

## DATING THE NEO-HITTITE KINGLETS OF GURGUM/MARAŞ

R.M. Porter

### Abstract

Halparuntiyas III was a king of Gurgum, a Neo-Hittite state based at modern Maraş which is about 120km northwest of Carchemish. Halparuntiyas gave a seven generation father-son list of himself and six predecessors, inscribed in hieroglyphs on a monumental gate lion (fig 1). Some of his predecessors link to Assyrian history thus giving an approximate dating for the genealogy with Halparuntiyas III c.800 BC. However, the style of the lion is appropriate to the period of Tiglath-pileser III in the second half of the eighth century. The genealogical dating was published by Bossert in 1932, and the stylistic dating by Akurgal in 1949. A solution to the problem was attempted by Orthmann in 1971, but it was not favourably received. The discrepancy has now existed for over 50 years – this article restates the problem and reviews the literature but can not offer a precise solution.

### The Maraş Lion and its Genealogy

The text with Halparuntiyas III's genealogy is known as MARAŞ 1. The genealogy can likely be extended back a further two generations by text MARAŞ 8, inscribed on a stela. Part of the genealogy of MARAŞ 1 is matched by another inscription on a statue fragment, MARAŞ 4. None of these three inscriptions were found *in situ*; all are conveniently illustrated by J David Hawkins in *Cambridge Ancient History: Plates to Vol.III*, pp.71-3, Nos.106-8. See also on Maraş, Hawkins in *Cambridge Ancient History* Vol.3, Pt.1 (1982; hereafter *CAH* 3/1), Ch 9 (especially p 383), and in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* Vol 7 (1987- 90, pp 352-3), and for the texts with illustrations and historical commentary, Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions Vol.I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age* (Berlin, 2000; hereafter *Corpus*), Ch 4 'Maraş' with pls 106-9, 112-13.

Table 1 shows the genealogies from the three inscriptions and the generally accepted links to Assyria, i.e. Shalmaneser III texts mentioning Mutallu and Qalparu(n)da in 858 & 853 BC respectively, and an Adad-nirari III boundary stela from 805 BC naming a Qalparu(n)da son of Palalam (A K Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millenium BC, II (858-745 BC)*, Toronto, 1996, pp 16, 23, 205 respectively).

MARAŞ 1 (& 8)	MARAŞ 4	Assyrian sources
Astuwaramanzas (8)		
Muwatalis (8)		
Laramas I (1&8)		
Muwizis	Muwizis	
Halparuntiyas I		
Muwatalis	Muwatalis	Mutallu (Shalmaneser III 858 BC)
Halparuntiyas II	Halparuntiyas	Qalparunda (Shalmaneser III 853)
Laramas I		Palalam
Halparuntiyas III		Qalparunda (Adad-nirari III 805)

Table 1 Orthodox Scheme

The equivalence of Mutallu/Muwatalis and Qalparunda/Halparuntiyas is fairly obvious but for Palalam as an equivalent of Laramas II, the link is not fully understood (*Corpus* p 263). By Sargon's time Gurgum was alternatively known as "the land of Bit - Pa'alla" which may suggest that a Palalam (presumably Laramas I) was regarded as the dynastic founder (*Corpus* p 251, n 32). That the first Laramas may have been the founder of the dynasty is also suggested by the fact that his father and grandfather are not stated to be kings on MARAŞ 8.

The main work on Neo-Hittite sculptural styles is still Winfried Orthmann's *Untersuchungen zur Späthethitischen Kunst* (Bonn, 1971; hereafter *USK*). Orthmann arranged the sculptures into sequences of local styles and into general Neo-Hittite periods (see below), making what use he could of historical and archaeological information. On pp 203-4 he attempted to alter the above scheme; instead of putting the Halparuntiyas of MARAŞ 4 as Halparuntiyas II, he equated him with Halparuntiyas I and inserted a hypothetical Muwatalis (indicated with \* in the table) into the MARAŞ 1 genealogy. This would result in the scheme shown in Table 2.

