ASSURBANIPAL INSCRIPTIONS IN THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, PART II:
PRISM I*

Jamie Novotny

Between the beginning of 1990 and the summer of 1994, Rykle Borger examined and transliterated all of the Assurbanipal prisms in the Asiatic (A) collection of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago that were purchased by E. Chiera and A. C. Piepkorn (A 7919-8163 and A 11848-11870); numerous new physical and non-physical joins were made during this time. In 1996, Borger did the Assyriological community a great service by publishing handwritten transliterations of all of these prism fragments in BIWA, a volume that has proven to be an extremely useful research tool for scholars and students of Near Eastern history and languages. Between March 2002 and October 2004, I recollated and copied the fragments of Prism I (= Borger’s TVar). Since copies of these pieces have not yet been published, I take this opportunity to do so with the kind permission of W. Farber, curator of the tablet collection of the Oriental Institute. New editions of the fragments, with a few minor notes and short studies on the king’s building activities, are also included here.

* I would like to thank R.F.G. Sweet for offering his critical remarks on a draft of this manuscript and R. Borger for pointing out some information that I overlooked regarding the cuneiform texts purchased by Chiera (see fn. 2). Moreover, I am grateful to W. Farber for allowing me access to the Assurbanipal material in the Oriental Institute and to J. Tenney for the efficient and speedy supply of prism fragments.
1. The cuneiform texts purchased by Chiera did not originate from clandestine digging at Nineveh during R.C. Thompson’s excavations. The fragments were seen by Breasted in 1920, but were not purchased at that time because the price was too high. The pieces were purchased several years later, in 1928, by Chiera during the second season of excavations at Nuzi. For further details, see Borger 1996, p. xv.
2. Borger 1996.
Prism I (formerly TVar) is known from fragments of four to ten clay prisms. The pieces originate from R.C. Thompson’s excavations in Area SH (“House of Aššur-šumu-uṣabši”, formerly “Sennacherib’s House”) and Area IT (the Ištar/Mullissu temple, Emašmaš), or were purchased from a dealer in Mosul. The text is unique as it is the only edition of Assurbanipal’s prism inscriptions that does not contain any military narration, but consists only of a lengthy prologue (approximately 3½ columns), the building account, a short petition, and advice to future Assyrian rulers, along with the standard benedictions and maledictions. The inscription, according to the date preserved on one exemplar, was composed in the post-canonical eponymy of Bēlšunu, governor of Ḥindanu (648).

The prologue, as far as it is preserved, is identical to those of Prisms C, Kh (formerly CND, CKalach), and G, and is an important primary source for the study of the construction, decoration, rebuilding and refurbishing of Assyrian and Babylonian temples and sanctuaries during the first half of Assurbanipal’s reign (668-648). The projects described are: 1) the completion and decoration of Eḫursaggalkurkurra in Assur; 2) the completion of Esagila in Babylon and the return of the statues of Marduk and his entourage; 3) the refurbishing and fashioning of objects for Marduk and Zarpanitu; 4) the setting up of wild bulls in gateways of Ezida in Borsippa; 5) the decoration of Emašmaš in Nineveh and Egašankalama in Arbela (not preserved); 6) the refurbishing of Šarrat-Kidmuri’s divine image and the renewal of her cultic rites (not preserved); 7) the setting up of lion-headed eagles and divine emblems in Egalmeslam in Tarbišu; and 8) the rebuilding of Eḫuḫulul and the construction of Emelamana in Ḥarrān. The king boasts also about completing sanctuaries in Assyria and Babylonia (Akkad) that were unfinished at the death of his father; making more temple appurtenances from silver and gold than any of his predecessors (not preserved); returning statues of his tutelary deities to their inner sanctums (not preserved); increasing the number of regular offerings and contributions (not preserved); and skillfully fashioning statues of himself from silver, gold, and bronze, and placing them in sanctuaries.


---

Millard 1968, pp. 102-105, 110-111, and pls. XXI and XXV; Cogan 1980, pp. 148-149 and fn. 10; Borger 1996, pp. 16-17, 92-94, 119-120, 134-139, 144, 146-147, 171-172, 359, 366, 378, 4° Heft 111-113, 116-117, and 183-184; and Novotny 2003, pp. 14-16, 314-315, and 378. The edition was formerly designated as “T-Type” or “T Variant” (“TVar”) since it most closely resembled the “Thompson Prism”, but with significant textual variants. Recent study of the text reveals that the inscription is a clearly definable edition, not a sub-edition or variant of another prism class, including Prism T. The author (Novotny 2003, pp. 14-16) suggested Prism I as a suitable replacement.


