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A. The Town

1. Ashur, the city from whose eponymous god the land of Ashur, or Assyria, takes its name, is now Qal'at ash-Sherqat, a high bluff on the right bank of the Middle Tigris dominating the south end of a fertile plain. This plain (Oates 1968, 19) is the southernmost of several places at which natural routes from northern Syria meet, and either cross or follow, the Tigris; it is easily accessible too to pastoral tribes, such as those by whom the Akkadian language was probably introduced into Assyria, approaching the river from the more barren country to the south-west. These factors led to the development of Ashur as an important town both in the third millennium and Assyrian periods, and later under the Parthians.

2. Ashur first became the capital of a small state, incorporated at different times into both the Agade and Ur III empires. Between 2000 and 1800 it was a centre of international trade; its town-wall enclosed over 40 hectares, and a series of powerful kings rebuilt and embellished its shrines. Shamshi-Adad I, the West-Semitic usurper into whose hands it eventually fell, treated it ambivalently, rebuilding some shrines but demolishing others; he seems to have moved the administrative capital of his Assyrian province northwards to the more convenient site of Ekallatum. After his death and the overthrow of his dynasty there is an interval of deep obscurity; about 1700 Bel-bani, to whom later Assyrian kings traced
their descent, established himself on the throne, and one late seventeenth-century king bore the name of Kidin-Ninua, but it is uncertain whether this means that Ashur yet controlled Nineveh. The city was again prospering at the end of the sixteenth century, when Puzur-Ashur III extended the town-wall to enclose another 15 hectares, but shortly afterwards the kings of Ashur may have become subject to the Mitannian emperors, ruling in northern Syria, one of whom carried off booty from the town. It is difficult to follow the fluctuations in Mitannian power (Gadd 1965, 1-10), and at one stage Ashur was regarded as a vassal of Babylon; Ashur-uballit I (1366-1330) is usually credited with the transformation of Assyria into a major independent power. Nonetheless his five predecessors, from Ashur-nirari II (1427-1420), have all left records of their building activities, including some work on the town-wall, and one of them, Ashur-nadin-ahhe, corresponded with Egypt; they may not have regarded themselves as vassals at all. Assyrian power continued to grow after Ashur-uballit's death, and reached a peak under Tukulti-Ninurta I (1245-1208) who at one moment held Babylon; many new buildings were erected at Ashur during these years.

Towards the end of his reign Tukulti-Ninurta, following the example of Shamshi-Adad I, attempted to shift the capital, together with its principal shrine, northwards; it reverted to Ashur when he died. In the next three centuries many kings worked on the maintenance and, where necessary, reconstruction of the public buildings of the city. Tiglath-pileser I (1116-1077) was the most active.

Ashurnasirpal II, in about 879, moved his primary residence, the administrative capital of Assyria, to Kalhu in the direction of Nineveh;
he did not attempt to move the temple of Ashur, and the town of Ashur remained the religious centre of his growing empire. Both Ashurnasirpal (884-859) and Shalmaneser III (859-824) emphasized their concern for the old capital by extensive building, but it is possible that, in the eighth century, the absence of the king led to some decline, at least in the lobbying power of its inhabitants: Sargon II (722-705) boasted of restoring the city's privileges and tax-exemptions (ARAB II, 69). Sargon himself, and all his seventh-century successors except Ashur-etil-ilani, worked on public buildings in Ashur. The city was finally destroyed during the Median attack of 614 (ARAB II, 418).

5. There were French and British soundings on the site of Ashur in the nineteenth century, but serious and extensive excavations were begun by the Germans, principally under Andrae, before the First World War. Preliminary reports on their work appeared in MDOG, and final reports on particular buildings have been appearing in volumes of WVDLG. Scholars, apart from Andrae, who have considered the history and topography of the site, are numerous; the most perceptive suggestions have been made by Weidner, who has published many of the Ashur texts; Schwenger, who planned but did not live to finish a detailed correlation of the textual and archaeological evidence; and Unger, who discusses the entire site in KIA I. One ancient document of outstanding interest is the Address-Book, written in Semitic during Sennacherib's reign and frequently mentioned below: it contains an extensive list of the statues, shrines, and other features of Ashur.

6. The principal buildings were at the north end of the city. The north-east corner was occupied by the Ashur temple, with to its west, in
order, the main ziggurat, the Old Palace, the Anu-Adad temple, the Ishtar of Nineveh temple, and Tukulti-Ninurta I's abortive New Palace. South of an open space in front of the Anu-Adad temple were, from east to west, the Sin-Shamash temple, the seventh century Nabu temple, and the main Ishtar temple complex. The temple of Gula may have been further west still.

There were several other public buildings, mostly smaller, the location of which is generally unknown, and few of which are discussed below.

B. The Town-Wall

1. The earliest recorded builder of the town-wall is Kikkia, first bricks of a size used by that king; it looks, however, more like a repair named in an Ashur- rim-nisheshu text (IAK, XIV, 4) found by the main ziggurat; the second king named in the text is Ikunum. Shalmaneser III includes the same pair, but inserts between them a Pu-..., presumably intended as Puzur-Ashur I; the builder in question should more probably be Puzur-Ashur III, a king who worked extensively on the wall but is omitted by Shalmaneser. We can, however, add two kings in Puzur-Ashur's place: Ilushuma (ZA XLIII, 115), who built a new wall and enlarged the town, digging two new wells to provide water for the bricks of what must have been a substantial construction on the landward side of the town; and Erishum I (IAK, V, 7) who completed his father's work, expropriating land between the Sheep gate and the People's gate (see below, I,C,6) perhaps for this purpose. Ikunum, and Sargon I whom Ashur- rim-nisheshu also mentions, may have put the finishing touches to this operation, and added reinforcement where necessary.
2. The line of the wall before Ilushuma can be identified with certainty only on the north front of the town. The clearest remains, discussed by Andrae (*WVDOG* XXIII, 95, Taf. V), adjoin the Ashur temple. Walls A, B, C, and possibly G must precede wall D which incorporates a stamped brick of Erishum I. The earliest feature seems to be A, a solitary buttress 4.5 m. wide, founded on "prehistoric", probably mid-third millennium, debris; its stone foundations, mudbrick superstructure, and general appearance recalls Agade work at Taya (*WVDOG* XXIII, Blatt 55; *Iraq* XXX, pl. LXX). G, a narrow wall abutting on A and founded on about the same level, is ascribed by Andrae to Shamshi-Adad I since it contains bricks of a size used by that king; it looks, however, more like a repair to the curtain-wall associated with A. C, a stretch of wall much like A and resting on the same approximate level, need not be much later; built into it was a defaced fragment of stone inscription, never apparently published. All these are probably third millennium constructions, and one may be part of the wall built or repaired by Kikkia. Further west (*WVDOG* XXIII, 65, Taf. X), by the main ziggurat, a curving stretch of wall, which incorporates a gate and has shallow towers projecting from it, must represent the original line of the town-wall along the cliffs, and may partly be original work. On the east side the wall obviously followed the Tigris; a possible fragment of it, by the Ashur temple, was very tentatively identified by Andrae (*WVDOG* XXIII, 147). This is all that is known of the defensive line; Unger's suggestion (*RLA* I, 177), that there were traces of an early town-wall by the south-east corner of the Anu-Adad temple, is not supported by the evidence (*WVDOG* X, 68).
Presumably the wall did extend far enough to include the Anu-Adad temple on the west, and the Ishtar temple on the south; but if Ilushuma's work was as extensive as the texts imply, the old wall must have cut back to the river through the middle of the later inner town.

3. The area adjoining the Ashur temple on the north also contains the best identifiable fragments of the Old Assyrian town-wall. D 3, in particular, had built into it three foundation-deposit boxes, one of which included an Erishum I brick stamped for use in the surroundings (isaru) of his Ashur temple. D 3 must be slightly later than D 2, with which it is closely associated, and than D 1, which could be the outer wall of the temple itself. Haller (WVD0G LXVII, 16) is inclined to ascribe all three to Erishum. If this is correct, Ilushuma's wall may be tentatively identified with the earlier buttress B. Ikunum or Sargon I may have been responsible for E, a reinforcement on the north side of D 2; it is quite plausible that repairs should have been needed at this time, as Erishum's temple itself only lasted a century.

4. B rests on meagre stone foundations; it is 11 m. wide. We should not attach undue significance to these details, but there is some similarity to the bastions projecting from the early town-wall on the west and south of Ashur. The structural elements of these cannot be precisely dated, as they are a patchwork of alterations and repairs; there is little doubt, however, that they belonged originally to the line of walls built by Ilushuma and his successors, and the extant foundations are likely to include a high proportion of early work, with the subsequent accretions lost. Seven of these bastions were located; five (WVD0G XXIII, 123) in
an area south of the later tabira gate, and two (WVDG XXIII, 135) near the point where the wall of the New Town eventually diverged from the old line. No two were identical, but they were generally between 9 and 11 m. wide, and projected some 20 m. out from the wall. The wall itself followed Shalmaneser III's inner wall on the south-west side of the town; on the south its line was parallel with Shalmaneser's wall, but about 20 m. northward. Some fragments of this wall may have survived on the south (WVDG XXIII, 61, 136), but none were found on the south-west, or on the Tigris front. On the north, beside the ziggurat, though much of the brickwork of the defenses is probably Old Assyrian (WVDG XXIII, Taf. X), it cannot be distinguished reliably from earlier and later work.

5. One construction that Erishum I (Bell. XIV, 225) claims to have repaired is the muššalatu of the Ashur temple. A muššalatu is a staircase or ramp, and that belonging to the Ashur temple has always been identified with a way leading down from the temple north-westwards and joining the muššalatu the foundations of which were found, with texts of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon in position, north of the main ziggurat. The texts, however, (OTP II, 151; Aföbh. IX, 9; Address-Book, line 121) make it perfectly clear that this seventh-century muššalatu belonged with the palace, presumably the Old Palace, rather than with the Ashur temple. The one temple muššalatu brick found in position, dating again from Erishum (WVDG LXVII, 15), was at the head of the ramp leading up from the outer court to the south-east door of the main temple block. It could be argued that the temple muššalatu is nothing more than this ramp. Nonetheless it is hard to believe that there was not a town-gate north-west of the Ashur temple,
and any such gate must have had a muššalu leading to it; the traditional location of the temple muššalu, somewhere north-west of the temple proper, is therefore accepted here. It may have incorporated the projecting terrace at the east end of the early wall east of the ziggurat (WVDOG XXIII, Taf. X).

6. The next known addition to the wall is buttress F, which is essentially part of Shamshi-Adad I's new Ashur temple (WVDOG LXVII, Taf. V). Andrae further ascribes G to this king, together with the brickwork (WVDOG XXIII, 65, Taf. X) of a gate by the north-east corner of the ziggurat; while he may be right, there is again no prospect of dating these features securely.

7. Puzur-Sin, in a text published by Landsberger (JCS VIII, 32), claims to have built an entirely new stretch of town-wall, situated between the ku-mi-im, which Landsberger translates as Hoohtempel and identifies with the Anu ziggurat, and the pariktum, or transverse wall, by the Ilula gate ("nicht Stadttor"). We do not in fact understand these topographical references; the kumu, pariktum, and abul Ilula might be anywhere. Nonetheless the neo-Assyrian house in which the text was found (WVDOG XLVI, 4) was situated just west of the Anu-Adad temple, and this suggests that it may have originally been deposited nearby, in a wall on the cliffs at what was the north-west corner of the town until Tukulti-Ninurta added his new palace terrace. This spot can hardly have been left undefended before Puzur-Sin, but the defenses could have been formed by the back-walls of buildings rather than by a specific town-wall.

8. Ashur-nirari I is given by Ashur-rim-nisheshu (IAK, XIV, 1) as the
next king to have worked on the wall; the same text puts a Puzur-Ashur before Ashur-nirari, but here the reference must again be to Puzur-Ashur III. The latter's own texts (IAK, XI, 3; EAK, III i) mentions repairs to the town-wall by the muššalālu, and to the construction of the wall of the New Town, the southern suburb of Ashur beside the Tigris. The muššalālu operation may have been a continuation of work started by his father Ashur-nirari, who was certainly active on the west side of the Ashur temple (see below, I,D,9). Some details of Puzur-Ashur's New Town wall are given by Adad-nirari I (IAK, XX, 6, 9). Enlil-nasir I also is named by Shalmaneser III (WO I, 393) as a king who worked on the main town-wall. No remains of these three kings' brickwork can be recognized, though some probably survives on the northern side of the town. There is what may be an early fifteenth-century building, the Scherbenzimmer (WVDOG XXIII, 69, Taf. X,IXXXIV), at the foot of the cliffs below the old line of the town-wall north-west of the ziggurat; the date of its abandonment is indicated by some fine painted sherds, of the Nuzu/Billah/Atchana/Subartu ware associated with the Mitannians, which were found on the floor. The walls of the building were apparently water-proofed, and it had one door opening outwards to the north, so that it may have been some kind of storehouse. One would expect such a building inside rather than outside the town-wall, but it was demonstrably earlier than the fortifications actually excavated in front of it.

9. The wall of the New Town was refaced on the landward side by Ashur-bel-nisheshu (IAK, XIII, 1); this is confirmed by Adad-nirari I (IAK, XX, 9), who adds that Eriba-Adad I also worked on it. An Ashur-nadin-šahe,
however, is the only king mentioned by Tiglath-pileser I (AfO XVIII, 344) in connection with the New Town wall; this is probably Ashur-nadin-ahhe II, brother of Ashur-bel-nisheshu and uncle of Eriba-Adad. Ashur-uballit I (IAK, XVII, 3; eponym Enlil-mudammik) also worked on a construction, in the New Town, which had been built by Puzur-Ashur and may therefore have been the wall; Ebeling's suggestion, however, that it was a palace, may be supported by Ashur-uballit's reference, in an Amarna letter (Mercer 1939, 59), to a palace then under construction.