MARAŞ 1	MARAŞ 4	Assyrian sources
Laramas I		
Muwizis	Muwizis	
*Muwatalis	Muwatalis	Mutallu 858 BC
Halparuntiyas I	Halparuntiyas	Qalparunda 853
Muwatalis		Palalam
Halparuntiyas II		Qalparunda 805
Laramas II		
Halparuntiyas III		

Table 2 Orthmann's Scheme

Orthmann's reason for his scheme was that the style of the MARAŞ 1 lion shows Assyrian influence of a type usually dated c.Tiglath-pileser III, presumably post 743 BC when Tiglath-pileser defeated an alliance which included Gurgum. Orthmann argues as follows (paraphrased from the German):

A difficulty is caused by the dating of the MARAŞ 1 lion. According to Bossert [orthodox scheme] it dates in the last quarter of the ninth century. The style comparison with Zincirli forces the placement of the lion in a group that can hardly be older than Zincirli IV [a local style dated to Tiglath-pileser or later (*USK* p 221)], and thus not before the second quarter of the eighth century [better: not before the third quarter!]' (*USK* p 205).<sup>1</sup>

Thus, on the orthodox system Halparuntiyas III is dated c.800 BC, not post 743, but on Orthmann's scheme with Halparuntiyas II contemporary with Adad-nirari III, Halparuntiyas III can almost be dated to Tiglath-pileser. Hawkins briefly rejected this scheme in a review of *USK* (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 63 [1973], pp 309-10). He objected that:

- 1) The 805 BC Adad-nirari III boundary stela was not known when Orthmann wrote. It gives Halparuntiyas as son of Palalam – hardly an equivalent of Muwatalis. (There may not be a problem if 'son of' is taken to mean 'descendant'; i.e. Halparuntiyas was descended from Palalam/Laramas I.)
- 2) Orthmann thought Muwizis on MARAŞ 4 was the grandfather of Halparuntiyas but the correct reading is great-grandfather, confirming the orthodox scheme (see also *Corpus* pp 256,258).

It should be added that:

- 3) Tarhulara was king of Gurgum by the time of Tiglath-pileser in 743 BC, not Halparuntiyas III.

Orthmann's scheme is probably wrong, but if the stylistic date of the lion is correct then the orthodox scheme can not be right either. There is no work on Hittite art that gives *stylistic* reasons for the lion being earlier than Orthmann's placement, and investigation tends to confirm that its style is late (see below).

Some extra room for manoeuvre might be gained if the inscription could be shown to have been inscribed by a son of Halparuntiyas III after his father's death. This possibility arises from the fact that a small ruler figure is illustrated at the beginning of the hieroglyphic

<sup>1</sup> There may be a misprint here. The German reads, "Der stilvergleich mit Zincirli führt aber zu einer Einordnung des [Maraş] Löwen in eine Gruppe, die kaum älter sein kann als Zincirli IV, eher etwas jünger, die also nicht vor dem 2. Viertel des 8. Jh. anzusetzen ist." The Maraş lion can not be 'somewhat younger/older' than Zincirli IV as this is the final style! One might suspect that Zincirli 'IV' is a misprint for III. This could then make some sense of the "2. Viertel des 8. Jh." which is certainly too early for Zincirli IV. If Zincirli III is meant, Orthmann would be saying that the style of the Maraş lion is more likely equivalent to Zincirli IV, but might be III. Both III and IV are within his general period *Sph* IIIb (*USK* p 148). Orthmann dates Zincirli III 'in the time around 730 BC' (p 221), which could presumably just be stretched back to the end of the second quarter of the eighth century. Whether a misprint is assumed or not, it is clear that Orthmann would see the natural place of the Maraş lion as after Tiglath-pileser's conquest.

text, intended to represent Halparuntiyas. Unfortunately the figure is badly damaged, but he appears to be standing on a lion which “seems to imply (posthumous) deification” (*Corpus* p 262, pl 113). If the inscription was posthumous, Halparuntiyas could have commenced his reign c.805 BC, died c.770 BC, and the lion could have been erected by Tarhulara (his son?) late in his own reign, c.740 BC. However, this requires long reigns for both kings and requires Tarhulara to commemorate his father (without mentioning himself) near the end of his own reign instead of at the beginning as would be expected. Perhaps the furthest that this type of argument can reasonably be pushed is to postulate a date for the lion inscription just after Halparuntiyas III’s reign which might have ended as late as c.770 BC.

