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ABSTRACT
Assurbanipal, the last great king of the Assyrian Empire (934-609 BC), ruled from 668 BC until at least 630 BC. He had to spend four years suppressing a revolt by Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, his older brother and the king of Babylon (667-648 BC), but his reign was much longer than his predecessors and he controlled almost all the area of the Ancient Near East. One of the essential bodies of research material on his reign is his correspondence, which has never before been studied in detail because much of it has been published in cuneiform copies only. His extant correspondence consists of 359 letters: 72 letters from him (the so-called royal letters) and 287 letters to him. Royal letters are particularly rare in the Assyrian correspondence and Assurbanipal’s royal letters outnumber those of his predecessors, hence this dissertation focuses on them. The letters deal with political, military, and diplomatic matters through the king’s point of view and in his words. The aim of this research has been to find out what image Assurbanipal tried to convey in his letters and how he utilized the image in order to further Assyrian policies. The dissertation uses philological method in a large sense and also takes advantage of the electronic database of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project (Helsinki), which contains all Assyrian and a large number of Babylonian texts of the Neo-Assyrian period in transliteration.

Most of Assurbanipal’s royal letters were written during the revolt and its aftermath, and sent to Babylonia, Elam, and the Sealand, which were deeply involved in the revolt. Since the most common recipients of the missives were citizens, Assurbanipal clearly considered it particularly important to address the population at large when the revolt shook the foundation of the empire. As the royal letters originate in the state archives in the capital of Assyria, Nineveh, most of them are archival copies or drafts. Two languages and two scripts (Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian) were used in them, but the drafts would have first been drawn up in Neo-Assyrian, and later translated into Neo-Babylonian, perhaps first in Assyrian script and only later in Babylonian script.

Assurbanipal had dialogue with both adversaries and adherents, emphasized the favours he had done, and described himself as a benevolent and merciful king who was capable of establishing justice, peace, and equality in the realm. He involved Nippur and Uruk in Assyrian military activities against rebels and settled a sibling rivalry between the governor of Ur and his predecessor. He continued a conciliatory policy towards Babylon even during the revolt in order to resolve the conflict peacefully. He tried to incorporate foreign countries into Assyrian control by treaties and sometimes exerted direct pressure on them with thinly veiled threats. Some countries came under Assyrian rule at their own initiative in order to acquire military and political gains from Assyria.
Throughout the royal letters, he stressed his devotion to the gods and their support for his rule. Especially Aššur, supreme god of Assyria, was an important figure in the letters.
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INTRODUCTION

0.1. Groundwork
Assurbanipal was the last great king of the Assyrian Empire (934-609 BC). He ruled from 668 BC until at least 630 BC, much longer than his predecessors, and gained splendid military and intellectual achievements. During his reign, the empire reached its imperial peak; he undertook military expeditions to Egypt, the Levant, Anatolia, Babylonia, and Elam and controlled almost all the area of the Ancient Near East. Taking advantage of his victories in Egypt and Babylonia, he collected a vast number of texts as booty, brought it to Nineveh, and built up a palace library, the so-called Assurbanipal library, to house his collection. Despite his remarkable success, the latter half of his reign is not well known due to a lack of sources. This may indicate that the empire began to decline. Twenty years after his reign, the empire rapidly collapsed. Hence his reign was one of the key periods of the Assyrian Empire.

Since the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal contain much valuable historical information, they were already made available in an excellent critical text edition by Maximilian Streck at the beginning of the 20th century, and at present there is a new edition by Rykle Borger. In addition, for the last three decades, the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus (NATC) Project in Helsinki has been publishing editions of Akkadian (Assyrian and Babylonian) texts mainly found at Nineveh, including ones deriving from the reign of Assurbanipal. Various dissertations on Assurbanipal’s reign have also been produced in the past.

Though Assurbanipal’s correspondence is one of the essential bodies of research material on his reign, it has never before been subjected to a detailed analysis and study because much of it has been published in cuneiform copies only, and what has been published has been only partially or inadequately translated. Even under such circumstances, several researchers have utilized the correspondence of Assurbanipal in their monographs. John. A. Brinkman examined Babylonian society and politics between 747 and 626 BC. Bill T. Arnold investigated the relationships between

---

1 Streck 1916.
2 BIWA.
3 SAA 2, SAA 4, SAA 7, SAA 9, SAA 10, SAA 12, SAA 13, SAA 14, SAA 16, SAA 18.
4 E.g., Gerardi 1987 and Novotny 2003a, but neither is published.
5 Harper published cuneiform copies of 1471 letters found at Nineveh, including Assurbanipal’s correspondence (Harper 1892-1914). After Harper’s work, L. Waterman (Waterman 1930-1936) and R. H. Pfeiffer (Pfeiffer 1935) provided translation, transliteration, and commentary of the letters published by Harper, although both are now out of date. Later, Dietrich published selected letters from Nineveh meeting modern scholarly standards. Parpola (Parpola 1979) and Dietrich (Dietrich 1979) published 593 cuneiform copies for most of the remaining letters.
Assyria and Uruk as well as the introductory formulae used by Urukean governors in the 7th century BC. Grant Frame reconstructed Babylonian political history from 689 to 627 BC and examined detailed historical issues in Babylonia under the reign of Assurbanipal. Matthew W. Waters also used the correspondence of Assurbanipal in his study on Neo-Elamite history (1000-550 BC). Nonetheless, none have dealt with the letters sent by Assurbanipal.

0.2. The Corpus
The extant correspondence of Assurbanipal consists of 359 letters or letter fragments, which fall into two main categories: 72 letters from Assurbanipal and 287 letters addressed to him. In this dissertation, I will focus on the 72 letters from Assurbanipal (the so-called royal letters). In addition, I shall analyse 7 letters addressed to him that are closely connected with the letters from Assurbanipal. In order to distinguish these 72 royal letters from other correspondence of Assurbanipal, I have put an asterisk (*) beside them. Hence the total number of letters analysed in this study is 79, that is, almost 22% of the entire correspondence of Assurbanipal. I have, however, made full use of the remaining correspondence as well, which I have been able to utilize thanks to the resources of the NATC Project even before its publication. A critical edition of the entire correspondence of Assurbanipal in two volumes is in preparation by Frame and Parpola, and is scheduled to appear in 2015.

0.3. The Methodology
My methodology is philological in a large sense. Most of the correspondence of Assurbanipal was published in cuneiform copy only from the end of the 19th century or the opening decades of the 20th century onwards, but I take advantage of the electronic database of the NATC Project, the Corpus of Neo-Assyrian (CNA) Texts, created under Parpola’s directorship. The CNA contains all Neo-Assyrian and a large number of Babylonian texts in transliteration, and all the transliterations of my research corpus are extracted from it. I have been allowed by Parpola to use the letter corpus and his preliminary translations of the letters prepared by him for the forthcoming text edition. Likewise, Frame kindly provided me with his transliterations, translations, and critical comments on the Neo-Babylonian letters of Assurbanipal. I also had an opportunity to study the cuneiform tablets of some letters in the British Museum in 2009. I analyse these letters from the point of view of the royal image and the politics of the Assyrian Empire

9 Waters 2000.
0.4. The Aims and Scope of the Dissertation
The primary purpose of this dissertation is to find out what kind of royal image Assurbanipal presented in his correspondence and how he utilized it in order to further Assyrian policies in practice towards the areas within and outside the territory of Assyria, especially during the time of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (652-648 BC) and its aftermath (648-646 BC), which shook the empire to its foundation.

The Assyrian Empire established its hegemony over the Ancient Near East. Since vast areas in this region were brought under the control of Assyria, the empire became heterogeneous. In order to maintain and run the empire, embracing its multi-ethnic population, the Assyrian king had to integrate inhabitants from different backgrounds into the empire as a single unified nation. For this purpose, he subjected the population to the strong influence of Assyrian culture and propagated Assyrian royal ideology and religion. Once this population assimilated into the empire and recognized the Assyrian king as legitimate, the king exercised his power and implemented Assyrian policies with the help of the administrative infrastructure and court scholars. In the empire as a coherent entity, he subjected the inhabitants, for instance, to tax and military service and at the same time gave them peace and security from external threats. The figurative aspects and the royal image of the Assyrian king were shared between the rulers and the ruled. These perceptions of the Assyrian king were also transmitted to independent states in the Ancient Near East under the influence of Assyria. Hence it seems that the people in the Ancient Near East shared many elements of their view of the world.

The image of the king was embodied in the iconography and concretized in Assyrian royal inscriptions, hymns, praises of the king, myths, epics, and prophecies, whereas in his own letters Assurbanipal described the image of the king himself. He conveyed it in his letters, making it appealing to the common people as well as the ruling classes, and made use of it for national interests under the complicated political conditions. So far, however, there has been little discussion about the royal image represented by the Assyrian king. I shall try to examine it and clarify the political thinking behind it.

---

0.5. The Manner of Presentation
When a text of the Neo-Assyrian period is dated, it contains a name of the eponymous official. Thanks to the study on Assyrian eponym lists and chronicles by Millard, the order of eponyms between 910 and 649 BC has been established.\(^{11}\) Such lists beyond 649 BC have not been preserved, although the eponym dating system continued until the collapse of the empire. A provisional order of eponyms between 649 and 609 BC was proposed in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (PNA) by Parpola.\(^{12}\) In accord with the accepted convention by Assyriologists, an asterisk (*) is added to a year number during this period (e.g., 648* BC). The chronology used in this dissertation follows the order established by Millard and Parpola. The present study also follows the dates of the reigns of Assyrian kings as indicated in PNA.\(^{13}\)

Dates are presented by year-month (in capital Roman numerals)-day. Each year has been equated with a single Julian year, but it should be remembered that the Assyrian calendar began around the time of the vernal equinox so that an event occurring late in the Assyrian calendar actually took place early in the next Julian year. The names of Assyrian months are occasionally given in this study.

As for the notation of personal names, except for Sargon II (Šarru-ukîn), Sennacherib (Sîn-aḫḫē-eriba), Esarhaddon (Aššūr-aḫu-iddina), Assurbanipal (Aššūr-bāni-apli), Merodach-Baladan (Marduk-apla-iddina) II, and the Urartian king Sārdûrî (Issār-dûrî) III, all the other personal names are presented in accordance with PNA, which gives the presumed Neo-Assyrian realization.\(^{14}\)

If an Akkadian text is given in an acceptable transliteration and English translation in a modern critical text edition, article, or book, I use them as they are. If the transliteration and/or translation is in need of major corrections, these are indicated in footnotes.

0.6. The Structure
Part One of this dissertation presents the basic information of the letters from Assurbanipal including their destinations in geographical order, geographical coverage, chronology, and their recipients. Individual recipients are presented in alphabetical order, whereas collective recipients are given in a rough geographical order. It also discusses the process of composing letters, which is

---

\(^{11}\) Millard 1994.
\(^{13}\) PNA 1/1, XXI.
\(^{14}\) Parpola 1998b.
made possible by the fact that the research corpus contains drafts, archival copies, and finished letters brought back to Nineveh for some reason. In addition, this part presents linguistic features of Neo-Assyrian (NA) and Neo-Babylonian (NB) found in the letters from Assurbanipal and examines the scribes who wrote these texts.

Part Two discusses and analyses the royal image of the Assyrian king and the empire’s policies towards Babylonia and foreign countries. Besides overviewing the Babylonian political history in the reign of Assurbanipal and the role of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, this part studies policies towards Babylonia on the basis of the letters addressed to that region. It also investigates the foreign policies manifest in the research corpus. The final part deals with the conclusions of the study.

PART I. PROLEGOMENA TO THE LETTERS OF ASSURBANIPAL

1.1. The Destinations of the Letters
A brief summary of the main topics of the letters is given below according to geographical coverage. In some letters, addressees are not preserved. The identification of recipients is discussed in the section on the recipients (see below pp. 34ff). The detailed contents that are related to the Assyrian royal ideology and Assyrian policies are argued in Part Two.

1.1.1. Babylon
The city of Babylon (the origin of the word in Greek: Βαβυλών, Babylôn, see also Neo-Assyrian: Bābili), situated along the Euphrates about 90 km south of Baghdad,15 was the most important metropolis in Babylonia because it had for centuries been the capital of lower Mesopotamia and an extensive territorial state. It had a long cultural tradition including scribal art, scholarship, and religion, and was respected and admired not only in the region but all over the Ancient Near East. Hence whoever controlled it had to respect its traditions and try to win over the support of its elites and inhabitants. After Babylonia became a part of the Assyrian Empire, controlling and maintaining its capital effectively became one of the priorities for the Assyrian kings. Despite their efforts, Babylonia sometimes brought upheaval to Assyria. Before examining the contents of the letters sent to the city, it is necessary to briefly review the political situation in Babylonia during the reign of Assurbanipal.

At the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal, Babylonia was under the control of Assyria. His father Esarhaddon had been concurrently the king of Assyria and the king of Babylonia. However, he decided to divide the realm of the Assyrian Empire. In the middle of Ayyāru (II) in 672 BC, Esarhaddon appointed his sons Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn to the thrones of Assyria and Babylonia respectively. He concluded a treaty concerning this royal succession with the Assyrian citizenry and vassal nations.

In 669 BC, Esarhaddon died due to illness on the way to a campaign against Egypt on the 10th day of Araḫsamna (VIII). In accordance with the succession treaty, Assurbanipal ascended the throne of Assyria in Kislīmu (IX) in 669 BC. The year 669 BC was his accession year and his regnal year started in 668 BC. In 668 BC, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn entered the city of Babylon with the statue of Marduk and ascended the throne of Babylon.

Even after Šamaš-šumu-ukīn took up residence in Babylon as the king, from the viewpoint of Assyria its city assembly continued to function as the administrative body. This is evident from the fact that no letter sent by Assurbanipal to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn has been found, while all the preserved letters to Babylon were addressed to the citizens of Babylon (see below pp. 50-55). The correspondence in this category numbers eight: *ABL 926, *K 2931, *ABL 301, *CT 53 142, *ABL 571, *ABL 1146, *CT 54 230, and *83-1-18,511. The topics of these letters vary widely.

In *ABL 926, Assurbanipal shows his full respect for Babylon using literary expressions and ideological phrases. The letter has a long introductory part with an extended introductory formula, but the body of the letter is not preserved. In the introductory part, Assurbanipal immediately affirms that he will maintain Babylon’s privileged status (*kidinnātu*). Secondly, he stresses his devotion to Marduk, his trust in Zarpanītu from his childhood, and his royal qualities as

---

16 On the rationale and motivations of this controversial and bold political decision, see Nissinen and Parpola 2004, 214-218; Parpola 2004b, 8; Porter 1993a, 119-153; Frame 1992, 93-114; Tadmor, Landsberger and Parpola 1989. The “division” was of course only meant to be cosmetic and by no means politically “final.”


18 SAA 2 6; BIWA, 15-16 and 208, A I 8-22 // F I 7-17.


20 Grayson 1975, 27, no. 14, 34.


22 In letters from Assurbanipal, the most common greeting is “I am well; you can be glad.” However, this letter has “I, my palace [and country] are well; may you, [great and] small, be well.” See also Radner 2014, 79.
truthfulness and righteousness, and the good fate destined to him by the gods. Finally, he elaborates on the prosperity of his reign.

In the middle of his reign, Assurbanipal sent altogether three messages to the citizens of Babylon in an effort to settle the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (652-648 BC) peacefully. The first message was written on a writing-board but the message is only known from a reference in *K 2931. The second was *K 2931 edited in Parpola 2004a, and the third was *ABL 301 dated 652-II-23 (see the next paragraph). In *K 2931, Assurbanipal refers to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as “no-brother” (lā aḫu) and denies Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s allegations of his evil intentions by swearing by Aššur, Marduk, and his gods. He then refers to a number of Babylonian captives who were captured in the “first fighting” (or “massacre,” dīktu maḫrītu). Taking into account the date of *ABL 301 (652-II-23), this otherwise unknown incident preceded the beginning of the hostilities between Assyria and Babylonia recorded in the Babylonian Chronicle (652-X-19). The king further states that he had robed the captives (in purple), given them a large amount of money (one mina of silver each), and sent them back to Babylon with a message. He starts quoting the message, but the letter breaks off. To recap, the missive proves that Assurbanipal tried to dissuade the citizens of Babylon from defecting by emphasizing beneficial treatment of the captives and by sending his message with them.

In *ABL 301, Assurbanipal repeatedly warns the citizens of Babylon not to join the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. As already stated above, *ABL 301 is the earliest dated text (652-II-23) that indicates the outbreak of the revolt and has already been translated and discussed several times. In the letter, Assurbanipal again calls Šamaš-šumu-ukīn a “no-brother,” “my opponent” (bēl-dabābīa), and “the one rejected (sikipti) by Marduk.” As in *K 2931, he also denies the words that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn spoke to the citizens of Babylon by swearing by Aššur, Marduk, and his gods, and emphasizes his continued goodwill towards them and the city of Babylon. Lastly, Assurbanipal urges the citizens of Babylon to quickly reply to his message. At the end of the letter, the date and the name of the deliverer of the letter, Šamaš-balāssu-iqi, are written down.

---

23 *K 2931:11′-22′, see Parpola 2004a, 229 and 231-232.
24 Parpola 2004a, 229, n. 8.
25 Grayson 1975, 131, no. 16, 11.
28 PNA 3/II, 1192b.
29 It is very rare to record the date and the deliverer’s name. It seems that those of *ABL 301 were added when this archival copy was made. See also the comment on SAA 19 1 r. 14 in Luukko 2012, 4.
*CT 53 142 is too fragmentary to allow translation. However, it seems that Assurbanipal writes on issues related to a battle during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn because he states that he dressed an unnamed man in purple, appointing him as a commander. This statement recalls the account of *K 2931 where Assurbanipal says that he robed the Babylonian captives and sent them back to Babylon. In the letter, he also mentions horses. It should be noted that Assurbanipal refers to his father, i.e., Esarhaddon, but the context and implications of the reference are unclear.

In *ABL 571, Assurbanipal made a final attempt to resolve the conflict between Assyria and Babylonia in order to avoid further violence during the time when Babylon was already under siege (started 650-IV-11 and ended around 648-V). The letter is presumably addressed to the part of the citizens of Babylon who were pro-Assyrian and had exchanged letters with Assurbanipal to save Babylon from massacre. Assurbanipal tells them that Milki-rāmu, the chief tailor (rab kāširi) and Aššur-dašînanni, the commander-in-chief (turtānu) are about to throw (their forces) against Babylon. In this situation, Assurbanipal asks the recipients to persuade the rest of the citizens of Babylon by using negotiation tactics, to open the city gate. At the end, he makes it clear that he will take the city by force if his request is rejected.

*ABL 1146 describes the king’s political and religious attitude. When a person or group of people benefit Assyria, Assurbanipal rewards their behaviour. He tells the citizens of Babylon, “My eyes are upon you. You returned (favour) to me, so that I will do justice (dīnu) to you. And [I am thin]king about you and your (expiatory?) offerings for Babylon.” Following this statement, Assurbanipal informs them that he is sending “the chieftains of the land of Akkad” to the citizens of Babylon to perform the offerings with them as soon as possible.

*CT 54 230 is a long but poorly preserved letter. Eight recipients of the letter are referred to by their names and filiations, though half of the names are lost. The theophoric elements (Bēl and Marduk) of these names and mentioning of the gods Bēl and Nabû indicate that the recipients are the citizens of Babylon. In the letter, Assurbanipal criticizes the recipients for not coming to the military service of Assurbanipal and for abandoning gardens. He also refers to the chief eunuch, the chief cupbearer, the general, 1000 or 2000 archers, and a military unit (kišru) of Assyria. These words indicate that

30 Fales 2009, 36-37; Parpola 2004a, 229. Concerning the period of the siege, see Frame 1992, 189-190.
31 The end of the letter is destroyed, but comparison with the obverse indicates that the break comprised only 2 lines maximum and probably only contained a date.
32 *ABL 1146 r. 1-2, LÚ[r]a]-ša-ni ša KUR–URI.KI.
this letter was related to military activities which were possibly carried out during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

*83-1-18,511 is too fragmentary to understand in its entirety.33 However, in this letter, Assurbanipal again refers to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as his “no-brother” and swears by Aššur, Marduk, and his gods to capture him and crush his revolt.

1.1.2. Nippur
The city of Nippur was located 85 km south east of Babylon and is identified with modern Nuffar.34 As an age-old centre of the cult of Enlil, the supreme deity of the Sumerian gods, equated with Aššur and Marduk, Nippur was a city of extraordinary religious and ideological importance to Assyria and Babylonia alike; it also had great strategic importance because it lay on the frontier “between non-tribal and tribal peoples, and between Assyrian and non-Assyrian territories.”35 Therefore, Nippur necessarily became a focal point in the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. In the early part of the reign of Assurbanipal, the city was firmly under Assyrian control and at least one Assyrian official, Aššūr-bēlu-taqqin, was stationed there as a prefect (šaknu).36 He forwarded orders and messengers of the king, and kept an eye on both the city and its governor on behalf of Assurbanipal. Nippur and its local governor were loyal to Assyria during the civil war. However, the city fell to the rebels for a short period between Kislimu (IX) and Šabātu (XI) in 651 BC.37 After these three months, it returned to the Assyrian side.

Among the letters from Assurbanipal, five letters were sent to the city of Nippur: *ABL 292, *CT 54 464, *ABL 561, *ABL 1186, and *ABL 287. These letters are respectively addressed to the local governor Illil-bāni38 and the citizens of Nippur collectively (*ABL 292), to Illil-bāni (*CT 54 464), and to the citizens of Nippur (*ABL 561, *ABL 1186, *ABL 287).

33 For a translation of the letter, see Parpola 2004a, 232, n. 11.
36 PNA 1/I, 173b; Cole 1996, 76f., n. 51.
37 An economic text IM 57923 (= K.116) from Nippur was dated on the third (?) day of Kislimu (IX) in 651 BC by the regnal year of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Thus this text indicates that Nippur fell into the rebels’ hands. Shortly after that, Nippur appears to have come under the control of Assyria because IM 57901 (= J.8, duplicate IM 57902) and IM 57902 (= J.9) were dated on the 18th day of Šabātu (XI) in 651 BC by the regnal year of Assurbanipal. See Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 21 and 34.
38 PNA 2/I, 519a-b, no. 2.
Most of these letters urge the recipients to watch the roads in order to capture an unnamed man trying to flee from a besieged city. Only one letter deals with other matters. In the following paragraphs, the contents are presented in more detail.

In *ABL 292, Assurbanipal urges Illil-bānī and the citizens of Nippur to watch all the roads in order to capture an unnamed person. After an opening formula, the following phrases occur: “You know that through the iron sword of Aššur and my gods you had that entire land consumed by fire, so that the land has retreated, been subjugated, and turned its face once again towards me.” As Frame has pointed out, these phrases have parallels in *ABL 297:5-9 from Assurbanipal to Nabû-[ušabši] and the citizens of Uruk. *ABL 297 breaks off after these phrases while *ABL 292 continues. And then in *ABL 292 Assurbanipal starts to talk about the man trying to escape. He promises that he will reward the person who seizes the man with his weight’s worth of gold. He quotes the episode in which his grandfather, i.e., Sennacherib, gave silver to Adda-barakka who seized the Babylonian king Šūzubu. Taking into account the motif that the Assyrian king gives precious metal to the one who seizes the rebellious Babylonian king, this episode suggests that the unnamed man was a very important person, probably Šamaš-šumu-ukīn himself.

In *CT 54 464, Assurbanipal orders Illil-bānī to keep watch and seize an unnamed person who is called “the defunct one” (ḫummur). There is no convincing evidence but this person could be the same man in *ABL 292 because Assurbanipal’s order is similar to that of *ABL 292. Assurbanipal also instructs Illil-bānī to cooperate with the sheikhs and the Urukeans. At the end of the letter, the Babylonians, Babylon, and Marduk are referred to in a broken context (r. 17, 19, and 20). These words could support the theory that the unnamed man in this letter and *ABL 292 was Šamaš-šumu-ukīn himself.

39 A study of the letter is in Ito 2013.
40 Frame 1986, 269-270. According to Frame, Walker informs him that *ABL 292 and *ABL 297 “look very much as if they were written by the same scribe.” Thus Frame assumes that “the two letters (or at least the archival copies) were written at around the same time” (Frame 1986, 270, n. 61).
41 Note that this promise is very likely to be the origin of the idiom “be worth your (or its) weight in gold” meaning “be extremely useful or helpful”; see Ayto 2009, 305, s.v. weight.
42 PNA 1/I, 44b, no. 1.
43 This Šūzubu was probably Mušēzib-Marduk from the Bît-Dakkûri (PNA 3/II, 1297b-1298, no. 3). See Ito 2013, 27.
44 Also personal communication from Parpola.
In *ABL 561, Assurbanipal request the citizens of Nippur to strengthen the level of watch on an unnamed besieged city.\(^{45}\) He reminds them of having been unaware that a certain Issarān-mušallim was going in and out of the besieged city,\(^{46}\) and points out that while the recipients may be thinking that their duty is finished, the guard is doubly essential because the people in the besieged city are in dire straits. Considering the contents of *ABL 292 and CT 54 464, the besieged city was possibly Babylon.\(^{47}\)

*ABL 1186 also deals with an unnamed besieged city. Since this letter was probably addressed to the citizens of Nippur, the city in this letter and that in *ABL 561 are the same, in other words, Babylon. The letter gives additional information on the siege. Assurbanipal orders the citizens of Nippur to guard his temples, while he states that his army is surrounding an unnamed man who is shut up in the city with all his forces.\(^{48}\) Moreover, he instructs them that wherever the citizens of Nippur see a messenger of the unnamed man, they should kill those who are to be killed and take prisoner those who are to be taken prisoner. Assuming that the besieged city was Babylon, the besieged man could be Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

In *ABL 287, Assurbanipal praises the citizens of Nippur for having captured three members of the Ru’uea tribe,\(^{49}\) one of the Aramean tribes who dwelled near Nippur on the banks of the Tigris,\(^{50}\) and orders them to keep the captives under guard. He then changes the subject and explains why half of the 15 elders of Nippur were prevented from seeing him when they came for the royal audience. He attributes the blunder to the governor and the prefect of Nippur, and secondly to the palace supervisor,\(^{51}\) who failed to bring the elders into his presence, and swears by Aššur and his gods that he did not know that half of the elders had entered into his presence and other half of them had not. At the end of the letter, interestingly, Assurbanipal states, “(How) would I know who is this and who is that? I am equally favourably disposed towards all of you.”

\(^{45}\) During the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal record that Babylon, Borsippa, Cutha, and Sippar were besieged by Assyrian forces (BIWA, 41 and 233, A III 128-135). Except Babylon, it is not known when each city was besieged and how long the siege lasted.

\(^{46}\) PNA 2/I, 567a, no. 2.

\(^{47}\) Personal communication from Parpola.

\(^{48}\) Since the location of these temples is not mentioned, it is unclear whether the temples were inside the besieged city or not. Perhaps the temples were located near the city wall.

\(^{49}\) Hannān (PNA 2/I, 453b, no. 3), Rēmūtu (PNA 3/I, 1048b, no. 23), and Aia-ilā’ī (PNA 1/I, 91a).


\(^{51}\) The palace supervisor’s involvement in audiences with the king is also known from SAA 13 80 during the reign of Esarhaddan. See Mattila 2009, 163.
1.1.3. Uruk

The city of Uruk was located in southern Babylonia about 35 km east of the modern course of the Euphrates and is identified with modern Warka. Uruk functioned as an important stronghold for Assyria during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. It did face crises during this period; for example, its governor Nabû-ušabšī was abducted from Uruk to Babylon. However, it is unlikely that Uruk was ever taken by rebels during the civil war because all documents from the city are dated by the regnal years of Assurbanipal. From the time of Assurbanipal, two governors of Uruk, Nabû-ušabšī (c. 661-c. 648 BC) and Kudurru (c. 647-c. 643 BC), are known. The numerous letters to Assurbanipal from these two governors provide an abundance of information on southern Babylonia and a lesser degree on northern and central Babylonia. Of the 12 letters sent to the governors and the citizens of Uruk, *ABL 273,*ABL 543, *ABL 1108, *ABL 1244, *ABL 945, *ABL 517, *ABL 294, *ABL 1100, and *ABL 539 are addressed to Nabû-ušabšī, *ABL 297 to Nabû-ušabšī and the citizens of Uruk, *ABL 518 and *ABL 296 are to Kudurru and the citizens of Uruk.

*ABL 273,*ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244 are near duplicates or drafts of the same message with some interesting variants discussed below (pp. 62-66; see also Appendix). In these letters, Assurbanipal, responding to pleas for aid by the Urukeans, refers to the reinforcements dispatched from Assyria to Uruk on four different occasions. He states that he has first sent the governor of Mazamua and the prefects, secondly the governors of Laḫīru and Arrapḫa, thirdly Aššūr-gimillu-tēre with an army, and fourthly Bēl-ēṭir and Arbāiu, the cohort commander, with 200 horses.

*ABL 945 shows that Nabû-ušabšī had intervened on behalf of the Assyrians with the Chaldean tribe Bīt-Amukāni that resided just north of Uruk (see also next paragraph). In the letter, Assurbanipal shows his approval of what Nabû-ušabšī had done though his deed is not mentioned.

53 PNA 2/II, 901b-902b, no. 9, see also nos. 10-11.
54 ABL 1186 and ABL 859. See Frame 1992, 159; Frame 1986, 263; Brinkman 1977, 312.
56 PNA 2/I, 633b-634a, no. 20.
57 Altogether 39 letters from these two governors to Assurbanipal are extant, of which 29 originate with Nabû-ušabšī and 10 with Kudurru.
58 The name of the governor is not mentioned in these letters, but we know from ABL 754 addressed from Kudurru to Assurbanipal that the governor of Mazamua was Nūrāia. See Baker in PNA 2/II, 968b, no. 8.
59 The names of governors are not referred to. It is unclear who the governor of Laḫīru was, but it is known from other letters that the governor of Arrapḫa was Aplāia. See PNA 1/I, 117b-118a, no. 28.
60 The title of Aššūr-gimillu-tēre is not given in these letters. However, he is known as chief treasurer, chief fuller, and eponym of the year 638* BC. PNA 1/I, 186, no. 1.
61 PNA 1/I, 299b-300a, no. 18.
62 PNA 1/I, 127b-128a, no. 7.
After several poorly preserved lines and a broken part, Assurbanipal instructs the Urukeans to call the name of Bēl and to present (an offering) in front of the gods. However, it is not clear on account of which occasion these offerings were actually to be presented.

*ABL 517, dated 650-II-19, again shows Nabû-ušabši acting for Assyria with Bīt-Amūkānī.63 Responding to a report of Nabû-ušabši on the actions of Bēl-ušallim from the city Ša-amēlē in Bīt-Amūkānī,64 Assurbanipal orders Nabû-ušabši to write a letter to Bēl-ušallim about Aia-zēra-qīša, the leader of Bīt-Amūkānī held in custody in Nineveh,65 the elders of Bīt-Amūkānī, and Ḥumbuštū, the mother of Aia-zēra-qīša,66 commending Bēl-ušallim for what he has done about Aia-zēra-qīša and the elders. Although it is not mentioned what he had accomplished, it is evident that he had arranged the apprehension of Aia-zēra-qīša and the elders and their transfer to Nineveh. In addition, Assurbanipal orders Nabû-ušabši to encourage Bēl-ušallim to come to Nineveh to see the king and give him advice on what to do with the people who “came in front of the king” (i.e., Aia-zēra-qīša and the elders); the king would not render the verdict against these people before Bēl-ušallim arrives.

*ABL 294 is a very short letter concerning the wine about which Nabû-ušabši had written to Assurbanipal. Now, Assurbanipal has issued orders to bring it. He does not make it clear for what purpose the wine was brought, but perhaps it was to be distributed to the military personnel who were sent to Uruk as reinforcements.67

*ABL 1100 is too fragmentary to be properly understood. Following the address formula, an “official” (bēl-piqitti) and a “house” (Ē) are mentioned in a broken context.

*ABL 297, addressed to Nabû-[ušabši] and the citizens of Uruk, is a virtual duplicate of *ABL 292 addressed to Illil-bānī and the citizens of Nippur, and begins with the same phrase: “You know that through [the iron sword of] Aššur and my gods you made fire consume that land [in its entirety], so that the land (= Akkad) [having defected, was subdued, and turned] its face [once again towards

---

63 Frame 1992, 162, n. 137.
64 PNA 1/II, 337b-338a, no. 5.
65 PNA 1/I, 94a; Frame 1992, 172, n. 201.
66 PNA 2/I, 478b. In fact, Aia-zēra-qīša wrote ABL 890 to his mother Ḥumbuštū saying that he is detained as a hostage in Assyria to prove the loyalty of Bīt-Amūkānī. He was faced with a charge of an alleged link to the Puqudian rebel leader Nabû-uṣēṣib and to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and of conspiring with them (Frame 1992, 172-173).
me].” After this the text breaks off but is very likely to have continued in the same way as *ABL 292.

*ABL 539 refers to four different treaties. According to the letter, the first treaty was concluded between Assurbanipal and Nabû-ušabši, though, in fact, the term adê is not used about this treaty. Assurbanipal just says, “You (sg.) did not sin against my favour (tābtu) and oath (māmītu).” As repeatedly pointed out by Parpola in his articles, when tābtu occurs beside adê or a related word in similar contexts, tābtu was used as a synonym of adê. Since in this letter tābtu is attested with māmītu, this tābtu would denote a treaty. Following the first treaty, Assurbanipal talks about the second treaty concluded between Assurbanipal and Nabû-ušabši at the initiative of Nabû-ušabši probably immediately after the outbreak of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Nabû-ušabši presumably wanted to show his loyalty to Assurbanipal. Assurbanipal also quotes four provisions of this second treaty. And then he mentions a third treaty concluded between Assurbanipal and the unspecified disloyal people. It is said in this letter that these people sinned against the treaty of Assurbanipal. Finally, Assurbanipal moves on to the fourth treaty which is being prepared. The king says that he is now sending his eunuch Nabû-eriba, his “third man” Nergal-šarru-ušur, and Akkullānu of the clergy of Aššur to Nabû-ušabši with his treaty tablet. At the end of the letter, the king urges Nabû-ušabši to join the treaty.

*ABL 518, dated 646-II-24, concerns the weeping (bikītu) ceremony of the month of Simānu (III). Assurbanipal now tells Kudurru and the citizens of Uruk that as a result of the weeping the gods worshipped in Uruk such as Šamaš, Nanāia, Uṣur-amassa, and Arkaštī have become reconciled. After several damaged lines and an uninscribed line, there is an interesting sentence: “Copy of the letters that were brought to the chieftains and to the land of Akkad” (r. 6-9). This phrase provides unequivocal evidence that at least some letters from Assurbanipal uncovered in Nineveh are copies of originals (see below pp. 68-71).

*ABL 296 is badly damaged. Following the opening formula to Kudurru and the citizens of Uruk, Assurbanipal says, “when I wrote to your brothers.” The term “brothers” (šEŠ/aḫu) could denote the citizens of Uruk in this letter. After this phrase, Assurbanipal states that he sent something to the

68 Parpola 2011, 41; Parpola 1987b, 182.
69 PNA 2/II, 828a, no. 30.
70 PNA 2/II, 955a, no. 22; see also nos. 20 and 21.
71 PNA 1/I, 95-96b, no. 1.
72 *ABL 518 r. 6-9, gab-re-e e-gir-a-ti / ša a-na LÚ.ra-šá-a-ni / ša a-na KUR–URL.K1 / á-bi-lu-ni.
recipients, but the rest of the letter is lost. Nevertheless, the date of the letter is preserved: the 12th of Addāru (XII) without specifying the year.

1.1.4. Ur
The city of Ur, modern Tell Muqayyar, was located in southern Babylonia along a former branch of the Euphrates. Like Uruk, Ur had been a pro-Assyrian city during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn although the city was far from Assyria. Hence Ur became a target for the rebels such as the Puqūdu and the Sealanders. The attack by the rebels probably took place in 652 BC at the commencement of the rebellion, and then it seems that Ur was relieved with external assistance at the beginning of 650 BC. All three royal letters sent to Ur, *ABL 290, *ABL 523, and *ABL 1002, are addressed to Sīn-tabni-uṣur, the governor of Ur. These letters deal with incidents during the rebellion, but they also refer to a feud between Sīn-tabni-uṣur and Sīn-šarru-uṣur, his predecessor and his brother. It seems that Sīn-šarru-uṣur was attempting to discredit Sīn-tabni-uṣur and probably hoping to regain control of Ur.

In *ABL 290, Assurbanipal reassures Sīn-tabni-uṣur that the king has confidence in him and supports him because of his loyalty. The king states that he would not listen to the slanders made by Sīn-šarru-uṣur and a certain Ummanigaš against Sīn-tabni-uṣur. In addition, he emphasizes that when the “the defunct one” (ḫummur) and Ummanigaš put up a siege to kill Sīn-tabni-uṣur the king had mercy on him. Acknowledging that Sīn-tabni-uṣur had endured the enemy and famine for two years on his behalf, Assurbanipal thanks Sīn-tabni-uṣur for services he had rendered together with the Assyrians, “his brothers,” and promises him his continued support until the time of his grandchildren.

74 ABL 1241 + 83-1-18,053 + CT 54 112 from possibly citizens of Ur to Assurbanipal: ll. 5'-6' Lręcz KUR šá KUR–tam-tim u KUR.pu'-qu'-du ina UGU-hi-nil / na-du-ú, “the enemy from the Sealand and the land of the Puqūdu are encamped against us” (by courtesy of Frame).
75 Frame 1992, 165-166.
76 PNA 3/I, 1148b-1150a, no. 2.
77 PNA 3/I, 1145b-1146b, no. 9.
78 Frame 1992, 166, n. 165. Frame has suggested that this Ummanigaš was probably not the Elamite king Ummanigaš II (c. 653-c. 652 BC). Cf. PNA 3/II, 1384b.
79 It is not clear whether the hummur alludes to Sīn-šarru-uṣur or another person. The term hummur is attested only four times in the royal correspondence of Assyria: in this letter *ABL 290 r. 1, in SAA 18 180 r. 6' from Nabû-balāssu-iqbi of Babylon to Assurbanipal, in *CT 54 464:4 from Assurbanipal to Illil-bānī, the governor of Nippur, and in *ABL 1380:22 from Assurbanipal to Menānu of Elam.
In *ABL 523, Assurbanipal tells Sin-tabni-usur again that he would not listen to the calumny against Sin-tabni-usur uttered by Sin-šarru-usur, called “this rogue/villain” (ḥappu anni)81 in the letter. And then he thanks Sin-tabni-usur for having stood by him and having kept watch for him for three years. He also states that the country is becoming safe, though keeping watch is still necessary, and instructs Sin-tabni-usur to come to see him when public order has been fully restored. Frame suggests that the letter was apparently written after the worst pressure on Ur had been relieved.82

In *ABL 1002, Assurbanipal informs Sin-tabni-usur that he realizes that Sin-šarru-usur came into his presence and surrendered to him when he saw that the gods of Assurbanipal would not deliver (him) to his enemy safely.83 At the end of letter, Assurbanipal refers to Sin-šarru-usur as “thes[is] rogue/villain” (r. 13, ḫappu an[niu], see the previous paragraph) again84 and he implies through a rhetorical question that Sin-šarru-usur cannot achieve anything.

1.1.5. Kissik
The city of Kissik, modern Tell al-Laḥm, was located southeast of Ur in southern Babylonia.85 The royal inscriptions of Sennacherib record that the city of Kissik belonged to Bīt-Iakīn, a Chaldean dynastic “house.”86 However, at the time of Assurbanipal, the Chaldeans no longer controlled it and the Kissikeans had built strong ties with Ur (see below p. 57). Two letters of Assurbanipal to the Kissikeans are known: *ABL 1121 and *CT 53 372.87 Both letters deal with Sin-šarru-usur, the previous governor of Ur.

In *ABL 1121, Assurbanipal responds to a letter that the Kissikeans had written to him concerning Sin-šarru-usur. He allays their feelings by pointing out through rhetorical questions that if the troops of Sin-šarru-usur indeed were so numerous and if he were on the alert because of the Kissikeans, he would not have fled into the presence of Assurbanipal. At the end of the letter, Assurbanipal urges the Kissikeans not to worry about him but do their work as usual.

81 *ABL 523:6.
82 Frame 1992, 165.
83 The name of the enemy is not mentioned in the letter, but Radner identified him with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in her PNA entry about Sin-šarru-usur, see PNA 3/I, 1146a, no. 9, d. 1’.
84 As far as we know, the term ḫappu appears only in this letter and *ABL 523 among the royal correspondence of Assyria.
86 RINAP 3/1, 1:48-49.
87 The address formula of his letter is almost completely destroyed and the identification of the recipients as Kissikeans is tentative only.
In the fragmentarily preserved *CT 53 372, Śīn-tabni-uṣur is mentioned twice in broken context (ll. 7 and 10). A man called Nabû-sarru-aḫḫēšu is also mentioned twice in obscure contexts (l. 8 and r. 2). The main topic of this letter remains unclear.

1.1.6. The Sealand

The Sealand (*māt-tāmti, literally “the land of the Sea”) was the marshy area of the lower courses of the Tigris and the Euphrates in southern Babylonia. In the 7th century BC, it was controlled by Bīt-Iakīn, a Chaldean dynastic “house.” Nabû-bēl-šumāti, the leader of Bīt-Iakīn and a grandson of Merodach-Baladan II, had been loyal to Assyria as the governor of the Sealand before the outbreak of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. By *Nisammu (I) of 651 BC, however, he had sided with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, and Assurbanipal considered him one of his bitter enemies. Nabû-bēl-šumāti eventually fled to Elam and died there. In order to regain control of the south from the rebels, Assurbanipal appointed Bēl-ibni as a military commander of the Sealand in 650 BC. Assurbanipal addressed one letter to the citizens of the Sealand (*ABL 289) and five letters to Bēl-ibni (*ABL 291, *ABL 402, *ABL 288, *ABL 399, and *ABL 400). These letters, except *ABL 289, are undated. However, since the first three letters sent to Bēl-ibni deal with the rebels during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, they can be dated in the time of the civil war. The last two letters could be either during the rebellion or in its aftermath.

In *ABL 289, dated 650-II-5, Assurbanipal agrees to treat the Sealanders differently from Nabû-bēl-šumāti, even though the latter betrayed Assyria. He tells them that he has dissociated them from the crime of Nabû-bēl-šumāti and informs them that he is sending Bēl-ibni to assume their leadership.

---

88 Baker has described this Nabû-sarru-aḫḫēšu as “details unknown” (PNA 2/II, 873a, no. 21). Parpola (personal communication) has suggested that this Nabû-sarru-aḫḫēšu could be identical with the governor of Samaria who became the post-canonical eponym of the year 646* BC. See PNA 2/II, 872a-b, no. 7. However, it remains uncertain whether either the citizens of Kissik or Śīn-tabni-uṣur had any connection with the (future) Samaritan governor.

89 Frame 1992, 40-42.

90 ABL 879. See Mattila 1987.

91 The extispicy SAA 4 280, dated 651-I-4, was performed to find out whether Nabû-bēl-šumāti would join the war. The omen was unfavourable. However, the extispicy clearly states that Nabû-bēl-šumāti did not keep the treaty of Assurbanipal (r. 2, *la PAB-īr MUN ʾANŠAR–DU–A MAN KUR–aš-šur; see Parpola 2011, 41).

92 For example, SAA 4 290 r. 10-12. Nabû-bēl-šumāti is mentioned in parallel with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and probably the king of Elam.

93 PNA 2/II, 811a-814b.

94 PNA 1/II, 306b-310b, no. 18.

95 Literally, “to their leadership” (*a-na a-lik–pa-nu-ṭi ana UGU-ḫi-ku-nu).
In *ABL 291, addressed to Bēl-ibni, Assurbanipal expresses his displeasure at the fact that Bēl-ibni had invaded the territory of the Gurasimmu[^96] without his explicit permission. The Gurasimmu lived in the vicinity of Ur and was under the jurisdiction of the governor of Ur[^97]. It seems that they had been loyal to Assurbanipal at the beginning of the revolt but later switched sides to the rebels because the Puqūdu, one of the Aramean tribes who resided in eastern Babylonia and appear as one of the main rebels during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukin[^98], and the Sealanders harassed them[^99]. At the end of the letter, Assurbanipal orders Bēl-ibni to mobilize all his archers and to observe what a certain Sīn-dīnī-epuš does. It is possible that Sīn-dīnī-epuš was one of the rebels. However, this remains uncertain because he is mentioned only in this letter[^100].

In *ABL 402, Assurbanipal thanks Bēl-ibni for having “brought out” a certain Kiṣir-Aššūr[^101] and having written to him about the Puqūdu, but he does not mention any details. The identity of Kiṣir-Aššūr remains obscure because the name is extremely common[^102].

*ABL 288 largely duplicates *ABL 402 and concerns a letter written by Bēl-ibni about the Puqūdu sojourning on a canal. The name of the canal is not specified, but it is likely to be the canal of Merodach-Baladan also mentioned in several other letters[^103]. Assurbanipal praises Bēl-ibni for his report, but does not reveal its content.

*ABL 399 concerns a nephew of Bēl-ibni named Mušēzib-Marduk[^104] who worked as his ally[^105] and intermediary[^106]. Assurbanipal relates that Mušēzib-Marduk had entered into his presence on time and been sent on a mission forthwith, without spending a night in Nineveh.

[^96]: Frame 1992, 47 and 170. Bēl-ibni claims in ABL 790 + CT 54 425 that he had subdued the Gurasimmu.
[^97]: Frame has tentatively suggested that the Gurasimmu was one of the Aramean tribes (Frame 1992, 47), while Lipiński (Lipiński 2000, 482-483) and Zadok (Zadok 2013, 317) have proposed that this tribe might be Arabs.
[^99]: Frame 1992, 170. The letters from Assurbanipal to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk (*ABL 273, *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244), indicate that Nabû-ušabši was concerned about the Gurasimmu.
[^100]: PNA 3/I, 1131.
[^101]: PNA 2/I, 626a, no. 50.
[^102]: PNA 2/I, 621-626.
[^103]: SAA 17 140:8-9, ABL 1293 + CT 54 61 r. 1, and SAA 10 354 r. 16.
[^104]: PNA 2/II, 780b, no. 3.
[^105]: ABL 280 from Bēl-ibni to Assurbanipal. Bēl-ibni reports that the sheikhs of Laḫīru and the men of Nugu became afraid and made an agreement with Mušēzib-Marduk. They then attacked Elam with Mušēzib-Marduk.
[^106]: ABL 277 from Kudurrû of Uruk to Assurbanipal. Kudurrû says Mušēzib-Marduk went to see the king on the instructions of Bēl-ibni. This letter is not dated but Frame suggests that it can be dated after the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukin (Frame 1992, 201, n. 47).
In *ABL 400, responding to a message from Bēl-ibni that he had entered the sand desert, Assurbanipal tells Bēl-ibni not to be afraid since he was travelling under his protection. Regarding the bdellium and the bronze on which Bēl-ibni had reported, Assurbanipal instructs him to send any available amount of them to the king for inspection.

1.1.7. Elam
Elam (Akkadian: Elamtu)\(^{107}\) was a kingdom in south-western Iran and often in conflict with Assyria. Assurbanipal defeated and beheaded a perjurous Elamite king Teumman (c. 664-653 BC)\(^{108}\) in 653 BC.\(^{109}\) After his death, the Elamite monarchy became very unstable and fragmented.\(^{110}\) Short-lived kings appeared one after another. In 9 years between 653 BC and 645 BC, seven kings were enthroned. Two kings had at least their second tenure (Tammarītu II, Ummanaldašu III) and two kings bore the same name (Tammarītu I, Tammarītu II). All this makes it difficult to distinguish the kings. Furthermore, it is not clear whether a king ruled the whole of Elam because two kings could be enthroned in different places at the same time (Ummanigaš II in Elam and Tammarītu I in Ḫaidālu). These kings, some of them enthroned by Assurbanipal as Assyrian puppets, frequently provided military aid and a refuge for Babylonia and the Sealand, although sometimes the Elamite kings had friendly relations with Assurbanipal. In addition, a civilian administration consisting of elders and citizens existed in Elam.

Eleven royal letters were sent to Elam: *ABL 1380, *ABL 1040, *ABL 1151, *ABL 1170, *ABL 1022, *CT 53 908, *BM 132980 (= Waters 2002, 80-86), *ABL 972, *CT 53 953, *ABL 1262, and *CT 54 116. Besides these, two letters sent from Elam, ABL 961 and ABL 879, are considered below as research material supplementing this study.

ABL 961 is a missive from the elders of Elam to Assurbanipal. After Assurbanipal won a victory against Teumman in 653 BC,\(^{111}\) it seems that the security in Elam deteriorated. In the letter, the elders of Elam are concerned about the deterioration of the social order caused by the Persians, and

---

\(^{107}\) The modern name-form of Elam comes from the biblical ‘ëlām (Gen 10:22 etc.; cf. Waters 2000, 1-2).

\(^{108}\) PNA 3/II, 1323b-1325b, no. 1.

\(^{109}\) BIWA, 103 and 225, B V 77 // C VI 79. Edition B states that the campaign against Teumman started in the month Ulūlu (VI).

\(^{110}\) Nabū-bēl-šumuṭi of the Sealand wrote ABL 839 to Assurbanipal and recommended that the king place a governor in Elam while he was still a loyal subject of Assurbanipal (Mattila 1987). Perhaps the governor was placed over a part of Elam. See Waters 2000, 58 and CT 54 490 (= ABL 1007 + 82-3-23,40) r. 22.

\(^{111}\) BIWA, 103 and 225, B V 77 // C VI 79.
they request Assurbanipal to install Tammarītu I in Ḫaiddālu and Kudurru in Iaḫdik.\textsuperscript{112} It is known from the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal that the Assyrian king installed Tammarītu I as the king of Ḫaiddālu and Ummanigaš II as the king of Elam.\textsuperscript{113} Kudurru, whom the elders of Elam suggested, was not selected. Instead, Assurbanipal chose Ummanigaš II.

*ABL 1380 is addressed from Assurbanipal to Menānu, an Elamite elder (r. 12). According to the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, the puppet king Ummanigaš II betrayed Assurbanipal and sided with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\textsuperscript{114} It is likely that Assurbanipal found some local partisans in Elam in order to overthrow Ummanigaš II. One of these partisans was Menānu. We know from this letter that Menānu had previously promised Assurbanipal that he and presumably his comrades would make battle with Ummanigaš II,\textsuperscript{115} but he did not contact Assurbanipal for 19 months. In the letter, Assurbanipal blames him for the lack of communication, urges him to reply and promises to help him. However, it does not seem that Menānu sent a reply or continued to support Assurbanipal because Nabû-bēl-Šumāti of the Sealand, the archenemy of Assurbanipal, is called the “whore of Menānu” in *ABL 289:7-8.\textsuperscript{116}

*ABL 1040 was sent from Assurbanipal to Tammarītu II, who overthrew Ummanigaš II around 652 BC and ascended the throne of Elam.\textsuperscript{117} In the letter Assurbanipal says: “he is/they are sending the first message [to you (?)]” (l. 6). The expression “first message” (rēš šipītī) could suggest that the letter was sent at the beginning of his first tenure (c. 652-c. 649 BC). The contents of the letter are lost, but at least the letter shows that Assurbanipal enjoyed friendly relations with Tammarītu II when he sent this letter because he calls Tammarītu II his brother and wishes him [and his palace] well (ll. 4-5).\textsuperscript{118} However, later Tammarītu II took the side of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{112} According to PNA 2/I, 634b, this Kudurru is possibly identified with Kudurru who was the son of Ummanaldašu II (681-675 BC) and sought refuge in Nineveh with Ummanigaš II and Tammarītu I when Teumman seized the throne in 664 BC.

\textsuperscript{113} BIWA, 38 and 226, A III 44-49 // F II 67-71; BIWA, 104 and 226, B VI 6-9 // C VI 137-VII 2; BIWA, 192, H 3 III’ 1-2; BIWA, 277 and 293, IIT 101-102.

\textsuperscript{114} BIWA, 108 and 229, B VII 3-8; BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 100-102; BIWA, 41 and 234, A III 136-138; BIWA, 148 and 229, C VII 120-129.

\textsuperscript{115} *ABL 1380:8-14, al-lak-ma / it-ti “um-ma-ni-i-gaš (...) / šal-ti it-ti-šu ni-ip-pu-uš tak-te-ka / nu’-tar’-ra, “I shall go and (...) we shall make battle with Ummanigaš and we shall revenge you.”

\textsuperscript{116} *ABL 289:7-8, “AG–EN–MU.MEŠ / M.KAR.KID ša “me-na-nu.


\textsuperscript{118} Since Tammarītu is called the king of El[am] in this letter (“tam-mar-îd LUGAL KUR.NI[M.MA.KI]), this Tammarītu is identified not with Tammarītu I but with Tammarītu II because Tammarītu I was the king of Ḫaiddālu. However, Waters points out that in Ḫaiddālu Tammarītu I was identified as the king of Elam in a Babylonian economic text BM 79013 written in Ḫaiddālu (Waters 2000, 56).

Indabibi, the servant of Tammarītu II, revolted against him and occupied the throne of Elam, and then Tammarītu II sought refuge in Nineveh.\(^{120}\) Indabibi sought cordial relations with Assurbanipal. In \(*ABL\) 1151 to Indabibi, the Assyrian king calls Indabibi his brother and wishes him well.\(^{121}\) The main body of this letter is broken away.

\(*ABL\) 1170, dated 648-IV-25, i.e., about one month before Babylon fell,\(^{122}\) is addressed to a certain Ummanšibar, whose title is not mentioned in the letter but who must have held a pivotal position in Elamite politics because he was involved in the replacement of an Elamite king and the hunt for Nabû-bēl-šumāti of the Sealand.\(^{123}\) In the letter, Assurbanipal refers to the “beautiful idea which Aššur put into your heart for your lord and which you wrote to Bēl-ibni” (ll. 5-9). He does not specify what the idea was, but swears [to implement it] (ll. 10-13) and promises to issue (relevant) orders to an individual whose name is not given.\(^{124}\) He states in conclusion that he does not expect an answer (r. 3, *mimma ḫippalānī*).

\(*ABL\) 1022 and \(*CT\) 53 908 are addressed to Tammarītu II, probably when Tammarītu II took part in the Assyrian campaign against Ummanaldašu III.\(^{125}\) In \(*ABL\) 1022, Assurbanipal writes to Tammarītu II about the dissolved forces. He also mentions the Rāšeans (l. 6), Nabû-bēl-šumāti (l. 15), and Ummanaldašu (r. 5) in broken contexts. Towards the end of the letter, he urges Tammarītu II to return his favours, and to [guard] and remember [the treaty] which he made Tammarītu II swear. In \(*CT\) 53 908, Assurbanipal rejoices at a massacre in Bīt-Bunakka, a city located on the border between Babylonia and Elam near Rāši,\(^{126}\) and at the news of Tammarītu II’s victory over the Din-šarreans in Elam.\(^{127}\)

During these campaigns against Ummanaldašu III, the extradition of Nabû-bēl-šumāti, who had sought refuge from the Sealand in Elam, became a heated issue. In \(*BM\) 132980, dated to Šabātu (XI) of 647\(^*\) BC, Assurbanipal in a furious tone orders the elders of Elam to deliver Nabû-bēl-

---

\(^{120}\) BIWA, 42-43 and 234, A IV 11-41// F III 19-32; BIWA, 110-112 and 230, B VII 56-76 // C VIII 43-48, partly parallel to G1B II′ 38-47 and G2B II′ 11-17′.

\(^{121}\) \(*ABL\) 1151:2-3, *a-na*\(^{12}\)*u-dan-da-bi-bi MAN KUR.NIM.MA.KI / ŠEŠ-šu, “to Indabibi, the king of Elam, his brother.”

\(^{122}\) The last economic document from Borsippa with the regnal years of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (BM 134973 = Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, K.142) is dated 648-V-28; The last economic document from Babylon with the regnal years of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (BM 40577 = Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, K.143) is dated 648-V-30.

\(^{123}\) PNA 3/II, 1385b-1386a.

\(^{124}\) Probably Bēl-ibni.

\(^{125}\) BIWA, 45-46 and 237, A IV 110-123 // F III 33-45.

\(^{126}\) Unger 1938.

\(^{127}\) Assurbanipal states in his inscriptions that he conquered the city of Din-šarri during the campaign against Ummanaldašu III (BIWA, 50 and 239, A V 85-86). Since Din-šarri is mentioned after Susa, it was probably located near Susa.
šumāti and his accomplices, Nabû-qāṭī-šabat\(^{128}\) and Kiribtu,\(^{129}\) to Assyria. At the end of letter, Assurbanipal swears to resort to violence if his demand is turned down. In another letter *ABL 972 to Ummanaldašu III, Assurbanipal requests him to extradite Nabû-bēl-šumāti or Nabû-qāṭī-šabat who both are in the presence of the recipient.

It is known from the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal that Ummanaldašu III eventually delivered the corpse of Nabû-bēl-šumāti to Assurbanipal.\(^{130}\) Further details on the end of Nabû-bēl-šumāti are provided by ABL 879, a letter from Ummanaldašu III to Assurbanipal, dated 646-IV-26.

*ABL 1262 is a letter dated 646*-XII-27 to an unknown recipient\(^{131}\) regarding Elam. In the letter, Assurbanipal says that he has descended into Elam and is concerned about public order in Elam. The king orders the recipient to send a certain [Am]man-appi immediately and asks for a quick reply.\(^{132}\)

Additionally, there are two fragmentary royal letters pertaining to Elam, *CT 54 116 and *CT 53 953. *CT 54 116 is possibly addressed from Assurbanipal to a refugee from Elam. Assurbanipal refers to Elam (r. 6) in a broken context perhaps demanding his extradition. The main contents of the letter are lost. In *CT 53 953, he writes to the city manager[s of Bašimu on the east side of the Persian Gulf\(^{133}\) mentioning Babylon in a broken context (l. 9), but the letter is too fragmentary to be properly understood.

### 1.1.8. Raši
Raši was a land located on the border between Babylonia and Elam in the Zagros Mountains and surrounded by Ellipi, Dēr, Gambūlu, and Iadburu.\(^{134}\) During the reign of Assurbanipal, the country was under strong influence from Elam. The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal record that Assyrian troops conquered Raši during the campaigns against Ummanaldašu III.\(^{135}\) Assurbanipal sent two letters, *ABL 1260 and *ABL 295, to Raši.

---

128 PNA 2/II, 859b, no. 5.
129 PNA 2/I, 619a, no. 3.
130 BIWA, 59-60 and 242-243, A VII 16-50, especially 38-46; BIWA, 278 and 293, IIT 107-110.
131 Probably a (newly installed) king of Elam.
132 This [Am]man-appi may be identified with Amman-appu, Elamite prince; see PNA 1/I, 102b.
In *ABL 1260, addressed to Ambappi and the Rāšeans, Assurbanipal tells them that Elam has from the beginning displayed undesirable behaviour although he has rendered favours to Elam. He mentions that he wrote to Ummanaldašu asking him [to extradite] a man who sinned against the Assyrian king, and also mentions Tammarītu in a broken context. At the end of the letter, he intimates the possibility of taking military action and urges them to open their ears.

*ABL 295 is addressed only to the Rāšeans. Its contents are similar to those of *ABL 1260. In this letter, Assurbanipal criticizes the evil deeds of Elam. He says, “I do not contest my friend or my enemy. I do good to everybody, but they have done evil to me,” and gives as an example the time of Urtaku when a famine struck Elam and the Elamite people fled to Assyria (ll. 9-12). After this statement, several lines are lost. However, it is highly likely that Assurbanipal gave aid to the Elamite people. This episode is also attested in his inscriptions. He wishes that his adversary (bēl-dīni) would come and stay with Tammarītu (II), and implies a threat if his wish is not fulfilled.

1.1.9. Gambūlu
The Gambūlu was one of the Aramean tribes who resided on the border between Babylonia and Elam. Since their location was close to Elam, the Gambūlu were in close contact with Elam at times and threatened by Elam at other times. The letters of Assurbanipal indicate that they corresponded with him in order to maintain their internal stability and to stay under his protection. Three letters to and from the Gambūlu are extant: *ABL 541, ABL 915, and *ABL 293.

*ABL 541 is Assurbanipal’s response to a letter from the Gambūleans in which they had expressed their willingness to submit to him because they were afraid of being deported by Assyria or being exposed to Elam. Complying with their will, Assurbanipal directs them to settle in a place of their choice under Bēl-iqīša, who is known as the leader of the Gambūlu tribe, and guard a royal fort as royal subjects. It is known from his inscriptions that Bēl-iqīša revolted against Assurbanipal with Urtaku, king of Elam, and Nabû-šumu-ēreš, the governor of Nippur, in 664 BC and eventually died in that year because a rat bit him.

ABL 915 is addressed from the Gambūleans to Assurbanipal probably after Bēl-iqīša died. In the letter, the Gambūleans ask Assurbanipal that Rēmūtu and Šama’gunu be installed over them. The

136 BIWA, 94-95 and 222, B IV 18-26 // C V 24-35.
138 PNA I/II, 315b-316a, no. 7.
139 BIWA, 94-96 and 222-223, B IV 18-71 // C V 24-77.
background of Rēmūtu is not known, while the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal record that Šama’gunu, son of Bēl-iqīša, was taken to Assyria and beheaded when the king carried out a campaign against Teumman and the Gambūlu in 653 BC.

*ABL 293 is a response from Assurbanipal to ABL 915. Assurbanipal agrees to appoint Rēmūtu over the Gambūuleans. However, he does not mention Šama’gunu at all.

1.1.10. Dilmun

Dilmun was a kingdom located in the Persian Gulf, including the island of Bahrain. In the time of Assurbanipal, Ḥundāru became the king of Dilmun under the aegis of Assurbanipal. However, it seems that Ḥundāru was also somehow associated with Nabû-bēl-šumāti of the Sealand. Assurbanipal sent *AAA 20 106 to Ḥundāru on 647*-VI-13.

In *AAA 20 106, Assurbanipal mentions Nabû-bēl-šumāti (l. 4) and Elam (l. 23) in broken contexts. He also tells Ḥundāru that he has seen the treaty tablet that Ḥundāru sent to him (r. 4-5). This statement may indicate that the treaty was prepared at the initiative of Ḥundāru. However, this treaty is not extant. Towards the end of the letter, Assurbanipal says that he will give the kingship of Dilmun to Ḥundāru (r. 25-29).

1.1.11. Urarṭu

Urarṭu was a kingdom located to the north of Assyria. The territory spread to the mountain areas between and around Lake Van in eastern Turkey, Lake Sevan in Armenia, and Lake Urmia in north-western Iran. During the reign of Assurbanipal, the military conflict between Assyria and Urarṭu had ended. In this period, two Urartian kings, Rusā and Sārdūrī (Issār-dûrī) III are known from

---

142 Assurbanipal quotes the statement of the Gambūuleans in *ABL 293:7-10. These lines duplicate ABL 915:6-11.
143 Fuchs 1994, 430.
144 It is most likely that a treaty party sent a treaty tablet to the other party in order to check treaty stipulations before treaty parties concluded the treaty. We can find a similar case in *ABL 292 where Assurbanipal writes probably to Nabû-ūšabšī, the governor of Uruk, that the king is sending to the governor his three servants with his treaty tablet.
145 Parpola 2011, 42.
147 “Issār-dûrī” probably stands for Sārdūrī [= Šārdūrī], because Issār → Sār in NA, just as Aššūr → Šūr. See the evidence presented in Parpola 2004b, 17, n. 55.
the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal.\textsuperscript{148} However, only Sārdūrī III is attested in the correspondence of Assurbanipal; ABL 1240 probably from Sārdūrī III and *ABL 1242 probably to Sārdūrī III.

In ABL 1240, Sārdūrī III asks why Assurbanipal always writes to him in irritated and angry terms. Moving then on to the subject of lapis lazuli in Urartu which Assurbanipal had demanded, he explains that lapis lazuli is extremely precious to Urartu and the country would revolt against him if he took it by himself. He then suggests that a huge army come to take the lapis lazuli without meeting him.

*ABL 1242 is a very fragmentary letter. The opening formula is partly preserved. In it, Sārdūrī III is described the “son” of the sender, i.e., Assurbanipal. The main contents of the letter are almost all broken away, but there is a reference to divine sanction given to [Sārdūrī III], his search for the “favour” of [Assurbanipal], and the word “benefactor” (bēl ūhēti). All this suggests that the letter was written soon after Sārdūrī’s accession.

1.1.12. Miscellaneous
Twenty-two letters are collected into a miscellaneous group because most of them are too fragmentary to be assigned to any geographical category.\textsuperscript{149} In addition, in most of the letters, addressees are not preserved and the topics vary widely.

*ABL 302 deals with horses.\textsuperscript{150} The letter is addressed to Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšu whose title is not mentioned in the letter. Assurbanipal talks about the timing of a letter order that requests Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšu to send horses for the review. Assurbanipal tells him that the letter order will be sent in the middle of Šabāṭu (XI) so that the horses can reach the destination in Nisannu (I). It is noteworthy that Assurbanipal uses “we,” the first person plural (l. 10, ni-šap-par; l. 13, nu-ulh-tar-rib; l. 14, nī-iš-sa-par; r. 5, nī-iš-pur) throughout the letter except in its opening formula.\textsuperscript{151} Assurbanipal usually uses “I,” the first person singular, in his letters.

\textsuperscript{148} Concerning Rusâ, see BIWA, 107 and 228, C VII 76-84. Rusâ sent his envoys to Arbela with gifts in order to inquire about the well-being of Assurbanipal. Assurbanipal embarrassed the envoys of the Elamite king Teumman in front of them. Since Teumman died in 653 BC, this episode took place before or in 653 BC. This Rusâ could be either Rusâ II or Rusâ III (Fuchs in PNA 3/I, 1057b, no. 3) Regarding Sārdūrī, see below pp. 44-45.


\textsuperscript{150} Van Buylaere 2009, 303-305; Fales 2000b, 269; Zaccagnini 1994, 40-41.

\textsuperscript{151} *ABL 302:3-4, di-nu ir-a-aši, “I am well.”
In *ABL 1210, dated 652-VII-3, Assurbanipal mentions horses (l. 6, r. 3 and 9). Since the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn broke out by 652-II-23, perhaps the horses were prepared for battles against Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

Assurbanipal writes *ABL 299 to Bēl-ibni, possibly the leader of the Bīt-Ibā. This letter is a response to the letter from Bēl-ēṭir about Šamaš-nāṣir. What Bēl-ēṭir had reported is not mentioned. The rest of the letter is too fragmentary to be interpreted.

*CT 53 282 is from Assurbanipal to an unknown recipient for an intelligence purpose. Assurbanipal orders the recipient to shadow a person without his noticing it. In addition, Assurbanipal requests the recipient to write a report if this person accompanies Bēl-[ib]ni, haruspex.

Some letters are related to the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. For example, in *ABL 1165, Assurbanipal mentions the rebels (l. 9', e-pi-šá-nu-tú). In addition, he says, “Perhaps God himself has commanded the destruction of Babylonia. What can we say? Before God, we [...]”. Moreover, he states that the unknown recipients have suffered hardship for his sake.

*ABL 1411 from Assurbanipal to an unknown recipient quotes a proverb: “[......] he fell into the [pit of] a lion / [...]... he took counsel with himself [...]..., and in order to save his life, he directed his course towards an unknown land.’ Now you have been treated in accordance with this proverb.” This proverb is not known from other texts.

In *CT 54 110, Assurbanipal tells an unknown recipient that the king is sending Nabû-ri[x x], the body guard (ll. 2'-3', [md](AG-[x x] LÚ.qur-ru-bu-l[u]) to the recipient. The king also mentions Nabû-[…], the son of Kînu (ll. 5'-6', [md]AG-[x x] / DUMU [kî]-na-a [x]). The rest of the letter is broken away.

---

153 *CT 53 282 r. 3'-4', [an] [x x]-ka x i DUMU / [md] NUM[UN]/BA[D']-a'-ta-a.
154 PNA 1/II, 340a (s.v. Bēl-[…]), no. 2.
155 *ABL 1165 r. 1-4, mîn-de-ma DINGIR šu-u / ḫa-pu-á šá KUR–UR1 Ki iq-ta-bi / mî-nu-ú ni-qab-bi ina IGI DINGIR / nu-[x x].
156 This Nabû-ri[x x] ([md] AG-[x x]) could be identified with Nabû-rēmanni, the bodyguard ([md] PA-rēm-an-ni qur-ba-ni-[n]), who is mentioned in an ordeal text A 1849:5 (Ass 15847b PhAss 1139/40) dated 620*-X-01. Cf. in PNA 2/I, 865a (s.v. Nabû-re[…]), Baker has suggested possible restorations of this name: Nabû-reṭu-usur, Nabû-rēmanni, and Nabû-rēšūwa.
157 Kînu ([kî]-na-a) could be the shortened version of Nabû-mukīn-apli (PNA 2/I, 616a).
In *CT 54 455, addressed to an unknown recipient, Assurbanipal mentions Zākiru (r. 2', mza-ki-ri DUMU) in a broken context.\(^{158}\)

ABL 1142 is a poorly preserved letter from an unknown author to Assurbanipal. There are a few signs at the ends of lines. After a blank space of three lines, the second to last line may say that the text itself is an archival copy.\(^{159}\) The contents of the letter are lost.

CT 53 402 is from an unknown author from southern Mesopotamia to Assurbanipal. The author mentions a certain Bēl-ibni and describes him as “not (his) enemy for blood” and as “not (his) enemy for deaths” (l. 8', mEN–DÙ la EN–ŪŠ.MEŠ-ia Ễ la EN–mu-ta-ʾ ti’-iá šu-u).\(^{160}\)

Assurbanipal writes *CT 53 968 to an unknown recipient. The king refers to Elam twice in broken contexts (ll. 3' and 15').

*K 995, duplicated by *CT 53 248, is from Assurbanipal to an unknown recipient.\(^{161}\) The main contents probably have connections with the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn because, for instance, Assurbanipal mentions rebellion (l. 4', saḫ-ма-āš-š[u]) and says, “[Babylonian]s seek to drink blood.”\(^{162}\) In addition, he requests that the recipient not deliver the city of the recipient to destruction but guard it. Towards the end of the letter, the king says that “fire will burn the land of Akkad (…) [The land] of Akkad will beco[me] powerless” (r. 18'-20').

*K 4534 is addressed to either the citizens of Babylon or the citizens of Sippar because the letter mentions the privileged status kidinnūtu in a broken context.\(^{163}\) It is known from the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal that this privileged status was granted to Babylon as well as to Sippar during his reign.\(^{164}\)

---

158 PNA 3/II, 1432b, no. 16.
159 ABL 1142 r. 4-5, [ur-š][u]-tu šā gab-ri e-gīr-te / [ur’]-ki’-i-ti, “[Archival copy (?)] of the reply to the later letter.” CAD defines ursūtu as “depot” (CAD U/W 249a). See below p. 71.
160 Cf. Baker has suggested that this Bēl-ibni was an official from Babylon during the reigns of Sargon II and Sennacherib, PNA 1/II, 305b, no. 8.
161 Cf. Watanabe 1985, 151, no. 155. Watanabe has proposed that this text can be assigned to Sargon II.
162 *K 995 r. 8' [L.U.TIN.TIR.K]MEŠ ana NAG MÜD.MEŠ ú-ba-[’u]-u], See also CT 54 248:5'-6' [L.U.TIN].’TIR’.KL.MEŠ ana NAG [MÜD.MEŠ] / [â-ba’-’u]
163 *K 4534:7', û ki-din-us-su-[nu]
164 Frame and Grayson 1994.
*K11875 is a very fragmentary letter from Assurbanipal. At the end of the letter, the king asks the recipients to reply to his letter.

In *CT 53 378, a person of an Aramean tribe is referred to. This person is said to be the son of Abi-ḥażâ, [the br]other (?) of the sheikh (‘L.’Ū. na-sik) Nasi’-i, son of Ḥatâ. According to the letter, the man was staying in Nippur but he ran away and went to Babylon. The Puqûdu is also mentioned in a broken context.

In ABL 1116, an unknown author reports to Assurbanipal about the matter of some sheep stolen by Bēlu-lū-[balat] (md?EN²–lu–[TI.LA]). The author says that the people who became subjects [of the king] and who were the owners of the sheep appealed to the chief eunuch (l. 6’, LÚ.GAL–SAG). The author further relates that the chief eunuch (?) ordered Bēlu-lū-[balat] to return the sheep but the latter refused. The author mentions Tammarītu in a broken context (l. 18’).

A very fragmentary letter *CT 53 966 is worthy of notice. This letter contains some proper names. Among them, it should be noted that the letter mentions Šērū’a-ēṭirat, Kandalānu, and Elam in broken contexts. Šērū’a-ēṭirat and Kandalānu were very important persons in the Assyrian Empire. Šērū’a-ēṭirat is known as the daughter of Esarhaddon and the sister of Assurbanipal, while Kandalānu was installed as the king of Babylonia by Assurbanipal after the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

Assurbanipal writes *ABL 944 to Zākiru and Kabtīa, who were probably Babylonians, concerning the people of Cutha and Surmarrātī. The king also mentions the son of Zākiru.

*CT 54 509 is too fragmentary to be interpreted. Only the reverse of the letter is preserved.

In *ABL 1198, Assurbanipal gives Ėṭiru, a royal delegate, orders relating to the allocation of foodstuffs in a damaged Babylonian edict. He also mentions Kudurru who probably worked in Babylonia. Towards the end of the letter, the king refers to Elam twice.

---

166 PNA I/II, 335b, no. 8.
167 PNA 3/II, 1264a-b.
168 PNA 2/I, 601a, no. 2.
169 PNA 3/II, 1432b, no. 8.
170 PNA 2/I, 594a, no. 2.
171 PNA I/II, 408b, no. 5.
An unknown author writes CT 53 664 to Assurbanipal and mentions [Tammarītu, king of E[lam] in a broken context.

1.2. The Geographical Coverage of the Letters from Assurbanipal
The letters from Assurbanipal geographically cover the areas north, east, and southeast of Assyria, in other words, Uraṭu, Elam, Rāši, Babylonia, the Sealand, and Dilmun. The Sealand was part of Babylonia, although any central authority found it difficult to fully control. Instead, the Chaldeans, who were no longer nomads but mostly sedentary, made up Chaldean dynastic “house” in the Sealand, which can be regarded as leftovers of the Kassite state of Karduniaš. Thus this dissertation treats the Sealand as a single entity to indicate the geographical distribution of the letters. The seven letter to (not from) Assurbanipal used as supplementary material in this study are not the subject of the following analysis. The destinations of some letters are still unclear. However, letters to the Northwest (Anatolia), the West (coastal and inland areas), and the Southwest (Egypt) are not attested. The missives to these areas were possibly written in Aramaic on different materials such as leather, wax, or papyrus, and have not survived, or perhaps they may have been archived in a difference place. 173

When we study the geographical distribution of the 72 letters from Assurbanipal in more detail, we find that 37 letters were sent to Babylonia, 174 12 letters to Elam, 6 letters to the Sealand, 2 letters to Rāši, one letter to Uraṭu, one letter to Dilmun, and 14 letters to unknown areas. 175 As these figures show, Babylonia was by far the most common destination. Further study of the letters to Babylonia shows that 12 of them were sent to Uruk, 176 8 to Babylon, 5 to Nippur, 3 to Ur, 2 to Kissik, 2 to the Gambūlu, one to the Bī-Ilbā, and four to an unknown destination in Babylonia. The following table shows a tally of these figures.

172 PNA 2/I, 633b, no. 16.
174 I collected the letters sent to individuals or tribal groups such Bī-Ilbā, the Kissik, and the Gambūlu in the Babylonian category because they were located within Babylonia. Bī-Ilbā was probably located in Bīt-Amukāni and it was not far from Uruk (Zadok 1985, 91). Kissik was located southeast of Ur (Parpola and Porter 2001, Map 16 and p. 12). The Gambūlu tribe resided on the border between Babylonia and Elam (Frame 1992, 169).
176 It should be noted that 4 letters are duplicate with some variants.
Table 1: The Geographical Coverage of the Letters from Assurbanipal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babylonia</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nippur</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissik</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambūlu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīt-Ibā</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sealand</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāši</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urartu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilmun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these numbers, the following chart shows the percentage of letters sent to each location.