10. The main town-wall, in this period, was repaired by Ashur-rim-nisheshu (IAK, XIV, 1); his sikkatu inscription was found by the ziggurat, as if it had fallen from a wall on the traditional line along the top of the cliffs. Perhaps wall H (WVDOG XXIII, 97, Taf. V), by the Ashur temple, belongs to this king. The fortifications on this side of the town were greatly changed by Ashur-nadin-ahhe (II ?), who was responsible for the great terrace (tamlu rabu) facing north in front of the Old Palace which he also built (see below, I,M,7). The terrace is described in the Broken Obelisk (ARAB I, 123; see below, II,M); that it adjoined the town-wall is confirmed by Tukulti-Ninurta II (ARAB I, 133; Weidner, AfO VI, 78), though he ascribes it to Ashur-bel-kala (originally read Ashur-uballit). This can only be the Westmassif (WVDOG XXIII, 73), though the brickwork exposed by the excavations need not include any of Ashur-nadin-ahhe's. Ashur-nadin-ahhe might also have been responsible for the Risalitmauer (WVDOG XXIII, 81, Taf. X), which adjoined the Westmassif and ran eastwards at the foot of the cliffs, enclosing the Scherbenzimmer which was probably disused and filled in at about this time. The
Risalitmauer is ascribed by Andrae (WVDG XXIII, 73, 76) to Shalmaneser I, who worked on its drains, but it could have been founded before him; it was probably part of the šalu, or outer wall. It is uncertain whether Ashur-uballit I's work on the patti tuhdi channel (IAK XVIII, 1), whereby he filled in a well dug by Ashur-nadin-ahhe behind the terrace, involved changes in the fortifications; he probably did (IAK IV, d) repair the terrace itself. Enlil-nirari (IAK, XVIII, 1: eponym Enlil-nirari-Marduk) rebuilt another section of the šalu between the Sheep gate (see below, I,6) and this was probably at the north-west corner of the town.

11. Adad-nirari I worked extensively on the walls of Ashur, and his progress can be followed in dated or datable texts (IAK, V 1). He started (Sumer, XX, 50; IAK, XX, 5: eponym Ashur-eresh) by reconstructing the town-wall opposite the Ashur ziggurat, and working on the quay-wall along-side the river; at about the same time (IAK, XX, 7, 22; WVDG XXIII, 148) he repaired a drain which ran out through the quay-wall south of the Ashur temple. Later (IAK, XX, 4: eponyms Sha-Adad-ninu (?) and Andarisina) he gives a more detailed description of his quay-wall, which extended along the entire Tigris front from the Ea-sharri gate to the Tigris gate (see below, I,4). He went on (IAK, XX, 9: eponym Itti-ili-ashamshu) to rebuild the wall of the New Town on the land front, and afterwards (IAK, XX, 6: eponym Ana-Ashur-kala) the wall of the New Town on the river front, overlooking the quay-wall. He also (IAK, XX, 3: eponym Shulmanu-qarradu) returned to his starting-point, and repaired the Ashur temple maššalu though without a specific mention of the town-wall. We also have an Adad-nirari I brick from the terrace (tamlu), probably Ashur-nadin-ahhe's
as Adad-nirari also worked on the palace above it. Adad-nirari's work on the town-walls cannot be distinguished, but long stretches of his quay-wall were found in good condition beside and south of the Ashur temple (WVDOG XXIII, 149).

12. Weidner (IAK, 70, 80-83, 104, 153) discusses the quay-wall and associated buildings at some length, and shows that Adad-nirari's word for quay-wall, kisirtu, can refer to any kind of protective facing or reinforcement used in architecture. The texts which cause difficulty are IAK, XX, 7 and IAK, XX, 22. The first refers to a kisirtu, constructed by Ashur-uballit, which reached from the ekallati to the tallakati, and had been washed away at the end of the gardens of the inner town; Adad-nirari refaced it with brick, and provided three outlets for the water. Weidner associates the tallakati with the mutaliktu, and regards them as a processional way at the foot of the Ashur temple musilalu on the north side of the town; he regards the gardens as stretching along the north side of the town from the Ashur ziggurat to the north-west corner, and locates the ekallati, in this instance, on the site of Tukulti-Ninurta I's New Palace at the north-west corner. He then restores an Adad-nirari quay-wall, for which there is no archaeological evidence, along the north face of Ashur. At the same time he accepts Andrae's view, confirmed by bricks found in position, that the kisirtu of IAK, XX, 22, which was at the outlet of the drain pi narti ša ekallati, was situated just south of the Ashur temple, and that this drain had its head somewhere between the Old Palace and the Sin-Shamash temple; Weidner identifies the ekallati mentioned in the drain's name as part of the Old Palace. It seems simpler
to regard the ekallati of both texts as a single building, namely the ekallati built by Ashur-nirari I and restored by Shalmaneser I (IAK, XXI, 15: eponym Shalmaneser); this building would be on the south of the Old Palace, and might even have adjoined it. The tallakati of IAK, XX, 7, would then be the processional ways outside the south gate of the Ashur temple, through which the mutaliki passed, and the gardens of the inner town could be anywhere along the length of the drain between the Old Palace area and the river. Ashur-uballit's kisirtu, which Adad-nirari restored in brick without mention of the stone which is described in his other long kisirtu texts, need not belong to the quay-wall kisirtu at all; it is instead an important and vulnerable section of the pi narti ës ekallati drain.

13. Shalmaneser I repaired a drain in the Risalitmauer (WVDOG XXIII, 76). He also states (IAK, XXI, 13: eponym Mushabshi-UMNA-BI) that he changed and rebuilt the libur ësalhi gate near the Ashur gate (see below, I,0,4). This gate should belong to the outer wall, perhaps the Risalitmauer, north-west of the Ashur temple.

14. At the time of Tukulti-Ninurta I's accession, therefore, the main town-wall probably overlooked the cliffs on the north side of Ashur, followed the river on the east, ran just inside Shalmaneser III's inner wall (Binnenwall) on the south, and followed the Binnenwall on the south-west. Attached to it on the south was the wall of the New Town, which followed Shalmaneser III's outer wall (Aussenwall), and on the north, at the foot of the cliffs, was an outer wall or ësalhu, namely the Risalitmauer. The position at the north-west corner of the town is less clear, as
Tukulti-Ninurta I and Shalmaneser III both redeveloped the area. It is possible that the main wall still followed the approximate line of Shalmaneser III's Binnenwall, but there was also Enlil-nirari's Salhu, which ran from to the Sheep gate; perhaps this was on the outer edge of Tukulti-Ninurta's New Palace terrace. At the western extremity of the terrace, by the south corner of Shalmaneser III's Aussenhaken (WVDog XXIII, 119, Taf. XXVII), there is an early wall running along the south-west side of the palace terrace. In front it joins a structure, consisting of a wall pierced at ground-level by a series of arches, which ran for some distance along the north-west face of the terrace. Andrae interpreted this complex as part of an early outwork; it would have incorporated two side-walls of which the southern only survived, and a front Poternenmauer, with the arches forming a row of adjacent postern-gates. No gate-fittings were found, however, and it is difficult to accept such an exceptional and impractical arrangement. It seems preferable to regard the Poternenmauer as the base of an arched ramp, like the way up to the nineteenth century temple at Rimah (Iraq XXX, pl. XXXI). The gate approached by means of it might be the Sheep gate, or the original tabira (Metal-workers') gate which Tukulti-Ninurta I locates (AfObh. XII, 40) at the far side, from the Adad ziggurat, of his palace terrace; some other name might also be applicable (see below, I, C, 7). The term "tabira gate" could be used of the area in general.

Tukulti-Ninurta I made the outer, north-western edge of his New Palace terrace into part of the town-wall (WVDog XXIII, Taf. XXVII). He also claims (AfObh. XII, 31) to have reconstructed the decayed portions
of the town-wall in general, and to have excavated in front of it a defensive ditch. The ditch was traced, and stretches from the north end of the town-wall on the west to the Tigris on the south. It is crossed in two places, where the bedrock was left unexcavated: at the Westtor on the south-west, and at what was to be Shalmaneser III's tabira gate near the north-west corner. In both places, and elsewhere (WVDOG XXIII, 21, 30, 45, 126), there was some evidence for an earlier Aussenwall on the line of that built by Shalmaneser III; this might be the work of Tukulti-Ninurta I, to whom Shalmaneser (WO I, 387) primarily attributes the old town-wall on the landward side, but it is safer to regard the Binnenwall as the real defensive line on most of the west side. Perhaps there was an outer wall proper by the tabira gate, as bricks of Ashur-dan II, on the site of Shalmaneser's tabira (WVDOG XXIII, Taf. XXXI, right), seem to show that the gate was already in this precise position; but there are no recorded early remains on the lines of Shalmaneser's Aussenhaken wall, though the ditch ascribed to Tukulti-Ninurta I runs alongside it.

16. Tiglath-pileser I (AFO XVIII, 344: eponym Ninuaia) claims to have rebuilt the wall of the New Town from the Tigris gate to the junction with the main town-wall; he also (ARAB I, 93, para. 279; cf. ARAB I, 123) rebuilt the tabira gate. The same king, or Ashur-bel-kala, in the Broken Obelisk (ARAB I, 123; see below, II,7), says that he rebuilt the quay-wall by the Tigris gate as well as the entire town-wall, cleared the ditch from the tabira gate to the Tigris gate, and worked on the terraces on the north of the town (see below, I,7). Ashur-bel-kala himself is mentioned by Tukulti-Ninurta II (AFO VI, 78) as builder of the town-wall
by the great terrace, probably Ashur-nadin-ahhe's. Ashur-dan II (ARAB I, 108: eponym Arrutu) rebuilt Tiglath-pileser's tabira gate. Adad-nirari II (ARAB I, 118: eponym Sheim-Ashur) restored the quay-wall below the Ashur temple, and Tukulti-Ninurta II (ARAB I, 133-135: eponyms Ashur-lakinu, 890/889, and Na'id-ili, 885/884) may have worked on the town-wall in general as well as on the wall of the great terrace on the north. Ashurnasirpal II (WVDG XXIII, 85) built or restored the quay-wall north of the main ziggurat; some of his stonework was found in position: if this was a restoration, we might look in this area for the edge of an Tigris off-shoot canalized by Ashur-nadin-apli (AfObb. XII, 46), which may be the same as a canal the head of which, according to the Broken Obelisk (ARAB I, 123), was built by Ashur-dan I and repaired by Tiglath-pileser I or Ashur-bel-kala.

17. Shalmaneser III greatly elaborated the defenses, and the brickwork of the walls visible today, as shown by Andrae (WVDG XXIII, passim), is very largely his work. He reinforced the terrace on the north side, but on the west and south he demolished most of his predecessors' work. His outer wall (Kalhu: WO I, 387) surrounded the New Town on the south, and proceeded west and north along the edge of the ditch to the tabira gate, beyond which it curved gently north-east and then turned back at right-angles, to join the face of Tukulti-Ninurta's New Palace terrace, just south of the Tigris flood-plain. At this corner the outer wall enclosed an outwork, the Aussenhaken, the internal wall of which ran back along the face of Tukulti-Ninurta's terrace and turned to rejoin the outer wall just north of the tabira gate. Shalmaneser's inner wall, the Binnenwall,
skirted the inside edge of the New Palace terrace, and then followed the line of the old town-wall south-eastward, turning to meet the Tigris north of the New Town. Work on these fortifications lasted at least ten years, from 842 when the tabira gate was being built (WO I, 257) to 833 (WO I, 206). The crenellations were handsomely formed of glazed bricks (WVDGG XXIII, Taf. LXXVIII), and the tabira gate, the main entrance to the city, was set out partly as a war museum (WVDGG XXIII, 35; MAOG III, heft 1/2, 13).

Shalmaneser’s outer wall was strengthened and repaired in many places by the later Augustan period. The Address-Book (lines 139-140), of Sennacherib’s reign, gives to both the inner and the outer walls the name which Shalmaneser (ARAB I, 246) had applied to his outer wall alone; this suggests that the new outer wall was to become the main town-wall. This confirms the early seventh-century date assigned by Andrae (WVDGG XXIII, 57, 116) to private houses which were found to extend over the ruins of the Binnenwall and across the Aussenhaken. We should anyway expect Shalmaneser to have built his outer wall first, leaving the old town-wall in position behind it for emergencies; perhaps therefore his work on the Binnenwall and the interior of the Aussenhaken was interrupted by the rebellion of his son Ashur-danin-apli in 829. In this case Shalmaneser would himself have been responsible for the blocking of the gate leading through the outer wall on the north into the unfinished Aussenhaken.

Adad-nirari III (MDG XXVI, 62) worked on the kisiratu of the Ashur temple, presumably the quay-wall at its foot, but no other eighth-century king is definitely recorded as a builder of the town-wall; one
may have been responsible for a reinforcement just east of the palace in
mušlalu on the north side (WVDOG XXIII, Taf. X), which Andrae ascribes to
Sargon. In this same area we have the stone foundations of the mušlalu,
as extended by Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, with their inscriptions in
position (WVDOG XXIII, 86; OIP II, 151; AFObh. IX, 9). A final stren­
thening on the north face of the mušlalu might be the work of Ashurbanipal
(AFO XIII, 206: dated 655).

