

© 1990 by the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project
and the Helsinki University Press
All Rights Reserved
Printed in Finland

Publication of this volume was made possible in part by a grant
from the Research Council for the Humanities of
the Academy of Finland



THE CORRESPONDENCE OF SARGON II
PART II
LETTERS FROM THE NORTHERN
AND NORTHEASTERN PROVINCES

Edited by
GIOVANNI B. LANFRANCHI
and
SIMO PARPOLA

Illustrations
edited by
JULIAN READE

Set in Times
Typography and layout by Teemu Lipasti
The Assyrian Royal Seal emblem drawn by Dominique Collon from original
Seventh Century B.C. impressions (BM 84672 and 84677) in the British Museum
Typographical encoding and Ventura Publisher format by Robert M. Whiting using Olivetti computers
with technical assistance from Timo Kiippa

Helsinki University Press
Vuorikatu 3 A 2, SF-00100 Helsinki, Finland
Tel. 358-0-701 9077, Tfx. 358-0-175 368

ISBN 951-570-001-9 (Whole Series, Paperback)
ISBN 951-570-002-7 (Whole Series, Hardbound)
ISBN 951-570-078-7 (Volume 5, Paperback)
ISBN 951-570-079-5 (Volume 5, Hardbound)

HELSINKI UNIVERSITY PRESS
1990

FOREWORD

The basic manuscript of this volume was prepared by Giovanni B. Lanfranchi and Simo Parpola and provides the continuation of the publication of the correspondence of Sargon II begun in SAA I. The specific contributions of the individual authors are set forth in more detail in the Preface.

The production of this volume marks a significant departure from the previous volumes of the series in that it has been produced almost entirely by the staff of the State Archives of Assyria Project using Xerox Ventura Publisher and Olivetti computers. This procedure has made unnecessary a physical pasteup of the manuscript by writing the output of the Ventura Publisher directly to film. Redeveloping the processes used in producing earlier SAA volumes has cost time and effort, but it is hoped that it will be repaid by a saving in the production time and cost of future volumes.

We thank the Olivetti (Finland) Corporation for heavily subsidizing the acquisition of the hardware and software necessary to implement this new system as part of their ongoing sponsorship of the Project. I am particularly grateful to Timo Kiippa of the Helsinki University Press for advice and help in developing formats and fonts.

Our thanks are due to the Trustees of the British Museum and to the Musée du Louvre for permission to publish illustrative material in their keeping and again to the Finnish Ministry of Education for generous subsidies to help offset the costs of publication, and to the Academy of Finland for the primary financial support of the Project.

Helsinki, December 1990

Robert M. Whiting

PREFACE

The present volume has been prepared in close co-operation by the two editors, and they share the responsibility for the end product. Before embarking on the work, in August 1987, we agreed on a division of the work involved in manuscript preparation and on the general principles according to which the work was to be completed. Lanfranchi was to supply the introduction and the basic translation of the texts, while Parpola was to concentrate on the transliterations.

Virtually all the texts selected for the volume were collated by Parpola in March, 1988. The results were subsequently incorporated in the Project's database and a fresh printout of transliterations and indices was sent to Lanfranchi who in the course of 1989 prepared preliminary translations of all the texts on the basis of this material.

The translations made by Lanfranchi were scrutinized and edited by Parpola during the summer of 1990. This work was accompanied by a detailed orthographical and prosopographical analysis of the material, which made it possible to identify a great number of previously unknown writers, establish the final text order, and exclude from the volume a considerable number of irrelevant fragments. The critical apparatus and indices were compiled by Parpola in the fall, while Lanfranchi completed the introduction and scrutinized the revised translations in November. A final round of collations in the British Museum was completed by Parpola in December, 1990.

This book is the first volume in the SAA series produced using the Ventura desktop publishing setup acquired by the Project earlier this year, and marks a turning point in the Project's publishing activities. The credit for setting up the system and actually producing the electronic paste-up of the volume goes to the Managing Editor of the Project, Robert Whiting, assisted by Timo Kiippa of the Helsinki University Press.

The two previously unpublished tablet fragments in this volume are published by the kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum. The staff of the Department of the Western Asiatic Antiquities of the Museum helped in every way in the study of the texts.

Galley proofs of the manuscript were read by Robert Whiting, Nicholas Postgate, F. M. Fales, and Julian Reade, who contributed many useful remarks. Results of collations and other corrections and modifications to the manuscript were entered by Laura Kataja.

December, 1990

G. B. Lanfranchi Simo Parpola

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	VII
PREFACE	IX
INTRODUCTION	XIII
The Geographical and Historical Setting	XIII
The War with Urartu	XV
The Empire and Minor Independent States	XXI
Provincial Activity in Border Areas	XXVI
On the Present Edition	XXX
Notes	XXXIII
Abbreviations and Symbols	XXXV
TRANSLITERATIONS AND TRANSLATIONS	
Letters from the Šubrian Frontier (1-83)	1
1. Letters from Liphur-Bel, Governor of Amidi (1-20)	3
2. Letters from Tušhan (21-43)	17
21-30 Ašipâ	18
31-43 Ša-Aššur-dubbu, Governor of Tušhan	23
3. Letters from Vassal Kings and Bit-Zamani (44-51)	37
44-45 Hu-Tešub, King of Šubria	38
46 Unidentified Vassal King	40
47 Šarru-emuranni, Governor of Bit-Zamani	41
48-51 Aššur-patinu	41
4. Letters from the Rab Šaqê Province (52-73)	45
52-61 Aššur-dur-paniya	46
62-73 Na'di-ilu, Chief Cupbearer	54
5. Varia (74-83)	61
74-77 Mahdê	62
78-80 Aššur-belu-da'in, Governor of Halzi-atbar	63
81 Aššur-zeru-ibni to Nergal-eṭir	65
82 Šulmu-beli-lašme	66
83 Nabu-šarru-ušur	66
Letters from the Urartian Frontier (84-198)	67
6. Letters from Kumme and Ukku (84-112)	69
84-103 Aššur-rešuwâ	70
104 Nabû-ušalla, Governor	81
105-112 Varia and Unidentified	82
7. Letters from Kurbail and Nearby Provinces (113-132)	89
113-125 Gabbu-ana-Aššur, Palace Herald	90
126-127 Aššur-belu-da'an	98
128-132 Varia and Unidentified	99
8. Letters from Eastern Kurdistan (133-172)	103
133-144 Šulmu-beli, Deputy of the Palace Herald	104
145 Urda-Sin to the Palace Herald	109
146-147 Urzana, King of Mušašir	110

148-149 Unidentified High Official	112
150-151 Atanha-Šamaš	114
152-161 Aššur-alik-pani	115
162-163 Upaq-Šamaš	120
164-167 Bel-iddina, king of Allabria	123
168 Adâ to the Vizier	124
169 Issar-šumu-iqiša	125
170-171 Dinanu	125
172 Abat-šarri-ušur	126
9. Fragmentary Letters Relating to Urartu and Zikirtu (173-198)	129
Letters from the Mannean Frontier (199-276)	141
10. Letters from Mazamua (199-226)	143
199-209 Šarru-emuranni, Governor of Mazamua	144
210-212 Nabû-hamatua, Deputy Governor	151
213-214 Kuškayu to Nabû-hamatua	152
215-225 Adad-issiya, Governor of Mazamua	153
226 Nabû-ahu-ušur, Royal Bodyguard	160
11. Letters from Šamaš-bel-ušur, Governor of Arzuhina (227-236)	163
12. Varia and Unassigned (237-276)	171
237-240 Mannu-ki-Adad	172
241 Adad-ibni	173
242 Aššur-balti-niše, Royal Bodyguard	173
243 Šarru-emuranni, City Lord of Qunbuna	175
244 Mušallim-Adad	175
245 Zabayu, Fort Commander of Appina	176
246 Bel-emuranni	176
247 Nanû	177
Letters from Assyria (Addenda to SAA I)	193
13. Letters from the King, the Crown Prince and the Treasurer (277-290)	195
277-281 Royal Letters	196
282 Crown Prince Sennacherib	199
283-290 Ṭab-šar-Aššur, Treasurer	200
14. Miscellaneous Letters (291-300)	205
291 Ṭab-šill-Ešarra	206
292 Šarru-emuranni	207
293 Nabû-ušabši and Iglî	207
GLOSSARY AND INDICES	215
Logograms and Their Readings	215
Glossary	217
Index of Names	243
Personal Names	243
Place Names	245
God and Star Names	249
Subject Index	250
List of Text Headings	258
Index of Texts	261
By Publication Number	261
By Museum Number	262
List of New Joins	264
List of Illustrations	264
COPIES AND COLLATIONS	265
PLATES I-II	273

INTRODUCTION

In the first volume of this series, it was fittingly stressed that the existence of the Assyrian Empire of the eighth-seventh centuries B.C. was vitally dependent on a functional system of communications between the administrative centre and its periphery.¹ In this perspective, the Neo-Assyrian administrative letters which have come down to us represent an invaluable source for our knowledge of the organization and functioning of the vast empire created principally by the Sargonid kings. They give us a vivid picture of the "work in progress" in maintaining, developing and enlarging the political structure of the empire in its day-to-day evolution.

