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Introduction

This paper aims first to provide a concise overview of the political interactions between Kassite Babylonia and the other Great Powers of the Amarna Age, i.e. Egypt, Ḫatti, Mittani and Assyria, a subject which could naturally fill a sizable monograph, or rather, a series of monographs. In an attempt to justify yet another general introduction to the era,1 this paper will also discuss two items to which some minor novel contribution can be made. The first consists of several chronological considerations made necessary by new evidence and new studies. The second is a new interpretation of a passage in one of Mursili’s prayers concerning the behaviour of the Hittite Queen Mother, who was the daughter of a king of Babylon.

Interactions between Kassite Babylonia and Assyria, Egypt, Mittani and Ḫatti

Defining the Age

In its stricter sense the term Amarna Age refers to the period covered by the Amarna Letters (Moran 1992), i.e. from the latter years of the reign of Amenhotep III (1391–1353) until the end of that of Akhenaton (1353–1336),2 the pharaoh otherwise so famous for his nearly exclusive dedication to the Sun God. In a broader sense it is often used to refer to the epigraphically well-illuminated period of the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1550–1200) that evinces intense international relations, for the most part peaceful but also belligerent, among the empires of the day. The present paper concentrates on the narrower time frame, primarily for reasons of brevity, but seeks to situate this narrower period within the 14th century in particular and the Late Bronze Age in general, thus requiring a quick glance backward or forward as the case may be.

The most eloquent and revealing testimony to the Amarna Age is of course the Amarna Letters, those 350 missives discovered in 1887 in Akhenaton’s abandoned capital, Akhetaten (Tell el-Amarna), along with a handful of cuneiform literary and scholarly texts, letters that define and lend the name of their find spot to the age. Of these, 44 comprise international correspondence with Kassite Babylonia (14 letters), Mittani (14), Alašiya (8), Ḫatti (4), Assyria (2) and Arzawa (2). The remaining 306 letters belong to Egypt’s correspondence with its Levantine vassals.

The language in which this Great Powers correspondence was carried out was almost exclusively Akkadian, the lingua franca of the day, written with the Babylonian cuneiform script on clay tablets. The only exceptions are EA 24 from Mittani, written in Hurrian and thus a godsend for Hur-

1 Other recent portrayals that have appeared since Liverani’s (1990) fundamentally important work can be found in Kuhrt (1995, 332–348); Grüsemann et al. (1995); Cohen and Westbrook (2000); Giorgieri (2006); Van De Mieroop (2007b, 129–148, 172–179); Mynárová (2007); Liverani (2008); Evans (2008); Podany (2010, 191–304); Devecchi (2011).

2 Some scholars assume that a few letters from Amarna were written to Akhenaton’s immediate successor(s); cf. Moran (1992, xxxiv–xxxv); Miller (2007, 265–267 and n. 63).
ritology, and EA 31 and 32, an exchange in Hittite between Egypt and Arzawa, which was otherwise isolated from the international stage by its location in western Asia Minor. The Arzawan scribe even asks his Egyptian colleague to always respond in Hittite (EA 32, 24–25), presumably since he had little opportunity to learn the *lingua franca*, Akkadian.

It is these epistles that inform us in such a detailed and often amusing way about the ca. 30 years they cover. And it is these letters that so radically skew our view of international relations in the Ancient Near East in general. No comparable Late Bronze Age epistolary archive has been excavated, though letters from Ḫattusa and Ugarit and a handful of other sites (Mynářová 2007, 67–91) contribute significantly to filling in some gaps, especially in the century following the decades covered by the Amarna Letters. The correspondence was not only between the rulers of the Great Powers of the age, but also with those of smaller kingdoms and city-states. For example, a letter from the king of Karkemiš, Ini-Teššub, addressed to the Kassite king Šagarakti-Šuriaš was, curiously, found at Ugarit (Singer 1999, 652; 2008, 235; Durand/Marti 2005, 128 and n. 32).

A recently discovered tablet fragment seemingly dating to the late Old Babylonian Period or perhaps slightly thereafter and two seal impressions from Tell ed-Dab'a (van Koppen/Radner 2009; Schneider 2010, 401; Warburton 2011, 14–20) and an apparently (late) 13th-century tablet fragment from Qantir/Pi-Rameses (Pusch/Jakob 2003), however, among other clues, should remind us that the Amarna Archive represents more of an exceptional find than an exceptional situation, as recognized long ago, e.g., by Brinkman (1972, 274–275). Though international contacts surely ebbed and flowed, the Amarna Age was presumably not the only era during which relations among the Great Powers were studiously cultivated (Liverani 2000, 15; Podany 2010; cf. Cohen/Westbrook 2000, 10–12), though the breadth and intensity of the Amarna Age contacts certainly represent a crest.

Among the many other documents revealing the nature of the age (Giorgieri 2006, 274–278; Pruzsinszky 2009), a disproportionally large number of treaties from the Late Bronze Age (Altman 2010), mostly from the Hittite capital Ḫattusa (Wilhelm 2011–2013), inform us above all about the relationships between the Great Powers and their vassals or between two (at least nominally) independent states, but also, in one instance, a treaty between Ḫatti and Egypt, about how relationships between the Great Powers were officially defined. An Egyptian version in hieroglyphics from the temple in Karnak and from the Ramesseum – in fact a translation of the version formulated by the Hittites – as well as an Akkadian version from the cuneiform archives of Ḫattusa – probably based on a version formulated by the Egyptians – are preserved (Edel 1997; Koch 2008, 19–105). From a reference in KBo. 1.10+, a (draft or copy of a) letter from Ḫattusili III of Ḫatti to Kadašman-Enlil II of Babylonia, it is clear that Ḫatti and Babylonia had also ratified a treaty during the reigns of Ḫattusili III and Kadašman-Turgu,3 both parties undoubtedly hoping to keep Assyrian expansion in check, Ḫattusili surely keen to firm up his questionable legitimacy, but no manuscript of such a document has been discovered thus far.

---

The earlier part of the Amarna Age witnesses four Great Powers in the Ancient Near East, Egypt, Mittani, Ḫatti and Kassite Babylonia, probably in approximately this order of clout (Fig. 3.01 left). The rulers of these lands bore the title Great King (Sum. Lugal gal; Akk. šarru rabû). They called each other “brother” in their correspondence and often did not refrain from lofty hyperbole in emphasizing the deep-rooted bonds that they claimed to have felt, whether manufactured or real.

Among the first attested contacts of the Amarna Age between these powers can be counted Thutmose III’s listing of gifts, designated “tribute” for the domestic audience, from Assyria, Babylon, Ḫatti, Asy and Tanaya (see n. 6) in his annals relating his first campaign in his 24th year around the middle of the 15th century (Van De Mieroop 2007a, 21–27; Giorgieri 2006, 293), whereby Mittani is conspicuously absent. The records of his eighth campaign in his 33rd year document “tribute” from Babylon and Ḫatti. Which Babylonian kings these may have been cannot be determined for certain at present, as the Kassite royal genealogy and chronology in the middle of the 15th century are sketchy at best; Kara-indaš seems likely to have occupied the throne of Babylon by the end of the reign of Thutmose III. As was so often the case in the ensuing part of the Late Bronze Age, Babylonia presented lapis lazuli among its gifts.

It was likely Thutmose’s successor, Amenhotep II, with whom Kara-indaš, according to a letter of Burna-Buriaš II to Akhenaton nearly a century later (EA 10: 8–10), initiated regular correspondence between these two Great Powers: “From the time of Kara-indaš, when the messengers of your ancestors came regularly to my ancestors, up to the present, they (the ancestors) have been friends.” And in fact an inscription of Amenhotep II records receiving delegations from Babylon, Ḫatti and Mittani. Just as Babylon sought alliances with Ḫatti and Egypt in the following century in order to limit Assyrian expansion, it may have hoped for an alliance with Egypt at this juncture in the last quarter of the 15th century in order to contain Mittani, which had extended its reach all the way to Nineveh, Aššur and Arrapḫe, leaving no effective buffer between it and Babylonia (Giorgieri 2006, 293). Despite this constellation Kara-indaš seems to have concluded a treaty of some sort with the Assyrian king Aššur-bēl-nišēšu according to the Synchronistic History, but little more than the mention of it is known.
After the fall of Mittani

The geopolitical scenery changed dramatically with Suppiluliuma I’s destruction, probably in the 1340s and 1330s, of the Mittanian Empire, which was at the time wracked by internal turmoil (Fig. 3.01 right). This situation was promptly exploited by Assyria, which not only reasserted its independence, but within the reigns of Aššur-uballiṭ’s successors in the decades that followed ingested most of the remains of Mittani, which Assyria referred to as Ḫanigalbat and which had, in part, become a protectorate of Ḫatti east of the Euphrates (e.g., Van De Mieroop 2007a, 30–36). According to Kühne (1999, 218–219; cf. Liverani 2001b, 308–310), Babylonia was attempting to get its share of the leftovers as well, as it seems to have made an effort to win the area of Arrapḫe from the defunct Mittanian empire.

