

Who were the Cimmerians, and where did they come from?

Sargon II, the Cimmerians, and Rusa I

By ANNE KATRINE GADE KRISTENSEN

Translated from the Danish by Jørgen Læssøe



Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 57
Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab
The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters

Commissioner: Munksgaard · Copenhagen 1988

The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters

publishes four monograph series, an Annual Report and, occasionally, special publications. The format is governed by the requirements of the illustrations, which should comply with the following measures.

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, 8°

Authorized Abbreviations

Hist.Fil.Medd.Dan.Vid.Selsk.

(printed area 175 × 104 mm, 2700 units)

Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter, 4°

(History, Philosophy, Philology,
Archaeology, Art History)

Hist.Filos.Skr.Dan.Vid.Selsk.

(printed area 2 columns,
each 199 × 177 mm, 2100 units)

Matematisk-fysiske Meddelelser, 8°

(Mathematics, Physics,
Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology)

Mat.Fys.Medd.Dan.Vid.Selsk.

(printed area 180 × 126 mm, 3360 units)

Biologiske Skrifter, 4°

(Botany, Zoology, Palaeontology,
General Biology)

Biol.Skr.Dan.Vid.Selsk.

(printed area 2 columns,
each 199 × 77 mm, 2100 units)

Oversigt, Annual Report, 8°

Overs.Dan.Vid.Selsk.

The Academy invites original papers that contribute significantly to research carried on in Denmark. Foreign contributions are accepted from temporary residents in Denmark, participants in a joint project involving Danish researchers, or partakers in discussion with Danish contributors.

Instructions to Authors

Manuscripts from contributors who are not members of the Academy will be refereed by two members of the Academy. Authors of accepted papers receive galley proof and page proof which should be returned promptly to the editor. Minidisks etc. may be accepted; contact the editor in advance, giving technical specifications.

Alterations causing more than 15% proof charges will be charged to the author(s). 50 free copies are supplied. Order form, quoting a special price for additional copies, accompanies the page proof. Authors are urged to provide addresses for up to 20 journals which may receive review copies.

Manuscripts not returned during the production of the book are not returned after printing. Original photos and art work are returned when requested.

Manuscript

General. – Manuscripts and illustrations must comply with the details given above. The original ms. and illustrations plus one clear copy of both should be sent to the undersigned editor.

NB: A ms. should not contain less than 32 *printed* pages. This applies also to the Mat. Fys.Medd., where contributions to the history of science are welcome.

Language. – English is the preferred language. Danish, German and French mss. are accepted and in special cases other languages. Where necessary, language revision must be carried out before final acceptance.

Title. – Titles should be kept as short as possible and with an emphasis on words useful for indexing and information retrieval.

Who were the Cimmerians, and where did they come from?

Sargon II, the Cimmerians, and Rusa I

By ANNE KATRINE GADE KRISTENSEN

Translated from the Danish by Jørgen Læssøe



Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser **57**
Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab
The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters

Commissioner: Munksgaard · Copenhagen 1988

Abstract

According to Herodotus and Greek tradition as a whole, the original home of the Cimmerians was north of the Black Sea in what was then known as Scythia. In spite of persistent archaeological excavations, however, it has not been possible to determine the presence of Cimmerians in Scythia or elsewhere. The question of the origin of the Cimmerians, therefore, remains somewhat of a mystery.

The author of the present investigation wishes to show, with an analysis of all available contemporaneous evidence from the time of Sargon II and Esarhaddon (8th to 9th centuries B.C.), that the Cimmerians were in fact identical with Israelites deported from Northern Israel after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. Large parts of these deportees were then posted or indeed settled in the Zagros area, under Assyrian supervision, and in garrisons along the frontier between Assyria and Urartu (Armenia), where we find them in 714.

ANNE K. G. KRISTENSEN
c/o Mrs Inger Ross-Kristensen
1318 Great Plain Avenue
Needham, Mass. 02192, U.S.A.

Table of Contents

Preface	p. 5
Introduction	p. 6
Chapter I: Where was Gamir?	p. 13
Chapter II: Gamir and Uishdish	p. 22
1. The Coronation at Muşāşir in the Autumn of 714	p. 24
2. From Uishdish and Mt. Uaush till Rusa's Death	p. 43
3. From Gamir to Urzana's Homage	p. 64
Excursus	p. 76
4. The Battle in Gamir and on Mt. Uaush	p. 80
Chapter III: The Cimmerians, and where they came from	p. 99
Bibliography	p. 133

TO
Melchior

Preface

In presenting this study, I wish to acknowledge with thanks the financial support which I received from the Danish Research Council for the Humanities during my studies on the Cimmerian people. I also wish to thank the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters for accepting this work for publication in the series *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser*. I wish to express sincere gratitude to Professor, Dr Jørgen Læssøe not only for the translation of my book, but also for his truly exceptional advice and patient guidance during my work with the Cimmerians. My warm thanks are due to Mr Henning Breindahl, author, of Odense, and to Mr Robert C. Boraker, England, and to Professor, Dr Simo Parpola, Helsinki, for his assistance in providing me with references to the most recent literature on the subject.

Furthermore, I wish to thank the staff of the Library at the University of Odense for their never-failing cooperation and tireless efforts in providing me with the literature I needed.

Odense, on the 2 November, 1987

Anne Katrine Gade Kristensen

Introduction

Time and again, when reading about the Cimmerians and their origin, we come upon expressions like “the Cimmerian enigma”, “the Cimmerian mystery” or “the Cimmerian problem”,¹ and it is a fact that, in spite of intensive studies within fields like history, Assyriology, archaeology and many other related fields, the question of the origin, geographical setting as well as the ethnic affiliation of the Cimmerians is very far from having been solved. Furthermore, it is odd that, with any degree of certainty, no one has yet succeeded in demonstrating the presence of the Cimmerians from an archaeological point of view, neither in the southern parts of Russia, nor elsewhere.²

In Greek tradition as recorded by Herodotus, the original haunts of the Cimmerians was a question which seems to have presented no problem. According to this tradition, they were to be looked for north of the Black Sea and in the Crimea, in what was later known as Scythia. However, according to Herodotus, the Cimmerians were driven out of this territory by the Scythians and were forced to move southwards along the coastline of the Black Sea and into Asia Minor where, in the 7th century B. C., during the reign of Ardys, king of the Lydians, they attacked and conquered Sardis.³

The tradition recorded by Herodotus and other classical authors⁴ was practically unanimously accepted up to the middle of the 19th century, when entirely new sources, throwing light on the earliest history of the Cimmerians, began to emerge. The discoveries made by Sir Henry Layard and other excavators in the royal archives at Nineveh and Calah, first and foremost the discovery of ancient Assyrian clay tablets, yielded an entirely new source-material for the study of the Cimmerians.⁵ A series of these tablets represents letters from the time of Sargon II (721-705 B. C.), referring to the Cimmerians and their country Gamir. The Assyrian letters show clearly that, at the end of the 8th century B. C., the Cimmerians were settled in an area not far from Urartu, i. e., to the south and not to the north of the Caucasus. Not only are these letters several centuries earlier than the writings of the Greek historian: they also represent an infinitely more reliable set of sources than that which we find in the learned tradition in Herodotus. In these letters we encounter contempor-

ary reports to Sargon, submitted by Assyrian military intelligence. The reports account for the prevailing political and military state of affairs in and around Urartu about the time of Sargon's 8th Campaign in the year 714 B. C., and it is in this connexion that we first hear about the Cimmerians.

The information derived from the Assyrian sources with regard to the settling of the Cimmerians south of the Caucasus about 714 B. C. must influence our evaluation of the entire thesis on the Cimmerians as expounded by Herodotus, as well as far as his chronology is concerned. Thus, it becomes difficult to maintain that the appearance of the Cimmerians in Asia Minor, in the 7th century, was a direct and immediate result of their having been expelled from southern Russia when we consider that as early as ab. 714 they found themselves in the neighbourhood of Urartu and Man. The image which Herodotus had drawn of the earliest home and history of the Cimmerians – uncontested for nearly two and a half millennia – was not easily dismissed. Therefore, the Assyrian sources did not decisively influence the traditional view concerning the original home of the Cimmerians. Instead of drawing the conclusion on the basis of the newly found sources, the result turned out to be that the two traditions were combined so as to explain the Cimmerian presence south of the Caucasus as a station in their wandering from the area north of the Black Sea on their way to Asia Minor.⁶ It had to be postulated, therefore, that the arrival of the Scythians in Ukraine, and therefore the Cimmerian

1 Cf., e.g., Baschmakoff 1932; Sulimirski 1959, cf. p. 62: "*the Cimmerian enigma*"; Werner, *Das Kimmerierproblem und die pontische Bronzezeit Südrusslands*, 1961, p. 129; Kothe 1963, p. 11: "Und doch bleibt nach allen diesen Meinungsäußerungen die fast dreitausendjährige Frage nach Alter und Herkunft *der rätselhaften Reiterkrieger* am Schwarzen Meer weiterhin ungelöst"; Jessup 1970, p. 51: "Much of *the mystery surrounding the Cimmerians* is based on a lack of thorough investigation and an almost total lack of relics of their existence."

2 Rolle 1977, pp. 308 f. (see passage quoted below on p. 10). See also the quote from Jessup in the preceding note.

3 Her. I:15, 103; IV:1, 11-13.

4 Besides Herodotus, cf. especially the *Odyssey* XI:11 ff.

5 Cf. Waterman 1936, p. 10; Fales 1983, p. 3. As for letters concerning the Cimmerians, see the most recent edition: K. Deller, *Ausgewählte neuassyrische Briefe betreffend Urartu zur Zeit Sargons II*, in *Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia, Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche nell'Azerbaigian iraniano*, ed. P. E. Pecorella e M. Salvini, 1984, *Incunabula Graeca* LXXVIII, pp. 97-122.

6 See, i.a., Lehmann-Haupt 1921, cols. 397 ff.; furthermore, already Winckler 1897, pp. 484 ff. with several other contributions.

exodus, could not have taken place in the 7th century as one was led to believe from Herodotus, but at some earlier date. Accordingly, the exodus was “moved” backwards in time to some point in the 8th century;⁷ indeed, some archaeologists have even operated with dates at varying times for their expulsion all the way back to the 2nd millennium.⁸

The first, and the most serious, challenge against the traditional concept of the North-Pontian origin of the Cimmerians was put forward in 1968 by Umberto Cozzoli in his *I Cimmeri*, one of the few explicit studies to appear since C. F. Lehmann-Haupt’s comprehensive article in the *Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1921). From the point of view of criticism of sources, Cozzoli did what is obviously the right thing to do: he accorded preference to the Assyrian letters rather than relying on the Greek tradition. Deducing from what the Assyrian sources had to tell about the Cimmerians, and from the absence of indisputable archaeological evidence of this population in southern Russia,⁹ he arrived at the conclusion that the earliest Cimmerian homeland which can be traced on the basis of reliable and trustworthy sources was not near the Cimmerian Bosphorus, nor in southern Russia, but to the east or north-east of Urartu, close to the country of the Mannaeans. Here we find them, not only at the time of Sargon II, but also in the century following.¹⁰

Cozzoli makes a point of stressing the fact that there is no reliable archaeological evidence to indicate that the Cimmerians were ever at home in the Pontian area. Admittedly, archaeologists have attributed remains from a variety of bronze- and early iron-age cultures to the north of the Black Sea to the Cimmerians, but with no other justification than that ancient writers had placed them there. These archaeological hypotheses are based on pure guesswork and lack any kind of proof or documentation.¹¹ Furthermore, Cozzoli inclines to maintain that it cannot with any degree of certainty be shown that the Cimmerians were ever in Scythia. Geographical names as given by Herodotus, such as “the Cimmerian Bosphorus” or “the Cimmerian country” provide no evidence in favour of their presence there. On the contrary, it cannot be excluded that in these northern Pontian areas the Greeks found a people akin to the Cimmerians both with regard to relationship as well as with regard to customs, so that they may have named the places according to the Cimmerians whom they knew so well after their appearance in Asia Minor.¹²

Cozzoli adheres to the concept that the disappearance of the Cimmerians from Scythia, as Herodotus will have it, betokens an historical hy-

pothesis which the latter attempts to show, rather than historical tradition. He is inclined to viewing the entire account as a shaky construction which, mainly, is based upon the following:

- a) the occurrence of Cimmerian geographical names in Scythia;
- b) the presence of Scythians in the country at the time of Herodotus himself;
- c) the knowledge of eastern Scythians near the Massagetae as well as of the western Scythians;
- d) the tradition concerning the Cimmerian invasion into Ionia and neighbouring countries;
- e) and finally, accounts about the havoc created by the Scythians in Asia at the time of Cyaxares.¹³

7 See, e.g., Lehmann-Haupt 1921, col. 400; Tallgren 1926, p. 219; Gimbutas 1963, p. 833; id. 1965, p. 159; Clark and Piggott 1968, pp. 275 f.; Jessup 1970, p. 66; Yamauchi 1976, p. 242; Brentjes 1981, p. 7.

8 Sulimirski 1954, pp. 283 f., 317; id. 1959, pp. 47 f., 62 ff.; id. 1970, p. 395; further, cf., for example Ebert 1929, p. 56; Werner 1961, pp. 129 and 132 f.; Ghirshman 1962, p. 327; Young 1967, p. 33.

9 Cozzoli 1968, pp. 12 ff.

10 Cozzoli 1968, pp. 95 ff., 103 f.

11 Cozzoli 1968, pp. 12 ff., 105.

12 Cozzoli 1968, pp. 16, 104. Besides, compare a similar conception forwarded already by Müllenhoff 1892, pp. 19 ff. – The Cimmerian place-names have been given by the Greeks, and they are at times explained on the assumption that a remaining group of Cimmerians had survived in the Crimea and east of the Maiotis (Werner 1961, p. 133; Artamonov 1969, p. 67). It has been a common assumption that the name of the Cimmerians has survived in the place name “Crimea”, which could then be identified with the “country Cimmeria” of Herodotus IV:12 (see, e.g., Herodotus, The Loeb Classical Library II, 1963, p. 213 note 1; Ghirshman 1954, p. 97.) However, it has been shown that the name of *Crimea* has nothing to do with the Cimmerians but that it hails from Turco-Tatar *qyrum* which means fortress (Harmatta 1976, p. 19; Zgusta 1955, p. 16.)

13 Cozzoli 1968, p. 67. – It is common knowledge that the account presented by Herodotus concerning the relations between Cimmerians and Scythians contains absurdities. Like Cozzoli, in Kretschmer’s opinion we are faced with an historical construction made by Herodotus (Kretschmer 1921, col. 939). George Rawlinson, already, stated that the notion according to Herodotus, the Scythians “entered Asia in pursuit of the Cimmerians is childish, and may safely be set aside” (G. Rawlinson 1864, p. 513 note 3). Müllenhoff considered the account “so elend und widersinnig, so voller unmöglichkeiten und ungereimtheiten, dass es ganz anderer beweis zur beglaubigung der behaupteten tatsache bedarf, und deren gibt es keine” (1892, pp. 19 f.).

Somehow, Cozzoli's voice didn't carry; at any rate, his points of view did not lead to any kind of clash with regard to the traditional concept of the original home of the Cimmerians. Nor did there ensue a clash with the great and far-reaching theses which archaeologists and others had propounded concerning Cimmerians and Scythians (their mutual relationships and their earliest material culture), basing their arguments on Greek tradition and archaeological finds in southern Russia and elsewhere.

When, in the 1960's, Cozzoli was writing about the Cimmerians, one prevalent archaeological thesis amounted to this: archaeologically speaking, the Cimmerians must be represented by the vast southern Russian Catacomb Culture from the Bronze Age, whereas the Proto-Scythians were supposed to be responsible for the Timber Grave Culture.¹⁴ When the latter replaced the Catacomb Culture, it was supposed that a counterpart had been found, confirming the expulsion of the Cimmerians by the Scythians as recorded by Herodotus. Or, as T. Sulimirski expressed it in 1954, "There is no other way in which the in-coming Scythians and the out-going Cimmerians can be identified with the archaeological remains of Pontic lands, if their identification with the *Strubnaia* [Timbergrave] and the Catacomb cultures is rejected."¹⁵ However, since then, new evidence and new points of view have replaced this and other theories,¹⁶ and by 1977 Renate Rolle was able to ascertain that so far, it had not yet been possible to separate an unambiguous Cimmerian hoard of material north of the Black Sea.¹⁷ We find ourselves in the position, she says, "dass wir von den Kimmeriern das geographische Ausgangsgebiet kennen, sie aber dort bisher unter den archäologisch bekannten Kulturgruppen noch nicht sicher identifizieren können."¹⁸ It seems, therefore, that we must point out that archaeological assumptions with regard to the Cimmerians in no way create a hindrance against Cozzoli's conception that the earliest attested home of this people has to be looked for, not north of the Black Sea, but somewhere near Urartu.¹⁹

At long last, there occurred what must be described as a turning point in our dealings with the Cimmerians, that in 1984 Mirjo Salvini arrived at, for all practical purposes, the same conclusion as Cozzoli without having had any knowledge of the latter's study dating from 1968. Based on analysis of the relevant Assyrian material in terms of letters from the time of Sargon II, Salvini was able to determine that this material, incontestably, contradicts the classical theory about the penetration of the Cimmerians from some point north of the Caucasus. On the contrary, the

Cimmerians find themselves, and therefore also Gamir to the south or the south-east of Lake Urmia, and this geographical placing ties in well with sources dating from the reign of Esarhaddon (680-669) when Cimmerian warriors appear in full association with Mannaeans and Medes.²⁰ The essential difference between Cozzoli's and Salvini's views is primarily that the former would prefer to place Gamir to the east or the north-east of Urartu, a difference of opinions to which we shall revert subsequently.²¹

With Cozzoli's and Salvini's re-evaluation of the Cimmerians and their original home, a decisive step has been taken towards our understanding of who, in fact, these people were. In the present study an attempt will be made to take one further step in that it will be possible to demonstrate a direct connexion between the defeat of Rusa I, king of Urartu, respectively at Gamir and at Mt. Uaush in the year 714 B. C. So far, this connexion has not been noticed previously inasmuch as studies were, almost by necessity, tied down by the notion that the Cimmerians derived from the north. My own conception that Gamir was to be looked for in the Man area, and my conviction that the earliest settlements of the Cimmerians were not to the north of the Black Sea, was arrived at before I became acquainted with the work done by Cozzoli and Salvini. When, independent of one another, three authors arrive at the same result and feel compelled to rejecting the tradition of a north Pontian origin of the Cimmerians, it might be argued that, generally speaking, research has been misled by Greek tradition; and it is to be hoped that, eventually, a truer and more realistic picture of this people and the rôle they played in history may be within reach.

In the present study we shall leave archaeological theses as well as

14 See the review of these theories by Sulimirski 1954, pp. 286 ff. and *passim*; id., 1959 and id., 1970, pp. 395 ff.; Smirnov 1979, pp. 16-37; Gimbutas 1956, p. 92; id., 1961, p. 22; id., 1963, p. 833; id., 1965, pp. 159, 576 f. and *passim*.

15 Sulimirski 1954, p. 288.

16 See, in particular, Leskov 1974.

17 Rolle 1977, pp. 306 ff. Cf. id. 1968, pp. 17 ff. See also, i.a., Farkas 1970, pp. 19 ff.; Phillips 1972, p. 129; Kammenhuber 1976-80, p. 595; Brentjes 1981, pp. 10 f.

18 Rolle 1977, pp. 308 f.

19 See also the rejection of the theory that the Cimmerians were in any way connected with the "Luristan Bronzes" in Meade 1968, pp. 130 ff.; Calmeyer 1969, pp. 168 ff.; Moorey in *Iran* 9, 1971, p. 117; id. 1974, pp. 19 f. and other contributions; cf. Cozzoli 1968, p. 16.

20 Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia, Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche nell'Azerbaigian iraniano, ed. P. E. Pecorella e M. Salvini, 1984, pp. 45 f.

21 Cf. below, p. 14.

classical tradition aside, instead trying to arrive at a greater insight into the background of the settlement of this people south of Lake Urmia and the country of Urartu. Whichever realities may lie hidden behind the myths, legends and reconstructions met with in the writings of Herodotus, or which may be hidden behind Cimmerian place-names in Scythia, are not likely to be ascertained with any degree of certainty as long as the movements of the Cimmerians south of Urmia in 714 and also at the time of Esarhaddon have not been interpreted in their proper context. Were it to turn out that Greek tradition expresses "an historical hypothesis rather than an historical tradition",²² and were it to turn out that behind the factual information upon which Herodotus has composed his account there are quite different historical and chronological realities than accepted by him,²³ well, in that case each and every archaeological thesis concerning the Cimmerians would completely collapse. Their justification depends entirely on the veracity of the notion in classical tradition that the home of the Cimmerians was in the north-Pontian area prior to their invasion into Asia Minor in the 7th century. Already, with Salvini's placing Gamir south of Urmia, it would appear that any basis for attributing now one, now the other kind of archaeological material north of Urartu and the Caucasus to this people, must be discarded. Before the historian begins to deal with Greek tradition, it is incumbent on him to examine which consequences and re-evaluations our Assyrian source-material necessitate, when dealing with the Cimmerians.

When, for so long, the question of the Cimmerians and their origin has been looked upon as a riddle, the reason is primarily that the starting point has been wrong: the Cimmerians have been looked for in places where they were not, at least not at the time which has been commonly assumed. The starting point was chosen on the basis of Greek tradition which spoke of the north-Pontian Cimmerians, in doing so, those who adhered to this thesis not only precluded themselves from solving the Cimmerian problem: rather, they created "the Cimmerian mystery".

22 Cf. Cozzoli 1968, referred to above, pp. 8 f.

23 Cf., for instance, Kothe in whose opinion the events narrated by Herodotus in connexion with the intrusion of the Scythians into the North-Pontian area pertain only to the beginning of the 6th century. According to Kothe, the Scythians at some point left their home in Sogdia and wandered westwards: "Sie kamen auf diese Weise über Medien und das Kubangebiet etwa zu Beginn des 6. Jahrhunderts in die pontische Steppe (also nicht umgekehrt, wie Herodot nach kolonial-griechischer Tradition mitteilt) und wurden hier zu Herren der kimmerischen Bevölkerung östlich und der skolotischen westlich der Krim" (Kothe 1969, p. 81).

Chapter I: Where was Gamir?

As we have seen, the name Gamir is first mentioned ab. 714 B. C. in letters addressed to Sargon II, king of Assyria. The letters contain reports from informants along the frontier at Urartu and recount the defeat suffered by Rusa I, king of Urartu, in Gamir.²⁴ One of these letters, ABL 146, gives specific information with regard to the location of Gamir: Aššur-rēšūja, the author of the letter, says that Gamir is separated from Urartu by the country of Guriania.²⁵

Over the years, Gamir has been placed to the west, the north, the east and to the south of Urartu. Earlier writers were inclined to think that the country was situated in the west, in Cappadocia; the basis of this theory was that historians like Moses of Chorene refers to Cappadocia as *Kamir*.²⁶ A. H. Sayce and A. T. Olmstead identified Guriania with present-day Gurun at Tokhma-su in Asia Minor.²⁷

However, later investigation, undertaken by Soviet scholars in particular, has maintained that Guriania is more likely identical with *Quriane* (qu-ri-a-né-né) in the annals of Sardur II, an area situated at the River Kura and Lake Childir.²⁸ Gamir, as mentioned in ABL 146, therefore,

24 ABL 146 = Deller 1.1; 197 = Deller 1.2; 1079 = Deller 1.4; CT 53, 99 = Deller 1.5 (?); cf. also ABL 112 = Deller 2.1; ND 1107 = Deller 2.5; 2608 = Deller 1.7. – As we have mentioned, the letters were edited by Deller 1984, pp. 98 ff.; as for ND 1107, cf. Postgate 1973, p. 227. – For practical reasons, the abbreviation ABL + a following number of the particular letter will be used in this study although Deller's edition has vastly expanded the evidence which was at Harper's disposal in his *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, 1892-1914, as well as his interpretations with the help of new joins and collations.

25 ABL 146 = Deller 1.1, obv. 1. 5-6: "Guriania ist ein Landstrich zwischen Urartu und Gamirra."

26 Delitzsch 1881, p. 245; Olmstead 1908, pp. 155 f.; Streck 1916, resp. p. CCCLXXIV note 1 and p. 784; RCAE III, p. 65. Still, Piotrovskij 1966, pp. 335 f., 345 f.; cf., however, our note 29 in our sequel; Azarpay 1968, p. 99. See also Moses of Chorene II 80 and Faustus of Byzantium IV 3, 4, 11.

27 Sayce 1903, p. 148; Olmstead 1908, p. 92 note 40, 156, cf. p. 93 note 42, 38 note 42; id. 1923, p. 266; Sayce 1965, p. 182.

28 König 1955, no. 103 § 15 III; Diakonoff and Kashkai 1981, pp. 70 f.; cf. map enclosed; Diakonoff 1961, p. 596; van Loon 1966, pp. 15 f.; Burney und Lang 1973, p. 340; Sulimirski 1978, pp. 8 f. Figs. 1 and 2. – See also references to works by I. M. Diakonoff and G. M. Melikišvili in Salvini 1984, pp. 45 f., notes 202 and 203.

should not be sought in Cappadocia,²⁹ but north or north-west of Urartu. So, some scholars would place Gamir in Georgia at the River Kura;³⁰ others a little further to the south in the area of present-day Kars and Leninakan west of Lake Sevan.³¹ The idea of a Gamir north of Urartu fits well with the commonly adopted assumptions that the Cimmerians came from the north, threatening the northern borders of Urartu,³² and naturally it originated direct from these.

A third thesis concerning the location of Gamir was put forward by Cozzoli. As mentioned in the Introduction, he arrived at the result that the country was east or north-east of Urartu, near the country of the Mannaeans.³³ Cozzoli, too, chose the geographical name in ABL 146 as his point of departure, connecting Guriania with *Guranii*, a people who, according to Strabo XI, 14, 14, lived beyond Armenia in the neighbourhood of *Saraparae* and Medes.³⁴ Cozzoli, however, had yet another card up his sleeve: following Waterman, he assumed that *KUR na-gi-ú* which, in ABL 146, occurs in the same line as *KUR Gu-ri-a-ni-a*, must designate a country by this name.³⁵ In other words: not only did Guriania, but also the country of Nagiu separate Gamir from Urartu. By introducing another Waterman letter (ABL 174) where the term *KUR na-gi-ú* also occurs, as well as certain bits of geographical information in the letter, Cozzoli was satisfied that he could prove Nagiu's location as being east of Urartu. Hence, Guriania as well as Gamir were placed east of the Urartians. Moreover, he found this location confirmed, with regard to Gamir, in sources from the time of Esarhaddon when Cimmerians perform in contexts where Mannaeans, Sapardaeans, Medes, and Umman-Manda also appear, people operating north-east of Mesopotamia.³⁶

It should be stressed at once that the theory of Gamir as being somewhere to the east of Urartu cannot be upheld. If for no other reason, then because of the simple fact that *KUR na-gi-ú* is not a geographical name: it means, simply, "district" or "region".³⁷ Consequently, Deller's translation, "Guriania ist ein Landstrich (*KUR na-gi-ú*) zwischen Urartu und Gamirra", is the only correct translation.³⁸ What remains is the identification of Guriania with *Guranii* – beyond Armenia, near *Saraparae* and Medes – but this would not necessarily entail an eastern rather than a southern or a south-easterly location of Gamir as seen in relation to Urartu and Lake Urmia.

It was to a location like that Salvini arrived, in 1984, albeit from a different set of premises, when he decisively argued in favour of Gamir south or south-east of Lake Urmia.³⁹ Unlike earlier scholars, Salvini em-

ploys not only the information furnished by ABL 146; he also introduces other letters mentioning the Cimmerians into the discussion. As against Diakonoff's and Melikišvili's identification of Guriania with the Quriane in the annals of Sardur II, he argues that Quriane is not the only possibility for an identification in this northern area. The inscription attributable to Rusa I, at Kolagran, among a number of areas conquered at Lake Sevan, mentions a country called *Gu-ri-a-i-ni*,⁴⁰ a name which by the same right might be identified with the Guriania of ABL 146, just like Quriane. It cannot be denied that this fact seriously weakens the argumentation of the Soviet scholars.⁴¹

29 Cf., however, Piotrovskij 1966: "La identificazione del paese di Guriania, menzionata in questa lettera, con Kuriani dei testi urartei conferma l'ipotesi che il paese di Gimirra si trovava a nord-ovest del regno di Van, probabilmente nella parte orientale della Cappadocia" (pp. 335 f; cf. pp. 345 f.).

30 Diakonoff 1981, p. 71; Burney und Lang, p. 340.

31 Leskov 1974, p. 48; Sulimirski 1970, p. 396. – Cf., also, van Loon's thesis, 1966, pp. 15 f., concerning an identity between Iš-qi-Gu-lu in an inscription from the time of Argishti I and Scythians/Cimmerians, and the rejection of this thesis by Barnett 1982, p. 344 note 235.

32 Cf., e.g., Yamauchi 1982, p. 52; Brentjes 1981, p. 7; Kammenhuber 1976-80, p. 594; Sulimirski 1978, p. 7; Rolle 1976, p. 22; van Loon 1974, p. 1040; Burney und Lang 1973, p. 289; Melikišvili 1971, p. 3; Azarpay 1968, p. 35; Riemschneider 1965, pp. 84 f.

33 Cozzoli 1968, pp. 97 ff., 103.

34 Strabo XI, 14, 14: "It is also said that certain of the Thracians, those called 'Saraparae', that is 'Decapitators,' took up their abode beyond Armenia near the Guranii and the Medes."

35 ABL 146 = Deller 1.1, obv. 5-6: "(5) KUR Gu-ri-a-ni-a KUR na-gi-ú (6) ber-te KUR URI ber-te KUR Ga-mir-ra." Cf. Waterman's translation in RCAE I, No. 146: "The land of Guriania (and) the land of Nagiu (are) between the land of Urartu (and) the land of Gamirra." Cf. Deller's translation, quoted above, note 25.

36 Cozzoli 1968, pp. 98 f., 103.

37 Olmstead 1908, p. 156 with note 38; Piotrovskij 1966, p. 335; Lanfranchi 1983, p. 131 with note 31; Salvini 1984, p. 45. Cf. von Soden 1967, art. *nagû* I, p. 712; CAD N II (1980), art. *nagû* A, pp. 121 ff. – It may be added that in his locating "Nagiu" which occurs together with Sangibutu in ABL 174, in an area to the east of Urartu, Cozzoli referred to Thureau-Dangin who placed the country of Sangibutu north of Lake Urmia (Cozzoli 1968, pp. 97 f.). Recent research has re-appraised the route taken by Sargon in 714 with the result that this particular location of Sangibutu has been rejected (Levine 1977, pp. 142 ff.; Mayer 1978-80, p. 29; Salvini 1984, pp. 32 f.).

38 Cf. the reference given above, note 25.

39 Salvini 1984, pp. 45 f.; cf. pp. 40 ff.

40 König 1955, No. 118 II.

41 Salvini 1984, pp. 45 f.

As for Salvini, the information provided by ABL 112 must needs be of paramount importance. Here we are told that the Cimmerians have taken off and that, marching from the country of the Mannaeans, they have penetrated Urartu.⁴² Furthermore, Salvini calls attention to the fact that in the very same letter (Rev. 5), according to Deller, the name ^{URU}*SU-ri-a-na-a+a* should perhaps, preferably, be read ^{URU}*Gur¹-ri-a-na-a+a*. This name is reminiscent of the place-name Guriania in ABL 146, and provided Deller's corrected reading is warranted, the Guriania of ABL 146, like ABL 112, must refer to the country of the Mannaeans.⁴³

Salvini also attaches importance to the circumstance that a number of letters concurrently connect military operations conducted by the Urartians prior to the battle in Gamir and, following this, with the fortified city and district of Uesi.⁴⁴ He therefore assumes that the Urartian troops who participated in the Cimmerian battle came from, and returned to, the Uesi fortress. In addition to this, the Cimmerian invasion into Urartu brings in its train the necessity on behalf of the Uesi governor to send a message to Urzana of Muṣāṣir requesting reinforcements (ABL 112).⁴⁵ Uesi/Uaiais, also mentioned in the account of Sargon's 8th campaign, belongs in the south-eastern area of Urartu, so Salvini believes, relatively close to Muṣāṣir and Khubushkia. He suggests that the area should be looked for in the Urmia Plain, in other words, west of the lake, and that the fortress as such may be identical with Qal'ah Ismail Aqa.⁴⁶

From having placed Uesi in southern Urartu, and the information according to ABL 112 that the penetration of the Cimmerians took place from Man, Salvini then arrives at the conclusion that the clash in Gamir must have taken place in some area to the south or south-east of Urmia. This conclusion, he says, contradicts the classical theory that the Cimmerian invasion took place from the Caucasus, and in contradistinction to earlier theses about Cimmerian penetration, it is based on the earliest mention of the Cimmerians in historical sources. Like Cozzoli, Salvini attaches importance to the fact that "Cimmerian warriors", at the time of Esarhaddon, are associated with Mannaeans and Median troops, i. e., they operate in the same geographical zone during the reign of Esarhaddon as they did at the time of Sargon II.⁴⁷

No doubt, Salvini's thesis rests on a much better foundation than that of his predecessors. Whereas they attempted to locate Gamir from a certain similarity between Guriania (ABL 146) and names like Gurun, Quriane and Guranii, stemming from earlier (Quriane) or from infinitely younger sources than ABL 146, Salvini builds his argument on the en-

tirely substantial and contemporary piece of information (ABL 112) that the Cimmerians arrived from the south, from Mannaeen country, into Urartu. He can also point to the possibility that the same letter contains the name ^{URU}*Gur¹-ri-a-na-a+a*.

It will, however, be necessary to modify Salvini's idea of the rôle played by Uesi before and after the Gamir battle, without thereby depriving this fortress of its crucial position with regard to events before and after the battle.⁴⁸ Neither ABL 444 nor 492 mentions Gamir, and neither of the two letters derive from the time when that battle took place.⁴⁹ According to Lanfranchi the two letters belong together, and since one, ABL 492, exhibits the date 1st *Nisānu*, both refer to events preceding the battle which didn't take place until after the 11th of the month of *Ulūlu*, but be-

42 ABL 112 = Deller 2.1: "Dieser Kimmerier ist abgezogen. Aus dem Mannäer-Land ist er nach Urartu eingedrungen."

43 Salvini 1984, p. 46; Deller, pp. 102 f., 98.

44 Before the defeat: ABL 444 = Deller 2.2 and 492 = Deller 2.3. After the defeat: ABL 197 = Deller 1.2; cf. 1079 = Deller 1.4.

45 Salvini 1984, p. 46.

46 Salvini, pp. 46 ff. – Levine also placed Uesi/Uaiais in south-eastern Urartu, but considerably further to the west than Salvini, northwest of Muşāşir near the Upper Zab (Levine, Sargon's Eighth Campaign, p. 143 and 145 Fig. 1). Cf., however, id., p. 147: "Uaiais, which would be the area between the Zab headwaters and Lake Urmia." Others have tended to locate Uesi at the south-western coasts of Lake Urmia and to identifying the city with Ushnū (Lanfranchi 1983, p. 124 note 9; Kinnier Wilson 1962, pp. 108 ff.; van Loon 1975, pp. 205 ff.) The latter thesis was rejected by Salvini 1984, pp. 23 ff.; in this connexion see also Levine's rejection of Kinnier Wilson's locating Khubushkia near Lake Urmia or on the Khaneh Plain (Levine, p. 144.) It is precisely the location of Khubushkia/Nairi which is decisive with regard to determining where in fact Uesi was situated; cf. the Ashur Letter, 1. 298: "(Der Stadt) *Uajūis*, dem Distrikt seiner [Rusa's] Versorgungsbasis an der unteren Grenze von *Urartu* zum Gebiet von *Na'iri* näherte ich mich" (The Ashur Letter, 1. 298). When discussing the location of Uesi it is also of importance to note that, according to Aššur-rēšūja (ABL 198), the Uesi governor is "the governor who is in front of me" (Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 128 f.; cf. later note 214). As Aššur-rēšūja was probably the Assyrian governor in Kumme (cf. our reference to Parpola, note 64), it would seem that Qal'ah Ismail Aqa as well as Ushnū are too far to the east to qualify for the term "in front of me." The placing suggested by Levine would seem to fulfil the required proximity to Kumme, Khubushkia (as for Khubushkia/Nairi, cf. however, our note 112) as well as Muşāşir but is, on the other hand, somewhat distant from Zikirtu (cf. ABL 515 = Deller 3.5) and Man (cf. ABL 198 = Deller 3.1).

47 Salvini 1984, p. 46.

48 Cf. following chapters, *passim*.

49 Cf. below, note 334.

fore the 1st of *Tāšrītu*.⁵⁰ Hereagainst, ABL 197 and 1079 are surely contemporary with Gamir in that they both contain reports containing the defeat of the king of the Urartians. ABL 1079, however, merely informs us that the governor of Uesi has been killed in battle,⁵¹ but this, of course, supplies no information with regard to the location of Gamir in its relation to Uesi. Presumably, Urartian governors must have been in a position to participate in battle anywhere in and outside the realm together with their king and not only in local border areas. Besides, ABL 646 informs us that no less than nine Urartian governors have been killed in battle.⁵²

Finally, there is ABL 197 with its message that after an internal controversy, in the wake of the defeat in Gamir, the king was in Uazaun/Uesi.⁵³ This is not to be understood in such a way that Rusa went direct from Gamir to the Uazaun area. On the contrary, in the meantime he went to Guriania where he reorganised the army;⁵⁴ and when arriving at Urartu he takes the road direct to Turushpa so as to assume control over the situation there after a rebellion. The sojourn at Uesi belongs after that in the capital.⁵⁵

What remains is the message contained in ABL 112: that the Cimmerian invasion came from Man, and that the Uesi-governor requested reinforcement from Urzana against the intruders. The question arises: can ABL 112 solely testify concerning southern Gamir? We believe it can. Admittedly, we cannot at the present time ascertain with absolute certainty that this invasion is a direct consequence of the victory over the army of the Urartians in Gamir.⁵⁶ But it does seem likely that there is a connexion between these two events, and that the Cimmerians have followed up their victory with an invasion into the homeland of the enemy. The fear of the Urartians, and their request to Urzana for help: “Deine Streitkräfte mögen kommen. Vor den Buliäern und Surianäern ist ganz Urartu in gewaltige Furcht geraten,”⁵⁷ also ties in well with a situation when the Urartian army was not exactly at its prime, but weakened and demoralised following a defeat and internal strife. The fact that a governor of Uesi should make his appearance does not by necessity contradict this theory, for Rusa has had ample opportunity to appoint a new governor whilst reorganising the army in Guriania or after his return to Urartu, to replace the departed Uesi governor.⁵⁸

The reference to Urzana would refer the letter, and therefore also the Cimmerian invasion, to a time before the autumn of 714 when Sargon attacked Mušāšir, and Urzana vanished from the picture as ruler of this

country.⁵⁹ By the way, it is that very same Urzana who, in ABL 1079, informs the Assyrians of the defeat in Gamir,⁶⁰ and there is no evidence to show that the Cimmerian onslaught into Urartu did not take place immediately after the Gamir battle.

Whether this be the case or not, it is difficult to connect the information provided by ABL 112 – the Cimmerians advancing from the Man-naean country – with the idea of a Gamir north of Urartu at the time of Sargon II, Rusa I, and Urzana, i. e., in or before the year 714, although it does seem that at some time, as in Cappadocia, a city bearing this name seems to have existed near present-day's Leninakan.⁶¹ To-day, most scholars seem to agree that the Gamir battle took place in or about 715/714,⁶² and this leaves no space of time for the Cimmerians, prior to Urzana's disappearance in the autumn of 714, to have left their northern home for the country of Man, from where they invaded Urartu. In whichever way you twist and turn the question of a possible connexion between Cimmerians in the north and in the south, the notion of northern Gamir in the light of ABL 112 becomes so complex and so unlikely that we shall have to drop it. On the other hand, Salvini's idea of a Gamir

50 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 132-136. Cf. also the following chapters.

51 ABL 1079 = Deller 1.4: "Die Streitkräfte des Urartäerkönigs sind in Gamir(ra), wohin er gezogen ist, geschlagen worden. Der 'Statthalter' von Uasi ist getötet."

52 ABL 646 = Deller 1.3: "Insgesamt neun seiner 'Statthalter' sind geschlagen."

53 ABL 197 = Deller 1.2: "Unter ihnen [the Urartians] ist ein furchtbares Blutbad angerichtet worden. Jetzt aber ist das Land ruhig. Jeder von seinen 'Grossen' ist nach seiner Provinz gegangen; Qaqqadānu, sein 'Feldmarschall', hingegen ist in Gefangenschaft geraten. Der Urartäerkönig befindet sich in Uzaun." For the revolt, see Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 124 ff.

54 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 131, cf. p. 136 and the reference to ABL 146: "When the Urartian (king) went to Gamir, (and) when a slaughter was made of the Urartians, the troops who from there [had fled (?)] to [G]urī'a'ni[a], that one (= the Urartian king) ... -es some, takes some others, (and) [...] puts them." Cf. Deller 1.1.

55 Cf. below, p. 68.

56 Cf. however, below, note 245.

57 ABL 112 = Deller 2.1.

58 Cf. ABL 1079 = Deller 1.4, above, in note 51.

59 Cf. the Ashur Letter, ll. 334 ff.

60 ABL 1979 = Deller 1.4.

61 Cf. the identification of Gymnias (Gymrias?) by Xenophon, *Anabasis* IV.vii, 18-19, with the ancient Armenian city Kumayri, later Gumri/Alexandropol/Leninakan by Hewsen 1983, p. 134; Manandian 1965, p. 27.

62 See later, pp. 22 f.

south of Urmia not only makes good sense, but, as we have already pointed out, his thesis is a starting point on the basis of a very precise piece of information in a contemporary source concerning Cimmerians coming upwards from the south; the other suppositions concerning the location of Gamir are founded on guesswork and entirely coincidental likeness of names or on late sources. In addition to this, there is the possibility that ABL 112 does in fact contain the name ^{URU}*Gur¹-ri-a-na-a+a* which, if correct, would establish a certain coherence between the events mentioned in ABL 112 and 146.

Furthermore, let us point out that there is no mention whatever in the Gamir letters which points to the north. Information concerning the defeat of the Urartian king – apart from that supplied by the Assyrian governors Nabû-le'i at Birtu,⁶³ and Aššur-rēšūja at Kumme,⁶⁴ – hails from Urzana in Mušāšir⁶⁵ and from “the Ukkean”,⁶⁶ in whom we should probably recognise the local ruler at Ukku near the city of Kumme west of Mušāšir.⁶⁷ Apart from Guriania (ABL 146) and Ukku (ABL 197), Mušāšir and Khubushkia are the districts which are referred to in connexion with the Cimmerian reports.⁶⁸

Locating Gamir to the south of Urmia, at or near Man, receives further support, it seems, in a message contained in ND 2608.⁶⁹ This letter is contemporary with ABL 197 and despatched by Sennacherib.⁷⁰ Although the text is in a poor state of preservation, it is clear that a person who was somehow connected with the town Ištaḥup was questioned concerning Urartian conditions. His answer was, “The Urartian, since he [...] went [to] Gamir, [now (?)] is very afraid of the king my lord”.⁷¹ H. W. F. Saggs inclines to identify Ištaḥup with *Ištaippa*; according to the Ashur Letter,⁷² the latter was in Zikirtu not far from Uishdish in Man.⁷³ Should Saggs' identification turn out to be correct, the question has to be asked: why would a person in Ištaḥup be expected to possess any kind of knowledge about the Urartu-Gamir confrontation if, indeed, Gamir was as far to the north as to-day's Georgia? The message of ND 2608 is in agreement with that of ABL 112 in that they both presuppose a location of the Cimmerians south of Urartu and Lake Urmia.

Hence, on the basis of the evidence at hand, we may wholeheartedly endorse Salvini's conclusion: the Cimmerians did not come down from the north; they were at home south or south-east of Lake Urmia where they are also to be found at the time of Esarhaddon. This is where Rusa's defeat took place, and from here the Cimmerians forced their way into Urartu.

- 63** ABL 197 = Deller 1.2.
- 64** ABL 146 = Deller 1.1. Cf. Parpola 1981, chart 3 s. v. Aššur-rēšūja.
- 65** ABL 1079 = Deller 1.4.
- 66** ABL 197 = Deller 1.2.
- 67** Lanfranchi 1983, p. 125 note 10. Cf. map in Salvini 1984, p. 47 Fig. 2.
- 68** ABL 1079 rev. 7, see RCAE II; ND 1107 = GPA 243 in Postgate 1973, p. 227. Cf. Salvini 1984, p. 40 note 172 and p. 42.
- 69** ND 2608 = Deller 1.7; Saggs 1958, pp. 198 f.; Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128.
- 70** Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128; Deller 1984, p. 101.
- 71** Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128.
- 72** Saggs 1958, pp. 199 and 211. Cf. the Ashur Letter, l. 87.
- 73** Saggs 1958, p. 199; cf. the Ashur Letter, ll. 87-91. Cf. Levine, Sargon's Eighth Campaign, p. 145 Fig. 1.

Chapter II: Gamir and Uishdish

The next question with which we have to deal concerns the date of the battle in Gamir, a question which over the years has been the cause of considerable differences of opinion.