The Geographical and Historical Setting

The letters published in this volume are of special interest because of the particular geographical area from which they originate. This area extends, in the shape of a broad crescent, roughly from the Euphrates to the Diyala river, surrounding and enclosing the Mesopotamian plain to the north and to the northeast. From the geographical point of view, the various territories which lie in this wide area all share a common feature: they represent the transition from the alluvial plain to the highlands of Anatolia and Iran. As such, the area of provenance of our letters may be described as comprising two basic elements: a territory of piedmont, slowly or swiftly rising to considerable altitudes; and a territory of high mountains in some places forming major systems, such as the eastern Taurus or the Zagros chain.

The special interest of this area stems from the fact that its geography affected the political entities at the time concerned. The piedmont was the seat of Assyrian provinces, of both ancient and recent establishment. In the mountainous territories, by contrast, a number of local communities or kingdoms still retained their independence, untouched by the expansion of the provincial system. Set apart from this constellation of small polities, to the north, another imperial structure, the kingdom of Urartu, long a major power in the Near East, still rivalled the Assyrian empire.

Generally speaking, the mountain territories as a whole represented the periphery of the Assyrian empire; but, at the same time, some of them (those placed on the northern borders) also represented the periphery of the Urartian empire. This means that we are dealing with areas on the fringes of established states which witnessed many kinds of interaction, both between the provinces and their small neighbours, and between the two imperial systems directly.

In this general framework, our letters are seen to deal with two kinds of information. The first is concerned with foreign relations, either with the major power of the Urartian empire, or with the minor independent territories. The information about Urartu, even if restricted to particular situations, offers exciting material for research, since it differs radically from the relatively few official sources (mostly royal inscriptions) which survive from the Urartian side. As for the independent territories, some of them were located precisely between the Urartian empire and Assyria, so that our texts also deal with their relations with Urartu — a fortunate situation which partly counterbalances the nearly total lack of such data on the Urartian side. Naturally, the correspondence also contains information on the internal situation of the independent territories, and in this way offers the reader a unique occasion to view historical and social developments in these otherwise forgotten lands.

The second type of information found in our letters is concerned with the internal situation of the Assyrian provinces, whether in their relations with foreign countries, or with the Assyrian central government, or among themselves. Similar data are available from other provinces, e.g. those situated on the western or southeastern borders of the empire, so that our letters provide an excellent opportunity for comparing the internal situation and social evolution of these lands.

The geographical provenance of our letters assumes a particular interest against the background of the historical developments which took place during the reign of Sargon II. The reign of this strong king represented the most impressive stage of the expansion of the Assyrian empire and of its consolidation as the dominant power in the Near East. The inscriptions of Sargon describe what appears as an irresistible succession of conquests in virtually all directions. To the west, all the independent states which separated Assyria from the Anatolian plateau were conquered and annexed to the provincial system; to the southeast, Assyrian influence was firmly established on the Iranian plateau; and to the south, a drastic solution was found for the Babylonian problem. Yet, on the northern and northeastern borders, Sargon's expansionist policies met with two major obstacles: the power of the Urartian kingdom, unchallenged in this area notwithstanding the successes of Tiglath-Pileser III, and the natural obstacles formed by the mountainous nature of the border territories. Our letters are an excellent source for the study of this conflict in detail, since they come from the very area which was affected by the military operations and diplomatic manœuvres of the conflicting powers.

The War with Urartu

The rivalry between Assyria and Urartu, a contest for supremacy over large areas of the Near East, was difficult and prolonged. Even if open war between the two powers is attested only for the years 715 and 714,² there is reason to believe that the strife between the two kingdoms lasted from the beginning of Sargon's reign till its very end.³ This long conflict affected the whole border area between Assyria and Urartu, from west to east.

The Western Sector

Echoes of war permeate the correspondence of three western governors, Liphur-Bel of Amidi, Ašipâ and Ša-Aššur-dubbu of Tušhan. Even if Sargon's inscriptions do not mention a confrontation with Urartu in this area, the possibility of a large-scale conflict is described in letters 3 and 21. The former relates the state of readiness of the whole Urartian army, the latter tells of six Urartian governors assembled along the borders, while the Assyrian governor Ašipâ is keeping watch. No. 3 is interesting because it mentions the Urartian king Argišti, showing that the possibility of a conflict did not end with the death of Rusa I. A direct conflict is attested in no. 2, a letter of Liphur-Bel which tells of alleged Urartian attacks on Assyrian forts, and of the protest sent by the Assyrian governor to his Urartian counterpart. An Assyrian attack on a fort is described in no. 4.

The state of war also led to difficulties for the Assyrians in obtaining important materials such as timber, which was particularly abundant and valued in this area (see below): no. 3 tells of a fight to move an amount of delayed timber to Assyrian territory.

The situation in the area was complicated by the position of the independent state of Šubria, which lay north of these three provinces and south of Urartu. Its king, relying perhaps on the difficulty of his territory, conducted an ambiguous policy towards Assyria. Letter no. 35 shows him seizing and protecting Urartian deserters on their way to Assyria, while Assyrian deserters were held back and their extradition cunningly delayed with the excuse of illness.

Unfortunately, there are no means of assigning exact dates to these texts. No. 3 certainly dates from the reign of Argišti, but the accession year of this king still remains unknown. As for the others, the letters written by Ašipâ may precede those of Ša-Aššur-dubbu, since the former is known to have been

active in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III⁴ and appears to have been followed in governorship of Tušhan by Ša-Aššur-dubbu.⁵

The Northern and Eastern Sectors

The area most involved in the conflict with Urartu was, however, the northern and northeastern border of Assyria, as clearly stated in Sargon's inscriptions. The conflict was centred on supremacy over the wide territories of Mannea, which was subjected to the pressure of the two empires, either in the form of internal dissension between pro-Assyrian and pro-Urartian parties, or more directly through the direct conflict of the Assyrian and Urartian armies. The climax of the war was reached with the campaign conducted by Sargon in his eighth year (714) and described vividly in his famous letter to the god Aššur. This campaign led to a heavy defeat of the Urartians, which the Assyrian sources describe as having taken place on Mount Wauš, to the pillaging of a number of Urartian provinces, and finally to the sack of the city of Mušašir with its temple of the Urartian national god Haldi, whose statue was abducted to Assyria.

A large group of letters, written by many different persons, pertains to these developments. The bulk of the correspondence comes from Aššur-rešuwa, an Assyrian official residing in the city of Kumme; but reports are extant also from the Assyrian crown prince Sennacherib (who often acted as a substitute for his father during the latter's absence from Assyria), from vassal rulers, and from various officials. Unfortunately, once again there are only slim chances of ever firmly dating the letters in this group. As is well known, virtually no Neo-Assyrian letters contain a date; therefore, only internal analysis of content, with all the problems that are involved in this procedure, may give clues in this direction.

Datable Letters

A firm dating may be obtained only for a small group of letters. No. 216 mentions, in a fragmentary context, Azâ, who is almost certainly to be identified with the ruler of Mannea who was dethroned and killed by his governors under Urartian influence in 716.⁶ No. 218 mentions Aššur-le'i as receiving horses from Ullusunu, the Mannean king. Aššur-le'i is certainly the king of Karalla, and the episode has to be related to the alliance of these kings (together with Ittî of Allabria) instigated by Rusa against Sargon, which ended in Sargon's campaign to Mannea in 716 with the elimination of Aššur-le'i and Ittî, and the reinstatement of Ullusunu as pro-Assyrian king of Mannea.⁷ No. 218 also mentions "the widow," a woman whose son is mentioned in no. 217 also. In the light of our dating, this widow could be identified with the wife of the Mannean king Azâ; and since no. 217 recounts a military

confrontation between an Assyrian governor (Adad-issiya of Mazamua) and "the son of the widow," this man could be identified with Ullusunu.

