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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.). 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has made it possible for other Assyriologists to examine the various prism editions, as well as numerous previously unpublished tablet fragments.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 C

This edition from Nineveh is the earliest known inscription to report on the death of Šamaš-sumu-ukīn and the fall of Babylon in the second half of 648. 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; (2) numerous editorial changes and additions were made to existing reports; (3) the death of Šamaš-sumu-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 (ekal masarti) 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.


3 Borger, Beiträge, pp. 16–26, 28–37, 41–42, 92–101, 103–117, 122–127, 133–131, 137–155, 159–164, 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.


2 Borger, Beiträge, pp. 16–26, 28–37, 41–42, 92–101, 103–117, 122–127, 133–131, 137–155, 159–164, 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.

1 R. Borger, Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals: Die Pris­
menklasse A, B, C = K, D, E, F, G, H, J und T sowie andere Inschrif­

2 Borger, Beiträge, pp. 16–26, 28–37, 41–42, 92–101, 103–117, 122–
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 Belsunu (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 Ezursagakkurkurs; (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 Zara, (4) the setting up of wild bulls in gateways of Ezida; (5) the decoration of Emashmat and Eaglekalamata; (6) the refurbishing of Sarrat Kidmuri’s divine image and the renewal of her cultic rites; (7) the setting up of lion-headed eagles and divine emblems in Eaglemaslam; and (8) the rebuilding of Ebulbul and the construction of its twin (Emalama). 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 Manne, VI–VII in Elam; and VIII in Gambulu, Elam, Babylonia, and Arabia.

127
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 Nabū-nādin-āḫi (governor of Kār-Shalmaneser; modern Tell Ahmar), the same year that Prisms CKalah and G were issued; however, there has been no consensus as to the year he held this post, 647 or 646. 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-haltaš 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.

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.

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[an-–al-da-si DUMU ma-ta-me-tu]
9’ i-[l-še-bi-ša ina GIS.GU.ZA-ša]
10’ [m[a-ša-.RemoveAll thanks go to me, approached me] about his gods and …]
11’ [UGAL KUR.qa-ad-ti e-pil ARAD-ri-]:
12’ [l-[ša-ša DINGIR MEŠ-ša im-ša-an-ni-ma]a

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 Nabū-nādin-āḫi (Prisms CKalah 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 CKalah and G, then the eponymy of Nabū-nādin-āḫi cannot immediately follow that of Bēššunu (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, Nabu-da’ ‘inanni of Que is tentatively assigned to this year. Given the new evidence for the dating of K. 1794+, the post-canonical eponyms for 648–645 should be:

648 Bēššunu of Hindanu
647 Nabu-da’ ‘inanni of Que (attribution uncertain)
646 Nabu-nādin-āḫi of Kār-Shalmaneser
645 Nabu-šar-ahḫēšu of Samaria


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. Segment 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 93–94 and xi 73–85. Restored from Borger, Beiträge, p. 113 B vii 93–95 and p. 155 C ix 85–86.

PRISM KH (= BOERGERS CKALACH AND CND)\(^\text{10}\)

This edition is the second of Assurbanapi's *res gestae* composed after the conclusion of the Šamši-šumu-ukin 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-nadin-âhi (646).\(^\text{11}\) 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.\(^\text{12}\) 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.\(^\text{13}\)

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).\(^\text{14}\) 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:\(^\text{15}\) (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 Bit-limût.\(^\text{16}\) 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.\(^\text{17}\)

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-nadin-âhi and copies of Prism G may

---


\(^{11}\) 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; KAM lim-mu mšAG-âš-PAP / [L.] UU; [KUR]’ KURUŠ; KURUŠ-mšAG-ma-ni; mšAG-ma-ni, [š][nym]25 of [the month ...], *eponymy of Nabû-nadin-âhi*, goḫ[t]er[n]or 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 00). For the provenances, see Knudsen, "Fragments of Historical Texts," pp. 65–69; and Muzahim Mahmud and Jeremy Black, "Recent Work in the Nabû 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 Sumur 44 (1985–86) No. 24; 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+ 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 Assurbanapis, 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). Until fully preserved dates for both 646-editions come to light, this suggestion must remain hypothetical.

