

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
51ST RENCONTRE ASSYRIOLOGIQUE
INTERNATIONALE
Held at
THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
of
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
JULY 18–22, 2005

edited by

ROBERT D. BIGGS,
JENNIE MYERS,
and
MARTHA T. ROTH

THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
STUDIES IN ANCIENT ORIENTAL CIVILIZATION • NO. 62
CHICAGO • ILLINOIS

Library of Congress Control Number: 2007937452

ISBN-13: 978-1-885923-54-7

ISBN-10: 1-885923-54-6

ISSN: 0081-7554

The Oriental Institute, Chicago

© 2008 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

Published 2008. Printed in the United States of America.

Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization • No. 62

Series Editors

Leslie Schramer

and

Thomas G. Urban

Series Editors' Acknowledgments

Lindsay DeCarlo and Katie L. Johnson helped with the production of this volume.

Cover Illustration

The Outer Portal of Citadel Gate A, with the Partially Excavated Central Portal Behind. *Khorsabad*, Part 2: *The Citadel and the Town*, by Gordon Loud and Charles B. Altman, pl. 7. Oriental Institute Publications 40. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Printed by McNaughton & Gunn, Saline, Michigan

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Services — Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

CLASSIFYING ASSURBANIPAL'S INSCRIPTIONS: PRISMS C, KH (= CND), AND G*

Jamie Novotny, Chicago, Illinois

In 1996, Rykle Borger did the Assyriological community a great service by publishing concise, conflated “editions” of Assurbanipal’s *res gestae* and handwritten transliterations of several hundred clay prism and tablet fragments. There is little doubt that *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals* is an extremely useful research tool for scholars and students of Near Eastern history and languages, and that it has begun filling the astonishingly large gap in our knowledge of late Neo-Assyrian inscriptions (721–612 B.C.).¹ Borger’s contribution has made it possible for other Assyriologists to examine the various prism editions, as well as numerous previously unpublished tablet fragments. This paper presents information on Prisms C, Kh (= CKalach), and G that has come to light since Borger’s publication, specifically on their classification and dates of composition (647 and 646 B.C.).

PRISM C²

This edition from Nineveh is the earliest known inscription to report on the death of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and the fall of Babylon in the second half of 648.³ Prism C is known from four poorly preserved, decagonal clay prisms; there could be as many as twenty-four additional exemplars, but their attribution is not entirely certain (see the Appendix below). Although the text is still fragmentarily preserved, it is known that (1) the prologue of Prism I (formerly TVar) and the military narration of Prisms B and D were used as a template;⁴ (2) numerous editorial changes and additions were made to existing reports; (3) the death of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and the fall of Babylon are described for the first time; (4) the inscription does not contain an account of the fourth Elamite campaign (see below); and (5) the building report described the rebuilding of a section of a palace in Nineveh, possibly the armory (*ekaḷ māšarti*) in the outer town (Nebi Yunus).

* I would like to thank Grant Frame, Ronald Sweet, and Irene Winter for offering their critical remarks on a draft of this manuscript. Their time and care is greatly appreciated. Moreover, I am grateful to John Curtis and Christopher Walker for permitting me to collate Assurbanipal inscriptions in the British Museum; to Walter Farber for allowing me access to the Assurbanipal material in the Oriental Institute; and to the staff of the Department of the Ancient Near East (British Museum) and to Jonathan Tenney (University of Chicago) for the efficient and speedy supply of prisms. The passages from Prism G cited here were collated from the originals and those from Prism Kh are based on the published copies.

¹ R. Borger, *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals: Die Prismenklassen A, B, C = K, D, E, F, G, H, J und T sowie andere Inschriften* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996).

² Borger, *Beiträge*, pp. 16–26, 28–37, 41–42, 92–101, 103–117, 122–127, 130–131, 137–155, 158–164, 205–208, 212–218, 220–232, 236–237, 243–245, and 253–254. All but one of the fragments originate from nineteenth-century British Museum excavations at Kuyunjik; VA 2972 most likely originates from clandestine digging at Nineveh. Borger rightly pointed out that Arthur Carl Piepkorn’s “Prism K” (= Theo Bauer’s “Prism G,” K. 1703) is identical to Prism C; for details, see Borger, *Beiträge*, p. 126. There are twenty-four prism fragments that may contain copies of this prism inscription, but the pieces do

not preserve enough for one to be certain to which inscription they belong. See the Appendix for the relevant pieces.

³ The Assyrians may have been in control of the city as early as the middle of the eponymy of Bēlšunu (648) or as late as the month of Tebet (X). Grant Frame, *Babylonia 689–627 B.C.: A Political History*, Publications de l’Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 69 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1992), pp. 155–57 and nn. 106–07, suggests that Babylon may have fallen by 1 Shebat (XI).

