)scallunē. *Scylax Caryandensis Periplus* (in C. Müller, *Geogr. Graec. minores*, 1855, I, 76) discusses the Cilician coastline and infers that Coracesium was the easternmost city of Pamphylia and Selinus (mod. Selindi) the most westerly coastal city of Cilicia (see also Erzen, *op. cit.* p. 76; J. C. G. Anderson, *Classical Map of Asia Minor*). The capture of Pitusu island would be a logical step if Neriglissar wished to control the coastal route between Tarsus and the Lydian border (see note below).

1. 25. *adi muḫḫi miṣir (āl)ltdu*. At this time the eastern boundary of Lydia probably ran from the Halys River west from the Cilician gates along the Bulgar dağ, which also formed the natural northern boundary of Ḥume, and thence across the mountains along roughly the same line as the modern vilayet boundary to the coast west of Sallunē, thus incorporating the state later known as Pamphylia. An advance by Neriglissar to Sallunē and just beyond to the border or north-west from Kiršu could both be interpreted by the chronicler as 'as far as the Lydian border', but it seems more likely that, without claiming the city of Sallunē itself, Neriglissar devastated the country from the narrow coastal track leading west towards the city right up to the Lydian border.
APPENDIX

SOME CHRONOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the brief survey of the contents of those Neo-Babylonian Chronicles published for the first time on pages 5-42 it has not been possible always to give the detailed evidence for some of the chronological statements made. A few of these more important instances are therefore discussed below.

The Death of Kandalanu

The statements in the Chronicle (B.M. 25127, 14) that for one year there was no king in the land. On the twenty-eighth day of Marcheswan Nabopolassar sat on the throne in Babylon and that Sin-šar-iškun, the king of Assyria, openly opposed the Babylonians before Nabopolassar's accession (l. 3) raise the question of the date of the death of Kandalanu. It is generally assumed that Kandalanu was appointed to rule Babylon immediately after its capture by Ashurbanipal and the death of Šamaš-šum-ukin in 648 B.C.¹ The latest dated contract testifying to Kandalanu's rule at Babylon has been one dated on the sixth day of the second month of his twenty-first year.² Two further contracts dated at Babylon, however, add the note 'after (the death of) Kandalanu' to the usual year formula. Thus B.M. 36514 is dated to 'the [x]th day of Marcheswan (eighth month) of the twenty-first year after Kandalanu' and B.M. 40039 on 'the second day of Marcheswan of the twenty-second year after Kandalanu'.³ Copies of these two tablets, of which the immediate importance is the date, are given on Plates XVIII-XXI. This evidence now limits the possible date of Kandalanu’s death to between the sixth day of the

¹ JNES, III, p. 39 (i.e. 19/20th July 648 B.C.).
² A. Goetze, JNES, III, p. 44 (YBC 11428).
second month (TBC 11428) and the eighth month of his twenty-first year of reign (B.M. 36514 above), i.e. between May and November 627 B.C. The Chronicle shows that the Babylonians thereafter acknowledged no king for one year ending with Nabopolassar's accession on 22/23rd November 626 B.C.\(^1\) According to the Chronicle of the Years this interregnum was styled 'after Kandalanu in the accession year of Nabopolassar'.\(^2\) B.M. 40039 now shows that in order to mark the Babylonian year between Nisan 626 B.C. and the accession of Nabopolassar the artificial 'twenty-second year after Kandalanu' was used. The Greek Astronomical Canon\(^3\) in giving twenty-two years for the reign of Kandalanu omits the distinction between his actual reign of twenty-one years and the posthumous period.

The Accession Year of Sin-šar-īškun

The accession date of Sin-šar-īškun of Assyria is not known and has been the subject of much discussion.\(^4\) There can be no doubt that he was a successor and son of Ashurbanipal and must have followed Aššur-eṭi-ilānī since he died at Nineveh when that city fell in 612 B.C.\(^5\) The new Chronicle which gives details of the accession year and early reign of Nabopolassar (see pp. 7 f.) gives some additional evidence which may eventually help to solve this difficult and important problem. It shows that by early October 626 B.C. Sin-šar-īškun had lost control of Babylon where, according to the same Chronicle, no king had been recognised for one year, i.e. 627-626 B.C.\(^6\) A contract dated at Babylon in the accession year of Sin-šar-īškun shows that he was recognised as king there on the twenty-first of the twelfth month of that year, i.e. Feb.-March in a year which must have been 627 B.C. or earlier.

