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Esarhaddon’s Babylon E Once Again

JAMIE NOVOTNY

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

The so-called Babylon Inscriptions are among the best known of Esarhaddon’s official texts and they are of great interest to Assyriologists, biblicalists, and historians. Their appeal to the modern scholar, including the honoree of this volume, is due in part to the fact that they present a challenge in cracking the order in which they were composed and the various levels of royal ideology imbedded in their contents. The issues of divine anger, retribution, and reconciliation included in them are also major points of interest and debate. Although scholars have carefully investigated many aspects of the official inscriptions of Esarhaddon, there is much that can still be gleaned from these texts. Fresh first-hand examinations of the originals and new joins between the various extant pieces often shed new light on these important texts of this seventh-century BCE Assyrian

Author’s note: I would like to thank the National Endowment for the Humanities for funding the Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period (RINAP) Project. I would also like to express my gratitude to Professor Grant Frame (director of the RINAP Project), Dr. Joshua Jeffers, Dr. Mikko Luukko, and Dr. Greta Van Buylaere for reviewing this manuscript. Their time and care are greatly appreciated. Any errors or omissions are solely the responsibility of the author.

Unless it is stated otherwise, the dates given in this article (excluding those in bibliographical citations) are all BCE. The term “Babylon Inscription” always refers to texts of Esarhaddon composed for Babylon.

1. The new editions of the Babylon Inscriptions have recently been published in E. Leichty, The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680–669 BC) (The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 4; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011) 193–258 nos. 104–26. New editions of Esarhaddon’s official inscriptions had been a desideratum for many years, and Leichty’s work on the material in RINAP 4 greatly improves our knowledge of this vast text corpus. My own work on Esarhaddon’s inscriptions has benefitted not only from his important publication but also from numerous discussions with him about these texts while working in the Babylonian Section of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. I am grateful to him for the excellent service he has provided to the field of Assyriology.
king composed for Babylon and its temple Esagil.\textsuperscript{2} Thus, I take the opportunity here to present a new study and edition of Babylon E in light of a recent international join and examinations of the known exemplars. It is an honor and privilege to present this paper to Professor Mordechai Cogan, who wrote about this same text in 1983.\textsuperscript{3}

\textbf{Babylon E’s Contents}

Babylon E is usually regarded by scholars as one of the latest known editions of Esarhaddon’s Babylon Inscriptions. This text is generally thought to have been composed ca. 674 or later, possibly ca. 672 to early 670.\textsuperscript{4} At present, this 436-word inscription (not including the 9-word date formula) is known from 5 partially preserved exemplars (see the Sources section below); the text includes 13 different proper names and 236 different Akkadian words (see Appendix 3 below, p. 472). With regard to Babylon E’s contents, Esarhaddon’s scribes more or less completely reworked the contents of the previous Babylon Inscriptions; very little of the wording of Babylon A, Babylon C, and Babylon D made it into this text. The reasons for this major overhaul are not known, but it is likely that construction at Babylon was nearing completion and that the Assyrian king was feeling much more confident about completing the projects in that city than he had been earlier in his reign. Therefore, Esarhaddon no longer needed to verbosely justify to Marduk his decision to rebuild Babylon and Esagil. On the other hand, as suggested by Cogan, the scribes who composed Babylon E may have been rationalists who did not view omens and fortune-telling as vital to royal policies and thereby took an anti-divinatory (as well as a pro-Assyrian) position when composing this text.\textsuperscript{5} At present, we can only speculate on the nature of the change.


\textsuperscript{5} Cogan, \textit{History, Historiography and Interpretation}, 82–84.
R. Borger divided the narratives of the Babylon Inscriptions into episodes. Following his divisions of the contents, modern scholars usually split the contents of Babylon E into 20 episodes, not including the date formula.6 Many of the episodes included in earlier Babylon Inscriptions (Babylon A, Babylon C, and Babylon D in particular) are excluded or abbreviated in this text.7

Babylon E begins with Esarhaddon’s name and titles and then narrates briefly, and vaguely, events that had happened before Esarhaddon became king. Marduk is said to have become angry, although the reasons for this are not as explicitly stated in this text as they are in earlier Babylon Inscriptions. On account of divine wrath, Babylon and Esagil fell into ruin and became empty plots of land. The deities living in them abandoned their shrines and the citizens were left on their own, which resulted in them becoming slaves living among foreigners. The narrative then shifts to the start of Esarhaddon’s reign, which initiated a period of divine reconciliation and cultic and urban revitalization at Babylon. Marduk’s anger subsided, thus ending the period of his abandonment of his city and temple. The Assyrian king claims that he himself formulated the idea of rebuilding Babylon and Esagil, renovating the damaged and destroyed statues of its tutelary deities and reinstating lapsed offerings.

Upon giving the order to rebuild, inhabitants of conquered cities and countries were assembled at Babylon and put to work. In public rituals, Esarhaddon mixed precious liquids into the mud used to make bricks and then he carried those bricks in a basket placed on his head. Afterward, the king states that bricks were made in wooden brick-molds for an entire year. It is uncertain if this reflects historical reality or is simply a literary topos echoing Enuma Elish Tablet VI line 60, šattu ištāt libittašu iltabnū “they made its bricks for one year.” With those bricks, the Assyrian king had Marduk’s temple constructed, from its foundations to its crenellations.

6. R. Borger, Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyriens (Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 9; Graz:, 1956) 10–29 §11; and R. Borger, “Zu den Asarhaddon-Texten aus Babel,” Bibliotheca Orientalis 21 (1964) 143–48. The episodes of the edition of Babylon E presented here correspond to Borger’s episodes as follows: E1 = Borger’s 1b; E2 = Borger’s 5c; E3 = Borger’s 7b; E4 = Borger’s 8b; E5 = Borger’s 9c; E6 = Borger’s 12b; E7 = Borger’s 10c; E8 = Borger’s 15b; E9 = Borger’s 19c; E10 = Borger’s 20; E11 = Borger’s 21; E12 = Borger’s 22; E13 = Borger’s 26c; E14 = Borger’s 32c; E15 = Borger’s 33b; E16 = Borger’s 35b; E17 = Borger’s 38b; E18 = Borger’s 39c; E19 = Borger’s 40; and E20 = Borger’s 41b.