The king of Assyria at the time of Suppiluliuma I’s campaigns, Aššur-uballiṭ I, was eager to let his augmented status be known and openly sought the prestige that admission to the Great Powers Club would bring, as his letters to the pharaoh, probably Akhenaton, demonstrate (EA 15–16). In what must have been his first letter, as it lacks the standard introductory formula of other Amarna letters, Aššur-uballiṭ writes bluntly, “I send my messenger to you to visit you and to visit your country. Until now, my predecessors have not written; today I write to you” (EA 15: 7–11; Moran 1992, 38). The pharaoh’s response, though not preserved, must have been generally accepting, even if not overly enthusiastic, and the Assyrian king’s other extant letter, which does employ the traditional Great Powers Club terminology, including “my brother”, betrays his mixed feelings towards the pharaoh’s lackadaisical reaction (EA 16: 6–31; Moran 1992, 39):

When I saw your [me]ss[en]gers, I was very happy. Certainly your messengers shall reside with me as objects of gre[at soli]citute. (In ll. 13–18 are listed presents intended for the pharaoh.) Is such a present (i.e. that which you sent me) that of a Great King? Gold in your country is (as common) as dirt, (and) one simply gathers it up. Why are you so sparing of it? … When Aššur-nādin-āḫē, my ancestor, wrote to Egypt, 20 talents of gold were sent to him. [Wh]en the king of Ḫanigalbat [wrote to your father in Egypt], [h]e sent 20 talents of gold to him. [Now] I am the (equal) of the king of Ḫanigalbat, but you sent me […] gold, and it is not (even) enough [for the pay of my messengers on the journey to (Egypt) and back.

The Babylonian reaction to Assyria’s initiation of ties with Egypt and the pharaoh’s acquiescence was indignant. Burna-Buriaš II bluntly rebuked Akhenaton: “Now, it was not I who sent the Assyrians, my own subjects, to you. Why have they come on their own authority to your country? If you love me, they should not make any business whatsoever. Drive them away empty handed!” (EA 9: 31–35).

Though the sources are meagre and for the most part do not come from Babylon itself, it is clear that Babylonia was neither uninterested nor uninvolved in the fate of Mittani. As related in the Hit-tite-Mittanian treaty styled as Šattiwaza’s agreement to submit to Suppiluliuma I (Beckman 1996, 45), the Mittanian king relates that a certain Aki-Teššub, who is otherwise unknown, had fled the tyrannical and incompetent rule of Šuttarna III, apparently with the Mittanian prince, Šattiwaza, a son of Tušratta, in tow, and had sought refuge in Babylon. The king of Babylon, however, took the 200 chariots and all the other possessions that Aki-Teššub had brought with him and relegated him to the position of charioteer in his army. According to Šattiwaza, this unnamed Babylonian king, which most chronological schemes would see as Kadašman-Enlil I or perhaps Burna-Buriaš II, even sought to kill him and Aki-Teššub, forcing Šattiwaza to flee to Ḫatti, where Suppiluliuma I magnanimously took him under his wing. While it may be assumed that Šattiwaza’s version of

---

4 For reading Ḫani-rabbat instead of the traditional Ḫanigalbat, see Valèrio (2011).

5 This statement obviously conflicts jarringly with that cited above from EA 15: 7–11. It also suggests that Assyria was allowed to maintain contacts with other lands even though it was a Mittanian vassal (Giorgieri 2006, 297–298), though neither can it be excluded that the contacts were made during a brief spell of independence.
events was tendentious to some degree, it would certainly suggest that Babylonia sought to involve itself in the tumultuous and violent throne succession in Mittani, apparently refusing to support the opponents of Šuttarna III, i.e. the Mittanian king who had the backing of Assyria, presumably ruled by Aššur-uballiṭ I at this point in time. If this indicates anything at all about the relations between Babylonia and Assyria, it might suggest either that they were on friendly terms, which Babylonia did not want to jeopardize, or that Babylonia bowed to pressure from a rather menacing Assyria that it felt it needed to contain. The latter supposition might be supported by the fact that at some point following the death of Burna-Buriaš II, perhaps when Assyria invaded Babylon to intervene in the succession to the Babylonian throne (see below), the Assyrian king Aššur-uballiṭ took the title šar kiššati, “king of the universe”, a traditional Mesopotamian royal title that had not been used by an Assyrian king since the time of Šamšī-Adad I (Giorgieri 2006, 303).

The disappearance of Mittani led to what is often thought of as the classical Amarna Age, with Egypt, Babylonia and Ḫatti forming the core of the Great Powers, followed by Assyria, which was also eventually considered a member of the family, even if it did take quite some time for Ḫatti, especially, to warm to the idea, as a facetious Hittite letter to Adad-nērārī I illustrates: “On what account should I write to you about brotherhood? Were you and I born from one mother?” (KUB 23, 102 i, 13–15; Beckman 1996, 138, no. 24A; Giorgieri 2011, 180).

The rulers of Aḫḫiyawa (likely Mycenae; Beckman et al. 2011, 1–6; Kelder 2010) and Alašiya (Cyprus) are also afforded the status of brother on occasion, but it is clear that they were not in fact on a par with the true Great Powers.6 Though Elam is never referred to explicitly as a member of the club, it surely would have had as much or more of a claim than did these two western entities. Several dynastic marriages between Elam and Babylon are attested in a Neo-Babylonian letter of uncertain historical veracity (Potts 2006, 114–115; Roaf in this volume), and the lack of further evidence that might point in the direction of Elam belonging to the club might be simply a problem of available sources, as intimated by Michael Roaf (see this volume). Cohen and Westbrook (2000, 1–2) refer to such entities as “independent states”, which were beholden to no Great Power, usually due to a peripheral location, but could make no claim to empire.

Much gold and beautiful women

During the Amarna Age Egypt was perennially regarded, and behaved, as the most illustrious and prestigious of the bunch, even during times of relative weakness. Its pharaohs did not trade their daughters on the international marriage market, nor did the foreign princesses that they married become queens in Egypt, but rather members of the harem, while the other kings shamelessly begged them for gold, acknowledging, or imagining, that their most sought-after prize was as common as dirt in Egypt. The Nile kings were perfectly aware of this imbalance and even chided their “brothers” for giving away their daughters for the trinkets of their neighbours (EA 1, 61–62, from Amenhotep III to Kadašman-Enlil I). The teasing did little to quench their thirst for gold or to cause them to assess their motives, though; to the contrary, their unabated desire for gold and the prestige that it carried with it was openly expressed, as exemplified in the Mittanian king Tušratta’s letter to Amenhotep III (EA 20: 71–74):

May my brother send me much gold that has not been worked, and may my brother treat me even better than he did my father. May (the Mittanian Storm God) Teššub und (the Egyptian Sun God) Amun grant that my brother show his love for me, that my brother greatly glorify me before my country and before my foreign guests.

---

6 For the possibility that Asy and Tanaya might be the designations for Cyprus and Mycenae in an inscription of Thutmose III, in which these two countries are mentioned alongside Assyria, Babylon and Ḫatti, see recently Van De Mieroop (2007a, 21–27) and Giorgieri (2006, 293).
The pharaohs seemed to be most pleased with the lapis lazuli they received in return from Babylon and with their famed equids, so important for chariotry, the high-tech weapon of the day. By the time of Ramesses II’s reign, however, Egypt did not seem to be otherwise impressed with Babylon’s stature, if Puduḫepa’s quote of Ramesses saying that “the king of Babylonia is not a Great King” (KUB 21, 38 obv. 55’–56’; Edel 1994a, 220–221) is to be understood literally. Egypt’s unique status must not be confused with hegemony, however; none of the Great Powers was, for the most part, in a position to exercise any prolonged control over any of the others, and serious conflicts such as the Battle of Qadeš generally ended in a stalemate – with the exception of the disintegration and subjugation of Mittani.

Trade relations, above all in metals and precious stones and minerals (Liverani 2008, 163), geologically very unequally distributed in the Ancient Near East, naturally played an important role among this quartet, and they are well illustrated in the Amarna Letters and, for example, among the wares of the shipwreck of Uluburun (Yağıcın et al. 2005). Copper, a principal ingredient in the production of bronze, came mostly from Cyprus and was traded and transported as large oxhide ingots, hundreds of which were found in the Uluburun wreck and also known from excavations at Babylon. One Cypriote consignment of copper to Egypt amounted to 100 talents, about three tons (EA 34: 18). Gold was the ultimate treasure for Egypt’s partners, which only Egypt could supply in great quantity during the period. And the Egyptians were actually less stingy than Aššur-ubal-liṭ’s complaining (see above) would suggest. Neither do the protests of Burna-Buriaš II convince when he feigns disbelief that his loving brother, Akhenaton, could have sent him such a paltry shipment of gold, writing that surely only a servant could have sealed and sent such a miserly gift, which when melted down yielded only a quarter of the weight it was purported to be (EA 7: 71–72; 10: 19–20). Complaining about the gifts that one received was in fact the norm and played a role in the complex patterns of gift exchange witnessed in the Amarna Letters, processes which have been thoroughly studied (Podany 2010, 243–264; Liverani 1990, 205–282). In fact, so much gold was imported from Egypt (up to 600 kg in the lists in the Amarna Letters; Sommerfeld 1995b, 920a) that Babylon switched from the silver to the gold standard at the time of Burna-Buriaš II and remained on it for ca. 100 years (Brinkman 1972, 274. 276), demonstrating that this gift exchange simultaneously constituted diplomatic gesture and cold, hard trade. Babylon in return exported textiles, manufactured goods and lapis lazuli, which it would have imported from Afghanistan, as well as horses and chariotry (Sommerfeld 1995b, 920. 926). Skills were also a prized commodity, traded in the form of craftsmen, healers, augurs and ritual practitioners, who often stayed for many years or even decades in the service of their foreign masters, though their prompt return was often promised, even if rarely expected or realized. Even deities were sent from one country to another, as seen in EA 23, Tušratta’s letter to Amenhotep III, in which the journey to Egypt of the primary goddess of the Hurrian pantheon, Šaušga (i.e. her statue), is a central theme.

