


OXFORD

The World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms

A Political and Military History



TREVOR BRYCE

THE WORLD OF THE NEO-HITTITE KINGDOMS

This page intentionally left blank

The World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms

A Political and Military History

TREVOR BRYCE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Trevor Bryce 2012

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

ISBN 978-0-19-921872-1

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Acknowledgements

It has been a pleasure to work with OUP's editorial staff, particularly Hilary O'Shea and Taryn Campbell, throughout this project, and I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dorothy McCarthy for her meticulous work in the copy-editing process, and to David Pelteret for his thorough proofreading and many valuable suggestions. My thanks are also due to the School of History, Philosophy, Religion and Classics, University of Queensland, for its valuable infrastructure support.

I would like to dedicate this volume to the memory of Robert Ireland, a fine young man who died well before his time. The world would be a better place were there more people like Robert within it.

Trevor Bryce

*University of Queensland
December 2010*

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

<i>Maps</i>	ix
<i>Figures</i>	x
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi

Introduction	1
--------------	---

PART I SETTING THE SCENE

1. The End of an Era	9
2. The Hittite Empire's Anatolian Successors	33
3. Defining the Neo-Hittites	47
4. The Biblical Hittites	64

PART II THE IRON AGE KINGDOMS AND DYNASTIES

Preface to Chapters 5–7	79
5. The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in the Euphrates Region	83
6. The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in the Anti-Taurus and Western Syrian Regions	122
7. The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in South-Eastern Anatolia	141
8. The Aramaean States	163
9. Other Peoples and Kingdoms	181

PART III THE NEO-HITTITE KINGDOMS IN THEIR HISTORICAL CONTEXT

10. The Kingdoms Evolve (12th–11th centuries)	195
11. Subjection to Assyria (10th–9th centuries)	209
12. Absorption by Assyria (8th century)	253
Afterword	290
<i>Appendix I</i> Transliterating the Inscriptions	297
<i>Appendix II</i> Neo-Hittite and Aramaean Rulers: A Summary List	301

<i>Appendix III</i>	The Kings of Late Bronze Age Hatti	310
<i>Appendix IV</i>	The Neo-Assyrian Kings	311
<i>Notes</i>		312
<i>Bibliography</i>		337
<i>Index</i>		347

Maps

1. Late Bronze Age Anatolia, Northern Syria, and Northern Mesopotamia. 8
2. The Hittite Empire's Anatolian Successors. 32
3. The Iron Age Kingdoms of Northern Syria and South-Eastern Anatolia. 46
4. The Kingdoms of Tabal, Hilakku, and Que (Adanawa). 140
5. The Neo-Assyrian Empire. 208

Figures

1. Reconstructed walls of Hattusa.	11
2. Suppiluliuma II, last king of the Hittite Empire (from the Südburg complex, Hattusa).	20
3. Rock tombs at Myra in Lycia.	37
4. Lion head, Carchemish (courtesy, British Museum).	48
5. Luwian hieroglyphic inscription of Kamani, early–mid 8th-century king of Carchemish (courtesy, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford).	61
6. Inscription of Katuwa, 10th- or early 9th-century king of Carchemish (courtesy, British Museum).	93
7. Yariri and Kamani, successive rulers of Carchemish (cast of an original now in Ankara) (courtesy, British Museum).	96
8. The goddess Kubaba, from Carchemish (courtesy, British Museum).	112
9. Shell clappers, presented to Shalmaneser III by the Hamathite king Urhilina (courtesy, British Museum).	136
10. Ivriz monument, depicting Warpalawa paying homage to the Storm God of the Vineyard (from K. Bittel, <i>Les Hittites</i> , Paris, Éditions Gallimard, 1976: Pl. 328).	151
11. Ashurnasirpal II (courtesy, British Museum).	212
12. Bearers of tribute to Ashurnasirpal II, perhaps from north-west Syria and Phoenicia (courtesy, British Museum).	217
13. Tiglath-pileser III (courtesy, British Museum).	259
14. Attack by Tiglath-pileser's army on a city perhaps in Syria (c.728, from Central Palace, Nimrud) (courtesy, British Museum).	263
15. Hieroglyphic Luwian logograms.	296

Abbreviations

- ABC A. K. Grayson (1975), *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, New York: J. J. Augustin (cited by page nos.)
- AfO *Archiv für Orientforschung*
- AJA *American Journal of Archaeology*
- AM A. Goetze (1933), *Die Annalen des Mursilis*, Leipzig (repr. Darmstadt, 1967)
- ANET J. B. Pritchard (1969), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd edn., Princeton: Princeton University Press
- AoF *Altorientalische Forschungen*
- ARAB D. D. Luckenbill (1928), *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, Vols. 1 and II, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (repr. Greenwood Press, New York, 1968) (cited by section nos.)
- ARE IV J. H. Breasted (1906), *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Vol. IV, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- AS *Anatolian Studies*
- BAR *Biblical Archaeological Review*
- BASOR *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
- BiOr *Bibliotheca Orientalis*
- BMD P. Bienkowski and A. Millard (eds.) (2000), *British Museum Dictionary of the Ancient Near East*, London: British Museum
- CAH *Cambridge Ancient History*
- CANE J. M. Sasson (ed.) (1995), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (4 vols.), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons
- Chav. M. W. Chavalas (ed.), *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*, Oxford: Blackwell (cited by page nos.)
- CHLI I J. D. Hawkins (2000), *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Vol. I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter
- CHLI II H. Çambel (1999), *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Vol. II: Karatepe-Aslantaş. The Inscriptions*, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter
- CRAI *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*
- CS I, II, III W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger (eds.) (1997, 2000, 2002), *The Context of Scripture* (3 vols.), Leiden, New York, and Cologne: Brill
- EA *The El-Amarna Letters*, most recently ed. and transl. by W. Moran (1992), *The Amarna Letters*, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press (cited by document nos.)

- Epon.* A. Millard (1994), *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910–612*, State Archives of Assyria Studies II, Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Dept. of Asian and African Studies, University of Helsinki
- ES* G. Bunnens (ed.) (2000), *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age*, Ancient Near East Studies, Supplement 7, Louvain, Paris, and Sterling (Virginia): Peeters
- Fuchs* A. Fuchs (1993), *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad*, Göttingen: Cuvillier (page nos. cited; roman type = transliterations, italics = translations)
Ann. = *Annals*
Cyl. = *Cylinder Inscription*
Disp. = *Display Inscription*
- HCBD* P. J. Achtmeyer (ed.) (1996), *HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*, New York: HarperCollins
- Hcl* F. W. König (1955), *Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften*, AfO Beiheft 8, Graz
- IEJ* *Israel Exploration Journal*
- Jas.* A. M. Jasink (1995), *Gli Stati Neo-Ittiti: Annalisi delle fonti scritte e sintesi storica*, Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore (*Studia Mediterranea* 10)
- JCS* *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
- JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
- KatHet* Katalog der Ausstellung: *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich. Das Volk der 1000 Götter* (Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 2002), Stuttgart, 2002
- Lie* A. G. Lie (1929), *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria*, Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner (page nos. cited)
- MDOG* *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin*
- OCD* S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.) (1996), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edn., Oxford: Oxford University Press
- OT* Old Testament
- PPAWA* T. R. Bryce (2009), *The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia*, Abingdon: Routledge
- Pros.* *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Editor in Chief: S. Parpola. (For details, see Bibliography under *Pros.*)
- RAss* *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie orientale*
- RGTC* *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes*, Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert
- RGTC 6* G. F. Del Monte and J. Tischler (1978), *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*

- RIMA *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Assyrian Periods*, Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press (cited by vol. and page nos.)
- RIMA 1 A. K. Grayson (1987), *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (To 1115 BC)*
- RIMA 2 A. K. Grayson (1991), *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114–859 BC)*
- RIMA 3 A. K. Grayson (1996), *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC)*
- RIMB *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Babylonian Periods*, Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press (cited by vol. and page nos.)
- RIMB 2 G. Frame (1995), *Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157-612)* (cited by page nos.)
- RIA *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter
- RS *Tablets from Ras Shamra*
- SAA *State Archives of Assyria*, Helsinki: Helsinki University Press (cited by page and document nos.)
- SAA I S. Parpola (1987), *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part I*
- SAA II S. Parpola and K. Watanabe (1988), *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*
- SAA V G. B. Lanfranchi and S. Parpola (1990), *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part II*
- SAA XV A. Fuchs and S. Parpola (2001), *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part III*
- SAAB *State Archives of Assyria: Bulletin*
- Sennach. D. D. Luckenbill (1924), *The Annals of Sennacherib*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (repr. Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005) (cited by page nos.)
- SMEA *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici*
- StBoT *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten*
- Tigl. III H. Tadmor (2007), *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria: Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities (cited by page nos.)
- TSSI II J. C. L. Gibson (1975), *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions II. Aramaic Inscriptions*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- TÜBA-AR *Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi*
- UF *Ugarit-Forschungen*
- ZA *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie*
- ZDPV *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*

Note that in translated passages, square brackets [] are used to enclose a restored word, part-word, or passage which has been erased from the original text.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

During the early centuries of the Iron Age, a number of kingdoms arose in south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria to which modern scholars have applied the label 'Neo-Hittite'. The name implies that these kingdoms were in at least some respects the successors of the Late Bronze Age kingdom of the Hittites. This kingdom collapsed during the upheavals that afflicted many parts of the Near Eastern world in the early decades of the 12th century. Egyptian records of the pharaoh Ramesses III associate the upheavals with the devastations caused by the so-called Sea Peoples in their progress through Anatolia, the Levant, and Cyprus before they reached the coast of Egypt. Drought, famine, plague, local uprisings, and the collapse of international trading networks have all been suggested as primary or ancillary reasons for the collapse of the Late Bronze Age civilizations in many parts of Greece and the Near East. The Hittite empire ended with the fall of its capital Hattusa. It was long assumed that Hattusa was captured and destroyed by outside forces. But the site's recent excavators Jurgen Seeher and Andreas Schachner believe that before the city was finally torched by invaders, or marauders, most of its occupants had already deserted it, taking their possessions with them. That leads us to ask two fundamental questions. What were the circumstances that induced them to leave? Where did they go?

The second of these questions is the one that will concern us here. If Seeher's and Schachner's conclusions about the archaeology of the site in its final years are correct, then Hattusa's population probably dispersed through many areas. But the last king Suppiluliuma II may well have had a specific destination in mind, prepared in advance to receive him, along with a substantial retinue of his family members, palace staff, and troops. Perhaps one of the states that were to be called (by modern scholars) Neo-Hittite kingdoms provided him with an alternative royal seat, which, he may fondly have hoped, would serve as a base from which he could eventually reclaim Hattusa¹—whatever the reason for his abandoning it in the first place.

How justified are we in using the term 'Neo-Hittite'? Many scholars believe that the kingdoms so called arose from massive shifts, at the end of the Late Bronze Age, of populations displaced from their homelands in central and

western Anatolia into south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria across to the Euphrates. But as we shall see, identifying the inhabitants of the ‘Neo-Hittite’ kingdoms is a rather more complex matter. The kingdoms were multi-ethnic and multi-cultural in their composition, and the reasons for their formation varied from one to another. Certainly there were old Hittite elements among them, and some like Carchemish on the Euphrates could justly claim to be the inheritors of many of the traditions of the Late Bronze Age Hittite world. But others had very tenuous links with this world, which became even more tenuous with the influxes of Aramaean peoples into Syria in the late second millennium. Aramaean and Hittite elements became closely blended in a number of Syrian states; hence the term ‘Syro-Hittite’ sometimes used to refer to them.

There is also the question of where the Hittites of the Old Testament belong within the context of the Iron Age kingdoms. Did the biblical Hittites have any connections with the peoples whom we identify by this name in Late Bronze Age and Iron Age historical sources?² I have briefly touched on this question in two of my books on the Hittites,³ and will try to provide a more comprehensive answer to it below, in Chapter 4.

One of my greatest difficulties in writing this book was working out a suitable structure for it. The Neo-Hittite label has been applied to a total of fifteen kingdoms spread through south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria. For a part of their history, these kingdoms shared a number of features which, from a modern investigator’s perspective, distinguished them from their neighbours. But they were politically separate from one other, except perhaps in the early decades of the Iron Age when some may have been dependants of or evolved from the kingdom of Carchemish. And on various occasions, a number of them joined forces, in combination with other kingdoms and peoples, to resist a common aggressor. But they were all caught up in the contests between the great powers of the age. Assyria became the most intrusive of these powers, playing a dominant role in shaping the history of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, as well as that of many other states and cities in Syria and Palestine. Urartu and Phrygia also played a role in this history, of increasing importance in the final phase of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms’ existence—the last decades of the 8th century.

The book’s overall coverage, then, extends beyond what we know of the individual histories of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms to a more broadly based survey of historical developments in the Near East in general throughout the Iron Age. This will sometimes take us much further than the confines of the Neo-Hittite world, into Babylonia as well as regions east of the Tigris. The reason for going so far afield is that the Assyrians’ involvement in these regions must have influenced significantly the timing, regularity, nature, and extent of their enterprises in the west. And Assyria’s western enterprises were linked closely with the fortunes and misfortunes of many of the states, Neo-Hittite and otherwise, across the Euphrates.

The book is divided into three Parts. The first of these does some scene-setting. Chapter 1 provides a retrospective of the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom and sets up some transitional links with its Iron Age successors. Chapter 2 looks at the Hittites' Iron Age successors in Anatolia, particularly in the west and on the plateau. The most important of these, the Phrygians, were to have a major impact on the Neo-Hittite states in south-eastern Anatolia in the last decades of the 8th century. Chapter 3 addresses the question of who precisely the people we call the Neo-Hittites were. To what extent can they really be regarded as the direct successors of the Late Bronze Age Hittites? What do we really mean by a Neo-Hittite state, or a Syro-Hittite state? Following on from this, Chapter 4 is devoted to the biblical Hittites. Were they in any way linked to the Late Bronze Age people to whom the name 'Hittite' has been applied by modern scholars? And if so, or even if not, can they be identified with the 'Neo-Hittites'?

Part II of the book begins with three reference chapters (5–7) on the individual rulers of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms and the dynasties (when these can be identified) to which they belonged. At this point, I must acknowledge the great debt I owe to the work of J. David Hawkins, particularly his *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume I*. Of fundamental importance to a study of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, this volume is a comprehensive and meticulously presented edition of all the Iron Age Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered in Anatolia and Syria up to the time of its publication in 2000, with detailed commentaries on the inscriptions and historical introductions to each of the regions dealt with. Also of great importance and distinction is Halet Çambel's Volume II of the *Corpus* (1999), which deals at length with the famous Luwian–Phoenician bilingual inscription discovered at Karatepe-Aslantaş in south-eastern Anatolia.⁴ Without these publications, my book could not have been written. They clearly rank among the great achievements of scholarship on the epigraphy, the history, and the culture of the Near Eastern world in the Iron Age.⁵

But the Luwian corpus raises many questions, as yet unanswerable, and presents many problems. Apart from the difficulties of reading and interpreting the hieroglyphic script, the inscriptions are often very fragmentary, providing frustratingly incomplete information about their subject matter, and about those who authored or commissioned them. But despite their limitations, we can construct from them partial lists of the rulers who held sway over the kingdoms where the inscriptions were located. In many cases, we can supplement the details they provide with information derived from Assyrian (and occasionally Aramaic and Phoenician) sources. Sometimes the same rulers are attested in both Luwian and Assyrian sources; more often, the Assyrian texts attest to rulers not known from the hieroglyphic texts.⁶

This leads to a more general point. Our largest collection of historical information about the Neo-Hittite kingdoms comes from the inscriptions of

those who plundered and subjugated and finally abolished the kingdoms—the Assyrians. Ironically, these destroyers of the Neo-Hittite world have preserved for us much of what we know about this world—albeit from a distinctly Assyrian perspective. The same applies to the Aramaean states, of which Chapter 8 provides an introductory summary. Spreading widely through Mesopotamia and Syria, the Aramaeans played an increasingly important role in Near Eastern affairs from the late second millennium onwards. Our particular interest will be in the Aramaean states that developed west of the Euphrates, several of which came into close contact with the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, sometimes as allies, sometimes as enemies, occasionally as parties to a treaty. We have noted above the fusion of Hittite/Luwian and Aramaean elements in a number of the states of the region. Part II concludes, in Chapter 9, with a brief outline of Assyria's rise and development prior to the Iron Age,⁷ followed by an account of the other Near Eastern kingdoms and cities which will figure in our discussions in Part III, namely the kingdoms of Babylon, Urartu, Elam, and Israel, and the cities of Phoenicia on the Syro-Palestinian coast.

In Part III, the histories of the various cities and kingdoms dealt with in I and II are integrated into a single historical narrative. It is almost inevitable that Assyrian chronology should provide a basic time-frame for this narrative. Assyria was the defining power of the age, and has left us the most detailed records of it. We begin Chapter 10 with an account of the reign of Kuzi-Teshub, the first Iron Age king of Carchemish, who ascended his throne some time in the first half of the 12th century. An important focus for the chapter is provided by the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I, who reigned at the turn of the 11th century (1114–1076) and crossed the Euphrates many times, receiving tribute from a king of Hatti called Ini-Teshub, almost certainly one of the rulers of Carchemish. The chapter proceeds to a survey of the Syrian and Syro-Palestinian regions, much of which Tiglath-pileser claims to have conquered, and ends with a discussion of the origins of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms that had very likely begun to develop by this time.

Chapter 11 covers the 10th and 9th centuries, beginning with the reign of the Assyrian king Ashur-dan II (934–912), generally regarded as the founder of the Neo-Assyrian kingdom. The reigns of two of his successors, Ashurnasirpal II (883–859) and Shalmaneser III (858–824), saw Assyrian authority planted firmly in the lands west of the Euphrates. We have much information from Assyrian records of the involvement of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms in the western campaigns which these kings conducted. The chapter ends with an account of Adad-nirari III's (810–783) Syrian campaigns, particularly those directed against a group of northern Syrian rulers called the 'kings of Hatti'. The last chapter (12) covers most of the 8th century, beginning with what many scholars believe was a period of weakness and instability in Assyria following the death of Adad-nirari. This was followed by the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (745–727), who vigorously reasserted Assyrian authority in the west

as well as in other parts of the Near Eastern world, and began the process of converting the Neo-Hittite (and other) kingdoms into Assyrian provinces. The process was continued by his second successor Sargon II (721–705), by the end of whose reign the last of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms had been absorbed into the Assyrian provincial structure.

Again it should be emphasized that much of our historical information about the Neo-Hittite kingdoms comes from Assyrian sources. We have noted the bias that these sources reflect in their treatment of Assyria's conflicts with their enemies. But their value is limited in another way as well. They are concerned almost entirely with reporting a king's triumphant progress through enemy territory, the destruction and devastation he inflicted on cities and kingdoms that refused to submit to him, the punishments he meted out to enemy kings or rebel leaders and their supporters, the amount of tribute he exacted, and the clemency he showed towards contrite rulers who were forgiven and restored to their thrones. In other words, Assyrian records provide us with mere chronicles of events, and only very rarely with any motives for the campaigns which they record, or for the resistance movements that prompted a number of these campaigns. Not surprisingly, we are never given the opportunity of seeing things from an enemy's or a rebel leader's perspective. We have to deduce such things for ourselves. I have attempted to do so on a number of occasions throughout this book, fleshing out the bare facts of the records with suggested reasons and motives as to why (for example) a group of local kingdoms banded together to overthrow their Assyrian overlord, or why an Assyrian conqueror decided in some instances to forgive and to reinstate a defeated ruler who had rebelled against him repeatedly, while brutally punishing another, who had rebelled but once. I trust that I have not given too much play to creative instinct in assigning motives and reasons in such cases, and that my historical reconstructions and suppositions are at least consistent with what facts we do have.

Finally, I should emphasize that there are several major aspects of the Neo-Hittite world that this book does not deal with. It is primarily a political and military history of this world, inevitably so because of the nature of the written sources from which I have drawn my basic information. There is undoubtedly scope for another volume on the Neo-Hittite kingdoms which focuses on what we know of the social and cultural history of these kingdoms, based primarily on their material remains. Of central importance to such a study is the art and architecture of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms themselves and those kingdoms which impacted culturally as well as politically and militarily upon them. An up-to-date account of Neo-Hittite sculpture, architecture, and small finds, which tell us much about the ideologies and cultural affinities of the kingdoms for which they were produced (as well as the nature and quality of the works themselves), is an essential component of an all-inclusive treatment of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. W. Orthmann's study of Late Hittite art

(*Untersuchungen zur Späthethitischen Kunst*, 1971) is still the only major work available on this topic. It is now four decades old, and a new comprehensive account of Neo-Hittite artistic achievement is clearly called for,⁸ within the context of a more broadly based presentation of social and cultural developments within the Neo-Hittite world. I hope that my book will provide a useful historical background for such a work when it does appear.

Part I

Setting the Scene



Map 1. Late Bronze Age Anatolia, Northern Syria, and Northern Mesopotamia.

The End of an Era

Evacuation

As first light glimmered above Hatti's royal capital Hattusa, the procession that had departed the palace precinct in pre-dawn darkness halted briefly before one of Hattusa's great gates. Many earlier processions had passed into the outer world through this gate, some setting forth on military campaigns, others on more peaceful missions to the holy centres of the Hittite world. Carved on the inner wall of the gate was a three-metre-high god equipped for battle. His right hand clasped a battle-axe, his left was raised and clenched in a gesture of farewell. For what would be the last time, the Hittite king Suppiluliuma II acknowledged the gesture, invoking the god's protection for the long and hazardous journey that lay ahead.

This was neither military expedition nor religious pilgrimage. There was no sense of excitement, no celebration. Already at this early hour, crowds had gathered in the streets to watch the procession pass. Kept firmly in check by the king's massive military escort, they remained sullen and silent. They knew that their king, in whom they had placed all their trust in these uncertain days, was abandoning them. Worse, the city was being stripped of its troops. It would be left leaderless, and defenceless. Baggage carts had been filled with grain and other supplies from the city's almost exhausted food reserves, other carts were laden with furniture, others with gold and silver sealed in chests, along with a fortune in luxury items assembled from the personal possessions of the king's family. Important documents inscribed on clay and metal tablets had been selected by scribes from the palace and temple archives of the city. These too would be conveyed to and housed in a new location. Special vehicles were needed for the safe conduct of the statues of the city's gods to this location, where new temples would be built. The king himself rode in a chariot, surrounded by his personal bodyguard. Behind him came his chief consort and other members of his family, closely followed by elite members of his court, and a

large array of palace personnel, from scribes to cooks and stableboys. Priests and ritualists were prominent in the entourage, for they had an essential role to play on this dangerous enterprise in ensuring the goodwill of the gods. But there were many in the city who had to be left behind.

Only after long consideration and consultation with his closest advisers had Suppiluliuma made the decision to abandon his capital. There were compelling enough reasons. The city's grain silos were now at a critically low level. For yet another year, crop production had fallen short of demand. And despite Suppiluliuma's alleged victories against the enemy fleets that attacked the ships bringing grain from Egypt and the Levant, imports of essential food supplies had almost ceased. As Hattusa's population faced the increasing threat of starvation, it was but a matter of time before they rose up against their rulers. Indeed, a number of the king's vassal states had already broken out in rebellion, aware that the empire was close to collapse. In southern Anatolia, their defiance of the royal authority had been led by Tarhuntassa, formerly an important appanage kingdom of Hatti, now ruled by a regime hostile to it. Suppiluliuma claimed to have restored his control over the rebellious cities and states. But his supposedly triumphant campaign had been little more than a rearguard action, ultimately ineffective in reasserting Hittite authority in the regions where it had been conducted. His ability to boost the kingdom's defence forces and strengthen its security by raising new levies was now severely limited. And the more troops he recruited to defend his realm, the smaller the labour force left for vitally important food-producing activities. No longer could manpower shortages be covered by the recruitment of new labour from defeated lands, like the booty-people brought back by earlier Hittite kings as spoils of conquest. This source of supply had by now been almost exhausted. Suppiluliuma could no longer feed or defend his people. The fall of the capital was increasingly imminent, and with its fall Suppiluliuma and the members of his family and his court would be doomed.

The king had no alternative. He must abandon his capital. There was a precedent for this. Two centuries earlier, a Hittite king called Tudhaliya, father of Suppiluliuma's namesake Suppiluliuma I, had made a similar decision to abandon Hattusa, on this occasion when the homeland was pressed by enemies from all sides. He had taken his court to the city of Samuha in the east, where he reigned for a time as king in exile. Hattusa had indeed fallen to the enemy and been destroyed. But from their place of exile, Tudhaliya and his son had rallied their forces against the invaders, and eventually won back their land and restored their capital. Perhaps a strategic withdrawal from Hattusa was the best thing now. The king and his army could live to fight another day, restoring the kingdom and its capital to their former glory as Tudhaliya and his son had done.

Once made, Suppiluliuma's decision to evacuate his family, his courtiers, and the rest of his entourage had to be put into effect without delay. The longer the operation was in the planning, the greater the risks to which it would be exposed as rumours of it began to spread. Even a large escort might not provide sufficient



Fig. 1. Reconstructed walls of Hattusa.

protection for the royal baggage train against a massed attack, particularly if news of the evacuation had reached Hatti's enemies ahead of the expedition's departure.

The fate of Hattusa

This is a hypothetical reconstruction of the circumstances in which Hatti's royal dynasty may have ended its days in Hattusa.¹ Archaeologists long believed that its end was more sudden and more violent, that Hattusa fell to enemy attack, and was destroyed in a single all-consuming conflagration, that its last king Suppiluliuma perhaps perished along with his city—his name an ironic reminder of the first Suppiluliuma who had brought Hatti to the peak of its power 150 years earlier. It is tempting to conjure up a dramatic image of the final moments of this second Suppiluliuma dying heroically among his people, like the last emperor of Constantinople, as his city collapsed around him. Recent excavations provide a different scenario. J. Seeher, the penultimate director of excavations at Boghazkoy/Hattusa, has concluded that the Hittite capital was abandoned, before its final destruction, by the royal family and other elite elements of the population, who took their most important records and most precious possessions with them. While parts of the city may have

been put to the torch at the very end of its existence, Seeher believes that by this time Hattusa had become largely derelict.² Perhaps those who remained after the royal evacuation were responsible for the fires that destroyed what was left of Hattusa, reducing the city to ruins by their scavenging activities before they too abandoned it. Alternatively, or in addition, the now defenceless city fell victim to outside forces, looting anything of value to them and destroying what was not. This may have happened within a matter of months, perhaps weeks or even days, of the city's abandonment by its leaders. Perhaps Kaskan warriors from the Pontic zone were the perpetrators of this final act. From the early years of the Hittite kingdom, Kaskan tribes had constantly harassed Hittite territory, and though Hittite kings often defeated them on the field of battle, the threats they posed to their powerful southern neighbour were never eliminated. Indeed, they had once taken part in massive invasions of the Hittite homeland, early in the 14th century, and were very likely responsible on that occasion for the sack of Hattusa.

If the end of the Hittite monarchy at Hattusa came with a planned evacuation of the capital by Suppiluliuma II, then undoubtedly the king had decided, before departing his capital, upon an alternative location for his residence and the re-establishment of his court. We can only guess where this may have been. The likelihood is that it was somewhere in south-eastern Anatolia or northern Syria, where Hatti's authority over its vassal territories had been most secure. It was in these regions that the states we refer to as Neo-Hittite kingdoms emerged and developed during the first four centuries of the Iron Age. For the most part, they lay within Hatti's former subject territories, where the name Hatti continued to be used throughout the Iron Age. We shall consider below the various states to which the Neo-Hittite label has been applied, and the extent to which they can legitimately be regarded as the successors of the Late Bronze Age Hittites. At this point, let us simply raise the possibility that one of these states came into being, or was re-established, as a refuge for the last king of Hattusa and his court, and that the central Hittite royal dynastic line did not die out with the fall of Hattusa.

More generally, south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria have been seen as regions to which many Anatolian peoples migrated in the wake of the Hittite kingdom's collapse.³ References to Late Bronze Age Hatti cease abruptly with the end of the kingdom. Could migrations from Hatti's subject territories in Anatolia help account for this? That is a question we shall address in Chapter 3. But even if the answer to it is yes, it is extraordinary that one of the most powerful kingdoms of the Near Eastern world, which at its peak controlled territories stretching from the Aegean coast of Anatolia in the west through northern Syria across the Euphrates river to the east, should so completely disappear from human memory, without the slightest reference to it even in legendary traditions. Homer's *Iliad* makes no mention of the Hittites, though they played a major role in western Anatolian affairs

throughout the Late Bronze Age and were almost certainly overlords of the kingdom Homer called Ilios/Troy during the period of the alleged Trojan War. Attempts to link them with legendary peoples appearing in the *Iliad*, like the Amazons and the Halizones, amount to no more than straw-clutching exercises. The likelihood is that Homer, who lived five hundred years after the ‘Trojan War’, was unaware that the Hittites had ever existed.

Yet we should be careful what we conclude from all this.

‘Hatti’ and ‘Hittites’ in their Late Bronze Age context

There can be little doubt that the upheavals associated with the so-called Sea Peoples,⁴ as recorded by the pharaoh Ramesses III, reflect profound changes in the geopolitical configuration of the Near Eastern world at the end of the Late Bronze Age. Ramesses reports:

The foreign countries made a conspiracy in their islands. All at once the lands were removed and scattered in the fray. No land could stand before their arms, from Hatti, Qode, Carchemish, Arzawa and Alasiya on, being cut off at one time. A camp was set up in one place in Amurru. They desolated its people, and its land was like that which has never come into being. They were coming forward toward Egypt, while the flame was prepared before them. Their confederation was the Peleset, Tjekker, Shekelesh, Denyen, and Weshesh, lands united.⁵

But the apparent agents of these upheavals were more likely to have been their victims than their perpetrators. Whatever the actual causes of the disturbances, a number of population groups may have abandoned their original homelands in the course of them, and sought new lands to settle, taking on a marauding aspect in the process. On the other hand, population groups in many parts of Anatolia, including what had been the core territory of the Hittite kingdom, almost certainly stayed put and were absorbed into the new power structures which evolved during the early centuries of the Iron Age. For the inhabitants of the Hittite homeland who remained after the kingdom’s collapse (we shall discuss below what elements of the population were likely to have migrated, and where), the process of losing their identity as ‘Hittites’ was very likely a rapid one. They had never been a coherent entity, ethnically or culturally. From the beginning of Hittite history, they were a mixture of different ethnic groups who spoke a range of languages. They never used—nor could they have used—a single specific ethnic term to designate themselves. Their identity as ‘Hittites’ was due primarily to the fact that they lived within the region traditionally called Hatti, given political coherence by the administrative structure which the line of kings ruling from Hattusa imposed upon it. The name Hatti was used first of a population group who had inhabited the region for centuries, perhaps millennia, before the foundation of the Hittite kingdom in the 17th century. Elements of their language and culture are preserved in a number of Hittite texts. And the survival of their

name was ensured by the fact that throughout Hittite history, the inhabitants of the homeland were identified as the ‘people of the land of Hatti’. Though we can only guess at the proportions of the different ethnic components making up the Hittite population, the kingdom’s official language, called Nesite by those who spoke and wrote it, was almost certainly a minority language within the kingdom, indeed probably even within the homeland region—at least by the last two centuries of the kingdom.

In the Late Bronze Age, the term ‘Hatti’ was used in its most specific sense of the core region of the Hittite world, the region in north-central Anatolia whose western, southern, and eastern limits were defined by a river which the Hittites called the Marassantiya (Classical Halys, modern Kızıl Irmak). But as the kingdom expanded, particularly from the mid 14th century onwards, so too did the application of the name Hatti. And when much of northern Syria became closely integrated into the kingdom with the establishment of viceregal seats at Carchemish and Aleppo (see below), ‘Hatti’ was used by foreign rulers (for example, the kings of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt) to refer to all Hittite-controlled territories from the homeland south-eastwards through the anti-Taurus region and northern Syria to the Euphrates river.

The long and bitter contest between Hatti and Mitanni for control over these territories had been resolved when Suppiluliuma I destroyed the Mitannian empire in the third quarter of the 14th century. Mitanni’s last remaining stronghold Carchemish fell to him in 1327. Following his capture of the city, Suppiluliuma took a step unprecedented in Hittite history: he imposed direct rule upon it, appointing his son Sharri-Kushuh (Piyassili) as viceroy, and placing under his overall authority a large conglomeration of subject territories which extended southwards along the Euphrates to the region of Ashtata, and westwards to the borders of the land of Mukish, once part of the kingdom of Aleppo and subsequently a subject-state of Mitanni. Aleppo became a second viceregal seat in Syria,⁶ Suppiluliuma appointing another of his sons, Telipinu, as its first viceroy. In the religious, judicial, and military roles assigned to them, the viceroys in Carchemish and Aleppo exercised in Syria the most important functions of the Great King himself throughout his realm. The northern Syrian states had now become a fully incorporated extension of the Land of Hatti. To the south, control of the states Amurru and Qadesh west of the Orontes river remained a cause of contention between Hatti and Egypt, finally resolved in favour of the former after the famous battle of Qadesh fought between the Hittite king Muwatalli II and the pharaoh Ramesses II in 1274. Effectively, Hittite-controlled territory now extended as far south as the region of Damascus, possession of which remained with Egypt after temporary Hittite occupation in the aftermath of Qadesh. In the treaty drawn up fifteen years later between Ramesses and the then Hittite king Hattusili III, all Syrian territory north of the Damascus border was tacitly acknowledged by the pharaoh as belonging to Hatti. This included the states

along the Mediterranean coast and in the Orontes valley region whose local rulers accepted Hittite sovereignty, or had it imposed upon them—Ugarit, Amurru, Nuhashshi, Tunip, Qatna, and Qadesh.

In the last two centuries of the Late Bronze Age, we might think of the Syrian territories subject to Hittite authority as consisting of two main groups: (1) the territories directly ruled by the viceroys from their seats in Carchemish and Aleppo, and (2) those along the Syrian coast and in the Orontes region, which retained a semi-independent status and were ruled by their own kings who acknowledged the sovereignty of the Great King and bound themselves to him by treaties and oaths of allegiance. Both groups comprised what we might call the south-eastern component of the Hittite empire. They too were part of the Land of Hatti. Following the empire's collapse in the early 12th century, 'Hatti' was no longer used of its former Anatolian territories. But it was retained, in Iron Age Assyrian, Urartian, and Hebrew sources, for the Syrian regions over which the Great Kings of Hatti had once held sway. These regions were no longer merely a part of the Land of Hatti. They became in effect *the* Land of Hatti. The use of 'Hatti' to refer to a large part of Iron Age Syria reflects not so much a shift as a contraction of the term to the Syrian region in the aftermath of the Late Bronze Age kingdom's fall.

In its Iron Age context, the term Hatti was not used by those who lived within the regions to which it applied—they never identified themselves as inhabitants of Hatti—but only by outsiders, like the Assyrians, Urartians, and Hebrews. That has a bearing on the main topic of our investigation. For many of the states located within Iron Age Hatti were among what scholars refer to as the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. In broad terms, the kingdoms in question are so called because they are commonly regarded as direct successors of the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti, and *may* have contained refugee populations who left their original homelands in Anatolia following the collapse of the Hittite empire. This conclusion is based largely on the use in most of these kingdoms of what very likely became the most widely spoken language of the Late Bronze Age Hittite empire. We call it Luwian. But Luwian was never the official language of the empire. How then do we explain its prominence? This question takes us back to the very beginnings of Hittite history.

The languages of Late Bronze Age Anatolia

The Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom was established in the 17th century by one of three Indo-European population groups who, most scholars believe, migrated into Anatolia from regions north of the Black Sea during the third millennium. They were speakers of related languages called Palaic, Luwian, and Nesite. Palaic speakers settled in the region immediately south of the Black Sea called Pala in Hittite sources, corresponding roughly to Paphlagonia in Classical texts. Luwian speakers came to occupy large areas of central, southern, and western Anatolia. Nesite-speakers became the founders of the

Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti. The name comes from Nesa, a city located just south of the Halys river where an earlier Indo-European dynasty had established its power-base during the Assyrian Colony period.⁷ Subsequently, the Nesite language, which we call Hittite, became the official language of the Hittite kingdom, as attested in the cuneiform archives of the capital Hattusa and other administrative centres. It remained the official language until the kingdom's collapse in the early 12th century. No doubt this was due partly to the fact that the royal succession in Hatti remained the prerogative of a small group of families throughout Hittite history. Occupants of the throne frequently proclaimed their links with their earliest known predecessors, and retained many of the traditions dating back to the kingdom's early years. If the earliest members of the dynasty used Indo-European Nesite at least as the kingdom's official language, then the retention of this language would have helped reinforce the sense of dynasty, of unbroken family continuity through a succession of generations.

But we cannot assume from this that Hittite, or more accurately Nesite, was a widely spoken language in the Hittite world, even in the homeland. It is possible that right from the foundations of the kingdom, the Indo-European component of its population was a minority one, even though it produced an elite ruling class. The indigenous Hattian people may well have been the largest population group in the region, at least in the kingdom's early stages, even if the Hattians' identity became progressively attenuated as new population groups from other areas resettled in Hattusa and other homeland territories. The policy of a number of Hittite kings, particularly Mursili II (1321–1295), of deporting large numbers of people—sometimes tens of thousands—from conquered regions to the homeland undoubtedly had a massive impact on the ethnic composition of the homeland's population.⁸ Perhaps already by Mursili's reign, Hattian had ceased to function as a spoken language, though remnants of it survived in a number of texts in the Hittite archives. But Nesite continued as a spoken language until the kingdom's end. The theory that it survived only as a chancery language is belied by the fact that it underwent a number of changes in its 500-year history, in a way that reflects a living, spoken language rather than a purely chancery one. Even so, it may have been largely confined to an elite administrative class within Hittite society, who used it for written as well as spoken communications among themselves. There is little doubt that Nesite's survival depended on the continuing existence of this class, and that its use outside this class declined steadily in the last two centuries—due in all probability to the influx of other population groups into the homeland.

In the post-Bronze Age era, Hittite cuneiform disappeared entirely. There is not the slightest trace of it in any of the Iron Age successor-kingdoms of the Hittites. One might reasonably suppose that along with the disappearance of the written language, Nesite also disappeared as a spoken one. The homeland

at the end of the Late Bronze Age was inhabited by a number of population groups, of different ethnic origins, and probably in many cases speaking their own native languages. If, then, a substantial migration of 'Hittite' population groups from the homeland into northern Syria did take place at that time, it might well be that not one of the immigrants spoke Hittite. So are we able to identify, from their ethnic backgrounds and the language or languages they spoke, who these alleged immigrants were?

The speakers of Luwian

This brings us to the people we have referred to as the Luwians, so called on the basis of their language which is preserved in several hundred passages inserted into Hittite festival, ritual, and incantation texts. The language is identified in these texts by the adverbial term *luwili*—'in the language of Luwiya'. Speakers of this language appear to have dispersed widely through Anatolia during the second millennium, particularly in the south and the west. By the middle of the millennium, Luwian population groups had occupied much of southern Anatolia, from the region of Classical Caria and Lycia in the south-west through Pamphylia, Pisidia, Isauria, and Lycaonia to Cilicia in the south-east. From the Luwian areas of southern Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age, several kingdoms or states came into being during the Hittite period. These included the kingdoms of Kizzuwadna, where Hurrian and Luwian elements were intermingled, and Tarhuntassa, perhaps a more exclusively Luwian state which was apparently created by the Hittite king Muwatalli II early in the 13th century.

In the west, most scholars believe that Luwians constituted a large part of the population, and provided the ruling class, of the countries called the Arzawa lands in Hittite texts. According to a proposal recently made by I. Yakubovich, the core area of Luwian population was located in central Anatolia, in the region of the Konya Plain, and Luwian migration into western Anatolia occurred only after the Arzawan kingdoms had been established.⁹ But there is no doubt that by the end of the Late Bronze Age, the inhabitants of central and north-central Anatolia, as well as of the western and southern parts of Anatolia, included substantial numbers of Luwian-speakers. This is indicated by Hittite military records which, as we have noted, report the deportation of tens of thousands of persons from conquered states, including those of western and southern Anatolia, to the homeland and its peripheral areas. Here they were used for service with the Hittite king and his land-owning officers, for restocking the workforce of agricultural estates, for reinforcing military garrisons in frontier regions, and for building up the population in subject-territories in or near the homeland that had been depopulated or abandoned because of enemy invasion and occupation.¹⁰

I should stress that 'Luwian' is not an ancient ethnic or political term. It is one adopted by modern scholars as a convenient label for the widely

distributed peoples who spoke the language identified by the word *luwili* in passages, generally of a ritual nature, contained in Hittite cuneiform texts. This language also appears in what is called a hieroglyphic script, made up largely of a series of pictographic symbols. (The name 'hieroglyphic' is adopted from the so-called, but totally unconnected, pictographic script of ancient Egypt.) The script first appeared on a small number of seal impressions, dating to the Hittite Old Kingdom period.¹¹ Some Hittite seals bearing the royal title 'Labarna' may belong to this period. In the last century of the Old Kingdom (c.1500–1400), the king's name was generally appended to the title.¹² From early in the 15th century, the hieroglyphic script appeared regularly along with the cuneiform script on seals bearing the names, titles, and sometimes genealogies of Hittite kings—so-called digraphic (or bigraphic) seals because of the two scripts inscribed upon them. The hieroglyphic inscription recorded the names and titles of the kings in an inner circle, with the cuneiform inscription appearing in (usually two) rings around it.¹³ These seal impressions are attested for all Hittite kings from Arnuwanda I, second ruler of the so-called New Kingdom, until the fall of the empire two centuries later. But the very first known example of such a seal dates back to the late 16th century. The inscription on the seal identifies its subject as 'Ispuḫsu, Great King, son of Pariyawatri', who was ruler of the country called Kizzuwadna in southeastern Anatolia at the time the Hittite throne was occupied by Telipinu (c.1525–1500).¹⁴ Kizzuwadna, probably a new name for the region, had formerly been subject territory of Hatti, but had established its independence during the reign of one of Telipinu's predecessors, perhaps Ammuna. Telipinu accepted its independent status, and drew up what appears to have been a parity treaty with Ispuḫsu.¹⁵

Hieroglyphic inscriptions dating to the Hittite empire include a few graffiti found on the paving stones and orthostats of the Temple of the Storm God at Hattusa. And a number of bowls and other small metal objects from this period also bear hieroglyphic texts, the most notable of which is a dedicatory inscription on a silver bowl, of unknown provenance and now in the Ankara Museum.¹⁶ Samaya, the author of the inscription, dates his dedication to the time when a Hittite king Tudhaliya won a victory over a land called Tarwiza. Historical considerations suggest that the king in question was the first clearly attested Hittite ruler called Tudhaliya, founder of the New Kingdom and predecessor of Arnuwanda I, c.1400. But the most substantial of the Late Bronze Age hieroglyphic texts date to the 13th century, and appear as monumental inscriptions on rock faces and, in a few cases, on built stone surfaces. Van den Hout notes that all Hittite kings from Muwatalli II to Hatti's last ruler Suppiluliuma II are represented, except for Urhi-Teshub (Mursili III), whose throne was seized by his uncle Hattusili (III), and Arnuwanda III, who died after a reign of perhaps only two years.¹⁷ In total, some eighty hieroglyphic inscriptions on stone have come to light. The majority of these have been

found within the Hittite homeland, but they are otherwise widely distributed throughout Anatolia. A number of them record a king's military exploits and other achievements, or are attached as epigraphs, i.e. identification labels, to the figures of deities or Hittite kings or other members of Hittite royalty.

The following selection, presented roughly in chronological order, will have some bearing on our discussions below.¹⁸ Throughout the book, I have adopted the designations commonly used (for example, in *CHLI*) for these and other hieroglyphic inscriptions.

ALEPPO 1 During the third quarter of the 14th century, Suppiluliuma I established Aleppo as one of the two viceregal seats of the Hittite empire, appointing his son Telipinu as its first viceroy. Telipinu was succeeded in this post by his son Talmi-Sharrumma. An inscription recording a dedication by Talmi-Sharrumma for the temple of Hepat-Sharrumma in Aleppo¹⁹ may be the earliest known hieroglyphic inscription to be carved on stone. It dates to the late 14th or early 13th century.

SİRKELİ This is the site of a Late Bronze Age Hittite city in south-eastern Anatolia, located 40 km east of modern Adana. Prominent among the city's remains are two rock reliefs, the better preserved of which depicts the Hittite king Muwatalli II (1295–1272), identified from the accompanying hieroglyphic inscription. The figure in the second relief, already mutilated in antiquity, is thought to represent one of Muwatalli's two known sons, Kurunta or Urhi-Teshub (Mursili III).

FRAKTİN Located in the region later known as Cappadocia, c.50 km south-east of modern Kayseri, Fraktin was the site of a rock relief depicting Hattusili III (1267–1237) and his wife Puduhepa engaged in a religious ceremonial. Hattusili pours a libation to the Storm God Teshub, Puduhepa to the god's consort Hepat. The king and queen are identified by the hieroglyphic labels which caption their sculptures.

YALBURT Located in the district of Konya in south-central Anatolia, Yalburt was the site of a spring where a rectangular basin lined with stone walls was constructed in the Late Bronze Age. It lay within or near the western edge of the region called the Lower Land, which served as buffer territory for the core region of the Land of Hatti against enemy attack from the west and south-west. Three of the water-basin's sides bear a long Luwian hieroglyphic inscription,²⁰ which records a military campaign conducted by Hattusili's son and successor Tudhaliya IV (1237–1209) against the Lukka Lands in the south-west.

EMIRGAZI The remains of hieroglyphic inscriptions²¹ carved on six stones were discovered at the site of Emirgazi, probably a religious sanctuary, also located in the Konya region. The inscriptions were commissioned by Tudhaliya IV. Those on four of the stones contain regulations concerning sacrificial offerings and the protection of the altars. The inscriptions on the other two stones are extremely fragmentary, but almost certainly record a military



Fig. 2. Suppiluliuma II, last king of the Hittite Empire (from the Südburg complex, Hattusa).

campaign undertaken by Tudhaliya IV, very likely the same campaign as recorded in the Yalbut inscription.

SÜDBURG In 1988, a two-chambered cult complex was discovered on the so-called ‘Südburg’ in the Hittite capital, located in the south-western corner of the Lower City, just south of the royal acropolis. ‘Chamber 2’ displayed on its walls reliefs of a deity, a king called Suppiluliuma, now identified as the last-known king Suppiluliuma II (his name is usually written Suppiluliuma), and a text in the hieroglyphic script.²² The text records an extensive military campaign conducted by Suppiluliuma into southern and south-western Anatolia, and his conquest and annexation of a number of countries in these regions. Once believed to be the king’s tomb, the Südburg structure is now thought to have served as a symbolic entrance to the Underworld, referred to in Hittite texts as a KASKAL.KUR.

NİŞANTAŞ This is the modern Turkish name (= ‘marked rock’) for a rocky outcrop located in the northern part of the Upper City of the Hittite capital,

between the city's temple quarter and palace district. The outcrop became part of a built fortress once guarded by two colossal sphinxes. On the natural rock face a hieroglyphic inscription was carved, the longest such inscription that has so far come to light. Unfortunately, it is weathered to the point of being almost entirely illegible. But enough of the first line can be read to identify its author as Suppiluliuma (II), who also names his father Tudhaliya (IV) and his grandfather Hattusili (III).²³ The rest of the text very likely contains a record of Suppiluliuma's building achievements and his military exploits, including perhaps his alleged victories on the island of Cyprus (Alasiya) and in the waters off its coast.²⁴

HATİP Located in the Konya Plain in southern Anatolia, 17 km south-west of modern Konya, Hatip was a fortified Hittite site, where in 1993 a rock-cut relief and hieroglyphic inscription were discovered.²⁵ They date to the late 13th century. The relief depicts a striding god wearing a horned peak cap and short tunic, and armed with bow, dagger, and lance. The accompanying inscription reads 'Kurunta, the Great King, [the Hero], the son of [Mu]watalli, the Great King, the Hero'. Kurunta was a nephew of Hattusili III, and had been installed by his uncle as ruler of the Hittite appanage kingdom Tarhuntassa. Hence the monument has been dated to the last decades of the 13th century. It is possible that it marks part of Tarhuntassa's northern boundary.

KARABEL Located in western Anatolia, 28 km west of Izmir, Karabel is the site of a Late Bronze Age cliff-face monument with relief sculpture and hieroglyphic inscription.²⁶ The relief depicts a male human figure wearing a tall peaked cap and armed with bow, spear, and sword. The subject of the weathered inscription is identified as Tarkasnawa, king of the land of Mira. Mira was one of the western Anatolian kingdoms called the Arzawa lands which became vassal states of the Hittite empire, probably in the late 14th century. Tarkasnawa was almost certainly ruler of Mira in the period the Hittite throne was occupied by Tudhaliya IV. He may in fact have been appointed by Tudhaliya as a kind of regional overlord in the west.²⁷ Tarkasnawa names his father and grandfather in his inscription, both of whom had been kings of Mira. But their names can no longer be read. It is possible that the Karabel monument, which lies in a pass through the Tmolus mountain range, marked part of the frontier between Mira and its northern neighbour Seha River Land.

KIZILDAĞ, KARADAĞ, BURUNKAYA Hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered on three sites in south-central Anatolia were commissioned by a ruler called Hartapu who identifies himself as a 'Great King' and 'Hero' and the son of a man called Mursili, who is similarly accorded the titles 'Great King' and 'Hero'.²⁸ Five of the inscriptions came to light in the Late Bronze Age hill-top settlement now known as Kızıldağ. One of them was commissioned by, or set up in the name of, Hartapu's father Mursili.²⁹ Hartapu is the author of the other four. Three were carved on an outcrop of rock where a seated human

figure is also depicted. He is bearded and long-haired, wears a peaked cap and long robe, and holds a bowl. It is now believed that the sculpture probably dates four centuries after the inscriptions.³⁰ Along with several other scholars, I think it likely that the Mursili of the inscription is the Hittite king Urhi-Teshub, also known as Mursili III.³¹ Urhi-Teshub was the son and successor of Muwatalli II, but had reigned for only a few years before his throne was seized by his uncle Hattusili (III), probably *c.*1267. On the assumption that this is the Mursili identified in the hieroglyphic inscriptions as the father of Hartapu, then these inscriptions should be dated some time within the second half of the 13th century, during the reign of either Hattusili or his son and successor Tudhaliya. In such a context, the titulatures ‘Great King’ and ‘Hero’, which Hartapu applies both to himself and to his father, assume particular significance, as we shall discuss below. In another of the inscriptions from Kızıldağ, Hartapu claims to have been a great military conqueror, with the support and blessing of the Storm God. This claim is also made in one of his two inscriptions discovered in the mountain-top sanctuary Karadağ, 80 km to the south-east of Kızıldağ. Some indication may be given of how far north Hartapu’s authority extended by another of his inscriptions, discovered on the site now called Burunkaya, which lies to the east of the Salt Lake near modern Aksaray. Here too Hartapu calls himself a Great King, accords the same title to his father Mursili, and claims that he is beloved of the Storm God.

The language of the script and the reasons for its use

As we have noted, many of the inscriptions, appearing on seals and stone surfaces, are no more than names or titles, used to identify kings, other persons of high rank, and gods. Without other context, the symbols representing these names and titles do not on their own identify a language for these inscriptions. In fact, the short epigraphs cannot be said to be written in any specific language.³² Nevertheless, it is clear that the language of the hieroglyphic dedicatory and commemorative texts dealt with above was Luwian, very largely identical with the language of the Luwian cuneiform passages inserted in many Hittite texts.³³ In contrast to the cuneiform script, which was used for writing a wide number of languages, there is no surviving hieroglyphic inscription, dating either to the Bronze Age or to the Iron Age, which was demonstrably written in any language other than Luwian.³⁴ How then did the script come about, and why did the Hittites adopt it—given that Nesite continued to be used, at least by the administrative elite and as the kingdom’s official language, until the end of the empire?

We have no firm evidence of when or in what circumstances the hieroglyphic and cuneiform scripts were first used for writing the Luwian language, partly because so little of this material has survived outside a Hittite context.³⁵ Singer suggests that the ‘spark’ for the invention of the hieroglyphic script may have been the idea to ‘transcribe’ the cuneiform legend in the circular border

of a seal into a hieroglyphic legend in the centre-field.³⁶ Among the few extant examples of the hieroglyphic script in what appears to have been a purely Luwian context are the late 16th-century seal of Ispuṭahsu, king of Kizzuwadna, in south-eastern Anatolia, and the late 13th-century inscription of Tarkasnawa, king of Mira, in western Anatolia. Kizzuwadna lay in a Luwian–Hurrian cultural zone. It had probably been settled by Luwian-speaking immigrants early in the second millennium, or even earlier, and the region in which it was located appears to have remained a Luwian-speaking one through most of the first millennium. The seal was found at Tarsus, which lay within the territory of Kizzuwadna. Mira was, as we have noted, one of the Arzawa lands, whose Luwian-speaking populations included, most scholars believe, the ruling elites of these lands.

We could perhaps add to these apparently *in situ* Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions the biconvex bronze seal, inscribed with the hieroglyphic script, recently discovered at Hisarlık, the alleged site of Troy. One side of the seal gives the name of a man and his profession as scribe, the other side the name of a woman, presumably his wife. The seal was found during excavations of what is designated as the VIIb1 level, which is dated between *c.*1180 and 1050. The inscription on it is thus one of the very last from the Bronze Age, and post-dates the fall of the Hittite empire by several decades or more. Of course, seals are portable objects, and we cannot be sure that this particular example did in fact originate at Troy, or that it was produced in the period to which the level where it was found belongs. There is in any case some doubt about the ethnicity of Troy's population in the Late Bronze Age. The city can now with reasonable certainty be identified with the core territory of the north-western Anatolian kingdom called Wilusa in Hittite texts. And there are, I believe, reasonably strong grounds for concluding that this region had a significant Luwian-speaking component in its population during the second millennium. But we have no clear proof for this. It has to be conceded that the doubts which a number of scholars have expressed about assigning a Luwian origin to the language and inhabitants of Wilusa-Troy³⁷ make less secure the assumption of a Luwian context for the findspot of the bronze seal.

The known examples of Late Bronze Age hieroglyphic inscriptions occurring within actual Luwian contexts are thus extremely rare. But there is no evidence at all for the use of Luwian cuneiform inscriptions anywhere outside the archives of the Hittite capital. We should, as always, be cautious about what conclusions we draw from absence of evidence. For example, we need to bear in mind that the western Anatolian states have left not the slightest trace of any cuneiform tablets, in Hittite, Akkadian, or any other language, though we know that the administrations of these kingdoms engaged in regular written communications with their Hittite overlords and must have had archives and chanceries where these communications were preserved. But nothing of them survives—or (perhaps we should say) has yet been found. It

is possible, then, that Luwian cuneiform tablets were produced in a number of centres outside Hattusa, and for that matter outside the Hittite homeland, but subsequently perished along with the vast bulk of other documents of the age.

On the other hand, the use of cuneiform for recording texts in the Luwian language may have arisen purely in a Hittite chancery context. As we have noted, the language is preserved in several hundred passages written in the cuneiform script and inserted into Hittite festival, ritual, and incantation texts. For the sake of consistency of presentation, and ease in recording, the chancery scribes used the cuneiform script for recording Luwian passages on tablets on which the script was otherwise used for writing Hittite (i.e. Nesite). They did so because it was more convenient and more efficient to use the same script throughout a tablet, even though more than one language was involved, rather than to switch from one script to another. Speakers of native Luwian origin may have been part of the Hittite administration's scribal establishments, and if so, they would as a matter of course have learned the cuneiform script. Hawkins is cautious about such an assumption: 'We must bear in mind that it was the same scribes writing both lots of texts (i.e. Hittite and Luwian), and while we have little positive evidence that the mother tongue of these experts was specifically Hittite, there is certainly no evidence that Luwian speakers wrote cuneiform Luwian at any time anywhere.'³⁸ On the other hand, Singer expresses agreement with van den Hout in his observation that 'the considerable increase in Luwianisms in texts written in the chancelleries of the Hittite capital must be indicative of the language of the scribes, either through intensive contact with Luwian speakers, or, more probably, as a result of the presence of many Luwians among the scribes of Hattusa'.³⁹ I think it most likely that speakers of native Luwian origin made up a significant component of the Hittite administration's scribal establishments from the middle of the second millennium onwards. These would as a matter of course have learned the cuneiform script, and could well have transliterated original hieroglyphic documents into cuneiform, still in their own language, or else written the passages in cuneiform directly from dictation by Luwian priests, ritualists etc., or for that matter from their own memory of Luwian ritual and festival texts and the like.

That brings us to an important question: Why did Hittite kings adopt the hieroglyphic script for their public monuments and seals? The most obvious answer is that it provided them with a more impressive medium than cuneiform for presenting a public record of their achievements. That has been the view of a number of scholars, who stress the element of visual propaganda which the hieroglyphic monuments reflect. As van den Hout notes, in contrast to the cuneiform Hittite documents, the hieroglyphic monuments that contain more than just names and titles are the most straightforwardly propagandistic texts that have come down to us.⁴⁰ Was the hieroglyphic script used essentially for aesthetic and decorative or prestigious reasons, designed to impress a

largely monolingual Hittite-speaking society? Or was it designed for a different kind of reader and viewer of both the monuments and the seals?

The latter is van den Hout's preferred option. His argument is that Luwian was not only the main language in large parts of western, south-central, and south-eastern Anatolia, as generally supposed, but that in the 14th and 13th centuries, Luwians formed the clear majority of the population in and around the capital. The situation as he sees it is that of a largely bilingual Hittite-Luwian society for the 13th century, where the Hittites politically and militarily dominated an increasing Luwian-speaking or increasingly Luwian-speaking population.⁴¹ None the less, despite the substantial—if not numerically dominant—Luwian presence in the Hittite heartland, 'Hittite' (Nesite) was the empire's official language, even though van den Hout may very well be right that there was no significant larger Hittite-speaking population besides that of the ruling elite. His argument continues that while the ruling class considered it important to maintain the status of Hittite as the traditional and official language of power, its public inscriptions were aimed at the majority of the population of the homeland—proclaiming the achievements of their royal authors in the language of this population. 'It does not have to mean (and most likely does not) that the population at large could read them, but Luwians would have recognized the medium and as a consequence (or at least the ruling class hoped so) their rulers as theirs. . . . Luwian imagery in script and word was the perfect means not to alienate the majority of the population and to make state propaganda effective.'⁴²

Van den Hout's conclusion that the hieroglyphic inscriptions carved on public monuments were addressed primarily to a Hittite king's Luwian-speaking subjects and were intended by the king as a means of identifying himself more closely with these subjects has much to recommend it. In this scenario, whether or not the targeted viewers were literate (and the great majority were almost certainly not), they would at least have been aware that the distinctive script which the king had chosen to record publicly his achievements or to honour the gods was the script traditionally used to record their own language. In this respect, adoption of the script would in itself have served a propagandistic purpose, irrespective of the actual content of the inscriptions. And a number of the pictorial signs making up the script must have been instantly recognizable and understood, even by illiterate viewers.

This may well have a bearing on the use of the royal digraphic seals. The inscription in the seal's outer ring or rings, which provided in cuneiform a king's name, titles, and genealogy, may not have been intelligible to all who inspected its impression on a document. But even the most rudimentary reading ability would have sufficed to identify the seal's owner from the hieroglyphic symbols in the centre of the seal. So too a viewer would not have needed to be literate to identify the hieroglyphic symbols for a king's name and the titles 'Great King', 'Labarna' on a public monument, particularly

in cases where the personal name was appended as a simple epigraph to a sculpture. Even in longer hieroglyphic inscriptions, viewers could easily identify who the subject of the inscription was, from the symbols for his name in the first line, and probably also who his ancestors were, if this information were also provided, even if they were unable to read the rest of the inscription. This aspect of the script must have added to its appeal as the most suitable medium for a Hittite king's public monuments. It is consistent with J. Seeher's interpretation of the extra-urban rock reliefs as regional demonstrations of power and territorial claims by the Hittite royal family.⁴³ These propagandistic displays would no doubt have been all the more effective in cases where the images were accompanied by inscriptions which addressed the local peoples in their own language.

That brings us to another question: Why did the hieroglyphic monuments appear only in the last century of the Hittite empire? In accordance with van den Hout's line of reasoning, their production at that time might be an acknowledgement of a substantially increasing Luwian population in the regions where they were located. But there is another factor, not inconsistent with this, that might also have applied. It has to do with the divisions that occurred within the royal family following the death of the king Muwatalli II c.1272.

The reign of Muwatalli's successor Urhi-Teshub (his son by a concubine) ended abruptly within a few years of his accession when a rift with his uncle Hattusili led to open war. Urhi-Teshub was defeated, lost his throne to Hattusili, and was exiled to the Nuhashshi lands in northern Syria. Despite his defeat, Urhi-Teshub retained the support of many of his former subjects, including some of the vassal rulers. Hattusili had succeeded in gaining the kingship for himself and his descendants. But his nephew never let up in his efforts to get his throne back and to restore the succession to his own family line, calling on the support both of Hittite vassal rulers and foreign kings in his attempts to do so. Though these attempts ended in failure, other members of his family, including his (half-?) brother Kurunta and his sons and grandsons, continued to challenge the legitimacy of the regime of Hattusili and his successors until the very end of the Hittite empire.⁴⁴ In his early regnal years, Hattusili made constant efforts to have his kingship recognized by foreign rulers, including the kings of Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria, as well as his own subjects. And even when he had consolidated his position upon the throne, he knew that neither he nor his heirs would ever be entirely secure, or able to cast off the taint of royal power illegally acquired, while his nephew's family and its supporters maintained their determination to restore the throne to its rightful line of occupants. The claims that he and his successors made to divine endorsement, support, and protection assumed particular significance within the overall political environment in which they were made. The foundations of the Hittite monarchy were becoming ever more unstable.

Documents of both Tudhaliya IV and Suppiluliuma II, Hattusili's son and grandson respectively, highlight the potential fragility of the Hattusa regime, and above all, its vulnerability to threats posed by rival branches of the royal family.⁴⁵ Public statements of rule by divine right, expressed in the kingdom's most widely spoken language, may well have been an important element in the propaganda repertoire of the last kings of Late Bronze Age Hatti.

This, I believe, helps explain the appearance of the royal hieroglyphic monuments in the empire's final century. The Fraktin and Yazılıkaya monuments explicitly link Hattusili and his consort Puduhepa in the former case and their son Tudhaliya in the latter with the chief deities of the Hittite pantheon. They are clearly identified by the hieroglyphic epigraphs appended to their sculptures, and there is implicit divine endorsement, in the display of their interaction with the deities, of their claim to rule by divine sanction. Tudhaliya's Yalburt inscription is more explicitly propagandistic in its intentions. Like the other hieroglyphic inscriptions carved on public monuments, it may well have been intended primarily for a Luwian-speaking audience. But in this case, it served not so much as a means of identification with this audience—by using 'the language of the people' for royal public statements and pronouncements—but as a clear statement to them of how far the king's power extended, and a warning of the consequences of defying his authority.

Seeher's interpretation of the rock reliefs as demonstrations of royal power and territorial claims has particular cogency in such a context. We should bear in mind that Tudhaliya inherited from his father Hattusili the prospect of serious uprisings in a number of his subject territories. Included among these was the Lower Land country called Lalanda, which had broken out in rebellion against Hittite rule.⁴⁶ Tudhaliya had written to his mother Puduhepa about the situation, expressing concern that the uprising could spread more widely through the region. Yalburt lay within or near the north-western fringe of Lower Land territory. Further to the west or south-west, the people of the Lukka lands had also risen in rebellion. The uprisings may well have been motivated by a perception that the regime in Hattusa was losing its grip on its western lands. Quite possibly, the unrest in these lands was, in part at least, a consequence of continuing threats posed by other branches of the royal family to the stability of the Hattusa regime, particularly the branch that had lost the succession rights with the overthrow of Urhi-Teshub. It may well be that this branch, operating from a base in Tarhuntassa, actively supported rebellion in the west against Hattusili and his successors, as part of a strategy of regaining the throne of Hatti.

According to the Yalburt inscription, Tudhaliya restored by military conquest his authority over the Lukka lands. By implication, he must have succeeded in reasserting his hold over the territories that lay in between. The population of this region was undoubtedly a predominantly Luwian one, and had been so for at least several centuries. The Yalburt inscription

made a clear statement to them, in its account of sweeping military victories in the region, that Tudhaliya was firmly back in control. Very likely, a similar statement is contained in the inscriptions from two of the stones found on the Emirgazi site, though this remains conjectural because of the fragmentary nature of these inscriptions. Further, we should not miss the significance of Tudhaliya's statement of his genealogy at the beginning of the Yalburt inscription: 'The Sun, Great King, Labarna, Tudhaliya, Son of Hattusili, Great King, Hero, [grandson] of Mursili, Great King, Hero . . .' (transl. Hawkins, 1995a: 69). The king's tracing of his line back to Mursili II, and perhaps further back to Suppiluliuma I,⁴⁷ is an assertion of the legitimacy of his succession, enhanced by the titles traditionally associated with Great Kingship—the winged sun disk, and the hieroglyphic symbols for Great King, Labarna, and Hero. The most rudimentary knowledge of the hieroglyphic script would have been sufficient for a viewer to read this statement and understand its significance. Whether or not he was able to read the rest of the inscription, he could have had little doubt as to its purpose. The very presence of Tudhaliya's inscription on the site, with the king's royal genealogy proclaimed, was in itself an explicit statement of this purpose: a declaration of the legitimacy of Tudhaliya's claim to the throne.

To such a context, I suggest, belong the inscription of Kurunta found at Hatip near Konya and the inscriptions of Hartapu, which came to light on the sites Kızıldağ, Karadağ, and Burunkaya. Kurunta was the younger brother of the displaced king Urhi-Teshub. Initially, he appears to have pledged his loyalty to Hattusili and accepted that the royal succession would now continue in Hattusili's line. For this he had honours and privileges bestowed upon him, both by Hattusili and Hattusili's son and successor Tudhaliya. The most prestigious of the honours was his appointment to the throne of Tarhuntassa, which had but recently been the seat of the Hittite empire, and was now one of the empire's most important sub-kingdoms. The gift of its throne conferred upon Kurunta a status similar to that of the viceroys at Carchemish and Aleppo. But he eventually broke his allegiance to the Hattusa regime, probably during his cousin Tudhaliya's reign, and declared himself the rightful king of Hatti. This may have happened after the death of Urhi-Teshub, who never regained the Hittite throne. Kurunta appears to have taken up his cause.

We have referred earlier to the possibility that the Hatip monument served as a northern boundary-marker of the kingdom of Tarhuntassa. It may have been more than that. Let us repeat the inscription which appears on it: 'Kurunta, the Great King, [the Hero], the son of [Mu]watalli, the Great King, the Hero'. There is no doubt that Kurunta's use of the titles 'Great King' and 'Hero' represented a direct challenge to the Hattusa regime.⁴⁸ And by referring to himself as the son of Muwatalli, Kurunta further asserted his right to the Hittite throne. If the Mursili of the Kızıldağ–Karadağ–Burunkaya inscriptions can be equated with Urhi-Teshub/Mursili III, then Hartapu, son of Mursili and the subject of these inscriptions, may have directly inherited from his

uncle Kurunta the role of maintaining his family's claim on the kingship of Hatti. His assertion of the title 'Great King' for himself and his father was a clear denial of the legitimacy of the current Hattusa regime. The warrior god provides divine endorsement for Kurunta's authority. He is almost certainly the Storm God, the most important deity in the Hittite pantheon, and most significantly the deity who appointed the king as his deputy.⁴⁹ In two of his inscriptions, Hartapu claims extensive military victories. Against whom were his battles fought? At that time, the Hittite throne was probably occupied by Tudhaliya, or by one of the two sons who succeeded him—Arnuwanda III, whose reign was very short, or Suppiluliuma II. Hartapu's statement may provide evidence of open conflict with the forces of the current Hattusa regime. And much of his military support may well have come from the Luwian populations of the Lower Land, which lay between the kingdom of Tarhuntassa and the southern boundary of the Hittite homeland. We have noted the uprisings in this region referred to by Tudhaliya. Conceivably, these uprisings were supported by—or broke out in support of—the 'alternative Hittite regime' based in Tarhuntassa. In such a context, Hartapu's inscriptions can be seen as a public declaration, addressed directly to his Luwian-speaking followers, of his right to the Hittite throne, of the endorsement of the greatest of the Hittite gods, who appointed the king as his deputy on earth, and of his military victories on his way to claiming the throne in Hattusa itself. His inscriptions represent not so much boundary-markers of his kingdom, but rather stages in his progress towards his ultimate goal. The most northerly of these, found at Burunkaya, may indicate just how close his forces came to penetrating the southern boundary of the homeland.

What happened next is still obscure. Suppiluliuma II's inclusion of Tarhuntassa in his list of conquests, recorded in his Südburg inscription, may provide a sequel to the events we have deduced from Hartapu's inscriptions. Suppiluliuma may eventually have retaliated against the Tarhuntassa regime, bringing to an end its aspirations for regaining the throne of Hatti. If so, he had little time to savour his victory. For his own regime, along with Hattusa and the rest of the Hittite empire, was close to collapse.

There is a possibility that Urhi-Teshub's family line survived the cataclysmic events at the end of the Bronze Age, and that a member of this line subsequently became one of the Great Kings of the early Iron Age. We shall investigate this possibility in Chapter 5. But let us for a moment return to the Südburg inscription. I have taken the line, following van den Hout, that the hieroglyphic inscriptions, which were highly propagandistic and intended for public display, were addressed primarily to a Luwian-speaking audience; this reflects the likelihood that by the last century of the empire, Luwian speakers made up the bulk of the population of Hittite Anatolia. Nevertheless, we should bear in mind that the Südburg inscription, which extols the military achievements of the last known Hittite king and is one of the most important

of the hieroglyphic texts, was inscribed on the walls of a chamber in a cult complex—and was therefore not on public display. A possible conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Luwian language written in the hieroglyphic script had by now become the chief medium for recording a king's achievements on whatever type of monument the script was written, and regardless of who its viewers were. A royal tradition had been established.

And that brings us to a possible connection between the Südburg complex and the Nişantaş inscription. The subject of both Südburg and Nişantaş texts is Suppiluliuma II. The latter text may have referred to Suppiluliuma's construction of the cult complex. But one of its main purposes was very likely to provide, for all to see, a record of the king's military achievements, similar to but more extensive than the secluded account of these events in the Südburg inscription. Both inscriptions reflect the adoption of a written tradition which was inherited and maintained—as a tradition *per se*—by the Hittite kings' Iron Age successors.

Late Bronze Age–Iron Age links: the discussion so far

Before we proceed to a further investigation of possible links between the peoples of the Late Bronze Age Hittite world and their Iron Age successors, let us review what has emerged from our discussion so far.

1. The Hittite kingdom was established by a dynasty of Indo-European origin, whose language Nesite (which we call Hittite) became the kingdom's official language. But already in the early stages of the kingdom, the Nesite-speaking component of its population was very likely a minority one.
2. This component decreased progressively as new population groups, particularly the large groups of deportees taken as plunder from their own lands in the aftermath of Hittite military victories, settled in the kingdom's homeland region. But occupancy of the throne was confined to members of a small number of elite family groups. Throughout the kingdom's life-span, there were no significant or lasting breaks in the royal succession. The Indo-European ethnicity of the royal family must have been considerably diluted through marriage unions (for example, Hattusili III's marriage to the Hurrian Puduhepa). But many of the traditions dating back to the dynasty's origins were preserved until the kingdom's final days. Most notably, Nesite remained the kingdom's official language.
3. Luwian-speaking groups long made up a large part of the Hittite homeland's population, probably from the kingdom's early years. The deportation system also brought in many new settlers from Luwian areas outside the homeland. By the end of the kingdom's history, the population of the Hittite homeland could well have been a substantially Luwian

one. It is likely that large numbers of Luwian scribes were employed in the Hittite administration by this time, as reflected in the numerous 'Luwianisms' found in Hittite texts. The eighty or so monuments inscribed with Luwian hieroglyphs, found mainly in the Hittite homeland and dating to the 13th century, may further reflect a majority Luwian population in the region.

4. After the fall of the empire, the language called Nesite disappeared entirely. But the hieroglyphic Luwian tradition survived and was adopted by the new royalty in the states that succeeded the Late Bronze Age kingdom, both in south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria.
5. All these considerations have led to the conclusion, held by a number of scholars, that following the collapse of the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom there was a south-eastwards migration of many of the kingdom's former inhabitants; these were predominantly Luwians who now came to form a substantial part of the northern Syrian populations. Luwians also continued to play a dominant role among the population groups of south-eastern Anatolia.

As we shall see, this conclusion raises a number of questions and problems, which we shall take up in Chapter 3.

Our discussion in this chapter provides us with a setting for the emergence of what are commonly called the 'Neo-Hittite' kingdoms. But before we turn to these, we should first consider what happened in the Anatolian peninsula in the post-empire period. Though we have yet to find clear evidence that the upheavals of the period resulted in substantial movements of peoples from their original homelands to other regions, within Anatolia or beyond, population shifts of a greater or lesser magnitude undoubtedly did occur. But there were always new settlers to replace the old. From the late second millennium onwards, a number of new immigrant groups arrived in Anatolia. Some were merely transitory and had no lasting impact on the territories through which they passed. But others provided the basis for the emergence of new civilizations and the development of new power structures. Sometimes their interactions with the indigenous peoples were peaceful, sometimes hostile. Sometimes they appear to have had only minimal contact with these peoples. In any case, a number of them became dominant forces in the regions where they settled. They were to play a major role in shaping Anatolia's cultural and political history in the centuries that followed the fall of the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti.



Map 2. The Hittite Empire's Anatolian Successors.

The Hittite Empire's Anatolian Successors

New arrivals from the Greek world

Towards the end of the second millennium, boatloads of travellers from mainland Greece began making landfalls along Anatolia's western coast. They were not warriors but family groups who had departed their homelands, perhaps to escape troubled conditions there following the collapse of the major centres of power in the Greek world at the end of the Bronze Age. They were now looking for new lands to settle, and the rich, fertile areas along the Anatolian coast offered good prospects for those who sought to start their lives afresh, or were compelled by circumstances to do so. We do not know whether they encountered any resistance from those already living in the regions they sought to occupy. With one notable exception (discussed below), our Greek sources contain no record of violence between the incoming Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants of these regions. It is possible that much of western Anatolia had suffered significant depopulation in the course of the so-called Sea Peoples' sweep through it, as reported by the pharaoh Ramesses III. One of the victims of the onslaught in Ramesses' account is the country called Arzawa. A complex of states called the Arzawa lands had extended over much of western and southern Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age. They were kingdoms administered by their own rulers who were subject to the overlordship of the Great King of Hatti. Several of these states extended to Anatolia's western or Aegean coast, in the regions now being occupied by new Greek settlers. But the Arzawa lands and kingdoms appear to have sunk into oblivion at the end of the Bronze Age, along with the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti. There is not a trace of them in Greek texts, nor in any other post-Bronze Age documents.

Greek sources identify two groups of immigrants to western Anatolia around the turn of the millennium. In the north-west, Aeolian Greeks found new places to settle, coming from homelands on the Greek mainland in the regions later called Boeotia and Thessaly. They first occupied the islands of Lesbos and Tenedos, just off Anatolia's north-western coast, and then perhaps over several generations established themselves on the mainland opposite, in

the region later called the Troad. By the end of the 8th century, a number of Aeolians had occupied the site today called Hisarlık, near the Hellespont (modern Dardanelles). They found there the remains of impressive fortifications, evidence apparently of a once great city. This, they believed, was the city of Troy, famous in tradition as the site of the Trojan War. Around the same time, a poet called Homer composed what was to become the most famous version of the story of Troy and the Trojan War. In his poem the *Iliad*, Troy is called by alternative names, (W)ilios and Troia. The new Aeolian settlement at Hisarlık preserved the traditional name in the form Ilion. Almost certainly, Homer's Ilios represents Wilusa/Wilusiya. The latter was the name of a small Late Bronze Age kingdom in north-western Anatolia. Its rulers for much of the Late Bronze Age were vassals of the Great King of Hatti, and the kingdom of Wilusa is in one Hittite text included among the Arzawa Lands. Hisarlık was probably the royal seat of the kingdom of Wilusa. Two of its nine major levels have been dated to the Late Bronze Age—Troy VI and VII. The subsequent Aeolian settlement on the site was the forerunner of Hellenistic Troy VIII. Much of the Troad was occupied by Aeolian groups who also spread southwards to the mouth of the Hermus river. The region as a whole where they settled was known as Aeolis. But the terms Aeolis and Aeolians were never used in a political sense. They were purely ethno-linguistic terms. The region was never united into a single political unit, though some of the southern Aeolian cities may have formed a league with its religious centre in the temple of Apollo at Grynium.

The region south of Aeolis was settled by waves of Greek immigrants called Ionians. Hence its name Ionia. It extended through the central Aegean coastal lands of Anatolia between the bays of Izmir and Bargylia and included the offshore islands Samos and Chios. According to Greek tradition, 'Ionia' is derived from the legendary Ion, son of the Athenian princess Creusa by the god Apollo. The tradition was fostered by the mainland Greek city Athens, which claimed to be the mother-city of all the Ionian colonists. It is a spurious claim, but the Athenians very likely did have strong kinship ties with many of the Ionian settlements, said to be a factor in their decision to support the Ionians in their rebellion against Persia in the early 5th century. The Greek historian Herodotus (1.146–7) tells us that the inhabitants of the Ionian cities were of mixed origin, with their ancestors coming from many different parts of the Greek mainland; but those who came from Athens considered themselves to be the noblest Ionians of them all. He goes on to say that the Ionians did not bring their wives with them but acquired instead local Carian wives, by murdering their fathers, husbands, and children.¹ This is the only reported instance in our Greek sources of an act of violence perpetrated by Greek settlers in western Anatolia against the peoples they encountered on their arrival. We may rightly be sceptical. Herodotus recounts the episode primarily to explain the alleged custom of Carian women of never sharing a meal with

their husbands or calling out to them by name. Neither the story nor the explanation for it appears anywhere else in Greek literature. But it may well have been part of the repertoire of tales told by Herodotus during his busking performances at Olympia.

Irrespective of their many places of origin, the Ionian settlers took great pride in the name 'Ionian', according to Herodotus. With good reason. In the early centuries of the first millennium, Ionia developed into one of the most prosperous regions of the Greek world, and played a leading role in the development of classical Greek culture, particularly in the fields of literature, science, and philosophy. Like Aeolis, Ionia never became a single political unit. But probably in the 9th century, the twelve chief Ionian cities formed a league called the Panionium, which met initially in the sanctuary of Poseidon at the foot of Mt Mycale (near Priene). Its member-cities and states were Miletus, Myus, Priene, Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedus, Teos, Erythrae, Clazomenae, Phocaea, and the islands Samos and Chios. The purpose of the league's meetings was to celebrate a religious festival called the Panionia and to discuss matters of common interest and concern.

Miletus was the largest and most important of the Ionian cities. It was located in the region called Milesia by Classical writers. The site of the city has a long history of occupation, extending from the Late Chalcolithic period (second half of the fourth millennium) through the Bronze Ages and the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine periods. There was also a later Ottoman settlement on the site. The Late Bronze Age city figures prominently in Hittite texts, under the name *Milawata*/*Millawanda*. Archaeological evidence indicates that immigrants from Minoan Crete had established a settlement there during the Middle Bronze Age (c.2000–1650), with a second period of Minoan colonization early in the succeeding Late Bronze Age. The Minoan presence at Miletus came to an end when the city was destroyed by fire in the first half of the 15th century, a destruction attributed by the current excavator, Wolfgang Niemeier, to conquerors from Mycenaean Greece.² Mycenaean culture became dominant on the site, as reflected in Mycenaean-type tombs and the abundance of Mycenaean-type pottery. These finds have been linked with references to *Milawata*/*Millawanda* in Hittite texts. Originally a subject state of the Hittite king, *Milawata* had apparently formed an alliance with the king of a land called *Ahhiyawa* early in the reign of the Hittite king Mursili II (c.1320), and by the early 13th century had probably come under *Ahhiyawan* sovereignty.³ *Ahhiyawa* is now confidently identified by the great majority of scholars with the Mycenaean world in general, and on some occasions with a specific kingdom in this world.⁴ *Milawata*/*Miletus* became a major base for the extension of Mycenaean influence, and political and military activity in the western Anatolian region, which inevitably caused tensions with Hatti, whose subject territories extended into the same region. It is likely that the Hittites succeeded in expelling the Mycenaeans from

Miletus during the reign of Tudhaliya IV (c.1337–1209).⁵ This effectively ended the Mycenaean presence in the region, at least on an official level. But within a few decades, Miletus was caught up in the upheavals associated with the end of the Bronze Age. And for the centuries immediately following, archaeological evidence for occupation of the site is confined almost entirely to pottery fragments—until the 8th century when stone-built houses began to appear. These, presumably, were the residences of early Ionian settlers at Miletus.⁶

Anatolia's indigenous populations

We have mentioned the Ionians' encounter on their arrival with a people called the Carians. The slaughter of the Carians by the Ionian newcomers was supposed to have taken place in Miletus. According to a tradition recorded by Herodotus (1.171), the Carians were immigrants to western Anatolia from the Aegean islands, displaced from their original homelands by Ionian and Dorian Greeks. If so, they may have participated in the general migratory movements to the coastlands of western Anatolia in the late second millennium. But Herodotus notes that the Carians themselves claimed that they were native Anatolians, and had always been called Carians. That would be consistent with Homer's description of them in the *Iliad* (2.867) as 'speakers of a barbarian language'—a description which clearly distinguishes them from immigrant Greeks. If they were in fact native Anatolians, are their ancestors identifiable in Late Bronze Age texts? A number of scholars have suggested that they do appear in these texts, more precisely in Hittite texts which refer to a country called Kar(a)kisa, located somewhere in the western Anatolian region.⁷ Kar-kisa remained independent of Hittite control throughout its history, and at times was clearly regarded by the Hittites as enemy territory. It did, however, provide troops for the Hittite army which fought the pharaoh Ramesses II in the battle of Qadesh (1274).⁸ Presumably these troops made up one of the foreign contingents which, according to Ramesses, fought on the Hittite side as mercenaries.

Bordering on Caria on Anatolia's south-western coast lay the country which the Greeks called Lycia.⁹ This rugged land had been part of the region referred to in Hittite texts as Lukka or the Lukka Lands,¹⁰ whose inhabitants belonged to the Luwian-speaking population groups of western Anatolia. The term Lukka was used not in reference to a state with a clearly defined political organization, but rather to a conglomerate of independent communities, with close ethnic affinities and lying within a roughly definable geographical area, extending from the western end of Pamphylia through Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Lycia. Though sometimes subject to Hittite sovereignty, the Lukka people could be rebellious and difficult to control. They seem also to have had a reputation as seafarers who engaged in buccaneering enterprises in the waters and against the coastal cities of the eastern Mediterranean. Almost certainly,



Fig. 3. Rock tombs at Myra in Lycia.

they were the ancestors, or one of the ancestors, of the first-millennium Lycians.

The Lycians spoke a language, known to us primarily from c.200 inscriptions carved on stone monuments (mainly rock-cut or freestanding tombs), which is closely akin to Luwian. This much is clear, though unfortunately the language itself is still largely undecipherable. Many of the personal names which appear in the inscriptions, both in the native texts, dating from the late 6th until the late 4th century, and in Greek texts which date from the Hellenistic through the Roman imperial period, are of Luwian origin.¹¹ As are also the names of a number of Lycian deities, most notably the Lycian mother goddess *ēni mahanahi* who can be equated with the Luwian 'mother of the gods' *anniš maššanaššiš*. Scholars also point out that a number of Lycian cities had names that were clearly of Bronze Age origin,¹² and that settlements with corresponding Bronze Age names¹³ lay in or near the region of Lukka. It

is thus tempting to regard the Late Bronze Age settlements as earlier foundations on the sites of the later Lycian cities. But we cannot be entirely sure about this, since many names were used of more than one place, in the Late Bronze Age as well as in later periods. Thus, even if similarity between two names is not merely coincidental, a genuine Late Bronze Age–Iron Age name-doublet may indicate a population shift from one region to another rather than provide evidence that a city in the later period had a history extending back to the earlier period. As yet, very few material remains before the first millennium have been unearthed in Lycia, and the Bronze Age pedigree assigned to various Lycian cities still awaits archaeological confirmation. At present, the earliest significant archaeological evidence for settlement in Lycia dates to the late 8th century, unearthed in the country's most important city, Xanthus.

Bordering Lycia to the east along Anatolia's southern coastal plain was the country which in the first millennium was called Pamphylia, a Greek name meaning 'place of all tribes'. According to Greek legendary tradition, it was settled by Greeks of mixed origin under the leadership of Amphilochus, Calchas, and Mopsus some time after the Trojan War. During the Late Bronze Age, this region belonged to the important Hittite appanage kingdom called Tarhuntassa, which extended eastwards through part of Classical Cilicia and inland to the region of modern Konya. Tarhuntassa's population was almost certainly a predominantly Luwian one, but we have yet to find clear evidence that a Luwian-speaking population continued to occupy Pamphylia in the Iron Age. Nor have we found evidence of a Greek presence there in the final years of the Late Bronze Age, as we would expect if the region were settled by Greeks in the aftermath of the alleged Trojan War. However, the Pamphylian city Perge, a Greek settlement according to Greek legendary tradition, was probably the successor of Late Bronze Age Parha, which lay just outside Tarhuntassa's western frontier. The remains of Late Bronze Age settlement that have recently come to light on the acropolis of Perge are very likely those of the city Parha.¹⁴

East of Pamphylia lay the country called Cilicia in Classical texts. It consisted of two distinct parts, known by the terms Cilicia Tracheia (Latin *Aspera*), 'Rough Cilicia', and Cilicia Pedias (Latin *Campestris*), 'Cilicia of the Plain'. Cilicia Tracheia was the rugged mountainous western part of the region, Cilicia Pedias the 'smoother', fertile eastern part. These regions corresponded roughly to the countries respectively called Hilakku and Que in Neo-Assyrian texts. In the Late Bronze Age, the western part of Cilicia lay within the south-eastern frontiers of Tarhuntassa, while the eastern part belonged to the territory of the Hittite vassal kingdom Kizzuwadna. Luwian elements of the region persisted through the Iron Age into the Hellenistic and Roman periods. In Classical tradition, the name Cilicia is derived from a legendary Greek people called the Cilices, who according to Homer (*Iliad*

6.397) were one of the peoples of the Troad. It is possible that the ancestors of one of Cilicia's first-millennium population groups did in fact originate in the Troad, migrating to south-eastern Anatolia during the upheavals which followed the collapse of the Late Bronze Age civilizations. However, the name Cilicia is clearly derived from Hilakku. As we have noted, this name is attested in Neo-Assyrian texts—where it is used to designate one of the Iron Age kingdoms that arose in the region following the collapse of the Hittite empire. Hilakku will feature prominently in our discussions of the Neo-Hittite world.

To the east of Hilakku, in the region the Greeks called Cilicia Pedias, a kingdom called Que in Assyrian texts emerged during the Iron Age. In Luwian hieroglyphic texts, the Iron Age kingdom is called Adanawa, a name whose pedigree extends well back into the Bronze Age.¹⁵ But in the famous Karatepe bilingual inscription, which we shall discuss in Chapter 7, it is also called Hiyawa. This is an aphaeresized form of the name 'Ahhiyawa'¹⁶ by which the Mycenaean Greek world was known in Hittite texts. The survival of this name, reflecting the Greek word *Achaioi*, one of the names used by Homer for the Greeks of the Trojan War, and indeed its use as an alternative for the native Anatolian name Adanawa, may indicate a substantial resettlement of Greeks from the Mycenaean world on Anatolia's south-eastern coast in the course or aftermath of the upheavals associated with the end of the Bronze Age.¹⁷ This seems to accord well with Herodotus' statement (7.91) that the Cilicians were originally known as Hypachaians ('sub-Achaians'), a further indication, perhaps, of settlement by late Mycenaean or 'sub-Achaian' Greeks in Cilicia. Another point of interest is that in the bilingual inscription, the kingdom's ruling dynasty in the 8th century is said to belong to the house of Mopsus. As we have noted, Mopsus was in legendary Greek tradition one of the leaders of the Greek settlers who occupied parts of the southern Anatolian coast. The reference to him in the bilinguals may provide a further indication of substantial Greek settlement in eastern Cilicia in the early Iron Age. It also raises the possibility that a leader of the Greek settlers founded the royal dynasty of the kingdom alternatively known as Que, Adanawa, and Hiyawa.

The Phrygians

The power vacuum in Anatolia created by the fall of the Hittite kingdom was eventually filled in the central and western parts of the region by newcomers to Anatolia called the Phrygians. According to Greek tradition, the earliest Phrygians were immigrants from Macedon and Thrace. To judge from Homer, they were already well established in Anatolia at the time of the Trojan War, i.e. by the last century of the Late Bronze Age. Homer refers to the Phrygians seven times in the *Iliad*.¹⁸ On one occasion, the aged Trojan king Priam recalls a visit he had once made to an encampment of theirs, which lay on the bank of the Sangarius river, one of the largest rivers in western Anatolia and now called the Sakarya. He fought alongside the Phrygians when

their camp was attacked by the Amazons (*Iliad* 3.184–9). Phrygians also appear among Troy's allies in the Trojan War (*Iliad* 2.862–3). But they take no actual part in the fighting at Troy, at least in Homer's account of it. In fact, the only contribution they appear to make to the war effort is to help finance it by buying up Troy's art treasures (*Iliad* 18.289–92). In all probability, the references to the Phrygians in the *Iliad* are anachronistic. The arrival of this people in Anatolia almost certainly dates to the early Iron Age, to the decades immediately following the Hittite kingdom's collapse early in the 12th century.

Probably by the end of the millennium, a Phrygian state had begun to evolve. We have no information about the early history of this state. But by the end of the 8th century, it had developed into the most powerful kingdom in central and western Anatolia. This was due at least in part to what most scholars believe was a union between the Phrygians and an eastern Anatolian people called the Mushki. The latter first appear in historical records during the reign of the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I (1114–1076), when they invaded and captured the Assyrian province of Kadmuhu in the Zagros mountains, north-western Iran. They were a fierce, aggressive tribal people whom, according to Tiglath-pileser, 'no king had ever repelled in battle'. Their five kings descended upon his province with a force of 20,000 troops (*RIMA* 2: 14). Tiglath-pileser confronted them in pitched battle, and claims to have massacred two-thirds of them. Elsewhere in his Annals, he reports defeating a force of 12,000 Mushki troops, adding their land to the borders of his own territory (*RIMA* 2: 33). Two centuries later, in 885, Tukulti-Ninurta II invaded and sacked Mushki territory (*RIMA* 2: 177). A further conquest of their lands was carried out in the late 9th or early 8th century by Shamshi-ilu, field-marshal of Adad-nirari III (*RIMA* 3: 232). Subsequently, the Mushki joined forces with the Phrygians of central Anatolia to produce a new united Anatolian kingdom. So most scholars believe.¹⁹

It has to be said that there are a small number of scholars who maintain that the Phrygians and the Mushki never did form a union, but remained separate powers.²⁰ They attach some significance to the fact that the name Phrygian (or its Assyrian equivalent) never appears in Assyrian texts, nor does the name Mushki ever appear in Greek texts. The clear division in pottery types between the eastern and western parts of central Anatolia has also been adduced as an argument for keeping Phrygians and Mushki separate. But the balance of scholarly opinion favours the assumption of a united Mushki–Phrygian kingdom,²¹ formed some time in the 8th century. Ongoing hostilities with Assyria may well have prompted the Mushki to unite with Phrygia,²² the rising power which lay to their west, perhaps under the leadership of a king called Mita of Mushki in Assyrian texts, better known to us under his Greek name Midas. In Greek tradition, Midas ascended his kingdom's throne in the late 8th century as successor to his father Gordius. According to the Greek scholar Eusebius, he reigned from 738 to 696/5.

The name Midas is well known as that of a notorious king of Phrygia in Greek legend,²³ whose greed for gold caused everything he touched to be turned into it, and who was punished for his decision to favour Pan over Apollo in a musical contest by being endowed with a pair of ass's ears. Though the historical Midas should not be too closely identified with his legendary namesake, it is quite possible that some aspects of his character may lie behind the figure of legend. A wealthy foreign ruler who bought his way into Greek culture would not have been without his detractors in the Greek world, perhaps reflected in the portrayal of Midas in Greek legend as a barbarian king obsessed with gold, and with an appallingly bad sense of judgement. The historical Midas may well have accumulated great wealth, and the interest he apparently took in Greek culture is illustrated by his dispatch of a throne to Apollo's sanctuary at Delphi (Herodotus 1.14). If, as seems quite possible, Midas was a contemporary of Homer, the Phrygians may have owed their unwarranted presence in the *Iliad* to some form of financial patronage bestowed upon the poet by Phrygia's king.

The capital of Midas's kingdom was located at Gordium, on the Sangarius river, c.100 km south-west of the modern Turkish capital Ankara.²⁴ Gordium's history of occupation extends back to the Early Bronze Age (third millennium), and there is evidence of occupation during the Hittite period as well. The earliest Iron Age level at Gordium is built directly over and into the final Late Bronze Age level, suggesting that there was no significant time-gap between the two. Gordium, meaning 'the place of Gordius', is generally assumed to have been named after Midas's father. The city's earlier name or names are unknown. Like the kingdom over which it ruled, Gordium reached the peak of its development during Midas's reign. It was an impressive, massively fortified city, the most prominent feature of which was a citadel mound, in which was located the palace complex. It contained a number of rectangular buildings laid out on the megaron plan, with roofed columned porch and large inner chamber. The largest and apparently the most important of these buildings, designated as Megaron 3, may have been Midas's palace.

Gordium's burial grounds, located outside the city's walls, contained c.140 Phrygian graves, which were typically wooden, flat-roofed chambers built into rectangular pits sunk into the ground, and then covered with mounds (tumuli) of rocks and earth. The largest of the tombs is still 53 m high (even after erosion) and almost 300 m in diameter, and was still equipped when discovered with a wide range of funerary gifts, including wooden furniture, bronze cauldrons, many smaller artefacts, 154 fibulae among them, and studded leather belts. These goods were buried with the deceased, a man in his sixties, whose body was found *in situ*, laid out on a bier. There was much speculation that this may have been Midas himself, though recent recalibration of the tomb's juniper logs suggests a dating of c.740, just before Midas's reign began.

This would make it likely that the tomb and the body found within it was that of Midas's father Gordius.

One of the most impressive surviving monuments of the Phrygian civilizations is the citadel now known as 'Midas City'.²⁵ It occupied a commanding position in the Phrygian highlands of central Anatolia, between modern Eskişehir and Afyon Karahisar. The citadel was so named in the 1880s by the English scholar-traveller W. M. Ramsay because of a structure within it commonly referred to as the Midas monument. The building, 16 m high, replicates a Phrygian temple façade, and has a central door niche, a low gabled roof, and a decoration of geometric patterns in relief. There is an open square in front. Fifteen inscriptions in the Phrygian language were discovered in Midas City. One of the most important of these is a single-line text carved above the roof of the Midas monument. Though its precise interpretation is uncertain, its subject is Midas and it may be a dedication to him.²⁶ Interestingly, it accords him the titles *lavag(e)tes* and *vanax*, recalling the similarly titled highest-ranking officials in the Mycenaean world. The inscriptions found in Midas City belong to the earlier of two surviving groups of Phrygian inscriptions, which preserve the last traces of the Phrygian language. The first group, dating from the 8th to the 3rd century BC, appear mainly on rock-cut monuments; the second group, of 2nd and 3rd century AD date, consist mainly of curse formulae. Written in an alphabetic script, Phrygian belongs to the Indo-European language family. Unfortunately, what is left of the language is now almost entirely unintelligible.

Under Midas, Phrygian power extended eastwards across the Halys river into what had been the heartland of the Hittite kingdom. A Phrygian settlement was established on the site of Hattusa, as indicated by the architecture and ceramic ware of the period and by the establishment in the city of the cult of Cybele. From early in the Iron Age, Hattusa had been reoccupied, by native Anatolian 'squatters', and by the 9th century (beginning of the middle Iron Age), a significant settlement had developed there. Other former Hittite settlements which the Phrygians occupied within the Halys basin include Gavurkalesi (ancient name unknown), site of a Hittite sanctuary 60 km south-west of Ankara, Alaca Höyük, probably the sacred Hittite city Arinna, 25 km north of Hattusa, and Tapikka (modern Maşat), located 116 km north-east of Hattusa and once a provincial centre of the Hittite homeland. None of these became major Phrygian settlements, but they marked the progressive expansion of Phrygian power eastwards, probably to the borders of the land of Tabal, occupying part of the region later known as Cappadocia.²⁷ That raised the prospect of war with Assyria, for Tabal was at that time subject-territory of the Assyrian king. We shall take up in Chapter 12 the disputes and conflicts to which this gave rise, particularly between Midas and his Assyrian counterpart Sargon II, and the surprising end to these conflicts. Tabal was the meat in the sandwich in the contests, and the kings of the region found themselves in the

predicament of having to decide which power it was in their best interests to support, and the risks entailed by whatever decision they made. From the Assyrian point of view, control of Tabal was of great strategic importance, for it provided a buffer between the Assyrian king's subject-territories further east and the territorial ambitions of an expanding Phrygian empire. From the Phrygian point of view, control of Tabal was of similar strategic importance—to counter the fear of an ever-westward expansion of an ambitious Assyrian king.

Tabal

It is very likely that a large part of the population of the land called Tabal in the Iron Age were direct descendants of the peoples who had occupied this region during the Late Bronze Age and perhaps even before this. Extending southwards from the southern curve of the Halys river (modern Kızıl Irmak) towards the Taurus mountains, Tabal covered much of what was called the Lower Land in Late Bronze Age Hittite texts, including the territory of the Classical Tyanitis. Westwards, it extended to the Konya Plain, encompassing the sites now known as Kızıl dağ and Karadağ. The region had been integrated into Hittite territory, probably very early in Hittite history, and served as a kind of southern and south-western buffer zone to the Hittite homeland. There is nothing in the material record to indicate that it was significantly affected by the upheavals at the end of the Late Bronze Age, or by the collapse of the Hittite empire. Certainly there is no evidence of a shift of peoples from it in this period. The likelihood is that almost all of the population stayed where they were, or else did not move far from their home region, or moved back to it.

Information about Tabal and its kingdoms comes primarily from Assyrian texts dating from the mid 9th to the late 7th century, supplemented by a small number of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, found at various locations within the region. The Luwian inscriptions have all been dated to the 8th century. In the mid 9th century, records of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III indicate that Tabal consisted of a number of small independent states (which may have evolved several centuries earlier) whose rulers became tributaries of Assyria. Shalmaneser claims to have received gifts from twenty-four kings of Tabal during a campaign which he conducted in the region in 837 (*RIMA* 3: 67; twenty kings, according to *RIMA* 3: 79). However, by the middle of the following century, many of the states were apparently consolidated into a small number of larger kingdoms. We shall trace the history of the Tabalian kingdoms and their rulers in later chapters. As with many of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, this history is closely linked with that of Assyrian intervention in the lands west of the Euphrates, particularly from the reign of Shalmaneser III onwards.

The Cimmerians

The Cimmerians were a people of perhaps Thracio-Phrygian or Indo-Iranian stock, whose original homeland may have been located somewhere in southern Russia. According to Herodotus (1.15), they descended upon Asia after nomadic Scythians drove them from their homeland. Made up of fierce, semi-nomadic tribal groups, they were the scourge of the peoples and kingdoms of the Near East for a century or more, from the late 8th until the late 7th or early 6th century. The Anatolian lands in particular suffered from their onslaughts, from Urartu in the east to the southernmost and westernmost parts of the Anatolian peninsula. They are first attested in Assyrian letters from Sargon's reign, which record their rout of an army from the kingdom of Urartu and the slaughter of a number of the kingdom's provincial governors.²⁸ Assyrians and Cimmerians frequently clashed as the latter sought constantly to expand their territories, often by invading Assyria's subject-lands. In most cases, the Assyrians had the better of the contests, and were generally successful in driving the invaders out. Further to the west, the Cimmerians had greater success. Their occupation of large areas of central and western Anatolia led to conflicts and an ultimate showdown with the forces of the Phrygian king Midas/Mita. Midas proved no match for the invaders. After destroying his army, they promptly set about pillaging and sacking his cities. The reign of Midas, along with the empire he ruled, was brought to an abrupt and violent end by the Cimmerians c.695.


Lydia

The emerging kingdom of Lydia now inherited Phrygia's mantle as the overlord of the west. But it also inherited the Cimmerians. Lydia barely appears on the horizon of the Neo-Hittite world. For the Lydian empire was not founded until twenty years or so after the last Neo-Hittite kingdom had been absorbed into the Assyrian provincial system. It was established c.685 by a man called Gyges, who put himself on his country's throne after murdering his predecessor Candaules, last member of what is called the Heraklid dynasty (allegedly founded by Herakles himself). Gyges became the founder of a new ruling family, the Mermnad dynasty, within whose 140-year time-span the growth, development, and fall of the empire took place. Herodotus (1.7–12) provides us with an entertaining account of how Gyges acquired his throne. But his story is just too good to be true—and for that reason one of the most widely quoted of the Herodotean tales.

Despite its peripheral relevance to a history of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, Lydia is worth mentioning for two reasons. The first is that a Luwian hieroglyphic inscription alludes to it. Though the reference is no more than a passing one, Lydia is one of the few places outside the Neo-Hittite world to receive any mention at all in the hieroglyphic texts. The reference occurs in a

building inscription of an early-mid 8th century ruler of Carchemish called Yariri, who seems to have developed many contacts with the wider world. In this particular text, Yariri refers in a single sentence to the Lydians, the Phrygians, and the Urartians.²⁹ The dating assigned to the inscription indicates that the Lydians of this time were under the rule of the Heraklid dynasty, and probably subject to a Phrygian overlord. Unfortunately, the inscription provides us with no historical context for the reference.

The second reason for mentioning Lydia is to round off the story of the Cimmerians. With the Phrygian empire now dispatched, the Cimmerians set their sights on its successor, launching repeated attacks on Lydia, whose territories encompassed much of the former Phrygian kingdom, from the Halys river to the Aegean coast. During one of the Cimmerian attacks, Gyges, founder of the Lydian empire, was killed, after a reign of some forty-five years. He had previously secured assistance against the invaders from the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal, but had forfeited this when he supported a rebellion by Egypt against Assyria. During Gyges' occupancy of his throne, Assyrian kings won at least two victories over the Cimmerians. In 679, Esarhaddon defeated the Cimmerian leader Teushpa in a battle in the land of Hubushna (Hupisna), which lay in south-eastern Anatolia.³⁰ The second known Assyrian victory occurred in 652, when another Cimmerian leader called Lygdamis (Tugdammu/Dugdamme in Assyrian records) was defeated by Ashurbanipal, Esarhaddon's son and successor.³¹ The Assyrians may have had other victories as well, of which records have been lost. But these victories proved of little benefit to the Lydians. Despite their defeats by the Assyrians, the Cimmerians continued to harass Lydian territory for perhaps another half century, until they were finally expelled by Alyattes, the fourth ruler of the Mermnad dynasty (c.609–560) (Herodotus 1.16). Henceforth, they are heard of no more in our sources.



Map 3. The Iron Age Kingdoms of Northern Syria and South-Eastern Anatolia.