The accounts which we possess about the defeat in Gamir do not mention the name of the defeated Urartian king. Rusa I (d. 714) as well as his son Argishti II were contemporaries of Sargon, and formerly most scholars favoured a dating of the battle to the time of Argishti, i. e., to the period between 709-707.⁷⁴ But C. F. Lehmann-Haupt had already argued that it took place during the reign of his father,⁷⁵ and this dating was supported by F. Thureau-Dangin who pointed out that one of the reports addressed to the Assyrian court describing the defeat hailed from Urzana at Mušāšir (ABL 1079), and that it seems highly unlikely for the latter, following Sargon's attack at Mušāšir in the autumn of 714, to have re-adopted the rôle of informer to the Assyrian court, let alone having returned to his former residence. Thureau-Dangin also attached importance to the circumstance that another Gamir-letter (ABL 197) contains a passage where we are told that Sennacherib has received a letter from Nabû-le'i at Tabal, *major domus* with Akhat-abisha. A daughter of Sargon's was married to Ambaris of Tabal, and Thureau-Dangin assumed that Akhat-abisha was identical with this daughter. In the year 713 Sargon had his rebellious son-in-law and his family taken away into captivity; hence, the letter ABL 197 cannot be dated to any point of time later than 713. It follows that the same argument must apply to the battle in Gamir, which Thureau-Dangin was compelled to date to the period of Rusa I, either after Sargon's campaign in 714 or, far more likely, prior to this campaign.⁷⁶

The dating referring to the time of Rusa I met with wide acceptance, also by later scholars such as I. M. Diakonoff, B. B. Piotrovskij, R. Ghirshman, M. N. van Loon, R. Rolle, A. Kammenhuber, and others; The Cambridge Ancient History (Vol. II, Ch. XXX) and Fischer Weltgeschichte (Bd. 4), both from the year 1967, favoured a date to a time

prior to Sargon's campaign in 714.⁷⁷ We may also mention, i.a., M. Riemschneider, E. D. Phillips, B. Brentjes, R. Barnett (in *The Cambridge Ancient History* from 1982), and R. N. Frye (1984).⁷⁸ But many scholars, particularly among British and American authors, persisted in claiming a date after 714, an opinion which we meet in the works by A. T. Olmstead (1923), S. Smith, A. H. Sayce and E. H. Minns (*The Cambridge Ancient History*, 1925), L. Waterman (1931), D. J. Wiseman (1951), H. W. F. Saggs (1962), W. Mayer (1980), and others.⁷⁹ The confusion occasioned by the two varying dates has, furthermore, led to the fact that, with some authors, the one and only Cimmerian battle became two, one in 714, the other in 707, notwithstanding the fact that in both cases reference is made to one and only one letter, viz., ABL 197.⁸⁰

Those two scholars who have most recently and most penetratingly investigated the first appearance of the Cimmerians, G. B. Lanfranchi and M. Salvini, both convincingly argue in favour of dating the defeat in Gamir to the time before Sargon's assault upon Mušāšir in 714. Lanfranchi attaches less importance to Akhat-abisha being mentioned in ABL 197, but would stress the fact that this letter tells us how, after the defeat, Urzana with his brother and his son sought the king of Urartu to greet him: "This homage, a sign of submission to Urartian power, certainly could not have been possible after Sargon's eighth campaign, when Mušāšir was forced to pass to the Assyrian side, or, better, to maintain a strictly balanced position between Assyria and Urartu – this obviously assuming that the claimed Assyrian annexation to the province of the *nāgir ekalli* lasted only a short period."⁸¹ No more can we assume that ABL 409, Urzana's letter to the Assyrian *nāgir ekalli*, as a reply to the latter's enquiry concerning the possibility of the arrival of the Urartian king

74 Johns 1904, p. 338; Olmstead 1908, pp. 155 f., 158 note 47. Cf. later in note 79.

75 Lehmann(-Haupt) 1904, p. 130; Lehmann-Haupt 1907, p. 178.

76 Thureau-Dangin 1912, pp. XIV f.

77 Salvini 1984, p. 43 with references in note 185.

78 Riemschneider 1965, pp. 84 f. and 87 ff.; Phillips 1965, p. 52; cf., however, id., 1972 in the following note; Brentjes 1981, p. 7; Barnett 1982, p. 355; Frye 1984, p. 70.

79 Salvini 1984, p. 43 with references in his note 186. Further, Culican 1965, p. 22; Phillips 1972, p. 131 (cf. id. 1965, see reference in the preceding note); Postgate, *Iraq* 35, 1973, p. 31 note 19; Hawkins 1982, pp. 420 f. with note 397.

80 Salvini 1984, p. 43. Besides Burney und Lang 1973, pp. 259, 283, 289, 305, 318 ff. and 340 (735 B.C.), see also Holcomb 1973, pp. 19, 21 and 36; Yamauchi 1982, pp. 35 and 52.

81 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 133 ff. Cf. Postgate, *Iraq* 35, 1973 p. 31 note 19.

and his troops at Muṣāṣir, could have been written after 714. Lanfranchi repudiates Annelies Kammenhuber's dating of the slaughter in Gamir to the year 714, regarding 715 as the most likely date.⁸² So does Salvini.⁸³

However, our possibilities for arriving at an even more precise dating of the battle in Gamir are far from having been exhausted with these investigations. That also applies to a greater insight into the factual and historical background of this episode. Contemporary sources contain lucid information which has most certainly not been utilised fully; such information shows that, as mentioned in our Introduction, a direct and hitherto un-noticed connexion exists between the events in Gamir and those on Mt. Uaush.

First, we shall have a closer look at the events which followed in the wake of the Mt. Uaush battle in 714, up to the death of Rusa in the autumn of that year. We shall begin with a discussion of the coronation celebration at Muṣāṣir as mentioned towards the end of Sargon's account of the 8th campaign in 714.

1. The Coronation at Muṣāṣir in the Autumn of 714

During the return march from Urartu in the autumn of 714, according to the Ashur Letter, Sargon was suddenly faced with the necessity of a change of plans. He broke off his homeward march, sent the major part of the army onwards to Assyria, whilst with an élite army group he approached Muṣāṣir which was taken without battle, sacked, and placed under Assyrian sovereignty.⁸⁴

Sargon has the following explanation to account for the the change of his original plan: Urzana, "der sündigt und Unrecht tut, der den Eid der Götter bricht, der sich nicht meiner Herrschaft unterwirft, der unverschämte Hochländer, der gegen die Eide bei ^dAššur, ^dŠamaš, ^dNabû (und) ^dMarduk sündigte und sich gegen mich empörte, meinen Marsch auf dem Rückweg meines Expeditionskorps unterbrochen, indem er nicht mit einem stattlichen Begrüßungsgeschenk meine Füße geküsst hatte. Abgabe, Tribut (und) sein Geschenk hielt er zurück und er schickte nicht einen einzigen reitenden Boten, um nach meinem Wohlergehen zu fragen."⁸⁵

In other words: up to this time Urzana had been a vassal of Assyria's, but had now broken his oath; he had not submitted to Sargon's supremacy; on the contrary, he had rebelled against the king of Assyria and had

failed to acknowledge his vassalage by omitting to present himself, by not kissing the king's feet, and by not delivering the presents and the tribute expected under the circumstances, indeed, he had not even dispatched a mounted messenger in his stead. In the passage dealing with the assault on Muṣāṣir the same things are said in fewer words, i. e., that Urzana had cast of Sargon's supremacy and neglected to yield the services which were his due.⁸⁶

But from the passage which introduces the account of Sargon's arrival at Muṣāṣir and his conduct there, we do see that Urzana's crime consisted not only in sins of omission, but that he entirely dismissed his position as a vassal of the Assyrian king, instead allying himself with Rusa. In E. F. Weidner's transliteration and translation, the passage runs as follows:⁸⁷

82 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 134 f.

83 Salvini 1984, pp. 43 ff.; cf. p. 38.

84 The Ashur Letter, ll. 309-410.

85 The Ashur Letter, ll. 309-312.

86 Urzana had, as it has been translated, "den Befehl des ^dAššur nicht gefürchtet und das Joch meiner Herrschaft abgeschüttelt und den Dienst für mich vergessen" (ibid., l. 346).

87 Weidner 1937-1939, pp. 146 f. Cf. the Ashur Letter, ll. 102 f.

The Ashur Letter, ll. 334-342

³³⁴ [.....
 a-la]-ka-ma gir-ri-ja e-mur-
 m [a] ⁽¹⁴⁾ [.....
] ³³⁵ [.....
] na bu šu-
 ma nišē^{me} [ē] u⁽¹⁵⁾-dan-ni-
 nu [.....] ³³⁶
 [..... ^{mât}ur]
 -ar-ti-ma a-na ^{âl} [mu-ša-šir šu] -bat
 šarru-ti-šu šu-bat ^dhal-di- [a
] ³³⁷[.....
 ^{mât}u] r-ar-ti a-na pāt gim-ri-šu ša
 el ša-a-šu i-na ša-ma-mi u qa-q-a-ri la
 i-du-u [.....] ³³⁸ [.....
] .. ša ul-la-nu-uš-
 šu ^{is}hattu u a-gu-u la in-na-aš-šu-u si-
 mat ri-e⁽¹⁶⁾-[u-ti] ³³⁹ [.....] .. mal-
 ku rî'û nišē^{meš} ^{mât}ur- [ar-ti
] .. ub-ba-lu-šu-ma a-a-um-ma i-na
 lib-bi mârê^{meš}-šu ša-bi-tu ^{is}kussî-šu ³⁴⁰
 [itt] i hurâši u kaspi mimma aq-ru ni-
 šir-te ekal-li (m)-šu i-na ^{âl}mu-ša-šir
 ma-ḥar ^dhal-di-a u-še-ri-bu-ma i-qi-
 šu⁽¹⁷⁾ qi-ša-as-su ³⁴¹ [alpê^m] ^{eš} kab-
 ru-ti immerê^{meš} ma-ru-ti a-na la ma-ni
 ma-ḥar-šu i-naq-qu-u a-na gi-mir âli-šu
 i-šak-ka-nu ta-[k] ul-tu ³⁴² [maḥar^d]
 ḥal-di-a ili-šu agâ be-lu-ti ip-pi-ru-šu-
 ma u-ša-aš-šu-šu ^{is}hatta šarru-ti ^{mât}ur-
 ar-ti u nišē^{meš}-šu i-n [am-bu] -u šum-šu

³³⁴ [.....
 das Heran]nahen⁽¹⁸⁾ meines
 Feldzuges sah er (Urzana) u[nd ..
] [.....
] ³³⁵ [.....
] und die
 Leut[e] verstärkten [..
] ³³⁶ [.....
 von Ur]
 artu und nach der Stadt [Mušasir,
 dem Si]tze⁽¹⁹⁾ seines Königstums,
 dem Sitze des Gottes Ḥald[ia . . .
]⁽²⁰⁾ ³³⁷ [.....
 U] rartu nach
 seinem Gesamtgebiete, (im Ver-
 gleich zu) dem man kein grösseres
 im Himmel und auf Erden kennt [
] ³³⁸ [.....
] .., ohne dessen⁽²¹⁾ Mit-
 wirkung Zeppter und Tiara nicht
 getragen werden, der Zubehör des
 Hirten[tums], ³³⁹ [.....] .. der Fürst,
 der Hirte der Leute von Ur[artu, ..
] .. bringen sie ihm, und
 einen von seinen Söhnen, der
 seinen Thron besteigen soll,
³⁴⁰lassen sie [mi]t Gold und Silber,
 allerlei Kostbarkeiten aus dem
 Schatz seines Palastes in der Stadt
 Mušasir vor den Gott Ḥaldia tre-
 ten und überreichen (ihm) sein
 Geschenk, ³⁴¹starke [Ochse]n, fette
 Schafe ohne Zahl opfern sie vor
 ihm und veranstalten für seine
 ganze Stadt ein Opfermahl-Fest⁽²²⁾.
³⁴²[Vor] Ḥaldia, seinem Gotte, set-
 zen sie ihm die Tiara der

Herrschaft auf und lassen ihn das Zepter der Königsherrschaft von Urartu ergreifen, und seine Leute r[ufe]n seinen Namen.

In the following, we add Weidner's notes:

¹⁴⁾ Reste von drei Zeichen, von denen nur das zweite sicher ist (UB, wie in Schroeders Autographie). Das erste ist eher PI als ŠI, das dritte gegen Schroeder gewiss nicht KI, wenn sich auch etwas Sicheres nicht feststellen lässt.

¹⁵⁾ *ú* nur teilweise erhalten.

¹⁶⁾ Das Zeichen *é* nach Kollation ziemlich sicher zu erkennen.

¹⁷⁾ So zu lesen, nicht BAD-šu, wie Schroeder bietet!

¹⁸⁾ Ergänzung sehr unsicher (vgl. Thureau-Dangin, Z. 32, 82).

¹⁹⁾ Ergänzung unsicher; die Zeichenreste vor *bat* sehen eigentlich nicht wie *šu* aus.

²⁰⁾ Wohl zu ergänzen: „[zog ich hinein]“.

²¹⁾ Gemeint ist der Gott Haldia.

²²⁾ Für *takultu* s. Weidner, AOB I, S. 109, Anm. 10; K.F. Müller, MVAG 41, 3, S. 51, Anm. 2.

It was Weidner's opinion that ll. 337-342 represent an excursus in the narrative, telling us how a royal coronation in Mušāšir takes place. When the Urartian king dies, his sceptre and crown are brought forward, and with abundant presents the crown prince is presented before the god Haldia, where he is endowed with "Tiara und Zepter der Königswürde", then to be hailed by his subjects.⁸⁸ In Thureau-Dangin's edition of the Ashur Letter there are several lacunae in this context, and without a fragment, recovered in Berlin, which Weidner takes into account, the text makes no sense.⁸⁹ It appears that Weidner's interpretation of these lines as an excursus, a description of the Urartian coronation ritual rather than a description of a contemporary event of great immediate importance, has not been contested,⁹⁰ although A. L. Oppenheim has wondered why this, as it seems, entirely irrelevant digression has been inserted: "What can possibly have prompted the author to insert a digression of such a nature at the very point when his report is full of dramatic events and drawing to a close?"⁹¹

88 Weidner 1937-1939, p. 147; cf. most recently Salvini 1984, p. 17.

89 Thureau-Dangin 1912, ll. 334 ff.

90 However, cf. Saggs 1962, p. 115.

91 Oppenheim 1960, p. 141.

In spite of the fragment recovered, the text introducing the account of Sargon's arrival at Muṣāṣir and of the events immediately preceding the coronation celebration (ll. 334-339) is still in a poor state of preservation, and consequently not easy to comprehend. But from the end of l. 339 it is preserved in full, and upon closer examination it becomes quite clear that Weidner's interpretation cannot be upheld. Neither are we faced with a digression, nor with a description of the Urartian coronation ritual. The person who is crowned is not a Urartian crown prince but the ruler of Muṣāṣir, that is to say, Urzana.

As I see it, the key-word in Weidner's translation is the *ihm* (l. 339). This person ("*ihm*") has several sons, one of whom ("*einen von seinen Söhnen*") is to ascend to his throne ("*seinen Thron*," l. 339). He owns a palace in Muṣāṣir ("*seines Palastes*") including a treasury, and he hands over his gift ("*sein Geschenk*") to Haldia (l. 340). For his city ("*seine ganze Stadt*") a sacrificial festival meal is arranged (l. 341). Before Haldia, his god (*seinem* Gotte), he receives "die Tiara der Herrschaft" and seizes "das Zepter der Königsherrschaft von Urartu", and his people (*seine* Leute) proclaim his name (l. 342). When we read on, we find (l. 344) mention of "*Seine* Leute, die alten Männer und die alten Frauen" in Muṣāṣir, those who upon Sargon's arrival appear on the roof tops and shed bitter tears.⁹² In ll. 346-347 Sargon goes on to say: "Weil ^m*Urzana*, der König, ihr Fürst, den Befehl des ^d*Aššur* nicht gefürchtet und das Joch meiner Herrschaft abgeschüttelt und den Dienst für mich vergessen hatte, plante ich, die Leute der besagten Stadt zu deportieren," etc.⁹³

Let us recapitulate. There can be no doubt that the person standing before Haldia, and who is being crowned (l. 342), and whose people proclaim his name, is identical with the person referred to with expressions such as "seine ganze Stadt" (l. 341), "sein Geschenk" and "seines Palastes" (l. 340), "seinen Thron" and "einen von seinen Söhnen" (l. 339). Nor can it be doubted that this person is "*ihm*". In other words, it is not the son, the crown prince, who is being crowned; he is a minor character who is mentioned as merely being present at the coronation. Then, who is this "*ihm*"? There is no reason to suppose that a Urartian crown prince, about to be crowned, may not have had sons. Nor is it unlikely that he, or rather the Urartian king, may have had a palace in Muṣāṣir. But it is entirely unlikely that the city of Muṣāṣir should have been described as the city of the crown prince, or the king, of Urartu. Muṣāṣir is Urzana's city. That is why this city and its inhabitants are punished for his offences against Sargon. The people ("*seine* Leute") who proclaim the name of

the crowned (l. 342) cannot be people belonging to the Urartian crown prince nor to the king of Urartu, for in l. 344 we are told, also, of the people of the person who has been crowned (“seine Leute”), the weeping men and women, and these are clearly Urzana’s people, the inhabitants of Muṣāṣir.

The person who is being crowned, then, is Urzana, ruler of Muṣāṣir. About him we do know, at least, that he had a palace with a treasury in Muṣāṣir. It is in this palace that Sargon sets up his residence during his sojourn in the city: “[In M]uṣāṣir... im Palast, der Wohnung des ^mUrzana, wohnte ich als Herrscher.”⁹⁴ The following lines tell us about the chambers in the palace filled with treasures, riches which Sargon confiscates and has brought with him to Assyria⁹⁵ – not to be mistaken for the treasures which, afterwards, he orders his eunuchs and soldiers to collect in Haldia’s temple.⁹⁶ Urzana’s palace is mentioned again in l. 408: “Das Eigentum des Palastes des ^mUrzana und des ^dHaldi, zusammen mit seinem enormen Reichtum, den ich aus *Muṣāṣir* wegführte,” etc.⁹⁷ But not one word about a palace or treasures belonging to the king of Urartu or to the crown prince of that country.

Owing to the poor state of preservation of ll. 336-339 it is not readily clear who are the persons referred to in the following lines, ll. 339-342, with Weidner’s “sie”:⁹⁸ “bringen sie ihm, und einen von seinen Söhnen” (l. 339); “lassen sie ... vor den Gott Haldia treten und überreichen sein Geschenk” (l. 340); “opfern sie vor ihm und veranstalten für seine ganze Stadt ein Opfermahl-Fest” (l. 341), and “setzen sie ihm die Tiara der Herrschaft auf und lassen ihn das Zepter der Königsherrschaft von Urartu ergreifen” (l. 342).

Weidner suggests that his “sie” may be the priests or the nobles.⁹⁹ Off-hand, this contention does not appear in any way inconsistent with the text. However, these persons appear to play a significant, indeed almost exaggeratedly important part prior to as well as during the coronation,

92 The Ashur Letter, l. 344.

93 The Ashur Letter, ll. 346-347.

94 The Ashur Letter, l. 350.

95 The Ashur Letter, ll. 351-367 and ll. 408-409.

96 The Ashur Letter, ll. 368-405.

97 The Ashur Letter, l. 408.

98 Where Weidner renders “sie”, Mayer uses the translation “man” (Mayer 1983, p. 103 ll. 339-342).

99 Weidner 1937-1939, p. 147.

whereas Urzana and his people participate mostly as extras in this entire undertaking. A suspicion grows upon one that stronger powers lie behind, persons who, for a time at least, have taken over the leading part in these events, and who are essentially foreigners in Muṣāṣir, for the population of which they arrange a festive sacrificial meal. Who took these initiatives – the instigators hiding behind the “sie” of the text: this may possibly be explained, by way of a hint, in l. 339, prior to the first “sie” (bringen sie ihm). Here, mention is made of the king of Urartu: “*der Fürst, der Hirte der Leute von Ur[ar]tu*”, and this might indicate that the king of Urartu and his men have had something to do with it: that they are the ones who are referred to by “sie”. In other words, it could be Rusa and his people who are behind the coronation of Urzana. At any rate, it is scarcely Urzana’s own people or nobles who arrange the ceremonial meal for “*seine ganze Stadt*”, part of which they themselves were.

It should be clear, then, that it is Urzana who is crowned, and that it was possibly Rusa who took the initiative to this coronation. But which is the kingdom for the benefit of which, according to the Ashur Letter, Urzana is crowned? What exactly lies behind the author’s words, “*lassen ihn das Zepter der Königsherrschaft von Urartu ergreifen*”?¹⁰⁰ Is Urzana being crowned as king of Urartu, as Rusa’s successor to the throne, or as co-regent? Or is he merely being crowned as king of Muṣāṣir, a viceroy under Urartian sovereignty in such a way that his grasping the sceptre of the Urartian realm and his use of her regalia merely symbolises the close political, historical and cultic connexions between Urartu and Muṣāṣir – a connexion which is also attested by the Haldia temple which represents such close relationships at this time?

Had the introductory lines (ll. 336-339) to the passage dealing with the coronation been intact, the answer would no doubt have been found there. The possibility that Urzana’s dominion was restricted to Muṣāṣir alone is suggested by l. 336: “*nach der Stadt [Muṣāṣir, dem Si]tze seines Königtums,*” even though the reconstruction of the text is not beyond a doubt.¹⁰¹ As against l. 342, where Urzana seizes the sceptre signifying royalty in Urartu (*šarru-ti* ^{māt}*ur-ar-ti*), l. 336 refers to Urzana’s kingdom (*šarru-ti-šu*) in Muṣāṣir. This might indicate that grasping the Urartian sceptre was a mere ceremonial formality, confirming the relations between the royal houses of Muṣāṣir and Urartu but without bestowing kingship upon Urzana in Urartu itself.¹⁰² On the other hand, l. 337 describes Urartu which in its entirety is greater than any other country in the world and then, at the end of l. 338, the god Haldia, it seems, without

whose “Mitwirkung Zepter und Tiara nicht getragen werden, der Zubehör des *Hirten[tums]*.” The notion of “*Hirtentum*” – the concept of the king being the shepherd of his people, a time-honoured titulary in the ancient Near East – is apparently a concept associated also with the kingdom of Urartu, particularly from the time of Rusa I who is “*der wahre Hirte der Menschen*.”¹⁰³⁻¹⁰⁴ But then again: that which has applied to Urartu may well have applied to Muşāšir and a Urartian vassalage there as well. But it seems odd that the Ashur Letter should have emphasised the greatness of Urartu in connexion with the coronation of Urzana unless the latter, up till then the ruler or provincial king in Muşāšir, was to be crowned as successor to the throne of Urartu and Rusa’s co-regent. At any rate, it is difficult to imagine why the author of the Ashur Letter, when writing about the size of Urartu, should have wished to stress that since of old this country was endowed with a natural state of supremacy over vassal kings in Muşāšir.

Offhand, the idea that Urzana might have been crowned as king of Urartu and thus as Rusa’s successor seems completely contradictory to our notions about the relations between Rusa and Urzana. But we have to admit that the situation as it was following the defeat on Mt. Uaush in the late summer of 714, Rusa may well have been in need not only of an alliance with the Assyrian vassal as Urzana had been till then,¹⁰⁵ but also of an adult heir to the throne and a co-regent. There are indications that Melarṭua, son of Rusa, heir to the throne of Urartu, had been killed shortly before in connexion with the uprising against Rusa after the defeat in Gamir.¹⁰⁶ Against this, it could be claimed that Rusa did have a

100 Cf. the translation offered by Mayer 1983, l. 342: “das Szepter der Königsherrschaft über Urartu.”

101 Cf. Weidner’s note 19, quoted above p. 27.

102 See also Salvini 1982, pp. 226 f. Salvini raises the question whether the Ashur Letter describes the ritual for a coronation of Urartian kings or a ceremony of coronation pertaining to heirs and co-regents in the Haldia Temple, and he tends to prefer the latter alternative. According to Salvini the royal coronation did not take place in Muşāšir, but rather within Urartu’s own borders.

103 König 1954 pp. 25 ff., 37, 51. See also Waetzoldt 1972-1975, art. Hirt § 15c, p. 424.

104 König 1954, p. 37. Cf. the Ashur Letter, l. 339: “*der Fürst, der Hirte der Leute von Ur[ar]tu*.”

105 See later, in particular p. 82 concerning the request issued to Urzana by the governor of Uesi for military assistance against the invading Cimmerians in the late summer of 714.

106 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 130 ff. Cf. below, in particular p. 76, Excursus.

son named Argishti, who did in fact succeed him, even if Argishti “did not claim to have sat on his father’s (royal) throne as his predecessors, but only on ‘the royal throne’.”¹⁰⁷ The extremely passive rôle played by Urzana in connexion with the coronation leads one to assume that it is the vassal, the viceroy in Mušāšir, who is being crowned, rather than Rusa’s co-regent and heir. This impression of Urzana’s passivity and un-free or forced situation in his relation to Rusa, the king of Urartu, and with regard to the ceremony of coronation, is fully confirmed as soon as we include other contemporary sources, i. e., the Rusa stelae and ABL 409 (= Deller 5.1), as we shall now proceed to do.

The Ashur Letter is by no means our only source of information concerning the events in Mušāšir in the autumn of 714. Besides Sargon’s own version in this Letter (“Götterbrief”), Rusa’s very own account of the same series of phenomena has come down to us thanks to the stelae in Topzawä and at Mergeh Karvan. Unquestionably, these inscriptions throw an entirely new light on the situation as it was, and over the interplay between Rusa and Urzana in the course of these weeks, much more so than Sargon in the Ashur Letter. The discovery of the Mergeh Karvan stela, in the 1970’s – which is a copy of the Topzawä-inscription – and Salvini’s edition of these stelae in 1984, all go to show that we are now in possession of a considerably better text from which to derive conclusions than formerly.¹⁰⁸ We can derive a reasonably clear picture of events preceding the coronation at Mušāšir, as well as of the circumstances which made Urzana go back on his word to Sargon.

Rusa, so the inscriptions tell us,¹⁰⁹ went to Mušāšir in order to offer sacrifices in the temple,¹¹⁰ but Urzana barred the doors of the temple against him and then fled to Assyria. Rusa wasted no time but pursued him, engaged him at the mountain pass at Andaruta¹¹¹ where he defeated him, and took him prisoner. Rusa, then, so we are given to understand, placed him upon his (paternal?)¹¹² seat so as to exercise the royal sovereignty (*lugal-ti*). Rusa remained in the city of Mušāšir for a period of fourteen or fifteen days while offering sacrifices and every day arranged a sacrificial feast for the inhabitants of the city.

The consistencies between the account in the Ashur Letter and the Rusa stelae are evident. According to Sargon as well as to Rusa, Urzana is invested with the office of kingship, and both sources inform us that a festive meal is arranged for the inhabitants of the city.¹¹³ The Rusa stelae fully confirm the impression conveyed by the coronation account of the Ashur Letter, viz., that Rusa and none other is behind these events; also

that the “*sie*” of the Ashur Letter refers to the Urartians and not to Urzana’s own people nor to the priesthood of the Haldia temple. Moreover, and not least, we attach importance to the fact that the sources concurrently inform us that, from having been an Assyrian vassal, Urzana becomes a vassal king of Urartu. The stelae also seem to answer the question concerning the nature of Urzana’s kingship in that he is placed “al suo posto per (l’esercizio del)la regalità” (the Assyrian version) or “sul pos[to] paterno[?]” (Urartian version).¹¹⁴ With these words, it would seem most likely to find a reference to the kingdom of Mušāšir and nothing else even if, undoubtedly, also before this coronation Urzana called himself king of Mušāšir.¹¹⁵ But that was under Assyrian supremacy, and in the meantime Urzana had forfeited it by his defeat at the hands of Rusa at Andaruta and by his being captured. Apparently, the coronation would have to be viewed as a case of reinstatement, but now, as a vassal of Urartu. The account as found in the Ashur Letter with regard to Urzana seizing the sceptre of Urartian kingship, as we have seen above, and assuming the veracity of Sargon’s information, may then be interpreted as an indication to show that concepts and formalities which applied to Urartian kingship and election of kings would also apply to a vassalage under Urartu.

There can be no doubt, then, that the Rusa stelae and the Ashur Letter present us with two accounts, one by Rusa and one by Sargon, of one and the same event: Rusa installing Urzana as king of Mušāšir in the au-

107 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 132.

108 Salvini 1984, pp. 79 ff.; see further pp. 18 and 37 f.

109 Salvini 1984, pp. 84 ff. (Assyrian Version), pp. 86 ff. (Urartian Version); see also pp. 37 f.

110 Cf. especially the Urartian Version ll. 2 f. (Salvini 1984, p. 93).

111 Cf. the Ashur Letter, l. 425; Salvini 1984, pp. 38 and 86 with Map. p. 47.

112 Cf. the Urartian Version, l. 21 (Salvini 1984, p. 93). See also the comparison undertaken by Salvini between the relations between Rusa and Urzana and the relations between Sargon and Ullusunu in Man (Salvini 1984, p. 38).

113 Cf. the Ashur Letter, above p. 26, ll. 341 f.; Salvini 1984, p. 85 ll. 21 and 24 f. (Assyrian Version), p. 93 ll. 20 f. and 23. – Salvini calls our attention to the parallel between the mention of the festival meals of the Rusa stelae and those of the Ashur Letter l. 341 (Salvini 1984, p. 86). Cf. Azarpay 1968, p. 35.

114 Salvini 1984, p. 85 l. 21 and p. 93 ll. 20 f.

115 The Topzawā Stela (Urartian Version): [*il r*]e²*di Ardini* (Salvini 1984, p. 93 l. 19). Further, Urzana’s seal: “*kunuk¹Ur-za-na šar²Mu-ša-šir*” (Thureau-Dangin 1912, p. XII note 3). ABL 1196 = Deller 3.7, obv. 8: “*LUGAL^{KUR}Mu-ša-šir*” (Salvini 1984, p. 37 note 152).

tumn of 714. If scholars have been unaware of the connexion between the account contained in the Ashur Letter – the coronation in Muṣāṣir – and the account found in the Topzawā and Mergeh Karvan stelae with their description of Urzana's instatement as king, the reason is simply an assumption that the Ashur Letter's account was an excursus describing the Urartian coronation ritual. For this reason difficulties arose as to the dating of the events which are mentioned in the Rusa stelae; tentatively, they were placed in the years preceding Sargon's campaign in 714 or else after this event,¹¹⁶ and not where they rightly belonged, i. e., in the autumn of 714.

We may conclude that the coronation in 714 took place not only in full agreement with Rusa, but that it was arranged under the direct supervision of the Urartians, and furthermore that Rusa himself was present during the ceremony and took part in the celebrations and sacrifices following. Thus Urzana betrayed the Assyrian king and his vassalage to the latter in favour of an alliance with Rusa even if this happened, as it would appear from the account of the Rusa stelae, under pressure from the situation as it was after his defeat at Andaruta. It is not the failure on Urzana's part to observe formalities as a vassal, such as not marching to meet Sargon, kissing his feet and presenting tribute,¹¹⁷ which caused Sargon to break off his homeward march so abruptly, when instead he marched against Muṣāṣir. Quite definite and far more serious realities lie behind this decision. It is Urzana's defection from Assyria and his alliance with Rusa, sealed by the coronation in Muṣāṣir, which explain Sargon's harsh words directed against his former vassal; these are the events which are the basic and direct cause of the attack on Urzana's city. As Sargon expresses it, Urzana has broken his oath, rejected the former's supremacy, risen against him and disregarded the service which was his due.¹¹⁸ He has not had the audacity to betray the Assyrian king

116 Cf., e. g., Salvini 1984, pp. 37 f. and 45; Barnett 1982, p. 352; Sayce 1965, p. 181; König 1957, p. 150; Olmstead 1908, p. 115.

117 The Ashur Letter, ll. 311 f.

118 The Ashur Letter, ll. 309 f. and 346. – In various ways, attempts have been made to explain Sargon's sudden decision to assault Muṣāṣir. According to Levine, Urzana's refusal to pay tribute to Sargon "is the most plausible explanation, and without further information a search for other causes seems unnecessary" (Levine, Sargon's Eighth Campaign, p. 148). Azarpay is of the same opinion but feels that Sargon's performance in Muṣāṣir was a punishment which vastly exceeded Urzana's crime (Azarpay 1968, p. 99 note 110). W. Mayer does not believe in Sargon's reason for the assault. Between Muṣāṣir and Sar-

as it might appear on the surface of Sargon's version.¹¹⁹ But he has had the misfortune of having been defeated by Rusa, thereby been forced to betray his overlord, the victor at Mt. Uaush, in favour of Rusa, the loser. The Ashur Letter account of the coronation, far from being an excursus, is a report of great immediate interest on what has just happened in Mušāšir.

It would not seem so strange if, as asserted by the Ashur Letter, Rusa should have felt such grief at the news of the tragedy at Mušāšir and the abduction of Haldia to Ashur¹²⁰ that he perished, possibly by his own hand, according to the Annals of Sargon.¹²¹ The alliance with Urzana was important to Rusa for military reasons,¹²² but equally important was the support of the war-god Haldia, "who blessed the king when he set out on a campaign, to whom the king prayed for victory, to whom an account was given of all military successes."¹²³ Now, Sargon had even vanquished Haldia and carried his statue off to Assyria. Therefore, Urartu had lost the protection of the deity, and according to the ideas prevalent at the time, this protection had been transferred to the abductor,¹²⁴ i. e., to Sar-

gon's route there were trackless mountains, and Urzana had no reason to assume that Sargon anticipated his homage. Sargon's account shows clearly that he was aware of his fraudulent undertaking which was to obtain the booty required (Mayer 1979, pp. 572 f.; id., 1978-1980, pp. 30 f.). Nor does Oppenheim seem to appreciate the real reason for Sargon's assault and writes that "the campaign seemed to have degenerated into a somewhat aimless pillaging expedition" (Oppenheim 1960, p. 135). Çilingiroğlu suggests that with his attack on Mušāšir, Sargon possibly wanted to cover up his failure in Armarili (Çilingiroğlu 1976-1977, p. 265). But Salvini sees clearly that as a buffer zone Mušāšir is under pressure from the two neighbouring states in the conflict between Urartu and Assyria, and that with his action in 714 Sargon let Mušāšir pay for Urzana's alliance with Rusa (cf. the Rusa stela) although, it must be admitted, Salvini dates this alliance to the years prior to Sargon's 8th campaign (Salvini 1984, pp. 36 f.).

119 Besides the account contained in the Ashur Letter, see also Sargon's annals according to which Urzana "had broken the oath to Aššur and Marduk, and to Ursâ the Urartian had despatched perfidious messages" (Lie 1929, p. 27 ll. 149-150). Cf. ARAB II: 22. Here, we are undoubtedly dealing with a *topos*; cf. Cogan 1974 Table 2 § 2 No. 3, p. 122.

120 The Ashur Letter, l. 423.

121 The Ashur Letter, ll. 411-413; Lie 1929, p. 29 ll. 164 f.; ARAB II: 22.

122 Cf. ABL 112 = Deller 2.1, according to which the Urartians have requested military assistance from Urzana, and see below, pp. 70 f.

123 Piotrovskij 1969, p. 66.

124 Melikišvili 1980, p. 36.

gon, the enemy. In a situation like this, Rusa may well have felt that the battle had been definitely lost.¹²⁵

Sargon's attack at Muṣāṣir took place immediately following a lunar eclipse on the 24/10, 714 B.C.¹²⁶ This appears from the Ashur Letter which informs us that the phenomenon occurred simultaneously with Sargon's decision to march against Urzana.¹²⁷ The coronation celebrations and Rusa's two weeks' stay in Muṣāṣir cannot have preceded these events much; for instance, they could not have taken place immediately following the battle at Mt. Uaush in the summer. When Sargon, all of a sudden, changes his original plan for the homeward march and decides to attack Muṣāṣir instead, it shows that at this point (ab. the 24/10) he has received information of what is going on or has just been going on around Urzana. By his quick strategy and by laying a siege round the city¹²⁸ he may well have hoped to find that Rusa was still there.

The analysis of the Rusa stela and the Ashur Letter, along with the documentation that the same events are recounted in both sources, clearly shows that Urzana's changing of sides took place in the late summer and not later than in the autumn of 714. This means that Urzana's letter, ABL 409 = Deller 5.1 – a letter which refers to the same events – may be dated to this time or, more precisely, to a time shortly before Rusa's arrival at Muṣāṣir in order for him to participate in the coronation celebrations there.

ABL 409 is a reply from Urzana to an enquiry from the Assyrian *nāgīr ekalli*: "Wird der Urartäerkönig mit seinen massierten Streitkräften kommen? Wo hält er sich (gegenwärtig) auf?" Urzana replies that the governor of Uesi and the governor at the border of the Ukkaeans have arrived in Muṣāṣir and are conducting the cult in the temple. They have forwarded the information that the Urartian king, who at the present time is at Uesi, will also be coming; likewise the other governors who will be arriving later and participate in the cult. In the letter from the *nāgīr ekalli* it was explicitly stated, to Urzana, that no cultic ceremonies were allowed to be executed without the consent of the king of Assyria. Urzana's reply is, "Als der König von Assyrien (nach Muṣāṣir) gekommen ist, habe ich ihn da zurückgehalten? Er hat getan, was er zu tun liebte. Und wie soll ich diesen (d. i. den Urartäerkönig) zurückhalten?"¹²⁹

W. Mayer finds it impossible to determine when this letter was written.¹³⁰ On the other hand, Lanfranchi would date it to some time between the 1st *Nisānu* and the 11th *Ulūlu*, prior to the battle in Gamir in 715.¹³¹ Salvini sees the connexion between the contents of the letter and

the Rusa stelae. He regards the request from the *nāgir ekalli* as a warning to Urzana and assumes that, after having dispatched his reply (ABL 409), Urzana did in fact yield to the Assyrian pressure and closed the border to Urartu. In other words, the letter is assumed to reflect a situation as it was before Rusa's first arrival in Muṣāṣir when Urzana barred the temple against him and fled towards Assyria; these are events which Salvini would date, along with the letter ABL 409, to the period before 714, most likely ab. 716.¹³²

Lanfranchi's dating of ABL 409 to some time before the battle in Gamir will be discussed in the sequel.¹³³ We agree with Salvini when he argues that the letter pertains to the time when the events referred to in the Rusa stelae took place; but in our opinion it is unlikely to have preceded the battle at Andaruta. The presence of two Urartian governors in Muṣāṣir at the time when Urzana wrote his letter scarcely indicates a state of affairs when Urzana would have been in a position to close either the border or the temple to Rusa; it would seem to indicate that Rusa has

125 Lehmann-Haupt was of the opinion that the reason for Rusa's suicide is not to be looked for in the Assyrian victories but as a result of the Cimmerian invasion (Lehmann-Haupt 1921, col. 402; id. 1926, pp. 327 f.). Others have doubted the truth inherent in the Assyrian assertion of suicide (Thureau-Dangin 1912, p. XIX; Olmstead 1916, p. 42), and whether Rusa did in fact die that year inasmuch as the Topzawā-inscription is dated to some time after 714 (cf. Olmstead 1908, p. 115). Yet, to-day it is commonly agreed that Rusa died in the year 714 as claimed by the Assyrian sources, but the circumstances concerning his death are still a matter of debate (Riemschneider 1965, p. 95; Burney und Lang 1973, p. 311; Çilingiroğlu 1976-1977, p. 267 note 81; Rolle 1977, p. 298 note 30). Whether Rusa died by his own hand or otherwise, cannot be determined. At least, there is nothing to contradict the Assyrian assertion of his death the year the assault on Muṣāṣir took place – even if information in Assyrian historiography about the death of an enemy frequently seems to be a *topos* (Fales 1982, p. 430).

126 Oppenheim 1960, pp. 137 f.

127 The Ashur Letter, l. 318.

128 Lie 1929, p. 27 ll. 153 f.

129 ABL 409 = Deller 5.1. The letter was also edited by Fales 1983, pp. 40 ff.

130 Mayer 1978-1980, p. 31.

131 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 134 f., especially p. 136. Thureau-Dangin (1912, p. XIII) also dated ABL 409 to a time before 714; cf. also Malbran-Labat 1982, p. 148.

132 Salvini 1984, pp. 37 and 45.

133 Cf. below, especially note 147.

the situation in Muṣāṣir under full control.¹³⁴ The letter clearly belongs to a time after Urzana's defeat at the Andaruta pass followed by his release from captivity; it has to be dated to a point immediately preceding Rusa's arrival in Muṣāṣir, there to participate in the coronation and the sacrificial festivities, just as Urzana specifically informs the *nāgir ekalli*. The festival described by Rusa in his stelae, according to ABL 409, appears to be well under way already at this juncture: the two Urartian governors have arrived and conduct services in the temple; Rusa is in Uesi but on his way; subsequently the other Urartian governors will arrive and participate in the cultic ceremonies. This is the prelude to the celebration of the coronation as such; it is the prelude to the festivities connected with sacrifices, offerings, and Rusa's fourteen days in Muṣāṣir as described in ABL 409. The letter gives vent to the situation when Urzana has betrayed the Assyrians and sided with the king of Urartu. A short time before this he was still loyal to Sargon, closed the temple against Rusa, fled towards Assyria, but was defeated so that what he saw as his only line of escape would be an alliance with Rusa. We are in the late summer or in the autumn of 714, not in the year 716 or 715.

We observe the Assyrian interest in Rusa's movements: where is he staying, the *nāgir ekalli* asks Urzana. This is clearly the position in 714 after Mt. Uaush. Rusa fled after the battle, and Assyrian intelligence attempts to trace his movements while the Assyrian armies ravage southern Urartu.¹³⁵ Precisely in the year 714, and particularly after the invasion into Urartu by Assyrian troops which came in the wake of the Urartian defeat at Mt. Uaush, interest in the whereabouts of Rusa ran high.

Urzana's sudden revulsion is reflected in all three sources from the late summer and autumn of 714: the texts of the Rusa stelae, ABL 409, and the Ashur Letter. The stelae provide us with information about the reasons for his veering, its background and the immediate consequences for Urzana. The letter (ABL 409) shows that apparently the Assyrians were not fully aware of the fact that Urzana was a definite defaulter, or that, at any rate, they tried to force him to withstand Rusa. Reading between the lines in Urzana's reply – which has been interpreted as impertinent and ironical, indeed derisive towards the Assyrians¹³⁶ – we may perhaps sense that feeling which Urzana may have had when realising that he was not much more than a plaything between the two great powers, Assyria and Urartu: a feeling of powerlessness and of despair, having been forced by circumstances into an alliance with Rusa, the loser. Finally, the third and the last source, the Ashur Letter, accounts for the defini-

tive consequences of the swing-over. All three sources furnish us with a vivid impression of the passive rôle played by Urzana in this game. He is nothing but the marionette or the puppet; Rusa and Sargon are the main characters in the game.

With all this, we have arrived at what is our essential task in discussing the events concerning Mušāšir in the months of September and October in the year 714, as well as with regard to the sources available to us: an attempt at arriving at a precise dating of Rusa's defeat in Gamir. One of the letters where the defeat is mentioned (ABL 197 = Deller 1.2), does in fact include a passage pertaining to a period of time shortly after the capture of Urzana at the Andaruta pass. In this particular letter, Sennacherib informs his father, the king of the Assyrians, Sargon himself, that Urzana together with his brother and his son have departed "zur Audienz zum Urartäerkönig".¹³⁷ Lanfranchi translates the pertinent passage as follows: "The king of Mušāšir, his brother and his son have gone to greet the Urartian king." Lanfranchi interprets this act as Urzana's "homage, a sign of submission to Urartian power".¹³⁸ His dating of ABL 197 and the Gamir battle to the year 715 would entail that Urzana's homage had taken place in that year.¹³⁹

However, we are conscious of the fact that the events mentioned in the Rusa stela, and thereby also Urzana's turning coat, took place in September or October in the year 714. For this reason, Urzana's homage towards Rusa must also have taken place in the late summer or in the au-

134 Furthermore, Salvini's thesis would entail that Urzana had changed sides no less than three times: at first, he is loyal towards Assyria (before ABL 409); then he refuses to abide by the request submitted by the *nāgir ekalli* with a view to keeping Rusa off the temple (ABL 409); then he submits to Assyrian pressure and does in fact close the temple to Rusa (the Rusa stela), and eventually, after Andaruta, he becomes a Urartian vassal king (cf. Salvini's presentation 1984, p. 37). All sources: the Ashur Letter, the Rusa stela and ABL 409 tell us of *one*, not of three swing-overs, to wit, that Urzana deserts Sargon and joins Rusa.

135 Cf. the following sections concerning the events after Mt. Uaush and Gamir where letters from Assyrian intelligence by which, i. a., Rusa's present whereabouts are reviewed, are placed in their chronological sequence. Cf. letters like, i. a., ABL 146, 197, 380, 144, 381 (= Deller 1.1, 1.2, 3.4, 6.1, 6.2) as well as CT 53, 114, cf. Lanfranchi 1983, p. 126.

136 Waterman, RCAE III, p. 153; Thureau-Dangin 1912, p. XIII; Riemschneider 1965, p. 87.

137 ABL 197 = Deller 1.2. – As for the text of the letter, cf. below, note 222.

138 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 134.