Seemingly the only trade item more sought after than gold was royal daughters. Indeed much of the riches traded among the powers took the form of a dowry. Dynastic marriage was a key element in the relations that bound the Great Powers together, as well as one of the chief areas of grievance and conflict, and the topic also provides the context of some of the wittiest passages of the Amarna Letters. That Egypt did not auction off its royal daughters did not always prevent other great kings from trying to obtain one, or failing that, to gain the prestige associated with such a coup, even if it would have to be accomplished by a ruse. In a letter from a Babylonian

---

7 That it would have been the/a king of Assyria who wrote to Ḫattusili III saying “Du bist (nur) der Ersatz eines Großkönigs” (Edel 1994a, 24–25; followed, e.g., by Jakob 2006, 15 and n. 3) is pure fantasy, as the identity of the speaker is fully restored by Edel in this letter from Ramesses II to Ḫattusili III. One could just as well restore, among other things, “Sollte jemand Dir sagen, ‘Du bist (nur) der Ersatz eines Großkönigs’, ….”.

8 See Pulak (2008) and the various contributions in Yağıcın et al. (2005). Of course, archaeological finds and iconographic evidence constitute entire arenas of evidence that cannot be further discussed here; see in general the other contributions to this volume and, among many others, Aruz et al. (2008) and Leick (2007).
king, perhaps Kadašman-Enlil I, he seems to accept the pharaoh’s refusal of a princess, but continues, “[Someone’s] grown daughters, beautiful women, must be available. Send me a beautiful woman as if she were [your daughter]. Who is going to say ‘She is no daughter of the king!’?” (EA 4: 4–13; Moran 1992, 9). Artatama of Mittani gave a daughter to Thutmose IV, after the latter begged the Mittanian king for her up to seven times, at least according to Artatama’s grandson, Tušratta (EA 29: 16–21). Tušratta of Mittani mentions that his father, Šuttarna II, had married off a daughter, thus Tušratta’s sister, Giluḫepa by name, to Amenhotep III, while Tušratta himself sent a daughter, Taduḫepa, to marry the same pharaoh, whom he thereafter took pleasure in referring to as his son-in-law. Kurigalzu I of Babylon married a daughter to Amenhotep III, which did not prevent this pharaoh from demanding a daughter of his successor, Kadašman-Enlil I, whom he eventually received, despite the Kassite king’s taking great umbrage at the treatment of his sister at the Egyptian court. Burna-Buriaš II married Muballiṭat-Šērū’a, daughter of the Assyrian king Aššur-uballiṭ I, one of the most fateful international unions of the age, as Aššur-uballiṭ felt obliged to invade Babylon when the product of that marriage, Kara-KIN-daš, was murdered shortly after his enthronement. The same Burna-Buriaš sent a daughter to Egypt to marry Akhenaton, despite what he felt was an unworthy delegation sent to escort her. Suppiluliuma I of Ḫatti married a Babylonian princess, probably a daughter – or perhaps a sister – of Burna-Buriaš II (see below, sub “The eternal rivals Babylon and Assyria”); and Ramesses II later married at least two Hittite princesses.

As many as four Elamite kings are also attested in a Neo-Babylonian text as having married Babylonian princesses (Potts 2006, 114–115; Roaf in this volume). That this trade in royal daughters was done for the purposes of power and prestige is no postmodern interpretation: Puduḫepa, wife of Ḫattusili III and Queen of Ḫatti, wrote to Ramesses II, boasting,

The daughter of Babylonia and [the daughter] of Amurru whom I, the Queen, took for myself – were they not indeed a source of praise for me before the people of Ḫatti? … And if at some time his (the royal father’s) messengers come in splendor to the daughter-in-law, or one of her brothers or sisters comes to her, is this not also a source of praise for me? Was there no woman available to me in Ḫatti? Did I not do this out of consideration for renown?

(KUB 21, 38 obv. 47′–52′; Beckman 1996, 128)

Perhaps the most momentous dynastic marriage of them all, however, was foiled just before its consummation, when Suppiluliuma I’s son Zannanza died before he was able to reach Egypt and marry the widow of a pharaoh, Nibḫururiya, who had died leaving his queen without an heir. Mystery surrounds this episode. The identification of the deceased pharaoh is disputed (Akhenena-
ton, Tutankhamun or Smenkhkare), as is the identity of the queen who had written to Suppiluliuma asking him for a son to be her husband, not to mention the culprit in the murder of Zannanza, if indeed he was murdered, as the Hittites claimed, an accusation denied by the Egyptians.

The friendly Hittite-Babylonian relationship during what must have been the latter half or latter third of Ḫattusili III’s reign as attested by this dynastic marriage would seem to represent a renewal of their rapport. Babylon appears to have taken quite seriously its brotherly affinity with Ḫattusili’s predecessors and to have offered steady if not very aggressive support for Urḫi-Teššub, the “rightful” king whom Ḫattusili deposed to gain the throne for himself. Ḫattusili in his Apology (Otten 1981; van den Hout 1997) explicitly recognizes that Urḫi-Teššub’s cooperation with Babylon could work to his own detriment, and this is the reason he gives for banning Urḫi-Teššub to where he does, apparently north-western Syria. In KBo. 1.10+, Ḫattusili’s letter to Kadašman-Enlil II, he speaks of hostile Babylonian behaviour during the earlier part of his addressee’s reign while he was still a minor under the tutelage of Itti-Marduk-balāṭu, but also of the gratifying support he claims that his father, Kadašman-Turgu, had lent Ḫattusili in what must have been the early days of his reign after his coup d’état against Urḫi-Teššub. Ḫattusili writes, namely, that Kadašman-Turgu had turned away messengers from Egypt (i.e. cut diplomatic ties) upon hearing that the pharaoh had provided refuge to the dethroned Urḫi-Teššub.

One of many further aspects that one could mention in such a whirlwind overview of the age is the fad of erecting new capitals (Van De Mieroop 2007a, 71–74; Sommerfeld 1995b, 919b). Amenhotep IV changed his name to Akhenaton and founded a new capital, Akhetaten, more commonly known by its modern name Tell el-Amarna, in the 1340s. Muwattalli II of Ḫatti left Ḫattusa in central Anatolia for Tarḫuntassa on the southern coast probably in the 1290s or 1280s. In the 1220s Tukultī-Ninurta I constructed a new capital city that bore his name only a few km from Aššur, Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta. Even the Elamite King Untaš-Napiriša played along, founding his new capital, Āl-Untaš-Napiriša, perhaps in the last quarter of the 14th century. It seems to have been the Kassite king Kurigalzu I, however, who was the first of the Great Powers to construct a new capital and to name it after himself, Dūr-Kurigalzu, which was founded perhaps in the 1380s or 1370s. To what degree the building activities of the other Great Powers were inspired by Dūr-Kurigalzu is difficult to assess, but it seems not unlikely to have been one aspect of the striving for prestige so well attested in the Amarna Age.

The eternal rivals Babylon and Assyria

Naturally, the most important relationship for Babylonia, in addition to that with Elam, was that with Assyria, as this state was its only direct neighbour among the Great Powers following the collapse of Mittani and was thus the entity with which it had by far the most in common, as well as the most conflicts; but it is the dynamic of this relationship about which we are in many respects the most poorly informed, due both to a lack of documentation and to the tendentiousness of that which is available, as much of what is extant portrays the Assyrian viewpoint. The fluctuating interactions between these two powers as they rose and fell and rose again were the subject of intense interest to the ancient Babylonians and Assyrians themselves, as revealed by their chronicles that detail them, known today by names such as the “Synchronistic History”, “Chronicle P”, the “Walker Chronicle 25” and the “Tukulti-Ninurta Epic” among others (Galter 2007; Glassner 2004). Toward the end of the 15th century the two powers seem to have been at peace, as a treaty is said to have been agreed by the Assyrian king Aššur-bēl-nišēšu and his Babylonian counterpart Kara-indaš, a peaceful contract that was confirmed by subsequent kings and cemented by marriage.

