



The Date of the Kapara Period at Gozan (Tell Halaf)

W. F. Albright

Anatolian Studies, Vol. 6, Special Number in Honour and in Memory of Professor John Garstang.
(1956), pp. 75-85.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0066-1546%281956%296%3C75%3ATDOTKP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>

Anatolian Studies is currently published by British Institute at Ankara.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/biaa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DATE OF THE KAPARA PERIOD AT GOZAN (TELL HALAF)

By W. F. ALBRIGHT

EVER SINCE THE discovery of the Palace of Kapara by Max von Oppenheim in 1911, there has been a debate—often acrimonious—with respect to its date. As late as 1934 there was a variation of some two millennia among active discussants.¹ With the death of Ernst Herzfeld, who stood out until the end for a date in the third millennium, the debate seems to have closed, at least for the time being. In 1954 the late H. Frankfort came out explicitly for a date during the ninth century, preferably in its second half, for the age of Kapara.² The same date, though with a higher upper limit, was maintained by A. Moortgat in the official publication of the sculpture of Gozan which appeared the following year.³ K. Galling had all along favoured such a dating, which he now espouses without reservation.⁴ The present writer has also maintained a date between 1100 and 900, concentrating for the past fifteen years on the tenth century.⁵ To this last date he tenaciously adheres, in spite of Frankfort's repeated statements that there was no monumental art in Greater Syria between about 1200 and about 850 B.C.⁶ In the Hetty Goldman *Festschrift* he is publishing a study of "North-east Mediterranean Dark Ages and the Early Iron Age Art of Syria", which examines the general subject of the chronology of Syro-Hittite art in the pre-Assyrian period, and deals rather briefly with Gozan and the Kapara problem. In this paper he proposes to discuss the latter subject at more length, sketching the problem in its relation to the culture of the period, surveying the data furnished by the inscriptions, and placing the art of the Kapara phase in its context.

The paper in the Goldman *Festschrift* outlines the chronology of the imperial Assyrian expansion westward after the revival of its power at the end of the tenth century B.C. and relates this expansion to the datable reliefs of the period now known from north-western Mesopotamia and northern Syria. In the first place it must be emphasized that, while the Kapara art of Gozan is not neo-Assyrian and shows no traces of

¹ For details see the complete survey of divergent views in Herzfeld's *Der Tell Halaf und das Problem der hettitischen Kunst* (*Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, VI, 3-4).

² *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (Pelican History of Art, Harmondsworth), pp. 172 ff.

³ *Tell Halaf*, III (Berlin, 1955), pp. 3 ff.

⁴ *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, XIII (1956), pp. 36 f.

⁵ Cf. *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore, 1940), in which I still dated the "earliest orthostates" from Gozan in the eleventh century (p. 120), and *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, 1942), by which time I had settled on the tenth century (p. 213, n. 5). In a copy of a letter to R. A. Bowman, dated the 14th January, 1942, I wrote: "for over three years I have maintained a date in the tenth century for Kapara and for the bulk of the orthostates."

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 166, supported by numerous other similar assertions.

influence by Assyrian art of the ninth century B.C., it is Mesopotamian as well as Syro-Hittite in its inspiration. From the early thirteenth to the late eleventh century B.C. the Assyrian Empire stretched with few known interruptions over Nisibis, Gozan, and Harran to the Euphrates, and before that this region had been part of the state of Mitanni, which was saturated with inherited Sumero-Accadian culture. As we shall see, the script of Kapara's time reflects a very early neo-Assyrian stage of cuneiform, preceding the earliest inscriptions of the Assyrian revival. It is, therefore, necessary to suppose that Kapara's reign preceded the westward advance of the Assyrian Empire in the ninth century B.C.; he can easily be dated at the end of the tenth century and may have been the immediate predecessor of Abisalamu, who was ruling at Gozan in 894.

The Assyrian revival began under Asshur-dan II (934-912), who vividly describes the poverty and weakness of Assyria at the outset of his reign.⁷ Though Asshur-dan himself scarcely got beyond Nisibis immediately north-west of Assyria Proper, his son, Adad-nirari II (911-891), successfully invaded the Euphrates Valley, accepting the submission of Gozan in the course of his westward movement. Adad-nirari's son, Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884),⁸ occupied much of the Middle Euphrates and the Khabur valleys, but it was not until the reign of Asshur-nâsir-apli (883-859) that north-western Mesopotamia was subdued as far as the Euphrates, and not until the early years of Shalmaneser III (858-824) that northern Syria became subject to Assyria. Of course, there were still rebellions against Assyrian oppression, and Assyrian provincial organization was seldom set up until decades and even generations had elapsed after the original conquest.