PRISM G

This edition from Nineveh is the second and only other known prism inscription composed in the eponymy of Nabû-nadin-ahži (646). 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. 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. 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-–ā-šar.KI] (“[I returned safely] to Assyria”) in place of [šal-meŠ a-tu-ra a-na NINA.KI URU be-fu-ii-ia (“[I returned safely to Nineveh, the city of] my [lords]hip”). 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 Dunanu 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-ki-ahžê and Nabû-usahaan in Arbela and altered and expanded the report of Dunânu’s execution in Nineveh. The pertinent passages read:

PRISM K H

As for Mannu-ki-ahžê, the [deputy of Dunânu], and Nabû-usahaan, the [city overseer of Gambulu], who had uttered grievous blasphemies against my gods, I [tore out] their tongue(s) (and) [flayed them] inside Arbela. (As for) Dunânu, [they laid him] on a slaughtering-bench inside Nineveh and butchered him [like a sheep].

---

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.


20 A date is partially preserved on A 8104 i’ 7–9 (Borger, Beiträge, p. 167): [...] UD 103-105 KAM [1 lim-mu nw(e) AG]-AS-PAP [l. C. GAM]-KURT URU-kur-an-MAŠ[šal-na-mu-MAS, “day 10 of [the month ... , eponymy of Nabû]-nadin-ahži, [governor of Kär]-Shalmaneser.”

21 In addition to the three exemplars identified by Borger, K. 13778 (Bauer, Das Inscriptienwerk Assurbanipals, pl. 47) and A 8149 (Borger, Beiträge, 4. 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": BAD IN-a-tu (“that wall”). See Borger, Beiträge, p. 119 (A 8111 ii’ 8’).


24 Borger, Beiträge, 4. Heft 267 ND 5411 ELM iv’ 43’–49’. The lines correspond to Borger’s C viii 84–107 (Borger, Beiträge, p. 108).
CLASSIFYING ASSURBANIPAL'S INSCRIPTIONS: PRISM C, KH (= CND), AND G

PRISM G

(vii 1') [... 3A UGU DINGIR.MEŠ-ta iq-bu-a (vii 2') [šīl-la-ti GAL-ti ... la?] iq-bu-a-hu (vii 3') [qē-reb URU. LĪMMA–DINGIR EMEŠ-šu-an] dī-la-a (vii 4') [dā-hu-ta KUS-šu-an (vii 5') [mas-tu-ni ni-hi] išl-galMAR.LA.MEŠ (vii 6') [... išl-e piš ARAD-ti-i (vii 7') [qē-reb NINA.KI mes-re-ti-ši-nU] iš-pa-ri-ši (vii 8') [... LUGAL.MEŠ aššu-pa-rik (vii 9') [... LUGAL.MEŠ aššu-pa-rik (vii 10') [...]

[As for Mannu-kt-agge, the deputy of Dunanu, and Nabû-usallî, the city overseer of Gambulu, who] had uttered grievous blasphemies against my gods, ... un]favorable [...], I tore out [their tongue(s) (and) flayed them [inside Arbel. (As for) Dunanu (and) Samgûmmu, exact copies of gallû-demons, ... who did [not] do obeisance to me, I had [their limbs] cut off [inside Nineveh. ...] the kings who sit upon throne-daises, I had [...] brought [...].23

3. Prism G provides some additional information on why Tammaritu was deposed by his servant Inda-bibi, 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 Ummanigas (Huban-niṣaṣ 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


[Tammaritu, king of Elam, who spoke insolent words on account of the decapitation of Teumman, whom a low-ranking soldier from my army had beheaded, and [his] brothers, [his family, (and) the seed of his father’s house, with 85 Elamite nobles who march at [his side] ...26

PRISM G

(viii 30') [mam-ma-rî-tu MAN KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 31') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 32') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 33') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 34') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 35') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 36') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 37') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 38') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI] (viii 39') [sa UGU KUR.ELAM.MA.KI]