12 For a recent overview of Kassite relations with Elam and the Persian Gulf, see Potts (2006).
13 For a recent analysis of the documentation as it touches on trade, see Faist (2001, 207–212).
unions, such as that between Muballiṭat-Šērū’a, a daughter of Aššur-uballiṭ, and Burna-Buriaš II, as noted above. This quiet period came to a dramatic end, however, when the Babylonian elite rebelled against and killed its king, Kara-KIN-daš, who just happened to be the son of this same Babylonian-Assyrian union, placing a certain Nazi-Bugaš on the throne. Aššur-uballiṭ felt compelled to intervene and avenge his grandson, invaded Babylon, put down the revolt and installed on the throne Kurigalzu II, a younger son of Burna-Buriaš according to the Synchronistic History, a son of Kara-indaš according to Chronicle P.

Ironically it was this same Kurigalzu II who again took the field against Assyria, probably against Enlil-nērāri (Synchronistic History), perhaps against Adad-nērāri (Chronicle P), the Babylonians suffering a significant defeat (Synchronistic History) in the Battle of Sugaga, or perhaps winning after all (Chronicle P); the confusion among the primary sources illustrates how difficult it can be to attain a robust reconstruction of the historical and chronological situation. In the so-called Epic of Adad-nērāri I (Weidner 1963, 113–115; Wilcke 1977, 187–191) this Assyrian king admits that his father, Arik-dīn-ilī, had suffered a defeat at the hands of the Babylonians, though the name of its ruling sovereign, probably Kurigalzu II, is not mentioned. Thereafter relations between the two powers would seem to have improved, if Tukulti-Ninurta’s Epic (Machinist 1978; Chang 1981) can be believed on this point, as he refers to a peace treaty, itself a result of an armed conflict, ratified by Adad-nērāri I and Nazi-Maruttaš, which had determined the border between Babylon and Assyria and which had apparently held until his own day.

Assyrian-Babylonian animosity thereafter reached a climax in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, who went as far as conquering Babylon and depositing its Kassite king, Kaštiliašu IV, replacing him with Assyrian governors and/or puppet kings. Naturally, Assyrian sources blame Kaštiliašu for starting the conflict by seeking to regain territories that had long been recognized as Assyrian. The conquest and capture of Kaštiliašu seem to have been effected in at least two stages during the latter half of the second decade of Tukulti-Ninurta’s reign, though the exact dates are still disputed. The city of Babylon was at least partially sacked, and the god Marduk – at this point an important Babylonian deity but not yet the all-powerful chief of the pantheon as he was in the first millennium – was schlepped off to Aššur (at least according to Chronicle P), along with an untold number of Babylonian literary, scholarly, religious and technical compositions. The rule of the Assyrian king’s protégé, Enlil-nādin-šumi, did not last long, however, as Babylon was invaded first by Elam’s Kidin-Hutran II, who seems to have installed Kadašman-Ḫarbe II on the throne, only to see him toppled and replaced by the seemingly pro-Assyrian Adad-šuma-iddina, which may have been the impetus for Elam’s second incursion into Babylonia during this short period. Neither did Adad-šuma-iddina’s rule, which at least lasted more than a few months, extend over all of Babylon for very long, as a certain Adad-šuma-uṣur, possibly from the Šušu region along the Middle Euphrates if not an actual son of Kaštiliašu (Singer 2008), was soon able to establish a state within the state, ruling from the southern cities of Nippur and Ur, from where he eventually was able to capture Babylon as well, a feat that was naturally celebrated with the composition of an epic, now known as the Epic of Adad-šuma-uṣur (Grayson 1975b, 56–77). Some 15 years after the assassination of Tukulti-Ninurta during an Assyrian rebellion led by his own son, Aššur-nādin-apli, Adad-šuma-uṣur was even able to assist Ninurta-apil-Ekur in ousting Enlil-kudurrī-uṣur from the Assyrian throne in order to become king in Aššur himself.

---

14 While some (e.g., Jakob 2013) would like to see the capture of Kaštiliašu as part of the first stage, Bányai (2010, 10, n. 28) makes the relevant point that in Tukulti-Ninurta’s epic he himself admits to first having fled before the Babylonian king, only later succeeding in capturing him.

15 For recent discussion of the number of kings who reigned under the name of Kidin-Hutran see Paulus (2013a).
Chronological synchronisms between Babylon and Assyria, Egypt and Ḫatti\textsuperscript{16}

This paper will now turn to the issue of the chronology of the Amarna Age and its rich offering of synchronisms. In a recent paper presented at a conference in Prague (Devecchi/Miller 2011, 146–168), I attempted to reconcile two pieces of new evidence for the interrelated chronologies of the Ancient Near East in and following the Amarna Age, namely (1) the synchronism between the Hittite king Mursili II’s 9th year and the Egyptian pharaoh Haremhab, likely before the latter’s accession (Miller 2007),\textsuperscript{17} and (2) van Dijk’s (2008) reduction of the reign of Haremhab from ca. 27 to ca. 14 years.

The principal conclusions reached in that paper pertain to the long-cherished synchronisms by which the reigns of the four Kassite kings Burna-Buriaš II through Kadašman-Turgu, which together lasted at least 96 or 93 years according to a combination of years attested in administrative documents (Boese 2009) and years given in Babylonian King List A (Grayson 1980–1983, 90 ii 1–3),\textsuperscript{18} have been linked to Egyptian chronologies (Fig. 3.02). At the upper end (a) the accession of Burna-Buriaš II has long been anchored to the last ca. 7 years of the reign of Amenhotep III, while at the lower end (b) the accession of Kadašman-Enlil II at least some 96 or 93 years later was calculated to have occurred at about the 16th year of Ramesses II on the assumption that Haremhab ruled for 27 years. I argued in Prague, as others had long suspected (see references in Devecchi/Miller 2011, 163, n. 62), that while the earlier synchronism remains robust, the latter must be abandoned entirely. Since the synchronism connecting the last years of the reign of Amenhotep III to the change on the throne of Babylon thus becomes the firmest single link between the Egyptian and Babylonian chronologies, van Dijk’s shortening of Haremhab’s tenure requires that the reigns of his successors\textsuperscript{19} be pulled upwards in order to fill the gap. The accession of Kadašman-Enlil II, according to the calculations presented in Prague, would therefore fall in about the 32nd year of Ramesses II, some 15 years later than previously assumed.\textsuperscript{20} Also irretrievably lost\textsuperscript{21} would be the fundamentally important 200-year astronomically determined time span between the accessions

\textsuperscript{16} Rather than “the/a solution” or the “Miller Chronology”, these considerations constitute an attempt to ascertain if and how recent suggestions and new evidence might be compatible with known data. Some other factors, such as the Distanzangaben (see Pruzsinszky 2009, 133–150; Janssen 2009), for example, are ignored for present purposes, so that the charts (Figs. 3.03–04), for instance, should be viewed not as “a chronology” but as a tool for testing hypotheses. It may be noted that the chart in Fig. 3.03 would place the Battle of Megiddo in ca. 1458, that in Fig. 3.04 in 1463. As 1458 could easily be reconciled with the oft-quoted astronomical date of 1457, that in Fig. 3.03 once again proves superior to that in Fig. 3.04. Also of note is the result that the year 1219, which would be Chronicle P’s [8]6 years prior to <Ninurta>-Tukulti-Aššur for the removal of Marduk (Pruzsinszky 2009, 119–120), would fall two years before the end of the reign of Adad-šuma-iddina in Fig. 3.03 and three years after his reign in Fig. 3.04, i.e. in the Babylonian reign of Tukultī-Ninurta. Neither result yields a figure that would seem compatible with when one would expect Tukultī-Ninurta’s invasion and sacking of Babylon to have taken place.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. since then Groddek (2007); Stipich (2008); Simon (2009); Wilhelm (2009b); Devecchi/Miller (2011); Theis (2011); Wilhelm (2012).

\textsuperscript{18} In the Prague paper I used the oft cited 96+ years (Devecchi/Miller 2011, 160 and n. 54). Here this 96 is supplemented with a 93, i.e. the minimum number of years for the four kings Burna-Buriaš II through Kadašman-Turgu if one accepts Boese’s (2009; see below) reduction of the reigns of Kurigalzu II, Nazi-Maruttaš, Kadašman-Turgu and Kadašman-Enlil II by one year each.

\textsuperscript{19} Warburton (2011, 16) assumes that reduction of the reign of Haremhab implies that “all of the other reigns of Dyn. XVIII likewise require adjustment”. As I have tried to show (Devecchi/Miller 2011, 163), however, this solution is unlikely, and it is surely the successors, not the predecessors, of Haremhab that should be adjusted.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Fig. 3.02 vis-à-vis Figs. 3.03–04, below, in the latter of which the beginning of Kadašman-Enlil II’s reign falls in Ramesses’ year 26, some 10 years later than previously assumed.

\textsuperscript{21} Unless one were able to find the years cut from the reign of Haremhab in the reigns of the pharaohs from Akhenaton through Seti I; see Devecchi/Miller (2011, 160 and n. 52) and below, n. 29.
of Thutmose III and Ramesses II, 1479 to 1279 according to the currently favoured Egyptian low chronology (Krauss/Warburton 2009; Huber 2011).

