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In June of 1980, a group of leading Italian scholars and several foreign guests convened at Cetona, near Siena, for a symposium on Assyrian royal inscriptions. The volume of papers presented there1 marked a new style in the study of that genre and of political ideologies in ancient Mesopotamia. I should like to acknowledge here the very substantial contribution to this field by the Italian scholars, leading to a better appraisal of the political-ideological lexicon of Assyrian court historians.2

The present paper, which deals with horizons of the Assyrian empire, is concerned with the political-ideological facets that shaped that empire’s territorial expansion. I shall not discuss the economic factors, though I am aware — as we all are — of their significance, which should in no way be underestimated, but which ought to be discussed in a different framework.

We shall begin with a text that contains our main argument in a nutshell, namely, that the primary duty of every Assyrian king was to expand the borders of his land. This assertion is clearly stated in the earliest surviving evidence of a royal ritual — a Middle Assyrian text from the reign of Tuduk-Numura.1 The text describes what was most likely a ceremony performed at the beginning of the Assyrian cultic year. In the course of the ceremony, the king was crowned by the priest of Asur, who placed a scepter in the king’s hands and said (Col. II, 35): “With your just scepter, extend your land! (mātēa ṭaqqiṣ)”3

This is the only royal duty mentioned in the ritual. The rest of the priest’s address consists of blessings or good wishes. About six hundred years later, we find a very similar ceremony in a text from the reign of Asurbanipal.4 Here, too, the king is ordered (I. 17): “Extend your land (mātēa ṭaqqiṣ) at your feet!” and he is blessed (I. 17): “May the gods give him a just scepter to extend (his) land and his people.” We should note especially the almost identical wording of the command to the king in both the earlier and the later texts. However, the king receives not only a “scepter,” bāṭa, to extend the land and people of Asur, but also a “weapon,” ṭakku, a maṣu.5 In fact, both “scepter” and “weapon” are mentioned by two outstanding warrior-kings, Asurbanipal II and Shalmaneser III, as having been given to them at the outset of their respective reigns. The “scepter” is for “shepherding” the people, while the “merciless weapon,” ṭakku la pādī, is for conquering lands, from the moment of accession to the throne, forever after.6

The imperative of territorial expansion had been expressed in several royal epitaphs already in the Middle Assyrian period. Adad-nirari I; two generations before our coronation ritual, refers to himself as the “enlarger” of the Assyrian territory (māragesiš ṭiṣši ƙa kudīri).7 He assigns this royal title to three of his predecessors, as far back as Asšur-uballit I in the 14th century BCE. Centuries later, Sargon II employs a similar epitaph; “one who upsurges (maragesiš) the border of Asšur.”8 Esharhadon rephrases it even more explicitly: “to attack, to plunder, to extend the border of Assyria — the gods empowered me.”9