Afterward, he had its interior sumptuously decorated, making it a sight to be seen. As one expects from a Mesopotamian king, Esarhaddon boasts that his achievements exceeded those of his predecessors. Next, the king claims to have refurbished Esagil’s divine occupants, reinstated regular offerings, and had every type of metal utensil needed for the functioning of the cult made. After the narrative concerning the work on Esagil, Babylon E states that Esarhaddon rebuilt (through the craft of the brick-god Kulla) Babylon itself, as well as its walls Imgur-Enlil and Nêmed-Enlil.

The inscription then provides a 16-word first-person statement in which the Assyrian king gives himself a few epithets related to his achievements in Babylon. Like the other Babylon Inscriptions, a sizeable portion of the text is devoted to the concluding formulae, which comprise (1) a lengthy petition to Marduk and Zarpanitu to perform numerous beneficent acts on Esarhaddon’s behalf on account of his good deeds; (2) a short statement recording the creation and inscribing of metal, stone, and clay foundation documents (narû and mušarû), as well as the depositing of these objects in the foundations (of buildings and walls); and (3) advice to future rulers about the proper treatment of these foundation documents, with applicable blessings and curses.

Some exemplars of Babylon E, like several other prisms inscribed with Esarhaddon’s Babylon Inscriptions (one copy of Babylon A, one exemplar of Babylon C, Babylon G, and MMA 86.11.283), are dated by the formula šanat rēš šarrūti Aššur-aḫu-iddina šar māt Aššur “Accession year of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria,” a date that reflected historical reality for this Assyrian king in Babylonia. 8

Sources

Babylon E is presently known from five exemplars. Through two international joins, one long known and one new, the seven exemplars cited

---

8. Although Esarhaddon refers to himself as “king of Babylon” in several inscriptions written (or stamped) on bricks and is named as a ruler of Babylon in several king lists, he never took Marduk by the hand during an akītu-festival at Babylon and, despite the fact that he was regarded as the de facto ruler of Babylon, Esarhaddon could not officially begin counting his regnal years as king of Babylon. Thus, because Marduk was in exile in Ashur and not in a position to confer kingship on the Assyrian king during a coronation ceremony that could only take place at Babylon itself, Esarhaddon’s twelve-year reign as king of Assyria was considered his accession year in Babylon. Therefore, the date added to Babylon E reflected historical reality: that is, Esarhaddon’s accession year as king of Babylon. For further details, see Novotny, JCS 67 (2015) 145–68, esp. 149–51 and 161.
in Leichty, RINAP 4, can be reduced by two. Three exemplars are written on six-sided clay prisms, one is inscribed on an eight-sided clay prism, and one is written on a multi-column clay tablet. The script of the copies varies from archaizing Neo-Babylonian and contemporary (seventh-century) Neo-Babylonian to Neo-Assyrian. The pieces are now in the British Museum (London), the Hirayama Collection (Kamakura, Japan), the Louvre (Paris), and the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York). None of the fragments were uncovered through systematic, scientific excavations; all were purchased.

The six-sided prisms (AO 7736+, BM 42668, and BM 78248) will be discussed first, then the eight-sided prism (BM 78225+), and finally the multi-column tablet fragment (BM 34899). This follows the order of the exemplars used in the master text of the edition of Babylon E presented here.

**AO 7736 (+) BM 78246 (+) MMA 86.11.278**

(Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 106 exs. 2, 6–7)

A large piece of a six-sided clay prism, now comprising three fragments housed in three different museums, is inscribed with a copy of Babylon E written in archaizing Neo-Babylonian script. Parts of all six columns,

9. Louvre fragment AO 7736 once belonged to H. Pognon. Although no details about its original purchase have been published, it was probably acquired at or near Babylon. BM 78246 (Bu 88-5-12,101) is part of the Budge 88-5-12 collection of the British Museum (London), objects that were purchased by E. A. W. Budge in 1888. At Babylon, Budge purchased “several large pieces of cylinders [= prisms] of Esarhaddon for a majîdî (dollar) each”; see E. A. W. Budge, *By Nile and Tigris: A Narrative of Journeys in Egypt and Mesopotamia on Behalf of the British Museum between the Years 1886 and 1913* (2 vols.; London: John Murray, 1920) 1:273. Despite the above statement, BM 78246 was registered as coming from Hillah. MMA 86.11.278 was purchased from the Reverend William Hayes Ward by the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York) in 1886; the fragment was acquired when Ward led the Catharine Lorillard Wolfe Expedition to Babylon in 1884–85. For copies of the three fragments, see R. W. Rogers, “Unpublished Inscriptions of Esarhaddon in Autograph Facsimile with Transliteration and Translation,” *Haverford College Studies* 9 (1891) pls. 5–6; B. Meissner and P. Rost, “Die Bauinschriften Asarhadons,” in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* 3 (ed. F. Delitzsch and P. Haupt; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898) 343; J. Nougayrol, “Nouveau fragment de prisme d’Asarhaddon relatant la restauration de Babylone,” *Archiv für Orientforschung* 18 (1957–58) pls. 21–22; T. G. Pinches, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum 44* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1963) pl. 8 no. 8; and I. Spar, *Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art 4: The Eabbar Temple Archive and Other Texts From the Fourth to First Millennium B.C.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014) pl. 121 no. 158.
as well as parts of the top and base, are preserved. The international join between AO 7736 and BM 78246 has long been known, but the join with MMA 86.11.278 is new; the author made the latter join on the basis of script (same scribe), column divisions, and text lineation. The breakdown of the fragments is as follows: (1) AO 7736 = i 3′–19′, iii 11′–16′, iv 1′–47′, v 1′–45′, and vi 11–45; (2) BM 78246 = i 1′–19′, ii 1′–22′, and iii 1′–16′; and (3) MMA 86.11.278 = i 1–14, ii 1–14, and vi 1–18. See figure 1 (above). Horizontal rulings separate each line of text.

AO 7736+ preserves ca. 72% of the inscription (314 complete and damaged words) and the extant text corresponds to i 1–14, 29–ii 14, 33–54, iii 29–44, iv 4–50, v 8–vi 41, and the date. The column divisions of the master text of the edition presented here are based on this fragment, which is the most complete exemplar of the known Babylon E pieces. The prism is dated by the formula šanat reš šarrūti Aššur-ahû-iddina šar māt Aššur “Accession year of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria.”

The distribution of text varies from column to column. The lines in col. vi are more densely packed than they are in cols. i and ii. This is the

---

10. J. Nougayrol (AfO 18 [1957–58] 314, with n. 1) recognized the join between AO 7736 and BM 78246. E. Leichty overlooked (or rejected) that join. Note that the RINAP Project generally edits separately objects that are not physically joined.
opposite of BM 78248, whose last two columns are less densely packed than its initial two columns.  