20. Shalmaneser's outer wall was strengthened and repaired in many
places, most probably by seventh century kings, but we do not know which.
A fragment of inscription suggested to Andrae that Sennacherib might be
responsible for the most impressive feature, a curved stone tower by the
west gate (WVDOG XXIII, 51, Blatt 68). The front of the outer wall, at
least by the Aussenhaken, was thickened by the addition of a lower parapet
in front, perhaps the seventh century šalhu, and there was yet another
Aussenhaken added, extending beyond the ditch on the north-west. Andrae
(WVDOG XXIII, 108-116) discusses the remains in this corner in detail.

C. The Names of the Town-Gates

1. Some of the town-gates have been mentioned above; they are corre­
related here with the names which appear in texts. The problems that arise
have been discussed in detail by Unger (RLA I, 175) and generally by Andrae
(1938, 64); Landsberger (Bell. XIV, 235) contributes further arguments.

2. There are five texts of particular significance:
The Address-Book (lines 120-135) lists thirteen gates known in Senna­
cherib's reign; the gates are numbered below in their Address-Book order.
Shalmaneser III's throne inscription (ARAB I, 245) lists gates 1-8 in the same order; the text was left unfinished, apparently because the divine name of 4, the Ashur gate, had been omitted, and the mistake was never rectified. It is closely

KAV 254 (MACG VII, heft 1/2, p. 48), a sheep-offering text from the reign of Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur, lists in order gates 4, 6, abul asate, 8, 9, and 1.

Assur 6096 bq (AfO X, 43), which is of the same type and date as KAV 254, lists in order gates 1, 4, 6, 8, and 9 (Landsberger omits 6).

KAR 214 (Frankena 1953, 25), a text written in the late seventh century but having Middle Assyrian ancestry, lists in order gates 4, 6, abul Ištar, 12, 11, and 13 (Landsberger puts 11 before 12). We have therefore to deal with texts dating from both before and after Shalmaneser III's work on the wall, and there will be some confusion at the north-west corner of the town. Nonetheless the order in which the gates are listed is strikingly regular in the different texts, and Landsberger's contention that they appear in geographical order is clearly sensible. Unger, with equal reason, considered that the sites of the gates should be reflected in their names. A reconciliation of these two viewpoints is attempted below; it relies on the assumption that the gates in the sheep-offering texts were the principal town-gates of Middle Assyrian Ashur, as reason again might suggest.

Of the gates included in the sheep-offering texts: 1, the tabira (formerly read gurgurri) gate, is securely located at the north end of the west wall, beside Tukulti-Ninurta I's New Palace (AfObh.
XII, 10). Shalmaneser used the name for his gate in the outer wall, a little to the south-west. Lasser and Landausberger identify the Lasser
4. The Ashur gate, should be an entrance through the north wall, just west of the Ashur temple, as Unger and others suggest; it is closely linked with the libur šalhi gate named only by Shalmaneser I (IAK, XXI, 13). It may have led to the Ashur temple mušlalu, which should be distinguished from the palace mušlalu north of the ziggurat. An early version of this gate may be the opening in the Old Assyrian town-wall just east of the ziggurat (WVDG XXIII, Taf. X).

6, the Shamash gate, should then be round to the east, on the Tigris, as might be expected from its name. Unger identifies it with the gate, inside the town, between the Anu-Adad temple and the Old Palace, but this view is rightly rejected by Weidner (AfO X, 23).

The abul asate, named in KAV 254, must surely be identical, as Unger suggests, with the Tigris gate (IAK, XX, 4; AfO XVIII, 344) located at the junction of the New Town wall with the river. It is characterized especially by its asate, "towers", which are not mentioned in connection with any other gate. This position fits well between gates 6 and 8, and the abul asate or Tigris gate could reappear in the Address-Book and in Shalmaneser's throne text as gate 7, abul magarat asu or Unger's abul magarat nari, which Lukenbill (ARAB I, 245) translated as "gate of the river landing (?)".

8, the tisarri gate, has been generally recognized as the Südtor, leading through the inner town-wall into the New Town.

9, the Sheruya gate, should then be the Westtor, on the south-west side
of the town; this completes the circuit. Sheruya herself (Frankena 1953, 114) was a form of Ishtar, and Landsberger identifies the Ishtar gate of KAR 214 with the Sheruya gate. Unger tentatively located the Sheruya gate near the Ashur temple, because Sheruya was a bride of Ashur (IAK XXI, 16), but this is not necessary.

5. Within this scheme gates 2, 3, and 5 fit without difficulty:

2, the mušlalu gate where the king entered, is undoubtedly represented by the remains of the palace mušlalu north of the ziggurat; the ramp or staircase will have had to ascend westwards to the Old Palace.

3, the gate of the ziggurrats, should be associated, as Unger states, with the twin ziggurrats of the Anu-Adad temple; it would thus be located between gates 1 and 2. The lie of the land, however, demands a steep approach, and the gate of the ziggurrats could be at the head of the ramp which led first to the palace. An alternative would be to associate this gate with the main Ashur ziggurat itself.

5, abul KAK-ME, must be placed on the river, towards the north end of the town. It might be identical with the Ea-sharri Gate (see above, I,B,11), and be represented by one of the flights of steps leading from the Ashur temple to the quay-wall (WDOG LXVII, Taf. V).

6. This leaves gates 10-13, or 12, 11, 13 in KAR 214.

10, the abul šade or Mountain gate, is connected by Unger with the wind from the mountains, and with the Ea-sharri gate at the north-east corner of the town.

11, abul seni or Sheep gate, is regarded by Ebeling (IAK, XVIII, 1) as an old name for the tabira gate, because part of an Enlil-nirari sikkatu,
mentioning repairs to the outer wall (ṣalhu) from ...... to the abul seni, was found in front of Shalmaneser III's tabira gate. Unger accepts this, but Landsberger, restoring abul tabira in the gap, places the abul seni beyond the Westtor (his abul niše or People's gate, no. 12) at the south end of the town. We could, however, just as well restore abul niše in the gap, as Erishum I (Bell. XIV, 225) mentions expropriating land between abul seni and abul niše. Unger suggests that the Sheep gate gained its name because sheep were taken out, through the tabira gate, to be grazed in the Tigris flood-plain, whereas the People's gate, which he also identifies with the Westtor, was the main road out of Ashur; this argument must be wrong, as sheep would have been grazed more frequently in the steppe west of the town rather than in the cultivable land to its north, while the tabira gate clearly carried the main road in Shalmaneser III's day and probably always had done so.

12, the abul niše or abul Illat, the People's gate, is accepted as the Westtor by Andrae, as well as Unger and Landsberger; we have seen that there is no good evidence to support this, and that its identification with the tabira gate would indeed suit the name better.

13, abul taḫimišunu or gate of Destiny, is tentatively connected by Unger with the bit akītu, and identified with the north entrance to Shalmaneser III's Außenhaken at the north-west corner of the town, north of the tabira gate.

7. Even if the order of the gates in KAR 214 is wrong, which we should not assume, gates 10-13 cannot be accommodated in a single logical circuit of the town-wall. The total identification of any of them, however, with
the tabira or any other of gates 1-9, is hardly compatible with the appearance of all thirteen, listed individually with their conventional and divine names, in the Address-Book. There are possible explanations, involving Shalmaneser III's Binnenwall and Aussenhaken neither of which may have been finished, but the more precise, the less plausible. An alternative would be to regard these four names, two of which are Old Assyrian or earlier, as being applied in the neo-Assyrian period to areas of the town, or architectural features, which were not gates in the outer wall. Nos. 11 and 12, which certainly had been town-gates in the past, were probably located in the north-west corner of the town, and one of them might be the old version of the tabira. No. 13 might be associated, because of its name, with the gateway, between the Anu-Adad temple and the Old Palace, which Andrae (1938, 215, Abb. 22) regarded as a Gerichtstor. No. 10 might be where Unger places it, or in some other locality.

8. Four other gates deserve mention: bab a-u-si-im and bab wertim are given by Ilushuma (ZA XLIII, 115, 118) as incorporating drains; perhaps they acquired other names later. abul Ilula is named by Puzur-Sin, but was not accepted as a town-gate by Landsberger when publishing the text (JOS VIII, 36); one may wonder if it is not identical with no. 12, one name for which was abul illat. abul SAR-PA (Address-Book, line 52) is probably the south gate of the Ashur temple.

D. The Ashur Temple

1. The earliest architectural remains found on the site, in the north-
east corner of the town, were fragmentary, and too unimposing to suggest a temple \(\text{[WVDOG LXVII, 9]}\). Nonetheless a hoard of bronze objects \(\text{[WVDOG LXVII, Taf. XXVI, XXVII]}\), buried in a jar in a burnt layer, probably do derive from one. Haller tentatively dates the hoard to the end of the Early Dynastic period, but it might be somewhat later. It was placed below the shrine of Shamshi-Adad I's temple, perhaps also below the shrines of the temples before Shamshi-Adad; though the published section does not show a pit \(\text{[WVDOG LXVII, Taf. VI]}\), the jar might have been inserted from above, for security's sake or as a foundation deposit.

2. The first remains identified as belonging to a temple \(\text{[WVDOG LXVII, 12]}\) were built in at least two phases; the walls were solid but poorly preserved. They already show the two basic alignments of the later temples: north-west to south-east and north-east to south-west in the main temple block, and north-south and west-east in the southern outer court. Haller suggests that the shrine at this time lay beneath the later inner court, but the evidence is inconclusive. These remains probably cover a substantial length of time, centring on the Ur III period \(\text{(Ishtar temple level E)}\) to which they are roughly assigned by the excavators. The stratigraphic evidence is unhelpful, though four infant burials \(\text{[WVDOG LXV, 52, nos. 658, 659, 662, and 663]}\), one of which cut a wall of the earlier phase, were discovered; the pottery containers look older than 2000 B.C., but this cannot be proved, nor does their presence necessarily indicate that the temple was out of use when the graves were dug. Shalmaneser I, however, names Ushpia \(\text{(IAK, XXI, 1)}\) as the earliest recorded builder of the temple, and some of these walls may be his. An object
which may have stood in this third-millennium temple, besides the hoard mentioned above, is a crouching lion (WVDG LXVII, 18, Taf. XXV b) from the foundations of Erishum I's later building.

3. Another king who may have worked on these walls is Shalimahum who describes, in a text (TAK, III, 1) found in the later temple foundations, how he built or repaired, on behalf of the god Ashur, a bit bu-?-mi(?); the "palace of king Dagan" (ekal šarrim(?)-Dagan); its shrine (kumšu) and its surroundings (isarišu); and the bit huburi, a building holding beer-jars, and its storerooms (abussišu). These buildings sound very like those in the later Ashur temple, and Landsberger (Bell. XIV, 237) goes so far as to suggest that "palace of king Dagan" was an original name for the whole of the temple complex rather than a part of it.

4. Shalimahum may equally well have built some of the walls normally assigned to Erishum I: in particular the bit huburi which Erishum refurbished but does not claim to have rebuilt (Bell. XIV, 225, 239). Now Schwenzer (AfO IX, 41), following Andrae, established that Shalmaneser I's bit hiburni, which seems to be the same as the bit huburi (Weidner, TAK, 136; Landsberger, Bell. XIV, 239), was situated at the north-west corner of the outer court, on the west side. The chief peculiarity of Shalmaneser's bit hiburni, like that of Shamshi-Adad I before him, (WVDG LXVII, 35, 50), was an elaborate basin for liquid, regarded by Schwenzer as used in the process of brewing. The Old Assyrian outer court was smaller, but one would expect the bit huburi in the equivalent position, and there are indeed two pre-Shamshi-Adad rooms (WVDG LXVII, 18) at this point. One of them was used for the storage of liquid in jars, and could
well belong to Shalimahum’s bit huburi or its attached storerooms.