---
As for the building report, it describes work on the Sîn-Šamaš temple in Nineveh. The king states that he rebuilt the temple’s dilapidated mud-brick superstructure in its entirety, roofed it with beams of cedar, hung doors of white cedar in its gateways, and placed its tutelary deities (Sîn, Nikkal, Nusku, Šamaš, and Aia) upon their respective daises.

Catalogue

1. BM 134462 (Borger’s TVar1)
2. A 8131 (Borger’s TVar2)
3. BM 127896 + BM 128004 + BM 128250 + BM 128296 (Borger’s TVar3)
4. BM 134464 (+) BM 134479 (Borger’s TVar4)5

Uncertain attribution

5. BM 134442 (Borger’s T14)
6. A 8112 (Borger’s T19)
7. A 8113
8. A 8114 (Borger’s T20)
9. A 8115 (Borger’s T21)
10. A 8116

One certain exemplar of Prism I and five likely exemplars of this prism edition have been identified among the cuneiform texts purchased by Chiera. The fragments listed here as uncertain attribution should be regarded as pieces of Prism I — rather than of Prism T (nos. 5, 6, 8, and 9) or of Prisms B, D, C, or G (nos. 7 and 10) — on the basis of one or more of the following characteristics: 1) the colour (deep orange) and composition of the clay (similar to nos. 1, 3, and 4); 2) very large script; 3) very wide columns; and 4) textual variants, particularly in the passage describing the circumstances in which Assurbanipal came to rebuild Eḫuḫul. All of the fragments appear to have come from pentagonal or hexagonal prisms. Prism I is reconstructed here as a pentagonal prism, with an estimated 50-55 lines per column.

5. The non-physical join between BM 134464 and BM 134479 was recognized by the author on the basis of the hand (same scribe) and the colour (deep orange) and composition of the clay.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§1: Assurbanipal’s titles</td>
<td>§5 (continued)</td>
<td>§9 (continued)</td>
<td>§12 (continued)</td>
<td>§14 (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2: Divine support</td>
<td>§6: Bulls for Ezida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3: Completion of Esarhaddon’s projects</td>
<td>§7: Report on Emašmaš, Egašankalama, and Šarrat-Kdmuri’s image</td>
<td>§10: General boasts of work on sanctuaries in Assyria and Babylonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§4: Report on Eḫursaggalkurkurra</td>
<td>§8: Anzūs for Egalmeslam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§12: Boasts of accomplishments with divine support</td>
<td>§14: Assurbanipal rewarded for rebuilding the Sin-Šamaš temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§16: Advice against destroying inscriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§17: Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Reconstruction of Prism I.
A 8112

A 8112 (old Oriental Institute no. 218; Borger’s TI9) measures 5.7 × 4.5 × 3.6 cm, is a duplicate of A 8115 (lines 5'-13’), and comes from near the bottom of the prism. The extant text contains part of a passage describing the circumstances in which Assurbanipal came to rebuild Eḫullul and the beginning of a report of the reconstruction and enlargement of Ḥarrān’s principal temple. The text lines preserved correspond to ii, 31'-39’ of the author’s reconstruction of Prism I.

Transliteration
Lacuna
1’. […] ’a-na’ […]
2’. […]-’a’-tu ip-[…]
3’. […] pa-rak d[a-…]
4’. […] r[u-qu-ti […]
5’. […].ME& ar-[…]
7’. […] -n[Mu-MAŠ A [...]
8’. […] -l[a e-[…]
9’. […] ’ú-šá’-[…]
Lacuna

Translation
(1’-9’) […] Sin, who created me] for [kingship, nominated me for (the task of re)building Eḫullul, saying: “Assurbanipal] will (re)[build t]his [temple and he will make me sit therein upon] an et[ernal] dais”. [The word of Sin, which he uttered in days lo]ng gone, [he now disclosed to people] of a la[ter generation]. He al[lowed the temple of Sin which Shalma]neser (III), son of [Ashurnasirpal (II), a king prior to m]e, had [built to become old ……].
Notes
1'-9': The preserved text duplicates A 8115, 5'-13'. For further information on the passage, see the commentary to A 8115.

A 8113

A 8113 (old Oriental Institute no. 273) measures 7.2 × 8.0 × 5.4 cm, partially duplicates the contents of BM 127896+ (no. 3), and comes from near the bottom of the prism. The extant text contains part of a passage stating that Assyria prospered during the reign of Assurbanipal: it rained regularly, the ground was moist, grain and corn grew in abundance, orchards were lush in fruit, and livestock successfully gave birth to their young. The text lines preserved correspond to iii, 11'-21' of the author’s reconstruction of Prism I.