This archaizing Neo-Babylonian copy of Babylon E probably belongs to the same recension of this inscription as the two Neo-Assyrian copies, BM 42668 and BM 78248 (see the Two Babylon E Recensions section below). The scribe who inscribed this prism uses both the ŠU and ŠÚ signs for third-masculine possessive and object suffixes; compare BM 42668 and BM 78248, both of which appear to use only the ŠU sign in such instances. As far as this exemplar is preserved, the preposition ina almost always appears at the beginning of the line; ii 2 is the only known exception, where it would have followed the relative-determinative ša. In cols. i–v, line-initial ina is written i-na, but in col. vi, line-initial ina is written ina, which may be due to the fact that the script density of this column is greater than in the previous columns. This is a little unusual, since the preposition ina is almost exclusively written as ina in the other known objects bearing Esarhaddon’s Babylon Inscriptions, with the exception of the two Neo-Assyrian exemplars of Babylon E, BM 42668 and BM 78248.

**BM 42668 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 106 ex. 3)**

A copy of Babylon E written in Neo-Assyrian script is preserved on a large fragment of a six-sided clay prism. The first two columns are completely broken away, but most of the last four columns, including parts of the top and base, are preserved. Each line of text is separated by a horizontal ruling.

This fragment preserves ca. 51% of the inscription (221 complete and damaged words) and the extant text corresponds to iii 3–vi 41. BM 42668 divides the inscription as follows: col. iii ends with iv 15, col. iv begins with iv 16 and concludes with v 15, col. v starts with v 16 and finishes with v 52a (liqbû), and col. vi commences with v 52b (ana) and ends with vi 41. Because the final line of col. vi (43) ends with the last line of Babylon E, the scribe was unable to inscribe the nine-word date formula on the prism.
In fact, he had to cram six words into the final line to be able to complete the text. Note that BM 42668, the other copy of Babylon E written in Neo-Assyrian script, is also not dated, despite the fact that there was sufficient room at the end of col. vi. This may suggest that the prism was not pre-ruled. The scribe appears to have added the ruling lines after he completed each and every line.

BM 42668 contains twenty-three orthographic variants; three of these appear in other Babylon E exemplars. This copy of Babylon E appears to belong to the same recension as AO 7736+ and BM 78248 (see the Two Babylon E Recensions section below). The scribe who wrote out this exemplar uses only the ŠÚ sign to write the third-masculine possessive and object suffixes, rather than using a combination of both the ŠU and ŠÚ signs; this is also the case for BM 78248.15 The preposition ina is generally written i-na when the word appears at the beginning of the line; it is written as ina in only one instance.16

BM 78248 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 106 ex. 5)

A second copy of Babylon E written in Neo-Assyrian script is preserved on another large fragment of a six-sided clay prism.17 Parts of the first two and last two columns, as well as part of the base, survive; cols. iii and iv are completely missing. Horizontal rulings separate each line of text.

BM 78248 preserves ca. 46% of the inscription (200 complete and damaged words) and the extant text corresponds to i 13–ii 24, 37–iv 4, vi 4–18, and 27–41. This exemplar divides the inscription as follows: Col. i ends with ii 24, col. ii begins with ii 25 and ends with iv 4, col. v finishes with vi 18, and col. vi starts with vi 19 and concludes with vi 41. Although there is sufficient space at the end of col. vi, the scribe did not inscribe the nine-word date formula there. The reason the prism was not dated is not known.18

15. See BM 42668 iii 19, 20, 21, 28, 33, 34, 38, 40, iv 5, 10, 12, 26, vi 19, and 42.
16. For i-na, see BM 42668 iv 13, v 7, 21, 41, and vi 20; and vi 40 for ina.
17. BM 78248 (Bu 88-5-12,103) is part of the Budge 88-5-12 collection of the British Museum (London); see n. 9 above. Although Budge purchased the piece at Babylon in 1888, it is registered as coming from Hillah. For copies, see Meissner and Rost, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 3, 347 and 349; and Pinches, *Cuneiform Texts* 44, pl. 9 no. 7.
18. One purely hypothetical suggestion is that BM 78248 was not dated because that prism was inscribed in the fall of 670, when an akītu-festival at Babylon was supposed to take place. Since the scribe was uncertain whether the object should be dated to Esarhaddon’s accession year or his first official, divinely sanctioned regnal year as king of Babylon, the date was not immediately added to the prism and the clay dried.
The distribution of text varies from column to column. The lines in cols. i and ii are more densely packed than they are in cols. v and vi. This is the opposite of AO 7736+, whose final column is more densely packed than its initial columns, especially cols. i and ii.

BM 78248 contains nineteen orthographic variants, four of which appear in other Babylon E exemplars. Moreover, this exemplar (intentionally) switches the order of three words and omits three words; the latter is presumably a scribal error.19 This Neo-Assyrian copy of the inscription presumably belongs to the same recension of Babylon E as AO 7736+ and BM 78248 (see the Two Babylon E Recensions section below). Like the scribe of BM 42668, the person who inscribed this prism uses only the ŠÚ sign to write out third-masculine possessive and object suffixes, rather than using both the ŠU and ŠÚ signs; compare AO 7736+, which alternates between the ŠU and ŠÚ signs.20 The preposition ina is written in two different ways: (1) i-na when the word appears at the beginning of the line and (2) ina generally when the word occurs in the middle of the line.21

BM 78225 (+) Hirayama Collection (unnumbered)
(Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 106 ex. 1)

A large piece of an eight-sided clay prism, now comprising two fragments housed in different museums, is inscribed with a copy of Babylon E written in archaizing Neo-Babylonian script.22 Parts of the first three and before the date could be inscribed on it. In the end, that akitu-festival was postponed due to the addition of an intercalary Ululu (VI₂) and the Assyrian king remained the de facto ruler of Babylon, rather than its divinely appointed king. For the letter describing the postponement of that akitu-festival, see S. Parpola, Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars (State Archives of Assyria 10; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1993) 200 no. 253 (= ABL 956 = K 930).

19. In i 13–14, BM 78248 i 1′ has [AMAR.UTU EN GAL]-ú “[the god Marduk, the great lord]” in lieu of EN GAL-ú AMAR.UTU “the great lord, the god Marduk.” This exemplar (v 14′–15′) omits vi 13, ina ‘uš-še’ [dš-kum] “[I placed] (them) in the foundations.”