⁴ The prologue describes eight building projects: (1) the completion and decoration of Eḫursaggalkurkura; (2) the completion of Esagila and the return of the statues of Marduk and his entourage; (3) the refurbishing and fashioning of cult objects for Marduk and Zarpanitu; (4) the setting up of wild bulls in gateways of Ezida; (5) the decoration of Emašmaš and Egašankalama; (6) the refurbishing of Šarrat-Kidmuri’s divine image and the renewal of her cultic rites; (7) the setting up of lion-headed eagles and divine emblems in Egalmeslam; and (8) the rebuilding of Eḫulḫul and the construction of its twin Emelamana. The military narration recounts the king’s achievements on the battlefield: campaigns I (and II) report on events in Egypt; [III] in Anatolia and along the Syrian coast; IV in Qirbit; [V] in Mannea and Media; VI–[VII] in Elam; and [VIII] in Gambulu, Elam, Babylonia, and Arabia.

Although no exemplar of this text of approximately thirteen hundred lines preserves a date, scholars usually date Prism C to the post-canonical eponymy of Nabû-nâdin-aḥi (governor of Kār-Shalmaneser; modern Tell Ahmar), the same year that Prisms CKalach and G were issued; however, there has been no consensus as to the year he held this post, 647 or 646.⁵ It is now fairly certain (see below) that this edition was composed in 647 and that this governor of Kār-Shalmaneser was eponym in 646. A physical examination of the inscription's principal exemplar (K. 1741+) reveals that its *terminus ante quem* is the first war against the Elamite king Ummanaldasu (Huban-haltāš III); there is no space for such a report between the accounts of the overthrow of Indabibi in Elam and the wars against the Arabs.⁶ There is a lacuna of approximately twenty-three lines at the end of col. ix and a gap of about eighteen lines at the beginning of col. x, and it is very certain that these missing forty-one lines contained the first half of the description of the Arabian wars.⁷

A fragment in the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (A 8128) may support this observation. Assuming the piece is a duplicate of K. 1794+ and not an exemplar of Prism G, then col. ii' 8'–12' confirms that accounts of the Arabian campaigns immediately follow the statement about the accession of Ummanaldasu. After collation, the pertinent lines read:

- 8' m[um]l-[man-al-da-si DUMU m[at-ta-me-tu]
 9' ṣ[il]-[še-ši-bu ina GIŠ.GU.ZA-šū]
 10' m[ia-u-ta-'] DUMU m[h]a-za-a-DINGIR]
 11' L[UGAL KUR.qa-ad-ri e-piš ARAD-ti-ia]
 12' ṣ[il]-[šū DINGIR.MEŠ-šū im-ḥur-an-ni-ma]⁸

Th[ey placed] Um[manaldasu, son of Atta-metu, on his (Indabibi's) throne. Iauta', son of Ḥazā-il],
 k[ing of Qedar, who does obeisance to me, approached me] a[bout his gods and ...]

With this new information, we now know that (1) the *terminus ante quem* for Prism C is the first war against Ummanaldasu; (2) that reports of the fourth Elamite campaign were recorded for the first time in inscriptions composed in the eponymy of Nabû-nâdin-aḥi (Prisms CKalach and G); and (3) that K. 13778 is an exemplar of Prism G (assuming the fragment comes from Nineveh). Since it is very likely that Prism C was composed one year earlier than Prisms CKalach and G, then the eponymy of Nabû-nâdin-aḥi cannot immediately follow that of Bēlšunu (648) but is separated from it by one year. Therefore, this governor of Kār-Shalmaneser had to have been eponym in 646. It is still uncertain which official was eponym in 647. Following Margarete Falkner, Nabû-da'ʾinanni of Que is tentatively assigned to this year.⁹ Given the new evidence for the dating of K. 1794+, the post-canonical eponyms for 648–645 should be:

- 648 Bēlšunu of Ḥindanu
 647 Nabû-da'ʾinanni of Que (attribution uncertain)
 646 Nabû-nâdin-aḥi of Kār-Shalmaneser
 645 Nabû-šar-aḥḥēšu of Samaria

⁵ For the opinion that Nabû-nâdin-aḥi's tenure was in 646 B.C., see A. Kirk Grayson, "The Chronology of the Reign of Ashurbanipal," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 70 (1980): 245; and Mordecai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, "Ashurbanipal's Conquest of Babylon: The First Official Report – Prism K," *Orientalia* NS 50 (1981): 239 and n. 24. For the suggestion that his eponymy was in 647 B.C., see most recently Robert Whiting, "The Post-Canonical and Extra-Canonical Eponyms," in Alan R. Millard, *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910–612 BC*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 2 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1992), p. 74; Borger, *Beiträge*, pp. 130–31 and 257; and Julian E. Reade, "Assyrian Eponyms, Kings, and Pretenders, 648–605 BC," *Orientalia* NS 67 (1998): 256–57.