139 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 133 ff. and diagram, p. 136. Cf. also Salvini 1984, pp. 37 f., 40 and 45.

tumn of 714, and must have taken place after Urzana had been released following his capture at Andaruta and before the coronation in Mušāšir. We also note that Urzana's son was in the footsteps of his father, just as – according to the Ashur Letter – he accompanied him during the coronation ceremony.¹⁴⁰ According to Lanfranchi, the meeting between Urzana and Rusa took place in Uesi.¹⁴¹ Admittedly, this is not specifically mentioned in the letter; but in a report from Aššur-rēšūja in the same letter, the latter tells us that an internal strife and bloodshed, taking place after the battle in Gamir, had been over and done with and that the country is now at peace,¹⁴² and he calls our attention to the fact that at the moment the king is to be found in Uazaun/Uesi.¹⁴³ It seems very likely that the meeting took place there, that is to say at a time when, having been relieved from intrigue from within, Rusa was able to concentrate on the alliance with Urzana. Also, this would tally with the fact that in his letter to the *nāgir ekalli* (ABL 409), Urzana tells us that Rusa is at Uesi but is expected to arrive in Mušāšir,¹⁴⁴ i. e., in anticipation of the festivities in connexion with the coronation and the offerings on the occasion.

ABL 197 as well as its account of Urzana meeting with Rusa not only fits well with the situation as it was after Andaruta and prior to the coronation in 714, but actually Urzana's homage cannot under any circumstances have taken place at any other time.¹⁴⁵ After the coronation, Sargon arrives in Mušāšir, Rusa dies, and Urzana disappears out of the historical picture. Before Andaruta, Urzana had been an Assyrian vassal and consequently could not have subjugated to the king of Urartu. Urzana's homage towards Rusa betokens the turning of the tide midstream which becomes evident from the Ashur Letter, from ABL 409, and from the Rusa stela, which happened in the late summer of the year 714.

Since Urzana's homage can be dated to the late summer or the autumn of 714, then the letter ABL 197, from Sennacherib, must derive from this very period. Consequently, the battle in Gamir must also have taken place in that same year. Sennacherib's letter contains reports from four sources indicated by name, as follows:

1. the Ukkæan recounting the defeat of the Urartians in Gamir and the imprisonment of the field marshal and two governors;
2. Aššur-rēšūja confirming a show-down in Urartu, verifying a report dispatched on an earlier occasion, but stating that the country is now at peace; all nobles having returned to

their provinces, but the Urartian field marshal Kakkadanu has been imprisoned, and the king is staying at Uzaun/Uesi;

3. Nabû-le'i, governor of Bīrtu, recounting the defeat in Gamir, the king's escape, his arrival in Urartu, and informing us that the king's baggage has not yet arrived;
4. Nabû-le'i, *major domus* with Akhat-abisha of Tabal, sending a letter to Sargon.

Besides the information derived from these four sources, Sennacherib is able to tell his father that Urzana, his brother and his son have departed to obtain an audience with Rusa; a messenger from Khubushkia also went to greet him. The source of this last piece of information derives from sentries at the border garrisons. ABL 197, then, allows us to establish the following sequence of events:

1. Battle in Gamir;
2. Rusa escapes;
3. He arrives in Urartu,
4. Where an internal show-down occurs.
5. He has Kakkadanu imprisoned,
6. Stays at Uesi,
7. Where he receives Urzana together with the latter's family, and a messenger from Khubushkia, in audience.

140 Cf. above, p. 28.

141 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 134.

142 Cf. Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 124 ff.

143 ABL 197 = Deller 1.2.

144 ABL 409 = Deller 5.1.

145 Unless we were to claim even several swing-overs on the part of Urzana, but neither the sources nor the thesis postulated here yields any background whatsoever for such an assumption.

The battle in Gamir may, therefore, with certainty be dated to 714,¹⁴⁶ shortly before Urzana's homage.¹⁴⁷ We cannot determine exactly the length of time which elapsed between Rusa's fleeing from Gamir and his receiving Urzana; nor can we determine with any degree of certainty how long it took for the individual reports to reach Sennacherib. It is scarcely a matter of a week or two at the most. Inasmuch as Urzana's homage must have taken place in September, or in the beginning of October at the very latest, the battle in Gamir may be dated to the summer or late summer of that year, i. e., at the very earliest, at the end of August or, more likely, September of 714.

Rusa has been busy during the last months of his life: flight from Gamir, quelling an uprising, confrontation and then allying himself with Urzana, coronation and fourteen days of festival in Mušāšir, all of which took place over a period from, at the earliest, the end of August or during September until approximately the 24th October, when Sargon makes up his mind to march against Mušāšir. It is during this same period that the Assyrians ravage the southern provinces of Urartu after Rusa's defeat at Mt. Uaush.¹⁴⁸ Consequently, before his flight from Gamir, this summer or late summer Rusa must have fought *two* battles and suffered *two* defeats, not only in engagements with the Cimmerians in Gamir, but also with Sargon on Mt. Uaush in Uishdish. Among scholars who date the Gamir battle to 714, opinions differ with regard to which time of year it took place. A. Kammenhuber would prefer a date early in the year and would look at it as the reason why Sargon decided to start his 8th campaign.¹⁴⁹ However, this theory cannot be upheld once it has been shown that the battle took place in the late summer. M. Riemschneider tends to think that it occurred immediately preceding the battle on Mt. Uaush, whereas R. D. Barnett favours a date shortly after this battle, dating it to the summer or autumn of 714.¹⁵⁰

It is difficult to see how the Uaush battle could possibly have followed that in Gamir; there simply isn't time if we assume that Rusa was present in both of these battles. Nor is it easy to imagine that Rusa would have been able to conduct a campaign in Gamir immediately following his defeat at Mt. Uaush, having fought two battles at such a short interval. One is forced to ask: isn't there, rather, a connexion between Rusa's defeats in Gamir and on Mt. Uaush – a connexion which has not been previously observed? Both battles are fought south of Urmia in or near the country of the Mannaeans, that is to say, they took place not only in the same year and at approximately the same time, but also indeed in the

same geographical area. Again, a suspicion grows upon us that there is something we have overlooked, tied as we are to the idea of the Cimmerians coming down from the north. Hence, a closer look is required concerning Rusa's movements after, respectively, Mt. Uaush and Gamir. First, let us consider the events from Rusa's sudden appearance in Uishdish and on Mt. Uaush in the summer of 714 until his death later in the year.

2. From Uishdish and Mt. Uaush till Rusa's Death

The primary sources with regard to the events of the summer and autumn of the year 714 are still the Ashur Letter, the Rusa stela, and the letters discovered which pertain to the period in question. From the point of view of source criticism, the latter group is, of course, the most trustworthy, but the state of preservation of the letters as well as difficulties concerning a precise dating with any degree of certainty makes it evident that not all fragments of letters can be utilized at all. We shall have to be satisfied with those which may, with reasonable certainty, be dated to this period.¹⁵¹ Since it was first published, the Ashur Letter has played a decisive rôle in the concept of the show-down between Assyria and Urartu. It cannot be otherwise, but we have to an ever-mounting degree become conscious of the variety of problems which are connected with the reliability of Assyrian royal inscriptions.

146 Cf. also, i. a., Riemschneider 1965, pp. 85 ff.; Kammenhuber 1976-1980, p. 594; Barnett 1982, pp. 354 f.

147 As mentioned above, according to Lanfranchi the letter sent by Urzana to the *nāgir ekalli* (ABL 409) would be from the time before the battle in Gamir, and he dates it to the period 1st *Nisānu* and the 11th *Ulūlu* (cf. above, p. 36). When the battle in Gamir took place – as we can see from ABL 197 – before Urzana's homage and his visiting Rusa, it would, however, be more reasonable to conclude that this battle was fought before ABL 409, and not vice-versa. Urzana's swing-over after Andaruta, his visit with Rusa and his letter to the *nāgir ekalli* belong together in terms of time, as we have demonstrated. We also note that according to ABL 409, Rusa is staying in Uesi and *that*, by all accounts, is where he receives Urzana.

148 See the Ashur Letter, ll. 167-305 and Levine 1977.

149 Cf. reference in note 146.

150 Cf. reference above in note 146.

151 For the possibility that other letters and fragments of letters may be relevant with regard to the period discussed here, cf. below, note 334.

Contemporaneous considerations with regard to the ideological framework, the literary pattern, the use of *topoi*, rhetoric devices and evasion of the truth – all these detract considerably from the veracity which we might have hoped for as historical witnesses of such sources;¹⁵² they urge us towards scepticism also towards Sargon's own presentation in the Ashur Letter.¹⁵³ Reality may well have been quite different from the one we encounter there. The Rusa stelae suffer from the same drawback; nevertheless, they are a valuable supplement to Sargon's account. But if we are to appreciate the correlation between the engagements at Mt. Uaush and in Gamir, we cannot dismiss the Ashur Letter as a vital source.¹⁵⁴

While, in the course of his campaign in 714, according to the Ashur Letter, Sargon was busy ravaging Ištaippa and other fortified towns in the Aukani district, in Zikirtu, with fire and destruction, Rusa – all of a sudden – made an appearance in Man itself, in the district of Uishdish. Sargon departed from Aukani and marched against Uishdish; but before his arrival Rusa had already taken charge of this area which belonged to Ullusunu, king of the Mannaeans, and had subjugated its population and conquered its numerous fortified towns.¹⁵⁵ Sargon met Rusa and the latter's ally, Metatti of Zikirtu, on Mt. Uaush, and the engagement ended with an Assyrian victory and Rusa's flight.¹⁵⁶ Sargon abandoned the furtherance of his campaign against Zikirtu and Andia, that which was apparently the original target for his enterprise; now, instead, he turned his attention to Urartu.¹⁵⁷ At first, he conquered Uishdish with its multitude of fortified towns and saw to it that their well-constructed walls were demolished.¹⁵⁸ Thereupon we have the account of Sargon's punitive expedition into southern Urartu,¹⁵⁹ an enterprise which we now know – as against previous assumptions – took him through the southerly provinces of the country in the area to the west of Lake Urmia.¹⁶⁰ Formerly it was assumed, in agreement with Thureau-Dangin, that Mt. Uaush was identical with Mt. Sahend east of Urmia, and that the Assyrian army had taken a route north of Lakes Urmia and Van.¹⁶¹ This postulate has now been abandoned. As we have seen, at the end of the account we are informed of Sargon's interrupted homeward march, the attack upon Muşāşir, the death of Rusa, and then Sargon's eventual return by way of the Andaruta pass and his arrival in Assyria.¹⁶²

Returning to the situation as it was immediately before the clash on Mt. Uaush, we shall have to ask ourselves: what made Uishdish, a Mannaeian district, so important that Rusa should have been prepared to

snatch it away, so to speak, while facing the Assyrian king and his army? It seems to be a daring provocation in view of the fact that Sargon and his army were at such close range, nearby. One explanation to account for Rusa's intrusion could be so as to create a diversion. According to the Ashur Letter, Metatti of Zikirtu is an ally of Rusa's. While Sargon is harrying Aukani, Metatti withdraws, allows the populace to seek shelter in the mountains whilst making his troops and horses ready to join Rusa, his ally, in order to come to his assistance and to provide reinforcement.¹⁶³ Not much later, it is the combined troops of Rusa and Metatti challenging Sargon to an engagement on Mt. Uaush in Uishdish.¹⁶⁴

152 Cf., i. a., Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons, ed. F. M. Fales, 1981, especially contributions by Grayson, pp. 35 ff. and by Zaccagnini, pp. 259 ff. Further, cf. Grayson 1980, pp. 170 f.; Zaccagnini 1982, pp. 409 ff.; Fales 1982, pp. 425 ff. See also Liverani 1979, p. 302.

153 Cf. von Soden 1962, p. 100; 1963, p. 132; Riemschneider 1965, pp. 93 ff. Mayer is of the opinion that historians are justified in being sceptical with regard to statements made by the Assyrian kings. But as far as the account of the Ashur Letter is concerned, his opinion is different: he considers it unlikely that Sargon would have submitted untrue statements to the god Ashur (Mayer 1979, p. 595; id., 1978-1980, pp. 14 ff.).

154 Cf. Grayson: "I doubt that there are many who would call these texts [i. e., the Assyrian royal inscriptions] either literature or history. That is not to deny the historical usefulness of these texts which are invaluable documentary sources for the modern historian who knows how to use them" (Grayson 1981, p. 47).

155 The Ashur Letter, ll. 87-95 and 163-166.

156 The Ashur Letter, ll. 96-145.

157 The Ashur Letter, ll. 14 and 162; see Salvini 1984, p. 36. Levine, *East-West Trade*, p. 182; id., *Sargon's Eighth Campaign*, pp. 144, 146 and 147 ff. Although the campaign against Zikirtu and Andia seems to have been Sargon's original target, according to the Ashur Letter, in the course of their meeting at the beginning of the campaign Ullusunu is supposed to have entreated Sargon to repel Rusa "durch eine Niederlage in einer Feldschlacht" (l. 56), and Sargon promised the Mannaeans "*Urartu zurückzuwerfen*" (l. 61), see Mayer 1978-1980, p. 32.

158 The Ashur Letter, ll. 163-165.

159 The Ashur Letter, ll. 167-306.

160 Levine, *Sargon's Eighth Campaign*, with sketch map Fig. 1, p. 145; Mayer 1978-1980, pp. 29 f. with sketch map Abb. 1, p. 15; Salvini 1984, p. 15 note 23 and pp. 48 f. See also Muscarella 1971, p. 49.

161 Thureau-Dangin 1912, pp. V ff.; Barnett 1982, pp. 353 f. Cf. objections raised against the thesis already by Rigg 1942; Adontz 1946, pp. 367 ff.

162 The Ashur Letter, ll. 309-425.

163 The Ashur Letter, ll. 80-85.

164 The Ashur Letter, ll. 103-111 and 141.

The letters which have come down to us enable us to follow very closely the interplay between Rusa and Metatti in the days before Mt. Uaush. A report from Bēl-iddin (king of Allabria, as it seems)¹⁶⁵ to Sargon, preserved in the letter ABL 515 (= Deller 3.5) shows that Rusa has been informed of the Assyrian assault upon Zikirtu because messengers from this country as well as from Andia had come to Uesi in order to convey such news to him. On the very same day when Rusa received these messengers, he struck camp, and we now find him, that is to say at the time when Bēl-iddin's report was written, in Zikirtu with his military units.¹⁶⁶ It is evident that a report from Aššur-rēšūja (ABL 198 = Deller 3.1) belongs in this context,¹⁶⁷ for like ABL 515 it refers to Urartian counter-measures in the wake of the Assyrian drive in Zikirtu.¹⁶⁸ According to Aššur-rēšūja, the Urartian king has returned empty-handed "von dort, wohin ihn die Zikirtäer ge/verbracht haben", and with his own forces he has entered Uesi. Here he has left the main party of his army and with a small number marched to the Mannaeen border zone. Following the king's departure, it seems that also the governor of Uesi has marched off,¹⁶⁹ but this rumour has not been confirmed.

It is reasonable to conclude that the events mentioned in ABL 198 followed immediately after those of which we are told in ABL 515. The information that Rusa has returned to Uesi after a campaign, or perhaps teamwork, with the people of Zikirtu, would naturally refer to his return from the expedition to Zikirtu mentioned in ABL 515, with Uesi as its starting point. When ABL 198 informs us of Rusa's intrusion, or imminent intrusion, into the Mannaeen border zone, it stands to reason that reference is being made to his campaign towards Uishdish which was at the very frontier of Urartu,¹⁷⁰ and which according to the Ashur Letter Rusa was taking possession of while Sargon's campaign in Zikirtu was in full flood.

The sequence of events from the time when Sargon invaded Zikirtu up to the encounter with Rusa and Metatti on Mt. Uaush must then be as follows. While the Assyrian army ravages Zikirtu, Metatti and Andia send messages to Rusa at Uesi to brief him. Rusa acts immediately, marches to Zikirtu with his army but returns to Uesi "mit leeren Händen", leaves the core of the army there and, with a smaller force, approaches the Mannaeen border area, conquers Uishdish with its multitude of fortified cities, and shortly afterwards, together with the Zikirtaeans, finds himself face to face with Sargon, the latter having been informed of Rusa's advance in Uishdish, on Mt. Uaush.¹⁷¹ Before this, it would

appear that also the governor of Uesi must have set forth with his units, presumably in order to march towards Uishdish and join forces with the king.¹⁷²

165 Parpola 1981, p. 139, Chart 3. Cf. Deller's comments on ABL 515 = Deller 3.5 obv. 2.

166 Cf. ABL 515 = Deller 3.5: "Der Gesandte von Andia (und) der Gesandte von Zikirtu sind nach Uasi gekommen und haben gesagt: 'Der König von Assyrien (mobilisiert) gegen uns'. An dem Tage, an welchem er (der Urartäerkönig) die Gesandten empfangen hat, ist er aufgebrochen. Er befindet sich mit seinen Streitkräften (jetzt) in Zikirtia". For the relevance of the letter as the situation was in the summer of 714, see Thureau-Dangin 1912, p. VI note 4; Salvini 1984, p. 48; cf. also Deller who places the letter under Group 3: "Nachrichten über die Mobilmachung der Urartäer vor und während des VIII. Feldzugs Sargons II", Deller 1984, p. 104.

167 ABL 198 = Deller 3.1: "Am 11. Ululu ist ein Brief des Aššur-rēšūja bei mir eingetroffen (mit folgendem Inhalt): 'Der Urartäer-König hat von dort, wohin ihn die Zikirtäer ge/verbracht haben, nichts mitgebracht. Er ist mit leeren Händen zurückgekehrt. Mit seinen Streitkräften ist er (jetzt) nach der Stadt Uajasi gezogen (und) in sie eingetreten. Dann hat er (das Gros) seiner Streitkräfte in Uajasi zurückgelassen. Daraus hat er nur wenige Streitkräfte mitgenommen und ist nach dem Grenzgebiet der Mannäer gezogen und (dort) eingedrungen. (D. h.) Ich (d. i. Aššur-rēšūja) habe (selbst) noch nicht gehört, dass er wirklich dort eingedrungen ist. Sobald ich es gehört haben werde, werde ich es dir schreiben. – Der (urartäische) Statthalter mir gegenüber befand sich (bis jetzt) in der Stadt Uesi. Ich habe jedoch gehört: 'Nach seinem (d. i. des Königs) Weggang ist (auch er) ausgezogen (und) fortgegangen'. Seinen Auszug aus Uesi hat jedoch niemand beobachtet."

168 Salvini 1984, p. 48; Deller 1984, p. 104 (Headline pertaining to Group 3); Rigg 1942, p. 134 note 38; cf. Thureau-Dangin 1912, p. VI note 4. – Lanfranchi, on the other hand, dates ABL 198 to the year 715 prior to the Gamir battle (Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 126 f., 128 f. and 136). We agree with Lanfranchi in dating ABL 198 to the time before Gamir, and that it was written before CT 53, 114 and ABL 197, but as we have emphasized above, p. 40, the Gamir battle took place in 714, not in 715.

169 Aššur-rēšūja's piece of information in ABL 198 – "the governor who is in front of me" – refers to the governor of Uesi (Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 128 f.). Cf. also below, note 214.

170 The Ashur Letter, l. 167. – For arguments in favour of locating Uishdish south of Lake Urmia, on the Urartian border, see Levine, Sargon's Eighth Campaign, pp. 141 f. and 146 with map sketch Fig. 1, p. 145. Cf. id. 1974, pp. 114 f. with map sketch Fig. 2, p. 105, which seems to place Uishdish slightly further to the northwest, but still south of Lake Urmia and close to the border of Urartu.

171 Cf. ABL 515 and 198 as well as the Ashur Letter, ll. 79-109.

172 ABL 198 = Deller 3.1 Cf. above, note 169. – On the face of it one would assume that the Uesi governor set forth so as to join the king in Uishdish. Aššur-rēšūja seems to assume that an attack on Kumme might be anticipated, cf. his concluding remark in ABL 198 (following the message of the Uesi-governor's departure): "Sie setzen jetzt die Strassen, die zu mir (hinführen), imstand (und) stampfen die Brückendämme fest. – Sobald ich Näheres (wörtlich: was es ist) gehört haben werde – ob er [presumably the governor of Uesi] mit seinen Streitkräften kommt oder ob er ohne Bedeckung kommt – werde ich sofort an den Kronprinzen schreiben". Cf. the information from Arjê contained in the same letter concerning Urartian plans to capture Assyrian governors in Kumme. See Lanfranchi 1983, p. 127.

Viewed on this background, Rusa's intrusion into Uishdish could very well be interpreted as a diversional manoeuvre designed to luring Sargon and his forces away from Zikirtu – which had suffered considerably – and at the same time challenging him into open battle on Mt. Uaush in a type of country which would make the movements of the Assyrian army exceedingly difficult. This last point of view would seem to represent the situation as the author of the Ashur Letter interpreted it. According to this, it was entirely impossible for the Assyrian main force to take part in the battle which was fought by Sargon in person, so the account will have it, with his personal cavalry, the “Regiment (?) des ^m*Sîn-aḥ-ušur*”. In the end, we mustn't forget that it was Rusa himself who, by messenger, challenged Sargon to battle.¹⁷³

The battle on Mt. Uaush may be dated to the days about the 11th *Ulūlu* or shortly afterwards. According to ABL 198, it is on this date that Sennacherib receives Aššur-rēšūja's report concerning Rusa's march against the Man frontier, and on that same day, so it would seem, he sends his letter to his father.¹⁷⁴ Naturally, we cannot determine the length of time which it took for Aššur-rēšūja's report to reach Sennacherib, nor how much time it took for Rusa to conquer Uishdish and be in readiness for the day of reckoning on Mt. Uaush. Most likely, the battle took place shortly after the 11th *Ulūlu*. Sargon set forth on his 8th campaign in the month of *Du'uzi* (June/July),¹⁷⁵ and it cannot have been earlier than round the middle of *Ulūlu* when he could have faced Rusa in open combat.

But Rusa's invasion of Uishdish is not merely a reflection of a diversional manoeuvre. This is not the first time that the Uishdish territory has been the cause of skirmishing, or formed the frame of such conflicts. Already in 716, according to the Annals, Sargon had found it necessary to intervene because Rusa had made two Mannaeen governors – Metatti of Zikirtu and Bagdatti of Uishdish – rebel against Sargon and Azâ, their king. Azâ had been killed and his body thrown away on Mt. Uaush; but Sargon intervened and had one of the ringleaders of the uprising, Bagdatti, taken prisoner and flayed alive on that very mountain. Eventually, Sargon acknowledged Ullusunū, Azâ's brother, as successor to the throne in Man.¹⁷⁶ The term “Bagdatti of Uishdish”¹⁷⁷ indicates that the latter was, or had been, governor of Uishdish and emphasises that an important centre for the uprising against Azâ, the ally of the Assyrian king, and for the conspiracy with Rusa was to be found precisely in this north Mannaeen border area up against Urartu. Since the end of the 9th cen-

tury, the southern border of Urartu had remained uncontested, as it seems, along the south coast of Lake Urmia, and the valleys along this coastline had been under Urartian dominance.¹⁷⁸ To the south of this borderline was Uishdish with all her fortified cities,¹⁷⁹ and Rusa's intervention into this particular district in the year 714, and in the years preceding, may naturally be viewed as a link in safeguarding the Urartian frontier and her interests towards the south, last, but not least, an attempt to curtail an Assyrian threat against Urartu.

In spite of Sargon's intervention in Uishdish, in the year 716, Rusa was on the warpath already in the following year, 715; and according to the Annals he deprived Ullusunu of 22 fortresses for which, as it seems, Daiaukku, the Mannaeen governor, was responsible. Sargon reconquered the fortresses, and he "annexed them to the territory of the land of Aššur"; Daiaukku and his family were deported.¹⁸⁰ In Weidner's edition of the Ashur Prism fragment we find a slightly different version of these events in the year 715: "Ursâ, der Urartäer... nahm ihm (dem Ullusunu) 12 seiner festen Kastelle, die gegen die Länder Urartu, Andia (und) Nairi zur Wache liegen, fort und verkleinerte sein Land. Krieger als seine

173 The Ashur Letter, ll. 110-111 and 127-132; Mayer 1978-1980, p. 26.

174 ABL 198 = Deller 3.1, rev. 25-26. Cf. Lanfranchi's translation, 1983, p. 126: "I have s[e]nt (this) message to the [ki]ng my lord on the 11th of *Ulûlu*". Contrary to Lanfranchi, it is Deller's opinion that *egertu* most probably refers to the most recent letter despatched by Sennacherib to Sargon, and he translates: "Am 11. *Ulûlu* habe ich einen Brief an meinen Herrn König abgeschickt" (Deller 1984, pp. 106 f.).

175 The Ashur Letter, l. 6; cf. Mayer 1978-1980, p. 20; Levine, Sargon's Eighth Campaign, p. 148; cf. Çilingiroğlu 1976-1977, p. 254 note 14.

176 Lie 1929, pp. 13 f., ll. 78-79; Salvini 1984, p. 35; Barnett 1982, pp. 352 f.

177 Lie 1929, p. 13 l. 79; cf. also The Display Inscription: "Bagdatti of the land of Uishdish", ARAB II:56.

178 Levine 1974, pp. 114 f.; id., East-West Trade, p. 178, maps pp. 177 and 180; id., Sargon's Eighth Campaign, pp. 141 f.; Kleiss 1980, p. 304; Salvini 1981, pp. 162-171.

179 The Ashur Letter, ll. 164 f.

180 Sargon's Annals: "In the seventh year of my reign Rusâ the Urartian planned treachery against Ullusunu the Mannaeen, and 22 of his fortresses he took from him; he uttered slanderous and contemptuous words against Ullusunu to Daiukku, governor of the land of the Mannaeans, and he received from him his son as hostage. To Aššur, my lord, I lifted up my hands, and those 22 fortresses I besieged and conquered, and I annexed them to the territory of the land of Aššur. Daiukku together with his family I removed" (Lie 1929, pp. 18 f., ll. 101-103). Cf. The Display Inscription, ARAB II:56: "22 fortresses of Ullusunu, the Mannean, I took away from him and brought (returned) them within the boundary of Assyria".

Garnisonstruppen liess er darin einrücken und verstärkte ihre Befestigungen. Um zu rächen den Ullusunu, den Mannäer, bot ich die massigen Truppen des Gottes Aššur auf und richtete auf die Eroberung dieser Kastelle mein Antlitz. Diese Kastelle na[hm] ich ein, plünderte sie aus, meine Soldaten liess ich gemeinsam mit (denen) des Ullusu[nu] dar[in] einrücken.”¹⁸¹

The account in the fragment of the prism corresponds to ll. 101-103 in the Annals, but provides us with a series of new details.¹⁸² We may note the variance concerning the number of fortifications. The prism inscription refers to 12, whereas the Annals (and the Display Inscription) indicate 22.¹⁸³ This variant is of no great consequence since we are obviously faced with the same event. But two pieces of information are of paramount importance. First, the information that these fortresses were placed as guards at the border at Urartu, Andia, and Nairi. Second, the information that after the Assyrian re-conquest they received garrisons consisting of Assyrian as well as of Mannaeans soldiers.

Streck, already, saw that Uishdish and the 22 fortifications concerned one and the same territory.¹⁸⁴ Certain items seem to favour that this was in fact the case, particularly the fact that the 12, or 22, were located close to the frontier of Urartu, Andia, and Nairi. As we know, Uishdish was on the borderline of Urartu; consequently, she must have had control of at least some of the fortresses. If we were to look at Levine’s sketched maps, we find Uishdish placed in such a way that not only does the country form a frontier against Urartu, but also – as the prism text tells us – may have had contacts with Andia, near Zikirtu to the east (?) and with Nairi/Khubushkia to the west; according to the third campaign of Shalmaneser III, the latter could not have been very far from Kurruri.¹⁸⁵ Hence, no-

181 Weidner 1941-1944, pp. 46 f.

182 Weidner 1941-1944, p. 47.

183 The Display Inscription, ARAB II:56.

184 Streck 1899, p. 136. This opinion is shared by Barnett 1982, p. 353; Boehmer 1964, p. 15 note 28.

185 See Levine 1974, map Fig. 2 p. 105; id., Sargon’s Eighth Campaign, pp. 143 f., map Fig. 1 p. 145. – Several hypotheses have been advanced with regard to the location of Khubushkia/Nairi, besides Levine and his references cf. also the same author’s article Hubuškia 1972-1975, p. 479; further, see Reade 1978, p. 141 with map Fig. 2 p. 140; Salvini 1984, pp. 13, 18, 35, and *passim*, cf. map Fig. 2, p. 47; cf. CAH III, 1982, map 11 p. 246 (near Kurruru) and map 13 pp. 324 f. (south of Lake Van). We cannot here enter into a discussion of these theses. In the present context the decisive factor must be that the Prism Inscription

thing precludes the assumption that all these fortifications were located in Uishdish, nor that Daiaukku was governor of this district and replaced Bagdatti there.¹⁸⁶ In 714, after the Mt. Uaush battle, Uishdish (which Rusa had conquered immediately before this event)¹⁸⁷ was taken from him and restored to Ullusunu, thus according to the Annals,¹⁸⁸ or as the Ashur Letter will have it, “Die Füße des bösen Feindes entfernte ich aus dem Lande der *Mannäer* und machte froh das Herz des ^m*Ullusunu*, ihres Herrn”.¹⁸⁹ In other words, the fortresses in Uishdish were once again under Ullusunu’s control.¹⁹⁰ This is precisely what is said about the 22 fortresses according to the Display Inscription: they were taken from Rusa and restored to Ullusunu, Sargon therefore, by the same token, restoring the damage inflicted upon the latter.¹⁹¹ The Ashur Letter shows clearly that the controversy between Rusa on one side and the rulers of

claims a common border for the part of Man where the 12 fortresses were, with Nairi. Consequently, there is nothing to suggest that a Mannaeian district like Uishdish could not also have it. (For a common border between Khubushkia and Man in the following century, cf. Knudtson 1893, No. 35, and Yusifov 1982, p. 351).

186 Boehmer 1964, p. 15 note 28. – A “Daiku of Shaparda” makes his appearance on Sargon’s stela from 716 (Levine 1972, pp. 40 f., l. 47, cf. pp. 9 and 33). On his p. 48, Levine reminds us of the Daiaukku of the Annals, but according to him the identity of the two is precarious. Cf., however, below, pp. 108 f.

187 The Ashur Letter, ll. 91-95.

188 Lie 1929, p. 25 ll. 136 f.: “Uišdiš, province of the land of the Mannaeans, I took from him [Rusa], and to Ullusunu the Mannaeian I gave it back”.

189 The Ashur Letter, l. 155.

190 Or whatever might be left of them: according to the Ashur Letter, ll. 163-165, Sargon had the walls surrounding the fortified cities dismantled after the re-conquest of Uishdish. Perhaps we are dealing with a *topos*, cf. below.

191 ARAB II:56: “22 fortresses, together with 2 of his strong cities, which I had taken from the hands of Ursâ and Mitatti, I gave (back) to him [Ullusunu], and repaired the damage his land (had suffered)”. The Display Inscription, with its usual lack of feeling for chronology (cf. Salvini 1984, p. 36) places the account of the return delivery of the 22 fortresses to Ullusunu among events which, according to the Annals, took place in the years 716, 715 and 714 respectively:

The Display Inscription, ARAB II:56:

“I flayed Bagdatti, of the land of Uishdish”, cf. the Annals 716 (Lie 1929, p. 15, l. 83).

“Daiaukku, together with his family, I deported, etc.,” cf. the Annals 715 (Lie 1929, p. 19, l. 103).

“Ullusunu, the Mannean, heard, in his precipitous mountain, of the deeds I was performing came flying, like a bird, and seized my feet, etc.,” cf. the Annals 716 (Lie 1929, p. 15, ll. 87-89). →

the Mannaeans and the Assyrians on the other had to do with the fortresses in Uishdish. Prior to the clash on Mt. Uaush in 714 Rusa, as we have seen, succeeded in conquering these fortresses or, as the Ashur Letter calls them, the innumerable fortified cities; having defeated Rusa, Sargon had to re-conquer them.¹⁹² Everything seems to indicate that Uishdish and the district where the 12 or 22 fortresses were to be found narrows down to one and the same territory, and all the fortresses, not just some of them, were in Uishdish.

We may conclude, then, that in the years from the rule of Azâ, Uishdish with her numerous fortified cities has been not much more than a plaything between Urartu and Man. During the uprising against Azâ the area is under Bagdatti, the governor, who is in league with Rusa. In 716 Sargon puts an end to the uprising and takes harsh measures against Uishdish and Bagdatti.¹⁹³ In the following year, by agreement with

"22 fortresses, together with 2 of his strong cities, etc."

"I made an image of my royal self, the might of Assur, my lord, I inscribed thereon, in Izirtu, his royal city, I set it up for all time", cf. the Annals 715 (Lie 1929, p. 19, ll. 108-109). "I received the tribute of Ianzu, king of Nairî, in his royal city, Hubushkia, – horses, cattle and sheep", cf. the Annals 714 (Lie 1929, p. 27, l. 148; in particular, compare the agreement with Luckenbill's translation in ARAB II:21.

"Assur-li'u of Karalla (and) Itî, of Allabria, etc."; cf. the Annals 716 (Lie 1929, p. 15, ll. 84-85 and 89-90).

The situation which agrees most favourably with Sargon's having "repaired the damage his [Ullusunu's] land (had suffered)" is definitely the situation after Mt. Uaush in 714 when Uishdish was restored to Ullusunu. After the re-conquest from Rusa and Daiaukku in 715, the fortresses were indeed *not* handed back to Ullusunu directly as it sometimes seems to have been assumed (see Boehmer 1964, p. 15 note 28; Azarpay 1968, p. 97 note 104; cf. Barnett 1982, p. 353). On the contrary, they were "annexed to the territory of the land of Aššur" (Lie 1929, p. 19, l. 103), and the fortresses were equipped with garrisons consisting of Assyrian as well as Mannaean soldiers (Prism Inscription from Ashur, above, pp. 49 f.).

192 The Ashur Letter, ll. 163-165, cf. ll. 92-95. – The Ashur Letter mentions "cities with strong walls":

(l. 164) "Seine vielen Städte, die zahllos wie die Sterne des Himmels sind, nahm, ich alle zusammen ein".

(l. 165) "Ihre überaus starken Mauern zerkleinerte ich bis zur Aufschüttung ihrer Fundamente wie Scherben und machte sie dem Erdboden gleich".

The Annals, on the other hand, for the year 715 employ the term "fortresses" (Lie 1929, p. 18, l. 103). Uesi, too, is referred to as "city" as well as "fortress" surrounded by strong walls (Ashur Letter, ll. 299-302).

193 The rôle played by Ullusunu in connexion with the fortresses and with Uishdish in or before the year 716 is not entirely clear. It appears from the Annals (Lie 1929, p. 15, ll. 83-89) that shortly after his accession to the throne he was an ally of Rusa's, but that soon

Daiaukku, the governor – so it seems – Rusa has taken over the 12 or 22 fortresses in the Uishdish area; but Sargon re-conquers them and, tired of rebellious Mannaeen governors, he places them under Assyrian supervision and appoints a garrison consisting of Assyrian and Mannaeen troops there. In the late summer of 714, shortly before the 11th *Ulūlu*, Rusa returns, conquers the fortified cities and the entire district. Sargon accepts the challenge, defeats Rusa on Mt. Uaush, once again re-conquers the fortified cities, demolishes their walls and leaves the remains, as well as Uishdish, to Ullusunu. It is perhaps a matter of debate whether, as he maintains, Sargon did in fact have the fortifications demolished or whether we are faced just with a *topos*.¹⁹⁴

Once it has been established that the 12 or 22 fortresses were in Uishdish, as well as the circumstance that in 715 garrisons manned by Assyrian and Mannaeen soldiers were stationed there, it must be accepted that round the 11th *Ulūlu*, 714, Rusa fought Assyrian forces *twice* in Uishdish.

afterwards he had to submit to Sargon. It cannot be ascertained with any degree of certainty whether as claimed by the Display Inscription, at the beginning of his reign, Ullusunu may have surrendered the 22 fortresses to Rusa (ARAB II:56); but reference may be made to, i. a., Olmstead 1908, p. 106; Adontz 1946, p. 98; Riemschneider 1965, p. 85; Wäfler 1976, p. 20; Barnett 1982, p. 353.

194 According to the Ashur Letter, the account of the demolition of the walls surrounding the fortified cities in Uishdish reads as follows:

“Ihre überaus starken Mauern zerkleinerte ich bis zur Aufschüttung ihrer Fundamente wie Scherben und machte sie dem Erdboden gleich” (l. 165).

Cf. the account, *ibid.*, l. 217, concerning Sargon’s conduct in Ulū: “Seine feste Mauer, die aus massiven Felsgestein gebaut war, zerkleinerte ich mit eisernen Hacken [und] eisernen [Schwert]ern (?) wie Scherben und machte sie (so) dem Erdboden gleich”.

The expression *machte sie dem Erdboden gleich* is met with throughout the Ashur Letter whenever we are told of the devastations inflicted by the Assyrian army in Urartu, cf. ll. 180, 185, 195, 232, 273 and 279. Naturally the use of *topoi* does not preclude that we are dealing with realities, particularly since the destruction of enemy fortifications was an obvious procedure. But the problem with regard to Uishdish is the circumstance that, unlike the case of Urartu, we are not dealing with a hostile territory but with a Mannaeen district which had been placed under Assyrian sovereignty so that it would seem to have been in the interest of the Assyrians to preserve its fortifications intact. In the situation as it was in the late summer of 714, while the issue of the entire campaign was still not certain, it might seem expedient to demolish the brickwork around the cities of Uishdish in order to make sure that Rusa would not be able, again, to establish a foothold there. Previous events had shown how difficult it was to maintain this exposed line of defence against Urartian attacks even when Assyrian troops were posted in the fortresses. However, we cannot be sure that the account of the walls demolished in Uishdish is reliable or true.

The first time when, immediately before the Uaush encounter, he occupied Uishdish and conquered the fortified cities or the 12 or 22 fortresses; consequently, on that occasion he must have been face to face with Assyrian and Mannaeian forces. The second time when he met Sargon's cavalry on Mt. Uaush. In a paragraph to follow we shall discuss the close connexion between the battles in Gamir and on Mt. Uaush, when we shall also look more closely at the fortresses in Uishdish and their Assyrian garrisons. For the time being, we shall leave the question and rather consider what happened following Rusa's defeat on Mt. Uaush.

According to the Ashur Letter Rusa was confined inside his camp on Mt. Uaush, but he succeeded in breaking out and flee on a mare in full view of his army.¹⁹⁵ Officers, advisers, governors, members of the royal family and others were taken prisoner,¹⁹⁶ and many Urartians were killed.¹⁹⁷ The enemy was followed in hot pursuit by the Assyrians from Mt. Uaush as far as Mt. Zimur, but Sargon let the remainder of the fleeing army run, only to be destroyed as the result of a violent storm accompanied by a cloudburst and hail.¹⁹⁸ Here, the Ashur Letter refers to two different parts of the fleeing army: (1.) that unit which is being pursued as far as Mt. Zimur, and (2.) the remainder of those trying to escape, those whom Sargon let off. It seems likely that the first group refers to Rusa himself, which incidentally tallies with Sargon's Annals,¹⁹⁹ whereas "der Rest der Leute" would refer to the remaining army, abandoned and deserted by Rusa. We can, at least, demonstrate that according to the Ashur Letter Rusa and the main part of the army fled from the battle along their own separate ways: first, the king in the face of his army, and then what remained of the beaten army.

At some point, Rusa arrived at his royal residence, Turushpa, which he then left to seek refuge in the mountains where he ended his life.²⁰⁰ However, it appears from the sequel of the letter that, before his death, Rusa managed to make Urzana betray Sargon and to instigate coronation and sacrifices in Muşāşir, i. e., before the 24/10 when Sargon is informed of what is going on there and therefore decides to divert his march and approach Muşāşir.²⁰¹ From the Rusa stela we know that, at first, Urzana resisted Rusa, closed the temple to him and fled towards Assyria but was defeated by Rusa at Andaruta and taken into custody. We also know that Rusa's sojourn in Muşāşir in connexion with the coronation lasted a fortnight.²⁰² The letters throw further light on the situation as it was between the defeat on Mt. Uaush and the coronation in Muşāşir. They inform us – while, for the moment, we disregard the Gamir battle

and the rebellion – of a Mannaean incursion into the cities at Urmia, of Rusa's visit in Turushpa,²⁰³ in Uesi, of the meeting with Urzana and the latter's homage,²⁰⁴ and of Urartian governors and their troops as they marched towards Mušāšir and arrived there in order to offer sacrifices in the temple.²⁰⁵ Not until he is informed of Sargon's assault on Mušāšir does Rusa take his life, or perishes in some other way.²⁰⁶

The question is: did Rusa's stay in Turushpa take place before or after the skirmishes with Urzana in Mušāšir and at Andaruta? In a report from Aššur-rēšūja (ABL 381), mention is made of a certain governor of Mušāšir, one Abaluqunu who makes his way to the Man border owing to the Mannaean invasion of the Urartian cities at Urmia. At this point the king is in Turushpa where he offers sacrifices, and all the governors are present.²⁰⁷ There can be no doubt that Abaluqunu is an Urartian, and

195 The Ashur Letter, ll. 139-140. – Cf. l. 140: “Um sein Leben zu retten, verliess er seinen Wagen und bestieg eine Stute und floh angesichts seines Heeres”, compared with the account of the flight of Sarduri II when he had sustained a defeat in an encounter with Tiglath-Pileser III; there, the source employs a similar *topos* (Rigg 1942, p. 134; Oppenheim 1960, p. 139 note 15; Rost 1893, pp. 52 f. l. 34; ARAB I:813).

196 The Ashur Letter, ll. 137 f.

197 The Ashur Letter, ll. 134-136 and 144.

198 The Ashur Letter, ll. 145-147: “Sechs Doppelstunden weit von *Uauš* bis zum *Zimur*, dem Jaspisberge, verfolgte ich *ihn* mit der Pfeilspitze (l. 145).

Der Rest der Leute (aber), die um ihr Leben zu retten, geflohen waren, (die) ich laufen liess, um die triumphale Macht *Aššurs*, meines Herrn, zu preisen (l. 146):

^d*Addu*, der überlegen starke, der kriegerische Sohn des ^d*Anu*, belegte sie mit seinem lauten Geschrei, mit überschwemmenden Wolkenbrüchen und Hagel vernichtete er den Rest (l. 147)”. For the hailstorm of l. 147, cf. a parallel in Josh. 10:11 (Albright 1917, p. 230).

199 Lie 1929, p. 25, ll. 134-136: “To save his life he mounted a mare, and he went up his mountains. For the distance of 5 (double) hours, from Mount *Uauš* to Mount *Zimur*, I pursued him”.

200 The Ashur Letter, ll. 148-151.

201 The Ashur Letter, ll. 339 ff.; cf. ll. 309 ff. and above, p. 24.

202 Cf. above, p. 32.

203 ABL 381 = Deller 6.2.

204 ABL 197 and above, p. 39.

205 Cf. ABL 409 above p. 36 and ABL 380 = Deller 3.4, chart below with note 214.

206 Cf. above, pp. 35 f.

207 ABL 381 = Deller 6.2: “Der Mannäer hat in den Städten des Urartäers, in dem Landstrich längs des Meeres (= Urmia-See) Stellung bezogen [in this connexion cf., however, Salvini's opinion, quoted below]. Er hat hochgehoben, ist hinaufgestiegen (unklar). Abaluqunu, der ‘Statthalter’ von Mušāšir (und) Ṭunnaun, der ‘Statthalter’ von Kār-siparri sind an die Grenze des Mannäerlandes zum Zweck der Bewachung gegangen. Der Urartäer

therefore Urartian governor in Muṣāšir. He is a brother of the Urartian vice-*turtānu* Ursinu (ABL 144),²⁰⁸ and is mentioned in a third letter together with the crown-prince in Urartu, Melartua, Rusa's son (CT 53, 7).²⁰⁹ In the latter report Abaluqunu, however, is mentioned as governor of a different province the name of which is not preserved in its entirety, but which at any rate cannot be Muṣāšir.²¹⁰ When Abaluqunu was transferred from his former province to Muṣāšir, it must have happened after the Andaruta battle, and his term of office in Muṣāšir can only have lasted the few weeks from Andaruta in the late summer of 714 until Sargon's onslaught on Muṣāšir in the autumn of the same year. Prior to this period Urzana was a vassal of Assyria, and a Urartian governor had no business in Muṣāšir. Following Urzana's defeat and capture the Urartians were forced to take hand of the situation, and that, presumably, is exactly what was Abaluqunu's task. Hence, the letter ABL 381 may be dated to the period after Andaruta, and inasmuch as at the time when the letter was written, and when the governor of Muṣāšir takes off in the direction of the Mannaeian border, Rusa is in Turushpa, the capture of Urzana and Muṣāšir's subjugation must have taken place prior to Rusa's stay in his capital.²¹¹ The conclusion presents itself that shortly, it not immediately after Mt. Uaush Rusa went to Muṣāšir in order to bring offerings to the god Haldia as recorded in the Rusa stela,²¹² and that he

(-König) befindet sich in Turušpa (Tušpa) (und) bringt seine Opfer dar. Alle 'Statthalter' haben sich vor ihm (dort eingefunden)". – Cf. Salvini's rejection of the prevalent concept that ABL 381 supposedly reports a *rebellion* among Mannaeians in Urartian cities at Lake Urmia as well as his showing that, on the contrary, we are dealing with a Mannaeian *incursion* into the cities: "Va però sottolineato che non vi si parla già di una 'rivolta dei Mannei nelle città urartee sulla costa del mare', bensì di una incursione di Mannei in quelle città" (Salvini 1984, p. 21, cf. pp. 43 and 45; Oppenheim 1941, p. 268 note 99).

