# þÿLKA 64: A possible Royal Song (zamar aarri) ce
# þÿTrans-Euphratian Victories of Aaaurnacirpal II s

## Bach, Johannes

publishedVersion

# UGARIT-FORSCHUNGEN

Internationales Jahrbuch
für die Altertumskunde Syrien-Palästinas

begründet von Manfried Dietrich und Oswald Loretz †

Herausgegeben von

Manfried Dietrich • Valérie Matoïan • Giovanni Mazzini
Wilfred Watson • Nicolas Wyatt

## Band 49
## 2018

Manfried Dietrich: ugarit@uni-muenster.de
Valérie Matoïan: valerie.matoian@college-de-france.fr
Giovanni Mazzini: giovanni.mazzini@unipi.it
Wilfred Watson: wge.watson@gmail.com
Nicolas Wyatt: niqmad3@gmail.com

Printed in Germany

Printed on acid-free paper

# Inhalt

# LKA 64: A possible royal song (*zamar šarri*) celebrating the Trans-Euphratian victories of Aššurnaṣirpal II's 9th campaign

*Johannes Bach, Helsinki*

## Abstract

The following paper edits, translates and comments on LKA 64, a royal hymn from the reign of Aššurnaṣirpal II that deals with the only trans-Euphratian military campaign of this king. Furthermore, it analyses the narratological setup of the text in minute detail and compares the results to the poetics of LKA 64's Middle Assyrian predecessor LKA 63 from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I. Lastly, the article draws attention to the rather exceptional narrative style that was used by the scribes of Aššurnaṣirpal II.

LKA 64, an Assyrian royal narrative text in form of a song of praise,[1] is the oldest of its kind from the first millennium BCE, at least within the corpus known to us today. Currently, the scholarly community knows of only one older comparable text, LKA 63, which stems from the times of Tiglath-Pileser I. The main theme of LKA 64 is the 9th campaign of Aššurnaṣirpal II (883-859 B.C.), which took place between 875 and 867 BCE.[2] In the course of this campaign Aššurnaṣirpal II crossed the Euphrates and reached the Mediterranean Sea, notably so as the first Assyrian ruler of the first millennium BCE.

The tablet LKA 64 is recorded on was found in the house of a *nargallu* (chief singer) in Assur (location N3, according to the counting of Pedersén 1986).[3] Today, it is housed in the Vorderasiatisches Museum Berlin (collection number VAT 10047). The autograph of VAT 10047 was drawn by Franz Köcher. It was published in 1953 as nr. 64 of the *Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur* (edited by

---

[1] See below for a discussion of LKA 64's genre.

[2] Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn 4 assumes that more campaigns than just one were "lump[ed] together as a trip" in LKA 64. However, we see the 9th campaign as the main event narrativized in LKA 64. As will be discussed below, almost every historic element of LKA 64 can be matched with events from Aššurnaṣirpal II's 9th campaign, yet it is possible that some minor references to the 8th and 10th campaign were made as well.

[3] Hurowitz 1997, 470; cf. Pedersen 1986, 38 Nr. 24 and *ibid*., 34-41.

Erich Ebeling, abbreviated: LKA). The publication did not include a photograph of the tablet. The Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative's corresponding web entry also lacks one.[4] No proper edition of the text exists. In 1997, Victor Hurowitz provided a translation of LKA 64 as a contribution to the anthological series *Context of Scripture* (edited by William Hallo, 3 vols., 1997-2003), but neither a photograph of the tablet nor an edition of the Akkadian was offered. Only a few other scholars referred to LKA 64[5] or commented on aspects of the text.[6]

### Historical outline of Aššurnaṣirpal II's 9th campaign[7]

The 9th campaign was a rather peaceful endeavour. Previously, on Aššurnaṣirpal II's 8th campaign, the Assyrians had already reached and conquered Kap(a)rabi, a fortress of Bīt-Adini presumably south of modern day Urfa and south-west of ancient Ḫuzirīna. Here the king received tribute from Aḫūnu of Bīt-Adini and Ḫabīnu of Til-abnē.[8] When the Assyrians returned to the area one year later, they met continued compliance from both Aḫūnu and Ḫabīnu, yet only the latter was assigned an annual payment. Aššurnaṣirpal II then crossed the Euphrates, likely at Til-Barsip. He received tribute in Karkemish, on which occasion "all rulers" (presumably Sangara of Karkemish, Ḫabīnu of Til-abnē and Aḫūnu of Bīt-Adini) submitted to him. The king of Pattinu, Lubarna, also submitted himself to Aššurnaṣirpal II in Kunulua.[9] Additional tribute was sent to there by Gūsu of Jaḫānu/Bīt-Agusi, and was also collected in the city of Ḫazazu. The Assyrians then continued southwards and occupied the fortress of Aribua, which was used as a base for a raid on the land of Luḫutu.[10] This event was the only military clash during the entire 9th campaign. Afterwards, Aššurnaṣirpal II traversed the Lebanon mountain ranges and reached the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, either north of modern day Tripoli or near Latakya. While at the coast he cleansed his weapons in the "Great Sea", and received tribute from the Phoenician cities between Arwāda and Ṣurru. On his return Aššurnaṣirpal ascended the Amanus and entered (even "conquered") the "land of the *meḫru*-trees". Precious woods were logged there and transported off to Aššur and Niniveh.

---

[4] https://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P413976

[5] Borger 1961, 73; Schramm 1973, 58.

[6] e.g., Groneberg 1987; Holloway 2002.

[7] Follows largely Bagg 2011, 191-194; cf. Bryce 2014, 117-119; Bryce 2012, 211-218; Cifola 1997/1998; Fales 2011, 218-219; Liverani 2014, 476-481; Liverani 2004; Liverani 1992; Yamada 2000, 69-76.

[8] A.0.101.1 iii 50-56.

[9] Possibly Tell Tayinat, see Bryce 2009, 386-387 *sub* Kinalua and 534-546 *sub* Pat(t)in.

[10] East of the Euphrates with capital Ḫattarikka, see Bryce 2009, 423 *sub* Luash.

**The inscriptional accounts for the 9th campaign (RIMA 2)**

**A.0.101.1**

The main account for Aššurnaṣirpal II's 9th campaign is A.0.101.1, iii 56-92. While the inscription itself generally is rather elaborate in style and rich in narrative innovations, the section recounting the events of the year 877 BC is a relatively unimpressive read.  Essentially it consists of detailed enumerations of the tribute and gifts received during the campaign,[11] which are loosely connected by short recounts of movement (*ištu* GN *attumuš ana* GN *aqṭirib* or similar). This is garnished with recurring reports of the submissions of the rulers of Karkemish, Til-abnē, Pattinu, and others. The only military clash during the entire campaign, the raid on Luḫutu, is dealt with quickly (iii, 81-84). The poetics used in A.0.101.1's account of the 9th campaign is throughout traditional, and there is no narrative stress put on a specific episode.

**A.0.101.2**

This inscription contains a second, significantly shorter account of the 9th campaign (ll. 25-31, 43-51, cf. 53-55). The structure is comparable to that of A.0.101.1, iii 56-92, yet emphasis is put on the submission of Lubarna of Pattinu and his offering of tributes (A.0.101.2, 48-51; ll. 53-55 refer to the settling of Ḫattean and Pattinean deportees in Calaḫ). The capture of Aribua and the subsequent raid on Luḫutu are left out, while reaching the sea coast as well as receiving Phoenician tribute were already reported in ll. 25-31 in form of a diachronically displaced summary.

**Other inscriptions in RIMA 2**

Further texts of Aššurnaṣirpal II either do not record the events of the 9th campaign[12] or just make passing references to some corresponding topics (e.g., the logging of trees in the Amanus).

**LKA 64 – Transliteration and translation**

obv. 1    ⸢*a*⸣-⸢*za*⸣-*mu-ru* MAN *kib-ra-te e-tel* DINGIR^MEŠ-*ni*
           I will sing (about) the king of the shores of the world, the hero of the gods
     2     *lu-na-ʾi-di*
           I will praise.
     3     *ša* ^dIDIM *a-šib* É.ŠÁR.RA *lu-šá-ri-iḫ* DINGIR-*ut-su*
           I will make glorious the divinity of (that) Ellil who dwells in É.ŠÁR.RA.

---

[11] A.0.101.1, iii 57-60 (Bīt-Baḫiāni, Azallu), 60-64 (Bīt-Adini), 65-70 (Carchemish / Ḫatti); 71 and 73-76 (Pattinu), 77-78 (Iaḫānu), 85-88 (Phoenician cities).

[12] The inscriptions LKA 3, 23 and LKA 3, 24, edited by E. Frahm in 2009, do not mention the 9th campaign either.

4      ᴵ*aš-šur*-PAP-A <*mu*->*ut-tal-ku ḫi-ši-iḫ-tu* DINGIRᴹᴱˢ GALᴹᴱˢ
       Aššurnaṣirpal, the deliberate, the desire of the great gods,

5      A ᴵTUKUL-MAŠ MAN *ta-na-da-te šur-ru-uḫ*
       the son of Tukultī-Ninurta, the king of fame is (made) glorious.

6      <*ina*> *ul-mí-e* // *ul-we-e* MURUB₄-*šú* MAN *ba-a-a-ri ut-ta-ʾa-*
       *pu* DÙ *ma-li-ki*
       <With> the hatchets of his warfare, the king of huntsmen knocks
       over all (foreign) princes.

7      *iṣ-ṣi/e*ˈ-*mid* TA ᵁᴿᵁ*Kal-ḫi* KUR *dan-na-nu*
       He has harnessedˈ, (and) from the City of Kalḫu, the stronghold,

8      *iṣ-ṣa-bat ana* KASKAL
       he took to the road (to campaign).

9      *a-na* DÙ-*uš ta-ḫa-zi-šu* <TA/*it-tí*ˀ> ᵁᴿᵁ*gar-ga-miš*
       For the execution of his warfare <with> the City of Karkemish

10     *is-si-ni-qi* <*na-ge-e*ˀ> *ša* ᴷᵁᴿ*Ḫat-ti*
       he approached <the districtsˀ> of Ḫatti.

11     *a-na da-na-ni* EN-*te-ia nam-ku-ru*

12     É.GAL-*i-šú áš-lu-la*
       „¹²I plundered ¹¹the possessions ¹²of his palace ¹¹to strengthen
       my lordship.