2. Of special interest for the present paper is M. Liverani’s Prestige and Interest (HANE/S 1), Padua 1990, which examines — among other topics — the ideological framework of the claim for world dominance in the royal inscriptions of the Middle Assyrian period (44-55); see also B. Oslin, War, Peace and Empire, Wiesbaden 1992, 169-176.
3. K.F. Müller, Das assyrische Ritual (MVAG 41/2), Leipzig 1937, 12.
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A recurrent motif connected with the principle of personal expansion is that of "heroic priority." The king boasted that he had traversed a land that none of his forefathers had heard of. This motif stems from another essential feature of Assyrian royal ideology: the image of the king as hero. At the outset of his reign, every monarch performed some sort of heroic deed. Tiglath-Pileser I passed over steep ridges, hacking his way with bronze pick-axes and Astammaral Ки. He pursued his enemies across impassable mountains, never sealed by his royal father. These demonstrations of royal valour, coupled with the claim of "heroic priority," recur in the inscriptions of the Sargonid kings of the Empire, in connection with their expansion of the borders and conquest of lands beyond the achievements of their fathers. What were the maximum borders claimed in this pattern of continuous expansion? In theory, they were the edges of the earth, marked in Mesopotamian cosmic geography by the large bodies of water for away: the Upper Sea of the Sunset and the Lower Sea of the Sunrise. The Upper Sea of the Sunset is of course the Mediterranean. To the north lay the two seas of Nairi, Urmiyä and Van (occasionally referred to in the early periods as the Upper Seas). The quest to reach the Upper Sea is a well-known feature of Assyrian territorial expansion, starting with Sennacherib, Ashur-Abi, who followed in the footsteps of Tiglath-Pileser I. Reaching the Mediterranean to perform the ritual of "washing weapons in the sea" was linked with climbing the Amurru—or the Lebanon—and the ceremonial falling of cedar trees. It was a feat not to be repeated by the king of Babylon. In the 14th century, Ashur-Abi climbed the mountain during the reign of the Hittite Empire. After its fall, near the end of the 12th century, Tiglath-Pileser I was the first to remove the practice, followed by Ashur-Abi. For each the campaign to the Mediterranean was a sporadic act, part of a larger campaign against his enemies. It became common practice, however, with Shalmaneser III, who already in his first campaign reached the Sea of Nairi—Lake Urmiyä—and the Upper Sea of the West. He then repeatedly campaigned to the Mediterranean coast, climbing the Amurru on the way. The declaration of this campaign, at this stage, did not refer to a permanent hold on the sea coast, which would only be achieved under Tiglath-Pileser III; rather, it was a function of a military campaign. The reign of Tiglath-Pileser III institutionalized the ideological claim: from that time on the Assyrian monarch became the permanent master of the whole earth from the Upper to the Lower Sea. The quest for expansion then turned to other directions.

The geographical extent of the Assyrian conquest was accompanied by monuments set up in distant lands in the course of or at the conclusion of successful military campaigns. In this context, the geocentric term salman denotes both the three-dimensional monument, the stela, and the stele-like round-topped rock relief. Since the monument carries an inscription recording the king's victories, it is denoted as "the record of the triumph in battle," "the record of my powerful victory" or "praise of Ashur and my own might." The key terms are iba and damātu, mostly as a bentuqti, kitšuqti, qr̲uqti, and compound forms such as šuq̲aqr̲itu, 6amātu kitšuqti and the like. Such a monument not only commemorated the victory of the monarch and his god; it was also a constant reminder of the Assyrian imperial presence in a distant land, substituting for the king's presence. At no other period in the history of the Assyrian empire did it so expand its horizons within the reign of one monarch as in the days of Tiglath-Pileser III. Within a decade, the border of the empire in the west moved from the Euphrates, where it had been for several centuries, to the Mediterranean and to the Euphrates of Egypt (Wadi el-Abi) in the southwest. At two points in his reign, Tiglath-Pileser defied the horizons of his empire. The first was in the course of a campaign to western Iran in his ninth year, 737. A stele set up far away in the mountains of Luristan commemorates his achievements with a short hymnic summary at the conclusion of the account of the campaigns to central and northern Syria, defining the extent of his empire at that stage.

The geographical extent of the Assyrian conquest was accompanied by monuments set up in distant lands in the course of or at the conclusion of successful military campaigns. In this context, the geocentric term salman denotes both the three-dimensional monument, the stela, and the stele-like round-topped rock relief. Since the monument carries an inscription recording the king's victories, it is denoted as "the record of the triumph in battle," "the record of my powerful victory" or "praise of Ashur and my own might." The key terms are iba and damātu, mostly as a bentuqti, kitšuqti, qr̲uqti, and compound forms such as šuq̲aqr̲itu, 6amātu kitšuqti and the like. Such a monument not only commemorated the victory of the monarch and his god; it was also a constant reminder of the Assyrian imperial presence in a distant land, substituting for the king's presence. At no other period in the history of the Assyrian empire did it so expand its horizons within the reign of one monarch as in the days of Tiglath-Pileser III. Within a decade, the border of the empire in the west moved from the Euphrates, where it had been for several centuries, to the Mediterranean and to the Euphrates of Egypt (Wadi el-Abi) in the southwest. At two points in his reign, Tiglath-Pileser defied the horizons of his empire. The first was in the course of a campaign to western Iran in his ninth year, 737. A stele set up far away in the mountains of Luristan commemorates his achievements with a short hymnic summary at the conclusion of the account of the campaigns to central and northern Syria, defining the extent of his empire at that stage. Further expansion of the horizons of Assyria took place towards the close of the reign of Sargon II, two decades after the death of Tiglath-Pileser III. In this last phase of his reign, after he had conquered Babylonia, Sargon's newly composed inscriptions redefined the territorial horizons of his empire. At the extremities of his realm, the northwest and the southwest, two kings—Mintu of Musti and Upel of Oa—"who lives like a fish, thirty double hours away, in the midst of the sea of the rising sun," and who, as the texts stress, had never submitted to any of Sargon's predecessors—were sent ambassadors to Dūr-Sarrukin bearing gifts which were regarded, from the Assyrian point of view, as tributes of submission. The third land whose submission Sargon claimed at that stage (707) was Yadnana—Cyprus. Its submission is recorded on a stele set up on top of a sacred mountain near Larnaca. Fragments of lines in the Dūr-Sarrukin annals, we gather that Sargon intervened in a conflict between the king of Tyre or the governor of Kition, and a confederation of seven Cypriot cities, whom he claims to have defeated. In the stele, only the heroic summary is recorded.