Fig. 3. A 8113.
Transliteration

Lacuna
1’) [...] i[š-…]
2’) [...] ṣẖu-b[u-u]l-[…]
3’) [...] na-ḥa-[a…]
4’) [...] ū-ṣah-na-[…]
5’) [...] ṣẖu-um-[a-h[a…]
6’) [...] [a-li-ti ina BALA.[…]
7’) [...] ku-um-[u’-[…]
8’) [...] G[ESTIN.ME]š[…]
9’) [...] ṣẖu-ṣam-[a…]

Translation

[……] (1’-7’) [Grain was 5 cubits] h[igh in its furrow (and) ears of corn were 5/6 cubits]
[l]ong. [Successful harvests] (and) the prosperity of [Nisaba permitted the pasture land
to continually] flouris[h, fruit orchards] to be very lus[h in fruit, (and) cattle to suc-
sessfully give birth to (their) y]oung. During [my] reign [there was plenitude (and)
abundance. During m[y] years (as king) there was] a stockpile [of wealth].

(8’-9’) [Throughout my en tire land, (in) ma]ny [sales transactions, 10 donkey-loads
of grain, 3 homers of w]ine, 2 seah of oil, (and) one talent of wool] could be purchas[ed
for one shekel of silver]. [……]

Notes

1’-9’: The damaged text can be restored from Prisms B, D, I (BM 127896+), C, Kh, G,
and A. For a composite edition, see Borger 1996, pp. 16-17, Prism A, i, 45-51, and p.
93, Prism B, i, 36-38. The scholar(s) responsible for the composition of this inscription
copied the passage directly from Prisms B (649 and 648) and D (648).

8’: Possibly restore 12 instead of 10. For the prism fragments containing this minor
variant, see Borger 1996, p. 93, Prism B, i, 36.
A 8114 (old Oriental Institute no. 243; Borger’s T21) measures 5.0 × 8.4 × 3.0 cm and comes from the top of col. ii of the prism. The extant text contains part of a report describing the refurbishing of an ornate pleasure bed for Zarpanitu in her bed chamber (Kaḥilisu) in Esagila and the setting up of four wild bulls in gateways of Ezida in Borsippa. The text lines preserved correspond to ii, 1-8 of the author’s reconstruction of Prism I.

Transliteration

1. [a-na ma]-‘a’-a-‘al’ tak-né-e *{o}+[EN ontvangst–MU]
2. [ša-ko ḫa]-ša-di e-peq[š ru-‘a-a-me]
3. [nak-liš] ʾe’-[pu-uš]
4. [ina ká-ḫi]-li-sù maš-[tak ṣar-pa-ni-tum]
5. [ša ku]-uz-bu sa-[al-ḫu ad-di]
6. [4 AM].MEŠ KÛ.BABBAR [ek-du-u-ti]
7. [na-ši]-ru ki-bi-[is LUGAL-u-ti-ia]
8. [ina KÁ-ṣi-i]-[*dUTU]-*š[i u KÁ–dLAMMA–RA.BI]

Lacuna

Translation

(1-5) I [skillfully] made a bed of musukkannu-wood ... as a] pleasure [b]ed for [Bēl (Marduk) and Beltīša (Zarpanitu) to perform mar]riage duties (and) to mak[e love. I placed (it) in Kaḥilisu, the bed cha[mber of Zarpanitu, which] is [laden with sex]ual charms.
(6-8) [I set up 4 fierce wild bull]s (overlaid with) silver, [protec]tors of [my royal] pat[h, in the Gate-of-the-Rising]-Su[n and (in) the Gate of Lamma-RA.BI, in gateway(s) of Ezida which is inside Borsippa]. […….]

Notes
1-8: The restorations are generally based on Prism T, i, 49 - ii, 2 (Borger 1993, pp. 139-140).

1-5: Prism I is the earliest prism inscription in which a report of the refurbishing and return of the pleasure bed is preserved. It is not known if the prologues of Assurbanipal’s res gestae composed between 654 and 649 contained this same report or an earlier version of it.

In 655, Assurbanipal returned the pleasure bed of Marduk and Zarpanitu that Sennacherib had taken to Assyria when he looted Esagila; the bed was placed in Kaḫilisu, the bed chamber of Zarpanitu. The musukkannu-wood bed was refurbished before it was sent out from the Balttil district in Assur: an inscription that Sennacherib had written on its gold plating was removed and replaced with a short, commemorative text; and its frame was plated with a gold alloy and inlaid with precious stones.

6-8: Prism I is the earliest prism inscription in which a report of the setting up of wild bulls in Ezida is preserved.

