AN OFFPRINT FROM

Themes from the Ancient Near East BANEA Publication Series, Vol. 4

CARCHEMISH IN CONTEXT
THE LAND OF CARCHEMISH PROJECT, 2006–2010

Edited by

TONY J. WILKINSON, EDGAR PELTENBURG
AND ELEANOR BARBANES WILKINSON

Hardcover Edition: ISBN 978-1-78570-111-5
Digital Edition: ISBN 978-1-78570-112-2

Oxford & Philadelphia
www.oxbowbooks.com

British Association for Near Eastern Archaeology (BANEA)

Published in the United Kingdom in 2016 by
OXBOW BOOKS
10 Hythe Bridge Street, Oxford OX1 2EW

and in the United States by
OXBOW BOOKS
1950 Lawrence Road, Havertown, PA 19083

Hardcover Edition: ISBN 978-1-78570-111-5
Digital Edition: ISBN 978-1-78570-112-2

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Wilkinson, T. J. (Tony J.) | Peltenburg, E. J. | Wilkinson, Eleanor Barbanes. | British Association for Near Eastern Archaeology.
Title: Carchemish in context : the Land of Carchemish Project, 2006-2010 / edited by Tony J. Wilkinson, Edgar Peltenburg and Eleanor Barbanes Wilkinson.
Description: Oxford : Oxbow Books, 2016. | Series: Themes from the ancient Near East (BANEA publication series) ; vol. 4 | "British Association for Near Eastern Archaeology (BANEA)." | Includes bibliographical references.
Identifiers: LCCN 2015046547 (print) | LCCN 2015047903 (ebook) | ISBN 9781785701115 (hardcover) | ISBN 9781785701122 (digital) | ISBN 9781785701122 (epub) | ISBN 9781785701146 (pdf) | ISBN 9781785701139 (mobi)
Subjects: LCSH: Carchemish (Extinct city) | Iron Age--Turkey--Karkami?s Region. | Iron Age--Syria--Jar?abulus Region. | Excavations (Archaeology)--Turkey--Karkami?s Region. | Excavations (Archaeology)--Syria--Jar?abulus Region. | Land of Carchemish Project. | Archaeological surveying--Turkey--Karkami?s Region. | Archaeological surveying--Syria--Jar?abulus Region. | Karkami?s Region (Turkey)--Antiquities. | Jar?abulus Region (Syria)--Antiquities.
Classification: LCC DS156.C32 C27 2016 (print) | LCC DS156.C32 (ebook) | DDC 939.4/202--dc23
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015046547

Printed in Malta by Melita Press

For a complete list of Oxbow titles, please contact:

UNITED KINGDOM
Oxbow Books
Telephone (01865) 241249, Fax (01865) 794449
Email: oxbow@oxbowbooks.com
www.oxbowbooks.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Oxbow Books
Telephone (800) 791-9354, Fax (610) 853-9146
Email: queries@casemateacademic.com
www.casemateacademic.com/oxbow

Oxbow Books is part of the Casemate Group

Front cover: Carchemish from the south-east. Photo: P. Newson
Back cover: Ceramic lion head found during 2006 survey at site LCP 6. Photo: E. Wilkinson

The Land of Carchemish Project was the last regional survey conducted by T.J. Wilkinson, and this volume was one of the last that he brought to completion. Tony's vision, hard work, and expertise shaped the entire project, and every field season benefitted from his steady guidance, boundless enthusiasm and inclusive humour.

This book is dedicated to Tony, who left us much too soon.

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Michael Brown
Dept of Archaeology, Durham University

Emma Cunliffe
School of Archaeology, University of Oxford

Jesper Eidem
Netherlands Institute for the Near East, Leiden

J.D. Hawkins
School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Dan Lawrence
Dept of Archaeology, Durham University

Paul Newson
Dept of History and Archaeology, American University of Beirut

Edgar Peltenburg
School of Classics, History and Archaeology, University of Edinburgh

Andrea Ricci
German Archaeological Institute (DAI), Berlin

Stefan L. Smith
Dept of Archaeology, Durham University

Mark Weeden
School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Eleanor Wilkinson
Dept of Archaeology, Durham University

Tony J. Wilkinson
Dept of Archaeology, Durham University

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AS	Algaze's survey along the banks of the Euphrates in Turkey (Algaze *et al.* 1994) see Chap. 1 bibliography
BRB	Bevelled-rim bowl
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DGAM	Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums in Syria
EBA/EB	Early Bronze Age
EBSE	other Euphrates surveys in Syria by Moore and Sanlaville and McClellan and Porter
EME	Early Middle Euphrates period
ESA	Eastern Sigillata A
FCP	Fragile Crescent Project
GIS	Geographical Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
GPCC	Global Precipitation Climatology Centre
IA	Iron Age
KCG	Karkemish Cist Grave
KOS	survey conducted by Mehmet Özdoğan and Necmi Karul in the Birecik district to the east of the Euphrates (Özdoğan and Karul 2002) see Chap. 1 bibliography
LBA	Late Bronze Age
LC	Late Chalcolithic
LCP	Land of Carchemish Project
LLC	Local Late Chalcolithic
MBA/MB	Middle Bronze Age
MP	McClellan and Porter survey
RIMA	Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia (Grayson 1991, 1996 in Chap. 3 bibliography)
SAA	State Archives of Assyria.
SCM	Sanlaville, Copeland and Moore survey
SRTM	Shuttle Radar Topographic Mission
WP	GPS waypoint on geographical location in the field

2

Sketch history of Karkamish in the earlier Iron Age (Iron I–IIB)

J.D. Hawkins and M. Weeden

The city of Karkamish had served as the seat of the Hittite viceroy in Syria, where a line of direct descendants of the Hittite Great King Suppiluliuma I had administered Hittite rule in Syria since the mid-14th century BC. The end of the Hittite Empire remains a complex of events that is largely shrouded in mystery. Building on a narrative mainly constructed from Egyptian sources historians had until recently seen the Hittites engulfed in the flames of widespread upheavals associated with large-scale population movements and multiple destructions of sites along the Levantine littoral and in northern Syria.[1] More recent appraisals of events towards the end of the Hittite capital at Hattusa (modern Boğazkale/-köy) in central Anatolia have suggested rather that the city was abandoned in a more or less organised way before any destruction by fire occurred (Seeher 1998, 515–523). It has also been clear since the discovery of the seal of Kuzi-Teššub, king of Karkamish and son of the last known Hittite viceroy at Karkamish, that some kind of continuity exists between the end of the Late Bronze Age Hittite Empire and its Iron Age successor state in northern Syria (Hawkins 1988). Everything else, however, is entirely unclear.

The early 20th century excavations at Karkamish revealed next to no Late Bonze Age remains, a state of affairs which has even of late led to suggestions that the Hittite imperial seat was not situated at the site of the Iron Age city (Summers apud Aro 2013; Summers 2013, 316). At the time of writing new excavations conducted by N. Marchetti have not yet conclusively answered this challenge, but the material evidence for significant Late Bronze Age occupation at the site is growing (Marchetti 2012; Marchetti 2013). The extent of Hittite imperial control in the areas beyond the central Anatolian heartland is also a matter of discussion. Some scholars refrain from using the word "Empire" to describe the political form taken by Hittite hegemony whether in Syria or elsewhere, eschewing the notion of a centralized economic and administrative unit for that of a network of interlocking and competing interest groups.[2] The suddenness of the disappearance of Hittite control could be explained from this perspective by the fragility of its grip on the areas subordinated to it (Summers 2013, 316).

Against this view is ranged the picture of a rump state of the Hittite Empire in Northern Syria that survived the fall of the Empire and carried on using the same instruments of propaganda, Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, the same religious and military ideology, and a similar set of titles and offices as those that characterized Late Bronze Age Hittite state, society and culture. This rump state, however, at least by the 11th century BC, would not have had its capital at Karkamish, but further to the West in the Amuq plain, centred around the newly re-settled Kinaliya (Tell Tayınat), just opposite the site of a massive LBA Hittite fortress at Alalakh (Tell Atchana).[3] During this period Karkamish is supposed to have been weak. The scarcity of specifically Early Iron Age (Iron Ia) material culture at the site is also surprising, whether or not one can link this to any kind of political inferiority. From the 10th century down to its annexation by the Neo-Assyrian Empire in 717 BC Karkamish remained the centre of a thriving, wealthy and international trade network with a monumental culture itself befitting the centre of an Empire rather than the hub of a small state on the fringes of one. Its changing geographical boundaries and enduring topographical features are explored in the paper by M. Brown and S. Smith in this volume (Chapter 3).

The 12th century BC

Despite the declaration of Ramesses III to the contrary, it does not appear archaeologically to be the case, nor is it apparent from external textual records, that Karkamish was destroyed around the end of the Late Bronze Age.[4] The attestation of Kuzi-Teššub, king of Karkamish, son of Talmi-Teššub, King of Karkamish, both on seal-impressions from Northern Syria and in a cuneiform text at Boğazköy, has been held to indicate a continuity of rule at Karkamish beyond the fall of the central Hittite Empire.[5]

More information concerning the end of the Hittite Empire around 1192 BC is now available from as yet unpublished cuneiform tablets found at the Assyrian outpost at Tell Ṣabi Abyad on the Balih river in northern Syria. In one letter references are made to a presumably recent conflict between the former Hittite dependency of Emar on the Middle Euphrates and Karkamish.[6] The conflict would appear to have been resolved. A further letter asks for information concerning the "Land of Hatti", which must refer to the central Anatolian Hittite state.[7] This must be around the time of Kuzi-Teššub himself.

