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[Signatures]
THE DESIGNATION OF FOREIGN TERRITORY
IN ASSYRIAN ROYAL INSCRIPTIONS
OF THE
SARGONID PERIOD
by Richard Lederman

ABSTRACT

The work is divided into two parts. Part I pertains to issues of territoriality involving the characterization and delimitation of territory in Assyrian royal inscriptions. In Chapter One, we discuss use of topographic features in the delimitation of territory and the demarcation of boundaries.

Chapter Two deals with topographic characterizations defined as "generic" in that they describe a particular territory in terms of its general location, i.e., on the coast of the sea, in the mountains, in the desert, etc. These terms reflect an attempt to identify and locate territory topographically.

Chapter Three deals with the terminology of borders in Assyrian royal inscriptions. The inscriptions of Sargon indicate a concern with the demarcation of boundaries—in the southeast with Elam, in the central Zagros, in the northeast with Urartu, as well as the internal boundaries of the Urartian kingdom.

In Chapter Four, the border-forming quality of topography is explicated by way of the terminology of riverine boundaries. The discussion focuses on the riverine
division of territory in southern Mesopotamia

Chapter Five expands on the concept of topographic borders by focusing on terminology applied to the mountains of the northern Zagros in the inscriptions of Sargon. Passages are adduced which point to the border-forming character of mountains. In addition, it is our contention that other descriptions of the landscape, such as flora, fauna, and meteorological conditions, also serve to identify, locate, and delimit particular territorial units.

Part II of the work involves the issues of the transfer of territory. Chapter Six deals with the issue of the seizure of territory, particularly the seizure of Assyrian or allied territory by an enemy. The terminology of seizure involves the use of the term ekešu. It is noted that the term is used most frequently of enemy seizure, and that this enemy seizure generally results in some form of restitution.

Chapter Seven deals with the question of Assyrian control and organization of conquered territory. It is noted that certain regions lay outside the sphere of direct Assyrian rule, consistently leading to methods of control involving the use of proxy or puppet kings.

The focus of the discussion in Chapter Seven involves the issues of annexation and province formation. The terminology is identified, and a regional analysis is undertaken.

In certain instances, Assyrian control is expressed in terms of restoring a sense of order and balance in an
internally troubled land. Chapter Eight addresses the subject of the extension of Assyrian control in conquered territory which does not involve direct political control in terms of annexation or province formation.

Having concluded the discussion of territoriality in Assyrian royal inscriptions, Chapter Nine takes up the discussion of sovereignty. One conclusion that emerges from the discussion of territory is that territorial issues are most prevalent in the inscriptions of Sargon, but only rarely attested in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.

With respect to the subject of foreign sovereignty, however, the situation is reversed. The inscriptions of Sargon show little regard for foreign sovereignty, while the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal abound with the language of foreign sovereignty. This can be seen in the use of royal titles applied to foreign rulers, as well as in the maintenance of foreign dynasties.
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INTRODUCTION

This study is based on an examination of a category of texts referred to as Assyrian royal inscriptions. Discovered over the past one hundred fifty years amid ruins located along or near the Tigris River north of the upper Zab, the Assyrian heartland, and in various locations representing the expansion of Assyrian power in western Asia, the inscriptions cover roughly thirteen centuries of written record culminating in the collapse of the Assyrian Empire at the end of the seventh century B.C.E.

In some respects, the term Assyrian royal inscriptions is a misnomer. In Assyria, as in much of the ancient world, the art of writing was restricted to specialists attached to the palace or the temples and under the control of the central government headed by the king. In this regard, much of the written record in Assyria was commissioned by the king and could, therefore, be considered under the rubric of royal inscriptions.

However, the category of Assyrian royal inscriptions has traditionally been analyzed in terms of the development of a particular corpus of Assyrian texts. While this development is rather complex, involving several types of documents, a preliminary definition of Assyrian royal inscriptions should be offered. An Assyrian royal inscription is an Assyrian text written in commemoration of
or dedicated to the king's role in construction projects and/or his military campaigns. As a rule, the text describes the action of the king by means of a first person narration, though there are a few examples of third person narration.¹

From the earliest period of Assyrian history, Assyrian kings commemorated important state occasions, particularly related to construction work on temples and palaces. A short dedicatory inscription,² listing the king's titles, epithets, and genealogy, along with a description of the particular project being commemorated, was inscribed on a variety of objects. Short inscriptions were often written on clay bricks, which were then built into the walls of the building. Longer, more detailed accounts of building activity could be written on tablets of stone, clay, and metal, as well as conical-shaped clay forms, which were then buried in the foundations of buildings.³

During the latter half of the first millennium B.C.E., an important development took place in the composition of Assyrian royal inscriptions. In addition to the king's accomplishments in construction, the scribes began to insert passages concerning the king's military campaigns, also written, for the most part, in the first person. Eventually an attempt was made to fashion these military narratives into a chronological framework, leading to the development of historical annals. Archeological excavations at Assyrian sites have unearthed hundreds of documents containing pa
extensive narrations of the military campaigns of Assyrian kings.

As the narratives grew longer and more complex, larger objects were fashioned to contain the expanded text. Like the early commemorative inscriptions, many of these objects served as foundation deposits—clay tablets, prisms, and cylinders buried in the foundations or built into the walls of public buildings. In other instances, royal inscriptions were written on the walls of palaces, on colossal bulls and lions, which guarded the palace gates, as well as on floor slabs, royal thrones, and in other monumental or architectural contexts.

With their extensive military narrations, Assyrian royal inscriptions focus a good deal of attention on foreign territory and foreign rulers. The current study began as an attempt to classify thematically the language, or terminology, of Assyrian royal inscriptions as it related to the enemy and the enemy's territory. It was quickly discovered that there is a certain thematic symmetry to these narrations involving the justification for conquest on the one hand and the consequences of conquest on the other.

With regard to the enemy himself, justification for conquest generally involves statements regarding the crimes or misdeeds of the enemy. The enemy is hostile, aggressive, disloyal, disobedient, or slanderous. The consequences of conquest involve the often brutal punishment of the enemy and his allies. The enemy army is massacred and the corpses
mutilated. The enemy ruler is captured or forced to flee. The ruler is often killed and his corpse mutilated, or he is brought to Assyria as a kind of trophy, displayed in some humiliating fashion before the Assyrian public.

With regard to territory, justification for conquest often involves the enemy's seizure of Assyrian or allied territory. The consequences of an enemy's hostile behavior frequently include the complete ruination of enemy territory. Cities and fields are burned and looted, while the population is taken captive. In addition, there are consequences involving the final political disposition of conquered territory. Frequently, conquered territory is annexed and incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system. In some instances, however, Assyrian kings choose not to bring conquered territory under direct Assyrian control, establishing puppet regimes instead.

In addition, Assyrian royal inscriptions include characterizations of foreign territory which, while not serving as aspects of the justification for conquest, appear as a prelude to conquest. These characterizations include what might be termed political or geopolitical expressions, which characterize territory in terms of borders, or as assigned to some larger political or territorial unit.

Moreover, as part of the prelude to conquest, Assyrian royal inscriptions often include characterizations of territory in terms of geography and topography. These expressions range from simple generic characterizations--for
instance, that a particular territory is located on the coast or in the mountains—to highly elaborate characterizations, which include graphic depictions of topography, flora, fauna, resources, and meteorological conditions.

This study is divided into two parts. The first part focuses on the characterization of territory, which serves as a prelude to conquest. Terminology used to describe territory in terms of topographic characterizations, borders, and geopolitical connections will be examined. It is our contention that topographic characterizations in Assyrian royal inscriptions function within the context of political geography. That is, topographic features serve to delimit territory and demarcate boundaries.

The second part of the study is concerned with issues of the exchange of territory. This includes the seizure of Assyrian or allied territory by an enemy, as well as the capture of territory by the Assyrian army. In the latter case, the analysis deals with the political organization of conquered territory, including the annexation of conquered territory and its incorporation into the Assyrian provincial system. Moreover, a third category is posited, whereby Assyrian control of conquered territory is expressed in terms of the re-establishment of order and balance in an internally troubled land.

Before proceeding, however, it is important to place our discussion within a methodological framework. Since our
work is based on an examination of terminology, it could be called a linguistic study. However, it is not a lexical study in the sense of classical philology. There are few discussions of etymology or morphology.

Rather, as noted, the discussion ensues from an attempt to recognize the literary/thematic significance of terminology. The definition of certain terms as topographic characterizations, border terms, terms of annexation, etc., emerges from the thematic classification of terms. By isolating certain themes and identifying the specific terminology related to those themes, the work aims at an understanding of the way in which terminology is used to describe certain political circumstances related to the Assyrian king’s military campaigns.

Any analysis of Assyrian royal inscriptions must begin with an understanding of the nature of the sources. Naturally, the attempt to relate the terminology to actual political issues and circumstances is based on the theory that the language of Assyrian royal inscriptions is deliberate, that is, it reflects a conscious attempt, on the part of the Assyrian scribes, to come to grips with the political issues involved.

The view that the language of Assyrian royal inscriptions represents a deliberate attempt to express certain ideas current in the Assyrian court is by no means self-evident. In 1923, S. Mowinckel was among the first scholars to deal with the nature of Assyrian royal
inscriptions, particularly their literary quality. In his literary critique, Mowinckel found the royal inscriptions stilted and wooden, comparing the narrative style to a Russian icon, beautifully ornamented, but stiff. The basic material can be broken down, shuffled and recombined, producing the same literary and aesthetic effect. There is no overall organization, no level of meaning above the individual phrase. The heroic campaigns of Assyrian kings, their great victories, are treated more in the fashion of descriptive accounts (Aufzählungen) than true narratives (Erzählungen). Thus, Mowinckel's analysis of the deeper meaning of Assyrian royal inscriptions was largely negative. That is, the inscriptions represented a rather haphazard arrangement of dry literary formulas.

Since Mowinckel, and, indeed, beginning before Mowinckel's article appeared, Assyriologists have grappled with the nature and significance of Assyrian royal inscriptions. Naturally, with their wealth of historical material, the primary problem has been that of historical reliability. To what extent do the inscriptions present an accurate account of the events which they cover? In some inscriptions, the military campaigns are undated and seem to reflect a geographical or topical arrangement. Of those in which the campaign material is arranged in a chronological format, the veracity of the chronology is often questionable. Moreover, since royal inscriptions appear in successive editions promulgated at different points in the
king's reign, the problem of source reliability involves the question of textual variants and the editorial procedures which engendered them.

Related to the issues of editing and textual variants is the question regarding the sources of royal inscriptions. How did the Assyrian scribe gain access to the information which he included in the inscription, and what, if any, were the compositional principles which he followed?

Moreover, an understanding of Assyrian royal inscriptions involves not merely the researcher's ability to determine the course of events as they transpired, but also the ideas reflected in a particular corpus or document. Assyrian royal inscriptions were not written simply for the sake of allowing modern historians to reconstruct events. Like all history-writing, Assyrian royal inscriptions were meant to place events into a certain interpretive framework. As the study of Assyrian royal inscriptions has progressed, scholars have begun to ponder their significance as reflections of an Assyrian world view, an Assyrian understanding of the idea of history, or as statements of an ongoing development of Assyrian foreign policy. As A.L. Oppenheim has written, Assyrian royal inscriptions functioned as instruments of communication, as

...a mirror of how these kings saw themselves, and what they wanted their "image" to be in the eyes of their subjects and enemies...they reflect a dialogue...at the court of the king between the ruler and those who helped him determine the policies of the realm.
Thus, for example, the inscriptions which place military campaigns within a formal, chronological framework, reveal a certain progression in the use of various systems of dating the campaigns. The question arises as to the motivation which prompted the use of these various systems. Indeed, the issues of textual variants and editorial procedures lead beyond the question of source reliability to the meaning and function of the revisions found in successive editions of Assyrian royal inscriptions.

All told, these questions have led, in recent times, to discussions regarding the "ideological" background underlying the development of Assyrian royal inscriptions. The search for a royal ideology has led scholars away from Mowinckel's position that the composition of royal inscriptions was a stiff, artificial process involving the haphazard arrangement of stock expressions. Rather, the composition and editing of royal inscriptions is seen as a conscious process meant to express a broader world view which developed within the Assyrian royal court. While we are reluctant to dabble with a subject as elusive as ideology, it is our contention that the language of territoriality in Assyrian royal inscriptions is designed to address specific policy issues.

We shall now proceed to trace in more detail the development of these issues in Assyriological research. The discussion is not meant to be comprehensive, but will concentrate on the most significant contributions with
regard to the literary style of Assyrian royal inscriptions, the questions of composition and editorial variants, and the broader issue of the nature and meaning of royal inscriptions.

Genres of Assyrian Royal Inscriptions

One of the first issues addressed in Assyriological research concerned the various genres of royal inscriptions. In general, scholars distinguish annals, in which the military narrative is arranged according to a chronological format, from display inscriptions, which exclude the formal chronological structure and appear to be arranged geographically. The distinction is perhaps best exemplified by the inscriptions of King Sargon (722-705 B.C.E.).

In 1843, P.E. Botta, who was serving as the French Vice-Consul to the Ottoman Empire in the city of Mosul, the site of ancient Nineveh, began excavations in the city of Khorsabad, 14 km. to the north-northeast. This turned out to be the site of Sargon’s palace at Dur-Sarruken. In the fourteen rooms excavated, Botta discovered walls covered with stone slabs, which had been decorated with bas-relief sculptures and numerous inscriptions. In 1849, Botta, along with V. Place, presented hand copies of the sculptures and inscriptions in the first publication of material from Khorsabad. 10

It was soon discovered that the fourteen rooms at Khorsabad actually contained various copies and recensions
of two separate inscriptions. In 1863, J. Oppert and J. Menant were able to publish what has come to be known as Sargon's Display Inscription, which they called, alternately, Grande Inscription and l'Inscription des fastes (records). This inscription presents a survey of the king's military campaigns, which are reported as having been undertaken between the king's first and fifteenth regnal years. Other than this summary date formula, which appears in the inscription's introductory passage, the campaign narratives proceed with no indication of chronology. Rather, the arrangement of narratives appears to be geographic/topical.

Several years later, Oppert published a number of other inscriptions from Khorsabad. A presentation of what has come to be known as the Annals inscription was offered in French translation only, with reference to the particular hall of the palace from which the text derived, as well as the page reference in Botta's work on which the original could be found. The campaign narratives of the Annals are arranged according to the king's regnal years, apparently beginning with the accession year and terminating with an account of the campaigns of the thirteenth regnal year.

When H. Winckler presented his edition of the inscriptions of Sargon, the work included the Annals, as well as the so-called Display Inscription, which he called Prunkinschrift, or "ornamented inscription." Writing in 1916, A.T. Olmstead was the first to employ the term Display
Inscription in referring to this non-chronological account of Sargon's military campaigns. According to Olmstead, Sargon's Display Inscription "gives the data of the Annals in briefer form and in geographical order." In general, Olmstead maintained that inscriptions of the display type "are usually on slabs of stone and are intended for architectural adornment."

Since Olmstead, scholars have continued to grapple with the definitions of the genres of Assyrian royal inscriptions. In 1973, H. Tadmor treated three historical inscriptions of Adad-nirari III (810-783 B.C.E.) written on steles. Tadmor designated the three short accounts of the kings campaigns as "summary inscriptions"--a designation he attributes to Schrader--but identified his classification with the German Prunkinschriften and Olmstead's "Display Inscriptions." He defines this type of royal inscription as representing "the condensation of early with later events into one geographically but not chronologically coherent narrative."

Most recently, P. Gerardi, examining the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (669-626 B.C.E.), places all building inscriptions--those commemorating the king's accomplishments in construction--which contain military narratives, whether or not they are arranged chronologically, under the rubric "annals." The term "summary inscription" is applied to "building inscriptions which contain military narratives arranged geographically and which are summaries of
campaigns." Gerardi reserves the designation "display inscription" for inscriptions which were actually displayed, in contrast to foundation deposits.\(^{19}\)

Despite these attempts to redefine the genres, the classification of Assyrian royal inscriptions in terms of annals and display inscriptions persists. In surveying Assyrian historical texts, A.K. Grayson recently analyzed Assyrian royal inscriptions in terms of four categories. One of these categories was labeled "Commemorative Texts," which Grayson further distinguished in terms of "Annalistic Texts" and "Display Texts."\(^{20}\) According to Grayson, the former "contain narration of military campaigns arranged in chronological order..." In display texts, military narration is generally "grouped according to geography."

Unfortunately, the entire question of the literary classification of Assyrian royal inscriptions is confounded by the corollary issues of the media upon which the inscriptions were written--stone slabs, colossal bulls and lions, clay tablets, cylinders, and prisms--as well as the function of each inscription--monumental, i.e., meant for display, and foundation deposits. A detailed examination of the relationships between these features would help to clarify the literary forms.\(^{21}\) Until such time as these relationships are analyzed, it seems appropriate to remain with what has become standard terminology. Therefore, we generally refer to military narrations arranged in a chronological format as "annals," while those not arranged
chronologically are referred to as "display inscriptions."

In addition to annals and display inscriptions, there is a third type of Assyrian royal inscriptions which is important to our study of the language of territory. This type is represented by documents which have been described as "Letters to Gods." The classic example of this genre is a document from the reign of King Sargon.

In 1912, F. Thureau-Dangin published a rather large and well-preserved clay tablet inscribed with the account of a military campaign undertaken by King Sargon to the northern Zagros. Dated by \textit{li\textsuperscript{mu}} to the year 714 B.C.E., the account was connected, in terms of content and dating, with the campaign of the eighth regnal year as reported in the Annals from Khorsabad. Also noted by Thureau-Dangin was the epistolary style of the document. The text begins with a salutation to the god Ashur and other gods, the city of Ashur, its residents, as well as the king himself. The epistolary style has given rise to the characterization of this and other documents as "Letters to Gods."

Since the publication of the \textit{Huitième Campagne}, several other documents of this type have been noted, including one written during the reign of Esarhaddon. Also included is a document dated to the reign of Sargon by Tadmor, who states that it "may well belong to the type of 'Letters to Gods.'" Since the first line of the document, which would have contained the epistolary salutation, is missing, Tadmor bases his classification on the "poetic style" of the
narrative. The same document is definitively assigned to this genre by N. Na'aman, who dates it to the reign of Sennacherib. Again, the "fine literary style" of the document is the basis for the classification. A document of this type attributed to Ashurbanipal has recently been published by Weippert. In this case, the text opens with the expression *atta tīde*, "you have known," followed by mention of the gods Ashur and Enlil and the accusation of hostile activity applied to Haza'ilu of Arabia.

The literary style of the so-called letters to the gods, mentioned by Tadmor and Na'aman, often involves the rather elaborate description of foreign territory, particularly topographic features. In 1960, A. Oppenheim wrote what has become a classic statement on the meaning and function of the *Huitième Campagne*. He determined that the topographic detail, the graphic presentations of the nature of the terrain, including natural phenomena--meteorological conditions, flora, fauna--were all part of an artistic endeavor to hold the attention of a live audience. This gathering, according to Oppenheim, was "part of a specific ceremony of a communal nature...[which] marked the end of each of the institutionalized annual campaigns..." Included in the ceremony was the king's official report. The basic notion that the document represents a detailed, colorful account of the eighth campaign read to a live audience at some sort of formal gathering has been generally accepted by scholars.
Sources and Composition of Royal Inscriptions

Naturally, a study of the literary style of Assyrian royal inscriptions, including the development of various genres, should take into account the sources of the inscriptions. That is, one would wish to determine the manner in which the Assyrian scribe gained access to the information related in the inscription. It is unlikely that the scribe simply invented his narrative out of thin air. The narrative details, including the protagonists involved in each campaign, the course of the campaign, the cities conquered, booty and prisoners taken, must have been conveyed to the scribe through some process of reporting.

Unfortunately, little has been undertaken in this area, aside from a few preliminary suggestions. The available material has been summarized recently in A.K. Grayson's study of Assyrian historiography. As noted by Grayson, scholars have been aware, for some time, of the existence of lists of tribute and booty taken in the course of a military campaign. The instances in which the narrative of a military campaign switches from first to third person narration when reporting the receipt of booty is taken as an indication that these booty lists, written in the third person, could simply be inserted into the account of a campaign.

Grayson also dealt with the question of the existence of campaign diaries or itineraries, which may have been used in compiling royal inscriptions. Two examples of this genre
are noted by Grayson, characterized by the description of the movement of an expedition from place to place, wherein the distance between each station is reported. One of these is a fragmentary clay tablet from Ashur which Grayson dates to the reign of Adad-nerari II (911-891 B.C.E.). The other is derived from the administrative documents published by Johns. The latter, according to Grayson, is not a report of a royal expedition.

Grayson goes on to note the existence of itinerary-style passages in royal inscriptions from the reign of Adad-nerari II, Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884 B.C.E.) and Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 B.C.E.). These inscriptions include reports of military campaigns, in the style of royal inscriptions, bracketed by statements regarding the movement of the army from place to place. Particularly in the annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II, the itinerary-style passages often display the fluctuation from first to third person narration noted with regard to the lists of tribute and booty.

However, the dearth of evidence for the existence of independent campaign diaries or itineraries lead Grayson to reject the notion that these documents were used in the compilation of royal inscriptions. Rather, the fluctuation between first and third person narration could be explained on the basis of the fact that some campaigns were often lead by military officers other than the king. These campaigns are narrated in the third person. Campaigns undertaken in
the thirtieth and thirty-first years of Shalmaneser III (858-824 B.C.E.) are examples of this feature. Grayson also noted the possibility that texts of the type referred to as "Letters to Gods" may have been used in the composition of royal inscriptions. However, the special rhetorical features of these documents lead Grayson to reject this connection. Rather, he concluded, the two types of documents were compiled from the same sources.

A somewhat more intriguing question is the relationship between the royal inscriptions and the hundreds of correspondences, reports, and dispatches that are contained in the Assyrian epistolary literature. Many of these represent reports of military and political affairs received by the king from his officers in the field. In a recent analysis of the nature and distribution of these documents, S. Parpola made the following statement with regard to the connection between the epistolary material and royal inscriptions:

The fact is that even though we know that letters were used in the compilation of royal inscriptions, even quoted verbatim in them, they do not usually deal with matters presented in the inscriptions.

Unfortunately, Parpola does not indicate the specific instances in which letters are quoted verbatim in royal inscriptions. Recently, however, Gerardi has remarked on the correspondence between material in the letters of Bel-ibni to King Ashurbanipal and one of the Elamite campaign narratives found in Ashurbanipal’s annals. Gerardi noted
the additions to the Elamite narrative in Prisms F and A of Ashurbanipal, maintaining that this new material hints at a separate army, presumably lead by Bel-ibni, which attacked from the south, supplementing the main Assyrian army, which attacked from the north.

...the close correspondence between the contents of Bel-ibni's letters and some of the newly inserted campaign accounts suggests that Bel-ibni's letters were the source of at least some of the new material which were added to the accounts of editions F and A.

In addition to the problem of the sources of royal inscriptions, Grayson offered some remarks regarding what he called "the mechanics of composition." Noting the existence of clay tablets containing material normally associated with royal inscriptions but lacking the building section, Grayson suggested that these represent text prototypes, which the scribes used in the preparation of royal inscriptions. Noting a suggestion offered by Tadmor, Grayson observed that scribes working in stone made use of stock phrases to fill space.

While the comments made by Grayson and others have, to some degree, increased our understanding of the methods involved in the production of Assyrian royal inscriptions, the issues of policy and ideology remain. These issues were first addressed on a broad scale in terms of an attempt to understand the impetus which lead Assyrian scribes to the practice of history-writing.

E.A. Speiser was the first to discuss the understanding
of history reflected in Assyrian royal inscriptions in terms of the original impetus toward history-writing in Assyria. He suggested that the annals of Assyrian kings could be traced to the "Letters to Gods" literature, such as the famous account of Sargon's eighth campaign. These letters, which represented the Assyrian version of the annual report, became the basis for the composition of the annals. That is not to say that the "Letters to Gods" represent the compositional sources of royal inscriptions. Rather, Speiser maintained that the idea of recording the annual campaigns of the king emerged from the procedure of issuing these annual reports.

J.J. Finkelstein, on the other hand, working with Old Akkadian sources, traced Mesopotamian historical consciousness to the omen tradition, that is, the attempt to predict future events based on past events. Following the definition of history offered by the Dutch historian, Johan Huizinga, Finkelstein described the omen texts as fulfilling the criterion of "an intellectual form in which the civilization renders account to itself of the past." According to this scholar, the significance of past events lay in their 'exemplificative' value. Since coincidence implied causality, and moments of time were repeatable, the more details that could be accumulated regarding a particular historical event, the more precise the prognostication could be. Thus, the omen tradition represents the primary source of Mesopotamian
Writing several years later, William Hallo focused on the Assyrian king lists, suggesting that these lists were compiled in an effort to present the history of Assyria as a continuous succession of native kings going back to the initial Amorite invasion of Mesopotamia, and to conceal any Assyrian subservience to non-native kings. The compilation of the lists represent the original impetus toward history-writing in Assyria.

Grayson also discussed the idea of history in Assyrian and Babylonian historical inscriptions. Grayson focused on the "propagandistic and didactic" nature of the texts— their image of the king as a "superhero." Echoing Finkelstein, he noted what he called "the practical use of history" as represented by the omen and astrological literature, as well as the desire to render to posterity the heroic deeds of the king.

These contributions address the question of meaning in royal inscriptions from the broad perspective of the development of history-writing in Assyria and elsewhere in the ancient Near East. However, the specific issues with regard to the manner in which the development of Assyrian policy and ideology find expression in Assyrian royal inscriptions must still be addressed.

The development of Assyrian annals is of particular interest in this regard. This is due to the fact that the history of research concerning the development of annals has
led scholars to confront other important issues arising from the study of Assyrian royal inscriptions. Among these are the issues of the various systems of dating the campaigns, as well as the principles underlying successive editions of the annals of individual kings. Attempts to understand these features have contributed to a better understanding of the specific policy considerations underlying the composition of Assyrian royal inscriptions.

Assyrian Annals

Before proceeding with our discussion regarding the issues of dating and editing in Assyrian annals, we must refine our understanding of what constitutes an annals-style inscription. As noted, annals are defined as commemorative building inscriptions containing military campaign narratives arranged in a chronological framework. In order to fully understand this development, a brief sketch of the appearance of military narration in Assyrian royal inscriptions, as well as the advent of chronological systems, is needed.54

When the simple dedicatory texts of Assyrian kings were first expanded to include a section commemorating the king's building activities, the commemorative narrative was often attached to the introductory part of the inscription by means of a temporal clause introduced by enūma, "when," or ʾimīšu, "at that time." The inclusion of military narration followed the same pattern.
The first significant example of military narration in a royal inscription appears on a stele belonging to Adad-narari I (1307-1275 B.C.E.). The inscription opens with a short introduction consisting of the king's titularies and genealogy. Beginning with enūma, "when," the next fifty lines describe the rebellion of Shattuara of the land of Ḫanigalbat, located in the Taurus Mountains, and the Assyrian king's subsequent struggle with the rulers of that region.

The appearance of true annals, that is, military narrations arranged chronologically, is generally assigned to the reign of Tiglath-Pilesar I (1114-1076 B.C.E.). In the Ashur Prism of Tiglath-Pileser I, five campaign narratives are separated from one another by passages praising the valor of the king. While the individual campaign narratives are undated, a summary statement at the end of the military narration dates the five campaigns according to palu, or "regnal year": ištū reš šarrūtiya adi 5 paliya, "from the beginning of my reign until my fifth regnal year."56

Beginning in the tenth century B.C.E., Assyrian scribes experimented with another system of dating. This involved the dating of campaigns according to eponym (Assyrian līmu), a method that had been employed for some time in the dating of administrative documents. Each year was named for a high administrative official, and lists of eponyms were maintained. Known to Assyriologists as the Eponym Canon,
the lists were divided into columns, with one column containing the name of the official and another his administrative title. One exemplar, known as the Eponym Chronicle, includes a column containing information regarding an important event which occurred during that year. This is generally in the form of either important construction work or a military campaign.

An early example of eponym dating in Assyrian royal inscriptions occurs in an inscription of Adad-nerari II. Ten eponym-date formulas appear in this inscription, each preceded by a ruled line. The system continues in use during the reigns of the two successors to Adad-nerari, Tukulti-Ninurta II and Ashurnasirpal II.

Beginning with inscriptions from around the middle of the reign of Shalmaneser III (858-824 B.C.E.), the successor to Ashurnasirpal II, a new experiment was undertaken in the dating of campaigns. This involved the use of the term *palâ*, or "regnal year." Unlike the use of *palâ* in the summary statement of the Assur Prism of Tiglath-Pileser I, the *palâ* formula is used in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III to date individually each successive campaign. This system was also employed in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III (745-727 B.C.E.) and Sargon II.

With the reign of Sargon's successor, Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.E.), another system was devised, whereby each successive campaign (Assyrian *girru*) was assigned a number—first *girru*, second *girru*, etc. This system was also
employed in the annals of Ashurbanipal (669-626 B.C.E.).

A corollary to the development of chronological systems in Assyrian royal inscriptions involves the assignment of events to the beginning of the king’s reign. As noted, the stele inscription of Adad-narari I (1306-1274 B.C.E.) includes a report of the king’s military campaigns introduced by the temporal pronoun, enūma, “when.” In a number of inscriptions of Adad-narari’s successor, Shalmaneser I (1274-1245 B.C.E.), the temporal clause is significantly expanded.

enūma Aššur bēlula ana palāṭīšu kīniš
utānnima ana šušur šalmaṭ qaqqaḍi hatta
kakka u šipirra iddina aga kina ša
bēlūti iṣruka ina ȗmēšuma ina šurru
šangûṭiyya maṭ Uruaṭtri ibuṭkitûnīmma

When Ashur, the lord, faithfully chose me for his worshipper, gave me the scepter, weapon, and staff to (rule) properly the black-headed people, and granted me the true crown of lordship; at that time, in my accession year, the land of Uruatri rebelled against me.

The inscriptions proceed with a series of campaign narratives, each introduced by either enūma, “when,” or inūmišu, “at that time.”

The expression šurru šangûṭiyya, literally “the consecration of my priesthood,” is used to refer to the king’s accession year, and all military activity is ostensibly assigned to that year. In subsequent reigns, the expression šurru šarrûṭiyya, “the consecration of my kingship,” comes into more general use and is, itself, replaced, in the eighth century, with the Babylonian form,
The campaign narratives of the Ashur Prism of Tiglath-Pileser I are likewise introduced with the expression *ina šurr[u šarrūtīya, "at the consecration of my kingship." As noted, the system of dating military campaigns according to *palu, or the king’s regnal year, is generally traced to this inscription. However, the term *palu appears as early as the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244-1208 B.C.E.), the successor of Shalmaneser I. Here, the campaign narratives are introduced by the formula *ina šurr[u [kussil] šarrūtīya [ina mārī palēya], "at the consecration of the [throne] of my kingship, [in my first regnal year]." In this instance as well, all of the king’s campaigns are included under the formula, suggesting that they all took place at the beginning of the king’s reign.

The expression *ina šurr[u šarrūtīya in mārī palēya, "at the consecration of my kingship, in my first regnal year," or variants thereof, becomes a frequently used formula in subsequent reigns, including instances in which campaigns are generally dated by means of one of the other prevalent systems. For instance, in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal II, all but the first campaign are dated according to eponym. The first campaign is introduced by the accession year formula, *ina šurr[u šarrūtīya ina mārī palēya.68

Thus, the development of Assyrian annals involves two chronological features: the evolution of the various systems of dating, as well as the special treatment often applied to
the beginning of the king's reign. In the search for an understanding of the meaning and purpose of these two features, the work of Tadmor offers several insights. Tadmor argues that the two features served separate literary and ideological functions. According to Tadmor, the attempt to consolidate events under the king's accession year was based on an "epic-heroic convention."

The central, ideologically conditioned motif, is that of the warrior king who performs mighty deeds in a single year, which has to be his first "term of office." Alongside the epic-heroic style, Assyrian annals adopted what Tadmor describes as a "dry chronistic style." The rather unembellished recording of yearly military and political events, describing the king's activity in the third person, is well known from Babylonian Chronicles and from the few extant remains of Assyrian Chronicles. Maintaining that the "annalistic form of royal history-writing developed under the influence of the chronicles," Tadmor ascribes the eponym method of dating events in the annals to the attempt to incorporate historical material drawn from chronicles.

Elsewhere, Tadmor explains the ongoing use of the accession year formula on the basis of the fact that the eponym lists generally record the king's eponym in the second year of his reign. The use of the accession year formula enabled the scribes to avoid the problem of attributing the campaigns of the accession year and the
first regnal year to an eponym other than the king.

Tadmor is unable to account for the change from the eponym system of dating the campaigns in favor of dating all of the campaigns in terms of̙pali̙, or "regnal year." This change seems to have taken place sometime during the reign of Shalmaneser III. As Tadmor notes, the change presents the Assyrian scribes with a new set of problems. Dating the campaigns to successive regnal years assumes that there must be a campaign corresponding to each year of the king's reign. That is, the "epic-heroic convention" would tend to require a military campaign for each year. During peaceful years, or during years in which the king was preoccupied with internal matters, the scribes were forced to interpolate, or borrow material from the campaigns of other years.

The case of the king being preoccupied with internal matters is best exemplified by the reign of Sargon II. A usurper, Sargon spent his accession year and his first full year of reign quelling internal opposition. A comparison of Sargon's early inscriptions with the later ones reveals an attempt to fill in those two years, including the assigning of the defeat of Samaria to his accession year, while that particular conquest was actually undertaken by his predecessor, Shalmaneser V. As a result, the Annals inscription from Khorsabad generally dates campaigns one year later than the various prism inscriptions. The change to the girru system of dating under Sargon's
successor, Sennacherib, whereby each successive campaign is assigned a consecutive number, can be viewed as an attempt to avoid the problem of the non-campaigning year.

What this analysis reveals is that the development of Assyrian annals was not random or haphazard, but reflects an ongoing effort at molding the material according to specific ideological concerns, particularly the concern to portray the heroic quality of the king. With regard to systems of dating, the development takes place over a period of hundreds of years, covering the reigns of numerous kings. However, in recent years, Assyriologists have begun to explore textual variants, that is, the variations which occur in successive editions of a particular king's annals, from the perspective of the development of policy and ideology.

As early as 1916, Olmstead made several important observations regarding the nature of the editing of Assyrian historical texts. He noted the tendency to introduce what he termed "corrections" to history in successive editions of a particular king's annals. He was the first to note the increased chronology in Sargon's Annals from Khorsabad as compared to the Nineveh Prisms, ascribing this feature to an attempt to supply campaign narratives for years in which the king did not personally campaign. The failure to mention the enthronement in Babylon of the Assyrian prince, Ashur-nadin-sumi in certain bull inscriptions of Sennacherib is explained by the fact that those inscriptions were written
subsequent to the Elamite capture of Ashur-nādin-šumi. The capture of the prince was clearly a source of embarrassment in the Assyrian court. Thus, the entire matter was simply omitted. Conflicting accounts of the Egyptian campaigns in successive editions of Ashurbanipal’s annals are explained in terms of a "movement toward increasing the credit the king should receive for them..." Olmstead was, thus, the first to consider textual variants in terms of an ongoing development of Assyrian royal policy and ideology.

**Ideology and Assyrian Royal Inscriptions**

More recently, scholars have begun to pay much more careful attention to the details of textual variation in order to more accurately identify the specific ideological concerns which motivated them. One example of this tendency is the study of M. Cogan and H. Tadmor regarding the development of the narrative concerning Gyges of Lydia in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (669-631 B.C.E.).

Cogan and Tadmor analyze two separate recensions of the inscription known as Prism E, one of the earliest of the historical inscriptions of Ashurbanipal. One of these recensions, labeled **E₁** by the authors, reports the appearance, on the Assyrian frontier, of a *rakbā*, a "rider," or diplomatic courier, whose unusual language was incomprehensible even to the host of court interpreters available to the king.
The recension labeled $E_2$ describes the mission of another courier, whose title is missing from the broken fragments of the prism. In this instance, the courier informs the Assyrian king of a dream which Gyges had received from the god Ashur. In the dream, the Lydian king is informed that his problems with the Cimmerians, who had invaded Lydia, would be solved only if he offered submission to Ashurbanipal. The courier's mission is a response to the dream.

In later editions of this episode, as noted by Cogan and Tadmor, these two narratives are combined, such that the report of Gyges' dream and subsequent submission is assigned to the rakbû, while the description of the incomprehensible nature of the rakbû's language is omitted. This version of the Gyges episode remains more or less intact through several consecutive editions.

However, the version of Ashurbanipal's Annals known as Cylinder A (Rassam Cylinder) includes the mission of two couriers: a rakbû, who offers submission to the Assyrian king, and a mār šipri, "messenger," who describes the dream of Gyges. From this, Cogan and Tadmor conclude that the A editor, borrowing from both $E$ accounts, extended the tale (to the glory of the Assyrian monarch?) and thus created the impression of a double mission; one by a rakbû, the other by a mār šipri.

The addition, in Cylinder A, of the idea that the Lydian defeat of the Cimmerians began ulti libbi 𒀕𒋀𒂑𒃇 𒄂𒂑 𒂑𒂑𒂑
šarrūtiya, "from the time that he (Gyges) seized my royal feet," further enhances the message:

...political disaffection leads to punishment at the hands of the gods...re-submission to Assyria restores good fortune and success.

It is a message which is also applied to the son of the Tabalean ruler Mugallu according to the Ishtar Temple inscription, the last of Ashurbanipal's extant historical inscriptions.

Collaborating on another article written several years later, Cogan and Tadmor attempted the reconstruction of the fragmented Prism K of Ashurbanipal. As the first extant inscription of Ashurbanipal to report the violent siege of Babylon by the Assyrian king, the authors noted one unusual feature of Prism K, namely, that the account of the king's far-flung building enterprises are reported in the introduction to the military campaigns rather than at the end of the inscription, which was a more common arrangement. This, the authors concluded, was meant "as a counterbalance to the harsh description of the havoc wrought in Babylon." Indeed, Prism F of Ashurbanipal, which was written shortly after Prism K, omits the Babylonian campaign entirely. Thus, there was an attempt to mitigate the onus connected with the king's hostile siege of Babylon.