20. See BM 78248 i 12′, 13′, 15′, vi 4′, 13′, 14′, and 17′.

21. For the former, see BM 78248 i 7′, 19′, 20′, ii 6′, 14′, 33′, v 21′, and vi 12′; and for the latter, see BM 78248 i 18′ and ii 12′.

22. BM 78225 (Bu 88-5-12,80) is part of the Budge 88-5-12 collection of the British Museum (London); see n. 10 above. The fragment is registered as coming from Hillah although Budge purchased it at Babylon in 1888. The other fragment of this exemplar is now in the Hirayama collection (Kamakura) in Japan. No details about its acquisition have been published. For copies of the two fragments, see Rogers, Haverford College Studies 9 (1891) pls. 1–4; Meissner and Rost, Beiträge zur Assyriologie 3, 339 and 341; Pinches, Cuneiform Texts 44, pl. 8 no. 6; and A. Tsukimoto, “A New Esarhaddon
the last two columns, as well as parts of the top and base, are preserved; cols. v and vi are completely broken away. The international join between BM 78225 and the unnumbered Hirayama fragment has been known since A. Tsukimoto published the latter piece in 1990. The break-down of the fragments is as follows: (1) BM 78225 = i 1–15, ii 1–17, iii 1–17, vii 1–13, and viii 1–12; and (2) Hirayama — = i 14–31, ii 15–33, iii 18–36, iv 1′–8′, vii 14–26, and viii 12–19. Each line of text is separated by a horizontal ruling.

BM 78225+ preserves ca. 48% of the inscription (221 complete and damaged words) and the extant text corresponds to i 1–36, 41–iii 21, iv 21–34, vi 15–41, and the date. This exemplar divides the inscription as follows: col. i ends with i 40, col. ii begins with i 41 and ends with ii 32, col. iii starts with ii 33 and finishes with iii 21, col. iv commences with iii 22 and probably concludes with iv 34, col. v likely begins with iv 35, col. vii starts with vii 15 and ends with vi 32, and col. viii commences with vii 33 and concludes with the date. The scribe had more than sufficient room at the bottom of the last column to write out the nine-word date formula šanat rēš šarrūti Aššur-ahu-iddina šar māt Aššur “Accession year of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria.” Compare BM 42668, where the scribe ran out of room at the end of the last column and was unable to inscribe the date. The distribution of text is fairly consistent throughout the exemplar. 23

BM 78225+ contains 55 orthographic variants; four of these appear in other Babylon E exemplars. Moreover, this exemplar (intentionally) does not include three words in one passage (Episode E16), includes two additional words in another passage (Episode E20); this copy of Babylon E also omits two words in the text’s concluding formulae, which may or may not be a scribal error. 24 This copy of the text presumably belongs to a different recension of Babylon E than AO 7736+, BM 42668, and BM 78248 (see the Two Babylon E Recensions section below). Like the scribe who

---

Prism Fragment Concerning the Restoration of Babylon,” Annual Review of the Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project 8 (1990) 64.

23. The script density of BM 42668 is also fairly consistent, at least in the four preserved columns. Compare the statements above about the script densities of AO 7736+ and BM 78248.

24. Unlike AO 7736+ and BM 42668, BM 78225+ (iv 6’–7’) does not include iv 28–30, i-na ši-pir ‘kulla “through the craft of the god Kulla.” This exemplar (vii 25–viii 4) adds ‘mu’-sa-ḫu-ú si-ma-ti-ia “the one who defaces my representations” between vi 31–32, mu-nak-kir ši-ṭir MU-ia “the one who changes an inscription with my name,” and vii 33, pa-si-su e-piš-ti “the one who dismantles (my) construction.” The scribe of this prism appears to have accidentally omitted or intentionally excluded i-na KUR “from the land” in vi 38; see BM 78225+ viii 10–11.
inscribed AO 7736+, the person who wrote out Babylon E on this prism uses both the ŠU and ŠÚ signs for third-masculine possessive and object suffixes; compare BM 42668 and BM 78248, both of which appear to use only the ŠÚ sign in such instances.\textsuperscript{25} As far as BM 78225+ is preserved, the preposition \textit{ina} generally appears at the beginning of a line and is usually written as \textit{ina}, rather than as \textit{i-na}, as it is in the other Babylon E exemplars.\textsuperscript{26} This orthographic practice is more or less in line with the other known objects bearing earlier editions of Esarhaddon’s Babylon Inscriptions (Babylon A, C, D, F, and G).

BM 34899 (\textit{Leichty, RINAP} 4, no. 106 ex. 4)

A small fragment of one face of a multi-column clay tablet preserves a small portion of Babylon E.\textsuperscript{27} The script is contemporary Babylonian; many of the signs are identical to their Neo-Assyrian counterparts. The exact purpose of the tablet to which BM 34899 belongs is not known since it may have been a draft (\textit{Vorlage}) or archival copy.

This fragment preserves ca. 7\% of the inscription (31 complete and damaged words) and the extant text corresponds to ii 37–48 and iii 38–iv 9. BM 34899 contains four orthographic variants, three of which appear in other Babylon E exemplars.

\textit{New Edition of Babylon E}

The first edition of Babylon E appeared in 1891. R. W. Rogers published transliterations and translations of BM 78225 and BM 78246.\textsuperscript{28} Seven years later, in 1898, B. Meissner and P. Rost published an edition of a third fragment of this Babylon Inscription: BM 78248.\textsuperscript{29} This piece was published along with editions of other texts of Esarhaddon concerning his building activities. In 1927, D. D. Luckenbill published translations

\textsuperscript{25} The ŠU sign is used in BM 78225+ i 27, vii 19, viii 9, 10, and 13, while the ŠÚ sign is utilized in BM 78225+ i 16, 17, 18, 20, 29, ii 16, 25, vii 23, and viii 10.

\textsuperscript{26} The preposition \textit{ina} occurs at the beginning of the line in BM 78225+ i 18, ii 4, 5, iii 1, 13, 29, and viii 7, and in the middle of the line in ii 6 and iii 25 of that prism. In all of these instances, with one exception in viii 7, this word is written as \textit{ina}.

\textsuperscript{27} BM 34899 (Sp 2,411) is part of the second Spartoli collection in the British Museum (London). Most of the objects in that collection were purchased in 1880 and are believed to have originated from Babylon. For a copy, see T. G. Pinches, \textit{Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum} 51 (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1972) pl. 25 no. 78.

\textsuperscript{28} Rogers, \textit{Haverford College Studies} 9 (1891) 57–67.