Chart 1: The Percentages of the Geographical Distribution of the Letters
As the table and the chart show, 54 letters, which comprise about 74% of the royal letters, were sent to Elam, Babylonia, and the Sealand. These statistics indicate that most of the letters from Assurbanipal were sent to the regions that were deeply involved in the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

1.3. The Chronology of the Letters
In general, most of the royal correspondence of Assyria is not dated. According to Fales, 95% of Neo-Assyrian letters are not dated.\(^{177}\) This percentage is applicable to the entire correspondence of Assurbanipal consisting of Neo-Assyrian letters and Neo-Babylonian letters. Among his 369 letters, 16 letters are fully or partly dated (4.3%). Of these dated letters, 14 missives are from Assurbanipal and they constitute 19.5% of his royal letters. Since this percentage is much higher than that of other Neo-Assyrian letters, putting a date on epistolary material could be one of the characteristics of archival copies.\(^{178}\)

As for the chronological distribution of the Neo-Assyrian letters of Assurbanipal (that is, letters written in the Neo-Assyrian language as opposed to these written in Neo-Babylonian; see below pp. 73-80), it is polarized into the first few years of his reign (668-666 BC) and the middle of his reign (652-646 BC).\(^{179}\) The correspondence analysed in this study includes not only Neo-Assyrian letters but also Neo-Babylonian ones. However, the tendency that Parpola has noted also applied to my research corpus as a whole. Except for 5 letters from Assurbanipal, most of the letters date roughly to 652-646 BC, the time of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and its aftermath. If the preserved undated 67 letters from Assurbanipal were distributed evenly over these seven years, the average number of the letters sent out per year would be 9.6, although undoubtedly many more had been sent out and we simply have not found them yet. According to Parpola, “The lack of the letters from the latter half of Assurbanipal’s reign probably finds its explanation in the fact that no letters have been found in the North Palace of Kuyunjik, where Assurbanipal seems to have shifted his permanent residence after 645 BC.”\(^{180}\)

\(^{177}\) Fales 2013, 92.

\(^{178}\) See also the comment on SAA 19 1 r. 14.

\(^{179}\) Parpola 1981, 120.

\(^{180}\) Parpola 1981, 120-121.
Most of the letters of Assurbanipal are not dated, but the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn Chronicle (C 15) and the Akītu Chronicle (C 16) provide the chronological framework of the civil war. For future reference, here is a list of the most important chronological landmarks related to the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn found in chronicles and economic texts:

669-XI  Assurbanipal ascended the throne of Assyria.
652-II to X The *rab-būti* levied troops (*biḥirti ibteḥir*) in Akkad (C 16:9-10).
652-X-19 Hostilities began between Assyria and Akkad (C 16:11).
652-XI-8 Šamaš-šumu-ukīn withdrew before the enemy into Babylon (C 15:6).
652-XII-27 The armies of Assyria and Babylonia did battle in Ḥirītu (C 16:13-14).
651-VI-9 Šamaš-šumu-ukīn mustered his army. He marched to Cutha and took the city (C 15:7-8).
650-IV-11 Babylon was besieged (C 15:19).
648-V- The revolt was crushed.

Among my research corpus, ten of the letters are dated to a specific year, month, and day. The earliest date is 652-II-23 of *ABL 301*, known as the first dated text indicating the outbreak of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The latest date is 646*-XII-27, of a fragmentary letter *ABL 1262* relating to the Elamite wars. Three letters, *ABL 1151*, *ABL 1022*, and *ABL 1142*, seem to have been fully dated, but their dates are unfortunately partly broken. *ABL 539* bears only a month name (III), while *ABL 296* is dated by month and day, XII-12, and *BM 132980* is dated by month and year: 647*-XI*. When focusing on the language and script of these 16 dated letters, seven letters are Neo-Babylonian, three letters are Neo-Babylonian but in Neo-Assyrian script, two letters are Neo-Babylonian but their dates are in Neo-Assyrian script, and four letters are Neo-Assyrian. Among the Neo-Assyrian letters, two of them are addressed to Assurbanipal.

---

181 Grayson 1975, 128-132.
182 Grayson 1975, no. 14, 34.
183 The date and the event do not come from the chronicles but from the economic documents found in Borsippa (BM 134973 dated 648-V-28) and in Babylon (BM 40577 dated 648-V-30) respectively. These documents are dated by the regnal year of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.
185 Frame 1992, 138f.
186 *ABL 1151*, 649-[……]: *ABL 1022*, […]-VI-16; *ABL 1142*, 646*-[…].
The dating of the rest of the letters must be based on prosopographical information and on their contents. Most of the correspondence can be at least roughly dated since, as already stated, it largely pertains to the period of the civil war between Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and its aftermath, which includes the campaigns against Elam and the extradition of Nabû-bēl-šumâti. In the following table, the dated and datable letters are shown in chronological order together with the undatable letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Dated, Datable, and Undatable Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dated Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668-664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663-653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4. The Recipients of the Letters from Assurbanipal

The letters from Assurbanipal were addressed to individuals and groups of people such as citizens of cities, Babylonian local governors, tribal groups, subordinates of Assurbanipal, and foreign rulers. Most of them were involved in the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and its aftermath. The aim of this section is to briefly provide prosopographical information on recipients and to attempt to identify recipients when their names are not preserved. If it is impossible to specify recipients due to breakage of tablets or lack of information, those unspecified recipients are not included in this section.\(^\text{188}\)

Since the term “citizen” originated in ancient Greek city states, the term and the concept of the “citizen” in Mesopotamia have long been discussed in the field of Assyriology.\(^\text{189}\) However, arguing about “citizen” is not my purpose in this section and, as Barjamovic has clearly stated in his

---

\(^{188}\) However, the topics of the letters are provided in pp. 25-29.

article, I simply take LÚ.GN.KI.MEŠ or DUMU GN.KI.MEŠ as the “citizens” of a geographical location, while I take a geographical name with the nisbe gentilic afformative such as -a-a (-ajju) as an individual or a particular group that belongs to a certain geographical region.

Recipients vary from the citizens of Babylonian traditional cities to foreign kings, though some names of recipients are unfortunately lost due to damage to the tablets. Several recipients are also known as senders of letters to Assurbanipal.

When we classify the addressees of 72 letters from Assurbanipal according to their social status, the statistics are as follows: the citizenry 24% (17 letters), governors 20% (14 letters), the combination of the citizenry and a governor 10% (7 letters), foreign kings 10% (7 letters), the commander-in-chief Bēl-ibni 7% (5 letters), tribal groups 4% (3 letters), individuals of a tribal group 4% (3 letters), influential foreign figures 4% (3 letters), the combination of an influential foreign figure and the citizenry 1% (1 letter), a representative from the citizenry 1% (1 letter), an Assyrian official 1% (1 letter), Babylonian officials 1% (1 letter), and unknown recipients 13% (9 letters). As the statistics show, groups of people who lived in a particular city, town, area, and country constitute a clear majority among the recipients (66% of the known recipients). This indicates that Assurbanipal considered it particularly important to address his letters to the masses rather than to individuals.

Chart 2: The Percentages of the Recipients of the Letters from Assurbanipal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenry</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenry and a governor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign kings</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal groups</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Commander-in-Chief Bēl-ibni</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential foreign figures</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals of a tribal group</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An influential foreign figure and the citizenry</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Assyrian Babylonian official</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative from the citizenry</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

190 Barjamovic 2004, 56.
The prosopographical information on individuals is provided below in alphabetical order, while each group of people is discussed after the individuals in roughly geographical order.

1.4.1. Ambappi
Ambappi ("am-ba-ap-[pi]) occurs as the recipient of *ABL 1260 together with the Rāšeans. Rāši was a region located between Babylonia and Elam and it was under the strong influence of Elam (see above pp. 22-23). The meaning of Ambappi is unknown but it is an Elamite name.192

The title/official position of Ambappi is not specified in the letter. However, since Ambappi and the Rāšeans appear as the addressees together, it is likely that Ambappi was a ruler or a representative of Rāši. He has been tentatively identified with Imbappi of Bīt-Imbî which was an Elamite royal city located on the border between Elam and Rāši.193 The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal say that Imbappi was the delegate (qēpu) of Bīt-Imbî, the brother-in-law of Ummanaldašu III, and the chief Bowman of Elam.194

In *ABL 1260, Assurbanipal complains that although he had rendered many favours to Elam, the Elamites had not reciprocated but made common cause with his enemies. He now informs Ambappi and the Rāšeans that he has written to Ummanaldašu (III) telling him to extradite an unnamed man who is presumably identified with Nabû-bēl-šumāti, and is going to have a meeting with him in the “tower” (r. 8, ašitu) located probably in Bīt-Imbî of Rāši, to negotiate about peace. This indicates that Assurbanipal believed that Ambappi and the Rāšeans could have some influence on the Elamite king. The letter ends with a threat that unless Ummanaldašu (III) submits to Assurbanipal and assists Tammarītu (II), the Assyrian king may not be able to control his rage.

1.4.2. Bēl-ēṭir of Bīt-Ibâ
Bēl-ēṭir ("m EN–ŠUR-ir) is the recipient of *ABL 299. This letter is a reply from Assurbanipal to the letter written by Bēl-ēṭir about a certain Šamaš-nāṣir (l. 6, [m] dšTU–ŠEŠ-ir).195 After the reference to

---

192 PNA 1/I, 99b.
195 The Šamaš-nāṣir in this letter is not registered in PNA 3/II, 1207a-1208a.
Several individuals with the name of Bēl-ēṭir are mentioned in texts from the Neo-Assyrian period. Among them, Luppert-Barnard has suggested that the recipient of *ABL 299 may be identified with one of the following three officials: a governor in Babylonia, a governor of ḪAR, and a royal official. However, as far as we know, Bēl-ēṭir, the leader of the Bīt-Ibâ, is the only person among his namesakes who directly corresponded with Assurbanipal (see ABL 454 in the next paragraph). Thus Bēl-ēṭir in *ABL 299 was probably Bēl-ēṭir of Bīt-Ibâ although there is no compelling evidence.

In ABL 454, Bēl-ēṭir of Bīt-Ibâ swears loyalty to Assurbanipal. However, he eventually betrayed the king. His treachery is indicated by two literary texts, SAA 3 29 and SAA 3 30. In these texts, Bēl-ēṭir is denounced ridiculed and connected with the image of a dog and fornication. In ABL 925:5′, we can find the phrase “a fornicating dog” and it may refer to Bēl-ibni.

1.4.3. Bēl-ibni
Commander-in-chief of the Sealand, Commandant of the Sealand, Royal Eunuch, and a Member of the King’s Entourage
Bēl-ibni (mdEN–DŪ,200 mdEN–ib-ni201), the commander-in-chief of the Sealand, the governor of the Sealand, the royal eunuch, and a member of the king’s entourage, received five letters from Assurbanipal: *ABL 291, *ABL 402, *ABL 288, *ABL 399, and *ABL 400.

His titles are not mentioned in these letters, but the letter *ABL 289 discussed below (p. 58), which is addressed to the Sealander and dated 650-II-5, indicates his appointment and position. In the letter, Assurbanipal states that he is sending Bēl-ibni, his servant (ARAD/ardu) and a member of his entourage (LŪ.GUB.BA–IGI/mazzāz-pānī), to assume the leadership (ālik-pānūti) of the Sealander. In addition, Bēl-ibni in one of his letters to Assurbanipal explicitly states that the king sent him to

196 Luppert-Barnard in PNA I/II, 298b-299a, nos. 6-8.
197 PNA I/II, 299a, no. 17.
198 Frame 1992, 118, 156, n. 107, 174-175; Parpola 1983a, 11.
200 *ABL 291, *ABL 399.
202 PNA I/II, 306b-310b, no. 18; de Vaan 1995, 33-34.
the Sealand as a commander-in-chief (*turtānu*), and he is referred to as a royal eunuch (*ša-rēšī ša šarri*) in a letter from Nabû-ušabši of Uruk, and as a commandant (*šākin ṭēmi*) in a letter by an unknown author to the king.

Bēl-ibni was instrumental in the success of Assyrian military operations in southern Babylonia during Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s revolt. His mission was to repossess that area. For instance, Bēl-ibni dealt with the issues of the rebellious tribal groups such as the Puqūdu and the Gurasimmu in southern Babylonia during the revolt. After the rebellion was suppressed, Bēl-ibni played a prominent role in the Elamite wars. His activities are reconstructed mainly from his correspondence with Assurbanipal. However, it is very difficult to follow his activities chronologically because most of the letters are not dated. A detailed study of his correspondence by J. M. C. T. de Vaan appeared in 1995.

### 1.4.4. Ḫundāru
**King of Dilmun**

Ḫundāru (*ḫu-un-da-[ru]*) , king of Dilmun during the reign of Assurbanipal, received *AAA 20 106* dated 647*-VI-13. Dilmun is identified with modern Bahrain. In the letter, Assurbanipal declares that he will give the kingship of Dilmun to Ḫundāru.

Apart from *AAA 20 106, Ḫundāru is mentioned in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal and Assurbanipal’s correspondence.* The inscriptions record that Ḫundāru, the king of Dil[mun], came to Nineveh every year without interruption with [his heavy tribute]. The reference to Ḫundāru as the king of Dil[mun] indicates that Assurbanipal’s promise in *AAA 20 106 was fulfilled.

Moreover, the tribute of Ḫundāru is attested in ABL 458, probably written by Bēl-ibni. The author says that he is sending ‘Idu, the *muribbānu* of Ḫundāru, who is carrying the tribute of Dilmun to the palace.” These documents show Ḫundāru’s good attitude towards Assurbanipal. However, in

---

204 ABL 795:10, l.ū.tur-ta-ru. See also de Vaan 1995, 289-292.
205 ABL 267 r. 11-12, mdEN-ib-ni / LÚ.SAG šā [LUGAL] EN-[i]a’ (x)].
206 CT 54 545:6, [x x]`e` mdEN-DU ’LUGARʾ–U[U|MUS] x x x x]
207 De Vaan 1995.
208 The original document was destroyed – only the transliteration is available (Thompson and Mallowan 1933, 103-106).
209 The location of Dilmun has been discussed for a long time. See, for instance, Fuchs 1994, 430; Zadok 1985, 311-312.
210 *AAA 20 106 r. 26, ki-i a-na-ka LUGAL-u-ti šá NITUK.KI ad-dan-ka.
211 PNA 2/I, 479, no. 2.
213 PNA 2/I, 507a. Concerning *muribbānu, CAD M/2 219b and AHw 676a do not give a definition of *muribbānu, while de Vaan translates it as “Bevollmächtigte (agent)” (de Vaan 1995, 258-259).
ABL 791, Bēl-ibni refers to a “[sin]” of Ḫundāru though what Ḫundāru did is not mentioned. It is also noteworthy that the property of Nabû-bēl-šumāṭi is said to have been brought from Dilmun in the same letter. Taking into account that Nabû-bēl-šumāṭi is mentioned also in *AAA 20 106:4 in a broken context, Ḫundāru may have had some connection with him. Unfortunately, it is unclear whether the “sin” of Ḫundāru preceded his submission to Assurbanipal or not.

1.4.5. Illil-bāni
Governor of Nippur (šandabakku)
Illil-bāni (conventionally Enlil-bāni, md+EN.[LIL–ba-n]i) was the governor of Nippur (šandabakku) under Assurbanipal. He seems to have received two letters from the king; *ABL 292 together with the citizens of Nippur and possibly *CT 54 464 alone.

In *ABL 292, the name of Illil-bāni is partially broken. However, since the other recipients are the citizens of Nippur, the restoration of Illil-bāni is beyond doubt. In the letter, Assurbanipal urges him and the citizens of Nippur to watch all the roads in order to capture an unnamed person (see pp. 9-11 and 178-180).

In *CT 54 464, the name of the recipient is broken away. However, the opening formula makes it clear that the letter was addressed to one individual only. Since the content of *CT 54 464 is parallel to that of *ABL 292, Illil-bāni should be the recipient.

Illil-bāni’s previous career is not known. He was appointed to the office of šandabakku sometime between 664 BC and 661 BC and held this office through the rebellion of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The terminus post quem for the beginning of his governorship is fixed by the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal, which record that his predecessor Nabû-šuma-ēreš died from dropsy in 664 BC. In a religious text, BM 78903 (88-5-12,89), dated on the 15th day of Ṭebētu (X) in the 7th year of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, i.e., 661 BC, Illil-bāni already figured as the governor of Nippur (md+EN.LIL–ba-

---

216 Concerning the pronunciation of Enlil, see PNA 1/I, XXV and CAD I/J, 85b.
217 *ABL 292:1-3, a-mat LUGAL a-na md+EN.[LIL–ba-n]i / ū LŪ.EN.[LIL.KI.MEŠ LŪ.AB.BA].MEŠ / ū TUR.MEŠ [ARAD.MEŠ-ia] md l ba-ṣu-ū, “The king’s word to Illil-bāni and the Nippurians old and young, every one of [my servants].”
218 Ito 2013, 23 and 30, n. 9.
219 *CT 54 464:3-4, [lu-[-]a-ub-ka e[n-n]a / a-du-ii al-tap‘-rak’-ka. The pronominal suffix -ka (see, ṭābka, altaprakka) is used for the 2nd person singular. However, when Assurbanipal gives instructions in the letter, the 2nd person plural forms appear almost all the time. This can mean that though Assurbanipal addresses his letter to Illil-bāni only, he expects that Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur work together as in *ABL 292.
220 PNA 2/I, 519b.
221 BIWA, 96 and 223, B IV 62-63 // C V 70-71.
The precise year when he resigned the position is not known. After Illil-bāni, no other šandabakku of Nippur is known for the last years of the Assyrian Empire. In my research material, Illil-bāni is not explicitly referred to as šandabakku. However, the unidentified šandabakku mentioned in the royal letter *ABL 287, sent to the citizens of Nippur, is likely to have been Illil-bāni.

1.4.6. Indabibi
King of Elam

Indabibi (m in-da-bi-bi), king of Elam (c. 649-648 BC), is the recipient of *ABL 1151, dated 649 BC. He is referred to as the king of Elam (MAN KUR.NIM.MA.KI) in the address formula.

It is not clear whether or not he was a member of the Elamite royal family because no text describes his lineage. The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal call Indabibi “his (= Tammarītu II’s) servant.” Indabibi revolted against Tammarītu II, overthrew him, and ascended the throne of Elam. The exact year and day when Indabibi seized the throne is not known. However, it must have taken place in 649 BC at the latest because *ABL 1151 bears that year.

In *ABL 1151, Assurbanipal calls Indabibi “his brother.” Unfortunately, the contents of the letter are almost totally lost, but the use of the word “brother” indicates that Assurbanipal maintained a peaceful relationship with Indabibi. This is also indicated by the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal (Editions B and C). They record that Indabibi released the Assyrians whom the perfidious Nabû-bēl-šumāti of the Sealand had seized and forwarded to Elam, and sent them back to Assurbanipal. At the end of this episode of Edition B, it is said that Indabibi sent a messenger of goodwill and peace (ṭūbi u sulummē) to Assurbanipal.

---

222 PNA 2/I, 519a-b, no. 2; Cole 1996, 54-55 and n. 71; Brinkman 1984, 92, n. 455; Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 39, Kn. 9.
223 Cole 1996, 55. Cole has pointed out that šandabakku is referred to in eight Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid texts from Nippur.
225 *ABL 1151 r. 1′-2′, [l]Tl ur-〈UD-x-KĀM〉 / lim-mu 〈PAB–le-il〉, “Mo[nth of ..., xth day], eponym year of Aḫu-ilāʾī (= 649 BC).”
226 BIWA, 42 and 234, A IV 11 // F III 19, m in-da-bi-bi ARAD-su; BIWA, 110 and 230, B VII 56 // C VIII 46, m in-da-bi-bi ARAD-su. See the inscription on reliefs in Assurbanipal’s palace at Nineveh, BIWA, 314, Rs 28, G 19′; BIWA, 315, Rs 32, G 23′ // Rs 32, H 3′. See also a tablet bearing texts of the inscriptions, Streck 1916, 174-175, K 1364 r. 6.
227 PNA 2/I, 542b-543a.
228 *ABL 1151:3, šēš-šū.
However, Edition C (dated in 647* BC), compiled after Edition B (649 and 648* BC), does not record the messenger from Indabibi. Instead, it tells another story. Edition C IX 59-86 reveals that Assurbanipal sent a messenger to Indabibi threatening that he would destroy Elamite cities, deport the Elamite people, and replace Indabibi with someone else if the latter does not comply with a demand for the return of the Assyrians. This messenger did not reach Indabibi, but the Elamites heard the message, killed Indabibi, and enthroned Ummanaldašu III (c. 648-c. 645 BC) after Indabibi had mobilized his forces against Assyria. It is likely that Edition C reflects Indabibi’s treachery, and the fact that the edition is dated to 647* BC indicates the year when Indabibi became hostile towards Assurbanipal.

1.4.7. Kudurru
Subordinate of Nabû-ušabši and later Governor of Uruk
Kudurru (m’Nîg.Gûb) received, together with the citizens of Uruk, two letters from Assurbanipal: *ABL 518 and *ABL 296. As in the letters to Nabû-ušabši, in both letters his name precedes the citizens of Uruk and his title is not mentioned.

There is evidence that Kudurru was active in Uruk already earlier during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, possibly as a subordinate of Nabû-ušabši before he held the office of the governor. For instance, he helped Ur at the request of the governor of the city. In ABL 754, Kudurru reports to Assurbanipal that he had levied 500-600 archers from Uruk and marched to Ur with the governor of Arrapḫa and the governor of Mazamua who had been sent to Uruk as reinforcements by Assurbanipal.

As stated below in the section on Nabû-ušabši (pp. 43-44), Kudurru is first mentioned as the governor of Uruk on the 20th of Nisan (I) of 647* BC. Since *ABL 518 is dated on the 24th of Ayyaru (II) of 646* BC, he was already the governor when the letter was addressed to him.

---

230 BIWA, 257.
231 BIWA, 153-155 and 232, C IX 59-86.
234 PNA 2/I, 633b-634a, no. 20.
Kudurru participated as the governor of Uruk in a weeping ceremony in the city. It is uncertain when his tenure ended, but Nabû-zêru-lêšir, his follower, first appears as governor of Uruk in 642 BC.²³⁶

1.4.8. Menânu
Elamite Elder
Menânû ("me-na-na) received from Assurbanipal the undated letter *ABL 1380. He is called “elder” (r. 12, Lû.ÂB.BA) in the letter, and his name suggests that he belonged to the Elamite royal family and possibly was the grandson of his namesake (Umman-)Menânû who was the king of Elam (c. 692-689 BC) during the reign of Sennacherib.²³⁷

In the letter, Assurbanipal complains that Menânû who had promised to fight against Ummanigaš II, the perfidious Elamite king (653-c. 652 BC) enthroned by him after the defeat of Teumman, had not kept his promise but had cut off all communication with Assurbanipal and detained the king’s envoys in Elam for 19 months. Since later in the letter Assurbanipal counts Menânû among “those who love Assyria and are well-disposed to me,”²³⁸ he nevertheless must have been counting on Menânû’s continued loyalty and cooperation.

However, around the beginning of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn’s rebellion, Menânû had actually broken with Assurbanipal and sided with Nabû-bêl-šumâti of the Sealand. In *ABL 289 to the Sealanders dated 650-II-5, Assurbanipal calls Nabû-bêl-šumâti “the whore of Menânû.”²³⁹ No further details of his life are known.

1.4.9. Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšu
Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšû (Âf.PA–MAN–PAB.MEŠ-šû) is the recipient of *ABL 302.²⁴⁰ This letter is a reaction of Assurbanipal to a message from him concerning the arrangements for a review of horses. In this letter, Assurbanipal informs him that a letter order to come will be sent in the middle of Šabâtu (XI) so that the horses will arrive within Nisannu (I). Details of Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšû are not known.²⁴¹

²³⁶ Frame 1992, 280. This person is not entered in PNA.
²³⁷ PNA 3/II, 1385.
²³⁹ *ABL 289:7–8, Âf .ÂG–ÂN–MU.MEŠ / Âf.KAR.KID š a ’”me-na-nu.
²⁴¹ PNA 2/II, 873a, no. 18. Van Buylaere has suggested that Assurbanipal possibly “had a more personal relationship with Nabû-šar-aḫḫēšû” because “it is rare that a king bothers to give such a detailed explanation of the reason why a delivery of horse will be late” (Van Buylaere 2009, 303, n. 47).
1.4.10. Nabû-ušabši
Governor of Uruk

Nabû-ušabši (mdPA–GÁL-ši,242 mdAG–GÁL-ši243), the governor of Uruk (c. 661-649),244 appears as the sole recipient of *ABL 273, *ABL 945, *ABL 294, *ABL 1100, and *ABL 517.

The beginnings of *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244 are not preserved. However, these three letters and *ABL 273, addressed to Nabû-ušabši, are duplicates of one another with minor variants. Hence, although the names of the recipients of *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244 are not preserved, the recipient of all these letters must be Nabû-ušabši.

In the address part of *ABL 297, the name of the recipient is half broken. Following the determinatives for a personal name and a god name, only the AG sign is readable. Nevertheless, after the name of this person, the citizens of Uruk also appear as the recipients of this letter.245 Thus it is extremely plausible to restore the name of Nabû-ušabši as the one of the addressees of *ABL 297.

The beginning of *ABL 539 is broken and the name of the recipient of the letter has been lost. However, he is consistently addressed in the singular in the letter246 and therefore he is clearly a single individual. In addition, he is said to have returned from the presence of Assurbanipal. This indicates that his status was high enough for an audience with the Assyrian king. An undated fragmentary Neo-Babylonian letter, CT 54 113, from an unknown author to Assurbanipal, pertains to the same situation as *ABL 539, where Assurbanipal states that he is sending Nabû-erîba, his eunuch, Nergal-šarru-usur, his “third man,” and Akkullânû, the priest of the Aššur temple (LÚ.TU–É šá AN.SÁR), to the recipient with a treaty tablet, while CT 54 113 refers to Nergal-šarru-usur (r. 13’) and Akkullânû twice (r. 13’ and r. 15’) in broken contexts. Since both letters mention Nergal-šarru-usur and Akkullânû, some Assyriologists have already pointed out that these two letters probably deal with the same event.247 Furthermore, CT 54 113 refers to the citizens of Uruk.248 Taking into

---

242 *ABL 273, *ABL 945.
244 PNA 2/II, 901b-902b, no. 9.
245 *ABL 297:1-2, a-mat LUGAL a-na mdAG–[x x] / ù LÚ.UNUG.KI.MEŠ, “The king’s word to Nabû-[…] and the citizens of Uruk.”
246 For example, *ABL 539:2, [lu-a DÜG.GA]-ka, “you (sg.) [can be glad]”; *ABL 539:5, [x x x-i]a ta-at-ta-ṣar, “you (sg.) have guarded my […]”; *ABL 539:6-7, a-na MUN-id a-na ma-mi-ti-id / ul taḫ-ti, “you (sg.) have not sinned against my favour and oath.”
247 Pearce and Radner in PNA 1/I, 95, no. 1; Mattila in PNA 2/II, 955a, no. 22.
consideration that CT 54 113 discusses the same topic as *ABL 539 and that CT 54 113 has a connection with Uruk, the most probable recipient of *ABL 539 is Nabû-ušabši.

The career of Nabû-ušabši has been carefully studied by Frame, who established from a number of economic texts that Nabû-ušabši was the governor of Uruk between at least Ṭebētu (X) of 661 BC and Nisannu (I) of 649 BC.\(^249\) He has also pointed out that Nabû-ušabši could have served as governor longer because his predecessor Ahhēšāia\(^250\) is last mentioned as the governor in 666 BC and his successor Kudurru\(^251\) first appears as the governor on the 20th of Nisannu (I) of 647* BC.\(^252\) Furthermore, Frame has shown that Nabû-ušabši came from a prominent family in Uruk based on ABL 269 in which Nabû-ušabši complains that the Elamites destroyed his father’s house and tried to kill his brother.\(^253\)

The letters from Assurbanipal indicate that Nabû-ušabši was loyal to Assurbanipal and deeply involved in opposing the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn, dealing with military issues, the Chaldean dynastic “house” of Bīt-Amûkān, wine, officials, and treaties.

1.4.11. Sārdûrî (Issār-dūrî) III
King of Uraṛtu
Sārdûrî III, king of Uraṛtu during the reign of Assurbanipal, was probably the sender of ABL 1240. His name is partially preserved: “Thus (says) S[ārdûrî], king of Uraṛtu.”\(^254\) In addition, Sārdûrî was possibly the recipient of *ABL 1242 although his name is not preserved.

Two Urartian kings, possibly identified with the sender of *ABL 1240, are known: Sārdûrî II (c. 760-730 BC) and Sārdûrî III during the reign of Assurbanipal.\(^255\) Taking into account that Sārdûrî II was mainly active in the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 BC)\(^256\) and no letters from the reign of Tiglath-pileser III are extant from Nineveh where ABL 1240 was found, the Sārdûrî mentioned in

\(^{249}\) Frame 1992, 280; Frame 1986, 260-261.
\(^{250}\) See also PNA 1/I, 60b-61a, no. 2.
\(^{251}\) See also PNA 2/I, 633b-634a, no. 20.
\(^{252}\) Frame 1992, 280; Brinkman 1977, 311; Pohl 1933-1934, Text 13:27.
\(^{254}\) ABL 1240:4-5’, \textit{um-ma} \textit{[S.TAR-du-rî]} / LUGAL KUR.\textit{ú-ra-ar-ṭi-im-}[\textit{ma}].
\(^{255}\) PNA 2/I, 569a-571a, nos. 4 and 28.
\(^{256}\) PNA 2/I, 569, no. 4. The name of Sārdûrî is attested in the reign of Sargon II, but he himself is not mentioned. Only “the right-hand commander-in-chief of the family [of Issār]-dūrî” (SAA 5 93:6-8’) and “the city of Sārdûrî” (Fuchs 1994, 113, Ann 144) are mentioned.
this letter must be Sārdūrī III. Moreover, the contents of the letter do not fit the situation in Tiglath-pileser’s time when Urarṭu was a major power and a serious rival of Assyria.

Sārdūrī III was possibly the recipient of the royal letter *ABL 1242. In the letter, both the sender’s and recipient’s names are broken away, but the letter shows that the sender is from Assyria (l. 1, [x x x x x x x KUR-R-AN.SÁR.KI] and the recipient is from Urarṭu (l. 2, [x x x x x x x KUR].URI DUMU-šū). Following the first two lines, the sender states, “M[y palace] and the whole of Assyria [are well; may] your palace and your country [be well].” Among the royal letters in the Assyrian royal correspondence, only Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal used this greeting mentioning the sender’s and/or recipient’s palace and/or country in the opening formula. In addition, the sender calls the recipient “his son” (l. 2, DUMU-šūtū). In the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal, Sārdūrī III is said to have constantly corresponded with Assurbanipal as a son correspond with his father. The inscriptions also mention that Sārdūrī III brought heavy tribute to him. In ABL 1240, Sārdūrī III agrees to give lapis lazuli to Assurbanipal on the condition that he would save his face, a clear indication of his submissive attitude towards Assurbanipal.

1.4.12. Sin-tabni-ušur

Governor of Ur

Sin-tabni-ušur (m₃₀-tab-nil-šES, m₃₀-DU-PAB), the governor of Ur, appears as the recipient of *ABL 290 and *ABL 523. He was also presumably the addressee of *ABL 1002 because the letter concerns Sin-šarru-ušur, Sin-tabni-ušur’s predecessor as governor, like *ABL 290 and *ABL 523.

As governor of Ur, Sin-tabni-ušur was loyal to Assurbanipal. His father Nikkal-iddin and his two brothers Sin-balāssu-iqbī and Sin-šarru-ušur had already served as governors of Ur before he succeeded his bother Sin-šarru-ušur. It seems that he was appointed sometime between 652 BC

---

257 Cf. PNA 2/I, 569, no. 4, d.
260 See also Lanfranchi 2009, 138.
261 BIWA, 71-72 and 250, A X 40-50.
262 *ABL 290.
263 *ABL 523.
264 *ABL 290.
265 *ABL 523.
266 PNA 3/I, 1145b-1146b, no. 9.
267 PNA 3/I, 1148b-1150a, no. 2.
268 PNA 2/II, 961a-962a.
269 PNA 3/I, 1129b-1130a, no. 3.
270 PNA 3/I, 1148b, no. 2, a.
and 650-III-23, and he probably held the position until 648 BC.  

Sīn-tabni-uṣur confronted difficult situations during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, but he remained loyal to Assurbanipal.

1.4.13. Tammarītu II
King of Elam
Tammarītu II (m-tam-mar-īd), king of Elam (c. 652-c. 649 BC and 647 BC), is the recipient of three letters from Assurbanipal: *ABL 1040:3, *CT 53 908:1, and *ABL 1022:2. In *ABL 1022, the reference to the Rāšeans (l. 6) makes it likely that the addressee is Tammarītu II during his second tenure rather than to the reign of Tammarītu I.

Tammarītu II was a member of the Elamite royal family. However, the description of his family genealogy in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal has provoked discussion. The inscriptions record that he was the son of “another” (indicated by -ma) Ummanigaš, the brother of his father. To solve this problem, Fuchs proposed that his father was not Ummanigaš II but the uncle of Ummanigaš II, and later Waters tentatively followed this suggestion.

Regarding his rise to power, Assurbanipal’s inscriptions state that he revolted against Ummanigaš II, killed him together with his family, and ascended the throne of Elam. Tammarītu II did not inquire about Assurbanipal’s well-being but received bribes from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The inscriptions further record that a few years later his servant Indabibi (c. 649-c. 648 BC) revolted against him and deposed him. Tammarītu II, with his family and entourage, sought refuge in Nineveh, and then submitted to Assurbanipal and lived in Assurbanipal’s palace. After a short

---

269 PNA 3/I, 1148b, no. 2 and b. See also Frame 1992, 126, 163f, and 278. The exact date of the appointment of Sīn-tabni-uṣur is not known. However, the extispicy query SAA 4 300 dated on V-11 (the name of the eponym is lost) was performed to find out if Sīn-tabni-uṣur would make common cause [with] Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in the event of his appointment as the governor of Uruk. Hence Sīn-tabni-uṣur must have been installed after the outbreak of the revolt. In addition, Sīn-tabni-uṣur is first called the governor in a text dated 650-III-23. Therefore, he functioned as governor sometime between 652-II-23 and 650-III-23. See Frame 1992, 163 and 279; Brinkman 1969, 342.

270 PNA 3/I, 1, 488b-1150a, no. 2, c, 1'-5', no. 2.

271 PNA 3/I, 1306b-1308b, no. 2.

272 Waters 2000, 73-74.

273 Waters 2000, 62-64.

274 BIWA, 83, K 2654:18, m-tam-ma-ri-i-tu DUMU m-um-man-i-gaš-ma ŠEŠ AD-šú.

275 Fuchs 2003, 136.

276 Waters 2006, 63-64. See also PNA 3/I, 1306b, no. 2, a.


reign (see above pp. 40-41), Indabibi was killed and Ummanaldašu III (c. 648-c. 645 BC) took the throne of Elam.

The royal letter *ABL 1380 from Assurbanipal to Menānu suggests that Assurbanipal supported both Menānu and Tammarītu II to overthrow Ummanigaš II, because he says that he had sent messages to Tammarītu (see above pp. 19-20 and 42).

As for the second tenure of Tammarītu II, he was installed as the king in Susa by Assurbanipal in 648 BC or more likely 647 BC. According to the royal inscriptions, the Assyrian king organized a campaign against Ummanaldašu III and had Tammarītu II participate in it. *CT 53 908 implies that Tammarītu II was actually in charge of the whole operation. The inscriptions continue that in fear Ummanaldašu III abandoned his royal city Madaktu and fled, and then UmbaḤABua sat on the throne of Elam. However, UmbaḤABua also fled and Assurbanipal enthroned Tammarītu II in Susa. Eventually, Tammarītu II revolted against Assurbanipal. He was captured alive and brought to Nineveh. The rest of his life is not known.

1.4.14. Ummanaldašu III
King of Elam
Ummanaldašu III, king of Elam (c. 648-c. 645BC), was almost certainly the recipient of *ABL 972, although its address is not preserved, because the letter is closely related to ABL 879, “A tablet of Ummanaldašu ("um-man-al-da-si"), king of Elam, to Assurbanipal, king of Assyria.”

In *ABL 972 Assurbanipal requires the extradition of an unnamed “criminal/traitor” (parriṣu) who is in the presence of the recipient. In the continuation, he clearly identifies Nabû-bēl-šumāṭi as the “criminal” (ll. 9'-10'). Moreover, he demands the extradition of Nabû-qāṭī-šabat who threw “his lord” (possibly Šamaš-šumu-ukīn) into a fire (r. 8-9).

In *BM 132980, addressed to the elders of Elam and dated to 647*-XI, Assurbanipal similarly demands the extradition of Nabû-bēl-šumāṭi, Nabû-qāṭī-šabat, and a certain Kīribtu (see pp. 21-22

281 This person’s name could be UmmanḪABua. PNA 3/II, 1378b-1379a; Waters 2000, 71.
284 BIWA, 71 and 249-250, A X 17-20; BIWA, 281 and 294, IIT 118
285 Ummanaldašu III became the king of Elam two or three times but the exact year of each enthronement is unclear.
286 Von Soden 1972.
and pp. 58-59). However, the elders failed to deliver them. The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal also mention Nabû-bêl-šumâti and Nabû-qâṭi-šabat together. Edition A, dated 645*-II-15, records that after Assurbanipal had sent his messenger to Umanaldašu III and demanded the extradition of Nabû-bêl-šumâti, the latter became afraid and instructed his groom to kill him. Umanaldašu III then delivered the corpse packed in salt to Assurbanipal, who cut off the head of Nabû-bêl-šumâti and hung it around the neck of Nabû-qâṭi-šabat, the simmagir-official of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn. In ABL 879, dated 646*-IV-26, Umanaldašu III reports to Assurbanipal that he sent the corpse of Nabû-bêl-šumâti to the Assyrian king without mentioning Nabû-qâṭi-šabat.

Thus Umanaldašu III, who had recently taken over the kingship of Elam, was the key figure in finally delivering Nabû-bêl-šumâti to Assurbanipal. Since *ABL 972 mentions Nabû-bêl-šumâti as well as Nabû-qâṭi-šabat, the recipient of the letter can only be Umanaldašu III.

In the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, Umanaldašu III is identified as the son of Atta-metu, the commander of the Elamite archery killed in a battle at the beginning of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn’s rebellion. After Indabibi was overthrown, Umanaldašu III became the king of Elam. Since he took a rebellious attitude towards Assurbanipal, the Assyrian king carried out several military campaigns against him. Whenever the Assyrian army invaded Elam, Umanaldašu III abandoned his city and escaped. Nevertheless, he survived and regained the kingship of Elam. As a result, Umanaldašu III had two or three tenures as the Elamite king. In the intervals between his reigns, UmbaḪABua, Tammaritu II, and possibly Pa’e took the throne of Elam. However, the exact year of each accession of Umanaldašu III is unclear. Eventually, Umanaldašu III was captured alive and he was taken to Assyria. His ultimate fate is unknown.

1.4.15. Umanšûbar
Umanšûbar (mişum-man-ši-[bar]), a prominent Elamite, is the recipient of *ABL 1170. The last sign of his name is not preserved, but the restoration is beyond doubt since Umanšûbar is well known from other texts and no other name fits the traces.

---

288 BIWA, 155 and 232, C IX 85; BIWA, 193 and 232, H 4:5'. See also PNA 1/I, 234.
289 PNA 3/II, 1380b-1385a, no. 3; Waters 2000, 68-80.
290 PNA 3/II, 1380b-1385a, no. 3; Waters 2000, 68-80.
Ummanšibar was active in Elam in the early 640s because the letter is dated 648*-IV-25 and the letter indicates that Ummanšibar had correspondence with Bēl-ibni who was appointed as the commander-in-chief of the Sealand in 650 BC (see above pp. 37-38).\textsuperscript{292} In addition, Bēl-ibni mentions Ummanšibar several times in his letters to Assurbanipal.\textsuperscript{293} Since Ummanšibar and the magnates conspired against their king who could be identified with either Indabibi (c. 649-648 BC) or Ummanaldāšu III (c. 648-c. 645 BC),\textsuperscript{294} it seems that he was deeply involved in Elamite politics. However, his office, his title, and his origin are unknown. The passage in a letter from Bēl-ibni (ABL 281:10-11), where Ummanšibar is associated with a “herald” (LÚ.NIGIR/nāgiru), is probably not to be rendered as “the herald Ummanšibar”\textsuperscript{295} because the title nāgiru precedes his name.\textsuperscript{296} The nāgiru of Elam is left unidentified by name in other letters of Bēl-ibni as well (ABL 1010:3, CT 54 520:5; cf. also ABL 1198:5').

Waters has plausibly suggested that Ummanšibar might have been one of the elders of Elam or their spokesman because Ummanšibar secretly sent a message of the Elamites to Assurbanipal through Bēl-ibni, and *BM 132980, which seems to have triggered this secret message, is addressed to the elders of Elam (see below pp. 58-59).\textsuperscript{297}

In ABL 281, Bēl-ibni also reports that, following the flight of Ummanaldāšu, Ummanšibar and all his friends (bēl-tābtīs) have gone off towards Šuḫari-sungar in order to settle either among the Ḫuḫan or in the city of Ḫaidālu.\textsuperscript{298} However, the chronological order of these events is uncertain. No existing texts record the fate of Ummanšibar.

1.4.16. Zākiru and Kabtīa
Zākiru received *ABL 944 together with Kabtīa (ll. 1-2, a-mat LUGAL mza- kir / m kab-ti-ia). In the letter, Assurbanipal writes about the people of Cutha and Surmarrāti. Since these places were in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{292} ABL 1170:8-9, u šād a-na UGU / nāDEN-ib- ni taš-pur, “and concerning what you wrote to Bēl-ibni.”
  \item \textsuperscript{294} ABL 460:3'-5' = de Vaan 1995, 259-261.
  \item \textsuperscript{296} PNA 3/II, 1385b. See also Waters 2000, 69, n. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{297} Waters 2002, 85. See also PNA 3/II, 1386b. The message of the Elamites is cited in ABL 792 = de Vaan 1995, 284-287.
  \item \textsuperscript{298} ABL 281:10-17 = de Vaan 1995, 243-248. Waters has suggested that perhaps failing to deliver Nabū-bēl-šumāti to Assurbanipal might have led to his flight (Waters 2000, 75, n. 40).
\end{itemize}
Babylonia, Zākiru was possibly a Babylonian. Neither his title nor his personal connection is given in the letter, hence his details are unknown.

As for Kabtīa, Baker has suggested that this person is possibly identified with Kabtīa of SAA 18 162 = ABL 202 (reign of Esarhaddon) who was involved in the taking of a loyalty oath in Babylonia. To judge from obv. 11-14 of that letter, he probably belonged to the ruling elite of Rāši.

1.4.17. The Citizens of Babylon
Assurbanipal probably sent eight letters to the citizens of Babylon: *ABL 926, *ABL 301, *K 2931 (= Parpola 2004a, 230-232), *83-1-18,511, *ABL 571, *CT 54 230, *ABL 1146, and *CT 53 142. Only two of these texts preserve “the citizens of Babylon” as the addressees in their opening formulae: *ABL 926:1, “To the citizens of Babylon, the men under my protection” (a-na LÚ.TIN.TIR.MEŠ ERIM.MEŠ ki-din-ni-ia) and *ABL 301:1, “The king’s word to the citizens of Babylon” (a-bat LUGAL a-na LÚ.KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KL.MEŠ).

The beginning of *K 2931, at least 10 lines, is broken away. However, Parpola has suggested that the letter was addressed to the citizens of Babylon because the content and structure of the first six preserved lines of the letter are parallel to *ABL 301, and both letters are written in Neo-Babylonian but in Neo-Assyrian script.

Concerning a fragmentary letter *83-1-18,511 which has lost its opening formula, Parpola has indicated in his article that the letter was probably sent to the citizens of Babylon because Assurbanipal calls Šamaš-šumu-ukīn “no-brother” (l. 2’, [la] ŠEŠ-ú-a) as he does in *ABL 301 and *K 2931, and because Assurbanipal swears by Aššur, Marduk, (and) his gods (l. 4’, [ina ŠÀ AN.ŠÁR d]A]MAR.UTU DINGIR.MEŠ-iá at-te-me) as he does in the above-mentioned letters. Parpola has further pointed out that Assurbanipal applies this formula only in these three letters while in all other letters of his he always uses a formula, “I swear by Aššur (and) my gods.”

---

299 Parpola and Porter 2001, Map 10 and pp. 12 (s.v. Kutē) and 16.
300 PNA 3/II, 1432b, no. 8.
301 Baker in PNA 2/I, 594a, no. 1. See also Radner in PNA 1/I, 209b, no. 1.
302 Parpola 2004a, 228-229 and 234. See also Reynolds 2003, XVI and XXXVI, n. 4.
303 *ABL 301:4’, la ŠEŠ a-ga-a.
304 The translation of *83-1-18,511 is in Parpola 2004a, 232, n. 11.
should also be noted that the letter likewise was written in Neo-Babylonian but in Neo-Assyrian script.

The first few lines of *ABL 571 are broken, hence the name of the recipient(s) is not preserved. However, Fales and Parpola have shown in their respective articles that Assurbanipal sent the letter as an ultimatum to the citizens of Babylon under siege.\(^{307}\) The contents of the letter clearly indicate that the letter was addressed to them. For example, in the letter Assurbanipal calls the Babylonians “your (pl.) brothers.”\(^{308}\) In addition, he refers to Babylon several times,\(^{309}\) “prayed to Aššur and Marduk, [my] gods” (r. 16-17, AN.ŠÁR u 𒀭 AMAR._UTU DINGIR. MEŠ-e-[a] / ú-šal-li-ma), and writes in Neo-Babylonian but uses Neo-Assyrian script as in the letters discussed above.

*CT 54 230 was probably sent to the citizens of Babylon. The letter contains the names of eight recipients with their father’s names though the names are poorly preserved: Bēl-aḫu-[... son of ......], [...]-ni son of Bēl-[...], [...] son of ......-Nergal, Aplāia son of […], […… son of […] Bēl-ēpuš, Mušēzib-Marduk [son of …], […]-zēri son of Bēl-ēṭir, Bēl-ibni son of […].\(^{310}\) It is difficult to identify these people because the names are very common. However, Frahm has suggested that the addressees are from Babylon because of the theophoric elements of these names such as Bēl and Marduk.\(^{311}\) In addition, the gods Bēl and Nabû are mentioned in r. 10\(^{′}\) in a broken context. However, Frahm has not ruled out the possibility that the recipients are the people of Uruk because Uruk is mentioned in l. 15\(^{′}\) “and you are destroying the rest of the […] of Uruk […].”\(^{312}\)

Though its beginning is broken away, *ABL 1146 could also be addressed to the citizens of Babylon because in the letter Assurbanipal states, “And [I am thin]king about you and your offerings for Babylon.”\(^{313}\) This statement does not contribute direct evidence that the recipients are the citizens of Babylon. However, Assurbanipal additionally tells the recipients that he is now sending “the chieftains of Akkad” (r. 1-2, LŪ. r[a] / šá-ni / šá KUR–URI.KI) to them,\(^{314}\) hence the recipients were certainly related to the south.

\(^{307}\) Fales 2009, 36; Parpola 2004a, 229.

\(^{308}\) *ABL 571:6-7, LŪ. TIN.TIR.KI [MEŠ] / ŠEŠ. MEŠ-ku-nu.

\(^{309}\) *ABL 571:14, 20, r. 1.

\(^{310}\) *CT 54 230:3\(^{′}-7\), [x x x x x x x x x x] mdEN-ŠEŠ- [x x x x x x x x x x] / [x x x x x x x x x x] / [A-šá šá maEN-x(x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
A fragmentary letter, *CT 53 142, might be sent to the citizens of Babylon though the opening formula is broken away. The content and the structure of the letter (r. 7-10) are similar to those of *K 2931:7'-12' which is quite likely addressed to the citizens of Babylon. In *CT 53 142, Assurbanipal has dressed an unnamed person in purple and he has sent him something,\(^\text{315}\) while in *K 2931 Assurbanipal had dressed all the captured Babylonians (in purple)\(^\text{316}\) and sent them to Babylon.\(^\text{317}\)

Several variations in the orthography of the term “the citizens of Babylon” are found in three letters: LÚ.TIN.TIR.KI.MEŠ in *ABL 301:12, *K 2931:7', 13', and *ABL 571:6; LÚ.TIN.TIR.MEŠ in *ABL 926:1; LÚ.KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI.MEŠ in *ABL 301:1. In letters that are not sent to the citizens of Babylon the spelling is LÚ.TIN.TIR.KI.MEŠ\(^\text{318}\) ([*CT 54 464 r. 17]) and DUMU TIN.TIR.KI (ABL 961 r. 7).\(^\text{319}\) All these texts are Neo-Babylonian. Thus LÚ.TIN.TIR.KI.MEŠ is the most common spelling for the citizens of Babylon in my corpus. The only exception is *ABL 301, where two spellings, LÚ.TIN.TIR.KI.MEŠ and the usual NA spelling LÚ.KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI.MEŠ, are used. The following table summarizes this discussion.

**Table 3: Spellings for the Citizens of Babylon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LÚ.TIN.TIR.KI.MEŠ</th>
<th>*ABL 301 (NB in NA script), *K 2931(NB in NA script), *ABL 571 (NB in NA script), *CT 54 464 (NB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LÚ.TIN.TIR.MEŠ</td>
<td>*ABL 926 (NB in NA script)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMU TIN.TIR.KI</td>
<td>*ABL 961 (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÚ.KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI.MEŠ</td>
<td>*ABL 301 (NB in NA script)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{315}\) *CT 53 142 r. 7-10, SIG.SA₂ us-[su-bi-su x x x x] / ā ana [I ]Ú.GAR–UM[UŠ-ā-ti x x x x x] / ap-[t]i-‘qid’-s[u x x x x x x x x ] / us-se-bi[t]ik x [x x x x x x x x x], ’I have dr[essed him] in purple [......] and I have appoint[e]d hi[ml] to the comma[ndantship of......]. I went sent [......].’

\(^{316}\) Postgate 1994, 235-237.

\(^{317}\) *K 2931 (NB in NA script):7'-12', ā šu-ā en-na ma ul-tu ik-kir LÚ.TIN.TIR.KI.MEŠ / ma-al šá ina di-ik-te maḥ-rī-i-te ū-šab-bi-tu-ū-ni / a-na IGI-iu i-bu-kū-ū-ni ki-i ū-la-bi-šu a-na IGI-ia i-bu-kū-ū-ni ki-i ū-la-bi-šu / 1 MA.NA.TA.ĀM KUG.UD ina MURUB-šu-mu ki-i ū-rak-ki-sù / um-ma a-na NIN.NA.HI.LA u A.MEŠ in-na-ad-di ana KÁ.DINGIR.RA.[KI] / [a]l-’a-ta ‘par.’ ’After his revolt, as soon as I had robed (in purple) all the Babylonians who were captured at the first fighting and taken into my presence, and I had tied a mina of silver to the waist of each of them with the words, ’it is to be spent on bread and water,’ [I sent] them to Babylon.’ See Parpola 2004a, 231.

\(^{318}\) A Neo-Babylonian letter probably addressed to Išil-bānī, governor of Nippur.

\(^{319}\) A Neo-Babylonian letter from Elamites, possibly the elders of Elam, to Assurbanipal.
The orthography of Babylon likewise varies: TIN:TIR:KI in *ABL 571:14, 20, r. 1, *ABL 1146:11', *CT 54 464 r. 19; KÁ:DINGIR:RA:KI in *K 2931:11'; KÁ:DINGIR:KI in *CT 53 953:9;320 URU.KÁ:DINGIR:MEŠ in *CT 53 378:6.321 This spelling of Babylon with a plural marker reflecting an understanding of the city name as “the gate of gods” is relatively rare but also otherwise attested in NA and NB/LB sources (see NAT 64 and RG 8 44-45, and note also KÁ:DINGIR:KI, RG 8 45). In any case, TIN:TIR:KI is the most popular spelling of Babylon in my corpus (see the following table for this discussion).

Table 4: Spellings for Babylon

| TIN:TIR:KI | *ABL 571 (NB in NA script), *ABL 1146 (NB), *CT 54 464 (NB) |
| KÁ:DINGIR:RA:KI | *K 2931 (NB in NA script) |
| KÁ:DINGIR:KI | *CT 53 953 (NA) |
| URU.KÁ:DINGIR:MEŠ | *CT 53 378 (NA) |

In *ABL 926:4, the address to the citizens of Babylon is complemented with the phrase “small [and great]” (TUR[MEŠ u GAL:MEŠ]).322 It is well known that this phrase is an idiomatic expression that denotes “everybody,” “all,” and “entire assembly.”323 In the royal correspondence of Assyria, the phrase is not often used. It is once applied to portray scribes in general324 and three times to citizens, including *ABL 926. When the phrase is attested with citizens, it is used not only for the citizens of Babylon but also for citizens of other cities. For example, in SAA 16 97, a letter from the administrators and citizens of Aššur to Esarhaddon, the senders refer to themselves as citizens of Aššur “small and great” (ll. 4-5 URU:ŠÀ–URU:‘a-a / TUR GAL). In another letter, SAA 18 199 from the governor of Nippur and the citizens of Nippur (l. 3, LÚ:EN:LI:LI:MEŠ) to Assurbanipal, they likewise refers to themselves as “small and great.”325 The phrase is more frequently attested in the royal inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian period, but there it tends to mean “everybody” in a broader

320 *CT 53 953 is a fragmentary Neo-Assyrian letter addressed to the city lord[s of Bašimu. Bašim was probably located in Elam. See Steinkeller 1982.
321 *CT 53 378 is a fragmentary Neo-Assyrian letter possibly sent from Assurbanipal to unknown person(s) concerning an Aramean tribesman who was in Nippur and then went to Babylon. Cf. Cole 1996, 29.
323 CAD § 184a-b; AHw 937b and 1089b
324 SAA 10 171 r. 1-3, en-na Lugal Sag' LÚ:DUB:SAR:MEŠ / ra-bu-ú u še-ē-ḫu Lugal / ki-i iš-šu-ú a-na-ku / ul it-it x[x].MEŠ, “Now the king has summoned scribes great and small, but the king has not sum[moned] me.”
sense. For instance, the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal record that Esarhaddon assembled the people (UN.MEŠ) of the land of Aššur, small and great (TUR u GAL), from the upper sea to the lower sea to make them conclude a treaty concerning royal succession for Assurbanipal. In another letter from Assurbanipal (*CT 54 230:8′), the address to the citizens of Babylon is complemented with the phrase “[old] and young” ([LÚ.AB.MEŠ] ù LÚ.TUR.MEŠ). This phrase is used per merismum to designate not merely the two extremes (old and young) but the whole citizenry irrespective of age. It appears more frequently than “small and great” in the royal correspondence of Assyria where it is applied not only to the citizens of Babylon and other cities but also to the members of a tribe. The phrase is hardly used in the royal inscriptions, perhaps because it was felt to be more colloquial. In addition to the phrases “small and great” and “old and young,” making it clear that the king’s messages were meant for the entire citizenry of Babylon, two specific designations for them occur in the letters from Assurbanipal. The first one is “the men under my protection” (ṣāb kidinnūa) in *ABL 926:1, the second one is “the troop that I have put together for Bēl” (kišru ša ana Bēl āšur) in *ABL 301 r. 16-17. Parpola has pointed out that the idiom kidinn(u)tu kašāru “to bind/put together the protection” alludes to the establishment of Babylon’s privileged status (kidinnūtu). I will discuss kidinnūtu later in the subsection on Assurbanipal’s policy towards Babylon (see below pp. 163-165). In fact, Assurbanipal repeatedly states in his royal inscriptions from Babylonia that he established the privileged status of Babylon. In addition, in SAA 18 158 the citizens of

326 For instance, RINAP 3/1 2:22, RINAP 3/1 3:22, 30, RINAP 3/1 4:14, 27, 51, RINAP 3/1 8:14, RINAP 3/1 15 i 31′, ii 13′, iv 13, RINAP 3/1 16 i 70, ii 49, iv 3, RINAP 3/1 17 i 61, ii 31, iii 47, RINAP 3/1 22 ii 50, iii 19, iv 24, RINAP 3/1 23 i 45, RINAP 4 40:13′, RINAP 4 99:8, UN.MEŠ TUR GAL; RINAP 4 1 i 15, UN.MEŠ KUR aš-šur:KI TUR GAL.
328 CAD Š/2, 391b; CAD ṣ, 184b; AHw, 1228b.
329 ABL 210:3; *ABL 292:2-3; *ABL 293:3; *ABL 295:2; *ABL 296:2; *ABL 297:2-3; ABL 459:7′; *ABL 518:3; ABL 915:3′; ABL 942:3; *ABL 1260:2-3; ABL 1274:3; CT 54 178:2; SAA 17 150:4; SAA 17 151:9.
330 The phrase is used for the citizens of Ur in *ABL 292, *ABL 296, ABL 1274, and possibly in CT 54 178. The unknown authors of this letter, presumably connected with Ur because of the reference to Kißik and Gurasišnu, call themselves “[y]our servants, [the people of ...], old and young.” In addition, the phrase is applied to the citizens of Ur and Śāt-iddina in ABL 942. Moreover, the phrase portray the citizens of Uruk in *ABL 297 and *ABL 518, and to Rāšeans (“the population of Rāši was predominantly Babylonian, as the majority of its towns had Babylonian names”, see Parpola 2006-2008, 255) in *ABL 295 and *ABL 1260.
331 The phrase is used for Kíssikeans in ABL 210, for Gambûleans in ABL 915 and *ABL 293, for Sealanders in *ABL 289, for tribal people in Tulišiš in SAA 17 150 and SAA 17 151:1-9. Tulišiš was located to the east of Gambûlu (Dietrich 2003, XXIX-XXX; Fuchs 1994, 465, see also PNA 1/II, 294b-a, no. 2); An unknown author of ABL 459 reports to the king that three hundred people, including old and young, were released. However, it is not stated who they were.
Babylon confirm the privileged status of Babylon granted to them. They request that the privileged status also be extended to a certain foreign woman who lives in Babylon.

We know from these letters addressed to the citizens of Babylon that the latter sided with Šamaš-šumu-ukîn after his revolt broke out. Nevertheless, Assurbanipal maintained a generous attitude towards them and tried to persuade them to remain loyal to the Assyrian king. It should be noted that not all the citizens of Babylon supported Šamaš-šumu-ukîn.334

1.4.18. The Citizens of Nippur
The citizens of Nippur (LÚ.EN.LÍL.KI.MEŠ) appear as the recipients of *ABL 292, *ABL 287, and possibly *ABL 561 and *ABL 1186. As already stated above (pp. 9-10 and 39), *ABL 292 was addressed jointly to Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur, while *ABL 287 was sent to the citizens of Nippur only.

The beginning of *ABL 561 is lost, and the name of the recipient(s) is not preserved. However, the letter is clearly connected with *ABL 292 addressed to Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur. Both letters deal with an unnamed man (probably Šamaš-šumu-ukîn) trying to escape from a city under siege (probably Babylon)335 and use the verb siāqu “to close in on; to become constrained, tight” to refer to the man’s desperate situation.336 Moreover, since Assurbanipal uses the 2nd person plural form toward the addressees, in other words, gives instructions to more than one person, the recipients of *ABL 561 are likely to be the citizens of Nippur.

The beginning of *ABL 1186 is broken away. The letter is clearly addressed to more than one person and refers to an unnamed besieged city which could be Babylon (p. 11). Thus the addressees of *ABL 1186 are likely to be the citizens of Nippur as well.

In *ABL 292:2-3, the addressees are specified as “citizens of Nippur, old and young, every one of [my servants]” (LÚ.EN.[LÍL.KI.MEŠ LÚ.AB.BA].MEŠ / ù TUR.MEŠ [ARAD.MEŠ-ia] mál ba-šu-ú).337 The

---

333 As Reynolds has pointed out (Reynolds 2003, XXX), SAA 18 158 “has an unusual format.” It quotes the words of the citizens of Babylon addressed to the kings, i.e., Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukîn. The letter also says that the words were spoken in front of the king, but it is unclear which king they spoke to.
334 *ABL 571.
335 See pp. 9-11.
337 The phrase [ARAD.MEŠ-ia] is reconstructed based on a parallel phrase in *ABL 297:2-3, LÚ.[AB.BA.MEŠ] / ù TUR.MEŠ ARAD.MEŠ-ia [mál ba-šu-ú], which was sent to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, and the citizens of Uruk (see below in the subsection on the citizens of Uruk).
phrase “old and young” probably is used here as a figurative expression making it clear that the letter was addressed to the whole citizenry of Nippur (see above, under the citizens of Babylon). The first part of the phrase, “old,” refers to the assembly of Nippur, which included at least 15 elders (*ABL 287:11-12, 15 a-ni-nu / LÚ.AB.MEŠ). These elders went to see Assurbanipal and later sent a letter to him. 338

Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur remained loyal to Assurbanipal even after the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn broke out. Moreover, since they appear as joint recipients, it seems that they worked together. Nevertheless, Nippur was seized by the rebels for a short period between Kislīmu (IX) and Šabātu (XI) in 651 BC. 339 It is not known how Nippur fell to the rebels and how Nippur was rescued from them. The letters from Assurbanipal note that Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur were engaged in military action on some occasions in cooperation with the people from Uruk. 340 They also interacted with Aššūr-bēlu-taqqin whom Assurbanipal installed as a prefect (šaknu) in Nippur. 341 It seems that the mission of Aššūr-bēlu-taqqin was to keep watch on the governor of Nippur, and he and Illil-bāni did not have friendly relations. 342

1.4.19. The Citizens of Uruk
The citizens of Uruk (LÚ.UNUG.KI.MEŠ) appear as recipients of three letters: *ABL 297 together with Nabû-ušabši; *ABL 518; and *ABL 296 together with Kudurru, who was the successor of Nabû-ušabši.

In these three letters, the Urukeans are addressed similarly but slightly differently. The longest address is in *ABL 297:2-3, “citizens of Uruk, old and young, [every one of] my servants” (LÚ.UNUG.KI.MEŠ LÚ.[AB.BA.MEŠ] / Ļ TUR.MEŠ ARAD.MEŠ-ia [mál ba-šu-ú]), paralleling the address of the citizens of Nippur in *ABL 292:2-3. *ABL 518 shows the shortest and simplest one: “the citizens of Uruk, old and young” (ll. 2-3, LÚ.UNUG.KI.MEŠ / LÚ.AB.BA.MEŠ Ļ TUR.MEŠ), while*ABL

338 *ABL 287:11-16, Ļ ina UGU šá taš-pur-a-ni / um-ma 15 a-né-nu / LÚ.AB.BA.MEŠ a-na šul-me / ša LU[GA]L₁ ki-i ni-nil-li-ka / [mi-šil-ni pa-an] LUGAL i-ter-bu / [mi-šil-ni-ma it-ta-aš-skip, “And as to what you wrote, ‘When we, 15 elders, came to visit the king, [half of us] entered [into] the king’s [presence but half of us were rejected.”]

339 IM 57923 was dated 651-IX-3(+) at Nippur by the regnal year of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. While IM 57901 (duplicate of IM 57902) and IM 57902, dated 651-XI-18, have the regnal year of Assurbanipal.

340 For example, in *CT 54 464:13-16, [i]’na’ iti’a-ga-a / at-tu-nu a LU.n[a-si-ku’ x x] ’x’ / Ļ Š a és [šá i]’- [i]’-ku-nu ší-ša-er a-ša-meš ša KUD-as, “this [monthly] you (pl.), the sh[eikhs] and the citizens of Uruk [who are with you should not be separated from one another.” In addition, we can find parallel phrases in *ABL 292:5-9 and *ABL 297:5-9 addressed to the governor of Uruk and the citizens of Uruk. See Ito 2013, 24.

341 PNA I/L, 173b, no. 11.

342 In SAA 18 192, Illil-bāni reports to the king that Aššūr-bēlu-taqqin had threatened to cut off his head.
296 adds to the specification “my servants” (ll. 2-3, LÚ.UNUG.KI.MEŠ LÚ.AB.BA.MEŠ u TUR.MEŠ / ARAD.MEŠ-iā).

*ABL 297 suggests that Nabû-ušabši and the citizens of Uruk participated in a war that is probably to be identified with Assurbanipal’s campaign against Elam and the Gambûlu in 653 BC. After crushing the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn, the citizens of Uruk and Kudurru took part in a weeping ceremony to reconcile the Babylonian god Marduk and the gods Nanāia, U[ṣur-amas]sa, and Arkaītu who were venerated in Uruk.

1.4.20. The Kissikeans
The Kissikeans (URU.ki-sik-a-a) are the recipients of *ABL 1121 and possibly *CT 53 372. Since the latter is very fragmentary, the name of the addressee is broken away and the contents are difficult to interpret. However, it refers to Sīn-šarru-ušur and its recipient is addressed in the second person plural as in *ABL 1121 where the address to the Kissikeans is preserved and which also discusses Sīn-šarru-ušur, the former governor of Ur. Hence *CT 53 372 was possibly addressed to the Kissikeans as well.

In the time of Assurbanipal, as in ABL 210 r. 5-6, the Kissikeans clearly distanced themselves from the Chaldeans. Rather, Kissik had strong ties with Ur because Kissik was located southeast of Ur. In their letters to the king, the Kissikeans use an Ur-type blessing formula invoking the gods Sīn and Nikkal.

To judge from their letters to the king, the Kissikeans remained loyal and supported Assurbanipal even during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn.

---

343 Ito 2013, 24. Concerning the record of the campaign, see BIWA, 105 and 226-227, B VI 17-VII 2 // C VII 10-119, F II 72-III 5 // A III 50-69, H3 III' 6-12. See also ABL 269 where Nabû-ušabši reports to Assurbanipal that he levied his army by the command of the king and sent them against the Gambûlu.

344 *ABL 518, which deals with the weeping ceremony, is dated 646-II-24.

345 *CT 53 372:7 [x x x x mal30–MAN]–PAB; CT 53 372:10, [x x x x mal30–MAN–PAB.

346 *CT 53 372:5, [S̱u-ku-nu lu DUG.GA]-ku-nu, “you (pl.) [can be glad]”; CT 53 372:11, [x x x x-k]u-nu “your (pl.) [……].”

347 ABL 210 r. 5-6, à LUGAL i-di ki-i LÚ.˹kal-da’-a-nu gab-bi i-ze-e’-rub’-u-ña-a-sš],[“Moreover, the king knows that all the Chaldeans hate us” (by courtesy of Frame).


349 See ABL 210 and ABL 736.
1.4.21. The Sealanders
The Sealanders (LÚ.KUR.tam-tim-a-a) figure as the recipients of *ABL 289. They have on good grounds been identified with the Chaldean dynastic “house” of Bēt-Iakīn, although the connection with Bēt-Iakīn is never made explicitly in preserved sources.  

In this letter, the Sealanders are addressed as “old and young, my servants” (l. 2, LÚ.AB.BA.MEŠ TUR.MEŠ ARAD.MEŠ-id). The phrase “my servants” suggests that the Sealanders had surrendered to Assurbanipal when he wrote the letter to them on 650-II-5, although Nabû-bēl-šumāti, their leader and the governor of the Sealand, had become disloyal to him. The king’s statement that he has dissociated the Sealanders from the crime of Nabû-bēl-šumāti, has to be understood as a tactical move to initiate a new page in the relations between Assyria and the Sealanders, implying that the latter even originally did not obey Nabû-bēl-šumāti. In any case, these people were supposed to stand on the side of Assurbanipal when the letter was composed. Assurbanipal further says in the letter that he is sending Bēl-ibni to lead them (see also pp. 37-38).

1.4.22. The Elders of Elam
The elders of Elam figure as the recipient of *BM 132980 (LÚ.AB.BA.MEŠ šá KUR.NIM.MA.KI), and they almost certainly were the sender of the letter ABL 961 addressed to Assurbanipal, although the line identifying the senders is not preserved.

The senders of ABL 961 clearly were a collective body invested with authority in Elam because they call Assurbanipal “ou[r lord],” and because they evidently were deeply involved in Elamite politics, in asking Assurbanipal to send and install Tammarītu I in Ḫaidālu. We know from the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal that Tammarītu I was eventually enthroned in Ḫaidālu in 653 BC. It should be noted that *BM 132980 addressed to the elders of Elam proves that they had the authority to deliver Nabû-bēl-šumāti of the Sealand to the king and the ability to exercise political power. Thus the authors of ABL 961, who were able to speak for Elam in the time of political turbulence, can only be the elders of Elam.

351 *ABL 289 r. 10-11, ITI.GUD UD-5-ḴĀM / lim-mu ṣEN-KASKAL–KUR-u-a, “Month of Ayyāru (II), 5th day, eponym year of Bēl-Harrān-šadû’a (650 BC).”
352 *ABL 289:7-9, ḫa-lu-pa-an ḫi-iṭ šā md AG–EN–MU.MEŠ / MLI.KAR.KID ša ṣem-na-nu / ap-ru-su-ku-nu-ši, “I have dissociated you from the crime of Nabû-bēl-šumāti, the whore of Menānu.”
354 Waters 2002.
355 ABL 961:3, [EN-][n].
356 ABL 961:11 and 13. See also PNA 3/II, 1306, no. 1.
357 BIWA, 104 and 226, B VI 6-9 // C VI 137-C VII 2.
*BM 132980, sent to the elders of Elam in order to enforce the extradition of Nabû-bēl-šumāti and his accomplices, is dated to Šabātu (XI) of 647* BC, in other words, after the suppression of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Curiously, as pointed out by Waters, there is no explicit reference to the elders of Elam in other texts and “it is difficult to determine who constituted this group or what function it fulfilled.” However, Menānu, possibly one of the Elamite royal family members, is said to be an elder in *ABL 1380 addressed to him (see above p. 42).

Concerning the relationships between the elders of Elam and Assurbanipal, ABL 961 shows that the elders of Elam had assumed a cooperative attitude towards him around 653 BC. They sanctioned the Assyrian domination in Elam and state that they are sending Bēl-ēṭir and the sons of the šandabakku back to him. This šandabakku has been identified with Nabû-šuma-ēreš who rebelled against Assurbanipal and allied with Urtaku of Elam and Bēl-iqīša of the Gambūlu in 664 BC. However, *BM 132980 shows that the friendly relationships deteriorated when Nabû-bēl-šumāti and his accomplices defected from the Sealand to Elam. In the letter Assurbanipal threatens with dire consequences if the elders of Elam do not deliver these people to him. Eventually, Ummanaldašu III, king of Elam (c. 648-c. 645 BC), sent the corpse of Nabû-bēl-šumāti to Assurbanipal.

1.4.23. The Inhabitants of a City in Elam
The fragmentary letter *CT 54 116 may have been sent to the inhabitants of a city in Elam though the addressees are lost. In the letter, the recipients always appear in the plural form, and Elam is mentioned in unknown context in r. 6’. Moreover, by its way of narrative the letter resembles

---

358 *BM 132980 r. 21’, itl.ATT lim-me mē PA–AŠ–PAB, “Month of Šabātu (XI), eponym year of Nabû-nādin-āḫī (647* BC).”
359 Waters 2002, 83. See also Waters 2000, 75, n. 37.
360 ABL 961 r. 5-6, KUR.NIM.MA.KI u KUR–aš-šur.KI / at-tu-ka, “Elam and Assyria are yours.” See also Mattila 1987, 28-30.
361 ABL 961 r. 6-10, mē EN–KAR-ir / DUMU TIN.TIR.KI / ǔ DUMU, MEŠ šá LŪ.GIJ, EN.NA / i-na ŠU.2 mē AMAR.UTU–LUGAL–ŠEŠ / [ni-il-ta]p-rak-ka, “[We are herewith sen]ding you in the hands of Marduk-šarru-uṣur, Bēl-ēṭir the Babylonian and the sons of the šandabakku.”
362 ABL 879.
363 *BM 132980 r. 17–20’, ū-la-a ta-ruk / la ta-āš-me-a ina šá aš-šur DINGIR, MEŠ-īa at-ta-ma / šum-ma ina GIŠ.MI šá DINGIR, MEŠ ur-ki-u a-na pa-ni-i / [ša ú-sak-ku-nu-ni, “However, if you persist in not complying, I swear by Aššūr and my gods that under the aegis of the gods I will make the future even more horrible than the past to you.”
364 ABL 879.
365 For instance, *CT 54 116:3’-4’, [x x x a]it-ta-nu la ti-da-a / [x x x k]u-nu u pa-šar šá-bi-ku-nu, “Do you (pl.) not know (pl.) that your (pl.)... and relenting of your (pl.) heart?” in l. 3 and “your (pl.) heart (livbikunu)” in l. 4’.
366 *CT 54 116 r. 6’, [x x x x]x x x KUR.NIM.MA.
those sent to Babylonian citizens; it seems that Assurbanipal promises something to the recipients or tries to persuade the recipients by saying twice, “I swear by Aššur and my gods.”  

1.4.24. The City Managers of Bašimu in Elam
The city managers of Bašimu are attested as the recipient of a very fragmentary letter *CT 53 953:1-2, [a-bat LUGAL a]-na LÚ.GAL–’URU’. [MEŠ] / [ša URU.ba]-ši-mu. The determinative and the first sign of Bašimu are not preserved. However, since among the geographical names only the city Bašimu has the element -šimu in its name, this reconstruction is very plausible. Regarding the title of the recipients, the Assyrian Dictionary defines rab āli as “town manager, city manager.” In the letter, the recipients appear in the plural form, hence it is possible to reconstruct the MEŠ sign after LÚ.GAL–’URU’. In the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal, Bašimu is mentioned with Ḫaidālu as one of the Elamite cities that Assurbanipal conquered and destroyed in the course of his campaign against Ummanaldašu III. Perhaps Bašimu had an anti-Assyrian attitude towards Assurbanipal. It is uncertain what political structure Bašimu had.

1.4.25. The Rāšeans
Besides *ABL 1260, addressed to Ambappi and the Rāšeans together, the Rāšeans “old and young” (šībūti u šeĥrūti) figure as the recipients of the royal letter *ABL 295 alone. According to Parpola, “the address formula may imply that Rāši was governed by an assembly of elders and younger men, but this is uncertain because the same formula is also found in other contemporary letters of Assurbanipal.” He also pointed out, “the population of Rāši was predominantly Babylonian, as the majority of its towns had Babylonian names.”

The contents of *ABL 295 largely parallel those of *ABL 1260. Assurbanipal criticizes the Elamites for having done evil to him and forgetting his many favours to them, urges [Ummanaldašu (III)] to come, assist Tammarītu (II), and closes the letter with a similar threat as in *ABL 1260 (see above p. 36).

---

367 *CT 54 116:8'-9', en-na-ma lu-aq-bak-ku-nu-ši / ina ŠÀ AN.ŠÁR DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a at-te-me, “Now let me tell you: I swear by Aššur and my gods” and r. 3'-5', ina ŠÀ AN.ŠÁR DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a / [at-te-me] ki i-na ŠÀ UD-me / [x x x-g]i an-nit ši-pir-ti, “[I swear] by Aššūr and my gods, on this very day [you see] this message of mine.”