Possibly shortly after this, cuneiform texts from Emar mention a people referred to as the *tár-wa*, who have besieged the town (Arnaud 1991, no. 25 and 44; Singer 2000, 25). This must be from a time shortly before the destruction of Emar in 1175 BC, a date arrived at on the basis of a date-formula using the name of the Kassite king Meli-Šipak on a tablet from Emar (Cohen 2004, 95). The famous Ankara Silver Bowl may also belong in this period, with its dating by means of the phrase "in the year that T[udhaliya] Labarna smote the Tarwean land".[8] "Labarna", a Late Bronze Age Hittite royal title, would appear to indicate a supreme executive of some kind in the imperial Hittite tradition, but it is unclear where this character, T[udhaliya] (?), would have been located.[9] The inscription itself commemorates the fashioning, purchase or dedication, depending on interpretation, of the bowl on which it is found "in the presence of king Maza/i-Karhuha" by an individual called Asmaya. Maza/i-Karhuha contains as a theophoric element a divine name which is only ever found at Karkamish and in the immediate vicinity (Tell Ahmar), written with a sign (*kar*) that is only otherwise used to write the name of Karkamish. This person was thus likely to have been king there. It is possible that the relationship "Labarna: King" in some way prefigures the relationship "Great King: Country Lord" which is found at Karkamish from the 10th century BC onwards, where it seems likely that both the "Country Lord" and his "Great King" would have been located at Karkamish, although this is not definitively secure. Might one also have had a "Labarna" and a separate "King" in the 12th century at Karkamish?[10]

G. Summers argues that the Late Bronze Age Hittite grip on the region from Malatya down to Karkamish was weak, due to lack of Late Bronze Age occupation at Lidar Höyük and now, as currently seems to be the case from the latest readings of the dendrochronological data, also at Tille Höyük (Summers 2013). Here the current interpretation of the archaeological record would seem to be in conflict with that won from texts, where Kuzi-Teššub, a figure straddling Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages, is certainly attested at Lidar.

Kuzi-Teššub, is not only known from impressions of his elaborate seal found at Lidar Höyük, but also from the inscriptions of the kings of Malatya, two of whom claim to be his "grandson" or "descendant" (Hawkins 1988; 2000, 285–287). The earliest Malatya inscriptions are dated to the late 12th or early 11th century BC on this basis, although the dating has recently been questioned (Singer 2012, 471). Lidar Höyük is itself halfway upstream from Karkamish towards Malatya along the Euphrates. A viable route between Karkamish and Malatya may have run along the river a certain way by boat, but is made virtually impassable by a deep gorge just before Malatya. The intervening terrain is mountainous and difficult to traverse, but roads did and do exist. Are we then to understand that Karkamish and Malatya formed some kind of political unit in the Early Iron Age? Or is it merely that the local kings legitimized their claims via the king of Karkamish as direct descendant of the Great Kings of Hattusa?

Doubtless belonging to the same geography as Malatya on topographical grounds is the Karahöyük-Elbistan stele, to be dated to sometime in the 12th century BC, in which a local official called Armanani apparently celebrates the visit of a "Great King" Ir(i)-Teššub to a country the name of which cannot yet be read due to being written logographically.[11] T.R. Bryce has supposed that the "Great King" in Karahöyük-Elbistan would have come from Karkamish, which is certainly worthy of consideration and F. Giusfredi suggests that the name is a by-form of the ancestral Karkamish ruler's name Ini-Teššub, predecessor of Talmi-Teššub king of Karkamish from the Empire Period (Bryce 2012, 86; Giusfredi 2010, 41). It is unlikely, however, that this name would have been misspelled in this way.

Palaeographically the inscription shows a number of similarities with those of the "Great King" Hartapu at Karadağ-Kızıldağ and Burunkaya on the southern Anatolian plateau, in particular in the shape of the sign/*sa*/.[12] These latter are almost certainly to be associated either directly with the late 13th century and possibly even still post-Hittite Empire kingdom of Tarhuntassa (classical Rough Cilicia), or with its successor state. Quite what form and extent such an Anatolian rump state of the Hittite Empire would have had, if it in fact existed, is currently difficult to determine on archaeological grounds, as well as being beyond the scope of this contribution. Thus in both these cases, Karkamish-Malatya and Elbistan-Tarhuntassa, the style and/or content of inscriptional evidence seems to hint at units of some

kind existing over and above what might be considered to be "natural" geographical boundaries. In the current state of our knowledge it is impossible to say whether these units were political in any sense.[13]

11th century BC

The annals of Tiglath-Pileser I of Assyria (r. 1114–1086 BC) document for the year 1100 BC an encounter with a king called "Ini-Teššub, king of the land of Hatti".[14] Although not explicitly stated in the text, it is commonly assumed that this must have taken place at Karkamish itself. The names Karkamish and Hatti are frequently used interchangeably in Neo-Assyrian documents. The city may have inherited the toponymic designation of the Late Bronze Age Hittites. The assumption that the Ini-Teššub encountered by Tiglath-Pileser I was at Karkamish carries with it the implicit acceptance of a hypothesis that Karkamish continued as a Hittite capital throughout the 12th and into the 11th century. This must, however, be reconcilable with the fact that material remains for Iron I are poorly represented at the site.

A further variant of the rump state continuity view sees the Hittite centre shift south-west towards the Amuq and the kingdom of Walastin most likely centred at Tell Tayinat. In the 11th century a king of this "land of Palastin" had influence over the temple of the storm-god at Aleppo, only *c*. 100 km to the south-west of Karkamish. Two inscriptions of Taita, king of Palastin, dated to the 11th century on palaeographic grounds, were found in the Aleppo Temple (Hawkins 2011). One of these not only mentions Karkamish, but also Egypt.[15] The immediate context for mentioning Karkamish is damaged. There is no agreement that such a mention in an inscription of Palistin implies that Karkamish was in any way subjugated to this potentially larger territory at this stage (Hawkins 2011, 53; Weeden 2013, 17). See the accompanying contribution by M. Brown and S. Smith (Chapter 3) for consideration of the expanding and shrinking physical borders of Karkamish, especially in their relationship to the Quweiq valley and Aleppo.

Consideration of the status of Karkamish at this stage may also be tied in with that of Malatya and the intervening area of the Euphrates states, as in the previous century. The latest archaeological research at Malatya indicates that the city experienced degradation to a "squatter" occupation during the mid-11th century, which lasted until its eventual re-flowering in the 9th century BC (Liverani 2012; Frangipane and Liverani 2013). The late 12th and early 11th centuries, on the other hand, saw Malatya exhibiting a flourishing monumental culture and two of its kings claiming descent from Kuzi-Teššub, king of Karkamish. At the time of the encounter between Tiglath-Pileser I and Ini-Teššub of Hatti (= Karkamish) the ruler of Malatya was known as Allumari according to Assyrian royal inscriptions.[16] In the Assyrian royal view at least these were separate entities, both of which had sufficient status to warrant being mentioned in the course of campaign narrative.

The area between Karkamish and Malatya may itself have experienced a renaissance of sorts during the mid-12th century, before falling into decline in the early 11th century. Summers also notes that the 12th century architecture of Tille Höyük, in particular the gate, does not appear to be "imperial", although he associates it with a supra-regional state on the North Syrian Euphrates that reached as far as Malatya (Summers 2013, 317). Whatever we conclude from this, a similar development of decline during the 11th century both at Malatya and at Tille can be observed. Whether this was a regional phenomenon and whether that reached as far as Karkamish are both points which are unclear.

10th century BC

From the 10th century at the latest and through the early 9th Karkamish was ruled by a dynasty of so-called "Country Lords", during the earlier part of this period also in some sort of tandem with a "Great King" (Hawkins 1995; Payne 2014). The chronological framework for these rulers is delimited at the lower end of the period by the encounter of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III with "Sangara the Karkamishean" as part of an anti-Assyrian coalition including Gurgum, Sam'al and Patin in 858 BC.[17] This Sangara is not yet mentioned in any of the published native inscriptions and is thus assumed to be later than them. The two earliest inscriptions belong to a father and son, one stela erected by Suhi I "Country-Lord" and one by his son, the "Priest of Kubaba". The texts appear to be almost identical in content and are both dedicated to Ura-Tarhunda, "Great King, Hero, King of the Land of Karkamish, son of Sapaziti, Great King, Hero".[18] We thus have a Great King, a Country Lord and a priest of Kubaba, with inscriptions only being prepared by the last two, who were also related.

Suhi I calls himself a *muwida* of the king, using a logogram that is otherwise also found in the early Malatya inscriptions and is shown by later usage to have the afore-mentioned phonetic form.[19] The precise meaning is unclear, but a translation "seed(?)" is currently the best available, indicating that the Country Lord was possibly a distant blood relative of the Great King. The later inscription of KELEKLİ, from the reign of the grandson of Suhi I, Suhi II, indicates that intermarriage was also possible between the lines of "Great Kings" and "Country Lords" (Hawkins 2000, 93).