\textsuperscript{29} Meissner and Rost, \textit{Beiträge zur Assyriologie} 3, 222–29.
of the three aforementioned Babylon E exemplars in the second volume of his *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. Nearly thirty years later, in 1956, R. Borger published editions of all of the then-known inscriptions of this seventh-century Assyrian king, including the texts written on BM 78225, BM 78246, and BM 78248. At that time, Borger dubbed the inscription “Babylon E,” a designation that remains in use to this day. In 1957–58, J. Nougayrol published an edition of a then-unpublished Babylon E fragment in the Louvre: AO 7736. He immediately recognized the join between AO 7736 and BM 78246. Shortly after T. G. Pinches’ copies of BM 78225, BM 78246, and BM 78248 appeared in *Cuneiform Texts* 44 (1963), in 1964, Borger updated his 1956 edition; AO 7736 was also included in his updated transliterations. Having been granted permission by Professor and Mrs. I. Hirayama to make public a prism fragment of Esarhaddon, which joined the long-known BM 78225, A. Tsukimoto published a partial score transliteration of Babylon E in 1990. Five exemplars were utilized: BM 78225 + the unnumbered Hirayama fragment, BM 78248, AO 7736 + BM 78246, BM 42668 (a fragment published by A. R. Millard in 1973), and BM 34899 (a small piece copied by Pinches and published by C. Walker in 1972 in *Cuneiform Texts* 51).

In 2011, E. Leichty published a new edition of this inscription in RINAP 4, a volume editing all of the now-known texts of Esarhaddon. Eight prism fragments were used by Leichty in his edition of text no. 106: BM 78225 + the unnumbered Hirayama fragment, AO 7736, BM 42668, BM 34899, BM 78248, and MMA 86.11.278 (a then-unpublished piece in the Metropolitan Museum of Art). The master text and lineation of the RINAP 4 edition were based on BM 78225+, when possible. That piece was regarded as being the most complete of the seven exemplars.

Recently, in 2014, Leichty published an edition of MMA 86.11.278, along with other inscriptions of Esarhaddon in the Metropolitan Museum of Art; the copy of the piece was prepared by I. Spar.

---

36. See n. 10.
The edition presented here builds upon the aforementioned publications, especially that of Leichty. Like the RINAP 4 edition, all eight of the known fragments are used but treated here as five, rather than seven, exemplars. AO 7736, BM 78246, and MMA 86.11.278 are treated as a single exemplar (see above). Since AO 7736+ preserves ca. 72% of Babylon E, which is 24% more than BM 78225+, and since the column divisions of all six columns can be determined from that piece, the master text and lineation, when possible, are based on that three-fragment exemplar. Because BM 42668 and BM 78246 are thought to belong to the same recension of Babylon E as AO 7736+ (see the Two Recensions of Babylon E section below), those two exemplars are used to help create the master text. When none of those three exemplars are preserved, BM 78225+ serves as the master text.

The edition is divided into twenty episodes, with the translation of each passage following its corresponding transliteration. Major variants are included in the footnotes and minor variants are listed in Appendix 2 (pp. 470ff.).

**Edition**

**Episode E1**

(i 1–11) Esarhaddon, king of the world, king of Assyria, governor of Babylon, king of the land of Sumer and Akkad, pious ruler who reveres the god Nabû and the god Marduk —

**Episode E2**

(i 12–23) Before my time, the great lord, the god Marduk, became angry, trembled (with rage), and his heart was furious with Esagil and Babylon; he was vexed. Through the wrath of his heart and the flaring up of his temper,

---

38. i 13–14: BM 78248 i 1′ has [d]AMAR.UTU EN GAL-ʿu “the god Marduk, the great lord” in lieu of EN GAL-ʿu dAMAR.UTU “the great lord, the god Marduk.”
(i 24–29) Esagil and Babylon became a wasteland and turned into vacant plot(s) of land.

(i 30–36) Its (Babylon’s) gods and goddesses became frightened and they abandoned their cellas and went up into the heavens.

(i 37–43) The people living in it (Babylon) were distributed among the riffraff; they became slaves.

(ii 10–20) the heart of the great lord, the god Marduk, calmed down and his mood became tranquil. He became reconciled with Esagil and Babylon, which he had punished.

(ii 21–41) As for me, Esarhaddon, the servant who reveres his great divinity, it occurred to me (and) my mind prompted me to (re)
build Esagil and Babylon, (rest)ore (the statues of its) gods and goddesses, (compl)ete (its) shrines, (and) [(re)con]firm (its) sat[tuk[ku-offerings]. I was encouraged and ordered the (re)building.

Episode E9

(ii 42–48) I gathered the people of the lands conquered by me and made them wield hoe (and) hod, and

Episode E11

(iii 5–13) In order to show the people his great divinity and to inspire awe (in) his lordship, I raised a basket onto my head and made myself carry (it).

Episode E12

(iii 14–21) In ivory, ebony, boxwood, (and) musukkannu-wood brick-molds, I had its bricks made for an entire year.

Episode E13

(iii 22–43) From its foundations to its battlements, I built anew (and) [com]pleted Esagil, the palace of the gods, along with its shrines. I made (it) greater, higher, (and) more glorious than the one in the days of the past. I made it shine like the stars (lit., “writing”) of the firmament. In order that (it become) an object of wonder for all of the people, I filled (it) with splendor.
(iii 44–iv 6) I restored (the statues of) the gods and goddesses who dwelt inside it. I made (them) take up everlasting residence in their sanctuaries.

(iv 7–20) I (re)confirmed their interrupted sattukku-offerings. I had [every] type of utensil of gold, silver, and bronze [that was re]quired for Esagil [and] its [sh]rines made and I placed (them) inside them.

(iv 21–34) Babylon, (which was measured by) the aslu-cubit checked by the gods, Imgur-Enlil, its city wall, (and) Nēmed-Enlil, its outer wall, I had built anew through the craft of the god Kulla and I made (them) rise up like mountains.

(iv 35–49) I am the one who (re)built Babylon, (re)constructed Esagil, (re)stored (the statues of its) gods and goddesses, completed (lit: “to complete”) (its) shrines, (re)confirmed (its) sattukku-offerings, (and) gathered its (Babylon’s) scattered people.

(iii 44–iv 6) I restored (the statues of) the gods and goddesses who dwelt inside it. I made (them) take up everlasting residence in their sanctuaries.

