available Assyrian sources, is Sidney Smith’s alternative proposal, suggesting that the names in Herodotus (II 144) were switched and that the actual reference was to Esarhaddon’s unsuccessful first Syrian expedition in 674 B.C. (cf. Babylonian Chronicle, iv 16).

Altogether, the historical background for Herodotus’ statement remains in question. The term “king of the Arabs and Assyrians,” however, can be explained without reference to a particular Assyrian king, on the assumption that the tradition about the failure of the invasion reached the ears of Herodotus when he was in Egypt. Because of the scope of the Arab role in military campaigns across the Sinai, the Egyptians thought of any army making such a crossing as “the army of X and the Arabs.” Why Egyptian tradition hit upon Semachersib as the Assyrian king who attacked Egypt exceeds the confines of this study.

C. THE REIGN OF ASSURBANIPAL (668-627 B.C.)

1. Source-Groups Relating to Arabs in the Inscriptions of Assurbanipal:

   Since M. Streck’s publication of the inscriptions of Assurbanipal in 1916, discussion of the Arabs during Assurbanipal’s reign has derived chiefly from the sequencing and reconstruction of events in Streck’s historical survey. The description of the so-called “ninth campaign” in the Rassam Cylinder (vii 82-ix 144; x 1-5, 21-39) supplies the essence of his survey, with other available sources used only to fill in details not included in the Rassam Cylinder. Recognizing that the events reported could not have taken place during a single campaign, and certainly extended over a number of years, Streek grouped the data under two headings, each connected with one of the two kings named Uaite (“U-a-a-tei”):

   The first war (ca. 650-647 B.C.)

   Sources: Rm. vii 82—viii 47; Cyl. B (Streck) vii 93—viii 57 (B [Piekorn] vii 1—viii 63); Cyl. C ix 33-49; K 2802 iv-v; VAT 5600 ii-iii; K 4687; K 3096.

   The war began during the conflict between Assurbanipal and Šamaš Šum-ukin. Uaite I assisted the Babylonian king on two fronts: a) By invading the territories in the western part of the Assyrian empire along with his Qedarite people, and another Qedarite leader named Ammulad(n). They were defeated by Assyrian units and none of the kings of the nations attacked. Ammuladi and his warriors were taken captive by “Ka-ma-as-hal-la-a” king of Moab. Adiya, the wife of Uaite, was also captured. Because the Qedarites were starving and decimated. Uaite was forced to flee and seek refuge with Natusi king of Nebaoth. Although his territory was outside of Assyrian control, Natusi, impressed by the might that defeated the Qedarites, sent tribute to Assurbanipal. Uaite II (possibly betrayed by Natusi) eventually turned up in Nineveh where he was caged as a punishment.

   B) By sending a reconstruction of history and certain basic geographical and chronological matters. We differ considerably, however, in interpreting various episodes, and especially in identifying the Arab kings (see Weippert 51; n. 50), namely because Weippert relies wholly on occurrences as they are recorded, without considering, as I have tried to do, the circumstances and temporal developments that conditioned variations in the sources.

500 In some inscriptions this is relegated to the first war (Pirahm-i viii 23-50; VAT 5600 ii 6-20 + K 2382 v 2-3), but in the Rassam Cylinder to the last campaign (v 13-39). Streek (see preceding note) found it impossible to place the ‘episode precisely, and thought in fact that it might relate to both campaigns.

501 Since Streek did not differentiate the punishments of Uaite I and Uaite II, he assumed that both Rm. vii 11-14, and K 103-111 referred to Uaite II, attributing the description of the punishment of Uaite II to an error resulting from the similarity of the names (op. cit., CCLXXIII n. 3). Indeed, although both were
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force to Babylon under Abiaye' and Ayamu, sons of Iti. They were attacked and badly beaten before they could join Sama'-sun-akin; remnants of the force escaped to Babylon. They tried to break out when famine threatened the city, besieged since 690 B.C., and were again defeated by the Assyrians. Abiaye' fled to Nineveh, hoping for mercy from Assurbanipal, who in fact bestowed it and made him king in place of Uarte'.

The second war (641-638 B.C.)

Sources: Rm. viii 48—ix 114; x 1-5, 21-30; K 2802 vi 2-43, iii 1-33

This was a war waged against Arab tribes rebelling against Assyria, led by Abiaye' and Uarte' II, son of Biridada, who became king of the Qedarites after his uncle Uarte' I fell into Assyrian hands. Reinforced by Natnu king of Nebaioth and Ayamu, brother of Abiaye', they attacked the western border regions of the Assyrian empire, at a time when the Assyrian army was involved in war against Urmanalda' king of Elam. Their action culminated in an Assyrian campaign, conducted on a grand scale, in the desert areas near Damascus and southward. In the course of the war Abiaye' and Ayamu, as well as the members of the family of Uarte', were captured and taken to Nineveh. The fate of Abiaye' is unknown; Ayamu was put to death. Uarte' and most of the Qedarite force survived the battle, but the severe shortage of food and water caused such bitterness that Uarte' was forced to flee. He was captured and carried off to Nineveh, where, after having been displayed at the city gate, he was forced into Assurbanipal's triumphal procession. We do not know what happened to Natnu, who may not have participated in the war, merely sending supporting forces. In any case, the Assyrian army did not reach Nebaioth territory.

This reconstruction, based on the main on what is said of the Arabs in the Rassam Cylinder, and upon the division of sources under two consecutive headings, raises difficulties with the inner logic of the sequence of events as set forth in the sources. Some instances follow:

- a. Is it likely that Abiaye', whose men were beaten at Babylon by the Assyrian army, would flee to Nineveh? Or that Assurbanipal would appoint as king of the Arabs the same Abiaye' who had just helped the Babylonian rebels and fought against the Assyrian army?

b. The inscriptions of Assurbanipal never imply that Uarte' was handed over to the king of Assyria by Natnu king of Nebaioth (a possibility offered by Streck). Rm. viii 5-7 in fact suggests that Uarte' went to Nineveh on his own initiative. Although the Rassam Cylinder says that Uarte' came to Nineveh because of madness inflicted by the god Assur, this hardly accounts for his arrival so soon after his defeat in the western part of the empire.

c. Of the two kings called "Uarte' in the Rassam Cylinder, which one is connected with episodes whose position in the narrative vary from source to source? 502

Later publications of additional inscriptions of Assurbanipal enable us to solve these and other problems. In 1933, Th. Bauer published some new Assurbanipal inscriptions and re-edited others. Relating to the Arabs are Prism C x 27-66 and its parallels; K 2664; K 300; K 3405; K 4437; and an additional fragment from the Letter to Assur (Th. 1905-4-9, 97). 502 In the same year, R. Campbell Thompson published the inscription from the temple of Assur in Nineveh, whose important information, especially about the later relations between Assurbanipal and the Arabs, appears in no other sources. 504 In that year also, A.C. Piepker published the complete text of Edition B of the Annals, based on parallel cylinders, the earliest of which was written in the month of Ab, 649 B.C. (a year earlier than the copy of Cylinder II at Streck's disposal). 506

With the publication of these sources, details were added that clarified the development of the historical inscriptions of Assurbanipal which annotated the Letter to Assur and the Rassam Cylinder (see pp. 46-52). The re-examination, thus made possible, of the episodes relating to the Arabs greatly contributes to more precise understanding.