Defining the Neo-Hittites

It is now time for us to begin our investigations of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. 'Neo-Hittite' is a modern term, coined by scholars to refer to a group of states located in northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia that arose, developed, and were finally absorbed into the Assyrian empire during the first four centuries of the Iron Age (mid 12th to late 8th century). The states so called displayed one or more of the following characteristics:

1. Most of them lay in the region called Hatti in Iron Age texts. What precisely this term meant in an Iron Age context will be discussed below.
2. A number of inscriptions found at various sites within them are written in the Luwian hieroglyphic script and language. Luwian had (probably) become the predominant language of Anatolia in the last centuries of the Hittite empire. Its use by Late Bronze Age Hittite kings on their public monuments and seals provides an apparent link with later Iron Age kingdoms.
3. The rulers of the kingdoms in question sometimes bore Luwian names, and sometimes the names, in Luwianized or Assyrianized form, of Late Bronze Age Hittite kings.
4. There is material evidence of cultural links between these kingdoms and the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom, notably in their iconography and architecture.

On the basis of these criteria, the following kingdoms are generally classified as Neo-Hittite (for their locations, see Maps 3 and 4):

In the Euphrates region: Carchemish, Malatya (Melid), Kummuh, Masuwari (= Til Barsip, modern Tell Ahmar)

In the Anti-Taurus region: Gurgum

In western Syria: Pat(t)in (Assyrian Unqi), Hamath, Luash (later incorporated into Hamath)

In central and south-eastern Anatolia:

- (a) the kingdoms of Tabal: ‘Tabal Proper’ (subsequently part of the kingdom called Bit-Burutash), Atuna, Shinuhtu, Tuwana, Hupishna;
- (b) the kingdoms of the region later called Cilicia: Adanawa (Hiyawa, Assyrian Que), Hilakku.

We shall discuss each of these kingdoms, and the rulers who held sway over them, in Part II (Chapters 5 to 7).

Also within the regions west of the Euphrates were the Aramaean states Bit-Agusi (Arpad), located between the Euphrates and the kingdom of Hamath, and Sam’al, which lay south of Gurgum on the eastern slope of the Amanus range. To the south of Hamath lay the Aramaean kingdom of Damascus. Contacts and conflicts between the Neo-Hittite and the Aramaean states played a major role in the history of Iron Age Syria. As Aramaean elements became increasingly dominant in the populations of the Syrian and Palestinian regions, they also became an increasingly significant component of many Neo-Hittite states. In some cases, ruling dynasties of apparently Aramaean origin succeeded those of Hittite/Luwian origin. As we shall see, Hamath provides a classic instance of this. Scholars sometimes use the term ‘Syro-Hittite’ to reflect the blending of Aramaean and Hittite cultures in the Syro-Palestinian regions.



Fig. 4. Lion head, Carchemish (courtesy, British Museum).

For the moment, however, we shall confine our attention to the kingdoms to which the Neo-Hittite label has been specifically applied. Were these kingdoms inhabited by displaced Anatolian Hittites abandoning their old homelands as the forces of chaos and destruction turned them into refugees? 'The very use of the name 'Neo-Hittite' involves a basic assumption—that the Iron Age kingdoms and peoples so called were the successors of, and can be linked directly to, the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti and the Late Bronze Age people we call the Hittites. To validate this assumption, do we need to show that there is in fact evidence of large-scale population movements out of Anatolia at the end of the Late Bronze Age, and that a significant number of the persons who participated in these movements actually did resettle in the lands where the Neo-Hittite kingdoms were established?

Where precisely did these lands lie? In a collective sense, how closely did they coincide with the region called Hatti in Iron Age texts?

The Iron Age Land of Hatti

The survival of the term 'Hatti' after the fall of the Hittite empire is indicated by references to it in Iron Age Assyrian, Urartian, and Hebrew texts. But the lands to which it applied varied from one source to another. Occasionally in Assyrian records, Hatti was closely identified with the kingdom of Carchemish, formerly a viceregal seat of the Hittite empire and subsequently a major political and cultural centre of the Neo-Hittite world. Thus when Ashurnasirpal II refers to envoys from Hatti among the delegates from the western states who attended the inauguration of his palace in Nimrud (*RIMA* 2: 293), he is very likely referring to representatives of the king of Carchemish.¹ The identification of Hatti with Carchemish most probably reflects the latter's status as (arguably) the pre-eminent kingdom of the 'late Hittite' world, a kind of archetypal representative of this world. 'Hatti' might well stand for 'Carchemish' in such a context.² In other contexts, the name refers more broadly to all the territories of northern Syria and the Taurus region over which Late Bronze Age Hittite kings had once held sway. More broadly still, the Assyrian king Sargon II seems to have regarded all regions west of the Euphrates as lands of Hatti—including the northern Syrian Neo-Hittite kingdoms, the south-central Anatolian kingdoms of Tabal, the Aramaean states, and the Phoenician cities along the Levantine coast. We conclude this from his characterization of the rulers of all these lands as 'wicked Hittites' (*Hatte lemni*).³ To the south of Tabal, along the coast and in the hinterland of later Cilicia, were the kingdoms Adanawa (Hiyawa, Que) and Hilakku. They occupied in part the region formerly called Kizzuwadna in Late Bronze Age Hittite texts. Through much of the second millennium, the region's population was predominantly a Luwian one, as we noted in Chapter 1. Though Adanawa and Hilakku appear to be distinguished from the Land of Hatti in most Assyrian texts,⁴ their populations, along with the peoples of the

Tabalian region, might well have claimed direct descent from their Late Bronze Age precursors in south-eastern Anatolia.

Of the various references to 'Hatti' in Assyrian records, those that encompass northern Syria and parts of south-eastern Anatolia, from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean coast and anti-Taurus range, probably come closest to reflecting what most Iron Age peoples understood by the term. This is best illustrated by an inscription of Adad-nirari III (810–783), who claims to have subdued and imposed tax and tribute upon all the lands stretching from 'the bank of the Euphrates, the land Hatti, the land Amurru in its entirety, Tyre, Sidon, Samaria (Humri), Edom, (and) Palastu (Palestine) as far as the great sea in the west' (*RIMA* 3: 213). In their totality, these lands covered a large part of the region west of the Euphrates occupied today by Syria, part of eastern Turkey, Lebanon, Israel, and Palestine. To how much of this region did the term Hatti apply, at least in Adad-nirari's account?

We can best answer this question by looking first at the other names on the list, beginning with Amurru. Like Hatti, Amurru was a term of variable extension. In the third and early second millennia, it covered a large part of the territory of modern Syria. But in the Late Bronze Age, its use was restricted to the lands lying between the Orontes river and the central Levantine coast, as attested in the mid-14th-century Amarna texts from Egypt. Early in the post-Bronze Age period, the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I reported receiving tribute from the island of Arvad (Arwad), 3 km off the Levantine coast, and further south from the Levantine coastal cities Byblos and Sidon (*RIMA* 2: 37, 53), in the context of his claim that he conquered Amurru in its entirety. This gives some indication of the northern and southern limits of the region covered, in the Assyrian view, by the term Amurru in the late 12th–early 11th century. Its northern limit probably corresponded closely to the northern frontier of Late Bronze Age Amurru. But if Sidon was also considered part of Amurru in Tiglath-pileser's reign, then Amurrite territory must have extended further south than it did in the Late Bronze Age, when Sidon clearly lay beyond its frontier.⁵ In Tiglath-pileser's reign too, Amurru encompassed territory extending much further eastwards than in the earlier period, since Tiglath-pileser includes Tadmor (Roman Palmyra) within its limits (*RIMA* 2: 38). Tadmor lay in the Syrian desert 235 km north-east of Damascus, and was apparently the furthestmost point reached by Aramaean tribesmen from east of the Euphrates who were pursued across the river by Tiglath-pileser, on twenty-eight occasions. We do not know if the Assyrians still regarded Tadmor as part of Amurrite territory in Adad-nirari III's reign, and if it was among the unspecified lands of Amurru which he subdued (e.g. *RIMA* 3: 211, 213). But we can deduce that Amurru's southern frontier was now considered to lie to the north of Sidon, since Sidon (along with Tyre) is listed separately from Amurru in the king's record of his campaign in the region. These inconsistencies in Assyrian references to Amurru make clear that throughout

the Iron Age the term was no more than a vague geographical one, encompassing a number of independent lands and cities located mostly in western Syria. Different Assyrian kings had different perceptions of how far Amurrite territory extended. What is clear is that at no time in the Iron Age was the term Amurru ever used to designate a specific kingdom or any other form of political entity.

South of Sidon and Tyre, Adad-nirari's conquests included Samaria, where Omri had established the northern kingdom of Israel c.870. To the south of Samaria/Israel, the Assyrian claimed that Palestine fell to him, as also the land of Edom, located further to the east in southern Transjordan south of the Dead Sea.

That brings us to the land of Hatti, and the territories and kingdoms that lay within it—at least in Adad-nirari III's view. It is clear that the Euphrates marked the eastern boundary of this land in the Iron Age. Carchemish was the most significant of the states in the Euphrates region, in the centuries following the collapse of the Hittite empire. We cannot be certain how far the rule of its first post-Bronze Age king Ku(n)zi-Teshub extended. But we know that his grandsons Arnuwanti and Runtiya were rulers of the kingdom of Malatya (called Melid in Assyrian texts), and it is possible that they had been installed there as representatives of a Carchemish-based regime. If so, then the land of Kummuh which lay between Malatya and Carchemish was presumably also a subject-territory, to begin with, of the kingdom of Carchemish. It occupied roughly the area of the modern Turkish province Adiyaman. To the south of Carchemish lay the large Aramaean state called Bit-Agusi, which extended over much of the territory in north-central Syria between Carchemish and the kingdom of Patin. It covered in part the land called Mukish in Late Bronze Age Hittite texts. To the south, it shared a frontier with the kingdom of Hamath. From a Mesopotamian perspective, all four countries referred to above—Malatya, Kummuh, Carchemish, and Bit-Agusi—constituted the easternmost territories of the region which stretched from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea and which in a broad geographical sense could be thought of as constituting the Iron Age Land of Hatti.

We should add to this list a city that lay on the east bank of the Euphrates, on the site of Tell Ahmar located 22 km south of Carchemish. In the Iron Age, the city was known by the Luwian name Masuwari and the Aramaean name Til Barsip. Almost certainly, Masuwari/Til Barsip was among the territories considered to lie within the Hatti land. As also the country called Gurgum, located to the north-east of the Amanus range and sharing a border with Kummuh. Its capital was located at Marqas (modern Maraş). To the south of Gurgum lay the Aramaean kingdom Sam'al, its capital located on the site now known as Zincirli.

From Adad-nirari III's perspective, the southernmost of the Hatti lands must have been the kingdom of Hamath which lay in the middle Orontes

region immediately to the north of Amurru. East of the Orontes was the country called Luash, in the region formerly occupied by the Late Bronze Age Nuhashshi lands. Around 800 (if not earlier), Luash was incorporated into Hamath by the Hamathite king Zakur.⁶ Further north in the Amuq Plain lay the kingdom of Pat(t)in (Assyrian Unqi) on the territory of the Late Bronze Age kingdom Alalah. Hamath and Patin were among the most important of the Neo-Hittite states. Almost certainly they fell to Adad-nirari in his conquests of the whole region from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean.

In a comprehensive sense, then, the term Hatti could be applied in the Iron Age to a complex of lands and kingdoms extending southwards from Malatya in the north-east along the Euphrates to Bit-Agusi, and westwards from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea, with the inclusion of Gurgum and Sam'al in the north, and the kingdoms of Patin on the coast and Hamath in the Orontes valley.⁷ Most of the states within the region belonged to the group of so-called Neo-Hittite kingdoms. But two of them, Bit-Agusi and Sam'al, were Aramaean foundations. The Hittites had impressed their stamp firmly upon the whole region in the Late Bronze Age when Suppiluliuma I installed viceregal seats at Carchemish and Aleppo. He and his successors made clear that all the territories from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea, south to the frontiers of Damascus, were now an integral part of the kingdom of Hatti. After the collapse of the Hittite empire, the name Hatti continued to be used as a general designation for the Syrian and south-eastern Anatolian regions once ruled by a Hittite viceroy or by local Syrian vassals who swore allegiance to the Hittite Great King. The survival of Carchemish in the post-Bronze Age era and its ruler's assumption of the mantle of Great Kingship may well have contributed to the retention of the name Hatti. But from the time written records begin for the individual states that lay within the land called Hatti in Iron Age texts, it is clear that there was no sense of these states constituting a single political entity, or any form of political federation. Each was entirely independent of the others, each had its own autonomous ruler. From time to time they did form military alliances against outside aggressors who threatened them all, particularly the Assyrians. But their unions were temporary, formed for *ad hoc* purposes, and were never underpinned by any sense of a common identity or shared traditional links.

That brings us to the question of who the inhabitants of these lands were.

Refugee populations from the old Hittite world?

We have noted the commonly held assumption that the collapse of the Hittite empire early in the 12th century led to large-scale population movements of Anatolian peoples into northern Syria. In the last half of the Late Bronze Age, this region had been incorporated into the Hittite empire, with the establishment of viceregal seats at Aleppo and Carchemish. From the reign of Suppiluliuma I to the empire's end, northern Syria formed the south-eastern

component of the Land of Hatti, the Hittite king's sovereignty extending over the territories, once controlled by Mitanni, lying between the Taurus mountains and the Euphrates river in the east and the Egyptian frontier at Damascus in the south. If mass migrations into these lands did occur after the fall of the Hittite empire, they serve to illustrate the broader upheavals which affected many parts of the Aegean and Near Eastern worlds at the end of the Bronze Age, as illustrated in Ramesses III's dramatic account of the devastations caused by the Sea Peoples as they swept through large parts of Anatolia, Syria, and Palestine. I have suggested that the peoples in question were more likely to have been among the victims of the upheavals rather than the causes of them—peoples displaced from their old homelands and seeking new places to settle.

Does this provide a plausible context for the emergence, in south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria, of the Iron Age kingdoms to which the name 'Neo-Hittite' has been applied? The earliest post-Bronze Age inscriptions discovered in the territories once subject to Late Bronze Age Hatti may have some bearing on this question. These are the inscriptions that identify Kuzi-Teshub as Great King of Carchemish and son of Talmi-Teshub, the last-known Hittite viceroy at Carchemish. They indicate that at least one branch of the royal dynasty survived the fall of the empire and continued to exercise authority through the early decades of the Iron Age. Since Hattusa was abandoned c.1185, Kuzi-Teshub's rule at Carchemish must date to the first half of the 12th century. His title 'Great King' is a significant one. No subordinate ruler within the Hittite kingdom, even a viceroy, would have used such a title while there was still a central regime at Hattusa. The administrative centre of gravity of what was left of the kingdom of Hatti had shifted from Hattusa in north-central Anatolia to Carchemish on the Euphrates. Kuzi-Teshub now consciously assumed the role of supreme ruler of the remnants of the Hittite world, in default of a continuing royal line at Hattusa. Evidence for his reign is provided by his royal seal impressions, discovered at Lidar Höyük in 1985,⁸ and the appearance of his name in the inscriptions of his grandsons Runtiya and Arnuwanti.⁹ The sealings are in the tradition of those of the Late Bronze Age kings of Hatti. But do they serve as evidence for an influx of Luwian-speaking migrants into the Carchemish region following the collapse of the Hittite kingdom?

We have no other documentary support for such a view. Perhaps already in the mid 14th century, when Suppiluliuma established the viceregal seat at Carchemish, new settlers had flowed into the Carchemish region, including many dispatched there by the Great King to provide a Hittite administrative infrastructure for the new regime. The expansion of the territories which Suppiluliuma placed under the immediate authority of the viceroy—south along the Euphrates to Emar and west to the borders of the second viceregal kingdom at Aleppo—would almost certainly have required the importation

from the homeland of large numbers of scribes, clerks, and other officials to staff the various departments of the viceregal bureaucracy. One such official was a man called Alziyamuwa, a Hittite garrison commander stationed in Emar who became involved in a dispute with a local priest over property and taxes.¹⁰ Other settlers from the homeland and other Anatolian regions no doubt contributed to the influx of newcomers to the Carchemish region, following the establishment of the Hittite viceregal seat there. And it may well be that Luwian was the first language of many if not the great majority of the new settlers. Further, in view of the strategic importance of Carchemish's location on the Euphrates, its defences were very likely boosted by contingents of troops relocated from the homeland, or made up of deportees acquired as prisoners of war during Hittite military campaigns (see below).

It is worth mentioning in this context the claim made by the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I that after his apparently resounding victory over Tudhaliya IV at the battle of Nihriya in northern Mesopotamia, he crossed the Euphrates and took prisoner 28,800 Hittite troops (lit. Hatti troops) (*RIMA* 1: 272, 275–6). Most scholars think that the number is highly exaggerated, and that the episode was probably no more than a minor border clash.¹¹ Questions might also be raised about the identity of these so-called Hittites. But it is possible that Tukulti-Ninurta's statement reflects a significant Hittite component among the population groups of the middle Euphrates region. In many cases, these Hittites could have been descendants of settlers who came from Anatolia at the time Suppiluliuma established direct Hittite rule in northern Syria. And as tensions mounted between Hatti and Assyria, Hittite kings may well have strengthened their defences in the frontier territories with fresh levies from Anatolia.

As in other parts of the Hittite world, a large proportion of the Hittite military forces stationed in the region, and of the new settlers in general, could have been compulsory migrants, sent there after their removal from their original homelands. Many of the Hittite kings' deportees came from lands occupied by Luwian-speaking groups, like the Arzawa lands of western Anatolia. The practice of reallocating prisoners of war to outlying regions of the kingdom may well have led to the resettlement of some of them in the regions controlled by Carchemish. And also perhaps in the regions controlled by the other Hittite viceregal administration at Aleppo. A significant number of those sent to Syria by the Hittite king, or who had relocated there of their own free will to take advantage of the new opportunities offered by the expansion of the imperial civil service, may have spoken Luwian as their first language. We have referred to van den Hout's conclusion that the Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions found in various parts of Anatolia and dating mainly to the 13th century reflect a large if not majority Luwian component in the Hittite population at this time. The earliest datable hieroglyphic monumental inscription was commissioned by the viceroy at Aleppo, Talmi-Sharrumma, grandson of

Suppiluliuma I, c.1300.¹² In accordance with van den Hout's line of reasoning, this may indicate a Luwian presence in north-central Syria already by the beginning of the Hittite empire's last century, and perhaps dating back to the establishment of a viceregal seat there. If the hieroglyphic inscriptions unearthed in various Iron Age Syrian states do in fact reflect a substantial Luwian-speaking population in these states (and we shall discuss this further below), then it is possible that this population was to a large extent descended from Luwians who had settled in the region already in the Late Bronze Age, perhaps within the context of the new arrangements Suppiluliuma made for the administration of northern Syria in the wake of his destruction of the Mitannian empire.

This provides but one of several possible scenarios for a significant Luwian presence in Syria centuries before the rise of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. And of course, it does not exclude the possibility that new waves of Luwian settlers from Anatolia established new homes in Syria following the collapse of the Hittite empire—thus adding to the numbers of Luwians already living there—particularly if they knew of and were able to make their way to parts of the region that had been left relatively unscathed by the upheavals of the early 12th century. Could Carchemish have been one of these regions? Admittedly, it figures in Ramesses III's list of the cities and countries devastated by the Sea Peoples' invasions.¹³ But there is nothing in the archaeological or epigraphic record to indicate that the city suffered significantly, if at all, from these invasions.¹⁴ Carchemish may have provided a new homeland for a number of groups from the old homeland. The survival there of a Hittite administration, one which maintained many of the old traditions, may well have created a social and cultural environment in the regions over which it exercised control not unlike that of the core territory of the old Hittite world. Displaced peoples may well have been attracted to regions which offered them conditions and a lifestyle similar to those of the homelands they had been forced to abandon.

All this could lend support to the hypothesis of population movements into northern Syria following the collapse of the Hittite empire, as well as in earlier times. Do we have any hard evidence to support such a hypothesis? Not from the inscriptional material. Kuzi-Teshub, the first of the Iron Age rulers of Carchemish, was probably a native of the city, born there during his father's viceroyalty. So too his grandsons Runtiya and Arnuwanti, the first known kings of Malatya, were almost certainly born and bred in the Euphrates region, as were probably many of the persons who constituted the defence forces, the civil administration, and the ancillary populations of the lands immediately west of the Euphrates. In short, the inscriptions which attest the existence of the earliest Iron Age rulers of Carchemish and Malatya do not provide evidence of a shift of an elite administrative group to the region at this time, let alone a general population movement there, allegedly from devastated homelands in the west.

How, then, do we explain the presence of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions at a number of other Iron Age sites, as well as the continuation of the Luwian epigraphic tradition at Carchemish and Malatya after Kuzi-Teshub's dynasty had come to an end? Many scholars believe that the persistence of the Luwian script and language in northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia over almost five centuries (12th–8th centuries) is strong evidence that the populations of the areas where the inscriptions were found contained a substantial Luwian component—whether or not this was due to movements of Luwian-speaking groups into these areas at the beginning of the Iron Age. We have already concluded that the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Hittite Anatolia indicate a substantial Luwian-speaking population in the regions where they were found in the Late Bronze Age. Could we not argue, similarly, that Luwian was widely spoken in the Iron Age kingdoms of northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia—on the basis of the Iron Age hieroglyphic inscriptions found there?

In support of this argument, scholars have drawn attention to the apparent end of the Hittite cuneiform scribal tradition with the fall of the Hittite kingdom. Not a single tablet or tablet fragment written in Hittite cuneiform has come to light in an Iron Age context. A further argument for the widespread use of Luwian in Iron Age Syria and eastern Anatolia has to do with the discovery of hieroglyphic texts inscribed on non-monumental writing materials. Three sets of such documents have survived. Two are inscribed on strips of lead. One consists of five strips found at the site now called Kululu which lay just south of the Halys river, 30 km north-east of Kayseri.¹⁵ The strips are inscribed with economic texts, listing various persons, their towns of origin, and gifts and payments, including livestock and human beings, made to or by them. They date to the mid–late 8th century. The second set consists of letters inscribed on seven strips, discovered in 1905 in the Assyrian city Ashur.¹⁶ Their original provenance is unknown, though Hawkins suggests a connection with Carchemish, and a late 8th-century date on the grounds of their epigraphic comparability with the inscriptions found at Kululu and Sultanhan (discussed below). The significance of these texts for the present discussion is that they indicate that the Luwian language was used for administrative purposes and personal written communications as well as for the records inscribed on public monuments. We should also mention in this context the small collection of non-monumental inscriptions found at Hama during the course of Danish excavations there.¹⁷ Now republished by Hawkins,¹⁸ they include (a) a stele fragment with traces of a hieroglyphic inscription, dated to the 9th century, of unknown content; (b) a basalt fragment, with traces of several signs; (c) an inscribed shell fragment bearing the royal title 'King' and the name *Urhilana*, and thus attributable to the 9th-century Hamathite king *Urhilana*; (d) an inscribed sherd, possibly a fragment of a letter; and (e) a group of *bullae*¹⁹ possibly of 8th-century date, with seal

impressions and hieroglyphic inscriptions, apparently a tally of sheep. These fragments have been dated to the 9th or the 8th century.

From the Kululu and Ashur strips and the Hamath fragments, it is clear that the Luwian hieroglyphic script was not confined merely to display inscriptions. And from this, Hawkins, Singer, and other scholars have concluded that they reflect regular and continuing use of Luwian for a range of purposes; the fact that there are not more surviving examples may simply mean that many such documents, perhaps the great majority of them, were written on perishable materials, like leather, parchment, and wood.²⁰ That may well be so. We certainly cannot rule out the possibility that the Luwian hieroglyphic script was used more widely in non-monumental inscriptions than is presently evident. Luwian may have been regularly used as a written language in a Neo-Hittite chancery context.²¹ But even if we could demonstrate this, we cannot then claim that the language must have been commonly used beyond such a context. Just as we do not know how widely Hittite (Nesite) was spoken outside the Hittite palace bureaucracy—it may well have been a minority language in the kingdom—so too we cannot assume, from the restricted evidence provided by the hieroglyphic inscriptions, that Luwian was widely spoken in the kingdoms where the inscriptions were found.

Apart from these inscriptions, do we have any *material* evidence to indicate that the Neo-Hittite kingdoms contained a significant Luwian-speaking element in their populations? A point to emphasize is that the Luwians in general are an extremely elusive people as far as the archaeological record goes. Despite their widespread distribution in Late Bronze Age Anatolia and the distinct possibility that they were by the end of the age the most numerous of all the population groups in Anatolia, we cannot actually identify any material remains, architectural or sculptural, that could be classified as Luwian, as distinct from Hittite or any other cultural or ethnic group. The same applies to Iron Age Syria and eastern Anatolia. Apart from the inscriptions, and the personal names of Luwian origin which some of them contain, nothing has been found in the regions of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms that could be specifically identified as Luwian.

More generally, can we identify anything in the material record to support the hypothesis of migrations from Anatolia into Syria at the end of the Late Bronze Age? The simple answer to this question is no. There is no clear evidence even for limited Anatolian resettlement there in this period. Admittedly, examples of Hittite-style architecture and sculpture found at a number of Neo-Hittite sites seem to indicate the preservation, albeit in a modified form, of certain Late Bronze Age Hittite cultural traditions. And there is no doubt that in some instances the existence of cultural links between two regions—in successive ages—clearly do reflect migrations of peoples who re-established their old traditions and customs in their new lands. But in an Iron Age Syrian context, there is a more plausible explanation for cultural continuity.

Before considering this, we should comment about burial customs in Iron Age Syria, where the practice of cremating the dead and depositing the ashes and bones in burial urns has been seen as a possible indication of migratory movements into the region. Cremation is widely attested in Late Bronze Age Anatolia, both in the archaeological record and in Hittite mortuary texts, most notably in the description of the fourteen-day festivals associated with the cremation of Hittite kings and queens. Cremation and inhumation burials have been found in many locations in Hittite Anatolia, burials of both types sometimes occurring in the same cemeteries. On the other hand, as Singer points out, the practice of cremating the dead was alien to the native populations of Syria prior to the Iron Age—though it seems gradually to have spread to Hittite centres in northern Syria.²² During the Iron Age, cremation in Syria became common—and in some places standard—as illustrated by the Iron Age cemeteries at Carchemish and Hamath.²³ While noting that Carchemish had already become a Hittite city in the 14th century, Singer argues that ‘the best way to account for the massive presence of cremation burials in Hama(th) is by assuming that Anatolian population groups immigrated in large numbers into central Syria during and after the fall of the (Hittite) empire’.²⁴ New burial practices are often closely associated with new arrivals in a region, reflecting the funerary customs of their original homelands. But there is nothing specific in the Syrian cremation-burials, beyond the practice itself, to link them to migrant groups from Anatolia. Collins believes that cremation was but one of a number of elements that should be understood as signs of a newly emergent cultural identity in Syria rather than the arrival of new population groups from the old Hittite lands.²⁵ She comments in general that: ‘The characteristics of the Neo-Hittite states that have been used to diagnose an Anatolian presence in the region—cremation, Luwian hieroglyphs, and artistic and architectural styles—confirm that (the Luwian/Hittite) royal lines continued to wield considerable cultural influence in northern Syria but do not support the idea of a major migration of Anatolians or Luwians into Syria following the collapse of the Hittite Empire.’²⁶ She may well be right—and if so, that would appear to leave us without any evidence at all for an Anatolian migration into Syria at the end of the Late Bronze Age.

It should, however, be stressed that even in the Late Bronze Age, material indications of a Hittite presence in Syria and Palestine are extremely meagre. We discussed earlier the possibility that the new administrative arrangements Suppiluliuma I made for Syria, with the establishment of the two viceregal posts there, led to the importation of a significant number of personnel from the homeland. If so, these personnel have left very little trace of themselves. In his survey of the ‘Hittite’ remains of Late Bronze Age Syria, Singer can find no more than a *bullā*, impressed with a royal seal, discovered at Aphek, which is located in Israel on the Sharon plain; four Hittite seals found at other sites in Israel; a silver scrap hoard discovered at Shiloh in northern Palestine; and a

Hittite ivory panel, depicting two Hittite kings, discovered at Megiddo and produced in one of the major centres of the Hittite empire, perhaps Hattusa, Carchemish, or Ugarit.²⁷ As he points out, this small assemblage of Hittite artefacts cannot be seen as an indication of a lasting Hittite presence in the region, 'but are stray finds related to Egyptian–Hittite diplomatic contacts'.

It is clear, then, that the archaeological record contributes very little to our knowledge of a Hittite presence in Syria and Palestine during the Late Bronze Age, and nothing to our investigation of whether the Iron Age culture of the region was at least in part the result of migratory movements from Anatolia at the end of the Bronze Age. There is no doubt that the hieroglyphic inscriptions found in a number of Iron Age Syrian and south-eastern Anatolian states reflect the retention of an epigraphic tradition that originated in the Late Bronze Age Hittite world. But these inscriptions are not in themselves evidence of migrating populations, especially Luwian-speaking populations, from the Hittite world at the end of the Late Bronze Age. I have suggested that already in the Late Bronze Age, from the reign of Suppiluliuma I on, significant numbers of Anatolian personnel were relocated in the Syrian regions, for political, administrative, and strategic purposes. By implication, there may already have been a significant Luwian-speaking population in the areas where the Neo-Hittite states were established before the Iron Age began.

What general conclusions can we draw from all this? The assumption that large-scale migrations from Anatolia, particularly of Luwian-speaking population groups, followed the collapse of the Hittite empire early in the 12th century is, I believe, not sustainable. Undoubtedly, the instability of the post-Bronze Age years caused significant disruptions to the old settlement patterns, and the abandonment of towns and areas most affected. Undoubtedly, many displaced peoples sought new homes elsewhere, and very likely some of these may have looked to resettlement in regions like Carchemish. But large areas of Syria, particularly the coastal areas, may have fared little better than the worst affected parts of Anatolia in the upheavals, and hardly offered, initially at least, incentives for mass migrations. I suspect that after a period of instability and volatility many of the abandoned areas were reoccupied, probably by the same population groups who had left them. New urban centres were established on the sites of earlier foundations, or on sites where no earlier cities had existed.²⁸ While there may have been some limited migrations of Anatolian peoples into northern Syria at this time, I think it likely that the majority of Anatolians who had resettled in Syria did so after Suppiluliuma I had incorporated the region into the Hittite empire, and established direct Hittite control over much of it, through the viceregal kingdoms at Carchemish and Aleppo. Other waves of settlers from Anatolia may have come in the wake of the peace accord drawn up between the Hittite king Hattusili III and the pharaoh Ramesses II in 1259. Undoubtedly the Hattusili–Ramesses treaty led to much more settled conditions in Syria-Palestine than had been the case in earlier periods, when control

of Syria had been disputed by Hatti and Egypt. And the more settled conditions must have considerably enhanced opportunities for trading and commercial enterprises both within the region and beyond, luring new settlers intent on making their fortunes.

In sum, I believe that the 'Hittite' component of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms in Syria and eastern Anatolia consisted largely of the descendants of emigrants who had come from the west generations before the kingdoms were founded. Other components of these kingdoms undoubtedly included indigenous peoples, in probably greater numbers, along with increasing numbers of Aramaean settlers. In the early post-Bronze Age era, new immigrants from the west may well have joined the existing populations. But the Neo-Hittite kingdoms of the Land of Hatti²⁹ were essentially an evolution out of the peoples who were already there rather than the result of large waves of new immigrants from devastated homelands in the west. And whether they were of post-Bronze Age or of earlier origin, the Luwian-speaking inhabitants of these kingdoms probably constituted only a minority of their populations.

The emergence of the Neo-Hittite dynasties

How then did the ruling dynasties of these kingdoms come to power? And how close were their links with the royal family of the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom?

One of the most important of these links was the continuation of the Luwian hieroglyphic tradition in the Neo-Hittite states. The rulers who composed or commissioned the inscriptions were thus maintaining an epigraphic convention that had from time immemorial (from their point of view) been associated with royalty. Even if their authors had only vague notions of the bygone era in which the Luwian hieroglyphic script and language had first been used for royal inscriptions, they preserved this medium of communication as the one appropriate to royalty in their own age.³⁰ This does not necessarily mean that Luwian was the primary language of the rulers who used it on their inscriptions. For that matter, we do not know how many of these rulers spoke Luwian, or which ones. All we can say for certain is that the retention of the Luwian language and script in various parts of the Neo-Hittite world until the end of the 8th century attests the existence of a professional scribal class trained in reading and writing the language. How far beyond this scribal class knowledge of the Luwian language extended remains unknown. Even if the lead inscriptions found at Kululu and Ashur and the ceramic fragments found in Hama do indicate that Luwian was widely used as a written language for records and communications other than the monumental inscriptions, the language may still have been spoken only by a minority of the inhabitants of each state, which no doubt included those at the top end of the social and administrative hierarchy. There may well have been much larger groups within the kingdoms who spoke other languages. By



Fig. 5. Luvian hieroglyphic inscription of Kamani, early-mid 8th-century king of Carchemish (courtesy, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford).

the end of the 8th century, Aramaic was almost certainly the dominant language in many of the Neo-Hittite states, including those whose rulers still bore Luvian names or the names of Late Bronze Age Hittite kings.

What significance can we attach to the appearance and recurrence of Late Bronze Age Hittite royal names in the Neo-Hittite texts? The names include Arnuwanda (Luvian Arnuwanti) at Malatya, Labarna (Lubarna) at Patin, Muwatalli (Assyrian Mutallu) at Kummuh, possibly Tudhaliya at Carchemish,³¹ Hattusili (Assyrian Qatazili) at Gurgum, and Suppiluliuma (Assyrian Sapalulme and Ushpilulume) at Patin and Kummuh. Does the adoption of these names reflect attempts by certain Iron Age rulers (or their families) to link themselves with Hatti's past Great Kings, in order to enhance their status with their own subjects, and with their peers in other kingdoms? Probably not. There is nothing in the inscriptions themselves to indicate that the Neo-Hittite

ruling families retained specific knowledge of their Late Bronze Age royal ancestors. None the less, it may well be that in at least some cases the old royal names were a genuine part of a Neo-Hittite dynasty's inheritance, their reappearance reflecting actual family links with the Late Bronze Age kings of Hatti. But the fact that they appear to have been used only on an occasional basis—the majority of Neo-Hittite royal names clearly have no Late Bronze Age royal pedigree—may indicate that no special significance was attached to them. They were simply part of a longstanding family tradition. Every so often, one of the names would be dusted off and used again. A Neo-Hittite king was called Hattusili or Suppiluliuma or Labarna or Arnuwanda primarily because the name happened to be a traditional one within his family. Certainly, the rulers of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms preserved the iconographic and epigraphic traditions of their royal forerunners. But there is no evidence that they also preserved specific memories of any of the Late Bronze Age kings with whom these traditions began—and nothing to suggest that political or propagandistic motives lay behind their reuse from time to time of the old royal names.

But this in no way diminishes the likelihood that some of the Neo-Hittite ruling dynasties were direct or collateral descendants of the Late Bronze Age kings of Hatti. We can, I believe, take quite literally the statement of the antepenultimate Late Bronze Age king Tudhaliya IV that: 'My Sun has many brothers and there are many sons of his father. The Land of Hatti is full of the royal line: in Hatti the descendants of Suppiluliuma, the descendants of Mursili, the descendants of Muwatalli, the descendants of Hattusili are numerous.'³² Particularly in its final decades, the Hittite court had an abundance of members of the royal line, and a superfluity of princes, all of whom Tudhaliya saw as a threat to his position on the throne. Especially as his father Hattusili had taken it by force from its rightful occupant, his (Hattusili's) nephew Urhi-Teshub! The latter had spent some time in exile in Syria, in the Nuhashshi lands, and subsequently after fleeing from Hittite custody had probably returned to northern Syria or south-eastern Anatolia (after a sojourn in Egypt) where he continued to threaten Hattusili's and subsequently Tudhaliya's occupancy of the Hittite throne.³³ We know from an oracle enquiry text dating to this period that Tudhaliya considered the question of territorial compensation for Urhi-Teshub's sons.³⁴ It may well be that these sons were born and bred in the region where their father was exiled, or where he subsequently re-emerged after his escape from his uncle's authority. Perhaps they were in fact compensated by Tudhaliya—and became the ancestors of one or more of the Neo-Hittite royal dynasties.

We are also faced with the intriguing question raised by J. Seeher's scenario of the evacuation of Hattusa by the last Hittite king Suppiluliuma II. Presumably, Suppiluliuma and his retinue did not simply walk off into the wilds of Anatolia with no idea of where they were going. This last Hittite

king must have arranged an alternative place for his administration, perhaps intending it to serve only as a temporary haven, until such time as he could return to Hattusa. There was, after all, a precedent for this, set by one of his predecessors, Tudhaliya III. Tudhaliya had located his residence-in-exile at the site of Samuha during the dark days of the so-called concentric invasions of the Hittite homeland in the early 14th century. But there was a difference. Tudhaliya had succeeded in regaining his homeland and his capital, driving the occupying enemy forces from them. Suppiluliuma was never to return. Where did he go? Remote as the possibility may seem, did he set up an alternative Hittite capital on the site of what was to become one of the Neo-Hittite cities? And if so, could the remains of this alternative capital still await discovery? Or has it already been discovered, but not yet recognized as a city that had served as Suppiluliuma's final place of refuge? We have yet to find answers to these questions. For the moment, it must suffice to say that the historical scenario envisaged by Seeher for the evacuation of Hattusa encourages us to search actively for links between the Late Bronze Age Hittite royal family and one or more successor dynasties in one or more of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms.

We cannot be sure when the majority of these kingdoms actually came into being. Carchemish and probably Malatya apparently continued from their Late Bronze Age predecessors with little or no interruption. In some cases, we can date the foundation of a kingdom with reasonable confidence on the basis of inscriptional and other types of evidence. But in other cases, we do not know how far back to date the foundation of a kingdom before the earliest inscriptions found in its territory. Sometimes, new settlements were established on the sites of earlier foundations, perhaps after an interval of time. On other occasions, the kingdoms developed from entirely new settlements on virgin sites. There is the further question of whether these settlements were established by newcomers, were developed by local populations, or were built by a newcomer ruling elite that established its authority over an existing population.³⁵ In Chapters 5–7, we shall consider each case individually.

While doing so, we may come closer to the answer to one of our basic questions. What happened to Suppiluliuma and his court after their departure from Hattusa?

The Biblical Hittites

Despite the rediscovery of the Late Bronze Age Hittites more than a century ago, and the establishment of Hittitology since then as a major field of Near Eastern studies, the name ‘Hittite’ in popular perception remains closely linked with the people so called in the Bible. Uriah the Hittite, attested in the Old Testament, is much better known than Suppiluliuma the Hittite, attested in Late Bronze Age texts. Uriah was an officer in the army of King David, sent by David to his death on the battlefield after David had seduced his wife Bathsheba. So the biblical story goes. Suppiluliuma, ruler of Late Bronze Age Hatti at its peak in the 14th century, was the most powerful man of his time, respected and feared throughout the Near East. Yet outside the world of Near Eastern scholarship, this archetypal Hittite warrior-king is now an obscure figure—while the more widely known Uriah was arguably not a Hittite at all. Hurrian, Luwian, and Hebrew etymologies have all been suggested for his name. But as far as the Bible is concerned, Uriah was a Hittite.

This provides us with a lead-in to a much debated question: What connections, if any, do the biblical Hittites have with the Late Bronze Age Hittites and the so-called Neo-Hittites? As a prelude to this question, it will be useful to consider briefly the biblical contexts in which references to the Hittites occur, beginning with their appearance among the Palestinian tribal groups that made up the Table of Nations.

The tribes of the Table of Nations

In Old Testament sources, the people called Hittites make their first appearance in the patriarchal narratives, where they are referred to as the sons and daughters of Heth (*bēnê het*, *bēnôt het* respectively) (e.g. Gen. 23:6, 16, 18; 27:46). Heth’s own ancestry is attested in Gen. 10:15 and 1 Chron. 1:13; in these sources, he is called the son of Canaan. The Hittites are thus indirectly assigned a Canaanite origin, figuring among the tribal groups who inhabited Palestine before the arrival of the Israelites. They were one of the peoples, listed in the so-called Table of Nations, whom God ordered the Israelites to destroy: ‘However, in the cities of the Nations the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance, do not leave anything alive that breathes. Completely

destroy them—the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites—as the Lord your God has commanded you’ (Deut. 20:16–17).¹ Similar lists appear in Exod. 3:8, 13:5, 23:23, 33:2, and we can add to them the more extensive table of peoples, in Gen. 10 and 1 Chron. 1:13, of whom Canaan is said to be the ancestor: Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites, Girgashites, Hivites, Arkites, Sinites, Arvadites, Zemarites, and Hamathites. All these peoples were located in the Judean hill-country of southern Palestine (e.g. Num. 13:29, Josh. 11:3). This too was the location of Hittite territory in the story which Genesis 23 tells of Abraham’s purchase of a site for burying his dead. It was from a Hittite called Ephron, son of Zohar, that he bought the cave Machpelah for this purpose. Other persons identified as Hittite in the Old Testament include Esau’s wives Jehudith, daughter of Beeri, and Basemath, daughter of Elon (Gen. 26:34), and David’s military commanders Ahimelech (1 Sam. 26:6) and Uriah (2 Sam. 11; 23:39, 1 Chron. 11:41). Of some significance is the fact that all the names of the Hittites specifically identified in the Bible are Semitic—with the possible exception of Uriah.² As we shall see, this has a bearing on the question of the origins of these Hittites.

We should also mention here a long-suggested identification between a king called Tid’al, ruler of Goiim (the name means ‘Nations’) in the age of Abraham, and a Late Bronze Age Hittite king called Tudhaliya. Tid’al was a member of a coalition of rulers who went to war against Bera and Birsha, the rulers respectively of Sodom and Gomorrah, and their allies (Gen. 14:1). From Hittite texts, we know of at least three and possibly four kings called Tudhaliya. The first clearly attested one came to the throne of Hatti c.1400. But some scholars have suggested that there may have been an earlier Tudhaliya, whose reign dated back to the early 17th century. Such a king, if he did exist, would come closest in time to the period traditionally assigned to the biblical patriarchal age—the early second millennium. But the chronology of the patriarchal narratives has been much disputed, with their dates lowered as late as the exilic and post-exilic periods, and many scholars now question whether there is any historical basis at all for these narratives.³ Even if we could prove the existence of a 17th-century Hittite king called Tudhaliya, the identification of biblical Tid’al with him, or with any of his later namesakes, is unlikely.

As for the other main groups listed in the Table of Nations, the Amorites and the Canaanites are well attested in Bronze Age historical sources. The Amorites were a branch of the Semitic-speaking peoples, representing the indigenous populations of western Syria and first attested in Early Bronze Age texts dating to the second half of the third millennium. In this period, they had already developed a relatively sophisticated culture, based on a number of urban centres like Ebla, Hamath, and Qatna. In later biblical sources, they appear frequently as tribal groups occupying parts of Canaan before the arrival of the Israelites. The Canaanites themselves make their first known

appearance in the Middle Bronze Age archives of Mari (18th century), a large city located in the middle Euphrates region.⁴ Subsequent references to the land of Canaan are found in various Late Bronze Age texts, including the famous 15th-century inscription of King Idrimi of Alalah, and the mid-14th-century Amarna letters, composed principally during the reign of the pharaoh Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV).

The Perizzites cannot be linked with any peoples or lands known from extra-biblical sources. But there *may* have been such links for the Hivites and the Jebusites. Speculations on possible northern origins for these groups have prompted scholars to suggest that the Hivites originated from the region called Que in Assyrian sources—biblical Kue/Quah. This was located in southeastern Anatolia in the eastern part of the region called Cilicia Tracheia/Aspera ('Rough Cilicia') in Classical texts. We shall have more to say about this region in Chapter 7. Here we simply observe that the proposed link between Que and the Hivites arises out of the phonetic resemblance between the name Que and the Hebrew form *hiwwi* (*Quwe* → **Huwe* → *hiwwi*). Scholars believe that support for this link is provided by the fact that an 8th-century king of Que called Awariku referred to his kingdom as *Hiyawa* (it is otherwise known as Adanawa) in the Luwian version of a Luwian-Phoenician bilingual inscription found near Adana (see below); they propose that *hiwwi* is derived from *Hiyawa*⁵—an aphaeresized form of the name Ahhiyawa, frequently attested in Hittite texts and almost certainly the Hittite form of the Greek name *Achaia*.⁶ In Homer's *Iliad*, the Greeks are often referred to as Achaians. One of the theories which argue a northern origin for the Hivites does in fact equate them with Achaian Greeks.⁷ According to another of the northern origin theories, which assigns an Asia Minor origin to the Hivites, these people appear, in the form *hwt*, in a topographical list of the 13th-century pharaoh Ramesses II.⁸

The Jebusites were in biblical tradition the occupants of Jerusalem. Though they are not mentioned outside Old Testament sources, where they appear frequently, a possible connection with the Hurrians has been proposed.⁹ These were a large group of peoples, of uncertain origin, who spread through extensive areas of northern Mesopotamia, northern Syria, and eastern Anatolia during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. From a number of Hurrian states, the kingdom called Mitanni emerged in the late 16th century, becoming in the 15th century one of the great political and military powers of the Near Eastern world. In the 14th century, Jerusalem was ruled by a king with a Hurrian name, Abdu-Hepa.¹⁰ Hence the suggestion that the Jebusites were a Hurrian people, a possibility that is reinforced, Singer believes, by the name of the biblically attested Jebusite king Arawnah (variants Aranyah and Awarnah) who sold to David the threshing-floor where he built an altar to God (2 Sam. 24:18–25).¹¹ In Singer's view, the king's name contains the Hurrian element *ewri* (+ the article *-ne*). If the Jebusites were in fact of

Hurrian descent, then their Bronze Age ancestral homeland very likely lay in Hurrian territory to the north of their later biblical homeland. Of course, this line of reasoning depends on the assumption that a kingdom's subject population had the same ethnic identity as that of its king or ruling class. There are many cases in the ancient world as well as in more recent times where this did not apply. Even if both Abdu-Hepa and Arawnah were genuine Hurrians, the subjects over whom they ruled need not have been. A strong case has yet to be made for a Hurrian origin for the Jebusites.¹²

Links between the biblical and the historically attested Hittites?

We have yet to find satisfactory answers to the questions relating to the origins and historicity of the Hivites and the Jebusites. But what of the biblical Hittites? Have we firmer grounds for linking them with a people or peoples attested in historical records? More specifically, were they descendants of the Late Bronze Age people we call the Hittites? If so, the contrast between these people and their biblical descendants could hardly have been more striking. The former, from their base in north-central Anatolia, built one of the most powerful empires in the Near Eastern world. The latter were but one of a number of small tribes living in the Judaeian hill-country of southern Palestine prior to the Israelite occupation of the region. According to Old Testament sources, this occupation began with Joshua's military invasion of the Promised Land following the Israelite exodus from Egypt.

Most scholars who accept the historicity of the exodus tradition date the event to the reign of the pharaoh Ramesses II (1279–1213). But the earliest historical reference we have to the Israelites post-dates Ramesses' reign. It appears on the so-called Merneptah stele,¹³ where (the people of) Israel are listed among the Syro-Palestinian conquests of Ramesses' son and successor Merneptah. The generally accepted dating of the stele to the year 1207 provides us with a *terminus ante quem* for the alleged Israelite occupation of Canaan. That is to say, the Israelites had settled, or resettled, in Canaan by the end of the 13th century at the latest. On this basis, the Hittites of biblical tradition, in the sources we have so far dealt with, must have been among the Late Bronze Age Canaanite peoples whom the Israelites allegedly displaced. If one were to adopt the traditional dating of the 'patriarchal age', then the origins of these Hittites along with other population groups listed in the Table of Nations, extend back at least to the beginning of the second millennium.

But there is another group of biblical references to the Hittites which appears to be inconsistent with the picture so far presented. These references are contained in five passages (the translations are from the New International Version of the Bible):

1. Joshua 1:4 (*God to Joshua*): Your territory will extend from the desert to Lebanon, and from the great river, the Euphrates—all the Hittite country—to the Great Sea on the west [i.e. the Mediterranean].
2. Judges 1:26 (*after the death of Joshua*): He [i.e. the Canaanite who betrayed Bethel/Luz to the Hebrews] then went to the land of the Hittites, where he built a city and called it Luz, which is its name to this day.
3. 1 Kings 10:28–29 (1 Kings 10:29 = 2 Chron. 1:17): Solomon’s horses were imported from Egypt and from Kue—the royal merchants purchased them from Kue. They imported a chariot from Egypt for 600 shekels [c.7 kgs] of silver and a horse for 150. They also exported them to all the kings of the Hittites, and of the Aramaeans.
4. 2 Kings 7:6 (*time of the 9th-century prophet Elisha*): for the Lord has caused the Aramaeans to hear the sound of chariots and horses and a great army, so they said to one another, ‘Look, the king of Israel has hired the Hittite and the Egyptian kings to attack us!’
5. 1 Kings 11:1: King Solomon, however, loved many foreign women besides Pharaoh’s daughter—Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Sidonians, and Hittites.

The books from which these passages are taken cover major episodes in Israel’s traditional history as recorded by the biblical writers: from the story of Adam (Chronicles), to the account of the Israelite occupation of the Promised Land under Joshua (Joshua), to a narration of events following the death of Joshua up to the time of the so-called United Monarchy (Judges), to a description of later events spanning the period from the death of David and the accession of Solomon to the destruction of Jerusalem and the beginning of the Babylonian Exile (Kings). Though these books may have been based in part on earlier sources, all of them were composed some centuries after the episodes which they record allegedly took place. The book of Joshua has been dated to the 7th and 6th centuries; the stories in Judges to the late 7th century, and to the 6th century following the destruction of Jerusalem; the two books of Kings to the mid 6th century; and the two books of Chronicles to the 4th century.¹⁴ The biblical compositions are thus essentially compilations of traditions passed down to the writers from earlier generations.

In some cases, these traditions may have been continuously preserved in written sources, but many were no doubt kept alive through the process of oral transmission over several centuries or more. In this process, actual events from early Israelite history became mingled with folklore and legend, with each generation of transmitters adding their own particular spin on the stories passed on to them from their predecessors. The explicit propagandistic and didactic purposes underlying the biblical narratives inevitably had a major influence on how the traditions on which they drew were edited, adapted, and

augmented to suit what their authors saw as the political, spiritual, and moral imperatives of their day.

That brings us to the question of the identity of the Hittites referred to in the five passages above. Are they in any way linked with their Judaeian hill-country namesakes? In terms of biblical chronology, the time-frame to which they belong appears to have extended from the late 13th century (the time most favoured for the alleged Exodus), following the Israelites' arrival in Canaan and their conquest of the region under Joshua's leadership, through the reign of Solomon in the mid 10th century, to the age of the prophet Elisha in the second half of the 9th century. Passage 1, which places the Hittites at the beginning of this time-frame, also contains the Bible's clearest statement about the extent of Hittite territory. According to God's advice to Joshua, it stretched from the Euphrates (the 'great river') to the Mediterranean (the 'Great Sea on the west'), with Lebanon on the coast marking its southern limits; in effect, the land of the Hittites encompassed virtually the whole of northern Syria. This, of course, is quite inconsistent with the biblical references that depict the Hittites as merely one of a number of peoples inhabiting the hill-country of southern Palestine. But it accords reasonably well with references to the Land of Hatti in Neo-Assyrian sources—in particular, the inscription of Adad-nirari III which, as we have noted in Chapter 3, lists Hatti among the lands located between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean coast. It is just possible that Passage 1 preserves some memory of the Syrian component of the Late Bronze Age Hittite empire during the period when much of the region was under direct Hittite rule, particularly in the last two centuries of the Late Bronze Age. This would be compatible with a late 13th-century date for the biblical tradition of the Israelite occupation of Canaan. But it is more likely that the description in Joshua of the Hittite country's extent originated from sources dating to a later period—the period of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms.

Passage 2 contains the only other reference to a 'Land of the Hittites' in biblical sources. According to this passage, the Canaanite city called Bethel was betrayed by one of its inhabitants who went to the Hittite Land where he built a city and called it Luz, after the original name of the city which he had betrayed. Unfortunately, there is no historically attested place with which Luz can be firmly identified. Several possibilities have been suggested, of which the most plausible, perhaps, equates it with the Late Bronze Age city Lawazantiya, an important cult-centre located in the Land of Kizzuwadna to the north of the Amanus range. Alternatively, Luz might have been the Iron Age city Lusanda, conquered by Shalmaneser III during an Assyrian campaign in south-eastern Anatolia in 839 (*RIMA* 3: 55).¹⁵ But these are purely guesses. They add nothing of substance to our investigation of possible links between the historical and the biblical Hittites.

Passages 3 to 5 offer more promising material. All three of them appear to relate to the period of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, which had begun in the 12th

century with the rise of Carchemish in the wake of the fall of Hattusa. By the 11th century, and in some cases probably already in the 12th century, a number of other Neo-Hittite kingdoms were beginning to develop. Also, from the 11th century onwards, Aramaean states were emerging in Mesopotamia, Syria, and south-eastern Anatolia. (Those located west of the Euphrates, notably Bit-Agusi and Aram-Damascus, will be discussed in Chapter 8.) In the 9th century, Aramaeans had become a formidable enemy to Israel, to judge from Passage 4, which reports their belief that the Israelites had hired the kings of the Egyptians and the Hittites against them. The passage very likely refers to the period of the Omride dynasty whose members held sway over northern Israel through the middle decades of the 9th century. But its claim that Egyptian and Hittite kings became hirelings in the service of an Israelite king is clearly an exaggerated one¹⁶—an embellishment, perhaps, of a tradition in which Egyptian, Hittite, and Israelite kings formed a military alliance against a common enemy like the Aramaeans—or the Assyrians. Such alliances were a feature of the age, as illustrated by the participation of Ahab, second ruler of the Omride dynasty, in a military coalition which confronted and was defeated by Shalmaneser III in the battle at Qarqar on the Orontes river in 853. But it is not entirely inconceivable that mercenary arrangements underlay some of the alliances so formed, and that Hittite kings, if not also Egyptian kings, were involved in such arrangements—and were thus represented in biblical tradition as hirelings in the pay of Israel.

The picture of a plurality of kings of the Hittite lands, presented in Passages 3 and 4, is consistent with what we learn of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms from extra-biblical sources, particularly Neo-Assyrian texts. The Neo-Hittite states never formed a single united kingdom over which a supreme ruler held sway, though the first attested Neo-Hittite king, Kuzi-Teshub of Carchemish, may for a time have exercised some form of hegemonic role in the region. Of particular significance in Passage 4 is the ranking of the kings of the Hittites alongside those of Egypt. This passage has long provided an important basis for concluding that the Hittites thus referred to are to be distinguished from the Hittite hill-tribesmen of Palestine, that they had a formidable reputation as warriors in the Syro-Palestine region, and that their kings appear to have enjoyed a status similar to that of the pharaohs.

All this is based on the premise that Egypt really is named in Passages 3 and 4. Its identification in these passages has sometimes been questioned, particularly in 4 because of the reference to the plurality of kings. Throughout its recorded history, rule in Egypt was strictly monarchical (allowing for a number of co-regencies). Could it be that Egypt has been wrongly identified in this passage? 'Egypt' is a translation of the Hebrew *Mizraim*, which has generally been taken to refer to the land ruled by the pharaoh on the grounds that Mizri or Musri was the name by which Egypt was commonly known in the Near Eastern world, from at least the Late Bronze Age onwards. (Indeed,

the Egyptians today call their country Misr.) But there were two other countries called Musri in Iron Age sources. One of them was located in south-eastern Anatolia or northern Syria, the other east of the Tigris river. The latter is too remote for consideration here. But does the former have some claim to being the biblical Mizraim—at least in Passage 4?

In addressing this question, we should also take account of Passage 3, where the country called Mizraim in the original text appears together with Kue/ Qoah as a source of the horses Solomon bought and imported; he subsequently sold these animals to the Hittite and Aramaean kings. Kue/Qoah is generally equated with the Neo-Hittite kingdom called Que in Assyrian texts (Luwian Adanawa/Hiyawa). As we have seen, this country was located in the east of the region later called Cilicia, in the coastal area of south-eastern Anatolia. If we accept Kue's identification with Que, and set aside for the moment the generally assumed identification of Mizraim with Egypt, then it *might* be argued that Mizraim's mention in the same context as Kue indicates that it too lay somewhere in south-eastern Anatolia, or northern Syria. Can we provide a more specific location? Makinson has recently suggested identifying the 'western' country called Musri in extra-biblical sources with the Neo-Hittite state Masuwari (Til Barsip, modern Tell Ahmar),¹⁷ which lay on the east bank of the Euphrates, south-east of Carchemish.¹⁸ Could this be the Mizraim of Passage 3?

Possibly. But it need not follow that because the countries Kue/Qoah and Mizraim are mentioned together in this passage, they must have been located in the same general region, even if we allow that this region could have extended from Cilicia to the east bank of the Euphrates. The passage belongs within the context of the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon. The account of her visit is used to highlight Solomon's wealth and splendour, his riches allegedly surpassing those of all the other kings of the earth. Much of his wealth was apparently due to his kingdom's supposed centrality within an international trading network. The reference in Passage 3 to Israel's export of horses and war equipment to the Hittites and the Aramaeans, after importing such items from elsewhere, provides an example of this. But Solomon's trading links extended far beyond the Syrian region. 1 Kings 10:22 reports that once every three years his navy returned from expeditions conducted much further afield, bringing back with them gold, silver, and ivory, and apes and baboons (1 Kings 11:22). Some if not most of these items almost certainly reflect a tradition of trading with Egypt and the countries beyond. It is quite possible that Egypt supplied horses and military equipment to Israel, as well as more exotic products, during the 'Solomonic' and other periods, and that we see an instance of this activity in Passage 3. Far from indicating that Kue and Mizraim lay in the same general region, the references to them in Passage 3 are probably intended to illustrate how widespread Solomon's trading contacts were—from Anatolia in the north to the land of the Nile in the south.

On balance, the context and rhetorical nature of Passage 3 make it much more likely that Mizraim refers to Egypt than to a northern Syrian or eastern Anatolian state. So too in Passage 4, Mizraim is almost certainly to be identified with Egypt. The reference to a plurality of kings of the country can be seen as a kind of rhetorical flourish, balancing the plurality of the Hittite kings from the north. As Lipiński points out, this illustrates a stylistic device that occurs very often in ancient Near Eastern literature, ‘expressing totality by mentioning two opposites, here practically “the kings of the north” and “the kings of the south”’.¹⁹

In Passage 5, Solomon is credited with a number of wives of foreign origin, among whom the pharaoh’s daughter apparently took pride of place. The other wives included one or more Hittite women, probably daughters of kings. Marriages between royal families were a standard means of consolidating diplomatic alliances between Near Eastern rulers throughout the Bronze and Iron Ages. That Solomon should include a Hittite wife (or wives) in his matrimonial establishment may be taken as a further reflection of links, in this case diplomatic, between the Israelite and Neo-Hittite kingdoms. But we should stress that the information relating to Solomon’s reign is derived entirely from biblical sources. This famous Israelite king is not attested in any outside sources of Iron Age date. It is quite possible that the biblical figure was based on a 10th-century Israelite ruler who exercised sovereignty over some of his immediate neighbours and established commercial and diplomatic links with states further afield. But there is no historical basis for a kingdom of the size, wealth, and influence attributed to Solomon in biblical tradition. We might also comment here on the matter of Solomon’s marriage to a daughter of the pharaoh. Such a marriage would have contravened longstanding Egyptian tradition, according to which pharaohs never wed their daughters to foreign rulers—though foreign rulers frequently sent their daughters to Egypt to marry the pharaoh.

Irrespective of the historicity of an Israelite king called Solomon, the traditions about him, along with other early biblical traditions, very likely preserve a few vague memories of the Iron Age kingdoms of Hatti, and of the role these kingdoms played in the lands west of the Euphrates during the late second and early first millennia.

Tabal in biblical sources?

We have mentioned above the biblical references to the land of Kue/Quah in south-eastern Anatolia, and the likely assumption that this land can be identified with Que attested in historical sources. To the north of Que lay the kingdoms of Tabal. Frequent references are made in Old Testament sources to a man called Tubal, one of the sons of Japheth (Gen. 10:2; 1 Chron. 1:5), and a number of scholars believe that these references have some link with the Tabal region. Particular attention is drawn to the frequent

association of Tubal with Meshech, another of the sons of Japheth (Gen. 10:2, Ezek. 27:13; 32:26; 38:2–3; 39:1; 1 Chron. 1:5). This association is seen as a reflection of a political alliance between a people called the Mushki, who combined with the Phrygians in the 8th century (see Chapter 2), and the lands of Tabal.²⁰ But there is no evidential support for this. The linking of the traditions associated with the sons of Japheth with the region called Tabal in historical sources is a matter of pure conjecture.

Questions of connections

Most scholars agree that the biblical references to the Hittites can be divided into two categories: (a) those that refer to a tribal people living in the hill-country of Judah, pre-Israelite inhabitants of Canaan, whose ancestry, according to biblical tradition, dates back to the age of the Patriarchs; (b) those that refer to the inhabitants of the so-called Neo-Hittite kingdoms of northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia. Singer designates the members of these categories respectively as ‘inland’ and ‘outland’ Hittites.

This presents us with two basic questions: Were the groups connected? Was the inland group linked in any way with the Late Bronze Age Hittites, either directly or via the latter’s Neo-Hittite successors?

Before addressing these questions, I should once more stress that ‘Hittite’ as applied to the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti is a term taken over by modern scholars from biblical references to a people or peoples called Hittites who lived centuries after the fall of the ‘Hittite’ empire. The name was adopted in scholarship on the assumption that the biblical Hittites were the same as, or at least directly linked with, the inhabitants of the Land of Hatti attested in Late Bronze Age sources. The supposed biblical connection is clearly reflected in the term used in German for the Late Bronze Age Hittites—‘Hethiter’, which literally means ‘the Sons of Heth’, after the eponymous ancestor of the Hittites in Old Testament tradition. ‘Neo-Hittite’ is a term applied by modern scholars to a number of the states that developed in south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria during the Iron Age, on the grounds that these states were occupied, or at least ruled for a time, by successors of the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom.

With these points in mind, I suggest four possible alternative answers to the questions raised above:

1. The similarity of the biblical terms referring to the ‘Hittites’—*Het*, *ha-hittî*, *hitti* (singular form), *hittîm* (plural form), *hittiyot*—and the historically attested term ‘Hatti’ is purely coincidental. There is no connection between them, etymological or otherwise, and the modern term ‘Hittite’ as applied to the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti and its Iron Age successors is based on a false assumption.

2. The connection is a valid one, and the biblical name does in fact reflect population movements from Anatolia and northern Syria into Palestine at the end of the Bronze Age. At the time the biblical narratives were composed, perhaps from the early first millennium onwards, descendants of immigrants from the Late Bronze Age Land of Hatti in its broadest sense were living in the Palestine region. Other groups listed alongside the Hittites in the Table of Nations could have had a similar origin.
3. Though their names may have been etymologically linked, the biblical and the Anatolian Hittites were not otherwise connected, either ethnically or culturally. This is the preferred view of Singer.²¹ Underlying Singer's arguments is the assumption that the authors of the biblical compositions which refer to the Palestinian 'Hittites' lived in the 7th and 6th centuries. By this time, 'Hatti' had become a geographical term of very broad extension, covering the regions stretching from south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria through Syria-Palestine to the borders of Egypt. The term had by now completely lost its original ethnic and cultural significance. It was none the less retained by the biblical writers who applied it anachronistically to one of the tribal groups occupying the Judaeian hill-country in this period. Then, by a kind of backward extension, the writers used it in their description of the make-up of the 'Promised Land' from earliest times.
4. The biblical Hittites can in fact be identified with the Late Bronze Age Hittites, but not specifically with the Hittites living in Anatolia. This is the view of Collins, who believes that what the biblical authors had in mind were the peoples living in the Syrian regions over which the Late Bronze Age Hittite kings exercised sovereignty—peoples 'who did not qualify already as Canaanite or Amorite, whatever their individual ethnic affiliation might have been'.²² She suggests that while the Table of Nations may have been initially compiled during the period of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, the original compilation probably drew on oral traditions and/or annalistic records that commemorated the significant role the Hittites played in the region, especially in northern Palestine, at the end of the Bronze Age. She dates the 'entry' of the Hittites into Judah to the period after the disappearance of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms in the late 8th century. The patriarchal stories are not geographically or historically accurate accounts, but rather provide evidence of a shared literary patrimony.

Singer's and Collins's views are both cogently argued, and both make a number of valid points. In the absence of definitive evidence, it is difficult to choose between them. I would, however, like to add further to the points made by Collins. I suggest that we should not altogether write off the possibility that

there was an actual direct link between the two groups of biblical Hittites, closer than most scholars would concede. An important point about the Neo-Hittite kingdoms is that we really have no idea what ethnic elements made up their composition. ‘Neo-Hittite’ is merely a convenient modern label. It reflects the fact that a number of inscriptions from the period and the regions so called were written in Luwian hieroglyphs, the script and language used by Hittite kings for their public monuments, and that some of the material remains of places where the inscriptions have been found preserve Late Bronze Age Hittite cultural traditions. The term represented as ‘Hittite’ in Old Testament texts—specifically, the five texts listed above—could have been widely used as a general comprehensive designation for the peoples inhabiting the lands of Iron Age Hatti, irrespective of their ethnic origins. Already during the period of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms many of the inhabitants of these kingdoms may have had good Semitic names, and preserved ancestral traditions which were of Syrian or Palestinian rather than Anatolian origin.

The destruction of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms by the Assyrians in the late 8th century and the incorporation of the conquered regions into the Assyrian provincial system undoubtedly led to large population shifts. In accordance with standard Assyrian practice, many of the inhabitants of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms were deported for resettlement elsewhere in the Assyrian empire, others may have fled from Assyrian authority, seeking refuge in such places as the Judaeian hill-country. It is quite possible that the terms *ha-hitti*, *hitti*, *hittim*, *hittiyot* reflect the *earlier* homeland of these refugees, the Iron Age lands of Hatti in northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia. But these homelands were almost certainly multi-ethnic in their composition, with each population component preserving the language and the traditions of their forefathers, and taking these with them when they went south following the end of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. With such a scenario, it would be well-nigh impossible to identify, either in written or archaeological sources, specific ‘Hittite’ elements among the Hittites so called in the biblical texts.

We should thus reconsider whether the division of the biblical Hittites into two categories really does have any validity. The group of passages that refer to what Singer calls the ‘inland Hittites’ may well refer to remnant populations from the Neo-Hittite kingdoms who sought refuge in the hill-country of Judah after these kingdoms fell to the Assyrians. The group of five passages which I have dealt with above and which Singer assigns to the ‘outland Hittites’ refer not to specific peoples or persons called Hittites, but rather to the extent and location of Neo-Hittite territories and the roles played by their kings in their interactions with Israel, Egypt, and the Aramaeans. The two groups of references may be seen as complementary rather than conflicting. All biblical references to the Hittites could well be of direct relevance to a study of the Neo-Hittite world.

This page intentionally left blank

Part II

The Iron Age Kingdoms and Dynasties

This page intentionally left blank

Preface to Chapters 5–7

The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms and Dynasties

NOTE: These chapters provide a catalogue of all the known Neo-Hittite rulers and the kingdoms to which they belonged. They are intended as a reference source, for consultation by readers as the need arises, rather than as a historical narrative to be read from beginning to end.¹ A summary list of all the kings dealt with appears in Appendix II. For the transliteration of the hieroglyphic names, see Appendix I.

We are now at the point where we can discuss in some detail each of the states comprising the Neo-Hittite world and the dynasties and individual rulers who held sway over them. But it will be useful, first, to review the general conclusions we have reached about the kingdoms to which the term ‘Neo-Hittite’ has been applied, expanding on the four basic characteristics of these kingdoms which I listed at the beginning of Chapter 3.

In brief:

1. ‘Neo-Hittite’ is a modern concept, applied by scholars to a number of states which emerged in south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria during the Iron Age. The period covered by these states extended from the 12th to the end of the 8th century BC.
2. They are called ‘Neo-Hittite’ partly because they preserved a number of the cultural traditions of the Late Bronze Age kingdom of the Hittites.
3. Many of them lay in the region called Hatti in Iron Age Assyrian, Urartian, and Hebrew sources. Broadly speaking, Iron Age Hatti covered the south-eastern territories of the former Hittite empire—Late Bronze Age Hatti—which were located between the Euphrates river and the anti-Taurus ranges and extended southwards through Syria to the northern frontiers of Damascus. The earliest and most important of these states was the kingdom of Carchemish, whose first Neo-Hittite ruler Kuzi-Teshub was the son of the last-known Hittite viceroy of Carchemish.
4. West of the anti-Taurus, in south-central Anatolia, was another group of Neo-Hittite states in the region called Tabal in Iron Age texts. South of Tabal, along the Mediterranean coast, were two kingdoms known as Adanawa (Hiyawa, Que) and Hilakku, in the region of later Cilicia.

5. A prime reason for the Neo-Hittite label is that in almost all the states so named inscriptions in the Luwian hieroglyphic script and language have been discovered. Luwian had very likely become the most widely spoken language of the Hittite empire in the last two centuries of the Late Bronze Age.
6. Many scholars believe that migrations of large numbers of refugees, particularly Luwian-speakers, from Anatolia to Syria at the end of the Late Bronze Age provided the genesis of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. Luwian apparently became the official language of these kingdoms.
7. I have suggested, however, that Luwian-speaking groups may already have settled in areas of Syria, later occupied by Neo-Hittite kingdoms, during the last two centuries of the Late Bronze Age, within the context of political, administrative, and strategic arrangements made for the region by Hittite kings from Suppiluliuma I onwards.
8. In any case, the inhabitants of the kingdoms were almost certainly a mixture of many ethnic elements, including native Syrians, Luwians, and Aramaeans.
9. We do not know how widely spoken Luwian was in these kingdoms. In some, it may have been essentially a chancery language, preserved because of its traditional associations with royalty; hence its use for public monuments commissioned by the Neo-Hittite rulers and other elite members of the local society and administration. We do not know how many of the rulers could actually speak the language used on their inscriptions, or at least spoke it as their first language.
10. In addition to the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, the Iron Age land of Hatti contained several Aramaean states, notably Sam'al and Bit-Agusi (Arpad). These often closely interacted with their Neo-Hittite neighbours, sometimes as enemies, sometimes as allies. Rulers of Aramaean origin also established themselves in a number of Neo-Hittite states, as successors to earlier generations of rulers. The term 'Syro-Hittite' is sometimes used to indicate the blending of Hittite and Aramaean elements in these states. Further south in Syria lay the Aramaean kingdom of Damascus. It also became directly involved in political, military, and commercial dealings with the Neo-Hittite world.

The Neo-Hittite states varied considerably in size, from a few to several hundred square kilometres. The smaller Tabalian kingdoms are examples of the former, Hamath and Bit-Burutash of the latter. The focus of each state was an administrative centre where the royal seat was located. Peripheral areas within the kingdom's frontiers typically contained a number of communities

called ‘cities’ in the texts, the majority of which could have been no more than small villages. But the larger kingdoms must have contained, in addition to the capital, one or more relatively large settlements or cities, the centres probably of regional sub-kingdoms, over each of which a local ruler presided. Regional administrations under local rulers appear to be attested within the kingdoms of Carchemish and Adanawa, for example, at certain periods in their history. The local man was subordinate and directly answerable to the occupant of the royal seat in the kingdom’s capital. But he may have been allowed a fair amount of freedom in administering the day-to-day affairs of his own region.

Though never united politically, the Neo-Hittite kingdoms sometimes formed military coalitions, along with other states in their region, against a common enemy. They would not have thought of themselves as having a common identity which distinguished them from other contemporary states. Nevertheless, they did share a number of distinctive characteristics, which provides some justification for grouping them together and giving them a label of their own. We shall now investigate each of the states making up this group, beginning with the earliest and most important of them. In most cases, we do not know how they came into existence. But many of them may well have been founded by dynasties whose origins extended back to the Hittite empire and were connected with, if not actually descended from, the royal line of Late Bronze Age Hatti.

In my outlines of the individual Neo-Hittite kingdoms (Chapters 5–7), I have used the following conventions:

PN	personal name
(PN)	not explicitly attested as a king
‘PN’	appointed as nominal ruler
↓	succeeded by
(↓)	non-royal succession; i.e. either the first or the second of the persons thus linked is not attested as a ruler of the kingdom.
—	a gap in the succession, occupied by one or more unknown rulers.
—?	a possible gap in the succession.
↔?	possible simultaneous rule
=?	possibly to be identified with
— before date	unknown starting-point of reign
— after date	unknown end-point of reign

When the sources for Neo-Hittite kings attested in hieroglyphic texts are cited, each citation is prefixed with a *CHLI* designation (*Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*). For ease of consultation, I have individually numbered the *CHLI* citations. The relevant page numbers in *CHLI* are appended in parentheses at the end of each reference. Citations of Neo-Hittite kings in

other sources (e.g. the Neo-Assyrian *RIMA* series) are given a collective number.

Thus the citations for Suppiluliuma, king of Kummuh are:

- (1) *CHLI* I: VI.1–2. BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2 (334–40);
- (2) *CHLI* I: VI.16. ANCOZ 7 (356–7);
- (3) *CHLI* I: VI.9. ANCOZ 5 (349–50);
- (4) *CHLI* I: VI.7–8. ANCOZ 3 and 4 (348–9);
- (5) *RIMA* 3: 205, 240.

Titles are appended to the names of the various rulers when these titles are attested in the hieroglyphic inscriptions.

Assyrian versions of Neo-Hittite place-names and personal names differ in varying degrees from their Neo-Hittite forms: e.g. Assyrian Melid = Malatya, Sapalulme and Ushpilulume = Suppiluliuma, Qatazili = Hattusili, Mutallu = Muwatalli. In these cases, the Assyrian and Neo-Hittite names are clearly of the same origin. There are, however, a few cases where the Assyrian and Neo-Hittite forms are quite different: e.g. the land attested as Que in Assyrian texts is called Adanawa (sometimes Hiyawa) in Neo-Hittite texts, Unqi is the Assyrian name for the Neo-Hittite kingdom Pat(t)in. In the discussions which follow, I have used Hittite/Neo-Hittite rather than Assyrian forms of names when dealing with the places and persons so identified (sometimes appending the Assyrian name in parentheses). That applies even when an Assyrian form is the only attested one—when it is clear what the original name must have been. For example, there is no doubt that Assyrian ‘Sapalulme’ and ‘Ushpilulume’ both represent Suppiluliuma. But there are many cases where the names of Neo-Hittite kings are attested only in Assyrian records, and we have no idea what their Neo-Hittite names were (e.g. Lalli, Sulumal, Tarhulara). In these cases, the Assyrian form of the name is obviously the only one we can use, though we should do so on the understanding that the original name may have differed significantly, or completely, from the Assyrian-attested version of it.

The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in the Euphrates Region

Carchemish

Carchemish (Karkamish, modern Jerablus) is located on the Upper Euphrates river near Turkey's border with Syria. In written records, it first appears among the cities subject to the king of Ebla at the end of the third millennium, and is subsequently mentioned in the 18th-century archives of the middle Euphrates city Mari; at this time, it was ruled by a local dynasty who traded with Mari. Later, Carchemish became a subject-state of Aleppo, capital of the kingdom of Yamhad, and after the final Hittite conquest of this kingdom in the early 16th century, it was incorporated into the Hurrian kingdom of Mitanni. It remained under Mitannian control until Suppiluliuma I captured it in 1327. Henceforth, it became a viceregal seat of the Hittite empire, under the immediate authority of a member of the Hittite royal family, a status which it retained until the end of the Hittite empire.

We have noted that the city appears to have escaped the devastations associated with the Sea Peoples' movements in the early 12th century, despite Ramesses III's claim to the contrary (*ARE IV*: §§65–6, *ANET* 262). Indeed at Carchemish a branch of the Hittite royal family continued to hold power for perhaps several generations after the disappearance of the central dynasty at Hattusa. Kuzi-Teshub, the first of the Neo-Hittite kings of Carchemish, was the son of the kingdom's last known viceroy, Talmi-Teshub. He assumed the title 'Great King', in effect proclaiming himself the heir of the last of the Great Kings of Hatti. But the kingdom over which he held sway extended through only part of the eastern territories formerly ruled by these Great Kings—along the west bank of the Euphrates from Malatya in the north to Emar in the south. And his kingdom soon fragmented, perhaps even in his own lifetime, into a number of small principalities, like Malatya where his grandsons later ruled, and Kummuh.

Like its fellow Neo-Hittite states and other Syrian principalities, Carchemish became a victim of Assyrian military enterprises in the west. Already in the late

12th century, its ruler Ini-Teshub was forced to pay tribute to the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I (*RIMA* 2: 37, 42; cf. *RIMA* 2: 23).¹ So too in the 9th century, the Carchemishian king Sangara became a tributary of Ashurnasirpal II (c.870) (*RIMA* 2: 217). Sangara later joined a military coalition that confronted Ashurnasirpal's son and successor Shalmaneser III several times during his campaigns west of the Euphrates. But the coalition was defeated on each occasion, and Assyrian tributary status was reimposed on Sangara and the other western leaders.

We hear nothing further of Carchemish from Assyrian records for almost a century. In the interval, Luwian inscriptions attest three rulers, Astiruwa, Yariri, and Kamani, under whose regimes Carchemish appears to have flourished, as an independent state. But in 743, Assyrian control over the kingdom and other regions west of the Euphrates was reasserted by a formidable new Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser III. Following his victory over a coalition of forces led by Urartu and Arpad in 743, Tiglath-pileser imposed or re-imposed tributary status on Carchemish's last-known king, Pisiri (*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9). The latter remained on his throne until 717, when he was deposed by Sargon II for allegedly plotting with the Phrygian ruler Mita (Greek Midas). Henceforth, Carchemish became a province ruled by an Assyrian governor.

The city was later to provide, in 612–610, a base of operations for an army of Assyria's Egyptian allies, led by the pharaoh Necho II, against a Median–Babylonian alliance. In a battle fought at Carchemish in 605, the Babylonian crown prince Nebuchadnezzar inflicted a resounding defeat upon Necho's troops (*CS* I: 467–8). Carchemish was henceforth abandoned. It was partly reoccupied in the Hellenistic period, under the name Europos.

The Kings of Carchemish: the 'Ku(n)zi-Teshub Dynasty'

I should stress at the outset that we have no direct evidence that the rulers listed below belonged to the same dynastic line. Their grouping together reflects the likelihood that all were kings of Carchemish, related or not, who reigned in the period extending from the mid 12th century to the late 11th or early 10th century, and most or all of them bore the title 'Great King'.

Ku(n)zi-Teshub

(early–mid 12th cent.) son of Talmi-Teshub; 'King', 'Great King', 'Hero' (*Jas.* 12–13).

(1) Sürenhagen (1986: 183–90);²

(2) *CHLI* I: V.2. GÜRÜN (295–9);

(3) *CHLI* I: V.3. KÖTÜKALE (300–1);

(4) *CHLI* I: V.4. İSPEKÇÜR (301–4).

Kuzi-Teshub was the earliest of the Neo-Hittite kings whose royal seat was located in Carchemish. But none of the inscriptions which refer to him

actually come from Carchemish. He is first attested in two sealings impressed on *bullae*³ discovered at the site of Lidar Höyük, which lay on the east bank of the Euphrates approximately halfway between Carchemish and Malatya. The inscription as translated by J. D. Hawkins (1988: 100) reads: '(King) Kuzi-Teshub, King of the Land of Karkamish, the son (of) (King) Talmi-Teshub, King of the Land of Karkamish, recognized by the god(s).' As we have noted, Kuzi-Teshub's father Talmi-Teshub, the great-great-grandson of Suppiluliuma I, was the last attested viceroy of Carchemish before the collapse of the Hittite empire. But it is possible that Kuzi-Teshub succeeded his father in this post before the fall of the empire. In the seal impressions, he is identified simply as 'King', not by the title 'Great King'—which may indicate that his initial appointment at Carchemish was as a viceroy during the reign of the last Hittite Great King. The discovery of his seal impressions at Lidar Höyük very likely indicates that this settlement (ancient name unknown) lay within the authority of the Carchemish regime.

The title 'Great King' is accorded to Kuzi-Teshub in the inscriptions of his grandsons Runtiya and Arnuwanti (I), the rulers, probably in succession, of the land of Malatya. This exalted title was almost certainly adopted by Kuzi-Teshub after the royal line at Hattusa had come to an end. By default, he now assumed the mantle of Great Kingship of Hatti. He may thus have been the last of the Hittite viceroys at Carchemish as well as the first of a line of Neo-Hittite Great Kings there.

—?

Ir-Teshub?

(later 12th cent.) 'Great King'.

CHLI I: V.VI. KARAHÖYÜK (288–95).

Excavations conducted in 1947 by T. and N. Özgüç on the site of Karahöyük, which lies in south-central Anatolia near Elbistan, brought to light the remains of a settlement with both Late Bronze Age and Iron Age phases. In the Late Bronze Age, it must have belonged to one of the eastern subject territories of the Hittite empire. But its name at that time is unknown. During the excavations, a stele was discovered bearing a hieroglyphic inscription. On palaeographic grounds the inscription has been dated to the 12th century,⁴ thus making it one of our earliest known Iron Age hieroglyphic texts. The stele, now housed in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara, was set up by a man called Armanani to mark the occasion of a visit to the land represented in transliteration as POCULUM (see Appendix I) by a Great King called Ir-Teshub. Armanani informs us that Ir-Teshub set about repopulating and redeveloping the land, after finding its (main) city in a derelict state, and handed over to Armanani control of three other cities within it. Armanani was presumably one of his officials.

How do we fit this information into the context of what we know about the early Iron Age—the decades immediately following the fall of the Hittite empire? And where does Ir-Teshub belong within this context? The statement that he was visiting POCULUM-land must mean that he came from somewhere else. From where? The titulature ‘Great King’ indicates his importance, and it is possible that he was one of the early rulers of Carchemish. Indeed from the dating of the inscription, he might have been the successor of Kuzi-Teshub. As we shall see, at least two other early Iron Age occupants of Carchemish’s throne were also called Great Kings—x-pa-ziti and Ura-Tarhunza. Their reigns have been dated to the 11th or the 10th century, and they were therefore later than Ir-Teshub. Some time after Ura-Tarhunza’s reign, the title ‘Great King’ ceased to be used, perhaps immediately after. But up to this time, all kings of Carchemish may well have borne the title—probably reflecting Carchemish’s dominance of the northern Syrian region through the period. A 12th-century Great King of Carchemish called Ir-Teshub would fit well into this scheme.

The scenario might have been as follows: Ir-Teshub, one of Kuzi-Teshub’s successors, perhaps one of his sons, took on or continued the task of reconstructing the eastern territories that formerly belonged to the Hittite empire, by rebuilding and repopulating cities in the region. The Karahöyük stele provides one instance of this undertaking. It may have been part of a broader project to redevelop the Malatya region, where a kingdom was established under the rule of members of Kuzi-Teshub’s direct family line. We know this from the inscriptions of two kings of Malatya, Runtiya and Arnuwanti, who identified themselves as the grandsons of Kuzi-Teshub. But if Ir-Teshub was in fact a son of Kuzi-Teshub, the Malatya kings cannot have been *his* sons, since they identify themselves in their inscriptions as the sons of PUGNUS-mili. They may thus represent a collateral line of the royal family line which was established in Malatya, perhaps by Kuzi-Teshub, perhaps by Ir-Teshub if the latter was Kuzi-Teshub’s son and successor. Ir-Teshub would thus have been the uncle of Runtiya and Arnuwanti, and may have been responsible for establishing a branch of his family as the ruling dynasty in Malatya. The land of POCULUM may then have been incorporated into the kingdom of Malatya, initially as a sub-kingdom under the authority of the Great King of Carchemish.

But there is an alternative scenario. Hawkins believes that the inscription reflects an epigraphic style that derives from the Tarhuntassa rather than the Carchemish tradition.⁵ This would imply that the kingdom of Tarhuntassa survived the fall of the Hittite kingdom and continued for at least a brief period into the early Iron Age. I have suggested in Chapter 1 that the last kings of Tarhuntassa assumed the title ‘Great King’ in opposition to and in defiance of the last ‘Great Kings’ who sat upon the throne of Hattusa. It could be that Ir-Teshub, if he were in fact king of Tarhuntassa, moved to fill the power

vacuum in the Malatya region left by the fall of the Hattusa regime by staking a claim to the territories in the region and repopulating them. This may have led to conflict with the Carchemish regime which sought to expand its own territories north to Malatya. If there were such a contest, then the Carchemish regime must eventually have won it, since it apparently succeeded in imposing its control over Malatya and establishing members of its own dynasty there. But this remains speculative. We have no other indication that the rival branch of the royal family which occupied the throne of Tarhuntassa in the final decades of the Late Bronze Age did in fact survive into the early Iron Age. The likelihood is that it too became defunct around the time the Hittite empire fell.

—?

Ini-Teshub?

(late 12th–early 11th cent.) ‘King of Hatti’.

RIMA 2: 37, 42.

In the records of a campaign which he conducted into Syria, the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I (1114–1076) refers on two occasions to a king of Hatti called Ini-Teshub. He reports that after conquering the land of Amurru and receiving tribute from Byblos, Sidon, and Arwad, he imposed his sovereignty, on his homeward journey, over ‘the entire land Hatti’ and made Ini-Teshub his tributary. Both references are clearly to the same campaign. The first occurs in the context of one of the Assyrian king’s annalistic records (*RIMA* 2: 37), the second in a summary account of his military achievements throughout his reign (*RIMA* 2: 42). As we noted in Chapter 3, ‘Hatti’ in these contexts is almost certainly to be equated with the kingdom of Carchemish. If so, then Ini-Teshub can probably be included in the royal ‘dynasty’ established by Kuzi-Teshub which ruled Carchemish for at least two centuries. He would thus have been the second known person of this name to hold regal authority in the kingdom.⁶ The fact that he was a contemporary of Tiglath-pileser indicates a late 12th–early 11th-century date for his reign. Using this synchronism, I suggest inserting him in the ruling dynasty at Carchemish as a successor of Ir-Teshub, and a predecessor of the rulers x-pa-ziti and Ura-Tarhunza (discussed below), to whom Hawkins has assigned an 11th- or 10th-century date. Ini-Teshub may have adopted the title ‘Great King’ following the tradition established by Kuzi-Teshub and continued by Ini-Teshub’s successors until the end of this ‘first dynasty’ at Carchemish. Understandably, Tiglath-pileser referred to him only as a king. From the Assyrian point of view, he was no more than a tributary, certainly not a Great King.

—?

Tudhaliya?

(probably 11th or 10th cent.) ‘Great King’, ‘Hero’.

CHLI I: II.2. KARKAMIŠ A 16c (82)

In the lower palace area of Carchemish, L. Woolley discovered a broken stele, with small fragments of an inscription. From what survives of the inscription, it is clearly that of a Great King of Carchemish. The author’s name is uncertain, but is possibly to be read Tudhaliya. This is suggested by Hawkins, who notes a resemblance between the stele and that of Ura-Tarhunza, referred to below. Hence an 11th- or 10th-century date for the supposed Tudhaliya.⁷ If he was in fact a Great King of Carchemish, Tudhaliya should probably be inserted in the King List before Ura-Tarhunza and his father x-pa-ziti, both attested as Great Kings, since as we shall see, Ura-Tarhunza appears to have been the last of the Carchemishean rulers to bear this title.

—?

x-pa-ziti

(probably later 11th or 10th cent.) father of Ura-Tarhunza; ‘Great King’, ‘Hero’.

CHLI I: II.1. KARKAMIŠ A 4b (80–2).

↓

Ura-Tarhunza

(probably later 11th or 10th cent.) son; ‘Great King’, ‘Hero’.

CHLI I: II.1. KARKAMIŠ A 4b (80–2).

—?

The discovery of an inscribed stele in the courtyard of the temple of the Storm God in Carchemish has provided us with evidence of two more Great Kings of Carchemish, a father and a son. Both are accorded the titles ‘Great King, Hero’ in the inscription. The son is the subject of the inscription, whose name MAGNUS TONITRUS is read as Ura-Tarhunza.⁸ x-pa-ziti is all that can be made of the father’s name. The inscription commemorates a military victory by Ura-Tarhunza over an army from another land (read ‘Sura(?)’ by Hawkins). It was composed by a certain Arnu- . . . who identifies himself as a priest of the goddess Kubaba and the son of a ruler called Suhi. As we shall see, Suhi was the name of the founder of a ‘second dynasty’ at Carchemish. Is he to be identified with the ruler so named in this inscription? And if so, why does his son commemorate a military achievement of a king who belonged, apparently, to an earlier dynasty?

These questions bring us to the next attested ruling line in Carchemish.

The Kings of Carchemish: the Suhi Dynasty

Genealogical information provided by three hieroglyphic inscriptions enables us to construct a second dynasty that ruled in Carchemish, beginning with a man called Suhi and consisting of four successive kings. Two of these inscriptions came to light in Carchemish. The first was authored by a certain Astuwatamanza, who bears the title 'Country-Lord of Carchemish', and names Suhi, 'Ruler of Carchemish' as his father. The subject of the second is a certain Katuwa, titled 'Ruler and Country-Lord', who names himself the son of (what must be) a second Suhi, and the grandson of Astuwatamanza. The third inscription was discovered on a broken stele near the village of Kelekli, located on the west bank of the Euphrates a few kilometres north of Carchemish. Its author Suhi can be identified as the second Suhi, for the Astuwatamanza to whom he refers was his father⁹ and the son of Suhi I. From the above information, we can reconstruct the second dynastic line at Carchemish thus: Suhi I → Astuwatamanza → Suhi II → Katuwa.

The succession was that of father to son in each case, so that the dynasty, or at least that part that is known to us, probably extended over a period of 100 to 125 years. Stylistic analysis of the sculptures associated with the inscriptions points to a 10th-century date for the dynasty, possibly extending into the early 9th century. It thus preceded the period in Carchemish's history for which we have historical data from Neo-Assyrian texts; these begin with the records of Ashurnasirpal II (883–859).

Were the Kuzi-Teshub and the Suhi dynasties in any way linked? Two or possibly three inscriptions of members of the latter may indicate that some form of connection did exist. As we have noted, the priest whose name begins Arnu-, son of a ruler called Suhi, erected a stele in Carchemish to commemorate a military victory by Ura-Tarhunza, Great King, over an enemy from another land. The Suhi in question was very likely the first member of the Suhi dynasty. How do we explain the commemoration by one of his sons of the exploits of a member of what was apparently the preceding dynasty? It is most unlikely that Ura-Tarhunza and Suhi I were rulers of Carchemish at the same time. There is, however, a possibility that Suhi was, initially, a local ruler within the Carchemish kingdom under the Great King's overlordship, and eventually replaced him on the throne of Carchemish.

In any case, Ura-Tarhunza was apparently the last ruler of Carchemish to use the title 'Great King'. Later kings used a lesser title—'Ruler' or 'Country-Lord', or both. This probably reflects political reality. By the time the 'Kuzi-Teshub dynasty' had come to an end, the 'Great King' title was no longer appropriate for the ruler of Carchemish—and indeed had probably long exceeded its use-by date. The kingdom that may once have controlled a large area of northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia in the wake of the Hittite empire's collapse had now become but one of a number of small states in the region, each of which

had its own ruler, and none of which could claim sovereignty over the others. It may be that the transition from the earlier line of Great Kings of Carchemish to the new line of Rulers and Country-Lords was a peaceful one. Indeed, it is possible that Suhi I's accession to the throne of Carchemish was prepared for him by the last of the Great Kings—perhaps Ura-Tarhunza. Suhi may have been one of Ura-Tarhunza's chief officials and protégés or, as we have suggested, a subordinate local ruler within the kingdom.

But there is no indication of any family link. And even if the transition of power in Carchemish from Ura-Tarhunza to the Suhi dynasty had been a peaceful one, conflict subsequently broke out between the families. Suhi I's great-grandson Katuwa reports taking a city away by force from Ura-Tarhunza's 'grandsons'—probably here 'descendants'. The context for this event is obscure. It may be that even if the Suhi dynasty had come to power by peaceful means, there were disaffected members of the former line who sought to regain the throne of Carchemish, and may have seized a number of towns within the Carchemish region as part of their bid to do so.

We shall now look in more detail at the individual members of the Suhi dynasty.

Suhi I

(probably 10th cent.) 'Ruler' (IUDEX) (*Jas.* 24)

- (1) *CHLI* I: II.4. KARKAMIŠ A 14*b* (83–7);
- (2) *CHLI* I: II.1. KARKAMIŠ A 4*b* (80–2)

This man is the earliest-known member of his dynasty. Though none of the surviving inscriptions can be assigned with any certainty to his authorship, he is attested twice in the inscriptions of his successors. KARKAMIŠ A 14*b* was authored by Astuwatamanza, who names Suhi as his father. And as we have noted, Suhi is also named as ruler of Carchemish in an inscription by another of his sons, a priest Arnu-, who commemorates a military achievement of the Great King Ura-Tarhunza (KARKAMIŠ A 4*b*). It is possible that the stele on which this inscription appears was set up after Ura-Tarhunza had died and Suhi had succeeded to the throne. Its author was paying homage, perhaps retrospectively, to the man who may have paved the way for his father's succession and the beginning of a new dynastic line.

↓

Astuwatamanza

(probably 10th cent.) son; 'Country-Lord' (*Jas.* 24–5)

- (1) *CHLI* I: II.4. KARKAMIŠ A 14*b* (85–7);
- (2) *CHLI* II.11+12. KARKAMIŠ A 11*b+c* (103–8).

The two surviving inscriptions which refer to Astuwatamanza provide us with little more than information about his place in his family's dynasty. The first, authored by him, names him son of Suhi (I), the second names him the grandfather of the inscription's author Katuwa.

↓

Suhi II

(probably 10th cent.) son; 'Ruler', 'Country-Lord' (*Jas.* 25–7)

- (1) *CHLI* I: II.5. KARKAMIŠ A 14a (85–7);¹⁰
- (2) *CHLI* I: II.6. KARKAMIŠ A 1a (87–91);
- (3) *CHLI* I: II.7. KARKAMIŠ A 1b (91–2);
- (4) *CHLI* I: II.8. KELEKLĪ (92–3);
- (5) *CHLI* I: II.11+12. KARKAMIŠ A 11b+c (101–8).

Though Suhi II is attested in a number of hieroglyphic inscriptions, most of these tell us little about their subject, beyond his place in the dynastic line. KARKAMIŠ A 1a (no. 2) is the most informative. It contains the remains of a six-line text carved on an orthostat,¹¹ which forms part of the Long Wall of Sculpture at Carchemish. Though primarily a building inscription, it also contains a record of the author's military exploits. Suhi refers to the destruction of a city called Alatahana, and makes reference to another city Hazauna. Neither city is known from other sources, and nothing is known of the context in which these references occur. The inscription also contains a reference to Suhi's wife, read as BONUS-ti, who appears in another inscription (dedicated to her), carved on one of the sculptured orthostats from the city (no. 3).

The KELEKLĪ inscription (no. 4), of which Suhi was the author, has attracted some interest because of the reference it contains to a forthcoming marriage between Suhi's daughter and a king called Tudhaliya. It has been suggested that this king is to be identified with the Great King of Carchemish whose name has been tentatively restored as Tudhaliya on KARKAMIŠ A 16c.¹² But the identification poses a number of problems, not least of which is the chronological gap of several generations which separates Suhi II from the last of the known Great Kings of Carchemish. This in itself would clearly exclude an identification between a supposed Great King called Tudhaliya, dated to the 11th or early 10th century, and a king of the same name who was to wed the daughter of Suhi II. As we have seen, Neo-Hittite rulers frequently adopted the names of the Late Bronze Age kings of Hatti, and more than one of these rulers may have been called Tudhaliya. Very likely, the one so identified in the KELEKLĪ inscription was a king of Malatya or Kummuh or another Neo-Hittite state independent of Carchemish.¹³ The marriage alliance referred to by Suhi was no doubt intended to consolidate relations between it and Carchemish.

↓

Katuwa

(probably 10th or early 9th cent.) son; ‘Ruler’, ‘Country-Lord’ (*Jas.* 27–31)

- (1) *CHLI* I: II.9. KARKAMIŠ A 11a (94–5);
- (2) *CHLI* I: II.11+12. KARKAMIŠ A 11b+c (101–8);
- (3) *CHLI* I: II.13+14. KARKAMIŠ A 2+3 (108–12);
- (4) *CHLI* I: II.15. KARKAMIŠ A 12 (113–14);
- (5) *CHLI* I: II.16. KARKAMIŠ A 13d (115–16);
- (6) *CHLI* I: II.19. KARKAMIŠ A 20a1 (118–21);
- (7) *CHLI* I: II.20. KARKAMIŠ A 25a (121–2).

Katuwa, the last of the known rulers of the Suhi dynasty, is also the best attested of them. For the most part, his inscriptions are carved on sculptured orthostat slabs and record the king’s building achievements, including his construction of temples and of upper floors of buildings as women’s quarters, his embellishment of ancestral gates, and in some cases his military exploits. Unfortunately, the context in which the last of these occurred is generally too fragmentary or the details too vague to be of much use for the purposes of historical reconstruction. The campaigns of which Katuwa speaks, including, apparently, some undertaken against rebel subjects, were probably typical of the military operations in which all members of his dynasty engaged from time to time, in order to maintain their control over the various towns and regions which lay within their kingdom and to defend the kingdom against outside forces. One inscription of particular interest from a historical point of view refers to the king’s action against the ‘grandsons of Ura-Tarhunza’ (no. 2 §§4, 30, pp. 103, 104). I have suggested that this inscription reflects ongoing challenges to the current regime at Carchemish by descendants of the previous regime. A few cities are mentioned by name among Katuwa’s conquests: for example, Sapsi on the Euphrates and the fortified settlement of Awayana which appear in an inscription on a basalt stele that records the king’s military achievements and acts of piety (no. 4). But the lack of any reference to these cities in other texts makes it impossible for us to assess how significant Katuwa’s conquests were, or how far his campaigns took him—whether to the frontiers of his kingdom or beyond it.

The image which the king presents of himself as a great restorer who built or rebuilt settlements in devastated areas, bringing prosperity to his whole land, is one to which a number of his fellow Neo-Hittite kings laid claim. But there is no doubt that during the period of the Suhi dynasty, and particularly in the reigns of Suhi II and Katuwa, Carchemish attained a high level of cultural development, as reflected in the sculpted façades of the public buildings of the age.

—?



Fig. 6. Inscription of Katuwa, 10th- or early 9th-century king of Carchemish (courtesy, British Museum).

Sangara

(— c.870–848 —) (*Pros.* 3/I 1088–9)

RIMA 2: 217; 3: 9–10, 16–17, 23, 37, 38.

The name and exploits of Sangara, the next known ruler of Carchemish, are provided by records of the Assyrian king Ashurnasirpal II and his son and successor Shalmaneser III. Sangara is the Assyrian form of his name. The Luwian form is unknown, and so far no hieroglyphic texts that can be attributed to this king have come to light. His reign must have begun not long after that of Katuwa had ended. But we do not know whether he succeeded Katuwa, or was indeed a member of his dynasty. He is first attested as a tributary of Ashurnasirpal (*RIMA* 2: 217). Subsequently, he joined the military coalition of kings from south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria that confronted Shalmaneser on his first campaign west of the Euphrates in 858, and thereafter on a number of occasions during the next ten years until Shalmaneser's devastating attacks on his cities in 849 and 848.

—?

The Kings of Carchemish: the Astiruwa Dynasty

Following the last appearance of Sangara in 848, there is no further reference to Carchemish in Assyrian records up to the time of its last king, called Pisiri in these records. But in the intervening period, hieroglyphic inscriptions provide information about another line of Carchemishian rulers, the first of whom probably came to the throne in the late 9th century. His name is Astiruwa.¹⁴ We do not know whether he was in any way connected with Sangara. The gap between the latter's death and Astiruwa's accession is also unknown, but the likelihood is that it was occupied by two or more kings of Carchemish—who may or may not have been earlier members of Astiruwa's dynasty. The dynasty lasted into the second half of the 8th century. There is no indication that its members were in any way subject to Assyria or indeed had any dealings with it—with one possible exception, discussed below. Hawkins notes that the House of Astiruwa still adhered to the dynastic title 'Country-Lord', but began to adopt archaic titles, like 'Hero', which had 'grandiose and Empire pretensions, representing the revival of archaic claims'.¹⁵

—?

Astiruwa

(end 9th cent.–beginning 8th cent.) 'Country-Lord', 'Hero', 'King' (*Jas.* 32–3)

- (1) *CHLI* I: II.24. KARKAMIŠ A 15*b* (130–3);
- (2) *CHLI* I: II.22. KARKAMIŠ A 6 (124–8);
- (3) *CHLI* I: II.40. KÖRKÜN (171–5);
- (4) *CHLI* I: II.35. KARKAMIŠ A 27*e* (165–6).

None of Astiruwa's own inscriptions survive, but he is referred to in four of those authored by his successors (once implicitly). The first reference to him is contained in an inscription of Yariri, the man who followed him on the throne. In this inscription, Yariri makes mention of the children of his lord Astiruwa (no. 1 §17, p. 131). An implicit reference to Astiruwa also occurs in another of Yariri's inscriptions, which calls Astiruwa's eldest son Kamani 'my lord's child' (no. 2 §8, p. 124). In the other two inscriptions Astiruwa's name is represented as Astiru. The first of these (no. 3) is authored by one of the king's servants, who refers to what Hawkins translates as *craft*-houses built by Astiru (§4, p. 172). In the second (no. 4), the author, probably Kamani, refers to himself as 'the Hero Astiru's son'.¹⁶

↓

Yariri

(early–mid 8th cent.) regent; 'Ruler', 'Prince' (*Jas.* 33–8)

- (1) *CHLI* I: II.22. KARKAMIŠ A 6 (124–8);
- (2) *CHLI* I: II.23. KARKAMIŠ A 7 (128–9);

- (3) *CHLI* I: II.24. KARKAMIŠ A 15*b* (130–3);
 (4) *CHLI* I: II.25. KARKAMIŠ A 24*a* (133–9);
 (5) *CHLI* I: II. 25*a*. KARKAMIŠ (stone pedestal bowl) (139).

Yariri succeeded Astiruwa on the throne of Carchemish, but essentially as a regent to keep the throne warm for Kamani—who at the time of his father's death was still a child. Yariri took responsibility for the care and upbringing of the young prince, and seems to have played a conscientious role in grooming him for the kingship. He publicly proclaimed in his inscriptions that Kamani would be his successor (e.g. no. 3 §13, p. 131), and he also took responsibility for the protection and upbringing of Astiruwa's other children (*ibid.* §17). During Astiruwa's lifetime, Yariri no doubt already played a prominent role in the kingdom's affairs, perhaps as the king's vizier. Above all others, he was the man whom Astiruwa selected to guide the kingdom through the period after his death, until the throne could be assumed by Kamani. An advantage of entrusting the regency to Yariri was that he was probably a eunuch.¹⁷ If so, Astiruwa could confidently appoint him as an *interrex* in the knowledge that he would have no issue of his own for whom he might seek the throne.