"And seven kings of Ia, a district of Yadnana—whose distant shores are situated a seven's days' journey over the Sea of the Setting Sun, and the name of whose lands from days of yore until now no one of the kings, my fathers, who lived before my days, had heard—(now, these kings) heard from afar, in the midst of the sea, of the crowds which I was performing in Chaldea and the land of Hai; their hearts palpitated, fear fell upon them: ... their gifts (they) brought me in Babylon, and they kissed my feet."

What emerges from these texts of heroic priority is that Sargon expanded the horizons of the Empire one step beyond the limits set by Tiglath-Pileser. These horizons no longer extended merely from sea to sea, but to the islands in the midst of the seas. One wonders if a state similar to that near Larnaca, now in the Berlin Museum, may not have been set up somewhere in Bahrain. Surely the mention of these two extremities across the Near and the Upper Seas reminded contemporaries of

27. Fuchs, Sargon, 175ff.
the seats of the king's illustrious ancient namesake, Sar- 
gon of Akkad, who in the Mesopotamian heroic tradi-
tion ruled over Dilman in the East and reached Kaptara 
far away in the Sea of the West. The very name of the 
Assyrian emperor epitomized the heroic tradition — 
indeed, in an iconic text of Sargon II he is occasionally 
referred to as "Sargon, the latter" (warka), clearly, the 
"former" was Sargon of Akkad. Was this historically 
premature name given to him by Tiglath-pileser III, his 
father,54 or was it a throne assumed name by the young 
prince upon his accession? In any event, we must connect 
the sudden re-emergence of the name of the creator of 
Mesopotamia's golden age with the fact that Sargon II, 
following Tiglath-pileser's example, expanded the hori-
zons of the Assyrian Empire to its maximal limits, in 
the footsteps of the kings of Akkad. The royal titles of 
the Assyrian kings: "King of the World," "King of the 
Four Quarters," and, especially, "King of Sumer and 
Akkad," were a link with ancient tradition. 
Sargon's imperial policies were continued not by his son, 
Sennacherib, but by his grandson, Esarhaddon. Having 
inherited an empire whose borders were set at their max-
um extent from the Upper to the Lower Sea, Esarhaddon 
took special pains to announce acquisitions of his own. 
Two stages can be distinguished in the expansion of 
Assyria's possessions under Esarhaddon, one beginning 
with his fifth year and the other — with his twenty-sixth. At the end 
of each stage the extent of Assyria's expansion was redefined. 
The first stage is reflected in the historical 
inscription from Nineveh, from 676.55 According to this 
text, Esarhaddon's first military achievement was to punish 
severely the port city of Sidon in Phoenicia, and to make the 
king have decided the economic burdens imposed upon 
the city. As the text claims, the Sidonian king was sup-
ported by a king in Cilicia, whose cities were situated in 
mountains difficult to be reached. 
This campaign of Esarhaddon was exceptionally brutal. 
Sidon was destroyed, and a new city called "The Port of 
Esarhaddon" was built in its place. This war culmin-
ated in a gory triumph: the heads of the king of Sidon and 
of his Cilician ally were carried in a procession, tied to 
the necks of their minions, through the streets of Nine-
veh amid much jubilation and song.56 
Another triumph followed by the humiliation of a 
vassal king was the case of the city of Arzûl on the border 
of Egypt. It was conquered, and its king was triumphantly 
exhibited in festivals of the gods of Nineveh, together 
with a bear, a dog and a pig.57 These manifestations of 
emperor power in Phoenicia, Cilicia and the border of Egypt 
determined once again the horizons of the empire in the 
West. 
As for Cyprus, the hold established by Sargon 
probably had not been lost. Though Esarhaddon does not 
mention explicitly that he was the sovereign of Yatnun, 
he claims that he held sway over the Greeks from Yat-
num to Tarsos in Asia Minor.58 On another occasion, ten 
kings of Yatnun are listed together with twelve kings of 
the seashore as vassals of Esarhaddon.59 
Having asserted the domination of Assyria in the West, 
Esarhaddon turned elsewhere to expand his imperial 
boundaries, as was expected of him according to the Assyr-
ian royal ideologica! and historical tradition. The only 
non-subjugated areas adjacent to his borders were the 
deserts in the south and faraway east. And indeed, the 
Arabian desert and the desert in Media, near Mt. 
Bíšit, see, was the next challenge.60 Not that there 
was much to conquer there, but Esarhaddon meant to 
do a great deal out of it, embellishing the account of his 
campaigns with legendary motifs. In both campaigns the motif 
of "heroe! priority" is duly stressed. No king of Assyria 
