

THE ARAB CAMPAIGNS OF AŠŠURBANIPAL: SCRIBAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PAST

Pamela Gerardi — College Park

The Arab campaigns of Aššurbanipal, accounts of which appear in a number of his annals inscriptions, were known but little discussed until fairly recently¹. The longest, most detailed account of these campaigns appears in Edition A of Aššurbanipal's annals, the last (known) edition of his annals. This account, the longest of the military accounts in Edition A², has posed many problems of narrative and historical interpretation. Among the most important of these problems is the identification of the persons called Uaite' in the narrative.

The name Uaite' appears, in Edition A, with two patronymics (son of Haza'el and son of Birdada) and three titles (king of the Arabs, king of Sumu-an, and "leader" of Qedar [lit. the Qedarites of Uaite']). Other documents recording the events of these campaigns also preserved the name of Yauta' for one of the Uaite's (son of Haza'el). Other problems concerned the composition of the narrative: one episode was thought to have appeared twice in the narrative³; there is at least one sentence fragment⁴; several sentences were poorly written with pronouns having incorrect antecedents⁵; and several

¹) The research for this article was completed under the auspices of the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung and while I enjoyed the hospitality of the Seminar für Assyriologie und Hethitologie in Munich. I would like to thank Tzvi Abusch, Maria Ellis, Israel Eph'al, Peter Machinist, and Hayim Tadmor for their comments on preliminary drafts of this article.

²) Edition A is published in M. Streck, *Aššurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's* (Leipzig 1916); the Arabs campaigns are found in cols. VII, 82-IX, 114, X, 1-5 and total 286 lines of narrative.

³) See below discussion of episodes II and v.

⁴) Episode complex *lmn* in Edition A; see below p. 91.

⁵) Episodes III and *h*; see below p. 90.

episodes vary their positions in different narratives⁶.

The historical problems of the Arab campaign narratives, the chronology of the campaign, and the correct identification of the persons known as Uaite^ʿ, have largely been resolved by I. Eph'al in his recent book, *The Ancient Arabs*⁷; thus this essay will focus on the compositional problems of the narratives of the Arab campaigns. The compositional problems, however, have indissolubly linked to the identification of the persons known as Uaite^ʿ. Therefore, the history of this problem is reviewed first.

In 1916, M. Streck published critical editions and discussions of six of Aššurbanipal's annals inscriptions (labeled with letters: A, B, C, D, E, and F) and other documents⁸. Five of these editions contained either an account of Aššurbanipal's first Arab campaign or an account of both campaigns against the Arabs. In addition, a fragmentary composition, later identified as the "Letter to the God", also included a substantial, if fragmentary, account of both Arab campaigns. Streck, in his interpretation of this material⁹, regarded Edition A as a combined text of all preceding narratives, and thus he treated this narrative as the main source for his discussion of the Arab campaigns. Streck, on the basis of the two patronymics, recognized that the name Uaite^ʿ referred to two different persons and that the two were not easily distinguished from one another. He divided the episodes of the two campaigns into two periods: the first war (650-647) and the second war (641-638). Relying on the narrative of Edition A, Streck interpreted the narrative of the first war to reflect two separate actions: an attack against the western borders of the Assyrian empire by Uaite^ʿ and his support of Šamaš-šum-ukīn's rebellion against Assyria by sending troops to Babylon under the command of Abiyate^ʿ and Ayamu, the sons of Te'ri. In the West, Uaite^ʿ and his allies were defeated, but Uaite^ʿ escaped and sought refuge with Natnu, king of Nabayyate. Natnu rejected Uaite^ʿ's pleas for refuge, however, and submitted to Aššurbanipal; Uaite^ʿ then returned to Nineveh, surrendered to Aššurbanipal, and was punished. The Arab troops sent to Babylon in support of Šamaš-šum-ukīn's rebellion were defeated. Abiyate^ʿ submitted to Aššurbanipal and was granted kingship over the Qedarites in place of Uaite^ʿ, who had surrendered to Aššurbanipal and was now imprisoned in Nineveh.

Streck notes only a few discrepancies between his "main source", Edition A, and other accounts: that it was the Assyrian army stationed in the West that accomplished the defeat of Uaite^ʿ and that it was Kamas-halta that defeated one of Uaite^ʿ's allies, Ammuladdi(n), rather than Aššurbanipal himself, for example. But, more importantly,

⁶) Episodes *h*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *e*, and *f*; see below pp. 90-91.

⁷) I. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent, 9th-5th Centuries B.C.*, Jerusalem 1982, esp. pp. 46-59 and 142-69.

⁸) Above fn. 1.

⁹) Streck, *Asb.* 1, pp. cclxxx-cclxxxii.

Streck fails to note that earlier editions of the annals make no connection between this western campaign and the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion in Babylon.

According to Streck, the second war was directed against Uaite' son of Birdada and Abiyate' son of Te'ri. Abiyate', already forgiven by Aššurbanipal for his aid to Šamaš-šum-ukin again rebels, joined with Natnu, until now loyal to Aššurbanipal, and revolted against Assyria. After a long march and many battles against various tribes of Syria and Palestine, Abiyate' and his brother Ayamu were captured as was Uaite' son of Birdada. Here again, Streck does not mention or account for discrepancies among the various accounts, important among them that, in an earlier annals narrative, Edition B, Abiyate' was made king over Qedar in place of Uaite' son of Haza'el when the "son of Haza'el" was defeated during the first war, not later after he had surrendered to and was punished by Aššurbanipal.

Despite many problems of interpretation, Streck's analysis of the events stood until the appearance of M. Weippert's study in 1973¹⁰. Weippert presented a new translation of the Edition A narrative, compared it with all the other available annals narratives, and, in an appendix, presented a new edition of the composition known as the "Letter to the God". Differences between the Edition A account and the earlier accounts were meticulously recorded and discussed. His detailed efforts resulted in several modifications to Streck's earlier interpretation, notably that the first war, Uaite''s attack on the western lands, should not be connected to the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion and that Abiyate' had been granted kingship over the Qedarites after Uaite' son of Haza'el's defeat and long before his submission to Aššurbanipal.

Weippert's interpretation of the second war differed significantly from Streck's: he considered the target of the second campaign to have been Uaite' son of Haza'el and thus a continuation of the first campaign. He based this conclusion on the text of the "Letter to the God" which explicitly links the second campaign to the first¹¹. Weippert completely rejected the accuracy of the episode in Edition A that suggests that Uaite' son of Haza'el surrendered to Aššurbanipal in Nineveh and was punished; he considered it to be a repetition of another episode (occurring later in the narrative) recording the capture of the target of the second campaign¹².

Weippert's discussion was a welcome advance over the preceding state of affairs, but, like Streck, he continued to give primacy to the latest narratives, the "Letter" and Edition A. While he noted all variants to his main text, he did not consider the process of

¹⁰) M. Weippert, *Die Kämpfe des assyrischen Königs Aššurbanipal gegen die Araber; Redaktionskritische Untersuchung des Berichts in Prisma A*, WdO 7 (1973-74), pp. 39-85.

¹¹) Episode *p*; see below p. 83. Weippert, *cit.*, p. 78, ep. 7, 12-15.

¹²) Weippert, *cit.*, p. 58: "In diesem Stück können nur die ZZ 11-14 als Ausgestaltung der Episode 9 verstanden werden".

narrative change, the source of the changes, or the purpose of those changes¹³.

Eph'al published his study of the Arab campaigns at about the same time as Weippert. Eph'al's approach, however, differed significantly; he took the earlier editions of the narrative as the starting point of his study¹⁴. By carefully determining what changes were made to the narratives and when those changes were made, he was able to resolve many of the historical problems posed by this narrative. He divides the sources into two groups: Source Group A and Source Group B. Group A consists of annals Editions B, D, K, and C. Group B consists of the "Letter to the God" and annals Edition A. Sources in Group A are distinguished by two features: they all focus exclusively on the first campaign and they all refer to the main protagonist as Yauta' son of Haza'el, king of Qedar.

Sources in Group B are distinguished by several features as well: both the "Letter" and Edition A name the "son of Haza'el" as Uaite' rather than Yauta', both connect the first campaign to the rebellion in Babylon, and both include the second campaign against the Arabs in their narratives.

Eph'al, by attending to which episodes appear in which Source Group as well as when the shift in the spelling of Yauta's name occurs, comes to a number of conclusions regarding the identification of the persons called Uaite' in Edition A's account. He concludes that Yauta' son of Haza'el launched the first attack against the Western Lands. This war was unrelated to, occurred prior to, and concluded before the beginning of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion. After his defeat, Yauta' escaped to Nabayyate; rejected by Natnu, he nevertheless remained at large. Aššurbanipal replaced the rebel Yauta' with Abiyate' son of Te'ri as king over the Qedarites. At some point early in the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion both Abiyate' and Natnu rejected their alliances with Assyria and cast their lot with the rebellion. The second campaign against the Arabs took place after the conclusion of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion and targeted those Arabs who had aided that rebellion: Abiyate', Natnu, and Uaite' son of Birdada. Yauta' son of Haza'el surrendered in Babylon sometime during this second campaign, perhaps hoping to regain his throne after Abiyate's betrayal. Eph'al maintains that the difficulties in interpretation stem from a confusion on the part of the scribes who appear to have

¹³) Weippert organizes his discussion of the various episodes according to the narrative order that appears in Edition A. While he notes in his discussion that certain episodes were moved to new positions in Edition A, this organization masks the structure of the earlier narratives and makes it impossible to discern organizational patterns.

¹⁴) Eph'al states on p. 146 that he relies on Olmstead's principle: "Any one of these editions is of value only when it is the most nearly contemporaneous of all those preserved. When it is not so contemporaneous, it has absolutely no value when we have the original from which it was composed". (A.T. Olmstead, *Assyrian Historiography: A Source Study*, Columbia 1916, p. 8). This principle, while useful for alerting scholars to the potential differences between editions, is certainly too strongly stated.

identified Yauta' (son of Haza'el) with the similarly named Uaite' (son of Birdada). This confusion occurred first in the "Letter", where the scribes apparently believed that the son of Haza'el, still at large after his rebellion against Assyria, was responsible for sending troops to Babylon in support of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion.

Eph'al's excellent work in unravelling the events and persons described in these narratives left aside the issue of the narrative itself. While scrupulously noting inconsistencies in the narratives and identifying chronologically misplaced events, he did not attempt to explain them. It is precisely this problem that is the subject of this essay. I propose to consider these same narratives with a different focus: What motivates the alteration of pre-existing narrative? And what do all the changes made to the narratives, so carefully documented by Weippert and Eph'al, mean?