208 ABL 144 = Deller 6.1; see Salvini 1984, p. 45.

209 CT 53, 7 = Deller 2.4; see Salvini 1984, p. 45; Lanfranchi 1983, p. 130.

210 Cf. the remains of the name of the province: [...] *x-pa*, see Salvini 1984, p. 45 with note 201.

211 Besides, from ABL 144 (= Deller 6.1) we know that Abaluqunu (Abliuqnu) went to Turushpa where his brother, the vice-*turtānu*, had been imprisoned in connexion with a conspiracy against Rusa. The two brothers were interrogated by the king and they managed to convince him that they had nothing to do with the matter. As it will appear from the following paragraph which will deal with the events after Rusa's defeat in Gamir, this letter belongs in the late summer of 714. Consequently, Abaluqunu may have been appointed to his new post in Muṣāšir during his stay in Turushpa and his being together with the king, but it may also have happened a short time previously, immediately after Andaruta.

212 The Rusa stela (Assyrian version), ll. 2 ff. (Salvini 1984, p. 85).

did not proceed to Turushpa till after the clash with Urzana, and the latter's defeat, had taken place. We should also take cognizance of Aššur-rēšūja's report, in ABL 381, concerning the Mannaeian attack against Urartian cities at Urmia. There cannot be much doubt that Mannaeians have participated in the Assyrian invasion of Urartu.²¹³

The sequence of events from the time when Sargon attacked Zikirtu in the summer of 714 until the death of Rusa in that same year (after the 24/10) may then be illustrated in a diagram as that which follows. For the time being, we disregard the war in Gamir and the uprising which followed. Not only on the basis of their factual information has it been possible to place the letters used with reasonable precision within this brief span of time, and in a relevant context. But it turns out that six out of the eight reports which we have drawn upon owe their existence to one informant, and one only, i. e., Aššur-rēšūja (ABL 198, 144, 381, 380, 197), or are contained in a letter where we also find a report from Aššur-rēšūja (ABL 197, on Urzana's homage). The two last reports stem from, respectively, Urzana himself (ABL 409) and from Bēl-iddin (ABL 515). This is a further guarantee that we are not dealing with a haphazard choice from the evidence offered by the letters; quite apart from the obvious connexion between these reports and the events which they recount, there is an inner connexion represented by our informants, viz., Aššur-rēšūja and Urzana.

213 Cf. the Ashur Letter, l. 259, which mentions people from Man in a different context.

TABLE 1

A: The Ashur Letter. Ann.: Sargon's Annals (ed. A. G. Lie). D: Display Inscription. P: Prism Fragment of Sargon's, from Ashur. R: Rusa Stelae.

	2. Urart. army and governors	3. Assyrians	1.	2.	3.
1. Rusa					
In Uesi: is informed of Assyrian attack on Zikirtu	In Uesi	Ravage Aukani in Zikirtu	ABL 515	ABL 515	A 1. 87-90
From Uesi to Zikirtu	From Uesi to Zikirtu	"	ABL 515	ABL 515	A 1. 87-90
In Zikirtu	In Zikirtu	"	ABL 515	ABL 515	A 1. 87-90
Returns from Zikirtu to Uesi	Return from Zikirtu to Uesi	"	ABL 198	ABL 198	A 1. 87-90
To Mannaeen border with a limited force before 11th <i>Uilūlu</i>	Main force remains in Uesi	"	ABL 198	ABL 198	A 1. 87-90
	Rumours have it that the governor of Uesi has left after the king's departure, before 11th <i>Uilūlu</i>			ABL 198	
Conquers Uishdish and its many fortified cities (= 12/22) from Ass.-Mannaeen troops		a) ", i.e. ravage Ishtaiippa and other cities in Aukani; b) Ass.-Mannaeen soldiers in Uishdish fortresses defeated by Rusa	A 1. 91-95, 163-165; Ann. 715-14; P 715; see above		a) A. 1. 87-90 b) see above
In Uishdish		From Aukani to Uishdish	A 1. 91-103		A 1. 91

		Sources		
		1.	2.	3.
1. Rusa				
On Mt. Uaush	2. Uart. army and governors On Mt. Uaush	3. Assyrians Main force not participating in battle; only Sargon with his personal cavalry; Šin-aḫ-ušur's regiment(?)	A 1. 96-103 ff.	A 1. 103 ff. A. 132-33, cf. I. 127-30
Surrounded in his camp but escapes in full view of his army; pursued by Assyrians as far as Mt. Zimur	Killed, captured, or flec. Sargon allows the fleeing army run with the exception of those who are pursued to Mt. Zimur. The former are lost owing to foul weather	Pursue the enemy (Rusa) from Mt. Uaush to Mt. Zimur	A 1. 139-40, 145; Ann. I. 134-36	A 1. 145; Ann. 134-36
To Mušāšir in order to offer sacrifices		Conquer Uishdish and fortified cities; walls demolished	R	A 1. 163-65
Urzana bars temple doors to Rusa		Invade and ravage southern Urtartu	R	A 1. 167 ff.
Urzana flees towards Assyria			R	
Rusa enters temple			R	
Pursues Urzana	Pursue Urzana		R	R
Defeats Urzana at Andaruta	Defeat Urzana at Andaruta		R	R
Takes Urzana prisoner			R	
Subjugates Urzana	[Abaluqunu appointed Urtart. gov. in Mušāšir]		R	cf. ABL 381

TABLE 1, continued

	2. Urtart. army and governors	3. Assyrians	Sources		
1. Rusa			1.	2.	3.
In Turushpa, offering sacrifices	Abaluqunu, governor of Mušāšir, and Tunnaun, governor of Kār-siparri, approaches the Man border. All governors present with the king at Turushpa	Mannaeans invasion of Urtartian cities at Urmia	A 1. 148-50; ABL 381	ABL 381	ABL 381, cf. A 1. 259, above note 213
Wishes to go to Uesi; not yet struck camp	Troops under Setini (gov. in front of Aššur-rēšūja) ²¹⁴ and Sunā (gov. in front of Ukkaeans) on their way towards Mušāšir		ABL 380 ²¹⁴	ABL 380 ²¹⁴	
Leaves Turushpa			A 1. 148-50		cf. A 1. 149
In Uesi			ABL 197		
Receives Urzana, the latter's brother and son in an audience, i.e., accepts their homage, no doubt in Uesi ²¹⁵		The Assyrians are concerned at the interplay between Rusa and Urzana. – The <i>nāgir ekalli</i> asks Urzana, Are Rusa and his troops on their way to Mušāšir? Where is he? He emphasises that no cult can be undertaken without permission given by the king of Assyria	ABL 197		ABL 409

		Sources			
1. Rusa	2. Urtart. army and governors	3. Assyrians	1.	2.	3.
In Uesi; anticipating later arrival in Mušāšir	The governor of Uesi and the gov. of the border against the Ukkaeans have arrived in Mušāšir and perform celebrations. The king and the other governors will arrive later and do the same	→	ABL 409	ABL 409	
To Mušāšir. Has Urzana (re-)in-stated or crowned as king in Mušāšir. Remains in M. for a fortnight where he offers sacrifices and each day arranges for a banquet for the inhabitants	In Mušāšir	To Khubushkia. Sargon learns about Urzana's defection. Breaks off his homeward journey and marches against Mušāšir, appr. 24/10	R A 1. 339 ff.	A 1. 339 ff.	A 1. 307 ff.
		Enters Mušāšir. Deports Urzana's family and the city's population. Abducts the treasures of the palace and the temple			A 1. 346 ff.
Dies ²¹⁶		Return to Assyria	A 1. 411-13, cf. 1. 150-51; Ann. 1. 162-63; D=ARAB II, 59		A 1. 425

214 ABL 380 = Deller 3.4: “An meinen Herrn König. Dein Knecht Aššur-rēšūja. ... 3000 Fusstruppen, die Offiziere, der *rab kallapāni* des ‘Statthalters’ Setini, (dessen Provinz mir gegenüberliegt), sind nach Mušāšir aufgebrochen. Den Fluss haben sie bei Nacht überschritten. Sein Tross und das Hauptquartier des Setini befindet sich vor ihm. Die Streitkräfte des ‘Statthalters’ Sunâ, (dessen Provinz gegenüber dem Ukkäer liegt), sind ebenfalls nach Mušāšir aufgebrochen. Ich habe gehört: der (Urartäer)-König will nach Uesi ziehen. Er ist jedoch noch nicht aufgebrochen”. – The two governors whose troops are on their way towards Mušāšir: Setini, “dessen Provinz mir (Aššur-rēšūja) gegenüberliegt”, and Sunâ, “dessen Provinz gegenüber dem Ukkäer liegt”, are identical with the two Urartian governors who – according to Urzana’s letter to the *nāgir ekalli* (ABL 409) – have arrived in Mušāšir, i. e., the governor of Uesi and the governor at the Ukkæan frontier. The connexion between the two letters is made even more plain by the king’s position: ABL 380 informs us that he *will be going* to Uesi; ABL 409 that he will be coming to Mušāšir, but that at present he *is staying* in Uesi. Thus, Setini has been governor in Uesi, and consequently the “governor in front of me” in the letters of Aššur-rēšūja here and elsewhere (ABL 198, cf. above, note 169) refers to the very governor of Uesi (Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 128 f.; cf. Adontz 1946, p. 115).

For the connexion, which exists between ABL 380 and the situation immediately before Urzana’s coronation, see also König 1957, p. 150.

Aššur-rēšūja uses the term “in front of me” in yet another letter (ABL 444 = Deller 2.2), and here, according to Deller’s translation, he is referring to Kakkadanu (cf. also Salvini 1984, p. 42): Five Urartian governors have entered Uesi, among them “Kaqqadānu, der gegenüber von [mir/uns liegt]”. This letter also mentions one *Setinu* who, according to Salvini, is identical with *Setini* of ABL 380 (Salvini 1984, p. 42), but here *Setini/Setinu* is not governor of Uesi but of a province the name of which is only partly preserved: []-[*te-x*]. Undoubtedly ABL 444 reflects a situation entirely different from that of ABL 380 (cf. also Salvini 1984, *ibid.*). The letter probably belongs in the same context as that described in ABL 492 = Deller 2.3 which is from the spring (cf. the date 1st *Nisānu* in this letter; cf. Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 132 f. and 136). In other words, *Setini/-nu* has changed provinces since the spring in question and has been appointed governor in Uesi. But is it Kakkadanu whom he has replaced? According to two of the reports on the defeat in Gamir (ABL 1079 = Deller 1.4 and ABL 646 = Deller 1.3), the Uesi governor was killed in that battle. Inasmuch as the Gamir encounter, as mentioned above, took place shortly before Urzana’s homage in the late summer of 714 (cf. ABL 197 and above, p. 40), and therefore also shortly before the arrival of *Setini* and *Sunâ* in Mušāšir, and inasmuch as Kakkadanu and *Setini* are both alive immediately after Gamir (ABL 197 and 308), there is something which doesn’t fit. On the assumption that ABL 444 is from the spring of 714 (and not from a previous year), no less than three Uesi-governors would have had to replace each other within about six months: a) Kakkadanu, b) the governor killed, and c) *Setini*. This does not seem likely. A possible explanation could be that Aššur-rēšūja was not at all, as is commonly assumed, the author of ABL 444, the introduction of which has been lost, but that the letter was dispatched by an entirely different sender (cf. Salvini 1984, p. 41; Parpola 1981, Chart 3 s. v. Aššur-rēšūja)? In that case it would turn out that Kakkadanu had been governor in front of a different sender, and therefore not a governor of Uesi. Waterman, it may be added, was of the opinion that Kakkadanu was governor in front of the Ukkæans (cf. his translation of ABL 444): “Kakkadanu who is over against the Ukkai”. Deller’s translation, following Salvini’s collation of the part of the letter dealing with Kakkadanu,

The festivities in Mušāšir and Rusa's sojourn there must have come to an end around the 24/10 when Sargon received information about the events which were taking place in connexion with Urzana, and therefore decided to march against him.²¹⁷ Sargon had started his campaign in the month of *Du'uzu* (June/July). Before he met with Rusa on Mt. Uaush, he had been far afield and instigated multifarious enterprises; therefore, the meeting between the two kings must have occurred latish in the summer. As far as we can judge, Aššur-rēšūja's report (ABL 198) must pertain to the time when Rusa attacked Uishdish.²¹⁸ Sennacherib received this report on the 11th *Ulūlu*, and consequently Rusa's arrival in Uishdish and the subsequent clash on Mt. Uaush may be set at this date. Within a span of time from ab. the 11th *Ulūlu* until ab. the 24/10 the main part of the events which we have just enumerated took place, including Rusa's fortnight in Mušāšir; but not only that: in the same period the battle in

runs as follows: "Kaqqadānu, der gegenüber von [mir/uns liegt], der Ukäer, Sakuatā von Qanium, etc". The expression *der Ukäer/KUR Ú-ka-a+a* seems somewhat out of place in the sentence in the midst of an enumeration of five Urartian governors (for Tuki, governor of Armiraliu, cf. Lanfranchi 1983, p. 133 note 38). The elements of uncertainty inherent in ABL 444 with regard to this as well as the question of the sender of the letter could speak in favour of abandoning the idea that, according to this letter, Kakkadanu could have been governor in front of Aššur-rēšūja and thus governor of Uesi in the spring of 714 (?). (If Waterman was right in thinking that Kakkadanu was governor over against the Ukkaeans, then at some later time he must have been replaced by Sunā, cf. ABL 380, quoted above. This could well have occurred in connexion with the uprising against Rusa following the defeat in Gamir, an uprising in which Kakkadanu seems to have been involved, cf. Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 131 f.; cf. further, below, pp. 76 ff.) In other words, we are forced to adhere to Lanfranchi's identification of Setini in ABL 380 with the Uesi-governor of ABL 409. This, in its turn, means that in the late summer of 714 Setini is no longer governor of the province ([]-[te-x]) in connexion with which he is mentioned in ABL 444, in the spring, but has replaced the Uesi governor who had been killed in the battle in Gamir. In that case the Uesi-governor (in front of Aššur-rēšūja), who, according to ABL 198, is staying in Uesi, but who is said to have left the fortress after the king's departure to the Mannaeon border (cf. above, p. 46), must then have been Setini's predecessor.

215 The meeting with Urzana, no doubt, took place in Uesi (cf. above, p. 40). Also, it would seem reasonable to assume that Urzana met with Rusa here in nearby Uesi rather than having travelled, with his brother and son, to the more distant Turushpa.

216 For the expression used in the Ashur Letter, l. 150: "nahm er Zuflucht in einem Winkel seines Gebirges" (Mayer's translation) or "he trod the slope of his mountain" (Luckenbill's translation, ARAB II:155) and its meaning – "he died" – see Langdon 1914, p. 29; Thureau-Dangin 1912, p. 26 note 1.

217 Cf. above, p. 24.

218 Cf. above, p. 46.

Gamir, the uprising in Urartu as well as its having been suppressed must have taken place. We shall now have a closer look at Rusa's movements after the battle in Gamir. The events which followed that battle cannot be compared with the diagram which was set forth on the preceding pages, and cannot be made to fit into it until a clearer picture of Rusa's flight after Gamir, and what followed, has been obtained.

3. From Gamir to Urzana's Homage

Rusa accepted Urzana's homage at a time when the latter had been released after his capture at Andaruta in 714, but before the coronation in Mušāšir that same year. As shown above, it cannot be assumed that the meeting could have taken place at any other time: before Andaruta, Urzana was an Assyrian vassal and, as evidenced by the Rusa stela, loyal to Sargon, his overlord. After the coronation Sargon arrived in Mušāšir, and Rusa as well as Urzana disappeared from the scene.²¹⁹ The message recounting Urzana's meeting with Rusa is found in a letter from Sennacherib to his father (ABL 197); this letter also contains information about the king's defeat in Gamir. This indicates that the two events are contemporary, so that the Gamir episode belongs in the summer or late summer of 714.²²⁰

Beside the information about Gamir and Urzana's visit with Rusa, ABL 197 also informs us of the suppression of a revolt and, in that connexion, of the imprisonment of the Urartian *turtānu*, Kakkadanu, and of two governors.²²¹ So all these events are more or less contemporary. Our information comes from four different sources, and that explains why this information could very well relate to a certain, even if shorter period in the late summer of 714.

Once again, let us have a closer look at the reports which Sennacherib brought together in ABL 197.²²²

1. The Ukkæan states:

an account of the defeat of the Urartian king in Gamir;
that 11 governors and their units have escaped after the battle;
and that the Urartian *turtānu* and two governors have been imprisoned.

2. Aššur-rēšūja:

concerning the veracity of a former report on a frightful bloodshed in Urartu;

peace in the country after the bloodshed;
 the return of the nobles to their provinces;
 the imprisonment of Kakkadanu, the *turtānu*;
 the king's stay in Uazaun/Uesi.

3. Nabû-le'i:

concerning reports from frontier fortifications on the defeat of
 the king of Urartu and his forces in Gamir;
 on the king having escaped and his return to Urartu;
 and on his baggage train which hasn't arrived yet.

219 Cf. above, p. 40.

220 Cf. above, p. 40.

221 Cf. above, pp. 40 ff. – Kakkadanu was not captured in the course of the battle in Gamir as it has been assumed here and there (see, still, Salvini 1984, p. 39 note 160 and pp. 41 f.); he was imprisoned by the Urartian king.

222 ABL 197 = Deller 1.2.:

“An meinen Herrn König. Dein Knecht Sin-aḥḥē-erība. Meinem Herrn König möge es wohl ergehen! Assyrien, die Tempel (und) alle Festungen des Königs befinden sich in gutem Zustand. Mein Herr König möge ganz zufrieden sein.

Der Ukkäer hat mir folgende Nachricht geschickt: ‘Die Streitkräfte des Urartäerkönigs sind in Gamir(ra), wohin er gezogen war, gänzlich geschlagen worden. Elf seiner ‘Statthalter’ [mit] ihren Streitkräften konnten sich absetzen (wörtlich: sind emporgeführt) sein [‘Feldmar]schall’ (und) zwei seiner ‘Statthalter’ [sind jedoch in Gefangenschaft geraten] ... (Z.14-18 teilweise zerstört). Dies ist die Information des Ukkäers.

Aššur-rēšūja hat mir folgendes geschrieben: ‘Die frühere Information über die Urartäer, welche ich geschickt habe, hat sich vollinhaltlich bestätigt (wörtlich: ‘ist sie selbst’): Unter ihnen ist ein furchtbares Blutbad angerichtet worden. Jetzt aber ist das Land ruhig. Jeder von seinen ‘Grossen’ ist nach seiner Provinz gegangen; Qaqqadānu, sein ‘Feldmarschall’, hingegen ist in Gefangenschaft geraten. Der Urartäerkönig befindet sich in Uazaun’. Dies ist die Information des Aššurrēšūja.

Nabû-le'i, der ‘Statthalter’ von Birtu, hat mir folgendes geschrieben: ‘Betreffs Informationen über den Urartäerkönig habe ich an die Wache(n) der Festungen, die sich an der Grenze befinden, geschrieben (und konnte von ihnen folgendes erfahren): Seine Streitkräfte sind in Gamir(ra), wohin er gezogen ist, gänzlich geschlagen worden. Drei seiner ‘Grossen’ sind mit ihren Streitkräften geschlagen. Er (selbst) ist entkommen (und) in sein Land eingetreten. Sein Tross ist noch nicht nachgekommen’. Dies ist die Information des Nabû-le'i. Der Mušaširäer (d.i. Urzana), sein Bruder (und) sein Sohn sind zur Audienz zum Urartäerkönig gereist. Ein Gesandter des Ḥubuškäers ist ebenfalls zu ihm zur Audienz gereist. Alle Wachen der Festungen, die sich an der Grenze befinden, haben mir Informationen wie diese geschickt.

Den Brief, welchen Nabû-le'i, der Majordom der Aḥāt-abiša (Tochter Sargons II.) aus Tabal überbracht hat übersende ich hiermit an meinen Herrn König”.

4. The guards at the frontier fortifications:
 - on Urzana, his brother and his son having gone to Urartu for an audience with the king;
 - on a messenger from the man of Khubushkia, who does likewise.

On the basis of the information derived from these four reports we arrive, as above, to the following sequence of events in the span of time from the Gamir battle up to Urzana's homage:²²³

1. Battle in Gamir.
2. Rusa escapes.
 - 11 governors and their forces escape.
3. Rusa returns to Urartu, but before the arrival of his baggage.
4. A bloodshed takes place amongst the Urartians.
5. The country is brought to ease.
 - The nobles return to their provinces.
 - The *turtānu*, Kakkadanu, and two governors are imprisoned.
6. The king is present in Uzaun/Uesi.
7. Urzana, his brother and his son, and also a messenger from Khubushkia, travel to Rusa for an audience.

The other Gamir letters throw additional light on the situation as it was immediately following the battle.²²⁴ ABL 1079 gives us a report from Urzana to the Assyrian court (addressed to the vice-*nāgir ekalli*, Šulmu-Bēl), telling us that the Urartian king has suffered a defeat in Gamir, and that the governor of Uesi has been killed in this battle.²²⁵ It should be noted

223 Cf. above, p. 41.

224 ABL 1079 = Deller 1.4; ABL 146 = Deller 1.1; ABL 646 = Deller 1.3. From among the other letters which mention the Gamir battle or the Cimmerians, ABL 112 = Deller 2.1 and ND 2608 = Deller 1.7 will be discussed below, pp. 70 f. and pp. 83 f. respectively. The remaining letters with reference to Cimmerians, CT 53, 99 = Deller 1.5; CT 53, 583 = Deller 1.6 and ND 1107 = Deller 2.5 = Postgate, No. 243 are too fragmentary for the information preserved in them to be utilized in the present context.

225 ABL 1079 = Deller 1.4: "Šulmu-Bēl, der Vize des *nāgir ekalli*, ist zu mir (Sennacherib)^a gekommen (mit den Worten): Urzanna hat mir (folgende Nachricht) geschickt: 'Die Streitkräfte des Urartäerkönigs sind in Gamir(ra), wohin er gezogen ist, geschlagen worden. Der 'Statthalter' von Uasi ist getötet'. Wir konnten (diese) Information noch nicht nachprüfen. Sobald wir sie nachgeprüft haben werden, werden wir dir (Sennacherib)^b schreiben, was es mit der Information auf sich hat".

a) The author of the letter is probably Sennacherib (Deller 1984, p. 100; Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128).

b) Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128 note 24.

that immediately after Gamir, Urzana is still the loyal informant to the Assyrian court. ABL 646 informs us that no less than 9 Urartian governors, among them also the governor of Uesi, were killed in action.²²⁶ With regard to Rusa, we are told, “And their king, in (this) misfortune of his, escaped alone; he took to the mountains, [he fled?]; the remnants of [his?] camp did not see their king, they [did not] know he had sa[ved his life?], [(and) retre]ated” (Rev. 1-7).²²⁷ In a broken context, the letter continues to tell us what went on in the Urartian army during the king’s absence: “(The remnants of the king’s camp) raised to the throne Melar [xx] [during] the journey (the return from Gamir), (and) Melar[xx] t[ook (??)] the [sovereign]ty.” (Rev. 7-10).²²⁸ In spite of the poor condition of the text, the letter affords a rather clear picture of the situation which pervaded Rusa’s army after the defeat: the king escaped, took to the mountains, and left his army behind, ignorant of his fate. When the army was not aware that Rusa had survived, and had fled, then, during the retreat from Gamir, they raised Rusa’s son Melarṭua to the throne in his father’s stead.²²⁹ However, Rusa had escaped to the country of Guriania which was somewhere between Gamir and Urartu. Here, he reorganised the forces which had fled together with him (ABL 146).²³⁰

226 ABL 646 = Deller 1.3: “... [Neun?] seiner ‘Statthalter’ sind geschlagen: der ‘Statthalter’, (dessen Territorium) gegenüber (der Provinz des) *rab šāqē* (liegt); der ‘Statthalter’ uns gegenüber; der ‘Statthalter’ gegenüber Ša-Aššur-dubbū; der ‘Statthalter’ gegenüber von Mušašir; der ‘Statthalter’ der Provinz Uazae; der ‘Statthalter’ der Provinz Šib[]ur; der ‘Statthalter’ gegenüber von Kār-siparri; der ‘Statthalter’ der Provinz Šattera; insgesamt neun seiner ‘Statthalter’ sind geschlagen. Ihr König hat sich ganz allein abgesetzt (wörtlich: ist nach seiner Seite hinübergegangen); er hat sich in das Gebirge zurückgezogen. Die Nachhut seines Trosses sehen ihren König nicht (und) wissen [nicht], dass er ... (Rs. 7-11 fragmentarisch)”. For rev. 7-10, cf. Lanfranchi’s translation, quoted in the following. – The author of ABL 646 cannot, as it has been assumed, be Aššur-rēšūja since the Urartian governor who, according to this letter is “in front of the writer”, is not the governor of Uesi; the governor of Uesi belongs “in front of Aššur-rēšūja”. Lanfranchi believes that the letter should be attributed to the *nāgir ekalli* (Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128 note 24; cf. above, note 214 concerning the expression “in front of me” in Aššur-rēšūja’s letters).

227 Lanfranchi’s translation 1983, p. 129. Cf. Deller’s translation of this letter in the preceding note.

228 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 130. Cf. Deller 1984, p. 100.

229 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 130; Deller 1983, p. 100. – According to the report offered by the Ukkæan in ABL 197 no less than 11 governors were supposed to have escaped from the battle, whereas 9 governors were supposed to have fallen (ABL 646).

230 ABL 146 = Deller 1.1. See Lanfranchi’s translation: “When the Urartian (king) went to Gamir, (and) when a slaughter was made of the Urartians, the troops who from there [had fled (?)] to [G]uri’a’ni[a], that one (= the Urartian king) ... -es some, takes some

Aššur-rēšūja, whom we hear in ABL 146, is also aware that at the time when the letter was written, the king was to be found in Turushpa.²³¹

With all the certainty we could hope for, ABL 646 warrants that the king and the main part of the army fled from Gamir separately; therefore, the letter throws light on the report in Nabû-le'i's account in ABL 197 to the effect that the king had returned to Urartu prior to the arrival of his camp.²³² In ABL 146, Aššur-rēšūja's information about the king staying at Turushpa shows that, from Gamir – via Guriania – he has taken off to Turushpa. This involves that Rusa's stay at Uesi, of which Aššur-rēšūja informs us (ABL 197), pertains to a date later than that which took place in the capital, to wit, that the latter report also informs us: after the bloodshed and the end of it. Already now, we perceive that the main stations were: Gamir to Guriania, from there to Turushpa, thence to Uesi.

Inasmuch as it was of vital importance to Rusa, immediately following his return to Urartu, to march direct to the capital, the reason was that a revolt, or as the letter will have it, a conspiracy had taken place, the leaders of which were now under arrest in Turushpa (ABL 144).²³³ Thanks to the analysis undertaken by Lanfranchi with regard to this revolt, we are now considerably better informed about the events which took place in the wake of the defeat in Gamir than we were a few years ago.²³⁴ Howe-

others, (and [...] puts them (obv. 8-15)", Lanfranchi 1983, p. 131. Cf. Deller's translation: (Aššur-rēšūja to the king) "Guriania ist ein Landstrich zwischen Urartu und Gamirra; er entrichtet den Urartäern Tribut. Als die Urartäer gegen Gamirra zogen, als den Urartäern eine Niederlage beigebracht wurde, die Truppen, soviel ihrer von dort ... Guriania ... dieser ... tötet den einen Teil (und) nimmt den anderen Teil gefangen, legt (sie in Fesseln?) ... Von der Kavallerie ... vor dem Feldzug ..." Deller continues: "Die nur fragmentarisch erhaltene Rs. enthält Nachrichten über die Bewegungen des Urartäerkönigs und seiner 'Statthalter'. Der Brief endet mit der Feststellung, dass er sich gegenwärtig in ʾṬurušpa (ʾṬušpa) aufhält". (Deller 1984, p. 98).

231 Cf. Deller as quoted in the preceding note.

232 Cf. ABL 197, above, note 222, and Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 129 f.

233 ABL 144 = Deller 6.1: "Betreffs des 'Hauptmanns' Naragê, wovon ich meinem Herrn König geschrieben habe: 'Die zwanzig Eunuchen seiner Entourage, die gegen den (Urartäer-)König konspiriert haben, sind arretiert'. Jetzt ist der Urartäerkönig in ʾṬurušpa (ʾṬušpa) eingetroffen (und) hat sie verhört. Die übrigen Soldaten, die sich bei ihnen befanden, hat man herbeigeht. Es sind 100 Mann, teils Eunuchen teils Bärtige. Die Soldaten sind hingerichtet. Uršinie, der Vize-Turtānu, der Bruder des Abliuqnu, ist in ʾṬurušpa (ʾṬušpa) festgenommen worden. Abliuqnu ist (darauf) nach ʾṬurušpa (ʾṬušpa) gekommen. (Der Urartäer-König) hat ihn und diesen seinen Bruder befragt. Die haben (damit) überhaupt nichts zu tun. (Der König hat seine Hand?) hochgehoben (und) man hat sie freigelassen".

234 Lanfranchi 1983; cf. Barnett 1982, p. 355; Salvini 1984, p. 45.

er, Lanfranchi does not seem to be aware that there is a connexion between the information offered by ABL 197 concerning Urzana's homage and the events which, according to the Ashur Letter and the Rusa stela, took place in the late summer or in the autumn of the year 714 (Andaruta and the coronation in Mušāšir), nor does he seem to realise that the information provided by ABL 197 about Gamir must by necessity pertain to this particular point of time. As mentioned above, he dates the Gamir battle to 715. Nor does Lanfranchi seem to be aware of Aššur-rēšūja's briefing in ABL 146 concerning Rusa's stay in Turushpa after the reorganization of his forces in Guriania. This means that he places Rusa's sojourn in Uesi to a time prior to his arrival in Turushpa, and that the sequence of events which Lanfranchi arrives at is considerably at variance with that which we are arguing in favour of here.²³⁵

In ABL 144, Aššur-rēšūja has his account of the revolt; he informs us that 20 eunuchs from the environment of a certain captain named Naragê had conspired against the king, and that they had been placed under arrest. Further, that the king had now arrived at Turushpa,²³⁶ and had interrogated them. The other soldiers, 100 men who were with them, had

235 Lanfranchi does not advance any serious reason for his dating of the events mentioned in ABL 144 to the time following them, as related in ABL 197 (cf. Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 124 f., 127 and 133); but he does emphasize the connexion between the revolt in Uesi and in Turushpa and says that Rusa "must have hurried back to Țurušpā (from Uesi) to repress the last *foci* of the revolt" (id., pp. 124 f. and 133). The notion that at first Rusa suppressed the revolt in Uesi, then in Țurushpa, does not agree with the information provided by Aššur-rēšūja in ABL 197 from which it appears that the slaughter was over and done with, and that the country was at peace at a time when Kakkadanu had been imprisoned, and when the king was staying in Uesi. But there is complete agreement between Aššur-rēšūja's report in ABL 146 to the effect that from Guriania, the king went to Turushpa, his report in ABL 144 concerning the measures taken by the king towards the rebels in Turushpa, and finally his account in ABL 197 that the stay in Uazaun/Uesi belongs to a period after the slaughter, i. e., after the repression of the revolt. – Salvini, too, tends to place the sojourn in Turushpa later than that in Uesi; but he incorrectly assumes that Aššur-rēšūja's information in ABL 197 is a report on the Gamir defeat and of Kakkadanu having been taken prisoner by the Cimmerians, and that according to this report the king went to Uesi immediately after Gamir. Consequently, the sojourn in Turushpa would have taken place after that in Uesi (Salvini 1984, p. 42 note 184; p. 39 note 160, pp. 41 f.).

236 Lanfranchi is of the opinion that CT 53, 365, most likely refers to a stage of the king's return to the capital: "He has not [y]et entered in Țu[rušpā]", and that ABL 1295 probably refers to his arrival in Turushpa: "He (the king of Urartu) brought [(his?)] governor[s?] with him to Țuruš[pā]" (Lanfranchi 1983, p. 133 note 40). – Whether these fragments refer to this particular return and to this particular stay in Turushpa, cannot of course be

been executed. Ursinu, the vice-*turtānu*, a brother of Abliuqnu (= Abaluqunu),²³⁷ had been arrested in Turushpa, but had been released after the king had questioned him and the brother who had arrived in Turushpa.

Lanfranchi is undoubtedly right in asserting that there is a direct connexion between the revolt in Turushpa and that in Uesi which resulted in the imprisonment of Kakkadanu, the *turtānu* (ABL 197).²³⁸ In any case, dramatic events took place in Uesi, Melarṭua having been killed by his nobles (*rabūte*) outside the fortress (CT 53, 462), a question to which we shall revert. But it is a matter of debate whether the revolt arose in Turushpa itself, or whether it was merely that some of its instigators were imprisoned there. In our opinion it seems more likely that the revolt may be assumed to have arisen in the army during the retreat march from Gamir.²³⁹

Before leaving Turushpa, following Rusa's further advance towards Uesi, we shall have a closer look at a letter from one Urad-Sin to the *nāgīr ekalli*, ABL 112.²⁴⁰ Here we are told that "this Cimmerian" has departed and penetrated into Urartu from Man. At this point it seems that certain persons – whose names, apart from *Sarduri*,²⁴¹ are not intelligible – were present in Turushpa. At the same time, a messenger from the governor of Uesi has arrived to Urzana with a request for military assistance. Urad-

determined with any degree of certainty. See, however, below, p. 72. – It should be mentioned that Aššur-rēšūja, in ABL 146, mentions Urartian governors (Deller 1984, p. 98; cf. Waterman's translation in RCAE I, p. 101). Owing to the fragmentary condition of the text it is not possible to determine to which situation the reference to these governors pertains. It would not seem that it would have any direct connexion with the king's stay in Turushpa.

237 Cf. above, pp. 55 f.

238 Apart from Lanfranchi 1983, see also Barnett 1982, pp. 355; Piotrovskij 1966, pp. 142 f. – ABL 492 and 444 (= Deller 2.3 and 2.2), which Piotrovskij connects with the revolt have nothing to do with it as already shown by Lanfranchi. The two letters belong to the spring, long before the revolt which broke out after the Gamir defeat (between the 11th *Ulūlu* and before the 1st *Tašrītu*), Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 132 f., 134; cf. pp. 127 and 136.

239 Cf. below, pp. 76 ff., Excursus.

240 ABL 112 = Deller 2.1: "Dieser Kimmerier ist abgezogen. Aus dem Mannäer-Land ist er nach Urarṭu eingedrungen. PN₁, PN₂, Sarduri [befinden sich?] in Turušpa (Ṭušpa). PN₃, der Bote des 'Statthalters' von Uesi, ist zu Urzana gekommen ... (und sagte zu ihm): 'Deine Streitkräfte mögen kommen. Vor den Buliäern und SURianäern [cf. below, note 242] ist ganz Urarṭu in gewaltige Furcht geraten. Sie sammeln (ihre) Streitkräfte (weil sie denken): Vielleicht werden wir gegen ihn Stellung beziehen können, nachdem starker Frost eingesetzt haben wird'".

241 *Sarduri* of ABL 112, obv. 11: "[]fĒ id di¹ 1d15-BĀD" has scarcely anything to do with Kakkadanu, "the right *turtānu* of the family [of Sar]duri" of CT 53, 462 (cf. below, with reference to Lanfranchi, note 262).

Sin is even in a position to quote the contents of the message to Urzana: “Deine Streitkräfte mögen kommen. Vor den Buliäern und Surianäern²⁴² ist ganz Urartu in gewaltige Furcht geraten. Sie sammeln (ihre) Streitkräfte (weil sie denken): Vielleicht werden wir gegen ihn Stellung beziehen können, nachdem starker Frost eingesetzt haben wird.”

In spite of the choice of words in the message to Urzana, it is clear that the request for military assistance has to do with the Cimmerian invasion of Urartu.²⁴³ It is also evident that a Urartian request for military assistance presupposes an alliance between Rusa and Urzana,²⁴⁴ an alliance which could not have been agreed upon until Urzana was defeated by Rusa at Andaruta in the late summer of the year 714. So, the events mentioned in ABL 112 must have taken place in the late summer or in the autumn of that year, but before the coronation in Mušāšir and before Sargon’s attack on the city. ABL 112 clearly points to a situation identical with that which we witness in ABL 197, that is to say, the situation as it was just after the Gamir defeat: according to ABL 197, shortly after the Urartians had been defeated by the Cimmerians, Urzana accompanied by his brother and his son took off to seek an audience with Rusa; and according to ABL 112, at the time of the Cimmerian invasion, an alliance exists between Urartu and Urzana. It is clear that by this time we find ourselves in the late summer of 714. This dating is clearly confirmed by the quote from the message to Urzana: “nachdem starker Frost eingesetzt haben wird”, showing that the Urartian request to Urzana, and therefore also the Cimmerian invasion, must have occurred before the coming of winter, i. e., late summer or early autumn;²⁴⁵ at a time when

242 Instead of ^{URU}*SU-ri-a-na-a+a* the reading ^{URU}*Gur’-ri-a-na-a+a* may be considered. Cf. ABL 146 which mentions the king’s flight to Guriania after the defeat in Gamir (Deller 1984, p. 103; Salvini 1984, p. 46).

243 Salvini 1984, pp. 37 and 41.

244 Salvini 1984, p. 37.

245 There is no longer any reason, then, to maintain the reservation which we felt compelled to uphold above in the Chapter concerning the location of Gamir, with regard to the date of ABL 112 to the same year as the Cimmerian battle (cf. above, p. 18). The Cimmerian invasion into Urartu is a direct consequence of their victory over Rusa in Gamir. – Consequently, ABL 112 contains no information about events preceding the Cimmerian battle (cf. Deller 1984, p. 102 and Salvini 1984, pp. 40 f.), but the letter belongs to a time immediately after it. Nor has ABL 112 anything to do with the situation referred to in ABL 492 (cf. Salvini 1984, p. 41) since this letter contains the date 1st *Nisānu* and therefore belongs to the spring.

frost might be anticipated, thus hampering a Cimmerian invasion and, at the same time, making it easier for the combined troops of Rusa and Urzana to counter such an endeavour.²⁴⁶

As we know, from Gamir, by way of Guriania, Rusa marched direct to his capital where certain high-ranking Urartians were present, either under arrest or at liberty (ABL 144). Possibly Rusa had assembled his governors in Turushpa.²⁴⁷ Although ABL 112 does not mention the king himself – as far as we can judge – the mention of the presence of certain persons in Turushpa would seem to indicate that the Cimmerian invasion should be dated to the days when the king was staying in the capital. All events taken into consideration, the invasion, as was the case with the king's sojourn, must have taken place not long after Rusa's having been defeated by the Cimmerians; therefore, the two events may reasonably be regarded as roughly contemporary. Consequently, the request from the governor of Uesi to Urzana must be dated to a time about or shortly after the king's stay in Turushpa.²⁴⁸

From Turushpa, Rusa proceeded to Uesi. Here, Kakkadanu and two governors are committed to gaol, and Aššur-rēšūja is able to report that the bloodshed is over, the country is at peace, and the *rabūte* have returned to their provinces (ABL 197). In other words: the revolt has been brought to an end in Uesi as well as in the capital. From CT 53, 114, we know that Kakkadanu arrives in Uesi before the king: “[The *turtānu* entered in Ua[si] on the 10 [+xth] of *Ulūlu*, the king entered [af]ter him” (obv. 2-5).²⁴⁹ Lanfranchi was the first to draw attention to this fragment, showing that the king's arrival in Uesi (CT 53, 114) belongs to the time after the defeat in Gamir and is the one which precedes the king's permanence in the land of Uazaun, mentioned in Aššur-rēšūja's report in ABL 197.²⁵⁰ Thus, CT 53, 114, must have been written before ABL 197.

CT 53, 114, contains uncertainty with regard to which fate the troops are faced with: will they be killed, or will they be banished?²⁵¹ The anticipation of punishment of these troops is clearly connected with the king's arrival in Uesi. That which is in the mind of the scribe is obviously the royal punishment. The connexion between CT 53, 114, and ABL 197 makes it difficult to think of troops other than the forces of Kakkadanu, the *turtānu*: he had entered the city just ahead of the king (CT 53, 114), and as far as he is concerned the punishment is that he is placed under arrest, as we know from ABL 197. On that same occasion Melarṭua is killed by the *rabūte* outside Uesi (CT 53, 462).²⁵² According to Lanfranchi the revolt was directed against Melarṭua who was then killed by the re-

bels.²⁵³ We, on the other hand, tend to think that the king instigated the killing, in other words the execution of the newly elected king, and that the entire revolt, its rise and its consequences, has its root in the premature appointment of Melartua by the army during the retreat from Gamir.²⁵⁴

After the killing of Melartua the *rabūte* are free to return to their provinces; the bloodshed is over and the country at peace. Rusa can now receive Urzana and the messenger from Khubushkia. This brings us to an end as far as our way of presenting the problem goes: Rusa's movements between Gamir and Urzana's homage. It is certainly in Uesi that the king receives the latter.²⁵⁵ The rest of the story – Rusa's last days, Urzana's coronation, the stay in Muşāşir and his death – is familiar from the preceding sections. The sequence of events from the Gamir battle until Urzana's homage, then, is as follows:

246 From some time round November, the risk of snow and thus the mountain passes being blocked seems to be at hand (Levine 1977, p. 148). Cf. Barnett 1982, p. 323: "Summer in the area of Lake Van lasts only from June to September. In winter snow falls deeply, isolating communities from each other often for several months, but largely closing the roads to enemies."

247 Cf. Lanfranchi's assumption that a connexion might exist between ABL 1295 and Rusa's sojourn in Turushpa during his intervention against the rebellion mentioned in ABL 144 (above, note 236).

248 As we have seen, the governor of Uesi was killed at Gamir (ABL 1079 and 646). Naturally, while re-organising the forces in Guriania or rather, perhaps, during his stay in Turushpa, Rusa has had the opportunity to appoint new governors in replacement of those who had fallen. We know that the governor of Uesi immediately before the coronation in Muşāşir was Setini, but that earlier in the year he was governor elsewhere. Cf. above, note 214.

249 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 126.

250 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 126 f.

251 Cf. below, note 266.

252 Cf. below, note 262.

253 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 131.

254 Cf. below, pp. 76 ff., Excursus.

255 Cf. above, note 215.

TABLE 2

Abbreviations: A – U – N refer to reports by Aššur-rēšūja, the Ukkacan, and Nabû-le'i, in ABL 197.

	2. Urtartian army and nobles	3. Cimmerians	Sources		
			1.	2.	3.
1. Rusa In Gamir	9 governors, including the governor of Uesi, killed	[In Gamir]	ABL 197 U + N, 646, 1079, 146	ABL 646, 1079	cf. ABL 197 U + N, 646, 1079, 146
Flees to the mountains	Remnants of the king's camp unaware of the king's flight; 11 governors and their troops escape		ABL 646, cf. 197 N	ABL 646, 197 U	
To Guriania, reorganising his troops	Remnants of the king's camp raise Melartua to the throne during the retreat from Gamir		ABL 146	ABL 646	
To Urtartu before the baggage ²⁵⁶			ABL 197 N		
In Turushpa ²⁵⁷	20 eunuchs are arrested and interrogated by the king; 100 soldiers are executed; Ursinu, the vice- <i>turtānu</i> , arrested; he and his brother Abliuqu (Abalaqunu), who arrived in Turushpa, are questioned by the king, then set free ²⁵⁷		ABL 146, 144	ABL 144	
	Sarduri, together with other persons, seem to be present in Turushpa ²⁵⁷ ; a messenger from the Uesi governor has come to Urzana requesting military assistance.	Have marched and, from Man, invaded Urtartu		ABL 112	ABL 112

1. Rusa	2. Urartian army and nobles	3. Cimmerians	1.	2.	3.
	The Urartians are worried, assemble combat-troops and consider taking up a position against the Cimmerian once heavier frost sets in			ABL 112	
Enters Uesi after the <i>turtānu</i> [Kakkadanu]	The <i>turtānu</i> [Kakkadanu] enters Uesi on the 10 [+xth] of <i>Ulūlu</i> [together with his troops]*		CT 53, 114	CT 53, 114	
Stays in Uesi	Uncertainty concerning the punishment of the troops: will they be killed or banished?		CT 53, 114	CT 53, 114	
	Kakkadanu and two governors are taken prisoner		ABL 197A	ABL 197 U+A	
	[Melartua] is killed by the <i>rabūte</i> outside Uesi*			CT 53, 462	
	The bloodshed is over, the country at peace. The <i>rabūte</i> have returned to their provinces			ABL 197A	
The man of Mušāšir [Urzana], his brother and son have left for a visit to the king of Urartu to seek an audience; so has a messenger from the man of Khubushkia			ABL 197		

*See Excursus.

Excursus

Before closing the present section of this dissertation, it is tempting to offer some comments on the Urartian revolt, and particularly what led to the killing of Melarṭua. On the basis of the available and very fragmentary evidence it is difficult to evaluate what is in fact the background behind the revolt, how it evolved, or who is behind the killing of Melarṭua at Uesi. The only certain bit of evidence seems to be that it was necessary for Rusa, having returned to Urartu, to demonstrate his power not only in Turushpa – where the rebels were already under arrest, including the vice-*turtānu* named Ursinu (ABL 144) – and later on in Uesi where Kakkadanu, the *turtānu*, had arrived before the king (CT 53, 114), and where he was imprisoned upon Rusa's arrival at the fortress (ABL 197). It is a fair guess that the leader of the revolt or one of its ring-leaders was Kakkadanu, who was in supreme command of the army.²⁵⁸ With regard to Melarṭua we know – providing that it was he who was killed at Uesi, adopting Lanfranchi's hypothesis – that he became the victim of the revolt: but *why*?