If we turn to datable monuments from the region of Greater Syria, we notice first the prism of basalt from the time of Tukulti-Ninurta's occupation of Laqê in the year 886, recently published by R. J. Tournay and Soubhi Saouaf.⁹ Found near Tell 'Ashârah, ancient Tirqa below the confluence of the Khabur with the Euphrates, it is scarcely surprising that it reflects Syro-Hittite models¹⁰ in spite of obvious Mesopotamian influence on its iconography; the inscription is in neo-Babylonian characters.¹¹ At that time there were no Assyrian-trained sculptors in this region, and the invaders naturally utilized local craftsmen, in spite of their lack of skill. Another pre-Assyrian monument which can be

⁷ Cf. E. Weidner, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, III (1926), pp. 151-161, and E. O. Forrer, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, I, p. 290 (1930).

⁸ For this date, which is now assured, see I. J. Gelb, *Jour. Near East. Stud.*, XIII (1954), pp. 221, 229, and O. R. Gurney, *Anatolian Studies*, III (1953), p. 17. The date of the prism from Tell 'Ashârah thus becomes 886 instead of 884.

⁹ *Les Annales Archéologiques de Syrie*, II (1952), pp. 169-190. Tournay's interpretation of the difficult text is in the main correct, though some minor corrections will be necessary.

¹⁰ For details see my treatment in the Hetty Goldman *Festschrift*.

¹¹ The line between Assyrian and Babylonian influence generally ran across the Middle Euphrates in periods known to us.

dated quite closely is the larger stele of Tell el-Aḥmar (Til-Barsip), some 20 km. south of Carchemish on the east bank of the Euphrates. The Hittite hieroglyphs mention Aḥunas, who is almost certainly the Assyrian Aḥuni of Bit-Adini, first mentioned by the Assyrians in 878 and captured by them in 855.¹² The stele may, accordingly, be safely dated about 875, or possibly a few years earlier or later. Crossing the Euphrates we come to the Melqart stele of Ben-hadad of Aram, found near Aleppo; I have dated it toward the end of the reign of Ahab's well-known contemporary, who died between 845 and 842 B.C.¹³ Again the representation of Melqart is wholly pre-Assyrian and the script is a very early Aramaic. There is nothing surprising about finding a distinct absence of Assyrian artistic influence in these areas at the times indicated. Nor is it surprising to find that these artistically pre-Assyrian monuments immediately precede monuments showing pronounced neo-Assyrian influence. For example, in the Middle Khabur Valley, at 'Arbân (Shadikanni) we find sculpture examined by Layard more than a hundred years ago¹⁴ and found to be inscribed with the name of a local chieftain called Mushêzib-Ninurta (note the Assyrian name), who was grandson of a prince mentioned in the Assyrian records for the year 883.¹⁵ This sculpture was indeed provincial, but it is none the less definitely Assyrian and has nothing to do with the near-by art of Kapara's Gozan. While its date cannot be fixed exactly, it can scarcely be later than the third quarter of the ninth century B.C. Crossing the Euphrates and visiting Shâm'al (Zincirli), north-west of Carchemish, we find an absolutely characteristic neo-Assyrian representation of its reigning prince, Kilamuwa, which must also date from the second half of the ninth century.¹⁶ His father and grandfather are mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions; the former paid tribute in 858-853, so his son belongs to the next generation. The script of the Phoenician inscription suggests a date about 825 in round numbers.

In the light of these and other monuments, it becomes clear that Assyrian cultural influence moved westward with Assyrian arms and trade; by the middle of the ninth century it was firmly entrenched in the Khabur Valley (naturally including Gozan) and by the end of the third quarter it was already at home in northern Syria. Study of the chronology of Carchemish as established by R. D. Barnett,¹⁷ with the

¹² Cf. R. D. Barnett, *Carchemish*, III, p. 263, and *Anatolian Studies*, III, pp. 90 f.

¹³ See especially M. Dunand in *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*, III (1939), pp. 65-76, and my study in *BASOR.*, No. 87 (1942), pp. 23-9.