13     *ṣal-mu bu-na-ni-ia ma-aq-ru a-na* É.KUR-*šú ú-šar-ri-ḫa*
       I made glorious for his temple a precious statue of my likeness."

14     ᴷᵁᴿ*ku-mu-ḫa-a-a pa-te-na-a-a me-lam-me saḫ-pu šu-nu*
       Kumuḫḫeans, Patineans – they were overwhelmed by *melammu*.

15     [*i-šu*]-*ṭú-ni nam-ku-ru* ᴳᴵˢESI *uq-nu*
       They [dragg]ed forth possessions, ebony (and) lapis

16     ˈ*i*ˈ-*ta-ḫur*
       – he had received (those items) constantly.

17     DUMU.MÍ<ᴹᴱˢ> MAN [ᴷᵁᴿ*pa-t*]*e-na-a-a a-na ḫa-de-e*ˈ
       The daughter<s> of the Patinean king, for pleasure,

18     *na-*[ʾ*i-du*]-*ni-ka*
       are si[nging] your pr[aise] (lit. "towards you").

19     DÙ [*kib*]-*ra-te* DU.DU-*ka a-na* KUR-*e Ḫa-*ˈ*ma*ˈ-ˈ*nu*ˈ

20     *e-ta-ta-li*
       ¹⁹He went forth to all corners of the world, (and) ²⁰he had con-
       tinuously ascended ¹⁹to the Amanus mountains.

21     [3]-*ú*ᴷᴬᴹ UDU.SISKURᴹᴱˢ KÙ<ᴹᴱˢ> *a-na*
       Three pure sacrifices to

22     […] ˈxˈ NI […] UL/MI *a-na* […]
       [DNs / the (great) gods he madeˀ / were made …] to […]


rev. 1   […] ˈx xˈ […]

2        […]-*ma kal* KUR[ᴹᴱˢˀ…]
         […] and […] all landsˀ […]

3        […] ˈxˈ-*ta* […]

4      […] GIŠ […]

5      […] ˹KUR˺Ḫa-ra-[an?…]
       […] Ḫarr[ān?…]

6      SISKUR˹MEŠ˺ […]-te ˹x (DI?)˺
       sacrifices […]

7      ˹GIŠ˺ÙRMEŠ eri₄-inú TA Ḫa-ma-n[a…]
       Roofbeams of cedar from the Ama[nus…]

8      […ú-še-ri-]du-˹ni˺ ˹a˺-na É-ŠÁR.[RA É ḫi-du-ti?...]
       […they brought do]wn to the Ešar[ra, the house of joy?...].

9      […] ˹x x˺ […]
       […] ˹x x˺ […]

10     [ᵈXXX] ù ᵈUTU [DINGIRMEŠ GALMEŠ]
       Sîn and Šamaš, [the great gods]

11     KU₄-bu a-na É.ŠÁR.RA ˹x˺ ˹x˺ […] ˹x˺
       entered the É.ŠÁR.RA ˹x˺ ˹x˺ […] ˹x˺

12     i-na ni-iš IGIMEŠ-šú-<nu>
       In the lifting of their eyes

13     ma-al-ku na-ra-ma ŠÀ-bi-ia ¹aš-šur-PAP-A
       the king, the beloved of my heart, Aššurnaṣirpal

14     šá-ga-na-ku
       is the šakkanakku.

15     [ina] KA ¹Su-ku-a-a šá-ṭí-ir
       Written down as dictated by Suk(k)uāyya.

## Commentary

obv.   1 azammuru: Groneberg 1987, 114: „singe [ich] / singen [sie?]“;
       vgl. Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn. 5. This is the first example of a num-
       ber of verbal forms with anaptyctic vowels in in LKA 64.[13]
       Similar cases of redundant final vowels are attested in Assyrian
       copies of the epic of Gilgameš.[14] SAA 3, 17,[15] a heroic poem
       from roughly the same time as LKA 64, shows only one verbal
       form with an anaptyctic vowel, that is i-ṣi-me-di "he harnessed"
       in line obv. 16.

       šar kibrāte: While usually applied to Assyrian monarchs in
       the form of šar kibrāt erbetti "king of the four shores" or similar,
       the designation "king of the shores" is to our knowledge attested
       only one more time as a divine title.[16]

       IDIM DINGIRMEŠ-ni: Hurowitz 1997, 470 translates „prince
       of the gods", suggesting the sequence of signs to be NUN

---

[13] Cf. on this GAG §82 e.

[14] Cf. George 2003, 441-442.

[15] Lambert 1961; Reade 1989.

[16] For Sîn, cf. CAD Š/2 s.v. šarru 1, esp. m₎; Tallqvist 1938, 235; for šar kibrāt erbetti as
royal title see Sazonov 2016, 65-68, 73-75, 97, 106 and 108.

DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*ni*. However, the autograph clearly shows a BAD (= IDIM) sign preceding DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*ni*.

2    Groneberg 1987, 113: "ich will preisen"; vgl. Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn 6. The verbal form exhibits an anaptyctic final vowel -*i*:

3    Following Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn.s 7 and 8; Groneberg 1987, 189-190 identifies the god in question as Bēl. There is good reason to assume that this designation might refer to the "Assyrian Enlil",[17] and not to Enlil proper as suggested by Hurowitz, *ibid*. The "Assyrian Enlil" is also prominently addressed in K 6007, the likely prologue to the epic of Tukultī-Ninurta (see below).

4    <sup>1</sup>*aš-šur*-PAP-A: standard 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC orthography for writing the name Aššurnaṣirpal.[18]

     <*mu*->*ut-tal-ku*: Hurowitz 1997 reads the signs in question as *par-ri-ku* and translates "obstinate".[19] There is no Middle- or Neo-Assyrian attestation of an epithet *parriku* used positively with the Assyrian king,[20] but it was applied once to Kaštiliaš IV in the epic of Tukultī-Ninurta i (= B obv.), 35', with the meaning of either "overseer", or, because of its context more likely, "obstinate".[21] Notably, *parriku* is attested as a divine title since Middle Babylonian times, yet its concrete meaning remains elusive.[22] While the possibility that the discussed line of LKA 63 is the first – and only – attestation of a royal epithet *parriku* resembling the divine model cannot be ruled out, there may be an alternative solution. An emendation of an initial sign MU is tempting, as it would lead to the reading <*mu*>-*ut-tal-ku* = *muntalku*/*muttalku* "deliberate (one)".[23] The spelling *mu-ut-tal-ku* is attested in Nabonidus' inscription no 2, 11 i, 20 (Ms. 1; cf. Schaudig 2001, 399 and 406), yet the term appears so far as a

---

[17]  On this deity see Maul 1998, 191-192; Lambert 1987, 82-86; Allen 2012, esp. 397-398 and 402-404.

[18]  Cf.  Fischer 1998 = PNA I, 205-207.

[19]  Hurowitz 1997, 470 with fn. 9, quoting Lambert 1957-1958, 43 fn. 35 and Groneberg 1987, 44. Note that AHw II, 834 s.v. *parriku* suggest a translation "sich querlegend", while CAD P, 189-190 s.v. *parriku* does not offer any translation and only indicates that the word must be "a laudatory title".

[20]  Although one synonym list (LTBA 2, 2:26) equates *parriku* with *šarru*, it is debatable if a positive epithet *parriku* existed: The attestation for *parriku* in the epic of Tukultī-Ninurta could very well be of a negative connotation ("obstinate" rather than "overseer"), while the epithet *qarrād parrikī* in Aššur-rēša-iši I's inscription A.0.86.1, 4 translates as "warrior amongst overseers" according to Grayson, RIMA 1, 310. The only other attestation of an alleged epithet *parriku* is the discussed line of LKA 64.

[21]  Cf. Machinist 1978, 64-65 and 163-164 and CAD P, 189-190 s.v. *parriku* A b).

[22]  cf. CAD P, 189-190 s.v. *parriku* A a).

[23]  cf. CAD M/2, 206-207 s.v. *muntalku*.

Neo-Assyrian hapax only in an inscription of Esarhaddon (RINAP 4.48 = Esh. 48, 24: NUN-*ú mun-tal-ku*). To avoid emendation at all one could also consider a reading *mút-tal-ku*, assuming that the scribe erroneously used an UD sign instead of the required BAD sign.[24] Unlike *parriku*, a reading *muntalku/ muttalku* "deliberate (one)" would be supported by the fact that Aššurnaṣirpal II's texts adorn their protagonist with comparable epithets of wisdom, e.g., in A.0.101.2, 23: […] *ana-ku* [I]*aš-šur-*PAP-A *er-šu mu-du-ú ḫa-si-si pe-et uz-ni né-me-qi* [d]É.A MAN ZU.AB *iš-ma-ni a-na ía-ši* "I, Aššurnaṣirpal, sage, expert, intelligent one, open to counsel (and) wisdom which Ea, the king of the *apsû*, destined for me […]".[25] If accepted, the line would be the oldest attestation of a monarchic epithet *mun/ttalku* in the corpus of Assyrian royal narrative texts known today.

5      A [I]TUKUL-MAŠ: this writing of the name Tukultī-Ninurta is widely attested in the inscriptions of Aššurnaṣirpal II.[26]

*šurruḫ*: following Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn 11 we interpret this form as a D stative 3rd p. s. of *šarāḫu*. Although it might be tempting to correct to *šuruḫ* ("Make glorious!") for the sake of a parallel construction of singer and audience ('I praise Ellil, you praise Aššurnaṣirpal') as suggested by Hurowitz *ibid.*, there is no sense in doing so, for it is the singer who continues to praise the king.

    MAN / *šar tanādāte šurruḫ*: *tanādāte* is the Neo-Assyrian plural form of *tanattu*, a "free variant" of *tanittu* (CAD T, 169). Several of the examples listed in CAD/T s.v. *tanattu* imply nonetheless that *tanādātu* retains a singular meaning (cf. *ludlul bēl nēmeqi* II, 31 [Ms. ABik]: *ta-na-da-a-ti* LUGAL *i-liš ú-maš-šil*). Reading the line as it is written, the correct translation is "the son of Tukultī-Ninurta, the king of glory / fame(, he) is glorified", with MAN = *šar* being the regens and *tanādāte* being the rectum of a regular status constructus. Aššurnaṣirpal II is explicitly called *šar tanādāte* "king of glory / fame" in his own inscription A.0.101.2, l. 19 ([…] MAN *ta-na-da-a-te* [LÚ]SIPA […] "[…] king of glory, shepherd […]"). Therefore, we clearly opt for the translation just given.[27]

---

[24] I owe many thanks to Ingo Kottsieper, who suggested this reading in his editor's review of this article.