In the same year that Cogan's and Tadmor's analysis of Ashurbanipal's Prism K appeared, M. Liverani contributed a number of valuable insights regarding textual variants in Assyrian royal inscriptions. Working solely with the
development of royal titularies in the inscriptions of King Sennacherib, Liverani insisted that each text must be viewed as a compositional unit, and that variants must be examined in terms of compositional rather than editorial principles. That is, variants represent deliberate attempts to mold a composition according to certain definitive ideas.

The critique of variants aims at clarifying how a text is progressively adjusted until it reaches a form that the author considers to be satisfactory and "final."

According to Liverani, textual variation "is to be connected with the diachronical development of the individual reign," particularly with regard to a constantly changing political situation.

From this point of view, variants can be appreciated a priori as hints of the change in the political and ideological tendencies inside the Palace.

To clarify his point, Liverani analyzes the royal titularies presented in the inscriptions of Sennacherib according to certain categories. With regard to territorial titles, he notes the development from the title šar māt Aššur šar la šanān, "king of Assyria, unrivalled king," which appears in inscriptions written after the first and second campaigns, both of which were directed to the south and southeast. In inscriptions written after the third campaign, which was directed against territory in the west, the titulary is expanded: šar kiššati šar māt Aššur, "king of the universe, king of Assyria." According to Liverani,
...the title šar kiššati, "king of the universe" is introduced only after the first three campaigns, that is only after a capacity of domination in different directions has been manifested.

Finally, the title šar kibrāt erbēti, "king of the four regions," is assumed only after the king has campaigned in all four directions.

Liverani also notes the development of what he calls "the phraseology of submission." The introduction to a bull inscription written after the sixth campaign is the first to include the following summary of the king's conquests:

ultu ūpatim elinīti ša ėlum Šami adi ūpatim šapliīti ša šit Šami gimri malki ša kibrāti īšakniš šēpū'a

From the upper sea of the setting sun unto the lower sea of the rising sun, all of the princes of the (four) regions he (the god Ashur) caused to submit at my feet.

According to Liverani, the introduction of this phrase is influenced by the actual sequence of the king's conquests.

Sennacherib does indeed reach the "upper sea" in the third campaign (Sidon), but he reaches and crosses the "lower sea" only in the sixth (Elam). Only after the sixth campaign he feels qualified to that particular boast.

Liverani also notes the theme of enemy fear of the king in the introductions to inscriptions written after the eighth campaign, which frequently employ the fear theme in the campaign narratives as well; the "demilitarization" of the titulary in the Bavian inscription, which is largely
devoted to descriptions of the construction of irrigation works; the themes of military and territorial superiority in titularies from Nineveh, a political center, as opposed to the religious themes in titularies from Ashur, a religious center.

In addition, Liverani offers one example of his method with regard to campaign material in the inscriptions of Sennacherib. By way of a detailed analysis of the various narratives referring to Sennacherib's ongoing struggle with the Merodach-Baladan, the Chaldean ruler of Babylon, Liverani demonstrates the manner in which successive editions reflect an unfolding political and military process. In the account written after the first campaign, Merodach-Baladan is said to have fled before the onset of the battle and is considered to be virtually eliminated. This results in the enthronement of a puppet, Bel-ibni. By the end of the fourth campaign, the failure of this policy is evident in that Merodach-Baladan is once again able to assert his power in Babylon. Apparently in response to this new set of political circumstances, accounts of the first campaign which appear in inscriptions written after the fourth campaign omit references to Merodach-Baladan's original flight and the enthronement of Bel-ibni. Here, again, Liverani demonstrates the deliberate attempt on the part of Assyrian scribes to compose narratives which reflect a particular political and ideological perspective.

The most recent attempt to connect textual variants in
Assyrian royal inscriptions to the development of policy can be seen in H. Tadmor’s analysis of what he calls "autobiographical apologies." While not limited to annals-type inscriptions, the study focuses on passages in royal inscriptions from the reigns of Esarhaddon and his son and successor, Ashurbanipal. These passages describe the arrangements, made during the previous reign, for the king’s accession. In each case, an unorthodox succession is justified on the basis of divine decree and consolidated by means of a special ceremony, wherein the king’s subjects are required to swear an oath committing them to the succession arrangement. Curiously, these passages do not occur in royal inscriptions from the beginning of the two kings’ reigns. This leads to the question as to what prompted the insertion of autobiographical apologies into later editions.

According to Tadmor, the autobiographical apologies were inserted "to serve certain imminent political aims," particularly in connection with the appointment of the king’s successor. That is, in preparing to name their own successors, Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal felt that it was important to reiterate the circumstances surrounding their own accession.

In the case of Esarhaddon, the terms of succession are spelled out in a series of documents discovered in Nimrud, the site of the ancient Assyrian administrative center of Calah, located near the point where the upper Zab River flows into the Tigris. Known collectively as "The Vassal-
Treaties of Esarhaddon, the documents set out the terms of the succession arrangement, with regard to which the parties to the treaty (adê) -- in this case, Median rulers who were allies of the Assyrian king -- were compelled to swear an oath of allegiance (māmītu). The documents are dated by īšu to the year 672 B.C.E.

As in the case of Esarhaddon’s own appointment, reported in his autobiographical apology, wherein older sons were bypassed, the arrangement for Esarhaddon’s succession as reported in the vassal-treaties is unusual. Upon the death of the king, one son, Ashurbanipal, was to be appointed as king of Assyria, while his brother, Šamaš-šum-ukīn, was to be crowned as king in Babylon. In the vassal-treaties, Šamaš-šum-ukīn is referred to as aḫi tašmekī. This is generally translated "twin brother," though there is reason to believe that Šamaš-šum-ukīn may have been the older brother. In any case, one of the king’s advisors goes on record as opposed to the arrangement.

The dating of the vassal-treaties is revealing, since the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon, which contains the autobiographical apology, was issued at about the same time. Tadmor concluded that the problem of succession was the impetus behind the inclusion of the autobiographical apology. With the king confronting defeat in the West, the death of his wife, and opposition to his succession policy, the apology was composed...as an ideological praeparatio for the dramatic events of the early spring.
The procedure undertaken for his own succession to the throne, as described in the apology--became paradigmatic for his own acts.

As Tadmor noted, the effect of Esarhaddon’s succession policy can be seen in the campaign accounts of the Nineveh A Prism. A short account of affairs in the south involving Nabu-zer-kitti-lishir as reported in an earlier prism inscription, Prism H, is expanded in the Nineveh A account. Many of the additions refer to the enemy’s failure to maintain his treaty obligations (adē) and his punishment in terms of the imprecations of the treaty oath (māmītu). Maintaining that the author of Nineveh A was writing "under the impact of the new arrangements for Esarhaddon’s succession," as determined in the vassal-treaties, Tadmor indicates the significance of the additional material in the Nineveh A inscription.

The brief story of the Babylonian rebel in H, therefore, had been rewritten and adapted to carry a new and pertinent message: any transgressor of the loyalty oaths will similarly be punished by the great gods—a point elaborated in the lengthy maldictions of the "vassal-treaties."

Similarly, the addition of autobiographical apologies in editions F and A of Ashurbanipal is considered by Tadmor to be related to the issue of succession. Indeed, edition A of Ashurbanipal was composed to dedicate completion of the bit ridāti, "house of succession," in Nineveh. Thus, the closing section of the inscription, the building passage describing work on the bit-ridāti, includes the succession
motif, such that "the topic of succession becomes the ideological framework of the entire text...." 105

In terms of the effect of the issue of succession on the campaign narratives of Ashurbanipal’s inscriptions, it has been suggested by Gerardi 106 that Prism F’s omission of the defeat of the rebellious brother, Šamaš-šum-ukīn, and the conquest of Babylon is due to the fact that "its inclusion would certainly have cast some doubt on the legitimacy of Assurbanipal’s own right to rule." That is, since Ashurbanipal ruled by virtue of the same succession arrangement which placed his brother on the throne of Babylon, the defeat of the latter would call into question the validity of the former. Since Prism F was written at a time when the issue of Assurbanipal’s succession was in question, the issue of the failure of the previous succession arrangement regarding Ashurbanipal and Šamaš-šum-ukīn was intentionally avoided. The rewriting of the episode in edition A of Ashurbanipal is also considered to be "intended to remove the onus of fratricide from Assurbanipal."

What the study of textual variation attempts to demonstrate is that the composition of Assyrian royal inscriptions was not a haphazard process of simply arranging stock phrases randomly, as originally proposed by Mowinckel. Rather, Assyrian royal inscriptions were meant to reflect the ongoing development of Assyrian policy and ideology.

In recent Assyriological literature, the focus on the
ideological background of Assyrian royal inscriptions— the study of royal inscriptions in terms of what they reveal with regard to an Assyrian world view—has been sharpened. Beyond the broad editorial issues, involving whole narratives or narrative portions, scholars have begun to examine the specifics of language and terminology in Assyrian royal inscriptions. For these scholars, the focus is on the use of language and terminology in building narratives which reflect an interpretation of the meaning of the Assyrian Empire and its role in the world.

Exemplary of this development is the Italian school, represented by such scholars as F. Fales, M. Liverani, and C. Zaccagnini. In recent years, these scholars have contributed a great deal of insight regarding the use of language in Assyrian royal inscriptions, particularly as it reveals an underlying Assyrian world view.

The approach taken by Italian scholars is perhaps epitomized by the work of M. Liverani. A minimalist with regard to the use of Assyrian royal inscriptions as historical sources, Liverani asserted the notion that all historical writing is interpretative.

"We are not in possession of the historical event, only some interpretation of it...the concept of 'historical event'... is a pure abstraction...a choice in interpretation, a way of understanding and presenting."

For this scholar, the focus is not on the document as a "source of information," but as information itself... In this type of
approach our attention is no more centered on the events, but on how they are narrated. 108

The author is concerned to set the text within the context of a "homologous series," 109 based not so much on genre as on thematic or ideological background. For example, the story of Idrimi, king of Alalakh in Syria, is studied in terms of folklorist V. J. Propp's analysis of Russian folk tales, emphasizing the "conquest of the throne" theme. Thus, Liverani's approach is structural and thematic.

Writing several years later, Liverani described the Assyrian royal inscriptions as representing a "self-indoctrination by the ruling class." 110 He called for an "attempt to outline a "grammar" of the Neo-Assyrian imperialistic ideology" by establishing an "inventory of themes" 111 presented in the inscriptions.

In developing the themes of Assyrian royal inscriptions, Liverani presents a "theory of diversity as justification of unbalance and exploitation." 112 He outlines four categories of diversity—of space, time, men, and goods—and divides each category into static and dynamic components. So, for example, static diversity of men is expressed in terms of the strange, sub-human quality of the enemy as opposed to the heroic Assyrians. The dynamics of the relationship is expressed in terms of the need to either assimilate or eliminate the strange foreigner through submission or defeat. 113
Liverani notes that his thematic pattern approach is fruitless until the particular "phrasing and vocabulary are identified and brought forth." In this regard, an important stage of the process has been bypassed. The larger structural analysis must be preceded by an analysis of the inventory of themes and expressions found in royal inscriptions. While Liverani begins the process of classifying themes, the failure to focus on the specifics of "phrasing and vocabulary" renders the process somewhat artificial.

Progress toward determining an inventory of themes and expressions has recently been undertaken by another Italian scholar. F. M. Fales has attempted to establish a literary code for the accounts of Ashurbanipal's Egyptian campaigns. The principle literary unit, his so-called "syntagm," is determined primarily on the basis of syntax, with elements of "semantic coherence and rhythmical structures" also considered.

Moving beyond the individual syntagm, Fales attempts to identify the literary patterns through which they become the building blocks of narrative. He begins with the so-called ebbu-ellu-namru (EEN) pattern, a tripartite literary pattern recognized 70 years ago by Ehelolf. He proceeds to identify parallelism in the successive editions of Ashurbanipal's Egyptian campaigns, followed by an analysis of three principles of development within the narrative tradition. These he labels amplification, variation, and
permutation. In some respects, Fales’ approach is a
continuation of the analysis of textual variants. However,
the focus is more acute in that Fales directs his attention
to variants consisting of individual expressions and
phrases.

For instance, in comparing the passages in
Ashurbanipal’s Harran Tablets inscription (obv.3) and its
variant in a later version, Prism B (I, 55-56), the
additional expression, [u Ištar u ilāni rabāti], "and Ištar
and the great gods," found in the later inscription, Prism
B, can be considered an amplification by means of a list.
Likewise, in B, II, 20-22, the EEN pattern is broken by an
amplification by means of a relative clause (ša akbusu
[mīṣir māt Muṣur], "that I stepped across the border of
Egypt") and an amplification by means of a causal-final
clause ([ala šuzub napištīšu], "in order to save his
life"). According to Fales, variant passages in the
several Ashurbanipal inscriptions which contain an Egyptian
campaign can be analysed on the basis of these several
patterns.

There appear to be several weak points in the system,
due, again, to the fact that the author has gone one step
too far in attempting to establish the code before the
terminology has been properly analyzed. In addition, the
artificial nature of the patterns adduced is often manifest,
as, for example, regarding the passages involving the
Assyrian king’s reaction to reports of rebellion in Egypt.

The three passages are as follows:

HT, obv., 10-11

libbi ḫugma ḫṣariḥ kabitti alsi turtān pāḥāti adi šābē qāṭīšunu ʿemūqiya šērāti

"My heart became angry, my liver seethed, I summoned the turtānu the governors—with the troops at their disposal—my crack forces."

B, I, 65-66

libbi ḫugma ḫṣaruḥ kabitti adke ʿemūqiya šērāti

"My heart became angry, my liver seethed, I summoned my crack forces..."

A, I, 64-66

libbi ḫugma ḫṣaruḥ kabitti ʿāssi qāṭēya ʿusalli Aššur u Ištar aššuritu adke ʿemūqiya šērāti

"My heart became angry, my liver seethed. I lifted my hands. I prayed to Ashur—and the Assyrian Ishtart—I summoned my crack forces."

In analyzing these passages according to his codes, Fales identifies the parallelism of libbi ḫugma and ḫṣaruḥ/kabitti in HT and A, whereas in B, they are combined with the adke expression to form a single EEN pattern. This seems unwarranted on several accounts. The syntactic structure of the first two expressions, connected as they are with the particle -ma, suggests parallelism, as does the semantic/thematic analysis. In fact, the two phrases represent a classic example of chiastic parallelism describing the emotional response of the king. It seems as though the adke expression, which is thematically unconnected, has been forced into his pattern.

The issue of thematic considerations can also be seen in the author’s analysis of the passage in Cylinder A. The last three expressions have been forced into an EEN pattern. Yet, here again, the third expression is thematically
unrelated to the first two, which both refer to prayer. Likewise, the passage in HT regarding the mustering of troops has been forced into an artificial EEN pattern made up of the expressions turtān, pāḥāti and emūqi ṣerāti. In the first place, these could just as easily be analyzed in terms of amplification by means of a list.

The "thematic/ideological" analysis also suffers from this attempt to force the material into a literary scheme. For instance, the rebellion of Yauta', the son of Haza'ilu of Qedar, as described in Prism B of Ashurbanipal, is analyzed as an example of the theme of "the enemy's lack of respect for pacts, treaties, etc." Fales detects an EEN pattern in the three expressions: adēya ihtīma, "he sinned against my treaty," tābtī la iṣṣurma, "he did not observe (my) good (deeds)," and isla nīr bēlūtiya, "he cast off the yoke of my lordship." According to this analysis, the theme of disrespect for treaties and pacts is expressed by means of an EEN literary pattern.

The first point to be made is that these expressions could fall under the more general rubric of 'misdeeds,' of which there are numerous sub-themes. The passage in question continues with an enumeration of four more misdeeds, which have been ignored for the sake of the tripartite scheme. Yet, the author has offered no thematic evidence for doing so, since he has not engaged in the prior step of determining conclusively which expressions contain
treaty terminology. He offers no explanation for his assumption that ša'āl šulmiya and isla nīr bēlūtiya indicate lack of respect for treaties, while the expression in the following line, ana ša'āl šulmiya šēpēṣu īprusma, "he avoided concerning himself with my well-being," does not.

M. Cogan offers such an analysis, which includes the ša'āl šulmi expression, but provides no clear basis for his classification. Instead, he attempts to reconstruct the terms of the pacts by "collecting the historical references to a'du [treaty] violations." But this is putting the cart before the horse. On the same page, Cogan points to the fact that his list of treaty violations contains no examples of a sacrilegious act, since "specific religious obligations were not part of these loyalty oaths," though he includes the expression mandattu Aššur nādān šattīšunu iklu, "they withheld Ashur's tribute, their yearly gift," as part of his list of treaty violations. Moreover, he fails to explain why an expression like amat šarrūtīya la īṣurū la ismu zikir šaptēya, "they did not keep my royal order, they did not obey my command," is considered an act of treaty violation, while the expression la nāṣir zikir Aššur Marduk, "who does not keep the command of Ashur and Marduk," is not. Clearly, an identification and classification of terminology is in order.

Two companion articles, however, one by Fales and another by Zaccagnini, go much further in the process of determining an inventory of themes and expressions.
articles examine the way in which Assyrian royal inscriptions describe the enemy and his habitation, seeking to develop an understanding of the manner in which the Assyrian royal ideology came to grips with the nature and meaning of the enemy. The method that each employs is one which we are advocating in the present study. The language of Assyrian royal inscriptions is analyzed thematically with the aim of creating an "inventory" of themes and the terminology associated with them.

Particularly in the article by Fales, the minimalist position assumed by Liverani is in evidence. That is, the ideological considerations are given precedence over the historical use of the sources. According to Fales,

...there is only one enemy--with a capital letter--appearing in and out of Assyrian royal inscriptions...a single coherent political ideology of nakrūtu [enmity]...

The various opponents are described as "separate manifestations of a unitary ideology of enmity."131

Finally,

...the historical result to be drawn from nakrūtu in Assyrian royal inscriptions regards much more the ideological biases that the Assyrian kingship conception "fed into" the texts, than pieces of information relevant to the nakrus [enemies] themselves.132

In analyzing the themes applied as moral judgements against the enemy, Fales distinguishes two broad categories: 1) the foreigner errs by not doing what he is supposed to do and 2) the foreigner errs by doing what he was not supposed
to do. 133 Into the first category is placed, on the one hand, those expressions which accuse the enemy of violation of oaths, betrayal, lack of reverential fear toward the Assyrian king, and failure to express submission. On the other hand are those acts indicating the enemy’s disregard for the kind deeds performed by the Assyrian king in the past.

As for the second category, wherein the foreigner errs by doing what he was not supposed to do, Fales includes three sub-classifications. One involves the enemy’s insolence and haughtiness, or his trust in his ability to oppose the Assyrian king. Another sub-classification involves the enemy’s words of suspicion or hostility, his anti-Assyrian plots and lies. Finally, the enemy is described as wholly wicked, rebellious, or hostile. In each case, Fales offers examples of specific terms and expressions which fit into his categories.

While Zaccagnini is less explicit as regards the specific terminology used to describe the ‘ethnic’ evaluation of the enemy, his analysis has important implications for the present study. This is primarily the case insofar as Zaccagnini focuses on the terminology which we are calling "topographic characterizations." The frequent reference to foreigners living in connection with mountains, seas, deserts, and marshes is part of "the topos of the enemy, who is viewed as an alien and 'other'"
According to Zaccagnini, the enemy's habitation represents

...a deviation from the normal, i.e., correct, way of life in Assyria. In addition to a long series of imperfections, the enemy is also charged for living in strange and unusual places, that contrast with the Assyrian landscape pattern.

Purpose of Study

As we have seen, any attempt to understand the ultimate purpose and function, or the ultimate sources of royal inscriptions, must come to grips with the vocabulary and terminology of the relevant texts. Even the question of style and literary quality can be adequately treated only after a careful examination of the terminology.

The study of terminology could be treated diachronically in the sense of tracing etymologies and the use of terminology over a broad historical period reaching back to Sumerian times. However, the purpose of the present work is to contribute to the process of creating an inventory and classification of terminology in Assyrian royal inscriptions. We will be dealing primarily with terminology at the level of simple expressions in terms of their contextual sense.
Naturally, it would be impossible to control the total inventory of terms found in the entire corpus of neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. The repertoire is, in fact, diverse, both thematically and with regard to individual expressions. Among the most common expressions are those describing the crimes, or misdeeds of the enemy, which tend to serve as the pretext or justification for the subsequent campaign. Within this broad category of terms, there are numerous sub-themes. Punishment of the enemy is also a widely employed category, with many sub-categories. In order to narrow the focus of the study, one very broad category of terms and expressions will be analyzed: that which involves issues of territoriality, particularly foreign territory.

As noted above, two aspects of territoriality can be discerned. The military campaign itself serves as the dividing line between these two aspects, such that one can speak of pre-conquest as opposed to post-conquest depictions of territory. The pre-conquest depictions of territory involve the characterization of foreign territory as regards location, most often described in terms of geography and topography. Pre-conquest issues of territoriality often involve the enemy's expropriation, or seizure of either Assyrian territory, or territory belonging to a vassal or ally. Post-conquest issues of territoriality involve the political disposition of conquered territory, involving themes and expressions describing annexation, province
formation, and other aspects of Assyrian control.

These, then, are the themes and expressions that are to be analyzed in this study. As for the period of time to be covered, the Sargonid period has been chosen for two reasons. First, it represents a standard, well-accepted periodization of Assyrian history. Second, our sources for this period, while continuing to offer challenges to Assyriologists, are relatively well-attested and, for the most part, reliably edited. We can, therefore, safely relinquish much of the task of source analysis and concentrate on the issues of language and terminology.

Moreover, the Sargonid period offers a unique laboratory for comparing and contrasting the application of the specific terminology under discussion. It will be our contention that the inscriptions of King Sargon, the founder of the Sargonid dynasty, display a tendency to emphasize the territorial issues, while the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal, the last significant ruler of this dynasty, include relatively few of these expressions. Rather, the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal frequently describe the Assyrian king’s attempt to maintain native sovereignty in conquered territory.

The focus on foreign sovereignty in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal is to be considered a reflection of the personal circumstances of the king, namely, the circumstances of his accession. Ashurbanipal was chosen by his father, confirmed by divine decree, and accepted by
his subjects in a formal state ceremony. Eventually, the arrangement was challenged by his brother, who had been appointed king of Babylon. Shortly thereafter, the subject of Ashurbanipal’s succession emerged. The issue of legitimate sovereignty was, therefore, of considerable significance to this king.

Sargon, on the other hand, was a usurper—a conquerer, of sorts, of the royal throne. Issues of conquest and control were of foremost significance and are reflected in the language of his inscriptions.

In addition, we hope to demonstrate that the arrangement of material is not haphazard. Contrary to Mowinckel, we will show that one cannot simply shuffle the deck and arrive at the same narrative; that there are subtle distinctions in the arrangement of material, most notably in the inscriptions of Sargon, which profoundly affect the significance of the narrative, particularly as regards what might be called the political status of conquered territory, including the distribution and nature of control of conquered territory. In so doing, we hope to contribute to the task of bringing to light the true nature of narrative art in Assyrian royal inscriptions.

The work is divided into two parts. Part I pertains to the pre-conquest issues of territoriality, involving the characterization and delimitation of territory. In Chapter One, we discuss the modern science of political geography, noting that modern geographers often make use of the
topographic features of the landscape in the delimitation of territory and the demarcation of boundaries. The discussion then turns to the subject of the exchange of private land in Assyrian administrative documents and in Babylonian boundary-stone (kudurrus) inscriptions. These documents also reveal the use of topographic features in the delimitation of private property.

Chapter Two deals with a certain class of topographic characterizations in Assyrian royal inscriptions. These are defined as "generic" characterizations in that they describe a particular territory in terms of its general location, i.e., on the coast of the sea, in the mountains, in the desert, etc. While these terms do not function in any technical sense of border formation, their prevalence reflects an attempt to identify and locate territory topographically. Also noted is a certain fluidity associated with these expressions which seems to reflect the attempt to deal with certain variegated topographic features.

Chapter Three deals with the terminology of borders in Assyrian royal inscriptions. Much of the material focuses on the inscriptions of Sargon, since border terminology is most prevalent there. Numerous passages are cited indicating a concern with the demarcation of boundaries—in the southeast with Elam, in the central Zagros, in the northeast with Urartu, as well as the internal boundaries of the Urartian kingdom.
In Chapter Four, we begin to develop the notion of the border-forming quality of topography by examining the terminology of riverine boundaries. The discussion focuses on the division of territory in southern Mesopotamia according to the boundaries formed by three bodies of water: the Tigris River, the Uqnû River, and the Bitter Lake. While there appears to be a consistent delimitation of this territory in the inscriptions of Sargon and his successor, Sennacherib, subtle differences reflect varying policy, particularly as it applies to the territory of Chaldea.

Chapter Five expands on the concept of topographic borders by focusing on terminology applied to the mountains of the northern Zagros in the inscriptions of Sargon. It is noted that the itinerary style of the Huitième Campagne, as well as the itinerary style found in other royal inscriptions, is often connected with topography in that the movement of the expedition from station to station often involves a mountain or river crossing. These and other passages indicate the border-forming quality of mountains. In addition, it is our contention that other descriptions of the landscape, such as flora, fauna, and meteorological conditions, also operate within the context of political geography. That is, they serve to identify, locate, and delimit particular territorial units.

Part II of the work involves the issues of the transfer of territory. The transfer of territory can operate in two directions. Territory can revert from the control of
Assyria, or one of her allies, to the control of an enemy. In the other direction, territory is captured from an enemy by the Assyrian king. The first of these can be considered a pre-conquest condition and generally functions as a justification for conquest. The latter is obviously a post-conquest issue.

Chapter Six deals with the issue of the seizure of territory, particularly the seizure of Assyrian or allied territory by an enemy. The terminology of seizure involves the use of the term ekēmu. It is noted that the term is used most frequently of enemy seizure, and that this enemy seizure generally results in some form of restitution. That is, the seized territory must be restored to its previous status once it is reclaimed by the Assyrian king. Indeed, even in those instances in which the Assyrian capture of territory is described in terms of the verb ekēmu, the territory in question always reverts to the control of a third party.

More significant, however, is the often subtle variations of the use of the term ekēmu, particularly in the several parallel narratives, contained in the inscriptions of Sargon, concerning Ullusunu of Mannea in the northern Zagros. The variations, which often involve subtle changes of context and literary structure, revealing a rather complex approach to issues surrounding Mannean territory.

Chapter Seven deals with the question of Assyrian control and organization of conquered territory. The
central theme of the chapter is the understanding that Assyrian control of conquered territory assumed different forms in different regions. Certain regions were apparently considered outside the sphere of direct Assyrian rule, consistently leading to methods of control involving the use of proxy or puppet kings. The consistent avoidance of direct Assyrian rule is an indication that Assyrian kings maintained a specific and deliberate policy with regard to these peripheral regions.

The focus of the discussion in Chapter Seven involves the issues of annexation and province formation. We begin by noting that any notion of annexation must involve the incorporation of the annexed territory into the political structure of the annexing power. In Assyria, this generally involves the incorporation of territory into the Assyrian provincial system. The language of province formation also displays certain regional variations, a further indication that Assyrian kings developed specific policies with regard to specific regions.

Chapter Eight addresses the subject of the extension of Assyrian control in conquered territory which does not involve direct political control in terms of annexation or province formation. In certain instances, Assyrian control is expressed in terms of restoring a sense of order and balance in an internally troubled land. Once again, the kingdom of Mannea, in the northern Zagros, is a prime example. Facing internal disorder engendered by a
decentralized political system, Mannea became the central stage for the struggle between Assyria and the kingdom of Urartu. The Assyrian response, after defeating the Urartians, was to resolve the internal disorder in Mannea and to establish a unified political structure.

Having concluded the discussion of territoriality in Assyrian royal inscriptions, Chapter Nine takes up the discussion of sovereignty. One conclusion that emerges from the discussion of territory is that territorial issues are most prevalent in the inscriptions of Sargon, somewhat less so in the inscriptions of Sennacherib, but only rarely attested in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.

With respect to the subject of foreign sovereignty, however, the situation is reversed. The inscriptions of Sargon show little regard for foreign sovereignty, while the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal abound with the language of foreign sovereignty. This can be seen in the use of royal titles applied to foreign rulers, as well as in the maintenance of foreign dynasties. Sargon’s inscriptions often dispense with royal titles, referring to the enemy by means of a simple gentilic, while the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal rarely fail to apply a royal title to a foreign king. In addition, the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal reveal a distinct policy of attempting to maintain foreign dynasties, something with which the inscriptions of Sargon are far less concerned.
Sources

Assyrian royal inscriptions, like other cuneiform sources, are often preserved in innumerable fragments of varying size, shape, material, and states of preservation. Naturally, the more well-preserved examples are written on stone: pavement slabs, wall slabs, throne bases, steles, and sculpted figures. Others are written on clay: tablets, prisms, and cylinders. These are obviously more prone to damage.

The often fragmentary nature of these sources has forced Assyriologists to devote a good deal of time over the years to the basic task of assembling and collating texts, a kind of cuneiform jig-saw puzzle. In many cases, this has resulted in publications of Assyrian royal inscriptions that have come to be regarded by experts as reliable editions. In other instances, however, the sources remain fragmentary—so many bits of clay and stone inscribed with broken lines of cuneiform writing.

To engage in the delicate chore of collating and analyzing the numerous fragments would create a powerful diversion to the task at hand, namely, the examination of terminology. Therefore, the sources chosen for this study are primarily confined to those for which there are a well-recognized editions. Where possible, the selection has also been made on the basis of providing examples written during various stages of a particular king's reign. In this respect, the corpus of texts cited in this work is not meant
to be a comprehensive analysis of royal inscriptions. It is hoped, however, that it provides a broad cross-section of material from each reign.

As noted, Sargon’s Annals are preserved on stone slabs, many bearing bas-relief sculptures, that decorated the king’s palace at Dur-Sharruken, known today as Khorsabad. Written in the year 707 B.C.E. on the occasion of the dedication of the palace, the Annals exist in four separate recensions mounted on the walls of rooms II, V, XIII, and XIV at Khorsabad. While an edition of the Annals was published by Winckler in 1889, this edition has been superceded by A. G. Lie’s 1929 publication, which relies primarily on the recension of room II, with emendations made on the basis of the other recensions. The text is arranged chronologically, utilizing the system of dating by palâ, or regnal year.

Written at about the same time as the Annals, the Display Inscription of King Sargon was discovered on stone slabs covering the walls in rooms IV, VII, VIII, and X of the palace at Khorsabad. Unlike the Annals, the various exemplars seem to represent a single recension, of which Wincker’s publication remains the principal edition. While the two inscriptions contain much of the same material, the Display Inscription appears to be arranged geographically, in contrast to the chronological arrangement of the Annals.

Another important source for the reign of Sargon is the
account of the campaign of the eighth regnal year contained in the "Letter to the God" published by Thureau-Dangin. This document was discussed in the section dealing with the genres of royal inscriptions.\textsuperscript{144}

The inscriptions of Sennacherib were compiled in 1924 by D. D. Luckenbill.\textsuperscript{145} Many of these are annalistic in style, with military undertakings dated according to \textit{girru}, "campaign," as opposed to the \textit{palû}, or regnal-year system employed in the Annals of Sargon.

Luckenbill’s publication includes a clay cylinder in the British Museum first published by Sidney Smith(A1).\textsuperscript{146} This cylinder contains an account of the first campaign only and was, therefore, probably written before the opening of the second campaign, i.e., between 703 and 702 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{147} The Bellino Cylinder (B1) includes accounts of the first two campaigns and is dated by \textit{līmu} to the year 702 B.C.E. A version of Sennacherib’s annals inscribed on a colossal bull from the palace at Nineveh (F1) contains an account of the first six campaigns. It’s composition should, therefore, be dated to ca. 693 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{148}

The impetus for Luckenbill’s endeavor came in the form of a six-sided prism, known as the Oriental Institute Prism (H2), which was "in almost as perfect condition as when it left the hands of the ancient scribe."\textsuperscript{149} Dated by \textit{līmu} to the year 689, the text is nearly identical to the so-called "Taylor Prism," which is dated two years earlier. These are
the latest extant compositions of Sennacherib’s Annals, containing the narratives of eight campaigns.

In 1956, R. Borger published the inscriptions of Esarhaddon. Many of these concerned the king’s building activities in Babylon, a task to which the king devoted himself with vigor. However, a number of campaign narratives can be found in various copies and recensions discovered during excavations at Nineveh. These have been collected by Borger, who refers to Nineveh recensions A-F, A being the most fully preserved.

The Nineveh A recension is reconstructed from a number of exemplars, chief of which is a six-sided prism discovered at Nineveh in 1927-28. The composition of the prism is dated by līmu to the year 673-672 B.C.E., as are a number of other exemplars. Much of the beginning of the text is devoted to a description of the internal difficulties encountered by the king upon assuming the throne. The campaign narratives are undated, following the style of the display inscription. We shall refer to this composition as the Nineveh A Prism inscription.

The publication by M. Streck remains the principle edition of the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal. One of the earliest compositions of Ashurbanipal’s campaign narratives appears on fragments of two related clay tablets. The tablets are referred to alternately as the large Egyptian Tablets and the Harran Tablets (HT). The former label is applied due to the fact that much of the campaign
material is devoted to affairs in Egypt, while the latter refers to the end of the inscription, which refers to the rebuilding of the temple of Sin at Harran. While no firm date for the composition of this document has ever been suggested, the fact that it mentions the second Egyptian campaign, including the campaign against Tandamane, as well as the submission Yakinlu of Arwad, suggests a date of ca. 663–662 B.C.E.

The text of the eight-sided Prism B was reconstructed in 1933 by A. C. Piepkorn from fragments housed at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. The composition of Prism B is alternately dated by lišu to the years 649 B.C.E. and 648 B.C.E.

In 1957, J.M. Aynard published a six-sided prism obtained by the Louvre, which she identified as an exemplar of what Streck had referred to as recension F of the annals of Ashurbanipal. The prism is dated by lišu to the year 646 B.C.E.

A late edition of the annals of Ashurbanipal is contained in the so-called Cylinder A, which is actually a ten-sided prism discovered in the north palace at Kouyunjik/Nineveh. A duplicate is contained in the so-called "Rassam Cylinder," which was discovered in roughly the same spot. Both inscriptions are dated by lišu to the year 636 B.C.E. While Streck uses the Rassam Cylinder as his primary text, this particular recension of the annals is generally referred to as recension A.
These sources represent the bulk of the evidence for the present study. Other sources are examined and discussed in the appropriate contexts.
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PART I
CHARACTERIZATION AND DELIMITATION OF FOREIGN TERRITORY
Nature and Topography

In 1916, the German Assyriologist, Bruno Meissner, published an often overlooked analysis of the ancient Mesopotamian view of nature and natural phenomena. The article focuses largely on aspects of physical geography and topography, including the ancients' understanding of mountains, deserts, forests, and bodies of water.

For each of these categories of topography, Meissner analyzed various aspects of meaning and significance. There is the mythological dimension; mountains as seats of the gods; the desert as underworld; the river as a source of ritual purity. The importance of certain geographic regions in terms of the resources they provide was also examined by Meissner.

In Assyrian royal inscriptions, however, natural phenomena become significant mainly with regard to their association with aspects of the military campaign. As Meissner noted, the topographic features of the campaign are described as obstacles to the king's march, or as aspects of an enemy's defense, or a place to which the enemy flees before the onslaught of the Assyrian army.

But there is one feature of topographic descriptions found in Assyrian royal inscriptions that has only recently...
been observed. In his article dealing with the ideology of royal inscriptions, Liverani noted the importance of topographic features as border forming in his analysis of the diversity of space. The purpose of this chapter is to expand on Liverani’s notion by examining the language of Assyrian royal inscriptions within a broader, more well-defined context of political geography.

**Topography and Boundaries**

In a certain sense, a place, a territory, has no status until it is defined and delimited. According to one political geographer, the function of a territory is "to fence off a portion of space for the security of its inhabitants." The function of political geography is to find the most suitable means of defining territory, particularly with respect to the delimitation of boundaries.

In discussing boundaries, or borders, political geographers have, for some time, distinguished natural from artificial boundaries. Natural boundaries are of the type discussed in Meissner’s article, though he was not presenting his study of nature in those terms. Even today, rivers, mountain tops, forests, swamps, and deserts serve, if not as boundaries themselves, then as frontier zones used to aid in the delimitation of boundaries.

In addition, there are natural features beyond topography that are taken into account in the delimitation of boundaries. The presence of certain resources, including
water, precious metals, minerals, vegetation, and the like, are also considered. Even such human factors as nationality, ethnicity, and linguistics, factors that a political geographer would refer to as anthropogeographic, are used to define and delimit territory.

In contrast to natural boundaries, so-called artificial boundaries are those that consist of imaginary lines drawn by cartographers, what political geographers refer to as geometric boundaries. These include boundaries formed as straight lines between two fixed points, or drawn on the basis of the meridians, or as parallel to some topographic feature, such as a coast line, or a watershed.

This study is particularly concerned with political geography as it is expressed in topographic characterizations of foreign territory in Assyrian royal inscriptions. There are a number of different types of topographic characterizations, bearing various levels of relationship to political geography. At the simplest level are the terse expressions which could be described as generic topographic characterizations. Short phrases such as ša aḫi tāṣtīm, "on the sea coast," ina ṣadbari, "in the desert," and ina šaddê šaqûti, "in the lofty mountains," are clearly not meant to delimit territory in the sense of determining specific borders. However, these phrases are related to political geography in that they are applied with great consistency and are meant to identify and locate foreign territory topographically.
In certain instances, topographic characterizations expand beyond the simple, generic expressions, becoming highly elaborate. This is especially true in the so-called epistolary style of Assyrian royal inscriptions exemplified by Sargon’s Huitième Campagne. Here, the rugged peaks of the northern Zagros Mountains are described in graphic detail. Consider, for instance, the description of Mt. Uwaush located in the Mannean province of Uishdish along the border with Urartu.

Mt. Uwaush, great mountain, whose peak touches upon the cloud formation in the heavens, which from days of old, no creature has crossed... nor seen its remote regions, and no bird has flown over... high mountain, sharply pointed like a dagger (with) fissures and mountain canyons... in the peak of summer and the height of winter, snow falls day and night, covering it.

In claiming that no soul had previously journeyed into this remote region, the passage is clearly meant to indicate the heroic feats of the king. All of the detail can be considered elaborations on the theme of the heroic king venturing into difficult terrain. In addition, however, the depiction is related to political geography in that it serves to locate the territory topographically, in much the same manner as the simple, generic expressions. The
mountain becomes a sort of landmark.