¹⁴ See A. H. Layard, *Discoveries among the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* (London, 1853), pp. 235 ff., and on their place in the history of Assyrian art see F. W. von Bissing in the *Abhandlungen* of the Bavarian Academy, XXVI (1914), pp. 12 ff.

¹⁵ See E. Unger in Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, XI, p. 181, and *BASOR.*, No. 130 (1953), pp. 15 ff.

¹⁶ F. von Luschan, *Sendschirli*, IV (Berlin, 1911), p. 375, and for a detailed bibliography see F. Rosenthal in J. B. Pritchard's *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, 1955), p. 500.

¹⁷ See *Carchemish*, III (1952), especially pp. 261 ff.

aid of H. T. Bossert,¹⁸ points in exactly the same direction. The following list of the kings belonging to the assyrianizing period (mentioned by their own hieroglyphic inscriptions or by the Assyrians) shows that we cannot reduce this period unduly :—

Asadaruwas.

His son (name lost) and perhaps other sons.

“ Araras ” (reading of name uncertain).

Kamanas, his son (contemporary with Sarduris II of Urartu).

His son (reigned to before 743).

Pisiris (from before 743 to 716).

There may be a gap between Asadaruwas's son and “ Araras ” since the latter claims to have displaced the “ sons ” of Asadaruwas,¹⁹ and a longer gap is possible between Kamanas's son and Pisiris. In any case, Barnett's date for Asadaruwas about 820 is very reasonable and can scarcely be reduced more than a few years. But the art of Asadaruwas is already infused with neo-Assyrian influence. Unfortunately, we have a considerable gap in the Hittite records until we get back to the dynasty founded by Luḫas and last represented by the latter's great-grandson Katuwas. All the monuments of this dynasty belong to the phases called “ Altspäthethitisch ” and “ Mittelspäthethitisch ” by Ekrem Akurgal,²⁰ whose analysis of the history of Hittite art is typologically most satisfactory of all so far presented ; there is no trace of neo-Assyrian art in them. Between the two groups there is a gap in Hittite records, partly filled by the Assyrian annals, which mention Sangara (Sankaras, with a name known also from eighth-century Hittite sources) as ruling Carchemish from not later than 866 to 848 or later. Since Sankaras is always mentioned as a faithful vassal of Assyria, it stands to reason that Assyrian influence was dominant during his reign, in complete accord with the evidence for the chronology of Assyrian westward advance which has been presented above.

There is thus no room in the last three quarters of the ninth century for an energetic builder like Kapara, supposed to have constructed magnificent buildings²¹ full of sculpture and to have strongly fortified Gozan during decades in which the Assyrian kings were in—generally—complete control of the entire region around the site. When we turn to the inscriptions found at Gozan and collect all available references to the

¹⁸ *Studi Classici e Orientali*, I (Pisa, 1951), pp. 35–67.

¹⁹ See Barnett, *op. cit.*, p. 262 f.

²⁰ See his excellent study, *Späthethitische Bildkunst* (Ankara, 1949), and for minor modifications see my paper in the Hetty Goldman *Festschrift*.

²¹ For the architecture of Tell Halāf see the splendid work of F. Langenegger, K. Müller and R. Naumann, *Tell Halaf*, II (Berlin, 1950), especially the “ Tempel-Palast ” (called “ Hilani ” in Vol. III) and the remaining constructions in the north-west section of the citadel, described by Langenegger, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–113. On pp. 112 f. he has a most impressive tabular contrast between the north-western group of buildings and the remaining constructions on the mound, ending with the following words : “ Danach überragte der Tempel-Palast alle übrigen Grossbauten auf der Burg in ihrer letzten Gestalt und am Ende der Herrschaft der Kapara-Dynastie.”

state in question in the Assyrian records, the impossibility of locating Kapara after the end of the tenth century becomes even more evident.