[25] Translation by Grayson in RIMA 2, 225.

[26]  Cf. A.0.101.1, 28; A.0.101.4, 1', here: TUKUL-[d]MAŠ; A.0.101.19, 23; A.0.101.23, 1 etc.; cf. Baker 2011 = PNA 3/2, 1332-1333 *sub* Tukultī-Inurta.

[27] Hurowitz misses the sign MAN directly after [I]TUKUL-MAŠ, and suggests *ibid.*, fn. 11 a reading of the second half of the line as either *tanadātē<-šu> šurruḫ* 'glorify his fame' or *<(ša) ina> tanadātē<-šu> šurruḫ* '(who) is glorified in his fame', correctly inferring

6     *ulmē*: *ulmū*-weapons, usually translated as "hatchets", are already accompanying Zimrī-Lîm, king of Mari, to battle in the correspondingly dubbed epic.[28] Unlike in other attested cases, LKA 64 does not couple *ulmu* with a derivative of a so far unattested, yet quite probable root *š ū r "to rage, be raging".[29]

---

that this formulation refers to Aššurnaṣirpal. For the sake of completeness, the suggestions made by Hurowitz 1997, 470 shall be discussed briefly. If one would follow Hurowitz, an emendation of the copula *ša* would generally be most convenient for forming a regular subordinated clause with the rest of the line. Two theoretical possibilities to rework the line would emerge:

1.) *šarru <ša> tanādāte<-šu> šurruḫ* "[…], king, whose praise is glorified (or, less likely: you shall glorify)": This solution, requiring a total of three emendations, would mirror the structure of the first line of lugal-e (*šarru ūmu ša melammu-šu etellum*), and is semantically close to older formulations in Assyrian Royal Narratives, e.g. in the epic of Tukultī-Ninurta (cf. vi = B rev. 14' *u tanattu kiššūtī-šu innammar-ma*, cf. Machinist 1978, 128-129). Additional weight for this solution could be stemmed from Aššurnaṣirpal II's own inscription A.0.101.1, iii 25-26: Here a statue of the king is described as bearing an inscript that reads: [25] [1]*Aššur-nāṣir-apli šarru ša tanatta-šu* [26]*danānu kajjamānu* […] "[25]Aššurnaṣirpal, the king whose praise / fame [26] is a constant strength […]" (contra the translation by Grayson in RIMA 2, 214 "[…] whose strength is constantly praiseworthy […]"). The same inscription would offer even more support for this suggested emendation, that is in ll. i 97-99, where a statue and a stele of Aššurnaṣirpal II are said to be inscribed with *lītī u tanattī* "my glory and fame" respectively *tanatti gešrūtīya* "the fame of my superior power", cf. also ll. ii, 5-7 and iii 24-26. Nonetheless, the fact that this solution would require two emendations vs. none for the translation given above lets one doubt the likeness of this reconstruction.

2.) *šarru <(ša)> <ina> tanadāte<-šu> šurruḫ* "[…], the king (who) is glorified in his praises": This solution would structurally fit standard appositions used in Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions *šarru ša ina* […] VERBAL FORM, e.g. A.0.101.1, i 15 ([…] *ša ina tukulti ilāni rabūti bēlū-šu illaku-ma*) or A.0.101.2, 19 (*šarru ša ina qibīt pî-šu ušḫarmaṭu matāte u tâmtāte*). The given examples are inscriptions of Aššurnaṣirpal II, and there are several more attestations of this figure in his and other Assyrian royal inscriptions. Again, the discussed solution would require at least as many emendations as 1.), and is therefore even less likely.

Another possibility would not necessitate the addition of a copula *ša*:

3.) *šarru tanadāte<-šu> šurruḫ* "(Aššurnaṣirpal) […], (the) king, his fame is glorified / whose fame you shall glorify". Although this solution would require the least number of emendations, it would still seem unlikely due to its rather dumsy syntax.

Although some argument could be made for Hurowitz' suggestions (which still hinge on the missed MAN sign), we see no reason to artificially "enhance" a perfectly fine sentence whose reading as given above does not require any emendations as well as being backed up by the evidence from Aššurnaṣirpal II's own royal inscriptions.

[28] ll. iii, 22-23; see Guichard 2014, 21 and 58-60, also cf. *ibid.* for the *ulmū*-weapons mentioned in the epic of Erra and in TCL 3.

[29] For *š ū r see Guichard 2014, 60.

Moreover, the writing with MÍ could indicate a possible labial shift between *m* and *w*, in which case we should read *ulwē* accordingly.

*šar bajjārī*: This is the first attestation of an epithet "king of huntsmen" within the known Assyrian royal narrative texts.[30] While the theme of the Assyrian king as hunter harks back to Tiglath-Pileser I, this specific epithet is, at least to our knowledge, not used in any other Assyrian royal narrative text. The time of composition as well as the text-class / genre of LKA 62, an Assyrian royal narrative text commonly dubbed "The Hunter", are currently debated.[31] Although it seems probable that LKA 62 is a late re-working of an originally Middle Assyrian piece, it does not contain any royal epithet comparable to the discussed *šar bajjārī*.

*utta'ʾapu*: We follow Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn 12 in identifying this form as a regular present Dt of *daʾāpu* "to knock over".[32]

*kal malikī* (DÙ *ma-li-ki*): Cf. the same expression in SAA 3, 17 obv.1: […] ʿreʾ-ʾu-u ša DÙ (= *kàl*) *ma-li-ki* "Shepherd of all (foreign) princes" and in Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions, e.g. A.0.101.1, i 20: LUGAL DÙ *mal-ki*[MEŠ] "king of all (foreign) princes" or i 35-36: MAN *kiš-šat* UB[MEŠ] *šá nap-ḫar mal-ki*[MEŠ] DÙ-*šú-nu* "king of all of the (world's) corners (and) of the sum of all their (foreign) princes".

7-8    Hurowitz 1997, 470 with fn. 13 suggested that the sequence of signs IZ TA ZIZ in obv. 7 are a scribal error which should be corrected by emending it to the structurally correct *it-ta-muš* = *ittamuš* "he has departed". This solution would be supported by inscriptional evidence, e.g., A.0.101.1, iii 56-57. However, the sign read by Hurowitz as TA is only one horizontal wedge short of being a regular ṢI/ṢE. Therefore, it is possible to read this sequence of signs as *iṣ-ṣeʾ-mid*, G Perfect of *ṣamādu* "to harness". As a reading *iṣ-ṣeʾ-mid* would only necessitate one slight correction instead of two major emendations (IT for IZ, and MUŠ for ZIZ), it is at least a solution that may be considered. Support for this alternative reconstruction can be drawn from another royal narrative text, presumably from the time of Shalmaneser III: The reconstructed lines LKA 64, obv. 7-8: [7]*iṣṣemid ultu* [URU]*Kalḫi*

---

[30] The expression is registered neither in AHw I, 96 *bāʾe/iru* nor in CAD B, 34 *bajāru*.

[31] Pongratz-Leisten 2015, 252 and 468-475 sees LKA 62 as a serious late Middle Assyrian praise-poem while Edzard 2004, 2004 understands the text as a Neo-Assyrian "satire" of royal narrative texts; also see Hurowitz/Westenholz 1990, 46-49.

[32]  Cf. AHW II, 146 sub *daʾāpu* (we do not assume a passive meaning of the Dt-stem of *daʾāpu* as given there!) and CAD N/1, 7 s.v. *naʾāpu* for the derivation *daʾāpu* <*naʾāpu*.

<sup>KUR</sup>*dannānu* <sup>8</sup>*iṣṣabat ana ḫarrāni* can be compared to SAA 3, 17 obv. 16: *i-ṣi-me-di* <sup>I</sup>*aš-šur*-PAP-AŠ <sup>KUR</sup>*na-ʾi-ru* x [x x *id?*]*-di-ki* "<sup>I</sup>*Aššur*-PAP-AŠ / Aššurnaṣirpal(?) harnessed and mobilized the land of Nairi […]".[33] While we shall not rule out the solution by Hurowitz, we opt for the one that requires the least amount of correctional interference with the text. Autopsy of the line remains necessary, as already called for by Hurowitz.

9-10    The emendation of both TA / *itti* "with" (in the sense of "against") in line 9 and *na-ge-e* (*nagē*) "districts" in line 10 is the least invasive solution when attempting to straighten out the syntax of the sentence. In line 10, *issiniqi*, G perfect of *sanāqu* "to approach", exhibits another anaptyctic final vowel.

11-13   As indicated by the verbal forms in 1<sup>st</sup> p. s., lines 11-13 contain a mimetic (respectively: virtual mimetic) speech of LKA 64's royal protagonist. It is debatable if these lines can be qualified as an "autodiegesis", where the main protagonist and the narratorial institution fall in one (standard narrative form of the royal inscriptions), or if the royal protagonist's utterance is merely "recounted" by the regular narrator (a so-called "alteration" from the regular pattern of narrating).[34] Since two lines out of 36 offer too little evidence for a deliberate change, we opt for the latter solution.

The two inscriptional accounts for the 9<sup>th</sup> campaign (A.0.101.1, A.0.101.2) do not record the erection of a statue in the city of Carchemish. However, inscription A.0.101.1 alone mentions the installation of some other royal monuments in conquered territory, that is in lines i, 97-99 (both a royal statue inscribed with an unspecified account of Aššurnaṣirpal II's feats and a monumental inscription in Hayyānu's palace in Ḫindānu), lines ii 5-7 (a royal statue in the city of Tušḫa, inscribed with an account of Aššurnaṣipal II's feats explicitly achieved in the land of Naʾiri, as well as the installation of another royal inscription on the city wall), lines ii 90 (inscribed royal statue in the city of Matiatu, cf. A.0.101.17, iv 15-18) and finally lines iii 24-26 (inscribed royal statue in the city of Sūru, with quotation! of its text).[35]

---

[33] Cf. Livingstone 1989, 44. The writing <sup>I</sup>*aš-šur*-PAP-AŠ is the second most attested form of writing <sup>I</sup>*Aššur-naṣir-apli* (cf. Fischer 1998 = PNA I, 205-207), but it is debatable if SAA 3, 17 indeed refers to the father of Shalmaneser III or to another individual (maybe an army commander) with the same name (Lambert 1961; Reade 1989). There is also the possibility to render the name as *Aššur-aḫu-iddina*, but the oldest attestation of this name only stems from the reign of Sargon II, cf. Porter / Radner 1998, 145-152.