The language of political geography in Assyrian royal inscriptions is most clearly represented in those phrases which make explicit reference to borders. The word used most frequently to denote border is mišru. Thus, a place can be characterized as ša mišir GN, "along the border with GN." In addition to mišru, the vocabulary of borders in Assyrian royal inscriptions often appears in terms of itû and paṭu.12

Related to the expressions which contain the vocabulary of borders is the simple formula GN1 ša GN2, "GN1 (belonging to the territory) of GN2." While this expression offers no border terminology, it is meant to assign a territory to a particular political unit, which is the ultimate goal of political geography. For convenience, we characterize this expression as "geopolitical."

The connection between topographic characterizations and political geography is most easily recognized in those instances in which the two types of expressions are combined. For instance, the introduction to Sargon's Display Inscription presents a summary of the king's conquests. This includes the conquest of the land of Raši in southern Mesopotamia, which is characterized as ša itê ša Elamti ša ah Idiglat, "which is alongside the land of Elam on the bank of the Tigris River."13 In this case, it seems as though the river forms the boundary between the Assyrian controlled land of Raši and the kingdom of Elam.
Indeed, riverine boundaries are common in narratives pertaining to this region, where the Tigris and its tributaries form easily discernible lines of demarcation.  

The purpose of this phase of the study is to analyze in more detail the connection between topographic characterizations and political geography. That is, we will attempt to demonstrate that, in many instances, topographic characterizations have boundary-forming functions and serve to delimit territory. In some instances, the connection between topographic characterization and political geography is explicit, as in the case of Raši in Sargon’s Display Inscription. In other passages it is more subtle. In either case, the effort to identify and locate foreign territory is one of the important functions of topographic characterizations in Assyrian royal inscriptions.

Since the topographic characterizations in Assyrian royal inscriptions are generally embedded within the context of the campaign narrative, their significance with regard to political geography can become obscured by the other themes enumerated thus far: the heroic deeds of the king, the flight of the enemy, etc.

Fortunately we have access to the thousands of private land-sale contracts discovered at a number of Mesopotamian centers from various periods. Documents from various Assyrian centers, as well as from Mari, Nuzi, and Babylon, describe the sale or lease of private property as contracted between individuals. The Babylonian boundary-stone
inscriptions witness the granting of state lands to individuals by the king, presumably as a reward for past service. As a function of the juridical nature of these documents, the delimitation of boundaries is set within a rather formal legal structure, where the issues can be more easily discerned; the buyer and seller are identified; the boundaries of the territory are defined; and the transaction is carried out before witnesses. There are no extraneous literary themes as there are in the royal inscriptions.

The private land-sale contracts will clarify two important aspects of the discussion. First, they will reveal the vocabulary of political geography, that is, the terms used to denote the borders or boundaries of a particular piece of territory. Next, they will demonstrate the role of topography in the delimitation and formation of those boundaries.

In neo-Assyrian land-sale contracts, the vocabulary of boundaries is rather limited, in most cases involving the word ṭihu, "adjoining." The term is obviously meant to indicate the boundary of the property and can, therefore, be translated "bounded by." The boundary is generally defined, or located, in terms of other topographic features, mostly roads, canals, wadis, and other parcels of private property. For instance, a contract which involves the leasing of a parcel of land defines the borders of the property as follows:

\[ ṭihu nahal ṭihu Kisir-Assur ṭihu šēri \]
In this case, the territory is delimited along four axes. Two boundary axes are defined in terms of other parcels of property, while the two other boundary axes are defined in terms of topographical features.

While the vocabulary used to depict boundaries in the neo-Assyrian land-sale contracts is largely limited to the word šiḫu, earlier land-sale contracts, such as those from Nuzi and Mari, make use of a more varied vocabulary. In addition, there is an attempt to more accurately define each boundary axis of the territory in question. For instance, a land-sale contract from Mari distinguishes itūm elēnnum, "the upper side" from itūm šaplam, "the lower side." One of the "brotherhood" contracts (ṣuppi aḫḫūti) from Nuzi also distinguishes the several axes.

[ina šupāl eqli ša Huti mār [...] ina elēnnum eqli ša Hurizati ina šūtān eqli ša Aripampa ina miṣri ša Kipkiwar iḫḫaš

[a pasture land] along the lower (axis) of the field of Huti, son of [...], along the upper (axis) of the field of Hurizati, south of the field of Aripampa, along the border of (the property of) Kipkiwar.

Like the land-sale contract from Mari, this document distinguishes the upper and lower boundary axes of the property. In addition, one of the boundary axes is defined according to a cardinal direction, namely šūtān, "South."
The fourth axis is described in terms of *miṣra*, "border," which must now be placed alongside *tiḥu* and *itu* as part of the repertoire of vocabulary used to denote the boundaries of private property.

Perhaps the clearest example of the language of boundary formation is provided by the Babylonian boundary-stone inscriptions, which were used, mainly during the Kassite Period, to delimit private property that was being awarded to a loyal subject by the king. Here, property boundaries are delimited according to certain rather detailed formulas. Boundaries along the two perpendicular axes are distinguished by *śiddu* and *pātu*, i.e., "length" and "breadth." Each is also distinguished in terms of *elâ* and *šaplu*, "upper" and "lower." Like the other land-sale contracts, the boundary is determined in terms of some topographic feature, usually a river or canal, or is defined as adjacent to another property. One example suffices to demonstrate the language of border delimitation in many of the boundary-stone inscriptions.

The common fields of the city of Kar-Ninsar on the bank of the Ninina canal in the province of Nippur (known as) Bīt-Tākil-ana-ilīšu...the upper length toward the North bordering upon (the property) of Ahua[tl], the lower length toward the South bordering upon (the property) of Bit-Ti[ll], the upper breadth toward the West on the bank of the
Ninina canal, the lower breadth toward the East, the šipiru facing the reed marsh.

Here, each axis is defined in terms of cardinal direction, representing the classic Babylonian formulation. This is of interest in itself in that one of the cardinal directions, namely KUR.RA = šadû, "mountain," is defined topographically. Moreover, while two of the boundary axes are delimited in terms of other parcels of property, two others are defined by features of the topography, namely, the bank of the Ninina canal and the irrigation ditch facing the reed marsh.

What all of these documents demonstrate is a varied vocabulary used to indicate borders or boundaries: țihu, itû, pûtu, miṣru, šiddû. In addition, they reveal a careful, technical definition of each boundary axis and the delimitation of boundaries according to fixed and recognizable topographic features. The important point is the boundary-forming quality of topography. The next step is to identify the topographic characterizations in Assyrian royal inscriptions and to examine the connection between borders and topography.
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CHAPTER 2

GENERIC

TOPOGRAPHIC CHARACTERIZATIONS

Boundary formation as defined in the private land-sale contracts is a technical, legal enterprise. The delimitation of private property reveals a careful location of identifiable boundaries by way of a technical vocabulary. It often involves the identification of boundaries in terms of some topographic feature, most notably, bodies of water. The association of foreign lands with certain topographic features is a common occurrence in Assyrian royal inscriptions. In numerous instances, the topographic characterizations are stated in terms of short, simple phrases that appear regularly, each within a particular topographic context. These phrases are not technical in the sense of the border-forming language seen in the private land-sale contracts, but describe the topography in generic terms, referring to the overall topographic characteristics of a particular region.

The topographic features most often depicted in this manner are oceans and other large bodies of water, as well as rivers, mountains, and deserts. Thus, we find simple, generic characterizations such as ša ahi tātīn, "on the coast of the sea," or ša aḥ Idiglat, "on the bank of the Tigris River," as well as ina madbari, "in the desert," or the characterization of a particular place as šadû marṣu,
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"treacherous mountain." In many cases, these phrases serve as epithets to the person or place which they are meant to characterize. One obvious example of this is the introduction of the Assyrian vassal Yakinlu as ʄar māt/āl Aruadda ʾāšib qabal tâstîm, "king of Arwad, residing in the midst of the sea." In this case, the topographic characterization forms part of the formal titulary of the foreign ruler.

While these simple, generic phrases cannot be considered as aspects of political geography in the technical sense, they do reflect an interest in identifying territory topographically. By examining these simple phrases, we can begin to understand the function of topographic characterizations in locating and identifying territory in Assyrian royal inscriptions.

Before proceeding, it is important to clarify one aspect of the simple phrases that are being described here as generic, since they characterize topography in a general sense. The pervasive application of these phrases to the territories in question, particularly mountains and oceans, gives them a certain formulaic quality. By formulaic is meant the consistent connection of one element with another such that any time one element appears, the other element is naturally associated with it. This feature has been most clearly defined in the analysis of classical Greek literature. Homer's consistent use of phrases such as "the wine-dark sea," "rosy-fingered dawn," or "the bright-eyed
Athene," are examples of literary formulas. The goddess Athene is always bright eyed, and the dawn is always rosy fingered.

In most instances, the application of topographic characterizations in Assyrian royal inscriptions is not quite as formal as is the case in the Homeric literature. Hence, the term "generic" is used in place of the stricter "formulaic." However, there are instances in which the application of a particular topographic characterization to a specific place is in fact formulaic in that it appears consistently. In other cases, the specific phrase may vary. Yet, toponyms associated with oceanic regions are consistently supplied with some characterization which describes their aqueous location, while mountains are invariably characterized by way of short, generic expressions.

Terminology

The topographic features most often employed to depict the heroic king marching through inaccessible terrain are the mountain regions which ring the fertile crescent, from the mountains of the Arabian desert, to the Amanus and Taurus ranges in the North, and the Zagros range in the East.² Hardly a mountain is mentioned without at least some generic phrase describing its height and inaccessibility. While these simple phrases may be followed by more graphic elaborations on the difficult conditions overcome by the
king, they often stand alone, serving as terse epithets to the territory in question. In either case, however, the focus on the difficult nature of the terrain tends to subordinate all other themes to that of the heroic king.

The most common of these simple characterizations of mountainous terrain is the phrase šaddû maršû, "treacherous mountain." This expression is applied in the inscriptions of Sargon to Mt. Uwaush, in the Mannean province of Urartu located in the northern Zagros.³ Sargon’s Annals inscription also employs this short epithet to characterize a number of other mountains in this region. One passage subsumes four mountains under the rubric šaddê maršûti, "treacherous mountains."⁴ In another passage, territory belonging to Mita of Muski (Phrygia), located in the mountains of Armenia in Asia Minor, is described as ša ina šadî marši, "which is in a treacherous mountain."⁵ The inscriptions of Sennacherib refer to Mt. Nipur, in the central Zagros, in this manner.⁶ In Cylinder A of Ashurbanipal, this phrase is applied to Mt. Ḥukkurina in the Arabian desert.⁷

Reporting on a major confrontation with anti-Assyrian forces in the northern Zagros Mountains, Sargon’s Huitième Campagne contains a variety of these alpine expressions. The Urartian king Ursa⁸ and his ally, Urzana of Musasir,⁹ are both given the epithet šaddû’â, "mountaineer."¹⁰ The use of generic phrases is highlighted in the numerous other simple expressions used in the Huitième Campagne to describe
king, they often stand alone, serving as terse epithets to the territory in question. In either case, however, the focus on the difficult nature of the terrain tends to subordinate all other themes to that of the heroic king.

The most common of these simple characterizations of mountainous terrain is the phrase šaddû marṣu, "treacherous mountain." This expression is applied in the inscriptions of Sargon to Mt. Uwaush, in the Mannean province of Urartu located in the northern Zagros. Sargon’s Annals inscription also employs this short epithet to characterize a number of other mountains in this region. One passage subsumes four mountains under the rubric šaddê marṣūti, "treacherous mountains." In another passage, territory belonging to Mita of Muski (Phrygia), located in the mountains of Armenia in Asia Minor, is described as ša ina šadî marṣi, "which is in a treacherous mountain." The inscriptions of Sennacherib refer to Mt. Nipur, in the central Zagros, in this manner. In Cylinder A of Ashurbanipal, this phrase is applied to Mt. Ḥukkurina in the Arabian desert.

Reporting on a major confrontation with anti-Assyrian forces in the northern Zagros Mountains, Sargon’s Huitième Campagne contains a variety of these alpine expressions. The Urartian king Ursâ and his ally, Urzana of Musasir, are both given the epithet šaddû’a, "mountaineer." The use of generic phrases is highlighted in the numerous other simple expressions used in the Huitième Campagne to describe
the mountainous terrain of the Zagros: šadû dannu, 11 šadû elû, 12 šadû rabû, 13 šadû šaqû, 14 šadû zaqru, 15 all having to do with the height and steepness of the mountains and, therefore, the prowess of the king in crossing them.

In a few instances, the word ḫuršānu replaces šadû as a term for "mountain." However, it appears that the two terms are simply alternates, since there is no evidence to suggest that they refer to different types of terrain. Indeed, the two words are often used appositionally. The four mountains described in the Huitième Campagne as šaddê elûti are also characterized as ḫuršâni šaqûti, "lofty mountains." 16 In the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon, the people of Hilakku (Cilicia) are characterized as šaddû'a āšibûte ḫuršâni pašqûti, "mountaineers, residing in difficult mountains." 17 The Harran Tablet inscription, an early account of the campaigns of Ashurbanipal, refers to Mugallu as šar màt [Tabal] āšib ḫuršâni šaddê pašqûti, "king of [Tabal], residing in difficult mountains," where the two terms are appositional. 18 In Prism B of Ashurbanipal, composed several years later, Mugallu, king of Tabal, and Sandisarme, king of Hilaku, two places which have already been characterized with the term ḫuršânu, are called šarrâni āšibûti šaddê šaqûti, "kings dwelling in lofty mountains," employing the term šaddû for "mountains." 19

There are, thus, a number of simple expressions designed to refer generically to mountainous terrain. There appears to be no concerted effort to distinguish different
types of alpine territory. All mountains are high, lofty, difficult, treacherous, or powerful. In this regard, the simple, generic phrases applied to mountains contain no traces of the language of political geography. There appears to be no attempt to delimit territory in the technical sense of boundary formation. The dominant theme is the vigor of the Assyrian king in reaching seemingly inaccessible regions.

Simple, generic phrases are often used to characterize territory associated with the two major oceans known to the Assyrians. The Mediterranean was known as tâštim erib Šamiši, "the sea of the entering sun," or tâštim šalām Šamiši, "the sea of the complete (course of the) sun," that is, the sea of the setting sun, or the western sea. On the other side of the world, the waters of the Persian Gulf leading into the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean were known as tâštim šit Šamiši, "the sea of the rising sun," or tâštim nipih Šamiši, "the sea of the blazing sun," that is, the eastern sea.

Not a maritime people, the Assyrians appear to have been somewhat uncertain as regards the varieties of marine topography present in these two regions. For example, there appears to have been some confusion regarding the distinction between the Persian Gulf itself and the estuary formed from the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers where they enter the Persian Gulf, the modern Shatt-al-'Arab, known to the Assyrians as Narrati, "the Bitter
Lake." Likewise, some of the Phoenician cities were built on small, offshore islands, which also caused some uncertainty with regard to the topographic characterization of such a situation. Reflecting the scribes' attempts to deal with these subtle nuances, the generic topographic phrases often shift and alternate, or are combined in an effort to include every possible topographic situation.

The Coast of the Mediterranean

To demonstrate the use of these generic phrases applied to oceanic regions, we will begin the discussion with a treatment of territories associated with the Mediterranean Sea. The characterization of certain locations was clear, and this is reflected in the phrases applied. For example, Cyprus, called Yadnana, Yadna, or Ya' in Assyrian sources, is consistently connected to the expression qabal tâmtim, "the midst of the sea." In the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription, Cyprus is qualified as yâ qabal tâmtim šalām šašši, "in the midst of the sea of the setting sun." Within the body of the campaign narrative, the qualification appears as yâ mālak šēm ina qabal tâmtim erib šašši šitkunu nissât šubāssun, "whose faraway dwelling is situated seven days' journey in the midst of the sea of the setting sun." The parallel passage in the Annals, while fragmentary, seems to have contained the same expression.
In the Bull Inscription (F1) of Sennacherib, Lulli, king of Sidon, is said to have fled to māt Yadnana qabal tāmti, "Cyprus in the midst of the sea." The parallel in the Oriental Institute Prism (H2) has him fleeing ana ruqqi qabal tāmti, "far off into the midst of the sea." Even where the toponym itself is lacking, the topographic characterization alone is enough to identify the location. In this respect, the expression Yadna qabal tāmti can be characterized as formulaic.

Another toponym that was readily located by means of a simple, generic phrase was the kingdom of Lydia. In the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal, references to Lydia are consistently accompanied by the topographic characterization nagû (ša) neberti tāmti, "a district on the other side of the sea." On the western edge of Asia Minor, Lydia, like Cyprus, must have been reached by sea rather than overland.

In the case of Cyprus and Lydia, the topographic circumstances were clear to the Assyrians. Cyprus was an island in the middle of the ocean. Lydia was a distant land which lay across the ocean. In each case, simple, generic phrases were sufficient to characterize the location of these places.

However, in the case of the Phoenician city-states along the coast of the Mediterranean, the situation was not quite so simple. The city of Arwad, for instance, was built on a small, rocky island just off the coast. Tyre was originally built on the mainland, but expanded in the tenth
century B.C.E. to include an offshore island. Other Phoenician city-states, such as Sidon, never expanded beyond their coastal locations.

While many of the references to places along the coast of the Mediterranean include topographic characterizations corresponding to the simple phrases examined thus far, the attempt to deal with these various topographic circumstances is reflected in a richer and often more complex variety of expressions applied to this region than was noted in connection with Cyprus and Lydia. However, this is often accomplished by simply combining the terse phrases. The language remains generic in that it is not meant to define or delimit territory in a technical sense, but appears designed to deal with the overall features of the topography.

We can begin with the application of the short, generic phrases to some of the Phoenician city-states. Like Cyprus, the city of Arwad is consistently associated with the expression qabal tāmītā, "the midst of the sea," apparently referring to its island location. In the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal, nearly every reference to Yakinlu, king of Arwad, characterizes him as āšib qabal tāmītā, "dwelling in the midst of the sea." In the same manner, Baal of Tyre is referred to as āšib qabal tāmītā, which would aptly describe that section of the city of Tyre which was built offshore. In these two cases, the topographic characterizations are appropriately applied to the two
Phoenician city-states built on islands off the coast of the Mediterranean.

In other instances, however, the topographic characterization of Phoenician city-states does not reflect the same accuracy. In the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon, for instance, Sidon, located on the coast of the Mediterranean, is characterized by the expression ša qereb tâtim nasu, "founded in the midst of the sea." That the expression is meant to refer to "the midst of the sea," and not simply "near the sea" can be seen in the course of the campaign narrative. Upon hearing of the approach of the Assyrian army, Abdi-milkutti, king of Sidon, like his predecessor, Lulli, in the inscriptions of Sennacherib, flees ina qabal tâtim, "to the midst of the sea," and is brought ultu qereb tâtim, "out of the midst of the sea." In this instance, the translation of qereb tâtim as "the midst of the sea" is clear. There is no indication that Sidon ever expanded beyond its coastal location. Yet, it is still qualified as qereb tâtim, "in the midst of the sea."

Moreover, the section of Esarhaddon's Nineveh A Prism inscription which describes the building operations in Nineveh refers to western kings brought to the capital along with building materials to aid in the construction. Here we find the combination and expansion of the simple phrases designed to deal with the various topographic circumstances. These kings are initially introduced as šarrāni māt Hatti u eber nāri, "kings of the Hittite land and across the
The passage can be divided into three sections. The first section lists twelve kings in the form PN šar GN, "PN, king of GN." The list includes a certain Matan-Baal of the city of Arwad. The list in this first section of the passage is summarized with the expression 12 šarrāni ša kišādi tāṣtim, "twelve kings of the seashore." However, as noted, Arwad was built on an island off the coast and, in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal, is connected to the expression ʾašib qabal tāṣtim, "residing in the midst of the sea." It would, therefore, not qualify as kišādi tāṣtim. Rather, the expression should be seen as a generic term, like eber nāri, referring, in a general sense, to cities associated with the coast of the Mediterranean.

The passage continues with a list of ten kings called šarrāni māt Yadnana qabal tāṣtim, "kings of Cyprus in the midst of the sea," an expression that has already been described as a simple, generic phrase consistently applied to Cyprus. The entire list of kings concludes with a summary phrase.

naphar 22 šarrāni māt Hatti aḫi tāṣtim u qabal tāṣtim

a total of twenty-two kings of the Hittite land, along the coast of the sea, and in the midst of the sea.

This expression is all inclusive. It could apply to the cities along the coast, those just offshore, as well as to Cyprus in the midst of the sea. However, as we have seen in the case of Arwad, the identification of the topography in these cases is not technical, but generic. The
expression simply represents a combination of shorter phrases designed to include all of the possible topographic circumstances encountered in connection with the Phoenician city-states, as well as the island state of Cyprus.

That this language is formulaic can be demonstrated by the appearance of much the same terminology in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal. During the course of his first Egyptian campaign, Ashurbanipal received the assistance of his western vassals. In the Harran Tablets, an early version of these events, these kings are referred to by means of the simple, generic phrase šarrāni eber nāri, "kings (from) across the river." 36

However, in Cylinder A, composed much later in the king's reign, the phrase eber nāri is replaced by a combination of phrases designed to distinguish the various topographic situations which would have been included in the more general phrase. In this instance, the western allies are described as ešrā šina šarrāni ša ahi tâstîm qabal tâstîm u nābali, "twenty-two kings of the seacoast, (those dwelling) in the midst of the sea, and (those dwelling) on the dry land." 37 Even with regard to the number of kings, this expression is remarkably similar to the summary of kings described in the building section of Esarhaddon's Annals. Where they differ is in the use of the term nābali, "dry land," in the Ashurbanipal passage, which replaces the phrase māt ḫatti found in the Esarhaddon passage. This
would indicate that the phrase māt Ḥatti referred to that part of eber nāri which was not connected to the sea.

More specifically, the terminology suggests that māt Ḥatti referred to that portion of eber nāri associated with the inland mountains as distinguished from the coastal regions. When Esarhaddon conquered Sidon, he commissioned the building of a replacement for the destroyed city. Those assigned to the project are called šarrāni māt Ḥatti u aḥi tāṭim, "kings of the Hittite land and the sea coast." Yet, when the project is completed, the people brought by Esarhaddon to resettle the new city are distinguished as ša šaddē u tāṭim šīt šamī, "from the mountains and the sea of the rising sun." The phrase māt Ḥatti, which appears in the initial reference, seems to alternate with ša šaddē found in the sequel. The distinction being made is between the sea coast and the inland mountains, which can be referred to as māt Ḥatti.

The distinction between coastal regions and the mountains of Syria and Asia Minor also appears in a passage from Ashurbanipal’s Prism B. The account places Yakinlu of Arwad together with Mugallu, king of Tabal, and Sandišarme, king of Ḥilakku. However, the topographic distinction is maintained in a short introductory statement referring to malkī qabal tāṭim u šarrāni āšibūti šaddē raqūti, "princes (dwelling) in the midst of the sea and kings dwelling in high mountains." Since the narrative concerning the three kings immediately follows these topographic
characterizations, one can assume that Yakinlu would be included in the *malkī qabal tāṣtim*, while Mugallu and Sandišarmē would be referred to as *āšibūti šaddē šaqtî*, i.e., residing in the Amanus Mountains of Asia Minor. While the three kings are treated in the same narrative, the text is careful to distinguish them topographically. Yet, the distinction is maintained by way of the combining of simple, generic expressions.

The same feature can be seen with regard to the distinction between territory along the coast of the Mediterranean and the inland desert regions of Arabia. With regard to desert terrain, the Annals inscription of Sargon contains two rather terse passages. The account of the seventh regnal year includes a report concerning the defeat of four tribes, Tamudi, Ibadidi, Marsimani, and Hayapa, who are described as *māt Arabāya rūqūti āšibūt madbāri*, "distant Arabs dwelling in the desert." This is followed by the receipt of tribute from three rulers, Pir'u, king of Musur (Egypt), Samsi, queen of Arabia, and It'amra of Saba, who are referred to collectively as *šarrāni ša aḥi tāṣtim u madbāri*, "kings of the seacoast and desert." Once again, short, generic phrases are combined to distinguish the variety of topography encountered in this region.

Thus, these simple phrases appear in various combinations meant to distinguish the different topographic features of the region west of the Euphrates. In some cases, they reflect the actual topography, while in other
instances they do not. For this reason, the expressions must be considered generic phrases, not technical terms.

While these phrases cannot be considered as part of the language of political geography in that they are not meant to define territory in terms of boundaries, they are related to political geography in that they are designed to identify and locate territory topographically.

The Persian Gulf

The language used to depict the waters of the Persian Gulf also displays a somewhat uncertain attempt to distinguish the various topographic features of this region. While a complete discussion of the historical topography of southern Mesopotamia would be beyond the scope of this study, a cursory examination of the topography reveals a complex system of rivers, lakes, and swamps all draining into the gulf. 44

While the issue is far from settled, the latest opinion offered by Hansman 45 assumes little change in the coast line of the Persian Gulf since about the fourth millennium. However, the changing courses of the rivers, as well as the inundating tides of the Persian Gulf, appear to engender continual changes in the landscape, which consists of several topographic features. There is the alluvial plain itself, formed by the periodic flooding of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Because of the periodic flooding, as well as the frequent tidal inundations from the gulf, much of the
alluvial plain of southern Mesopotamia is covered with broad expanses of marshland, shallow lakes, and lagoons. South of Basra, this swampland receives further drainage from the Karun River. Beginning north of Basra, the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers forms a tidal estuary known today as the Shatt-al-’Arab.

One problem generated by the Assyrian literature is the apparent alternation between the term *tam-tim*, "sea," and *Marratu*, "Bitter Lake." It would appear, however, that *Marratu* refers to the tidal estuary represented today by the Shatt-al-’Arab, which drained the rivers, lakes, and swamps to the north into the Persian Gulf. Naturally, however, the ebb and flow of tides and floods would have produced different effects at different times, such that the swamps and estuary would have, at times, seemed as broad and inundated as the gulf itself.

During the first half of the first millennium B.C.E., the territory of southern Mesopotamia was infiltrated by a variety of Aramean and Chaldean tribes. By the time of the accession of King Sargon (722 B.C.E.), the Chaldean nation comprised an alliance of five principal tribal groupings: Bit-Yakin, Bit-Amukkāni, Bit-Dakkūri, Bit-Šilani, and Bit-Sa’alla. Within this tribal alliance, the Bit-Yakīn tribe was dominant. Indeed, one of its members, Merodach-Baladān II, known in Assyrian and Babylonian sources as Marduk-apla-iddina, gained ascendency over the larger Chaldean alliance and was able to exercise kingship in Babylon at various
times during the reigns of Sargon and his son and successor, Sennacherib. In this regard, Merodach-Baladan remained the principal focus of Assyrian attention in the south throughout the reign of Sargon and through much of the reign of Sennacherib.

In addition, anti-Assyrian activity in the south often found support in the kingdom of Elam, which extended from the lowlands east of the Tigris River into the mountains of the south-central Zagros. Rebellious elements in the south, including Merodach-Baladan, relied on Elam for military support as well as a place of refuge in the event of a successful Assyrian advance.

In the inscriptions of Sargon and Sennacherib, references to Chaldea and Chaldeans, including Merodach-Baladan, invariably include descriptions of the aqueous nature of the territory which they occupied. In addition, topographic characterizations also become prominent in passages dealing with the flight of Merodach-Baladan to those portions of the gulf coast which were under Elamite control. As in the case of territories associated with the Mediterranean coastal regions, these descriptions often appear as simple, generic phrases, many of which serve as epithets for the enemy or the territory he occupies. The phrases often shift and alternate, reflecting the varying topographic features of this region.

The opening of the campaign of the twelfth regnal year of Sargon's Annals refers to the enemy, Merodach-Baladan, by
way of a formal titulary: Marduk-apla-iddina mār Yakin šar māt Kaldi, "Merodach-Baladan, son of Yakin, king of Chaldea." This formal titulary is followed by a characterization of the enemy in terms of his topographic location: ša ina sapan tāmtim šīt Šamši šitkunu dadmesu, "whose dwelling is in the lowlands of the sea of the rising sun." The passage goes on to describe the protagonist as one who relies for his protection upon Ṣarrati u gupuš edē, "the Bitter Lake and the broad flood." As in the case of the characterization of Cyprus in Sargon’s Display Inscription, the description of Merodach-Baladan’s maritime location is somewhat more graphic than most of the simple phrases examined thus far. Indeed, this short passage seems to combine several themes, including the enemy’s distant location and aspects of his defense, presumably meant to highlight the heroic quality of the Assyrian king in pursuing this particular enemy. The effect is to describe, in one broad stroke, the variegated marine topography of southern Mesopotamia in connection with the formal titulary of the enemy ruler.

The aqueous characterization of southern Mesopotamia is also a significant feature of narratives concerning Merodach-Baladan in the inscriptions of Sennacherib, particularly as they relate to the flight of the Chaldean ruler to Elamite territory. In the account of the fourth campaign against Bit-Yakin, both the Oriental Institute Prism (H2) and the Bull Inscription (F1) describe the
maritime flight\textsuperscript{55} of Merodach-Baladan to the city of Nagîte,\textsuperscript{56} which is called ʾa qabal tāmētām, "in the midst of the sea." In his haste to retreat, the Chaldean ruler left members of his household stranded ʾaḥī tāmētām, "on the sea shore." The Assyrian king then takes prisoners from the land of Bit-Yakin, called qereb agamē u appărāti, "in the midst of swamps and marshes." This epithet appears again in the account of the fourth campaign, where Musézib-Marduk (Šuzubu) is called Kaldāya ʾašib qereb agamē, "a Chaldean who dwells in the midst of the swamps."\textsuperscript{57} Again, the material includes the various types of terrain encountered in this region.

Both inscriptions\textsuperscript{58} return to the subject of Bit-Yakin in the account of the sixth campaign, this time with respect to the niše māt Bit-Yakin, "the people of Bit-Yakin," wherein the previous flight to Nagītu\textsuperscript{59} is reviewed. In the Oriental Institute Prism (H2), the topographic designation for the city, ʾa qabal tāmētām, used in the initial account of the fourth campaign, is replaced with a geopolitical expression, ʾa māt Elami, "of (the territory of) the land of Elam." As if to compensate, the flight itself is described topographically: tāmētām rabītum ša ʾṣīt Šamši eburūma, "they crossed the great sea of the rising sun," using terminology reminiscent of Merodach-Baladan’s location as described in Sargon’s Annals.\textsuperscript{60}

The Bull Inscription (F1) applies a similar geopolitical expression to the two cities, mentioning alani
ša šar māt Elamti, "cities of the king of Elam." However, the topographic designation ša ina ebīrtān Harrati, "on the far side of the Bitter Lake," is also included. The flight passage has Harrati āburū, "they crossed the Bitter Sea," in contrast to the Oriental Institute Prism's (H2) tāmtum rabītum ša šīt Šamši āburūma. Thus, it would appear that tāmtum šīt Šamši and Harratu are interchangeable. More likely, however, the Assyrian scribes were somewhat uncertain with regard to the distinction between the estuary and the open sea. At certain times, or during certain seasons, the distinction may have been more readily discernible than at other times.

Thus, a number of topographic characterizations are applied to the territory in southern Mesopotamia and along the coast of the Persian Gulf. As in the case of the language applied to the Mediterranean coast, the terminology is generic, and is not meant to delimit territory in a formal, technical sense. Rather, the language shifts and varies in an effort to deal with the varying topographic circumstances encountered in this region.
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CHAPTER 3

BORDERS

The use of generic topographic characterizations in Assyrian royal inscriptions has been viewed as evidence of a tendency to identify and locate territory in terms of topographic features. The generic quality of these topographic characterizations, that is, their application to the territory of a particular region in general terms—mountain, ocean, desert—distinguishes them from the language of political geography in its technical aspect of boundary or border formation. The generic topographic characterizations studied thus far reveal none of the language of border formation.

In order to develop a sense of the relationship between topography and borders, the discussion must first focus on the terminology of borders in Assyrian royal inscriptions. The word most frequently employed to denote "border" in Assyrian royal inscriptions is širī. The words ītu and pātu also appear frequently. As noted, the words širī and ītu appear in juridical documents from Mari and Nuzi concerned with the delimitation of private property.1 Ironically, the word ṭīḫu, used as a border term in neo-Assyrian land-sale contracts, is not common in Assyrian royal inscriptions.
The scope and diversity of the language of borders in Assyrian royal inscriptions is perhaps epitomized in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription. The passage is ostensibly a survey of the king's domain arranged geographically, beginning rather tersely with Cyprus in the Mediterranean, Egypt, Anatolia and north Syria, and moving quickly through the central Zagros, culminating in a highly elaborate geopolitical interpretation of affairs in the south-central Zagros and Babylonia. The areas of the Taurus Mountains and the northern Zagros are bypassed, leaving Urartu and Mannea with its satellites out of the survey entirely.²

As a narrative unit, the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription is bracketed by the expressions *adi pāt māt Muṣuri,* "unto the border of Egypt," and *adi pāt Dilmun,* "unto the border of Dilmun."³ Throughout the passage, the places mentioned are carefully located in terms of borders as well as topographic features. Media is said to be *ša pāt šad Bikni,* "bordered by Mt. Bikni."⁴ The land of Raṣi is said to be *ša itē māt Elamti ša aḥ Idiglat,* "alongside Elam on the bank of the Tigris River." A list of cities is said to be *ša mīṣir māt Elamti,* "along the border of Elam." Another list of tribes is said to be *ša māt Yadīburi,* "of the land of Yadbur." This last phrase has been defined as geopolitical in that it is clearly meant to assign these tribal units to a certain territory. Thus, the
three most common terms for border, ṣišru, itû, and pātu, all appear in this passage. In this respect it could be argued that the introductory passage presents the borders of the Assyrian Empire. More accurately, the passage sketches a peripheral zone beyond which Assyrian kings were reluctant to exercise direct Assyrian control.⁵

For the most part, there seems to be no clear distinction in meaning between the terms. Indeed they appear to be interchangeable. One passage in Sargon’s Annals characterizes the city of Sam’una, together with four other towns located in southern Babylonia, as ʾṣa ṣišir māt ElamJti, "[along the border with El]am."⁶ A separate passage describes Sam’una as ʾṣa [pāṭ māt ElamJti].⁷

There are, however, a few features of the use of the terminology of borders which display a certain consistency. It would appear that, in most instances, the notion of extremity is part of the meaning of the word pātu. It is used mostly of Egypt and territory connected with the Medes in the central Zagros, representing the extreme eastern and western extent of Assyrian influence. In general, border terminology is largely restricted to territory in the northern and central Zagros, as well as southern Mesopotamia, particularly as regards the border with the kingdom of Elam. Moreover, a preponderance of material appears in the inscriptions of Sargon, with only scattered references in the inscriptions of later kings.
In addition to the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription, the use of the border term pāṭu in connection with Egypt is found in other passages. Sargon's Display Inscription also refers to the flight of the enemy usurper in the city of Ashdod, Yamani, ana itē māt Muṣuri ša pāṭ māṭ Meluhha, "to the edge of Egypt bordering on Meluhha." Here, the term pāṭu refers to the extreme limits of the Egyptian kingdom. Also in connection with Egypt, the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon refers to the city of Arza as ša pāṭi nahal māṭ Muṣur, "bordered by the 'Wadi of Egypt.'"

At the other end of the empire, the word pāṭu is used in connection with Median territory in the central Zagros, particularly territory associated with Mt. Bikni. Identified with the high peaks of the Alwand range, Mt. Bikni represented the furthest extent of direct Assyrian control in the central Zagros, where Assyrians encountered the independent Median states. The introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription refers to this region as māṭ Mādāya rūqūti ša pāṭ Šad Bikni, "distant Media bordered by Mt. Bikni." In the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon, the land of Patusarri is called nagû ša itê bīt ṭabti ša qereb māṭ Mādāya rūqūte ša pāṭi Šad Bikni, "a district bordering the salt flats, in the midst of Media, bordered by Mt. Bikni." Though not connected to Mt. Bikni, both the Annals and the Display Inscription of Sargon include a reference to territories associated with Media.
which are said to be ṣa pāṭi ṣa Aribi ṣa nipīḫ ṣaramū, "bordering on (the territory of) the eastern Arabs." 14

Sargon in the South

As noted, the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription contains a rather elaborate description of the region of the southern lowlands of Mesopotamia, along the Tigris river and its tributaries leading into the highlands of the south-central Zagros. The rather complex ethnic situation represented by the numerous Aramean and Chaldean tribes is given careful attention with regard to the territory occupied by each group. This attention involves the issue of boundaries expressed both in terms of imaginary lines, in this case represented by the most common expression, ṣa miṣir GN, "along the border with GN," as well as the natural boundaries formed by rivers.

To demonstrate the concern for political geography in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription, the discussion will focus on one statement which deals purely with the issue of boundaries, excluding topographic features. The passage includes a list of six cities which are described as ṣa miṣir Elamūti, "along the border with Elam." 15 The word adi, "including," which precedes the list, has the effect of connecting this list of cities with the tribal units that are described as ṣa māt Yadburi mala bašû, "of the entire (lit. all that exists) land of Yadbur." 16 Combined with the designation of the cities as
ša mišir māt Elamti, the passage seems intended to resolve a border issue. That is, while these towns are situated along the Elamite border, they are not Elamite towns, but are assigned to the territory of Yadbur. In this regard, the six towns serve to define the border between Yadbur and Elam.

Several of the places mentioned in this passage appear elsewhere in the inscriptions from Khorsabad. While the details may vary somewhat, there appears to be a consistent attempt to locate these places in terms of political geography. This occurs either in the form ša GN, "of GN," ša mišir GN, "along the border with GN," or both. Throughout, the issue appears to be the determination of the border with Elam, a preoccupation perhaps precipitated by the constant interference of Elamite rulers in Babylonian affairs.

The passages under consideration are the following:

1. Lie has restored part of his text from two slabs deriving from Doorway C at Khorsabad, labelled C₁ and C₂, which he does not consider to be part of his principal recension from Room II. These include:

   1-a. Mentioning Sam'ūna and Bāb-dūri in connection with Yadbur and Elam.