The Sources

There are four substantial accounts of Assyrian campaigns against the Arabs during Aššurbanipal's reign¹⁵. Three are contained in editions of the annals (labeled here with uppercase letters), and one appears in a so-called "Letter to the God". Other accounts are either repetitions of these accounts or are very abbreviated¹⁶. The earlier editions contain accounts of a single campaign (Editions B, D, K, and C). The later accounts (the "Letter" and Edition A) record the events of two separate campaigns. The second campaign account is always narrated together with the first; it is never separated from the first and given a separate narrative¹⁷.

¹⁵ Accounts or narratives, for the purposes of this discussion, are defined by the Assyrian scribal convention of beginning a narrative in Aššurbanipal's annals with an introductory phrase "in my *n*th campaign" and/or by drawing a line across the prism. The narrative ends with the appearance of a line drawn across the prism and the next occurrence of the introductory phrase or the building inscription.

¹⁶ The sources for the Arab campaign narratives are: Editions B and D: A.K. Piepkorn, *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Aššurbanipal I: Editions E, B1-5, D, and K (Assyriological Studies 5)*, Chicago 1933. Edition K: Edition K is currently reconstructed from four fragments, see M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *Ashurbanipal's Conquest of Babylon: The First Official Report—Prism K*, OrNS 50 (1981), pp. 229-240. Edition C: The only available reconstruction of Edition C is found in R.D. Freedman, *The Cuneiform Tablets in St. Louis* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1975). Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*; "Letter to the God Aššur": M. Weippert, *cit.*, pp. 39-85, other fragments: see Eph'al, *Arabs*, pp. 46-49.

¹⁷ See above fn. 15. There are two examples of two campaigns composed as a single narrative in Aššurbanipal's annals: the Arab campaigns and the Egyptian campaigns.

Editions B and D

The earliest account of a campaign against the Arabs appears in Edition B, composed in 649 B.C.; it is repeated *verbatim* in Edition D, composed one year later in 648¹⁸. The account concerns Yauta^c, son of Haza'el, king of Qedar, who, having earlier concluded a peace agreement with Esarhaddon, revolted against Esarhaddon's son and successor, Aššurbanipal, and attacked the Western Lands of the empire. Aššurbanipal dispatched his troops against him, defeated him, and plundered their encampment. Yauta^c, however, escaped capture and fled.

The account continues with a series of other episodes (labeled here with lowercase, italicized letters) concerning the western regions¹⁹. Abiyate^c submitted to Aššurbanipal and was given kingship over the Qedarites in place of Yauta^c. Another king in the West, Ammuladdi(n), also revolted, apparently in conjunction with Yauta^c's rebellion. Kam-as-halta king of Moab, a vassal loyal to Aššurbanipal, defeated him and sent him in chains to Assyria. Finally, Natnu king of Nabayyate heard of the power of Aššur and submitted to Assyria. As Edition B's narrative is the starting point for the following discussion, it is worth translating here in full²⁰.

Part 1: VII, 93 - VIII, 31

- b* [Yauta^c] son of Haza'el, king of Qedar, [who serve]d me, approached me [about] his [god]s and [implor]ed my majesty. I made him in[v]oke the name[s] of the great gods] and returned A[tarsamain] to him.
- c* Lat[er] he sinn[ed] against my treaty; he did not guard my favors; and he cast off the yoke of my dominion. *He restrained his feet* from asking my health and kept

¹⁸) Both Editions B and D preserve their dates: 649 and 648 respectively. Laurence Shiff, working on the Aššurbanipal volumes for the Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project informs me [oral communication] that his reconstruction of the prism fragments shows that Edition D, not Edition B, is the more complete. He also informs me that this reconstruction does not affect the content of the narratives.

¹⁹) Episodes are more or less arbitrary divisions of the narrative into smaller units for discussion. Divisions may be determined by subject or structure. The episodes labeled here with lowercase, italicized letters or roman numerals follow, in general, the system set up by Eph'al, *Arabs*, in his chart between pages 164 and 165. Note also his comment on p. 146: "When the textual order of the episodes conforms to the actual chronology of events, they are lettered A to X; the four episodes from later sources only (in our opinion incorrectly inserted) are numbered in Roman I to IV".

²⁰) Piepkorn, AS 5, VII, 93-VIII, 63.

bac[k] from me (his) gifts. The people of Arabia he incited to revolt with him, and they repeatedly plundered Amurru.

- d* My troops, [which] dwelt [in the ter]ritory of his land, I dispatched against him. Their defeat they [accomplished], and the people of Arabia, as many as had re[voltd], they struck down with weapons. The tents, their dwellings, [they se]t on [fire], allotted (them) to the flames.
- e* Cattle, shee[p], asses, camels, (and) slaves they plundered without number. The whole stretch of (my) land in its entirety they filled (with them) to its extreme border. Camels I distributed like sheep, [divi]ded (them) among the people of Assyria (so that), in the center of my land, they (could) buy camels for a shekel and a half of silver at the market gate. The *sutammu* as a gift, the brewer for a jug, the gardener as wages, received [cam]els and slaves.
- f* [Yauta^c together with] the rest of the Arabians, who had fled before my weapons, mighty Irra struck down. Famine broke out among them, and to still their hunger they ate the flesh of their sons. The curses, as many as were written in their oath, Aššur, Sin, Šamaš, Bel, Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arba'il, the great gods, my lords, brou[gh]t upon them suddenly.
- g* (As for) Yauta^c, evil befell him, and he fled alone.

Part 2: VIII, 32 - 38

- h* Abiyate^c son of Te'ri came to Nineveh and kissed my feet. I made an oath-bound treaty with him to serve me, I put him in place of Yauta^c as king. Gold, "eye"-stones, *pappardillu*-stone, antimony, camels, and donkeys for the *bīt-rēdūti* as annual tribute, I laid upon him.

Part 3: VIII, 39 - 50

- j* Ammuladdi(n) king of Qedar—who like him wa[s hostile], who repeatedly plundered Amurru—by the invoking of my name (and the names) of Aššur, Sin, [Šamaš, Bel], Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arba'i[l, Ninurta, Nergal, (and) Girra], Kamas-halta king of [Moab], a servant subject to me, accomplished his defeat in a pitched battle. Ammula[ddin] (and) the rest of his people who had escaped be[fore the carnage] he capt[ured with (his own) hands]. Hand and foot [he bound (them)] with ir[on] fetters and [had them brought] to Nineveh into [my] presence.

Part 4: VIII, 51 - 63

- l* Natnu, king of Nab[ayyate], whose (dwelling-)place was far away, heard of the powe[r] of Aššur (and) Marduk, who enc[ourages] me; he, who previously had not sent [his] messenger [to] the king[s (my) fathers], had not a[s]ked the health of [their majesties],
- n* now he sent me his messenger [of peace and kiss]ed my feet. He implored my majesty to establish a treaty of good relations (and) [to perform my service]. I looke[d] upon him graciously [and] turned my favoring countenance upon him. A tribute of presents yearly I imposed upon him.

The account is constructed in four parts; each begins with the personal name of its subject: (Part 1) Yauta^ʿ; (Part 2) Abiyate^ʿ; (Part 3) Ammuladdi(n); and (Part 4) Natnu. The longest and most detailed account (comprising more than one half of the entire narrative) concerns Yauta^ʿ (Part 1), who incited rebellion among the people of Arabia and repeatedly plundered the Western Lands. He was defeated by Assyrian troops, but escaped capture. In Part 2, Aššurbanipal accepts the submission of Abiyate^ʿ, favors him by giving him Yauta^ʿ's throne, and imposes the obligation of yearly tribute. Part 3, while briefer, parallels Part 1: Ammuladdi(n), "like him (Yauta^ʿ)" was hostile and repeatedly plundered the Western Lands. Ammuladdi(n) was defeated by Kamas-halta. Unlike Yauta^ʿ, however, Ammuladdi(n) was captured and sent to Assyria. Also note that in both Parts 1 and 3, the protagonist is not defeated by Aššurbanipal, but rather by "third parties", by Assyrian troops in Part 1 and by the king of Moab in Part 3. The fourth and final part (Part 4) parallels the second (Part 2). Aššurbanipal accepted the submission of Natnu, favored him, and imposed the obligation of yearly tribute. The symmetry of the organization of the narrative can be seen in the following table (Table 1).

There are several interesting features of this narrative that should be noted. First, the introductory phrase, "in my *n*th campaign", typical of Aššurbanipal's campaign narratives, is missing here. Second, the main protagonist, Yauta^ʿ, was not captured, he fled. And third, Yauta^ʿ was defeated by the Assyrian army, rather than by Aššurbanipal himself.

1) Standard phrases typically introduce the individual military narratives in the annals of the Assyrian kings. These phrases vary over time²¹. The introductory phrases, along with lines drawn across the surface of the prism, are the most obvious delimiters of

²¹) The introductory phrases of the Assyrian annals were discussed by H. Tadmor in *The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur*, JCS 12 (1958), pp. 29-32, and see also P. Gerardi, *Aššurbanipal's Elamite Campaigns: A Political and Literary Study* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1987 [University Microfilms 87-14039]), pp. 233-241.

TABLE 1: Arrangement of Edition B's Narrative

Part 1	Yauta' son of Haza'el, king of Qedar ... <i>I caused him to invoke the names of (godlist) ...</i> . The people of Arabia he incited to revolt with him, <i>they repeatedly plundered Amurru</i> . My troops, ..., I dispatched against him. <i>Their defeat they accomplished....</i>	Part 3	Ammuladdi(n) king of Qedar, who <i>like him</i> was hostile, he <i>repeatedly plundered Amurru, ... by invoking my name and the names of (godlist) Kamas-halta accomplished his defeat in pitched battle.</i>
Part 2	Abiyate' son of Te'ri ... I put him in place of Yauta' as king. <i>I imposed yearly tribute.</i>	Part 4	Natnu king of Nabayyate I looked upon him graciously and turned my favoring countenance upon him. <i>I imposed yearly tribute.</i>

the beginnings and ends of individual narratives. The phrase used exclusively in Aššurbanipal's annals is, "in my *n*th campaign (*ina n girriya*)". This introductory phrase in Aššurbanipal's annals is occasionally omitted, usually in narratives placed at the end of the military narration section²². In Edition B, two narratives omit this introductory phrase: the Arab campaign narrative (here under discussion) and the narrative concerning the participation of the Elamite king, Ummanigaš, in the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion²³. These two narratives are the last two accounts given in Editions B and D and are clearly delimited by the presence of lines drawn across the surface of the prism.