Fig. 3.02: Babylonian vis-à-vis Egyptian chronology after Devecchi/Miller (2011, fig. 5).
Horizontal lines indicate synchronisms numbered according to the kingdoms they relate to (e.g., E-B 2 is the second synchronism between Egypt and Babylon). A circle at the end of the line indicates that the synchronism is imprecise and is dated within a particular reign but not to a particular year of that reign. An arrow at the end of the line indicates that the synchronism is precise and is dated to a particular year or a particular moment in a reign. The grey rectangle behind E-B 2 indicates the maximum range of this synchronism.

I would now like to expand on and update these results and to shift the focus onto Kassite Babylonia’s synchronisms with its neighbours. In doing so I will incorporate the results of further new research by (a) Boese (2009), who has suggested that one year be subtracted from Babylonian King List A’s figures for each of the reigns of the Kassite kings from Kurigalzu II to Kadašman-Enlil II, for a total of four years; (b) Schneider (2010), who has suggested that some 25 years of leeway should be assumed for the chronology of the Egyptian 22nd and 23rd Dynasties; and (c) Bloch (2010a; 2010b) and Jakob (2013),22 among others, who have sought to establish the order of the Assyrian eponyms from the latter half of the 13th century and thereby to determine in which year of his reign Tukulti-Ninurta I terminated the rule of Kaštiliašu IV of Babylon.23

22 I would like to express my gratitude to Stefan Jakob for kindly giving me a copy of his paper before its publication.
23 Further recent studies on Kassite chronology include Sassmannshausen (2004b; 2006), Bányai (2011), Janssen (2011) and the enormously useful compilation of the evidence and arguments by Pruzsinszky (2009). The fundamen-
My reassessment of the situation in light of these studies has led to the chronological charts in Figs. 3.03 and 04, which cover the Amarna Age as well as some 50 years before and nearly two centuries thereafter. The charts deck this entire period in order to incorporate as many known synchronisms as possible between Kassite Babylonia and the other Great Powers with which it maintained contact. The anchor for the entire chart is obviously provided by the Assyrian chronology, the most robust of the four, whereby the longer Assyrian chronology is employed for reasons I have detailed elsewhere.

Only clear direct synchronisms are included, thus excluding, e.g., that between Tukulti-Ninurta I and Šagarkiti-Suriḫ based on KBo. 28.61–64 (even if it is quite likely), since the former’s name is not preserved and the name Ilī-padā is not certainly an eponym (Pruzsinszky 2009, 42; Singer 2008).

Fig. 3.03 illustrates what seems to be the more likely scenario, in which Kaštiliašu IV was dethroned around Tukulti-Ninurta’s years 18(–21). Fig. 3.04 follows Jakob (2013) in placing the overthrow of Kaštiliašu IV in Tukulti-Ninurta I’s 13th year and, since this necessitates that the end of Adad-šuma-ūṣur’s reign be pushed down in order to maintain his synchronisms with Enlil-kudurri-ūṣur and Ninurta-apil-Ekur (see below), Yamada’s (2003) seven years for Tukulti-Ninurta I’s direct reign over Babylon are inserted (Jakob 2013 writes of “wenige Jahre”). The reigns of Kurigalzu II through Kadašman-Enlil II are reduced by one year each vis-à-vis the numbers in the Babylonian King List A following Boese (2009).

If Assyria prior to Tukulti-apil-Ešarra I (1114–1076) employed solely a lunar calendar, as assumed, e.g., by Gasche et al. (1998, 50. 63; cf. Pruzsinszky 2009, 106–108; Mebert 2010, 101) and argued most recently by Joshua Jeffers at the 60th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in Warsaw, 21–25 July, 2014, then three years per century would have to be subtracted from the Assyrian line and consequently from the entire chronological scheme.

For a Kara-KIN-daš (for -ḫardaš) following Burna-Buriaš II (B-A 4 see Fig. 3.03 inset) see Pruzsinszky (2009, 116–118), with references; cf. Sassmannshausen (2004b, 61 and n. 3), who would see in Kara-KIN-daš a mistake for Kadašman-Ḫarbe “II”.

For a Kadašman-Enlil “II” following Nazi-Maruttaš, see Boese (2009) and Sassmannshausen (2006, 166–167). The charts give Enlil-nādin-šumi and Kadašman-Ḫarbe II 1.5 years each following Babylonian King List A; see recent discussion in Singer (2008, n. 16); Sassmannshausen (2006, 167–168); Bloch (2010b, 72–74). The charts give more weight to the sources that assume a short reign for Kadašman-Ḫarbe II than to the 10+ years indicated by Bab 39045 (Pedersén 2005, 94. 98). (Perhaps the 10+ should be ascribed to Kadašman-Ḫarbe I rather than to Kadašman-Ḫarbe II? After all, texts dating to Kaštiliašu and Kadašman-Turgu are present among the otherwise late 13th/early 12th-century archive in which Bab 39045 was found, showing that it might reach back this far.)

Mursili’s 9th year is placed about a year before Haremhab’s accession (Miller 2007; Devecchi/Miller 2011, 146–157). E-B 2, the last of Kadašman-Enlil I’s synchronisms with Amenhotep III, is placed one year after Amenhotep III’s 30th year (and one year before the end of Kadašman-Enlil I’s reign): the 30th year is a likely date for this pharaoh’s “great festival” mentioned in EA 3 (II. 19–22).

E-H 1–3, the Egyptian-Hittite synchronisms, are dated with reference to the years of the reign of Ramesses II.

B-A 6: The Synchronistic History’s Enlil-nērārī is preferred to Chronicle P’s Adad-nērārī as the opponent of Kurigalzu II; see discussion above and refs. in Pruzsinszky (2009, 118–119).

B-A 9, the end of the reign of Kaštiliašu IV is placed at the 18th year of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I in Fig. 3.03 following Bloch (2010a) and at the 13th year in Fig. 3.04 following Jakob (2013).

B-A 12 and 13, the last two synchronisms between Adad-šuma-ūṣur and the Assyrian kings are placed at the end of Enlil-kudurri-ūṣur’s and the beginning of Ninurta-apil-Ekur’s reigns, corresponding to Adad-šuma-ūṣur’s taking of the city of Babylon, as Walker (1982) suggested can be gleaned from Chronicle 25 (cf. Reade 2000 and below, n. 31).

B-H 2, the synchronism between Kadašman-Enlil II and Ḫattusili III, is placed in the mid to latter part of the Babylonian king’s reign, based on KBo. 1.10+ (Devecchi/Miller 2011, 163–166; Devecchi in this volume).

See further support now in Bloch (2010b, 28–30).
Fig. 3.03: Synchronisms among the Great Powers of the 15th to 12th centuries with the fall of Kaštiliašu IV placed in Tukultī-Ninurta I’s year 18. The inset (bottom right) shows the details of synchronisms B-A 3–5 between Babylon and Assyria. For the conventions used see the caption to Fig. 3.02. For details of the synchronisms see Pruzsinszky (2009) supplemented by the remarks in n. 24.
Fig. 3.04: Synchronisms among the Great Powers of the 15th to 12th centuries with the fall of Kaštiliāšu IV placed in Tukulti-Ninurta I’s year 13. See also the captions to Figs. 3.02 and 3.03.
The Babylonian chronology can be tightly bound to the Assyrian through a robust series of well-known synchronisms, most of which stem from the so-called Synchronistic History (Pruzsinszky 2009, 42, 115–116). Until recently, the Babylonian chronology could be anchored to the Assyrian with a precision of only ca. ±9 years (e.g., Sassmannshausen 2006, 170), a figure provided by the synchronisms between Adad-šuma-usūr and Ninurta-apil-Ekur at the lower end (B-A 13) and Aššur-uballiṭ I and Kurigalzu II at the upper (B-A 5). Determining that the reign of Kaštiliašu IV was brought to an end by Tukultī-Ninurta I in the latter’s 18th (Bloch 2010a; 2010b) or in his 13th (Jakob 2013) year would connect the Assyrian and the Babylonian chronologies to each other with a precision of a single year. The importance of precisely anchoring the entire stretch of Kassite chronology from Burna-Buriaš II (death 1330s) down to the end of the dynasty with Enlil-nādin-aḫi (death 1150s) to the Assyrian can hardly be exaggerated.

The Egyptian chronology, in turn, is anchored to the Babylonian on the basis of the well-known synchronism provided by EA 3 (ll. 19–22). This synchronism places the death of Kadašman-Enlil I within the last ca. 7 years of the reign of Amenhotep III (E-B 2), thus leaving up to 7 years of potential leeway in the Egyptian dates. The fact that Kadašman-Enlil’s successor, Burna-Buriaš II, is also attested as having written to Amenhotep III demonstrates that the death of Kadašman-Enlil occurred before that of Amenhotep III.

The Hittite chronology, which is by far the most malleable of them all and which is entirely dependent on the Egyptian and Babylonian chronologies, since essentially no reign lengths are precisely and securely known, is then anchored to them through the synchronisms shown.