(iv 50–v 19) May the Enlil of the gods, the god Marduk, and the goddess Zarpanitu, the queen, joyfully look upon the product of my good deeds and may they command that my days be prolonged (and) discuss that my years be many. May they determine as my lot the protection of offspring, the increase of progeny, the expansion of family, (and) the branching out of descendants.

(v 20–35) In battle and warfare, may they constantly turn to my side like a father and mother, come to my aid, mobilize my weapons, and kill my enemies. Let my hands achieve whatever my heart commands. Through victorious conquest may he (Marduk) make me stand upon (my) enemies (and) may he squash all of my enemies like ants.

(v 36–52) May he make the foundation of the throne of my priestly office as secure as a great mountain (and) make my dynasty endure alongside the foundation(s) of Esagil and Babylon. May the great gods, as many as reside in sanctuaries in Babylon, continually bless my kingship until far-off days (and) may they order security for my dynasty for eternity.

Episode E19


(vi 1–14) I had foundation inscriptions made of silver, gol[d], lapis lazuli, alabaster, basalt, pendû-stone, elallu-stone, (and) white limestone, (as well as) inscribed objects of baked clay, and I wrote upon them the might of the great warrior, the god Marduk, (and) the deeds that I (text: “he”) had done, my handiwork. [I placed] (them) in the foundations⁴₀ and left (them there) for all time.

⁴₀. vi 13: BM 78248 (v 15’) omits ina ‘uš-še’ [āš-kun] “[I placed] (them) in the foundations.”
Episode E20

(vi 15–30) In future days, in the very distant future, may one of the kings, my descendants, whose name the king of the gods, the god Marduk, calls to rule the land and people, find inscribed objects bearing my name, and may he (then) anoint (them) with oil, make an offering, (and) return (them) to their place. The god Marduk, the king of the gods, will (then) heed his prayers.

(vi 31–41) (As for) the one who changes an inscription with my name (or) dismantles (my) construction, may the great lord, the god Marduk, glare disfavorably upon him among all of the rulers and make his name (and) his seed disappear from the land. May he have no mercy on him for all future time.

Date

(vi 42) Accession year of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria.

Two Recensions of Babylon E

Despite the fragmentary condition of the known exemplars, there appear to be two recensions of Esarhaddon’s Babylon E. There are only a few major variants between the two versions of the text. BM 78225+, an eight-sided prism, belongs to Recension 1, while AO 7736+, BM 42668, and BM 78248—all three of which are six-sided prisms—appear to belong
to Recension 2. As far as they are preserved, the principal differences between the two Babylon E versions are:

1. Recension 1 does not include *ina šipir Kulla* “through the craft of the god Kulla” (iv 28–30) between *Imgur-Enlil dūršu Nēmed-Enlil šalḫušu* “Imgur-Enlil, its city wall, (and) Nēmed-Enlil, its outer wall” (iv 25–27) and *eššiš ušēpišma* “I had built anew and” (iv 31–32). These three words, however, are included in Recension 2.

2. In Episode E20, iv 23–24a and 27, Recension 1 reads [*mušar*]ū [šiṭ]i[r *šumî]ya . . . [an]*a ašr[išu] [lu]tēr “[an inscribed object] bearing my name . . . may he return (it) [to] its place”; note the singular noun and possessive suffix. Recension 2 has *mušarē šiṭir šumîya . . . ana ašr[išun]u lu[tēr] “inscribed objects bearing my name . . . may he return (them) to their place”; note that *mušarū* is plural and the plural suffix (-*šunu*) is found on *ašru*.

3. In the last part of Episode E20, the section starting the advice against damaging or destroying objects bearing inscriptions of Esarhaddon, Recension 1 has in vi 31–33 [*munak][k]i[r *šiṭir* *šumîya* *musahhû simâtiya pâsisu epišti* “[the one who changes an inscription] with my name, defaces my representations, (or) dismantles (my) construction.” The corresponding passage in Recension 2 has *munak[k]i[r *šiṭir* *šumîya* pâsisu epišti* “the one who changes an inscription with my name (or) dismantles (my) construction”; *musahhû* simâtiya “the one who defaces my representations” is not included in this version of Babylon E.

4. In E vi 39, Recension 1 has *ana šât ūmē* “for all time,” while Recension 2 has *ana ūmē šâti* “for all future time.”

Individually these textual deviations are not significant, but as a combined group they give us a small clue as to the chronological order of the two versions of Babylon E. Three of the four textual variants above

44. BM 34899, the copy of Babylon E that is written on a multi-column clay tablet, is not sufficiently preserved to be able to determine if it is an exemplar of the earlier or later recension of this text.

45. BM 78225+ iv 6’–7’.

46. AO 7736+ iv 25’–27’ and BM 42668 iv 13. This passage is not preserved in BM 78248.


48. AO 7736+ vi 23–24a and 27.


50. AO 7736+ vi 31–33, BM 42668 vi 37–38, and BM 78248 vi 6’–9’.

51. Compare BM 78225+ viii 12 to AO 7736+ vi 39 and BM 78248 vi 16’.
(nos. 1–3) suggest that Recension 1 (BM 78225+) was composed slightly earlier than Recension 2 (AO 7736+, BM 42668, and BM 78248) since the wording of that version of the text has more in common with earlier Babylon Inscriptions of Esarhaddon (Babylon A, Babylon C, Babylon D, and Babylon F).

Like Recension 1, Babylon A, C, and F: (1) have mušarû šiṭir šumîya . . . ana ašrîšu lutêr “an inscribed object bearing my name . . . may he return (it) to its place,” with the singular noun mušarû and the third-masculine singular suffix (-šu) attached to ašru; (2) include curses against anyone who defaces the hieroglyphic/astroglyphic representations of Esarhaddon’s name and titles (text: musaḫḫû simāṭîya “the one who defaces my representations”); and (3) write the verb nekelmû (“to glare disfavorably”) as likkilmēšûma (spelling with an e), and not as likkilmūšûma (spelling with a u). 52 Moreover, the scribe who inscribed BM 78225+ wrote the preposition almost exclusively as ina, rather than as i-na, which is consistent with how scribes wrote out the known copies of Babylon A, C, and F; the scribes who inscribed the known copies of Babylon E Recension 2 regularly wrote out that word, especially in line-initial position, as i-na.53

52. For likkilmēšûma in Recension 1 and likkilmūšûma in Recension 2, see AO 7736+ vi 36, BM 78225+ viii 9, and BM 78248 vi 13’. For the earlier Babylon Inscriptions, see Leichty, RINAP 4, 201 no. 104 (Babylon A) vii 24, 27b–28a, 30–34, and 37, and p. 210 no. 105 x 7–8, 12, 16–21, and 24; and Novotny, JCS 67 (2015) 167 Appendix 2 (Babylon F) vi’ 9′–10′, 15′–25′, and 31′.