2) Normally, a campaign narrative concludes with the death or capture (or resubmission) and punishment of the main protagonist in the campaign, followed by the return to Assyria of the troops or at least the transfer of the booty and captives to

²²⁾ The inscriptional form known as annals is typically made up of three sections: an introduction, a military narration, and a building inscription. The introduction identifies the king and lists his titles and epithets. The military narration contains individual narratives of his (mostly) military achievements. The building inscription concludes the inscription with an account of one of the king's significant building projects.

²³⁾ There is also a very brief narrative in Edition B (IV, 5-17) concerning the defeat of the Median Birishatiri, that is delineated by a line drawn across the surface of the prism, but does not begin with the introductory phrase "in my *n*th campaign", and is not located at the end of the military narration section.

Assyria. In this case, however, Yauta^c is not captured; he flees. The narrative notes the defeat of Yauta^c and the other rebels and the destruction of their encampment; then, detailed attention is given to the enormous booty taken and its distribution. In place of the capture of Yauta^c, we are told of his punishment at the hands of the gods: “[Yauta^c, together with] the rest of the Arabians who had fled before my weapons, mighty Irra struck down ...”. Sandwiched between this overwhelming evidence of Assyrian victory over Yauta^c and the notice that his position as king of Qedar was given to Abiyate^c son of Te’ri (who came to Nineveh and submitted to Aššurbanipal) is the brief statement that Yauta^c escaped: “Yauta^c, evil befell him, he fled alone”. Thus, Assyrian failure to capture the main protagonist in this account is mitigated by focusing on Yauta^c’s military defeat, the scattering of his encampment, punishment at the hands of the gods, and finally the loss of his position as king of Qedar²⁴. Yauta^c may have remained at large, but he was, nonetheless, eliminated as a potential troublemaker. These episodes effectively close the story of Yauta^c’s rebellion, and the narrative goes on to record the activities of other kings in the West.

3) Also conspicuous in this narrative is the fact that Yauta^c and Ammuladdi(n) are defeated by the Assyrian army and Kamas-halta respectively, rather than by the Assyrian king himself. Normally, the Assyrian king claims a personal victory over his enemies. In the episodes concerning Yauta^c, Assyrian troops (stationed locally) were dispatched against Yauta^c and his followers. They defeated the rebellion, destroyed the enemy encampment, and took booty. In the episode concerning Ammuladdi(n), Kamas-halta, a western king loyal to Aššurbanipal, defeated the rebellion, captured Ammuladdi(n), and sent him in chains to Nineveh.

Editions K and C

The next edition of the annals, Edition D (composed 648), repeats the account of Edition B *verbatim*. Succeeding Editions K and C, composed in 647²⁵, make several changes and additions to the Edition B narrative. Edition K is very fragmentary, represented by only four prism fragments, and the beginning of the Arab campaign narrative is entirely missing in Edition K. The extant account begins with an episode that

²⁴) For comparison one may note the campaign against Urtak in the same edition: “I defeated him, pursued him to the border of his land. Angry Aššur’s heart was not appeased His royal dynasty they (the gods) overthrew, caused another to receive dominion over Elam” (Edition B, IV, 69-73).

²⁵) Edition K was probably composed shortly after the conclusion of the Šamaš-šum-ukin campaign in 647, and Edition C shortly after that; see Cogan-Tadmor, *cit.*, pp. 238-240 and fn. 24.

is new to the narrative (episode *k*): a notice of the capture of Adiya, queen of the Arabs. This new episode *k* is positioned in front of the Natnu episodes (i.e. between episodes *j* and *l* of the earlier editions). It recounts the defeat and capture of Adiya, queen of the Arabs; the victory over Adiya is recounted as a personal victory of the king²⁶:

Ad[iya, queen of Arabia, I through]ly defeated. [Her] tents, [I set ablaze. I seized] her alive [with my own hands.] With the booty of [her land], I brought her [to Assyria].

Changes were also made to the Natnu episodes. The additional information that Yauta^c escaped to Nabayyate and an explanatory quotation are added to the narrative of Natnu's submission to Aššurbanipal to form a new episode *m*²⁷:

When Yauta^c [king of Arabia], servant, [my] atten[dant, fled] to Nabayyate, he came before [Natnu]. Natnu spoke thus to [Yauta^c]: "I, [shall I be saved] from the hands of Assyria, if you make me [your refuge]"? Natnu feared; [he worried].

These changes to the Natnu episodes are significant. In the narrative of Editions B and D, Yauta^c escaped, his whereabouts were unknown, and Natnu's submission was motivated by his recognition of the power of Aššur. From Edition K, however, we learn that Yauta^c escaped to Nabayyate and that it was his presence there that provoked, in Natnu, the fear that he would be punished if he allowed Yauta^c to remain there, and for this reason he submitted to Assyria. Although Yauta^c is reintroduced into the narrative in this episode, Natnu remains the focus of the episode since the emphasis is placed on Natnu's reaction rather than on Yauta^c's request for refuge. The addition of the direct speech to this episode thus serves to strengthen the characterization of Natnu rather than of Yauta^c²⁸.

Edition C

Before discussing the overall structure of Edition K's narrative, we must consider Edition C. Composed in the same year as Edition K, Edition C is more fully preserved

²⁶) Edition K: R.C. Thompson, *A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh, Iraq* 7 (1940), fig. 19. The reconstruction is provided by Editions A and the "Letter".

²⁷) The reconstruction is supplied by Edition C and the "Letter".

²⁸) The quotation serves to reinforce the significance of Natnu's submission: despite the distance and the efforts of Yauta^c to corrupt him, he nevertheless recognized the superiority of Aššur and submitted.

TABLE 2

EPISODES	Editions B and D	Edition K	Edition C
Yauta ^ʿ , king of Qedar, receives gods from Aššurbanipal	b		
Yauta ^ʿ incites Arabs to rebel	c		c
Assyrian troops dispatched, defeat Yauta ^ʿ	d		d
Arabs massively plundered, causes inflation in Assyria	e		e
Fleeing Arabs struck down by terrible famine	f		f
Yauta ^ʿ escapes (+ to Nabayyate)	g		g+
Abiyate ^ʿ submits, made king of Qedar	h		h
Ammuladdin, like Yauta ^ʿ , rebels, defeated by Kamas-halta	j		j
Adiya, queen of the Arabs, captured by Aššurbanipal		k	k
Natnu, king of Nabayyate, hears of power of the god Aššur	l	l	l
Natnu rejects Yauta ^ʿ : quotation		m	m
Natnu submits to Assyria	n	n	n

and a larger percentage of the Arab campaign narrative is available for analysis²⁹. The opening sentences of the campaign narrative are missing in Edition C; the available narrative begins with episode *c*. The narrative preserved in Edition C is identical to the narrative of Editions B and D until episode *g*, in which a single phrase is added to the notice of Yauta^ʿ's flight: "Alone he fled to Nabayyate"³⁰. Thus, Edition C identifies Yauta^ʿ's destination after his escape and flight from Assyrian troops. Edition C's narrative continues to follow the narrative of Editions B and D through episode *j*

²⁹) Edition C: Freedman, *St. Louis Tablets*, pp. 121-127. The reconstruction of Edition C remains problematic.

³⁰) Edition C: Freedman, *St. Louis Tablets*, p. 122, X, 6-7; K.1794: T. Bauer, *Das Inschriftenwerk Aššurbanipals*, p. 18, X, 52, pls. 5-13; and ND 5413+5522: E.E. Knudsen, *Fragments from Historical Texts from Nimrud*, Iraq 29 (1967), pl. XXII.

(Ammuladdi[n]). From this point on Edition C follows the narrative of Edition K; that is, it follows the narrative of Editions B and D with the insertion of the new episodes *k* (defeat of Adiya) and *m* (Natnu's rejection of Yauta'). Because the narratives of Editions C and K, wherever they overlap, seem to be identical, they are treated here as though they were identical in their entirety. Table 2 shows the episodic development of the narratives schematically and Table 3 shows the structure of the narrative in Editions K and C.

The insertion of the note that Yauta' fled to Nabayyate (labeled α) in Part 1 establishes a connection between the Yauta' episodes and the closing Natnu episode (Part 4), creating a tighter, more integrated structure: it ties the primary subject of the narrative to the final episodes narrated. Yauta', although unsubmitive and still at large, is both distant (with Natnu, king of Nabayyate, "whose location is distant") and he is

TABLE 3: The Structure of the Narratives of Editions K and C

Part 1 α	[Yauta', son of Haza'el, king of Qedar, ... The people of Arabia he incited to revolt with him, <i>they repeatedly plundered Amurru</i> . My troops, ..., I dispatched against him. <i>Their defeat they accomplished ...</i>]. <i>Alone he fled to Nabayyate.</i>	Part 3	Ammuladdi(n), king of Qedar, who <i>like him</i> was hostile and <i>repeatedly plundered Amurru ...</i> . Kamaš-halta ... <i>he accomplished his defeat</i> in pitched battle.
		ep. <i>k</i>	Adiya, queen of Arabia, I defeated and burned her tents. I captured her alive and brought her to Assyria with the booty of Arabia.
Part 2	Abiyate', son of Te'ri, ... <i>I put him in place of Yauta' as king. I imposed tribute.</i>	Part 4 α	Natnu, king of Nabayyate, ... When Yauta' ... <i>fled to Nabayyate</i> and went before Natnu. ... <i>I looked upon him graciously and turned my favoring countenance upon him. I imposed tribute.</i>

rejected (Natnu's quotation and his submission to Aššurbanipal); thus he is effectively, if not in fact, neutralized. The symmetry that governed the structure of Edition B's narrative (Parts 1 and 2 parallel (//) Parts 3 and 4) remains intact here but is enhanced by an additional element (indicated with an "α") which ties Part 1 to Part 4: 1α, 2 // 3, 4α.

On the other hand, the new Adiya episode (episode *k*) is somewhat discordant. Edition B's narrative, with its parallel structure 1, 2 // 3, 4 (PN they defeated, PN₂ submitted // PN₃ he defeated, PN₄ submitted), is here interrupted by a discordant first-person verb ("Adiya I defeated") forming a lopsided 1, 2 : 3, *k*, 4 construction. Subsequent changes to the narrative will smooth this apparent discordance.