During his regency, Yariri appears to have done much to raise Carchemish's international profile. He was, among other things, an accomplished linguist who spoke twelve languages, including Uartian and Assyrian, and perhaps Aramaic. This can be deduced from a fragmentary passage in no. 3, where Yariri states: '[. . .] in the City's writing, in the Suraeen writing, in the Assyrian writing and in the Taimani writing, and I knew twelve languages' (§§18–20, p. 131, transl. Hawkins). Suraeen is the adjective from Sura, probably to be identified with Urartu,¹⁸ and Taimani has been equated with the Temanites, an Aramaean tribe of northern Mesopotamia.¹⁹ It appears that Yariri sought to achieve what may initially have been Astiruwa's vision—the elevation of his kingdom to international status, primarily through establishing a wide range of diplomatic contacts with other kingdoms of the day. In pursuit of this, he had acquired reading and speaking skills in many languages, while Astiruwa still occupied the throne, and apparently at his instigation: 'My lord *gathered* every country's son to me by wayfaring concerning language, and he caused me to know every skill' (no. 3 §§21–2, p. 131, transl. Hawkins).

According to his own statement, Yariri became well known on the international scene, in Egypt to the south-west, in the Anatolian kingdoms of Lydia and Phrygia to the west, in Urartu to the north-east (and possibly in Babylon to the south-east): 'and my name the gods caused to *pass* abroad, and men heard it for me on the one hand in Egypt (*Mizra*), and on the other hand they heard it (for me) in Babylon(?), and on the other hand they heard it (for me) among the Musa (= Lydians), the Muska (= Phrygians), and Sura (= Urartu)' (no. 1 §§4–6, p. 124, transl. Hawkins).²⁰ Yariri seems also to have been in communication with an Assyrian king, perhaps Ashur-Dan III (772–755), but

the reading of the fragmentary passage which allegedly provides this information (no. 4 §§6–7, p. 135) is very uncertain. At all events, Hawkins suggests that Carchemish enjoyed peaceful relations, and very likely close commercial contacts, with Assyria in this period. ‘It would seem unlikely’, he comments, ‘that Carchemish took part in any of the anti-Assyrian groupings of the early 8th century, nor is there at present any concrete evidence for Urartian influence or control in the city.’²¹

Carchemish flourished under Yariri’s rule. This was a time of peace and stability and prosperity in the kingdom. The fine quality of the sculptures of the period attest to a high level of cultural sophistication within the kingdom’s centre, which may well have taken on a strongly cosmopolitan character, as a result, at least in part, of Yariri’s foreign initiatives. On a practical level, Yariri claimed credit for irrigation works and other building projects (no. 3 §§7–10,



Fig. 7. Yariri and Kamani, successive rulers of Carchemish (cast of an original now in Ankara) (courtesy, British Museum).

p. 131). Though he is designated by modern scholars merely as ‘regent’, he was undoubtedly one of the most effective and influential rulers that Carchemish ever had.

↓

Kamani

(early–mid 8th cent.) son of Astiruwa; ‘Ruler’, ‘Country-Lord’ (*Jas.* 38–41)

- (1) *CHLI* I: II.22. KARKAMIŠ A 6 (123–8);
- (2) *CHLI* I: II.23. KARKAMIŠ A 7 (128–9);
- (3) *CHLI* I: II.24. KARKAMIŠ A 15*b* (130–3);
- (4) *CHLI* I: II.26. KARKAMIŠ A 31 + fragments 30*b*1–3 (140–2);
- (5) *CHLI* I: II.27. CEKKE (143–51);
- (6) *CHLI* I: II.28. KARKAMIŠ A 4*a* (151–4).

We do not know whether Yariri occupied the throne of Carchemish until his death, or whether he relinquished his powers to Kamani as soon as the latter had reached an age when he could rule in his own right. In any case, the succession was apparently a smooth and peaceful one. Inscriptions from Kamani’s own reign refer to:

- (a) the king’s building achievements, a military conquest, and the resettlement of devastated areas within his kingdom (no. 4);
- (b) the purchase of a city, Kamana, by Kamani and his vizier Sastura, from a (neighbouring?) city Kanapu (no. 5) (the inscription is a foundation charter for the newly acquired city, and includes details of its boundaries and its resettlement by various father–son pairs brought from other cities);
- (c) a record of real estate sales in which Kamani was involved (no. 6).

As far as we can judge from the limited information these inscriptions supply, Kamani’s reign appears to have been one of continuing peace and stability, an important legacy passed on to the king by his mentor and predecessor Yariri.

↓

son of Sastura

(= Pisiri?) (2nd half of the 8th cent.) ‘Hero’, ‘Country-Lord’ (*Jas.* 42–4)

CHLI I: II.31–2. KARKAMIŠ A 21 (*b* + *a*) with A 20*b* (157–63).

Though not himself a king of Carchemish, Kamani’s vizier Sastura was a highly influential figure in the kingdom. Most importantly, he was the father of Kamani’s successor. We know this from an inscription of the man who names Sastura as his father and calls himself ‘Hero, Country-Lord of the city Carchemish’. This undoubtedly means that he became king. Unfortunately,

his own name is now lost, and the circumstances of his accession are unclear. But he was almost certainly not a member of Astiruwa's dynastic line, and his elevation to the throne was very probably engineered by his father. We conclude this from an admittedly uncertain reading of a fragmentary passage in his inscription which refers to his accession: 'To make me great my father Sastu(ras) the sun-blessed prince [...] Kubaba ... -ed [me?] the hand, [and me(?)] she caused to sit on my paternal throne(?), [...] she(?) caused to embrace [me(?)], who (were) not dear to me' (§§2–6, p. 160, transl. Hawkins). This broken text *may* contain a hint that there were those who were hostile to the new king's accession but were eventually reconciled to him.

There has been some debate about who this son of Sastura was. The two possibilities suggested are Pisiri, known from Assyrian texts and reigning from at least 738 to 717, and a hypothetical 'Astiru II'.²² If the son of Sastura is in fact to be distinguished from Pisiri, then the latter would have been one of his successors, perhaps his immediate successor.

Pisiri was the last king of Carchemish. He first appears in 738, when Tiglath-pileser III listed him among his tributaries (*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9). To the best of our knowledge, he remained loyal to his Assyrian allegiance for the next two decades. But in 717, he was accused by the current Assyrian king Sargon II of communicating with the Phrygian ruler Mita (Midas), presumably for the purpose of forming an alliance with him. Whether or not this was his intention, Sargon forestalled any further contacts between him and Mita by attacking and capturing Carchemish and stripping the kingdom of its wealth. Pisiri and his family and leading courtiers were taken back to Assyria as prisoners (CS II: 293). That was the end of Carchemish as a quasi-independent kingdom. Henceforth, it became a province ruled by an Assyrian governor.

Malatya

(Neo-Assyrian **Milidia**, **Melid**, **Meliteia**, Classical **Melitene**, modern **Arslantepe**)²³

Settlement on the mound now called Arslantepe, located in eastern Anatolia, 6 km north-east of modern Malatya, began in the late fifth millennium (Chalcolithic period), and continued through succeeding ages until the middle of the 1st century AD. But the most significant phase in its history dates to the Neo-Hittite period. The city is first attested, in the form Maldiya or Malitiya, in an early 14th-century Hittite text commonly known as the Indictment of Mita.²⁴ In this period, it was subject territory of the Hittite empire, and may have been included within the jurisdiction of the viceroy of Carchemish. In any case, there is little doubt that immediately after the empire's fall, authority over Malatya was assumed by the most important survivor of the Hittite royal family, Kuzi-Teshub. We have noted that two of Kuzi-Teshub's grandsons,

Runtiya and Arnuwanti, ruled in Malatya, which became the centre of one of the most significant of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. It is possible that by their reigns Malatya had already become independent of the Carchemish regime. Hawkins notes that the title which they bear is 'Country-Lord of the city Malatya', and this appears to have been the regular Malatya dynastic title.²⁵ But their stated affiliation with Kuzi-Teshub and their acknowledgement of him as Great King make it likely that their grandfather had originally installed a branch of his family in Malatya as a ruling dynasty there, under his sovereignty. Hawkins observes that on the basis of the hieroglyphic inscriptions, the territory of the kingdom of Malatya was by this time comparatively well defined, 'centring on the plain of Malatya on the west bank of the upper Euphrates below the junction of the Kara Su and Murat Su branches, and extending westwards along the routes to Anatolia and into the plain of Elbistan'.²⁶

The first historical references we have to Malatya in Iron Age texts are found in the records of Tiglath-pileser I (1114–1076). These records twice make mention of a city called Milidia. In the first, the king calls Milidia a 'rebellious and insubmissive city of the land of Hanigalbat' (*RIMA* 2: 22)—though when he marched upon the city, its citizens surrendered without further resistance. Henceforth, the city became his tributary, handing over hostages and paying him an annual tribute of lead ore. Tiglath-pileser relates this episode immediately following an account of his conquest of the Nairi lands in his third regnal year. In his second reference to Milidia, the king reports that he marched to the city Milidia 'of the great land Hatti' and received tribute there from a man called Allumari (*RIMA* 2: 43). His account of this episode follows the report of an expedition he conducted to the Mediterranean coast, where he gathered cedars from Mt Lebanon; he then conquered Amurru, received tribute from the city Arwad and the lands of Byblos and Sidon, and subsequently, on his return journey to Assyria, established his sovereignty over the land of Carchemish, then ruled by Ini-Teshub (*RIMA* 2: 42).²⁷

Two contrary assumptions have been made about the references to Milidia in these texts. The first is that there is only one city called Milidia, located in Hatti territory on the west bank of the Euphrates, and that Tiglath-pileser has in one of his texts wrongly referred to it as a city of Hanigalbat (which would have put it in northern Mesopotamia).²⁸ Alternatively, there were two Milidias, and one of them did in fact lie in northern Mesopotamia, in the land of Hanigalbat; it should thus be distinguished from the city so called in Hatti. This would fit better into the context of the campaigns which Tiglath-pileser conducted in the Nairi and Dayenu lands; we would not need to suppose that after passing through these lands Tiglath-pileser took a detour west of the Euphrates to impose his authority over the city Milidia before returning to Assyria. On the other hand, a northern Mesopotamian Milidia is not attested

anywhere else in our sources, and it seems more likely, on balance, that both references to Milidia in Tiglath-pileser's records refer to Hattian Milidia, or Malatya.

If that assumption is correct, there is still the question of how many times the Assyrian king approached the city and received tribute from it. Hawkins assumes that each passage in Tiglath-pileser's record indicates a different visit to Milidia, the first (*RIMA* 2: 22) following upon his conquest of Dayenu and the Nairi lands, the second (*RIMA* 2: 42–3) on his return from the Mediterranean coast and the imposition of his sovereignty over Ini-Teshub, king of Carchemish.²⁹ But the matter is complicated by the different nature of the two texts which contain these passages. The first passage comes from an annalistic record, which provides a sequential narrative of the king's campaigns in successive years. The second passage is part of a broad summary of Tiglath-pileser's military campaigns, 'reconstructed from numerous fragments of clay tablets as well as three stone tablets and one clay prism fragment, all from Ashur'.³⁰ Though Tiglath-pileser's reference to his Milidia campaign in the summary document follows directly upon his account of his Levantine campaigns and his return home via Ini-Teshub's kingdom, we cannot assume as a matter of course, given the nature of the document, that the Assyrian king's dealings with Milidia occurred within the same context as the imposition of his overlordship upon Carchemish. Tiglath-pileser is using the document to highlight a series of enterprises throughout his reign, and in such a context, the juxtaposition of two episodes need not mean that one directly followed upon the other.³¹ They may belong to two entirely different campaigns. Tiglath-pileser may have visited Malatya on only one occasion, but the visit was reported twice—once in the king's annalistic record, and subsequently in the document summarizing a number of episodes which occurred at different times in his reign.

One thing that does emerge clearly from the summary document is that by this time Malatya, part of the wider region called the 'great land of Hatti',³² was quite separate from the kingdom of Carchemish, of which the name 'Hatti' was used in a specific sense in the summary and other texts. By the time of Tiglath-pileser's western campaign, the fragmentation of the kingdom over which Kuzi-Teshub once held sway had probably already taken place. Malatya may already have become independent of Carchemish by or in the period when Kuzi-Teshub's grandsons occupied its throne.³³

Assyrian and Urartian sources provide further information about the kingdom of Malatya for a period of two centuries, from c.850 to 650. In these sources, the kingdom's name appears in the form Melid and Meliteia respectively. During this period, Malatya was regularly involved in the conflicts of the region, beginning with the campaigns conducted against it by Shalmaneser III (858–824). And in the following century, Urartian sovereignty was forced upon it when three Urartian kings, Minua, Argishti I, and Sarduri II, invaded

its territory. But Urartian overlordship came abruptly to an end in 743, when Tiglath-pileser III inflicted a decisive defeat upon an alliance led by forces from Urartu and Arpad (*Tigl. III* 100–1, 132–3³⁴). Malatya had been a member of this alliance. Henceforth, the kingdom probably remained subject to Assyrian overlordship until the reign of Sargon II, who was obliged to conduct further campaigns into its territory to keep it in subjection.

Two ruling families in Neo-Hittite Malatya have been identified from the hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered in the region. We shall attempt to reconstruct their family lines and the possible relationships between them, using Hawkins's genealogical table (*CHLI* I: 287) as our starting-point.

<p>A</p> <p>Kuzi-Teshub Dynasty</p> <p>(Kuzi-Teshub)</p> <p>(↓)</p> <p>(PUGNUS-mili (I))</p> <p>(↓)</p> <p>*Runtiya—*Arnuwanti I</p> <p>(↓)</p> <p>(PUGNUS-mili (II))</p> <p>(↓)</p> <p>*Arnuwanti II</p>	<p>B</p> <p>CRUS + RA/I-sa (read as Taras(?)) Dynasty</p> <p>*CRUS + RA/I-sa (read as Taras(?))</p> <p>↓</p> <p>Wasu(?)runtiya</p> <p>↓</p> <p>*Halpasulupi</p>
--	--

An asterisk precedes the names of those persons explicitly attested as rulers.

The Kings of Malatya: the 'Kuzi-Teshub Dynasty'

(Names in parentheses indicate that the persons so designated are not explicitly identified as kings of Malatya.)

(Ku(n)zi-Teshub)

(early–mid 12th cent.)

Kuzi-Teshub is not attested as a king of Malatya, but it is likely that Malatya originally lay within his jurisdiction, and I have suggested that he installed a branch of his family there as a local regime under his authority. By the time its throne was occupied by his grandsons Runtiya and Arnuwanti, Malatya had almost certainly become independent of Carchemish. The fact that the first known Malatyan kings included their grandfather's name and titles in their genealogy probably indicates that their kingdom had gained its autonomy by peaceful means. Kuzi-Teshub was clearly an honoured ancestral figure in their family line.

(↓)

(PUGNUS-mili (I))

(later 12th cent.) son of Kuzi-Teshub (*Jas.* 56–8)

- (1) *CHLI* I: V.2. GÜRÜN (295–9);
- (2) *CHLI* I: V.3. KÖTÜKALE (299–301);
- (3) *CHLI* I: V.4. İSPEKÇUR (301–4);
- (4) *CHLI* I: V.5. DARENDE (304–5).

PUGNUS-mili³⁵ is identified in the inscriptions of both of Kuzi-Teshub's grandsons as the father of these men. He is thus the son of Kuzi-Teshub, and *may* have preceded his own sons as ruler of Malatya. But in none of their inscriptions is he referred to as a King or Country-Lord or ruler of any kind. The lack of any such titulature for him may indicate that he was never a ruler in his own right, and was perhaps installed by his father Kuzi-Teshub at Malatya purely as an official of the Carchemish administration, before Malatya became independent. His sons may have been the first to use the titles that were henceforth adopted by many Neo-Hittite rulers in the post-Great King era.

(↓)

Runtiya

(later 12th cent.) son of PUGNUS-mili (I); 'Country-Lord' (*Jas.* 58–9)

- (1) *CHLI* I: V.2. GÜRÜN (295–9);
- (2) *CHLI* I: V.3. KÖTÜKALE (299–301).

Runtiya is the first clearly attested ruler of the Neo-Hittite kingdom Malatya. His two surviving inscriptions refer to his city-restoration and population-resettlement enterprises and his road-building activities. These probably reflect a programme of redeveloping areas of his kingdom that had suffered neglect, ruin, and abandonment during the upheavals at the end of the Late Bronze Age or in the early years of the post-Bronze Age era.

↓

Arnuwanti I

(later 12th cent.) son of PUGNUS-mili (I) and brother and successor(?) of Runtiya; 'King', 'Hero', 'Country-Lord' (*Jas.* 59–60)

- (1) *CHLI* I: V.4. İSPEKÇUR (301–4);
- (2) *CHLI* I: V.5. DARENDE (304–5).

Arnuwanti is the subject of the İSPEKÇUR inscription, which was carved on a stele probably set up by his grandson who was also called Arnuwanti. Unfortunately, the inscription is too fragmentary for us to derive any information from it apart from the king's titulature and genealogy. Since it is extremely unlikely that Arnuwanti and his brother Runtiya ruled jointly in Malatya, then

one must have succeeded the other. Hawkins is probably right in suggesting that Arnuwanti succeeded Runtiya, since the former's grandson, Arnuwanti II, was also a king of Malatya, and names his grandfather in his genealogy (no. 2).³⁶ This would mean that after Runtiya's kingship the succession shifted to a collateral line. We do not know the circumstances under which such a shift may have taken place.

(↓)

(PUGNUS-mili (II))

(late 12th–early 11th cent.) son of Arnuwanti I (= Assyrian Allumari???)
(*Jas.* 60)

(1) *CHLI* I: V.5. DARENDE (304–5);

(2) *RIMA* 2: 43.

This man can be so identified from the the DARENDE inscription, where he is named the father of the author Arnuwanti (II). No inscriptions of his own have survived and, like the earlier PUGNUS-mili who was apparently his grandfather, we have no indication that he was ever a king. It is significant that his son Arnuwanti, who did occupy Malatya's throne, clearly identifies his grandfather Arnuwanti as king, but accords no royal title to his father.

When Tiglath-pileser I marched upon Malatya, he received tribute from a man called Allumari. What was this man's status, and where does he fit into the ruling line at Malatya? Hawkins's assumption that Allumari was king of Malatya at the time³⁷ is probably right. But there is no apparent reference to a man of this name within the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Malatya region. From a chronological point of view, it is difficult to find a place for him in the sequence of Malatya's known rulers. If he did in fact occupy the Malatyan throne, he must have done so around 1100, at the time of Tiglath-pileser's western campaign. But at this time, the throne's incumbent must have been one of the attested members of the 'dynasty' established by Kuzi-Teshub in Malatya. The (successive) reigns of Kuzi-Teshub's grandsons Runtiya and Arnuwanti probably date to the middle-to-late decades of the 12th century. We know of at least two further generations of the Malatyan ruling family following them, represented by PUGNUS-mili (II) and Arnuwanti II, which probably extended the dynasty into the early years of the 11th century. As we shall see, there was possibly a third member of the dynasty called PUGNUS-mili, who may have been a successor of Arnuwanti II, or a later 11th-century king.

There is no obvious link between any known members of the Malatyan royal dynasty and the man called Allumari in the Assyrian record. If he ruled Malatya, is he to be identified with one of the kings attested in the hieroglyphic

inscriptions? There is no name in these inscriptions which is remotely like his, unless it is concealed behind the hieroglyphic symbol represented as PUGNUS.³⁸ It may fit chronologically if the PUGNUS-mili (II) of the hieroglyphic inscriptions was the man Tiglath-pileser calls Allumari. But this would depend on the establishment of more precise dates for the reigns of the kings of the late 12th and 11th centuries, and as we have noted, there is no clear evidence that the PUGNUS-mili in question ever occupied the Malatyan throne. If Allumari was in fact the ruler of Malatya at the time of Tiglath-pileser's campaign (and not simply a Malatyan official who paid the tribute to Tiglath-pileser on his king's behalf) he could have been a member of the 'Kuzi-Teshub dynasty' who has left no trace of himself or his reign in the hieroglyphic record.

(↓)

Arnuwanti II

(late 12th–early 11th cent.) son of PUGNUS-mili (II), grandson of Arnuwanti I; 'Country-Lord' (*Jas.* 60–2)

- (1) *CHLI* I: V.4. İSPEKÇUR (301–4);
- (2) *CHLI* I: V.5. DARENDE (304–5).

The genealogy at the beginning of the DARENDE inscription identifies Arnuwanti, its author, as the grandson of another Arnuwanti, undoubtedly the grandson of Kuzi-Teshub, and the son of PUGNUS-mili, the second known member of this name in the Malatyan family line. The fragmentary inscription provides no further information about this king beyond his resettlement of a city. He was probably responsible for setting up the stele on which the İSPEKÇUR inscription appears, which honours his grandfather Arnuwanti I.³⁹

—?

PUGNUS-mili (III)?

(probably 11th or early 10th cent.) 'Potent(?) King'

- (1) *CHLI* I: V.6. MALATYA 5 (306–7);
- (2–7) *CHLI* I: V.8–13. MALATYA 7–12 (308–13);
- (8) *CHLI* I: V.14. MALATYA 14 (313–14).

The subject of these inscriptions is perhaps to be identified with one of the two members of the Malatyan dynasty already designated by this name and referred to above. But it is possible that he was a later member of the dynasty. The precise meaning of the title which Hawkins translates as 'Potent(?) King' is uncertain.⁴⁰

*The Kings of Malatya: the CRUS+RA/I-sa Dynasty***CRUS+RA/I-sa = Taras?**

(probably 11th–10th cent.) ‘Hero’, ‘Country-Lord’ (*Jas.* 62–3)

(1) *CHLI* I: V.15. IZGIN (314–18);

(2) *CHLI* I: V.16. MALATYA 1 (318–20).

Several of the inscriptions from the Malatya region provide evidence of what is apparently a second Neo-Hittite dynasty at Malatya. Its first explicitly identified member has a name transliterated as CRUS+RA/I-sa. The name has been read as Taras,⁴¹ and we will henceforth refer to CRUS+RA/I-sa by this name. We have noted what Hawkins refers to as the ‘grandiose and Empire pretensions’ associated with the use of the archaic term ‘Hero’ in the king’s titulare. Taras reports on various enterprises upon which he embarked after he occupied his father’s throne (no. 1 §§4–9, p. 315). He was therefore not the first ruler of his dynasty. Information about him is provided by the remains of relatively substantial inscriptions of which he is the subject, carved on all four sides of a stele discovered in a cemetery in the village of Izgin, 9 km west of Elbistan, and now in the Ancient Oriental Museum, Istanbul. There are two inscriptions on the stele, a 16-line text appearing on three sides, and a second separate but partially parallel 20-line inscription constituting another text.⁴² The inscriptions claim substantial extensions made by Taras to the frontiers of his kingdom and the river-lands which they incorporated, along with an extensive city-building and resettlement programme. According to Hawkins, they are probably to be assigned an 11th–10th century date. If so, then Taras’s dynasty may have followed closely upon the end of the ‘Kuzi-Teshub dynasty’. In fact, the first inscription makes reference to an Arnuwanti (no. 1 §13, p. 315). The context is very fragmentary, so we do not know the circumstances in which the reference was made. But it is possible that the Arnuwanti in question was a late king of that name in the Kuzi-Teshub dynasty, and that the ‘new’ dynasty followed immediately upon its predecessor and was in fact a continuation of it.

↓

Wasu(?)runtiya

(probably 11th–10th cent.) son of CRUS+RA/I-sa (Taras?), father of Halpasulupi; ‘King?’ (*Jas.* 64)

CHLI I: V.16. MALATYA 1 (318–20).

This man was apparently the son and successor of Taras. He is attested only once, in the inscription of his son Halpasulupi, where he is possibly identified as a king.⁴³

↓

Halpasulupi

(probably 11th–10th cent.) son of Wasu(?)runtiya, grandson of CRUS+RA/I-sa (Taras?); ‘Hero’, ‘Lord of Malizi’, ‘Potent(?) King’ (*Jas.* 64–5)

(1) *CHLI* I: V.16. MALATYA 1 (318–20);

(2) *CHLI* I: V.17. MALATYA 4 (320–1).

The name Halpasulupi has been read in two inscriptions, the first discovered on the site of Arslantepe, which was probably also the provenance of the second inscription (now housed in the Anatolian Civilizations Museum, Ankara). It is assumed that Halpasulupi in these two inscriptions refers to the same person. In the first, he is named as the grandson of Taras and the son of Wasu(?)runtiya, and accorded the titles ‘the Hero, the lord of the city Malizi’. In the second, his title has been translated by Hawkins ‘Potent(?) King’.

The Kings of Malatya: later rulers

—?

(Suwarimi)

(probably 11th or 10th cent.) (*Jas.* 65)

CHLI I: V.18. MALATYA 3 (321–2).

This man is attested in a brief inscription which appears with the sculpture of two men in a chariot on an orthostat, now in the Louvre Museum, Paris, and probably originating from Arslantepe. Suwarimi is identified as the father of Mariti, the subject of the inscription. There is no explicit indication in the inscription that he was actually a king of Malatya.

(↓)

Mariti

(probably 11th or 10th cent.) son; ‘King?’ (*Jas.* 65–6)

CHLI I: V.1.8. MALATYA 3 (321–2).

The stylistic similarity of the inscription to that of Halpasulupi (*CHLI* I: MALATYA 1, p. 319) indicates that Mariti and his father belonged to a period close to that of Halpasulupi. Thus an 11th- or 10th-century dating has been proposed. Because of the fragmentary nature of the inscription, the reading of Mariti’s title is uncertain, but the likelihood is that he was a ruler of Malatya.⁴⁴ If so, since Malatya could not have been ruled at the same time by more than one king, and we know that Halpasulupi was preceded on the throne by his father, and prior to that his grandfather, then Mariti and his father presumably came later. It is possible that they were members of an already established

ruling dynasty at Malatya, but there is no evidence to link them up with any other known rulers of the kingdom.

—

Lalli

(— 853–835—) (*Pros.* 2/II 651)

RIMA 3: 23, 39, 67, 79.

A gap of a century or more now follows in written records before the next attested king of Malatya makes his appearance. This is a man called Lalli, who figures among Shalmaneser's tributaries west of the Euphrates in 853 and 844 (*RIMA* 3: 23, 39). He was still on Malatya's throne in 835, when Shalmaneser reports receiving tribute from him at the beginning of his twenty-third campaign across the Euphrates (*RIMA* 3: 79).⁴⁵ Nothing more is known of this king, nor can we link him with any name known to us in the hieroglyphic inscriptions.

—

Opponent of Hamathite king Zakur

(— early 8th cent.)

CS II: 155, Lipiński (2000a: 254).

This man was one of the members of the coalition of states led by Bar-Hadad II, king of Damascus, against Zakur, the ruler of Hamath, probably c.800. The information is recorded on the so-called Zakur stele (discussed in later chapters). Most of the coalition's rulers, including the Malatyan king, are not identified by name. But it is possible that the latter is to be equated with a man called Shahu (Sahwi?).

=?

Shahu (= Sahwi?)

(— early 8th cent.) 'Hero' (*Jas.* 67)

(1) *CHLI* I: V.19. ŞIRZI (322–4)?;

(2) *Hcl* 116, no. 102, rev. I, *Hcl* 130, no. 104 I.

A Malatyan called Shahu is known to us from references to him as the father of a ruler of Melid called Hilaruada in inscriptions of the Urartian king Sarduri II (765–733) (no. 2). Since Hilaruada must have occupied Malatya's throne by the mid 780s at the latest (see below), then his father's reign dates to the early 8th century, and possibly began earlier. On chronological grounds, he could thus have been the unnamed king of Malatya in the Zakur inscription. He may also be attested in a hieroglyphic inscription carved on a rock face near the

village of Şırzı, which lies east of the road connecting Malatya and Sivas. We shall discuss this below.

↓

Hilaruada (= Sa(?)tiruntiya?)

(— c.784–760 —) son (*Jas.* 67–8)

(1) *CHLI* I: V.19. ŞIRZI (322–4);

(2) *Hcl* 88, no. 80 §3 II, *Hcl* 116–17, no. 102, rev. VII, VIII, *Hcl* 130–1, no. 104 I, VII, VIII.⁴⁶

Urartian references indicate that Hilaruada's reign extended through several decades of the first half of the 8th century. Argishti I (787–766) claims that he attacked Malatya in his fourth regnal year, i.e. c.784 (*Hcl* 88, no. 80 §3 II), and Hilaruada still reigned when Argishti's successor Sarduri II conquered it c.760 (*Hcl* 116–17, no. 102).⁴⁷ Malatya then apparently remained subject to Urartu until 743 when Tiglath-pileser III defeated the Urartian–Arpad led coalition that fought against him.⁴⁸

Does Hilaruada appear anywhere in the hieroglyphic inscriptions? Just possibly in the Şırzı inscription, under a different name. The inscription was authored by a certain Sa(?)tiruntiya, who bears the titles 'Hero, Country-Lord of Malizi' and names himself the son of the Hero Sahwi. (What remains of the inscription appears to be the dedication of some kind of building, primarily to the god Runtiya.) Both titulatures indicate that father and son were kings of Malatya. But where do they belong in Malatya's royal line? If, as Hawkins suggests, Sahwi can be identified with the Urartian-attested Shahu, father of Hilaruada,⁴⁹ can we then equate Sahwi's son Sa(?)tiruntiya with the Urartian-attested Hilaruada? Not according to Hawkins, who points out that the names are quite dissimilar, though he notes that the reading of the first syllable of Sa(?)tiruntiya's name is doubtful, and allows the possibility that the last element of the name *-runtiya* could be represented by *-ruada*. Contrary to Hawkins, I believe that we should not entirely dismiss an equation between Hilaruada and Sa(?)tiruntiya. It would not be the only occasion when the foreign representation of a Neo-Hittite name differs substantially from the original.⁵⁰ The alternative would be to suppose, as Hawkins has done, that Sa(?)tiruntiya was another son of Sahwi/Shahu, and thus a brother of Hilaruada. He too must have been a king of Malatya, to judge from his titles, and presumably occupied the throne before or after his brother (the latter if Argishti's record implies that Hilaruada directly succeeded his father). But that is a matter of conjecture. And of course this whole line of reasoning depends on the basic assumption that the Sahwi of the ŞIRZI inscription has correctly been equated with the Urartian-attested Shahu. If not, then both Sahwi and his son Sa(?)tiruntiya must have belonged elsewhere in the line of Malatyan kings. Perhaps they followed immediately after the reign of Hilaruada.

—?

Sulumal

(— 743–732 —) (*Pros.* 3/I: 1157)

Tigl. III 69, 101, 109.

Following the reign of Hilaruada (Sa(?)tiruntiya?), four further kings of Malatya are known to us, though none from hieroglyphic sources. The first of these was a man called Sulumal in the texts of Tiglath-pileser III. Sulumal was one of the leaders of the coalition that joined forces with Sarduri II against Tiglath-pileser. In terms of the chronology of their reigns, Sulumal could well have succeeded Hilaruada on the Malatyan throne. But we have no evidence of any connection, family or otherwise, between the two kings. For reasons, apparently, of realpolitik, Tiglath-pileser decided to let Sulumal and the leaders of several other coalition forces retain their thrones after his victory over them. The Malatyan king is attested among Tiglath-pileser's tributaries for the years 738 and 732, and may have maintained his tributary status for the rest of his reign.

—?

Gunzinanu

(— c.719) (*Pros.* 1/II 431)

ARAB II §§60, 79, 92, 99, Lie 34–5, Fuchs 126 vv. 205–6 (324), 217 v. 83 (348).

The next known king of Malatya, Gunzinanu, is attested in the Annals of Sargon II (721–705). We do not know when his reign began, but it ended abruptly c.719, when he was deposed by Sargon after taking part in anti-Assyrian uprisings in the Hatti lands.

↓

Tarhunazi

(c.719–712)

ARAB II §§26, 60, Lie 34–5, Fuchs 125–7 vv. 204–5, 211–13 (324), 216–17 vv. 78–81 (347).

In place of Gunzinanu, Sargon appointed a man called Tarhunazi ruler of Malatya.⁵¹ But Tarhunazi too proved treacherous (at least from the Assyrian point of view), violating his oath to Sargon and withholding tribute from him. Sargon responded by marching against, occupying, and ravaging his kingdom, destroying the royal capital Malatya and other cities in its environs. Tarhunazi fled to Til-garimmu, one of his royal cities. But he failed to elude his Assyrian conqueror, and he and his family and many of his subjects were deported to Assyria. Sargon assigned part of his kingdom, the land of Kammanu with the

city Til-garimmu, to a provincial governor, while the city of Malatya was placed under the control of Muwatalli, king of Kummuh.

The last of the known kings of Malatya, Mugallu, reigned in the 7th century and is dealt with in the Afterword (following Chapter 12).

Kummuh (*Urartian Qumaha*)

Occupying roughly the area of the modern Turkish province of Adiyaman, the kingdom of Kummuh was located west of the Euphrates between the kingdoms of Malatya to the north and Carchemish to the south.⁵² Its capital, also called Kummuh (= Kimuhu in Neo-Babylonian texts?), was probably the predecessor of Classical Samosata (modern Samsat Höyük). Almost certainly it was part of the kingdom of Carchemish during the reign of Kuzi-Teshub. Already before the fall of the Hittite empire, the region encompassed by Iron Age Kummuh may have been subject to the Carchemish viceroy. Nothing specific is known of Kummuh's Late Bronze Age history, though its location between Hittite and Mitannian territory in the first half of this period no doubt gave it some strategic importance in the conflicts between the two kingdoms.

We do not know, from either archaeological or textual evidence, at what stage in the early Iron Age the kingdom was established. The earliest reference to it dates to c.870 when its king Hattusili (Assyrian Qatazilu) is recorded as a tributary of Ashurnasirpal II (883–859) (*RIMA* 2: 219). But the kingdom may well have been founded much earlier, probably initially as a sub-kingdom of Carchemish, and almost certainly under the rule of a branch of the former Hittite royal dynasty. As we shall see, four of the six known kings of Kummuh, beginning with Hattusili, bore the names of Late Bronze Age Hittite kings. We have already noted the possibility that the king called Tudhaliya in the Keleki inscription, who was to wed the daughter of the king of Carchemish (*CHLI* I: § 2, p. 93), was a ruler of Kummuh. Like Malatya, Kummuh may have become independent not long after Kuzi-Teshub's reign, or perhaps even during it. We shall consider this further below.

References to the kingdom appear in Assyrian records from c.870 to 605, in the Annals of the 8th-century Urartian king Sarduri II, and in Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions from c.805 to 770. Generally, Kummuh's rulers remained loyal to Assyria, and received some support from it in their disputes and conflicts with other states west of the Euphrates. For a time in the 8th century, Kummuh became vassal territory of Urartu, then ruled by Sarduri II. But it reverted to Assyrian sovereignty following Tiglath-pileser III's defeat of the anti-Assyrian military alliance led by Urartu and Arpad in 743. During the reign of Sargon II, it seems to have had favoured status in the region, due no doubt to the loyal support which Sargon received from its king Muwatalli. But Muwatalli subsequently fell foul of Sargon, who accused him of plotting

with the Urartian king Argishti II. Reprisals quickly followed. Kummuh was invaded and plundered by an Assyrian army, and large numbers of its population were deported, for relocation in Babylonia.⁵³ The kingdom was annexed, and remained an Assyrian province until the fall of the Assyrian empire at the end of the 7th century.

The Kings of Kummuh

The attested rulers of Kummuh known from Assyrian and hieroglyphic Luwian records are:

—?

Hattusili I (Assyrian Qatazilu)

(— c.866–c.857) (*Pros.* 3/I 1011)

RIMA 2: 219; 3: 15, 18–19.

Hattusili is the earliest known ruler of Kummuh. He is first attested as a tributary of Ashurnasirpal II c.866 (*RIMA* 2: 219), and subsequently of Shalmaneser III in the latter's first and second regnal years (858, 857) (*RIMA* 3: 15, 18–19). His reign must have come to an end shortly after, in unknown circumstances.

↓?

Kundashpu

(c.856 —) (*Pros.* 2/I 638)

RIMA 3: 23.

Hattusili was probably succeeded by a man called Kundashpu, who appears among Shalmaneser's tributaries on his sixth western campaign (854) (*RIMA* 3: 23). We do not know whether Kundashpu belonged to the same dynasty as Hattusili, or the circumstances of his accession. His name, and that of Kush-tashpi, a later king of Kummuh, stand apart from the otherwise traditional Hittite names of Kummuh's rulers.⁵⁴ But the fact that the majority of Kummuh's known rulers bear the names of Late Bronze Age Hittite kings may indicate that descendants of these kings ruled in Kummuh—perhaps down to the annexation of the kingdom by Sargon II in 708. The 'intrusive' names Kundashpu and Kushtashpi could be explained in a number of ways. It is possible, for example, that in the absence of a blood-heir to the throne, the succession may have passed to a son-in-law from outside the royal family who was adopted by marriage into it, the succession then passing to a son of the union who was given a traditional family name.

—

Suppiluliuma (Assyrian Ushpilulume⁵⁵)

(— 805–773 —) ‘Ruler’ (*Jas.* 46–8)

- (1) *CHLI* I: VI.1–2. BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2 (334–40);
- (2) *CHLI* I: VI.16. ANCOZ 7 (356–7);
- (3) *CHLI* I: VI.9. ANCOZ 5 (349–50);
- (4) *CHLI* I: VI.7–8. ANCOZ 3 and 4 (348–9);
- (5) *RIMA* 3: 205, 240.

We do not know how long the interval was between the end of Kundashpu’s reign and the accession of Suppiluliuma, the next attested Kummuhite king. Given that Suppiluliuma occupied his throne until at least 773, then at least one king must have preceded him after Kundashpu’s death. It is in any case possible that he continued a family line which extended back to the rulers of Late Bronze Age Hatti.



Fig. 8. The goddess Kubaba, from Carchemish (courtesy, British Museum).

In Assyrian sources, Suppiluliuma makes his appearance in an inscription carved on the so-called Pazarcık stele (*RIMA* 3: 205). This was a boundary-stone, erected on the orders of the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III (810–783), on the frontier between the kingdoms of Kummuh and Gurgum. Kummuh had evidently become a client-state of Assyria, and almost certainly the boundary-stone reflects a reallocation of part of Gurgum’s territory to it (see Chapter 11). The stone had subsequently been seized in one of the campaigns which the Damascene king Bar-Hadad II had conducted against Kummuh and other states in the region. It had been recovered by the Assyrian commander-in-chief Shamshi-ilu, who restored it to its original place, thus confirming the frontier between the two kingdoms as established by Adad-nirari (*RIMA* 3: 240⁵⁶). This happened in 773, during the reign of Shalmaneser IV. The inscription attests to the fact that Kummuh’s throne was still occupied by Suppiluliuma at the time.

We can probably identify the Suppiluliuma of the Pazarcık stele with the husband of Panamuwati, author of a hieroglyphic inscription (no. 1) found in 1931 by von der Osten and Koşay in the village of Boybeypinarı. Carved on two pairs of blocks, the inscription is now housed in the Anatolian Civilizations Museum in Ankara. It records its author’s dedication of a throne and table to the goddess Kubaba. Panamuwati calls herself the wife of a ruler whose name is transliterated as PURUS.FONS.MI-sa and read Suppiluliuma.⁵⁷ Almost certainly the man in question is the king of Kummuh, who can further be identified with the Suppiluliuma attested in nos. 2–4, discovered in or near the village of Ancoz.

↓

Hattusili II

(— mid 8th cent.) son of Suppiluliuma; ‘Ruler’ (*Jas.* 48–9)

- (1) *CHLI* I: VI.3. MALPINAR (340–4);
- (2) *CHLI* I: VI.7–8. ANCOZ 3 and 4 (348–9);
- (3) *CHLI* I: VI.9. ANCOZ 5 (349–50);
- (4) *CHLI* I: VI.16–19. ANCOZ 7 (356–7).

The three Ancoz inscriptions also name a son of Suppiluliuma, called Hattusili. No. 4 ends with a curse formula: ‘(Whoever) erases the name of Suppiluliuma and Hattusili, of the father and son, may the gods be the prosecutors against him!’ (transl. after Hawkins). Here in particular, the explicit coupling of the names Suppiluliuma and Hattusili in what is probably an official (dedicatory?) inscription (though the content is fragmentary and unclear) indicates that Hattusili was Suppiluliuma’s designated successor to the throne. This is supported by no. 1, dating to Hattusili’s own reign. The inscription is authored by a certain Atayaza who names himself the servant of the Ruler Hattusili. Nothing more is known of this Hattusili, from either hieroglyphic or Assyrian sources.

—?

Kushtashpi

(— c.750 —) (*Pros.* 2/I 644)

Hci 123–4, no. 103 §9⁵⁸; *Tigl.* III 68–9, 168.

This man, attested in inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, is the next known ruler of Kummuh. It is possible that he was Hattusili's immediate successor, given the likely short gap between Hattusili's kingship and Kushtashpi's accession. Whether or not the two were related remains unknown. Kushtashpi was apparently forced to break his Assyrian allegiance and become a tributary of Sarduri II (*Hci* 123–4, no. 103 §9) when Sarduri led an expedition against him c.750. He probably remained subject to Sarduri until 743, when Tiglath-pileser defeated the Urartian–Arpad led military alliance, of which Kummuh was a member. In the wake of his victory, Tiglath-pileser granted a pardon to Kushtashpi and allowed him to resume his throne as an Assyrian tributary (*Tigl.* III 68–9). Kushtashpi's underlying loyalties may have been with Assyria all along, despite his subjection to Urartu. In a summary inscription from Calah (Kalhu) Tiglath-pileser refers to him as 'a loyal vassal, not a rebel' (*Tigl.* III 168, transl. Tadmor).

—?

Muwatalli (Assyrian Mutallu)

(— 708) (*Jas.* 49–50, *Pros.* 2/II 785 s.v. **Mutallu** 3)

ARAB II §§45, 64, Lie 36–7, 70–1, Fuchs 128 vv. 220–1 (324), 177 vv 398–401 (337–8), 222–4 vv 112–16 (349).

Muwatalli was the last ruler of Kummuh before the kingdom was incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system. He may have been Kushtashpi's immediate successor, and if so, his reign was a long one since it continued until 708. The fact that like a number of his predecessors he bore the name of a famous Late Bronze Age Hittite king *may* indicate that the ruling family at Kummuh was from beginning to end a continuation of a branch of the Late Bronze Age Hittite royal dynasty. Initially, Muwatalli was loyal to Assyria, his kingdom perhaps remaining submissive to the Assyrian crown from the time Kushtashpi received a pardon from Tiglath-pileser. In fact, Muwatalli was rewarded for his loyalty when Sargon gave him the city of Malatya after the break-up of the troublesome kingdom of the same name.⁵⁹ But he subsequently lost favour with Sargon, who accused him of plotting with Argishti II. Punishment followed swiftly. Sargon invaded and plundered Muwatalli's kingdom and deported large numbers of its population, though Muwatalli himself managed to escape. Kummuh was henceforth annexed and remained an Assyrian province until the fall of the Assyrian empire at the end of the 7th century. Its territorial successor in later centuries was the kingdom called Commagene.

Masuwari/Til Barsip

On the site of Tell Ahmar, a 60-ha tell located on the east bank of the Euphrates river 22 km south of Carchemish, a small Neo-Hittite kingdom called Masuwari had emerged by the beginning of the first millennium—perhaps earlier (see Chapter 10 under *Masuwari*). The history of the site dates back to the Ubaid period (mid sixth to end of fifth millennium), with later remains dating to the Early and Middle Bronze Age.⁶⁰ But Masuwari's main period of occupation began in the 10th century, when the settlement was, apparently, the centre of a small kingdom. Masuwari appears to have been the name of both the kingdom and its capital. Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions collectively provide the genealogies of two contemporary dynasties who competed with each other for the kingdom's throne. The inscriptions indicate that kingship alternated between the two families, and the contest between them has been seen as ethnically based, with an original Luwian-speaking dynasty being replaced ultimately by one of Aramaean origin. The fact that the city also had a second name in this period, Til Barsip, is seen as support for the assumption that there was a contest between Luwian and Aramaean dynasties for royal power; Masuwari is almost certainly a Luwian name,⁶¹ and Til Barsip an Aramaean name. But the situation may be more complex than this, as we shall see below. At all events, the material remains of Masuwari/Til Barsip remained decisively Neo-Hittite, even when the city was under the rule of an Aramaean regime, its architecture and sculpture showing close parallels with the remains of Carchemish. This is a clear instance of the fact that a site's cultural affinities need not reflect its regime's ethnic origins. Further, as Bunnens has argued, the use of the Luwian language and script in inscriptions does not necessarily imply that the authors of the inscriptions were themselves Luwians.⁶²

Our most important source of information on the ruling dynasties of Masuwari/Til Barsip is provided by an inscription carved on a stele originally from the site of Tell Ahmar and now housed in the National Syrian Museum in Aleppo. The fragmentary text is published as *CHLI* I: III.6. TELL AHMAR 1 (239–43). Unfortunately, the name of its author is now lost, but what does survive of his titlature identifies him as the son of a ruler called Ariyahina and the great-grandson of an earlier ruler called Hapatila. This gives us four generations in the dynastic line, beginning with Hapatila:

Hapatila

son of Hapatila (unnamed)

Ariyahina

son of Ariyahina (author of inscription, name lost)

We shall call this Dynasty A.

But the royal succession did not run smoothly. This is apparent from what we can make out of a later section of the text, on the basis of Hawkins's reading and translation of it:

....

- §7: When [my great-]grandfather(?) [was king(?)],
 §8: he was lord to/for his *demesne*
 §9: he governed in the west and the east.
 §10: But when he *died* in the country Ana,
 §11: my father (as) a child, because his 20-TATIS *despised* (him),
 §12 he took over his *power by violence* (?)
 §13: Thereafter his son Hamiyata *arose*(?)
 §14: he [...]ed me up to my great-grandfather's *power*
 §15: [...] me] he made lord of his (own) house,
 §16: and me he made great(er) than his (own) brothers,
 §17: everyone *regarded* my face (i.e. obeyed me)
 §18: But when he *died*,
 §19: his son decreed evil for me,
 §20: and he desired wickedness for my *demesne*.
 §21: But I raised up (my) han[d(s)] to this celestial Tarhunza,

.....

- §25: This celestial Tarhunza heard me,
 §26: to me [he] gave my *enemy*,
 §27: (his) head [I] destroy[ed],
 §28: and his son[s...
 §29: and his daughter a hi[erodule I made...⁶³

By a process of deduction, the events recorded here can be pieced together thus: §12 refers to a violent seizure of power from the father of the inscription's author. From the introductory passage, we know that the father's name was Ariyahina. The man who seized power is not named, but is identified in §13 as the father of a man called Hamiyata, who succeeded his father. Hamiyata decided to elevate Ariyahina's son to a high status, even above that of his own brothers (§§15–17). This possibly indicates his intention of restoring the succession to the original family line. But on his death, Hamiyata's son turned against Ariyahina's son, apparently removing all benefits conferred upon him by his father. In response, Ariyahina's son rose up against him, defeated him, and regained his throne (§§21–9).

We can thus identify from this text two apparently competing dynasties— an original dynasty (A), and a usurping dynasty (B). These can be schematically represented as follows⁶⁴ (the numbers in parentheses indicate those persons who actually occupied the throne, and the sequence in which they ruled):

<i>Original dynasty (A)</i>	<i>Usurping dynasty (B)</i>
Hapatila (1)	unattested
(son; father of Ariyahina)	father of Hamiyata (3)
Ariyahina (2)	Hamiyata (4)
son of Ariyahina (6)	son of Hamiyata (5)

The Kings of Masuwari/Til Barsip

—?

Hapatila

(late 10th–early 9th cent.) Dynasty A; ‘King’ (*Jas.* 91)

CHLI I: 240 III.6. TELL AHMAR 1 (239–43).

Named as the great-grandfather of the inscription’s author, this man is the earliest known king of Masuwari. His name is generally assumed to be Luwian, hence the assumption that he was the founder of a Luwian-speaking dynasty in the city. S. Dalley, however, has suggested that Hapatila may be a new pronunciation of an old Hurrian name Hepa-tilla.⁶⁵ She rightly observes that we cannot deduce a person’s ethnic grouping on the basis of one name, nor can we connect a particular script with a name that belongs to a particular language in order to identify race. Nonetheless, the use of Hurrian personal names had been well established in the Hittite royal family from the empire period onwards, as illustrated by the name of the 13th-century Hittite king Urhi-Teshub and the 14th-century Hittite viceroy at Carchemish Sharri-Kushuh. It therefore remains probable that the dynasty of which Hapatila was the first attested member was, if not itself of Luwian origin, one that preserved the traditions of royalty that linked it, in a broad cultural sense, with the other Neo-Hittite kingdoms that emerged in the wake of the Hittite empire’s fall.

↓

Ariyahina

(late 10th–early 9th cent.) Dynasty A, grandson of Hapatila; ‘Ruler’ (*Jas.* 91)

CHLI I: III.6. TELL AHMAR 1 (239–43).

Ariyahina appears to have directly succeeded his grandfather, if one can so judge from the lack of any reference to a son of Hapatila in the inscription.

↓

father of Hamiyata

(late 10th–early 9th cent.) Dynasty B (*Jas.* 92)

- (1) *CHLI* I: III.6. TELL AHMAR 1 (239–43);
- (2) *CHLI* I: III.1. TELL AHMAR 2 (227–30);
- (3) *CHLI* I: III.2. BOROWSKI 3 (p. 230–1);
- (4) *CHLI* I: III.3. TELL AHMAR 5 (231–4);
- (5) TELL AHMAR 6 (Bunnens, 2006).

This man is not explicitly named in any of the above inscriptions. It is clear, however, that he began a new royal dynasty at Masuwari by usurping the throne from its previous incumbent Ariyahina. He was succeeded by his son Hamiyata. The conflicts in which he was engaged during his reign, as recorded by his son in no. 5 (for further detail, see below under **Hamiyata**), may well have had to do with ongoing struggles against the displaced dynasty. Ariyahina reports that his father filled the city's granaries with barley (no. 4 §2, p. 232). This perhaps reflects a period of restored stability within the kingdom when the usurper had firmly established his authority over his enemies and set about renewing the land's productivity, which may well have suffered from the conflicts over the succession.

↓

Hamiyata

(late 10th–early 9th cent.) Dynasty B (*Jas.* 92–3)

- (1) *CHLI* I: III.6. TELL AHMAR 1 (239–43);
- (2) *CHLI* I: III.1. (227–30);
- (3) *CHLI* I: III.2. BOROWSKI 3 (230–1);
- (4) *CHLI* I: III.3. TELL AHMAR 5 (231–4);
- (5) *CHLI* I: III.5. ALEPPO 2 (235–8);
- (6) TELL AHMAR 6 (Bunnens, 2006).

It is assumed that the name Hamiyata⁶⁶ in all these inscriptions refers to the same person. This includes no. 5, in which the author Arpa names Hamiyata as his brother. The inscription appears on a stele now housed in the National Syrian Museum, Aleppo. Its provenance is uncertain, but internal evidence points to Tell Ahmar as its likely origin. The most recently discovered of the Tell Ahmar inscriptions (no. 6) was carved on a stele which came to light in 1999, in the Euphrates river, near the modern village of Qubbah and downstream from Tell Ahmar. Authored by Hamiyata, the inscription commemorates victories won by Hamiyata's father and by Hamiyata himself while his father was still alive, with the support of the Storm God Tarhunza, who is depicted as a Smiting God armed with an axe and trident-thunderbolt, and standing on a young bull. A list of at least seventeen other deities, all of whom

bestowed their favour upon Hamiyata, appears at the beginning of the text. The inscription has been published by Bunnens (2006), and translated and edited within this publication by J. D. Hawkins. As noted above, the victories to which Hamiyata refers may well belong within the context of conflicts between the two competing dynasties for rule over the kingdom.

Two monumental buildings of this period, of which remains survive, may have been built by Hamiyata, who was perhaps responsible for a number of construction projects in the city. He claims credit for building or restoring at least one other city, Haruha (not otherwise attested), in his kingdom (no. 3 §5, p. 231).⁶⁷ It is possible that the city Hadatu, located on the site of modern Arslan Taş, where a hieroglyphic inscription of a ruler of Masuwari was discovered (*CHLI* I: 246–7), was also at this time part of the kingdom of Masuwari. Situated in the Saruj plain to the north-east of Tell Ahmar, Hadatu covered an area of c.31 ha and consisted of a citadel surrounded by a lower town. It is commonly believed to have been founded by the Assyrians in the 9th century as a provincial administrative centre. In the early 8th century, the city was under the immediate authority of an official called Ninurta-bel-usur, who was subordinate to a well-known Assyrian governor Shamshi-ilu based in the city of Kar-Shalmaneser, the Assyrian name for Masuwari/Til Barsip. Kar-Shalmaneser must have exercised some sort of regional authority over Hadatu. Bunnens assumes, though as he says this cannot be proved, that Hadatu was already part of the kingdom of Masuwari/Til Barsip during Hamiyata's reign.⁶⁸

↓

son of Hamiyata

(early–mid 9th cent.) Dynasty B (*Jas.* 93)

CHLI I: III.6. TELL AHMAR 1 (239–43).

This man is attested, but not named, in the narrative of events recorded by Ariyahina's son. He clearly succeeded his father on the throne, and may be the 'child' associated with Hamiyata in *CHLI* I: III.2. BOROWSKI 3 (§9, p. 231). It is, however, not clear whether his father actually intended him for the succession, or planned to bypass him in favour of the son of Ariyahina.

↓

son of Ariyahina

(–mid 9th cent.) Dynasty A; 'Country-King' (*Jas.* 94–6)

CHLI I: III.6. TELL AHMAR 1 (239–43).

The sequence of rulers recorded in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Masuwari ends with this man. He is the author of TELL AHMAR 1, which is carved on a victory stele celebrating his military defeat of his predecessor, and his accession to the throne. Unfortunately, the portion of the opening line that records

his name is lost. He refers to the powers conferred upon him by his predecessor-but-one, Hamiyata, who allegedly elevated him to a status higher than that of his (Hamiyata's) own brothers; presumably, one of these brothers was the man called Arpa, author of ALEPPO 2 (see above under Hamiyata). From this statement, some scholars have concluded that Hamiyata was by his action paving the way for the eventual restoration of the original dynasty to the kingship.⁶⁹ Whether or not the elevation of Ariyahina's son to a status greater than that of Hamiyata's own brothers implied an elevation above the king's son as well remains conjectural.

Indeed, it is quite possible that Hamiyata intended the succession to pass to his own son, and that his son actually did occupy the throne, until it was seized by Ariyahina's son. If so, this fact is conveniently obscured by the latter, who gives no indication that he had usurped the throne from a man who had inherited it from his father. So we cannot be sure whether or not Hamiyata did in fact intend the succession to pass back to Ariyahina's line. The inscription is highly propagandistic. Its author provides his genealogy to demonstrate that he was entitled to claim the throne from its current occupant, Hamiyata's son, and he implies, even if he does not state, that Hamiyata had intended him, Ariyahina's son, to be his successor—all designed to justify his seizure of royal authority. In any case, the action by Hamiyata's son in apparently rescinding the powers which his father had conferred upon the son of Ariyahina provided the latter with the excuse for the coup which put him on the throne. His inscriptions gives no indication that Hamiyata's son ever occupied the throne—which he almost certainly did. At the very least, he must have staked his own claim to it following his father's death.

We are thus presented with two possible scenarios: (1) Hamiyata, a member of the rival dynasty currently occupying the throne, had through a sense of conscience or because he was well-disposed towards him, elevated Ariyahina's son to high status in his kingdom, above that of his brothers, and was in fact grooming him for the succession. But on his father's death, and in defiance of his wishes, Hamiyata's son claimed the throne for himself. He was removed from it when Ariyahina's son claimed his 'rightful' inheritance. (2) Hamiyata may have conferred certain benefits and offices upon Ariyahina's son, but still intended the succession to pass to his own son. The latter did in fact accede to the throne and occupied it for a short time. Ariyahina's son has conveniently obscured this fact in his inscription so as not to diminish in any way his justification for overthrowing the reigning king.

Both of these scenarios present us with a picture of intermittent conflict between two family groups in Masuwari/Til Barsip. The question arises as to whether this conflict was ethnically based, emerging out of a contest for power between rival 'Hittite' and Aramaean elements.⁷⁰ Discussion of this possibility has focused on the ethnic origins of some of the personal names in the inscriptions.⁷¹ Undoubtedly, the populations of many of the Neo-Hittite

kingdoms contained Aramaean as well as Hittite/Luwian and native Syrian elements. But almost certainly ethnicity was not a factor, or at least not a significant factor, in the contest for the throne in Masuwari/Til Barsip. The contest was purely a family affair, played out between two households who had by one means or another gained pre-eminence in the kingdom, and who may or may not have been of different ethnic origins.⁷²

Irrespective of their origins, the rulers of the Neo-Hittite states used Luwian in their inscriptions, from a desire to maintain a longstanding royal tradition—one which had originated in the Hittite imperial age and which subsequently became the mark of their own claim to royalty. So too, the iconography of royalty in the Neo-Hittite period was in large measure based on the iconography of the Hittite empire, initially preserved and passed on by the first rulers of Carchemish. Both the language and the iconography became embedded in the ongoing tradition of royalty in the Neo-Hittite world. If you became a king, you used the traditional language of royalty to proclaim your status and your achievements. It was a way of legitimizing your rule. All the more so, perhaps, if you were of non-Hittite or non-Luwian origin. Let us remember that Luwian was not the official language of Hittite royalty in the Late Bronze Age. But it was adopted by Hittite kings for their public monuments, and in this way became an established part of the tradition of royalty, which persisted in the Neo-Hittite kingdoms for centuries after the fall of the empire where the tradition had originated.

—?

Ahuni

(— 856) (*Pros.* 1/I 84–6)

RIMA 3: 10–11, 19, 21–2.

In the mid 9th century, Masuwari/Til Barsip came under the control of a certain Ahuni, ruler of the Aramaean tribe Bit-Adini, and a longstanding enemy of the Assyrians. It was in Masuwari/Til Barsip that Ahuni made his last-but-one stand, against the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III (856). The city was captured by Shalmaneser, who renamed it Kar-Shalmaneser (Port Shalmaneser), and allocated to it settlers from Assyria (*RIMA* 3: 19). We shall return to Ahuni in Chapter 11. He is well known to us from the records of Shalmaneser's reign, but there are no hieroglyphic inscriptions associated with his name. So the chronological relationship between him and the hieroglyphic-attested rulers of Masuwari remains unclear. If there were in fact a gap between the latter and Ahuni's occupation of the kingdom, it must have been a relatively short one, since the genealogy of the earlier rulers extended well down into the 9th century. Bunnens suggests the possibility that Hamiyata was a member of the tribe of Bit-Adini ruled by Ahuni. One could speculate that Ahuni himself took possession of Masuwari and ended the rule of Arihayina's son there.⁷³

The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in the Anti-Taurus and Western Syrian Regions

Gurgum

In the reign of Ashurnasirpal II, envoys from Gurgum were among the thousands of foreign representatives who took part in the ten-day celebrations held by the Assyrian king in his royal city Nimrud (Calah) to mark the inauguration of a great new palace in the city (*RIMA* 2: 293). This is the first time Gurgum is referred to in Assyrian records. The kingdom so called by the Assyrians (its Luwian name is unknown) lay in the plain of modern Maraş, south-eastern Anatolia, bordering Sam'al to the south and Kummuh to the east. Its capital was located on the site of Maraş, called Marqas in the inscriptions of Sargon II. As with other Neo-Hittite kingdoms, much of what we know about Gurgum comes from Assyrian sources. But a relatively large number of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions found at or in the vicinity of Maraş provide our most important information about its royal dynasty. From these inscriptions, we can reconstruct a continuous line of nine kings of Gurgum. Three inscriptions in particular contribute to this reconstruction.

(1) *CHLI* I: IV.1. MARAŞ 8 (252–5) was authored by the first known Gurgumean king called Larama. He includes in his titulature the names of his father and grandfather: 'I am Larama, grandson of Astuwaramanza, son of Muwatalli.'¹ We thus have the sequence Astuwaramanza → Muwatalli (I) (son) → Larama (I) (son).

(2) *CHLI* I: IV.4. MARAŞ 1 (261–5). This commemorative inscription is our most informative source of information on the genealogy of the Gurgumean dynasty. It begins: 'I am Halparuntiya, the Ruler, King of Gurgum, the governor Larama's son, the hero Halparuntiya's grandson, the brave Muwatalli's great-grandson, the ruler Halparuntiya's great-great-grandson, the hero Muwizi's great-great-great-grandson, the governor Larama's descendant...'. The author of the inscription, Halparuntiya, traces his family line back at least six generations. He was the third member of this line to be

called Halparuntiya. He identifies, in order, his father Larama (II), grandfather Halparuntiya (II), great-grandfather Muwatalli (II), great-great-grandfather Halparuntiya (I), great-great-great-grandfather Muwizi, and ancestor (presumably his great-great-great-great-grandfather) Larama (I). This last we can identify with the Larama of inscription (1)—which enables us to extend the dynasty of Halparuntiya III back to Larama's grandfather Astuwaramanza. The royal succession appears to have passed for at least nine generations—in orderly fashion as far as we know—from father to son.

(3) Further partial evidence for the sequence of Gurgumean rulers is provided by *CHLI* I: IV.2. MARAŞ 4 (255–8), an inscription carved on the remaining fragment of a colossal ruler-figure found on the site of Maraş and now in the Ancient Oriental Museum, Istanbul. The inscription was composed by one of the three kings called Halparuntiya, who tells us: 'I am Halparuntiya the Ruler, king of Gurgum, the ruler Muwatalli's son, . . . Muwizi's great-grandson . . .'. By comparing this information with the more comprehensive genealogy provided in (2), we can identify the inscription's subject as the second Halparuntiya and his father as the second Muwatalli. (The inscription also provides confirmation that the Muwatalli in question did in fact occupy the throne of his kingdom, since the title 'ruler' is here appended to his name. No royal title is accorded to him in MARAŞ 1.)

By combining the information supplied by these inscriptions, we can reconstruct Gurgum's ruling dynasty thus: Astuwaramanza → Muwatalli I → Larama I → Muwizi → Halparuntiya I → Muwatalli II → Halparuntiya II → Larama II → Halparuntiya III.

Fixed points in the chronology of the dynasty are provided by synchronisms with several of the Gurgumean rulers attested in Assyrian records. In his first regnal year (858), Shalmaneser III records receiving tribute from a king of Gurgum called Mutallu (*RIMA* 3: 16). Five years later, Shalmaneser did battle with a coalition of Syro-Palestinian states at Qarqar on the Orontes river. Prior to the battle, a Gurgumean king called Qalparunda was one of a number of rulers of south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria who paid tribute to him (*RIMA* 3: 23). Since only five years separate the references to these kings in the Assyrian record, then it is likely that Qalparunda succeeded Mutallu. Mutallu is clearly the Assyrian rendering of Muwatalli, and Qalparunda of Halparuntiya. The Mutallu–Qalparunda sequence thus exactly reflects the Muwatalli II–Halparuntiya II sequence in the Luwian record, giving us two absolute dates in the reigns of these kings. Muwatalli II was preceded by at least five members of his dynasty, each representing one generation. This would suggest a period of *c.*130 years, perhaps more, extending back from his reign to the dynasty's first known member—which would date the origins of the dynasty to the late 11th century, or earlier. In fact, we cannot be sure that Astuwaramanza was the first member of his dynasty, or for that matter the first ruler of

the kingdom of Gurgum. Its foundation may date back even earlier, which would make it one of the earliest of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms to develop. The preservation of the name Muwatalli possibly indicates that the Gurgumean dynasty was founded by a branch of the central Hittite dynasty after the fall of the Hittite empire.

But more than mere name-preservation may have been involved. We recall that the Hittite Muwatalli's son and heir, Urhi-Teshub, had been deposed by his uncle Hattusili, who ruled in his place and made his own descendants heirs to the throne. Urhi-Teshub had been banished to Syria, and probably spent some years in Egypt as a refugee from Hattusili's authority. But he never gave up his ambition of reclaiming his throne, and his sons may have continued his efforts to restore Muwatalli's line to the kingship of Hatti. The collapse of the Hittite kingdom in the early 12th century would have brought such attempts to an end. Nevertheless, it is possible that Iron Age descendants of the family were responsible for building a new kingdom in south-eastern Anatolia—the kingdom of Gurgum.

There are other possibilities. Hawkins notes that the city and area of Maraş have never been systematically excavated or surveyed; the numerous sculptured and inscribed monuments which have been appearing from the site for more than a century have all been found by irregular digging and have no accurately recorded provenance.² Conceivably, there are other remains at Gurgum, yet to be discovered, dating to the very end of the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age. Could this have been the place where the last Bronze Age Hittite king Suppiluliuma set up residence in exile after his departure from Hattusa? Another possibility is that the Maraş region lay originally under the control of the early rulers of Neo-Hittite Carchemish, and that a branch of the royal family was established there to develop the region under the overlordship of Carchemish—in perhaps much the same way as (I have suggested) the Neo-Hittite kingdom Malatya began its development.

One further synchronism between Gurgumean and Assyrian records can be dated to 805, the year in which Adad-nirari III ordered an inscribed boundary stone to be set up between Kummuh and Gurgum. Kummuh was at that time ruled by a king called Suppiluliuma, Gurgum by one of the local kings called Halparuntiya (Assyrian Qalparunda).³ The latter is undoubtedly to be identified with Halparuntiya III, author of the hieroglyphic inscription MARAŞ 1, and son of Larama II. In the Assyrian text (*RIMA* 3: 205), the father's name is represented as Palalam; hence the names Palalam and Larama can be equated.

The Kings of Gurgum

We can summarize what we know about the individual kings of Gurgum as follows:

—?

Astuwaramanza

(late 11th cent.) (*Jas.* 70)

CHLI I: IV.1. MARAŞ 8 (252–5).

Attested as the grandfather of Larama I, author of the inscription, Astuwaramanza is the earliest known of Gurgum's kings, and may have founded the dynasty which ruled the kingdom until its end in 711. It is possible, however, that he had one or more royal predecessors. Excavations have yet to reveal the kingdom's origins.

↓

Muwatalli I

(— early 10th cent.) son (*Jas.* 70)

CHLI I: IV.1. MARAŞ 8 (252–5).

Known only as the father of Larama I.

↓

Larama I

(— c.950) son (*Jas.* 70–1)

CHLI I: IV.1. MARAŞ 8 (252–5).

Larama is the author of the inscription, which commemorates his achievements. Though the text is too fragmentary to provide us with any detailed information, it appears to refer to a programme of reconstruction undertaken by Larama, including the replanting of crops and vineyards, following some devastation inflicted upon his land.

↓

Muwizi

(later 10th cent.) son (*Jas.* 71)

(1) *CHLI* I: IV.2. MARAŞ 4 (255–8);

(2) *CHLI* I: IV.4. MARAŞ 1 (261–5).

Known only for his place in the Gurgumean genealogical table.

↓

Halparuntiya I

(earlier 9th cent.) son

CHLI I: IV.4. MARAŞ 1 (261–5).

Known only for his place in the Gurgumean genealogical table.

↓

Muwatalli II (Assyrian Mutallu (II))(— 858 —) son (*Jas.* 71–3, *Pros.* 2/II 785 s.v. **Mutallu** 1)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IV.2. MARAŞ 4 (255–8);
- (2) *CHLI* I: IV.4. MARAŞ 1 (261–5);
- (3) *RIMA* 3: 16.

This is the first king of Gurgum to be attested in Assyrian records. In 858, he became a tributary of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III during the latter's first western campaign.

↓

Halparuntiya II (Assyrian Qalparunda (II))(— 853 —) son (*Jas.* 71–3, *Pros.* 3/I 1005 s.v. **Qalparunda** 1)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IV.2. MARAŞ 4 (255–8);
- (2) *CHLI* I: IV.4. MARAŞ 1 (261–5);
- (3) *RIMA* 3: 23.

This man is the author of no. 1, which is inscribed on the fragment of a colossal statue of the king, probably a funerary monument commemorating his achievements. Only the feet of the statue remain, but a record of its author's military exploits has been preserved in the accompanying inscription. Reference is made in the inscription to an attack by Halparuntiya on the city Hirika and his capture of the city Iluwasi. Neither of these places is otherwise known to us, though it has been suggested that Hirika may be the land of Hilakku in the region later known as Cilicia Tracheia/Aspera (Rough Cilicia) in south-eastern Anatolia.⁴ If the identification is correct, Halparuntiya's invasion of Hilakku would have involved a campaign of considerable magnitude for a relatively small kingdom like Gurgum, and a reason for it is difficult to suggest. Disputes over territorial boundaries were often a source of conflict between neighbouring states. But Gurgum and Hilakku did not share a common border. More plausible is Hawkins's suggestion that 'Hirika could be identified with the border city Hiliki mentioned in a Malatya inscription from Elbistan, and the place might be sought as a border territory between Gurgum and the plain of Elbistan.'⁵ In general, Gurgum seems to have pursued a policy of peaceful coexistence with its neighbours. A number of its kings undertook reconstruction projects involving the development of their kingdom's agricultural resources (e.g. MARAŞ 8 §§6–8, p. 253, İSKENDERUN §§2–4, p. 259).

Halparuntiya is among Shalmaneser III's tributaries listed for the year 853. He should not be confused with a contemporary ruler of the northern Syrian kingdom Patin/Unqi (see **Pat(t)in** below) who was also called Qalparu(n)da in

Assyrian records. Both rulers are mentioned as tributaries of Shalmaneser in *RIMA* 3: 23.

↓

Larama II (Assyrian Palalam)

(later 9th cent.) son (*Jas.* 73–4)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IV.4. MARAŞ 1 (261–5);
- (2) *RIMA* 3: 205.

This man is known only for his place in the Gurgumean genealogical table, and his identification, under the name Palalam, in an inscription from the reign of Adad-nirari III (810–783).

↓

Halparuntiya III

(— 805–c.800 —) son (*Jas.* 74–6, *Pros.* 3/I 1005 s.v. **Qalparunda** 3)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IV.4. MARAŞ 1 (261–5);
- (2) *RIMA* 3: 205.

The inscription of which Halparuntiya III is the subject (no. 1) was carved on a lion portal orthostat, discovered on the site of Maraş and now in the Ancient Oriental Museum, Istanbul. It commemorates the achievements of Halparuntiya, perhaps posthumously. This king is better known from his appearance in the inscription carved on the boundary stone set up in 805 between the kingdoms of Kummuh and Gurgum (no. 2). Subsequently, Halparuntiya may have been the unnamed king who led a contingent from Gurgum in the alliance which c.800 laid siege to the northern Hamathite city Hatarikka.⁶

—

Tarhulara

(— 743–c.711)

Tigl. III 100–1, 102–3, 108–9, *ARAB* II §§29, 61, Fuchs 131–2 vv. 237–9 (325–6), 217–18 vv. 83–6 (348).

Halparuntiya III is the last of the kings of Gurgum attested in Luwian inscriptions. There is now a gap of more than fifty years in the sequence of rulers before the appearance of Gurgum's next known king, called Tarhulara in the records of Tiglath-pileser III. The gap was doubtless filled by a number of rulers, who may or may not have been members of the original Gurgumean dynasty. The fact that the final occupant of Gurgum's throne, Muwatalli, had the same name as two earlier members of this dynasty *may* indicate dynastic continuity. We have no information about relations between Gurgum and Assyria during the period of the unattested rulers of Gurgum. But the

kingdom's hostility to Assyria in Tarhulara's reign is indicated by its membership in the Urartian–Arpad led military alliance that confronted Tiglath-pileser III in 743 (*Tigl. III* 100–1, 132–3). In the process of crushing the alliance, Tiglath-pileser invaded Tarhulara's kingdom and allegedly destroyed one hundred of his cities. He forced Tarhulara into submission, but accepted his plea to spare his royal capital (*Tigl. III* 102–3). A deal had obviously been struck with the Gurgumean king in advance. Tarhulara was allowed to retain his throne, and continued to occupy it, as an Assyrian tributary (*Tigl. III* 108–9). But Gurgum suffered a further reduction in its territory.⁷ On this occasion, Tarhulara was forced to cede some of his cities to his southern neighbour Panamuwa II, king of Sam'al (*TSSI* II: 14, 15, *CS* II: 160). He is subsequently attested as an Assyrian tributary in 732, and continued to occupy his kingdom's throne until c.711.

↓

Muwatalli III

(c.711) son (*Pros.* 2/II 785 s.v. **Mutallu** 2)

ARAB II §§29, 61, Fuchs 131–2 vv. 237–9 (325–6), 217–18 vv 83–6 (348).

Tarhulara reigned for more than thirty years, before being assassinated by his son Muwatalli (III) who seized his throne. Assyria's current ruler Sargon II responded by deposing the usurper and deporting him to Assyria. That event marked the end of Gurgum's existence as a separate kingdom. It also brought to an end a royal dynasty which may have begun with the first attested Gurgumean ruler Astuwaramanza in the late 11th century—possibly even earlier. Sargon annexed the kingdom and made it an Assyrian province, called Marqas after Gurgum's former capital. Marqas appears to have retained its status as a separate province until the fall of the Assyrian empire.

A Kingdom of the Philistines?

Taita

(11th or 10th cent.?)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IX.13. MEHARDE (415–16)
- (2) *CHLI* I: IX.14. SHEIZAR (416–19)
- (3) *CHLI* VII.1. TELL TAYINAT 1 (365–7)
- (4) ALEPPO 6 (Hawkins, 2009: 169).

During the course of his recent excavations of the temple of the Storm God on the citadel of Aleppo, K. Kohlmeyer uncovered, in 2003, well-preserved statues, facing each other, of the Storm God and a king. The latter bears an

eleven-line hieroglyphic Luwian inscription with a dedication to the Storm God (no. 4). Designated as Aleppo 6, the inscription begins by naming the king and his titles: 'I (am) King Taita, the Hero, the King of [the land?] PaDAsatini' (transl. Hawkins). This king was already known to us from two hieroglyphic inscriptions found at the sites of Meharde and Sheizar, located close to each other at a crossing on the Orontes river, 25 km north-west of Hamath (nos. 1 and 2). The Meharde inscription is dedicated to Taita's wife, who is titled 'Queen of the land'; the Sheizar inscription is the queen's funerary monument. The latter indicates that she lived one hundred years, and that her name was Kupapiya. In both inscriptions, Taita bears the title 'Hero' and his country is called WaDAsatini. In the Meharde inscription, he is explicitly named as king of this country.

The only other reference to a country called WaDAsatini occurs in a fragmentary inscription discovered at Tell Tayinat in 1936 (no. 3). Following Meriggi, Hawkins suggests that the name could be the Luwian designation for the Amuq Plain. From his attestation as king at Aleppo and in the Hamath region, and the references to his land as P/WaDAsatini in these inscriptions and in the inscription from Tell Tayinat, Hawkins concludes that Taita ruled over a substantial kingdom, which incorporated the Amuq Plain, and extended eastwards to the territory of Aleppo and southwards along the Orontes river to the environs of modern Hama. Assyrian and other Luwian hieroglyphic texts indicate that these regions belonged respectively to the kingdoms of Patin (Assyrian Unqi), Arpad (Bit-Agusi), and Hamath. And that of course raises the question of how Taita's kingdom is to be accommodated within the historical framework of the period. As Hawkins concedes, the dating of Taita's reign is a matter of conjecture. In addressing this matter, he hypothesizes that Tell Tayinat was Taita's capital, and links the king with the expansion of the city in what is designated as the Amuq Phase O, when Tayinat came to be the dominant site of the plain; the palatial buildings of Building Period I could be considered his royal seat.⁸ This would date Taita back to the 11th century.

Hawkins then discusses the possibility of a philological equation between P/WaDAsatini and *Palastin-* and speculates on a connection between Taita's kingdom and the Philistines, one of the Sea Peoples who swept through the region in the 12th century during Ramesses III's reign. Was Taita's kingdom in fact a kingdom of the Philistines? If so, its ruler clearly adopted a number of the trappings of a Neo-Hittite kingdom, as reflected in both the epigraphy and the iconography of the sites which allegedly belonged to the kingdom. But the dating remains questionable, and later periods for Taita have been proposed; he should perhaps be assigned to the 10th century, perhaps near its end.⁹ Whatever the time-frame for his reign, he might well be regarded as a predecessor of the rulers, attested primarily in Assyrian sources, who held sway over the kingdom of Patin.¹⁰

Pat(t)in (Assyrian Unqi)

Patin, called Unqi in Assyrian records, lay on the Amuq plain of northern Syria,¹¹ on the territory formerly occupied by the Late Bronze Age kingdom Alalah. Assyrian texts provide us with the names of a number of Patin's cities, the most important of which was its capital Kinalua (Kunulua), almost certainly to be identified with the site of Tell Tayinat.¹² There had been an important settlement on this site in the Early Bronze Age, but it was apparently abandoned in the second millennium as the nearby city of Alalah was developed. Alalah's destruction in the 12th century left a vacuum in the immediate region, which renewed settlement at Tell Tayinat eventually filled. During the Iron Age, Tell Tayinat was dominated by a citadel which featured two main building phases. The first of these, dating back to the 10th century or earlier, contained what appears to have been a palace complex of the *bit hilani* type,¹³ designated Building XIII. This was presumably the royal residence of the kings of Patin. (We have noted above the suggestion that the king called Taita had resided here.) The history of the kingdom is known to us primarily from Assyrian sources, from Ashurnasirpal II (883–859) to Tiglath-pileser III (745–727), supplemented by scraps of information provided by Patin's own (poorly preserved) records dating to the 9th and 8th centuries.

The Kings of Patin

—?

Lubarna (I)(— c.870–858?) (*Pros.* 2/II 667 s.v. **Lubarna**¹⁴)*RIMA* 2: 217–18, 3: 25.

A man called Lubarna (Labarna) is the earliest of the attested kings of Patin.¹⁵ He first appears in the campaign which Ashurnasirpal II conducted across the Euphrates to the Mediterranean coast c.870. After receiving in Carchemish the submission of the Carchemishean king Sangara, and a number of other kings of the region, Ashurnasirpal led his troops westwards to the land of Patin, and advanced upon its capital Kinalua. Lubarna, who was in residence at the time, submitted without resistance (*RIMA* 2: 217). His reign probably ended in the first regnal year of Ashurnasirpal's successor Shalmaneser III (858), who reports attacking and destroying one of Lubarna's fortified cities, Urimu, during his first western campaign (*RIMA* 3: 25).

↔?

Suppiluliuma (Assyrian Sapalulme)(—? 858/857) (*Pros.* 3/I 1090–1)*RIMA* 3: 9–10.

Suppiluliuma, the second known ruler of Patin who bears a traditional royal Hittite name, was a member of the alliance of northern Syrian and northern Mesopotamian states that fought against and were defeated by Shalmaneser III in 858, in a battle near the city of Lutibu on Sam'al's frontier. Shalmaneser's victory removed the main obstacle to his advance southwards into the kingdom of Patin. But it failed to destroy the coalition's armies, which had regrouped under Suppiluliuma's leadership by the time Shalmaneser crossed the Orontes river into Patinite territory. A second confrontation took place outside Suppiluliuma's fortified city Alimush (Alishir) (*RIMA* 3: 10). Again the battle honours went to Shalmaneser, this time more decisively.

↓

Halparuntiya (Assyrian Qalparunda)(858/857–853 —) (*Pros.* 3/I 1005 s.v. **Qalparunda** 2)(1) *CHLI* I: VII.1. TELL TAYINAT 1 (365–7);(2) *RIMA* 3: 11, 18, 38(?).

Shalmaneser's second victory over the anti-Assyrian alliance apparently brought Suppiluliuma's reign to an end, as it had probably also ended the reign of Lubarna. Patin may up to this time have been divided between the two kings.¹⁶ The succession now passed to a man called 'Qalparunda the Unqite' or 'Qalparunda the Patinite' in Shalmaneser's records. At least for the time being, the new king submitted to Assyrian authority, with recorded payments of tribute to Shalmaneser in the years 857 and 853. This king can probably be identified with the man called Halparuntiya in a Luwian hieroglyphic inscription found beneath a palace floor at Tell Tayinat (no. 1).¹⁷ The inscription is too fragmentary to provide us with any further useful information about the man or his status. But it is worth recalling that at least three kings of Gurgum were called Halparuntiya. Possibly, the reappearance of this name in Tell Tayinat indicates family links between Patin's and Gurgum's royal dynasties.

↓?

Lubarna (II)

(— 831)

RIMA 3: 69.

Patin may have remained a tributary of Assyria from Halparuntiya's reign through that of his successor(?) Lubarna II. During the latter's reign, Patin was apparently submissive to Assyrian overlordship for a period of more than two decades. But in 831, matters came to a head when Shalmaneser received news that the Patinites had risen up against their king, perhaps because of his loyalty to Assyria, and assassinated him. In his place, they appointed a commoner called Surri.

↓

Surri (831)

(*Pros.* 3/I 1160)

RIMA 3: 69.

Shalmaneser refers to this man as 'a non-lord of the throne' (transl. Grayson). He was thus not a member of the Patinite royal dynasty, and had presumably been installed by a populace hostile to Assyria. Shalmaneser's dispatch of an army to the kingdom in response to the coup indicates that Patin was at this time still an Assyrian tributary. The army was led by the Assyrian commander Dayyan-Ashur. But Surri died before a confrontation took place, probably by his own hand. His death brought the crisis to an end. Dayyan-Ashur took no military action against the city, contenting himself with the substantial tribute he received from it on Shalmaneser's behalf.

↓

Sasi

(831 —)

RIMA 3: 69.

Dayyan-Ashur now appointed a man called Sasi from the land of Kurussa (otherwise unknown) as Patin's new ruler.

—

Tutammu

(— 738).

Tigl. III 56–9.

There is a gap of almost a century between the record of Sasi's appointment and the next reference to a Patinite king. The kingdom may have remained submissive to Assyria in this period, if we can so judge from the lack of any reference to it in the Assyrian record. But in 739, during the reign of Tiglath-pileser III, an oath of allegiance which bound it to Assyria was

breached by the last of the Patinite kings, a man called Tutammu. Tiglath-pileser deposed the rebel, executed him, and converted his kingdom into an Assyrian province, now called Kullanni(a).

Hamath

The city of Hamath, located on the Orontes river in central Syria, is first attested in texts from the third-millennium archives discovered at Ebla. Excavations have revealed that the city underwent significant development during its Late Bronze Age phase, when it was involved in international trading activities, as indicated by imported goods from Cyprus and the Mycenaean world—though the absence of any reference to it in Egyptian texts of the period has led to the conclusion that it was not at this time a major urban centre.¹⁸ Its status was, however, to improve dramatically in the Iron Age, when it became the capital of a large and important kingdom of the same name, thenceforth frequently attested in biblical and Assyrian sources.¹⁹ Material remains of the city in this period include a temple to the goddess Ba'alat, and a complex of large, public buildings, of 10th–9th century date, surrounding an open courtyard and accessed via a fortified monumental gateway. The temple is attested in several Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, referred to below. Lion sculptures of Hittite type flanked the entrances and staircases of several buildings, but apart from these, sculptural remains of this period are relatively meagre.

The earliest references to Hamath in Assyrian texts date to the reigns of Tukulti-Ninurta II (890–884) and Shalmaneser III (858–824). Shalmaneser names a number of the towns and cities of the kingdom (*RIMA* 3: 23), which probably reached its greatest extent during the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (745–727) (*Tigl. III* 60–3).

Hamath's northernmost territory was the important land variously called Luash, Luhuti, Lugath. It was located east of the Orontes river, and south of the kingdom of Patin, in the region formerly occupied by the Late Bronze Age Nuhashshi lands. Luash first appears in Assyrian records in 870, the year in which Ashurnasirpal II campaigned against the states of Syria and Palestine. After invading Patin and receiving the submission of its king Lubarna, Ashurnasirpal used the Patinite city Aribua as his base for military operations against Luash, which lay to its south. The Assyrian king records the capture and conquest of Luash's cities, and the impalement of their troops on stakes before their walls (*RIMA* 2: 218). By 800 at the latest, Luash had been incorporated into the kingdom of Hamath, perhaps the achievement of an Aramaean king of Hamath called Zakur, who identifies himself on a stele found at Tell Afis—the so-called Zakur stele—as 'King of Hamath and Luash'. (Tell Afis was a fortified urban centre in north-western Syria.) Clearly Luash

was by then a part of the Hamathite kingdom, and Hawkins suggests that it already formed the northern province of Hamath by the reign of Shalmaneser III, or even earlier.²⁰ Its capital was a city called Hatarikka/Hazrek (biblical Hadrach), which may have become the royal seat, or one of the royal seats, of the new Aramaean dynasty in Hamath.

Hamath-city has the distinction of being the first site in Syria where Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions came to light. They were carved on four stone building blocks, discovered, or rather rediscovered, in the bazaar of modern Hama in 1870 by two Americans, J. A. Johnson and S. Jessup. One of the stones had actually been seen and noted almost sixty years earlier, in 1812, by the Swiss traveller Johann Ludwig Burckhardt. In 1877, the 'Hamath stones' were transported to Istanbul, and are now housed in the Ancient Oriental Museum. They have been published by Hawkins as *CHLI* I: IX.8–10. HAMA 1–3 (411–42) and *CHLI* I: IX.1. HAMA 4 (403–6). The inscriptions on HAMA 4 were authored by the Hamathite king Urhilina; those on HAMA 1–3 by his son Uratami.

Lipiński expresses some surprise at the emergence of the Luwian hieroglyphic tradition in central Syria. From the fact that the inscriptions are limited to just two Hamathite rulers, and that no 'private' hieroglyphic inscriptions have been recovered from the kingdom, he concludes that 'the Neo-Hittite element among the inhabitants of the country was rather restricted, and that the old stock of North Semitic or Amorite peoples formed the bulk of the local population, expanding as a result of the steady immigration of new and intrusive Aramaean and North Arabian groups speaking related Semitic languages.'²¹ His comments may well be valid, not only for Hamath, but also, increasingly, for a number of the other Neo-Hittite states in the Syrian region. As we have noted, the ethnic origins of the ruling class of many of these states may have differed from that of the large majority of the population, particularly from the late 9th century onwards.

The Kings of Hamath: Neo-Hittite rulers

Despite the fact that Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions are associated with only two of its rulers, Urhilina and his son Uratami, Hamath almost certainly began the Iron Age phase of its history as a kingdom ruled by a succession of Neo-Hittite kings. We do not know who founded the Iron Age state or the circumstances of its foundation. But its royal line may well have extended back to the late second millennium. In Old Testament tradition, a king of Hamath called 'Toi (Tou)' sent his son Joram to King David to congratulate him on his victory over Hadadezer, king of Zobah (2 Sam. 8:9). In terms of biblical chronology, this event would date to the early 10th century, in the period traditionally assigned to the reign of David. But no king of this name is otherwise attested, nor can he be identified with any king known from non-

biblical sources. It is possible that there is a historical personage behind the biblical tradition, but we have no historical sources dating to this early period.

—?

Parita

(first half of the 9th cent.) (*Jas.* 98–9)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IX.1. HAMA 4 (403–6);
- (2) *CHLI* I: IX.5. HINES (408–9);
- (3) *CHLI* I: IX.6. HAMA 8 (409–10).

This man is known only from three inscriptions authored by his son Urhilina. He was presumably his son's predecessor on the Hamathite throne, though in none of the inscriptions is there a royal title associated with his name.

↓

Urhilina (Assyrian Irhuleni)

(— 853–845 —) son; 'King' (*Jas.* 99–101, *Pros.* 2/I 564)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IX.1. HAMA 4 (403–6);
- (2) *CHLI* I: IX.5. HINES (408–9);
- (3) *CHLI* I: IX.6. HAMA 8 (409–10);
- (4) *CHLI* I: IX.8–10. HAMA 1–3 (411–14);
- (5) *CHLI* I: IX.18. HAMA frag. 4 (420–1);
- (6) *RIMA* 3: 23, 37–9.

Urhilina can be equated with the Hamathite king called Irhuleni in the records of Shalmaneser III. He was one of the leaders of the anti-Assyrian coalition that confronted Shalmaneser at Qarqar on the Orontes river in 853 (*RIMA* 3: 23), and in later years (849, 848, 845) (*RIMA* 3: 37–9). Shalmaneser seems eventually to have won over Urhilina by diplomacy. In his own inscriptions, Urhilina records his construction of buildings dedicated to the goddess Ba'alat, including a temple (no. 1) and a granary (no. 3). Inscription no. 2 refers to a city which he built apparently in the goddess's honour. The name of the city, which presumably lay somewhere in the Hamathite kingdom, is not given. What is particularly puzzling is that this inscription was found in northern Iraq, in an ancient Assyrian context. We do not know the circumstances in which it was carried off to Assyria. Hawkins suggests that it is a copy made in antiquity of an original inscription taken to Assyria by Shalmaneser, or by Sargon II, the conqueror of Hamath.²²

↓



Fig. 9. Shell clappers, presented to Shalmaneser III by the Hamathite king Urhilina (courtesy, British Museum). (Note Urhilina's name in Luwian hieroglyphs on the right-hand shell.)

Uratami (=Rudamu?)

(— c.830 —) son; 'King' (*Jas.* 101–3)

- (1) *CHLI* I: IX.8–10. HAMA 1–3 (411–14);
- (2) *CHLI* I: IX.11–12. HAMA 6 and 7 (412–14).²³

Uratami is the last attested of the 'Neo-Hittite' rulers of Hamath. He may have been the last member of his dynastic line, but it is possible that he had one or more successors who have left us no trace of their existence. Hawkins sees the dynasty as 'clearly Hittite in the general sense, i.e. the father (Urhilina) bears a name recognizably Hurrian and the son (Uratami) Luwian'.²⁴ The above inscriptions contain information about the construction of a fortress or wall. In each case, Uratami refers to assistance provided by various river-lands, no doubt districts along the Orontes under Hamathite control, perhaps in a programme of refortifying the capital during his reign.

Uratami is also the addressee of a letter which was among the cuneiform tablets found on the Hamath citadel. The letter's author was Marduk-aplar-usur, ruler of the middle Euphrates state Suhu.²⁵

The Kings of Hamath: Aramaean rulers

—?

Zak(k)ur

(— c.800 —) ‘King’.

CS II: 155²⁶ (‘Zakur stele’).

Zakur is the first attested ruler of a line of Aramaean kings who held sway over Hamath, from c.800, for the next eighty years. The former Neo-Hittite dynasty that had ruled there, perhaps from the early Iron Age, had by now become defunct. But the circumstances which resulted in the establishment of an Aramaean line of rulers in its place remain unknown. An Aramaean may have seized the throne, or peacefully occupied it, following the Neo-Hittite dynasty’s demise. Intervention by Assyria may have played a part in the change of dynasty. As we have earlier noted, Zakur was the author of an Aramaic inscription carved on a stele discovered at Tell Afis, and dated to the late 9th–early 8th century. The inscription upon it records Zakur’s victory over a coalition of enemy forces, led by Bar-Hadad II, king of Damascus, after these forces had blockaded him in the city of Hatarikka.

—

Two or more kings

Since Zakur came to the throne of Hamath in or before 800 and the last Hamathite king Yaubidi was killed in 720, we should allow for at least two successors of Zakur to fill the gap between the reigns. Two possibilities have been suggested: (1) Bar-Ga’ya, king of the Aramaean state Ktk (discussed in Chapter 8) who drew up a treaty in Aramaic with Mati’ilu, ruler of the Aramaean kingdom Arpad, prior to Tiglath-pileser III’s conquest of Arpad in 740; (2) a man called Azriyau, who according to Tiglath-pileser had nineteen districts of Hamath seized for him (*Tigl. III* 62–3) when he became involved in Patin’s rebellion against Assyrian rule. The rebellion broke out in 739 and was crushed by Tiglath-pileser in the following year.²⁷ We have no other references to Azriyau, and there is nothing to indicate that he was ever a king of Hamath. I suggest that he was in fact a rebel leader who attempted to detach the northern part of the Hamath kingdom, including the city Hatarikka, and make a separate state of it, in opposition to the current king of Hamath (see immediately below) and his overlord Tiglath-pileser.

Eni’ilu(— 738 —) (*Pros.* 1/II 397 s.v. **Eni-il** 1)*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9,²⁸ 170–1.²⁹

This man was perhaps the official king of Hamath at the time of the suggested breakaway movement by Azriyau. Eni'ilu apparently remained loyal to his Assyrian allegiance, and retained rule over the southern part of the kingdom of Hamath after the Azriyau-led rebellion was crushed.

—?

Yaubidi (Ilubidi)


(— 720)

CS II: 293, 295, 296.

Yaubidi, the last king of Hamath, is known to us from his leadership of a rebellion involving a number of Syrian kingdoms against the recently enthroned Assyrian king Sargon II. Sargon crushed the rebellion, captured Yaubidi, and had him flayed alive. The kingdom of Hamath now became a province of the Assyrian empire.

We do not know if there were dynastic links between any of the Aramaean rulers of Hamath.

This page intentionally left blank



Map 4. The Kingdoms of Tabal, Hilakku, and Que (Adanawa).

The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in South-Eastern Anatolia

THE KINGDOMS OF TABAL

The region called Tabal in the Iron Age extended over a large part of south-eastern Anatolia, southwards from the southern curve of the Halys river (Kızıl Irmak) towards the Taurus mountains, westwards to the Konya Plain and eastwards towards the anti-Taurus range. The population of the region was very likely a predominantly Luwian one, as it had been throughout the Late Bronze Age and perhaps already in the early second millennium.

We have noted the reference in the Annals of Shalmaneser III to twenty-four kings who held sway in Tabal at the time of Shalmaneser's campaign in the region in 837 (*RIMA* 3: 67).¹ A century later, by the reign of Tiglath-pileser III, this number was much reduced, no doubt due to the incorporation of many of the states into a small group of larger kingdoms. Five such kingdoms are listed by Tiglath-pileser among his tributaries: Tabal ('Proper') (see below), Atuna, Tuhana (Luwian Tuwana), Ishtu(a)nda, and Hupishna (*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9). They were ruled respectively by Wasusarma (Assyrian Wassurme), Ushhitti (Assyrian name), Warpalawa (Assyrian Urballa), Tuhamme (Assyrian name), and Uirime (Assyrian name). To this list of kingdoms in the Tabal region we can add a sixth, Shinuhtu, attested in both Luwian and Assyrian inscriptions dating to the reign of Sargon II. Shinuhtu's ruler at that time was a man called Kiyakiya (Assyrian Kiakki).

We shall consider each of these kingdoms, and their rulers, in turn.

Northern Tabal (Tabal 'Proper')

Of the five tributary rulers listed above, Tiglath-pileser explicitly identifies only Wasusarma as a king of Tabal. His was the northernmost of the kingdoms in the Tabal region, and almost certainly the largest of them. It probably

incorporated a number of the small Tabalian principalities to which Shalmaneser had referred a century earlier. Extending southwards from the Halys river, it corresponded roughly to the modern provinces of Kayseri and Niğde. Its capital *may* have been located on the site of modern Kululu, which lies 30 km north-east of Kayseri. Another of its cities was discovered at Sultanhan, a few kilometres to the west of Kululu. Scholars now sometimes refer to Wasusarma's kingdom as 'Tabal Proper'. This is to distinguish it from other kingdoms which lay in the Tabal region. While in a specific political sense, Tiglath-pileser may have used the term Tabal to refer exclusively to the kingdom over which Wasusarma held sway, it was probably also used by the Assyrians as a generic designation for all the kingdoms that lay within the broader Tabal region as we have defined it above.

The Kings of Northern Tabal

—?

Tuwati (I)

(Assyrian *Tuatti*) (— 837)

RIMA 3: 79.

This man, the first of the kings of Tabal to be attested in written sources, appears in the record of Shalmaneser's western campaign in 837. Shalmaneser reports his invasion of Tuwati's land and the destruction of his cities, most of which were probably little more than small towns or villages with a few hectares of rural land attached to them. Tuwati was forced to take refuge in his 'royal city' Artulu, very likely his capital. The city was probably located within the Kululu–Sultanhan–Kültepe region,² just south of the Halys river not far upstream from its southernmost bend.³

Tuwati was perhaps the founder of a dynasty which came to exercise sovereignty over the most powerful of the kingdoms in the Tabal region. He may be attested, indirectly, in an inscription of the Urartian king Argishti I (787–766) who refers to 'the land of the sons (= descendants?) of Tuate' (*HCI* 89, no. 80 §3 VII). The last member of this supposed dynastic line was Wasusarma, son of a later Tuwati, who was deposed by Tiglath-pileser III c.730. If the Tuwati we are dealing with here was in fact the first of his family to exercise royal power, then we could date the beginning of Tabal's ruling line to the middle of the 9th century. But we should leave open the possibility that its foundation dated back much earlier—perhaps to an ancestor of Tuwati I, if not to an earlier ruling line.

↓

Kikki

(837 —) son (*Pros.* 2/I 615)

RIMA 3: 79.

Shalmaneser reports that he called off his investiture of Artulu when Tuwati's son Kikki surrendered and paid tribute to him. He may then have installed Kikki on his father's throne. The latter's fate is unknown.

—

Tuwati (II)

(mid 8th cent.) 'Great King', 'Hero' (*Jas.* 129–32)

- (1) *CHLI* I: X.9. KULULU 1 (442–5);
- (2) *CHLI* I: X.11. ÇİFTLİK (448–51);
- (3) *CHLI* I: X.12. TOPADA (451–61);
- (4) *CHLI* I: X.1.5 KAYSERİ (472–5).⁴

Tuwati (II)'s title 'Great King' is indicated in the one surviving inscription of his son and successor Wasusarma (no. 3), who also bears this title. The spread of the inscriptions in which Tuwati and Wasusarma are named, from Topada in the west to Kululu in the east, probably indicate the west–east extent of their kingdom's northern boundary, which doubtless lay along the south bank of the Halys river. None of the inscriptions in which Tuwati's name appears were actually authored by this king. We know of him only from the reference to him in his son's inscription, and from building and dedicatory inscriptions of his subjects.

↓

Wasusarma (*Assyrian* Wassurme)

(c.740–730) son; 'Great King', 'Hero' (*Jas.* 132–6)

- (1) *CHLI* I: X.12. TOPADA (451–61);
- (2) *CHLI* X.13. SUVASA (462–3);
- (3) *CHLI* X.14. SULTANHAN (463–72);
- (4) *CHLI* I: X.15. KAYSERİ (472–5);
- (5) *Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9, 170–1.

Wasusarma appears in several inscriptions of his subjects, but is best known from the TOPADA inscription, which he himself authored or commissioned. It is carved on a cliff-face on the road between Nevşehir and Aksaray, near the village of Acıgöl (formerly Topada). The inscription records a battle in which the king or one of his subordinate commanders engaged against a coalition of eight enemy rulers near the city of Parzuta, which probably lay close to the western frontier of Wasusarma's kingdom.⁵ Wasusarma claims that he had the

support of three ‘friendly kings’: Warpalawa, Kiyakiya,⁶ and Ruwata (who is otherwise unknown). Whether or not these kings actually took part in the conflict, which may have arisen out of a dispute over frontiers, Wasusarma defeated the coalition forces, and doubtless took the opportunity to extend his frontiers at their expense.

In the records of Tiglath-pileser III’s reign, Wasusarma can be identified with the king called Wassurme who was one of Tiglath-pileser’s tributaries. But the relationship was not a happy one, and Tiglath-pileser became infuriated with his subject. No doubt Wasusarma’s retention of the grandiose titles ‘Great King’ and ‘Hero’ already used by his father was one of the chief causes of Assyrian royal wrath. Accusing his tributary of acting as his equal, Tiglath-pileser deposed him and installed on his throne a ‘nobody’ (i.e. a commoner) called Hulli (*Tigl. III* 170–1).

↓

Hulli

(730–726 —) (*Pros.* 2/I 476–7)

Tigl. III 170–1, *ARAB* II: §25, Lie 32–3, Fuchs 123–4 vv. 194–7 (323).

Hulli, too, was deposed a few years later, probably by Tiglath-pileser’s son and successor Shalmaneser V (726–722). He was deported to Assyria, along with his son Ambaris and the rest of his family, but restored to his throne by Shalmaneser’s successor Sargon II (721–705). We do not know what arrangements, if any, the Assyrian administration made for Tabal while Hulli was in Assyria.

↓

Ambaris (*Amris*)

(c.721–713) son (*Pros.* 1/I 99–100)

ARAB II: §§25, 55, Lie 32–3, Fuchs 35 v. 23 (291), 123–5 vv. 194–202 (323), 199–200 vv. 29–32 (344).

Sargon installed Ambaris on the throne of Tabal as his father’s successor, married his daughter to him, and gave him the country of Hilakku, which lay on Anatolia’s southern coast, as a dowry. He claims that he ‘widened the land’ which he placed under Ambaris’s rule. The new name Bit-Burutash (Bit-Paruta) by which Ambaris’s kingdom was called almost certainly reflects a significant expansion southwards of the former kingdom of northern Tabal (‘Tabal Proper’), probably to the northern border of Hilakku. In the southwest, Bit-Burutash may have extended to the region of modern Konya, in whose vicinity the site now known as Kızıldağ was located. The five Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions found on the site, naming a Great King called Hartapu, and his father Mursili, also accorded the title Great King (*CHLI*

X.1: 433–6), have been dated to the last decades of the Late Bronze Age, though the dating remains problematic (as discussed in Chapter 1). Hartapu was, perhaps, a king of Tarhuntassa, belonging to a branch of the Hittite royal family which ruled in Hattusa. But on the same outcrop of rock which bears these inscriptions is the figure of a seated man, bearded and long-haired, wearing a peaked cap and long robe and holding a bowl. This relief dates some four centuries after the inscriptions, probably to the 8th century.⁷ Hawkins suggests that it may depict the king of northern Tabal called Wasusarma. But I think it unlikely that Wasusarma's kingdom extended so far to the south-west. As an alternative, I suggest that the figure represents Ambaris. The additional territories assigned by Sargon to Ambaris may well have extended the newly constituted kingdom of Bit-Burutash to include the Konya region. Kızıldağ perhaps marked part of the south-western boundary of Ambaris's kingdom. The strong Assyrian influence evident in the representation of the hair and clothing of the figure in the relief may reflect Ambaris's Assyrian acculturation during his sojourn as a 'guest' of the Assyrian king. At all events, Ambaris later fell out of favour with Sargon, who accused him of plotting with Phrygia and Urartu, and deported him along with his family and chief courtiers to Assyria in 713. Bit-Burutash along with Hilakku was placed under the administration of an Assyrian governor.

Atuna

The second of the five kings listed by Tiglath-pileser III among his tributaries in the Tabal region is a man called Ushhitti. He was ruler of the land of Atuna. The Luwian form of his name is unknown, and almost all the information about his kingdom and his successors comes from Assyrian records. The lack of any hieroglyphic inscription which contains the name Atuna has led to some debate about the kingdom's location, and whether or not it was connected with 'Mt Tunni, the silver-mountain' referred to by Shalmaneser III. An identification has been suggested, for Atuna, with the site of Classical Tynna (Hittite Dunna), located at Zeyve Höyük in the south-eastern corner of Anatolia. But I think it more likely that the city lay much further to the north—in the region south of the Halys river, west of the northern kingdom of Tabal. The main reason for thinking so is a hieroglyphic inscription discovered at modern Aksaray, which lay c.30 km west of the southern end of the Salt Lake (*CHLI* I: 476 X.16. AKSARAY (475–8)). The inscription names a certain Kiyakiya as ruler of a city-kingdom called Shinuhtu, presumably the Iron Age settlement on the site of Aksaray. This ruler is almost certainly to be identified with a king called Kiakki in the records of Sargon II (721–705). Sargon reports that Kiakki, one of his tributaries, had broken his oath, and in response he (Sargon) had marched to Shinuhtu and taken it by

force (718). He captured and deposed Kiakki, and handed over his city to the current king of Atuna, called Kurti. The fact of his doing so almost certainly means that Shinuhtu lay close to the territory of Atuna, and was now incorporated into it.⁸

Kurti can probably be identified with the king so called in a hieroglyphic inscription carved on a stele found near the village of Bohça, which lies just south of the Halys near its southernmost bend (*CHLI* I: X.17. BOHÇA, 478–80).⁹ If the identification is correct, then the stele's findspot provides us with a specific location within the kingdom of Atuna, probably not far from the western frontier of northern Tabal. The stele could conceivably have been erected by Kurti on the boundary between his kingdom and northern Tabal. However, its inscription appears to refer to hunting expeditions in which Kurti engaged, in territories supposedly granted to him by the god Runtiya. Hence Hawkins's suggestion that the stele has to do with hunting rights which the king claimed over the open countryside where it was set up.¹⁰

The Kings of Atuna

—?