The earliest two inscriptions mention a conflict that came from the land of Sura. It has recently been proposed to identify this Sura with the designation "Leukosyroi" given by Greek authors to the Cappadocians and to assume that it was the native designation of the land called Tabal by the

Neo-Assyrians (Simon 2012). This proposal is essentially without foundation in the native inscriptions. The toponym Sura is more conventionally equated with Assyria, as unequivocally demonstrated by the correspondence between a toponym ʾšr in the Phoenician text of the 8th century BC ÇİNEKÖY Bilingual and Sura in the Hieroglyphic Luwian of the same text.[20] This identification has to contend with the consideration that Assyria was apparently weak in military and economic terms at the end of the 11th/beginning of the 10th century BC and might not have been expected to be conducting campaigns as far west as the Euphrates. Assyrian activity is attested on the Habur during this period (Grayson 1991, 126–127; Weeden 2013, 10).

The first longer narrative inscription was written by Suhi II, son of Astuwalamanza, grandson of Suhi I, and erected to accompany the Long Wall of Sculpture at Karkamish sometime during the 10th century BC.[21] It concerns injury done to and revenge exacted on behalf of the Storm-god of S(a)mar(i)ka, which H.C. Melchert compared with the Late Bronze Age Hittite toponym Ismerikka (Melchert 1988, 37). Siverek in the direction of Diyarbakir has often been identified with Ismerikka, although this identification is tentative.[22] The place-names Alatahana and Hazauna, which are mentioned in a hostile context by Suhi II in his inscription, have also not been located.[23] It is thus not possible to assess the extent of any military campaign in which Suhi II may have been involved. The mention of Hazauna, however, is closely followed by a fragmentary reference to a "grandfather" and "(of) my city", so it is possible that Suhi was re-asserting earlier territorial claims.[24]

The son of Suhi II, Katuwa, is by far the most prolifically attested among the authors of inscriptions. In the inscription KARKAMISH A11b+c we learn of an apparent transaction, according to the latest interpretation of the verb in question, (LOCUS)*pit*(*a*)*haliya*, between Katuwa and the "Grandsons of Ura-Tarhunda".[25] This may refer to the same Ura-Tarhunda who was "Great King" at the time of Suhi I, the great-grandfather of Katuwa. However, if the grandsons of Ura-Tarhunda are at all related to the Great Kings of the reigns of Suhi I and II, they are not given that title and this is the last we hear of them.

The passage is disputed, but the latest interpretation, offered by H.C. Melchert, implies that "this city", i.e. Karkamish, had both been empty for some time and previously belonged to a man called Ninuwi. Katuwa is supposed by Melchert to have rebuilt it, possibly exchanging it with the grandsons of Ura-Tarhunda for land-holdings of some kind in two other towns, Ipani and Muzik (Melchert 2011, 75–77). The latter of these might be associated with the Mount Munziganni to the west of Karkamish encountered by Aššurnāṣirpal II in 870 BC (Hawkins 2000, 105). While this interpretation is philologically possible, it is historically unlikely given the significant building activity at Karkamish registered by Katuwa's predecessor, Suhi II.

Katuwa almost certainly experienced a revolt at some time in his reign, presumably by relatives of his, who are referred to as the 20-*tá-ti-zi* in KARKAMISH A11a §5–6 (Hawkins 2000, 97). Comparison with occurrence of the same word in TELL AHMAR 1 makes it likely that these are "relatives",[26] while the verb used (*ARHA* CRUS+*RA*/*I*) suggests "secession" when compared with similar Late Bronze Age Hittite locutions.[27] Rather than these "relatives" being identical with the grandsons of Ura-Tarhunda, as previously assumed (Hawkins 2000, 97) it is possible that these latter helped Katuwa regain the city from the secession of the former, with the verb (LOCUS)*pit*(*a*)*haliya*- referring to the manner in which this occurred, whatever that was. An etymological explanation does not suggest itself, nor is it necessary. The further mention of the particular kind of land-holdings in the cities of Ipani and Muzik may then refer to additional confiscations, rather than gifts in exchange. Here the verb is lost in a break.[28]

Indeed, the narrative continues with further military achievements which took place in the year in which Katuwa completed the building of the "upper floors" for his wife which the inscription is commemorating.[29] These consist of "I carried/moved the chariotry of the city **Kawa/i*", and of the standard trope of marching further than any of one's ancestors.[30] This ethnic adjective *Kawiza*- has been interpreted as corresponding to the Assyrian provincial place-name Que (Plain of Cilicia), which is occasionally spelled Qaue in Assyrian cuneiform.[31]

However, it remains rather problematic why Karkamish inscriptions should refer to this place as **Kawa/i* when the Cilician ÇİNEKÖY inscription from the 8th century BC and now the two new stelae from ARSUZ from the 10th century BC, which commemorate a victory of the Walastinean king Suppiluliuma in the region, refer to the area as Hiyawa.[32] One would have to hypothesize that Karkamish, concomitant with its geographical location, uses a form of the name that was more usual either further to the east, possibly even forming the point of departure for the Assyrian borrowing of the name Q(a)ue itself, or in Aramaic.[33] Until the place-name Hiyawa is found on inscriptions from Karkamish, thus excluding that *Kawa/i refers to the same area, the matter cannot be considered closed.

An identification of *Kawa/i with Que, or at least with part of it, also tallies with the apparently western focus of the previous engagements, if Muzik can be associated with Mount Munziganni. It is thus interesting that both the land of Walastin and the land of Karkamish had military engagements with Que/Hiyawa during the 10th and early 9th centuries BC. This is doubtless to be seen in the light of the increasing wealth and resources that accrued to the diverse Neo-Hittite states during an economic upturn after the Early Iron Age period. Increased resources mean increased potential for the exercise of expansionist tendencies. It is into this heating cauldron of conflicting territorial interests

that the Assyrians marched in the second quarter of the 9th century BC.

9th century BC

For the bulk of the 9th century, inscriptions from Karkamish are lacking, although Katuwa might well fit into the beginning of this period and its end may accommodate the earlier inscriptions of the next dynasty to rule the city that is known from native inscriptions. Most of our information during this period is to be found in Assyrian royal inscriptions.

Neo-Assyrian policy towards Karkamish follows an interesting pattern of isolation, Karkamish being the last Neo-Hittite territory in Northern Syria to be annexed to the Assyrian Empire in 717 BC. By this time all the other Neo-Hittite states had first been reduced to vassal-status and then annexed to the Empire and provided with an Assyrian governor.

When Shalmaneser III (859–824 BC) crossed the Euphrates in 858 BC he seems to have done so to the north of Karkamish into the territory of Kummuh, and then moved around it into Gurgum and then Sam'al, where he met the forces of an anti-Assyrian alliance including Karkamish (Yamada 2000, 92). When he receives the tribute of the defeated enemies in the next year at Dabigu, after apparently dealing with Til-Barsip and the lands of Bit-Adini to the south and south-west of Karkamish, Karkamish itself is conspicuously absent from the list of tributaries recorded on the stone slab from Fort Shalmaneser.[34] According to the reconstruction of Shigeo Yamada this recalcitrance prompts an approach towards Karkamishean territory at Sazabê, "a fortified city of Sangara the Karkamishean".[35] The Kurkh monolith records the receipt of tribute by all the fearful "kings of the land H[atti]" after this action, including that of Karkamish, thus conflating the submission of tribute by Karkamish with that of the other states.[36]

Sangara appears already in the Balawat Bronze Bands of Aššurnāṣirpal II (883–859 BC) as a tributary of the Assyrian king, probably at some time between 875 and 868 BC (Yamada 2000, 74–75). He also appears in years 1, 2, 6, 10 and 11 of Shalmaneser III (859–824 BC) (Yamada 2000, 117 fn. 146). In the last of these Shalmaneser boasts of capturing 97 of his cities.[37] This does not necessarily indicate that Karkamish was any bigger than any of its neighbours. Certainly, however, the above-noted initial hesitancy of Shalmaneser in dealing with the state of Karkamish, and the apparent re-focussing of the narrative of the second regnal year in the Kurkh Monolith to place the panic of the "Kings of H[atti]" after the attack on Sazabê are both indications that the Assyrians perceived the "Land of Karkamish" as the strongest and most important of the Neo-Hittite states during the 9th century BC. If there ever had been any competition with the "Land of Walastin" (= Patin) during earlier centuries, this had been entirely overcome by now. Sangara himself, however, is likely to have been so tested by his Assyrian adversaries that he failed to leave any clearly identifiable inscriptional traces at the city of Karkamish itself.