502 See note 500.

503 See notes 500-501, and also pp. 51-52. On further difficulties in interpreting the sequence of data on Arabs in the Rassam Cylinder, see also Weipert, op. cit., 18-49.

504 Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipal. For references to the sources mentioned here see pp. 47-48.

505 AAA 20 (1933), 80-98.

506 Historical Prism Inscriptions of Assurbanipal, 19-94.
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of the course and sequence of events. In such a re-examination greater reliance should be placed on the earlier sources, closer in time both to the events and to the early phases of reporting them, than on later ones which sometimes suffered from copying and editing errors, and were affected by varying literary and historiographical approaches. We shall therefore, unlike Streck in 1916, prefer such earlier sources as Cylinders B and C (rather than the Rassam Cylinder and the Letter to Assur, which are among the later historical inscriptions of Assurbanipal, for those episodes recounted differently in the various sources).

For the purpose of examination, the material concerning the Arabs in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal is classified into 28 episodes, which are listed in the foldout page chart after p. 164. When the text order of the episodes conforms to the actual chronology of events, they are lettered A to X; the four episodes from later sources only (in our opinion incorrectly inserted) are numbered in Roman I to IV.

On the chart facing the list of episodes in the foldout, the episodes are further arranged according to their occurrence in the sources, in order to demonstrate that the sources themselves divide into two groups:

Group A— the early editions (Cylinders B and C), which include a historical survey up to Episode N only;

Group B— the later editions (K 3405; K 2664 and 3090; Letter to Assur; K 4637; the Rassam Cylinder; the Slaab Inscription from the temple of Bitar), which include the material covered in Group A, plus the episodes from Q onwards, as well as I, II, III and IV.

In Group A the Arab king's name is always written "Ia-ua-te" and refers only to Uaité b. Häza'il, the same orthography is used in the treaty between Assurbanipal and the Qedarites during the period of Episode II and in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon. In Group B the name "U-a-aa-te" is applied both to Yauta b. Häza'il and Uaité b. Birdada. The failure to distinguish between the names Yauta' and

507 Episodes P and H have been recorded only in the Letter to Assur, where the textual damage prevents ascertaining the subject and deciding whether the episode belongs to Source Group B.

508 For the text of this treaty see Ecken-Pappola, Orientstude 37 (1963), 464.

509 Compare "Uaité mdr "Izitaiu, Rm. viii 1, 46; "Uaité mdr "Birdada, Rm. viii 2; vi 1-2. K 202 irr 2-3.

From Sennacherib to Assurbanipal

Uaité can be explained by their similarity and by the composition of the sources of Group B (after the defection of Uaité b. Birdada, no earlier than 646 B.C.), which was late enough for various details about Yauta' b. Häza'il (who was defeated no later than 632 B.C.) to have been forgotten. The confusion seems to have occurred for the Letter to Assur, the basis for later inscriptions. The spelling of b. Häza'il's name thus helps to classify references to Arabs in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal into their proper source group.

The chronological classification of episodes illustrates the complexity and irregular line of events as they are recorded in the account of the "ninth campaign" in Rm. vii 82-83. The accompanying sketch on the following page serves as a visual aid.

Our survey of the history of the Arabs during Assurbanipal's reign is divided into two episode-complexes paralleling the two groups of sources. The first step is a reconstruction of events by internal analysis of the inscriptions; the second an attempt to establish the actual dates through data from other sources.

2. Survey of Events Covered by Source-Group A:

After Assurbanipal's accession, Yauta' b. Häza'il, king of the Qedarites, appealed for the return of the divine images captured by Esarhaddon. When he had sworn allegiance to the king of Assyria, the image of Atarsarrûn was returned (Episodes A and B). A treaty fragment (Bu. 91:5-9, 178), published by K. Deller and S. Pappola, mentions Yauta' and offers evidence about Qedarite relations with Assurbanipal at that time. Sometime later, under the leadership of Yauta', the Arabs revolted, raiding the border regions of Transjordan.

510 For the dates see pp. 153-156.

511 See pp. 51-52. The Bitar Temple Slaab Inscription, line 11, is exceptional in spelling Uaité b. Birdada "Ia-ua-te" for 1b-Su-mu-AN. In line 13 the same person is called "U-a-aa-te" for 1b-Su-mu-AN. The name Yauta' appears here probably because the author remembered and wanted to mention in Arab of that name although knowledge about him was no longer precise. (It should be noted that the inscription under discussion differs from the other late inscriptions of Assurbanipal in the multiplicity of kings' names and changes in style and content; its author must have depended on sources other than the Letter to Assur.)

512 Orientstude 37 (1963), 464-466.

513 The common noun "Arabi" is used in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal for various
and southern Syria (Episode C). They were repulsed and defeated by Assyrian units stationed at key points along the frontiers from the province of Šupite to Edom (Episode D), by the armies of the border countries themselves, Moab in particular (Episode J). The details and extent of the Arab defeat are described at length in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal: the Assyrian army attacked the Arab camps and burned their tents (Episode D); so much booty was taken — people, donkeys, camels, sheep and goats — that the price of camels and slaves in Assyria dropped drastically (Episode E); the Arabs who survived the Assyrian operations suffered such extreme hunger that they were

Note
1 Filled in spaces signify passages unrelated to Arabs.
2 Episodes A and B do not occur in the Rassam Cylinder.
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reduced to eating their children (Episode F). The effect of the defeat on the subjects of Yauta' and the influence of Assurbanipal in the border regions near the inner cup of the Fortile Crescent prevented Yauta' from taking to the desert and resuming authority. He was forced to flee to the land of Nebiath, farther than that of the Qedarites from Assyrian-controlled territory to request sanctuary of their king, Natun; but to no avail (Episodes G, M). Kingship of the Qedarites was assumed by Abiyate' b. Te'ti, apparently not a member of the same family as Yauta' b. Hazael. Abiyate' went to Nineveh, received Assurbanipal's consent that he replace Yauta', swore allegiance and bowed himself to pay annual tribute (Episode H). Augmented Assyrian influence in the desert region impelled Natun king of Nebiath to make an arrangement with Assurbanipal, pay annual tribute and swear allegiance (adu salummit epēs ardut) (Episode N).