Ushhitti

(— c.740 —)

Tigl. III 68–9, 108–9, 170–1.

Ushhitti was probably the successor of a number of earlier rulers of Atuna, whose foundation may date back at least to the early first millennium. Presumably Atuna began life as one of the many kingdoms in the Tabal region to which Shalmaneser III refers. But it may subsequently have grown in size and status. The fact that in Tiglath-pileser's reign its king Ushhitti is one of only five rulers of the region specifically identified as tributaries of Assyria suggests that by this time the kingdom had absorbed a number of the smaller states in the region. But it was still probably smaller in size and of lesser status than the neighbouring kingdom ruled by Wasusarma.

(—?)

(Ashwis(i))

(3rd quarter of 8th cent.) (*Jas.* 148)

CHLI I: X.17. BOHÇA (478–80).

This man appears only once, as the father of Kurti in the latter's titulary. We do not know whether Ashwis(i) was himself a king of Atuna. Hawkins suggests that he is to be identified with the Assyrian-attested Ushhitti.¹¹ An

interesting but unlikely identification has been proposed between Ashwis(i) and Askanius, mentioned in the *Iliad* as a Phrygian chieftain (*Iliad* 2.862).¹²
(↓)

Kurti (probably = Assyrian Kurti¹³)

(— 718 —) son (*Jas.* 148–50, *Pros.* 2/I 642)

(1) *CHLI* I: X.17. BOHÇA (478–80);

(2) *ARAB* II §§7, 55, 214, Lie 10–11, Fuchs 93 v. 71 (316), 199 v. 29 (344).

It is possible that Kurti directly succeeded Ushhitti, or Ashwis(i), on the throne of Atuna. His own reign is attested by his dedicatory inscription (no. 1), discovered near the village of Bohça, which he set up in honour of the Storm God and the Stag God. For some time he remained loyal to his Assyrian overlord, perhaps through the final years of Tiglath-pileser's reign, the reign of his successor Shalmaneser V, and the early years of Shalmaneser's successor Sargon II. As a reward for his loyalty, Sargon handed over to him the territory of Kiyakiya, the disgraced king of Shinuhtu. Subsequently, Kurti switched his allegiance to the Phrygian king Mita. But the action which Sargon took against another rebel king in the area, Ambaris, was sufficient to induce him to switch back to the Assyrian side, sending an envoy to Sargon, who was at that time in Media, to renew his homage and make tribute payments to him.

Around 710, Atuna joined forces with the neighbouring kingdom Ishtuanda for an attack on the cities of Bit-Paruta (Bit-Burutash). We do not know whether Kurti was still on Atuna's throne at this time.

Ishtu(a)nda

—?

Tuhamme

(— 738–732 —)

Tigl. III 68–9, 108–9.

Ishtuanda was one of the five kingdoms of Tabal which paid tribute to the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser III in 738 and 732. It was ruled at that time by a man called Tuhamme, the country's only known king. Around 710, Ishtuanda joined its neighbour Atuna for an attack on the cities of Bit-Paruta (Bit-Burutash) (*SAA* I: no. 1 vv. 43–6, p. 6). Its apparent proximity to the kingdom of Atuna, which almost certainly lay in the north-western part of the land of Tabal in the vicinity of modern Aksaray, provides a pointer to Ishtuanda's location in the same region.

—?

Shinuhtu

—?

Kiyakiya (*Assyrian Kiakki*)

(— 718) (*Jas.* 151–2, *Pros.* 2/I 613–14)

- (1) *CHLI* I: 476 X.16. AKSARAY (475–8);
- (2) *CHLI* I: X.12. TOPADA (451–61);
- (3) *ARAB* II: §§7, 55, Lie 10–11, Fuchs 35 v. 22 (290), 92–3 vv 68–71 (315–16), 198–9 vv. 28–9 (344).

As we have noted, Shinuhtu was a small kingdom whose capital was probably located at modern Aksaray. The kingdom perhaps consisted of little more than the city itself and a peripheral area of a few square kilometres. It was bordered by, or lay close to, Atuna to its north, and northern Tabal to its east. Kiyakiya is the only known ruler of Shinuhtu, though the kingdom's origins may date back at least to the early first millennium. It is possible that one of Kiyakiya's predecessors was among the twenty-four (or twenty) kings of the region referred to by Shalmaneser III. In an inscription found at Aksaray and dedicated to the Storm God Tarhunza (no. 1), Kiyakiya claims that under his rule the kingdom prospered, its capital greatly admired by other kings. Kiyakiya also figures in the TOPADA inscription of Wasusarma (no. 2), ruler of Tabal 'Proper', where he appears among the three kings who were 'friendly' to Wasusarma in his conflict with eight enemy rulers. He is almost certainly the Assyrian-attested Kiakki who broke his allegiance to Sargon and suffered the loss of his kingdom to the neighbouring(?) land of Atuna.

Tuwana

Tuwana was one of the southernmost of the kingdoms located in the region of Tabal, the term here used in its broadest sense. Occupying the territory of the Classical Tyanitis, Tuwana was the largest and most important kingdom of the southern Tabal region. Its capital is probably to be identified with Classical Tyana (Kemerhisar), 20 km south-west of modern Niğde, though at one time the royal seat may have been located at Nahitiya¹⁴ on the site of Niğde itself. Tuwana derives its name from Late Bronze Age Tuwanuwa, one of the cities of the Hittite Lower Land. Conceivably, the kingdom arose in the wake of the Hittite empire's fall, with a population perhaps largely made up of Luwian elements from Tuwanuwa. Tuwana's importance in the 8th century, if not also earlier, is indicated by the fact that it contained at least one sub-kingdom, as attested in the inscription *CHLI* I: X.45. BULGARMADEN (521–5). The inscription was

authored by a certain Tarhunaza, who bears the title ‘Ruler’ (IUDEX), and identifies himself as the ‘servant’ of the Tuwanean king Warpalawa.

The Kings of Tuwana

—?

Warpalawa (I)?

(early 8th cent.?)

CHLI I: X.42. ANDAVAL (514–16).

The suggestion that there was such a ruler in the royal dynasty of Tuwana is a highly conjectural one. See the discussion below under *Muhawarani (I)*.

—?

Saruwani

(first half of the 8th cent.?) ‘Ruler’, ‘Lord’ (*Jas.* 137–8)

CHLI I: X.42. ANDAVAL (514–16).

This man is attested as ‘ruler’ and ‘lord’ of the city Nahitiya, which was almost certainly part of the kingdom of Tuwana, and may have been an early capital of it.

—?

Muhawarani (I)

(— c.740) father of Warpalawa (II); ‘Ruler’

CHLI I: X.44. BOR (518–21)

Muhawarani is known only from a reference to him in an inscription of his son Warpalawa. His name appears as a patronymic in the damaged first line of the inscription.¹⁵ We do not know what relationship he had (if any) with the previously attested king Saruwani, but it is possible that he was a successor, if not the immediate successor, of this man. That they were members of the same dynasty *may* be indicated by the appearance of a man called Warpalawa in Saruwani’s inscription. The passage in question is extremely fragmentary, leaving the reference to Warpalawa almost totally isolated (‘and (for) me it [.] and Warpalawa [. . .] make great [. . . ’; *CHLI* I: 515 §5, transl. Hawkins). This Warpalawa was perhaps the father of Saruwani, or at least a member of his family line. But there are other possibilities. The man so named could, for example, have been the famous son and successor of Muhawarani, and was perhaps referred to in the inscription as a potential heir to the throne.

↓

Warpalawa (II?) (Assyrian Urballa)

(c.740–705) son; ‘King’, ‘Hero’, ‘Ruler’ (*Jas.* 138–41, Lipiński, 2004: 133–5)

- (1) *CHLI* I: 517 X.43. İVRİZ 1 (516–18);
- (2) *CHLI* I: X.44. BOR (518–21);
- (3) *CHLI* I: X.4. BULGARMADEN (521–5);
- (4) *CHLI* I: X.46. İVRİZ 2 (526);
- (5) *CHLI* I: X.47. NIĞDE 2 (526–7);
- (6) *CHLI* I: X.12. TOPADA (451–61);
- (7) *Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9; *SAA* 1: no. 1.

Warpalawa was very likely the longest-reigning of the Tabalian kings. He is first attested among the five rulers of the region who paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser III (*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9), and last attested c.709, in a letter written by Sargon II to Ashur-sharru-usur, the Assyrian governor of Que (*SAA* 1: no. 1).¹⁶ Hawkins suggests that his long reign was probably due to a policy of ostensible cooperation with the Assyrians, and notes the strikingly Assyrianizing style of sculpture on his surviving monuments.¹⁷ In the best known of these, discovered at the site of İvriz, 17 km south of Ereğli, Warpalawa is depicted offering prayers to the Luwian Storm God Tarhunza.¹⁸ The king himself is endowed with distinctly Assyrian features.¹⁹ On the other hand, the robe that he wears and the fibula that fastens it have been considered to display Phrygian characteristics.²⁰ But this interpretation has been disputed,²¹ and even if Warpalawa did choose to represent himself in Phrygian garb on one of his public monuments, this need not have been politically significant. His longstanding attachment to Assyria may not have prevented him from taking an interest in the latest Phrygian fashions, or demonstrating what Melville calls his ‘artistic erudition’.²² That he had some form of contact with the Phrygians is made clear by Ashur-sharru-usur’s report that he sought an audience with the Assyrian governor in the company of an envoy from Phrygia (*SAA* I: no. 1 vv. 26–7, p. 6). Ashur-sharru-usur certainly had his suspicions about his loyalty,²³ but none of the texts relating to his reign give any indication that he ever broke his allegiance to Assyria.

In this context, some reference should be made to the discovery of Old Phrygian inscriptions in Tuwana/Tyana, carved on basalt slabs (‘Black Stones’).²⁴ These are considered to be among the earliest of the Old Phrygian texts, generally dated from the late 8th to the 3rd century BC. What is of particular interest here is the possibility that one of the Tuwana inscriptions contains the name Midas.²⁵ If so, then according to some scholars, this may indicate a Phrygian presence in the region during the last years of the 8th century. Thus M. J. Mellink, who suggests that the Phrygian king penetrated Neo-Hittite territory and set up the monument on which his name (allegedly) appears, in a city of ‘a Luwian friend and ally’²⁶—that is to say Warpalawa.



Fig. 10. Ivriz monument, depicting Warpalawa paying homage to the Storm God of the Vineyard (from K. Bittel, *Les Hittites*, Paris, Éditions Gallimard, 1976: Pl. 328).

The notion that this long-time tributary of Assyria turned in his final years to Midas/Mita and threw his cities open to him is not without appeal. But again we must emphasize that there is no hard evidence that Warpalawa was ever an ally of Midas. Nor is there any evidence to indicate that any of the Phrygian stelae, whatever their nature,²⁷ were set up in Tuwana during Warpalawa's

reign. This does not rule out the possibility that some of them do in fact belong to the period of Midas. But if they do, they may date to the very last years of his reign following Sargon's death in 705 (which occurred while Sargon was campaigning in Tabal). In the post-Sargonic period, Midas *might* have sought to fill the vacuum in overlordship left by the Assyrian king's death, by occupying Tuwana, and perhaps other neighbouring lands, and setting up his monuments there. But this is conjectural.

In sum, elements of Phrygian culture may well have found their way into parts of the Tabal region during the last years of the 8th century. But from the relatively meagre evidence for this, little can be deduced about the nature of Phrygia's contacts with the Tabal kingdoms, political, commercial, or otherwise.

We have noted that Warpalawa's kingdom included at least one sub-kingdom, governed by a certain Tarhunaza, who accorded himself the title 'Ruler' but acknowledged Warpalawa as his overlord. Tarhunaza refers in his inscription (no. 3) to the services he carried out for Warpalawa and the benefits he received from him. The inscription was found *in situ* on an outcrop of rock in the Taurus range near the Cilician Gates. This was presumably the place which Tarhunaza refers to as Mt Muti. Hawkins suggests that his seat may have been located at the site of Porsuk, c.10 km north-west of the inscription.²⁸

Warpalawa also appears in the TOPADA inscription of the northern Tabalian king Wasusarma as one of the three rulers who supported Wasusarma in his encounter with eight enemy kings near the city Parzuta (no. 6).

↓

Muwarharani (II)

(end 8th cent. —) son; 'Hero', 'King' (*Jas.* 141–2)

CHLI I: X.47. NIGDE 2 (526–7).

Muwarharani, who identifies himself as the son of Warpalawa (II), is known only from this inscribed stele, discovered at Niğde, which displays a dedication to the Storm God Tarhunza and a sculpture of the god. Hawkins notes that the stele's contents provide us with the latest securely datable Neo-Hittite inscription and sculpture apart from the Karatepe examples (discussed below).²⁹

By the time of Muwarharani's reign, Tuwana was probably already under direct Assyrian rule, and had been so since the last years of his father's reign. This is suggested by the communications which passed between Sargon and the locally installed Assyrian official Ashur-sharru-usur about the affairs of Warpalawa's kingdom (*SAA* I: no. 1). Ashur-sharru-usur was the governor of Adanawa (Que), but Tuwana and other southern Anatolian regions may have been included within his administrative sphere, as part of the new arrangements Sargon made for the land of Tabal and the kingdoms of Hilakku and Adanawa after his removal of Ambaris from the kingdom of Bit-Burutash in 713. I will discuss this further in Chapter 12.

Hupis(h)na

(Hapisna, Assyrian Hubishna/Hubushna, Hubushnu, Classical Cybistra)³⁰

Hupishna is first attested in imperial Hittite texts, which indicate that the country lay in southern Anatolia within the Lower Land; more specifically, within the area of the Classical Tyanitis. Some time after the collapse of the Hittite empire, Hupishna became one of the southern kingdoms constituting the land of Tabal.

The Kings of Hupishna

—?

Puhame

(— 837 —) (*Pros.* 3/I 998)

RIMA 3: 79.

The Iron Age kingdom is known only from brief references in Neo-Assyrian texts. It is first mentioned by Shalmaneser III, who claims that he passed through the cities of the land during his campaign in the Tabal region in 837 (*RIMA* 3: 79). Puhame, its ruler at the time, became one of his tributaries. Nothing is known of his predecessors or immediate successors.

—

U(i)rim(m)e

(— c.740 —)

Tigl. III 68–9, 108–9.

The only other known king of Hupishna is U(i)rimme, who is listed among the five kings of Tabal who were tributaries of Tiglath-pileser III.

—?

We know nothing further of Hupishna's kings or the land itself, apart from a final reference to it as the place where in 679 the Assyrian king Esarhaddon fought a battle against the Cimmerians, defeating the Cimmerian leader Teushpa (*ARAB* II: §516). Following his victory, Esarhaddon claims to have conquered the people of Hilakku.

THE KINGDOMS OF SOUTH-EASTERN ANATOLIA

Adanawa

(Hiyawa, Assyrian Que)

The Iron Age kingdom of Adanawa occupied the region known as Cilicia Pedias/Campestris ('Cilicia of the Plain') in Classical sources, but extended also

into the mountainous region to the north-east of the Cilician plain. This kingdom lay in a Luwian as well as a Hurrian cultural zone, and its population was largely an admixture of Luwian and Hurrian elements. The former element seems to have persisted well into the post-Bronze Age era. The Iron Age name Que is attested in Assyrian sources. In Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, the kingdom is called Adanawa. This name first becomes known to us, in the form Adaniya, in a Hittite text of the mid 15th century, which includes Adaniya (a variant of Adana) among the countries which rebelled against the Hittite king Ammuna (*Chav.* 231). Subsequently, Adana became part of Kizzuwadna, an independent kingdom created out of former Hittite subject territory in the second half of the 15th century. But it was restored to Hittite control by the Hittite king Tudhaliya I/II when he annexed Kizzuwadna early in the 14th century. It is possible that Adana played a role in the Sea Peoples' onslaught on Egypt during the reign of the pharaoh Ramesses III (1184–1153); but this depends on whether we can equate the group called the *Dnyn* in the list of Sea Peoples, generally vocalized as 'Denyen', with the 'people of Adana'. There are at least four possibilities for the identification of the Denyen.³¹ The identification with the country of Adana in Kizzuwadna seems the most plausible one.

In the Iron Age, Adana was preserved as Adanawa, probably the name of both the country and its capital. Its retention almost certainly reflects the continuation of a substantially Luwian population in the region. The name Kizzuwadna also survived in the Iron Age, in the form Kisuatnu, one of the cities of Adanawa captured in 839 by Shalmaneser III (*RIMA* 3: 55, 58).

Important information about the history of Adanawa is provided by two sets of Luwian–Phoenician bilingual inscriptions, the so-called Karatepe and Çineköy bilinguals. These will be discussed below. Here, we shall simply note the names used to refer to the country in the bilinguals. In the Karatepe inscriptions, authored by Azatiwata, who is the subordinate of a king called Awariku, the country is referred to as the land of the Danunians in the Phoenician version of the text, and Adanawa in the Luwian. In the Çineköy inscriptions, authored by Awariku himself, the country is called the land of the Danunians in the Phoenician version, but Hiyawa in the Luwian version. Hiyawa is an aphaeresized form of Ahhiyawa,³² a name well known from Hittite Late Bronze Age texts. Ahhiyawa is generally believed to designate the Achaian or Mycenaean Greek world. If so, then its appearance in the Çineköy inscription may reflect a migration of Greek populations from western Anatolia or the Aegean to Cilicia at the beginning of the Iron Age (as discussed in Chapter 2). The retention of the name Hiyawa may thus indicate a significant continuing Greek element in the population of Iron Age Adanawa.³³ But that still leaves us with the question of why Awariku's kingdom should be called by one name (Adanawa) in the Luwian version of the Karatepe bilingual, and by another (Hiyawa) in the Luwian version of the Çineköy bilingual.³⁴

In later Neo-Babylonian sources, the kingdom is called Hume (i.e. *Khuwe).

The Kings of Adanawa (Hiyawa)/Que

—?

Kate(— 858–831) (*Pros. 2/I 609* s.v. Kati)*RIMA* 3: 10, 16–17, 68–9, 80, 119.

Kate is first attested, along with Pihirim, the ruler of Hilakku which bordered Adanawa to the west, in the records of Shalmaneser III for his first regnal year, 858. Both kings joined the military coalition of northern Syrian states which confronted and was defeated by Shalmaneser in that year (*RIMA* 3: 10, 16–17). But it was not until 839 that Shalmaneser carried out a campaign in Adanawa, with further expeditions into the land in the late 830s (*RIMA* 3: 68–9, 80, 119).³⁵ During this period, Kate still occupied its throne. Shalmaneser deposed him on his fourth campaign in the kingdom, in 831, and replaced him with his brother Kirri (*RIMA* 3: 69).

Adanawa apparently suffered substantial loss of territory as a result of its conflicts with Assyria, and by the reign of Tiglath-pileser III probably covered no more than the Cilician plain. We can be fairly certain that Kate was not the first ruler of Adanawa. The kingdom may have emerged soon after the fall of the Hittite empire, and was perhaps allowed to develop without intervention from outside forces until Shalmaneser's reign.

↓

Kirri(831 —) brother (*Pros. 2/I 619–20*)*RIMA* 3: 80, 119.

We know nothing of Kirri beyond the fact that Shalmaneser installed him on the throne of Adanawa in 831, in place of his brother Kate.

—

Awariku (Awarikku, Warika, Assyrian Urikki)(c.738–709) (*Jas.* 199, Lipiński, 2004: 116–28)(1a) *CHLI* I: I.1. KARATEPE 1 (45–68) (Karatepe bilingual, Luwian version);(1b) *CHLI* II (Karatepe bilingual, Phoenician version);

(2) Tekoğlu and Lemaire (2000) (Çineköy bilingual);

(3) *Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9; *SAA* I: 1.

The name Awariku is known from the two Luwian–Phoenician bilingual inscriptions referred to above, and from Assyrian inscriptions, in the form Urikki, dating to the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II. An Urikki first

appears in the 730s as one of the tributary kings of Tiglath-pileser. He *may* have continued to occupy his kingdom's throne until the late 8th century, well into the reign of Sargon—if Sargon's client-ruler of this name was the same man as Tiglath-pileser's tributary. (We shall discuss this below.) If in fact they were one and the same, then unswerving allegiance to the Assyrian crown through three reigns (those of Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser V, and Sargon) may account for the longevity of Awariku's tenure—which lasted almost as long as that of his contemporary Warpalawa, king of Tuwana.

The closeness of the relationship between Awariku and his Assyrian overlord is evident from the Çineköy Luwian–Phoenician bilingual, which is carved on a statue of the Storm God Tarhunza. The site where the statue was discovered (not its original location) lies 30 km south of Adana. Its inscription was authored by Warika (= Awariku) so named in the Luwian version. The fact that in the Phoenician version this man is called Urikki confirms the earlier assumption that the name Urikki of Assyrian texts equates with Luwian Awariku. In the Çineköy bilingual, Awariku declares that the king and royal house of Ashur became a 'mother and father to him', and that the people of Adanawa and Assyria became one house. Taken at face value, this statement seems to indicate some form of special relationship between local ruler and Assyrian Great King.³⁶ Among the achievements of his reign, Awariku claims to have built fifteen fortresses, in both the east and the west of his kingdom. As we shall see, similar defence measures were undertaken by his subordinate Azatiwata, probably after Awariku's death. It was perhaps not long after the inscription was composed that Adanawa, along with the neighbouring kingdom of Hilakku, lost its status as a client-kingdom and came under direct Assyrian rule, probably in or shortly after 713.³⁷ In that case, the Assyrian Great King referred to in the Çineköy inscription must have been Sargon. We shall discuss below the circumstances which probably led to Adanawa's loss of status.

A further significant piece of information provided by the Çineköy inscription is that Awariku claimed descent from the line of Muk(a)sas, a name corresponding to MPŠ—i.e. Mopsus—in the Phoenician text. In Chapter 2, we referred to the Greek legendary traditions associated with a man called Mopsus, alleged founder of a number of Greek settlements along the Anatolian coast in the early Iron Age. It is possible that the reference in the bilingual to the house of Mopsus does in fact indicate that Adanawa's ruling dynasty was founded by the leader of a Greek colonizing group. This would tie in with Adanawa's alternative name Hiyawa which, we have suggested, reflects a Greek element in the kingdom's population.

Additional information about Awariku (or one of the kings so called) and his family comes from the famous Karatepe bilingual inscription, which played a substantial role in the decipherment of the Luwian hieroglyphic script. Karatepe is the modern name for a Neo-Hittite site located above the

Ceyhan valley in the Taurus region of Classical Cilicia, 100 km north-east of Adana.³⁸ We know from the inscription that the site's ancient name was Azatiwataya, and that it was so called after its founder Azatiwata, the author of the inscription. It was a small hill-top settlement, built as part of a system of frontier fortresses to protect the kingdom of Adanawa, and thus probably marks part of the north-eastern boundary of the kingdom at that time. Azatiwata names himself in his inscription as a subordinate of Awariku. The bilingual is made up of five inscriptions, two written in Luwian hieroglyphs, three in Phoenician. They are parallel versions of a single text which commemorates the founding of the city.³⁹

Azatiwata provides us with quite detailed information about his achievements, his relationship with the house of Awariku, and the services he performed for it. Our task is to try to correlate this information with what we know about Awariku from the Çineköy bilingual and Assyrian records. The matter is complicated by the fact that we cannot be sure that the Awariku who was a tributary of Tiglath-pileser III in 739 was the same man as the Awariku attested in documents from the latter years of Sargon's reign. The Awariku of Sargon's reign could, for example, have been the grandson of his earlier namesake. In family lines, it is common practice for a grandson to be given the name of his grandfather. However, I have based the following reconstruction of events on the assumption that Tiglath-pileser's and Sargon's Awariku were the same man, while conceding that the data provided by the inscription could be interpreted differently. Stylistic analysis of the sculptures from the site appears to muddy the waters further, since from this analysis both 9th- and 8th-century elements have been identified in the monument. A possible explanation is that the monument was in fact built at the end of the 8th century but sculptural elements dating to the previous century were reused in its construction. This possibility is referred to by Hawkins,⁴⁰ who then goes on to say that the excavator does not believe that the archaeological evidence supports it;⁴¹ the problem remains for further exploration.

Leaving this difficulty aside for the moment, we shall first summarize what appears to be pertinent information from the Karatepe inscriptions, and then proceed to a summary of the information that can be extracted from Assyrian records. Then we shall see how far these two sets of information can be correlated.

The Karatepe inscriptions Azatiwata had received his authority from Awariku. The Storm God Tarhunza (Phoenician version, Baal) had bestowed upon him the role of 'mother and father' to Adanawa (Phoenician version, the Danunians). Azatiwata built the city of Azatiwataya to protect the plain of Adanawa and the house of Mopsus. He built fortresses on all the frontiers of the kingdom, in the places where there were evil men, none of whom had been servants of the house of Mopsus. He subdued these men beneath his feet.

He subdued strong fortresses ('lands' in the Phoenician version) in the west which former kings had been unable to overcome, and he made all the frontier regions secure, and settled Adanaweans (Danunians) in them. He brought prosperity to the land of Adanawa, and he extended its frontiers both eastwards and westwards. He filled the granaries of Pahar, built up the herds and flocks, and greatly increased the kingdom's military forces. He removed the evils from the land, and brought about the succession of his lord's son to the throne. He established peace with every king. And every king treated him as a father because of his justice and wisdom and goodness.

The Assyrian inscriptions A king of Que called Urikki is attested as one of the tributaries of Tiglath-pileser III c.738. As the Çineköy bilingual has shown, the name Urikki is to be equated with Luwian Awariku (Warika). An Urikki is subsequently attested in a letter written in 710/709 by Ashur-sharru-usur to the Assyrian king Sargon II. Ashur-sharru-usur had been appointed by Sargon as governor of Adanawa, perhaps within the context of the new administrative arrangements which Sargon made for the Tabal region in 713, following his removal of Ambaris from the throne of Bit-Burutash. In his letter, Ashur-sharru-usur reports to his overlord news of a fourteen-man delegation from Que which Urikki had dispatched to Urartu, presumably secretly and with the intention of conducting anti-Assyrian negotiations with the Urartian king. The operation ended in failure when the delegation fell into the hands of the Phrygian king Mita. Mita reported the matter to Ashur-sharru-usur, and held the delegation in custody, pending a decision on their fate by the Assyrian king. There can be little doubt that the Awariku/Urikki in question is the author of the Çineköy bilingual. His actual status immediately prior to this episode is uncertain. It is possible that he still occupied his kingdom's throne following Ashur-sharru-usur's appointment as governor of the region. But if so, his position was probably now only a token one, with effective power in the hands of the Assyrian governor. Or if he had been deposed from the throne on the appointment of Ashur-sharru-usur, he could have been relegated to some lesser position in the region, perhaps adviser to the Assyrian governor. Alternatively, he was living in exile. But the letter seems to imply that he was still in Adanawa at the time he sent the delegation—either as a puppet occupant of the throne, or in some other capacity. In either case, the treatment he had received from Sargon, after long and faithful service to the Assyrian crown, had probably left him disenchanted with Assyrian rule—prompting his approach to Urartu. The discovery of his envoys' mission almost certainly brought his career as well as his life to an abrupt end.

Splicing the information from Luwian/Phoenician and Assyrian records We have made the assumption (with reservations) that the Awariku/Urikki of Sargon's reign, as attested in Sargon's letter to Ashur-sharru-usur, was the

same as the homonymous ruler of Adanawa/Que who became a tributary of Tiglath-pileser III several decades earlier. But what about the Awariku of the Karatepe bilingual? Can we be sure that he was the Urikki of the Assyrian records? As we have noted, opinion on the dating of the Karatepe monument has fluctuated between 9th- and 8th-century alternatives on the basis of the style and iconography of the sculptures. If the earlier date is preferred, then the Awariku of the bilingual was probably an earlier member of Adanawa's royal line, who reigned several generations prior to the Urikki of the Assyrian inscriptions. However, Hawkins points out that the palaeography of the Phoenician script would support a date at the end of the 8th century (i.e. around the end of Sargon's reign or the first years of his son and successor Sennacherib),⁴² while admitting that the monument's chronology still remains problematic. Allowing that the question has yet to be finally resolved, I will take the line here that the inscription does date to the final years of the 8th century, and that the Urikki of Ashur-sharru-usur's letter, and the Çineköy bilingual, was the same as the tributary of Tiglath-pileser III, and the overlord of Azatiwata.

It is clear from the Karatepe inscription that Azatiwata owed his elevation to Awariku. This is likely to have happened before the installation of Ashur-sharru-usur as the country's governor, for which 713 provides a *terminus post quem*. Azatiwata's precise status is not made clear in the inscription. There is no title (at least none that survives) for him in the inscription. We might conclude that he was appointed as a regional ruler in the east of Awariku's kingdom, and that Azatiwataya, the city he claims to have built himself, was his base within that part of Adanawa that was assigned to his authority. We can be virtually certain that the inscription was carved after the death of his benefactor Awariku.

Azatiwata makes considerable claims about his achievements. He states that he fortified and extended the land of Adanawa, brought peace and prosperity to it, and (re-?)established his overlord's family on Adanawa's throne. The last of these claims (*CHLI* I: 50 §§XIV–XVI) seems to suggest that Awariku's family had lost their royal status, and that Azatiwata had been responsible for putting them back in power. It is hard to see, as Hawkins comments, that the actions which he recounts could have been performed during Sargon's reign, and certainly not during the period when Ashur-shurru-usur was governor. The most likely context for his achievements is the last years of the 8th century, following Sargon's death. After Awariku's fall from grace, and his probable execution by Adanawa's Assyrian administration in 710–709, the local monarchy was almost certainly abolished and Ashur-sharru-usur assumed full control over the country. This may have simply formalized the powers he already had. Perhaps while Awariku was still alive, the Assyrian administration maintained, for diplomatic reasons, an illusion that he was still ruler of the land, albeit in partnership with Ashur-sharru-usur as

representative of the Assyrian king. But all effective authority over the state almost certainly lay in the governor's hands.

The extension of direct Assyrian control over Tabal was probably not just a reaction to political volatility in the region, as reflected in the behaviour of Ambaris and the aggressive activities of the people of Atuna and Ishtuanda. Rather, Sargon was becoming increasingly concerned at the threats posed by foreign enemies to the region, which might ultimately put at risk all Assyria's interests in the west. Most notable among these enemies were the Phrygians, the Urartians—and the Cimmerians. Sargon's *entente* with Mita had seemingly put an end, for the time being, to the prospect of war between Assyria and Phrygia. No doubt the *entente* included a guarantee that neither king would attack the subject territories of the other. This would have freed the Tabal region, at least temporarily, from the prospect of Phrygian invasion. Urartu still remained a threat. But a more immediate danger to Assyria's western subject territories was posed by a third party, the Cimmerians.

It was probably to fight this fierce semi-nomadic people that Sargon conducted a campaign in the Tabal region in 705, the last year of his reign (*ABC* 76). He was killed in the course of this campaign. His sudden death may well have led to unsettled conditions in Assyria's southern Anatolian territories, including the Tabal region, which may then have become exposed to onslaughts by the Cimmerians. As we have noted, the Cimmerians had set about occupying large areas of Anatolia, including the territories ruled by the Phrygians, and ten years after Sargon's death they succeeded in destroying the kingdom of Mita. Our sources give us the impression of a people more intent on plunder and destruction for its own sake rather than as a means of subjugating an area and establishing their own rulers over it. Ruthless and brutal though they often were, the Assyrians must have been considered the lesser of two evils by the rulers of those lands which were vulnerable to Cimmerian attack.

This provides a possible context for the achievements of which Azatiwata boasts in his inscription. I suggest the following scenario: In the wake of Sargon's death, and very likely a distinct loosening, if not loss, of Assyrian control in central and south-eastern Anatolia, Adanawa descended for a time into a state of anarchy. Awariku's former subject-ruler Azatiwata responded by mustering a substantial military force to restore order in the land, stating that prior to this it had fallen prey to numerous evils. One of these 'evils' was evidently the occupation of the country by 'bad men, bands of robbers' (*CHLI* I: 51 §XX). Hawkins suggests that Azatiwata was at this time operating as an Assyrian client, and that the 'bad men' represented an anti-Assyrian revolt (presumably in the reign of Sargon's son and successor Sennacherib)—though the inscription makes no reference to the Assyrians. But it may well be that these events resulted from a vacuum in Assyria's authority in the region following Sargon's death. The 'bad men' may have been invading bands of Cimmerians. Or, if Mita had secured a Phrygian presence in Tuwana after

Sargon's death (as discussed earlier), then the Phrygians may have sought to extend their control into Adanawa as well. Perhaps *they* were the 'bad men' referred to by Azatiwata. But whoever the evildoers were, Azatiwata apparently drove them from his land, and restored it to prosperity, seeing to the planting of crops and vineyards and the restocking of the grazing areas with flocks and herds. He extended the land's boundaries both eastwards and westwards, and strengthened its defences by building or restoring fortresses on all its frontiers. Yet in all this, he was acting purely as the agent for the house of his former overlord Awariku, whose family he re-established as the ruling dynasty of Adanawa. That at least is his spin on the way events unfolded in his country in the years immediately following Sargon's death.

Sargon's son and successor Sennacherib (704–681) may subsequently have reasserted some measure of Assyrian authority over Adanawa. But it was probably not until the reign of his own son Esarhaddon (680–669) that Assyrian control was fully restored, with the re-establishment of Adanawa as an Assyrian province, for which an Assyrian governor is attested in 675. Henceforth, Adanawa appears to have remained submissive to Assyrian rule until at least the end of Ashurbanipal's reign (668–630/27).

Hilakku

To the west of Adanawa lay the kingdom of Hilakku. It covered much of the rugged western half of Cilicia, called Cilicia Tracheia/Aspera ('Rough Cilicia') in Classical sources. The name Cilicia is clearly derived from Hilakku, which is the Assyrian name for the region. In the Late Bronze Age, this region formed part of the kingdom of Tarhuntassa. From then until the Hellenistic and Roman periods, it almost certainly contained a predominantly Luwian population, as attested by the large number of Luwian names still found there up to the period of the Roman empire.⁴³ Unfortunately, no Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions of Iron Age date have been discovered in the region, and its local Iron Age name remains unknown.

The kings of Hilakku

—?

Pihirim

(mid 9th cent.) (*Pros.* 3/I 993)

RIMA 3: 10, 16–17.

As we have noted, Pihirim, the Assyrian-attested ruler of Hilakku, joined Adanawa's ruler Kate in a military alliance of northern Syrian states which

confronted Shalmaneser III in 858. Shalmaneser later conducted four campaigns against Adanawa between 839 and 831 (*RIMA* 3: 67–8),⁴⁴ but apparently made no attempt during these campaigns to invade Hilakku, which lay in a more remote, much less accessible region.

(Ambaris)

(c.718–713)

ARAB II: §55, Lie 32–3, Fuchs 124, vv. 197–8 (323), 199, vv 29–30 (344).

Hilakku may in fact have remained independent of Assyria until the last decades of the 8th century. It was perhaps incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system in the reign of Shalmaneser V (726–722). But there is no explicit reference to it until Sargon installed Ambaris as ruler of Bit-Burutash, married his daughter to him, and allegedly gave him Hilakku as a dowry. The fact that Hilakku was apparently within his gift implies that it had earlier come under Assyrian control, and had no king of its own. At least none is attested in the Assyrian texts. How effectively Ambaris managed Hilakku as well as his own kingdom remains a moot question. This rugged country, populated by a fiercely independent people, remained largely free of Assyria throughout the Neo-Assyrian period, and at the best of times, the Assyrians could claim no more than token sovereignty over it. During his relatively short career as king of Bit-Burutash, Ambaris may never have involved himself in Hilakku's affairs. When he was deposed by Sargon in 713, Hilakku, along with Bit-Burutash, was placed under direct Assyrian rule.

The Aramaean States¹

The origins of the peoples called the Aramaeans are not altogether certain. It is possible that they were the descendants of West Semitic population groups, like the Amorites, who already occupied parts of Syria during the second millennium. But more likely they originated as tribal pastoral groups who immigrated into Syria, northern Mesopotamia, and eastern Anatolia from the fringes of the Syrian Desert. Speaking a West Semitic language called Aramaic, they make their first explicit appearance in history in the records of Tiglath-pileser I (1114–1076). Tiglath-pileser claims to have conducted no fewer than twenty-eight campaigns across the Euphrates against them, more precisely against the Ahlamu-Aramaeans (*RIMA* 2: 43). ‘Ahlamu’ is a term used for nomadic or semi-nomadic tribal groups in Syria and Mesopotamia, first attested in an 18th-century Mesopotamian text, and used of immigrants into Babylonia in the 17th century. Though they are often closely associated with the Aramaeans, in Babylonian and Assyrian texts of the late second and first millennia, the exact relationship between the two groups remains uncertain.²

The impression we have of the Aramaeans in the first two centuries of the Iron Age is that of large groups of desert dwellers, who not only robbed bands of travellers passing through their territories but seized and plundered cities as well. It was no doubt attacks carried out by them on Assyrian lands and cities that prompted the campaigns against them by Tiglath-pileser and his successor-but-one Ashur-bel-kala (*RIMA* 2: 93, 94, 98, 101, 102). But to judge from the frequency of these campaigns, Assyrian retaliation had limited effectiveness. The Aramaeans’ nomadic or semi-nomadic character made them an elusive and ultimately unconquerable enemy. They also harassed the territories of the Babylonian king Adad-apla-iddina (1068–1047), who reports that Aramaean forces desecrated and plundered the sanctuaries of his land, including Agade, Der, Nippur, Sippar, and Dur-Kurigalzu (*ABC* 180–1, *RIMB* 2: 50, 73).

By the end of the second millennium, many Aramaean groups had begun to adopt a more settled way of life, particularly in parts of Mesopotamia, Syria, and eastern Anatolia. Here, in the wake of the collapse and disappearance of the Late Bronze Age kingdoms, a number of small Aramaean states emerged.

Some of the more important of these were Bit-Zamani, Bit-Bahiani, Bit-Adini, Bit-Agusi, Aram-Damascus, and Sam'al (Zincirli). The prefix 'Bit' ('House (of)') reflects the tribal origins of these states. As we shall see, the Aramaeans were to have a major impact on the political and cultural development of the regions with which we are principally concerned, as well as on other parts of the Near Eastern world, and were to change profoundly the ethnic composition of these regions. Yet they never achieved any form of lasting political or military union amongst themselves. When on occasions some of them united to meet a specific military threat, they did so not as peoples bound by ethnic loyalties but as a group of independent states confronted by a common enemy. Nor did the Aramaeans ever develop a distinctive culture of their own. What might be called Aramaean culture was largely a composite of elements drawn from the civilizations of their neighbours, most notably the Neo-Hittites, the Assyrians, and the Phoenicians. Further, despite the widespread adoption of the Aramaic language in the Near Eastern world, the information we have about the Aramaeans themselves from their own written sources is very limited. Most of what we know about their history is derived from Assyrian and biblical texts. And while a combination of written and archaeological sources provide a significant amount of information about the more important Aramaean states, we know very little about the many Aramaean tribes who must have lived outside an urban context, or, more generally, about Aramaean tribal structures and the *mores* and ethos which underpinned Aramaean society.

In our discussion below, we shall be dealing principally with four of the Aramaean states that emerged towards the end of the second millennium or early in the first millennium—namely, those states which became most directly involved in the history of the Neo-Hittite world, through their interactions with the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, and in some cases through the blending of groups from them with the populations of these kingdoms. The states in question are: (a) Bit-Agusi, a large Aramaean state located west of the Euphrates, and included in Assyrian records within the Iron Age Land of Hatti. (b) The kingdom of Sam'al, also an Aramaean state, founded in the 10th century by the Aramaean tribal chieftain Gabbar. It too lay in the Land of Hatti, in Hatti's north-western region, on the eastern slope of the Amanus range. From the Assyrian point of view, this range probably marked Hatti's western limit. Beyond it lay the kingdoms of Adanawa (Que) and Hilakku along Anatolia's southern coast, and further north the kingdoms of Tabal. (c) Bit-Adini, a large tribal land and people, which lay mainly east of the Euphrates, between the Balih and the Euphrates rivers. But its territory also extended across the Euphrates. In the mid 9th century, it participated in a number of anti-Assyrian activities in the west. (d) Damascus, which became in the 10th century one of the most important Aramaean states in the west and was heavily involved in the political and military activities of the region. It lay

south of the Neo-Hittite kingdom of Hamath, the latter being the southernmost of the kingdoms comprising the Land of Hatti.

Bit-Agusi

Bit-Agusi was a large Aramaean state located in north-central Syria between the kingdom of Carchemish on the Euphrates and Pat(t)in (Assyrian Unqi) on the north-west coast of Syria.³ To the south, it shared a frontier with the kingdom of Hamath.

It appears to have had its origins in a tribe called Yahan(u). The earliest reference we have to Yahan appears in the Annals of the Assyrian king Ashur-dan II (934–912), who reports its conquest, and indicates that a land of this name already existed in the reign of Ashurabi II (1013–973), one of his predecessors (*RIMA* 2: 133). It can thus be dated back at least to the late 11th century. But the land in question apparently lay east of the Tigris river. In later references, Yahan is clearly located in northern Syria. This has led to the conclusion that some time in the late 10th or early 9th century there was a migration of the Yahanite tribe, or part of it, westwards, across the Euphrates into northern Syria. Around 870, Ashurnasirpal II passed to the north of Syrian Yahan on his expedition from Carchemish to Patin, receiving tribute in Patin's capital Kinalua from a 'man of Yahan' called Gusi (*RIMA* 2: 218), apparently Yahan's ruler. Gusi became the founder of a dynasty which ruled over what became the tribal state of Bit-Agusi—the house of Gusi—for perhaps the next 150 years. He was succeeded by his son Hadram (Assyrian Adramu, Arame), who paid a substantial tribute to Ashurnasirpal's son and successor Shalmaneser III, during the western campaigns which the latter conducted in his first, second, and sixth regnal years (*RIMA* 3: 17, 18, 23). The first capital of the state was probably the city called Arne, which Shalmaneser captured and destroyed in his tenth year (849) (*RIMA* 3: 37, 146).⁴ Its destruction at this time, along with that of other cities in Hadram's land, indicates that conflicts between Assyria and Bit-Agusi had broken out afresh after Shalmaneser's sixth year. But a reconciliation must subsequently have occurred, since Hadram appears to have enjoyed a long reign, lasting approximately thirty years (c. 860–830).

One question yet to be satisfactorily answered concerns the apparently separate identities of Bit-Agusi and the land of Yahan, at least during the early part of Hadram's reign. For although Bit-Agusi was founded by Gusi from the land of Yahan, and it is generally agreed that the latter was called Bit-Agusi at a later time,⁵ Yahan appears separately from Bit-Agusi in Shalmaneser's account of his first western campaign, in 858. Yahan's ruler at that time was a man called Adanu, one of the local leaders who had opposed but were conquered by Shalmaneser (*RIMA* 3: 10, 17). The apparent distinction

between Bit-Agusi and Yahan has been variously explained. For example, (a) Gusi's kingdom may have been divided on his death into two kingdoms—Bit-Agusi and Yahan, ruled respectively by Hadram and Adanu. Perhaps Adanu was another of Gusi's sons. (b) Gusi ruled over only part of the land of Yahan, the part which became Bit-Agusi and over which his son Hadram held sway, whereas the rest of Yahan preserved its original name and was ruled by another king, Adanu. (c) Adanu was appointed ruler, under Hadram's overall authority, of part of Bit-Agusi's territory (which perhaps preserved the original name Yahan), but acted independently of Hadram by joining a coalition of forces against Shalmaneser. These alternative suggestions are offered purely in an attempt to rationalize the separate references to Bit-Agusi and Yahan at the beginning of Shalmaneser's reign. We have no explicit evidence to indicate that there was ever any distinction between the lands. The matter remains unresolved. There are no later references to the land of Yahan.

Attar-shumki I and his successors

Hostilities with Assyria continued into, or broke out afresh in, the reign of Hadram's son(?) and successor Attar-shumki (I), whose royal seat was located in the city of Arpad.⁶ The name Arpad was sometimes used to designate the kingdom as a whole. In 805, some thirty years into his reign, Attar-shumki led a coalition of northern Syrian states against the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III (810–783). The opposing armies met outside Paqar(a)hubunu, a city on the upper Euphrates in the region of modern Pazarcik. Evidence of the battle is provided on a monument now referred to as the Pazarcik stele (*RIMA* 3: 205), whose main purpose was actually to define the frontier between the Neo-Hittite kingdoms Kummuh and Gurgum. Adad-nirari apparently defeated the enemy coalition on this occasion, but he failed to break it up. It was to continue to threaten Assyrian sovereignty in the region for at least the next ten years.

This perhaps was the context in which Attar-shumki participated in another coalition army, c.800, led by Bar-Hadad II, king of Damascus, against his kingdom's northern neighbour Hamath, at that time a client-state of Assyria ruled by a man called Zak(k)ur (*CS* II: 155⁷). Zakur's city Hatarikka (Hazrach) was the particular target of the Damascus-led attack. The coalition was made up of sixteen kings, including a man called Bar-Gush. Bar-Gush's kingdom is not named in the inscription, nor is a king of this name otherwise attested in our written sources. But the name means literally 'son of Gusi', and we can safely conclude that the kingdom which he ruled was in fact Bit-Agusi. In this case, 'son' is to be understood in the sense of 'descendant' (of Agusi). So who was Bar-Gush? Almost certainly Attar-shumki, according to most scholars. If so, then the episode must have occurred very late in his reign since the reign of Zakur, king of Hamath, could not have begun before the very end of the 9th century at the earliest.

That provides us with the earliest possible date for the coalition attack on Hamath, which Zakur claims to have repulsed. It was in the wake of this attack, I suggest, that Adad-nirari intervened in the region, through his agent Shamshi-ilu, and attempted to bring some stability to it, particularly in the neighbouring states of Bit-Agusi and Hamath, by the provisions he made in an inscription on the so-called Antakya stele (*RIMA* 3: 203–4). The stele was discovered in a field near the modern city of Antakya (close to the Orontes river)—hence the name now assigned to it.⁸ Drawn up by Shamshi-ilu on behalf of his king, the document appears to concede to Attar-shumki a slice of Hamathite territory, which would have extended Bit-Agusi's territory up to the Orontes river.

Several questions are raised by the events we have outlined above. In particular, how sure can we be that Bar-Gush really was Attar-shumki? When were the provisions in the Antakya stele actually drawn up? And what were the reasons for the concessions they made to Attar-shumki, at the expense of Zakur, who appears to have been a loyal and faithful Assyrian ally? These questions will be taken up in Chapter 11.

For the moment, we should turn our attention briefly to the so-called Sefire inscriptions (*CS* II: 213–17), a set of three Aramaic inscriptions carved on basalt stelae unearthed in the late 1920s at a site called Sefire in north-central Syria, 25 km south-east of Aleppo. Together, the inscriptions comprise the oldest known Aramaic text. Because of their fragmentary nature, it is uncertain what relationship, if any, they bear to one other. It is possible that one of them is an original text, of which one or both of the others are copies. They contain the text of a treaty drawn up between Bar-Ga'ya, king of Ktk, an Aramaean kingdom in northern Syria, and Mati'ilu, who is called king of Arpad and son of (an) Attar-shumki. The treaty must date some time before Tiglath-pileser III conquered Bit-Agusi/Arpad in 740 and incorporated it into the Assyrian provincial system. Tiglath-pileser reports that several years before this, in his third regnal year (743), Mati'ilu stirred up a rebellion against the Assyrians, in breach of his loyalty-oath (*Tigl. III* 100–1). His reign must therefore have begun around the middle of the 8th century, during the reign of the Assyrian king Ashur-nirari V (754–746), with whom Mati'ilu was also bound by treaty (*ARAB* I: §§749–60). But even if he came earlier to the throne, he cannot have been the son of Attar-shumki I. The chronological gap separating him from this man would be too great to allow for this. We must therefore conclude that Mati'ilu was the son of a second Attar-shumki who was perhaps the grandson of the first king of this name. It is possible that Attar-shumki II's father and predecessor was a man called Bar-Hadad. But our knowledge of the genealogy of the royal line becomes somewhat shaky at this point.⁹

Though he was allied with Assyria by his treaty with Ashur-nirari, Mati'ilu apparently took advantage of his overlord's death in 746 to provoke rebellion

among the northern Syrian and eastern Anatolian states against Assyrian rule. He was encouraged in this enterprise by Sarduri II, king of Urartu, Assyria's most formidable enemy. The new Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser responded by attacking and inflicting a major defeat on the anti-Assyrian forces in his third regnal year, 743 (*Epon.* 59, *Tigl. III.* 100–1, 132–3). Bit-Agusi was a specific target of Assyrian retaliation (*Tigl. III* 186–7). After a three-year siege, its capital finally fell to the Assyrians, in 740 (*Epon.* 59). The conquered land became Assyria's first fully-fledged province in Syria, and was renamed Arpad after its capital. Henceforth, it appears to have remained submissive to Assyrian overlordship, except for one (known) occasion when it joined Hamath in a revolt against Sargon II at the beginning of his reign.

From information supplied in Assyrian and Aramaic sources, we can reconstruct the following line of rulers of Bit-Agusi prior to its incorporation into the Assyrian provincial system:

Gusi	(— c.870 —)
Hadram (Assyrian Adramu, Arame) (son)	(c.860–830)
Attar-shumki (I) (son?)	(c.830–c.800 —)
Bar-Hadad (?) (son)	(c.800 —)
Attar-shumki (II) (son)	(during 1st half of 8th cent.)
Mati'ilu (son)	(— mid 8th cent. —)

Bit-Adini

Bit-Adini was the name of an Aramaean tribal land and people which lay in the middle Euphrates region between the Balih and the Euphrates rivers.¹⁰ But its territory also extended westwards across the Euphrates into north-eastern Syria. In the mid 9th century, it came under the rule of a man called Ahuni, who was to become one of Assyria's most persistent and elusive enemies in the west. The region over which Ahuni extended his sway included the small city-kingdom Masuwari (modern Tell Ahmar) on the east bank of the Euphrates. At that time, the Assyrian throne was occupied by Ashurnasirpal II. Bit-Adini's excellent strategic location, astride important routes which linked Anatolia and the Syro-Palestinian coastlands with Mesopotamia, made it an obvious target of the westward expanding Neo-Assyrian kingdom. But the first attested conflict with Assyria may have been provoked by Bit-Adini's support, along with that of Babylonia, for an unsuccessful rebellion by the states Suhu, Hindanu, and Laqe (which lay between Bit-Adini and Babylonia) against Assyrian rule. Ashurnasirpal followed up his victory over the rebel states by launching an attack upon Dummetu and Azmu, cities of Bit-Adini (*RIMA* 2:

215). However, under the leadership of Ahuni, Bit-Adini's conflicts with Assyria were to continue for the rest of Ashurnasirpal's reign and for the first three years of Shalmaneser III. They came to an end with Shalmaneser's final conquest of the region in 856. Bit-Adini was then absorbed into the Assyrian empire, forming part of the Province of the Commander-in-Chief.¹¹ Its elimination as an independent state paved the way for the consolidation of Assyrian power in the middle Euphrates region, and provided the Assyrians with an important bridgehead across the Euphrates for their campaigns in the west.

Sam'al¹²

During the last decades of the 10th century, a tribal chieftain called Gabbar laid the foundations of a small kingdom on the eastern slope of the Amanus range in south-eastern Anatolia, west of the modern Turkish city Gaziantep. The kingdom became known by the Semitic name Sam'al (which means 'North'), reflecting probably a northern branch of an Aramaean tribe.¹³ But the name *Y'dy* was also used of the kingdom (e.g. in the Kilamuwa inscription referred to below), probably representing another tribal component in Sam'al's population, perhaps of Luwian origin.¹⁴ In the earliest surviving inscription from Zincirli (the modern name of the site of Sam'al's capital), the 9th-century Sam'alian king Kilamuwa identifies two population groups in his kingdom—the *Ba'ririm* and the *Muškabim*: 'Now whoever of my sons who will sit (reign) in my place and damages this inscription, may the *Muškabim* not honour the *Ba'ririm*, and may the *Ba'ririm* not honour the *Muškabim*' (CS II 2.30: p. 148, transl. K. Lawson, Jr.) Whatever this passage actually means—it appears to hint at the possibility of hostilities between the two groups if the king's successors do not honour the terms of his inscription—the *Ba'ririm* are generally considered to represent an Aramaean group from an originally nomadic or semi-nomadic pastoralist background who became dominant in the land, while the *Muškabim*, Lipiński suggests, were perhaps descendants of the original Luwian inhabitants of the region, 'of old sedentary and partly urbanized'.¹⁵ The latter, now downtrodden, may represent the remnants of the population of a small Luwian state in the area before the period of the Aramaean occupation.

Strategically, the kingdom's location was an important one. During the Late Bronze Age, Hittite armies must have passed through or close by the territory later occupied by the Iron Age kingdom in many of their expeditions into Syria. And it lay on the campaign route taken by Shalmaneser III in his progress to the Mediterranean coast during his first regnal year.¹⁶ A cluster of Neo-Hittite states lay around it—Gurgum to its north, Patin to its south, Carchemish to its east, and Adanawa to its west. It was clearly vulnerable to

aggression by these states. Indeed, Sam'al's king Kilamuwa highlights the precariousness of the kingdom in his statement: 'The house of my father was in the midst of mighty kings. And each one stretched forth his hand to fight' (CS II: 147). Lacking as it did the means to protect itself by its own resources, its kings needed to choose their allies well.

The kingdom covered an area of approximately 1,750 sq. km, c.50 km from north to south and c.35 km from east to west. Its capital was the site now known as Zincirli Höyük, very likely called Sam'al by its occupants, like the kingdom itself. The site was excavated by J. Garstang in 1908 and 1911, and subsequently by M. V. Seton-Williams and J. Waecher in 1949, with renewed excavations, from 2006 onwards, by D. Schloen and A. Fink on behalf of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago.¹⁷ Zincirli was a strongly fortified city. Roughly circular in shape, its outermost defences consisted of a double wall, punctuated by three gates and surmounted by towers. The southernmost gate gave access to a walled citadel, with yet another protective wall and gate inside it. Within this inner fortification were a number of buildings, including two royal palaces of the *bit hilani* type, the term that is used of public buildings, commonly found in Iron Age Syrian cities, in which a columned portico provides entry to a rectangular central room. Schloen and Fink report that the four excavations conducted between 2006 and 2009 have resulted so far in the exposure of 1,800 sq. m of 8th- and 7th-century structures in the lower town and 1,200 sq. m on the upper mound and outer city walls.¹⁸ Most notable among the recent discoveries is an inscribed funerary stele belonging to a royal official of the 8th century, identified as KTMW, discussed further below. The royal necropolis of the city is probably to be located at modern Gerçin, 7 km north-east of Zincirli. 21 km to the north-east of Zincirli lay the settlement now known as Sakçagözü, on the western slopes of the mountain called Kurd Dağ. It is a small settlement, 70 x 50 m in area, and is very likely to be identified with the city called Lutibu which lay on Sam'al's frontier. As we shall see, a battle was fought near Lutibu by Shalmaneser III in 858 against a coalition of states including Sam'al.

From information provided by his inscription (CS II: 147–8), we can deduce that Kilamuwa was the fifth of the kings of Sam'al, Gabbar being the first. As far as we can judge from the inscription, these kings were all members of the same dynasty.¹⁹ Kilamuwa was dismissive of the lot of them—Gabbar, BNH (Banihu?), his own father Hayya(nu), and his brother and immediate predecessor Sha'il. None of them, he declared, had achieved anything. Perhaps at the time of his accession the kingdom still maintained many of the customs and practices that reflected the non-urban origins of its Aramaean population. There may also have been active discrimination against the Luwian component of the population—if they can be identified with the *Muškabim*, who according to Kilamuwa were 'living like dogs' under the former kings. It seems that these in particular benefited from reforms introduced by Kilamuwa:

But I was to some a father;
and to some I was a mother;
and to some I was a brother.

Now whoever had never possessed a sheep,
I made lord of a flock.

And whoever had never possessed an ox,
I made owner of a herd and owner of silver and lord of gold.
And whoever from his childhood had never seen linen,
now in my days wore byssos.²⁰

(CS II: 148, transl. K. Lawson Younger, Jr.)

Kilamuwa's claim that he acted like a father towards some of the *Muškabim*, a mother to others, and a brother to others, suggests that he sought to integrate these people more fully as equals with the Aramaean groups in his kingdom. But the *Muškabim* and the *Ba'irim* groups appear to have maintained their distinct identities, and, as we have noted, Kilamuwa hints at the possibility of hostilities between them if his successors do not respect his inscription, and thus the provisions which it contains.

From both Sam'alian and Assyrian inscriptions, we can construct a list of eleven consecutive kings of Sam'al. Their precise regnal years cannot be determined, but collectively their reigns extended from c.900 to c.713, when Assyria annexed the kingdom as an Assyrian province. The attested kings of Sam'al (with regnal dates suggested by Lipiński) are:

Gabbar	c.900–880
Banihu (son)	c.880–870
Hayya(nu) (son)	c.870–850
Sha'il (son)	c.850–840
Kilamuwa (brother)	c.840–810
Qarli (son?)	c.810–790
Panamuwa I (son)	c.790–750
Bar-Sur (son)	c.750–745
usurper	c.745–740
Panamuwa II (son of Bar-Sur)	c.740–733
Bar-Rakib (son)	c.733–713/11

We do not know whether these kings were all members of the one dynasty. While some of the names are Semitic, including Gabbar (apparent founder of the kingdom), Banihu, Hayya(nu), Sha'il, Bar-Sur, and Bar-Rakib, others are not—Qarli, and the clearly Luwian names Kilamuwa and Panamuwa. But there is nothing in the inscriptions to indicate a change of dynasty during Sam'al's history as an independent kingdom. In fact, Kilamuwa identifies his two immediate predecessors Hayyanu and Sha'il as his father and brother respectively. Lipiński speculates that Kilamuwa's mother may have been

different from that of Sha'il and of Luwian stock.²¹ It is possible that Hayyanu married a woman of Luwian origin, perhaps as a second wife, as a step towards closer integration of the Luwian and Semitic elements in his kingdom. And to judge from his inscription, Kilamuwa sought particularly to enhance the status, and improve the material lot, of the kingdom's Luwian elements, if they can be so identified with the *Muškabim* discussed above. But alternatively, as Lipiński comments, the mixture of Semitic and Luwian names in the royal line may simply reflect the ethnically and linguistically composite nature of Sam'al's population.

In any case, Sam'alian culture incorporated elements from all its population components, as reflected in the remains of the kingdom's capital. Zincirli's predominantly Aramaean character is indicated by its many Aramaic inscriptions—about half of all the known inscriptions in this language. The best known of these appears on a statue set up in the city by its last known king Bar-Rakib in honour of his father Panamuwa II (CS II: 158–60). It was written in Sam'alian, a local archaic dialect of Aramaic. The Sam'alian language was also used for an inscription of the first known Panamuwa (CS II: 156–8), found at nearby Gerçin and dedicated to the Semitic god Hadad. But the earlier Kilamuwa inscription, found at Zincirli (CS II: 147–8), was written in what is called North Phoenician.²² Only two hieroglyphic inscriptions have so far come to light in Zincirli, both engraved on Luwian seals. One appears on a signet ring of Bar-Rakib.²³ The other dates to the period of the Hittite empire, and can thus be considered an heirloom preserved for many generations by a Luwian family.²⁴ Sculptural remains of the Sam'alian capital indicate a mingling of Luwian and Aramaean cultural traditions. A noteworthy feature of the sculptures are the guardian bulls and lions carved on the orthostats of the gate which provided access to the citadel. As we have noted, the palaces inside the citadel were of the *bit hilani* type. Another building of the *bit hilani* type found at Sakçagözü includes lions flanking the entrance, and a pair of human-headed sphinxes. Schloen and Fink stress the readiness with which the Semitic-speaking rulers of Sam'al adopted Neo-Hittite iconography and decorative styles, as shown by the reliefs lining the gates of their city, thus demonstrating 'the continuing prestige of that cultural tradition, which echoed the past glories of the Hittite empire and so was widely imitated even by non-Luwian rulers'.²⁵

Assyrian records indicate that in 858, Sam'al under the leadership of its king Hayyanu joined a coalition of states in its region which twice confronted Shalmaneser III during his first western campaign (*RIMA* 3: 10, 16–17). The first confrontation took place near the fortified city of Lutibu, on Sam'al's frontier, the second in the territory of Sam'al's southern neighbour Patin. Shalmaneser was victorious on both occasions, and subsequently Hayyanu and other leaders of the coalition forces became his tributaries. During the reign of Kilamuwa, Hayyanu's son, Sam'al came under threat from its western

neighbour Adanawa (Que). An appeal from Kilamuwa to Shalmaneser for assistance almost certainly triggered the Assyrian's first campaign against Kate, king of Adanawa, in 839. No doubt Kilamuwa pledged his allegiance to Shalmaneser in return for his support, affirming or reaffirming his status as an Assyrian client-king.

Sam'al seems not to have suffered aggression from any of its neighbours while it had Assyrian client-status, and to have prospered during this period. The 'Hadad Inscription' of Panamuwa I (CS II: 156–8), second successor (and grandson?) of Kilamuwa, conveys the impression of a land free of war under this king's reign, a period of agricultural development and great abundance for its population. Much of the first half of the inscription is devoted to a description of the great blessings bestowed by the gods on Sam'al at that time. But the second half suggests that the kingdom was far from secure. It envisages the possibility of strife among potential claimants upon the throne, and prescribes what action should be taken if such a situation arises:

Whoever of my house seizes the sceptre in Y'dy and sits on my throne
and reig[ns in my place],
[May he not] stretch his hand with the sword against [] of my
[hou]se [either out of] anger or out of violence;
may he do no murder, either out of wrath or out of [];
And may no one be [put to death], either by his bow or by his
word [or by his command].
But may [his kins]man plot the destruction of one of his kinsmen or
one of his relatives or one of his kinswomen.
[Or if any member of my house] should plot destruction;
may he (the king) assemble his male relatives,
and may he stand him in the middle.

(CS II: 157, transl. K. Lawson Younger, Jr.)

The fact that Panamuwa devotes so much attention in his inscription to the prospect of violence over the succession may well indicate that he regarded this prospect as far from remote. His concerns go far beyond the standard formulaic statements included in many royal inscriptions for the protection of the succession.

Future events were to show that these concerns were justified. We learn from the inscription of Panamuwa II, probably his grandson, that the first Panamuwa's successor Bar-Sur was overthrown and killed along with seventy (*sic*) of his brothers. Bar-Sur's son—Panamuwa II—managed to escape, and sought refuge with Tiglath-pileser III. The coup seems to have led to widespread devastation throughout the land, for the usurper (name unknown) 'made ruined cities more numerous than inhabited cities', and he filled the prisons, presumably with the assassinated king's supporters. It is not unlikely that this succession of disasters belonged within the context of the events of

743–740,²⁶ when, as we have seen, the north-central Syrian city Arpad played a leading role in a coalition of northern Syrian and south-eastern Anatolian states against Tiglath-pileser. The extent of the devastation caused by the coup, as described by Bar-Rakib, suggests that it went far beyond a palace conspiracy. It may well be that the state had become divided between pro- and anti-Assyrian factions, the latter encouraged by the Arpad-led defiance of Assyria in the region. Very likely this provided the context for the coup in Sam'al against Bar-Sur's apparently pro-Assyrian regime. But Tiglath-pileser's response was a comprehensive one. His action against the rebel alliance resulted eventually in the fall of Bit-Agusi/Arpad and its incorporation into a new Assyrian province. And it was probably in the course of his retaliatory operations that he installed the refugee from Sam'al on the Sam'alian throne as Panamuwa II, adding some territory to his kingdom from Sam'al's rebel northern neighbour Gurgum. Henceforth Panamuwa remained firm in his allegiance to Tiglath-pileser as a vassal ruler and tributary, and took part in apparently numerous Assyrian campaigns under Tiglath-pileser's command. He was killed during the Assyrian siege of Damascus, conducted by Tiglath-pileser between 733 and 732.

Tiglath-pileser now installed Panamuwa's son Bar-Rakib on Sam'al's throne, and the latter continued his father's allegiance to Assyria (CS II: 160–1) until his own death *c.*713. At that time, Assyria's throne was occupied by Sargon II. Bar-Rakib claims that his reign was a time of great prosperity in his kingdom's history, making him the envy of all his brother-kings:

And I took control of the house of my father.
 And I made it better than the house of any powerful king.
 And my brother kings were desirous (*transl. uncertain*) for all that is
 the good of my house.

(CS II: 161, transl. K. Lawson Younger, Jr.)

Remains of the impressive buildings and sculptures of the capital attributable to Bar-Rakib's reign suggest that his claim was not greatly exaggerated. Neveling Porter comments: 'The image of Bar-Rakib that emerges from the text is of a ruler whose faithfulness to Assyria strengthens his own prestige as ruler of a city that retained a lively sense of its own political identity despite its long and apparently happy association with Assyria.'²⁷

Yet Sam'al's days as a quasi-independent kingdom were numbered. Probably at the time of Bar-Rakib's death, or shortly after, Sam'al was converted into an Assyrian province. Lipiński comments that since no traces of a violent destruction of Zincirli can be attributed to this period, Assyria's annexation of Sam'al was probably a peaceful one. That is to say, the decision to convert it into a province was made in the context of general administrative changes which were being made in the west and the comprehensive incorporation of this region into the Assyrian provincial system.

Some time during the 7th century, the acropolis of Zincirli was destroyed. No precise date can be assigned to the destruction, but Lipiński suggests that it may have been a consequence of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon's unsuccessful campaign against Mugallu of Melid (Malatya) in 675, and of the latter's expansionist policy in the region.²⁸

A recent discovery In July 2008, during the course of the University of Chicago's excavations at Zincirli, a sculptured and inscribed mortuary stele, set up in honour of a man called KTMW (= Kuttamuwa?),²⁹ was discovered in a small room which served as a mortuary chapel where rituals were performed for the deceased. The inscription, written in the West Semitic Sam'alian dialect, identifies KTMW as a 'servant of Panamuwa'. Almost certainly, the Panamuwa in question was the second Sam'alian king of this name. This has been deduced from a close resemblance between details of the stele's carvings—including facial characteristics, furniture, and clothing—and the Zincirli sculptures in which Bar-Rakib, son of Panamuwa II, features.³⁰

Damascus (Aram-Damascus)³¹

Damascus, city and kingdom, lay in southern Syria, east of the anti-Lebanon range. In Iron Age texts, the name Aram is sometimes linked with Damascus and other cities and lands to indicate that the places to which it was applied came under Aramaean control. In Old Testament sources, Aram is sometimes used on its own to designate the kingdom of Damascus (e.g. 2 Kings 8:28–9). But Damascus' history extends well back before the Aramaean occupation. It is first attested as one of the cities and kingdoms which fought against and were defeated by the pharaoh Tuthmosis III at the battle of Megiddo during Tuthmosis' first Asiatic campaign in 1479 (*ANET* 234–8). Henceforth, it appears in Late Bronze Age texts as the centre of a region called Aba/Apa/Apina/Upi/Upu.³² From Tuthmosis' conquest onwards, for the remainder of the Late Bronze Age, this region remained under Egyptian sovereignty, though for a short time after the battle of Qadesh, fought in 1274 by the pharaoh Ramesses II against the Hittite king Muwatalli II, it came under Hittite control. After the Hittite withdrawal, Damascus and its surrounding region marked part of Egypt's northern frontier with the Hittites.

It was probably in the 10th century that Damascus became the capital of one of the most important Aramaean states in the Levant. According to Old Testament sources, it was embroiled in a number of conflicts with the Israelites from this time onwards. In 2 Sam. 8:5–6, the Israelite king David occupied the city and placed garrisons in it. However, 1 Kings 11:23–4 reports that it was lost to the Israelites in the reign of David's son and successor Solomon. There is a further report in 1 Kings 15: 16–22 that the then king of Damascus

Bar-Hadad (I) (Hebrew Ben-Hadad) made a treaty with Israel's king Baasha, which he treacherously broke (presumably around 900), attacking the kingdom after receiving a bribe from Asa, king of Judah.

The above information is found only in biblical sources. It is thus not independently verifiable, and considered unreliable by a number of scholars who question the historical reality of the Davidic and Solomonic monarchies. By the mid 9th century, however, we find ourselves on surer historical ground, with the beginning of references to Damascus in contemporary Assyrian records. From these we learn that in 853 Bar-Hadad's successor Hadadezer (Assyrian Adad-idri) played a leading role in the anti-Assyrian coalition which confronted Shalmaneser III at the battle of Qarqar on the Orontes river (*RIMA* 3: 23). Shalmaneser reports that Hadadezer led several more actions against the Assyrians, for example in the king's tenth and eleventh regnal years, 849, 848 (*RIMA* 3: 37–8), before the coalition forces were finally crushed, in 845 (*RIMA* 3: 39).

Shalmaneser apparently took no further retaliatory action against Damascus or any other member of the coalition. Perhaps he felt his victory was sufficiently decisive to keep the region submissive for the time being. And he may already have been planning the campaign which he conducted the following year into the regions lying to the east of his kingdom, notably the lands of Nairi, Urartu, and Dayenu. In any case, Hadadezer remained upon his throne in Damascus. But only for a brief period. He died within a few years of Shalmaneser's final defeat of the coalition forces, and was succeeded by one of his officers, a man called Hazael. Shalmaneser records Hazael's accession (*RIMA* 3: 118) and speaks with contempt of the new king as 'the son of a nobody'. That is to say, he was a commoner, probably illegitimate. The fact that such a man should accede to the throne may well raise suspicions as to how he came by it. Indeed, we have a biblical report of the accession (2 Kings 8:7–15) which informs us that he had seized the throne after murdering his predecessor, wrongly identified as Ben-Hadad (who was the previous king but one). Usurper though he may have been, Hazael maintained his predecessors' anti-Assyrian policy, which resulted in two invasions of his kingdom by Shalmaneser, in 841 and 838 (*RIMA* 3: 48, 60; *RIMA* 3: 67). In the aftermath of his victories, Shalmaneser took no further punitive measures against the kingdom, whose independence Hazael managed to retain. He had no doubt come to an arrangement with the Assyrian king, which left him on his throne in return for certain assurances to his conqueror.

In fact, Hazael went on to build his kingdom into an empire which incorporated large parts of Palestine, including Judah, Israel, and Philistia, and perhaps also parts of northern Syria.³³ From Hazael himself we have the remains of an Aramaic royal inscription, recently discovered in the city of Dan (Tell el-Qadi), which contains, among other things, a report of Hazael's victory over the kings of Israel and Judah, and the deaths of these kings at

his hands (CS II: 161–2 = *Chav.* 307). This inscription, incidentally, provides what appears to be the first non-biblical evidence for the existence of a king called David. The relevant passage reads: '[I killed Jeho]ram, son of [Ahab,] king of Israel and [I] killed [Ahaz]iahu, son of [Jehoram, kin]g of the house of David. And I set [their towns into ruins and turned] their land into [desolation. . . .]' (vv. 7–10, transl. B. B. Schmidt in *Chav.*).

Hazael's long and apparently successful reign probably came to an end in 803. It was in this year, most likely, that the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III attacked and conquered Damascus (*RIMA* 3: 213). But there is some uncertainty about the identity of the Damascene king at the time of Adad-nirari's conquest (and tied in with this, some disagreement about the date of the Damascus campaign). The Assyrian calls him Mari', a name which in Aramaic simply means 'lord'—and thus conceals the specific identity of the king to whom it refers. Was it still Hazael, or Hazael's son and successor Bar-Hadad II?³⁴ If it was Hazael, then the capture and destruction of his city marked an abrupt and inglorious finale to a career that had extended through the reigns of three Assyrian kings—Shalmaneser III, Shamshi-Adad V, and Adad-nirari III. The third of these came to the throne in 810. Presumably Hazael's long rule was tolerated by Assyria, or even backed by it, if he had acted as a kind of *de facto* agent of Assyrian interests in the west. And if so, the final attack on his kingdom by the Assyrians might indicate that he had suddenly decided to throw in his lot with other anti-Assyrian states in the region (Adad-nirari refers to comprehensive conquests in the Syro-Palestinian region before advancing on Damascus). Alternatively, Hazael had recently died and been succeeded by his son Bar-Hadad—who would thus have been the Mari' of the Assyrian record. It may be that it was Bar-Hadad who had decided to reverse what we assume to have been Damascus' alignment with Assyria during his father's reign and adopt an anti-Assyrian policy. Whoever Mari' was, he lost his royal capital to Adad-nirari, and was taken prisoner, later securing his freedom, and sparing his kingdom further devastation, by a substantial tribute-payment.

But Damascus did not long remain submissive to Assyria. Already c.800 we find Bar-Hadad leading a coalition of sixteen Syrian and eastern Anatolian rulers in an attack on the kingdom of Hamath, then ruled by Zakur. As we have noted, Zakur claims to have fought off the enemy—and very likely had Assyrian support in doing so, for he was a client and probably staunch supporter of Assyria. The attack on his kingdom is almost certainly to be construed as an enterprise hostile to Assyria. In subsequent years, tensions between Damascus and Assyria continued to mount, prompting Adad-nirari's successor Shalmaneser IV to dispatch an army against Damascus' current ruler Hadyan II (Hezyon, Assyrian Hadiiani) in 773,³⁵ under his commander-in-chief Shamshi-ilu. Once again, Damascus was forced to pay a substantial

tribute to avoid destruction, the tribute on this occasion including the king's daughter along with an extensive dowry.³⁶

This payment may have bought Hadyan's kingdom some respite from further Assyrian intervention. But Damascus was now weak and vulnerable to its neighbours. To judge from Old Testament sources, within about three years of its submission to Shamshi-ilu it became a subject-state of the Israelite king Jeroboam II (c.770) (2 Kings 14:28). But its subjection was short-lived. Nor did it resubmit to Assyria. In one final gesture of defiance, Damascus' last independent king Rasyan (Rahianu, *OT Rezin*) led another anti-Assyrian coalition, which included Israel, Tyre, and Philistia. It was to be one of the last in a long series of quixotic attempts by the Syro-Palestinian states to cast off the Assyrian yoke, and was, like many earlier attempts, doomed to failure. The Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser III took the field against the coalition's army and inflicted a decisive defeat upon it (c.732) (*Tigl. III* 78–81). Biblical sources provide further details about Rasyan's enterprises and his final showdown with Tiglath-pileser. According to 2 Kings 16:5–9, he joined forces with Pekah, the son of the Israelite king Remaliah, for an attack upon Jerusalem, then ruled by Ahaz. Ahaz sent an appeal to Tiglath-pileser for assistance against the Damascene and Israelite forces, stripping his city's palaces and temple treasures and sending the proceeds to Tiglath-pileser as an inducement. Tiglath-pileser responded by marching upon and attacking Damascus. The city fell to the Assyrians, though initially its king Rasyan avoided capture by taking to his heels (*Tigl. III* 78–81). His fate is recorded in 2 Kings 16: 5–9. He was eventually captured by Tiglath-pileser's troops, and on the king's orders executed. This biblical passage also records the Assyrian capture of Damascus, and the deportation of its population. The days of the city's and kingdom's independence were now at an end. Damascus was absorbed into the Assyrian provincial system.

The following list of rulers of Damascus is derived from information contained primarily in Assyrian records, with supplementary information from Aramaic and Old Testament sources. (For these sources, see Appendix II.) Alleged earlier rulers of Damascus, attested only in Old Testament sources (Ezron, Hadyan I, and Tab-Rammam), are not listed here. For information about them provided by the biblical texts, see Lipiński's index.

Bar-Hadad (I) (Hebrew Ben-Hadad)	(— c.900 —)
Hadadezer (Assyrian Adad-idri)	(— mid 9th cent. —)
Hazael	(mid 9th cent.—803?)
Bar-Hadad II (= <i>OT</i> Ben-Hadad) (son)	(c.803?—775?)
Hadyan (II) (Hezyon, Assyrian Hadiiani)	(c.775?—mid 8th cent.)
Rasyan (<i>OT</i> Rezin, Rahianu)	(mid 8th cent.—732)

Ktk

The Aramaean kingdom called Ktk lay somewhere in northern Syria, to the west of Carchemish. But a precise location for it and its capital city (which had the same name) has yet to be determined.³⁷ The reading of the name, which appears in Aramaic, and thus without vowels, is also problematic. In Assyrian texts, it is vocalized as Kaska/Kasku, perhaps because of the similarity of the name known to Neo-Assyrian scribes from Late Bronze Age records (Ktk, Ksk). There is, however, no ethnic, cultural, or political connection between Aramaean Kaska/Kasku (Ktk) and the Late Bronze Age Pontic region so called. Bar-Ga'ya, who reigned in the mid 8th century, is the only known king of Ktk. As we have seen, he is attested as one of the two contracting parties in a treaty which he drew up with Mati'ilu, the ruler named as king of Arpad in the treaty (CS II: 213–17).

Soba

The Iron Age kingdom Soba (a.k.a. Aram-Zobah, Bet Rehob), located in the Biqa' valley between the kingdoms of Hamath and Damascus, was perhaps founded early in the 10th century by an Aramaean clan or dynasty called Rehob. This suggested origin of the kingdom, proposed by Lipiński,³⁸ provides an explanation for the existence of the two names Soba and Bet Rehob in the sources, *contra* the assumption of two originally separate Aramaean states which eventually amalgamated. The kingdom's chief city, also called Soba, has yet to be located. But its strategically important position between Hamath and Damascus placed it under threat from both these kingdoms. In the early 8th century, it became part of the Hamathite kingdom. But before the end of the century, it had been incorporated into the Assyrian empire, becoming the administrative centre of an Assyrian province, called Subutu or Supite.³⁹

Attested in biblical sources under the name Zobah, the kingdom was, according to Old Testament tradition, an arch rival of the early kingdom of Israel. 1 Sam. 14:47 refers to it among the enemies of Israel whom Saul fought and defeated. Subsequently in the reign of Saul's successor David, Zobah's ruler Hadadezer built his kingdom into a powerful 'mini-empire' by annexing territories in eastern Syria across to the Euphrates. A final showdown with Israel was inevitable. This came in a battle fought between the forces of Hadadezer and David near the Euphrates. David resoundingly defeated Hadadezer's army, then plundered his subject-territories and allies, reducing many of them to tributary status (2 Sam. 8:3–12). Zobah's days as a significant political and military power in the Syro-Palestinian region were at an end.

The tradition thus recorded in the passages from Samuel provides a colourful episode in Israel's early history. But none of the information it contains about Soba/Zobah appears in any other ancient source. For this reason many scholars are reluctant to give much weight to, or reject altogether, these biblical passages in a reconstruction of Soba's history.

Other Peoples and Kingdoms

In this chapter, we shall broaden our discussion of the world of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms to include a survey of the other Near Eastern peoples of the age, in addition to the Aramaeans. As we shall see, almost every one of these peoples played some role, direct or indirect, in shaping the course of Neo-Hittite history. But Assyria had the most pervasive influence of all upon the Neo-Hittite states, politically, militarily, and culturally. Despite several periods of weakness and decline, Assyria was, overall, the greatest political and military power of the age. More than any other Near Eastern kingdom, it impacted upon the development of the Neo-Hittite states, until the late 8th century when it brought about their demise, as they were absorbed, one by one, into its provincial system.

We shall begin our chapter with a brief outline of Assyrian history up to the early Iron Age. This will set the scene for our investigations of the interactions between the Neo-Hittite and Assyrian kingdoms through the four centuries of Neo-Hittite history.

Assyria before the Iron Age

During the third millennium, a group of Semitic-speaking peoples, perhaps originally nomads from the Syrian desert, entered the plains of Mesopotamia in search of new pasture-lands for their flocks. They were called Amorites. As their numbers grew, they posed ever-increasing threats to the security of the kingdoms and city-states of the region. Many of these kingdoms and states were overrun and destroyed, and in their wake, a number of small independent Amorite states arose. One of them was established on a site called Ashur, located in an excellent strategic position on the west bank of the Tigris river. Its origins dating back to the early years of the Middle Bronze Age (*c.*2000), Ashur was to become the royal seat of one of the greatest, and one of the most feared, political and military powers of the Near Eastern world—the kingdom of Assyria, whose history was to span some fourteen centuries before its final collapse and destruction in the last years of the 7th century.¹ Around

1796, a ruler of Amorite stock called Shamshi-Adad came to power here. The first of the great Amorite kings, Shamshi-Adad embarked on a series of military operations that in the west took him across the Euphrates through northern Syria to Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea.

Under his predecessors, there was also a peaceful westwards movement of Assyrian enterprise, across the anti-Taurus range into north-central Anatolia. Assyrian merchant colonies were established along trade-routes which linked Ashur with the eastern and central Anatolian kingdoms, from the reign of the Assyrian king Erishum I (1974–1935), until that of Shamshi-Adad's son Ishme-Dagan (1775–1735). The termination of Assyrian merchant enterprise in Anatolia was no doubt closely linked to the disintegration of the Assyrian kingdom in Ishme-Dagan's reign, and its conquest, c.1763, by the Babylonian king Hammurabi. But in any case, conflicts among the Anatolian states with which the Assyrians traded may well have destabilized the region to the point where the merchants believed that they could no longer conduct their business safely or profitably there, and closed down their trading operations. It was to be 700 years before organized Assyrian enterprises again took place in Anatolia. These enterprises were of an entirely different nature to the peaceful commercial operations of the colony period.

After its fall to Hammurabi, Assyria became a relatively insignificant player in Near Eastern affairs, for a period of about four centuries. Within this period, Hammurabi's dynasty was abruptly ended, by the Hittite conquest of Babylon, c.1595, and henceforth northern Mesopotamia was dominated by the Hurrian kingdom of Mitanni. Assyria was reduced to Mitannian vassal status, after its traditional capital Ashur had been sacked and looted by the Mitannian king Saushtatar. But Mitanni became locked in a long conflict with the land of Hatti, its most bitter enemy. The fortunes of each side fluctuated in the conflict, until the Hittite king Suppiluliuma I decisively defeated his Mitannian counterpart Tushratta c.1344, and in the years that followed crushed the Mitannian empire into oblivion. The fall of Mitanni provided an opportunity for the resurgence of Assyria, which rapidly began to fill the power vacuum in northern Mesopotamia by taking over parts of former Mitannian territory. The rise of Assyria appears to have begun in the reign of Ashur-uballit (1365–1330), whose accession marked the start of the period commonly referred to as the Middle Assyrian Kingdom. Ashur-uballit sought to bolster his international standing by entering into correspondence with the pharaoh Akhenaten (*EA* 15, 16). The other great Near Eastern kingdoms, Hatti and Babylon, viewed the Assyrian resurgence with alarm—particularly Babylon, whose territories lay directly south of Assyria. Burnaburiash, the Babylonian king, sent a strong protest to the pharaoh when he received word that Assyrian envoys had come to the pharaoh's court, no doubt with a view to establishing diplomatic relations between their country and Egypt (*EA* 9). Burnaburiash urged the pharaoh to have nothing to do with them, claiming that the

Assyrians had no right to make independent representations to the Egyptian court since they were his vassals! It would seem that Babylon had sought to impose its own sovereignty upon Assyria once the Hittites had dispatched its former overlord Mitanni.

Disputes between the Mesopotamian neighbours had erupted afresh with the fall of Mitanni. During Ashur-uballit's reign, the Assyrians invaded Babylonian territory and captured Babylon itself, in the wake of a failed marriage alliance between the respective royal families.² Tensions between the kingdoms subsequently eased in the reign of the Assyrian king Adad-nirari I (1307–1275). This was partly, it seems, because Adad-nirari had his sights set on other objectives, which became evident when the Assyrian consolidated his hold over former Mitannian territory (what was left of it was now called the kingdom of Hanigalbat) up to the east bank of the Euphrates. This caused the Hittites no small concern, for their own subject territory began immediately west of the river. But there was little they could do to stop Assyrian expansion on the other side, and they probably failed to provide any support for the rulers of Hanigalbat east of the Euphrates—first Shattuara and subsequently his son and successor Wasashatta—in their abortive attempts to keep the Assyrians out of their lands. Hanigalbat was annexed to Assyrian territory. The Assyrians were now but a river's breadth away from the frontier of Hatti, placing all Hatti's Syrian subject territories under threat. Nevertheless, it seems that Adad-nirari tried to establish good relations with the Hittite king, at that time Urhi-Teshub (c.1272–1267), writing cordially to him and addressing him as 'My Brother'. Curtly, Urhi-Teshub rebuffed him. Though he admitted that Adad-nirari had demonstrated his credentials as a 'Great King' on the field of battle, he still regarded him as an upstart, not worthy of a place in the 'club' of royal brothers, membership of which was restricted to the pharaoh, the king of Babylon, and himself.³

Adad-nirari may have been quite sincere in his attempts to establish peace with the Hittites. Perhaps he made his approach to Urhi-Teshub to assure him that his action against Hanigalbat was in no way intended as a threat to Hatti. And perhaps he had no designs—at least no immediate ones—upon Hittite subject territory west of the Euphrates. But the Assyrian menace was always there, and was, quite possibly, one of the factors prompting the famous peace treaty between Urhi-Teshub's successor (and uncle) Hattusili III and the pharaoh Ramesses II in 1259.

Tensions between Hatti and Assyria erupted into conflict when the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244–1208) confronted and decisively defeated a large Hittite army under the command of the Hittite king Tudhaliya IV at the battle of Nihriya in northern Mesopotamia.⁴ We know some of the details of the battle, at least as it was presented from the Assyrian point of view, from a letter which Tukulti-Ninurta wrote about it to the ruler of Ugarit, a Hittite vassal state on the northern Syrian coast.⁵ There can be little doubt that

Tukulti-Ninurta sought to establish diplomatic relations with the Ugaritic king (name unknown), and to win him away from his Hittite allegiance, very likely in preparation for an Assyrian campaign into Syria. The destruction of the Hittite army at Nihriya had paved the way for this, and appears to have been followed by an Assyrian foray across the Euphrates, which resulted, according to Tukulti-Ninurta, in the capture of 28,800 Hittite troops (*RIMA* 1: 272, 275–6). Exaggerated though this figure may be, the episode may well indicate that Tukulti-Ninurta had his sights set firmly on the conquest of Syria, with this foray across the Euphrates as his first step.

But then came a reprieve for the Hittites. For instead of following up on his successes against them, Tukulti-Ninurta turned his attention to Babylonia, where he conducted a series of campaigns which ended with the conquest of Babylon and its incorporation into the Assyrian empire. The Hittite world suffered no further Assyrian attacks. Tukulti-Ninurta was subsequently assassinated, after suffering a series of military defeats elsewhere in his realm. For a time after his death, Assyria's role in international affairs was a much diminished one. But within a few decades of the decline and fall of the other Great Kingdoms of the Late Bronze Age, Assyria had re-emerged to become once more the most formidable power in the Near Eastern world.

Babylonia Before the Iron Age

The city of Babylon has a history of occupation that spans more than three millennia, from the third millennium BC until the 2nd century AD. The earliest references to it are found in the records of the Akkadian and Ur III periods,⁶ which together cover the last three and a half centuries of the Early Bronze Age, from c.2334 to 2004. The city suffered attack, plunder, and destruction by both Akkadian and Ur III rulers. For a time, it was a provincial centre of the Ur III kingdom. But it survived the fall of this kingdom, and a little over a century later, its own rise to prominence began—when it became the seat of an Amorite dynasty. Under the first five rulers of this dynasty, Babylon was the capital of but one of a number of small Mesopotamian states. But under the dynasty's sixth ruler, Hammurabi, it achieved military and political supremacy over its neighbours, and throughout the whole of Mesopotamia. Yet the empire that Hammurabi built, commonly known as the Old Babylonian empire, began to contract and decline almost immediately after his death. It fell 150 years later, when it was captured and destroyed, c.1595, by the Hittite king Mursili I, thus bringing to an abrupt end the reign of Hammurabi's last successor, Samsu-ditana, and what was left of the kingdom over which he held sway.

The Hittites made no attempt to establish any permanent form of control over the territories formerly subject to Babylon, but were content to return

home, laden with the treasures they took from the city before putting it to the torch. Some years later, a group of Kassites, an immigrant people perhaps from the Zagros mountain region in south-western Iran, became politically dominant in southern Mesopotamia, and established a ruling dynasty there. Babylon once more rose to prominence, as the administrative centre of the Kassite kingdom. But it lost this status in the late 15th or early 14th century when the royal seat of the kingdom was shifted to a new site, a city called Dur-Kurigalzu (modern Aqar Quf). The former capital now became a centre of culture, learning, and commerce. Modern scholars have adopted the name Babylonia for the region over which the Kassite kingdom and its Iron Age successor extended—roughly from Baghdad southwards to the Persian Gulf. The period of Kassite ascendancy is commonly referred to as the Middle Babylonian period.

In the Late Bronze Age, the Kassite rulers of Babylonia were ranked along with the rulers of Hatti, Mitanni (later replaced by Assyria), and Egypt as the Great Kings of the Near Eastern world. These kings wrote to one another, exchanged diplomatic embassies, and addressed one another as ‘My Brother’. But tensions often arose between them, which sometimes developed into open conflict. Squabbles over territory were a common source of such conflict, particularly between Assyria and Babylonia. Matters came to a head in the Mesopotamian region when Tukulti-Ninurta I invaded and conquered Babylonia, captured its ruler Kashtiliash IV, and took him back to Assyria in chains (*Chav.* 145–52). Fifteen years later, Kashtiliash’s son Adad-suma-usur liberated his country from Assyrian rule. But Babylonia still continued to suffer from external aggression, particularly from the Elamites who brought the Kassite regime to an end during the brief reign of its last king Enlil-nadin-apli (1157–1155) (see below). Henceforth, Babylonia was ruled by a new line of kings referred to as the Second Dynasty of Isin (*RIMB* 2: 5–69).

Conflict between Babylonia and Elam was to continue sporadically for many years. But both countries were to face a far greater threat to their survival, and sometimes joined forces to resist it—a resurgent Assyria.

Elam

Located in western Iran, Elam was among the longest-lasting and most important powers of the ancient western Asian world. Its history spans some two thousand years, from the third until the first millennium BC. Under the successive regimes of what are known as the Shimashki and the *sukkalmah* (Epartid) dynasties (c.2100–1600), Elam reached the peak of its political, military, and commercial development, becoming in this period one of the largest and most powerful of the western Asian kingdoms, with extensive diplomatic, commercial, and military interests in Iran, Mesopotamia, and

Syria. Its territories stretched north to the Caspian Sea, south to the Persian Gulf, eastwards to the desert regions of Kavir and Lut, and westwards into Mesopotamia. Subsequently, during the middle centuries of the second millennium, Elam suffered a relatively long period of decline, reaching one of its lowest points in the late 14th century when the Babylonians invaded and devastated the region called Susiana, and captured the royal Elamite capital Susa.

But by the 13th century, Elam was again emerging as a major power, betokened by its new religious and ceremonial royal capital Al-Untash-Napirisha. Named after its founder, the Elamite king Untash-Napirisha, the city was built on the site now known as Chogha Zanbil. Elam's subsequent history was marked by continuous warfare with the Mesopotamian states, particularly Babylonia, which was then under Kassite rule. Though the Elamites eventually secured the upper hand, bringing the Kassite dynasty to an end when its last ruler Enlil-nadin-ahi (1157–1155) succumbed in battle to his Elamite counterpart Kutir-Nahhunte, Babylon's conflict with Elam was continued by the rulers of the Second Dynasty of Isin. Around 1110, Elam suffered a major defeat, at the hands of the dynasty's fourth king Nebuchadnezzar I (1126–1105), who went on to sack the city of Susa.

This brings us to the final phase of Elam's existence, the so-called Neo-Elamite period (1100–539). Disputes with the Mesopotamian states persisted through much of the period. But by and large, Elam's role in western Asian affairs was now a greatly diminished one, with a few intervals of renewed vigour, and a final resurgence of Elamite power in the late 8th and early 7th century.⁷ Conflicts between Elam and Assyria broke out on a number of occasions, the former sometimes strengthened by temporary alliances with its Babylonian neighbour. Indirectly, this has a bearing on our investigations of the Iron Age kingdoms of northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia, and the ways in which their history was shaped by their interactions with Assyria. There was no actual political or military contact between Elam and these kingdoms, as far as we know. Nevertheless, the Assyrians' commitment of military resources for ventures east of the Tigris must have influenced the policies adopted by their kings towards the western states, and the decisions of these kings as to the nature and scale of the military operations they undertook across the Euphrates—at times when substantial resources were required for operations in the opposite direction—against the Elamites and other eastern peoples.

Epilogue Relations between Assyria and Elam remained generally hostile through the 7th century, with Assyria usually getting the better of conflicts between them. In 653, Elam's fortunes took a marked turn for the worse when the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal conducted a campaign into Elamite territory and defeated and killed the Elamite king Te-Umma. From this time onwards, the pattern of decline in Elam becomes increasingly marked. The Elamite capital Susa was sacked by the Assyrians in 646. Humban-haltash III,

last-known Elamite ruler, managed to avoid capture on this occasion by fleeing to the nearby mountains. But his pursuers tracked him down, and he subsequently sought refuge in Luristan. Here he was taken prisoner by local tribesmen, who delivered him up to Ashurbanipal. The stage was set for Humban-haltash's final humiliation. He was yoked to his conqueror's chariot and forced to pull it to the temple of Ishtar—where, presumably, he was offered up as a sacrifice to the goddess.

Israel

In the popular view, based on Old Testament sources, the history of Israel begins effectively with the story of Moses who led the Hebrews out of their captivity in Egypt to the land promised them by God. Two (successive) pharaohs are associated with the story of Moses in the Bible. However, neither of them is actually named, so that we cannot supplement what we know of the biblical story with information supplied by Egyptian sources. Various dates have been proposed for the exodus. The earliest, *c.*1450, is based on Solomonic chronology. From information provided by the Old Testament, Solomon is believed to have been king of Israel from *c.*960 to 922. According to 1 Kings 6:1, the exodus took place 480 years before Solomon began building, in his fourth regnal year, the great Temple in Jerusalem. Exodus 12:40 states that an interval of 430 years separated the arrival of Joseph and his brothers in Egypt from the exodus. From these figures, we can calculate that the Hebrew migration into Egypt occurred *c.*1870, and the exodus *c.*1440—if we use biblical chronology as the basis of our calculations. But there are differences of opinion on the validity of the figures, even among scholars who accept the basic historicity of the exodus tradition. The majority of such scholars prefer to assign the Hebrew departure from Egypt to the latter years of the pharaoh Ramesses II (1279–1213), *i.e.* to the later 13th century. Other scholars are highly sceptical of, or dismiss outright, the historical reality of the exodus story.

What is not in doubt is the first clearly attested historical reference to Israel, which appears in an inscription carved on a stele of Ramesses' son and successor Merneptah (1213–1203), discovered in 1896 by W. F. Petrie in Merneptah's mortuary temple in Thebes (*ANET* 376–8). Merneptah includes the name Israel in a list of his conquests in Syria-Palestine. The hieroglyphic determinative accompanying the name indicates that the pharaoh is referring to a people not to a land. As a nation-state, Israel seems not to have existed prior to the first millennium.

At this point, we should note a fundamental problem relating to the incorporation of information about Israel into a history of the Syro-Palestinian states. The bulk of the information that we have about the Israelites and their kings, from

the time of Saul onwards, comes from Old Testament sources. According to biblical tradition, King Saul established a united monarchy of Israel in the 11th century, and the united kingdom saw its full flowering in the 10th century, during the reigns of David and his son and successor Solomon. The latter organized the kingdom into twelve administrative districts, and under his rule, Israel reached the height of its cultural and commercial development. But politically, Solomon's reign was less successful, and on his death, the tensions that had been brewing between the northern and southern tribes of Israel erupted into open conflict. This led to the establishment of two separate kingdoms—Israel in the north, with its capital at Samaria, and Judah in the south. Many scholars accept, by and large, the historicity of this and other biblical accounts of Israelite history, while conceding that there are anomalies and inconsistencies which need to be taken into account in using the Old Testament as source material.

At the other end of the spectrum of opinion, there are a number of scholars who do not accept the historical validity of any part of biblical tradition that cannot be backed up by independent sources. That is why they reject the notion that the exodus tradition has any basis in fact. Some have expressed the view that the Israelites were a branch of the Canaanites, who withdrew to the Palestinian hill-country during the unsettled conditions in Syria-Palestine and elsewhere towards the end of the Late Bronze Age and the early years of the Iron Age. There is now also a good deal of scepticism about the whole notion of a united monarchy, which was allegedly established by Saul at the end of the 11th century, and developed by David and Solomon in the 10th century. Indeed, doubts have been expressed about whether David and Solomon (let alone Saul) ever existed. This scepticism may be going too far. Admittedly, hard evidence has yet to be found for an Israelite king called Solomon. But we have noted in Chapter 8 that evidence has recently turned up in the city of Dan for an early Israelite tribal leader called David—who may well be the historical figure behind the king so named in biblical tradition. So too evidence for Solomon may one day emerge.

But whether or not this happens, the kingdom that David and Solomon *may* have ruled would have been far less extensive than the kingdom associated with them in biblical tradition. Further, some scholars believe that if there ever were a union of Israel and Judah, it is more likely to have been the achievement of the 9th-century Israelite king Omri, allegedly the sixth ruler of Israel and founder of the so-called Omride dynasty, whose capital was located at Samaria in central Palestine. The dynasty founded by Omri c.876 was undoubtedly one of the most important in Israel's history. An indication of its significance is the fact that for a century after it ended the Assyrians continued to refer to Israelite kings as sons of Omri, and Israel itself as belonging to the house of Omri.

It is in fact with Omri's son and successor Ahab that we can start correlating biblical information with information from contemporary non-biblical

sources. In 853, Ahab joined the military coalition that confronted and was defeated by Shalmaneser III in the battle at Qarqar on the Orontes river (*RIMA* 3: 23). But the united kingdom supposedly founded by Omri was very short-lived, at least if one accepts the chronology normally assigned to it. Around 842, the death of Jehoram/Joram, traditionally considered the dynasty's last ruler, brought the Omride period to an end. Subsequently, Adad-nirari III (810–783) listed the Israelite king Joash among his Syro-Palestinian tributaries (*RIMA* 3: 211). Half a century later, Tiglath-pileser III made extensive conquests in Israel, mentioning Jehoahaz of Judah among his tributaries (*Tigl.* III 170–1), and under his successor Shalmaneser V (726–722) or his successor-but-one, Sargon II (721–705), the kingdom of Israel was ended. Judah survived, by submitting to Sargon and joining the ranks of his subject states.

Urartu

Urartu, in the form Uruatri, first appears in the records of the 13th-century Assyrian king Shalmaneser I. It was the name which the Assyrians used for the highland areas of eastern Anatolia, initially the areas lying in the vicinity of Lake Van. The local inhabitants called this region Bianili, from which the name Van is derived. In Shalmaneser's time, the region was occupied by a number of small principalities which were apparently independent of one another but at least nominally subject to Assyria. This is implied by Shalmaneser's report of a rebellion by Uruatri against him, and the conquest of its eight lands and fifty-one cities (*RIMA* 1: 183). Subsequent Assyrian conquests in the Uruatri/Urartu region are claimed by Ashur-bel-kala (1073–1056) (*RIMA* 2: 91, 97) and Adad-nirari II (911–891) (*RIMA* 2: 148). While the Urartian principalities remained small and fragmented, they could be readily picked off, one by one, by their powerful Assyrian neighbour. But in the latter half of the 9th century, that situation changed. In the city of Tushpa, on the south-eastern shore of Lake Van, a royal dynasty emerged, founded by a king called Sarduri I (832–825),⁸ who succeeded in uniting Urartu's lands and cities into a single political entity.

Very likely, the constant attacks launched by the Assyrians on Urartian territory provided the chief catalyst for the union. It was in fact formed during the reign of Shalmaneser III, who claims to have conducted no fewer than five campaigns into Urartian territory. This may well have led to a rallying of the forces of the region under the banner of Sarduri, and the origins of the united kingdom that was to prove one of Assyria's most formidable enemies. It quickly assumed the role of an aggressor. Continuing expansion of Urartian territory was the prime objective of the numerous campaigns conducted by Sarduri and his successors. The greatest expansion occurred in the reign of

King Minua (805–788), grandson of Sarduri and son and co-regent of Ishpuini. At this time, Urartu's territory stretched from Lake Van northwards into Armenia, eastwards to the Araxes river, south-eastwards to the shores of Lake Urmia, and south-westwards to the western bend of the Euphrates. For administrative purposes, the kingdom was divided into a number of provinces. Each was assigned to a governor, who may have enjoyed a high degree of local autonomy, given the topographically fragmented nature of the kingdom.

Minua's successor Argishti I (787–766) brought Urartu to the height of its power and prosperity, setting the scene for a succession of military confrontations between Assyria and Urartu. These began with a showdown between Argishti and the Assyrian commander-in-chief Shamshi-ilu in the western Zagros region (in the land of the Qutu people) during the reign of either Adad-nirari III or his successor Shalmaneser IV (*RIMA* 3: 232–3). Though Shamshi-ilu claimed victory, the outcome of the engagement was probably inconclusive. Tensions between the Assyrians and the Urartians remained high, erupting in conflict a number of times through the rest of the 8th century and at least the first half of the 7th. Assyria's subject territories east of the Tigris were particularly vulnerable to Urartian intervention—politically as well as militarily. Many a time Urartian kings sought to win away these territories from their Assyrian overlord by secret diplomatic negotiations. Many a time Assyrian kings or their commanders-in-chief had to take the field against rebellious subject rulers lured by an Urartian king from their Assyrian allegiance. To remain loyal to Assyria was not always the best option. Those rulers who chose to do so sometimes paid a heavy price—uprisings by pro-Urartian factions among their own people, and a violent end from an assassin's dagger.

Urartian kings sought also to destroy Assyrian supremacy within a number of regions by allying themselves with local rulers when confrontations with the Assyrians were looming. Thus in 743, early in Tiglath-pileser III's reign, Urartian forces led by Sarduri II formed an anti-Assyrian alliance with the Aramaean kingdom Arpad (Bit-Agusi) in northern Syria. Tiglath-pileser claimed victory over Sarduri's army in a battle fought in the land of Kummuh (*ARAB* I: §§769, 797; *Tigl. III* 100–1). But the Urartians continued to threaten Assyrian subject-territories in the west, as they did in the east, partly by their attempts to subvert local regimes. The Urartian factor undoubtedly had a major bearing on many of the decisions made by Assyrian kings about where they should commit their military resources in a particular year, and the conduct of campaigns that would take Assyrian armies far from their homeland, and from the defence of their eastern frontiers. Sargon II attempted to resolve the Urartian problem once and for all with his famous eighth campaign, directed primarily against Urartu, in 714. While campaigning in the northern Zagros region in this year, he met and decisively defeated the army of the Urartian king Rusa I, and then invaded and plundered part of Rusa's

kingdom. Rusa himself managed to escape the Assyrians but died shortly after, possibly by his own hand.