⁶ The earliest account of the fourth Elamite campaign is preserved on K. 13778, ND 4309, ND 4378B+, ND 5409, ND 5527, A 8149, and A 8150+, but not on Prism C's principal exemplar; see Borger, *Beiträge*, pp. 158–63 ix 87'–89'.

⁷ For the relevant fragments, see Theo Bauer, *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals*, Assyriologische Bibliothek, n.F., 1 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1933), pls. 5–6 and 12–13. Fragment 2 (pls. 5 and 12) contains Borger's C i 17–34 and x 39–55; i 17 is beside x 39. Fragments 9 and 37 (pls. 6 and 12–13) preserve Borger's C i 91–103, xi 70–86, and x 108–122; i 91 is next to x 111 and ix 73 is beside x 108. Lastly, fragment 36 (pls. 12–13) contains Borger's C ix 55–70 and x 100–107; ix 65 is next to x 101. The gap in the Arabian campaigns corresponds to Prism B vii 93–viii 30 (Borger, *Beiträge*, pp. 113–14).

⁸ Restored from Borger, *Beiträge*, p. 113 B vii 93–95 and p. 155 C ix 85–86.

⁹ For the proposed date of Nabû-da'ʾinanni's tenure, see Margarete Falkner, "Die Eponymen der spätassyrischen Zeit," *Archiv für Orientalforschung* 17 (1954–56): 118; and Jamie R. Novotny, "Zaḥalt-Metal for Marduk's *Paramāhu* and the Date of Assurbanipal's E-Prisms," *Orientalia* NS 72 (2003): 215.

PRISM KH (= BORGER'S CKALACH AND CND)¹⁰

This edition is the second of Assurbanipal's *res gestae* composed after the conclusion of the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn rebellion, the only positively identified inscription of this king to have come from Calah (modern Nimrud), and the first of two prism inscriptions issued in the eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḫi (646).¹¹ The fragments belong to a single prism class, one (according to Borger) most closely resembling Prism C. Since the military narration of this edition and Prism C were considered to be identical, Borger classified the inscription as CKalach (or CND), suggesting not only the version of the *res gestae* to which these fragments belong, but also the place where they were discovered.¹² However, a recent examination of K. 1794+ (see above) reveals that the Calah fragments are not exemplars of Prism C but are pieces of a different inscription, one that included a description of the fourth Elamite campaign. Since the present classification of Nimrud material is no longer valid, it is recommended that the designations CKalach and CND be discontinued. Prism Kh (= Kalach) is suggested as a suitable replacement.¹³

It is unclear how many exemplars there are, but there could be as many as fifteen copies or as few as two or three different prisms (see the Appendix below for the relevant fragments).¹⁴ Although there are large gaps in the text, it is certain that (1) Prism C's prologue and military narration were used as a template; (2) one new report was added to the military narration, a description of the fourth Elamite campaign; and (3) its building report described work on a section of Ezida.

Prism Kh is the first of two known prism inscriptions to have been issued in 646; the other is Prism G. Although the months in which the two editions were composed are not preserved, the evidence for the Calah inscription being the earlier of the two is three-fold:¹⁵ (1) the military narration of Prism G contains several editorial changes and additions; (2) the order of the first war with Ummanaldasu and the Arabian campaigns in Prism G was changed; and (3) the scribes responsible for the Nimrud prisms appear to have allocated more space for the description of war with Ummanaldasu than those who wrote out the copies of Prism G. Since the first two pieces of evidence will be presented in full with Prism G, only the third point is addressed here.

The Nimrud fragments (ND 4306+, ND 5406, and ND 5527) give the impression that the scribe(s) compressed the prologue and most of the military narration into eight columns so that they could describe *in extenso* the most recent campaign, the first war against Ummanaldasu with the conquest of Bīt-Imbî.¹⁶ The fragments from Nineveh (A 8150+, K. 13778, and BM 134436), on the other hand, give the impression that the scribes copied the same passage into a more confined space, between the description of the Arabian wars at the end of col. ix and the building account in the second half of col. x. A comparison of the script and line density of the fragments containing this report supports this theory; on average one line in Prism G corresponds to approximately two lines in Prism Kh.¹⁷

Given the evidence presented above, it is very likely that Prism Kh was the first prism inscription to report on the first war against Ummanaldasu. If this proves true, then this edition may have been issued sometime during the first two or three months (Nisan, Iyyar, or Sivan) of the eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḫi and copies of Prism G may

¹⁰ Borger, *Beiträge*, pp. 16–26, 28–37, 41–42, 92–101, 103–117, 127–132, 137–155, 158–165, 205–208, 212–218, 220–232, 236–237, 243–245, 253–254, 257, and 381–383. Clay cylinder ND 6209, which is said to be a fragment of an Assurbanipal inscription, actually contains part of a copy of Sîn-šarru-iškun B.