368 According to the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus
369 Parpola 2007, 90a.
370 *CT 53 953:3, [dt-mu ia-ši ŠÀ]-ba-ku-nu, “[I am well]; you (pl.) [can be glad], and r. 2’, [x x x LÚ.ERI]M–MAN-ku-nu, ”your (pl.) king’s [me]n.”
1.4.26. The Gambūleans
The Gambūleans (L.Ü. gam-bu-la-a-a) appear as the recipients of two letters from Assurbanipal (*ABL 293 and *ABL 541) and as senders of one letter to the king (ABL 915). In *ABL 293:3 and ABL 541:2-3, they are specified as “old and young” (šibūti u ṣehrūti). Though their names are not preserved in *ABL 541, it is plausible to reconstruct the Gambūleans as the recipients since Assurbanipal instructs them (addressed in the 2nd person plural) to obey Bēl-iqīša who is known from other sources as the leader of the Gambīlu tribe.373 *ABL 293 is Assurbanipal’s response to ABL 915. The contents of the letters indicate the geopolitical significance of the Gambūleans due to their location on the border between Babylonia and Elam (see above pp. 23-24).374

1.5. The Process of Composing the Letters
The letters from Assurbanipal were not unearthed at their destination but found at Nineveh; hence they would be archival copies or drafts for royal orders.375 Some of these texts contain information elucidating the process by which they were composed. This section attempts to discuss dictation, drafts, finished letters, and copies of originals.

1.5.1. Dictation
In composing letters, there are two possibilities as to who actually inscribed a letter on a tablet. First, the author personally wrote the letter. Second, the author had it dictated to a scribe. When the Assyrian kings composed letters, it is more probable that they had letters written in their name by scribes. For example, Worthington has shown this to be the case with Sargon II,377 who says in one of his letters (SAA 17 3): “Verily, all the words that the prelate (šatammu) Bēl-iqīša writes to you have been uttered by me.”378

Evidence of dictation is also found in the first half of the second millennium BC. Charpin has suggested that some letters from the reign of Rim-Sin I, king of Larsa (1822-1763 BC) were clearly dictated. According to Charpin, these letters were “written on large tablets with a very elongated form” and their reverse sides were usually not inscribed. Charpin has explained that the scribes did

373 PNA 1/II, 315b-316a, no. 7.
375 Worthington 2006, 62-63; Reynolds 2003, XVI.
376 As also pointed out by Parpola 1981, 122.
378 SAA 17 3 r. 18-21e, lu-ū dib-bi ma-la 𒃎EN-BA-ŠA LÚ.ŠA.TAM i-šap-pa-rak-ka gab-bi ša pi-il[a].
not know how long the messages would continue and used big tablets. He gives other examples of
dictation in that period. For instance, he has proposed that several letters from King Šamšî-Adad to
his son Yasmah-Addu were dictated because they include uncompleted sentences, long incidental
clauses, and unusual verbal positions. Furthermore, Charpin has indicated a letter from the city of
Andarig that states “Send me a discreet scribe, so that I may have (him) write the message that the
god Shamash sent for the king through me” (ARM 26/2 414:30-33). Moreover, he has suggested
that the king gave instructions on the main points of the message to be written to his scribe, instead
of having dictated to him. When the king instructed the scribe, the scribe took notes. After that, the
scribe wrote the definitive letter based on the notes. A few texts from Mari are notes of this type. 379

Assurbanipal is known to have received scribal training and to have been literate. 381 Nonetheless,
his letters were more than likely inscribed by scribes based on the size of the script. Livingstone has
pointed out that the script attributed to Assurbanipal’s personal handwriting is big and clumsy (see
SAA 16 19 = 83-1-18,22) and the script of K 8005+ probably attributed to Assurbanipal is well over
half a centimetre in height. 382 When I measured the letters from Assurbanipal analysed in this
volume, the average size of the script in height turned out to be much smaller: about 3.4 mm
including the space between lines. 383 Therefore, the letters sent by Assurbanipal as a king were
probably dictated to and written out by professional scribes.

Among the letters from Assurbanipal, there are clear traces of dictation. In a Neo-Babylonian letter
*ABL 292 sent to Illil-bāni, the governor of Nippur, and the citizens of Nippur, a phrase in Neo-
Assyrian that sounds like an oral statement by the king or a person concentrating on continuing his

Furthermore, it is highly likely that *ABL 1244, a virtual duplicate of three other letters, was
written down from dictation because it contains an unusually large number of all sorts of
abbreviations. The main subject of the letter is the reinforcements dispatched to Nabû-ušabši, the
governor of Uruk. The three duplicates with variants (*ABL 273, *ABL 543, and *ABL 1108) seem

---

379 Charpin 2010, 122.
380 Charpin 2010, 122-123.
381 Zamazalová 2011; Livingstone 2007.
382 Livingstone 2007, 106-113, especially 108; cf. already Parpola 1983b, 39 and LAS 34 (= SAA 10 39), r. 6ff.
383 I measured some complete letters sent by Assurbanipal when I visited the British Museum with Parpola in December
2009. Later, I also used the photos of the CDLI (Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative) site
(http://cdli.ucla.edu/collections/bm/bm.html). For example, *ABL 301 is 7.65 cm long with 24 lines. Thus each line is
on average 3.2 mm. Other examples are as follows: 3.5 mm average line height in *ABL 292, 3.3 mm in *ABL 291, 3.8
mm in *ABL 399, 3.4 mm in *ABL 302.
to have been written and edited by different scribes based on *ABL 1244. In the following paragraphs and the tables, I examine the shorthand techniques of the scribe to whom the king dictated the letter, by comparing *ABL 1244 to the other three letters.

The comparison indicates that the scribe used four different techniques. First, he utilized numerous logograms for words and verbal forms that are not commonly written with logograms in the royal correspondence. For instance, the scribe of *ABL 1244 always expressed the preposition *issi “with” by the KI sign. As for the verb *epāšu “to do,” he wrote it syllabically twice but also used the logogram DŪ twice (ll. 4' and r. 3). For šapāru “to send,” he employed syllabic writing once (l. 4') and logographic writing with the KIN sign twice (ll. 8' and r. 3). Other examples of logographic writings of verb forms are ÍL for elû “to go up,” IGILAL1 for amāru “to see,” ÚŠ for muātu “to die,” and DÛš for paṭāru “to loosen, release.”

Table 5: Logographic Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*ABL 1244</th>
<th>*ABL 543</th>
<th>*ABL 1108</th>
<th>*ABL 273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l. 10' KI-ku-nu</td>
<td>r. 10 is-si-ku-nu</td>
<td>r. 7 is-si-ku-nu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 3 KI-šā</td>
<td>r. 13 is-si-šā</td>
<td>r. 10 is-si-šā</td>
<td>l. 7 is-si-šā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 9 K[1-k]u-nu</td>
<td>r. 20 is-[si-ku-nu]</td>
<td>r. 18 is-si-ku-nu</td>
<td>r. 7 is-si-ku-nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 4’ DŪ</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>l. 18’ le-pu-uš</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 3 DŪ</td>
<td>r. 13 e-pa-še</td>
<td>r. 18 e-pa-a-še</td>
<td>l. 9 e-pa-še</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 8’ KIN</td>
<td>r. 7 as-sa-par</td>
<td>r. 4 as-sa-par</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 3 KIN-ra</td>
<td>r. 13 as-sa-par</td>
<td>r. 10 as-sap-ra</td>
<td>l. 8 as-sap-ra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 3’ ÍL,MEŠ</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>l. 17’ [e]l-šú</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 7’ IGILAL1-ni</td>
<td>r. 6 e-mur-u-ni</td>
<td>r. 3 [e-mur]-ú-ni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 8’ ÚŠ,MEŠ-ni</td>
<td>r. 7 me-tú-u-ni</td>
<td>r. 7 [me]-tú-u-ni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 8’ DÛš-šú-nu</td>
<td>r. 7 ap-ta-ṭar-šú-nu</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the scribe often omitted determinatives and some redundant elements of compound logograms. In *ABL 1244, the determinatives KI, LÚ, URU, and ÍD are omitted. As the following

---

384 Parpola 2004a, 228-229. Cf. Frame 1986, 267-269. Frame has pointed out that the letter contains more logographic writings than others. Nonetheless, Frame does not mention the possibility of dictation. Regarding scribes, Frame has stated that Walker had informed him that the script of *ABL 1244 differs from *ABL 273, *ABL 543, and *ABL 1108. Among these three letters, Walker had assumed that the scribe of *ABL 273 and *ABL 573 might have been the same and *ABL 1108 may also have been written by the same scribe.
table shows, Uruk is written in [ŠEŠ.UNUG, pāhutu “governor” is expressed by only NAM, bēl pīhāti “governor” in the NB term is represented by EN.NAM instead of LŪ.EN.NAM, and the names of the cities Laḫru and Arrapḫa do not have the determinative URU. Similarly, emūqi “armed force” and the proper name of a river have no determinatives either. In addition, sometimes the scribe did not write compound logograms at full length. For instance, the adjective tābu “good” = DÙG.GA is written only with the DÙG sign, and sīsū “horse” = ANŠE.KUR.RA is written only with the sign KUR plus the plural sign MEŠ.

Table 6: Omitting Determinatives and Some Elements of Compound Logograms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*ABL 1244</th>
<th>*ABL 543</th>
<th>*ABL 1108</th>
<th>*ABL 273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l. 2’ [ŠEŠ.UNUG</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>l. 15’ [ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 2’ gūr-sīm-mu</td>
<td>l. 18’ [LŪ].gūr-ā’-sīm</td>
<td>l. 16’ [LŪ].gūr-a-sīm-mu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 5’ NAM</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 9’ EN.NAM</td>
<td>r. 8 LŪ.EN.NAM</td>
<td>r. 5 LŪ.EN.NAM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 9’ EN.[NAM]</td>
<td>r. 9 LŪ.EN.NAM</td>
<td>r. 6 LŪ.EN.NAM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 9’ ḫū-ri</td>
<td>r. 8 URU.ṛ-ḥi-ri</td>
<td>r. 5 URU.ṛ-ḥi-ri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 9’ ḫū-ri</td>
<td>r. 9 URU.ṛ-ḥi-ri</td>
<td>r. 6 URU.ṛ-ḥi-ri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 2 ṣu-muq-qi</td>
<td>r. 12 ṣu-muq-qi</td>
<td>r. 9 ṣu-muq-qi</td>
<td>l. 7 LŪ.ṣu-muq-qi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 4 ḫar-ru</td>
<td>r. 14 ḫar-ru</td>
<td>r. 12 ḫar-ru</td>
<td>l. 11 ḫar-ru</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 4 DŪG.u-ni</td>
<td>r. 14 DŪG.GA-u-ni</td>
<td>r. 11 DŪG.GA-u-ni</td>
<td>l. 10 DŪG.GA-u-ni</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 8 KUR.MEŠ</td>
<td>r. 18 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ</td>
<td>r. 16 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ</td>
<td>r. 4 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, it seems that the scribe of *ABL 1244 tried using simpler signs that have a smaller stroke count. He tends to use śā instead of ša and u instead of ū. For another instance, in *ABL 1244, šumma is spelled out only BE-ma. However, in *ABL 543 and *ABL 1108, šumma is written BE-ma and šūm-ma. Concerning the compound preposition ina dātiddāt “after,” *ABL 1244 has a simpler writing: ina da-at, but the other three letters show id–da-at. A similar case is also found in the spelling of the preposition ana “to.” *ABL 1244 uses one sign (ana), but the other two use two signs a-na (*ABL 273:9 and *ABL 543 r. 13). A personal name is also abbreviated in *ABL 1244. The second element of the name of the cohort commander Bēl-ēṭir is written with the sign ŠUR in *ABL 1244, but the scribes who wrote *ABL 273 and *ABL 543 used a more complicated sign (KAR) with a phonetic complement KAR-ir.
### Table 7: Simpler Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*ABL 1244</th>
<th>*ABL 543</th>
<th>*ABL 1108</th>
<th>*ABL 273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l. 1’ šá</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>l. 14’ ša</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 6 u</td>
<td>r. 16 u</td>
<td>r. 14 u</td>
<td>l. 13 u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 1’ taq-bu-u-[ni]</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>r. 5 taq-bu-ú-ni</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 6 ina da-at</td>
<td>r. 16 id-da-at</td>
<td>r. 14 id-da-at</td>
<td>l. 13 id-da-at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 3 ana</td>
<td>r. 13 a-na</td>
<td>r. 11 ana</td>
<td>l. 9 a-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 7 [md?]EN–ŠUR</td>
<td>r. 17 [md]EN–KAR-ir</td>
<td>r. 7 [md]EN–ŠUR</td>
<td>r. 1 [md]EN–KAR-ir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourth, the scribe of *ABL 1244 seldom marked long vowels. For example, *kî “when” is written just *ki in *ABL 1244, but in the other three letters, the long vowel is usually spelled out (*ki-i*). Similarly, *ABL 1244 (r. 3) writes *mî-nu šá* for *mīnu ša* “whatever,” but the other three letters *mì-i-nu šá*; *ABL 1244 (r. 5) writes *am-mu-te* for *ammūte* “those,” but *ABL 1108 marks the long vowel (*am-mu-ú-te*).

### Table 8: Unmarked Long Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*ABL 1244</th>
<th>*ABL 543</th>
<th>*ABL 1108</th>
<th>*ABL 273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l. 7’ ki</td>
<td>r. 5 ki-i</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 1 ki</td>
<td>r. 11 ki-i</td>
<td>r. 8 ki-i</td>
<td>l. 4 ki-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 3 mi-nu šá</td>
<td>r. 13 mi-i-nu šá</td>
<td>r. 10-11 mi-i-nu šá</td>
<td>ll. 8-9 mi-i-nu šá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. 5 am-mu-te</td>
<td>r. 15 am-mu-te</td>
<td>r. 13 am-mu-ú-te</td>
<td>l. 12 am-mu-te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, the scribe of *ABL 1244 attempted to reduce the number of signs and sign elements by using logographic writing, by omitting determinatives and some elements of compound logograms, and by not marking the long vowel. He also preferred to use the simpler signs that have a smaller stroke count.

1.5.2. Drafts
Based on dictation, a scribe probably first produced a draft of a letter and read it to find mistakes. Perhaps at this stage, he may have added an introductory formula which consists of an address and a salutation. Since the beginning of *ABL 1244 is unfortunately broken, we cannot tell whether it had an introductory formula or not. After the scribe had drawn up the preliminary draft, he reread it in front of the king to get his approval. When needed, the king requested changes. Upon request, the scribe erased sign(s)/line(s) and rewrote them.

With regard to drafts of royal letters in the Neo-Assyrian period, Villard has argued that SAA 1 1 from Sargon II to Aššûr-ṣarru-ūṣur, the governor of Quê, was a draft because the letter was not completed. He noted that unfinished letters are rare and explained it by reasoning that drafts that were prepared at the early stage of composing letters were probably destroyed already in antiquity.

There are no unfinished letters of the type that Villard has discussed in the Assurbanipal letter corpus analysed by me. This could mean that most of my corpus consisted of archival copies and/or very final drafts.

1.5.3. Finished Letters
Once the king and the scribe were satisfied with a final draft, the scribe produced a definitive letter. In the Neo-Assyrian period, most of the letters were inscribed on standardized clay tablets called egirtu, having a one-column, vertical format with the ratio between the horizontal and the vertical

385 Charpin 2010, 126-129. In my study, 22 traces of erasure are found: *ABL 301 r. 3, *ABL 1146:12’, *ABL 543 r. 9, *ABL 1108:10’ and 11’, *ABL 945 s. 1, *ABL 517 r. 14, 15, 16, *ABL 1121:3, *ABL 402:9 and e. 14, *ABL 1380:22, *ABL 972:3’, 5’, and 6’, *ABL 1262:7’, *ABL 1260:12 and r. 12, *ABL 1411 r. 1 and 3. However, it seems that *ABL 1244 is the only preliminary draft in the dossier. Perhaps scribes left small mistakes on tablets when they made archival copies and/or final drafts.

386 PNA I/1, 218b-219a, no. 2.

387 The last topic (r. 66-71) of SAA 1 1 is as follows: "DUMU.UB-‘ia’ šu-tú a-du UN.MEŠ-šú / LÚ*.A–KIN-ka a-du UGU-ḫi-ia lu-ḫi-la-šú-nu / lu DUMU.MEŠ KÁ.DINGIR.KI lu-ḫi DUMU BÁR.SIPA.KI / lu-ḫi KIŠ.KI-a-a lu EN.LIL.KI-a-a l / lu URU.UNUG.KI-a-a l KUR.BAD.DINGIR.KI-a-a l (blank), “As for Aplaiu, let your messenger bring him and his people to me. Whether (they are) citizens of Babylon, Borsippa, Kish, Nippur, Der, or (…).”

Radner has made interesting comments on the standard egirtu format of letters in the Neo-Assyrian period egirtu. She has pointed out that because the size of tablets was fixed, some space on the tablets frequently remains uninscribed, while sometimes the space is not enough for the whole message. Therefore, a second tablet was sometimes used, as in the case of the petition of the exorcist Adad-šumu-uṣur to Assurbanipal, written on two tablets, SAA 10 197 and SAA 10 198. The latter begins with the words “this is a continuation of the words of the previous letter” (an-ni-ú re-eḫ-ti / da-ba-a-bi šá e-gír-ti / pa-ni-it-ti). However, such a continuation letter does not exist in my corpus.

The letter actually dispatched was enclosed in a clay envelope. The name of the sender and the addressee were inscribed on the surface of the envelope, and then the sender’s seal was impressed. An unopened envelope SAA 15 289 is extant: “[To the deputy (governor)], my lord (seal impression): [your servant Aššur-rešūwa (seal impression)].” Sometimes a salutation and a blessing were also written on the envelope, as SAA 5 214 shows: “A letter (to) Nabû-hamatua (seal impression): your servant Kuškāiu. Good health to my lord!”; similarly SAA 13 42, “A letter of the temple steward to the temple steward (seal impression). Good heal[th to] my brother (seal impression). May Aššur and Ešarra bless my br[ot]her.” The function of the sealed envelope was to protect the letter from physical damage and to keep it secret from other people’s eyes. Only after the letter had gone through the entire process, was it finally ready to be transported to its destination by a messenger. Since the recipients destroyed the envelope when they received the letter, the envelopes are seldom preserved. The envelopes of Assyrian royal letters sealed with the

390 Charpin 2010, 129-130.
391 Radner 1995, 72.
392 Charpin 2010, 130-135.
393 SAA 15 288 and its envelope SAA 15 289, (l. 1) [a-na LÚ.2-e] EN-iá (seal impression) / (l. 2) [ARAD-ka ʼaš]-ʼšur – re-ṣi-u-a / (r. seal impression). See http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sargon/highlights/. This web page includes the photo of these texts taken by Van Buylaere; see also Radner 2014, 66-68.
394 SAA 5 213 and its envelope SAA 5 214, (l. 1) IM ṣ-a-ha-am-mat-u-a (cylinder seal impression) / (l. 2) ARAD-ka ku-uš-ka-a-a / (e. 3) lu DI-mu a-na EN-ia / (e. 4) a-dan-niš. The photograph of the envelope is in Herbordt 1992, pl. 23, no. 6. In addition, an unopened envelope, As 51 excavated at Assur, is known. See Hrouda 1991, 101, fig. 8; Radner 1995, 76, n. 17.
395 SAA 13 41 and its envelope SAA 13 42, (l. 1) IM LÚ.šá-ha-hi-nu (cylinder seal impression) / (l. 2) ʼa’-[n]a LÚ.šá-ha-hi-nu / (r. 1) lu DI-[mu a-na] šEŠ-ia (cylinder seal impression) / (r. 2) aš-šur EŠÁR.RA a-na š[E]š-iá lik-ru-bu.
396 Charpin 2010, 130-131; Radner 1995, 71-73; Parpola 1987a, XV.
imperial seal are attested\textsuperscript{397} and an envelope fragment with the imperial Assyrian seal, Sm. 2403, was found possibly at Nineveh.\textsuperscript{398}

Since all the correspondence making up the corpus of letters from Assurbanipal was excavated at Nineveh, it is likely that most, but not all of them, are archival copies and/or drafts. Theoretically the corpus could also include original letters that were never sent out or were returned to the capital for some reason. In practice, it is almost impossible to distinguish archival copies and very final drafts from originals because they seem to be almost identical (see also the next section pp. 68-73). Even *ABL 1244, which appears to be written down from dictation, has the \textit{egirtu} format. Perhaps the identical size and shape made it easier to store the tablets in an archive.

Due to the \textit{egirtu} format, tablets with uninscribed space at the end are not difficult to find in my corpus. At least 18 letters certainly\textsuperscript{399} and 15 probably have unused space.\textsuperscript{400} On the other hand, 13 letters use all the available space fully\textsuperscript{401} and 6 letters seem to take maximum space on the tablet.\textsuperscript{402} As for the remaining 27 letters, it is unclear whether or not all available space is used due to the damage to tablets.

\section*{1.5.4. Copies}
As noted above in the previous subsections, it is extremely difficult to distinguish between archival copies and drafts in the extant corpus of the letters from Assurbanipal. However, *ABL 518, addressed to Kudurru, the governor of Uruk, and the citizens of Uruk concerning the weeping ceremony, is certainly a copy because the letter itself states that it is a copy. The body of the letter ends at r. 5 and after that there is one blank line. From r. 6 to 11, *ABL 518 has a thought-provoking archival note: “Copy of the letters (\textit{gab-re-e e-gír-a-ti}) that were brought to the chieftains and to the

\textsuperscript{397} Radner 2008, 488-494; Parpola 1987a, XV.
\textsuperscript{398} Bezold 1896, 1952 and see http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/cdlisearch/search_beta/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P426338. Bezold 1896. However, it is not clear if the envelope was for a royal letter or the letter written by the state official who received a copy of the imperial seal from the king upon his appointment; see Radner 2014, 67-68 and 77-78.
\textsuperscript{400} *ABL 1146, *ABL 292, *ABL 945, *ABL 518, *ABL 1121, *ABL 402, *ABL 399, *ABL 400, *ABL 1151, *ABL 1170, *ABL 1262, ABL 1240, *ABL 1210, ABL 1142, ABL 1116. In his hand copies of these letters, Harper does not add the note “rest uninscribed.” However, when comparing the number of lines on obverse and reverse in these letters, the reverse is shorter than the obverse.
land of Akkad. The month of Ayyāru (II), 24th day, eponym year of Nabû-šar-ahḫēšu (646 BC)."\(^{403}\) Because of its importance to our topic, it is worthwhile to discuss it in parts: gabrû, egirāti with the relative clause, the dating, and the particular way in which the note was written.

First, the word gabrû is defined as “copy, duplicate; reply, response, answer” when used in letters.\(^{404}\) The term gabrû is referred to in three letters from Assurbanipal\(^{405}\) and always in the following context: “let me see a gabrû to my letter.” In these cases, gabrû is certainly to be translated as “answer.” However, in *ABL 518 Assurbanipal does not request a response from Kudurru and the citizens of Uruk. Hence it is appropriate to interpret gabrû here as “copy.” *ABL 518 thus provides crucial evidence of the existence of copies.

Second, the phrase egirāti ša ana raʾšāni ša ana māt–Akkadī ūbilűni is also worth noting. It could be just a note made by the copyist, but it may also imply that letters from Assurbanipal were systematically classified when copies were made and subsequently archived. Assuming that classification was an established practice, the word egirāti, a plural form of egirtu/egertu, suggests that multiple copies of the letter classified in this category were prepared. Furthermore, since the phrase includes raʾšāni and māt Akkadī, the system of classification may have been based on ethnicity and geographical regions. The raʾšāni, the plural form of NB raʾšu,\(^{406}\) was an Aramaic loan word and means “chieftain.”\(^{407}\) This term usually denotes the leaders of the Chaldeans,\(^{408}\) e.g., raʾšāni ša māt Kaldi,\(^{409}\) who resided in Babylonia.\(^{410}\) It should also be noted the relative clause has

\(^{403}\) *ABL 518 r. 6-11, gab-re-e e-giř-ti / ša a-na LŪ-ra-šā-a-ni / ša a-na KUR–UR.LI / ú-bi-lu-ni / ITI.GUD UD-24-KĀM / lim-me / PA–MAN–PAR MEŠ-Sā.\(^{404}\) CAD G, 2a-3b (s.v. gabarû) “1. duplicate, answer, copy, 2. opponent, corresponding entry, 3. epact”; AHw 271b-272a, “Copy; Gegner”; Parpola 2007, 29a “reply, response, answer; copy.”

\(^{405}\) *ABL 301 r. 15, “K. 11875 r. 4, 83-1-18,511 r. 10.”


\(^{407}\) Frame 2013, 109; Frame 1992, 37; Brinkman 1968, 265, n. 1705. Brinkman has pointed out that “the word is perhaps one that the Chaldeans themselves used.”


\(^{410}\) Frame 2013, 97; Frame 1992, 36-43.
two Assyrianisms though the letter itself is in Neo-Babylonian: the use of the G-stem 3rd person plural for expressing a passive instead of the N-stem\textsuperscript{411} and the Assyrian subjunctive marker -\textit{ni}\textsuperscript{412} (see below pp. 76-78).

Third, this letter is dated though letters in general were undated. It is assumed that the person who delivered the letter would have informed the recipient when and where the letter was written.\textsuperscript{413} However, archived documents cannot retain such oral information. Therefore, it is likely that a scribe recorded the date on the copy that was filed in the palace archives. Nevertheless, not all the letters from Assurbanipal have a date. Thus letters without a date may have been drafts, finished letters but not sent out, or actually sent letters for some reason brought back to Nineveh.

Fourth, the particular way in which the archival note was written attracts our attention. As mentioned above, it occurs after a blank space of one line at the end of letter. Almost all the letters with date in the Assurbanipal’s letter corpus have a similar visual indication before the date. For example, *ABL 301 has a blank space of two lines before the date and a faint beginning of a dividing line can be found in the middle of that space.\textsuperscript{414} In *ABL 517, the date appears after two erased lines and is inscribed in Assyrian script even though the text is in Neo-Babylonian. *ABL 296 is very fragmentary but at least one blank line can be seen before the dating.\textsuperscript{415} *ABL 289 also has two blank lines between the body of the text and the date.\textsuperscript{416} Harper has indicated that there is one uninscribed line before the date in *ABL 1151 and two blank lines before the date in *ABL 1170. In *ABL 1022, a horizontal dividing line is drawn before the date.\textsuperscript{417} *BM 132980 also has a horizontal line before the date according to the hand copy of Waters.\textsuperscript{418} ABL 879 has both a deep horizontal line and blank space of about five lines.\textsuperscript{419} The date of *AAA 20 106 is written in Assyrian script though the letter is the Neo-Babylonian. ABL 1142 has one blank line before the date according to Harper’s copy. There is one exception; *ABL 1262 has no blank lines and no horizontal line. Here I summarize the above information.

\textsuperscript{411} Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 88.
\textsuperscript{412} Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 92.
\textsuperscript{413} Charpin 2010, 128.
\textsuperscript{414} http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P393748.jpg
\textsuperscript{415} http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P237991.jpg
\textsuperscript{416} http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P393821.jpg
\textsuperscript{417} http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P395715.jpg
\textsuperscript{418} Waters 2002, 81.
\textsuperscript{419} http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P393823.jpg
Table 9: Visual Indication before Date

| *ABL 301      | Blank space of 2 lines                  |
| *ABL 517      | Erasure of 2 lines. Dating in NA script  |
| *ABL 518      | Blank space of 1 line                   |
| *ABL 296      | Blank space of 1 line                   |
| *ABL 289      | Blank space of 2 lines                  |
| *ABL 1151     | Blank space of 1 line                   |
| *ABL 1170     | Blank space of 2 lines                  |
| *ABL 1022     | Horizontal line                         |
| *ABL 1022     | Horizontal line                         |
| *BM 132980    | Horizontal line                         |
| ABL 879       | Horizontal line and blank space of 5 lines |
| *AAA 20 106   | Dating in NA script                     |
| ABL 1142      | Blank space of 1 line                   |
| *ABL 1262     | (none)                                  |

It should be noted that *ABL 301, addressed to the citizens of Babylon, is certainly a copy. At the end of the letter, we can read as follows: “The month of Ayyāru (II), 23rd day, eponym year of Aššūr-dūru-uṣur (652). Šamaš-balāssu-iqbi delivered (it).”

It is unlikely that the name of the deliverer and his action were included in the original. This archival note was added when this archival copy was made.

Moreover, the very fragmentary ABL 1142, from an unknown author to Assurbanipal, might be a copy. After the body of the letter, there is a blank space of three lines and the following archival note occurs: “[Archival copy] ([ur-s]u-tū) of the reply to the later letter. [Month of ..., x]th [day], eponym year of Nabū-šar-aḫḫēšu (646* BC).” However, both the restoration [urs]utu and its interpretation “archival copy” are tentative.

Furthermore, *K 995 r. 3′-17′ is duplicated by *CT 53 248:1′-13′ with minor variants. The rest of CT 53 248 is broken away. Since these parallel lines are quite long, it does not seem that they are

---

421 See also the comment on SAA 19 1 r. 14-15.
quotes. Rather, it is likely that one of them is a copy of the other. Or perhaps both are copies or drafts.

Now, let us return to the set of four duplicate letters discussed above (pp. 62-66): *ABL 1244, *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 273. They are duplicates, but *ABL 1244 was found to be a first draft written down from dictation and *ABL 273 is shorter than the others. Frame has proposed regarding *ABL 273 that “the shorter text may have been sent at a different time to the others.” On the question of why there are several duplicates, he writes: “It is possible that several copies were made so that they could be sent with different messengers to ensure at least one copy got through to Uruk but for some reason they had never been sent (…) One could also suggest that these are school copies made by students in a Ninevite chancellory school, preliminary drafts, or spoiled copies”. He concludes by asking: “May we again ponder the possibility that the number of copies was a result of various offices in the Nineveh court each requiring one?”

I agree with Frame that there are several possibilities for explaining the existence of this the set of these four duplicate letters. Now let us examine the texts themselves in more detail (see the score of these texts in Appendix in this dissertation).

As mentioned above, *ABL 273 is the shortest one among these four. It has 22 lines (on obverse 14 lines and on reverse 8 lines) with almost no textual damage, whereas *ABL 543 has 42 lines (21 + 21), *ABL 1108 has 39 lines (20 + 19) with its first line of the obverse broken away, and *ABL 1244 has 21 lines (11 + 10) and many more lines missing at the beginning of the obverse. Since *ABL 273 is short, the section where parallels the other texts starts is at *ABL 543 r. 11, *ABL 1108 r. 8, and *ABL 1244 r. 1, respectively. *ABL 543 and *ABL 1108 are very similar in their lengths. Nonetheless, regarding their orthography, beside 66% shared spellings, there are 33% differences, although Walker has suggested the writers of *ABL 543 and *ABL 1108 might have been the same person. When comparing *ABL 543 and *ABL 1108 with *ABL 1244, the traces of the letter’s shorthand techniques are still found in those two. For instance, e-muq-qi lacks the determinative LÚ in *ABL 543 r. 12 and *ABL 1108 r. 9. Likewise ki-na-te-ka (the plural form of kinattū “colleague” with the pronominal suffix -ka) does not have LÚ in *ABL 543:12, and the verb

---

424 Frame 1986, 267-269.
425 Among 93 parallel words, the spellings of 30 words are different. As for other differences, for example,*ABL 1108 has ā but *ABL 543 does not have it in the parallel phrase. On the second to last line, *ABL 543 r. 19, li-iz-zi-zu is-[si-ku-nu], but *ABL 1108 r. 18, is-si-ku-na li-iz-zi-zu.
426 Frame 1986, 268.
šapāru is written logographically (KIN-āš-šá-nu-u-ni) in *ABL 1108:10.\footnote{Cf. *ABL 543:13, a-šap-par-āš-šá-nu-u-ni.} It is hard to say which of the two letters is closer to *ABL 1244, because both agree and disagree with it in different ways.\footnote{Cf. *ABL 543:13, a-šap-par-āš-šá-nu-u-ni.} Since those two letters contain erasures and traces of dictation, they could be separate drafts based on *ABL 1244.

With regard to *ABL 273, in contrast to the other letters, it specifies the number of horses sent. In addition, the verb našû found in the other texts has been replaced by ubālu in *ABL 273. Hence this text states that “I (Assurbanipal) am sending” two officials and horses, whereas the other three texts state two officials “are bringing” horses. In addition, no determinatives are omitted in *ABL 273. Moreover, as stated in the previous paragraph, *ABL 273 is the shortest among these four letters. This fact could indicate that the scribe of *ABL 273 summarized the essential of matters in the letter. Thus, it is possible that *ABL 273 is a definitive letter.\footnote{Cf. *ABL 273, *ABL 543, and *ABL 1108 are just “polished versions” of *ABL 1244.} The greeting formula of *ABL 273 is different from that of *ABL 543. *ABL 273 begins with ana Nabû-ušabši,\footnote{The greeting formula with only ana + addressee is attested in another three letters among my corpus. See *ABL 926, *ABL 523, *ABL 1121.} while *ABL 543 starts with aba[t šarri ana Nabû-ušabši].

1.6. Language, Script, and Scribes

1.6.1. Neo-Assyrian Language and Script, Neo-Babylonian Language and Script\footnote{Parpola 2007, XI-XII.}

Two languages and two scripts were employed in the letters from Assurbanipal: the Neo-Assyrian language and script, and the Neo-Babylonian language and script. In general, letters in Neo-Assyrian are written in Neo-Assyrian script, and letters in Neo-Babylonian in Neo-Babylonian script. However, there are exceptions.

While 26 letters (36%) of the corpus of letters from Assurbanipal are written in the Neo-Assyrian language and in Assyrian script, and 32 letters (45%) are written in the Neo-Babylonian language and in Babylonian script, 14 letters (19%) are written in the Neo-Babylonian language but in the

Assyrian script. No letters in the Neo-Assyrian language and Neo-Babylonian script are found in the corpus.

Chart 3: The Percentage of NA Letters and NB Letters among the Letters from Assurbanipal

Neo-Assyrian was the language of the Assyrian ruling elite, while Neo-Babylonian was limited to the Babylonian south. Disregarding the script, the number of Neo-Babylonian letters is 46 and the number of Neo-Assyrian letters is 26. Hence, letters in Neo-Babylonian clearly outnumber those in Neo-Assyrian, which is to be expected since most of the letters were sent to Babylonia and the neighbouring areas (see above pp. 29-31). Reynolds has also pointed out that most of the letters written in Neo-Babylonian and in Assyrian script are from the Assyrian king to the south. Her indication is applicable to my corpus. Of the 14 letters in Neo-Babylonian and in Assyrian script, 5 were sent to Babylon, 2 to somewhere in Babylonia, one to the Sealand, and the destinations of the remaining 6 letters are unknown.

---

432 Cf. Four of seven letters addressed to Assurbanipal are written in Neo-Assyrian, whereas three letters are in Neo-Babylonian.
433 Reynolds 2003, XVI. She gives some examples such as *ABL 289, *ABL 301, *ABL 571, *ABL 926, ABL 944, CT 54 509 and ABL 1198 (Reynolds 2003, XXXVI, n. 4).
435 *K 4534 and *ABL 944
436 *ABL 289.
I had first thought the choice of language would correlate with the linguistic background of the addressees. However, a closer study of the letters from Assurbanipal shows that the matter is not as simple as that. For instance, five Neo-Babylonian letters and five Neo-Assyrian letters were addressed to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk. Moreover, a Neo-Babylonian letter was sent to Indabibi, the king of Elam, while, a Neo-Assyrian letter was addressed to Ummanaldašu III, another king of Elam. These facts suggest, though the native language of the addressees did affect the choice of the language of communication, that the particular language found in the letters constituting the corpus depended on whether they were drafts or archival copies. It should be noted that *ABL 1244, the first draft written from dictation, is Neo-Assyrian in Assyrian script and Babylonianisms are rarely found in Neo-Assyrian letters against numerous Assyrianisms in Neo-Babylonian letters in my research corpus (see next subsection pp. 75-80). Hence drafts of letters would have first been drawn up in Neo-Assyrian, and only later translated into Neo-Babylonian, perhaps first in Assyrian and only later in Babylonian script. Note that the letters from Elamite and Urartian kings were certainly translations from the originals.

1.6.2. Linguistic Features: Assyrianisms and Babylonianisms
This subsection will discuss the linguistic features in the letters from Assurbanipal. Neo-Assyrian words and grammatical features occasionally appear in Neo-Babylonian letters, while features of Neo-Babylonian are sometimes seen in Neo-Assyrian letters. These lexical and grammatical interferences are called Assyrianisms and Babylonianisms respectively, and are also found in the letters from Assurbanipal.

As discussed above (pp. 61-73), the letters from Assurbanipal are mainly archival copies or drafts found at Nineveh and Assurbanipal had probably dictated them to his scribes. Concerning the languages of Assurbanipal, he probably used Neo-Assyrian but also Standard Babylonian, Aramaic,
and possibly Neo-Babylonian. Scribes took dictation, wrote one or several drafts, revised it, and then they finalized it and made its copy.

It is likely that several scribes were involved in composing a letter. For instance, *ABL 1244, *ABL 273, *ABL 543, and *ABL 1108 are duplicates with some variants. All of them are phrased in Neo-Assyrian and written in Assyrian script. Walker thinks that the writing of *ABL 273, *ABL 543, and *ABL 1108 may all be attributed to the same scribe but the script of *ABL 1244 is different from that of the other three letters. On the other hand, Parpola has suggested that these texts were prepared by different scribes.

In addition to Assyrian scribes, it can be assumed that Babylonian scribes too were employed for drafting letters in Neo-Babylonian because we know that many Babylonian scholars worked at Nineveh. It is likely that Assyrian and Babylonian scribes collaborated in reading, copying, and composing royal letters, but we can hardly determine which letter was written by Assyrian scribes or Babylonian scribes.

It seems that several people were engaged in creating a letter and a letter passed through various composing stages. Thus it is difficult to determine who caused the Assyrianisms and Babylonianisms in the letters, and at what stage these features arose. In the following sections, I hesitate to solve this problem but simply list the most salient Assyrianisms and Babylonianisms in the correspondence of Assurbanipal.

1.6.2.1. Assyrianisms in Neo-Babylonian letters
The composers of Neo-Babylonian letters from Assurbanipal had a good command of the Neo-Babylonian language as generally expected. However, Assyrianisms are occasionally observed in these texts. Especially the Neo-Babylonian letter in Assyrian script *ABL 301 has numerous Neo-Assyrian forms.

444 Parpola 2004b, 11-12.
445 Frame 1986, 268.
446 Parpola 2004a, 229.
447 Parpola 1993b.
448 Nonetheless, Worthington has suggested that “Letters in Babylonian script and dialect from Assyrian signatories (especially the kings) could have been inscribed by Babylonian scribes” (Worthington 2006, 63).
ABL 301 was sent to the citizens of Babylon on 652-II-23. This letter is the earliest dated text that indicates the outbreak of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn. In the letter, Assurbanipal tries to convince the citizens of Babylon not to side with his “no brother” (lā ḫu), i.e., Šamaš-šumu-ukîn. It exceptionally records the name of the person who delivered it: Šamaš-balāssu-iqbi. The letter seems at first glance to be prepared quite carefully, but Assyrianisms are found throughout the letter. Assyrian forms in ABL 301 are as follows:

*ABL 301
1 a-bat LUGAL, for NB amat šarri
5 gab-bu id-dab-bu-ú-ni, for NB gabbu iddabbû
7 at-ta-ma, for NB atteeme
12 it-ti-kil, for NB ittakil
13 lu-ba-iš, for NB lubiš
19 ap-pit-tim-ma, for NB libbû
20 šu-un-ku-nu, for NB šungunu
21 gab-bu, for NB gabbi
22 tu-ba-ʾa-a-šá, for NB tubahššā, see also *ABL 301:13 lu-ba-iš
23 ra-man-ku-nu, for NB ramâŋunu
r. 2 ku-us-su-pa-ku-nu, for NB kuššupātunu
10 ra-me-ni-ku-nu, for NB ramânikunu
14 ra-man-ku-nu, for NB ramâŋunu
21 it-tu-bil, for NB ittabal

In other Neo-Babylonian letters, Assyrianisms do not appear as often as in *ABL 301. Some Babylonian letters have no Assyrianisms at all. The most frequently occurring Assyrianism is the Assyrian compound preposition ina muḫḫi “concerning” which introduces a new topic. The usage of ina muḫḫi corresponds to Neo-Babylonian aššūt and to Standard Babylonian aššu and šūt. Other Assyrianisms in Neo-Babylonian letters are, for example, the precative prefix lu- of the 3rd

---

450 PNA 3/II, 1192a. Šamaš-balāssu-iqbi brought this important letter, but he is not known from other than this text.
452 Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 73. In Neo-Babylonian, ina muḫḫi mainly means “above, against, on, upon” (Woodington 1985, 180-181). The ina muḫḫi meaning “concerning” is found in *AAA 20 196:3; *ABL 287:11; *ABL 288:6; *ABL 290:4, r. 14; *ABL 294:4; *ABL 399:6; *ABL 400:6, r. 1; *ABL 402:6, 8, 12; *ABL 517:4, 7, 11, 13; *ABL 1165:2; *ABL 1170:5.
person of the D-stem and Š-stem, the Assyrian subjunctive marker (ū)...-ni, Assyrian subjunctions, adverbs, and other particles, and infinitives in Assyrian form.

In addition to Assyrianisms, hybrid forms that are mixtures of Neo-Assyrian forms and Neo-Babylonian forms arise in Neo-Babylonian letters. As mentioned above, ABL 301 r. 2 ku-ūṣ-šu-pa-ku-nu consists of a Neo-Babylonian D-stem stative kusṣup- and a Neo-Assyrian stative suffix for the 2nd m. pl. -ākunu. In other instance, ABL 292:7 shows kur ki taḥ-ḥi-sa translated as “so that the land retreated.” The lemma of the verb (taḥ-ḥi-sa) is a Babylonian word naḥāsu. This Babylonian verb has the Neo-Assyrian ta- prefix for the G-stem preterit 3rd f. s. Furthermore, in the same letter on l. 9 tu-ut-tir-ma is interpreted as the Neo-Assyrian tu- prefix for the D-stem perfect 3rd f. s. of tāru with a Babylonian connective particle -ma.

Assyrianisms in Neo-Babylonian letters could be attributed to Assurbanipal or Assyrian scribes whose primary language was Neo-Assyrian. However, it cannot be ruled out that Babylonian scribes who were acclimatized to Assyrian brought Neo-Assyrian forms into Neo-Babylonian letters.

1.6.2.2. Babylonianisms in Neo-Assyrian letters
Neo-Assyrian letters from the king contain a very small number of Babylonianisms when compared with Assyrianisms in Neo-Babylonian letters. I will show the instances of the Babylonianisms that have been found so far.

The use of the N-stem as passive hardly occurs in Neo-Assyrian. Instead, the 3rd person m. pl. form is used. However, The N-stem of paṭāru as a passive appears in the Neo-Assyrian letter ABL 1022:4-5, ina UGU e-mu-qi an-nu-ti ša i[p-paṭ-ru-ni3]/ la im-ma-ga-a-ni ip-paṭ-r[u x x x], “Concerning these forces which were dis[banded], they were not dis[banded] for nothing [...]”

---

453 ABL 291:11, lu-šam-ḥi.r.MEŠ-ka, ABL 961 r. 1, lu-ša-dōš-ki-nu. However, Woodington points out that the prefix lu-employed for the 3rd person s./pl. D-stem and S-stem appears in Neo-Babylonian letters from Nineveh (Woodington 1985, 98-102). See also the preceptive of the 3rd m. s. of the G-stem ABL 926:9, le-e-mur (for NB limur).
454 ABL 517 r. 4, il-li-ku-ni, ABL 518 r. 9, ā-u-bi-lu-ni, ABL 1380 e. 27, iq-su-ni,
455 ABL 1146 r. 6, a-di ē, CT 54 230:14’, ā-di im-mat, ABL 292 r. 12, aḥ-ṭur, ABL 291:12, ša la.
456 *K 995 r. 1’, ḫap-’u-u and r. 13’, ḫap-e.
457 CAD N/1 128b-129a; AHw 713a-b.
*BM 132980 r. 17’ contains a Babylonian term sułummû “peace.”

This word was employed only in Babylonian, but frequently in Assyrian royal inscriptions drawn up in Standard Babylonian.

*CT 53 402:9’ shows the perfect tense of a verb, although the verb is used in an interrogative sentence with an interrogative: ma-a a-ta-a ina UGU UN.MEŠ ša an-‘na-ka’ [ip’]-taq-d[u-šá] “Why [did they] appoint [him] over the people here?” In Neo-Assyrian, the preterite tense is expected in questions including an interrogative word.

As shown above, Babylonianisms in Neo-Assyrian letters are very limited. This indicates that the primary language of the composer(s) of these letters was Neo-Assyrian.

1.6.2.3. Two Babylonian Dialects in a Neo-Babylonian Letter
In addition to Assyrianisms and Babylonianisms, we find two dialects, Neo-Babylonian and the so-called Standard Babylonian, interfering in a Neo-Babylonian letter, *ABL 539. This letter is well composed in Babylonian and contains no Assyrianisms.

The letter mentions four treaties and the treaty discussed here is the second one. According to the text, the recipient, probably Nabû-ušabši, governor of Uruk, made his people conclude a treaty with Assurbanipal after the revolt began. The letter includes the sworn statements of this treaty which show dialectal confusion of Neo-Babylonian and Standard Babylonian formulae.

In Neo-Babylonian and Late-Babylonian oath formulae, the future affirmative (SAA 2 “FUTURE POSITIVE”) for the 1st person is kî + the present tense + subjunctive -u (e.g., kî aqabbû “I will speak”) and the future negative for 1st person is kî + the perfect tense + subjunctive -u (e.g., kî aqtabû “I will not speak”). The first two vows of the treaty fit into the Neo-Babylonian and Late-Babylonian future negative formula. However, the vows on e. 25-27 and r.2 which are both future negative do not fit the formula. The first vow ma-la b[al-ta-nu] [x x x]-di-ni a-de-e x[x x]x [x x x x]x

---

459 Waters 2000, 80-82 r. 17’, su-lam-mu-u la-dāš-kun, “I will make peace.”
460 CAD S 372a-b. However, bēl sulummā’e is found in MA (CAD S 373a).
461 Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 110.
462 See above pp.14 and 43-44.
463 *ABL 539:19-21.
464 Parpola and Watanabe 1988, XXXVIII-XLI.
465 *ABL 539:22-23, [k]i a-ni-nu a-de-e [šá] AN.SÂR]–DÛ–A nu-al-tan-nu-u, “we will not change the treaty of Assurbanipal”; *ABL 539:24-e.25, (kî) [pi-i-n]i u šâ-a-ba-ni it-ti EN–KûR-šâ [ni-il]-taq-nu ma-la b[al-ja-nu], “we will not side with his enemy as long as we l[iive].”
“la ni-na-ṣa’-ru, should mean future affirmative and be translated as “as long as we [live], we will keep the treaty [……].” Thus the grammatically correct form would be (ki) ninaṣṣaru. However, the negation lā is added here. The Middle Babylonian and Standard Babylonian formula for future affirmative of the 1st person is šumma lā + the present tense + subjunctive -u (e.g., šumma lā aqabbû). The composer of this letter may have confused the NB/LB formula with the MB/SB formula. The second vow is [ir]-ti-šú la ni-tal-ku. Since this statement is to be understood as future affirmative “we will walk with him,” the expected sentence is in Akkadian: (ki) ittišu nillaku. However, the unnecessary negation lā is intruded and the tense (the perfect tense) is not correct.

The confusion of these verbal forms may be accounted for in a variety of ways. However, it cannot be ruled out that the original treaty was written in Standard Babylonian. If so, when he converted the SB formulae into the NB formulae, he might have mixed up the formulations. It is of course unclear whether the composer wrote this tablet by reference to the original treaty or from memory.

1.6.3. Who Wrote the Letters from Assurbanipal?
As the earthly representative of the god Aššur, the Assyrian kings are in official propaganda portrayed as having achieved all their accomplishments only by themselves. However, royal correspondence and often documents confirm that the Assyrian kings ran and maintained the Assyrian Empire together with administrative officials, military personnel, physically close entourages, and cultural elites.466

At first glance, the letters from Assurbanipal give the impression of transmitting his direct personal orders. However, these letters concern important political and military issues. In addition, they were addressed to Babylonian cities, tribal groups in Babylonia, and foreign countries during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and in the aftermath of the civil war, in other words, in times of a great crisis of the Assyrian Empire. Taking into account these matters, it is unlikely that Assurbanipal made the decisions solely. Rather, “the king’s word” (abat šarri in NA; amat šarri in NB) was crafted on the basis of the state policy and strategy that has been officially agreed by a sort of committee. The committee probably consisted of the influential men who occupied the above-mentioned posts. The king and the committee members presumably had meetings for royal decision-making.467

466 Radner 2011; Mattila 2009; Postgate 2007; Mattila 2000.
Several passages in *ABL 302 concerning a horse review imply that messages of Assurbanipal could represent the intentions of the empire. In general, Assurbanipal uses the first person singular “I” to describe his behaviour in his letters. However, sometimes he employs the first person plural “we”:

*ABL 302
ll. 9-10, ši-dín-ma ina ŠÀ ṗTI / Šá ṗTIŠÉ ni-šap-par,
“Normally we send (a letter order/an order to come) at the new moon of the month of Addāru (XII).”
ll. 13-14, nu-uḫ-tar-rib / ina ŠÀ ṗTI.ZÍZ ni-is-sa-par,
“We sent (a letter order/an order to come) earlier in Šabātu (XI).”
r. 4-5, ina meš-la-te šá ṗTI.ZÍZ / ni-iš-pur bi-is,
“Let us send (a letter order/an order to come) in mid-Šabātu (XI).”

In addition, it is worth noting that Assurbanipal also uses “we” when he refers to the actions of the Assyrian troops.

*BM 132980
ll. 14-15, ṣ.2-in-ni-i ina ŠÀ Ė.KUR.MEŠ ina ŠÀ URU.MEŠ lu-u ina ŠÀ me-me-ni ni-it-tu-bil,
“Did we lay our hands on the temples, cities or anything?”
l. 16, ḫu-ub-tu-ú ni-iḫ-tab-ta,
“Did we take spoils of war?”
ll. 16-18, l.ME ina UGU ŮŠ.ME la ni-id-di-bu-ú-ku a-na EN–MUN la ni-tu-ú-ru-u,
“Did we not pour oil on blood and become friends?”
ll. 19-20, [Ė.KU]R-ri-ku-nu ’ni’-iḫ-tab-ta,
“We plundered your [temp]les.”

*ABL 1165
ll. 4-6, a-ni-ni ul ni-di ul ni-is-ḫu'-pa' / ú-tu-la-ni nit-te-ba-a nís-ḫu / nu-ul-te-eš-ḫi-ṭa,
“We did not know (this) and (therefore) did not overwhelm (them); we (just) attacked the chief herdsmen and had the cut(s) of meat removed.”
r. 1, mën-de-ma DINGIR šu-u / ḫa-pu-ú šá KUR–URI.KI iq-ta-bi / mį-nu-ú ni-qab-bi ina IGI DINGIR,
“Perhaps God himself has commanded the destruction of Babylonia. What can we say before God?”
As to the question of who actually inscribed the letters from Assurbanipal on clay tablets, it can be said with certainty that experts with specialized training in scribal arts, in other words, professional scribes, played this role because these letters contain the typical greeting formula, CVC signs, and CV-VC spelling. In addition, the texts have the standard Neo-Assyrian letter format. Now, what sort of scribe actually wrote down these letters? Several possibilities emerge: for example, the chief scribe, the palace scribe, a royal tutor, and scholars. The following paragraphs briefly examine their role and look for potential candidates.

A recent study on the duties of the chief scribe (rab ṣupšarrī) and the palace scribe (ṭupšar ēkallī) has been done by Luukko (2007). He has pointed out that the chief scribe bore more scholarly characteristics. The chief scribe was a regular adviser on political, religious, administrative issues to the king and the royal family. His duties included copying texts and preparing royal inscriptions, whereas the palace scribe was part of the bureaucratic elite. The palace scribe was in charge of the state archives and he may have been the personal scribe of the king. In addition, Luukko maintained that only one person could hold the title of the chief scribe and the palace scribe at any time, and he identifies Issār-šumu-ēreš (tenure 672-657 BC) as the chief scribe and Marduk-ērība (tenure c. 668-650 BC) as the palace scribe in the time of Assurbanipal.

The palace scribe Issār-šumu-ēreš was an Assyrian. His extant astrological reports as well as letters indicate that he also worked as an astrologer. Since Frahm has suggested that Issār-šumu-ēreš may have lived around between 705 and 630 BC, he could be the potential candidate for the scribe of Assurbanipal’s letters.

---

468 Luukko 2004, 44-68 and n. 176; Parpola 1997b.
469 Radner 1995, 71-72; Parpola 1987a, XV and n. 10.
471 Luukko 2007, 232.
472 Luukko 2007, 253.
474 Frahm 1999, 78.
As for the palace scribe Marduk-erība, his name and his title are mentioned with a [chariot driv]er, horse trainers of the king’s chariot, and governors in a “list of people of various professions” (SAA 7 18 i 14'-15’). Luukko has suggested that Marduk-erība probably compiled this list in the early reign of Assurbanipal and has indicated the possibility that this Marduk-erība could be the same person who is mentioned probably as a deputy of the palace scribe in SAA 16 49 r. 6 dated to the reign of Esarhaddon. However, Baker thinks that they are different persons.

In Luukko’s short overview on the palace scribe on the website of “Assyrian empire builders” (2011), he claims that “They (the palace scribe and his staff) issued ‘the king’s word’ in a formal, concise manner, using a very specific language that was designed to leave no room for misunderstandings.” If his suggestion is correct, Marduk-erība, the palace scribe in the time of Assurbanipal, would write Assurbanipal’s royal letters. However, it is difficult to find clear evidence that the palace scribe and his assistants wrote all the royal letters during the reign of Assurbanipal.

The royal tutor of Assurbanipal was Balasī. He was also known as an Assyrian astrologer from Nineveh. He was appointed by Esarhaddon in order to educate the crown Prince Assurbanipal. In his letter SAA 10 39 probably dated in early Du’uzu (IV) of 671 BC, Balasī expresses his gratitude to Esarhaddon for the appointment as the royal tutor teaching the scribal art to Assurbanipal (SAA 10 39 r. 8-9, um-ma-an-šú a-na-ku-ni / li-gi-in-nu a qa-ba-šu-ni). His astrological report and letters can be dated to the 670s and 660s. In addition, his latest datable letter (SAA 10 63) was written in 664 BC. It is unclear whether Balasī was still active in the time of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (652-648 BC) and its aftermath (647-645 BC), but he could be one of the candidates for who wrote Assurbanipal’s royal letters.

The presence of scholars in the administration of the empire is well documented during the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal. Their disciplines varied from astrology, extispicy, exorcism,
medicine, to lamentations. In his study of the scholarly correspondence, Parpola charts the names and careers of the scholars who were employed at court in the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal. He points out that 21 scholars were active during the reign of Esarhaddon and 16 scholars (some continued to be employed at the court after Esarhaddon’s death, such as the chief scribe Issār-šumu-ēreš and the royal tutor Balasî) were engaged in their professions under Assurbanipal. They could have been involved in the process of composing letters from Assurbanipal.

Some other scribes who worked closely for Assurbanipal are also known. For instance, Kēnî is attested as “the scribe of the crown prince” of Assurbanipal (موظف لطيف الساري) in a colophon of the tablet copied by Apilāi, apprentice scribe of Kēnî for “Assurbanipal, the great crown prince of the Succession Palace.” A man with the same name was active as public scribe in Nineveh between 668 and 665 BC. This Kēnî is probably to be identified with the scribe of the crown prince. Furthermore, we also know that Dugul-pān-ili and Kiṣir-Aššūr worked for Assurbanipal’s libraries. An unknown author, probably Akkullānu, a well-known astrologer and the priest of the Aššur temple in the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, wrote in SAA 10 102 that Dugul-pān-ili and Kiṣir-Aššūr are copying a lexical text of Urra (ḪAR-ra) = ḫubullu. It is worth noting that Kiṣir-Aššūr was an exorcist from Aššur and certainly involved in a library and archive found in a private house at Aššur as well.

In addition, Luukko points out that the title of “the scribe of the king” (توضتر شرري) is mentioned during the reigns of Sargon II and Assurbanipal though this title is “not often attested in Neo-Assyrian.” In the colophon of Sargon’s “Letter to Aššur” dated to 714 BC, Nabû-šallimšunu, the author of this document, is said to be “scribe of the king, chief scribe, royal tutor of Sargon, king of

---

482 Parpola 1993b, XIII-XV. Concerning foreign experts such as Syro-Anatolian and Egyptian scholars, see Radner 2009.
484 PNA 2/I, 610b, no. 8; Parpola 1983b, 196.
485 PNA 2/I, 610b, no. 9; Parpola 1983b, 196.
486 PNA I/II, 387a, no. 5.
487 PNA 2/I, 623a-624a, especially “d. In a letter from the royal correspondence.” Kiṣir-Aššūr is a well-known exorcist from Aššur. See also Villard 1998.
489 Luukko 2007, 230, n. 17.
It should be noted that Nabû-šallimšunu’s several titles also included that of chief scribe. He is also attested in ND 1120 dated in 714 BC, which states that Nabû-šallimšunu, scribe of the king, went to Aššur in order to perform a ritual there. His father Ḫarmākki also appears as the scribe of the king from Aššur in the colophon of Sargon’s “Letter to Aššur.” In addition, Fuchs and Parpola restored Balāssu as the scribe of the king in SAA 15 37:23’-24’, which may be dated to 707 BC. In SAA 6 317, Nādinu, the king’s scribe, appears as a witness for the loan of Rēmanni-Adad, Assurbanipal’s charioteer (r. 9). The text is dated 666 BC. Luukko speculates that during the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal the scribe of the king may have been next to the chief scribe, and the royal tutor Balasî or his colleague and astrologer Nabû-aḫḫē-erība may have held this title.

The above are some candidates for persons capable of writing the letters from Assurbanipal at the professional level, though we do not have concrete evidence to pinpoint who actually wrote these letters. Assuming that the aforementioned people wrote their reports and letters themselves, it might pay to compare these texts with the letters from Assurbanipal. Future research on distinctive writing features such as orthography and palaeography in these documents may throw new light on this issue, although such a study requires considerable effort and time.

The Background of the Scribes

While it remains difficult to identify the scribes of the letters from Assurbanipal, phrases in these texts somehow indicate the background of the person(s) who crafted the letters because many of these phrases are not prosaic but literary, and similar expressions are found in other contemporary texts.

The authors of the letters of Assurbanipal appear to have prepared the royal inscriptions. In the letters of Assurbanipal, the name of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is seldom directly mentioned. Instead, he is

---

490 Hunger 1968, 86, no. 264:1 = TCL 3 428, ¹⁴AG–šal-lim-šu-nu LÚ.DUB.SAR šar-rì GAL-ú LÚ.GAL–G.LU LÚ.UM-MA-AN
491 Wiseman 1952, 65 and 69 (Plate XXIII). ND 1120:6, ¹⁴AG–šal-lim-šu-nu LÚ.DUB.SAR LUGAL. ND 1120:10, LÚ.DUB.SAR LUGAL. See also PNA 2/I, 870b, no. 1.
492 Hunger 1968, 86, no. 264:2 = TCL 3 429 bu-uk-ru Ḫar-ma-ak-ki LÚ.DUB.SAR LUGAL BAL.TIL.KI-ú, “(first-born) son of Ḫarmākki, the king’s scribe, Assyrian.” Concerning the nisbe -u, see GAG §56 q. See also PNA 2/I, 460b.
493 PNA 1/I, 256b, no. 5. CT 53 92 = SAA 15 37:23’-24’, ²⁶ba-la-su ‘LÚ* LÚ.ŠÁ ḪU.GAL]. ‘EN-a’. Regarding the date, see Fuchs and Parpola 2001, XLI.
494 PNA 2/I, 920a-b, no. 13. SAA 6 r. 9, IGII ²⁶na-di-nu LÚ.A.BA šá LU.[GAL].
495 Luukko 2007, 230, n. 17.
496 See queries in SAA 4, astrological reports in SAA 8, and scholarly letters in SAA 10. No texts written by Marduk-eriba, Kēnī, and Dugul-pān-ili are preserved.
designated as “no brother” (lā ḫu). This expression occurs in three Neo-Babylonian letters: *ABL 301:4 dated 652-II-23, *K 2931:1’ and 14’ probably dated to 652 BC, and *83-1-18,511:2’ (undated). Later, this designation was slightly developed in an extispicy report and the royal inscriptions. In the extispicy report of Dārī-šarru and Dannāia SAA 4 282 dated 651-VII-15, the phrase “[Šamaš]-šumu-ukīn, unfaithful brother” (l. 18, [GIŠ.NU₁₁]–MU–GL.NA ṣEŠ lá GIN) is found. The same designation is attested in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal that were composed in and after 648* BC. In these texts, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is frequently referred to as an “unfaithful brother” (aḫu lā kēnu).

Another example of the connection between the letters and the royal inscriptions is found in the undated letter *K 995, duplicated by CT 53 248, which contains the phrase “[Babylonian]s seek to drink blood” (r. 8, [LÚ.TIN.TIR.K].MEŠ ana NAG MŪD.MEŠ ú-ba-[u-u]). The phrase “to drink blood (dāmu šatû)” is unusual but can be found in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal among the inscriptions from Tiglath-pileser III to Assurbanipal in a different context. In the inscriptions, the Arabian people are described that “Due to their thirst, they drank blood and water again and again” (a-na ṣu-um-melmi-šū-nu iš-ta-at-tu-u MŪD.MEŠ u A.MEŠ par-šālšu).

Moreover, the usage of siāqu in the letters from Assurbanipal is suggestive of the royal inscriptions of Sennacherib and Assurbanipal as well as of the creation epic Enūma eliš. The verb siāqu generally means “to close in on; to become constrained, tight.” However, the aforementioned inscriptions and literary composition show that when siāqu is accompanied with napištu/napšatu (nupšatu in NA) “life,” it means “someone’s life is narrow” in the G-stem and “to make life narrow” in the D-stem. Among the letters from Assurbanipal, the verb is not combined with

---

997 It is worth noting that all these three Neo-Babylonian letters are inscribed in the Neo-Assyrian script. *ABL 301 and *K 2931 are addressed to the citizens of Babylon. In addition, Parpola suggests that *83-1-18,511 is presumably sent to the citizens of Babylon too (Parpola 2004a, 232).

998 By contrast, the undated letter *K 995, duplicated by CT 53 248, which contains the phrase “[Babylonian]s seek to drink blood” (r. 8, [LÚ.TIN.TIR.K].MEŠ ana NAG MŪD.MEŠ ú-ba-[u-u]). The phrase “to drink blood (dāmu šatû)” is unusual but can be found in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal among the inscriptions from Tiglath-pileser III to Assurbanipal in a different context. In the inscriptions, the Arabian people are described that “Due to their thirst, they drank blood and water again and again” (a-na ṣu-um-melmi-šū-nu iš-ta-at-tu-u MŪD.MEŠ u A.MEŠ par-šālšu).
napištu/napšatu. Nevertheless, an elliptic usage of the idiom is to be assumed in translating these letters because it fits the contexts better than the plain meaning of the verb.504

In addition to royal inscriptions, extispicy reports, and literary works, the scribes of Assurbanipal’s royal letters were conversant with treaties. *ABL 539 cites the vows of the treaty which was concluded between Assurbanipal and the citizens of Uruk after the breakout of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn in 652 BC (see pp. 14, 43-44, 79-80, and 190-193).

Furthermore, a sentence in two letters from Assurbanipal looks like an allusion to Esarhaddon’s succession treaty. *ABL 297 to Illil-bâni and the citizens of Nippur begins with a long sentence of literary grace: “You (pl.) know that through the iron sword of Aššur and my gods, you (pl.) had consumed that entire land by fire, so that the land has retreated, been subjugated and turned its face once again towards me.”505 The same phrase is also attested in *ABL 292 to Nabû-ušabšî and the citizens of Uruk. The motif of “iron sword” and “to consume” is included in the ceremonial curse section of Esarhaddon’s succession treaty, where it is stated (SAA 2 6:632-636 §96) that “If you should forsake Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, (his brothers, [sons by the same mother] as Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, and the other sons, the offspring of [Esar]haddon, king of Assyria), going to the south or to the north, may iron swords consume him who goes to the south and may iron swords likewise consume him who goes to the north.” Part of this section is also quoted in a letter to Esarhaddon from Itti-Šamaš-balāṭu, an Assyrian official in northern Phoenicia (SAA 16 126:19-23).506

As seen above, the letters from Assurbanipal contain a number of elements that are attested in various contemporary texts. Thus it is hard to narrow down only one office or one person for the writer of these letters.

504 *ABL 292:9 (NB) // *ABL 297 (NB) u en-na i-si-qa-dāš-šá “And now life has become narrow for him.” *ABL 292 r. 14-16, lu-ši-pu-da-tu-nu a-mur ki-i / i-si-qa-dāš-šá pa-an šá mu-se-e-šá / ú-ba’-e-em-a i-hal-lik. “Now then I am writing to you: be attentive, considering that since life has become narrow for him, he is seeking ways to get out and escape.” *ABL 561 r. 8-10 (NA), ú-ma-a šu-ú ma-aš-šar-tu né-me-il i-si-qa-dāš-šá-nu-ú-ni, “the guard is doubly essential today, as life has begun to get narrow for them!”
506 “As [it is said] in the treaty: [May iron swords consume him] who go[es] to the south [and may iron swords consume him] who go[es] to the north. May your waterskins br[eak] in a place of [severe] th[hirst].”
The Number of the Scribes

In this subsection, I will examine how many scribes were engaged in inscribing the letters from Assurbanipal. As stated above (p. 31) the average number of the preserved letters sent out per year is 9.6, although there were certainly more letters that have not yet been discovered. Since this number is very modest per year, one capable scribe could have easily handled this writing assignment.

However, the orthography of these letters indicates that several scribes wrote the letters from Assurbanipal. For example, the greeting formulae in *ABL 292, *ABL 290, and *ABL 291, all of which are Neo-Babylonian letters and are perfectly preserved, vary in orthography as follows:

*ABL 292:4,  
\[\text{Di-mu ia-a-ši Šlà-ba-ku-nu lu-u DÛG.GA-ku-nu-šú}\]

*ABL 290:2-3,  
\[\text{Di-mu ia-a-ši Šlà-ba-ka / lu-ú ūa-ab-ka}\]

*ABL 291:3,  
\[\text{Di-mu a-a-ši Šlà-ba-ka lu DÛG.GA-ka}\]

In this short formula, orthographical differences are found in the spelling of the words iāši (ia-a-ši and a-a-ši), lū (lu-u, lu-ū, and lu), and ūab- (DÛG.GA- and ūa-ab-). These differences are not conclusive evidence, but they do suggest that there probably were several scribes.

Furthermore, the set of four duplicate letters from Assurbanipal discussed above (pp. 62-66, *ABL 273, *ABL 546, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244) supports this hypothesis. At least two scribes, if not four, were engaged in writing these letters. Hence it is highly likely that more than one scribe was employed to prepare the letters from the Assurbanipal.

Moreover, it seems that the officials and advisors probably involved in the process of drafting the royal letters often worked as a team with their assistants and colleagues. Luukko points out that the deputy and the subordinate of the chief scribe are attested in the texts from the reigns of Esarhaddon and Sennacherib. He also shows that the chief scribe was in charge of other scribes and served the king and his family together with other scholars. For example, during the reign of

---

507 Walker provides Frame with the information that from the point of view of script *ABL 273 and 543 “might have been written by the same scribe,” ABL 1108 “may also belong to the group,” and it is unlikely that ABL 1244 belongs to the same group (Frame 1986, 268). Parpola also believes that several scribes prepared these letters (Parpola 2004a, 229).

508 Luukko 2007, 242-243. SAA 7 5 i 50 dated to the reign of Esarhaddon refers to Nabû-mušēši, deputy of the chief scribe. Ezbu, the servant of the chief scribe is attested in ABL 307:4 dated to the reign of Sennacherib.

Esarhaddon, the chief scribe Issār-šumu-ēreš acted as a leader of other scribes for the treaty ceremonies of Esarhaddon’s succession treaty (SAA 10 6) and united scholars such as the scribes, the haruspices, the exorcists, the physicians and the augurs for the same treaty ceremonies (SAA 10 7). Issār-šumu-ēreš sent letters to Esarhaddon jointly with exorcists, scribes/astrologers, lamentation priest, and his own deputy.

As for the palace scribe, Luukko indicates that the palace scribe had a deputy. During the reign of Assurbanipal, his deputy is referred to as a witness 663-VI-18 though his name is not preserved. The extant documents related to the palace scribe also suggest that he managed a complicated household including a “third man,” a chariot driver, a female subordinate, servants, and a village manager. The female subordinate, Sāraia, is known from a petition to the palace scribe during the reign of Esarhaddon or Assurbanipal (SAA 16 49). She sent this petition to the palace scribe on behalf of seven servants of the palace scribe. It is worthy of note that the governor of Bēt-Naiālu had taken them and assigned them to Marduk-erība who was possibly the deputy of the palace scribe at that time, and Marduk-erība did not allow them to enter the palace (see above p. 83).

Luukko further states that the palace scribe was “the manager of palace archives which were organized into ‘departments’ of their own” and the office “may have been closer to the king than that of the chief scribe’s.” He also provides phrases that describe the palace as the source of letters and orders. Like the chief scribe, it seems that the palace scribe also worked with his own team.

Moreover, it seems that many scribes worked for Assurbanipal’s library. Parpola has calculated that some 2000 tablets and 300 writing boards are listed in the library records (SAA 7 49-52) alone, and though some of them were just imported to the library, much manpower was certainly

510 Adad-šumu-uṣur and Marduk-šākin-šumi.
511 Akkullānu and Nabū-šumu-[iddina].
512 Urd-Aia/Urd-Ea.
513 Nabū-muššē. See these joint letters: SAA 10 1, 3, 24-25, 205, 232.
514 Luukko 2007, 243.
515 PNA 3/I, 1092a. It should be noted that Kessler has understood this letter differently.
516 Luukko 2007, 246, nn. 237 and 253. See also PNA 2/II, 716a, no. 10, Marduk-erība in SAA 16 49; PNA 2/II, 716a, no. 12, Marduk-erība as the palace scribe in SAA 7 18 i 14’. Cf. Svärd 2012, 221, n. 140. Svärd tentatively dates this letter to sometime between 678-674 BC when Issār-šumu-ēreš was the palace scribe, or slightly later.
519 Parpola 1983a, 4.
required in their production and management. Besides, Hunger identifies 29 different types of colophons of Assurbanipal’s library.\textsuperscript{521}

Regrettably we have no clear evidence of how many scribes wrote the letters from Assurbanipal. However, we may get a rough idea about this issue on the basis of the lists of scholars. For instance, SAA 7 1, probably compiled in 670 BC,\textsuperscript{522} includes 45 experts at the court of Nineveh. In SAA 10 160, Marduk-šāpik-zēri, a Babylonian scholar in the time of Esarhaddon, recommends to the king 20 able scholars for the royal service. As mentioned above (pp. 83-84), Parpola has shown that 21 scholars were active during the reign of Esarhaddon, as against 16 scholars during the reign of Assurbanipal and that some scholars of Esarhaddon continued to be employed at the court of Assurbanipal after Esarhaddon’s death.\textsuperscript{523}

To sum up, it is likely that about 20 to 50 magnates, and 10 to 20 scholars worked for Assurbanipal, and all these high officials and scholars may have been involved in composing the king’s letters.

\textsuperscript{521} Hunger 1968, 97-98, nos. 317-345.
\textsuperscript{522} Radner 2011, 366.
\textsuperscript{523} Parpola 1983b, 467-471.
PART II ASSYRIAN ROYAL IDEOLOGY AND ITS PRACTICAL APPLICATION IN THE LETTERS OF ASSURBANIPAL

2.1. The Royal Image of the King

2.1.1. Previous Views of the Royal Image of the Assyrian King

The Assyrian royal ideology inherited the Sumerian and Akkadian tradition of “divine kingship.” Hence a ruler in Mesopotamia was basically seen as a mediator or agent of god. In Assyria, the key concept of the royal ideology was that the Assyrian king was the earthly representative of Aššur, the supreme god of Assyria, and he was in charge of maintaining the divine order and executing the divine will.\(^{524}\)

During the long history of Assyria, and especially when Assyria expanded its territory by military campaigns and became an empire in the early first millennium, the traditional image of the king had to change on a practical level. In the course of the expansion, as Tadmor has pointed out, the emphasis was on the king’s military capabilities and his heroic acts.\(^{525}\) Hence his military achievements, often surpassing those of his predecessors, became the main theme of the Assyrian royal inscriptions. As several scholars have pointed out, on a theological level, the king’s battles against his enemies were seen as cosmic battles against the chaos caused by the embodiment of evil and sin on the periphery of the cosmic world. By analogy with Ninurta who fought against cosmic forces of chaos such as Anzû and asakku, the Assyrian king was identified with the heroic warrior god Ninurta, son of Enlil,\(^{526}\) the heavenly crown prince and the celestial saviour of Mesopotamian mythology. This analogy also justified the Assyrian expansion on a physical level.\(^{527}\) In this way, the Assyrian king acquired the “saviour” aspect. Maul has further stated that the Assyrian king was regarded as Marduk who fought against chaos such as Tiamat in the mythology, and that the king was also thought to represent Šamaš, as the “sun/sun god of all people” (šamšu kiššat nīšī) who leads to truth.\(^{528}\)

Frahm has conducted a deeper study on the solar aspect of the Assyrian king. He has revealed that the close connection between the king and the sun in Mesopotamia is traceable back to the Ur III period and Hammurabi of Babylon refers to himself as the “sun(-god) of Babylon.” He has added that this image of the king was introduced into Assyria by Tukulti-Ninurta I during the Middle

---

\(^{524}\) Zamazalová 2011, 313; Parpola 2010, 35; Radner 2010, 25; Machinist 2006, 153-159; Liverani 1979, 297-310.

\(^{525}\) Tadmor 1999, 57.

\(^{526}\) Annus 2002, 39-47. Enlil (= Illil, “god of gods”) was in Assyria a name of Aššur, and Ninurta was identified as “son of Aššur.” Ninurta was syncretized in Assyria with Nabû, son of Marduk.


\(^{528}\) Maul 1999, 201-207.
Assyrian period and was continuously used by Neo-Assyrian rulers. He has further explained that the features of the sun’s stability and regularity brought the idea of righteousness and the king, who had a judicial role, was equated with the sun. He has accurately pointed out that the king is “neither the real sun nor is he the sun-god,” and that the king made himself one step removed from the sun, in other words, the king was the incarnation and living “image” (ṣalmu) of the sun-god.

Radner has indicated that, with the success of the imperial expansion, the traditional royal title from the Akkad dynasty in the 3rd millennium BC onwards, “the king of universe, without equal/rival” (šar kiššati lā šanān), actually reflected the political realities in Mesopotamia from the 9th to 7th century BC. When Esarhaddon conquered Egypt, “king of kings” was added to the Assyrian royal titles.

As a response to the dramatic expansion of the empire, the Assyrian royal ideology needed to be modified. As suggested by Fales and Lanfranchi, in the Sargonid period, the king’s expertise and knowledge became important aspects in order to control and maintain the vastly expanded multi-ethnic territory that consisted of Assyrians and subjugated non-Assyrians. This modification would provide a balance between the king’s fierce aspect and his “wisdom,” and it would be acceptable for the conquered peoples. In the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, it seems that they avoided leading the troops into battle. Instead of the king, his subordinates such as magnates, entourages, provincial governors, or vassal kings, proceeded against enemies, although, as Parpola has indicated, their military victories were ascribed to the king. Sometimes in their royal inscriptions and prophecies, Ištar is depicted as the goddess who protects the king in a safe place on campaign, is at the head of the army, and annihilates opponents.