Boese (2009) has observed that the large corpora of administrative and economic texts from the reigns of Kurigalzu II, Nazi-Maruttaš, Kadašman-Turgu and Kadašman-Enlil II provide a maximum number of years that are exactly one year less than the numbers found in Babylonian King List A in all four cases. This, he understandably concludes, is unlikely to be a mere coincidence, and he therefore suggests that the reigns of these four kings should be shortened by one year each, a conclusion which seems hard to avoid pending the discovery of contrary evidence.

Boese (2009, 92) would leave Kadašman-Enlil I where he has long been, pulling his successors upwards, so that Burna-Buriaš II would be raised by one year vis-à-vis the conventional dates, while Kadašman-Enlil II’s dates would be raised by four years. If, however, one sets the end of the reign of Kaštiliašu IV as the link between the Babylonian and the Assyrian chronologies, one must naturally pull the affected Babylonian kings downward instead. Thus, the accession of Kadašman-Enlil II is brought down by one year, while at the upper end Burna-Buriaš II is pulled down by four. Moreover, since the transition between Kadašman-Enlil I and his successor Burna-Buriaš II provides the synchronism with the Egyptian chronology, the latter must likewise be brought down by a corresponding four years.

One major result of factoring in the evidence and considerations mentioned thus far, i.e. primarily the reduction in the length of Haremhab’s reign, is the raising of the accession date of Ramesses II from the currently favoured 1279 to a date closer to the once preferred 1290. One is thus forced to pose the question of whether Egyptian chronology might be able to accommodate such a change or not. Schneider’s reassessment of the chronology of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties

---

26 It must be noted that Freydank (2011) has demonstrated that Bloch’s insertion of Aššur-mušabši and Adad-šamši as his eponyms 17 and 20, respectively, is quite unlikely. The crucial eponym Ina-Aššur-šuma-aṣbat, which forms the terminus ante quem for the fall of Kaštiliašu IV (see below), thus remains floating between Tukultī-Ninurta’s years 17/18 (Bloch 2010a) and 22 (Bányai 2011).

27 The terminus ante quem for the fall of Kaštiliašu IV is provided by RIMA 1, A.0.78.6, dated to the eponym Ina-Aššur-šuma-aṣbat, in which the capture of Kaštiliašu is mentioned. Since Freydank (2005, 45–56), Röllig (2008, 4), Bloch (2010a) and Jakob (2013) place the eponym Ina-Aššur-šuma-aṣbat in Tukultī-Ninurta I’s years 19, 21, 18 and 18, respectively, one might assume that the end of the reign of Kaštiliašu could be set between years 17 and 21 of Tukultī-Ninurta. Jakob (2013), however, suggests that Kaštiliašu would have been captured already in Tukultī-Ninurta’s year 13, in the eponymate of Etel-pî-Aššur.
sugests that there are up to 25 years of leeway in that period. So clearly this era in the 10th and 9th centuries is one place where one might find the extra years that would be required to push the 19th-Dynasty pharaohs upwards and to fill the gap left by van Dijk’s reduction of Haremhab’s reign. Schneider discusses four recent proposals that have sought to address the difficulties in 22nd and 23rd-Dynasty chronology, schemes which result in a dating of Haremhab’s reign anywhere from a minimum 1290–1276 up to a maximum 1315–1301. Schneider (2010, 377) prefers the latter, maximum dates, since they fulfill the lunar requirements that demand a 14-year half-cycle for Thutmose III and a full cycle for Ramesses II. The results presented in the timelines in Figs. 3.03 and 04 would seem to demand Schneider’s higher dates, the scheme in Fig. 3.03 yielding numbers for Haremhab (1317–1304) that come quite close to his preferred dates, though it would be difficult to pull the Egyptian dates downwards some 2–3 further years without disturbing the synchronism between Kadašman-Enlil I and Amenhotep III established by EA 3 (E-B 2). The dates for Haremhab in Fig. 3.04, however (1322–1309), would seem a fair bit too high for Schneider’s maximum dates, and can hardly be pulled downwards as much as 7–8 years to match them.

The reduction of the Egyptian dates that follows from Boese’s observations and the adjustments that result from Schneider’s are in fact rather convenient for the chronological scheme developed in an attempt to account for the reduction of Haremhab’s reign and the synchronism between him and Mursili’s 9th year (Devecchi/Miller 2011, 146–168). Without these adjustments one would have had difficulty accounting for the fact that Ḥattusili III neglects to mention any dynastic marriages in his letter to Kadašman-Enlil II, KBo. 1.10+ (B-H 2; see Devecchi in this volume, excursus 1), likely datable to the Babylonian king’s latter years. For it is known from a letter from Ḥattusili’s queen Puduḫepa to Ramesses II (KUB 21, 38) that the Babylonian-Hittite marriage must have been finalized some (probably short) time before the Hittite-Egyptian wedding, which is firmly dated to Ramesses’ 34th year. It would thus be quite odd that Ḥattusili makes no mention of these important events in his letter to Kadašman-Enlil, in which he otherwise provides a rather extensive review of Hittite-Babylonian relations, if that letter had been written shortly after the Egyptian-Hittite marriage, and by implication, shortly after the Babylonian-Hittite marriage; the momentous diplomatic marriage binding Ḥatti and Babylon would have been only a very few years past. Boese’s reduction of the Babylonian chronology, however, pulls the Egyptian chronology down with it far enough for the wedding of the 34th year of Ramesses II to fall a few years after the writing of KBo. 1.10+. The letter would thus fall some few years before the Babylonian-Hittite nuptials, so that its lack of reference to them is no longer surprising. In fact, as Ḥattusili’s letter to Kadašman-Enlil is clearly one of the first letters of the renewed Hittite-Babylonian correspondence, it is likely to have played a preliminary role in paving the way for the wedding, which would have followed in the ensuing years.

If, following Boese (2009), one subtracts one year each from the reigns of the kings from Kurgalzu II to Kadašman-Enlil II, for a total of four years, then Tukulti-Ninurta’s capture of Kaštiliašu IV cannot have been as late in his reign as year 21, as this would pull the line of Babylonian kings down just far enough to disallow the attested synchronisms (B-A 2 to B-A 5) between Aššur-ubal-ši and the four Babylonian kings from Burna-Buriš II to Kurgalzu II. Boese’s reduction would still be compatible with an end to Kaštiliašu IV’s reign in Tukulti-Ninurta year 18 (Fig. 3.03; Bloch 2010a; 2010b) or year 13 (Fig. 3.04; Jakob 2013). The eponym Ina-Aššur-šuma-aṣbat, the terminus ante quem for the capture of Kaštiliašu (see below), can therefore not be placed any later than Tukulti-Ninurta’s year 20, eliminating at least Röllig’s (2008, 4) eponym list reconstruction.

Of primary interest is the fact that Ramesses II’s accession falls in Fig. 3.03 in 1290, in Fig. 3.04 in 1295, the former corresponding to the middle of the three dates discussed in recent decades (the

28 Depending primarily on the existence and reign lengths of the elusive pharaohs Shoshenq IIa (Heqa-cheper-Re), IIb (Tut-cheper-Re) and Ic (Maa-cheper-Re). Cf. also Schneider’s (2008) argumentation casting doubt on the low chronology for the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period.
other two being 1304 and 1279). That said, the low date of 1279 is currently strongly favoured by most Egyptologists, while 1304 is held by others to be a further possibility, 1290 being quite out of fashion and deemed astronomically the most unlikely of the three, at least by some.\(^{31}\) Jakob's (2013) scheme, which places Tukulti-Ninurta's overthrow of Kaštiliašu IV in the Assyrian's 13th year (Fig. 3.04), would for all practical purposes disallow at least the two lower of three favoured accession dates for Ramesses II. If one restored to Fig. 3.04 the four years subtracted by Boese (2009) and moved the death of Amenhotep III as close to the death of Kadašman-Enlil I as possible, allowing one to move the Egyptian kings up another ca. five years, one could just reach 1304. There seems to be no way that Jakob's scheme could be reconciled with a date of 1290, not to mention 1279.

A further potential difficulty\(^ {30}\) with Jakob's fall of Kaštiliašu IV in Tukulti-Ninurta's year 13 relates to the attested synchronisms between Adad-šuma-uṣur and the Assyrian kings Enlil-kudurri-uṣur and Ninurta-apil-Ekur (B-A 12–13), which involve Adad-šuma-uṣur's aiding Ninurta-apil-Ekur in his seizure of the throne from Enlil-kudurri-uṣur. Assuming the King List's sequence Kaštiliašu – Enlil-nādin-šumi – Kadašman-Ḫarbe – Adad-šuma-iddina – Adad-šuma-uṣur (i.e. without inserting further years for Tukulti-Ninurta), only in the best case scenario could Adad-šuma-uṣur have campaigned alongside Ninurta-apil-Ekur, falling over dead immediately afterwards in the same year as Enlil-kudurri-uṣur. In fact, Jakob (2013) does assume that Tukulti-Ninurta himself would have ruled over Babylon following the fall of Adad-šuma-iddina for some undetermined amount of time, a reign that, according to Yamada (2003), would have been consciously ignored during the composition of Babylonian King List A.\(^ {31}\) Such a short reign for Tukulti-Ninurta in Babylon would indeed push the end of the 30-year reign of Adad-šuma-uṣur into the reign of Ninurta-apil-Ekur (Fig. 3.04), easily allowing the attested synchronisms between Adad-šuma-uṣur and the Assyrian kings Enlil-kudurri-uṣur and Ninurta-apil-Ekur.