Lanfranchi considers the possibility that Kakkadanu, “of the family of [Sar]duri” (CT 53, 462) belonged to a branch of the royal family which was in opposition to Rusa and Melarṭua, his legitimate heir. In that connexion, he mentions a hypothesis which has been set forth from time to time, namely that Rusa was not a legitimate king but a usurper.²⁵⁹

We cannot exclude the possibility that dynastic rivalries may have played a rôle in connexion with Kakkadanu's rebellion. But was the revolt also, as Lanfranchi assumes, directed against Melarṭua?²⁶⁰ It is difficult to dismiss the thought that the show-down, in Turushpa as well as in Uesi, had to do with the somewhat premature appointment of Melarṭua as king, an act which had been undertaken after Rusa had left his army in the lurch at Gamir. Why did the army appoint a new king? By itself, this act could be interpreted as a revolt, for no one could with any right claim to have been a witness to the king's fall in battle. Isn't it rather so that the killing of Melarṭua was due to the fact that, after Gamir, all of a sudden there was one king too many in Urartu? In any case, it must have been somewhat of a surprise for Rusa to have returned to Urartu, only to discover that during the retreat his son had taken upon himself his father's righteous position. The imprisonment, first of Ursinu, the vice-*turtānu* in Turushpa, and later of Kakkadanu, the *turtānu* himself, at Uesi, goes to show that those who are under suspicion in connexion

with the revolt are the superior officers of the army. This could speak in favour of an assumption that the revolt was instigated by the army, the army returning from Gamir, and that, consequently, it had something to do with the appointment of Melarṭua as king.²⁶¹ But in that case the heir to the throne – nilly-willy – must have been involved in the revolt, and the killing of him at Uesi may be viewed as a result of the premature installation of him as king and of his involvement in a conspiracy against Rusa, a circumstance which took place already in the course of the retreat from Gamir. It would not be the first, nor the last time in history, that an heir to the throne participated in a conspiracy against his father. According to CT 53, 462, Melarṭua was killed at Uesi by the *rabūte*;²⁶² according to Aššur-rēšūja (ABL 197), following the bloodshed, they returned to their provinces. Kakkadanu and two governors were imprisoned whereas, apparently, the *rabūte* went scot free. On whose behalf did they act: on their own behalf, on behalf of the rebels, or on behalf of the king?

256 For the possibility that CT 53, 365 refers to a situation prior to Rusa's arrival in Turushpa, cf. above, note 236.

257 The possibility exists that ABL 1295 belongs in this context; there we are told that the king brought his governor(s?) with him to Turushpa (cf. above, note 236).

258 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 131 f.

259 Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 131 f. For CT 53, 462, cf. below, note 262.

260 Cf. Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 131 f.

261 Also Ursinu's brother, Abliuqnu (Abaluqunu), is interrogated by Rusa in Turushpa (ABL 144), cf. above, note 233. As for Abaluqunu we know that at one point he appears together with Melarṭua, cf. CT 53, 7 = Deller 2.4: "Der Urarṭäer(könig) hat seine Streitkräfte in der Provinz Uazan zusammengezogen. Wohin (zu ziehen) er beabsichtigt, ist mir nicht zu Ohren gekommen. Melarṭua, der Prinz, ist mit seinen Tru[ppen] zu Abaluqunu, dem 'Statthalter' von []pa [gezogen]. (Lücke.) Inmitten des Gebirges beziehen sie/haben sie die Position bezogen." Cf. the rendering by Lanfranchi 1983, p. 130, of obv. 7-10: "Melarṭu'a, his son, and Abaliuqunu, the governor of/who... [with their? tr]oops...". Deller places the fragment under his Category 2: "Nachrichten über die kimmerische Gefahr" (Deller 1984, pp. 103 f., cf. p. 102). Cf. Salvini who connects CT 53, 7 with preparations for the Cimmerian battle or measures to prevent the Assyrian onslaught during the 8th campaign (Salvini 1984, p. 42 note 179 and p. 45). If Melarṭua's and Abaluqunu's troops have joined forces to Gamir, the king may have good reason to question Abaluqunu, too, about the situation.

262 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 130. Cf. Lanfranchi's rendering of the text offered by CT 53, 462: »[Out]side Ūa[si] his nobles [surr]ounded and killed him" (Melarṭua, according to Lanfranchi), obv. 2-5. Obv. 6-7 continue with a mention of the *turtānu*, i.e. Kakkadanu: "the right *turtānu*," and Lanfranchi reconstructs the continuation of obv. 7 and of l. 8: "of the family [of Sar]duri" (id., pp. 130 ff.).

Let us have a closer look at the contents of the two fragments, CT 53, 114, and 462. According to Lanfranchi, the killing of Melarṭua (CT 53, 462) does not only precede the arrival of the king, but also that of Kakkadanu into the fortress (CT 53, 114).²⁶³ This assumption does not entirely agree with the fact, that Kakkadanu (the right *turtānu* of the family [of Sar]duri) is mentioned in CT 53, 462, in a direct continuation of the killing of Melarṭua – a fact which Lanfranchi himself stresses and, as he thinks, throws light on the rôle played by Kakkadanu in connexion with the revolt (against Melarṭua).²⁶⁴ Would Kakkadanu, one wonders, have been mentioned if he hadn't been present, already at the time of the killing, in Uesi? In CT 53, 114, the author of the letter, (Aššur-rēšū-ja?),²⁶⁵ as we have mentioned, doubt as to which fate would await the troops once, first, the *turtānu* and then the king would have entered Uesi: the question was, would they be killed, or would they be banished?²⁶⁶

Who are the troops who may anticipate capital punishment or banishment, and which is their crime? According to CT 53, 114, and on the basis of the fact that Kakkadanu is gaoled upon the arrival of the king at Uesi (ABL 197), it is difficult to imagine that troops other than those of the *turtānu* could be involved; that is to say, troops which had entered Uesi together with Kakkadanu immediately before the king's entry. As the situation is at this moment, shortly after Gamir and about a date like the 10 [+xth] of *Ulūlu* (CT 53, 114), we must assume that we are dealing with the army from Gamir returning home.²⁶⁷ We know that the king and the army fled from Gamir separately (ABL 646), and that the king returned to Urartu before the baggage (ABL 197).²⁶⁸ If it were the Gamir army which, under Kakkadanu's command, entered Uesi on yon day in the month of *Ulūlu*, then it would be that very army which had appointed Melarṭua as king and the crime for which the troops ran the risk of death

263 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 136.

264 Cf. CT 53, 462 above in note 262 as well as Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 130 ff.

265 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 126 note 17.

266 CT 53, 114: “[The *turtānu*] entered Ua[si] on the 10[+xth] of *Ulūlu*, the king entered [af]ter him” (obv. 2-5). The fragment continues: “I have not yet obtained any news about the [...] troops; [here] is the question: [eith]er they will kill them, [or] they will banish them” (obv. 6-10), Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 126 f.

267 It would be natural for the army to return to Uesi after Gamir as the possibility exists that this was the place where the troops were assembled before the campaign, cf. CT 53, 7, above, note 261.

268 Cf. above, pp. 66 f.

penalty or banishment – would be that very act. It seems reasonable to assume that it is the Gamir army, under the command of Kakkadanu together with the newly appointed king Melarṭua, which entered Uesi. The crime committed by Kakkadanu and by the troops can scarcely have anything to do with the killing of Melarṭua in the sense that they had any part in it. Which interest could Kakkadanu or others have had in killing Melarṭua immediately before the king's arrival in Uesi? At this particular juncture it must have been evident that Rusa was alive, and a revolt directed against Melarṭua would have no political power or dynastic consequences. This would equally apply to a descendant of Sarduri's, such as Kakkadanu. We tend to assume that the king and not the rebels were behind the killing of Melarṭua.²⁶⁹

Based on the fragmentary information at our disposal we find that the revolt was directed against Rusa, that it took shape during the retreat from Gamir when Melarṭua was raised to the throne, and that Melarṭua was killed because of his participation in this revolt by having had himself proclaimed king in his father's stead. When the troops had to face punishment, when Kakkadanu was committed to gaol, when Ursinu, the vice-*turtānu* was under suspicion and imprisoned in Turushpa and his brother interrogated, then, as far as we can judge, it all has to do with the premature and unnecessary instatement of a king which the army instigated in the course of the retreat from Gamir.

As far as we can judge, CT 53, 462, must then belong after, and not before CT 53, 114, and consequently, the sequence of events would be as follows:

1. Kakkadanu enters Uesi on the 10 [+xth] of the month of *Ulūlu*, presumably together with the troops (CT 53, 114) from Gamir and the newly-instated king Melarṭua²⁷⁰
2. The king arrives at Uesi after the *turtānu* (CT 53, 114)
3. Melarṭua is killed at Uesi by the *rabūte* (CT 53, 462)
4. Kakkadanu is imprisoned in Uesi (ABL 197)
5. The *rabūte* return to their provinces (ABL 197)

269 Admittedly, CT 53, 462 tells us that Melarṭua was killed by his *rabūte*. But the *rabūte* also make their appearance in ABL 197 where, however, they are described as the *rabūte* of the king: "Jeder von seinen 'Grossen' (*rabūte*) ist nach seiner Provinz gegangen." There is little doubt that we are dealing with the same persons as those who, according to CT 53,

4. The Battle in Gamir and on Mt. Uaush

The battle on Mt. Uaush took place latish in the summer of 714. Shortly afterwards, as a consequence of his defeat at Andaruta, Urzana had no choice other than deserting the Assyrians and entering into the alliance with Rusa which resulted in coronation, sacrifices, and Rusa's fourteen day stay in Mušāšir.²⁷¹ The battle in Gamir also took place latish in the summer of that same year, and shortly afterwards the alliance between Mušāšir and Urartu was confirmed by virtue of the fact that Urzana visited Rusa (ABL 197), a meeting which, by all accounts, took place in Uesi.²⁷²

It is reasonably certain that Mt. Uaush can be dated to the days round the 11th *Ulūlu*.²⁷³ Gamir, on the other hand, may be dated to a time shortly before the 10 [+xth] of *Ulūlu* when Kakkadanu, presumably with the troops from Gamir,²⁷⁴ and later on the king marched into Uesi. We cannot determine with any degree of certainty how many days passed between the defeat of the Urartian army in Gamir and then, first Kakkadanu's, then the king's entering the fortress. But it is certain that the two entries took place after Gamir, and that the king, before having arrived at Uesi, had visited first Guriania, later Turushpa. Nor do we know how many days may have passed between, respectively, the entry

462, kill Melartua because in both cases these *rabūte* perform in connexion with events taking place at Uesi and at about the same time.

270 If we are right in assuming that, from Gamir, the army marched into Uesi under command of Kakkadanu, the question must be asked: what did the *turtānu* and the army do while Rusa was in Turushpa? Nothing seems to suggest that Kakkadanu was there together with the king (cf. above, note 241). It is a fact that the king arrived in Urartu ahead of the baggage (ABL 197); still, it is a matter of wonder that, Rusa managed to march first to Turushpa and then southwards and yet found it possible to enter Uesi immediately after Kakkadanu (CT 53, 114). But perhaps it cannot be excluded that Kakkadanu and the troops had already been staying in Uesi for a while, short or long, before the king's arrival. With the words, "[The *turtānu*] entered Ua[si] on the 10 [+xth] of *Ulūlu*, the king entered [af]ter him" (CT 53, 114), the sole purpose of the author of the letter may have been to convey the message that the king's arrival at the fortress occurred after the *turtānu* had arrived there on the 10 [+xth] of *Ulūlu*. The wording does not necessarily imply that the king arrived immediately after the *turtānu*.

271 Cf. above, Section 2.

272 Cf. above, Section 3.

273 Cf. above, Section 2.

274 Cf. above, p. 78, Excursus. Cf. Lanfranchi's dating of the Gamir battle: "after *Ulūlu* 11th (ABL 198) and before *Tašrītu* 1st (CT 53, 114)", Lanfranchi 1983, p. 134, cf. p. 127.

by Kakkadanu and by the king into the fortress. According to our source (CT 53, 114), probability speaks in favour of the king having arrived immediately following the arrival of the *turtānu* – although not necessarily so.²⁷⁵ However this may be, the battle in Gamir like that on Mt. Uaush must have taken place in the first half, or round the middle of the month of *Ulūlu*.

Not only did the Mt. Uaush- and the Gamir battles take place in the same year, and at the same time of that year, they were also fought in the same geographical area. The Uaush-battle was fought south of Lake Urmia in Uishdish, in Man. The battle with the Cimmerians was fought in Gamir which, like Mt. Uaush and Uishdish was south of Lake Urmia in Mannaeen country.²⁷⁶ Not only that: Rusa and the Urartian army perform exactly the same procedures before and after the two battles. In both cases we find Rusa penetrating into enemy country.²⁷⁷ (It also seems that on both occasions the troops have set out from Uesi).²⁷⁸ The Urartian army sustains a considerable defeat on Mt. Uaush as well as in Gamir. In both cases, Rusa leaves his troops in the lurch and flees without the main part of the army which has to return to Urartu without their king.²⁷⁹ According to Assyrian sources, after both defeats Rusa's first known station in Urartu is Turushpa,²⁸⁰ which he then abandons in favour of a southerly course, entering Uesi.²⁸¹ In spite of Rusa's having met his defeats south of Lake Urmia, in neither case does he proceed to Uesi in the first place but chooses the somewhat unexpected route: Man – Turushpa – Uesi. Following both defeats, the enemy enter Urartu: in one case, the Assyrian army and the Mannaeans, in the other, the Cimmerians (ABL 112).²⁸²

275 Cf. above, note 270.

276 Cf. above, Chapter I.

277 For Rusa's appearance in Uishdish before the battle on Mt. Uaush, cf. above, p. 44. For his invasion of Gamir, cf. the phraseology employed in Gamir-letters like ABL 1079, 146 and 197. For example, see the wording chosen in the former of these letters: "Die Streitkräfte des Urartäerkönigs sind in Gamir(ra), *wohin er gezogen ist*, etc." (ABL 1079).

278 As for Mt. Uaush, cf. ABL 198, above, p. 46; as for Gamir CT 53, 7, above, p. 77 note 261.

279 Cf. above, p. 54 and p. 67.

280 Cf. above, pp. 54 ff. and pp. 68 f., respectively. – With regard to the stay of Rusa's and that by Urartian governors in Turushpa following, respectively, Mt. Uaush and possibly Gamir, see above p. 55 (ABL 381) and note 236, p. 72 with note 247 (ABL 1295).

281 Cf. above, pp. 54 f. and 72.

282 Cf. above, pp. 44, 55 and 70 f.

It is just as noteworthy that after Rusa's defeat as opposed to the Assyrians as well as to the Cimmerians, Urzana lets Sargon down and enters into an alliance with Rusa, the loser. The fact that Urzana turned coat after Mt. Uaush is clearly apparent from the Ashur Letter, the Rusa stela and the letter to the *nāgir ekalli* (ABL 409).²⁸³ With regard to the situation as it was after Gamir, immediately following this Urzana loyally (and as the first to submit the message) informs the Assyrian court of Rusa's defeat (ABL 1079).²⁸⁴ but when the Cimmerians invade Urartu, he is an ally of the Urartians (ABL 112), and shortly afterwards, his meeting with Rusa takes place (ABL 197). After both battles at a time when, apparently, the Urartian king has not yet arrived at Uesi – he is probably still in Turushpa – the governor of Uesi sends his messenger to Urzana.²⁸⁵ According to ABL 380, which pertains to a time following Mt. Uaush, but before Rusa's sojourn at Uesi, “*der rab kallapāni* [“chef d'estafettes”]²⁸⁶ des 'Statthalters' Setini [the governor of Uesi]” is sent to Muṣāṣir (ABL 380, cf. ABL 409).²⁸⁷ Correspondingly, ABL 112 informs us that, in consequence of the Cimmerian invasion of Urartu, the Uesi-governor has dispatched his messenger (the *mār šip-ri*) to Urzana.²⁸⁸ Both incidents presuppose that the alliance between Rusa and Urzana has taken effect, and that the defeat at Andaruta is past history.²⁸⁹

There is a remarkable similarity between the events which took place at the time of, and immediately following, Rusa's defeat when he was faced partly with the Assyrians and partly the Cimmerians. Were we to attempt to maintain that we are dealing with two events, widely separated from one another and having nothing to do with each other – Rusa having been unfortunate enough to sustain two defeats in the course of the first half of, or round the middle of the month of *Ulūlu* in 714 (starting on Mt. Uaush, then in Gamir), the consequence would be as follows: At the beginning of *Ulūlu*, before the 11th, Rusa has set out for Man where he conquers the district of Uishdish with its many fortresses; next, he is defeated by the Assyrians on Mt. Uaush and flees in the full view of his army, an army which must then return to Urartu without their king; immediately afterwards, again Rusa has assembled a large army, has returned to Man only to be defeated by the Cimmerians in Gamir, again leaves his army in a quandary, the army having to return to Urartu without their king; after the interlude in Guriania (and in Muṣāṣir and at Andaruta), Rusa appears in Turushpa; at about this time Assyrian, Mannaean and Cimmerian troops, all from the country of the Mannaeans, have invaded Urartu, and some time round the 10 [+xth] *Ulūlu* first

Kakkadanu, then Rusa make their appearance in Uesi.

A sequence of events like this would, I think everyone will agree, be highly unlikely. There is only one plausible explanation of this dilemma: Rusa's defeats on Mt. Uaush and in Gamir are one and the same matter, but viewed and described from widely separated types of sources, on one hand a royal inscription, on the other reports from Assyrian intelligence. We are faced with two versions of that particular battle in the summer of 714 and not with accounts of two separate happenings.

The veracity of this conclusion, it may be emphasised, is corroborated further by ND 2608, an account addressed to Sargon and written by Sennacherib shortly after the Gamir-battle.²⁹⁰ As we have mentioned previously, this letter mentions a person who appears to have emerged from the city of Ištaḥup/Ištaippa in Zikirtu which Sargon ravaged with fire and destruction shortly before the battle on Mt. Uaush.²⁹¹ This person was interrogated about the Urartians, and he answered, "The Urartian, since he [...] went [to] Gamir, [now (?)] is very afraid of the king my lord".²⁹² This statement shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the fear on the part of the Urartians towards the Assyrian king and the defeat in Gamir is a case of cause and effect. It tells us – as we have been able to deduce in a different way – that Sargon and the Assyrians were engaged in the battle with Rusa in Gamir. Assuming the correctness of the identification of Ištaḥup with Ištaippa²⁹³ – the letter confirms that there exists a close connexion not only in terms of geography and chronology, but also with regard to the events which did in fact take place in Ištaḥup/Ištaippa and in Gamir, respectively, in the summer of 714. It was while

283 Cf. above, Section 1.

284 Cf. above, pp. 66 f.

285 Cf. ABL 380, above, note 214, and ABL 112, above pp. 70 f.

286 For *rab kallâpâni* ("chefs d'estafettes"), see Malbran-Labat 1982, p. 53 and 123 f.; further p. 83: "Ne pourrait-on voir dans ces *kallâpâni* non spécialisés une sorte d'infanterie légère, que sa mobilité permettrait précisément d'employer, le cas échéant, comme estafettes ou courriers?". Cf. the Ashur Letter, ll. 26, 258 and 426 where Mayer translates *Kurriere(?)*.

287 Cf. above, note 214.

288 Cf. above, pp. 70 f.

289 Cf. above, note 214 and above p. 71.

290 ND 2608 = Deller 1.7. Cf. Deller 1984, p. 101; Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128.

291 Cf. above, pp. 20 and 44.

292 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128; cf. Saggs 1958, pp. 198 f.

293 Cf. above, p. 20.

Sargon was engaged in the burning of Ištaḥup/Ištaippa and other cities in Zikirtu that he received information to the effect that Rusa was arriving in Uishdish; therefore, he broke camp and met him on Mt. Uaush. So, this mountain was located in an area known by the name Uishdish as well as by the name Gamir. How could it happen that one and the same Mannaeen district was called now Gamir, now Uishdish? And how could it have happened that the Cimmerians, as we must conclude, had agreed to serving in the Assyrian army and were prepared to participate, side by side with the Assyrians, in the invasion of Urartu, already in the year 714, or even earlier, and not just at the time of Esarhaddon?

Before attempting to answer these questions, another question presents itself. Why should it have been necessary for Sargon to receive reports from Sennacherib, from Aššur-rēšūja, or from others, concerning Rusa's defeat when, according to the Ashur Letter, he himself was present on Mt. Uaush, and that it was he who inflicted this disaster upon the king of Urartu? One might argue against this that, with a single exception, these reports were submitted by informers (the Ukkaean, Nabû-le'i, and Urzana) who are not addressing Sargon himself, but Sennacherib (ABL 197), the *nāgir ekalli* (ABL 646)²⁹⁴, or the vice-*nāgir ekalli* (ABL 1079). The exception is Aššur-rēšūja. In ABL 146 he addresses the Assyrian king direct; however, his task is not to submit an account of the defeat in Gamir, but on the contrary: to describe Rusa's movements after that event. Besides, it would not be so strange if the Assyrian court were ignorant of Sargon's personal presence at Mt. Uaush/Gamir when the reports were forwarded. The king's decision to march to Uishdish seems to have been taken suddenly as a result of Rusa's unexpected appearance there, and this decision constituted an interruption of the Assyrian campaign in Zikirtu which was in full flood.²⁹⁵ On the other hand, one might have expected that the informers or their sources—those who had an intimate knowledge not only with regard to the result of the battle, but who were also aware of the number of governors killed as well as of the situation in the beaten Urartian army in general—one might have been expected that they would have given at least a hint to the effect that Rusa had been defeated in battle by none other than the Assyrian king himself. But there is no mention of that. Nor do they submit any direct indication that the opponents were the Cimmerians; merely that the Urartian king sustained a defeat when on his way to Gamir. Not one word suggests who the opponents were.

We are left with a feeling that something does not fit, and we inevitably

ask whether Sargon – as postulated in the Ashur Letter – was in fact present on Mt. Uaush? It is by no means unusual, and certainly not in Assyrian historical sources, that feats accomplished by his army are attributed to the king.²⁹⁶ There are clear indications of this long before the time of Sargon, e. g., at the time of Shalmaneser III (858-824). According to the Black Obelisk Inscription, Shalmaneser, more than once, sends his *turtānu* on expeditions in which the king does not participate; but nevertheless the account describes the achievements by the *turtānu* and the army as if the king had been present and discharged these achievements personally.²⁹⁷ Everywhere, throughout the Ashur Letter, Sargon appears as he who performs everything done by the army, including acts which were clearly carried out by his soldiers, e. g., when Sargon butchers Rusa's warriors, chops off their heads, captures Urartian nobles and their horses, forces open the store-rooms in the cities of Uishdish, plunders the fortress of Ushkaia, etc.²⁹⁸ Furthermore, with regard to Sargon, we know that he is reported to have led campaigns which must, in fact, have been conducted by others inasmuch as, otherwise, he would have had to be present in two widely separated parts of the empire at one and the same time.²⁹⁹ A striking testimony to the fact that the allegation of the king's active participation does not always conform with realities is the account of the battle at Ashdod in 712 where, according to the annals, Sargon participated in person with his cavalry and conquered the city.³⁰⁰ From a different source, the Book of Isaiah, we know, however, that the celebrated campaign against Ashdod was led by the Assyrian *turtānu*; apart from that, according to the Eponym Chronicle, Sargon remained in Assyria in that particular year.³⁰¹

294 Lanfranchi 1983, p. 128 with note 24.

295 Cf. the Ashur Letter, ll. 91 ff., cf. l. 162.

296 Malbran-Labat 1982, p. 2.

297 Cf. the campaigns of Shalmaneser III in his 27th, 28th, 30th and 31st *palû* (Michel 1956, pp. 224 ff.; cf. ARAB I: 584, 585, 587 and 588).

298 Cf., e. g. the Ashur Letter, ll. 133 ff., 166 and 178.

299 Olmstead 1916, p. 7; id., 1908, pp. 4 f. See also Levine according to whom Sargon probably did not participate in his 9th campaign to Karalla (Levine, Sargon's Eighth Campaign, p. 137).

300 Lie 1929, ll. 256-258.

301 Olmstead 1916, p. 7; id., 1908, p. 5; Tadmor 1958, pp. 79 f., 92 ff. and 95; Hallo 1964, p. 181.

With regard to the account of the Mt. Uaush battle, Levine has pointed out that it is impossible to try to separate literary convention from reliable account, at any rate as far as details are concerned.³⁰² Mayer, for his part, has arrived at the impression on the basis of the long description that there is something which Sargon is anxious to conceal.³⁰³ He has also drawn our attention to certain elements of absurdity in the account. For instance, Rusa is confined to his own camp, "während er ja eigentlich seine Truppen in einer für ihn entscheidenden Schlacht führen sollte?" Likewise, a numerically superior Urartian force is defeated solely by Sargon's and Šin-aḥ-ušur's cavalry, the other part of the Assyrian army not having part in the encounter.³⁰⁴ The troops have had no rest, they are exhausted and tired after their long march crossing countless mountain ranges, and their features have changed, but Sargon can offer them neither a place to sleep nor water to drink; he is unable to pitch camp or fortify one. Nor can he collect his forces or issue orders to them. "Was rechts und links war, konnte ich nicht an meine Seite bringen (und auf) die Nachhut konnte ich nicht warten."³⁰⁵

Sargon, however, is fearless. Neither Rusa's great force, his horses or his mailed warriors scare him. He engages in person: "Mit meinem eigenen (Führungs-)Wagen allein und den Pferden, die an meiner Seite gehen, die in Feindes- und Freundesland nicht von meiner Seite weichen, dem Regiment (?) des ^mŠin-aḥ-ušur, traf ich wie ein schrecklicher Pfeil in seine Mitte und bewirkte eine Niederlage und wandte (so) seiner Angriffs ab."³⁰⁶

I have always been intrigued by the rôle which Šin-aḥ-ušur played on that day on Mt. Uaush. He was close to the king, he was "Grand-Vizier" and, for all we know, the king's own brother; and apparently he was commander of the king's personal cavalry.³⁰⁷ Why was the king himself not in command that day on Mt. Uaush? In the first place, why is Šin-aḥ-ušur mentioned by name in this connexion, and that in a part of the text where otherwise, in every respect, the account attributes the discharge of all actions to Sargon himself? This is one of the very few cases when an Assyrian king mentions, by name, an officer who participated in a military campaign.³⁰⁸ It seems that Mayer, too, must have speculated over the part played by Šin-aḥ-ušur since he raises the question, Was he in possession of an honorary post as "Colonel-in-Chief" in charge of the mounted guard, or was he its "Commanding Colonel"; but he leaves the question open.

We arrive at the answer to the question concerning the part played by

Sin-aḥ-uṣur in the battle on Mt. Uaush when we compare the present account with the Annals and their description of Sargon's participation at Ashdod. In order to strike a balance between the wording of two accounts, we have chosen two editions in English rendering, one by Lucenbill, the other by Lie:

Mt. Uaush

*With my single chariot and the horse- (men) who go at my side, who never leave (me) either in a hostile or friendly region, the troop, the command of Sin-aḥ-uṣur, I plunged into his midst, etc.*³⁰⁹

Ashdod

In the anger of my heart, *with my own chariot and with my cavalry, who in a hostile land never leave my side, to Ashdod, his royal city, quickly I marched.*³⁰⁹

302 Levine 1977, p. 146.

303 Mayer 1978-1980, p. 26.

304 Mayer 1978-1980, p. 27.

305 The Ashur Letter, ll. 127-130.

306 The Ashur Letter, ll. 131-133.

307 Mayer 1978-1980, pp. 26 f.; Burney und Lang 1973, p. 318.

308 Mayer 1980, p. 27 note 53. Cf. also von Soden 1963, pp. 132 f.

309 ARAB II: 154 (cf. Mayer's German translation, quoted above); Lie 1929, ll. 256-258.

Note, however, the agreements between the original texts:

The Ashur Letter, l. 132:

it-ti narkabat šēpē^{ll}-ia e-di-ni-ti ù sisē^{pl} a-li-kut i-di-ia šá a-šar nak-ri ù sa-al-mi la ip-ṣar-ku-ú ki-tul-lum pi-ir-ra^l Sin-aḥ-uṣur

(according to Thureau-Dangin's edition, 1912), and then the Annals, ll. 256-258:

256. *[i-na ug-gat lib-bi-ia] it-ti^u narkabat šēpē^{ll}-ia ù im^{tr} pit-ḫal-lu-[i]a*

257. *[ša a-šar sa-al-me i-da]-a-a la ip-ṣar-ku-ú a-na^{ai} As-du-[d]i*

258. *[ál šarrúti^{tr}-šu hi-it-mu-ṭiš] al-lik-ma*

(according to Lie's edition, 1929). –

Note also a certain similarity between the accounts of Sargon's performance at Ashdod in the Display Inscription and on Mt. Uaush according to the Ashur Letter:

Mt. Uaush

(Ashur Letter, ll. 129-132)

Ein Feldlager konnte ich nicht aufschlagen und nicht aufbauen ein befestigtes Lager... meine Truppen nicht versammeln... Mit meinem eigenen (Führungs-)Wagen allein und den Pferden, die an meiner Seite gehen, die in Feindes- und Freundesland nicht von meiner Seite weichen...

Ashdod

(The Display Inscription, ARAB II: 62)

In the fury of my heart, I (did) not (stop) to gather the masses of my troops or to prepare the camp, but with my warriors, who do not leave the place of danger (?) at my side, I marched against Ashdod.

The complete concordance between the description of Sargon's participation, partly at Mt. Uaush and partly at Ashdod, clearly shows that, in both cases, we are faced with a *topos*. Furthermore, we now know that Sargon did not at all participate at Ashdod, but that his army was led by his *turtānu*. Consequently, we cannot with any degree of certainty be assured at all that Sargon was present when the battle on Mt. Uaush took place, nor that any realities lie behind the *topos* employed. But what we can deduce is that Šin-aḥ-ušur did in fact participate in, and played a decisive role in leading the battle which led to the victory against Rusa. When the Ashur Letter introduces him in what may seem a slightly unusual manner, and when – very much against customary practice – he is mentioned by name, the explanation is that Sargon himself was *not* present on Mt. Uaush, just as he was not present at Ashdod. If Sargon did not attend in person when Rusa was defeated, but found himself elsewhere, be it in Zikirtu, be it Man, or some other place, in that case he naturally needed the reports which Sennacherib and others sent him concerning the defeat suffered by the Urartian king in Gamir, that is, on Mt. Uaush.

We have previously raised the question how it could have happened that one and the same area in Man could have been known now as Uishdish, now as Gamir. We also wondered at the part the Cimmerians and their country could have taken in Sargon's fight against Rusa, and at the fact that, like the Assyrian army, they advance into Urartu after the victory.

It can scarcely be doubted that the troops against whom Rusa fights on Mt. Uaush in Gamir are Assyrian troops under the command of Šin-aḥ-ušur. Then, how do the Cimmerians come into the picture? Once again, it must be emphasized that not one of the Assyrian reports indicate, in so many words, that Rusa's defeat in Gamir was inflicted by the Cimmerians, nor that he fought a battle with them. All reports, which incidentally are surprisingly stereotypic, agree that Rusa marched off to Gamir where he suffered a defeat. Therefore, there is no reason to think that Šin-aḥ-ušur could not have defeated Rusa on Mt. Uaush without the coöperation of the Cimmerians. The mountain may have been in an area of Uishdish which for some reason or other, in the reports, was called Gamir. It is only in connexion with the Cimmerian invasion of Urartu (ABL 112) that these people are mentioned direct ("dieser Kimmerier"). On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the Cimmerians were residents of Gamir, nor any doubt that at this very time they played a sig-

nificant military part in the showdown with Rusa. Both is apparent from ABL 112 which shows that the Cimmerians were residents in Man from where they were “abgezogen” or had marched off and had entered Urartu.³¹⁰ It is quite clear that their starting-point was Gamir and that, consequently, the Cimmerians were at home there.

As to the question how they had happened to reside in Uishdish and joined the Assyrian military service, we may derive an inkling of an answer when we recall the events which preceded the Mt. Uaush-battle. For a couple of years Uishdish and the 12/22 fortresses in this district had been a controversial matter and indeed almost a plaything between Rusa and the king of the Mannaeans. In 715 Sargon re-conquered these fortresses, and in them he appointed garrisons consisting of Assyrian as well as Mannaeian troops. According to the view handed down in The Display Inscription, the fortresses were placed direct under Assyria.³¹¹ In the late summer of 714, while the Assyrian army was busy ravaging Zikirtu, Rusa – according to the Ashur Letter – invaded Uishdish and succeeded in conquering this district which, in reality, means the numerous fortified cities in the area; otherwise, it would not have been necessary for the Assyrian troops, after the victory on Mt. Uaush, to re-conquer them. In other words, within a few days about the 11. *Ulūlu*, Rusa fought *two* battles against Assyrian units in Uishdish, and against two completely different sections of the Assyrian army. First, the battle of the fortresses, and Rusa’s opponent is the Assyro-Mannaeian complement in them. Then, *Sīn-aḥ-uṣur* comes to the rescue of these people and defeats Rusa on Mt. Uaush, when the Assyrians re-conquer all of Uishdish and occupy all the fortresses.

Who are the people whom Sargon has placed in these fortresses? There is no reason to assume that native Assyrians would have constituted the garrisons in the fortresses in Uishdish. “The Assyrian army was not large enough to supply forces to guard all the numerous strategic points. The population of Assyria was relatively small and could not provide an army large enough for the needs of the expanding empire.”³¹² One of the solutions was recruiting manpower among deportees from countries which the Assyrian king had subdued. Part of these people were settled in border areas or in fortified cities or fortresses there.³¹³ The Uishdish for-

310 Cf. ABL 112, note 240.

311 Cf. above, p. 49.

312 Oded, 1979, p. 50.

313 Oded, 1979, pp. 47 f., 50 ff; Malbran-Labat 1982, p. 10; Eph’al 1983, p. 105.

tresses have not formed any exception to this method, not, at least, as far as the use of foreigners is concerned. When the Assyrian reports say that Rusa went to Gamir, whereas the Ashur Letter will have it that he went to Uishdish, conquered the area and its fortified cities, it cannot be interpreted in any other way than that the Cimmerians were present in Uishdish and verily constituted the Assyrian garrison in the fortresses which Sargon had placed there the preceding year. No doubt, Gamir must have been the official designation used for this Assyrian enclave in foreign environments, and “dieser Kimmerier” ([LU] Ga-mì-ra-a+a) must have been a term used for the Assyrian troops in the fortresses which, in this case, included units of Cimmerian origin. “Dieser Kimmerier”, who invaded Urartu simultaneously with the Assyrian invasion of Urartu and with the assault by Mannaeen troops against the cities along Lake Urmia,³¹⁴ were thus under Assyrian command and constituted part of the Assyrian invasion army. Yet, the Cimmerian foothold in Man does indicate that they were not part of Šīn-aḫ-ušur’s cavalry nor part of the army which conducted the 8th campaign, but that – as pointed out – belonged to the Assyro-Mannaeen border-fortifications in Uishdish. Whether, or to which extent, they may have taken part in the battle on Mt. Uaush itself, we have no way of determining. Nor can we form an opinion regarding how great, or how little, a contribution to the Assyrian invasion of Urartu may be attributed to the Cimmerians.

However, we are in a position to conclude that in 714 the Cimmerians were enlisted in the Assyrian army and that, in 715, Sargon had stationed them as soldiers in the Assyro-Mannaeen border fortresses in Uishdish so that, consequently, not later than that year, they had entered Assyrian service. The first time we hear about the Cimmerian people, they are in the service of the Assyrians.

Decisively, this conclusion contradicts every previous notion concerning the Cimmerians and their clash with Rusa. Their performance in Man and their enrolment in the Assyrian army is not, however, so surprising; it tallies well with certain pieces of information from the time of Esarhaddon. A treaty from the year 679 B.C. shows that, at that time, the Cimmerians were enlisted in the Assyrian army. In this treaty, a *rab kišir Gimirai* shows up as a witness. The people of a *kišru* were often members of one and the same nationality, and as we observe, a *kišru* could have been named after the tribe in question. In the present case consequently, we are faced with a unit of Esarhaddon’s army (*kišir šarrūti*), the members of which were Cimmerians.³¹⁵

In the year 675 B. C. we are told of the presence of Cimmerians in or close to Man, and of Esarhaddon's scepticism towards them (ABL 1237). Albeit, they have assured the Assyrian troops which were ready, in the mountains, to hurl themselves upon Man, that they would remain neutral: "The Mannean territory is at your disposal; we have become separate". But Esarhaddon does not quite take their words at face value: "Who knows if it is a lie", and he describes them as "*zēr amēl ḫal-qá-ti-i*, who recognize neither the oath (sworn before) a god nor treaties".³¹⁶ The question is to which degree we can rely on these statements, and whether it is merely a question of *topoi* without any real background in reality?³¹⁷ When we consider the performance of the Cimmerians in 715-714 as well as in 679 as units in the Assyrian army, in spite of these stereotypes, we can scarcely exclude the possibility that the Cimmerians in question (ABL 1237) served in the Assyrian army and that, as maintained by Esarhaddon, broke their oath and their treaty and may therefore be described as *zēr amēl ḫal-qá-ti-i*, "a race of fugitives"³¹⁸ or "deserters",³¹⁹ an expression, by the way, also used about a Cimmerian chieftain like Lygdamis.³²⁰ Esarhaddon's choice of words concerning the Cimmerians is not a casual side-remark of no particular consequence. On the contrary, it constitutes his very reason to keep the Assyrian troops who are waiting in the mountains from invading Man.³²¹ Yet, Fales and Lanfranchi feel that the Cimmerians were mere scapegoats "for Esarhaddon's wider mis-

314 Cf. above, pp. 70 f. (ABL 112) and p. 55 (ABL 381).

315 Manitius 1910, pp. 185 f., 221; Wiseman 1958, p. 10; Diakonoff 1961, p. 596 and 607. – For the rejection of Ghirshman's notion of the rôle played by Cimmerians as Assyrian mercenaries at the time of Sennacherib's campaign in Babylon in 689, and their subsequent appearance in Luristan, in the Zagros, see Moorey, Catalogue, 1971, pp. 10 f.

316 Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, pp. 15 and 17.

317 The expressions "lie", "seed of dispersion", "who do not recognize, etc." belong to the "complex of negative 'moral' evaluations of the enemies present throughout the textual category of the royal inscriptions"; "such evaluations have been shown to be of preconceived, or prejudicial, origin, and – as such – of totally ideological worth". (Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, p. 29).

318 Fales and Lanfranchi translate *zēr amēl ḫal-qá-ti-i* with "vagabonds" and "seed of dispersion", respectively; M. Cogan and H. Tadmor prefer "ruinous breed" (Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, p. 15 note 12 and pp. 17 and 29). Yusifov, on the other hand, speaks of "a race of fugitives" (1982, s. 351).

319 Cf. Malbran-Labat 1982, pp. 108 f.

320 Cf. Millard 1979, p. 121; Cogan and Tadmor 1977, p. 80 note 26.

321 Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, pp. 18 and 28.

givings and apprehensions on the outcome of the Mannean enterprise”, and that his pronouncement concerning the Cimmerians cannot be taken at face value.³²² On the other hand, the two editors are in no way alien to the concept which A. Schott proposed in 1937 – no one, by the way, paid any attention to it – to wit that the Cimmerians mentioned in ABL 1237 were apparently in the pay of the Assyrians. In this connexion, they emphasize, “In general, it appears increasingly probable that the Gimirrāyu-Cimmerians may have to be subjected to a ‘de-mythologizing’ historical reading as regards the judgements passed upon them by ‘ruling’ peoples of the ancient Near East”. Thus, they reserve their opinion with regard to “the common monolithic portrait of this people as a fierce barbaric horde”.³²³ If the Cimmerians of ABL 1237 were in the pay of the Assyrians, then, at the time of Esarhaddon, these people served the Assyrian king in or near the Mannaeen country, just as their fellow tribesmen did in 715-714 under Sargon.

The presence of the Cimmerians in Man or nearby areas at the time of Esarhaddon is also attested by this particular king’s inquiries to Shamash, the sun-god. Here, it seems, the Cimmerian activities and alliances with Mannaeans, Medes and Sapardaeans directed against the Assyrian realm are mentioned.³²⁴ But the commonly accepted conception that the Cimmerians arrived in the Zagros region at the time of Esarhaddon,³²⁵ in other words, does not hold water. Their appearance in Uishdish/Gamir in the years 715-714, when they were part of the Assyrian army, shows that Cimmerian connexions with Man and their relations with the Assyrian king is of an earlier date, going back to the time of Sargon II.

To sum up, it will perhaps be expedient to recapitulate the sequence of events from the time when Rusa turned up in Uishdish shortly before the 11th *Ulūlu* in 714 until his death in the autumn. In the two preceding chapters, we have placed these events in their relation to, respectively, Rusa’s defeat on Mt. Uaush and in Gamir, based on the assumption that reports on these two defeats referred to two entirely different incidents.

Immediately after his return from Zikirtu, in the summer of 714, Rusa, with a force small in number, shortly before the 11th *Ulūlu* departs from Uesi where the main part of the army is assembled, heading for the frontier of the Mannaeen country.³²⁶ Rumours will have it that, following the king’s departure, the governor of Uesi has also departed. Rusa conquers Uishdish with the 12/22 fortresses which Sargon had subjugated under Assyrian rule the previous year (715); and in that year he had appointed

a garrison consisting of Assyrian as well as Mannaeen soldiers. With regard to the Assyrian soldiers in Uishdish, they were not native Assyrians but a Cimmerian task force who had sided with the Assyrians. It is the presence of this Cimmerian force which accounts for the fact that, in the Assyrian reports, Uishdish is referred to as Gamir.

At the time when Rusa's invasion of Uishdish/Gamir takes place, the Assyrian army which took part in Sargon's 8th Campaign, finds itself in Zikirtu, busy ravaging and burning cities like Ištaippa and several others. But when informed of the situation in Uishdish/Gamir, Sīn-aḥ-uṣur, Sargon's brother, sets out from Zikirtu so as to come to the relief of the local Assyrian, i. e., Cimmerian and Mannaeen troops in fortresses in Uishdish/Gamir; and he meets Rusa and the latter's allies on Mt. Uaush. Whether the Cimmerian and Mannaeen soldiers posted in the fortresses were able to participate in that battle, we have no way of telling. But we have good reasons to doubt that Sargon personally participated in the battle on Mt. Uaush as claimed by the Ashur Letter. The account of the participation of the Assyrian king and his cavalry, and their achievement there, is a *topos* which, in the choice of words, is in complete agreement with the account which we find in the Annals concerning Sargon's personal engagement in the battle at Ashdod; there we know that, in spite of what the annals claim, the king was not present at all, the Assyrian *turtānu* having been in command.

The Urartians suffer a smarting defeat on Mt. Uaush. Many are killed in battle, among them the governor of Uesi and eight other Urartian governors. The king flees and leaves the main part of the army high and dry, thus leaving no alternative for them but to retreat without the king. Unaware of the fact that the king has escaped, the army – which is supposed to have included 11 governors and their troops, among them presumably the *turtānu* Kakkadanu – during the retreat elevated Melarṭua, son of Rusa and heir to the throne, to kingship.

322 Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, pp. 31 and 28 ff.

323 Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, pp. 10 f. note 5. Cf. Schott 1937, col. 364.

324 See further, below.

325 Cf. Levine 1973, p. 43 with p. 45 note 29; Yusifov 1982, p. 352.

326 It is possible that CT 53, 7, belongs in this context, cf. above, note 261. The fragment informs us that the Urartian king has assembled his forces in the province of Uazaun and that Melarṭua and Abaluqunu have established their positions in the mountains.

In the meantime the king has reached Guriania where he reorganizes the forces which fled with him. He then proceeds to Mušāšir³²⁷ in order to offer sacrifices to Haldia, but Urzana, who incidentally has just sent messages to the Assyrian court about the defeat suffered by Rusa, refuses to admit him to the temple.³²⁸ Urzana flees in the direction of Assyria,³²⁹

327 Cf. also Adontz 1946, p. 105.

328 One wonders: why were reports to the Assyrian court and to Sargon, so it seems, submitted without any reference to Rusa's arrival in Mušāšir directly following the defeat on Mt. Uaush in Gamir or to the intermezzo with Urzana. The letters merely refer to the alliance between Rusa and Urzana (ABL 112 and 197; cf., also, ABL 380 and 409, and the mention of the governor of Mušāšir in ABL 381). There is, however, no reason to assume that the Assyrian court would have been ignorant of these events although, admittedly, their Assyrian informant in Mušāšir was none other than Urzana himself, and he would scarcely be the person to report his defection to them on his own accord. The fragmentary condition of many letters emphasizes that we cannot deduce for this intermezzo to have been unknown. – Cf., also, the reference to Urzana in the following fragments:

ND 1107 = Deller 2.5 = Postgate 243 (Postgate, *The Governor's Palace Archive*, p. 227):
2': [...] it is well with [...], it is well with [the fortresses(?) ...].

4': As to that? report of which the king my lord [wrote to me], saying: "Make the report exactly [...], the Cimmerians [...]