had ever set foot in these out of reach, remote places, which, 
in royal inscriptions, were often compared to "barbarous 
and inaccessible and hardship. The invasion of Bazu in Africa 
is colorfully and dramatically described.61 
"The land of Bazu, a remote district, godforsaken desert, 
the land of salt, place of thirst, (march of) 
one hundred and forty bills (Var. 120) of dunes 
(qapar barqat), thorns, and "gazelle-stone" stones, 
where snakes and scorpions, like ants, fill the 
ground, (march of) two days. My soldiers behind 
me and passed on. That district to which, in days 
of old, no king before me had come, by 
the command of Assur, my lord, I marched therein, 
victoriously. 
A new topos, that of itinerary, is introduced in this 
description. The distances are expressed in terms of "bázah, 
"a double hours' 'stretch of land,' roughly ten kilometers. 
The use of the figures is unusual realistic figures, like six 
or seven bázah, are mentioned alongside one of 120 bázahs, 
roughly 1,200 km, surely a highly inflated number. 
Similar typological numbers appear in the so-called 
"Sargon Geography," which delineates the borders of the 
Empire of Sargon of Akkad.62 We find that 120 bázahs 
separate the "cistern of the Euphrates" from Malabah 
and Magan. Other figures are 40, 60, 90, and even 180 
baras — the last representing the circumference of Akkad. 
Though using older, different types of sources, this 
romanticizing element was probably composed in Sargonid 
Assyria.63 
Already Sennacherib had been concerned, in the latter 
part of his reign, with extending Assyrian control over 
desert routes, possibly as far as Adummatu — the major 
axis of Domat al-Telid and Jaul, in North Arabia.64 
Esarhaddon refers to Adummatu, "which Sennacherib 
my own father had conquered ..." and whose goods he 
carried off to Assyria.65 Esarhaddon made a point of 
returning these images of gods to the Arabs, while impos-
ing upon them an additional tribute, which included 
among other items, one thousand leather bags of spices. 
However, this affair with the Arabs did not serve as 
a platform for royal boasting, along the lines of heroic 
priority. It was specifically the campaign to Bazu, in 
Esarhaddon's fourth year, 677 (the date in the Babyloni-
an chronicles should be corrected),66 which became 
the paradigmatic tale of ultimate expansion into the desert. 
Esarhaddon's description of his campaigns to the des-
ert lists the exact names of the eight kings of Bazu who 
were captured and killed, but it nevertheless has a legen-
dary shading. Would it be too far-fetched to suggest 
that the episode of the "eight kings of Bazu" was intro-
duced as an analogy to the "seven kings of Yatnun," 
subducted by Esarhaddon's grandfather? Moreover, there 
is an obvious similarity between the name of the land, 
Bázah, and the term harapat, "hand of dunes; could this 
have been a further trigger for the embellishment of that 
tale?67 
A fresh definition of the horizons of the Empire 
took place in 671, after Esarhaddon's conquest of Northern 
Egypt. This extraordinary military feat was not an 
unprovoked invasion of the fabulously rich empire of 
the south, traditionally hostile to Assyria's imperial horizon. 
Rather, it came as a result of the Egyptian military expedi-
tion as far as Ashkelon in Philistia, under Tahhutu, 
the militant pharaoh of the 25th Nubian dynasty of Egypt.68 
In their chronicle of the war with the Nubian army, 
Esarhaddon's annals often refer to the land of Nubia 
— askins in Akkadian — under the elevated geographical 
term "Malabah," the fabulous land of the heroic age of 
Mesopotamia.69 In olden times, Magan and Malabah 
were mentioned in the Oman peninsula, and clearly, in the first millennium, Magan became to 
be the name of Nubia, likewise a source of gold and inhabited by a dark-skinned people. Magan, linked in the heroic tradition to Malabah, was also transferred to the 
same site. Thus, on the ideological plane, Esarhaddon's 
conquest of Magan was responsible for the 
emperor the company of the great kings of Akkad. Only somewhat 
later was the exact geographical terminology of 
Nubia and Nubia employed. The string of royal titles of the king 
now read: 
"Great king, mighty king, king of Assyria, viceroy of 
Babylonia, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of 
Kush (Nubia), king of the kings of Egypt, 
Parsiru and KusI.70 
The account of Esarhaddon's audacious campaign to the 
Sinai desert on the way to Ashkelon and Malabah resembles 
that of the campaign to Bazu, it is a mixture of a military 
itiary, expressed in terms of "bázah (double hours' 
March), and imaginative heroic clichés.71 after four bázahs 
of ground, a journey of two days, the king encountered 
two-hundred serpent's spawing forth death' and 'yellow 
wolves with wings.'72 Similar topos describing the de-