53. See nn. 13, 16, 21, and 26 above. The preposition ina is written as ina in the following instances in the other Babylon Inscriptions: Babylon A (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 104): BM 78223 (ex. 1) i 19, 20, ii 13, 35, 39, 40, 46, 49, iii 6, 12, 23, iv 16, v 1, vi 8, vii 17, 20, 37, 39; VA 8420 (ex. 2) ii’ 9, 16, iii’ 12; MAH 15877 (ex. 3) ii’ 10, iv’ 5, 20; and BM 60032 (ex. 4) i 5′, 6′, ii 2′, 16′, 17′, 18′, iii 21′, iv 14′, 26′, vi 12′. Babylon B (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 116): obv. 17′, 21′, rev. 8. Babylon C (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 105): BM 78221+ (ex. 1) i 9′, 10′, ii 12′, 26′, 27′, 28′, iii 5′, 12′, 16′, 19′, 23′, iv 8′, v 20, vi 37, vii 34, viii 4, 14, 30, 40, ix 10, 17, 34, 39, x 25; and BM 78224+ (ex. 2) i 19, ii 11, iv 8, 16, v 7, 9, 11, vi 1, viii 9. Babylon D (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 114): i 8, iii 9, 10, 13, 19, iv 7, 10, 12, 26. Babylon F (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 104 ex. 7 + no. 107): iii’ 3, iv’ 21′, [42′], v’ 8′, 40′, vi’ 32′. Babylon G (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 108 + no. 109): i 9′, 14′, ii 10′, 14′, 15′, iii 6′, 13′, iv 14′, v 2′. MMA 86.11.277 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 110): ii’ 3′. MMA 86.11.283 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 111): vii 7′. IM 142109 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 113): 15, 18, 19, 24, 26, 33.

The preposition ina is written as i-na in only six instances outside of the Babylon E exemplars: Babylon C (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 105): BM 78221+ (ex. 1) vii 10. 82-3-23,55 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 117): 8′. IM 142109 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 113): 15, 16, 20, 29. Note that the IM 142109 was inscribed sometime after Ayyāru (II) 672 since it mentions Ashurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as the heirs to the thrones of Assyria and Babylon, respectively.
An earlier date of composition for Recension 1 may also be supported by the fact that that version of Babylon E does not include ina šipir Kulla “through the craft of the god Kulla” (iv 28–30) between Imgur-Enlil dūršu Nēmed-Enlil šalḫûšu “Imgur-Enlil, its city wall, (and) Nēmed-Enlil, its outer wall” (iv 25–27) and eššiš ušēpišma “I had built anew and” (iv 31–32). The passage corresponding to Episode E16 (iv 21–34) in Babylon D (iv 16–24; = Borger’s Episode 23) likewise does not have the expression ina šipir Kulla.\[54\] Compare BM 78225+ iv 3′–7′ Imgur-Enlil dūršu Nēmed-Enlil šalḫûšu ušēpišma “I had Imgur-Enlil, its city wall, (and) Nēmed-Enlil, its outer wall, built anew and” to Babylon D iv 19–23a Imgur-Enlil dūršu Nēmed-Enlil šalḫûšu ultu uššēšun adi naburrēšun eššiš ušēpiš “I had Imgur-Enlil, its city wall, (and) Nēmed-Enlil, its outer wall, built anew from their foundations to their battlements.”\[55\] Later, in Recension 2, ina šipir Kulla was added.

Since the contents of Recension 1 have more similarities to those of Babylon A, C, D, and F than those of Recension 2, that version of Babylon E is presumably the earlier of the two. Shortly after its initial composition, the wording of the first recension of Babylon E was slightly modified. Three words (ina šipir Kulla) were added to the passage concerning the construction of Babylon and its walls Imgur-Enlil and Nēmed-Enlil (Episode E16); in addition, two words were deleted from and three words altered in Esarhaddon’s advice to future rulers (Episode E20). The reason musahhû simātiya “the one who defaces my representations” was removed from the concluding formulae is not known. One possibility, although it is highly conjectural, is that Esarhaddon’s scribes were no longer stamping clay prisms with hieroglyphic/astroglyphic representations of his name and titles.\[56\] The absence is less likely due to the fact that none of the three prisms inscribed with Babylon E Recension 2 are so stamped since several of the Babylon A, C, and F prisms with musahhû simātiya included in their concluding formulae do not have stamped hieroglyphs/astroglyphs on their tops and/or bases.\[57\] Of course, there may have been other reason(s). At best, given the complete lack of firm evidence, we can only speculate on the nature of the change.

Moreover, the orthography of some words in BM 78225+ (Recension 1) follows more closely that of earlier Babylon Inscriptions (Babylon A,

---

54. See Leichty, RINAP 4, 237 no. 114.
55. Leichty, RINAP 4, 237 no. 114.
56. In the case of AO 7736+, the prism was not stamped because a circular hole for a wooden pole runs down its vertical axis; see Nougayrol, AfO 18 (1957–58) pl. 21.
57. BM 78223, BM 78247, and MMA 86.11.283 are stamped. See Leichty, RINAP 4, 238–43 (with figs. 12–15) no. 115.
C, D, and F). The significant variants are: (1) ze-\textsuperscript{c}nu-te i\textsuperscript{r}-\textsuperscript{s}i-\textsuperscript{š}u (i 17) “he was vexed with it” instead of ze-nu-tu i[r]-\textsuperscript{s}i “he [w]as vexed” in i 20; (2) ú-\textsuperscript{s}i-bu “when I sat” (ii 8) in lieu of ú-\textsuperscript{s}i-\textsuperscript{bu}-ma “when I sat and” in ii 5; and (3) MU-\textsuperscript{s}u NUMUN-\textsuperscript{s}ú li-\textit{ḫal-liq}-ma “may he make his name (and) his seed disappear and” (viii 10–11) instead of MU-\textsuperscript{s}u NUMUN-\textsuperscript{s}ú ina KUR lu-\textit{ḫal-liq} “may he make his name (and) his seed disappear from the land” in vi 37–38. With regard to variant 1, compare IM 142109 line 9 (Leichty, RINAP 4, 229 no. 113), which has ze-nu-tu i\textsuperscript{r}-\textsuperscript{s}i “he [w]as vexed,” just like Recension 2. The inscription written on cylinder IM 142109 was probably composed later than Babylon E and, therefore, ze-nûte iršīšu appears to have become zenûtu irši. As for variant 2, u\textit{š}ibu (without enclitic -\textit{ma}) in Recension 1 follows more closely earlier Babylon Inscriptions; note that in Babylon A (Leichty, RINAP 4, 196 no. 104 ii 26–27a), Babylon C (ibid. 204 no. 105 [iii 1b–3a]), and Babylon D (ibid. 236–37 no. 114 iii 11b–13a) u\textit{š}ibu is followed by iššaknānimma idāti damqāti “auspicious omens were established for me,” rather than bēlūt mātāti umallū qātū’a “when they placed in my hands dominion over (all of) the lands.” Therefore, it is possible that enclitic -\textit{ma} was not originally included in Episode E6 (i 44–ii 9) in Recension 1 but later added in Recension 2 to u\textit{š}ibu to coordinate that verb with the next clause (bēlūt mātāti umallū qātū’a). As for variant 3, there are presently no parallels in the Babylon Inscriptions to help make a determination on Recension 1 being earlier than Recension 2.