The contracts dated at Sippar give another line of evidence which may be followed. The Chronicle B.M. 25127 shows that Nabopolassar ruled at Sippar in the second month of his first year (Iyyar began 23rd April 625 B.C.), while B.M. 49656 makes it most likely that Sippar acknowledged his rule, even before Babylon did so, in Elul of his accession year (month beginning 31st August 626 B.C.).\(^8\) He was certainly acknowledged king there in the days after his accession. There is no indication in the Chronicles or contract

---

\(^1\) See p. 13.  
\(^2\) B.M. 86379, 4 (BHT, p. 24).  
\(^3\) H. Usener and T. Mommsen, Chronica Minora (1898), III, pp. 447, 459.  
\(^4\) For the latest discussions see JNES, III (1944), pp. 41-42; AfO, XVI (1953), pp. 305-310.  
\(^5\) See p. 17.  
\(^6\) See p. 7.  
\(^7\) YBC 11378 (A. Goetze, JNES, III, p. 44).  
\(^8\) B.M. 49656 dated 22. vi. access. Nabopolassar (pp. 93 f. Pl. XXI).
datings 1 that Sippar ever afterwards lapsed from the control of the Babylonian kings. In the light of this it is significant that the latest dated contract tablet of Sin-šar-îškun is the twenty-fifth day of the third month of his second year. 2 The latest possible date for this would therefore be 28-29th June 626 B.C. which would require an accession date for Sin-šar-îškun in 629 B.C.

The evidence from Erech is less helpful since there are fewer dated texts available from that city for the years in question. The Chronicle (B.M. 25127, 9) shows that Erech was successfully held by Nabopolassar against the Assyrians in the month of Tisri 626 B.C. and remained under his control from then on at least until his third year (623/2 B.C.). Contract dates agree with this 3 though one shows that the city had been under Sin-šar-îškun in the eleventh month of his accession year. 4 At least for a time in the seventh year of Sin-šar-îškun besieged Erech dated contracts by the Assyrian king 5 although in that year, if the same as the fifth year of Nabopolassar (621 B.C.), the city, again while under siege, dated a contract by the Babylonian ruler. 6 This can but indicate that c. 622-620 B.C., when there is unfortunately no Chronicle information available, the struggle for this city still continued, and there is at present insufficient evidence to show when Erech finally owed a steady allegiance to the increasingly powerful dynasty ruling at Babylon. By 616 B.C. when the Babylonians began more aggressive expeditions into Assyria it can be assumed that Erech was part of a united Akkad.

All the above evidence would favour an accession date for Sin-šar-îškun of 629/8 B.C. 7 A study of the contract dates from Nippur, however, raises other problems, quite apart from the possibility of error that is present with any study based on such datings drawn from sources which must always be regarded as incomplete. Nippur long continued to owe allegiance direct to the Assyrian king by reason of its status as a garrison city and the first

---

1 E.g. a survey of more than five thousand tablets from Abu Ḥabbah shows that there are numerous contracts dated in the first eight years of the reign of Nabopolassar.
2 B.M. 92718 (B. T. A. Evetts, *Inscriptions of Reigns of Evil-Merodach etc. Appendix No. 1*, pp. 90-91). Other texts of his early reign from Sippar are dated: 1.II. 2nd yr. (*VAS*, VI. 6); B.M. 57149. 11.II. 1st yr. (*AfO*, XVI, p. 308); 8.VII. access. (*AfO*, XVI, p. 307); B.M. 49188. 22.VII. access. (ibid.).
contract dated there by any Neo-Babylonian ruler is in the eleventh (?) year of Nabopolassar.¹

The following table shows the contract evidence from Nippur at present available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year B.C.</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Day Month Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Sept. 633</td>
<td>Ashurbanipal</td>
<td>17 vi. 36</td>
<td>JNES, III, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 x. 37</td>
<td>Ao, XVI, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June 631</td>
<td>Assur-entiful-ilami</td>
<td>20 iii. 38</td>
<td>N. 4016²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 vi. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 vi. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 iv. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627 (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 vi. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626 (?)</td>
<td>Sin-sar-iskun</td>
<td>9 ix. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625 (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 vii. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618 (?)</td>
<td>Nabopolassar</td>
<td>11(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, assuming that all the years are covered by these texts this would require an accession year of 626 B.C. for Sin-sar-iskun which would contravene the evidence from Sippar and Babylon given above. There is the possibility either of posthumous dating,⁴ or even of a double dating, so that we must await further evidence for a final solution to be reached. In the light of this divergence an accession date of 629 B.C. has been assumed for Sin-sar-iskun in the foregoing pages.⁵