   1-b. A complex passage in three parts, involving:

   1-b-1. Sam'ūna, Bāb-dūri
   1-b-2. Āhilimmu, Pillutu
2.19 The flight of Merodach-Baladan to Yadbur.

3.20 A passage in the Display Inscription describes the conquest of Bit-Yakin, including the resettlement of exiles from Commagene, defensive arrangements, and the authorization of provincial officials. The toponyms listed include three that are mentioned in the introductory passage of the Display Inscription: Dūr-Tilītim, Bubê, and Til-Ḥumba. The list also includes the city of Samʿūna. There is a parallel in the Annals from Room V at Khorsabad, which Lie assigned to the narrative of the thirteenth regnal year. The text is fragmentary in the portion assigning the list of toponyms, and must be restored from the Display Inscription. It includes two toponyms, Bab-duri and Dūr-Tilītim, in place of the single Dūr-Tilītim found in the Display Inscription.

4.21 A summary of the king’s conquests in the South, including Yadbur.

The inscription on one of the doorway slabs (1a = C1) includes details regarding military action in the Yadbur region and along the border with Elam. Two toponyms are mentioned, Samʿūna and Bab-duri, which are characterized as ḫalṣē ša Šutur-Nahundu Elamû eli māt Yadburi irkusu, "fortresses which Sutur-Nahundu, the Elamite, had erected against the land of Yadbur." While this passage reflects the language of military strategy, not political geography, it clearly has political-geographic implications. The towns
are Elamite strongholds defending the border between Elam and Yadbur.

Yadbur and the Elamite border are also concerns of the passage contained on the second doorway inscription (1-b = C₂). There are actually three separate pertinent statements. The first refers to Sam'ūna and Bāb-dūri as ālānī dannūti ša māt Yadburi, "fortified cities of the land of Yadbur." That this contradicts the first doorway slab suggests that the two passages are variants.

The passage from the second doorway inscription continues with a characterization of the cities of Ahilimmu and Pillutu as ša ăṣir māt Elamti, "along the border with Elam." These two toponyms are variants of Ḫilimmu (= Ḫilmu) and Pillatu found in the introductory passage of the Display Inscription, where they are also characterized as ša ăṣir māt Elamti.

Finally, the cities of Til-Humba, Dunnī-Samaš, Bubē, and Ḥamānu, the first three of which are also included in the list of cities in the introductory passage of the Display Inscription described as ša ăṣir Elamti, are here characterized as māḫāzī dannūti ša māt Raši, "fortified settlements" of the land of Raši." While there is no explicit border language in this statement, it will be recalled that the introductory passage of the Display Inscription refers to Raši as ša itē māt Elamti, "alongside Elam." Together, the several doorway passages reflect a concern to determine the Elamite border, particularly in the
Yadbur region.

The next passage (2) reports the flight of Merodach-Baladan from Babylon to what is described as 𒈗ật 𒈭𒁇 𒈬𒈬STEM, "Yadbur of Elam." This clearly indicates that Yadbur was part of Elamite territory.

So far, all of these passages represent reports of events leading to the final goal, the defeat of Merodach-Baladan and control of southern Mesopotamia. Taken together, the passages reflect an attempt to describe what might be called the pre-conquest border of Elam. The conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that Yadbur represented a border zone between Elam and Assyrian controlled territory. Presumably, part of Yadbur was under Elamite control. The focus of the border issue involves the status of the border strongholds of Sam'ūna and Bāb-dūri.

The next passage (3) reports the conquest of Bit-Yakin, representing, for the time being, the ultimate defeat of Merodach-Baladan. The passage includes the following description of the conquered territory:

\[ 
\begin{align*} 
\text{Alamat Bit-Yakin eliš} & \ u \ šapliš \ adi \ šl \\
\text{Sam’ūna} & \ ašl Dūr-Tiltiš \ al Bubē \ ašl Til-Humba \ sa \ mišir \ māt \ Elamti \ mithariš \ abēl \\
\text{All of (lit. upper and lower) Bit-Yakin, including Sam’ūna, Dūr-Tiltiš, Bubē, Til-Humba, along the border with Elam, altogether I ruled.} 
\end{align*} 
\]

Despite the fact that this passage refers to the territory of Bit-Yakin rather than Yadbur, it is remarkably similar to the passage in the introductory section of the
Display Inscription as regards both content and structure. The territory of Bit-Yakin is qualified as elīš u šapliš, literally "upper and lower," which is semantically equivalent to the phrase māla bašû, "all that exists," applied to Yadbur in the introductory passage. In addition, the list of toponyms in both passages is introduced with the word adī, "including," and there are three toponyms common to the two lists: Dur-Tilītim, Bubê, and Til-Humba. The disputed Samʿūna, here included with the territory of Bīt-Yakin, is conspicuously absent from the introductory passage of the Display Inscription. Finally, both passages locate the toponyms ša mīšir Elami, "along the border with Elam."

It should also be noted that two of these towns, Til-Humba and Bubê, are mentioned in the second doorway passage assigned to the Annals. In that passage, they were designated as part of the territory of Raši, which, according to the introductory passage of the Display Inscription, also bordered Elam. In either case, the towns serve to delimit the border of Elam.

The account of the defeat of Bīt-Yakin (3) continues with a description of the final political organization of the captured territory, including the resettlement of exiles from Commagene and the authorization of provincial officials. Also included is the commissioning of a certain Nabû-dāmiq-ilâni in the city of Sagbat, which is established as a citadel (birtu) to prevent Elamite incursions. The issue of the border between Elam and
Assyrian controlled territory in the south is clearly at hand when the citadel is said to be founded eli ́niṣir ˇmat Elaṣṭi, "over against the border with Elam."

A final passage (4), representing a summary of the king’s conquests in the south, refers to Yadbur as ˇla iṭe ˇmat Elaṣṭi, "alongside Elam." Again, the function of this statement is to define the border between Assyrian controlled territory and the kingdom of Elam. The same statement is applied to the land of Rasi in the introductory passage of the Display Inscription.

Compared with the passages describing the Elamite border prior to the defeat of Bit-Yakin, the post-conquest borders appear to have undergone little change. That is, many of the same toponyms are used to define the border before and after Sargon’s victory in the south. There may have been a border rectification involving the cities of Sam’ūna and Bāb-dūrī, though this is not altogether clear. In any case, these passages reveal a consistent attempt to deal with the issue of the border between Elam and Assyrian controlled territory in the south.

Sargon in the Northern Zagros

As noted, the introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription, with its consistent characterizations of toponyms according to the language of political geography, completely disregards the king’s campaigns to the northern Zagros. What makes this particularly unusual is that the
language of political geography in general, including the terminology of borders, is applied frequently in several accounts of the king’s campaigns to this region.

Our principal sources for events surrounding Sargon’s struggle with the Urartian king, Ursa, for control of the northern Zagros are the inscriptions from Khorsabad, that is, the Annals and the Display Inscription, and the account of Sargon’s eighth campaign as contained in the "letter to the god" published by Thureau-Dangin, which has come to be known as the Huitième Campagne. There is also relevant material in the Ashur Prism fragment, the Cylinder Inscription from Khorsabad, and the Nimrud Inscription published by Winckler, as well as the stele discovered by L. Levine and T. Cuyler Young in the village of Najafehabad in western Iran.

This multiplicity of sources creates numerous problems with regard to the historical analysis. The problems are caused in part by the system of dating, with the prism inscriptions dated one year earlier than the Annals from Khorsabad. In addition, there are significant differences, in both arrangement and content, between the Annals and the Display Inscription.

Despite the problem of source criticism, the Annals from Khorsabad can be used as a guide in determining the basic outline of events which transpired in the northern Zagros during the reign of Sargon. As noted, Sargon’s confrontation with the Urartian king, Ursa, occurred as part
of a struggle for control in the northern Zagros. The principal staging area for this struggle was the kingdom of Mannea, with the two king's, Sargon and Ursa, vying for influence. From the time of Šamši-Adad V, Assyrian relations with Urartu focused on the issue of control and influence in Mannea. At the same time, Iranian tribal units, particularly the Medes, were infiltrating the region of the central Zagros.\(^{35}\)

As early as the year 719, corresponding to Sargon's third regnal year, the king engaged in the suppression of a rebellion in Mannea, when two Mannean cities rebelled against their ruler, Iranzu of Mannea, who had been a loyal Assyrian vassal. The revolt is said to have been inspired by a certain Metatti of Zikirtu.\(^{36}\)

The ongoing struggle with Urartu for control in Mannea seems to have occupied the king between the years 716 and 714 B.C.E, involving campaigns which are assigned in the Annals to the king's sixth through eighth regnal years. In 716, a revolt broke out in Mannea directed against Sargon's ally, Aza, the son of the previous ruler, Iranzu. The revolt, which was inspired by Ursa, involved two principal figures, Bagdatti of Uishdish and Metatti of Zikirtu, who are called \(\text{šaknūtu māt Mannāya rab̄ti}, \) "the chief governors of Mannea."\(^{37}\) With the defeat of the conspirators, sovereignty in Mannea passed to Ullusunu, another son of Iranzu. For a time, Ullusunu continued the anti-Assyrian action, but eventually surrendered.\(^{38}\)
The revolt of the Mannean governors reveals not only the impact of Urartian influence in Mannea, but the fragmented nature of the Mannean state as well. In addition to the reference to rebellious Mannean governors, two Mannean districts are mentioned in the sources in the form GN nāgâ ša māt Mannāya, "GN, a district of the land of Mannea," including Uushdiš, the home of the rebellious governor, Bagdatti. Thus, in Mannea, the Assyrians were faced with complex internal territorial relationships.

The depiction of the denouement of the struggle between Sargon and Ursa for control of Mannea appears to be one of the primary motivations underlying the composition of Sargon's Huitième Campagne. As noted, the Huitième Campagne follows an itinerary-style format, describing the progress of the army from place to place. The first appearance of the itinerary formula in the Huitième Campagne is preceded by a ruled line drawn across the width of the tablet and a short date formula indicating the month in which the campaign was undertaken. It describes the king marching forth from his capital of Calâh, crossing the Zab river at the start of his campaign.

Beginning with the march into Mannean territory, each section of the itinerary is divided by a ruled line. Each new section describes the itinerary according to an introductory formula, altu GN1 attumaš ana GN2 aqterib, "I marched forth from GN1 and approached GN2." The final section introduces the march against the city of Mušašir,
the climax of the campaign, with the expression *ina tayyārtīya*, "on my return (to Assyria)."\(^{44}\)

Together with the ruled line, the itinerary formula serves to divide the inscription into narrative units. In this respect, it could be said that the itinerary formula represents a narrative boundary. Indeed, the development of the itinerary formula in Assyrian royal inscriptions seems related to the process of experimentation with systems for dating the campaign narratives. Itinerary formulas accompany many of the eponym date formulas in the Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II and Ashurnasirpal II, which are among the earliest of the Assyrian royal inscriptions to employ the eponym system of dating the campaigns. The date formulas also serve as literary divisions, distinguishing the various campaign narratives.\(^{45}\)

Most important to our discussion, however, are the other themes and expressions which consistently appear embedded within the itinerary formulas of Sargon’s *Huitième Campagne*. These include border terms, the geopolitical expression *ša GN*, "of (the territory of) GN," river and mountain crossings, and topographic characterizations. This part of the discussion will focus on the border terms and the geopolitical expressions which are included as part of the itinerary formulas of the *Huitième Campagne*. As in the case of the language of borders applied to Elam and the territory of southern Mesopotamia in the inscriptions of Sargon, this discussion will reveal the underlying border
issues involved. We will then be in a position to understand the border-forming quality of topography.

The language of boundaries appears in the introductions to two itinerary sections, which report the king's entering and leaving Urartian territory. In this respect, the narrative refers to two boundary axes delimiting the territory of Urartu. The terminology is, however, somewhat unusual, referring to ᵜ وعن "the head of the border," and ᵤ وعن "the foot of the border."

The itinerary section of the Huitième Campagne describing the king's entry into Urartian territory begins as follows:

ultu ṭat Uiišdiš attumuš ana āl Ušqaya birti rabiti ᵜ وعن ša ṭat Urarti aqterib

I marched forth from Uishdish and approached the city of Ushqaya, a great fortress at the head of the border of Urartu.

Since the Huitième Campagne twice refers to Uishdish as a district of Mannea which Ursa had seized, the border terminology serves to mark the Urartian border beyond the territory of Uishdish, thereby challenging any Urartian claim to Uishdish.

The description of the king's departure from Urartian territory is stated in somewhat more graphic terms, but also includes the language of boundaries.

ultu ṭat Ayadi attumuš Alluria Gallania, Innaya nārāti েτেবি ana āl Uwayais েন tuklātēšu ᵤ وعن ša ṭat Urarti ša pāṭṭi ṭat Na'iri aqterib
I marched forth from Ayadi. I crossed the Alluria, Qallania, and Innaya rivers and approached the city of Uwayais, a district which he (Ursa) relied upon, at the foot of the border of Urartu bordering on Na’iri.

It should be noted that this section includes a river crossing, such that the king enters the new territory after crossing the rivers, supporting the notion of the boundary-forming quality of rivers.

Most of the other formulas introducing itinerary sections in the Huitième Campagne include aspects of political geography stated in terms of the geopolitical expression \( G\text{H}1 \, \hat{\text{sa}} \, G\text{H}2 \), "\( G\text{H}1 \) of (the territory of) \( G\text{H}2 \)," or \( G\text{H}1 \, \text{nagû} \, \hat{\text{sa}} \, G\text{H}2 \), "\( G\text{H}1 \) a district of \( G\text{H}2 \)." Many of these involve the territory of Mannea, which, as noted, was the principal staging area for the struggle between Sargon and the Urartian king, Ursa, in the northern Zagros. As the itinerary moves beyond Mannea into Urartian territory, the geopolitical expressions are less prevalent in the introductory formulas and the political divisions are less clear.

Both Missi and Uishdish are characterized as \( \text{nagi} \, \hat{\text{sa}} \, \text{mât Mannâya} \), "a district of Mannea." The city of Zirdiakka is called \( \text{birti} \, \hat{\text{sa}} \, \text{mât Hannâya} \), "a citadel of Mannea." The land of Aukane is called \( \text{nagi} \, \hat{\text{sa}} \, \text{mât Zikirte} \), "a district of Zikirtu." The Aukane formula also involves a river crossing.
I marched forth from Panzish. I crossed the Istaraura River and approached the land of Zikirtu.54

Between the two itinerary sections introduced by the formulas which refer to the borders of Urartu are five more itinerary sections, each identified by a ruled line followed by the itinerary formula. Since these sections appear between the two sections describing the two borders of Urartu, it can be assumed that they pertain to action undertaken within the territory of Urartu. Two of the formulas introducing these five sections include the geopolitical expression GNI ša GN2.55 Another introductory formula appears in a broken context wherein only the two toponyms remain.56 Of the two remaining formulas, one simply repeats the geopolitical expression applied in the introduction to the previous section,57 while the other includes a mountain crossing.58

Moreover, border terminology involving the expression ina mışir GN occurs within the body of the Ushqaya section, which is introduced by the formula describing the head of the border of Urartu.59 Within the body of the following section, whose introductory formula includes the geopolitical expression "GN1 of (the territory of) GN2,"60 a second geopolitical expression is applied separately.61

Ironically, in each instance in which the geopolitical expression "GN1 of (the territory of) GN2" occurs, the second toponym, the larger territory to which the first toponym belongs, is never Urartu. In the two instances in
which the expression appears in the formulas introducing the itinerary sections, the second toponym is Sangibutu. As noted, the first of these Sangibutu sections includes a geopolitical expression within the body of the narrative, immediately following the introductory formula. In this case, two cities are assigned to the territory of Dallaya. What emerges, therefore, is a description of geopolitical arrangements in Urartu which were either quite complex, or were not fully comprehended by the Assyrians.

As noted, the border terminology and the geopolitical expressions applied in the itinerary sections of the Huitième Campagne referring to Urartian territory relate to the land of Sangibutu. The boundary language involving the land of Sangibutu appears in the section of the Huitième Campagne introduced by the march to the city of Ushqaya located "at the head of the border of Urartu." Included in the Ushqaya section is a reference to the city of Aniastania, which is characterized as *ina mišir mašt Sangibutu birīt āl Ušqaya u āl Tarmakisa epšu*, "built along the border with Sangibutu between Ushqaya and Tarmakisa." In the introductory formula to the next section, the land of Bāri is characterized as *tukulti būlīšu ša mašt Sangibuti iqabbūšuni*, "(which) they call his choice grazing land (lit. the trust of his herd) of the land of Sangibutu," thereby assigning the land of Bāri to the territory of Sangibutu. The introduction to a subsequent section characterizes a toponym as *reš alānī dannūti ša mašt Sangibuti*
The introduction to the following section has the king marching forth ulti šilāni dānnūti ša māt Sangibutu, "from the fortified cities of the land of Sangibutu." Yet, the section introduced by the characterization of the land of Bari as the grazing land of Sangibutu includes a reference to the cities of Tarui and Tarmakisa described as ša ina māt Dallāya tamerti bit še’īšu matti epšu, "which are in the land of Dallaya, a plain, a great grain (growing) region." Since the land of Sangibutu continues to be mentioned in the introductions to subsequent sections, including one that reports the departure of the Assyrian army from Sangibutu, it is odd that the two cities are assigned to Dallāya rather than Sangibutu. The characterization signifies that there were two cities which were considered part of the territory of Dallaya, which is part of the territory of Sangibutu, which is part of the territory of Urartu. Again, the internal political relationships in the kingdom of Urartu were either quite complex, or simply misunderstood by the Assyrian scribes. Despite the confusion, however, these passages reflect a consistent attempt to define and delimit Urartian territory.

The prevalence of border terminology and geopolitical expressions in the Huitième Campagne, particularly those embedded within the introductions to the itinerary sections, is an indication that more is involved in the itinerary pattern than a simple report of the army marching from place
to place. What emerges is an effort to describe the political geography of the region by determining borders and designating territory in terms of its incorporation within particular political units. As in the case of Elam in the south, the language of boundaries focuses on the territory of the principal rival, in this case, Ursa of Urartu. Yet, there is also an attempt to otherwise assign territory geopolitically—in Mannea, Zikirtu, and within the borders of Urartu.

Only two of the expressions studied thus far in the *Huitième Campagne* appear in the Annals from Khorsabad. 70 The city of Aniastania is called ša miṣir māt Sangibuti, "on the border of the land of Sangibuti." In the same passage, the two cities, Tarui and Tarmakisa are called ša māt Dallāya, "of the land of Dallaya." None of this language applied to the northern Zagros appears in Sargon's Display Inscription. The language of political geography applied to the northern Zagros, including the border terminology and the geopolitical expression, as well as boundary-forming topography, is more prevalent in the *Huitième Campagne* than in any of the other inscriptions of Sargon.

**Sargon in the Central Zagros**

In the Annals from Khorsabad a good deal of attention is devoted to affairs in the central Zagros, a region where Assyrian interests came into contact with the emerging Median states. One passage assigned to the campaign of the
ninth regnal year, which opens as a campaign to Ellipi, Media and Karalla, includes several toponyms, each located either by means of boundary terminology or the geopolitical expression ṣa GN, "of (the territory of) GN." 71

In this passage, the land of Baʾit-ili is called nagû ṣa māt Mādāya ṣa ṣāṣir māt Ellippi, "a territory of the land of Media along the border with Ellippi." Five more lands are described as nagû ṣa māt Uppuria, "districts of the land of Uppuria." Included in this list is one town called ʿal Diristanu ṣa māt Uriakki, "the city of Diristanu of the land of Uriakki," thereby locating the town geopolitically. Five more lands are described as nagî ḫūṭī ṣa pāṭṭi māt Aribi ṣa nipīḥ Ṣamši, "a distant territory alongside the land of the eastern Arabs," 72 locating these lands in terms of political geography and topography. The list ends with a reference to nagî ḫā ṣā Ṣāl Mādāya ḥannūti, "districts of the mighty Medes."

However, while most of the toponyms mentioned in this passage from the Annals also appear in a parallel passage within the campaign narratives of the Display Inscription, 73 much of the language of political geography is missing in the latter. For instance, the land of Baʾit-ili is not located in any manner, and the reference to the districts of Uppuria is altogether lacking. Of the four places described in the Annals in connection with the alleged "eastern Arabs," two appear in the Display Inscription. In this case, Media is actually part of the list, rather than part
of a summary statement as in the Annals.

In general, the inscriptions of Sargon contain numerous examples of the use of border language and geopolitical expressions, language which is largely absent from the inscriptions of later kings. Now that the language of borders and the various border issues have been examined, the subject of topography and borders can be addressed in more detail.
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CHAPTER 4
RIVERINE BOUNDARIES

The discussion concerning the determination of the border between territory in the south controlled by Sargon and the kingdom of Elam has focused on the language of political geography as expressed in the vocabulary of boundaries, particularly the words *mišru* and *itu*. The identification of these words as boundary terms has been demonstrated in the study of the vocabulary of boundaries in the private land-sale contracts, as well as the Babylonian boundary-stone inscriptions. In passages studied in the previous chapter, Yadbur and Bīt-Yakīn, along with cities associated with them, have been described as *ša mišir māt Elamti*, "along the border with Elam," or *ša itē māt Elamti*, "bordering on (along the side of) Elam." The latter phrase was also used of the land of Raši in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription.

What the discussion did not cover was the connection between boundaries and topographic features similar to the connection made in the private land-sale contracts and in the Babylonian boundary-stone inscriptions. As noted in the discussion of those documents, the boundaries of private property could be delimited in terms of adjacent property or in terms of features of the topography, particularly rivers and canals. This section of the study will deal with the notion of riverine boundary formation in Assyrian royal inscriptions. It will seek to demonstrate
that riverine location of territory in these inscriptions has boundary-forming functions.

In Assyrian royal inscriptions, riverine location of territory is most often applied to the well-watered region of southern Mesopotamia. As in the case of the generic topographic characterizations of territory, the riverine expressions most often appear as territorial epithets. They also appear in the context of the flight of the enemy, where the topography is relied upon for protection. However, the riverine characterization of territory in southern Mesopotamia shows a far stronger connection to the language of political geography than the generic expressions. The connection with political geography is seen in terms of the boundary-forming quality of rivers.

Terminology

To begin, however, it is important to examine the terminology, as well as the particular riverine locations to which it is applied. As in the case of the private land-sale contracts, the vocabulary of riverine epithets refers not to the river itself, but to the bank of the river. The words most frequently employed are *aḫu*, literally "arm" or "side," *ṣiddu* meaning "edge" or "rim," and *kišādu*, literally "neck," but also "edge," "rim." A territory can, therefore, be characterized as *ša aḫ G/N*, *sa kišād G/N*, or *ša ṣiddi G/N*, all meaning "on the bank of the GN River."
The territory of southern Mesopotamia is frequently characterized in connection with the Tigris River and its tributaries, particularly the Uqnu, which flows into the Tigris from the highlands of the south-central Zagros. There are also numerous references to the location of territory on the shores of the Bitter Lake, which is provided with the determinative for river.

With regard to the Tigris River, the introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription characterizes the land of Raśi as ša itē Elamiš ša aḫ Idiglat, "along the border with Elam on the bank of the Tigris River." In the earliest account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1), directed against Merodach-Baladan, a number of Aramean tribes are described as ša kisād Idiglat, "on the banks of the Tigris River." Connected with the first campaign against Merodach-Baladan according to the Bull Inscription of Sennacherib (F1), composed after the sixth campaign, is a reference to the Arameans, called ša šiddi Idiglat Puratti, "on the banks of the Tigris (and) Euphrates rivers." In the Oriental Institute Prism (H2), one of the last extant editions of the Annals of Sennacherib, the city of Halule, the site of the final battle against Merodach-Baladan’s Elamite allies, is said to be ša kisād Idiglat, "on the bank of the Tigris."

In Sargon’s Annals from Khorsabad, Aramean tribal groups are frequently associated with the Uqnu River. One report assigned to the campaign of the twelfth regnal year
ments the flight of four Aramean tribes, Ru’a, Hindaru, Yadburu, and Puqudu, of whom it is said: ʻUqn̂u ʾiṣbatu, “they took to, i.e. fled to the Uqn̂u River.” Following their submission, the narrative continues with actions taken against sittit Arimē, “the rest of the Arameans,” of whom it is said: ʻUqn̂u ʾšuṣu ʾsubat rūqti dacmešunu, “their distant camp hung on to (lit. grabbed) the Uqn̂u River.” The river is then described as ʾašar tapzirtišu, “their refuge (lit. the place of their concealment).” A list of fourteen cities in the region is given the epithet ša šiddi Uqn̂u, “on the edge of the Uqn̂u River.”

In addition, the introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription characterizes a list of Aramean tribes as ša ʾaḥ Surappi Uqn̂u, “on the bank of the Surappi and Uqn̂u rivers.” In the earliest account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1), another list of Aramean tribes, two of which appear in Sargon’s Display Inscription, is given the epithet ša kišād ʾUqn̂u, “on the bank of the [Uqn̂u River.”

With regard to territory located in connection with the Bitter Lake, some of the material has been treated in the discussion concerning the generic topographic expressions. In addition to these, the introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription characterizes the territory of Bit-Yakin, the ruling tribe of the Chaldean tribal alliance, as ša kišād Marrati, “on the bank of the Bitter Lake.” The earliest account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1) applies the same expression to Chaldean territory in its
entirety. In a subsequent passage of this inscription, dealing with the conquest of Chaldea, the expression ša kišād Harrati is applied to the city of Kār-Nabû, which is located in the territory of Bit-Yakin.

The reference in the introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription to the Surappi River (or canal) along with the Uqnû in the characterization of Aramean tribes is an example of territory located along a small tributary or canal. Likewise, Sargon’s Annals characterizes small towns in the environs of the cities of Ahīlimmu and Pillatu as ša šiddi Naditi, "on the edge of the Naditu canal."

The connection between these expressions and the language of political geography is most clearly seen in a comparison with the private land-sale contracts. As noted, boundaries of private property were denoted with words like itû and šiddu. In this regard, the expression ša šiddi GN could be translated "bounded by the GN River."

In addition, boundaries denoted as šiddu and pūtu in the Babylonian boundary-stone inscriptions are frequently delimited in terms of rivers and canals, using expressions like kišād GN, "the bank of the GN canal." This type of association between the vocabulary of boundaries and the delimitation of riverine boundaries can also be seen in the references noted thus far. For instance, the introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription characterizes the land of Raši as ša itû māt Elamti ša aḫ Idiglat, "bordering on Elam along the bank of the Tigris River." Since the
discussion concerning the private land-sale contracts has demonstrated both the vocabulary of boundaries, in this case the word *itâ*, as well as the function of rivers and canals as boundaries, it appears reasonable to assume that the Tigris River was meant to function as a border between the land of Rasi and the kingdom of Elam. The passage then represents another clear example in Assyrian royal inscriptions of the boundary-forming character of rivers. Thus, expressions used to locate territory on the bank of a river can be considered riverine-boundary statements.

The connection between border issues and riverine location of territory can also be seen in the reference to the small towns in the environs of the cities of Aḫilimmu and Pillatu. As noted in the discussion concerning the vocabulary of borders, Aḫilimmu and Pillatu are described as *ša mišir māt Elamti*, "along the border with Elam." That the small towns in their environs are characterized as *ša šiddi Naditi*, "bounded by, i.e., on the bank of the Naditu canal," may be an example of the delimitation of two separate border axes, one delimited in connection with another territorial unit, the other in terms of the canal. That is, one border is delimited by the territory of Elam, while another border is delimited by the canal. This would correspond to the delimitation of boundaries in the private land-sale contracts both in terms of adjacent parcels of property and other topographic features.
The delimitation of separate border axes appears to be the purpose of the dual river locations cited. The characterization of Aramean tribes in the Sennacherib Bull Inscription (F1) as ša šiddi Idiglat Puratti, "on the banks of the Tigris (and) Euphrates rivers," has the effect of delimiting two border axes of the territory occupied by these tribes, one border defined by the Tigris River and another defined by the Euphrates. Likewise, in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription, Arameans are described as ša aḫ Surappi Uqna, "on the banks of the Surappi and Uqnû rivers." This, too, may serve to delimit two separate border axes.

As we have seen, riverine boundary formation in southern Mesopotamia is often stated with reference to three principal bodies of water: Tigris River, Uqnû River, and the Bitter Lake. The remainder of the discussion of riverine boundaries in this region will be devoted to a demonstration of the more formal features of this tripartite riverine delimitation. That is, we will attempt to show that the choice of riverine locations is not haphazard, but is part of a conscious effort to delimit territory in southern Mesopotamia according to these three rivers. Moreover, we will attempt to show that despite many of the formal similarities in the passages that display this feature, subtle distinctions, especially as regards the structure of the passage, are related to the varying approaches to Assyrian control in the south.
Riverine Boundary Formation in Southern Mesopotamia: A Comparison of the Inscriptions of Sargon and Sennacherib

There are two principal documents which relate to this discussion. The introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription contains extensive material dealing with the region of southern Mesopotamia, including riverine boundaries. Likewise, the earliest account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1) includes two passages, one dealing with the territorial divisions of southern Mesopotamia in general and another, more detailed description of Chaldean territory.

The introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription includes a section dealing with the delimitation of territory in southern Mesopotamia in terms of boundaries formed by three bodies of water: Tigris River (Idiglat), Uqnu River (Uqnu), and the Bitter Lake (Marratu). Riverine boundary formation begins with the characterization of the land of Rasi as ša itē māt Elamti ša ap Idiglat, “alongside Elam on the bank of the Tigris River.” This is followed by a list of Aramean tribes, which are characterized as ša ap Surappi Uqni, “on the banks of the Surappi River (and the) Uqnu River.” Finally, the territory of Bit-Yakin is described as ša kišād Marrati, “on the shore of the Bitter Lake.”

The persistence of the pattern is indicated by the appearance of a similar territorial delimitation of southern Mesopotamia, which is treated in great detail in the account
of Sennacherib's first campaign (A1). As part of Merodach-Baladan's preparations for the ensuing battle with Assyria, the opening of the campaign narrative describes the mustering of troops in all of the territories under his control. 30

The list of territories from which the troops are gathered includes a tripartite delimitation based on the expression ša kīšād 6N, "on the edge of the river 6N," where the three bodies of water mentioned in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription—Tigris River, Uqnu River, and Bitter Lake—again form the boundaries between the various territorial units. In this instance, Chaldeans are located along the shore of the Bitter Lake, while two lists of Aramean tribes are located along the banks of the Tigris and Uqnu rivers respectively. Thus, the passage in Sargon's Display Inscription and the account of Sennacherib's first campaign (A1), both of which deal with riverine boundaries in southern Mesopotamia, reveal a consistent outline in terms of the tripartite division of territory by means of boundaries formed from the same three bodies of water.

Nonetheless, the two passages display some structural differences. If we assume that the structure of the narrative is congruent with the territorial division, that is, that each riverine boundary statement marks the end of a narrative section, then we see that the passage in Sargon's Display Inscription seems to grow in complexity with each
new section. The treatment of territory along the Tigris River includes the single toponym, Raši, with the statement of its location bordering Elam along the bank of the river. The next section lists several tribes and actually supplies the names of two rivers, Surappi and Uqnû. This presumably marks the end of one section and the beginning of the next section which terminates with the statement regarding territory associated with the Bitter Lake. This section is highly complex, including a list of tribal groups assigned to the territory of Yadbur, the cities situated along the border with Elam, and culminating in a division of Chaldean territory according to the five tribal groups which comprised the larger Chaldean tribal alliance.

The passage in the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1) appears more formal, the structure being fairly simple and consistent. The description of territory associated with the Bitter Lake reveals some complexity in that a list of urban centers is combined with the tribal division of Chaldea. The other two sections, however, simply list the names of Aramean tribes in connection with the two rivers.

Moreover, the passages also vary with regard to the internal details, that is, the specific toponyms mentioned in each corresponding section. The list of Aramean tribes located along the Tigris River in the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1) does not include Raši, which is the only toponym associated with the river in
Sargon’s Display Inscription. The two corresponding sections which list Aramean tribes settled along the Uqnu River, are structurally identical, presenting simple lists of tribes followed by the riverine-boundary statement. Yet, of the eight tribes listed in Sargon’s Display Inscription compared to the seven in the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign, only two, Ubbulu and Ru’a, appear in both lists. The others are mutually exclusive.

However, the two corresponding sections dealing with territory associated with the Bitter Lake reveal the most subtle variations of the three pairs, as well as the most complexity. When viewed apart from the overall outline as determined by the three riverine-boundary statements, the two sections reveal important structural variations. As noted, the section in the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (Al) is less complex and, therefore, easier to define and analyze. It begins with a list of urban centers in the southern region, including Ur, Eridu, and Nemed-Laguda. This is followed by a division of Chaldean territory according to four of the tribal groupings which belonged to the Chaldean tribal alliance: Bit-Yakīn, Bit-Amukkāni, Bit-Sa’alli, and Bit-Dakkūri. These are characterized as siḥirti māt Kaldi mala bašu ša kīšad ĖMarrati, "the environs of Chaldea in its entirety, on the bank of the Bitter Lake."

The corresponding section in Sargon’s Display Inscription is far more complex. It begins with a list of
four Aramean tribes summarized geopolitically with the expression ša μāt Yadburī mala baṣ, "of the entire land of Yadbur." Three of the four tribal names, Gambūlu, Hindaru, and Puqdu, are included in the Uqnu River section of the passage in the account of Sennacherib's first campaign. In the Display Inscription, this is followed by the list of urban centers characterized as ša misir μāt Elātī, "along the border with Elam." The remainder of the passage in Sargon's Display Inscription deals with the territorial division of Babylonia and Chaldea, culminating in the location of Bit-Yakin on the shore of the Bitter Lake.

All of (lit. upper and lower) Kar-Duniash, the land of Bit-Amukkāni, the land of Bit-Dakkūri, the land of Bit-Silānī, the land of Bit-Sa'alla, the environs of Chaldea in its entirety, the land of Bit-Yakin on the shore of the Bitter Lake unto the border of Dilmun. The geographic scope of the passage includes both the northern part of Babylonia and the southern areas, most likely corresponding to the classic formulation, Sumer and Akkad. It is also a complex passage which can be divided into three distinct units: Kār-Duniash, Chaldea, and Bit-Yakin. Kār-Duniash should be considered a separate territorial unit distinct from the characterization and delimitation of Chaldean territory. This distinction is
clearly maintained in the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1), where Kār-Duniash forms a separate section.41

In many respects, the remainder of the passage covering Chaldea and Bit-Yakin resembles the division of Chaldean territory in the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1).42 Four Chaldean tribes are summarized as siḫirti māt Kaldi mala bašū, "the environs of Chaldea in its entirety," a phrase also applied in Sennacherib’s account. Likewise, the territory is located on the bank of the Bitter Lake.

However, there is one important structural difference between the two passages. In Sargon’s Display Inscription, the summarization of the first four tribal groups as comprising the entire land of Chaldea is followed by the reference to Bit-Yakin, characterized as ša kišād Marrati adi pāṭ Dilmun, "on the bank of the Bitter Lake unto the border of Dilmun." This has the effect of placing Bit-Yakin, which was in fact the ruling Chaldean tribe, outside of the Chaldean tribal grouping. By separating Bit-Yakin from the other toponyms, the language of political geography applies exclusively to the territory of Bit-Yakin, thereby serving to distinguish it from the rest of Chaldean territory.

To summarize the discussion thus far, the persistence of a tradition whereby territory in southern Mesopotamia is delimited according to boundaries formed by three bodies of water—Tigris River, Uqnû River, and the Bitter Lake—is demonstrated in the comparison of the introductory passage
of Sargon’s Display Inscription with the earliest account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1). The analysis also reveals a tradition of dividing Chaldean territory according to the principal tribal groups which formed the Chaldean tribal alliance. Where the passages differ with regard to the analysis of Chaldean territory is in the treatment of Bit-Yakin. Whereas the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign includes Bit-Yakin in the summary of Chaldean territory, Sargon’s Display Inscription has the effect of treating Bit-Yakin as a separate territorial unit.

The territorial division of Chaldea receives even more detailed treatment in the passage from the account of Sennacherib’s first campaign (A1) describing the conquest of the region following the flight of Merodach-Baladan. The passage reflects a territorial division of Chaldea based on the four tribes listed in the account of the opening of the campaign, where Chaldea is located on the bank of the Bitter Lake.

The passage can be divided into four sections, each containing a list of toponyms, mostly names of cities, summarized by the following formula:

\[
\text{naphr} \langle\text{number}\rangle \text{ alāni dannūti bīt dūrāni} \text{ ša BN adi} \langle\text{number}\rangle \text{ alāni šehrūti ša limētišunu}
\]

A total of \langle\text{number}\rangle fortified, walled cities together with \langle\text{number}\rangle small cities in their environs.

The geographic names that occur in the summaries of the four sections are Bit-Dakūrri, Bit-Ša’alli, Bit-Amukkāni, and
Bīt-Yakīn, the four tribal groups which are listed in the opening passage of this inscription. The four sections are themselves summarized with the identical formula.

\[\text{naphar 88 ālāni dannūti bīt dūrāni ša māt Kaldi adi 820 ālāni šeḥrūti ša liūmētišunu}\]

A total of 88 fortified, walled cities of the land of Chaldea together with 820 small cities in their environs.

That the numbers add up correctly is a good indication of the integrity of the passage with respect to the inclusion of the four geographic names within the larger māt Kaldi.\textsuperscript{46}

There is, however, one curious structural distinction between the list of Chaldean tribes in the opening passage of the account of Sennacherib's first campaign and the list contained in the passage describing the conquest of the region. The two lists arrange the tribal names in opposite order. Whereas Bīt-Yakīn is listed first in the opening passage, it appears last in the conquest passage.