From Sennacherib to Assurbanipal

Source-Group A further reports the attack made by Ammuadili(n) king of Qedar on the western part of the Assyrian empire, and his defeat by "Kama-as-hal-ta-a king of Moab" (Episode J), as episode probably depicted as well on reliefs in Assurbanipal's palace (the North Palace) in Nineveh. Since the inscriptions of Assurbanipal refer to Yauta' b.

The defeat of Ammuadili by Kama-as-hal-ta-a is recorded only in the early group of sources (8 viii 39 ff; C x 31-43), the later sources attributing the event to Assurbanipal himself (K 2802 v 15-25; K 4687 rev. 1-4; K 18 viii 15-23; AFO 8 (1912-1933), 200 No. 79; cf. H. S. Smith, 114). The inscription in later versions to the king of Assyria by personal victories in fact won by others (as recorded in earlier versions) is typical of the historiography of the Assyrian royal inscriptions.

The reliefs from Room L ("the Arich Room") in the Palace of Assurbanipal, depicting scenes of war against the Arabs, were recently described and comprehensively published by Barnett, Sculptures from the North Palace of Assurbanipal at Nineveh, 661-671 B.C., London 1975, pp. 15-16, 45; Pls. XXXIV-XXXVII and C (for previous discussions of these reliefs see B. Weisz-Amit, AFO 7 (1912-1933), 7-13; J. E. Reade, Iraq 26 (1964), 8-9). These (some fragmentary, and others of which we possess only the drawings made when the reliefs were discovered, less in size and fewer than half of the reliefs that decorated this room. They can be divided into two or three groups: Group I — end to of slab 1 and slabs 4-7 (slabs 1-2, instead of slab 1), contiguous with them that form the corner of the room, may belong to this group, or maybe a separate episode; Group II — slabs 9-12 and perhaps slab 13. In Group I, of which only drawings survive, three registers can be distinguished. On the middle register of slab 1 camels are kneeling in a line beside Arab warriors, each of whom stands holding a sword and a bow, as though in parade before battle. On the lower register, Assyrian soldiers — some in a chariot, some mounted and some on foot — pursue Arabs escaping on camels, reach an oasis and cut down its palm trees. Group II depicts an Assyrian raid — by chariot(s), horse and footsoldiers — on an Arab camp, setting fire to its tents, killing its inhabitants (including women) and pursuing those who escape on camels and on foot. Since the reliefs from Room L, like most of the North Palace, are representations of the Assyrian military establishment, the same conventions are used to depict Arab warriors and camels in the reliefs as are found in the representations of the same subjects in the reliefs from the East Palace. The naturalistic character of these reliefs, which is due to the artist's efforts to depict the subject as a realistic representation of the actual scene, can be seen in the way in which the figures are drawn and the various elements are depicted. The reliefs from Room L, like those from the East Palace, are not copies of the original scenes but are representations of the events as they were seen by the artist. The reliefs from Room L, like those from the East Palace, are not copies of the original scenes but are representations of the events as they were seen by the artist. The reliefs from Room L, like those from the East Palace, are not copies of the original scenes but are representations of the events as they were seen by the artist. The reliefs from Room L, like those from the East Palace, are not copies of the original scenes but are representations of the events as they were seen by the artist.
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Hazael as “king of the Qedarites” from the beginning of Assurbanipal’s reign until the defeat of Yau’ta in the west, when Abiyate b. Te’ri replaced him. Ammutulak presumably was another, contemporary Qedarite king.519 Ammutulak appears to have invaded the west at or close to the time when Yau’ta died, and played a role integral to the complex of events reviewed above, which centered upon Qedarite pressure against the arable lands of the Syro-Arabian desert.

Although Source-Group A contains nothing about the Assyrian army assault on the camp of Abiyate, her capture and transfer to Nineveh (Episde K), it obviously belongs in the same complex of events because: 1) In the later source-group (Group B) the Ammutulak and Abiyate episodes (J and K) are consecutive, two links in a chain of events. In fact, the Rasam Cylinder records that the two were captured at the same time.520 In the epigraph list (K 3056) the two episodes are also contiguous and the only ones dealing with Arabs.521 2) According to Rm. viii 24-25 Abiyate was the consort of Yau’ta, “king of the Arabs.” If she had possessed this title (other inscriptions called yer), without further definition, “queen of the Arabs”),522 its significance would have obtained only while Yau’ta was king of the Qedarites, until Abiyate b. Te’ri replaced him. It is possible to explain the absence of Episode K from Source-Group A by assuming that only events whose political-military essence was clear were reported in this source-group and matters of secondary importance unrecorded.

If it is acceptable to include the Abiyate episode in the events described, an interesting parallel can be drawn between that episode and the assault by Sennacherib’s army on Te’elhunu’s camp near the Babylonian border.523 Neither queen is said to have commanded armies which were defeated in battle; about both it is written only that their camps were attacked by the Assyrians. Evidently Abiyate, like Te’elhunu in her time, arrived with the nomads to invade the settled area and stayed in a camp sufficiently in the rear to be out of danger in case of defeat.

The nomad pattern of reorganizing at a reasonable distance from their pursuers after they had been defeated is paralleled in Judg. 8:10-12: “Now Zebah and Zalmunna were in Karkor with their army, about fifteen thousand men, all who were left of all the army of the People of the East; for there had fallen a hundred and twenty thousand men who drew the sword. And Gideon went up by the caravan route (lit.:The Way of the Tent-dwellers, אָבוּרָא הַשָּׁם הָעֵדֶת) east of Nobah and Jogkahah, and attacked the army; for the army was off its guard (שָׁבַע) east of Nobah, and Zebah and Zalmunna fled; and he pursued them and took the two kings of Midian, Zebah and Zalmunna, and he threw all the army into a panic (כָּכָה בְּשָׁבָע הַמֵּלֶךְ).” The distance of the rear camp to which the nomads fled on their camels certainly depends on the distance that their camel-less pursuers could cover without resorting to water sources. The fact that Assyrian infantry took part in the attack on the Arab camps along with cavalry and chariots (see the Assurbanipal reliefs) suggests that the camps were no more than 20-25 kilometers from the settled area. It is therefore difficult to countenance Mols’ generally accepted identification of Karkor in Judg. 3:10 with Qereq in Wadi Sirbha, which is about 170 kilometers from the edge of the settled region, and more than 250 from Israelite territory in Transjordan,524 and exaggerates Israelite ability to pursue the Midianites.525