First, however, a few words with regard to the stratification of Tell Halâf are necessary. The excavators found only one level in the "Tempel-Palast", with indication of several partial phases of reconstruction and addition. But the picture was unnecessarily complicated by making the "Tempel-Palast" of Kapara contemporary with the so-called "Wohnpalast" or "Nordost-Palast" in the north-eastern part of the citadel of Tell Halâf. Actually it can, I believe, be demonstrated that the North-east Palace (which was situated on a lower terrace of the citadel hill) has nothing to do with the Kapara period but was built by the Assyrians in the eighth century as the residence of the governor of Gozan. In the first place its general plan resembles Assyrian palaces excavated at Khorsabad and elsewhere,²² belonging to the eighth and seventh centuries, and does not in the least remind us of the pre-Assyrian palaces of Greater Syria, which are generally of the "hilani" type. In the second place, the mud-brick arch in the "Wohnpalast" complex, shown in Fig. 127 (p. 263) of *Tell Halâf*, II, has exactly the same spring construction as the arch in the Outer Portal of Gate 7 at Khorsabad, built of baked brick; the Khorsabad arch was thus pointed, and not round as shown in the impossible reconstruction.²³ Fortunately we have a number of mud-brick arches from the "Tempel-Palast" complex (*Tell Halâf*, II, pp. 102, 109, 111, 128), and all have entirely different construction of definitely more archaic type. Thirdly, details of construction and external ornamentation, etc., are entirely different. Since no small finds are as yet published from these buildings, it is impossible to say whether their content throws any light on the time of their construction or not.²⁴ Needless to say, I am speaking only of the "Wohnpalast" as a whole and not of the traces of earlier construction (which should have suggested a later date for the "Wohnpalast").²⁵

It is virtually impossible to date the orthostates and other sculpture of the pre-Assyrian period by their location when found. There had certainly been some re-use and adaptation, but it is impossible to say *a priori* was that may mean. It is quite certain that many of the orthostates

²² Cf. Place's plan of the palace of Sargon (e.g., in the frontispiece of *Khorsabad*, I, Chicago, 1936) and especially Residences J-M in Pl. 70 of *Khorsabad*, II (Chicago, 1938). Of course, the provincial residence at Gozan may go back to the early eighth century and looks in any case more archaic than the constructions of Sargon.

²³ For a good photograph of the spring of the arch in the Outer Portal of Gate 7 see *Khorsabad*, I, Fig. 3 on p. 3; the reconstructed section appears at the upper right of Fig. 4 in the next page. Unfortunately, all the vaults and arches represented in *Khorsabad*, II, are restored as semi-circular in section, though none of them was preserved as high as the spring.

²⁴ R. J. Braidwood's survey of the chronological situation with respect to small objects, *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, LVIII (1941), pp. 364 ff., does not throw much light on the date of construction of the buildings in question, since practically all small finds naturally date from the Assyrian occupation.

²⁵ *Tell Halâf*, II, p. 225, Fig. 116. I do not mean to imply that the "Altbau-Epoche" went back to the Kapara period, since the early phase seems to have been quite similar in plan to the later phase.

were brought from elsewhere to be set up at Gozan, but one must be very cautious in making inferences. Moortgat's division of the sculpture into two main groups, one pre-Kapara and the other Kapara, scarcely seems reasonable when it is recalled that most of the inscriptions mentioning Kapara or his palace appear on the so-called pre-Kapara orthostates.²⁶ The character of these short inscriptions makes it practically certain, in my judgment, that they were the original indications of the *atelier* or *ateliers* where they were carved, specifically designating them for the "palace of Kapara". It is naturally possible that the orthostates which are labelled "palace of the storm-god" (so apparently we must render *é-kal-lim U*) were intended for another building originally; it is also possible that the orthostates were in part taken from an older building and relabelled. These are, however, dubious alternatives at best. Moreover, there is nowhere any clear iconographic difference between the allegedly pre-Kapara and Kapara sculptures; the differences are mainly in execution and may just as well be traced to different *ateliers* or different sculptors. In any case, it stands to reason that sculpture in the round would depart considerably in style from the small orthostates, and that the large orthostates may have been made by quite different sculptors. In any case, the sculpture is most closely related iconographically as well as in execution to the oldest phase at Zincirli and to sculpture of the Luḫas dynasty of Carchemish.²⁷ Iconographically there is much in common with the Megiddo ivories of the early twelfth century, on the one hand,²⁸ and especially with the Loftus group of Nimrud ivories, dated by both Barnett and Frankfort (*mirabile dictu*) in the first half of the ninth century.²⁹ Neither iconographically nor stylistically is there

²⁶ See the fuller discussion of this point in my study in the Hetty Goldman *Festschrift*

²⁷ The comparative material is treated most carefully by Ekrem Akurgal in his *Späthetitische Bildkunst* (see above, n. 20); see especially pp. 23 (where the hair-do is shown to have changed in the eighth century), 30 ff., 66 ff., 73 ff., 83 ff. Akurgal's date for the sculptures of Tell Ḥalāf in the ninth century should be pushed back a little, but this does not affect his relative chronology or his treatment in detail.