No. 164, written by Bel-iddina, who was most probably the king of Allabria, is a report to Sargon about military preparations of the Urartian king after the latter had heard of Sargon's advance against the countries of Andia and Zikirtu. The wording of the letter ("The Urartian king ... ordered his magnates: 'Organize your troops, I shall array myself against the Assyrian king'") corresponds perfectly with what is described in Sargon's letter to Aššur, and places this letter at the crucial point of the 'Eighth Campaign' of 714, immediately before the battle on Mount Wauš. The same date may be assigned to a letter of Sennacherib which, referring to a message from Aššur-rešuwa, informs Sargon that the Urartian king is marching towards Mannea: "He (Rusa) set out and entered the territory of the Manneans"⁸ — a situation fitting that described in no. 164.

Another small group of letters may be attributed to the period immediately following the Eighth Campaign, although with no certain dating. The first (no. 88) is a letter from Aššur-rešuwa reporting that two Urartian governors with their army are on the march towards Mušašir. This letter cannot be separated from a famous letter of Urzana, king of Mušašir, who relates the arrival of the same governors⁹ and their celebration of rituals in the temple of his city (no. 147). Another fragmentary letter (no. 11) refers to the arrival of the governor of Waisi in Mušašir. A fragmentary letter of Bel-iddina (no. 165) further reports on sacrifices performed by the Urartian king in a town whose name is regrettably broken.

The clue for dating these texts, which all seem to refer to the same occasion, is given by two details in the letter of Urzana: the facts that he addresses his letter to the Assyrian *nāgir ekalli*, quoting a prohibition issued by the latter against performing any ritual in the temple; and that he mentions a previous visit of Sargon to his city. The first detail points to the submission of Urzana to Assyrian dominion after the Eighth Campaign (when Mušašir was administratively subordinate to the *nāgir ekalli*), the second is an evident reference to Sargon's "visit" to Mušašir during the Eighth Campaign. Urzana says: "Could I hold him back? He did what he did," evidently a thinly veiled reference to the sack of his city. In the light of this, the group of letters may be dated *after* 714.

However, the most important dating criterion in these texts is the possibility of comparing them with the bilingual Assyro-Urartian inscriptions of Rusa I of Topzawa and Mergeh Kervan.¹⁰ They describe Rusa's sacrifices in a border town, his arrival in Mušašir, the military opposition of Urzana, who barred the temple door and tried to flee to Assyria; the recapture of Urzana, and his reinstatement as king of Mušašir, after which he remained in that city, offering meals to the inhabitants of the country. In Urzana's letter to the *nāgir ekalli*, a question by the Assyrian official is quoted regarding the current whereabouts of the Urartian king and his likely intention to come to Mušašir, to which Urzana answers that the king is coming, and will be followed by other governors. These indications seem to fit perfectly with the situation described in the Urartian bilinguals: frightened by the *nāgir ekalli*'s order, Urzana evidently tried to block Rusa, and fled towards Assyria. If these

associations are correct, another historical problem, the much-debated dating of Rusa's bilinguals, would be solved by our letters.

Reports on Military Activities

A large group of letters describes Urartian military movements, a type of information which was urgently and continuously needed in times of war. This information was obtained through scouts (*daiālu*), who were sent out to reconnoitre and spy, even as far as the Urartian capital, as one of the letters attests (see no. 85). The same activity was undertaken by the enemy, as is reported in a message about the capture of Urartian spies (no. 12). More generally, keeping the king constantly informed about what was going on in the Urartian kingdom was a service requested or required of many individuals, who wrote about the "news of the Urartians" (e.g., nos. 22, 113, 115, 144, 182), even from the western sector (no. 1). Particularly interesting is no. 113, written by the *nāgir ekalli* Gabbu-ana-Aššur, in which he confirms to the king that his messengers are in constant communication with three other governors (Nabû-le'i, Aššur-belu-da'in and Aššur-rešuwa), two of whom are mentioned as informers of the crown prince Sennacherib in one of his letters (SAA I 31).

The kind of information obtained through this channel essentially concerned war preparations and operations which were being made behind the lines by the Urartians. So we hear of the departure of the Urartian army at the command of the king and his *turtānu* (no. 86); of the concentration of five Urartian governors with their troops in the city of Waisi (no. 87), or of the assembling of troops by the king and his entourage (no. 114); of military movements near the country of Andia (no. 177); or of the movements of the Urartian king and his commander-in-chief (no. 112).

Quite probably, information about the military activities of Assyria's allies was largely obtained through direct communication. Very interesting in this connection are two texts dealing with attacks of a Mannean king, in all probability Ullusunu, on Urartian territory. In no. 84, Aššur-rešuwa forwards the information that "the Mannean (king) has attacked the Urartian cities in the district along the lake shore";¹¹ another fragmentary text refers to a Mannean attack against Urartian forts, which called for the swift intervention of the Urartian *turtānu* (no. 131).

These texts show clearly that the war between Assyria and Urartu deeply involved local rulers, who were able (and perhaps forced) to fight against imperial territories, in a turbulent scene of shifting alliances. This pattern is also evident in the letter of Bel-iddina to Sargon about the preparations of Rusa, mentioned above, in which we see the king of Hubuškia marching together with the Urartian king. The king of Hubuškia apparently was forced to change sides at least twice: he paid tribute to Sargon, who visited his city, in 715;¹² he then co-operated with Rusa before the battle on the Wauš, and finally went to pay tribute to Sargon at the end of that same campaign.¹³

Direct and certain information about battles between Assyrians and Urartians is unfortunately almost totally lacking. Perhaps the small fragment no.

273, which contains news about a storm and an attack of Assyrian soldiers coming out of fortresses, refers to such a battle. A surrender of Urartian soldiers is perhaps described in no. 184, where an Assyrian official proclaims: "You are subjects of the king, my lord; you are no longer subjects of the U[rartian]!"

Urartu's Internal and Dynastic Instability

The effectiveness of imperial dominion was at times shaken by local rebellions, which led to military repression and severe punishment. On the Urartian side — the Assyrian one is well attested in royal inscriptions — such a situation is described in no. 166, which tells of the rebellion of a town against the Urartian king, and of military intervention by his commander-in-chief, the *turtānu*, in the context of a military campaign conducted by the king. No. 179 probably deals with the measures taken after a failed revolt in Urartian territory, and with the discharge of a governor and other officials in the wake of a general alarm in Urartu.

However, the most dangerous occurrence was internal strife caused by dynastic aspirations, which could materialize in open rebellion. A large group of letters informs Sargon on a revolt which took place within the Urartian empire, and led to military confrontations, trials and punishments. The main texts are nos. 91 and 93. The first mentions the arrest of 21 people in the Urartian capital and the killing of another 100 people, all involved in the revolt. The situation was truly dramatic, since the Urartian deputy commander-in-chief and another magnate, otherwise known as the governor of Mušašir (no. 90), went to the capital, to be questioned by the king personally about the revolt, only to be set free later because they were found innocent. These two letters are quite probably linked to SAA I 8, a letter written by Sargon to Rusa of Urartu, mentioning the revolt against him and the defection of an Urartian governor (who was made commander-in-chief in Assyria). This same letter mentions hostile actions of Rusa against Mannea, and could refer to the wars of 715 (Urartian capture of Mannean forts)¹⁴ and 714 (Urartian seizure of the Mannean province of Wišdiš).¹⁵

The Urartian commanders-in-chief were surely of royal lineage, as in no. 93 the "commander-in-chief of the right" is said to be "of the family of Sarduri," clearly the king who preceded Rusa on the Urartian throne. This same text seems to describe a crucial moment in Urartu: the murder of the sovereign, as the Assyrian informer tells that "his magnates surrounded him ... and killed him."