---

530 Frahm 2013, 102-103 and 112.
532 Fales and Lanfranchi 1997, 111-112.
533 For instance, Assurbanipal sent his chief eunuch Nabû-šarru-uṣur against Teumman according to SAA 4 270-272, Bēl-ibni to the Sealand in *ABL 292, and Tammaritu II against Ummanaldašu III in *ABL 1022 and *CT 53 908.
534 An example of Assurbanipal not leading a military campaign but being credited with having done so is the campaigns to Egypt where the earliest accounts in his inscriptions say that he did not go, while the later ones record that he did. See Fales 1981, 180-194; Spalinger 1974, 324-325.
535 For instance: SAA 9 1 i 31'-35', “I will deliver up the enemy of the king of Assyria for slaughter. [I will] keep you safe and [make] you [great in] your Palace of Succession.” SAA 9 1 vi 19-26, “I will banish trembling from my palace. You shall eat safe food and drink safe water, and you shall be safe in your palace.” SAA 9 2 ii 1'-2', “[I will annihilate] whatever enemies you have. As for [you, stay] in your palace.” BIWA, 99-100 and 224-225, B V 15-46 // C VI 7-44 and its English translation can be read in Parpola 1997a, XLVI-XLVII. In this episode concerning Teumman of Elam, the goddess says: “You shall stay here, where your residence is! Eat, drink wine, make merry, and praise my godhead until I go and accomplish that task and make you attain your heart’s desire.”
Furthermore, as suggested by Parpola, in the process of the expansion, the Assyrian king had to establish “internal stability and cohesion” politically and administratively, cope with “external threats,” avoid “internal power struggle and disruption of dynastic success,” and deal with “vastly increased distances and the excessive accumulation of tasks” in the government. To solve all these problems, the royal image of the Assyrian king was enhanced, ideological doctrine was enriched, and the institutions were developed in order to support the king strongly and to carry out policies effectively. As a result, the portrayal of the king as a “perfect man” (eṭlu gitmālu) was introduced into the Neo-Assyrian royal ideology, making all inhabitants of the empire accept and believe in the Assyrian king.\(^{536}\) Therefore, the Assyrian king was given many images and attributes deriving from the concept of the “perfect man,” consolidated by the Assyrian sacred tree.

In the Assyrian royal and religious ideology, one of the most important symbols was the sacred tree, as has been long discussed by many scholars. Porter, following earlier scholarly works, has accepted that the scene of the sacred tree depicted the fertilization of a palm, although she has stated that the Assyrians did not raise palm trees due to their relatively cooler climate but incorporated the tree motif from Babylonia. She has also suggested that the tree could allude to Ištar, goddess of fertility. Finally, she has concluded that the sacred tree represents the abundance and security bestowed on the king by the gods and that the king played the role of a regent of the gods on earth in the tree scene.\(^{537}\)

In the same year as Porter’s article, Parpola also argued intensively about the sacred tree in order to illuminate its symbolic meaning and to give a new interpretation.\(^{538}\) He has suggested that the sacred tree represents both the God, i.e., Aššur manifested in the physical universe, as a composite deity\(^{539}\) and the Assyrian king as the perfect human being. Based on the comparison with Sephirot trees in Kabbalah and the calculation of mystic numbers of the Mesopotamian gods, he has also suggested that the sacred tree is composed of the Assyrian great gods, namely, Anu, Ea, Šīn, Šamaš, Marduk, Ištar, Ninurta, Adad, and Nergal. Each of the great gods has specific functions and/or attributes: Anu = crown, authority, majesty; Ea = wisdom, knowledge; Šīn = prudence, purity, understanding; Šamaš = justice, righteousness, judgement; Marduk = mercy, creativity, representative, omnipotent; Ištar = beauty, love, purity; Ninurta = victory, saviour, crown prince.

\(^{536}\) Parpola 2010, 35-36.
\(^{537}\) Porter 1993b.
\(^{538}\) Parpola 1999a.
\(^{539}\) Parpola 2000, 165-173; Parpola 1997a, XXI; Parpola 1993a, 185, n. 94. Aššur is depicted as the winged disk hovering over the tree.
healer; Adad = glory; Nergal = foundation, punisher, destructive/sexual power. These great gods were considered to constitute the divine council to rule and direct the universe. He has further argued that the sacred tree also represents the God as a sum total of all the gods. The God, i.e., Aššur in the Assyrian religion, was regarded as transcendent because Aššur was equated with the god Anšar of the Enûma eliš through the logographic writing of his name as AN.ŠÁR. At the same time, Aššur had an immanent nature and he was present through his emanations, in other words, the great gods, who were thought to represent the different aspects of the transcendent God and the limbs of the God. Thus, the Assyrian sacred tree can be understood as the symbol of the unity of the gods and the divine perfection.

According to Parpola, the Assyrian king was equated with the sacred tree, representing the realization of the divine world order in the cosmic man because of his perfection. This identification can implant the idea that the king was the incarnation of the transcendent God and he included all the above-mentioned qualities of the great gods. Thus, he was conceived as the perfect man of divine parentage. The sacred tree could also make the king a metaphor for the bridge between heaven and earth and for a soul ascending from earth to heaven.

When Giovino compiled previous interpretations on the Assyrian sacred tree, she pointed out that the fertilization idea is still the mainstream. Recently, based on iconographic and textual sources, Seidl and Sallaberger have suggested that the sacred tree illustrated a cultic object called urigallu “great protector,” depicting a divine standard, a tipped pole, or a long staff that represents the great gods. A new interpretation may yet appear but at least the importance of the sacred tree and the strong connection between God and the Assyrian king are evident.

With the connection between God and the Assyrian king, the environment surrounding the king came to parallel the formulation of the divine world, according to Parpola. He has suggested that the Assyrian royal council can be understood as the divine council depicted in the sacred tree. At the same time, the king’s magnates, literally the “great men” (LÚ.GAL.MEŠ), were linked to the great

545 Parpola 1993a, 192-199.
547 Seidl and Sallaberger 2005. See also Wiggermann 1992, 70-73.
gods, each bearing a particular aspect of the God. And then the actions of the individual magnates were ascribed to the king.\textsuperscript{548}

The notion of the king’s birth and origin was carefully developed in several stages. Radner has pointed out that the king was seen as the creation of Bēlet-ili, separate from and superior to regular people at least by the 7th century BC. According to a literary composition of Neo-Assyrian origin about the creation of man (VAT 17019 = VS 24 92:31-36, edited by Mayer 1987), by the command of Ea, Bēlet-ili first made the ordinary man, and then created the king separately.\textsuperscript{549} In the 7th century BC, especially during the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, as Parpola has discussed, the Assyrian king was depicted as the son of two goddesses: Mullissu, divine mother and the consort of Aššur, and Ištar, the goddess of purity, love, beauty, and war. The Assyrian king was born of a human mother, but created and nursed by the goddesses. Hence the Assyrian king was seen as a semi-divine being, partly man and partly god like Gilgameš, gaining divine spirit and legitimation.\textsuperscript{550} This concept is attested in Assyrian prophetic oracles, royal inscriptions, a hymn to Ištar, a dialogue between Assurbanipal and Nabû, and a royal letter of Assurbanipal (see below pp. 100-102).

The concept of the son of the goddesses was taken one step further. Both Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal in their royal inscriptions and literary texts claim that they are the creation of the god/the gods. Esarhaddon occasionally and Assurbanipal repeatedly state in their inscriptions that they are the creation of Aššur and Mullissu.\textsuperscript{551} Assurbanipal asserts that he is the creation of the hands of the great gods in his hymn to Ištar of Nineveh and Ištar of Arbela;\textsuperscript{552} he is said to be the creation of Aššur’s hands in his coronation hymn;\textsuperscript{553} and he is designated as the creation of Aššur [and] Šamaš in literary letters to him from his son.\textsuperscript{554} Thus, the Assyrian king became the son of the god and the goddess. The concept of the king as the son of the god also fit the preconceived image of the king as Ninurta, the crown prince and the saviour in Mesopotamian mythology.

\textsuperscript{548} Parpola 2010, 36; Parpola 2000, 191; Parpola 1995, 385-386.
\textsuperscript{549} Radner 2010, 25.
\textsuperscript{550} Parpola 2010, 35-36; Parpola 1997a, XXVI-XXXI and XXXVI-XLIV.
\textsuperscript{551} RINAP 4 I ii 16, bi-nu-ut aššur nin.lil.; BIWA, 14 and 208, A 11 // F 11, bi-nu-tudît an,sar nin.lil.; BIWA, 193 and 209, J 13, bi-nu-ut su.2 an,sar nin.lil.; BIWA, 175 and 204, bi-nu-ut an,sar ʿut 4 nin.lil.
\textsuperscript{552} SAA 3 3:23, [a-na-ku] aššur–du–a bi-nu-ut su.2 dingir.mes gal.mes.
\textsuperscript{553} SAA 3 11:15, aššur luγal. aššur–ma luγal. aššur bi-nu-ut su.2–šú.
\textsuperscript{554} SAA 3 25 r i 17'-18', bi-nu-ut an.ša[r ū] / 4 utu.
Since the Assyrian king became the offspring of the God and the cult of Ištar was closely tied to the Assyrian royal ideology, the Assyrian king was also equated with Tammuz, the good shepherd guiding people to the right path, who was sacrificed for Ištar in the myth of Ištar's Descent to the Netherworld, and also possibly for the redemption of all fallen human souls. This identification also explains why the king, perfect man like the God, had to die. His death could be understood as the symbol of God’s love. However, Frahm does not give his positive approval to these innovative ideas.

It was believed that wisdom and physique were bestowed on the Assyrian king by the gods, but of course he was not born perfectly in reality. In order to acquire physical and mental perfection, the future Assyrian king received education in order to prepare for his kingship. In the so-called L, a damaged two-column clay tablet (broken into two fragments, K 2694 and K 3050) which “contains a draft copy of an inscription of Assurbanipal that was to be inscribed on a stela (or stelae) that was to be placed in Marduk’s temple in Babylon (Esaggil) after that deity was returned to his rightful place,” the king claims that he has learnt disciplines including scribal arts and extispicy, the art of war, and the art of government.

In addition, Parpola has pointed out that the perfection and divine features of the Assyrian king were not strongly propagated to the masses, but his humanity and devotion to the God are emphasized. The king was depicted as a merciful man who loves his people, the good shepherd who guides his sheep to the right path and dies for them, a righteous judge defeating sin and chaos, a helper of the poor and destitute, a great healer, and a substitute for the resurrection of mankind. The reason for stressing these aspects to the masses may have been that it was more attractive than insisting on the king’s perfection to them. In fact, Assurbanipal frequently refers to his good aspects deriving from his humanity in his letters when he tries to persuade the addressees or as long as they are loyal to him. However, at the same time, he threatens the addressees by hinting at his fierce aspects in case his political requests are refused. Hence, the various images of the king are used as
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555 Lapinkivi 2004; Parpola 1997a, XXVI-XXXVI.
556 Parpola 2000, 200-201; Parpola 1997a, XXXI-XXXVI.
558 Zamazalová 2011; Livingstone 2007; Villard 1997. Zamazalová has also pointed out that the Assyrian royal family members received some education as well.
559 Novotny 2014, xvi-xvii.
560 Novotny 2014, Text 18, 42-44 for cuneiform copy, 77-80 for transcription, and 96-99 for translation. See also BIWA, 187; Parpola 1997a, C, n. 183; Zamazalová 2011, 314-316; Baruchi-Unna 2013, 613.
561 Parpola 2010, 36.
literary tools for political manoeuvering in the royal letters. To show these aspects, the royal letters are often replete with literary allusions to religious and mythological texts.

Parker has also dealt with the Assyrian royal ideology from the point of view of the construction and implementation of kingship in the Assyrian Empire. He has pointed out that the Assyrian king was believed to have power because of his special qualification and position among human beings and that the king was expected to expand his earthly and cosmological territory in order to change chaotic and uncivilized outer realms into Assyria. Parker has emphasized that, in the Assyrian Empire, though the king was a central actor, “the inner and provincial elite” played an important role. He has defined the former as magnates (rabûti) and scholars (ummânū) in Assyrian palaces and the latter as provincial governors, Assyrian royal delegates (qēpānī) and the royal body guards (ša qurbūti) in provinces and vassal states. He has argued that the inner and provincial elite perceived the king’s power, invested their authority in the king, and then they applied the king’s supreme power and spread it into the rest of the empire.\(^{562}\)

To sum up, the images of the Assyrian king were as follows: “earthly representative of the god Aššur,” “saviour,” “perfect man,” “son of the god and the goddess” on a symbolic level. In addition, the Assyrian king was thought to include the aspects of all the great gods: “authority,” “wisdom,” “prudence and purity,” “righteousness and justice,” “love,” “mercifulness,” “glory and punisher,” “victory and saviour,” “physical power,” and “good shepherd.” Externally, the Assyrian king had “no equal” in relation to the other kings. The inner and provincial elite played the important role of promulgating the Assyrian king. They propagated those images of the Assyrian king to the masses verbally and visually.

### 2.1.2. The King’s Perfection

One of the most significant images of the Assyrian king was the “perfect man” (eṭlu gitmālu).\(^{563}\) Parpola has pointed out that the “perfect man” is well attested as an Assyrian royal epithet\(^{564}\) and this image was created by equating the king with the sacred tree.

Parpola has also suggested that the king’s perfection was strongly associated with Gilgameš, who was two-thirds god and one-third human. In addition, since the name of Gilgameš is spelled out as

---

562 Parker 2011.
563 Parpola 1993b, 168, n. 34.
in the Middle Babylonian version of the Epic of Gilgameš and in the Standard Babylonian version of the Epic. Parpola has proposed that Gilgameš was identified with the sacred tree. Furthermore, he has interpreted that the epic describes the development of Gilgameš’s spirit.

The king’s perfection was the central image of the Assyrian royal ideology. However, Parpola has pointed out that the image was not propagated to the masses nor did the Neo-Assyrian royal ideology claim full divinity of the king. Actually, the term “perfect” is not attested in the letters from Assurbanipal

2.1.3. The King’s Favour

The king’s MUN, ṭābtu (“(royal) favour, good deed, kindness”) is frequently mentioned in the letters from Assurbanipal, probably because he aims to stress his positive aspect in order to (re)establish and maintain Assyrian rule peacefully. The concept of ṭābtu would be easily understandable for the common people including the citizens, hence it was strongly propagated. In my research corpus, the favours rendered by Assurbanipal are referred to 17 times, whereas the favours from the correspondents are mentioned only twice.

In addition to the general usage of ṭābtu as “favour,” there is another important meaning for the word. When ṭābtu occurs beside adē “treaty” or related words such as māmītu “oath,” ebrūtu “friendship, alliance,” or sulummā/salīmu “peace,” ṭābtu was used as a synonym of adē from Middle Assyrian onwards, especially in Assyrian royal inscriptions and NA and NB letters. Many treaties were concluded at the initiative of politically weak parties to gain benefits such as military aid and political backing from Assyria in exchange for concessions, hence a treaty, providing the benefits from Assyria towards the other party, was depicted as a royal favour and ṭābtu became equivalent to adē. This usage is found in *ABL 539 (NB) concerning the treaties with Nabû-ušabši, the governor or Uruk, and the citizens of Uruk. In the letter, ṭābtu is attested with māmītu. Assurbanipal says, “you (sg.) did not sin against my favour (ṭābtu) and oath (māmītu).” In this

---

565 Parpola 1998a.
566 Parpola 1993a, 192-196.
567 Parpola 2010, 36.
568 *ABL 289 r. 9; *ABL 290 s. 1; *ABL 291 r. 3; *ABL 295:8; *ABL 539:6; *ABL 1022:13, r. 18, r. 21; *ABL 1260:5 and 7; *ABL 1380:5, r. 18, r. 21; *CT 53 98 r. 12; *CT 53 968 r. 1’; possibly r. 3’ and r. 4’.
569 *ABL 287 r. 14; ABL 1146:7’. The favours in broken contexts are found in *ABL 961 r. 11 and CT 53 968 r. 2’.
570 Parpola 2011, 41; Parpola 1987b, 182. See also CAD T 16b-17b.
571 Brinkman 1990, 88 and 95; Parpola and Watanabe 1988, XVI.
572 *ABL 539:6-7, a-na MUN-idā u a-na ma-mi-ti-âl / ul taḥ-ti.
context, ūṣibtu would denote a treaty. We also know from *ABL 1380 (NB) that Assurbanipal had granted his favour to an Elamite herald by imposing a treaty upon him but the latter transgressed against it.

In the same letter, Ummanigaš II is said to have been received a great favour from Assurbanipal but to have violated the treaty by siding with Assurbanipal’s adversary and crossing over to his territory.

As these cases show, ūṣibtu was closely linked to a treaty.

Assurbanipal granted favours spontaneously or in return for the good deeds of his correspondents. However, granting favours was not simply an expression of the king’s good will. In practice, it was used as a political tool. The royal favour was bestowed even on the people who had been hostile and later became loyal to Assurbanipal as long as they showed allegiance to the Assyrian king and accepted the treaty conditions. In *ABL 289 Assurbanipal tells the Sealanders that they will see what rewards and favours they will have from him after he has sent his army and it has done its job.

In *ABL 290 s. 1, he commends the governor of Ur for his loyalty from the beginning and assures him his continued favour until the time of his grandchildren.

Those who received royal favours were strongly expected to return them to their lord. Assurbanipal indirectly requests Bēl-ibni to return the king’s favour in *ABL 291 r. 2-4. When Tammarītu II launched the campaign against Ummanigaš III on behalf of Assurbanipal, the king urged him to count the God’s help in fighting among his many favours. In addition, he straightforwardly orders Tammarītu II to pay back his favours by saying: “I have [done] and given to you this favour which not (even) a father has done for a son. As for you, remember [this], unremittingly strive to pay me back these favours.”

---

573 *ABL 1380:5-7, um-ma ṣim-bur šā MUN te-pu-šā-áš-šum-ma / u a-de-e tu-še-es-bi-ti-uš ū šu-u / ana a-de-e-ka iḥ-ṭu-ā a-dak, “saying, ‘I have killed Šimbur, to whom you rendered a favour by imposing a treaty upon him but who sinned against the treaty.’”

574 *ABL 1380:9-14, it-ṭi ṣim-ma-ni-i-gaš šā at-ta MUN / GAL-ti te-pu-šā-āš-šum-ma a’-na a-de-ka-ma / iḥ-ṭu-ā it-ti EN-sḥal-ti-kā iz-zi-za-ma / u a-na mi-ṣīr-i-ka ib-bal-ki-tu-u’ / šal-ti it-ti-šu ni-ip-pu-uš tuk-te-ka / nu’-tar-ra, “I shall go and we shall make battle with Ummanigaš, to whom you rendered a great favour but who has likewise sinned against your treaty by siding with your adversary and crossing over to your territory, and we shall fight with him and revenge you.”


576 *ABL 290 s. 1-2, ū MŪ-ŠA-a-ga-a šā ina 1G1-id ban-u ū MUN.HLA / šā ū-tar-rak-ka ana šā-bi-ša ana DUMU-DUMUL.MEŠ, “and this name of yours which is good before me and the favours that I shall render to you until the time of your grandchildren.”

577 *ABL 291 r. 2-4, it-ṭi šā ša-ba-ka / a-ga’-a tur-ru šā MUN-ia / ir-ri-šu-ā-ka, “as this heart of yours asks you to return my favour.”

578 *CT 53 908 r. 6-12, [miḫ-ṣa-ā-ša as-ni-ū / [gab]-bi-šā šā in-né-piš-u-ni / [ina KUR-pa] šu-u-a šū u DINGIR / [ina G]IŠ.BAN-ša is-sa-kan / [a-k] šu-mi ina UG-ḫi-ka-ni / [an-ni]-ša-[šu-a'-nu a'] MUN.MEŠ-id / [ma-a']-da-a-te mu-nuu, “All this [f]ighting which has happened is in [Parša]u; God (himself) has intervened [with] his bow, [because] my name is upon you. Count [that] among my many favours.”
If the recipient of a favour did not return it to the king, he deserved punishment and denouncement. In the letters addressed to Rāši, *ABL 1260 and *ABL 295, Assurbanipal says that Elam has from the beginning displayed undesirable behaviour although Assurbanipal has rendered favours to Elam and implies a punishment if his wish of extraditing Nabû-bēl-šumāti is not fulfilled. The harsh treatment of the person who does not return favours reminds us of sanctions in the curse section of the treaty. If a treaty partner violates the treaty, divine retribution is imposed on him, although the punishments are actually implemented by the Assyrian army. This reaction might have come from the analogy between ṭābtu “favour” and adē “treaty.”

The recipients also do favours towards Assurbanipal. In *ABL 287 to the citizens of Nippur, after Assurbanipal explains why half of the 15 elders of Nippur were prevented from seeing him when they came for the royal audience, he states that he does not know who is who and further states that all of their favours are like one to him.580 This passage implies that the king does not distinguish between people, in other words, he treats people equally. When Assurbanipal receives a favour from his subordinates, he is willing to reciprocate it. In *ABL 1146 addressed to the citizens of Babylon, Assurbanipal says: “My eyes are upon you. You returned your favour to me, so that I will do justice to you” 581

2.1.4. The Mother-Child Relationship between Zarpanītu and Assurbanipal
The recent studies of Parpola and Nissinen show that Assyrian prophecies illustrate the mother–child relationship between the goddesses and the Assyrian kings, especially Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal. To the former, the prophetess [Sinqīša-āmur] conveyed the words of Ištar of Arbela, “I am your father and mother. I raised you between my wings; I will see your success.” 582 To the latter, Mullissu-kabtat said, “You whose mother is Mullissu, have no fear! You whose nurse is the Lady of Arbela, have no fear!” (SAA 9 7:6) 583 and Dunnaša-āmur said, “May Mullissu and the Lady of Arbela keep Assurbanipal, the creation of their hands, alive for ever!” 584 As these sentences indicate, the kings are presented as semi-divine beings that were born of a human mother but

580 *ABL 287 r. 12-15, a-na-ku i-de-e l a-ga-a man-nu ù a-ga-a / man-ru MUN šá gab-bi-ku-ru / ki-i 1.en ina UGU-ḫi-iá.
581 *ABL 1146;7-8, ḠI₂-a-a ina UGU-ku-ru[u ḠI₂-ša-l]-r[a-am-ma] / de-en-ku-ru ep-pu-uš. In this letter, the favour is indicated by nāṣhuru, the N-stem of saḫāru, meaning “to turn again with favour to.” See CAD S, 53.
582 SAA 9 2 ii 26-28, a-na-ku AD-ka AMA-ka / bir-ti a-gap-pi-ur-ta-bi-ka / né-ma-al-ka.
584 SAA 9 8 r. 1’-3’.
created and raised by the goddess. In this way Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal were legitimated as kings.

This mother-child relationship between the goddesses and the Assyrian king was also repeatedly described in the contemporary texts such as royal inscriptions and literary texts. For instance, Assurbanipal claims in his inscriptions,

“I am Assurbanipal, a creation of Aššur and Mullissu, the great crown prince of the Succession palace, whom Aššur and Sīn since times immemorial called by name to kingship and created inside his mother for the shepherd ship of Assyria” (Edition A I 1-5 // F I 1-4).  

“[Aššur], the father of the gods, determined as my lot a royal destiny while (I was) in my mother’s womb; [the goddess Mullissu, the great mother, called [my name] for ruling over the land and the people; Ea and Belet-ili artistically fashioned (me) a form fit for lordship” (L 4:10-12).

The imagery of the mother-child relationship may have been realized in the real world. In other words, the Assyrian royal princes could have been raised in temples of Ištar. In SAA 3 13 “Dialogue Between Assurbanipal and Nabû,” Nabû says,

“You were a child, Assurbanipal, when I left you with the Queen of Nineveh (= Ištar of Nineveh); you were a baby, Assurbanipal, when you sat in the lap of the Queen of Nineveh! Her four teats are placed in your mouth; two you suck, and two you milk to your face” (SAA 3 13 r. 6-8).

SAA 3 3, “the hymn of Assurbanipal to the Ištar of Nineveh and Arbela,” most frequently mentions the mother-child relationship between the goddesses and Assurbanipal. The king says:

586 BIWA, 14 and 208. Its translation is in Parpola 1997a, C, n. 183. See also BIWA, 175 and 204, E I 4, “a creation of Aššur and Mullissu”; BIWA, 193 and 209, J 1 3, “a creation of the hands of Aššur and Mullissu.”
587 Novotny 2014, 96. Cf. BIWA, 187; Parpola 1997a, C, n. 183, “[Aššur], the father of the gods, destined me for kingship inside my mother, [Mul]lissu, the great mother, called me by name to rule the land and the people, [E]a and Bēlet-ilī gave [my statue] lordly features” (L 4:5'-7’); Zamazalová 2011, 314-316. Šamaš-šumu-ukīn also states that the goddess appointed him for the rulership while still in his mother’s womb: “In the womb of (my) mother who bore me (lit. ‘in the palace of creating of the mother who bore me’), the queen of the gods, the goddess Erua, gladly appointed me to be lord of the people” (RIMB 2 B.6.33.1:6-8).
588 Parpola 1997a, XXXIX.
“I am Assurbanipal … product of Emašmaš (= the temple of Ištar of Nineveh) and Egašankalamma (the temple of Ištar of Arbela)” (SAA 3 3:8 and 10).

“I knew no father or mother, I grew up in the lap of my goddesses. As a child the great gods guided me, going with me on the right and the left” (SAA 3 3:13-15).

“The Lady of Nineveh (= Ištar of Nineveh), the mother who bore me, endowed me with unparalleled kingship; the Lady of Arbela, my creator, ordered everlasting life (for me)” (SAA 3 3 r. 14-16).

These texts clearly indicate that Ištar and Mullissu were considered the mother and the nurse of Assurbanipal. However, in *ABL 926 to the citizens of Babylon, probably written at the very beginning of his reign, the goddess Zarpanītu, the consort of Marduk, was interpreted as the mother of Assurbanipal. The king states, “ever since my childhood until n[ow] I have trusted in the Lady Zarpa[nītu]; father and mother did not raise me, [I grew up in her lap]”. Since the wording is very similar to SAA 3 3:13-15 (see the previous page), the last phrase can be reconstructed based on it. By this sentence, Assurbanipal emphasizes his devotion to Zarpanītu as his tutelary goddess and his mother. It is interesting that he uses the metaphor of the mother-child relationship developed in the Assyrian prophecies towards the citizens of Babylon. More interesting is that this replacement probably took place due to political considerations for the citizens of Babylon. However, at the same time, his solicitousness towards them was merely within the frame of the Assyrian royal ideology.

2.1.5. The Gods Mentioned in the Letters from Assurbanipal

The conciliatory nature of Assurbanipal’s Babylonian policies finds a concrete expression in his alleged devotion to Marduk, which is repeatedly stressed in his letters. However, other gods too are mentioned in the corpus. This subsection will examine the gods who appear in the texts and analyse the relevant contexts in order to reveal Assurbanipal’s real religious attitude. A table at the end of this section summarizes the evidence.
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589 Concerning the names of the temples, see George 1993, 90 and 121-122.
590 Parpola 2004a, 227, n. 2. As stated above, in the letter Assurbanipal calls the citizens of Babylon “my kidinnu” and tells them how his reign is good.
591 *ABL 926:11-13, ut-tu še-ḫe-ri-ia a-di šÀ-bi i-[na-an-na] / [t]ak-la-ku a-na šar-ra-ti₄ zar-pa-[ni-tum] / AD u AMA ul ū-rab-ba-an-ni \[x x x x x\].
2.1.5.1. Marduk or Bēl Alone
In the letters from Assurbanipal, Marduk is mentioned five times in four letters592 linked with Babylon. Soon after the revolt broke out, in *ABL 301 dated 652-II-23, Assurbanipal tried to persuade the citizens of Babylon not to side with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn by labelling him as “the one rejected by Marduk” (r. 17, sikipti Marduk). By this phrase, the king meant that Marduk, the supreme god of Babylonia and the patron god of Babylon, had ceased to support Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Though the wording is different, this expression reminds us of a passage in the literary text, given the heading of “Aššur’s Response to Assurbanipal’s Report on the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn War” (SAA 3 44) that reads “Because of these evil deeds [which] he kept on perpetrating, on my account (even) his (own) gods became angry, abandoned him (umašširūšu), and took to foreign parts” (ll. 20-21).

The most interesting phrase is that Marduk is described as the god who has full responsibility for the life of the citizens of Babylon. When the Assyrian forces laid siege to Babylon, Assurbanipal sent *ABL 571 to the citizens of Babylon and said, “If Marduk wants to keep them (= ‘your brothers’, i.e., the rest of the citizens of Babylon) alive, let them open [the city gate] in friendly terms.”593 The letter indicates that Assurbanipal and the citizens were concerned about the potential massacre and the plunder of the city (l. 16-r. 8). To avoid this crisis, Assurbanipal urged the recipients to persuade other Babylonians to open the city gate peacefully. In reality, their chance of survival was totally dependent on Assurbanipal and the “enemy” (nakru), but Assurbanipal clearly states that Marduk held a life or death authority over the citizens of Babylon.

After the suppression of the revolt, more precisely on the 27th of Addāru (XII) of *646 BC, in *ABL 1262 probably sent to Elam, Assurbanipal refers to Marduk in a broken context. The letter is fragmentary but its main topic seems to be restoration of public order in Elam after his campaign against Ummanaldašu III. In the letter he states, “[...] with the help of Marduk I have descended into Elam.”594 Assuming that the translation is correct, Assurbanipal claims that he conducted the military campaign by the will and with the assistance of Marduk, although the campaign itself was of course conducted by humans.

The name of Marduk can be restored in *ABL 926, probably composed right at the beginning of his reign. Assurbanipal wrote it to the citizens of Babylon, described himself as “the one who fears

592 *ABL 926:2, 6; *ABL 301 r. 17; *ABL 571 r. 13; *ABL 1262 r. 3'.
594 *ABL 1262 r. 3'-4', [x x x x] 4AMAR.UTU e-tap-dāš / at-tu-rid ina KUR.NIM.MA.KI. If this sentence is translated literally, the translation would be “[...] Marduk has achieved, I have descended into Elam.” This phrase corresponds to the more common, ilāni etapšu, lit. “the gods achieved,” which is idiomatic for “with the help of god,” “god willing.”
[Marduk]” (l. 2, pāliḫ [Marduk]) and urged them to “hear of the might of Marduk” (l. 6, šimā dannāssu Marduk). It seems that he strongly wished to show his full respect for Marduk to the citizens of Babylon by mentioning Marduk immediately after his ascension of the throne of Assyria (see below pp. 171-174).

Marduk is also twice referred to simply as “Bēl.”595 In *ABL 301, Bēl appears in the same sentence that contains the above-mentioned “the one rejected by Marduk”. Assurbanipal states, “May this one rejected by Marduk not deprive my hands of the troops that I have put together for Bēl.”596 The phrase “the troops that I have put together for Bēl” alludes to the citizens of Babylon,597 but it is unclear why not Marduk but Bēl is used here in the same letter. Assurbanipal may have tried to avoid the repetition of the name of Marduk, or perhaps using the name Bēl (“lord”) had some finer nuance that escapes us. In *ABL 945 probably dated during the revolt, Assurbanipal writes to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, and instructs the Urukeans to call the name of Bēl (šumu ša Bēl ina muḫ[ḫi] zukrā) and to present (an offering) in front of the gods (r. 2′-4′). It seems that he orders them to worship of Marduk, but it is not clear on account of which occasion these offerings were actually to be presented.

In sum, Marduk or Bēl is mentioned alone seven times in six letters from Assurbanipal. Except one missive, these letters are dated before and during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Marduk or Bēl appears as the god who is worshipped by Assurbanipal and Urukeans, and who rejects Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, and controls the life and death of the citizens of Babylon. It is evident that Assurbanipal mentions Marduk or Bēl for political reasons.

2.1.5.2. Aššur or God Alone
Aššur was the supreme god of the Assyrian Empire, but Aššur is mentioned alone by name only three times in three letters during and after the revolt.598 Rather, Aššur is more frequently simply referred to as “God” (dingir, AN(7) = ilu).599 The use of ilu(m) “God” as Aššur already appeared in Old Assyrian personal names600 and the interchange of Aššur and “God” is found in Middle and Neo-Assyrian personal names.601 Some Assyrian cultic texts also address Aššur as “God.”602

595 *ABL 301 r. 16; *ABL 945 r. 2′.
596 *ABL 301 r. 16-17, ki-îṣ-ru ša a-na4EN l ak-ṣur.
597 Parpola 2004a, 228, n. 5.
598 *ABL 1170:6; *K 995 r. 18; *AAA 20 106 r. 19,
599 Parpola 1997a, XXI.
600 Lambert 1983, 82-83 and 86; Garelli 1962.
In the fragmentary *K 995, possibly dated during the revolt, Assurbanipal discusses the guarding of an unknown city probably in Babylonia where the anonymous recipient lives. In the letter, Aššur is depicted as the god of war who can bring destruction. The king states, “However, if you do not guard [...], through the power of Aššur ([ina li]-te šá AN.ŠÁR), fire will burn the land of Akkad [...]. On that day you will see [...]. [The land] of Akkad will becom[e] powerless; [the ... of] the land of Akkad [...] in the hands of [...]” (r. 17′-21′).

Aššur is also mentioned in *ABL 1170 to Ummanšibar, a prominent Elamite, dated 648*-IV-25. The letter indicates how Aššur had influence on this Elamite person. The king tells him, “Concerning this beautiful idea that Aššur so nicely put into your heart for your lord.”

In *AAA 20 106 to Ḥundaru, king of Dilmun, dated 647*-VI-13, Aššur is depicted as a tutelary god of the foreign king: “Do you not know that [you have been sitting on the throne] under the protection of Aššur (and) my fathers?” (r. 19-20).

Aššur as the “God” is attested alone 14 times in 11 letters throughout the time before and after the revolt. The number of references to the “God” is the largest in my research corpus. God is closely connected with treaties, and he especially plays the role of a punisher of violators of a treaty. In *ABL 301 r. 10-11, Assurbanipal tells the citizens of Babylon that the ones who violated the treaty will be judged before God. He also reminds them not to make themselves culpable before God (ll. 23-24). In *ABL 539 probably to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, “This very day, those who have sinned against my treaty — [you] will notice through your eyes how God will once again swiftly call to account those who tampered with the treaty” (r. 6-9).

God is also depicted as the one who gives revelation. The phrase “God opens ears” (NA: uznī petū; NB: uznī petū) is attested three times. It is worth noting that God performs this deed towards foreign people such as the citizens of Babylon, the Rāšeans, and the Gambūleans.

---

602 E.g., van Driel 1969, 88-89, BM 121206:36′ and 136-137, the Istanbul text A 126 (= Ass 13956):16 and 18. The former must have been discovered at Aššur and may deal with the cultic high-days. It is also closely connected with Sennacherib. The latter belongs to a group of Neo-Assyrian texts found in the so-called “House of the Incantation-priest” in Aššur and describes cultic functions performed by the king with lamentation priests. See also Parpola 1993a, 185, n. 94.

603 *ABL 1170:5-8, i-na UGU a-mat a-[g[a]-a] / bab-ba-ni-ti ša AN.ŠÁR / a-na EN′-ka ina UGU šál-bi-ka / is-suk ú-tib.

604 *ABL 301:23 and r. 11; *CT 53 142:14′ and r. 3; *ABL 539 r. 8; *K 995 r. 11; *CT 53 908 r. 8; *ABL 295 r. 4; *ABL 1242:5; *AAA 20 106:19; *ABL 1165 r. 1 and 3; *CT 53 968:8′; *ABL 293:12.

605 CAD U/W, 370b-371a.

606 *ABL 295 (NB) r. 4-6, [UD-mu] šá DINGIR PL2-šá a-na′ [dib-bi]-[i]-[l]a / ū′-pē[t-ū]-ūš li-lil-kām-ma / it-ti šam-mar-īd li-iz-zīz. “[The day] when God opens his ears to m[y word]s, let him come and stay with Tammarītu.” Possibly also CT
God is also associated with destruction as is Aššur too. In *K 995, Assurbanipal refers to the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and says that the unknown recipient will be displaced in the Sealand. Following this, he says: “God [...] the destruction which he wrote,” although the verb is unclear (r. 11′). After that he urges the recipient to guard the city where he lives. In *ABL 1165 to unknown recipients, Assurbanipal says that the houses of the recipients have been destroyed for the sake of Assurbanipal and refers to the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn: “From the beginning, why and for what reason did he do it? And the rebels who devised this plot, what fortune did they gain for themselves?” He continues: “perhaps God himself has commanded the destruction of Babylonia. What can we say?” It is worth noting that Assurbanipal attributed responsibility for the destruction of Babylonia to God and he implies that a human being must obey God’s order without questioning. A very similar expression about the destruction of Babylonia is attested in SAA 3 44, “Aššur’s Response to Assurbanipal’s Report on the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn war.” In this text, Aššur says, “Because of these evil deeds [which Šamaš-šumu-ukīn] committed against you, I pulled out the foundations of his royal throne, over[threw] his reign and [comma]nded the destruction of the entire land of Babylonia.”

God uses his bow to assist a foreign vassal king for the sake of Assurbanipal. In *CT 53 908, Assurbanipal tells Tammarītu II who led the campaign against Elam, “God (himself) has intervened [with] his bow, [beca]use my name is upon you.”

To sum up, Aššur or God is the most frequently attested god mentioned alone in the letters from Assurbanipal. When Aššur or the God appears, he deals with wars, controls people’s way of thinking, punishes violators of Assurbanipal’s treaty, grants revelation, and effects destructions. His influence extends to foreign people. It should be noted that Aššur and God are mentioned in the same letters. It seems that there is at least the following tendency: when Aššur is mentioned with

53 142 (NA) r. 3, DINGIR PI.2-ku-nu [p-te-te x x x x x], “God [has opened] your ears”; *ABL 293 (NB) II. 12-14, DINGIR šu-u PI.2-ku-nu / ki-i ba-la-ti-ku-nu / ip-te-ii, “When you survived, the God himself has opened your ears.”

607 *ABL 1165:3′, É.MESš-ku-nu ina UGU-ḫi-iöğ he-pp-a-a, “your houses have been destroyed for my sake.”

608 *ABL 1165:6′-r. 1, al-tu / re-eš-su ša i-pu-šī ina UGU mī-ni-i / ina UGU a-a-i-tū a-mat i-pu-ša-ma / u e-pi-ša-nu-tū ša nik-šu / a-ga-a ik-ki-šu mī-nu-u / SIGS īn ta-ru-ma-tū ša-ni ša-nu / iš-šu-nu.

609 *ABL 1165 r. 1-3, min-de-ma DINGIR šu-u / ṣa-pu-šī ša KUR–URI ki iq-ta-bi / mī-nu-ā ni-qab-bi.


611 *CT 53 968 r. 8-10, DINGIR / [ina GIŠ.BAN-šu is-sa-kan / [a-k] šu-mi ina UGU-ḫi-ka-ni.
other god(s) consecutively (see the following two subsections), in many cases his name appears as Aššur, but when Aššur appears alone, he is often referred to as the God.

2.1.5.3. Aššur and My Gods
Aššur is seldom mentioned alone, but his name often appears together with “my gods”: 13 times in 11 missives. In each case, Aššur’s name comes first. The recipients vary from citizens of Babylonian cities to foreign people. The most common phrase (six out of 13) is “I swear by Aššur, my gods” and Parpola has pointed out that Assurbanipal almost always uses this oath formula (for exceptions, see below p. 108).

“Aššur and my gods” are also depicted as the supporters of military capability and battles. In *ABL 1210, dated 652-VII 3, Assurbanipal states: “Under the aegis of Aššur and my gods, who have given me faith, there will be many ho[rs]es.” By this phrase, he also claims that these gods gave him faith. In *ABL 292 to Il[lil-bān], parallel to *ABL 297 to Nabû-[ušabši] and the citizens of Uruk, he mentions “the iron sword of Aššur (and) my gods” and commends the recipients to win a battle by the sword. In addition, Assurbanipal writes in *CT 53 908 to Tammarītu II that “[Aššur] and my gods” faced the fighting. In *ABL 1040, addressed to Tammarītu II as well, the Assyrian king refers to “the decision of Aššur and [my] gods” but the context is broken.

“Aššur and my gods” are also used by Assurbanipal to threaten Ambap[pi] and the Rāšeans at the end of *ABL 1260: “If not, I shall do as Ašš[ur] and my gods make me deem best. Afterwards may nothing make me angry. Now then I have written to open your ears” (r. 16-22).

The combination of “Aššur and my gods” is attested as frequently as Aššur or God alone and connected with military matters. It is particularly worth noting that “Aššur and my gods” appears as the standard phrase for the oath formulae of Assurbanipal.

612 For instance, *K 995 r. 11’, God and r. 18’, Aššur; *ABL 539:13 and r. 10-11, Aššur and Marduk, r. 8, God; *ABL 295 r. 3, the gods, r. 4, God, r. 7-8, Aššur and Marduk, my gods; *ABL 1165 r. 1 and 3, God, r. 4-5, Aššur, Marduk my gods]; *CT 53 908:4, [Aššur] and my gods, r. 8, God. Cf. *AAA 20 106:19, God and r. 19-20, Aššur and my fathers. 613 *ABL 1210 r. 7, *ABL 287 r. 8, *ABL 297:6, *ABL 290:12, *ABL 1040:7, *CT 53 908:4, *BM 132980 r. 18’. 614 *ABL 1260 r. 16-17, *CT 54 116:9’ and r. 3’. 615 Parpola 2004a, 232-233. 616 *ABL 1210 r. 6-9, ina ši-l-ili 1 ašš-šur u DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a / šá ú-ta-kil-u-ni ni / ma-a’-du ANŠE.[KUR’]ME. 617 *ABL 292:5-9, at-tu-nu ti-du-a šá ina ša GÍR AN,BAR šá / ANŠAR DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a KUR ul-li-ti gab-bi-šá / i-šá-a-tu tu-ša-ki-la u KUR ki-ti tab-bi-sa / tu-at-ta-ká-as u pa-ni-šá ana UGU-ši-šá / tu-at-tir-ma, “You know that through the iron sword of Aššūr and my gods you had that entire land consumed by fire, so that the land has retreated, been subjugated, and turned its face once again towards me.” 618 *CT 53 908:3-5, as-se-me / šá ašš-šur u DINGIR.MEŠ-ia e-pu-šá-u-ni / [miš-šu iḫ-ḫur-a-ni (3rd. f. pl?)
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2.1.5.4. Aššur and Marduk
Aššur is attested with Marduk in my research corpus only twice, in *ABL 539, probably addressed to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. In the letter, Nabû-ušabši is said to be keeping on the side of the representative of Aššur (and) Marduk and to be under the protection of Aššur and Marduk. The letter indicates that Marduk helps the pro-Assyrian local Babylonian governor even after Marduk had abandoned Šamaš-šumu-ukīn who had provoked the revolt. In addition, the Assyrian god Aššur also protected the governor.

2.1.5.5. Aššur (and) Marduk, My Gods
The combination of “Aššur (and) Marduk, my gods” is common. In the letters from Assurbanipal, this combination appears in total six times, four during the revolt and twice after the revolt. During the revolt, Assurbanipal writes to the citizens of Babylon three times saying: “I swear by Aššur (and) Marduk, my gods” and once “I pray to Aššur and Marduk, my gods.” As Parpola has pointed out, Assurbanipal always swears by “Aššur and my gods” in his other letters, but the name of Marduk is inserted in these letters. It is very likely that he intentionally added the name of Marduk to appeal to the citizens of Babylon for political reasons. At the end of *CT 54 464, probably to Illil-bāni, Assurbanipal refers to “the […]s of Babylon […], [Aššur (and)M]arduk, my gods” (r. 19-20) in a broken context.

After the revolt, “Aššur (and) Marduk, my gods” is found in two letters addressed, respectively, to the Rāšeans and an unknown recipient. Both contain this phrase with a threatening tone: “I shall do as Aššur and Marduk, my gods, make me deem best.”

618 *ABL 539:12-13, šá a-na UGU šu-mi-iá ra-man-ga l [it]-ti ša-né-e šá AN.ŠÁR 4 AMAR.UTU tap-ru-us, “The fact that for the sake of your name you have isolated yourself, [keeping on the side of] the representative of Aššur and Marduk.”
619 *ABL 539 r. 10-11, u at-ta ina šīl šá AN.ŠÁR / u 4 AMAR.UTU ú-šu-uz-za-ta, “As for you, remain under the protection of Aššur and Marduk.”
620 *K 2931:3′, *ABL 301:6-7, *83-1-18,511:4′, *ABL 571 r. 16-17. We may restore “[Aššur, M]arduk, (and) my gods” in *CT 54 464 r. 20.
621 *ABL 295 r. 7-9, * ABL 1165 r. 4-6.
622 *K 2931:3′, ina šá AN.ŠÁR 4 AMAR.UTU DINIGIR.MEŠ-iá at-te-me; *ABL 301:6-7, ina šá aššur l 4 AMAR.UTU DINIGIR.MEŠ-iá at-te-me; *ABL 571 r. 16-17, AN.ŠÁR u 4 AMAR.UTU DINIGIR.MEŠ-e-[a] / ú-šal-li-ma.
624 *ABL 295 r. 7-10, ia-a-na-ú ki-i šá AN.ŠÁR / ú 4 AMAR.UTU DINIGIR.MEŠ-e-a / ú-šal-ú-in-ni ep-pu-uš / mim-ma šá-bá-ti-iá la im-ma-l[u], “If not, I shall do as Aššur and Marduk, my gods make me deem the best. May nothing make me angry!”; * ABL 1165 r. 4-6, ki-i (šá) AN.ŠÁR 4 AMAR.UTU / [DINIGIR.MEŠ-e-a] ú-šal-ú-in-ni / [ep-pu-uš], “I shall do as Aššur and Marduk, my gods make me deem the best.” See also p. 107, *ABL 1260 r. 16-22.
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2.1.5.6. Other Gods

Beside Aššur and Marduk, the phrase “the gods” also frequently appears alone. This term is attested seven times including two reconstructions. In some cases, the context is unclear or broken. However, in *ABL 945 Assurbanipal urges the Urukeans to call the name of Bēl and present (an offering) in front of “the gods” (DINGIR.MEŠ-ni). Perhaps Bēl was included in “the gods” in this case. In *BM 132980, Assurbanipal threatens the elders of Elam by stating, “I swear by Aššur and my gods that, under the aegis of the gods, I will make the future even more horrible than the past to you” (r. 18’-20’). Since “Aššur and my gods” are mentioned shortly before “the gods,” it seems that the latter are the same as “Aššur and my gods.”

“My gods” are also referred to alone in two letters. First, a very rare oath formula of Assurbanipal is found in *ABL 541. He states, “I swear by my gods” (r. 2-3, ina ŠÀ DINGIR.MEŠ-iá / at-ta-ma) and promises to the Gambūleans not to deport them nor expose them to Elam. Second, in *ABL 1002, Assurbanipal tells Sîn-tabni-uṣur, the governor of Ur, that when the previous governor of Ur “saw my gods had not brought success in the hands of my enemy, he passed over, came, and grasped my feet” (r. 6-9). “My gods” are here depicted as the opponents of Assurbanipal’s enemy.

“Your gods” is attested only once, in *BM 132980, addressed to the elders of Elam in 647*-XI: “Send me Nabû-bēl-šumāti and his accomplices, and I will promptly send you your gods and make peace” (r. 15’-18’). “Your gods” here refers to the statues of the Elamite gods, which had been taken to Assyria as hostages. Assurbanipal intended to use the statues of the gods for the diplomatic deal between the elders of Elam and himself.

Mullissu, the consort of Aššur, is once mentioned with Aššur. In *CT 54 464, probably addressed to Illil-bāni, the governor of Nippur, Assurbanipal orders him to keep watch on an anonymous person and states: “See how Aššur and Mullissu, my gods, have taken from his hands whatever he had planned with his heart.” It is not surprising that Aššur and Mullissu, the Assyrian supreme god and his consort, overcome villains in order to support Assurbanipal. However, it is worth noting that Mullissu is referred to just once in all the letters from Assurbanipal. After this phrase, the text becomes fragmentary.

---

626 *ABL 945 r. 4’, *ABL 1210 r. 15, *ABL 518:8, *CT 53 908:13 and r. 2, *BM 132980 r. 18’, *ABL 295 r. 3.
627 *CT 54 464:4-7, LÚ ḫum-“mur’ / a-ga-a biṟ’-‘a’-a-nu ’-tu us-šu-[x] / lu-u pīl-qud-da-tu-nu ma-šar-ta-šú / uṣ-ra i-na ŠU.2-ku ’nu’ sa-ba-ta-šú’, “this defunct one is trying to ... get out (of the city). Be attentive, keep watch over him, (and) [... him] in your hands.
628 *CT 54 464 r. 12-14, it-ti / ŠÀ-bi-šu ú-kaṣ-ši$p$ AN.ŠÁR a ’NIN.LÍL / DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a ina ŠU.2-šu it’ ta-šu-u’.
Another goddess, Zarpanītu, the consort of Marduk, is referred to once in *ABL 926, addressed to the citizens of Babylon probably at the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal. She appears as the tutelary mother goddess of Assurbanipal since his childhood (for details, see above pp. 100-102).

Bēl and Nabû are once attested together in *CT 54 230, addressed to individuals probably in Babylon. However, the context is too broken to be translated.

Šamaš is mentioned alone twice; one case probably appears in the context of extispicy. In *ABL 290, addressed to Šīn-tabni-ūṣur, the governor of Ur, Assurbanipal writes to him: “With Šamaš, I shall extract his (= Šīn-šarru-ūṣur, the previous governor of Ur) proper intentions” behind Šīn-šarru-ūṣur’s calumny against him. However, such an extispicy has not been identified, although extispicies concerning Šīn-šarru-ūṣur (SAA 4 286 and SAA 4 302) are preserved. In the second case, in *83-1-18,511, probably addressed to the citizens of Babylon, Assurbanipal swears “[by Aššur and M]arduk, my gods [that …]” and refers to Šamaš in a broken context: “[…] his leadership, Šamaš, t[o …].”

In addition, Šamaš is attested with Nanāia, U[ṣur-am]s[a] and Arkaītu in *ABL 518, dated 646*-II-24, concerning a weeping (bikītu) ceremony. The Assyrian king states, “[through weeping and unkempt hair of body, Šamaš, Nanāia, U[ṣur-am]s[a] and Arkaītu have become reconciled, and in my reign they have delivered [all the lands into] my hands.” They appear as the gods worshipped in Ur.

“All the gods of heaven and earth” are attested on one occasion in *ABL 1022 to Tammarītu II when he took part in the campaign against Ummanaldašu III. Towards the end of the letter, Assurbanipal urges Tammarītu II to [guard] and remember [the treaty] which he made Tammarītu II swear “before [all] the gods of heaven and ea[rth].”

---

629 Frahm points out that “the theophoric elements of these names suggest that the persons mentioned come from Babylon”; see PNA 1/II, 285a.
630 *CT 54 230 r. 10’, [x x x x]x-ma ša’r chopping awl g in x x x x x x x x x x x x x. x x x x x x x.
631 *ABL 290:7-8, a a-nu-ku a-šem-šeš / TA GISH.NU11 ŠAK ša Zi-ša.
633 *ABL 1022 r. 22-24, ū [a-de-e] / ša ina IGI DINGIR.MEŠ ša AN-e ū KI [TIM x x x x x / ú-tam-mu-ka-a-n[î x x x x x x x].
Ištar is referred to once as the “[wet nurse]" of the citizens of Babylon in *K 2931, assuming that the passage has been correctly restored by Parpola. The goddess appears in the quoted message given to the Babylonian captives, who had been taken prisoner in the first battle between Assyrians and Babylonians after the revolt began. The identification of Ištar with the wet nurse is indicated by an esoteric text (SAA 3 39:19-22), Marduk Ordeal Assur Version (SAA 3 34:33), and another Marduk Ordeal from Nineveh (SAA 3 35:39). These texts state that the wet nurse of Marduk was Ištar of Nineveh and Arbela. In addition, it is known that Ištar of Nineveh was worshipped in Babylon. The message of Assurbanipal in the letter reads: “[This] no-brother has alienated you [from] your [wet nurse], [but he is going to have a hard time].” This passage implies that the citizens of Babylon had been under the protection of Ištar herself, who is the wet-nurse of Marduk and worshipped in Babylon, and who is the protector of the Assyrian king, but the treacherous Babylonian king Šamaš-šumu-ukīn separated the citizens from the goddess.

All in all, Assurbanipal basically refers to “God,” i.e., Aššur, and “Aššur, my gods” in his letters. However, he sometimes mentions Marduk for political reasons in letters when addressing the Babylonians as well as non-Babylonian peoples. Other gods and goddesses who were deeply incorporated into the Assyrian royal ideology, for instance, Ninurta and Ištar, seldom appear in my corpus. Assurbanipal often emphasizes the divine intervention in political events, although many of the incidents were deliberately caused by human beings.

Table 10: The Gods and Goddesses mentioned in the Letters from Assurbanipal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s) of god(s)</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient of Letter</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marduk</td>
<td>*ABL 926</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td>l. 2, “who reverse [Marduk]” (= Assurbanipal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk</td>
<td>*ABL 926</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>The citizens of</td>
<td>l. 6, “Hear of the might of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

635 Parpola 2004a, 234.
636 Concerning the edition and the study on *K 2931, see Parpola 2004a.
640 Parpola 2004a, 234.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marduk</th>
<th>*ABL 301</th>
<th>D (652-II-23)</th>
<th>Babylon</th>
<th>Marduk&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td>r. 17, “the one rejected by Marduk” (= Šamaš-šumu-ukīn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk</td>
<td>*ABL 571</td>
<td>D (650?)</td>
<td>[the citizens of Babylon]</td>
<td>r. 13-14, “If Marduk wants to keep them (= the citizens of Babylon) alive”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk</td>
<td>*ABL 1262</td>
<td>A (646*-XII-27)</td>
<td>[NN] from Elam</td>
<td>r. 3-4, “[...] through the act of Marduk I have descended into Elam”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēl</td>
<td>*ABL 301</td>
<td>D (652-II-23)</td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td>r. 16-17, “the troops which I have put together for Bēl” (= the citizens of Babylon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēl</td>
<td>*ABL 945</td>
<td>D (?)</td>
<td>Nabū-ušabšī</td>
<td>r. 2′-3′, “call the name of Bēl”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur</td>
<td>*K 995</td>
<td>D (?)</td>
<td>[NN]</td>
<td>r. 18′, “[through the pow]er of Aššur, fir[e will burn] the land of Akkad [...]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur</td>
<td>*ABL 1170</td>
<td>D (648*-IV-25)</td>
<td>Ummanšībar</td>
<td>ll. 5-8, “Concerning this beautiful idea which Aššur so nicely put into your heart for your lord”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur</td>
<td>*AAA 20 106</td>
<td>A (647*-VI-13)</td>
<td>Ḥundāru of Dilmun</td>
<td>r. 19-20, “[under the protection of Aššur (and) my fathers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 293</td>
<td>B (653)</td>
<td>The Gambūleans</td>
<td>ll. 12-14, “When you survived, the God himself has opened your ears.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 301</td>
<td>D (652-II-23)</td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td>ll. 23-24, “do not make yourself culpable before God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 301</td>
<td>D (652-II-23)</td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td>r. 10-11, “violating the treaty (is a matter to be settled) before God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*CT 53 142</td>
<td>D (?)</td>
<td>[The citizens of Babylon]</td>
<td>l. 14′, “let him pla[ce] for God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*CT 53 142</td>
<td>D (?)</td>
<td>[The citizens of Babylon]</td>
<td>r. 3, “God has [opened] your ears”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 539</td>
<td>D (?)</td>
<td>[Nabū-ušabšī]</td>
<td>r. 7-9, “those who have sinned against my treaty — your eyes will notice how God will once again swiftly call to account those who tampered with the treaty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*K 995</td>
<td>D (?)</td>
<td>[NN]</td>
<td>r. 11′, “God [...] the destruction which he wro[te]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*CT 53 908</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tammarītu II</td>
<td>r. 8-10, “God (himself) has intervened [with] his bow, [beca]use my name is upon you” (= Tammarītu II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 295</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Rāšeans</td>
<td>r. 4-6, “[The day] when God opens his ears to m[y word]s, let him come and stay with Tammarītu”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 1242</td>
<td>A (?)</td>
<td>Sārdūrī (Issār-dūrī) of Urartu</td>
<td>ll. 5-6, “[... e]ver since God [...]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*AAA 20 106</td>
<td>A (647*-VI-13)</td>
<td>Ḥundāru of Dilmun</td>
<td>l. 19, “[... God (AN)to [...]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 1165</td>
<td>A (?)</td>
<td>[NN]</td>
<td>r. 1-3, “Perhaps God himself has commanded the destruction of Babylonia. What can we say?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Line(s)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>*ABL 1165</td>
<td>A (?)</td>
<td>[NN]</td>
<td>r. 3-4, “Before God, we […]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 1210</td>
<td>D (652-VII-3)</td>
<td>[NN]</td>
<td>r. 6-9, “Under the aegis of Aššûr and my gods, who have given me faith, there will be many ho[r]ses”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 287</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>The citizens of Nipp[ur]</td>
<td>r. 7-8, “I swear by Aššûr, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 292</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Il[lil-bân]i</td>
<td>ll. 5-6, “the iron sword of Aššûr, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 297</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Nabû-[ušabši], the citizens of Uruk</td>
<td>ll. 5-6, “[the iron sword of] Aššûr, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 290</td>
<td>D (650?)</td>
<td>Sin-tabni-ušur</td>
<td>ll. 12-13, “did Aššûr, my gods, not make me […]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 1170</td>
<td>D (648*-IV-25)</td>
<td>Unmanšibar</td>
<td>ll. 10-11, “I swear by Aššûr, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 1040</td>
<td>D or A</td>
<td>Tammarîtu II</td>
<td>l. 7, “[Through] the decision of Aššûr and [my] gods […]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*CT 53 908</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tammarîtu II</td>
<td>II. 3-4, “I have heard what Aššûr and my gods have done; [that] they have faced the fighting, and (that) [my troops] have gone and inflicted a massacre in Bit-Bunakkâ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*BM 132980</td>
<td>A (647*-XI)</td>
<td>The elders of Elam</td>
<td>r. 2’, “[I swear b[y Aššûr and my gods]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*BM 132980</td>
<td>A (647*-XI)</td>
<td>The elders of Elam</td>
<td>r. 18’, “I swear by Aššûr, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 1260</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ambap[pi] and the Râšeans</td>
<td>r. 16-17, “I shall do as Aššûr and my gods make me deem best”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*CT 54 116</td>
<td>A (?)</td>
<td>[the citizens of an Elamite city]</td>
<td>l. 9’, “I swear by Aššûr, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, my gods</td>
<td>*CT 54 116</td>
<td>A (?)</td>
<td>[the citizens of an Elamite city]</td>
<td>r. 3’-4’, “[I swear by Aššûr, my gods]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk</td>
<td>*ABL 539</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[Nabû-ušabši]</td>
<td>l. 13, “[keeping on the side of] the representative of Aššûr, Marduk”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk</td>
<td>*ABL 539</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[Nabû-ušabši]</td>
<td>r. 10-11, “you remain under the protection of Aššûr and Marduk”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>*K 2931</td>
<td>D (before 652-II-23)</td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td>l. 3, “I swear by Aššûr, Marduk, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 301</td>
<td>D (652-II-23)</td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td>ll. 6-7, “I swear by Aššûr, Marduk, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 571</td>
<td>D (650)</td>
<td>[The citizens of Babylon]</td>
<td>r. 16-17, “if n[ot], I have prayed to Aššûr and Marduk, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>*83-1-18,511</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[the citizens of Babylon]</td>
<td>l. 4’, “[I swear [by Aššûr, M]arduk, my gods]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>*CT 54 464</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[Illil-bâni]</td>
<td>r. 20, “[Aššûr and M]arduk, [my] gods […]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>*ABL 295</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Râšeans</td>
<td>r. 7-9, “I shall do as Aššûr and”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God(s)</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Translation Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>#ABL 1165</td>
<td>[NN]</td>
<td>r. 4-6, “[I shall do] as Aššur, Marduk, my [gods] make me deem best”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Marduk, my gods</td>
<td>#ABL 945</td>
<td>D?</td>
<td>r. 4’, “and then present them to the gods”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gods</td>
<td>#ABL 1210</td>
<td>D (652-VII-3)</td>
<td>r. 15, “of the gods […]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gods</td>
<td>#ABL 518</td>
<td>A (646*-II-24)</td>
<td>ll. 7-10, after the gods became angry, they [… left] their abode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gods</td>
<td>#CT 53 908</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tammaritu II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gods</td>
<td>#CT 53 908</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tammaritu II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gods</td>
<td>#BM 132980</td>
<td>A (647*-XI)</td>
<td>The elders of Elam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gods</td>
<td>#CT 295</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Rāšeans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My gods</td>
<td>#ABL 541</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[the Gambūleans]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My gods</td>
<td>#ABL 1002</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sīn-tabni-uṣur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your gods</td>
<td>#BM 132980</td>
<td>A (647*-XI)</td>
<td>The elders of Elam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur, Mullissu, my gods</td>
<td>#CT 54 464</td>
<td>D (?)</td>
<td>Illil-bānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarpanītu</td>
<td>#ABL 926</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>The citizens of Babylon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēl, Nabû</td>
<td>#CT 54 230</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[The citizens of Babylon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš</td>
<td>#ABL 290</td>
<td>D (650?)</td>
<td>Sīn-tabni-uṣur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš</td>
<td>#83-1-18,511</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[the citizens of Babylon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš, Nanāia, U[ṣur-amas]sa and Arkaītu</td>
<td>#ABL 518</td>
<td>A (646*-II-24)</td>
<td>Kudurru and the citizens of Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[All] the gods of heaven and earth

*ABL 1022

A

Tammaritu II

r. 22-24, “[the treaty] which I made you swear before [all] the gods of heaven and earth!”

(Ištar)  

*K 2931

D (before 652-II-23)

The citizens of Babylon

r. 14'-16', “[This] no-brother has alienated you [from] your [wet nurse], [but he is going to have a hard time]”

2.1.6. The Image of the Assyrian King in the Letters of Assurbanipal

The image of the Assyrian king was presented both visually and verbally. The visual images of the king took the form of iconography and public festivities, while the verbal transmission of the king’s image was carried out through monumental inscriptions, hymns, epics, myths, and correspondence. My research corpus, mostly consisting of letters from Assurbanipal, reflects the image of the Assyrian king which he claimed and wished to convey. The following table shows the image that appears in the letters from Assurbanipal and in a letter addressed to him.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images of the Assyrian king</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Son of God/Goddess</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>*ABL 292:13, “father and mother did not raise me, [I grew up in her (Zarpanitu’s) lap]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devotion to the gods</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>*ABL 292:2, “the one who reveres [Marduk]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>*ABL 292:6-8, “Hear of the might of Marduk[ ...], behold his august heroism [...], praise his great godhead [...]!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>*ABL 292:11-12, “Ever since my childhood until now I have trusted in the Lady Zarpanitu”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>*ABL 541 r. 2-3, “I swear by my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*K 2931:3’, “I swear by Aššur, Marduk, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 301:6-7, “I swear by Aššur, Marduk, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 287 r. 7-8, “I swear by Aššur, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 1170:10-11, “I swear by Aššur, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 1210 r. 7 “Under the aegis of Aššur and my gods, who have given me faith, there will be many ho[rs]es.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*BM 132980 r. 18, “I swear by Aššur, my gods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*CT 54 116;9 and r. 3’, “I swear by Aššur, my gods”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                            | A     | *ABL 1146:9'-12’, “And [I am thin]king about you and your
| Righteousness, Justice | **B** *ABL 292:14, “[The great gods] presented me with truth and righteousness”*

**D** *ABL 290:8, “With Šamaš I shall extract his proper intention”*

**A** *ABL 1146:7-8’, “My eyes are upon you. You returned your favour to me, so that I will do justice to you”*

| Authority | **B** *ABL 292:15, “[The great gods] (…) decreed a good fate to me”*

**D** *83-1-18,511:11’, “[Your freedom come into existence [in] my hands]”*

**A** *ABL 972:4-5’, “I am the human being who gave (him) his land, his gods, and his kingship, and removed the fornicating dog!”*

**A** *AAA 20 106 r. 25-29, “Don’t you [know] that I will give the kingship of Dilmun to you? You shall sit there and live under my protection, and my watch will be established there in this manner.”*

| Mercifulness | **D** *K 2931:7′-13′, “After his revolt, as soon as I had robed (in purple) all the Babylonians who were captured at the first fighting and taken into my presence, and had tied a mina of silver to the waist of each of them with the words, ‘it is to be spent on bread and water,’ [I sen]t them to Babylon I sent them (prisoners of the first fighting) to Babylon”*

**D** *ABL 301:15-18, “Your brotherhood with the Assyrians and your privileged status which I have established remain valid until the present day”*

**D** *ABL 301 r. 5-7, “it will not be a burden; it is nothing, since the name is very good”*

**D** *ABL 290 r. 4-6, “was that not because I, knowing your loyalty, had mercy again to you?”*

**D** *ABL 289:6-9, “I hold you in good regard and have dissociated you from the crime of Nabû-bēl-šumāti, the whore of Menānu”*

**D** *ABL 291 r. 9-10, “and in due course you will see yourself pardoned”*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punisher of sinners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 292:24-r. 2, “Whoever keeps his hands off him, I will delete his posterity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ABL 1240 (from Sārdūrī III):8′-15′, “When at the time of your father Munuḫi was calumniated in this very manner, did I not rule to the effect that the king of the gods, the exalted one, the ruler of the entire universe delivered in the hands of his worshipper sinners (in every direction), before and behind, right and left, above and below?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating the people equally</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 287 r. 14-15, “I am equally favourably disposed towards all of you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*ABL 295:6-8, “I do not contest my friend or my enemy. I do good to everybody.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granting favour</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 539 r. 21-22, “favours that I have already granted to you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 290 s. 1-2, “the favours that I shall render to you until the time of (your) grandchildren”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 289:8-9, “what rewards and favours you will have from me”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>*ABL 1022 r. 19-24, “I have [done] and given to you this favor which not (even) a father has done for a son”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*ABL 1260:5-6, “From the beginning I have rendered favours to Elam”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 543 r. 5-7 // *ABL 1108 r. 2-4 // *ABL 1244:7′-8′, “When I saw that they were weakening and dying, I sent orders to release them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacemaker</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*BM 132980 r. 17’, “I will promptly send you your gods and make peace”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*ABL 972:2-3, “he would have seen whether I am the peacemaker”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*ABL 1260 r. 8-10, “I shall go in the tower to negotiate a peace (lit. brotherly relations)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of the gods</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 539:13, “the representative (šanē) of Aššur (and) Marduk”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord of the kings</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*ABL 1380 r. 20, “[l]ord of the kings”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. The Revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn: A Historical Context of the Corpus and Overview
This section briefly reviews the events related to the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in chronological order with particular attention to my corpus. The reconstructed history for this period is based on the sources only from the Assyrian side, hence authors looked at things from the Assyrian perspective and some documents are propagandistic. Narratives from the rebel side are not preserved. Additionally, since most of the letters are not dated, even the relative order of some events is still unclear. However, I will make an attempt to relate the letters to the historical framework. The political history of the rebellion has been examined in detail by Frame.641

2.2.1. Before the Revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn
During his lifetime, Esarhaddon, king of both Assyria and Babylonia (680-669 BC), officially appointed his sons Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn respectively to the thrones of Assyria and Babylonia. To guarantee this royal succession and to legitimize it by the gods, Esarhaddon imposed a treaty in the middle of Ayyāru (II) of 672 BC.642

Several treaty tablets of this royal succession treaty have survived. At least eight manuscripts of the treaty were found in 1955 in the Nabû temple (Ezida) at Calah, modern Nimrud, the earlier Assyrian capital in the 9th century BC.643 The treaty parties of these manuscripts are Median vassals who ruled the Assyrian eastern periphery as city lords (in Akkadian bēl ālī), their descendants, the people they rule, and all the people in Assyria under Esarhaddon’s control.644 Concerning the reason why the treaty tablets with Median vassals were found in Calah, Steymans has proposed that Median vassals probably visited the Nabû temple in Calah which was the administrative centre of the Assyrian cavalry in order to deliver horses as a tribute, and they may have been forced to take the loyalty oath in the temple. He has further stated that the Assyrians kept the treaty tablets in Calah because they considered the treaty tablets with the seal of Aššur as the symbol of the divinity or a

641 Frame 1992, 131-190.
642 Lauinger 2012, 112. The manuscript from Tell Tayinat is dated 663-II-16 (or 19); see VIII 663, ITL.GUD.SLSÁ UD- "16[+ x]-KĀM. Lauinger comments: “The top of the numeral designating the day is damaged. The numeral is at least 16 but could be as high as 19. This date is in accordance with the Nimrud manuscripts, two of which date to the 18th and one of which dates to the 16th” (Lauinger 2012, 122); SAA 2 6:664-665, ITL.GUD.SLSÁ UD-18-KĀM (var. Q: UD-16-KĀM) l lim-mu  mdp-EN–PAB LÚ.GAR.KUR URU.BĀD–LUGAL-ur-ku "18th (Q: 16th) day of Ayyāru, eponym of Nabû-bēlu-usur (672), governor of Dur-Šarruku”; BIWA, 15f and 208, A i 12 // F i 11 ina ITLGU.  ḋ-a EN te-ni-se-e-ti UD-12-KĀM (F: UD-18-KĀM) “In the month Ayyāru, the month of Ea, the lord of mankind, on 12th (F: 18th).”
643 SAA 2 6. SAA 2 6 is the composite text based on eight manuscripts. See also Watanabe 1987, Wiseman 1958.
644 SAA 2 6:3-10 and a note on l. 3.
holy icon and the Assyrians were concerned that the semi-nomadic Medians could not take care of the tablets properly. Three small fragments of the treaty tablet were also found at Assur.

A recent excavation in 2009 unearthed another manuscript of the succession treaty from the Neo-Assyrian temple at Tell Tayinat in Turkey, ancient Unqi, which was the capital of the Assyrian province of Kullania. In the manuscript of Tell Tayinat, treaty partners are an unnamed governor (bēl pāhibi) of the province of Kullania, sixteen persons or groups referred to by their professions, and “all the men of his hands, great and small, as many as there are.” Since the manuscript from Tell Tayinat clearly shows that the text is rotated along its vertical axis in order to read the reverse and that it is pierced through its horizontal axis in order to be supported upright, Lauinger has suggested that the treaty tablet was displayed in the temple.

The treaty is referred to in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, where he states that Esarhaddon assembled the people of the land of Assyria, great and small, from the upper sea to the lower sea and made them take the treaty (and) an oath of the great gods. The letters (SAA 10 6, SAA 10 7) from Issār-šumu-ēreš, the chief scribe, to Esarhaddon indicate that scribes of Nin[evah], Kilizi, Arbail, Assur, and citizens of Nineveh and Calah, and scholars in the palace also joined the treaty.

On the 10th day of Araḫsamna (VIII) in 669 BC, Esarhaddon died of disease on the way to a campaign against Egypt. In accordance with the succession treaty, Assurbanipal ascended the throne of Assyria in Kislimu (IX) in that year. Probably soon after his accession, Zakūtu, queen of Sennacherib and mother of Esarhaddon, imposed a treaty (SAA 2 8) which pledges loyalty to Assurbanipal on the Assyrian royal family including Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the subjects of Assurbanipal, and the Assyrians. Assurbanipal himself addressed *ABL 926 to the citizens of

---

645 Steymans 2013, 9-10; Steymans 2006, 342-344.
647 Lauinger 2012, 90; Lauinger 2011.
648 Lauinger 2012, 90-92 and 112, T i 3-12, “the governor of Kunalia, with the deputy, the major-domo, the scribes, the chariot drivers, the third men, the village managers, the information officers, the prefects, the cohort commanders, the charioteers, the cavalrymen, the exempt, the outriders, the specialists, the shield bearers (?), the craftsmen, (and) with [all] the men [of his hands], great and small, as many as there are.” See also Lauinger 2011, 9.
649 Steymans 2013, 9-10; Steymans 2006, 342-344.
650 BIWA, 15f and 208, A I 8-22 // F I 7-17.
652 Grayson 1975, 127, no. 14:34. Since the year 669 BC is the accession year of Assurbanipal, his first regnal year started in the year 668 BC.
653 PNA 3/II, 1433.
654 SAA 2 8. The treaty was concluded “with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, his (Assurbanipal’s) equal brother (PAB ta-li-me-šū), Šamaš-mētu-uballṭ and the rest of his (Assurbanipal’s) brothers, the royal seed, with the magnates and the governors,
Babylon probably at the beginning of his reign and showed his good will towards them, his devotion to Marduk and Zarpanitu, and his prosperous reign (see below pp. 171-174).

On the 23rd of Nisannu (I) of the following year 668 BC, a query (SAA 4 262) was performed to determine whether or not Šamaš-šumu-ukīn should escort a statue of Marduk to Babylon.655 On the 14th/24th (Chronicle 1) or 25th (Esrhaddon Chronicle) of Ayyaru (II), Šamaš-šumu-ukīn entered Babylon with the statue of Marduk and ascended the throne of Babylonia.656 Concerning his accession, Assurbanipal claims in his inscriptions from Babylon, Sippar, Borsippa, and Uruk that he appointed Šamaš-šumu-ukīn to the kingship of Babylon,657 but he never mentions that Esarhaddon appointed Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as the crown prince of Babylon.

Babylonia now had its own king, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. However, the city assemblies of Babylon and other ancient cities of Babylonia continued to function as administrative bodies and Babylonia remained a part of the Assyrian Empire. Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was regularly called Assurbanipal’s “equal brother” (aḫu talīmu) in contemporary royal inscriptions, but he was expected to remain a loyal vassal of Assurbanipal. His authority was very limited (see below pp. 150-156).658 Instead, Assurbanipal had extensive authority over Babylonia as Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s overlord, and he directly received reports about both domestic and foreign affairs from Babylonian officials. Perhaps Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s raison d’être as king was to have a member of the Assyrian royal family in charge of Babylon.

2.2.2. The Outbreak of the Revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in 652 BC
At the beginning of 652 BC, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn started his revolt. We know from *K 2931 that a fight between Assyrians and Babylonians took place, a number of Babylonians were taken captive in the battle, and Assurbanipal sent them back to Babylon (see below pp. 201-203). The letter does not record which side won the battle. After these events, on the 23rd of Ayyaru (II), 652 BC, Assurbanipal sent *ABL 301 to the citizens of Babylon and urged them not to side with Šamaš-
šumu-ukīn (see below pp. 203-206). From Ayyāru (II) to Ṭebētu (X) of this year, the Akītu Chronicle records that a major-domo (rab-bīti) levied troops in Akkad, although it is not mentioned whether he worked for Šamaš-šumu-ukīn or Assurbanipal.659

Many questions about the outbreak of the rebellion remain open because no clear answers are provided by the extant texts. The main question is why Šamaš-šumu-ukīn revolted against Assurbanipal. It can easily be imagined that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had been dissatisfied with his limited authority and status as the king of Babylon because he was the eldest living son of Esarhaddon.660 Radner has proposed that Esarhaddon may have planned to split the Assyrian Empire into Assyria and Babylonia equally but since Assurbanipal treated Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as his vassal, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in the end renounced allegiance to him.661 However, it does not seem that Esarhaddon intended to divide the empire evenly. For instance, the political inequality between Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is indicated by the Esarhaddon Succession Treaty in which Assurbanipal appears dominantly (SAA 2 6; also see below pp. 144-146). Rather, Esarhaddon’s aim in the “division” was to put the theological reconciliation with Babylonia into practice.662 Frame has proposed that Assurbanipal’s involvement in Babylonian affairs made Šamaš-šumu-ukīn revolt against Assurbanipal. He has further stated that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s limited authority, reliance on Assyrian military forces, and possibly the payment of tribute to Assyria caused Šamaš-šumu-ukīn to become hostile towards Assurbanipal. He also added that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had had an axe to grind ever since 672 BC.663 Additionally, Parpola has suggested that replacing a traditional governor of Babylonia (šākin ṭēmi) with an Assyrian governor (pāḥụtu) in 656 BC may have caused the revolt.664 All these suggestions are plausible.