There was, however, a resurgence of Urartian power under Rusa's successor Argishti II, who campaigned further to the north-east than had any other Urartian ruler. His successor, Rusa II, was noted for his building enterprises, as illustrated by the fortified settlements of Ayanis, Adilcevaz, Karmir Blur, and Bastam.⁹ Urartu's natural defences provided by its mountainous terrain were substantially strengthened by the fortresses which its kings built on great outcrops of rock. Indeed, the kingdom's massive fortress settlements are the most spectacular of its remains. An invader had no hope of capturing these fortresses without a substantial commitment of time and resources to the undertaking. This must have been a major consideration in an Assyrian king's assessment of the risks and costs involved in conducting campaigns in Urartian territory—to be weighed up against the alternative of leaving Urartu free to embark on its own aggressive enterprises, in the territories of the Assyrians and their subject states.

Rusa II was the last Urartian king to leave any building inscriptions. And after his reign, we have little further information about Urartu. The last datable reference to an Urartian king occurs in an inscription from the reign of Ashurbanipal (668–630/27), who refers to a diplomatic mission sent to his court by 'Ishtar-duri'—Sarduri III or IV. By the end of the century, Assyria had fallen to a coalition of Medes and Chaldeans. The Urartian kingdom came to a violent end around the same time, or a few decades earlier, reflected in the destruction by fire of almost all Urartian sites.

In reconstructing Urartian history, as it has a bearing on the main subject of this book, we should bear in mind the nature of our sources. Written information about the Urartian kingdom begins with Sarduri I, founder of the kingdom. But the inscriptions of this period, though they are produced by Urartian scribes, are in the Assyrian language and script. In the reigns of subsequent Urartian kings, the surviving inscriptions were written in Urartian (except for a few bilinguals). These inscriptions provide a range of data about the kingdom's building programmes, religious activities, and some military enterprises. But the historical information they contain is very piecemeal and fragmentary. We learn far more about Urartu's history from the Assyrians. That of course is a limiting factor in our attempts to reconstruct this history. The fact that much of what we know about Urartu comes from the kingdom's arch enemy imposes a significant and inevitable bias on any assessment we make of Urartu's development and the states with which it came into contact, either as enemies, Assyrian subjects, or allies.

The Phoenicians

The peoples whom the Greeks called the Phoenicians play a small part in our history of the Neo-Hittite world. The Iron Age region called Phoenicia in Classical texts¹⁰ extended along part of the Syro-Palestinian coast and inland to the Lebanon and anti-Lebanon ranges. By and large, the Phoenicians were the Iron Age descendants of the Late Bronze Age coastal Canaanites, though the point at which these coastal Canaanites attained a specific identity and became Phoenicians is difficult to determine. Phoenicia consisted of a number of principalities or city-states, the most prominent of which were Sidon, Tyre, and Byblos. The Phoenician cities' economies were very much oriented towards the sea. Trading links had been established with Cyprus, and Old Testament sources indicate good commercial relations between Tyre and the early Israelite monarchy. The production of timber and purple dye featured amongst the Phoenicians' most important industries, along with the manufacture of a range of products fashioned from ivory, wood, stone, metal, wool, and linen. Inevitably, Phoenicia's wealth attracted the interest of the emerging Neo-Assyrian empire, beginning with the reign of Ashurnasirpal II, who imposed tributary status on the coastal cities. It was of course in Assyria's interests to allow Phoenicia's commercial enterprises to flourish, and indeed expand, while they were subject to the Assyrian king and helped fill his coffers with a variety of valuable goods. But though the Phoenicians often resigned themselves to their tributary status, with the benefits as well as the costs that this entailed, there were times when they joined other peoples and kingdoms in the Syro-Palestinian region in anti-Assyrian uprisings. Escalating tensions and conflicts between Assyria and a number of the Phoenician cities culminated in the Assyrian conquest of these cities, most notably Sidon and Tyre, in the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon.

Part III

The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in their Historical Context

In earlier chapters of this book, we have investigated the various Iron Age successors of the Late Bronze Age civilizations, including those that followed the Hittites in western and central Anatolia, the Neo-Hittite kingdoms of south-eastern Anatolia and northern Syria, the Aramaean kingdoms, particularly the ones that emerged and developed west of the Euphrates, and a range of other peoples of the age, including Assyrians, Babylonians, Elamites, Uartians, Israelites, and Phoenicians. In the final three chapters, we shall attempt to integrate the histories of the various Neo-Hittite states with those of their neighbours and contemporaries up to the time when the last Neo-Hittite kingdom was absorbed into the Assyrian provincial administration. The overall aim of these chapters is to construct a historical synthesis of the period extending from the 12th to the late 8th century. Assyria will play a dominant role throughout this synthesis, but its focus will be primarily on the cities, states, and territories that made up the world of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms.

This page intentionally left blank

The Kingdoms Evolve (12th–11th centuries)

As the Late Bronze Age drew to a close, many Near Eastern kingdoms were caught up in the cataclysmic upheavals that were to plunge the world to which they belonged into chaos. Early in the 12th century, the kingdom of Hatti collapsed and disappeared, along with many of its vassal kingdoms. The kingdom of Egypt survived the devastations of the age. But it withdrew from the Syro-Palestinian region, and for several centuries played but a minor role in the international scene. Between them, Hatti and Egypt had controlled virtually the whole of Syria and Palestine. The collapse of Hatti and the withdrawal of Egypt changed forever the geopolitical configuration of the region. Some of the vassal states, like Ugarit and Amurru, disappeared altogether. The urban centres of others, like Qadesh and Qatna, were reoccupied in the Iron Age, but remained insignificant. Other urban centres, like Sidon and Tyre, may have suffered decline. But they rose again in the centuries that followed, to enter upon the most prosperous phase of their existence. In the early centuries of the Iron Age, no overlords emerged to impose their sovereignty on the region, like the former Great Kings of Egypt, Hatti, and Mitanni. New independent principalities arose in Syria and Palestine, many containing towns and cities that had existed and often prospered through the second millennium. But their culture and the ethnic composition of their populations underwent significant changes.

It was in this setting that the Neo-Hittite kingdoms began to develop, within a few decades of the collapse of the Hittite empire. The earliest of these, Carchemish, took on apparently without interruption the mantle of sovereignty over what was left of the Hittite world, under the leadership of Kuzi-Teshub, son of Talmi-Teshub, the last clearly attested viceroy of Carchemish. Kuzi-Teshub almost certainly succeeded his father in Carchemish, probably as viceroy to begin with, in the dying years of the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Hatti. But when it became clear that Hattusa had been abandoned by its last king and the disintegrating Hittite world had been left leaderless, Kuzi-Teshub made Carchemish the new centre of this world, and declared himself the new Great King of Hatti.

But the kingdom over which he held sway covered only part of the territory of Late Bronze Age Hatti. Perhaps he planned, originally, to restore the kingdom to its former glory, with Hattusa once more its royal capital, and himself as the occupant of its throne. Perhaps this was what prompted him to adopt the title Great King. But if so, he soon realized the impossibility of such an ambition, and contented himself with restoring and consolidating under his rule the eastern part of the former empire, the part once governed by the Late Bronze Age Hittite viceroy based in Carchemish, and perhaps also the part governed by the other viceroy based in Aleppo. We do not know whether he ever exercised, or claimed to have exercised, sovereignty over all the Syrian regions where Neo-Hittite kingdoms were established. But it is possible that a number of the kingdoms originated under local administrations set up by Kuzi-Teshub or one of his successors. At the very least, in the early post-empire period, Carchemish must have been the administrative centre of a region along and west of the Euphrates encompassing the territories where the kingdoms of Malatya and Kummuh arose. Malatya was ruled by Kuzi-Teshub's grandsons Runtiya and Arnuwanti, and may originally have been set up as a sub-kingdom of Carchemish under a branch of Kuzi-Teshub's family. Kummuh's location between Malatya and Carchemish makes it likely that it too was originally part of the Iron Age kingdom of Carchemish.

One of the most pressing tasks of the Carchemish administration and its regional branches was to restore the lands devastated by the upheavals that had brought down the Hittite empire and other Late Bronze Age centres, by rebuilding cities and roads and resettling populations in their home territories or in other depopulated regions. These activities are recorded among the achievements of the Malatyan ruler Runtiya. They were undertaken probably in close cooperation with the central regime at Carchemish. I have suggested in Chapter 5 that the second ruler of Carchemish, perhaps the son whom Kuzi-Teshub chose to succeed him on his throne, was the Great King Ir-Teshub, referred to in the hieroglyphic inscription which was carved on a stele discovered at Karahöyük near Elbistan.¹ Ir-Teshub appears to have taken on or continued the task of reconstructing the eastern territories that formerly belonged to the Hittite empire, by rebuilding and repopulating cities in the region. These projects were apparently associated with the tours of inspection which Ir-Teshub conducted throughout his kingdom. Runtiya continued the programme of reconstruction within the Malatya region. We do not know whether he did so as a subordinate of the king of Carchemish or as an independent ruler. But in any case, he named Kuzi-Teshub in his titlature, and accorded him the title 'Great King'. Malatya must have become independent of Carchemish early in the Neo-Hittite period, perhaps already by the time Kuzi-Teshub's grandsons had been installed on its throne. But at whatever time it achieved its independence, it probably did so by peaceful means. Its new status may reflect a more widespread fragmentation of the kingdom of Carchemish into a number of autonomous units.

The Assyrian resurgence under Tiglath-pileser I

This fragmentation may have been linked with the invasion of the region by the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I (1114–1076). During the period when many other Near Eastern states had collapsed and disappeared, or suffered serious decline, Assyria had re-emerged as a powerful kingdom, still retaining control over a substantial part of northern Mesopotamia. Tiglath-pileser had spent the first years of his reign on campaigns in the north and to the north-east of his kingdom. He had crushed a force of 20,000 tribesmen called the Mushki who had invaded and captured the Assyrian province of Kadmuhi in the Zagros mountain region, put down a rebellion by the Subarian peoples in the north-east, and destroyed a coalition force of kings from the land of Nairi in the region of modern Kurdistan. (We will have more to say about these campaigns below.) By his fifth year, he was ready to turn his attention westwards, and to realize an ambition held by many of his royal predecessors—to carry Assyrian arms across the Euphrates through Syria to the lands that lay along the Mediterranean Sea. He became the first Assyrian king since Shamshi-Adad I, 700 years earlier, to accomplish this feat. In doing so, he was in effect fulfilling one of the chief obligations that kingship imposed upon him—to give a clear and continuing demonstration of his prowess as a war leader by victorious campaigns abroad, and by enriching his kingdom with the spoils brought back from his campaigns. Plunder and tribute ranked high among the rewards of military conquest. And there were many prizes to be had from the cities and kingdoms of the west by those who conquered them, including a wide range of manufactured products, of gold, silver, and finely made cloth. Most importantly, the western campaigns provided access to the forests of Lebanon and other regions of Syria-Palestine, whose timbers featured prominently in the royal construction projects of the Assyrian homeland cities.

By the late second millennium, the great powers that had extended their control, and their protection, over the western lands and cities had gone. The Hittite empire was no more, Egypt had withdrawn from the region and could no longer claim to have any influence in it. There was no powerful overlord upon whom the Iron Age states could call for support against an invading Assyrian army. The kings of Carchemish may have borne the title ‘Great King’ and regarded themselves as the heirs of the Hittite imperial royal line. But they would be no match for an Assyrian Great King who decided to attack their land.

In general terms, timing must have had an important bearing on any decisions which Assyria’s kings made for mounting campaigns in the west. Consideration had to be given to potential threats posed to the kingdom by its powerful enemies, threats which might well be translated into action if Assyria’s frontiers were seen to be left vulnerable by the absence of the Great King

and a large part of his army on a campaign far to the west. To the north-east of Assyria lay the land of Urartu, to the south the kingdom of Babylonia, and to the south-east the kingdom of Elam. There was also, to the north-west, the kingdom of Phrygia, which in the 8th century was to contest with Assyria control over the territories that lay between them. But we shall deal separately with the Phrygian question. The first three mentioned kingdoms had one important thing in common: they were in striking distance of the Assyrian homeland, and in peak periods of their power constituted a significant threat to its territories—and an even greater threat when they joined forces, as they sometimes did. An Assyrian king who committed a substantial part of his military resources to campaigns in the west must, before making this commitment, have taken into account the security of his own kingdom at such a time against his neighbours. There were a number of occasions when the Great King conducted campaigns in the west when he knew his enemies near his homeland were weak and divided. At other times, he needed to make careful decisions as to the size of his campaigning force for a western campaign, the likely length of the campaign, and the benefits to be gained from it, to be set against its risks and costs.

For Tiglath-pileser I, the fifth year of his reign was an opportune time for a campaign deep into Syrian territory. Babylonia was then under the rule of a line of kings called the Second Dynasty of Isin (*RIMB* 2: 5–69). The best known of these kings, Nebuchadnezzar I, Tiglath-pileser's contemporary, was currently locked in conflict with Elam (*RIMB* 2: 19–35)—which meant that for the time being Assyria was spared the prospect of hostile action by either of its two most dangerous neighbours. And Urartu was as yet no more than a motley collection of little states whose amalgamation into a powerful kingdom lay almost 250 years in the future. But on his accession, Tiglath-pileser did face serious problems in his kingdom's northern territories. The most pressing of these was the aggressive activities of a coalition of tribal groups called the Mushki. In the latter half of the second millennium, the Mushki had been taking over, gradually, a number of regions within the Armenian highlands.² For some fifty years prior to Tiglath-pileser's reign, they had occupied the lands of Alzu and Purulumzu, located in northern Mesopotamia to the north of the Kashiyari range. These lands were nominally subject to Assyrian sovereignty, but the intruders had avoided conflict with the Assyrians, by becoming tributaries of the Assyrian crown (*RIMA* 2: 14–15). However, their numbers had grown to alarming proportions, and in Tiglath-pileser's accession year, a force of 20,000 of them, under five kings, marched south into the land of Kadmuhi, an Assyrian province, and took possession of it. With Kadmuhi under Mushki control, the security of Assyrian heartland territory could be seriously threatened.

Prompt, retaliatory action was essential. Barely having had time to warm his throne, Tiglath-pileser left it to lead an expedition of infantry and chariotry

through the Kashiari range for a showdown with the Mushki. The result, according to his own account, was a total rout of their forces. More than two-thirds of their numbers were slaughtered, and the 6,000 survivors were forced into subjection. There remained the question of what to do about Kadmuhi. This Assyrian subject state had long proved troublesome, and the king's predecessors had conducted a number of campaigns of pacification against it.³ From Tiglath-pileser's account, it is clear that the people of Kadmuhi had given their support to the Mushki invaders, perhaps regarding them as their liberators from Assyrian rule. The time had come for retribution. Following his victory over the Mushki, Tiglath-pileser conquered the whole land of Kadmuhi, and then ran to ground those of its population who had sought refuge in a stronghold called Shereshshu across the Tigris. The fugitives and their defenders were butchered, after the king and his chariotry and infantry had hacked their way through rugged mountain terrain to get to them. As thorough as this military operation appears to have been, Tiglath-pileser had to undertake a second campaign against Kadmuhi before he succeeded in fully establishing his authority over it (*RIMA* 2: 17).

There were several other urgent problems that required prompt action by the king early in his reign, to ensure the security of his kingdom. One of these had to do with an assortment of fierce tribal groups inhabiting the Nairi lands. This was a mountainous region north of the upper Tigris, extending roughly between modern Diyarbakır and Lake Van and then to the south-east, to the region west of Lake Urmia. Nairi was made up of an array of small tribal principalities. We first hear of it in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244–1208), who claimed to have fought, defeated, and imposed tribute upon no fewer than forty of its kings (*RIMA* 1: 244). But Nairi continued to threaten Assyrian territory, and Tiglath-pileser conducted further military operations against it early in his reign (*RIMA* 2: 21–2)—with a decisive outcome, according to his own account. After crushing a coalition of twenty-three of its kings (thirty in another account), he set about plundering their lands and destroying their cities. The kings themselves were taken prisoner, but subsequently released on the condition that they deliver up their sons as hostages for their good behaviour. The Nairi ventures would thus appear to have been successfully concluded. Tiglath-pileser had brought this wild and multi-tribed land effectively to heel, to the point where he could safely turn his attention to military enterprises elsewhere. But the Nairi problem was one that would resurface many times in later Assyrian history. Nairi remained a constant threat to the security of Assyria's north-eastern frontiers.

Tiglath-pileser's western campaign

For the time being, however, Tiglath-pileser had consolidated his control over the far-ranging territories of his kingdom, and secured the frontiers of these

territories, to the point where he could commit his forces to an invasion of the west:

I marched to Mount Lebanon. I cut down and carried off cedar beams for the temple of the gods Anu and Adad. . . . I continued to the land Amurru and conquered the entire land. I received tribute from the lands Byblos, Sidon, and Arwad. . . . Finally, upon my return, I became lord of the entire land of Hatti and imposed upon Ini-Teshub, king of the land of Hatti, hostages, tax, tribute and impost of cedar beams (*RIMA* 2: 37, vv. 16–28, transl. after Grayson).

In Neo-Assyrian texts, the term Amurru apparently refers primarily to the region occupied by the Phoenician cities along the Levantine coast and its hinterland.⁴ Tiglath-pileser claims to have conquered the whole of it, though his particular objectives were the coastal cities and the timber-bearing regions of the hinterland. It seems that the prime reason for his campaign was to acquire the cedar timbers of Lebanon, to be taken back to Assyria for use in the construction of temples and no doubt other monumental buildings. But there were also rich pickings to be had from the cities along the coast. These included Sidon and Byblos. Whatever the fate of these cities at the end of the Late Bronze Age, both had become flourishing centres of trade and commerce by the end of the millennium. Sidon's wealth was due partly to its overseas enterprises. It was probably the first of the Phoenician cities to engage in such enterprises, and was well known for these already in the 11th century. The Egyptian *Tale of Wenamun* text which dates to this period refers to fifty merchant ships in Sidon's harbour (*CS* I: 91). The city's merchant enterprises were complemented by its craft industries, for which Sidon was renowned. Highly sought after on foreign markets were the products of the city's weavers and gold-, silver-, and copper-smiths. A reference in Homer's *Iliad* (6.289–92) to the elaborately wrought robes which the Trojan prince Paris brought back from the land of Sidon provides a literary allusion to the reputation of the city's craftsmen. Byblos also figures in the *Tale of Wenamun* (*CS* I: 89–93); the merchant Wenamun had been sent to the city to obtain a consignment of cedar from its king. During its Iron Age phase, Byblos played an important role in the export of Lebanese timber, and was noted as a major centre for the papyrus trade. It was famous also for the skills of its stonemasons and carpenters, who, according to 1 Kings 5:18, assisted in the construction of Solomon's temple.

On his way back to Ashur, Tiglath-pileser declared his sovereignty over the whole land of Hatti—which in its broadest sense encompassed virtually all the northern Syrian states. His report of the campaign includes a reference to a king of Hatti called Ini-Teshub, who became one of his tributaries and was almost certainly the current ruler of Carchemish.⁵

As far as we can judge from the sources available to us, Tiglath-pileser's operations in Syria and Palestine were bloodless ones. Though the king claims

that he conquered the entire land of Amurru, he gives no indication that he resorted at any time to military action. The mere show of force in the region was apparently sufficient to win the submission of the lands and cities which he approached without the need for violence. For Tiglath-pileser, the western campaign was essentially a revenue-gathering exercise. The king had no intention of establishing direct rule over his 'conquered' lands—despite his claim that he made himself 'lord of the entire land of Hatti'. Indeed, the account of his expedition to the Levantine coast sometimes has more the sense of a royal tour about it than a military operation—as illustrated by the king's report of a boat trip he made from the island of Arwad to the city of Samuru, during which he hunted a sea-creature called a *nahiru*.

Limited as it was to a series of tribute-gathering exercises, the king's western campaign had no lasting impact upon the lands through which he passed. And after his return home, the Assyrians were heard of no more in the west, for many years to come. Upon the king's death c.1076, Assyria entered upon a long period of decline, which saw its territory reduced, by the beginning of the first millennium, to a narrow strip of land extending c.150 km along the Tigris river. It was only in the last decades of the 10th century that the kingdom's fortunes changed for the better, with the accession of a king called Ashur-dan II (934–912). Regarded as the founder of the Neo-Assyrian kingdom, Ashur-dan began the process of winning back Assyria's lost territories. But it was not until the reign of his great-grandson Ashurnasirpal II (883–859) that Assyrian forces once more appeared in the lands west of the Euphrates.

The emergence of the first Neo-Hittite kingdoms

The period between Tiglath-pileser's and Ashurnasirpal's reigns must have witnessed the evolution and development of a number of Neo-Hittite kingdoms and western Aramaean states. But written information about them is extremely sparse before they appear in Ashurnasirpal's records, where they figure among the tributaries who submitted to the king during his western campaign. Exceptional in this respect are the kingdoms of Carchemish and Malatya. As we have seen, the hieroglyphic inscriptions of these kingdoms provide us with bits and pieces of information about them from the first decades of their existence in the 12th century, long before they are attested in Ashurnasirpal's records.

From the Carchemish inscriptions, we have tentatively reconstructed a first Neo-Hittite line of rulers, beginning with Kuzi-Teshub, who adopted the old imperial titles 'Great King', and 'Hero'. Dating considerations indicate that this line extended from the early or mid 12th century until the 11th or 10th century. We cannot tell whether its kings were all members of the same family, and thus all descended from a branch of the Late Bronze Age Hittite royal dynasty, as the first of them, Kuzi-Teshub, certainly was. But it does seem clear that the early kings of Carchemish were (with two known exceptions) the only

Neo-Hittite rulers to retain the grandiose titles of Late Bronze Age Hittite royalty,⁶ and did so for perhaps almost 200 years. Later rulers of Carchemish adopted the more fitting title ‘Country-Lord’, or ‘King’ without the ‘Great’ epithet. Perhaps originally applied to local rulers subordinate to a central monarch, these titles were now used of men who were rulers in their own right.

As we have noted, the hieroglyphic inscriptions from Carchemish attest to a ‘second’ ruling dynasty in the kingdom, consisting of four known members. It began with a man called Suhi (I) and proceeded from him through three successive generations, with the throne passing from father to son in each case—from Astuwatamanza to Suhi (II) to Katuwa. We have discussed in Chapter 5 the question of possible connections between the so-called Kuzi-Teshub and Suhi dynasties, and indeed whether the latter may have been a continuation of the former. We have also noted the possibility that inter-dynastic disputes broke out between different families or branches of the same family. Katuwa’s inscriptions record a number of building projects undertaken by the king and a number of military campaigns in which he engaged. We do not know how wide-ranging the latter were. They may have been largely if not entirely confined to operations against rebel subjects within his kingdom, including perhaps factions led by members of the former line of rulers.

But this is speculative. It is not until the intervention once more of Assyria in regions west of the Euphrates that we begin to obtain—from the Assyrian kings who campaigned there—specific new information about Carchemish and its kings. So too with Malatya. Following the brief reference (or references) to it in one of Tiglath-pileser’s campaigns, our knowledge of Malatya is confined largely to the names of a number of its rulers (plus fragmentary details of the exploits of a couple of them), until the Assyrians resumed their operations west of the Euphrates. The record takes up again with the expeditions of Ashurnasirpal II and his son and successor Shalmaneser III, the first Assyrian kings to penetrate the Syrian region since Tiglath-pileser.

The changing face of Syria and Palestine at the turn of the millennium

In the late 11th and the 10th centuries, a number of important changes took place in the socio-political landscape of Syria and Palestine. New states were emerging throughout the region, able to develop peacefully, it seems, without the threat of aggression by territorially ambitious neighbours or expansionist foreign powers. Assyrian intervention was a thing of the past, and while Assyria remained weak and divided, there was no prospect of a return of its armies. A defining feature of the age was the great movement of Aramaean settlers into the region. As we have noted, the Aramaeans are first attested in the records of Tiglath-pileser I, where they are portrayed as warlike tribal groups frequently in conflict with the Assyrian king. Yet Aramaean settlement in Syria from at least the late 11th century onwards was in the main a peaceful

process, accompanied by the rapid urbanization of the settlers, once a largely semi-nomadic people. The occasional references we have to violent occupation of a land or city by Aramaeans all appear in Assyrian records.⁷

In Syria, relations between Aramaean and other states seem by and large to have been harmonious, an important factor in promoting the urbanization and commercial development of all the states. The Neo-Hittite kingdoms may well have played a leading role in this development. Foremost among them was Carchemish, which under the rulers of the so-called Suhi dynasty, particularly Suhi II and Katuwa, was restored and rebuilt. The impressive sculptured façades of the walls of public buildings, the temple of the Storm God, and the so-called King's Gate and Herald's Wall project an image of the might and grandeur of the city and the rulers who commissioned them, and no doubt served as a model and inspiration for other developing kingdoms in the region. The organizational pattern which emerged in this period is one of a series of states or city-states, each independent and each ruled by a king, with a royal capital as its administrative centre. Some of the larger states included within their frontiers a number of smaller towns and cities, many fortified. Even the smallest states, which contained little more than a single urban centre, appear to have included one or more minor settlements within their boundaries.

Precisely how and when did these states emerge? Apart from Carchemish and Malatya, the earliest evidence we have for any of them, textual or archaeological, dates back no earlier than the late 11th century. In some cases, they may have begun before this, their origins perhaps extending back to the first decades of the Iron Age in the 12th century. One thing of which we can be fairly certain is that with few exceptions the states were new Iron Age foundations, their chief cities sometimes built close to but quite separately from Late Bronze Age urban centres such as Alalah and Ugarit. In considering the reasons for their emergence, we should again emphasize that the states we have called Neo-Hittite are so named primarily because their rulers used the Luwian hieroglyphic script on stelae, wall and gate orthostats, and building blocks (that is to say, on public monuments), for dedicatory and commemorative inscriptions. In this they followed Carchemish, by maintaining a writing tradition that had been established by the rulers of Late Bronze Age Hatti. Their iconography and much of their public architecture similarly hark back to the cultural traditions of the old Hittite world.

We have already expressed caution about assuming as a matter of course that the authors of the hieroglyphic inscriptions were themselves of Hittite or Luwian origin, or that the populations over which they ruled were predominantly Luwian speakers. It is, however, possible that the ruling class of many if not all of the Neo-Hittite states were initially descendants of a Late Bronze Age elite class, with the Hittite royal family at its head, who were able to establish their authority afresh in the developing Iron Age kingdoms. We can only

speculate on the means by which they succeeded in doing this. Some of the kingdoms may have been founded originally by Kuzi-Teshub, as regional centres of the Carchemish administration, to enable the new Great King to consolidate his sovereignty over the Syrian territories formerly subject to his royal predecessors in Hattusa. The first local rulers of the new kingdoms may thus have been appointees of the king of Carchemish. This would assume an early foundation date—around the middle of the 12th century—for these kingdoms, well before they are attested in our sources. Alternatively, the new kingdoms evolved independently of the Carchemish regime, though still under the rule of families whose links extended back to the Late Bronze Age Hittite royal family. In either case, they could not have achieved the power they held without the support of an administrative and military infrastructure whose personnel may in part have had ethnic affinities with them.

In general, I can envisage a situation where the ruling groups that emerged to fill the vacuum left by the fall of the Hittite empire in the south-east developed out of local administrations already set up in the region following Suppiluliuma I's establishment of viceregal seats at Aleppo and Carchemish. Alternatively, these groups may reflect the emergence of ruling dynasties from descendants of collateral branches of the Hittite royal dynasty who dispersed, perhaps, to both northern and southern Syria in the final decades of the Hittite empire. Could it be that the sons of the displaced Hittite king Urhi-Teshub were the ancestors of some of the ruling dynasties of the Neo-Hittite world? Another possibility is that one of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms started life as the residence-in-exile of the last Late Bronze Age Hittite king Suppiluliuma II after his departure from Hattusa. In any case, it is worth reiterating that the retention of Late Bronze Age Hittite royal names by a number of Neo-Hittite ruling dynasties may well reflect actual family links between these dynasties and the royal family of imperial Hatti. Of course in any of these scenarios, the majority of a kingdom's inhabitants may have had different ethnic origins from those of their rulers—just as the administrative elite that established the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom probably represented only a minority ethnic group in the kingdom over which it ruled.

The origins of the Neo-Hittite ruling families reviewed

We have discussed in some detail the questions of when and in what circumstances the earliest ruling lines were established in Carchemish and Malatya following the collapse of the Hittite empire. At this point, it will be useful to review what we know about the origins of the royal lines in the other Neo-Hittite states. In so doing, we should allow the possibility that these lines and the states over which they ruled may have begun much earlier than current evidence indicates. Indeed, some may have been established well before the end of the 12th century.

Kummuh Located between Malatya and Carchemish, Kummuh may have been one of the regions that Kuzi-Teshub and his successors sought to redevelop, during the early post-Bronze Age era, by rebuilding and repopulating cities in them. It was perhaps in the context of such a project that the (Carchemishean?) king Ir-Teshub visited the land 'POCULUM'.⁸ The stele containing this information was found on the site of Karahöyük near Elbistan. Karahöyük may have been part of the land of Malatya, but could alternatively have lain within the territory which became the kingdom of Kummuh—initially, perhaps, a sub-kingdom of Carchemish. Unfortunately, archaeological remains from the site are meagre; few from either the preceding late Bronze Age or this phase of the city's existence have been recovered. The earliest written references to Kummuh are found in the records of Ashurnasirpal II, c.870, some decades earlier than the kingdom's own hieroglyphic inscriptions, which date from c.805 to 770. Of the six known kings of Kummuh, four bore the names of Late Bronze Age Hittite kings: there were two Hattusilis, one Suppiluliuma, and one Muwatalli. It is possible that these names link the dynasty which ruled Kummuh in the 9th and 8th centuries to the first rulers of the kingdom of Kummuh, which could conceivably have been established as an initiative of the first Iron Age kings of Carchemish.

Masuwari (Til Barsip) The earliest known ruler of this little kingdom is Hapatila, so identified in an inscription carved on a stele from the site in which the author (name now lost) identifies Hapatila as his great-grandfather. On stylistic grounds, Hawkins links the stele to the style of the Suhi II–Katuwa period in Carchemish—i.e. the late 10th century or perhaps the early 9th century.⁹ Such a date would place Hapatila back in the early 10th century, or possibly earlier. We do not know if he was the first member of his dynasty. The origins of the Neo-Hittite state could go back even further. Given the proximity of Masuwari to Carchemish, it is possible that the kingdom was created by Kuzi-Teshub as part of his programme of restoring and resettling lands depopulated by the upheavals at the end of the Late Bronze Age.

Gurgum The earliest attested ruler of the kingdom of Gurgum is also to be dated to the late 11th century. This is on the basis of genealogical information provided by several hieroglyphic inscriptions which indicate a dynastic line extending over nine generations. Synchronisms with Assyrian chronology provide us with several fixed points in the Gurgumean chronology, giving us an 11th-century date for the first known member of the dynasty, Astuwar-amanza. He may not have been the earliest ruler of the Neo-Hittite kingdom. Again, I suggest the possibility that the kingdom was first established by Kuzi-Teshub under an appointee of his from the Hittite royal line. The territory over which Kuzi-Teshub held sway would thus have extended along the Euphrates north to Malatya and westwards to the plain of modern Maraş.

Three members of the known dynasty at Gurgum bore the Hittite imperial royal name Muwatalli.

Sam'al Though strictly an Aramaean state, Sam'al had a number of Neo-Hittite connections. Its founder is believed to have been a North Arabian or Aramaean chieftain called Gabbar, whose clan seized power in a predominantly Neo-Hittite area in southern Anatolia in the last decades of the 10th century.¹⁰ The state is sometimes called Bit-Gabbari, 'the house of Gabbar', by the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III (*RIMA* 3: 18, 23). But the fact that the list of eleven known Sam'alian kings contains a mixture of Luwian and Semitic names *may* indicate that the ruling class of Sam'al, if not a substantial part of its population, was a mixture of Luwian and Semitic elements. There is indeed a possibility that the Kilamuwa inscription (CS II: 147–8) indicates a Luwian component within the population which may point to the existence of a Luwian state before the period of the Aramaean occupation—perhaps dating back to the reign of Kuzi-Teshub. Gurgum and the state later to be known as Sam'al may have been founded around the same time.


Pat(t)in Located in the Amuq Plain of northern Syria, Patin was one of the largest of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. It contained a number of cities within its boundaries in addition to its capital Kinalua. We know the names of seven kings of Patin, almost entirely from Assyrian records, including a line of four kings apparently of the one family, who reigned in the 9th century. The names of three of the four—Lubarna (I), Suppiluliuma, and Lubarna (II)—are also those of Late Bronze Age Hittite kings. A fixed point in the reign of the earliest of them, Lubarna (I), is established by a reference to him in an account of Ashurnasirpal II's campaign in the region c.870. This means that the first recorded mention of Patin is no earlier than the early 9th century. Only one Luwian inscription is known for the kingdom. The subject of this inscription is a man called Halparuntiya, who can probably be equated with the Patinite ruler Qalparunda, referred to in the record of Shalmaneser III's 858 campaign in the region. The Luwian inscription bearing his name, discovered beneath the floor of the palace at Tell Tayinat, supports the likely identification of this site with the Patinite capital Kinalua. If the identification is correct, then the dating of the first Iron Age palace on the site to the 10th century or earlier extends the kingdom's history back at least to the beginning of the first millennium. An even earlier foundation cannot be ruled out, and I suggest, very tentatively, that the kingdom may have been founded by one of the descendants of the Late Bronze Age Hittite royal line, whose family preserved at least two names from this line in succeeding generations.

We have noted in Chapter 6 the possibility that Tell Tayinat was the royal seat of a king called Taita, identified in Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions as ruler of a land called W/PaDAsatini. Taita's reign may date back to the 11th century, but could have been as late as the end of the 10th century. In any case,

he pre-dated the known kings of Patin and may well have been one of their predecessors.¹¹

Hamath Hamath almost certainly began its Iron Age phase under the rule of a succession of Neo-Hittite kings. Only three such kings are attested, and they are in a direct family line: Parita → Urhilina (son) (Assyrian Irhuleni) → Uratami (son). All belong to the 9th century. The reference in Old Testament tradition to an early 10th-century king of Hamath called Toi (Tou) cannot be accepted as reliable evidence for a historical king of this name. Hamath's archaeological remains indicate that the city was of some significance in the Late Bronze Age, though the name is not attested in any sources dating to this period, or in any second-millennium sources for that matter. The city survived the upheavals at the end of the Late Bronze Age, and flourished during its Iron Age phase. It was clearly not a new foundation, and could have developed as a Neo-Hittite kingdom quite independently of Carchemish, perhaps under a ruling class whose ancestors belonged to the administrative elite which Suppiluliuma I installed in the region when the viceregal kingdom of Aleppo was established.

The kingdoms of south-central and south-eastern Anatolia From the Late Bronze Age through the Iron Age, a high degree of population continuity is probable in the lands which extended south of the Halys river to the Mediterranean coast, covering predominantly the regions later known as Cappadocia and Cilicia. Immediately to the south of the Halys lay the kingdoms belonging to the complex known as Tabal. Along the Mediterranean coast were the kingdoms called Hilakku to the west and Adanawa (Hiyawa, Assyrian Que) to the east. Luwian-speakers were very likely the dominant peoples of these regions in the Iron Age, as they had been through most of the second millennium. Unfortunately, archaeological evidence is extremely sparse for south-central and south-eastern Anatolia during the last two centuries of the millennium, and written evidence non-existent. It is not until the mid 9th century that Tabal first appears in written sources, in the Annals of Shalmaneser III, and later in 8th-century records, both Luwian and Assyrian. Shalmaneser indicates that at the time of his campaigns, the Tabal region was divided among many small kingdoms. From later records, these appear to have been consolidated into a small number of generally larger kingdoms, which became tributaries of Assyria. It is possible that the first kingdoms of Tabal began to emerge soon after the collapse of the Hittite empire. Nothing specific can be said of the early history of Hilakku and Adanawa before their appearance in Shalmaneser's records. The royal house of the latter may have been founded by a family of Greek settlers who came to the region in the early decades of the Iron Age. We have discussed this possibility in Chapter 7.



Map 5. The Neo-Assyrian Empire.

Subjection to Assyria (10th–9th centuries)

The Assyrian slant

We have noted that in the two centuries following the reign of Tiglath-pileser I, Assyria suffered a severe shrinkage in the territory it controlled. Tiglath-pileser's successors were unable to prevent constant incursions by Aramaean tribes, and attacks upon its frontiers by other nomadic groups. There could have been no thought that the beleaguered and much reduced kingdom would ever again interfere in the affairs of the lands west of the Euphrates. But Assyria's fortunes rose again in the last decades of the 10th century with the accession of Ashur-dan II (934–912), who began the process of winning back his kingdom's lost territories and restoring its status as a major international power. His reign effectively marked the beginning of the New Assyrian, or Neo-Assyrian, kingdom. Regular military campaigns were once more undertaken—primarily against the Aramaeans, who had occupied much of the northern part of the kingdom. The enemies were driven from Assyrian territory, the frontiers restored, and the lands within them repopulated with the refugees, or their descendants, who had fled the invaders. All this served as a prelude to the reign of Ashur-dan's son and successor Adad-nirari II (911–891). Not content with simply restoring Assyria's old boundaries, Adad-nirari embarked upon a new programme of territorial expansion (*Chav.* 280–5). His successful expeditions against the Aramaeans in the Tigris valley and against the Babylonian king Shamash-mudammiq, part of whose territory he incorporated into his own rapidly expanding empire, laid the foundations for further campaigns beyond Assyria's frontiers—including the lands west of the Euphrates. The first western campaign since the days of Tiglath-pileser was undertaken by Adad-nirari's grandson Ashurnasirpal II (883–859). After expeditions to the north and north-east of his kingdom to consolidate Assyrian authority there, Ashurnasirpal made ready to cross the Euphrates, into the Neo-Hittite kingdoms and other lands between the river and the Great Sea.

From this point onwards, almost all our information about the Neo-Hittite kingdoms comes from the records of their Assyrian conquerors, with occasional supplementary information provided by Luwian, Urartian, Aramaic,

Phoenician, and biblical texts. That is to say, we have the task of compiling a history of the kingdoms almost entirely from the records of those who attacked, plundered, and eventually destroyed them. When we know so little about the victims of conquest from their own records, it is perhaps inevitable that we should write about them primarily from the perspective of their conquerors, whose records are so much more informative. This qualification should be kept in mind throughout the following pages. Of course, we need also to bear in mind that our Assyrian sources are far from comprehensive in the information they provide. They are largely confined to the military successes which Assyrian military commanders won, the plunder and tribute they acquired, and the arrangements they made in the aftermath of conquest to ensure that the defeated territories remained subject to them, if only as tributaries. Clearly, the sources on which we have to rely for reconstructing the history of the Neo-Hittite world are selective and biased in what they record, and give us little insight into the internal operations of the individual states with which they dealt, the relations between them, and in general the history of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms beyond their dealings with Assyria.

We should also at this point make a general comment about the content of the hieroglyphic inscriptions. Despite the fact that Assyria played so dominant a role in the history of the Neo-Hittite world, particularly in the 9th and 8th centuries, the entire corpus of Neo-Hittite inscriptions contains but one reference to Assyria.¹ By and large, the inscriptions consist of commemorative and dedicatory texts, recording a king's titlature and genealogy, and sometimes reporting his building achievements, or his dedication of a statue or building to a god, the restoration of foodlands, and occasionally conflicts with rebel subjects or a neighbour. The texts are focused very much on the activities of the king *within* his kingdom. Of course, the extant inscriptions must represent only a tiny fraction of those that were produced through the four centuries of Neo-Hittite history, and the majority of those that have survived are very fragmentary and often difficult to interpret. Further, it is most likely that much of the detailed information about the history of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms and their relations with other states and kingdoms was recorded on perishable writing material, such as leather, wood, or papyrus, no examples of which have come to light. The Kululu lead strips and the Ashur documents (see Chapter 7) give some indication of the other types of information that have now been lost to us—but no indication of their kingdom's relations with the broader Near Eastern world.

It is with these limitations in mind that we shall attempt to reconstruct the history of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms in the last two centuries of their existence, using the reigns of the Assyrian kings in this period, from Ashurnasirpal II (883–859) to Sargon II (721–705), as our chronological frame of reference. Ashurnasirpal's campaign into Syria provides our starting point.

The resumption of Assyrian campaigns in the west

Ashurnasirpal made what appear to have been extensive preparations for this campaign, which he conducted c.870. Some years earlier, c.877, he had received news of a rebellion in the middle Euphrates region, involving the lands of Laqe, Hindanu, and Suhu. Once tributaries of his predecessors Adad-nirari II and Tukulti-Ninurta II, these lands had broken their allegiance and formed an anti-Assyrian coalition. In response, Ashurnasirpal marched his troops to the Euphrates, ferried them across on rafts made of inflated goat-skins, and inflicted a crushing defeat on the enemy's infantry and chariot contingents on the river's west bank. He then set about destroying their cities and deporting large numbers of their populations (*RIMA* 2: 214–15).

But there was a further score to settle. The Aramaean state Bit-Adini had supported the anti-Assyrian uprising, and had now to answer for it. Two of its cities had already been stormed and put to the torch, after they had offered, apparently, refuge to one of the Laqean rebel leaders. But Bit-Adini remained defiant. To subdue it, Ashurnasirpal conducted another campaign in its territory, probably the following year. On this occasion, he captured and destroyed Kaprabu, a towering fortress-city 'that hovered like a cloud in the sky', rounding off his conquest by massacring or deporting a large part of the city's population (*RIMA* 2: 216). This, he believed, was sufficient to pacify the region. He made no attempt to annex Bit-Adini's territory but was content to receive tribute from its ruler Ahuni. For the time being, Ahuni appeared to accept Assyrian sovereignty. But in the years to come, down into the reign of Ashurnasirpal's son and successor Shalmaneser III, he was to lead further uprisings against his overlords, until he was finally run to ground. Ashurnasirpal also received tribute from a representative of the city Til-Abni. Probably to be identified with the site of El-Qitar within the bend of the Euphrates, Til-Abni was a small Aramaean state bordering upon Bit-Adini. The taking of hostages from both Bit-Adini and Til Abni would provide some assurance of their lands' continuing submissiveness to Assyria. So the Assyrian king hoped.

Ashurnasirpal was now ready for his campaign into the lands of Syria.² Apart from the king's earlier foray across the Euphrates, this would be the first time Assyrian arms had been carried into Syria for nearly a quarter of a millennium. All stages of the enterprise were carefully planned. As he progressed westwards, Ashurnasirpal entered the territory of the Aramaean state Bit-Bahiani, located in the Habur valley of northern Mesopotamia. He had taken tribute from the land in his second regnal year (*RIMA* 2: 203), and now demanded further payment. This time, it was more substantial, and of a kind clearly intended to boost the king's military resources for his expedition. In addition to the silver, gold, and other 'gifts' provided on the earlier occasion, the new payment included chariots, cavalry, and infantry. So too did the tribute Ashurnasirpal imposed upon the land of (A)zallu, located near the



Fig. 11. Ashurnasirpal II (courtesy, British Museum).

upper reaches of the Balih river, between Bit-Bahiani to the east and Bit-Adini to the west. The richest tribute of all came from Ahuni, ruler of Bit-Adini. Like the other tributaries, Ahuni was obliged to hand over oxen, sheep, and wine (no doubt intended to provide the king's troops with meat on the hoof during their expedition, and drink), but in addition, a large assortment of luxury items—gold, silver, ivory dishes, couches, chests, ivory thrones decorated with silver and gold, a range of gold jewellery, and a gold dagger. Like the other tributaries too, Ahuni included chariotry, cavalry, and infantry in his payment. (Thus reinforced, Ashurnasirpal's army must have grown considerably in size as it advanced westwards.) For the present, he had no choice but to amass and deliver all that was demanded of him. It was the necessary price for keeping his country free from Assyrian sack and plunder. One day, he resolved, he would cast off the Assyrian yoke. But the time was not yet ripe.

Ashurnasirpal now led his troops across the Euphrates. He conducted the operation downstream of Carchemish, taking advantage of the river's flooding

to ferry his troops over it on inflated goatskins (*RIMA* 2: 217), as he had done on his earlier trans-Euphrates venture. This way he could cross at a point of his own choosing, and thus avoid any fortified posts on the river set up by the kings of Carchemish. For his first objective was Carchemish. Its ruler at the time was a man called Sangara.³ Confronted with a vast array of enemy chariotry, infantry, and cavalry, led by a king whose formidable reputation as a war-leader had gone well before him, Sangara promptly surrendered his kingdom. The prize was a rich one. Carchemish was one of the most prosperous states in the Land of Hatti, and had very likely reached new heights of wealth and sophistication in the reign of its recent king Katuwa. Sangara must have come to the throne not long after Katuwa left it. He may indeed have been Katuwa's successor. The price Ashurnasirpal exacted for his submission included 20 talents of silver, 100 of bronze, 250 of iron, thrones and other furniture, elephants' tusks, a chariot of gold and a couch of gold, 200 adolescent girls—and chariotry, cavalry, and infantry of the city to swell even further the ranks of the Assyrian army (*RIMA* 2: 217). The adolescent girls were no doubt intended to service the king and his officers while the campaign was in progress. Sangara paid handsomely to spare his city the ravages of an Assyrian attack upon it.

After his surrender, Ashurnasirpal claimed that 'all the kings of the lands came down and submitted to me'. Who these kings were is not specified. Some, perhaps, were rulers of minor principalities lying within the region of Carchemish. But others may have been the kings of larger states, like Kummuh and Malatya to the north, and Gurgum to the west. That Ashurnasirpal did not campaign against these states may indicate that they had bought him off, persuaded by the news of Carchemish's submission that their chances of beating the Assyrians and driving them back across the Euphrates were virtually nil. But just to make sure his new tributaries remained submissive while his army was deep in Syrian territory, Ashurnasirpal took seventy hostages from them as a pledge of their good behaviour, and kept them with him on his march to the Mediterranean.

With the submission of the trans-Euphrates kingdoms now secure, Ashurnasirpal began his descent upon Syria's coastal states. This brought him into the northernmost part of the Neo-Hittite kingdom Patin. Called Unqi by the Assyrians, Patin was located in the Amuq plain of northern Syria, on the land once occupied by the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Alalah, and extended from there across the Orontes river through the territory of Late Bronze Age Ugarit. Control of this region was the key to domination of the entire Levantine coast. The first Patinite city encountered by Ashurnasirpal was called Hazazu. It surrendered without resistance, buying its freedom from Assyrian attack with a tribute of gold and linen garments. But this was only a small down-payment on the riches Ashurnasirpal expected to extract from the kingdom. He would

exact the balance when he came face to face with Patin's ruler Lubarna, at that time resident in his royal seat Kinalua.

A two-day march, including a crossing of the river Apre (modern Afrin), brought the Assyrians to the city. They massed their forces beneath the walls and began waving their spears and banging their swords against their shields. It was an effective display of intimidation. A terrified Lubarna promptly threw his gates open to the enemy. The tribute-payment demanded of him was enormous, exceeding even that exacted from Sangara. It included large quantities of precious and commodity metals (silver, gold, tin, iron), 1,000 oxen, 10,000 sheep, 1,000 linen garments, many items of luxury furniture, a mass of ornaments from the palace of undetermined weight, ten female singers, and the king's niece with a rich dowry. Ducks and a large female monkey completed the list. Added to all this was a demand for further reinforcements for the king's army, in the form of chariotry, infantry, and cavalry, and for hostages, no doubt of high status, to ensure the tributary's good behaviour. On receipt of the payment, Ashurnasirpal declared that he 'showed mercy' to the Patinite king—by leaving him on his throne, and sparing his capital and the rest of his kingdom the brutalities of Assyrian attack and plunder.

While he was in Kinalua, Ashurnasirpal received a delegation from the Yahanite ruler Gusi. Yahan was a region within the Aramaean tribal state Bit-Agusi, located in north-central Syria. As we have seen, Gusi became the founder of a dynasty which held sway over Bit-Agusi—the house of Gusi—for perhaps the next 150 years. Relations between Bit-Agusi and Assyria were to prove volatile in the years to come. But for the time being, Agusi ensured that his land was left in peace by sending his representatives to Kinalua with a substantial tribute-payment for its Assyrian occupier (*RIMA* 2: 218).

Ashurnasirpal then crossed the Orontes river, and after leading his troops over another river, called the Sanguru, he proceeded to the southernmost part of Lubarna's realm. Here he occupied the fortified city of Aribua, which lay on the frontier shared by Patin with a land called Luash (Luhuti). Administered from its capital Hatarikka/Hazrek,⁴ Luash was located in the region of the Late Bronze Age Nuhashshi lands. Though later to become the northernmost province of the kingdom of Hamath, it was at this time independent. Ashurnasirpal paused for a time in Aribua, and held a celebratory banquet in its palace. By way of consolidating his authority over the city, he settled some of his own Assyrians there, including perhaps officials and military personnel, to help ensure that the city remained loyal to him after he had left it.

No doubt to provide for the swell in Aribua's population and the establishment of the city as a base for his further military operations, Ashurnasirpal sent an expeditionary force to Luash to gather the produce of its grainlands. The grain was to be brought back to Aribua and stored there (*RIMA* 2: 218). This was no tribute-collecting exercise. Ashurnasirpal may have attempted to intimidate Luash into submission by the mere threat of force, a tactic used

successfully against other countries on his campaign route. But if so, his attempt failed. For it was in Luash, for the first time on his campaign, that he met with armed resistance. Alone of all the Syrian states, Luash refused to bow to Assyrian aggression. In response, the Assyrian expeditionary force attacked it and razed its cities. Their inhabitants were put to the sword—except for a number of the defending troops who were taken alive. For them, a different fate was in store. Probably on the king's orders, they were impaled on stakes erected before the smouldering ruins of their cities. Such punishment would serve as a warning to others of the consequences of resisting the might of Assyria.

News of Luash's fate travelled before the king as he marched southwards along the Levantine coast to Mt Lebanon. The rulers of the Phoenician cities in the region, from the island-city of Arwad southwards to Tyre and including Sidon and Byblos, needed no further inducement to make their peace with him. And they did so with lavish tribute-offerings. Ashurnasirpal thus completed his victorious sweep of the entire Levantine coast. He was the first Assyrian king after Tiglath-pileser I to reach the Great Sea, and he marked his achievement with a ritual cleansing of his weapons in its waters and sacrifices to the gods.

The king concluded his campaign with an extensive timber-gathering expedition in the Amanus range, located in Syria's north-western corner. As on Tiglath-pileser I's campaign, the felled trees were transported to Assyria for building projects in Nineveh and no doubt other Assyrian cities. Some of the timber, including beams of cedar and cypress, was almost certainly intended for the great construction project which was to become a defining feature of Ashurnasirpal's reign—the redevelopment of the city which the Assyrians called Kalhu, biblical Calah, better known to us by the name Nimrud. Kalhu was probably founded in the last century of the Late Bronze Age, though its site had already been occupied since the sixth millennium. It quickly became an important centre of the Assyrian kingdom. But its status as a royal capital was due to Ashurnasirpal, whose building enterprises in the city included massive new fortifications *c.*7.5 km long, nine temples, and at least five palaces, the most important of which is now known as the North-West Palace. Undoubtedly, many of the materials collected as tribute from the Syrian states, including the vast quantities of precious and base metals, were used in the construction and adornment of the temples and palaces of Kalhu. Hawkins comments that Assyria's renewed contact with the west under Ashurnasirpal may well have led to the importation into Assyria of distinctive western influences.⁵ These were no doubt reflected in the ornamentation of the new buildings at Kalhu.

Before departing the Amanus range, Ashurnasirpal erected there a permanent memorial to himself, in the form of an inscribed stele recording his achievements. His western venture had proved a lucrative one, opening up

channels for an ongoing flow of western tribute into Assyria's royal treasuries and warehouses. In return, the Syrian tributaries were no doubt promised freedom from Assyrian military action—as long as they kept paying up. The Assyrians were, after all, not likely to harm the goose that was providing them with an abundance of golden eggs.

It was hardly coincidental that Ashurnasirpal's campaign-route closely followed that of Tiglath-pileser I almost 250 years earlier. We can be sure that the new conqueror of the trans-Euphrates lands had carefully studied his predecessor's western enterprise and its achievements, noting the substantial tribute that it had produced for Assyria's royal coffers—with apparently little or no resistance from those from whom it had been taken. Certainly, Assyrian kings revelled in the carnage of the battlefield, and took delight in providing graphic detail of the destruction of enemy cities and the mutilation and massacre of their inhabitants. Their own records make this abundantly clear. But they were generally willing to spare from havoc and destruction the lands where they campaigned if the mere threat of military action was sufficient to win their submission and turn them into revenue-producers.

Like Tiglath-pileser, Ashurnasirpal led his expeditionary force from Carchemish directly westwards to the coastal kingdom of Patin and then southwards along the Levantine coast and hinterland as far as Tyre. The cities and kingdoms he targeted were those likely to offer the least resistance and the richest tribute. Significantly, he makes no reference on this campaign to the large and powerful kingdom of Hamath in the middle Orontes region. Had he received any form of payment from it, the kingdom would undoubtedly have appeared among his tributaries. Hamath was clearly bypassed by the Assyrian expeditionary force. This *may* indicate some form of pact concluded by Ashurnasirpal with the Hamathite king, which gave the latter a guarantee that his kingdom would not be invaded, in return for an undertaking by him not to interfere with the Assyrian progress through the Levantine lands or ally himself with any of these lands. Similarly, the northern Neo-Hittite states Kummuh, Melid, and Gurgum receive no mention in Ashurnasirpal's account of his campaign. I have suggested that their rulers bought off the invader. But it may be that they had never been part of Ashurnasirpal's campaign planning, and were thus never under threat from the Assyrian.⁶

This, the first expedition to be conducted by an Assyrian king into Syria in 250 years, marked a significant reassertion of Assyrian military power in the west. But it was a relatively conservative operation when compared with subsequent Assyrian campaigns across the Euphrates. Though Ashurnasirpal himself conducted no further campaigns in the region, his western initiative was vigorously taken up by his son and successor Shalmaneser III, who carried out numerous and much more wide-ranging operations in Syria and Palestine, and westwards into the Anatolian kingdoms beyond the Taurus. The father's western campaign paved the way for those of the son. But it was first and

foremost a revenue-gathering exercise, to be conducted with force if necessary but without it wherever possible.

Very likely one of the chief reasons for Ashurnasirpal's western campaign was the access it provided to building materials and other forms of booty which could be plundered from the invaded territories and taken to Assyria for use in the massive redevelopment and refurbishment of the royal city Kalhu (Nimrud)—from the timber cut from the forests of the Levantine coastlands to the wide array of precious and commodity metals, luxury furniture, and exotic items collected from the Syro-Palestinian states. No doubt many of the materials acquired as tribute were incorporated into the king's North-West Palace. Ashurnasirpal marked the completion of his palace with a grand ceremony of consecration, attended by representatives from all the regions subject to the Assyrian crown, including the western states Patin, Tyre, Sidon, and Carchemish (*RIMA* 2: 292–3).



Fig. 12. Bearers of tribute to Ashurnasirpal II, perhaps from north-west Syria and Phoenicia (courtesy, British Museum).

For some years, the fear of a return of Assyrian forces to the west may have been sufficient to ensure that the local kingdoms continued their tribute-payments to their overlord. And at this stage, the Assyrian crown seems to have given no serious thought to imposing more direct control over them, as provinces of the empire under an Assyrian administration. (That would come later.) But continuing subservience to a remote overlord, no matter how lightly imposed, could not have failed to arouse strong anti-Assyrian feelings in the west, held in check only by the threat of military retaliation against any who broke their obligations to Assyria—a threat which diminished in the last decade of Ashurnasirpal's reign as the likelihood of new Assyrian campaigns across the Euphrates became increasingly remote.

The Assyrians return: Shalmaneser III's first western campaign

That situation was to change dramatically in the reign of Ashurnasirpal's son Shalmaneser III (858–824). Of his thirty-four recorded campaigns, Shalmaneser conducted no fewer than nineteen across the Euphrates, the first in his first regnal year. He was to encounter far greater and much more widespread resistance in the Syrian states than his father had done, primarily because of the military coalitions that these states now formed. In earlier times, the Neo-Hittite kingdoms and other Hatti lands had apparently never given much thought to combining their military resources, for there had been no common enemy that might have induced them to do so. But Ashurnasirpal had provided them with such an enemy. In the first instance, Shalmaneser's Syrian campaigns may have been provoked by an upsurge of anti-Assyrian activity among the western kingdoms. The Aramaean state Bit-Adini seems to have provided the initial focus of resistance to Assyria. Located as it was in the middle Euphrates region between the Balih and the Euphrates rivers with territory extending west of the Euphrates, its commanding strategic position astride important routes, which linked Anatolia and the Syro-Palestinian coastlands with Mesopotamia, made it an obvious first target for an Assyrian king who sought to re-impose Assyrian authority over the states lying to its west.

Bit-Adini had already come to blows with the Assyrians during Ashurnasirpal's reign. It had been bested in these conflicts, and its ruler Ahuni reduced to Assyrian tributary status. But it remained a powerful state, and would prove a major obstacle to Shalmaneser's attempts to reassert and expand Assyrian authority west of the Euphrates. Prompt resolution of the Bit-Adini problem was essential. And so, within a year of his accession, Shalmaneser launched an attack upon the kingdom. He led his troops first to the city of Lalatu, which lay within Bit-Adini's eastern frontier, and burnt it to the ground. Then he advanced upon Ahuni's fortified stronghold Til Barsip. Ahuni was determined to make a stand against the invaders, and assembled his forces outside the walls of his capital for a military confrontation. But it was a futile act of

defiance. His army quickly succumbed to the enemy, and their leader was forced to seek refuge inside his walls (*RIMA* 3: 15). Shalmaneser made no attempt to flush him out, but left his city intact. He now moved on to his next objective in Bit-Adini, the city Burmarina. No quarter was given to the inhabitants of this city. After a short siege, Burmarina was captured, and 300 of its fighting men slaughtered. A tower was made of their corpses before the walls. That was enough to persuade the rulers of the nearby Aramaean states, including Til-Abni, Sarugu, and Immerinu, to offer their submission, accompanied by a tribute-payment of silver, gold, oxen, sheep, and wine (*RIMA* 3: 9, 15).

Shalmaneser was now ready for his invasion of Syria. Following his father's example, he transported his troops across the Euphrates on inflated goatskin-rafts (*RIMA* 3: 15). This was his first venture into Syrian territory, at least as king. He may well have believed, initially, that it would be little more than a royal progress to the Mediterranean, as his father's had been, with one kingdom after another submitting to him and bestowing lavish tribute upon him. Indeed, as soon as he crossed the Euphrates, he received tribute of silver, gold, oxen, sheep, and wine, from Hattusili, ruler of Kummuh. A quixotic display of defiance from a city called Paqar(a)hubunu was quickly dealt with. Paqarhubunu lay on the west bank of the Euphrates within the territory of Bit-Adini near the border between Kummuh and Gurgum. After attacking and destroying the city, and slaughtering 1,300 of its troops (*RIMA* 3: 16),⁷ the king marched westwards, into the land of Gurgum. Gurgum's ruler Muwatalli submitted without resistance, and like Hattusili delivered up silver, gold, oxen, sheep, and wine, topping off his tribute-payment with his daughter and a rich dowry.

Confident, no doubt, of a similar reception from other western states on his route, Shalmaneser turned south from Gurgum and advanced upon the small Aramaean kingdom Sam'al (*RIMA* 3: 16). But here a surprise was in store for him. Confronting him on the kingdom's frontier was an alliance of hostile local rulers, one of whom was Ahuni, king of Bit-Adini. Despite the Assyrian invasion of his kingdom, and the Assyrian conquests within it, Ahuni was still free to pursue his actions against the invader, and his forces were still largely intact. Both were ready to take on the enemy again. Within a short time of his engagement with Shalmaneser, Ahuni had begun secret negotiations with his fellow-rulers in Carchemish, Sam'al, and Patin—with the object of forming a powerful anti-Assyrian alliance. Sangara was at that time king of Carchemish, Hayyanu of Sam'al, and Suppiluliuma of Patin. The four rulers decided to attack the Assyrian army as it was entering Sam'al's territory. Individually, none of their kingdoms could match the military might of Assyria. In combination, they constituted a formidable fighting force. For the Patinite king Suppiluliuma, there were obvious advantages in forcing a showdown with Shalmaneser in Sam'al. If the coalition managed to defeat the Assyrians,

Suppiluliuma might be spared the prospect of fighting them on his own soil. A significant victory by the alliance might end the western ambitions, at least for the time being, of the new Assyrian king before he had a chance to set foot in Patinite territory. As Shalmaneser approached the fortified city of Lutibu⁸ on Sam'al's frontier, his army came under attack.

This raises several questions about Assyrian reconnaissance. First, was Shalmaneser's army really taken by surprise by the enemy that suddenly confronted it? Did the coalition forces succeed in marching to Sam'al and mustering there without the knowledge of the Assyrians? Their combined army must have totalled well in the tens of thousands to have had any chance of making a show against Shalmaneser. Could troop movements on this scale, and the preparations which led up to them, really have escaped Assyrian intelligence? That is not altogether impossible. It may be that the new king proceeded ever further westwards without bothering to carry out effective reconnaissance. The ease of his progress up to this stage in his campaign may well have made him complacent. The mere presence of his army would be enough, surely, to win submission from every western state. So he may have believed. That, after all, had been his father's experience. And the apparent ease with which he had swept aside the opposition that he did encounter before crossing the Euphrates, and the brutal, follow-up punishment of those who defied him, had very likely induced the rulers of states spared invasion, like Kummuh and Gurgum, to surrender before one drop of their own or their subjects' blood had been spilt.

So it is possible that the coalition attack upon Shalmaneser's forces came without warning. But—if we are to believe Shalmaneser's account—the allies suffered a devastating rout. We are presented with a familiar litany of slaughter and destruction, with bodies of the slain enemy filling a large plain, the mountain being dyed red with their blood, towers of heads being erected before the cities which were destroyed and burned to the ground (*RIMA* 3: 16). So too in accordance with his father's practice, Shalmaneser took large numbers of chariots and teams of horse from the enemy. At least that is what the Assyrian record tells us. But Assyrian rhetoric probably exaggerates the reality. It may well be that the outcome of the conflict was favourable to the Assyrians, and paved the way for Shalmaneser's advance south into Patin. But the defeat of the alliance was not a decisive one. Its forces very likely staged a tactical withdrawal, with their numbers still largely intact. Shortly afterwards, they were to assemble again, under the same leaders, for another showdown with Shalmaneser.

In the short term, however, the confrontation in Sam'alian territory did remove from Shalmaneser's path the chief obstacle to his advance to the Mediterranean coast in Syria's north-western corner. Here, before the source of the Saluara river at the foot of the Amanus range, the Great King set up a colossal statue of himself, inscribed with an account of his exploits (*RIMA* 3:

16). It was a monumental statement of his conquest of the entire region from the Euphrates to the shores of the Great Sea. Yet far from intimidating the states whose forces had confronted him in Sam'al, this conquest seems to have strengthened the spirit of resistance among them.

The anti-Assyrian alliance was called together again by Patin's king Suppiluliuma when his fortified city Alimush (Alishir) came under threat from the Assyrians.⁹ Suppiluliuma's coalition partners promptly responded to their ally's summons, assembling their forces near Alimush. Their numbers were swelled by troops which came from other lands, from the kingdoms of Adanawa, Hilakku, Yasbuq, and Yahan(u). They were led by their respective rulers: Kate (Adanawa), Pihirim (Hilakku), Burannati (Yasbuq), and Adanu (Yahan) (*RIMA* 3: 10, 16–17). Yasbuq was a northern Arabian tribal state located in the lower Orontes valley. Yahan was a region within the Aramaean tribal land called Bit-Agusi in north-central Syria; it had formerly been a tributary of Shalmaneser's father.¹⁰ Both Yasbuq and Yahan faced the prospect of invasion and conquest by Shalmaneser, if the alliance of which they became members failed to stop his advance. For Adanawa and Hilakku, on the other hand, the Assyrian threat may have seemed more remote. But there is little doubt why their rulers joined the coalition. Adanawa was located immediately to the west of the passes of the Amanus range, and Hilakku adjoined Adanawa to the west. If Patin fell to the Assyrians, Shalmaneser might well decide to turn his attention in their direction. The planting of his statue at the foot of the range made it clear that they were not beyond his reach. Far better, then, to join a coalition against the Assyrians in someone else's territory before their own was invaded—in the hope that the Assyrians would be defeated and go home.

Despite its increased size, the multi-leadered alliance army was no match for the highly disciplined and well coordinated Assyrian forces. Shalmaneser reports the outcome of the battle thus: 'I carried off valuable booty from (the enemy forces)—numerous chariots and teams of horse. I felled 700 of their fighting men with the sword. In the midst of this battle, I captured Burannati, the Yasbuqean. I captured the great cities of the Patinite . . .' (*RIMA* 3: 17, transl. after Grayson). The rhetoric here is relatively restrained. But the Assyrian victory had a more decisive outcome than the earlier encounter, for it effectively gave the Great King undisputed overlordship of the Syrian states for the next five years. This is reflected in part by the payments of tribute which he received on at least two occasions in subsequent years (857 and 853) from the Patinite and the other kingdoms that had joined the alliance. Nevertheless, the western states had learned an important lesson from their first engagements with Shalmaneser. By uniting their forces against the invader, they had a good chance of surviving a confrontation with him to the point where they could regroup and fight again. Ultimately, they might succeed in weakening Assyrian resolve in the west, to the point where the Assyrians would abandon their attempts at domination of the region. Wishful

though such thinking may have been, it undoubtedly prompted the formation of many of the alliances that were mustered against Assyria until the end of the Neo-Hittite period—and beyond.

The kings of Adanawa and Hilakku had managed to save themselves, and probably most of their troops, from the immediate consequences of the Assyrian victory. But they may well have feared follow-up retaliation by Shalmaneser. As it happened, Shalmaneser did no more than exact tribute from them. Twenty years were to elapse before he was to lead his troops in their direction. For now, he was content to savour his triumph over his enemies, by marching along the Mediterranean coast and gathering his rewards from the kingdoms through which he passed. His goal had been to reach the Great Sea. That goal he had now achieved—in his first year upon the Assyrian throne. And with that he would be content, for the time being.

At this early stage in his career, Shalmaneser seems to have had no plans for imposing direct rule over the western territories he had conquered. By and large, these territories were treated primarily as continuing sources of revenue. A wide variety of their products, especially those of the coastal states, were taken either as booty from conquered cities or as tribute exacted from conquered rulers. They included luxury items and exotic goods as well as commodity materials and human and animal livestock. As in Ashurnasirpal's reign, the timber regions of the Levant provided a rich source of materials for public building projects in the Assyrian homeland cities. After his progress through the northern Syrian coastal regions, Shalmaneser returned to the Amanus range where he organized the gathering of timber from cedar and juniper trees for transport to Assyria (*RIMA* 3: 17). But resistance in parts of Patin still continued. Shalmaneser reports the capture of the Patinite cities Taiia, Hazazu, Nulia, and Butima, and the massacre of 2,800 Patinite troops before he returned home. According to the figures tallied by his scribes, his spoils of conquest included 14,600 prisoners-of-war. Chariots and teams of horse also appeared regularly in the plunder he took from sacked cities.

There was an ideological dimension to the king's campaigns. As we have earlier commented, throughout the history of the ancient Near Eastern world, a king's reputation among his subjects and among foreign nations depended in large measure on his demonstrated prowess in the field of battle. To be a great king one needed also to be a great warrior. His Majesty demonstrated his fitness to rule by matching, and if possible outdoing, the exploits of his royal predecessors. By walking the shores of the Mediterranean and dipping his weapons in its waters, Shalmaneser accomplished in his very first regnal year what his father had not managed until his thirteenth or fourteenth year. He had marked this achievement by erecting a colossal statue of himself at the foot of Mt Amanus. And after conquering the alliance forces in the battle fought in Patin, he erected another statue of himself on Mt Adalur, an offshoot of the Amanus range, during his timber-getting expedition in the region

(*RIMA* 3: 17). It was also important for a king to display to his own subjects in Assyria the results of his campaigns abroad. The loot from conquered cities, including prisoners-of-war, was regularly exhibited in the reliefs depicting Assyrian kings' military triumphs. These reliefs may well reflect actual victory processions in which captives and other spoils were put on show for the entertainment of the king's subjects, and the enhancement of His Majesty's image as a great warrior.

Ahuni run to ground

Despite Shalmaneser's apparently decisive defeat of the alliance forces in Patin, resistance to Assyria remained strong. Bit-Adini's king, it seems, was at the forefront of this resistance. One of the most elusive of Shalmaneser's enemies, Ahuni had avoided capture by the Assyrians on three occasions during Shalmaneser's first regnal years: the first when he had shut himself up in his capital Til Barsip after the defeat of his army outside Til Barsip's walls, the second and third times when he escaped the Assyrian victories in Sam'al and Patin. Now, in the following year (857), he made a stand once more against the Assyrians.

This put to the test Shalmaneser's determination to consolidate his authority over the western states. Ahuni's continuing defiance of this authority could well encourage a renewal of anti-Assyrian movements in other kingdoms in the Euphrates region. Carchemish was the most important of these. Should its ruler Sangara, who had remained on his throne despite his membership of the defeated alliance, once more reject Assyrian overlordship, and get away with it, other Syrian states might follow. A domino-like crisis was in the making. Shalmaneser could not afford to let it develop. Once more, he marched west, and invaded Bit-Adini, descending upon its capital Til Barsip. In a reprise of the previous year's events, Ahuni attacked the Assyrian forces outside the city, was defeated, and took refuge inside the walls (*RIMA* 3: 17). Once again, Shalmaneser decided not to follow up his victory by investing Til Barsip, but moved instead against six other fortified cities within Bit-Adini. All were captured and plundered, and their inhabitants massacred. The Assyrian claims to have reduced to ashes 200 more cities in the land (*RIMA* 3: 18).

But Til Barsip was still intact, and Ahuni still free. The final confrontation had yet to come. For the time being, however, Shalmaneser shifted his operations elsewhere. After laying siege to and capturing Dabigu, the last of Bit-Adini's cities to fall to him (*RIMA* 3: 11, 18, 35, 51, 64), he marched north-westwards to the kingdom of Carchemish. Inside its territory, he promptly destroyed Sazabu, a fortified city probably located on the frontier. No further military action was necessary. As soon as they received news of the city's fall, 'all the kings of the land of Hatti' declared their submission to the invader (*RIMA* 3: 18). Among them was a new ruler of Patin, Halparuntiya, who sent to Shalmaneser a large tribute, including 100 talents of silver, 500 oxen, and

5,000 sheep (*RIMA* 3: 18). Shalmaneser's former enemy Hayyanu, king of Sam'al, also dispatched a substantial payment to the Assyrian, including silver, bronze, iron, oxen and sheep, linen garments, and a Sam'alian princess with a rich dowry. From Sangara, king of Carchemish, came the largest tribute of all—2 talents of gold, 70 of silver, 30 of bronze, 100 of iron, 20 of red purple wool, 500 garments, his daughter and dowry, 100 of his nobles' daughters, 500 oxen, and 5,000 sheep.

The initial tribute-payments made by all three kings—Halparuntiya, Hayyanu, and Sangara—provided handsome back-up to their renewed pledges of allegiance. Further payments were required from them, on an annual basis. But the ongoing payments were much smaller than the initial ones, no doubt to lessen the likelihood that the tributaries would once more rebel. Hattusili, king of Kummuh, who had declared his submission to Shalmaneser the previous year, also had to pay a modest annual tribute—20 minas of silver and 300 cedar beams—but without having an initial 'penalty tribute' imposed upon him. His apparent loyalty to Assyria during the uprisings of the other local rulers was thus duly recognized. The fact that Sangara was allowed to retain the throne of Carchemish illustrates the often pragmatic element in an Assyrian king's policy towards his subject states. Assyrian interests in the middle Euphrates region were best served by not removing from Carchemish, one of the key states to the extension of Assyrian control in the west, its longstanding ruler—once he had given assurances that he would henceforth remain true to his overlord.

But action of a different kind was required against Bit-Adini and especially its ruler Ahuni. With grudging admiration, Shalmaneser speaks of his enemy as 'the man of Bit-Adini, who had fought with might and main since (the days of) the kings, my fathers' (*RIMA* 3: 21, transl. Grayson). Four times he had escaped the clutches of the Assyrian king after losing battles to him. Much of his kingdom had been reduced to ruins in the wake of these battles. But his capital Til Barsip remained intact, and defiant. So long as it stood, and Ahuni remained free, the Assyrians could never claim victory over the land of Bit-Adini. It was time now for the final contest.

In 856, Shalmaneser launched a fresh assault upon Ahuni's kingdom. Departing his capital Nineveh, he invaded Bit-Adini for the third time, fully resolved to breach—now at last—its capital's defences. This time, Til Barsip fell to him, though Ahuni escaped, taking flight west across the Euphrates, with a large force of infantry, chariotry, and cavalry. But his capital was now in Assyrian hands, and in the wake of his victory, Shalmaneser converted it into an Assyrian stronghold, taking advantage of its strategic location at one of the Euphrates' most important crossings. Renaming the city Kar-Shalmaneser (Port Shalmaneser), he allocated to it settlers from Assyria (*RIMA* 3: 19), and founded there a palace, to serve as one of his royal residences. (The remains of an Assyrian palace were in fact found on the city's principal

mound over part of an earlier settlement.) Kar-Shalmaneser became the administrative centre of a region, perhaps largely co-extensive with the former kingdom of Bit-Adini, which was first attached to the Assyrian province of Harran. Later, in the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (745–727), it became a province of the Assyrian empire in its own right, with the old name Til Barsip restored.

Another year passed before Shalmaneser resumed his pursuit of Ahuni. Though deprived of his royal city, Ahuni was not yet finished. With the forces that accompanied him when he fled Til Barsip, Ahuni had taken refuge in a mountain stronghold called Shittamrat, located on the west bank of the Euphrates and ‘suspended from heaven like a cloud’ (*RIMA* 3: 21, 29, transl. Grayson).¹¹ Shalmaneser marched his troops to the foot of the mountain. Hunting down his quarry would be no easy task, for Ahuni had chosen his final stronghold well. No Assyrian army had ever before penetrated Shittamrat’s fastnesses. The risk of ambush, of the pursuers suddenly becoming the victims, was high. Shalmaneser spent three days reconnoitring the mountain’s rugged terrain before ordering his forces to begin the ascent. When the Assyrian advance was well under way, the defenders suddenly broke cover and attacked. But Shalmaneser’s reconnaissance had deprived them of the element of surprise. Though the ensuing battle was fierce, its outcome was inevitable. Ahuni’s forces were routed. Shalmaneser claims to have captured 17,500 of them in the engagement (*RIMA* 3: 29). Their leader had nowhere else to flee. Ahuni had finally been cornered, and captured. He and those of his men who survived the battle were deported to Ashur and resettled there (*RIMA* 3: 21–2). Shalmaneser evidently respected Ahuni and perhaps accorded him an honoured place in his court. That at least is the sort of ending Herodotus may have given the tale.

The southern alliance

Shalmaneser had now gained for himself permanent access into Syria. But as yet he could claim authority over only the northern part of the region. Some of the wealthiest Syrian cities lay in the south, including Sidon and Tyre, former tributaries of Ashurnasirpal. There were rich rewards to be won from a comprehensive military operation against the south-western Syrian states and the lands and cities along the Syro-Palestinian coast. This, no doubt, provided one of the main incentives for the campaign on which Shalmaneser embarked in his sixth regnal year, 853, a campaign that would take him into western Syria, and then along the Orontes valley into the kingdom of Hamath and the lands beyond. Crossing the Euphrates at Kar-Shalmaneser, he paused for a time in Ana-Ashur-uter-asbat. This city had been established c.1100 by Tiglath-pileser I, but in the reign of Ashur-rabi II (1013–973), an Aramaean king had seized it (*RIMA* 3: 19). Henceforth, the city remained under Aramaean control, becoming part of Bit-Adini’s territory and called by a new

name, Pitru,¹² until Shalmaneser occupied it, restored its original name, and resettled it with an Assyrian population.

It was here that he received tribute from the rulers of the kingdoms west of the Euphrates (*RIMA* 3: 23). There are well-known names in the list. They include Sangara of Carchemish, Kundashpu of Kummuh, Arame (Hadram) of Bit-Agusi, Hayyanu of Bit-Gabbari (Sam'al), Halparuntiya of Patin, and another Halparuntiya, the current ruler of Gurgum. Also among the tributaries was Lalli, ruler of Malatya. No doubt these men had come to Ana-Ashur-uter-asbat in response to a summons from their overlord. But it was not merely to receive their tribute that Shalmaneser had sent out the call. The main purpose of his summons was almost certainly to extract from his tributaries new promises of allegiance, prior to his advance into Syria's south-western regions. The king wanted to satisfy himself, as far as this was possible, that he faced no risk of another anti-Assyrian alliance forming in his rear.

On reaching the Orontes valley, after he had stopped *en route* to receive the submission and tribute of Aleppo, the king proceeded south into Hamath, then ruled by Urhilina (Assyrian Irhuleni). He first approached Urhilina's northernmost cities, taking them by storm and burning their palaces when they refused submission. Three cities are named—Adennu, Parga, and Argana. The first two were considered important enough for Shalmaneser to depict their conquest on the bronze bands decorating his palace's monumental gates in Imgur-Enlil (*RIMA* 3: 144).¹³ But the bulk of Urhilina's kingdom was still intact, including the royal capital city Hamath, which lay further south along the Orontes. Most importantly, Urhilina remained defiant. But he well knew that on his own he had not the resources to resist the Assyrian advance, and that the whole of his kingdom faced devastation if he failed to persuade other states and cities in the region to join him. He had approached a number of their rulers to form an alliance with him, probably well before Shalmaneser began his march along the Orontes. The incentive for them to unite with him was clear: an Assyrian invasion of the region was imminent, and if the large Hamathite kingdom fell to Shalmaneser, conquest of the others would quickly follow. Of course Urhilina had the option of simply submitting to Shalmaneser and paying whatever tribute he imposed. But that would mean accepting Assyrian overlordship, an option he was not willing to consider. He was committed to resistance, confident that the southern kingdoms, collectively, had the military resources to withstand and repel the Assyrian invader—if they could but agree to unite against him.

Urhilina first approached Hadadezer (Assyrian Adad-idri), king of Damascus. A powerful and determined enemy of Assyria for years to come, Hadadezer brought to the alliance 20,000 infantry, 1,200 chariots, and 1,200 cavalry. Urhilina himself gathered a force of 10,000 infantry, 700 chariots, and 700 cavalry. Between them, the Hamathite and Damascene kings had assembled a formidable army, impressive enough to persuade other kings to join them. A

coalition of twelve states was formed (*RIMA* 3: 23). In addition to the forces from Hamath and Damascus, the allied army consisted of: 2,000 chariots and 10,000 troops from Israel; 500 troops from Byblos; 1,000 troops from the country called Musri; 10 chariots and 10,000 troops from Irqata; 200 troops from the island-city Arwad; 200 troops from Usanatu; 30 chariots and []000 troops from Shianu; 1,000 camels of Gindibu of the Arabs; []000 troops provided by the Ammonite ruler Ba'asa (*RIMA* 3: 23–4).

These and other battle statistics were provided by the scribes who accompanied Shalmaneser and kept detailed records of his campaign. The numbers are incomplete, and not all of the alleged twelve member-states are listed here. But if we are to believe the clerks' figures, the coalition army totalled between 50,000 and 60,000 foot troops, 4,000 or more chariots, around 2,000 cavalry, and 1,000 camels—a massive fighting force, and we might suspect that the figures have been exaggerated for propaganda purposes. But even if we take a more conservative line and scale back the figures (see below), it is not unlikely that the coalition was able to put at least 40,000 infantry and 3,000 chariotry into the field. Hamath and Damascus were the only states to provide cavalry; the reported total of 1,900 horse from these kingdoms is probably close to the actual figure.

From its location third in the list of allies, and the alleged size of its forces, Israel was the most important member of the coalition after Hamath and Damascus. According to the Assyrian account, it provided by far the largest chariot contingent—2,000 chariots along with its 10,000 troops. The Israelite leader was Ahab, well known from biblical sources as the second member of the Omride dynasty (see Chapter 9). Israel, probably at the peak of its development at this time, may well have had both the means and the incentive to contribute substantially to the alliance. But the reported size of its chariot force, and the logistical problems that transportation of so large a force to a battle-site in Hamath would have entailed, have led scholars to question the veracity of the record; scribal error or deliberate exaggeration may have greatly inflated the size of the chariot numbers, from a more credible figure of perhaps 200.¹⁴

Byblos appears next in the catalogue of allied forces. Located on the coast in the northern part of the region called Phoenicia, it joined the coalition with a contingent of 500 troops.

The fourth-named coalition member, Musri, was undoubtedly the kingdom of Egypt. Musri was the name by which Egypt was commonly referred to in Near Eastern texts. Two other countries in the Near Eastern world also bore this name, one east of the Tigris, the other in south-eastern Anatolia or northern Syria (see Chapter 4), but clearly neither of them could have been the Musri of this context. It was Egypt that declared its solidarity with the coalition by dispatching a contingent of 1,000 troops to join it. The force sent was no more than a token one, a gesture of support for the coalition rather

than a significant contribution to the war effort. Perhaps that was all the pharaoh thought he could spare. Egypt's ruler at this time was a man called Osorkon II (864–850) (if we have the synchronism right), who had problems enough to attend to in his own country and involved himself little in international affairs. His membership of the alliance may have been prompted by his apparent friendship with the Israelite king Ahab, a friendship which has been deduced from the discovery in Samaria of an alabaster vase bearing Osorkon's cartouches,¹⁵ perhaps part of a consignment of precious unguents for the Israelite king.¹⁶ 'Egypt and Israel had every reason for preserving peaceful relations,' I. E. S. Edwards comments, 'Egypt, owing to her internal problems and Israel owing to the threat to her existence posed by the westward advance of the Assyrian army.' No doubt the pharaoh had concerns about the possible consequences of an Assyrian victory over the coalition. If Shalmaneser succeeded in conquering the Syro-Palestinian lands, he might then have set his sights on Egypt. As later Mesopotamian conquerors were to prove, the land of the Nile was by no means beyond the reach of a powerful, determined warlord who had imposed his authority over the countries to the north of it.

Irqata (Irqanatu, Arqa) lay on the coast of northern Lebanon, on the site now known as Tell 'Arqa. Excavations indicate that the city, attested several times in Egyptian texts of Middle and Late Bronze Age date, became a relatively important one in the second millennium. Shalmaneser's claim that it contributed no fewer than 10,000 troops to the enemy coalition would suggest that in the Iron Age it was a significant player in regional affairs, with military resources, at least in infantry power, comparable with those of Hamath. But almost certainly the numbers are greatly exaggerated, probably ten times or more the actual size of the force that Irqata actually did put into the field. A much smaller contingent would be more consistent with the numbers provided for other lesser states in the coalition, like Byblos and Arwad. The latter, a Phoenician island-city located 3 km off the Levantine coast, joined the anti-Assyrian coalition under the leadership of its ruler Matinu-Ba'al. Its contribution to the alliance was a modest force of 200 infantry.

Shianu and Usanatu (Ushnata), located on the northern Syrian coast, had been closely linked in the Late Bronze Age, when they were dependents of the important Hittite vassal kingdom Ugarit. They now joined, apparently independently, the Hamathite coalition. Shianu was ruled by a man called Adunuba'al. How many troops he contributed to the coalition is questionable. The figure cited in the Assyrian text appears to have been 1,000 or more. 200 is a more likely figure, comparable with that given for Usanatu, whose king is not named.

The herd of camels provided by the Arab chieftain Gindibu (he is not otherwise attested, and the land from which he came is unknown) reflects the growing importance of this animal in the Iron Age for transportation

purposes. Its domestication may date back to the early third millennium (the Bactrian two-humped camel), but the first clear evidence of the domestication of the dromedary (one-humped camel) belongs to the late second millennium. The camel became indispensable as a pack animal in desert regions where there were extremely limited supplies of water. It was much more valuable than the donkey in these regions—also because of its greater load-bearing capacity. It greatly facilitated merchant trade in Syria, but also provided an effective vehicle for the transportation of equipment and baggage supplies to a theatre of war for troops separated by large desert tracts from their homeland.¹⁷

The coalition list ends with the reference to [x] hundred troops provided by a man called Ba'asa, ruler of the land of Beth-Rehob. This was the name of the Aramaean city and land otherwise called Soba (*OT* Aram-Zobah), located in the Biqu' Valley between the Lebanon and anti-Lebanon ranges. Though at this stage it appears to have joined the coalition as an independent ally, it soon after became part of the kingdom of Hamath. Its strategic location between Hamath and Damascus gave it an importance which went beyond the relatively small size of the contingent which it contributed to the alliance.

Such was the force assembled under the general command of Urhilina, king of Hamath, and Hadadezer, king of Damascus, to confront Shalmaneser's army as it marched southwards along the Orontes deep into Hamathite territory. News of the Assyrian advance had reached Urhilina well before the arrival of the army itself. As we have noted earlier, Urhilina must have planned a response to the invasion, in collaboration with Hadadezer, long before it occurred, perhaps as early as Shalmaneser's campaigns across the Euphrates in his first regnal years (858–856). The Assyrian king's decisive victories over the states on either side of the Euphrates, and the booty and tribute he derived from them, left little doubt that it was but a matter of time, and probably little time at that, before he would seek to extend his conquests more deeply into Syrian territory. Perhaps already in these early years, Hamath and Damascus began calling on other states in their region, and sending an appeal to Egypt, to be ready to respond to the summons for a showdown with Assyria.

As far as we know, none of the states that were approached refused the call. To begin with, the allied forces probably assembled outside Hamath city. From there, they advanced north along the Orontes to confront the enemy at a city called Qarqar. This meant an extra march, of perhaps four or five days, in addition to the long distance already travelled by a number of the coalition's southern members to join their allies. But a confrontation with the enemy some distance north of Hamath city would give the Hamathite royal capital a buffer against an immediate attack in the event of an Assyrian victory. And a coalition victory might well spare the bulk of Urhilina's kingdom and its neighbours the ravages of Assyrian plunder, an inevitable consequence of leaving Shalmaneser's route to the Hamathite capital unimpeded. It is in any

case clear that the allies had time to march northwards to Qarqar and forestall there, at least temporarily, any Assyrian advance further south. The camels provided by the Arab chieftain Gindibu no doubt played an important role in the transportation of materiel to the battlefield.

On the land outside the city, probably the site now called Tell Qarqur, the armies clashed. The fate of the whole of southern Syria and Palestine lay in the balance. The details of the battle are unknown. But Shalmaneser proclaims its outcome in unequivocal terms: ‘With the supreme forces granted me by Ashur, my lord, I fought with them and defeated them from the city Qarqar as far as the city Gilzau. I felled with the sword 14,000 troops, and rained down destruction upon them. I filled the plain with their corpses and flooded the wadis with their blood. There was not enough room on the plain to lay out their bodies flat. I dammed up the Orontes river with their bodies like a bridge. In the midst of the battle I took away from them chariots, cavalry, and teams of horse’ (*RIMA* 3: 23–4, adapted and condensed from transl. by Grayson).

In other words, Shalmaneser claimed victory in the contest. It was, perhaps, a foregone conclusion. Numbers alone were not enough to defeat the Assyrians. For all the initial enthusiasm that may have brought the coalition together, it was but a motley collection of allied states, whose diversity must have hindered rather than helped the coalition leaders. They had matched themselves against a highly disciplined army united under the command of battle-hardened officers with but one supreme commander, Shalmaneser himself. Defeat for the coalition forces may have been inevitable. But it was far from a decisive defeat! All the allied leaders survived to fight another day, and the coalition which they led was to form again to continue its resistance to Shalmaneser.

The Babylonian venture

In the three years following his first engagement with the Qarqar coalition, Shalmaneser was occupied with military operations elsewhere (852–850). The chief objective of the first of these years was to put down rebellions that had broken out among his other subject-territories. He began with a swift campaign against the small Euphrates kingdom Til-Abni, upon which his father had imposed tributary status some thirty years earlier. In response to a rebellion by its ruler Habinu, Shalmaneser invaded the kingdom and destroyed its capital, along with other cities in its environs, and then marched eastwards to the lands near the source of the Tigris, where he put to the sword the inhabitants of cities that had risen against him, and received tribute from the land of Nairi. It may well be that his focus on his western campaign in 853 had encouraged the uprisings among his other tributaries, in the belief that this diversion of Assyrian military effort meant a slackening of the Great King’s control over them, and that the time was opportune to break free of

Assyria. A prompt and brutal response from Shalmaneser put paid to any such notions.

With order restored among his northern and north-eastern subject territories, Shalmaneser may then have intended to embark on his second venture across the Euphrates. His business in the west was far from finished. But he was forced to put his plans on hold when he received disturbing news from Marduk-zakir-shumi, king of Babylon. It had been some time since the southern Mesopotamian kingdom had posed any serious threat to Assyria, and had until recently enjoyed a relatively long period of peace, stability, and prosperity under the reign of Nabu-apla-iddina, a member of the so-called 'Dynasty of E' (thus it is called in the Babylonian King List). Nabu-apla-iddina had come to the throne in 888 and occupied it until his death in 855, several years after Shalmaneser's accession. Relations between the two kings had almost certainly been cordial, and remained so when the Babylonian was succeeded by his son Marduk-zakir-shumi (*RIMB* 2: 103–8). Perhaps now, if not already in his father's reign, the new king concluded a treaty of alliance with Shalmaneser,¹⁸ in which each partner promised support to the other if called upon. Whether or not such a pact was made, Shalmaneser received an urgent appeal from Marduk-zakir-shumi, who had found himself in deep trouble. His brother Marduk-bel-usate had challenged his right to the throne and risen in rebellion against him.

The Babylonian kingdom became divided between the two brothers. There is no doubt that the rebel was supported by a significant number of his fellow-countrymen, and Marduk-zakir-shumi felt his situation was sufficiently desperate to appeal to Shalmaneser for help (*RIMA* 3: 30, 37). He must have weighed up the risks of such an appeal—above all, the possible consequences of letting loose in his own lands, at his own invitation, hordes of Assyrian warriors notorious for their brutality and lust for plunder. And he was asking not merely for troops from Assyria, but for an entire Assyrian army led in person by the Assyrian king. Even if all went well and the Assyrian king and his troops behaved themselves in his country, the very fact that they were there at his request might well have swung support among his own people more firmly behind his brother—who could now represent himself not merely as a participant in a family squabble over the throne, but as the defender of his people against a foreign invader. Marduk-zakir-shumi must indeed have been desperate to send out the call to Shalmaneser. Of course, we have only Shalmaneser's word that he marched into Babylonia at its king's request. It is one of the very few occasions where an actual reason is given by an Assyrian king for undertaking a campaign, apart from responding to an uprising by his own subjects.

Shalmaneser has left us two accounts of his campaign, one fairly detailed (*RIMA* 3: 30–1), the other of a very summary nature (*RIMA* 3: 37). In the former, the Assyrian king presents his Babylonian venture almost as a

religious pilgrimage. Before entering Babylonia, he visited the city Zab(b)an, which lay in Assyrian territory on the Assyrian–Babylonian frontier, and sacrificed to the god Adad. Later, after completing the mission to which Marduk-zakir-shumi had summoned him, he visited the famous Babylonian cult-centres Cutha and Borsippa, and made there humble obeisance to the Babylonian deities, offering sacrifices and performing rituals in their honour. No doubt this show of piety was intended to give the impression of a divinely endorsed enterprise, sanctioned by Babylonia's gods as well as his own. Shalmaneser came not to conquer Babylonia but to protect its people, at its own king's request, from a pretender to the throne—with the approval and blessing of the gods, both Assyrian and Babylonian. At least that was probably how Shalmaneser intended the whole episode to be seen. The propagandistic flavour of his narrative is unmistakable!

But we are now a little ahead of ourselves. It took Shalmaneser two campaigns, in successive years (851 and 850), to run Marduk-bel-usate to ground. His first reported action was against the city Me-turnat (Me-Tur(r)-an) (*RIMA* 3: 30), located on the Diyala river in territory belonging to Babylonia in its far north-east. The city had apparently declared its support for Marduk-bel-usate. Shalmaneser placed it under siege, captured and plundered it, and slaughtered its population. He then moved on to the city Gannanate, also located on the Diyala river, where the pretender had made a stand. Though he claims to have defeated Marduk-bel-usate's forces in a battle outside the city, expressing scorn at his opponent's alleged incompetence, he was unable to take the city itself. The rebel leader escaped the battlefield and found safe refuge, for the time being, within Gannanate's walls. Shalmaneser had to content himself with ravaging the city's surrounding orchard- and crop-lands, and blocking up its canals.

The territory over which Marduk-bel-usate had won control may have been limited to the top end of Babylonia, to judge from the location of the cities specifically mentioned by Shalmaneser on his campaign. This perhaps provides us with the reason for Marduk-zakir-shumi's approach to the Assyrian king—to destroy the strongholds which his brother had occupied in the north-east, near the Assyrian frontier. Shalmaneser would not have had to advance far into Babylonian territory to accomplish his mission. It is somewhat surprising that it took him two campaigns to complete it. On the second campaign, again in the Diyala region, he attacked, plundered, and destroyed the city of Lahiru, massacring its inhabitants (*RIMA* 3: 30). Lahiru's location near the Elamite frontier gave the city important strategic significance. (It was to suffer attacks by Assyrian armies in later years, before finally being incorporated into the Assyrian empire in the reign of Tiglath-pileser III.)

Shalmaneser now made ready for a final assault on Marduk-bel-usate's main stronghold Gannanate. Intelligence reports revealed that the rebel was still holed up there. On this occasion, the Assyrian king took the city by storm

and inflicted upon it the usual Assyrian atrocities. But Marduk-bel-usate managed, yet again, to elude the Assyrians, escaping the city 'like a fox through a hole', and fled with some of his military officers to a mountain refuge called Arman. Here, his luck ran out. Shalmaneser tracked the fugitives down, captured and plundered Arman, and killed his quarry to the last man.

At this point, Marduk-zakir-shumi might have expected Shalmaneser to withdraw his troops from Babylonian territory and return home. But Shalmaneser had other plans. Now that he was firmly entrenched in Babylonia, he could not pass up the opportunity to lead his troops into its heartland, very likely to the discomfiture of the Babylonian king. It was at the command of Marduk, chief of all Babylonian deities, that Shalmaneser now proceeded to Babylon. At least that is what Shalmaneser claimed. He depicted the expedition as a divinely inspired enterprise, undertaken at the behest of Marduk, to pay homage to the gods of his host country, stopping on his way to Babylon at the holy city of Cutha, which lay *c.*30 km to the north-east, and then proceeding after his stay in Babylon to another of the kingdom's famous holy cities—Borsippa, *c.*20 km to the south-west. It was all done under the guise of the most pious of motives, but it provided Shalmaneser with an unparalleled opportunity for demonstrating his military might to the inhabitants of his brother-king's lands. We do not know what Marduk-zakir-shumi thought about all this, whether he simply accepted it because he was powerless to do otherwise. No further reference to him is made by Shalmaneser after he (Shalmaneser) reported that he had now conquered his enemies and 'achieved his heart's desire'.

It is just possible that the Assyrian progress through Babylonia was part of a deal which Shalmaneser struck with the Babylonian king as a condition of his acceptance of the mission against Marduk-bel-usate. The reason for such a deal may be reflected in the action Shalmaneser took immediately after his visit to Borsippa. He now marched his troops to the land he calls Chaldaea. The inhabitants of this land were made up of a number of tribal groups, probably speaking a West Semitic language. They appear to have entered Babylonia from the north-west some time in the 11th or 10th century, settling along the lower Euphrates and the Sealand marshlands at the head of the Persian Gulf. Two of the most important groups were the Bit-Dakkuri, located south-east of Borsippa, and the Bit-Yakin, who dwelt around the city of Ur and the marshes to the east.

The Chaldaeans were apparently independent of Babylon at this time, and may in fact have posed a significant threat to the security of the kingdom. Many of the tribal groups adapted fairly quickly to a settled way of life, building towns and villages, and a number of them became closely integrated into Babylonian social and political life. Indeed in the 8th century, several Chaldaean tribal leaders occupied Babylon's throne. But at the time of Shalmaneser's campaigns, the region called Chaldaea, covering large parts of

southern Babylonia, was apparently quite separate from the Babylonian kingdom. As part of his price for responding to Marduk-zakir-shumi's appeal for assistance against his brother, Shalmaneser perhaps demanded passage for his army, after the rebellion had been put down, through Marduk-zakir-shumi's kingdom into the lands of the Chaldaean tribes. For there was rich plunder to be had from these lands. After paying due homage to the gods in Borsippa, Shalmaneser marched into the territory of Bit-Dakkuri and destroyed its fortified city Baqanu. This action appears to have discouraged any further resistance in the land, and when Shalmaneser approached the royal city Huradu, Bit-Dakkuri's ruler Adinu submitted voluntarily to him, paying a handsome tribute in the form of gold, silver, and other metals, special wood, ivory, and elephant hides (*RIMA* 3: 31). Shalmaneser's demonstration of force, and the submission of Adinu, were sufficient to induce other Chaldaean leaders to bring the Assyrian king tribute while he was still in the city Huradu. The rulers of the Chaldaean tribes Bit-Amukani, which lay to the south of Bit-Dakkuri, and Bit-Yakin to the south-east were among the tributaries.¹⁹

The return to the west

It had been a good year for Shalmaneser. But his two-season preoccupation with Babylonian affairs led to a perception of a weakening of Assyrian authority west of the Euphrates, and anti-Assyrian uprisings broke out afresh. At the forefront of those in the Euphrates region were two longstanding rulers—Sangara, king of Carchemish, and Arame (Aramu, Hadram), ruler of Bit-Agusi. Both men had submitted to Shalmaneser and become his tributaries in 853, prior to his campaign in Hamath. But they had now once more rebelled. If Assyrian authority were to be maintained in the west, it was essential that they be brought to heel. Shalmaneser crossed the river and in quick succession launched attacks on both rebel kingdoms. He began by destroying and burning a number of Sangara's cities, then marched into Bit-Agusi and headed for its royal capital Arne. The city was completely demolished (*RIMA* 3: 37),²⁰ and may never have been rebuilt. Arpad subsequently became the capital of Bit-Agusi. The kingdom as a whole was henceforth commonly referred to as Arpad.

The further spread of anti-Assyrianism among Shalmaneser's western tributaries is reflected in a resurrection of the coalition that had confronted Shalmaneser at Qarqar in 853. Again, Shalmaneser engaged the enemy forces, and claimed a decisive victory over them. But the results of his western conquests in 849, from the Euphrates through the Syro-Palestinian region, proved ephemeral. In the following year, he had to repeat his military operations, with further campaigns against both the kingdoms of Sangara and Arame, and the Syro-Palestinian coalition that had re-formed within a year of its alleged destruction. (We shall return to this below.) Once more we are treated to a litany of conquest and devastation. Shalmaneser claims to have

captured ninety-seven cities of Sangara's kingdom and to have taken and destroyed one hundred of Arame's cities—after he had already, in the previous year, allegedly razed, burned, and destroyed Sangara's cities and one hundred of Arame's cities (the same ones on each occasion?).²¹

Statements of this kind cannot always be taken at face value. Cities that were supposedly left by their conquerors as charred, abandoned ruins often miraculously resurrected themselves in time to be destroyed all over again the following year. Assyrian kings were far from being the only warlords, past and more recent, in making what sometimes appear to be extravagant claims about the extent of the damage they inflicted upon their enemies. Yet such claims often had substance. There is no doubt that Assyrian armies regularly left trails of devastation and ruin throughout many of the countries where they campaigned. Nor is there any doubt that some of the cities and countries so afflicted never recovered. But some did, despite the worst the Assyrians could do to them. There was, moreover, no consistency in the Assyrians' treatment of the lands they conquered. For reasons often not clear to us, some were spared, others allowed to rise once more from the ashes of their destruction.

This brings us back to Carchemish and Bit-Agusi. Despite the uprisings of these states against Assyrian sovereignty in two consecutive years, 849 and 848, they appear to have suffered little, in the long run, from Assyrian retaliation. And their rulers remained on their thrones. Perhaps they had Shalmaneser to thank for this—the Assyrian king deciding that his interests would best be served by leaving them in power, presumably with a fresh undertaking from them that they would henceforth acknowledge his sovereignty. (I have suggested as much for Shalmaneser's treatment of Sangara on an earlier occasion.) Alternatively, their survival might indicate that Shalmaneser's victories over their lands had been less complete than the Assyrian would have us believe—or that they managed to elude him when he marched into their lands, returning once again to their thrones after his departure.

In any case, we hear no more of Sangara after Shalmaneser's 848 campaign. As far as we know, he continued to occupy his throne for some years to come. That certainly was the case with Arame, who held sway over his kingdom until at least 833, and perhaps later. His continuing reign may indicate that he did indeed submit to Assyrian authority following Shalmaneser's attack upon his land in 848, and henceforth remained a loyal tributary of the Assyrian crown. Indirectly, Shalmaneser may give us some indication of this. He reports that as he was returning home to Assyria after his campaign against Adanawa (Que) in 833, he took possession of a fortified city of Aramu called Muru, and set up there a royal residence. The city was probably intended to serve as a centre for future Assyrian campaigns across the Euphrates (*RIMA* 3: 68). Its occupation was evidently a peaceful one—and if so, a fairly sure sign that Bit-Agusi's ruler remained submissive to Assyrian overlordship, and accepted the Assyrian king's right to take one of his cities and turn it into an Assyrian base.

Let us go back to Shalmaneser's campaigns in Hamath. His second victory over the Syro-Palestinian coalition forces in 849 (following his first in 853) had failed to prevent the allies from reassembling in 848 for a third contest with him. Shalmaneser took up the challenge. Immediately after the victories which he claimed over Sangara and Aramu in 848, he marched to the slopes of the Amanus range, and from there proceeded south, once more, into the land of Hamath (*RIMA* 3: 38). On his progress through the kingdom, he claims to have captured the Hamathite city Ashtammaku (very questionably identified with the site of Tell Mastuma²²) along with eighty-nine other cities. And it was then that he was confronted once more by the combined Syro-Palestinian forces, still under the leadership of Urhilina and Hadadezer: 'At that time Hadadezer, the Damascene, and Irhuleni, the Hamathite, together with twelve kings on the shore of the sea, trusting in their united forces, attacked me to wage war and battle' (*RIMA* 3: 38, transl. Grayson). The engagement ended disastrously for the allies. Once more they suffered a heavy defeat, and (according to the Assyrian record) the loss of 10,000 of their troops, along with chariotry, cavalry, and military equipment. But the coalition was not yet at an end. It would regroup one more time.

That was several years in the future. Immediately after his third victory over the Syro-Palestinian coalition, Shalmaneser turned northwards, first of all finishing off his campaign against Bit-Agusi by capturing the city Aparazu, located on or near Bit-Agusi's western limits, and then heading back to the Amanus range, where he organized the felling of cedar trees for transport to Assyria. No doubt some of the livestock he had acquired as tribute from Patin's king Halparuntiya (Qalparunda), through whose territory he passed on his way to the mountain range (*RIMA* 3: 38),²³ were used in the transportation of these timbers; horses, donkeys, and oxen formed part of Halparuntiya's 'gift' to his overlord.