In the first half of his reign, Assurbanipal renovated the enclosure wall of this temple of Nabû and set up pairs of wild bulls in two of its principal gateways, the Gate-of-the-Rising-Sun and the Gate of Lamma-RA.BI. For work on the enclosure wall, see Frame 1995, p. 218 no. B.6.32.16, 33-36. The (inscribed?) silver-plated statues of the wild bulls were placed in the temple for the protection of the king’s path sometime between Kislev (IX) 669 and Ab (V) 648. Late in his reign (645-ca. 639), the king stationed a third pair of wild bulls in Ezida, in the Luguduene (or Ludurene) Gate; decorated Kiza-

7. Craig 1895, Vol. I, pp. 76-79, K 2411, rev. An examination of the tablet in 2001 suggests that the text copied by Craig is on the reverse. The evidence is two fold: 1) the bottom 6.3 cm of the column containing the Assurbanipal inscription (= col. iv) is uninscribed; and 2) the last parts of 5 lines of an inscription of Sennacherib(?) are preserved in the upper left corner of the side of the tablet not copied by Craig (= col. ii).
8. Tablet fragment K 6806 (Borger 1996, LoBl 36) may have contained an inscription that was written on the silver plating of one or more of these wild bulls. The subscript (3') reads: [……] ša UGU AM.MEŠ ša BÂRÂ.SIPA.K[i], “[inscription] which (is written) upon (statues of) wild bulls in Borsipp[al]”. Since Esarhaddon also had several pairs of wild bulls fashioned for Ezida (Borger 1956, p. 95, §64, Smlt., rev. 11'), the attribution of the inscription to Assurbanipal is not certain.
laga, the seat of Nūru, with 83 talents of shiny silver; and set up two massive *pirku* (meaning unknown) in Kamaḥ and Kanamtila. For reports of Assurbanipal’s activities in Borsippa composed ca. 640-638, see Foxvog 1978, pp. 44-45 no. 1 (UCLM 9-1773), i’, 5’-11’; and Borger 1996, p.189, H1, i, 4’-13’; p. 195, J Stück 2, 15-29; and pp. 271-272, IIT, 51-57.

8: The restorations are based on Prisms C and Kh i, 51 (Borger 1996, p. 140). Compare Prism T, ii, 4 where *ina*, not *u*, appears before KÁ—dLAMMA—RA.BI.

**A 8115**

A 8115 (old Oriental Institute no. 57; Borger’s T21) measures 8.9 × 5.9 × 2.9 cm, is a duplicate of A 8112, and comes from the lower half of the prism. The extant text contains a passage describing the circumstances in which Assurbanipal came to rebuild Eḫulḫul and the beginning of a report of the reconstruction and enlargement of Ḫarrān’s principal temple. The text lines preserved correspond to ii, 27’-44’ of the author’s reconstruction of Prism I.

Transliteration

Lacuna

1’. [šá URU.tar-bi-ši] ’az'-q[u-up]
2’. [a-di a-di-ni a-bi l]a i-ma'-al’-[la-du]
3’. [AMA a-li-ti la] ’ba’-na-at ina ša-ša [AMA-ša]
5’. [30 ša] ’ib’-na-an-ni a-na LUGA[L-u-ti]
8’. [a-ma] [d3]0 ša ul-tu [u₃-me]
9’. [ru-qu] ’u’-ti iq-bu-[u]
10’. [e-nen-na] ’u’-kal-lim UN.MEš ar-[ku-ti]
11’. [é d30 ša¹šu] l-ma-nu—MAŠ A ¹aš-sur—P[AP—IBILA]
12’. [LUGAL pa-ni m]aḥ-ri-i[a e-[pu-šu]]
13’. [la-ba-r] ša ša-[lik-ma]
14’. [ú-šad-g]i-la ’pa’-n[u-u-a]
15’. [É.KUR šú-a-tu šá t]a-ba-riš i[L-li-ku]
16'. \[ina\ a-mat\ 30\ \text{d}nusk\]u an-\text{su}\-[s-su\ ad-ke]
17'. \[e-li\ ša\ u₃-me\ pa-n]i\ šu-bat-s[u\ ú-rap-piš]
18'. [...] “x’ [...] 
Lacuna

Translation

[......] (1') [For the preservation of my life], I set [up lion-headed eagles (and) divine emblems in gateway(s) of Egalmeslam, the temple of Nergal-of-Tarbišu].