A more definite chronology for the episodes reviewed above can be established by further data and arguments:

a) The Šamaš-Erīm-ukin Choricle states that he attacked Cutha on the 9th of second Ebt, 651 B.C., and took it (BM 96273/10).526 The event appears to be connected with ABL 1117, obv. 6-12, in which

519 For the designation of Yau’ta as “king of Qedar” see Ct.B (Sievek) vii 87-88; cf. B (Pipkan) vii 93-94; for the connection between Yau’ta and the Qedarites see also Assurbanipal’s treaty with them (see note 512). For the designation of Ammutulak as “king of Qedar” see B viii 39; cf. K 2802 v 15; ISar Ssbl, 144; A/3 8 (192: 1933), 200, No. 79.
520 Cf. K 2802 v 21-30; K 4687 rev. 1-5; Rm. viii 24-25.
521 See note 518.
522 Cf. K 2802 v 26, A/3 8 (1932-1933), 200, No. 81-82.
523 Cf. VA 3310 rev. 22 ff.
524 Mols, Northern Hebrews, 284-285; idem, Arabia Deserta, 494-495.
525 Doubt about Mols’ proposed identification of Karkor has been raised by Malamat, in Military History, 120-121.
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Nabû-šam-lišir announced to Assurbanipal the delivery by Šamaš-šumu-ukin of 405 prisoners, slaves of Assurbanipal who were taken at Cutha, by the evens of Natnu the Nabayatean (the king of Nebaiot of the inscriptions of Assurbanipal). At about the time Cutha was conquered (a few months after hostilities broke out between the kings of Assyria and Babylon), therefore, contact between Natnu and Šamaš-šumu-ukin seems to have been made, a fact brought to Assurbanipal's attention as indicated by the discovery at Nimekh of the letter under consideration. In Source-Group A, however, Natnu still appears as Assurbanipal's vassal, with no link at all to enemies of Assyria, which confirms Natnu's position of a veris Assurbanipal before second Elul 651 B.C., a date that may serve as a terminus ad quem for the Arab episodes in Source-Group A.

b) Assurbanipal's siege of Babylon began, according to the Šamaš-šumu-ukin Chronicle (line 19), on the 11th of Tamuz in Šamaš-šumu-ukin's 18th regnal year (650 B.C.). We know from Rm. viii 30-42 (Episode III) that Abi-ya'ae b. Te'rī and his men went to Babylon to support Šamaš-šumu-ukin, who were within the city during Assurbanipal's siege and that famine was occurring within them. When the Arabs at some unknown stage attempted to break out of the city, they were overthrown by the Assyrians. It is more logical to suppose that the Arab army entered the city before the onset of the siege, rather than that it forced its way into Babylon at the height of siege and famine. This would mean that Abi-ya'ae changed his policy and turned against Assurbanipal rather early — no later than the beginning of 650 B.C. — in the war between Assurbanipal and his brother. Further supporting this is the reference in Prol B (vii 3-29, 43-51) to the revolt of Šamaš-šumu-ukin and the aid brought to him by Ummanīqa and Tammarra, kings of Elam. The Akku Chronicle (BM 86374:11) indicates that hostilities between Šamaš-šumu-ukin and Assurbanipal broke out in January, 651 B.C. Since Episode H in Source-Group A mentions only the beginning of Abi-ya'ae b. Te'rī's reign under Assurbanipal's patronage, and the annual tribute requested, not he collaboration with Šamaš-šumu-ukin, Abi-ya'ae must have replaced Ya'u'a b. Hazaqel as king shortly before the beginning of the war between Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukin.

The Qedarite raids on the border regions of Transjordan and southern Syria under the leadership of Ya'u'a and Ammaladi (Episodes C and J) therefore appear to have taken place prior to the war between Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukin, no later than 652 B.C. They should thus be viewed as an independent action, not resulting, as has been the common interpretation, from joint initiative on the part of the Aramaeans and the king of Babylon, to operate simultaneously against the two extremities of the Assyrian empire.

3. Survey of Events Covered by Source-Group B:

The episodes added by this Group to those of Source-Group A fall into two chronological complexes: i) the war between Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukin (651-648 B.C.) and ii) the period following 646 B.C.

i) 651-648 B.C. (Episodes I, II, III): During the war in Babylonia between the two brothers, Qedarite forces led by Abi-ya'ae and Ya'mu b. Te'rī, with warriors sent by Ya'u'a b. Bîrdâ, proceeded to Babylon to help Šamaš-šumu-ukin (Episodes I, II, III). According to Rm.

527 Millard, ibid.
528 Later Assyrian sources also disclose nothing about Natnu's aid to Šamaš-šumu-ukin (cf. for example, Episode III, line 11) even the part of the king in Babylon, including the bestowal of captives, seems not to have moved Natnu to join Assurbanipal's enemies.
529 Millard, op. cit., 28; Grayson, op. cit., 113.
530 On the aid Abi-ya'ae extended to Šamaš-šumu-ukin cf. also Episode I.
531 The famine is described in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal referring to the "sixth campaign"; Rm. iii 128-135, and, more elaborately in Prum C (from Nimrud, see E. Knudsen, Iraq 29 (1967), 35-56. The severity of the famine is corroborated by Babylonian "seige documents", five of which were discussed by Oppenheimer, Iraq 17 (1955), 76-77. The dates of these legal documents and that of the Šamaš-šumu-ukin Chronicle show that, although the effects of the siege were not fully manifest within a few months after it started, Babylon held out for about two more years.
533 See note 499.
534 In the inscriptions of Assurbanipal there is no direct connection between the Qedarites and Ya'ahu b. Bîrdâ, whose title in the iltar Sîhê šum-An, For clarification of his identity see pp. 165-168.
535 Another example of a combined political stance of the Aramaeans and the inhabitants of Babylon against Assyrian rule occurs in the days of Semachu (see pp. 112-113); it evidently springs from common economic interests.
viii 30-42, they clashed with the Assyrian army and were defeated, the survivors retreating into the city proper. When they attempted to break out of the city because of the famine, the Arabs were beaten a second time. The Arab force entered Babylon in 651 or the beginning of 650 B.C., close to the start of the battle for the city (above pp. 154-155). Contrary to the general view, his exhaustion all the available data in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal regarding the military collaboration of the Arabs and Šamaš-šum-ukin.