5. Erishum I then rebuilt the main temple block, and perhaps some of the outer court. A few remains of his work, with some stamped bricks in position, have been excavated (WVDOG LXVII, 14), and texts (mainly Bell. XIV, 224) describe it. They mention, apart from the mašlalu (see above, I,B,5), the kaššum, wadmanum, the whole periphery (gimerti isarim), and various fittings. Landsberger takes kaššum as the courtyard and wadmanum as the shrine, but it is doubtful if any such precision was intended. On one of its long sides this temple could well be the work of a

6. Shamshi-Adad I cleared the site and constructed the temple on a plan which, with additions and some changes, survived to the end of the Assyrian empire. His foundation inscriptions (mainly IAK, VIII, 1), largely found in the ruins, refer to the building as the Enlil temple (see below, I,E), but he is named as builder of the Ashur temple also; the two are one and the same. The text, which must date from the middle or end of his reign, names the parakkam and the wadmanam, together with various fittings. A fuller description of the temple before it was destroyed by fire in the thirteenth century is given by Shalmaneser I (IAK, XXI, 1): bitu eširtašu suški saši parakke ... minna makkur bit Aššur, everything belonging to the temple of Ashur. The specific connotations of these room-names, all of which can bear the translation "shrine", escape us. Another text (IAK, VIII, 4; JCS VIII, 36; EAK, II k), according to which Shamshi-Adad reconstructed Iktumun’s Ereshkigal temple, is an unreliable neo-Assyrian copy. The building seems to be the later Allatum temple, in the Ashur temple complex; the Address-Book (line 50) lists it among the last of the Ashur
temple shrines, and it may have been in the southern half of the outer court. The plan of Shamshi-Adad's temple (WVDOG LXVII, 17), which retained the traditional alignments, is largely self-explanatory. The main building was a rectangular block, with sides about 110 by 55 m. long, having a small forecourt at the south-west end, a large central court, and a shrine suite of rooms at the north-east. The only asymmetrical room is the shrine itself, a long room entered, via an ante-chamber, through a door in one of its long sides; this asymmetry could well be the work of a later Assyrian, restoring the shrine to a traditional plan. The block was entered through gates on every side except the north-eastern. To the south was a courtyard up to 172 m. long, reflecting in its irregularities the line of the older walls; there were gates in its southern and presumably its western corners. The superstructure was almost entirely destroyed, but we should note the presence of half-columned and niched mudbrick decoration on the south and east sides of the outer court and on the main south-west facade: the decoration in more important positions must have been correspondingly elaborate. The great stone cult-relief of Ashur or Enlil (WVDOG LIII), which was dumped in the old temple well when Ashur was sacked in 614, may have been made for this building; it is usually dated to the mid second millennium, though Unger (Bell. XXIX, 452) argues for the Agade period; it would appear to us to lie between the two. It should probably be associated with the ban dayane, men- tioned by the temple archive. Since the archive was west of the

8. Five kings are known to have worked on the structure between Shamshi-Adad I and Shalmaneser I.
9. Bricks of Ashur-nirari I (IAK, X, 2) mention the kisal abari, which is known, from Adad-nirari I, to be the outer court on the south. One of these bricks was found in the door-socket of the south-eastern door to the main block, so that Ashur-nirari may have been responsible for repairs here, in the court itself, and on the ramp linking the two, where alterations were observed by the excavators (WVDG LXVII, 21, 27). The same king built the temple of Belum-ibria (previously read Enlil-shipria); these bricks (IAK, X, 1) were found just west and north of Shalmaneser I's new court, which was west of the main block and north of the bit hiburni, an area in which, according to Haller (WVDG LXVII, 45), any older remains would have been entirely destroyed by Shalmaneser's builders. Belum-ibria (Frankena 1953, 82) seems to be closely related or identical with Bel-labiru or Bel-sharri, whose statue is placed by the Address-Book (line 23) in the bit hurše, equated by Landsberger (Bell, XIV, 239) with the bit hiburni. The bit hiburni area itself (WVDG LXVII, 36) was altered between the reigns of Shamshi-Adad I and Shalmaneser I, and it is not unlikely that Ashur-nirari's Belum-ibria shrine was nearby.

10. Eriba-Adad I (IAK, XVI, 1, 2) left his inscriptions in the temple, but we do not know the extent of his work. Ashur-uballit I, according to Shalmaneser I (IAK, XXI, 5), repaired the bit dayyane, the shrine of the gods of judgement; the text was found (WVDG LXVII, 67) in the south-eastern gate-chamber of the main block, but in a neo-Assyrian context. The bit dayyane should probably be associated with the bab dayyane, mentioned by Adad-nirari I (IAK, XX, 3), together with the bab niš il mati, as lying opposite the temple mušlalu. Since the mušlalu was west of the
temple, these two gates might be the north-western and south-western entrances to the main block; there could, however, have been a further entrance on the west, connected with the Belum-ibria shrine and the pre-Shalmaneser south-west court.

11. Adad-nirari I (IAK, XX, 27; WVDOG LXVII, 37, 40, 47) repaired the outer court (kisal abari), the processionial way running through it (mutaliktu), and the great drain underneath; he probably continued his work on the mutaliktu up the ramp at the south-eastern door of the main block and into the inner court where his bricks have also been found. He also repaired the wall (durum) and drainage-system of the temple beside the northern (saru elu) garden (IAK, XX, 14, 23). Weidner (IAK, 101) locates this garden between the main ziggurrat and the north-west corner of the town, relying on an improbable separation of the two IAK texts; Schwenger (AFO VIII, 35) places it between the Ashur temple and the ziggurrat. It would seem more natural, since the term durum is normally associated with a town-wall, to look for the garden in the northernmost part of the town, in the north-eastern corner overlooking the Tigris, behind the Ashur temple shrine.

12. Shamshi-Adad's temple was finally destroyed by fire, and entirely reconstructed by Shalmaneser I. The work lasted several years, and obviously proceeded in different places at the same time; but the eponyms named in the texts, the relative dates of which have been established on independent grounds (EAK, VI, 1), give a general impression of how it went. Shalmaneser's earliest versions (IAK, XXI, 1: eponyms Mushallim-Ashur and Ashur-nadin-shumati) refer to the main temple block or the temple in
general. More particularly (IAK, XXI, 3, 5: eponym Ashur-nadin-shumati) he worked on the Nunnammir court, its gates, and the bit dayyane; he con-
tinued (IAK, XXI, 2, 16: eponym Ashur-damik) with work on the shrines of Sherua and Dagan in the inner court (terbasu), in the Nunnammir court, and in the outer court (kisallu); finally (IAK, XXI, 4: eponym Ashur-
shumadi) he completed the Kalkal gate and the bit hiburni.

13. Excavations (WDOG LXVII, 37) have shown that Shalmaneser's work was as extensive as he claimed. The building was too badly damaged to give more than its basic plan, but it is clear that Shalmaneser followed Shamshi-Adad closely in the main temple block. To the south-west there was an additional court, which he only claims to have enlarged, bringing the length of the north external front up to 140 m.; this court had doors leading north-west and south-east, the latter into an outer court which had been enlarged by moving its west side backwards. Schwenzer (AfO VIII, 117; IX, 41), correlating the excavated remains with the texts, has ably demonstrated that the Nunnammir court (kisallu) is the new or enlarged court south-west of the main temple block, with the Enpi gate and the Kalkal gate as its north-western and south-eastern entrances, and that the bit hiburni is the building with an elaborate basin at the north end of the west side of the outer court. One remaining problem is the mean-
ing of namaru, one of which was placed at each of the Nunnammir court gates. Schott (ZA XL, 1) interprets the word as "gate-tower"; this has been generally accepted (Hwb), though Weidner prefers the translation "glaze" or "wall with glazed decoration" (AfO III, 2), but it should at least be mentioned that a more general meaning, "facade", with particular
reference to temple facades decorated with brickwork patterns, would seem equally appropriate to the contexts in which the word is found. Among objects which may have been set up in Shalmaneser's temple, we should note a fragment of carved relief and a stela (WVDOG LXVII, 66, Taf. LVIII c, LIX a), both from the south-east gate of the main block.

14. Shalmaneser's temple, like Shamshi-Adad's, was naturally repaired by many subsequent kings some of whom have left records of their work. Tukulti-Ninurta I (AfObh. XII, 36; WVDOG LXVII, 72) was responsible for an unfinished text on a block of stone found in the north-east corner of the outer court; it seems to deal with alterations which were presumably begun. The same king erected an altar to Nusku outside the shrine (see below, I,3,4). A text of Ashur-resh-ishi I, if Borger's ascription is correct (EAK, VIII m; AfO IV, 12), should also refer to work on the temple, and Tiglath-pileser I worked on the Bel-labiru shrine (ARAB I, 86; eponym Ina-ilia-allak). Eriba-Adad II (ARAB I, 106) has left a fragmentary text mentioning the temple's name, Eharsagkurkurra, apparently in connection with repairs to the structure. Shalmaneser II (Ebeling 1954, 20; eponym Nathaia) was closely concerned with its upkeep. Tukulti-Ninurta II (AfO VIII, 117; IX, 47; WVDOG LXVII, 64) repaired the bit namerru at the Enpi gate, where Tiglath-pileser's library was stored; Ashurnasirpal II may have lined some walls with orthostats, fragments of which were found re-used in the area (WVDOG LXVII, 53, 55); and Shalmaneser III (WO I, 395; WVDOG LXVII, 54, 57) repaired at least the processional way (mutaliktu), the platform on the north side of the outer court, and the pavement of the smaller central court. Later Tiglath-pileser III...
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(Arab I, 294; WVDog LXVII, 63, Taf. LVII a) added a platform (kigallu), faced with glazed bricks, to the south-west facade of the main block facing the Ninnaamir court; he may have done the same to the facade of the main block facing the outer court (WVDog LXVII, 57; EAK, IX h), though his inscribed bricks from this area were originally designed for the kigallu of the gate of the Adad temple. Throughout this time the basic plan of the temple seems to have remained unchanged, though a number of small rooms (WVDog LXVII, 67) were allowed to encroach on the south-west corner of the outer court.

15. Sargon II (WVDog LXVII, 62, 64; Arab II, 113) again repaved the outer court and repaired the processional way through it. His main text, however, published by Weidner (AFO III, 1: dated 705), deals with refacing the facades (namaru) and friezes around the whole temple, and setting up glazed sikkate. Many bricks and sikkate from this frieze were excavated (WDOG XXVI, 22), and at least one panel of glazed bricks (Andrae 1925, pl. VI) from the platform in front of the south-east facade of the main temple block has been convincingly attributed by Weidner (AFO III, 4) to this king; Weidner's opinion, based on the captions, is fully confirmed by the iconography. It therefore seems probable that many of the glazed bricks found in the temple date from Sargon's reign: there were panels, partly preserved, along much of the platform on the south-east facade of the main block, on the ramp leading though the platform to the south-east gate, and on the gate-tower itself (WVDog LXVII, 55-62). Fallen bricks were also found in and near the large central court, where they could have adorned the facade of the ante-chamber to the shrine (WVDog LXVII, 40, 54),
and in the Nunnamir court, though there they may derive from Tiglath-
pileser III's kigallu (WVDG LXVII, 63). A feature noted by Weidner is
that some of the panels, which may have incorporated pre-Sargon bricks,
had been constructed wrongly; he suggests that this may have happened
when the work was interrupted by the news of Sargon's death and the acces-
sion of Sennacherib, a king who preferred not to name his father in royal
inscriptions and who may well have objected to spending money on this
group of pictures.

16. Sennacherib initiated the last drastic reconstruction of the Ashur
temple (WVDG LXVII, 69). He raised the level of the north end of the
outer court, concealing Sargon's glazed panels, and built on to its north-
eastern corner a massive square of buildings surrounding a new court
aligned with the main temple block. Remains of the decoration included
glazed bricks on either side of the gate joining the new court to the
outer court, and a monolithic basalt basin beside a well in the new court.
A fragment of bronze, bearing part of Sennacherib's Ashur temple inscrip-
tion (Sumer XVIII, 48, fig. 1; XIX, 111), probably derives from one of
the new doors. It is further possible that some pieces of a colossus
with bull's feet (WVDG LXVII, 65), found by the south-east door of the
main block, date from Sennacherib's reign; they might, however, be
earlier. Elsewhere in the temple seventh-century work is hard to distin-
guish with any certainty. This poverty of the archaeological record con-
trasts greatly with the wealth of texts, which are unusually detailed.
They date from the reigns of Sennacherib (OIP II, 144-151), Esarhaddon
(AfObh. IX, 1: dated 679; AfObh. IX, 83, 87: dated 672 or later), and
Ashurbanipal (Bauer 1933, 13: in the introduction to a text dated 647 or 646, eponym Nabu-nadin-ahi), and refer to what may have been one long operation. Further information, for Sennacherib's reign, is found in the Address-Book (lines 1-53, 179-183).

17. Sennacherib's new court (kisal sidir manzaz Igigi) was the new inner court of the temple, through which the shrine of Ashur was approached. What Sennacherib did was cut a new door in the south end-wall of the shrine, and another through the outer wall beside the new court. He thus transformed the shrine into what had become the usual Assyrian type, entered through a central door opposite the altar rather than through a side-door in one of the long walls. The redecoration of the shrine itself (papahu) is claimed by Esarhaddon; he added statues of lahmu- and kuribu- genies and two binut-apsi genies of precious metal to the thirteen statues already in the shrine, overlaid its walls and doors with gold, and carved abubu-genies on the jambs of the new south door (bab ṣarruti). Statues of himself and Ashurbanipal were placed in the parak ūmāti where Ashur himself dwelt, probably the holy of holies at the north end of the shrine; this was adorned with išmaru, a precious metal (QAD: "silver") clearly superior to the previous zahalu. The ante-chamber (bit ṣuhuri) in front of the shrine to the south seems to have had columns in its south doorway onto the new court (bab harran șut Enlil), and to be the bit hilani of the Address-Book, with statues of Minurta and Gaga on its right-hand side, and of Nusku on its left; a less likely alternative is that the bit hilani is a columned portico outside the door in the court. There were two column-bases, a fish-man and a fish-goat, both of bronze; these
were erected by Sennacherib. They supported, according to Sennacherib, four bronze statues of GUD, son of Shamash, probably caryatid bull-men (Frankfort 1939, 201); these seem to be identical with Esarhaddon's two bronze "bison" (kusariqgi), each of which looked both forwards and backwards, and must therefore have been two-headed; Landsberger (1934, 93) in fact suggests that the kusariqgu may sometimes be the bull-man. The door-jamb on each side were decorated by Sennacherib with UR-EE genies and scorpion-men. The door facing the new court on its south-west side (bab hisib mati) was also columned, as Ashurbanipal overlaid the columns with silver; it led into the old outer court, through a door (bab kamsu Igigi) which was decorated by Esarhaddon with twin abubu-genies. We know of no decoration on the other doors of the court, but their names are given: bab parak ūmate on the north-east, leading to the bab sumbi on the external facade, and the bab nirib Igigi on the south-east, leading to the bab burumu outside. We also have the name of one building in Sennacherib's new court: the bit tikate; this cannot be located.