¹¹ A date is partially preserved on ND 5518+ vi' 5'–6' (Ebbe E. Knudsen, "Fragments of Historical Texts from Nimrud-II," *Iraq* 29 [1967], pl. 23): [... U]D.25.KĀM *lim-mu* ^{md}AG-A[Š-PAP] / [L]Ü.[GA]R?-[KUR?]¹ URU.kar-^{md}šil-ma-ni-[MAŠ], "[d]ay 25 of [the month ...], eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḫi, go[v]ern[er] of Kār-Shalmaneser."

¹² Most of the fragments were discovered in the Nabû temple (Ezida) by the British School of Archaeology and the Iraqi State Organization for Antiquities and Heritage; ND 814 was discovered in Assurnasirpal's palace (Room OO). For the provenances, see Knudsen, "Fragments of Historical Texts," pp. 65–69; and Muzahim Mahmud and Jeremy Black, "Recent Work in the Nabu Temple, Nimrud," *Sumer* 44 (1985–86): 136.

¹³ The redesignation of the inscription as Prism K is avoided so that the edition is not confused with Piepkorn's "Prism K."

¹⁴ It is certain that the following fragments do not come from the same object: ND 814 and ND 5406+; ND 814 and ND 5538+; ND 4306+ and ND 5406+; ND 4306+ and ND 5527; ND 4306+ and ND 5411A+; ND 4306+ and ND 5541; ND 4306+ and *Sumer* 44 (1985–86) No. 2+; ND 4378+ and ND 5408; ND 4378+ and ND 5410; ND 4378+ and ND 5538+; ND 5405 and ND 5410; ND 5405 and ND 5541; and ND 5411A–E+ and ND 6206.

¹⁵ For the dates, see notes 11 and 20.

¹⁶ On exemplar CND2, the report begins on col. ix, line 9; see Knudsen, "Fragments of Historical Texts," pl. 14 ND 4306.

¹⁷ For example, compare ND 4306 i' 10–13 with BM 134436 ii' 29'–30' and ND 5407 i' with K. 13778. See Bauer, *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals*, pl. 47; R. Campbell Thompson, "A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh (1927–32)," *Iraq* 7 (1940), fig. 19 No. 34; and Knudsen, "Fragments of Historical Texts," pls. 14 and 20.

have been written a few months later, but probably before or during the sixth month of the year (Elul).¹⁸ Until fully preserved dates for both 646-editions come to light, this suggestion must remain hypothetical.

PRISM G¹⁹

This edition from Nineveh is the second and only other known prism inscription composed in the eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḥi (646).²⁰ As suggested by several editorial changes and additions made to its military narration (see below), Prism G was probably issued not more than a few months after Prism Kh. Borger identified the inscription from fragments of Prism C and the now obsolete Prism “K.” The inscription is known from five poorly preserved, decagonal clay prisms, most of which were purchased from a dealer in Mosul; there could be as many as twenty-five additional exemplars, but their attribution is not entirely certain.²¹ Although there are large gaps in the text, it is fairly certain that (1) Prism Kh’s prologue and military narration were used as a template; (2) editorial changes were made to existing reports; (3) a new report was added to the description of the Arabian wars; (4) the order of the first war with Ummanaldasu and the campaigns against the Arabs was reversed; and (5) its building report described work on a section of Nineveh’s citadel wall.²² As far as the edition is preserved, the military narration differs from that of the earlier 646-edition as follows:

1. After the description of the surrender of Ba’alu of Tyre, the king states that he returned home. Prism G has [šal-meš a]-tu-ra a-na KUR-aš-šur.K[1] (“[I] returned [safely] to Assyria”) in place of [šal-meš a-tu-ra a-na NINA.KI URU be-l]u-ti-ia (“[I] returned safely to Nineveh, the city of [my [lords]hip”).²³ Prism Kh follows Prisms B, D, and C in this regard (the same is true for Nos. 2, 3, and 4).