With regard to the inclusion of Bīt-Yakīn as part of the survey of Chaldean territory, the conquest passage agrees with the opening passage of the inscription. However, the placement of Bīt-Yakīn at the end of the list in the passage describing the conquest of Chaldea corresponds to the survey of territory contained in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription, where Bīt-Yakīn is treated as a separate territorial unit.\textsuperscript{47}

Moreover, the statement regarding the location of territory on the bank of the Bitter Lake as it is reported...
in the conquest passage of Sennacherib's first campaign also bears a certain structural similarity to the survey in Sargon's Display Inscription. The list of cities assigned to Bit-Yakin in Sennacherib's account (Al) begins with seven toponyms followed by the phrase adi al Kār-Nabû ša kišad Marrati, "including Kār-Nabû, which is on the bank of the Bitter Lake."48 This is then followed by the summary statement referring to eight strongholds of Bit-Yakin and one hundred smaller towns in their environs. Just as the riverine-boundary statement is used exclusively of Bit-Yakin in Sargon's Display Inscription, it is used here exclusively of the city of Kār-Nabû. This is in contrast to the survey which appears in the opening of Sennacherib's first campaign, where the riverine-boundary statement characterizes the entire territory of Chaldea.49

**Political Implications**

To summarize, a comparison of the three passages describing the territorial delimitation of Chaldea, one in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription and two in the account of Sennacherib's first campaign, reveals certain consistent features. The division of territory according to the principal tribal groupings, as well as the association of territory with the Bitter Lake functioning as a riverine boundary, are common to the three passages. The differences are largely structural, particularly as regards
the arrangement of tribal names and the placement of the riverine-boundary statement.

While the riverine-boundary statement applies to the entire territory of Chaldea in the opening passage of Sennacherib's first campaign (AI), 50 its placement in Sargon's Display Inscription 51 and in the passage reporting the conquest of Chaldean territory during Sennacherib's first campaign 52 has the effect of restricting the characterization to a separate territorial unit. In Sargon's Display Inscription, the characterization is restricted to the territory of Bīt-Yakīn. In the account of Sennacherib's conquest of Chaldea, it is restricted to the city of Kār-Nabû, located within the territory of Bīt-Yakīn.

The separation of the territory of Bīt-Yakīn from the rest of Chaldean territory in the introductory passage of Sargon's Display Inscription can be related to the broader issue of Sargon's policy with regard to conquered territory in southern Mesopotamia. According to the chronology of the Annals from Khorsabad, Sargon managed to gain control of northern Babylonia, including the city of Babylon, during the campaign of the twelfth regnal year. 53

The final Assyrian assault on Dūr-Yakīn is the subject of the account of the thirteenth regnal year of the Annals from Khorsabad. As noted in the previous chapter, the conquest of Bīt-Yakīn included the resettlement of exiles from Commagene, defensive arrangements, and the
authorization of provincial officials. This is in contrast to the Assyrian king's treatment of other territory in southern Mesopotamia, including Chaldean territory. It seems that, in order to gain a certain propagandistic advantage in the south, Sargon handled these other territories with a certain beneficence. Indeed, the Annals reports not the conquest of Babylon, but its voluntary surrender to the Assyrian king. While stationed in the city of Dūr-Ladīnu in the Chaldean territory of Bit-Dakkūrī, the king claims to have received the citizens of Babylon and Borsippa, who invite him to enter Babylon. The narrative goes on to report the digging of a canal from Borsippa to Babylon, the defeat of the Hamarana tribe, which had been interrupting trade in the region, all of which culminates in the celebration of the ākitu festival in Babylon.

Included in the account of the conquest of Bit-Yakin is the receipt of tribute from Arameans, as well as from the Bit-Amukkāni and Bit-Dakkkūrī tribes, members of the Chaldean tribal alliance. There is no reference to appointment of officials, nor any other indication that the territory of these two tribes was incorporated into a provincial system. The implication is that Bit-Yakin, the home of Merodach-Baladan, was treated separately from the other Chaldean tribes. It is precisely this territorial dissociation which seems to be reflected in the separation of Bit-Yakin from the rest of Chaldean territory in the introductory passage of the Display Inscription.
Thus, the language of political geography applied to Chaldea in the introductory passage of the Display Inscription, including the riverine location of Bīt-Yakīn, is part of a more general policy of separating Bīt-Yakīn from the other Chaldean tribes. This, along with the numerous other riverine characterizations of territory, demonstrates the manner in which riverine statements serve to define and delimit territory and demarcate boundaries.
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CHAPTER 5
ALPINE BORDERS
IN THE NORTHERN ZAGROS

The study of the use border terminology and the geopolitical expression ša ḪN, "of (the territory of) GN," in the account of Sargon's eighth campaign known as the Huitième Campagne has shown that the itinerary structure of the document functions beyond a simple report of the Assyrian army's movement from station to station. Rather, the prevalence of the language of political geography, including border terms and the geopolitical expression, reveals a concern with the territorial delimitation of the particular political units involved: Zikirtu, Mannea, Sangibutu, Urartu, etc. The purpose of this section is to understand the language of political geography as it is revealed in the often elaborate topographic characterizations which appear in the Huitième Campagne.

The Itinerary Format

As noted, two of the itinerary formulas in the Huitième Campagne include river crossings,\(^1\) while a third includes a mountain crossing.\(^2\) The reports of the Assyrian kings crossing mountains and other physical barriers clearly function as aspects of the heroic-king motif. However, the appearance of these river and mountain crossings within the itinerary formulas, where the king's movement from one
territory to another is reported, points to the boundary-forming function of the river or mountain which is crossed. Inasmuch as the king is said to enter a new territory after the crossing, the river or mountain serves as a border between the territory from which the king disembarks and the new territory which he enters.

Indeed, the initial date formula of the Huitième Campagne includes the itinerary formula accompanied by a river crossing:

ultu āl Kalha āl šarrūtīya ʾammūṣa Zāban ʾilū ina ḫiršatīšu šarmīḵ ābir

From Calah, my royal city, I marched forth and ferociously crossed a swollen upper Zab River.

Since the itinerary format is meant to describe the movement of the king from one station to the next, i.e., from one territory to the next, these other features of the itinerary formulas, including the mountain and river crossings, as well as the characterizations of topography, must be considered aspects of political geography. That is, they serve to distinguish, define, and delimit the territory of the various political units mentioned in the itinerary formulas. Together with the ruled lines and/or the itinerary formulas, both of which serve as narrative boundaries, the topographic features serve as physical and political boundaries.

To support this thesis, the itinerary style must be examined in more detail. The itinerary style of the Huitième Campagne is neither a new feature, nor is it
restricted to documents considered examples of the "letter to the god" genre. It appears in the account of Sargon’s campaign of the sixth regnal year according to the stele discovered by L. Levine and T. Cuyler Young in western Iran, though the campaign narratives of the stele are dated by regnal year in the style of Sargon’s Annals. In addition, the itinerary format appears in the inscriptions of earlier kings which are considered annals, not letters to the god. These include the Annals of Adad-nerari II (911-891), Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884), and Ashurnasirpal II (883-859).

The itinerary style first appears in royal inscriptions during the reign of Adad-nerari II, in an inscription which also represents an early manifestation of the eponym system of dating campaigns in royal inscriptions. Ten eponym date formulas, each preceded by a ruled line, are followed by a passage which begins ina qibīt Aššur, "by the command of (the god) Ashur," and includes an eponym date formula which reads ina Simānu ina Išme annīma, "in the month of Simānu in this (same) eponym." The campaign continues with action in Hanigalbat and Gūzānu, including the crossing of the Ḫabur River, activity at the source of the Ḫabur, and culminating in the imposition of tribute. The final ruled section preceding the report of the king’s building activity employs the itinerary style. In this respect, the itinerary style marks the culmination of the campaign narrative. The first itinerary formula refers
to the topography of the campaign.

\[ \text{ina girrīyama eli ūiddi Ḥabar lū asbat ina āl Arnabani lū bēdāk} \]

During my campaign, I took up a position on the bank of the Habur River. In the city of Arnabani I spent the night.

Within this section, there are seven examples of the itinerary formula. Each example includes the verb *attummuš*, "I marched forth," in the first half of the formula, with the second half displaying some variation. The seven examples are as follows:

\[ \text{iṣtu āl Arnabani attummuš ina āl Dabite bēdāk, } \]
\[ \text{"I marched forth from Arnabani (and) spent the night at Dabite."} \]

\[ \text{iṣtu āl Dabite attummuš ana āl Sadini ērub, } \]
\[ \text{"I marched forth from Dabite (and) entered Sadini."} \]

\[ \text{iṣtu āl Sadini attummuš ina āl Kisirri bēdāk, } \]
\[ \text{"I marched forth from Sadini and spent the night at Kisirri."} \]

\[ \text{iṣtu āl Sikiri attummuš ana āl Qatni ērub, } \]
\[ \text{"I marched forth from Sikiri and entered Qatni."} \]

\[ \text{iṣtu āl Qatni attummuš ina māt Ebusi ina muḫḫi Ḥabar assakan bēdāk } \]
\[ \text{"I marched forth from Qatni, I pitched camp for the night in the land of Ebusi along the Habur River."} \]

\[ \text{iṣtu māt Ebusi attummuš ana āl Dūr-adūk-ana-pānī ērub, } \]
\[ \text{"I marched forth from Ebusi and entered the city of Dūr-adūk-ana-pānī."} \]

\[ \text{iṣtu āl Dūr-adūk-ana-pānī attummuš ana māt Lāqē ana āl Askiluriḫ Bār-Atara mār Ḥalube ukallāni lū ālik, } \]
\[ \text{"I marched forth from Dūr-adūk-ana-pānī (and) went to the land of Lāqē, to the city of Askiluriḫ, (which) Bār-Atara, son of Ḥalube, held."} \]

The entire section consists mainly of these itinerary statements along with statements regarding the collection of tribute and taxes. Together with the fact that the passage is appended to the campaign narrative, the pure itinerary
form, largely devoid of other types of material found in royal inscriptions, suggests that the passage may reflect the wholesale incorporation of a separate itinerary document.

As noted, the itinerary-style passage in the inscription of Adad-nerari II includes references to the riverine topography of the campaign. The association of the itinerary format with topography is more even clearly expressed in the Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II and Ashurnasirpal II.

The extant version of the Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II contains three date formulas each followed by an itinerary formula. The first appears two lines beneath a ruled line, while the other two immediately follow a ruled line. In each case, the date is given according to month, day, and eponym. In the first itinerary formula, the march begins from Nineveh. The two others describe campaigns undertaken from the city of Ashur. All three formulas use $\text{attummaš}$, "I marched forth," in the first half. The part of the formula which describes the destination is broken in the first example. The two remaining formulas vary with regard to the way in which the destination is described. One has $\text{ina nērebē ša šad Kirruri ērubu}$, "I entered the passes of Mt. Kirruri," while the other has $\text{ina NI [ J] issakan bēde}$, "in the passes of GN] the camp was pitched for the night."

In addition, most of the material follows the last date formula, with only short campaigns described in the first
two sections. The last section, which follows the third date formula, is also divided by additional itinerary formulas, mostly in the form \textit{išt\u{u}tu G\textsubscript{1} att\u{u}m\u{u}s} \textit{ina} G\textsubscript{2} \textit{issakan bêde}, "I marched forth from G\textsubscript{1}, in G\textsubscript{2} the camp was pitched for the night." Occasionally, \textit{aqterib}, "I approached," replaces \textit{issakan bêde} in the second half of the formula.

The Annals of Ashurnasirpal follow a similar format. The opening of the campaign account is dated \textit{ina šurrât šarrûti\u{u}ya ina mahrî palêya}, "at the consecration of my reign, in my first regnal year."\textsuperscript{13} The remainder of the inscription is dated according to eponym, with a total of seven eponym date formulas, representing six separate eponyms, appearing.\textsuperscript{14}

The seven eponym date formulas in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal II appear as follows:

I, 69:
\textit{ina lîmê annîmma Abu ûm 24 ina qibît Assûr Ištar ilânî rabûti bêlêya ištû âl Ninua attûmûs ana âlânî ya Ŝep Šad Nipur a Šad Paštata šaddê dannûti šaknû lû ṣëlik}, "In this (same) eponym, in the month of Abu, twenty-fourth day, by the command of Ashur and Ishtar, the great gods, my lords, I marched forth from Nineveh and went to the cities situated at the foot of Mt. Nipur and Mt. Pasata, mighty mountains."

I, 99:
\textit{ina lîmê šatti šumîya}, "In the eponym of the year of my name..."

I, 101:
\textit{ina lîmê annîmma ina âl Ninua usbâku}, "In this (same) eponym, while I was residing in Nineveh..."

II, 49:
\textit{ina lîmê Bêl-aku ina âl Ninua usbâkuni}, "In the eponym of Bel-aku, (while) I was residing in Nineveh..."
II, 86-87:
ina Simanu úm 1 ina Išme śa-ilima-damqa narkabāti ummānāti
akel Idiglat etebir ana māt Kamūnu ētarab, "In the month of
Simanu, the first day, in the eponym of Sa-ilima-damqa, I
mustered my chariots and troops, crossed the Tigris River,
and entered the land of Kummuh.

III, 1-2:
in a Simanu úm 22 Išme Dagan-bēl-nāṣir ištū āl Kalхи attummaš
Idiglat etebir ina ūmp ammatī ša Idigalt meddattu mātu
attaḥar ina āl Tabite assakan bēdāk, "In the month of
Simanu, twenty-second day, eponym of Dagan-bēl-nāṣir, I
marched forth from Calah and crossed the Tigris River. I
received much tribute on that bank of the Tigris River. I
pitched camp for the night in the city of Tebite."

III, 92-93:
in a Išme Samaš-nūri ina qibṭt āšur bēle rābē bēlīya ina
Ulūlu úm 20 ištū āl Kalхи attummaš, Idiglat etebir ana māt
Qepani attarad, "In the eponym of Samaš-nūri, by the command
of Ashur, the great lord, my lord, in the month of Ulūlu,
twentieth day, I marched forth from Calah, crossed the
Tigris River, and descended upon the land of Qepani."

As in the case of the Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta, the
date formulas in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal, particularly
those which present a full date in terms of month, day, and
eponym, are often accompanied by itinerary formulas. Curiously, these correspond to the first and the last three
eponym date formulas in the inscription. The last two
examples describe the march from the city of Calah, using
the verb attummaš, and include a report of the crossing of
the Tigris River. The example which precedes these two
describes the mustering of the troops followed by the river
crossing, wherein the river crossing itself seems to
replace the attummaš expression. The first example has the
king marching forth from Nineveh, again using the verb
attummaš. In this case, however, there is no river
crossing. Rather, the destination is a mountain range,
characterized as šaddê dannûti, "mighty mountains."

While the itinerary formulas which accompany the eponym date formulas in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal display a certain amount of variation, particularly in the second half of the formula which announces the destination, they all clearly involve the movement of the army from one territory to another. That they include topography is an indication that the latter also serves to distinguish one territory from another, and to identify and delimit the territory of destination.

In addition, date formulas reporting the month and day appear between the various eponym date formulas in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal. Three of these appear within the section introduced by the eponym date formula assigned to Dagan-bēl-nāṣir. 16 All three describe the king marching forth from the city of Calah, employing the verb attummu, followed by the crossing of the Tigris river and the second half of the itinerary formula. The river, thus, serves as the boundary between Assyria and the campaign’s destination.

Two other examples show a connection between the itinerary formula and topographic boundaries. 17 Both formulas refer to the king residing in Nineveh and are followed by the report of information reaching the king regarding hostile activity in the territory in question. This then becomes the pretext for the campaign. In the first example, the report of information is followed by a somewhat modified itinerary formula.
I crossed over to the Mt. Kasi\i\'ri (and) approached the city of Kinabu, the fortified city of Hulai.

Here, the mountain crossing replaces the verb *attummuš* in the standard formula. In the second example, the report of information reaching the king is followed by a date formula in terms of month and day, as well as an itinerary formula.

*Ištu al Kalizi attummuš Zaba šapli ētebir ina nērebi ša al Babite ērub Radānu ētebir ana šēp šadē šad Simaki kal ūmēya aqerib*

I marched forth from the land of Kalizi, crossed the lower Zab River and entered the pass at the city of Babite. I crossed the Radanu River and spent all day approaching Mt. Simaki.

In this instance, there are two river crossings, as well as other references to the topography, all included as part of a date formula together with an itinerary formula.

Moreover, itinerary formulas appear throughout the document unaccompanied by date formulas. The pattern seen with regard to those itinerary formulas which accompany date formulas prevails in these cases, as well. That is, the first half of the formula generally includes the verb *attummuš*, or some variant form, while the second half displays more variation, employing phrases already noted in connection with the date formulas.

For our discussion, however, the most important feature of the itinerary formulas in the Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta
II and Ashurnasirpal II is the rather consistent appearance of topographic boundaries, particularly rivers and mountains, which are embedded within the formulas. A vast majority of the itinerary formulas in these inscriptions include either a river crossing, a mountain crossing, the characterization of the formula’s destination in terms of a river or mountain location, or the king taking up a position along a river or in connection with a mountain. That these topographic features are part of the itinerary formula means that they serve to distinguish the various political units described in the formula and are, therefore, in a sense, boundary forming.

As discussed in Chapter Three, many of the formulas which introduce itinerary sections of the Huitième Campagne include the language of political geography, either in the form of boundary terminology, particularlymişru and pāṣu, or the geopolitical expression, ša GN, "of (the territory of) GN. These expressions serve as epithets to the toponyms mentioned in the itinerary formula.

In addition, the formulas often include river or mountain crossings, as well as other features of the topography. While the mountain and river crossings can be considered examples of the king’s heroic deeds, their inclusion in the itinerary formulas, together with the other aspects of political geography appearing in those formulas, points to their significance as border crossings.

The inclusion of mountain and river crossings within
the formulas introducing itinerary sections also takes place in the account of the campaign of Sargon's sixth regnal year as it is reported in the stele discovered by L. Levine and T. Cuyler Young in the village of Najafehabad in western Iran. The campaign narratives of the stele are dated by regnal year, using the system found in the Annals from Khorsabad. Following the defeat of Assur-lē'ēš of Karalla, an event which seems to be reported in a fragmented section of the Annals also assigned to the campaign of the sixth regnal year, the king enters the territory of the central Zagros. At this point, the narrative begins to reflect the itinerary style found in the *Huitième Campagne*.

Between the entry into the central Zagros and the end of the campaign narrative, the formula employed for introducing itinerary sections of the *Huitième Campagne*, ultu GN1 attumuš ana GN2 aqterib, "I marched forth from GN1 and approached GN2," appears fourteen times on the stele. Three of these include river crossings, one reports a mountain crossing, and another describes the entrance to a mountain pass.

What distinguishes the itinerary formulas of the stele from those of the *Huitième Campagne* is the absence from the stele of the border terms and the geopolitical expression which are so prevalent in the *Huitième Campagne*. Yet, both documents show evidence of the border-forming character of rivers and mountains with the reports of river and mountain crossings embedded within the itinerary formulas.
The Boundary-forming Feature of Mountains

The discussion concerning the riverine location of territory in southern Mesopotamia as reported in the inscriptions of Sargon and Sennacherib has demonstrated the border-forming character of rivers. While the itinerary formulas indicate both mountain and river crossings, it is the alpine characterization of territory that is most prevalent in the accounts of Sargon’s campaigns in the northern and central Zagros.

Topographic characterizations of territory in the mountains of the Zagros, particularly as they appear in Sargon’s Huitiéme Campagne and in similar documents, are replete with the language of political geography. This involves not only the border-forming quality of mountains, but aspects of resource and ethnic geography as well. The elaborate depictions of topography in the Huitiéme Campagne, therefore, function beyond aspects of the heroic-king motif, or as a way of entertaining a crowd gathered to hear the report of the king’s annual campaign. Topographic characterizations in the Huitiéme Campagne serve to delimit territory and to settle issues of boundaries in foreign territory.

One indication of their boundary-forming quality is the appearance of boundary terms in connection with mountains, in the Huitiéme Campagne and elsewhere. As noted, the introductory passage of Sargon’s Display Inscription characterizes Median territory as ša pāt šad Bikni,
"bordered by Mt. Bikni." A similar reference appears in the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon.

Border terms also appear in connection with the mountains of the northern Zagros. In the *Huitième Campagne*, the territory of Gizilbundi is characterized as

\[
\text{nāği ša ina šaddē nesūtī ašar rūqte usūma ina šid māt Mannāya u māt Mādāya kīma gišri parku,}
\]

A district situated in remote mountains, a distant place barring the border of Mannea and Media like a barricade.

The term *šiddu* is used to denote parallel boundary axes of property granted in the Babylonia boundary-stone inscriptions, and refers to the river bank in some of the riverine characterizations of territory seen in connection with riverine-boundary formation in southern Mesopotamia. In this case, the land of Gizilbundi serves as a boundary marker between two territories, a sort of topographic boundary stone.

The term *ittu*, another border term, is also used in connection with territory in the northern Zagros. The term is used on several occasions in the Uishdish section of the *Huitième Campagne*. That Uishdish represents a frontier zone between Assyrian controlled territory and the kingdom of Urartu is indicated by the fact that the section of the *Huitième Campagne* immediately following the Uishdish section refers to the city of Ushqaya as *birti rabīti reš mišri ša māt Urartīi "a great citadel at the head of the border of Urartu."*
One example of border terminology in the Uishdish section of the Huitiéme Campagne involves Mt. Uwaush. The elaborate topographic depiction of Mt. Uwaush in the Huitiéme Campagne qualifies it as an easily recognized boundary marker, much like the mountains of Gizilbundi, which marked the border between Mannea and Media. Indeed, the description of Mt. Uwaush includes border terminology.

\[\text{ētiq itēšu ina šibiṭi imulli zumuršu isṣabbītu}\]

Whoever crosses its border, his body is smitten by the evil wind.

Clearly, this statement is connected to the heroic-king motif, in that the king is able to conquer this difficult terrain. Yet, the word itē has been shown to be a border term. By traversing it, the king crosses at least a physical boundary, if not a political one.

As noted, Ursa is twice charged with the seizure of Uishdish, which is called "a district of Mannea." The Uishdish section also includes a kind of royal apologia, wherein the righteousness of the Assyrian king is contrasted with the mendacity of the enemy. At one point, the Assyrian king claims that he was not responsible for the outbreak of hostilities. While there is no topography involved, the passage further demonstrates the border issues in the district of Uishdish.

\[\text{aššu itē Ursa māt Urartāya pāṭtī mātīsu rapaṣṭīm lā ētiq ina šēri lā aqqu dāme qurādenyū...qāti aššīšu}\]

I swore to him (the god Ashur) that I
Moreover, the inscriptions of Sargon offer further indications that the territorial dispute between the Assyrian king and Ursa of Urartu in the northern Zagros focused on control of Mt. Uwaush. In the Annals from Khorsabad, the narrative concerning the campaign of the sixth regnal year involves the anti-Assyrian conspiracy, inspired by Ursa and undertaken by the vetica, "governors," of Mannea. The anti-Assyrian action included the slaying of Aza, the son of Iranzu and an Assyrian ally, and the abandonment of his corpse on Mt. Uwaush. The Assyrian action in response included the flaying of one of the conspirators, Bagdatti of Uishdish, on the same Mt. Uwaush. This type of reciprocal action appears symbolic. The abandonment of the corpse of Aza on Mt. Uwaush signifies control by the conspirators over that region. Sargon’s action serves to symbolize his renewed control.

The routing of Ursa and his forces is described in both the Annals and the Display Inscription from Khorsabad, as well as in the Huitième Campagne. The outline of events as described in the Annals on the one hand and the Huitième Campagne on the other is much the same. The Assyrian king captured 260 of the enemy. The Urartian king mounted a horse and fled. Sargon proceeded to chase the enemy between Mt. Uwaush and Mt. Zimur, wreaking havoc on the enemy forces along the way. Where the Display Inscription differs is in
specifically locating the defeat of the forces of Ursa in Mt. Uwaush.

I inflicted the defeat of Ursa the Urartian in Mt. Uwaush, a treacherous mountain. Two hundred fifty members of his royal entourage I captured.

While the details differ, both the Annals and the Display Inscription include within the section dealing with the battle in Mt. Uwaush a report of the restoration of territory which had been transferred from Mannean to Urartean control. This is further indication that the border issues involved varying claims to the region of Mt. Uwaush.

What is most significant, however, is the use of the other aspects of political geography, including resource and ethnic geography, which serve, particularly in the Huitième Campagne, to legitimize the Assyrian understanding of what constituted the border between the territory of Mannea, an Assyrian ally, and the kingdom of Urartu. Examples of resource geography abound in the account of the Huitième Campagne. In many instances, they appear in connection with those aspects of political geography discussed thus far, that is, border terminology and the geopolitical expression ša GN, "of (the territory of) GN." In this respect, the appearance of resource and ethnic geography must be considered aspects of the identification and delimitation of
territory. That is, they function as means of distinguishing and, thereby, delimiting the territory of the various political units.

An example of resource geography can be found in the Ushqaya section of the Huitième Campagne with regard to the city of Aniastania, which is called bit sugullatētu, "the place of his (Ursa's) herds (?)", and is located ina miśir māt Sangibuti birīt āl Ušqaya u āl Tarmakisa, "along the border of Sangibutu between Ushqaya and Tarmakisa." That the description of the region's resources is placed alongside the border language and the explicit description of the location of the town is an indication that it also serves to identify and delimit the territory surrounding the city of Aniastania.

As noted, the Ushqaya section of the Huitième Campagne is followed by the section which is introduced by a formula describing the land of Bari. The itinerary formula includes the geopolitical expression, which assigns Bari to the territory of Sangibutu. As in the case of Aniastania, the characterization also includes aspects of resource geography, describing the land of Bari as tukulti būlīsu ša māt Sangibuti iqabbūšuni, "(which) they call his choice grazing land (lit. the trust of his herd) of the land of Sangibuti." This is immediately followed by the reference to the cities of Tarui and Tarmakisa, characterized as ša ina māt Dalla'yā tamerti bit se'īšu matti epšu, "which are built in the land of Dalla, a plain, a great grain (growing) region."
That the formulas introducing the itinerary sections of the Huitième Campagne frequently employ either border terms or the geopolitical expression sa GN, "of (the territory of) GN," as a way of describing the movement of the king from one political unit to another has been discussed. Since the formula referring to the land of Bari includes a description of resources, the latter also functions as a means of identifying the new political unit. Presumably, the description of resources in the land of Dallaya serves the same purpose. In addition, the characterization of the land of Dallaya as a plain is an example of the use of topography to identify and delimit territory.

As noted, the formula which introduces the Ushqaya section of the Huitième Campagne characterizes the city as birti rabiti reš mišri ša māt Urartī, "a great citadel at the head of the border of Urartu." This statement clearly explicates the border issue. The passage which follows the introductory formula is also replete with examples of the various aspects of political geography, including border terminology, resource and ethnic geography, as well as characterizations of the topography. All of this material seems designed to justify the Assyrian king's claim with regard to the location of the Urartian border.

In this section, Ushqaya is also said to be ina nērebi ša māt Zaranda, "at the entrance to the land of Zaranda," an example of the geopolitical expression. The land of Zaranda is described as nagī kīma dalti edlatma kalât mār šipri, "a
district which, like a bolted door, kept out the messengers." Zaranda is further characterized as

\[ \text{ina šad Mallawu šad burāši pulukkiš' asātma eli tamirti māt Sübi šutalbuşat šärūriš,} \]

In Mt. Mallawu, the juniper mountain jutting out like a promontory over the plain of the land of Sübi, clothed in splendor.

The term *pulukkiš'*, applied to the mountain may be another example of border terminology used to describe aspects of mountainous terrain, much like the use of *ittu*, used of Mt. Uwaush, and *paçu*, used of Mt. Bikni.\(^49\) It is, therefore, the topography of the land of Zaranda, located in the Mallawu Mountains, to which the "locked door" image refers. The characterization of Mt. Mallawu as a "juniper mountain" is an example of resource geography, wherein the territory is identified in terms of the natural resources to be found in the region. The passage, thus, combines border terminology with features of the topography, as well as resource geography.

The passage then goes on to describe the special equestrian skills possessed by the people of this district, presumably Zaranda.

\[ \text{nišē ašibūt nāgî šuātu ina māt Urartî mał bašû īe'at sisê pēṭalliām īa išṣu tamsīlšun} \]

In all the land of Urartu, there were none to compare with the people of this region (as regards) ability with horses and cavalry.

This is then contrasted with the lack of horsemanship in the
land of Subi, described as ṇañī ṭa niṣē māt Urartī māt Mannāya iqabbūšunī, "a region which the people of Urartu call Mannea." All of this can be seen as aspects of ethnic geography. The fact that the people of Zaranda are considered skilled equestrians in the land of Urartu, while the people of Sūbi are not, serves to distinguish the two peoples and to locate the people of Subi outside of Urartian territory. That the people of Urartu refer to the Sūbians as Mannean further legitimizes the distinction that is first offered in terms of ethnic geography.

Thus, beyond the reference to Ushqaya as being located on the border, the elaborate characterizations of the political geography of this region, including the topographic characterizations, seem intended to establish the fact that Urartian control begins at Ushqaya, which protects the passes leading to the land of Zaranda in the Mallawu Mountains, but that the plain of Subi, which the fortress overlooks, is not part of that territory, but should be considered, like Uishdish, part of Mannean territory. Beginning with the rēš miṣri, the Assyrian king is in the recognized Urartian sphere of influence.

To the Urartian, Mt. Uwaush marked the border, beyond which he apparently recognized Assyrian-allied control. In the Ushqaya section of the *Huitième Campagne*, the Assyrian king claims Uishdish, including Mt. Uwaush, as well as the plain of Sūbi, locating the border at the entrance to the land of Zaranda in the Mallawu Mountains. The *Huitième*
Campagne employs descriptions of the mountainous topography, as well as ethnic and resource geography, to legitimize the Assyrian king’s claim, and to counter the Urartian king’s claim to territory associated with Mt. Uwaush.

The use of topographic characterization as an aspect of border formation can also be seen in Sennacherib’s so-called "letter to the god." As part of Sennacherib’s campaign in Palestine, the document describes the king’s attack on the city of Azeqa. The passage includes border terminology together with a graphic description of the topography.

Azeqa, his stronghold (lit. house, or place of his trust), which is between my borders (i.e., territory) and the land of Judea[...] situated atop the mountain peaks like the point of iron daggers without number, as high as heaven...

The passage is intended to draw the border between Assyrian controlled territory in Philistia and the independent kingdom of Judea. Such being the case, it is important to note that Azeqa is located in the lowlands of Judea, the rolling hills situated between the mountains of Judea and the sea, a region known in Hebrew as the Šefelah. It could hardly be located on a particularly imposing mountain. An accurate description of the topography appears, therefore, to be subordinated to the requirements of border formation. That is, the mountain is described in
these grandiose terms in order that it qualify as a proper border marker.

So far, the discussion has demonstrated the use of border terms in connection with mountainous terrain, particularly in Sargon’s \textit{Huitième Campagne}. In several instances, the border-forming quality of mountains has been clarified. The combination of border terms, topographic characterizations, resource and ethnic geography have been shown to be important tools in the delimitation of territory in the northern Zagros. We are now in a position to better understand the significance of the rather elaborate topographic characterizations found in the \textit{Huitième Campagne} and elsewhere. The prominent features associated with the high peaks of the northern Zagros make them easily recognizable boundary markers.

As noted, the territorial dispute between Sargon and the Urartian king, Ursa, for control of the northern Zagros focused on the Mannean district of Uishdish. It appears that Ursa meant to encroach on Mannean territory, using the prominent Mt. Uwaush to mark the border between Urartian controlled territory and territory controlled by the pro-Assyrian factions in Mannea. While the location of the Urartian border at Ushqaya in the \textit{Huitième Campagne} was meant to challenge the Urartian king’s border claims, it appears that Mt. Uwaush marked the border between the Mannean district of Uishdish and the plain of Subi which lay beyond the mountain. Presumably, the prominent appearance
of the mountain made it a suitable boundary marker. The

Huitième Campagne describes Mt. Uwaush in graphic detail.

Mt. Uwaush, great mountain, whose peak touches upon the cloud formation in the heavens, which from days of old, no creature has crossed... nor seen its remote regions, and no bird has flown over... high mountain, sharply pointed like a dagger (with) fissures and mountain canyons... in the peak of summer and the height of winter, snow falls day and night, covering it. Whoever crosses its border is smitten by the evil wind.

This depiction involves not only topography, but also meteorological conditions, as well as a point concerning the absence of certain fauna. Naturally, all of this could be considered aspects of the motif of the heroic king who overcomes formidable physical barriers. Yet, the boundary-forming quality of this mountain has been noted. As such, the prominent features of the mountain make it an easily recognizable boundary marker.

In addition, the section of the Huitième Campagne following the announcement of the campaign, expressed in terms of the date formula, the march from Calah, and the crossing of the Zab River, and preceding the first itinerary section is replete with the language of political
geography as it has been defined here, including examples of
the geopolitical expression ša GN, "of (the territory of) GN," mountain and river crossings, resource geography, and
graphic depictions of topography. As noted, this section
does not strictly follow the itinerary format of the rest of
the document. However, the itinerary formula is represented
in the numerous appearances of terminology connected with
the second half of the formula which describes the
destination. For example, after crossing the lower Zab
River, the king enters a mountain pass, using a form of the
verb itrubu, "to enter," which was seen in several examples
of the itinerary formula.

\[ \text{ina nērebi ša šad Kullar šadı zagri ša māt Lullumı\nša māt Zamua iqabbūšuni etarba} \]

I entered the pass of Mt. Kullar, a high
mountain of the land of Lullum which
they call the land of Zamua.

While the mountain is described in generic terms, the
passage includes an aspect of ethnic geography in reporting
on the various ways of referring to the territory in
question.

Another passage describes a mountain crossing,
including a graphic depiction of the topography. Again, the
terminology of mountain crossing has been noted in
connection with the itinerary format.

\[ \text{ina birit šad Mikippa šad Upa šadde\nelditı ša gimir iše hitlupūmа gerbišun esitumma pitlühu nērebšun kīma qištı
erënı elı tamertı<šu>nu şillu tarsuma} \]
I passed between Mt. Nikippa (and) Mt. Upa, high mountains completely covered with trees, such that their inner regions are confusing, their passes frightening, casting a shadow over the plain like a cedar forest. Whoever travels their paths cannot see the splendor of the sun.

While the imposing character of the mountains could constitute an example of the heroic-king motif, the graphic depiction of topography also serves to identify and define the region.

An equally graphic depiction is provided for Mt. Simirria, where the king established an encampment. The passage continues with various mountain and river crossings. In one instance, the fragrant aroma of the flora in a mountain region is reported, representing an example of resource geography. The descent into the land of Surikas is expressed in a manner which reflects the itinerary formulas of the Huitieme Campagne, including the use of border terminology.

That rivers are boundary forming has been demonstrated in the study of riverine borders in southern Mesopotamia. The boundary-forming quality of rivers can also be seen in the river crossings which are often included in itinerary formulas found in Assyrian royal inscriptions, including
Sargon's *Huitième Campagne*. Since the itinerary formulas describe the movement of the king from one territory to another, the river serves as a boundary.

Many of the itinerary formulas include mountain crossings. Moreover, the evidence of the *Huitième Campagne* has demonstrated the significance of mountains in the determination of the border between Assyrian controlled territory in the northern Zagros and the kingdom of Urartu. The two mountains upon which the border dispute focused, Mt. Uwaush and Mt. Mallawu, are characterized in vivid detail in the *Huitième Campagne*. The characterizations include features of the topography, including atmospheric conditions, resources, flora, and fauna, as well as ethnic geography. Since the issue is border formation, these characterizations serve to identify the mountain and thereby mark the border. Thus, topography in Assyrian royal inscriptions must be considered an aspect of political geography.
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PART II
EXCHANGE OF TERRITORY
CHAPTER 6
SEIZURE OF TERRITORY

There are a number of themes in Assyrian royal inscriptions which involve the transfer of territory. These can be distinguished in terms of three basic means by which control of territory passes from one party to another. One involves what might be called expropriation, that is, the hostile seizure of territory from Assyria, or one of its allies, by an enemy. Contrariwise, territory conquered by the Assyrian king is brought under Assyrian control through a process of annexation. Territory can also pass peaceably from Assyrian control to the control of another party by means of a land grant. The discussion will focus on the first two processes, since they are most frequently represented.

In many respects, the themes of seizure and annexation are related. Like other instances in these narratives, the theme of enemy expropriation is stated in relation to a military campaign. Each act of expropriation requires some form of restitution, which takes place in the course of the campaign and is, in a sense, its justification. That is, an act of seizure creates an imbalance which must be rectified through reconquest and restoration of the former status quo. What happens to territory reclaimed in this way amounts to an intricate literary web of territorial issues such as annexation, province formation, and grants of territory, the latter often associated with the language of regime.
establishment. As a result, it is often difficult to analyze the individual motifs within the tightly-knit fabric of the narrative. What can be demonstrated, however, is that the inscriptions of Sargon provide a number of intricate accounts of territorial issues surrounding the various types of exchanges of territory. The quantity and intricacy of these narratives is not found in the inscriptions of later kings.

**Terminology**

The seizure of territory by an enemy is most often expressed by a form of the verb *ekētu*. A passage from Sargon's Cylinder Inscription, which generally reports the king's military exploits in short participial epithets, demonstrates many of the territorial issues surrounding the hostile seizure of territory. The passage names Mita of Musku (Phrygia), then applies to the Assyrian king the epithet, *mutir ḥalšē māt Que ekētē murappišu pulungēšun*, "the one who restores the seized fortresses* of the land of Que, extending their borders." This passage notes the role of the Assyrian king as the restorer of expropriated territory, while the phrase *murappišu pulungēšun* connects the event with the issue of borders.

Many of the same themes appear in the expanded version of affairs in Phrygia found in the Annals from Khorsabad, where the account of the campaign of the seventh regnal year
includes two variant versions of an encounter with Mita, both of which refer to cities belonging to the territory of the land of Que. The second account qualifies the status of the cities as ḫalṣē, "fortresses." Both versions refer to the past, during which Mita had seized the cities, using the simple third person subjunctive, ēkimu. In the first passage, the Assyrian king conquers and despoils the cities, with no report of their ultimate political disposition. In the second passage, however, the role of the king as restorer is indicated by the phrase asrūššu uterra, "I (re)turned to their (proper) place." 7

Seizure of Territory in Mannea

Like the language of political geography, the complexity of these territorial issues in the inscriptions of Sargon is best exemplified in the various narratives involving the kingdom of Mannea in the northern Zagros region, and its king, Ullusunu. Territorial issues involving the fragmented nature of Mannea has been discussed in Chapter Three. There, it was noted that Mannea consisted of a number of districts, whose rulers often exerted independent power. This is most apparent in the Urartian-sponsored rebellion of several Mannean governors against the pro-Assyrian ruler in Mannea.