One text interpreted by Contenau as dated to the twenty-first year of the reign of Sin-sar-iskun⁶ has been rightly omitted in most discussions of his rule but on the wrong grounds. Poebel,⁷ followed by Dubberstein,⁸ Cross and Freeman,⁹ has assumed that the year 21 has been misread for 'year 3 of

¹ A. T. Clay, BE, VIII/I, 9.
² This Nippur tablet is unpublished. I am indebted to Professor A. J. Sachs for the information.
³ I.e. O. Krückmann, Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungs texte (1933).
⁴ As with Kandalanu see p. 89 above. Cf. Iraq, XVI, pp. 205 f.
⁵ See pp. 5 ff. The short reign of Sin-sum-ilšir (see p. 11) wherever placed will not affect the above discussion materially.
⁶ TCL, XII, No. 16.
⁷ JNES, II, p. 90, n. 35.
⁸ JNES, III, p. 42, n. 31.
⁹ JNES, XII, p. 56, n. 3.
Sin-šar-iskun’. Professor Nougayrol kindly informs me that the ‘year 21 is absolutely certain’ but that the signs now remaining at the beginning of l. 25, are somewhat more spaced out.¹ A study of the text shows that ll. 25-26 must be an additional entry of the same form as earlier in the text, XXX (m)A ina ṭan ( m)B (cf. ll. 2, 6). The figure (38?) or object is now unfortunately lost. It is very unlikely that the name of Sin-šar-iskun is to be read. Moreover, the name bears no determinative or post-fixed royal title.

A comparison of the texts in which the two officials Ninurta-šarru-ūṣur qipu (šá) é-an-na and Nabu-nadin-šumi(?), the šatammu é-an-na occur shows them both to have been active between the 15th year of Nabopolassar and the 17th (26th?) year of Nebuchadrezzar.² The above explanation of this text would therefore make it probable that ‘year 21’ refers to Nabopolassar. Since that king had died on 8.V.21 and Nebuchadrezzar did not ascend the throne at Babylon until 1.VI of the same year,³ probably on the very day that this text was written, this may be a reason for the omission of the king’s name, since the news of Nebuchadrezzar’s accession would not yet have reached Uruk.

The Date of Nabopolassar’s Accession

The Chronicle (B.M. 25127, ll. 14-15) expressly states that Nabopolassar sat on the throne of Babylon on the 26th of Marcheswan and thus ended a year in which ‘there was no king in the land’ (see p. 7). Yet an economic memorandum, B.M. 49656, which is part of the temple records of Sippar (Abu Habbah) as clearly calls Nabopolassar King of Babylonia on the twenty-second of the month of Elul of his accession year, that is, more than two months earlier. Unless a scribal error is assumed it would seem, therefore, that Nabopolassar was acknowledged king at least at Sippar which had become independent of Assyria before the final battle at Babylon. This break from the Assyrian yoke may be implied in the Chronicle (ll. 1-2) and the recognition of Nabopolassar may have been precipitated by the necessity for Sippar to take sides in the final phase of the struggle for Babylon which commenced with the fall of Šāznaku (l. 5).

The text of B.M. 49656 (A.H. 82-3-23, 647) is copied on Plate XXI and transliterated below for its obvious importance because of the question it thus raises.

¹ In a letter dated 10.iii.54. See also AfO, XVI, p. 308.
² M. San Nicolò, Beiträge zu einer Prosopographie neubab. Beamten . . ., pp. 15 ff., 25, and especially n. 28a, 44.
³ Bab. Chron., B.M. 21946, 10-11.
Obv. (1) 50 ma-ši-hu ina libbi(ŠA) ù-ši-tim (2) ša ina muh-hi (m)Šarra-a-ni 1 (3) (amēl) si-ši-ri 2 ša amēl rab mu-um-gu 3 (4) (m)At-kal-(d)Nabā 4 it-ta-din (5) (araḫ)ululu āmu 22-KAM (6) MU.SAG.NAM.LUGAL.LA (7) (m.d)Nabu-apal-usur LUGAL TIN.TIR.(KI).