This important set of letters throws new light upon the feebleness of the Urartian dynasty, a matter perhaps hinted at in Sargon's "Letter to the God" with its cryptic references to the towns "of the father's house of Rusa" and "of Sarduri,"¹⁶ and to the inscription on the statue of Rusa which was looted in Mušašir, "with two horses and one charioteer of mine he (Rusa) took in his hands the kingship of Urartu," perhaps an indication of the illegitimacy of his ascent to the throne.¹⁷

The Cimmerian Problem

The identity of the Urartian king murdered by his magnates is a problem linked with another long-debated issue, the interpretation of a large number of letters dealing with a crushing defeat suffered by the king of Urartu in or near Gamir, the territory inhabited by Cimmerians. The significance of this defeat is underlined both by the number of governors reported to have been killed (perhaps as many as 11) and by the very number of letters dealing with this matter (nos. 90, 92, 174 and probably no. 173).¹⁸ A detailed description of the battle is lacking, but no. 90 tells us what happened immediately after: the Urartian king flees on a lone horse, while the rest of the army, ignoring his survival of the massacre, declares the crown prince Melarṭua (thus identified in no. 114) the new king. Letter 92 refers to the reorganization of the Urartian army in Guriania, a territory situated between Urartu and Gamir, and to the outbreak of a revolt in the city of Waisi. Two further letters report on an invasion of Cimmerian troops into Urartian territory (nos. 144 and 145) and on anxiety in Urartu, testified to by a call for help sent by the Urartian governor of Waisi to Urzana of Muṣaṣir.

The "Cimmerian defeat" has been amply discussed in various recent works, with respect to both its dating problems and its general interpretation. A direct succession of letters, pertaining to this event and to the Urartian revolt, has been proposed, linking together the texts about the defeat and the revolt in Urartu and suggesting for them a date preceding or contemporary with Sargon's Eighth Campaign.¹⁹ The "Cimmerian defeat" has also been identified with Sargon's victory in his Eighth Campaign over Rusa on Mount Wauš,²⁰ an identification which raises a large set of problems whose detailed exposition is beyond the scope of this Introduction. Suffice it to say that this hypothesis, if correct, would have important historical consequences. The Cimmerians would be the inhabitants of the district where that famous battle took place, the Mannean Wišdiš, and therefore a Mannean people (a thesis which was already expressed elsewhere);²¹ they would become a people allied with the Assyrians, in whose name they would have fought against the Urartian king; and finally, the defeated king would be Rusa I, not his son Argišti, as assumed in earlier interpretations.²²

As was anticipated above, this complex problem clearly involves the identity of the Urartian king killed by his magnates (no. 93). If the letter concerned describes the murder of Rusa, it would have to be dated after 714 since, as we have seen, Rusa was able to retake Muṣaṣir after the Eighth Campaign (which ended in late 714). However, the murdered king does not necessarily have to be Rusa; he could also be the prince Melarṭua who was raised to the throne after the "Cimmerian defeat" in total ignorance of Rusa's survival.²³

However that may be, our letters show clearly that a whole page of Urartian history must be rewritten, particularly with regard to the stability of its throne and the cohesion of its structure.

The Empire and Minor Independent States

The provinces where our letters originate were a pivotal place for relations with the independent communities and states bordering on the Assyrian empire. Many of these territories, due to their position between the two fighting empires, were directly, and in varying degrees, involved in the conflict. Owing to the selection dealt with in this volume, we have only very few examples of territories which were not directly involved in that war. From this point of view, the data provided by our texts on the relations between Assyria and independent states, which are essential for a full understanding of the relations between imperial and peripheral political structures, seem *ab origine* conditioned by an underlying specific political situation (the great war), which may condition in some way the nature of the documentation.

The Concept of Independent States or Communities

A crucial problem which must be dealt with as a preliminary question in the matter of foreign relations, consists of establishing where the Assyrian imperial ideology considered the official border of the marginal provinces to end; that is to say, what countries and territories and communities were regarded as formally independent, and how relations with such entities were managed. This set of problems has obvious repercussions on the relations between kingdoms and on their different ranks, and on the relations between provincial government and foreign rulership; but also on the extension and the nature of Assyrian dominion in marginal lands.

The picture provided by our letters is not clear at all in this respect. While it seems roughly clear that some territories were considered fully independent because of the prerogatives which their rulers appear to have had in practice, this is not absolutely clear for many others. Hu-Tešub of Šubria was able to refuse the extradition of deserters to the Assyrian government (no. 35) or to bargain about this matter (no. 52), and to deny the consignment to Assyrian officials of timber cut in his own territories (no. 33). This points to his total autonomy from provincial government. Formally, also the sovereigns of Hubuškia and Muṣaṣir must be regarded as on the same level, as they were entitled to bring tribute to the Assyrian king (nos. 133 and 146).

On the other hand, the position of other territories is not well defined, nor is the institutional rank of their rulers clear. The case of Kumme, whose ruler might be identified with the often mentioned Ariye, may be paradigmatic in this regard. While Ariye is entitled to write directly to Assyrian crown prince

Sennacherib (SAA I 29), or to meet with the ruler of Ukku (SAA I 41), the status of the ruler of Kumme is said in no. 117 to be that of *bēl āli*, “city lord,” a title normally referring to (recently subjugated) vassal rulers. Further, in no. 95 we hear that Kumme was totally in the hands of Assyria, and was subjected to a foreman of cavalry (obv. 12-15). On the other hand, in this same letter Argišti of Urartu complains about not having received any greetings from Kumme since his accession — a reference which would point towards a partial autonomy of that city (and its leader), at least in Urartian eyes. Historical developments which may have led to a change in the status of Kumme are otherwise unknown to us.

This problem involves even the status of some correspondents who bear clearly Assyrian names. It is the case of Aššur-rešuwa, a man who wrote a large number of letters to Sargon (9 with his name preserved in the salutation, and 11 attributable to him on graphic and orthographic grounds), and who, just because of this plain fact, may be suspected to be a high official, even a provincial governor. Some of his letters deal with problems in Kumme (e.g., nos. 94, 97, 105), and this would lead one to consider him as a governor in charge of that area.²⁴ On the other hand, in letter no. 117, quoted above, Aššur-rešuwa is listed, among others, as a “city lord.” Further, in another letter (no. 106), Kummean citizens are described as no longer tolerating the Assyrian *qēpu*, while Aššur-rešuwa asks for the elimination of high-ranking Kummeans, giving room for the suspicion that he is the *qēpu* in question. Since the *qēpu* is normally understood as an “official of the Assyrian king abroad,”²⁵ this would imply an independent status for Kumme, contradicting all that has been delineated above.

The matter clearly calls for further study, and this is connected with the long-lasting debate about the prosopography and *cursus honorum* of Assyrian officials; our correspondence is a valuable means to begin to face this problem.

Intensity of Communication

A basic feature which emerges from our letters is a strong link in written communication between the empire and foreign communities. The volume of letters exchanged was obviously very high, judging from the number of references made to them. An extensive set of letters deals with direct relations between the imperial centre and provincial government, on one hand, and foreign rulers and communities on the other. These relations resulted in movements of people and information across the border and between administrative centres, even on the royal level.

Assyria was visited by foreign rulers or foreigners of royal blood bringing tribute (e.g., the Hubušian king, no. 133 and 192; the crown prince of Andia, no. 171; the brother of Urzana of Mušašir, no. 148), while emissaries and messengers of foreign countries formed an essential relay of communication (emissaries of Šubria, nos. 36 and 52; of Zikirtu, no. 169; of Labdudu, no. 194; messengers from Hubušia, nos. 134, 162). Foreign visitors could move freely through the outer provinces towards the Assyrian capital, cf. nos. 138

and 203 (referring to seven rulers from the environs of Kumme, and city lords, probably Mannean, summoned by the king).

In the introduction to SAA I, it was stated that the letters from the reign of Sargon at our disposal may be regarded as a fairly representative sample of the whole of the original correspondence.²⁶ On this basis, the intensity of contact between foreign countries and Assyria revealed by our letters cannot be taken as accidental. It is clear that in Sargonid Assyria there was extensive political and cultural interchange between the imperial centre and periphery, in which different ideologies and cultural models met on a day to day basis. Assyria and Urartu being culturally and militarily by far the superior parties in this daily give-and-take, one may legitimately expect our letters to contain valuable information on the question of how marginal areas were gradually integrated into the imperial system.