²⁸ Comparison between the lily and palmette motifs among the Megiddo ivories and at Tell Ḥalāf is most instructive. There are two principal varieties, both of which appear in both places. One shows the lily stamens in three branching units between the two volutes, which spiral toward them, emerging from a proto-Ionic volute below (*The Megiddo Ivories*, Pl. 34, nos. 166 *a* and *b*, etc.; *Tell Halaf*, III, Pl. 70 *b*, 125 *a-b*, etc.). The other shows a crown originating in the six elements of the three stamens, projecting far above the inturned spiral volutes (*Megiddo Ivories*, Pl. 6, no. 14, etc.); by the time of the Kapara sculpture this has become a curved or flat-topped crown containing from six to a dozen stamen elements rising far above the top of a conical stand (?) from which project two everted volutes at some vertical distance apart (*Tell Ḥalāf*, II, Pls. 71-8). In the second variety there can be no doubt that a considerable period of development has intervened between the Megiddo ivories of the early twelfth century and the Kapara period at Tell Ḥalāf. On the other hand, both Gozan varieties are older than the closest parallels in the ninth-eighth century ivories of Phoenicia and Syria.

²⁹ See R. D. Barnett, *Iraq*, II (1935), pp. 186 ff., and *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, LXVIII (1948), p. 14; see also H. Frankfort, *op. cit.*, p. 260, n. 135, who defends Barnett's dating, in spite of the fact that he repeatedly elsewhere in the same volume denies the existence of Syrian art before the middle of the ninth century.

anything neo-Assyrian about the sculpture of Gozan (omitting a few admittedly later objects).

Turning now to the cuneiform inscriptions from Gozan³⁰ and Assyria Proper in search of historical data, we may observe that the situation is not really as confused as appears after reading what has hitherto been published. The best-preserved text reads as follows³¹ :—

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>ēkalli(ḷi) mKapara aḫil mḤadiāni</i> | Palace of Kapara son of Ḥadiānu. |
| 2. <i>ša abiya abi-abiya baḫtūte</i> ³² | What my father and grandfather while living |
| 3. <i>lā ēpušūni anāku ētapša</i> ³³ | did not do I have done. |
| 4. <i>man(n)u ša šuma ipaḫituni šumu</i> | Whoever erases (my) name and (his) name |
| 5. <i>iḫakanuni VII mārēšu pān Adad</i> | sets, seven of his sons before Adad |
| 6. <i>lit-tās(!)-ru-ḫu</i> ³⁴ <i>VII mārātešu</i> | shall be burned, seven of his daughters |
| 7. <i>ana ḏIštar ḫarimātu lu-ra-a(!)</i> ³⁵ | harlots shall bring to Ishtar. |
| 8. <i>mAbdi-ilimu</i> ³⁶ <i>ummān ištur</i> ³⁷ | 'Abdi-ilimu the master-craftsman has written. |

³⁰ Published by B. Meissner in the *Oppenheim Festschrift* (Berlin, 1933), pp. 71–9, and by E. F. Weidner and A. Ungnad in *Die Inschriften vom Tell Halaf* (Berlin, 1940).

³¹ Meissner, *op. cit.*, pp. 72 ff. For a rather indistinct photograph of the original see *Tell Halaf*, III, Pl. 133.

³² So W. von Soden in *Tell Halaf*, III, p. 20, for *TI. ME* (read *AN-ŠI = ilim* by Meissner).

³³ An Assyrian dialectal form, like *ēpašūni* below. Attention has already been called to the fact that this statement reflects Syro-Hittite usage (e.g. in the somewhat later Kilamuwa inscription).

³⁴ This word has been a *crux interpretum*, since the original is damaged at its beginning and since the parallel text is supposed to offer *li-ši-ru-ḫu*. However, I have never believed in the value *li*, supposed to be attested here and in the next inscription, line 2 (see below, n. 39), for normal *LID*, since it has not yet been found anywhere except in the Kapara texts at Gozan, and suggest that we should read simply *lit-tās(DIŠ)-ru-ḫu*, disregarding the thin horizontal line (which replaces the normal wedge at the end of a character in the Kapara texts) and the damaged initial corner wedge as reconstructed after the *ši* in the parallel text. The form *littatrupu* is IV.2 from *SRP*; the *u* for *a* is dialectal Assyrian, and neo-Assyrian sometimes replaces the normal precativ by this form, called "perfect" by von Soden (*Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (1952), §81 *e*, note), who also quotes (*loc. cit.*, and *Orientalia*, XIX, p. 396) late Assyrian iterative forms such as *littatlak* and *littataprur*.