50 measures, part of a debt(-document) owed by Šarrani, the accountant of the rab mungu, Atkal-Nabu has paid. 22nd of month Elul, accession year of Nabopolassar king of Babylon.

Nebuchadrezzar’s Campaigns in 568/7 B.C.

In the absence of Chronicle texts to follow B.M. 21946 the only indication of Nebuchadrezzar’s later campaigns against Egypt is the text B.M. 33041 (and possibly fragment B.M. 33053), 5 which refers to a Babylonian march in the thirty-seventh year of his reign to do battle against [Ama]sis, king of Egypt, who had raised his army. The city of Putu-Iaman is clearly mentioned in what is otherwise a broken passage.

The text was first made known in 1878 and published in Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, Vol. VII (1882), pp. 210-225, by T. G. Pinches who showed that it referred to an expedition in 568/7 B.C. to suppress Aḥmes or Amasis, the general set on the Egyptian throne by Nebuchadrezzar after his defeat of Apries in 572 B.C., who later revolted. The text is not a part of the Babylonian Chronicle series but seems to be rather historical allusions in a religious text. In 1889 J. N. Strassmaier copied the same texts with the addition of the small fragment B.M. 33053, the exact relation of which to the main text is unknown (Babylonische Texte—Inschriften von Nabuchodonosor, No. 329). His copy, less reliable than that by Pinches who only gave a rendering in cuneiform type, was followed by H. Winckler in his transliteration and translation in Altorientalische Forschungen, I, 511-515. For further Bibliography see Schrader Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, III, 2, 5, 141 (early works) and, for more

1 LUGAL-a-ni. Neither this name nor Atkal-Nabā are otherwise known from this period and therefore afford no check on the date. For the form (abbreviated for (d)x-šarrani), cf. Strassmaier, Nabonidus, 151, 8; 152, 8; TBC, 3807, 18; Dougherty, IOS, VI, 73.

2 (amēl) sipi. See San Nicolò and Ungnad I, 503, n. 8; Glossar, 139. There is no evidence (contra Dougherty, JAOS, 48, 110-130 and Eilers, OLŻ, XXXIV, 931-933) that sipi denotes a writer on leather or parchment (Driver, Semitic Writing, 16, n. 7).

3 rab mungu. Cf. rab mu-um-gu, VAT, 2703, 3 (VS, V, 117).

4 Atkal-(d)Nabā. Probably an abbreviated form for Atkal-ana-(d)Nabā, cf. Atkal-ana-(d)Bēl; Atkal-ana-(d)Marduk (Strassmaier, Cyrus, 64, 2; 315, 2); Atkal-ana-(d)Bau (Strassmaier, Darius, 309, 25); Atkal-ana-mar-Esagil (CT, XXII, 74, 23). See also Stamm, Die akkadische Namengebung, p. 311.

5 B.M. 78-10-15, 22 and (frag.) 38.
recent transliterations and translations, Langdon in *Die neubabylonischen Königslistsätze*, No. 48; Sidney Smith in *Cambridge Ancient History*, III, p. 304; and A. L. Oppenheim in *ANET*, p. 308. In view of this a new copy only of the tablets B.M. 33041 and 33053 is given on Plates XX-XXI.

*The Mobilisation of the Babylonian Army*

The new chronicles well illustrate the intense military activity undertaken by the Neo-Babylonian kings. In the record of twenty-three years (616-594 B.C.) the Babylonian army (*ERIM. ME(š)*) was called out (*dekū*) twenty-one times in seventeen years. Twice within this period there were two distinct campaigns in a single year each based on Babylon, and for at least one year (607/6 B.C.) the army operated for a time in two formations under the king and the crown-prince respectively. Throughout these busy years when Babylonia first struggled for her freedom and then fought to gain and hold all the former Assyrian provinces between the eastern mountains and Egypt only three years were free of any major expedition. Even in these three years the king himself went to Carchemish and presumably required a substantial bodyguard, and a defensive show of military strength was made on the eastern (Elamite?) border. It is significant that one period of eighteen months was occupied in extensive re-armament following the defeat by Egypt in 601 B.C. The only other interruption in the annual military expeditions, some of which involved lengthy siege operations, was caused by internal strife which may have been occasioned by an army revolt.\(^1\)