Political and Social Relations

Our correspondence reveals a number of instances of the political and social effects of imperial policies. As for the former, the whole “outside world” seems to have been totally conditioned by its relations with imperial politics. Imperial interference in the dynastic succession of an independent country, for instance, is attested by a very interesting fragmentary letter (no. 108), which is now basically understandable thanks to several recent joins. An unnamed individual has killed the legitimate queen of Habhu in order to raise an Urartian lady to the throne; faced with accusations of murder, he excuses himself by blaming the Urartian king for the assassination. The local populace, however, does not accept this fait accompli but mumbles: “An Urartian woman may not sit on the throne!” This situation has a parallel in the marriage of a daughter of Sargon to a ruler of Tabal,²⁷ which was meant to Assyrianize that Anatolian dynasty.

Another interesting case of imperial interference is provided by no. 31, where a king of Urartu pressures the ruler of Šubria by various means, among other things by demanding back “the jewellery that my father and I have given to you,” thus recalling the binding value of gifts exchanged between dynasts.

Imperial interference in local politics was exerted both overtly and covertly. On the one hand, we have Argišti’s request for homage from Kumme (no. 95), mentioned above; on the other, the case of an Urartian informer secretly going to Ariye captured by the Assyrians, reported in no. 55. But perhaps the most devastating effect on local social compactness was caused by recruitment to imperial armies, a phenomenon which must have taken place as a matter of fact. On the Assyrian side, Kummean troops would serve under their local rulers, but they would be strategically directed by Assyrian commanders (no. 97), whereas vassal rulers were required to take part in Assyrian military expeditions (nos. 199 and 200). On the Urartian side, Urzana of Mušašir was asked to provide military aid during the Cimmerian attack (no. 145), a situation exactly opposite to that presented in no. 139, where Mušaširian troops were called by the Assyrian king.

On another level, imperial interference was caused by problems inherent in the imperial systems themselves. Deserters from imperial armies, political fugitives, as well as criminals constantly tried to take refuge in bordering lands which were formally autonomous. Many letters attest this important social phenomenon. Nos. 32, 34, 35, 52 and 54 deal with Assyrian (and Urartian, no. 35) deserters in Šubria, a land which evidently represented a kind of "sanctuary" until the time of Esarhaddon, who annexed Šubria in 673 and disposed of the Assyrian and Urartian deserters there.²⁸ Searches for criminals sometimes caused embarrassing moments in political relations, cf. no. 53, where a renegade officer flees to Šubria taking with him the seal of the Assyrian governor.

The subjection of formerly independent territories to Assyrian rule apparently resulted in friction between various elements of the local population. While the representatives of the Assyrian king may have been tolerated or welcomed by local rulers, other sectors of the populace were often less tolerant, resulting in unrest and demands for the removal of the local Assyrian delegates. A small group of letters reveals such a situation in Kumme, where the opposition to the Assyrian *qēpu* resulted in demands against Ariye, the ruler (no. 107), and led to a serious confrontation with Aššur-rešuwa (no. 106). The story may have had a happy ending though (at least from the Assyrian point of view), for in one of the letters the Kummeans proclaim: "The king, our lord, is the lord of all; what can we say?" (no. 105).

Naturally, problems had occasionally to be solved by force: refusal to provide horses for the Assyrian king, for instance, was heavily punished (no. 202, probably in the Mannean area). Use of force, however, was not mandatory. The Assyrian approach to local problems may rather be perceived as generally cautious — a picture which decidedly contrasts with the stereotyped image of Assyrian cruelty and violence. In letter 203 an Assyrian governor fulfills the king's order to "speak kindly" to a local representative; another Assyrian official puts up a show of kindness in front of the men of Allabria (no. 202). Even long insubmissive mountain territories could be "appeased" by negotiations, which resulted in the acceptance of the "king's treaty," and with it, the re-imposition of labour and military duties (no. 78).

Economic Relations

Economic relations, both in the form of formally established "unequal exchange" (tribute) and "parithetic exchange" of goods (trade), constituted a tight link between minor states and empires.

The mountain area northeast and east of Assyria was the prime breeding ground for horses, and tribute from that area was essentially composed of such animals. The crown prince of Andia could bring, probably as tribute, up to 51 equids (no. 171). Cattle and sheep were, however, not disregarded either. In no. 133, the king of Hubuškia brings to Assyria a tribute of this kind; in no. 136, Urzana of Mušašir is reported to be on his way to Arbela with 56 horses and a good number of oxen and sheep.

The numbers of tribute animals mentioned in our letters are in general not particularly high, which makes it understandable that refusal to bring tribute was felt more as an ideological offence than as an economic loss. In no. 146, Urzana excuses himself for not being able to come with his tribute because of snow — probably on the very occasion which "justified" Sargon's attack on Mušašir: "Urzana of Mušašir ... not submissive to my lordship ... did not embrace my feet with his heavy gift, and withheld his tribute and gift."²⁹

Trade was the vital medium to acquire quality goods generally not obtainable through war (booty) or tribute and gifts. In the Assyrian empire, trade was carried on both by governmental authorities and licensed merchants, who enjoyed royal protection and were aided by local administrators. Rather surprisingly, trade of horses, probably considered a matter of nobility, appears to have been carried on even by foreign royalty: in no. 169, the king of Zikirtu is expected to sell horses to an Assyrian official, who deposits the money needed for the transaction in a stronghold.

Timber was probably also considered a commodity to be dealt with by royalty. According to no. 33, both Urartian and Šubrian kings objected to selling timber cut in their territories to the Assyrians. Evidently timber, like horses, was considered royal property, which would underscore the value of this material, particularly in view of its total lack in Mesopotamia. A royal timber monopoly thus seems not to be ruled out.

While merchants went around searching for horses in the east (nos. 208 and 224), unofficial trade was carried on locally. An interesting example of a routine infringement of custom duties is offered by no. 100, a letter which deals with smuggling of goods between Urartu and Assyria. Kummeans smugglers are reported to have bought precious merchandise in the Assyrian capitals, carried them to Kumme, and then sold it in Urartu, bringing back other precious goods to be sold in Assyria. Aššur-rešuwa, the author of this letter, asks for their arrest and thorough examination. This text casts an unexpected ray of light on the constant ineffectiveness of borders vis-à-vis people's economic needs — a picture totally "blacked out" in the official records of Mesopotamia.³⁰

Imperial Activities in Border Provinces

Border provinces were essential cogs in the military and economic mechanism of the Assyrian empire. On one hand, they were the base for military control of bordering territories, which consisted of a constant surveillance of the situation in these territories and of military campaigns launched from time to time. On the other hand, they were an important target of economic exploitation, either as direct sources for materials needed in the heartland of the empire, or as regular conveyor belts of finished products extracted by means of taxation.

Provinces as Bases for Military Control

Control of military activity in border provinces was a duty imposed upon governors, who acted as the king's representatives in providing and organizing the army, both as contingents locally installed and as groups centrally managed and sent to provinces for specific reasons.

Reporting briefly about the state of forts in the province was a widely attested procedure: many letters contain such a report immediately after the greeting formula (e.g., nos. 1-3, 6, 21-25). A number of letters deal with the problem of feeding the local troops (no. 60, 109, 126), a problem which, judging from the frequent communications to the king, must have been of constant difficulty for local administration and must have required particular attention on the part of the central authority. No. 109, in particular, shows the care given to reserve fields for the garrison's feeding requirements despite protests from the local populace. As for troops sent to outer territories, provincial governors had to report their movements, checking their accuracy (e.g., nos. 3, 72), and to provide for their sustenance (no. 68, referring to provisions for charioteers arriving from Que).

Border provinces were obviously the base for launching military campaigns abroad. Few examples of operations led by local authorities survive, and they seem to have been of limited extent: no. 3 refers to fighting to recover timber from a town, no. 5 probably refers to an attack on the same town, and no. 24 deals with deportation from a mountain town. A particularly interesting set of letters deals with the reviews of troops in preparation for a military campaign: the king asks precise details about the number and the composition of the available army, a request which is duly answered by governors or local authorities. No. 67 tells about an order from the king to review troops to be brought to him; no. 251 contains a short, detailed list of

cavalrymen and charioteers, who were enlisted in groups of 200 (cavalrymen) and 100 (charioteers). The unnamed writer reports about present and missing individuals, and distinguishes between "king's men" and "chariot owners."