³⁵ Meissner's *lu-ra-me* makes no sense. I see nothing whatever in the photograph after the vertical wedge of "ME" and see no difficulty in reading *lu-ra-a*, where the last vertical wedge of *RA* has been dropped by haplography before *A*. In any case, the last upright wedge looks double. The text must be referring to the dedication of young girls as harlots to their patron goddess.

³⁶ Meissner's reading of the name of the scribe as *mAb-di-ili* is in itself very reasonable, but makes the rest of his translation improbable. His alternative proposal, *mAb-di-ili-ia₅(MU)* is also possible and has parallels. However, elsewhere in our text *abiya* is written *a-bi-ia*, so I have adopted the reading *Abdi-ilimu* after two names found in the Ugaritic tablets of the fourteenth–thirteenth centuries published by Nougayrol (C. F. A. Schaeffer, *Le palais royal d'Ugarit*, III, Paris, 1955, index, p. 240). In several Ugaritic occurrences the name is spelled *mARAD-AN-mu*, corresponding to alphabetic 'bd'-elm. The final *u* may be an Accadian adaptation.

³⁷ This is Meissner's alternative reading, which is vastly preferable to his choice.

The second-longest inscription runs as follows ³⁸ :—

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>ēkalli(li) mKapara apil mHa[di]āni</i> | Palace of Kapara son of Ḫadiānu, |
| 2. <i>šar māt Ḫat-té-e</i> ³⁹ <i>ša abiya abi-abiya</i> | king of the land of Ḫattê. What my father and grandfather |
| 3. <i>lā ēpašūni anāku e[taḫša] man(n)u ša š[umi] ipašitu[ni]</i> | did not do I [have] done. Whoever erases my name and |
| 4. <i>šumšu išaka[nuni VII mārēšu] pān A[dad]</i> | his name [sets, seven of his sons] before Adad |
| 5. <i>li-ši-ru-pu</i> ⁴⁰ <i>mAbdi-[ilimu ummān ištur]</i> | they shall burn. 'Abdi-[ilimu the master-craftsman has written]. |

The script of these texts is archaic neo-Assyrian, with forms like *LI* ⁴¹ which do not appear in the Assyrian inscriptions after the revival in the late tenth century, so far as I know ; the orthography is intermediate between bad archaizing spelling of the second millennium and neo-Assyrian (e.g. on the one hand use of *LIM* for construct *li*, on the other the use of *TAM* with the value *tú*), but is less inconsistent than sometimes supposed ; the language is strongly influenced by Assyrian dialectal forms, as to be expected in North-Mesopotamian cuneiform inscriptions of about the tenth century. ⁴²

An Old Aramaic inscription on the base of a little limestone altar from Tell Ḫalâf has been published by J. Friedrich ⁴³ and subsequently by R. A. Bowman, ⁴⁴ with whom I had some correspondence on the subject in early 1942. The text is badly damaged and the end is missing ; the forms of letters are crude and very archaic in comparison with the script of any other known Aramaic inscription. A date in the ninth century seems inevitable, preferably rather early in the century. I should read *ṢDNT.B'L.ṢY. BḪY[N]*, "Zidant (?) lord of (the tribe of)

³⁸ Meissner, *ibid.*, pp. 74 ff. ; we have no published photograph.

³⁹ Though the word seems to be written *PA-LID-E*, there can be no doubt that the second character is not an otherwise unattested *li*, but is simply the three-wedge form of the sign *DIN*, which has the value *tî* in Old Assyrian and Amarna texts. The different stance of the wedges is not surprising in the Kapara inscriptions. The form is presumably a gentilic like the Assyrian *Ḫa-at-te-e* of the texts of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon. Since writing my study in the Hetty Goldman *Festschrift* I have become convinced that the word is identical with "Hittite", especially since it appears in the inscriptions of Asshur-našir-apli and Shalmaneser III as *Ḫat-ta-aya*, which can also be duplicated in the Assyrian inscriptions in the sense of "Hittite".