2. In the account of the “eighth” campaign, Assurbanipal boasts that he humiliated and executed Dunānu of Gambulu and some of his family and supporters. The scholar(s) responsible for this edition added one line to the description of the torture of Mannu-kî-aḥḥē and Nabû-ušalli in Arbela and altered and expanded the report of Dunānu’s execution in Nineveh. The pertinent passages read:

PRISM KH

(vii 21) ša mman-nu-ki-PAP.MEŠ LÚ.[2-u (š) mdu-na-nu] (vii 22) ṛū mAG-l-šal-li LÚ.[šá-UGU-URU KUR.gam-bu-li] (vii 23) ša UGU DINGIR.MEŠ-lia¹ iq-b[u-u šil-la-tú GAL-tú] (vii 24) qé-reb URU.LÍMMU-DINGIR EME-šú-ṛum¹ á[š-lu-up áš-lu-ṛa KUŠ-šú-un] (vii 25) mdu-na-nu q[é-reb NINA.KI] (vii 26) e-li GIŠ.ma-ka-ši [id-du-šú-ma] (vii 27) iṭ-bu-ḥu-uš [as-liš]

As for Mannu-kî-aḥḥē, the [deputy of Dunānu], and Nabû-ušalli, the [city overseer of Gambulu], who had utte[red grievous blasphemies] against my gods, I [tore out] their tongue(s) (and) [flayed them] inside Arbela. (As for) Dunānu, [they laid him] on a slaughtering-bench in[side Nineveh and] butchered him [like a sheep].²⁴

¹⁸ Compare the relationship between Prisms F and T; the earliest known F-exemplar was inscribed on 24 Ayyaru (II) 645 and the earliest copy of T preserving a date was written out on 6 Abu (V) 645; see Borger, *Beiträge*, p. 76 Assur 825 vii 5–6 and p. 172 K. 1729 iii’ 7’–9’. The “Thompson Prism” (BM 121006+) is the latest known prism inscribed within the lunar year: 24 Elul (VI) 645.

¹⁹ Borger, *Beiträge*, pp. 16–17, 21–22, 29–30, 35–37, 41–42, 93, 98, 104–106, 108–112, 115–117, 119–120, 127, 130–132, 143–146, 150–154, 159–160, 165–167, 205, 207, 213, 216–217, 221, 224–226, 229–232, 237, 244–245, 257, 338, 370–373, and 378. There are twenty-five prism fragments that may contain copies of this prism inscription, but the pieces do not preserve enough for one to be certain to which inscription they belong. See the Appendix for the relevant pieces.

²⁰ A date is partially preserved on A 8104 i’ 7’–9’ (Borger, *Beiträge*, p. 167): [...] ṛUD.10?KÁM¹ / [lim-mu m^d(+)]AG]–AŠ–PAP / [LÚ.GAR?–KUR? URU.kar–m]d[šil-ma-nu–MAŠ, “day 10 of [the month ..., eponymy of Nabû]-nādin-aḥi, [governor of Kār]-Shalmaneser.”

²¹ In addition to the three exemplars identified by Borger, K. 13778 (Bauer, *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals*, pl. 47) and A 8149 (Borger, *Beiträge*, 4^o Heft 122) are now regarded as copies of Prism G since they both preserve part of the report of the fourth Elamite campaign.

²² Although the building report is not preserved, the association with the citadel wall is known from the concluding formula in ix 8’’: BĀD šu-a-tu (“that wall”). See Borger, *Beiträge*, p. 119 (A 8111 ii’ 8’).

²³ Compare A 8003 i’ 14’ (Jamie R. Novotny, “A 8003: A Fragment of Assurbanipal Prism G,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 56 [2004]: 20, fig. 1) with ND 4378D i’ 4’ (Knudsen, “Fragments of Historical Texts,” pl. 17). The passage is restored from Borger, *Beiträge*, 4^o Heft 73 A 8005 iii’ 28’.

²⁴ Borger, *Beiträge*, 4^o Heft 267 ND 5411A–E iv’ 43’–49’. The lines correspond to Borger’s C vii 84–107 (Borger, *Beiträge*, p. 108).

PRISM G

(vii 1'') [... ša UGU DINGIR.MEŠ-ia i]q-bu-[u] (vii 2'') [šil-la-tú GAL-tú ... la?] [ta]-a-bu (vii 3'') [qé-reb URU. LÍMMU-DINGIR EME-šú-un] áš-lu-up (vii 4'') [áš-ḫu-ṭa KUŠ]-šú-un (vii 5'') [mdu-na-nu (u) msa-am-ḡu-nu? ḫi-ri]-[i] GAL₅.LÁ.MEŠ (vii 6'') [... l]a? e-piš ARAD-ti-iá (vii 7'') [qé-reb NINA.KI meš-re-ti-šú-un?] ú-par-ri-is (vii 8'') [... LUGAL.MEŠ a-šib pa-rak-ki (vii 9'') [...]] [ú]-še-bil