A most interesting and much debated text is no. 215, which contains a long and detailed list of military personnel described as "king's men" available in the province of Mazamua, including Assyrians, Itu'eans and Gurreans. This list has been used for determining the size and composition of the standard Assyrian chariotry unit,³¹ however without taking into consideration the end of the letter which explicitly states that the figures listed pertain to the troops actually present at the review rather than the whole strength of the army.³² Mazamua was the base for launching major campaigns into the Mannean and Median territories and the letter probably refers to one of them. Perhaps a similar occasion is recalled in no. 234, which refers to a military review and an order to send barley rations to Mazamua.

Letter no. 162 mentions the departure of Assyrian magnates and the visit of the otherwise unknown Zaba-iqiša to Rusa of Urartu. The mention of magnates recalls the expedition of year 713, which was led by them, while Sargon remained at home;³³ if the attribution is correct, this would be a welcome indication that the Urartian king was still alive the year after Sargon's Eighth Campaign.³⁴ Letters no. 199, 210, 226 and 250 deal with the preparation and activity of a campaign to the east. No. 250 is a detailed report about the arrival of the magnates in Kar-Aššur, about the quantities of day and month rations available for troops, and about a review of troops. The location of Kar-Aššur in eastern Babylonia³⁵ would favour a dating to the same year, 713, since the Eponym Chronicle lists Ellipi as an objective of the campaign of that year.³⁶

The result of military campaigns was the distribution of booty and prisoners of war, both to the centre and to provincial administrations. No. 226, from Mazamua, mentions the sharing of booty of horses; if grouped with the other letters attributable to 713, this one could be placed in the autumn of that year.

Deportees and POWs appear to have been inspected at regular intervals and provided with food, drink and other necessities — a 'humanitarian' feature not included in the usual image of Assyrian war conduct. No. 156 is a report commenting on the miserable condition of a group of freshly arrived captives; no. 242 refers to rations of corn and salt given to deportees.

Economic Exploitation

Provincial territory was a source of exploitation of fundamental importance to the central administration. It formed the primary basis for fixed state income, independent of the irregular and uneven quantities obtained as tribute from foreign kings or as booty from military campaigns. The *ilku*-duty ("forced" labour for the king), *iškāru*-duty (quotas on finished products and sheep), *nusāhē* (corn-tax) and other taxes³⁷ provided the centre with revenues and labour forces. Failure to punctually forward the *nusāhē* to the king was a serious fault, which earned a reprimand from the king personally (no. 82).

The pressure of the imperial centre upon the provincial system appears to have been sometimes excessive,³⁸ so that local authorities often complain of scarcity in their territories. See no. 117, where the sender attributes the lack of straw for pack animals in his province to forwarding all available supplies to Dur-Šarruken, the new capital under construction, and no. 120, referring to lack of reeds (though in this case a wish for increased supplies could be behind the request). Both letters were written by the *nāgir ekalli* Gabbu-ana-Aššur, who might be suspected of protesting, from his high position, against excessive pressure on his own province, and to be trying to reserve for himself a higher proportion of its income.

On the other hand, attention was duly paid to keeping local production on a regular standard: the communication of observations on rain quantity (nos. 274-276) to the king was certainly intended to relate to the state of crops.

In general, many economically precious raw materials were extracted from provinces and forwarded to the centre. The subjects of cutting and floating timber (e.g., nos. 4, 6, 7, 8, 127, 129)³⁹, as well as pulling up fruit tree saplings for the royal parks (nos. 27, 105; no. 268 deals with problems of transport) figure prominently in our corpus. The cutting and transport of bull colossi (nos. 17, 115, 117 and 118) or stone thresholds (no. 17) is also a frequent subject; long distance seems not to have posed a major problem, as one bull colossus is dealt with by Liphur-Bel, whose territory (Amidi) is far from central Assyria. Sheep were also forwarded to the centre (no. 263: 1,000 rams). Other letters deal with shipments of red wool to the king (no. 28, from Tušhan) and of hewn stone objects (no. 29, same provenance); a letter containing a fragmentary list of precious stones (no. 205, probably from Mazamua) and another mentioning carnelian from Kumme (no. 284) may possibly refer to the same matter.

Specialized manpower was also conveyed from the provinces to the central administration, possibly resulting in the impoverishment of local craftsmanship.⁴⁰ In no. 56, the author refuses to give junior master builders to the magnates, as senior ones had already been distributed to various points of the empire; in no. 71, an axe maker from Syrian Damascus is sent to the king by the chief cupbearer.

Economic Development

While border provinces were exploited for the needs of the central administration, nonetheless the actions of the Assyrian king could also stimulate the local economy in various ways: the simple presence of Assyrian military and administrative personnel provided consumers who had to be maintained, at least to some extent, by trade with the local population — a matter often overlooked in historical research. Several letters show that extensive building activity was carried out in the provinces under the king's orders. No. 15 describes the building of a town and a fort in the province of Amidi, no. 210 the building of a fort in the province of Mazamua, and no. 211 the building of forts and houses in the bordering Allabria. Royal roads were built and repaired (no. 229, road to Mazamua), and were a medium for easy communi-

cation with the centre, thus facilitating commerce. Cf. especially no. 227, dealing with improving the mule express towards Mazamua.⁴¹

Installing troops and deportees to cultivate arable land in provinces (see, e.g., no. 14, concerned with Chaldean deportees in Bit-Zamani) could result in improvement of the local economy. Troops exempted from taxes evidently gave rise to a local economic circuit not burdened by contributions to the centre.⁴² It was doubtless in the king's interest to increase the economic potential of the provinces, for the expansion of arable land was vital for creating a good basis for future exploitation (cf. no. 225, mentioning a royal order to three different governors to cultivate 1,000 homers of seed corn each).

Governors were naturally concerned with maintaining a high economic standard in their administrative sector. Materials needed by military installations were at times provided by the centre, cf. no. 48, listing equids, camels, sheep and carts, and no. 152, a request for new carts (notice, incidentally, the specification that these should be the "latest model," furnished "with linen above and with *tunimmu* leather below"). In order to keep up a good standards, local authorities were informed on how to deal correctly with corn distribution. In no. 289 the writer (probably the state treasurer Tab-šar-Aššur) explains the rationale behind providing garrison troops with rations taken from the corn tax:

"I give it, so they can cultivate their fields. If I did not allot it, they would take [the corn] they have harvested [prev]iously and eat it, and would not cultivate the fields but turn to me [with]out a superior, saying: 'Bread [is being with]held from us!'" (obv. 8ff).

Social Control and the Power of the Governors

The capture of people fleeing from taxation, debt, or other obligations seems to have been the responsibility of an official called "mule stable attendant," *ša bēt kūdini* (nos. 48, 79). Quite large groups of people appear to have tried to escape from the "blessings" of the Assyrian government: no. 79 deals with the recapture and resettling of more than 380 Chaldean deportees. The picture of social disorders is enlarged by references to captured criminals or ones to be captured by a governor (nos. 227, 228, 231). However, this picture should not be exaggerated to suggest that Assyria in general was in a state of turmoil. The strongly expansionist policy carried out in the reign of Sargon, with its heavy strain on internal cohesion and effort, had evidently taken its toll in social disaffection.

On the other hand, Assyria's expansion brought affluence to its ruling class which surely affected the mutual relations between the provincial authorities. Allotting booty, prisoners of war and shares of taxes to incorporated territories must have created uneven or unfair situations in different provinces, and rivalry between governors. The very frequent letters denouncing the "foul" deeds of Assyrian authorities to the king (cf. nos. 81, 121, 149, 260; many more examples are known from outside the present corpus) are probably to be understood in this light. They provide evidence of continuous and

large-scale variation in provincial competence, jealousy over the exploitation of annexed countries, and competition for territorial jurisdiction over mutually bordering areas.

Letters from Assyria (Addenda to SAA I)

In this volume are published 24 fragmentary letters (nos. 277-300), which on epigraphical and other grounds belong to the correspondence edited in Volume I of this series. They deal mainly with building activities and related problems (nos. 281, 282, 291-296, 300, with river transport of timber (nos. 254-255) and bull colossi (nos. 290, 297-299). Very interesting is no. 282, dealing with palace reliefs of(?) the Old Palace depicting a Mannean campaign. This text may be added to the small roster of (roughly) datable letters, as the last campaign to Mannea was the one conducted in 714 (Sargon's Eighth). Interestingly, the text mentions that captions giving the names of Assyrian governors were to be fixed in the reliefs — a detail not paralleled by other textual evidence nor evident from the extant reliefs themselves.