18. A text (Ebeling 1954, 25), ascribed to Sennacherib's reign, gives what seems to be a principal door of the bit šahuri as the bab Kunuškadri; in the Address-Book (line 11), written after the alterations, Kunushkadru is one of the gods inside the shrine itself. Since there is no bab Kunuškadri mentioned in connection with the alterations, it would appear that the text precedes them, and that the bab Kunuškadri belonged to the previous bit šahuri, the antechamber alongside the shrine between it and the old central court. The same text also names the abul bit ili, which would normally be regarded as an outer gate, and which may have linked the
bit Šahuri with the court; if so, the bab Kunuškadi could have led from the bit Šahuri into the shrine, though it seems that in the Middle Assyrian period (ÄIVÄG XLI heft 3, pp. 8, 29) this particular door was called the bab Azu'i.

19. Sennacherib (OTP II, 147) also paved the kisal Esharra, perhaps the great outer court, partly with limestone, and rebuilt the shrine of Hani, which the Address-Book (lines 26-29) identifies as the right-hand shrine in a tarbasu or inner court which also contained a well; this could be either the old or the new inner court. Later Esarhaddon (ÄtÖbh. IX, 5; dated 679) worked on the shrines of Kuba, Dibar, and Ea in the Ashur temple, but none of these can be located on the ground with any certainty. The same applies to the remaining shrines, courts, and doors listed in other texts, especially the Address-Book and VAT. 10426 (Frankena 1953, 25, 31-36), except where these have been discussed above. Frankena's identification of his text's kisal namri with one of the central courts, and of his bit irbitti with four shrines named separately and not all consecutively in the Address-Book (bit Ninil, bit hurše, bit Ea-Šarri, and bit Allatum) is too speculative. The excavators did, however, succeed in identifying three rooms in the temple as minor shrines (ÄIVÄG LXVII, 55, 68): the pair on either side of the smaller central court, and the room beside the south gate of the outer court. The last two entries in the section of the Address-Book dealing with the Ashur temple (lines 51, 52) name the abul SAR-PA and the bit Siras; these could well be the south outer gate and its adjoining shrine.
E. The "Enlil" Temple

1. Andrae (WVDOG LXVII, 5) locates this elusive building between the Ashur temple and the Ashur-Enlil zigurrat. Landsberger (JCS VIII, 36) identifies Shamshi-Adad's Enlil temple with the Ashur temple itself, and Borger (EAK, II g), following Weidner and Schwenger, identifies it with some part of the Ashur temple. Unger (Bell, XXIX, 463) suggests that the worship of Ashur replaced that of Enlil at the end of the Agade period. What follows is a synthesis of most of these views.

2. The first god worshipped on the site of the Ashur temple was a local god whose name, to the normal native inhabitant, was probably always Ashur. This god shared many attributes with Enlil, and men familiar with southern culture may have equated the two. The Agade and Ur III emperors are most likely to have done so, whereas Erishum I did not.

3. Shamshi-Adad I, a foreigner, equated the two gods, preferring the name of Enlil in his more pretentious inscriptions. Since copies of his text (IAK, VIII, 1) relating the construction of Eaahkurkurra, the Enlil temple, were found throughout the later Ehursagkurkurra, the Ashur temple, the two buildings cannot be distinguished.

4. The Ashur-Enlil equation was subsequently neglected when Assyria was cut off from Babylonia, but not forgotten. It was explicitly revived by Shalmaneser I (IAK, XXI, 12; EAK, II, g) because he had found, while rebuilding the temple, one of Shamshi-Adad's texts; he imitated this, and refers, on this one occasion, to the Enlil rather than the Ashur temple. In this copy he omits the name of Ushpia, given elsewhere as founder of
of the Ashur temple, for the simple reason that Shamshi-Adad had omitted him. Shalmaneser also gave names associated with Enlil to the area which he redesigned at the south-western end of the main temple block, but this need not mean there was a separate shrine of Enlil nearby. The ambiguous relationship between the two gods is further emphasized in an altar of Tukulti-Ninurta I (AFOBh. XII, 36), probably set up originally in the Ashur temple; it was dedicated to Nusku, who lived in front of the shrine ante-chamber according to the Address-Book (line 16), and states that Nusku stood in front of both Ashur and (u) Enlil.

5. In the neo-Assyrian period the two gods, though very close together, were usually distinguished, and Enlil, in his own right, was the principal god of the bit hurme and/or bit rimki in the Ashur temple (Address-Book, lines 22, 147). Parallel versions of the Address-Book, however, (line 176), name both as the god to whom the main ziggurat belonged, and one can well imagine Babylophilic scribes arguing that the two were identical.

F. The Main Ziggurat

1. Adad-nirari I (Sumer XX, 50) refers to the great new ziggurat of the god Ashur built by Arik-den-ili; this implies the existence of an old ziggurat, which might be a previous Ashur ziggurat or that in the Adad temple, known to have existed by this time. The earliest excavated foundations of the main ziggurat at Ashur consisted of mudbricks measuring 35 by 10 cm., and there was a foundation deposit of shells, frit, and glass (WVDOG LIlll, Taf. XXVII a) at the southern corner. Andrae (WVDOG
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LXVII, 2) suggests that these foundations, because of the brick-size, should be ascribed to Shamshi-Adad I, but the presence of glass, which has not yet been recorded in the eighteenth century B.C., would be characteristic of the late fourteenth. It seems therefore more satisfactory to associate these remains with Arik-den-ili, leaving open the question of whether an earlier version of the ziggurat existed beforehand.

2. The ziggurat was entirely rebuilt, on a slightly different alignment, with mudbricks measuring 37.5 by 12 cm., by one of the Shalmanesers, whose foundation deposit, consisting of shells and metal discs, was found at the same southern corner; the discs are inscribed, but do not give the king's father's name. Andrae (WVDOG LXVII, 3), again relying on the brick-size, assumes that the king responsible is Shalmaneser III. Borger, however, on epigraphic grounds, attributed the text first to Shalmaneser I (EAK, VI c, x), and then to Shalmaneser II (HKL I, 172). If we are right in regarding the earlier remains as Arik-den-ili's, Borger's second suggestion should be preferred, as it seems unlikely that Shalmaneser I would have had to reconstruct his grandfather's ziggurat virtually from the foundations upward.

3. The ziggurat in both periods was just over 60 m. square; in the second period at least, it had niched decorations on its side (WVDOG LXVII, 2). No approach to its upper terrace or terraces was found; presumably there was one, and Andrae is probably right in locating it on one of the northern sides of the ziggurat, opposite the Ashur temple and the town-wall. Andrae favoured access via a bridge from the "Priest-King Palace" on the north-east, an arrangement similar to that which he
reconstructed at Kar Tukulti-Ninurta (see below, V,A,3). It would be somewhat simpler to visualize a ramp or series of ramps built into the side of the ziggurat, starting perhaps at the north corner or at both the north and east corners at once. Another possibility, enormously impressive if it was technically feasible, could be a long staircase extending from the centre of the north-west side down into the muṣṭalu fortifications, with secondary approaches from the level of the town.

G. The Sin-Shamash Temple

1. This building stood opposite the Anu-Adad temple, to the south-east across an empty square, occupying the site of a third-millennium house. Little more than the foundations survived of the original building (WVDOG LXVII, 82). It was basically an oblong some 60 m. long, with one of its long sides stepping outwards towards the middle to form a facade; the maximum width is some 32 m. Its plan was roughly symmetrical, with a central door leading through the facade into a courtyard on either side of which was a shrine; each shrine consisted of a long room entered through an ante-chamber at one end. The foundations consisted of clean yellow mudbricks 35 cm. square, five courses being 44 cm. high; fragmentary pavements incorporated baked bricks measuring 42 by 7, and 35 by 8 cm. Similar building materials were employed by Shamshi-Adad I in the Ashur temple, and the neatness of the plan recalls this king's work. Haller therefore is probably right in ascribing the Sin-Shamash temple to this same king, though the earliest text referring to it is on a broken brick
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of Ashur-nirari I (IAK, X, 3).

2. An inscription of Arik-den-ili (IAK, XIX, 1; eponym Berutu) states that the shrine (parakku) of Shamash the guardian deity (ilu nasiru) was encumbered with private houses and was no longer used as a place of judgement; he demolished the houses and restored the temple. This inscription was found in the Ashur temple; the provenance of a shorter version (IAK, XIX, 2) is unknown. Because of this, and because there is no mention of Sin, Haller doubts whether these texts refer to the Sin-Shamash temple at all; perhaps there was at one time a shrine of Shamash, in his capacity as guardian deity, near the Shamash gate on the east. In any event any traces of Arik-den-ili's work were obliterated by Tukulti-Ninurta I (ArObh, XII, 23: eponym Ashur-bel-ilani), who rebuilt the Sin-Shamash temple thoroughly. Haller identifies his work with some stone foundations, which follow so far as can be seen the lines of the previous building.

3. Ashurnasirpal II, in a text written after his Mediterranean expedition (ARAB I, 196), records that he demolished the old Sin-Shamash temple and rebuilt it; sikkatu fragments, ascribed to this king (WDOG LXVII, 83), were found in the courtyard. Only a few traces of the building were extant, but its general plan, with twin shrines on either side of the main entrance but entered through the courtyard within, has been ingeniously and convincingly restored. Part was later repaired with Sargon II bricks, perhaps as Haller suggests by Sennacherib who had large supplies of them available.
H. The Anu-Adad Temple

1. The first recorded builder of this, when it was simply an Adad temple, is Erišum I (IAK, V, 10); Iku(nun) (IAK, VI, 1) completed it.

The temple of both Anu and Adad was ascribed, by a king who may be Shamši-Adad III (AFO XV, 94; JCS VIII, 41; EAK, III a), to Shamši-Adad I; it then incorporated at least one zigurrat. The activity of Shamši-Adad III on the site is confirmed by Tiglath-pileser I (ARAB I, 88), though he is given a date applicable to Shamši-Adad I. Ishme-Dagan I or II also worked here probably, as Enlil-nasir I names him as founder of a namiru or "gate-tower" which he himself rebuilt (IAK, XII, 1); the best example of this text was found in the Anu-Adad temple, which should then be the building to which this namiru belonged. Adad-nirari I (IAK, XX, 12) restored the storeroom (abusu) of the gate of Anu and Adad, and renewed the fittings of the door, presumably the main temple entrance. Finally Tiglath-pileser I (ARAB I, 88) records that the temple was demolished by Ashur-dan I. All that remained of all this work was a fragment of stone walling (WVDOG X, 21).

2. The foundations of a new Anu-Adad temple were laid by Ashur-resheishi I, whose inscribed mudbricks survived (WVDOG X, 4; AFObh. XII, 57); the superstructure was built, with minor changes, by Tiglath-pileser I (WVDOG X, 26; ARAB I, 88: eponym Ina-ilia-allak, 1110; ARAB I, 98: later). The main block of the building was an oblong, some 14 by 38 m., divided into three squares: two zigurrats, one at either end, and in the centre a pair of shrines. In front of the shrines, to the south-east,
was a courtyard unit, some 72 by 45 m., with a central door opposite the shrines and a staircase, by which the ziggurats were probably approached, along the north-eastern side. No more than the ground-plan of this construction survived, but it must have been partly decorated with half-columns, mudbricks from which were found in the later foundations (WVDOG X, 30). Buildings named by Tiglath-pileser include the bit abugate, which clearly includes the gate in the outer court, and the bit haami, perhaps the shrine, of Adad. If Ashur-resh-ishi's plan reflects older usage, the south-western ziggurat should be that dedicated to Adad, as Tukulti-Ninurta I (ArObh. XII, 5) states that his new palace, situated to the west, adjoined the Adad ziggurat.

3. The Anu-Adad temple is mentioned in the Broken Obelisk (EAK, X e), ascribed to Ashur-bel-kala, but this is probably another instance of Ashur-bel-kala taking credit for his father's achievements. The next serious builder is in fact Shalmaneser III (WVDOG X, 39; ARAB I, 252) who entirely reconstructed it, though re-using probably some glazed tiles of Tukulti-Ninurta II (Andrae 1925, 25, pls. VII-IX) which may have decorated the platform by the door of the Adad shrine, near which they were found; they would belong to the original kigallu. The ground-plan of Shalmaneser's temple was only half preserved; it seems to have followed essentially the same lines as Tiglath-pileser's, but was much smaller.

The shrines and ziggurat block must have measured some 75 by 25 m., and the courtyard unit 61 by 45 m.; between the two was a waist, some 10 m. wide, incorporating the ante-chambers of the shrines. The external faces of the west (Adad) ziggurat partly survived; they were decorated with
simple stepped niches. The crenellations probably consisted of glazed bricks like those on the town-wall, as fragments of these were found in the courtyard well (WVDOG X, 48); there was also a fragment of bronze door panelling (WVDOG X, 79; Taf. XXXIII) from the ante-chamber of the Adad shrine. Further, a fragment of bronze door panelling (WVDOG X, 79; Taf. XXXIII) from the ante-chamber of the Adad shrine. Improvements, but B (WVDOG XXXIX, 37) is a substantial improvement.

4. Tiglath-pileser III (WVDOG LXVII, 57; ApO III, 1; EAK, IX g) had glazed bricks made for the podium (kigallu) of the bulls' gate of the Adad temple; the bricks were found in the Ashur temple, re-used by Sargon II. The only evidence for late repairs to the Anu-Adad temple is seventh-century, when Sargon's Ashur temple bricks (WVDOG X, 84) were employed, together with fragments of Ashurnasirpal II orthostats. The quality of the work suggested to Andrae that it should be very late indeed, but the resemblance to what could be Sennacherib's work in the Old Palace is also noted. We probably have to deal with a number of alterations at different times.