[34] For forms of narrative speech cf. Genette 1980, 161-189.

[35] On royal statues set up in conquered territories as a tool of domination see Holloway 2002, 151-159 (for LKA 64 cf. *ibid*., 151 fn. 238); cf. Barcina Pérez 2016, 27 with fn. 138.

14     The motif of royal *melammu* is used in Aššurnaṣirpal II's inscriptions too, e.g. in A.0.101.1, i, 26 (*melammu* as royal feature), i, 57, 80 (each with very similar formulation as in the line discussed here: *melamme ša ᵈAššur isḫup-šunu* "the *melammu* of Aššur threw them down/overwhelmed them", cf. also ii, 46, 81), ii 112 (*melammu* is "poured out" over 50 cities/towns of the land of Dirru) or iii, 54 (*melammu* is set over Bīt-Adini). On the history of *melammu* see Emilianov 2010; the literary history of *melammu* in Assyrian royal narrative texts is discussed by the author of this paper in a forthcoming monograph.

    The occurrence of a GN Kumuḫḫu is rather curious here. There should be no doubt that this toponym is meant to indicate the northern most border of Aššurnaṣirpal II's campaign as narrated in LKA 64, likewise Ḫatti (Karkemiš) stands for the subdued north-western regions, and Pattinu (with the Sea coast) for the western parts. Although there is no mention of Kumuḫḫu in the inscriptional accounts of the 9th campaign, it appears in the report of the next year's military endeavour.[36] This could indicate that campaigns (or: at least the one campaign) after the 9th were also integrated into LKA 64's narrative. On the other hand, and assuming that LKA 64 relates only to events from the 9th and maybe the 8th campaign, it seems possible that its author(s) subsumed the small kingdom of Tīl-abnē,[37] according to the inscription A.0.101.1 the northern most point reached during the 9th campaign, under the larger geographical entity Kumuḫḫu, which is thought to have been Tīl-abnē's neighbour to the north.[38] The three major powers Kumuḫḫu, Ḫatti and Pattinu all align nicely in a straight line from the north-east to the south-west. It could be possible that such an arrangement was considered as geographically "aesthetic", thus causing the (assumed) substitution of Tīl-abnē with Kumuḫḫu in LKA 64.

    All of this consecutively leads to the question for the time of composition of LKA 64. Judging from its content the 9th campaign is a certain *terminus post quem*, but as Aššurnaṣirpal II probably did not campaign that far to the west again it could also have been composed much later.[39] The mention of Kumuḫḫu, the only indicator for a later composition, would move the *terminus post quem* up one campaign. Unfortunately, not much is known

---

[36] Hurowitz 1997, 472 fn 21; A.0.101.1, iii 96; Bryce 2009, 397-398.

[37] Cf. Bagg 2011, 104 fn 364 and 192 with further readings; Bryce 2009, 705; Yamada 2000, 70-71.

[38] Following the placement by Bagg 2011, maps 4.1-4.10 and 4.14.

[39] On the question of the number of Aššurnaṣirpal II's western campaigns see Yamada 2000, 74-75 with further readings.

about LKA 64's author, Suk(k)uāyya,[40] while the name of the actual scribe, judging from the writing errors made in the text most probably a student, is not recorded. The issue must therefore remain open for the time being.

17-18   Judging from the autograph and *pace* Hurowitz 1997, 471 the last sign in this line should undoubtedly be read as KA, preceded by a NI. This sequence of signs as well as the initial *na-* strongly suggests (*contra* Hurowitz *ibid.*) that line 18 should contain a stative form ending in ventive pl + personal suffix 2nd sg. dat. of a root starting with *n*.[41] The damaged part of obv. 18 is big enough to accommodate presumably up to three signs. The root *nʾd* = *nâdu* "to praise", which is attested with the Assyrian king as object of glorification, is a likely candidate. Admittedly, this restoration would necessitate the emendation of DUMU.MÍ<MEŠ> in the previous line (obv. 17). It seems reasonable that the omission of MEŠ in obv. 17 is simply a scribal error, a similar mistake was made in obv. 21. Without this emendation, one could also restore something completely different like *na-[ʾi-id bu-u]-ni-ka* "(the daughter of the Pattinean) takes care of your features", which would be structurally possible and not necessitate any changes in obv. 17. Yet the likelihood of the missing verb stemming from the semantic field "praise" is increased by a statement elsewhere. A.0.101.1 iii, 76 records[42] that Lubarna gave "ten female singers" (10 MÍNAR MEŠ) as well as "his (= Lubarna's) niece with her [r]ich dowry" (DUMU.MÍ ŠEŠ-*šú* TA *nu-du-ni-šá* [*ma*]-*ʾa-di*) to Aššurnaṣirpal II as part of his tribute. Lines 46-51 of inscription A.0.101.2, on the other hand, do not mention any female hostages as part of Pattinu's tribute. It stands to reason that in LKA 64 a) Lubarna's niece mentioned in A.0.101.1, iii 76 had been transformed into Lubarna's daughter(s) and b) mingled together with the ten female singers mentioned in the same inscriptional line.

One should note that with these lines LKA 64 puts some narrative stress on the submission and tribute-offerings of Lubarna of Pattinu, as he is the only ruler having to hand over his own child as hostage, yet virtually equal importance is given to the treatment of Carchemish (installation of an Assyrian royal statue) and, to a lesser degree, to the Kumuḫḫean's offering of tribute. As mentioned above, the submission of Lubarna is the

---

[40] Cf. Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn 37; Hunger 1968, 86 no 262; Tallqvist 1914, 203 r; Radner 2003 = PNA 3/1, 1156.

[41]  With -*ni-ka* as deficit writing for Neo-Assyrian -*nimka* > -*nikka* "towards you"; cf. GAG § 42 j, k and GAG verbal paradigm 12b for n.A./n.B. 2. p. s. dative suffix -*ka*.

[42] Already noted by Hurowitz 1997, 472 fn 30.

most significant episode in the short report on the 9th campaign in inscription A.0.101.2, but not so in the main account in inscription A.0.101.1.

   *Note on the narratorial institution*: The narrator, who is usually located outside of the story of LKA 64 ("extradiegetic"), turns into a speaker in these lines and addresses Aššurnaṣirpal II directly (*na*[*ʾidu*]*nikka*¹ "…singing your praise"), therefore shortly becoming "intradiegetic" (i.e. an active participant in the story).

19       DU.DU-*ka* can be interpreted as a ventive Gt preterite of *alāku* (*ittalaka*), corresponding with the Gtn perfect *ētatalli* in l. 20 and thus following a narrative "*consecutio temporum*".[43]

20       We follow AHw I, 208 *elû* IV Gtn 1.b) in interpreting *ētatalli* as Gtn perfect of *elû* "to go up, ascend". The grammatical functions of Gtn perfects, usually denoting aspect of pluractionality and verbal plurativity, were discussed by Kouwenberg, who also acknowledges that Gtn forms are adding notions of habituality and iterativity to a verb's original meaning.[44]

21-22   The emendation KÙ[MEŠ] is mandatory due to the preceding UDU.SISKUR[MEŠ].

   Hurowitz 1997, 471-472 with fn 31 interprets [2]-*ú*[KAM] as "twice", yet no rendering of the Akkadian is offered. However, [2]-*ú*[KAM] should yield a reading *šanû* "second", not "twice", which would have been expressed with *šaniš*. A cardinal number "two" would be *šina* / *šena*, f. *šitta*. Since a first sacrifice is not mentioned in the first 20 lines of LKA 64, a "second" one hardly makes much sense. There is a possibility that this line might correspond to the gods mentioned in rev. 10 (see below), [dXXX] *ù* dUTU, who are described there as entering the Ešarra-temple. If obv. 21-22 indeed refers to gods mentioned on the reverse, we could add the temple's main god Aššur to Sin and Šamaš, and therefore restore [3]-*ú*[KAM], to be read here as female status rectus *šalaštu* (= nA *salassu*) "three".[45] This also fits with the preserved case ending in -*u*.

rev. 5   The toponym Ḫarrānu is too isolated to make further sense of its appearance. Although information on the status of the city and the land of Ḫarrānu during the early Neo-Assyrian period is scarce and scholarly opinions differ, it is possible that it was annexed by Aššurnaṣirpal II at some point.[46]

---

[43] Cf. GAG §§ 80d.

[44] Kouwenberg 1997, 69-88; Kouwenberg 2010, 417-422.

[45] According to GAG § 139.f cardinal numbers usually take a grammatical gender diametrically opposite to the counted items. Furthermore, in literary texts cardinal numbers in status rectus can precede the counted items.

[46] Yamada 2000, 70 with further readings; also see Bryce 2009, 293 who dates the conquest of Ḫarrānu to the reign of Shalmaneser III.

7-11    Lines rev. 7-8 are similar to the inscription A.0.101.1, iii 90:
        GIŠÙRMEŠ GIŠ*e-re-ni iš-tu* KUR*ḫa-ma-ni na-šá-ku* DU-*ka a-na*
        É.ŠAR.RA *a-na* É *ia-as-ma-ku* É *ḫi-da-te a-na* É d30 *u* dUTU
        DINGIRMEŠ KÙMEŠ "Carrying beams of cedar from the Amanus
        I went to the Ešarra, 'my temple the shrine', the house of joy, to
        the temple of Sîn and Šamaš, the pure ("holy") gods."[47] This in-
        scriptional line, although in part almost matching LKA 64 rev. 7,
        cannot be connected to the following line in LKA 64, because
        the signs […]-*du-ni* preserved there indicate a verbal form end-
        ing in ventive plural. However, both texts are too similar not to
        suspect a direct hypertextual dependence, on which the unfortu-
        nately completely damaged line rev. 9 could have shed some
        more light. Two possible solution emerge, either […DU.]DU-*ni*
        = *illikūni* "they went forth (to the temple)", or […*ú-še-ri*]-*du-ni*
        = *ušeridūni* "they brought down (beams of cedar to the temple).
        While both verbal forms would correspond (either verbally or
        content-wise) with the hypotext A.0.101.1, iii 90, the latter is
        much more likely as the transport of beams into the temple is also
        mentioned there. The same inscriptional passage also justifies an
        emendation of the broken first DN in rev. 10 as Sîn.