It is reasonable to suppose that Yauta' b. Šašeš−u 327 appeared before Assurbanipal and was punished in Nineveh (Episode II) during the period under discussion. Episode II states that Yauta' came but because he was out of his mind, implying that he went to Nineveh or his own initiative, probably to arrive at an agreement with Assurbanipal. He would hardly, even though he had not been given sanctuary by Natru king of Nebiath, have gone to Nineveh during the period covered by Source Group A. Not only was such an action not recorded in this Source Group, but its proximity in time to his own disloyalty and the enthronement of Ahiya(š) b. Te’ir, who had initially been loyal to the king of Assyria, makes such a possibility unlikely. It would have been more reasonable for Yauta’ to have gone to Nineveh when Assurbanipal was at war with Šamaš-šum-ukin, who was at that time supported by Ahiya(š). According to this logic, Yauta’ journeyed to Nineveh hoping that Assurbanipal would restore him to his former position as a counsellor to Ahiya(š), now in the Tivr camp. In any case, Rm. viii 8 ff. asserts that Assurbanipal was inimical to Yauta’ and punished his disloyalty, possibly because he thought Yauta’ unable to resume his former leadership of the Qedarites.

530. For reference regarding the acceptance in one case of a man of the same name who served the Assyrians at Nineveh, see note 336. 527. In the Rassam Cylinder, the only document containing Episode II, the name is written "U-šešu" or "Išašu" (vii 1). For the change from "Yauta" to "Išašu" in the later inscriptions of Assurbanipal see pp. 146-147 and also pp. 51-52.

531. The intimacy of Yauta’ is also mentioned in the Letter to Assur (K 2802 v 37-38) but in a context different from that of the Rassam Cylinder. The statement about his condition, because of his position in the letter to Assur, interrupts the narrative flow, and the reason for its inclusion is not clear. On this point the literary structure of the Rassam Cylinder seems preferable.
nomads involved dwelt in the Palmyrene region (see below for details of the routes) and had been threatening the area from Jebel Behri to the vicinity of Damascus.

We know from the inscriptions of Assurbanipal that Ahiyā'te and Ayamu, the sons of Tērī, as well as Uaiyite (b. Biritada) helped Šam-dumu-ukin in his war against his brother, but we have no specific information about Nāmū's stance in that war. Although initially it seems strange that the inscriptions fail to report that the offending leaders were punished and dispersed by the Assyrian king after his victory in Babylon, examination of the state of the Assyrian empire prior to the Arab campaign offers some explanation: Between the conquests of Babylon and Susa the Assyrian army fought in Elam in two campaigns which took place, according to Prism F, in 647 and 646 B.C. and culminated in the capture of Susa. Because the army was actively occupied in the east between 651 and 646 B.C. — first in Babylonia and then in Elam — it could not undertake large-scale action in other parts of the empire, to the pronounced advantage of the west: Egypt could retain its independence it had recently achieved from Assyrian rule, and the cities of southern Phenicia could rebel against Assyria. Another by-product may have been the capture of Manassē's king of Judah by the commanders of the army of the king of Assyria and the fortification of his kingdom after his return from Babylonia, as reported in II Chron. 33:11f. In other words, Manassē maintained his anti-Assyrian policy. In a similar situation Zedekiah was commanded to appear before the suzerain and nonetheless subsequently continued to undermine Babylonian control. Thus, given the situation in other regions in the western part of the empire, the silence in Assyrian sources about punishing of Arabs who had assisted the king of Babylonia can be explained by Assurbanipal's inability to take real action against them, and in fact by his loss of control over the desert dwellers (usually the first group to break away when political hegemony weakens). Since Assurbanipal had no choice but to let them alone, their pressure on the Middle Euphrates and Palmyrene regions increased. Only after victory over Elam could the Assyrian army correct the situation in the west.

The later inscriptions of Assurbanipal report the last campaign against the Arabs most of it conducted in desert terrain. The report

They probably did so when the chance of expansion seemed slight, rather than when the Assyrian army was waging a campaign to the west.

Weakening of Assyrian control in the west may have started even earlier and is further illustrated by a deed of sale from Ëzer, dated Sivan 17th, in which the "king of Elam" (referred to as Am furn or Atartûr-nu) gave the Phœnician port of Tyre to the "king of Alalakh" (in the east). This would have been in the context of the campaigns against Assurbanipal.
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contains two dates which point to the length of the campaign: On the
25th of Sivan the Assyrian army set out from Hadattâ for Lâribda,
which was either in or on the edge of the desert (K 2802 vi 17-21; Rm.
viii 96-100; or the 3rd of Ab it left Damascus for Hûbbûlitî (K 2802 iii
11-13; R. viii 9-12) and proceeded to the Mount Hûkurrûma region,
where it overcame the nomads by attacking them and seizing all the
nearby water sources. The campaign as a whole therefore lasted for
about three months. So long a campaign by the Assyrian army against
so negligible an enemy is understandable only by reason of
Assurbanipal's desire to subdue the nomads once and for all. This could
be accomplished only by a combination of frequent assaults on oases
and encampments, long-range pursuits of the survivors into the desert,
and seizure of the water sources vital to them and their livestock.251
(Because the campaign took place in the dry season — Sivan-Ab, i.e.,
July-August — the Arabs had to stay with their livestock near the
settled land and could not, as was customary, take refuge in the desert.)
Assurbanipal's determination to disempower the nomads by burdening
his army with so strenuous a campaign reflects the degree of the
nomads' threat to the border regions of his kingdom.

Episodes Q to T chart the essential campaign route in a three-part
description, each part concerned with a specific section of the route and
the attack made on a particular group of nomads. Episode Q outlines
the first part of the campaign, starting at Hadattâ and continuing
through desert terrain between Lâribda, Hûrûrinâ and Yarîkî ending
in Azûlî. The second part (Episode R) proceeds from Azûlî to
Qurastî, from which point captives and booty were transported via
the "Damascus Road" (Karrān wa-ta-mašt qa). The third part (Episode S)
begins in Damascus, continues with a night march to Hûbbûlitî and ends
with a final blow to the Arabs in the Mount Hûkurrûma region. Since
the line of march to Damascus is described as scarce in water sources,
the Assyrian army must have moved from the east through the desert
to Damascus, and not along the Hâma-Homs-Damascus route, where
water abounds. Thus Yarîkî can be identified with Arâk, about 27 kms

From Sennacherib to Assurbanipal

east of Tadmor (Palmyra), but the other points of the march to
Damascus and Mount Hûkurrûma are less easily identifiable because our
data are not clear enough. The ensuing discussion of the topography of
the route draws mainly on Musûl, whose survey is the most extensive.252
Certain of his proposals are based on phonological similarity between
temporary toponyms and those in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal,
and others on key points along the desert routes from Damascus to the
Euphrates through the Jebel Bishri region (after the probable route is
determined from the meager data available).