It is also not entirely clear why Šamaš-šumu-ukīn chose to start the rebellion exactly in 652 BC after having been loyal to Assurbanipal for 16 years, ever since his succession.665 It seems that there are at least four possible reasons. First, since Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was of Assyrian royal origin, it probably took him long to win Babylonian city dwellers, tribal groups in Babylonia, and

659 Grayson 1975, 131, no. 16:9-12.
660 PNA 3/II, 1205. See also SAA 10 185:10-11, “your eldest son you have set to the kingship in Babylon”.
662 See also p. 6, n. 16.
664 Parpola 2004b, 8, n. 17.
665 In the previous year 653 BC, Assurbanipal carried out a campaign against Elam and subjugated the country. Perhaps this campaign aroused anti-Assyrian sentiment in Babylonia. Concerning the campaign, see BIWA, 95f and 222f, B IV 18-86 // C V 24-92.
surrounding counties over to his side. Second, Babylonia increased its economic strength in the middle of the 650s (see below p. 153). This economic growth could have made Šamaš-šumu-ukîn more confident that Babylonia was able to withstand a war with Assyria. Third, an Assyrian punitive military campaign against Elam and the Gambûlu in 653 BC would have provoked strong reactions from anti-Assyrian elements within and outside Assyria and Šamaš-šumu-ukîn may have calculated that this gave him an opportunity to build up a strong anti-Assyrian coalition with Elam. A fourth reason probably was that the rebuilding of Babylon’s walls, which already started soon after Šamaš-šumu-ukîn’s accession at his initiative, was not completed in the desired strength until late in the 650s.

It is also not well known how Šamaš-šumu-ukîn started the rebellion and whether he declared independence from the Assyrian Empire. However, as mentioned above in this section, two letters from Assurbanipal (*K 2931 and *ABL 301) describe the very first phase of the rebellion. Both indicate that Šamaš-šumu-ukîn vilified Assurbanipal to the citizens of Babylon and he was possibly intent on abolishing their privileged status.

The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal (Edition A compiled in 645 BC) record the initial suspicious behaviour of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn. They state that he deceived the pro-Assyrian citizens of Babylon and sent them to Nineveh to inquire about the welfare of Assurbanipal in order to buy time before the revolt. They further state that he did not adhere to the treaty of Assurbanipal and that he encouraged the people of Akkad, Chaldea, Aramu, and the Sealand, who were obedient servants of Assurbanipal, to take part in the rebellion. Once Šamaš-šumu-ukîn gained support from them and from the kings of Elam, Gutium, Amurrû, and Meluḫḫa, he shut the gates of Babylon, Borsippa, and
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666 BIWA, 95f and 222f, B IV 18-86 // C V 24-92.
668 SAA 13 168 (= ABL 119), a letter from Urdu-Aḫḫēšu (“High official active in Babylon”; see PNA 3/II, 1395b-1396a, no. 7) to Assurbanipal, the reverse of which (r. 8-16) reads, after reporting on the rebuilding of Esaggil: “The king of Babylon (= Šamaš-šumu-ukîn) has told us: ‘You should rebuild the continuous enclosure wall (dūru läḫītu kašmānum) of Esaggil ... Let the oth[er] masons glaze the kiln-fired bricks for the enclosures of Esagg[il].’ The king, my lord, should know (this).’ The letter is not dated, but Parpola has suggested that it can be dated to Nisannu (I) of 668 BC. See Parpola 1983b, 283, n. 522.
669 RIMB 2 B.6.32.1. The inscription inscribed on clay cylinders uncovered in Babylon commemorates the restoration of Nêmet-Enlî, the outer city wall of Babylon, and its gates carried out by Assurbanipal. Its terminus ante quem is before the outbreak of the revolt because it mentions Šamaš-šumu-ukîn favourably. See also Holloway 2001, 259; Porter 1993a, 56; George 1992, 344-346.
670 BIWA, 75 and 257.
671 BIWA, 39-40 and 232-233, A III 70-93.
Sippar and prevented offerings from Assurbanipal for their city gods. It is not clear exactly when the gates were closed.

An unknown author wrote SAA 18 164 to Assurbanipal and reported the situation when the citizens of Babylon locked the city gate: “The Babylonians have several times performed the ritual on [the city gate, on the xth day th]ey [have lo]cked it. And [Šam]aš-šumu-ukīn has spoken to them as [follows]: ‘[If the king of Assyria] and your brothers who [are] in [Assyria should march] against you, [the gods …] will make them retreat and throw […] in manacles.’ (…) [Nobody] has entered or left [B]abylon.” It should be noted that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had made a speech in order to appeal to the citizens of the city.

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn managed to spread the rebellion, but Babylonia was not politically unified under his authority. Some cities in central and southern Babylonia such as Nippur, Uruk, and Ur remained loyal to Assurbanipal. Cutha also sided with Assyria though the city was in northern Babylonia. These cities faced predicaments, but Assurbanipal attempted to help and support them.

After two months Assurbanipal sent *ABL 301 to the citizens of Babylon, he probably considered sending his troops to capture Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. An extispicy query SAA 4 279 dated 652-IV-17 was performed to decide whether or not Šamaš-šumu-ukīn would fall into the hands of Assurbanipal’s troops. Its result was unfavourable and no extant text records that Assurbanipal at this time launched a campaign against Babylonia.

The revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn deteriorated the relationship between Assyria and Elam because Ummanigaš II, whom Assurbanipal had installed on the Elamite throne after the defeat of Teumman in 653 BC, took sides with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal record that Ummanigaš II did not keep the treaty, accepted bribes from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, went to his aid, and took away the property of Esaggil and Ezida. The inscriptions further state that the Assyrian troops stationed in the city (var. the land) of Mangisu within the city of Sumandir defeated the
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672 BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 93-117.
673 BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 107-114.
674 PNA 3/II, 1383a-1384b, no. 3.
675 BIWA, 108-109 and 229, B VII 3-8; BIWA, 41 and 233, A III 136-137.
676 BIWA, 41 and 233, A III 138.
677 BIWA, 148 and 229, C VII 120-129.
Elamite forces sent by Ummanigaš II. It is not known exactly when Ummanigaš II switched sides and when the battle took place. Ummanigaš II kept his throne even after losing the battle.

In Assurbanipal’s letter to Menānu, *ABL 1380 (see above pp. 19-20 and 42), Ummanigaš II is described as a traitor to whom Assurbanipal had rendered favours but who had sinned against the treaty by siding with Assurbanipal’s adversary and crossing over to the territory of Assurbanipal. Towards the end of the letter, Assurbanipal may well refer to the gift from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and the Elamite forces defeated by the Assyrian troops, as recorded in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal.

We know from the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal that Ummanigaš II was eventually killed by Tammarītu II, who became the king of Elam (his first tenure during c. 652-c. 649 BC). He also received bribes from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, came to his aid, and rushed to fight against Assurbanipal’s army (see also pp. 46-47). However, it is difficult to date Tammarītu II’s accession and his battle with the Assyrian troops.

The tension between Assyria and Babylonia rapidly grew in the last three months of 652 BC. The Akītu Chronicle records that hostilities began between Assyria and Akkad on X-19. The Šamaš-šumu-ukīn Chronicle relates that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn withdrew before the enemy into Babylon on XI-8. This statement is significant because it indicates that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn came out of Babylon for the first time after he had provoked the rebellion. In addition, astronomical diaries register that a battle between Assyria and Babylonia took place on XII-12. The outcome and the location of this battle are not mentioned. Lastly, the Akītu Chronicle and astronomical diaries record that the armies of Assyria and Babylonia clashed at Ḫirītu and the Babylonian army was defeated on XII-27.
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679 Following the description of the battle, the inscriptions add that Ummanigaš II detained the messengers from Assurbanipal, see BIWA, 110 and 229, B VII 36-39 // C VIII 27-29.
682 Grayson 1975, 131, no. 16:11.
683 The infinitive form of the verb is erēbu “to enter” with the ventive (TU-ba). Thus it is literally translated as “the king came into Babylon before the enemy.”
684 Grayson 1975, 131, no. 16:12.
685 Sachs and Hunger 1988, 44f, no. -651 iv 10’.
686 Sachs and Hunger 1988, 44f, no. -651 iv 10’.
689 Following the description of the battle, the inscriptions add that Ummanigaš II detained the messengers from Assurbanipal, see BIWA, 110 and 229, B VII 36-39 // C VIII 27-29.
692 Grayson 1975, 131, no. 16:11.
693 The infinitive form of the verb is erēbu “to enter” with the ventive (TU-ba). Thus it is literally translated as “the king came into Babylon before the enemy.”
694 Grayson 1975, 131, no. 16:12.
695 Sachs and Hunger 1988, 44f, no. -651 iv 10’.
696 Sachs and Hunger 1988, 44f, no. -651 iv 10’.
697 The infinitive form of the verb is erēbu “to enter” with the ventive (TU-ba). Thus it is literally translated as “the king came into Babylon before the enemy.”
2.2.3. The Second Year of the Revolt: 651 BC
Except for a battle at Cutha between Assyria and Babylonia, no major armed conflicts are recorded in the chronicles. However, royal correspondence indicates that violence erupted several times and many extispicies concerning the revolt were performed in this year.

The Akitu Chronicle records that there were [insu]rections in Assyria and Akkad in Nisannu (I), 651 BC, and the New Year’s festival was not celebrated.\(^\text{687}\)

By the same month, Nabû-bēl-šumāti, the leader of the Sealand, became treacherous. On the 4th of Nisannu (I), an extispicy was performed to determine whether or not Nabû-bēl-šumāti would do battle with Assyrian troops or allies of Assurbanipal (SAA 4 280). In the query, Nabû-bēl-šumāti is described as a traitor who did not keep the favour of Assurbanipal and disregarded it haughtily. In addition, the query reveals that Assurbanipal had heard that Nabû-bēl-šumāti had mustered archers in Elam and was coming. This statement shows Nabû-bēl-šumāti’s strong connection with Elam. The result of the query was unfavourable. An extispicy SAA 4 319 dated on the 9th of [Nis]annu (I) was carried out to determine if a letter sent to Assurbanipal was reliable. This letter might have been sent from the rebel side.

In Ayyaru (II), Assurbanipal became ill. A query dated on the 26th of that month was carried out to examine whether the nature of Assurbanipal’s illness was light or serious (SAA 4 317). The result of the extispicy is not preserved, but the illness was not fatal because he did not lose his life on this occasion.

In the middle of 651 BC, Elam made a threatening move against Assurbanipal. The Elamite king at this time was Tammarītu II (c. 652-c. 649 BC). Probably in Abu (V),\(^\text{688}\) an extispicy SAA 4 281 was performed to determine if the Elamites would mobilize and join the war.\(^\text{689}\) Its result was unfavourable.
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\(^{687}\) Grayson 1975, 132, no. 16:17-19.

\(^{688}\) Frame 1992, 145, n. 56.

\(^{689}\) SAA 4 281. Starr reads the damaged sign for the month of the date as Addāru (XII), but Frame reads it as Abu (V) because the extispicy period ranges between the 8th of Abu (V) and the 8th of Ulālu (VI) (Frame 1992, 145-146). Klauber, the previous editor of queries, also reads Abu (Klauber 1913, 140, no. 128 r. 13).
Cutha was located only 30 km northeast of Babylon, but the city remained loyal to Assurbanipal when Šamaš-šumu-ukīn started the revolt. The Šamaš-šumu-ukīn Chronicle records that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn mustered his army, marched to Cutha, took the city, defeated the Assyrian army, and captured the statue of Nergal on the 9th of the intercalary month Ulūlu (VI2). This is the only official record that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn himself achieved victory over Assurbanipal. Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had possibly obtained intelligence about Assurbanipal’s sickness and decided to utilize the opportunity to attack Cutha. He may also have timed this military action with the threatening Elamite move. The Cutheans were possibly involved in the battle if the restoration by Grayson is correct.

At the battle of Cutha, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn captured Assyrian prisoners. Nabû-šumu-lēšir, an Assyrian official who was stationed at the city of Bīrāti located on the Euphrates in the border zone between Assyria and Babylonia, mentioned them in SAA 18 147 (not dated). He reports to Assurbanipal that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn sent one hundred Bīrāteans and five Assyrians who had been taken prisoner in Cutha to the Nabatean king Natnu as an extra gift when the Nabatean emissaries came to see Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. He does not explain how and when the Bīrāteans were captured, but they were likely taken prisoner when Bīrāti was destroyed and looted presumably by the supporters of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. By giving prisoners as a gift, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn probably sought an alliance with the Nabateans.

However, the Nabateans did not take sides with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Since they were active in the Syro-Arabian desert region, they were involved in troubles with other Arab tribes such as the Qedarites. The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal state that they had never contacted the ancestors of Assurbanipal. However, after the rebellious Iauta’, king of the Qedarites, sought refuge with their king Natnu, the latter was afraid and voluntarily sent his messenger(s) to Assurbanipal in order to conclude a peace treaty and to become a vassal of Assurbanipal, and then Assurbanipal imposed a
yearly tribute (mandattu) on Natnu. The submission of Natnu to Assurbanipal probably took place sometime between 650 and 647 BC. After the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was crushed, Natnu eventually withheld his tribute and raised troops together with Abī-Iate’, king of the Qedarites, against Assurbanipal, but they were defeated.

In addition to Cutha, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn took part in an action against Kār-Nergal in the vicinity of Cutha. In SAA 18 183 (not dated), Aplāia, a high official from Dilbat, claims to be an ally of Assurbanipal by saying that when Šamaš-šumu-ukīn went out to Kār-Nergal against the camp of Assurbanipal he was in the king’s camp. Since Kār-Nergal was not far from Cutha, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s march to the city may well have been associated with the battle of Cutha. It is unknown whether or not an actual fight between Assyrians and Babylonians broke out at Kār-Nergal. The exact date of this event is unknown, but it predates the siege of Babylon started on 650-IV-11.

Following the description of the battle in Cutha (651-VI-2-9), the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn Chronicle refers to magnates (LŪ.GAL.ME) and a horse rider in a broken context. Regarding the magnates, Grayson has suggested that the Assyrian officers rebelled, while Millard has proposed that this section mentions the nobles of Assyria who were captured by Nabû-bēl-šumāti of the Sealand, and the rider went to Ša-pi-Bēl, the city of the Gambūlu tribe. On the other hand, Frame has assumed that this entry could be related to the insurrections in Assyria and Akkad in 651 BC recorded in the Akītu Chronicle and to a fragmentary extispicy report SAA 4 318 performed on the 4th of Šabātu (XI) in 651 BC. The Šamaš-šumu-ukīn Chronicle also mentions an individual, but only the last
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700 Eph’al 1982, 142-144.
701 PNA I/I, 11b.
703 PNA I/I, 118a, no. 30.
704 Saggs 2001, 19-21 and 33-34; Saggs 1956, 50-51, NL no. 35 (ND 2452):23 and the note on l. 23; Saggs 1955, 23-24, NL no. 1 (ND 2632):35. Saggs has suggested that Kār-Nergal was on the canal that linked Cutha and Sippar, and that its name shows the special connection with Cutha because Nergal was the patron god of the city. Black has added that Kār-Nergal was located on the Tigris at approximately the latitude of Cutha (Black 1987, 18). See also Parpola and Porter 2001, Map 10 and p. 11.
705 Saggs 1975, 129, no. 15:11-12, [x (x) U]D-27-KÁM LŪ.GAL.ME šá KUR–a[Dš–šur x x (x)] / [x x (x)] x ra-kib ANš.KUR.RA x [x x x x (x)] x DÜ’-ma.
707 Millard 1964, 26-27.
708 Grayson 1975, 132, no. 16, 17.
709 SAA 4 318, r. 1 ’-2’, “[In]decisive [extra], to be performed again, concerning the land.”
710 Frame 1992, 149. Since SAA 4 318 is badly damaged, it is unclear what “the land” means. Nevertheless, Frame suggests that the extispicy could have been performed to determine whether the Assyrians would support Assurbanipal during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn or whether they would support the rebels. He further states that Assurbanipal may have had domestic problems and did not send a huge army to Babylonia to crush the revolt when it broke out.
In spite of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s success in Cutha, it does not seem that the rebels gained the upper hand over Assyria anywhere else. For instance, according to an extispicy (SAA 4 282) dated on the 15th of Tašrītu (VII), Assurbanipal heard the rumour that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was fleeing to Elam. Its result was unfavourable. Another extispicy SAA 4 283 was performed on the 16th of Araḫsamna (VIII) to determine whether or not Šamaš-šumu-ukīn would fall into the hands of Assyrian troops if Assyrians marched against Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. This was favourable.

In this situation, Nippur fell to the rebel side by the day between the 3rd and 9th of Kislimu (IX), but the city was eventually regained by the Assyrians by the 18th of Šabātu (XI). This can be deduced from the fact that, after the revolt broke out, economic documents at pro-Assyrian Babylonian cities were usually dated by the regnal years of Assurbanipal. However, one economic document from Nippur, IM 57923, is dated on the day between the 3rd and 9th of Kislimu (IX), 18th year of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. This indicates that the city fell under his influence. About two months later, on the 11th of Šabātu (XI), an extispicy (SAA 4 285) was performed to find out if Šamaš-šumu-ukīn would leave Babylon and flee. This extispicy report implies that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was losing support in Babylon. About a week later, the Assyrians had regained Nippur, as we know from two economic documents, IM 57901 and IM 57902 (a duplicate of the former text), dated on the 18th of Šabātu (XI) by the regnal year of Assurbanipal. Probably after Nippur had returned under the control of Assyria, an undated extispicy (SAA 4 289) was carried out to determine whether Tammarītu II (c. 652-c. 649 BC), king of Elam, would make a hostile
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711 Grayson 1975, 129-130, no. 15:13-18, [x x] x MU.MEŠ LŪ,šá-kīn [x x x] / [x x x]-li-šá-nu-ti-ma ki-i [x x x] KI / [x x x] e KI-šá u-šé-rib-šá x [x x x] UD / [x x x]-sá-ni iš-‘kun-ma’ la izon-bal-ma-ni-ma / [x x x] x KUR–aš-Sur ı́š-ba-at-am-ma / ([x x x]) ki is-húp-pa-ur a-na LUGAL.TIN.TIR.KI il-qa-a “Nabû-bel-shumate, governor of the Sealand detained them [by night]. When [x x x] he made them enter his [x x x], he removed (?) their [fetters], but did not let them go out. [x x x] the army of Assyria he captured. When he had overcome [x x x] he took (him or it) to the king of Babylon.”


713 Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 34. Brinkman and Kennedy say that the day on this text is XI-3(+). We should note that IM 57926 (= K. 114) is dated on “V’-25(+) by the regnal year of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, but the month name is obscure; see Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 33.

incursion into Assyrian territory or against Nippur, and whether the troops of the Puqūdu would rebel when they heard of the sortie of the Elamite king.\footnote{SAA 4 289. Concerning its date, see Waters 2000, 62.}

Possibly around the same time, it seems that Sīn-šarru-uṣur, the former governor of Ur, undertook suspicious activity\footnote{Concerning Sīn-šarru-uṣur, see PNA 3/I, 1145b-1146b, no. 9. Regarding Sīn-tabni-uṣur, see PNA 3/I, 1148b-1150a, no. 2. The latter gained the governorship by 650-II-23 at the latest (see above pp. 45-46).} because an extispicy (SAA 4 286) dated 651-XI-16 was carried out to examine if a certain Sīn-šarru-uṣur would “hear and escape.” Later, Sīn-šarru-uṣur made insinuations about Sīn-tabni-uṣur and Assurbanipal settled this issue around 650 BC.

Sometime in 651 BC, Assurbanipal was considering waging war against Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. An extispicy (SAA 4 287) dated in this year\footnote{The month and the day as well as the result are not preserved.} was performed to determine if the Assyrian troops should pitch camp at Bāb-Sāmi (KÁ-sa-a-mi) and fight against the army of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The location of Bāb-Sāmi is not known.\footnote{Streck has suggested that Bāb-Sāmi was located near Babylon and identified it with KÁ-sa-a-me which is mentioned as the “Gate of Same” in SAA 11 154:15 and r. 6 (= ADD 89), see Streck 1916, CXCIV-CXCV; Starr has proposed that Bāb-Sāmi was in Southern Babylonia though he has not specified its location; see Starr 1990, 364, index of names.} This campaign may have had some connection with the loss of Cutha and Nippur.\footnote{Frame 1992, 147, n. 65.} In addition, another extispicy (SAA 4 293) was conducted to investigate if a certain man would make common cause with the enemy.

2.2.4. The Third Year of the Revolt: 650 BC
In 650 BC, Assurbanipal gradually regained control of Babylonia. This change in power relationships between Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is indicated by the appointment of Bēl-ibni over the Sealand, the release of pressure on Uruk and Ur,\footnote{Frame 1992, 165.} and the commencement of the siege of Babylon.

In Nisannu (I) of this year, the Akītu Chronicle records that the New Year’s festival was not celebrated as in the previous year.\footnote{Grayson 1975, 132, no. 16:20-21.} This description indicates that the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn continued.

Probably in Nisannu (I) or Ayyāru (II), Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, writes to Assurbanipal that he has received messengers announcing that the Sealand and Bīt-Amukāni would surrender to
Assyria. He adds that Na[bû-bêl-šumâti] has brought a certain man to the king of Elam (probably Tammarîtu II c. 652-c. 649 BC), and the Elamite king has promised him the governorship of Uruk. If the restoration of Nabû-bêl-šumâti’s name is correct, this means that the Sealanders disapproved of the action of Nabû-bêl-šumâti and his close relations with Elam. In addition, the very prospect of an Urukean governor appointed by the Elamite king implies political chaos in southern Babylonia.

On the 5th of Ayyaru (II), Assurbanipal sent *ABL 289 to the Sealanders, his “servants,” and informed them that he is sending Bêl-ibni to lead them and has dissociated them from the crime of Nabû-bêl-šumâti (see pp. 58 and 215-216). On the 25th of Ayyâru (II), Assurbanipal sent *ABL 517 to Nabû-ušabši and ordered him to write a letter to Bêl-ušallim about important persons of Bît-Amukâni such as their leader, their elders, and the leader’s mother (see pp. 13 and 188-190).

As these letters show, Assyria started regaining control of southern Babylonia. In the same year, both Uruk and Ur were released from the pressure of the rebels. There were several stages in this process and the dates of all the related events are unclear. However, it seems that they took place around the first half of 650 BC, after the appointment of Bêl-ibni (II-5) and before the commencement of the siege of Babylon (IV-11), because Bêl-ibni was involved in the release of Uruk and Ur and the troops of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn were still active outside of Babylon.

Uruk and Ur did not support Šamaš-šumu-ukîn when he revolted against Assurbanipal. In the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal, they are not included among the cities that closed their gates upon the outbreak of the rebellion and they dated their economic documents from the beginning by the regnal years of Assurbanipal. Both cities fell into difficult straits because of their pro-Assyrian attitude: Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, was abducted to Babylon, while Sîn-tabni-ušur, the governor of Ur, suffered from famine for two years.

The troubles of Uruk and Ur began with the abduction of Nabû-ušabši from Uruk to Babylon by a general of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn and an Urukean named Mukin-zêri, whose brother Nabû-nâšir was
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722 Cf. CT 54 507 (not dated); Frame 1992, 161, n. 134, and 179.
723 ABL 754 + CT 54 250 and ABL 790 + CT 54 425. Bêl-ibni worked with Aplâia and Nurâia, who first aided Uruk on the request of Nabû-ušabši, and then headed to Ur on the request of Sîn-tabni-ušur.
724 In ABL 1106, the author, probably the governor of Uruk, Nabû-ušabši, writes to Assurbanipal that he was abducted to Babylon and the Babylonian troops marched towards Uruk (see below pp. 130-131).
725 The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal state that Babylon, Borsippa, and Sippar closed their gates; see BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 93-117.
appointed to the governorship of Uruk by Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\(^{727}\) Before Nabû-ušabšī left Uruk, he ordered Nabû-zēru-iddina, the city overseer of Uruk,\(^{728}\) to bring Aplāia, the governor of Arrapḥa,\(^{729}\) and Marduk-šarru-uṣur, son of Gabbī, the chariot driver of the queen,\(^{730}\) into Uruk to protect the city from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\(^{731}\)

At the request of Nabû-ušabšī, Assurbanipal sent reinforcements to Uruk, which in addition to Aplāia and Marduk-šarru-uṣur also included Nūrāia, the governor of Mazama and Lāḫīru. These reinforcements are discussed in the correspondence of Assurbanipal (see *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244, pp. 62-66) where Aplāia and Nūrāia are referred to only by their titles.\(^{732}\)

When Nabû-ušabšī was abducted to Babylon, his brother was killed. However, he was saved by the relatives of his mother in Babylon.\(^{733}\) After his rescue, presumably on the way to Uruk or possibly already in Babylon, he wrote to Aplāia and his subordinate Kudurrū that the troops of the Babylonian king (*emu-qa ša Lugal Tīn.Tīr.Kī*) were marching towards them. He also repeatedly sent his messenger to the magnates to report on this urgent matter.\(^{734}\)

---


In addition to the above-mentioned reinforcements, Assurbanipal sent the chief treasurer (masennu) Aššūr-gimillu-tēre with his army to Uruk, as reported in the duplicate letters *ABL 273, *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244.735 Since the chief treasurer was one of the highest officials of the Assyrian Empire, he may have been sent to oppose Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s army marching towards Uruk. Later, Assurbanipal also sent Bēl-ēṭir and Arbāiu, the cohort commander, with 200 horses to Uruk. This dispatch is also recorded in the same letters.736

Uruk probably prevailed against the troops of the Babylonian king because no texts record that the city ever fell to the rebels. Sometime after Uruk was relieved, in Simānu (III) of an unknown year Assurbanipal sent his eunuch Nabû-erība, his ‘third man’ Nergal-šarru-usur, and the priest of Aššūr, Akkullānu, with his treaty tablet to Nabû-ušabši in order to conclude a new treaty with him.737 Uruk was now secured but southern Babylonia was still threatened by Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, and Uruk became involved in the political and military issues of Ur and neighbouring tribal groups.

According to *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244, Nabû-ušabši wrote to Assurbanipal urging him to keep Ur and the Gurasimmu on the Assyrian side.738 Kudurru, the deputy of Nabû-ušabši, also wrote to Assurbanipal concerning the critical situation of Ur caused by a messenger from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn sent to incite the Gurasimmu.739 He states that he personally levied 500 to 600 Urukean archers, marched to Ur together with Aplāia of Ararrā and Nūrīa of Mazamau,740 who had been dispatched by Assurbanipal in order to aid Uruk when Nabû-ušabši was taken prisoner. It

---

735 *ABL 273:2-8 // *ABL 543 r. 10-13 // *ABL 1108 r. 7-10 // *ABL 1244 r. 1-3. The transliteration and the translation of *ABL 543 r. 10-13, u u-ma-a / ki-i ud-din-na la ta-sap-par-an-ni / m-as-šur-SU-GUR-ra LUGALU ma-e-maq qi l is-si-šā as-sa-par. “And now, even before you wrote me, I have sent the treasurer Aššūr-gimillu-tēre with the forces.” The chief treasurer (masennu) was in charge of construction works and military operations in border province and sometimes outside of the province (Mattila 2000, 161-162). Concerning Aššūr-gimillu-tēre, see Mattila 2000, 17 and PNA 1/I, 186a-b.


737 *ABL 539 r. 25. ’TI’. SĪG. The name of the eponym is not written on the tablet. Since Kudurru, the successor of Nabû-ušabši, is first attested as the governor of Ur on 647-I-20 (Brinkman 1977, 311), the treaty tablet was brought to Uruk in Simānu (III), 648 BC at the latest.


740 ABL 754 + CT 54 250:10-13, UNUG.KI-a-ar.ARAD.MEŠ šá LUGAL be-li-i[a] LÜ.GIŠ.BAN 5-me 6-me i-na ŠU.2-ia / ki-i aš-ba–tu it-ti “DUMU.USA–a [L]U.E.N.NAM šá KUR.ār-rap–ha ū / *ZALAG-e-a LÜ.E.N.NAM šá KUR–za–me– e [x x (x)] ’x x a-na’ ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI / at-ta-lak.
seems that the general of the Sealand, Bēl-ibni, joined them, since Kudurru says that Aplāia, Bēl-ibni, and Sīn-tabni-uṣur worked together. Later, Bēl-ibni reported to Assurbanipal that he and Nūrāia had subdued the Gurasimmu.

The expedition to Ur was hence successful. Assurbanipal commends Sīn-tabni-uṣur in his letter *ABL 290, probably dated in 650 BC, for enduring enemy and famine for two years, and economic documents show that food shortages continued even into the next year. The letter also indicates that there was rivalry between Sīn-tabni-uṣur and his predecessor and brother Sīn-šarru-uṣur.

On the 11th day of Du’īzu (IV), 650 BC, the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn Chronicle records that the Assyrians laid siege to Babylon. In his inscriptions, Assurbanipal claims that he also besieged Sippar, Borsippa, and Cutha, but it is not known exactly when the siege of each city started and ended. An economic document from Babylon dated on the 13th day of Araḫsamma (VIII), 650 BC, records the sale of a garden when “famine (sunqu) and hardship (dannaṭu) were established in the land and a mother would not open (her) door to (her own) daughter.” Assurbanipal’s inscriptions also confirm that people died of famine and hunger (bubūṭu).

After the siege of Babylon began (650-IV-11), Abī-Iate’, the king of the Qedarite Arabs, who had once sworn an oath of loyalty to Assurbanipal probably just before the beginning of the revolt.
sent Arabian troops to besieged Babylon in order to help Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. However, their troops were defeated by the Assyrians.\textsuperscript{752}

At some point during the siege of Babylon (650-IV-11 to 648-V), Assurbanipal sent *ABL 571 as an ultimatum to some pro-Assyrian members of the citizens of Babylon, telling them that Milki-rāmu, the chief tailor (\textit{rab kāṣirī}), and Aššur-dāl["inanni], the commander-in-chief (\textit{turṭānu}), were about to throw (their forces) against Babylon, and urged them to open [the city gate] in order to effect a bloodless surrender.\textsuperscript{753}

Assuming that the besieged city mentioned in *ABL 561 and *ABL 1186 sent to Nippur was Babylon, the citizens of Nippur joined the Assyrian army which surrounded the city (see pp. 10-11 and 183-185). No other significant events can be dated to the year 650 BC.

\textbf{2.4.5. The Fourth Year of the Revolt: 649 BC}

In 649 BC, the political situation in Elam drastically changed. Tammarītu II was deposed from the throne by his subordinate (\textit{ARAD-su}) Indabibi who became the king of Elam, while Tammarītu II sought refuge in Nineveh with the help of Bēl-ibni of the Sealand. In addition, it was probably in this year that Nabū-bēl-šumātī sought asylum in Elam. Bēl-ibni dealt with many Elamite issues as one of the main players, but the precise dates of these events are unknown.

The Akītu Chronicle records that as in previous years the New Year’s festival was not celebrated in 649 BC,\textsuperscript{754} doubtless because of the siege of Babylon.

As already discussed in detail above (see pp. 40-41 on Indabibi and pp. 46-47 on Tammarītu II), the inscriptions of Assurbanipal describe how Indabibi rebelled against Tammarītu II and seized the throne of Elam.\textsuperscript{755} The inscriptions further record that Tammarītu II with his family, relatives, and 85 noblemen sought asylum in Nineveh, and that Assurbanipal took pity on him and installed all of

\textsuperscript{752} BIWA 61 and 245, A VII 82-106. See also Frame 1992, 151; Gerardi 1992; Eph'al 1982, 142-165.
\textsuperscript{753} Fales 2009, 36; Parpola 2004a, 229. For Milki-rāmu and his title \textit{rab kāṣirī}, see Mattila 2014, 407-410.
\textsuperscript{754} Grayson 1975, 132, no. 16:22.
\textsuperscript{755} BIWA, 42 and 234, A IV 11-12 // F III 19-20; BIWA, 43 and 234, A IV 25; BIWA, 46 and 237, A IV 115 // F III 38; BIWA, 59 and 242-243, A VII 16-23; BIWA, 110 and 230, B VII 54-57 // C VIII 44-47; BIWA, 112 and 231, B II 77-80 // C IX 45-48; BIWA, 156, a fragmentary prism inscription K 2656+ r. 7-8; BIWA, 314-315, the inscription of reliefs RS 28 G 19'-23'; BIWA, 314-315, the inscription of reliefs, Rs 30, H1 1'-3'; Streck 1916, 174-175, a tablet bearing texts of inscriptions K 1364:5-7.
them in his palace. It is not stated how this large group of the people was treated there. The inscriptions specify by name a certain man among the asylum seekers: “Marduk-šarru-uṣur, my (Assurbanipal’s) eunuch, whom they had carried away by force.” This Marduk-šarru-uṣur may be identical with a namesake who was sent to Elam to try to annex the country to the Assyrian provincial system after the defeat of Teumman in 653 BC.

Two letters from Bēl-ibni of the Sealand to Assurbanipal, ABL 282 and ABL 284, indicate that he organized Tammarītu II’s flight from Indabibi probably over the Persian Gulf by boat, although his aid is not clearly recorded in the inscriptions. In ABL 284, Bēl-ibni writes to Assurbanipal: “now, I am sending Tammarītu (II), his brothers, his family, and his few nobles into the presence of the king, my lord” (ll. 10-14). In ABL 282, he promises to send to the king the nephew of Tammarītu (II), who had escaped from Elam (ll. 6-16).

The exact dates of these events are unknown. However, Assurbanipal sent to Indabibi *ABL 1151 dated in 649 BC (the day and the month are lost, only the name of eponym is preserved) where he called Indabibi “king of Elam, his (Assurbanipal’s) brother.” Thus Indabibi ascended the throne of Elam before the letter was composed. In addition, calling Indabibi “brother” indicates good relations between Assurbanipal and Indabibi at that point.

ABL 282, referring to the flight of Tammarītu II’s nephew, also indicates that Nabū-bēl-šumāti had already transferred his base from the Sealand to Elam around that time. This transfer suggests that Nabū-bēl-šumāti lost his power in the Sealand because Bēl-ibni had gained the upper hand there. In ABL 282, Bēl-ibni reports that the messengers of Natannu, the rebel leader of the Puqūdu, met...

---

756 BIWA, 43 and 234, A IV 23-41 // F III 21-32 (but A IV 37-41 is not paralleled in F); BIWA, 110-112 and 230, B VII 58-76 // C VIII 48-68 // (partly) G1 B II’ 38’-14’ // (partly) G 2 II’ 11’-17. See also the description of Indabibi in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal. Concerning the details of some members who escaped with Tammarītu II, see a fragmentary text K 2825 (Streck 1916, 206-207).


758 See Baker in PNA 2/II, 728b-730a.

759 Waters 2000, 64. Two epigraphs could be related to the flight of Tammarītu II; see BIWA, 315-316, nos. 69-70.


762 *ABL 1151:2-3, a-na ”in-da-bi MAN KUR.NIM.MA.KI / ŠEŠ-šu, r. 1’-2’, [I]TLX UD-a-KÁM] / lim-mu ”PAB—le-ia’. Aḫu-ilā” was the governor of Carchemish and the eponym of the year 649 BC (PNA 1/I, 76b-77a, no. 11).

763 PNA 2/II, 938a-938b, no. 5.
Nabû-bêl-šumāti in the city Targibātu and pledged to send any news they may hear.⁷⁶⁴ We know that Targibātu was located in Elam because Nabû-ušallim, the son of Merodach-Baladan, had been settled among the Targibāteans sometime between 680 and 650 BC⁷⁶⁵ and in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal Nabû-ušallim is said to have fled to Elam.⁷⁶⁶ Soon after the writing of ABL 282, Natannu ended up in Assurbanipal’s hands; an unknown author, probably from Uruk, reports to Assurbanipal that he had captured Natannu along with Mukin-zēri, who had taken the governor of Uruk captive (see above pp. 130-131) and had sent them to the king.⁷⁶⁷

When Nabû-bêl-šumāti moved to Elam, he took Kissikean captives with him. The Kissikeans later wrote to Assurbanipal that Nabû-bêl-šumāti had taken captives from Kissik and carried them off to Elam but they had escaped from prison in Elam back to the Sealand.⁷⁶⁸

Nabû-bêl-šumāti had also held Bēšunu, the elder brother of Bēl-ibni,⁷⁶⁹ for four years. It is not clear whether Bēšunu had been kept imprisoned in Elam or the Sealand, but eventually he was rescued, probably in 649 BC, by soldiers that Bēl-ibni sent out.⁷⁷⁰

While Nabû-bêl-šumāti was active in Elam, he attacked Bēl-ibni from there. Bēl-ibni wrote to Assurbanipal that Nabû-bêl-šumāti had hired members of various tribes and they had crossed over on rafts against him with 250 Gurasimmu, taken two families with their dependents captive, and then fled. In retaliation he sent out 400 archers by boat, crossed over the sea to Elam, attacked them, and brought back 150 captives.⁷⁷¹

---


⁷⁶⁶ BIWA, 107 and 227, B VI 70-72 // C VII 67-68, see also PNA 2/II, 903a-b, no. 10.

⁷⁶⁷ ABL 1437:9′-11′, “na-tan ʾu ʾGIN–NUMUN ki-i / ni-iš-ba-ba a-na LUGAL be-li-ia / ni-il-tap-ra, “we have seized Natannu and Mukin-zēri, and have sent (them) to the king, our lord.” See Dietrich 1970, 182-183, no. 112.


⁷⁷⁰ PNA 1/II, 331b-332a, no. 7.

⁷⁷¹ ABL 460 r. 3-11; see de Vaan 1995, 259-261. If Bēšunu was captured when the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn broke out, the four-year detention suggests that he was rescued in 649 BC at the earliest. De Vaan has proposed that this Bēšunu can be identified with the namesake who was the governor of Hindanu and the eponym of the year 648* BC (de Vaan 1995, 61-62 and 261, see also PNA 1/II, 331b, no. 6). However, it cannot be ruled out that Bēšunu was released sometime after the crushing of the revolt because Nabû-bêl-šumāti was still alive in 648 BC (Frame 1992, 181, n. 253). In that case, de Vaan’s identification seems implausible.

⁷⁷² ABL 1000:11′-r. 12, u ʾAG–EN–MU. MEŠ / ša “AG ma-ša-kš-a na-ma ḫa-ra i-nam-di-nu LÚ.e-mu-qu / ša LÚ.ḫi-li-im LÚ.pil-lat LÚ.nu”–guḫu LÚ.ia-ši–DINGIR / ēù LÚ.la-kab-ru a-na 10 GUR.ÂM ZÛ.LUM.MA / ēù 2.AM a-me-lut-ti a-na UGU-ḫi-
While Indabibi was still on the Elamite throne, probably in 649 BC, in ABL 622 + ABL 1279, an unknown author mentioned the messengers from Indabibi and recommended to Assurbanipal that 500 horses and a high military official (rab mūgi) should be released from the camp and stationed in Nippur while 100 horses should be stationed in Uruk.

In Ur, the power contest between Šin-tabni-usur and Šin-šarru-usur continued in the year 649 BC, assuming that *ABL 290, referring to Šin-tabni-usur’s endurance of enemy and famine for two years can be dated in 650 BC. *ABL 523 to Šin-tabni-usur shows that he still feared his brother in his third year as the governor of Ur. This conflict was resolved once the tide turned against Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, although the exact date is unknown. Assurbanipal informed Šin-tabni-usur in his third year as the governor of Ur.

---

772 BIWA, 118 and 257. It is worth noting that the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was suppressed around at the end of *Abu (V), 648 BC.
773 BIWA, 165 and 257. Unfortunately the name of the month is broken away.
774 BIWA, 112 and 231, B VII 81-86 // C IX 49-53.
775 BIWA, 112-113 and 231, B VII 87-92 // C IX 54-58.
777 De Vaan 1995, 42 and 276; Dietrich 1970, 113; PNA I/II, 310a, no. 18, h. Cole proposes that the sender was the official from Ur (Cole 1996, 79) while Waters suggests that the governor of Nippur (Waters 2000, 67, n. 64).
779 *ABL 523:2-4, "Concerning Šin-šarru-usur about whom you s[aid] 'Now then, he is devising a scheme and putting terrible things against me' – don’t be afraid!"
780 *ABL 523:18-r. 6, "And concerning your coming about which you said, 'The magnates have held me back,' (it is) the third year (now that) you have stood by, kept my watch, and made me aware of a good name in my presence."
Meanwhile, the Assyrian army also tightened the siege of Babylon. In SAA 18 175, Marduku, an Assyrian official based in Babylonia,\(^{782}\) suggests to Assurbanipal that the magnates besieging Dilbat should set up a camp within the siege wall surrounding Babylon, 520 (of their army) should be in Cutha, and the horses of Assurbanipal should be in hiding and thwart their exit from Babylon.\(^{783}\) It is not specified which magnates were involved in this. Since Marduku refers to a siege wall set up “last year” (r. 17-18, \(\text{ina}^\prime \text{BAĐ} \text{ma-dak-ta šá TIN.TIR.KI} l^\prime \text{šā}^\prime \text{šad-da-qâd}\)) and the siege of Babylon started on 650-IV-11,\(^{784}\) the letter dates either from 649 or from early 648 BC, before the fall of Babylon.\(^{785}\)

### 2.2.6. The Fifth Year of the Revolt: 648 BC

In 648 BC, the revolt was finally suppressed with the death of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and the fall of Babylon around the end of Abu (V) of the year. However, the sequence of events that led to crushing the rebellion is not well known. After the revolt, Assurbanipal appointed Kandalānu as the new king of Babylon.

As in previous years (651-649 BC), the Akītu Chronicle states that the New Year’s festival was not celebrated at the beginning of the year,\(^{786}\) surely because of the continuing siege of Babylon.

It seems that in early 648 BC, a political power shift took place in Elam, leading to the overthrow of Indabibi and the enthronement of Ummanaldašu III. On the 25th of \(\text{Du}^\prime \text{ūuzu}\) (IV) of 648* BC, one month before the fall of Babylon, Assurbanipal sent *ABL 1170 to Ummanšibar, a prominent Elamite,\(^{787}\) in response to a letter from Bēl-ibni,\(^{788}\) reporting that Ummanšibar and the magnates

---

\(^{781}\) *ABL 1002 and the Kissikeans in *ABL 1121 that Sîn-šarru-uṣur eventually came to see Assurbanipal and surrendered to him when he saw that he lost ground.\(^{781}\)

\(^{782}\) PNA 2/II, 734b-735a, no. 10.

\(^{783}\) SAA 18 175, r. 8-s. 3.

\(^{784}\) Grayson 1975, 130, no. 15:19.

\(^{785}\) Reynolds 2003, XXXI. Cf. Frame suggests that the letter is dated to at least the second year of the revolt (Frame 1992, 144, n. 47).

\(^{786}\) Grayson 1975, 132, no. 16:23.

\(^{787}\) PNA 3/II, 1385b-1386a.
were conspiring against their king and all the lands had become rebellious. The name of the king is not mentioned, but it almost certainly was Indabibi.

This sudden turn of events finds an explanation in Edition C of Assurbanipal’s inscriptions. According to this text, Assurbanipal had sent a messenger to Indabibi demanding the release of the Assyrians imprisoned in Elam by Nabû-bêl-šumâti and threatening to destroy his cities, to deport the people of Susa, Madaktu, and Haidâlu and to replace Indabibi with someone else in case his request was turned down. This messenger never reached Indabibi since the Elamite people heard of the mission, killed Indabibi, and installed Ummanaldašu III as the new Elamite king. The exact date of this event is unknown, but Frame has suggested that the fall of Babylon in 648 BC affected the political power balance in Elam and the accession of Ummanaldašu III occurred in this year.

At the fall of Babylon, Šamaš-šumu-ukîn died in the fire under uncertain circumstances. The royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal describe his death, the longest being that of Edition A: “Aššur, Šin, Šamaš, Adad, Bêl, Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh, Šarrat-Kidmuri, Ištar of Arabela, Ninurta, Nergal, and Nusku who, marching ahead of me, killed my enemies, cast Šamaš-šumu-ukîn, my hostile brother who turned hostile towards me, into fall of blazing fire and destroyed his life” but “the people who had plotted with my hostile brother Šamaš-šumu-ukîn (...) did not perish in the fire with Šamaš-šumu-ukîn, their lord”. The Ištar Temple inscriptions too confirm that Šamaš-šumu-ukîn perished in the fire: “Enlil, [Ninlil], Marduk, and the gods of my helpers saw his evil deeds and n was cast into a fire by the gods, he died in the fire under uncertain circumstances. The royal great". It is obvious that while the inscriptions allege that Šamaš-šumu-ukîn was cast into a fire by the gods, he actually either committed suicide or was killed at his own wish by one of his servants in order to

788 ABL 1170:5-9, i-na UGU a-mat a-g[a’-a] / bab-ba-ni-ti ša AN.SâR / a-na EN-ka ina UGU ŠA-hi-ka / is-suk ǔ-tiḫ u ša’-a-na UGU / md EN-ib-ni taš-pur, “Concerning this beautiful idea which Aššur so nicely put into your heart for your lord and which you wrote to Bêl-ibni.”
789 ABL 460:3*-7*, num-man-ši-bar ｕ LU.GAL MEŠ ša’ il-ti-šü’ / ki-i ip-šu-ru dib-bi bi-šu-[u a-na UGU] / ’UGU ša-nu id-dab-bu ｕ ina pa-an DINiR.M[EŠ-ša-nu] / il-tak-nu ki–ma-de-e LUGAL ša-nu a-ga-[a iš-me’] / ｕ ši-i-tu KUR MEŠ gabbit is-s[e-ša-a]. See Waters 2000, 68. In this letter, Bêl-ibni mentions Nabû-bêl-šumâti who was dead by 646-IV-26 (see ABL 879 from Ummanaldašu III to Assurbanipal) and Bêlsunu who was probably rescued in 649 BC at the earliest. Thus the letter could be dated sometime between 649 and 646 BC.
790 BIWA, 155-55 and 232, C IX 59-86.
791 Frame 1992, 185-186.
avoid the terrible fate (e.g., being flayed alive) that would have befallen him had he been taken alive into the hands of Assurbanipal.

In *ABL 972, probably addressed to Ummanaldašu III, Assurbanipal requests the recipient to hand over Nabû-bēl-šumātī or Nabû-qāṭī-šabat “who threw his lord [into] the fire [and who ...] has been staying in [your (Ummanaldašu III’s)] presence.” Furthermore, in *BM 132980 dated in 647*-XI, Assurbanipal tells the elders of Elam that they have been treated badly because of Nabû-bēl-šumātī, Nabû-qāṭī-šabat, and Kiribušt and he demands that the elders extradite these people. ABL 1309 from an unknown Urukean to Assurbanipal refers to Nabû-qāṭī-šabat and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in a broken context. In his inscriptions, Assurbanipal states that “I cut off the head of Nabû-bēl-šumātī and hung it around the neck of Nabû-qāṭī-šabat, the simmagir official of my hostile brother Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, who had gone to Elam with him (i.e., Nabû-bēl-šumātī) to encourage Elam to rebel.

Von Soden (1972) took all these references to Nabû-qāṭī-šabat to pertain to the same person and suggested that it was the simmagir official of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn who threw “his lord” [into] the fire, as related in *ABL 972.

Frame has questioned this interpretation because he doubts that Nabû-qāṭī-šabat could have come from Elam, entered the besieged Babylon, killed Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, and fled from the city to Elam. However, it does seem to me that it was not at all impossible to escape from the chaotic, falling Babylon because in *ABL 561 Assurbanipal warns the citizens of Nippur, who were...

---

796 *ABL 972 r. 8-10, ú-la-a ṾPA–ŠU.2–ša-bat ša EN–šša / [i-na] i-sá-a-ti ik-ru-ur-u-ni / [x x x x x ina] stdarg-ka iz-zi-zu-ni, “Alternatively/If not, [send me] Nabû-qāṭī-šabat who threw his lord [into] the fire [and who ...] has been staying in [your] presence.”
797 *BM 132980:8-9, ina ṾPA–EN–MU.ŠEŠ ṾPA–ŠU.2–sa-bat ṾPA–kri-rib-tá / ki i ha-an-ni–i ep–šá-ku-nu, “It is because of Nabû-bēl-šumātī, Nabû-qāṭī-šabat and Kiribušt that you have been treated in this way”; *BM132980, r. 1’-4’, ‘m-a-a’ [ina ṾPA–EN–šum-ku–ki] ‘an-ni–i’ ep–šá–a’-[ni] / ina Ś[ir-šîr DINGIR.ŠEŠ-ša at-ta-ma šum-ma la ina U[G]U / ṾPA–EN–MU.ŠEŠ ṾPA MEŠ L(U),”EN–hu–’if’–ti ša is−si−šá / ki i ha–[n-ni]‘i ep–šá–ka-nu–ni,” “[Why] have we been treated [like this]?” [I swear by my gods and my gods]: it is because of [Nabû-bēl-šumātī] and his criminal accomplices that you have been treated in this way.”
801 Von Soden 1972, 84-85. The role of the simmagir official is obscure. CAD S 272a renders “(a high official)” and AHw 1045a “ein Resident des bab. Königs.” This title appears from the NB period onwards.
802 Frame 1992, 154, especially n. 101. See also PNA 2/II, 859b-860a, nos. 5-6. In these entries Ambos and Gesche identify Nabû-qāṭī-šabat in *BM 132980 with Nabû-qāṭī-šabat in the inscriptions, but they distinguished this person from Nabû-qāṭī-šabat in *ABL 972.
probably laying siege to the city, that a certain man went out without being noticed. Therefore, most likely it was the simmagir official Nabû-qāṭī-sabat who threw his lord Šamaš-šumu-ukīn into the fire in Babylon and escaped to Elam in the confusion.

A literary text (SAA 3 44 “Aššur’s response to Assurbanipal’s report on the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn”) also alludes to the fate of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. In the text, Aššur states, “I decreed for him [the fate] of his predecessor Išdu-kīn, king of B[abylon]” (r. 7). However, as Išdu-kīn, king of Babylon, is otherwise unknown, the point of this allusion remains obscure.

In any case, with the death of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and the fall of Babylon, the revolt was over. What happened before these incidents is not well known. The last known documents dated to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, from Borsippa and Babylon, are dated on the 28th and the 30th of Abu (V), 648 BC, respectively. Sippar and Cutha had also been under siege for some time (see above p. 133), but it is not known when the siege of these cities ended. Curiously, no chronicle entry records the date of the fall of Babylon and other rebel cities.

Following the description of the demise of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, Edition A additionally notes that Assurbanipal took away Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s chariots, rickshaw, sunshade, sekretu-women, and property of the palace. He also split the tongues (var. mouths) of supporters of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as a punishment. He took some of them to Assyria and sacrificed them as a funerary offering for Sennacherib (ina ki-is-pi-šû), and fed dogs, pigs, jackals (or vultures), eagles, birds, and fish with their flesh.

Assurbanipal further states in his inscriptions that he brought out the dead bodies from the streets and squares of Babylon, Cutha, and Sippar and purified the temples of these cities, appeased their...
gods, re-established the regular offerings, appointed new officials, and imposed taxes, tribute and offerings for Assyrian gods upon the Babylonians.\textsuperscript{811}

The booty from Babylon is depicted on the relief BM ME 124945-6 found in Room M, the so-called “Throne Room” of the North Palace at Nineveh. The relief is horizontally divided into two registers by a river with wavy bands. The upper register depicts the victory over Elam, while the lower register shows Assurbanipal reviewing the war spoils taken from Babylonia. The lower register is further divided into three rows. In the uppermost row, a eunuch who raises his right hand, three items of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn’s regalia (the Babylonian crown, the royal seal of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn, and the long staff),\textsuperscript{812} and two wheeled vehicles are depicted. In the middle row, there are four foreigners who pay homage to Assurbanipal,\textsuperscript{813} two scribes who make records of bows, quivers, severed heads, and a team of horses. In the lowermost row, a procession of prisoners, two chariots with a round shield and with a triangular object respectively, and horses led by soldiers are portrayed. In addition, an epigraph is engraved in the upper row: “I, Assurbanipal, king of the universe, king of Assyria, who at the command of the great gods, achieved my (text: his) heart’s desires. They paraded before me clothing (and) jewelry, appurtenances of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn’s royal person – the treacherous brother – women of his palace, his courtiers, his battle troops, a chariot, a processional carriage – the conveyance of his lordly person – every single piece of equipment that was in his palace, (and) people – men (and) women, young and old.”\textsuperscript{814}

In addition, probably as the booty of the civil war, a large number of Babylonian literary tablets were brought to Assurbanipal’s library from Babylonia on the 1st of Šabāṭu (XI) and the 29th of Addāru (XII) of 648 BC.\textsuperscript{815}

\textbf{2.2.7. The Aftermath of the Revolt: 647 BC and After}

After the suppression of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn, Assurbanipal appointed Kandalânû as the king of Babylon in 647 BC and his reign lasted until 627 BC.\textsuperscript{816} A detailed study on this period has been presented by Frame.\textsuperscript{817} Though no inscription of Assurbanipal mentions his appointment and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{811} BIWA, 45 and 235, A IV 77-109.
\item \textsuperscript{812} Novotny and Watanabe 2008, 112-118.
\item \textsuperscript{813} Novotny and Watanabe have not identified these four foreigners (Novotny and Watanabe 2008, 119-120). Reade has suggested that the four people may be (from right to left) the Elamite king Tammaritu II (c. 652-649 BC), the Qedarite Arab leaders Abi-late’ and Aia-ammu, and the Nabatean king Natnu (Reade 1998).
\item \textsuperscript{814} This translation is quoted from the article of Novotny and Watanabe 2008, 124-125.
\item \textsuperscript{815} Parpola 1983a, 11.
\item \textsuperscript{816} PNA 2/I, 601a, no. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{817} Frame 1992, 191-213.
\end{itemize}
no inscription of Kandalānu is extant, his reign is attested in chronological texts and economic documents.

Kandalānu appears in king lists. Babylonian King List A inserts Kandalānu between Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and Sīn-šumu-lēšir but the number of years of his rule is not preserved,\(^{818}\) while the Uruk King List puts Kandalānu with 21 regnal years before Sīn-šumu-lēšir.\(^{819}\) The Synchronistic King List registers Kandalānu with Assurbanipal after Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\(^{820}\) The Ptolemaic Canon includes Kandalānu between Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and Nabopolassar and assigns him 22 regnal years.\(^{821}\)

He is also mentioned in the Akītu Chronicle. After the revolt was suppressed, the New Year festival was probably held without interruption during the reign of Kandalānu because the chronicle has no entry between 647 BC and 627 BC, and for the year 626 BC the text reads “After Kandalānu, in the accession year of Nabopolassar, there were insurrections in Assyria and Akkad.”\(^{822}\)

In addition, more than two hundred economic documents were dated by the regnal years of Kandalānu. No document refers to his accession year,\(^{823}\) and his name first appears in an economic document from Babylon dated on 647-X-6 for his first regnal year.\(^{824}\) It seems that his rule gradually spread in Babylonia because during his first (647 BC) and second regnal year (646 BC) some documents were still dated by the regnal years of Assurbanipal.\(^{825}\) After 646 BC, all Babylonian documents, except those from Nippur, were dated by the name of Kandalānu. In the documents, he was called “the king” or “the king of Babylon” (LUGAL URU.DŪG).\(^{826}\)

Since the genealogy of Kandalānu is not known and he died in 627 BC\(^{827}\) at approximately the same time Assurbanipal died or retired, it has been suggested that Kandalānu and Assurbanipal were the

\(^{818}\) Grayson 1980-1983, 93, the Babylonian King List A iv 22. See also Grayson 1975, 222, Appendix B Kandalānu.
\(^{819}\) Grayson 1980-1983, 97, Uruk King List 3. The name of his predecessor is uncertain.
\(^{820}\) Grayson 1980-1983, 120, the Synchronistic King List iv 15 and 20. Kandalānu’s name is probably to be restored in the Synchronistic King List Fragment (KAV 182) iv 6; see Grayson 1980-1983, 125.
\(^{822}\) Grayson 1975, 132, no. 16:24-25, ar-ki mākan-da-la-nu ina MU.SAG 4AG-IBILA-ŠEŠ / sah-ša-ša-ti ina KUR.aš-šur u KUR.Ú.RI.KI GAR-me-ma, “After Kandalānu, in the accession year of Nabopolassar, there were insurrections in Assyria and Akkad.”
\(^{823}\) Frame 1992, 192.
\(^{824}\) Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 39, VAT 2963 (= L. 1).
\(^{825}\) Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 22-23. These documents came from Borsippa, Uruk, Nippur, and Dilbat. See also Brinkman 1984, 106.
\(^{826}\) Frame 1992, 192. Concerning the writing URU.DŪG for Babylon, see Brinkman 1968, 116, n. 653.
\(^{827}\) Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 49. The last economic document which bears the name of Kandalānu is dated 627-VIII-1(+). In addition, the year 627 is described as “after (arki) Kandalānu.”
same person,828 but this is unlikely.829 As Frame pointed out, Kandalānu could have been a member of the Assyrian royal family830 because, in a fragmentary Neo-Assyrian letter *CT 53 966, Kandalānu is mentioned just after Šērū’a-ēṭirat, the sister of Assurbanipal, in a broken context.831

2.3. The Role, Designation, and Authority of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn
In order to understand why Šamaš-šumu-ukīn provoked the revolt against Assurbanipal in 652 BC, we will in this section investigate the texts referring to him under three time frames: during the reign of Esarhaddon (680-669 BC), during the reign of Assurbanipal prior to the outbreak of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (668-653BC), and during and after the revolt in the time of Assurbanipal (652-c. 630 BC).

2.3.1. During the Reign of Esarhaddon
Esarhaddon had at least 19 sons832 and his eldest son Sīn-nādin-apli was appointed as the crown prince around 677 BC. However, the lack of sources about him suggests that he died untimely.833 After his demise, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn became the eldest living son.834

In Ayyāru (II) of 672 BC, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was officially designated heir to the throne of Babylon at the same time as his brother Assurbanipal was chosen heir to the throne of Assyria. To ensure the realization of this arrangement, Esarhaddon drafted and imposed a treaty, known in scholarship as “Esarhaddon’s Succession Treaty,”835 which clearly indicates that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was not to have the same status as Assurbanipal. In all extant copies of the text, Assurbanipal is always referred to as “the great crown prince designate (of Assyria),”836 but Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is merely called “the crown prince designate of Babylon” without the adjective “great.”837 Moreover, the name of

830 Frame 1992, 300-301.
831 *CT 53 566:9-10, [x x x x] ’ù‘ M.l.še-ru-u-a–kăr-a[ ] / [x x x x] mn kan-dàl-a-nu. See also Frame 1992, 300-301.
832 Parpola 1983b, 117-119.
834 SAA 10 185:5-11.
835 Lauinger 2012; SAA 2 6.
Assurbanipal appears about 70 times in the treaty, while Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is mentioned only twice: in §7 “Succession at Esarhaddon’s Untimely Death” and in §107 “Date and Colophon” at the end of the treaty. In the former section (§7), Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is promised the throne of Babylon with the most detailed description of his status found in the treaty: “If Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, passes away while his sons are minors, you will help Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, to take the throne of Assyria, and you will help Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, his equal brother, the crown prince designate of Babylon, to ascend the throne of Babylon. You will reserve for him the kingship over the whole of Sumer, Akkad and Karduniaš. He will take with him all the gifts that Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, his father, gave him; do not hold back even one.” In the final section (§107), Šamaš-šumu-ukīn appears side by side with Assurbanipal: “The treaty of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, conclu[ded] on behalf of Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the crown prince designate of Babylon.”

It is worth noting that the two princes are referred to as “minors” (sa-ḫa-ri) in the treaty. The exact ages of Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in 672 BC are unknown, but it does not seem that “minors” fits the time when Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn were promoted as crown princes.

Concerning the age of Assurbanipal at this point, Parpola has stated that: “since Assurbanipal was already married and possibly even had children before his father’s death, it is questionable whether he still was legally a ‘minor’ at the time of his accession.” Livingstone has suggested that when Assurbanipal was appointed as the crown prince he was at least in his later teens because he became king just two years later, reigned for 39 years, and Adad-šumu-usur mentioned the marriage of Assurbanipal in SAA 10 185, perhaps written in Ayyāru (II) or Simānu (III), 672 BC. Perhaps the reason for the referring to minority of the princes is that there might have been a model or a formula for succession treaties in the Neo-Assyrian period for a young son of the king. More likely,

(Lauinger 2012, 112). However, one exemplar does not call Assurbanipal “great” and another calls Šamaš-šumu-ukīn “great”. See Frame 1992, 95, n. 154.


Parpola 1987b, 168. Regarding the child of Assurbanipal, see Parpola 1983b, 139f and SAA 10 217.

SAA 10 185, r 23-25, [tu-up]-ra-šar-ša-am ḫu-ad-[a] // [x x x r]a qur-šu DUMU.MEŠ.K[a] // [x x x x] niš ša-ša-ša-[u] ba-[l]-i [i-f]. “While you] will grow old, jo[y ….. Arrange] the wedding night of your sons, make their hearts delighted!” Concerning the date of the letter, see commentary to LAS 171 in Parpola 1983b, 159-160.

Livingstone 2007, 102.
however, the treaty was drawn up when Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn were actually minors, and the minority clause was fully justified when the treaty was concluded.\textsuperscript{843}

The political correspondence of Esarhaddon indicates that Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn officially served Esarhaddon and supported him during their crown princehood (672-669 BC). In their letters, they call Esarhaddon “the king” (\textit{LUGAL}, \textit{MAN}) and themselves “your servants” (\textit{ARAD-ka}). Seven letters (SAA 16 14-20) from Assurbanipal to Esarhaddon are extant. In addition, ten letters are addressed to Assurbanipal as crown prince\textsuperscript{844} and eleven letters sent to Esarhaddon refer to Assurbanipal.\textsuperscript{845} As Luukko and Van Buylaere have pointed out, he is not referred to by his name but by his title, the crown prince (\textit{mār šarrī}).\textsuperscript{846} Four letters (SAA 16 21-24) from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn to the king are preserved, but no letters sent to him as crown prince are extant. This suggests that Assurbanipal was more deeply involved in the governance of Assyria than Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

The gods invoked in the blessing formulae of their letters are also different. Assurbanipal invokes three different patterns; Aššur, Bēl, and Nabû in four letters (SAA 16 14-15, 17-18); Bēl and Nabû in SAA 16 20; and Nabû and [Mard]uk in SAA 16 19. Since the beginning of SAA 16 16 is not preserved, it is unclear which gods are invoked in it. By contrast Šamaš-šumu-ukīn always invokes Nabû and Marduk. Likewise, Šamaš-mētu-uballit, a younger brother of the princes,\textsuperscript{847} always invokes Nabû and Marduk in the blessing formulae of his letters to Esarhaddon (SAA 16 25-27).\textsuperscript{848}

In his letters to Esarhaddon, Assurbanipal dealt with both political and military matters of the north, the heartland of Assyria, and Babylonia, although Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was designated as the crown prince of Babylon. Assurbanipal interrogated an official operating in the north about the Cimmerians (SAA 16 15), reported on the movements of the Cimmerians (SAA 16 16), and informed Esarhaddon on the border of Urartu (SAA 16 18). Four petitions (SAA 16 34-35, 37-38) were addressed to him and one petitioner asks him to grant permission for completing the work of the petitioner’s father in Calah (SAA 16 34). He was also involved in Babylonian matters. He reported the message from a supervisor of scholars about a Chaldean who had appealed to the king

\textsuperscript{843} Unfortunately, §7 is not preserved in the Tell Tayinat manuscript.

\textsuperscript{844} SAA 16 34, 35, 37, 38, 69, 70, 106, 107, 116, 124.

\textsuperscript{845} SAA 16 36, 60, 63, 65, 106, 118, 133, 136, 149, 155, 207. Assurbanipal is also mentioned as the crown prince in SAA 16 28 from Šērū’a-ēṭrat, his sister, to Libbāli-Sarrat, his wife.

\textsuperscript{846} Luukko and Van Buylaere 2002, XXVII. In addition, they have said that “it seems certain that the crown prince referred to was Assurbanipal rather than Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.”

\textsuperscript{847} PNA 3/II, 1205.

\textsuperscript{848} Parpola has pointed out that the most frequently appearing gods in blessing formulae of scholarly letters are Nabû and Marduk (in this order); see Parpola 1983b, 439.
on account of Babylonian scribes working in the royal library (SAA 16 17). In SAA 16 155 concerning the return of a field to the Chaldeans, Assurbanipal is mentioned in a broken context (r. 11). Regarding military matters, Esarhaddon ordered the recipient of SAA 15 148 to send deserters from Mannea to Assurbanipal and [the bodyguard of the crown prince is mentioned with the wounded in Bīt-Hamban in SAA 16 149. In addition, the “third man” of the crown prince was included among 15 deserters whom the governor of Der sent to the authors of SAA 13 136.

More importantly, Assurbanipal dealt with a significant domestic affair, the conspiracy of Sāsî, a city overseer of Harran,849 in 671/670 BC.850 He interrogated a certain Milki-nūrī, eunuch of the queen and one of the adherents of Sāsî,851 at the request of Esarhaddon (SAA 16 20). In addition, an anonymous person reported to Assurbanipal that Sīn-balāssu-iqbi, governor of Ur, had sent gold to Sāsî (SAA 16 69).

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was also already involved in Babylonian affairs when he was the crown prince of Babylon. In SAA 16 21, he paraphrases two letters. The first letter was addressed to him by Ašarēdu (Šarēdu) and Nabū-ahḫē-ēreš, citizens of Babylon (DUMU.KÁ.DING.RA.KI),852 and Bēl-iddina, a citizen of Borsippa (DUMU.BÁR.SIPA.KI).853 These three informers denounced Bēl-ēṭir and Šamaš-zēru-iqīša, two astrologers,854 and Aplāia, a haruspex,855 because they had failed to report omens relevant to the king or Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and because Aplāia had assembled the people who had captured and delivered Aššur-nādin-šumi, the elder brother of Esarhaddon and the king of Babylon (699-694 BC),856 to Elam, and concluded a treaty with them. The other letter paraphrased by Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had been sent to the accused Bēl-ēṭir and Šamaš-zēru-iqīša by Urdu-Nabû, priest of the Nabû temple at Calah,857 who wrote to them that the treasurer had come without the consent of the king and that Sulāia,858 called “our brother” by Urdu-Nabû, was being detained in the Review Palace of Nineveh by royal command. Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was probably suspicious about the letter and felt the need to inform the king because the astrologers were denounced in the first-mentioned

---

849 PNA 3/I, 1093b-1095a, no. 7, but see also nos. 8 and 12.
851 PNA 2/II, 752a, no. 1.
852 PNA 1/I, 140a, no. 2 and PNA 2/II, 794a, no. 2. These citizens of Babylon are not attested elsewhere.
853 PNA 1/II, 312a, no. 14. Like Ašarēdu and Nabū-ahḫē-ēreš, this person is not otherwise known.
854 Radner 1999, 299a, no. 9 and PNA 3/II, 1221a, no. 1.
855 PNA 1/I, 116b, no. 18. In SAA 10 182, Tabnî complains to the crown prince Assurbanipal that he is overshadowed by this Aplāia.
856 PNA 1/I, 202a-203a.
857 PNA 3/II, 1408b-1409b, no. 5.
858 PNA 3/I, 1156b, no. 3. Sulāia is identical with Šulâ, one of the sons of Babylonian aristocrats “brainwashed” in Nineveh (see Parpola 1972, 33-34).
Concerning the date of SAA 16 21, Parpola has suggested that it was composed in 670 BC and the presence of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in Babylonia is attested in that year. In SAA 16 22, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn reports audience gifts for the king: one horse from (the governor of) Rašappa and one castrated sheep from a certain Nabû-bāni-aḫḫē, who is not well attested. It is unknown why and how Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was related to Rašappa, probably located west of the Assyrian heartland. The rest of his letters, SAA 16 23 and SAA 16 24, are badly broken, and only their greeting formulae are readable.

As already stated above (see p. 146), Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is not mentioned in the political correspondence of Esarhaddon, but he appears in eight scholarly letters. These mainly concern Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s health. In many cases, he appears with Assurbanipal but his name always comes after Assurbanipal. In SAA 10 193, the author, probably Esarhaddon’s personal exorcist Adad-šumu-usur, tells the king that a ritual is going to be performed for Assurbanipal, but since Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is doing well, it is not necessary to perform it for him. In SAA 10 223, presumably the same author sends a medical report on the royal family and says that Assurbanipal, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, and other family members are well. In SAA 10 238, Marduk-šākin-šumi, the chief exorcist, wishes good health for Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Possibly the same author mentions Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in a broken context in SAA 10 239:4. Adad-šumu-usur’s son Urdu-Gula also blesses Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn together in SAA 10 289, a letter mainly concerned with salary complaints. In SAA 10 314, an unknown author, probably Urdu-Nanâia, chief physician, asks the king why Adad-šumu-usur, the king’s exorcist, had said that Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn should not go outdoors before a certain day. Ikkāru, a court physician, enquires about the delivery of medications for Esarhaddon and reports on the treatment and the recovery of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in SAA 10 328. Finally Mār-Issār, Esarhaddon’s agent in Babylonia, informs the king in SAA 10 352 that a substitute king had died for the deliverance of the king and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

859 Parpola 1972, 33-34.
861 PNA 2/II, 809a, no. 3.
862 Parpola and Porter 2001, MAP 3 and p. 15.
864 PNA 3/II, 1402b-1403a, no. 6.
865 PNA 3/II, 1411, no. 2.
866 PNA 2/I, 509, no. 2.
867 PNA 2/II, 739a-740a, no. 18.
Moreover, in an astrological report, SAA 8 102, possibly dated 669-III-15, Akkullānu states that he had made burnt offerings on behalf of the king, Assurbanipal, and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. In all these missives, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is never mentioned with his royal title, although Assurbanipal is called “the crown prince.”

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn does exceptionally appear with his royal title in a priestly letter. In SAA 13 56, Urdu-Nabū writes to Esarhaddon that he has given instructions about the offerings for “Assurbanipal, the great crown prince, for Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the crown prince of Babylon (r. 7, DUMU–MAN KÁ.DINGIR), for Šērū’a-êti-rat, for Aššūr-mukīn-palē’a, and for Ašš[ūr-ett]el-šamē-erṣetī-muballissu” (r. 6-10).

By contrast, the royal inscriptions of Esarhaddon use Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s title with his name. He is attested three times in three inscriptions (see the following three paragraphs). According to these texts, it seems that Esarhaddon aimed to secure the succession of the crown princes and was concerned about them. In addition, he emphasized the connection between Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and Babylonian gods, especially Marduk.

In SAA 2 14, “Esarhaddon’s Treaty Inscription”, the king states: “[he (the king or Marduk?) took the hand] of Assurbanipal, the crown prince designate, and that of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the crown prince designate of [Babylon], [princes] superbly suitable for [the exercise of kingship].”

In a fragment of a tablet from Nineveh, RINAP 4 53 (Aššur-Babylon G = AsBbG), describing the installation of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in Babylon, which may have taken place in Edadiḫegal, “House of Abundant Tribute (?)” of the Esaggil complex, Esarhaddon states: “I gave [Šamaš]-šumu-ukīn, (my) son, my offspring, as a present to the god Marduk and the goddess Zarpanītu.”

---

868 Parpola 1983b, 420, Appendix J. See RMA 89 = SAA 8 102
869 PNA 1/1, 197b-198b. Aššūr-mukīn-palē’a (“Aššūr is the one who established my reign”) was the son of Esarhaddon and was “probably born in 681 or shortly after, as is witnessed by his very name.”
870 PNA 1/1, 184a-b. Son of Esarhaddon; Assurbanipal calls him “my youngest brother” (ŠEŠ.MU TUR).
871 Assurbanipal is mentioned 13 times in 8 inscriptions, see RINAP 4 60:29; RINAP 4 64:7; RINAP 4 77:64B; RINAP 4 79:5′, 12′; RINAP 4 93:25, 31, 34, 37, 40; RINAP 4 94:5; RINAP 4 95:7; RINAP 4 113:30.
873 George 1993, 73, no. 135.
In RINAP 4 113, a cylinder from Babylon on the rebuilding of Enignidrukalamasuma, the temple of Nabû in Babylon, Esarhaddon, appealing to Marduk and Zarpanîtu, writes: “for Assurbanipal, crown prince of Assyria, and Šamaš-šumu-ukîn, crown prince of Babylon, both brothers, my offspring, may they decree as their destiny a good fate, a favourable fate, one of the lengthening of the days of their reigns (and) the protection of the throne(s) of their priestly offices; may their kingships … lead my land in truth and justice; (and) may the gods Šīn and Šamaš together keep answering the true princes with a firm ‘yes’!”

2.3.2. During the Reign of Assurbanipal Before the Revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn
In this section I will briefly review the authority and the behaviour of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn between his accession to the throne of Babylon and the outbreak of the revolt. A detailed study for this period can be found in Frame’s monograph.

On the 10th day of Arâhsamna (VIII) of 669 BC, Esarhaddon died on his way to Egypt, and in Kisîmu (IX) of the same year, Assurbanipal ascended the throne of Assyria. Probably soon after his accession, Zakûtu, queen of Sennacherib and mother of Esarhaddon, imposed the so-called “Zakûtu Treaty” upon the Assyrian royal family, subordinates, and the citizens of Assyria. In the treaty, Šamaš-šumu-ukîn appears the first treaty partner and he is described as Assurbanipal’s “talîmu brother” (PAB ta-li-me-šû). Many scholars have discussed the term, translated as “equal brother,” “favourite brother,” “close brother,” “beloved brother,” and “the brother” and I take the term as “equal brother.” Later, Šamaš-šumu-ukîn designates himself as the “talîmu of Assurbanipal” and calls Assurbanipal “my talîmu.” This term and its usage recall the epic of Gilgameš in which Šamaš (the god of justice) talks to Enkidu about Gilgameš as Enkidu’s talîmu. Parpola believes that the relationship between Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukîn was covertly

---

876 RINAP 4 113:30-34. In l. 31 Leichty translates ŠEŠ MEŠ ki-lal-la-an as “both brothers.”
877 Frame 1992, 103-130, Chapter 7 “Ashurbanipal, King of Assyria, and Šamaš-šuma-ukîn, King of Babylonia (669-653).”
879 Grayson 1975, 127, no. 14:34. Since 669 BC is the accession year of Assurbanipal, his regnal years started in the year 668 BC.
880 SAA 2 8:3, TA* md-GIŠ NU11–MU–GI. NA PAB ta-li-me-šî.
881 E.g., Bartelmus 2007; Stamm 1939, 45; Koschaker 1933, 64-68.
882 E.g., AHw 1310; CAD T 94b-96a.
defined as that between Gilgameš and Enkidu, i.e., a perfect king and a loyal servant, through the mythological implication of the term talīmu.  

On the 14th/24th (Chronicle 1) or 25th (Esarhaddon Chronicle) of Ayyāru (II) of the following year 668 BC, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn ascended the throne of Babylon. In his accession, Assurbanipal played the role of the appointer. He states in his inscriptions that “I appointed Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, my talīmu brother, to the kingship of Babylon in order that the strong might not harm the weak.”  

In L, he describes Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as “my talīmu brother whom I dedica[ted to Marduk].” Some of them indicate that Assurbanipal had good relations with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn from his point of view, for instance, he prays for the long life of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Assurbanipal never mentions Esarhaddon’s arrangement for the succession of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in his inscriptions. 

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn also commissioned his own inscriptions and six of them are extant (RIMB 2 B.6.33.1-6). Since four of the six (RIMB 2 B.6.33.2-5) favourably refer to Assurbanipal and RIMB 2 B.6.33.6 notes his descent of the Assyrian royal family, these inscription were probably composed before the revolt. The following table summarizes their content. 