[As for Mannu-kî-aḫḫē, the deputy of Dunānu, and Nabû-ušalli, the city overseer of Gambulu, who] had utter[ed] grievous blasphemies against my gods, ... un]favorable [...], I tore out [their tongue(s) (and) flayed th]em [inside Arbela. (As for) Dunānu (and) Samgumu, exact cop]ies of ḡallû-demons, [...] who did [n]ot do obeisance to me, I had [their limbs] cut off [inside Nineveh. ...] the kings who sit upon throne-daises, I had [...] brought [...]²⁵

3. Prism G provides some additional information on why Tammaritu was deposed by his servant Indabibi, namely what the Elamite said to offend Assurbanipal's tutelary deities (Aššur and Mullissu). Tammaritu's "insolent words" (*mēreḫtu*) concerning the beheading of his predecessor Teumman and the submission of Ummanigaš (Huban-nikaš II) are recorded in this inscription for the first time. There are a few additional changes to the report. Compare the two accounts:

PRISM KH

(vii 34') [m]am-ma-ri-tu MAN KUR.ELAM.M]A.K[I] (vii 35') [ša me-ri-iḫ-tu i]q-bu-ú] (vii 36') [e]-[li ni-kis SAG.DU m]e-um-man] (vii 37') [š]a ik-k[i-su a-ḫu-ru-ú ERIM.ḪI.A-ia] (vii 38') [ú]l ŠEŠ.MEŠ-[šú qin-nu-šú NUMUN É AD-šú] (vii 39') it-ti 8[5 NUN.MEŠ šá KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (vii 40') a-li-kut [Á^u-šú]

[Tammaritu, king of Elam, [who spoke insolent words] on ac[count of the decapitation of Teumman, w]hom [a low-ranking soldier from my army] had beh[eaded], and [his] brothers, [his family, (and) the seed of his father's house], with 8[5 Elamite nobles] who march at [his side] ...²⁶

PRISM G

(viii 38b') m]am-ma-ri-tu [MAN KUR.]ELAM.MA^l.KI (viii 39') [š]a UGU ni-k[i]s SAG.DU m]e-um-man] me-ri-iḫ-tú^l (viii 40') [i]q-bu^l-u šá ik-k[i-su a-ḫu-ru-ú] ERIM.ḪI.A-ia (viii 41') um-ma i-nak-ki-su-u S[AG.DU MAN KUR. ELAM.M]A.KI (viii 42') ina qé-reb KUR-šú ina [UKKIN^l [ERIM.ḪI.A-šú šá-ni-ia-a-nu i]q-bi] [ú]l m]um^l-man-i-ḡaš (viii 43') ke-e [i]-na^l-[áš-šiq qaq-qa-ru ina pa-an LÚ.A-K]IN.MEŠ (viii 44') [š]a maš-šur^l-DÜ-A MAN [KUR.AN.ŠÁR. KI bi-mu-ut AN.ŠÁR u? d]NIN^l.LÍL (viii 45') [UGU^l [a-ma-a-ti an-na-a-ti šá il-zi-nu AN.ŠÁR u d]NIN.LÍL? e-ri-ḫ]u-šú-ma (viii 46') m]am-ma^l-[ri-tú ŠEŠ.MEŠ-šú qin-nu-šú NUMUN É] [AD^l-šú (viii 47') [i]-[ri] 8[5 NUN.MEŠ šá KUR. ELAM.MA.KI a-li-kut i]-[di^l-šú (viii 48') [...]] x x

Tammaritu, [king of] Elam, [wh]o spoke insolent words on account of the decap[itation of Teumman], whom a low-ranking soldi[er from] my [ar]my had beheaded, saying: "Does one cut off the h[ead of the king of Elam] in his own land, in the assembly of [his troops?]" He spoke a second time: "Moreover, how could Ummanigaš ki[ss the ground before the messe]ngers of Assurbanipal, king of [Assyria, the creation of Aššur and] Mullissu?" On account of [these words that he had slanderously uttered, Aššur and Mullissu attac]ked him. Tamma[ritu, his brothers, his family, (and) the seed of] his father's [house, w]ith [85 Elamite nobles who march at] his [s]ide [...]²⁷

²⁵ Borger, *Beiträge*, 4° Heft 109–110 A 8109 i' 1'–9'.

²⁶ Donald J. Wiseman, "Two Historical Inscriptions from Nimrud," *Iraq* 13 (1951): pl. 12 ND 814 i' 20'; and Knudsen, "Fragments of Historical Texts," pl. 17 ND 4378C ii' 1'–5'. The lines correspond to Borger's C viii 48–53 (Borger, *Beiträge*, pp. 110–11).