First Part (Episode Q):

"²Ha-da-at-ta-a: This is undoubtedly a rendering of the Aramaic
toponym Ḥâdattâ. Musûl assumed that the Assyrian army crossed the
Euphrates in the Meskeneh region and consequently proposed
identifying Ḥâdattâ with the al-Juddâ (the exact Arabic equivalent
of Aramaic Ḥâdattâ) ruins, on the border between the desert and the
colony. E. Honigmann's suggested relationship of Ḥâdattâ with the
Adûthâ of Notitia dignitatum, or XXXII, 29,253 is untenable, since
Adûthâ was close to and apparently west of Tadmor (Palmyra).254
wheras Ḥâdattâ of the inscriptions of Assurbanipal was near the
Euphrates.

"³La-rî-i-ib-da: This is described as a fortress of unknown stone, from
whose water euterm the Assyrian soldiers drank deeply before
penetrating the desert. Musûl suggested locating it either in the Jebb al-

551 The same combination of elements obtains in the fragmentary reliefs found in
Room L ("the Arab Room") of Assurbanipal's palace in Nineveh. The parallelism
is typological only, however, since these reliefs appear to deal with episodes earlier
than the campaign under discussion; see note 318.

552 Musûl, Arabia Deserta, 487-492; cf. Dem, Palmyra, 76, 36. For exhaustive
discussion of the campaign see also Glasser, Skizze, 273-278; 309-314; Hommel,
Ass. 193-194; and recently Weipert, WO 7 (1973), 65-66. Glasser's and
Hommel's proposed identifications are useless, since they are based on erroneous
assumptions. (Glasser assumed that Assyrian imperial rule in the 8th and 7th
centuries extended to Oman and Yamâna and Jebel Samnûn, and therefore
located places referred to in Assurbanipal's campaign along the Aleppo-Damascus axis.)
Hommel's assumption that the campaign took place
along the Kûta-Jafî-Wadi Siyâha-Damascus axis is unacceptable, since the
Assyrians could not have waged so extensive a campaign without use of
camels. For a discussion of various details of the campaign (the most important of
which will be indicated below), see also Delitzsch, Pathologia, 399-301.


554 Thus Dusast, Topographie historique, 270-271, locates Ḥâdattâ about five
kilometers north of Hawaiûn.
Qdeim well region at the edge of al-Labbeh range, or some 40 kms southeast of the oasis of 'Urd (present-day al-Taiyibah) at the southwestern end of Jebel Bisri. The second proposal seems more likely, since the 'Urd oasis is on the central thoroughfare between Damascus—Tadmor and the Euphrates, while Jebel al-Qdeim is remote from it, on a side road to Akko.

"Hu-ra-ri-xa: Which Musil proposed identifying with Qal`at al-Hurri in the Palmyrene range, some 15 kms northwest of Arak."

"La-ar-ki: This is present-day Arak, spelled in Byzantine and later sources Harac, Yareca, and Araca, about 27 kms east of Tadmor, and a key point on the road from 'Urd (at-Taiyibah) to Tadmor-Damascus. Armies were stationed there during various periods."


In a kind of summary, K 2802 vi 29-40 and Rm. viii 107-119 says that the Assyrian troops defeated the "Li-a-am-mar", "La-ur-a "A-tar-sa-nad-a-t-an" ("the confederation of the god Atarsamân and the Qedarites of Unite` son of Bîlîk king of the Arabs") was attacked and booty, dispatched via the "Damascus road" (harrân nûnem Di-mal-qat), was taken: divine images, the mother, sister (Letter to Assur says "sisters") and family of Unite`, and "all the people of the Qedarites" (nîtê nûnem di-id-tî ko-ha-mo), as well as donkeys, camels and quantities of sheep and goats.

Third Part (Episode S):

At this point the Assyrian army left Damascus and swiftly marched 6 bēru (65 kms) through the night to "Hu-li-ay-ri (to Rm.; Letter to Assur has "Hu-li-ay-li"). which Delitzsch acceptably identified with the village of Hululîth in the northeastern part of al-Leja region. The distance between this village and Damascus corresponds exactly to the data in the Assyrian inscriptions. The strenuous Assyrian advance, under cover of darkness, favors the assumption that the nomads against whom they were marching were camped not far from Hululîth. At or near Mount Hûu-ek-rî-rî-nê-nu the nomads were beaten, Abiațî and Ayamu, the sons of Te`ri, captured, and booty taken (K 2802 ii 17 ff. and Rm. ix 15 ff.). The surviving nomads sought refuge on Mount Hukurina itself, at all of whose surrounding water points the Assyrians stationed sentries, so that eventually the Arabs succumbed to thirst. The water points, unfortunately unidentifiable, are listed in Rm. ix 27-30: "Ma-an-ha-ab-ri, "Ap-pa-ru, "Te-nu-qu-ri, "Za-a-nîr-ri-an, "Mar-


556 Tadmor (Li-a-am-mar) appears in ARM V 2:16 in connection with the attack of the Sultans, and also, as "Tà-dàina, in the desertion of the wars of Tiglath-Pileser I with the Arameans from Babylon's western border in the Middle Euphrates and the foothills of the Lebanon (Weidner, AFO 19 [1957-1958]. 344 35, 35.35). For a list of sources on Palmyra (Tadmor) from the first millennium B.C. on, see Dussaud, topographie historique, 247 n. 2, Musil, Palmyra, 233-235; J.G. Fievet, Essai sur l'histoire politique et économique de Palmyre, Paris 1931.

557 In the Letter to Assur the word "Qid-ta-a-a, apparently not part of the original text, are added, but see see note 556.

558 Oppenheim, ANET 299 n. 11. considers that here and in other Neo-Assyrian inscriptions "nîf" means woman. If this is correct, the characteristics of such a rear camp became even clearer.

Historical Survey

qa-nu-a, "Sa-da-te-in, "En-zî-kar-me, "Te-na-a and "Ir-ra-na-nu. Since Hululul is Hululul the water points must have been on the eastern fringe of al-Leja region, so that Musil's location of Mount Hukkurina in the Tulul al-Iyyat area east of Damascus becomes untenable, both because it is far removed from Hululul, and is arid and without springs and nearby settlements.