(2'-14') [Even before my father was born (and prior to) my own birth-mother being conceived in [her mother’s] womb, [Sîn, who] created me for king[ship], nominated [me] for (the task of re)building Eḫulḫul, [saying: “A]ssurbanipal will (re)-[build] this temple [and] he will make me sit [therein] upon an et[ernal] dais”. [The word of S]în, which he utter[ed] in [days lo]ng gone, he [now] disclosed to people of a
lat[er generation]. He a[l]lowed the temple of Sîn which Sh[almaneser (III), son of Ashurna[sirpal (II), a king prior] to me, had [built to become] old [and he entr]usted (its renovation) to [me].

(15'-18') [By the command of Sîn (and) Nusk[u, I removed] the dilapidat[ed section(s) of that temple which had] become [old (and) made i]ts structure [larger than be-for]e. [……]

Notes

1¥: The restorations are based on Prism T, ii, 28 (Borger, 1996, p. 141). Prism I is the earliest prism inscription in which a description of work in Tarbiṣu is preserved.

The king appears not to have worked on Egalmeslam’s structure, as his grandfather Sennacherib had done, but merely to have set up divine emblems and lion-headed eagles in its gateways.9 The divine emblems were placed in Nergal’s temple at the very beginning of his reign, probably in his accession year or in his first year as king (Kislev [IX] 669-668). Sometime before Ab (V) 648, at least one pair of lion-headed eagles was stationed in a gateway of the temple, likely in one of the entrances of Nergal’s antecella. Shortly after the defeat of the Elamite king Ummanaldasu (Huban-haltas III) and the return of Nanāia to Uruk in late 646, another pair of lion-headed eagles was set up in Egalmeslam. These statues are reported to have been shrouded in fearsomeness and splendour, and plated with an inscribed silver covering (Borger 1996, p. 141, Rm 406, 8'-11', and p. 274, IIT, 73).

2'-18': When possible, the restorations are based on K 3065, i, 1-15, and Prism T, ii, 29-46 (Borger 1996, pp. 141-143); the restorations in line 15' are based on Prisms C and Kh, i, 81 (ibid., p. 142). The extant text of A 8115 preserves the first part of the “canonical first summary report” of rebuilding of Eḫullul and the construction of Emelamana. The “canonical first summary report” is the second earliest extant account describing the king’s building activities in Ḫarrān; the earliest is known from the building report of the Large Egyptian Tablets (Novotny 2003, pp. 88-94), which was written approximately fifteen years earlier (ca. 663-662). The passage is known from seven inscriptions (K 3065, Rm 589, and Prisms I, C, Kh, G, and T) and remained virtually unchanged during the four to five year period that it was in circulation, from 648 (eponymy of Bēšunu) to 645 (eponymate of Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšu) or 644.10 The report, which utilizes

9. For textual evidence for Sennacherib’s work on Egalmeslam, see Frahm 1997, pp. 188-190 B. Tarbiṣu.
10. Apart from minor variations, BM 121006+ (the “Thompson Prism”) omits E.KUR šu-a-tu ša la-ba-riš il-li-ku, “that temple which had become old”; BM 121006+, K 1769+ (Prism T), and ND 4378B+ (Prism Kh) add la (“not”) between LUGAL pa-ni maḫ-ri-ia (“a king prior to me”) and e-pu-šú (“which
material from the LET report and other descriptions of the construction in Ḫarrān written prior to 649-648 (not preserved or identified), contains the following information:11

1) Sin commissioned Assurbanipal in the distant past to rebuild Eḫuḫul; 2) the king removed the dilapidated remains of the temple after the “prophecy” (vaticinium ex eventu) was confirmed by extispicy; 3) the superstructure of Eḫuḫul was completely rebuilt; 4) a temple for Nusku (Emelamana) was constructed inside the temple complex; 5) both temples were roofed with cedar beams and white cedar door leaves were hung in principal gateways; 6) statues of wild bulls and long-haired heroes were set up as guardians; and 7) the statues of Sin and Nusku were escorted into their temples and installed upon their daises. For further information on the passage and for a new edition, see Novotny 2003, pp. 94-100 and 194-219.