The Letter to the God Aššur and the Second Arab Campaign

The genre known as "letters to the gods" is not well attested or defined for the neo-Assyrian period; there are few examples and they differ significantly from one another³¹. Aššurbanipal's "Letter" is structured as a report addressed to the god Aššur and is therefore composed in first- and second-person narrative. The so-called "Letter to the God" was composed after Editions K and C (647) and before Edition A (643)³². If we leave aside those elements and alterations that were made to the account as a result of its appearance in a different genre, it is clear that the account that appears in Editions B, D, K, and C formed the basis of the "Letter's" account which was then modified and that the "Letter" in turn formed the basis of the later Edition A's account.

The narrative of the "Letter" is significantly altered from that of the preceding editions, and it adds events that took place later, that is, during a second campaign conducted against the Arabs.

The changes that were made to earlier versions of the narrative of the first campaign against the Arabs are critical to understanding the later development of the narrative; most of these changes are additions to the narrative. The first addition is an introduction (episode *a*) that clarifies Yauta's earlier relationship with Assyria³³:

You know, Aššur, Enlil of the gods, (everything) from past to future.
 A When Yauta' son of Haza'el, king of Arabia, became hostile towards Esarhad-
 don, king of Assyria, servant, born of your hands, cast off the yoke of his

³¹) RIA 3, 575-76, s.v. "Götterbriefen".

³²) The "Letter" seems to have contained portions of the Pa'e and Ummanigaš episodes which were not recorded in Edition F (ca. 646) but do appear in Edition A (643).

³³) Weippert, WdO 7 (1973-74), p. 75, "Anrede", Obv. I, 1-16.

domination. With your encouragement, your exalted strength, Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, my father, called up his troops, dispatched them against him. In open battle he defeated him; he plundered his gods. Yauta', to save his life, left his camp; he escaped alone; he fled far away.... When Aššur, king of all heaven and earth, with the raising of his pure eyes, looked upon me and desired for me kingship, shepherdship of Assyria he bestowed upon me.

The augmented introduction adds little information to the narrative, except to say that Yauta' had also revolted against Aššurbanipal's father, Esarhaddon³⁴. This provides some context to the earlier statements that Yauta' appealed to Aššurbanipal for the return of his gods. But, more importantly, this passage contains the first indication of a confusion of two persons.

In earlier editions of the annals, the name of Yauta' son of Haza'el had been spelled *ya-ú-ta'*. But, here, in the "Letter", his name is spelled *ú-a-a-te'*. The significance of this spelling shift has been demonstrated by I. Ephal; the spellings represent two different names and two different persons: the spelling *ya-ú-ta'* represents the name and person Yauta' son of Haza'el and the spelling *ú-a-a-te'* represents the name and person Uaite' son of Birdada³⁵. This shift in the spelling of the name of Yauta' thus indicates that the scribal authors of the "Letter" identified Yauta' with another Arab, Uaite' son of Birdada and also a "leader" of the Qedarites. The import of this confusion will be explored below.

The second change to the earlier narrative is located immediately after the notice of Yauta's rebellion against Aššurbanipal: a passage (labeled here with the Roman numeral I) is inserted into episode *c*³⁶.

³⁴) Note however the perfect parallelism between Yauta's behavior during Esarhaddon's reign and in the following events during Aššurbanipal's reign.

³⁵) Eph'al, *Arabs*, pp. 50-52. The "Letter" calls both Yauta' and Uaite', Uaite' throughout. I have substituted Yauta' in the translations when appropriate to avoid confusion.

³⁶) "Letter", Weippert WdO 7 (1973-74), p. 75, "Anrede", Obv. I, 39-44.

TABLE 4

EPISODE	EDITION C	LETTER
c ¹	after[wards] he sinned against my oath; the favors he did not guard; he cast off the yoke of my dominion, he held back from greeting me; he withheld tribute.	[the favors that I did] for him, he did not guard; he cast off the yoke of my dominion, he held back from greeting me; he withheld tribute, his weighty obligation.
I		Like Elam, he listened to the lies of Akkad; he did not guard my oath. He abandoned me, Aššurbanipal, pure priest, servant, born of your hands; with Šamaš-šum-ukin, my [...] ... he set his face.
c ²	The people of Arabia, with him revolted; they constantly plundered the Western Lands	The people of Arabia, with him revolted; they constantly plundered the Western Lands

Entirely new to this account is the association of Yauta's rebellion with the rebellion in Babylonia (652-648). Eph'al's reconstruction of these events placed these early Arab raids prior to the Babylonian rebellion³⁷. This episode (I) inserted into the "Letter", however, explicitly connects the plundering of the Western Lands with the rebellion in Babylonia and assumes a third front to the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion (Babylonia, Elam, and the West).

The next addition to the narrative of the "Letter" is probably connected to the first: it comprises three lines added to episode *f*, the account of famine as a punishment for the rebellious Arabs. The addition of these lines results in a five-part poetic structure (discussed below in an addendum), which considerably strengthens the motif of famine as punishment for the rebellion. By the time Editions K and C were composed, the motif of famine as punishment for rebellion was already well developed in the account of the Babylonian rebellion³⁸. Therefore, the addition of an episode (I) linking the Arab

³⁷ Eph'al (*Arabs*, pp. 153-55) places them not later than 652.

³⁸ For a discussion of the motif of famine in these accounts see, Gerardi, *Elamite Campaigns*, pp. 158-80.

campaign with the Babylonian rebellion and the strengthening of the motif of famine (episode *f*) are unlikely to be coincidental (see below).

The next change to the earlier narrative in the “Letter” comes in the episode concerning Ammuladdi(n). The episode is abbreviated and changed to first-person narration; consequently all mention of Kamas-halta is omitted. Episode *k*, the capture of Adiya which follows this, is no longer so discordant since the Ammuladdi(n) episode has been changed to first-person narrative as well.

The Letter and the New Campaign

The most important addition to the “Letter” is the new campaign account. Beginning, “(Because) of t[hose] words which *ú-[a-a-te-’]* to Natnu [spoke] ...”³⁹, this new campaign is presented as a continuation of the preceding campaign. The episodes concerning Natnu (episodes *l*, *m*, and *n*), which in preceding editions of the annals had provided closure to the campaign account, now provide a transition to the new campaign account that begins with episode *p*⁴⁰.

- l* [Na]tnu ki[ng of N]abayyate, whose location is distant, heard of the pow[er of Aš]šur who encourages me, who previously had not sent his messenger [to the k]ings my fathers, did not greet their kingship. When Uaite’ king of Arabia —whose senses you turned, you spoke the downfall of his land— fled to Nabayyate, he came before Natnu.
- m* Natnu to Uaite’ spoke thus: “I, shall I be saved from the hands of Aššurbanipal, whose trust is Aššur, if you take me for your stronghold”. Natnu feared; he worried.
- n* His messenger he sent to ask my well-being; he kissed my feet. To make a treaty of friendship, to perform service to me, he constantly besought my lordship. Joyfully I looked upon him, I showed him a good face, upon him I set tribute; payments yearly I imposed upon him.
- p* (Because) of the[se] words which U[aite’ spoke] to Natnu, [my heart] became angry [...]. A second time I c[alled up my troops], against him [I took the road ...].

The campaign account consists largely of descriptive passages of the Assyrian army’s journey across Syria, in search of this *ú-a-a-te-’* and his Arabian subjects. The

³⁹ “Letter“: Weippert, WdO 7 (1973-74), p. 78, episode 7, III, 12-16.

⁴⁰ “Letter“: Weippert, WdO 7 (1973-74), p. 78, episodes 6 and 7, obv. II, 50-III, 18.

TABLE 5

EPISODES	Edition B/D	Edition K/C	Letter
			<i>a</i>
Yauta' king of Qedar receives his gods from Aššurbanipal	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>
Yauta' rebels			<i>c</i> ¹
Yauta' sends troops to aid Šamaš-šum-ukin (I)	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	I
Arabs join Yauta' in rebellion			<i>c</i> ²
Assyrian troops dispatched; defeat Yauta'	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>
Arabs massively defeated. Causes inflation in Assyria	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>
Fleeing Arabs struck down by famine	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>
Yauta' escapes (to Nabayyate +)	<i>g</i>	<i>g+</i>	<i>g+</i>
Abiyate' submits, made king of Qedar	<i>h</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>h</i>
Ammuladdi(n), like Yauta', rebels; defeated	<i>j</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>j</i>
Adiya queen of Arabs captured		<i>k</i>	<i>k</i>
Natnu hears of power of Aššur	<i>l</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>l</i>
Natnu rejects Yauta': quotation		<i>m</i>	<i>m</i>
Natnu submits to Assyria	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Aššurbanipal begins second campaign against Yauta'/Uaite'			<i>p</i>
March from Hadatta to Azalla: defeat of Nabayyate			<i>q</i>
March from Azalla to Damascus: defeat of Uaite'			<i>r</i>
March from Damascus to Hulhuliti			<i>s</i>
Capture of Abiyate'			<i>t</i>
Campaign against Uššu and Akko on the return journey			Uššu/ Akko

campaign is recounted as a three-stage journey, beginning with a descriptive account of the difficulties of crossing the Syrian desert followed by the march from Hadatta to Azalla during the month of Siwan (episode *q*), then from Azalla to Damascus (episode *r*), and finally from Damascus to Hulhuliti during the month of Ab (episode *s*). At each stage the defeat of a number of tribes is noted, including the Isamme', the "people of Atarsamain", and the Nabayyate in episode *q*. The appearance of the Nabayyate here is curious and left unexplained in the narrative. Natnu, their king, was—according to the preceding account—a submissive and obedient vassal.

The end of the "Letter's" narrative is fragmentary. Episode *t* is followed by a short narrative concerning a campaign against Uššu and Akko. The content of the final two columns (V and VI) is unclear but seems not to concern the Arab campaigns⁴¹.

As noted above (p. 81), the "Letter" shows a different spelling for the name of Yauta', *ú-a-a-te'*, in the narrative of his rebellion against Aššurbanipal. In fact, there are two persons in the "Letter" whose names are spelled *ú-a-a-te'*: Yauta' son of Haza'el and Uaite' son of Birdada. The availability of earlier versions of the first campaign (episodes *a-n*) in Editions B, D, K, and C allow the clear identification of the person called Uaite' in the "Letter's" episodes *a* through *n* as Yauta' son of Haza'el; but, in succeeding episodes, who is meant by *ú-a-a-te'* is less clear. Although the introduction to the second campaign explicitly links the target of this new campaign with the target of the preceding campaign, "because of these words which he spoke to Natnu", Yauta' son of Haza'el is never again mentioned in this account. In fact, the only reference to any Uaite' comes in episode *r* where the surrounding of the family and subjects of "Uaite' son of Birdada" is noted⁴²:

The people of Atarsamain and the Qedarites of Uaite' son of Birdada, king of Arabia, and (other) Qedarites I surrounded. His gods, his mother, his sisters, his wife, his family, all the people of their land, donkeys, camels, small animals, as many as my hands captured with the help of Aššur, my lord, I had marched to Damascus.