12      The lifting of eyes is a traditional Mesopotamian trope indicating
        benevolence, compare e.g. already in the Sumerian hymn Šu-Sîn
        A, lines 13-14.[48]

13      The final -a in *narāma* seems redundant, but could have been
        added for rhythmic reasons. The line consists as it is of one tro-
        chee followed by two amphibrachs and three trochees for the
        king's name, with each rhythmic unit limited to a single word.
        Without this final -a, the first half of the line would consist of a
        rhythmic sequence trochee-amphibrach-trochee, with a caesura
        between the last syllable of *narām* and the first syllable of
        *libbīyya*.[49]

14      The title *šakkanakku* is used only rarely for Assyrian kings, yet
        is attested since Old Assyrian times (reign of Zarriqum).[50]

15      As already mentioned, virtually nothing is known about the pre-
        sumed author of LKA 64, Suk(k)uāyya.[51]

---

[47] Follows the edition and translation by Grayson in RIMA 2, 219.

[48] Edition Sefati 1998, 344-352; on this text see recently Halton/Svärd 2018, 105-108.

[49] On rhythm and meter in Akkadian literature see Helle 2014 with further readings.

[50] See Sazonov 2016, 21, 34, 51 and 89; Cifola 1995, 7.

[51] Cf. Hurowitz 1997, 470 fn 37; Hunger 1968, 86 no 262; Tallqvist 1914, 203 r; Radner
2003 = PNA 3/1, 1156 no. 52.

## LKA 64 and LKA 63: a structuralist comparison[52]

As mentioned before, the text closest to LKA 64 in form and content is the Middle Assyrian piece LKA 63 (reign of Tiglath-Pileser I). There were probably more and other literary relatives to LKA 63 and 64 not yet discovered.[53] Westenholz/Hurowitz 1990, 40-45 consider LKA 63 a "heroic poem" or "narrative hymn" respectively, whose narrative form is roughly defined by a) length, b) formal criteria (pro- and epilogue; colophon),[54] and c) protagonist and theme (a single military event under the reigning king). We will discuss these points first before taking an even closer look at the narrative make-up of both texts.

a)  LKA 63 and LKA 64 are indeed comparable in length, the former comprising 46, the latter 37 lines (respectively 36 regular lines + one line of colophon). Unfortunately, LKA 63 is damaged, and the first five lines of the obverse are missing.

b)  Both LKA 63 and LKA 64 show an epilogue. LKA 63 invokes the absolute dominance of Aššur (rev. 22: [*a-n*]*a* ᵈ*A-šur ik-nu-šu ka-liš* [*ḫu*]*r-ša-nu* "to Aššur bowed down all mountain ranges") before mentioning the king (rev. 24: [*iš*⁇*-m*]*e*⁇ MAN *si-qir-šu-nu ša ṭu-ub* ŠÀ "the king [hear]d⁇ their statement of good will"), and LKA 64 likewise stresses the benevolence of the gods by mentioning their "eye-lifting" before invoking the

---

[52] LKA 62, a debated royal narrative text commonly dubbed "the Hunter" is not suitable for comparison (on this text see Pongratz-Leisten 2015, 252 and 468-475; Edzard 2004). Probably stemming from Middle Assyrian times, there are reasons to assume a later reworking of the piece, and although it features an Assyrian king as protagonist, it is set in a rather metaphorical environment where the enemies are consistently portrayed as donkeys (note that animal comparisons and metaphors are common in royal inscriptions, but they are used very selectively and not for a general portrayal of antagonists). While it cannot be ruled out that the text was taken seriously, as argued recently by Pongratz-Leisten 2015, it also contains moments of a comical nature (e.g. the "fart" of the hunter that should "shake his circumference" in obv. 13, or the "barking" sun in rev. 2), and possibly onomatopoetic writings attempting to imitate the donkeys' neigh (obv. 7 *i-iš-mu-ú i-me-re-´e`* "listened the donkeys", obv. 20 *i-ka-ki-i-ni-i* "with our weapons"; cf. Edzard 2004, 85). Additionally, the bombastic ending of the narrative where the rampaging hunter even "slashes open the wombs of the pregnant" and "blinds the younglings" (rev. 3) seems at odds with the unusually flat narrative bow of suspense in the rest of the text, and might have served parodistic aims rather than a celebration of the king's feats (Edzard 2004, 82).
[53] Westenholz/Hurowitz 1990, 44 cite the "Liederkatalog" KAR 158 (Tiglath-Pileser I) which lists 12 Akkadian royal hymns (12 *za-mar* LUGAL *ak-ka-du-ú*; rev. i, 24), 5 Sumerian and Akkadian heroic songs (*qurdu*; rev. i, 40) and two corresponding titles / first lines of *gangiṭṭu*-songs ("Trampler of the corners [of the world], who throws all cities into confusion" and "Let me sing of the strong god, the royal one, the heroic god"; rev. iii, 13-14). They point out that it seems that of all these genres LKA 63 survived as the single Middle Assyrian witness to a great and lost narrative tradition.
[54] We subsume point d) "epilogue" and "colophon" under b) for the sake of brevity.

royal protagonist by name and giving him the rather traditional(ist) title of *šakkanakku* (rev. 12-14).

Concerning the opening, LKA 64 starts off with a bipartite prologue of firstly divine and then royal praise (obv. 1-6). We would compare this to the opening of LKA 63, but the first five lines of the tablet's obverse are lost, and its main narrative already starts in obv. 6. Therefore, the next best suitable piece for comparison is the damaged tablet K 6007, which contains the fragmentary opening of the Tukultī-Ninurta epic.[55] We give the transliteration by Borger 1961, 73 (with some minor modifications):[56]

**K 6007**

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | *ši-ma-a ta-nit*[!][57]*-tuš ta-ni-ti* LUGAL[!][58] EN[MEŠ] […] |
| 2 | *šá* EN KUR.KUR [d]EN.LÍL *áš-šu-re-e ú-š*[*ar-raḫ-*(*ma*)…] |
| 3 | *dan-dan-nu-su* NUN-*u lit-taš-qa-*[*ar..*] |
| 4 | GIM *šur-bu-ma* [GIŠ]TUKUL[MEŠ]-*šú* UGU […] |
| 5 | *ú-šar-raḫ-ma ta-na-ti aš-šur* LUGAL […] |
| 6 | *ù* LUGAL[MEŠ]-*ni šur-bu-ti* […] |
| 7 | *šá i-na* MURUB₄ MÈ UGU KUR-*ti* […] |
| 8 | *ù i-na siq-ri* [d]UTU *qu-*[*ra-du…*] |
| 9 | *e-zib* 40 MAN[MEŠ]-*ni* […][59] |
| 10 | *šá i-na pa-li-*X/*š*[*ú*[?]*...*] |
| 11 | *li-ta-at meṭ-l*[*u*[?](*-ti-šú*)…][60] |

---

[55] Foster ³2005, 299; Hurowitz/Westenholz 1990, 42; cf. Wilcke 1977, 215.

[56] Lines 15-20 were not transliterated by Borger; for the autograph see Winckler 1894, 76; also see the photo provided by CDLI (https://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P396312).

[57] *Pace* Borger 1961, 73 we assume a scribal mistake here, for both the tablet and Winckler's autograph clearly show a RI sign.

[58] This must be another scribal mistake (cf. Foster ³2005, 299 with the same emendation as made here), for the sequence LÚ EN[MEŠ] (*amēl bēlē* "man of lords") hardly makes sense, while LUGAL EN[MEŠ] (*šar bēlē* "king of lords") does. This correction is additionally backed up by very similar expressions in Tukultī-Ninurta I's royal inscriptions, e.g. the so-called "paronomastic genitives of intensity" (cf. Schäfer 1974) *šar šarrāni* "king of kings" in A.0.78.24, 7; *bēl bēlē* "lord of lords" in A.0.78.3, 3 as well as the triadic *šar šarrāni bēl bēlē mālik mālikī* "king of kings, lord of lords, ruler of rulers" in A.0.78.13, 3-4, A.0.78.16, 4-5 and A.0.78.38, 3-4 (fragmentary). While the correction to LUGAL EN[MEŠ] itself does not qualify as such a poetic figure, it is considerably more likely than an expression LÚ EN[MEŠ], which to our knowledge cannot be found a second time in the known corpus of Assyrian royal narrative texts.

[59] This first historic reference can be connected to the 40 conquered kings of Naʾiri mentioned in Tukultī-Ninurta's inscriptions A.0.78.23, 46-47 and A.0.78.24, 31-33, cf. Foster ³2005, 299.

[60] Cf. A.0.100.5 (Tukultī-Ninurta II), 135: *ina qitrub meṭlūtīyya* "with my vigorous assault"; contra Borger 1961, 73 BE-*l*[*ūtišu*].

12     *ù al-k*[*a-kat*…][61]
13     *šá ul-tu* [X …]
14     UGU KUR-*šu* […]
15     [Id][X…]
16     *a-na* KUR-[*ti*…]
17     URU […]
18     [I]la[ʾ]-[…]
19     *a-n*[*a*…]
20     [Id][…]

A translation for lines 1-11 is provided by Foster ³2005, 299 (with some minor modifications and an added translation for lines 12-20):

1.   Listen to his praise, the praise of the king[ꞌ] of lords […]
2.   I ex[tol] the [(praise?)] of the lord of the lands, the Assyrian Enlil,
3.   Let his mighty power, his […] be spoken of,
4.   [Hear…] how great his weapons were over his enemies!
5.   I extol and praise Aššur, king of [the gods],
6.   The great king also […]
7.   Whom [he…] in the campaign against Kadm[uḫi],
8.   And (whom) by the command of the w[arrior] Šamaš [he…],
9.   Aside from the forty kings of [Naʾiri…]
10.  Whom, in his reign […]
11.  The triumph of his lordship […]
12.  And [his] co[nduct…]
13.  That/who from […]
14.  Over his land […]
15.  [Id][X…]
16.  To the land [of…]
17.  The city of […]
18.  [I]La[ʾ]-[…]
19.  To […]
20.  [Id][…]

Like LKA 64, K 6007 opens with divine praise, here for the "Assyrian Enlil",[62] and then switches, presumably in line 5 or 6, to lauding the king. Yet unlike the introduction (or: prologue) of LKA 64, which uses two verbal forms from the semantic range of praising (*zamāru*, *nâdu*) without any further typological indications, K 6007 explicitly names the literary

---

[61] Cf. A.0.77.1 (Shalmaneser I), 8-9: *ša alkakātūšu sūturā* "whose ways of conduct are exceedingly great".