Shalmaneser cannot have regarded his campaign for his eleventh regnal year, 848, as an unqualified success. He may have ended, at least for the foreseeable future, the anti-Assyrian uprisings in the Euphrates region. And he may have emerged once more with battle honours in his third engagement with the Syro-Palestinian coalition. But the coalition had not been destroyed. Despite its evident losses, it still constituted a major obstacle to Assyrian dominance of southern Syria and Palestine. Another confrontation was inevitable. And for the time being, the coalition had succeeded in what must have been its main objective—to keep the cities and kingdoms of its members free from subjection to Assyria.

The coalition's final bow

Frustrated at his failure to impose his authority over the Syro-Palestinian region, Shalmaneser returned to it three years later, in 845, for what was to be his last showdown with the allied forces that defended it, still led by

Urhilina, king of Hamath, and Hadadezer, king of Damascus. Entering Syrian territory with a massive force of 120,000 men, Shalmaneser once more sought out and confronted the coalition army—whose troops were reportedly too numerous to be counted. Urhilina and Hadadezer ordered an attack, resolved to commit everything to a last-ditch stand. Again the Assyrians prevailed. The battle must have been one of epic proportions, if Shalmaneser's figures are to be believed. But the terms in which the Great King describes his victory are surprisingly restrained (*RIMA* 3: 39). In a single, brief statement, he refers to the enemy's defeat and the destruction of its chariotry and cavalry. There is none of the rhetoric that characterizes his account of his earlier triumphs. And his final words on the episode—"To save their lives they ran away"—give the impression that the losing side survived the engagement largely intact.

But at this point, the alliance came apart. The catalyst for its disintegration was probably the death of Hadadezer, some time between 845 and 841. His place on the throne was taken by one of his officers, a man called Hazael. Shalmaneser speaks slightly of the new king, calling him 'the son of a nobody' (*RIMA* 3: 118). There is no suggestion in the Assyrian record that foul play was involved in his elevation. But the biblical report is in no doubt about this. According to 2 Kings 8: 7–15, Hazael had seized power by assassinating his predecessor,²⁴ spreading a thick cloth soaked in water over his face and suffocating him. But even if Hazael had come to the throne by foul rather than fair means, he was no less committed than his predecessor to resisting Assyria. He none the less lost his two major coalition partners. The belief that he had murdered the man whose throne he now occupied was probably fairly widespread, and is thought to have precipitated Israel's secession from the alliance.²⁵ And from this time on, there is no further known association between Hamath and Damascus, at least not of the kind that had existed during the coalition years. The alleged assassination of Hadadezer, Urhilina's longstanding partner, may well have caused the Hamathite king to sever relations with his new Damascene counterpart. Hawkins suggests that Shalmaneser also had a hand in the breaking of the ties, using diplomacy where force had failed to detach Urhilina from Damascus.²⁶ Suspicions about the cause of Hadadezer's death would have made a diplomatic initiative a lot easier.

Deprived of its partners-in-arms, Damascus had to face the might of Assyrian arms alone. In 841, Shalmaneser crossed the Euphrates for the sixteenth time, Damascus being his specific target on this occasion. He claimed a crushing victory over Hazael, putting to the sword 16,000 of his troops and seizing 1,121 of his chariotry and 470 of his cavalry. Hazael fled the battlefield, to Damascus city where Shalmaneser blockaded him (*RIMA* 3: 54, 48, 67). But the Assyrians were unable to take the royal capital. And three years later, while another Assyrian onslaught on the kingdom resulted in the capture of four of Hazael's cities, it left the capital intact and its king still free (*RIMA* 3: 67). On both these campaigns, Tyre and Sidon preserved their

territories from Assyrian attack by paying tribute to Shalmaneser, as Israel also did on the first occasion and Byblos on the second.²⁷

Despite his scoffed-at origins, Hazael was undoubtedly one of the most successful of all the kings of Damascus. His reign, which Shalmaneser tried unsuccessfully to cut short, was a long one, lasting perhaps forty years. During this period, he managed to retain his kingdom's independence, and went on to build it into an empire which incorporated large parts of Palestine, including Judah, Israel, and Philistia, and perhaps also parts of northern Syria.²⁸ Hazael's victory over the kings of Israel and Judah, and the deaths of these kings at his hands, is reported in a fragmentary Aramaic royal inscription, of which Hazael was the author, recently discovered in the city of Dan (Tell el-Qadi) (*Chav.* 307). His death is probably to be dated to 803—if this was the year when the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III attacked and conquered Damascus (*RIMA* 3: 213) (see below).

The Anatolian campaigns

In 839, Shalmaneser finally turned his attention to the kingdom of Adanawa (Hiyawa, Que), located in the Cilician Plain of south-eastern Anatolia. The kingdom was still ruled by Kate, who in 858 had joined the coalition of northern Syrian states that confronted Shalmaneser on his first western campaign. The Assyrian had taken no direct retaliatory action against Adanawa after his victory over the coalition. Why, then, so many years later, did he decide to invade it, undertaking within the space of eight years at least four campaigns in its territory? The first of these was in 839 (*RIMA* 3: 55, 58), the last three in successive years—833, 832, and 831 (*RIMA* 3: 68–9, 80, 119, *Epon.* 57).²⁹

We may find a motive in a statement made by Kilamuwa, king of Sam'al, that he 'hired' the king of Assyria to support him against the 'king of the Danunians' (*CS* II: 147) that is to say, against Kate. Shalmaneser's failure to capitalize upon his earlier western campaigns with an invasion of the south-eastern Anatolian kingdoms may well have emboldened Kate to seek to expand his own territory eastwards by establishing control over Sam'al. Kilamuwa appealed to Shalmaneser for assistance. His claim that he 'hired' the Assyrian king is a euphemistic way of saying this, and no doubt he sweetened his appeal with a pledge of allegiance to the Assyrian king and a substantial tribute to back it up. In effect, he may have been affirming, or reaffirming, his status as an Assyrian client. With the relatively high degree of autonomy that it allowed, Assyrian client-status was a more attractive prospect than subjection to a territorially ambitious neighbour.³⁰ Hawkins comments that the call from Kilamuwa provides us with 'a useful insight, rarely available from Assyrian sources, into the possible motivation of a series of campaigns, and is the first of a number of specific indications that Assyria did not always cross the Euphrates uninvited'.³¹ Sam'al may have warmly

welcomed Assyrian intervention in the region. From Kilamuwa's reign onwards, its rulers seem to have cultivated close links with their overlords, no doubt in the hope that their status as Assyrian clients would provide them with some assurance of protection against aggression by their neighbours.³²

According to the Assyrian report, Shalmaneser's first campaign against Adanawa was a comprehensive operation, carried out after the Great King's passage through the Amanus range. He mentions his conquests of three fortified cities in the kingdom, Lusanda, Abarnanu, and Kisuatnu (*RIMA* 3: 55), but claims that many of its other cities fell to him as well. To mark his victory, he ordered two statues of himself to be erected, one at the eastern and one at the western end of the kingdom. But Kate remained firmly seated upon his throne, and Shalmaneser had to conduct at least three more campaigns against Adanawa before it was fully subdued. The first clearly attested of these³³ was undertaken in 833. In the preceding years, Shalmaneser led campaigns against the kingdoms of Tabal. These together with the Adanawa campaigns represent the furthestmost western enterprises in which Shalmaneser engaged in his long career as a warrior-king. They also represent the final phase of his role as commander-in-the-field of Assyria's extensive military operations.

Hawkins comments that it is hard to detect any motives for the Cilician–Anatolian campaigns beyond pure adventurism.³⁴ There was certainly the incentive of plunder and tribute that flowed from military conquests wherever the Assyrian king carried his arms. But the pickings were far less rich than they had been in Syria and Palestine. And from a strategic point of view, it is indeed difficult to see any practical motive for the extension of Assyrian authority into the western lands—at this time.³⁵ Indeed, the maintenance of such authority would undoubtedly have placed a significant additional strain on the Great King's resources. Nevertheless, a new set of military ventures into lands that had never before seen Assyrian arms would do much to bolster Shalmaneser's image as the most powerful warlord of the age as his reign passed its twenty-year mark. Assyria's eastern and southern frontiers were, for the time being, secure. The Nairi lands had but recently been pacified, Urartu had yet to develop into a powerful, united kingdom (though this was not far off), Assyria's traditional opponent Babylon was not at this time a threat, and Elam to the south-east had yet to re-emerge as a significant international power. All that would soon change. But for the time being, Shalmaneser felt confident enough to campaign in what from the Assyrian point of view was the far west, without putting the security of his kingdom at risk.

Prior to his Anatolian campaigns, the king must have been well briefed on the current state of affairs in the region called Tabal, which was still divided among a number of petty kingdoms whose rulers were not expected to offer any significant resistance. And so, in his twenty-third regnal year, 836, Shalmaneser set off for the Anatolian plateau (*RIMA* 3: 79).³⁶ After crossing the

Euphrates, he received tribute from the trans-river kingdoms, including Carchemish (whose ruler was almost certainly among the 'kings of Hatti' to whom Shalmaneser refers) and Malatya. With renewed pledges of allegiance extracted from their kings, Shalmaneser was ready to invade Tabal, no doubt confident that he was secure from attack in his rear. His march across the anti-Taurus range (Mt Timur in the text) brought him first into the region of northern Tabal and the kingdom ruled by a man called Tuwati (Assyrian Tuatti). Meeting with little resistance, he set about destroying Tuwati's towns and villages, forcing the king and his son Kikki to take refuge in the royal capital Artulu, which lay within the Kululu–Sultanhan–Kültepe region. The city was placed under siege, and Kikki, afraid to fight, promptly gave it up. His father's fate is unknown. News of Artulu's surrender quickly brought the other kings of northern Tabal into line. Twenty of them now became Shalmaneser's tributaries.

With the northern Tabalian kingdoms secured, Shalmaneser marched south, climbing a mountain called Tunni in the Taurus–Bolkar Dağ massif.³⁷ The mountain's large silver deposits almost certainly provided the incentive for his expedition. A similar incentive took the Assyrian forces to Mt Mulu which lay in the same region. The mountain was a rich source of alabaster. Shalmaneser extracted and carried off vast quantities of the substance (*RIMA* 3: 118), and rounded off his progress through the ranges by having statues of himself erected on top of them (*RIMA* 3: 79, 118). He then proceeded into the land of Hupishna/Hubushna, in the region of the Classical Tyanitis. At this time, Hupishna was ruled by a king called Puhame, whose capital is probably to be identified with Karahöyük near modern Ereğli. Puhame apparently submitted without resistance, and Shalmaneser began his homeward journey—perhaps through the land of Adanawa via the Cilician Gates. It may have been on this occasion that he conducted against Adanawa's king Kate the campaign he reports in a summary account of his military conquests (*RIMA* 3: 119).³⁸ He claims that he confined Kate, his 'perverse enemy', to his royal city Pahrū.³⁹ Terms of surrender were agreed, and Kate was reinstated on his throne—minus one of his daughters, who was taken back to Assyria, along with a dowry, as a pledge of her father's future loyalty.

Shalmaneser's Anatolian campaign might be accounted a major success. He had gained the submission of a large part of the Tabalian region, from the southern bend of the Halys river southwards to the land of Hupishna, and by his subjugation of Adanawa the south-eastern Mediterranean coast, with relatively little resort to military force. But he seems to have bypassed altogether the land called Tuwana, which within a few decades was to become the largest and most important of the southern Tabalian kingdoms. Hilakku too, in the region later called Cilicia Tracheia/Aspera ('Rough Cilicia'), was left untouched. None the less, Shalmaneser had carried Assyrian arms further west than any of his predecessors, and the large consignments of silver and

alabaster brought back to the homeland from the mountains of Tunni and Mulu provided impressive material evidence of the rewards which his Anatolian operations had won.

The king followed up these operations with another campaign across the Euphrates in the following year, 835, passing through the land of Malatya, where he captured the fortified city Uetash,⁴⁰ and secured, or resecured, the submission of Malatya's current king Lalli (*RIMA* 3: 67, 79–80), first mentioned as a tributary of Shalmaneser during the king's sixth campaign across the Euphrates in 853. While Shalmaneser was in the region, the twenty Tabalian kings presented themselves to him and renewed their allegiance with tribute-gifts—insurance against another Assyrian campaign into their lands.

In 833, the king turned his attention once more to Adanawa. Its throne was still occupied by Kate. Though he may have been ready enough to bend his knee to the Assyrian king when the Assyrians were in his land, Kate quickly gave up all pretence of submission once they had departed. As we have noted, Shalmaneser needed three campaigns, in consecutive years (833 to 831), to bring the country fully and finally under his authority. In the course of these, he reports (a) besieging and capturing the city Timur, and massacring its inhabitants, (b) besieging the city Tanakum, a fortified settlement whose ruler Tulli (apparently a regional leader subject to Kate) surrendered and paid a tribute of silver, gold, iron, oxen, and sheep, (c) besieging, capturing, and plundering a mountain-land called Lamena, and (d) marching upon the city Tarsus (Tarza in the text) on the coast. Tarsus submitted without resistance, and handed over a tribute of silver and gold. And it was in Tarsus that the Assyrian king appointed a man called Kirri, brother of Kate, to be the new ruler of Adanawa. We do not know what happened to Kate. Perhaps he was killed during the last of Shalmaneser's campaigns in his kingdom. In any case, we hear nothing more of Adanawa until, around 800, it joined Gurgum, Patin, and Malatya in another anti-Assyrian uprising.

That, however, was several decades into the future. For the present, Shalmaneser's last campaign against Adanawa brought successfully to an end the king's military operations in south-eastern Anatolia.⁴¹ There is of course the question of why Shalmaneser bothered so long with Adanawa. Why was control over it so important to him—as it apparently was, to judge from his repeated campaigns into its territory? Perhaps because failure in any of his south-eastern Anatolian enterprises would have been unthinkable—particularly following the limited successes of his Syria–Palestine ventures. Once committed to imposing his sovereignty over Adanawa, Shalmaneser could not be seen to weaken or give up in the face of that country's resolve. That would set a very bad precedent, likely to encourage other kingdoms in the region to rise up against him, with possibly much wider repercussions elsewhere in the lands subject to Assyrian control.

The rise of the kingdom of Urartu

But Shalmaneser's days for military campaigns beyond his homeland were now done. While he continued to occupy the throne, this responsibility would be passed to others. And it is at this point we see the emergence of one of Assyria's most able military commanders—Dayyan-Ashur, commander-in-chief of all Shalmaneser's armies.⁴² Dayyan-Ashur first comes to light in the record of Shalmaneser's twenty-seventh regnal year (832) when the king dispatched a large army under his command to Urartu. A number of Shalmaneser's predecessors had campaigned in the Urartian region, beginning, as far as Assyrian records reveal, with Shalmaneser I in the 13th century, and continuing with military operations by later Assyrian kings, including Ashur-bel-kala (1073–1056) and Adad-nirari II (911–891). Shalmaneser himself claims to have conducted five campaigns there. Urartian territory was extensive, but Assyrian victories within it had been achieved with comparative ease, for the small independent principalities of which the region was made up had no hope individually of making a stand against the invaders.

Then, around 832, a king called Sarduri combined the separate Urartian states into a single federation. This was alarming news for Assyria. Unchecked, a united Urartian kingdom could pose a serious threat not only to Assyria's north-eastern territories, but ultimately to the homeland itself. Pre-emptive action was essential—hence Shalmaneser's dispatch of a large army to Urartu, under the command of Dayyan-Ashur, whose mission, no doubt, was to crush the fledgling united kingdom before it had a chance to develop. Sarduri was eager to meet the challenge. As soon as he received word that the Assyrians had entered his territory, he mustered a large army and sought out and attacked the invaders. According to the Assyrian record, the contest ended disastrously for him: 'Dayyan-Ashur fought with Sarduri, defeated him, and filled the wide plain with the corpses of his warriors' (*RIMA* 3: 69, 81, transl. after Grayson). But Sarduri survived the battle, and Dayyan-Ashur appears not to have followed up his victory with more extensive operations on Urartian soil. In fact, the Assyrian–Urartian confrontation was to prove no more than a preliminary to a contest that would see a royal dynasty founded by Sarduri firmly established in Urartu, and the development of a powerful kingdom that would soon challenge Assyria's status as the supreme power of the Near Eastern world.

Trouble in Patin

In any case, Shalmaneser's attention was diverted from Urartu by disturbing news from the west. There had been a coup in the kingdom of Patin, led by a certain Surri who seized the kingship. Up to this point, Patin's throne had been occupied by Lubarna, the second Patinite ruler of that name, and perhaps the last member of a dynasty that may have had links with the imperial Hittite

royal family. After Shalmaneser's invasion of Patinite territory in 858, and his defeat of the anti-Assyrian coalition forces there, the kingdom appears to have remained submissive to Assyrian rule. If so, the coup that removed Lubarna almost certainly represented a fresh rejection of Assyrian authority. There were wider implications. Reports that the Great King was no longer campaigning personally in the territories beyond his homeland may well have encouraged many in the tributary states to seek to re-establish their independence, and to overthrow rulers who still remained loyal to Assyria. The seizure of power in Patin by a rebel faction put the matter to the test. Patin lay directly to the north of and bordered upon the Orontes river near its mouth. Control of it was the key to control of the entire Levantine coast. Loss of it to an anti-Assyrian regime might trigger a complete breakdown of Assyrian authority throughout the western Syrian region, if not more widely.

What precisely was the nature of Assyrian authority in the west as a consequence of Shalmaneser's many campaigns there? At this stage, direct Assyrian rule over the local kingdoms had not yet been established. It would be another century or so before these kingdoms were absorbed into the Assyrian provincial system. By and large, the imposition of Assyrian authority over the local states meant that their kings accepted tributary status and made regular payments, in one form or another, into the Assyrian royal coffers, and (or else) conceded the Assyrians access to resource-rich regions, particularly the forested areas of the Levantine and northern Syrian coast. We do not know whether the relationship between a local ruler and the Assyrian king was formalized by a written pact—though in at least some instances there may well have been some form of agreement drawn up. But generally speaking, local rulers were free to rule their states in whatever manner they wished, without interference from the Assyrian king, unless they took actions which were prejudicial to Assyrian interests, such as participation in an anti-Assyrian alliance with other local rulers.

What influence or authority the Assyrians did exercise in the west, as also in other regions over which they claimed control, was often largely of an informal nature.⁴³ The incentive for acknowledging Assyrian overlordship was primarily a negative one—the threat of severe reprisals against those who refused to do so. On the other hand, for those who accepted Assyrian sovereignty, the obligations that it imposed—most commonly, the provision of an annual tribute—were generally not intolerable. Indeed, many of the states may have derived significant benefits from their links with Assyria. Nevertheless, resistance to the Assyrians was often fierce and persistent, and even repeated campaigns by Shalmaneser, and allegedly decisive victories, failed to ensure the submission of a number of hostile states, like Damascus, for any length of time. In some cases, the Assyrian king may simply have decided to cut his losses, as in the case of Damascus, and concede the impracticability of continuing to conduct campaigns against lands that could

never be fully subdued. In other cases, defiance of Assyrian authority met with a vigorous and brutal response.

The coup in Patin was one of these cases. Shalmaneser decided that action against its ringleader and usurper Surri was essential, and he dispatched Dayyan-Ashur to the land to get rid of him. The Assyrian army crossed the Euphrates when it was in flood and advanced directly into Patin, setting up camp outside the walls of Kinalua, its capital (*RIMA* 3: 69). Surri was inside the city. The sudden appearance of the Assyrian army allegedly struck terror in the hearts of all those within the walls. We are told that Surri himself ‘overwhelmed by fear of the radiance of (the Assyrian god) Ashur, departed this life’ (thus Grayson). That is to say, he realized his position was hopeless and committed suicide. The people of Kinalua, now left leaderless, panicked as the Assyrian forces, brandishing swords that flashed in the sunlight, moved in to storm the city. Terrible retribution would surely be inflicted upon the city’s inhabitants for the overthrow of their rightful king. In a last-ditch effort to save themselves, the Kinualites seized the usurper’s sons and the troops who had supported him, and delivered them to the Assyrian commander. All were impaled on stakes around the city. Dayyan-Ashur put his own appointee on the throne, a man called Sasi from the land of Kurussa, and erected in Kinalua a colossal status of the Assyrian king as a sign of permanent Assyrian sovereignty. Content that Patin had been securely restored to the Assyrian fold, Dayyan-Ashur set off home, taking with him a substantial tribute from the city—silver, gold, tin, bronze, iron, and elephant ivory.

As far as we know, this was the last Assyrian campaign conducted west of the Euphrates in Shalmaneser’s reign. Political upheavals within Assyria which marked the end of the reign, and continued through that of his son and successor Shamshi-Adad V (823–811), ensured that Syria and Palestine were for the time being spared any further intervention. Many states in the region no doubt took the opportunity to cast off all trappings of Assyrian sovereignty. Shamshi-Adad did, however, consolidate Assyrian control over the river-city now called Kar-Shalmaneser (formerly Masuwari, Til Barsip) during the first campaign which he conducted, from Nairi in the east to the Euphrates in the west, to reaffirm Assyrian control over these regions (*ARAB* I §716). In effect, Kar-Shalmaneser became the Assyrians’ western boundary.

The resumption of Assyrian campaigns in the west

The longstanding peace between Assyria and its southern neighbour Babylonia came to an end in 814,⁴⁴ when Shamshi-Adad launched his first of several campaigns into Babylonian territory. At this time Babylon’s throne was occupied by a man called Marduk-balassu-iqbi (*RIMB* 2: 109), the son and successor of Marduk-zaki-shumi who had enjoyed friendly relations with Shamshi-Adad’s father Shalmaneser III. At Dur-Papsukkal, a city in the Diyala region of eastern Babylonia, Shamshi-Adad’s army clashed with the forces of

Marduk-balassu-iqbi (*RIMA* 3: 188). Though the Assyrian claimed victory, the confrontation appears to have been inconclusive, prompting Shamshi-Adad to embark in 813 on a second Babylonian campaign. This one resulted in a more decisive Assyrian victory, in a battle fought near Der, another city in the Diyala region. Marduk-balassu-iqbi was captured and taken back to Assyria along with his ‘criminal troops’ (*RIMA* 3: 190–1). Again in the following year, Shamshi-Adad invaded Babylonia, and fought and defeated there the new king Baba-aha-iddina. Like his predecessor, Baba-aha-iddina was taken prisoner and deported to Assyria (*RIMA* 3: 191). Chaos and anarchy followed in Babylonia, to continue for more than sixty years until the country’s fortunes took a turn for the better with the accession of a king called Nabonassar (Nabu-nasir) in 747. In the intervening period, Assyria appears to have been untroubled by its southern neighbour. But there were other concerns. From the Assyrian point of view, a disconcerting aspect of the conflict at Dur-Papsukkal was the support Marduk-balassu-iqbi had received from allies from a number of other regions. They included Elamites, Namrites, Aramaeans, and Chaldeans. Enemies like these—and Urartu—were an ongoing threat to Assyria in many of its eastern frontier territories.

But though they needed to monitor closely developments within these territories and the neighbouring regions, the Assyrians had by no means forgotten the lands lying in the other direction—across the Euphrates. These lands enjoyed but a brief respite from Assyrian intervention. For in the reign of Shamshi-Adad’s son and successor Adad-nirari III (810–783), Assyria turned its attention westwards once more, to the rewards to be won from campaigning in the cities and states between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. In 805, Adad-nirari conducted his first of a number of expeditions across the Euphrates. Reports reaching the western lands that a new Assyrian invasion was imminent prompted the formation of an alliance of northern Syrian rulers, referred to by Adad-nirari as ‘the eight kings of Hatti’, under the leadership of a man called Attar-shumki (I), ruler of the Aramaean kingdom Arpad (Bit-Agusi). The Assyrian campaign was allegedly triggered by an appeal which Suppiluliuma, king of Kummuh, had made to Adad-nirari, for support against one of his neighbours, Halparuntiya, ruler of Gurgum, who was attempting to seize a slice of Suppiluliuma’s territory. This emerges from an Assyrian text commonly known as the Pazarcık inscription, carved on a stele that was discovered in a village near the modern city of Maraş during the construction of the Pazarcık dam (*RIMA* 3: 204–5).⁴⁵ It provides us with one of the very few attested examples of conflict, or at least dispute, between two Neo-Hittite kingdoms over territorial issues.

But far more than the resolution of a boundary squabble between two Neo-Hittite states was involved. When Adad-nirari crossed the Euphrates, supposedly in response to Suppiluliuma’s appeal, he was confronted by a large allied Syrian army, which engaged his forces outside the city called Paqarhubunu,

located on the west bank of the upper Euphrates. In the 9th century, Paqarhubunu was part of the territory of the Aramaean kingdom Bit-Adini, then ruled by Ahuni. As we have seen, Assyrian military action against it dates back to the first regnal year of Shalmaneser III (858). And here, fifty-three years later, the northern Syrian coalition led by Attar-shumki clashed with Adad-nirari's army (*RIMA* 3: 205).⁴⁶ No indication is given of what states, apart from Arpad, made up the coalition, though we can deduce who some of the other eight kings may have been from later similar groupings; they probably included the rulers of Adanawa (Que), Patin (Unqi), Gurgum, Sam'al, and Malatya (Melid).⁴⁷ Obviously Kummuh's ruler Suppiluliuma is to be excluded since he had summoned the Assyrians and no doubt fought on the Assyrian side.⁴⁸

Adad-nirari claimed victory over the coalition, and in its immediate aftermath ordered a stele to be erected, with his victory recorded upon it, on the boundary between Kummuh and Gurgum. It may well be that he took the opportunity to change this boundary, handing over to Suppiluliuma a significant portion of Gurgum's territory as a reward for his loyalty. But despite the Assyrian victory at Paqarhubunu, Adad-nirari failed to break up the enemy coalition. For at least the next ten years, it would continue to resist his attempts to destroy it.

An interesting sidelight to the campaign is that it was accompanied by the king's mother Sammu-ramat, who is identified in the stele inscription as the 'palace-woman' of Adad-nirari's father Shamshi-Adad, and daughter-in-law of his grandfather Shalmaneser.⁴⁹ Sammu-ramat is the original of the famous Semiramis, a figure of legendary status in both Near Eastern and Classical tradition. In Greek sources, she is the wife of Ninus (*sic*), king of Nineveh, generally identified now with Shamshi-Adad or with an early 9th-century Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta II. According to these sources, Semiramis conquered Bactria and built the walls of Babylon and other monuments in the city; she is thus credited with many of the achievements associated with the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar II. In Armenian sources, she is the conqueror of Urartu. To a greater or lesser extent, the historical Sammu-ramat, wife of Shamshi-Adad V, may lie behind the figure of legend, though in the traditions of various countries the latter took on a life of her own. It is not so surprising that the historical figure should have become the stuff of legend. An Assyrian queen who accompanied her son on his military campaigns was a phenomenon of the age that could well have helped generate the stories associated with her in later ages. Indeed, the later legends may preserve some details, albeit distorted and exaggerated, of events and enterprises in which she played a prominent part, but which are no longer known to us from the historical records. Undoubtedly, Sammu-ramat held a position of considerable and perhaps, for a woman, unprecedented importance in the Assyrian court, as reflected not only in the reference to her in the Pazarcik stele, but also in the

inscription on a famous royal stele of hers which was found in Ashur. It bore the words: ‘To Ishtar, her lady. Sammu-ramat, Consort of Shamshi-Adad, King of Assyria, gave (this) for her health.’⁵⁰ Grayson comments that behind the stories of Semiramis, ‘there must have been a woman with a presence, an aura, an almost superhuman quality. But apart from discrediting the more obvious extravagances of the late legend, it is still impossible for us to describe and appreciate her personality and her influence.’⁵¹

The problems of the chronology of Adad-nirari’s western campaigns

We know from the records of his reign that Adad-nirari led a number of military enterprises into Syria. We can work out the dates of the first and last of these (805 and 796 respectively) from Assyrian texts of the period. But the dates of other events and the overall chronology of the western campaigns are far from certain, since we have no annalistic records of the reign. (Such records report sequentially the chief events of a king’s career and are dated by specific references to the regnal years in which they occurred). The accounts we do have of Assyria’s western enterprises in this period are fragmentary and piecemeal. We sometimes do not know whether there is any connection between events recorded in what are essentially ‘stand-alone’ documents, nor can we be sure that the documents that have survived cover all the western enterprises in which Adad-nirari or his deputies engaged. We know, for example, that he undertook a campaign against Damascus, which resulted in his conquest of the kingdom. But scholars differ on when this campaign actually took place. And the debate becomes considerably muddled if we allow for the possibility that Adad-nirari campaigned more than once against Damascus.

Three inscriptions refer to his conquest of the kingdom, which at the time was ruled by a man whom the inscriptions call Mari’:

(1) *Adad-nirari’s conquests from east to west (Kalhu inscription) (RIMA 3: 212–13)*. In a text found at Kalhu (Nimrud), Adad-nirari summarizes his extensive conquests throughout his career, from the Zagros region in the east to the Mediterranean coast in the west. Two sets of events are highlighted. The second records Adad-nirari’s imposition of his sovereignty over ‘all the kings of Chaldaeae’ in Babylonia, following upon the successful Babylonian campaigns conducted by his father Shamshi-Adad in the final years of his reign.⁵² The first gives details of a campaign which Adad-nirari conducted to Damascus. This is in the context of his claim that he subdued all the territory from the banks of the Euphrates to the Syro-Palestinian coast.⁵³ Adad-nirari reports that he marched to Damascus where he confined the kingdom’s ruler Mari’. The latter apparently submitted to him without further resistance and paid a substantial tribute—2,300 talents of silver, 20 talents of gold, 3,000 talents of

bronze, 5,000 talents of iron, linen garments with multi-coloured trim, a couch with inlaid ivory, and his property and possessions without number.

(2) *Adad-nirari's launch of his western campaigns (Saba'a inscription)* (RIMA 3: 207–9). This inscription, commissioned by Adad-nirari's governor Nergal-erish, appears on a stele discovered at the site of Saba'a, which lay south of the Jebel Sinjar in northern Mesopotamia. It provides a firm date for the first of Adad-nirari's western campaigns—launched in his fifth regnal year—and describes first an expedition conducted by the king against the land of Hatti. The rulers of the kingdoms within the land had withheld tribute from him, but resumed payments when he forced their submission. Adad-nirari then reports marching upon Damascus and blockading its king Mari' within his capital. Mari' submitted and became a tributary, paying his overlord 100 talents of gold and 1,000 talents of silver. Since Adad-nirari became king in 811, his fifth regnal year must be 806 (i.e. excluding his accession year). This is assumed to be the date when he made his decision to resume Assyrian campaigns in the west, with the first campaign actually dating to 805, in accordance with the dates provided by the Eponym Chronicle.⁵⁴ Grayson points out that we know from this document that there were several campaigns to the west, between 805 and 796, and that the description on the Saba'a stele is just a brief summary of these events.⁵⁵ Lipiński argues for an 803 date for the Damascus campaign.⁵⁶ Hawkins believes the campaign should be placed in the same context as the so-called Mansuate campaign (referred to below), which can confidently be dated to 796.

(3) *Further on Adad-nirari's western campaigns (Tell al-Rimah inscription)* (RIMA 3: 209–12). The text of this inscription is carved on a stele discovered at Tell al-Rimah, a settlement mound in northern Mesopotamia 60 km west of Mosul. It reports Adad-nirari's march into the land of Hatti and his subjugation in a single year of all the lands of Hatti and Amurru. The king followed up his victories with the imposition of a permanent tax and tribute on the conquered lands. He also received tribute from Mari', king of Damascus (consisting of 2,000 talents of tin, 1,000 talents of copper, 2,000 talents of iron, 3,000 linen garments with multi-coloured trim), Joash, the Samaritan, and the people of Tyre and Sidon. He then marched to the Mediterranean and the island-city of Arwad, and ascended Mt Lebanon where he cut 100 beams of cedar for his palace and temples. Grayson notes that the inscription which records these events is a summary, and that the phrase 'in a single year' is a literary convention, not a chronological statement, for the description summarizes various western campaigns and highlights receipt of tribute from Damascus and Samaria'.⁵⁷

Scholars generally agree that the references to the conquest of Damascus in all three of the above inscriptions belong to the same campaign,⁵⁸ despite the considerable discrepancies in the amounts of tribute allegedly exacted from its

king.⁵⁹ The question is, when did this campaign take place? One of the reasons for uncertainty is that the name of the king of Damascus is not specified. In each of the three texts, he is called Mari', which in Aramaic simply means 'lord'. That is to say, his actual name is concealed beneath the title. I have already referred to this problem in Chapter 8. Here I will simply express my preference for an 803 date for Adad-nirari's conquest of Damascus and an identification of the Damascene king at the time as Hazael. If, however, the Damascus campaign belongs to the same context as the Mansuate campaign (discussed below), then the king called Mari' in the Assyrian texts must be Hazael's son and successor Bar-Hadad II.⁶⁰

The redrawing of the boundary between Arpad and Hamath

Damascus may have briefly submitted to Assyrian overlordship. But it continued to be a significant force within the Syro-Palestinian scene, as illustrated by the leading role Bar-Hadad played in the coalition of forces that laid siege to the northern Hamathite city Hatarikka.⁶¹ The siege is recorded on a monument commonly known as the Zakur stele, which bears an Aramaic inscription of Zakur, king of Hamath and Luash (CS II: 155)⁶² and is circumstantially dated to c.800. Hamath may at this time have been a client-state of Assyria. According to Zakur, the coalition led by Bar-Hadad (identified in the text as 'king of Aram') included a king called Bar-Gush and his army, and the kings of Que (Adanawa), Amuq (Patin, Unqi), Sam'al, Gurgum, Melid (Malatya), Tabal, Ktk(?), and seven kings of Amurru. As indicated in Chapter 8, I believe that Bar-Gush is to be identified with Attar-shumki, king of Arpad (Bit-Agusi).⁶³ (We shall discuss this further below.) Zakur had marched north to meet the enemy, and was blockaded by them in Hatarikka. He claims that with divine support he fought his way out of the city and defeated the coalition. One suspects that Adad-nirari's army actually saved the day for him by relieving the blockade and driving off the enemy forces.

The reason for the combined military action against Zakur is unknown. Various explanations have been offered. The assault may, for example, have been provoked by Zakur's incorporation of Luash within his kingdom, generating concerns in the region that he might seek to expand his territories even further at the expense of his neighbours, Damascus and Arpad in particular. This may also have prompted the action subsequently(?) taken by Adad-nirari, who redefined, through the agency of Shamshi-ilu, the boundaries between the lands of Zakur and Attar-shumki. The new provisions were recorded on the Antakya stele (*RIMA* 3: 203–4), to which we referred briefly in Chapter 8. As we noted there, the redefinition of the frontier appears to have resulted in territorial gains for Attar-shumki—at Zakur's expense. It may seem surprising that Adad-nirari should impose such terms on his loyal client-king Zakur, while rewarding Attar-shumki, who had been one of the most prominent anti-Assyrian leaders in the west. But we cannot be sure where chronologically the

arrangement made in the Antakya document fits in with other events of Adad-nirari's western enterprises. Hawkins sees the new boundary provisions as part of Adad-nirari's preparation for his campaign against Damascus,⁶⁴ Lipiński assigns it to the period before the Arpad-led uprising in 805, in the days when Attar-shumki was still, supposedly, a 'subdued vassal'.⁶⁵ In any case, the Antakya document cannot be earlier than 807/6 since it was only then that Shamshi-ilu was appointed to the post that gave him the authority to act on Adad-nirari's behalf.

I suggest another possible scenario, which would place the document after the events of 805 recorded on the Pazarcık stele, and possibly before the Damascus campaign, for which, as I have noted above, I prefer an 803 date.⁶⁶ The settlement recorded in the document could still have been part of the preparations for Adad-nirari's campaign against Damascus, as Hawkins believes, though he opts for a 796 date for the campaign. The reasons for my suggestion are:

The two main enemies confronting Assyria in the west during Adad-nirari's reign were Attar-shumki and Hazael, king of Damascus. These men had been at the forefront of the coalition that had blockaded Assyria's protégé Zakur in Hatarikka. The coalition had been defeated on this occasion, very likely with assistance from Assyrian troops. But Attar-shumki and Hazael remained powerful influences in their region, and could again provide the nucleus for an attack on Assyrian subject-kingdoms. It was clear that Assyrian interests could never be secure in Syria and Palestine while these men remained on their thrones—or unless at least one of them could be won over to the Assyrian side. To bring about a reconciliation with Attar-shumki was almost certainly the motive behind the new boundary provisions of the Antakya document. His allegiance, or at least his good will, would undoubtedly play a significant role in future Assyrian activities across the Euphrates. In the first place, the substantial territory that Attar-shumki's kingdom covered west of the river gave it considerable strategic significance in Assyrian military enterprises in the region. The cooperation of its ruler in these enterprises would undoubtedly heighten the chances of their success. Secondly, one of Adad-nirari's chief military objectives in Syria-Palestine was the final conquest of Damascus, whose defiance had long been a major obstacle to Assyrian control of the Syro-Palestine states. In the past, Damascus had formed a relatively effective alliance with Hamath against Assyria. Now its partnership with Arpad provided if anything an even more formidable challenge to Assyrian supremacy. But if Attar-shumki could be won over to the Assyrian side, this would in effect detach him from his alliance with Hazael, leaving the latter deprived of his most important ally in the event of an Assyrian expedition against Damascus.

It was in the wake of the abortive coalition attack on Hatarikka, I suggest, that Adad-nirari attempted to bring some stability to the region, particularly

in the neighbouring states of Arpad and Hamath, by the provisions he ordered to be set out on the Antakya stele. Could the arrangements recorded thereon reflect a compromise he made in order to win over Attar-shumki by territorial concessions? If Adad-nirari believed that Assyrian interests were best served in this way, then he may well have decided, finally, that diplomacy rather than military force had the better chance of success in his dealings with Attar-shumki. With the expansion of Arpad's territory westwards, frontier disputes with the neighbouring kingdom of Hamath had become inevitable. The concession of some of Hamath's territory to Attar-shumki could have been sufficient to satisfy the Arpadite ruler for the time being—at least that is what Adad-nirari may have hoped—and win back, if not his allegiance to Assyria, at least his cooperation in maintaining the peace in the region.

All this assumes that we have correctly identified the 'son of Gusi' in the Zakur inscription as Attar-shumki. Lipiński takes issue with this identification. He believes that the 'son of Gusi' was not Attar-shumki but a son of his, called Bar-Hadad, who became the next king of Hamath;⁶⁷ the reason this man was not given his proper name in the inscription was to avoid any possible confusion with Bar-Hadad II, king of Damascus. One of the advantages of identifying Bar-Gush with Attar-shumki's son and successor rather than with Attar-shumki himself is that we would avoid the risk of stretching the latter's reign beyond credibility. Yet if Attar-shumki came to the throne c.830, it is by no means impossible that he continued to be actively involved in military campaigns at the end of the 9th or even the beginning of the 8th century. We can cite at least two instances of Neo-Hittite kings who reigned for three decades or more (Warpalawa, king of Tuwana, and Awariku, king of Adanawa). Besides, we cannot be sure that there actually *was* a king of Bit-Agusi called Bar-Hadad, son of Attar-shumki. The only 'evidence' that such a king existed is confined to a brief inscription which contains a dedication to the god Melqart, carved on a stele found near Aleppo—the so-called Melqart stele. The dedication was made by a king of Aram called Bir-Hadad, son of Attar-hamek: 'The stele which Bir-Hadad the son of Attar-hamek, [] king of Aram, set up for his lord Melqart, to whom he made a vow and who heard his voice' (CS II: 152, transl. W. T. Pitard). Whether or not the subject of the inscription is Attar-shumki's successor in Bit-Agusi is very much open to question. As Pitard points out in his notes to his translation, the name Attar-hamek is possibly but not certainly to be equated with Attar-shumki, and the name Aram was used to designate a number of Aramaean states in Syria and Mesopotamia.

In sum, I suggest that Adad-nirari's territorial concessions to Attar-shumki (identified with Bar-Gush), which in effect extended his kingdom all the way to the Orontes river, were intended to win the Arpadite ruler over to the Assyrian side, or at least to secure his support in maintaining stability in the region. No doubt Zakur did not find the new provisions pleasing. But he had

no choice other than to accept them as the price for the security of his kingdom, albeit now reduced in size, against further enemy attacks. For Adad-nirari, the conclusion of an understanding, if not an actual alliance, with Attar-shumki may have been an important step in his preparations for a final onslaught on the kingdom of Damascus.

The campaign which Adad-nirari conducted ‘as far as Mansuate’ is attested in the Eponym Chronicle (*Epon.* 57), and can be securely dated from the Chronicle to the year 796. Mansuate was located somewhere in western Syria, and was later to become a centre of the Assyrian administration. It is perhaps to be identified with modern Masyaf,⁶⁸ located west of the Orontes and c.50 km south-west of Hamath city. If this location is correct, Mansuate very likely lay in the kingdom of Hamath, well north of Damascus—an argument against linking it with Adad-nirari’s campaign to Damascus. On the basis of its 796 date, the ‘Mansuate’ campaign is the last datable event of Adad-nirari’s reign.

The role of Shamshi-ilu

Appointed commander-in-chief of the army c.807/6,⁶⁹ Shamshi-ilu was to prove one of the most illustrious and long-lived of all officials of the Assyrian crown. He led Assyrian military forces in many theatres of war, and was to serve under no fewer than four Assyrian kings, Adad-nirari III, Shalmaneser IV, Ashur-dan III, and Ashur-nirari V, with a career extending to at least 752 and thus covering more than fifty years. On a number of occasions, he deputized for the reigning king, either as military commander or as the king’s agent in diplomatic resolutions of disputes between neighbouring kingdoms. He also had governors under his command, like Ninurta-bel-usur, governor of Hadatu (Arslan Taş) and Kar-Shalmaneser (Tell Ahmar). The rise of powerful officials like Shamshi-ilu and Dayyan-Ashur before him reflects, in the opinion of a number of scholars, a period or periods of weakness and political fragmentation in the Assyrian kingdom. This assumption, Dalley claims, is based on too limited a view of a phenomenon which is attested both in the Middle Assyrian and the Neo-Assyrian periods.⁷⁰ It is none the less clear that from Shalmaneser III onwards, a number of the major roles traditionally assumed by the kings themselves were assigned to deputies, particularly the post of commander-in-chief of the army. To this post Shalmaneser had appointed Dayyan-Ashur in the final years of his reign. The royal deputies came of necessity to play roles of ever-increasing importance in the kingdom as Assyrian territorial interests grew, as Assyrian kings sought to consolidate their hold upon various regions by non-military means, often in the wake of military conquest, and as the Assyrian kingdom was increasingly drawn into a number of theatres of war simultaneously, with the rise of states like Urartu to the north-east and the breakdown in relations with the Babylonian kingdom in the south.

Absorption by Assyria (8th century)

In the aftermath of Adad-nirari

After Adad-nirari III's death in 783, Assyrian campaigns in the west for the next four decades, during the reigns of Shalmaneser IV, Ashur-dan III, and Ashur-nirari V, were limited to a few sporadic military operations. That they were so few and so limited may reflect further political instability within the heartland of the Assyrian kingdom, and a consequent reduction of Assyrian influence in the west. The revival of Damascus's fortunes may be an indication of this. In 803, Adad-nirari had attacked and conquered Damascus, an event with which, perhaps, the death of the long-reigning Damascene king Hazael is linked. But though undoubtedly weakened by the Assyrian conquest, Damascus under Hazael's son and successor, Bar-Hadad II, was by no means finished. Within a couple of years of his accession, the new king had led a coalition of Syrian states against the Hamathite city Hatarikka. On this occasion, the coalition was defeated. But Bar-Hadad continued to defy Assyrian authority. He later conducted a campaign into the land of Kummuh, far to the north of his kingdom. Here he seized the boundary stone (the so-called Pazarcik stele) set up in 805 by Adad-nirari, defining the frontier between Kummuh and Gurgum. It was an act of no small symbolical importance, for the stele had proclaimed Adad-nirari's victory over an alliance of anti-Assyrian forces, including those led by Attar-shumki, former military partner of the Damascus regime. Bar-Hadad carried the stele back to Damascus in triumph. There it was no doubt publicly displayed, as a taunt to Assyria, and as statement to all the western states that Assyria could now be defied with impunity, and its loyal subjects no longer assured of its protection.

Bar-Hadad's enterprise was very likely prompted by a widening belief that Assyrian authority was on the wane, particularly in the states west of the Euphrates. His invasion of Kummuh and the theft of the boundary stone were provocative acts that could not go unanswered if Assyria were to retain any semblance of authority over its western tributaries. The commander-in-chief Shamshi-ilu eventually did respond. But not until 773, the last year of the reign of Shalmaneser IV, when Bar-Hadad had been replaced on the Damascene

throne by Hadyan II (Hezyon, Assyrian Hadiiani).¹ Shamshi-ilu attacked and conquered Damascus, and took extensive tribute from it, including Hadyan's daughter and a rich dowry. He also retrieved the boundary stone. We know this from an inscription authored by Shamshi-ilu and carved on the reverse of the stone. Shamshi-ilu returned home via Kummuh. The kingdom was still ruled by Suppiluliuma, occupant of its throne when the original document was drawn up. No doubt with great ceremony, Shamshi-ilu restored the stele to its original location, and the former boundary provisions were confirmed (*RIMA* 3: 239–40). It was a clear statement that Assyria's overlordship of the region was still intact. Or so Shamshi-ilu wanted Kummuh and its neighbours to believe. But Assyrian sovereignty remained fragile. It was soon put to the test as another power vied with it for supremacy over the territories lying west of the Euphrates.

Urartu on the move

In eastern Anatolia, in the region around the lakes Van and Urmia, the kingdom of Urartu was developing rapidly. Within a short space of time, the increasingly aggressive military ambitions of its kings would constitute a serious threat to Assyrian territories lying to the north-east, north, and north-west of the Assyrian heartland. The lands and cities of the Urartian region had been consolidated into a united kingdom under Sarduri I in the late 830s. With the combined resources of its constituent parts, the union provided Sarduri and his royal successors with a substantial base for their programmes of territorial expansion. Assyrian and Urartian armies had first clashed when Shalmaneser III had dispatched, under the command of Dayyan-Ashur, a large army to Urartu for a showdown with Sarduri. The Assyrians were victorious on this occasion, but their success proved no more than a temporary setback to Urartu's territorial ambitions. The kingdom's greatest expansion occurred in the reign of Sarduri's grandson Minua (805–788), and under Minua's son and successor Argishti I (787–766) Urartu reached the peak of its political and military power.

For more than a hundred years, Urartu's imperial aspirations led to repeated conflicts with Assyria. The contest between Dayyan-Ashur and Sarduri was but the first of these. Later, an Assyrian army under the command of Shamshi-ilu clashed with the forces of Argishti in the land of Qutu which lay in the western Zagros region. The battle was fought in the mountains of Qutu, and resulted, according to Shamshi-ilu, in a resounding Assyrian victory—though the outcome was probably less conclusive than he claimed. We learn of it from an inscription, authored by Shamshi-ilu himself, carved on two colossal stone lions on the site of Kar-Shalmaneser (Til Barsip) (*RIMA* 3: 232–3).² In the inscription, Shamshi-ilu records his governorship of Qutu (here written Guti), and the lands of Hatti and Namri. Kar-Shalmaneser provided Shamshi-ilu with a base in the Euphrates region, from which he exercised authority as a

regional overlord over a territory perhaps largely coextensive with the former kingdom of Bit-Adini. This kingdom had been absorbed into the Assyrian empire following Shalmaneser III's conquest of it in the mid 9th century. Immediate authority in Kar-Shalmaneser was exercised by a man called Ninurta-bel-usur, under Shamshi-ilu's governance.

Like their Assyrian counterparts, the kings of Urartu, from Minua onwards, sought to expand their territories west of the Euphrates. One of the specific Urartian objectives was the Neo-Hittite kingdom Malatya. The kingdom was invaded first by Minua, c.796, who imposed tribute upon its current ruler (unnamed) (*Hcl* 64, no. 25 IV³), and subsequently by his immediate successors Argishti I in his fourth year, c.784, and Sarduri II, c.760. Sarduri entered Malatya by seizing a crossing on the Euphrates at a place called Tumeshki, an event which he commemorated in an inscription carved on a cliff-face (*Hcl* 130–2, no. 104⁴). Control of this crossing, comments Hawkins, opened the way to the Urartians for their domination of Syria.⁵ Malatya was then ruled by a man called Hilaruada, son of Shahu. For the next seventeen years, it remained subject to Urartu, until in 743 Tiglath-pileser III reasserted Assyrian authority over the region in which it lay with a crushing victory over a military coalition led by Urartu and Arpad (*Tigl. III* 100–1, 132–3).

Prior to the Urartian attacks, we have no information about Malatya in the decades following Shalmaneser III, who had imposed tributary-status upon the kingdom. It may have remained a tributary, in at least a token sense, up to the time of the Urartian invasions. On the other hand, the lack of any indication that these invasions provoked a response from Assyria may indicate that Malatya was at this time independent of it—perhaps a reflection of Assyria's declining power beyond its core territories after Adad-nirari's death. This raises the question of how far the authority of Shamshi-ilu, who claimed the title of 'governor of the land of Hatti', really did extend. It seems not to have included the kingdom of Carchemish which lay just a few kilometres to the north of his administrative seat at Kar-Shalmaneser. At least two of the rulers of Carchemish known from their Luwian inscriptions, Yariri and Kamani, must have occupied their kingdom's throne while Shamshi-ilu presided over Assyria's western territories.⁶ The likelihood is that these rulers were independent of the Assyrian administration, and enjoyed peaceful and probably cordial relations with it. So too in subsequent years, the absence of any reference to Carchemish among the western members of the Urartian–Arpad alliance formed against Assyria suggests that while Carchemish continued to be independent of Assyria, it remained apart from Urartu and its western allies.

In addition to Shamshi-ilu's Damascus campaign in 773, a number of military operations were undertaken by Adad-nirari's successors in attempts to restore or bolster Assyrian authority in the west. Two years before the Damascus operation, Shalmaneser IV conducted an expedition to the 'Cedar

Mountain' in Lebanon, and in 772 the new king, Ashur-dan III, led a campaign against Hatarikka, and further campaigns against the city in 765 and 755 (*Epon.* 58, 59). The Eponym Chronicle entry for 758 reports Ashur-dan's suppression of a rebellion in the Aramaean land of Guzana, in north-western Mesopotamia. Guzana had been annexed to Assyria by Ashurnasirpal II, but continued to enjoy a high degree of autonomy under a local dynasty, and was conquered afresh by Adad-nirari III in 808.

The Arpad problem

Assyrian armies undoubtedly had their successes in the western campaigns conducted by their kings between Adad-nirari III's death and the accession of Tiglath-pileser III. But their victories had no lasting effect on the lands their leaders claim to have subjugated, or re-subjugated. What authority the Assyrians did exercise across the Euphrates remained tenuous. The kingdom of Arpad was largely responsible for this. Arpad had become a formidable power in the Syrian region during the 9th century, when it had engaged in several contests with the Assyrians. Not only was it a force to be reckoned with in its own right, it had also significantly destabilized Assyrian authority in the west by acting as a focus for anti-Assyrian activities in the region. This was illustrated by its leadership of the coalition that confronted the Assyrians in the battle of Paqarhubunu in 805. I have referred in Chapter 11 to what I believe was an attempt by Adad-nirari III to resolve the Arpad problem by diplomatic means—giving its ruler Attar-shumki a part of the kingdom of Hamath in a redefinition of the boundaries between Arpad and Hamath. The Assyrian 'diplomatic initiative' was perhaps undertaken in an attempt to satisfy Arpad's territorial ambitions in the region.

Whether or not this was Adad-nirari's actual intention, Arpad may have abandoned its anti-Assyrian activities for the time being. We hear no more of it from Assyrian records until 754, when it was the object of a campaign by the new Assyrian king Ashur-nirari V (*Epon.* 59), a year after his father Ashur-dan III's third expedition against Hatarikka. These campaigns may indicate that a new anti-Assyrian coalition was taking shape in northern Syria.⁷ If so, it almost certainly had the support of Urartu, which was seeking to extend its influence and authority beyond the Euphrates into the northern Syrian and south-eastern Anatolian territories that were, or had been, tributary to Assyria. Arpad's and Urartu's ambitions in the west may ultimately have been conflicting ones. But for the moment, the two kingdoms were apparently prepared to join forces to rid themselves of a common enemy.

Within such a context, the campaigns of Ashur-dan and Ashur-nirari were no doubt intended to crush any movements towards a new anti-Assyrian alliance, by demonstrating that Assyria could still mount an effective military presence in the region in response to hostile action against it by the western states. Their military operations also gave notice to Urartu that Assyria had no

intention of slackening its hold over these states. At least, that is the impression Adad-nirari's successors might have sought to convey, irrespective of their actual capacity to maintain their authority in the west against a powerful and determined enemy. There were important strategic reasons for the Assyrians to remain militarily active in the west. But sporadic campaigns in the region, whether by the kings themselves or by their commander-in-chief Shamshi-ilu, had at best only a temporary effect in bringing recalcitrant states to heel. In any case, these campaigns seem to have been very specific in their targets—Damascus, Hatarikka, Arpad etc.—in contrast to the comprehensive operations conducted across the Euphrates by Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III. The weakness of the Assyrian regimes in the first half of the 8th century, coupled with the need for protecting Assyria's core territories against Urartian attacks in the east, must have been major factors preventing any large-scale western operations by the Assyrians, certainly on a regular basis, during this period. There was a clear need for such operations. But the risks in committing the substantial resources that were required to ensure their success were enormous. That was the essential dilemma facing Adad-nirari's successors.

We have no details from Assyrian records of Ashur-nirari's campaign against Arpad in 754, or its outcome, but it appears from Urartian records that the Urartian king Sarduri II joined the conflict, and allegedly inflicted a crushing defeat on the Assyrian army.⁸ According to K. Radner, the victory Sarduri claimed was 'quite clearly a disaster for Assyria', and 'for the next years, the troops did not leave the kingdom's borders . . .'.⁹ Sarduri may well have won a victory over Ashur-nirari at this time, though we have no evidence that the engagement had disastrous or long-lasting consequences for Assyria. But concern about an alliance between Arpad and Urartu may have persuaded Ashur-nirari to end hostilities with Arpad by diplomatic means. His campaign was followed by a treaty, or more strictly a 'loyalty-oath', which he drew up with Mati'ilu, Arpad's current ruler, (great-?) grandson of Attar-shumki I and son and successor of a second Attar-shumki (*ARAB* I §§749–60). From the various strictures which the oath contains, and the various curses to be inflicted on Mati'ilu and his family and his nobles if any of the oaths were violated, there is no doubt that Ashur-nirari was the superior partner in the pact and that Mati'ilu had the status of a subject. What the oaths were that Mati'ilu actually swore remain unknown. But it is clear that they bound Mati'ilu in unconditional loyalty to his Assyrian overlord, and that he was thus precluded from forming alliances with any other states.

It may be that one of the states Ashur-nirari had in mind was Damascus, with which Mati'ilu's grandfather Attar-shumki had allied himself against Hamath. Damascus no longer had the military muscle it had once exercised, and had suffered a substantial defeat in 773 at the hands of the Assyrian commander Shamshi-ilu. But it could still join with other states in an anti-

Assyrian coalition, and indeed was later to do just that. So one of the purposes of the pact may have been to ensure that Arpad remained apart from states such as Damascus. But almost certainly, Ashur-nirari's prime purpose in the terms he imposed upon Mati'ilu was to isolate him from Urartu. The king may have reasoned that a diplomatic settlement with Mati'ilu had better prospects of keeping Urartu out of the picture than more aggressive action, which would have proved counterproductive if Mati'ilu were thereby prompted to ally or re-ally himself with the Urartian king.

We also have another diplomatic pact to which Mati'ilu was one of the signatories, a treaty, or 'loyalty-oath', drawn up between him and a man called Bar-Ga'ya, king of the land called Ktk (*CS II*: 213–17), and preserved in the so-called Sefire inscriptions (see Chapter 8). It is clear from this document, which belongs to the period prior to Tiglath-pileser's conquest of Arpad in 740, that Mati'ilu was again the inferior of the two treaty-partners, and that the conditions of the document were imposed by the Assyrian king. It is also clear that Mati'ilu's treaty-partner Bar-Ga'ya benefited from the arrangement. As I indicated in Chapter 8, the identity of Bar-Ga'ya's country Ktk remains problematical. The king's name is of no help, since it is otherwise unattested, and it may in fact be an 'Aramaic surname (like Bar-Hadad and Bar-Gush) which masks the identity of a known dynast'.¹⁰ Ktk evidently lay close to, and probably bordered upon, the kingdom of Arpad. One would expect that it was a country of some significance, given that it appears in the treaty as the superior partner of the major state, Arpad. This has led to the suggestion (among other highly unlikely possibilities) that it is somehow to be identified with the kingdom of Hamath, or at least with one of its northern territories. But the identity of the kingdom remains a matter for speculation.

Ashur-nirari's attempts to retain Mati'ilu's loyalty through diplomatic settlements were in the long term of no avail. Probably soon after his overlord's death in 746, the Arpadite king stirred the northern Syrian and south-eastern Anatolian states to rebellion against Assyrian rule—with the support of Assyria's most formidable enemy, Urartu.

Which brings us to the reign of Tiglath-pileser III.

The early challenges of Tiglath-pileser's reign

Tiglath-pileser ascended the Assyrian throne in 745, following a rebellion in the city of Kalhu (Nimrud), which he had certainly supported.¹¹ Known to us from a brief reference in the Eponym Chronicle (*Epon.* 59), this uprising came at what was to prove a turning-point in Assyrian history. The circumstances of the new king's accession have not been recorded, and there are two conflicting versions of his parentage; one makes him a son of Adad-nirari (III), the other of Ashur-nirari (V).¹² In either case, he is represented as a member of the same dynastic line as his predecessors. But Grayson has doubts, suggesting



Fig. 13. Tiglath-pileser III (courtesy, British Museum).

that Tiglath-pileser was a usurper, who took advantage of the chaotic times to stage a *coup d'état* and win the Assyrian crown for himself.¹³

The royal house may well have needed an injection of fresh blood to reverse Assyria's decline as an international power. Had it not been for Tiglath-pileser, there was every prospect that the kingdom, divided by internal political problems and under increasing pressure from outside forces, would have faded into obscurity, as it had done in the decades following the reign of the Old Assyrian king Shamshi-Adad I. Nor was it an entirely remote possibility that Assyria itself would have fallen to the still youthful but increasingly aggressive kingdom of Urartu. The first rulers of this kingdom had already swept across northern Mesopotamia and established for a time sovereignty over two former Assyrian tributaries west of the Euphrates, Malatya and Kummuh. Other rulers in the region no doubt considered afresh where their best interests lay. While several of them appear to have held to their Assyrian allegiance as their overlords found it increasingly difficult to maintain their authority in the region, others had virtually abandoned all ties to Assyria. They

had done so with little fear of retaliation, to judge from the small number of recorded campaigns which Tiglath-pileser's predecessors had conducted west of the Euphrates. But they may have had good reason to fear that the weakening grasp of their former overlord was leaving a power vacuum in their region which a vigorous new overlord from the east could be eager to fill.

We are left with the imponderable question of how far the power of Urartu might have extended through Syria had there been no resurgence of Assyrian power in the last half of the 8th century. It is possible that Urartian kings would not have sought to penetrate the region as deeply as Assyrian kings had done, despite the prospects which its states and cities offered for plunder and tribute-gathering. Urartu was more remote than Assyria from the western Syrian states, and because of its location the logistical challenges of conducting major military operations in Assyria's traditional plundering fields up to and along the Mediterranean coast were so much the greater. Arpad was much closer to hand. It had become a force to be reckoned with in Syria ever since its throne had been occupied by Attar-shumki I, in the late 9th century. Despite the several setbacks it had suffered during its conflicts with Assyria, it had assumed a prominent, indeed leading, role in Syrian affairs, and its position had been considerably strengthened by its links with Urartu. Arpad may well have seen itself as the new overlord of the Syrian region, when there was no longer an Assyrian presence there.

Urartu may have been more intent on expanding its power directly to the west, beyond Malatya and Kummuh, into the south-central Anatolian region where the kingdoms of Tabal were located. As far as we can tell, these kingdoms had long since thrown off any semblance of Assyrian sovereignty. One of them, the kingdom we have called 'Tabal Proper', was now ruled by a certain Wasusarma, who seems to have regarded himself as a regional supremo, claiming the grandiose title 'Great King', as had his father before him. With Assyrian authority over Tabal and its neighbours now, apparently, a thing of the past, the Urartians may have seen opportunities for imposing their own authority upon the region. But if this was the direction in which their ambitions were leading them, a potential obstacle stood in their path, in the form of another newly emerging power—the kingdom of Phrygia, soon to reach its full potential in the reign of the king called Mita.

Tiglath-pileser was fully aware of the problems facing his kingdom on his accession, and may well have been prompted to seize the throne in a bid to resolve them. He soon gave clear notice of his intentions to reclaim Assyria's subject territories by launching, in the second year of his reign, an attack upon the land of Namri (*Tigl. III* 164–5). Located in the upper Diyala valley on the western fringes of the Zagros mountains, Namri had a long history of hostility to Assyria and resistance to Assyrian overlordship. It became Tiglath-pileser's first major military objective. The land was thoroughly and brutally subjugated, and other recalcitrant subjects east of the Euphrates quickly accepted or

were forced into submission. Once more, the Assyrians could turn their attention westwards.

The ashes of Namri's cities were barely cold when Tiglath-pileser assembled his forces, in 743, for a campaign across the Euphrates. Here, an Urartian-Arpad led military alliance presented the most formidable challenge to his bid to re-establish Assyrian authority in the west. The alliance, led by Sarduri II of Urartu and Mati'ilu of Arpad, counted the Neo-Hittite kings of Malatya (Sulumal), Gurgum (Tarhulara), and Kummuh (Kushtashpi) among its members. It may be that not all the participants were wholehearted in their commitment to the anti-Assyrian cause. To be sure, Gurgum had a long history of defiance of Assyrian authority. But Kummuh seems to have enjoyed favoured status as an Assyrian subject prior to its subjection to Urartu, which came about when Sarduri attacked it and forced the submission of its king Kushtashpi (c.750 or later).¹⁴ It probably fought on the coalition's side through compulsion rather than choice. (Tiglath-pileser makes reference in his inscriptions to Kushtashpi as a faithful vassal, not a rebel; *Tigl. III* 168.) Malatya's king too may have been compelled to join the alliance. In any case, Tiglath-pileser reports a resounding victory over the anti-Assyrian forces, in a battle fought within Kummuh's territory. According to this report, Sarduri was decisively defeated, and withdrew to Urartu (*Tigl. III* 100–1, 124–5, 132–3). Eight years later, in 735, Tiglath-pileser would confront Sarduri again, this time on Sarduri's home territory.¹⁵

In the aftermath of the Assyrian victory, the kings of Malatya, Gurgum, and Kummuh gave themselves up to Tiglath-pileser. All were pardoned, and were subsequently listed among the king's tributaries (*Tigl. III* 68–9). But Arpad had yet to be subdued. Though the Assyrians had conquered much of his territory, Mati'ilu was still at large and his capital still intact. Tiglath-pileser placed the city under siege. Its capture was vital to Assyrian interests. But the city held out against its attackers for three years. We do not know the details, since the only record we have of its siege and capture is provided by a terse statement in the Eponym Chronicle (*Epon.* 59). Tiglath-pileser must have reported his victory in a section of his Annals which is now missing, and which no doubt included an account of what happened to Mati'ilu. After the city fell, he may have escaped his conqueror and taken refuge in the mountains, as other fugitives from Assyrian authority had done. Or he may have fallen into Assyrian hands and been executed or deported. One thing clear is that he was not restored to his throne. Tiglath-pileser had other plans for his kingdom. It became the first of the western states to be brought directly under Assyrian control—by being converted into an Assyrian province, with the name Arpad. This meant the installation of an Assyrian governor in the region, and very likely the deportation of part of its population with replacement settlers brought from other parts of the Assyrian empire.

The provincialization process

Already in the first years of his reign Tiglath-pileser may have set his sights firmly on the incorporation of the regions west of the Euphrates into his kingdom, as provinces. The defeat of Sarduri in the land of Kummuh and Sarduri's subsequent return home, along with the reduction of Arpad to provincial status, effectively paved the way for this. But the western states gained a brief respite when Tiglath-pileser suddenly found himself confronted with a crisis in the east. News came that an army from the land of Ulluba was preparing to invade Assyrian territory across its north-eastern frontier. We know this from an inscribed rock relief, discovered at a place called Mila Mergi, which records a campaign conducted by Tiglath-pileser against Ulluba in 739, in response to the planned invasion of Assyrian territory by Ulluba (*Tigl. III* 111–16).¹⁶ The site of the inscription enables us to fix Ulluba's location near the Assyrian frontier c.100 km north of the royal city Nineveh. If Ulluba and its allies had succeeded in occupying Assyrian territory in this region, enemy forces would thus have been within striking distance of Assyria's heartland—a prospect made more dangerous by the likelihood that Ulluba had the backing of its powerful neighbour Urartu. Despite the apparent drubbing Tiglath-pileser had delivered to Sarduri four years earlier, the Urartian king's determination to destroy his rival remained as fierce as ever.

Tiglath-pileser's campaign against Ulluba ended successfully, and in accordance with his policy of establishing more permanent authority over the conquered territories, he converted Ulluba into an Assyrian province (*Tigl. III* 166–7). It was to play an important role as a buffer-zone on Assyria's north-eastern frontier—particularly as a means of strengthening the region against an invasion by Urartu. But Tiglath-pileser had to return three years later, in 736, for a further campaign against Ulluba, to bring about the complete subjugation of the land and all its cities. He set up a provincial capital called Ashur-iqisha (*Tigl. III* 124–7), expanded the province's territories by the addition of a number of cities to it, and increased its population by resettling within its borders deportees from his western conquests (*Tigl. III* 62–3).

We see here a particular instance of the provincialization process—that is to say, the conversion of subject territories formerly ruled by local tributary kings into Assyrian provinces directly ruled by Assyrian officials. This was the chief means used by Tiglath-pileser and his successors to consolidate their hold upon the conquered lands. Large numbers of the populations of these lands were deported and resettled in other parts of the Assyrian realm, far from their homeland, their numbers often replaced by deportees from other regions.¹⁷ This policy had the effect of radically changing the demographics of a region, in the process destroying many of the traditional local allegiances which had generated resistance to Assyrian overlordship. As in the case of Ulluba, a

former independent or quasi-independent state converted into an Assyrian province might have its boundaries changed and often expanded, to take in neighbouring territories which became part of the new province. Grayson comments that Tiglath-pileser's massive resettlement project was designed 'to bring peace and security to his western and northern frontiers with Urartu. Groups of people were shunted back and forth, and Assyrian contingents carried out raids in Babylonia to capture Aramaeans, who were removed to the newly-formed provinces in Syria.'¹⁸

The earliest application of this policy to a Neo-Hittite kingdom occurred in 738, the year following Tiglath-pileser's first campaign against Ulluba. Perhaps taking advantage of the Assyrian king's preoccupation with this campaign on his north-eastern frontier, the ruler of Patin, a man called Tutammu in Assyrian records, severed his ties with Assyria by breaking his loyalty-oaths (*Tigl. III* 56–7). Tiglath-pileser responded swiftly. He conducted a campaign against Patin in the same year, seized its royal city Kinalua, and deported its king (or executed him¹⁹) and large numbers of his former subjects. The latter were distributed along with captured livestock among Tiglath-pileser's troops. Other spoils of conquest included precious and commodity metals, fine garments, all types of herbs, and the furnishings of Tutammu's palace. Tiglath-pileser marked his victory by setting up his throne in the palace. Patin was converted into an Assyrian province with the name Kullani(a) (a dialectical variant of Kinalua), and placed under the immediate authority of an Assyrian




Fig. 14. Attack by Tiglath-pileser's army on a city perhaps in Syria. (c.728, from Central Palace, Nimrud) (courtesy, British Museum).

governor. Deportees from the Assyrian king's eastern conquests were now settled in the cities of the former kingdom.

Around the time of his Patin campaign, Tiglath-pileser received word that rebellion had broken out in Hamath. Prior to this, we hear little of Hamath following the unsuccessful Damascus-led attack on its northern stronghold Hatarikka c.800. Like Patin, it may have remained within the Assyrian fold until Tiglath-pileser's reign, taking no part in the anti-Assyrian uprisings of the preceding decades. We have noted the suggestion that the land called Ktk in the Sefire inscriptions was in fact the kingdom of Hamath, or at least a part of it. If so, the contents of the inscriptions would reinforce the view that Hamath retained its allegiance to Assyria during the period of the alleged weakness of the central Assyrian regime, and was rewarded for its loyalty at the expense of its powerful neighbour Arpad. The first clear indication of new problems in Hamath came in 738 with the insurrection of a man called Azriyau, not otherwise known in our sources.

As reported by Tiglath-pileser (*Tigl. III* 62–3), the insurrection involved nineteen districts of Hamath, which included the coastal cities of the land, and the city Hatarikka. These districts were 'in rebellion seized for Azriyau' (transl. Tadmor). The context is not clear, but it is possible that Azriyau's rebellion was directed in the first instance against Hamath's current ruler Eni'ilu,²⁰ an apparently loyal subject of Assyria. The uprising might have sprung from an attempt by the northern regions formerly belonging to the land of Luash (before their incorporation into Hamath), to re-establish their independence. Azriyau would thus have been the leader of a breakaway 'northern kingdom' seeking to detach itself from the Hamathite regime and, as a consequence, its Assyrian overlord. But its cause ended in failure. Tiglath-pileser made short work of the rebels, with or without Eni'ilu's support, and annexed the conquered territories to Assyria, installing eunuch governors over them. Two new Assyrian provinces were thus created – Simirra, a district and city located on the Levantine coast, and Hatarikka, once the capital of Luash (*Tigl. III* 186–7). The organization of the northern part of Hamath into these provinces probably reduced the Hamathite kingdom to the territories that had belonged to it prior to Zakur's reign. Tiglath-pileser may have decided to leave this southern region as an independent kingdom, in recognition of its ruler's loyalty. A population exchange took place between the newly created Assyrian provinces, with settlers from Tusha in the upper Tigris region relocated there, and deportees from the conquered western states deported to Ulluba (*Tigl. III* 62–3).

Tiglath-pileser's tributaries

Perhaps shortly before his campaigns in 738 against Patin and the northern lands of Hamath, Tiglath-pileser made a survey of all the western rulers who were subject to his authority. Two versions of this survey survive—*Tigl.*

III 68–9 and 106–9.²¹ The western tributary-kings and the lands they ruled are listed in the following order:

Kushtashpi of Kummuh
Rezin of Damascus
Menahem of Samaria
Tuba'il of Tyre
Sibitba'il of Byblos
Urik of Que
Sulumal of Melid
Uassurme of Tabal
Ushhiti of Atuna
Urballa of Tuhana
Tuhame of Ishtundi
Uirimi of Hubishna
Dadi-il of Kaska
Pisiri of Carchemish
(Eni'ilu of Hamath)²²
Panammu of [Sa]m'al
Tarhulara of [Gur]gum
Zabibe, queen of the Arabs

The list represents a stocktaking exercise by Tiglath-pileser of the names of all the western lands and kingdoms which were, or had become, subject to him, probably following his final conquest of Arpad and its reorganization as an Assyrian province in 740. It serves as a particularly useful source of information for scholars today since it indicates in fairly precise detail the extent of Assyrian authority in the west in the early years of Tiglath-pileser's reign. From it, we can compile a comprehensive catalogue of all states west of the Euphrates which were subject to Tiglath-pileser—with the addition of (a) Arpad, which in 740 had become the first of the western states to be converted into an Assyrian province, (b) the lands of Patin and Hamath, over which Assyrian authority had been re-established by the end of 738, and (c) Masuwari on the Euphrates' east bank. It will be useful at this point to review briefly what we know of the history of the various states and peoples which make up the list in the decades leading up to Tiglath-pileser's assertion of his authority over them. We do not know the reasons for the order in which the names are presented.²³ But I will group them below according to the regions where they were located. Names preceded by an asterisk (*) are those of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms.

REGION A: ASSYRIAN SUBJECT-STATES IN NORTHERN SYRIA AND SOUTH-EASTERN ANATOLIA, WESTWARDS FROM THE EUPHRATES TO THE AMANUS AND ANTI-TAURUS RANGES²⁴

**Malatya (current ruler Sulumal)* The location of Malatya's capital west of the Euphrates made the city an excellent transit-base for Urartian armies proceeding across northern Mesopotamia into northern Syria and from there into the regions west of the anti-Taurus range. As we have noted, Malatya was invaded by three Urartian kings, Minua, Argishti I, and Sarduri II. Its only ruler attested in that period was a man called Hilaruada who occupied his throne during Argishti's and Sarduri's campaigns, and was forced to accept Urartian overlordship when Sarduri invaded his kingdom in 753 or 752 (*Hcl* 116–17, no. 102). Malatya's participation in the Urartian–Arpad alliance that fought Tiglath-pileser ten years later, in 743, was very likely a consequence of its subjection to Urartu rather than a decision freely made by its king. In any case, Tiglath-pileser's victory brought Malatya back firmly under Assyrian control. Its king Sulumal was retained by Tiglath-pileser as his vassal ruler.

**Kummuh (current ruler Kushtashpi)* During the middle decades of the 8th century, Kummuh assumed particular strategic importance for Assyria as a buffer against Urartian encroachment south along the west bank of the Euphrates, following Malatya's subjection to Urartu. But Kummuh also fell to the Urartians, and like Malatya became part of the Urartian–Arpad alliance that confronted Tiglath-pileser III in 743. At that time, a man called Kush-tashpi occupied Kummuh's throne. Kushtashpi may have had no option but to fight on the side of the alliance after the Urartian king Sarduri II had invaded his land and imposed his sovereignty upon him. Following his defeat of the alliance, Tiglath-pileser reinstated Kushtashpi on the throne of Kummuh, thus restoring his kingdom to Assyrian sovereignty.

**Carchemish (current ruler Pisiri)* The decades preceding the accession of Tiglath-pileser III witnessed one of the peak periods in the history of Carchemish, particularly during the reigns of Yariri and Kamani, who can be dated, on the basis of their inscribed monuments, to the first half of the 8th century. Carchemish appears to have been independent of Assyria in this period, and to have played no role in any military activities or alliances against it. It perhaps remained independent until the early years of Tiglath-pileser III's reign, when tributary status was imposed by Tiglath-pileser on its current ruler Pisiri.²⁵

**Masuwari/Til Barsip (modern Tell Ahmar)* Following Shalmaneser III's seizure of the small city-kingdom located on the east bank of the Euphrates, called by the Luwian name Masuwari and subsequently by the Aramaean name Til Barsip, the city had in 856 been renamed Kar-Shalmaneser by Shalmaneser. Henceforth, it served as an important centre of the Assyrian administration in the west. It became the seat of the commander-in-chief

Shamshi-ilu, and was still, apparently, under Assyrian control at the time of Tiglath-pileser III's accession. In Tiglath-pileser's reign, the region became a province in its own right, with the original Aramaean name Til Barsip restored.

Arpad (within the region earlier attested as Bit-Agusi; deposed last ruler Mati'ilu) Arpad was the most powerful state west of the Euphrates in the 8th century, and the most formidable threat to Assyrian authority in northern Syria. Its defiance of this authority became explicit in the reign of its king Attar-shumki I, who led a coalition army against Adad-nirari III in 805 in the battle of Paqarhubunu, and subsequently participated in the attack led by Damascus's king Bar-Hadad II against Assyria's client-ruler(?) Zakur, king of Hamath c.800. Though Adad-nirari may have attempted a diplomatic settlement with Attar-shumki, Arpad under its next rulers, Bar-Hadad(?) and Attar-shumki II, continued to stir up opposition against Assyria among the northern Syrian and eastern Anatolian states. Its alliance with Urartu at the head of anti-Assyrian coalition forces, after an ultimately ineffective treaty or 'loyalty-oath' which Ashur-nirari V imposed on Attar-shumki II's son and successor Mati'ilu, put at threat all of Assyria's western territories. Understandably, Arpad became a prime target for Assyrian retaliation in the campaigns mounted by Tiglath-pileser III early in his reign. It was the first of the western states to be converted into an Assyrian province following Tiglath-pileser's seizure of its capital after a three-year siege.

Kaska (current ruler Dadi-ilu) Dadi-ilu appears in the list of Tiglath-pileser's tributaries for the years 738 and 732.²⁶ Hawkins comments that the Kaska so mentioned were apparently a late representative of the Late Bronze Age Kaska people, Hatti's unruly Pontic neighbours; at this time, they may have been located in the Taurus region north of the Malatya–Tabal route.²⁷

**Gurgum (current ruler Tarhulara)* Gurgum was probably a member of the anti-Assyrian coalition led by Attar-shumki I and defeated by Adad-nirari III in 805, and undoubtedly a member of the coalition led by the Damascene king Bar-Hadad II against Hatarikka c.800. Its subsequent history is unknown, up to the time when a Gurgumean king called Tarhulara in Assyrian records joined the Urartu–Arpad led coalition against Tiglath-pileser in 743. The Assyrian king claims to have destroyed one hundred of Tarhulara's cities, but spared the royal capital in response to a plea from Tarhulara, whom he reinstated on his throne as an Assyrian vassal (*Tigl. III* 102–3). Tarhulara reappears among Tiglath-pileser's tributary kings in 732 (*Tigl. III* 170–1), and continued to occupy his throne until c.711, well into the reign of Tiglath-pileser's second successor Sargon II. But he was forced by Tiglath-pileser to hand over a significant portion of his territory to his southern neighbour Panamuwa II, king of Sam'al (*TSSI II*: 14, 15, *CS II*: 160).

Sam'al (current ruler Panamuwa II) Sam'al had first appeared in Assyrian records when its king Hayyanu joined the coalition of states which confronted Shalmaneser III on his first western campaign in 858. Subsequently, it became a tributary of Assyria, and its rulers, from Hayyanu's son Kilamuwa onwards, appear to have cultivated close links with Assyria. Some time after Kilamuwa's reign, Sam'al's throne was occupied by a man called Qarli, perhaps the founder of a new dynasty. Qarli was succeeded by his son Panamuwa I, whose long, peaceful, and apparently prosperous reign indicates that it was left undisturbed by external enemies. It remained beyond the reach of the Urartian kings who had subjected the Euphrates states Malatya and Kummuh, and it apparently took no part in any alliance either on the side of the Assyrians or their enemies. This was the situation around the middle of the 8th century, when the kingdom was destabilized by internal strife, resulting in the assassination of Panamuwa's first successor Bar-Sur c.745. His throne was seized by a usurper whose name has not survived in our records. However, Panamuwa, the son of the murdered king, and grandson of the first Sam'alian king so named, successfully appealed to Tiglath-pileser for support. At the instigation of the Assyrian king, the usurper was killed and Panamuwa was installed on his kingdom's throne. The new king became one of Tiglath-pileser's staunchest supporters. He was killed in 732, fighting on the Assyrian side in the siege of Damascus. The succession passed to his son Bar-Rakib, who was to rule as a loyal Assyrian subject until his death c.713.

REGION B: ASSYRIAN SUBJECT-TERRITORIES IN THE ORONTES REGION AND PALESTINE

**Patin (Assyrian Unqi; current and last independent ruler Tutammu)* Assyrian texts provide almost all our written sources of information about Patin and its rulers. We have no information at all about the kingdom between the time the Assyrian commander-in-chief Dayyan-Ashur appointed a man called Sasi as its new ruler in Shalmaneser III's twenty-eighth regnal year, 831, and Tiglath-pileser III's seizure of the kingdom from its current ruler Tutammu in 738. After Tutammu's removal, Tiglath-pileser converted his kingdom into a province, now named Kullannia, under the immediate authority of an Assyrian governor (*Tigl. III* 56–9; *Epon.* 59). Patin was the first of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms to be incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system. Its absence from Tiglath-pileser's 738 tributary list may indicate that it had not yet been subdued at the time the list was drawn up. Alternatively, it had already been conquered, and was no longer a tributary state with its own local king, but an integral part of the Assyrian provincial system.

**Hamath (current ruler Eni'ilu)* Eni'ilu occupied the throne of Hamath from at least 738, when he appears as a tributary of Tiglath-pileser (*Tigl. III* 68–9). Two new Assyrian provinces, Simirra and Hatarikka, were created from the lands in northern Hamath following Tiglath-pileser's victory over the nineteen

districts that had rebelled against him in support of a man called Azriyau. But the rest of Hamath was left as an Assyrian client-kingdom under Eni'ilu, who is still attested as a tributary of Tiglath-pileser in the 732 tribute list (*Tigl. III* 170–1). The kingdom apparently continued until 721 when a rebellion led by its last king, Yaubidi, was crushed by Sargon II. Hamath henceforth became an Assyrian province.

Damascus (current ruler Rasyan, Rahianu, OT Rezin) Despite Adad-nirari III's conquest of it in 803, Damascus remained an aggressive power in Syria-Palestine, as attested by its leading role in the attack on the northern Hamathite city Hatarikka c.800. It was conquered again by the Assyrians in 773, but to judge from 2 Kings 14:28, it may subsequently have become a subject-state of the Israelite king Jeroboam II (c.770). It later regained its independence, and remained free of foreign control until it once more became an Assyrian tributary, in 738, under Tiglath-pileser. Its ruler Rasyan may have submitted voluntarily to Tiglath-pileser following the latter's defeat of the Hamathite rebel Azriyau. But six years later, Rasyan led his kingdom in another anti-Assyrian rebellion, at the head of a coalition whose members included Israel, Tyre, and Philistia. Tiglath-pileser inflicted a decisive defeat upon the coalition's forces, then attacked and stormed Damascus, captured and executed Rasyan, and converted his kingdom into an Assyrian province. We shall consider this episode, and its outcome, in more detail below.

Tyre and Byblos Tyre and Byblos had apparently been tributaries of Assyria (perhaps spasmodically) from 845, the year when Shalmaneser III engaged for the final time the anti-Assyrian coalition that had first confronted him eight years earlier. Qarqar on the Orontes river had been the site of the confrontations. In 738, the ruler of Tyre was a man called Tuba'il, of Byblos a man called Sibitbu'il (Sibittibi'il). Though Tyre had shortly afterwards joined the rebel coalition led by the Damascene king Rasyan against Tiglath-pileser, both cities seem otherwise to have accepted their tributary role, and as far as we know remained subject to Assyria until the fall of the empire at the end of the 7th century. There are records of a 7th-century king of Tyre called Baal who led rebellions of his countrymen against Assyrian rule in the reigns of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.

Samaria (current king Menahem) From c.870, Samaria had been the political centre of power in Israel under a line of kings beginning with Omri. In the late 9th–early 8th century, it appears among the western states conquered and made tributary by Adad-nirari III (*RIMA* 3: 213). According to 2 Kings 15:14, Menahem, Israel's ruler during Tiglath-pileser's reign, had seized his throne by murdering its previous occupant Shallum. Further information about Menahem's status as one of Tiglath-pileser's tributaries is provided by 2 Kings 15:19–20, which reports that when the Assyrian king (called by his Babylonian throne name Pul) invaded his land, Menahem gave him a

thousand talents of silver 'to gain his support and strengthen his own hold upon his kingdom'; the funds were extracted from the wealthy inhabitants of the land, at the rate of fifty shekels of silver per head. Pocketing the tribute, Tiglath-pileser withdrew from the land, leaving it intact. Menahem reigned for approximately ten years, and his kingdom appears to have remained tributary to Assyria until its rebellion against Assyrian rule in 722 and 721, which resulted in the end of the kingdom of Israel.

Zabibe, queen of the Arabs This, the only reference we have to an Arabian queen called Zabibe, belongs within the context of agreements which both the Assyrians and the Babylonians made with Arabian nomads 'to maintain important trade routes across the northern Arabian peninsula and to provide auxiliary forces on the borders of the empire'.²⁸ Whatever the precise nature of the arrangements he made with Zabibe, Tiglath-pileser regarded these as justifying her inclusion among his list of tributaries. Mitchell comments that (Queen) Samsi, Zabibe's probable successor, 'may plausibly be seen as queen by virtue of some religious role, of loosely knit tribal groups whose seasonal movements brought them in the summer months as far north as the area to the east of Damascus'.²⁹ The same comment might apply just as well to Zabibe. The arrangement very likely was that the Arabian traders would be left unmolested by the Assyrians, and perhaps also afforded some protection by them, in exchange for a portion of their trade goods, which might be classified as 'tribute'.³⁰

REGION C: ASSYRIAN SUBJECT-STATES ON THE ANATOLIAN PLATEAU AND SOUTH-EASTERN ANATOLIAN COAST

The reign of Tiglath-pileser saw the first significant extension of Assyrian influence and authority west of the anti-Taurus, into the region called Tabal, since the days of Shalmaneser III. Following Shalmaneser's reign, the states of south-central Anatolia appear to have been left untouched by the Assyrians until Tiglath-pileser's accession. In the intervening century, the amalgamation of a number of the Tabalian kingdoms must have occurred. Shalmaneser records twenty to twenty-four kings of Tabal among his tributaries. A century later, there were perhaps no more than five or six. This figure is based primarily on Tiglath-pileser's record of the five kings of the region who became his tributaries: Wassurme (Tabal), Ushhiti (Atuna), Urballa (Tuwana), Tuhamme (Ishtuanda), and Uirime (Hupishna) (*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9). These are the Assyrian forms of the kings' names. In the Luwian inscriptions, Wassurme is called Wasusarma and Urballa Warpalawa. The Luwian forms of the other names are unknown. Of the kingdoms over which they ruled, only Wasusarma's is actually identified by the name Tabal, but all lay within the region more generally designated as Tabal. Wasusarma's kingdom is thus sometimes distinguished from other kingdoms in the region by being referred to, by modern scholars, as 'Tabal Proper'. A sixth Tabalian kingdom,

Shinuhtu, is attested in the inscriptions of Sargon II. Its ruler at this time was a man called Kiyakiya (Assyrian Kiakki). There is no reference to Shinuhtu in Tiglath-pileser's tributary-lists.

**Tabal (Proper) (current ruler Wasusarma; Assyrian Wassurme)* Aggressive military action almost certainly accounted for the development of Tabal Proper as the largest and most powerful of all the Tabalian kingdoms. A long hieroglyphic inscription authored or commissioned by Wasusarma refers to conflict in which the king or one of his commanders engaged with eight enemy rulers, with the support of three 'friendly kings', near a city called Parzuta. Very likely attempts by Wasusarma to expand his territories at the expense of his neighbours had given rise to the conflict. Wasusarma succeeded to the throne of 'Tabal Proper' either shortly before Tiglath-pileser III's accession or early in his reign. Like the other kings of Tabal, he had become an Assyrian tributary by 738. We do not know whether the submission of these kings resulted from an Assyrian campaign into their region,³¹ or whether Tiglath-pileser's assertion of authority over Arpad and other states west of the Euphrates was enough inducement for them to acknowledge his sovereignty without a test of arms.

But Wasusarma appears to have had some difficulty in adjusting to his subject status. In his own inscriptions, he continued to use the title 'Great King', as his father and predecessor Tuwati had done. In fact, these two rulers were, as far as we know, the only ones to assume this most exalted of all royal titles since its adoption by the earliest rulers of Carchemish. Tiglath-pileser believed that Wasusarma was too big for his boots, and accused him of acting as his equal. He summoned his tributary to appear before him, and when Wasusarma failed to respond, his overlord deposed him, putting on his throne a commoner(?) called Hulli, a 'son of nobody' (*Tigl. III* 170–1).³² By installing 'nobody's son' as king of Tabal, Tiglath-pileser brought to an end the royal dynasty to which Wasusarma had belonged. But Hulli too seems to have fallen foul of his Assyrian overlord, for he and his family were taken off to Assyria by Tiglath-pileser's successor Shalmaneser V (726–722).³³

**Other kingdoms of Tabal:*

Atuna (current ruler Ushhiti),

Ishtu(a)nda (current ruler Tuham(m)e),

Hupishna (current ruler U(i)rimme),

Tuwana (Assyrian Tuhana; current ruler Warpalawa = Assyrian Urballa)

These four kingdoms all lay within the territories comprising the land of Tabal in its broader sense. None of the first three kings appear in other sources; we know nothing of them beyond the fact that they paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser in 738 and again in 732. Much more is known about Warpalawa. Attested in both Assyrian and Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, this man had a long and

apparently illustrious career, which continued well down into the reign of Tiglath-pileser's successor-but-one Sargon II—as we shall see.

**Adanawa (Hiyawa, Assyrian Que)* (current ruler *Awariku; Assyrian Urikki*) Shalmaneser III's last campaign against this kingdom in 831 had marked the end of Assyrian intervention in south-eastern Anatolia for the time being. But we know that c.800 the kingdom became involved in further military activities against the Assyrians or their loyal subject states, as illustrated by its participation in the Damascus-led attack on Hatarikka. Adanawa may have engaged in other anti-Assyrian military operations as well; for example, the Arpad-led coalition which fought Adad-nirari III in 805. It seems to have suffered significant loss of its territory in the aftermath of these operations, and by the time of Tiglath-pileser III's reign, its remaining lands had been confined largely to the Cilician Plain. The kingdom lay in a strategically important area from the point of view of armies passing from south-eastern Anatolia into northern Syria, and would figure prominently in Assyrian campaigns in the region in the last decades of the 8th century. To this period belongs the famous Karatepe bilingual, one of our most valuable local sources of information on the history of south-eastern Anatolia in the late Neo-Hittite period. Adanawa's current king Awariku was another of the long-lived and long-reigning kings of Anatolia, his occupancy of the throne extending from c.738 (if not earlier) to 709.

The Urartu and Damascus campaigns

We are now almost ready to embark upon the last phase of our investigation of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. But before doing so, I would like to round off what I have said about Tiglath-pileser's career with a brief survey of the king's chief enterprises in the second half of his reign. The first of these took him to Urartu. Its specific target was the man who posed the greatest threat to the security of his empire: the Urartian king Sarduri II. Tiglath-pileser had triumphed over Sarduri in their first encounter, when he had destroyed his alliance with Arpad and seized back from him the lands he had occupied west of the Euphrates. Sarduri had been forced to withdraw, ignominiously, to his own land. But for how long? Urartu was an empire on the rise. Its king would not hesitate to seize any further opportunity that arose for extending his power westwards, at the expense of his Assyrian rival. But Tiglath-pileser bided his time. Finally, in 735, eight years after his defeat of the Arpad-Urartian alliance, he mustered his forces for an invasion of Sarduri's kingdom. Advancing deep into Urartian territory, he blockaded Sarduri in his capital Tushpa, near the south-eastern shore of Lake Van, and defeated his army in a battle fought outside the city's gates.³⁴ Tushpa itself withstood the Assyrian attack, and Tiglath-pileser had to be content with erecting a statue of himself in front of the city, to commemorate his victory.³⁵ Though hardly an unqualified

success, the Assyrian campaign was sufficient to put an end to conflicts between the two kingdoms for the rest of Tiglath-pileser's reign, leaving the king free to concentrate his resources on securing and strengthening other regions over which Assyria claimed sovereignty. But the Urartian threat to Assyrian territories, including those west of the Euphrates, was by no means at an end.

Within a year of his Urartian venture, Tiglath-pileser received word of a new and serious crisis developing in the Syro-Palestinian region. Damascus was at the centre of this crisis. Assyrian overlordship sat heavily upon the Damascene king Rasyan, and within a few years, he assembled another anti-Assyrian coalition, whose members included Israel (then ruled by Pekah), Tyre, and Philistia, and some Arab tribes. He was unable, however, to win the support of Ahaz, king of Judah,³⁶ which prompted him, in company with Pekah, to attack and seize part of Ahaz's territory. But the success of this enterprise was a limited one, for Rasyan failed to capture Ahaz's capital Jerusalem or to dislodge the Judaeen king from his throne. According to 2 Kings 16:5–10, Ahaz had requested support from Tiglath-pileser, boosting his appeal with a huge gift of gold and silver, extracted from the temple treasury. This may have provided an incentive for Tiglath-pileser's return to the Syro-Palestinian region in 734. But the Assyrian king needed little urging to campaign afresh in the region.

According to 2 Chronicles 28:16–18, Ahaz had approached Tiglath-pileser for assistance against the Edomites and Philistines, who had attacked and captured Judaeen territory and the cities within them. In this version of the story, the Assyrian king on his arrival gave his Judaeen appellant short shrift: 'Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, came to him, but he gave him trouble instead of help' (2 Chron. 28:20–1). What precisely is meant by these words is unclear. In the biblical context, the point is made that Ahaz was punished by God for his string of evil acts, including the sacrifice of his son in accordance with Canaanite practices and his appeal to the Assyrians rather than to God in his present predicament. A short campaign by Tiglath-pileser against Philistia in 734 sufficed to bring about the submission of the country (*Epon.* 59), and Edom may also have submitted at this time. Tiglath-pileser lists a certain Qaushmalaka of Edom among his tributaries (*Tigl. III* 170–1).

This left the Assyrian king's way clear for an attack upon the kingdom of Damascus, recorded in the Eponym Chronicle for the years 733 and 732.³⁷ Tiglath-pileser defeated Rasyan's army in the first of these years, but the Damascene king managed to escape the battle and found refuge within his capital (*Tigl. III* 78–9). Tiglath-pileser laid siege to the city. After forty-five days, he had failed to breach its walls, and had to content himself instead with destroying the city's surrounding orchards and gardens. But the following year, he returned, and this time his siege was successful. He also captured Bit-Hadara, Rasyan's birthplace, and carried off large numbers of the population

of this and other cities and districts belonging to Damascus (*Tigl. III* 80–1). The fall of Damascus, and associated with it the capture and execution of Rasyan, is reported in 2 Kings 16:9. Damascus was now incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system.³⁸ That left Rasyan's main coalition-partner Pekah to be dealt with. According to 2 Kings 15:30, the Israelite king was assassinated by a man called Hoshea, son of Elah, who seized his throne and became what was to be Israel's last king (c.732–724). There is no doubt that the usurpation and assassination were carried out with the support of Tiglath-pileser, who claims as much in his own inscriptions where he refers to the installation of Hoshea on the Israelite throne in place of Pekah, and Hoshea's status as an Assyrian tributary (*Tigl. III* 140–1, 181, 199, 203, etc.).

After the capture of Damascus, Ahaz had gone to the city for an audience with its conqueror (2 Kings 16:10). The main purpose of his visit may have been to seek rewards from Tiglath-pileser, possibly in the form of territorial additions to his kingdom, for his steadfast refusal to have any dealings with the anti-Assyrian forces in the region—at great risk to himself and his kingdom. He may as well have stayed at home. We have no indication that he derived any benefits at all from his loyalty to Assyria, beyond the ultimate satisfaction of seeing his enemies devastated by his Assyrian overlord. There is only one recorded result from his visit to Damascus: while in the city he was inspired by an altar which he saw, and ordered one just like it to be set up in the temple in Jerusalem.

Tiglath-pileser's dealings with Babylonia

Following a period of chaos and anarchy in Babylonia in the first half of the 8th century, the country's fortunes had improved markedly in the reign of a king called Nabonassar (Nabu-nasir) (747–734). But after his death, Babylonia was again divided by struggles between competing power groups until Tiglath-pileser intervened in 729. He overthrew Nabu(-eri), a usurper from the clan Bit-Amukani who happened to be occupying the throne at the time, and declared himself king of Babylonia. This instituted a period of 'double monarchy', where kingship in the country was in theory shared by the Assyrian king and a Babylonian appointee. But Assyrian overlordship in Babylonia was constantly challenged, particularly by a series of Chaldaean leaders. The most notable of them was a man called Marduk-apla-iddina II (who figures in the Bible as Merodach-baladan). Seizing the throne of Babylon in 721, Marduk-apla-iddina was to prove a sharp thorn in the Assyrian side, where he remained embedded for much of the last two decades of the 8th century (*RIMB* 2: 135–42). We shall have more to say about him below.

The accession of Sargon II

The brief reign of Tiglath-pileser's immediate successor, Shalmaneser V (726–722), has left us with very few records, and nothing of substance, relating to

the Neo-Hittite kingdoms in this period. Whether or not Sam'al and Adanawa were annexed to Assyria at this time, as sometimes suggested, remains speculative.³⁹ The chief event of Shalmaneser's reign appears to have been the siege, capture, and destruction of Samaria at the very end of it (*ABC* 73). According to Old Testament sources, the Assyrians in the wake of their victory deported large numbers of Samaria's population, resettling the land with colonists brought from other conquered territories (2 Kings 17:6, 24). But immediately upon Shalmaneser's death, Samaria broke out in rebellion again—in the same year as the Assyrian throne was occupied by Shalmaneser's son Sargon II.

Sargon pursued vigorously the policy adopted by Tiglath-pileser of eliminating troublesome subject-states by incorporating them into the Assyrian provincial system. This brought to an end many of the local kingdoms whose existence dated back, in some cases, to the early decades of the Iron Age. He also pursued, far more intensively than any of his predecessors, the policy of resettling large numbers of the conquered populations in regions far from their homeland, replacing them with new settlers who were themselves brought from distant lands. In some cases, tens of thousands of people participated in the forced migrations. The logistics of such operations are unknown to us. But they must have required a substantial commitment of human and material resources to ensure that the deportees were constantly and closely guarded, from escape or against enemy attack, and were provided with sufficient sustenance to ensure that the majority of them survived the rigours of the journey to their new homelands. Undoubtedly, these mass people-movements resulted in major changes to the ethnic composition, and correspondingly to the cultures, of the regions, states, and cities that were affected.

One of the legacies inherited by Sargon from his predecessor was the continued defiance of Samaria. Despite the devastation Shalmaneser claimed to have inflicted on it, Samaria could still muster sufficient resources to join the rebellion of Syro-Palestinian states that broke out against the new king in his politically turbulent accession year.⁴⁰ The rebellion was led by Yaubidi (Ilubidi), ruler of Hamath. In addition to Samaria, Yaubidi had won Arpad over to his side, as recorded in a document called the 'Ashur Charter' (CS II: 295, no. 2.118C). Other states in the alliance included Simirra, a northern Syrian city formerly belonging to Hamath until Tiglath-pileser annexed it in 738, and Damascus. The latter had been incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system by Tiglath-pileser in 732. It now sought to re-establish its independence (CS II: 296, no. 2.118E).

In the 'Ashur Charter', Sargon fiercely denounced Yaubidi. He declared that he was 'not the rightful holder of the throne, not fit(?) for the palace, who in the shepherdship of his people did [not attend to their] fate, [but] with regard to the god Ashur, his land (and) his people he sought evil, not good' (transl. K. Lawson Younger, Jr.). This moralistic diatribe seems intended to persuade

us that the action Sargon took against Hamath was directed specifically against its leader, and that he really had no quarrel with Yaubidi's subjects (the sort of claim that has often been made by later leaders in later times). Yaubidi, he states, had no right to the throne of Hamath, and once he had taken it, ruled the kingdom badly. All this probably means that Yaubidi had seized power from a king who had been loyal to Assyria. The king in question may well have been Eni'ilu, Hamath's last attested ruler, who appears among Tiglath-pileser's tributaries for the years 738 and 732. Eni'ilu or one of his immediate successors very likely lost his throne to Yaubidi in a coup.

In 720, Sargon confronted the coalition forces on ground where Assyrian and anti-Assyrian forces had famously clashed in the past – Qarqar on the Orontes. This time, the Assyrian victory appears to have been a decisive one. Sargon crushed the rebellion, captured Yaubidi, and had him flayed alive (CS II: 296, no. 2.118E). His capital, Hamath city, was almost certainly sacked and put to the torch.⁴¹ The kingdom was converted into an Assyrian province, and many of its inhabitants were relocated in Assyrian-controlled territories elsewhere (including Samaria, according to 2 Kings 17:24). Their places were taken by colonists brought from other parts of Sargon's empire (CS II: 294, no. 2.118A). With the fall of its capital Samaria, the kingdom of Israel was at an end, and the province of Samaria was created. One of the king's eunuch officials was appointed to govern it. As part of his arrangements for the new province, Sargon deported 27,280 of its current inhabitants,⁴² and replaced them, in greater numbers, with new settlers from other conquered lands (CS II: 295–6, no. 2.118D).⁴³ The action he took against the other members of the rebel alliance, Arpad, Simirra, and Damascus, is unrecorded. But an Old Testament source alludes to the conquests of Hamath, Samaria, and Arpad in the words it attributes to the field-commander of Sargon's son and successor Sennacherib, during Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem in 691. Demanding the surrender of the city, the commander 'stood and called out in Hebrew: "Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria! This is what the king says: 'Make peace with me and come out to me. . . . Do not listen to Hezekiah (the Judaeian king), for he is misleading you when he says, 'the Lord will deliver us.' Has the god of any nation ever delivered his land from the hand of the king of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Illah? Have they rescued Samaria from my hand? Who of all the gods of these countries has been able to save his land from me? How then can the Lord deliver Jerusalem from my hand?"' (2 Kings 18:28–35).

Problems with foreign powers

In addition to dealing with rebel movements in the west, Sargon had also to bolster the security of his territories in the east and the south against threats from other powers of the day. In the south-east, the kingdom of Elam, though

well past its prime, was still a force to be reckoned with. It posed a particular threat to Assyria's south-eastern Babylonian frontier. We recall that Tiglath-pileser III had instituted a system of 'double monarchy' whereby kingship in Babylonia was shared by the Assyrian king with a Babylonian appointee. In 720, Sargon clashed with the Elamite king Humban-nikash at the city of Der in the Diyala region of eastern Babylonia (CS II: 296, no. 2.118E). The Assyrian claimed a decisive victory in the contest. But a Babylonian chronicle reports that it was Humban-nikash who won the day (*ABC* 73–4). In actual fact the battle probably ended in a stalemate. While the Elamites defeated the Assyrian army in the field and gained territory south of Der, the Assyrians retained control of the city.⁴⁴

The danger of Elamite incursions in the region was compounded by the emergence of Marduk-apla-iddina (*OT* Merodach-baladan), a Chaldaean tribal leader from the Bit Yakin clan, and a former ruler of the Sealand.⁴⁵ In 721, Sargon's first regnal year, Marduk-apla-iddina seized the throne of Babylon, claiming to have established the kingdom's independence after many years of Assyrian rule, and united Babylonia under his leadership for a protracted struggle with Assyria—in alliance with the Elamites. He suffered a number of defeats from Sargon's forces, and at the end of 710 he had to abandon his throne in Babylon and flee for his life as Sargon advanced upon the city; Babylon surrendered to Sargon, who formally occupied its throne at the New Year festival of 709. But Marduk-apla-iddina had not yet given up. After an unsuccessful bid for asylum in Elam, he led a fresh uprising against the Assyrians, first of all using his tribal capital Dur-Yakin as his base. Though he was defeated, yet again, in a battle with Sargon's forces outside the city, he managed, yet again, to elude his conquerors, and rallied his troops for further operations against them. These continued until a final campaign conducted by Sargon's son and successor Sennacherib in southern Babylonia, c.703 (CS II: 300–2, no. 2.119), forced him to look once more for refuge in Elam, this time successfully. He died there soon afterwards.⁴⁶

To the north-east of the Assyrian frontiers, Urartu remained a constant threat. Tensions with Assyria had in no way eased since Tiglath-pileser III's campaign against Sarduri II in 735. The Urartian throne was now occupied by Sarduri's son Rusa I, who quickly developed a reputation both as a builder and as a fierce warlord. It was but a matter of time before conflict broke out afresh between Assyria and Urartu. In the west, Sargon was confronted by another serious threat to his hold over his subject-territories—in the form of the rapidly developing central Anatolian kingdom called Phrygia. We have noted that towards the end of the 8th century, probably in the early years of Sargon's reign, a king called Mita, known in Greek sources as Midas, amalgamated the Phrygian peoples from the west with eastern Anatolian tribal groups called the Mushki. From his base in the city of Gordium, Mita had embarked on a series of campaigns which built him an empire extending

eastwards towards the Euphrates, southwards into the region later known as Cappadocia, and westwards as far as the Aegean Sea. Inevitably, his programme of territorial expansion east of his homeland led to severe tensions with Assyria, particularly when he started establishing contacts with Assyria's tributary-kingdoms. We cannot be sure when Mita actually ascended his throne. He was certainly upon it in 717 (see below), and may have been king some years earlier, his reign perhaps beginning around the same time as Sargon's accession, or even before it.