The third stage of the campaign, narrated in episode *t*, includes the capture of Abiyate' and Ayamu, sons of Te'ri. Abiyate' son of Te'ri had earlier submitted to Aššurbanipal, and the Assyrian king had given him kingship over the Qedarites in place of Yauta' (episode *h*). There is no other mention of Abiyate''s rebellion or a reason for

⁴¹) Nothing but the final lines of the Uššu and Akko campaign is preserved from column V. Two fragmentary sections of column VI seem to concern the activities of the Elamite kings Ummanigas and Pa'e. Cf. Bauer, IWA, p. 66, col. VI, and Streck, *Asb.*, p. 196, cols. I and II (= Weippert cols. VI-V).

⁴²) "Letter": Weippert, *WdO* 7 (1973-74) p. 80, episode 7, Rev. IV, 1-10.

rebellion. The campaign closes with the capture of the remaining Arabs, who, without water and in desperate straits, had fled to the mountains (episode *t*).

As in the case of the earlier campaign against Yauta^ʿ, in Editions B, D, K, and C, the failure to capture the main protagonist is passed over and the narrative focuses instead on the capture and punishment of his followers. The narrative of the “Letter” then leaves the reader with a series of “loose ends”: Yauta^ʿ son of Hazaʿel who rebelled but escaped capture during the first campaign (episodes *a-n*) and seemingly continued to incite rebellion (episode *p*) was also not captured during the second campaign; Abiyate^ʿ, son of Teʿri, who had submitted to Aššurbanipal and was granted kingship in episode *h*, must have rebelled since he is captured as a rebel in episode *t* of the second campaign, but how or when he went from “favored” to “rebel” is never stated in the “Letter”; and finally the Nabayate are mentioned as defeated in episode *q*, without any reference to what happened between their king’s (Natnu’s) submission (episode *n*) and this defeat.

Summary

Before looking at Edition A, let us review the composition of the Arab campaigns up until this point. Editions B and D first reported the rebellion of Yauta^ʿ, king of Qedar. He incited the Arabs to rebel, attacking the Western Lands of the Assyrian empire; and Aššurbanipal sent his troops against him. Yauta^ʿ was defeated but escaped capture (episodes *b* through *g*). The campaign against Yauta^ʿ concludes with the information that Abiyate^ʿ submitted and was given Yauta^ʿ’s position as king of Qedar (episode *h*). The narrative continues with three episodes containing the information that another king in the West, Ammuladdi(n), also rebelled, was defeated, and sent in chains to Assyria by Kamas-halta (episode *j*), and that Natnu, king of Nabayate, heard of the power of Assyria and submitted to Aššurbanipal (episodes *l* and *n*).

In the account of Editions K and C, the final episodes *l* and *n*, dealing with Natnu, are brought back into the main storyline by a newly inserted episode *m*, which adds the information that Yauta^ʿ fled to Natnu, king of Nabayate. The new episode *m*, the quotation discussed above (p. 77), refocuses the Natnu episode. According to the earlier editions, Natnu had submitted because of the power of Aššur. In the new version, Natnu submits for fear that if he allows Yauta^ʿ to take refuge there, he, Natnu, will be punished. His submission to Assyria is an effect of that fear.

The “Letter” makes changes to the first campaign while also recording the events of the second campaign. By inserting episode I into the account of the first campaign, the “Letter” makes an explicit connection between the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion and the Arab raids against the Western Lands. The “Letter” also changes Yauta^ʿ’s name, calling him Uaite^ʿ. Both of these changes demonstrate a confusion between two persons: Yauta^ʿ son of Hazaʿel and Uaite^ʿ son of Birdada.

In the "Letter" the quotation (episode *m*) which had earlier served as the motivation for Natnu's submission to Assyria becomes the justification for launching the campaign against Yauta': "Because of these words ... I called up my troops". Uaite' son of Birdada, named in episode *r*, is referred to only as a leader of one tribe of Arabs besieged during the campaign. The "Letter" presents all episodes as relating to Yauta'/Uaite' son of Haza'el, king of the Arabs, who first attacked the Western Lands in support of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion (episode I), was defeated (episodes *d*, *e*, and *f*), but escaped and then sought to incite Natnu to rebel (episodes *g*, *l*, *m*, and *n*), thus bringing down a second campaign upon himself and his people (episodes *p-t*).

The Arab Campaigns and the Šamaš-šum-ukin Rebellion

The next and final known version of these events appear in Edition A with a greater development of the linkage between the Arabs and the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion established by episode I. During the years 652-648 B.C., Assyria fought a multifront civil war to retain control over Babylonia. The brother kings, Aššurbanipal in Assyria (668-627) and Šamaš-šum-ukin in Babylonia (667-648), had been appointed to their respective thrones, probably in 672, by their father Esarhaddon⁴³.

This arrangement survived some 15 years (667-652) until Šamaš-šum-ukin, clearly in the subordinate position *vis-à-vis* his brother in Assyria, revolted, closing the gates of his cities. Šamaš-šum-ukin had allies in his revolt: the Elamites—often allies of Babylonia against Assyrian domination—sent troops in support of the rebellion, and Arab troops also joined Šamaš-šum-ukin in Babylon.

Accounts of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion appear in the same editions as do the accounts of the Arab campaigns. Edition B preserves an account of a portion of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion within the account of a battle against the Elamites who joined that rebellion. The connection between the Elamite campaign and the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion is mentioned but not fully developed⁴⁴:

Ummanigaš, for whom I had done many favors, whom I had established as king of Elam, who was not mindful of the favors, did not keep the treaty (and) the oath of the great gods, (but) accepted a bribe from the hand of an emissary of Šamaš-šum-ukin, faithless brother, my enemy. He sent his forces with them to fight my troops, my warriors, ...

⁴³ H. Tadmor, *Autobiographical Apologies in the Royal Assyrian Literature*, in H. Tadmor-M. Weinfeld (Eds.), *History, Historiography, and Interpretation*, Jerusalem 1986, pp. 43-44.

⁴⁴ Edition B: AS 5, VII, 3-11; above, fn. 16.

The development of the combined Elamite-Babylonian narrative is too complex to discuss here in detail⁴⁵, but it should be noted that the first full narrative recounting the Babylonian rebellion appears in Edition K, after the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion had been successfully quelled. While the Elamite episodes were clearly associated with the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion right from the start, the episodes concerning Yauta' are not associated with this rebellion in Babylonia until much later, indeed, not until a second campaign against the Arabs, first reported in the "Letter", had been conducted. Thus, the complex of changes in the "Letter"—the shift in the spelling of Yauta's name to Uaite', the appearance in episode *r* of another Uaite', and the connection of Yauta' with the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion—leads to the conclusion that the only reason for associating Yauta's rebellion with the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion was the confusion of Yauta' with Uaite', both of whom remained at large at the time of the writing of the "Letter".

Edition A

The First Campaign

Edition A's account uses the "Letter's" narrative as a base, but relatively radical changes are made to this base narrative: new material is added to both the first and the second campaign accounts, episodes from the first campaign narrative are shifted to the second, episodes within the first campaign narrative are rearranged, and the focus of the second campaign is changed entirely.

Edition A provides the Arab campaign narrative with an entirely new introduction⁴⁶:

On my ninth campaign I called up my troops; I seized the way against Uaite', king of Arabia, who sinned against my oath, did not guard the good which I had done, cast off the yoke of my dominion, which Aššur had imposed upon him to pull my (chariot) rope. From asking my health, he held back; he withheld tribute, his weighty gifts.

Note that the history of Yauta's submission to Aššurbanipal is here omitted and that the use of the name "Uaite'" for Yauta' son of Haza'el continues in Edition A. The

⁴⁵ See Gerardi, *Elamite Campaigns*, pp. 158-80.

⁴⁶ Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VII, 82-90.

passage that connects the Arab campaign with the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion, episode I, remains in place, but some new information is included (in italics)⁴⁷:

Like Elam, he listened to the lies of Akkad; he did not guard my oath. He abandoned me, Aššurbanipal, pious priest, servant, born of the hands of Aššur; *to Abiyate° (and) Ayamu son(s) of Te'ri, troops he gave*, (and) he decided to send aid to Šamaš-šum-ukin, my brother, my enemy.

Here, the roles of Abiyate° and Ayamu in the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion are given: they commanded the Arab troops that joined the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion. The reason for their fugitive status and final capture, already noted in the “Letter”, episode *s*, is now clarified.

Episode *d*, recording the defeat of Yauta°/Uaite° son of Haza'el is changed from third- to first-person narrative, resolving the discordance observed in Editions K and C caused by the shift from third-person narration for the Yauta°/Uaite°, Abiyate°, and Ammuladdi(n) episodes to first-person narration for the Adiya episode.

The next change in the narrative is the shifting of two episodes to another position in the narrative. Episodes *e* and *f*, recording the inflation caused by the tremendous booty brought back to Assyria as a result of this campaign and the terrible famine that afflicted the Arabs in their attempt to flee from the troops of Aššurbanipal, are in Edition A moved to the second Arab campaign. This shift is discussed below⁴⁸.

Episode *h*, the submission of Abiyate° and his placement on Yauta°'s throne, is also shifted to a position later in this narrative. A new episode, labeled episode II, is added in episode *h*'s position⁴⁹:

Uaite° son of Haza'el, son of the brother of the father of Uaite° son of Birdada, who set himself for kingship over Arabia, Aššur, king of the gods, great mountain, altered his senses; he came before me. To praise Aššur and the great gods, my lords, a weighty punishment I imposed upon him; I placed him in a cage, and with a bear (and) a dog I bound him; I made him guard the gate in Nineveh (called) *nērib masnaqti adnāti* [“Entrance to the place from which the world is controlled”].

In this passage we are given a clear differentiation of the two Uaite°s. The first Uaite° son of Haza'el is clearly Yauta° son of Haza'el of the earlier editions B, D, K, and C and

⁴⁷) Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VIII, 91-101.

⁴⁸) Below p. 93.

⁴⁹) Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VIII, 1-14.

cousin to Uaite^c son of Birdada⁵⁰. Uaite^c son of Haza'el (= Yauta^c) here voluntarily returns to Assyria to be punished for his rebellion. This new episode is placed immediately following the account of the defeat of the Arabs in battle and Yauta^c's escape to Nabayyate (episodes *d* and *g*).