Of the king’s many building projects, construction in Ḫarrān received almost as much attention as the building and decoration of the House-of-Succession (bīt redūti; the North Palace) in Nineveh; the scholars responsible for the composition of his res gestae described the rebuilding of Eḫuḫul and the construction of its twin(?), Emelamana, in more detail than any of his other projects. By the time Assurbanipal came to the throne, it had been at least 155 years since Ḫarrān’s principal temple had been rebuilt; Eḫuḫul had apparently been last worked on by Shalmaneser III (858-824). Therefore, it is not surprising that Sin’s residence had to be completely rebuilt. After receiving divine approval from Sin and Nusku, most likely by means of a positive response to a haruspical query, the dilapidated walls were removed. The foundations were exposed, inspected carefully, and deemed suitable for reuse; reports of this project do not mention the foundation’s poor condition or state that new foundations were laid. Following the old plan of the temple, the mud-brick walls were raised to a height of 30 courses (about 3.5 m high). After the structure was finished, the entire temple was roofed with beams of cedar, and doors of white cedar and cypress were hung in its gateways. According to one inscription (the Large Egyptian Tablets), the wood was supplied by rulers of the Sea Coast from Mount Lebanon and Mount Sirāra; Ba’alu of Tyre, Milki-ašapa of Byblos, Iakīn-Lū (Ikkilū) of Arvad, and Abī-Ba’al of Samsimurrana are the most likely candidates he built”); and BM 128263 (Prism T) adds [ša e-re-si-na] ‘ta’-a-bu (“[whose fragrance] is pleasant”) after Giš.GiMEŞ Giš li-ia-a-ri (“white cedar doors leaves”). For a score edition of this summary report, see Novotny 2003, pp. 290-303.

11. The author (Novotny 2003, pp. 94-96) has suggested that prism fragments 82-5-22,21 and BM 128302+ and tablet fragments Rm 2,329 and BM 134557 may have contained reports of the rebuilding of Eḫuḫul and the construction of Emelamana. Based on the extant text of the inscription preserved on BM 134557 and duplicate Rm 2,329, it is possible that these two tablet fragments may have contained an earlier version of the “canonical first summary report”.
dates since Mount Lebanon and Mount Shūrāra were in their sphere of influence. The doors were plated with bands of silver.12

Around 663 or 662, Assurbanipal lavishly decorated the temple’s interior. The walls of the inner sanctum were covered with objects made from 70 talents of shiny silver. Although it is not known exactly what types of objects were displayed in the room, it is likely that the metal used came from the booty acquired during the sack of Thebes in 664, possible from the two obelisks removed from a gateway of the Amun temple in Karnak.13 Metal from Thebes may have been used to decorate three pairs of inscribed, protective figures: wild bulls, long-haired heroes, and lion-headed eagles. In the inner sanctum, likely near Sīn’s raised dais, the king placed an identical pair of fierce wild bulls, poised to gore and trample enemies of Assyria; they were ornately decorated with silver and another metal alloy. Flanking the gateways of the ante-cella, Assurbanipal placed statues of long-haired heroes and lion-headed eagles. The long-haired heroes are reported to have contained some elements of sea-creatures, to have been bearded, and to have held divine emblems in their hands; these skillfully crafted figures were plated with silver and another metal alloy, and were placed in the ante-cella to bring forth the abundant yield of mountain and sea and to make requests to the moon-god on the king’s behalf. Little is known about the lion-headed eagles, but it is certain that they were plated with an inscribed silver covering and stationed on both sides of a gateway of the ante-cella.14 Lastly, some of the temple’s walls were decorated with friezes of baked-bricks coloured with obsidian (green, black, white, or red) and lapis lazuli (blue). After Eḫulḫul was completed, the statue of Sīn was brought into the temple in the midst of a joyous celebration and placed upon its new dais.

Very early in his reign, Assurbanipal decided to build a new temple for Nusku; it was named Emelamana, likely after his cella in Eḫulḫul or the Nusku temple in Nippur. Before construction could begin, workmen cleared a large tract of land to the east of Eḫulḫul and raised the level of the ground to the same height as the foundations of Sīn’s temple.15 It took a great deal of time and manpower to clear an area approximately 175 m (350 cubits) long and 32.5 m (72 cubits) wide and to raise the 12 to 14 m (130 courses) high mud-brick platform. By 663 or 662, the platform had been completed and the stone foundations had been laid. Construction on Emelamana was likely completed before the end of his first decade as king (ca. 659). Although inscriptions provide few details about the later phases of building, it is known that the temple was roofed with

beams of cedar and doors of cedar and white cedar were hung in its gateways; the doors were plated with inscribed bands of silver. Assurbanipal is known to have fashioned at least three other objects for the temple: 1) a pair of lion-headed eagles for the ante-cella; 2) a reddish gold-plated arch; and 3) an object which is said to help the king obtain victory, possibly a pair of wild bulls or long-haired heroes. After Emelamana was completed, the statue of Nusku was brought into the temple and placed upon its new dais.

For a more detailed study of these building activities, see Novotny 2003, pp. 109-193.

15: The restorations are based on Prisms C and Kh, i, 81 (Borger 1996, p. 142). The line appears only in inscriptions composed prior to 645: this text, K 3065, i, 13, and Prisms C and Kh, i, 81 (Borger 1996, p. 142). The scholar(s) responsible for the composition of Prism T had É.KUR šú-a-tu šá la-ba-riš il-li-ku (“that temple which had become old”) removed from the report.