[62] Maul 1998, 191-192; Lambert 1987; Allen 2012, esp. 397-398 and 402-404. LKA 64's extraordinary use of *šar kibrāte* as a divine title for the "Enlil dwelling in Ešarra" (obv. 1-3) might resemble the traditional title *bēl mātāti* used in K 6007 for the "Assyrian Enlil".

type of praise that is about to be given, namely a *tana/ittu* "(hymn of) praise", in line 1: *ši-ma-a ta-nit!-tuš* "Listen to his [= the Assyrian Enlil's] (hymn of) praise" and line 5: *ú-šar-raḫ-ma ta-na-ti Aš-šur* LUGAL [DINGIR^MEŠ…] "I will make glorious the (hymn of) praise of Aššur, king [of the gods…]. Machinist 1978, 374 has suggested that the noun *tana/ittu* in the Epic of Tukultī-Ninurta (besides in K 6007 also occurring in vi = B rev. 14') can indeed be understood as an auto-reference to the epic, or at least to a specific part of it. According to the terminology established by Gérard Genette[63] *tana/ittu* functions here as a so-called "paratextual marker" which is used to indicate the genre of a respective literary piece. It is debatable if the expression *šar tanādāte* as used in LKA 64 and in some inscriptions of Aššurnaṣirpal II falls into the same category, meaning that the epithet *šar tanādāte* would not only adorn the protagonist, but also have the sublime qualities of a paratextual marker that refers to LKA 64 belonging to the text-class of *tanattu*. Due to the expression being used indiscriminately in both LKA 64 and in inscriptions one should be careful not to overinterpret its paratextual significance, but treat it as an extraordinary epithet while still acknowledging its paratextual potential. As mentioned by Westenholz/Hurowitz 1990, 43, it seems reasonable to consider the shortness of both LKA 63 and 64 as an essential feature of a narrative type differing from that of the epics. This leads to the cautious conclusion that the Middle Assyrian epics concerning Adad-nīrārī I and Tukultī-Ninurta I can be labelled as *tana/ittu*, while considerable shorter royal narrative texts should not.[64] However, due to the verbs of praising used in its first two lines (*zamāru, nâdu*) it is very tempting to connect LKA 64 with the designation *zamar šarri* "royal song/hymn", an emic literary category for which the Middle Assyrian "Liederkatalog" KAR 158 mentions 12 Akkadian exemplars (rev. i, 24: 12 *za-mar* LUGAL *ak-ka-du-ú*).[65]

Unfortunately, the royal protagonist of K 6007, Tukultī-Ninurta I, is not named in the preserved part of the text. What is left of his description focusses on heroic martial superiority (lines 7-9, 11-12). LKA 64, on the other hand, introduces its protagonist by name and filiation (in clear parallel to the royal inscriptions), yet combines this with epithets of wisdom, divine favour and fame in lines 4-5. Additionally, a statement on his global dominance is made in line 6, for which a common topos from the royal inscriptions (the conquest of foreign rulers) was enhanced by connecting it with both a traditional motive (wielding of *ulmū*-weapons) and the innovative (or better: otherwise unattested), metaphorical title "king of huntsmen". Another royal narrative text of similar qualities as LKA 64

---

[63] Genette 1997a, 3-4; Genette 1997b; Broich 1985; Helbig 1996.
[64] This also affects the texts labelled „epic" in SAA 3 (SAA 3: 18, 19, 20, 23, 24 and probably 50).
[65] Cf. Hurowitz/Westenholz 1990, 44; Pongratz-Leisten 2015, 248.

is SAA 3, 17.[66] Unfortunately, the beginning of this text is damaged, but it appears as if the royal protagonist[67] was introduced in these lines.[68]

LKA 63 does not feature a colophon in the preserved part. According to Westenholz/Hurowitz 1990, 43 it seems also unlikely in general to expect one due to LKA 63 being a 2nd millennium text. The colophon of LKA 64, on the other hand, can be considered as common for the 1st millennium.

c) LKA 63 and LKA 64 agree in both protagonist and theme. The former is the corresponding ruling monarch of Assyria, the latter is a single campaign or military achievement that supposedly so was perceived as somewhat more significant than comparable events at its time, or at least deemed worthy of a special literary treatment. As shown by Westenholz/Hurowitz 1990 *passim*, LKA 63 deals with the (U)Qumānu-campaign of Tiglath-Pileser I, while, as pointed out above, LKA 64 is clearly concerned with the 9th campaign of Aššurnaṣirpal II.

Next, we are going to compare the so-called "narrative form" of both LKA 63 and 64. According to Genette 1980, "narrative form" comprises the three major fields "time", "narrative mode", and "voice".

**1.) Time[69]**

1.1) *Order*

LKA 63 and 64 each follow a linear temporal order. They do not exhibit pro- or analepses, or other anachronisms.

1.2) *Duration*

Both texts are "summary narratives" in which the time of the story outweighs the time of the narration (by far).

1.3) *Frequency*

In a macroscopic perspective both LKA 63 and 64 are singulative narrations for they describe one event once. On the

---

[66] Lambert 1961; Reade 1989.

[67] It remains unclear if this protagonist is Shalmaneser III, who is never named, or Aššurnaṣirpal (II?, written ¹*aš-šur*-PAP-AŠ), who is mentioned in obv. 16 and rev. 7.

[68] Hurowitz/Westenholz 1990, 42 see the protagonist of SAA 3, 17 as only introduced in line 4 after Aššur, Ishtar and Shamash, yet the (admittedly quite fragmentary) context suggests that the gods, or at least Ishtar and Shamash, are referred to only after the king. While the initial [...K]UR.KUR^MEŠ remains unclear and might indeed refer to Aššur as *bēl mātāti*, the following *re-ʾu-u ša kàl ma-li-ˈki*ˈ points more towards an earthly ruler than to a god (cf. *šar šarrāni* "king of kings" and similar expressions). Likewise, line 2 refers to an "elevated one of¹ the Lady of Niniveh". Line 3 is very fragmentary. Only the word *mišāri* "of justice" is preserved, which doesn't necessarily indicate the sun-god as (sole) subject of the line. The equally fragmentary line 4 [...-*k*]*a kiš-šá-ˈtú*ˈ "[VERBAL FORM] you the universe" clearly addresses the protagonist, if -*ka* is indeed correctly interpreted as possessive suffix 2nd sg.

[69] Genette 1980, 33-160; also see Genette 1988.

microscopic level, LKA 63 shows a slight tendency towards narrative hypotyposis ("stressing") or even iterativity, that is: narrating a singular event more than once (e.g., the dwelling on the enemies uprising in obv. 6'-18' or the divine support for the king in rev. 5-10), while in LKA 64 only the ascent to the Amanus is formulated in a corresponding manner (obv. 20: *ētatalli* "he had ascended continuously").

### 2.) Narrative mode[70]

2.1) *Distance*

Both LKA 63 and 64 are largely devoid of personal speeches. Again, it is LKA 63 that exhibits a larger amount of narrated (obv. 19'-20', 23'-24', 29'; rev. 23'-24') and mimetic speeches (obv. 22', 26'-27') than LKA 64 which only features one mimetic speech (obv. 11-13).[71]

2.2) *Perspective / Focalization*

LKA 63 is externally focussed in general, meaning that the recipients are not given any real insights into thoughts and motivations of the involved characters. Yet the focus varies between enemies (1st half of the obverse), gods (2nd half of the obv.), gods and king (rev. 1-10, 22-26), and king (rev. 11-18). LKA 64 is equally so externally focussed, yet here the focus quickly shifts from the divine (obv. 1-3) to the king (rest of the obverse). The upper half of the reverse of the tablet is too damaged to make more precise statements, but it seems that the gods (rev. 8-11) and then the king (rev. 12-14) are focalized when the text becomes legible again.

### 3.) Voice[72]

3.1)  *Narrative level*

The narrative level in both texts is always intradiegetic, with no alterations. This is not to be confused with the intradiegetic narrator: an intradiegetic narrative level means that there are no narratives within or around the core narrative, that is, e.g., no connective narrative framework as in the case of Boccaccio's *Decameron*, or independent sub-narratives like Dostoyevsky's "inquisitor"-novel which is embedded in the greater narrative of *The Brothers Karamazov*.

---

[70] Genette 1980, 161-211.

[71] If reconstructed correctly, the mention of the princesses singing praise in obv. 17-18 could be considered as a type of a (highly abbreviated) narrated speech.

[72] Genette 1980, 212-262.

3.2) *Time of the narration*

    Both LKA 63 and 64 exhibit in their larger parts "subsequent narrating", using mostly verbal forms in past or perfect tense. LKA 63 also features a longer section of "simultaneous narrating" (usage of verbal forms in present tense and stative), that is the description of the fighting king in rev. 5-18. LKA 64 has one (rev. 12-14) respectively two (obv. 17-18) instances of "simultaneous narrating", achieved by using verbal statives.

3.3) *Person*

    The narrating instance of LKA 63 is, for the major part of the preserved text, extradiegetic-homodiegetic, meaning that the narrator is located outside of the story and describes the events mostly with his own words rather than letting the story's characters speak. A few alterations (the mimetic speeches mentioned above) are not enough to influence this assessment. It remains possible, however, that the narrator was an intradiegetic-homodiegetic one in the broken first five lines of the obverse.

The narrating instance of LKA 64 differs to quite a degree from the one encountered in LKA 63. Admittedly, this narrator likewise qualifies as extradiegetic-homodiegetic for the major part of the text (with a single heterodiegetic alteration, the mimetic speech in obv. 11-13), but clearly should be identified as intradiegetic-homodiegetic in the first and the last three lines (obv. 1-3, rev. 12-14). Here, the narrator is indeed part of the story, or at least of its literary framework, as indicated by the verbal forms in 1st sg at the beginning (*azammur*[*u*] "I will sing" etc.) as well as the use of a possessive suffix in 1st sg. at the end of the text (rev. 13: *Aššurnaṣirpal narāma libbīyya* "Aššurnaṣirpal the beloved of my heart"). Besides that, the narrator not only directly addresses the protagonist in obv 17-18 (*nā*[ʾ*idū*]*nikka* "singing praise towards you", if restored correctly), but also emphatically expresses his favour towards him (again rev., 13: "… the beloved of my heart").