Until Eph'al's re-analysis of this campaign account, this addition to the narrative had caused much confusion, particularly since Uaite^c's fate, narrated later in Edition A, is somewhat similar⁵¹. While the placement of Yauta^c's surrender here is chronologically inaccurate since Yauta^c did not appear in Nineveh until much later (sometime during the second campaign), I would like to suggest that this episode was placed here in order to complete the story of Yauta^c; thus all other events contained in the Edition A narrative concern Uaite^c son of Birdada and other Arabs. I will come back to this point later.

The episodes concerning Ammuladdi(n) and Adiya (episodes *j* and *k*) remain in place in Edition A but are collapsed into a single episode. New to Edition A is the epithet of Adiya who is called "wife of Uaite^c, king of Arabia"⁵².

The Narrative Transition to the Second Campaign

The following series of episodes are a combination of new and displaced episodes: III-*h*-IV¹-*lmn*-IV². They form the transition to the new campaign account and are perhaps the most difficult episodes of the account to understand⁵³:

- III ³⁰ At the command of Aššur and Ištar, the great gods, my lords, the helpers of Abiyate^c (and) Ayamu son(s) of Te'ri, who had come into Babylon to aid Šamaš-šum-ukin, my brother, my enemy, I killed, I defeated; I defeated him. The rest who had entered Babylon, because of famine (and) hunger, ate each other's flesh. To save their lives, they came out of Babylon; my troops, who were arrayed against Šamaš-šum-ukin, defeated him again; he fled alone.
- h* ⁴³ To save his life, he submitted to me, I had mercy on him; the oath of the great gods I made (him) swear. Instead of Uaite^c, I granted him kingship in Arabia.
- IV¹ ⁴⁸ But he with Nabayyate set his face; the oath of the great gods he did not fear; he constantly plundered the border of my land.

⁵⁰) Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VIII, 1-2. *Uaite^c mār Haza'el mār ahi abi ša Uaite^c mār Birdada*, "Uaite^c, son of Haza'el, son of the brother of the father of Uaite^c, son of Birdada".

⁵¹) Episode *u*.

⁵²) See Eph'al's discussion of Adiya's identity, *Arabs*, p. 152.

⁵³) Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VIII, 30-78.

- lmn* ⁵² With the encouragement of Aššur, Sin, Šamaš, Adad, Bel, Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh, Šarrat Kidmuri, Ištar of Arba'il, Ninurta, Nergal, (and) Nusku—Natnu, king of Nabayyate, whose dwelling is distant, to whom Uaite' had fled, heard of the power of Aššur who encourages me, whose land had never sent a messenger to the kings, my fathers; who had not asked after the well-being of their kingship. For fear of the conquering weapons of Aššur he had come; he had asked after the well-being of my kingship.
- IV² ⁶⁵ But Abiyate' son of Te'ri did not attend the good, did not guard the oath of the great gods, the speaking of lies he spoke to me; his mouth with Natnu, king of Nabayyate he set; their army they called up for an evil uprising against my border. ⁷³ At the command of Aššur, Sin, Šamaš, Adad, Bel, Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh, Šarrat Kidmuri, Ištar of Arba'il, Ninurta, Nergal (and) Nusku, I called up my troops, against Abiyate' I seized the way

Episode *h*, recording the submission of Abiyate', originally appeared after episode *g* but now follows a newly inserted episode III. Another new episode IV¹ appears following episode *h* and is followed by a condensed version of episodes *l*, *m*, and *n* concerning Natnu; episode IV² elaborates on the statements of episode IV¹.

Episode III returns to the story of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion and recounts the defeat of the Arab troops led by Abiyate' and Ayamu. After the account of the defeat of the Arab troops, episode *h*, the submission of Abiyate', is inserted. New passage IV¹ recounts that Abiyate' immediately revolted and joined with Nabayyate in plundering the borders of Assyria. This is the first mention that Nabayyate had become hostile toward Assyria. A condensed version of episodes *l*, *m*, and *n* recounting Natnu's submission to Assyria, is then inserted and followed by a new episode IV², which is a slightly more detailed statement of IV¹.

These new passages are followed by the account of the second campaign, following the Assyrian army on its three-stage journey across Syria in pursuit of the fugitive Arabs (episodes *q*, *r*, and *s*). There is a new focus to this campaign, however. In the "Letter" the focus of this second campaign was Uaite'/Yauta' who "spoke those words"; here the account is recast as a campaign to capture Abiyate' and Ayamu, sons of Te'ri; Uaite' is barely mentioned.

Before continuing the discussion of this campaign, let us look at this new transition between campaigns a little more closely. The arrangement of the episodes is somewhat awkward, as is the rewriting of the displaced episodes. Consider for example the final lines of episode III: "My troops, ... , defeated him again; he fled alone". The pronouns "him" and "he" should refer to Abiyate'. The grammatical antecedent, however, is either "the rest" or Šamaš-šum-ukin.

Also troublesome is the placement of episode *h* after the defeat of the rebels in Babylon. First, the pronoun "he" has the same problem with its antecedent as it did in episode III and second, it is known from Edition B that Abiyate' submitted to Aššur-

banipal and was appointed king of Qedar after Yauta's defeat not, as would seem from this new arrangement, after he escaped from Babylon.

To understand why episode *h* was placed in this position one must consider the alternatives. Normally, an adversary's past is presented the first time he is mentioned. Thus in episode I, where Abiyate' is first mentioned, we might expect: "Abiyate', son of Te'ri, who submitted to me, whom I had set for kingship ...". In this narrative, however, it would be impossible to place this episode with Abiyate' the first time he is mentioned since Abiyate' was made king over Qedar only after Yauta's defeat recounted in episode *d* which appears later in the narrative.

The scribes would have faced a similar problem had they left episode *h* in its original position, after the narrative of the defeat and flight of Yauta', since the submission of Abiyate' would then be placed after the notice of his rebellion (episode I) but before his defeat (episode III). Thus, once episode I was positioned and Abiyate''s role identified there, the scribes could not leave episode *h* in place. The solution may have been chronologically inaccurate and factually incorrect, but at least it made logical sense. Abiyate' had rebelled but was defeated and, after submitting to Aššurbanipal, was rewarded with kingship over Qedar. The arrangement was unusual but not unprecedented; Tammaritu, king of Elam, had also rebelled, was defeated, and later re-placed on his throne⁵⁴.

Episode IV¹ notes an alliance between Abiyate' and Natnu; this is entirely new to Edition A. In preceding narratives, Natnu's presence in the narrative was exclusively as a distant king who voluntarily submits to Assyria after Yauta's defeat and flight. Suddenly, here, Natnu is named as an enemy of Assyria⁵⁵: "He (Abiyate') with Nabayate set his face".

The condensed episode complex *lmn*, which is placed after this startling information, functions to identify Natnu, king of Nabayate. The Natnu episodes in Editions B, D, K, and C closed the narrative. In the "Letter", these episodes provided the narrative

⁵⁴) Writing some ten years after the rebellion of Yauta', it is entirely possible that the scribes thought that what was narratively logical was also, in fact, correct. What we term ancient scholarship was in many ways sophisticated, but it was not research scholarship. While it has been established that the scribes had access to previous inscriptions, royal letters, and archival material in the composition of their inscriptions, there is no evidence that they made use of this material in a systematic and deductive fashion. In consulting the earlier inscriptions they must have noted that Abiyate' was given the Qedarite throne after Yauta's defeat in the first Arab campaign; they certainly also knew that all the events of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion had been omitted from the earlier editions and thus that any interconnection between the the Arabs campaigns and the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion would also have been omitted. Thus without access to a document that gave the year of Abiyate''s accession to Yauta's throne, could the scribes, in fact, have known that the first campaign had taken place before the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion began?

⁵⁵) Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VIII, 69-70.

transition between the first and the second campaign. The Natnu episodes, in Edition A, are shifted entirely to the second campaign narrative. They form a section that relates the past, correct actions of Natnu as a contrast to the current identification of Natnu as a rebel, allied with Abiyate^c in the second campaign; episodes IV¹ and IV² form a “frame” for this “flashback”⁵⁶.

The Second Campaign against the Arabs

The formal beginning to the second campaign is episode IV² stating that a campaign was launched against Abiyate^c, who was supported by Natnu⁵⁷. Natnu is never again mentioned in the narrative, although his people, the Nabayyate, are listed as defeated in episode *q*. A single line inserted into the following episode *q* widens the campaign to include the pursuit of Uaite^c as well: “They pursued Uaite^c, king of Arabia, and Abiyate^c, who had come with the troops of Nabayyate”⁵⁸.

The following narrative reports the same three-stage campaign across Syria in pursuit of the fleeing Arabs (episodes *q*, *r*, and *s*) given in the “Letter”. Episode *s* records the capture of Abiyate^c and his brother Ayamu.

Episodes *e* and *f*, which in the earlier editions had been part of the Yauta^c narrative, appear in Edition A after episode *t*, the flight of the Arabs to the mountains. A new, short addition is made to episode *f*, labeled episode *fa*. This new episode *fa* is a short poetic narrative that has no historical content and was simply inserted into the narrative after episode *f*; there is no discernible purpose to its addition to the narrative (see below Appendix). The reassignment of episodes *e* and *f* is easier to understand. By the time of the composition of A’s narrative, three famines are described among the Arabs: after Yauta^c’s defeat (episodes *e* and *f*), among the Arab troops trapped within the besieged city of Babylon (episode III), and among the Arabs who had fled to the mountains at the end of the second campaign (episode *t*). The famine account that is most vivid (and the most moralizing) is that labeled episode *f*. The scribes simply moved the moral to the end, where it belongs.

⁵⁶) For the use of flashbacks as contrast to current events or behaviors see Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, Sheffield 1989, pp. 175-79. Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VIII, 65-78.

⁵⁷) Weippert completely misunderstands this complex as poorly written narrative rather than as a digression or framebreak (p. 58): “In Prisma A handelt es sich hier ziemlich deutlich um einen Einschub, der den Zusammenhang so gründlich stört, daß nach seinem Abschluß der Redaktor erneut beim Abfall Abijate^c einsetzt und ihn mit ähnlichen Worten wie vorher ein zweites Mal berichtet”.

⁵⁸) Edition A: Streck, *Asb.*, VIII, 93.

Three new episodes are added onto the end of Edition A's account: episodes *u*, *v*, and *w*. Episode *u* records the capture of Uaite', king of Arabia, and his punishment. The campaign against Uššu and Akko which closed the "Letter"'s narrative of the Arab campaigns⁵⁹ follows episode *u*. Episode *v*, the capture of Ayamu, follows the campaign to Uššu and Akko. Finally, episode *w* records that Uaite' and the captured Elamite kings were paraded in Nineveh, harnessed to the king's chariot. Table 6 compares the narratives of the "Letter" and Edition A and separates the episodes of Edition A, showing which episodes belong to Yauta' and which to Uaite'.

The narrative of the "Letter" recounts the events of two separate campaigns as a linear narrative concerning a single individual, and thus the second campaign follows smoothly and logically from the first. Edition A, also recounting the events of two separate campaigns, has structured a narrative that introduces two storylines with two separate protagonists at the beginning of the narrative. It then recounts the first campaign through to its conclusion before picking up the second storyline. The episode complex *b-c¹-I-c²* forms the introduction to the narrative, setting the stage for both storylines: Yauta' foments rebellion in the West in support of the rebellion in Babylonia and even sends troops under the command of Abiyate'. The following episodes deal first with the story of Yauta' and continue through to its conclusion: Yauta's appearance in Assyria and his punishment. The narrative then picks up the second story, that of Abiyate' and his aid to Šamaš-šum-ukin, his flight, and his alliance with Natnu. Despite the fact that much of the narrative remains identical to that of the "Letter", the focus of the story has completely shifted. Edition A focuses on the activities of Abiyate' rather than on those of Uaite'.

Clearly once the Assyrians had both Yauta' son of Haza'el and Uaite' son of Birdada in custody, they realized the error and attempted to sort out the confusion by re-assigning the episodes of the narrative to the correct "Uaite'". Writing ten years after Yauta's rebellion and four years after the end of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion, the scribes seem to have had some difficulty reconstructing the events. The movement of blocks of narrative along with the apparent reluctance to rewrite the material suggests a certain hesitancy with the new formulation. Perhaps because of the availability of the earlier annals editions, the scribes recognized that Yauta's own actions were confined to the raids on the western borders, and they assigned those episodes to him and then closed the account with his appearance in Assyria as the swiftest and simplest way of removing him from the story (despite the intervening time).

Uaite' son of Birdada loses the prominent role he held in the "Letter" and becomes a secondary character in the Edition A narrative. His most important action, the sending of troops to Šamaš-šum-ukin, remains assigned to Yauta' in the Edition A

⁵⁹) See above fn. 40.

TABLE 6

LETTER Uaite'	EDITION A	
	Yauta'	Uaite'
a		
b	b	
c ¹	c ¹	
I		I
c ²	c ²	
d	d	
e		
f		
g+	g+	
h	II	
j	jk	
k		III
l		h
m		IV ¹
n		lmn
p		IV ²
q		q
r		r
s		s
t		t
		e
		f,fa
		u
Uššu/Akko		Uššu/Akko
		v
		w

narrative, and the scribes refocused the narrative of the second campaign to concentrate on the activities of the two commanders, Abiyate⁶ and Ayamu, of whose activities more was known.

Natnu's role is also altered in Edition A; shifted from the first to the second campaigns, Natnu's support of the Šamaš-šum-ukin campaign is stressed rather than his role as a new and submissive vassal of Assyria. His role is not fully developed, however, perhaps because he was not captured or punished⁶⁰.

Only one other campaign account in Aššurbanipal's annals shows such a complex narrative, that of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion, which underwent a long period of development. For it as well, the scribes devised a structure to convey the time and shifts in location of the battles and events that made up the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion, within the framework of a linear narrative⁶¹. The Arab campaigns were never included within that narrative, but as we have seen they still posed some difficulties for the Assyrian scribes.

Perhaps most interesting in the unraveling of this account of the Arab campaigns is that the Assyrian scribes, in recognizing their own errors, attempted to restructure the narrative to reflect their new understanding of the events. It has been too often said that the Assyrian scribes focused narrowly on the ideology of kingship, sacrificing accuracy, and even lying to protect it. Imperfect as their attempts to correct their mistakes were, the case at hand is nevertheless evidence that in the inevitable tension which exists between form, ideology, and event in the creation of any narrative, the Assyrian scribes gave at least some weight, some concern, to getting the story straight.

⁶⁰) R.C. Thompson-M.E.L. Mallowan, *The British Museum Excavations at Nineveh, 1931-32*, AAA 20 (1933), pp. 80-98, ll. 124-29.

⁶¹) Gerardi, *Elamite Campaigns*, pp. 158-80.

APPENDIX

Episodes F and Fa

I. Episode F

The episode recounting the famine that befell the Arabs after their rebellion against Aššurbanipal (episode *f*) appears in all the recensions of the Arabian campaign narratives. The account first appears in Edition B, following the defeat of Yauta', and consists of three sentences *a*, *b*, and *c* (B, VIII, 23-30).

- a* ²³ [Yauta' adi] sitti Aribi ša lapan kakkēya ²⁴ ipparšidū ušamqit Irra qardu
b ²⁵ sunqu ina birišun iššakinma ²⁶ ana burišunu ēkulū šēri mārēšun
c ²⁷ arrāte mala ina adēšun šaṭrū ina pitti ²⁸ išimmūšu Aššur Sin Šamaš Bel Nabû
²⁹ Ištar ša Ninua Ištar ša Arba'ili ilāni ³⁰ rabūti bēlīya

- a* Yauta' together with the rest of the Arabs, who (had) fled before my weapons, Irra, the hero, struck down.
b Famine among them he laid down; because of their hunger they ate the flesh of their sons.
c Curses, as many as were written in their treaties, suddenly Aššur, Sin, Šamaš, Bel, Nabû, Ištar of Niniveh, (and) Ištar of Arba'il, the great gods, my lords, decreed for him.

The episode is highly structured. Sentences *a* and *c* are syntactically parallel; both have an Object-Verb-Subject word order, and in both cases the object is modified by a subordinate clause. Sentence *b* is a couplet with OV chiasm interrupted by a prepositional phrases: O Pp V :: Pp V O. These prepositional phrases, however, contribute a consonant parallelism in *ina birišunu* :: *ana burišunu*.

When the "Letter to Aššur" was composed, two more sentences were added: *b'* and *a'*. These two sections form a complementary chiasmic structure for the three original sentences ("Letter", col. II, 6-22).

- a* ⁶ sitti māt Aribi ša lapan kakkēya ⁷ ipparšidū ušamqit Irra qardu
b ⁸ sunqu ina birišunu iššakinma ⁹ ana burišunu ēkulū šēri mārēšunu
c ¹⁰ arrāte mala ina adē ¹¹ ina nibūt šumika u ilāni mārēka šaṭru ina ¹² pitti šimtu lemuttu tašimšunūti

- b'* ¹³ *bakrū imerū suhīrū būrū kukkallū* ¹⁴ *ina eli 7-a-a mušēniqāte ēniqūma* ¹⁵ *šizbu lā ušabbū karassun*
- a'* ¹⁶ *nišē qereb māt Aribi* ¹⁷ *ištēn ana ištēn ištana* "alū ahāmeš" ¹⁸ *umma ina eli minē ipšē[tu]* ¹⁹ *annītu lem[uttu imhurū māt Aribu]* ²⁰ *aššu ad[ē rabūti ša Aššur lā niššuru* ²¹ *nihtu ina tābti [Aššur-bāna]-apli* ²² *[šarri mi]gir libbi Ellil*
- a* The rest of Arabia, who before my weapons fled, Irra, the hero, struck down.
- b* Famine among them he laid down; because of their hunger they ate the flesh of their sons.
- c* Curses, as many as were written—at the invoking of your name and (those of) the gods, your sons—in their treaties, you decreed an evil fate for them suddenly.
- b'* Young camels, young asses, calves, (and) spring lambs suckled from their nurses seven times; but the milk did not sate their stomachs.
- a'* The people in Arabia, one by one, queried each other thus: "Why has this evil befallen Arabia?". "Because we did not attend to the great treaty of Aššur; we sinned against the favors of Aššurbanipal, king, favorite of Ellil".

The changes made to sentence *c* break down the syntactic parallelism with sentence *a* (*a*: O clause V S, *c*: O clause Pp S V). These same changes, however, contribute to a new connection with the newly added final sentence:

- a*: You fated an evil fate for them (Arabia)
- a'*: "why has this evil befallen Arabia".

The author's statement of what has happened in the opening sentence is paralleled and reinforced by the victims' questioning of what has happened in the new closing sentence. The consonant parallelism of the couplet in sentence *b* remains intact. Sentence *c*, with its new, central position, becomes a pivot between the two curses given in sentences *b* and *b'*. The two curses are furthermore thematically parallel in their common association with hunger. The concluding sentence *a'* contains a couplet with several parallelisms.

Because to the great treaty of Aššur we did not attend;
(Because) we sinned against the favors of Aššurbanipal, king, favorite of Enlil.

This final couplet is syntactically, chastically parallel, PP-V :: V-PP; and within each half of the couplet there is lexical equivalence both in the verbs ("we did not attend to" :: "we sinned against") and in the objects (the treaty of Aššur :: the favors of Aššurbanipal). Both verbs are commonly used in reference to the breaking of a treaty; likewise "treaty" and "favors" occur commonly for the formal arrangements between the Assyrian king and his vassals. Since any treaty made with or by the Assyrian king would also be

considered a treaty with the god Aššur, the god Aššur and the king Aššurbanipal should be considered lexically equivalent as well.

The repetition of the words “evil” and “treaty” in the quotation of sentence *a'* creates a thematic chiasmic parallelism with sentence *c*, the pivot:

- c* Curses, as many as were written...in their treaties,
you fated (as) an evil fate for them suddenly
- a'* ...“Why has this evil befallen Arabia”?
“Because we did not attend to the great treaty of Aššur; we sinned against the favors of Aššurbanipal, king, favorite of Ellil”.

Connecting the closing sentence *a'* with the first sentence *a* are the beginning parallel phrases, “the rest of Arabia” and “the people of Arabia”.

Another series of changes appear in this episode in Edition A (A, IX, 53-74). The parallelisms that connect sentences *a*, *c*, and *a'* in the “Letter” are considerably strengthened, a new episode (*fa*: A, IX, 75-89) is added, and the location of the episode (along with the preceding episode *e*) is moved from the first campaign to a position at the end (following episode *t*) of the second campaign.

- a* ⁵³ *Uaite^c adi ummānātešu* ⁵⁴ *ša adēya lā išsurū* ⁵⁵ *ša lapan kakkē Aššur bēliya*
⁵⁶ *ipparšidū innabtūni maharšunu* ⁵⁷ *ušamqitšunūti Irra qardu*
- b* ⁵⁸ *sunqu ina birišunu iššakinma* ⁵⁹ *ana burišunu ekulū šēri mārēšun*
- c* ⁶⁰ *ina arrāte mala ina adēšunu šaṭru ina* ⁶¹ *pitti šimtu limuttu išimmūšunūti Aššur*
Sin Šamaš ⁶² *Adad Bel Nabū Ištar ša Ninua* ⁶³ *Šarrat-kidmuri Ištar ša Arba'ili*
⁶⁴ *Ninurta Nergal Nusku*
- b'* ⁶⁵ *bakru imēru suhīru būru kirru* ⁶⁶ *ina eli 7-ta-a-an mušēniqāte ēniqūma* ⁶⁷ *šizbu lā*
ušabbū karašišunu
- a'* ⁶⁸ *nišē mat Aribi ištēn ana ištēn* ⁶⁹ *ištana*”*alū ahāmeš* ⁷⁰ *umma ina eli minē ipšētu*
annītu limuttu ⁷¹ *imhurū māt Aribu* ⁷² *umma aššu adē rabūti ša Aššur lā niššuru*
⁷³ *niḫtu ina tābti Aššur-bāna-apli* ⁷⁴ *šarri migir libbi Ellil*
- a* Uaite^c together with his troops who did not attend to my treaty, who before my weapons fled, who before them escaped, Irra, the hero, struck them down.
- b* Famine among them he laid down; because of their hunger they ate the flesh of their sons.
- c* Curses, as many as were written in their treaties, an evil fate for them suddenly Aššur, Sin, Šamaš, Adad, Bel, Nabū, Ištar, Šarrat-Kidmuri, Ištar of Arba'il, Ninurta, Nergal (and) Nusku decreed for them.
- b'* Young camels, young asses, calves, (and) spring lambs suckled from their nurses seven times; but the milk did not sate their stomachs.

a' The people of Arabia, one by one, queried each other thus: “Why has this evil befallen Arabia?”. “Because we did not attend to the great treaty of Aššur; we sinned against the favors of Aššurbanipal, king, favorite of Ellil”.

Sentence *a* has been completely rewritten and the king’s name changed from Yauta^c to Uaite^c. Sentence *c* has been changed from the second-person narration of the “Letter” to third-person narration appropriate for the annals. *b*, *b'*, and *a'* remain as they were in the “Letter”.

The object-clause of sentence *a*, “who before my weapons fled”, is, in Edition A, split into three clauses, the final two forming a parallel repetitive couplet.

Letter:	The rest of the Arabs who before my weapons fled,	Irra, the hero, struck down.
Edition A:	Uaite ^c with his troops, who did not attend my treaty, who before the weapons of Aššur my lord fled, who before ^f them escaped,	Irra, the hero, struck them down.

The SV of the original sentence *a*, “Irra, the hero, struck (them) down”, remains intact with the addition of a pronoun attached to the main verb: *ušamqitšunūti*. The introduction of the word *adê*, “treaty”, and the god Aššur into sentence *a* links it with sentences *c* and *a'*. The expression *adê lā našāru*, “to fail to attend to a treaty”, in sentence *a* now parallels the same phrase in sentence *a'*. Edition A also changes the beginning (i.e. the object) of sentence *a* from “the rest of Arabia” to “Uaite^c together with his troops”, or the variant “Uaite^c together with the Arabs”⁶². Perhaps the reintroduction of Uaite^c’s name⁶³ was intended to contrast with the name of Aššurbanipal that appears at the end of sentence *a'*?

The rewriting of sentence *a* is particularly effective in strengthening the summary of the dominant motif given in the final sentence:

⁶²) The variant is also similar to the formulation of the earlier Edition B: “Yauta^c together with the rest of the Arabs”.

⁶³) Cf. Edition B: AS 5, VIII, 23: “[Yauta^c together] with the rest of the Arabs”.

- a*: who did not attend to my treaty, Irra struck them down
- X
- a'*: Why did the evil come upon us? Because we did not attend to the great treaty of Aššur

The motif of the episode develops progressively through a series of lexical equivalences: treaty broken = Irra = famine = treaty curse = evil = treaty breaking. One or more of these words appear in all but one line of the episode and create a circular pattern. The breaking of the treaty brings about the wrath of Irra, the god associated with famine in sentence *a*. Sentence *b* elaborates the actions of Irra by noting that famine (a curse) was his weapon. Sentence *c* equates treaty curses with evil. Sentence *b'* sacrifices the direct progression in favor of creating a chiasmic parallelism for sentence *b* (see above) and describes another curse associated with famine: insatiability. And finally, in sentence *a'*, we are brought full circle to equate evil with treaty breaking.

If we line up the repetitions and other equivalences schematically we can see the strong connections that define this episode:

<i>a</i>	Uaite ^c	Irra	<i>adê nšr</i>	Aššur	
<i>b</i>		Irra = famine (= curse)			
<i>c</i>		curses = evil	<i>adê</i>	Aššur	
<i>b'</i>		insatiability (= curse)			
<i>a'</i>		evil	<i>adê nšr</i>	Aššur	Aššurbanipal

II. Episode *Fa*

Episode *fa* appears only in Edition A (IX, 75-89). It is attached to the end of episode *f*, the famine that afflicted the Arabs, and is followed by episode *u*, the capture and punishment of Uaite^c son of Birdada. It consists of sixteen lines divided into five sections, each beginning with the name of a deity. Each section is composed of various epithets of the named deity.

Many repetitions and parallelisms are immediately discernible. Each section begins with the name of a deity. The first and the last sections follow the divine name with two epithets and continue with an epithet subordinate clause beginning with *ša*. Each section concerns the deity's dealings with the enemy. The five-part structure combined with the obvious parallelisms tempts one to seek a chiasmic structure here, similar to the one discussed in episode *f* above. Any attempt to understand the structure fails, however, until one realizes that this section itself contains an intrusive element: the Ištar section. This can be demonstrated in several ways: first, it is the only section in which a specific enemy is named, the Arabs; all the other sections use general terms for enemy(ies), "gārû, nakrûtu". Second, it is the only section without an epithet using the root *qrd* or

qdr; *qadirtu*, *qardu*, *qarradu*, and *qaridtu* appear in the other sections. Third, for each section there is a corresponding section that repeats the imagery; this is the only section in which the imagery centers on light and fire. And finally, the title most often given to Ištar in Aššurbanipal inscriptions, *bēlet tāhāzi* is here associated with Ninlil⁶⁴.

- ⁷⁵ *Ninlil rimtu Enlil šaqītu*
qadirtu ilāti
ša itti Anim u Ellil šitlutat manzazu
unakkip nakrūtiya ina qarnēša ga-
prāte Ninlil, exalted, wild cow of Enlil,
 feisty of the goddesses,
 who with An and Enlil takes precedence,
 She gored my enemy with her powerful
 horns.
- ⁷⁹ *Ištar āšibat Arba’ili*
išāti litbušat melamme našāta
eli Aribi izannan nabli Ištar, who dwells in Arba’il,
 clothed in fire, bearing awesomeness,
 upon the Arabs she rains fire.
- ⁸² *Irra qardu anuntu kussurma*
urassipa gārêya Irra, the valiant, readied for battle;
 he slayed my enemy.
- ⁸⁴ *Ninurta šiltahu qarradu rabû mār Ellil*
ina ušši zaqti uparri’ napištim nakrūti Ninurta, the dart, great warrior, son of
 Enlil,
 with his pointed arrow he cut through the
 life of my enemy.
- ⁸⁶ *Nusku sukallu na’du mušappû bēlūti*
ša ina qibūt Aššur Ninlil qaridtu bēlet
tāhāzi Nusku, attentive councilor, proclaimer of
 dominion
 who—at the command of Aššur and Ninlil,
 the valiant the lady of Arba’il—
 went at my side and guarded my kingship,
 the vanguard of my troops he seized and
 struck down my enemies.

When this narrative is analyzed without this section, the parallelisms form clear patterns. Appearing in each section is the name of a deity, an epithet containing the root letters *q-d-r* and a word for “enemy”. Both the first and last sections are written on four lines, the second and third on two lines, indicating an original, visibly chiasmic structure: 4-2-2-4.

⁶⁴ See var: Ki. 1904-10-9, 81, Weippert WdO 7 (1973-74), fn. 36.

Chiastic parallelism is also evident in the syntax of sections 1 and 5, which show similar though not perfectly parallel syntactic structures. In both 1 and 5, the divine name is followed by two appellative epithets, an epithet (subordinate) clause including two deities, and finally the main sentence. In both cases the clause and main sentence tends to parallel and elaborate the appellative(s). In the case of section 1 the first element, “exalted”, of the compound appellative, “exalted, wild cow of Enlil”, is paralleled in the clause, “who with Anu and Enlil takes precedence”, and the second element, “wild cow of Enlil” is paralleled in the main sentence: “she gored my enemy with her powerful horns”. Similarly, in section 5 the first appellative, “attentive councilor”, is paralleled and reduplicated in the clause “who went at my side and guided my kingship”. The second appellative, “proclaimer of dominion”, is paralleled and reduplicated in the main sentence “the vanguard of my troops he seized and struck down my enemies”.

Other parallelisms are not chiastic. Sections 1 and 4 share parallel imagery (boring, piercing), vocabulary (*nakrūtu*, “enemy”), and, in part, syntax:

- | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|---------|--------|
| 1. | S | (ša | Pp V O) | V O Pp |
| 4. | S | | Pp V O | |

Similarly, sections 3 and 5 share parallel imagery (battle), vocabulary (*gārû*, “enemy”), and syntax:

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------|------------|
| 3. | S | | O V-ma V O |
| 5. | S | (ša Pp O | V-ma V O) |
| | | | O V-ma V O |

The purpose for the placement of episode *fa* in the Arabs campaign narrative is not at all clear. There seems to be no particular relationship between the gods listed here and treaty curses. Its constant reference to the defeat of enemies as well as the mention of the god Irra may explain its selection but it does not explain its purpose in the narrative.

Why the Ištar section was inserted into this passage is similarly odd. The Ištar section seems to have been inserted to make an existing text written for another purpose fit a specific context, i.e. the Arabs thus: “Ištar ... shall rain down upon the Arabs flames”. But one cannot help but observe that simply changing the word “enemy” to “Arabs” in the original four-part structure would have been a more successful strategy.