Sargon turns to Tabal

The 'Phrygian factor' may well have influenced Sargon's policies towards his western territories, most notably the Tabalian kingdoms on the Anatolian plateau. Of particular concern was the possibility that Mita might persuade some of Assyria's subject-states in the region to switch their allegiance to him—or at least encourage them to sever their ties with Assyria in the expectation of Phrygian support should the Assyrian king attempt to reimpose his authority over them. Further, if Sargon failed to take action against a disloyal subject-king, especially one who had made overtures to Mita, other such kings might be tempted to declare their independence. The policies and strategies Sargon adopted in response to crises like these in his western lands required a careful assessment of all political and military options available to him, and the chances of success or failure in whatever action he took.

A test case arose early in his reign when Kiakki, one of Assyria's tributary kings in the Tabal region, provoked his overlord's wrath by withholding his tribute and apparently conspiring with Mita. Kiakki, so called in Assyrian records, can be identified with Kiyakiya, who is attested in a hieroglyphic inscription found at Aksaray as king of Shinuhtu.⁴⁷ The kingdom is almost certainly to be located in the Aksaray region, just to the south-east of the Salt Lake. Assyrian sovereignty in the west was being put on trial by Kiyakiya's treasonable conduct, and Sargon decided that prompt, exemplary action was called for—as a warning to other rulers in the region who might be tempted to break their allegiance and ally themselves with Phrygia. In 718, the Assyrian took Kiyakiya's city by storm, and deported the king along with his family, his warriors, and 7,350 of his city's inhabitants to Assyria.⁴⁸

Sargon demolished Kiyakiya's kingdom in the wake of his victory, and handed over what was left of it to Kurti, the current ruler of Atuna.⁴⁹ Kurti was evidently a successor of Ushhitti, who had paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser. His kingdom probably lay north of what had been the kingdom of Shinuhtu, and therefore close to, if not actually adjoining, the south-eastern frontier of Mita's kingdom. Sargon may have hoped that his act in expanding Atuna's territory would help keep his tributary loyal to him. But there is little doubt that Mita put pressure on Kurti to switch his allegiance—in the knowledge that a Phrygian army could quickly strike at him if he refused. Because of its

location, Atuna was one of the most susceptible of the Tabalian kingdoms to Phrygian attack, or to diplomatic approaches by Mita's envoys. An alliance with Kurti would have given the Phrygian king a valuable base in the north-western Tabal region. As we shall see, Kurti did eventually yield to overtures from the Phrygian king. But only temporarily.

In any case, Sargon saw that arrangements of a more substantial nature were necessary to ensure his sovereignty over the Anatolian kingdoms south of the Halys river. His ultimate plan was to incorporate much of the Tabalian region into a single united kingdom, under one king directly responsible to him. This would provide a more secure defence against Phrygia, and a more effective means of maintaining his authority over the region, than its continuing division into a number of separate states. The basis of this new organization was to be the kingdom we have called Tabal Proper, the largest and most powerful of the Tabalian kingdoms. It had been ruled by a self-styled 'Great King' called Wasusarma, whom Tiglath-pileser III had deposed and replaced with a commoner called Hulli. Hulli had also been deposed, by Tiglath-pileser's successor Shalmaneser V, who deported him to Assyria, along with the rest of his family, including his son Ambaris (Amris). But Sargon had further thoughts about the matter. He repatriated the pair, restored Hulli to his throne, and subsequently installed Ambaris upon it.⁵⁰

This marked the beginning of a new era in the history of Tabal. Hulli's removal from its throne seems to have left a vacuum in the country's leadership, yet to be satisfactorily filled. That situation could not continue, Sargon well realized, particularly because of the threats to the region posed by Phrygia—and by Urartu as well, as we shall see. Perhaps it was worth taking a gamble on reinstating Hulli, with a view to the succession passing within a short time to Ambaris. Sargon may have come to know Ambaris well during his enforced stay in Assyria, where he presumably underwent some form of 're-education' programme. His qualities, and no doubt his pledges of loyalty, convinced the Assyrian king that he could be entrusted with his father's throne. So he put him on it, with some substantial bonuses thrown in. Sargon claims to have widened his land, married him to one of his daughters, Ahat-abisha,⁵¹ and presented him with the land of Hilakku as a dowry. Further, though referring to Ambaris as a man of Tabal, Sargon called him king of Bit-Burutash.⁵²

This is the first reference we have in our texts to a land called Bit-Burutash. Where does it fit within the context of the Tabalian kingdoms? Does it have any connection with the kingdom called Tabal, formerly ruled by Ambaris's father? Was it in fact simply another name for this kingdom?⁵³ I think it most likely that Bit-Burutash was a newly created Assyrian client-state, which included the former kingdom of Tabal but was much more extensive, stretching south through the western region of Tabal to the northern borders of Hilakku. This would make sense of Sargon's 'gift' of Hilakku to Ambaris; Hilakku actually adjoined the kingdom to which he had been appointed, but

was not considered an integral part of it.⁵⁴ That said, it is unlikely that Ambaris ever exercised any effective authority over Hilakku. The country remained largely independent of Assyria throughout the Neo-Assyrian period, and at the best of times, the Assyrians could claim no more than token sovereignty over it. It is doubtful whether, during his brief occupancy of the throne of Bit-Burutash, Ambaris had any involvement at all in Hilakku's affairs.

We cannot be sure when Sargon created the kingdom of Bit-Burutash. Perhaps he did so following his campaign in Tabal in 718, when he dismantled Kiyakiya's kingdom. His paramount concern was to secure the entire Tabal region against incursions by the Phrygians from the north-west. This, he may have believed, could best be achieved by uniting the whole of northern and western Tabal into a single kingdom, with Ambaris as its first ruler. A number of the former Tabalian kingdoms must have been incorporated into the new kingdom. I have suggested in Chapter 7 that its territory extended in the south-west to the region of Konya, and that the 8th-century relief sculpture carved on an outcrop of rock found at Kızıldağ to the south of Konya depicts Ambaris. Quite possibly, the rock on which the relief appears marked part of the western boundary of Ambaris's kingdom. Ambaris was a ruler whom Sargon believed he could trust—or hoped he could. As we shall see, his faith was misplaced. But for the moment, he no doubt felt fairly confident that he had re-established his control over the Tabal region, or at the very least bolstered Assyrian authority there against encroachment by Phrygia.

The end of the kingdom of Carchemish

It was then that he received a fresh blow. News came that Pisiri, ruler of Carchemish, had secretly communicated with Mita: 'In my fifth regnal year (i.e. 717), Pisiri, the Carchemishite, sinned against the treaty of the great gods, and he sent a message to Mita, the king of Mushki' (CS II: 293, no. 2.118A, transl. K. Lawson Younger, Jr.). The content of the message is unknown. Apparently, Sargon's informers had not intercepted the communication itself but only the report of its being sent. But the very fact that it *was* sent was tantamount to an act of treason on Pisiri's part. And almost certainly it had to do with establishing an alliance with Mita. The loss, which such an alliance would have meant, of Sargon's control over Carchemish, one of his key strategic cities on the west bank of the Euphrates, would have significantly damaged Assyria's authority throughout its western territories. A Phrygian-allied, or Phrygian-dominated Carchemish would have given Mita an excellent power-base for extending his control to other Assyrian subject-states west of the Euphrates. And in between the Euphrates region and Mita's homeland lay the kingdoms of Tabal, currently tributaries of Assyria. The loyalty of these states could not be counted on at the best of times. And any of their rulers who received diplomatic approaches from Mita might well feel that their interests

were best served by allying themselves with him and casting off their Assyrian allegiance. Equally or even more alarming for Sargon, was the distinct prospect of Mita forming an alliance with the Urartian king Rusa I. Such a union might not only threaten arrangements Sargon had made for the security of his south-central Anatolian territories. Ultimately, it could lead to the total elimination of Assyrian authority across northern Mesopotamia and through the whole of the eastern half of Anatolia, Assyria's subject-territories in these regions being apportioned between new Urartian and Phrygian overlords. Punitive action had to be taken against Carchemish at the earliest possible opportunity, as a warning to all other subject-kings who might be tempted to act as Pisiri had done. Without giving Pisiri any opportunity to explain his conduct, or to reaffirm his allegiance to the Assyrian crown, Sargon swept into his kingdom, attacked, captured, and plundered his capital, and took the king himself and his family and courtiers back to Assyria. Pisiri's fate is unknown. Very likely he was executed, perhaps in the same way as the luckless king of Shinuhtu. The land over which he had ruled was converted into an Assyrian province (717).

Thus ended the first Neo-Hittite kingdom to be established after the collapse of the Late Bronze Age Hittite empire. Carchemish had been ruled by several dynasties during its Neo-Hittite phase, all of whom may have been linked with the earliest Hittite administrations of the region. Its first rulers had borne the title 'Great King'. We have noted a florescence in the kingdom's culture in the reigns of the mid 8th-century rulers Yariri and Kamani. They had occupied the Carchemishean throne during one of the peak periods in the city's and the kingdom's Iron Age history. All that was now past. Carchemish's 'sinful inhabitants' were deported to Assyria, significant numbers of its cavalry, chariotry, and infantry were incorporated into the Assyrian army, and settlers from Assyria were sent to Carchemish to make new homes there. The earliest and greatest of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms was at an end.

But Mita seems to have maintained his pressure relentlessly on the borders of Assyria's western territories, and pursued with increasing vigour his attempts to win local rulers away from their Assyrian allegiance. His military operations took his forces as far south as the land of Adanawa (Que) on Anatolia's south-eastern coast. We know this from an Assyrian report that in 715 Sargon recaptured three border fortresses of the land of Que (Harrua, Ushnanis, and Qumasi), which had earlier been seized by Mita's troops.⁵⁵

Sargon's Urartian campaign

While maintaining constant vigilance against the Phrygian menace in the west, Sargon had also to remain alert to the dangers posed by his powerful enemy Urartu in the east. Against the latter, he decided to take pre-emptive, comprehensive action. So it was that in 714, while he was campaigning in the

northern Zagros region, he led a major campaign into the Urartian kingdom against its current ruler Rusa I. This, the so-called eighth military campaign of Sargon, is heralded as the greatest single event and achievement of the Assyrian king's career. It is recorded in a well-known document called 'Letter to Ashur'.⁵⁶ In this, Sargon reports a crushing victory over Rusa's forces. Rusa himself survived the battle and fled to safety. But his reign was almost at an end. Sargon received reports from his officials that the Urartian king dispatched another army against an invading force of Cimmerians in the same year (*SAA I*: 29–32, nos. 30–2). Again, his forces suffered total defeat. Rusa died shortly afterwards, probably by his own hand. His death has been attributed to the deep state of depression into which he fell following the Cimmerian rout of his army. According to Sargon, however, the king's mental state which presumably led to his suicide was due to the Assyrian capture and plunder of the holy city Musasir.⁵⁷ When Rusa heard what happened to Musasir, 'he fell to the ground. He ripped his garments and bared his limbs. His headgear was thrown to the ground, he tore out his hair and beat his breasts with his fists. He threw himself on his stomach. His heart stood still, his insides burned, in his mouth were painful lamentations' (*Chav.* 339, transl. S. C. Melville).

The fall of Ambaris

Resounding though Sargon's victory over Rusa had been, it did little to curb Urartu's ambitions, under Rusa's successor Argishti II, to expand its influence, if not its sovereignty, into Assyrian subject-territories, including those west of the Euphrates, on the Anatolian plateau, and on Anatolia's south-eastern coast. Both Urartu and Phrygia were determined to extend their control into and through these regions, in a challenge to the monopoly of power that Assyria had exercised over them particularly from the early years of Tiglath-pileser III. A number of Assyria's western tributary-kings found themselves under increasing pressure from one or other of Assyria's two main rivals. In some instances, the tributaries themselves may have taken the initiative by communicating with the Phrygian or the Urartian king, in a bid to free themselves from their current overlord. This provides, very likely, the context for the spate of uprisings that became a feature of Assyria's relations with its Anatolian tributaries during Sargon's reign—which led ultimately to the conversion of the last remaining Neo-Hittite kingdoms into Assyrian provinces. Our sources for the uprisings provide us with no motive for them. In fact the disloyalty of some of the tributary-kings may seem difficult to explain since Sargon had, apparently, bestowed considerable benefits upon these kings.

A signal example of this occurred in 713 when Ambaris turned traitor to his overlord, by communicating secretly with both the Urartian and the Phrygian kings. Sargon bitterly condemned his disloyalty, and ordered his arrest. The

disgraced vassal was deported along with his family and chief courtiers to Assyria.⁵⁸ Very likely it was news of his fate that persuaded Atuna's king Kurti, who had himself earlier switched his allegiance to Mita, to change sides to Sargon again. Kurti promptly dispatched an envoy to Sargon, at that time in Media, to renew both his homage and his tribute payments (*ARAB II* §214).⁵⁹

We should not be too surprised at Ambaris's apparent decision to break his allegiance to Sargon and ally himself with either the Urartians or the Phrygians, or both. The luckless vassal may have been subject to a good deal of coercion, from both the Urartian and the Phrygian kings. Both may have sought to win him over to their side, perhaps initially through diplomatic advances, but ultimately with the threat of military force. Ambaris's intercepted messages to Mita and his Urartian counterpart Rusa may have sought assurances from both kings that they would give him all necessary protection should he break with Sargon. One can appreciate Ambaris's dilemma. If he joined with Sargon's enemies, the likelihood of Assyrian retaliation was extremely high. But if he remained true to Sargon, he might well lose his kingdom, and with it his throne, to the enemies of Assyria whose overtures and threats he had rejected. Phrygia was probably the greater threat. Mita's south-eastern frontiers abutted those of Ambaris's domain.⁶⁰ Defence of the extensive territories that constituted the newly formed kingdom of Bit-Burutash may have been well beyond its ruler's capacity, particularly against Phrygia whose armies could quickly reach his cities. What decision was the ruler of Bit-Burutash to make under the circumstances? It may well be that Mita began applying pressure to him in the year before he was deposed by Sargon—i.e. in 714, the year which the Assyrian king devoted to his campaign against Urartu and other territories to the north-east of the Assyrian homeland.⁶¹ The timing was probably deliberate. If there were no large Assyrian army ready to hand to help defend his territories, Ambaris probably felt he had little choice but to take seriously the prospect of a Phrygian alliance, at the expense of his ties with Assyria. But he never had the chance to act on this. No doubt acting on intelligence received from the west, Sargon forestalled any takeover of this his largest territory in the region by his punitive action against Ambaris, which he followed up by imposing a tighter grasp on his western territories.

Sargon's new arrangements in the west

The fear that these territories could fall to Phrygia was probably one of the prime motives for Sargon's extension of direct Assyrian rule in the west. An Assyrian province was created, covering (at least) the territories of Bit-Burutash, over which Ambaris had ruled as Sargon's tributary, and Hilakku. This is made clear from Sargon's report that after Ambaris's removal, he appointed an official of his own as governor of Bit-Burutash and Hilakku. But he gives no indication who this governor was. It has been suggested that

Ambaris's wife, Sargon's daughter, may have retained authority in the province.⁶² But there are other possibilities.⁶³ For the one I would like to suggest, we should turn our attention first to the southern kingdom called Adanawa (Que).

Adanawa had been ruled since at least 738 by a king called Awariku (Assyrian Urikki), one of Tiglath-pileser III's tributary rulers. Awariku continued to occupy Adanawa's throne well into the reign of Sargon, until 709. As we have seen, he figures in two Luwian-Phoenician bilingual inscriptions dating to Sargon's reign. We know, however, that by 710, Adanawa was under the overall authority of an Assyrian governor called Ashur-sharru-usur. This is indicated in a letter generally dated to 710 or 709, which Sargon wrote to Ashur-sharru-usur as governor of Adanawa (SAA 1: 6, no. 1).⁶⁴ We shall have cause to refer several times to this important document. It indicates that Adanawa had become part of the Assyrian provincial system by 710, and possibly several years earlier. I suggest that Ashur-sharru-usur was appointed to the region in the context of Sargon's removal of Ambaris from Bit-Burutash and his incorporation of Bit-Burutash and Hilakku into the Assyrian provincial system. To ensure that the region was united under Assyrian rule, Sargon conferred upon Ashur-sharru-usur the status of a regional supremo, based in Adanawa but with authority extending over Hilakku and part of Bit-Burutash. He may also have had general oversight over the kingdom of Tuwana, which lay in the Classical Tyanitis region and was the largest and most important of the southern Tabalian kingdoms. Its current king Warpalawa (Assyrian Urballa) was another of the long-lived rulers of the region, being first attested as one of Tiglath-pileser III's tributaries in 738. He appears to have remained consistently loyal to his Assyrian allegiance throughout his long career, down into the last decade of Sargon's reign.

The likelihood, then, is that Adanawa and Tuwana, along with Bit-Burutash and Hilakku, had come under direct Assyrian rule some time before Sargon's letter to Ashur-sharru-usur, probably in the aftermath of Ambaris's removal from the throne of Bit-Burutash. Awariku and Warpalawa remained token rulers of their kingdoms subsequent to Ashur-sharru-usur's appointment, and perhaps retained some degree of authority in the management of their kingdoms' local affairs. Both rulers must by now have been elderly, for they had occupied their thrones for thirty or more years. And despite their apparent loyalty, Sargon may have considered them to be beyond the age when they could effectively maintain Assyrian authority in a region that had become very volatile, particularly because of the destabilizing effects of the Phrygian presence nearby. This very likely influenced his thinking in the new arrangements he made in south-eastern Anatolia following his sacking of Ambaris. In accordance with these arrangements, Sargon installed a governor of his own over Bit-Burutash and Hilakku, and extended his authority to the neighbouring kingdoms of Adanawa and Tuwana. The local rulers of these kingdoms

were allowed to remain on their thrones, in recognition of their long and loyal service to the Assyrian crown. But they were now subordinate to the Assyrian governor of the region. Warpalawa may have gracefully accepted this new situation.⁶⁵ (His dynastic line continued for at least one more generation after his death, for he was succeeded by his son Muwaharani II). But Awariku was less ready to do so, as we shall see.

It was perhaps also around this time that the kingdom of Sam'al was converted into an Assyrian province. Located on the eastern slope of the Amanus range, this small Aramaean state had been a tributary of Tiglath-pileser III under its king Panamuwa II. After Panamuwa died fighting on the Assyrian side in the siege of Damascus in 733–732, the Sam'alian throne had been occupied by his son Bar-Rakib, who claims that his reign was a time of great prosperity in his kingdom's history (CS II: 160–1). Bar-Rakib appears to have maintained his allegiance to the Assyrian crown until his death, c.713. Sargon may then have converted the kingdom into a province—perhaps without any resistance from its inhabitants.⁶⁶ But we cannot be sure when the annexation actually took place, since we have no record of it. It may have been as late as the reign of Sennacherib, or even later.

The last resistance movements

Other kingdoms among Sargon's western subject-states were far less ready to accept their conversion into Assyrian provinces, and sought to sever completely their ties with Assyria—almost certainly with the backing of Phrygia or Urartu or both. Two of the Neo-Hittite states on the west bank of the Euphrates, and one further west, appear to have conducted secret negotiations with the Phrygian and Urartian kings. The states in question were Malatya, Kummuh, and Gurgum.

Malatya had become a tributary of the Assyrian empire during Tiglath-pileser III's reign, and had remained under Assyrian sovereignty through the reign of Shalmaneser V and the first years of Sargon. But like other Assyrian subject-states west of the Euphrates, it was becoming increasingly restive, and probably around the time of Pisiri's rebellion in Carchemish, Malatya's king Gunzinanu broke his allegiance to Assyria. Sargon promptly removed him from his throne. But instead of abolishing the kingship in Malatya, he appointed in his place a man called Tarhunazi (c.719). This proved an unfortunate decision. Like Ambaris, Tarhunazi entered into secret negotiations with Mita, and finally, in 712, declared his support for him. Sargon reacted furiously to the news, and took his customary brutal revenge: 'Melid, his royal city, I smashed like a pot. All of his people I treated (lit. counted) as a flock of sheep. . . . Tarhunazi and his warriors, I threw into fetters of iron. His wife, his sons, his daughters, with 500 of his captive fighters, I carried away to my city Ashur.'⁶⁷

The Malatyan kingdom was now dismembered. Part of it, including the land of Kammanu⁶⁸ and the city Til-garimmu, was made into an Assyrian province.⁶⁹ Til-garimmu had provided Tarhunazi with a final place of refuge before his capture.⁷⁰ According to Sargon's successor Sennacherib, it lay on the border of the kingdom of Tabal (*Sennach.* 62), and was thus important strategically. The Assyrian king had it rebuilt when he made it the seat of an Assyrian governor, and brought in new settlers from other lands to inhabit it. Sargon also refers to ten strong fortresses that he established on the frontiers of the new province. They were no doubt intended to give protection against both Phrygia to the west and Urartu to the east, for the province was located within striking range of each of these kingdoms. Perhaps as part of the new defence arrangements, Sargon allocated Malatya city to Muwatalli, king of the neighbouring land of Kummuh.⁷¹ Muwatalli was another of the local rulers in whom Sargon had placed his trust. And in this case, his trust appears initially to have been rewarded with some years of loyal service from its beneficiary. Muwatalli had the important task of defending his part of Assyria's frontier region, particularly against incursions by Phrygia and Urartu. Sargon may also have annexed to Kummuh a city on the site of modern Sakçagözü, located 21 km north-east of Zincirli, and provisionally identified with the Sam'alian city Lutibu.⁷² A portrait sculpture found on it is believed, on stylistic grounds, to be that of Muwatalli.

In the following year, 711, Sargon had to deal with another crisis in his western subject-states, this one arising in the kingdom of Gurgum which was located to the west of Kummuh in the plain of modern Maraş. Gurgum's throne had long been occupied by Tarhulara, whom we first met as a rebel against and subsequently as a tributary of Tiglath-pileser III. Since that time, he had apparently remained loyal to his Assyrian allegiance. But c.711 he was assassinated by his son Muwatalli (not to be confused with the Kummuhite king of the same name), who seized his throne.⁷³ We may suspect, once again, that secret dealings with Urartu or Phrygia, whose rulers preferred diplomatic plotting to military force in their attempts to win over Assyria's subject-states, lay behind the coup. Once again, Sargon responded promptly, removing Muwatalli, the third Gurgumean king of that name, from his throne and annexing his kingdom as a province of the Assyrian empire. It was now called Marqas, the name of the former kingdom's capital, and apparently retained its provincial status until the Assyrian empire's fall.

By 709, only one tributary-state west of the Euphrates had yet to be reduced to Assyrian provincial status—the kingdom of Kummuh. We recall that its ruler Muwatalli enjoyed favoured status with Sargon, who had assigned to him the capital of the former kingdom of Malatya. In return, Muwatalli gave Sargon a number of years of loyal service—at least that is how it appears. But it was not to last. In 709, Sargon was in Babylonia, getting himself formally installed on Babylon's throne after its Chaldaean king Marduk-apla-iddina

had been forced to abandon it and flee for his life. While there, he received reports that Muwatalli was plotting with the Urartian king Argishti II.⁷⁴ An Assyrian expeditionary force was immediately dispatched against him. Kummuh was occupied and plundered by the Assyrians, and the king's family together with large numbers of his population were deported, for relocation in Babylonia. Muwatalli himself managed to escape, and we hear of him no more. Perhaps he found refuge in Urartu.⁷⁵ His kingdom was converted into an Assyrian province, and resettled by deportees from the Chaldaean tribe Bit-Yakin.⁷⁶ Kummuh was to remain an Assyrian province until the fall of the Assyrian empire at the end of the 7th century. Its incorporation into the Assyrian provincial system in 708 marked effectively the end of the history of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms.

The Assyrian–Phrygian entente

I have referred earlier to the new administrative arrangements Sargon made in south-eastern Anatolia *c.*713, with the installation in the region of an Assyrian governor Ashur-sharru-usur, whose authority (I have suggested) extended over the former kingdoms of Bit-Burutash, Tuwana, Adanawa, and Hilakku. According to my reconstruction of events, Tuwana's and Adanawa's long-reigning rulers, Warpalawa and Awariku, had been allowed to retain their thrones as puppet rulers under Ashur-sharru-usur's authority, and Warpalawa seems to have been content to see out his days in this manner. Awariku was less inclined to do so. Very likely tensions between himself and Ashur-sharra-usur prompted him to attempt to break his ties with Assyria. That seems to be implied by an event which was to prove a major turning-point in Assyrian–Phrygian relations.

A brief account of this event was contained in a report that Ashur-sharru-usur sent to Sargon, referred to by Sargon in his reply to the governor (SAA I: no. 1). It appears that Awariku had secretly sent a fourteen-man delegation to the Urartian king, who is not named but must have been Rusa I's successor, Argishti II. No details are provided of the actual mission on which the delegation was sent, but almost certainly it had to do with negotiations Awariku was conducting with the Urartian king, which could only have been prejudicial to Assyrian interests. The aged Awariku, no doubt furious at his humiliating loss of status after three decades of faithful service to the Assyrian crown, may well have sought revenge against his overlord. What he could actually have done to advance Urartian interests at the expense of Assyrian ones remains a matter for speculation. But whatever his plans may have been, events overtook them. The members of the delegation were seized by the agents of Mita, who promptly ordered them to be handed over to Ashur-sharru-usur. Sargon was delighted by the news. Not simply because the secret mission had been discovered and aborted, but probably more so because of Mita's decision to deliver the members of it into the Assyrian governor's

hands. Mita was making a clear statement, by this gesture, that he wanted an accord with his Assyrian counterpart—and took the opportunity which the capture of Awariku’s representatives provided to demonstrate his good faith. Sargon’s response was to instruct Ashur-sharru-usur to release immediately all Phrygian prisoners held in his custody. One of the major benefits of the new accord was that the Tabalian states could no longer exploit enmity between the two Great Kings for their own advantage: ‘—now that the Phrygian has made peace with us . . . what can all the kings of Tabal do henceforth? You will press them from this side and the Phrygians from that side . . .’ (SAA I no. 1 vv. 47–9, p. 6, transl. Parpola).

It was perhaps to be the beginning of a new era in Assyrian–Phrygian relations.⁷⁷ Mita’s initiative appears to have been triggered by an expedition which Ashur-sharru-usur undertook against the Phrygians on Sargon’s behalf.⁷⁸ It resulted in a significant victory for Ashur-sharru-usur, according to Sargon, who claimed that his governor defeated the enemy in three battles. The apparent success of the mission may have prompted Mita to seek to end his hostilities with Assyria, particularly now that he was confronted not by a mere vassal of the Assyrian crown but by the king’s own deputy. But there may have been a further, underlying reason for Mita’s initiative—one connected with the constant threats posed to his lands by another enemy, the Cimmerians, who constantly harassed his kingdom, and would one day engulf it. More on this below. Whatever the motives for the *entente*, we have no further indications of conflicts between Phrygians and Assyrians following it. But any hopes their respective rulers held for a long-lasting pact between their kingdoms failed to materialize—perhaps because one of them had but a few years to live. Nothing more is known of Awariku. He may have been arrested or hunted down by Ashur-sharru-usur’s men, or taken his own life. Perhaps he escaped to Urartu.

Sargon’s continuing interest in the Tabal region is shown by his campaign there in 705 (*ABC* 76), possibly undertaken in collaboration with his recently acquired ally Mita. Almost certainly the Cimmerians were the chief target of the campaign. These aggressive tribal groups had repeatedly attacked Phrygian, Assyrian, and Urartian territory, sometimes winning significant victories. On their own, none of the Great Kings could come up with a permanent solution to the Cimmerian problem. Perhaps cooperative action might work. Was this one of the prompts for Mita’s peace initiative with Sargon? That is a possibility—though if so, nothing apparently came of it, certainly not a resolution of the Cimmerian problem. Sargon was killed during his military operations in south-eastern Anatolia, probably in an engagement with the Cimmerians.⁷⁹ And ten years later, Mita’s army was routed by another Cimmerian force,⁸⁰ who then proceeded to wreak havoc upon his kingdom. Greek tradition has it that Midas committed suicide following the Cimmerian triumph, by drinking bull’s blood.⁸¹ We have noted that the

Uartian king Rusa I had probably also taken his own life, in 714, after one of his armies had been wiped out in a Cimmerian attack. To these fierce, wide-roaming hordes—the Gumurru from the land of Gamir in Assyrian records—we might well assign responsibility for the destruction of the armies, and the abrupt termination of the careers, of the three greatest sovereigns of their age: Rusa I, ruler of the united lands of Urartu, Sargon II, overlord of the mighty Assyrian empire, and Mita/Midas, Great King of Phrygia, the most powerful ruler on the Anatolian plateau since the days of the Late Bronze Age Lords of Hatti.

Afterword

The absorption of Kummuh into the Assyrian provincial system in 708 effectively brought to an end the era of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. Four and a half centuries earlier, the era had begun when Kuzi-Teshub established himself as Great King in Carchemish following the fall of the Hittite empire. For a time, Carchemish appears to have held sway over a number of the northern Syrian territories that had once been subject to the kings of Hattusa. Kuzi-Teshub himself had been the clearest link with the past. He was a member of the Hittite royal dynasty and the son of the last known viceroy of Carchemish. He may himself have held the office of viceroy in Carchemish before assuming the title of Great King, no doubt declaring his new status as soon as he received word that the regime in Hattusa had come to an end. Other states that emerged in Syria in the Iron Age, perhaps independently of Carchemish, also demonstrated links with Bronze Age Hatti, as reflected in the names of a number of their rulers, in their use of the Luwian language and hieroglyphic script for their public records, and in their material culture. In the final centuries of the Hittite empire, speakers of the Luwian language probably outnumbered all other population groups in the territories over which the kings of Hatti held sway. And in the centuries that followed, Luwian groups may have formed a significant component of the populations of many of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms—particularly those located south of the Halys, a region occupied by Luwian speakers throughout the second millennium. Luwian groups may have arrived as new settlers in Syria during and after the upheavals associated with the end of the Late Bronze Age. But many of the region's Luwian-speakers may have been descendants of families who had settled there earlier, from the time when Syria came under direct Hittite rule, with the establishment of viceregal seats at Carchemish and Aleppo.

In an Iron Age context, 'Luwian' and 'Neo-Hittite' are sometimes treated as virtually synonymous terms, primarily because one of the defining features of the kingdoms called Neo-Hittite is the monumental inscriptions found within them, written in the Luwian language and hieroglyphic script. But we should remember that the evidence, both written and archaeological, on which our knowledge of the Neo-Hittite world is based relates almost entirely to the elite

elements of this world—to its ruling hierarchies and the inscriptions that they produced. The lower social orders have left us no records of their own, and are ignored in the inscriptions of those who held authority over them. So too the public monuments, which in many respects represent a continuation of the artistic traditions of the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom, reflect the cultural traditions and ideologies of a ruling class. The world of these monuments is one of gods and of kings and their families and high officials. They tell us nothing about the lives or lifestyles of those who belonged to a less privileged world—that is to say, the bulk of the populations comprising each of the kingdoms. Luwian-speakers may have figured prominently in the upper levels of society in the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. But the majority of the populations over which they ruled may well have been of a different ethnic origin, perhaps in many cases descendants of indigenous population groups who had inhabited the lands of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms centuries before these kingdoms were established.

We should also bear in mind that the composition of the populations of at least some of these kingdoms may have changed substantially over the ages, even before the massive deportation and resettlement programmes which Assyrian kings implemented in the wake of their conquests. The influx into Syria and Palestine of large numbers of Aramaean groups from the late second millennium onwards undoubtedly changed the ethnic profile of many of the cities and lands in the region. And as we have seen, Aramaean rulers established themselves in several of the Neo-Hittite states. Initially, a distinction appears to have been drawn between the kings of ‘Aram and Hatti’.¹ But there was a gradual fusion of the two cultures, which scholars identify by the use of the term ‘Syro-Hittite’. Yet even in states where Aramaean regimes *appear* to have been established in place of Luwian-speaking ones,² many traditional Hittite–Luwian elements persisted, and are still evident in the final decades of the 8th century. Royal Hittite names continue to the very end of the Neo-Hittite period; for example, Kummuh was the last Neo-Hittite state to be converted into an Assyrian province, and its last king was called Muwatalli (Assyrian Mutallu). So too was the last ruler of the kingdom of Gurgum, which had suffered the same fate three years earlier. This man was in fact the third ruler in Gurgum’s line of kings to be called Muwatalli.

The continuation of Hittite artistic traditions to the final years of the Neo-Hittite period is evident in the sculptures found on a number of sites,³ though these traditions were progressively attenuated as they became fused with Aramaean and Assyrian elements. Zincirli, capital of the kingdom of Sam’al and an Aramaean city in origin, displays sculptural features indicative of a mingling of Late Hittite and Aramaean cultural traditions, with strong Assyrian influence becoming evident in the 8th century. It thus illustrates the blending of three artistic traditions—Aramaean, Hittite, and Assyrian.⁴ The Luwian hieroglyphic tradition also continued to the very end of the

Neo-Hittite period in a number of Neo-Hittite kingdoms—including several in the Tabal region on the Anatolian plateau, and to the south the kingdom of Adanawa on the Mediterranean coast. Late hieroglyphic inscriptions survive from (a) the reign of Kiyakiya, the king of the north-western Tabalian land Shinuhtu, who was defeated and overthrown by Sargon c.718; (b) the reign of Muwaharani (II), the last king of Tuwana in southern Tabal, who has left us an inscription which dates to the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 7th century (*CHLI* I: 527); and (c) the period of the so-called Karatepe bilingual, which was also composed at the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 7th century; its author was a man called Azatiwata, a sub-ruler within the land of Adanawa (Que) on the Mediterranean coast. Further in the context of late survivals of the Luwian epigraphic tradition, we have noted the appearance of Luwian inscriptions on stelae, several other stone fragments, and five lead strips, all dating from the mid to the late 8th century, at the site now known as Kululu, possibly the capital of the northern kingdom of Tabal. These inscriptions not only reflect the persistence of the Luwian hieroglyphic tradition to the last decades of the Neo-Hittite period, but *may* indicate a more widespread use of the script—for economic and administrative purposes, as well as for commemorations and other official pronouncements.

The massive resettlement programmes implemented by a number of Assyrian kings, most notably Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II, must have gone far, according to Hawkins, towards obliterating the national identities of the states so affected.⁵ And the substantial changes often made by the Assyrians to the boundaries of their conquered territories, particularly within the context of their administrative reorganizations of a number of them, no doubt contributed further to this process of ‘obliteration’. At least this is what we might expect. But devastating though the Assyrian impact upon them may have been, many of the the lands once ruled by Neo-Hittite kings maintained their identities throughout the Iron Age, despite their incorporation into the Assyrian provincial structure, down to the end of the Assyrian empire, and sometimes beyond. Ruling dynasties came and went. But lands like Carchemish, Malatya (Melid), Hilakku, and Tabal persisted. Indeed, some of them were to rise up once more against their Assyrian overlords, in the decades following the disappearance of the last of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms.

After the death of Sargon in 705, the spirit of anti-Assyrian resistance remained strong in many of the Anatolian kingdoms. Hilakku repeatedly fought against Assyrian attempts to dominate it, even though Sennacherib’s successor Esarhaddon claimed to have subdued its rebellious population (*ARAB* II: §516). By the reign of Esarhaddon’s successor Ashurbanipal (668–630/27), Hilakku had become completely independent of Assyria.⁶ We have noted that Adanawa’s last known king Awariku had suffered a humiliating loss of status and become a puppet of the Assyrian governor Ashur-sharru-usur around 710. But Adanawa regained its independence for

a time after Sargon's death, when Azatiwata, one of Awariku's subordinate rulers, restored Awariku's family to the throne, and strengthened the kingdom's frontiers against enemy attack.⁷ Malatya too may have regained its independence after Sargon's death, and perhaps retained it, despite further Assyrian attacks, until early in the reign of Ashurbanipal. Babylonian and Assyrian Chronicles record a campaign by the Assyrian king Esarhaddon in 675 against Malatya (Melid) and its king Mugallu. The continuing existence of Tabal, or a land within its region, in the post Neo-Hittite era is indicated by the actions of a Tabalian leader called Ishkallu who apparently joined forces with Mugallu.⁸

Despite the Assyrian resettlement programmes and the imposition of Assyrian administrations over the conquered territories, the Assyrianization of the western Iron Age territories had but limited impact. Irrespective of where they came from, and the fact that they were subjects of the Assyrian crown, the populations who inhabited these territories developed a loyalty first and foremost to the soil upon which they had settled, either as longstanding inhabitants or as deportees. The latter had been uprooted from their homelands and relocated in what was originally an alien world. But they quickly adapted to it and identified with it—and were ready to defend it, under the banner of whichever king happened to call them to arms against the threat of an aggressor. Kings and royal dynasties came and went, but during the period of their ascendancy, they were the symbols of the lands over which they ruled, so that the loyalty of their subjects was not so much to them *per se* as to the lands for whose protection they assumed the responsibility. Those who fought in their armies did so in defence of the land to which they belonged. It was country rather than king for which they fought. And despite the territorial slice-ups and frontier shifts that often accompanied the imposition of the provincial administration system upon those states that had defied Assyrian authority, many of these states seem to have shown remarkable resilience to any long-term change to their boundaries. By and large, they were defined by certain natural features, like rivers, mountain ranges, or coastlines, and the tangibility of such features reinforced the sense of unity and common identity of those who dwelt within their boundaries. The sites where their capitals were located were often chosen because of certain advantages with which they were endowed; for example, they lay near a river, in a well-watered, fertile valley, on a harbour, or on a site that was easily defensible. Many of them, by virtue of the benefits bestowed upon them by nature, became natural focal points of the lands and territories which surrounded them, and often remained so many centuries after the Assyrians had disappeared.⁹

The absorption of the last of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms into the Assyrian provincial system in the late 8th century marked the end of the history of the Neo-Hittite world. But not the end of all the states that had belonged to this world. As we have seen, some of them made new bids for independence in the

following century. Even after this, the legacy of the Hittites lived on in the retention of the name Hatti for a large part of the region where the Late Bronze Age kingdom had held sway, and where a number of its successors had developed and for a time flourished. Elements of the Hittite imperial legacy survived for many centuries after the last Late Bronze Age king Suppiluliuma II had departed his capital Hattusa for the last time.

Where did he go? Did one of the fledgling Neo-Hittite kingdoms provide him with his final home, and a base for the continuation of his dynastic line? An archaeologist's spade may one day unearth the answers to these questions.

Let us end as we began, with a hypothetical. Suppiluliuma II may indeed have set up a new royal residence for himself, his family, and his descendants in a new base somewhere to the southeast of Hattusa. But from here he failed to re-establish his authority more widely over his disintegrating empire. The mantle of Great Kingship now passed, in circumstances unknown to us, to a man more fitted to exercise it, Kuzi-Teshub, ruler of Carchemish. For a time Kuzi-Teshub became paramount leader of the remnants of the kingdom of Hatti. For a time he and his successors provided the stimulus for rebuilding parts of the shattered Hittite world, until this world fragmented into smaller units and became the independent kingdoms of the New-Hittite era. Over one of these kingdoms, perhaps, the direct heirs of Suppiluliuma II continued to hold sway.

This page intentionally left blank

Hieroglyphic Luwian Logograms

(Sample illustrations from *CHLI* I: pp. 26–7, Table 2)

1.  foot = *CHLI* I: PES (no. 90)
2.  pointed hat = *CHLI* I: REX (no. 17)
3.  twin mountain peaks = *CHLI* I: REGIO (no. 228)
4.  pair of eyes = *CHLI* I: DEUS (no. 360)
5.  curved staff = *CHLI* I: LITUUS (no. 378)
6.  pot = *CHLI* I: VAS (no. 341)
7.  thunderbolt = *CHLI* I: TONITRUS (no. 199)
8.  fist = *CHLI* I: PUGNUS (no. 39)
9.  leg = *CHLI* I: CRUS (no. 82)
10.  river = *CHLI* I: FLUMEN (no. 212)
11.  'ram's horns' = *CHLI* I: MAGNUS (no. 363)

Fig. 15. Hieroglyphic Luwian logograms.

APPENDIX I

Transliterating the Inscriptions¹

Like the majority of ancient Near Eastern writing systems, the Luwian hieroglyphic script was a syllabic one, made up of a number of syllable signs and logograms. There are over 500 signs in the script, including some 225 logograms. Each syllable sign and logogram has been allocated a number in a sign list originally drawn up by the French scholar E. Laroche.² Each number from Laroche's original list is prefixed by an asterisk (*).³ In general terms, syllable signs used in the ancient cuneiform scripts⁴ represent various combinations of vowels + consonants, or vowels on their own: e.g. in the Late Bronze Age Hittite syllabary, single vowel sounds (*a, e, i, u*), a consonant + vowel (e.g. *na*), a vowel + consonant (e.g. *an*), or a consonant + vowel + consonant (e.g. *nab*). In the Luwian hieroglyphic script, the syllable signs are restricted to three vowels (*a, i, u*), and consonant + vowel combinations (e.g. *ka*), with the additional of a few syllabograms made up of vowel + consonant + vowel (e.g. *ara*) or consonant + vowel + consonant + vowel (e.g. *tara*). The convention adopted in transliterating syllabograms is to represent them in lower-case italics.

Logograms are of two types: (1) Pictograms, where an image represents the actual object to which it refers. Thus, the picture of a foot (no. 1)⁵ may simply have the meaning 'foot'. Sometimes, pictograms are highly stylized, making it difficult if not impossible for an untrained observer to recognize what they are depicting. (2) Ideograms. These are concept signs. They are images of recognizable objects, but are not literal representations of these objects. Rather, they are intended to convey concepts or actions. Sometimes, these are related to the actual images. Thus the picture of a foot referred to above could, in addition to having the meaning 'foot', be used in other contexts to indicate the verbs 'go, come' or related verbs like 'walk, run'. A pointed hat is used for 'king' (no. 2); a land is represented by twin mountain peaks (no. 3). Sometimes, the relationship between the pictogram and the meaning assigned to it is less easy to recognize. The sign for 'god' (no. 4) is a case in point. It actually depicts a pair of eyes, though the stylization of the image makes this difficult to recognize. We need to go a step further and perceive behind the image the concept of 'all-seeing', which reflects one of the qualities associated with a god. Thus the concept conveyed by the stylized image enables us to identify this image as the hieroglyphic representation of a god. Sometimes, however, the image appears to have no relationship at all, or none that is evident to us, with the meaning assigned to it. Examples noted by Hawkins include a curved staff (no. 5) used to indicate verbs of perception, and a pot (no. 6) to indicate parts of the body. Sometimes, we cannot identify what a logogram is intended to depict visually, or what relationship it has to the meaning assigned to it. Hawkins quotes the example of *273: 'what is *273 and why does it determine both *warpi-*, 'skill, etc.', and *tupi-*, "smite"?'⁶ As we shall discuss below, it is now a commonly accepted convention to designate logograms in the transcribed texts by Latin names.

A number of logograms are commonly used in the Near Eastern syllabic scripts as determinatives. These define the word to which they are attached. Thus we know that a

word preceded by the determinative meaning 'person' is a personal name, and one preceded by the determinative meaning 'god' is the name of a deity. Similarly, we know that a word is the name of a country or city if a determinative which has the meaning 'country' or 'city' is attached to it. In these cases, the determinative generally follows the word it identifies in the Luwian hieroglyphic script. In transcribed texts, the determinative is now generally transliterated in parentheses, immediately preceding or immediately following the name it 'determines'; thus (DEUS) *pahalati* = 'for (the goddess) Ba'alat', *Nikima* (REGIO) = 'Nikima (the land)'. Names of persons are indicated by a superscript ¹ preceding the name; thus ¹*Suhis* = '(the person called) Suhis'.

One of the features of the Near Eastern syllabic scripts is that logograms and syllabograms are often combined, with the latter attached as complements to the former—for example, to provide a grammatical ending to a verb or noun written as a logogram, or to make a noun in logographic form into a plural (e.g. REGIO-*ní-ia* = 'lands' (CHLI I: 95 §8)). Personal and divine names often contain both logographic and syllabic elements.

That brings us to the question of transliterating the Near Eastern scripts, which contain a mixture of syllabic and logographic signs, into the roman script. Ever since the languages written in cuneiform were deciphered, the convention has been to represent syllabically written words, or syllabic elements in words, in italicized lower case with the individual syllable signs separated by dashes. Thus the Hittite word meaning 'now' is transliterated *ki-nu-na*. Logograms are conventionally written in non-italicized capitals. Thus LUGAL represents the Sumerian word 'king'. Hittite also adopted a number of Akkadian logograms into its script. To distinguish these from Sumerian logograms, they are written in italicized capitals. The logograms used in writing Sumerian, the earliest of the cuneiform languages, were taken over in later languages, like Akkadian and Hittite, though the actual reading of these logograms varied from one language to another. Thus the Sumerian word for 'land' was 'kur'. In Akkadian it was 'matu' and in Hittite 'utne'. This was evident from the way these words were rendered syllabically in their own languages. But the same logograms were used in each of these languages. Thus KUR was used to represent 'land' in Akkadian and Hittite as well as in Sumerian when the word was represented logographically—though the logogram would have been read 'matu' in Akkadian and 'utne' in Hittite. Also, the logograms functioning as determinatives, and used to identify names of persons, gods, lands, cities, etc., were adopted from the Sumerian script for use in other cuneiform languages. When logograms are used as determinatives, this is generally indicated by prefixing the logogram, which as a rule is written in superscript, to the name in question.

The first line of the 10-year Annals of the Hittite king Mursili II illustrates the transliteration conventions referred to above:

^M*Mur-ši-li* LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR *Ha-at-ti* UR.SAG.

'Mursili, the Great King, King of the Land of Hatti, the Hero.'

^M designates the logogram used as a determinative for a male person, 'Mursili' and 'Hatti' are written syllabically, whereas the words for 'king', 'great', and 'hero' are Sumerian logograms, sometimes called Sumerograms, and are capitalized in the transliteration to distinguish them from the syllabically represented words.⁷

Later in the text (line 22), the words transliterated as *A-NA* ^DUTU ^{URU}*A-ri-in-na* are translated 'to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna'. *A-NA* is an Akkadian logogram,

^D represents the Sumerian logogram 'DINGIR' which means 'deity'. It is here used here as a determinative to identify the following logogram UTU, which in this passage represents the name of the Sun-Goddess. ^{URU} is the logogram for 'city' used here as a determinative of the cult-centre Arinna, which was dedicated to the goddess's worship.

That brings us to the problems involved in transliterating the Luwian hieroglyphic script. As we have noted above, some of the hieroglyphic logograms are simply pictograms which represent what they look like, as in a number of instances of the symbol for a foot. In other cases, such pictograms are used to indicate related concepts, such as, in the foot symbols, 'come', 'go', 'walk'. There are, however, other cases where logograms, with syllabic complements sometimes attached, have a range of different meanings, often bearing no relation to the images which they depict. And in some cases, the logogram is not understood at all. The challenge that the Luwian epigraphists faced was to devise a set of conventions that could be applied to all logograms when transliterating the hieroglyphic inscriptions, including instances where neither the meaning nor the reading of certain logograms was known. The solution, which Hawkins in collaboration with A. Morpurgo Davies and G. Neumann reached, was to use Latin, an 'international' language, to designate the logograms in the hieroglyphic texts. Thus the logogram for 'god' is represented by the Latin DEUS, for 'king' by the Latin REX, for 'lord' by the Latin DOMINUS, and for 'land' by the Latin REGIO. As we have noted, a number of words consist of a logogram + one or more syllabic complements. For example, the name of the goddess Kubaba is transliterated in the texts as *ku* + AVIS-*pa-sa-ha*. Other words, including personal and divine names, and titles, consist of two juxtaposed logograms. Thus the logograms DOMINUS and REGIO combined represent the title translated as 'Country-Lord', used of a number of the rulers of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms (see below).

When the phonetic form of a name is known, this form is used in the translations. Thus, as we have noted, the name represented in transliteration as *ku* + AVIS-*pa-sa-ha* is that of the goddess Kubaba—and she is called Kubaba in the translated texts. Similarly, we know that the logogram represented by the Latin word for thunderbolt, TONITRUS (no. 7 in fig. 15), stands for the name of the Luwian Storm God Tarhunza. And that is how his name is translated. But there are a number of cases where the phonetic equivalent of a logogram is not known. This applies, for example, to the logogram no. 8, which depicts an outstretched forearm with clenched fist. It is represented in transliteration by the Latin word for a fist, PUGNUS. This logogram with the syllabic complement *-mi-li* occurs in several texts from Malatya, in reference to at least two and possibly three members of one of the city's ruling dynasties. The phonetic rendering of the logogram is unknown, so that in the translations the men in question are called PUGNUS-*mili*. This particular logogram also appears in a number of other contexts, in combination with various syllabic complements, to represent various verbs or adjectives.

The logogram depicting a human leg is represented by CRUS (no. 9), the Latin word for leg. When reduplicated—CRUS.CRUS—the logogram functions as a verb meaning 'follow'. When it is linked to the logogram which appears to indicate a river (depicted schematically as two lines with a kink in them; sign no. 10) and is thus represented by the Latin word FLUMEN ('river'), it is probably to be translated as the verb 'cross', generalized from the representation of someone crossing a river. CRUS + the complement *RA/I* is used both as an intransitive and a causative verb, to which the meanings 'stand' and 'make

stand' have been assigned,⁸ and also as the name of one of the early members of a ruling dynasty in Malatya. This name has been read phonetically as Taras(?).⁹

In their inscriptions, the rulers of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms indicate their status by one or more titles. The most prestigious of these is made up of the logogram resembling a ram's horns or the volute-capital of a Greek Ionic temple and represented by the Latin MAGNUS (no. 11) followed by the logogram represented by the Latin REX (no. 2). When used together, the signs mean 'Great King', a title used by the first Neo-Hittite kings of Carchemish. The first of the two signs is also used in conjunction with the sign for the thunderbolt, Latin TONITRUS, which on its own is the hieroglyphic form of the Storm God Tarhunza's name, as we have noted. MAGNUS and TONITRUS are used together to represent the name of one of the kings of Carchemish, now read phonetically as Ura-Tarhunza.¹⁰ 'ura' is the phonetic reading of MAGNUS.

After the Carchemishian rulers had ceased to style themselves 'Great Kings', the hieroglyphic inscriptions attest to a number of other titles borne by the rulers of various Neo-Hittite states. There appear to have been three main titles which, in accordance with the conventions we have discussed above, are transliterated thus:

IUDEX ('Prince', 'Judge', 'Ruler') = cuneiform Luwian *tarwani-*

REGIO.DOMINUS ('Country-Lord')

REX ('King') = cuneiform Luwian *handawati*.¹¹

The precise connotations of the original titles represented by these Latin terms, and the distinctions (if any) between them, are uncertain. The translations suggested for them are purely tentative ones, based on the meanings of the Latin terms. Hawkins comments that the title read REGIO.DOMINUS and translated 'Country-Lord' seems to have served as the main dynastic title at Carchemish as at Malatya,¹² though in the Hittite empire it appears to have been a rather subordinate title, designating no more than a provincial governor or local magnate.¹³ On the other hand, the occasional use of the word transcribed HEROS ('Hero') in Neo-Hittite royal titulature has what Hawkins calls grandiose and Empire pretensions, representing the revival of archaic claims.

The following provides a brief illustration of what a transliterated hieroglyphic text looks like, using the above conventions:

EGO-wa/i-mi¹ka-tú-wa/i-sa (IUDEX)tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa kar-ka-mi-si-za-sa(URBS)
RE[GIO DOMINUS . . .]

I (am) Katuwa(s) the Ruler, Karkamišean Coun[try-Lord. . .]¹⁴

Katuwa is identified as a personal name by the superscript ¹ before it. His title translated as 'Ruler' is indicated by the logogram represented as IUDEX which serves as a determinative for its phonetic equivalent *tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa*. The city over which he ruled, Carchemish, is phonetically represented as *kar-ka-mi-si-za-sa* whose identity as a city is indicated by the attached logogram represented by the Latin word for city URBS. REGIO DOMINUS 'Country-Lord' is another of the titles assumed by Katuwa. The square brackets indicate restoration of an obliterated part of the text.

APPENDIX II
Neo-Hittite and Aramaean Rulers
A Summary List

Conventions

- PN personal name
(PN) not explicitly attested as a king
'PN' appointed as nominal ruler

The letters prefixed in superscript to the inscription references indicate the language in which the inscriptions are written:

- ^{AR} Aramaean
^{ASS} Assyrian
^{BAB} Babylonian
^{Luw} Luwian
^{PH} Phoenician
^{UR} Urartian

^{OT} is prefixed to Old Testament references.

- ↓ succeeded by
(↓) non-royal succession; i.e. either the first or the second of the persons thus linked is not attested as a ruler of the kingdom.
— a gap in the succession, occupied by one or more unknown rulers.
—? a possible gap in the succession
↔? possible simultaneous rule
=? possibly to be identified with
— before date unknown starting-point of reign
— after date unknown end-point of reign
C + no. a particular century BC. Thus C5 = 5th century BC.

The references appended to each entry indicate translated passages and the relevant page numbers in the publications cited.

**I: The Rulers of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms
in the Euphrates Region**

Carchemish (mid C12–2nd half of C8)

Ku(n)zi-Teshub dynasty

Kuzi-Teshub (early–mid C12) (^{LUW}Hawkins (1988: 100), *CHLI* I: 296–7, 300, 302)

—?

Ir-Teshub? (later C12) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 289–90)

—?

Ini-Teshub? (late C12–early C11) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 2: 37, 42)

—?

Tudhaliya? (probably C11 or C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 82)

—?

x-pa-ziti (probably later C11 or C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 80)

↓

Ura-Tarhunza (son) (probably later C11 or C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 80)

—?

Suhi dynasty

Suhi I (probably C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 80 (§6), 85–6)

↓

Astuwatamanza (son) (probably C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 85–6, 103)

↓

Suhi II (son) (probably C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 85–6, 88–9, 92, 93)

↓

Katuwa (son) (probably C10 or early C9) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 95–6, 103–4, 109–10, 113–14, 115–16, 119–20, 122?)

—?

Sangara (— c.870–848 —) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 2: 217, 3: 9–10, 16–17, 18, 23, 37, 38)

—?

Astiruwa dynasty

—?

Astiruwa (end C9–beginning C8) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 130–1, 165–6, 172–3)

↓

Yariri (regent) (early–mid C8) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 124–5, 129, 130–1, 139)

↓

Kamani (son of Astiruwa) (early–mid C8) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 124–5, 129, 130–1, 141–2, 145–6, 152)

↓

(Sastura, vizier of Kamani) (mid C8) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 145, 160)

↓

son of Sastura (2nd half of C8) (= Pisiri?) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 160, ^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9)

Malatya (mid C12–1st half of C7)

Ku(n)zi-Teshub dynasty

(Kuzi-Teshub) (early–mid C12) (^{LUW}Hawkins (1988: 100), ^{LUW}CHLI I: 296–7, 300, 302)

(↓)

(PUGNUS-mili (I)) (son) (later C12) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 296–7, 300, 302, 305)

(↓)

Runtiya (son) (later C12) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 296–7, 300)

↓

Arnuwanti I (brother) (later C12) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 302, 305)

(↓)

(PUGNUS-mili (II)) (son) (late C12–early C11) (= Assyrian Allumari???) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 305, ^{ASS}RIMA 2: 43)

(↓)

Arnuwanti II (son of PUGNUS-mili (II), grandson of Arnuwanti I) (late C12–early C11) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 302, 305)

—?

PUGNUS-mili (III)? (probably C11 or early C10, if at all) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 307, 309–14)

CRUS + RA/I-sa dynasty

—

CRUS + RA/I-sa (= Taras?) (probably C11–10) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 315–16, 319)

↓

Wasu(?)runtiya (son) (probably C11–10) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 319)

↓

Halpasulupi (son) (probably C11–10) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 319, 321)

—?

Later rulers

—?

(Suwarimi) (probably C11 or C10) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 321)

(↓)

Mariti (son) (probably C11 or C10) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 321)

—

Lalli (— 853–835 —) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 23, 39, 67, 79)

—

opponent of Hamathite king Zakur (— early C8) (^{ARC}S II: 155)

=?

Shahu (— early C8) (= Sahwi?) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 322–3, ^{UR}Hcl 116, no. 102, rev. I, *HeI* 130, no. 104, I)

↓

Hilaruada (son) (— c.784–760 —) (= Sa(?)tiruntiya?) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 322–3, ^{UR}Hcl 88, no. 80 §3 II, *Hcl* 116, no. 102, rev. II, VII, *Hcl* 130–1, no. 104 I, VII, VIII)

—?

Sulmal (— 743–732 —) (^{ASS}Tigl. III 69, 101, 109)

—?

Gunzinaanu (— c.719) (^{ASS}ARAB II §§60, 79, 92, 99, Lie 34–5, Fuchs 324, 348)

↓

Tarhunazi (c.719–712) (^{ASS}ARAB II §§26, 60, Lie 34–5, Fuchs 324, 347).

—

Mugallu (— 675 —) (^{BAB}ABC 126)

Kummuh (— c.870–708)

—?

Hattusili I (Assyrian Qatazilu) (— c.866–c.857) (^{ASS}RIMA 2: 219; 3: 15, 18–19)

↓?

Kundashpu (c.856 —) (RIMA 3: 23)

—

Suppiluliuma (Assyrian Ushpilulume) (— 805–773 —) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 336–7, 349, 350, 356–7, ^{ASS}RIMA 3: 205, 240)

↓

Hattusili II (— mid C8) (son) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 341–2, 349, 350, 356–7)

—?

Kushtashpi (— c.750 —) (^{UR}Hcl 123–4, no. 103 §9, ^{ASS}Tigl. III 68–9, 168)

—?

Muwatalli (Assyrian Mutallu) (— 708) (^{ASS}ARAB II §§45, 64, Lie 36–7, 70–1, Fuchs 324, 337–8, 349).

Masuwari/Til Barsip (— C10–856)

The two dynasties

—?

Hapatila (Dyn. A) (late C10–early C9) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 240–1)

↓

Ariyahina (Dyn. A) (grandson) (late C10–early C9) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 240)

↓

father of Hamiyata (Dyn. B) (usurper) (late C10–early C9) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 228, 230–1, 232, 240, Bunnens (2006: 12–18))

↓

Hamiyata (Dyn. B) (son) (late C10–early C9) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 228, 230–1, 232, 236, 240–1, Bunnens (2006: 12–18))

↓

son of Hamiyata (Dyn. B) (early–mid C9) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 240)

↓

son of Ariyahina (Dyn. A) (— mid C9) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 240–1)

Bit-Adini regime

—?

Ahuni (— 856) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 10–11, 19, 21–2)

II: The Rulers of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms in the Anti-Taurus and Western Syrian Regions

Gurgum (— late C11–711)

—?

Astuwaramanza (late C11) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 253)

↓

Muwatalli (I) (son) (— early C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 253)

↓

Larama (I) (son) (— c.950) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 253, 262–3)

↓

Muwizi (son) (later C10) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 256–7, 262–3)

↓

Halparuntiya (I) (son) (earlier C9) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 262)

↓

Muwatalli (II) (Assyrian Mutallu II) (son) (— 858 —) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 256–7 (= CS II: 126–7), 262–3, ^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 16)

↓

Halparuntiya (II) (Assyrian Qalparunda II) (son) (— 853 —) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 256–7 (= CS II: 126–7), 262, ^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 23)

↓

Larama (II) (Assyrian Palalam) (son) (later C9) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 262, ^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 205)

↓

Halparuntiya (III) (Assyrian Qalparunda III) (son) (— 805–c.800 —) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 262–3, ^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 205, ^{AR}CS II: 155)

—

Tarhulara (— 743–c.711) (^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 100–1, 102–3, 108–9, ^{ASS}*ARAB* II §§ 29, 61, Fuchs 325–6, 348).

↓

Muwatalli (III) (Assyrian Mutallu III) (c.711) (^{ASS}*ARAB* II §§ 29, 61, Fuchs 325–6, 348).

Pat(t)in (Assyrian *Unqi*) (— c.870–739)

(Taita) (C11? C10?) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 416–17, Aleppo 6 (Hawkins, 2009: 169))

—?

‘Lubarna dynasty’

—?

Lubarna (I) (— c.870–858?) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 2: 217–18, 3: 25)

↔?

Suppiluliuma (Assyrian Sapalulme) (—?858/857) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 9–10)

↓

Halparuntiya (Assyrian Qalparunda) (858/857–853 —) (^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 366, ^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 11, 18, 38?)

↓?

Lubarna (II) (— 831) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 69)

↓

Later kings

Surri (usurper) (831) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 69)

↓

Sasi (Assyrian appointee) (831 —) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 69)

—

Tutammu (— 738) (^{ASS}Tigl. III 56–9)**Hamath (C10–720)**‘Toi (Tou)’ (early C10) (^{OT}2 Samuel 8:9)

Parita dynasty

—?

Parita (first half of C9) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 405, 409, 410)

↓

Urhilina (Assyrian Irhuleni) (son) (— 853–845 —) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 405, 409, 410, 413, 421, ^{ASS}RIMA 3: 23, 37–9)

↓

Uratami (= Assyrian Rudamu?) (son) (— c.830 —) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 411–12, 413)

Aramaean rulers

—?

Zak(k)ur (— c.800 —) (^{AR}CS II: 155)

—

(Azriyau?) (— 738 —) (^{ASS}Tigl. III 62–3)Eni’ilu (— 738 —) (^{ASS}Tigl. III 68–9, 170–1)

—?

Yaubidi (Ilubidi) (— 720) (^{ASS}CS II: 293, 295, 296)**III: The Rulers of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms
in Central and South-Eastern Anatolia****Northern Tabal and Bit-Burutash (— C9–713)**

—?

Tuwati (I) (— 837) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 79)

↓

Kikki (son) (837—) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 79)

—

Tuwati (II) (mid C8) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 443, 449, 452–3, 473)

↓

Wasusarma (Assyrian Wassurme) (son) (c.740–730) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 452–3, 462, 465–6, 473, ^{ASS}Tigl. III 68–9, 108–9, 170–1)

↓

Hulli (Assyrian appointee) (730–726 —) (^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 170–1, *ARAB II*: §25, Lie 32–3, Fuchs 323)

↓

Ambaris (son) (c.721–713) (^{ASS}*ARAB II*: §25, Lie 32–3, Fuchs 291, 323, 344)

Atuna (— last half of C8)

—?

Ushhitti (— c.740 —) (^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9, 170–1)

(—?)

(Ashwis(i) = Ushhitti?) (3rd quarter of C8) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: I: 479)

(↓)

Kurti (son) (— 718 —) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: I: 479, ^{ASS}*ARAB II*: §§7, 55, 214, Lie 10–11, Fuchs 316, 344)

—?

Ishtu(a)nda (— 738–732 —)

—?

Tuhamme (— 738–732—) (^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9)

—?

Shinuhtu (—718)

—?

Kiyakiya (Assyrian Kiakki) (—718) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: 452–4, 476, ^{ASS}*ARAB II*: §§7, 55, Lie 10–11, Fuchs 290, 315–16, 344)

Tuwana (— C8 —)

—?

Warpalawa (I)? (early C8?) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: 515)

—?

Saruwani (first half of C8?) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: 515)

—?

Muwaharani (I) (— c.740) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: 520)

↓

Warpalawa (II?) (Assyrian Urballa) (son) (c.740–705) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: 453, 517, 520, 522–3, 526, 527, ^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9, *SAA I*: no. 1)

↓

Muwaharani (II) (son) (end C8 —) (^{LUW}*CHLI I*: 527)

Hupis(h)na (— 837–c.740 —)

—?

Puhame (— 837 —) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 79)

—

U(i)rim(m)e (— c.740 —) (^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 68–9, 108–9)

Adanawa (Hiyawa, Assyrian Que) (— C9-early C7?)

—?

Kate (— 858–831) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 10, 16–17, 68–9, 80, 119)

↓

Kirri (brother) (831 —) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 80, 119)

—

Awariku (Warika, Awarikku; Assyrian Urikki) (c.738–709) (^{LUW}CHLI I: I: 48–58 (= CS II: 124–6), ^{PH}CHLI II: 50–7 (= CS II: 148–50), ^{ASS}Tigl. III 108–9, ^{ASS}SAA I: no. 1, ^{LUW} & ^{PH}Tekoğlu and Lemaire (2000))

—?

Azatiwata (?) (regent?) (c.705?–) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 48–58 (= CS II: 124–6), ^{PH}CHLI II: 50–7 (= CS II: 148–50))

—?

son of Awariku? (late C8–early C7?) (^{LUW}CHLI I: 50 §XVI, ^{PH}CHLI II: 51, ll. 10–11)**Hilakku** (— C9-late C8)

—?

Pihirim (mid C9) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 10, 16–17)

—

(Ambaris) (King of Bit-Burutash) (c.718–713) (^{ASS}ARAB II: §25, Lie 32–3, Fuchs 323, 344).**IV: The Rulers of the Aramaean Kingdoms****Bit-Agusi (Arpad)** (early C9–mid C8)Gusi (— c.870 —) (^{ASS}RIMA 2: 218, 3: 25)

↓

Hadram (Assyrian Adramu, Arame) (son) (c.860–830) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 17, 18, 25, 37, 38, 46, 47, 53, 66, 76)

↓

Attar-shumki (I) (son?) (c.830–800 —) (^{ASS}RIMA 3: 203–4 (Antakya stele), 205 (Pazarcık stele), ^{AR}CS II: 155 (Zakkur inscription¹))

↓

Bar-Hadad (?) (son) (c.800 —) (^{AR}CS II: 152–3 = Melqart stele)

↓

Attar-shumki (II) (son) (1st half of C8) (^{AR}CS II: 213)

↓

Mati'ilu (son) (— mid C8 —) (^{AR}CS II: 213–17)**Sam'al (Y'dy)** (c.900–713/11)

(The dates assigned to the members of this dynasty are those proposed by Lipiński (2000a: 247).)

Gabbar (c.900–880) (^{PH}CS II: 147)

↓

Banihu (son) (c.880–870) (^{PH}CS II: 147)

↓

Hayya(nu) (son) (c.870–850) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 10, 16, ^{PH}CS II: 147)
 ↓
 Sha'il (son) (c.850–840) (^{PH}CS II: 147)
 ↓
 Kilamuwa (brother) (c.840–810) (^{PH}CS II: 147–8, 161)
 ↓
 Qarli (son?) (c.810–790) (^{AR}CS II: 156, 158–9)
 ↓
 Panamuwa I (son) (c.790–750) (^{AR}CS II: 156, 158–9)
 ↓
 Bar-Sur (son) (c.750–745) (^{AR}CS II: 158–160)
 ↓
 usurper (c.745–740) (^{AR}CS II: 158–9)
 ↓
 Panamuwa II (son of Bar-Sur) (c.740–733) (^{ASS}*Tigl. III*: 68–9, 108–9, ^{AR}CS II: 158–60, 161, ^{AR}Pardee 2009)
 ↓
 Bar-Rakib (son) (c.733–713/11) (^{AR}CS II: 160–1, ^{LUW}*CHLI* I: 576).

Damascus (— C10–732)

Bar-Hadad (I) (Hebrew Ben-Hadad) (— c.900 —) (^{OT}1 Kings 15:16–22)
 ↓
 Hadadezer (= Assyrian Adad-idri) (— mid C9 —) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 23, 37–9, 118)
 ↓
 Hazael (mid C9–803?) (^{OT}2 Kings 8:7–15, ^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 48, 60, 67, 118, ^{AR}CS II: 161–2)
 ↓
 Bar-Hadad II (= *OT* Ben-Hadad) (son) (803?–775?) (^{OT}1 Kings 20, ^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 213 (if = Mari'))
 ↓
 Hadyan (II) (Hezyon, Assyrian Hadiiani) (c.775?–mid C8) (^{ASS}*RIMA* 3: 240)
 ↓
 Rasyan (*OT* Rezin, Rahianu) (mid C8–732) (^{OT}2 Kings 16:5–9, ^{ASS}*Tigl. III* 78–81).

APPENDIX III

The Kings of Late Bronze Age Hatti

Old Kingdom

Labarna ?-1650
Hattusili I 1650-1620
Mursili I 1620-1590
Hantili I 1590-1560
Zidanta I }
Ammuna } 1560-1525
Huzziya I }
Telipinu 1525-1500
Alluwamna }
Tahurwaili }
Hantili II } 1500-1400
Zidanta II }
Huzziya II }
Muwat(t)alli }

New Kingdom

Tudhaliya I/II¹ }
Arnuwanda I } 1400-1350
Hattusili II? }
Tudhaliya III }
Suppiluliuma I 1350-1322
Arnuwanda II 1322-1321
Mursili II 1321-1295
Muwat(t)alli II 1295-1272
Urhi-Teshub (Mursili III) 1272-1267
Hattusili III 1267-1237
Tudhaliya IV 1237-1209
Arnuwanda III 1209-1207
Suppiluliuma II 1207-?

APPENDIX IV

The Neo-Assyrian Kings

(to the reign of Ashurbanipal)

Ashur-dan II 934–912
Adad-nirari II 911–891
Tukulti-Ninurta II 890–884
Ashurnasirpal II 883–859
Shalmaneser III 858–824
Shamshi-Adad V 823–811
Adad-nirari III 810–783
Shalmaneser IV 782–773
Ashur-dan III 772–755
Ashur-nirari V 754–746
Tiglath-pileser III 745–727
Shalmaneser V 726–722
Sargon II 721–705
Sennacherib 704–681
Esarhaddon 680–669
Ashurbanipal 668–630/27

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. As his ancestor Tudhaliya III had done, in establishing an alternative royal seat at Samuha, probably located on the upper course of the Halys (Hittite Marassantiya) river, after abandoning Hattusa under pressure from enemy invasions of the Hittite homeland some time during the first half of the 14th century; see Bryce (2005: 147–9).
2. We should bear in mind that in translations of these sources the term ‘Hittite’ is a modern one, used by scholars of the inhabitants who in the Late Bronze Age texts are simply called ‘people of the land of Hatti’. ‘Hittite’ is a designation adopted for them from its use in the Bible. Obviously, this in itself does not necessarily mean that there was a connection between them and the biblical Hittites. We shall discuss this further in Chapters 3 and 4.
3. Bryce (2002: 3–4; 2005: 355–6).
4. A third volume of the *Corpus* is currently in preparation. It will include the inscriptions of the second millennium, along with a sign-list and grammar.
5. I should acknowledge here the Italian study of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms by A. M. Jasink (1995). In her book, Jasink analyses the written sources of information on the kingdoms and their rulers, and presents a brief historical synthesis of this information, particularly in relation to the Assyrian kingdom into which the Neo-Hittite states became progressively absorbed. Though the *CHLI* volumes appeared too late for Jasink to take into account the material they contained, her book none the less remains a useful, concise reference work on the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, their rulers, and the sources which deal with them.
6. In these cases, we know the rulers only by the Assyrian forms of their names, which may sometimes have differed substantially from the original Luwian forms.
7. We shall leave to Part III an account of the Neo-Assyrian empire, which will be integrated into a discussion of the other kingdoms upon which this empire impacted.
8. In the meantime, Aro’s study of ‘Luwian’ art and architecture (2003) provides a useful overview of a number of aspects of Neo-Hittite material culture.

CHAPTER 1. THE END OF AN ERA

1. It is clear that Hattusa was not at this time abandoned by its entire population. As de Martino points out (2009: 25), ‘People continued living in Hattusa, even though the loss of the city’s importance and its progressive economic impoverishment are recognizable from the archaeological evidence of this period.’ It is likely that the king’s exit from the city was a closely controlled one, which excluded the masses from accompanying those privileged to be allowed to join the royal entourage.
2. Seeher (1998, 2001).

3. e.g. Hawkins (1982: 372).
4. For brief accounts of these, see Bryce (2005: 333–40), *PPAWA* 626–8.
5. Extract from the Medinet Habu inscription of the pharaoh Ramesses III's 8th year, transl. Wilson, *ANET* 262.
6. It is possible that it was the earlier of the two viceregal establishments set up by Suppiluliuma.
7. See Bryce (2005: 35–40).
8. The substantial numbers of deportees brought back by Mursili in the wake of his military campaigns must have significantly bolstered the homeland population, and perhaps significantly changed its ethnic composition, following a devastating and long-lasting plague that broke out in Hatti towards the end of Suppiluliuma's reign; see Bryce (2005: 205–7) and Singer's comments and references (2005: 446).
9. Yakubovich (2009).
10. See Bryce (2005: 217–19).
11. On seals from Karahöyük near Konya, Kültepe, Boğazköy/Hattusa, and Tarsus. See Singer (2005: 432).
12. See Hawkins (1997: 15).
13. See Bryce (2005: 389–90).
14. The *bulla* bearing the seal impression was first reported by Goldman (1935: 535–6). See also Goetze (1936), Klengel (1976–80).
15. See Bryce (2005: 104–6).
16. Hawkins (1997).
17. See van den Hout (2007: 225).
18. See also *CHLI* I: 18–19. The sites referred to are briefly described, with references, under their respective headings in *PPAWA*.
19. Ed. Meriggi (1975: 330–1, no. 306).
20. Ed. Hawkins (1995a: 66–85).
21. Ed. Hawkins (1995a: 86–102).
22. Ed. Hawkins (1995a: 21–65).
23. For the reading of the line, see Masson (1988: 150–2).
24. See Bryce (2005: 332).
25. Ed. Dinçol (1988).
26. Published and ed. by Hawkins (1998).
27. See Bryce (2005: 306–8).
28. The inscriptions are ed. by Hawkins (1995a: 103–7; *CHLI* I: 433–42).
29. KIZILDAĞ 5 (*CHLI* I: 435). Only the introductory words naming Mursili along with his titles 'Great King' and 'Hero' have survived.
30. For further discussion and the possible identification of the figure, see Chapter 7, under *Ambaris* (p. 145).
31. This identification has recently been questioned by Sürenhagen (2008), who presents a case for equating the Mursili in question with Mursili II, grandfather of Urhi-Teshub/Mursili III. Hartapu would thus have been a (half-?) brother of Muwatalli II and Hattusili III, and therefore an uncle not a son of Urhi-Teshub. In the absence of conclusive evidence for either identification, the matter remains speculative, though on balance I am still inclined to favour identifying Hartapu's father with Urhi-Teshub/Mursili III. Further on the chronological problems raised

- by the Kızıldağ inscriptions, see Hawkins, *CHLI* I: 434–5, and Freu and Mazoyer (2010: 206–9).
32. Hawkins (2003: 167) comments that it is impossible to characterize any hieroglyphs earlier than c.1300 as specifically Luwian, except the Ankara silver bowl, if it dates to c.1400.
 33. For differences between cuneiform and hieroglyphic Luwian, see Melchert (2003b: 170–5).
 34. Note Hawkins’s comments (2003: 140–1).
 35. The use of the cuneiform script for writing the Luwian language dates back at least to the late 16th century; see Starke (1985: 21–31).
 36. Singer (2005: 432).
 37. See Bryce (2006: 118–22).
 38. Hawkins (2003: 152).
 39. Singer (2005: 447), referring to van den Hout (2007: 235). (Singer had received a pre-publication copy of van den Hout’s article.)
 40. van den Hout (2007: 225).
 41. van den Hout (2007: 226–41).
 42. van den Hout (2007: 238–9).
 43. Seeher (2009).
 44. According to my reconstruction of the events of the period; see Bryce (2007).
 45. See Bryce (2005: 300–1, 327–8).
 46. See Bryce (2005: 299).
 47. For this possibility, see Hawkins (1995a: 83–4), with ref. to block 16 of the inscription.
 48. Note also the seals bearing the inscription ‘Kurunta, Great King’ in the Hittite capital. On these, see Bryce (2005: 319–20), with refs. therein.
 49. See Bryce (2002: 18).

CHAPTER 2. THE HITTITE EMPIRE’S ANATOLIAN SUCCESSORS

1. Herodotus 1.146. This allegedly happened in the city of Miletus, the most important of the Ionian cities.
2. Niemeier (2005).
3. See Bryce (2005: 224).
4. See *PPAWA* 10–11.
5. See Bryce (2005: 309–10).
6. For a general account of Miletus throughout its history, see *PPAWA* 472–6.
7. See *PPAWA* 368–9.
8. Gardiner (1960: 8).
9. See Bryce (1986) and *PPAWA* 430–2.
10. See *PPAWA* 424.
11. See Houwink ten Cate (1965).
12. e.g. Arña (the city which the Greeks called Xanthus), Pinara, Tlawa (Greek Tlos), Oenoanda, Kandyba.
13. Awarna, Pina[], Dalawa, Wiyawanda, Hinduwa.

14. See the respective entries in *PPAWA* on Parha, Pamphylia, and Perge.
15. See *PPAWA* 5–6.
16. ‘Aphaeresize’ means to remove a letter or syllable from the beginning of a word.
17. Cf. Tekoğlu and Lemaire (2000: 1006), *PPAWA* 10–11, s.v. Ahhiyawa.
18. *Iliad* 2.862–3; 3.184–9, 401; 10.431; 16.719; 18.291–2; 24.545.
19. For a comprehensive survey and analysis of the written sources of information on the Mushki and the Phrygians (Assyrian, Urartian, Hittite, Luwian, Phoenician, biblical, Phrygian, Greek, Latin), and a reconstruction of historical events in which these peoples were involved, from the 12th to the 7th centuries BC, see Wittke (2004).
20. See e.g. Laminger-Pascher (1989: 24), Wittke (2004; with summary of her conclusions, in German, English, and Turkish, presented on pp. 291–4).
21. See Vassileva (2008: 165), Sagona and Zimansky (2009: 353).
22. On the possible circumstances of the formation of the union, see Kossian (1997).
23. See *OCD* 978.
24. For a general account of the city, see *PPAWA* 260–1.
25. See *PPAWA* 471.
26. See Brixhe and Lejeune (1984: 6–9 (Vol. I), M01a), with Plate I in Vol. II.
27. It is possible that Midas may for a time have extended his authority to the southern Tabalian kingdom called Tuwana, if his name has been correctly read on one of the Old Phrygian inscriptions found in the region. See further on this in Chapter 7 under *Warpalawa (II)* (p. 150).
28. Ivantchik (1993: 161–79), *SAA* I: 29–32, nos. 30–2, *SAA* V: 109–10, no. 145.
29. *CHLI* I: A6 §§4–6, p. 124; see Chapter 5 under *Yariri* (p. 95).
30. *ARAB* II: §516; Ivantchik (1993: 180–5).
31. Ivantchik (1993: 268–74). According to Strabo (1.3.21), Lygdamis was killed in Cilicia after returning from an expedition to Lydia and Ionia.

CHAPTER 3. DEFINING THE NEO-HITTITES

1. The fact that representatives from other Neo-Hittite states – Patin, Gurgum, Melid and Kummuh – are listed alongside those of Hatti would support the likelihood that ‘Hatti’ here = Carchemish. So too Hatti is almost certainly to be identified with Carchemish in the 12th-century Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I’s report of his imposition of tributary status upon Ini-Teshub, ‘king of the Land of Hatti’ (*RIMA* 2: 37, 42); Ini-Teshub would thus have been a king of Carchemish; see Hawkins (1972–5: 153 §§3.1, 3.3).
2. Carchemish and Hatti are also equated in passages where the Carchemishite kings Sangara and Pisiri are identified by the title ‘king of Hatti’; see Hawkins (1972–5: 154 §4.1, with refs.).
3. e.g. *ARAB* II §118, Fuchs 35 v. 26 (291), in ref. to the kingdom of Carchemish. See also Hawkins (1972–5: 154 §4.4), and refs. in Collins (2007: 207, n. 47).
4. Though the 7th-century Assyrian king Esarhaddon applied the term ‘wicked Hittites’ also to the inhabitants of Hilakku; see Borger (1956: 51, line 49).
5. For the locations of the Syrian principalities in the Late Bronze Age, see *PPAWA* p. xxix, map 6.

6. Hawkins (1982: 389) suggests that it may already have formed the northern province of Hamath by the reign of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III (858–824), or even earlier.
7. Singer (2006: 756) observes that as the states west of the Euphrates were integrated into the Assyrian provincial administration, the term ‘Hatti’ became virtually synonymous with ‘Amurru’, with both terms referring to the entire area west of the Euphrates from Asia Minor to Egypt (see refs. cited in his n. 193), and that in fact ‘Hatti’ gradually replaced ‘Amurru’ during the 7th and 6th centuries, and completely lost its original ethnic and cultural content. Collins (2007: 205) notes that though the term ‘Hittite’ as an ethnicon ceased to carry any political or historical relevance after Sargon II, Assyrian records continued to employ the term *mât Hatti*, ‘land of the Hittites’, as a geographical designation to refer to northern Syria (though in n. 34 she cites Cogan (2002: 86–92), who, *contra* others, does not believe that the cuneiform documents used the terms *Hatti* and *Amurru* coterminously).
8. See Hawkins (1988: 99–100).
9. *CHLI* I: 296, 299 for the former, and 301, 305 for the latter. The inscriptions are discussed in Chapter 5.
10. See Singer (1999).
11. See Singer (1985: 104). Liverani (2001: 27) explains the statement thus: ‘There was no victory over the Hittites at all, either in the first year (of Tukulti-Ninurta’s reign) or later. But in the anti-Hittite climate during the war, while the real front remained stalemated on the Euphrates, an old episode was re-used in order to provide a victory to celebrate.’ (We shall discuss the episode further in Chapter 10.)
12. Designated as ALEPPO 1. We have discussed this inscription in Chapter 1.
13. *ARE IV*: §§65–6, *ANET* 262.
14. Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 73) suggests that in this context ‘Carchemish’ probably refers to the Hittite empire in Syria.
15. *CHLI* I: 442–513. Discussed in Chapter 7.
16. *CHLI* I: 533–55. See also Hawkins (2003: 151).
17. Riis and Buhl (1990).
18. *CHLI* I: 420–3.
19. A *bullā* (plur. *bullae*) is a lump of clay stamped with a seal impression and attached to a document, as a label, certificate of authentication, etc.
20. Cf. Singer (2005: 438). Collins (2007: 87, n. 170) refers to a stele of Bar-Rakib of Sam’al, depicting a scribe holding a wooden writing board. But the language which he is using is unknown.
21. It is worth noting here that in the Late Bronze Age Arzawa lands, no trace of a clay tablet has yet been found, though the kings of these lands must have had their own chanceries, as evidenced by their frequent written communications with their overlord in Hattusa.
22. To judge from the cremation-burials found at Alalah; see Singer (2006: 742, with refs. in n. 110).
23. See Singer (2006: 742, with refs. in n. 111). On the Hamath cemeteries, see Riis (1948). A recently discovered ‘mortuary chapel’ and inscribed stele at Zincirli *may*

provide a further example of an Iron Age cremation; see Schloen and Fink (2009: 10–11).

24. Singer (2005: 439).
25. Collins (2007: 214–15).
26. Collins (2007: 90).
27. Singer (2006: 736–43).
28. See also Bunnens (2000b), Klengel (2000).
29. A broad distinction can be drawn between these kingdoms and the Neo-Hittite kingdoms of south-central Anatolia (those of the Tabal region, Adanawa, and Hilakku), which will be dealt with in Chapter 7.
30. Cf the comment of S. Dalley (2000: 88): ‘If rulers in Syria chose to write some of their public inscriptions in hieroglyphic (Luwian), their choice was dictated by the prestige of monuments that would connect them with the glorious past of their country.’
31. See *CHLI* I: 82 and the discussion in Chapter 5 under *Tudhaliya?* (p. 88).
32. See Bryce (2005: 300) for full passage, context, and refs.
33. Houwink ten Cate (2006) is among those scholars who favour the view that Urhi-Teshub returned to his first place of banishment in northern Syria, where he took refuge after his sojourn in Egypt, and suggests that his return there must have been associated with the renewed establishment of ‘a sort of royal court’.
34. See Ünal (1974: II, 104–11, obv. II 29’). Cf. Houwink ten Cate (1994: 249).
35. The last of these possibilities is generally considered to account for the origins of the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom.

CHAPTER 4. THE BIBLICAL HITTITES

1. Translation from the New International Version.
2. See Singer (2006: 745, with refs.).
3. See Singer (2006: 728).
4. A possible earlier reference to Canaan found in the Early Bronze Age archive at Ebla, which dates to the 24th century, depends on the disputed reading of the term *ga-na-na* as ‘Canaanite’.
5. Collins (2007: 201 with refs. in n. 15).
6. As noted in Chapter 1; see again *PPAWA* 10–11.
7. Margalith (1988).
8. Görg (1976).
9. See e.g. Hoffner (1973: 225).
10. See refs. in Moran (1992: 379).
11. Singer (2006: 745). Thus previously Hoffner (1973: 225).
12. For the suggestion that they are to be identified with an Amorite tribe called the Yabusi’um, referred to in one of the letters in the Mari archives, see Lipiński (2004: 502), Collins (2007: 202).
13. *ANET* 376–8.
14. This follows the chronology adopted in *HCBD*.
15. The city has sometimes been identified, implausibly I believe, as Lawazantiya’s Iron Age descendant.

16. It is in fact presented in the context of a delusion inflicted by God upon the Aramaeans.
17. Makinson (2002-5).
18. See the discussion in Bunnens (2006: 88–94).
19. Lipiński (2000a: 395, n. 261). It would be much less easy to explain the plurality of kings if Mizraim did in fact refer to a kingdom in south-eastern Anatolia or northern Syria, especially if it is to be equated with the small kingdom of Masuwari/Til Barsip.
20. We shall consider in Chapter 12 the nature of the relationship between the Phrygians/Mushki and the kingdoms of Tabal.
21. Singer (2006: 756).
22. Collins (2007: 212).

PREFACE TO CHAPTERS 5–7

1. Readers with access to Italian should compare my treatment with that of Jasink (1995). As I have noted in the Introduction, the latter is at the disadvantage of having appeared five years before the publication of the *CHLI* volumes.

CHAPTER 5. THE NEO-HITTITE KINGDOMS IN THE EUPHRATES REGION

1. Tiglath-pileser actually calls Ini-Teshub king of Hatti. But as we noted in Chapter 3, n. 1, ‘Hatti’ in these passages is almost certainly to be equated with Carchemish.
2. See Hawkins (1988: 99–100) for the reading of the sealings.
3. For the term, see Ch. 3, n. 19.
4. See *CHLI* I: 289, 290–1.
5. *CHLI* I: 283, 288 with n. 75, 291, 429, n. 60.
6. An earlier Ini-Teshub is attested as the third viceroy of Carchemish, grandson of the first viceroy Sharri-Kushuh. His appointment dated to the reign of Hattusili III in the mid 13th century and continued into the reign of Hattusili’s son and successor Tudhaliya IV. See Bryce (2005: 312–13).
7. Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 82, and 1995b: 82–3, with genealogical table, p. 83).
8. For this reading of his name, see Hawkins (1995b: 77).
9. On the basis of a text restoration proposed by Hawkins.
10. Hawkins attributes the authorship of this inscription, which like A14b is inscribed on a lion, to Suhi II on the grounds that it is later both stylistically and epigraphically than the inscription of his father Astuwatamanza with which it was paired.
11. The author’s name is actually missing from the inscription. For its attribution to Suhi II, see *CHLI* I: 77. Orthostats are large, upright rectangular slabs of stone commonly used to revet the bases of city-walls and public buildings, and sometimes decorated with relief sculptures.
12. See *CHLI* I: 82. Hawkins here notes the resemblance of the text of the inscription to that of KARKAMIŠ A4b, authored by Astuwatamanza.
13. Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 333), suggests that he may have been a king of Kummuh.
14. For the dating of his dynasty, see *CHLI* I: 78.

15. Hawkins (1995b: 75, 79, 84–5). In the Neo-Hittite inscriptions, the title ‘Hero’ is otherwise used of Taras(?), a later occupant of the throne of Malatya (*CHLI* I: V.15. IZGIN 1 §1, p. 315), and Warpalawa, king of Tuwana in south-eastern Anatolia (*CHLI* I: X.43. İVRİZ 1 §3, p. 517).
16. For the form Astiru = Astiruwa, see *CHLI* I: 79, n. 81.
17. See *CHLI* I: 78 with n. 64.
18. See *CHLI* I: 126, n. on §6.
19. See *PPAWA* 700. For the equation, see Grayson (1982a: 354–5), *CHLI* I: 133, n. on §19.
20. For these equations, see *CHLI* I: 126, n. on §6.
21. Hawkins (1982: 407).
22. For discussion of these possibilities, see *CHLI* I: 79.
23. The reading of the hieroglyphic form of the name is uncertain but probably represents Malizi (see Hawkins, 1995c: 88–9; *CHLI* I: 298). Throughout this book I use the modern form Malatya in reference to the ancient capital and kingdom. The former is located on the site of modern Arslantepe, which lies 7 km north-east of the modern Turkish provincial capital Malatya.
24. See Bryce (2005: 143).
25. Hawkins (1995b: 75). He comments that ‘in origin this may have been a rather subordinate title: the Empire period has Cuneiform EN KUR and its hieroglyphic equivalent on seals, REGIO DOMINUS, which seem to designate no more than a provincial governor or local magnate’. Elsewhere (1995c: 88), he suggests that the title ‘Country-Lord’ rather than ‘King’ was ‘very likely in recognition of the nominal overlordship of the “Great Kings” of Carchemish’.
26. Hawkins (1995c: 88).
27. Ini-Teshub’s kingdom is called Hatti here, but almost certainly the reference is to Carchemish, as discussed in Chapter 3.
28. Thus Hawkins (1972-5: 153 §3.1, *CHLI* I: 283, n. 11); cf. Grayson (*RIMA* 2: 22, n. on v 34).
29. *CHLI* I: 283.
30. Thus Grayson (*RIMA* 2: 38, 39).
31. Support for separating the Milidia episode from the western campaign is provided by the absence of any mention of the former in Tiglath-pileser’s report of his western campaign in his annalistic record (*RIMA* 2: 37).
32. By Assyrians and other foreigners, including the Urartians. Note Hawkins’s discussion (1972–5: 153–4 §§3.2–4.1).
33. Hawkins (1995b: 84) comments that the Malatya rulers appear to have maintained their originally subordinate title, seldom supplementing it with ‘king’. Elsewhere (*CHLI* I: 283, 284), he notes that the discovery of inscribed stelae and rock-inscriptions, connected with the Arslantepe material, from areas outside the plain of Malatya, provides evidence that Malatya’s control extended over the plain to the west bank of the Euphrates river, and up the routes to the north-west at least as far as modern Hekimhan and Gürün, and into the plain of Elbistan.
34. For a full list of refs. to the Urartian–Arpad led alliance, see *CHLI* I: 250, n. 19.
35. For the reading of his name, see Appendix I.
36. *CHLI* I: 287.

37. *CHLI* I: 283.
38. Alternatively, could Allumari have been one of the members of the dynasty attested in the hieroglyphic inscriptions but referred to in Assyrian records by a quite different name? For possible similar examples, see below under *Hilaruada* (p. 108), and Chapter 6 for the equation of Assyrian Palalam with Luwian Larama.
39. See Hawkins's discussion in *CHLI* I: 303, of Side C, frags. *c + d*, referred to also on p. 287, para. 2, col. 1.
40. See Hawkins's discussion, *CHLI* I: 307.
41. *CHLI* I: 316.
42. *CHLI* I: 314.
43. See Hawkins's note on REX, *CHLI* I: 320.
44. Thus Hawkins, *CHLI* I: 322.
45. According to Shalmaneser's Annals (*RIMA* 3: 79), this campaign should be dated to the king's 23rd regnal year, and thus 836. For the discrepancy in dates between Shalmaneser's inscriptions and the Epon. Chron., see Reade (1978: 251–5) and *CHLI* I: 284, n. 36.
46. See also Salvini (1972: 101–4).
47. See Salvini (1995: 52).
48. See refs. in *CHLI* I: 250, n. 19.
49. *CHLI* I: 288. See also *CHLI* I: 285.
50. See n. 38, above.
51. Tarhunazi's succession to Gunzinanu is implied in *ARAB* II §60 (Fuchs 217, v. 83 (348)), where Gunzinanu is referred to as 'the king who came before him'.
52. On the extent of its territory, see Hawkins (1995c: 94), *CHLI* I: 331.
53. *ARAB* II §§45, 64, 69, Lie 64–5, Fuchs 222–4, vv. 112–16 (349).
54. Hawkins comments on the 'striking but perhaps deceptive resemblance (of these names) to Iranian names' (*CHLI* I: 333 with refs. in n. 55).
55. The name Suppiluliuma is elsewhere represented as Sapalulme in Assyrian texts; see Chapter 6 under *Pat(t)in*, p. 131.
56. = the inscription on the reverse of the Pazarçık stele.
57. For the reading of the name, see *CHLI* I: 337–8.
58. See also Salvini (1972: 104–5).
59. It has been suggested that Sakçagözü, perhaps to be identified with the city Lutibu in the kingdom of Sam'al, may also have been assigned to Muwatalli in this period. Muwatalli may be the ruler represented in the portrait-sculpture found on the site.
60. On current evidence, the site may have been unoccupied during the Late Bronze Age, though Bunnens (2006: 88–96) has made a case for identifying it with one of the countries called Musri in Late Bronze and Iron Age Assyrian texts (see *PPAWA* 485, s.v. Musri (2)).
61. Though this is questioned by Bunnens (2009: 77, 81), who believes that the city was so called by a branch of the Bit-Adini tribe, represented by Hamiyata and his father, and probably (following Makinson, 2002–5) perpetuated the Middle Assyrian name Musur.
62. Bunnens (2006: 97).
63. Transl. Hawkins, *CHLI* I: 240–1.
64. Following Hawkins, *CHLI* I: 226. Cf. Lipiński (2000a: 187).

65. Dalley (2000: 80).
66. Dalley (2000: 80) suggests that it may be a new pronunciation of an old Canaanite or west Semitic name Hammi-Adda.
67. See the comments by Bunnens (2006: 94), who discusses other possible cities which lay within Masuwari's territory at this time (94–6).
68. Bunnens (2006: 95).
69. Thus e.g. Bunnens (2006: 85).
70. See Lipiński (2000a: 187).
71. See also Dalley (2000: 80), Bunnens (2006: 86–7).
72. Bunnens (2006: 87) in fact raises the possibility that both dynasties were of Aramaean origin.
73. Bunnens (2006: 103). For his most recent views on Ahuni's role in Masuwari/Til Barsip's history, and the possible relationship between Ahuni and Hamiyata, see Bunnens (2009: 75–6).

CHAPTER 6. THE NEO-HITTITE KINGDOMS IN THE ANTI-TAURUS AND WESTERN SYRIAN REGIONS

1. The translations of this and subsequent passages from the hieroglyphic inscriptions are slightly adapted from Hawkins's translations in *CHLI* I: 1.
2. *CHLI* I: 249.
3. Discussed in Chapter 11. For the inscription on the boundary stone, the so-called Pazarçık stele, see *RIMA* 3: 205; see also Lipiński (2000a: 283–4).
4. See Hawkins, *CS* II: 127, n. 9. Hilakku is discussed in Chapter 7.
5. *CHLI* I: 251, 284, n. 26.
6. *CS* II: 155. The siege and its outcome are discussed below.
7. It had almost certainly lost territory earlier to the neighbouring kingdom of Kummuh when Adad-nirari III ordered a redrawing of the boundaries between the two kingdoms.
8. Hawkins (2009: 170).
9. This information was kindly supplied to me in a letter by Dr Stephanie Dalley, who refers to two publications which I was not able to see before the deadline for the submission of my book to the publisher. Dr Dalley writes: 'I have seen recently that Benjamin Sass, in *Tel Aviv* 37, 2010, prefers to date Taita around 900 BC; and independently Stefania Mazzoni, ed. S. M. Cecchini et al., *Syrian and Phoenician Ivories*, 2009, p. 114, on art-comparison grounds makes links with Suhi II of Carchemish.' (On Suhi II, see Chapter 5.)
10. On the possible shift from hieroglyphic *Palistin-* to cuneiform *Pat(t)in-*, see Hawkins (2009: 172).
11. Hawkins (2009: 171) observes that Unqi clearly represents West Semitic 'mq 'low-lying plain', surviving to the present as *Amuq*.
12. See *PPAWA* 695.
13. As we have previously noted, *bit hilani* was the term used of public buildings, commonly found in Iron Age Syrian cities, whose main feature was a rectangular central room to which entry was provided by a columned portico.

14. *Contra* the impression given by the entry in *Pros.*, there must have been two known Patinite kings called Lubarna.
15. The first known Labarna was (most scholars believe) the founder of the Late Bronze Age Hittite kingdom. His name was reused by a number of his successors as a royal title.
16. Hawkins's suggestion, *CHLI* I: 363. Alternatively, could 'Lubarna' sometimes have been used as a royal title, like Late Bronze Age Labarna (thus Fuchs, *Pros.* 2/II 667 s.v. Lubarna)? If so, then Lubarna and Suppiluliuma may have been one and the same person. For several reasons, I think this is an unlikely possibility.
17. We have referred to this inscription above in our discussion of Taita.
18. *CHLI* I: 399.
19. For the sources, see Sader (1987: 185–213).
20. Hawkins (1982: 389).
21. Lipiński (2000b: 126–7). He comments that even in the Neo-Hittite period the chief deity of Hamath remained the Semitic goddess Ba'alat.
22. *CHLI* I: 409.
23. Near-duplicate building-block inscriptions, now in the Hama Museum.
24. *CHLI* I: 400.
25. Parpola (1990).
26. = Lipiński (2000a: 254–50), *Chav.* 307–11.
27. For discussion of Azriyau, see Chapter 12 and *CHLI* I: 401 with refs. cited in nn. 50, 51. The passage referring to Azriyau occurs in *Tigl. III*: 62–3.
28. These two references are, respectively, to later and earlier versions of the text of the 738 tribute-list. Only the later version includes Eni-ilu of Hamath. Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 401, n. 54) suggests that the omission of this entry from the earlier version may indicate that the outcome of the Azriyau revolt was still uncertain when the list was drawn up.
29. This version of the tribute-list is dated to 732.

CHAPTER 7. THE NEO-HITTITE KINGDOMS IN SOUTH-EASTERN ANATOLIA

1. Twenty kings, according to *RIMA* 3: 79.
2. Thus *CLHI* I: 427.
3. It is evident from his record of this campaign that Shalmaneser clearly distinguished the Tabal region from the land of Hatti. For he claims that after crossing the Euphrates, he received tribute from all the kings of Hatti, and *then* moved on to Tabal.
4. For the conclusion that all references to a king called Tuwati refer to the same person, see *CHLI* I: 452, with a similar conclusion for all references to Wasusarma below.
5. See *PAWA* 530, s.v. Parzuta.
6. Almost certainly to be identified with Kiakki, king of Shinuhtu in Assyrian texts; see below.
7. Hawkins (1992: 272).
8. *Contra* the assumption of Melville (2010: 100) (and other scholars) that 'Atuna and Shinuhtu were discontinuous and lay on either side of Tuhana (so that

Sargon could keep Tuhana in check by flanking it with Atunan territory'. Cf. Chapter 12, n. 54 with respect to Melville's comment on Bit-Burutash.

9. Further on the identification of Kurti, see Vassileva (2008: 166).
10. *CHLI* I: 478.
11. *CHLI* I: 479.
12. A suggestion made by I. M. Diakonoff, cited by Vassileva (2008: 166).
13. For the reading of the name, formerly read Mat(t)i, see Fuchs 411, with refs., *CHLI* I: 427, n. 43.
14. Perhaps to be identified with Late Bronze Age Hittite Nahita.
15. For its restoration, see *CHLI* I: 520.
16. Discussed in Chapter 12.
17. Hawkins (1982: 421).
18. For the relief, see Bittel (1976: figs. 269, 327–9), and Fig. 10 in this volume.
19. See Aro (2003: 336).
20. See the refs. cited by Vassileva (2008: 169, n. 7).
21. Aro believes that the garment is probably simply a local Tabalian one. The fibula is more certainly of Phrygian origin. Many scholars believe that it represents a gift from Mita to Warpalawa. But it could well have been acquired by a number of other means, including trade, or as part of the spoils of a military operation.
22. Melville (2010: 102, n. 63).
23. As indicated more explicitly in one of Sargon's responses to his letter: 'As to what you wrote: "Urpala'a [*may slip away*] from the king, my lord, on account of the fact that the Atunnaeans and Istuandean came and took the cities of Bit-Paruta away from him" . . .' (transl. Parpola). For further discussion of this passage, see Galil (1992: 56–8).
24. See Brixhe and Lejeune (1984, Vol. 1: 253–68).
25. Brixhe and Lejeune (1984, Vol. 1: T-02b, 264–6).
26. Mellink (1991: 625).
27. Vassileva (2008: 167) comments that the inscriptions carved on them are more likely to be dedicatory rather than historical.
28. *CHLI* I: 522.
29. *CHLI* I: 527.
30. Kessler and Devine (1972-5), *RGTC* 6: 117–19.
31. See *PPAWA* 191, s.v. Denyen.
32. As noted in Chapter 2, aphaeresis involves the removal of a letter or syllable at the beginning of a word.
33. For a suggested explanation of the Greek presence there, see Bryce (2010).
34. Hawkins (2009: 166) concludes from a comparison of the Assyrian and Luwian texts that in Luwian terms Hiyawa referred to the country and Adana(wa) to the city.
35. See also the refs cited by Hawkins, *CHLI* I: 41, n. 45.
36. Tekoğlu and Lemaire (2000: 1004) suggest that the relationship at this time was one of alliance or partnership in which the Assyrian king exercised the role of protector/suzerain and probably had a treaty with Awariku.
37. The inscription appears to be in the nature of a retrospective summary of its author's reign.

38. For an account of the discovery of the site, its excavation, an abbreviated English version of the Phoenician text, and the site's conservation programme, see Çambel (2001).
39. For further details, see *PPAWA* 371, s.v. Karatepe.
40. *CHLI* I: 44, citing Winter (1979).
41. Citing Çambel, *CHLI* II: 9–11.
42. *CHLI* I: 44.
43. See Houwink ten Cate (1965).
44. For the dating of the last three campaigns, see Chapter 11, n. 29.