49. Grayson, AIO 25, 56f.; Horowitz, Cusmic Geography. 
678b.
50. Cf. M. Livriani (ld.), Axelord, The First World Empire, 
52. Bauer, Ezerth., 53, Col. IV, 1-5. 

58. This is a case of Iraq and Syria, in Grayson, ABC, 83, 5-6. 
59. H. Tadmor, BIA 29 (1966), 97-100; A. Spilinger, Ons 
50. Bauer, Ezerth., S 24, S 76, Obv. 5. 
51. H. Weisskopf, BIA 7, 195-199; S 53-55. 
50. Ibid., 76, Obv. 5. 
52. Ibid., Rev. 4-7.
sort are well known from the Hebrew Bible, which refers to fiery serpents and scorpions (Deuteronomy 8:15), and to the land of the viper and the flying serpent (Judith 30:6). Herodotus, too, refers to flying serpents (or, the ring which Asikir, king of the gods entwined to me.

We can easily recognize here the heroic depiction of Sennacherib in his battle with the king of Elam in the course of his eighth campaign. As recently shown, this depiction speaks of Sennacherib in terms expressly similar to those used to describe the god Marduk in his battle against the sea-monsters in Enuma-Elish. It appears that the royal hounds not only made use of heroic metaphors when describing a major victory, but also transported these heroic achievements to the mythical sphere. The use of elevated-style geographical terminology did not cease with the death of Esarhaddon. Assurbanipal, in the tradition of his father, states that he marched against Magon and Meluhha, though Sennacherib is correctly named as king of Egypt and Nahrain. This archaistic terminology was employed even long after Assyria lost control of Egypt, never again to expand the horizons of its Empire in the southwest.

Moreover, it would seem that Assurbanipal’s loss of his political hold over Egypt triggered repetitive—even compensatory—references to his achievements “in Magon and Meluhha,” which his historical inscriptions always mention as the king’s first campaign.254 We observe continuity with Esarhaddon in relation to the Ardash. Like his father, Assurbanipal considered the history of his life’s work with war long, elaborate descriptions of his campaigns against the Ardash, mainly in the Deser Desert. However, no mythical elements were employed in these accounts. On the contrary, their elegant, literary narrative style with its

90. Lagarde, Arab. B. § 561; Binger, Erzb., § 3, 8, 6-12.
92. P. Weisert and E. Haestad, H. Haestad, Assur inspirierenden Texten wiedergefunden (CSEA 1900), Halle, 1907.