**A 8116**

A 8116 (old Oriental Institute no. 216) measures 5.0 × 4.2 × 2.1 cm, does not belong to the same object as BM 127896+ (no. 3), and comes from the top of the prism. The extant text contains a passage stating that the gods granted Assurbanipal surpassing strength and virility that allowed him to march uncontested from the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea. The text lines preserved correspond to iii 25‘-30’ of the author’s reconstruction of Prism I.

![Fig. 6. A 8116.](image)

16. Respectively Novotny 2003, p. 175, K 9143, rev. 11‘-13’; pp. 176-177, K 2813+, 24-27; and p. 181, Sm 530+; 24-29.
Transliteration
1. [DINGIR-us-su-un dun-nu zik-ru]-u-[ê]
2. [e-mu-qi si-ra-a-ti uša]t-li-mu-[n-ni]
3. [KUR.KUR la ma-gi-re-ia ina] "ŠU.2"-ia im-n[u-û]
4. [ušam-su-in-ni m]a-"la" ŚA-b[i-ia]
5. [ul-tu tam-tim e-ÅB a-di ta]m-tim ša[p-ÅB]
6. [ša LUGAL.MEŠ AD.MEŠ-ia ir]-"te"-[d-du-û]

Lacuna

Translation
(1-6) [The great gods whose divinity I constantly revere en]dowed [me with power, vi-
ril]ity, (and) outstanding strength. They] placed [lands which had not submitted to me
into] my hands (and) [allowed me to achieve my] hear[t’s de]sire. [As for me, I marched
from the Upper Sea to the] Lo[wer S]ea, [where the kings, my predecessors, had
tr]ave[led]. […….]

Notes
1-6): The restorations are based on Prism T, iv, 12-22 (Borger 1996, p. 146). The pas-
sage appears to have been composed anew for Prism I.

A 8131

A 8131 (old Oriental Institute no. 198; Borger’s TVar2) measures 9.0 × 8.3 × 4.2 cm, is
a duplicate of BM 134462 (no. 1) and BM 134464+ (no. 4), and comes from the top of
the last two columns of a hexagonal(?) prism. The fragment is the only certain exemplar
of Prism I identified in the Asiatic collection of the Oriental Institute. Col. i holds part of
a passage stating that rulers from east to west looked to Assyria for protection
and the beginning of the building report, which describes the rebuilding of the Sin-
Šamaš temple in Nineveh. Col. ii holds part of the concluding formulae, specifically
Assurbanipal’s advice to future rulers. The text lines preserved correspond to iv, 1-17
and v, 5-17 of the author’s reconstruction of Prism I.
Transliteration
Col. i'
1. [ú-šak-ni-šá] ṣa'-na ni-ri-ia
2. [GUN man-da-at-tú] šat-ti-šam-ma
3. [ú-kin ED]IN-uš-šú-un
4. [ina qí-bit d30 dNI]N.GAL dUTU u d-a-a
5. [LUGAL.MEš a-ši]b pa-rak-ki
6. [ú-na-āš-ša-qu] GÌR.2-ia
7. [mal-ke GAL.MEš šá ši-taš] u ši-la-an
8. [a-na kit-ri-šú-nu ú]-pa-qu-ni

9. [ina u₃-me-šú-ma É d30 dNI.N.GAL] dUTU d₄-a-a
10. [šá qé-reb NINA.KI ša ¹AN.ŠÁR—PAP—AŠ LUGA] L KUR.aš-šur.KI
11. [AD DŪ-ia e]-pu-šū
12. [il-li-ku l]a-ba-riš
13. [Ē.KUR šū-a-tū e-na]-aḫ-ma
14. [i-qu-pa Ė.GAR]MEŠ-šū
15. [Ē.KUR šu-a-tū a-na si-ḫi]r-ti-šū
16. [ar-šip u-šak-li]l ul-la-a] re-ši-šū

Lacuna

Col. ii'
1. a-na be-lut [KUR u UN.MEŠ]
2. i-nam-bu-ú [zi-kir-šū]
3. e-nu-ma eš-re-[e-ti ša-ti-na]
4. i-lab-bi-ra-[ma en-na-ḫa]
5. an-ḫu-us-si-n[a lu-ud-diš]
6. MU.SAR-ú [ši-šir MU-ia]
7. li-mur-[ma ]MEŠ lip-šu-us]
8. UDU.SISKUR BAL-qi a-n[a ša-ri-šū lu-tir]
9. ki-i ša-ša] a-na-ku [MU.SAR-u]
10. ši-šir šu-me 1AN.ŠAR—’PAP”–A[S MAN KUR.AŞ-SUR.KI]
11. AD ba-ni-ia [a-mu-ru]
12. Ė.MEŠ ap-šu-šū [UDU.SISKUR aq-qu-u]
13. ’it-i’ [mu-šar-re-e ši-šir šu-mi-ia āš-ku-nu]

Lacuna

Translation

(i, 1-8) [I made the people who live in those lands bow down] to my yoke. Each year, [I imposed tax (and) tribute up]on them. [At the command of Sîn, Nikkal, Šamaš, and Aia, [the kings who sit up]on throne-daises [kissed] my feet (and) [great rulers from east] to west [looked to me [for their protection].