The chronicler, whose main purpose is to record the major military successes of the regime, is careful to state the actual month in which the army is summoned for foreign service. These times vary between the months of Iyyar and Tisri (spring to autumn) and reveal no obvious campaigning season, the timing of operations being usually dictated by military necessity. Thus we find the army absent on each year’s march for a minimum of four and usually for more than five months. The troops were away in the distant hill-countries of Armenia or Judah during the months of heavy rain or winter cold. The army was absent from the homeland for at least eighteen months during the year in which the battles of Carchemish and Hamath were fought (605 B.C.), and there are indications that it may not have returned before the campaigns of the following year commenced, being, perhaps, retained in Syria for garrison

\(^1\) See p. 37.
It therefore appears that the Neo-Babylonian army was no haphazard collection of unwilling conscripts or a levée whose absence at seed-time or harvest impaired the national or local economy. During these victorious years the incentive of booty and loot must have aided recruitment and there is no evidence of any large scale impressment. Many of the campaigns were not arduous and consisted of little more than an unopposed military display to ensure the payment of dues by peoples previously subjugated.

The term *dekšu* as used in the Chronicle would therefore seem to imply the calling out of a standing and already trained and equipped force for service outside Babylonia. The summons could apply to the whole army or to those parts designated as 'the army of the king of Akkad' or 'the army of Nebuchadrezzar the Crown-Prince'. The Chronicle does not usually specify the strength or composition of the forces involved as is the case in the Assyrian Annals.

Special steps were taken if it was necessary to supplement the regular and seasoned troops. For example, Nebuchadrezzar spent a year and a half, following his defeat by Egypt, in collecting and reinforcing his army for a further series of campaigns. The term for this reorganisation (*kašaru*) implies that various elements were brought together into a compact and ordered array, and the word is used in this sense both in relation to building materials used in construction work and of army formations in close contact with the enemy. Thus when Nebuchadrezzar 'collected' (*iktasar*) horses and chariots in great number to re-equip his defeated army he no doubt had to acquire the horses and train them and to build the chariots and provide them with trained crews. All these diverse functions together with the correspondence needed to ensure that the provincial administrators had made adequate local arrangements to receive and provision a large force would take a long time and probably required some form of conscription.

1 B.M. 22047, 6-7 (p. 20).

2 E.g. *ummanīšu madutu idkamma* (Nabonidus Chronicle, ii, 42). Cf. Sargon, II (Cyl. l. 56) *ummanīšu ma'adi ana la manī idkā*; Shalmaneser III (Obelisk, l. 91), *mātī adki*; cf. *narkabātī adki*.

3 E.g. Tigrath-pilesrer III, Annals, v, 84.

4 E.g. Tigrath-pilesrer III, Annals, v, 84.

5 fahdzu *iksaru* (Ashurbanipal: Sm. 122, 42).
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NOTE

The photographs of the Chronicle tablets (Plates I-VI) are all to the scale 1:1. The measurements of the tablets being:

- B.M. 25127 — $2\frac{1}{8} \times 2\frac{3}{8}$ ins.;
- B.M. 21901 — $5\frac{3}{8} \times 2\frac{13}{16}$ ins.;
- B.M. 22047 — $2\frac{1}{8} \times 1\frac{13}{16}$ ins.;
- B.M. 21946 — $3\frac{1}{4} \times 2\frac{7}{16}$ ins.;
- B.M. 25124 — $1\frac{13}{16} \times 2\frac{5}{16}$ ins.
Chronicle of the early reign of Nabopolassar (B.M. 25127)
PLATE II

Chronicle of the years 616-609 B.C. (B.M. 21901—obverse and edges)
Plate III

Chronicle recording the Fall of Nineveh (B.M. 21901—reverse and edges)
Chronicle of the years 608-605 B.C. (B.M. 22047)
Chronicle recording the Battle of Carchemish in 605 B.C. and the Capture of Jerusalem in 597 B.C. (B.M. 21946)
B.M. 25127 cont.
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B.M. 21901

Plate IX
PLATE XI

B.M. 21901 cont.
B.M. 21901 cont.
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PLATE XIII
B.M. 22047

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obv</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower edge</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.M. 40039 cont.