Table 12: Royal Inscriptions of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn probably composed before the Revolt 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Language and Script</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Main Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.33.2 Sumerian</td>
<td>Sippar Brick</td>
<td>The restoration of the Ebabbar temple for Utu (Šamaš)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

886 Personal communication with Parpola.  
891 RIMB 2 B.6.33.2:8–11, “for the sake of the life of Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, his favourite brother”; RIMB 2 B.6.33.3: 12, “favourite (brother) of Assurbanipal, king of the world, king of Assyria, (and) king of the four quarters (of the world)”; RIMB 2 B.6.33.4:20, “favourite (brother) of Assurbanipal, great king, mighty king, king of the world, (and) king of Assyria” and 24–25, “In order to ensure the good health of Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, my favourite brother, to prolong (his) life, to ensure the well-being of (his) descendant(s), to confirm (his) reign, and to defeat (his) enemy”; RIMB 2 B.6.33.5:36–37, “[…] … Assurbanipal […Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the kin[g …]”]. Shibata has pointed out that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had to refer Assurbanipal as his overlord in his commemorative inscriptions (Shibata 2014, 87).
| RIMB 2 B.6.33.3 | Akkadian in NB script | Borsippa | Stone stela (the king holding a work-basket on his head) | The restoration of the enclosure wall of the Ezida temple for Nabû |
| RIMB 2 B.6.33.4 | Akkadian in NB script | - (Borsippa?) | Cylinder | The renovation of the storehouses of the Ezida temple for Nabû |
| RIMB 2 B.6.33.5 | Akkadian | - (Borsippa?) | Tablet | The building of probably a piece of equipment for a boat for Nabû |
| RIMB 2 B.6.33.6 | Akkadian in NB script | - | Cylinder | (Only the epithets and genealogy of the king are preserved) |

It is striking that RIMB 2 6.33.2 was written in Sumerian. The use of Sumerian for inscriptions of the Assyrian royal family in the first millennium BC is very rare and practically limited to the reign of Sargon II who commissioned Sumerian brick inscriptions at Assur, Dūr-Šarrukīn, and Uruk. His son Sennacherib did not use Sumerian, but Esarhaddon made Sumerian handwritten bricks at Babylon that commemorate the rebuilding of Etemenanki for Asari (Marduk). Like Sargon II and Esarhaddon, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn probably aimed to show his respect for old Babylonian tradition to the Babylonian elite who could read and write Sumerian.

In these inscriptions, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn refers to himself as “viceroy (šakkanakku) of Šuanna (Babylon),” “viceroy of Babylon,” “viceroy,” “king of Sumer (and) Akkad,” “king of the land of Sumer and Akkad,” “king of Babylon,” and “vice-regent.” Porter has pointed out that “viceroy of Babylon” and “king of the land of Sumer and Akkad” were old traditional royal titles of southern rulers and kings used these titles to legitimize themselves. According to her, for ideological and political purposes, these titles were used by several Assyrian kings before Šamaš-šumu-ukīn; the former title was adopted only by Sargon II and Esarhaddon, and the latter one was...
used by Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244-1208 BC), Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 BC), Sargon II, and Esarhaddon.\textsuperscript{901}

As was customary in Babylonia, none of the inscriptions of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn record any military campaigns. Rather, they commemorate his building projects and emphasize his full respect for Babylonian gods. It is noteworthy that three of them allude to the historical event of the return of Marduk’s statue.\textsuperscript{902}

Inscriptions of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn have been found only in Sippar and Borsippa, but various economic, administrative, and legal documents attest that his authority was not restricted to a few cities because documents dated by his regnal years came from all over Babylonia.\textsuperscript{903} Between 668 and 653 BC, 101 documents were composed under his name. Cities that have yielded more than one document are Babylon (37 texts), Borsippa (19), Dilbat (8), Kīš (3), Ḫursagkalama (2), Cutha (2), Nippur (5), Uruk (15), and Ur (5). No documents have been found in Sippar. It is worth noting that after 656 BC the number of the documents increased. In 656 BC, it first reached double-digits.\textsuperscript{904} In 655 BC, it decreased to single-digit. However, in 654 and 653 BC, it became double-digit again.\textsuperscript{905} These figures could indicate the economic revitalization in Babylonia. The economic growth may have been one of the factors that led Šamaš-šumu-ukīn to revolt. On the other hand, the number of Neo-Babylonian economic documents under the name of Assurbanipal between 668 BC and 653 BC is only five: four texts from Uruk in 669 BC and one text from Nippur in 664 BC.\textsuperscript{906} Since Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was not yet the king of Babylon in 669 BC, the economic documents in that year were dated by Assurbanipal.\textsuperscript{907}

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had authority over local matters within Babylonia. Two kudurru dating to his reign before the revolt are extant. In VA 3614, he granted a prebend in Ebabbar, the temple of Šamaš, in Sippar,\textsuperscript{908} while in BM 87220, dated in his 9th year, he confirmed Adad-ibni’s ownership

\textsuperscript{901} Porter 1993a, 79-81.

\textsuperscript{902} RIMB 2 B.6.33.3:5-7, RIMB 2 B.6.33.4:15-16, RIMB 2 B.6.33.6:2′-3′.


\textsuperscript{904} There are 21 documents in this year.

\textsuperscript{905} There are 16 documents in 654 BC and 14 documents in 653 BC.

\textsuperscript{906} Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 21.

\textsuperscript{907} Frame 1995, 194.

\textsuperscript{908} Groß 2014, 4-7; Frame 1992, 9, 107, and 232-237; Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 37, K. 163; Steinmetzer 1935b (transliteration and translation); Steinmetzer 1935a (copy). The year date of the text is damaged, but the text describes Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as the talīmu brother of Assurbanipal. Thus it can be dated in 667-652 BC.
of the land in Bīt-Dakkūr that had been lost during the reign of Esarhaddon.\textsuperscript{909} In addition, in BM 77611 + BM 77612 + four unnumbered fragments from the 84-2-11collection,\textsuperscript{910} he renewed and expanded the prebend that had previously been granted by Aššur-nādin-šumi, son of Sennacherib and the king of Babylon (699-694 BC), though the name of the temple is not preserved.\textsuperscript{911}

Outside Babylonia, not Šamaš-šumu-ukīn himself but a member of his household is attested in a Neo-Assyrian legal text from Assur. According to StAT 2 134 (= Ass 17764),\textsuperscript{912} Nergal-šarru-uṣur, a member “of the household of the king of Babylon” (šá Ė LUGAL KĀ.DINGIR),\textsuperscript{913} purchased a field from Nabû-tariṣ in Assur.

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn himself wrote letters to Assurbanipal showing that he was in charge of Babylonian politics. A letter from the citizens of Babylon indicates that he had been intending to (re-)establish kidinnūtu of Babylon with Assurbanipal.\textsuperscript{914} However, it is obvious that he had to report to Assurbanipal on his actions and the latter had the right to make the final decisions even for internal Babylonian issues.

Four letters from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn are extant: ABL 809, CT 53 140, ABL 1385, and ABL 426. All are written in Neo-Assyrian. In these letters, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn addresses Assurbanipal as “my brother”\textsuperscript{915} and “the king”\textsuperscript{916} and uses the personal name of Assurbanipal only once.\textsuperscript{917} On the other hand, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn never mentions his own royal title and just uses his personal name as customary with Assyrian provincial governors.\textsuperscript{918} However, he once calls himself “your brother.”\textsuperscript{919}

Two of the letters (ABL 809 and CT 53 140) are severely damaged and their contents are lost, but the remaining two (ABL 1385 and ABL 426) are well preserved. ABL 1385 deals with river traffic control. In the letter, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn discusses the passage of the boats of a foreign emissary

\textsuperscript{909} Groß 2014, 4-7; Frame 1992, 9, 107, and 232-237; Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 38, K. 169; King 1912, no. 10 (copy, translliteration, translation, and commentary); CT 10 4-7 (copy).
\textsuperscript{910} Frame 2006-2008, 620-621; Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 16, Fr. 5 and 39, Kn. 5.
\textsuperscript{911} Frame 1992, 9 and 107, n. 29.
\textsuperscript{912} Donbaz and Parpola 2001, 96; Pedersén 1986, 123, Text (36). Its date is lost, but can be dated between 667 and 652 BC.
\textsuperscript{913} PNA 2/I, 955b, no. 30.
\textsuperscript{914} SAA 18 158. See below pp. 163-164 and 171.
\textsuperscript{915} ABL 809:3, ŠEŠ-ia, ABL 809:5; [ŠEŠ-ia; CT 53 140:5, ŠEŠ-ia`; ABL 1385:1, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 1385:3, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 1385:6, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 1385:9, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 1385:11, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 1385:14, ŠEŠ-ia]; ABL 426:1, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 426:3, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 426:6, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 426:8, ŠEŠ-ia; ABL 426:11, ŠEŠ-ia`; ABL 426 r. 1, ŠEŠ-ia.
\textsuperscript{916} ABL 1385:1, LUGAL; ABL 1385:14, LUGAL; ABL 1385 r. 3, LUGAL; ABL 1385 r. 16, MAN; ABL 426:1 LUGAL.
\textsuperscript{917} CT 53 140:1, a-na `ašš-SUR–[A LUGAL KUR–ašš-SUR]`.
\textsuperscript{918} ABL 809:2, [mdGIŠ].NU11–MU–GI.L.NA; ABL 1385:2 mdGIŠ.NU11–MU–GI.L.NA; ABL 426:2, mdGIŠ.NU11–MU–GI.L.NA.
\textsuperscript{919} CT 53 140:2, ŠEŠ-ka.
which he was very likely required to report and to defer to Assurbanipal. He claims to have written to Assurbanipal regarding the boats “once or twice” but since Assurbanipal had not replied, he had become “afraid,” and because the (Elamite) prince Ummanigaš, described as “aggressive,” had put pressure on him, he had sent an order and given the right of passage. However, after he read a missive from Bēl-iqiša, leader of the Gambūlu, he had sent a new order not to let the boats pass and forwarded the letter from Bēl-iqiša to Assurbanipal. At the end of the letter, he leaves the decision to Assurbanipal and states, “May the king do as he chooses!”

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn also had an obligation to report on treason, as the Zakūtu treaty regulates (SAA 28). In ABL 426, he writes to Assurbanipal that he has heard rumours about Šīn-balāсsu-iqbi, the governor of Ur, and he suggests that the king should detain the man until he has investigated and written a detailed report to the king. However, in fact, no other contemporary texts attest the treachery of Šīn-balāсsu-iqbi. Rather, he is known for his loyalty to Assurbanipal from his dedicatory inscriptions, saying that his works were “for the good health of Assurbanipal,” “king of kings,” “king of Assyria, mighty king, king of the world.” At the same time, Frame has pointed out that Šīn-balāсsu-iqbi never mentions Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in his inscriptions, though Ur was nominally under the control of the Babylonian king as the date formulae of economic documents indicate.

It is important to note that, by contrast, Šīn-šarru-uṣur, who succeeded Šīn-balāсsu-iqbi shortly before the outbreak of the revolt, mentions Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in his own dedicatory inscription. He states that he dedicated the land to the goddesses Ištar and Nanāia “for the good health of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, king of Babylon.”

Taking into consideration the governors’ inscriptions and ABL 426, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn may have written ABL 426 when he had already prepared the revolt and tried to get rid of Assurbanipal’s

---

920 ABL 1385:7-13, ina UGU GIŠ.MĂ.MEŠ ša LŪ.ši-i-ri / am-mi-i ša āš-pur-an-ni / a-na ŠEŠ-ia mu-uk a-sap-ra / ā-ra-am-mu-u né-me-el / 2-ša a-na ŠEŠ-ia āš-pur-an-ni / gab-ri di-lib-bi la iš-pur-ni-ni / a-na-ku ap-ta-lāh, “Concerning the boats of that emissary about which I wrote to my brother, saying: “I have sent word and they will let them go. Because I had written to my brother once or twice but he had not answered my letters(s), I became afraid.” For the translation and the interpretation of ABL 1385, see Frame 1992, 111.

921 ABL 1385 r. 15-17, ki-i / ša MAN i-la-’u-u-ni / le-pu-uš.

922 PNA 3/I, 1129b-1130a, no. 3. Šīn-balāсsu-iqbi had the office from 658 BC at the latest to shortly before the revolt in 652 BC.


925 Frame 1992, 110.

926 RIMB 2 B.6.33.2001:2, a-na TIN ZI.MEŠ ša ŠEŠ GIŠ.NU₁₁–MU–GL.NA LUGAL E.KI.
loyal subordinate by deceiving the king through the letter. His scheme eventually succeeded and Sīn-šarru-ušur, who was in favour with him, became the governor of Ur.

2.3.3. During and After the Revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn
The revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn broke out at the latest in Ayyāru (II), 652 BC. Many texts, such as a treaty, extispicies, and the royal correspondence, pertain to this civil war, but most of them come from the Assyrian side. Hence the revolt is largely described from the Assyrian point of view.927

However, some texts deriving from Babylonia also provide information about this period. In total, 44 documents coming from Babylon, Borsippa, Dilbat, Nippur, and unknown provenance, dated by the regnal years of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn,928 indicate that these cities were ruled by Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, although the control of Nippur was temporary and short (from IX to XI of 651 BC). For example, BM 77216, a siege document from Babylon dated to 649 BC, bears the following date formula: “Babylon, month of Du’ūzu (IV), day 24, year 19 of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, king of Babylon (LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI).”929

Thirteen economic documents from Babylonia were dated by the regnal years of Assurbanipal between 651 and 648 BC. They come from Babylon, Nippur, Uruk, Ur, Nina, Ša-ṣur(u)-Adad, and Iltuk(?),930 so these cities were probably under the control of Assurbanipal. The text from Babylon (BM 52925 = 82-3-23,3959) may have been composed between the fall of Babylon (after 648-V-30) and the accession of Kandalānu.931 Even after the revolt was suppressed and Kandalānu was installed as the king of Babylon, texts from Nippur continued to be dated by regnal years of Assurbanipal.932 Brinkman and Frame have suggested that Nippur was directly controlled by Assurbanipal after the revolt.933

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s Sumerian-Akkadian bilingual inscription, RIMB 2 B.6.33.1, was possibly compiled immediately before or during the revolt because he does not mention his Assyrian lineage

927 Frame 1992, 132.
929 Frame 1999, 103. Also at the beginning of the text, the name and the title of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn are mentioned. BM 77216:1-2, [([ina]-MU-19-KĀM) 4giš.NU11–mu–GL.NA LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI / [su]-un-qu åt dam-na-tu₄ ina KUR iš-šá-kīn-ma, “In the nineteenth year of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, king of Babylon, [fæ]mine and hardship were established in the land” (Frame 1992, 102).
931 Frame 1999, 106. The exact regnal year of Assurbanipal is not preserved in the text and Frame reads ḫīpī-ẖīpī (ẖīpu “break(age)” [year?] of Assurbanipal.
and Assurbanipal at all.\textsuperscript{934} Instead, he explains his legitimacy by saying that he was chosen by the goddess Erua, Babylonian birth goddess, before his birth.\textsuperscript{935} Since this is a bilingual text written in pseudo-archaic Babylonian script, he probably intended to appeal to Babylonian people, especially the highly educated elite. In addition, he emphasizes that the statue of Marduk returned from Baltil (Assur) to Babylon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13: A Royal Inscription of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn possibly dated during the Revolt (cf. Table 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.33.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize Šamaš-šumu-ukîn’s deeds during the revolt attested in contemporaneous texts, mainly letters and extispicies, he allied with Elam and the Sealand,\textsuperscript{936} sent messengers and officials to make common cause with them,\textsuperscript{937} gave bribes,\textsuperscript{938} appointed officials,\textsuperscript{939} performed military operations,\textsuperscript{940} and spoke to the citizens of Babylon in order to appeal to them.\textsuperscript{941}

In the texts deriving from this period, Šamaš-šumu-ukîn is referred to only by his personal name, without his royal title. Only once, in Assurbanipal’s treaty with his Babylonian allies (SAA 2 9:6') concluded during the rebellion, he is mentioned with his title “kin[g of Babylon]” (\textsuperscript{942}Šamaš-šumu-ukîn).\textsuperscript{942}

When the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukîn became an oft-repeated theme of the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal and literary texts, the civil war was depicted from an Assyrian perspective. Of the inscriptions, Editions B and D were composed during the revolt: the former in \textit{Abu} (V) of 649 BC.

\textsuperscript{934} Shibata 2014, 87. He has further said that “in the case that the inscription was made earlier, that it was composed by (an) anti-Assyrian scholar(s) in Babylon.” See also Jacobsen 1991 for a detailed study on the text.\textsuperscript{935} Frame 1992, 96.\textsuperscript{936} ABL 462 r. 7; ABL 1326:2, r. 6; CT 65 206:6 and r. 6; SAA 4 282:18 and r. 7; SAA 4 290:22 and r. 10.\textsuperscript{937} ABL 462 r. 7, ABL 754: 6, CT 54 507:19.\textsuperscript{938} *ABL 1380 r. 10-11.\textsuperscript{939} SAA 18 183:9, CT 54 92:5 and 8, CT 54 496:4.\textsuperscript{940} *K 2931:8', SAA 18 157:9, SAA 18 183 r. 1, ABL 1106:14, CT 54 208 r. 5, SAA 4 287 r. 2 and 6.\textsuperscript{941} *K 2931:1'-6', *ABL 301:3-13, SAA 18 164:9'-13'.\textsuperscript{942} However, in the same text, he is just referred to by his personal name; see SAA 2 9:7', 27', and 29'.
and Abu (V) of 648* BC,\(^{943}\) and the latter in Du’āzu (IV) of 648* BC.\(^{944}\) They refer to the revolt only briefly in relation to Elam. After the revolt, eleven inscriptions were compiled and four of these, Edition A in 645* BC,\(^{945}\) Edition C in 647* BC,\(^{946}\) Edition F in 646* BC,\(^{947}\) and IIT (Inscription from Istar Temple, date lost),\(^{948}\) mention Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. In these inscriptions, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is accorded no title,\(^{949}\) but simply referred to as an “unfaithful brother” (aḫu lā kēnu)\(^{950}\) or “hostile brother” (aḫu nakru).\(^{951}\) The former expression is worth noting because it was anticipated by “no brother” (lā aḫu) in the letters from Assurbanipal (*K 2931 and *ABL 301 dated in 652 BC), and then developed into “unfaithful brother” (aḫu lā kēnu) in the extispicy report SAA 4 282 in 651 BC and in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal. The latter one, “hostile brother” (aḫu nakru), occurs only in the inscriptions and is attested more frequently than “unfaithful brother.”

Concerning the behaviour of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the message of the inscriptions is that he forgot all the favours of Assurbanipal, did not adhere to the treaty of the Assyrian king, did evil deeds, gave bribes, and instigated people to rebel against Assurbanipal.

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is also referred to in two literary compositions: SAA 3 25 and SAA 3 44. The former, written in Standard Babylonian with a mixture of Neo-Babylonian and a few Assyrianisms,\(^{952}\) praises Assurbanipal and mentions Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in a broken context (SAA 3 25 i 13), probably alluding to his revolt.\(^{953}\)

The latter, given the heading of “Aššur’s Response to Assurbanipal’s Report on the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn War” in the SAA volume, is written in Standard Babylonian.\(^{954}\) It mentions the name of

\(^{943}\) BIWA, 118 and 257. Edition B 9 and B 16 are dated by the name of Aḫu-ilāa, the eponym of the year 649 BC, and Edition B 1 is dated by the name of Bēlšunu, eponym of the year 648* BC.

\(^{944}\) BIWA, 121 and 257.

\(^{945}\) BIWA, 75 and 257.

\(^{946}\) BIWA, 165 and 257.

\(^{947}\) BIWA, 75-76 and 257.

\(^{948}\) The Inscription from the Istar Temple is not dated but mentions the civil war and the capture of the Elamite king Ummanaldašu III (c. 648-c. 645 BC) briefly, so it was probably written in and after 645 BC. Novotny suggests that it can be dated to 638 BC at the earliest; see Novotny 2003b, 215.

\(^{949}\) BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 129; BIWA, 43 and 234, A IV 42; BIWA, 44 and 235, A IV 57; BIWA, 45 and 235, A IV 98; BIWA, 53 and 241, A VI 14 // F V 8; BIWA, 63 and 246, A VIII 32; BIWA, 63 and 246, A VIII 40; BIWA, 148 and 229, C VII 120 (but Borger reconstructs “Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, [unfaithful brother]”); BIWA, 109 and 229, C VIII 8; BIWA, 149 and 230, C VIII 78.

\(^{950}\) BIWA, 39 and 232, A III 70; BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 96; BIWA, 279 and 293, IIT 110; BIWA, 109 and 229, B VII 7-8; BIWA, 42 and 234, B VII 49-50 // C VIII 39-40.


\(^{952}\) Livingstone 1989, XXII.

\(^{953}\) Livingstone 1989, XXVII-XXVIII.

\(^{954}\) Livingstone 1989, XXII.
Šamaš-šumu-ukīn without any title four times. The text records the deeds of the god Aššur, Assurbanipal, and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in detail from the point of view of the god Aššur in a highly literary language. The evil deeds of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn are described as follows: he did not keep the treaty of the god Aššur and sinned against the favour of Assurbanipal (ll. 7-10), overlooked Aššur’s lordly curse and did not take seriously good counsel regarding his own life (ll. 13-15), aroused [the anger of] all the gods (ll. 16-17), and carried off the property of the gods (ll. 18-19). Because of his sins, Aššur pulled out the foundations of his royal throne, overthrew his reign, [comm]anded the destruction of the entire land of Akkad (ll. 3-4), confined him in harsh imprisonment, bound [...], placed lead ropes on his magnates, [led] them to the presence of Assurbanipal (ll. 9-10), appointed Assurbanipal as the just shepherd of the subjects of Enlil (ll. 11-12), sent fierce weapons to Assurbanipal to defeat enemies (l. 26), stood at Assurbanipal’s side, [poured out the blood] of enemies (ll. 28-29), smashed the [bows] of Elam, strengthened the bow of Assurbanipal (r. 5-6), decreed as [the fate] of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn that of his predecessor during whose reign people were seized by famine, made [...] to seize the people of Akkad, made them eat each other’s flesh (r. 7-10), spoke to Assurbanipal with a divine word (r. 21), commissioned Assurbanipal to renew gods and [to prov]ide for their shrines (r. 23), and promised to deliver him [any other] enemies who do not fear Aššur’s great divinity into Assurbanipal’s hands (r. 26-29). Assurbanipal conquered cities, took heavy booty as plunder from enemies to Assyria (ll. 22-23), brought about the defeat of the warriors of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, [handed over] his warriors to Aššur alive and slew them with weapons in Nineveh (ll. 24-25), beseeched Aššur’s great divinity with prayers and supplications (ll. 28-29), [took …] in his hands like sheep and slaughtered like lambs (r. 1-2), [...]ed the word of] Aššur’s great divinity, eased [Aššur’s angry heart and made the land of Akkad conclude peace] with Aššur (r. 19-20), and sent a tablet of good tidings and peace to the presence of Aššur’s [god]head. This text was politically and propagandistically drawn to denounce Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and justify Assurbanipal’s counteractions.

2.4. Assurbanipal’s Policies towards Babylonian Cities in Peace Time
Babylonia had been annexed to Assyria already under Tiglath-pileser III, but controlling the country was extremely difficult for various reasons, not least because the highest god of Babylon played a pivotal role in Assyrian religion and royal ideology, the Assyrian kings had to respect Babylonian

955 SAA 3 44: 3, 7, 14, and 18.
traditional institutions and administrative structures, which helped the Babylonians keep their national identity. Consequently, the Assyrian kings strove to exercise their rule indirectly through pro-Assyrian elites of the big cities of Babylonia.

Esarhaddon’s considerable effort to win the support of the Babylonian city dwellers seems to have been successful. During his reign, no major military conflict between Assyria and Babylonia took place. Assurbanipal continued his policy to win the goodwill of the Babylonians. This section will document Assurbanipal’s basic stance towards Babylonian city dwellers in peacetime. His policies during the revolt, which is one of the main topics of this dissertation, will be discussed in the next section.

2.4.1. The Return of the Statue of Marduk
Assurbanipal inaugurated his conciliatory policy towards Babylonia by returning the statue of the god Marduk to Babylon at the beginning of his reign. His grandfather Sennacherib had destroyed Babylon in 689 BC and claimed in his inscription from Aššur commemorating the construction of the Akītu house there, that he broke the gods of the city. The inscription does not specify which gods were destroyed, but it is possible that the statue of Marduk was shattered on this occasion, or more likely, it was carried off to Assyria.

Esarhaddon either made a completely new statue of Marduk or repaired the old one, stating in his inscriptions that Marduk and other Babylonian gods were (re)born in the temple of the god Aššur, “their progenitor.” By this definition, Marduk now became the son of the Assyrian national god.

---

956 Parpola 2004b, 8.
957 Porter 1993a, 27-75.
958 RINAP 3/2 168:36-39, iš-tu TIN.TIR.KI aḫ-pu-u / DINGIR.MEŠ-šá u-šab-bi-ru UN.MEŠ-šá ina GIŠ.TUKUL as-pu-na / aš-šu qa-qar URU šu-ā-ti "la mus-si'-i qa-qar-šá as-suḫ-ma la-na ID.pu-ra-ti a-na tam-tim u-šá-bil," “After I destroyed Babylon, smashed its gods, (and) put its people to the sword, I removed its earth in order to make the site of that city unrecognizable and I had (it) carried to the sea by the Euphrates River.”
959 RINAP 4 48:87-90, 4EN GAŠAN-iaš, 4be-let-KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI 4é-a 4DLKU₂ DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ qé-reb é-šár-ra ē za-ri-šá-nu ke-niš im-ma-al-du-ma / iš-mu-ḫu udu-ta ina ša-ri-ri ru-uš-še-e nab-ni-u rā-an-lī e-per šad-di-šá ū-šar-ri-ḫa nab-ni-u ši-ti qe-ni MAḪ.MEŠ šu-ku-tu a-qar-šá / ša-shá-šu-un ū-ta-qq-šu ina ū-ma-al-la-a GABA-su-an mīn-mu-μu "EN GAL-u 4AMAR.UTU ina ša-bi-ti ū-bi-ti ū-ši-šu ub-la ka-ba-ta šé-ši šar-rat 4NUMUN.Ū-ŠU ū-ša-ša-ši DINGIR-ti ša-šu UN.GAL ti ū-ni me-pa-ni uš-ši-u-ba-dši ū-ma diš ū-šar-ri-ḫu bal-tū ū-suḫ-li-du ū-ša-ša-an-bi-ḫu GIM 4UTU-ŠU, "The gods Bēl, Bēltiya, Bēlet-Bābili, Ea, (and) Mandānū, the great gods, were truly created in Ešarra, the temple of their progenitor, and they grew beautiful in figure. I sumptuously adorned their features with red šārīnum-gold, the creation of Mount Arallu (and) an ore from its mountain. I adorned their necks and covered their chests with magnificent ornaments (and) precious jewelry, all that the great lord, the god Marduk, had in mind (and) that the queen, the goddess Zarpanītu, wanted. They fashioned images of their great divinity more artfully than before (and) greatly adorned them. They provided (them) with awe-inspiring vigor (and) made (them) shine like the sun.” RINAP 4 60:36–41, 4EN ū 4GAŠAN-ia DINGIR. MEŠ mur-ta-’a -me ki-i tē-me-šu-’nū’ ina qe-reb URU.ūś-šur ina ša-šu-ma ina ša-šar-šu-gal kur-kar-ra ke-niš im-ma-al-du “be-let-KÁ.” DINGIR.RA.KI 4é-[a] 4DLKU₂ / ina qe-reb URU.ūš-šur a-šar nab-ni-it DINGIR. MEŠ in-nē-ep-šu-ma ū-šak-li-la nab-ni-šu-un’ / ina 50 AM GUN ša-ri-ri ru-uš-še-e nab-ni-it KUR.a-ra-al-ši e-per
Aššur. Esarhaddon claims in his inscriptions that he returned the statue of Marduk to Babylon.

He may well have attempted to do that and only been prevented by an ominous event. This unsuccessful attempt is probably attempted in SAA 10 24 (= LAS 29) from his chief scribe and two exorcists. They said that on the 18th day the god Bēl, together with his divine escort, was in the city of Labbanat and a man attending to a horse mounted the animal and delivered an oracular message from Bēl and Zarpanītu meaning Babylon was going to be looted. Consequently the statue of Marduk was not sent back to Babylon during his reign, possibly because of the third campaign against Egypt which caused his death.

Assurbanipal launched the project to return the statue of Marduk to Babylon as one of his first acts as the king. Five extispicy reports are extant on this matter: SAA 4 262-266. On the 23rd of Nisannu (I) in 668 BC, SAA 4 262 was performed to determine whether Šamaš-šumu-ukīn should escort the statue of Marduk to Babylon. It is important to note that from the beginning Assurbanipal tried to have Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, not Assurbanipal himself, escort the statue. It was inevitable that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn should become the king of Babylon as Esarhaddon had decided because the...
position of Assurbanipal as the king of Assyria had also been established by Esarhaddon.\footnote{Frame 1992, 105.} SAA 4 263, not dated, is similar to the first extispicy report but much shorter because the text is broken. Both SAA 4 264 and SAA 4 265 enquire whether the statue of Marduk should be loaded on a boat in the city of Assur and go to Babylon in the coming year. The dates of these texts are not preserved, but they should date from 669 BC because the statue actually returned to Babylon in 668 BC. The undated SAA 4 266 was performed to determine whether Assurbanipal should appoint a certain man, whose name is lost, as a priest of Marduk.

It seems that Assurbanipal received positive answers. He decided to return the statue of Marduk with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn who embarked a boat at Assur, entered Babylon with the statue later in the month of Ayyāru (II) of 668 BC, and ascended the throne of Babylon.\footnote{The Babylonian Chronicle and the Esarhaddon Chronicle state that this happened on 668-II-24/25 (Grayson 1975, 86, no. 1, iv 36 and 127, no. 14:36. The exact day in both chronicles is uncertain. The Akītu Chronicle records that it was on 668-II-24 (Grayson 1975, 131, no. 16:7).} Assurbanipal frequently declares in his inscriptions that he returned the statue of Marduk to Babylon, established the privileged status of the city, and appointed Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as its king.\footnote{The same description is found in RIMB 2.B.6.32.1:39-44, EN [GAL] / 4 ḌAMAR.UTU šá ina BA[LA-ē] / LU[GAL maḫ-[r]i] / ina ma-ḫar AD ba-ni-[i-šú] / i-ši-bu ina qe-[reb] / bal-ti Ki ina u-[me] / BALA-īa ina ri-ša-[r][i] / a-na TIN.TIR.KI / i-ra-um-ma. See also Frame 1992, 56.} By emphasizing these facts, Assurbanipal clearly wanted to present himself as the overlord of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The same is implied by the fact that he does not mention the succession arrangement by Esarhaddon. In a couple of inscriptions, Assurbanipal adds an explanation why the statue was returned. He states that “during my reign, the [great] lord, the god Marduk, who during the reign of a previous king had resided in Baltil (ceremonial name of Assur) in the presence of the father who created [him], entered Babylon amidst rejoicing.”\footnote{Grayson 1975, 127, no. 14:31-32 and 131, no. 16:1-3.} As stated above (pp. 160-161), the inscriptions of Esarhaddon created the idea that Marduk was born as the son of the god Aššur, but that Marduk had taken up residence in Assur was an innovation of Assurbanipal. It was also perpetuated in the chronicles both the Esarhaddon Chronicle and the Akītu Chronicle, stating that Marduk (who appears as Bēl in the chronicles) stayed in Assur for 8 years during the reign of Sennacherib and for 12 years during the reign of Esarhaddon.\footnote{Grayson 1975, 127, no. 14:31-32 and 131, no. 16:1-3.}
Šamaš-šumu-ukīn himself also repeatedly refers to the return of the statue of Marduk in his inscriptions. Interestingly, however, he never acknowledges his or Assurbanipal’s involvement in this matter before the revolt, but states that Marduk returned to Babylon with a will of his own. For instance, in RIMB 2 B.6.33.3:5-6, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn refers to himself as “the one during [who]se reign the Enlil of the gods, the god Marduk, had pity, entered Babylon amidst rejoicing, and took up his residence in Esagila forevermore.” However, in his bilingual inscription RIMB 2 B.6.33.1, probably written immediately before the revolt or during it, he stresses his own involvement in the return of the statue: “The king of the gods, the god Asari, came happily with me from Baltîl unto ‘the Seat of Life.’ The great lord (and) hero, the god Marduk, gladly took up his holy residence in Esagila, the palace of heaven and netherworld” (ll. 14-18). After the statue of Marduk had been returned, the New Year’s festival of Babylon could again be celebrated until the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn broke out.

2.4.2. The Re-establishment of the Privileged Status (kidinnūtu)
At the beginning of his reign, Assurbanipal granted the privileged status (kidinnūtu) to Babylon and Sippar, possibly Uruk and Ur as well. Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was also involved in establishing the kidinnūtu of Babylon according to SAA 18 158 from the citizens of Babylon. It seems that kidinnūtu could include protection from physical harm, immunity from taxation (certain taxes, for instance customs dues), freedom from the expropriation of land by civil authorities, exemption from military conscription and corvée duty, and the right of appeal to the king in court cases. Other terms denoting privileged status (andurāru, šubarrū, zakātu) are known from the reigns of Assyrian monarchs in the Neo-Assyrian period, but their semantic spheres were more limited than that of kidinnūtu, which under Assurbanipal was bestowed only on the Babylonian cities.

969 RIMB 2 B.6.33.1:14-18, RIMB 2 B.6.33.3:5-6, RIMB 2 B.6.33.4:15-16, RIMB 2 B.6.33.6:1'-2'.
971 Shibata 2014, 87.
972 Grayson 1975, 127, no. 14:37, 131, no. 16:8, and 132, no. 16:17-27.
973 Personal communication from Parpola.
974 Porter 1993a, 64, n. 145. Porter suggests that the kidinnūtu “seems to include protection from physical harm, since the shedding of blood of people who hold this status is treated as a transgression.” In SAA 18 158, the citizens of Babylon mention the “for the safety of/safeguarding” (l. 5, a-na šu-ul-l[u]m!]) foreign women and state that even a dog that comes inside Babylon should not be killed (l. 11).
976 Frame 1992, 35. Andurāru means “cancellation of debts,” šubarrū “liberation from slavery,” and zakātu “exemption from taxes.” The basic connotation of kidinnūtu is “protection.”
Assurbanipal frequently states in his inscriptions from Babylonia that “I (re-)established the privileged status kidinnūtu of Babylon” (kidinnūtu Bābili akṣur). Interestingly, all these inscriptions were certainly commissioned before the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn because they mention him in a positive light. In all the inscriptions, the verb used is kaṣāru and Babylon is written either TIN.TIR.KI or KĀ.DINGIR.RA.KI. The privileged status granted to the city probably encompassed all the citizens of Babylon.

In *ABL 926, probably composed at the very beginning of his reign, Assurbanipal clearly calls the citizens of Babylon “the people under my protection (kidinnu)” (l. 1, LŪ.TIN.TIR.MEŠ ERIM.MEŠ ki-din-ni-ia). This expression recalls the phrases of “(the people of) Babylon and Borsippa, people under kidinnu and of freedom (šubarrē)” in the Imgur-Enlil (Balawat) inscription of Shalmaneser III, “Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, Borsippa (…) all the people under my kidinnu” in the inscriptions of Sargon II, and “the wronged citizens of Babylon, people under kidinnu and of freedom” in the inscription of Esarhaddon. In SAA 18 158 addressed both to Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, probably soon after their accession (early 668 BC), the citizens of Babylon write that the kings have intended to (re-)establish kidinnūtu and happiness of the citizens of Babylon and request them to establish kidinnūtu for the women from the house of Ėṭiru, identified with a temple prelate of Esaggīl at Babylon who was killed by Šūzubu of the house of Gaḫal. It is worth noting that although Šamaš-šumu-ukīn here appears as one of the establishers of the kidinnūtu, other texts never assign this role to him. After the revolt broke out, in *ABL 301 dated 652-II-23, Assurbanipal tells the citizens of Babylon that “your kidinnūtu, which I have established, remains valid until the present day.”

977 RIMB 2 B.6.32.1:12, ki-din-nu-ū-tu TIN.TIR.KI ak-ṣur (from Babylon). The same phrase is also attested with minor orthographic variations and a different writing of the name of Babylon (e.g., KĀ.DINGIR.RA.KI) in RIMB2 B.6.32.2:48-49 from Babylon, RIMB 2 B.6.32.3:10 from Babylon, RIMB 2 B.6.32.4:10 from Babylon, RIMB 2 B.6.32.5:10 from Babylon, RIMB 6.6.32:6.12 from an unknown place, RIMB 2 B.6.32.12:10-11 from Sippar, RIMB 2 B.6.32.13:15 possibly from Borsippa but could be from Nineveh, RIMB 2 B.6.32.14:29 from Borsippa, and RIMB 2 B.6.32.19:18 from Ûruk. See also SAA 18 158 from the citizens of Babylon to Assurbanipal discussed below. The citizens appeal to the king saying that the privileged status is not protected.
978 Based on the sentence in *ABL 926:5, ul-tu UD-me an-nē-e ša-ba-ku-[nu lu DŪG.GA-ku-nu-šī], “may you be h[appy] from this day on”, Parpola suggests that the letter could be dated at the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal and the letter may have contained the first official confirmation of Babylon’s privileged status (Parpola 2004a, 227, n. 2).
980 Fuchs 1994, 191, Prunk. 5-7.
981 RINAP 4 104 v 10-12, DUMU.MEŠ KĀ.DINGIR.RA.KI / dal-lu-tu ERIM.MEŠ / ki-din-nī šu-ba-re-e.
982 PNA 1/II, 408, no. 2.
983 *ABL 301:16-17, ki-din-nu-ta-ku-nu ša ak-šu-ru / ad-di UGU ša en-na šu-ȗ.
Assurbanipal also granted *kidinnūtu* to Sippar because, in an undated fragmentary royal inscription of Assurbanipal, Sippar is described as “the city of *kidinну*.”

The fragmentary letter *K* 4534, possibly from Assurbanipal to unknown recipient(s), also refers to *kidinnūtu* in a broken context. However, it is obscure which city is referred to in the letter.

In sum, Assurbanipal repeatedly mentions in his royal inscriptions from Babylonia that he established the *kidinnūtu* of Babylon. It seems that he was strongly conscious of the audiences of the inscriptions, in other words, the citizens of Babylon, Sippar, Borsippa, and Uruk, and aimed to present himself to these citizens of Babylonian cities as the protector of traditional city-dwellers.

### 2.4.3. Sponsoring Building Projects in Babylonia

Esarhaddon carried out the construction work on secular buildings such as palaces and arsenals in Assyria, whereas in Babylonia he sponsored repairs to temple buildings in order to be seen as a traditional Babylonian king according to Porter.

Assurbanipal continued Esarhaddon’s building policy. Of his 23 royal inscriptions from Babylonia, only two commemorate secular construction works: the city wall of Babylon and its gates, and the city wall of Borsippa. The remaining 21 inscriptions record religious building projects in Babylon, Sippar, Borsippa, Nippur, Uruk, Dūr-Kurigalzu, and Mē-Turran/Mē-Turnat. Their exact dates are unknown, but at least 11 of them were composed before the outbreak of the revolt because they mention Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in a friendly manner. Some building projects were also carried out in the name of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in Sippar and Borsippa before he began the revolt. Though he

---
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988 RIMB 2 B.6.32.1.

989 RIMB 2 B.6.32.13.

990 RIMB 2 B.6.32.1-11 and probably RIMB 2 B.6.32.20 came from Babylon, RIMB 2 B.6.32.12 came from Sippar, RIMB 2 B.6.32.13-14 and probably RIMB 2 B.6.32.23 came from Borsippa, RIMB 2 B.6.32.15-18 came from Nippur, RIMB 2 B.6.32.19 came from Uruk, RIMB 2 B.6.32.21 came from Dūr-Kurigalzu, and RIMB 2 B.6.32.22 came from Tell-Haddād. It is worth noting that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn also carried out restoration work in Babylonia under his name. RIMB 2 B.6.33.1 records the restoration work of the city wall of Sippar and RIMB 2 B.6.33.2 commemorates the restoration work of Ebabbar temple in Sippar. RIMB 2 B.6.33.3-5 records the building project on the wall, the storehouse, and an object of the temple Ezida in Borsippa.

991 RIMB 2 B.6.32.1-6, 12-14, 19.
was the king of Babylon, he does not claim to have undertaken any building projects in the city. The following table summarizes the building projects of both kings in Babylonia.

**Table 14: The Building Projects of Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Building Description</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Outer city wall (Nēmet-Enlil) and its gates</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Shrine of Ea (Ekarzagina) within the Esaggil complex</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Some structure associated with Ea</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Temple of Ištar</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Temple of Ninmaḫ</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Platforms and daisies of Esaggil</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Esaggil and ziqqurat (Etemenanki)</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Ziqqurat (Etemenanki)</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Sumerian) RIMB 2 B.6.32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>A lamp or lampstand to Marduk</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar</td>
<td>Temple of Šamaš (Ebabbar)</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar</td>
<td>Temple of Šamaš (Ebabbar)</td>
<td>Šamaš-šumu-ukīn</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.33.2 (Sumerian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar</td>
<td>City wall of Sippar</td>
<td>Šamaš-šumu-ukīn</td>
<td>After 652 BC?</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.33.1 (Akkadian and Sumerian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsippa</td>
<td>City wall of Borsippa (Tābi-supūršu)</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsippa</td>
<td>Temple of Nabû (Ezida)</td>
<td>Assurbanipal</td>
<td>Before 652 BC</td>
<td>RIMB 2 B.6.32.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As this table indicates, Assurbanipal worked energetically on building projects in Babylon before the revolt. It is well known that he claimed to have completed the construction work on Esaggil at Babylon which Esarhaddon had begun but had not finished. Since Nippur was a significant city from a religious and ideological point of view (see above p. 9), Assurbanipal strenuously engaged in building projects for Enlil, who, as Illil “god of gods,” was equated with both Aššur and Marduk, after he put the city under his direct control.

---

To sum up, Assurbanipal’s inscriptions from Babylonia indicate that he intended to represent himself as a benevolent and responsible Babylonian ruler who protected sanctuaries and emphasized an ideological aspect of the Babylonian king, although Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and Kandalānu ceremonially functioned as the kings of Babylon.

2.4.4. The Reconfirmation of Offerings
Offerings are an aspect of religion, but they were also economically important. In the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn from Babylonia, “regular offerings” (*sattukku*) are frequently mentioned. The term *sattukku* is a loan word from Sumerian *sa₂ dug₄*, a noun-verb combination meaning “to arrive; to cause to arrive (regularly),” and the relevant offerings consisted mainly of food such as dates, grain, spices, lambs, and sheep. After these food offerings had been presented to the gods, they were distributed to temple offices as prebends; hence they were a very important source of especially meat. In addition, prebends could be sold personally and handed over as securities for loans. Thus the regular offerings provided by the king were a great benefit to prebendary personnel at temples in Babylonia.

In his royal inscriptions from Babylonia, Assurbanipal often claims to have “(re)confirmed the regular offerings for Esagila and the gods of Babylon” (*sattukkī Esagil ū ilāni Bābili ukīn*). Actually, SAA 13 166, a memorandum possibly from Urdu-aḫḫēšu, a high official who kept reporting the progress of the restoration works on the temples of Babylon including Esagil, records that Halmaneans stopped sending regular sheep offerings for Bēl since the crown prince took the throne. Another type of offering, *niqû* (*UDU . SISKUR*), meaning sacrificial sheep or sacrifices in general, is referred to by Assurbanipal in an undated letter (*ABL 1146*) probably addressed to the citizens of Babylon, reading: “my eyes are upon you. You returned to me, so I will do justice to you. And *I am thin*king about you and your (expiatory?) *niqû*-offerings for

---

993 CAD S 198a-202a; AHw 1201b-1202a, s.v. šattukku.
994 As for the redistribution of the leftovers derived from the sacrificial cult, see Frame and Waerzeggers 2011, 128-132 and Jursa 2007, 229-230.
995 Though the sales of a prebend were more common in the Neo-Babylonian period and later times, we have evidence for the existence of the prebendary system in Babylonia already in the reigns of Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. See Frame and Waerzeggers 2011; Frame 1992, 9, 107, and 115.
997 PNA 3/II, 1395b-1396a, no. 7.
999 CAD N/2 252a-259a; AHw 793a-b.
The interpretation of the passage is uncertain due to the lack of context, but it seems that the letter was written after the conquest of Babylon because Assurbanipal promised to sponsor the offerings of the citizens of Babylon and probably meant to atone for the participation of the city in the rebellion.

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn also states in his inscriptions that he (re)confirmed the regular offerings (sattukku) and provided them “(in) Esagila (for) the gods of the land of Sumer and Akkad” and “for Esagila and the gods of the land of [Sumer and Akkad]”. The phrase “the land of Sumer and Akkad” recalls one of his royal titles, “king of the land of Sumer and Akkad,” a traditional title for the ruler of Babylonia used by only four Assyrian kings (Tukulti-Ninurta I, Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II, and Esarhaddon) before him. It is likely that he intentionally used this title since it sounded more traditional from the Babylonian point of view.

Both kings clearly aimed to show that kings from the Assyrian royal family were generous to Esaggil, the Babylonian gods, and the Babylonians. Both of them emphasized that they gave importance to the regular offerings of Esaggil, the temple of Marduk, the supreme god of Babylon.

2.4.5. The Restoration of Rites and Rituals
Restoring traditional rites and rituals was also one of the important tasks for the rulers of Babylonia. However, interestingly, Assurbanipal never claims to have done this in his inscriptions from Babylonia, possibly because Esarhaddon had already “restored the rites (and) rituals according to the old pattern” (ša … parṣī kidudē kīma labūrīma utēru ašruššun).

On the other hand, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn once does make the claim of having restored ancient rites, namely those of the gods of Ekur, the temple of Enlil at Nippur. In his bilingual inscription commemorating the restoration work of the city wall of Sippar, which was probably composed immediately before or during the revolt, he states: “I restored the precious rites (and) choice cult...
practices of the great gods who sit upon dais(es) in the whole Ekur." He clearly intended to represent himself as the true protector of Nippur, ideologically the most important city in Babylonia, in an effort to gain the favour of the Nippurians at a crucial moment.

2.4.6. The Recruitment of Locals as Administrators
The key administrative positions in Babylonia were reserved for members of limited local aristocratic families. Frame has shown that the members of the most prominent families in Borsippa, the Arkât-ilî-damqā, the Iliya, and the Nūr-papsukkal, held the offices of the governor of Borsippa and the administrative head of the temple Ezida. He has also pointed out that Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk (c. 661-649 BC), was probably a member of a prominent Urukean family. Furthermore, Sīn-balāssu-iqbi, Sīn-šarru-uṣur, and Sīn-tabni-uṣur, who functioned as governors of Ur under Assurbanipal, were all sons of Nikkal-iddin who was the governor of Ur during the time of Esarhaddon.

When Assurbanipal became the king, he let the officials who had gained their jobs during the reign of Esarhaddon keep their posts. This is a further indication that Assurbanipal followed Esarhaddon’s reconciliatory policy towards Babylonia. For instance, Nabû-nādin-šumi, the temple administrator (šatammu) of the temple of Nabû at Borsippa, Nabû-šuma-ēreš, the governor of Nippur, and Aḫḫēšāia, the governor of Uruk, maintained their positions from the reign of Esarhaddon into the reign of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. As far as we know, before the outbreak of the revolt, there is no evidence to indicate whether or not Šamaš-šumu-ukīn could appoint officials in Babylonia. All new officials were appointed by Assurbanipal, who was careful to maintain the traditional Babylonian official titles such as šakin ūmi, šandabakku, and šakkanakku, except in Babylon.

All these Babylonian officials owed a duty to report to Assurbanipal and they were closely monitored. Nippur illustrates this circumstance well. Ilīl-bāni was the governor of Nippur from the latter half of the 660s roughly to the end of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (see above pp. 39-40), but a prefect (šaknu) called Aššur-bēlu-taqqin was stationed in Nippur to keep watch over the governor because the previous governor of Nippur had betrayed the Assyrian king. The šaknu was

1008 Frame 1986, 260-261.
1009 During the revolt, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn appointed officials who were on his side. For example, he installed Nabû-nāṣir as the governor of Uruk, see above pp. 130-131 and 157.
in charge of important royal documents and messengers. For instance, in SAA 18 192 (not dated but datable before the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn\(^{1011}\)), Illil-bānī describes Aššur-bēlu-taqqīn as “the prefect appointed in Nippur to pass on sealed documents and royal messengers.”\(^{1012}\) He also complains to Assurbanipal that Aššur-bēlu-taqqīn had threatened to cut off his head, writing: “about the sealed documents and the royal servants who come and stay for three or four days in Nippur and whom he refuses to pass on — when I spoke to him about them, [sayin]g: ‘The people of Nippur and the whole country have [d]is[c]redited me,’ he [raised] his hand against me [... and sa]id: ‘I will cut off your head and [hang it] by the neck [of ...].’”\(^{1013}\) However, the governor and the prefect performed together the guard duty assigned by Assurbanipal (SAA 18 197) and were both present at an audience for Nippurian elders with the king (*ABL 287*).

### 2.4.7. City Councils

Democratic organizations also played a significant role in Babylonia. As stated above (pp. 163-165), some Babylonian cities, at least Babylon and Sippar, enjoyed the privileged status of kidinnūtu. The councils of these cities, which included elders, had political influence, although each city had its own governor. They could even directly correspond with Assurbanipal.\(^{1014}\) When Šamaš-šumu-ukīn revolted against Assurbanipal, the Assyrian king attempted to curb the rebellion in collaboration with the governors and the city councils. This shows that, especially during the revolt, the latter were politically important for Assurbanipal.

### 2.4.8. *ABL 926 as a Statement of Assurbanipal’s Babylonian Policy

As already discussed above (pp. 6-7, 102, and 164), *ABL 926, addressed to the citizens of Babylon, features many key elements of Assurbanipal’s Babylonian policies such as granting the privileged status kidinnūtu\(^{1015}\) and the metaphor of the figurative mother-child relationship between Zarpanītu and Assurbanipal. The king also describes his legitimacy, his good reign, and his kingship with figurative expressions, but never refers to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in the letter. These suggest that

\(^{1011}\) Frame 1992, 276, n. 45.  
\(^{1012}\) SAA 18 192 r. 8'-10', AN.ŠĀR–EN–taq-qin LŪ.šak-nu šā' a'-na' / (šá' a'-na') šu-tu-qu-ti šá un-qa-a-ti u LŪ.A–KIN šá LUGAL / ina EN.LĪL.ŠI puq-du.  
\(^{1013}\) SAA 18 192 r. 10'-e, 2, ana UGU un-qa-a-ti u ARAD.MEŠ / šá LUGAL šá il-la-ku-nim-ma 3 UD-‘ma’ 4 UD-mu ina EN.LĪL.ŠI / dāš-bu-ša la i-man-gu-ru-nu la šu-ši-ti-iz-šā-šu-ni-tū / [ana] UGU-ḫi it-it-šā ki-i ad-bu-bu / [um-ma]-a LŪ.EN.LĪL.ŠI.MEŠ u KUR gab-bi / ‘qu-la’–li-ia il-tak-nu / [0] SU.2-sū a-na UGU-ḫi-šā / [x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x] ma SAG.DU-ka a-bat-taq-ma ina it-ik-ki / [x x x x x x x x x x x] ‘x’.  
\(^{1014}\) E.g., SAA 18 158. On the one hand, the letter is sent to “the king” (LUGAL). On the other, it quotes a speech by the citizens of Babylon addressed to “the kings, our lords” (LUGAL.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-nī) (e.g., ll. 2, 6, 12, r. 3', 8', 12').  
\(^{1015}\) Kidinnītu could include protection from physical harm, immunity from taxation, freedom from the expropriation of land by civil authorities, exemption from military conscription and corvée duty, and the right of appeal to the king in court cases. See above p. 163.
the letter was probably written at the very beginning of his reign and it is probable that through it he aimed at announcing these benevolent intentions directly to the citizens of Babylon. Thus, this letter is especially important to the topic of this thesis, and even at the risk of repetition, it is worth paying closer attention to its contents.

In the opening formula, Assurbanipal addresses the citizens of Babylon as “the people under my protection (kidinnu).” On the other hand, Assurbanipal calls himself “king of Assyria, who reveres [Marduk].” The name of Marduk is not preserved, but since Marduk is referred to (l. 6) and his consort Zarpantiḫu is mentioned as the mother of Assurbanipal (ll. 11-15), the restoration seems certain. Through this phrase, Assurbanipal depicts himself as a pious and god (Marduk)-fearing Assyrian king towards the citizens of Babylon.

The address formula is closed by a salutation: “I, my palace [and my country] are well; may you, [great] and small, be well; may you be h[appy] from this day on.” This salutation is more elaborate than the usual formula in the letters from Assurbanipal: “I am well; you can be glad.” By this special greeting, he probably aims to emphasize that all is well and his letter is addressed to the whole community of the citizens of Babylon. The letter itself is not dated, but Parpola has suggested that the letter was probably composed at the very beginning of Assurbanipal’s reign because of the phrase, “may you be h[appy] from this day on.” Parpola has further proposed that the letter “may well have contained the first official confirmation of Babylon’s privileged status.”

Following the salutation, Assurbanipal orders the citizens of Babylon to “hear of the might of Mardu[...], behold his august heroism [...], praise his great godhead [...].” It is interesting to note an Assyrian king urging the people presumably already devoted to Marduk to take these actions, reminding them of the end of Enūma eliš. After these orders, there is another unequivocal
allusion to *Enûma elîš*: “May the first one see and recount, may the last one hear how [...].”

These allusions to *Enûma elîš* were probably meant to underline Assurbanipal’s devotion to Marduk, but it should be noted that by defining Marduk as the grandson of AN.ŠÂR, the epic also implied the subordination of Babylonia to Assyria.

After this, he affirms his devotion to Zarpanûtu, stating: “ever since my childhood until now I have trusted in the Lady Zarpa[nîtu]; father and mother did not raise me, [I grew up in her lap].”

Although the king does not explicitly call himself the son or the creation of the goddess, this statement definitely derives from the mother-child imagery of the Assyrian prophecies (see above pp. 100-101). Mullissu/Ištar being here replaced for political reasons by Zarpanûtu, the consort of Marduk. It is evident that Assurbanipal intends to stress his legitimacy since his childhood by stating that he was raised by the goddess instead of a human father and mother.

He further emphasizes the admirable qualities given to him by the gods, saying: “[the great gods] presented me with truth and righteousness, decreed a good fate for me [...]” Truth (kittu), righteousness (mīšaru), and good fate (šîmtu ṭábbtu) were essential aspects of the Assyrian king.

Following these words, Assurbanipal describes the prosperity of his reign: “In my reign there is prosperity, in [my] years there is [abundance]. My [king]ship is good as choicest oil [......]. Good [...] beer. I have placed in my palace [...].” As Parpola has pointed out, “happy reign” is a topos of Assyrian literary compositions, and the elements of the “happy reign” are described in detail in SAA 10 226, a long petition for Urdu-Gula written by his father Adad-šumu-usur. He writes to the king:

A good reign – righteous days, years of justice, copious rains, huge floods, a fine rate of exchange! The gods are appeased, there is much fear of god, the temples abound; the great

---

1022 *ABL 926:9-10, [ma]ḫ-ru-u le-e-mur [i]-ṣá-an-ni / ar-ku-u liš-me ki-i [x x x x]. Cf. Lambert 2013, 132-133, *Enûma elîš* VII 157-158, tak-lim-ti maḫ-ru-ä id-bu-ba pa-nu-uš-ša / iš-tur-ma iš-ta-kan ana šî-mê-e ar-ku-ti, “Instruction which a leading figure repeated before him (Marduk): He wrote it down and stored it so that generations to come might hear it.” See also Lambert 2013, 492, note on VII 157-158. Lambert has pointed out that these two lines allude “to its author as mahûrî.”


1024 *ABL 926:11-13, ul-ṭu še-ḫe-ri-ia a-di šâ-bi i-[na-an-na] / [t]ak-la-ku a-na šar-ra-ti 4-dar-pa-[ni-tum] / AD u AMA ul ū-raq-ba-an-ni [x x x x]. See also SAA 3 3:13, ul i-di AD u um-me ina ’bur’-ki” dus! DAR.MEŠ-ī-a ū-ba-a ana-ku, “I knew no father or mother, I grew up in the lap of my goddesses”.

1025 *ABL 926:14-15, iš-ru-ku-in-ni kit-tu mi-šâ-[ru x x x] / šīm-tu ṭa-ab-tu i-ši-mu-in-ni [x x x].

1026 *ABL 926:16-20, ina pa-le-ia nu-ul-šu ina MU.AN.NA.[MEŠ-ia tuḥ-du] / [šar-r]a-u-ti kī-ma ū-lu 1,GŠ UGU x x x] / [x x]-e DUG.GA.MEŠ ši-ka[r x x x] / [x x i-na Š]Ā.E.GAL-ia aš-[k]u[m x x x] / [x x x x x]-pa-ti ṭu-[la x x x].

1027 Parpola 1983b, 103-107.
gods of heaven and earth have become exalted in the time of the king, my lord. The old men
dance, the young men sing, the women and girls are merry and rejoice; women are married
and provided with earrings; boys and girls are brought forth, the births thrive (SAA 10 226:9-20).

Additionally, in a hymn for Assurbanipal’s coronation, SAA 3 11, constant rain and flood are
invoked for his reign.\textsuperscript{1028} In fact, at the beginning of his reign, Assyria enjoyed abundant crops as a
result of ample rains and floods. Assurbanipal tells proudly about this rich harvest at the end of the
epilogue of his royal inscriptions, Editions A, B, C, T, all compiled in the 640s, as well as in some
fragments.\textsuperscript{1029} Interestingly, one phrase in these inscriptions is parallel to the expression in the
present letter: “In my reign there was prosperity aplenty, in my years there was fullness to
overflowing.”\textsuperscript{1030} Assuming that the letter was composed at the beginning of Assurbanipal’s reign,
the phrase used in this letter was reused in the inscriptions around 20 years later. Moreover, this
parallel could indicate that the scribes drafting the letter were also involved in compiling the
inscriptions. Although the reign of Assurbanipal had probably just begun, he already depicted it in
abstract terms and metaphors. Unfortunately, the rest of the letter is broken.

As we have seen, in *ABL 926 Assurbanipal stresses three main points to the citizens of Babylon:
his goodwill towards them, his devotion to Marduk and Zarpanītu, and his “happy reign.” He never
says a word about Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. All in all, the letter embodies Assurbanipal’s policies towards
Babylonian cities, especially Babylon.

2.5. Assurbanipal’s Babylonian Policies during the Revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn
During the time of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, Assurbanipal tried to resolve the conflict through
loyal local governors of the large Babylonian cities. He wrote conciliatory letters to the citizens of
Babylon who took side with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. In the letters he emphasized his generosity to the
citizens of Babylon and attempted to persuade them to come to their senses at the last moment.

\textsuperscript{1028} SAA 3 11:20, “In his years may there cons[tantly] be rain from the heavens and flood from the (underground)
source!”
\textsuperscript{1029} BIWA, 16-17 and 205, A I 45-51 // B I 27-38 // C I 118-127 // K 13730:1’-4’ // (partly) T IV 8-9 // Tvar 3 1’ 9’-18’ //
A 8113:1’-7’ // Rm 291 r. 6-10. See also Parpola 1983b, 104-105.
\textsuperscript{1030} BIWA, 17 and 205, A I 51 // B I 35 // C I 126-127 // K 13730:4’ // Tvar 3 1’ 17’-18’ // A 8113 6’-7’ // Rm 291 r. 10,
ina BALA.MEŠ-ia ṭE.NUN (u) ūḫ-du ina MU.AN.NA.MEŠ-ia ku-um-mu-ra ṭE.GAL.-lum. See also a letter from Marduk-
šāpik-zēri to Esarhaddon about celestial portents, his own qualifications, and twenty able scholars for royal service,
SAA 10 160:16, ṭE.”NUN’ u ṭE.GAL.”LA ina KUR” [O] GAL-šī, “there will be prosperity and abundance in the land.”
While, although we may not have a direct reference to an attack on one of the rebel cities, Assurbanipal did besiege several of them, in particular Babylon, with the result that conditions inside the city became terrible. The historical overview of the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn revolt was already examined above (pp. 120-144). In the present section, I will investigate the royal letters from the view point of Assurbanipal’s policies towards Babylonian cities during the revolt with careful consideration of the political relations between Assyria and Babylonia, the political situation at the time the letters were composed, and the intentions of Assurbanipal.

The extant letters were sent to Nippur, Uruk, Ur, and Babylon. With the exception of Babylon, these cities took the side of Assyria. Before the rebellion began, the economic texts from these cities were dated under the name of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, but after the revolt broke out, all these pro-Assyrian cities switched to dating by the regnal years of Assurbanipal. The exact reason why these cities were loyal to Assyria during the revolt is not stated in the letters, but presumably Assurbanipal lent intensive support to them because of their political and strategic importance for the control of central and southern Babylonia.

The recipients of the royal letters during the revolt were the city governors or the assembly of the citizens, or both of them, indicating that they worked together. In order to implement his policies, Assurbanipal shows a willingness to compromise and provide aid to the recipients; he encourages them, and gives orders to them with either generous or harsh words depending on the circumstances.

It should be noted that not a single letter addressed to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn during the revolt is extant even in draft. In addition, he is seldom mentioned in my research corpus though he was the key and central figure on the rebel side. This may indicate that Assurbanipal refused to negotiate with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Probably he also felt deep hatred against Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Each time he mentions Šamaš-šumu-ukīn in the letters, he calls him “no-brother” (lā aḫu). This designation betrays Assurbanipal’s strong feeling about Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

1031 Only two economic texts from Nippur were dated under the name of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn during the revolt. As mentioned above (p. 128), in the second year of the revolt (651 BC), Nippur had fallen into the hands of the rebels when these documents were composed. See Brinkman and Kennedy 1983, 33-34.

1032 *ABL 292 (not dated) was addressed to the governor of Nippur and the citizens, *ABL 297 (not dated) to the governor of Uruk and the citizens, *ABL 518 dated 646-II-24 and *ABL 296 dated XII-12 of an unknown year to the governor of Uruk and the citizens.

1033 *K 2931:1’, 14; *ABL 301:4 dated 652-II-19, *83-118,511 r. 2’.
However, the Aramaic text in Demotic script (Amherst Egyptian 63) possibly dictated by a priest in Upper Egypt at the beginning of the 3rd century BC records that, through his sister and a general, Assurbanipal tried to persuade Šamaš-šumu-ukīn not to rebel but to return to Nineveh when the latter refused to pay tribute to him. It also relates that the general induced Assurbanipal to release the emissaries from Babylon who told of the refusal to pay the tribute. He also kept the citizens of Babylon alive when Šamaš-šumu-ukīn committed suicide. 1034

The citizens of Babylon were given special treatment. Though most of the citizens of Babylon took sides with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, Assurbanipal pursued a conciliatory policy and kept sending his letters to persuade them through flattery. Even after the Assyrian army put Babylon under siege, the king and the pro-Assyrian citizens in Babylon corresponded in secret to find a peaceful solution to the conflict between Assyria and Babylonia.

2.5.1. Nippur

Letters from Assurbanipal to Illil-bāni, the governor of Nippur, and the citizens of Nippur, show that they had to engage in military activities: taking part in military campaigns, keeping watch, checking passers-by, capturing a man who was trying to escape, cooperating with Urukeans and tribal leaders, besieging a city, guarding the temples of Assurbanipal, and dealing with captives from tribal groups. The elders of Nippur came to see the king, probably in response to the king’s request or possibly spontaneously. An obligation to report to the king was also imposed upon them. They had to send reports even about small details unconditionally, and the king expressed his opinions through letters. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss the policies of Assurbanipal towards Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur in more detail.

Some nomadic tribes and ethnic groups within the borders of Assyria may not have been fully brought under Assyrian rule. However, Assurbanipal made the governor and the citizens who resided near their territory intervene in their matters to control them. The citizens of Nippur were involved in the affairs of the Ru’ueans, one of the Aramean tribes who settled near Nippur, although Illil-bāni himself is not mentioned in the extant letters and the reason for this is unclear. 1035

According to *ABL 287 addressed to the citizens of Nippur, an elder of the city had captured three Ru’ueans, Ḥannān, Rēmūtu, and Aia-ilāʾī, and had reported to Assurbanipal about this event.

1034 Steiner 1997, 309-327, especially 322-327.
1035 This reminds us that the Assyrian king made Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, deal with Bīt-Amukānī (*ABL 517 and ABL 945) and Nabû-ušabši himself was worried that the Gurasimmu would defect to the side of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (*ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244).
Assurbanipal commends him for arresting them, saying: “it is good that you (sg.) captured them.” The fate of the Ru’ueans and what wrong they did are not known, but they had probably become hostile to Assyria.

A passage in the same letter reveals the identity of the person who had written to the king: “And as to what you (sg.) wrote, ‘when we, 15 elders, came to visit the king, [half of us] entered [into] the king’s [presence but half of us were rejected.’” This implies that the author of the letter to the king was one of the elders of Nippur. In addition, the passage indicates that the elders constituting the city council of Nippur were at least 15 in number. This is an important piece of information, since there is hardly any other evidence on the constitution of this institution.

It is unclear whether these 15 elders came to see Assurbanipal on their own initiative or at the request of the king. However, the latter case seems more probable because in other letters Assurbanipal orders Sīn-tabni-uṣur, the governor of Ur, and Bēl-ušallim of the Bīt-Amukāni to come over to see his “beaming face.”

Assurbanipal takes pains to explain why half of the elders were prevented from seeing him: “[it is in the first place the fault of Issār-bāni and the fault (ḫiṭṭu) of the šandabakku and of your (pl.) prefect (šaknu), and in the second place of the palace supervisor (ša-pān-ēkalli), who did not let you into my presence.”

He thus mentions two reasons for the rejection. Firstly, he blames three persons: Issār-bāni, the šandabakku, and the prefect of Nippur. The individual called Issār-bāni is otherwise unknown, but he was presumably from Nippur. It is unclear whether the governor (šandabakku) and prefect of Nippur had accompanied the elders or not, but it is worth noting that they were involved in the audience of the elders who belonged to the civic institution. What those three had done actually remains obscure, but they might have failed to communicate with the administration in the royal palace. In any case, Assurbanipal attributes the first fault to the people from Nippur.

---

1036 *ABL 287:8, ba-ni šá taš-ba-ta-šá-nu-ti.
1037 *ABL 287:9-10, en-na a-na EN.NUN-šu-nu / la te-eg-ga-a-a’.
1039 *ABL 523 (NA, not dated), r. 10-15.
1040 *ABL 517 (NB, dated 650-II-19), r. 10-16.
1041 PNA 2/I, 568a, no. 1. He might have been the representative of the elders of Nippur.
Secondly, Assurbanipal blames the palace supervisor. This statement suggests that the palace supervisor carried out the final screening for the audience with the king in the royal palace. Mattila has already pointed out that the palace supervisor was in charge of audiences with the Assyrian king. She has referred to SAA 13 80:14-r. 6 as a clear example. This letter tells how a certain man asked Esarhaddon to let the palace supervisors allow him to have a personal audience with the king. *ABL 287 strongly supports her conclusions.

Towards the end of the letter, Assurbanipal states: “I swear by Aššur and my gods that I did not know that half of you had entered into my presence and half of you had not. (How) Would I know who is this and who is that?” He thus emphatically denies that he had anything to do with screening, and his oath by Aššur carries the undertone of excuse and apology. It is unusual but not unparalleled (see e.g., SAA 19 1) for an Assyrian king to show such an attitude. It is also worth noting that he could not even recognize the people who he had audience with, but it may reflect the realities of royal life. The passage shows that Assurbanipal considered it very important not to upset the elders.

At the end, Assurbanipal says, “I am equally favourably disposed towards all of you.” The literal translation of this statement is “the goodness/favour (ṭā btu) of all of you is like one to me.” This indicates that Assurbanipal promoted the royal image that the Assyrian king treats the people who obey the king equally (see above p. 117).

The detailed study on the letter is found in Ito 2013.
You know that through the iron sword of Aššur and my gods you had that entire land consumed by fire, so that the land has retreated (mātu naḥāsu), been subjugated (nakbusu), and turned its face once again towards me (pānī turru).

This phrase is parallel to *ABL 297:4-9 (not dated) addressed to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, and the citizens of Uruk. Neither of the letters clearly mentions against whom the campaign was conducted. However, it is important to note that the Babylonian people are said to have metaphorically used the iron sword of Aššur and the gods of Assurbanipal against the enemy and a similar phrase is found in the ceremonial curse section of Esarhaddon’s succession treaty.

It seems that the Nippurians and the Urukeans worked together during the campaign, because Assurbanipal writes *CT 54 464 (not dated) to Illil-bānī, saying: “this [month] you, the sh[eikhs] and the Urukeans [who are w]ith you should not be separated from one another.” They probably cooperated beyond the borders of their cities in time of need. Moreover, the letter says that the citizens of Nippur were also with nasīkus “sheikhs,” a term used for the leaders of the Aramean tribes.

In *ABL 292, after the parallel phrase, Assurbanipal changes the topic to the unnamed man who is trying to escape, presumably Šamaš-šumu-ukīn (see above p. 10). He orders Illil-bānī and the citizens of Nippur to tighten the security and states:

It has closed in on him. All the work that you have done since those days – behold! Now a[gai]n it is time for you to keep him under watch, and lest he escape, you are to seize all his roads. On all the roads, just as sieves are placed at the the opening of an outlet in order to filter out twigs, litter, and pebbles, in like manner you are to filter and to stand (and wait) on all the roads. Maybe he will change his looks deceptively and escape; do

---

1048 Concerning the literary references of this expression, see Ito 2013, 24-25.
1051 SAA 2 6 § 96, 635-636, “may iron swords consume him who goes to the south and may iron swords likewise consume him who goes to the north”. The same phrase of the treaty is possibly quoted in SAA 16 126 from Itti-Šamaš-balātu, an Assyrian official in northern Phoenicia, to Esarhaddon. In the treaty and the letter, the user of the iron swords is not mentioned but the iron swords themselves are the subject of the sentence. See Ito 2013, 24-25 and 31, n. 17.
1052 * CT 54 464:14-15, at-tu-nu u LŪ M[a-si]-ku x x } x / u UNUG.KI.M[ES šá i] t-[t]t-[t]-ku-nu / la-pa-an a-ša-meš la KUD-as.
1054 Personal communication from Parpola and see also Ito 2013, 26-27; cf. Frame 1992, 121. Frame dated the letter to the time before the rebellion and identified the unnamed man with Nabû-šuma-ēreš, the previous governor of Nippur who became an ally of Urtaku (PNA 2/II, 883, no. 2).
not let anyone pass uninterrogated, even if he should pass with a face as white as gypsum.\textsuperscript{1055}

Assurbanipal uses the image of sieves that filter out twigs, litter, and pebbles as an analogy of a strict roadblock to catch the man. The name of the escaping man is not mentioned in this letter, but he appears to have been a very important person because the king promises the addressees that he will provide a reward in gold for the apprehension of the man dead or alive. The wanted man is compared to Šûzubu, probably identified with Mušēzib-Marduk from Bīt-Dakkûrī and the king of Babylonia (692-289 BC) during the reign of Sennacherib.\textsuperscript{1056} Assurbanipal says,

Whoever keeps his hands off him, I will delete his posterity; but if one takes him prisoner and brings him into my presence, even if he should kill him, just as my grandfather, on account of Šûzubu, placed Adda-barakka on scales and weighed out and gave him his weight in silver, so I will now place on scales whomever takes him prisoner, even if he should kill him, and weigh out and gave him his weight in gold.\textsuperscript{1057}

Here Assurbanipal uses an episode from Sennacherib’s reign as an example from the past. The insertion of this episode well indicates that Assurbanipal had his royal archives and his advisors that made him able to access such a record. In addition, this episode includes new historical information that Adda-barakka\textsuperscript{1058} arrested Mušēzib-Marduk.\textsuperscript{1059} Paying gold as a reward and the episode of capturing the Babylonian king in the time of Sennacherib suggest that the unnamed person could have been Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\textsuperscript{1060} At the end of \textit{ABL} 292, Assurbanipal orders the recipients again to be attentive and reminds them that the man tries to escape for his life.\textsuperscript{1061}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\setcounter{enumi}{1055}
\item Cf. Cole 1996, 34; Frame 1992, 121.
\item \textit{PNA} 1/1, 44b.
\item Ito 2013, 26-27.
\item Also personal communication from Parpola.
\item \textit{ABL} 292 r. 13-16, \textit{a-du-al ta-tap-rak-ku-nu-ši} / lu-a pit-qu-da-tu-nu a-mur ki-i / i-si-qa-dāš-šu pa-an Ša mu-še-e-šā / ú-ba- e-e-ma i-ḫal-liq. “Now then I am writing to you: be attentive, considering that since it has closed in on him, he is seeking ways to get out and escape.”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
An unnamed man is also discussed in *CT 54 464, probably addressed to Illil-bānī. In its opening formula, the recipient appears in the singular. Following this opening formula, Assurbanipal states: “N[œ]w then I am writing to you (sg.)” (e[n-n]a / a-du-ū al-tap-rok-ka). Nevertheless, when he gives instructions, he issues the orders to more than one person. We already know that some of Assurbanipal’s royal letters were addressed to the governor and the citizens of the city, hence the singular form in the opening formula and the plural form in the main contents may indicate that while technically the recipient was only Illil-bānī, in practice this letter was aimed at Illil-bānī and the citizens of Nippur, and Assurbanipal clearly wanted them to act together.

In *CT 54 464, the king discusses the issue of an anonymous person, called ḫummur āgâ “this defunct one.” The word ḫummur is an adjective, meaning “shrunken, shriveled; lame, crippled.” This word is only attested four times in the Neo-Assyrian period. It is likely that this ḫummur in the present letter is the same as the person whom Assurbanipal wants to catch in *ABL 292 because the wording is quite similar. In *CT 54 464, the king discusses the issue of an anonymous person, called Illil-bānī and escape (l. 13, r. 16, ḫalāḫu). In order to apprehend the man, Assurbanipal urges Illil-bānī and the citizens of Nippur to behold (l. 11, r. 14, amāru), to keep watch (l. 12, mašṣartu našāru), to stand by (l. 18, izuzzu), to check passers-by on roads (ll. 13, 14, 18, ḫarrānāti), and to capture (r. 2, 8, šabātu) him. In *CT 54 464, the ḫummur also attempts to get out (l. 5, asā) and escape (l. 8, r. 4, ḫalāḫu) and Assurbanipal urges the recipient to behold (r. 12, amāru), to keep watch (ll. 6-7, mašṣartu našāru), to stand by (l. 10, izuzzu), and to capture (l. 7, šabātu) him. In addition, in this letter “road” (r. 4, ḫarrānāti) is mentioned as well. The terms chosen in these two letters are very general, but the

1062 *CT 54 464:1-3, [a-mat LUGAL] a-[na x x x x x] / d[im-ma šá ba-ka] l-[l]u-u ša-ab-ka, ’) [The king’s word] to [..]: I am well; you can be glad.”

1063 *CT 54 464:3-4.

1064 *CT 54 464:6, lu-a pū-a-qud-da-tu-nu, “Be attentive (static, pl.)”; ll. 6-7, ma-šar-ta-sā / us-ra, “keep watch (imperative, pl.) over him”; l. 7, i-na šu₂₂-ku-na' šab-ta-sē₂₂, “seize (imperative, pl.) him in your (pl.) hands”; l. 10, i-ši-iz-za-a-ma, “Stand by(imperative, pl.)”; l. 13, la ta-sīl-la-ma, “Do not be negligent (prohibitive, pl.)”; l. 14, at-tu-nu, “you (pl.)”; l. 15, [i]j⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻~-~-­-

1066 Cf. Parpola 2007 38b; CAD H 235a; AHw 355b.

1067 *CT 54 464:4-5; *ABL 290 r. 1 to describe an anonymous person who conspired with an Elamite called Ummangai; *ABL 1380:22 in a broken context; SAA 18 180 r. 6’. A Babylonian official Nabû-balassu-qiḫ writes the letter to Assurbanipal and reports that the unnamed person who was fleeing to Assyria wrote to the defunct one (r. 6’, [ki-i] il-tur ana 1.L.ḫummur) and the person also referred to Bēl-ētīr of Bit-Ilbā in a broken context.
similarly in the wording is clear. This shows how closely *CT 54 464 and *ABL 292 are related to each other.