45. Lagarde, ARAB. B. § 561; Binger, Erzb., § 3, 8, 6-12.
47. P. Weisert and E. Haestad, H. Haestad, Assur inspirierenden Texten wiedergefunden (CSEA 1900), Halle, 1907.

in the Assyrian tradition of territorial expansion, the reign of Sennacherib marks a dramatic departure from centuries-old norms. Except for the campaign to Phoenicia, Judah and Philistia, Sennacherib did not personally initiate any campaign of expansion in the west. His generals had two additional expeditions to the northwest—to Cilicia in the year 703 and to the border of Tabal in 695, for the suppression of rebellions—which were dated in the Annals not in terms of Sennacherib’s own campaigns, gurru, but, exceptionally, in the old-fashioned manner, in terms of respective epigraphs. The only campaign of expansion which resulted in territorial annexation, Sennacherib’s second campaign, was in the east, in the mountainous land of the Kasites. It is in connection with this campaign that the motif of “heroic priority” was invoked. A similar motif is repeated in the course of the narration of Sennacherib’s fifth campaign — to Mount Nipur north of Assyria: “none of the kings who lived before me have traveled unblazed trails and wornseom paths along those rugged mountains.” It is also on this occasion of the campaign that the motif of the king’s personal heroism is unfurled expressively.

“Guillies, mountain torrents and dangerous cliffs. I surmounted in my (bed) chair; where it was too steep, I descended on foot. Like a young gazelle, I mounted the highest peaks, ... yet whenever my knees gave out, I sat down and drank cold water from my water-skin to quench my thirst.”

However, this isolated incursion into the mountain north of Assyria represented no more than a mere acknowledgment of the traditional duty of the king to expand the borders. The court scribes must have been hard pressed trying to correlate the high style of royal heroism with the fact that there was not much to boast about in this ephemeral attempt at territorial expansion.

All in all, Sennacherib was overly not an expansionist. Throughout his reign, the Assyrian borders remained more or less the same. In some places (such as Philistia) they even shrunk slightly. However, Sennacherib repeated

only translated the motif of outstanding novel achievement into two very different areas of activity. The first was architecture: almost at the very beginning of his reign, he abandoned Dir-Surumkin and started to rebuild the ancient city of Nineveh, turning it into Assyria’s magnificent new capital. He changed the course of the river flowing through the city, brought water from afar with the aid of a masterfully designed aqueduct, built massive walls, temples, and royal palaces. He employed in this work scores of deportees brought from the entire empire, among them Cilicians, Phoenicians and Philistines. In the folk tradition (and for the prophet Jonah), Sennacherib’s Nineveh became a megalopolis, a three days’ walk from one end to the other.

The second realm of innovation and extension of horizons was metal technology, especially the art of casting bronze. Sennacherib claims that he personally supervised the casting of bull-colossi and pillars, and invented a new method for casting these giant sculptures as simply “as one casts half-fused pieces.” It is here that we find the “heroic priority” motif, which we would have expected in other contexts: his royal predecessors were ignorant of the proper casting technique, it was the king who—in his own wisdom, clever understanding, and ingenuity (mabiš šumma)—made the innovation possible. When casting bronze doors for the newly built Anu House on the outskirts of the city of Ashur, Sennacherib addresses the reader with a rather emotional statement, most unusual for a king of Assyria:

“To future generations (ana lābirīn), in order that they should know, I say: In this casting, it is I who enlarged the quantity of tin. From this you will learn that it is I who accomplished this work of casting.”255 And to dispel any doubt that he and no one else engineered the casting of the gates, he swears that he and no other was responsible for this innovative technological procedure.256