I. The Ishtar Temple Complex

1. This area, west of the Sin-Shamash and south of the Anu-Adad temples, had an obscure and complicated history, and several deities were worshipped there. The basic plan of what may have been the main original shrine, enlarged versions of which survived into the thirteenth century, was already established by the mid third millennium. It consisted essentially of an oblong room entered from the west through a side-door towards one end; there were outbuildings around an irregular courtyard in front. The earliest phases were H and G (WVDOG XXXIX, 27); the latter, which produced
a great number of finds, was probably destroyed in the Agade period, and
a dedication made for Manishtushu by Azuzu (IAK I, b), together with
another of about this date, made for the goddess Ishtar by Ititi (IAK, I,
1), may have belonged to it. Phase F (WVDOG XXXIX, 95) represents an
interval of impoverishment, but E (WVDOG XXXIX, 97) is a substantial
building which was standing, judged by a seal-impression of Izi-Dagan
(Kupper 1957, 206), about the end of the third millennium. It may be
the work of Zariquum, whose inscription (IAK II, 1), mentioning the con-
struction of a shrine for Belat-ekallim, was found in Tukulti-Ninurta's
Ishtar temple; Belat-ekallim, as Ninegal, had a separate shrine in the
complex in the seventh century (Address-Book, line 85).

2. Ilushuma is the first king who definitely built a temple for Ishtar;
some of his texts (IAK IV, 1, 2; ZA XLIII, 115) were found on the site.
Ilushuma is also given by Tukulti-Ninurta I (AfObh. XII, 20) as builder
of the connected Diniitu shrine. Ilushuma and Sargon I are named by
Puzur-Ashur III (IAK, XI, 1) as builders, before himself, of the bit
šuhuri of the temple of a goddess specifically called Ishtar of Ashur
(Ashuritu); one of these kings may also have been responsible for the
shrine of Ishtar Kudnitu, restored by Ashur-uballit I (IAK, XVII, 4).
Ilushuma, Sargon I, Puzur-Ashur III are again given by Adad-nirari I
(IAK, XX, 10) as builders of the Ishtar of Ashur temple as a whole. Adad-
nirari renewed (eponym Ashur-damik) the temple itself, its gate-towers
(namaru), and two buildings in the court (tarbasu): the bit šuhuri, which
must be the main entrance from outside the court as Tukulti-Ninurta I
(AfObh. XII, 17) states that the shrine had no bit šahuru or ante-chamber.
in front of it, and the hururū or altamnu of Ishtar, taken by Landsberger
(Bell. XIV, 239) as a place of refreshment; later (eponym Sha-Adad-ninu)
he added the Ishhara shrine in the court. A possible Adad-nirari I text
(IAK, XX, 13), referring to a bakery, resembles IAK, XX, 10, in some
respects, and may also concern the Ishtar temple complex; so might his
Belat-skallim courtyard brick (IAK, XX, 25). Shalmaneser I (IAK, XXI,
8) continued his father's work on the Ishtar temple.

3. Andrae associates Ilushuma with phase D (WVDOG XXXIX, 111), of
which little survived. It also seems likely that many buildings in the
temple courtyard, which Andrae does not date precisely (WVDOG LVIII, 16)
but the plan of which would not suit Tukulti-Ninurta I's alterations to
the temple, were first erected by some of these second millennium kings.
It is further possible that a "private house" (WVDOG LXIV, 9, Taf. V)
just north-west of the old shrine, where Ashur-resh-ishi I later built a
shrine perhaps for Ishtar of Ashur, may have already belonged to the
shrine complex. But Adad-nirari's Ishtar temple, by Andrae's system,
is entirely missing; in its place we have a building ascribed by Andrae
(WVDOG LVIII, 113, Taf. IV), after some hesitation, to Shalmaneser III.

4. This consisted of stone foundations, deeper than those of Tukulti-
Ninurta I and Ashur-resh-ishi I, and following "sklavisch" the lines of
the phase D temple. The stonework apparently incorporated material taken
from temple D, but might also be neo-Assyrian; two stones, found in a
disturbed area on the north but possibly deriving from these foundations,
bore a Shalmaneser III text (ARAB I, 252) stating that he repaired Tukulti-
Ninurta's Belit-nipha shrine or temple. Andrae therefore suggested that
Shalmaneser III was responsible for all these foundations, and that, in
reverting to the plan of phase D, he was making amends for Tukulti-Ninurta's
blasphemy in moving it elsewhere: Tukulti-Ninurta's temple was not demoli-
ushed, but remained standing though entirely masked by the new building.
There are several objections to Andrae's interpretation, among them that
Ishtar of Ashur and Belit-nipha are distinct goddesses with their own
shrines in the Address-Book (lines 74, 86); that Shalmaneser would have
had difficulty copying a building demolished four centuries previously;
and that if he had been correcting a blasphemy, he would hardly have
claimed to be renewing the blasphemer's work. There are, furthermore,
two published sectional drawings which imply that the "Shalmaneser" build-
ing is very much earlier than suggested:

WVDOG LVIII, 116, Taf. II d (bottom right). This shows a floor, incorp-
orating Tukulti-Ninurta I bricks and level with the floor of Tukulti-
Ninurta's temple; it overruns the "Shalmaneser" foundations. Andrae
considered that it belonged to a late neo-Assyrian house, but there seem
to be no associated remains to support this view. It is simpler to assign
the pavement to Tukulti-Ninurta. We should note that the crucial part of
a wall thought to link the Tukulti-Ninurta and "Shalmaneser" temples in
this vicinity (WVDOG LVIII, Taf. IV b) is restored.

WVDOG LVIII, Taf. V b (bottom left). This appears to show that the
"Shalmaneser" foundations precede Ashur-resh-ishi's temple to the north-
east. Preusser (WVDOG LXIV, 10), noting that there was definitely no
foundation-trench cutting down to the "Shalmaneser" stonework, suggests
that Shalmaneser must have entirely cleared all the soil in the passage
between the two buildings. He brings no evidence to support this view, and appears to have put it forward only because the "Shalmaneser" building was, so far as he was concerned, already correctly dated. It seems unlikely that Shalmaneser would have endangered Ashur-resh-ishi's temple in this unnecessary way; even if he had, the fill between the two buildings would probably have been recognized by the excavators.

These considerations indicate that Andrae's doubts about his final interpretation of the sequence were well founded, and that the "Shalmaneser" building is better ascribed to Adad-nirari I. Shalmaneser III merely wrote his inscription on an old block recovered while he was rebuilding nearby.

5. Tukulti-Ninurta I (AfObh. XII, 15) claims to have changed the site and completely reconstructed the temple. He added, in front of the cela of Ishtar of Ashur, a bit šahuru which the old shrine had not possessed, and provided "gate-towers" (namari); the bit šahuru in this instance is the entrance to the shrine rather than the courtyard, and it must be observed that none existed, though restored on the plan, in the "Shalmaneser" building. Tukulti-Ninurta also (AfObh. XII, 19) rebuilt the shrine of Dinitu, which had been left in ruins by Adad-nirari I, and is presumably the king responsible for the Belit-nipha shrine later repaired by Shalmaneser III (ARAB I, 252). Several of Tukulti-Ninurta's texts were found in position, and his main building is identified with certainty (WVDOG LVIII, 15, Taf. I). It stands south of the old shrine, with its two entrances on the north; in shape it approaches a square, with sides some 40 m. long, and with a small projection at its south-west corner.
There are three ranges of rooms, running east-west: at the front the bit Sahuru and two side-rooms; in the centre the shrine of Ishtar of Ashur; and at the back two rooms entered through the shrine, and a third, which was entered through the corner projection, and was the separate shrine of Dinitu. A wall across the middle of the south-east corner room, behind which was concealed a collection of Middle Assyrian frit objects, may indicate the presence of a staircase to the roof. The building was free-standing, so far as we can tell, and its sides were elaborately decorated with niches and half-columns of mudbrick. It is unclear what buildings there may have been in the old courtyard to the north: presumably the Belit-nipha shrine, since Shalmaneser's inscription was found on this side, and probably others.

6. The last two kings who definitely worked on the temple of Ishtar of Ashur are Ashur-resh-ishi I (AfObh. XII, 58) and Tiglath-pileser I (~I, 86: eponym Ina-ilia-allak). It seems best to assume that they were concerned with Tukulti-Ninurta's great building, which stood, with repairs, into the neo-Assyrian period (WVDOG LWIII, 15, 23). Andrae suggests, however, that this building was temporarily abandoned, or dedicated to another god, as Ashur-resh-ishi's inscribed mudbricks were in fact found (WVDOG LWIII, 111, Taf. IV) built into the altar of a smaller temple a little to the north-west. Nonetheless it seems possible that mudbricks, like baked bricks, sometimes came to be used in buildings for which they were not originally intended.

7. Our knowledge of later developments on this site is largely derived from texts, three of which deserve mention. Shalmaneser II (Ebeling 1954,
lists at least six shrines which may belong with the Ishtar temple complex: those of Bel-sharri and Nabu, of Ishtar and Tashmetum, of Kudnitu, of Dinitu, of Belit nak(?)-ri, and of Belit-ekallim; at the same time, however, Nabu and Tashmetum had one joint priest. We know also of Tukulti-Ninurta I's Belit-nipha shrine, restored by Shalmaneser III, though its plan is lost. In the Address-Book (lines 68-93, 157-165), of Sennacherib's reign, there are four principal shrines, but at least nine shrine-names: the main gods are Bel-sharri and Nabu, whose joint shrine included a statue of Kuddinittlm; Ishtar of Ashur whose shrine included a statue of Tashmetum; Ninegal or Belit-ekallim; and Belatinipa. An Esarhaddon text, (APO XIII, 214) again mentions a joint priest for Nabu and Tashmetum, and another for Sharrat-nipha. Unger (RLA I, 185) and Frankena (1953, passim) discuss some of the possible interrelationships of these and other divinities.

8. When Sin-shar-ishkun (APO XVI, 305; ARAB II, 413: eponyms Sailu, Bel-ahu-usur, Ashur-mata-tuqquin) came to build the last temple on the site, dedicated primarily to Nabu and Tashmetum, he states that he was replacing one that already existed, built by Ashur-...... and perhaps another king. His own temple (WVDCG LVIII, Taf. VII) straddled the original east wall of the complex, and was roughly oblong, with maximum dimensions of 70 by 58 m. It contained two courts, each with a shrine area to its west.

The northern court had its entrance on the east, and opposite was a building close in plan to Tukulti-Ninurta's temple for Ishtar of Ashur, to whom it was perhaps devoted though it might be a bedroom for Nabu and Tashmetum. The twin shrines of Nabu and Tashmetum, unmistakably placed side by side
and facing the southern court, partly overlay the old Tukulti-Ninurta
temple; apparently the only entrance to the southern court was from the
other to its north.

J. The Temple of Ishtar of Nineveh or Anunitum

1. Weidner (ArO XV, 95) mentions a fragment of a third-millennium
vase dedicated to Anunitu; this was found between the main ziggurat and
the southern end of the Ashur temple. We next have three texts, all of
precious metal and found together, which must have been a foundation
deposit; they were in a box by the eastern inner corner of Shalmaneser
III's inner town-wall, between the Anu-Adad and the principal Ishtar
temples (WVDOG LVIII, 51), and though no substantial walls were preserved,
this is where the shrine must have stood. In one text Shalmaneser I
(IAK, XXI, 9) mentions rebuilding the temple of Ninuaitu, and in the
others (ArObb. XII, 22) Tukulti-Ninurta I states that, in the temple of
Annumaitu, he added twenty extra courses to Shalmaneser's seventy-two, and
completed the temple generally. Clearly there was not much difference
between the two goddesses, though the Address-Book (lines 94-96) gives
each of them a statue in the shrine. Their relationship is fully dis-
cussed by Borger (EAK, VI j).

K. The Gula Temple

1. Adad-nirari II (ARAB I, 116: 894) records the demolition, and
rebuilding on a larger scale, of this building, the foundation of which
he ascribes to Tukulti-Ninurta I. The building is named in the Address-Book (lines 100-109, 168-169) just after the Ishtar temples, and this suggests that the Gula temple may have been situated somewhere to their west. It seems possible therefore, though we have no architectural remains, that the group of lead objects (WVDOG LVIII, Taf. XLVI; WVDOG LXVI, 30) which were found by the inner corner of Shalmaneser III's inner town-wall due west of the main Ishtar temple, and which clearly derived from the shrine of a female goddess, may well have been associated originally with the temple of Gula.

L. The bit akitu

1. Sennacherib (OIP II, 136) states that the bit akitu festival, properly held outside the town, had been neglected before his reign and celebrated inside the walls of Ashur. He may be referring back to a bit akitu of Tukulti-Ninurta I's reign (ZA I, 192); it seems uncertain whether there really was, before Sennacherib, a neo-Assyrian festival modelled closely enough on the Babylonian bit akitu festival to be recognizably the same. His own bit akitu (WVDOG LXVII, 74) occupied a site which had not been previously built on, beside an offshoot of the Tigris.

2. Sennacherib's main bit akitu text (OIP II, 135; after 689) deals with the foundation of the building. Another (OIP II, 136) states that tentatively associated with it is a text of about 740 B.C. and in a second part of it, the outer room or group of rooms (bitu kamu) had been burnt, that the changed the name of the shrine area (bit papášu), and set up a door with bronze decoration which is elaborately described. Another text,
dealing with final arrangements for the temple (Ebeling 1954, 1), is dated 682.