It may be possible to adapt Orthmann’s approach, i.e. to question whether Halparuntiyas III’s genealogical inscription is giving a true father-son consecutive seven generation sequence. Were some of the rulers brothers, or were brother rulers omitted? D Henige in Chapter 2 of *The Chronology of Oral Tradition* (Oxford, 1974) discussed ‘The Problem of Extended Father/Son Succession’. He surveyed 660 documented dynasties from around the world and found that only nine had ten or more consecutive father-son direct successions (p 72). He said, “These data strongly suggest that the probability of more than eight or nine such successions is extremely low” (p 76). One might therefore guess that the six successions in the MARAŞ 1 genealogy would be slightly unusual but still plausible. However, more important are Henige’s warnings about the nature of such genealogies; “Nor have ascendant genealogies [i.e. those running back up the genealogy from the last ruler, as here] often been recognized for what they usually are – simple legitimizing ancestral documents and not kinglists at all” (pp 77-8), and “The presence of unbroken filial succession implied strength, power, prestige, and continuity, and furthermore indicated that the state had *always* been strong and united. Ruling collaterals, therefore, tended to be forgotten, for they contravened this principle” (pp 80-1). Henige finished his chapter with, “it need scarcely be emphasised that an ascendant genealogy which does not claim to be more than that should under no circumstances ever be treated as a kinglist” (p 94) – as has happened with the MARAŞ 1 inscription!

Freed from the king list concept there may be other ways of achieving Orthmann’s two generation adjustment. Some such adjustment seems little hindered by other evidence: Hawkins merely gives the reasons for linking Shalmaneser III to Halparuntiyas II as “satisfactorily identified” (*Corpus* p 251) and “Already identified by Bossert... and generally followed” (p 251, n 29). H Bossert had just assumed that the lion inscription was giving a direct father-son succession of seven generations (*Santas und Kupapa*, Leipzig, 1932, p 66). At this point suggestions for an alternative scheme might be expected. However, any such suggestion would probably be incorrect and would distract from the main aim here, which is simply to re-establish that there is a problem.

### **Stylistic Development of Lion Sculptures**

It is generally accepted that ninth century Neo-Hittite lions have features largely derived from Empire period lions (e.g. tongue hanging out) whereas the Assyrianising lions

of the later eighth century have a fiercer, more realistic look, with different ears, etc. (e.g. fig 2). Unlike Assyrian lions, both groups of Hittite lions usually have the tail hanging forward between the hind legs, with a curl on the end. Assyrian influences are thought to have entered Neo-Hittite sculpture following Shalmaneser III's invasions c.850 BC, perhaps in concepts rather than details at that time (although the relief figure of Kilamuwa at Zincirli [c.840 BC] is an early example of a close copy of Assyrian style). Assyrian influence becomes more pronounced with Tiglath-pileser III's reconquests c.740 BC. This simplified general picture can be illustrated by comments from five authors (arranged in date order):

- 1) Henri Frankfort's well known *Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (4<sup>th</sup> edn., 1970 but originally 1954) briefly touches on Neo-Hittite lions, and comments, "The earlier north Syrian lions are merely brutish [!]. But in the course of the eighth century they change their style and allow us to judge how strongly the closer contrast [*sic*; contact] with the Assyrian art of the Syrian palaces of Tiglath-pileser III influenced north Syrian sculpture" (pp 300-1 [p 181 in early edns.]). Thus he makes a distinction between the earlier and later lions, with Tiglath-pileser's expansion as the apparent cause of the change.
- 2) Ekrem Akurgal in *Art of the Hittites* (London, 1962, from which quotes are taken; see also German edns., *Die Kunst der Hethiter*, Munich, 1961 & 1976) says concerning the earlier lions:

"Lion sculptures are the link between Hittite [Empire] and late Hittite art. Thus the lions of Sam'al (Zincirli), where there is least of the Hittite character, are, to begin with, purely Hittite. The older gate lions and those on the orthostat reliefs of Sam'al are Anatolian Hittite, like the lion sculptures of Carchemish; with their round, massive ears, gaping [better: half open] jaws, hanging tongues, and noses wrinkled at their lower edges they are faithful copies [better: derivations] of the gate lions of Hattusas" (1962, pp 127-8; 1976, p 93).

Concerning Assyrian influence on Neo-Hittite sculpture generally Akurgal makes some cautionary comments before making a division c.745 BC:

"Assyrian influence in late Hittite art did not infiltrate uniformly everywhere. We can observe this process earlier in some localities than in others. One might speak of strong and slight Assyrian tendencies in various places. The degree of Assyrian influence, however, offers a safe starting point for chronology only within the same place, but not within [better: among] workshops of different principalities with disparate political orientation. More important still is the fact that during this period Assyrian influence penetrated in some cases indirectly, through the intervention of the Aramean peoples. On the whole a slight and a strong Assyrian phase can be noted. The first may date from about 850-745 BC, and the second from about 745-700 BC" (1962, p 130; 1976, pp 94-5).

For the later lions, in Akurgal's second phase of Assyrian influence (note that not all the features mentioned here are evident on the lions in fig 2):

“The gate lions of Sam'al and Sakçagözü ... are handsome examples of the Assyro- Hittite type of lion. They lack the most important characteristics of Hittite lions, i.e. the hanging tongue, the wrinkles on the lower ridge of the nose and the heart-shaped, stylized ears. Typical of this kind of lion with a strong Assyrian influence are the double and triple lobes of the ear, the wrinkled centre part of the nose, and the folds beneath the eye in palmette form. Typically Assyrian is the naturalistic rendering of the bodies which in the Hittite lions are also square [better: somewhat cubic]” (1962, p 135; 1976, pp 99-100).

- 3) Tariq Madhloom in *Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art* (London, 1970) notes that lion gate sculptures were first adopted in Assyria in the time of Assurnasirpal II (883-859 BC) and may have originated from North Syrian models (p 101). He makes a division between lions of the ninth century (examples are given from Carchemish, Zincirli and Hama) and those from the second half of the eighth century (examples from Sakçagözü, Tainat, Göl-lüdag and Zincirli) (p 101).
- 4) In Winfried Orthmann's *Untersuchungen zur Späthethitischen Kunst* (Bonn, 1971), Neo-Hittite sculptures were periodised into *Späthethitisch* I, II, IIIa & IIIb (i.e. Neo-Hittite I, II & III; abbreviated '*Sph*'). Orthmann did not clearly spell out dates for these periods but he seems to have had in mind that *Sph* II would cover roughly 950-850 BC (p 221; see also table on p 148). Orthmann's chapter on Neo-Hittite art in a recent multi-author work, placed the beginning of the third phase slightly later, not at c.850 but 'towards the end of the ninth century BC' (*Die Hethiter und ihr Reich*, Bonn, 2002, p 278).

A section on lions would be expected in Chapter 7 of *USK*, but they are excluded, perhaps due to Akurgal's previous extensive treatment of the subject in his *Späthethitische Bildkunst* (see below). In pp 159-161 Orthmann compares Neo-Hittite and Assyrian animal styles. Page 160 says that 'in the *Sph* I-II periods lion representations are wholly in the Hittite tradition and show no Assyrian influence', and 'in *Sph* III numerous influences from Assyrian lions are seen'. As examples of these Assyrianising features Orthmann lists; the ears, head proportions, belly hair and lack of protruding tongue. Thus Orthmann also makes a division between the earlier Hittite style lions and the later Assyrianising lions but with the division placed earlier than Akurgal, at c.850 BC (*USK*) or late ninth century (*Die Hethiter und ihr Reich*).