Rev. 4': [...] we trembled(?); the Cimmerians [...] against [...], within the land? of Ušunāli he camped?. A report [...] from the land of Hubuš[kia?] I [sent?] to Urzāna, saying: "Make an exact report [...]

L.E. 1':]until I hear[? ..., let] them send [...]

We note the appeal to Urzana: "Make an exact report ...". Earlier in the letter there is also a request for a specific report, and this seems to have something to do with the Cimmerians. At an earlier time, Urzana has provided information concerning the defeat in Gamir to the Assyrian court (ABL 1079), and the possibility is at hand that the Assyrians desire a more specific account of this event just as the letter-writer (Sennacherib?) promises in ABL 1079 (cf. above, note 225).

CT 53, 172 = Deller 4.2 (Aššur-rēšūja?). According to Deller, it could be Urzana of Mušāšir who is mentioned in obv. 3-4: "Anlässlich meiner Thronbesteigung". The letter also mentions Rusa, as well as Arie and Arizā (Deller 1984, p. 110).

ABL 1196 = Deller 3.7. The letter mentions Urzana as king of Mušāšir; Uesi and Arizā are also mentioned.

ABL 1083 = Deller 3.6. The letter informs us that the governor of Uesi has taken off for (?) Mušāšir. The report reminds us of the situation described in ABL 409 where Urzana informs the *nāgir ekalli* that the Uesi-governor is in Mušāšir and is making offerings (Salvini 1984, p. 41). The letter contains two references to the Khubushkaean.

CT 53, 918. The fragment mentions Urzana and *Sa-ni-ia* (Deller 1984, p. 118). Sania, the city ruler, is known also from ABL 590 where he appears together with Kakkadanu: "Sania, the city ruler, against Kakkadani I sent" (RCAE I, No. 590; cf. Follet 1957, pp. 69 f., and cf. below, note 334). Apparently Sania was the city ruler of ^{URU}*A-i-ra* (Deller 1984, p. 118).

329 Salvini suggests that ABL 891 = Deller 6.8 where Šulmu-Bēl gives an account of

but is caught up with by Rusa at Andaruta, defeated and taken prisoner, but again released so that he is free to return to Muṣāṣir after he and Rusa have agreed on an alliance.

Rusa returns to Urartu and arrives ahead of the baggage train. He immediately proceeds to Turushpa. During Rusa's absence a conspiracy against him had been instigated, the ring-leaders of which are now under arrest in the capital. Among those arrested are twenty eunuchs who are interrogated by the king, and 100 soldiers are executed. Also Ursinu, the vice-*turtānu*, is placed under arrest. He and Abaluqunu, his brother, who has arrived in Turushpa, are questioned by the king, but as it turns out that they have nothing to do with the matter, they are released. By all tokens the conspiracy is rooted in the army, and it is probably connected with the premature or unlawful election of a king during the retreat from Gamir/Mt. Uaush.

While the king is offering sacrifices in his capital, and all the governors have called on him,³³⁰ Abaluqunu who has been appointed governor in Muṣāṣir, and Ṭunnaun, the governor of Kār-siparri, have to march to the border against Man. Mannaean troops have penetrated and entered

Urzana's itinerary towards Assyria may have a connexion with the report of the Rusa stela when they deal with Urzana's fleeing towards Assyria (Salvini 1984, p. 37; cf. Deller 1984, pp. 120 f.). Here, however, we shall have to point out that Urzana's flight towards Assyria is a precipitate departure, at least according to the Rusa stela, whereas according to ABL 891 the journey has been accurately planned; therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the two sources refer to two different events. Deller, by the way, connects ABL 891 with ABL 768 = Deller 5.2; according to this letter it would seem that Urzana has been invited to a visit with Sargon. His excuse is that frost has blocked the roads and that spring is not in sight. Later on, nevertheless, the journey was undertaken as appears from ABL 891 (Deller 1984, pp. 121 and 115 f.). It is clear that ABL 768, written in the spring, cannot be relevant with regard to Urzana's flight in the late summer of 714.

330 The information in ABL 381 = Deller 6.2 reads: "Der Urartäer(-König) befindet sich in Ṭuruṣpa (Ṭuṣpa) (und) bringt seine Opfer dar. Alle 'Statthalter' haben sich vor ihm (dort eingefunden)". Inasmuch as the same letter mentions Abaluqunu as being governor of Muṣāṣir, as already mentioned, it cannot very well pertain to any other time than the very weeks between the battle at Andaruta and the end of October when the Assyrians fell upon Muṣāṣir. Consequently, the Turushpa sojourn which is hinted at must have been Rusa's visit to the capital shortly after the defeat on Mt. Uaush in Gamir. When the letter tells us that "all" of the Urartian governors have presented themselves to the king in Turushpa, we would be inclined to draw the conclusion that this also applies to the governors who survived the battle in Gamir, which – according to ABL 197 – would mean eleven governors who escaped. Presumably, the Urartian governors had been summoned

the Urartian cities at Lake Urmia. About the same time, Šin-aḫ-ušur's troops must have completed the re-conquest of Uishdish and the fortified cities there, and Cimmerian troops are advancing from Man into Urartu. Rusa wishes to go to Uesi but hasn't yet departed, that is, undoubtedly, from the capital; but startled by the Cimmerian invasion, the newly appointed Uesi-governor sends Setini, his messenger, and other units to Urzana in order to solicit assistance. Also Sunâ, governor in front of the Ukkaeans, sends troops to Mušāšir. The invading Mannaean and Cimmerian troops are clearly the soldiers from the fortifications in Uishdish and constitute part of the Assyrian invasion of Urartu which is so vividly described in the Ashur Letter.

As we have mentioned, the messenger from the Uesi-governor requests assistance in Mušāšir. He tells of the fear felt by the Urartians faced with a Cimmerian invasion; the Urartians are assembling their troops and are considering taking measures against the enemy once the frost has taken a stronger grip.

At some point the king leaves Turushpa in order to go on to Uesi where the *turtānu* Kakkadanu has arrived with his troops on the 10 [+xth] *Ulūlu*, no doubt this means the army from Gamir,³³¹ together with Melarṭua. Upon the King's arrival in Uesi, Kakkadanu and two governors are imprisoned, surely as a result of their collaboration in the premature election of a king, and outside the fortress the newly-appointed king, Melarṭua, is killed, or executed, by the *rabūte*, presumably by order of the king.

by the king for consultation after the defeat and after the rebels had been arrested in Turushpa. But the particular purpose of the consultation might have been to account for the sudden appointment of Melarṭua as king. However, we know that Melarṭua and Kakkadanu, the *turtānu*, were both present in Uesi, and above (pp. 76 ff., Excursus) we advanced the hypothesis that it was the Gamir army which entered the fortress on the 10[+xth] of *Ulūlu* under Kakkadanu's command. With the evidence at our disposal it is, of course, not possible to make anything other than a qualified guess with regard to what became of the eleven governors who escaped and what their wanderings were once they had arrived in Urartu. But it would scarcely be unreasonable to assume that they became aware that Rusa was still very much alive and that they – at least the majority of them – left the army so as to join the king with all despatch – either summoned by himself, or with a view to confirming their loyalty to him. In so doing, they wished to separate themselves from the premature installing of Melarṭua as king, an act which could be interpreted as conspiracy or rebellion against Rusa. Kakkadanu and Melarṭua together with the two governors who were subsequently imprisoned together with the *turtānu*, entered Uesi together with the rest of the army.

331 Cf. the preceding note.

Bloodshed and rebellion are over, the country again at peace,³³² and the *rabūte* can return to their provinces, while Rusa receives Urzana, the latter's brother and son as well as a messenger from the Khubushkhian for an audience.

The Assyrian court seems disturbed at the interplay between Urzana and Rusa, and the *nāgir ekalli* sends a letter to the former, asking whether Rusa and his troops will be coming to Muṣāšir, and where is Rusa staying at the moment? He reminds Urzana that without permission given by the Assyrian king, no cultic ceremonies are to be performed in Muṣāšir. Urzana replies that Rusa is staying in Uesi, but that he will be coming to Muṣāšir. The governors Setini and Sunâ have arrived and are in the process of performing cultic ceremonies in the temple. The other governors will arrive later and do the same. Urzana emphasizes that there is no way for him to prevent the Urartian king from coming, just as he has had no way of deterring the Assyrian king from coming to Muṣāšir.

Eventually, Rusa is in a position to go to Muṣāšir, presumably at a time round the 1/10, and this time Urzana does not deny him access to the temple. On the contrary, with the participation of Rusa and the Urartians, Urzana is crowned before Haldia. Rusa remains in the city for about a fortnight, during which time he sacrifices and, each day, arranges for a banquet for the inhabitants of the city; also, he has the two Rusa-stelae in Topzawā and Mergeh Karvan executed in commemoration of his victory over the Assyrian vassal Urzana and the latter's coronation as a Urartian vassal-king. The purpose of Rusa's prolonged stay in Muṣāšir was scarcely to celebrate a well-deserved "holiday" after the hectic and dramatic days following in the wake of his defeat in Uishdish. Rather, it is likely that Rusa assembled his governors and their forces in Muṣāšir to keep at a distance while the Assyrian, Mannaean and Cimmerian combined troops invaded and ravaged the southern parts of his country where, incidentally, i. a., they bypassed the Uesi-fortress,³³³ the reason being – as the Uesi-governor wrote to Urzana – that they might then take strong measures against the invading army once the winter cold had taken hold.

332 Aššur-rēšūja's message in ABL 197 to the effect that the country is at peace may, at first sight, appear slightly peculiar when viewed in connexion with the panic-stricken Urartian reaction over the Cimmerian invasion (ABL 112). But clearly Aššur-rēšūja's remark aims at the preceding bloodshed among the Urartians, and it says: internal unrest and revolt have now ceased to exist.

333 The Ashur Letter, ll. 298-305.

But in case this was Rusa's intention, his plan was thwarted. Sargon has been informed of Urzana's defection and of the alliance between him and Rusa, and about the 24/10 he suddenly decides to march upon Mušāšir. Whether Sargon was personally present in this march, cannot be determined. After it has been shown that there is no reason whatsoever to rely on the description, as offered by the Ashur Letter, of his personal participation on Mt. Uaush, we tend to leave the question of Sargon's presence in Mušāšir an open question. One thing is certain: the city is attacked, plundered, the population deported, and shortly after these events Rusa dies, presumably by his own hand.³³⁴

334 In the epistolary material preserved we find an amount of reports which may well have belonged to that period of the year 714 dealt with here. For a variety of reasons, particularly the very fragmentary condition in which we find many of them, they cannot be utilised forthwith, and in most cases it would be precarious to determine where, in the period discussed, they should be placed and furthermore whether they have any bearing on these particular events rather than pertaining to earlier incidents. Cf. especially ABL 101 = Deller 6.4 (cf. Lanfranchi 1983, p. 127 note 18; Salvini 1984, p. 39 with notes 162, 164 and 166); ABL 145 = Deller 6.5 (cf. Salvini 1984, pp. 39, 162 and 166); ABL 148; ABL 215 = Deller 3.2 (cf. Salvini 1984, pp. 35 with note 144 and 48 with note 208). ABL 491; ABL 596 = Deller 6.7; ABL 1048 = Deller 6,9; CT 53, 99 = Deller 1.5; ND 2453 = Deller 4.4 (cf. Salvini 1984, p. 39); ND 2463 = Deller 4.3 (cf. Fales 1983, pp. 42 f.; Salvini 1984, 39). Note also ABL 590: "Sania, the city ruler, against (*itti*) Kakkadani I sent, etc." (cf. Diakonoff's translation of *itti* with "*vers, auprès de*" in Follet 1957, p. 70). Apparently Sania was the city ruler in ^{URU}A-i-ra, and in CT 53, 918 (Deller 1984, p. 118) he is mentioned together with Urzana. For the term *bēl āli* (city ruler), see Malbran-Labat 1982, pp. 135-137. ABL 492 and 444 = Deller 2.2 and 2.3 belong to the spring, presumably the spring of the year 714 (cf. Lanfranchi 1983, pp. 132 f. and 136). Cf. also ABL 123 (which cannot be earlier than from the 20th of the month of *Abu*). It seems that Salvini suspects that some kind of alliance existed between Urartu and Khubushkia during the show-down which took place between Rusa and the Assyrians (Salvini 1984, p. 40), when he refers to ABL 197, 515 and CT 53, 54 = Deller 3.3. Khubushkia is also mentioned in ABL 441 = Deller 4.1. (The letter contains the date 20th *Dūzu*.) Further, ABL 1083 = Deller 3.6 (cf. Salvini 1984, p. 41, 46-48); ABL 1298; ND 1107 = Deller 2.5 = Postgate 243 (cf. above, note 328; cf. Salvini 1984, pp. 40 note 172 and p. 42.)

Chapter III: The Cimmerians, and where they came from

It is, by now, quite clear who the Cimmerians were *not*, and from where they did *not* come. It was not a question of “von Norden her eingedrungene Völkerscharen”³³⁵ nor “aggressive horsemen and plundering hordes of warriors” pouring “like a stream of lava down the southern slopes of the Caucasus”.³³⁶ The Cimmerians were not a South Russian group of nomads or tribes from the steppes, and they invaded neither Urartu from the north, nor did they appear as a wave of people as has so far been a common conception.³³⁷ On the contrary, they came from the south in the year 714, from Uishdish in Man, where they constituted the Assyrian forces in the Mannaeen fortresses along the border. Sargon had re-conquered the fortresses from Rusa in 715, when he placed them under direct Assyrian control and placed an Assyro-Mannaeen garrison there. In accordance with usual Assyrian procedure, the Assyrian com-

335 Rolle 1977, p. 297.

336 Ghirshman 1954, p. 97.

337 Cf., e. g., Winckler 1892, p. 268; Maspéro 1899, p. 238; Burney und Lang 1973, pp. 318 ff. Burney and Lang, as we have mentioned above (p. 23 with note 83), unjustifiedly assume that we are dealing with *two* Urartian defeats as against the Cimmerians, one at the time of Rusa I and a second at the time of his son Argishti II in the year 707, and with regard to the reign of the latter, they state, “In dieser Epoche sah sich Urartu in ganz besonderem Mass in Auseinandersetzungen mit den Kimmeriern verwickelt, die immer wieder aus den Steppen jenseits des Kaukasus einbrachen und brennend und mordend durch weite Gebiete des Königsreiches zogen” (Burney und Lang 1973, pp. 319 f.). Contrary to what we might have been led to believe off-hand, Burney and Lang are not in possession of any kind of source material to support this concept of repeated Cimmerian raids into Urartu. There are no sources with regard to Cimmerian relations with Urartu at the time of Rusa I and his son other than those which we have used in the preceding chapter. – An exception from “the common monolithic portrait” of the Cimmerians “as a fierce barbaric horde” is to be found, however, in Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, pp. 11 f., note 5, where they write: “In general, it appears increasingly probable that the Gimirrāyu-Cimmerians may have to be subjected to a ‘de-mythologizing’ historical reading as regards the judgements passed upon them by ‘ruling’ peoples of the ancient Near East”. Cf. above, p. 92.

plement was not made up of native Assyrians but of soldiers brought in from among foreigners, in this case, Cimmerians. The Cimmerian troops took part in the invasion of Urartu by the Assyrian army, and we must conclude that they had already fought Rusa when, shortly before the battle on Mt. Uaush, he conquered all of Uishdish and her fortresses there.³³⁸ “The Land of the Cimmerians” (Gamir) has turned out to be situated in the Mannaeen district, Uishdish, on the Urartian frontier, this being the earliest seat of the Cimmerians of which we have any knowledge. The first time this people appears in our sources, they are in the service of the Assyrians.

As we have seen, it is not only in the years 715-714 that the Cimmerians are enlisted in the Assyrian army. The next time when, with certainty, we encounter this people in our sources³³⁹ is in the year 679 at the time of Esarhaddon when they have given their name to an Assyrian military unit known as the *kišir Gimirai*.³⁴⁰ So, at that time there are still Cimmerians who are loyal to the Assyrian king and are in his pay. But otherwise, the Cimmerians stand out more characteristically as hostile towards the Assyrians. According to the divination questions put by Esarhaddon to the god Shamash, they appear in the Zagros region where, so it seems, they ally themselves with Mannaeans, Medes, indeed with Scythians, in constellations when Dusanni of Saparda and Kashartitu of Karkašši are frequently involved and appear to have been the leaders.³⁴¹ Teushpa, a Cimmerian chieftain, is defeated by Esarhaddon ab. 679 in Khubushna (= Ҳупишна), a city in Khubushkia.³⁴² Allied with Rusa II of Urartu, they threaten the Shubria area;³⁴³ whether their attack against Phrygia ab. 696/695 or 676³⁴⁴ is also a result of this alliance with Urartu, as it has sometimes been claimed,³⁴⁵ is possible but cannot be verified with certainty. According to Herodotus, at some point of time the Cimmerians are supposed to have settled near to what was later Sinope.³⁴⁶ At the time of Ashurbanipal they exercised hegemony over Syria (657 B. C.).³⁴⁷ They threaten and attack Lydia where, under the leadership of the Cimmerian chieftain Dugdamme (Lygdamis) Sardis is conquered and Gyges killed. Greek coastal cities along the Aegean Sea are plundered, but when Dugdamme threatens the Assyrian border, he is defeated by Ashurbanipal and, according to Strabo, dies in Cilicia (ab. 640).³⁴⁸ According to Herodotus, at the time of the Lydian king Alyattes the Cimmerians are supposed to have been expelled from Asia Minor.³⁴⁹ Cimmerian place-names in Scythia and elsewhere show that they have been far afield,³⁵⁰ just as the designation *Kamir* for Cappadocia could

favour an assumption that, at some time, the Cimmerians settled there, long enough for the name to have survived into the following millennium.³⁵¹

338 Cf. Chapter II, Section 4.

339 Between 714 and 679 we have no information which can with any certainty be assumed to relate to the Cimmerians. Assumptions of a Cimmerian threat against Phrygia in 709 (Barnett and Hawkins in CAH III, 1982, pp. 356 and 420 f; Labat in the Fischer Weltgeschichte 4, 1967, p. 66; Saggs 1962, p. 117), in my opinion, are based on guesswork without any solid evidence. – The thesis about Sargon's death in battle against the Cimmerians in Tabal in 705 (cf., i. a., Barnett and Hawkins in the CAH III, 1982, pp. 356 and 422; cf. Saggs 1962, pp. 117 f.) is based on an uncertain identification of *Eshpai*, the *Kulummean* in the Eponym Chronicle as being a Cimmerian tribal leader and on the assumption that ABL 473 were to be dated at the time of Sargon's death. Tadmor is not convinced by the argument (Tadmor 1958, p. 97). As for ABL 473, see also below, note 424.

Nor is it certain that the dating by Eusebius regarding the Cimmerian attack on Phrygia (Gordium) and of the death of Midas to the year 696/95 is reliable; quite possibly, this event belongs rather about the year 676 (Jeffery in the CAH III, 1982, p. 832; Houwink ten Cate in the Fischer Weltgeschichte 4, 1967, p. 131; Cozzoli 1968, pp. 81 f.). For a dating to ab. 676, see, i. a., Lehmann-Haupt 1921, cols. 413 f.; Adontz 1946, p. 293; Grousset 1947, p. 60; Azarpay 1968, p. 61; Kammenhuber 1969, col. 210; id., 1976-1980, p. 594. Cf. the dating of the attack on Phrygia to 696/695 as advanced by, i. a., Bryce 1983, p. 145; Barnett and Hawkins in the CAH III, 1982, pp. 356, 422 and 429; Labat in the Fischer Weltgeschichte 4, 1967, p. 78.

340 Cf. above, p. 90.

341 Cf. Barnett 1982, p. 368, and further, below.

342 Borger 1956, Klch. A, ll. 18-19; Nin. A III, ll. 43-46; AsBb E., ll. 1-2; Mnm. B., ll. 23-24; cf. Grayson 1975, p. 125 with comment; Hawkins 1982, p. 427; Levine, articles *Hubuškia* and *Hubišna* B 1972-1975, pp. 479 and 500 f.; Læssøe 1959, pp. 154 f., l. 33. See also Culican 1965, p. 49.

343 Knudtzon 1893, No. 48; Yusifov 1982, p. 351; van Loon 1966, p. 21; Piotrovskij 1967, p. 12; id. 1966, p. 337.

344 Cf. above, note 339.

345 Wiseman 1958, p. 10; Diakonoff 1961, p. 598; Riemschneider 1965, pp. 119 f.; Azarpay 1968, p. 61. Cf. Barnett 1982, p. 361.

346 Her. IV:12; van Loon 1966, p. 20.

347 Parpola 1983, pp. 307 f. and 375 ff.

348 Hawkins 1982, p. 432; Yusifov 1982, p. 353; Millard 1979, p. 121; id. 1968, pp. 109 f.; Cogan and Tadmor 1977, pp. 80 f. with note 26, p. 84; Kammenhuber 1976-1980, pp. 594 f.; van Loon 1966, pp. 20 f. Cf. the discussion concerning the dating of the death of Gyges in Lehmann-Haupt 1921, cols. 414 ff. (652); Cogan and Tadmor 1977, pp. 78 f., note 25, and 84 (ab. 650); Spalinger 1977, pp. 400 ff. (644).

349 Her. I:16. See Lehmann-Haupt 1921, cols. 420 f.; Cozzoli 1968, p. 107; Kammenhuber 1976-1980, p. 595; Hawkins 1982, p. 433.

350 Cf. above, pp. 8 and 12.

351 Cf. above, p. 13.

We shall not in this context attempt to anticipate future and far more penetrating studies and revaluations of the Cimmerian people and its history in the time after 714.³⁵² It would not be possible, at this juncture, to delve further into this question. We shall have to limit ourselves to adding some remarks to the thesis propounded by Herodotus concerning the North-Pontian Cimmerians and to the notion of the Cimmerian people as barbarian hordes sweeping across the Near East, and in conclusion, we shall ask *who*, in fact, the Cimmerians were.

Viewing the thesis that the Scythians dislodged the Cimmerians from the North-Pontian areas on the basis of our present knowledge of the earliest known whereabouts of the Cimmerians, we cannot dismiss a suspicion that Greek tradition has in fact turned facts topsy-turvy. Herodotus and his informants were ignorant of the presence of Cimmerians in the Zagros region at the time of Sargon and Esarhaddon, and apart from legend, they depended on the tradition concerning their invasion of Asia Minor in the 7th century, and had some knowledge of Cimmerian place-names in what was then Scythia. Consequently, they were drawn to the conclusion that the Cimmerians had resided there before the Scythians and prior to their assault upon Anatolia, when in fact the situation was precisely the opposite: the Cimmerians came from the south, and from Man and the Zagros they moved westward into Asia Minor and, at a given time, also north, to the North-Pontian area – as did, incidentally, the Scythians. The latter people arrived in Scythia in the second half or at the end of the 7th century as evidenced by the earliest archaeological remains of them and of their culture north of the Black Sea. Their route from the northern border of Urartu to the Pontian steppes can be followed very closely owing to archaeological material; likewise, the conquest and destruction of strongly fortified Urartian citadels as, e. g., Karmir-blur, at the beginning of the 6th century, has been connected with the “return” of the Scythians to the area north of the Black Sea, a “return” which supposedly took place in waves.³⁵³ In other words, they must have reached the area shortly before or around the time when the Medes are said to have got rid of the Scythians, and the Lydian king Alyattes of the Cimmerians.³⁵⁴ The whole confusion concerning these two groups of people who seem inclined to operate in the same geographical zones,³⁵⁵ and whose names seem to be interchangeable already in the Assyrian sources,³⁵⁶ clearly contributed to the circumstance that Greek tradition had no shadow of a chance to distinguish which realities lay behind the presence of Scythians and Cimmerians in Scythia, nor could it have been

acquainted with the historical background which could have explained Cimmerian place-names there.

The primary operational area used by the Cimmerians, and so their proper home at the time of Sargon II and Esarhaddon, was obviously the Zagros, including Media.³⁵⁷ When they make their first appearance in history, in the years 715-714, they reside in Uishdish in Man, in Daiaukku's former fief, and still in 675 they play a decisive rôle with regard to the possibility for the Assyrians to take a military stand in

352 Cf. the quote from Fales and Lanfranchi 1981, above p. 92.

353 Barnett 1982, p. 364; Rolle 1977, particularly pp. 307 ff.; cf. pp. 299 f. Cf. also id., 1968, p. 19, where an unambiguous archaeological demonstration of the presence of Scythians north of the Black Sea is dated to the end of the 7th or the beginning of the 6th centuries; see also van Loon 1966, pp. 24 f. – Cf. Leskov 1974, p. 57: “Die Zahl der Importerzeugnisse ist jedoch in den frühskythischen Kurganen vom Ende des 7.-6. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. noch gering. Wodurch charakterisiert sich die eigentliche skythische Kultur jener Zeit? Wir möchten uns hier den Kurganen der Schwarzmeersteppen zuwenden. Hier finden wir das vielleicht grösste Rätsel der skythischen Archäologie. Es erwies sich, dass sich in den Schwarzmeersteppen höchstens 20 Gräber aus der Zeit zwischen dem 7. und dem 6. Jahrhundert befinden”. In the southern Cherson area and on the eastern part of the Crimea, in the years between 1961 and 1972, 400 Kurganes with more than 1200 graves from various periods were examined, but out these only three were datable to the 6th century B. C. – Further, cf. Farhas 1970, p. 20: “On the basis of the Ziviye objects and the earliest Scythian burials in the north-west Caucasus and the Pontic steppes, Soviet and western scholars now generally regard Scythian art as a Near Eastern creation of the late seventh century B. C. Scythians, fleeing northward at the end of the seventh century B. C., brought to the Pontic region Near Eastern objects and perhaps craftsmen”.

354 Cf. Frye 1984, p. 72; Hawkins 1982, pp. 433; van Loon 1966, pp. 24 f.; Rolle 1977, pp. 299 f.; Sulimirski 1978, p. 29.

355 See, i. a., Yusifov 1982, pp. 349 ff.; Knudtzon 1893, No. 25. – Besides, note Xenophon's reference to the city of *Gymnias* (*Gymrias*?) in the country of the Scythenians. The city could be identical with “the Armenian Kumayri (later Gumri/ Alexandropol/ Leninakan)” and would, in that case, suggest “that the Scythenians, themselves, had replaced an earlier Cimmerian enclave in the same region” (Hewsen 1983, p. 134).

356 Yusifov 1982, p. 352; van Loon 1966, p. 16; Diakonoff 1961, p. 607; Zgusta 1955, p. 18; Yamauchi 1982, pp. 98 f.; Burney und Lang 1973, pp. 333 f.; cf. Spalinger 1978, p. 405 note 30. See also Frye 1965, p. 265 note 27: “The terms for the nomadic invaders are sometimes misleading. It would seem that the Assyrians and Babylonians used the name ‘Cimmerian’ for all of the nomads from South Russia and Central Asia, as the Greeks used ‘Scythian’ and the Persians ‘Saka’, but Dyakonov's suggestion that all three terms should be equated cannot be wholly valid”. The term *Ummān-manda*, it seems, can be used indiscriminately about Cimmerians, Scythians as well as of Medes (Frye 1984, pp. 70 f.).

357 Cf. Yusifov 1982, pp. 349 ff.

Man.³⁵⁸ Allied, as it seems, with Mannaeans and/or Medes, Sapardaeans and Scythians, primarily, as far as we can judge, under the leadership of Kashtaritu of Karkašši, at the time of Esarhaddon they threaten, i. a., the city of Suba (probably in Saparda), Kishassu in Media and Bit Hamban, and they conquer a city near Ellipi.³⁵⁹ For mere chronological reasons it seems quite unlikely, on the other hand, that the united Median/Cimmerian/Scythian forces under Kashtaritu could have “carried off Ariaramna’s gold-tablet inscription to the important Median center of Ecbatana”³⁶⁰ – but one is quite prepared to believe that Kashtaritu’s sway could have had a particular connexion with Ecbatana.³⁶¹ In a fragmentary letter from Esarhaddon to Shamash there is a reference to “the Cimmerian troops” and the name Ahsiri, which probably covers the Mannaeian king known by this name. Unhappily, the letter is too fragmentary for us to determine how the association between the Cimmerians and the Mannaeian king was.³⁶² But from all evidence available it seems that the area where the Cimmerians operated comprised a territory from Man in the north to Ellipi in the south, including Median cities towards the east.

Undoubtedly, it is from this core that their operations to the north and north-west emanate. The Cimmerian chieftain Teushpa, “whose home is far off” (and whose name has been connected with Teispes, the name for certain Iranian chieftains), in 679 invades Khubushkia, to the north-west a neighbouring country to Man,³⁶³ and it is not a far-fetched conclusion that he stems from the area which has just been described.³⁶⁴ Dugdamme, king of Sacae and Qutians, undertakes incursions into Anatolia where he attacks Lydia and Aegean cities. He establishes an alliance with the king of Tabal and threatens the borders of Assyria (ab. 652-640).³⁶⁵ Like the name Teushpa, also the names of Dugdamme and his son Shandakshatru have been interpreted as being Iranian, and as far as the latter is concerned, with greater certainty than with regard to the former two.³⁶⁶ Dugdamme certainly came from the Zagros because Qutian (Gutium) is beyond any question the term used for the people who live, e. g., in Man.³⁶⁷ The Cimmerians have also coöperated with the Urartians, but whether this collaboration has been more than the threat against Shubria and also included the attack against Phrygia, must, as we have mentioned, remain an open question. We may note that, in spite of the fact that the Cimmerians perform in the Zagros already in 715/714, it is only at the time of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal that we are informed of “raids” into Asia Minor, that is, the attacks against the Phrygian realm, later on against Lydia and the Aegean cities – all this on the assumption

that the dating of the onslaught on Phrygia to the year (ca.) 696 has to be rejected in favour of a date ab. 676. As we have seen, Esarhaddon's battle with Teushpa took place not in the Tabal-area, but in Khubushkia.

As we have stated, it has not been possible, nor has it been the intention with this outline to undertake a penetrating investigation of the

358 Cf. above, pp. 91 f. – It is a matter of wonder why there are no accounts which can with any degree of certainty be referred to the Cimmerians in the period between 714 and 679 (cf. above, note 339). See also Smith in the CAH III, 1965, p. 59; Phillips 1972, p. 131. Part of the explanation may have to do with the fact that Sennacherib's archive in Nineveh has not been found (cf. Böhl 1953, p. 390; Fales 1983, pp. 5 f.; Parpola 1981, pp. 120 f. note 3). We should not overlook, however, the possibility that as long as the Assyrian grip on Man was intact, then for that length of time they also held sway of the Cimmerian troops stationed there. Most likely, it was not until this begins to fail that the Cimmerians desert their former masters and join the Mannaeans and the Medes in their fight against the Assyrian realm. Frye is of the opinion that the entire Mannaeian territory was most likely lost to Assyria by 673 B. C. (Frye 1965, p. 72; cf. Levine 1973, p. 43,).

359 Klauber 1913, Nos. 4, 7, 8, 22, 38; Knudtzon 1893, Nos. 1, 6, 23 + 75, 24, 25, 109. Also, i. a., Barnett 1982, p. 358; Sulimirski 1978, p. 19; Kammenhuber 1976-1980, p. 594; Cozzoli 1968, pp. 98 f.; Meade 1968, p. 131; Piotrovskij 1966, pp. 337 f.; Culican 1965, p. 46; Olmstead 1923, pp. 359 ff. For the location of Kishassu/Kishesim in Media, see Barnett 1982, p. 358 note 323; Reade 1978, p. 140 with Fig. 2; Knudtzon 1893, p. 75; cf. Levine 1972, pp. 31 f. See also below, note 390.

360 Culican 1965 p. 50.

361 Frye 1965, p. 72; but see also Helm 1981, p. 86 and, further, below note 371.

362 Knudtzon 1893, No. 24; Yusifov 1982, p. 352.

363 Heidel 1956, p. 15; Borger 1956, Nin. A III, l. 43. For a discussion of Teushpa's name, see Kammenhuber 1976-1980, p. 596; Cozzoli 1968, p. 74; Culican 1965, p. 49; Werner 1961, p. 132; Zgusta 1955, pp. 16 ff. As for the question of Khubushkia being a neighbouring state to Man, see Knudtzon 1893, No. 35; Yusifov 1982, p. 351, and also above, pp. 49 f. with note 185.

364 Note also the interpretation advanced by Lewy 1925, p. 4 with note 5.

365 Cf. the references above in note 348. For an alliance with Tabal, see Hawkins 1982, p. 432; Cogan and Tadmor 1977, pp. 80 f. and 84; Cozzoli 1968, p. 74.

366 Cf. the reference above in note 363.

367 Yusifov 1982, p. 353; cf. p. 351; Cogan and Tadmor 1977, p. 80 note 26. Here, by the way, the reading *šad-da'-a-a-u* is preferred as against Thompson's *sak-a-a*. See Thompson 1933, pp. 88 f., l. 146. Cf. Hallo 1957-1971: in the first millennium B. C. Gutium was a vague notion "and referred to all or part of the Transtigridian land", and it was merely just one of several other terms used as a designation for this area. Cf. also Parpola 1970, p. 138; Reade 1978, p. 143. For the identity of Mannaeian-Gutian, see Heidel 1956, p. 17; van Loon 1966, p. 16 note 72. For the use of *Guti* as a designation for Urartians and in connexion with Sargon's decision to march against Mušāšir, see Oppenheim 1960, p. 138.

movements of the Cimmerians after 714 B. C. Yet, it is difficult to reject that a new and different picture than that which has been commonly accepted begins to emerge – a truth different from the one otherwise adopted concerning the Cimmerian people and their conduct not only in 714, but also during the following century. Everything indicates that we are dealing with a people specifically connected with the Zagros and with the Medes. A people at first in the service of the Assyrian kings, but subsequently – at least from the 670's onwards – allied now with Median chiefs, now with the king of Urartu or Tabal, and possibly also with the king of the Mannaeans. At one time they held the hegemony of Syria; one of their kings, Dugdamme, concluded a non-aggression pact with Ashurbanipal, but broke it,³⁶⁸ and at one point some of their members settled, i. a., in Cappadocia; others arrived all the way to the regions north of the Black Sea. Even if the expeditions into Asia Minor may look like predatory raids,³⁶⁹ which they possibly were, it would not be correct to describe the behaviour of the Cimmerians, in general terms, as “migrations of a people” or the invasion of “barbarian hordes”, at least not at that time. If we consider the time of Sargon and Esarhaddon when, primarily, they appear to move within or near the Zagros territories, we are evidently dealing with military operations carried out in full agreement and in alliance with the rulers of the time. The entry by the Cimmerians into Urartu from Man in the year 714, in connexion with Sargon's 8th campaign, is a clear indication that there was nothing irregular in their conduct, nothing deviating from the norms of warfare as it was at the time, nor anything particularly “barbarian” about them. They were Assyrian soldiers, were under Assyrian command, and were naturally subjected to the rules governing Assyrian warfare. When Diakonoff asserts that the Cimmerians assaulted Urartu, “wo sie alles, was sie vorfanden, verheerten und vernichteten”,³⁷⁰ then this statement is based on pure guesswork. There are no sources which inform us of the conduct of the Cimmerians in Urartu. Yet, in a way Diakonoff is right because, although unknown to him, the Cimmerians were part of the Assyrian army which invaded Urartu in the late summer of 714 and, according to the Ashur Letter, performed exactly as described by Diakonoff.

368 Lehmann-Haupt 1921, col. 417; Cogan and Tadmor 1977, p. 84.

369 Cf., i. a., Diakonoff 1961, p. 607.

370 Diakonoff 1961, p. 596.

So, the Cimmerians were at home in the Zagros region and in Media, but *who* were they, in fact? Before trying to answer this question, it is tempting to take a closer look at whom they succeeded in the fortresses in Uishdish in 715, and then let this investigation wind up with a thesis, or a supposition as I would prefer to call it, which would immediately present and illuminate the following explanation of the origin of the Cimmerians – without constituting its premises. This has to be emphasized so as to preclude misunderstandings which might otherwise arise.

It fell to the Cimmerians to succeed the governor Daiaukku in the fortified cities of Uishdish. According to most scholars, Daiaukku would be identical with the Deioces mentioned by Herodotus, Deioces being the founder of the Median Royal House as well as the founder of Ecbatana. According to the Greek historian he was the father of Phraortes, by many identified with Kashtaritu of the Assyrian sources. Behind the Assyrian form, Kashtaritu, is the Iranian Kshathrita which is supposed to be the throne-name of Phraortes, signifying “possessing a kingdom”. By the way, according to Herodotus Phraortes was supposed to be the father of Cyaxares, the Median king. As we have seen, Daiaukku/Deioces also appeared as a Mannaean governor, and in 716 he replaced Bagdatti in Uishdish, but in the following year surrendered the 12/22 fortresses in that district to Rusa of Urartu, simultaneously leaving his son to the latter as a hostage. When Sargon intervened that same year, Daiaukku was captured, and he and his family were deported to Hamath in Syria.³⁷¹

371 Besides above, p. 49 and Her. I:96-103, cf. especially Barnett 1982, p. 358; Frye 1984, pp. 69 f., 74 f.; id. 1965, pp. 70 ff.; Culican 1965, pp. 43 ff.; Ghirshman 1954, pp. 94 ff.; König 1934, p. 27 and 29 ff.; Olmstead 1923, pp. 243 and 245. Against this, Boehmer 1964, p. 15 note 28 and Helm 1981, pp. 85 ff., *et al.*, rejected the idea of an identity between the Daiaukku, the Mannaean governor of the annals, and the Deioces, the Median chieftain mentioned by Herodotus; Labat, also, expressed very serious doubts with regard to the identity between Kashtaritu and Phraortes (Labat 1961, pp. 1 ff.). Helm flatly rejects that Kashtaritu was a Mede in the first place, and that he were in any way related to Daiaukku (Helm 1981, pp. 85 ff.). This is not the place to discuss the Median list of kings; it would take us too far afield. But disregarding this element of uncertainty it does seem likely that historians who maintain that not only was Daiaukku governor of Man, but that he was also a chieftain in Media and identical with the Deioces of Herodotus, are right. Daiaukku of Uishdish was undoubtedly the same person as “Daiku of Shaparda” in Media in 716 (the Najafehabad stela, cf. Levine 1972, p. 41, l. 47) and Dasukku in ABL 174. It seems that he was also involved in the unrests in the Harhar-province in the years 716-715; cf. further below. Helm has not taken Daiaukku’s appearance in the Najafehabad stela from 716, nor ABL 174 into consideration, but it cannot be denied that these two sources drastically

However, Daiaukku's "offences" towards Sargon were much more far-reaching than the annals lead us to assume, because by all accounts, at the time when he was conspiring with Rusa, he was also involved in the uprisings in the Harhar-district in the years 716-715. Daiaukku's territorial interests and possessions were not limited to Uishdish or, as Herodotus will have it, to Ecbatana,³⁷² but also included Shaparda in Media; this is apparent from Sargon's Najafehabad stela from 716 which

change the image of the Mannaeen governor, as will be accounted for in the sequel. When it can be rendered probable that Daiaukku was a Median chieftain and identical with Deioeces, then there is no immediate reason to doubt, at least not so far, that he was the ancestor of the Median royal family and therefore, if not father of Phraortes, then one of his forebears. We cannot, as mentioned, decide at this point which consequences the identity between Daiaukku and Deioeces would entail with regard to an assumed identity between Kashtaritu and Phraortes, nor the question of a family relationship between Kashtaritu and Daiaukku. For the time being, let us leave the possibility open that a kinship exists between Daiaukku and Kashtaritu. For reasons of chronology one would hesitate to accept that Kashtaritu could have been a son of Daiaukku's; a descendant would seem more likely (cf. Helm 1981, p. 85). Various successors of Daiaukku's have been proposed. Thus, Adontz had an idea that a Median chieftain of Karkasia (= Karkašši) at the time of Sargon (ARAB II:192) might have been Daiaukku's successor and preceded Kashtaritu (Adontz 1946, pp. 303 ff.). König, on the other hand, suggested that Uksatar (Greek Cyaxares) succeeded Daiaukku in Bit Daiukku (König 1938, Article Bit-Daiukku/i, p. 38). However, the idea that a country by this name existed is due to a misunderstanding (cf. below, note 372). Uksatar is mentioned in the Ashur Letter, l. 42, and also in ABL 645 in connexion with the country Šaparda (Fales 1983, nr. II:9); whether he was a chieftain there is not immediately clear. In Shaparda itself, at any rate, Daiaukku had been succeeded by Darî who is mentioned in 714 (cf. the Ashur Letter, l. 47). – When Helm disputes whether Kashtaritu was a Mede in the first place, his argument suffers somewhat when we remember that Fravartish (Phraortes), the Median rebel who lived at the time of Dareios and is mentioned in the Behistân Inscription claimed, "I am Khshathrita, of the family of Cyaxares." Helm says himself: "It is significant that in 522 B. C. the rebel Phraortes could hope to rally support among the Medes by invoking the name of Khshathrita (Assyrian 'Kashtaritu'). Within less than 150 years this historical Zagros prince [Kashtaritu in Esarhaddon's omens], who was apparently no Mede at all, seems to have become a legendary name by which Medes could conjure" (Helm 1981, p. 87). We must object for the simple reason that he would scarcely have become a legendary person if he had not been of Median descent, and if he hadn't rallied the Medes to a rebellion against the Assyrians, just as it is commonly assumed.

372 The idea that there was a country named after Daiaukku, to wit, Bit-Daiaukku (ARAB II:23; also still König 1938, Art. Bit-Daiukku, p. 38; cf. Helm 1981, p. 89 notes 20 and 9), according to Lie goes back to Winckler's misreading of Sargon's annals from 713. Where Winckler read [^{mât}Bit]-Da-a-a-uk-ki, Lie would read [^{mât}Ma]-da-a-a (the land of the Medes); see Lie 1929, pp. 28 f., l. 166 with note 18; Helm 1981, p. 86.

mentions “Daiku of Shaparda”.³⁷³ Shaparda was one of the countries which, according to the annals, had been conquered by Sargon in 716 after the rebellion in Harhar, and together with five other countries it was placed under the jurisdiction of Harhar which now changed its name to Kār-Sharrukīn. At the time when Harhar was conquered, Sargon had deportees from other countries which he had subdued settle there, placing his official as governor of the city. Already in the following year (715), however, revolts broke out in the countries which had just been associated with the Harhar-province, among them Shaparda and also in Bit Sangi which is not mentioned during the previous year; and again Sargon took the matter in hand and suppressed the insurgents.³⁷⁴

Evidently, Shaparda and Daiaukku have been involved in the events in the Harhar-province in the years 716-715, both years in direct confrontation with the Assyrian king. When reading the annals and the Sargon stela, it is not clear whether the causes of the confrontation in 716 had any connexion with the revolt in Harhar itself which, at the time, appears to have lasted for four years.³⁷⁵ But inasmuch as the Assyrian king feels induced to subduing the countries in question and placing them under the newly-appointed Assyrian governor and garrison in Harhar, they, and therefore also Daiaukku, have scarcely been entirely out of touch with this conflict. As for Daiaukku, this impression may be confirmed in

373 Cf. Levine 1972, p. 41 ll. 47 and 48. Shaparda which is mentioned in the Najafehabad Stela, l. 47, is in Media (cf. Levine 1972, p. 29: “From line 46 to the end of the narrative of the campaign, some 24 lines, we have a detailed description of a march through Median territory”). The country is close to Harhar. Levine was of the opinion that Harhar was at the border of western Median territory (Levine 1974, pp. 116 f., 118 with note 153); a more recent investigation has shown that the city should be placed in Media (Reade 1978, pp. 140 f.). – According to Levine it is uncertain whether Daiaukku of the annals and Daiku of the stela are one and the same person. Yet, in favour of the identity – apart from the similarity of names and the assumed identity between Daiaukku and Deioces, the Median chieftain mentioned by Herodotus – would seem to be the circumstance that the chieftain of Shaparda, who paid tribute, already two years later, in the year 714 during Sargon’s campaign, was no longer Daiku but *Darī of Saparda* (Ashur Letter, l. 47). It would be a natural assumption that Darī succeeded Daiaukku in 715 when the latter was deported.

374 Lie 1929, ll. 96-100 and 109-111. For Bit Sangi, cf. below, note 379.

375 Cf. the Najafehabad Stela from the year 716, ll. 41 ff.:

“41. At that time, the Harharites, submissive to Ashur, performers of corvée [...

“42. their city chiefs they drove off. Horses, their tribute, they held back for four years. They strengthened their walls, and against ...