Conclusions

Babylon E is one of the latest preserved narrative inscriptions of Esarhaddon concerning Babylon. The text was composed ca. 674 or later, possibly ca. 672 to early 670. Given the fragmentary state of preservation of the five known exemplars, there appear to be two extant recensions. The earlier is represented by only one exemplar (BM 78225+) and the later, slightly modified version is known from three exemplars (AO 7736+, BM 42668, and BM 78248). Recension 2 is better preserved than Recension 1 and, therefore, that version should serve as the master text in modern editions. The two recensions are virtually identical, but there are a few minor textual variants in Episodes E16 and E20, as well as a few significant orthographic variants. Further careful first-hand examinations of Babylon E, and of other Babylon Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, will continue to bring forth interesting details about the compositional history of official Assyrian inscriptions and scribal practices of early-seventh-century Assyrian and Babylonian scribes. Although the inscriptions of Esarhaddon have been carefully and critically examined since the mid-nineteenth century, there is still much that can be learned about these fascinating
royal compositions. It is hoped that in thirty years this paper will inspire a future scholar to reassess Esarhaddon’s Babylon Inscriptions, just as Professor Cogan’s influential 1983 paper did for this author.

Appendix 1:
Transliterations of the Individual Exemplars

I take this opportunity to present new transliterations of the known exemplars of Babylon E, including the new join between MMA 86.11.278 and AO 7736 (+) BM 78246.

AO 7736 (+) BM 78246 (+) MMA 86.11.278 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 106 exs. 2, 6–7)
BM 78248 (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 106 ex. 5)
BM 78225 (+) Hirayama Collection (unnumbered) (Leichty, RINAP 4, no. 106 ex. 1)

11 AN.ŠÁ-ŠEŠ-SUM.NA 2 LUGAL kiš-ša-ti 3 LUGAL KUR aš-šur. KI 4 GİR.ḪÍTA 5 KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI 6 LUGAL KUR šu-me-ri 7 ū URI. KI 8 NUN a-a-du 9 pa-lih 1 AG u 1 dAMAR.UTU 10 ul-la-nu-ú-a 11 EN GAL dAMAR.UTU 12 i-gu-ug 13 i-ru-um-ma 14 i-ša-ti é-sag-gil 15 ū KÁ. DINGIR.
23 na-[sh]-tu 24 'il-li-[šu]-ma 25 e-[mu]-u 26 [k]-šub-bi-[ši] 27 [DINGIR.]R'-šu u
28 [u, t]i-[šu]-šú-[nu] 29 [k]-šu-[šú]-[nu] 30 [e]-zi-bu-[m] 31 [e]-lu'-šú
šá-[ma]-še (Lacuna)

ii 1 zu-[šu]-ú-[šu] 2 [še-em-me] 3 i-nu-[š]-ta[a] 4 na SAG LUGAL-šú-[i]-a 5 na ma-[š]-li-
re-šu 6 BALA-ia šá ina GIŠ.GU.ZA 7 LUGAL-šú-[i]-u 8 ra-biš ú-[ši]-bu 9 be-šu-[t] KUR.
KUR 10 ú-[ši]-nu-[i]-a 12 li-[ši]-EN GAL-ú 13 DINGIR.U.TU 
14 i-[mu]-u-[š]-ma 15 ŠE-[šú]-šú-[a] 17 'a-na' [é]-š[a]-g-il 18 [u, t] KÁ.'DINGIR.'RA.KI
19 ša-[š]-ni-[š]-nu 20 in-[š]-šú-[š]-21 sa-li-[š]-mu 22 a-a-ši 23 AN.
ŠÁR.'ŠEŠ-SUM.'NA 24 ar-du [p]-a-li-[š] 25 DINGIR.-šú GAL-[i]-m 26 a-na
e-[š]-e 27 e-[š]-šá 31 ŠÁR.'ŠEŠ-SUM.'NA 24 ar-du [p]-a-li-[š] 25 DINGIR.-šú GAL-[i]-m 26 a-na

vii 1 [a-na] EGIS.'MEŠ 2 [UD]'MEŠ 3 [a-na UD.M]EŠ 4 [ša-a-š]-u
5 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 8 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
9 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 11 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
12 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 13 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
14 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 15 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
16 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 17 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
18 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 19 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
20 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 21 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
22 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 23 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
24 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 25 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
26 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 27 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
28 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 29 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
30 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ 31 [ša LUGAL] DINGIR.'MEŠ
Appendix 2:

Minor Variants

Because AO 7736+, rather than BM 78225+, is used as the principal exemplar and with primacy given to BM 42668 and BM 78248 when AO 7736+ is not preserved, it is best to provide a new list of variants. These are:
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iii 42: BM 78248 ii 30’ and BM 34899 ii’ 2’ la-la-a and la-[a-a], respectively, for la-‘le’-e.

iv 2: BM 78248 ii 32’: a-ši-[b]’ for a-šib. iv 17: BM 42668 iv 2 ZABAR for si-par-ri.

v 20: BM 42668 v 7 qa-ab-li for MURUB₄. v 21: BM 42668 v 9 a-bi for AD.


Appendix 3:
Index of Names and Akkadian Glossary

Proper Nouns

In total, thirteen names appear in Esarhaddon’s Babylon E. These are:


Akkadian Words

In total, 236 different Akkadian words appear in Esarhaddon’s Babylon E. These are: