COMPOSITIONAL AND EDITORIAL PROCESSES
OF ANNALISTIC AND SUMMARY TEXTS OF TIGLATH-PILESER I

Marco De Odorico — Udine

The poor state of preservation of many of the summary inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser I, and the consequent unavailability of satisfactory and complete translations and editions, prevented scholars from tackling with these texts for many years. However, thanks especially to the work of Weidner, Borger and Grayson, the situation has changed in recent years. In particular, work on the texts of Tiglath-pileser is now made easier by the publication of the second volume of the RIMA series, with its high standard of accuracy, and with its particular organization, which allows to check or reconstruct the contents of each text or exemplar with little difficulty.

1) The present study has been written in the contest of a post-doctoral program for the Istituto Universitario Orientale of Napoli, concerning the compositional and ideological characteristics of the Assyrian royal inscriptions. In a subsequent study of mine I will carry on a similar analysis of the inscriptions of later rulers, from Ashur-bêl-kala to Ashurnasirpal II. General conclusions on the subject will be drawn on that occasion. I thank Professors C. Zaccagnini (Napoli) and F.M. Fales (Udine) for several helpful suggestions and for revising my English style.


3) A.K. Grayson, Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC, I (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia - Assyrian Periods 2), Toronto 1991 (= Grayson, RIMA 2). His earlier volume, Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia - Assyrian Periods 1), Toronto 1987 will be quoted as Grayson, RIMA 1.
Our reconstruction of the compositional techniques must be effected from "within" the texts themselves, since little or no actual information is available, for instance via royal letters or else. We will focus especially on the matter regarding military feats, which are the areas of enhanced editorial intervention. Thus we will analyse and discuss such features as alterations in the ordering of military campaigns, transpositions of the same, telescoping of more campaigns in one, etc. This kind of analysis presupposes using inscriptions which are fairly complete, or that at least allow us to identify a great part of their structure. We will also analyse variations on the level of words and phrases, with reference to the so-called "analysis of variants." This procedure, consisting in close comparisons of parallel passages from different inscriptions, which proves particularly fruitful when the diachronical sequence of the inscriptions themselves is known.\(^4\)

The standard reference book for the study of Assyrian historical writing is still Olmstead's *Assyrian Historiography*, published in 1916. It may be supplemented by a couple of recent general introductions to the genre of Mesopotamian royal inscriptions, i.e. an article by Grayson\(^5\) and a contribution to the *Reallexikon* by J. Renger\(^6\). Because of their brevity, these studies limit themselves to a general synchronical survey of the subject, and do not carry discussion in the depth to the level of single inscriptions, or even of single reigns.

As far as the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser I are concerned, Olmstead's work is decidedly outdated, since it was written before the publication of most of the summary texts. A recent and detailed examination of the royal texts of this age can be found in Borger, EAK 1. Together with its companion volume by W. Schramm, it represents, generally speaking, the most detailed analysis available for the inscriptions of each reign, down to the period of Tiglath-pileser III. However, these works are mainly intended as a bibliographical introduction to the texts, and even if they gather a good deal of information on the compositional practices, in many cases this information is left undiscussed, and thus proves difficult to use.

Apart from these studies, and the useful but very brief remarks prefixed to Grayson's edition of the texts in RIMA, we can only count on a couple of succinct

---

\(^4\) Such comparisons have been rarely undertaken (e.g. by Brinkman, PHPKB, 390 ff.), until M. Liverani demonstrated their usefulness in a paper read at the Cetona symposium in 1980, and published as "Critique of Variants and the Titulary of Sennacherib," in F.M. Fales (Ed.), *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons (Orientis Antiqui Collectio 17)*, Roma 1981 (henceforth ARINH), pp. 225-257. My chart on p. 94 ff. below has many affinities with what Levine calls "fixed format score", see L.D. Levine, "Manuscripts, Texts, and the Study of the Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions", in ARINH, especially pp. 65 ff.

\(^5\) A.K. Grayson, "Assyria and Babylonia [Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East]", OrNS 49 (1980), pp. 149-159 (= Grayson, Or 49); see also id., "Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: Literary Characteristics", in ARINH, pp. 35-47.

articles by H. Tadmor dealing with topics of a more general nature, but going in detail on some aspects concerning the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser I 7.

A fair number of studies, in recent years, has been devoted to the examination of the whole corpus of the Assyrian royal inscriptions, from the point of view of specific constitutive elements, or of certain topical subjects. For instance, the royal titulary has been surveyed by Barbara Cifola 8, while the use of numbers and quantifications has been dealt with in a work of mine 9. Thus we may recall also Sylvie Lackenbacher’s analysis of the building inscriptions (including those appended to the annalistic or summary texts) 10, and Oded’s examination of the Assyrian royal inscriptions from the point of view of the “justifications for war” 11. A small number of works on certain literary motifs have also appeared 12. All these studies are often interesting from the point of view of the study of editorial practices, since the conclusions which are drawn may extend beyond the specific topics examined, allowing to identify certain factors of variation and permutation having a general value.

However, the limit of this approach lies in the fact that it implies, in one way or another, the virtual dissection of the texts under examination. Depending on the studied subject, the relevant sections or passages are selected and analysed, ignoring, in many cases, “the rest” of the inscription, which is, in a figurative sense, thrown out of the window. On the other hand, to undertake a global discussion of the inscriptions (i.e., the literary, historical, etc. contexts) before every quoted passage would be impractical—and hardly useful—in most cases.

Indeed, royal inscriptions as self-contained and unitary texts have also been taken into consideration, but in the main discussion is limited to a single inscription, which

8) B. Cifola, Analysis of Variants in the Assyrian Royal Titulary from the Origins to Tiglath-pileser III, Napoli 1995 (= Cifola, Royal Titulary). For obvious reasons, the bibliographical references henceforth given, concerning the contributions to the study of Assyrian editing as a whole, will be extremely selective and limited to the last 20-25 years only.
9) M. De Odorico, The Use of Numbers and Quantifications in the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions (State Archives of Assyria Studies 3), Helsinki 1995 (= De Odorico, Numbers).
11) B. Oded, War, Peace and Empire, Wiesbaden 1992, to be followed by a further study (cf. preface).
is analysed from the literary\textsuperscript{13}, ideological\textsuperscript{14}, or historical/geographical\textsuperscript{15} point of view. The reconstruction of the compositional history of particular inscriptions has also been tackled, as in the case of Sargon's account of the eighth campaign, a text which has drawn much attention because of its peculiarities and of its outstanding literary qualities\textsuperscript{16}.

But the study of editorial practices on the level of single reigns is probably the most profitable, even if it has not received particular attention. We may record a couple of doctoral dissertations, which however are as yet unpublished\textsuperscript{17}, and a small number of shorter studies on the compositional characteristics of the inscriptions of some Neo-Assyrian kings, such as Adad-narari III\textsuperscript{18}, Sennacherib\textsuperscript{19} or, especially, Ashurbanipal\textsuperscript{20}. Some of these analyses were carried out on the occasion of epigraphical/philological works aiming at improving the reconstruction or edition of certain inscriptions\textsuperscript{21}.

In all these cases the period taken into consideration ranges from the reign of Ashurnasirpal II to that of Ashurbanipal. This is quite surprising, if one thinks that, as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} E.g. R. Gelio, "Caratterizzazione ideologica e politica del cilindro Rassam", «Vicino Oriente» 1 (1978), pp. 47-63.
\item \textsuperscript{16} See recently F.M. Fales, "Narrative and Ideological Variations in the Account of Sargon’s Eighth Campaign", in M. Cogan - I. Eph’al (Eds.), \textit{Ah, Assyria ... Studies (...) Presented to Hayim Tadmor}, Jerusalem 1991, pp. 129-147.
\item \textsuperscript{17} I know only of P.D. Gerardi, \textit{Assurbanipal's Elamite Campaigns, a Literary and Political Study} (Pennsylvania 1987) and T.J. Schneider, \textit{A New Analysis of the Royal Annals of Shalmaneser III} (Pennsylvania 1991).
\item \textsuperscript{18} H. Tadmor, "The Historical Inscriptions of Adad-nirari III", \textit{Iraq} 35 (1973), pp. 141-150.
\item \textsuperscript{19} E.g. L.D. Levine, "The Second Campaign of Sennacherib", JNES 32 (1973), pp. 312-317.
\item \textsuperscript{21} E.g. W. de Filippi, \textit{The Royal Inscriptions of Aššur-nāṣir-apli II, «Assur» 1/7} 1977; L.D. Levine, "Preliminary Remarks on the Historical Inscriptions of Sennacherib", in H. Tadmor - M. Weinfeld (Eds.), \textit{History, Historiography and Interpretation}, Jerusalem 1983, pp. 58-75 (see also fn. 4 above). The recently appeared edition of Tiglath-pileser III’s inscriptions by H. Tadmor (Jerusalem 1994) is very attentive to the compositional aspects.
\end{itemize}
remarked above, we can count on good editions of all the royal inscriptions down to the early Neo-Assyrian period, while, in most cases, this is not the case with later reigns. Apparently, this is due to the fact that literary, historical, or other “secondary” analyses are frequently occasioned by epigraphical or philological works on the texts (i.e., the “primary” work).

A word on the classification of texts is called for. The purpose of this study is not to review our current classification\(^{22}\): in case, this task should be carried out in a second moment, as a result of the analysis of the editorial practices. It is generally obvious, however, that there are not a few problems with the extant classification of the texts and the terminology consequently employed for them. It would be too easy to observe how often even the most common definitions (annals, annalistic, summary or display inscription, etc.) are used in a rather approximate and inconsistent way. At times, the designation “annalistic,” or even “annals,” is applied to texts that are not annalistic at all. Thus, also the use of the term “display inscription” is quite unsatisfactory, since it is used to indicate conspicuously different texts, in which a record of the military campaigns of the reign may or may not be included, which are inscribed on a wide variety of objects (clay tablets, stone slabs, bricks, etc.), often also implying different formats (length of lines, subdivision into paragraphs, etc.)\(^{23}\). In sum, this term ends up by indicating any text which is not an annal, a letter to the god, a dedicatory inscription or a label (i.e., those texts which belong to fairly uniform categories).

In any case, in this work the term “annalistic” will be used in a very restrictive sense. It will be applied to texts subdivided according to year of reigns, or to passages including the events of a single year (i.e. not telescoping the events of different years) and separated from the previous and subsequent passages by means of a horizontal ruling or a clear textual indication (such as the reference to the beginning of a new campaign). Following Tadmor, “summary text” will be preferred to the more common definition “display” inscription, which is rather inaccurate and misleading, to indicate a text or passage summarizing the events of several years without clear chronological demarcactions. A better definition of these two terms (annals and summary texts) is not necessary, nor possible, for the moment.

---

\(^{22}\) See fn. 5 above.

\(^{23}\) The subject of physical form of the inscriptions is, generally speaking, far underestimated. Such subject has (or should have) a conspicuous importance in the discussions concerning for instance royal propaganda, communication, etc.: see D. Morandi, “Stele e statue reali assire: localizzazione, diffusione e implicazioni ideologiche”, «Mesopotamia» 23 (1988), pp. 105-155.
A Brief Survey of the Royal Inscriptions of the Middle-Assyrian Period

Annalistic and summary texts are part of a much larger category: commemorative inscriptions, or, specifically, building inscriptions. In fact, during the old and middle Assyrian periods, most of the longer texts were composed by an introductory section, including the royal epithets, and a building account. At the time of Adad-narârî I (1305-1274), the first detailed military narration appears, inserted between the two mentioned section. The narrative concerns the conquest of the city of Ta'idu, and its inclusion may be explained on the basis of the building account, which describes work on that site, situated on the North-West of Assyria.

In a later text of Shalmaneser I (1273-1244) the military narration was moved within the epithet section. It is introduced by a temporal clause, "when ...," and the remainder of the subject (the epithets) resumes at the end of the military narration. In any case, the passage describes the accession year campaign to Urua'tri, and a number of later campaigns which, however, are not dated, nor clearly subdivided.

His son Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207) also made use of this clumsy arrangement in one of his earliest inscriptions, but in some later texts the military narration was returned to the older position, that is after the epithet section. Also in the inscriptions of this king the sole chronological marker is the mention of the year of accession appearing at the beginning of the narration. As all of the subsequent events are linked by a series of vague references (such as ina ūmēšuma, "then," or ina šattima šištî, "in that year"), one draws the impression that they occurred within one single year. Apparently, this artifice was consciously devised by the author in order to convey the message that all the military feats of the king took place within the first year of reign, disregarding the actual chronology of events.

Tiglath-pileser I

There is very little textual material for the following century, until the reign of Tiglath-pileser I (1114-1076), and no military account is recorded. The age of Tiglath-pileser I, instead, is characterized by an intense scribal activity. His royal inscriptions make up an outstanding corpus for number, variety and length of texts. They show several analogies with those of his predecessors, but also some important...
innovations, especially from the point of view of the form and composition of texts. A remarkable case is that of his fifth year annals, the first known example of this literary genre in Assyria\textsuperscript{32}. Also very important in the evolution of Assyrian royal inscriptions are his later summary texts, which give an updated but heavily condensed record of the events of the reign, arranged in a more or less accurate chronological order. All these texts will become a (direct or indirect) model for the texts of his successors, down almost to the times of the Sargonids\textsuperscript{33}. This fact is most evident in the case of Aššur-bēl-kala, whose inscriptions closely resemble those of his father Tiglath-pileser I\textsuperscript{34}.

Tiglath-pileser's royal inscriptions have been recently re-edited by Grayson in the second volume of the RIMA series. He singled out the various versions of the annalistic and the summary texts, distinguishing between those originating in Assur and the Ninevite ones. The basic characteristics of these texts are summarized in chart 1.

**Chart 1: Annalistic and Summary Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>EXS.</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assur, Nineveh(?)</td>
<td>c. prism</td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>annals (up to 5th year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nineveh(?), Assur</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>annals (up to 10th year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assur</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>summary (later than 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assur</td>
<td>c. tab. *</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>summary (later than 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assur</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fragm., similar to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Assur</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td></td>
<td>fragm., very little is preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>similar to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>similar to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fragm., otherwise unknown campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>c. tab.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fragm., similar to 2-4 and 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>s. prism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fragm., very little is preserved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

exs. = exemplars (see commentaries to each text in Grayson, RIMA 2)
c. = clay, s. = stone, * mostly clay tablets, but there are also three stone tablets and one prism fragment.

\textsuperscript{32} See e.g. Borger, EAK 1, 112 ff.; Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 6; Tadmor, St. Finkelstein, 209. The following discussion focuses on the development of the annals and their relation to the summary inscriptions rather than their origin. No comprehensive study concerning the origin of the annals has yet been conducted: consult provisionally Tadmor, St. Finkelstein, pp. 209 ff.

\textsuperscript{33} For some indications see e.g. Tadmor, St. Finkelstein, p. 209; Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 7; Cifola, Royal Titulary, p. 84; De Odorico, Numbers, pp. 144 ff., fns. 138, 140 and 147.

\textsuperscript{34} To the point that Aššur-bēl-kala “broken obelisk” was originally credited to his father — cf. Borger, EAK 1, p. 135 and Brinkman, PHPKB, p. 383 for its definitive attribution to Aššur-bēl-kala.
We will follow RIMA’s numeration, and therefore Tiglath-pileser’s so-called “fifth year annals”, or text A.0.87.1, will be referred to as “text 1” and so on. Texts will be examined according to the hypothetical chronological order 1, 2, 3 and 4/10/11. Texts 5 to 9 and 12 ff. will be left out from our discussion since they are too fragmentary: the structure of a couple of them will be briefly commented afterwards.

**Texts 1 and 2**

Text 1, written on 8-sided prisms, is subdivided into paragraphs by horizontal lines, and most of exs. agree on the number and the subdivision of paragraphs, with few exceptions — for instance, each of the six military campaigns recorded on these annals consists of a number of paragraphs ranging from one to seven. The campaigns are easily identifiable on the basis of formal clues: the first one is introduced by *ina šurrū šarrūtija*, “in my accession year,” while afterwards the beginning of any new campaign is indicated by a short paragraph repeating the king’s name with a selection of his epithets, such as, for instance, “Tiglath-pileser, strong king, snare for the insubmissive, overcomer in battle with criminals”. Each of these passages is different, while no relation between the chosen epithets and the contents of the relevant campaign narrative is apparent.

The attribution of the six campaigns to the accession year and the first five regnal years is based on a statement included in the first paragraph of the “summary of conquests” section:

> “Altogether I conquered 42 lands and their rulers from the other side of the Lower Zab in distant mountainous regions to the other side of the Euphrates, people of Ḫatti, and the Upper Sea in the west — from my accession year to my fifth regnal year.”

Details on the contents of text 1 are summarized in the following chart, together with some statistics.

---

35) See Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 12.
36) Cf. also the remarks of Tadmor, ARINH, pp. 18 f.
37) Note that some exs. show a slightly different line arrangement, employing a few more or a few less lines for certain paragraphs (see e.g. text 2 ex. 1 in Winckler, SKT 1, 27: cf. also next fn.); however, I think it is still advisable to use the number of lines for rough estimates and comparisons.
**CHART 2: ANNALISTIC TEXTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Text 1 passage</th>
<th>nr of lines</th>
<th>Text 2 passage</th>
<th>nr of lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name, titles, epithets</td>
<td>i 1-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divine charge</td>
<td>i 46-61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genealogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acc.) Mušku name, epithets</td>
<td>i 62 - ii 84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii 85-88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1st) Šubaru name, epithets</td>
<td>ii 89 - iii 31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii 32-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2nd) Paphû/Lullumu name, epithets</td>
<td>iii 35 - iv 39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv 40-42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3rd) Na'iri name, epithets</td>
<td>iv 43 - v 41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v 42-43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4th) Aramaeans name, epithets</td>
<td>v 44-63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v 64-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5th) Qumanû name, epithets</td>
<td>v 67 - vi 38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?) campaign(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37-4'</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5'-8'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(summary) conquests name, epithets</td>
<td>vi 39-54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi 55-57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi 58-84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(summary) building name, epithets</td>
<td>vi 85 - vii 35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9('?)</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii 36-41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9('?)</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii 42-59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii 60 - viii 49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building account blessings</td>
<td>viii 50-62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii 63-88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii 89-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunting deeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genealogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A later version of Tiglath-pileser’s annals is represented by text 2, which is also taken into account in the above chart. Its first three paragraphs, consisting of royal titulary and epithets, are closely similar to the corresponding ones of text 1, which also includes a fourth paragraph, lines i 46-61, concerning the divine charge. Further on, we find the royal genealogy, which has been moved to the end of the titulary, and after that a very concise narrative of the military events of the reign. The first six paragraphs of this section correspond to the six campaigns recorded in text 1 — thus,
it is clear that each paragraph represents a year of reign and that no. 2 is an annalistic
text, even if the campaigns are not dated in any manner, and there is no inner clue
telling us that the chronological order was respected\textsuperscript{38}. While length of paragraphs in
text 1 is decidedly uneven, text 2 has consistent short paragraphs. It is clearly observ­
able that the campaign to Qumānu was given, in the new text, a proportionally bigger
space: it takes up 7 lines, instead of 2 or 3 as the other campaigns, and its paragraph
appears to be the longest preserved.

The next paragraph or two, which originally probably recorded some other cam­
paign(s), are exceedingly fragmentary for interpretation. The obverse of the text lets
us identify only two passages: the “summary of conquests,” which echoes that of text
1, and the final blessing formulae. Within these two paragraphs, a passage summariz­
ing the building activities of the king, with the gathering of animals and equipment,
etc. and a building account must have appeared\textsuperscript{39}.

The first part of the “summary of conquests” is very similar to that of text 1,
quoted here above, except that it reads “to my tenth regnal year” (the number of lands
is broken) — thus A.0.87.2 can be conjecturally dated to the 11th year of reign\textsuperscript{40}. The
second paragraph of the “summary of conquests” of text 1 apparently makes refer­
ence to some minor campaign (e.g. the campaigns against the Aramaeans mentioned
in the later summary texts — see below):

“(This) is apart from the numerous foreign campaigns which do not appear
in the (account of) my victories (and) upon which I pursued my enemies by
chariot in favourable terrain and on foot in rough terrain. I prevented the
enemies from setting foot in my land.”

No such passage appears in the new text, which instead completes the “summary
of conquests” with the following statement:

“[To Assyria I] added [land and to its people I] added [people]. I provided
[them] with a secure abode.”

which was probably meant as a replacement for the “divine charge” appearing on the
introductory section of text 1 (i 46-61):

“The god Aššur (and) the great gods who magnify my sovereignty, who
granted as my lot power and strength, commanded me to extend the border

\textsuperscript{38} Note, however, that ex. 2 has no dividing rule after line 22, that is between the campaigns to Šubaru
and to Paphû/Lulhumu: see copies in King, AKA, p. 117; Winckler, SKT 1, 28, and 3 R, 5 no. 2.
\textsuperscript{39} Cf. Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 32b. That a “summary of building activities” directly follows the “summary
of conquests” is almost certain: compare 9’ with A.0.87.1, vi 86. Thus, no hunting report was apparently
recorded in text 2.
\textsuperscript{40} Thus Borger, EAK 1, p. 116.
of their land. They placed in my hands their mighty weapons, deluge in battle. I gained control over lands, mountains, towns, and princes who were hostile to Aššur and I subdued their districts. I vied with sixty crowned heads and achieved victory over them in battle. I have neither rival in strife nor equal in conflict. I added territory to Assyria (and) people to its population. I extended the border of my land and ruled over all their lands.”

**Campaign narrative of texts 1 and 2**

Despite the drastical shortening of the annalistic narrative\(^\text{41}\) in the later text, a comparison between text 1 and 2 may be undertaken. In the course of the analysis, for practical reasons, text 2 will be considered as directly deriving from the earlier one, even if this might not actually be the case.

Disregarding the chronological order of campaigns, we will begin with the campaign to Na'iri of the 3rd year, since it requires a more complex analysis — for the same reason we will also postpone that of Pāphū (2nd year) to the end of discussion.

Text 1, after listing the names of 16 mountains crossed on the way to the lands Na'iri, specifies the names of the enemy lands\(^\text{42}\):

“The king of the land Tummu, the king of the land Tunubu (… other 20 kings follow …) the king of the land Daîênu, altogether 23 kings of the lands Na'iri combined their chariotry and army in their lands (and) advanced to wage war, strife, and combat.”

Then, a lengthy description of the fight and of its issues is given, which we may subdivide into eighteen sections to ease referencing:

1) “With the onslaught of my fierce weapons I approached them (and) destroyed their extensive army like a storm of the god Adad”.
2) “I laid out like grain heaps the corpses of their warriors in the open country, the plains of the mountains, and the environs of their cities”.
3) “I seized in battle 120 of their chariots with equipment”.
4) “Sixty kings of the lands Na'iri, including those who had come to their aid, I chased at arrowpoint as far as the upper sea”.
5) “I conquered their great towns”.
6) “I brought out their booty, possessions, (and) property”.
7) “I burnt, razed, (and) destroyed their cities (and) I turned them into ruin hills”.

\(^{41}\) For an examination of the titulary and the genealogy of Tiglath-pileser I see Cifola, *Royal Titulary*, pp. 62 ff.

\(^{42}\) Translation is largely based on Grayson, RIMA 2, pp. 21 ff.; see lines iv 71b-87a and iv 87b - v 41 for the two quoted passages.
8) “I brought back extensive herds of horses, mules, (and) donkeys — the livestock of their pastures — without number”.
9) “I captured all of the kings of the lands Na'iri alive”.
10) “I had mercy on those kings and spared their lives”.
11) “I released them from their bonds and fetters in the presence of the god Šamaš, my lord, and made them swear by my great gods an oath of eternal vassaldom”.
12) “I took their natural, royal, sons as hostages”.
13) “I imposed upon them a tribute (madattu) of 1,200 horses (and) 2,000 cattle”.
14) “I allowed them to return to their lands”.
15) “I brought Sēni, king of the land Daiēnu, who had not been submissive to the god Aššur, my lord, in bonds and fetters to my city Aššur”.
16) “I had mercy on him and let him leave my city Aššur alive in order to proclaim the glory of the great gods”.
17) “I became lord of the vast lands of Na'iri in their entirety”.
18) “Indeed all their kings I subdued”.

The report of an expedition to the city Milidia of Ḫanigalbat closes the campaign. In text 2 the campaign is described in a much more succinct way (lines 25-27):

“[With the support of the god Aššur], my lord, I conquered the extensive lands Na'iri from the land Tummu to the land Daiēnu and the Upper Sea [in the west]. I subdued 30 of their kings. Like oxen I attached to their noses ropes (and) took them to my city [Aššur]. I took hostages from them. I imposed upon them tribute and impost (biltu u tamartu).”

Although the differences between the two accounts are noticeable, it is obvious that the same campaign is described, since text 2 respects the chronological succession of campaigns. It must also be considered that later texts (nos. 3, 4, 10 and 11, for which see below) openly declare that three expeditions against Na'iri had occurred.

The listing of the 23 lands is here replaced by the indication of the extreme borders of Na'iri, i.e. the first and the last item of the list43. No reference to the fight and the killings (see above sub 1, 2 and 4), the looting (3, 6 and 8) and the destruction of cities (5 and 7) is made; rather, the stress is laid on the lasting issues of the campaign: subjugation (above, 17-18), punishment of the enemy (15), deportation (12) and imposition of tribute (13). Imposition of tribute is a “definitive” event, and tribute is destined to be repeatedly received in the future, while booty is obtained only once. Likewise, any reference to having allowed the kings to return to their lands (14) or to the releasing of hostages (10-11, 16) is left out from the new version.

43) As it has been frequently noted (e.g. by Borger, EAK 1, p. 115), the enemy kings now become 30 instead of 23 or 60: see my comments in Numbers, pp. 92 f. and 139.
Thus, the campaign of the accession year to Mušku was subjected to a similar editing. Text 2 (lines 18-20) only mentions the deportation of the defeated enemies and the enlargement of the land, ignoring killings, looting and destructions which are repeatedly described in text 1:

“ [...] my father, with the support of the god Aššur, my lord, [I defeated] 12,000 troops of the extensive Mušku. [The remaining] troops I uprooted (and) brought down into my land. (Thus) I became lord of [the entire land of the Mušku] (and) added (it) to the borders of my land.”

It is unnecessary to quote the whole Mušku campaign of text 1, suffice it to remark that no deportation is recorded. The king speaks of the defeat inflicted upon 20,000 men-at-arms and five kings of Mušku, and states that the remaining 6,000 troops who had fled and submitted to him were regarded as people of his land. Later on, a booty, including also wives, sons and clan, was taken from Kili-Tešub, and, similarly, the sons and family of Šadi-Tešub of the city Urratinaš were taken as hostages. On that occasion, the enemy king also paid a tribute, which also included 120 men. Apart from these cases, no deportation or imposition of tribute are recorded.

It is quite unlikely that the Mušku, which were reckoned as people of Assyria some 10 years before, had been deported in the meantime, and that the new text had accounted for the changed situation. It is easier to surmise that they had been “transformed” into deportees in obedience to the new editorial policy which is at work on the new text. It required, as we have seen, to record permanent solutions: subjects may rebel, while deportees never do, as they are integrated and eventually absorbed by the homeland population.

This artifice was not necessary for the subsequent campaign to Šubaru. The laconic account of text 2 (lines 21-22) clearly derives from that of text 1:

“I subdued [the rebellious and] insubmissive [Šubaru]. I took 4,000 Urumu (and) Abešlû, [insubmissive] troops of Ḫatti, (and) regarded them as people of my [land].”

Text 1 actually speaks of “4,000 Kasku (and) Urumu, insubmissive troops of Ḫatti” and, to explain this discrepancy, it has been suggested that Kasku and Abešlû are equivalents and thus the latter denomination would have replaced the former in this period 44. We may accept this explanation, since it is not possible to discuss here the geographical implications of the terms “Kasku” and “Abešlû,” which rarely occur in the cuneiform literature of this age 45.

44) See Nashef, RGTC 5, p. 2.
45) Kaskaja appears only on text 1 (Nashef, RGTC 5, p. 162), but there are several other occurrences in texts from earlier or later reigns (cf. E. von Schuler, Die Kaškāer, Berlin 1965; RIA 5, pp. 460 ff.). Abešlû, instead, is known only from text 2 and the later summary texts of Tiglath-pileser I.
Concerning the outcome of the campaign, text 1 states that

“They submitted to me. I took them, together with their property and 120 chariots (and) harnessed horses, and regarded them as people of my land.”

There is hardly any doubt that a deportation is described, and not a simple reckoning of subject people, since the chariots and the horses were obviously destined to be taken to Assyria. Skipping the campaigns to Na'īri and Paphû/Lullumu, which will be discussed later on, next we find, in text 2, the campaign against the Aramaeans, which occurred in the 4th year. The account parallels some passages of the relevant paragraph of text 1, and records also booty and conquest of cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT 1</th>
<th>TEXT 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“With the support of the god Aššur, my lord, I took my chariots and warriors (and) set off for the desert. I marched against the ahlamû-Aramaean, enemies of the god Aššur, my lord.”</td>
<td>“[The ahlamû-Aramaean (?)]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I plundered from the edge of the land Suḫu to the city Carchemish of the land Ḫatti in a single day.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I massacred them (and) carried back their booty, possessions, and goods without number. The rest of their troops, who fled from the weapons of the god Aššur, my lord, crossed the Euphrates.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I crossed the Euphrates after them in rafts (made of inflated) goatskins.”</td>
<td>“I conquered six of their cities at the foot of Mount Bešri.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“burnt, razed, (and) destroyed (them)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I brought their booty, possessions, and goods to my city Aššur.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the campaign against the Qumānu, it appears that some parts of the account of text 2 have no parallel in text 1. The earlier account is exceedingly long to

---

46) Leqû, “to take,” is not employed in connection with the above mentioned 6,000 troops of Mušku which were reckoned as subjects of Assyria. Leqû is also employed in the case of the hostages deported from Na’īri.
be quoted here in full, and we must limit ourselves to a short summary of its contents, following the original subdivision into four paragraphs:

A) (v 67-81): the land Mušri is conquered and their cities are destroyed — the Qumānu come to the aid of the land Mušri — they are defeated and confined into the city Arinu — they submit and the city is spared — hostages and tribute are imposed.

B) (v 82-98): 20,000 troops of the Qumānu are defeated at Mount Tala — pursuit of the fugitives — slaughter — destruction of towns, which are turned into ruin hills.

C) (v 99 - vi 21): “I overwhelmed the city Ḫunusu, their fortified city, (so that it looked) like a ruin hill (created by) the deluge” — defeat of its army — slaughter — destruction of the town: “I turned (it) into a ruin hill and strewed šipu-stones over it”.

D) (vi 22-38): the city Kipšuna is surrounded — the king of the Qumānu submits — the city is spared — its wall and towers are destroyed and turned into a ruin hill — 300 families of rebels are deported — hostages are taken — tribute is imposed, larger than before — “(Thus) I conquered completely the extensive Qumānu (and) subdued (them)’’.

The comparison with the relevant paragraph of text 2 is quite difficult because of the many breaks. We may subdivide it into five units for reasons of clarity:

1) “[... the Qumānu as far as the land Mebru I conquered”.

2) “I overwhelmed the city Ḫunusu, [their fortified city], turned (it) into a ruin hill, and strewed šipu-stones over it”.

3) “[... Kipšuna(?)] their great royal [city] like a flood [I passed through] (and) turned (it) into a ruin hill”.

4) “When the goddess Istar [...] to my city [Aššur [...] the Kir(?)mau who relied upon force and violence [...] with [...] and siege engines I conquered it. 2,000 of their captives [...] them”.

5) “20,000 troops of the [extensive] Qumānu, which I had defeated, I uprooted] (and) brought down [into] my land, above and below”.

Unit 1 includes only a generic statement, which may be associated either with paragraphs A, B or (more easily) with § D of text 1 (which does not mention the land Mebru at all). Unit 2 brings to § C, which twice reminds that Ḫunusu was reduced to a hill of ruins. Unit 3, if we put Kipšuna in the lacuna, may correspond to § D, while unit 4 has no parallel in the older text. Unit 5, instead, refers to events recorded in § B, but —apparently— it also mentions a deportation which should be associated to § D. The situation is, thus, rather complex. One explanation for these discrepancies might be that the older text recorded a somewhat provisional report of the campaign, which, presumably, was just over. We could thus explain the passage about the Kir(?)mau and the deportation of the 2,000 captives as an expedition taking place during the return march. This may also work with the 20,000 Qumānu deportees — even if I would be sceptical in this case, since defeated enemies were quite easily
transformed into deportees in text 2, as we saw. The idea of the “provisional report” is, however, difficult to accept\(^47\). I would also exclude the possibility that in text 2 the report of some other campaign has been condensed with that of the 5th year, for reasons which will be explained below. Thus, it appears quite likely that the editor responsible for the production of the concise version to be used in text 2 made a very liberal use of the information available to him.

In any case, the preference, on the part of the editor of the new text, for the narration of deportations may be confirmed. Tribute and killings have again been left out, but not the destruction of cities. We may also notice that the report of the campaign is here given, apparently, in reverse order, starting with the very last statement of the account of text 1.

In the case of the campaign to Paphû/Lullumu, no deportation is recorded on the new text. Rather, it favours the donation of 25 (statues of) gods to the Assyrian deities:

“...I conquered the entire land of the Lullumu. I gave 25 of their gods [to the deities Ninlil, Anu, Adad, and the Assyrian Istar], the gods of my city Aššur and the goddesses of my land. I gave [their] property to the god Adad, my lord.”

Text 1 clearly indicates “the land Ḫaria and the army of the extensive lands Paphû” as the objective of the campaign (see lines iii 36 ff.), and here again the replacement of that term with Lullumu, a toponym which is never mentioned in the older text is hard to explain (the possibility that not the campaign to Papḫû but a different one to Lullumu was meant has to be ruled out, since the episode of the 25 gods is too singular). The account of text 1 goes on with a lengthy narration of conquests, destructions and slaughters, recording also imposed tribute\(^48\) but, apparently, no deportations\(^49\). According to the last two paragraphs of that campaign, the Assyrians “marched to the land Sugu of the land Ḫabḫu,” and, after defeating 6,000

---

\(^47\) Text 12 (see below p. 111) possibly records an alternate version of the Qumanu campaign and a later (?) campaign to Lullumu, but no deportation nor any Kirmu is there mentioned. Note also how text 3 ignored the first campaign to Karduniš and the expedition to Suḫu, which had already occurred by the time of its composition, and how an account of those wars only appeared after they came to a close, that is at the time of text 4 (below p.951).

\(^48\) iii 72, 89 f., iv 29 f.

\(^49\) If we except šallāssunu aššū or ušēšu, which occur in iii 62 f., 81 f., iv 2 f. and 23 f. It is difficult to decide if these wordings refer to the capture of human beings, or to that of property and livestock, or both (see B. Oded, Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire, Wiesbaden 1979, p. 7).
troops belonging to a coalition of lands "of the extensive Paphû," took the 25 gods from the land Sugu:

"I conquered the entire land of Sugu. I brought out 25 of their gods, their booty, their possessions, (and) their property. I burnt, razed, (and) destroyed all of their cities. The remainder of their troops submitted to me (and) I had mercy on them. I imposed upon them tribute and impost (and) regarded them as vassals of the god Aššur, my lord."

The last paragraph (iv 32-39) reports how the 25 gods were donated to the Assyrian deities, Ninlil, Anu, Adad, and the Assyrian Istar.

The explanation for the replacement Paphû vs. Lullumu might lie, given the geographical proximity/overlap of those lands, on the ideological connotations of these two toponyms. In other words, we should know what each of these terms was supposed to mean, in the editor's eyes, for the supposed audience of the text. In any case, remaining on the level of editorial procedures, it would seem that the scribe responsible for the production of the new text did not even try to summarize all the events related by the older version, probably because they seemed quite unimportant to him. He therefore limited himself to recount the event of the 25 gods, i.e. the last episode recorded in the older campaign narrative, which had a conspicuous symbolic value. We already noticed how the editor of text 2 regularly picks up the last portions of the older campaign narrative: see the comments on the campaign against the Qumânu and the discussion on the campaign to Nâ'iri above. I would then hazard the hypothesis that the editor, who was, evidently, well aware of the fact that the "gist" of each campaign appeared at the end of the account, working hastily—or lazily—went directly to the last paragraph of the account, finding the passage on the 25 gods. Since this was a worthy representative of the whole matter, he decided to pick up the above quoted passage, recording the capture of the gods. But, the land Sugu, which appeared there, was almost unknown to him, and therefore to the potential readers of the text as well. Thus, he replaced mât Sugi ana siḫriša aḫšud (= line 22 of the older account) with mât Lullumē ana siḫriša aḫšud. In this way, he overlooked the first occurrence of the toponym, where it appears as mât Sugi ša mât Ḥabḫi (text 1, iv 8). The choice of the recurrent Lullumu, which indicated	

50) "The entire land Lullumu" is a rather generic indication, covering a large entity. Lullumu indicates the area between the Diyala and the lower Zab (cf. H. Klenge in RIA 7, pp. 164 ff.). For Paphû, see Nashef, RGTC 5, pp. 190 ff.
51) It is known to us only from the passage under discussion: see Nashef, RGTC 5, p. 235 (see also next fn.).
52) Since no other toponym of the same name is known, this expression has to be interpreted as an help to the reader to identify the location of Sugu, and not as a discrimination between two Sugus. Ḥabḫi is of difficult localisation; the denomination, in any case, covered a quite large area: see Liverani, Asn., pp. 25 ff.; Salvini, Nairi e Ur(na)tri, pp. 81 ff. (for Sugu cf. ibid., pp. 29 ff.).
modo the relevant area, can be easily explained: the Lullu(mu) were long-known enemies of the Mesopotamian populations, since the times of the dynasty of Akkad\textsuperscript{53}, and thus they represented an easily identifiable geographic and ideological referent.

This solution, besides implying that the editor of the new text treated the source(s) available to him in a very cavalier way, does not explain everything, e.g. why he did not pay attention to (if not for simple laziness) the lands Papḫū, thrice mentioned in the older account, and Ḫabḫu, which must have been well known to him, and therefore may have represented a better replacement for Sugu.

Then, to complete the new version of the campaign, he took up a short statement of text 1, “at that time I gave that copper to the god Adad, who loves me” (iv 5-6), referring to a booty taken in the city of Murattaš, which he found immediately before the episode concerning Sugu, replacing “the copper” with “the properties of the Lullumu.” Thus, again the facts are given, in the new text, in reverse order.

\textit{On the nature of text 2}

The numerous differences we found in the narrative of texts 1 and 2, and the use of different geographical names, let it arise a legitimate question, that is, whether text 2 is a genuine annalistic text, recording campaigns arranged in chronological order, or rather it represents a kind of summary text which groups events according to geographical principles or to some other rule of association.

I believe that text 2 was meant as a chronologically ordered collection of the events. We saw that the “summary of conquests” paragraph is very similar to that of text 1, and that it clearly states that the narration covers 10 regnal years: such a passage is known only from these two texts, and clearly points to a chronological rather than a geographical arrangement of the contents. We also observed that each ex. of text 2 clearly subdivides the narrative into paragraphs, each corresponding to one successive campaign of text 1, with one exception only (see fn. 38 above), and that nowhere text 2 states that more than one campaign against a certain land occurred, as happens in the later summary texts in connection to the campaigns to Na\textsuperscript{2}iri. In these texts, as we will see below, the Aramaean wars are summarized in a paragraph recalling that the Euphrates was crossed 28 times, which indicates 28 different campaigns\textsuperscript{54}. Now, in text 2, the report on the campaign of the 4th year shows no deviation from that of text 1, except for the necessary shortenings. If other campaigns against the Aramaeans had occurred in the meantime, which is very likely the case, one would have expected that passage to be “updated” in some way\textsuperscript{55}. Similarly, in case a geographical arrangement of the narrative is to be supposed, the

\textsuperscript{53} See e.g. H. Klengel in RIA 7, pp. 164 ff.; Salvini, \textit{Nairi e Ur(u)atri}, p. 17 fn. 17.
\textsuperscript{54} See fn. 82 below.
\textsuperscript{55} Possibly, some other Aramaean campaign(s) once appeared in the broken sections of the text.
campaign to Qumānu (5th year) would have been merged to that of Lullumu/Paphû (2nd year), as in the later texts.

Thus, the many differences in the accounts of the two annalistic texts of this reign are not due to the intent of adding new facts, but are the result of precise ideological conditionings which demanded the “improvement” of the earlier version.

In sum, text 2 gives an annalistic record of the military events of the reign, abridged in accordance to the new tablet format, which replaced the prism. Apart from the shortenings, the narrative was revised laying the stress on the consequences of campaigns, i.e. tribute and deportations. This is not the case, however, with the Qumānu and Aramaean campaigns, possibly because they did not bear truly definitive results. The report of the campaign against the Aramaeans, in particular, was left almost intact, and not “improved,” since the Aramaeans were a still open problem\(^56\), as we will see in connection with the later summary texts. It is a pity that the second part of text 2 is fragmentary — however, it would seem that the Obv./Rev. division fell just before the end of the military narrative, slightly before the beginning of the “summary of conquests” section. In this case, the Obv./Rev. division would underscore a clear bipartite arrangement of the text (introduction and military narrative = Obv. — summary of conquests/buildings, building account and concluding formulae = Rev.) which we will see at work on the later summary texts of the reign.

The summary texts

Texts 3, 4, 10 and 11 represent the best preserved “summary inscriptions” of this reign. The account of military events is still subdivided into paragraphs by horizontal rulings, but in this case, as we will see, these subdivisions are not necessarily to be understood as chronological markers. The single texts differentiate for the number of paragraphs included, and for the building account, while comparison of the text of each paragraph reveals little or no variation — for instance, the royal genealogy is identical in all texts (if we except variants on the level of writing)\(^57\), the paragraph on the Aramaean wars is almost identical in the two texts which have it (nos. 3 and 4), etc.

The next chart will help to point out the compositional differences between all these texts. Text 2 will also be taken into consideration, to ease comparison. Note that the Obv. of text 11 has been edited in Grayson, RIMA 2 together with text 10, even if it shows conspicuous deviations, and that some exs. of text 4 differ from the master text as fas as leaving out entire campaigns — in the chart, 4.22 and 4.23/24 indicate ex. 22 and exs. 23-24 respectively\(^58\). For a comparison of the text of each paragraph see chart 4, pp. 94ff.

\(^{56}\) It is possible that other campaigns to the West were recorded in the broken section.

\(^{57}\) E.g., šarru is written MAN in texts 3, 4 and in text 10 ex. 1, and LUGAL in texts 10 ex. 4, and 11.

\(^{58}\) It is obviously possible that some other fragmentary exs. of text 4 actually belong to editions 4.22 and 4.23-24 (for instance, ex. 10, 13 and 20).
### CHART 3: LATER TEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles, epithets</td>
<td>1-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genealogy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Na’iri I-III</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acc) Musku</td>
<td>18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1st) Urumu-Abeslu</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2nd) Lullumu</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3rd) Na’iri</td>
<td>25-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4th) Aramaeans</td>
<td>28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5th) Qumānu</td>
<td>30-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unidentified)</td>
<td>37-4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatti</td>
<td>26-28-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Lebanon-Ḥatti</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milidia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramaeans (summary)</td>
<td>29-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karduniaš I</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Karduniaš (II)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karduniaš II .</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(summary) lands</td>
<td>5'-8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(summary) buildings</td>
<td>9' ff (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building account</td>
<td>(1')-4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blessings</td>
<td>5'-9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in parentheses, as in (1)-13, refer to first/last line after/before a text break. Hyphens indicate passages (almost) certainly left out from the original text, while blank spaces indicate lacunae. Each section represents a single paragraph, with some exceptions on the titles/epithets and the building sections. Note that every campaign has been listed, even at the cost of repetitions, so that the sequence of paragraphs of each text is respected. Repetitions are marked with an asterisk, thus, * Lebanon-Ḥatti is the conflation of two paragraphs which are kept distinct by text 3, while * Karduniaš (II) is inserted before Sulu to emphasize the anticipation of this campaign operated in text 4.23, where it replaces Karduniaš I. For line numberings see Grayson, RIMA 2 (texts 2, 3 and 4); Weidner, AfO 19, Taf. XXVIII ff. (text 10); King, AKA, pp. 109 ff. (text 11); Schroeder, KAH 2, 71 (text 4.23/24 — numbering starts after the initial lacuna). Text 4.22, of which no copy has been published (see *ibid.*, pp. 71-71a), follows the line numbering of text 4 (thus, lines 20-21 actually do not exist).

Notes:

59) Titles and epithets make out 3 §§ on text 2, and 2 §§ on texts 10 and 11. The building account, which is different in each text, has 5 §§ on text 4, and 3 §§ on text 10. Note that text 4 ex. 7 (a prism) and exs. 12 and 15 (stone tablets) have rules after every line. Text 10 ex. 6, which is a tiny fragment, shows some divergencies in the Karduniaš II campaign (see Millard, *Iraq* 32, Pl. XXXVI, No. 134564).

60) Line numbering is not valid for text 4 ex. 7, which is an 8-sided prism with very short lines (cf. Schroeder, KAH 2, 63).
All these texts are certainly much later than text 2, but an exact date is often difficult to establish. Three exs. of text 3 are dated to the eponymy of Nimuāja son of Aššur-aplu-lišir, which corresponds roughly to the 20th year of reign, while at least one ex. of text 4 was written during the eponymy of [Ta]klāk-ana-Aššur, who was in charge around the 22nd year.

As for texts 4.22, 4.23-24, 10 and 11, no dating has been preserved. It would be enough for our needs to establish a chronological relation between these texts and nos. 3 and 4, e.g. analysing internal indications, but even this is extremely difficult. We will adopt the hypothetical chronology 4 - 10 - 11, mostly on account of certain structural characteristics of the texts. The analysis of the minute variations between homologous passages, instead, is of little help in this connection: the scanty information which may be drawn is summarized in the following chart. Column II, taking into consideration texts 3, 4, 10, 11 and 4.23/24, reports indications having some usefulness for the chronological issue. They result either from a comparison with text 2, which is certainly older (it is implied that the closer a text is to text 2, the older it is), or from a comparison between summary texts. Column III collects information on the completeness of each text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. UNIT</th>
<th>II. RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>III. LENGTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epiteths</td>
<td>4 intermediate to 10 and 11</td>
<td>4 shorter than 10 and 11 (3 much shorter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naʾiri</td>
<td>3 earlier than 4, 10 and 11</td>
<td>3 more complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mušku</td>
<td>4 earlier than 11</td>
<td>4 more complete than 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urumu-Abēšlu</td>
<td>(4 earlier than 11 ?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luliumu</td>
<td>4 later than 11 (?)</td>
<td>4 more complete than 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>3 differs from 4 and 10</td>
<td>3 and 4 more complete than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatti</td>
<td>10 differs from 3 and 4</td>
<td>3 more complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milidia</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 more complete than 4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramaeans</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 more complete than 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karduniaš I</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 more complete than 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suhu</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 more complete than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karduniaš II</td>
<td>4.23 intermediate to 4 and 10</td>
<td>4 more complete than 4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 shorter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61) See now Freydank, *Beiträge*, pp. 85 and 87. This date had already been conjectured by Tadmor (*St. Finkelstein*, p. 209; *75th ASOR*, p. 11).
The very scanty evidence in the matter of chronological relationship confirms that text 3 is older, and would suggest that text 11 is the most recent. Some additional information may be drawn from the completeness of the narrative (see column III). Of course, completeness is not a reliable chronological indicator. It has been observed how in the royal inscriptions of later rulers the older texts have a longer narrative, while subsequent editions shortened the accounts concerning the earlier years, to add some new campaigns. However, in the case of Tiglath-pileser's summary texts the matter does not seem so simple. For instance, the narrative of Lebanon and Subu in text 10 might appear as an abbreviation of that of text 4, but text 10 has no new campaign to add — rather, it omits many paragraphs both in comparison to text 4 and to text 3. In short, it is quite clear that the editors of these texts played on the level of the number (and sequence) of campaigns to be included, and not of the length of the single accounts.

Text 3

Text 3 is the earliest and shortest summary inscription from this reign, at least among those who have come down to us in a fairly good state of preservation. The introduction, with royal titles and genealogy, is very concise in comparison to both those of texts 1 and 2 and those of the other summary texts, which are almost identical. The section recording the military events includes only four short paragraphs, while the building account, recording work on the wall of the new city at Aššur, is also very succinct (it takes up 9 lines only), and ends with the mention of monumental inscriptions to be deposited within the wall.

Apparently, the brevity of this text is in relation with the nature of its building account, which, contrarily to that of the other summary texts, reporting of the building of palaces or temples, did not imply detailed descriptions. Thus, the military

---

63) This is actually the case with Shalmaneser III, see e.g. Olmstead, Assyrian Historiography, pp. 8 and 21 ff.
64) See Cifola, Royal Titulary, p. 66 for details.
65) “I built (and) completed it from top to bottom I deposited my monumental inscriptions therein”. Since this expression, NA.NA.RU.A = narā, which usually stands for “stela,” may also refer to stone and even clay tablets (Ellis, Foundation deposits, pp. 145 ff.), it is just possible that our copies of text 3 represent some specimen of such “monumental inscriptions” — consider that a clay tablet of Adad-narari I identifying itself as narā was found inside a niche in the old city wall of Aššur (cf. ibid., pp. 97 and 147). Actually, no exemplar of text 3 was found within the new wall, which however, was not deemed of particularly careful excavations (cf. Weidner, AfO 18, p. 346). Only three exs. were (probably) found in situ, on the paving of a large building, possibly having some official or administrative function: see O. Pedersén, Archives and Libraries of the City of Assur I, Uppsala 1985, pp. 69 and 81 (but cf. ibid., p. 68 fn. 1 for the possibility that the findspot is secondary). In any case, it is legitimate to expect that these narā would have been duplicates of text 3, either in form of tablets or else.
66) For instance, the only text of Tukulti-Ninurta I describing work on the wall of Aššur, A.0.78.19 (Grayson, RIMA 1, pp. 266 f.), is one of his shortest inscriptions, if we except bricks or seals.
account was proportionally shortened — note how each text of this reign observes a certain proportion between campaign narrative and building account. Alternatively, one may suggest that a globally short text was demanded, e.g. to be inscribed onto cones.

The first paragraph of the military narrative recalls the “third time” in which the royal army marched to the lands Na'iri, thus representing — at least theoretically — the conflation of three different campaigns. This passage, however, is clearly based on the account of the campaign of the 3rd regnal year as recorded on text 2 (see also chart 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT 2</th>
<th>TEXT 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“By the command of the god Aššur, my lord,”</td>
<td>I conquered from the other side of the Lower Zab to the Upper Sea in the West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thrice I marched to the lands Na'iri (and)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I conquered the extensive lands Na'iri from the land Tummu to the land Daiēnu, and the Upper Sea [in the West], Himua and to the land Païtenu,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I subdued 30 of their kings.</td>
<td>I subdued 30 kings of the lands Na'iri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like oxen I attached to their noses ropes (and) took them to my city [Aššur]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>received their tribute (madattu) of teams of horses in harness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(and) imposed upon them tax and impost.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “extensive lands Na'iri” included, according to text 2, those spreading “from the land Tummu to the land Daiēnu, and to the Upper Sea [in the West]”. In the later text, Himua and Païtenu replace the third corner of this virtual triangle, as they lie on the westernmost limits of Na'iri (the addition of the earlier passage, “from the other

67) Text 1 has about 2 and a half columns of building text (from vi 55 on) as against 5 and a half of introduction and campaign narrative. Text 2 is too broken to draw some conclusion. For the other summary texts see below (esp. fn. 84 and p. 98).
68) For instance, text 3 of Aššur-bēl-kala (A.O.89.3 in Grayson, RIMA 2, pp. 93 ff.), written on clay cones, also has a very concise narrative, summarizing that of text 2, and a very short building text concerning a gate.
69) For the localisation of Himua and Païtenu on the Western side of Na'iri see Salvini, Nairi e Ur(u)atri, p. 58. The two toponyms also appear on text 1, within the list of 23 lands forming the coalition of Nairi (see above p. 77), in the 12th and 13th position.
side of the Lower Zab to the Upper Sea in the West", will be discussed below). As for the reference to the tribute of teams of horses, it may derive from text 1 which, as we saw, reports that a tribute (madattu) of 1,200 horses and 2,000 cattle was imposed upon the enemies, but it may also record the receipt of the tribute imposed on that occasion — the cattle, in any case, have not been considered worthy of mention.

Two subsequent paragraphs concern an expedition to the Lebanon and the conquest of Ḫatti which took place during the return march. In this case events have not been telescoped, and it appears that a single campaign is described. The fact that it has been subdivided into two paragraphs, confirms that these subdivisions are not to be intended as chronological markers anymore.

Finally, a summary of the wars against the Aramaeans is given. The differences with the account of texts 1 and 2 referring to the campaign of the 4th year (cf. p. 26 above) are conspicuous, yet there are also some analogies:

“I have crossed the Euphrates [28?] times, (even) twice in one year, in pursuit of the aḫlamū-Aramaeans, to the land Ḫatti. I brought about their defeat from the foot of mount Lebanon, the city Tadmar of the land Amurru, Anat of the land Suḫu, as far as Rapiqu of Karduniāš. I brought their booty (and) possessions to my city Aššur.”

Despite the shortness demanded for this text, its editor amplificated the accounts on Naʿiri and the Aramaeans, including in both cases a statement referring to the extent of the conquests: “from the other side of the Lower Zab to the Upper Sea in the West” and “from the foot of mount Lebanon, the city Tadmar of the land Amurru, Anat of the land Suḫu, as far as Rapiqu of Karduniāš”72. In the first case, the passage draws a clear North-East to North-West semicircle, and is added to the beginning of the paragraph73. In the second case, an equally obvious South-West to South-East contour is drawn, while the passage is posticipated and its direction reversed in comparison to text 274.

These paragraphs are separated by the annalistic account of the Lebanon-Ḫatti campaign, which thus represents the focus of the narrative. The position of this unit was therefore demanded by a rule of compositional symmetry (summary - campaign -
summary), respecting a predetermined geographical pattern (from the North-East to the North-West - Far West - from the South-West to the South-East). The position of the paragraph on the Aramaean wars — after and not before Lebanon-Ḥatti — is thus explained.

The passage on the (single) crossing of the Euphrates of text 2, “I crossed the Euphrates after them in rafts (made of inflated) goatskins”, was anticipated, and the total number of crossings was added. This number — which is unfortunately broken — was most suited for this position, since the paragraph recalled the passage with the “summary of conquests”, recording the number of conquered lands, appearing on the appendix to the campaign narrative of texts 1 and 2. It also corresponds to the “30 kings of Naʿirī” of the first summary passage, according to the symmetrical arrangement of this text — compare the following outline of the military account:

1) (summary:) conquests from the North-East to the North-West, resulting in → 30 kings subdued
2) a campaign to the far West, with a travel of 3 double hours from the city Arvad to an island
3) [28?] crossings of the Euphrates ← the result of (summary:) conquests from the South-West to the South-East.

The core of the composition proves to be the travel on the sea, and the killing of the nāhiru, a gesture of high symbolical value\(^\text{75}\), which is preceded by the Lebanon-Amurru campaign, and followed by that of Ḫatti.

**Text 4**

The military account of text 4 records a more exhaustive summary of the royal wars, yet it shows the same basic structure of text 3, grouping the events according to geographical areas. As in the older text, the narrative is opened by the Naʿirī unit, which is followed by a new version of the first three actual campaigns, presumably deriving from text 2 — in this way, the proper chronological order is disregarded\(^\text{76}\).

The Mušku campaign shows some differences from that of text 2 (see above p. 79), as it echoes certain massacres described by text 1\(^\text{77}\):

“I conquered 12,000 of the troops of the land of the extensive [Mušku] in battle. I laid out by means of the bow (lit. 'at arrowpoint') the corpses of their fighting men right through the plain.”

\(^{75}\) For the nāhiru see further below, fn. 85.

\(^{76}\) Cf. also Borger, EAK 1, pp. 118 ff.

\(^{77}\) Actually, no word-by-word correspondence with text 1 can be found: for šalmāt qurāḏīsu nun cf. text 1, i 77 and ii 23; for muqtabībī cf. ii 13, 21 and 79; for lumeṣṣī cf. ii 14. For namē (“steppe”), cf. ii 23; in nāme (“the river Nāme”).
After the Urumu-Abeslu unit, which is very similar to that of text 2, a fourth paragraph referring to the Lullumu campaign (2nd year) ends the Northern section:

"I completely conquered the entire land of the Lullumu, the lands Salua, Qummēnu, Katmμu, and Alzu."

This unit telescopes events which occurred during several years, since the mention of Qummēnu indubitably hints at the campaign of the 5th year (Qummēnu = Qumānu). As for Katmμu, in text 1 it is indicated as the target of the accession year campaign, and it is mentioned again within the narrative of the subsequent campaign — conceivably, it had been inserted here for mere reasons of completeness. Salua and Alzu, instead, are never mentioned in other texts of this reign, and it is therefore possible that they represented the objective of some later campaign.

After the Lebanon-Ḫatti passage, which here is merged into a single paragraph, the account of an expedition against the cities of Milidia and Enzata appears. The former, according to text 1, was submitted during the campaign of the 3rd year, having Na'iri as the main target, but, clearly, a different campaign is here described. This paragraph, with little doubt, was inserted after Lebanon-Ḫatti in subservience to a principle of geographical association of the events. The military narrative is completed by the passage on the Aramaean wars, which gives the number of crossings as 28, occurring in the space of several years, and by three new paragraphs with the campaigns against Karduniaš and Suḫu.

---

78) Apparently, Katmμu was involved by an Assyrian campaign very late in Tiglath-pileser's reign (after the campaigns to Karduniaš): cf. chronicle fragm. 4 (Grayson, ABC, p. 189, 13; see also Tadmor, 75th ASOR, pp. 12 f.).
79) See Nashef, RGTC 5, pp. 27 and 227 (and also Salvini, Nairi e Ur(u)attri, pp. 58 f. for Salua).
80) Text 1, v 33-41.
81) Note how Milidia is here defined ša māt Ḫatte, while text 1 has ša māt Ḫanigalbat (Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 22 fn. to v 34). Actually, both Milidia and Enzata are to be located to the North-West of Assyria — see Kinnier-Wilson, «Iraq» 24, pp. 102 ff.; for the latter see also H.F. Russell, "Shalmaneser's Campaign to Urartu in 856 B.C. and the Historical Geography of Eastern Anatolia according to the Assyrian Sources", AnSt 34 (1984), pp. 180 ff.
82) Grayson suggests to interpret šatta 2-šu as referring to a double crossing occurred in one year only, and consequently translates "I have crossed the Euphrates 28 times, twice in one year, in pursuit of the ahlamā-Aramaeanos" (e.g. in RIMA 2, p. 37, 29 f.; see ibid., p. 38 fn. 30 and Borger, EAK 1, p. 117). However, as text 4 was written around the 22nd year of reign, it is obvious that the statement under discussion should be taken with a certain elasticity, or we would obtain a total of 27 years. I would therefore suggest to translate "(even) twice in one year", to indicate that in some years a double crossing occurred. It is difficult to understand, instead, that the passage refers to 14 and not to 28 expeditions, i.e. that each time both the outward and the return crossings have been taken into account. For instance, the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III quantify the crossing of the Euphrates as well, but here it is clear that at least in some cases a single crossing has been counted: see De Odorico, Numbers, pp. 136 ff. (esp. fn. 100).
Certain peculiarities of the military narrative of text 4 can be explained in light of the building account. For example, within the Na'iri unit, despite the abridgements effected on the version of text 3, the mention of the land Ḫabḫu is added. This is quite surprising since that land is mentioned in text 1 within the account of the campaign of the 2nd year against Paphû. Similarly interesting is the omission of the original *incipit* of the Na'iri unit—and of the whole military narrative—"by the command of Aššur, my lord", which is counterbalanced by an analogous passage inserted before the Lebanon campaign ("by the command of the gods Anu and Adad, the great gods, my lords, I marched to mount Lebanon"), not present on text 3.

The building account consists of a lengthy description of works on several parts of the royal palace at Aššur, making up five paragraphs, which, together with the final blessing formulae, occupy the whole obverse. The first two paragraphs (52-58 and 59-66) describe the reconstruction of the "house of šahûru," which was decorated with cedar, and of the "house of labûnu," decorated with terebinth. The subdivision of this section into two parts might be due to stylistical reasons (so as not to have a too long paragraph), but it also serves to highlight the use of the cedar beams taken back from the Lebanon, which is described just on the beginning of the second paragraph (lines 59-62):

"With cedar and beams, which by the command of the gods Aššur and Anu, the great gods, my lords—(after) I had marched to Mount Lebanon— I had cut down, carried off, (and) installed (these) excellent beams in the temple of the gods Anu and Adad, the great gods, my lords: with the remains of the cedar I constructed the house of those šahûru from top to bottom."

The third paragraph (lines 67-71) relates the creation of basalt replicas of a *nāhiru* (= a narwhal) and of a *burḫiš* (= a yak), which were set up at the palace entrance. The figurines, it is said, were fashioned after the *nāhiru* killed "in the [Great] Sea of Amurru", and after a *live burḫiš* which was brought from the mountain/land Lumaš [...] on the other side of the land Ḫabḫu*. These passages explain both the mention of the land Ḫabḫu within the Na'iri unit, and the omission of the travel at sea with the killing of the *nāhiru* within the Lebanon account.

A fourth paragraph (lines 72-76) describes the construction of a "palace of weapons" made with boxwood "cut down (and) carried off with the cedar beams". The building account ends (lines 77-89) with the description of the building of "the cedar palace", i.e. the royal palace itself.

83) See p. 85 above. Ḫabḫu is not mentioned by text 2.
84) The building account here takes 38 lines out of 95 ('), i.e. exactly 40% of the text. Note that line 93 in Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 45, probably subsumes two actual lines, as rubū arki and Aššur are separated by two lines in the corresponding passage of text 10.
85) See Weidner, AfO 18, pp. 355 f.; CAD N/1, p. 137 and B, p. 329; Salonen, Fischerei, p. 214.
In my opinion, the special care dedicated to the description of the woodworks is related to the addition of "by the command of the gods Anu and Adad" before the Lebanon campaign, which yielded the cedar beams. Not by chance, also the Karduniash II unit, representing the conclusion of the military account, begins with a similar statement ("by the command of the god Ninurta, who loves me, I marched to Karduniash"). This paragraph includes the description of the destruction of the royal palaces of Babylon, which were burnt: such a description, quite rare in the corpus of the Assyrian royal inscriptions, is the most obvious parallel to the construction of the cedar palace in Assur.

In sum, it appears that the contents of the building account influenced the editing of the military narrative. We know, from text 4.23-24 (see below), that military accounts were independently composed in this period. Each time one such text had to be coupled to a building account, it was subject to a further re-adaptation, both in terms of length, by omitting/adding some campaign units, and in terms of textual contents. Thus, the author of text 4 first wrote the account of the construction of the cedar palace, including a detailed record of the woodworks, and a description of the figures of exotic animals from the Sea of Amurru and the land Ḫabhu, representing the extreme geographical limits of Tiglath-pileser's influence. Subsequently, he undertook the editing of the military account to be prefixed. Starting from the version given by text 3, or a similar one, he expanded the narrative of the Naʿiri campaigns by adding the mention of some other lands on the North-East, taken from the account corresponding to text 2. Since Ḫabhu did not appear therein, he added it to the list of lands of Naʿīri, within the first paragraph. Some other lands were added to the Lullumu unit. Further amplifications involved the addition of a new incipit to the Lebanon narrative, while a new campaign to the cities Milidia and Enzatu was placed after Ḫatti. The military account of the new text, as we just remarked, had to be more extensive, but also more comprehensive, as the stress is now laid on the territorial extent of Assyrian dominion. Instead, mention of hostages (Naʿīri and Ḫatti) and of imposition of tribute (Naʿīri) was avoided. News of the receipt of a

86) However, such a passage ("by the command of the god Adad, who loves me, ...") also appears on the beginning of the Lebanon account on text 13, which is, most likely, older than text 4 (see below p. 101).
87) Note how chronicle 21 (i.e. the Synchronistic History, see here below fn. 93) does not mention the destruction of the palaces of Karduniash.
88) Ratio between length of introduction, military account and building account is quite constant in the summary texts of this reign: see p. 98 below.
90) It is not impossible to hypothesize that Salua, Katmuḫu and Alzu appeared in the broken portion of text 2. See also p. 92 above.
91) Incidentally, note how in texts 4 and 10, Lebanon unit, the scribe anticipated the mention of Armada (= Arwad) when he realized that it is a city and not a land, as erroneously indicated in text 3.
crocodile and of a monkey was added to the Lebanon narrative, in replacement for
the travel at sea and the killing of the nāhiru, which was to be mentioned in the
building account. Similarly, mention of “the land Ḫatti” and of “the mount Lebanon”
within the Aramaean unit were cancelled in order to avoid repetitions.

Text 4 clearly conforms to the same geographical arrangement of text 3, that is
the North - West - South sequence. In this case we may add that the chronological
order of events is not always respected, even within each section.92. This tripartite
pattern is already announced in a passage of the royal titulary, representing one of the
additions operated to the very concise version of text 3:

“Attentive prince who, by the command of the god Šamaš the warrior, has
conquered by means of conflict and might from Babylon of the land Akkad
to the Upper Sea of the land Amurru and the sea of the lands Naʾiri and
become lord of all.”

The sequence is here reversed to South - West - North, which perhaps is owed to
the sense of formal symmetrism which we saw at work in text 3.

The new passages, concerning Karduniaš and Suḫu, deserve a couple of further
comments. The events are here narrated with greater detail, in a chronistic style which
closely resembles that of the so-called Synchronistic History, so that a common
source for the two accounts has been postulated.93 Now, text 3 is dated to the third
month of the eponymy of Ninuaḫa, that is, it was written on the beginning of the year
which saw the second battle against Marduk-nādin-aḫḫē. This means that it omitted
to record the earlier campaign to Karduniaš, and that of Suḫu, even if it mentioned
those lands in a passage summarizing the Aramaean wars, “from ... the land Suḫu, as
far as Rapiqu of Karduniaš”, which has been repeatedly quoted. This statement also
shows clear reminiscences of the Synchronistic History, as it corresponds almost
literally to a passage of that text.94 The relation between royal texts and chronicles in
this age would deserve further investigation,95 but the task exceeds the interests of
this article.

92) Cf. the antedating of the Naʾiri campaigns, but cf. also the case of the Karduniaš II campaign in text
93) Grayson, ABC, pp. 247b f. and Tadmor, St. Finkelstein, pp. 210 f. For the relevant passage see
Grayson, ABC, chron. 21, II 14'-24'. For other chronicles mentioning Tiglath-pileser I see Assyrian chron.
the Kassite and Isin II Dynasties”, in G. van Driel - Th.J.H. Krispijn - M. Stol - K.R. Veenhof (Eds.), Zikir
Šamim, Assyriological Studies Presented to F.R. Kraus on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, Leiden
94) “[He ruled] every part of Suḫu as far as Rapiqu”, Grayson, ABC, p. 165, 24' (see his remarks on p.
248).
95) The subject has been surveyed by Tadmor in St. Finkelstein.
In any case, it is evident that the mentioned “common source” was already available, and that the omission of Karduniash I and Sułu from text 3 was intentional. The reason for this omission may lie in the fact that the first of the two already discussed chariot battles was not so fortunate for the Assyrians\(^{96}\), and thus the whole expedition was passed over in silence.

**Text 4, exs. 22 and 23-24**

Text 4 ex. 22 is a quite small fragment, and lets us only understand that it omitted the campaign of the 1st year, against the Urumu and Abešlu. On the contrary, exs. 23 and 24 are largely preserved, and can be more thoroughly examined. They include royal titulary and military narrative only\(^{97}\), while the building account and the final blessing formulae are absent, and it has been argued that they were in fact patterns (*Vorlage*) for inscriptions to which a conclusion was to be added\(^{98}\).

The number of campaigns would suggest that these fragments represent an intermediate stage between texts 3 and 4. However, some clues indicate that they are younger, or that, at least, they have been produced during the complex production process of text 4, which, judging from the number and variety of written copies (one prism and several clay and stone tablets), was a very important “publication”. As we just saw, the mention of Ḫrabḫu within the Naʾirī passage is explainable as an addition demanded by the building account of text 4\(^{99}\), while the reference to the destruction of the palaces of Babylon looks like a calculated parallel to the construction of the cedar palace in Aššur, also described in the building account of text 4. Moreover, it is quite difficult to surmise that the *timu* dates appearing in the Karduniash II unit of text 4, but not in exs. 23-24, were added in a later moment\(^{100}\). Most likely, they were removed by a later editor for reasons of brevity and style\(^{101}\) — this omission was compensated by the news of the plundering of the palaces.

\(^{96}\) See also Brinkman, PHPKB, p. 128.

\(^{97}\) The royal titulary is completely broken away, but some traces would indicate that at least ex. 23 once had it (see scores to line 14 in Grayson, RIMA 2).

\(^{98}\) Weidner, Afo 18, p. 347; Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 40b.

\(^{99}\) According to the scores included in Grayson, RIMA 2, both 4.23 and 24 have *māt Ḫabbi* in line 16.

\(^{100}\) I assume that text 4.23, as well as text 10, speak of 2 battles against Marduk-nādin-aḫḫē (the lacuna would allow it: see chart 4 below). The possibility that these texts recorded a single battle and that the *timu* dates together with the mention of the second battle were added by the editor of text 4 is implausible. Chronicle 21 states that the Tiglath-pileser defeated the Babylonians “in the second year” (cf. Grayson, ABC, 164, 17), and therefore one should assume that *adūkšu* in texts 10 and 4.23 was also omitted, which seems very unlikely.

\(^{101}\) The use of such formulae in the royal inscriptions is so unusual as to induce Tadmor to speak of “intrusive passage” in relation to these dates (St. Finkelstein, p. 210).
Comparing nos. 23-24 to the other exs. of text 4, we notice the absence of the first three actual campaigns, of the expedition to Enzata (within the Milidia unit), and of the Karduniaš I unit. If a later date of composition is assumed, we may explain these omissions as shortenings dictated by the necessity of producing a shorter text. In fact, these campaigns represent the least important feats recorded in text 4 for the sections North, West and South respectively. The first three campaigns were quite outdated and, in any case, they were less important than Na'iri, as texts 3 and 10 testify. Similarly, the expedition to Enzata gave way to the Lebanon-Ḫatti enterprise. As for the first campaign to Karduniaš, we may observe, in the first instance, that it was intentionally omitted (i.e. its omission is not due to an error) because of its quite uneventful issue, and perhaps because of its stylistical similarity with the preceding Aramaean unit.

The most interesting feature, however, is the anticipation of Karduniaš II, which is placed before Suhu, with the consequence of an infringement of the chronological succession of events. This anticipation was evidently suggested by the position of Karduniaš I. In fact, the Karduniaš unit of text 4.23 is the summary of the campaigns to Karduniaš, i.e. it is the theoretical sum of Karpuniaš I and II. Simply, no event from the first campaign was chosen, and the text consequently resulted identical to that of Karduniaš II as given by text 4.

Text 10

Text 10 is more or less contemporary to text 4, but contains a very short account of the royal wars, including five paragraphs only, which recalls that of text 3. If compared to the latter, it omits the passage summarizing the Aramaean wars, which is replaced by the report of the Kardunias-Suhu campaigns. In order to respect the usual geographical pattern North-West-South, the Na'iri and Lebanon-Ḫatti units were also chosen, although they were much longer and recorded (presumably) older events. The absence of the campaign to Milidia would allow us to think that text 10 is older than no. 4, but the brevity of the text under discussion is a good reason for the

---

102) Note how the subsequent Suhu unit is correctly lacking ina girija annimma.
103) See above p. 96.
104) I do not know how to explain the addition of the cutting of gardens in Suhu. Thinking of text 4, I dare to suggest that text 4.23-24 was prepared to be prefixed to a building account describing works in a garden, such as that mentioned in text 10, lines 71 ff.
105) In text 3 the units Na'iri and Lebanon-Ḫatti take up 10 and 13 lines respectively, against 7 of the passage on the Aramaeans. The editor of text 10 clearly aimed at giving a very concise account of the royal wars, as testified by the shortenings operated in the narrative of the campaigns to Na'iri and Lebanon-Ḫatti, and by the joining of the Lebanon and Ḫatti paragraphs (note that it is not necessary to imply that text 3 was the direct source of no. 10, since texts 4 and 11 are also less concise than no. 10).
exclusion of this campaign. Rather, some circumstances suggest a later date for text 10: for instance, it often follows ex. 4.23 instead of text 4\textsuperscript{106}, while the narration is refined by avoiding some repetitions\textsuperscript{107} and correcting a couple of inconsistencies\textsuperscript{108}. We may then submit that the editor of text 10 made use of a draft (something similar to text 4.23)\textsuperscript{109} prepared during or slightly after the compilation of text 4.

Titulary is almost identical to that of text 4, while the building account, recording a summary of works at Nineveh, is rather extensive: it takes up about 40% of the inscription, which corresponds, including the final blessings and dating, to the whole obverse\textsuperscript{110}, as in text 4. The first two paragraphs describe work on the city wall and at the palace of Aššur-rēśa-iši, Tiglath-pileser’s father. The third paragraph, despite the fragmentary character of certain passages, allows us to understand that it refers to three different palaces: one within a garden (lines 71-77), another upon a terrace besides the temple of Ištar (78-82), and a third one, located just opposite, and called “the house of the Step Gate” (82-88)\textsuperscript{111}.

\textsuperscript{106} It omits the īlimu dates in the Karduniāš II passage, replacing it with the plundering of the palaces. Note also “Hinđānī” instead of “Himāndānī” in Sūju. Still valid is the argument that the addition of Ḫabḥu (in Naʼiri) and the mention of the palaces of Babylon are owed to the editor of text 4 (see p. 94 above).

\textsuperscript{107} Cf. the changes in the Sūju unit, where nīšē + nasāḫu replaces šallutu + šalalu, which is already employed in Karduniāš I and, slightly after, in Karduniāš II. Similarly, ālānī gabba ša māt Sūḫī is omitted to avoid the repetition of the toponym (Sūju is mentioned three times in text 4), and replaced by ālānī ša šēpē annāte u šēpē annāte.

\textsuperscript{108} According to text 4, the palaces of Babylon were conquered and burned. The “conquest” of the palaces may have seemed a not particularly remarkable effort to the editor of text 10, who passed it over in silence, leaving only the news of the burning. Note also the addition of īštu, as antecedent to adī within the Sūju unit, and the addition of u between mounts Kamulla and Kaštilla (Karduniāš I). The specification of māt Ḫabḥi ša bērānu in the Nairi unit can be easily explained. Similarly, it is much more likely that the mention of the god Aššūr in “by the command of Aššur, Anu and Adad” (Lebanon unit) represents and addition of text 10 rather than an omission of text 4.

\textsuperscript{109} Cf. fn. 98 above. In the case one supposes that no. 4.23 was the actual draft of text 10, it would be difficult to explain the omission of the Aramaean unit and its replacement with Karduniāš I.

\textsuperscript{110} See ex. 1 in Weidner, AňO 18 and ex. 6 in Millard, «Iraq» 32, Pl. XXXVI. Ex. 8, which possibly shows the same subdivision, is unpublished.

\textsuperscript{111} Weidner (AňO 19, p. 142) thought that the passage describes works on two palaces only (the garden palace and that besides the Ištar temple). Grayson, instead, interpreted the passage as describing works at the palace besides the Ištar temple and at the “house of the Step Gate” (thus AŘI 2, p. 32).
In such way, an interesting aspect comes to light, that is, the clear tripartite structuring of text 10. Its contents may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL SUBDIVISION</th>
<th>ACTUAL PARAGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Titulary I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titulary II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military account</td>
<td>Na'iri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanon-Ḫatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karduniash I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulḫu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karduniash II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building account</td>
<td>City wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palace of Aššur-reša-iši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other three buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final formulae</td>
<td>Blessings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Titulary and genealogy together consist of three paragraphs (against four of text 2 and two of texts 3, 4 and 11), and this happens also with the building account, as we just saw. The central part — i.e. the military narrative — may be subdivided into three sections, Na'iri, Lebanon-Ḫatti\(^{112}\) and Karduniash-Sulḫu, the latter consisting of three actual paragraphs, which, however, represent an obvious narrative unit.

If we go back to the introduction, we would notice that the royal titulary includes a list of the conquered lands, i.e. Babylon, Amurru and Na'iri\(^{113}\), and that it refers to three persons, Tiglath-pileser, who is mentioned the first paragraph, and his father and grand-father, mentioned within the genealogy:

"Son of Aššur-reša-iši, king of the universe, king of Assyria, son of Mutakkil-Nusku (who was) also king of the universe and king of Assyria."

Now, within the building account earlier work of both Aššur-reša-iši and Mutakkil-Nusku is recalled. Tiglath-pileser completed, it is stated, his father's palace:

"[The palace] which Aššur-reša-iši, my father, vice-regent of the god Aššur, had built (but) not completed — this palace I constructed (and) completed."

---

112) Note also that Lebanon and Ḫatti here make up one single paragraph instead of two as in text 3.
113) Mentioned here above at p. 95. Titulary has been split after this list. In this manner the first paragraph contains the religious titles and those underscoring the king's military triumphs, while the titles referring to the king's military heroism and valor are left for the second paragraph, which we called Titulary II (see chart in Cifola, Royal Titulary, p. 70).
He also restored the palace of an earlier king, whose name is not given, and which had been rebuilt by his grandfather:

"[...] the palace which is upon the terrace, which is beside [the temple of] the goddess Ištar, my mistress — which a prince who preceded me had built (and when) it became dilapidated Mutakkil-Nusku, my father, vice-regent of the god Aššur, [rebuilt it ...] — had become dilapidated. This palace [which is beside the temple of the goddess Išt]ar, my mistress, the ... and the terrace [I] entirely [rebuilt]."

Thus, it would seem that the editor of text 10 conceived the text as formed by three parts —titulary, military account and building account— and that he was strongly influenced by this tripartite conception. Titulary and genealogy were left almost identical to those of the other contemporary summary texts, except for the subdivision into three paragraphs. The military account was readapted (or shortened if text 4 was the direct or indirect source) so as to emphasize the three geographical sections, corresponding to the three lands mentioned in the titulary, while the building account was arranged into three paragraphs, emphasizing, in this case, the continuation of the works of Tiglath-pileser' s father and grandfather.

Both these sections were built according to a similar tripartite scheme: three (ideal) geographical regions making up five actual paragraphs for the military account, and three paragraphs describing work on five buildings for the building account.

In my view, then, the structure of text 10 should be seen as the result of an over-regularization. It may be interpreted on different levels: the general structure of the summary texts of this period, which were formed by three parts (titulary, military account, building account), influenced a tripartite arrangement of the single sections or sub-sections. On the other hand, the first section may be seen as the premise (i.e. the declaratio of the king’s valour and legitimacy) and the subsequent two as the realization (i.e., the conquests and the continuation of the constructions of his predecessors). This fact is underscored by the correspondences between the names of the lands and of the kings.

Text 11

The military account of text 11, as far as preserved, repeats that of text 4 — however, since the middle part is broken, we cannot go much deeper. The building

114) Note also, within the Lebanon unit, the addition of a third god, Aššur, to the names of Anu and Adad.
115) The royal titulary of the later summary texts, as it has been observed, insists on the heroic epithets (see also Cifola, Royal Titulary, p. 66).
116) Note, however, that in the Lullumu unit text 11 omits either Qummēnu or Katmuḫu (cf. Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 53 fn. 27).
account is very fragmentary, and records work at a royal palace in Nineveh, actually the palace dealt with by the second paragraph of the building account of text 10 (that of Aššur-rēša-iši). The description is, in this case, very detailed, and mentions also some alabaster replicas of a burhīš and of other animals, most likely a nāhiru — apparently, the whole paragraph corresponding to lines 67-71 of text 4 was taken over to be re-employed in this context. The mention of cedar wood (line 20') makes it virtually certain that text 11 once included also the Lebanon-Ijatti campaign.

Other texts

A couple of other texts from Nineveh might deserve some attention, but unfortunately their fragmentary condition practically brings to nil their usefulness for our investigation. Thus, no. 12, a broken text preserving parts of 4 paragraphs,117 would seem a summary text118 approximately contemporary to no. 3, but it may also turn out to be an annalistic inscription of older date119.

No. 13, instead, is almost certainly a summary text. It preserves parts of 3 paragraphs, apparently recording alternate versions of the Naṣiri campaign120, of the Aramaean wars121, and of the campaign to Lebanon122. This geographical arrange-

117) The first one mentions [Kardu]niaš and, after a short break, speaks of booty taken to Aššur: it can thus correspond to the passage on the Aramaean campaigns (according to the later version in summary fashion), or, less probably, to Karduniāš I. The two subsequent paragraphs record some military campaign(s) which are very difficult to identify. A few of the mentioned toponyms, i.e. the lands [Iš][bhu(?)], [Lull]umu and Adauš, appear on texts 1 or 2 within the 2nd year campaign account (add also the city Andaria, for which Borger, EAK 1, p. 120 suggested an identification with Daria of text 1). The land Qu[mnēu(?)] might also be involved, and this would bring us to the 5th year (Qumānū/Qummēnu of texts 1 and 2; see above p. 80). The last preserved paragraph describes work at the Ištara temple of Nineveh.

118) It has no “summary of conquests” before the building account, as the annalistic texts of the reign do. Also, compare the length of its paragraphs, which approaches that of text 3, while those of text 2 are much shorter. If interpreted as a summary text, it would record, apparently, a summary of the Aramaean wars and of the Qumānū/Lululum campaigns (2nd and 5th year?).

119) It is possible that it records an annalistic account of either the 2nd year campaign (see fn. 117 here above) or of the 5th year one (as suggested by Hurowitz - Westenholz, JCS 42, pp. 27 ff.), strongly differing from those of texts 1 and 2. In the former case, the first paragraph, mentioning Karduniāš, might represent one of the 28 Aramaean campaigns indicated by the later summary texts (see p. 90), i.e. one of “the numerous foreign campaigns which do not appear in the (account of) my victories (and) upon which I pursued my enemies by charriot in favourable terrain and on foot in rough terrain” (text 1, vi 49 ff.).

120) The reconstruction of 3-su in RIMA 2, which would point to the “Nairi I-III” summary account, is entirely conjectural. Rather, the passage may look a shortened version of the Naṣiri campaign of the 3rd year (cf. the version on text 2).

121) This paragraph would seem an intermediate version of the account given by texts 2 and 3 — note, however, that the Aramaeans are not mentioned at all. Restoration of “from [the city Tadmar of the land Amurrū] (Anat of the land Sů̱tu), as far as Ṣapikuq of Karduniāš” (Grayson, RIMA 2) is uncertain. A better solution would be “from [the city Tadmar of the land Amurrū, as far as Anat of the land Sů̱tu]”.

122) This passage is very fragmentary, but strongly recalls the corrispondent paragraph of text 4. The mention of the god Anum, at the beginning, is omitted.
ment (North - South - West) would be unique for a summary text from this reign, but no solid conclusions can be drawn without having access to the rest of the inscription.

Conclusion

Shortly after the fifth year of reign, the first Mesopotamian annalistic inscription, text 1, appeared, almost abruptly. The composition of the text, of which more than 40 copies were made, was apparently demanded by the completion of the works on the Anu and Adad temple. However, since we know that further works were necessary on the building, it is just possible that its composition was not connected to any specific building enterprise, and that annalistic accounts were compiled at regular intervals of time, for instance every five or ten years, as suggested by Tadmor.

The subsequent annalistic text was written some five years later. The military account is very concise, and records a single paragraph for each year of reign. The re-edition of the older sections, i.e. those covered by the older text, was made in a rather negligent way. The editor of text 2, in fact, often limited himself to pick up the last portions of each campaign, to which, in case, he added some sentences taken from the preceding passages, thus giving the information in the reversed order.

Possibly, also chronologically ordered selections of the military campaigns of the reign were written at this time. In any case, the annalistic arrangement of the campaigns was abandoned on the occasion of editing text 3, around the 20th year of reign. The brevity of text 3 did not allow a comprehensive record of the military events of the reign to be recorded. Therefore, a brief summary of the most relevant military deeds was given, together with the account of a campaign to Lebanon and the land of Ḫatti.

One feature of the summary texts of this reign is the consistent subdivision into paragraphs of the military narrative. In text 3, as well as in all the subsequent ones, the narration of military events is subdivided into paragraphs by horizontal rulings, but, in this case, they are no more functional as chronological markers. Each paragraph now represents either one or several campaigns, associated according to geo-

---

123) Obviously, the Lebanese campaign appears after the Aramean one in respect of the chronological succession of the events. It is thus possible to estimate that text 13 represents a chronologically ordered record of the military activities of the reign, which, however, omitted most of campaigns.

124) According to the text itself, the works were over by the fifth year of reign: “I planned (and) laboriously rebuilt (and) completed the pure temple, the holy shrine…” (lines vii 90 ff.)

125) According to the later summary texts, the campaign to the Lebanon was undertaken to get cedar beams for the temple (see e.g. text 4, lines 24 ff. and 59 ff.).

126) St. Finkelstein, p. 210

127) See the comments on the campaigns to Naʿīri and to Qumānu above.

128) E.g. text 13, see fn. 123, above
graphical criteria. The texts mostly differentiate for the number of such paragraphs—comparison of the text of each paragraph reveals little variation—and for the building account. In this sense, these texts represent a quite homogeneous group, in spite of the obvious differences on the level of contents.

Titulary and genealogy were quite standardized, as they are almost identical in every summary text of this period. Editing was only possible for the military account and for the building account, which was to be written for the occasion. Military accounts were independently composed\textsuperscript{129}, and, when they had to be coupled to a building text, they were re-adapted, both in terms of length (by omitting or adding some campaign-units) and in terms of textual contents. Each of these units was conceived as an independent "block" of text, and a high degree of flexibility was allowed as for the possibility of adding or taking out one or more of these units, in view of the general structure of the text.

As for the text editing, some of the campaign-units were subject to further shortenings, which, however, cannot be considered simple abbreviations. The process may rather be described as a condensation, as it implied the diminution of the non-conforming traits, so as to keep and strengthen the common trait or traits. Each time the material was subjected to a re-adaptation, it inherited certain characteristics of the newer composition. In this way, we find that different layers were superimposed: for example, the particular stress laid on the Lebanon campaign by the editor of text 3 caused a certain characterization of that campaign-unit, which was inherited by the later texts 4 and 10. Similarly, text 10 took up certain changes which the editor of text 4 had made to the military narrative (and thus also to the Lebanon campaign) in consideration of the building account to be appended thereafter.

Several hints allow us to think that the contents of these texts were carefully planned, possibly by making a very gross draft of their contents on perishable material. For instance, in the case of texts 4 and 10 (and possibly some others) the editor divided the text into two parts, corresponding to the obverse and the reverse of the tablet, leaving two sections for each side, \textit{i.e.} titulary and military account for the obverse, and building account and final blessing formulae for the reverse: in any case each section of the text had a proportionally calculated space\textsuperscript{130}. Text 3, the most concise of the group, shows an interesting structuring of the campaign narrative, which makes it clear that it was subjected to a complex reorganization, while the structure of text 10, a similarly short inscription, also seems to be the result of the systematization effected by a very orderly editor. Finally, it appears that the military account of text 4 was heavily revised in consideration of the building feats to be described thereafter.

\textsuperscript{129} See text 4.23-24, p. 96 above.

\textsuperscript{130} Length of military and building account were quite consistent, see e.g. fn. 88 above.
CHART 4

COMPARISON OF TIGLATH-PILESER'S SUMMARY TEXTS

Text 2 is also inserted for the purpose of comparison (for this text, order of paragraphs is not respected). Line numbering follows Grayson, RIMA 2, except for text 11 and text 4 ex. 23, which follow King, AKA, 110 ff. and Schroeder, KAH 1, 71 respectively. Comparison is passed over if texts do not show differences. Variants on the level of writing and minor breaks are not shown. Please note that blank spaces are used to emphasize text affinities and that breaks and restorations are, as usual, placed within brackets, with a ... to replace one or two missing words and ...... to indicate a larger lacuna. Translation which follows is based on Grayson’s.

Invocation to the gods

Two units, only present on text 2, lines 1-6 and 7-10.

Titles-Epithets

Texts 2 11-16, 3 1-4, 4 1-8a., 11 1-7 and 10 1-8. Texts 4 and 10 are identical and this may also be the case with text 11, which is very fragmentary (however, it is uncertain if “merciless mighty man” is present on 10 and 11). Texts 4 and 11 do not divide this unit from the subsequent one.

2 Tukultí-apil-[ešarra šarru danmu šar kiššati lã šanān]
3 [Tukultí]-apil-ešarra šarru danmu šar kiššati šar māt Aššur
4/10 Tukultí-apil-ešarra šarru danmu šar kiššati šar māt Aššur

2 šar kullat kibrāt arbaoci šar kal malk[i ...]
3 šar kullat kibrāt arbaoci
4/10 šar kullat kibrāt arbaoci mula22it gimir targiš šaḥtu

2 etlu qardu
4/10 zânin Ekur bibil libbi Aššur etlu qardu (gešru là pādā)

2 sa ina tukulti Aššur u Ninurta ilāni rabūti bēlišu ittallāku ušamqitu gērīšu
3 sa ina tukulti Aššur u Ninurta ilāni rabūti bēlišu ittallāku ušamqitu gērīšu rubū nadu
4/10 ša ina siqir Šamas gurādi ištu Bābili ša māt Akkadā adi tāmti elēnīte ša māt Amurrī u tāmti ša māt Naʾiri ina tašnītī u danāni qāṣlu ikšudīma ipēlu gimra

Tiglath-pileser, strong king, king of the universe, <3,4,10: king of Assyria>, king of all the four quarters, <2: king of all princes,> <4,10: encircler of all criminals, pious, provider for Ekur, select of the god Aššur, valiant young man, (mercileless mighty man)> who acts with the support of the gods Aššur and Ninurta, the great gods, his lords, and who has felled his foes <4,10,11: attentive prince who, by the command of the god Šamas the warrior, has conquered by means of conflict and might from Babylon of the land Akkad to the upper sea of the land Amurru and the sea of the lands Nairi and become lord of all>.
Epithets (cont.)
Texts 4 8b-12, 11 8-13 (in both cases attached to the previous unit) and 10 9-15 (as a separate unit). The first section is identical in texts 4 and 10 (for text 11 see Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 52 fn. to lines 11-13). Text 2 is here strongly different, and it is left out from comparison. Text 3 omits this unit.

4/10 gišginu dannu ša ina šu kakkēšu ezzūte tubuqat erbetta ušrabbūma iḫillū
11 [ ... ] ša ina šišb kakkēšu ezzūte tubuqat erbetta ušrabbūma iḫillū

4/10 dadmu u altūti nakirūt Aššur ašar tarubti ana ḫalte uḳīnṣunuma zīqi-qūmī
11 dīadmū u altūti nakirūt ša Aššur [ ... ] ma zīqi-qūmī

4  dāppanu šămru ša napḫar malkī ša
10  dāppanu šămru ša ina qitrūb tamḫērēšu ekduṭe malkī ša
11  ušumgallu dannu ki [ ... ] ša napḫar malkī ša

4  kibrāte tāḫāssu ezzū eḏurūma [kīma šūtinni išbatu tubuqati
10  kibrāte tāḫāssu ezzu eḏurūma kīma šūtinni išbatu tubuqati
11  kibrūte tāḫāssu ezzu ēḏurūma kīma šūtinni išbatu tubuqāti

4 u kīma arrabē ḫittallalū erset là bāri
10 u kīma arrabē ḫittallalū erṣet là bāri
11 u kīma arrabē ḫittallalū erṣet là bāri

strong gišginu who by the attack of his fierce weapons has caused the four corners (of the world) to quake so that the habitations convulsed - indeed on the battlefield he has put in their graves the dangerous enemies of the god Aššur and turned them into ghosts, <4, 10: storm-trooper> <11: strong dragon [...] at the approach of whom <10: whose ferocious onslaught> <4, 11: all> the princes of the (four) quarters dreaded so that they took to hiding places like bats and scurried off to inaccessible regions like jerboa;

Genealogy
Identical in all texts (2 17, 3 5, 4 13f., 10 16 and 11 14).

Naʾrī
Texts 2 25-27, 3 6-15, 4 15-17, 10 17-20 and 11 15-17 (text 4 exs. 23-24 show no deviations).

2 [ina siqri Aššur] bēlija
3 ina siqri Aššur bēlija īstu īberṭān nār Zābē ṣupālē adī tāmmī elēnītē ša ṣalāmu Šamšī
4
10
11

2
3 qāti lu iķṣud 3-šu ana māṭāt Naʾrī lu allik
4 3-šu ana māṭāt Naʾrī lu allik
10 3-šu ana māṭāt Naʾrī [lu allik]
11 [3-šu ana māṭāt] Naʾrī lu allik
By the command of Aššur, my lord, I conquered from the other side of the lower Zab to the Upper Sea in the west. Thrice I marched to the lands Na'iri. I conquered the extensive lands Na'iri from the land Tummu to the land Dańenu, and the upper sea [in the west]. I conquered the interior of the land Ṭabbu, the lands Ḥimua (and) Paiteru, and Ḥabbu. Like oxen I attached to their noses ropes and took them to my city [Assur]. Hostages from them I took. I received their tribute of teams of horses in harness. I established tribute and impost upon them I established.

**Mušku [accession year]**

**Texts 2 18-20, 11 18-20 and 4 18f. (omitted by exs. 23-24). Omitted by texts 3 and 10.**

<2,3: By the command of Aššur, my lord,> <3: I conquered from the other side of the lower Zab to the Upper Sea in the west.> Thrice I marched to the lands Na'iri. I conquered the extensive lands Na'iri from the land Tummu to the land Dańenu, <2: and the upper sea [in the west]> <11: I conquered> <10,11: the interior of the land Ḥabḫu> <4,10,11: the lands Ḥimua (and) Paiteru> <4: and Ḥabḫu>. <2,3: I subdued 30 of <2: their kings> <3: the kings of the lands Na'iri> <2: Like oxen I attached to their noses ropes and took them to my city [Aššur].> Hostages from them I took.> <3,4,10,11: I received their tribute of teams of horses in harness.> <2,3: Tribute and impost upon them I established.>
[the entire land of the Mušku] and added it to the borders of my land> <4,11: I laid out by means of the bow <4: the corpses of> their fighting men right through the plain>.

Urumu-Abeslu [1st year]

2 [... lā mā]girī ušēknī 4 4 im urumāja abeslāja ummānāt māt Ḥatte [lā kānišē] alqa
4 4 im urumāja abeslāja ummānāt māt Ḥatte alqa
11 [4 im uru]māja abeslāja ummānāt māt Ḥatte ... ]

2 ana nīšē [māt]ja amnu
4 [(...)] ana nīšē mātīja amnu
11 assūha [ana nīšē mātīja amnu]

<2: I subdued [the rebellious and] insubmissive [Šubaru].> <2,4: I took> <11: I up-rooted> 4,000 Urumu and Abeslu, <2,11: [insubmissive(?)]> troops of Ḫatti, and regarded them as people of my land.

Lullumu [2nd year]

2 māt Lulumi ana sēhirīša akšud 25 ilānišunu [ana ... Ištar aššurī]e ilāni
4 māt Lulumi ana sēhirīša māt Salua māt Qummēni māt Ḫatmuḫi u māt Alzi
11 [māt Sal]u' māt Lulumi ana sēhirīša māt Qummēni or Ḫatmuḫi u māt Alzi

2 ša ālija Aššur u ištarāte ša mātīja aqīš namkū[ršunu] ana Adad bēlīja ašruk
4 ana pāt gimrēsina lī akšud
11 lī [akšud]

I <4: completely> conquered the entire land of the Lullumu, <4,11: the lands Salua, <4: Qummēnu, Ḫatmuḫu> and Alzu.> <2: I gave 25 of their gods [to ... and the Assyrian Ištar], the gods of my city Aššur and the goddesses of my land. I gave [their] property to the god Adad, my lord.>

Lebanon
Texts 3 16-25, 10 28-33a and 4 24-28a (exs. 23-24 show no deviations [but see Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 42 fn. 27]). Texts 2 and 11 are broken.

Texts 4 and 10 do not divide this unit from the subsequent one.

3 ana šadē Labnānī lī allik
4 ina qibit Anim u Adad ilāni rabūti bēlīja ana šadē Labnānī lī allik
10 ina qibit Aššur Anim u [Adad ilāni ra]būti bēlīja ana šadē māt Labnānī lī all[ik

3 gušūrē ša erēni ana bit Anim u Adad ilāni rabūti bēlīja akkas aššā
4 gušūrē ša erēni ana bit Anim [u Adad] ilāni rabūti bēlīja [akk]is aššā
10 gušūrē ša erēni ana bit Anim u Adad ilāni ra'būti bēlīja akkas aššā
By the command of the gods, I marched to mount Lebanon. I cut down (and) carried off cedar beams for the temple of the gods Anu and Adad, the great gods, my lords. I continued to the land Amurru and conquered the entire land Amurru. I received tribute from the city Arvad, the lands Byblos, Sidon; a crocodile (and) a large female monkey of the sea coast.

Finally, upon my return I became lord of the entire land Hatti. I imposed upon Ini-Tesub, king of the land Hatti, hostages, tax, tribute, and cedar beams.

Only present on text 4, lines 31-33 (ex. 4.23, lines 17 f.).

I marched to the city Milidia of the great land Hatti. I received the tribute of Allumaru. I conquered the city Enzatu of the land Isua and the land Suhmu. I uprooted prisoners (from) their (midst and) brought (them) to my land.
Aramaeans (summary)

Texts 3 29-35 and 4 34-36 (ex. 23 shows no deviations). Not present on text 10. Text 11 is broken. The pertinent passage on text 2, lines 28f. is completely different.

3 [...]-šu nār Puratta arki aḥlamē armājja
4 28-su arki aḥlamē armājja nār Puratta

3 ana māt Ḥatte šätta 2-šu [lū ē]tebbir
4 šätta 2-šu lū ētebbir

3 ištu šēp šadē Labnāni āl Tāḏmar ša māt Amurri Anāt ša māt Sūḫī u adī āl Rapiqi
4 ištu āl Tāḏmar ša māt Amurri āl Anāt ša māt Sūḫī u adī āl Rapiqi

3 ša māt Karduniaš dabdašunu aškun šallassunu maṛissunu ana ālija Aššur ēbla
4 ša māt Karduniaš dabdašunu lū aškun šallassunu maṛissunu ana ālija Aššur ēbla

I have crossed the Euphrates 28 times, (even) twice in one year, in pursuit of the aḥlamu-Aramaeans <3: to the land Ḫatti>. I brought about their defeat from <3: the foot of mount Lebanon,> the city Tadmar of the land Amurru, Anat of the land Suḫu, as far as the city Rapiqu of Karduniaš. I brought their booty and possessions to my city Aššur.

Karduniaš I

Texts 10 36-40 and 4 37-40 (but omitted by exs. 23-24). Not present on text 3. Texts 2 and 11 are broken.

4 ana māt Karduniaš lū allīk ištu ebertān nār Zāba šupālē āl Arman
10 [ana] māt Karduniaš lū allīk ištu āl Turšan ša ebertān nār Zāba šubālē āl Arman

4 Ugar-Sallum adī āl Lubdi lū aḵṣud nār Radāna lū ētebbir
10 Ugar-Sallum adī āl Lubdi lū aḵṣud nār Radāna lū ēbir

4 ālānī ša šēp šad Kamulla šād Kaštilla lū aḵṣud
10 ālānī ša šēp šād Kaštilla u šād Kamulla lū aḵṣud

4 šallassunu buṣašunu lū ušēšā ana ālija Aššur ēbla
10 šallassunu buṣašunu luṣēšia ana ālija Aššur ēbla

I marched to Karduniaš. I conquered from <10: the city Turšan on> the other side of the Lower Zab, the city Arman of Ugar-Sallu, as far as the city Lubdu. I crossed over the River Radanu. I conquered the cities at the foot of mounts Kamulla <10: and> Kaštilla. I took out their booty (and) possessions (and) brought them to my city Aššur.

Suḫu

Texts 10 41-44 and 4 41-43 (4.23 lines 34-38). Not present on text 3. Texts 2 and 11 are broken.

4 ina girrija annimma ana māt Sūḫī lū allīk āl Sapirata ša qabal nār Puratte
4.23 ana māt Sūḫī lū allīk āl[ Sapirata ...... ]
10 ina girrija annimma ana māt Sūḫī lū allīk ištu āl Sabirite [ša qa]bal nār Puratte
4 adī āl ḫiṃdānī ālānī gabba ša māt Sūḫī lū aḵṣud
4.23 adī āl ḫiṃdānī āl[ānī ...... ]
10 ālānī ša šēpē annāte u šēpē ammāte [adī āl ḫe]ndāna lū aḵṣud
On this campaign of mine I marched to the land Su-u. I conquered from the city Sabirite/Sapiratu, an island in the Euphrates, the cities on this bank and the far bank as far as the city Hindānu/Hjīmdānu, <4: all the cities of the land Suḫu>. <4: ex.23: [...] I cut [down] their orchards [...] > I took prisoners from them <10: I uprooted their people>, carried off their <4: numerous> gods <4: and their property>, (and) brought (them) to my city Assur.

Karduniaš II
Texts 10 45-53 and 4 44-51 (4.23 lines 24-33). Not present on text 3. Texts 2 and 11 are broken.

By the command of the god Ninurta, who loves me, I marched to Karduniaš. I conquered Marduk-nadin-ahhe šar māt Karduniaš lē akšud diktašunu ma'ata lē aškun ekallatee ša ašlil narkabiiti istu Marduk-nadin-ahhe šar māt Karduniaš aškun adukšu 4 2-su sidirtaša narkabati istu Marduk-nadin-ahhe šar māt Karduniaš aškun adukšu 4.23 [... ] ša narkabati istu Marduk-nadin-ahhe šar māt Karduniaš aškun adukšu 4.23: [I plundered(?)] the
abundant properties of his palaces>. In the eponymy of Aššur-şumu-ēriš and in the eponymy of Ninuāja, twice I drew up a battle line of chariots against Marduk-nādin-alḫē, king of Karduniaš, and defeated him.

Building account
Not examined since each text has a different account (entirely omitted by text 4 exs. 23-24).

Blessings
Texts 2 5".9", 3 45-49, 10 89-93, 11 rev. 19'-26 and 4 90-93 (omitted by exs. 23-24).

In the future, in days to come, may a later prince, when this / these palace(s) / wall(s) become(s) old and dilapidated, restore its weakened portions <11: either with cedar [...] or tamarisk [...] > <4: [...] boxwood [...] within them [...] >. may he <2,10,11: may he see my <2: clay and> monumental inscriptions,> <2: [read about the might] of my dominion which the gods Aššur [and] Ninurta gave to me> <10,11: identify them, anoint them with oil> <2,10,11: make sacrifices and return them to their places.> <3: restore my inscribed name to its place> <2: [His name let him write with mine. Like me] may> the gods Aššur <3,10,11: the great lord> <2: [and Ninurta]> <10,11: and the
goddess Istar, mistress of Nineveh> <3,4,10,11: will listen to his prayers> <2: properly
guide him in joy and success>.

**Date**

Texts 2 10", 3 50f., 10 94, 4 94 (ex. 23 illegible; ex. 24 omits). Text 11 broken.

2 [ ... ... mār Nin]urta-nādin-apli
   sukkallima «rab» rubē
3 araḫ Kuzallu  ûmu 13.KÂM liμu Ninuāja mār Asšur-aplu-lišir(?)
   rab makisi
10 [ ...... ] ûmu 18.KÂM li[m[u ... ]-me Sūtē

Month of XXX, <4: equivalent of the (Babylonian) month Kislev> Xth day, eponymy
of XXX.