Late 9th to 8th centuries BC

Apart from a brief mention by Samši-Adad V (824–811 BC), Karkamish does not appear in Assyrian sources from the mid-9th until the mid-8th century BC.[38] This is peculiar, as the Assyrians were clearly established very close by, only 20 km downstream, at Kar-Shalmaneser (formerly Til-Barsip, modern Tell Ahmar) during the whole of this period. Karkamish is not mentioned in the Pazarcık stela from 805 BC which includes details of pitched battle between Adad-Nerari III and an alliance of Ataršumki of Arpad and eight other kings at nearby Paqirahubuna.[39] Adad-Nerari III and his commander (*turtānu*), Šamši-ilu, established a border between Ataršumki of Arpad and Zakur of Hamath around 796 BC according to the Eponym Chronicle and the Antakya stele, an event probably to be related to that narrated in the Aramaic stele of the same Zakur from Tell Afis.[40] Here we are told that Bar-Guš (=Ataršumki of Bit-Agusi) had attacked Zakur at the instigation of Hazael of Damascus in an alliance with kings of Que, Unqi, Gurgum, Sam'al, Melid and two or three other names which are lost in damage to the text. It would be strange if Karkamish were not mentioned here. However, the city is also not mentioned in the alliance led by Urartu and Arpad which was defeated by Tiglath-Pileser III in 743 BC, nor in any of the successive Assyrian actions against Arpad (742–740 BC) and Unqi (739–738 BC), but a king Pisiri of Karkamish does finally appear in the list of tributary kings from 738 BC.[41] This same Pisiri appears to have still been in power in 717 BC when Sargon II had him removed and deported to Assyria for colluding with Mita of Muski, and finally annexed the land of Karkamish to the Assyrian Empire.[42]

However, the period of the late 9th and first half of the 8th centuries coincides with a renewal of activity in the inscriptions and building work at Karkamish. Possibly Assyria was consciously leaving Karkamish alone during this period, a policy hardly fit to be mentioned in royal inscriptions, or there were yet other reasons for the Assyrian silence. Karen Radner has identified an Assyrian imperial tendency to leave major trading centres to their own devices, as long as politically expedient, in order to be able to profit from their already established and functioning networks and infrastructures.[43] Certainly Karkamish appears to have been left until last among all the Neo-Hittite states before being turned into a province.

During this period we find three generations of builders

and inscription-makers at Karkamiš. A king Astiruwa is referred to in the inscription of KÖRKÜN (Hawkins 2000, 171), who is then succeeded by a regent, Yariri, calling himself "ruler" (*tarwani*-), who appears to be a eunuch and has responsibility for the care of Astiruwa's son, Kamani, as well as for the rest of the family. Kamani apparently presides as "ruler", "country-lord" (REGIO.DOMINUS), and also once as "king", over a short-term expansion or consolidation of Karkamishean influence towards the Quweiq river, as possibly evidenced in the inscription found at Cekke, and is later replaced by an Astiru, who is not his son, but that of his vizier, Sastura. New evidence indicates that there may have also been a son of Kamani, called Atika, who for some reason did not become king or ruler (Akdoğan 2013; Hawkins *et al.* 2013). It is possible, but not certain, that the final king, Pisiri, known from the royal inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II, may also have had his name on a preserved monument at Karkamish.

The inscriptions of Yariri, who was regent while Kamani was a child, are among the most impressive and detailed from Karkamish. He was responsible for the Royal Buttress, a series of sculptures and inscriptions on orthostats added to a structure built by Katuwa beside the King's Gate. One of Katuwa's own inscriptions was thereby removed and re-used as paving slabs in the floor of the King's Gate. In the sculptures Yariri is shown, beardless and carrying a sceptre upside-down, leading Kamani by the arm, followed by the other children of Astiruwa. This depiction may suggest that he is a eunuch, as is further corroborated by the use of the word *wasinasi*- illustrated by the beardless bodyguards depicted on the Royal Buttress.[44] The word clearly refers in another context to (male) offspring who have been turned into eunuchs.[45] The structure itself is referred to as the ("MENSA.SOLIUM")*asa*-, possibly just a "seat (?)", to which Kamani used to run and where Yariri "seated him on high".[46]

International relations are prominent in the inscriptions of Yariri. On the inscription attached to the Royal Buttress he boasts that his name was heard "in Egypt, in Babylon(?), among the Musa, Muska and Sura".[47] The Musa and Muska are usually associated with Lydians (Mysioi) and Phrygians (Greek Moschoi, Assyrian Muški), but the precise associations of those terms are rather unclear. Even less clear is the identity of the Sura, supposed variously to be Urartians or the Anatolian Neo-Hittite group of states which was referred to by the Assyrians as Tabal.[48] The intended rhetorical opposition appears to be between Egypt and possibly Babylon on the southern field of the compass (west and east), and a suitably broad geographical sweep encompassing the corresponding world to the north-west and north-east of Karkamish. This understanding of the references in the inscription would make Urartu still the best candidate for Sura in this text.[49]

Another text written on a statue-base of Yariri found out of its original context refers to different types of writing and languages, after a break in the narrative:

> "… in the City's writing, in the Tyrian writing, in the Assyrian writing and in the Taimani writing, and I knew 12 languages. By means of travelling my lord *selected* every country's son for me because of language."[50]

Again, the precise the referents of the types of writing are not all agreed, in particular whether "S/Zurawani" in the text refers to Tyre (i.e. Phoenician) and whether Taimani refers to Teima and a very early stage of Early North Arabian Script, or to Aramaic via a similar-sounding tribal name known from Assyrian texts.[51] Yet the passage is clearly intended to highlight the pre-eminent position of Karkamish in the mercantile world (Radner 2004, 158). Multilingualism and knowledge of scripts rather than military engagements and conquests are here the currency in which Yariri's achievements are valued. One should be careful not to generalize from this depiction and infer a time of peace and prosperity in a military and political vacuum corresponding to silence in the Assyrian sources.

An unfortunately very broken text found among other stones at the bottom of the Great Staircase appears to have been attached to another statue of Yariri and explicitly refers to conflict with Assyria.[52] It is not entirely clear from the preserved fragments that Yariri was directly involved in the conflict, although he was active in some fashion and the context of a commemorative statue can only suggest that it was celebrating his or his lord's deeds. There is some clearly negative military action either on the part of mounted troops (?) towards a city called Parnassa, or directed by someone at mounted troops (?) from a city called Parnassi, after which Yariri becomes active in some way.[53] Then we have a clear historical reference, which has unfortunately not been identified in accounts from any of the other powers of the time: "[Wh]en(?) the Assyrian king *carried* off Halabean Tarhunzas, and he *smote* Assyria with a *firebrand* … Kubaba (nom. or acc.) brought forth … [and Assyr]ia(?) she x-ed away"[54]

The passage is not only badly broken but also peppered with *hapax legomena*, which hinder a clear understanding beyond the relatively secure reference to what Yariri thought was an Assyrian defeat. This would presumably be far too early to refer to the defeat inflicted on Assur-Nerari V by Sarduri II of Urartu in 754 BC, only 16 years before Pisiri is attested in Assyrian Annals as king of Karkamish. It seems likely that it would have been Urartu once again which punished the Assyrians for transgressing against the Storm-God of Aleppo, but another agent of his divine displeasure cannot be ruled out. One can only speculate on the circumstances behind this tantalizing reference.

There are three monuments which explicitly belong to the reign of Kamani: the Kubaba stele with appended inscription detailing the building of her temple; the storm-god stele from

Cekke, located further to the south-west towards the Quweiq valley; and a drum commemorating a property transfer which refers to Kamani as "king" (Hawkins 2000, 140–154). In the Cekke stela, Kamani is referred to as "Country Lord of the cities Karkamish and Ma(li)zi (=Malatya?)", "ruler" and he is acting in concert with his "first servant" Sastura.[55] In the Kubaba-stele, of which the beginning is currently broken, he only refers to himself as "ruler (*tarwani*)".[56] A fragment referring to a "…] Country Lord, the Hero, son of Astiru" is also likely to be attributed to him, despite the use of the archaizing title "Hero".[57]

The reference to Malatya, although in an irregular writing which only occurs in one other Karkamish inscription, might recall the possible connection between Karkamish and Malatya which we noted during the 12th century BC and thus be a memory of much earlier dynastic claims. The Kubaba stele mentions expansionist activity: "I subjected the Pinatean fortresses to Karkamish and [resettl]ed (?) the devastated areas."[58] Unfortunately we have no idea where Pinata was located. Furthermore, the phenomenon of CEKKE itself, planted outside of the central Karkamish area, needs to be taken into consideration.

The inscription of CEKKE was set up by a "servant of Sastura" and commemorates the purchase of a town called Kamana, presumably in the region of Cekke itself, by Kamani and Sastura. The town is acquired from a group of Kanapuweans, presumably either residents of a nearby settlement which had previously exercised some sort of property rights over Kamana, or more likely previous residents of Kamana itself, which may formerly have been called Kanapu.[59] The city is "to be bound as a *kitri* (donation?)" for 20 *TAMI* and ten children, where the term *TAMI* is not understood, and a mayor and "Great Ones" are also mentioned.[60] Then "*frontier stelae*" are "to be engraved and bound as a *kitri* (donation?)" for 15 fathers and sons from a list of unidentified towns: Zilaparha (vel sim.), Hawara-, Lutapa (vel sim.), Apakuruta, Zarahanu, Sarmuta, Isata, Huhurata and Satarpa.[61] Some of the language of the stele has been supposed to reflect the language of Assyrian border-markers such as the Antakya-stele (Hawkins 2000, 147). The settlement of men and their sons in the area, after its purchase by Kamani and Sastura, may be as a reward for services rendered. See further M. Brown and S. Smith, Chapter 3, in this volume.