It was also noted that the internal complexity of the Mannean kingdom made it a suitable stage for the carrying
out of the struggle between King Sargon and the Urartian ruler, Ursa, for control of the northern Zagros. A major issue in Sargon's campaign narratives relating to Mannea is the seizure of Mannean territory by Ursa.8

The issue of the seizure of Mannean territory as expressed by forms of the verb *ekēmu* becomes a point of overlap among numerous inscriptions of Sargon. Yet, while the root term remains consistent, the form and structure of the various usages differ. A comparison of the various versions of these events reveals a certain ambiguity as to the details of the transfer: which territory is seized from whom and by whom. Ultimately, this ambiguity may arise from the internal complexity of Mannea, and the internal territorial issues involved.

An early account of affairs in Mannea appears on the prism fragment from Ashur.9 In this case, the account of the sixth regnal year refers to events that are said to have transpired *ina alāk girriya māḥri*, "in the course of my previous campaign." According to the prism fragment, Ullusunu became subject to Assyrian authority in the course of that previous campaign, i.e., of the fifth regnal year. The prism then goes on to describe Ursa's undermining of the defensive arrangements made in Mannea, which becomes the pretext for the new campaign.

12 halšešu dannāti ša eli māt Urartī māt Andia māt Na'īri ana kādi nada ḫkimšuma usahhir masu
12 of his (Ullusunu's) strong fortresses, which were founded as outposts against Urartu, Andia and Na'iri, he (Ursa) seized from him, reducing (the size of) his land.

It is important to note that the fortresses are clearly under the control of Ullusunu. Their seizure results in the diminution of his territory.

So far, all of this material seems to be connected with the former campaign, the fifth of the prism. As the account of the sixth regnal year resumes, the king proceeds to conquer and despoil the outposts, stationing therein troops of his own, as well as those of Ullusunu. A certain sense of balance is restored in the return of the seized cities to Assyrian and allied control.

In seeking the parallels to this narrative in later inscriptions, one must bear in mind that Sargon's prism inscriptions generally date campaigns one year earlier than the corresponding narratives in the Annals from Khorsabad. This would mean that the campaign of the sixth regnal year in the Ashur Prism should correspond to the account of the seventh regnal year of the Annals. If the alāk girriya māphri of the prism refers to the campaign of the previous regnal year, the fifth, this would correspond to the sixth regnal year of the Annals.

However, the only correspondence between the account of the "the previous campaign" in the prism and the campaign of the sixth regnal year of the Annals is the report of the submission of Ullusunu. The account in the Annals reports
Ullusunu's continuing anti-Assyrian activity following the defeat of the conspirators and his own accession to the Mannean throne. It is the threat of the approaching Assyrian army which ultimately induces Ullusunu's surrender.\footnote{13} The prism, at least the surviving remnants of it, makes no mention of Ullusunu's complicity in the initial anti-Assyrian conspiracy involving Ursa and the šaknūti of Mannea, as reported in the Annals.\footnote{14} Ullusunu remains a loyal ally in the prism account, and the fortresses appear to be restored to something of their former status.

In the Annals from Khorsabad, the account of Ursa's seizure of Mannean territory is assigned to the campaign of the seventh regnal year.\footnote{15} This account involves the conspiracy of Ursa of Urartu together with a certain Dayaukku, called šakin māt Mannāya, "governor of Mannea," and directed against Ullusunu. Embedded within the terms of this conspiracy expressed as acts of lying and slander, this version of events includes the statement, \textit{22 birātīšu ākīmmu}, "twenty-two of his citadels he (Ursa) seized from him (Ullusunu)." As in the Ashur Prism, the cities were presumably under the control of Ullusunu. However, in this case, the recapture of the cities does not lead to the restoration of the prior condition. Rather, the strongholds are conquered and apparently annexed to Assyria.\footnote{17}

Sargon's \textit{Huitième Campagne} also refers to Ursa's seizure of Mannean territory. The first reference involves
the Assyrian king's initial march toward the territory of Uishdish, called "nagû ša mât Mannâya ša Ursa ēkimûš, "a district of Mannea which Ursa seized." 18 The end of the Uishdish section in this document describes the seizure in similar terms, with one additional phrase: "nagû ša mât Mannâya ša Ursa ēkimûma ramânuš utirru, "a district of Mannea which Ursa took and claimed (lit. turned) to himself." 19 In this case, the text goes on to describe the destruction of towns in the region, whose provisions were used to supply the Assyrian army. 20 There is no explicit indication as to the final disposition of this territory.

The interesting feature of these episodes is the ambiguity that they contain. So far, each statement of seizure has included the verb ekešu, in most instances modified with some variation of the 3 m.s. dative suffix. While the true dative meaning could be applied, i.e., he (Ursa) seized for him(self), there remains a certain ambiguity in that the suffix could be interpreted as an ablative, i.e., he (Ursa) seized from him (Ullusunu). The one example that does not apply the suffix, the second example from the Huitiéme Campagne, substitutes the phrase ramâsuš utirru, "he turned to himself." Since this locative phrase seems to substitute for the suffix in the first example, the dative significance of the other suffixes seems assured.

However, the analysis is further confounded by the appearance of ekêmu in the account of the eighth regnal year
of the Annals. In this narrative, the pursuit of Ursa between Mt. Uwaush and Mt. Zimur\textsuperscript{21} includes a reference to the district of Uishdish.

\begin{verbatim}
Maṭ Uṣiṣidīš Maṭu nagū řa Maṭ Mannāya ēkim̥aššuma ana Ullusunu Maṭ Mannāya addin
\end{verbatim}

Again, the use of the dative suffix results in a certain ambiguity. There are at least two ways to translate this passage.

- The land of Uishdish, a district of Mannea, I seized from him (and) gave to Ullusunu the Mannean.

- The land of Uishdish, a district of Mannea, (which) he (Ursa) seized from him, I gave to Ullusunu the Mannean.

Each of these choices presents difficulties of its own. The first case would involve an ablative suffix, with the king as subject and Ursa as object, as opposed to the dative meaning determined for the earlier passage. The ablative significance of the suffix would also represent a rare example of the Assyrian king's seizure of territory expressed in terms of \textit{ekēmu}, a term that seems to be reserved for seizure of territory by foreigners. Moreover, it would mean a change of subject, an alternation that could only appear with this class of verbs. To assume the dative meaning, as in the second choice, would reflect a situation in which the king is granting land for which there is no statement of conquest.

Unfortunately, the material dealing with the transfer
of Mannean territory as reported in Sargon’s Display
Inscription only adds to the confusion. What is described
here is not the seizure of the twenty-two citadels by Ursa,
but rather Ullusunu’s offering the cities as a bribe to
Ursa.

\[22 \text{ birātī ki ṭaʾṭūti iddinšu}\]

he gave him (Ursa) twenty-two citadels
as a bribe.\[29\]

In this case, the transfer is connected with the initial
anti-Assyrian conspiracy, corresponding to events of the
sixth regnal year of the Annals.

However, the narrative proceeds with details found in
the account of the eighth regnal year of the Annals.\[26\] As
in the Annals, the pursuit of Ursa is interrupted by a
report concerning the transfer of territory. This report
represents a blending, or dovetailing, of language found in
two separate narratives in the Annals.

\[22 \text{ birātī ša Ullusunu māt Mannāya}\]
\[\text{ēkimāššuma ana mīšir māt Assur utirra}\]

Twenty-two citadels of Ullusunu the
Mannean I took from him (Ursa) and
(re)turned to the border of Assyria.\[27\]

The form of the verb \emph{ekēmu} is exactly the same as that used
to describe the seizure of Uishdish from Ursa in the account
of the eighth regnal year of the Annals. Yet, it involves
not the territory of Uishdish, but the twenty-two citadels,
which are annexed, as in the account of the seventh regnal
year of the Annals. Moreover, the passage displays much of
the ambiguity found in the Annals, offering at least one other interpretation:

The twenty-two citadels belonging to Ullusunu of Mannea, which he (Ursa) had seized, I restored to the border of Assyria. 28

However, the matter does not end there. The final disposition of Ullusunu and Mannea in the Display Inscription is described in a separate section which includes the reinstatement of Ullusunu corresponding to the account of the sixth regnal year of the Annals. In this case, re-enthronement is accompanied by a land grant.

22 birāti adī 2 ālānīšu dannūti ša ultu qāti Ursa u Mitatti ēkīma addinīšu

Twenty-two citadels together with two of his fortified cities, which I took from Ursa and Mitatti, I gave to him. 29

Several features of this passage connect it, at least at a terminological level, to the grant found in the eighth regnal year of the Annals. The cities granted are said to have been seized, ēkīma, from Ursa of Urartu and Mitatti of Zikirtu, just as Uishdish had been seized in the Annals. The term of granting, nadānu, is also common to the two narratives. 30 Yet the territory granted is the twenty-two citadels, not Uishdish. Indeed, references to Uishdish in the Display Inscription are restricted to the initial conspiracy of the šaknūti and the punishment of Bagdatti. It is neither seized nor restored, nor is it explicitly connected with Ullusunu or Mannea.
Thus, in each case in which territory is seized by the Assyrian king, it does not remain under direct Assyrian control, but is ultimately transferred to another party. This further confirms the distinction between seizure, largely applied to foreigners, and Assyrian annexation. Yet, while the two inscriptions from Khorsabad offer much the same terminology, subtle alternations of structure and usage produce two significantly different passages. The complexity of the analysis of these passages seems to represent a concern for territorial issues; an attempt to place complex territorial relations into a simplified terminological framework.

Other Acts of Seizure

That the word *ekēmu* is largely restricted to instances of illicit seizure by an enemy can be further demonstrated by passages in Assyrian royal inscriptions referring to the seizure of private property. As in the instances of the seizure of territory discussed so far, the seizure of private property also requires a restitution. In Sargon’s Annals and Display Inscription, the reference is to private property belonging to certain citizens of the ancient centers of northern Babylonia—Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, and Borsippa—which had been seized by the Sutu tribe allied with Merodach-Baladan.

*eqlātīšumu ša ultu ūme ullūti ina ēsīti māti Sutī ekīmūtu ramānuššun utirru*
Their fields, which in those days, during (the period of) disorder in the land, the Sutu people had seized and turned over to themselves...

Note that the statement of seizure is the same as the one applied to Ursa’s seizure of Uishdish in the Huitième Campagne. While the two inscriptions from Khorsabad agree with respect to the seizure of this property, the description each offers of its restoration to its rightful owners varies. The Annals offers an expression containing features that are mostly familiar, but with one anomaly.

\[ \text{kisurrēšunu ekmuti utir āšruššun} \]
their seized boundaries I restored to their place.

The border language presented by the term kisurru is rare in these inscriptions. That it is explicitly connected with ekēmu is a feature of boundary language not noted so far, although border issues were observed in connection with the cities of Que seized by Mita as it is described in the Cylinder Inscription. In the Annals, the phrase describing the restoration of the cities of Que is the same \( *ašrum turrur \) seen here.

Somewhat surprising is the statement of restoration found in the parallel passage in the Display Inscription.

\[ \text{kisurrēšunu mašāti ša īna diliḫ māti ibbatlū ušādgila pānuššun} \]
their forgotten boundaries, which had been disregarded during (the time of) trouble in the land, I reassigned to them.
A new element is introduced in this passage in the form of the statement of restoration, *pānum śudgulu*, "to (re)assign, hand over." This vocabulary is found elsewhere. Quite similar to the Sutu seizure of private property in the inscriptions of Sargon is the account of the seizure of fields belonging to citizens of Babylon and Borsippa by Šamaš-ibni, king of Bit-Dakkūri, as reported in the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon. Here, the seizure is described in terms that seem to parallel the *ekēmu* expression found in connection with the seizure of private property in the inscriptions of Sargon, though the term *ekēmu* is not used.

\[
\text{ša eqlēt mārē Bābilāni u Barsip ina parikte itbalūma utirru rațānu数目}
\]

who carried off the plowed fields of the citizens of Babylon and Borsippa by force and turned over to himself.

The restoration of this private property is stated in terms reminiscent of the private-property passage in Sargon’s Display Inscription.

\[
eqlēti šatina utirra pān mārē Bābili u Barsip uḫadgil
\]

I returned these fields and assigned them to the citizens of Babylon and Borsippa.

Thus, the seizure of private property also requires an act of restitution on the part of the Assyrian king.
the remaining examples from the inscriptions of Sennacherib and Ashurbanipal, the act of restoration is expressed in terms of the statement *ana mišir maṭ Aššur turru, "to (re)turn to the border/territory of Assyria." The same expression was applied to the twenty-two Mannean cities in the inscriptions of Sargon.

In the Oriental Institute Prism of Sennacherib (H2), the seventh campaign against Elam begins with an account concerning two cities which had previously been under Assyrian control, but which had been seized by the Elamites. Notably, the Mannea passages in the Prism B inscription of Ashurbanipal, which provide the sole examples of the language of territorial exchange in the inscriptions of this monarch, also present an interesting combination of themes and expressions found already in Sargon's Mannea passage and in the Elam passage of Sennacherib discussed above. Here, the Manneans themselves, under the leadership of Ahseri, are involved in two instances wherein they are subjects of the verb *ekēsu. The
first case involves seizure described by means of language reminiscent of the seizure of Mannean territory by Ursa in Sargon's Huitième Campagne.

Cities in the environs of the city of Pattiri, which in the period of the kings, my fathers, the Manneans had seized and turned over to themselves.

In this case, it is not clear whether the cities had previously been under the control of Assyria or an independent city of Pattiri.

A similar event takes place following the king's return to Assyrian territory, as indicated by the expression *akbusa "I stepped across the border of Assyria."

That the cities listed are considered part of Assyrian territory is explicit in the statement of seizure, reminiscent of the statement of Elamite seizure in Sennacherib's Oriental Institute Prism.

In each of these passages, the sequel describing the Assyrian king’s actions in response to the seizure involves some form of the expression *ana "to turn over to the border/territory of Assyria." While this it appears to be a simple statement of annexation, there are
numerous difficulties encountered in connection with this expression.

Whether *turru* should be translated "to return to" or "to turn over to" depends upon the former status of the territory in question. If the territory is described as having formerly been under Assyrian control, then the statement amounts to an act of restoration or restitution. If, however, the territory is said to have been under the control of another party, then the statement would appear to refer to an act of Assyrian expropriation and annexation. While the two issues, restoration and annexation, may be related in that irredentist claims are often used as a pretext for conquest and annexation, the distinction should not be overlooked.

In addition, the classification of the expression *ana mišir māt Assur turru* as a statement of annexation can also be questioned. In the Display Inscription of Sargon, the twenty-two Mannean cities, to which this statement is applied, are eventually restored to the control of Ullusunu. In this case, the statement of annexation could be considered a kind of propaganda device. The king asserts control over the cities, then, in an act of beneficence grants the cities to Ullusunu.

More important, however, is the nature of control implied in the statement. That is, the expression itself does not indicate the instruments of control and political organization. Thus, in order to fully understand this and
similar expressions, the nature of Assyrian control of conquered territory must be examined.
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CHAPTER 7
THE STATUS AND ORGANIZATION OF
CONQUERED TERRITORY

The subject of Assyrian organization of conquered territory is complex. To begin, one confronts a number of theoretical issues involving the expansion of any state and the development of empire. Here, one becomes caught in a web of definitions. Terms such as "state," "imperialism," and "sovereignty" are not to be treaty lightly. Yet, it is not our purpose to treat such theoretical topics as the nature of the state, center-periphery relations, institutional restructuring, to mention but a few of the issues treated by sociologists, anthropologists, and political scientists.¹

While it may seem simplistic, the definition of imperialism offered by George Lichtheim offers a good perspective on the nature of the Neo-Assyrian Empire: "...the relationship of a ruling or controlling power to those under its dominion."² In royal inscriptions, the Assyrian king’s relationships with foreign rulers and territories is generally described in terms of the latter’s subservience. However, the inscriptions themselves reveal various levels and methods of control or coercion in foreign territory. This ranges from the delivery of "tribute" by an otherwise independent ruler to Assyrian annexation of
foreign territory and its incorporation into the Assyrian provincial system.

In this chapter, we will present a survey of issues relating to the nature of Assyrian control of conquered territory in various regions of the empire. The survey will demonstrate that the level and methods of control in foreign territory as they are reported in Assyrian inscriptions display certain regional variations. Both Assyria's ability to control certain regions, as well as the underlying policy goals and motivations, engendered various institutions of control.

As noted in Chapter Three, Sargon's Display Inscription contains a summary passage apparently reflecting the king's perception of the borders, as it were, of his domain. This is not to say that the passage is meant to delimit borders in any technical sense, but to define a border or peripheral zone. In general terms, one could say that this summary represents the Sargonid ideal of the extent of Assyrian dominion. That is, beyond the rather rough peripheral area defined by Sargon's summary passage, Sargonid kings tended to avoid direct Assyrian political control, relying instead on nominally independent vassals. Inside the peripheral area, conquered territory was subject to incorporation into the Assyrian provincial system.

The study will begin with an examination of those areas which seem to lay outside the sphere of direct Assyrian political control. The focus of the discussion, however,
will be on the language of annexation and province formation. The ways in which the language of annexation and province formation are combined, as well as the concomitant instruments of control in annexed territory, will be examined. We will then be in a position to analyze some of the regional issues as they relate to annexation and province formation. Finally, we will attempt to show that some of the language commonly associated with annexation, particularly the expression *ana mišir māt Assur turru, "to turn over to the border/territory of Assyria," in fact expresses a more generalized conception of Assyrian control in conquered territory.

Peripheral Territory: The West

The patterns of Assyrian expansion reflect a certain reluctance on the part of Assyrian kings to bring territory west of the Euphrates under direct Assyrian control. While direct control of the mountainous regions west of the Euphrates was eventually undertaken by Assyrian kings, the desire to avoid direct involvement in the political structure of territories located along the coast of the Mediterranean, particularly the Phoenician and Philistine city-states, persisted.

The primary function performed by the states along the Mediterranean coast was maritime trade. Living in a land-locked country, the Assyrians were ill-equipped to exploit the Mediterranean trade, which brought luxury items from
Egypt, as well as precious metals from the western Mediterranean, into western Asia. In addition, the overland trade routes which linked Egypt with western Asia traversed the Sinai desert region, forcing a dependence on the Arab tribes which possessed the skills and equipment needed for such an expedition.

These factors engendered a number of different patterns of Assyrian domination in this region. The first Assyrian king to attempt any form of organized control of the Mediterranean coast was Tiglath-Pileser III (745-727 B.C.E.). In 738 B.C.E., the Assyrian king suppressed an uprising staged by a coalition of Syrian states. Pressing his campaign to the coast, the king conquered several important cities in the northern part of the Mediterranean littoral. These he organized into Assyrian provinces.

However, during the years 734-732 B.C.E., Tiglath-Pileser faced another serious threat to his domination of territory west of the Euphrates. A coalition of western kings, including Aram-Damascus, the kingdom of Israel, as well as the kingdom of Tyre, was suppressed in a sweeping campaign which brought virtually all of Syria and Palestine under Assyrian domination. While much of this territory was brought under direct Assyrian control through incorporation into the Assyrian provincial system, the coastal states remained independent, forced only to provide Assyria with substantial tribute.

As noted, Assyrian interests along the Mediterranean
coast involved the lucrative trade which passed through this region. Recognizing their dependence on the well-established economic institutions of the Phoenicians, Assyrian kings, nonetheless, attempted to maintain a certain level of control over trade. A correspondence between Tiglath-Pileser III and a certain Qurdi-Assur-lāmur, who apparently occupied an important position within the provincial administration of the northern Phoenician cities, reveals an attempt to establish trade agreements with the city of Tyre which would serve Assyrian interests. The document makes reference to biṯ karāni, apparently trading stations, wherein the Tyrian traders buy and sell. Assyrian influence extended to the imposition of taxes on the felling of cedar logs, as well as a ban on trade with Egypt.

Assyrian interest in controlling trade along the Phoenician coast can also be demonstrated from the reign of Esarhaddon (680-669 B.C.E.) A treaty between Esarhaddon and Baal, king of Tyre, demonstrates the nature of institutional control of trade imposed by Assyrian kings. The treaty states that all goods arriving by ship in the Tyrian port technically belong to the Assyrian king. The treaty also stipulates the specific coastal areas with which the Tyrians were entitled to trade. Moreover, the treaty stipulates that no correspondence between the Assyrian king and the Tyrian king should be opened except in the presence of an Assyrian official, who is given the title qēpu, literally "trustee." Apparently, the qēpu served as a kind of
diplomatic official who represented Assyrian interests in an otherwise independent state. The Assyrian king commissioned the building of a rival city in the vicinity of Sidon, calling it Kār-Esarhaddon (Kār-Âššur-âḫu-iddina). The element kār in this place name is related to the bīt kārrāni mentioned in the correspondence between Tiglath-Pileser III and Qurdi-Âššur-lāmur mentioned above. The kāru or bīt kāri, of which bīt kārrāni is the plural form, refers to a port of trade or trading station. By building a separate port of trade and naming it after himself, Esarhaddon was apparently attempting to exercise complete control over Sidonian trade. This would appear to be the only occasion on which an Assyrian king attempted to exercise such direct political control in the southern portion of Phoenicia.

The situation was much the same along the southern coast, where the Philistine city-states played an important role in maritime trade, as well as the overland trade between Egypt and western Asia. The importance of this region as a trading center is demonstrated by a rather unusual arrangement conducted by King Sargon II in the year 716 B.C.E. The account preserved on a clay prism from Nimrud (Calah) describes the establishment of a kāru on the Egyptian border, wherein Egyptians and Assyrians were
encouraged to mingle and engage in trade. Furthermore, the Ashur Prism fragment describes the appointment of an Arab sheikh to oversee Assyrian interests in this region. Thus, the area was not formally incorporated into the provincial administration of the empire, but the trading interests of Assyria were overseen by a loyal ally.

Further evidence from the reign of Sargon suggests that this Assyrian king made certain attempts to exercise more direct political rule in Philistia, capturing Hanun, king of Gaza, and appointing Assyrian officials over the city of Ashdod. However, reports concerning the third campaign of Sargon's successor, Sennacherib, list independent kings along the entire coast, a situation which is maintained even after the reported Assyrian conquest of the rebellious cities.

Aside from Esarhaddon's attempt to exert direct control over the city of Sidon, the Assyrian tendency to maintain nominally independent states along the Mediterranean coast continued through the reign of Ashurbanipal. Reporting on the first Egyptian campaign, the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal mention twenty anonymous kings of the seacoast who provided aid to the Assyrian army. Thus, throughout the Neo-Assyrian Period, Assyrian kings remained satisfied with exerting a certain level of control over trade in this coastal region, while maintaining nominally independent native rule.
Peripheral Territory: The South

It could easily be argued that the territory to the south of Assyria in Babylonia should not be considered a peripheral zone outside the area of direct Assyrian political control. However, the special nature of Assyrian rule in the south places Babylonia on the edge of Assyrian political control in the sense that it was not simply incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system. Assyrian kings faced a multitude of confounding political, social, and cultural factors in Babylonia which made Assyrian rule complicated and, therefore, tenuous.22

To begin, the status of Babylonia as a religious and cultural center was not lost on Assyrian kings. They were well aware that the ancient Mesopotamian traditions to which Assyrians fell heir had been originally nurtured in the south. The Akkadian language, of which their own Assyrian language was a dialect, as well as the cuneiform writing system, were originally developed in southern Mesopotamia. Southern cities housed ancient shrines wherein were worshipped some of the same gods revered by the Assyrians.

Also complicating affairs in Babylonia were the rather complex geographic and demographic circumstances. The northern part of the alluvial plain, including the city of Babylon itself, was inhabited by native Babylonians, themselves part of a polyglot people, which included Sumerians, Akkadians, Amorites, and Kassites.23 The swampy south, however, was home to a number of Chaldean tribes alongside an even more diverse Aramean tribal population.
While the Assyrians could, on occasion, exert control over the northern segment of the country, their inability to pacify the tribal south made any kind of permanent rule in Babylonia virtually impossible.

Throughout the Neo-Assyrian Period, Babylonia was divided into provincial districts called *piḫāta.* The nature and distribution of these provinces reflected the diverse geography and demography of the country. Some of the provinces reflected tribal divisions, while others consisted of territory surrounding the ancient urban centers. More often than not, however, the tribal territories remained outside the jurisdiction of the central administration. Indeed, the Chaldean tribesmen were frequently able to control the urban centers of the south and even to assume sovereignty over the entire country.

The first Assyrian attempt to exert direct political control over Babylonia occurred during the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III. From that point forward, Assyrian kings utilized three basic methods of control in the south, at least during those periods when Assyrian control was effective: Assyrian kings ruled Babylonia directly, in a kind of dual monarchy, they appointed loyal natives as king of Babylonia, or they appointed members of the Assyrian ruling family to that position.

In the year 729 B.C.E., Tiglath-Pileser III defeated Ukin-zeri, an Aramean claimant to the Babylonian throne, and had himself declared king of Babylonia. In the year
722 B.C.E., however, the internal turmoil facing Assyria following the death of Tiglath-Pileser's successor, Shalmaneser V, and the accession of the usurper, Sargon II, gave Merodach-Baladan, chief of the Chaldean tribe known as Bit-Jakin, the opportunity to assume the kingship of Babylonia.

Merodach-Baladan was able to maintain his rule of Babylonia through much of the reign of Sargon and was even able to reassert his authority for a brief period at the beginning of the reign of Sennacherib (703 B.C.E.). He continued to harass Assyrian rulers until his apparent death in 694 B.C.E.

Upon his defeat of Merodach-Baladan in 709 B.C.E., Sargon followed the lead of Tiglath-Pileser III by personally assuming the throne of Babylonia. Though the documentation for the beginning of the reign of Sennacherib is sparse, it can be assumed that upon his succession to the throne in Assyria, Sennacherib also assumed the kingship of Babylon. However, beginning almost immediately, Sennacherib was forced to respond to a series of revolts in the south. Two rivals, Marduk-zākir-šumi II, and the Chaldean arch-rival, Merodach-Baladan, were able to assume brief reigns, both during the year 703 B.C.E.

The suppression of these rebellions culminated in the installation of an Assyrian puppet, the Babylonian Bēl-ibni. This method of rule proved unsuccessful. In the year 700 B.C.E., Bēl-ibni was removed by Sennacherib, who then appointed his own son, Ashur-nādin-šumi, as king of
Babylonia. Six years later, the Elamite king, Inshushinak I, invaded Babylonia, capturing Ashur-nādin-šumi and installing the Chaldean Nergal-ušēzib as king. While Sennacherib was able to capture Nergal-ušēzib, he was unable to prevent the accession of the Babylonian Mušēzib-Marduk.

In 689 B.C.E., Sennacherib besieged and conquered the city of Babylon. The complete devastation wrought by the Assyrian king apparently resulted in an eight year period during which there was no king in Babylon. With his accession in Assyria in 680 B.C.E., Esarhaddon also assumed the kingship of Babylonia and proceeded to restore the shattered city.

As noted in the Introduction, Esarhaddon provided for his succession during his reign, such that upon his demise, his son, Ashurbanipal succeeded him as king of Assyria, while another son, Šamaš-šum-ukīn assumed the Babylonian throne. This situation prevailed until Ashurbanipal’s supression of revolt in Babylon led by his brother. While there is evidence in the royal inscriptions of Ashurbanipal for the appointment of officials in the conquered south, those inscriptions are not clear as regards the issue of ultimate royal sovereignty in Babylonia. Following the death of Ashurbanipal in 626 B.C.E., Babylonia reverted to Chaldean rule, ushering in the era of the Neo-Babylonia Empire.

Details of the nature of the internal administration in Babylonia during the period of Assyrian domination are not
particularly clear and would take us well beyond the scope of this work. Suffice it to say that, in theory, it would seem, the native provincial structure of the Babylonian kingdom remained intact, with the provincial governments responsible to whomever was the officially reigning king. In practice, it would appear that Assyrian kings preferred to maintain a pretext of preserving native government, though the royal inscriptions reveal certain attempts to intervene in the provincial structure of the kingdom.

That Assyrian kings attempted to control territory in the south by installing native puppets is not unusual, as the study of Assyrian control in the west has demonstrated. The notion that an Assyrian, whether the Assyrian king himself or a member of the Assyrian royal family, could rule as king in Babylonia is unique. Perhaps even more remarkable is the fact that, at least in some official Babylonian circles, this was considered legitimate. Thus, while Assyrian kings did exert powerful political control over Babylonia, a semblance of independence was maintained. When the Assyrian king ruled, he ruled as king of Babylon, i.e., as the head of a Babylonian polity, not as the head of an Assyrian provincial structure.

Peripheral Territory: The Northern and Central Zagros

With regard to the northern Zagros, the rather loose political configuration of the Mannean state was treated in the previous chapter. It has also been noted that the
summary of conquests in Sargon's Display Inscription fails to mention Mannea. Like the city-states of the Mediterranean coast, Mannea remained an independent vassal despite numerous rebellions against Assyria and pro-Assyrian parties.

In the central Zagros, the territory occupied by the nascent Median nation, the situation is even more complex. In general, the Medes seem to have been organized into tribal units, with each tribe attached to a particular urban center. Yet, it appears that we must distinguish between the Median tribes occupying the Iranian plateau and those which had infiltrated into the Zagros Mountains. The former are often referred to as dwelling in māt Mādāya ṿauqūti, "the distant land of Media." Assyrian kings appear to have been reluctant to bring this territory under direct political control. On the other hand, Median territory in the Zagros Mountains, specifically, the cities of Kisheshim and Ḥarḥar, was subject to annexation during the reign of Sargon.

Recently, Stuart Brown has made some valuable observations on the purpose and effect of Assyrian control in Median territory. Brown's basic thesis is that the period of Assyrian control in the central Zagros witnessed the development of the Median political structure from one of kinship to one of kingship, that is, from a tribal conglomeration to a territorial state. Furthermore, according to Brown, the Assyrian method of control in this region was one factor in this development.
Assyrian concern was with what Brown refers to as the "economic symbiosis of the Iranian mountains and the Tigris-Euphrates basin." In places such as Mannea, which, while somewhat fragmented, had attained a degree of centralization in terms of a nominal kingship structure, a system of loyal vassals enabled the Assyrians to achieve their symbiosis. In the central Zagros, however, the smaller, kinship-based political structure was less conducive to the kind of internal manipulation of conflicting parties that was used effectively in Mannea.

The solution was annexation and province formation. In this manner, Assyrian kings were able to affect the kind of political centralization needed to exploit the economic resources of the country. In so doing, however, the Assyrians offered the Medes a model of centralized political development, which, according to Brown, precipitated the rise of the centralized Median kingdom. By the end of the seventh century B.C.E., this Median kingdom was powerful enough to participate in bringing down the Assyrian Empire.

Annexation in Theory

In modern theory, the term annexation largely involves the question of sovereignty. Annexation is defined as an ...act of state whereby territory not previously held under the sovereignty of that state is acquired. Annexation confers all powers of use, exclusion, alienation, titles to public property rights, etc., on the annexing state. Allegiance of the inhabitants of the
annexed territory is automatically assumed by the new sovereign.

As this definition suggests, the extension of sovereignty naturally involves the adoption of legal and administrative functions in the annexed territory by the new sovereign. In the neo-Assyrian Empire, this would involve the incorporation of the annexed territory into the existing provincial system. Indeed, in one study of the Assyrian administrative system, annexation is defined in terms of province formation.

This distinction between tributary states, which still retained some local identity, and those lands which were fully annexed, is often described in the historical texts. As soon as an area was to be incorporated, it was placed under the authority of a provincial governor...

Ultimately, therefore, the determination of the language of annexation must occur as part of a broader examination of political organization of conquered territory. In order that a term be considered an expression of annexation, it must occur within the context of other instruments of control which are more explicit as regards the extension of Assyrian provincial administration to conquered territory.

In order to test this principle, however, we will begin by offering examples of what could ostensibly be considered the terminology of annexation. We can then examine the terminology of provincial organization, determining thereby the extent to which the putative terms of annexation fulfill the criteria noted above.
Terminology of Annexation and Province Formation

Assyrian royal inscriptions of the Sargonid period offer four expressions which could tentatively be assigned to the language of annexation. One of these refers to the status of people in conquered territory: *itti nīše māt Aššur manû, "to count with the people of Assyria," i.e., to consider part of the Assyrian people. That is, the people of conquered territory acquire the status of Assyrian "citizens," apparently bringing these citizens under direct Assyrian control.

Three other expressions refer to the Assyrianization of territory rather than people. The most common of these is *ana mišir māt Aššur turru, "to turn over to the border/territory of Assyria." A variation of this expression, *eli mišir māt Aššur ruddû, "to add to the border of Assyria," is found in the inscriptions of Sennacherib. Also found in one passage from the inscriptions of Sennacherib is the expression *ana kudurri māt Aššur abāku, "to carry off to the boundary (stone) of Assyria.

Related to the Assyrianization of people expressed as *itti nīše māt Aššur manû is the imposition of certain obligations on conquered peoples which are characterized as Assyrian obligations. In certain instances, this involves the obligation to deliver corvée labor, termed ilku tupsikkû, which is characterized as kī ša Aššuri, "as (imposed on) Assyrians." There are even instances in
which tribute, described as biltu and addatru, is qualified in this manner. 40

As for the organization of Assyrian provinces, there were actually a number of methods employed by Assyrian kings. Most often, conquered territory was organized into new provinces governed by newly appointed provincial officials. Officials appointed to oversee Assyrian provinces are referred to as šut reši, "courtiers," 41 who are usually appointed with a status described in terms of some other station, generally that of bel pāḥati. 42 The terminology of appointment is generally in the form of the verb šakānu, "to appoint (lit. set in a position)." Thus, the most common expression of provincial organization is Šut reši bel pāḥati aškun, "I appointed courtiers (acting as) provincial governors."

Alternatively, Assyrian kings employed the option of aggrandizing existing provinces. As we shall see in the detailed regional study, this practice was employed mostly in the south and southeast, as well as in the region of the central Zagros. In the south and southeast, the terminology involves the authorization of officials from a neighboring province over the newly conquered territory. Most frequently, the officials are given the title šut reši šakin, "courtiers (acting as) governor." The term of authorization is *ina qaṭe raṭan, "to count into the hand of," i.e., to authorize. Thus, we frequently encounter the expression *ina qaṭe šut rešiya šakin BN raṭan, "I authorized
my courtier (acting as) governor of GN."

With regard to the central Zagros, the territory in which the Assyrians encountered the politically diffuse Medes, aggrandizement of existing provinces is expressed in different terms. Here, the language involves the actual addition of territory rather than the authorization of officials. This addition of territory is expressed by the verb ruddû, "to add."

Another expression relevant to province formation is the rather generalized expression *ana essûti šabātu, usually taken to indicate a political and administrative reorganization of conquered territory. This phrase most often precedes the statement of the appointment of provincial officials. In addition, there are other, less frequently employed expressions accompanying province formation in various instances, including such issues as tribute, the seating of gods, offerings to the gods, the erection of steles, the resettling and renaming of conquered towns and territories. These will be examined in the proceeding section.

One of the striking features of the distribution of the language of annexation and province formation in Sargonid royal inscriptions is its prevalence in the inscriptions of Sargon as compared with those of later kings. The inscriptions of Sargon include the language of annexation and province formation for territory encompassing virtually
every region in which Sargon campaigned: Samaria and Ashdod in the west; Tabal and Gurgum in the Taurus Mountains; Mannea and Urartu in the northern Zagros Mountains; Niksam, Kisheshim, and Harhar in the central Zagros; in Babylonia. In contrast, this terminology is sparsely attested in the inscriptions of later kings, and seems to be more regionally restricted.

However, while annexation and province formation are attested for various regions in the inscriptions of Sargon, the bulk of the evidence pertains to territory east of Assyria in the Zagros Mountains, as well as the territory of Babylonia. In the inscriptions of Sennacherib, the language of annexation and province formation focuses almost entirely on the region of the south-central Zagros, while the few examples from the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal pertain to Mannea in the northern Zagros.

**Distribution of Terminology: The West**

The inscriptions of Sargon include accounts of the king’s subjugation of the territory of Samaria at the beginning of his reign. Relevant material can be found in a badly mutilated passage in the Annals from Khorsabad, in the Display Inscription from Khorsabad, and in the roughly contemporaneous account of the king’s campaigns as reported in the Nimrud Prism. While the passage in the Annals is broken, both the Display Inscription and the Nimrud Prism refer to the appointment of officials.
However, the three passages differ with regard to the language accompanying the appointment of officials. In this case, as elsewhere, the terminology seems to overlap. That is, each expression contains elements found in one of the other passages. Yet, the arrangement of elements is different, resulting in rather significant variations.

Both the Annals and the Display Inscription from Khorsabad refer to tribute imposed on the territory. In each case, the tribute is characterized. The Annals mentions maddatu ki ša Assurî, "tribute as (imposed on) Assyrians," while the Display Inscription reports the imposition of biltu šarri mahriti, "the tribute of the former king." The latter could be construed as tribute imposed on an independent vassal state, while the former suggests annexation in that the obligations imposed are characterized as the same obligations imposed on Assyrians. Like the Annals, the Nimrud Prism explicates the status of the people of the territory, but without reference to tribute: itti nišē māt Aššur annūsunūti, "I counted them part of the Assyrian people." This variation of terminology seems to reflect a certain ambivalence with regard to the status of conquered Samaria.

Located amid the inland mountain region of Palestine, Samarian territory had been subject to Assyrian annexation since the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III. As noted, however, the coastal region of Syria and Palestine was generally not
annexed by Assyrian kings, but maintained as independent
vassal kingdoms. Sargon’s treatment of the Philistine city
of Ashdod appears to be an exception.

With regard to Ashdod, the passage in Sargon’s Annals
is the best preserved, though the Display Inscription seems
to have contained much the same text. After describing the
conquest of three cities in the area, Ashdod, Asdudimmu, and
Gimtu, the text proceeds with the disposition of this
territory.

\[
\text{ālāni šunuṭi ana ēšūti aṣbat niše}
\text{māṭāti kisitti qatēya inā libbi uṣēṣib}
\text{šūt rešiy[a]l bel pāḥati \'elīšunu aṣkun}
\text{itti niše māṭ Aššur arnrūšunūtimā}
\]

These cities I reorganized. I settled
(in them) peoples of the lands, the
conquest of my hand. Courtiers (acting
as) provincial governors I set over
them. I counted them with the people of
Assyria.