⁴⁰ This form, though not normal, is certainly possible in a barbarous orthography. However, the Kapara inscriptions are not nearly so poorly spelled as is sometimes thought, so I suggest a possible alternative *li/liš-ru-pu* as a simple scribal error for *lišrupu*. We must again remember that the horizontal wedge of *ŠI* is written only as a thin line with no head, which might easily be an illusion when one deals with squeezes of this kind.

⁴¹ Among other archaic northern forms is *TU* written with only two vertical wedges at the left, as sometimes in Mitannian.

⁴² See W. von Soden, *Tell Halaf*, III, p. 20, and for a detailed account of the Assyrian dialect grammar of the royal inscriptions between 932 and 859 see J. Seidmann, *Mitt. Altorient. Ges.*, IX, 3 (1935), pp. 46 ff.

⁴³ *Die Inschriften vom Tell Halaf* (Berlin, 1940), pp. 68–70.

⁴⁴ *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, LVIII (1941), pp. 359–367.

Baḫyân.”⁴⁵ Since Gozan formed part of the territory of the tribe of Baḫyân at this time (see below), rendering and provenance are both satisfactory.

The first mention of Gozan and Bit Baḫiāni in the neo-Assyrian inscriptions comes from the reign of Adad-nirari II, who says in the account of his fifth campaign against the land of Ḫanigalbat (archaic name of the region commonly known as Mitanni) in the year 894 : “The river Khabur I crossed, to the city Gozan, which Abisalamu of Bit-Baḫiāni had barred⁴⁶ (to me) I marched; the city of Sikanu, situated at the source of the river Khabur, I entered . . . his many chariots, chariot horses, silver, gold, the property of his palace I received from him, tribute I imposed upon him.”⁴⁷ Sikanu is probably Fekheriyeḥ, near Tell Ḥalâf, where the Oriental Institute has discovered remains of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages, including Middle-Assyrian tablets and ivories which I should date about the tenth century B.C.; the identification with the Mitannian residence, Waššukanni, is very plausible.⁴⁸

Thirteen years later, in 881, the Annals of Asšur-našir-apli II mention reception of tribute from princes of the land of Ḫanigalbat.⁴⁹ Two are specifically mentioned, Aḫiramu of Bit-yaḫiri, the Zallaean (from Azallu) and X (the name is omitted) of Bit-Baḫiāni the Ḫattaeen (or Hittite). Here we have the *Baḫyân* of the little altar and the *Ḫat-té-e* of the Kapara inscription, written *Ḫat-ta-aya*.⁵⁰ At least five years later, in the account of the campaign against northern Syria, the same king again mentions the prince of Bit-Baḫiāni, whom he again fails to name, presumably because he is not considered sufficiently important (no

⁴⁵ *ḪDNT* is the clear reading of G. R. Meyer's copy, on which Friedrich based his attempt at decipherment. This would be the Hittite royal and noble name *Ḫidantas*, etc., from the fifteenth-fourteenth centuries. However, the second and third letters of the name are not quite certain. I have thought of a good later Aramaic name *Ḫabnat*, but it never occurs in such early times. Hittite royal names recur again and again among the Syro-Hittite rulers of northern Syria in the ninth-eighth centuries, and it is hard to escape the fact that the reigning dynasty of Gozan considered itself as Hittite. The second word is particularly clear in Bowman's copy, all that is needed to make it certain being the line closing *B* at the top. The title *ba'al*, “lord,” is well attested: Niqmadda of Ugarit is called in the alphabetic inscriptions *'adn Yrgb b'l Trmn*, “lord (*'adon*) of *YRGB* and lord (*ba'al*) of *TRMN*,” and *bēl āli*, “lord of the city,” is a common Assyrian expression for “local ruler”. If the first letter of the second word is *B*, the first letter of the last must also be *B*, again with the top line worn away. Bowman's copy shows clearly that the word need not end with *r*, so in the light of the excellent attestation of *Bit-Baḫiāni* as name of the district we are almost compelled to read as we do.

⁴⁶ The usual rendering of *u-kal-lu-ú-ni* as “inne hat, held” from *kālu* is very improbable; read the *pi'el* of *kalū*, which occurs in the suggested sense.

⁴⁷ For the text see J. Seidmann, *Die Inschriften Adadniraris II* (*Mitt. Alter. Ges.*, IX, 3, 1935, pp. 28 ff.).