Additionally, we are going to look at the inter- and hypertextual[73] features of LKA 63 and 64, focussing on the use of mytho-epical pre-texts ("hypotexts"):

    LKA 63 employs a general idiolect (genre specific language) very close to that of the Middle Assyrian royal epics and royal inscriptions (especially those of Tiglath-Pileser I).[74] Most of this idiolect is traditionally mythologizing, meaning that

---

[73] Genette 1997a, *passim*.

[74] Cf. the connections listed in Hurowitz/Westenholz 1990, 6-13 and 23-30. Hurowitz/Westenholz consider interdependencies between LKA 63 and the royal epics largely as allusions, an assessment that we do not share for there are no concrete text-text relations between LKA 63 and the two epics surpassing the use of a shared genre-specific language.

it serves the metaphysical elevation of the figure of the king by describing him in a similar fashion as gods. A mythologizing idiolect works by applying, e.g., adjectives or epithets commonly used for portraying divine entities to the king, or connecting him explicitly with divine features like possessing *melammu*. Some sections of LKA 63 are clearly using the Tukultī-Ninurta epic or other epic pieces like An-gim-dim-ma as a thematic Vorlage, e.g. for the battle description on the reverse including the "vanguard" motive.[75] Clearly relating to the Ninurta mythology is LKA 63, rev. 18. This line can be loosely connected to An-gim-dim-ma, and more concretely to Lugal-e, 83 (Ms. n). In sum, LKA 63 does not hypertextualize mytho-epics as much as the Middle Assyrian royal epics do, and rather recurs to those epics' contents and idiolects, as well as to that of Middle Assyrian royal inscriptions. The high share of mythologizing elements in LKA 63 should nevertheless be noted.

By contrast, LKA 64 is devoid of any hypertextual usage of mytho-epics. LKA 64 does use traditional mythologizing idiolects at least twice (Aššurnaṣirpal II as *ḫišiḫtu ilāni* "desire of the gods" in obv. 3, the enemies overwhelmed by *melammu* in obv. 14), and perhaps also in the broken parts of the reverse. But otherwise it focuses on the quite secular military activities of the king which are described in a fashion very similar to the style of the royal inscriptions. Almost the entire obverse of LKA 64 reads like a condensation of any contemporary inscriptional military account: in obv. 7-10 the goal of the campaign, stated in a rather generic style (to execute warfare against the city of Carchemish), is embedded in standard tropes of movement ("taking to the road", "approaching a district/city" etc.). For obv. 11-13, one should point out the exceptionality of the military report as given literally by the king in a very synecdochal style, where only the plundering of the enemy's palace and the installation of a royal monument are recounted as the (symbolic) epitomes of Aššurnaṣirpal II's victory. What follows then is a bundled reiteration of common topoi of victory as used in the royal inscriptions: The delivery of tribute (obv. 15-16), the taking of royal hostages (obv. 17-18) and the plundering of the conquered region's natural resources, here expressed by referencing the "continuous ascent" of the king to the Amanus mountains (obv. 19; also cf. the "beams of cedar from the Amanus mountains" in rev. 7). Then LKA 64 changes tone, and from obv. 20 on more sacral events (e.g. the sacrifices mentioned there) seems to have been narrated. Unfortunately, the damage to the remaining text makes it difficult to grasp its concrete content. The reverse may have, again, portrayed some military action (occurrence of the land of Ḫarrān in rev. 7), and mentions the roofbeams of cedar from the Amanus (rev. 8) before focussing on the gods Sîn and Šamaš entering the É.ŠAR.RA (rev. 10-11) and their benevolence towards the king (topos of eye-lifting in rev. 12). LKA 64 ends in a celebratory exclamation otherwise unknown from Assyrian royal narrative texts (rev.

---

An exception to this is LKA 63, obv. 24' which seems to allude to TNE vi (= B rev.) 36'-37', but could also be related to or derived from the idiolect of the Anzû epic, specifically Anzû I, 103 (Hurowitz/Westenholz 1990, 10).

[75] Hurowitz/Westenholz 1990, 12, 30-40.

13-14), stressing both the author's affection for the king ("beloved of my heart"), and the importance of royal tradition, by invoking the old title of *šakkanakku*. What needs to be clearly noted is that LKA 64 does not employ explicit inter- or hypertextual poetics outside of the genre of royal narrative texts, meaning there are no recurrences to any mytho-epics. Rather, content and idiolect/style of the contemporary royal inscriptions are the key to understanding its literary make-up, even more so than for LKA 63.

## Comparative discussion of poetic features of LKA 63 and 64

LKA 63 and 64 share many substantial formal criteria, yet also show differences. As there should be no disagreement concerning the divine supremacy for the whole of LKA 64, one should note nonetheless that the portrayal of its protagonist is not as sacralised as in LKA 63. This is evident from comparing the use of my-thologizing idiolects used for the description of the corresponding protagonist. While they are abundant in LKA 63, LKA 64 only shows a (by then) traditional usage of mythologizing architextual elements (the king as "desire of the great gods" or the enemies "overwhelmed by *melammu*"). Furthermore, LKA 63 exhib-its clear intertextual connections to Lugal-e, An-gim-dim-ma and perhaps Anzû, while there is no such intertextual utilization of mytho-epics in LKA 64. The most significant difference between the two pieces is the status of the narrator: In LKA 63, the narrator rarely alternates from an extradiegetic-homodiegetic style, while the narrator of LKA 64 is in part much more intradiegetic. One could argue that LKA 63 has a few more instances of heterodiegesis than LKA 64, but in sum those switches have only a minute impact on the general style of the narration. The only mimetic speech in LKA 64 (obv. 11-13) mirrors not only standard inscriptional tropes of plunder, but also the installation of (inscribed) royal monuments men-tioned often in military accounts (see above for A.0.101.1), and therefore does not transgress from the general style of the text. Likewise, the mimetic speeches of LKA 63 resemble divine and royal speeches from its most important hypotexts, the Middle Assyrian royal epics and inscriptions.

It seems as if LKA 64 adheres to a relatively new style of royal narrative texts that stresses the quite earthly heroism of the glorious conquering king. Various royal inscriptions of Aššurnaṣirpal II give ample witness to that literary trend. Most poignant in this regard are short passages encountered in a row of texts, e.g., in A.0.101.1, i 50-52: [50][…] *ina 3 u₄-me* [51]UR.SAG KUR-*ú i-ḫi-ṭa gap-šu* ŠÀ-*ba-šú* GIŠ.LAL *ub-la e-li ina* GIR$_{II}$^MEŠ-*šú* KUR-*ú ú-sa-ḫi-ip iḫ-pi qi-na-šú-nu* [52]*ú-pa-ri-ir* […] "[…] For three days the hero explored the mountain. His bold heart yearned for battle. He ascended on (his very own) foot. He overwhelmed the mountain. He smashed their nest. He scattered their flock. […]"[76] or A.0.101.1, ii 35-37: [35][…] [1]*aš-šur*-PAP-A UR.SAG EGIR-*šú-nu* [36]*ki-ma* MUŠEN^MEŠ *i-še-ʾu ina* KUR-*e* ^KUR*ni-muš/ṣir* LÚ.AD^MEŠ-*šú-nu* DUB-*uk* 3 ME 26 *muq-tab-li-šú-nu ú-na-pi-iṣ* ANŠE.KUR.RA^MEŠ-*ú e-kim-šu* [37]*si-ta-te-šú-nu ḫur-ru na-at-ba-ku šá*

---

[76] Also attested in A.0.101.17, i 74-75.

KUR-*e e-kul* […] "Aššurnaṣirpal, the hero, flew after them like a bird. He piled up their corpses in Mt. Nimuš/Niṣir. He slew 326 of their men-at-arms. He deprived him ([the enemy ruler] Muṣaṣina) of his horses. The rest of them the ravines (and) torrents of the mountain swallowed. […]".[77] On the formal level the usual autodiegesis ("I-narrator") of the inscriptional military narrative is here shortly replaced with an extradiegetic-homodiegetic narrator. This can be regarded as a new poetic means, a special type of hypotyposis (narrative stressing) that dwells on the martial achievements of the protagonist.[78] Such developments might already hark back to the inscriptions of Adad-nīrārī II and Tukultī-Ninurta II, who undertook some other poetic experiments like the introduction of the so-called "self-praise formula" (A.0.99.2, 14-15; A.0.99.3, 2'-5'; A.0.100.1, 28-32)[79] or verbally (?) citing intelligence reports and loyalty oaths (A.0.100.5, 11-12, 24-25).[80] One should also note the elaborate style of the Nūr-Dagan story in A.0.99.2, 73-79 (T.-N. II). But it is probably adequate to give the most credit for this new and dynamic style of narrating to the innovative authors of Aššurnaṣirpal II's inscriptions. Besides using a language rich in traditional mythologizing idiolects and imagery, and a trend towards increased narrative details (e.g. A.0.101.1, iii 41, stating that an enemy was only pursued "on the next day" or A.0.101.17, i 71, informing the audience that an enemy was not pursued due to the "exceptionally rugged mountain" he flew to),[81] the texts of Aššurnaṣirpal II stand out at their time, not only for such daring new ways of extradiegetic-homodiegetic narrating as mentioned above, but also for the use of the "self-praise formula" (A.0.101.1, 32-33; A.0.101.17, i 34-36; A.0.101.19, 40-47), comparatively long and emotionally charged statements of submission (e.g., A.0.101.1, i 80-81), an increased amount of information relaying analepses (e.g., A.0.101.1, i 102-103, ii 84-85; A.0.101.2, 52; A.0.101.40, 31-32), allusions to Middle Assyrian royal epics (amongst others: A.0.101.1, ii 107, A.0.101.17 iv 74 and TNE v = A rev., 45': warriors as Anzû-birds; A.0.101.17, i 53 *ina ašri namrāṣi* and ANE = VAT 9820, ii 7' *eqlētu namrāṣī* as metaphors for "battlefield"), strewn-in repetitions of the filiation of the protagonist with a heterodiegetic portrayal of his victories so far (e.g., A.0.101.1, ii, 125-131, iii 113-118 and 126-132) and other royal self-descriptions outside of the titular/genealogy (e.g., A.0.101.2, 21-23; A.0.101.26, 32-46) as well as verbal citations of statue inscriptions (A.0.101.1, iii 25) and intelligence reports (A.0.101.1, iii 26-28; already attested for Tukultī-Ninurta II).