No. 293 mentions the finishing of the winged 'claw' or 'hoof,' probably the leg of a piece of furniture, whose making is described in SAA I 51. Interestingly again, this same letter, in its fragmentary reverse side, seems to contain a slighting remark on the competence of the Babylonians engaged in the work: "Had it been at the disposal of the Assyrians, we would have retrieved it from them and quick[ly fin]ished it!" Such a remark, if correctly understood here, would strikingly illustrate the mental climate that fostered the war soon to break out between the two sister nations.

On the Present Edition

The present volume continues the edition of the correspondence of Sargon begun in SAA I, and the general scope and objectives of this edition remain unchanged. The basic objective is to provide an up-to-date edition of the corpus that can be profitably used both by the specialist and the more general reader. While every effort has been expended to make it as complete and reliable as possible, no claim is laid to absolute "perfection." This can be achieved only after the texts have been subjected to a detailed and thorough analysis and their contents has been fully integrated with other contemporary evidence, which is beyond the scope of the present edition.

The Order of Texts in this Edition

The order in which the texts are presented is, in principle, the same as in SAA I. The primary sorting criterion is prosopographical, so that all letters by the same sender, insofar as identifiable, appear together. The individual letter dossiers are arranged geographically, the general order being from west to east to south. Within each dossier, individual texts are arranged topically. Wherever possible within the limits of this arrangement, letters displaying similar orthographies, introductory formulae and other unifying features have been put together. No attempt at a chronological ordering of the material has been made. Senders whose identity or seat of office cannot be determined (or ones with only one extant letter) are to be found under "Varia and Unidentified" or "Miscellaneous Letters."

It goes without saying that a considerable number of fragmentary texts included in the volume would probably have been placed differently had they been completely preserved.

Texts Included and Excluded

As indicated by its title, the volume is meant to contain all Assyrian letters published or identified to date that can with reasonable certainty be assigned to the correspondence of Sargon and that were written by persons stationed in the northern and northeastern provinces of Assyria. The basic problems and methods involved in the selection process have been reviewed in ARINH

p. 118-134 and will not be further discussed here. It is necessary to point out once again, however, that some of the letters assigned to the Sargon correspondence may actually date from the beginning of the reign of Sennacherib (c. 705-702 BC), when the latter still resided in the North Palace, waiting for the completion of his SW Palace. There is generally no way of differentiating these letters from those written to or by Sargon, since the king is never identified by name.

Like SAA I, the present volume contains, in addition to letters from Nineveh, also a few Nimrud Letters. While as many as 17 letters found in Nimrud are related by subject matter and geographical provenience to texts edited in the present volume, only five of them have actually been included. The remaining 12 have been excluded since none of them can be proved to belong to the reign of Sargon, but some of them can *certainly* (NL 29, 49, 67, 100) and others with a great likelihood (NL 45, 75) be assigned to the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III. Since letters from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser seem to clearly outnumber those from the reign of Sargon in the Nimrud material, the likelihood for the unassignable letters to belong to Tiglath-Pileser's reign is considerable. Accordingly, we have considered it wisest to include only letters *certainly* assignable to Sargon's reign and leave the rest for a future volume on the correspondence of Tiglath-Pileser. The only deviation from this principle is NL 62 (no. 74), which may well date from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser (or Shalmaneser V) but has been included to supplement the otherwise very fragmentary dossier of Mahdê.

A large number of tiny fragments originally assigned to this volume were excluded as either not pertinent or not worth editing in their present condition. 24 fragments provisionally assigned to the volume or previously overlooked turned out, in the final analysis, to belong to the correspondence edited in SAA I. In order to make them available for study without further delay, it was decided to append them to the present volume.

Transliterations

The transliterations, addressed to the specialist, render the text of the originals in roman characters according to standard Assyriological conventions and the principles outlined in the Editorial Manual. Every effort has been taken to make them as accurate as humanly possible. All the texts edited have been specifically collated for this volume with the exception of four Nimrud Letters in the collections of the Iraq Museum.

Results of collation are indicated with exclamation marks. Single exclamation marks indicate corrections to published copies, double exclamation marks, scribal errors. Question marks indicate uncertain or questionable readings. Broken portions of text and all restorations are enclosed within square brackets. Parentheses enclose items omitted by ancient scribes.

Translations

The translations seek to render the meaning and tenor of the texts as accurately as possible in readable, contemporary English. In the interest of clarity, the line structure of the originals has not been retained in the translation but the text has been rearranged into logically coherent paragraphs.

Uncertain or conjectural translations are indicated by italics. Interpretative additions to the translation are enclosed within parentheses. All restorations are enclosed within square brackets. Untranslatable passages are indicated by dots.

Month names are rendered by their Hebrew equivalents, followed by a Roman numeral (in parentheses) indicating the place of the month within the lunar year. Personal, divine and geographical names are rendered by English or Biblical equivalents if a well-established equivalent exists (e.g., Esarhaddon, Nineveh); otherwise, they are given in transcription with length marks deleted. The rendering of professions is a compromise between the use of accurate but impractical Assyrian terms and inaccurate but practical modern or classical equivalents.

Critical Apparatus

The primary purpose of the critical apparatus is to support the readings and translations established in the edition, and it consists largely of references to collations of questionable passages, scribal mistakes corrected in the transliteration, and alternative interpretations or restorations of ambiguous passages. Restorations based on easily verifiable evidence (e.g., parallel passages found in the text itself) are generally not explained in the apparatus; conjectural restorations only if their conjectural nature is not apparent from italics in the translation.

Collations given in copy at the end of the volume are referred to briefly as "see coll."

The critical apparatus does contain some additional information relevant to the interpretation of the texts, but it is not a commentary. Comments are kept to a minimum, and are mainly devoted to problems in the text, elucidation of names and lexical items, or Akkadian expressions necessarily left untranslated. The historical information contained in the texts is generally not commented upon.

Glossary and Indices

The glossary and indices, electronically generated, follow the same pattern as the previous volumes. Please note, however, that the sorting program which previously treated short and long vowels as different letters has been modified, so that the order of short and long vowels now corresponds to that used in the major Assyriological lexicons.

NOTES

¹ S. Parpola, SAA I p. xiii, quoting M. Liverani, "The Growth of the Assyrian Empire in the Habur/Middle Euphrates Area: a New Paradigm," *Les Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes* 1984, p.110ff, now SAAB 2 (1988), p. 92.

² Generally, cf. Lie Sar. p. 18: 103-106 for year 715: pp. 22-28: 127-165, for 714. For the latter, see naturally also Sargon's letter to the god Aššur (TCL 3).

³ Note the attempt to obtain Urartian support by the Kummuhian Mutallu (Winckler Sar. p. 116:112f), who was eliminated in 709 (thirteenth year of Sargon: Lie Sar. p. 79:467ff).

⁴ Cf. S. Parpola, "Assyrian Royal Inscriptions and Neo-Assyrian Letters," ARINH (1981), pp. 132 and 138.

⁵ Eponym (as governor of Tušhan) in 707: A. Ungnad, "Eponymen," RIA 2 (1938), p. 427, C^d 13. It should be pointed out, however, that there is no evidence (except the introductory formula that he shares with Ša-Aššur-dubbu) that Ašipâ actually ever was a governor of Tušhan. It is equally possible that his seat of office was the neighboring city of Tidu.

⁶ Lie Sar. p. 12:78-82.

⁷ Lie Sar. p. 14:83-90.

⁸ SAA I 29:31f. The letter became understandable in full thanks to two joins made by K. Deller; the attribution to 714 was advanced in Deller Zagros p. 104.

⁹ The governors mentioned in the first letter are called "opposite me" and "opposite Ukku" by Aššur-rešuwa (lines 6f and 12-r.1); Urzana speaks of the governor of Waisi and of the governor next to the Ukkean king (lines 9-10). On this equation, see G. B. Lanfranchi, "Some New texts about a revolt against the Urartian King Rusa I," *OrAnt* 22 (1983), pp. 128f.