²⁷ Borger, *Beiträge*, 4° Heft 71 A 8004 ii' 11'–14', 83 A 8012 i' 16'–26', 103 A 8094, and 108 A 8107 ii' 5'–13'. The passage is a conflated text (exs. G1B and G2).

4. In the description of the Arabian wars, a brief report of the defeat and capture of queen ADīia (exact reading uncertain) was added before the episode describing the submission of the Nabatean king Natnu. The event probably took place very early in the eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḥi (646) and appears to be the latest event narrated in Prism G. The new report reads:

(ix 1'') [f]l^a-[Di-ia-a šar-r^at KUR.a-ri-bi] (ix 2'') di-ik-[ta]-[šá ma-^a-as-su a-duk] (ix 3'') kul-ta-re-e-[šá] [ina dGİŠ.
BAR aq-mu] (ix 4'') šá-a-šá bal-tu-us-[sa ina ŠU^u aš-bar] (ix 5'') it-ti lu-bu-ut [KUR-šá?] (ix 6'') al-qa-áš-ši [a-na
KUR-aš-šur.KI]

[I inflicted a heavy] defeat [on] A[Dīia, a queen of Arabia, (and) I burned] her tents [with fire. I captured] her alive (and) brought her [to Assyria] with plunder from [her land].²⁸

5. The last known difference in the military narration of the two 646-editions is that the order of the first war with Ummanaldasu and the Arabian campaigns was altered. The report of the fourth Elamite campaign (including the conquest of Bit-Imbī) is placed after the description of the submission of the Nabatean king Natnu; in Prism Kh the Elamite campaign appears before the account of the wars in Arabia.

With regard to the first war with Ummanaldasu, an examination of the opening lines of the reports of the “eleventh” campaign reveals that both 646-editions began in the same way. Compare the poorly preserved passages:

PRISM KH

(ix 10) [i-na 11-e? gir-r]i-ia (ix 11) [a-na KUR.ELAM.MA.KI?] al-lik (ix 12) [ina? me-ti-iq? gir-r]i-ia (ix 13) [URU.
É-mim-bi-i? URU tukul-ti? KUR.ELAM.MA.KI? ak?-š]u-ud

[On] my [eleventh campai]gn, I marched [against *Elam* (and) during the course of] my [campai]gn [I conqu]ered [Bit-Imbī, a city upon which *Elam* relies].²⁹

PRISM G

(ix 29'') i-na 11-e gir-ri-ia [a]-[na KUR.ELAM.MA.KI?] al-lik? ina? me-ti-iq? gir-ri-ia? (ix 30'') URU.É-mim-bi-i
URU tukul-ti KUR.ELAM.MA.KI ak-š]u-ud

On my eleventh campaign, [I marched] ag[ainst *Elam* (and) during the course of my campaign I conqu]ered Bit-Imbī, a city upon which [Elam] reli[es].³⁰

SUMMARY

To summarize, Borger's new volume has laid a solid foundation for the future publication of Assurbanipal's vast text corpus and made it possible for Assyriologists to readily examine the various prism editions. Recent work on the numerous prism and tablet fragments in the British Museum and the Oriental Institute (University of Chicago) has brought to light new information on the more fragmentary texts of Assyria's last great king, in particular on Prisms C, Kh (formerly CKalach), and G. From these, five advances in our knowledge of these three inscriptions have come to light:

1. Prism C does not contain a report of the first war against Ummanaldasu and this inscription was likely written in the year before the eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḥi, i.e., 647.

²⁸ Thompson, “Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts,” fig. 19 no. 34 BM 133436 ii' 1'-6'.

²⁹ Knudsen, “Fragments of Historical Texts,” pl. 14 4306 i'. The lines correspond to Borger's C ix 87-91 (*Beiträge*, p. 158).

³⁰ Thompson, “Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts,” fig. 19 no. 34 BM 133436 ii' 29'-30'; and Borger, *Beiträge*, 4° Heft 111 A 8111 i' 1'.

2. Reports of the fourth Elamite campaign were recorded for the first time in inscriptions composed in the eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḫi (646).

3. Prism Kh (= Kalach) is suggested as a replacement for the Assurbanipal material from Calah. (CKalach is no longer valid since an examination of Prism C's principal exemplar reveals that the Nimrud fragments belong to a different inscription, one containing an account of the first war against Ummanaldasu.)

4. The military narration of Prism G differs from that of Prism Kh in at least three passages, adds a new passage to the description of the Arabian campaigns, and places the fourth Elamite campaign after the report of the wars in Arabia.