⁴⁸ First proposed by D. Opitz, *Zeits. f. Assyr.*, 1927, p. 300.

⁴⁹ See Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, I (1889), p. 74; the text appears in I R, Pl. 20, ii; 21 ff.

⁵⁰ Exactly the same spelling, *Ḫat-ta-aya*, appears twice in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (Monolith, ii: 85, Obelisk, 40) for “Hittite”, referring to Pitru (Pethor) in northern Syria.

Kapara !).⁵¹ The identity is certain, since he is called *apil Baḫiāni* and his country is explicitly called *Bīt-Baḫiāni*, though the gentilic *Ḥattāya* is omitted. If there were any possible doubt it should be removed by the fact that the reference to payment of tribute by Bīt-Baḫiāni is again coupled with reception of tribute from the land of Azalli, which receives the gentilic "Zallaeen".

There seems to be no further reference to Gozan until we reach the year 808, when the Eponym Chronicle says *ana āl Guzana*, "against the city of Gozan," which no more proves that Gozan became an Assyrian province in that year than the same⁵² entry does for the year 758 (in the year after a revolt in Gozan). Eponyms who were governors of Gozan at the time are mentioned for the years 793, 763, 727, and 706, and Gozan may have been incorporated in the Assyrian provincial system many years before 808. It is obvious that the Assyrians would not have tolerated such a wealthy native prince as Kapara at any time after Abisalamu's submission in 894. Nor is it credible that a native prince of this period could have remained so completely uninfluenced by Assyrian art and architecture. The following list of known rulers of Gozan may simplify the picture we have drawn :—

Ḥadiānu⁵³ (middle of tenth century?).

Kapara, his son (late tenth century?).

Abisalamu⁵⁴ (submitted to the Assyrians in 894).

Unknown prince (paid tribute in 881).

Second unknown prince (paid tribute after 876).

Zidant (?) (probably ruled in the early or middle decades of the ninth century).

Briefly stated, our principal conclusions are as follows. Most of the Iron I constructions and sculpture found at Gozan (Tell Ḥalâf) belong to the time of Kapara, who must be dated toward the end of the tenth century B.C.—not earlier than c. 950 B.C. in any case. There does not seem to be good reason for dating any of the monumental art of this period at Gozan before the middle of the tenth century or after the first

⁵¹ See Schrader, *op. cit.*, p. 105, and Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria*, I, p. 164. It may be observed that the Assyrians took with them native levies from all the conquered states as far as Carchemish, including Gozan.

⁵² In the Hetty Goldman *Festschrift* I have made a slight mistake, following a *lapsus calami* of Weidner, reading *mât Guzana* in the entry for 808; actually we have *āl Guzana* in both entries—for 808 as well as for 758.

⁵³ This is obviously the same name as Ugaritic *Ḥdyn* (Virolleaud, *Syria*, XV, p. 245 f., line 8). This name has been overlooked by De Langhe, and the damaged *Ḥdyn*, which he quotes after Virolleaud, *Rev. d'Assyr.*, XXXVII (1940), p. 144, RS 141, 7, may just as well have been *Qdyn*. In *BASOR.*, No. 87 (1942), p. 26, n. 7, I have made the identifications, pointing out that the verbal stem was *ḥdy* or *ḥdw*, in view of the Heb. *Ḥz*. The biblical *Ḥezyon* would presumably have been a contemporary of the *Ḥadiānu* of Gozan.

⁵⁴ Pronounced *Abišalām* (Heb. *Abšalôm* or *Abišālôm*), since the Assyrians reversed the Babylonian sibilants and no longer pronounced final short vowels. This is naturally the same name as was borne by the slightly earlier biblical Absalom, whose mother was also an Aramaean princess.

quarter of the ninth. The North-East Palace ("Wohnpalast") has nothing to do with Kapara but was the residence of the Assyrian governors of the eighth century B.C. The ancestors of Kapara were originally, it would seem, chiefs of the nomadic Aramaean tribe of Baḥyân (Baḥiānu), who settled at Gozan in the eleventh or more probably in the early tenth century; the name "Hittite" may indicate their belief that they were the heirs of the ancient Hittites, just as the Aramaean princes of northern Syria were termed "Hittite" by the Assyrians.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ This represents a change in my attitude since writing my paper in the Hetty Goldman Festschrift, where I left the identity of *Ḫattē* and *Ḫattāya* with "Hittite" open for discussion; see n. 39, 45.