A damaged relief with an archaizing inscription by an author whose name is broken preserves almost exactly the same title as Kamani had on CEKKE: "… Hero, Country Lord of the city Karkamish and the land of Malatya, beloved of Kubaba".[62] However, the inscription also refers to "my father Sastu(ra)". It is possible that this is the same Sastura as the "first servant" of Kamani from the CEKKE inscription. A further fragment may fit at the beginning of the inscription, although this is not assured, and would in this case supply the name of the inscription's author: Astiru. We would then have an Astiru II, son of Sastura succeeding Kamani as ruler of Karkamish (and Malatya).[63]

From another fragmentary inscription attached to a colossal figure of a seated ruler from the South Gate we learn of a further ruler "beloved of Kubaba", whose name is broken, but whose filiation is "son of Astir[u]".[64] It is a reasonable but tentative hypothesis that we are here dealing with the last king at Karkamish, Pisiri, who is otherwise known only from Assyrian inscriptions and must have ruled for at least 21 years before the city's annexation in 717 BC. This interpretation of the inscription from the South Gate would mean that Astiru II succeeded to rule Karkamish after Kamani, despite being the son of Kamani's "first servant", and that then his son succeeded him. However, the inscription could also date to Kamani, son of Astiru(wa) I, and indeed this is supported by the script style (Hawkins 2000, 168).

Unequivocal evidence for the existence of an Astiru II is provided by a new stele allegedly from the Karkamish area but now in Adana Museum, belonging to one Atika, "son of K[am]ani, [be]loved servant of Astiru, hero [Country] Lord of Kar[kamish]".[65] It does, however, create further problems for our understanding of the sequence, especially if this Astiru is the son of Sastura. The change in line from Kamani to Sastura's son, Astiru II, might have been more easily intelligible if Kamani had had no male issue. Why did Kamani's son not succeed him, becoming instead the servant of Sastura's son? The first inscription on the Cekke stele was written by a servant of Sastura, who clearly had important executive powers while still being the "first servant" of Kamani. Indeed, the act of purchasing the city of Kamana is performed by Kamani and Sastura together. The circumstances surrounding the switch in line from Astiruwa (Yariri his servant) – Kamani (Sastura his servant) to Astiru II (son of Sastura, Atika, son of Kamani his servant) – [Pisiri?] son of Astiru, remain a matter of speculation for the moment.

Nevertheless, the complex relations of the last attested rulers of Karkamish, with some apparent fluctuation between the lines of rulers and those of their servants, may be a distant echo of the political set-up involving Great Kings and Country Lords in Karkamish from the 10th to early 9th centuries. Such a two-tier system of government may indicate a division of functions, such as responsibility for foreign *vs* domestic policy (see Astiruwa *vs* Yariri above), or ceremonial *vs* executive offices. Comparable cases where a high-ranking official or vizier succeeded to royal or supreme power are known, for example in New Kingdom Egypt, but any explanation remains currently unverifiable in the absence of further data.

717 to 605 BC

The period after the Assyrian take-over in 717 BC is not well known. Few Assyrian finds have been documented at Karkamish itself, the early excavations producing one Neo-Assyrian cuneiform economic tablet, a fragment of an inscribed stele, inscribed bricks of Sargon, a fragment of an Assyrian relief, an inscribed Lamaštu amulet and a Pazuzu head.[66] The tablet concerns the organization of tanners and other workers as part of the *iškāru*-service of the king in the nearby town of Elumu and is of some importance for the understanding of Neo-Assyrian administration of Empire.[67] The 2013 excavations produced a literary cuneiform tablet in Neo-Assyrian ductus from the building associated with the Royal Buttress, but this appears to belong to the period before the Assyrian occupation.[68]

Assyrian documentation from Nineveh and Kalhu (Nimrud) mentions Karkamish with reference to the "Mina of Karkamish", which appears to have been a unit of measurement used not only in the west but also closer to the Assyrian heartland. The governor of Hamath, Adda-Hati, collects silver tribute from the local population according to the "mina of Karkamish" in a letter found at Kalhu dating to the reign of Sargon II.[69] It is unclear whether this letter dates from before or after 717 BC, but it demonstrates the importance that Karkamish's position as a trade hub and its political pre-eminence among the Neo-Hittite states had for the Assyrians in implementing their imperial administration.[70] Dated documents referring to the mina of Karkamish as the unit of payment are:

Text	*Find-city*	*Location concerned*	*Year*
SAA 6.17	Nineveh	Du'ua	747
SAA 6.26	Nineveh	—	711
SAA 6.34	Nineveh	—	709
SAA 6.39	Nineveh	—	694
SAA 6.40	Nineveh	—	693
SAA 6.41	Nineveh	—	693
SAA 6.81	Nineveh	Aššur	694
SAA 6.104	Nineveh	—	690
SAA 6.107	Nineveh	—	686
SAA 6.90	Nineveh	Nabur	683
SAA 6.108	Nineveh	—	683
SAA 6.45	Nineveh	—	682
SAA 6.91	Nineveh	Talmusu	681
SAA 6.110	Nineveh	—	681

Assyrian documents thus use the term "mina of Karkamish" both before and after 717 BC. The significance of this unit may be less geographical than to do with the fact that the mina of Karkamish represented a different amount to the regular Assyrian mina, possibly even a continuation of the Late Bronze Age Hittite mina, which consisted of 40 as opposed to 60 shekels, although the details of precisely what weight of shekel would be appropriate for which weight of mina still need to be worked out.[71] Why the Assyrians should have occasionally used this weight rather than the regular Assyrian mina is unclear. The chariot driver Šumma-ilani, who frequently uses the mina of Karkamish in his business dealings, does appear to have some direct contact to an official in the city (see below).[72]

A badly broken document from Nineveh lists deliveries of "red wool" and "madder" from 14 western provinces, as far as the tablet is preserved.[73] Among these Karkamish sends in more than three times as much of the item being counted as do the other provinces for which the figures are preserved. It is therefore possible that Karkamish continued to play a key role in the textile industry and trade while part of the Assyrian Empire, although one should be wary of the evidence provided by a single, isolated and broken document. There was a relatively seamless transition between the economic roles of "tribute" (*mandattu*) paid by a client ruler and the various kinds of taxes that a province would pay via its governor once annexed to the Assyrian Empire (Radner 2006, 226–7). Here one might recall the tribute that Sangara paid to Shalmaneser III (859–824 BC) according to the Kurkh monolith, which included: "20 talents of red purple wool, 500 garments ... and 5,000 sheep."[74] Each of these elements was also present in the tribute of Qalparunda of Patin from the same year, so textiles cannot be said to be a particular speciality of Karkamish.

One other Assyrian letter may, according to S. Parpola's interpretation, give details of the Assyrian administration of Karkamish, although it is unclear whether the letter should be dated before or after the Assyrian takeover. The reference to a "(king of) Karkamish", in Parpola's translation might indicate that he favours a dating before 717 BC, and the reference to Arpad as a place of refuge for those trying to escape corvée-labour (*ilku*) may well support this, given that Arpad participated in a rebellion against Sargon II at the beginning of his reign.[75] It is, however, not clear that the letter is written from the perspective of Karkamish in the first place, and the king of Karkamish is not specifically mentioned, merely "Karkamishean(s)".[76] A further letter deals with the arrest and delivery to the king of a group of people from Karkamish who had arrived illicitly in another town.[77]

We only know the names of two governors who were installed in Karkamish by the Assyrians on the basis of their appearance as limmu-officials for the years 691 and 649 BC.[78] A "major-domo of Karkamish" (^{lú}GAL É) called Aššur-bēl-uṣur is attested on a legal document from Nineveh loaning oil from the above-mentioned chariot driver Šumma-

ilani.[79] The tablet is dated to late in the reign of Sennacherib, 681 BC. One of the witnesses on the document has a name written $^{I.d}$*kù*-KÁ-*sa-pi*, which can be normalized as Kubaba-sapi.[80] The Karkamish tablet dealing with the organization of *iškāru*-service of the king in the town of Elumu mentions a "captain" (*rab kiṣri*) called Šarri-taklak who may well be stationed in Karkamish (Postgate 1974, 362).

The last chapter in the history of the Karkamish before its classical resettlement is the role it played in the fall of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. It is thought that the Assyrians and their Egyptian allies fell back to Karkamish after they had been driven out of Harran by Babylonian forces in 610 BC, although this is not certain. By 607–6 BC a Babylonian Chronicle implies that the Egyptian army was already stationed in Karkamish, from where it was routed and chased as far as Hamath by the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar in 605 BC, the last year of his father Nabopolassar, as a further chronicle tablet informs us.[81] The garrison of the Egyptian army in Karkamish also finds some support from reports in the Old Testament.[82] Interestingly, House D in the Outer Town, in which the Pazuzu-head mentioned above was found, also contained Egyptian and Egyptianizing artifacts (Woolley 1921, 126, 127 fig. 43; Holloway 2002, 214 fn. 448).

The prime location of Karkamish for trade and its historical political importance ensured that it remained a regionally defining city in northern Syria throughout the earlier Iron Age, with a possible although undemonstrated decline during the 11th century BC. It functioned not only as a wealthy trade hub, but was also seen as the ancestral seat of Hittite power in the region, an association which clearly had an enduring ideological appeal. Among all the Neo-Hittite states Karkamish was virtually avoided by the Assyrians until the late 8th century BC, although it is not possible to exclude that this was part of a wider Assyrian strategy. After its annexation to the Assyrian Empire it appears to have left an imprint on the formation of trade and collection of tribute through the measurement known as the mina of Karkamish, which was used not only in the west as far as Hamath but apparently also in contracts regarding areas nearer the Assyrian heartland, although this may be partly due to the contracting parties having western connections. The period immediately after the fall of the Assyrian Empire saw some of the key power-struggles for the domination of the whole of the area formerly controlled by Assyria played out there.

Notes

1 See Weeden 2013 for a recent summary of some of the vast previous literature on this topic.

2 Glatz 2009, as a model for understanding ancient Empires in general. An intermediate form of external control referred to as 'Intensive Hegemony' on the Middle Euphrates (*ibid*., 138) is contrasted with a more 'hands-off' approach to rule at Ugarit.

3 Harrison 2013, 61. Alalakh is now thought to have been deserted much earlier in the 13th century than previously thought, which should change significantly our assessment of its significance at the end of the Hittite Empire (Yener 2013; Akar 2013).

4 This statement may naturally be subject to revision in the course of the new excavations at the site conducted since 2011 by the Universities of Bologna, Istanbul and Gaziantep under the directorship of N. Marchetti.

5 E.g. Hawkins 1988; Güterbock 1992.

6 T96-1, cited at Cohen and d'Alfonso 2008, 14–15.

7 T93-12, cited at Cohen and d'Alfonso 2008, 15 n. 54.

8 Publication Hawkins 2005; for the connection of the Emar *Tarwa* with the bowl's *tarwiza* ("Tarwean") see Mora 2007, 519.

9 See Oreshko 2012 for a a rejection of the reading of "T[udhaliya] Labarna". Oreshko reads instead "Mount Labarna", which he equates with Mount Lebanon, which is not convincing. In the reading MONS[.*tu*] (= Tudhaliya) the *tu* is restored because the area is covered with modern solder. For the location of this Tudhaliya (V) on the central plateau see Simon 2009. For his location in Karkamish see Giusfredi 2013.

10 Giusfredi 2013, followed by Oreshko 2012, reads the title of the figure named Asmaya on the silver bowl as "Country Lord", rather than "man of the land of Hatti" (Hawkins 2005), a reading which is not defensible

11 KARAHÖYÜK §1: POCULUM.PES.*67(REGIO). Hawkins 2000, 291. The reading of the name Ir(i)-Teššub is also not secure, as it is written half-logographically. See Simon 2013, 827–828 for a summary of suggestions.

12 Hawkins 2000, 291. See Simon 2013, 824–826 for the arguments (a) that KARAHÖYÜK belongs stylistically to the Karkamish group, which is not substantiated, (b) that the stylistic similarities with inscriptions from the central plateau are not indicative of geographical grouping, but merely of archaism, (c) that the style of the Karkamish inscriptions developed more slowly than in Malatya, for which this is the only evidence, (d) that the king Iri-Teššub is identical with the king of "Karkamish" Ini-Teššub encountered by Tiglath-Pileser I in 1100 BC (*ibid*., 828). The specific form of the sign /*sa*/ is not addressed in the discussion of (a) and (b). The evidence for n/r rhotacism at this date needed to explain (d) is not sufficient.

13 Simon (2013, 824) argues that Iri-Teššub must have been king of Karkamish because otherwise the dominion of Malatya over Karahöyük-Elbistan, allegedly demonstrated by an inscription of PUGNUS-*mili* from the end of the 12th century, is unexplained (MALATYA 9, Hawkins 2000, 284). This timeframe does not exclude that the "Great King" of the KARAHÖYÜK inscription is an earlier Great King from the central plateau area.

14 A.0.87.3, 28 (Grayson 1991, 37).

15 ALEPPO 7, 5 §7 (Hawkins 2011, 48).

16 It is notable, although not clear from the composite transliteration by Grayson (1991, A.0.87.4, 31) that the name Allumari is not spelled out completely in any of manuscripts

but always appears in a break. It is thus a reconstruction. See Hawkins 1998, 66 fn. 15.

17 RIMA A.0.102.1, 55', 67' (Stone slab from Fort Shalmaneser).

18 KARKAMIŠ A4b (Hawkins 2000, 80–82); Dinçol *et al.* 2012.

19 Dinçol *et al.* 2012.

20 ÇİNEKÖY Luwian §6–7 = Phoenician 8–9; Payne 2012, 43.

21 KARKAMIŠ A1a. Hawkins 2000, 87–91. Astuwalamanza now is re-read from previous Astuwatamanza.

22 See Del Monte and Tischler 1978, 149 for literature. One should of course be wary of associations made on the basis of an alleged phonetic similarity to a modern Turkish name, especially one containing a common Turkish morpheme like —*erek*, but the Armenian name Sevovorak implies a greater age to the formation. Two monuments with hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions have been found in the Siverek area, although their content is not known (Çelik 2005; Kulakoğlu 2003).

23 KARKAMISH A1a §9, §12 (Hawkins 2000, 88).

24 KARKAMISH A1a §14 (Hawkins 2000, 88).

25 KARKAMISH A11b+c §4, §31; Edition at Hawkins 2000, 101–108; interpretation at Melchert 2011, 75–77.

26 TELL AHMAR 1, §11 (Hawkins 2000, 242).

27 KARKAMISH A11a §5 (Hawkins 2000, 95, 97).

28 KARKAMISH A11b+c §5 (Hawkins 2000, 103).

29 *ibid*., §15.

30 *ibid*., §7–8.

31 Hawkins 2000, 105, with question mark.

32 *Kawa/i* ≠ *Que* at Giusfredi 2010, 50 fn. 68; Simon 2011, 260; Gander 2012, 292.

33 Simon (2011, 261 fn. 19) argues on phonetic grounds against **Kawa*/*i* being a "dialect form" of *Hiyawa*. The difference in form could be areally rather than dialectally conditioned, however, or could have been generated through an Aramaic transmission (see *qwh* in the inscription of Zakkur of Hamath, Donner and Röllig 1962–64, 202 A6, albeit almost a century later). Simon (*ibid*., 261) further sees **Kawa*/*i* in A11b+c as referring to the place–name *kw* mentioned in the Phoenician inscription of Cebel İres Dağı (Mosca-Russell 1987, 5–6), which would itself be located in Hiyawa! This may be supported by the fact that **Kawa/i* in Karkamish A11b+c is given the determinative "city". For the purposes of assessing the extent of Katuwa's military reach it is irrelevant whether one interprets **Kawa*/*i* as referring to the area *Que* or to a city *kw* in the area *Hiyawa* (= *Que*).

34 RIMA A.0.102.1, 93'–95' (Grayson 1996, 11)

35 RIMA A.0.102.2 ii 19 (Grayson 1996, 18); Yamada 2000, 117. See Chapter 5 for possible location of Sazabê.

36 RIMA A.0.102.2 ii 27–9 (Grayson 1996, 18)

37 RIMA A.0.102.6 ii 69 (Grayson 1996, 38)

38 The extent of Assyrian rule is delimited towards the west by Kar-Shalmaneser (= Tell Ahmar), "which is opposite Karkamish" A.0.103.1, 9–10 (Grayson 1996, 184). See Radner 2004, 158 fn. 21 for a more sinister explanation of this phrase.

39 A.0.104.3, 12 (Grayson 1996, 205).

40 Donner and Röllig 1962–4 no. 202, A1, 1–9.

41 Tiglath-Pileser III 11, 9; 14, 11; 27, 4; 32, 3; 35 iii 16 (Tadmor and Yamada 2011).

42 *Annals* 72–76 (Fuchs 1994, 88, 316).

43 Radner 2004, 158–159. The "Phoenician" ports of Tyre and Sidon provide a parallel (*ibid*., 159–162).

44 KARKAMIŞ A6, §30, referring to sculpture KARKAMIŞ B4–5 (Hawkins 2000, 128, also p. 78 fn. 64).

45 MARAŞ 4, §12–14 (Hawkins 2000, 257, see also *ibid*., 266).

46 KARKAMIŞ A6 §8 (Hawkins 2000, 126).

47 KARKAMIŞ A6 §6 (Hawkins 2000, 126).

48 Hawkins 2000, 126; Simon 2012.

49 It may be tempting to understand the name *Sura* here as Assyria, but this is unlikely given the fact that Yariri otherwise spells Assyria as *a-sú+ra*/*i-* KARKAMIŞ A15b §19 (Hawkins 2000, 131).

50 KARKAMIŞ A15b §19–21 (Hawkins 2000, 131).

51 Hawkins 2000, 133; Starke 1997, 388–92.

52 KARKAMIŞ A24a (Hawkins 2000, 135).

53 KARKAMIŞ A24a §3 (Hawkins 2000, 135).

54 KARKAMIŞ A24a §6–7 (Hawkins 2000, 135).

55 CEKKE §6a (Hawkins 2000, 145).

56 KARKAMIŞ A31 §7 (Hawkins 2000, 142).

57 KARKAMIŞ A27e frag. 1 §1 (Hawkins 2000, 166, where dated to Kamani).

58 KARKAMIŞ A31 §5 (Hawkins 2000, 142).

59 CEKKE §6b–12 (Hawkins 2000, 145).

60 CEKKE §13–14 (Hawkins 2000, 145).

61 CEKKE §15–17o (Hawkins 2000, 145–146).

62 KARKAMIŞ A21+A20b §1 (Hawkins 2000, 160). Dated to Pisiri on the basis of sculptural style at Hawkins 2000, 159, 162, also 79).

63 KARKAMIŞ A21 frag. 1. It is also possible that the fragment belongs to the genealogy of the author (Hawkins 2000, 162).

64 KARKAMIŞ A13 c1, See Hawkins 2000, 168. A number of fragments from Karkamish A13, thought to be lost, were re-discovered during the 2013 season at Karkamish.

65 Akdoğan 2013; Hawkins, Tosun, Akdoğan 2013. Clearly the evidence from this stele has no bearing on the question of the ascription of KARKAMIŞ A13 to either Kamani or Pisiri.

66 See Hawkins 1976–80, 446. Lamaštu (BM 1177587) Holloway 2002, 212 fn. 447. Pazuzu: Woolley 1921, 127 fig. 43, Holloway 2002, 214 fn. 448.

67 BM 116230, Postgate 1974, 95, 216, 226, 360–62; dated to 702 BC at Fales 1973, 108 fn. 102 due to partially restored eponym; Holloway 2002, 419 fn. 526. The same town is the subject of a land-grant during the reign of Aššurbanipal (SAA 12.90, Kataja and Whiting 1995, 110–112).

68 See Marchesi 2014.

69 SAA 19.173, 6–7 = SAA 1.176 (Parpola 1987). For Adda-Hati see Radner 1998: 45.

70 An as yet unverified proposal in the literature has been that the mina of Karkamish formed the basis for the "light" mina of Assyria (*c.* 500gm). Powell 1987–90, 516 with further literature.

71 Van den Hout 1987–1990, 525–527; Vargyas 1996. Middle and Late Bronze Age evidence for Karkamishean weights is discussed at Vargyas 1998. If the "light" mina and the mina of Karkamish are identical (cf. fn. 70 above), the question becomes rather why specific Assyrian texts opt for calling this weight the mina of Karkamish.

72 SAA 6.34; 39; 40; 41; 45; 46; 53; 54 (Kwasman and Parpola 1991). It is notable that all of these transactions concern traffic

in slaves. Šumma-ilani does not use the mina of Karkamish in his property transactions, for example (SAA 6.37; 42). This restriction to transactions concerning slaves does not apply to other individuals who use the mina of Karkamish.

73 SAA 7.116 obv. 4': Karkamish delivers 100+2 talents; also recorded are 30 talents from Arpad (*ibid*., 3'), 30 from Que (*ibid*., 5'), 15 from Megiddo (*ibid*., 6'), [1]5 from Manṣuate (*ibid*., 7').

74 A.0.102.2 ii 28 (Grayson 1996, 18). One should note that the terms translated "red wool" in SAA 7.116 rev. 4' (ḪÉ.MED) and "red purple wool" in the Kurkh Monolith (SÍG ZA.GÌN SA_5), while both being wool, appear to denote different types of wool or wool products.

75 SAA 1.183, 10', 16' (Parpola 1987, 146). Parpola points out that Sargon imposed *ilku*-duties on Karkamish in his 5th year (718 BC).

76 The letter could have been written by an Assyrian governor or magnate in a neighbouring area, e.g. Kar-Shalmaneser on the other side of the river, as the reference to people crossing the Euphrates to go to Arpad might indeed indicate (SAA 1.183, 16'). For an Assyrian governor of Kar-Shalmaneser during the reign of Sargon II see Radner 2006.

77 SAA 5.243, 13–18. The editors suppose on the basis of the handwriting that the sender "may be identical with the governor of Mazamua" who authored SAA 5.199 (Lanfranchi and Parpola 1995, 175). If so, this incident did not happen locally to Karkamish.

78 Hawkins 1976–80, 446; Radner 2006–2008, 58. A further unnamed governor of Karkamish is mentioned in SAA 7.136 rev. i 3', a list of food provisions from Nineveh presumably for rather than from the governors of eight provinces as preserved (Fales and Postgate 1992).

79 SAA 6.46, obv. 1 (Kwasman and Parpola 1991, 47); Radner 1998, 175.

80 SAA 6.46, rev. 5 (Kwasman and Parpola 1991). The goddess Kubaba with the same writing appears in the curses attached to Esarhaddon's loyalty oath (SAA 2.6, 469) where she may be responsible for causing venereal disease, depending on interpretation (Parpola and Watanabe 1988).

81 Written ^{uru}*gal-ga-meš*. Glassner 2004: 226–7, Chronicle 23, Nabopolassar; ibid. 227–8, Chronicle 24, late Nabopolassar/early Nebuchadnezzar II. The latter text also mentions a campaign by Nebuchadnezzar II as far as Karkamish in *Hattu* (i.e. northern Syria) in 596 BC.

82 II Chronicles 33, 20 (cf. II Kings 23, 29); Jeremiah 46, 2. Hawkins 1976–80, 446.

Bibliography

Akar, M. (2013) The Late Bronze Age Fortresses at Alalakh. Architecture and Identity in Mediterranean Exchange Systems. In K.A. Yener (ed.) *Across the Border: late Bronze–Iron Age relations between Syria and Anatolia,* 37–55. Leuven, Peeters.

Akdoğan, R. (2013) Adana Müzesinde Luwi Hiyeroglif Yazıtlı Stel. *Aktüel Arkeoloji* 35, 14.

Arnaud, D. (1991) *Textes syriens de l'Age du Bronze Récent.* Barcelona, Aula Orientalis Supplementa 1.

Aro, S. (2013) Carchemish before and after 1200 BC. In A. Mouton, I. Rutherford and I. Yakubovich (eds) *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean,* 233–276. Leiden-Boston, Brill.

Bryce, T. (2012) *The World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Çelik, B. (2005) A new stele base of the Late Hittite period from Siverek-Şanlıurfa. *Anadolu/Anatolia* 28, 17–24.

Cohen, Y. (2004) Kidin-Gula – The foreign teacher at the Emar scribal school. *Revue d' Assyriologie* 98, 81–100.

Cohen, Y. and d'Alfonso, L. (2008) The duration of the Emar archives. In L. d'Alfonso, Y. Cohen, and D. Sürenhagen (eds) *The city of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires, History, Landscape and Society. Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar conference 25–26.04. 2006*, 3–25. Münster, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 349.

Dinçol, A., Dinçol, B. Hawkins, J.D. and Peker, H. (2012) At the origins of the Suhi-Katuwa Dynasty. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 75/3, 145.

Donner, H. and Röllig, W. (1962–4) *Kananäische und Aramäische Inschriften Vol. I*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Fales, M.F. (1973) *Censimenti e catasti di epoca neo-assira*. Centre per le antichita e la sto- ria dell'arte del Vicino Oriente: Studi economici e technologici 2. Rome, Centro per le antichita e la storia dell'arte del Vicino Oriente.

Fales, F.M. and Postgate, J.N. (1992) *Imperial Administrative Records, Part I. Palace and Temple Administration* State Archives of Assyria 7. Helsinki, Helsinki University Press.

Frangipane, M. and Liverani, M. (2013) Neo-Hittite Melid: continuity or discontinuity? In K.A. Yener (ed.) *Across the Border: late Bronze–Iron Age relations between Syria and Anatolia,* 349–372. Leuven, Peeters.

Fuchs, A. (1994) *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad*. Göttingen, Cuvillier.

Gander, M. (2012) Aḫḫiyawa – Ḫiyawa – Que: Gibt es Evidenz für die Anwesenheit von Griechen in Kilikien am Übergang von der Bronze- zur Eisenzeit. *SMEA* 54, 281–309.

Glassner, J.-J. (2004) *Mesopotamian Chronicles* Writings from the Ancient World. Atlanta, Society for Biblical Literature.

Glatz, C. (2009) Empire as network: Spheres of material interaction in Late Bronze Age Anatolia. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 28, 127–141.

Giusfredi, F. (2010) *Sources for a Socio-Economic History of the Neo-Hittite States.* Heidelberg, Texte der Hethiter 28.

Giusfredi, F. (2013) Further considerations on the Ankara Silver Bowl. In L. Feliu, J. Llop, A. Millet Albà and J. Sanmartin (eds) *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona, 26th–30th July 2010 at Barcelona*, 665–680. Winona Lake IN, Eisenbrauns.

Grayson, K. (1991) *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC (1114–859 BC)*. Toronto, Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 2.

Grayson, K. (1996) *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC)*. Toronto, Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 3.

Güterbock, H.G. (1992) Survival of the Hittite Dynasty. In W.A. Ward and M.S. Joukowsky (eds) *The Crisis Years: The 12th Century B.C. From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, 53–55. Dubuque, Kendall/Hunt.

Harrison, T.P. (2013) Tayınat in the Early Iron Age. In K.A. Yener (ed.) *Across the Border: late Bronze–Iron Age relations between Syria and Anatolia*, 61–87. Leuven, Peeters.

Hawkins, J.D. (1976–80) Karkamiš. In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vordersiatischen Archäologie* 5, *Ia ... Kizzuwatna*, 426–446. Berlin, De Gruyter.

Hawkins, J.D. (1988) Kuzi-Tešub and the 'Great Kings' of Karkamiš. *Anatolian Studies* 38, 99–108.

Hawkins, J.D. (1995) "Great Kings" and "Country Lords" at Malatya and Karkamiš. In Th. van den Hout and J. de Roos (eds) *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* PIHANS 74, 73–86. Leiden, NINO.