“43. ... I defeated them, etc.” (Levine 1972, pp. 38 ff.).

a different way (ABL 174) although in this context, it is difficult to unravel the rôle played by him in precise terms.³⁷⁶ The fact that it is not only the country of Shaparda but also Daiaukku, its chief, which have to submit to Assyrian supremacy in 716 appears from the stela dated in that

376 The Assyrian sources offer us three versions of the reasons why Sargon intervened in Harhar in 716. According to the annals the people of Harhar had expelled Kibaba, their mayor, and sent a message to Talta of Ellipi to pay homage (Lie 1929, ll. 96-97). The Najafehabad Stela informs us that, in 716, the Harharites had driven away their city chiefs – that is to say, not only Kibaba – and that for four years they had withheld their tribute to the Assyrians (Levine 1972, pp. 38 ff., ll. 41-42). Against this, however, the Display Inscription informs us that it was Kibaba himself, the governor of Harhar which Sargon besieged and captured, and which, “together with the people of his (Kibaba’s) land”, he counted as spoil (ARAB II: 57). It would be tempting to guess that in this case the latter version contains a core of truth although, in general, it is less reliable than the annals. Kibaba, too, is an acquaintance from ABL 174 where he appears under the name Kibakashshe (?) or Kibabishe (RCAE III, p. 73, comment on ABL 174), and he is clearly in opposition to the Assyrians. Kibaba/Kibakashshe is not isolated but allied with a certain *Dasukku*, a name which according to Waterman must be regarded as a misread form of Daiaukku (RCAE III, p. 73 f., comment on ABL 174). [*The author would like to point out that whenever the name *Dasukku is mentioned in the following, it should be taken for granted that it is meant to represent the name Daiaukku*]. The letter is addressed to Sargon and written by Marduksharusur; in Waterman’s translation, it starts with a quote from a message delivered orally by a messenger, so it seems, to Kibakashshe and Dasukku: “The king has given the land of Ellipa to me and the land of Shungibutu to Marduksharusur. It is established. Your cities are taken away. If you make any attempt to attack (them) or try to overthrow (them) shall I not retaliate?” After this manner he spoke before the people of the land. Now Kibakashshe and Dasukku have summoned a hundred horsemen. They constantly go before *them*. The king my lord they rival...” (Waterman’s translation; but for obv. 14-17, cf., however, Meier 1939, p. 305 and Deller 1961, p. 350). The remaining part of the letter is in a poor state of preservation, but we do note the reference to Ashpabari (Ishpabara), son of Talta of Ellipi (RCAE III, p. 213 with comments on No. 645); the latter seems to have been involved with Kibakashshe and Dasukku.

It is difficult to determine with certainty what is behind this entire case, but the heart of the matter seems to be as follows. Certain cities in Ellipi and Shungibutu (probably identical with Bit Sangi in Sargon’s annals, cf. RCAE III, p. 74, comment on No. 174; Levine 1974, p. 106, and below, note 379) were originally in the possession of Kibakashshe and Daiaukku. Now the king, (who is presumably the Assyrian king, cf. the rôle played by Marduksharusur as, in the first place the author of the letter to Sargon, and then as the person who receives Shungibutu from the king) surrendered Ellipi and Shungibutu to, respectively, a) the person who sends the message to Kibakashshe and Daiaukku, and b) to Marduksharusur, and in so doing he deprived Kibakashshe and Daiaukku of their cities. At the time when this message was issued, so it seems, these two chieftains represent a threat to the Assyrian control of the cities. Kibakashshe and Daiaukku assemble troops; they now stand

year. This stela tells us that immediately following the conquest of Harhar, Sargon has received tribute from Daiku (Daiakku) of Shaparda³⁷⁷ and from other Median chiefs.³⁷⁸ But as we have mentioned, already in the following year as soon as the Assyrian army has departed, Shaparda and the other countries which had been placed under Harhar administration free themselves, and once again the Assyrians have to subdue them. Among the rebellious countries, in 715, we also find Bit

up openly against the Assyrian king (“The king my lord they rival”), and apparently they are allied with Ishpabara, the son of Talta of Ellipi.

It seems likely that the circumstances which are referred to in this letter would pertain precisely to the same situation, about 716, which obtained in connexion with the revolt in Harhar where Kibaba/Kibakashshe was involved, and when Shaparda, Daiakku’s land, and in the year following also Bit Sangi (Shungibutu of the letter) were at loggerheads with the Assyrians. There is no reason why, with Olmstead, we should date the letter to 708 when Nibe and Ishpabara, the sons of Talta of Ellipi, were rivals to their father’s throne (Olmstead 1923, p. 249). The reference to Kibaba/Kibakashshe and to Dasukku/Daiakku would date the letter to the time about 716 at the latest (taking Waterman’s identification of the two main characters for granted), for Daiakku was removed by Sargon in the year 715. Kibakashshe’s relations with the Assyrians in 716 are not clear owing to the three versions which are at variance with each other. The open revolt against Sargon and against the measures he had taken concerning Ellipi and Shungibutu, according to ABL 174, might indicate that there was a core of truth in the Display Inscription when this text claims that Kibaba was captured by the king of Assyria. It is, of course, quite possible that first he may have become unfriendly with the people of Harhar and then with Sargon, particularly since he was not reinstated by the latter in Harhar after the Assyrian conquest of the city (cf. Olmstead 1908, p. 120).

Furthermore, Talta of Ellipi seems to have been involved in the rebellion in Harhar in the year 716, the people of which, according to the annals, paid homage to him by way of a messenger, thereby casting off Assyrian sovereignty. But that was not all; everything indicates that in the year 716, in the months following the conquest of Harhar, Talta was “in trouble with the Assyrian authorities and under house arrest pending payment of tribute” (Saggs 1958, pp. 209 f. with ND 2655, pp. 191 f.). Therefore, it is not surprising that Ishpabara, his son, should appear in ABL 174 together with Kibakashshe and Daiakku. However this may be, according to ABL 174 Daiakku is clearly in opposition to the king of Assyria, as he was in 716 in Shaparda, and in 715 in Shaparda as well as in Uishdish – and possibly also in Bit Sangi.

377 Cf. also Darī of Shaparda, Daiakku’s successor, who in 714 has to pay tribute to Sargon; see the reference above in note 373.

378 Cf. the Najafehabad Stela 716, ll. 47 f.: “The tribute of Daiku of Shaparda... I received” (Levine 1972, pp. 40 f.). From l. 46 to the end of the account we are informed of a march through Median territory (Levine, p. 29).

Sangi³⁷⁹ where, so it seems, Daiaukku also had certain interests at stake at this time.³⁸⁰ This happens in the year when Daiaukku joins Rusa I of Urartu and hands over to him the fortresses in Uishdish. Like Daiaukku's possessions in the Harhar-province, they are conquered that same year by Sargon and placed under Assyrian administration, while Daiaukku himself is put out of action, carried off to Hamath, and Cimmerian and Mannaeans soldiers take over the fortresses in Uishdish.

Daiaukku, then, had interests and possessions in the north, in Uishdish at the borderline towards Urartu, as well as in the south/southeast in Media, near Harhar.³⁸¹ There cannot be much doubt that a connexion existed between Daiaukku's interference in the disturbances in the Harhar-province, and those in Uishdish; for Daiaukku did not stand alone. As an ally of Rusa of Urartu in the north, and apparently of Talta of Ellipi³⁸² in the south, in the years about 716-715, Daiaukku was an active participant in a wide-ranging, but eventually abortive attempt to free Zagros from Assyrian supremacy at the time of Sargon. Large parts of the Zagros were in a state of rebellion. Prompted by Rusa – this is the version handed down by the annals – the Mannaeans, Bagdatti of Uishdish and Metatti of Zikirtu, “rose against Sargon and Azâ (king of the Mannaeans) ... On Mount Uauš, an inaccessible mountain, they brought about the repulse of the Mannaeans, and the corpse of Azâ, their lord, they threw away”. Sargon went to work. Bagdatti was flayed alive on Mt. Uauš. But Ullusunu who had placed himself on the royal throne after his brother Azâ, was not popular with the Assyrians – “the dislike of Aššur rested on him” – for he put his trust in Rusa, and he incited Assur-li'u of Karalla and Ittî of Allabria to revolt against Sargon, suggesting that they should acknowledge Urartu. Again, Sargon intervened. Ullusunu “together with his whole country gathered as one man” and seized Sargon's feet, and Sargon pardoned Ullusunu, placed him on his royal throne and received tribute from him. But Assur-li'u of Karalla suffered the same fate as Bagdatti whereas Ittî of Allabria, together with his family was removed, Karalla added to the province of Lulume, and its population deported to Hamath.³⁸³

Karalla and Allabria were south of Man; further to the south Sargon has problems in six cities in Niksamma which are conquered and now added to the province of Parsua. In Kishesim Bêl-shar-ušur is taken prisoner and taken to Assyria because he “spoke untruths to the city chiefs surr[ounding him]”.³⁸⁴ Kishesim receives an Assyrian governor in control and is re-named Kâr-Nergal. Three near-by countries, Bit Sagbat,

Bit Hirmami, Bit Umargi and the cities Ḥarḥubarra (?), Kilambāti and Armangu, apparently also Shurgadia, are conquered and placed under the jurisdiction of Kār-Nergal. Finally, as we have seen, Sargon also has to intervene in Harhar which for four years has neglected to offer tribute, expelled its mayor(s) and paid homage to Talta of Ellipi. Like Kishesim, Harhar receives an Assyrian governor together with a garrison made up by deportees; the city is re-named Kār-Sharrukīn, and six neighbouring countries among them Daiaukku's Shaparda, are conquered and gathered together under this district. The expedition is concluded with a march through Median territory where a long string of mayors have to pay tribute, and direct acts of war between Medes and Assyrians ensue.³⁸⁵

This was the year 716. In the following year, Sargon has new problems in Uishdish, this time with Daiaukku who succeeded Bagdatti and, like him, is in league with Rusa to whom he surrenders the fortresses in Uishdish. But there is also an uprising in the Harhar-province where, once again, Sargon has to conquer the countries which had been placed under Harhar, among them, Shaparda. Daiaukku is deported, and the Uishdish-fortresses are manned by Assyro-Mannaean troops and placed under direct Assyrian supervision. In Andia, Sargon conquers the Telusina-district from where 4,200 inhabitants are deported; the city of Kimirra in Bit Hamban is conquered, and 2,530 inhabitants are taken away. Cities like Kisheshlu and Anzaria, as well as others, are conquered

379 Lie reads *Bit-Sangibuti* (Lie 1929, l. 109), but Levine observes that the text has *Bit Sangi*. For this country, its location and Bit Sangi's identity with southern Bit Sangibutu, see Levine, Sargon's Eighth Campaign, pp. 142 f.

380 Cf. above, note 376.

381 As for Reade's locating Harhar in Media, see below.

382 Cf. above, note 376.

383 Lie 1929, ll. 78-90; cf. the Najafehabad Stela, Levine 1972, pp. 36 ff., ll. 23-32.

384 However, according to the Najafehabad Stela it could look as if Bēl-shar-ušur avoided an action by paying tribute – provided we are dealing with *him* and not with a different person whose name may have been lost in the text (cf. Levine 1972, p. 39, ll. 36 f.).

385 Lie 1929, ll. 92-100; cf. the Najafehabad Stela, Levine 1972, pp. 39 ff., ll. 33-75. The name of Daiaukku, possibly, occurs in 716 in the Prism fragment from Ashur (Weidner 1941-1944, p. 41, note 5). The location of Karalla, Allabria, Parsua, Kishesim, Shurgadia and Bit Sagbat are discussed by Levine 1972, pp. 30 ff., see also Map, p. 8; id., 1974, *passim*, and map p. 105; id., Sargon's Eighth Campaign, pp. 137 f., together with the re-locating of Allabria, Parsua, Kishesim and Bit Sagbat undertaken by Reade 1978, pp. 139 f.

and re-named: Finally, also this year, the Median chieftains have to render tribute to the Assyrians.³⁸⁶

The disturbances in Harhar and in Man originate from a time several years before Sargon's intervention in 716. According to the Najafchabad Stela, in Harhar they date to a period four years previously,³⁸⁷ that is to say about the time (719) when the revolt in Man seems to have started and when, with the support from Metatti of Zikirtu, strongly fortified cities like Shuandahul and Durduka rise against their king Iranzu "who carried my (i. e., Sargon's) yoke".³⁸⁸

Were we to have a closer look on the areas in the Zagros where Sargon took a hand in the years 716-715, we note to which high degree exactly Median territories were implicated in the controversies. To the new province now known as Kār-Nergal (Kishesim), no less than six countries and cities were added, among them Bit Sagbat, Bit Umargi as well as the cities of Ḥarḥubarra (?) and Kilambāti, all of which were located in Media.³⁸⁹ So was Kishesim itself.³⁹⁰ Likewise, six territories, among them the three Median lands Shaparda, Sikris and Uriakku, are added to Kār-Sharrukīn (Harhar).³⁹¹ Upparia which Sargon was forced to conquer in 715 was also a Median country.³⁹² Bit Sangi which was conquered in the same year seems to be within the sphere of interest of the Median chieftain Daiaukku.³⁹³ So far, it has been assumed that Harhar was at the border of Media; according to Levine it was most likely in Mahidasht, but in 1978, through his studies of the locations of Namri and Bit Hamban, Reade arrived at entirely new results with regard to the placing of a number of locations in the Zagros which led to the conclusion that not only Kishesim, but also Harhar were to be looked for within Median territory.³⁹⁴ Even in the north, in Uishdish, it was the Median chieftain Daiaukku who had given rise to the conflict in 715. Since Kishesim was in Media, then Bēl-shar-uşur – like Daiaukku – must have been a Median chief. The possibility cannot be excluded that one of the ringleaders – apart from Rusa I, who fanned the flames – behind the disturbances in the Zagros over those years was Daiaukku himself. The alliance with Rusa is quite clear from the annals. Undoubtedly, Talta of Ellipi also played his part. Daiaukku *may* have been the person who gathered or stirred up Median chiefs towards resistance against the Assyrian threat, and against the demand of paying tribute. Sargon's expedition into Media as it turned out, was not always entirely peaceful. In several places it developed into active acts of war.³⁹⁵

Anyhow, nothing prevents us from assuming that the efforts exercised

by Daiaukku, the Median chieftain, in connexion with an attempt to shake off the Assyrian supremacy and the Assyrian tributary claims may have thrown such glory upon his name among his descendants that even if the recollection of his participation in the fight for freedom from the Assyrians, and the exile in Hamath, was gradually forgotten, he was still looked upon as the person who gathered the Medes into one nation, and as the first king of the Medes. Actually, we know the contemporary history concerning Daiaukku only from the Assyrians. Therefore, our knowledge of his activities is very limited. He may well have controlled possessions far beyond those in Uishdish and in Shaparda – those which the Assyrian sources, as chance would have it, reveal – or the part he played

386 Lie 1929, ll. 101-126 *passim*; Weidner 1941-1944, pp. 46 f.; the Display Inscription, ARAB II: 56. For Daiaukku and the events in Uishdish, cf. above, pp. 49 f.

387 For four years the people of Harhar had failed to pay tribute to the Assyrians (Levine 1972, pp. 40 f., l. 42).

388 Lie 1929, ll. 58-61.

389 Bit Sagbat, Ḥarḥubarra (?) and Kilambâti are mentioned in connexion with the payment of tribute by the Medes to Sargon in the year 714 (Ashur Letter, ll. 43 f.). According to the Najafehabad Stela, Bit Umargi is one of the countries at which Sargon arrived during his campaign into Media in the year 716 (Levine 1972, pp. 40 f., l. 48; cf. comment, p. 48). For Bit Sagbat, see also *ibid.*, pp. 38 f., l. 40; cf. comment, p. 47 and pp. 31 f.

390 Cf. Barnett 1982, p. 358 note 323; Reade 1978, p. 140 with Fig. 2; Knudtzon 1893, p. 75; Levine 1972, pp. 31 f. The *Kishesim* of the Annals, in the Najafehabad Stela is known as *Kishesa* (Levine 1972, pp. 38 f., l. 36), thus confirming the assumed identity of Kishesim with Kishassu/Kishassa in Esarhaddon's divination questions; cf. the opinions held by Knudtzon and Barnett.

391 The three countries appear in the Najafehabad Stela (in the year 716) in the section which deals with the campaign into Media (Levine 1972, pp. 40 ff., ll. 47, 48 and 55; cf. comment, p. 48). For Uriakku, cf. also the Ashur Letter, l. 49.

392 See the part of the Najafehabad Stela which deals with Media (Levine 1972, pp. 42 f., l. 56; cf. comment, p. 48).

393 Cf. above, note 376.

394 Cf. Levine 1974, pp. 116 f., 118 note 153; *id.*, 1972, p. 32; Reade 1978, p. 140 with Fig. 2; cf. further below, p. 125.

395 Cf. the Najafehabad Stela, Levine 1972, pp. 40 f., ll. 49-51:

(The Sikris area) "... He became hostile to them. They deserted their cities. Their people and possessions they gathered. Mt. Abrau ... I struck down with the sword. Their remainder, people, horses, mules, cattle, sheep, donkeys, I carried off as spoil ... [I] destroyed, I tore down, I burned. From Sikris I departed, etc.:" l. 53: "I fed my troops to suffice with their harvest;" pp. 42 f., l. 55: "... he uttered cries of mourning;" l. 57: "... archers to raid the plain, against the cities of Bustus I sent ...;" pp. 44 f., l. 67: "the untiring, befitting battle."

among the Medes may have been suppressed by the Assyrians. Perhaps it was not included in what they considered relevant to be told in their inscriptions the purpose of which, first and foremost, was meant to be a glorification of the Assyrian king. Therefore, there is no reason to reject, as a foregone conclusion, the possibility that the area around Ecbatana may have been in the hands of Daiaukku, or that it may have been his headquarters as the tradition handed down by Herodotus will have it. The connexion of the Median royal family with Ecbatana (Hamadan) may be of a later date, but not necessarily so. The city of *Ḥamadāni* existed already at the time of Sargon.³⁹⁶ Actually, when Reade places Kishesim near modern Kangavar and Harhar slightly further to the east in the direction of Nehavend or Malayer,³⁹⁷ the conclusion would seem to be that Daiaukku's Shaparda must have been rather close to the area of Hamadan (Ecbatana).³⁹⁸

Proceeding further, it seems slightly conspicuous that not only did the Cimmerians take over Uishdish in 715, after Daiaukku, but also that at the time of Esarhaddon they appeared in an alliance with Kashtaritu who was presumably a son or a descendant of Daiaukku.³⁹⁹ Or else, equally conspicuously, they were allied not only with him, but also with Dusanni of Saparda, a country which is presumably identical with Daiaukku's Shaparda. They were allies of the Medes, Sapardaeans and Mannaeans, people who were at home in countries where formerly Daiaukku had had his domains. With regard to Uishdish we are fortunate. Thanks to the existence of a rich and varied source material from the years 715-714, and after a long and complicated investigation of this material, we have been able to conclude that the Cimmerians had been placed there as Assyrian soldiers after Daiaukku had been deported. A similarly comprehensive material is not at our disposal when we are talking about Shaparda or Media.⁴⁰⁰ On the contrary, our information is extremely sporadic. But this should not lead us to disregarding the possibility that Sargon, when he suppressed and re-organised Daiaukku's domains in Uishdish and in Shaparda, not only placed a Cimmerian garrison in the first-named place, but he could very well have placed a similar garrison in Shaparda as well as in any other Daiaukku domain in the Zagros. This would explain the coalitions between the Cimmerians and Kashtaritu and with Dusanni.

But what is the reason why Sargon arranged for the Cimmerians to be placed in the former lands of Daiaukku? Why did he not, as elsewhere in the realm, and as it was the custom of the time, place deportees from

other countries which he had conquered, settle them there, and form the Assyrian garrison?⁴⁰¹ This is what he did in Harhar in 716,⁴⁰² then why not in Uishdish? Or is there something which we have overlooked, caught as we have been and to some degree probably still are in preconceived notions of the barbarian Cimmerians who, like streams of lava, poured down the slopes of the Caucasus. Could it be that, in spite of the fables which over millennia have been fabricated about this people, they were in fact deportees, “peoples of the lands my [Sargon’s] hand had conquered”? Oded asserts that at the time of Sargon people were deported from Bit Umargi, Sikris and Anzaria,⁴⁰³ territories which had been conquered in the years 716-715. It is difficult to see on which this notion is based as far as Bit Umargi and Sikris are concerned, but at any rate both countries were in Media, and they are mentioned in connexion with Sargon’s Median campaign in 716 immediately after the reference to Daiaukku and Shaparda.⁴⁰⁴ In Kimirra in Bit Hamban, also, the population was deported in 715.

In a way, the supposition that, as deportees, the Cimmerians had been settled in different places in the Zagros and in Media would supply us with the most natural and simplest explanation of their presence there, and of their alliances. It could also explain why, from 714 until the 670’s,

396 Ecbatana/Hamadan was founded in the Neo-Assyrian period (Levine 1974, p. 119 note 167; cf. p. 118). Contrary to current opinions, Hamadan is in fact mentioned in an Assyrian source, to wit in Sargon’s annals dealing with his 12th year (Lie 1929, l. 293). Cf. Levine 1974, p. 118; Frye, s. v. Hamadhān, p. 105.

397 Reade 1978, pp. 140 f.; cf. Figs. 2 and 3.

398 Cf. below, pp. 125 f.

399 The centre of Kashtaritu’s Median confederation was probably the area of Ecbatana/Hamadan (Frye 1965, p. 72). Cf., however, above, note 371 and reference there to Helm.

400 It is difficult to see whether letters other than ABL 174 (cf. above, note 376) in the Harper material would be of relevance for the situation ab. 716, last but not least owing to their fragmentary state of preservation. Whether letters like ABL 126, 128, 556, 645, 713 and 1046 possibly belong in this context cannot be determined with certainty.

401 For mass deportations in the Neo-Assyrian Empire, see Oded 1979.

402 It seems that here we are dealing with people from Hatti, cf. ARAB II: 183, and Sargon’s Barrel Cylinder Inscription: “I destroyed Karallu, Šurda, Kišisim, Ḥarḥar; of the Medes: as far as Mount Bikni (and) Ellipi I left no offshoot of them: [the people of Hatti conquered by my hand, in their midst I set]tled, etc.” (Thompson 1940, p. 88). See also Oded 1979, p. 124.

403 Oded 1979, pp. 120, 131 and 117.

404 Levine 1972, p. 41, ll. 47 f.

we have no records which with certainty refer to this people, and consequently no records of conflicts between them and the Assyrian realm.⁴⁰⁵ Had the Cimmerians been deported and settled in the Zagros as Assyrian military colonists with an obligation to and a responsibility for maintaining Assyrian supremacy there, then naturally one could not have expected them to act in any kind of direct military confrontation against their overlord, the Assyrian king, participating in warfare which the latter had not ordered, or which were against the interests of the Assyrian realm. It is only in 679 that they reappear in our sources, and we might carry on with our line of thought and consider the possibility that as the Assyrians were gradually losing control with Mannaeans and Medes, the local "Assyrian" troops – i. e., the deportees who had been settled there and so the Cimmerians – would have been free to disengage themselves from their obligations to the Assyrian king. Either they may have joined new powers-that-be or chieftains like Kashtaritu and Dusanni – or indeed a Teushpa. Or rather, perhaps, as we well know from far later military colonists in Europe, they may have retained the status and the obligations which were previously owed to the king of Assyria and transferred them to the new master of the city or territory, and now served the latter in the same fashion. If it were so, Esarhaddon, in 675, truthfully and rightly so – *topos* or no *topos* – could describe them as *zēr amēl ḫal-qá-ti-i*, "a race of fugitives" or "deserters"!⁴⁰⁶ It is possible that his experience from 679 with the Cimmerian chieftain Teushpa might have created a very realistic background for him as an evaluation of this people and its "unfaithfulness" towards its overlord, the king of Assyria. Could the truth about the Cimmerians be that they had been recruited from among prisoners of war or from among deportees? In that case it would be interesting to consider which countries and peoples Sargon had subdued during the years prior to 716-715 and to investigate whether it would be possible, in this way, to trace the real identity of the Cimmerian people and thus solve the riddle of their origin which has persisted for more than two thousand years. Here ends our supposition, and we now arrive at the question: who were, in fact, the Cimmerians?

In reality, the answer as to who the Cimmerians were has been given long ago and has been known since the last century, perhaps even earlier. Not, however, by established scholarly research but by a long series of people who showed up with different backgrounds: people who asked themselves the question, What did in fact become of the Israelites who were deported, already at the time of Tiglath-Pileser III and later on,

after the conquest of Samaria in 722, to Assyria, and in the latter case also to the cities of Media.⁴⁰⁷ For them there is no doubt: the Cimmerians were Israelites who came from the northern kingdom of Israel, and wherever and whenever Assyrian and later sources refer to Cimmerians, we are in fact dealing with deported Israelites. Already Sir Henry Rawlinson, it has been claimed, was cognizant of this identity, and he is quoted as having made the following statement, “We have reasonable grounds for regarding the Gimiri, or Cimmerians, who first appeared on the confines of Assyria and Medea in the seventh century (B. C.), and the Sacæ of the Behistun Rock, nearly two centuries later, as identical with ‘Beth Khumree of Samaria’, or the Ten Tribes of the House of Israel.”⁴⁰⁸ I have not been able to verify this quote anywhere in the writings by Sir Henry Rawlinson which have come to my hand,⁴⁰⁹ but contrary to my expectations found quite different statements by him concerning the “Gimiri”.⁴¹⁰

The proof which has been provided for the identity of the Israelites with the Cimmerians is of a philological nature. The northern kingdom of Israel was known by several names at the time, among them, *Beth-‘Omri*, the House of ‘Omri, named after the founder of Samaria, Omri, the king of northern Israel who lived in the 9th century. When the Assyrians referred to North Israel, they always used the name Beth-’Omri which was rendered as *Bit-Humri*.⁴¹¹ When Omri could be rendered as “*Humri*,” then

405 Cf. above, note 339.

406 Cf. above, pp. 91 f.

407 At this point I wish to express my warm gratitude to my friend, Henning Breindahl, the author, and to Mr Robert C. Boraker, England. Henning Breindahl was the first to draw my attention to research concerning “The Ten Tribes of Israel” and therefore also to the identity of the deported Israelites with the Cimmerians. I thank Mr Boraker for having placed his vast knowledge of this wide subject at my disposal through our correspondance. Cf. Mr Boraker’s article, “Skandinavenes opprinnelse” (The Origin of the Scandinavians) in the Norwegian journal “Den Enkle Sannhet” (The Plain Truth), 1984. – Literature concerning “The Ten Tribes of Israel” is extremely comprehensive; cf. literature listed by Godbey 1930. To my knowledge, the author who has most recently dealt with the subject is E. Raymond Capt, *Missing Links Discovered in Assyrian Tablets*, 1985.

408 Adams 1883, p. 61; Hannay, n. d., p. 286; Boraker 1984, p. 28.

409 Mr Boraker, at my request, has investigated the matter but has also failed to identify the original source.

410 Cf., e. g., Sir Henry Rawlinson’s comment in *History of Herodotus III*, ed. G. Rawlinson 1875, p. 178 note 1.

411 Hannay, n. d., p. 269.

according to Pinches it shows that at the time the name was pronounced "Ghomri, in accordance with the older system before ghain became ayin".⁴¹² Inasmuch as the Assyrians "had no ġ or gh in their language, they had to represent it by a character which may be transliterated *Kh*, *Gh*, or *H*, according to choice. In Assyrian, therefore, Beth- Omri is renderable by *Bît-Khûmrî*, *Bît-Ghûmrî* or *Bît Hûmrî*, as may be preferred",⁴¹³ so Hannay writes, and he goes on to saying, "The Assyrian word which may be transliterated *Khûmrî*, *Ghûmrî*, or *Hûmrî*, expressed the same idea, and stood in the same degree of relation to its Hebrew etymon 'Omri as did the Babylonian word *Gimiri*, or *Gimirrâ*."⁴¹⁴ When historians have failed to find the exiled Israelites in the sources of the time, Boraker maintains, it is due to the circumstance that the Assyrians did not call them "Israel", but designated them as "*Bît-Ĥumrî*" or the like. "At the time of Esarhaddon ... ghomri was written Gimirrai (Cimmerians)."⁴¹⁵

These are the arguments of those scholars. But it is not only at the time of Esarhaddon that the term *Gimirrâja* occurs.⁴¹⁶ Yet, in the letters datable to the reign of Sargon, this term, KUR GI-MIR-AJA, occurs in one single letter only (ND 1107).⁴¹⁷ Otherwise, at the time of this king, we find terms like KUR GA-MIR (ABL 197, obv. 9), KUR GA-MIR-RA (ABL 146, obv. 6 and 9) or LU₂ GA-MI₃-RA-AJA (ABL 112, obv. 4).⁴¹⁸ It may be taken for granted that there is a linguistic relationship between 'Omri and the terms used for the Cimmerians,⁴¹⁹ but one may wonder why the Assyrians would have applied these terms for deportees from the house of Omri when so far, in their inscriptions, they had used the term *Ĥumrî*. The arguments adduced by the students of the Ten Tribes amounts to the possibility that there may have been two different ways in which the Assyrians attempted to render the Hebrew 'Omri. Incidentally, the Hebrew word for Cimmerians, *Gomer*,⁴²⁰ appears to be rather close to the older form 'Omri.

I am in no way blind to the fact that the idea of connecting the Cimmerians with deported Israelites will rouse an immediate wave of contradiction, if for no other reasons, then psychologically. We have for so long become accustomed to the idea of the Cimmerians as a nomadic horseborne people from the North Pontian steppes that, quite naturally, we would find it difficult to accept the idea that we are in fact dealing with a people which is already well known in history, such as Israelites. An untrustworthy tradition as that of the classical conception of the Cimmerians can be repeated for so long, indeed for millennia, that truth, once it

appears, is unlikely to appear for our benefit. I myself was utterly sceptical, not to say extremely reserved, when I first encountered this hypothesis in print. But it forced me to take up the question of the earliest history of the Cimmerians, and as the premises of the commonly accepted opinions of this people began to crumble, and an entirely new picture began to take shape, I had to admit that the students of the Ten Tribes must have seen the truth. The result of the analyses which have been undertaken in the present contribution concerning the Cimmerians and their first appearance in 714, as well as probings into their history in the next century provide us with a geographical, chronological and an historically solid basis for the theses of these scholars which so far has not been available. When established scholarship, if you like, so far has either ignored or perhaps been ignorant about the idea of an identity between those who were deported from the country of Omri and the Cimmerians,⁴²¹ then the explanation might be the following. The students of the Ten Tribes have not made any attempt to reject the hypothesis concerning the North Pontian Cimmerians and their wanderings towards the south and the south-west – a thesis generally accepted until Cozzoli and Salvini set forth their thesis. As long as no critical stand had been taken with regard to the archaeological findings of North Pontian Cimmerians in Southern Russia, nor from the commonly accepted notions of the intrusion of the “barbarian people” from the north into Urartu and Man, any idea of an identity between the two peoples must appear completely

412 Pinches 1903, p. 339.

413 Hannay, n. d., p. 269.

414 Hannay, n. d., p. 288, cf. p. 19. Cf. i. a., Fasken 1941, p.p. 23; Capt 1985, pp. 120 and 122 f.

415 Boraker 1984, p. 11.

416 See Parpola 1970, pp. 132 ff.

417 ND 1107, rev. 5; cf. obv. 7: KUR GI-(...) (Parpola 1970, p. 133 with Postgate 1973, p. 227). Cf. below, note 424.

418 Parpola 1970, pp. 132 f.; cf. Deller 1984, *passim*. Further, cf. the form KUR PAP-IR (ABL 197, rev. 10; ND 2608, obv. 12); LU₂ PAP (ABL 146, obv. 16) and [KUR PA]P-IR (ABL 1079, obv. 6 = Deller 1.4). See Parpola and Deller, *op. cit.*

419 Cf. also the Armenian name for northern Gamir in the vicinity of Leninakan: *Kumayri* (later *Gumri*), Hewsen 1983, p. 134.

420 Kammenhuber 1976-1980, p. 594.

421 For a critical discussion of the many theories which have been advanced with regard to the Lost Tribes, cf. Godbey 1930; May 1943; Cook 1965, pp. 385 f.; Rabinowitz 1971, cols. 1003 ff.; Neusner 1983, p. 909.

unlikely. The philological connexion between ‘Omri and “Gimiri” has been so conclusive to the students of the Ten Tribes that they have made no attempt to refute the prevalent Cimmerian theory in a traditional manner. But it should be stressed that everywhere in the works by these scholars, in spite of an apparent lack of petty criticism of sources, we find results and conclusions which will turn out to be of invaluable importance for professional historians as well, particularly if we would go to the trouble of checking the premises on which the conclusions rest. The perspectives which are laid open, and the insight and intuition displayed by these scholars, are truly remarkable.

Let us consider where the deported Israelites were taken. According to Assyrian sources, at the beginning of his reign Sargon had 27,290 inhabitants of Samaria led into captivity. “Peoples from (all) countries, whom my hands had made prisoners, I caused to dwell there; my functionary as prefect over them I placed and tribute and tax I imposed upon them as if they were Assyrians.”⁴²² Some years later, in 715, also tribes from the Arabian desert were settled in Samaria.⁴²³ After a siege lasting for two or three years the city had been conquered in 722, a few months before the death of Shalmaneser V, and the deportations were presumably not begun until Sargon had come into power.⁴²⁴ How large a proportion of the population of Samaria and of the northern kingdom in general

422 Lie 1929, ll. 10-17; cf. the Display Inscription, ARAB II: 55. Cf. 2 Kings 17:24: “And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof.” Cogan feels that “the deportations listed in 2 Kgs 17: 24 resulted from several Assyrian campaigns during the reigns of more than one monarch” (Cogan 1974, p. 101 note 23). Cf. Bright 1972, p. 274.

423 Lie 1929, ll. 120-123; Cogan 1974, p. 101 note 23.

424 Tadmor 1958, p. 37; Bright 1972, p. 274. Cogan seems to think that the deportations began only after the rebellion in Samaria in 720 and Sargon’s re-conquest of the city in that year (Cogan 1974, p. 100). – ABL 473 has been connected with Sargon’s accession in 722, and Sargon has been identified with the rebellious prefect in this letter and the late king with Shalmaneser V (Thompson 1937, pp. 35 ff.; Hallo 1964, p. 177; cf. Tadmor 1958, p. 37 note 138). Others have suggested that the letter belongs to the time when the throne passed from Sargon to Sennacherib (cf. Tadmor 1958, p. 97 note 311; cf. Parpola 1970, p. 133 with p. XVII – this author leaves the question of the date of ABL 473 open.) We do not intend to enter into this discussion but confine ourselves to the circumstance that the term ^{matu}Gim[ir(?)-ra-a-a?], which possibly occurs in this letter (Thompson 1937, p. 36 l. 18; cf. pp. 41 f.), is not necessarily a hindrance to dating the letter to the accession of a new king in 722, as has been argued (Tadmor 1958, p. 37 note 138), provided an identity exists between Gimiri-

was in fact deported is a question which we shall not delve upon here.⁴²⁵ For our purpose it must suffice to state that, according to the Assyrians, some 30,000 people were removed from the country.⁴²⁶ Whereto were they taken?

The answer to that question is to be found in 2. Kings, 17:6: "In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan and in the cities of the Medes" (cf., also, 2. Kings, 18:11). What is of interest here is that the Israelites were settled in the cities of Media. Which cities may have been involved? Sargon did not exercise sovereignty over Media as a whole; but at the end of his campaign in 716, into the

raja and the population of Bit Humria. Cf. also *Zêr-ibni* of l. 15, according to Thompson to be identified with *Zêr-ibni*, eponym and governor of Ra[sappa] in 718 and later *turtânu* (Thompson 1937, p. 41). – Note, also, that according to the Book of Tobit, before his accession to the throne, Sargon is reported to have been "*bêl pihati* of the province of Ashur" and to have "deported some Israelites ere Shalmaneser died" (Godbey 1930, pp. 313 f.; Halévy 1900, p. 23, identified the "Énémessar" of the Book of Tobit with Shalmaneser).

425 2 Kings 17 expresses the opinion that all of Israel, i.e., the ten tribes of the northern kingdom, were abducted into captivity so that now only the tribe of Judah (the Jews) were left. 2 Kings 17:6: "In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, etc."; 17:18: "Therefore the LORD was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only;" 17: 23: "Until the LORD removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets. So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day." It does indeed seem to be the consensus of opinion among students of the Ten Tribes that these ten tribes were carried off in their entirety (see, e.g., Adams 1883, pp. 118 f.; Hannay, n.d., p. 109; Fasken 1941, pp. 9 ff.). That only part of the population was deported seems to be commonly accepted by professional scholars (cf., e.g., Hamburger 1883, p. 1282; Godbey 1930, p. VIII, 5, 12 ff.; May 1943, p. 58; Oded 1979, p. 66; Neusner 1983, p. 909). For Cogan's opinion, cf. the following note. During the reign of Hezekiah of Judah (715-687/686) there were still members of Israel, Ephraim and Manasseh in the north: Hezekiah sends messages to them, inviting them to celebrate the Passover in Jerusalem (2 Chr. 30:1-11).

426 Cogan emphasizes: "While our sources do not tell of a systematic Assyrian depopulation of the Ephraimite hill country, it seems clear that the native Israelites left on the land were not, as Noth contended, 'numerically much greater' than the 'foreign upper class' settlers. The opposite was the case. Sargon's exile of 27.290 Israelites from Samaria was but the final stage in a bitter four-year struggle to subdue the rebellious city. This extended engagement of the Assyrian army, meanwhile, must have had a devastating effect on the Samaritan countryside. ... Furthermore, that the Samaritan province served as the reception center for countless deportees ... means that areas outside the capital city were available for resettlement, i.e., cleared of their former residents" (Cogan 1974, pp. 101 f.).

country of the Medes, he forced a large group of Median chieftains to pay tribute.⁴²⁷ Prior to this campaign he had conquered Kishesim and Harhar that same year; they were converted into Assyrian provinces under an Assyrian governor and renamed Kār-Nergal and Kār-Sharrukīn, respectively. As we have mentioned above, a number of Median cities and countries were added to these two provinces; Bit Sagbat, Bit Umargi and the cities of Ḥarḥubarra (?) and Kilambâti were placed under the jurisdiction of Kishesim whereas Shaparda, Sikris, Uriakku and Upparia fell to Harhar.⁴²⁸ Deportees were placed in Kishesim as well as in Harhar. We know this from Sargon's Cylinder Stela and from his Barrel Cylinder-inscriptions⁴²⁹ and as for Harhar also from the annals.⁴³⁰ The two sources mentioned first state unequivocally that we are dealing with people from Ḥatti, but the expression "peoples from (all) countries", used in connexion with the Harhar settlements, here as elsewhere shows that people from different countries were collected together in one settlement.⁴³¹ The Harhar and Kishesim provinces are obvious candidates when it comes to the question of identifying "the cities of the Medes" to which, according to 2. Kings, 17:6, the Israelite deportees were taken. As it would appear unlikely that the annals or the Najafehabad Stela would have kept silent about other major Assyrian conquests or the establishment of other Assyrian provinces in Media, they are also the only candidates.⁴³²

427 Lie 1929, l. 100; Levine 1972, pp. 40 ff., ll. 46 ff.

428 Cf. above, p. 114.

429 Besides the Cyprus Stela (ARAB II: 183), cf. Sargon's Barrel Cylinder inscription: "I destroyed Karallu, Šurda, Kišesim, Ḥarḥar; of the Medes: as far as Mount Bikni (and) Ellipi I left no offshoot of them: [the people of Ḥatti conquered by my hand in their midst I set]tled: my officials (as) governors I set over them and caused (them) to draw my yoke" (Thompson 1940, p. 88, ll. 13-14). Cf. Oded 1979, p. 64, 124 s.v. Harhar and p. 127 s. v. Kishesim.

430 Lie 1929, ll. 97 f.

431 Oded 1979, p. 32.

432 Like the Barrel Cylinder, several of Sargon's inscriptions claim that Sargon subdued the Medes "as far as Mount Bikni," and that he set his officials as governors "over them and caused them to draw his yoke" (cf., besides the quote from the Barrel Cylinder, above, note 429, also ARAB II: 54, 79, 82, 96-99 and 112). Levine rejects the theory that Mt. Bikni is identical with Mt. Damavand, east of Teheran, and suggests that an identification with Kuh-i-Alwand is more likely; he further suggests that in the course of his campaign into Media in 716 Sargon made no attempt to cross the barrier which Alwand represented. He considers it unlikely that any of the places mentioned on the Najafehabad Stela were to be found beyond Kuh-i-Alwand where Hamadan was founded in the Neo-Assyrian period

But were Kishesim and Harhar in Media? We have touched upon the question in an earlier context. Levine found no basis for this assumption as far as Harhar is concerned; he proposed that Harhar should be placed in central or eastern Mahidasht. If Reade's relocation of Namri and Bit Hamban, and thus also of Kishesim and Harhar – both of which he placed inside Media⁴³³ – proves correct, the problem would be solved, and the information provided by 2. Kings would then refer to the fact that Sargon had Kishesim and Harhar placed under Assyria and deportees settle there. Reade would place Kishesim near Hamadan and Kangavar, where the Najafehabad Stela was discovered, whereas Harhar, as mentioned, would have to be looked for slightly further to the east in the direction towards Nehavend and Malayer.⁴³⁴

(Levine 1974, pp. 118 f.; id. 1972, pp. 30 and 32). Reade's re-locating Harhar to Media as well as his placing Zakruti, Sargon's first stop after having left Harhar in 716, near or beyond Hamadan (Reade 1978, pp. 140 ff. with maps, Figs. 2 and 3), are not in agreement with Levine's concept. Besides, Levine feels that "it is hard to conceive the Medes building their capital city where it would be vulnerable to Assyria. If, on the other hand, Bikni (= Alwand) marked the eastern limit of Assyrian penetration, Hamadan sited on the far side would have been relatively secure" (Levine 1974, p. 119 note 167). It is, however, apparent from the annals that Hamadan did not escape from some sort of Assyrian encroachment in Sargon's 12th year (Lie 1929, l. 293). So, the city was there at the time of Sargon. In any case, we may conclude that Sargon did not subjugate the entire Median territory, nor countries in quite different parts of Media other than those which are mentioned in the annals and on the Najafehabad Stela. Therefore, we cannot assume that Sargon organised Assyrian provinces in Media other than those which he specifically mentions, Kishesim and Harhar.

433 Cf. above, p. 114. – We agree with Levine that the expression ^{URU}Harhar ša ^{KUR}Madya in Sargon's Barrel Cylinder inscription deviates from the customary formula in comparable lists and its value, as a historical datum, therefore somewhat questionable (cf. Levine 1974, p. 118 note 153; for the Barrel Cylinder, see above, note 429). But when the Display Inscription tells us that Sargon "strengthened the defenses (guard) of the neighborhood of Kâr-Sharrukîn" (ARAB II: 58; cf. Winckler's translation: "befestigte ich die umgebung von Kâr-Šarrukîn mit einer befestigung," Winckler 1889, p. 111, l. 66) with a view to subjugating the Medes, this might well – although not necessarily – imply that Harhar was in Median territory. At least, it is clear from ABL 128 that the Medes "who are round about us" must have lived round Harhar/Kar-Sharrukin where Mannuki-Ninua, who sent the letter, is at home and where he carries out tasks imposed upon him by the king (besides ABL 128, cf. also 126).

434 Reade 1978, pp. 140 ff. with Figs. 2 and 3. Cf. the sketch map, Levine 1972, p. 8. – For Winckler, too, it was "selbstverständlich" that "Median cities" referred to the newly-established Harhar-province (Winckler 1903, p. 269 note 4). Cf. also Rawlinson 1875, p. 392. According to Oded, "the cities of the Medes" were at the Assyrian border to the east (Oded 1979, p. 70).

It is noteworthy, then, that late traditions in “The Book of Tobit” and certain Talmudic glossarists do in fact connect the exiled Israelites with Ecbatana and Nehavend and with cities in their neighbourhood. The account in “The Book of Tobit” is supposed to have found its present form ab. 350 B. C., but it clearly contains a much earlier core which according to Godbey would date back to ab. 700 B. C.⁴³⁵ However, Tobit mentions Israelites not only in Ecbatana but also in Rhages in Media, a city which, it is claimed, might be identical with modern Teheran.⁴³⁶ It seems unlikely that Sargon has been in a position to plant Israelite colonies in this area,⁴³⁷ and it will scarcely be possible to separate what belongs to the original core of the book from that which has been added later. In the Talmud, a glossarist from the third century A. D., one R. Abba b. Kahana, gives us the following comment to “the cities of the Medes” in 2. Kings: “Madai, d. i. Hamadan und dessen Nachbarstädte.” Other glossarists speak of “Nehawend und seine Nachbarstädte.”⁴³⁸

According to these traditions, then, the Israelites are supposed to have come to the Ecbatana- and Nehavend-districts. If we follow Reade, Harhar was somewhere in the direction of the latter area, and in the Harhar province was Daiaukku’s Shaparda. In the opinion of Herodotus, Ecbatana was his headquarters, and at the time of Sargon II it existed and was known by the name of Hamadan; it is mentioned in the year 710.⁴³⁹ Assuming that Reade’s relocation is correct, Shaparda, too, must have been rather close to the Hamadan/Ecbatana area.⁴⁴⁰ In other words, Israelite deportees are supposed to have arrived precisely to those areas in Media where also Daiaukku had and is claimed to have had his supremacy ab. 716-715 – i. e., in the Harhar province and in the area of Ecbatana.