Finally, it should be noted that neither scheme in Figs. 3.03 and 04 yields a date for the solar omen in Mursili II's 10th year that would be amenable to known solar eclipses, recently conveniently tabulated by Huber (2011, 200; cf. Devecchi/Miller 2011, 167, n. 71).\(^ {32}\) One would therefore be

\(^{29}\) E.g., Krauss (2007); Krauss/Warburton (2009, 133); cf. Huber (2011). As mentioned in n. 21, it seems at present, if the premises underlying the charts in Figs. 3.03 and 04 should prove valid, that the only way to save 1279 would be to find ca. 20 extra years among the pharaohs between Akhenaton and Seti I. How this could be reconciled with the other end of this 200-year period, which should define the accession of Thutmose III, will not be pursued further here.

\(^{30}\) A potential difficulty that exists only if Walker (1982) is followed in assuming that the conquest of Babylon by Adad-šuma-uṣur is to be connected to the action that placed Ninurta-apil-Ekur on the throne of Assyria. Reade (2000) has shown, however, that this is not the only possible understanding of the fragmentary Chronicle 25. Moreover, Bab 39043, noted by Pedersén (2005, 98, no. 16), suggests that Adad-šuma-uṣur in fact reigned in Babylon for at least 10 years. Still, Bab 39043 does not quite entirely exclude Walker's interpretation, as one could, assuming a fall of Kaštiliašu in Tukulti-Ninurta's year 18, resort to inserting a reign of Tukulti-Ninurta over Babylon of a few years, as Yamada (2003) and Jakob (2013) prefer, giving Adad-šuma-uṣur 10+ years at Babylon after the battle leading to the fall of Enlil-kudurri-uṣur. In other words, Jakob's scheme (with the capture of Kaštiliašu in Tukulti-Ninurta year 13) disallows Walker's interpretation, while Bloch's (capture of Kaštiliašu in Tukulti-Ninurta year 18) allows it only if Tukulti-Ninurta reigned alone in Babylon for at least ca. 5 years.

\(^{31}\) Without wanting to deny the possibility, it seems more likely that the composer of Babylonian King List A would have dealt with the ugly prospect of a full-blooded Assyrian on the Babylonian throne not by simply excising the years in question, but by assigning them to some (at least nominally) Babylonian king, e.g., to Adad-šuma-uṣur (or his two predecessors), even if he was not reigning in Babylon itself the entire time, as Walker Chronicle 25 seems to suggest. In other words, the seven-year reign of Tukulti-Ninurta as king in Chronicle P is likely to be subsumed somewhere within the reigns of Kaštiliašu's successors; the attested first year of Tukulti-Ninurta from an administrative text from Nippur (Yamada 2003, 155–156 and n. 12) need not invalidate such a suggestion, as the chroniclers need not have recognized such a fact. Moreover, it seems not unlikely that the period may have been even messier still, if, e.g., a half-Assyrian, half-Hittite prince, perhaps Nabû-apli-iddina, managed to occupy the throne for some length of time, as Singer (2008, 230–233) and Bánkay (2011) have suggested, or if the ruler of Suḫu managed to occupy Babylon for some period (Singer 2008; Durand/Marti 2005).

\(^{32}\) Huber's assumption that the eclipses of Aug. 26 1315 BC and Aug. 17 1306 BC would be too late in the year seem too exclusive and should not be struck from the list of candidates for this reason. Whether they were complete enough to
forced to assume either that the solar omen was not an eclipse or that some significant element(s) of these hypothetical chronologies are errant.

The Hittite Queen Mother (the *tawannanna*) and her contacts with Babylonia

Finally, I turn to an intriguing passage in a prayer of the Hittite king Mursili II. In this prayer he seeks above all to justify before the gods his act of stripping the Queen Mother, the *tawannanna*, of her power and banning her from Ḫattusa. The *tawannanna* was accused of trying to murder Mursili’s wife through witchcraft, presumably a sincere but baseless charge motivated and conditioned by power struggles within the Hittite court. This *tawannanna* was none other than the Babylonian wife of Mursili’s father, Suppiluliuma I, whom he had married to replace his first wife, Ḫenti, presumably for political purposes. This passage (KUB 14.4 ii 3’–8’ [70.I.A]) reads:

3’ ... *nu šu-me-e-eš Dingir*nušu-me-e-eš Dingirmeš
4’ ū-ul še-ket, te-e-ni Ḫa-ri-a-kán ma-ḫ-ya-an Ḫu-u-ma-an
5’ Ḫa-ra-zi-a Ḫa-ri-a-kán Ḫu-u-ma-an
6’ ū-ul še-ket, te-e-ni Ḫa-ri-a-kán Ḫu-u-ma-an
7’ an-ṣa-ḫa-ša-an ni pa-ra-a pē-eš-ta nu-kán EGIR-an ū-ul Ka-it-ši
8’ da-a-li-iš-ta nu DINGIRnud-a-li-iš-ta nu DINGIRuššu-me-e-eš Dingirmeš ū-ul ūš-ket, te-e-ni ...

Do you gods not see how she (the *tawannanna*) has diverted my father’s entire estate to the Ḫekur-institution of the protective deity (and?) to the stone-house of the deities? Some, moreover, she dispatched to Babylon, while some she distributed to the whole population in Ḫattusa. Nothing at all remained. Do you gods not see (this)?

Of interest for present purposes is the reference to Babylon. Despite what appears to be a semantically and grammatically relatively clear statement, this clause has been translated “she brought something from Babylon”, or similarly, in all published treatments of which I am aware. The scholars who followed the traditional translation of this passage, which does not specify what she is supposed to have brought from Babylon, do not agree what this might have been, and their suggestions range widely, even wildly. Some assume that she imported foreign customs not to the liking of the Hittite court; others opt for statues of her ancestors; some propose, rather soberly, that it refers to a wealthy dowry that she used to buy power and influence; while still others fan-

---

33 For the position of the *tawannanna* in the Hittite state, see most recently Collins (2007, 98–101).
34 Güterbock *apud* Laroche (1956, 103 and n. 2); Singer (2002, 75); De Martino (1998, 33); CHD P, 54b; Otten (1966, 151); van den Hout (1994, 49); Bryce (2005, 208); Klengel (1979, 87); Cambi (2007, 399); Boley (2000, q. 725); Opfermann (1998, 235).
35 Bin-Nun (1975, 189): “Muršili goes on accusing her of having turned his father’s house into a graveyard by bringing over things from Babylon and giving others away to the population of Ḫattuša. She may have brought over statues of her deceased ancestors and given away disks or statues of deceased kings and princes which had been dedicated to Hittite gods.”
36 Singer (2002, 74): “Much speculation has revolved around the nature of the ‘things’ she brought with her from Babylonia and distributed among the population of Hatti. The more tantalizing options, from sorcery to prostitution, must probably be given up in favor of the more prosaic possibility that her own dowry is referred to, which she spent entirely in the pursuit of enhancing her popularity in Hatti and winning over influential supporters for her devious concoctions.”
tasize that above all her use of Babylonian black magic constituted the mysterious something that she had brought from her homeland.\textsuperscript{37}

These all, however, seem to be misunderstandings of the passage. The verb ḫuinu- is simply a causative of the verb ḫuwai-, “to run”, thus “she made/let run” and the ablative case attached to Babylon is the well-attested ablative of direction (Hoffner/Melchert 2008, §16.92), i.e. “some she had expedited in the direction of Babylon”. Only in Melchert’s unpublished 1977 dissertation\textsuperscript{38} does one find what is clearly to be the correct translation, namely, that she had been reducing the wealth of the royal family by sending some of it back to Babylon and giving other portions to persons in Ḫatti.

What relevance for the present topic might the determination bear, if correct, that the passage in question actually has the tawannanna sending a significant portion of the Hittite royal family’s wealth to Babylon rather than her importing something from there to Ḫattusa? Here one can only speculate. It must be emphasized again that the passage constitutes part of Mursili’s accusations against the tawannanna, and there is no evidence available that would support or challenge his indictment. Be that as it may, it is nonetheless quite interesting that Mursili apparently believed that the Hittite royal family was being significantly harmed by a foreign, in this case Babylonian, princess and Hittite queen, who was siphoning off some portion of the wealth of the royal family and sending it to her Babylonian homeland. If she in fact had been doing so, this would presumably indicate, at a minimum, that she maintained strong ties with Babylon and its royal family.