Hawkins, J.D. (1998) Hittites and Assyrians at Melid (Malatya). In H. Erkanal, V. Donbaz and A. Uğuroğlu (eds) *XXXIVème Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Istanbul, 6–10/VII/1987*, 63–77. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Hawkins, J.D. (2000) *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions Vol. I.1–3: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin, de Gruyter.

Hawkins, J.D. (2004) A Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription on a silver bowl in the museum of Anatolian civilisations Ankara. *Studia Troica* 15, 193–205.

Hawkins, J.D. (2011) The inscriptions of the Aleppo temple. *Anatolian Studies* 61, 35–54.

Hawkins, J.D., Tosun, K. and Akdoğan, R. 2013: a new hieroglyphic Luwian stele in Adana Museum. *Höyük* 6, 1–13.

Holloway, S.W. (2002) *Aššur is King! Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire.* Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 10. Leiden-Boston-Köln, Brill.

Hout, Th. van den (1987–1990) Masse und Gewichte Bei den Hethitern. In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und der vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7, 517–527. Berlin-New York, De Gruyter.

Kataja, L. and Whiting, R. (1995) *Grants, Decrees and Gifts of the Neo-Assyrian Period,* State Archives of Assyria 12. Helsinki, Helsinki University Press.

Kwasman, T. and Parpola, S. (1991) *Legal Transactions of the Royal Court of Niniveh,* Part 1*: Tiglath-Pileser III through Esarhaddon*, State Archives of Assyria 6. Helsinki, Helsinki University Press.

Kulakoğlu, F. (2003) Şanlıurfa'da Son Yıllarda Keşfedilen Geç Hitit heykeltıraşlı Merkezleri ve Eserleri, *2002 Yılı Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Konferansları,* 65–87. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Anıtlar ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü Anadolu Medeniyetler Müzesi.

Lanfranchi, G.B. and Parpola, S. (1990) *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part II: Letters from the Northern and Northeastern Provinces*. State Archives of Assyria 5. Helsinki, Helsinki University Press.

Liverani, M. (2012) Melid in the Early and Middle Iron Age: Archaeology and History. In G. Galil, A. Gilboa, A.M. Maeir and D. Kahn (eds) *The Ancient Near East in the 12th to 10th Centuries BCE: Culture and History. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the University of Haifa, 2–5 May, 2010*, AOAT 392, 327–344. Münster, Ugarit-Verlag.

Marchesi, G. (2014) A Bilingual Literary Text from Karkemish Featuring Marduk (with contributions by Werner R. Mayer and Strahil V. Panayotov). *Orientalia* 83/4, 330–340 (Tab. XXXII-XXXIV).

Marchetti, N. (2013) The 2011 Joint Turco-Italian Excavations at Karkemish, in *34. kazı sonuçları toplantısı, 28 mayıs–1 haziran 2012, Çorum. 1. cilt*, 349–364. Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.

Marchetti, N. (2012) Karkemish on the Euphrates: Excavating a City's History. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 75 (3), 132–147.

Melchert, H.C. (1988) "Thorn" and "Minus" in hieroglyphic Luvian orthography. *Anatolian Studies* 38, 29–42.

Melchert, H.C. (2011) Enclitic subject pronouns in hieroglyphic Luvian. *Aramazd, Armenian Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6 (2), 73–86.

Monte, G. del and Tischler, J. (1978) *Die Orts-und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 6 (BTAVO, Reihe B7). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Mora, C. (2007) Three Metal Bowls. In: M. Alparslan, M. Doğan Alparslan, H. Peker (eds) *VITA – Festschrift in Honor of Belkis Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*. Istanbul, Ege Yayinları 515–521.

Mosca, P.G. and Russell, J. (1987) A Phoenician inscription from Cebel İres Dağı in Rough Cilicia. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 9, 1–28.

Oreshko, R. (2012) Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on the Ankara Silver Bowl: an essay of epigraphic and historical re-interpretation (in Russian with English summary). *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 2012 (2), 3–28.

Payne, A. (2012) *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Writings from the Ancient World 29, Atlanta, Society for Biblical Literature.

Payne, A. (2014) Zum Herrscherhaus von Karkamiš. In C. Brosch and A. Payne (eds) *Na-wa/i-VIR.ZI/A MAGNUS SCRIBA Festschrift für Helmut Nowicki zum 70. Geburtstag*, 149–156. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Parpola, S. (1987) *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part I: Letters from Assyria and the West*. State Archives of Assyria 1. Helsinki, Helsinki University Press.

Parpola, S. and Watanabe, K. (1988) *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyality Oaths*. State Archives of Assyria 2. Helsinki, Helsinki University Press.

Postgate, J.N. (1974) *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire.* StPSM 1. Rome, Pontificial Institute.

Powell, M.A. (1987–90) Masse und Gewichte. In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und der Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7, 457–517. Berlin-New York, De Gruyter.

Radner, K. (ed.) (1998) *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire Vol. I Part I: A.* Helsinki, Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.

Radner, K. (2004) Assyrische Handelspolitik: die Symbiose mit unabhängigen Handelszentren und ihre Kontrolle durch Assyrien. In R. Rollinger und C. Ulf (eds) *Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World. Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project. Held in Innsbruck, Austria, October 3rd–8th, 2002,* 152–169. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag.

Radner, K. (2006) Aššur-dūr-pānīya, Statthalter von Til-Barsip unter Sargon II. von Assyrien. *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 36, 185–195.

Radner, K. (2006–8) Provinz C. Assyrien. In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und der vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 11. *Prinzessin ... Samug,* 43–68. Berlin, De Gruyter.

Radner, K. (2007) Abgaben an den König von Assyrien aus dem

In und Ausland. In H. Klinkott, S. Kubisch and R. Müller-Wollermann (eds) *Geschenke und Steuern, Zölle und Tribute. Antike Abgabenformen in Anspruch und Wirklichkeit*, 213–230. Leiden-Boston, Brill.

Seeher, J. (1998) Neue Befunde zur Endzeit von Hattuša: Ausgrabungen auf Büyükkaya in Boğazköy. In S. Alp and A. Süel (eds) *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996*, 515–523. Ankara, publisher unknown.

Simon, Zs. (2009) Die ANKARA-Silberschale und das Ende des hethitischen Reiches. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 99 (2), 247–269.

Simon, Zs. (2011) The Identification of Qode. Reconsidering the Evidence. In J.-P.Mynářová and V. Maříková (eds) *Egypt and the Near East – The Crossroads. International Workshop on the Relations between Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age*, 249–269. Prague, Czech Institute of Egyptology, Charles University.

Simon, Zs. (2012) Where is the land of Sura of the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription KARKAMIŠ A4b and why were Cappadocians called Syrians by Greeks? *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39 (1), 160–180.

Simon, Zs. (2013) Wer war der Großkönig I(a)+ra/i-TONITRUS der KARAHÖYÜK-Inschrift. In L. Feliu, J. Llop, A. Millet Albà and J. Sanmartin (eds) *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona, 26th–30th July 2010 at Barcelona*, 823–832. Winona Lake IN, Eissenbrauns.

Singer, I. (2000) New evidence on the end of the Hittite Empire. In E. Oren (ed.) *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*, 21–33. Philadelphia PA, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Singer, I. (2012) The Philistines in the North and the Kingdom of Taita. In G. Galil, A. Gilboa, A.M. Maeir, and D. Kahn (eds) *The Ancient Near East in the 12th to 10th Centuries BCE: Culture and History. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the University of Haifa, 2–5 May, 2010*, 451–472. AOAT 392. Münster, Ugarit-Verlag.

Starke, F. (1997) Sprachen und Schriften in Karkamiš, in P. Pongratz-Leisten, H. Kühne and P. Xella (eds) *Ana šadî Labnāni lū allik. Beiträge zu altorientalischen und mittelmeerischen Kulturen (= Festschrift Wolfgang Röllig)*, 381–395. AOAT 247. Kevelaer, Butzon und Bercher and Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag.

Summers, G.D. (2013) Some implications of revised C14 and dendrochronological dating for the "Late Bronze levels" at Tille Höyük on the Euphrates. In K.A. Yener (ed.) *Across the Border: late Bronze–Iron Age Relations between Syria and Anatolia,* 311–328. Leuven, Peeters.

Tadmor, H. and Yamada, Sh. (2011) *The Royal Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BC) and Shalmaneser V (726–722 BC), Kings of Assyria*. Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 1, Winona Lake IN, Eisenbrauns.

Vargyas, P. (1996) The Mina of Karkemiš in the Neo-Assyrian Sources. *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 10 (2), 9–14.

Vargyas, P. (1998) Talent of Karkamish and Talent of Yamhad. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 25, 303–311.

Weeden, M. (2013) After the Hittites: the Kingdoms of Karkamish and Palistin in Northern Syria. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 56 (2), 1–20.

Woolley, C.L. (1921) *Carchemish: Report on the Excavations at Jerablus on Behalf of the British Museum, Part II: The Town Defenses*. London, British Museum.

Yamada, Sh. (2000) *The Construction of the Assyrian Empire. A Historical Study of the Inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (859–824 BC) Relating to His Campaigns to the West.* Leiden–Boston, Brill.

Yener, K.A. (2013) New Excavations at Alalakh: The 14th–12th Centuries BC. In K.A. Yener, (ed.) *Across the Border: late Bronze–Iron Age Relations between Syria and Anatolia*, 11–35. Leuven, Peeters.