Viewed on this background it would be entirely natural if in 715 when Daiaukku’s supremacy collapsed, Israelites were placed also in the fortified cities of Uishdish on that occasion.⁴⁴¹ It is no less noteworthy that the deportees from Bit Humria were settled in the parts of the Zagros where Gimirrāja operated at the time of Esarhaddon: in alliance with Medes, Mannaeans, Dusanni of Saparda and Kashtaritu (presumed to be Daiaukku’s descendant) they threatened the city of Kilman, Kishesim/Kishassu and the nearby Bit Hamban (in the Behistān area).⁴⁴² There is scarcely reason, any longer, to doubt the exciting and verily astonishing assertion propounded by the students of the Ten Tribes that the Israelites deported from Bit Humria, of the house of ‘Omri, are identical with the Gimirrāja of the Assyrian sources. Every-

thing indicates that Israelite deportees did not vanish from the picture but that, abroad, and under new conditions, they continued to leave their mark on history.⁴⁴³

In conclusion, let us add a few remarks to the terms *Sapardaeans*, *Shaparda* and *Saparda*. In Esarhaddon's inquiries to Shamash, the sun-god, we meet with Dusanni, the Sapardaeon, and according to Knudtzon's reconstructions also the name of the Sapardaeon people as such, as well as the country of Saparda.⁴⁴⁴ It has been claimed that Dusanni and the Sapardaeans belonged in Sardis in Lydia, that which is identical with the Old Persian satrapy of Sardis or Sparda of the Behistān Inscription.⁴⁴⁵ However, this hypothesis seems completely unlikely. Dusanni of Saparda is an ally of Kashtaritu's and allied with Medes, Mannaean and Cimmerians; besides with these people, the Sapardaeans are also allied with Scythians. The governor from Saparda (?), together with nobles from this country,

435 Godbey 1930, pp. 313 f. Cf. Grintz 1971, cols. 1183 ff.

436 Cf. Halévy 1900, pp. 23 ff.; Hannay n. d., p. 105; Godbey 1930, pp. 287 f. and 622 f.; Fasken 1941, p. 11; Widengren 1961, p. 118; Capt 1985, p. 73.

437 Cf. Levine's rejection of an attempt at identifying the Bikni Mountains with Mt. Damavand east of Teheran. Sargon claims to have subjugated "the distant Medes who live on the border of the Bikni Mountains" (Levine 1974, pp. 118 f.; cf., i. a., ARAB II: 82).

438 Hamburger 1883, p. 1282.

439 Cf. Sargon's annals for his 12th year (Lie 1929, l. 293; cf. above, note 396).

440 Reade's re-location, not only of Kishesim and Harhar, but also of the city of Zakruti (Reade 1978, pp. 140 ff. with Figs. 2 and 3) involves that Shaparda must have been rather close to the Hamadan/Ecbatana area. According to the Najafehabad Stela, Zakruti – which Reade places east of Hamadan – was Sargon's first stop after Harhar in 716. The next stop was Kurabli where Sargon received Daiiau'ku's tribute (Levine 1972, p. 41, ll. 46 f.). A look at Reade's sketch map could give us the impression that the Hamadan/Ecbatana area was not too far from the Kishesim- and from the Harhar-provinces, respectively.

441 Note also that in 715 Sargon settles Arabian tribesmen in Samaria (Lie 1929, ll. 121-123; cf. Cogan 1974, pp. 100 ff.).

442 Cf. Reade 1978, pp. 138 f.

443 For the further fate of the north – Israelite deportees, cf., i. a., Oded: "Those inhabitants of Samaria who were deported, but not conscripted into the army, continued in Assyria to practise the trades they had practised in their own country, or else were taught new trades for which there was a need in the Assyrian empire" (Oded 1979, p. 56, cf. p. 52).

444 Klauber 1913, Nos. 4, 7 and 25; Knudtzon 1893, Nos. 11a, 25 and 30.

445 Streck 1900, pp. 346 f.; Winckler 1903, p. 301; Olmstead 1923, p. 363; König 1934, pp. 37 f.; Sayce 1965, p. 181. Cf. Frye 1965, p. 81.

has a task to perform in a Median district where they have to carry out a collection.⁴⁴⁶ Dusanni and his people are clearly at home in the Zagros and not in Asia Minor. The idea immediately presents itself that they did in fact live in Shaparda, Daiaukku's old country.⁴⁴⁷ Otherwise we would have to assume that in or near Media there existed both a *Saparda* and a *Shaparda*.

The occurrence of a Lydian as well as a Median Saparda/Shaparda also occasions discussion when we consider the interpretation of the site of "Sepharad" in Obad. 20. According to the Hebrew text, the question here concerns "exiles of Jerusalem who are in Sepharad".⁴⁴⁸ From the end of the 8th century A. D. Sepharad was adopted as the common Hebrew name for the Iberian peninsula just as Sephardim became the term for Jews living in Spain or Portugal, until their expulsion in 1492. The name lived on among their descendants, wherever resident. Originally, however, the terms Sepharad and Sephardim could derive from either Shaparda in Media or from Sardis/Saparda in Lydia. Schrader, Streck and others accepted the first point of view, but the latter opinion prevailed. Not only because of the Sparda of the Behistān Inscription, but also because an earlier name of Sardis has proved to be *Sfard* which could correspond, i. a., to Aramaic *Separad* and Babylonian *Saparda*.⁴⁴⁹ In his time Barton, in his article in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, opposed Schrader's identification of Sepharad with Median Shaparda, arguing that we know of no Jewish colony of captives here, "nor are any circumstances evident which would render probable the existence at this point of a colony of sufficient importance to be referred to in the terms used by Obadiah".⁴⁵⁰ To some degree, however, the reasons for rejecting the thesis of a connexion between the Median Shaparda and the Sepharad of Obadiah may be said to have been dispelled now that the arrival in 716 of displaced Israelites to the province of Harhar – where Shaparda was located – has become apparent.

But first, let us have a closer look at verse 20 of Obadiah which reads as follows, according to *The New English Bible* (1970): "Exiles of Israel shall possess Canaan as far as Zarephath, exiles of Jerusalem shall possess the cities of the Negeb." The Hebrew text has a number of deviations from this, and what is of interest in this context is the circumstance that after "exiles of Jerusalem" it adds "who are in Sepharad".⁴⁵¹ When "exiles of Israel" are mentioned, the reference naturally is to the vast deportations from northern Israel in the 8th century; "exiles of Jerusalem" evidently refers to the deportations carried out by Nebuchadnezzar from

Jerusalem and Judah in 586 B. C. Therefore, in a way the Hebrew text is incorrect: the exiles of Jerusalem were taken to Babylon, not to Sepharad. We cannot very well doubt that the words “who are in Sepharad” is a later addition, a gloss which at some point has been added to the original main text. In that case the dates which have been proposed with regard to Obadiah (after 586 B. C., and ab. 400 or later for the finished work)⁴⁵² do not necessarily apply to the gloss. As far as I can see, it may be dated to any time before Jerome (342-420 A. D.) who has been acquainted with the gloss in Obad. 20, but apart from that he refers Sepharad to the Taurian Bosphorus.⁴⁵³

But what could be the reason why the author, or originator, of the gloss should have wished to call attention to the presence of the “exiles of Jerusalem” in Sepharad in direct opposition to what he and everybody else knew? Of course it was not his intention to polemize against the fact that the exiles have come to Babylon; rather, he would have wished to point out the connexion between these exiled Jews and Saparda. It would be a natural assumption that the reason for the gloss could be that, already at the time when the gloss was added, a group of exiled Jews were known as Sephardim, i. e., people from Saparda.

However this may or may not be, we have to ask, Which Saparda did the glossarist have in mind? Neither Assyrians nor Babylonians seem to have had any opportunity to set up colonies of deportees, whether Jews or others, in Sardis in Lydia. But as we know, deportees from northern Israel arrived, in 716, to that very province of Harhar where Shaparda was situated. There is no reason to reject the possibility that such deported Israelites may have been settled in Shaparda itself – where

446 Besides Knudtzon 1893, No. 30 with comment, cf. Forrer 1920, p. 93 and 95.

447 Cf. Lewy 1925, p. 4 note 5; Olmstead 1908, pp. 121 f. note 20; Godbey 1930, pp. 282 f.

448 Cf. The New English Bible, 1970, p. 1313.

449 Streck 1900, pp. 346 f.; Winckler 1903, p. 301; Godbey 1930, pp. 282 ff.; articles Sepharad and Sephardim in The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia, 1970, cols. 1715 f., and in Encyclopaedia Judaica 14, 1971, cols. 1164 ff.; article Obadiah, Book of, in The Jewish Encyclopedia IX, 1901-1906, p. 370. Cf. Minns 1965, p. 188.

450 Article Obadiah, Book of, in the Jewish Encyclopedia IX, 1901-1906, p. 370.

451 The New English Bible, 1970, p. 1313 with note c. For the placing of the Hebrew text in the tradition, see Introduction, *ibid.*

452 Cf. the article Obadiah, Book of, in The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia III, 1986, p. 574.

453 Cf. Godbey 1930, p. 284.

Daiaukku was the local chieftain. We have seen that during the following century Sapardaeans appear in the Zagros, and the possibility presents itself that deported Israelites in Shaparda may have named themselves by the name of this country so that here we might have the origin of the Sephardim of later days. But it is not so simple as that, and a hypothesis like this would in no way solve the problem of the Sepharad gloss in the Book of Obadiah: the Israelites in the Harhar province came from the northern part of Israel and not from Jerusalem.⁴⁵⁴

Since the author of the Obadiah gloss connects Sepharad with the “exiles of Jerusalem”, i. e., with Babylonian Jews, there has to be a good explanation. The reason could be that such exiled Jews were transferred to “Sepharad”. Josephus, in his Jewish *Antiquitates*, informs us that as a result of a revolt in Lydia and Phrygia, Antiochus III (223-187 B. C.) had 2,000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia sent there. “Learning that the people in Lydia and Phrygia are revolting”, Antiochus III – according to Josephus – writes to the Governor of Lydia, “... I determined to transport two thousand Jewish families with their effects from Mesopotamia and Babylonia to the fortresses and most important places. For I am convinced that they will be loyal guardians of our interests because of their piety to God, and I know that they have had the testimony of my forefathers to their good faith and eagerness to do as they are asked. It is my will, therefore – though it may be a troublesome matter – that they should be transported and, since I have promised it, use their own laws”.⁴⁵⁵

The tradition handed down by Josephus furnishes the most natural and simple explanation of the Obadiah gloss.⁴⁵⁶ The sources do not appear to mention other situations which might explain the conception that Babylonian Jews – some of whom, of course, returned from captivity, whereas others remained abroad – are now in “Sepharad” (Lydia).⁴⁵⁷ It seems likely that this is the tradition on which the gloss is based, whether its originator knew of it direct from Josephus or otherwise. Inasmuch as the term “Sepharad” does not occur in Josephus’ work whereas “Lydia” does, it would seem a natural conclusion that the glossarist was not dependent on Josephus. The lack of dependence which the Old Persian term for Lydia implies, would furthermore strengthen the authenticity of the Josephus tradition and, presumably, also the possibility that the term Sephardim may stem from these Mesopotamian and Babylonian Jews in western Asia Minor. Through a freak of chance, it seems, it is not unlikely that deportees from northern Israel and from Jerusalem may

have been brought to, respectively, the Median and the Lydian Saparda.

But let us emphasize at once that with these reflections we have had no wish to pretend that the final answer as to what lies behind the Sepharad of the Obadiah gloss or behind the term Sephardim should thus have been given. We have attempted to throw light on the question from the occurrence of, respectively, a Median and a Lydian Shaparda/Saparda. But there are other peoples and places which, over the years, have been connected with Sepharad, Saparda and Sephardim,⁴⁵⁸ and it would take us too far to consider these proposals and possibilities here. As we have mentioned, Jerome for some reason connected Sepharad with the Taurian Bosphorus⁴⁵⁹ where earlier traditions and place-names put the Cimmerians – and the Scythians in the immediate neighbourhood. At the time of Esarhaddon a people called Sapardaeans were at home in the Zagros; they were allied with and were settled in the same area as Cimmerians and Scythians. Later, Cimmerians and Scythians found their way to the north and settled north of the Black Sea. If we are to believe the tradition conveyed by Jerome, Sapardaeans may have done the same – but which Sapardaeans, Median or Lydian? Offhand, you would think that those from Lydia were involved as they are the ones, as far as we can judge, who are referred to in the gloss. At least we can say as much as this, that there are things which seem to indicate that Cimmerians, Scythians as well as Sapardaeans or Sephardim have led a somewhat vagrant existence.

Most surprising of all is, perhaps, that apart from the Sephardim, there is another large group of Jews in Europe, known as Ashkenaz (pl.

454 Sennacherib claims that in 701 he deported no less than 200,150 people from 46 cities in Judah (ARAB II: 240; cf. Cogan 1974, pp. 101 f.). Although the main part of the deportees were to be taken to Nineveh (Cogan 1974, p. 102 note 28; Oded 1979, p. 13), other destinations cannot, of course, be excluded. The decisive factor in the present connexion is, however, that neither during the campaign of 701 nor during that of ab. 688 did the Assyrians succeed in conquering Jerusalem itself.

455 Josephus, *Jewish Antiquitates* XII: 147-153.

456 Winckler expressed his scepticism with regard to the tradition found in Josephus and was of the opinion that it was scarcely historical (Winckler 1903, p. 301). Cf., however, i. a., the article Sardis in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 14, 1971, cols. 876 f.; Neusner 1983, p. 910.

457 Cf., however, Godbey's discussion of the "circumcised Syrians" in the Parthenius region mentioned by Herodotus (Godbey 1930, pp. 281 ff.). Here, the reference is scarcely to Babylonian Jews.

458 Cf., e. g., the reference to Godbey in the preceding note.

459 Godbey 1930, p. 284.

Ashkenazim). If it turns out that the Sephardim are in fact descendants of the Babylonian Jews, then who are the Ashkenazim? The name is identical with the Hebrew term for Scythians, Ashkenaz, which corresponds to the Ishguza of the Assyrians.⁴⁶⁰ How could it ever have happened that one main group of European Jews should have become known as “Scythians”? Is it merely a case of “misunderstanding” or “a curious development”?⁴⁶¹ Isn't the truth, rather, that the last word remains to be said about the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the children of Israel?

460 See, i. a., the two articles on Ashkenaz in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 3, 1971, cols. 718 ff.

461 Cf. König 1934, p. 38; Yamauchi 1982, p. 63 note 1.

Bibliography

- ABL: abbreviation for R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, q. v.
- Adams, R. N., *Great Britain's Rank among the Nations*, London 1883.
- Adontz, N., *Histoire d'Arménie, Les Origines du X^e siècle au VI^e (Av.J.C.)*, Paris 1946.
- Albright, W. F., *The Eighth Campaign of Sargon*, *JAOS* 36, New Haven 1917.
- ARAB, see Luckenbill.
- Artamonov, M. I., *Treasures from Scythian Tombs in the Hermitage Museum*, Leningrad, London 1969.
- Ashur Letter, see the edition by W. Mayer, 1983.
- Azarpay, G., *Urartian Art and Artifacts*, Los Angeles 1968.
- Barnett, R. D., *Urartu, The Cambridge Ancient History III,1*, Cambridge 1982.
- Baschmakoff, A., *Le Problème Scythique et l'Enigme Cimmérienne*, *Revue Anthropologique* 12, Paris 1932.
- Bible editions:
 The Scofield Reference Bible, The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, Authorized King James Version, ed. Rev. C. I. Scofield, New York 1945.
 The New English Bible, The Old Testament, 1, Oxford 1970.
 La Bible de Jérusalem, Paris 1981.
- Boehmer, R. M., *Volkstum und Städte der Mannäer*, *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 3, Berlin 1964.
- Boraker, R. C., *Skandinavenes Opprinnelse (The Origin of the Scandinavians)*, *Den Enkle Sannhet (The Plain Truth)*, Oslo 1984.
- Borger, R., *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien*, *Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft 9*, hrsg. E. Weidner, Graz 1956.
- Brentjes, B., *Die Skythen und ihre Kunst – der Tierstil*, *Das Altertum* 27, Berlin 1981.
- Bright, J., *A History of Israel*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia 1972.
- Bryce, T. R., art. *Phrygia and Lydia*, *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Civilizations*, London 1983.
- Bunker, E. C., Charwin, C. B. and Farhas, A. R., "Animal Style" Art from East to West, New York 1970.
- Burney, C. und Lang, D. M., *Die Bergvölker Vorderasiens, Armenien und der Kaukasus von der Vorzeit bis zum Mongolensturm*, München 1973.
- Böhl, F. M. Th. de Liagre, *Opera Minora, Studies en Bijdragen op Assyriologisch en Oudtestamentisch Terrain*, Groningen-Djakarta 1953.
- CAD: see I. J. Gelb.
- Calmeyer, P., *Datierbare Bronzen aus Luristan und Kirmanshah*, *Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 5, Berlin 1969.
- The Cambridge Ancient History III, The Assyrian Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury *et al.*, Cambridge 1965.

- The Cambridge Ancient History III,1, The Prehistory of the Balkans, and the Middle East and the Aegean world tenth to eighth centuries B.C., ed. J. Boardman *et al.*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1982.
- Capt, E. R., *Missing Links Discovered in Assyrian Tablets*, Thousand Oaks 1985.
- Çilingiroğlu, A. A., *The Eighth Campaign of Sargon II, Anadolu Arastirmaları = Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung IV-V, Istanbul 1976-77.*
- Clark, G. and Piggott, S., *Prehistoric Societies*, London 1968.
- Cogan, M., *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B. C. E.*, Missoula 1974.
- Cogan, M. and Tadmor, H., *Gyges and Ashurbanipal: A Study in Literary Transmission*, *Orientalia N. S.* 46, Roma 1977.
- Cook, S. A., *Israel and the Neighbouring States, CAH III*, Cambridge 1965.
- Cozzoli, U., *I Cimмери*, *Studi Pubblicati dall'Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica*, fasc. ventesimo, Roma 1968.
- Culican, W., *The Medes and the Persians*, London 1965.
- Delitzsch, F., *Wo lag der Paradies? Eine biblisch-assyriologische Studie*, Leipzig 1881.
- Deller, K., *Die Verdrängung des Grundstamms von ezēbu durch rammū im Neuassyrischen*, *Orientalia N. S.* 30, Roma 1961.
- Deller, K., *Ausgewählte neuassyrische Briefe betreffend Urartu zur Zeit Sargons II; Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia, Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche nell' Azerbaigian iraniano*, ed. P. E. Pecorella e M. Salvini, *Incunabula Graeca LXXVIII*, Roma 1984.
- Diakonoff, I. M., *Urartu und Transkaukasien, Die Kimmerier und die Skythen*, in *Weltgeschichte in 10 Bänden*, Bd. 1, hrsg. I. M. Zikov, Berlin 1961.
- Diakonoff, I. M. and Kashkai, S. M., *Geographical Names according to Urartian Texts, Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes IX, Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des vorderen Orients, Reihe B (Geisteswissenschaften) No. 7*, hrsg. H. Gaube und W. Röllig, Wiesbaden 1981.
- Eber, M., article *Südrussland*, *Rlv* 13, Berlin 1929.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Jerusalem 1971.
- Eph'al, I., *On Warfare and Military Control in the Ancient Near Eastern Empires: A Research Outline*, in: *History, Historiography and Interpretation, Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*, ed. H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld, Jerusalem 1983.
- Fales, F. M. (ed.) *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons, Orientis antiqui collectio XVII*, Roma 1981.
- Fales, F. M., *The Enemy in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: "The Moral Judgement", Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn, Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr., XXV. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Berlin 3. bis 7. Juli 1978, Teil 2. hrsg. H.-J. Nissen und J. Renger, Berlin 1982.
- Fales, F. M., *Centro lettere Neo-Assire. Tralitterazione e traduzione I, Quaderno del Seminario di Iranistica, Uralo-Altaistica e Caucasologia dell' Università degli studi di Venezia, Venezia 1983.*
- Fales, F. M. and Lanfranchi, G. B., *ABL 1237: The Role of the Cimmerians in a Letter to Esarhaddon, East and West, N. S.* 131, Rome 1981.
- Farhas, A. R.: see E. C. Bunker *et al.*
- Fasken, W. H., *Cimmerians and Scythians*, Haverhill, Mass., 1941.

- Follet, R., "Deuxième Bureau" et Information diplomatique dans l'Assyrie des Sargonides, Quelques notes, *Rivista degli studi orientali*, Roma 1957.
- Forrer, E., *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches*, Leipzig 1920.
- Frye, R. N., article Hamadhān (Hamadān), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam III*, Leiden-London 1965.
- Frye, R. N., *The Heritage of Persia*, London 1965.
- Frye, R. N., *The History of Ancient Iran*, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft III*, 7, München 1984.
- Gelb, I. J.: see CAD = *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago-Glückstadt, 1956 ff.
- Ghirshman, R., *Iran from the Earliest Times to the Islamic Conquest*, Bungay 1954.
- Ghirshman, R., *Arte dell' Iran Pre-Sasanide*, *Le civiltà dell' oriente* 4, Roma 1962.
- Gimbutas, M., *The Prehistory of Eastern Europe, Part I, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Copper Age Cultures in Russia and the Baltic Area*, ed. H. Hencken, Cambridge (Mass.) 1956.
- Gimbutas, M., "Timber-Graves" in Southern Russia, *A Pre-Scythian Culture*, Expedition 3, Philadelphia 1961.
- Gimbutas, M., *Indo-Europeans: Archeological Problems*, *American Anthropologist* 65, 1963.
- Gimbutas, M., *Bronze Age Cultures in Central and Eastern Europe*, Haag 1965.
- Godbey, A. H., *The Lost Tribes – A Myth, Suggestions Towards Rewriting Hebrew History*, Durham 1930.
- Grayson, A. K., *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles, Texts from Cuneiform Sources V*, ed. L. Oppenheim *et al.*, New York 1975.
- Grayson, A. K., *Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: Assyria and Babylonia*, *Orientalia N. S.* 49, Roma 1980.
- Grayson, A. K., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: Literary Characteristics in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons*, *Orientalis antiqui collectio XVII*, ed. F. M. Fales, Roma 1981.
- Grintz, M., art. Tobit, *Book of*, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971.
- Grousset, R., *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071*, Paris 1973 (1947).
- Halévy, J., *Tobie et Akhiakar*, *Revue Sémitique d'Épigraphie et d'Histoire Ancienne* 8, Paris 1900.
- Hallo, W. W., *From Qarqar to Carchemish: Assyria and Israel in the Light of New Discoveries*, *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader II*, New York 1964.
- Hallo, W. W., art. Gutium (Qutium), *RIA III*, Berlin-Leipzig 1951-71.
- Hamburger, J., art. Zehn Stämme, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Strelitz 1883.
- Hannay, H. B., *European and other Race Origins*, London n.d.
- Harmatta, J., *Darius' Expedition against Sakā Tigraxaudā*, *Acta Antiqua* 24, Budapest, 1976.
- Harper, R. F., *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, Chicago 1892-1914.
- Hawkins, J. D., *The Neo-Hittite States in Syria and Anatolia*, *CAH III,1*, Cambridge 1982.
- Heidel, A., *A New Hexagonal Prism of Esarhaddon (676 B. C.)*, *Sumer, A Journal of Archaeology in Iraq* 12, Baghdad 1956.
- Helm, P. R., *Herodotus' Médikos Logos and Median History*, *Iran XIX*, London 1981.
- Hewsen, R. H., *Introduction to Armenian Historical Geography II: The Boundaries of Achaemenid "Armina"*, *Révue des Études Arméniennes* 17, Paris 1983.

- Holcomb, W. R., *The Cimmerian and Scythian Invasions into Western Asia*, M. A. thesis Miami University, Miami 1973.
- Houwink ten Cate, H. J., *Kleinasien zwischen Hethitern und Persern*, in *Fischer Weltgeschichte 4, Die Altorientalischen Reiche III, Die erste Hälfte des 1. Jahrtausends*, ed. E. Cassin *et al.*, Frankfurt am Main 1967.
- The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia III*, Michigan 1986.
- Jeffery, L. H., *Greek alphabetic writing*, CAH III,1, Cambridge 1982.
- Jessup, J. E., *Scythia: The Early Era of Steppe Nomadism, A Survey based on Recent Archaeological Discoveries and other Studies*, Diss. Georgetown University, Georgetown 1970.
- The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Jerusalem 1901-06.
- Johns, C. H. W., *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters*, Edinburgh 1904.
- Josephus VII, *Jewish Antiquitates*, trsl. R. Marcus, The Loeb Classical Library, London-Cambridge 1966.
- Kammenhuber, A., art. *Kimmerier*, *Der Kleine Pauly*, *Lexikon der Antike III*, Stuttgart 1969.
- Kammenhuber, A., art. *Kimmerier*, *RIA 5*, Berlin 1976-80.
- Kinnier Wilson, J. V., *The Kurba'il Statue of Shalmaneser III*, Iraq 24, London 1962.
- Klauber, E. G., *Politisch-Religiöse Texte aus der Sargonidenzeit*, Leipzig 1913.
- Kleiss, W., *Bastam, an Urartian Citadel Complex of the Seventh Century B. C.*, *American Journal of Archaeology 84*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1980.
- Knudtzon, J. A., *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott für Staat und königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons und Assurbanipals II*, *Einleitung, Umschrift und Erklärung, Verzeichnisse*, Leipzig 1893.
- Kothe, H., *Die Herkunft der kimmerischen Reiter*, *Klio 41*, Berlin 1963.
- Kothe, H., *Der Skythenbegriff bei Herodot*, *Klio 51*, Berlin 1969.
- Kretschmer, K., art. *Scythae*, *RE II A,1*, Stuttgart 1921-23.
- König, F. W., *Älteste Geschichte der Meder und Perser*, *Der alte Orient 33*, Leipzig 1933-34.
- König, F. W., *Gesellschaftliche Verhältnisse Armeniens zur Zeit der Chalder-Dynastie (9. bis 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.)*, *Archiv für Völkerkunde IX*, Wien-Stuttgart 1954.
- König, F. W., *Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften I-II*, *Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 8*, Graz 1955-57.
- Labat, R., *Kaštariti, Phraorte et les Débuts de l'Histoire Mède*, *Journal Asiatique CCXLIX*, Paris 1961.
- Labat, R., *Assyrien und seine Nachbarländer (Babylonien, Elam, Iran) von 1000 bis 617 v. Chr./Das Neubabylonische Reich bis 539 v. Chr.*, in *the Fischer Weltgeschichte 4, Die Altorientalische III, Die erste Hälfte des 1. Jahrtausends*, hrsg. von E. Cassin *et al.*, Frankfurt am Main 1967.
- Lanfranchi, G. B., *Some New Texts about a Revolt against the Urartian King Rusa I*, *Oriens Antiquus XXII*, Roma 1983.
- Langdon, S., *A new Inscription of Extraordinary Importance for History and Philology*, *PSBA 36*, London 1914.
- Lehmann, C. F., *Die Einwanderung der Armenier im Zusammenhang mit den Wanderungen der Thrakier und Iranier*, *Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses*, Hamburg September 1902. Leiden 1904.

- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F., *Materialien zur älteren Geschichte Armeniens und Mesopotamiens*, Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, N. F. IX Nr. 3, Berlin 1907.
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F., art. *Kimmerier*, RE XI, 1. Stuttgart 1921.
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F., *Armenien Einst und Jetzt II*, Berlin und Leipzig 1926.
- Leskov, A. M., *Die skythischen Kurgane*, Antike Welt 5, Sondernummer, Künstler 1974.
- Levine, L. D., *Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae from Iran*, Toronto 1972.
- Levine, L. D., art. *Hupišna B*, RIA 4, Berlin 1972-75.
- Levine, L. D., art. *Hubuškia*, RIA 4, Berlin 1972-75.
- Levine, L. D., *Prelude to Monarchy: Iran and the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, in: *Iranian Civilization and Culture: Essays in honour of the 2,500th anniversary of the founding of the Persian Empire*, ed. C. J. Adams, Montreal 1973.
- Levine, L. D., *Geographical Studies in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros – II*, Iran 12, London 1974.
- Levine, L. D., *Sargon's Eighth Campaign, Mountains and Lowlands: Essays in the Archaeology of Greater Mesopotamia*, ed. L. D. Levine and T. Cuyler Young Jr., Malibu 1977.
- Levine, L. D., *East-West-West Trade in the Late Iron Age: A View from the Zagros*, Colloques Internationaux du C.N.R.S. N° 567, Le Plateau Iranien et l'Asie Centrale: des Origines à la Conquête Islamique, Paris 1977.
- Lewy, J., *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte Vorderasiens*, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft (E.V.) 1924, 2, 29. Jahrgang, Leipzig 1925.
- Lie, A. G., *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria, Part I*, The Annals, Paris 1929.
- Liverani, M., *The Ideology of the Assyrian Empire; Power and Propaganda*, ed. M. Trolle Larsen, Mesopotamia 7, Copenhagen 1979.
- Luckenbill, D. D., *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia I-II*, New York (reprint) 1968 (1926-1927).
- Læssøe, J., *A Statue of Shalmaneser III, from Nimrud, Iraq XXI*, London 1959.
- Malbran-Labat, F., *L'armée et l'organisation militaire de l'Assyrie*, École Pratique des Hautes Études IV^e Section, Sciences historiques et philologiques, II Hautes Études Orientales 19, Genève-Paris 1982.
- Manandian, H. A., *The Trade and Cities of Armenia in Relation to Ancient World Trade*, Lisbon 1965.
- Manitius, W., *Das stehende Heer der Assyrerkönige und seine Organisation*, ZA 24, Strassburg 1910.
- Maspéro, G., *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient Classique, Les Empires*, Paris 1899.
- May, H. G., *The Ten Lost Tribes*, Biblical Archaeology 6, New Haven 1943.
- Mayer, W., *Sargons Feldzug gegen Urartu – 714 v. Chr.*, Eine militärhistorische Würdigung, MDOG 110-112, Berlin 1978-1980.
- Mayer, W., *Die Finanzierung einer Kampagne (TCL 3, 346-410)*, Ugarit-Forschungen 11, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1979.
- Mayer, W., *Sargons Feldzug gegen Urartu – 714 v. Chr.*, Text und Übersetzung, MDOG 115, Berlin 1983.
- Meade, C. Goff, *Lüristān in the First Half of the First Millennium B. C.*, Iran 6, London 1968.
- Meier, G., *Lexikalische Bemerkungen*, Orientalia N. S. 8, Roma 1939.

- Melikišvili, G. A., *Die Urartäische Sprache*, hrsg. A. Kammenhuber und M. Salvini, Rome 1971.
- Melikišvili, G. A., *Urartu und das südliche Transkaukasien*, *Georgica* 1980, Jena 1980.
- Michel, E., *Die Assur-Texte Salmanassars III. (858-824)*, *Die Welt des Orients* II.3, Göttingen 1956.
- Millard, A. R., *Fragments of Historical Texts from Nineveh: Ashurbanipal*, *Iraq* 30, London 1968.
- Millard, A. R., *The Scythian Problem*, in *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt*, ed. J. Ruffle *et al.*, Warminster 1979.
- Minns, E. H., *The Scythians and Northern Nomads*, *CAH* III, Cambridge 1965.
- Moorey, P. R. S., *Catalogue of the Ancient Persian Bronzes in the Ashmolean Museum*, Oxford 1971.
- Moorey, P. R. S., *Towards a Chronology for the "Lūristān Bronzes"*, *Iran* 9, London 1971.
- Moorey, P. R. S., *Ancient Bronzes from Luristan*, Oxford 1974.
- Muscarella, O. W., *Qalatgah: An Urartian Site in Northwestern Iran*, *Expedition* 13/3-4, Philadelphia 1971.
- Müllenhoff, K., *Deutsche Altertumskunde* III, Berlin 1892.
- Neusner, J., *Jews in Iran*, *The Cambridge History of Iran* 3,2, *The Seleucid, Parthian and Sassanian Periods*, ed. E. Yarshater, Cambridge 1983.
- The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*, London 1970.
- Oded, B., *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Wiesbaden 1979.
- Olmstead, A. T. E., *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria*, New York 1908.
- Olmstead, A. T. E., *Assyrian Historiography*, *The University of Missouri Studies Soc. Science Ser.* vol. III number 1, Columbia (Mo.), 1916.
- Olmstead, A. T. E., *History of Assyria*, Chicago and London, reprint 1975. (1923).
- Oppenheim, A. L., *Idiomatic Accadian*, *JAOS* 61, New Haven 1941.
- Oppenheim, A. L., *The City of Assur in 714 B. C.*, *JNES* 19, Chicago 1960.
- Parpola, S., *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*, *AOAT* 6, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970.
- Parpola, S., *Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions and Neo-Assyrian Letters*, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons, Orientis antiqui collectio* XVII, ed. F. M. Fales, Roma 1981.
- Parpola, S., *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, Part II: Commentary and Appendices*, *AOAT* 5,2, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983.
- Phillips, E. D., *The Royal Hordes*, London 1965.
- Phillips, E. D., *The Scythian domination in Western Asia: its record in history, scripture and archaeology*, *World Archaeology* 4,2, London 1972.
- Pinches, T. G., *The Old Testament, In the Light of The Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, London 1903.
- Piotrovskij, B. B., *Il regno di Van, Urartu*, *Incunabula Graeca* XII, Roma 1966.
- Piotrovskij, B. B., *Urartu. The Kingdom of Van and its Art*, London 1967.
- Piotrovskij, B. B., *Urartu, Ancient Civilizations*, London 1969.
- Postgate, J. N., *The Governor's Palace Archive, Cuneiform texts from Nimrud II*, London 1973.
- Postgate, J. N., *Assyrian Texts and Fragments*, *Iraq* 35, London 1973.
- Rabinowitz, L. I., *Ten Lost Tribes*, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971.

- Rawlinson, G., *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World*, 1-4, London 1864.
- Rawlinson, Sir Henry, in *History of Herodotus*, ed. G. Rawlinson, London 1875.
- RCAE: abbreviation for L. Waterman, *Royal Correspondance*, etc., *q. v.*
- Reade, J. E., *Kassites and Assyrians in Iran*, Iran 16, London 1978.
- Riemschneider, M., *Das Reich am Ararat*, Heidelberg 1965.
- Rigg, H. A., Sargon's 'Eighth Military Campaign', *JAOS* 62, New Haven 1942.
- Rolle, R., *Hölzerne Grabbauten und Totenritual der frühen Eisenzeit in Südrussland und den nordwestlichen Kaukasusgebiet*, Diss., Göttingen 1968.
- Rolle, R., *Urartu und die Steppenvölker*, in *Urartu. Ein wiederentdeckter Rivale Assyriens; Ausstellungskataloge der Prä-historischen Staatssammlung München, Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte* 2, hrsg. H.-J. Kellner, München 1976.
- Rolle, R., *Urartu und die Reiternomaden*, *Saeculum* 28, München 1977.
- Rost, P., *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglath-Pileasers III*, Bd. 1, Einleitung, Transcription und Uebersetzung, Wörterverzeichnis mit Commentar, Leipzig 1893.
- Saggs, H. W. F., *The Nimrud Letters, 1952 – Part IV, The Urartian Frontier*, Iraq 20, London 1958.
- Saggs, H. W. F., *The Greatness that was Babylon, A sketch of the ancient civilization of the Tigris-Euphrates valley*, London 1962.
- Salvini, M., *Die Ausdehnung Urartus nach Osten*, in *The 2nd International Symposium on Armenian Art*. Yerevan 1978, September 12-18, Yerevan 1981.
- Salvini, M., *Bemerkungen über die Thronfolge in Urartu, Gesellschaft und Kultur im alten Vorderasien*, *Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients* 15, hrsg. H. Klengel, Berlin 1982.
- Salvini, M., *La Storia della Regione in Epoca Urartea e I Documenti*, in *Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia, Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche nell' Azerbaigian iraniano*, ed. P. E. Pecorella e M. Salvini, *Incunabula Graeca* LXXVIII, Roma 1984.
- Sayce, A. H., *Decipherment of Hittite Inscriptions*, *PSBA* 25, London 1903.
- Sayce, A. H., *The Kingdom of Van (Urartu)*, *CAH III*, Cambridge 1965.
- Schott, A., in his review of R. H. Pfeiffer, *State Letters of Assyria, 1935*, in *OLZ* 40, Berlin 1937.
- Schrader, E., *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3. Auflage, neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern und H. Winckler, Berlin 1903.
- Smirnov, A. P., *Die Skythen*, Dresden 1979.
- Smith, S., *The Supremacy of Assyria*, *CAH III*, Cambridge 1965.
- Spalinger, A. J., *The Date of the Death of Gyges and its Historical Implications*, *JAOS* 98, New Haven 1977.
- Strabo, *The Geography of Strabo V*, trsl. H. L. Jones, *The Loeb Classical Library*, London and Cambridge (Mass.) 1969.
- Streck, M., *Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften Armenien, Kurdistân und Westpersien nach den babylonisch-assyrischen Keilinschriften*, *ZA XIV*, Berlin 1899.
- Streck, M., *Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften Armenien, Kurdistân und Westpersien nach den babylonisch-assyrischen Keilinschriften*, *ZA XV*, Berlin 1900.
- Streck, M., *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergang Niniveh's*, *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek* 7, Leipzig 1916.
- Sulimirski, T., *Scythian Antiquities in Western Asia*, *Artibus Asiae* 17, Ascona 1954.

- Sulimirski, T., *The Cimmeric Problem*, Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology 2, London 1959.
- Sulimirski, T., *Prehistoric Russia, An Outline*, London 1970.
- Sulimirski, T., *The Background of the Ziwie Find and its Significance in the Development of Scythian Art*, Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology 15, London 1978.
- Tadmor, H., *The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: a Chronological-Historical Study*, JCS XII, New Haven 1958.
- Tallgren, A. M., *La Pontide Préscythique après l'introduction des Métaux, Eurasia septentrionalis antiqua II*, Helsinki 1926.
- Thompson, R. C., *The British Museum Excavations at Nineveh 1931-32*, Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology 20, Liverpool 1933.
- Thompson, R. C., (I) *An Assyrian Parallel to an Incident in the Story of Semiramis*, (II) *Fragments of Stone Reliefs and Inscriptions found at Nineveh, Iraq 4*, London 1937.
- Thompson, R. C., *A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh (1927-32)*, Iraq VII, London 1940.
- Thureau-Dangin, F., *Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon*, TCL 3, Paris 1912.
- van Loon, M. N., *Urartian Art, its distinctive traits in the light of new excavations; Uitgaven van Het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut Te Istanbul 20*, Istanbul 1966.
- van Loon, M. N., art. *Urartu and Armenia*, History of, The New Encyclopædia Britannica 18, Chicago 1974.
- van Loon, M. N., *The Inscription of Ishpuini and Meinua at Qalatgah, Iran*, JNES 34, Chicago 1975.
- von Soden, W., *Der Nahe Osten im Altertum, Propyläen Weltgeschichte 2*, Berlin 1962.
- von Soden, W., *Die Assyrer und der Krieg*, Iraq 25, London 1963.
- von Soden, W., *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1959-1981.
- Waetzoldt, H., art. *Hirt*, RIA 4, Berlin-New York 1972-75.
- Waterman, L., *Royal Correspondance of the Assyrian Empire, I-IV*. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vols. XVII-XX, Ann Arbor 1930-1936.
- Weidner, E. F., *Neue Bruchstücke des Berichtes über Sargons achten Feldzug*, Archiv für Orientforschung 12, Berlin 1937-39.
- Weidner, E.F., *Šilkan(ḫe)ni, König von Mušri, ein Zeitgenosse Sargons II. Nach einem neuen Bruchstück der Prisma-Inschrift des assyrischen Königs*, Archiv für Orientforschung 14, Berlin-Graz 1941-44.
- Werner, R., *Geschichte des Donau-Schwarzmeer-Raumes im Altertum, Abriss der Geschichte antiker Randkulturen*, hrsg. W.-D. v. Barloewen, München 1961.
- Widengren, G., *The Status of the Jews in the Sassanian Empire*, Iranica Antiqua I, Leiden 1961.
- Winckler, H., *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen I*. Leipzig 1889.
- Winckler, H., *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens, Völker und Staaten des alten Orients 1*, Leipzig 1892.
- Winckler, H., *Kimmerier, Ašguzäer, Skythen*, Altorientalische Forschungen I,6, Leipzig 1897.
- Winckler 1903, see Schrader.
- Wiseman, D.J., *The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon*, Iraq 20, London 1958.

- Wäfler, M., Urartu und Assyrien, in Urartu. Ein wiederentdeckter Rivale Assyriens, Ausstellungskataloge der Prähistorischen Staatssammlung München, Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte 2, hrsg. H.-J. Kellner, München 1976.
- Yamauchi, E., Meshech, Tubal, and Company: A Review Article, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 19, Wheaton, Ill. 1976.
- Yamauchi, E., Foes from the Northern Frontier, Invading Hordes from the Russian Steppes, Grand Rapids 1982.
- Young, T. C., The Iranian Migration into Zagros, *Iran* 5, London 1967.
- Yusifov, Y. B., On the Scythians in Mannea, in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff*, ed. M. A. Dandamayev, Warminster 1982.
- Zaccagnini, C., An Urartian Royal Inscription in the Report of Sargon's Eighth Campaign, in *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons, Orientis antiqui collectio XVII*, ed. F. M. Fales, Roma 1981.
- Zaccagnini, C., The Enemy in the Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: The "Ethnographic" Description, in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn, XXV. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Berlin 3. bis 7. Juli 1978, I. 2. hrsg. H.-J. Nissen und J. Renger, Berlin 1982.
- Zgusta, L., Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste, Die ethnischen Verhältnisse, namentlich das Verhältnis der Skythen und Sarmaten, im Lichte der Namenforschung, Praha 1955.

Submitted to the Academy May 1988.

Published December 1988.

Abstract, Summary. – An abstract in English is compulsory. It should count 10-15 lines, outline main features, stress novel information and conclusions, and end with the author's name, title, and institutional and/or private postal address. – Papers in Danish may be provided with a summary in another language by agreement between author and editor.

Typescript. – Page 1 should contain title, author's name and the name of the Academy. Page 2: Abstract, author's name and address. Page 3: Table of contents if necessary. Captions should be delivered on separate sheets. Footnotes should be avoided if at all possible; if indispensable, they, too, should be typed on separate sheets. Consult a *recent* issue of the series for general layout.

Typewrite with double space throughout and leave a 4 cm margin *right*. Indicate desired position of illustrations and tables with pencil in margin *and repeat it in the galley proof*.

Use three or fewer grades of heading unless more are indispensable. Avoid long headings. Indicate clearly the hierarchy of headings.

Figures. – Please submit two copies of each graph, map, photograph, etc., all marked with the author's name. Whenever possible all figures will be placed within the text; the nature of the illustrations will govern the editor's choice of paper quality.

All figures, also line drawings, must be submitted as glossy, photographic prints suitable for direct reproduction. Prints fitting the indicated printed area are preferred, but the final size is the responsibility of the editor. The scale should be indicated in the caption or, preferably, on the illustration itself.

Fold-out figures and tables should be avoided. Use distinct (but not dominant) capital letters for the items in composite figures. For transfer lettering use simple, semi-bold typefaces. The size of the smallest letters should not be less than 1.5 mm. Intricate tables are often more easily reproduced from line-drawings or from technically perfect original computer or type processor output.

References. – In general, the editor expects all references to be formally consistent and in accordance with accepted practice within the particular field of research. Bibliographical references should preferably be given as, e.g., Shergold 1975, 16, the latter figure indicating the page number unless misunderstandable.

Correspondance

Manuscripts should be sent to the Editor, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, H. C. Andersens Boulevard 35, DK-1553, Copenhagen V, Denmark (tlf. +45.1.11 32 40). Questions concerning subscription to the series should be directed to the publishers.

Publisher

Munksgaard Export and Subscription Service
Nørre Søgade 35, DK-1370 Copenhagen K, Denmark

Editor: Poul Lindegård Hjorth

© (Year). Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the copyright owner.

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab

Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter

Hist. Filos. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk.

Priser excl. moms / Prices abroad in Danish Crowns.

Vol.

- 10:3.** OLDENBURG, EVELYN, and RØHWEDER, JØRGEN: The Excavations at Tall Dar-
ūk and at 'Arab al-Mulk. (Publications of the Carlsberg Expedition to Phoeni-
cia 8). 1982 200.-
- 10:4.** BUHL, MARIE-LOUISE: Sūkās VII. The Near Eastern Pottery and Objects of
Other Materials from the Upper Strata. (Publications 9). 1983 200.-
- 11.** STEENSBERG AXEL: Hal og gård i Hejninge. En arkæologisk undersøgelse af to
sjællandske landsbytomter. 1986 200.-
- 12.** LUND JOHN: Sūkās VIII. The Habitation Quarters (Publications of the Carls-
berg Expedition to Phoenicia 10). 1986 400.-

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser

Hist. Filos. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk.

Vol.

- 48:1.** HENDRIKSEN, HANS: Himachali Studies. I. Vocabulary. 1976 180.-
2. HENDRIKSEN, HANS: Himachali Studies. II. Texts. 1979 150.-
3. HENDRIKSEN, HANS: Himachali Studies. III. Grammar. 1986 200.-

Vol.

- 52:1.** Part I-II. MATTHIESSEN, POUL CHRISTIAN: The Limitation of Family Size in
Denmark. (Princeton European Fertility Project). 1985 180.-
2. KØLLN, HERMAN: Der Bericht über den Dänenkönig in den St.-Wenzels-Bio-
graphien des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts. 1986 100.-
3. MCKINNON, ALASTAIR: Dating Kierkegaard's Battles with Fate. 1986 50.-
- 53.** ANDERSEN, LENE: Studies in Oracular Verses: Concordance to Delphic Re-
sponses in Hexameter. 1987 300.-
- 54.** PETERSEN, ARNE FRIEMUTH: Why Children and Young Animals Play. A New
Theory of Play and its Role in Problem Solving. 1988 120.-
- 55.** OLSEN, BIRGIT ANETTE: The Proto-Indoeuropean Instrument Noun Suffix
*tlom and its Variants. 1988 100.-
- 56.** HANSEN, MOGENS HERMAN: Three Studies in Athenian Demography. 1988 50.-
- 57.** KRISTENSEN, ANNE KATRINE GADE: Who were the Cimmerians, and where did
they come from? 1988 220.-