Assuming that the accusations were not entirely false, we may speculate about what intentions might have stood behind her actions. Did she intend to return to Babylon at some point and to enjoy the fruits of her time at the Hittite court? Was she preparing for the possibility of being replaced by a younger wife and ejected from Ḫattusa just as she had replaced her predecessor, Ḫenti? What might her actions indicate about her relationship to Suppiluliuma’s successors on the throne in Ḫatti? Could they suggest that her interests never lay solidly in Ḫattusa, since it was after all Ḫenti’s sons, Arnuwanda and Mursili, who occupied the throne rather than any child of hers? Might she have had sons of her own, who she imagined might have greater prospects in Babylon than they did in Ḫattusa; and was her transfer of Hittite wealth related to supporting some such prospects? It is also conceivable that this daughter (or sister) of Burna-Buriaš II might have attempted to play a role in the struggle for the Babylonian throne, which saw a first son of Burna-Buriaš, Kara-KIN-daš, lose the throne to one Nazi-Bugaš, who was in turn replaced by another son of Burna-Buriaš, Kurigalzu II, with the helping hand of the Assyrian king Aššur-uballiṭ. Kara-KIN-daš and Kurigalzu might even have been the tawannanna’s brothers (or at least half-brothers). If so, it might not have been the last time that the Hittites attempted to intervene in the struggle for the Babylonian throne, as Singer (2008) has recently suggested regarding the period following the death of Tukulti-Ninurta I. As noted above this enticing scenario is entirely speculative.


\textsuperscript{38} Melchert (1977, Ex. 254, p. 358): “She (re)moved part (of the goods) to Sanhara, part she gave away to the population in Ḫattusa; she left nothing behind.” He comments (oddly), “Why one has an ablative rather than a dative-local (expressing goal) is not entirely clear. Since the accusation is that the tawannanna dissipated the royal family’s wealth, perhaps the ablative has a derogatory nuance: she did not even see to it that the goods reached Sanhara, but merely sent them off in the general direction, not caring where they ended up” (358–359).
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDP 2</td>
<td>Scheil (1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDP 6</td>
<td>Scheil (1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDP 10</td>
<td>Scheil (1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDP 28</td>
<td>Scheil (1939)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MesCiv.</td>
<td>Mesopotamian Civilizations (Winona Lake, Ind.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHEM</td>
<td>Mesopotamian History and Environment, Memoirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHEO</td>
<td>Mesopotamian History and Environment, Occasional Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHET 1</td>
<td>Van Lerbergh/Voet (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC</td>
<td>Signatur von Tafeln in der J. Pierpont Morgan Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMA</td>
<td>Signatur von Akzessionsnummern in der Sammlung des Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moussai eff</td>
<td>Signatur von Tafeln in der Shlomo Moussaieff Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRWH</td>
<td>Petschow (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Signatur von Tafeln in der Martin Schøyen Collection, Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSL 8/1</td>
<td>Landsberger (1960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSL 11</td>
<td>Reiner (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSKH 1</td>
<td>Brinkman (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULAPIN</td>
<td>Hunger/Pingree (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>nach Sassmannshausen (2001a) zitierte Textnummern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1. Signatur von Tafeln (etc.) in der Sammlung des University Museum, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abkürzungsverzeichnis

2. Signatur von Funden aus den amerikanischen Grabungen in Nippur (ab 1948); mit vorangestellter Kampagnennummer

NABU Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires
NAPR Northern Akkad Project Reports
NBC Signatur von Tafeln (etc.) in der James B. Nies Collection, Yale University
Nbn. Strassmaier (1889)
ND Signatur von Funden aus den britischen Grabungen in Nimrud, 1949–1963
NF Neue Folge
Ni. Signatur von Tafeln (etc.) in der Nippur-Sammlung der İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzeleri
NT Signatur beschrifteter Objekte aus den amerikanischen Grabungen in Nippur (ab 1948); mit vorangestellter Kampagnennummer

OBO Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis (Fribourg/Göttingen)
OBO 116 Matthews (1992)
OBO SA Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica (Fribourg/Göttingen)
OECT 1 Langdon (1923)
OIC Oriental Institute Communication (Chicago)
OIP Oriental Institute Publications (Chicago)
OIP 2 Luckenbill (1924)
OLA Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta (Leuven)
OLA 21 Van Lerberghe (1986)
Or. NS Orientalia Nova Series
PBS Publications of the Babylonian Section, University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)
PBS 1/2 Lutz (1919)
PBS 2/2 Clay (1912b)
PBS 8/2 Chiera (1922)
PBS 13 Legrain (1922)
PBS 15 Legrain (1926)
PIHANS Publications de l’Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul (Leiden)
PNA 1/II Radner (Hg.) (1999)
PNA 2/I Baker (Hg.) (2000)
PNA 3/I Baker (Hg.) (2002)
RA Revue d’assyriologie et d’archéologie orientale
RGTC Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes (= TAVO Beihefte, Reihe B, Nr. 7) (Wiesbaden)
RIAA Speleers (1925)
RIMA The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods (Toronto)
RIMA 1 Grayson (1987)
RIMA 2 Grayson (1991)
RIMA 3 Grayson (1996)
RIMB 2 Frame (1995)
RIME The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods (Toronto)
RIME 2 Frayne (1993)
RIME 3/2 Frayne (1997)
RIME 4 Frayne (1990)
RINAP The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period (Winona Lake, Ind.)
RINAP 1 Tadmor/Yamada (2011)
RINAP 3/1 Grayson/Novotny (2012)
RINAP 4 Leichty (2011)
RIA Ebeling et al. (Hg.), Reallexikon der Assyriologie (und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie). Berlin/Leipzig (Band 1–2, bzw. Berlin/New York (Band 3–11), bzw. Berlin/Boston (Band 12–14)
Rm. Rassam. Signatur von Tafeln (etc.) in der Sammlung des British Museum
RS Signatur von Tafeln aus den Grabungen in Ugarit (Ras Shamra)
SAA State Archives of Assyria (Helsinki)
SAA 1 Parpola (1987)
SAA 4 Starr (1990)
SAA 5 Lanfranchi/Parpola (1990)
SAA 12 Kataja/Whiting (1995)
SAA 15 Fuchs/Parpola (2001)
SAA 17 Dietrich (2003)
SAA 19 Luukko (2012)
SAAS State Archives of Assyria Studies (Helsinki)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abkürzung</th>
<th>Beschreibung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>Signatur von Objekten aus Susa in der Sammlung des Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCNH</td>
<td>Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Smith. Signatur von Tafeln (etc.) in der Sammlung des British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEA</td>
<td>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT</td>
<td>Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten (Wiesbaden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVA</td>
<td>Schriften zur Vorderasiatischen Archäologie (Saarbrücken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAVO</td>
<td>Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 1</td>
<td>Thureau-Dangin (1910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCS 5</td>
<td>Grayson (1975a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THeth.</td>
<td>Texte der Hethiter (Heidelberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Rep.</td>
<td>Thompson (1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tgl.</td>
<td>Tadmor (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>Leemans (1954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMH NF 5</td>
<td>Bernhardt (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUAT</td>
<td>Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments (Gütersloh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUAT NF 6</td>
<td>Janowski/Schwemer (Hg.) 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Signatur von Funden aus den britisch-amerikanischen Ausgrabungen in Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td>Ur Excavations (London/Philadelphia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UET</td>
<td>Ur Excavations, Texts (London/Philadelphia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UET 1</td>
<td>Gadd/Legrain (1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UET 4</td>
<td>Figula (1949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UET 5</td>
<td>Figula/Martin (1953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UET 7</td>
<td>Gurney (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UET 8</td>
<td>Sollberger (1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>Ugarit-Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Signatur von Objekten in der Sammlung des University Museum, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVB</td>
<td>Vorläufiger Bericht über die (...) Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka (genauer Titel variiert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Vorderasiatische Abteilung. Signatur von Objekten in der Sammlung des Vorderasiatischen Museums, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAB</td>
<td>Vorderasiatische Bibliothek (Leipzig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAB 7/2</td>
<td>Streck (1916)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>Vorderasiatische Abteilung, Tontafel. Signatur der Tafeln in der Sammlung des Vorderasiatischen Museums, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen (Staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 1</td>
<td>Messerschmidt/Ungnad (1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 4</td>
<td>Ungnad (1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 7</td>
<td>Ungnad (1909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 13</td>
<td>Figula (1916)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 16</td>
<td>Schroeder (1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 22</td>
<td>Klengel (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 24</td>
<td>van Dijk (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 29</td>
<td>Klengel/Klengel-Brandt (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Signatur von Funden aus den deutschen Grabungen in Uruk (Warka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAW</td>
<td>Writings from the Ancient World Series (Atlanta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>Die Welt des Orients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWDOG</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZ 8</td>
<td>Bernhardt/Aro (1958–1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
<td>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC</td>
<td>Signatur von Objekten in der Yale Babylonian Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS</td>
<td>Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts (New Haven)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 1</td>
<td>Clay (1915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7</td>
<td>Tremayne (1925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 10</td>
<td>Goetze (1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 13</td>
<td>Finkelstein (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOSR</td>
<td>Yale Oriental Series, Researches (New Haven)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOrA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Orient-Archäologie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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