3. Excavations showed that the building was constructed in two phases (WVDOG LXVII, Taf. XIV), both ascribed to Sennacherib; the two plans are generally similar, but the second, presumably made after the fire, is slightly larger and more elaborate. It consisted of a single range of rooms on limestone foundations round a central court; the maximum dimensions of the whole block were 69 by 62 m., and the main entrance was through the centre of one of the long sides. On either side of the courtyard was a series of podia or niches, where divine statues may have been erected during the festival. The shrine stood opposite the central door, and consisted of a long room with three entrances in one long side; its back wall was separated from the back wall of the temple by a narrow corridor. A number of holes dug in the bedrock in the temple court and around the temple appear to have been designed for the roots of trees; Sennacherib (OIP II, 137) mentions the garden and the irrigation ditches.

M. The Old Palace

1. The earliest architectural remains (WVDOG LXVI, 6) identified not show how long it remained in use; Freuzer indeed suggests that the between the main ziggurat and the Anu-Adad temple were fragments of a walls are foundations only, and that the building was never completed, respectable building on stone foundations; this had been burnt. We may tentatively associate with it a tablet of Agade date found in a trench like that used in Khantil-Adad I's sun temple. It is worth-noticing that cut through the area later. One grave (WVDOG LXV, 104, no. 22) cut by one of the same set of trenches contained no dateable objects; another,
stated to be in this area (WVDOG LXVI, 10), is best ignored as it may have a different provenance (WVDOG LXV, 39, no. 486).

2. The trenches were dug after the site had been approximately levelled (WVDOG LXVI, Taf. III, VII); they follow an elaborate plan, clearly that of a palace some 112 by 99 m. square. These trenches were found to be filled with soil and debris; among the finds were a barely legible text identified as Old Babylonian, and a sherd bearing the seal-impression of Erishum I. Preusser (WVDOG LXVI, 8) regards the Erishum seal as evidence that the trenches were dug before this king's reign, but it seems just as likely that one or both of these texts were in debris disturbed by the digging of the trenches and the levelling of the site, and that they fell back in as the Agade text must have done. After the trenches were full, a series of massive mudbrick foundation walls were built above them. Preusser considered that a significant interval must have elapsed between the digging of the trenches and the construction of the walls, but the walls normally rest directly on the trenches and follow the same plan. This suggests rather that the trenches acted as guidelines for the builders, and that both belong to the same building operation.

3. The walls of this palace, then, cannot precede Erishum I. We do not know how long it remained in use; Preusser indeed suggests that the walls are foundations only, and that the building was never completed. While no conclusions can be safely drawn from the brick-size, 35 by 10 cm. like that used in Shamshi-Adad I's Ashur temple, it is worth noting that Shamshi-Adad did build a palace at Ashur, and that this was at least partly demolished after the fall of his dynasty. The information is given
by Puzur-Sin (JCS VIII, 32), who states that the palace stood on a site previously occupied by shrines; Puzur-Sin erected instead, apparently in the same area, a stretch of town-wall (see above, I,B,7) and perhaps a palace for his daughter-in-law. We cannot locate these exactly, but they should be on the northern side of the town.

4. An extreme alternative would be to regard the palace as the work of Ashur-nadin-ahhe I or II (probably the latter who ruled when the Mitannian empire was past its peak); this king founded the Middle Assyrian version of the Old Palace. Weidner (AfO XVIII, 355) apparently favours Ashur-nadin-ahhe, commenting on the remarkable concordance between the dimensions of room 1 in the building in question and the Middle Assyrian palace as restored, on the one hand, and the measurements given by Tiglath-pileser I for its enlargement on the other. Room 1, however, is one place where the Middle Assyrian walls rest directly on the earlier version, so it is probable that Ashur-nadin-ahhe found the old walls at this point in good repair, and chose not to change the plan. Elsewhere, where Ashur-nadin-ahhe bricks were found in position (WVDOG LXVI, 15), they cannot be fitted into the old plan.

5. Since the building under discussion influenced the Middle Assyrian palace, whereas Shamshi-Adad's palace was sacrilegiously sited, it may be more satisfactory to assign the remains to some other period. There are two natural possibilities: the prosperous years around 1900, during or after the reign of Erishum I, and those around 1500, when Ashur-nirari I and Puzur-Ashur III were active builders. One might hope for some enlightenment from comparable palaces elsewhere. Preusser (WVDOG LXVI, 8)
has disposed of a suggested relationship to the Agade/Ur III palace at Brak, and those standing during the eighteenth century at Mari (Parrot 1958, last pl.), Rimah (Iraq XXX, pl. XXXIV), and Chagar Bazar (Iraq IX, pl. LXXXIII) bear no real resemblance to that at Ashur. The Kassite palace at Dur-Kurigalzu (Iraq VIII, pl. IX) resembles that at Ashur in having many small rooms surrounding much larger ones, though in other ways it is very different; so is the Mitannian palace at Nuzi (Starr 1937, plan 13). The combined evidence, therefore, inadequate as it is, tends to point to the middle rather than the start of the second millennium.

6. The walls of the Middle Assyrian palace were poorly preserved (WVDG LXVI, 13, Taf. IV). Its north wall coincides with that of the earlier building, and it must have had about the same dimensions. Its architectural history was complicated, and the work of different kings cannot usually be distinguished. The plan, in so far as it survives, is probably that of Tiglath-pileser I's reconstruction, which differed to some extent from that of his predecessors. The textual evidence is more informative.

7. Ashur-nadin-ahhe (probably II) is named as founder of the building by Adad-nirari I (IAK, XX, 11), and as builder of the bit labuni by Tiglath-pileser I (APO XVIII, 352); Ashur-nadin-ahhe's own bricks (IAK, XV, 1; WVDG LXVI, 15) were found in the south-east corner of the central court. Ashur-nadin-ahhe is further named in the Broken Obelisk (ARAB I, 123) as builder of the great terrace facing north, and the context associates this terrace, which was north of the palace, with a bit šahuri ascribed to his son Eriba-Adad I. Weidner (APO XVIII, 355) identifies the bit
Šahuri, or ante-chamber, with room 1, in the centre of the north front overlooking the north terrace. While Weidner's reasoning is based on measurements which may be unreliable, this identification is quite possibly correct; in any event Eriba-Adad must have completed his father's work on the palace.

8. Adad-nirari I (IAK, XX, 11, 20, 24-26: eponym Sha-Adad-ninu) commissioned extensive repairs. His inscribed bricks were found in position (WDOG LXVI, 15) on the south side of the central court, and one names a specific area, the tarbas Šurinme or court of the symbols; Weidner originally (IAK, 106) and Unger (RIA I, 191) regarded this as the name of the main central court of the palace, but the excavators identified the tarbas Šurinme (formerly read tarbas niše) with the large court between the temples south-west of the Old Palace (Andrae 1938, 42; WDOG LXVI, 14). Other bricks, two of which were found loose in the central court (IAK, XX, 26), name the kisallu ša bit labuni; the bit labuni certainly belonged in the palace, and Weidner (AfO XVIII, 355) accepts this therefore as the name of the central court; the evidence seems against this. Adad-nirari I also worked on the terrace. His longest text refers to work on the wall in front of the shrine (papahu, parakku) in the palace, where the statue of Ashur was erected during its annual visit; this cannot be located safely.

9. Bricks of Shalmaneser I and Tukulti-Ninurta I were also found in the palace (WDOG LXVI, 15 f.): the former in the small north-eastern court, and the latter, probably re-used, in the south-eastern corner of the central court. Tukulti-Ninurta I is further credited, by Tiglath-
pileser I (AfO XVIII, 351), with the construction of the bit šahuri. Ashur-resh-ishi I (AfObh. XII, xvi) is another king who may have worked on the palace.

10. Tiglath-pileser I (AfO XVIII, 351: eponym Taklak-ana-Ashur) gives elaborate details of his work on the bit šahuri behind it, and the ekal kiššu to one side; he mentions basalt statues of a nahiru and a burhiš at the royal entrance. A later text (ARAB I, 96: after eponymate of Ninuaia) gives further information on the bit labuni, and other parts of the palace. The Broken Obelisk (ARAB I, 123) refers to the same palace, adding that there were altogether two nahiru, four burhiš, and four lions of basalt, two aladlamme or human-headed winged bulls of parutu (a type of stone which can probably include fine Mosul marble), and two burhiš of white limestone. Weidner's notes on the AfO XVIII text argue that the main room of the bit šahuri is room 1 and that of the bit labuni room 2; this may be too precise; though the bit labuni is clearly approached through the other, it could be a separate block on one side of the inner court. Weidner also identifies a nahiru, which one might expect to resemble the beast represented on an Ashur-bel-kala figurine (RLA I, Taf. XXXIII), with a swordfish, and a burhiš with an aurochs; fragments of basalt sculpture (AfO XVIII, 357, Abb. 1-5; WVDOG LXVI, Taf. XII d, XIII a), found in front of the north facade, are thought to belong to these statues. The only part of the palace which can be ascribed clearly to Ashur-bel-kala is his tomb (WVDOG LXV, 176), at the southern end of the building. This is one of a group of tomb-chambers which continued in use into the seventh century, and should incorporate the work of many kings.
whose work on the palace is otherwise unrecorded.

11. Tiglath-pileser's palace was restored by Ashur-dan II (AFo III, 160: eponym ....... -dannani), but subsequently demolished. Its neo-Assyrian replacement (WVDog LXVI, 19, Taf. V) retained the old basic alignments, with the main entrance on the north, but followed a new plan. Its founder seems to have been Ashurnasirpal II, many of whose bricks were found in the paving; his orthostats (ARAB I, 196: before the Lebanon campaign) were also found built into the walls of rooms 21 and 22 in a later reconstruction. With the orthostats (WVDog LXVI, 27, Taf. XXIII) were parts of two winged bulls; parts of a similar winged bull were found by the Anu-Adad temple to the west (WVDog X, Abb. 70). The heads of these colossi differ from those of Ashurnasirpal's Kalhu figures in having flat horned caps and inlaid eyes; such features are not intrinsically datable, and occur in Shalmaneser III's reign (NB, 284; Iraq XXI, pl. XL). One might be inclined to refer them back to Tiglath-pileser I, but it is stated that the example from the Anu-Adad temple had fragments of an Ashurnasirpal inscription upon it. In the south end of the palace Ashurnasirpal's tomb survived, as did that of his grandson, Shamshi-Adad V. In room 1, east of the inner court, some of the wall decoration was extant (WVDog LXVI, 21, Taf. XIV-XVII): it consisted of glazed wall-plaques set at head-height, and of glazed fists inserted into the brickwork in such a way as to appear to support the roof. The objects are uninscribed, but typically ninth-century.

12. Preusser (WVDog LXVI, 27) ascribes the alteration of rooms 21 and 22 to Sennacherib. This is possible, as Sennacherib certainly worked on
the muššalu (OIP II, 151) by which room 22 was approached from the north, and he is further likely to have been responsible, since he had many Sargon bricks intended for the Ashur temple at his disposal, for a pavement incorporating some of them in the central court (WVDOG LXVI, 23). Nonetheless Esarhaddon also worked on the muššalu, on a more extensive scale (WVDOG XXIII, Taf. X; AfObh. IX, 9), while the reuse of Ashurnasirpal orthostats is most characteristic of Sin-shar-ishkun's Nabu Temple (WVDOG LWIII, 122). A group of vases from Phoenicia and Egypt, found in rooms 1 and 2 (WVDOG LXVI, 21), belonged to Tashmetum-sharrat, who was one of Sennacherib's wives, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal. One inscription of Esarhaddon (AfObh. IX, 8), referring to a palace on a terrace, was found exclusively in the foundations of a Blockmassif on the outer side of the muššalu (WVDOG XXIII, 87), where some kind of summer-house may have been located; it can hardly be applied to the Old Palace proper.

13. Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal are also the last three kings known to have worked on the tomb-chambers in the southern part of the palace (OIP II, 151; AfObh. IX, 10, concerning a tomb for Esharhamat, wife of Esarhaddon; AfO XIII, 214; Ebeling 1954, 18). The mausolea were given several more or less poetic names; Esarhaddon's bit kimahhi is the most straightforward.

N. The "Priest-King" Palace

1. Tukulti-Ninurta I (AfObh. XII, 13; eponym Ina-Ashur-shumi-asbat) re-pared or completed a palace which, he states, had been built by his king, Tiglath-pileser I or Ashur-bel-kala, restored the storerooms (Ili
father Shalmaneser I to the east of the Ashur ziggurat. Bricks of both kings were found in this area, in a row of rooms just west of the south-western court of the Ashur temple (WVDOG LXVI, 28). A brick of Ashur-\dnan I (AfObh. XII, xv) also came from the vicinity. The excavators suggested that this might be a palace in which the king performed rites as high-priest of Ashur.

2. KAR 135, published by Müller (MVAG XLI/3, 4 ff., especially 13 f.) and dated to 1220-1150, describes what may be a coronation ritual. In it the king leaves the Ashur temple through its south-western (Nunnammir) court, in order to go directly to the palace; he performs a ritual at the \textit{reš hameluhhi}, perhaps "the edge of the enclosure" (\textit{HWb}); passes through a gate (\textit{abullu}); comes to a terrace (\textit{tamlu}); and reaches the entrance of the bit labuni. The last term, as we have seen above (I,M, 10), refers to part of the Old Palace, which fronted on the great terrace of Ashur-nadin-ahhe II. The \textit{reš hameluhhi} and the gate may be expected between this and the north-west door of the Ashur temple, on the north side of the town. The Broken Obelisk associates the \textit{reš hameluhhi} with a small terrace (\textit{tamlu gallu}; \textit{AKA\textsuperscript{A}} of EAK, X e), which is explicitly distinguished from Ashur-nadin-ahhe's great terrace. This implies that the small terrace was some way away, perhaps east of the ziggurat; the \textit{reš hameluhhi} would also be east of the ziggurat, and the gate through which the king passed might be a version of the Old Assyrian gate through the town-wall by the ziggurat's north corner (WVDOG XXIII, Taf. X).