As mentioned above (p. 179), in *CT 54 464 Assurbanipal orders that Illil-bānī, the Aramean sh[eihs], and the people of Uruk should not be separated from one another. Following this, Assurbanipal says:

_He (= the man who tries to escape) has decided (to do) the things that you (pl.) hear. [Let] the army (and) their [......] be assembled before him, [and let ...] their guard [be strong]. Do not be negligent but [...]. Do not say: “The things that we heard were false; we assembled, but he disappeared on the road ...” Let your forces go to the aid of one another, and let the watch over him be strong in your (pl.) country._

Again, the unnamed man appears to have been a very important person because Assurbanipal instructs that the army was to be assembled before him. In addition, Assurbanipal ordered increased surveillance of the man in their territory.

Assurbanipal continues: “Now then I have written to open your ears; be extremely attentive. See how Aššur and Mullissu, my gods, h[ave taken] from his hands whatever he concocted with his heart, until he returns to the temples.”

He further refers to “Aššur and Mullissu, my gods” (AN.SÁR u ٤NIN.LÍL DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a), and indicates that it is not he but these gods who have prevented the conspiracy which the unnamed man concocted. Following this, the difficult phrase of “until he returns to the temples” appears. This passage probably means that he seeks refuge in temples. The main clause may continue after this passage, but the text is broken.

There follow several damaged lines. In these lines, Assurbanipal mentions the citizen[s] of Babylon (r. 17, LÚ.TIN.TIR.KI.‘MEŠ”), Babylon (r. 19, TIN.TIR.KI), and [Aššur and M]arduk, my gods (r. 20,}

---


1069 *CT 54 464 r. 8-15, a-da-ū / ki-i aš-pur PL.2-ku-nu / up-te-ti a-ki-i ma-a-de-e / lu-u pit-quot-da-tu-nu / a-mur ak-ka-a-‘i mál it-ti / SÁ-ŠÁ-ŠÁ-ŠÁ a-kāš-šip AN.SÁR u ٤NIN.LÍL / DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a ina ŠU.2-šū it-‘a-šá-u’ / a-di i-tur-ra ina É.”KUR.ME” x x’.
These words indicate that the letter has some connection with the city of Babylon and her citizens.

Two undated Neo-Assyrian letters, *ABL 561 and *ABL 1186, indicate that unknown recipients were involved in besieging a city by the command of Assurbanipal. The recipients appear in plural form in these letters. *ABL 292, discussed above in this subsection, probably addressed to Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur, has the expression siāqu “to close in on; to become constrained, tight” twice. The same expression is also used in *ABL 561 r. 10, i-si-qa-dāš-šā-nu-ú-ni “it has closed in on them.” This wording could imply that the recipients of *ABL 561 were either Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur, or merely the citizens of Nippur. Furthermore, as *ABL 561 and *ABL 1186 deal with the same topic about the besieged city, the recipients of *ABL 1186 could be also Illil-bāni and the citizens of Nippur.

Assurbanipal claims in his royal inscriptions that during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn he laid siege to the cities of Sippar, Babylon, Borsippa, and Cutha. Among these cities, the besieged city mentioned in *ABL 561 and *ABL 1186 was probably Babylon. As mentioned in this subsection, in *CT 54 464, the Babylonian[s] and Babylon are mentioned in a damaged text. Hence the broken passages could describe the siege of Babylon. Taking into consideration that all these three letters were probably addressed to Nippur, and that *CT 54 464 includes the words “the Babylonian[s]” and “Babylon,” the besieged city mentioned in *ABL 561 and *ABL 1186 could be Babylon.

Nippur had fallen into the hands of the rebels by the day between the 3rd and 9th of Kislīmu (IX) and the 18th of Šabātu (XI) of 651 BC, but it seems that the citizens of Nippur could recover enough to take part in the siege of Babylon before it started on 650-IV-11.

1070 *CT 54 464 r. 16-19, šā x[x x]-šā šā-šā x[x x]x / x[x x x]x, MEŠ šā LŪ.TIN.TIR.KI ’x’ / x[x x x] x ’uḥ-te-ef-ṭi x x’ u ’x x’-a-te šā TIN.TIR.KI ’x x x’ “[...] his heart [...]s of the Babylonian[s ...] made to sin [...] and the [...]s of Babylon [...]”.

1071 For instance, *ABL 561:5’, la ta-mu-ra, “you (pl.) saw nothing”; *ABL 1186:4-5, ʿu at-ta-nu a-la-a ki-i l an-ni-ū ta-mur-a-ni “But you, when you saw this”.

1072 *ABL 292:9, i-si-qa-dāš-šā, *ABL 292 r. 15, i-si-qa-dāš-šā, “it has closed in on him.”


1075 Grayson 1975, 130, no. 15:19, [MU] XVIII ITIŠU UD-11-KĀM LŪ.KUR ana TIN.TIR.KI is-sa-an-qa “The eighteenth [year]. On the eleventh day of Du‘ūṣu (IV), the enemy invested Babylon.”
In *ABL 561, Assurbanipal points out that a certain Issarān-mušallim could go out, run about, and re-enter the besieged city as he wished without being noticed by the recipients of the letter. Then he urges the recipients to keep watch more carefully so that no one can escape and get away. It seems that people could still slip the encircling forces secretly even though the city was under siege.

Assurbanipal also tells the recipients: “Ever since those times you have kept watch and made yourself a good name in my presence; and you are enjoying your ‘salt’ for this in my presence.” As we have seen repeatedly in the letters from Assurbanipal, “to keep watch” (maṣṣartu naṣāru) and “to make a name good” (šumu dummuqu) are desired aspects for loyal subordinates of Assurbanipal. Moreover, for these deeds, the recipients are said to be able “to enjoy goodness/favour (or salt?)” (ṭātu akālu) in the presence of the king.

He further states: “I know that from the very beginning those people have not loved you, and that you do not love them either, but love the house of your lord.” This passage includes two important expressions: “house of the lord” (bēt bēli) and “to love” (raʾāmu). The former term has been carefully studied and rendered as “the house of the lord,” “domain of lord,” and “Master’s House.” As for the latter, it implies loyalty and a politically friendly relationship. This usage recalls the love of the king/royal house required in the succession treaty of Esarhaddon and the love of god in Deuteronomy (see also below pp. 188 and 204).

Following this, Assurbanipal again exhorts the recipients to guard tightly: “No doubt you are thinking like this: ‘The job is do[ne].’ But certainly the guard is doubly essential today, as it has closed in on them!” These passages vividly describe the situation when the siege had lasted for a long time and the besieged people had become desperate.

---

1076 PNA 2/1, 567a, no. 2. This Issarān-mušallim is only known from *ABL 561.  
1077 *ABL 561:4’-11’, ina UGU-bi-šu-nu e-ta-at-qu l la ta-mu-ra as DI-ŠÀ-šu-aš-su-kulli / ki-i šA-bi-šu it-tu-ši / id-du-lu is-su-hur / e-ta-rab la ta-mu-a-ma l lu šu-a šu-a ab-hur l la ki-i an-nim-ma-a l ú-še-zib il-ši, “They proceeded against them, and you saw nothing. Issarān-mušallim could go out, run about, and re-enter (Babylon) as he wished, and again you saw nothing. Should the same thing happen once more, would he not escape and get away just like that?”  
1078 *ABL 561:11’-18’, TA ṢA / UD.MEŠ am-mu-a-te ma-šar-tú / ta-at-ta-aš-ra / šu-an-ku-nu ina 1I-šI-a / tu-dam-mi-iq-qa / ṣa-ab-ta-ku-nu / ina ȘA-bi ina 1GI-id-e / KU [x x x].  
1081 Braaten 2000. Yahweh entered into a covenant with the Israelites and bestowed love on them, and the Israelites were requested to respond with a whole-hearted love. The Israelites’ love was expressed by obedience to Yahweh’s law.  
1082 *ABL 561 r. 6-10, at-tu-nu la ki-i an-ni-e / ta-qab-bi-a ma-a dul-lu / [gam]-mur la ú-ma-a šu-ú / ma-aš-šar-tu nē-me-il / i-sti-qa-dāš-sā-nu-ú-ni.
Finally, he orders the recipients: “Now, just as you have from the beginning stood by, kept watch and made yourself a good name in my presence, stand by even now and […] your (pl.) house […]”\(^{1083}\) “To keep watch” (\textit{massartu naṣāru}) and “to make a name good” (\textit{šumu dummuqi}) seem to be one of the desirable behaviours for the loyal subordinates of Assurbanipal.

\(^{1083}\) ABL 1186 also deals with the besieged city, probably Babylon. After a lost beginning, Assurbanipal blames the recipient: “… [who] were bringing you \textit{troops}. But you, when you saw this, why did you not kill those who were to be killed and take prisoner those who were to be taken prisoner? Certainly (the troops) who came were not more numerous than you!”\(^{1084}\) It is unclear whether the troops came from inside the besieged city or outside of it for its aid. They might have been the Qedarite Arabs sent to Babylon by their leader "Abī-īate’ and his brother Aia-ammu to help Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. According to the inscriptions, this attempt eventually failed.\(^{1085}\)

Assurbanipal finally orders the recipients: “Now fear not, but guard my temples. He is shut up in the city with all his forces, and my army is surrounding him. Now, wherever you see a messenger of his, kill those who are to be killed and take prisoner those who are to be taken prisoner.”\(^{1086}\) Though the recipients were taking part in besieging the city, it is not clear where they were stationed to guard the temples of Assurbanipal. Assuming that the besieged city was Babylon, the unnamed person who was shut up in his city was probably Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

2.5.2. Uruk
The letters sent to the governors and citizens of Uruk cover a broad range of topics including military reinforcements, treaties, a cultic ceremony, and diplomatic matters outside Uruk such as Ur, Bīt-Amušānī of the Chaldeans, and the Gurasimmu, but in essence reflect the same basic policies as the letters to Nippur.

One of the best documented actions of Assurbanipal with regard to Uruk was the dispatch of reinforcements from Assyria to Uruk to keep the city on the Assyrian side during the revolt because

\(^{1083}\) ABL 561 r. 11-17, ú-ma-a ki-i ša TA* re-šê / ta-zi-za-a-ni ma-šar-tu / ta-šur-a-ni šu-un-ku-nu / ina |Ga-ia tu-damm-qi-a-ni / ú-ma-a i-i-is-sa / [x x] é-ku-nu / [x x x] x’ ud’ x’ ši.


\(^{1085}\) BIWA, 61 and 245, Edition A VII 82-106.

Uruk was an important stronghold in southern Mesopotamia. A message addressed from Assurbanipal to Nabû-ušabši shows that rescue forces were sent to Uruk on different occasions. The text exists in four different copies: *ABL 273, *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244 (see also above pp. 62-66).

Reinforcements were dispatched on four different occasions. Firstly, Assurbanipal sent the governor of Mazamua and the prefects to Uruk.\footnote{ABL 1244:4'-5', la ûš-pu-ru / LÜ.KUR.za-mu-u LÜ.GAR.ME, "did I not send the governor of Mazamua and the prefects?" In *ABL 543 and *ABL 1108, the sentences could be restored as follows. *ABL 543 r.1-3, [la ûš-pu-ru LÜ.EN.NAM] / [KUR.za-mu-a LÜ.GAR.ME] / [KU-ku-nu la is-šu-ru] / *ABL 1108:19'-20', [la ûš-pu-ru LÜ.EN.NAM KUR.za-mu-a] / [LÜ.GAR.ME].} The name of the governor is not given in *ABL 1244, but it is known from ABL 754 from Kudurru to Assurbanipal that the governor of Mazamua was Nûrâia.\footnote{PNA 2/II, no. 8.} He and the prefects are said to have kept watch (našâru), to have become weak (enâšu), and to have been dying (muâtu) for the guard/defence (maššartu) of Uruk.\footnote{ABL 1244:5'-7', Ki-ku-nu / la is-šu-ru la e-ni-sú / LÜ.MES / ina UDU EN.NUN-ku-nu. "Did they not keep watch with you, did they [not] get weak and [die] for your defence?"}

Secondly, Assurbanipal dispatched the governors of Laḫûrû and Arrapâha\footnote{ABL 543 r.3-5, [Ki-ku-nu la is-šu-ru] / [la e-ni-[šu la me-e-tú] / ina UDU EN.NUN-[ku]-nu / *ABL 1108:20'-21', [is-si-ku-nu la is-šu-ru] / [la e-ni-sú]-la [me-e-tú] / ina UDU EN.NUN-[ku]-nu / *ABL 1244:5'-7', Ki-ku-nu / la is-šu-ru la e-ni-sú / LÜ.MES / ina UDU EN.NUN-ku-nu. "If the governors have not kept watch with you, did they not get weak and [die] for your defence?"} because he saw the governor of Mazamua was Aplâia.\footnote{PNA 1/1, 117b-118a.} Aplâia was very active in southern Babylonia; first he came to Uruk, and then marched to Ur and fought against Aramean tribes. When Nabû-ušabši was abducted to Babylon, he ordered the city overseer of Uruk to bring Aplâia and the chariot driver of the queen into Uruk to protect the city from Šamaš-šumu-ukîn. In ABL 754, Kudurru states that he, Aplâia, and Nûrâia went to Ur to aid the city as requested by the governor of Ur. In addition, Bêl-ibni, the general of the Sealand, reports to Assurbanipal that he and Nûrâia carried out a campaign in the land of the Gurasimmu, the Sealand, and the Puqûdu.\footnote{ABL 790.}
Thirdly, Assurbanipal sent the treasurer (masennu) Aššūr-gimillu-tēre with an army to Uruk. He is also known to have a title of rab ašläki (GAL–TŪG.UD), which translates as “chief fuller,” but this is possibly a rebus writing for treasurer (masennu). He was also a post-canonical eponym of the year 638 BC. Having stated that the king had sent this person, he continues: “Do whatever is opportune to do, be it to block the canal or to subjugate those people.”

Lastly, Assurbanipal dispatched Bēl-ēṭr and Arbāiu, the cohort commander, with 200 horses. It is uncertain whether both were cohort commanders or not because the title of the cohort commander only appears after the name of Arbāiu and the title is in the singular in these four letters. The number of horses is only specified in *ABL 273. These auxiliary troops were expected “to stay” (izuzzu) and “to work” (dullu epāšu) with Nabū-ušabši.

These rescue forces sent to Uruk were also used to release the tension of Ur at the request of its governor, and Nabū-ušabši himself, who according to *ABL 543 had said: “May the king not abandon Ur, and may the Gurasimmu not be lost to the king! What else can be done? Let me do it!” This indicates that there was a close connection between Uruk and Ur, both of which were under the control of Assyria and had probably interacted even before the revolt broke out.

Frame has pointed out that the Gurasimmu, about whom Nabū-ušabši was worried, resided near Ur and, under the pressure of the Puqūdu and the Sealanders without any aid from Assyria,
eventually deserted to the rebel side and became hostile. Later on, Bēl-ibni fought against them. In ABL 790 + CT 54 425, he reports having subjugated the Gurasimmu with Nūraia, the governor of Mazamua, with 50 horses and 200 soldiers. Bēl-ibni also reports to Assurbanipal that at the command of Nabû-bēl-šumāti of the Sealand, 250 Gurasimmu and other people had crossed over on rafts against him and he had sent 400 archers by boat against them (see above p. 136).

In 650 BC, Nabû-ušabši helped Assurbanipal ensure the loyalty of Bīt-Amukāni, a Chaldean dynastic “house” in the vicinity of Uruk. It is known from *ABL 945 addressed to Nabû-ušabši that the governor had sent a report about Bīt-Amukāni to Assurbanipal. The king commends him, saying: “Concerning the Bīt-Amukāneans about whom you wrote, what you did is excellent (de’iq bēt tēpušāni). A person who loves his lord (rā’imu ša bēlīšu, literally, ‘the lover of his lord’) acts in this way!” It is not stated what Nabû-ušabši did. As in *ABL 561 (see p. 184), Nabû-ušabši’s loyalty is also expressed by the terms of “love” and “the household of the lord.” Assurbanipal then continues: “Where one’s objective can be reached with a poker face (ina pānē ḫardāti), one achieves it with a poker face; where it can be reached with friendly words, one achieves it with friendly words.” This remark is phrased in colloquial Neo-Assyrian and hence may reflect the king’s political thinking and methods (see also below pp. 207 and 224).

In *ABL 517 dated 650-II-19, Assurbanipal refers to several leading persons of Bīt-Amukāni by name: Bēl-ušallim, a prominent individual, Aia-zēru-qīša, the chieftain, and Ḥumbuštu, the mother of Aia-zēru-qīša. According to the letter, Nabû-ušabši forwarded the message of Bēl-ušallim to Assurbanipal, and then the king orders Nabû-ušabši to convey his answer to Bēl-ušallim. Thus Assurbanipal and Bēl-ušallim did not correspond directly, but Nabû-ušabši served as a middleman between them. The text reads: “As to the lord Aia-zēru-qīša and the elders of Bīt-Amukāni about whom you wrote, what you did is good; you have done a thing that is good for the

1104 See ABL 1241 to Assurbanipal from unknown authors who could be the citizens of Ur.
1105 ABL 790 + CT 54 425:4-10.
1106 ABL 1000:6-r. 11. See Frame 1992, 182.
1107 *ABL 945:3-6, ina [UGU] LŪ-È=m-a-muk-a-na-a-a / šā [KIN-an]-ni SIG3 Ė te-pu-šā-ni / r[a’]-i-mu šā EN.ÈMEŠ-šu / ki-i ḫa-an-ni-i DŪ-āš.
1108 Parpola 2007, 35b.
1110 PNA 1/II, 337b-338a, no. 5.
1111 PNA 1/I, 94a.
1112 PNA 2/I, 478b.
1113 *ABL 517:4-5, ina UGU dīb-bi šā mdEN–GI / šā taš-pur, “Concerning the words of Bēl-ušallim about which you (= Nabû-ušabši) wrote.”
1114 *ABL 517:5-6, a-ki-i a-ga-a / šup-ra-āš-šā um-ma, “write to him (= Bēl-ušallim) as follows.”
Assurbanipal there commends Bēl-ušallim for his “reporting” (šá taš-pur) and for having done a “good thing for the house of his lord” (ba-ni / šá ta-pu-šú / a-mat šá / ina UGU É–EN-ka ū-ba-ta / ši-i te-tep-uš). Although the king does not mention what Bēl-ušallim had done, it is evident that he had arranged the interception of Aia-zēru-qīša and the elders of Bīt-Amukāni and their delivery to Nineveh. In the letter, Assurbanipal tells Nabû-ušabši to write to Bēl-ušallim and then goes on as follows:

And regarding the words of the Lady Ḫumbuštu, about which you wrote, “I have written to the palace about them, saying ‘May the king not render the verdict of men who go to the king until Bēl-ušallim comes to the presence of the king, my lord, and gives him a counsel that pleases the king, my lord.’”

The word of Ḫumbuštu probably indicated that she had affirmed the loyalty of the Bīt-Amukāneans (see below in this subsection). Bēl-ušallim clearly was the key person in settling the affairs of Bīt-Amukāni because he is supposed “to come to the presence of the king” and “to give the king counsel.” The letter that Nabû-ušabši was to send ends with the exhortation: “Now go and see the beaming face of the king, your lord, and give him counsel that pleases the king your lord, and may he listen to you.” After these instructions, the letter ends with its dating.

Bēl-ušallim is also otherwise attested as a spokesman of Bīt-Amukāni. The unknown author of CT 54 507 (not dated), who could be Nabû-ušabši, reports to Assurbanipal that messengers of Bēl-ušallim and Nabû-gāmil had come to Uruk from Šamēlē, a town in Bīt-Amukāni, and declared that the Bīt-Amukāneans were servants of the Assyrian king. The author continues to report that he had sent the messengers back and ordered them to seize the officials of Ša[maš-šumu-
ukin] in Samelē and to hand them over.\footnote{Frame 1992, 161 and 172; CT 54 507: 12-23. This letter has no date, but Frame suggests that it could be dated before the second month of 650 BC. The text also refers to the submission of the Sealand, a man brought by Nabu-bel-shumati to the Elamite king and Samas-sumu-ukin in a broken context.} One of those officials could have been Šulāia, who was appointed as an administrator in Samelē by Šamaš-šumu-ukin according to CT 54 92.\footnote{Dietrich 1970, 174f, no. 97}

Aia-zēru-qīša was the leader of Bīt-Amukāni.\footnote{PNA 1/I, 94a; Frame 1992, 172, n. 201.} We know from ABL 896 that he was detained as a hostage in Assyria in order to assure the loyalty of Bīt-Amukāni. Accused of a link to Šamaš-šumu-ukin and the Puqūdian treasurer Nabû-ušēšib and having conspired with them from the beginning, he wrote a letter, ABL 896, to his mother Ḫumbuštū in Bīt-Amukāni.\footnote{PNA 2/I, 478b.} In this, he says that he has heard that the family of Nabû-ušēšib had moved from Puqūdu to Bīt-Amukāni and asks his mother to hand them over to the Assyrians. In addition, he requests her to assure Assurbanipal that he and his country are loyal to the Assyrian king.\footnote{Frame 1992,173, n. 204.} He also mentions the defeat of Šamaš-šumu-ukin. Frame has pointed out that it “could refer to the final fall of Babylon, the commencement of the siege of Babylon, or some major battle in which Assyrians proved victorious, and is thus of limited value for dating the text.”\footnote{Frame 1992, 173 and n. 205.} Aia-zēru-qīša may have been loyal to Assurbanipal throughout the rebellion as he repeatedly claims. Nevertheless, his sons appear to have been involved in the revolt and to have stood on the rebel side,\footnote{BIWA, 312, no. 63.} as they are mentioned in an epigraph connected with the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukin.\footnote{ABL 539 r. 25 ˹ITI˺.SIG₄, “Simānu (the third month)”.} The loyalty of the governor of Uruk and the Urukeans was secured through treaties. *ABL 539, dated in Simānu (III, no year date),\footnote{ABL 539:19 UN,MEŠ KUR-ka; *ABL 539 r. 18, UN,MEŠ KUR. As for the usage of nišē mātī, see CAD M/1, 418b, 1h ; CAD N/2, 287a, 2b; Parpola 2007, 63a.} indicates that Assurbanipal concluded three treaties with them on separate occasions.

As shown above (pp. 43-44), *ABL 539 was addressed to Nabu-ušabši alone, but the letter shows that each of the three treaties also involved his people, described as “citizenry/countrymen” (nišē māti) and “your citizenry/countrymen” (nišē mātiₕₖᵃ).\footnote{Parpola 2007, 63a.} In addition, as shown below in the quotations of the stipulations of the treaty that had already been concluded, the contracting parties always appear in the 1st person plural as “we.”

\footnote{Frame 1992, 161 and 172; CT 54 507: 12-23. This letter has no date, but Frame suggests that it could be dated before the second month of 650 BC. The text also refers to the submission of the Sealand, a man brought by Nabu-bel-shumati to the Elamite king and Samas-sumu-ukin in a broken context.\footnote{Dietrich 1970, 174f, no. 97}\footnote{PNA 1/I, 94a; Frame 1992, 172, n. 201.}\footnote{PNA 2/I, 478b.}\footnote{Frame 1992, 172f. Frame quotes the translation of ABL 896:4-r. 18.}\footnote{Frame 1992,172, n. 204.}\footnote{Frame 1992, 173 and n. 205.}\footnote{BIWA, 312, no. 63.}\footnote{*ABL 539 r. 25 ˹ITI˺.SIG₄, “Simānu (the third month)”.}\footnote{ABL 539:19 UN,MEŠ KUR-ka; *ABL 539 r. 18, UN,MEŠ KUR. As for the usage of nišē mātī, see CAD M/1, 418b, 1h ; CAD N/2, 287a, 2b; Parpola 2007, 63a.}}
The letter reveals that two treaties were already concluded and a new treaty was being prepared. The first treaty, referred to as tābtu, is mentioned in lines 6 to 7. Assurbanipal states, “You did not sin against my favour (tābtu) and oath (māmītu).” It might be possible to restore line 5 as “you have adhered to my treaty” (⟨a-valu-e-ta⟩a ta-at-ta-ṣar). It is uncertain when the first treaty was concluded, but very probably the reference is to Esarhaddon’s succession treaty. It seems that the first treaty required great devotion to Assurbanipal because the king says about Nabû-ušabši: “You have fallen and died on account of all the messages and orders I have been sending to you.”

The motif of “fall and die for the Assyrian king” is attested in Esarhaddon’s Succession Treaty: “you shall fall and die for him” and “you shall fall and die for Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, son of Esarhaddon, your lord.” Assurbanipal also commends Nabû-ušabši for his deeds and endurance in the difficult situation. He says:

And truly by these recent things that you have done, you have surpassed everything. The fact that for the sake of my name you have isolated yourself, [keeping on the side of] the representative of Aššur and Marduk; that you have kept [my watch] (maṣṣat-ti-iā) and not made common cause with my enemy (pù u liibbu itti bēl-nakāri lā šakānu).

The second treaty was concluded immediately after the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn had broken out. Assurbanipal states, “the fact that ever since you returned [from] my presence and saw that the Babylonians, Chaldeans, and Arameans were not loyal (lā kīnu), you sent [...] your countrymen [...] and made them conclude (this) treaty with me.” That this refers to the outbreak of the revolt is supported by the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal where the event is described as follows: “And he, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, unfaithful brother, who did not adhere to my treaty, caused the people of Babylonia, Chaldea, Aram, the Sealand, from the city Aqaba as far as Bāb-Salīmēti, servants, my

---

1131 Parpola 2011, 41.
1132 *ABL 539:6-7, a-na MUN-idd a-a-na ma-mī-ti-idd / ul taḥ-ṭi.
1133 *ABL 539:7-9, a-na UGU šip-re-ti-idd / ma-la al-tap-pa-ru-ka u a-na UGU / a-mat-ia ki-tan-qu-tu me-ta-ta.
Assurbanipal quotes four vows and pledges of the second treaty, which probably represented only a part, but the most essential part of it. The first one is “we will not change the treaty of Assurbanipal.”\footnote{BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 96–100, “ša-ma ʾaššur-ku-in-a-ri-NU.U.RI.KI.KUUR–kal–du / KUUR–a-ra-mu KUUR–tam–tim ul–tu URU.qa–ba / a–di URU.KA-Sà-LI–ME-ta / ME-Š da–gīl pa–ni–ia / aš–bal–ki ṣa la a·ti / UD-šà, 192, SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:507–509, SAA 2 6:507–509, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} This phrase resembles of a passage in Esarhaddon’s Succession Treaty: “you shall neither change nor alter the word of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria”.\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} The second vow is “we will not side with his enemy,”\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} i.e., Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and his allies. The third one is “as long as we [live], we will keep the treaty [we have concluded with him].”\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} A similar pledge is also found in Esarhaddon’s Succession Treaty: “as long as we, our sons (and) our grandsons are alive, Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, shall be our king and our lord”\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} and Assurbanipal’s treaty with Babylonian allies (SAA 2 9:3′, 17′, and 32′-33′): “From this day on for as long as we live.”\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} The fourth pledge (“[…] his ally shall be our ally, and we will walk with him […]”)\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} prescribes that the contracting parties harmonize their relations towards enemies of Assurbanipal. The same pledge, slightly differently phrased, also occurs in Assurbanipal’s treaty with Babylonian allies (SAA 2 9:20′-21′): “the enemy of Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, […] shall not be our ally.”\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} Having cited these pledges, the king concludes: “From these facts I have experienced your [genuine love] and loyalty (rāmu u kīnītu) [to me].”\footnote{SAA 2 9:17, 192, SAA 2 9:3, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58, SAA 2 6:57–58} The third treaty was about to be concluded at the time the letter was written. Assurbanipal describes the situation in which the Assyrians and their enemies found themselves, stating in a grave tone:

\[\text{Now ...} \] this campaign [...] set for your life. This very day, those who have sinned against my treaty – your eyes will notice how God will once again swiftly call to account those who tampered with the
treaty. As for you, remain under the protection of Aššur and Marduk, and you will thrive within their castle.\footnote{ABL 539 r. 4-12, [x x x] 'a''-zu-ú ina šá a-ta-mar / [x x] 'x' i-di-ka šá KASKAL.2 a-ga-at / [šá a-n]a ba-la-ti-ka šá-ka-nu ki-\textsuperscript{i} UD-me / [a-ga]-a šá a-de-ia iḫ-ṭu-ú IGL.2,MEŠ-ka / [ti']\textendash;da-a ak-ka-a-a-i DINGIR ina ŠU.2 / [šá a]-de-e Ļ-še-nu- u ḫa-an-ḫiš ū-tir-ra-ma / [a]–ba’-u-ú a-ta ina ši-šu AŠ.KI / a\textsuperscript{3} AMAR.UTU Ļ-še-uzu-za-ta ù ina šá / i-si-tī-šu-nu tu-man-da.}

In accordance with the treaty stipulations, God, not the king himself, is presented as the judge of the rebels who sinned against the treaty of Assurbanipal and tampered with it (adē ḫaṭû, adē šunnû). Assurbanipal then states that he is sending three Assyrians (Nabû-erîba, his eunuch,\footnote{PNA 2/II, 828a, no. 30.} Nergal-šarru-uşur, his “third man,”\footnote{PNA 2/II, 955a, no. 22. See also nos. 20 and 21.} and Akkullānu, the priest of Aššur temple\footnote{PNA 1/I, 95-96b, no. 1.} ) with the treaty tablet (ṭūp-pi a-de-īa) to conclude the third treaty. It is likely that he had already negotiated with the Urukeans because Assurbanipal urges Nabû-ušabši to join the treaty and to make the confidence of Assurbanipal’s servants settle upon the countrymen.\footnote{ABL 539 r. 16-19, a-de-e / Ļ-še-nu- u ḫa-an-ḫiš ū-tir-ra-ma / [a]-ba’-u-ú a-ta ina ši-šu AŠ.KI / a\textsuperscript{3} AMAR.UTU Ļ-še-uzu-za-ta ù ina šá / i-si-tī-šu-nu tu-man-da. These passages are very problematic because it is difficult to understand Ļ-še-nu-. These two signs might be Ļ-še-ba and analyzed as imperative plural of Ļ-še-na. The D-stem of raḫāṣu is not well attested. CAD R 74b s.v. raḫāṣu cites these passages but does not translate them. CAD R 408b s.v. ruḫṣu translates them as “in order to (inspire) confidence in my subjects.”} At the end of the letter, Assurbanipal requests Nabû-ušabši to let the Assyrian king see his “love and affection” (rāmu u kīnātu lū amāru), in other words his loyalty even more clearly,\footnote{ABL 539:20-21, u ana-ku-ma lu-red-di-ma ra-an-ga / u ki-nu-tú šá ŠÀ-ka lu-mur, “For my part, let me see your love and affection even more clearly.”} and then promises to multiply the numerous favours already granted to him. The king also urges him to pay back fully his good deed, and make his name great in the assembly of Babylonia (UKKIN šá KUR–URI.KI).\footnote{ABL 539:21-24, u MUN.ŠÀ เม_push gi-nil dum-qī-ka / ū-šal-lim-ga u šu-me GAL-ú / ina UKKIN šá KUR–URI.KI lu-ūš-kun-ga, “multiply the numerous favours I have already granted to you, pay back fully my debt with you, and make your name great in the assembly of Babylonia.”}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{ABL 539 r. 4-12, [x x x] 'a''-zu-ú ina šá a-ta-mar / [x x] 'x' i-di-ka šá KASKAL.2 a-ga-at / [šá a-n]a ba-la-ti-ka šá-ka-nu ki-\textsuperscript{i} UD-me / [a-ga]-a šá a-de-ia iḫ-ṭu-ú IGL.2,MEŠ-ka / [ti']\textendash;da-a ak-ka-a-a-i DINGIR ina ŠU.2 / [šá a]-de-e Ļ-še-nu- u ḫa-an-ḫiš ū-tir-ra-ma / [a]-ba’-u-ú a-ta ina ši-šu AŠ.KI / a\textsuperscript{3} AMAR.UTU Ļ-še-uzu-za-ta ù ina šá / i-si-tī-šu-nu tu-man-da.}
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  \item \footnote{ABL 539 r. 16-19, a-de-e / Ļ-še-nu- u ḫa-an-ḫiš ū-tir-ra-ma / [a]-ba’-u-ú a-ta ina ši-šu AŠ.KI / a\textsuperscript{3} AMAR.UTU Ļ-še-uzu-za-ta ù ina šá / i-si-tī-šu-nu tu-man-da. These passages are very problematic because it is difficult to understand Ļ-še-nu-. These two signs might be Ļ-še-ba and analyzed as imperative plural of Ļ-še-na. The D-stem of raḫāṣu is not well attested. CAD R 74b s.v. raḫāṣu cites these passages but does not translate them. CAD R 408b s.v. ruḫṣu translates them as “in order to (inspire) confidence in my subjects.”}
  \item \footnote{ABL 539:20-21, u ana-ku-ma lu-red-di-ma ra-an-ga / u ki-nu-tú šá ŠÀ-ka lu-mur, “For my part, let me see your love and affection even more clearly.”}
  \item \footnote{ABL 539:21-24, u MUN.ŠÀ เม_push gi-nil dum-qī-ka / ū-šal-lim-ga u šu-me GAL-ú / ina UKKIN šá KUR–URI.KI lu-ūš-kun-ga, “multiply the numerous favours I have already granted to you, pay back fully my debt with you, and make your name great in the assembly of Babylonia.”}
\end{itemize}
abode”), paralleling SAA 3 44, given the heading “Aššur’s Response to Assurbanipal’s Report on the Šamaš-šumu-ukīn War” in its text edition, where it is stated: “his (= Šamaš-šumu-ukīn) gods became angry, abandoned him, and took to foreign parts.” *ABL 518 then continues: “[through weeping and unkempt hair of body, Šamaš, Nanāia, U[šur-amās]a and Arkaītu have become reconciled.” This passage, which appears to refer to the return of pillaged divine statues to Uruk after the victory over Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, requires lengthy commentaries.

Actually, the divine statues of Uruk had been carried off to Elam in the reign of Sennacherib. The Babylonian Chronicle entry for 693 BC states: “On the first day of the month of Tishri (VII) the army of Assyria entered Uruk (and) plundered the gods and inhabitants of Uruk. After the Elamites had come and carried off the gods and inhabitants of Uruk, Nergal-ušēzib did battle against the army of Assyria in the district of Nippur on the seventh day of the month Tishri.” The royal inscriptions of Sennacherib give more detailed information on this event: “I ordered archers, chariots, (and) horses of my royal contingent to confront the king of the land Elam. They killed many troops, including his son, and he killed me in Calah: ‘What work [on the gods] is [i]ncomplete?’ I (then) informed the king, my lord, as follows: ‘The decoration of king on 672-VII-12 a report on the statues of Nanāia, Nanāia, Uṣur-amāsā, Bēlet-balāti, Kurunam, Kaššitu, (and) Palil, the gods who live in Uruk, together with their property (and) possessions, which are without number.’”

During the reign of Esarhaddon (680-669 BC), the divine statues of Uruk are mentioned again in contemporary documents. Mār-Issār, Esarhaddon’s scholar and agent in Babylonia, sent to the king on 672-VII-12 a report on the statues of Nanāia, Uṣur-amāsā, and Arkaītu of Uruk: “formerly, before the king, my lord, went to [S]urmarrate, the k[ing, my lord, as]ked me in Calah: ‘What work [on the gods] is [i]ncomplete?’ I (then) informed the king, my lord, as follows: ‘[The decoration of N]anāia is incomplete. Furthermore, (while) the face and the hand[s of Uṣur]-amāsā have been overlaid with gold, the figure and [the feet] have not. She is dressed with a la[mahuššu]-robe and

---

1155 *ABL 518:8-10, ul-[ṭū DINGIR], MEŠ iz-nu-ā / al-[x x x] ina la šub-ti-ša-nu / ā-[šu-ā].
1157 *ABL 518:10-13, [ina bi]-ki-tu u ma-le-e / pag-ri ạTUU na-na-a / ạ-šu-[a-mat]-sa ạdUNUG.KI-a-i-tu / [ki]-i is-li-ma.
1160 PNA 2/II, 739a-740a, no. 18.
Parpola has further pointed out that the statue of Nanāia was also returned to Uruk by Esarhaddon. His inscriptions from Uruk record: “Eḫiliana, the cella of the goddess Nanāia, my lady, which is inside Eanna, which a previous king had built, became old and dilapidated. I sought its (original) ground-plan (and) repaired its dilapidated parts with baked bricks from a (ritually) pure kiln. I grasped the hands of the goddess Nanāia, great lady, brought (her) inside, and caused (her) to take up residence (there) forever. I offered splendid offerings and made her door bolt extremely fine.”

Thus, Esarhaddon returned statues of Nanāia and Uṣur-amāssa “made in Assyria” to Uruk during his reign. However, no texts refer to the return of the statue of Arkašu to Uruk though we know from the letter that it had been in the making.

Parpola has further pointed out that Esarhaddon claimed to have sent the statue of Uṣur-amāssa to Uruk in an inscription and this event could be dated after his Egyptian campaign in 671 BC, stating: “I returned the goddess Uṣur-amāssa, the one who gives counsel, the intercessor, to Uruk, her city.”

Parpola has pointed out that Esarhaddon returned statues of Nanāia, Uṣur-amāssa, and Arkašu to replace the statues pillaged by the Elamites, and Mār-Issār returned the statue of Uṣur-amāssa to Uruk.

Equipped with a golden tiara. The two golden [dragon]s are ready and they stand right and left [upon] her [pedestal]. I have sent her from Assyria to Uruk. Furthermore, the work [on Arkašu, Anunitu and Pāli] [of the temple of] Mummu: the carpenter’s and metalworker’s work is [finished], (but) they have not been overlaid with gold. We have given them silver, (but) they are still to get gold from me. After we have finished the work on Uṣur-amāssa and on the temple of Mummu and the temple is complete, then we shall make the decoration of Nanāia.”

It is clear that Esarhaddon made completely new statues of Nanāia, Uṣur-amāssa, and Arkašu to replace the statues pillaged by the Elamites, and Mār-Issār returned the statue of Uṣur-amāssa to Uruk.


1163 RINAP 4 48 r. 95, 4 “u-šur-a-mat-sa ma-li-kāt mil-ki ša-bi-ta-at ab-bu-at-ti a-na UNUG.KI URU-ša ū-ter.”

During the reign of Assurbanipal, according to Parpola, the Assyrian king claims in his inscription known as L⁴, which could be dated to 668 BC,¹¹⁶⁵ that Nanāia and Uṣur-amāssa took part in the welcome ceremony for Marduk in the first year of Assurbanipal when he had Šamaš-šumu-ukīn bring the statue of Marduk with him.¹¹⁶⁶ The statues of Nanāia and Uṣur-amāssa mentioned in this inscription had probably been returned to Uruk by Esarhaddon. On the other hand, as Parpola has indicated, in a later inscription Assurbanipal claims that he took the hands of Nanāia, Uṣur-amāssa, and Arkaītu, and then guided them from Susa into Eanna of Uruk.¹¹⁶⁷ The date of the inscription is unknown, but it is very likely that these statues had been taken to Elam during the reign of Sennacherib. Hence there eventually were two statues each of Nanāia and Uṣur-amāssa in Uruk. One made in Assyria and another returned from Elam.

In any case, at the time of the weeping ceremony of Simānu (III), 646* BC, the statues of Šamaš, Nanāia, Uṣur-amāssa, and Arkaītu were back to Uruk. In *ABL 518, Assurbanipal states: “in my reign they have delivered [all the lands into] my hands,”¹¹⁶⁸ thus attributing his victory over Šamaš-šumu-ukīn to the gods worshipped in Uruk. At the end of the letter, Assurbanipal orders: “[perform the] weeping (and) turn it to joy!”¹¹⁶⁹

To sum up, the policies of Assurbanipal towards Uruk in wartime included military aid to the city, using it as a military base in southern Babylonia, controlling the Chaldean Bīt-Amukāni through the governor, concluding treaties with the governor and his subjects, and soothing the sufferings of the city through a weeping ceremony after the defeat of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

2.5.3. Ur
The letters of Assurbanipal sent to Ur, *ABL 290, *ABL 523, and *ABL 1022, were addressed only to the governor, Sīn-tabni-ūṣur; the citizens of Ur do not appear as the recipients. The main topic of the letters is the sibling rivalry between him and Sīn-šarru-ūṣur, the previous governor of Ur.¹¹⁷⁰ The letters also take up the issue of the severe conditions of Ur during the revolt.

In order to understand know the background of the letters and the relationship of the two brother-governors, it is necessary to take a look at their predecessors and the dates of their appointment as

¹¹⁶⁶ Parpola 1983b, 266; Streck 1916, 266, L³ r. III 12-14.
¹¹⁶⁹ *ABL 518 r. 3-5, [x x x x] bi-ki-tu / [x x x]-ma a-na ḫa-du-tu / tir-ra.
¹¹⁷⁰ PNA 3/I, 1145b-1146b, no. 9.
governors of Ur. It is very likely that both Sīn-šarru-uṣur and Sīn-tabni-uṣur were from the ruling family in Ur because their father Nikkal-iddin was the governor of Ur during the reign of Esarhaddon and probably already under Sennacherib,1171 and their brother Sīn-balāssu-iqbī succeeded to that position during the reign of Assurbanipal or perhaps earlier.1172 Sīn-balāssu-iqbī left 16 dedicatory inscriptions that commemorate building and restoration works in Ur: RIMB 2 B.6.32.2001-2016. Except RIMB 2 B.6.32.2015, all these inscriptions are written in Sumerian.1173 None of his inscriptions mentions Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, while RIMB 2 B.6.32.2003 refers to Assurbanipal in a broken context1174 and two inscriptions, RIMB 2 B.6.32.2003 and RIMB 2 B.6.32.2015, wish good health to Assurbanipal.1175 Sīn-balāssu-iqbī appears to have respected Babylonian traditions, but it seems that he placed more value on Assurbanipal than on Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. It was probably for this reason that the latter sent ABL 426 to the former, claiming that he had heard rumours about Sīn-balāssu-iqbī and recommending the Assyrian king take him into custody until further notice. As noted above (pp. 155-156), this was probably a ruse to get rid of Sīn-balāssu-iqbī who remained loyal to Assurbanipal. The scheme was apparently successful since Sīn-balāssu-iqbī was replaced by Sīn-šarru-uṣur shortly before the outbreak of the revolt in 652 BC.

However, shortly after the commencement of the revolt, Sīn-šarru-uṣur was in his turn replaced by Sīn-tabni-uṣur probably because Assurbanipal suspected his loyalty. The extispicy query SAA 4 286 dated 651-XI-16 was performed to determine if someone associated with Sīn-šarru-uṣur would try to escape having heard something. In addition, the citizens of Ur report to Assurbanipal in ABL 1274 (not dated) that Sīn-šarru-uṣur had defected to Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s side. Two extispicies (SAA 4 300 and 301, both undated) were performed to find out whether Assurbanipal should appoint Sīn-tabni-uṣur over Ur and whether, if appointed, he [will become hos]tile to [Assurba]nupal, [side] with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, or [make com]mon cause with him. Eventually, Sīn-tabni-uṣur was appointed as the governor of Ur. He is first mentioned as the governor of Ur in an economic text dated 650-III-23 at Nina by the regnal year of Assurbanipal.1176

1171 PNA 2/II, 961a-962a.
1172 PNA 3/I, 1129b-1130a, no. 3.
1173 RIMB 2 B.6.32.2016 is a copy of the Sumerian inscription of Amar-Suen but its colophon is written in Akkadian.
A letter from the citizens of Ur to Assurbanipal (ABL 1274, not dated) reports that having faced famine, Šīn-šarru-uṣur submitted to Śamaš-šumu-ukīn, and warns that he was slandering Šīn-tabni-uṣur to Assurbanipal. In fact, according to *ABL 290, *ABL 523, and *ABL 1002, the former calumniated the latter. In ABL 1274, a treaty is mentioned, but it is not clear whose treaty it was.

In *ABL 290, *ABL 523, and *ABL 1002, Šīn-šarru-uṣur appears as a villain, while Šīn-tabni-uṣur is depicted as a loyal servant, and Assurbanipal as the protector of the latter: “He (= Šīn-šarru-uṣur) tells me (= Assurbanipal) malicious things about you (= Šīn-tabni-uṣur),” “Now then, he (= Šīn-šarru-uṣur) is devising a scheme and putting terrible things against me (= Šīn-tabni-uṣur),” and “He is saying terrible things about me in the presence of the magnates.”

In response to Šīn-tabni-uṣur’s fears, Assurbanipal repeatedly assures him that he will not listen to what Šīn-šarru-uṣur has said: “Why would I listen to him? With Šamaš I shall extract his proper intentions,“ “don’t be afraid! What can this ḫappu say against you?“ “What could he say against you? And for that matter, why would I listen to it? Do not fear his return,” “what can this ḫappu (do)?”

The word ḫappu by which Assurbanipal refers to Šīn-šarru-uṣur in these letters is taken in the Assyrian-English-Assyrian Dictionary as a noun and translated “rogue, villain, scoundrel, rascal, scamp,” while CAD ḫ 85a-b takes it as an adjective meaning “bitter, stinking,” and likewise AHw 322a translates it as “stinkend.” The word is rarely used; except for lexical texts and an omen text belonging to the series Mutābiltu from Assurbanipal’s library (CT 20 49:24), it is only attested in these two letters, *ABL 523 and *ABL 1022. The dictionaries indicate that ḫappu could be related to the Sumerian loan word istsḫappu “rogue, rude man” “crook, rogue, villain,” and

1177 Frame dates the letter during the revolt (Frame 1992, 166 and n. 164), whereas Durand thinks that it was composed before the revolt in 655/654 and 653/652 (Durand 1981, 184-185).
1178 Frame 2004, 71, no. 69.
1179 *ABL 290:5-6, dib-bi-ka / bi-šu-ú-tu i-qab-ba-am-ma.
1181 *ABL 1002 r. 11-13, dib-bi-ia sam-ku-u-te / ina 1GI LÚ.GAL. MEŠ i-qab-b[1].
1182 *ABL 290:7-8, u a-na-ku a-šem-meš / TA 4gš.NU₁₁ ŠA-šù ži-ha.
1184 *ABL 523:13-16, šu-ú mi-i-nu i-qab-bi / ina UGU-ḫi-ka u inā’ ŠA-ḫi-ka i-qa-bi / ina-ku a-ta-a a-šam-me / la ta-pal-lāh
GUR-šu.
1185 *ABL 1002 r. 13, mi-i-nu LÚ.ḫap-pu an-[ni-u].
1186 Parpola 2007, 35a.
1187 CAD I 189a-b.
1188 Parpola 2007, 42a.
“Schurke, Schuft” in the Middle Babylonian and the Standard Babylonian dialects. Actually, this word is attested in an undated Neo-Babylonian letter, CT 54 118, probably addressed to Assurbanipal. The unknown author says: “[Did not] (this) scoundrel (ishappu) write to me, saying: ‘When you led him off [r]o Uruk by guile, you gave him to ….’ Although he committed an offence, I will save (him) from his sin.” The word ishappu also appears in the royal inscriptions of Esarhaddon as a standard epithet of Šamaš-ibni, the evil chief of the Chaldean house of Bīt-Dakkūri, who is always called “its (= the Bīt-Dakkūri’s) king, a rogue (and) outlaw” (LUGAL-šu/šu is-ḫap-pu ḫab/ḫa-bi-lu/lum).

Sīn-tabni-uṣur had also reported to the king that Sīn-šarru-uṣur “does not love” Assyria, whereas in *ABL 290, Sīn-tabni-uṣur appears as “a servant who loves the house of his lord”. In ABL 1274 from the citizens of Ur to Assurbanipal, the citizens also call Sīn-tabni-uṣur “a loving servant of the king, my lord” (r. 8-9, ARAD LÚ-ra′-a-an-nu1194 / śa LUGAL EN-a-nī). In *ABL 290, Assurbanipal further states that when Ummanigaš calumniated Sīn-tabni-uṣur in presence, he did not kill Sīn-tabni-uṣur because “you (= Sīn-tabni-uṣur) are wholeheartedly with the house of your lord,” adding: “Did you not endure these two years enemy and famine because of the house of your lord?” and emphasizing that he knows the loyalty (kīnūtu) of Sīn-tabni-uṣur. Thus “loving Assyria” and “being with the house of one’s lord” are synonymous expression of loyalty and describe the relationship between the king and his subordinates. Now let us examine each letter in detail. In *ABL 290, Assurbanipal affirms that he will not listen to what Sīn-šarru-uṣur says about Sīn-tabni-uṣur and encourages and praises the latter’s actions. Beside Sīn-šarru-uṣur, two evil men figure in this letter: a certainUmmanigaš and an anonymous person who is called “that defunct one” (ḫummur agā), certainly to be identified with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The former slandered Sīn-tabni-uṣur in front of the king, and he and his comrades (?) wanted

---

1189 AHw 387a.
1190 CT 54 118:7′-11′, LŪ.‘is’-ḫa-pu (x) / [a]l iš-pu-ra ur-ma i-na pir-ša-at (x) / [a-n]a’ UNUG.KI ki-i ta-bu-ku-uš a-na x x x / ta-at-ta-din-su ša-ū lu-ū ḫi-tu a’-na’-ku” / ṭi-na ḫi-ti-š lu-ū ū-še-zib. Frame has kindly given me his preliminary translation of the letter.
1191 RINAP 4 1 i 63 // RINAP 4 2 ii 37 // RINAP 4 7 7′-8 // RINAP 4 78:21 // RINAP 4 79:21, RINAP 4 93:11.
1192 *ABL 1002 r. 3-5, 𒀀 ina UGU ṅa₃âte-Man-Pab šā taq-ba-a-[ni] / ma-a la ra-i-mu ša KUR-ash-šar šu-a / a-na-ku la ḫa-a, “And concerning Sīn-šarru-uṣur about whom you [said]: ‘He does not love Assyria,’ do I not know it?”
1193 *ABL 290 r. 12, LŪ.ARAD ša )$/\mathfrak{E}-\mathfrak{E}$ ū RAM-MU
1194 CAD R 81b-82a, ṭa-a’-a-nmu is registered under ṭa-ā’imānu.
1196 *ABL 290 r. 6-10, ṭa-a’-a-nmu-at-ta a-ga-a Mu.AN.MeŠ / LŪ.KUR u bu-bu-ti / i-na UGU )$/\mathfrak{E}-\mathfrak{E}$ ka / ul taš-du-ud.
1197 *ABL 290 r. 4-5, ana-ku ki-nu-ut-ka / i-di-ū.
to have Sin-tabni-ushur killed. Assurbanipal reacts toward them by saying: “Aššur (and) my gods enable me not to kill my servant and the foundation of my dynasty high-handedly.” It is not clear why Assurbanipal refers to Sin-tabni-ushur as the “foundation of my dynasty” (išdu ša bīt-abīa) here. In addition, he emphasizes that when “that defunct one” and Ummanigaš put up a siege to kill Sin-tabni-ushur, he knew the loyalty of Sin-tabni-ushur and had mercy on him. He then commends Sin-tabni-ushur for enduring enemy and famine for two years, for the work that he and the Assyrians, called his “brothers,” have done, and for having kept watch. “The Assyrians” can be identified with the rescue forces dispatched to Uruk and then to Ur, mentioned in the letters to Uruk (*ABL 273, *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244). At the end of the letter, Assurbanipal promises his continuous favour until the time of Sin-tabni-ushur’s grandchildren since his name is good for the king.

In *ABL 523, Assurbanipal reaffirms that he has rejected the calumnies of Sin-šarru-usur and he changes the topic to the possibility of Sin-tabni-ushur’s royal audience. He stresses that the country is getting safe and orders Sin-tabni-ushur to come to see him when it becomes safe enough.

According to a fragmentary letter, *ABL 1002, Sin-šarru-usur, the previous governor, submitted to Assurbanipal when Assyria gained the upper hand: “When he (= Sin-šarru-usur) saw that my (Assurbanipal’s) gods had not brought success in the hands of my enemy, he passed over, came, and grasped my feet.”

To sum up these three letters, Assurbanipal consistently stresses his generous attitude towards Sin-tabni-ushur who had been concerned about the calumnies made against him. Towards the end of the

---

1198 The phrase karṣū akālu “to slander” in *ABL 290:9-10 has the 3rd person singular form, but ana dākī nadānū “to want to have someone killed” in *ABL 290:10-11 has the 3rd person plural form.
1199 *ABL 290:12-e.16, AN,SĀR DINGIR.MEŠ-ia-a / ū-šal-an-ni-i-ma / la’ aḫ-du-u-ma ARAD-a-a / u iš-du šā-Ĕ-AD-ia / la a-du-ka. The passage may imply that Assurbanipal established marriage ties with Sin-tabni-ushur.
1200 *ABL 290 r. 1-6, ūm-mur a-ga-a šú-u ù/ mumm-an-i-gaš a-na UGU/ GAZ-ka il-mu-ú / u ina ŠA šā ana-ku ki-nu-ut-ka/ i-du-ú [u]-tir re-mu / dē-kun-ak-ka, “(When) that defunct one and Ummanigaš put up a siege to kill you, was that not because I, knowing your loyalty, had ... had mercy with you?”
1201 *ABL 290 r. 7-18.
1202 *ABL 290 r. 19-s. 2.
1203 *ABL 523 r. 7-15, ū-ma-a si-man ta-qa-ni / ūš KUR EN.NUN-ka tu-ak-[tin] / te-ti-qa tal-la-ka / ū-la i-ni-iz EN.[NUN-ka] / ū-šur EN KUR tu-ā[1-qa-nu-ni] / u ina’ UD “me-šā tal-la-ka [IGL.MEŠ-idh] / ḫad-du-ū-te tam-mar [x x] / u ta-saḥ-ḥur ina šā-[i]-[im-te] / tal-lak, “Now, at the moment that the country is getting safe, you could move on to come, having made your guard firm. Alternatively, stay there and keep [your] watch until the country has been put in order; then you can come, see [my] beaming [face], and return in safety.”
1204 *ABL 1002 r. 5-9, ki-i / e-mur-u-ni DINGIR.MEŠ-īdā i-na ŠU.2 / LŪ.KUR-īdā la ū-šal-lim-ni / e-ta-at-qa it-tal-ka / i-na GĪR.2.MEŠ-īdā iṣ-sa-lat.
conflict, he requests Sîn-tabni-uṣur to come to see him, showing great concern for his safety. Finally he tells of the submission of the previous governor to reassure Sîn-tabni-uṣur.

Ur had a strong connection to the city of Kissik, modern Tell al-Laḥm, because it was located to the southeast of Ur. According to the annals of Sennacherib, Kissik belonged to Bīt-Iakīn, the biggest Chaldean dynastic house. However, the Kissikeans appearing in the correspondence of Assurbanipal identified themselves with the citizens of Ur. For example, in ABL 210, the Kissikeans, calling themselves “old and young” (ll. 2-3, LÚ.URU. ki-sîk. MEŠ-a-a LÚ.Šî-bu-tu û LÚ.TUR. MEŠ), which denotes the whole citizenry irrespective of age, use an Ur-type blessing that invokes the gods Sîn and Nikkal and say (r. 5-6) that all the Chaldeans hate them.

The Kissikeans were involved in political issues of the city and harmonized their policy with the Assyrian policy. *ABL 1121 records that they had sent a report to Assurbanipal on Sîn-šarru-uṣur and implies that they had exercised military or political pressure against him. Assurbanipal informs them in the letter that eventually Sîn-šarru-uṣur came to surrender to him. At the end of the letter, Assurbanipal orders them to do their [work] as they wish (r. 5‘-6‘).

2.5.4. Babylon
Assurbanipal applied an appeasement policy towards the citizens of Babylon even during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. Remarkably, his peacetime policy did not change but had continuity and stability, and aimed at resolving the conflict peacefully. For that purpose, from the beginning of the revolt to the period when Babylon was put under siege, Assurbanipal tried to persuade the citizens of Babylon not to side with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn using political rhetoric. Also, it would be politically astute for Assurbanipal to send friendly letters to the citizens of Babylon. Even it did not make them abandon the rebellion, it might make Šamaš-šumu-ukīn suspicious of their loyalty and support, thus sowing dissension in the enemy ranks. Assurbanipal’s conciliatory attitude is made explicit in three letters: *K 2931, *ABL 301, and *ABL 571, all of them addressed to the citizens of Babylon.

1207 RINAP 3/1 1:48-49.
1208 Cf. Frame 1992, 177, n. 227. Frame suggests that Kissik was probably not inhabited by the Chaldeans because he thinks that the people of Kissik “distinguish themselves from the Chaldeans” based on ABL 210 r. 5-6.
1209 *ABL 1211:4-7, TA* ma-aṣ-ṣi-in  Á.KAL. MEŠ-šu / ma-a-`du-ú-ni u TA*  IGI-ku-nu / “ḥâ-rid”-du-ú-ni a-ta-a l in-qu-ta ina IGI-ia, “if his troops had indeed been so numerous and if he had indeed been protected from you, why would he have fled into my presence? Now then, he is in my presence.”
As Parpola has argued in his article, *K 2931 was probably composed before *ABL 301 dated 652-II-23. It deals with two main topics: the vicious words of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and the Babylonians who had been taken captive in the “first fighting” (I. 8’, dīktu maḥritu). Assurbanipal states:

[I have heard] the words [that th]is [no-br]oth[er] has concoct[ed] – that he has spoken (them) to you and that you have believed [him]. I swear by Aššur (and) Marduk, my gods, that I did not know, nor have said a word of what he has spoken to you, nor has anybody given me such advice! They are all but lies and vain words which he has invented and spoken for his own purposes.  

This indicates that Assurbanipal received a report on Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s malicious statement from Babylon. As Parpola has pointed out, we should note that Assurbanipal swears by Aššur and Marduk together for political reason only in *K 2931, *ABL 301, and *83-1-18,511. Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s remark is described as “lies” (piršāte, sg. pirišatu) and “vain words” (šārāte, sg. šāru) that he invented and spoke for his own purpose (ana šibītu nakālu dabābu). In lines 7’-14’, Assurbanipal states:

And look at him now! After his revolt, as soon as I had robed (in purple) all the Babylonians who were captured in the first fighting and taken into my presence, and had tied a mina of silver to the waist of each of them with the words, “it is to be spent on bread and water,” [I sen]t them to Babylon, and having written a writing-board, I placed it in their hands and said, “G[ive it] to the Babylonians [and] tell them [thi]s word.”

It has long been known from an astronomical diary and the Akītu Chronicle that there were armed clashes between Assyrian and Babylonian troops in the month of Addāru (XII) of 651 BC; one on XII-12 and another on XII-27. However, as Parpola has pointed out, *K 2931 records a “first

---

1210 Parpola 2004a, 228-229.
1211 *K 2931:1’-6’, “dibbi” [ša lu] [a ša] [a ib lu] [a al-te-me-šā-nu] / ki i id bu-[b]a-ku-nu ši u at-tu-nu ’taq-qippašu’ / ina ša anšār AMAR.UTU DINGIR.MEŠ-li at-te me ki i mim ma / ma al id bu ba ku nu-ši a mat ina ša-bi i-du-u / aq bu-ú u mam ma im lik an ni al la gab bi pir-ša-ša-íe / ù ša-ra a-ti a-na ši bu ti šišu ik kil’am ma id bu bu, see Parpola 2004a, 231.
1213 Parpola 2004a, 231. *K 2931:7’-14’, “ši-ši a-nu na ma ul tu ik kir LŪ.TIN.TIR.KL.MEš / ma al šā ina di ik te maḥr ir i-ši ú ša lab bit u ni / a-na IGI-ia i bu ku ú ni ki i úlab bi ši / 1 MA.NA.TA. AM KUG UD ina MURUB-šu na ki i ú rak ki su / um ma a na NINDAḪI.LA u A.MEŠ in na ad di ana KĀ.DINGIR.RA.[KI] / [a] lu ši a-šu-ši u at / [al ta ka]n um ma a na LŪ.TIN.TIR.KL.MEŠ i n-[na ma] / [a mat a g]a-a qı ba niš šu nu ti.
1214 Sachs and Hunger 1988: 44-45, No.-651 iv 9’-10’, 12 TŪR’ x ILLU GIN x [……] / ERĪNWM KUR URI3 ana ša ERĪN KUR aššur šal-tú DUMME ERĪN MU x [……], “The 12th, a halo …. The river level rose [……] / The troops of Babylonia fought against the troops of Assyria; the troops …[……]”; Sachs and Hunger 1988, 44-45, No.-651 iv 17’-19’, [x x] x A 27 TIR.AN ša SŪH3-ša ma-a-ši MAH ina NI GIB / [x x x] ši ri ti nam UD.KI.BU.NUN4 ERĪN KUR URI5 u KUR aššur / [šal-tú KI a-ḥa]l-meš DUMME-MA ERĪN KUR URI5 BAŠMA-a-ši DAZ, “The 27th, a rainbow whose brightness was very great stretched in the east. / […] in] Hiritū in the province of Sippar the troops of Babylonia and of Assyria / foul[ght
fighting” which occurred before 652-II-23. Assurbanipal’s way of handling the Babylonian captives reflects his conciliatory policy. He did not detain them, but dressed them in purple, brought them in his presence, and sent them back with a message and money. By his conciliatory attitude, he probably attempted to appeal to the citizens of Babylon.

The message is very fragmentary: “[This] no-brother has alienated you [from] your [wet] nurse, [but he is going to have a hard time. Once this with [...]. [...] your [...] I do not see [...] the enemy, help [...] I will not let (him) live. [...] no mercy [...].” After that, the text breaks off. Thus it is not clear if the message continued or not. As has already been mentioned (pp. 111), the wet nurse of Marduk was Ištar of Nineveh. On the reverse of the letter, there are at least 7 lines. However, the text is almost completely destroyed and it is impossible to restore its content.

ABL 301 was also sent to the citizens of Babylon at an early stage of the revolt, on 652-II-23. Assurbanipal put many rhetorical flourishes into the letter in order to conciliate the citizens of Babylon even though he stated that the Babylonians had been hostile towards him. His conciliatory policy finds its best expression in this letter.

As Parpola has pointed out, “the first six preserved lines [of *K 2931] run entirely parallel to ABL no. 301: 3-11; the phrasing is slightly different, but the content and even the structure of the passage is the same.” In *ABL 301, Assurbanipal writes to the citizens of Babylon:

The words of wind that this no-brother has spoken to you have been related to me. I have heard them; they are but wind, do not believe him. I swear by Aššur (and) Marduk, my gods, that I have never thought in my heart or said by my mouth any of the detestable things that he has with each] other, and the troops of Babylonia withdrew and were heavily defeated.” Grayson 1975, 132, no. 16:13-16, Addāru XXVII ummānī kurAš-šur u ummānī kurAkkadī / šal-tum ina ḫi-rōṣu(meš) ma ummānī kurAkkadī / ina tāhzāz šēri ibballūši(meš) ma dabdā-šā-ḫa ma-a-ṭi šašīni / šal-tum sad-ṣar, “On the twenty-seventh day of Adar the armies of Assyria and Akkad / did battle in Hirit. The army of Akkad / retreated from the battlefield and a major defeat was inflicted upon them. (However), there were still hostilities (and) warfare continued.”

Parpola 2004a, 228-229.

*K 2931:13-21, um-ma a-na LŪ.TIN.TIR.KI.MEŠ in-[na-ma] / [a-ma] / [a-mat a-g]a-a qī-ba-niš-šu-nu-ti um-ma la šES [a-ga-a] / [la-pa-an MLE]-zi E-kū-nu ap-ta-rī-is-kū-nu-[sī] / [x x x x x] a-a-zA-ŠA-i ʾšū a-ga-a it-tī [x x x] / [x x x x x]-bi-kū-na la am-mar um-ma [x x x] / [x x x x x]-li LŪ.KUR a-a-la [x x x] / [x x x x x x x] / [x x x x x x x x x] re-em-

mu / [x x x] / [x x x x x x x] ʾx / [x x x x x x x x x].

See also SAA 3 34, SAA 3 35, and SAA 3 39.

*K 2931 r. 1'-7’. See Parpola 2004a, 231-232.
spoken against me. It is nothing but a scheme that he has devised in order to make the name of Babylonians, who love me, detestable along with him.\textsuperscript{1220}

In this letter, the statement of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn is said to be “the words of wind” (dībbī ša šārī), “wind” (šāru), “detestable things” (dībbī bi’šūte), “scheme” (niklu), and “vain words” (šārāte, sg. śāru). Assurbanipal warns the citizens of Babylon that they should not listen to the “vain words” of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\textsuperscript{1221}

Here Assurbanipal calls the citizens of Babylon his “lovers” (l. 13, rā’imānu). As seen above (pp. 184 and 188), “lover [of Assyria]” and “love [of the king]” were centrally important concepts in Assyrian politics. At the end of the letter (r. 16-17), the citizens of Babylon are addressed as “the troop which I have put together for Bēl” (kiṣru ša ana Bēl aḵṣur).\textsuperscript{1222}

Having refuted these “words of wind,” Assurbanipal says:

But I will not listen to it. Your brotherhood (aḫḫūtu) with the Assyrians and your privileged status which I established remain valid until the present day; you are close to my heart.

Correspondingly, do not listen to his vain words, do not taint your name which is in good repute before me and the whole world, (and) do not make yourself culpable before God.\textsuperscript{1223}

“Brotherhood” (aḫḫūtu) is worth noting. The term is attested only five times, during the reign of Assurbanipal, in the Sargonid period. Assurbanipal states two times in his inscriptions that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn severed brotherhood with him.\textsuperscript{1224} He also describes how the predecessors of Sārdūrī, king of Urarṭu, used to write to his fathers on brotherhood.\textsuperscript{1225} In *ABL 1260 r. 10, he tells Ambappi and the Rāšans that he will go in the tower probably in order to negotiate about brotherhood with Ummanaldašū III.\textsuperscript{1226} Here in *ABL 301, “brotherhood with the citizens of Assyria” (aḫḫūtu itti

\textsuperscript{1220} *ABL 301:3-13, dib-bi ša šá-a-ri / ša la šEš a-ga-a id-bu-ba-ku-nu-ši / gab-bu id-dab-bu-a-ni al-te-me-šu-na / ša-a-ru la ta-qī-pa-šu ina ŠA aš-šur / \textsuperscript{1221} *ABL 1260 r. 8-10, ina uru ki mus-ti śi / šu-up-na-a-ti al-lak-ma / [x x]-ši u’ ina’ aḫ-bi [u-ti]-[i]a a-di-ba-bu-ub.

\textsuperscript{1222} *ABL 301:19-20, ap-pit-tim-ma šá-ra-te-e-šu / la ta-šem-ma-a.

\textsuperscript{1223} Parpola 2004a, 227-228.


\textsuperscript{1225} BIWA, 40 and 233, A III 108; BIWA, 279 and 293, IIT 111.

\textsuperscript{1226} BIWA, 71 and 250, A X 42.
mārī māt Aššur) meant nothing less than parity with Assyria, which along with the “privileged status” (kidinnātu) granted to Babylon (see above pp. 163-165), brought considerable advantages to its citizens. Assurbanipal emphasizes that this privileged status is still valid and the citizens of Babylon are “close to his heart.” The “name” (šunu), i.e., reputation of Babylon is one of the key concepts here. It is said to be good not only in front of Assurbanipal but also in the presence of “the whole world,” and Assurbanipal warns the Babylonians not to taint it and make themselves “culpable before God.”

After this, a reference to the involvement of the citizens of Babylon in the rebellion occurs:

I also know another matter that you have been pondering in your hearts: “Now, the very fact that we have taken hostile action against him will be a burden on us” — it will not be a burden; it is nothing, since the name is very good. Though the very fact that you have sided with my opponent is like placing a burden on you, and violating a treaty is a matter (to be settled) before God. Assurbanipal emphasizes that this privileged status is still valid and the citizens of Babylon in saying that it will not be a “burden” (biltu) because of their “good name.” It is clear that Assurbanipal is here making maximum concessions to the citizens of Babylon, but in the continuation he makes a controversial point. He hints at possible punishment for violating the treaty on behalf of God.

The letter concludes: “Now then I am writing to you: if you do not wish to stain yourself with him in these matters, let me quickly see an answer to my letter. May this man whom Marduk hates not treaty on behalf of God.

It is clearly said here that the citizens of Babylon had been hostile (nakāru) to Assurbanipal and had “stood with his enemy” (bēl dabābi). However, he surprisingly condones this behaviour of the citizens of Babylon in saying that it will not be a “burden” (biltu) because of their “good name.” It is clear that Assurbanipal is here making maximum concessions to the citizens of Babylon, but in the continuation he makes a controversial point. He hints at possible punishment for violating the treaty on behalf of God.

The letter concludes: “Now then I am writing to you: if you do not wish to stain yourself with him in these matters, let me quickly see an answer to my letter. May this man whom Marduk hates not deprive my hands of the troop which I have put together for Bēl.” Here we find a new term for bad political behaviour ramānu tunnupu “to stain oneself.” Assurbanipal stresses that he requires a quick answer from them.

1227 RIMB 2 B.6.32.1:12; RIMB 2 B.6.32.2:48-49; RIMB 2 B.6.32.3:10; RIMB 2 B.6.32.4:10; RIMB 2 B.6.32.5:10; RIMB 2 B.6.32.6:12; RIMB 2 B.6.32.12:10-11; RIMB 2 B.6.32.13:15; RIMB 2 B.6.32.14:29; RIMB 2 B.6.32.19:18. See also *ABL 926 and SAA 18 158 from the citizens of Babylon to Assurbanipal. The citizens appeal to the king in the letter that the privileged status is not protected.


To summarize *ABL 301, Assurbanipal still pursues his appeasement policy even though the citizens of Babylon had sided with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn. The Assyrian king emphasizes in the clearest possible terms that his good will continues.

Assurbanipal’s constant effort to win the citizens of Babylon over to his side is also apparent in *ABL 571, which was probably composed after the Assyrians had laid siege to Babylon. Even in this situation, Assurbanipal attempts to open the final negotiations through a certain group of the citizens of Babylon. The letter begins:

[The king’s word to the Babylonians: I am well]; you can be glad. [The day] you see this [letter], speak [with] your hearts, take with you any number of the Babylonians, your brothers, whose hearts you know and whom you can vouch for, and come over before Milki-rāmu, the chief tailor (rab kāšīrī), and Aššur-da’’inanni, the commander-in-chief (turtānu), because they are about to throw (their forces) against Babylon, in accordance with what you said.

It is remarkable that there were still some Babylonians who supported Assurbanipal inside the besieged city and that they had kept up contact with Assurbanipal. He refers to Milki-rāmu, the chief tailor, who is well known to have been deeply involved in the Elamite war and Aššur-Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, the commander-in-chief who led the Assyrian main army. These names and office titles probably sufficed to make it clear to the Babylonians what would happen if they did not surrender. The next lines, citing the words of the recipients, show that they had been planning a counter rebellion:

Let us go and speak to our brothers, rend our garments, take the obsidian knife and discuss with them the matters by which they have destroyed themselves and through which we can snatch Babylon from the hands of the enemy. Perhaps Babylon can still be saved from massacre.

---

1231 Parpola 2004a, 229.
Rending one’s garments and slashing oneself with a knife were well-known rites of mourning and repentance. It is very likely that this group of the citizens thought that siding with Šamaš-šumu-ukin was suicidal and the only way of saving the city was to switch sides.

Assurbanipal continues: “Now then I am writing to you: remember these words of yours, come, line up, speak with your brothers, and let us snatch the city from enemy hands so that it will not be subjected to plunder.” This is a verbatim repetition of the words of the Babylonians, except that Assurbanipal uses the verb of “to plunder” (ḥabālu) instead of “to massacre” (dāku).

The following lines: “If it requires kind words, speak kindly, and if it requires harsh words, speak to them harsh words.” Here the dichotomy is between “to speak kind words” (dibbi ṭābūtī dabābu) and “to speak harsh words” (dibbi šipsūte dabābu), the former also finds a parallel in *ABL 945 addressed to Nabû-ušabši, the governor of Uruk, as discussed above (p. 188, see also p. 224).

The letter concludes: “If Marduk wants to keep them alive, let them open [the city gate] on friendly terms; if n[ot], I have prayed to Aššur and Marduk, my gods, and [my] gods [...]. However, let the city not be left in the hands of the enemy by itself [...] (rest destroyed).” As has been discussed above (p. 103), Assurbanipal claims that not he himself but Marduk controls the fate of the city.

In the preceding paragraphs, we have focused on the policy of Assurbanipal towards the citizens of Babylon. Now we have to examine what political attitude Assurbanipal takes towards Šamaš-šumu-ukin in these letters. Assurbanipal was always negative towards him. He never mentions his name, but repeatedly calls him “no-brother” (lā aḥu). In addition, in *ABL 301 he alludes to him as “the one rejected by Marduk” (sikipti Marduk). The use of such terms indicates that Assurbanipal not only renounced his brotherhood with Šamaš-šumu-ukin but also negated the
latter’s connection to Marduk, the supreme god of Babylonia. Furthermore, in *ABL 301, he refers Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as his “enemy” (bēl dabābi1243 and nakru1244).

All in all, these three letters are eloquent witnesses to Assurbanipal’s conciliatory policy towards the citizens of Babylon even during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, or at least this was the image he wanted to give of himself.

There are three more letters and fragments that may have been addressed to the citizens of Babylon during the revolt: *CT 54 230, *83-1-18,511, and *K 11875. None of them except *CT 54 230 contain the names of recipients and all are undated. *83-1-18,511 and *K 11875 are written in Neo-Babylonian but use the Neo-Assyrian script.