5. Prism Kh can now be argued to have been written earlier in the eponymy of Nabû-nādin-aḫi than Prism G. The former may have been issued sometime during the first two or three months (Nisan, Iyyar, or Sivan) of the year, while copies of the latter may have been written a few months later, but probably before or during the sixth month of the year (Elul).

A better understanding of Prisms C, Kh, and G now makes it possible to reconstruct with more certainty the dates of Nabû-nādin-aḫi's (646) and Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšu's (645) tenures as eponym-officials, and the dates of the two wars with the Elamite king Ummanaldasu (647 and 646) and the capture of the Arabian queen ADīia (early 646). These advances in knowledge also provide new information on how Assurbanipal's literary craftsmen codified and modified the king's accomplishments with each new edition, in particular his victories in Arabia, Babylonia, and Elam.

APPENDIX: CATALOGUE OF PRISM C, KH, AND G EXEMPLARS

PRISM C

1. K. 1703 (C11B) (+) K. 1704 (C11A)
2. K. 1705 (+) VAT 2972 (C2B) (+) K. 1707 (C2C) (+) Rm 3 (C2A)
3. K. 1794 (BM 93007) + Sm 2101 + Sm 2103 + Sm 2109 + 81-2-4,172 + 81-7-27,16 + 82-5-22,15 (+)? K. 13730 (C1)
4. Rm 27 (C15)

PRISM KH

1. ND 814 (IM 56875) (CND1)
2. ND 4306 (CND2A) (+) ND 4378B + ND 4378C + ND 5407 + ND 5413E + ND 5522 (BM) + ND 5518 + ND 5519 + ND 5524 + ND 5525 + ND 5520 + ND 5521 + ND 5523 + ND 5532 (IM 67611) + ND 5529 + ND 5531 (BM) + ND 5533 (BM) + ND 5537 + ND 5548 (CND2B) (+) *Sumer* 44 (1985–86) No. 4 (CND2C)
3. ND 4378 + ND 4378A + ND 4378D + ND 5409 + ND 5528 (BM) + ND 5530 + ND 5549 + ND 5536 (BM) + ND 6205A (BM) (CND3)
4. ND 5405 (BM) (CND4)
5. ND 5406 (+)? ND 5517 (IM 67608) (CND5)
6. ND 5408 (BM) (CND6)
7. ND 5410 (BM) (CND7)
8. ND 5411A–E (BM) + ND 5413A–D (BM) + ND 6205B–D (BM) (+)? ND 5412 (+) ND 6205E (BM) (CND8)
9. ND 5527 (CND9)
10. ND 5534 (BM) (CND10)
11. ND 5538 (BM) + ND 5546 + ND 5547 (CND11)

12. ND 5541 (IM 67613) (**CND12**)
13. ND 5543 (BM) (**CND13**)
14. ND 6206 (**CND14**)
15. *Sumer 44* (1985–86) No. 2 +? No. 3 (**CND15**)

PRISM G

1. K. 13778 (**C16**)
2. A 7960 + A 8003 + A 11867 (**G1A**) (+) A 7982 + A 7985 + A 8012 + A 8107 + A 8117 + A 8151 + A 8162 (**G1B**) (+) A 8011 + A 8104 (+) A 8137 (**G1C**) (+) A 8106 (**G1D**) (+) A 8111 (+)? BM 134436 (1932-12-12,431; TM 1931–2,26) (**G1E**) (+) A 8150 + A 8159 (**G1F**) (+) A 11870A (**G1G**)
3. A 7988 + A 8004 + A 8094 (**G2**)
4. A 8109 (**G3**)
5. A 8149

UNCERTAIN ATTRIBUTION

C or G

1. K. 1709 (**C10**)
2. K. 1848 (**C5**)
3. K. 1854 (**C8**)
4. Sm 1882 (**C14**)
5. Rm 2,387 (**C6**)
6. Rm 2,546 (**C3**)
7. BM 127918 (**C12**)
8. BM 127941 (**C7**)
9. BM 127958 (**C4**)
10. BM 128130 (1929-10-12,786) + BM 128133 (1929-10-12,789) + BM 128136 (1929-10-12,792) (+) A 7942 (**C9**)
11. A 8001 (+)? BM 128307 (1932-12-10,564) (**C13**)
12. A 8128

C, G, B, D, F, or A

13. K. 17588
14. BM 121118

C, G, B, D, or A

15. K. 16033
16. K. 16775
17. K. 21420
18. K. 21651
19. A 7941

C, G, or A

- 20. K. 1801
- 21. K. 13751
- 22. Sm 2026
- 23. A 8089
- 24. A 8090

G or D

- 25. 1905-4-9,135 (BM 98629)