(i', 9-17) [At that time, the temple of Sîn, Nikkal], Šamaš, (and) Aia [which is inside Nineveh (and) which Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, [the father who engendered me, had] built [had become old]; [that temple had become dilapidated and its walls] had collapsed. I completely (re)built that temple in [its] [entire]ty (and) [I raised up] its summits. [I roofed it with tall] [beams of cypress . . . .]

(iii, 1-8) [In the future, may (somebody) among the children, grandchildren, (their) children and (grand)children, one of the kings, my descendants, who Aššur, Sin, (and) Šamaš choose and] nomi[nate] for ruling over [the land and people, renovate] the dilapi-
dated section(s) of [these] shrines when they become old [and dilapidated]. May he see (this) inscription [written in my name, anoint (it) with oil], offer sacrifices, (and) [return] (it) to its place.

(ii', 9-13) When I [saw an inscription] written in the name of Esarhad[don, king of Assyria], the father who engendered me, I anointed (it) with oil, [offered sacrifices, (and) placed (it) with an inscription written in my (own) name]. [………]

Notes

i', 1-8: The restorations are generally based on Prism T, iv, 28-35 (Borger 1996, p. 147).

i', 4: Borger (1996, p. 147) restores u between d30 and dNi[N].GAL. However, compare the god list in Prism T, iii, 18: d30 dNi[N].GAL dUtU d-a-a. Prism T, iv, 31, and Prism Kh, ii, 12c have Aššur and Mullissu and Aššur and Ištar respectively in place of the tutelary deities of the Šin-Šamaš temple in Nineveh.

i', 9-17: The restorations are based on Prism T, iii, 18-25 (Borger 1996, p. 144).

The restoration of the Šin-Šamaš temple appears to be the second biggest project undertaken in Nineveh; the largest, of course, the rebuilding of the House-of-Succession (būt redāti; the North Palace). Assurbanipal states that he tore down the temple’s walls because they had become old and dilapidated. This is a little surprising since Esarhaddon had completely rebuilt them less than twenty-five years before; it is possible that the bricks used were not fully dry when they were set in place or the inner brick walls were not well protected from the elements. After the stone foundations were inspected and deemed suitable for reuse, the superstructure of the entire temple was rebuilt, the building was roofed with beams of cedar, and doors of white cedar were hung in its gateways. After construction came to a close, the images of Šin, Nikkal, Nusku, Šamaš, and Aia were returned to the temple and placed upon their respective daises. Although the building report of this inscription describes the work as completed, it is likely that the project was actually finished two years later, sometime in 646. This is suggested by the fact that Assurbanipal does not mention the rebuilding of the Šin-Šamaš temple again until Ab (V) 645. If the project had been completed in 648, a report of this accomplishment should have been included in the prologues of Prisms C (647), Kh (646), and G (646), but it is not.

i’, 9: The restoration of ina u₄-me-šū-ma is based on Prism T, v, 33, and Edition L (K 2664+; formerly TTaf1), v, 14 (Borger 1996, p. 169). The main building accounts of Assurbanipal’s Assyrian prism inscriptions begin without exception with ina u₄-me-šū-ma

(“at that time”); see Borger 1996, p. 72, Prism F, vi, 22, and Prism A, x, 51; p. 117, Prism B, viii, 64; p. 118, Prism D, viii, 64; p. 163, Prism C, x, 88; p. 164, Prism Kh, x, 88; and p. 183, Prism E, Stück 18, 4.

The restorations are based on Prism I exemplars BM 134462, 5-17, and BM 134464+, ii', 1'-13' (Borger 1996, pp. 119 and 171). The advice to future rulers was borrowed from Prism D, viii, 81-100 (Borger 1996, pp. 119-120). The scholar(s) responsible for the composition of this inscription utilized Prism D, viii, 81-100, for the king’s advice to future rulers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Borger R. 1956, Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien (AfO Beih. 9), Graz.
Frame G. 1995, Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (RIMB 2), Toronto.