The success, in all its stages, of the campaign against the Arabs, and fear of further Assyrian action, gave rise to rebellion against Uaia. He fled, but was captured, possibly even with the connivance of his own people, and taken to Assyria (Episode U).

No further action against the Arabs is mentioned in the Letter to Aššur and the Rassam Cylinder, but in the Slab Inscription from the temple of Ištar; written later, Assurbanipal is said to have turned against Natsu king of Nebiatho also (Episode X; see also note 156). Lines 124-129 refer to a punitive campaign against the people of Nebiatho and the complete destruction of their settlements. Natsu, his wife and children, and much booty were captured by Assyrian troops. Natsu's son, Nuhuru, escaped but later surrendered to Assurbanipal, bringing heavy tributes, and was made king in his father's place. The absence of Episode X from the Letter to Aššur and the Rassam Cylinder and the statement in the Slab Inscription about an assault on oases where permanent settlement existed suggest that the campaign against Natsu was a separate operation from the one described in Episodes Q to V, and took place under different circumstances, along a different route (in the Wadi Sirhan area or south of it), some time after the major campaign.

In sum, in the historical inscriptions of Assurbanipal we can distinguish three phases of the war against the Arabs during his reign: against the Qedarites on the northern border of southern Syria and Transjordan (in 652 B.C. or earlier), against the tribes advancing from the desert to Babylon to assist Samaš-sum-ukin (in 651 or early 650 B.C.) and against the nomad federations in the Palmyrene region (c. 645 B.C.). It is also possible that the campaign against Natsu king of Nebiatho (Episode X) was a later, fourth phase. At least two of these phases, those involving vaster operations, were connected with nomad incursions from the Syro-Arab desert and their pressure on extensive border regions in Transjordan, southern Syria and the Jebel Bishri area. These episodes marked the beginning of a protracted struggle in the western half of the cup of the Fertile Crescent. The nomads, repressed in the second half of the 7th and early 6th centuries B.C. by the countries in the region, supported by Assyrian and later by Babylonian armies, so increasingly exerted pressure during the Chaldaean and Achaemenid periods that they finally penetrated the settled areas, including Palestine.

4. Nomad Leaders According to Groupings During Assurbanipal's Reign:

The inscriptions of Assurbanipal differ from other Assyrian royal inscriptions in that they supply names and personal data for the leaders of the various nomad groups in the Syro-Arabian desert, instead of using the general term kûtim Aribi. Certain groups and individuals will now be considered.

a. Yau'a' king of Qedar and Uaia' king of kûtim Su-mu(-)-AN:

Beginning with the Letter to Aššur (and excepting the Ištar Slab Inscription from Niniveh, on which see note 511) in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, as listed in the chart after p. 166, the appellation "U-á-te-" šar kûtim Aribi designates both Yau'a' b. Hazael and Uaia' b.

560 Delitzsch (op. cit., 301) raised the possibility of identifying "En-zî-kar-me with the village of ‘Arl in the South Haoran and "Ir-ra-na-nu with ‘Su-bir-Ran near Busân in East Haoran. One at least has to be rejected, however, because of the distance between them. Oates’s JNES 29 (1970), 185 n. 37) identification of "Ap-pa-re, discussed here, with Affar in Wadi Hafer on the southeastern border of the land of Mecab must also be rejected, because the places listed in this section of the Rassam Cylinder were in northern Transjordan.

561 See CASKET, PETERS, 357 n. 11. For a suggested identification of Moom Hukkurina in al-Leja region and its link to mhk in Egyptian inscriptions see Na‘aran and Zadok. Tel Aviv 4 (1977), 172-174.

562 Tadmor (JCS 23h Congress, 240) sets the time of composition at about 640 B.C., two or three years after the Rassam Cylinder.

563 On slabs 5-7 of the Room I ("the Arab Room") reliefs in Assurbanipal's palace, Assyrian soldiers are cutting down palm trees on a captured oasis. The passage in the Ištar Slab line 125, is the only one of all the Assurbanipal inscriptions to mention devastation of permanent Arab settlements; all other passages remark to refer to temporary camps. As against the possibility of aligning the discussed reliefs with Episode V, however, stands the reservation about the terminus ad quem of the reliefs of Room I; see note 518.

564 K 2802 r 37; Rm. vii 83, viii 25; cf. vii 46-47.
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Birdādā.565 In other inscription of Assurbanipal, we read "ye-ut-u-" for Yau'ta' b. Hazael566 and "U-a-e-tee-" for Su-mu-AN for Yau'ta' b. Birdādā.566 The people of Su-mu-AN led by Uau'ta' are undoubtedly identical with those of Su-mu-AN who appear with the people of ye-e-me in the inscriptions of Sennacherib.568

Fr. Delitzsch, followed by R. C. Thompson, reading Sumu(?)-AN as Sumu(?)-il, interpreted the name as a development of Ishmael, the biblical designation for nomadic tribes in the Syro-Armenian North Sinai deserts.569 J. Lewy, in agreement, and because of the identical title ye-e-ABi-preferred both to kings and especially because of the confusion of their names in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, changed the name of Sumu(?)-il and 562 ye-e-ABi all to the same person (Yau'ta' b. Hazael), and hence that the first two are synonymous, applied to the leader whose specific title was "king of the Arab(s)".570

If Lewy were right, the Assyrian sources would demonstrate a clear link, even an identity, between the terms "Ishmaeelites" and "Arabs". Given the fact that "Ishmaeelites(s)" appears only in biblical sources anecting to David's reign, and "Arab(s)" only in sources from mid-9th century B.C. onward, and that the Bible makes no connection between the Arabs and Ishmael,571 such an assumption is of special interest. But it must, nevertheless, be rejected.

1. The phonetic development Yie-sar > Sumu-il is unsupportable. Moreover, Ysema'il is a proper name with a verbal construction which, in the Islaic, Yaqutian forms, is found in documents as early as those from Bshā (where it is spelled "Uy-md-il"),572 the Akkad period (where it is spelled "Uy-md-il, "Uy-mu-AN") and the Old Babylonian period (where it is spelled "Uy-md-il, "Uy-mu-AN").573 The names "Yse-sar", "Uy-md-il, "Uy-mu-AN", of the same construction also appear in Neo-Assyrian documents from Gurban and Calah.574 It is therefore most unlikely that the scribes of Sennacherib and Assurbanipal transcribed Ishmael as Sumu-il,575 which is a proper name with a nominative construction. The Hebrew transcription of Sumu-ill would be ʾšmā’ or ʾšmā’, but surely not ʾšmā’-e.576

2. Yau'ta' b. Hazael, king of the Qedarites, was succeeded by Abihe's b. Te'ri (episode H), whose leadership ended at the same time as that of Uaute' b. Birdādā (cf. Episode S and U). They must therefore have been contemporaries.