Here, a separate theme is introduced, namely, the
resettlement of conquered peoples, presumably deportees,
into territories that are described in the language of
annexation and province formation.\(^51\)

This is the extent of the provincial organization of
territory in the west under Sargon. Under Sennacherib, the
Mediterranean coastal region is described mainly in terms of
vassal kingdoms, as is the inland kingdom of Judea. The
Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon, however, reports
the conquest of the city of Sidon, employing the expression
\(^\text{\ṣana mīṣir māṭ Aššur turru} \) within the context of province
formation. The passage represents the only example of province formation in this inscription. Following the flight and capture of Abdi-Milkutti, king of Sidon, the narrative describes what appears to be the building of a rival city.

šarrāni māt Hatti u aḥi ṭātim kalīṣunu
ina ašri šanîmma ālu ušepišma āl Kār-
Aššur-ahu-iddina attabi nibīssu

I had the kings of the land of Hatti and the sea coast, all of them, build a city on another site, and I called it Kār-Esarhaddon.

This is followed by the conquest of a list of cities, described as ša limēt Šidūnī, "in the environs of Sidon," whose final disposition is narrated as follows:

niṣe ṭubut qaṭṭīya ša šaddē u ṭātim šīṭ
Šamši ina libbi uṣēṣibma ana μišir māt
Aššur utīr nagū šuātu ana eṣṣūti aṣbat
šūt reṣīya ana pāḥūti elišūnu aškun
biltu u mandattu eli ša muḥri utīrma
ēmīssu

People, plunder of my bow, from the mountains and the sea of the rising sun I settled there. I turned (it) over to the border/territory of Assyria. This district I reorganized, setting my courtiers as provincial (governors) over them. I restored their tribute and gifts more than before, imposing it (upon them).

The passage, thus, represents thorough political reorganization, including the language of annexation, renaming, resettlement, and the appointment of officials. Moreover, this passage also displays the rare juxtaposition of these themes with that of tribute imposition, which is generally reserved for independent vassal states.
In addition to this arrangement in Sidon, Esarhaddon’s Zenjirli stele describes the king’s political arrangements following his initial conquest of Egypt. This represents Assyria’s first attempt to affect direct control over affairs in Egypt, an historically powerful but, at this time, somewhat amorphous kingdom on the periphery of Assyrian expansion. In this instance, the arrangement involves the appointment of numerous officials, including šarrāni, "kings," šaknūti, "governors," pāḫāti, "provincial governors," as well as qēpāni, "trustees," who, as noted, were often appointed to oversee Assyrian interests in nominally independent states. In addition, the verb of appointment is paqādu, a term rarely used in province formation, reflecting, perhaps, a somewhat unusual arrangement.

In fact, the list of appointed officials seems to reflect the entire internal political apparatus of the Egyptian regime. It should be noted that the term ṣūt rēṣīya, "my courtiers," is absent from the list. This suggests that the king was not appointing Assyrian provincial officials, but native government officials, exercising control over the internal affairs of Egypt without actually incorporating the territory into the Assyrian provincial system. The attempt to maintain this method of control was undertaken by Esarhaddon’s successor, Ashurbanipal.
Distribution of Terminology: The Northwest

The language of annexation and province formation appears in the inscriptions of Sargon relating to two countries located in the Taurus Mountain region of Asia Minor: Gurgum and Tabal. The Tabal passages present a number of territorial issues bearing on the political structure of Tabal. In the Display Inscription, the protagonist, Ambaris, is called simply "the Tabalean." In the Annals, he is called "the Tabalean, king of Bit-Burutis," while the Nimrud Prism refers to him by the sole title "king of Bit-Burutis." All three passages make reference to an apparent land grant involving the territory of Cilicia (Hilakku), which was given to Ambaris by Sargon when Ambaris assumed the throne of Tabal. Thus, there is some ambiguity as to what exactly constituted the kingdom of Tabal and the extent of the territory ruled by Ambaris.

The ambiguity regarding the political structure of this territory carries over into the passages describing the final political arrangements following Sargon's defeat of Ambaris. The Display Inscription describes the organization of territory without mentioning specifically which territory fell subject to Assyrian political organization. The Annals and the Nimrud Prism, on the other hand, list Bit-Burutis and Hilakku as the territories which Sargon subjected to Assyrian provincial control.

All three passages mention the appointment of officials in the conquered territory: 𒈗𒊉 𒊝𒊏𒈗𒊉 𒉈𒇀𒈗 𒈉anna
askun, "I appointed my courtiers (acting as) provincial governors over them." However, as in the case of Samaria, the concomitant material involves a variety of terms expressing certain overlapping themes.

In the Display Inscription, Assyrians are settled in the conquered territory and assigned tribute obligations: biltu maddattu ukīn elīkun, "I imposed tribute obligations upon them." These themes of settlement, Assyrian status, and obligations also appear in the Annals, but with some significant variation. In the Annals, the territory is settled not with Assyrians, but with other conquered peoples, who are obliged to provide tupšikki Āṣšuri, "Assyrian corvée labor," i.e., corvee labor generally supplied as the obligation of an Assyrian. While the Nimrud Prism does not mention settlement, it employs the expression aburriš ušarbiš, "[the lands] I caused to dwell in (peaceful) pastures." This is followed by the expression itti niše māt Āṣšur amnūšunūtima, "I counted them (part of) the people of Assyria," thereby omitting the language of imposition while maintaining the Assyrianization of the territory. Thus, while the issues of who was settled in the territory and which obligations were imposed are treated differently in each passage, the notion of the Assyrianization of the territory is maintained. The conquered territory was annexed and incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system.
The language of annexation and province formation is also applied to the territory of Gurgum. Here, the Annals and the Display Inscription appear to contain parallel passages:

\[ niše māt Gurgume ana pāšt gîmriša ana eššūti āšur žūt rēšiyā bēl pāḫāti elīšunu aškunma itti niše māt Aššur amnūšunūti \]

The people of Gurgum in its entirety I mustered again. I set my courtier (acting as) provincial governor over them and counted them (part of) the people of Assyria.  

While Assyrian kings who followed Sargon fought campaigns in this region, there is no reference to annexation or province formation. Indeed, during the reign of Ashurbanipal, Tabal and Hilakku appear to have been two separate kingdoms ruled independently by Assyrian vassal kings.

**Distribution of Terminology: The Northern Zagros**

With regard to the northern Zagros, the language of annexation and province formation is applied to the territory of three states: Urartu, the city-state of Musasir, and Mannea. Perhaps the clearest example is the depiction of Sargon’s conquest of Musasir as reported in the *Huitième Campagne*. The *coup de grâce* of the battle depicted in this document involved the attack on the city of Musasir, a major urban center protecting the southern flank of the Urartian sphere of influence. So important was this city to the kingdom of Urartu that its defeat is said to have
occasioned the suicide of the Urartian king, Ursa. 60

Following the defeat and despoliation of the city, the text describes a new status imposed on the inhabitants.

\[
\text{niše nagī ša āl Mušašir itti niše māt Aššur amnūma ilku āppikku kī ša Aššuri emissunūte}
\]

The people of the district of Mušašir I counted (part of) the people of Assyria. I imposed upon them the corvée service as (though they were) Assyrians.

The passage would appear to reflect a thorough Assyrianization of Mušašir, with the residents considered Assyrians obliged to provide corvée services like other Assyrians. Oddly, however, there is no reference to the appointment of officials.

Less clear is the report in Sargon's Annals from Khorsabad concerning the final defeat of Ursa of Urartu, which includes a statement regarding the organization of conquered Urartian territory.

\[
nagu šulātu a[n]a mišir māt Aššur utirrama] [ina qāte] [šūt rešiy]la nāgir ekal[i]ii amnūṣu
\]

This district I turned over to the border of Assyria and placed it under the authority of my courtier (acting as) chief of the palace. 52

Here we have what appears to be a clear example of annexation and the appointment of officials. However, the appointment of a nāgir ekalli is unique. The nāgiru or nāgir ekalli was an official who served to call up those obliged to perform various public services, such as the ilku
or *tupšikku* services. In this sense, the arrangement may be related to the Assyrian obligations imposed upon the citizens of Muṣaṣir, the fulfillment of which this *nāgir ekalli* was meant to insure.

On the other hand, this version of events, which describes the demise of Ursa and the total control of Urartian territory by Assyria, is generally called into question by scholars. It is doubtful that Sargon ever actually gained prolonged control of Urartian territory. In this regard, the claim of annexation is dubious.

In Mannea, the issue of annexation involves the twenty-two cities which were transferred from the control of Ullusunu of Mannea to Ursa of Urartu. This matter has been treated in detail in the previous chapter. Curiously, despite the many contradictions between the Annals and the Display Inscription from Khorsabad with regard to these citadels, they both apply the expression *ana mišir māt Aššur turru.*

What is most striking about the Mannea passages in the inscriptions from Khorsabad is that while the terminology is the same in each passage, structurally they are so disparate, a circumstance observed with regard to the issue of the seizure of Mannean territory as well. The example in the Annals, assigned to the seventh regnal year, appears in the context of the conspiracy initiated by Ursa against Ullusunu, wherein the citadels were seized. As noted, the closest parallel in the Display Inscription has Ullusunu
handing over the citadels to Ursa as a bribe, making it part of the continuation of the initial conspiracy in Mannea, corresponding to the account of the sixth regnal year of the Annals. 67

There is also a discrepancy between the two inscriptions from Khorsabad with regard to the final disposition of the twenty-two cities, a circumstance noted in connection with their seizure by Ursa. The Display Inscription reports the granting of the twenty-two cities to Ullusunu as part of his rehabilitation and re enthronement. 68 This raises the question as to the exact meaning of the expression *ana mššr mät Assur turru. Would the Assyrian king have granted annexed territory--territory which had been formally incorporated into the Assyrian Empire--to another king?

Moreover, even in the Annals, in which the granting of territory to Ullusunu involves the province of Uishdish rather than the twenty-two cities, 69 the statement of annexation applied to the twenty-two cities stands alone. There are no concomitant themes indicating the appointment of officials or the imposition of obligations. Indeed, it is odd, given the penchant for restoring seized territory to its former status noted in the previous chapter, that these cities were not also restored to their former status as Mannean cities.

In this regard it should be recalled that, according to the Ashur Prism fragment, the twelve fortresses seized by
Ursa were simply reoccupied by Assyrian and Mannean troops. Thus, in the case of the twenty-two Mannean cities, the classification of the term *ana mishir māt Aššur turru as a statement of annexation is not certain, since it is not clear that the twenty-two cities were at any time actually incorporated into the political system of the Assyrian Empire.

The two passages regarding territory seized by the Manneans as reported in Prism B of Ashurbanipal also display certain discrepancies regarding the true meaning of the expression *ana mishir māt Aššur turru. The first passage involves cities in the environs of the city of Paṭṭiri. In the course of the campaign, the cities are retaken.

\[\text{akšud ina girri aṣm} \text{u ašlula šallassum} \]
\[\text{ālāni šatunu ana mishir māt Aššur utir(ru)} \]

I conquered, I burned, I despoiled. These cities I turned over to the border of Assyria.

This passage raises a number of questions. The absence of language regarding the nature of the organization of these cities within the Assyrian administrative system raises doubts as to whether they were actually annexed. Moreover, it makes little sense for the Assyrian king to destroy and despoil cities whose productivity within the Assyrian provincial system he wished to maintain. Moreover, if the cities had originally been considered within the environs of the city of Paṭṭiri, why were they not restored to their original status, just as the fortresses seized by
Mita of Muski were restored to the province of Que.\textsuperscript{73}

The second account regarding cities seized by Mannea is much clearer in terms of the political assignation of the territory in question. The cities are explicitly characterized as ʾālāni ṣaḥrūti ša miṣir māt Aššur, "cities which had formerly been part of the border/territory of Assyria."\textsuperscript{74} Moreover, the account is introduced by the rare formula akbasa miṣir māt Aššur, "I stepped across the border of Assyria," clearly indicating that the king considered the cities to be part of Assyrian territory.\textsuperscript{75} Indeed, the sequel is expressed in the familiar language of annexation and province formation.

\begin{align*}
  Ṿāṭunu\text{ ana } ēṣṣūti āṣbat utirra\text{ ana } miṣir māt Aššur
\end{align*}

These cities I reorganized, returning them to the border of Assyria.\textsuperscript{76}

While there is no account of the appointment of officials, the expression *ana ēṣṣūti šabātu is often associated with province formation expressed in terms of appointment. The lack of explicit reference to province formation expressed in terms of the appointment can be viewed as a general feature of the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal.\textsuperscript{77} What this analysis reveals, however, is that while the language of annexation expressed in terms of *ana miṣir māt Aššur turru is applied to territory in the northern Zagros, there appears to be a lack of clear reference to province formation.
As noted, the language of political organization of conquered territory in the central Zagros more often involves the aggrandizement of pre-existing provinces rather than the establishment of new provinces. With regard to this region, Sargon's Annals and Display Inscription from Khorsabad offer three examples in which territory is added to either newly formed or previously formed provinces. In these instances, however, the terminology is unlike anything discussed thus far, indicating an attempt to experiment with new patterns of organization. All of these passages are assigned to the campaign of the sixth regnal year in the Annals and are paralleled in the Display Inscription. In each case, the terminology is much the same, utilizing the word ruddu, "to add," or "aggrandize."

In the first case, territory of the land of Niksam, as well as the city of Surgadia are conquered and added to the province of Parsuash: eli pīḫāt mēt Parsuāš uraddi, "I added to the province of Parsuāš." The next two cases, involving the cities of Kišesim and Ḥarḥar respectively, begin as examples of province formation expressed in the familiar terms of the appointment of šūt reši bēl pāhāti. This is followed by further conquests in the region, culminating in the attachment of the newly conquered territory to the newly formed provinces. With regard to Kišesim, the addition of territory is expressed as eli pīḫātīšu uraddi, "I added to his/its province." With regard
to Ḫarḥar, the Annals has a simpler elišunu uraddi, "I added to them." 79

Both of these examples contain references to the renaming of the cities. As in the case of Sidon under Esarhaddon, the new place names include the kāru element, indicating their importance as trading centers. Kišesim is named Kār-Nergal, while Ḫarḥar is named for the king, Kār-Sarru-kēnu. Certain religious or quasi-religious obligations are also imposed on these territories, including the seating of Assyrian gods and the erection of steles, similar to the treatment of Egypt by Esarhaddon. 80 Moreover, the Ḫarḥar passage includes the resettlement of conquered peoples.

In addition, the Annals inscription contains a reference to further rebellion in the Ḫarḥar region in the account of the campaign of the seventh regnal year. This account first reviews the events of the previous campaign.

\[
\text{nīšē} \ pārti \ elīṭi \ u \ šaplīṭi \ ša \ ina \\
girr[ī]ya \ maḫrīṭi \ itti \ [nīšē] \ āl \ Ḫarḥar \ ānā
\]

People of the upper and lower (Zab) rivers, whom, during my previous campaign, I counted with the people of Harhar...

In this case, terminology previously seen as referring to annexation, namely, *itti nīšē māt Assur mānu, is being used to describe the attachment of territory to a newly formed province. This tends to confirm the notion that annexation and province formation are two aspects of a
single political process, the Assyrianization of conquered territory.

The suppression of the rebellion in the Harhar province again involves the conquest of more cities in the region.

\[
\text{Kîšēšlu āl Kindāu āl Anzārija āl Bīt-Gabāya ša akšudu [ana eššūti] ēpuš āl Kār-Nabû āl Kār-Sîn āl Kār-Adad āl Kār-Ištar šumšunu abbi}
\]

Kišēšlu, Kindāu, Anzāriya, Bīt-Gabāya, which I conquered, I rebuilt and named Kār-Nabû, Kār-Sîn, Kār-Adad, Kār-Ištar.

While this passage lacks detail as to the status of these cities vis-à-vis province formation, the importance of the Harhar region as a trading center is again indicated by the kāru element contained in the new place names. Ironically, the new name, Kār-Sarru-kēnu, which had been given to the city of Harhar as part of the provincial organization of the sixth regnal year is ignored in this narrative, as it is in a province-forming narrative found in the inscriptions of Sennacherib. B3

There is one more passage in the inscriptions of Sargon relating to province formation in the central Zagros. The account of Sargon's eighth campaign contained in the document known as the Huitième Campagne begins with a sweep through territory south of the upper Zab River. One passage B4 refers to the submission of Zizi, of the city of Appatar, and Zalaya of the city, of Kitpataya, called bēl ālāni ša māt Gizilbundi nagî, "city rulers of the Gizilbundi province." The passage includes the two rulers' offer of gifts (igisû) to the Assyrian king presented in the Mannean
city of Zirdiakka. The section concludes with both the appointment of an official and the authorization of officials from another province, as well as a statement of the king’s beneficent motivation in this circumstance.

\[\text{ana šalām mātīšun qēpu ēlišunu apqidma ina qāte šūt rēšiya šakin māt Parsuaš āmnūšunūti}\]

In order to establish the well-being of the land, I appointed a trustee and placed them under the authority of my courtier (acting as) the governor of Parsuash.

There are several unusual features of this passage. As we shall discuss shortly, the title, šakin, applied to a provincial official is rare in Sargonid royal inscriptions. Most of the examples are confined to provinces in the south. Moreover, the official designated as qēpu is usually regarded as the Assyrian representative in an independent vassal state. Indeed, the term of appointment, paqādu, is the one used in Esarhaddon’s Zenjirli Stele to describe arrangements for the internal political structure of a nominally independent Egypt. Yet, as we have seen, the authorization of officials from an existing province over newly conquered territory is clearly an act of annexation. Parsuash was apparently formed into an Assyrian province in 744 under Tiglath-Pileser III.85 Whatever the precise nature of this arrangement, the tendency to deal with conquests in the central Zagros by means of adding territory to existing provinces is further revealed in this passage.
There is, however, one apparent anomaly to this pattern. Sargon's Display Inscription contains the following statement applied to Median territory:

\[ \text{ana misir mat Assur utirra nadan sise šattišam elišunu uktiñ} \]

I turned (it) over to the border of Assyria. The yearly giving of horses I imposed (lit. set) upon them."

The second part of this statement implies some form of tribute, in this case, in the form of horses needed by the Assyrian military. The tribute language immediately raises suspicion as to the qualification of this passage as a statement of annexation. Throughout the Sargonid period, Assyrian kings seem to have avoided any direct involvement in territorial issues concerning the Medes, particularly those residing in the more remote regions of the Iranian plateau. Instead, they appear to have remaining satisfied with the exaction of tribute from the various local rulers. It is, therefore, doubtful that this territory ever came under direct Assyrian control.

**Distribution of Terminology: The South-central Zagros**

In both frequency and complexity, the language of territorial exchange decreases considerably in the inscriptions of Sennacherib. In fact, the language of annexation and province formation in the inscriptions of Sennacherib focuses mainly on territory in the south-central Zagros. The terminology employed is interesting in that it represents a sort of overlapping, or dovetailing of elements
found in the terminology employed in the inscriptions of Sargon.

For instance, the various accounts of the second campaign against the lands of Kašši and Yasubigallāya in the south-central Zagros include the appropriation of certain cities to officials in the province of Arrapḫa. While Arrapḫa is not involved in province formation in the inscriptions of Sargon, the language of appropriation, *ina qāti šūt rešî bēl pəḫēti Arrapḫa amnūšunûti*, "I placed under the authority of my courtier (acting as) provincial governor of Arrapḫa," is reminiscent of Sargon’s appropriation of the territory of Gizilbundi to the province of Parsuash. As will be demonstrated in the next section, this terminology is frequently employed in the inscriptions of Sargon with regard to territory in the south. However, the passages in the Bellino Cylinder (B1) and the Oriental Institute Prism (H2) of Sennacherib include descriptions of stele erection similar to the erection of steles in newly formed provinces in the central Zagros in narratives assigned to the sixth regnal year of Sargon’s Annals. Thus, various elements employed in the inscriptions of Sargon are recombined in the inscriptions of Sennacherib.

Another example of this kind of weaving of terminology in the inscriptions of Sennacherib is the account involving the reorganization and redistribution of the land of Bit-Barrū, which had apparently been part of Ellipi, in the south-central Zagros, before the defeat of its king,
Ispabara. The Bellino Cylinder (B1), the earliest of these documents, records the event as follows:

The land of Bit-Barrū, the district in its entirety, I detached from his (Ispabara’s) land and added it to the border of Assyria. The city of Elenzash I organized as a royal city, the stronghold of this district, removed its former name and called it Kār-Sennacherib.

The word ruddu was used in the inscriptions of Sargon to indicate the appropriation of territory to provinces formed from cities in this region, including Ḥarhar. Here, the same terminology is apparently used to indicate simple annexation, that is, the transfer of territory to Assyrian control. Yet, there is no indication that the cities were incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system in terms of the appointment or authorization of officials. What is present, however, is the theme of renaming, seen consistently in the inscriptions of Sargon with regard to cities in the central Zagros. Again, the place name includes the element kāru, indicating its significance as a trading center.

The Bull Inscription (F1) and the Oriental Institute Prism (H2), while preserving this version of events, added new material to the account that creates a more explicit connection between these narratives and passages in the
inscriptions of Sargon regarding the organization of provinces in the central Zagros.

Peoples of the lands, conquest of my hands, I settled in (its) midst (and) placed (it) under the authority of my courtier (acting as) provincial governor of the city of Harhar.

The two later inscriptions explicate the incorporation of this territory into the Assyrian provincial system, as indicated by the authorization of officials. Once again, however, the terminology of authorization is more closely related to that used of the south in the inscriptions of Sargon, rather than that used of the Harhar region in those inscriptions. Thus, while the inscriptions of the two kings make use of the same vocabulary, there is a kind of rearranging and regional redistribution of terminology.

One further example of annexation of territory in this region under Sennacherib involves the disposition of the Assyrian cities of Bit-Hā’iri and Raša which had been seized by Elam. In this case, the sequel includes the authorization of an official. However, as in the case of Urartu, the language of appointment is familiar, but the title of the appointed official is unique.

I conquered, I despoiled, I settled my garrison troops within them and turned them to the border of Assyria, counting them into the hand of the fortress commander at Der.
It is worth noting that the other examples of the title rab ḫalṣu in Assyrian royal inscriptions are found in passages associated with border issues. It is applied in Sargon’s Annals to the rulers of the cities of Sam‘ūna and Bab-duri, which are called ḫalse ša Šutur-Naḥundo Elamū eli māt Yadburi irkusu, "fortresses which Šutur-Naḥundo the Elamite established against the land of Yadbur." It is also applied in Prism B of Ashurbanipal to Rayādisāde of the city of Arsianis in the northern Zagros. That these were border territories has been demonstrated in the analysis of border terminology. Likewise, the city of Der was the scene of struggle between Assyrians and Elamites, particularly in the year 720, when a battle was fought between Sargon and the Elamite ruler, Ḫumbanigaš, the outcome of which was indecisive. The arrangement in this passage apparently reflects a military regime established to defend Assyrian-held territory from invading Elamite armies, as opposed to a provincial regime.

Distribution of Terminology: Babylonia and the South

The inscriptions of Sargon contain numerous passages dealing with the political organization of conquered Babylonia following the king’s extensive campaigns of the years 710–709 B.C.E. This involves both annexation and province formation. However, as noted, King Sargon
personally assumed the throne of Babylon as the culmination of his conquests in the south. Presumably, the internal political structure of the kingdom remained intact. It is our contention that the language of province formation in these passages reflects a native Babylonian provincial organization, or at least the attempt to maintain a semblance of native political organization.

With regard to territory in the south, Sargon’s Annals inscription refers to districts of the land of Gambūlu with the unique expression *ana kudurri māt Aššur ābak*, "I carried (them) away to the boundary of Assyria," a statement of annexation perhaps reflecting the southern tradition of boundary formation. In this case, there is no reference to reorganization, resettlement, appointment of officials, or any of the other surrounding expressions that have been noted thus far. The statement of annexation stands alone.

However, in a passage placed shortly after the annexation of Gambūlu, a number of tribal sheikhs submit to the Assyrian king in the city of Dūr-Atšara. The passage includes the treatment of the supplicants.

\[
\text{biltu maddattu kī ša Aššur? emissunūṭi ina qāte šūt rešiya šakin māt Gambio} \\
\text{laḫmūnūṭima šibit alpēšunu šēnēšunu ana Bel màr Bēl ukiš šattīšam}
\]

Tribute and gifts as (though they were) Assyrians I imposed upon them. I placed them under the authority of my courtier (acting as) governor of Gambūlu. The seizing of their herds and flocks for Bel (and) the son of Bel I set upon them yearly.
In this case, there is no statement regarding the appointment of officials. Rather, the territory in question is assigned to what appears to be an already existing province. Thus, while the Gambūlu passage contains no reference to the appointment of officials, this passage presumes that such an appointment had been made. However, the title, šaknu, applied in this passage, suggests a traditional Babylonian provincial system, rather than an Assyrian provincial system, which, from the time of Tiglath-Pileser III, employed officials called bel pāšati. The obligation to supply offerings to the god Bel, presumably referring to Marduk, whose central shrine, Esagila, was located in the city of Babylon, is further indication that Sargon meant to impose a Babylonia regime on the conquered Arameans.

The arrangement whereby a previously constituted provincial regime is given authority over new conquests is found elsewhere in Sargons Annals in passages dealing with affairs in the south. For example, Aramean territory along the Karun River is said to be abandoned by its inhabitants, who submitted to the king in fear.

ultu qereb Uqni Caišar rūqi
illīiškūnimma ʾišbatū šepēlja nagû šuštu
eli ša māhri parqāništ ušāribišma ina qāte
šūt reši šakin (LÚ) Gambūlu amnu

From the midst of the Uqnu River, a distant location, they came to me and seized my feet. This district I caused to lie in green meadows and placed it under the authority of my courtier (acting as) the governor of the Gambūlu people.
Once again, the reference is to territory being placed under the authority of the šaknu in the province of Gambulu.

Moreover, both the Annals and the Display Inscription describe the disposition of the territory of Bīt-Yakin. The arrangements include the resettlement of people from Kummuḫu along the border with Elam and the strengthening of defenses in the city of Sagbat. The section concludes with a division of this territory between two provincial regimes.

\[\text{matu šuātu malalīš azūzma ina qāte šūt rešiya šakin Bābili u šūt rešiya šakin māt Gambūli amnu}\]

"This land I divided equally and placed it under the authority of my courtier (acting as) the governor of Babylon and my courtier (acting as) the governor of Gambulu."

This territory is also assigned to previously existing provinces under the authority of the šaknu in each province. The special treatment of Bīt-Yakin in this passage, i.e., the division of its territory between two separate provincial regimes, may be related to the distinction drawn between Bīt-Yakin and the other Chaldean tribes in the summary of Sargon’s campaigns found in the Display Inscription. While passages relating to these other tribes are poorly preserved, there appears to be no evidence for their incorporation into the Babylonian provincial system, and it may be presumed that they maintained a degree of official independence. However, the territory of Bīt-Yakin was, in effect, separated from the
rest of Chaldea and incorporated into the Babylonian provincial system.\textsuperscript{115}

Thus, the language of province formation applied to the south in the inscriptions of Sargon focuses mainly on the incorporation of territory into an already existing provincial structure. The title, šaknu, applied to provincial officials suggests a desire to maintain the native Babylonian provincial structure. This appears to have been the intention of Ashurbanipal following his suppression of the revolt in Babylonia fostered by Samaš-sum-ukin. The account in Cylinder A of Ashurbanipal includes a statement regarding the political organization of conquered Babylonia.

\begin{quote}
šaknūti qēpāni šikin qātēya āštakkana elīšum
\end{quote}

Governors and trustees, chosen (lit. established) by me, I appointed over them.\textsuperscript{116}

Evidence from the city of Ur reveals a continuity of administration in the city before, during, and even after the Samaš-šum-ukin rebellion.\textsuperscript{117} As in Egypt, Ashurbanipal attempted to control Babylonia not by extending Assyrian rule to the territory, but by attempting to maintain control over a nominally independent internal political structure.

\textit{Analysis of Regional Distribution}

As noted, the evidence regarding annexation and province formation in Sargonid royal inscriptions derives mainly from narratives concerning territory to the east and
south of Assyria. Since the dearth of evidence pertaining to other regions renders any general analysis somewhat hazardous, we shall confine the current discussion to those subjects for which there is adequate evidence. Once again, the evidence demonstrates that Assyrian kings exercised various methods of control in various regions.

Throughout the previous chapter and, again, in this chapter, the point has been made that territorial issues in the northern Zagros, particularly involving Mannea, were complex. This was due primarily to the somewhat amorphous political structure of the Mannean state. During the reign of Sargon, local Mannean rulers were able to exert a certain independence by exploiting the struggle for control of this region undertaken between Sargon and the Urartian king, Ursa.

With the defeat of Urartu, Sargon was in a position to apply his own solution to the Mannean question. Yet, an analysis of the terminology of political organization, at least as it is applied to the territory of Mannea, is ambiguous. The expression *ana mišir māt Assur turru "to turn over to the border/territory of Assyria," is ubiquitous in passages involving Mannea. In both Sargon’s Annals and Display Inscription from Khorsabad, it is used of the twenty-two Mannean cities, which had come under the control of Ursa. It is used again in Prism B of Ashurbanipal with regard to cities which had been captured by
Manneans. As noted, however, these passages fail to mention the details of political control, such as the appointment of officials, Assyrian obligations, resettlement, etc., which were seen to be features of Assyrian annexation and province formation. Their status within the provincial structure of the Assyrian Empire is left unexplained. In fact, in the Display Inscription, the cities are returned to the control of Ullusunu, who is restored to the throne of Mannea by Sargon.

This last point is most significant in terms of Sargon's political organization of Mannea. The sources make it abundantly clear that, despite his complicity in anti-Assyrian activity, Sargon chose to uphold the regime of Ullusunu. While the tendency to maintain native regimes in certain peripheral regions has been noted, it seems unusual that such an arrangement would be applied in a region directly bordering Assyria. The reason for this can only be surmised. Perhaps Sargon preferred to rely on a loyal vassal in this treacherous mountain region, where direct Assyrian control may have been problematic. In any case, it appears that part of Sargon's plan for the region involved the centralization of the internally diffuse kingdom of Mannea under the rulership of a single vassal king.

As noted in the opening section of this chapter, however, this method was not conducive to controlling the
small, kinship-based political structures of the Medes in the central Zagros. This required the kind of centralization which only incorporation into the provincial structure of the Assyrian Empire could provide. What is important to note, however, is that Assyrian province formation in the central Zagros consistently involved not only the appointment of officials, but also the aggrandizement of territory. Whereas a city-state such as Ashdod on the Mediterranean coast could simply be incorporated, as is, into the provincial structure of the empire, city-states in the central Zagros required further centralization through the consolidation of territory. This was apparently necessitated by the particular circumstances, namely, the fragmented nature of the indigenous political structure.

A different policy prevailed with regard to Assyrian political organization in Babylonia. The point was made in the opening section of this chapter that Assyrian kings, whether they ruled Babylonia directly or through a proxy, appear to have maintained the idigenous internal structure of the Babylonian kingdom. The terminological study has revealed several points. Of the examples of province formation applied to the south in the inscriptions of Sargon, only one, referring to the initial conquest of Gambulu, applies a statement of annexation: *ana kudurri šat Assur ābak*, "I carried (them) away to the boundary of Assyria."
While this would suggest annexation to Assyria, the use of the term *kudurru* implies a Babylonia tradition of border formation. Moreover, the two narratives which describe the provincialization of Aramean tribes refer to the authorization of the šakin of Gambūlu, which, as noted, seems to reflect Babylonian provincial administration, as opposed to Assyrian provincial territory, which is generally placed under the authority of a bēl pāḥāti. The distribution of the territory of Bit-Yakin between the šakin of Babylon, as well as the šakin of Gambūlu, is further evidence for the notion that whatever province formation Sargon undertook in the south, the provincial administration remained an indigenous Babylonian administration, i.e., under the ostensible control of the king of Babylon.

While there is no evidence for province formation in the south in the inscriptions of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, the Nineveh A Prism Inscription of Esarhaddon describes an attack undertaken by Nabû-zēr-kitti-lîṣir, the son of Merodach-Baladan, who is called šakin māt tātīs, "governor of the Sealand," against Ningal-iddina, called šakin Īri, "governor of Ur." As noted, the documentary evidence from Ur reveals a continuous governorship of Ur held by members of Ningal-iddina's family through much of the reign of Ashurbanipal. Ashurbanipal's report of the appointment of šaknūti, "governors," following his suppression of the Šamaš-šum-ukīn rebellion is further indication of the tendency to maintain a semblance of indigenous rule in Babylonia.
Thus, Assyrian control of conquered territory expressed in terms of annexation and province formation was not monolithic. Assyrian kings responded to varying circumstances, formulating policy in keeping with specific goals and motivations in different regions of the empire.
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CHAPTER 8
RESTORING ORDER AND BALANCE

The study of the language of annexation and province formation covered in the previous chapter left one important problem unresolved; that of the true significance of the expression *ana mišir mat Aṣšur turru. At the beginning of the previous chapter, this expression was classified as a statement of annexation. However, many of the passages in which this statement appears, in particular, those passages describing Assyrian conquests in Mannea in the northern Zagros, fail to mention any of the other instruments of control which were associated with province formation.

Since the definition of annexation includes the extension by the annexing power of governmental authority and administration over the annexed territory, the failure to mention province formation in passages containing the expression *ana mišir mat Aṣšur turru casts some doubt on its classification as a statement of annexation. Other reasons for doubting this classification have also been offered. It is applied, for instance, to Urartian territory, though it is doubtful that direct Assyrian political control extended for any protracted period over this territory. The expression is also used in Sargon’s Display Inscription with regard to the twenty-two Mannean cities, which eventually reverted to the control of the Mannean king, Ullusunu.
This raises the question as to whether there were other aspects of Assyrian control in conquered territory not yet discussed. The purpose of this chapter is to examine these other aspects. It is our contention that the expression *ana mišir māt Assur turru has a range of meaning which does not always include formal annexation, but rather points to other effects of Assyrian control in conquered territory. In this regard, the treatment of the kingdom of Mannea in the inscriptions of Sargon offer a number of useful insights.

There are numerous expressions in the inscriptions of Sargon that seem to relate to the king’s attempt to restore a sense of order and balance in an internally fractured Mannea. Like the terms of seizure, these expressions also appear to be points of overlap between the various Mannea passages, including the relevant passages in the Huitième Campagne. It will be our contention that the effect of Assyrian control in Mannea as implied by the expression *ana mišir māt Assur turru involves the benefits of Assyrian control expressed in terms of the restoration of order in Mannea.

An example of terminology expressing the benefits of Assyrian control in conquered territory can be seen in the Cylinder Inscription of Sargon. This short inscription retains the participial-epithet style throughout much of what would correspond to the campaign narratives of the Annals from Khorsabad. In one passage, the king is called
One who gathers the scattered land of Mannea, who restores order to the land of Ellipi, establishing the kingship of both lands.

Here, the expressions are connected with regime establishment, a feature also applied to Ullusunu in the Display Inscription.²

The true meaning of these expressions can be elucidated when one bears in mind that the appearance of Mannea together with Ellipi is based on similar political circumstances in the two countries. Like Mannea, Ellipi experienced internal discord. Both the Annals and the Display Inscription report the struggle between Nibê and Ispabara of Ellipi following the death of their father, Delta.³ Nibê sought the support of Shutur-Nahundu of Elam, while his brother appealed to the Assyrian king. The latter came to the rescue of his suitor, defeating Nibê. While the two inscriptions from Khorsabad disagree with regard to the final political arrangement in Ellipi, both employ an expression regarding the restoration of order. The Display Inscription makes use of a virtual duplicate of the expression applied to Ellipi in the Cylinder Inscription quoted above: māt Ellipi daliḥtu utaqqin, "I restored order to the disturbed land of Ellipi."⁴ The Annals applies a different expression to Ellipi, but the sense is much the same.

mupahhir māt Mannāya saphi mutaqqin māt Ellipi šarrūt mātāti kilallān ukinnuma

One who gathers the scattered land of Mannea, who restores order to the land of Ellipi, establishing the kingship of both lands.
The people of the land of Ellipi unto its entire border I settled peaceably.

Since there appears to be no territorial issues in Ellipi, only political ones, the language of restoring order and balance must also relate to internal political relationships. As we have seen, the disorder in Mannea involved political issues in terms of the rival parties and the overall loose political structure of the Mannean state, in addition to the territorial issues. The nature of rule, who rules and in what capacity, is also an aspect of the meaning of the expressions which describe the restoration of order.

It is, however, the territorial issues that seem to be of most significance in the inscriptions of Sargon. That the question of restoring order and balance to a troubled land of Mannea is connected to the larger territorial issues can also be detected in the relevant passages from the inscriptions from Khorsabad. For instance, the Annals sums up affairs in Mannea during the seventh regnal year, which includes the territorial issue of the twenty-two citadels seized by Ursa, as well as what appears to be an internal conspiracy, with the following series of statements.

\[22 \text{ birāti šatina alme akšud ana mišir } \text{[māt AššuIr utirra Dayaukku adi kimtišu assuha māt Mannāya dalḥu utaqqin}\]

These 22 citadels I besieged and conquered, I turned them over to the border/territory of Assyria. Dayaukku and his family I deported. I restored order to the disturbed land of Mannea.
Thus, the resolution of the issue of the twenty-two cities amounts to the restoration of order in an internally divided Mannea. Likewise, the regime-establishment passage applied to Ullusunu in the Display Inscription makes use of the same terminology regarding the restoration of order. In this case, the expression immediately follows the granting of the twenty-two citadels to Ullusunu, indicating the relationship between the statement of the restoration of order and the disposition of the citadels.

It was noted with regard to the Ashur Prism fragment that the return of the twelve fortresses seized by Ursa to Assyrian and allied control seemed to suggest a sense of balance in that the fortresses were restored to their previous status. In fact, the notion of restored balance is made explicit in that passage by way of a statement of the king's purpose in the campaign expressed as ana turri gimilli Ullusuni, "in order to avenge Ullusunu." The expression *gimilla turru can mean "to avenge," or "to return an act of kindness," depending upon whether the action for which it is meant to compensate was positive or negative. In this respect, it has the broader meaning of restoring a previous balance. This expression represents another point of overlap between the various accounts of Mannea in the inscriptions of Sargon.