---

[77] Follows the translations by Grayson in RIMA 2, 197, 204 (with minor modifications). Also compare similarly stylized passages in A.0.101.1, ii 85, A.0.101.17, iii 7-8 or A.0.101.30, 102-105).

[78] This unique style of narrating fades out of use after the end of the reign of Shalmaneser III.

[79] See Cohen 2013, 10-11.

[80] While the partial citations of oaths or statements of submission were already used as a poetic device in Middle Assyrian times, the citing of an intelligence report is not attested before Tukultī-Ninurta II, at least not in the corpus known today.

[81] Also cf. similar passages in, e.g., A.0.101.17, ii 21-24 (Assyrians having fled to the land of Šubrû because of hunger).

## Summary

LKA 64 is one of the oldest examples of heroic royal narratives from the early 1st millennium B.C. There is reason to assume that it is – probably like LKA 63 – a sample of the genre of otherwise almost completely lost *zamar šarri* "royal hymns", short song-like pieces that deal with one military feat of the reigning king. The literary tradition to which LKA 64 belongs undoubtedly goes back to the Middle Assyrian period. But in contrast to its Middle Assyrian relatives LKA 63, and more distantly, the Middle Assyrian royal epics, LKA 64 features a new and so-far unique, dynamic style of narrating that focuses on the earthly feats of the protagonist. It employs an idiolect closely related to that of Aššurnaṣirpal II's royal inscriptions, although also gives reference to tradition by the occasional use of inherited mythologizing topoi. An increased use of hypotyposis to dwell on the achievements of the monarch is another feature that connects LKA 64 with the poetics of royal inscriptions, as well as a slightly adjusted narrator who is now a bit more fluid than in Middle Assyrian times. Unfortunately, there is no other example of a text comparable to LKA 63 and 64 that could bridge the century-wide gap between these two remarkable texts. The direct comparison between LKA 63 and 64 reveals changes in a row of narratorial categories, sometimes less significant, as in the case of the varying status of LKA 64's narrator, sometimes more significant, as in the case of the much more 'secular', inscription-like idiolect of LKA 64. As the inscriptions of Aššurnaṣirpal II are outstanding on their own in comparison to the older inscriptions since Tiglath-Pileser I, it is tempting to credit his scribes with a major role in this development. Nonetheless, as we are lacking the connective pieces, we should always be aware of the chance that such changes in poetics could already have taken place one or two generations earlier, and that we need to account for a number of lost related texts far exceeding the small number we know today. LKA 64 is important testimony for a discipline of royal narrative discourse that persisted in various forms until the end of the Neo-Assyrian empire. And although we have only fragments of a few younger royal narrative texts of a similar style like LKA 64 at our disposal nowadays (e.g., SAA 3, 17-24), their continued detailed study is needed to further advance our knowledge of Neo-Assyrian literary history.

## Bibliography

ALLEN, S., 2012. *Aššur and Enlil in Neo-Assyrian Documents*; in: Wilhelm, G. (ed.): *Organization, Representation and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East*, 33-49. Winona Lake

BAGG, A., 2011 *Die Assyrer und das Westland*. Leuven – Paris – Walpole.

BAKER, H. 2011 *Tukultī-Inurta*; in: Baker, H. (ed.): *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, Vol III/2* (PNA 3/2), 1332-1333. Helsinki.

BARCINA PÉREZ, C., 2016. *Display practices in the Neo-Assyrian Period*. Leiden. Open access MA-thesis, to be found at https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/44225.

BORGER, R., 1961. *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften*. Erster Teil. Leiden – Köln.

BROICH, U., 1985. *Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität*; in: Broich, U. / Pfister, M. (eds.): *Intertextualität – Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, 31-47. Tübingen.

BRYCE, T., 2014. *Ancient Syria*. Oxford.
          2009 *The Routledge Handbook of Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia*. London – New York.

CIFOLA, B. 1995 *Analysis of Variants in the Assyrian Royal Titulary from the Origins to Tiglath-Pileser III*. Naples.

—          1997/1998 *Ashurnasirpal II's 9ᵗʰ Campaign: Seizing the Grain Bowl of the Phoenician Cities*; in: AfO 44/45, 156-158.

COHEN, Y., 2013. *Fearful Symmetry: The Poetics, Genre and Form of Lines 109-118, Tablet I in the Poem of Erra*; in: Vanderhooft, D. / Winitzer, A. (eds.): *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature* (HV Machinist), 128. Winona Lake.

DIJK, J. VAN, 1983. *LUGAL UD ME-LÁM-bi NIR-GAL*. Leiden.

EDZARD, D., 2004. *LKA 62: Parodie eines assyrischen Feldzugberichts*; in: Frame, G. / Wilding, L. (eds.): *From the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea. Studies on the History of Assyria and Babylonia in Honour of A. K. Grayson*, 81 87. Leuven.

EMILIANOV, V., 2010. *On the early history of* melammu; in: Kogan, L. / Koslova, N. / Loesov, S. / Tishchenko, S.*: Proceedings of the 53ʳᵈ Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Vol I: Language in the Ancient Near East*, 1109-1119. Winona Lake.

FALES, M., 2011. *Die Ausbreitung Assyriens gegen Westen und seine fortschreitende Verwurzelung: Der Fall der nordwestlichen Jezira*; in: Renger, J. (ed.): *Assur – Gott, Stadt und Land*, 211-237. Wiesbaden.

FISCHER, S., 1998. *Aššur-naṣir-apli*; in: Radner, K. (ed): *Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Vol I/1, 204-207. Helsinki.

FOSTER, B., ³2005. *Before the Muses*. Bethesda.

FRAHM, E. 2009 *Historische und historisch-literarische Texte. KAL 3*. Wiesbaden.

GENETTE, G., 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca.

—          1988 *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca.

—          1997a *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln and London.

—          1997b *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge.

GEORGE, A., 2003. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic* (2 vols.). Oxford.

GRONEBERG, B., 1987. *Syntax, Morphologie und Stil der jungbabylonischen „hymnischen" Literatur*. Freiburg.

GUICHARD, M., 2014. *L'Èpopée de Zimrī-Lîm*. Paris.

HALTON, CH. / SVÄRD, S., 2018 *Women's Writing of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Cambridge.

HELBIG, J., 1996. *Intertextualität und Markierung*. Heidelberg.

HELLE, S., 2014. *Rhythm and Expression in Akkadian Poetry*; in: Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie 104, 56-73.

HOLLOWAY, S., 2002. *Aššur is King! Aššur is King!* Leiden – Boston – Köln.

HUNGER, H., 1968. *Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone*. Neukirchen-Vluyn.

HUROWITZ, V., 1997. *A Hymn Celebrating Assurnasirpal II's Campaign to the West (1.139)* (LKA 64); in: Hallo, W. (ed.): *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I*, 470 472. Leiden – New York – Köln.

HUROWITZ, V. / WESTENHOLZ, J.. 1990 *LKA 63: A Heroic Poem in Celebration of Tiglath-Pileser I's Muṣru–Qumanu Campaign*; in: Journal of Cuneiform Studies 42, 1-49.

KOUWENBERG, N., 1997. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb*. Leiden.
      2010 *The Akkadian Verb and its Semitic Background*. Winona Lake.

LAMBERT, W., 1957-1958. *Three unpublished fragments of the Tukulti-Ninurta epic*; in: AfO 18, 38-51.

—     1961 *The Sultan Tepe Tablets. VIII. Shalmaneser in Ararat*; in: Anatolian Studies 11, 144-158.

—     1987 *The God Aššur*; in: Iraq 45, 82-86.

LIVERANI, M., 1992. *Studies on the Annals of Ashurnasirpal II. 2: Topographical Analysis*. Rome.

—     2000 *Once again on MLK KTK in the Sefire stelas*; in *NABU* 53, 60.

—     2004 *Assyria in the Ninth Century: Continuity or Change?*; in: Frame,G. / Wilding, L. (eds.): *From the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea. Studies on the History of Assyria and Babylonia in Honour of A. K. Grayson*, 213-226. Leuven.

—     2014 *The Ancient Near East*. London – New York.

LIVINGSTONE, A., 1989. *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea* (SAA 3). Helsinki.

MACHINIST, P., 1978. *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I: A Study in Middle Assyrian Literature*. Yale.

MAUL, S., 1998. *Marduk, Nabû und der assyrische Enlil; in: Maul, S: (ed.): Festschrift für Rykle Borger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Mai 1994*, 159 -197. Groningen.

PEDERSÉN, O., 1986. *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur, Part II*. Uppsala 1986.

PONGRATZ-LEISTEN, B., 2015. *Religion and Ideology in Assyria*. Boston – Berlin.

PORTER, B. / RADNER, K., 1998. *Aššur-aḫu-iddina*; in: Radner, K. (ed): *Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Vol I/1, 145-152. Helsinki.

RADNER, K., 2003. *Sukkāia or Sukki-Aia*; in: Baker, H. (ed.): *The Prosopography of theNeo-Assyrian Empire*, Vol. III/1 (PNA 3/1), 1153-1156. Helsinki.

READE, J., 1989. *Shalmaneser or Ashurnasirpal in Ararat?*; in: SAAB 3, 93-97.

SAZONOV, V., 2016. *Die assyrischen Königstitel und -epitheta*. Helsinki.

SCHRAMM, W., 1973. *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften. Zweiter Teil*. Leiden– Köln.

SEFATI, Y., 1998. *Love Songs in Sumerian Literature*. Ramat-Gan.

SODEN, W. VON, ³1995. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (GAG). Rome.

TALLQVIST, K., 1914. *Assyrian Personal Names*. Helsinki.
      1938 *Akkadische Götterepitheta*. Helsinki.

YAMADA, SH., 2000 *The Construction of the Assyrian Empire*. Leiden.