52. Ibid., 119, 17-19.
53. Ibid., 108, 80-109; A. Hekeld, Samsu (91), 162, 7-25.
54. Luckenbill, Senn., 141 (K. 1356), Rev. 8-9; B. Laidner, JNES 24 (1965), 297.
once was Babylon, with its plethora of sacred sattelizing sites. In the terminology of Edward Schils, 76 which nowadays has become almost a commonplace, Sennacherib restructured the center — and not the periphery, as had traditionally been the mode in the Assyrian Empire. However, this process was halted relatively soon. Sennacherib was killed by the rebel king to the throne, and Asarhaddon, the youngest but preferred son, immediately changed the course of Assyrian history. The city of Babylon was rebuilt and restored, and eventually, within less than a century, Babylonia succeeded Assyria as the predominant — but no longer expansion-oriented — Empire in the Ancient Near East, a forerunner of the first truly universal Empire of the Achaeemendids, which extended, as the book of Esther puts it, from India to Ethiopia — "over an hundred and seven and twenty provinces." 77


TREES(S) ON THE MOUNTAIN
LANDSCAPE AND TERRITORY ON THE VICTORY STELE OF NARANM-SIN OF AGADE *

Irene J. Winter — Harvard

If any work of art can be said to have the status of an "icon" in our field, comparable to the Last Supper of Leonardo da Vinci, it is the Stele of Naram-Sin of Agade — commemorating that ruler's victory over the coalition of mountain peoples identified as Lullubi in what remains of the stele's own inscription (Fig. 1). 1 The special status accorded to this monument is not entirely inherent in the work itself, rather, we come predisposed to appreciate it by our own "habits of viewing" in the West — habits that privilege a correlation between rank and size, symmetry or balance disposed on either side of a vertical axis, and culmination of action in the upper field; not unlike what we find in religious paintings such as Titian's Assumption of the Virgin, where Mary seems to float in the air amid a heavenly host, larger than and observed by the faithful below.

But then, scholars have gone a step further, in finding in the Stele — as did Henketter Groenewegen Frankfort — in what is the best art historical description of the Stele to date — evidence for the Akkadian ruler's personal striving against the mountain of his fate: "Man alone before his destiny." 2 Here, I think, the paradigm has been determined by a particularly 19th century Romantic vision — whether that of Thomas Cole, whose Voyage of Life: Manhood of 1840 shows the mature individual riding the rapids of life in his roller coaster, or that of Caspar David Friedrich, whose Wanderer of 1818 depicts the individual, male, having sealed a mountain peak to stand alone before the sublime power of nature.

Neither of these constructs maps particularly well over Naram-Sin, however. He is certainly the victorious ruler and the focus of the work, occupying a privileged place in the upper field. But in the end, he is not alone. Naram-Sin's own "deification" notwithstanding, he has arrived at his destination accompanied by an Akkadian cohort; while the protective amulet around his neck, the symbols that accompany him as standards into battle, and the celestial elements at the top all attest to the ruler's embeddedness within a system of divine power and patronage. 3 Also, his victory is political and military, over a physical enemy, as distinct from personal triumph or religious ascendance.

* Acknowledgments: I would like to thank Zainab Bahrani, Jeremy Black, Annie Coubet, John Gage, Robert C. Hunt, David McKitterick, Marc Van De Mieroop, Lorenza Negri, Hans J. Nissen, Nicholas Postgate, Michael Roaf, Duncan Robinson and John M. Russell for providing perspective, comments and/or sources.

1. Discovered in 1938, originally published by J. de Morgan et al., Recherches Archéologiques, première série: Fouilles de Suse en 1897-1898 et 1899-1899 (Mémoires de la Delegation du Perse 1), Paris 1900. For the most recent publication of the monument, see P. Harper et al. (eds.), The Royal City of Suse: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre, New York 1992, No. 198, which includes bibliography; also the recent dissertation by Dani Bamber, Die Sargstele von Naram-Sin und ihre Stellung in Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte (Berichte zur Kunstgeschichte, 101), Staatliche Museen zu Berlin 1995. The inscription was in the field directly above that held by the king; it is badly eroded, with only a few cases preserved, which has led to the frequent misinterpretation that the manumess was inscribed in its original form (published now in L. Celli & B. Kienast, Die althethiopischen Königsliste- schriften des dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr., FAOS 7, Stuttgart 1990, 90f., N204).
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