A similar purpose is stated with regard to the campaign of the sixth regnal year according to the Annals from Khorsabad. Once again, there are territorial issues
involved. After describing the initial conspiracy, involving the action of the šaknūti of Mannea against the pro-Assyrian Aza, the statement of purpose includes a clear reference to borders and territory.

\[ \text{[ana turr]i gi[mill]i māt Mannāya ana isîr (sic) māt Assūr turri} \]

to avenge/restore a balance in Mannea, to restore the border/territory of Assyria.

Here, the restoration of balance is clearly connected to the larger issue of Assyrian territorial control. Indeed, this passage could be alternatively translated:

\[
\text{to avenge/restore a balance, to turn Mannea over to the border/territory of Assyria.} \]

Yet, there is no indication that Mannea was to be annexed. The statement *ana mišir māt Assūr turru simply refers to the extension of Assyrian control in restoring order.

That this is the case can be further demonstrated from the account of territorial issues in Mannea according to the Nimrud Inscription published by Winckler. These issues are first reported in the form of a participial epithet describing the Assyrian king as mutaqiqin māt Mannāya dalhūti, "one who restores order to the disturbed land of Mannea," which is followed by the common epithet murappis mišir māt Assūr, "one who extends the border/territory of Assyria." In a sense, this might be viewed as the fulfillment of the king's purpose as stated in the Annals. By restoring order in Mannea, the king effectively extends
Assyrian territorial control. Several lines later, the subject of Mannea is taken up once again.

\[kāṣid māt Mānnāya māt Karallu māt\]
\[Pattīri mutīr gimillī mātīsu\]

One who conquers Mannea, Karallu, and Pattiri, avenging/restoring a balance to his land.

The two places mentioned alongside Mannea in this passage can be connected to the anti-Assyrian activity dated to the sixth regnal year of the Annals. In the Ashur Prism fragment, we find a reference to Aššur-lēšu of Karalla and ltti of Pattiri. The latter corresponds to Itti of Allabria, who, along with Aššur-lēšu of Karalla, was part of the initial anti-Assyrian conspiracy in Mannea. In this respect, the reference is to the political upheaval in Mannea. However, as the study of the language of expropriation has shown, the struggle in Mannea also involved territorial issues. Restoring order and balance in an internally troubled Mannea included the resolution of the territorial issues. Yet, there is no reason to conclude that this resolution amounted to the annexation of Mannean territory and its incorporation into the administrative system of the Assyrian Empire.

The connection between the theme of restoring order and balance in Mannea and the broader territorial issues is well documented in the Huitième Campagne. There are two passages relating to Ullusunu and Mannea in this document, both of which depict Ullusunu as a loyal vassal, on an equal footing with the highest officials of the realm. In the first
passage, Ullusunu marches forth from his royal city of Izirtu to greet the king in the course of his campaign. This passage is introduced by a statement that appears to serve as an explanation for the Mannean ruler’s action.

\[ \text{aššu ana turri gimilli ša šattišam lāparakkū} \]

Because of my yearly acts of kindness/ restoring balance, (which) never cease.

Whether the Assyrian king’s actions are interpreted as vengeance against a common enemy or acts of kindness on behalf of Ullusunu, the Mannean ruler’s display of loyalty is in response to the king’s previous efforts to assure stability in Mannea, stated in the same terms as those used in the Annals and the Ashur Prism fragment to describe his motivations in Mannea.

In a separate passage, Ullusunu again marches forth to greet the king. Like Ispabara of Ellipi, Ullusunu, together with his courtiers, make certain requests from the king, including a request for aid against the arch-rival, Ursa of Urartu. The requests include one concerning the land of Mannea itself.

\[ \text{māṭ Mannāya saphu ana aššu turri} \]

to restore the dispersed people of Mannea to their (proper) place.

This is reminiscent of the epithet in the Cylinder Inscription, mupahhīr māṭ Mannāya saphi, "who gathers the dispersed people of Mannea," an apparent reference to the internal political disorder in Mannea. However, the
expression *ana ašri turru is equivalent to the statement regarding the restoration of the cities of Que, which had been seized by Mita of Muski. This would tend to link the subject of restoring order to a troubled land with the issue of the distribution or exchange of territory. In his response to Ullusunu's request, the king agrees to a number of items, including the defeat of Ursa.

\[
\text{sakāp māt Urartu turri mišrišun niše māt Mannāya dalpātī supšuhi aqbišunūtimā irhišū libbu}
\]

I promised to force back the land of Urartu, restore their borders, and quiet the harassed people of Mannea, and they trusted me.

Here, restoring calm and order involves the territorial integrity of Mannea and the issue of Mannea's borders. It amounts to Mannean control over its territory.

The connection between the restoration of order and the territorial issues in Mannea is further confirmed in a short passage in the Us̄hdish section of the Huitièmes Campagne. This is the territory which the Huitièmes Campagne describes as forming the border between Urartu and Mannea, and which Ursa is accused of seizing. After forcing the flight of Ursa and defeating his ally, Metatti of Zikirtu, the king reports:

\[
\text{šēpē nakri lemnī ultu qereb māt Mannāya aprusma libbi Ullusunu bēlišunū utibma ana nišešū dalpātē ušēsi nūru}
\]

I forced out the wicked enemy from the land of Mannea, making Ullusunu happy and shedding light over his harassed people.
In a sense, this passage represents the fulfillment of the Assyrian king’s promise to the Manneans noted above. By eliminating Urartian control in Uishdish and restoring the borders, the Assyrian king was, in effect, restoring a sense of balance, order, and well-being to the land and its people.

None of this material in any way suggests Assyrian annexation of Mannean territory. The principal issue pertaining to Sargon’s activity in Mannea was his struggle with the Urartian king Ursa for influence in the northern Zagros. Clearly, Ursa meant to exploit the internal problems in Mannea as a means of gaining influence in the region. This is most clearly demonstrated by the Urartian king’s attempts to incite rebellion among the Mannean governors. By forcing the Urartian king out and restoring order and unity in Mannea, the Assyrian king was reasserting control in Mannea in terms of securing a stable and trustworthy ally on his eastern flank. It is this type of influence and control that, at least in the case of Mannea, is meant by the expression *ana mišir māt Assur turru, which can be translated "I (re)asserted Assyrian control."
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CHAPTER 9
SURVEY
OF THE THEME OF
FOREIGN SOVEREIGNTY

The analysis of the language of territoriality in Sargonid royal inscriptions has revealed, among other things, a distinction between the inscriptions of Sargon and those of later kings. The language of territoriality in all of its dimensions—political geography, the seizure of territory, annexation and province formation, as well as the concept of restoring a balance and its territorial ramifications—have been seen to be far more prevalent in the inscriptions of Sargon than in those of his successors. Indeed, the language of territoriality, particularly the subjects of annexation and province formation, are rare in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal.

To grasp the true significance of this feature, it seems worthwhile to contrast the language of territoriality with some other prominent subject in these inscriptions. This would serve to bring the the language of territoriality into greater relief. It would also demonstrate that Assyrian royal inscriptions do not reflect a simple reshuffling of formulas, but that each monarch confronted the issues of foreign affairs from a particular perspective.

In contrast to the language of territoriality, the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal tend to focus on the issue of
legitimate sovereignty in foreign territory. This is demonstrated in the consistent use of royal titles applied to foreign rulers. More significant, however, is the propensity toward maintaining independent native regimes in conquered territory. This is in marked contrast to the inscriptions of Sargon, where royal titles are less prevalent, and where there is a tendency to describe annexation and incorporation of conquered territory into the provincial system of the Assyrian Empire.

While royal titles are applied in the inscriptions of Sargon, more often the foreign ruler is identified by a simple gentilic statement, for example, *Ullusunu māt Mannāya*, "Ullusunu, the Mannean." The Appendix to this work supplies a listing of rulers mentioned in Sargon’s Annals and Display Inscription. The first list consists of references to foreign rulers which include the gentilic only. The second list contains references to foreign rulers wherein a royal title is applied. It is clear that with few exceptions, gentilic statements predominate.¹

Perhaps the most profound example of the lack of royal titles in the inscriptions of Sargon is the case of Ullusunu of Mannea. Both the Annals and the Display Inscription from Khorsabad describe this ruler in terms of royalty in two passages, one referring to his self-enthronement following the death of Aza² and again when he is re-enthroned by the Assyrian king.³ Yet, he is consistently identified by gentilic only and never supplied with a royal title. This
could be attributed to a certain ambivalence toward Ullusunu, who was at first implicated in anti-Assyrian activity according to these two inscriptions. Yet, the Ashur Prism fragment, which is wholly favorable toward the Mannean ruler, also avoids the use of a royal title applied to Ullusunu.4

Likewise, the Huitième Campagne is wholly favorable toward Ullusunu. The promises made by Sargon to Ullusunu regarding the elimination of the Urartian enemy and the restoration of order in Mannea, as well as the fulfillment of those promises, were discussed in the previous chapter.5 One such passage includes promises made by Sargon combined with a confirmation of Ullusunu’s kingship, all of which appears to be consecrated in some form of public ceremony.6

Unlike the Annals and the Display Inscription, the Huitième Campagne twice refers to Ullusunu as šarrī bēlīṣunu, "the king, their lord," the title used of his father, Iranzu, in the Annals. In both instances, the antecedent is Mannea itself, or the Mannean people.7 In a separate passage, Mitatti of Zikirtu is accused of slandering Ullusunu, who is called šarrī bēlīṣu, "the king, his lord,"8 a circumstance apparently related to the internal divisions in Mannea.9

Thus, while the Annals and the Display Inscription consistently fail to apply a royal title to Ullusunu, the Huitième Campagne is more consistent in recognizing Ullusunu’s sovereignty. However, it should be noted that
neither Ullusunu nor his predecessors are ever called šar māt Manna, "king of Mannea."

The title applied to Iranzu and Ullusunu, *šarru bēlu, "king, lord," indicates another significant feature of the use of titles in the inscriptions of Sargon. The occurrence of the element bēlu in the title applied to Iranzu in the Annals and Ullusunu in the *Huitième Campagne suggests a connection with the Medes and other states occupying the central Zagros south of Mannea. These rulers are most often accorded the title bel āli.

The literal translation of the term bel āli, "lord of the city," suggests perhaps "city ruler," or "mayor." Indeed, the title is applied to the rulers of two cities in the central Zagros, Šēpē-Šarru of Surgadia and Kibaba of Ḥarhar, in both inscriptions from Khorsabad. Another passage in the Annals begins as a campaign to the lands of Mannea and Media and includes receipt of tribute from Mannea and Ellipi, as well as from two minor figures, Zizi and Zala, who are called bel ālāni ša āl Gizīlbumdî, "city rulers of the city of Gizīlbumdî." In the *Huitième Campagne, however, these two rulers are mentioned with their respective cities, Appatar and Kitpataya, and are called bel ālāni ša māt Gizīlbumdî. This would indicate that individual lords ruled in various towns, but were united in some intra-urban political unit.

It is clear that there were, in fact, political units larger than the city to which the bearers of the title bēl
ali belonged. This applies particularly to the Medes. The Annals contains three passages describing receipt of tribute from the Medes. Two instances involve the formation and strengthening of the newly reorganized territory surrounding the city of Harhar. Another is in connection with tribute received from Ullusunu the Mannean, Dalta the Ellipean, and Bēl-apla-iddina the Allabrian. The three passages refer generically to 28, 22, and 45 rulers respectively with the title bēl ʾālāni ša māt Mādāya dannūti, "the powerful city rulers of Media."

The term appears in two passages in the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon. Again, the reference is to territories in the central Zagros, specifically the region of Media. One passage lists several personal names each followed with a title in the form of bēl ʾāli ša GN, "ruler of the city of GN," and subsumed under the generic māt Mādāya ša ašaršunu rūqu, "the land of Media whose places are distant." The second passage lists two rulers who are called bēl ʾālāni dannūti, "powerful city rulers." This episode opens as a campaign to the land of Patushari, which is said to be qereb māt Mādāya rūqūte, "in the midst of the distant land of Media."

In a section that also refers to Ullusunu and Bēl-apla-iddina, Sargon's Huitième Campagne refers to bēl ʾālāni ša māt Namri māt Sangibuti māt Bit-Abdadānī u māt Mādāya dannūti, "powerful city rulers of Namri, Sangibuti, Bit-Abdadānī, and Media." In the same section, Dalta of
Elippi is mentioned with three others who are referred to as bēl ālānī ša nārti, "city rulers of the river," presumably referring to the region of the lower Zab. This would indicate that the region was occupied by political units internally organized in the same manner as the Medes, that is, tribal groups associated with various urban centers.

Regardless of how we describe the nature of this larger structure, tribal or otherwise, the fact remains that in the inscriptions of Sargon, the non-royal title bēl āli is rather consistently applied to rulers of territories in the central Zagros.

The same consistency can be seen in the use of another non-royal title that also seems to be related to a tribal structure. The term nasīku, "sheikh," is applied to various Aramean rulers who submit to the Assyrian king during his sweep through southern Babylonian territory during the campaign of the twelfth regnal year.

In the first passage, eight nasīkāte are said to have surrendered to Sargon following the conquest of Merodach-Baladan's stronghold of Dūr-AtMari. Several lines later, in a passage which Lie has restored from an inscription found above door O, room V of Khorsabad, the flight and eventual surrender of four parties is described. The parties are each preceded by the determinative Lū, followed by the place names: Ru’a, Hindaru, Yadburu, Puqudu, i.e., the man of Ru’a, etc.

This apparently prompted the submission of more
adversaries. The suppliants are presented my means of two lists of five and four personal names respectively in the form PN ša āl GN, "PN of the city of GN." Each list concludes with the collective title nasīkāti ša Lū GN, "the sheikh of the citizens of GN," mentioning Puqudu and Hindaru respectively.

In certain respects, this political arrangement seems to resemble the situation in Media: individual rulers holding sway in particular territories or urban centers, but united, perhaps along ethnic or tribal lines. Nevertheless, the two groups are distinguished politically in terms of the titles applied to the leaders. The ruler of a city in the Puqudu land is not called bèl āli, but nasīku.

Thus, it is not as though the inscriptions of Sargon fail to use titles. There is, in fact, a certain consistency in the use of the non-royal titles bèl āli and nasīku with regard to tribes occupying the central Zagros and southern Mesopotamia. It is rather a tendency to avoid the use of royal titles, substituting simple gentilics in connection with rulers for whom a royal title is expected.

We might point out one glaring exception. In the inscriptions of Sargon, the Chaldean arch-rival, Merodach-Baladan is generally provided with a royal title. In the introduction to the campaign of the twelfth regnal year in the Annals, he is called mār Yakīnī šar māt Kaldi, "son of Yakin, king of Chaldea. The first part of this title also appears in a broken passage derived from the inscription of
Room V at Khorsabad. The title šar mātu Kaldi, "king of Chaldea," is used in the Nimrud Prism.

One passage in Sargon’s Annals refers to Merodach-Baladan with the title šar mātu Karduniš, "king of the land of Karduniash." This is the title of preference in the inscriptions of Sennacherib. The account of Merodach-Baladan’s mustering of troops according to the earliest account of Sennacherib’s first campaign includes a reference to Nippur, Borsippa, and Cutha described as gimir mātu Karduniš, "all of the land of Karduniash." At this time, the toponym, Karduniash, apparently referred to territory connected with some of the northern Babylonian urban centers. The title šar mātu Karduniš, therefore, has the effect of extending recognition of Merodach-Baladan’s sovereignty to parts of northern Babylonia. One title which is not applied to Merodach-Baladan is šar Bābili, "king of Babylon."

As noted, the consistent application of a title of royalty to Merodach-Baladan remains an anomaly in the inscriptions of Sargon, where gentilic titles are far more prevalent. The situation is otherwise in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal. There, not only are royal titles applied to nearly all of the foreign rulers mentioned, but they are applied frequently, if not universally, even to a defeated and deceased enemy. The titles become formulaic in that once a title is applied, it remains with the bearer in most subsequent references. While this may not seem terribly
unusual, it is in marked contrast to the inscriptions of Sargon.

A good example of the consistent use of a royal title in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal is the case of Yakinlu of Arwad on the Phoenician coast. This ruler is mentioned once in an early inscription of Ashurbanipal, the Harran Tablet inscription, and is named on several occasions in subsequent inscriptions. In every case, he is provided with his proper royal title, šar Arwadda, "king of Arwad."

The royal title is also consistently applied to Baal of Tyre, Gyges of Lydia, Nadnu of Nabatea, Ya’uta/Uate’ of Arabia/Qedar, Tarqu of Egypt/Ethiopia, and Asheri of Mannea. The last ruler provides an especially glaring contrast with Sargon’s inscriptions, where Ullusunu of Mannea is consistently referred to by means of a gentilic.

As noted, the tendency to supply royal titles to foreign rulers extends even to those enemies of Assyria who have been overthrown. Elam is case in point. During the reign of Ashurbanipal, Elam was ruled by a succession of regimes involving various family ties and sometimes ruling from different urban centers. One of the earliest accounts of affairs in Elam, Prism B, reports a major action against Urtaki assigned to the sixth campaign. The name is mentioned eight times in the course of that narrative and once in the introduction to the narrative of the seventh campaign. On five of those occasions, including the initial reference announcing the opening of the sixth
campaign, the ruler is assigned the formal title šar māt Elamti, "king of Elam." 39

Indeed, the three sons of Urtaki, Ummanigash, Ummanappa, and Tammaritu, are mentioned twice by name following the report of Urtaki's death and the succession of Teumman. In both cases, they are called mārū Urtaki šar māt Elamti, "the sons of Urtaki, king of Elam." 40 Thus, while the narrative reports the death of Urtaki and the overthrow of his dynasty, 41 he is still accorded his formal title. This tradition continues in Prism F and Cylinder A, which exclude the Urtaki narrative, but refer to Ummanigash as mār Urtaki šar māt Elamti. 42

Moreover, the consistent use of royal title can be observed with regard to Teumman, the successor of Urtaki. 43 This ruler was a bitter enemy of the Assyrians, called tamsīl gallī, "image of a demon." 44 Nevertheless, even after his death and dismemberment, 45 even after the succession of several subsequent regimes, Teumman continues to be referred to as šar māt Elamti. 46

The situation grows more complex as the narrative of the eighth campaign in Prism B continues with the ouster of Ummanigash by a certain Tammaritu, who assumes the throne. 47 Tammaritu is, in turn, deposed by one of his servants, Indabigash. Immediately following the initial announcement of the accession of Indabigash, the text of Prism B reports the flight of Tammaritu, calling him šar māt Elamti. 48 However, the conclusion of the narrative in Prism B includes
a statement reviewing the succession of Indabigash, as well as a subsequent reference wherein the royal title is applied to Indabigash. Thus, Tammaritu’s title persists despite the fact that his throne had been seized by a rival, who is also accorded an official royal title.

The accession of Indabigash and the flight of Tammaritu mark the end of the Elamite material found in Prism B. When the account resumes in the later inscriptions, there is no mention of Indabigash as king. Instead, the various narratives refer to a certain Ummanaldash, whose origin is unclear. The narrative opens as a campaign against Ummanaldash, who is provided with a royal title. The Assyrian king reports that he was accompanied on the campaign by Tammaritu, for whom a royal title is also supplied. Indeed, the narrative describes the conquest of the Elamite city of Bit-Imbi, including the seizure of the sons of Teumman, who is also called šar māt Elamti. The nature of rulership in Elam as it is reported in the inscriptions becomes extremely confused at this point, with different rulers assigned to various places. The Elamite material concludes with the sacking of Susa. Throughout, however, Ummanaldash is consistently supplied with a royal title.

The Elamite material reveals a powerful inclination in these inscriptions to accord foreign rulers their proper royal title, in marked contrast to the inscriptions of Sargon, where Elamite rulers are identified by gentilic
only. The tendency within the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal to focus on issues of legitimate royal sovereignty in foreign territory can also be demonstrated with respect to the continuing effort to establish and maintain local dynasties. This is not to say that King Sargon did not engage in regime establishment in conquered territory. There are examples in which Sargon enthroned native kings, in some cases even hostile kings who had become submissive. Yet, the examples are far less frequent than in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal.

Moreover, the instances of regime establishment in the inscriptions of Sargon display features which distinguish them from those of Ashurbanipal. In many cases, the regime appointed by Sargon fails, and the territory is incorporated into the empire, whereas Ashurbanipal repeatedly attempts to maintain a native regime. A number of examples from the inscriptions of Sargon also include some sort of transfer of territory accompanying the establishment of the regime, a feature connected with Sargon's concern for issues of territory.

The case of Ullusunu of Mannea is an example of the transfer of territory accompanying the establishment of his regime. Admittedly, this does not occur in the account found in the Annals from Khorsabad, where the submission and re-enthronement of Ullusunu is assigned to the campaign of the sixth regnal year, while the granting of the territory of Uishdish occurs in the narrative of the eighth regnal
However, in the Display Inscription, the re-enthronement of Ullusunu is announced at the very end of the narrative and is accompanied by the granting of the twenty-two citadels seized from Ursa. In this case, the establishment of the regime appears successful in that Ullusunu remains a loyal vassal. This is also the case with regard to Ispabara of Ellipi, whose regime, supported by Sargon, survives into the reign of Sennacherib.

However, the inscriptions of Sargon include references to regime establishment which eventually fail. Both the Annals and the Display Inscription describe the Assyrian king’s enthronement of Ambaris of Tabal, which includes the granting of the territory of Hilakku to the new Tabalean king. Unlike the case of Ullusunu, the arrangement in Tabal fails. Ambaris is defeated and his realm incorporated into the Assyrian provincial system. Likewise, the establishment of the regime of Ahimitti in Ashdod fails when the Assyrian vassal is deposed and replaced by Yadna/Yamani. This leads to the reconquest of Ashdod and its incorporation as an Assyrian province.

Whereas the inscriptions of Sargon often report the failure of regime establishment, the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal display a persistent effort to maintain native dynasties. One simple, but graphic, example of this is the account of the succession to kingship in Arwad following the death of Yakinlu. Yakinlu had submitted to the Assyrian king and was required to fulfill certain tributary
obligations. Upon his demise, his sons travelled to Assyria to perform obeisance to the king. One son was chosen from the group and made king. However, the other sons were not ignored, but were provided with gifts from the Assyrian king consisting of variegated tunics and gold bracelets, symbols of their status. 65 Thus, the larger royal family received the beneficence of the Assyrian monarch.

In the case of Arwad, Ashurbanipal was simply acknowledging the legitimate succession in a friendly state. In Mannea, however, the Assyrian monarch faced a hostile king, Aḥšeri. Nonetheless, while the Mannea passages in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal do not describe the Assyrian king’s actual enthronement of Aḥšeri’s successor, the new regime is acknowledged and sanctioned by Assyria. 66

Moreover, a theme is presented in the Mannea passages which proves to be quite common in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal. The enemy king is not defeated and deposed by the Assyrians, but falls victim to an internal rebellion. This results in the assumption of kingship by Aḥšeri’s son, Uwalli, who dispatches the new crown-prince, Erisinni, to do obeisance in the Assyrian court, much like the sons of Yakinlu. The embassy is accepted, messages of peace are sent back to Mannea, and Uwalli is established as a loyal tributary king. Thus, despite the hostilities faced in Mannea, Ashurbanipal sought to legitimize the native dynasty.
Perhaps the most graphic example of this tendency to establish and/or maintain native dynasties can be seen in Ashurbanipal's handling of affairs in Elam. Repeatedly, members of the ruling regime in Elam, apparently considered to be members of the legitimate dynasty, flee to the Assyrian court in the face of internal opposition, appeal to the Assyrian king for support, and are reinstated. This is the case despite the fact that certain members of this ruling dynasty carry out hostilities against Assyria.

The earliest account of affairs in Elam appears in Prism B, where the Elamite king, Urtaki, is said to have initiated hostilities against Assyria. He is overcome by what is described as a punishment inflicted by the gods of Assyria, becomes ill, and dies. Indeed, so angry are the gods, that Urtaki's entire dynasty is said to have been overthrown, and his throne is then occupied by Teumman. Apparently seeking to eliminate any rival claims to the throne, Teumman proceeds to plot the murder of all members of the previous dynasty. The sons of Urtaki, Ummanigash, Ummanappa, and Tammaritu, together with other members of the royal family, flee to Assyria and submit to the Assyrian king.

The following campaign is undertaken against Teumman, who is defeated, killed, and beheaded. The Assyrian king then proceeds to reinstate the regime of the sons of Urtaki, placing Ummanigash on Teumman's vacant throne and establishing Ummanigash's brother, Tammaritu, as king of the
city of Hīdalu. This was accomplished despite the fact that the father of these rulers had been an enemy of Assyria.

Ummanigash subsequently falls out of favor with the Assyrian king when he joins the rebellion of the king of Babylon, Ashurbanipal’s brother, Šamaš-šum-ukin. He is then deposed by a rival named Tammaritu, who is also charged with conspiracy in the rebellion of Šamaš-šum-ukin, and is, in turn, deposed by one of his servants, Indabigash. Like the sons of Urtaki, Tammaritu, together with his retinue, flees to Assyria and seeks refuge by submitting to the Assyrian king. Tammaritu is eventually returned to Elam and enthroned in the city of Susa.

Despite Ashurbanipal’s repeated attempts to maintain native sovereignty in Elam, the kingdom continued to be a source of trouble. Yet, when the Elamites are finally defeated by the Assyrians and the city of Susa is sacked and destroyed, the rubble is simply left as an example of the Assyrian king’s power. There is no effort to incorporate Elamite territory into the Assyrian provincial system.

The language of foreign sovereignty is far more complex than the simple use of royal titles and statements regarding the enthronement of native regimes. Throughout the survey, other themes have been noted in connection with regime establishment; the continuous appearance of submissive claimants at the Assyrian royal court; the language of mercy and beneficence applied when a claimant’s submission is
recognized; the imposition of tribute, or the lack of it, connected to the various acts of enthronement. All of these would require careful examination in any thorough study of the language of foreign sovereignty in Assyrian royal inscriptions. What the survey does reveal, however, is that whereas the language of foreign sovereignty is rather sparse and tenuous in the inscriptions of Sargon, it becomes a highly elaborate theme in the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal.
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The study of the language of territoriality in Assyrian royal inscriptions of the Sargonid period has revealed three major points. The first point involves the abundance of language related to issues of territory in the inscriptions of Sargon as compared to those of later kings. The second point is the significance of topographic characterizations as aspects of political geography. Finally, our study has demonstrated that Assyrian royal inscriptions were not composed of dry formulas arranged haphazardly. Rather, they reveal an ongoing effort to develop what might be called an Assyrian foreign policy.

With regard to the comparison between the inscriptions of Sargon and those of later kings, the study of generic characterizations of topography does not adequately reveal the discrepancy. Generic expressions describing the topography of maritime regions such as the coast of the Mediterranean and the watery terrain of southern Mesopotamia, as well as alpine and desert terrain, are well attested in the inscriptions of the four Sargonid kings presented in this study.

In most other respects, however, the inscriptions of Sargon show a far greater emphasis on territorial issues than those of later kings, particularly Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. The language of borders, prevalent in the
inscriptions of Sargon, is scarce in the inscriptions of later kings. The focus on particular border issues found in the inscriptions of Sargon, specifically the Elamite and Urartian borders, has no parallels in subsequent reigns. While the inscriptions of Sennacherib follow those of Sargon in depicting the riverine boundaries in southern Mesopotamia, this sort of territorial delimitation is not found in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.

Concerning issues surrounding the exchange of territory, the inscriptions of Sargon display both greater frequency and complexity. The greater complexity is most apparent in the treatment of the seizure of Mannean territory as reported in the various inscriptions of Sargon. What these passages reveal is an ongoing attempt to confront the intricate political and territorial issues which confronted the Assyrian king in the rather fragmented Mannean kingdom. By comparison, the treatment of territorial seizure in Mannea as reported in Prism B of Ashurbanipal is rather terse, if not particularly straightforward. Indeed, the issue is omitted in subsequent inscriptions of Ashurbanipal.

The subject of province formation provides the best example of the abundance of territorial issues in the inscriptions of Sargon as compared to those of subsequent kings. The language of province formation in the inscriptions of Sargon is applied frequently and covers virtually every region of the empire. In addition, there
appears to be a certain regionalization of the language of province formation in the inscriptions of Sargon. That is, special terminology is reserved for certain regions. While there are a few examples of province formation in the inscriptions of Sennacherib, the subject is virtually ignored in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.

Like the generic topographic characterizations, the graphic depictions of topography offer a diminished opportunity for comparative study. This is due to the fact that much of the evidence comes from one particular genre of royal inscriptions, the so-called "Letters to Gods." Our study has focused on the account of Sargon's eighth campaign known as the *Huitième Campagne*, a classic example of this genre. Yet, the same kind of topographic detail can be seen in an inscription of this type from the reign of Ashurbanipal (Weippert, 1973-74). Indeed, a similar version of events covered in his "Letter to the God" has been incorporated into Ashurbanipal's Cylinder A inscription (A, VIII, 78 ff.). The literary background of the graphic descriptions of topography presents a confounding factor in any attempt to analyse the comparative distribution of this terminology.

However, the study of topographic characterizations has led to another important conclusion regarding the significance of topography as it relates to political geography. Specifically, our study has revealed the boundary-forming quality of topography, particularly rivers...
and mountains. This was first observed with regard to the land-sale contracts and the Babylonian boundary-stone inscriptions wherein topographic features served to delimit the boundaries of private property.

The discussion regarding the boundary-forming quality of topography in Assyrian royal inscriptions has focused on two features: riverine boundary formation in southern Mesopotamia and alpine boundary formation in the northern Zagros. We have noted the tripartite riverine division of southern Mesopotamia in the inscriptions of both Sargon and Sennacherib. In addition, the inscriptions of Sargon contain riverine locations pertaining to a number of Aramean tribal groups in the region.

With regard to the northern Zagros, the inclusion of topographic features in the itinerary formulas of the *Huitième Campagne*, particularly mountain and river crossings, have been cited as evidence for the boundary-forming quality of rivers and mountains. That is, since the itinerary formulas represent the movement of the king from one territory to the next, the rivers and mountains crossed serve to delimit the boundary between the two territories mentioned in the formula. Other graphic depictions of geography in the *Huitième Campagne*, including topography, meteorology, resource and ethnic geography, were seen to be related to the issue of what constituted the boundary between the Assyrian and Urartian spheres of influence in the northern Zagros.
All of the issues covered in this study point to the fact that Assyrian royal inscriptions reflect the development of an Assyrian foreign policy. This is not to say that we have uncovered any particular evidence in Assyrian royal inscriptions for an institutionalized foreign policy, complete with ministers, secretaries, and embassies. Rather, we have found that the inscriptions often seem designed to address particular policy issues.

The study of border terms in the inscriptions of Sargon, including topographic borders, has revealed the desire to deal with certain important border issues, in particular, the Elamite and Urartian borders. Both Elam and Urartu presented serious challenges to Assyrian hegemony. While the king must have realized that complete conquest of these two powerful kingdoms was not within his grasp, he seems to have been determined to establish borders which guaranteed the protection of his sphere of influence.

Likewise, the discussion of province formation in the inscriptions of Sargon has revealed certain regional variations. The policy of territorial aggrandizement, part of the king's province-forming activity in the central Zagros, was discussed in terms of the need to apply a more centralized system of control over territory occupied by the politically diffuse Medes. Province formation in southern Mesopotamia was designed to separate the territory of Bit-Yakin, home of the arch-rival, Merodach-Baladan, from the
larger Chaldean tribal alliance, while otherwise maintaining a semblance of native Babylonian provincial administration.

Even the rather ambiguous territorial issues involving the fragmented kingdom of Mannea reveal a desire to implement a policy specific to the region. Unlike the policy in the central Zagros, where Assyrian provinces were established, Sargon chose to maintain an independent Mannean kingdom in the northern Zagros. However, this policy involved the establishment of a centralized, pro-Assyrian regime in Mannea, whose control was apparently extended to the rebellious province of Uishdish. This was clearly meant to alleviate the situation whereby the Urartian ruler, Ursa, could exploit the internal divisions in Mannea in order to extend his sphere of influence.

Finally, the different use of language in the inscriptions of Sargon as compared to those of Ashurbanipal also has implications with regard to our understanding of the development of Assyrian policy. As we have seen, the inscriptions of Sargon reveal an emphasis on territorial issues, while those of Ashurbanipal focus on the subject of foreign sovereignty. While it may seem logical to view this discrepancy in terms of an expanding empire under Sargon as opposed to a declining empire under Ashurbanipal, this explanation fails to take into account other significant issues.

While the modern historian may detect the seeds of Assyrian decline in the reign of Ashurbanipal, it would be
an exaggeration to describe Assyria during this period as a declining empire. Ashurbanipal’s ability to exert effective military pressure on Egypt, to march through the Arabian desert, to destroy the kingdom of Elam and sack its capital city, Susa, can hardly be considered signs of decline.

Rather, the distinction in the use of language must be considered in terms of the nature of the two kings’ reigns. While it is true that Sargon came to the throne during a period of renewed Assyrian expansion, it must also be borne in mind that he was a usurper. To Sargon, legitimate sovereignty was something to be overcome. Legitimacy had to be achieved, as it had been achieved in the past, through conquest and expansion.

Ashurbanipal, on the other hand, assumed the throne under somewhat unusual circumstances, involving issues of legitimate sovereignty and succession in Assyria. His father, Esarhaddon, was forced to contend with his own brothers, rival claimants to the throne. The nature of Ashurbanipal’s succession, arranged by his father in the face of a certain amount of internal opposition, tended to bring the issue of legitimate sovereignty into sharp focus. It is, therefore, not surprising that his inscriptions reflect this concern with legitimate sovereignty.

The language of foreign territory is, therefore, not a haphazard array of stock formulas. Assyrian kings not only viewed the world in terms of political and topographic regions, but also developed specific policies in various
regions, policies which reflected their own understanding of hegemony and sovereignty.
APPENDIX

The following is a list of enemies and other protagonists whose names are followed by simple gentilic statements in Sargon's Annals and Display Inscription.

Ambaris, Tabal
D. 29-30. In the Annals, Ambaris is called Tabalaya šar māt Bit-Burutaš (Lie, Sargon, 32:194; 201).

Assur-le'u, Karalla
Lie, Sargon, 14:84; D. 55.

Bagdatti, Uishdish
Lie, Sargon, 12:79; D. 49.

Bēl-apla-iddina, Allabria
Lie, Sargon, 30:192.

Bēl-šar-ūšur, Kisesim
Lie, Šargon, 16:93; D. 59.

Dalta, Ellipi
Lie, Sargon, 16:97; 30:192; D. 70

Iranzu, Manna
D. 36. Iranzu of Manna, mentioned in the Annals in connection with the revolt of Shuandahul of Durdukka (Lie, Sargon, B:58-59), is called Iranzu māt Mannāya šarri bēlisunu, "Iranzu the Mannean, the king their lord."

It'amara, Saba'
Lie, Sargon, 22:123; D. 27.

İtti, Allabria
Lie, Sargon, 14:85; D. 55.

Kiakki, Sinuhtu
Lie, Šargon, 10:68; D. 28.

Matti, (A)tunu
Lie, Sargon, 10:71; D. 29.

Mita, Muski
Lie, Sargon, 66:446; 68:452; D. 31,151,152.

Mitatti, Zikirtu
Lie, Sargon, 12:79; 22:131; D. 45.

Muttallum, Kumuḫu
Lie, Sargon, 36:221; 70:467; D. 112.
Pisiris, Carchemish  
  Lie, Sargon, 10:72;74.

Šutur-nahundu, Elam  
  Lie, Sargon, 52:15; 54:367; D. 119.

Tarḫulara, Gurgum  
  D. 83.

Tarḫunazi, Meliddu  
  Lie, Sargon, 34:204; D. 79.

Telusina, Andia  
  Lie, Sargon, 18:107; D. 45.

Ullusunu, Mannea  

Ummanigash, Elam  
  Lie, Sargon, 42:265; D. 23, 123.

Ursa, Urartu  
  Lie, Sargon 14:84; 16:101; 24:133; 26:149; D. 37, 39, 42, 73.

Urzana, Muṣaṣir  
  Lie, Sargon, 26:149; 152; D. 72.

Yanzū, Naʿiri  
  D. 54. Lie, Sargon, 18:104 reads Ia-an-zu-ú šar māt Naʿ-i-i-ri and justifies the restoration based on 1. 54 of the Display Inscription, which reads Ia-an-zu-ú māt Naʿ-i-i-ri.

Yau/Ilubiʿdi, Hamath  
  Lie, Sargon, 6:23; D. 33.

This can be compared to the list of those supplied with a royal title:

Ambaris, Bit-Burutas  
  Lie, Sargon, 32,194; 32,201. The Annals provides Ambaris of Tabal with a unique title, calling him the Tabalean, king of Bit-Burutas. According to Forrer, Provinzeinteilung, 73. the name Tabal was an ethnic designation and consisted of various kingdoms, of which Bit-Burutas was one. Eventually, the latter could be applied to Tabal in a narrower political sense. This view was accepted by Landsberger, Samal, 19.

Argišti, Urartu  
  D. 113
Azuri, Ashdod
Lie, Sargon, 38, 249; D. 90

Dalta, Ellipi
Lie, Sargon, 72, 13 (restored from Display Inscription); D., 117

Gunzinanu, Kammanu
Lie, Sargon, 34, 206; D. 83

Hanunu, Hazitu
D. 25, 26. The passage that would give the title is missing from the Annals. In the concluding section, Hanunu is referred to by name only.

Iranzu, Mannea
Lie, Sargon, 8, 59

Merodach-Baladan, Kaldu
Lie, Sargon, 42, 293; perhaps also 58: 13; D. 122. Elsewhere in the Annals (Lie Sargon, 54: 9), he is called šar Karduniaš.

Mita, Muski
Lie, Sargon, 10, 72; 20, 120; 22, 12 5; 32, 199

Pir'ı, Muš(u)ri
Lie, Sargon, 22, 123; D. 27. In the same passage, Samsi is called Šarrat māt Aribi, "queen of Arabia." Queens ruling in Arabia are quite common in these inscriptions. For instance, Yati'e in the account of Sennacherib's first campaign (Smith, 28.) and Ismakallatu in the Nineveh A Prism inscription of Esarhaddon (Nin A, IV, 4).

Uperi, Dilmun
Lie, Sargon, 66, 14; 68, 454; D. 144. Restored from Display Inscription.

Ursa, Urartu
Lie, Sargon, 28, 162; 32, 199; D. 76

Yanzu, Na’iri
Lie, Sargon, 26, 14
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