- 5) J David Hawkins in *Cambridge Ancient History* Vol 3, Pt 1 (Cambridge, 1982), pp 436-7 summarises Neo-Hittite sculpture using Orthmann's scheme. He writes that *Sph* II "bears a certain, but still controversial, relationship to the beginning of Assyrian relief sculpture"

and that *Sph* IIIa & IIIb “show increasingly strong Assyrian affinities”. He dates these periods (p 436): *Sph* II c.950-850 BC, *Sph* IIIa c.850-750, and *Sph* IIIb c.750-700. Thus he also sees a weak link to Assyria followed by a stronger link. He has Tiglath-pileser influencing only the final IIIb phase and places the inscribed Maraş lion earlier, in *Sph* IIIa, in agreement with its orthodox dating c.800 BC. Hawkins does not give stylistic reasons why the Maraş lion should be *Sph* IIIa rather than IIIb, since he regards this dating as proven by the textual evidence (*CAH* 3/1, p 383).

The tendency of some of the above authors to divide Neo-Hittite lions between the first half of the ninth century or earlier and the later part of the eighth may be too simplistic. It has to be remembered that Adad-nirari III (810-783 BC) was active in this area, presumably continuing to bring Assyrian influence, and that during the entire period from 850 to 740 BC many of the Neo-Hittite and Aramaean kingdoms may have prospered and continued to develop varying sculptural styles. Orthmann and Hawkins place *Sph* IIIa roughly covering this period whereas the others seem to have some degree of gap.

In the *Sph* IIIa period should come Shamshi-ilu, the increasingly independent Assyrian *turtanu* from the time of Adad-nirari III onwards. He had a pair of gate lions erected at Til Barsib/Kar Shalmaneser on the Euphrates (perhaps c.774 BC [R Barnett, *CAH* 3/1, p 346]) which seem to be a local North Mesopotamian product. They have a number of Assyrian details typical of the statuary and reliefs of Assurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III (e.g. tapering hair ruff, features around the nose, realistic paws, belly hair, thigh muscle, etc) but their general shape and stance are not Assyrian (e.g. oversize head which rises above the block, lack of the Assyrian extra leg, tail between rear legs [restored]). These features were analysed by Arlette Roobaert in G Bunnens [ed], *Tell Ahmar: 1988 Season* (Leuven, 1990, pp 126-135). She summarised the lions as “a local North Syrian product bearing almost all [better: many of] the stylistic characters of Ashurnasirpal II’s style” (p 132).

### The Place of the Inscribed Maraş Lion (fig 1)

There are two quite similar gate lions from Maraş. The inscribed lion (Orthmann’s B/1) is significantly smaller than the other (B/2) so they are not a matching pair, but Orthmann notes such strong similarities that they must date from approximately the same time (*USK*, p 89). On the same page he also notes that the style of these lions can not be dated with respect to other Maraş sculpture but only by comparing with lions from other sites. In this connection it should be noted that H Genge’s *Nordsyrische- südanatolische Reliefs* (Copenhagen, 1979), although having a chapter on other Maraş sculptures, does not cover lions. Also, the small ruler figure which introduces the hieroglyphic text is, unfortunately, too damaged to use for stylistic comparison.

In *USK* pp 524-6, the Maraş sculptures were categorised as in Table 3 (B/numbers are Orthmann’s).



KINGSCULPTURE	(TEXT)PERIOD
Laramas IB/16	(MARAŞ 8) <i>Sph</i> II
Muwizis	
Halparuntiyas I	
Muwatalis	
Halparuntiyas IIB/3	(MARAŞ 4) <i>Sph</i> II/IIIa [perhaps better IIIa]
Laramas II	
Halparuntiyas IIIB/1	(MARAŞ 1) <i>Sph</i> III [perhaps better IIIb]