¹⁰ Recently edited by Salvini Zagros pp. 79-95.

¹¹ Salvini Zagros p. 21, was the first to show that the meaning of the verb *zaqāpu* in this text (ll. 4-7) means "to attack," and not "to revolt," as previously believed (cf. Deller Zagros p. 117).

¹² Lie Sar. p. 18:104.

¹³ Lie Sar. p. 26:147f.

¹⁴ Lie Sar. p. 16:101.

¹⁵ TCL 3, 91.

¹⁶ TCL 3, 404.

¹⁷ On this matter, see my contribution quoted above, n. 9.

¹⁸ See also SAA I 30-32, written by Sennacherib, and containing various reports on the defeat by different informers.

¹⁹ See my contribution, n. 9 above.

²⁰ A.K.G. Kristensen, *Who Were the Cimmerians, and Where did they come from? Sargon II, the Cimmerians, and Rusa I*, Copenhagen 1988. For a study of this problem, and an analysis of the entire matter, see my *I Cimmeri. Emergenza delle élites militari iraniche nel Vicino Oriente (VIII-VII sec. a.C.)*, Padova 1990, and its English translation *The Cimmerians* (Padova 1991, in press).

²¹ Salvini Zagros pp. 45f.

²² See the pertinent bibliography in Salvini Zagros, p. 43, n. 186. A discussion of the chronology is found *ibid.*, pp. 42-45.

²³ This thesis was put forward in my contribution in *OrAnt* 22 (above n. 9).

²⁴ In no. 104, a governor named Nabû-ušalla appears to be in charge of a community of Kummeans. As pointed out in the critical apparatus, it is not at all certain, however, that he actually was in charge of the city of Kumme as well.

²⁵ CAD Q, p. 265 and 268, with bibliography.

²⁶ S. Parpola, SAA I p. xvii.

²⁷ Lie Sar. p. 32:197f.

²⁸ Borger Esarh. p. 106, Gbr. II, III 23-34.

²⁹ TCL 3, 309-312.

³⁰ For a similar example, or perhaps the very same situation, cf. SAA I 46.

³¹ H.W.F. Saggs, "The Nimrud Letters, 1952 - Part VIII," *Iraq* 28 (1966), p.187; J.V. Kinnier Wilson, *The Nimrud Wine Lists*, London 1972, pp. 50-52.

³² The crucial fragmentary sentence "[Per]haps the [ki]ng, my lord, (now) says: 'Where are the rest of the troops?'" (r. 3-4) was correctly understood by the first editor (Saggs, *ibid.*) but not taken into account by later scholars.

³³ A. Ungnad, "Eponymen," RIA 2 (1938), p. 433, C^b 3, 8. Cf. Lie Sar. pp. 28-32: 165-194.

³⁴ Contrary to the statement of his death after Sargon's sack of Mušāšir contained in Sargon's Annals (Lie Sar. p. 28:164f).

³⁵ Rost Tigl. p. 2:10; 42:7; 56:11.

³⁶ A. Ungnad, "Eponymen," RIA 2 (1938), p. 433, C^b 3, 11. Sargon's annals do not contain any indication about Ellipi.

³⁷ On this matter, see Postgate, TCAE.

³⁸ No. 269, a request by the king to forward 7,000 homers of barley, may be perhaps understood in this way; cf. also SAA I 26 and 27.

³⁹ On this matter, see F.M. Fales, "Il taglio e il trasporto di legname nelle lettere a Sargon II," in O. Carruba - M. Liverani - C. Zaccagnini (eds.), *Studi orientalistici in ricordo di Franco Pintore*, Pavia 1983, pp. 49-92.

⁴⁰ M. Liverani, *Antico Oriente. Storia società economia*, Bari 1989, p. 826.

⁴¹ See in detail for this text L. Levine, "K. 4765+ - The Zamua Itinerary," SAAB 3 (1989), pp. 75-92.

⁴² Cf. no. 16, royal confirmation of Iu'eans' exemption from straw and barley tax; no. 263, gift of house, plough and field to an archer.

Abbreviations and Symbols

Bibliographical Abbreviations

ABL	R. F. Harper, <i>Assyrian and Babylonian Letters</i> (London and Chicago 1892-1914)
ADD	C. H. W. Johns, <i>Assyrian Deeds and Documents</i> (Cambridge 1898-1923)
AO	tablets in the collections of the Musée du Louvre
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ARINH	F. M. Fales (ed.), <i>Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological and Historical Analysis</i> (Oriens Antiqui Collectio XVIII, Rome 1981)
BM	tablets in the collections of the British Museum
Borger Esarh.	R. Borger, <i>Die Inschriften Esarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien</i> (AfO Beiheft 9, Graz 1956)
Bu	tablets in the collections of the British Museum
CAD	Chicago Assyrian Dictionary
CT	Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum
Deller Zagros	K. Deller, <i>Ausgewählte neuassyrische Briefe betreffend Urartu zur Zeit Sargons II.</i> , in P.E. Pecorella - M. Salvini, <i>Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia. Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche nell'Azerbaigian iraniano</i> (Rome 1984)
DT	tablets in the collections of the British Museum
GPA	J. N. Postgate, <i>The Governor's Palace Archive</i> (Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud 2, London 1973)
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
K	tablets in the collections of the British Museum
LAS	S. Parpola, <i>Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal I, II</i> (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 5/1-2, Neukirchen-Vluy 1970, 1983)
Lie Sar.	A. G. Lie, <i>The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria I</i> (Paris 1929)
Menant,	J. Ménant, <i>Catalogue des cylindres orientaux du Cabinet Royal des Médailles de la Haye</i> (La Haye 1878)
<i>Catalogue</i>	
N.	tablets in the collections of the Musée du Louvre
ND	field numbers of tablets excavated at Nimrud
NL	H. W. F. Saggs, "The Nimrud Letters," <i>Iraq</i> 17 (1955), 21ff., etc.
OrAnt	Oriens Antiquus
Payne-Smith	J. Payne Smith (ed.), <i>A Compendious Syriac Dictionary</i> (Oxford 1903)

R	H. C. Rawlinson, <i>The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia</i> (London 1861-1884)
RCAE	L. Waterman, <i>Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire, I-IV</i> (Ann Arbor 1930-1936)
RIA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie
Rm	tablets in the collections of the British Museum
Rost Tigl.	P. Rost, <i>Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileasers III</i> (Leipzig 1893)
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAAB	State Archives of Assyria Bulletin
Salvini Zagros	M. Salvini, <i>La storia della regione in epoca urartea. I documenti</i> , in P.E. Pecorella - M. Salvini, <i>Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia. Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche nell'Azerbaigian iraniano</i> (Rome 1984)
Sm	tablets in the collections of the British Museum
TCAE	J. N. Postgate, <i>Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire</i> (Studia Pohl, Series Maior 3, Rome 1974)
TCL	Textes cunéiformes du Louvre
TCL 3	F. Thureau-Dangin, <i>Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon</i> (Musée du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales. Textes Cunéiformes 3, Paris 1912)
Th	tablets in the collections of the British Museum
Winckler Sar.	H. Winckler, <i>Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons</i> (Leipzig 1889)
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie

W and Y in the critical apparatus (followed by page number) refer to collations in RCAE and S. Ylvisaker, *Zur babylonischen und assyrischen Grammatik* (LSS 5/6, Leipzig 1912) respectively.

Other Abbreviations and Symbols

Aram.	Aramaic
Bab.	Babylonian
Hebr.	Hebrew
Syr.	Syriac
NA	Neo-Assyrian
NB	Neo-Babylonian
DN	divine name
GN	geographical name
RN	royal name
e.	edge
obv.	obverse
r., rev.	reverse
s.	(left) side
coll.	collated, collation
mng.	meaning
unpub.	unpublished
var.	variant
!	collation
!!	emendation
?	uncertain reading
: :: ::	cuneiform division marks
*	graphic variants (see LAS I p. XX)
0	uninscribed space or nonexistent sign
x	broken or undeciphered sign
()	supplied word or sign
(())	sign erroneously added by scribe
[[]]	erasure
[...]	minor break (one or two missing words)
[.....]	major break
...	untranslatable word
.....	untranslatable passage
→	see also
+	joined to