The beginning of *CT 54 230 is destroyed, but at least ten names of the persons to whom the letter was addressed are partly or fully preserved. It seems that these recipients were members of the city council because at the end of the opening formula we can find the phrase of “[old] and young.”1245 Let us now consider to whom this letter was sent. There are two possibilities: the citizens of Uruk or the citizens of Babylon. That the recipients were the citizens of Uruk, is suggested by line 15′ of the letter: “you (pl.) are destroying the rest of the […] of Uruk […]....”1246 This attribution is favoured by Radner,1247 Baker,1248 and Mattila.1249 On the other hand, that the recipients were the citizens of Babylon is suggested by the personal names of the addressees, five of which have Bēl and one Marduk as their theophoric elements.1250 In addition, Bēl and Nabû are referred to (in a broken sentence) in this letter.1251 Frahm has opined that Assurbanipal sent this letter to individuals from Babylon because of the names, but has not ruled out that the recipients could have been citizens of Uruk.1252 Luppert-Barnard in a PNA entry indicates that the letter was sent to the individuals in Uruk,1253 but in another entry of PNA she says that the letter was addressed to the people in

---

1243 *ABL 301 r. 8, EN-da-ba-bi-ia.
1244 *ABL 571: 21, L.U.KUR.
1245 *CT 54 230:8′, [L.U.AB.BA.MEŠ] ù L.U.TUR.MEŠ.
1246 *CT 54 230:15′, [0] ù šît-te [x-]i šā UNUG.KI tu-ḫal-qa a-[x x x x x x x]. This suggestion is favoured by Radner (PNA 1/II, 118a, no. 31), Baker (PNA 2/II, 780b, no. 5), and Mattila (Mattila 2000, 59).
1247 Radner in PNA 1/I, 118a, no. 31.
1248 Baker in PNA 2/II, 780b, no. 5.
1249 Mattila 2000, 59.
1250 Bēl-ahu-[…] Bēl-[…] Bēl-ēpuš, Bēl-ētūr, Bēl-ibni, and Mušēzib-Marduk. The names of other people are […]ni, […]-Nergal, Aplāia, and […]-zēri.
1251 *CT 54 230 r. 10′, [x x x x]x-ma ša d4EN d4A[G x x x x x x x x x].
1252 Frahm in PNA 1/II, 284b-285a, no. 2.
1253 Luppert-Barnard in PNA 1/II, 295b, no. 10.
I suggest that the letter was addressed to the citizens of Babylon because of their names, the reference to Bēl and Nabû, and their undesirable behaviour towards Assyria which could imply that they took side with the enemy. At the beginning of the letter, Assurbanipal blames the recipients for not having obeyed his instructions:

[Although] I gave you much [advice], you did not listen to me [...]. Because you did not come to my military service [...], [...] your sons and daughters [...] and you have let your gardens become abandoned [......]. You have ma[de …] pass by and you have […ed] your great deficit. [You have …ed] ... For how long (still)? Because you [have not paid attention to] yo[urselves …..] and you are destroying the rest of the […] of Ur[uk [……].] 1255 (…) You have burnt with fire. 1256

These reproaches could suggest that the recipients were the citizens of Babylon. However, the tone of the letter is not in harmony with the conciliatory tone of the three letters certainly addressed to the citizens of Babylon, analyzed above. In any case, the most important point of this letter is that it refers to important Assyrian ministers and a huge Assyrian army sent to the city by Assurbanipal:

After the chief eunuch (rab ša-rēšī), the […], the chief cupbearer (rab šāqē), the general (rab mūği), Nabū-šāgi[m …], [……] Assyria, our 1,000 or 2,000 archers of […], [……] the great host of Assyria (kiṣir rabū ša māt Aššur) [……], […] many good […], a new decision [……], [……] your city wall [……]. 1257

In addition, Assurbanipal mentions [1]00 or 200 unspecified Assyrians. 1258 It is possible that these were troops sent to besiege Babylon, but it cannot be ruled out that were sent to Uruk in order to reinforce the city, to rescue Ur, and to wage war in southern Babylonia. 1259 It is certain that both cities were of great strategic importance. This military action might have been biggest during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.
It is very likely that *83-1-18,511 was sent to the citizens of Babylon during the revolt because Assurbanipal calls Šamaš-šumu-ukīn “[no]-brother of mine” and swears [by Aššur and M]arduk, and his gods. Having Šamaš in a broken sentence, Assurbanipal makes a curious statement: “[…] has lighted up on him. And if [he should flee […] in the place where he goes […],], I shall break[ ] his […]” These sentences remind us the royal inscriptions of Esarhaddon, where the king’s enemies in the midst of the sea are quoted as saying, “where can the fox go to get away from the sun?” Thus the letter probably concerned Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’santicipated attempt to flee from besieged Babylon (see pp. 178-185) and should be dated to the time immediately preceding the fall of the city. There is no reason to connect it with *ABL 972 and the other texts relating to the extradition of Nabû-bēlu-šumāti and his accomplices, on which see pp. 140-141.

At the end of *83-1-18,511, Assurbanipal demands an answer from the recipients: “[Now then I am writing to you: if you do not wish to stain yourself with him in these matters, let me quickly see an answer to my letter.” This adds to the likelihood that the recipients of the letter were the citizens of Babylon. Finally Assurbanipal states: “[Your] freedom is [in] my hands.” If this reconstruction is correct, Assurbanipal implies that the recipients have no choice but to side with Assurbanipal.

*K 11875 is a very fragmentary letter, but it contains some negative phrases such as “[in] darkness,” “[abandoned,” and “despicable deeds” that could allude to the revolt. It is worth noting that in the letter Assurbanipal requests a reply as he does in *ABL 301 and *83-1-18,511. Assurbanipal states, “Now make good […] in your (pl.) country, and let me see an answer to my letter!” Thus this letter might also have been addressed to the citizens of Babylon.

1260 *83-1-18,511 r. 2’, [x x x x la] šEŠ-ú-a šú-u ’da’-[x x x x].
1261 *83-1-18,511 r. 4’, [ina ŠA AN,ŠAR 4]MAR,UTU DIN.GIR,MEŠ-iša at-te-me [ki-i].
1262 *83-1-18,511 r. 5’, [x x x x q]aq-gad-us-su ÛTU ana U[GU’ x x x], “[…] his leadership, Šamaš, t[o…].”
1263 *83-1-18,511 r. 7’-9’, [x x x x ina U]GU-ḫi-šá ii-ša ’ba u ki-[i x x] l [x x x x] ina ă-s-rî ii-la-ku [x x x x] l [x x x x] x-[ti]-iš-šá ă-ha-ep-[pi].
1264 RINAP 4 1 v 24-25.
1265 *83-1-18,511 r. 9’-11’, [en-na a-da-á] / [al-tap-rak-ku]-nu-šá ḥa-ăn-țiš gab-ri ši-[i-pi]-ti-ia / [lu-mur].
1267 *83-1-18,511 r. 11’, [ina ŠU.2]-’la ib-ba-ši za-[ku-ut-ku-nu].
1268 K 11875’2, [i-n]a e-kel-ti [x x x].
1269 K 11875’4, [x x u]-maš-šir-ua-ma [x x x].
1270 K 11875’7, e-p’-se-et bi-i-s-ši-[i x x].
1271 K 11875 r. 2’-4’, en-na le-’-[x x x] / ina KUR-ku-nu bu-un-’na’-[a-ma] / gab-ri ši-pi-ri-ti-ia ’lu’-[mur].
The opening formula of *CT 53 142 is not preserved, but the letter was certainly addressed to more than one person because the recipients are addressed in the 2nd person plural, e.g., “The god [has opened] your ears (PI 2-ku-nu)” and “Assemble! (pl.).” On the reverse, Assurbanipal states: “I have dr[essed him] in purple […] and I have appoint[e]d hi[m] to the comma[ndantship ……] I have sent […].” This recalls *K 2931, analyzed above, where Assurbanipal tells the citizens of Babylon that he has dressed in purple all the Babylonians who were captured in the first fighting and sent them to Babylon. However, this is not by any means conclusive evidence. The letter may have been written during the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn because it includes a passage that could be related to battle action: “Assemble […] and the horse[s……]”

All in all, Assurbanipal’s conciliatory policy towards the citizens of Babylon is well attested especially in *K 2931, *ABL 301, and *ABL 571. According to these letters, he forgave the rebellious deeds of the citizens of Babylon, tried to persuade them not to side with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, and attempted to avoid the destruction of Babylon. Assurbanipal applied this policy from the very beginning of the revolt up to the very end of the siege of Babylon.

2.6. Foreign Policy
In this section, I aim to study the foreign policies of Assurbanipal. “Foreign policy” means in this context not only the policies toward foreign countries but also towards foreign tribal groups and non-Assyrian political entities inside Assyrian territory, such as the Gambilu and the Arabs. I shall pay attention especially to the following information found in the letters from Assurbanipal: the persons or the groups who played a major role in international relations, the rhetoric that embodies the Assyrian royal ideology, the political connections to foreign parties, the practical implementation of foreign policy, and the underlying political situations. When appropriate, other contemporary texts are also taken into consideration.

1272 *CT 53 142 r. 3, DINGIR PI 2-ku-nu [p-te-te x x x x x].
1273 *CT 53 142 r. 12, pu-ah-ra x[x x x x x x x].
1274 *CT 53 142 r. 7-10, SÍG 5 x x x x x / ù ana [L]Ú.GAR–UM[Uš-ú-ti x x x x x] / ap-[t]i-‘qid’-š[u x x x x x x x / us-se-bil x[x x x x x x x].
1275 *K 2931:7-14.
1276 *CT 53 142 r. 11-12, ù ANŠE.KUR.RA.[MEŠ x x x x x x x / pu-ah-ra x[x x x x x x x].
1277 Since his letters to the Arabs are not extant, I will not discuss in detail the policy towards them in the present study.
2.6.1. Enemies
Two major foreign powers appear as enemies of Assyria in the letters of Assurbanipal: Elam and the
Sealand. The Sealand was part of Babylonia, but the Chaldeans made the dynastic “house” there,
which can be regarded as the residue of the Kassite state of Karduniaš. Both supported the revolt of
Šamaš-šumu-ukin, although these states sometimes appear as submissive adversaries. Perhaps the
geographical distance from Assyria, and ethnic and cultural differences enabled them to keep their
anti-Assyrian attitude.

After Assurbanipal defeated Teumman, king of Elam (664-653 BC), Assyria gained control over at
least part of Elam. However, it was never fully integrated into Assyria. The office of the king of
Elam was retained. Nevertheless, all Elamite kings were de facto under Assyrian control and had to
follow Assyrian policy and pay tax and tribute. The relationships between Assurbanipal and the
Elamite kings were confirmed by treaties.

Elam was very unstable. The Elamite king changed eight times in nine years between 653 and 645
BC. Some were installed by Assurbanipal, others seized the throne in turmoil or by force, and
two deposed kings reascended the throne later on. Most of these Elamite kings were rebellious
towards Assurbanipal. Thus Elam can be classified as inimical to Assyria.

Elam was also politically fragmented. Two kings simultaneously were in different places in Elam on
several occasions. For instance, before Elam was made into a province of Assyria, there were two
kings in Elam: Teumman, king of Elam, and Šutur-Nahűndi, king of Hádlū. After Assurbanipal
defeated them in 653 BC, Nabû-bēl-šumāti recommended that he place a governor in Elam in ABL
839 and perhaps the governor was placed over the part of Elam. However, it does not seem
that Assyrian control over Elam worked well. Probably in the same year, unknown authors,
presumably the elders of Elam, wrote to Assurbanipal that public security had deteriorated in Elam

1279 CT 54 490 = ABL 1007 + 82-3-23,40. See also Waters 2000, 56- 58.
1278 Ummanigaš II (653-c. 652 BC), Tammarītu I (653-c.652 BC), Tammarītu II (c. 652-c. 649 BC), Indabibi (c. 649-c.
648 BC), Ummanaldašu III (c. 648-c. 647 BC), UmmanHABua (c. 647 BC), Tammarītu II (c. 647 BC), Pa’ē (c. 647
BC), Ummanaldašu III (c. 647-c. 645 BC).
1280 Ummanigaš II and Tammarītu I were appointed at the same time. Tammarītu II had sought refuge from Indabibi in
Nineveh and he was installed as king of Elam by Assurbanipal (c. 646 BC) during the campaign against Ummanaldašu
III.
1281 Tammarītu II (c. 646 BC) and Ummanaldašu III (c. 646-c. 645 BC) had a second tenure.
1282 PNA 3/II, 1297a-b, no. 2.
1283 Mattila 1987.
1284 Waters 2000, 58 and see CT 54 490 (= ABL 1007 + 82-3-23,40) r. 22.
and asked him to install Tammarītu [in] the city of Ḥīḍālu and [Kudū]rru in the city of Iahdik.\textsuperscript{1285} According to Assurbanipal’s inscriptions, he granted one of their requests and installed Ummanigaš as the king of Elam but he chose Tammarītu I as the king in the city of Ḥīḍālu.\textsuperscript{1286} At this point three authorities, the governor and two kings, ruled Elam simultaneously. Beside them, high-ranking officials and an assembly including elders held political power to various degrees. For instance, elders, citizens, city lords, and prominent individuals appear as recipients of letters from Assurbanipal. Therefore, Elam had a complex, multi-layered political structure.

The Sealand was ruled by the Chaldean dynastic “house” of Bīt-Iakīn.\textsuperscript{1287} During the reign of Assurbanipal, its leader was Nabû-bēl-šumāti, a grandson of Merodach-Baladan II.\textsuperscript{1288} Neither his father’s name nor his title is specified in any source. However, since two sons of Merodach-Baladan II held the office of the governor of the Sealand,\textsuperscript{1289} Nabû-bēl-šumāti probably served as the governor of the Sealand as well. He was loyal to Assurbanipal until the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn,\textsuperscript{1290} but then became an ally of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.\textsuperscript{1291} Later he sought refuge in Elam. Assurbanipal chose Bēl-ibni from his entourage and appointed him as military commander (\textit{turtānu}) of the Sealand in 650 BC,\textsuperscript{1292} and informed the citizens of the Sealand about his appointment. After the revolt was crushed, Bēl-ibni was involved in the campaigns against Elam.

The policies and attitudes of Assurbanipal towards these hostile states varied depending on the nature of the opposing political factions (and individuals). I will study his stance on the foreign kings who were submissive adversaries, subordinates of Assurbanipal, and people from civic organizations.

The Elamite kings often appear as submissive adversaries. They were probably bound to Assurbanipal by vassal treaties though the treaty tablets are not extant. However, some treaties are referred to in the letters from Assurbanipal and contemporary texts. If they broke the treaty, they were regarded as committing a sin (\textit{ḫiṭṭu}). For example, the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal record that Ummanigaš did not adhere to (\textit{naṣāru}, lit. “guard”) the treaty (\textit{adē}) and the oath

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[1285] *ABL 961:9-r. 1.
\item[1286] BIWA, 104 and 226, B VI 6-9 // C VI 137-VII 2; BIWA 192 and 226, H 3 III’ 1-5; BIWA, 277 and 293, IIT 101-102.
\item[1287] Frame 1992, 40-42.
\item[1288] Brinkman 1964, 29.
\item[1289] Nabû-zēr-kittī-lišir and Na’id-Marduk.
\item[1290] Mattila 1987.
\item[1291] SAA 4 280 dated on 651-I-4 first refers to the treacherous act of Nabû-bēl-šumāti.
\item[1292] PNA 1/II, 306b-310b, no. 18.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
(māmītu) of the great gods.\textsuperscript{1293} This violation of the treaty by Ummanigaš II is also mentioned in *ABL 1380, an undated letter from Assurbanipal to an Elamite partisan Menānu.\textsuperscript{1294} Moreover, according to *ABL 1022 r. 22-24, Assurbanipal probably made Tammarītu II enter a treaty and swear an oath in front of the gods. The words “treaty (and) oath” are restored, but the restoration can be certain in view of the context. In the letter, Assurbanipal emphasizes that he has rendered favour (tābtu) to Tammarītu II, his submissive adversary. In return, he was strongly expected to pay it back to Assurbanipal. The words of Assurbanipal read: “I have [done] and given to you this favour which not (even) a father has done for a son. As for you, remember [this], unremittingly strive to pay me back these favours, and [guard] and remember [the treaty and the oath] which I made you swear before [all] the gods of heaven and ea[rth]!” (r. 18-24)\textsuperscript{1295}

The submitted foreign princes were under Assyrian divine protection. When Tammarītu II took part in the campaign against Ummanaldašu III in Elam on the side of Assurbanipal, the Assyrian king sent *CT 53 908 to him. According to the letter, Aššur, the gods of Assurbanipal, and God metaphorically have assisted Tammarītu II in the name of Assurbanipal. The king’s words read:

I have heard [what Aššur] and my gods have done; [that, after you] appealed to me, [my troops] have gone and inflicted a massacre in Bit-Bunakka.\textsuperscript{1296} (…) I also heard [that the god]s have in my name assisted you to defeat the Dīn-Šarreans, and I rejoiced. All this […] which has happened is through my …; God (himself) has intervened [with] his bow, [beca]use my name is upon you. Count [thi]s among my many favours.\textsuperscript{1297}

As an overlord of the submitted foreign princes, Assurbanipal claims to have enthroned them. The royal inscriptions record that Assurbanipal installed Ummanigaš II, Tammarītu I,\textsuperscript{1298} and Tammarītu

\textsuperscript{1293} BIWA, 109 and 229, B VII 6, la ʾiš-šu-ru a de-e ma-mit DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ.
\textsuperscript{1294} *ABL 1380:9-11, “um-ma-ni-i-gaš šā at-ta MUN / GAL-ṭi te-pu-šā-dš-šum-ma a’-na a-de-ka-ma / iḥ-ṭu-ā, “Ummanigaš, to whom you rendered a great favour but who has sinned against your treaty.”
\textsuperscript{1295} *ABL 1022 r. 18-24, an-ni-t M [UN x x x] / šā aššur DINGIR. MEŠ ia e-pu-šú-u-ni / miḫ-ṣu iḫ-ḫu-ra-ni / [Â.MEŠ-ia] il-lik-ū-ni / [de]-ek-tu ina URU.E-bu-nak-ka / [i]-du-ku-u-ni. Concerning the reconstruction of [Â.MEŠ-ia], since the verbs (alāku, duāku) take the 3rd person plural form, perhaps the word emītē “troops, forces” is a logical subject.
\textsuperscript{1296} *CT 53 908:3-5, as-se-me / [šā aššur] u DINGIR.MEŠ-ia e-pu-Ššu-u-ni / [miḫ-šu] iḫ-ḫu-ra-ni / [Â.MEŠ-ia] il-lik-ū-ni / [de]-ek-tu ina URU.E-bu-nak-ka / [i]-du-ku-u-ni. Concerning the reconstruction of [Â.MEŠ-ia], since the verbs (alāku, duāku) take the 3rd person plural form, perhaps the word emītē “troops, forces” is a logical subject.
\textsuperscript{1297} *CT 53 908 r. 2-12, , [DINGIR.MEŠ] ina MŪ-ia is-se-e-ka / [i]-z-[z]-zi-u-ni de-e-kū-ta / [i]-a-du-ku-u-ni / [miḫ-šu]-a-ma an-ni-ū / [gab]-bi-šu šā in-nē-piš-u-ni / [ina KUR.pal] ʾšu-ϵ-u-a šū DINGIR / [ina GIŠ.BAN-šu is-sa-kan / [a]-k] šu-mi ina UGU-ḫi-ka-ni / [an-ni]-i-ta TĂ MUN.MEŠ-ia / [ma-a] da-a-te mu-mu.
\textsuperscript{1298} BIWA, 104 and 226, B VI 6-9 // C VI 137-VII 2; BIWA, 192 and 226, H 3 III’ 1-5; BIWA, 277 and 293, IIT 101-102.
Towards his own subjects who were active in hostile countries, the king seems to have taken a stricter attitude. He demands from them devotion, love, and loyalty to the king and Assyria with a feeling of awe. The loyal servant is described as one “who loves the house of his lord,”1303 “who loves Assyria,”1304 “who is loyal to the house of [his] lord,”1305 “knows my fear.”1306 Assurbanipal expects absolute obedience from them. In his letter *ABL 291, Assurbanipal criticizes Bēl-ibni, the general of the Sealand, for disobeying his orders. He strongly demands that he send reports. For instance, Assurbanipal tells Bēl-ibni that he must keep the king informed on what he sees and hears.1307 Assurbanipal also accuses Menānu, an Elamite patrician, of not contacting him for 19 months1308 because reporting was one of the important duties for subordinates. This could indicate that Assurbanipal used his foreign contacts as intelligence agents. Assurbanipal also assures them that they are under his aegis (šillu)1309 and their heart should be at rest with the king.1310

Assurbanipal considered the people who belonged to a civic organization in hostile states, such as citizens, elders, and their spokesmen as separate from, and not inalienably related to, their rebellious leader or king. He tells the citizens of the Sealand that “my eyes are upon them and I have dissociated you from the sin (ḫiṭṭu) of Nabû-bēl-šumāti” in *ABL 289:6-9. It should be noted that the disloyalty of Nabû-bēl-šumāti is here viewed as a sin (against God). Assurbanipal further says that the citizens reciprocate in doing what is good for Assurbanipal (ll. 13-14). He adds that the citizens will see what profit (nēmel[u]) there is for the servants who promote the wish of their

---

1300 Since the main topic of the letter is the extradition of Nabû-bēl-šumāti, it seems that the recipient is Ummanaldašu III.
1302 This is a tentative translation. The word literally means “a person who provides peace”; see GAG §56 r. *ABL 972:3′, DI-ma-a-nu ana-ku and 7′, DI-ma-a-nu-šú.
1304 Concerning the expression “the house of the lord,” see Fales 2000a.
1305 *ABL 1380 r. 2, ra-im-a-ni šá KUR–AN.SÁR.KI.
1306 *ABL 402:12-13, ina UGU E–EN.MEŠ-šú / am-ru.
1307 *ABL 291:5, pu-lud-ta-a ti-ti-u.
1308 *ABL 288:12-r. 2, šá im-ma-ra / ú šá i-šem-mu-u / PL2 šá EN.MEŠ-šú / ú-pat-ta.
1309 *ABL 1380 r. 25-26, 19 ITL.MEŠ / [x x x x x] a-mat-ka ul áš-m[e].
1310 *ABL 400:10-12, ina GIS.MI-[l][a] / ta-tal-la–”ka′”, “you are walking under my aegis.”
1311 *ABL 1380 r. 3, ŠA-ba-ka it-ti-ia pa-áš-ru.
previous lord, and see what rewards (\textit{dumqu}) and favours (\textit{ṭātu}) they will have from Assurbanipal after he has sent his army and it has completed its mission (r. 2-9).

Assurbanipal emphasizes the intercession of Aššur in human actions. Aššur behaves aggressively towards enemies, while he is supportive of Assurbanipal and foreign people who remain loyal to the Assyrian king. As discussed above (p. 106), God (as Aššur) has intervened [with] his bow in \*CT 53 908. In the same letter, Aššur and his gods assisted Tammarītu II in favour of the Assyrian king when he fought against enemies of Assyria. In addition, Assurbanipal several times swears by Aššur and his gods in the letters to drive home a point. In \*BM 132980 r. 18, he swears by Aššur and his gods that, under the aegis of the gods, he will make the future even more horrible to the elders of Elam than the past. Assurbanipal also refers to the past as an example of his favours; he stresses his goodness by stating that he accepted Ummanigaš II as a refugee from Teumman, sent his army with Ummanigaš II against Teumman, and did not plunder and persecute Elam when the Assyrian army conquered the country. Sometimes Aššur can directly influence a foreigner in a hostile country. In \*ABL 1170, the Assyrian king tells Ummanšibar, a prominent Elamite who acted as a spokesman of the Elamites, that he has heard “this beautiful idea which Aššur so nicely put into your (Ummanšibar’s) heart for your lord and which you wrote to Bēl-ibni.” This phrase indicates that Aššur can directly influence a foreigner in a hostile country. As discussed above (p. 106), a similar case is found in \*CT 53 908. God (or Aššur) supported Tammarītu II in favour of Assurbanipal.

2.6.2. Allies
Rulers, not formally subjected to Assyria, were addressed in Assurbanipal’s letters as “brother,” a term connoting parity and equality. In the time of Esarhaddon, the Elamite king Urtaku (675-664 BC) can be categorized as the equivalent ally of the Assyrian king. He concluded a friendship and peace treaty with Esarhaddon and was addressed as “my brother” by Esarhaddon in his letter.\footnote{SAA 18 7 and SAA 18 202.}

\footnote{SAA 16 1:2 a-na \textit{ur-ta-ku} LUGAL KUR.NIM.KI Š[ES]-ia “to Urtaku, king of Elam, [my] br[other]”; SAA 16 1:6 \textit{lu šul-mu} a-na \textit{ur-ta-ku} LUGAL KUR.NIM.KI ŠES-ia “May Urtaku, king of Elam, my brother, be well.”}
Urtaku was still alive at the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal who kept the treaty and maintained friendly relations with him, as can be seen from his letter (*ABL 295) and royal inscriptions. Assurbanipal claims in his inscriptions that when shortages occurred and famine arose in Elam he sent grain to Urtaku, accepted refugees, and later let them return. Assurbanipal also states in his letter *ABL 295 to the elders of Rāši that after the famine became great in Elam, people came to Assyria. However, the friendly relations did not last forever. Urtaku invaded Babylon and died in distress in 664 BC. In the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal, Urtaku is described as he “who did not guard my friendship” (*ibrātu). Nevertheless, it is not known whether they concluded a treaty (adē). No letters between Urtaku and Assurbanipal are extant.

After Urtaku died, allies equal to the Assyrian king did not exist anymore. There were only lower rank kings at that time. Assurbanipal was in effect “the king of kings.”

In the correspondence of Assurbanipal, only Indabibi, king of Elam (c. 649-c. 648 BC), is once addressed as “brother.” Unfortunately, almost all the contents of the letter are lost, but at least Assurbanipal wishes him well in the introductory formulae. The term “brother” indicates that Indabibi established peaceful relations with Assurbanipal, and the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal support this. Editions B and C of the inscriptions record that Indabibi released from prison the Assyrians who had been brought as captives to Elam by Nabû-bêl-šumâti and both state that Assurbanipal sent a messenger to Indabibi.

According to Edition B, the messenger was sent for “good relations and peace” (B VII 91, Lû.A.KIN-šû šá ṭu-u-bi u su-lum-me-e). However, Edition C, composed later, tells a different story: Indabibi did not release the Assyrian captives and the people of Elam became afraid and killed Indabibi, and Ummanaldašu III ascended the throne of...
Elam and ruled the country.\textsuperscript{124} In any case, the term “brother” was clearly accorded to Indabibi in the hopes of winning him over as a reliable ally.

Another Elamite king, Tammarītu is also addressed as “brother” (or perhaps “[son] of my brother”) in *ABL 1040.\textsuperscript{125} This Tammarītu is probably identified with Tammarītu II (c. 652-c. 649 BC, see above pp. 46-47), less likely with Tammarītu I, the son of Urtaku.\textsuperscript{126} The proposal to restore [DUMU] in line 4 is based on the fact that Tammarītu II appears to have been the nephew of Ummanigaš II (653-c. 652 BC).\textsuperscript{127} In any case, this is based on restoration and Ummanigaš is not here referred to as “brother” of Assurbanipal. Following the introductory formula, we find the ideological expression “[through] the decision of Aššur and [my] gods ([ina] ’EŠ.BAR’ šá AN.ŠÁR u DINGIR.MEŠ-[ia x x]),” but the rest of the letter is lost. Thus this letter is largely irrelevant to our discussion.

All in all, in the letters from Assurbanipal, the policy toward allies is indistinct. Since foreign kings who were as powerful as the Assyrian king and who could become his potential allies almost disappeared during the reign of Assurbanipal, the category of equal allies hardly existed. Indabibi is considered as an ally of Assurbanipal, but the contents of the letter addressed to him are unfortunately lost.

2.6.3. Buffer State: Rāšī
The country of Rāši/u (Arāši)\textsuperscript{128} was never turned into a province of the Assyrian Empire, even though Rāšī was conquered twice by Assurbanipal after the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was crushed, but functioned as a buffer state between Assyria and Elam.\textsuperscript{129} Assurbanipal was not the first king who defeated Rāšī. Before him, Sargon II had conquered Rāšī in 710 BC\textsuperscript{130} and he

\textsuperscript{124} BIWA, 153-154 and 232, C IX 59-79; BIWA, 155, 193, and 232, C IX 80-86 // H4 1’-5’. Waters discusses these two stories, see Waters 2000, 66-67.
\textsuperscript{125} *ABL 1040:3-4, [a-n]a \textsuperscript{a}tam-mar-\textsuperscript{a}LUGAL KUR.[M.MA.KI] / [DUMU]’-ŠEŠ’-\textsuperscript{a}dad.
\textsuperscript{126} BIWA, 97 and 223, B IV 79-80 // C V 85-86; BIWA, 97 and 224, B IV 89-90 // C V 95-96.
\textsuperscript{127} BIWA, 83, Die Nergal-Laš-Inschrift 34 (K 2654:18’), \textit{ina ŠU.2} \textsuperscript{a}tam-ma-ri-tu DUMU \textsuperscript{a}um-man-i-gaš-ma ŠEŠ AD-šú im-ni-ú-[šû], “They delivered [him] into the hands of Tammarītu (II), the son of Ummanigaš (II) the brother of his father.” Waters’ interpretation is that DUMU is to be understood as “heir”; see Waters 2000, 62.
\textsuperscript{128} Parpola 2006-2008, 255, “It thus seems that R. was the original and official name of the country, and the longer form with prothetic a- was a Neo-Assyrian innovation, which gradually gained ground in Babylonia, too.”
\textsuperscript{130} Fuchs 1994, 152 and 330, Ann. 302. Rāšī was conquered on the way to the campaign against Elam and its king Šutur-Nahündî.
probably appointed an Assyrian royal legate (qēpu) there.\textsuperscript{1331} After that, Sennacherib reconquered Rāši in 693 BC.\textsuperscript{1332} Esarhaddon did not take military action against Rāši. It is known that an Elamite named Pa’ê served as an Assyrian royal legate of Rāši in the time of Esarhaddon.\textsuperscript{1333} Before Assurbanipal seized Rāši, it is likely that the state was under the strong influence of Elam because Imbappi, the Assyrian royal legate of Bīt-Imbī, the fortress city in Rāši, is described as the brother-in-law of the Elamite king Ummanaldašu III and the commander of the Elamite bowmen in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal.\textsuperscript{1334} Imbappi was captured and taken to Assyria when Assurbanipal conquered Rāši for the first time.

Two letters from Assurbanipal to Rāši are extant, *ABL 1260 and *ABL 295. The former is addressed to Ambappi and the citizens of Rāši consisting of elders and younger men. As already mentioned above (p. 36), this Ambappi is tentatively identified with Imbappi, mentioned in the royal inscriptions. The latter is addressed only to the citizens of Rāši. Both letters concern an unnamed fugitive who is probably to be identified with Nabû-bēl-šumāti of the Sealand and the relations between Assyria and Elam. Assurbanipal blames Elam and wants the fugitive to surrender.

In these letters, Assurbanipal describes himself as a benevolent king who renders favours (tābtu). He emphasizes that he grants favours to everyone including his enemy: “I do not contest my friend or my enemy. I do favours for everybody” (*ABL 295:6-8 EN–MUN-ia u EN–ṣal-ti-iá / ul ú-ba-qar a-na gab-bi MUN / e-pu-uš). He demonstrates this royal quality in a tangible way, for instance, by having protected Elamite refugees from the king of Elam and his nobles (*ABL 1260:8-10), having sent them back with food and water (*ABL 1260:10-12), having sent his messengers to them for greeting (*ABL 1260:13-14), having provided aid to his subject (ARAD-ia) who had sinned against him (*ABL 1260:15-17), and having given the writing board of his gods to his subject who sinned against him (*ABL 1260:17-18), though it is unclear what “the writing board of my gods” (Giš.ZU DINGIR.MEŠ-iá) exactly means. In addition, Assurbanipal gave refuge to the Elamites from a famine that took place in Elam during the reign of Urtaku (*ABL 295:9-12). This benevolent attitude of Assurbanipal is also mentioned in his royal inscriptions.\textsuperscript{1335}

\textsuperscript{1331} The legate of Rāši is mentioned in SAA 15 35:8, SAA 17 152 r. 16-17, and SAA 17 153:19-r. 1 that are dated to during the reign of Sargon II. His name is unknown.
\textsuperscript{1332} Grayson 1975, 79, no. 1 iii 10; Grayson 1963, 90-91, ll. 23-34.
\textsuperscript{1333} PNA 3/I, 979a-b, no. 1; see also no. 2. Parpola states that “he may have been a local aristocrat with Elamite background raised in Nineveh” (Parpola 2006-2008, 256).
\textsuperscript{1334} BIWA, 46, A V 1; BIWA, 47, F III 53.
\textsuperscript{1335} BIWA, 94-95 and 222, B IV 18-26 // C V 24-35; BIWA, 190-191 and 223, H1 III 10'-22'.
In spite of all this, Assurbanipal claims that Elam did not return his favour (*ABL 1260:6-7, šu-nu / MUN-a-a ul ú-tir-ú-ni*). Furthermore, the king wonders why he should love Elam (*ABL 295:4-6, mi-nam-ma / a-na-ku i-na ra-a-mi šá KUR.NIM.MA.KI / a-ra-am) as the Elamite people had done evil to him (*ABL 295:8-9, šu-nu le-mut-ti / e-tep-šu-ú-ni*). The actions of the Elamite people are described as follows: they held back the messengers of Assurbanipal (*ABL 1260:13-15), and a person who is probably to be identified with Ummanaldašu III kept appealing to gods with the adversary of Assurbanipal (*ABL 295 r. 2-4), though Ummanaldašu III had reacted positively to the request for extradition of the man who sinned against Assurbanipal (*ABL 1260 r. 3-10).

When comparing the descriptions of Assurbanipal’s favour with the examples of Elamite bad behaviour, one finds that Assurbanipal expends much effort to describe his goodness. In addition, Assurbanipal judges the deeds of the Elamites especially from a moral perspective and expresses the moral wrong of Elam in abstract terms such as “to sin (ḫaṭû)” and “evil (lemuttu).” Placing emphasis on morality is also found in the Assyrian royal inscriptions.

These criticisms were directed against Elam, but it seems that Assurbanipal put indirect blame on Rāši as well because Rāši was leaning towards Elam. At the end of the letters, Assurbanipal puts strong pressure directly on Rāši: “I shall do as Ašš[ur] and my gods enable me. Afterwards I shall be full of anger” (*ABL 1260 r. 16-20) and “I shall do as Aššur and Marduk (and) my gods enable me. May nothing make me angry!” (*ABL 295 r. 7-10) Assurbanipal does not explicitly threaten to use force, but he intimates that he will act for Aššur, Marduk, and his gods. At the very end of *ABL 1260, Assurbanipal states that he has written the letter to enlighten Ambappi and the citizens of Rāši (lit. to open their ears, *ABL 1260 r. 21-22, a-du-u ki-i áš-pur / pi.2-ku-nu ap-te-te), while in *ABL 295 r. 4-5 it is not Assurbanipal but God who enlightens the unnamed fugitive to surrender.

To sum up, on the one hand Assurbanipal stresses his favour towards the buffer state Rāši, and on the other, he condemns Elam for its evil deeds. After these statements, Assurbanipal directly exerts pressure on the buffer state with a thinly veiled threat. Nevertheless, the king maintains a stance aiming at peacefully persuading the recipients, Ambappi and the citizens of Rāši.

1336 *ABL 295 r. 2-4, [š]ú-ú [mi-na]m-ma it-[ti "AG–EN–MUŠ] / LÜ.EN–di-ni-ia [ina] IGI DINGIR.MEŠ di-[ni] / [i]-dáb-bu-ub, ”[Wh]y does he plead for jus[ti]ce be[fore the gods wi[th Nabû-bēl-šumâti], my adversary?” When Assurbanipal mentions his god(s) in this letter, he uses both DINGIR (r. 4) and DINGIR.MEŠ-e-a (r. 8) as he had done in the above-mentioned sentence regarding to Ummanaldašu III’s god (DINGIR.MEŠ).

1337 Fales 1987.
2.6.4. Vassal Kings

Once the Assyrian king reached an agreement with lower-ranking foreign kings, they became his vassals. The Assyrian king provided them with military and political protection, but imposed obligations on them in return. The obligations included, for example, regular payment of tribute \( (\text{mandattu, biltu}) \), regular visits to the Assyrian court, labour supply, and providing Assyria with intelligence. As long as a vassal fulfilled the obligations, he maintained his power and controlled his subjects and country under the monitoring of an Assyrian official stationed in the vassal state.\(^{1338}\)

Vassal kings can be categorized into two groups. The first category includes foreign kings and princes exiled to Assyria and later returned to their country, such as Ummanaldašu III, Tammarītu I, and Tammarītu II during his second tenure. Since the policy towards Elam is mainly discussed above (pp. 212-216), there is no need to go into this category in depth here. The second one includes vassal kings not known to have sought exile or been raised in Nineveh, such as, Sārdūrī III, king of Uraṯu and Ḫundāru, king of Dilmun. These appear as recipients of the letters from Assurbanipal.\(^{1339}\) The vassal kings of both groups were probably legitimated by written agreements.

Written agreements such as \( \text{adē} \) with these kings are not extant, but the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal record that both categories paid tribute to Assurbanipal constantly (see below in this subsection). In the following paragraphs, I will briefly review the relations between Assyria and these states. After that, I will study the attitude of Assurbanipal to these vassal kings.

Uraṯu was located to the north of Assyria. Contacts between Assyria and Uraṯu began in the 9th century BC.\(^{1340}\) Assyria and Uraṯu had fought each other for about two centuries.\(^{1341}\) However, it seems that their conflict ended in the 7th century BC. In the time of Assurbanipal, there were two Uraṯian kings, Rusā III\(^{1342}\) and Sārdūrī III. Rusā III is only known from the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal, which record that he sent his envoys with an audience gift \( (\text{tāmartu}) \) to Arbail.\(^{1343}\) By contrast, the inscriptions state that Sārdūrī III heard about the mighty deeds that the great gods had

\(^{1338}\) Parker 2001, 89-94 and 250-251.

\(^{1339}\) *ABL 1242 to Sārdūri III and *AAA 20 106 to Ḫundāru.

\(^{1340}\) Radner 2012, 233 and 234, Fig.17.01.

\(^{1341}\) For instance, according to the inscription of Sārdūrī II, king of Uraṯu, he fought with Aššūr-nērārī V. See PNA 1/I, 208b, no.5, b. Tiglath-pileser III campaigned against Uraṯu in 743 BC and 735 BC. See, e.g., RINAP 1 39:20-36.

\(^{1342}\) Fuchs states that “According to the Uraṯian sources, this Rusā might have been either Rusā III, son of Erimena, or Rusā II (see 2.).” in PNA 3/I, 1057b.

\(^{1343}\) For Rusā III, see BIWA107 and 228, C VII 76-84. Rusā III sent his envoys to Arbail with an audience gift in order to inquire about the well-being of Assurbanipal. In front of the envoys, Assurbanipal humiliated the envoys of Teumman, king of Elam (664-653 BC). Since Teumman died in 653 BC, this event must have taken place before that year.
granted Assurbanipal, and that now he constantly sent letters and his heavy audience gifts (tāmartu) to Assurbanipal.1344

Dilmun, modern Bahrain,1345 sporadically appears in the royal inscriptions of Assyria. It is depicted as a state that had brought tribute/gifts to Assyria occasionally since the reign of Sargon II. The royal inscriptions of Sargon II record that Aḥundara, the king of Dilmun, sent tribute (mandattu, kardû) to him.1346 Sennacherib states in his inscription that after he destroyed Babylon, the people of Dilmun saw the terror and the fear of Aššur and they brought their audience gift (nāmurtu) to Sennacherib.1347 It is worth noting that not the king but the people of Dilmun brought it. Esarhaddon claims in his inscription that he fixed the tribute (mandattu) of his lordship on Qanâ, king of Dilmun.1348 Assurbanipal states in his inscriptions that Ḥundāru, king of Dilmun, overwhelmed by [Aššur and] Mullissu, the gods whom Assurbanipal trusts, came every year without interruption to Nineveh with [his heavy tribute] and asked after the royal well-being of Assurbanipal.1349

As we have seen, Assurbanipal claims in his inscriptions that both Sārdūrī III and Ḥundāru took the first action on their own initiative and then sent tribute to Assurbanipal regularly. Now I will examine how Assurbanipal displays himself to these vassal kings in his letters, *ABL 1242 to Sārdūrī III and *AAA 20 106 to Ḥundāru.

Assurbanipal rhetorically depicts the relations between the Assyrian king and the vassal kings as a father-son relationship. In *ABL 1242, Assurbanipal calls Sārdūrī III his son.1350 In his inscriptions, he claims that Sārdūrī III regularly sent him letters just as a son does to his father.1351 The rhetoric

---

1344 BIWA, 71-72 and 250, A X 40-50; BIWA, 281 and 294, IIT 121-123. IIT (The Inscriptions of the Ištar Temple) deal with the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn but they are not dated. However, Edition A was compiled in 645* BC (BIWA, 75 and 257). Thus the sending of letters and gifts from Sārdūrī III started in or before 645* BC. The current episode is inserted between the result of campaigns against Elam and the building project in Nineveh. The royal inscriptions do not order the stories chronologically. Rather, they arrange the episodes geographically. However, it might be possible to assume that the victories of Assurbanipal over Elam made Sārdūrī III send letters and gifts.

1345 Fuchs 1994, 430.


1347 RINAP 3/2 168,39-44.


1350 *ABL 1242:2, [a-na]-a-[iš]-du-ri LUGAL KUR], URI DUMU-ša, “[to Issār-dūrī (Sārdūrī), king of] Urarṭu, his son.”

1351 BIWA, 71 and 250, A X 45-47, kīma ša māru ana abiša išanappara bēlūtu / u šī kī pi annimma / išanappara. It should also be noted that the position of the Urartian kings was demoted from “brother” to vassal during the reign of Assurbanipal. Both Edition A (X 40-50) and Inscriptions of the Ištar Temple (121-123) claim that before the time of Assurbanipal the ancestors of Sārdūrī III corresponded with the ancestors of Assurbanipal for their brothership but Sārdūrī III regularly corresponds with Assurbanipal for his lordship.
of the father-son relationship also occurs in the letter *ABL 1022 from Assurbanipal to Tammarītu II, king of Elam. Tammarītu II had sought refuge in Assyria when Indabibi seized the throne of Elam and later he was installed on the throne by Assurbanipal. In the letter *ABL 1022 r. 18-20, Assurbanipal states that “I have [done] and given to you this favour which not (even) a father has done for a son."\(^\text{1352}\)

The father-son metaphor was also used by vassal kings. Warikas, king of Que (Cilicia), who is called Uriaikki in Assyrian texts and who is mentioned during the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II,\(^\text{1353}\) uses this metaphor in his bilingual inscriptions in Phoenician and Hieroglyphic Luwian. In §6, Warikas states that “So the Assyrian king and the whole Assyrian 'house' were made a fa[ther and a mo]ther for me,”\(^\text{1354}\) although it is not excluded that this inscription was actually drafted in Assyria.

As their overlord, Assurbanipal provided vassal kings with benefits in a “fatherly” way. He installed vassals on the throne or helped them to seize the throne of their land. Many of the vassals were persons of noble origin who already had some authority in their homeland.\(^\text{1355}\) Assurbanipal transformed them into more legitimate kings. The instalment of vassal kings such as Ummanaldašu III, Tammarītu I, and Tammarītu II is well described in the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal. The letter *AAA 20 106 dated 647*-VI-13 illustrates the instalment of Ḫundāru, the king of Dilmun.

In this letter, Assurbanipal promises the kingship of Dilmun and his protection to Ḫundāru, telling him: “don’t you k[now] that I will give the kingship of Dilmun to you?”\(^\text{1356}\) He further states that “you shall sit there and live under my protection (ina šīlīja), and my watch will be established there in this manner.”\(^\text{1357}\) It is not known whether Qanâ, king of Dilmun, who is mentioned in the reign of Esarhaddon,\(^\text{1358}\) was still alive when Ḫundāru became the king of Dilmun. The relationship between Qanâ and Ḫundāru is unclear as well.

\(^\text{1352}\) ABL 1022 r. 18-20, an-ni it M[UN\(^3\) x x x] / šá AD a-na DUMU la ep-pa-diš-u-ni ana-ku [e-ta-pa-diš] / at-ta-an-na-ak-ka.
\(^\text{1353}\) PNA 3/II, 1414a-b, s.v., Uriaikki.
\(^\text{1354}\) Lanfranchi 2009.
\(^\text{1355}\) For example, the father of Ummanaldašu III and Tammarītu I was Urtaku, king of Elam.
\(^\text{1356}\) *AAA 20 106 r. 25-26, at-ta ti-[de-e] / ki-i a-na-ku LUGAL-u-ti šá NI.TUK.KI ad-dan-ka.
\(^\text{1357}\) *AAA 20 106 r. 27-29, ina ŠA-bi lu-u diš-ba-a-ta ina GIŠ.MI-ia lu-u / bal-fa-a-ta ma-aš-šar-ta-a ina ŠA-bi / ki-i a-ga-a i-ma-aš-šar.
\(^\text{1358}\) PNA 3/I, 1006a.
It seems that vassalage always involved the conclusion of a treaty. *AAA 20 106 r. 4 refers to a treaty tablet sent by Ḫundāru to Assurbanipal. Ḫundāru may have submitted himself to Assurbanipal on his own initiative, as the inscriptions of Assurbanipal claim.

In *ABL 1242:7 addressed to Sārdūrī III, king of Urartu, the existence of a treaty is alluded to by the term ṭābtu “favour,” which is often found as a synonym of adē “treaty” in Neo-Assyrian sources (see pp. 98-100 and the discussion of *ABL 1022 on pp. 213-214). Here, too, it was the vassal that took the initiative, as Assurbanipal states that Sārdūrī III had sought his “favour” (ṭābtu).

Vassal kings were expected to devote themselves totally to Assurbanipal. He says to Ḫundāru, “[ma]y your heart be completely with [me]!” in *AAA 20 196 r. 17. Assurbanipal plays the role of a kind and helpful king in his letters. Nevertheless, sometimes this approach did not work and harsher words were needed. In *ABL 1240, Sārdūrī III asks Assurbanipal why the king always writes to him in irritated and angry terms. This reminds one of *ABL 945: 7-11 and *ABL 571 r. 9-12, discussed above pp. 188 and 207, where Assurbanipal advises his governor and the citizens of Babylon to use kind or harsh words depending on the situation. Here, the Assyrian royal ideology filters through the words of Sārdūrī III, one of the vassal kings: “the king of the gods, the exalted one, the ruler of the entire universe delivered sinners in every direction to the hands of his worshipper,” in other words, the god Aššur handed the sinners over to the Assyrian king. In these phrases, we can discern one of the Assyrian king’s functions as the punisher.

Vassal kings had to meet the demands of the Assyrian king. In *ABL 1240, Sārdūrī III promises to provide the lapis lazuli which Assurbanipal had demanded. However, on a practical level, he had hesitated to bring it personally on the pretext that the country would revolt against him. Instead, he asks the king to let a huge army come and take the lapis lazuli without contacting with him directly if that is agreeable to the king.

All in all, Assurbanipal presents a good and benevolent image to vassal kings in his letters through the metaphor of the father-son relationship. He also emphasizes his favour/goodness. He installed

---

1359 *AAA 20 106 r. 4-5, ṭu-šē-bi-la a-ta-mar, “I have seen the treaty tablet [which] you sent to me.”


1361 *ABL 1240:7, x x x x x MUN tu-ba-ʾu-u-ni, “you sought the favour.”

1362 *AAA 20 106 r. 17, ŠA-ba-ka it-ti-[a la]-u qa-ti.


1364 *ABL 1240:11’-15’.

1365 *ABL 1240:16’-r. 11.
the vassals on the thrones of their countries and gave protection to them. However, the vassal kings
had to prove their loyalty to the Assyrian king, to return his favours, and to devote themselves to
him. In practice, they were expected to pay tribute annually, to visit the Assyrian court regularly, to
hand over precious materials, and to admit incursion of the Assyrian army into their territory. It is
very likely that those obligations were specified on treaty tablets, although none of them are extant.

2.6.5. Tribal Groups
In southern Mesopotamia, beside city dwellers in the traditional Babylonian cities such as Babylon,
Borsippa, Nippur, Sippar, Uruk, and Ur, Aramean tribes occupied interurban areas, whereas Arab
tribes resided in the desert to the south and west of Mesopotamia.\(^{1366}\) They were partly settled,
partly moved around, and went in and out of the periphery of cities.\(^{1367}\) Some tribal groups were
under the control of Assyria, while others were hostile towards it. Each tribal group had its own
leader. In Assyrian texts, the Aramean leaders were called *nasīku* “sheikh,”\(^{1368}\) while the Arab leader
was often called “king.” During the reign of Assurbanipal, the Aramean tribes of the Puqūdu, the
Gambūlu, and the Ru’ua, and the Arabian tribe of the Qedarites are known. The Gurasimmu had
also been regarded as one of Aramean tribes, but it has recently been suggested that they were
Arabs.\(^{1369}\) In any case, these tribal groups are mentioned in the correspondence of Assurbanipal and
some received Assurbanipal’s letters. The Arab leaders are attested in Assurbanipal’s inscriptions,
but do not appear as the recipients of his letters. In this subsection, I will attempt to explore the
relations between Assyria and the tribal groups, mainly Arameans, and the attitude of Assurbanipal
towards them.

Of the extant royal letters, only Gambūleans contacted Assurbanipal and pledged allegiance to him
at their own initiative in order to obtain military and political gains. The king accepted their
allegiance and made them into his servants. Assurbanipal guaranteed the right of residence in the
territory of the tribal group. In return, they had to provide military cooperation to Assyria.

*ABL 541addressed to the Aramean Gambūlu is a good example. The letter indicates that they had
previously written to Assurbanipal: “We wish to grasp your feet; we are afraid of being deported by
Assyria and of being exposed to Elam” (ll. 2′-6′). Since the Gambūlu resided in the border area

\(^{1366}\) Frame 2013; Lipiński 2000; Frame 1992, 43-48; Eph’al 1982. The Chaldeans were not nomads any longer, but most
of them were sedentary. They made a Chaldean dynastic “house,” which can be regarded as the residue of the Kassite
state of Karduniaš.
\(^{1367}\) Fales 2011, 91.
\(^{1368}\) Fales 2011, 94.
\(^{1369}\) For the Gurasimmu as Arameans, see Frame 1992, 47; as Arabs, see Lipiński 2000, 482-483 and Zadok 2013, 317.
between Babylonia and Elam, they sometimes faced a threat from Elam, at other times they allied themselves with it, or were under its control. It is worth noting the subject of these sentences. Not their sheikh but several individuals sent the letter to Assurbanipal together. It seems they were the representatives of this group of people. The king grants their wish in the letter. He tells the recipients to come before Bēl-iqiša, the leader of the Gambūlu and the loyal servant of the king, and let him settle them in the territory wherever they like. Fales has pointed out that Aramean tribal groups were subdivided though they retained their common tribal denomination. As Assurbanipal urges the recipients to accept Bēl-iqiša, they could have been one of the internal subdivisions of the Gambūlu tribe. It is interesting that people who were probably internally separate could directly address the letter to Assurbanipal, and then Assurbanipal attempted to control them through the sheikh of the tribal group within a larger structure. The king may have respected conventions of the tribes. In the letter, Assurbanipal confirms that the Gambūlean recipients can live in their territory (*ABL 541:11′) and swears by his gods that he shall not deport them nor expose them to Elam. Now the king calls the recipients “my servants” (r. 2-7). In return, the recipients are required to guard “the fortress of the king (?)” (URU ḤAL.ŠU ša LUGAL13) with Bēl-iqiša (e. 13′-r. 2).

Later, the Gambūleans again pledged allegiance to Assurbanipal in their letter ABL 915 in which they ask Assurbanipal to install Rēmūtu1373 and Šama’guna, son of Bēl-iqiša, over them to organize their country. In response to ABL 915, Assurbanipal writes *ABL 293 to them. After he shows his good will towards them by saying: “from this very day, I listen to as much as you speak, and I do what you request” (r. 2-5), the king asks them to have Rēmūtu come before him so that the king can dress him and install him over them.

Some tribal groups had a strong tie with their neighbouring cities. Sometimes the cities carried out Assyrian policy towards tribal groups on behalf of Assurbanipal. Before the revolt, the Gurasimmu tribe was under the jurisdiction of Ur.1375 Once the revolt broke out, the governor of Uruk pleaded

---

1371 Bēl-iqiša was a loyal servant of Assurbanipal but later he revolted against the Assyrian king with the Elamite king Urtaku and the governor of Nippur Nabū-šumu-êreš. Bēl-iqiša died from a rat bite in 664 BC. *ABL 541 is not dated. However, this letter refers to Bēl-iqiša. Thus *ABL 541 can be dated before 664 BC. See BIWA, 94-96 and 222-223, B IV 18-71 // C V 24-77. See also PNA 1/II, 315b-316a, no. 7.
1372 Fales 2011, 94.
1374 PNA3/II 1187b-1188a.
1375 Frame 1992, 162.
with Assurbanipal by stating: “may the Gurasimmu not be lost to the king.” As already discussed above (pp. 187-188), the Gurasimmu suffered from the pressure of the Puqūdu and the Sealanders without any aid from Assyria and eventually deserted to the rebel side. The citizens of Nippur were also involved in the issue of the Ru’ua tribe, who probably became disloyal to Assyria. In *ABL 287, Assurbanipal commends the citizens for capturing several individuals from the Ru’ua tribe and orders them to keep the captives under guard.

Of the tribal groups, the Arabian Qedarites alternated allegiance to and defection from Assyria. They are not mentioned in the letters from Assurbanipal, but often appear in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal. According to the inscriptions, their leaders, both Iauta’ and Abī-İate’ I, respectively, had sworn an oath of loyalty to Assurbanipal, but later they betrayed him and the king carried out punitive operations against them. As mentioned above (pp. 133-134), the troops of Abī-Iate’ attempted to enter besieged Babylon.

Assurbanipal’s policies towards the tribal groups were similar to those towards vassal kings. Once a tribal leader pledged allegiance to the king, he earned political and military support but had to inquire after the well-being of the king and pay audience gifts. However, what was observed characteristically in the policies towards them is that the king promised them territorial inviolability and sometimes the king tried to control them through the cities near which the tribal groups resided. Occasionally, members of a tribe made contact with the king directly in order to ask him to install a leader over them for security and order.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The present research focuses on 72 royal letters from Assurbanipal that have never before been subjected to a detailed analysis and study because most of them have been published in cuneiform copies only. In the letters, Assurbanipal dealt with political, military, and diplomatic matters. He also presented the Assyrian royal image in rich literary expressions and utilized it in order to implement Assyrian policies towards areas within and outside the territory of Assyria, especially in

---

the time of the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and its aftermath, which shook the empire to its foundation.

Geographical Distribution of the Letters
The letters geographically cover the areas north, east, and southeast of Assyria, in other words, Urartu, Elam, Rāši, Babylonia, the Sealand, and Dilmun. Of these areas, Babylonia was by far the most common destination. Within Babylonia, a dozen letters are sent to tribal groups, but much of the correspondence is sent to the ancient cities such as Babylon, Nippur, Uruk, and Ur. After Babylonia, Elam and the Sealand – the neighbouring areas of Babylonia – appear as the second and third most popular destinations. These three regions were deeply involved in the civil war. No missive is directed to Anatolia, coastal and inland areas in the West, nor Egypt, probably because the letters addressed to these areas were written in Aramaic on organic material, for instance, leather, wax, or papyrus, which is now irretrievably lost.

Chronological Distribution of the Letters
Of the 72 letters from Assurbanipal, 14 missives, consisting of 12 Neo-Babylonian letters and 2 Neo-Assyrian letters, are fully or partially dated by day, month, and/or a name of an eponym, constituting 19.5% of his royal letters. The correspondence deriving from the Assyrian state archives is generally not dated, and only 5% of all Neo-Assyrian letters bear dates. Compared with this figure, the number of the dated royal letters is exceptionally high. It is unlikely that the dates were a part of the original letters, more probably the dates were at least in some cases added when archival copies were produced. Of the undated letters from Assurbanipal, many of them can be dated based on prosopographical information and their contents. The chronological distribution of the letters is heavily skewed; three letters probably belong to the first few years of his reign (668-666 BC) and 57 letters to the middle of his reign (652-646 BC). The remaining 12 letters are undatable.

Recipients of the Letters
The recipients of the royal letters are individuals and groups of people involved in the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and its aftermath. The most common recipients are citizenry and the second most prevalent are Babylonian local governors. In some cases, the citizens of a city and its governor appear together as recipients. In addition, foreign kings, Bēl-ibni in charge of the Sealand, tribal groups, influential foreign figures, and Assyrian and Babylonian officials are attested as addressees.
The statistics of the recipients indicate that Assurbanipal considered it particularly important to address his letters to the population at large rather than to individuals.

The Process of Composing the Letters
The letters from Assurbanipal were not found at their destination but excavated at Nineveh, the capital of the Assyrian Empire during his reign. This means that the letters are archival copies or drafts for royal orders. Even though Assurbanipal is known to have been highly educated and literate, it is very likely that he had his letters dictated to a scribe. Based on dictation, the scribe produced a preliminary draft, edited it, added an introductory formula with an address and a salutation, gained the approval of the king, and made a final draft. When the final version was confirmed, the scribe produced a definitive letter, made its archival copy/copies, filed it/them away under their classification system for administrative purposes, created an envelope, put the original in the envelope, and finally dispatched it to its addressee(s).

Of my research corpus, *ABL 1244, a virtual duplicate of three other letters, is the only preliminary draft. The text was probably written down from dictation because it contains an unusually large number of all sorts of abbreviations. The scribe of the letter attempted to reduce the number of signs and sign elements by using logographic writing, by omitting determinatives and some elements of compound logograms, by not marking the long vowels, and by using simpler signs that have a smaller stroke count.

No preliminary drafts, memoranda of dictation, or unfinished letters are found in the dossier, except for *ABL 1244. The drafts in the early stages may have been destroyed already in antiquity and recycled for their tablet clay. Thus most of my corpus consists of archival copies and/or very final drafts. In practice, it is almost impossible to distinguish archival copies and very final drafts from originals because they were inscribed on the same format (*egirtu*) and seem to be almost identical with the originals. One of the possible ways to recognize archival copies is to identify archival notes, which include a particular word “copy” (*gabrû*) or a date with some visual indications, for instance, blank space and a horizontal line before the date, at the end of the texts. On the other hand, the letters without a date may have been drafts. However, they may also be finished letters that were not sent out, or actually sent out but for some reason brought back to Nineveh.
Language, Script, and Scribes
Two languages and two scripts (Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian) were employed in the 72 letters from Assurbanipal. There are 26 Neo-Assyrian letters and 46 Neo-Babylonian letters. Since many of his royal letters are addressed to Babylonia and its neighbouring areas, the Neo-Babylonian language and script is expected to be predominant in the corpus. However, of these Neo-Babylonian letters, 14 missives are written in Neo-Assyrian script.

The particular language and script used in the letters depended on whether they were drafts or archival copies. It should be noted that the preliminary draft written from dictation (*ABL 1244) is a Neo-Assyrian text in Assyrian script. Babylonianisms are rarely found in Neo-Assyrian letters against numerous Assyrianisms in Neo-Babylonian letters in my research corpus. Since Neo-Assyrian was the language of the Assyrian ruling elite while Neo-Babylonian was limited to the south, drafts would have first been drawn up in Neo-Assyrian, and only later translated into Neo-Babylonian, perhaps first in Assyrian and only later in Babylonian script.

The contents of the letters were probably determined on the basis of the state policy and strategy that had been officially agreed to by a sort of committee, consisting of influential men such as administrative officials, military personnel, entourages, cultural elites, and of course the king. The king and the committee members presumably had meetings for royal decision-making. Assurbanipal generally used the first person singular “I” in his letters, but sometimes he employed the first person plural “we,” especially when he discussed military affairs.

Persons who may have acted as scribes for the letters of Assurbanipal include the chief scribe Issār-šumu-ēreš, the palace scribe Marduk-erība, Assurbanipal’s tutor Balašī, court scholars, a scribe from his crown princehood, scribes for his library, and their deputies and subordinates. The missives contain a number of elements that are attested in various contemporary texts such as extispicy reports, royal inscriptions, oracle texts, literary compositions, and treaties. Hence the scribe(s) of the letters had knowledge of these texts. However, we do not have concrete evidence to pinpoint who actually wrote the missives and how many scribes were engaged in writing them. Future research on distinctive writing features may throw new light on this issue.
The Royal Image

Assurbanipal conveyed the royal image in his letters and made use of it for the empire’s interests under complicated political conditions. The Assyrian king was traditionally regarded as the earthly representative of Aššur and he was in charge of maintaining the divine order and executing the divine will. However, the royal image in Assyria needed to be modified as a response to its expansion. In the process of the imperial expansion, the Assyrian king acquired the aspects of a “hero” who has a military capability, a “saviour” who fights against chaos, and “the sun” who seeks righteousness and leads all the people to truth. With the success of the expansion, the emphasis was placed on the king’s “wisdom” to be balanced against the king’s fierce aspects. In the imperial period, the royal image was enhanced, ideological doctrine was enriched, and institutions were developed in order to establish internal stability and cohesion and to cope with domestic affairs and external threats. As a result, the portrayal of the king as a “perfect man” was introduced into the Neo-Assyrian royal ideology, making all inhabitants of the empire accept and believe in the Assyrian king. The king was given various images and divine attributes deriving from the concept of the “perfect man,” consolidated by the Assyrian sacred tree. However, the king’s perfection and full divinity were not strongly propagated to the masses. Rather, his humanity and pious manner were promoted, probably because these aspects brought direct benefits to the audiences and were more appealing to them.

Of the royal images, the king giving “(royal) favour,” ṭābtu, is repeatedly presented in the letters from Assurbanipal. He grants favours spontaneously or in return for the good deeds done by the correspondents. However, granting favours was not a simple image of the merciful king. In practice, it was used as a political tool. Those who received royal favours were strongly expected to return them to their lord. If they did not, they deserved punishment and denouncement. The “(royal) favour” was also regarded as a synonym for “treaty,” adê, because in exchange for the concessions a contracting party gained benefits, depicted as royal favours, from the Assyrian king.

The notion of the king’s birth and origin was also carefully developed. During the reign of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, the king was depicted in literary compositions, royal inscriptions, and prophecies as the son of two goddesses, Mullissu and Ištar. He was born of a human mother, but created and nursed by the goddesses. Hence the Assyrian king was seen as a semi-divine being, partly man and partly god like Gilgameš, gaining divine spirit and legitimation. However, in a letter from Assurbanipal addressed to the citizens of Babylon, Mullissu and Ištar were replaced for political reasons by the goddess Zarpanītu, consort of Marduk.
Assurbanipal’s religious attitude also appears in his royal letters. His devotion to “God,” i.e., Aššur, is indicated by the fact that he most frequently refers to “God” in the missives. “Aššur, my gods” were the second most common one. There is a tendency that when Aššur is mentioned with other god(s) consecutively, his name appears as Aššur, whereas when Aššur appears alone, he is often referred to as the God. Assurbanipal also mentions Marduk, the third most frequent god in my corpus, for political reasons when addressing the Babylonians as well as non-Babylonian peoples. The contexts of the letters show that Assurbanipal often emphasizes divine intervention in political events.

The image that Assurbanipal wished to convey to the recipients of his letters was the king having benevolence and good will to treat the people kindly during the crisis of the empire, although he sometimes threatened them by hinting at his fierce aspects as a judge and a punisher. He stresses that he protects the privileged status of Babylon, provides offerings, treats all the people equally, gives favours, makes peace, and has a prosperous reign. He seldom displays his full divinity, but he clearly gives an account of his close relationship to the gods. He claims that he was raised by the goddess, given truth and righteousness by the great gods, decreed a good fate by the great gods, and given faith by Aššur and his gods.

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn: His Role, Authority, and Revolt

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was an important figure for Assurbanipal to promote his image and to frame the policies against him. In 672 BC, Esarhaddon officially appointed the two to the thrones of Assyria and Babylonia respectively. To guarantee this royal succession and to legitimize it by the gods, Esarhaddon imposed a treaty. Though Šamaš-šumu-ukīn was the eldest living son, the treaty clearly indicates that he was not treated equally with Assurbanipal. During their crown princehood, they were loyal to Esarhaddon and supported him. The political correspondence of Esarhaddon shows that Assurbanipal was more deeply involved in Assyrian governance than Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

After Esarhaddon’s death in 669 BC, Assurbanipal was enthroned in the same year, but Šamaš-šumu-ukīn ascended the throne of Babylon a year later. Assurbanipal claims in his inscription that he appointed Šamaš-šumu-ukīn as the king of Babylon without mentioning Esarhaddon’s arrangement. Šamaš-šumu-ukīn commissioned his own inscriptions in which he shows his full respect for Babylonia by using the Sumerian language, introducing Babylonian traditional titles, and
reconstructing religious buildings. During his reign, Babylonia achieved economic growth. However, his authority was limited and he was expected to remain a loyal vassal of Assurbanipal. Perhaps the reason for his existence as king was to have a member of the Assyrian royal family in charge of Babylon.

Šamaš-šumu-ukīn started the revolt against Assurbanipal in 652 BC. The reconstructed history for this period is based on the sources only from the Assyrian side, hence they describe events from their point of view and some are clearly propagandistic. Narratives from the rebel side are not preserved. During the civil war, Šamaš-šumu-ukīn allied with Elam and the Sealand, sent messengers and officials to make common cause with these countries, gave bribes, appointed officials, performed military operations, and made a speech in front of the citizens of Babylon in order to appeal to them. After the revolt started, it became an oft-repeated theme of the royal inscriptions of Assurbanipal and literary compositions to denounce Šamaš-šumu-ukīn and justify Assurbanipal.

Assurbanipal’s Policies towards Babylonian Cities

The royal image presented in Assurbanipal’s letters was utilized in order to further Assyrian policies. In peace time, Assurbanipal continued the conciliatory policy of Esarhaddon. He showed to the Babylonians visibly and publicly that he was able to execute the traditional responsibility of the Babylonian king by returning statues of the gods, including that of Marduk, re-establishing the privileged status of the cities, sponsoring religious building projects, reconfirming offerings, and restoring rites and rituals. He also took the Babylonians and their national pride into consideration; politically and administratively important positions were reserved for local ruling family members and a city assembly in each city continued to function as its administrative body.

At an early phase of the revolt, Assurbanipal tried to stop a skirmish from escalating into an all-out war and searched for a diplomatic solution by stressing the king’s good image. However, his attempts were eventually futile and the conflict between Assyria and Babylonia became bitter. Even in such a situation, Assurbanipal did not destroy Babylon but chose to put the city under siege. He rescued pro-Assyrian cities in Babylonia encouraged them to rise against the rebels, and made them cooperate with each other beyond the borders of the city. Assurbanipal had the governors of Nippur and its citizens involved in the military activities, such as joining forces with Urukeans, pursuing a man who was trying to escape, and besieging a city. He repeatedly sent military aid to Uruk and
later used the city as a military base in the south. He also concluded several treaties with its governor and citizens. Reinforcements were sent from Uruk to Ur and they relieved the city from famine. He also settled the sibling rivalry between the Urukean governor and his rebellious predecessor.

Assurbanipal continuously applied a conciliatory policy towards Babylon from the very beginning of the revolt up to the time of the diplomatic break due to the siege of Babylon. He kept appealing to the citizens of Babylon and trying to persuade them with political rhetoric not to side with Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, although they had actually betrayed him. In practice, he informed them that he forgave their rebellious deeds and attempted to avoid the destruction of the city and a massacre. As he states in a letter that he had corresponded with the Babylonians under siege, he managed to secure some Babylonian supporters in the city. However, these Babylonians could not release the city peacefully. Babylon eventually fell to Assyria with the death of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn.

**Foreign Policy**

Assurbanipal took a harsher attitude towards his foreign enemies. However, once they submitted to him, they were given royal favours and subjected to a treaty. If they violated it, the king could punish them severely. Assurbanipal also tried to use the people from civic institutions in hostile states for his political purposes. He talked to these people in a warm but sometimes dramatic tone. A similar tendency, though less strong, is also found in the letters to the submissive adversaries.

The Assyrian king concluded a mutual assistance and non-aggression pact with his equal allies. Esarhaddon had such a pact with the Elamite king Urtaku, whom he addressed as “brother.” The latter was still alive at the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal. It is evident that they also concluded a treaty, although this is not extant. Probably in accordance with a treaty provision, Assurbanipal provided him with aid as his royal favour. After Urtaku died, though, another Elamite king, Indabibi, might have been his ally, but there was no longer an equal alliance. Assurbanipal became the “king of kings.”

Towards the buffer state Rāši, Assurbanipal stressed the favours that he had rendered to Elam, but he also condemned Elam for their moral wrongs in order to make Rāši comply with his request. Nevertheless, he first raised the possibility of negotiation and later hinted at possible military action against them.
Assurbanipal also presented a benevolent image to vassal kings through metaphorical father-son relationships. He concluded a treaty with them and installed them on their thrones and gave them protection. However, they had to prove their loyalty to the Assyrian king and to return the king’s favour. In practice, they were expected to pay annual tribute, to visit the Assyrian court regularly, to hand over precious materials, and to admit incursions of the Assyrian army into their territory. Those political agreements were possibly specified in vassal treaties, although none of them are extant.

Aramean and Arab tribes occupied interurban areas in Babylonia and on the borders of the Fertile Crescent. They were partly settled, partly nomadic, and went in and out of the periphery of cities. Some tribal groups were under the control of Assyria, while others were hostile towards the empire. Each tribal group had its own leader. When tribal groups pledged their loyalty to Assurbanipal, the king promised them territorial inviolability. In return, the tribal groups had to cooperate with Assyria militarily and politically. In some cases, the king and a tribal leader concluded a treaty. Sometimes cities located near the tribal groups played an important role as intermediates between the king and the tribal groups.

**Final Conclusions**

In his correspondence, Assurbanipal presented the royal image based on the Assyrian royal ideology. This enabled him to implement his polices and achieve his political aims. Towards the pro-Assyrian people, Assurbanipal stressed the continuation of his favours and involved them in suppressing the revolt. In practice, he sent reinforcements to them and incorporated them into Assyrian military activities. He also tried to control the tribal groups through Babylonian governors. Towards the anti-Assyrian people, Assurbanipal has a harsher attitude. He often indicated the use of force.

To the areas both within and outside the territory of Assyria, whether their inhabitants were adversaries or adherents of Assyria, Assurbanipal emphasized his devotion to the gods and the intervention of the gods. He portrayed himself as the king who has mercy, truth, justice, and authority. He also claimed that he ensured equality and rendered favours. In addition, he depicted himself as a saviour as well as a punisher of sinners.
Appendix: Comparison of *ABL 273, *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244

The score of *ABL 273, *ABL 543, *ABL 1108, and *ABL 1244 is as follows.

*ABL 273 1
*ABL 543 1
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 2-3
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 4-5
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 6-7
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 8-9
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 10-11
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 12
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 13-14
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 15-16
*ABL 1108
*ABL 1244

236
*ABL 273
*ABL 543 16-18 [šá la]aq-bu-u-ni / [ma-a LUGAL la ú-ra]m-ma / [ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI
*ABL 1108 14'–15' ša taq-bu-ú-ni ma-a LUGAL / la ú-ram-ma ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI
*ABL 1244 1'–2' šá taq-bu-u-[ni ma MAN la ú-ram-ma] / [ŠEŠ.UNUG

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 18-19 u LÚ.gúr]-’a’-sím` / [TA šu.2 LUGAL la el-li-ú]
*ABL 1108 16'-17' [u LÚ.gúr]-’a’-sím-mu TA šu.2 LUGAL / [la-a e]l-li-ú
*ABL 1244 2'–3' u gúr-sím-mu TA la (la) šu.2 LUGAL / la ÍL.MEŠ

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 20-21 [a-ke-e aḥ-ḥur ep-pu-šú] / [ana-ku le-pu-uš]
*ABL 1108 17'-18' a-ke-e aḥ-ḥur / [ep-pu-šú] ana-ku le-pu-uš
*ABL 1244 3'-4' a-ke-e aḥ-ḥur / ep-pu-šú ana-ku DÚ

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 r. 1-2 [la áš-pu-ra LÚ.NAM] / [KUR.za-mu-a LÚ.GAR.ME]
*ABL 1108 19'-20' [la áš-pu-ra LÚ.NAM KUR.za-mu-a] / LÚ.GAR.MEŠ
*ABL 1244 4'-5' la áš-pu-ru / LAM KUR.za-mu-u LÚ.GAR.ME

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 r. 3-4 [KI-ku-nu la is-šu-ru] / [la] e-ni]-šú-[šu la me-e-tú] /
*ABL 1108 20'-21' is-si-ku-nu la is-šu-ru] / [la e-ni-šú] la [me-e-tú] /
*ABL 1244 5'-6' ki-ku-nu la is-šu-ru la e-ni-šú la ÚŠ.MEŠ /

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 r. 5-6 ina UGU EN.NUN-[k]u-nu ki-i / e-mur-u-ni e-ni-šu-u-ni
*ABL 1108 r. 2-3 ina UGU EN.NUN-[k]u-nu ki-i / e-mur-u-ni e-ni-šu-u-ni
*ABL 1244 7'-8' ina UGU EN.NUN-ku-nu ki IGILAL.-ni / e-ni-šú-ni

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 r. 7-8 me-tú-u-ni as-sa-par ap-ta-šar-šú-nu / LÚ.EN.NAM URU.la-ḫi-ri ü
*ABL 1108 r. 4-5 [me]-tu-ú-ni as-sa-par [ap-ta-šar-šú-nu] / LÚ.EN.NAM.URU.la-ḫi-ri ü
*ABL 1244 8'-7' ÚŠ.MEŠ-ni KIN DUŠ-šú-nu / EN.NAM la-ḫi-ri ü

*ABL 273
*ABL 543 r. 9-10 LÚ.EN.NAM URU.arrap-ḥa / is-si-ku-nu la ap-qid u ú-ma-a
*ABL 1108 r. 6-7 LÚ.EN.NAM URU.ar-ḥa / is-si-ku-nu la ap-qid u ú-ma-a
*ABL 1244 9'-10' EN.[NAM] / är-ḥa Ki-ku-nu / la ap-qid u [0] / u ú-ma-a

*ABL 273 4-6 ki-i ud-di-na / la ta-šap-par-an-ni / maš-šur-ŠU–GUR-ra
*ABL 543 r. 11-12 ki-i ud-din-na la ta-šap-par-an-ni / maš-šur–ŠU–GUR-ra
*ABL 1108 r. 8-9 ki-i ud-di-na la ta-šap-par-an-ni / AN.SÂR–ŠU–GUR-ra
*ABL 1244 r. 1-2 ki ud-[di-na la KIN-ni] / AN.SÂR–ŠU–GUR-ra

*ABL 273 6-8 LÚ.IGI.DUB / LÚ.e-muq-qi is-si-šú / as-sap-ra mi-i-nu
*ABL 543 r. 12-13 LÚ.IGI.DUB u e-muq-qi / is-si-šú as-sa-par mi-i-nu
*ABL 1108 r. 9-10 LÚ.IGI.DUB u e-muq-qi / is-si-šú as-sap-ra mi-i-nu
*ABL 1244 r. 2-3 u e-muq-qi / Ki-šú KIN-ra mi-nu
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**ABL 273** 9-11  šá a-na e-pa-šē / DÙG.GA-ú-ni ep-šá / BE-ma ÍD.ḫaṛ-ru sik-ra

**ABL 273** r. 12-14  šá taš-pur-an-ni / [m]d EN–KAR–ir / mār-ba-a-a

**ABL 273** r. 3-4  šá ana  DÙ / DÙG-u-ni ep-šá / BE-ma ḫaṛ-ru sik-ra

**ABL 543** r. 13-14  šá a-na e-pa-šē / DÙG.GA-u-ni ep-šá / BE-ma ÍD.ḫaṛ-ru sik-ra

**ABL 1108** r. 11-12  šá ana e-pa-a-šē DÙG.GA-ú-ni ep-šá / BE-ma ÍD.ḫaṛ-ru sik-ra

**ABL 1108** r. 12-14  šúm-ma  UN. MEŠ am-mu-te kub-sa / u id–da-at / e-gir-te

**ABL 1108** r. 14-15  ša / taš-pur-an-ni / [m]d EN–ŠUR / u” ar-ba-a

**ABL 1108** r. 16-17  ša / taš-pur-an-ni / [m]d EN–ŠUR / u” ar-ba-a

**ABL 1244** r. 3-4  šá ana  DÙ / DÙG-u-ni ep-šá / BE-ma ḫaṛ-ru sik-ra

**ABL 1244** r. 5-6  BE-ma  UN. MEŠ am-mu-te kub-sa / u ina da-at šá e-gir-tū

**ABL 1244** r. 6-7  KIN-ni / [m]EN–ŠUR / mār-ba-a-a

**ABL 273** r. 3-4  šá taš-pur-an-ni / [m]d EN–KAR–ir / mār-ba-a-a

**ABL 273** r. 5-8  us-se-bi-lak-ka / li-iz-zi-zu / is-si-ku-nu dul-lu

**ABL 453** r. 19-20  na-aš-su-u-ni / li-iz-zi-zu / is-[si-ku-nu] / dul-lu

**ABL 1108** r. 17-19  na-aš-su-u-ni / li-iz-zi-zu / d[u]-l[u]

**ABL 1244** r. 9-10  [na-š]u-ni iz-za-zu K[1-k]u-nu / [dul-lu]

**ABL 273** r. 8  le-pu-šu

**ABL 543** r. 20  le-[pu-šu]

**ABL 1108** r. 19  le-[pu-šu]

**ABL 1244** r. 10  ep-pu-šu
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