Table 3 Stylistic Periodisation

In Table 3, MARAŞ 4 is shown in the orthodox position whereas Orthmann would place it with Halparuntiyas I (p 205). Although Orthmann gives *Sph* II/IIIa for MARAŞ 4, other indications in his book suggest that it is more IIIa than II (in terms of local style it is ‘definitely Maraş II’ [p 524] which on p 148 is tabulated as *Sph* IIIa). Similarly with MARAŞ 1, except for the historical problems, he might have happily dated it *Sph* IIIb (e.g. on p 139 his closest comparissons are to the latest lions at Zincirli and Sakçagözü). Despite these criticisms, the ruler sequence is in reasonable agreement with the stylistic sequence. It remains to investigate further whether the style of the Maraş lion truly dates from the time of Tiglath-pileser III in the second half of the eighth century, i.e. that it is *Sph* IIIb.

On p 139 of *USK* Orthmann briefly compares the Maraş lions with those from other centres, especially Zincirli and Sakçagözü both of which are within about 75km of Maraş. He finds a close comparison of the head and mane with Zincirli H/3 and somewhat with Zincirli C/4&5 (fig 2 shows C/5 on the right). The slender body he compares with Zincirli J/1 (misprinted as J/2) and Sakçagözü A/3. With the exception of the weaker comparison to the pair C/4&5 which Orthmann allocated to *Sph* IIIa (between the local styles Zincirli II and III [p 544; see also chart on p 148]) these lions are all *Sph* IIIb (Zincirli III or IV [pp 548-9]; Sakçagözü II [p 530]). As mentioned above, it was this late placement of the Maraş lion which caused him to attempt to lower the dates of the genealogy by two generations, otherwise there would have been a strong Assyrian influence on lions at Maraş at a very early date (c.800 BC). Such early strong Assyrian influence on lions at Maraş is unlikely because the strong Assyrian influence would have had to bypass Til Barsib where Shamshi-ilu would have been erecting old fashioned lions in the Assyrian regional capital!

In Akurgal’s *Späthethitische Bildkunst* (Ankara, 1949), in the section ‘Löwendarstellungen’ (pp 39-76, with conclusions by period on pp 70-76) he deals with 16 different lion features under sub-headings. In these sections he often has the later Zincirli, Sakçagözü and Maraş lions and a few others, as an Assyrianising late group which he refers to as *jungspäthethitischen* (shown in his figs 41-7 & pls 27-37). This is the case particularly for ears (p 41, p 52 n 47), mane (pp 45-6), eyebrows (p 51), nose shape (p 54), tongue (p 52 n 47) and shoulderblades (p 63). In two cases the inscribed Maraş lion lacks the late features. The late group generally has long wrinkle lines under the eyes (presumably an effect of snarling) but the



inscribed lion from Maraş does not have these, although the other lion from Maraş does. This feature and another divergent aspect of the nose wrinkles are dealt with on pp 52 & 54 but on both pages Akurgal adds a footnote to emphasise that the inscribed lion is nevertheless included in the late group (nn 47 & 61). Thus there may be scope for suggesting, as he does, a slightly earlier date for the inscribed lion compared to the larger one from Maraş and others in the late group. However, the general similarity in appearance of the two Maraş lions suggests that the difference in time is slight. Akurgal summarises the late group of lions on pp 74-6. They are strongly Assyrianising and he divides them into three phases. The first phase includes the inscribed Maraş lion and the second the uninscribed Maraş lion. Akurgal puts all three phases roughly in the period 730-700 BC, presumably assuming the influence of Tiglath-pileser III's conquests.

Thus, both Akurgal and Orthmann, who studied this subject in the most detail, place the style of the inscribed Maraş lion too late for the conventional interpretation of its inscription and consequent dating. Although Orthmann tried to overcome the problem, others have just ignored it. Something has to move.



Fig. 1. The inscribed Maraş lion (after K. Bittel, *Die Hethiter*, Beck, Munich, 1976, p 275).



Fig. 2. Two Zincirli lions as arranged in the Berlin Museum. The left lion, actually a replica, is an example of Orthmann's *Sph* II period, probably ninth century. The lion on the right has Assyrianising features and belongs in *Sph* III, eighth century.