[Tammaritu, king of Elam, who spoke insolent words on account of the decapitation of Teumman, whom a low-ranking soldier from my army had beheaded, saying: “Does one cut off the head of the king of Elam in his own land, in the assembly of [his troops?]” He spoke a second time]: “Moreover, how could Ummanigas kiss the ground before the messengers of Assurbanipal, king of [Assyria, the creation of Aššur and Mullissu]?” On account of [these words that he had slanderously uttered, Aššur and Mullissu attacked him. Tammaritu, his brothers, his family, (and) the seed of] his father’s [house, with] 85 Elamite nobles who march at [his side] [...].27

---

23 Borger, Beitriäge, 4° Heft 109–110 A 8109 i’ 1–9’.
4. In the description of the Arabian wars, a brief report of the defeat and capture of queen ADiia (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 Nabu-nadin-ahī (646) and appears to be the latest event narrated in Prism G. The new report reads:

\[(ix 1') (iv 2') \text{Di-ia-a sar-rat KUR.a-ri-bi} (ix 2') \text{di-ik-ftal-[sc[1, as-su a-duk]} (ix 3') \text{kul-ta-re-e-[s]1} \text{ina \(d\)G\(i\)}\(s\), BAR aq-mu} (ix 4') \text{[s]}\(a\)-\(a\)-\(a\)-\(b\)-\(a\)-\(u\)-\(u\)-\(s\)-\(a\)-\(i\) na \(S\)U\(a\)-\(a\)-\(b\)-\(a\)] (ix 5') \text{it-ti [\(\text{j\(u\)-\(b\)-\(u\)-\(u\)-\(t\)} KUR-\(b\)u\(\text{[r]}\)] (ix 6') \text{al-qa-d[\(d\)-\(d\)-\(i\)] a-na KUR-\(\text{a\(l\)-\(s\)}\(u\)-\(r\)-\(K\text{\(i\)}\]}\]

[i inflicted a heavy] defeat [on] ADiia, 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].

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-Imbi) 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') \text{i-na 11-e? gir-r-\(r\)-ia} (ix 11') \text{a-na KUR.ELAM.MAKI?} \text{al-li[9} (ix 12') \text{ina? me-ti-iq[9} \text{gir-r-\(r\)-ia} (ix 13') \text{[URU. \(E\)-\(m\)-bi-i? URU tukul-t[9]} KUR.ELAM.MAKI? ak-[\(\text{a}\)]\(\text{i}\)-\(m\)-\(u\]-\(u\)-\(d\)]


**PRISM G**

\[(ix 29') \text{i-na 11-e gir-ri-ia} (ix 30') \text{[a-na KUR.ELAM.MAKI?} \text{al-li[9} (ix 31') \text{[ina? me-ti-iq[9} \text{gir-ri-ia]} (ix 32') \text{[URU.\(E\)-\(m\)-bi-i URU tukul-t[9]} KUR.ELAM.MAKI? ak-[\(\text{a}\)]\(\text{i}\)-\(m\)-\(u\]-\(u\)-\(d\)]

On my eleventh campaign, [I marched] against Elam (and) during the course of my campaign I conquered Bit-Imbi, a city upon which [Elam] reli[es].

**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-nadin-aḫī, i.e., 647.

28 Thompson, “Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts,” fig. 19 no. 34 BM 133436 ii'-3-5'; 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'.

29 Knudsen, “Fragments of Historical Texts,” pl. 14 4306 i'. The lines correspond to Borger’s C ix 87-91 (Beiträge, p. 158).
2. Reports of the fourth Elamite campaign were recorded for the first time in inscriptions composed in the eponymy of Nabû-nadin-ahī (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 Ummanimalu.

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-nadin-ahī 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-nadin-ahī’s (646) and Nabû-šar-ahīṭēšu’s (645) tenures as eponym-officials, and the dates of the two wars with the Elamite king Ummanimalu (647 and 646) and the capture of the Arabian queen ADiia (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 93000) + 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)

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

$C, G, \text{ or } A$

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

$G \text{ or } D$

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