3. Since we have seen that it is possible to distinguish between Yau'ta' b. Hazael and Uaute' b. Birdādā, whatever their names in the inscriptions

565 K 2802 vi 15; Rm. viii 93, in 1-2, c. 21. Although K 2802b i (1) ʾr'yr Yd ʾkq-iq-ar-ni-ni (1) and ʾr'yr 200 a 10 ʾkq-iq-ar-ni-ta "U-a-e-tee-" (3) mr ʾr'yr 200 a 10 ʾkq-iq-ar-ni-ta "Bir-ud-dā da ʾr'yr A-bi-ri-bi (1) ʾkq-iq-ar-ni-ta" "I surrounded the city of the god Atar Mitar and the Qedarites, of Uaute' b. Birdādā, king of the Arab(s), and the Qedarites." implies that Uaute' b. Birdādā was titled "king of the Arab(s) and the Qedarites"; the absence of ʾkq-iq-ar-ni-ta in the parallel verse of Rm. vi 19 suggests that the verbal repetition in the former list of Assur was due to the scribal error of copying on line 4 what appeared on line 2.

566 Cyl. B (Strock), vi 87-88; cf. B (Herriken) vi 93-94. This Yau'ta' was king of the Qedarites is corroborated by Assurbanipal's treaty with them, published by Delitzsch-Paner, Quellen 37 (1968), 461 ff.

567 AAA 20 (1933), 86:111 (cf. line 19: "ye-ut-u-" ʾr'yr ba-su-mu-AN).

568 BM 83116 vi 96 (see note 434).

569 Fr. Delitzsch, Assyrische Literatur, Leipzig 1912, 183; Thompson, AAA 20 (1933), 98.


571 See pp. 60-63 and also Appendix B.
of Assurbanipal, it seems apparent that the names Qedar and Sumud' are used for two groups of differing sizes. Šar 'uṣur 'Arabi is the general title for both leaders and provides no clue to their status or the extent of their dominion.

At the same time, since, during the major campaign against the Arabs, the Qedarites were perhaps also the a'lu SC. 'Ašaršumdu are said to have been led by Uaitê b. Bīrdāda (Episode B), he may have had Qedarite connections. In other words, the people of Sumud' are under his leadership may have been members of the larger Qedarite confederation (for the social implications of this possibility and for other examples of Qedarite identification, see Appendix A. 11).

Uaitê b. Bīrdāda and Abiyeṭe b. Tērī, who became chief of the Qedarites after Yauṭa b. Ḥazael was deposed in about 652 B.C., are known collaborators from the time they both dispatched men to help Šīmaš-šām-um-kin at the start of his war against Assurbanipal (Episode I). They were eventually captured by the Assyrian king, sent to Nineveh, and Uaitê was put on display at the city gate with a rope strung through a hole in his cheek. Later he was forced to take part in Assurbanipal’s triumphal procession along with the kings of Elam (Episodes U and W). Nothing, however, is known of the fate of Abiyeṭe.

b. Abiyeṭe and Ayamu, sons of Tēri

The inscriptions of Assurbanipal record two leaders whose father’s name was "Tē’-‘e-rē". One, Abiyeṭe who replaced Yauṭa b. Ḥazael as king of the Qedarites, appears in Prism E, in the Letter to Āṣur and in the Rassam Cylinder, the other, Ayamu, appears only in the later sources. These, although sometimes referring to "A-bi-ta-te-‘e-rē‘-e-tē‘-e-rē-ri", never use the plural DUMU MEŠ-mārē or the conjunction ṣ between the two names. Two or even three given names, in fact, are not uncommon among South Arabian rulers in later periods, and in some of the passages considered, therefore, Abiyeṭe Ayamu might indicate one person (Rm. vii 91, viii 31). However, despite the difficulty of explaining the nomenclature appearing above, Rm. ix 19-20, x 1-2 and K 2802 iii. 22 make it clear that we are dealing with two brothers. The Qedarite chiefman Abiyeṭe b. Tērī, was entitled Šar 'uṣur Qidri after he swore allegiance to and concluded a treaty with Assurbanipal (Episode I and Rm. vii 65-68; cf. also K 2802 iii. 18-20 and Rm. ix 16-17, giving his name to the confederation of "A-hu‘-zi-te-mārē Tē’-ri Qid-μa-a-a"). He was joined by his brother Ayamu in leading the Arab forces to Babylon to support Šīmaš-šām-um-kin (Episodes I, III) and certainly also in raising the Assyrian border and in the last campaign against the Arabs. Both were captured during that campaign and taken to Nineveh (K 2802 in 22-23; Rm. ix 19-24, and Episode V). Ayamu was skinned alive (Episode V), but about Abiyeṭe, supreme Qedarite leader and violator of his oath to Assurbanipal, the Assyrian inscriptions are silent.

c. Natnu and Nuḥuru, kings of Nebaioth:

Assuming that the Ishtar Slab covers later episodes of Assurbanipal’s reign, the affairs reported in lines 123 ff. seem related to an expedition against Natnu king of Nebaioth, whose throne was given to his son Nuḥuru, who had sworn loyalty to the Assyrian king. Natnu, according to Epistle L, had led the people of Nebaioth even before Assurbanipal’s accession, thus giving him at least 24 years of leadership at the time of Assurbanipal’s major campaign against the Arabs (ca. 645 B.C.).

578 See pp. 1-37, and also pp. 148-147.
579 For the connection of "Tē’-‘e-rē" with the name of the moon god Šīr, see Lewy, HUCA 19 (1945-1946), 25.
580 B viii 11; Rm. viii 65 (77, 94), ix 16; K 2802 iii. 18-19, v 6; see also note 382.
581 Rm. x 1-1; see also note 382.
582 Rm. vii 91, viii 31, ix 19-20, K 2802 iii 22, 25 (in line 25 the proper names are superficially, apparently recorded through scribal error).
583 See, for example, J. Ryckmans, L’Institution monachique en Arabie méridionale avant l’Islam (Mâre et Sabo), Louvain 1951, 17, 338-361; J. Pirenne, Paléographie des inscriptions Sud-Arabes, 1: Des origines jusqu’à l’époque himyârite, Brussels 1936, 323-327.
584 On this source, see p. 51.