CHAPTER 8. THE ARAMAEAN STATES

1. In general on these states, see Sader (1987), Dion (1997), Lipiński (2000a). For a fresh perspective on the nature of the Aramaean presence in Syria during the Iron Age, see Masetti-Roualt (2009).
2. See *PPAWA* 11–12, s.v. Ahlamu, van de Mieroop (2010: 63–4).
3. For the cuneiform and Aramaic sources for Bit-Agusi, see Sader (1987: 99–136), and for the history of the kingdom, Dion (1997: 112–36) and Lipiński (2000a: 195–219).
4. Shalmaneser claims to have razed one hundred towns and villages in the environs of Arne, a claim which Lipiński (2000a: 212) says does not have to be taken literally. But Lipiński believes that this may have provided a context for the relocation of Bit-Agusi's capital at Arpad, though Arpad is not actually attested as the capital of the kingdom until the reign of Hadram's son(?) and successor Attar-shumki I.
5. See Lipiński (2000a: 196, with refs. in n. 11).
6. Identified with Tell Rifa'at, 35 km north of Aleppo. We do not know whether Arpad became the capital during his reign or, as Lipiński suggests, that of his father.
7. Also Lipiński (2000a: 254–5), *Chav.* 307–11.
8. On the puzzle presented by its findspot, see Hawkins (1995c: 95–6).
9. There is some doubt about whether an Arpadite king called Bar-Hadad ever existed. This is a matter to which we shall return in Chapter 11.
10. For the written sources, see Sader (1987: 47–77), *CHLI* I: 224–5, Lipiński (2000a: 163–93).
11. 'Province of the Commander-in-Chief' is a Neo-Assyrian designation. From the time of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III onwards, a number of Assyrian provinces are attested which were attached to some of the highest offices of the land (the officials themselves are sometimes called the 'magnates', hence collectively the 'provinces of the magnates'). Probably this arose out of a reform of the provincial system by Shalmaneser III himself. These new provinces were all in key border regions. Therefore 'Province of the Commander-in-Chief' indicates the province attached to the Commander-in-Chief. Postgate has described these provinces as: 'ex officio governorates, provinces which were habitually attached to the major offices of the state'. (H. D. Baker is the source of this information.)
12. For the sources, see Sader (1987: 153–72).

13. I follow here the long-held view that Gabbar was of Aramaean origin and leader of an Aramaean group that established itself in what became the kingdom of Sam'al. *Contra* this, Schloen and Fink (2009: 9–10) have argued that Gabbar may have been 'a local resident of Amorite heritage who threw off the Luwian yoke and restored his Semitic-speaking compatriots to a position of power'. Consistent with their hypothesis, they propose that the Sam'alian language was not Aramaic but 'could instead be an otherwise unattested branch of Northwest Semitic that developed in this topographically isolated region on the east side of the Amanus range, being brought there during the Middle Bronze Age.' They thus present a quite different scenario for the rise and development of the kingdom of Sam'al to that presented here and in other accounts of Sam'al's history and culture.
14. The name's vocalization and ethnic origin are uncertain. Schloen and Fink (2009: 7) suggest that it may be a Luwian word, possibly pronounced 'Yadiya', and perhaps the name of an earlier Luwian state which (a number of scholars suggest) was taken over by Gabbar and his successors.
15. Lipiński (2000a: 236).
16. Schloen and Fink (2009: 6) comment on Sam'al's strategic importance thus: 'Despite its remote location, walled in by the Taurus and Amanus mountain ranges in the far northwestern corner of ancient Syria, Sam'al was politically and economically important because it guarded the northern pass over the Amanus Mountains, which divide the Syrian interior from the Mediterranean Sea and the Cilician Plain to the west. Sam'al therefore controlled the caravan traffic from inland Syria and Mesopotamia that travelled westward to the Mediterranean from the Upper Euphrates river, leaving the Euphrates north of Carchemish at a point c. 100 km due east of Zincirli, where the river comes closest to the sea.'
17. See Schloen and Fink (2009).
18. Schloen and Fink (2009: 3).
19. Though Lipiński (2000a: 239) has questioned this.
20. A fine textile fabric, originally of flax.
21. Lipiński (2000a: 242).
22. Another of Bar-Rakib's inscriptions found at Zincirli was written in the Old Aramaic dialect identified as 'Mesopotamian Aramaic' (CS II: 160–1).
23. *CHLI* I: XIII.3. ZINCIRLI, p. 576. The inscription is written syllabically in the hieroglyphic script.
24. Schloen and Fink (2009: 10).
25. Schloen and Fink (2009: 7–8).
26. Thus Lipiński (2000a: 244).
27. Nevling Porter (2000: 154).
28. Lipiński (2000a: 246–7). See also Nevling Porter (2000: 155–6).
29. For this suggested vocalization of the name, which would make it a Luwian name, like Kilamuwa and Panamuwa, see Pardee (2009: 58).
30. Thus Struble and Herrmann (2009: 16) whose article provides a detailed account of the stele's main sculptural feature, a banquet scene, and concludes with a discussion of the monument's broader archaeological and social context. The inscription is transcribed, translated, and discussed at length by Pardee (2009).

31. For the sources, see Sader (1987: 231–46). For a history of Damascus and southern Syria in the Iron Age, see Dion (1997: 171–216), Lipiński (2000a: 347–407).
32. See *PPAWA* 741–2, s.v. Upi (2).
33. For the extent of his kingdom, see map in Liverani (2005: 115).
34. Lipiński (2000a: 390–3) prefers the former, suggesting that Hazael may have died while his city was under siege by the Assyrians, or shortly after its capture.
35. Hawkins (1982: 405) thinks it possible that this man was in fact Bar-Hadad II, with Hadyan being his personal name, Bar-Hadad his dynastic name.
36. This information is recorded in an inscription which appears on the reverse of the so-called Pazarçık stele, found near Maraş (*RIMA* 3: 239–40; for the obverse inscription, see *RIMA* 3: 204–5).
37. For a comprehensive discussion of the possibilities, see Na’aman (1977–8), Fitzmyer (1995: 167–74), Lipiński (2000a: 221–31).
38. Lipiński (2000a: 332).
39. *Epon.* 61 (for the year 683).

CHAPTER 9. OTHER PEOPLES AND KINGDOMS

1. Scholars commonly divide Assyria’s history into three main phases: Old Kingdom (c.2000–1760), Middle Kingdom (c.1365–1076), and New (Neo-Assyrian) Kingdom (c.911–607).
2. See Bryce (2003b: 14).
3. On the notion of a ‘club’ of Great Kings, see Bryce (2003b: 76–94).
4. See Singer (1985), *PPAWA* 507.
5. *RS* 34.165, ed. Lackenbacher (1982).
6. For these periods, see *PPAWA* 17–18, 743–5 s.v. Akkad, Ur respectively.
7. In particular, during the reigns of Shutruk-Nahhunte II (716–699) and his brother and successor Hallushu (699–693).
8. The dates given below and throughout this book for the reigns of Urartian kings are largely conjectural; see Zimanky’s note in *PPAWA* 801–2.
9. See *PPAWA* for entries under their respective headings on each of these sites.
10. For an explanation of the name and other details of the Phoenicians, with further references, see *PPAWA* 555–7.

CHAPTER 10. THE KINGDOMS EVOLVE (12TH–11TH CENTURIES)

1. *CHLI* I: V.VI. KARAHÖYÜK (pp. 288–95).
2. See Kossian (1997). Most recently on the origins, ethnic relationships, and migrations of the Mushki people, see Wittke (2004: 177–82).
3. See *PPAWA* 360.
4. The regions to which the term Amurru referred at various times in the history of the Syro-Palestinian region have been discussed in Chapter 3. We noted there Tiglath-pileser I’s inclusion of Tadmor in the land of Amurru in his account of his victories over the Aramaeans.
5. See Chapter 3, and Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 73–4, 1972–5: 153 §3.3).

6. The two known exceptions are 8th-century kings of Tabal, Tuwati (II) and his son Wasusarma. See Chapter 7.
7. e.g. the Aramaean seizure from the Assyrian king Ashur-rabi II (1013–973) of the cities of Pitru and Mutkinu on opposite banks of the Euphrates (*RIMA* 3: 19).
8. As the place-name whose reading is unknown is now represented; see *CHLI* I: V. VI. KARAHÖYÜK (288–95), and Chapter 5 s.v. Ir-Teshub?, pp. 85–7.
9. *CHLI* I: 239–40.
10. See Lipiński (2000a: 239).
11. This would not necessarily conflict with Hawkins’s conjectural identification of Taita’s kingdom as a kingdom of the Philistines.

CHAPTER 11. SUBJECTION TO ASSYRIA (10TH–9TH CENTURIES)

1. *CHLI* I: 131 §19; see Chapter 5, s.v. Yariri (p. 95).
2. Grayson (1982b: 256) thinks that the account of Ashurnasirpal’s Syrian enterprises probably covers two separate campaigns in the region, though he notes that there is no break in the narrative which would indicate this. Hawkins (1982: 388) believes that there was only one Syrian campaign. This is the line I have taken here.
3. Thus he is called in Assyrian records. Unfortunately, he cannot be equated with any kings known from the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Carchemish.
4. Perhaps to be identified with Tell Afis; see *PPAWA* 8.
5. Hawkins (1982: 390).
6. Support for the suggestion that the northern Neo-Hittite states paid tribute to Ashurnasirpal to dissuade him from invading them may be found in the only other reference we have to a Neo-Hittite kingdom during the king’s reign. This occurs in the record of a campaign which Ashurnasirpal conducted in north-western Mesopotamia in 866 (*RIMA* 2: 219). He reports that while he was in the city Huzirina (= Sultantepe?), he received tribute from a number of rulers, including Qatazili (= Hattusili), king of Kummuh. It is possible that this was an annual tribute payment which *may* have begun some years earlier, perhaps during the king’s western campaign.
7. In 847, Shalmaneser again campaigned against Paqarahubunu (*RIMA* 3: 38, 66), which may then, Hawkins suggests (*CHLI* I: 75), have belonged to the kingdom of Carchemish.
8. Perhaps to be identified with the site of Sakçağözü, which lay 21 km north-east of modern Zincirli.
9. Another Patinite king, called Lubarna, is also attested at this time, and was also a participant in the conflict with Shalmaneser. As noted in Chapter 6 (s.v. Pat(t)in, p. 131), it seems that Suppiluliuma’s rule in Patin overlapped with that of Lubarna. There may have been some division of territory between the two kings. An alternative but, I think, unlikely possibility (referred to in Chapter 6, n. 16) is that ‘Lubarna’ was a royal title, like Late Bronze Age Labarna; Suppiluliuma might have been so designated on two of the occasions on which he is mentioned in Shalmaneser’s records.

10. We have seen that in this same year (858), Shalmaneser received tribute from a man of Bit-Agusi called Arame (Aramu) (Chapter 8 s.v. Bit-Agusi, p. 165). Arame is the Assyrian form of the name Hadram who was son and successor of Gusi, founder of the Bit-Agusi dynasty.
11. See Lipiński (2000a: 174–5, with map, p. 167).
12. According to Shalmaneser, this was the name given to it by the people of the land of Hatti.
13. Modern Balawat in northern Mesopotamia; see *PPAWA* 332–3.
14. See e.g. Na’aman (1976: 97–102), Mitchell (1982: 478–9).
15. Kitchen (1973: 324).
16. Thus Edwards (1982: 558).
17. On the use of camels in the ancient Near East, see MacDonald in *BMD* 64, who notes that their use permitted the 7th-century Assyrian king Esarhaddon to undertake the first successful Mesopotamian invasion of Egypt.
18. We know that Shalmaneser’s son Shamshi-Adad V had as crown prince concluded a treaty with Marduk-zakir-shumi (*SAA* II: XXVI–XXVII, 4–5).
19. A scene, with inscription, carved on the throne-base of Shalmaneser found in Fort Shalmaneser depicts tribute being brought to Shalmaneser by Mushallim-Marduk, ruler of Bit-Amukani, and Adinu, ruler of Bit-Dakkuri (*RIMA* 3: 139).
20. Its fall is also recorded on one of the bronze bands discovered at Balawat (*RIMA* 3: 146).
21. For the accounts of the campaigns referred to in this paragraph, see *RIMA* 3: 37–8.
22. On which, see *PPAWA* 459–60.
23. Qalparunda is named without further identification at this point in Shalmaneser’s record. As we have noted, this name was also that of a contemporary king of Gurgum. But the context of the present passage indicates that it is the Patinite king who is being referred to here.
24. Wrongly identified as Ben-Hadad (= Bar-Hadad I), who was in fact Hadadezer’s predecessor on the throne of Damascus.
25. See Hawkins (1982: 393). It was perhaps around this time that the Omride dynasty came to an end in Israel, with the death of its last member Jehoram (Joram) c.843. There is, however, debate over how long the Omride dynasty lasted; see also n. 27 below.
26. Hawkins (1982: 393) is sceptical of the claim made by a later successor of Shalmaneser, Sargon II, that Shalmaneser had imposed tributary status on Urhilina (so claimed by Sargon in a letter referred to by J. Nougayrol and cited by Finet (1973: 12–13, n. 48)), noting that in the reign of the Hamathite king Zakur (around the end of the 9th century) Hamath enjoyed the position of favoured Assyrian client. This he believes, supports the view that Shalmaneser came to a diplomatic agreement with Urhilina.
27. Israel’s ruler on the first occasion was a man called Jehu, who had seized his country’s throne several years earlier in a bloody coup by murdering its incumbent Jehoram, last member of the Omride dynasty. The information about Jehu’s coup comes from 2 Kings 9:14–27. However, in Shalmaneser’s record, Jehu is still referred to as belonging to the ‘house of Omri’, a term used of Israel and its rulers for the next hundred years or so.

28. For the extent of his kingdom, see map in Liverani (2005: 115).
29. Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 41, n. 45) notes that in the record of the last three campaigns, appearing in the inscription carved on the so-called ‘Black Obelisk’ (*RIMA* 3: 62–71), the campaigns of the final two years appear to have been compressed into one. The two campaigns which the inscription indicates are assigned to Shalmaneser’s 25th and 26th regnal years, i.e. to 834 and 833. The Eponym Chronicle clearly specifies three campaigns, and dates them to 833, 832, and 831. For the discrepancy in dating, see Grayson (1976: 141) and Reade (1978: 251–7, 260). It is possible that Shalmaneser also passed through Adanawa in 836; see below.
30. That the term ‘client-state’ can appropriately be applied to Sam’al in its relationship with Assyria is perhaps open to question. Further on this, see n. 43 below.
31. Hawkins (1982: 398).
32. Further on the nature of the relationship between Sam’al and Assyria, see Nevling Porter (2000: 153).
33. As we shall see, there may have been an earlier one, in 836.
34. Hawkins (1982: 398).
35. Phrygia did not yet pose a serious threat to Assyrian dominance of the regions west of the Euphrates, as it would a century later in the reign of Mita/Midas.
36. The date is that of the Eponym Chronicle. For the discrepancy between this date and that of Shalmaneser’s Annals, which states that the invasion of Tabal occurred in the king’s 22nd regnal year (i.e. 837), see Reade (1978: 251–4) and *CHLI* I: 427, with nn. 29–30.
37. See Hulin (1963: 66–7).
38. Probably composed c.833; see *RIMA* 3: 117. The dating of this episode to the aftermath of Shalmaneser’s campaign in Tabal is suggested by Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 41).
39. Possibly to be identified with Misi, Classical Mopsuestia.
40. Uetash lay on the border of Malatya and Kummuh, and was apparently considered part of the latter’s territory when it was captured the following century by the Urartian king Sarduri II.
41. We should, however, note that Hilakku, Adanawa’s western neighbour, does not figure at all in Shalmaneser’s campaigns in the region, a fairly clear indication that the country’s rugged terrain protected it, at least on this occasion, against an Assyrian invasion.
42. For his career details, see *Pros.* 1/II 368.
43. The precise nature of the relationship between the Assyrian king and the states which submitted to him may have varied from one state to another. Melville (2010: 91–2, n. 24) questions (rightly in my view) Yamada’s assumption (2000: 305–6) that all states paying tribute to the Assyrian king achieved true client-status ‘constitutionalized by some form of political agreement between the kings’. She argues that while this was the case for some states (placing Carchemish, Sam’al, and Que in this category in Shalmaneser III’s reign), the Assyrians probably maintained a looser hold on more distant places. Melville’s argument is plausible, but it should be emphasized that the texts themselves make no distinction between supposed client-kingdoms and other tribute-paying states. I have suggested that the Sam’alian king Kilamuwa had a client-type relationship with Shalmaneser III.

Around 800 Zakur, ruler of the Orontes valley kingdom Hamath, may have had a similar relationship with the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III, at the time of the Damascus-led attack on his city Hatarikka (see Chapter 12), and his younger contemporary Suppiluliuma, ruler of the Euphrates region kingdom Kummuh, perhaps also had such a relationship with Adad-nirari and his successor Shalmaneser IV. But the evidence in these cases is purely circumstantial. More explicit is the evidence that Arpad was, or became, a client-kingdom of Assyria in the mid 8th century, from the attestation of a treaty which the current Assyrian king Ashur-nirari V drew up with Arpad's ruler Mati'ilu (see Chapter 12). But it was not until the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (745–727), when the tributary states became subject to increasingly tighter Assyrian control, that client-status seems to have been regularly conferred, or imposed, upon the western kings, on the way to the full absorption of their kingdoms into the Assyrian provincial administrative system.

44. For possible factors that led to the breakdown in relations, see Grayson (1982b: 270).
45. Published by Donbaz (1990). See Galil's brief discussion (1992: 58).
46. This is probably the same conflict as recorded in the fragmentary inscription *RIMA* 3: 207. In what remains of this inscription, Adad-nirari reports a campaign into the land of Hatti and a confrontation with its kings, who had rebelled against him and withheld tribute. Attar-shumki is mentioned here as one of the opposing rulers, along with the kings of Hatti.
47. Thus Hawkins (1982: 400).
48. Hawkins (1982: 407) believes that Carchemish too was not among the participants, on the supposition that there was at this time a close and harmonious relationship between Carchemish's rulers, Yariri and Kamani in particular, and the Assyrian regime, the latter represented by the commander-in-chief Shamshilu who had a base at nearby Til-Barsip.
49. See *Pros.* 3/I 1083–4.
50. Transl. in Finkel and Seymour (2008: 104).
51. Grayson (1982b: 275).
52. 814–811 (*RIMA* 3: 189–91).
53. We have discussed in Chapter 3 the extent of the territories which his account appears to encompass.
54. *Epon.* p. 33, transl. p. 57. On the apparent discrepancy between the fifth year of the Saba'a stele inscription and the sixth year of the Eponym Chronicle, see Poebel (1943: 82–3), Lipiński (2000a: 391–2, n. 242).
55. Grayson (*RIMA* 3: 207).
56. Lipiński (2000a: 392).
57. Grayson (*RIMA* 3: 210).
58. This would not of course rule out the possibility that Adad-nirari conducted other campaigns against Damascus, of which no record has survived.
59. Lipiński (2000a: 393) comments that 'accuracy in numbers meant little to scribes eager to align impressive figures'.
60. This alternative would still leave open the possibility that Bar-Hadad had already succeeded his father at the time of Adad-nirari's attack on Damascus.

61. Hatarikka had originally been capital of the kingdom of Luash. The latter had been incorporated by this time into the Hamathite kingdom as its northernmost province.
62. Translated also by Lipiński (2000a: 254–5) and by S. Noegel in *Chav.* 307–11.
63. With Hawkins (1982: 404) and *contra* Lipiński (2000a: 216), who identifies Bar-Gush with a supposed Bar-Hadad, son of Attar-shumki.
64. Hawkins (1982: 404).
65. Lipiński (2000a: 284).
66. With Lipiński and *contra* Hawkins, though my overall chronology is quite different from that of Lipiński (2000a: 283–5).
67. Lipiński (2000a: 216).
68. Thus Lipiński (2000a: 263 map, 304–10 with refs.).
69. See Lipiński (2000a: 284).
70. Dalley (2000: 83–4).

CHAPTER 12. ABSORPTION
BY ASSYRIA (8TH CENTURY)

1. As already noted in Chapter 8, Hawkins (1982: 405) thinks it possible that Hadyan and Bar-Hadad are one and the same.
2. Probably the same engagement is referred to in another fragmentary inscription, purchased in Mosul and said to have come from Dohuk (Dehok) (thus Grayson, *RIMA* 3: 233), which also records a battle between Shamshi-ilu and Argishti (*RIMA* 3: 233–4). We cannot be sure whether this engagement took place in the reign of Shalmaneser IV (782–773) or already in the reign of his father and predecessor Adad-nirari III, who died in 783. Most likely it belonged to one of the five Assyrian campaigns into Urartu conducted during Shalmaneser's reign, each year from 781 to 778, and again in 776 (*Epon.* 58), and all perhaps under the command of Shamshi-ilu. See also Grayson (1982b: 276), who adds a sixth campaign in 774, in which Namri is specified as the Assyrian objective.
3. The so-called Palu inscription; see Salvini (1972: 101, 105).
4. The so-called Izoğlu inscription, from which *Hcl* 116–17, no. 102 rev. 2–31 has been restored. See also Salvini (1972: 103–4), Van Loon (1974), Hawkins (1995c: 90, *CHLI* I: 285).
5. *CHLI* I: 285.
6. Thus Hawkins (1982: 407).
7. Thus Lipiński (2000a: 216).
8. See *Pros.* 1/I 208 s.v. Aššur-nerari 5.b.
9. Radner (2008: 137).
10. Thus Hawkins (1982: 408).
11. Thus Radner (2008: 137–8), who notes that the rebellion also had the support of the governors of Ashur and Kalhu who were among the very few high officials remaining in power after the coup.
12. See Grayson (1991a: 73), and for support of the latter, Garelli (1991: 46).
13. Thus Grayson (1991a: 74). Cf. Brinkman (1984: 40).
14. *Hcl* 123–4, no. 103 §9. See Salvini (1995: 52–3), *CHLI* I: 332.

15. This is dealt with below. But note Salvini (1995: 53), who believes that the latter confrontation should not be distinguished from the 743 episode. This too was my earlier view, as expressed in my entry on Urartu in *PPAWA* (p. 748).
16. See also Postgate (1973a).
17. In general on Assyria's deportation policies and practices, see Osted (1979).
18. Grayson (1991a: 76).
19. If that is to be understood by the expression '(Tutammu) forfeited his life' (thus Tadmor's translation).
20. See Hawkins (1982: 412).
21. Most of the names in the survey lists reappear with some omissions and additions in a fragmentary summary inscription from Nimrud (Calah) (the so-called Nimrud Tablet) dated to the year 732 (*Tigl. III* 170–1) following a campaign conducted by Tiglath-pileser into Arabia in 733, against Samsi, queen of the Arabs (*Tigl. III* 168–9). For the Arabian campaign of 733–32, see Eph'al (1982: 29, 83–4). With regard to the omissions from and additions to the 738 tributary list, see Hawkins's comments on the Nimrud Tablet (*CHLI* I: 42, n. 50).
22. Neither Eni'ilu nor Hamath appears in the version of the 738 list given here (i.e. *Tigl. III* 106–9). But Eni'ilu does appear in the other version of the 738 list (*Tigl. III* 68–9), and later in the 732 list (*Tigl. III* 170–1). Hawkins (*CHLI* I: 401, n. 54) comments: 'It is interesting to note that in the earliest version of the text of 738 B.C., that on the Iran stele set up in 737 B.C., Hamath is missing, possibly because at the time of the composition of the text, the outcome of the revolt (of Azriyau) was still uncertain.' Alternatively, the omission may simply be a case of scribal error.
23. Though some of the states may have been listed next to one another because they were neighbours or near-neighbours, there is no clear geographical basis for the sequence as a whole. It may be that the tributaries were listed in the order in which each of them formally submitted or resubmitted to Assyrian overlordship. But in that event, we would expect the three Neo-Hittite participants in the Urartu–Arpad coalition to be mentioned together, on the assumption that their submission followed directly after Tiglath-pileser's victory.
24. The states are ordered in a rough geographical progression, from north to south in the Euphrates region (Malatya, Kummuh, Carchemish, Til Barsip), and then proceeding north-westwards to Kaska, and from there south to Gurgum and Sam'al.
25. For the possible identification of this man with a king attested in the Luwian inscriptions, see Chapter 5 s.v. *son of Sastura*, p. 98.
26. The reading of the name in the latter case is dependent on a textual restoration.
27. Hawkins (1982: 412–13).
28. Grayson (1982b: 78).
29. Mitchell (1991: 345).
30. See Eph'al (1982: 82–7) for further discussion of the nature of the relationship between Tiglath-pileser and Zabibe and Samsi.
31. Like the campaign Tiglath-pileser had conducted into Sam'al to install Panamuwa as king after his father's assassination, or the campaign he conducted into Samaria to intimidate the Samarian king Menahem into submission.

32. Melville (2010: 97) suggests that despite his derogatory epithet, Hulli was probably Wasusarma's competitor—'a local elite whose desire for power the Assyrians could exploit, but who would be dependant on Assyrian backing to maintain his position'.
33. Reported by Shalmaneser's successor Sargon II (Lie 32–3, Fuchs *Ann.* 123 vv. 194–5 (323)). Sargon refers to Shalmaneser here not by name but simply as 'my royal predecessor'.
34. Details of the campaign are frustratingly brief. The only information we have about it comes from a summary of Tiglath-pileser's exploits throughout his career (*Tigl. III* 124–5) and a brief reference to it in the Eponym Chronicle (*Epon.* 59). Salvini (1995: 53) is sceptical about the historicity of the campaign. He comments: 'The march across Urartian territory is given so little characterization as to give the impression of a literary-propagandistic "topos".'
35. See Tadmor's discussion (2008: 271–2) of the 'historiographical aspect' of the reported siege of Tushpa.
36. Who is referred to by Tiglath-pileser as Jehoahaz in one of his tributary lists (*Tigl. III* 170–1). An account of Rasyan's and Pekah's attack on Judah is also provided by Isaiah 7:1–9, and 2 Chronicles 28:5–6, 16–23.
37. *Epon.* 59. A very fragmentary version of the conquest appears in *ARAB I*: §§776–7.
38. Hawkins (1982: 414) comments that it is possible that some later-attested provinces were carved out of its territory at this date, possibly Subutua and/or Mansuate.
39. Hawkins (1982: 415–16).
40. On which, see Grayson (1991a: 87–8).
41. This is concluded from the conflagration which brought phase E of the site to an end.
42. These were presumably of the same stock that had already been relocated by his father Shalmaneser.
43. Cf. *CS II*: 293, no. 2: 118A.
44. Thus Brinkman (1984: 48).
45. With the following account of his career, cf. Brinkman (1984: 45–60). See also *Pros.* 2/II 705–11.
46. For a recent treatment of the Assyrian wars against Marduk-apla-iddina during Sargon's reign, see *SAA XV*: XIII–XXIII, and for reports to Sargon from his officials on Marduk-apla-iddina's movements and activities, *SAA XV*: 119 ff., nos. 177 ff.
47. *CHLI I*: X.16. AKSARAY, p. 476.
48. Sources for Kiyakiya's reign: *ARAB II* §§7, 55, 118, Lie 10–11, Fuchs *Cyl.* 35 v. 22 (290), *Ann.* 92–3 vv. 68–9 (315–16), *Disp.* 198–9 vv. 28–9 (344).
49. *ARAB II* §§7, 55, Lie 10–11, Fuchs *Ann.* 93 v. 71 (316), *Disp.* 199 v. 29 (344).
50. Lie 32–3, Fuchs *Ann.* 123–4 vv. 194–7 (323).
51. As identified by Thureau-Dangin (1912: XIV–XV). See *Pros.* I/1 59.
52. *ARAB II* §25, Lie 32–3, Fuchs *Ann.* 124 vv. 197–8 (323), *Disp.* 199 vv. 29–30 (344).
53. The two appear to be equated, for example, in Hawkins's map of the Syro-Hittite states (1982: 374).

54. *Contra* the assumption of Melville (2010: 100) and other scholars that Bit-Bur-tash and Hilakku were not adjacent territories. Melville believes that their (supposed) lack of contiguity reflects a strategy on Sargon's part to check any territorial ambitions Ambaris might have had.
55. *ARAB II* §16, Lie 20–1, Fuchs *Ann.* 109–10 vv. 119–20 (319–20), 125–6 (320).
56. For an account of the battle, with references, see Grayson (1991a: 95–6). Extracts from the Ashur letter are translated in *Chav.* 338–40.
57. Musasir lay on the frontier between Assyrian- and Urartian-controlled territory. It was at this time claimed by Rusa to be vassal territory of Urartu. For further details, see *PPAWA* 483–4.
58. *ARAB II* §55, Lie 32–3, Fuchs *Cyl.* 35 v. 23 (291), *Ann.* 124–5 vv. 198–202 (323), *Disp.* 199–200 vv. 30–2 (344).
59. See *CHLI I*: 428, n. 47.
60. Cf. Melville (2010: 99, n. 50).
61. A dating of or before 714 is made virtually certain by the fact that the Assyrian record indicates that Rusa was the king of Urartu to whom Ambaris sent his message. As noted above, 714 was Rusa's last year on the Urartian throne.
62. Thus Postgate (1973b: 31), Hawkins (*CHLI I*: 428).
63. In fact, Melville (2010: 101) rules out this one, on the grounds that Sargon transported to Assyria the whole of Ambaris's family along with him (Fuchs, *Disp.* 200 vv. 31–2 (344)) (though Postgate and Hawkins suggest that his daughter may have been excluded from the transportees and left behind to administer the province), and according to the Display Inscription, appointed a eunuch governor over the region. We shall return below to the question of the identity of the governor.
64. Nimrud Letter No. 39 (ND 2759), first published by Saggs (1958: 182–7), and subsequently by Postgate (1973b: 21–34). For the dating, see Postgate (1973b: 32–4), but note Lanfranchi (1988), who argues for a 715 date, and provides a different reconstruction of events of the period to that of Postgate (who is followed by Hawkins, 1982: 420–1) and the one I have offered below. In Lanfranchi's view, the letter fits much better into the context of events in 715 than it does into the aftermath of Ashur-sharru-usur's 709 campaign against the Phrygians. Though there is no clear evidence one way or the other, persuasive arguments against Lanfranchi's proposal have now been put forward by Melville (2010: 102, n. 61).
65. Though as we have noted in Chapter 7 under *Warpalawa II*(?) (p. 150), Ashur-sharru-usur had suspicions about his loyalty.
66. Lipiński (2000a: 246) concludes this from the lack of any evidence for violent destruction of Sam'al's capital Zincirli in this period.
67. After Luckenbill, *ARAB II* §26; Lie 34–5, Fuchs *Ann.* 125–7, vv. 204–13 (324).
68. A region perhaps to be located in the plain of Elbistan, and probably constituting the northern part of the kingdom of Malatya; see Hawkins (1995c: 90).
69. *ARAB II* §§26, 60, Lie 34–7, Fuchs *Ann.* 127 vv. 213–17 (324), *Disp.* 216–17 vv. 81–2 (347).
70. It was the Iron Age successor of the Late Bronze Age city Tegarama.
71. *ARAB II* §27, Lie 36–7, Fuchs *Ann.* 128, vv. 220–1 (324).
72. See the comments of Lipiński (2000a: 237).

73. ARAB II §29, Lie 38–9, Fuchs *Ann.* 131–2 vv. 235–40 (325–6), *Disp.* 217–18 vv. 83–9 (348).
74. Sources for this act of treason and the consequences that followed from it are: ARAB II §§45, 64, 69, Lie 64–5, 70–1, Fuchs *Disp.* 222–4, vv. 112–16 (349).
75. Suggested by Hawkins (1982: 421).
76. The choice of deportees from the Bit-Yakin tribe in southern Mesopotamia illustrates a general point that one of the most effective ways of dealing with a land that had been a centre of resistance against an overlord was to transfer large numbers of its population, including no doubt many of its able-bodied men, to a totally different region. Bit-Yakin was the tribe of Marduk-apla-iddina, who had been decisively defeated by Sargon and driven from his throne in Babylon. But he had eluded his victor, and still remained at large—and a threat to Sargon’s authority in Babylonia. By deporting many of his fellow-tribesmen to new lands far removed from their original homeland, Sargon was cutting off at least one of Marduk-apla-iddina’s sources of support in the event that he tried once more to reclaim kingship in Babylonia.
77. For possible archaeological evidence of the Mita–Sargon relationship, see Muscarella (1998).
78. ARAB II §43, Lie 68–9, Fuchs *Ann.* 171–2 vv. 386, 386a–c (336), *Disp.* 233–4 vv. 149–51 (352–3).
79. The only evidence we have for his death is a fragmentary reference in the Eponym Chronicle for the year 705, which reports that the Assyrian king lost his life in battle and that the enemy leader was a certain Qurdi (or Eshpai) the Kulummean. This man is generally assumed to be a Cimmerian tribal leader. See *Epon.* 60, and Tadmor (1958: 97, n. 311), Hawkins (1982: 422).
80. It is possible that in the intervening years, Mita may for a time have extended his authority to the southern Tabalian kingdom called Tuwana, if his name has been correctly read on one of the Old Phrygian inscriptions found in the region. See further on this Chapter 7 under *Warpalawa (II)*, p. 150.
81. Strabo 1.3.21. The traditional date of 695 for Mita’s death is adopted from the 3rd–4th century AD Greek chronicler Eusebius. See Mellink (1991: 614), Wittke (2004: 221–2).

AFTERWORD

1. See Hawkins (1972–5: 154 §4.2, 155 §5.2).
2. See, for example, the discussion of Masuwari in Chapter 5.
3. A good example is provided by the sculptures from the temple of ‘Ain Dara; see Sagona and Zimansky (2009: 304–6).
4. See most recently Sagona and Zimansky (2009: 307–9).
5. Hawkins (1982: 425).
6. Though early in his reign Ashurbanipal received an embassy from its king Sandasarme (Houwink ten Cate, 1965: 26).
7. According to the interpretation I have proposed for the Karatepe bilingual; see Chapter 7.
8. The Mugallu who is attested as a king of Tabal in Ashurbanipal’s reign is almost certainly the same man as the king of Malatya. His association with two countries

very likely indicates an extension of his power from Malatya to Tabal by the beginning of Ashurbanipal's reign.

9. This explains why, as Hawkins observes (1982: 435), the Syro-Hittite states correspond frequently to modern administrative provinces whose chief cities often stand directly on the ancient capitals (e.g. Damascus, Hama, Maraş).

APPENDIX I. TRANSLITERATING THE INSCRIPTIONS

1. The following account is based partly on Hawkins's discussion of the Luwian language and hieroglyphic script in *CHLI* I: 4–6, 22, 23–34. See also Hawkins (2003: 152–66). For a comprehensive introduction to Hieroglyphic Luwian, which includes a discussion of the script, language, and research history, and a number of sample texts, see Payne (2010).
2. Laroche (1960).
3. For a complete sign list, see Payne (2010: 161–95).
4. Cuneiform is the most common type of script used in the ancient Near Eastern world. The term, meaning 'wedge-shaped', is a modern one, derived from the Latin word *cuneus* meaning 'wedge'. Its symbols were most commonly produced by pressing into soft clay the triangular ends of reeds cut from the banks of the Mesopotamian and other rivers. Cuneiform was inscribed primarily on clay tablets but also on other writing surfaces, over a period of several millennia.
5. This and the following bracketed numbers refer to the list of logograms in Figure 15.
6. *CHLI* I: 25.
7. As we have noted above, superscript ¹ is now conventionally used to transliterate the personal determinative in the hieroglyphic texts.
8. See *CHLI* I: 97, n. on §5 for the former; 238, n. on §11 for the latter.
9. See *CHLI* I: 316, n. on §1.
10. *CHLI* I: 81, n. on §1.
11. For IUDEX and REGIO.DOMINUS, see KARKAMIŞ A11a §1 (*CHLI* I: 95). For REX, see e.g. KARATEPE 1 §XXVI (*CHLI* I: 52, with commentary on pp. 61–2).
12. Hawkins (1995b: 79).
13. Hawkins (1995b: 75).
14. KARKAMIŞ A 11a §1, *CHLI* I: 95, transliterated and translated by Hawkins.

APPENDIX II. NEO-HITTITE AND ARAMAEAN RULERS: A SUMMARY LIST

1. Included here on the assumption that Bar-Gush in this inscription = Bit-Agusi's king Attar-shumki.

APPENDIX III. THE KINGS OF LATE BRONZE AGE HATTI

1. It is uncertain whether there were one or two early New Kingdom rulers of this name.

Bibliography

- Achtmeier, P. J. (ed.) (1996), *HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*, New York: HarperCollins (cited as *HCBD*).
- Aro, S. (2003), 'Art and Architecture', in Melchert (2003a), 280–337.
- Bittel, K. (1976), *Les Hittites*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- (1987), *Die Hethiter*, Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Borger, R. (1956), *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien*, Graz: Ernst Weidner (*AfO* 9).
- Brinkman, J. A. (1984), *Prelude to Empire, Babylonian Society and Politics 747–626 B.C.*, Philadelphia: Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund, 7.
- Brixhe, C. and Lejeune, M. (1984), *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes* (2 vols.), Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Bryce, T. R. (1986), *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- (2002), *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2003a), 'History', in Melchert (2003a), 27–127.
- (2003b), *Letters of the Great Kings of the Ancient Near East: The Royal Correspondence of the Late Bronze Age*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- (2005), *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (new edn.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2006), *The Trojans and their Neighbours*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- (2007), 'The Secession of Tarhuntassa', in D. Groddek and M. Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum, Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie, Bd. 25), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 119–29.
- (2009), *The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia: From the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire*, Abingdon: Routledge (cited as *PPAWA*).
- (2010), 'The Hittite Deal with the Hiyawa–Men', in Y. Cohen, A. Gilan, and J. L. Miller (eds.), *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (*StBoT* 51), 47–53.
- Bunnens, G. (ed.) (2000a), *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age*, Louvain, Paris, and Sterling (Virginia): Peeters, *Ancient Near East Studies*, Supplement 7 (cited as *ES*).
- (2000b), 'Syria in the Iron Age: Problems of Definition', in Bunnens (2000a), 3–19.
- (ed.) (2006), *A New Luwian Stele and the Cult of the Storm-God at Til Barsib–Masuwari (Tell Ahmar II)*, Louvain, Paris, and Dudley (Mass.): Peeters.
- (2009), 'Assyrian Empire Building and Aramization of Culture as seen from Tell Ahmar/Til Barsib', *Syria* 86: 67–82.
- Çambel, H. (1999), *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume II: Karatepe–Aslantaş*, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter (cited as *CHLI* II).
- (2001), 'The Story of Karatepe–Aslantaş', in Jean *et al.* (2001), 122–43.
- Carruba, O. (1977), 'Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte: I—Die Tuthalijas und die Arnuwandas', *SMEA* 18: 137–74.

- Chavalas, M. W. (ed.) (2006), *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*, Oxford: Blackwell (cited as *Chav.*)
- Cogan, M. (2002), 'Locating *māt Hatti* in Neo-Assyrian Inscriptions', in E. D. Oren and S. Ahituv (eds.), *Aharon Kempinski Memorial Volume: Studies in Archaeology and Related Disciplines*, Beersheba 15, Beersheba: Ben Gurion University of the Negev, 86–92.
- Collins, B. J. (2007), *The Hittites and their World*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Collins, B. J., Bachvarova, M. R., and Rutherford, I. C. (eds.) (2008), *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours*. Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, 17–19 Sept. 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., Oxford: Oxbow.
- Dalley, S. (2000), 'Shamshi-ilu, Language and Power in the Western Assyrian Empire', in Bunnens (2000a), 79–88.
- Dinçol, A. M. (1988), 'Die Entdeckung des Felsmonuments in Hatip und ihre Auswirkungen über die historischen und geographischen Fragen des Hethiterreichs', *TÜBA-AR* 1: 27–35.
- Dion, P.-E. (1997), *Les Araméens à l'Âge dur Fer: Histoire politique et structures sociales*, Paris: Librairie Lecoffre.
- Donbaz, V. (1990), 'Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae in the Antakya and Kahrammaras Museums', *ARRIM* 8: 5–24.
- Edwards, I. E. S. (1982), 'Egypt: from the Twenty-Second to the Twenty-Fourth Dynasty', *CAH* III.1: 534–81.
- Elat, M. (1975), 'The Campaigns of Shalmaneser III Against Aram and Israel', *IEJ* 25: 25–35.
- Eph'al, I. (1982), *The Ancient Arabs*, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, the Hebrew University; Leiden: Brill.
- Erkanal, H., Donbaz, V., and Uğuroğlu, A. (eds.) (1998), *XXXIV^{ème} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 6–10/VII/1987, Istanbul*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.
- Finet, A. (ed.) (1973), *La Voix de l'opposition en Mésopotamie*, Brussels: Institut des Hautes Études de Belgique.
- Finkel, I. L. and Seymour, M. J. (2008), *Babylon: Myth and Reality*, London: British Museum.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. (1995), *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (rev. edn.), Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Frame, G. (1995), *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Babylonian Periods, Vol. 2: Rulers of Babylonia From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157–612)*, Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press (cited as *RIMB* 2).
- Freu, J. and Mazoyer, M. (2010), *Le Déclin et la chute du nouvel empire hittite: Les Hittites et leur histoire*, Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Fuchs, A. (1993), *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad*, Göttingen: Cuvillier.
- Fuchs, A. and Parpola, S. (2001), *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part III* (State Archives of Assyria, Vol. XV), Helsinki: Helsinki University Press (cited as *SA* XV).
- Galil, G. (1992), 'Conflicts between Assyrian Vassals', *SAAB* VI: 55–63.

- Gardiner, A. (1960), *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*, Oxford: Ashmolean Museum.
- Garelli, P. (1991), 'The Achievement of Tiglath-pileser III: Novelty or Continuity?', in M. Cogan and I. Eph'al (eds.), *Ah Assyria . . . Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography presented to Hayim Tadmor*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 46–51.
- Gitin, S., Mazar, A., and Stern, E. (eds.) (1998), *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition: In Honor of Professor Trude Dothan*, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Goetze, A. (1933), *Die Annalen des Mursilis*, Leipzig (repr. Darmstadt, 1967) (cited as AM).
- (1936), 'Philological Remarks on the Bilingual Bulla from Tarsus', *AJA* 40: 210–14.
- Goldman, H. (1935), 'Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus, 1935', *AJA* 39: 526–49.
- Görg, M. (1976), 'Hiwwiter im 13. Jahrhundert v. Chr.', *UF* 8: 53–5.
- Grayson, A. K. (1975), *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, New York: J. J. Augustin (cited as ABC).
- (1976), 'Studies in Neo-Assyrian History: The Ninth Century B.C.', *BiOr* 33: 134–45.
- (1982a), Review of K. Kessler, *Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie Nordmesopotamiens nach keilschriftlichen Quellen des 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1980, *BiOr* 39: 352–6.
- (1982b), 'Assyria: Ashur-dan II to Ashur-Nirari V (934–745 B.C.)', *CAH* III.1, 238–81.
- (1987), *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods, Vol. 1. Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennium BC (To 1115 BC)*, Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto (cited as RIMA 1).
- (1991a), 'Tiglath-pileser III to Sargon II (744–705 B.C.)', *CAH* III.2: 71–102.
- (1991b), *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods, Vol. 2. Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114–859 BC)*, Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto (cited as RIMA 2).
- (1995), 'Assyrian Rule of Conquered Territory in Ancient Western Asia', *CANE* II, 959–68.
- (1996), *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods, Vol. 3. Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC)*, Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto (cited as RIMA 3).
- (1998), 'Assyrian Expansion into Anatolia in the Sargonid Age (c. 744–650 BC)', in Erkanal, Donbaz, and Uğuroğlu (1998), 131–5.
- Hagenbuchner, A. (1989), *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Hawkins, J. D. (1972–5), 'Hatti', *RLA* 4: 152–9.
- (1982), 'The Neo-Hittite States in Syria and Anatolia', *CAH* III.1: 372–441.
- (1988), 'Kuzi-Tešub and the "Great Kings" of Karkamiš', *AS* 38: 99–108.
- (1992), 'The Inscriptions of the Kızıldağ and the Karadağ in the Light of the Yalburt Inscription', in H. Otten *et al.* (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 259–75.
- (1995a), *The Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG) (StBoT Beiheft 3)*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Hawkins, J. D. (1995b), ‘“Great Kings” and “Country–Lords” at Malatya and Karkamish’, in T. van den Hout and J. De Roos (eds.) (1995), *Studio Historiae Ardens: Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch–Archaeologisch Instituut in Het Nabije Oosten, 73–85.
- (1995c), ‘The Political Geography of North Syria and South–East Anatolia in the Neo–Assyrian Period’, in Liverani (1995), 87–100.
- (1997), ‘A Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on a Silver Bowl in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara’, Ankara: *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Musezi*, 1996 Yilligi.
- (1998), ‘Tarkasnawa King of Mira: “Tarkondemos”, Boğazköy Sealings and Karabel’, *AS* 48: 1–31.
- (2000), *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Vol. I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter (cited as *CHLI I*).
- (2003), ‘Scripts and Texts’, in Melchert (2003a), 128–69.
- (2009), ‘Cilicia, the Amuq, and Aleppo’, *Near Eastern Archaeology* 72: 164–73.
- Hoffner, H. (1973), ‘The Hittites and Hurrians’, in D. J. Wiseman (ed.), *Peoples of Old Testament Times*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 197–228.
- Hout, T. van den (ed.) (2006), *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. De Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden*, Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- (2007), ‘Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second Millennium Anatolia’, in S. Sandars (ed.), *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 221–62. (Second printing of the 2006 edition with postscripts and minor corrections.)
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J. (1965), *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*, Brill: Leiden.
- (1994), ‘Urhi–Teshub Revisited’, *BiOr* 51: 233–59.
- (2006), ‘The Sudden Return of Urhi–Teššub to his Former Place of Banishment in Syria’, in Hout (2006), 1–8.
- Hulin, P. (1963), ‘The Inscriptions on the Carved Stone–Base of Shalmaneser III’, *Iraq* 25: 48–69.
- Ikeda, Y. (1984), ‘Hittites and Aramaeans in the Land of Bit–Adini’, in T. Mikasa (ed.), *Monarchies and Socio–Religious Traditions in the Ancient Near Eastern World*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 27–36.
- Ivanchik, A. I. (1993), *Les Cimmériens au Proche–Orient*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 127, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jasink, A. M. (1995), *Gli Stati Neo–Ittiti: Annalisi delle fonti scritte e sintesi storica*, Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore (*Studia Mediterranea* 10) (cited as *Jas.*).
- Jean, E. et al. (2001), *From Boğazköy to Karatepe: Hittitology and the Discovery of the Hittite World*, Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.
- Kessler, H. and Devine, L. D. (1972–5), ‘Hupišna’, *RIA* 4: 500–1.
- Kitchen, K. A. (1973), *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Klengel, H. (1976–80), ‘Išputahšu’, *RIA* 5: 199.

- Klengel, H. (2000), ‘“Crisis years” and the New Political System in Early Iron Age Syria: Some Introductory Remarks’, in Bunnens (2000a), 21–30.
- König, F. W. (1955), *Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften*, AfO Beiheft 8, Graz (cited as Hcl).
- Kossian, A. V. (1997), ‘The Mushki Problem Reconsidered’, *SMEA* 39: 253–66.
- Lackenbacher, S. (1982), ‘Nouveaux documents d’Ugarit’, *RAss* 76: 141–56.
- Laminger-Pascher, G. (1989), *Lykaonien und die Phryger*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 532, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lanfranchi, G. B. (1988), ‘Sargon’s Letter to Aššur-šarru-usur: An Interpretation’, *SAAB* 2.1: 59–64.
- Lanfranchi, G. B. and Parpola, S. (1990), *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part II* (State Archives of Assyria, Vol. V), Helsinki: Helsinki University Press (cited as SAA V).
- Laroche, E. (1960), *Les Hiéroglyphiques hittites, Première partie, L’Écriture*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Lie, A. G. (1929), *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria*, Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner (cited as Lie).
- Lipiński, E. (2000a), *The Aramaeans: Their Ancient History, Culture, Religion*, Leuven, Paris, and Sterling (Virginia): Peeters, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 100.
- (2000b), ‘The Linguistic Geography of Syria in Iron Age II (c. 1000–600 B.C.)’, in Bunnens (2000a), 125–42.
- (2004), *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Louvain: Peeters.
- Liverani, M. (ed.) (1995), *Neo-Assyrian Geography*, Padova: Università di Roma ‘La Sapienza’ (*Quaderni di Geografia Storica* 5).
- (2001), *International Relations in the Ancient Near East, 1600–1100 BC*, New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- (2005), *Israel’s History and the History of Israel* (transl. C. Peri and P. R. Davies), London and Oakville: Equinox.
- Luckenbill, D. D. (1928), *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, Vols. 1 and II, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (repr. Greenwood Press, New York, 1968) (cited as ARAB).
- Makinson, M. (2002–5), ‘Muşru, Maşuwari and MŞR: From Middle Assyrian Frontier to Iron Age City’, *SAAB* 20: 33–62.
- Margalith, O. (1988), ‘The Hivites’, *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100: 60–70.
- Martino, S. de (2009), ‘Anatolia after the Collapse of the Hittite Empire’, in E. Borgna and P. C. Guida (eds.), *From the Aegean to the Adriatic: Social Organisations, Modes of Exchange and Interaction in Postpalatial Times (12th–11th Century B.C.)* (*Atti del Seminario internazionale, Udine, 1–2 dicembre 2006*), Rome: Qasar, 21–8.
- Masetti-Rouault, M. G. (2009), ‘Cultures in Contact in the Syrian Middle Euphrates Valley at the End of the Bronze Age’, *Syria* 86: 141–7.
- Masson, E. (1988), ‘La Formule <<aimé des dieux>> dans les hiéroglyphes louvites’, in F. Imparati (ed.), *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, Florence: Elite (Edizioni Librarie Italiane Estere), 147–54.

- Mazar, B. (1981), 'The Early Israelite Settlement in the Hill Country', *BASOR* 241: 75–85.
- Melchert, H. C. (ed.) (2003a), *The Luwians*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 68, Leiden: Brill.
- (2003b), 'Language', in Melchert (2003a), 170–210.
- Mellink, M. J. (1991), 'The Native Kingdoms of Anatolia', *CAH* III.2: 619–65.
- Melville, S. C. (2010), 'Kings of Tabal: Politics, Competition, and Conflict in a Contested Periphery', in S. Richardson (ed.), *Rebellions and Peripheries in the Cuneiform World*, New Haven: American Oriental Society, 87–109.
- Meriggi, P. (1975), *Manuale di eteo geroglifico*, II/2–3, Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Mieroop, M. van de (2010), *The Eastern Mediterranean in the Age of Ramesses II*, Oxford: Blackwell–Wiley.
- Millard, A. (1994), *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910–612*, State Archives of Assyria Studies II, Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Dept. of Asian and African Studies, University of Helsinki (cited as *Epon.*).
- Mitchell, T. C. (1982), 'Israel and Judah until the Revolt of Jehu (931–841 B.C.)', *CAH* III.1: 442–87.
- (1991), 'Israel and Judah from the Coming of the Assyrian Domination until the Fall of Samaria, and the Struggle for Independence in Judah (c. 750–700 B.C.)', *CAH* III.2: 322–70.
- Moran, W. (1992), *The Amarna Letters* (English language edition), Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press (cited as *EA*).
- Muscarella, O. W. (1998), 'Relations between Phrygia and Assyria', in Erkanal, Donbaz, and Uğuroğlu (1998), 149–57.
- Na'aman, N. (1976), 'Two Notes on the Monolithic Inscription of Shalmaneser III from Kurkh', *Tel Aviv* 3: 89–106.
- (1977–8), 'Looking for KTK', *Die Welt des Orients* 9: 220–39.
- Nevling Porter, B. (2000), 'Assyrian Propaganda for the West: Esarhaddon's Stelae for Til Barsip and Sam'al', in Bunnens (2000a), 143–76.
- Niemeier, W.–D. (2005), 'Minoans, Mycenaean, Hittites, and Ionians in Western Asia Minor: New Excavations in Bronze Age Miletus–Milawata', in A. Villing (ed.), *The Greeks in the East*, London: British Museum, 1–36.
- Oettinger, N. (2008), 'The Seer Mopsus (Muksas) as a Historical Figure', in Collins, Bachvarova, and Rutherford (2008), 63–6.
- Orthmann, W. (2002), 'Koninuität und neue Einflüsse', *KatHet* 274–9.
- Osted, B. (1979), *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Pardee, D. (2009), 'A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincirli', *BASOR* 356: 51–71.
- Parpola, S. (1987), *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part I* (State Archives of Assyria, Vol. I), Helsinki: Helsinki University Press (cited as *SAA I*).
- (1990), 'A Letter from Marduk-apla-usur of Anah to Rudamu/Uratamis, King of Hamath', in Riis and Buhl (1990), 257–65.
- (ed. in chief) (1998–), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. See details below under *Pros.*

- Parpola, S. and Watanabe, K. (1988), *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths* (State Archives of Assyria, Vol. II), Helsinki: Helsinki University Press (cited as SAA II).
- Payne, A. (2010), *Hieroglyphic Luwian* (revised edn.), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Poebel, A. (1943), 'The Assyrian King List from Khorsabad', *JNES* 2: 56–90.
- Postgate, J. N. (1973a), 'The Inscription of Tiglath-pileser at Mila Mergi', *Sumer* 29: 47–59.
- (1973b), 'Assyrian Texts and Fragments', *Iraq* 35: 13–36.
- Powell, B. B. (2004), *Homer*, Blackwells: Oxford.
- Pritchard, J. B. (1969), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* (3rd edn.), Princeton: Princeton University Press (cited as ANET).
- Pros.* = *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Editor in Chief: S. Parpola.
- Vol. 1, Part I (A): K. Radner (ed.), 1998.
- Vol. 1, Part II (B–G): K. Radner (ed.), 1999.
- Vol. 2, Part I (H–K): H. D. Baker (ed.), 2000.
- Vol. 2, Part II (L–N): H. D. Baker (ed.), 2001.
- Vol. 3, Part I (P–S): H. D. Baker (ed.), 2002. (One further fascicle is to be published; it had not yet appeared before the manuscript of this book went to press.)
- Radner, K. (2008), Review of Tadmor 2007, *JCS* 60: 137–40.
- Reade, J. B. (1978), 'Assyrian Campaigns, 840–11 B.C., and the Babylonian Frontier', *ZA* 68: 251–60.
- Riis, P. J. (1948), *Fouilles et recherches 1931–1938, II.3. Les Cimetières à crémation*, Aarhus University Press.
- Riis, P. J. and Buhl, M. L. (eds.) (1990), *Hamas: Fouilles et recherches de la fondation Carlsberg 1931–1938, II.2. Les Objets de la période dite syro-hittite (l'Âge du Fer)*, Copenhagen: Carlsberg Foundation.
- Sader, H. (1987), *Les États Araméens de Syrie depuis leur fondation jusqu'à leur transformation en provinces assyriennes*, Beirut: Franz Steiner.
- Saggs, H. W. F. (1958), 'The Nimrud Letters, 1952—Part IV', *Iraq* 20: 182–212.
- Sagona, A. and Zimansky, P. (2009), *Ancient Turkey*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Salvini, M. (1972), 'Note Critiche e Filologiche', *La Parola del Passato* 27: 100–11.
- (1995), 'Some Historic–Geographical Problems Concerning Assyria and Urartu', in Liverani (1995), 43–53.
- Schloen, J. D. and Fink, A. S. (2009), 'New Excavations at Zincirli Höyük in Turkey (Ancient Sam'al) and the Discovery of an Inscribed Mortuary Stele', *BASOR* 356: 1–13.
- Seeher, J. (1998), 'Neue Befunde zur Endzeit von Hattuša', in S. Alp and A. Süel (eds.), *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology (Ankara 1996)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından, 515–23.
- (2001), 'Die Zerstörung der Stadt Hattusa', in Wilhelm (2001), 623–34.
- (2009), 'Der Landschaft sein Siegel aufdrücken—hethitische Felsbilder und Hieroglypheninschriften als Ausdruck des herrscherlichen Macht- und Territorialanspruchs', *AoF* 36: 119–39.
- Singer, I. (1985), 'The Battle of Nihriya and the End of the Hittite Empire', *ZA* 75: 100–23.

- Singer, I. (1999), 'A New Letter from Emar', in L. Milano, S de Martino, F. M. Fales, and G.B. Lanfranchi (eds.), *Landscapes, Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East* (Proceedings of the 44th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Venice, 1997, Vol. II, *Geography and Cultural Landscapes*), Padua: History of the Ancient Near East/Monographs III, 65–72.
- (2005), 'On Luwians and Hittites' (review of Melchert 2003a), *BiOr* 62: 430–52.
- (2006), 'The Hittites and the Bible Revisited', in A. M. Maeir and P. de Miroschedji (eds.), *'I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times': Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 723–56.
- Starke, F. (1985), *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (StBot 30), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Struble, E. J. and Herrmann, V. R. (2009), 'An Eternal Feast at Sam'al: The New Iron Age Mortuary Stele from Zincirli in Context', *BASOR* 356: 15–49.
- Sürenhagen, D. (1986), 'Ein Königssiegel aus Kargamis', *MDOG* 118: 183–90.
- (2008), 'Hartapus—Ein Sohn Mursilis II?', *SMEA* 50: 729–37.
- Tadmor, H. (1958), 'The Campaign of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological–Historical Study', *JCS* 12: 22–40, 77–100.
- (2007), *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III King of Assyria*, Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities (second printing with *addenda et corrigenda* of 1994 edition) (cited as *Tigl. III*).
- (2008), 'Assyria at the Gates of Tushpa', in M. Cogan and D. Kahn (eds.), *Treasures on Camels' Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Ancient Near East Presented to Israel Eph'al*, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, Magnes Press, 266–73.
- Tekoğlu, R. and Lemaire, A. (2000), 'La Bilingue royale louvito–phénicienne de Çineköy', *CRAI*: 961–1007.
- Thureau-Dangin, F. (1912), *Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon*, Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner.
- Thureau-Dangin, F. and Dunand, M. (1936), *Til-Barsib*, Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Ünal, A. (1974), *Hattusili III. Teil I Hattusili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung, Band I: Historischer Abriss, Band II: Quellen und Indices*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Van Loon, M. (1974), 'The Euphrates Mentioned by Sarduri II of Urartu', in K. Bittel, Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, and E. Reiner (eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch–Archaeologisch Instituut in Het Nabije Oosten, 187–94.
- Vassileva, M. (2008), 'King Midas in Southeastern Anatolia', in Collins, Bachvarova, and Rutherford (2008), 165–71.
- Wakita, S., Wada, H., and Nishiyama, S. (2000), 'Tell Mastuma: Change in Settlement Plans and Historical Context during the First Quarter of the First Millennium B.C.', in Bunnens (2000a), 537–57.
- Wilhelm, G. (2001), *Akten IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie. Würzburg, 4–8 Oktober 1999* (StBoT 45), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Winter, I. J. (1979), 'On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and their Context', *AS* 29: 115–51.

- Wittke, A.-M. (2004), *Müşker und Phryger: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Anatoliens vom 12. bis zum 7. Jh. v. Chr. Kommentar zur TAVO-Karte B IV 8 Östlicher Mittelmeerraum und Mesopotamien um 700 v. Chr.* (Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Beiheft B 99), Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Yakubovich, I (2009), *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics, Vol. 2, Brill: Leiden and Boston.
- Yamada, S. (2000), *The Construction of the Assyrian Empire: A Historical Study of the Campaigns of Shalmaneser III (859–824 B.C.) Relating to his Campaigns in the West*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 3, Leiden: Brill.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

Ass. = Assyrian, Bab. = Babylonian, bibl. = biblical, Hitt. = Hittite, LBA = Late Bronze Age, q. = queen, r. = ruler (covers kings, chieftains, governors). Neo-Hittite rulers are identified by the abbreviation NH, Assyrian rulers by one of the following abbreviations: OA (Old Assyrian), MA (Middle Assyrian), NA (Neo-Assyrian), or early IA (early Iron Age, pre Neo-Assyrian period).

Personal names are briefly defined. Page nos in bold indicate main refs.

- Abarnanu 239
Abdu-Hepa (r. Jerusalem) 66–7
Abraham (bibl. patriarch) 65
Achaia(ns) (Achaioi) 39, 66
Adad-apla-iddina (r. Babylonia) 163
Adad-idri *see* Hadadzezer (r. Damascus)
Adad-nirari I (MA r.) 183
Adad-nirari II (NA r.) 189, 209
Adad-nirari III (NA r.) 40, 50–2, 113, 166–7, 177, **245–52**, 253, 256, 258, 267
Adad-suma-usur (r. Babylonia) 185
Adalur (mt.) 222
Adana *see* Adaniya
Adanawa 39, 49–50, **153–61**, 172–3, 207, 221, 222, 238–9, 240, 241, 246, 249, 272, 275, 281, 284–5; *see also* Hiyawa, Que
Adaniya (Adana) 154
Adanu (r. Yahan) 165–6, 221
Adinu (r. Bit-Dakkuri) 234
Adramu *see* Hadram
Adunu-ba'al (r. Shianu) 228
Aeolis (Aeolians) 33–4
Afis, Tell 133, 137
Ahab (r. Israel) 70, 177, 188–9, 227, 228
Ahat-abisha (q. Bit-Burutash) 279, 284
Ahaz (r. Judah) 178, 273–4
Ahaziahu (r. Judah) 177
Ahhiyawa 35, 39, 154
Ahimelech (bibl. Israelite military commander) 65
Ahlamu(-Aramaeans) 163
Ahmar, Tell *see* Masuwari
Ahuni (r. Bit-Adini) 121, 168–9, 211, 212, 218–19, **223–5**, 246
Akhenaten (r. Egypt) 66, 182
Alaca Höyük 42
Alalah 52, 66, 130, 203
Alasiya 13, 21
Alatahana 91
Aleppo 14, 19, 83, 128–9, 204, 226
Alimush (Alishir) 131, 221
Allumari (r. Malatya?) 99, 103–4
Al-Untash-Napirisha 186
Alyattes (r. Lydia) 45
Alziyamuwa (Hitt. garrison commander) 54
Alzu 198
Amanus (mt. range) 215, 220, 222, 236
Amarna letters 66
Amazons 13, 40
Ambaris (Amris) (NH r. Bit-Burutash) **144–5**, 147, 162, 279–80, **282–3**
Ammonites 68
Ammuna (LBA r. Hatti) 154
Amorites 65, 181–2, 184
Amphilochus (Greek legendary city-founder) 38
Amris *see* Ambaris
Amuq Plain 52, 129, 130
Amurru 13, 14, 15, 50–1, 99, 200–1, 249
Ana-Ashur-uter-asbat 225–6
Antakya stele 167
Aphek 58
Aparazu 236
Apollo 34, 41
Apre (mod. Afrin) (river) 214
Arabs 227, 265, 270
Aramaeans 48, 68, 70, 115, 137, **163–80**, 202–3, 209, 225, 245, 291
Aramaic
 language 61, 163
 inscriptions 172
Aram-Damascus *see* Damascus
Arame *see* Hadram
Aram-Zobah *see* Soba
Arawnah (Aranyah, Awarnah) (Jebusite r.) 66–7
Argishti I (r. Urartu) 100–1, 108, 142, 190, 254, 255
Argishti II (r. Urartu) 111, 114, 191, 282, 287
Aribua 133, 214
Arinna 42
Ariyahina (NH r. Masuwari) 115–17
Arman 233
Armanani (NH official) 85
Arne 165

- Arnuwanda I (LBA r. Hatti) 18
 Arnuwanda III (LBA r. Hatti) 18, 29
 Arnuwanti I (NH r. Malatya) 51, 53, 55, 85,
 86, 98–9, 101, 102–3
 Arnuwanti II (NH r. Malatya) 101, 103, 104
 Arnuwanti III? (NH r. Malatya?) 105
 Arpad 101, 166, 174, 245–6, 249–52, 256–8,
 260, 261, 264, 265, 267, 275–6; *see also*
 Bit-Agusi
 alliance with Urartu 261
 Arslan Taş *see* Hadatu
 Arslantepe *see* Malatya
 Artulu 142, 240
 Arwad (Arvad) 200, 201, 215, 227, 228, 248
 Arzawa 13, 17, 21, 33
 Asa (r. Judah) 176
 Ashtammaku (mod. Tell Mastuma?) 236
 Ashur 181–2, 247
 ‘Ashur Charter’ 275–6
 ‘Ashur letters’ 56–7
 Ashurabi II (early IA Ass. r.) 165
 Ashurbanipal (NA r.) 45, 161, 186–7, 191,
 269, 292, 293
 Ashur-bel-kala (early IA Ass. r.) 163, 189
 Ashur-dan II (NA r.) 165, 201, 209
 Ashur-dan III (NA r.) 95, 253, 256
 Ashur-iqisha 262
 Ashurnasirpal II (NA r.) 49, 84, 133, 209,
 211–18, 256
 Ashur-nirari V (NA r.) 253, 256, 257–8, 267
 Ashur-sharru-usur (NA governor) 150, 152,
 158, 159, 284, 287–8
 Ashur-uballit (MA r.) 182–3
 Ashwis(i) (father of Kurti; = Ushhitti?) 146–7
 Askanius (legendary Phrygian chief) 147
 Assyria (select refs) 96, 181–4, 197–201
 bias of Assyrian sources 3–4, 5, 191, 209–10
 Assyrian Colony Period, merchant
 colonies 16, 182
 Assyrian-Phrygian *entente* 287–9
 Astiru(wa) (NH r. Carchemish) 84, 94
 ‘Astiru(wa) II?’ (NH r. Carchemish?) 98
 Astiruwa dynasty 94–8
 Astuwaramanza (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3,
 125, 205
 Astuwatamanza (NH r. Carchemish) 89–91,
 202
 Atayaza (NH scribe Kummuh) 113
 Athens 34
 Attar-hamek (= Attar-shumki?) 251
 Attar-shumki I (r. Arpad/Bit-Agusi) 166–8,
 245–6, 249–52, 267
 Attar-shumki II (r. Arpad/Bit-Agusi) 167–8,
 267
 Atuna 141, 145–7, 265, 270–1, 278–9
 Awariku (Ass. Urik(ki)) (NH r. Adanawa/
 Hiyawa/Que) 66, 154, 155–61, 265, 272,
 284–5, 287–8, 292–3
 Awayana 92
 (A)zallu 211
 Azatiwata (NH sub-r. Adanawa) 154, 157–61,
 293
 Azatiwataya 157
 Azmu 168–9
 Azriyau (rebel leader Patin) 137, 264, 268
 Baal (r. Tyre) 269
 Ba‘alat 133, 135
 Ba‘asa (r. Bet Rehob) 227
 Baasha (r. Israel) 176
 Baba-aha-iddina (r. Babylonia) 245
 Babylon 182, 184–5, 246, 277, 286–7
 Babylonia 184–5, 186, 198, 230–4, 244–5, 274
 Babylonian exile 68
 Bactria 246
 Banihu (r. Sam‘al) 170, 171
 Baqanu 234
 Bar-Ga‘ya (r. Ktk) 137, 167, 179, 258
 Bar-Gush (= Attar-shumki I?) 166–7, 249
 Bar-Hadad I (Hebrew Ben-Hadad)
 (r. Damascus) 175–6
 Bar-Hadad II (r. Damascus) 107, 113, 137,
 166, 177, 249, 253, 267
 Bar-Hadad(?) (r. Arpad/Bit-Agusi?) 167, 251,
 251, 267
 Bar-Rakib (r. Sam‘al) 171, 172, 174, 175,
 268, 285
 Ba‘ririm 169, 170–1
 Bar-Sur (r. Sam‘al) 171, 173, 268
 Basemath (bibl. Hitt. fig.) 65
 Bathsheba (wife of Uriah) 64
 Bethel 69
 Bet(h) Rehob *see* Soba
 Bianili 189; *see also* Urartu
 biblical Hittites 64–75
 Bit-Adini 121, 164, 168–9, 218–19, 223,
 246, 255
 Bit-Agusi 51, 164, 165–8, 214, 221, 235, 236;
 see also Arpad
 Bit-Amukani 234, 274
 Bit-Bahiani 164, 211
 Bit-Burutash (Bit-Paruta) 144–5, 147, 279–80,
 283, 284
 Bit-Dakkuri 234
 Bit-Gabbari 206
 Bit-Hadara 273–4
 bit hilani 130, 170, 172
 Bit-Paruta *see* Bit-Burutash
 Bit-Yakin 234, 277, 287
 Bit-Zamani 164

- Boeotia 33
 Boğazköy *see* Hattusa
 BOHÇA stele 146
 BONUS-ti (wife of Suhi II) 91
 Borsippa 232, 233, 234
 Burannati (r. Yasbuq) 221
 burial practices 58
 Burmarina 219
 Burnaburiash (r. Babylonia) 182–3
 Burunkaya 21–2, 28–9
 Butima 222
 Byblos 99, 192, 200, 215, 227, 238, 265, 269

 Calah (Kalhu, Nimrud) *see* Nimrud
 Calchas (Greek legendary city-founder) 38
 camels 227, 228–9, 230
 Canaan (bibl. ancestral figure) 64
 Canaan(ites) 65–6, 67, 69, 188, 192
 Candaules (r. Lydia) 44
 Cappadocia 42
 Carchemish (Karkamish) 13, 14, 49, 51, 53–5,
 83–98, 99, 124, 196, 201–2, 203, 204,
 212–13, 240, 255, 265, 266, 280–1, 290
 Caria(ns) 34–5, 36
 Chaldaeans 233–4, 245, 247, 274, 286–7
 Chios 34, 35
 Chogha Zanbil 186
 Chronicles (bibl. source) 68
 Cilices 38–9
 Cilicia (Pedias Tracheia) 38–9
 Cilician Gates 240
 Cimmerians 44, 45, 160, 282, 288–9
 Çineköy bilingual 154, 158, 159
 client-status 238, 329–30 n. 43
 'Country-Lord' (royal title) 89, 90, 91, 92, 94,
 97, 99, 102, 104, 105, 108, 202
 Creusa (legendary Athenian princess) 34
 CRUS+RA/I-sa (= Taras?) (NH r.
 Malatya) 101, 105
 CRUS+RA/I-sa dynasty 101, 105–6
 cuneiform script
 Hittite 16, 22–4
 Luwian 23–4
 Cutha 232, 233
 Cyprus 21, 192; *see also* Alasiya

 Dabigu 223
 Dadi-il(u) (r. Kaska) 265, 267
 Damascus 14, 164–5, 175–8, 226–7, 237–8,
 247–9, 250, 253–4, 257–8, 265, 269, 273–4,
 275–6
 Dan (Tell el-Qadi) 176
 Danunians 154, 158, 238; *see also* Adanawa
 David (r. Israel) 64, 68, 134, 175, 177,
 179, 188

 Dayyan-Ashur (NA military
 commander) 132, 242, 244, 254
 Dayenu (lands) 99–100
 Delphi 41
 Denyen 13, 154
 deportations 16, 17, 54, 75, 98, 109, 111, 144,
 145, 178, 225, 262–4, 275, 276, 278, 281,
 283, 285, 287, 292, 293
 Der 245, 277
 divine endorsement 29
 'double monarchy' (Babylonia) 274, 277
 Dugdammê *see* Lygdamis
 Dummetu 168–9
 Dur-Kurigalzu (mod. Aqar Quf) 185
 Dur-Papsukkal 244–5
 Dur-Yakin 277

 Ebla 83, 133
 Edom(ites) 50, 51, 68, 273
 Egypt 68, 71–2, 95, 227–8
 Elam 185–7, 198, 245, 276–7
 El-Qitar 211
 Emar 53–4
 Emirgazi 19–20, 28
 end, Late Bronze Age 9–31
 Eni'ilu (NH r. Hamath) 137–8, 264, 265,
 268–9, 276
 Enlil-nadin-apli (r. Babylonia) 185, 186
 Enlil-nadin-ahi (r. Elam) 186
 Ephron (bibl. Hitt. figure) 65
 Erishum I (OA r.) 182
 Esarhaddon (NA r.) 45, 153, 175, 269,
 292, 293
 ethnicity 13–14, 16–17, 34, 67, 75, 115, 120–1,
 172, 204, 206, 291
 Europos (formerly Carchemish) 84
 Eusebius (Greek scholar) 40
 Exodus (bibl.) 67, 187–8

 Fraktin 19, 27

 Gabbar (r. Sam'al) 170, 171, 206
 Gannanate 232–3
 Gavurkalesi 42
 Gilzau 230
 Gindibu 227, 228, 230
 Goiim 65
 Gordium 41, 277
 Gordius (r. Phrygia) 40, 41, 42
 'Great King' (royal title) 21–2, 25–6, 28–9, 53,
 85–8, 89–90, 143–4, 144–5, 183, 185, 196,
 201–2, 260, 271, 281
 Grynium 34
 Gumurru (Cimmerians) 289
 Gunzinanu (NH r. Malatya) 109, 285

- Gurgum 51, 113, 122–8, 205–6, 213, 216, 219, 245–6, 249, 261, 265, 267, 285–6
- Gusi (r. Yahan) 165, 214
- Guti *see* Qutu
- Guzana 256
- Gyges (r. Lydia) 44, 45
- Habinu (r. Til-Abni) 230
- Hadad 172
- Hadadezer (Ass. Adad-idri) (r. Damascus) 176, 226, 229, 236–7
- Hadadezer (r. Soba/Zobah) 134, 179
- Hadatu (mod. Arslan Taş) 119
- Hadiiani *see* Hadyan II
- Hadrach *see* Hatarikka
- Hadram (Adramu, Arame) (r. Bit-Agusi) 165–6, 226, 234–5
- Hadyan II (Hezyon, Ass. Hadiiani) (r. Damascus) 177–8, 254
- Halizones 13
- Halparuntiya (personal name) = Ass. Qalparunda
- Halparuntiya I (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3, 125
- Halparuntiya II (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3, 126–7, 226
- Halparuntiya III (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3, 124, 127, 245
- Halparuntiya (NH r. Patin) 126–7, 131, 206, 223–4, 226, 236
- Halpasulupi (NH r. Malatya) 101, 106
- Halys (river) 42
- Hamath 51–2, 133–8, 168, 207, 216, 226–7, 229, 236–7, 249–52, 258, 264, 265, 268–9, 275–6
- ‘Hamath stones’ 134
non-monumental inscriptions 56–7
- Hamiyata (NH r. Masuwari) 116, 118–20
- Hammurabi (r. Babylonia) 182, 184
- Hanigalbat 99, 183
- Hapatila (NH r. Masuwari) 115, 117, 205
- Harran 225
- Harrua 281
- Hartapu (r. Tarhuntassa?) 21–2, 28–9, 144–5
- Haruha 119
- Hatarikka (Hazrek, bibl. Hadrach) 134, 137, 214, 249, 256, 264
- Hatip 21, 28
- Hatti
general 74–5
Late Bronze Age 13–15, 182–4
Iron Age 15, 47–63, 69, 87, 254–5
- Hattians 13–14, 16
- Hattusa 9–12, 42, 62–3
- Hattusili III (LBA r. Hatti) 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26–7, 28, 62, 183
- Hattusili I (NH r. Kummuh) 110, 111, 219, 224
- Hattusili II ((NH r. Kummuh) 113
- Hattusili (NH r. Gurgum)
- Hayya(nu) (r. Sam'al) 170, 171–2, 219, 224, 226, 268
- Hazael (r. Damascus) 176–7, 237–8, 249, 253
- Hazauna 91
- Hazazu 222
- Hazrek *see* Hatarikka
- Hepat 19
- Hepat-Sharrumma 19
- Heraklid dynasty (Lydia) 44, 45
- Herodotus (Greek historian) 34, 35, 36, 39, 44
- Heth (bibl. patriarch) 64, 73
- Hezekiah (r. Judah) 276
- Hezyon *see* Hadyan II
- Hilakku 38–9, 49–50, 126, 144, 153, 161–2, 207, 221, 222, 240, 279–80, 283–4, 292
- Hilaruada (= Sa(?)tiruntiya?) (NH r. Malatya) 108, 109, 255, 266
- Hiliki 126
- Hindanu 168, 211
- Hirika 126
- Hisarlık 23, 34
- Hittites (LBA) 13–15, 184–5
- Hittites (bibl.) 64–75
- Hivites 65, 66
- Hiyawa 39, 66, 154, 156; *see also* Adanawa, Que
- Homer (Greek epic poet) 12–13, 34, 36, 38–9, 41
- Hoshea (r. Israel) 274
- Hubushna *see* Hupis(h)na
- Hulli (NH r. Tabal ‘Proper’) 144, 271, 279
- Humban-haltash III (r. Elam) 186–7
- Humban-nikash (r. Elam) 277
- Hume (= Adanawa) 154
- Hupis(h)na (Hubishna, Hubushna) 45, 141, 153, 240, 265, 270–1
- Huradu 234
- Hurrians 17, 66–7, 154
- Hypachaians 39
- ideology, royal 222–3
- Idrimi (r. Alalah) 66
- Iliad* 12–13, 39–40, 66
- Ilios 13, 34; *see also* Troy
- Ilubidi *see* Yaubidi
- Imgur-Enlil (mod. Balawat) 226
- Immerinu 219
- Indo-Europeans 15–16, 30, 42
- Ini-Teshub (r. Carchemish) 84, 87, 99–100, 200
- Ion (legendary ancestor of Ionians) 34
- Ionia(ns) 34–5

- Irhuleni *see* Urhilina
 Irqata (Tell 'Arqa) 227, 228
 Ir-Teshub (r. Carchemish?) 85–7, 196, 205
 Isauria 17, 36
 Ishkallu (post-NH r. Tabal) 293
 Ishme-Dagan (OA r.) 182
 Ishpuini (r. Urartu) 190
 Isin *see* Second Dynasty of
 Isputahsu (r. Kizzuwadna) 18, 23
 Israel 70, 187–9, 227, 228, 237, 238, 269–270,
 273, 274, 276
 Israelites 64–5, 67, 68
 'Ishtar-duri' *see* Sarduri III/IV
 Ishtu(a)nda (Ishtundi) 141, 147–8, 265,
 270–1
 İvriz monument 150, 151

 Japheth (bibl. figure) 72–3
 Jebusites 65, 66–7
 Jehoahaz (r. Judah) 189
 Jehoram (Joram) (r. Israel) 177, 189
 Jehu (r. Israel) 328 n. 27
 Jehudith (bibl. Hitt. fig.) 65
 Jeroboam II (r. Israel) 178, 269
 Jerusalem 68, 178, 273, 276
 Joash (r. Israel) 189, 248
 Joseph (bibl. fig.) 187
 Joshua (bibl. source) 68
 Joshua (Israelite r.) 67, 69
 Judaeen hill country 65, 67, 69, 73, 75
 Judah 74, 75, 238, 273
 Judges (bibl. source) 68

 Kadesh, *see* Qadesh
 Kadmuhi 40, 197, 198–9
 Kalhu *see* Nimrud
 Kalhu inscription 247–8
 Kamana 97
 Kamani (r. Carchemish) 84, 95, 97, 255,
 266, 281
 Kammanu 109–10, 286
 Kanapu 97
 Kaprabu 211
 Karabel 21
 Karadağ 21–2, 28–9, 43
 Karahöyük (near Elbistan) 85, 196, 205
 Karahöyük (near Ereğli) 240
 Kar(a)kisa 36
 Karatepe bilingual 39, 154, 156–61
 Karkamish *see* Carchemish
 Kar Shalmaneser 224–5; *see also* Masuwari/
 Til Barsip
 Kashiari range 198–9
 Kashtiliash IV (r. Babylonia) 185
 Kaska(ns) 12, 265, 267
 Kassites 185

 Kate (NH r. Adanawa) 155, 173, 221, 238–9,
 240, 241
 Katuwa (NH r. Carchemish) 89, 90, 92–3,
 202, 213
 Kayseri 142
 KELEKLĪ inscription 89, 91
 Kiakki *see* Kiyakiya
 Kikki (NH r. Tabal 'Proper?') 143, 240
 Kilamuwa (r. Sam'al) 169, 170–3, 238–9, 268
 Kinalua (Kunulua) 130, 206, 214, 244, 263
 Kings (bibl. source) 68
 Kirri (NH r. Adanawa) 155, 241
 Kisuatnu 154, 239
 Kiyakiya (Ass. Kiakki) (NH r. Shinuhtu) 141,
 144, 145, 147, 148, 271, 278
 Kızıladağ 21–2, 28–9, 43, 145, 280
 Kızıl Irmak (river) *see* Halys, Marassantiya
 Kizzuwadna 17, 18, 23, 69, 154
 Konya Plain 21, 43
 Ktk 137, 179, 249, 258
 KTMW 170, 175
 Kubaba 88, 98, 113
 Kue (Qoah) 71
 Kullani(a) 263, 268
 Kululu 142
 lead strip inscriptions 56–7
 Kummuh 51, 110–14, 196, 205, 213, 216,
 245–6, 253–4, 261, 265, 266, 285–7
 Kundashpu (NH r. Kummuh) 111, 226
 Ku(n)zi-Teshub (NH r. Carchemish) 51, 53,
 55, 83, 84–5, 101, 195–6, 201, 204, 205,
 290, 294
 'Ku(n)zi-Teshub dynasty' (Carchemish)
 84–8, 89, 98–9, 201–2
 'Ku(n)zi-Teshub dynasty' (Malatya) 101–5
 Kupapiya (q. WaDAsatini) 129
 Kurti (NH r. Atuna) 146, 278–9, 283
 Kurussa 132, 244
 Kushtashpi (NH r. Kummuh) 114, 261, 265, 266
 Kurunta (LBA r. Tarhuntassa) 19, 21, 26, 28–9

 Labarna (Hitt. royal title) 18, 25–6, 28
 Labarna (royal name = NH Lubarna) *see*
 Lubarna I and II
 Lahiru 232
 Lalanda 27
 Lalatu 218
 Lalli (NH r. Malatya) 107, 241
 Lamena 241
 Laqe 168, 211
 Larama I (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3, 125
 Larama II (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3, 127
 Lawazantiya 69
 Lebanon (mt.) 200, 248
 Lesbos 33
 Lidar Höyük 53, 85

- Lower Land 19, 29, 43
 Luash (Lugath, Luhuti) 52, 133–4, 214–15, 249, 264
 Lubarna (I) (NH r. Patin) 130, 131, 206, 214
 Lubarna (II) (NH r. Patin) 131–2, 242–3
 Lugath *see* Luash
 Luhuti *see* Luash
 Lukka (Lands) 19, 27, 36–7
 Lutibu 131, 170, 172, 220, 286
 Luwian
 inscriptions 17–30, 43, 44–5, 54–5, 56–7, 60, 203, 210, 290–1, 291–2, 297–300
 language 15, 17–30, 37, 56–7, 60
 population groups 15, 17–30, 38, 54–7, 115, 154, 169, 172, 206, 207, 290–1
 Luwian-Phoenician bilinguals *see* Çineköy and Karatepe bilinguals
 Lusanda 69, 239
 Luz 68, 69
 Lycaonia 17, 36
 Lycia(ns) 36–8
 Lydia(ns) 44–5, 95
 Lygdamis (Tugdammu/Dugdamme) (Cimmerian r.) 45
- Macedon 39
 Malatya (Melid) 51, 86–7, 98–110, 196, 201, 202, 213, 216, 240, 241, 246, 249, 255, 261, 265, 266, 285–6, 293
 Maldiya *see* Malatya
 Malitiya *see* Malatya
 Malizi (= Malatya) 106, 108
 Mansuate 248, 252
 Maraş *see* Marqas
 Marassantiya (river) 14
 Marduk 233
 Marduk-apla-iddina II (bibl. Merodach-baladan) (r. Babylonia) 274, 277, 286–7
 Marduk-aplar-usur (r. Suhu) 136
 Marduk-balassu-iqbi (r. Babylonia) 244–5
 Marduk-bel-usate (pretender to Bab. throne) 231–3
 Marduk-zaki-shumi (r. Babylonia) 231, 234
 Mari 66, 83
 Mari' (royal title) (r. Damascus) 177, 247–9
 Mariti (NH r. Malatya) 106–7
 Marqas (mod. Maraş) 51, 122, 124, 128, 285
 Masuwari (Til Barsip, Kar Shalmaneser, mod. Tell Ahmar) 51, 71, 115–21, 205, 218, 223, 224–5, 244, 254–5, 266–7
 Masyaf 252
 Mati'ilu (r. Arpad) 137, 167–8, 257–8, 261, 267
 Matinu-Ba'al (r. Arwad) 228
 Megiddo 59
 Melid *see* Malatya
 Meliteia *see* Malatya
 Melitene *see* Malatya
 Melqart stele 251
 Menahem (r. Samaria/Israel) 265, 269–70
 mercenaries 36, 70
 Mermnad dynasty (Lydia) 44–5
 Merneptah (r. Egypt) 67
 Merneptah stele 67, 187
 Merodach-baladan *see* Marduk-apla-iddina II
 Meshech (bibl. figure) 73
 Me-Turnat 232
 Midas (Mita) (r. Phrygia) 40–3, 44, 84, 98, 147, 150–2, 160–1, 260, 277–9, 280–1, 283, 285, 287–9
 Midas City 42
 migrations 12, 13, 17, 33–40, 52–60, 74, 154
 Mila Mergi 262
 Miletus (LBA Milawata/Millawanda) 35–6
 Milidia 99–100; *see also* Malatya
 Minoans 35
 Minua (r. Urartu) 100–1, 189–90, 254, 255
 Mira 21
 Mita (r. Phrygia) *see* Midas
 Mitanni 14, 66, 83, 182–3
 Mizraim 70–2
 Moabites 68
 Mopsus (Greek legendary city-founder) 38, 156, 157; *see also* Muk(a)sas
 Moses (Israelite leader) 187
 Mugallu (post-NH r. Malatya) 110, 175, 293
 Muk(a)sas (= Mopsus?) (founder of Adanawa dynasty) 156
 Mukish 14, 51
 Mulu (mt.) 240
 Mursili I (LBA r. Hatti) 184
 Mursili II (LBA r. Hatti) 16, 28, 35
 Mursili III *see* Urhi-Teshub
 Mursili (father of Hartapu; = Mursili III/Urhi-Teshub?) 21–2, 144
 Muru 235
 Musasir 282
 Mushki 40, 73, 197, 198–9, 277
 Muškabim 169, 170–1, 172
 Musri (Mizri) (= Egypt) 70–1, 227
 Musri (in southeastern Anatolia) 71
 Musri (east of Tigris river) 71
 Mutallu (Ass. form of Muwatalli)
 Muti (mt.) 152
 Muwaharani (I) (NH r. Tuwana) 149
 Muwaharani (II) (NH r. Tuwana) 152, 285
 Muwatalli II (LBA r. Hatti) 14, 17, 19, 26
 Muwatalli I (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3, 125
 Muwatalli II (NH r. Gurgum) 123, 126, 219
 Muwatalli III (NH r. Gurgum) 127–8, 286
 Muwatalli (NH r. Kummuh) 110–11, 114, 286–7
 Muwizi (NH r. Gurgum) 122–3, 125

- Mycale (mt.) 35
 Mycenaean world 35–6, 39, 42

 Nabonassar (Nabu-nasir) (r. Babylonia) 245, 274
 Nabu-apla-iddina 231 (r. Babylonia)
 Nabu(-eri) (r. Babylonia) 274
 Nahitiya (mod. Niğde) 148
 Nairi (lands) 99–100, 197, 199, 230, 244
 Namri 245, 254, 260–1
 Nebuchadnezzar I (r. Babylonia) 186, 198
 Nebuchadnezzar II (r. Babylonia) 84, 246
 Necho II (r. Egypt) 84
 Neo-Elamite period 186
 Nergal-erish (NA governor) 248
 Nesa 16
 Nesite (language) 14, 15–16, 22, 25
 Niğde 142, 148
 Nihriya 54, 183–4
 Nimrud (Calah, Kalhu) 49, 215, 217, 258
 Nineveh 215, 246, 262
 Ninurta-bel-usur (governor Kar-Shalmaneser, Hadatu) 119, 252, 255
 Ninus ('r. Nineveh') (Greek tradition) 246
 Nişantaş 20–1, 30
 Northern Tabal *see* Tabal 'Proper'
 Nuhashshi lands 15, 26, 52, 62, 133, 214
 Nulia 222

 Omri (r. Israel) 188
 Omride dynasty 70, 188–9, 227
 Osorkon II (r. Egypt) 228

 PaDAsatini (WaDAsatini) 128–9, 206–7
 Pahar 158
 Pahru 240
 Pala, Palaic (people and language) 15
 Palalam (= Larama II, NH r. Gurgum) 124
 Palestine 50, 51
 Pamphylia 17, 38
 Pan 41
 Panammu *see* Panamuwa II
 Panamuwa I (r. Sam'al) 171, 172, 173, 268
 Panamuwa II (Panammu) (r. Sam'al) 128, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 265, 268, 285
 Panamuwati (NH q. Kummuh) 113
 Panionium 35
 Paphlagonia 15
 Paqar(a)hubunu 166, 219, 245–6
 Parha *see* Perge
 Paris (Trojan prince) 200
 Parita (NH r. Hamath) 135
 Parzuta 143, 271
 Pat(t)in (Ass. Unqi) 52, 129, 130–3, 206–7, 213–14, 222, 242–4, 246, 249, 263, 265
 Pazarçik stele 113, 166, 245, 253–4

 Pekah (r. Israel) 178, 273–4
 Peleset 13
 Perge 38
 Perizzites 65, 66
 Philistia 269, 273
 Philistines 128–9, 273
 Phoenicia(ns) 192
 Phrygia(ns) 39–43, 45, 95, 150–2, 160–1, 260, 277–8, 280, 282–3, 285–6, 287–9
 language and inscriptions 42
 'Black Stones' (Phrygian inscriptions) 150
 Pihirim (NH r. Hilakku) 155, 161–2, 221
 Pisidia 17, 36
 Pisiri (NH r. Carchemish) 84, 97–8, 265, 266, 280–1, 285
 Pitru 226
 Piyassili, *see* Sharri-Kushuh
 'POCULUM' (NH land) 85–6, 205
 Porsuk 152
 Priam (legendary r. Troy) 39–40
 propaganda 25–6, 29, 232
 'Province of the Commander-in-Chief' 169
 provincialization (Assyrian) 262–4
 Puduhepa (LBA q. Hatti) 19, 27
 PUGNUS-mili (I) (NH r. Malatya?) 86, 101, 102
 PUGNUS-mili (II) (NH r. Malatya?) 101, 103–4
 PUGNUS-mili (III) (?) (NH r. Malatya?) 104
 Puhame (NH r. Hupishna) 15, 240
 Pul (= Tiglath-pileser III) 269
 Purulumuzu 198

 Qadesh (Kadesh) 14, 15, 36
 battle of (1274) 14, 175
 Qalparunda (Ass. form of Halparuntiya)
 Qarli (r. Sam'al) 171, 268
 Qarqar (Tell Qarqur?) 229, 230
 battle of 230, 276
 Qatazili/u (Ass. form of Hattusili)
 Qatna 15
 Qode 13
 Que 38–9, 66, 71, 265, 272; *see also* Adanawa
 Qumaha *see* Kummuh
 Qurnasi 281
 Qutu 190, 254

 Ramesses II (r. Egypt) 14, 36, 66, 67, 183, 187
 Ramesses III (r. Egypt) 13, 33, 154
 Rasyan (Rahianu, Rezin) (r. Damascus) 178, 265, 269, 273–4
 Remaliah (r. Israel) 178
 Rezin *see* Rasyan
 royal marriages 72, 91
 Rudamu *see* Uratami

- Runtiya (NH r. Malatya) 51, 53, 55, 85, 86,
98–9, 101, 102, 196
- Runtiya (god) 146
- Rusa I (r. Urartu) 190–1, 277, 281, 282, 283,
289
- Rusa II (r. Urartu) 191
- Ruwata (NH r. Tabal) 144
- Saba'a inscription 248
- Sahwi *see* Shahu
- Sakçagözü 170, 172, 286
- Saluara (river) 220
- Sam'al 51, 164, 169–75, 206, 219–20, 238–9,
246, 249, 265, 268, 275, 285
language 172
- Samaria 50, 51, 265, 269–70, 275, 276
- Sammu-ramat (NA q.) ('Semiramis') 246–7
- Samos 34, 35
- Samosata (mod. Samsat Höyük) 110
- Samsi (Arab q.) 270
- Samsu-ditana (r. Babylonia) 184
- Samuha 10, 63
- Samuru 201
- Sangara (NH r. Carchemish) 84, 93, 213, 219,
224, 226, 234–5
- Sangarius (mod. Sakarya) (river) 39, 41
- Sanguru (river) 214
- Sapalulme (Ass. form of Suppiluliuma)
- Sapisi 92
- Sarduri I (r. Urartu) 189, 242, 254
- Sarduri II (r. Urartu) 100–1, 107–8, 109, 110,
114, 168, 190, 255, 257, 261, 266, 272
- Sarduri III/IV (r. Urartu) 191
- Sargon II (NA r.) 42, 49, 84, 98, 101, 109,
110–11, 114, 145, 147, 158, 189, 190–1,
274–89
- Sarugu 219
- Saruwani (NH r. Tuwana) 149
- Sastura (NH vizier Carchemish) 97–8
- Sasi (NH r. Patin) 132, 244, 268
- Sa(?)tiruntiya *see* Hilaruada
- Saul (r. Israel) 179, 188
- Saushtatar (r. Mitanni) 182
- Sazabu 223
- scribes 23, 24, 60
- Scythians 44
- Sealand 277
- seals 18, 22–3, 25–6, 53, 56–7, 58, 172
- Sea Peoples 13, 33, 53, 55, 154
- Second Dynasty of Isin 185, 186, 198
- Sefire inscriptions 167, 258
- Seha River Land 21
- Semiramis *see* Sammu-ramat
- Semitic (languages and peoples) 163, 169,
172, 175
- Sennacherib (NA r.) 159, 160, 161, 276, 277, 286
- Shahu (= Sahwi?) (NH r. Malatya) 107–8, 255
- Sha'il (r. Sam'al) 170, 171, 172
- Shallum (r. Israel) 269
- Shalmaneser I (MA r.) 189
- Shalmaneser III (NA r.) 43, 84, 93, 131, 155,
162, 172–3, 189, 218–44, 254
- Shalmaneser IV (NA r.) 177, 253, 255–6
- Shalmaneser V (NA r.) 189, 271, 274–5, 279
- Shamash-mudammīq (r. Babylonia) 209
- Shamshi-Adad I (OA r.) 182, 258
- Shamshi-Adad V (NA r.) 244–5, 246, 247
- Shamshi-ilu (NA governor, military
commander) 113, 119, 167, 177, 190,
252, 253–5, 256, 266–7
- Sharri-Kushuh (Piyassili) (Hitt. viceroy
Carchemish) 14
- Shattuara (r. Hanigalbat) 183
- Sheba, Queen of 71
- Shekelesh 13
- Shereshshu 199
- Shianu 227, 228
- Shiloh 58
- Shimashki dynasty 185
- Shinuhtu 141, 145–6, 148, 270–1
- Shittamrat (mt.) 225
- Sibitba'il (Sibittibi'il) (r. Byblos) 265, 269
- Sidon 50, 99, 192, 200, 215, 237–8, 248
- Simirra 264, 275–6
- Sirkeli 19
- Soba ((Aram-)Zobah, Bet(h) Rehob) 179, 229
- Solomon (r. Israel) 68, 71, 72, 175, 187–8
- Storm God 29, 128–9, 147, 203; *see also*
Tarhunza, Teshub
- Subarians 197
- Subutu (Supite) 179
- Südburg (Hattusa) 20, 29–30
- Suhi I (NH r. Carchemish) 88, 89–90, 202
- Suhi II (NH r. Carchemish) 89, 91, 202
- Suhi dynasty 89–90, 202, 203
- Suhu 136, 168, 211
- sukkalmah* dynasty 185
- Sultanhan 142
- Sulmal (NH r. Malatya) 109, 261, 265, 266
- Suppiluliuma (personal name) = Ass.
Sapalulme, Ushpilulume
- Suppiluliuma I (LBA r. Hatti) 10, 14, 19, 28,
52, 64, 85, 182, 204
- Suppiluliuma II (Suppiluliuma) (LBA r.
Hatti) 9–11, 20–1, 27, 29, 30, 62–3,
124, 294
- Suppiluliuma (NH r. Kummuh) 112–13,
124, 245
- Suppiluliuma (NH r. Patin) 131, 219–21
- Sura (= Urartu) 95
- Surri (NH r. Patin) 132, 244
- Susa 186

- Susiana 186
 Suwarimi (NH r.(?) Malatya) 106
 Syria, Late Bronze Age 14–15
 Syro-Hittite(s) 48, 291
 Syro-Palestinian alliance 225–30, 236–8
- Tabal 42–3, 49–50, 72–3, 141–53, 207,
 239–40, 241, 249, 260, 265, 270–2,
 278–80, 288, 293
 Tabal ‘Proper’ (Northern Tabal) 141–5, 240,
 260, 270–1
 Table of Nations 64–7, 74
 Tadmor (Palmyra) 50
 Taia 222
 Taimani (Temanites) 95
 Taita (NH r. P/WaDAsatini) 128–9, 206–7
 Talmi-Sharrumma (Hitt. viceroy
 Aleppo) 54–5,
 Talmi-Teshub (Hitt. viceroy Carchemish) 19,
 53, 83, 85
 Tanakum 241
 Tapikka (mod. Maşat) 42
 Taras *see* CRUS+RA/I-sa
 Tarhulara (NH r. Gurgum) 127–8, 261, 265,
 267, 286
 Tarhunaza (NH sub-r. Tuwana) 148–9, 152
 Tarhunazi (NH r. Malatya) 109–10, 285–6
 Tarhuntassa 10, 17, 21, 28, 29, 38,
 86–7, 145
 Tarhunza (Luwian Storm God) 118, 148, 150,
 152, 156, 157
 Tarkasnawa (r. Mira) 21, 23
 Tarsus (Tarza) 23, 241
 Tarwiza 18
 Tarza *see* Tarsus
 Tayinat, Tell 129, 130, 206
 Telipinu (LBA r. Hatti) 18
 Telipinu (Hitt. viceroy, Aleppo) 14, 19
 Tell al-Rimah inscription 248
 Tenedos 33
 Teshub (Hurrian Storm God) 19
 Te-Umman (r. Elam) 186
 Teushpa (Cimmerian r.) 45, 153
 Thessaly 33
 Thrace 39
 Tid’al (bibl. r.) 65
 Tiglath-pileser I (early IA Ass. r.) 40, 84, 87,
 99, 103–4, 163, 197–201, 216, 225
 Tiglath-pileser III (NA r.) 84, 101, 114, 128,
 168, 173–4, 178, 255, 258–74
 Til-Abni 211, 219, 230
 Til Barsip *see* Masuwari
 Til-garimmu 109–10, 286
 Timur 241
 Tjekker 13
 Tmolus (mt. range) 21
- Toi (Tou) (bibl. r. Hamath) 134–5, 207
 TOPADA inscription 143
 trade 71, 192, 200, 270
 transliteration (NH texts) 297–300
 treaties (chron. order)
 Isputahsu – Telipinu 18
 Rameses II – Hattusili III 59–60, 183
 Bar-Hadad I (Damascus) – Baasha 176
 Ashur-nirari V – Mati’ilu 167, 179,
 257–8, 267
 Bar-Ga’ya – Mati’ilu 137, 167, 179, 258
 tributary-lists (Tiglath-pileser III) 264–72
 tribute payments (select refs) 99, 211–12,
 213–14, 215–16, 219, 222, 223–4, 234,
 247–8
 Troad 34, 39
 Trojan War 13, 34, 38, 39, 40
 Troy 13, 23, 34
 Tuba’il (r. Tyre) 265, 269
 Tubal (biblical fig.) 72–3
 Tudhaliya I/II (LBA r. Hatti) 18, 154
 Tudhaliya III (LBA r. Hatti) 63
 Tudhaliya IV (LBA r. Hatti) 10, 19–20, 21,
 27–8, 35, 54, 62, 183–4
 Tudhaliya (NH r. Carchemish?) 88
 Tudhaliya (NH r. Malatya?) 91
 Tudhaliya (NH r., son-in-law of Suhi II) 91
 Tugdammu *see* Lygdamis
 Tuham(m)e (NH r. Ishtuanda) 141, 147,
 265, 270–1
 Tuhana *See* Tuwana
 Tukulti-Ninurta I (MA r.) 54, 183–4,
 185, 199
 Tukulti-Ninurta II (NA r.) 40, 133, 246
 Tulli (r. Tanakum) 241
 Tumeshki 255
 Tunip 15
 Tunni (mt.) 145, 240
 Tusha 264
 Tushpa 189, 272
 Tushratta (r. Mitanni) 182
 Tutammu (NH r. Patin) 132–3, 263, 268
 Tuthmosis III (r. Egypt) 175
 Tuwana (Ass. Tuhana) 141, 148–52, 265,
 270–1, 284
 Tuwanuwa 148
 Tuwati (I) (Ass. Tuatti) (NH r. Tabal
 ‘Proper’) 142, 240
 Tuwati (II) (NH r. Tabal ‘Proper’) 143, 271
 Tyana 148, 150
 Tyanitis 43, 240, 284
 Tynna 145
 Tyre 50, 192, 215, 237–8, 248, 265, 269, 273
- Uassurme (Wassurme) *see* Wasusarma
 Uetash 241

- Ugarit 15, 183–4, 203
 U(i)rim(m)e (Uirimi) (NH r. Hupishna) 141,
 153, 265, 270–1
 Ulluba 262, 263
 united monarchy (Israelite) 68, 188
 Unqi *see* Pat(t)in
 Untash-Napirisha (r. Elam) 186
 Urartu 45, 95, 100–1, 108, 110–11, 158,
 189–91, 198, 242, 246, 254–6, 257,
 272–3, 277, 281–2, 282–3, 285–7
 inscriptions 191
 Urartu-Arpad alliance 261
 Ura-Tarhunza (r. Carchemish) 86, 88,
 89–90, 92
 Uratami (Rudamu) (NH r. Hamath) 136
 Urballa *see* Warpalawa (II)
 Urhilina (Urhilana, Ass. Irhuleni)
 (r. Hamath) 56, 135, 226, 229, 236–7
 Urhi-Teshub (= Mursili III; LBA r. Hatti) 18,
 19, 22, 26–7, 28, 62, 124, 183, 204
 Uria (bibl. Hitt. fig.) 64, 65
 Urik(ki) *see* Awariku
 Urimu 130
 Uruatri (Urartu) 189
 Usanatu (Ushnata) 227
 Ushhitti (NH r. Atuna) 141, 146, 265,
 270–1
 Ushnanis 281
 Ushpilulume (Ass. form of Suppiluliuma)
 viceregal kingdoms, viceroys 14, 15,
 53–4, 85
 WaDAsatini *see* PaDAsatini
 Warika *see* Awariku
 Warpalawa (I)? (NH r. Tuwana?) 149
 Warpalawa (II) (Ass. Urballa) (NH r.
 Tuwana) 141, 144, 149?, 150–2, 265,
 270–2, 284–5, 287
 Wasashatta (r. Hanigalbat) 183
 Wasu(?)runtiya (NH r. Malatya) 101, 105
 Wasusarma (Ass. Uassurme, Wassurme) (NH
 r. Tabal ‘Proper’) 141–2, 143–4, 145,
 260, 265, 270–1, 279
Wenamun, Tale of 200
 Weshesh 13
 Wilusa 23, 34
 writing materials 57
 Xanthus 38
 x-pa-ziti (NH r. Carchemish) 86, 88
 Yahan 165–6, 214, 221
 Yalburt 19, 27–8
 Yamhad 83
 Yariri (NH r. Carchemish) 45, 84, 94–7, 255,
 266, 281
 Yaubidi (Ilubidi) (NH r. Hamath) 137, 138,
 269, 275–6
 Yazılıkaya 27
 Y’dy 169, 173
 Zab(b)an 232
 Zabibe (Arab q.) 265, 270
 Zak(k)ur (NH r. Hamath) 52, 107, 133, 137,
 166–7, 177, 249–52
 Zakur stele 133, 137, 249
 Zeyve Höyük 145
 Zincirli 169, 170, 172, 174–5, 291
 Zobah 134; *see also* Soba