Now beside the \textit{reš hameluhhi} and the small terrace the Broken Obelisk describes how, in the earlier period when the town was enclosed by the Old Assyrian wall, a king, Tiglath-pileser I or Ashur-bel-kala, restored the storerooms (bit
abusate) of a royal palace: obviously, if the above argument is correct, the palace founded by Shalmaneser I. KAR. 135, however, does not support the view that this building had any particular ritual function.

3. Schwenzer (AfO VIII, 35) associates an Adad-nirari I text, which concerns repairs to a palace founded by Ashur-nadin-ahhe, with the "Priest-King" palace. Weidner's original assumption (IAK, 94), that it refers to the Old Palace where both these kings are known to have worked, must be preferred.

0. Tukulti-Ninurta I's New Palace

1. Tukulti-Ninurta I texts (AfObh. XII, 5-12: before and after the capture of Babylon) describe how he built a new palace, Elugalumankurkurra, on massive foundations between the Adad ziggurat and the tabira gate. The remains of the terrace were found (WVDOG LXVI, 30), but the superstructure, though probably completed (AfO XVII, 145, with a mention of its bit papahi or shrine), had disappeared.

Bricks of Ashur-nadin-apli (AfObh. XII, 47; WVDOG XXXVII, no. 62), one of which was built into a neo-Assyrian house on the site, name the bit buši ša KUR, and may have been intended for a storeroom in this building. The great terrace of this New Palace was restored by Tiglath-pileser I or Ashur-bel-kala, as stated in the Broken Obelisk (ARAB I, 123), but the main residence of these kings was the Old Palace, which they reconstructed. The area was occupied by private houses in the neo-Assyrian period (WVDOG LXIV, Taf. IX, X).

2. One early text of Tukulti-Ninurta I (AfObh. XII, 9) describes how,
in the neighbourhood of a ziggurat, he cleared a site beside an older palace to build himself a new one. This text was recovered from the Ashur temple area, and might therefore refer to the "Priest-King" palace on which Tukulti-Ninurta certainly worked; Unger (RLA I, 191) refers it to the Old Palace, but Weidner (AfObh. XII, 6) maintains that it refers to the New Palace. The older palace on the site is identified by Weidner with the new building (bitu esšu) named in a text (IAK XXI, 14) found by the west ziggurat of the Anu-Adad temple; the bitu esšu was begun by Adad-nirari I and continued by Shalmaneser I. Unger's argument that, if the bitu esšu had been on the New Palace site, Tukulti-Ninurta would have mentioned it again in his other inscriptions, is probably valid.

P. The Palace of Ashur-ili-bullit-su

1. The foundations of this building (WVDOG LXVI, 32, Taf. X) adjoined the Tigris just north of the Binnenwall. Inscriptions in position (OIP II, 150) showed that it had been built by Sennacherib for his younger son, whose name was apparently Ashur-ili-bullit-su. The internal plan of the building was not found; its maximum surviving dimensions were 60 by 40 m.

2. Sennacherib (OIP II, 151) also built a palace at Ashur for his elder son, Ashur-nadin-shum, presumably before this prince was sent to take over the rule of Babylon in 699. Its location is unknown.

Q. Other Buildings

1. These are listed by Unger (RLA I, 179); in the absence of
archaeological evidence for their location, there seems no object in repeating them. One that must be noted, however, is Adad-nirari I's bit Šuduni/Šudutini sami (IAI XX, 28-29), bricks from which were sometimes found in the vicinity of the Anu-Adad and Ishtar temples; two of the bricks were glazed, and are the earliest examples of glazed bricks from Assyria.
CHAPTER II

Nineveh

A. The Town

1. The original Nineveh is the modern mound of Kuyunjik, on the edge of the Tigris flood-plain opposite Mosul. It forms an approximate oval of about 40 hectares, some 2500 m. round, and is bounded on the south and east by the Khošr stream, the ancient Husur. The town was favourably placed on what has frequently been the most important route from northern Syria to Babylonia and Iran, and had been settled by at least the Hassuna period (AAA XX, 149: Ninevite 1). In the Agade period Manishtushu restored its Ishtar temple, and Shamši-Adad did the same later; his building inscription implies that it had belonged before him to the powerful principality of Narrugum (?Eski Mosul). One seventeenth-century king of Ashur was named Kidin-Ninua, but Ashur-uballit I is the first Assyrian king known to have built there. Subsequently Mutakkill-Nusku constructed a palace, and most of the more active Assyrian kings after him have left traces of their work on Kuyunjik. Ashurnasirpal II (ARAB I, 143) may have resided there in 883-879.

2. Sennacherib on his accession made Nineveh the administrative capital of his empire. He claims (OIP II, 111) that the previous city had had a circumference of 9300 cubits, and that he enlarged this to 21815 great cubits by the addition of 12515. The actual circumference of Sennacherib's wall is about 12000 m., giving a length for the cubit (ammatu) or great cubit of 55 cm.; the previous town therefore had been some 5115 m. round.
This is too much for Kuyunjik alone, but would just enclose a narrow area with Kuyunjik on the north and Nebi Yunis, where the old arsenal stood, on the south; if so, no signs of a town-wall on the necessary internal line have been observed, and it may be that Sennacherib was simply referring to a built-up area around Kuyunjik. His new wall enclosed a roughly triangular area adjoining the river plain, over 750 hectares in extent. Sennacherib also worked on a series of elaborate schemes for controlling the Khoir and providing extra water for the lands around Nineveh (Oates 1968, 49); these do not concern us here, but attention should perhaps be drawn to a fine and apparently unpublished weir, plainly of Assyrian workmanship, on the Khoir about a third of the way from Nineveh to Khorsabad. It seems likely that, some years after his accession, Esarhaddon planned to move the administrative capital back to Kalhu, but this attempt was unsuccessful. Nineveh probably remained the capital until it was sacked by the Medes and Babylonians in 612 (Arab II, 420).

3. The quality of most excavations at Nineveh has left much to be desired, but some essentials have been established. Neo-Assyrian Kuyunjik had the palace of Sennacherib, the Ishtar temple complex, the Nabu temple, and the palace of Ashurbanipal along its spine from southwest to north-east. The city arsenal underlay the present mound of Nebi Yunis, on the town-wall south of the citadel.

B. The Town-Wall

1. Sennacherib (OIP II, 111) states that before his time Nineveh had from Sennacherib's Royal diversion canals between it and the main wall, it was left unfinished. If this was intended as a fortification, it may be preferable to regard it as a small-scale resulting...
had neither a wall (duru) nor an outer wall (šalhu); Tigrath-pileser I (AFO XIX, 141), however, seems to have repaired a town-wall, and Sargon II (AAA XIX, 103; AFO VII, 280) mentions the existence of a great new north gate, presumably through fortifications, opposite the Nabu temple on Kuyunjik. Nineveh cannot have remained undefended throughout its long history, but there may have been no coherent structure deserving the name of duru.

Sennacherib first claims to have enlarged the area of Nineveh in 702 (OIP II, 101). A summary description of the wall, outer wall, and ditch is given in an undated text (OIP II, 153), and perhaps in a 697 prism (Smith 1875, 296, 308). A detailed account, with a list of gates, was written in 696 (King 1914, xix, 233); this was amplified in 694 (OIP, II, 111) and again later (Iraq VII, 89). Sennacherib is further credited by Ashurbanipal (Iraq XXX, 103) with the construction of a citadel-wall. We can identify the citadel-wall with a wall round Kuyunjik, remains of which are sometimes found, and the main wall, through which the gates named by Sennacherib seem to have passed, with the great wall visible around the whole site of Nineveh. Thompson, who discusses the fortifications at length (1929, 125, plan 1), accepts that the outer wall is 1. The locations of these are carefully discussed by Thompson (Arch, represented by a massive rampart between 500 and 1300 m. east of the main wall; he argues that, because its ends are not connected with the main wall, it was left unfinished. If this was intended as a fortification, it can hardly correspond to Sennacherib's šalhu, which was built entirely of stone; it may be preferable to regard it as a spoil-heap resulting from Sennacherib's Khosr diversion canals between it and the main wall.
If so, the *salhu* would be the lower stone fortification, in front of the line of the main wall, part of which has recently (*Sumar* XXIII, 77, pl. VI, VII) been excavated. This identification is supported by the width of the main wall at this point, which is between 14 and 15 m.; the excavators give the length of the average brick as 37 cm., whereas Sennacherib states that the main wall was 40 bricks wide, i.e. 14.8 m. excluding mortar. The width of both walls together is about 25 m.

3. Ashurbanipal repaired the citadel-wall (*Iraq* XXX, 102-105); his work may have begun before 653 (edition E) and was certainly in progress in 649 and 648 (edition D). Smith (1875, 90) observed stone footings belonging to it.

4. When Nineveh fell in 612, the wall was probably breached by engineers who destroyed Sennacherib's weirs on the Khosr upstream. Olmstead (1923, 637) states that the wall was breached at the north-east corner, and that an emergency rampart inside the walls is visible, but I have been unable to see this on the ground.

C. The Town-Gates

1. The locations of these are carefully discussed by Thompson (*Arch. LXXXIX*, 111, pl. LXI; *Iraq* VII, 92); he wrongly assumes that the gates are today represented by depressions rather than elevations in the town-wall, but high mounds do frequently adjoin the places at which he sites the gates. Otherwise his conclusions are mostly correct. Three lists of gates are available, stating the directions in which the gates faced...
and giving them, with one discrepancy, in what is clearly geographical order. The first text, dated 696, has fourteen gates, the second, dated 694, has fifteen, and the third eighteen; the third text refers to the mušlalu rather than the abullu of the ekal maḫarti or Arsenal, and should therefore be dated during or after Sennacherib’s work there in 691-689 (see below, II,K,3). The gates are listed here in the order of the third text.

2. the 1, the handuri gate, faced either south or east on the one hand, or west on the other. Clearly it was at the south-west corner of town.

3. Gates 2-8 all faced south or east, and must proceed east and then north from 1.

2, the Ashur gate towards the town of Ashur, must be the single high mound in the south face of the town-wall.

3, the Sennacherib gate towards the district of Halzu (Oates 1968, 59), is on the east, near the south corner, and has been partly dug (Sumer XXIII, 77, pl. XIII).

4, the Shamash gate towards the district of Gagal, adjoins the Erbil road, and has also been partly dug (Sumer XXIII, 77, pls. IV-VII).

5, the Ninlil gate towards the town of Kar-Ninlil, must be between 4 and the Khoṣr river, but hardly in the gap just south of the Khoṣr as Thompson suggests.

6, the mušlalu gate, may be just north of the Khoṣr, a suggestion put forward but not preferred by Thompson; the mušlalu would lead down to the water.

7, the gate towards the town of Shibaniba (Tell Billah, by Ba’shiqa),
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would be somewhere between the Khoar and the north-east corner of town.

8, the gate towards the district of Halahhi and the mountains, must be on the east face near the north-east corner.

4. The Gates 9-12 all faced north.

9, the Adad gate towards the park (embasu), is a third of the way along the north wall from the north-east corner, and has been dug by Mosul University.

10, the Nergal gate towards the town of Tarbisu (Sherif-khan), is about two-thirds of the way along the north face. The ramp outside it has recently been cleared by the Iraq authorities; the gate itself was investigated partly by Layard and partly by the Iraqis. Finch (Iraq X, 9) discusses these excavations in detail, but does not appreciate that there must have been two gate-chambers rather than one. The external door was flanked by the two winged human-headed bulls now visible; the door between the gate-chambers was flanked by the winged human-headed bulls and genies drawn by Layard and later removed by stone-cutters; and the door facing the town was flanked by the sculptures which Layard found virtually destroyed. So far as we know, this was the only sculptured gate; the carving of some of the figures was never completed.

11, the Sin gate, or Gardens gate (abul kirate) in the 696 text, must lie between 10 and the north-west corner of town; there was a major road leading through Nineveh from this gate (OIP II, 153). Excavations in this area (Sumer XXIII, 77, pls. II-III) have only exposed a ramp, in the thickness of the town-wall, leading up to the battlements.

5. Gates 12-18 all faced west.
12, the mašqe gate or gate of the watering-places, has now been located by excavations; it lies about half-way between the north-west corner of the town and the mound of Kuyunjik.

13, the palace muslalu, appears only in the latest text; it must be a sloping approach to Sennacherib's south-west palace on Kuyunjik, and was probably linked with the descending corridor LI dug by Layard (see below, II,H,2). This then should be on the north side of the Khoşr, as it flows out of Nineveh south-west of the palace; certainly there was a garden by the Khoşr in Tiglath-pileser I's reign (AFO XIX, 142). Thompson prefers to break the order in which the gates are listed, and places the park on Kuyunjik, north of the south-west palace, where few or no buildings have been discovered.

14, the garden muslalu, also appears only in the latest text; it must be connected with the garden laid out by Sennacherib beside his palace (OIP II, 97). This then should be on the north side of the Khoşr, as it flows out of Nineveh south-west of the palace; certainly there was a garden by the Khoşr in Tiglath-pileser I's reign (AFO XIX, 142). Thompson prefers to break the order in which the gates are listed, and places the park on Kuyunjik, north of the south-west palace, where few or no buildings have been discovered.

15, the Quay gate, lies between Kuyunjik and Nebi Yunis, presumably south of the Khoşr near the Mosul road. Thompson prefers a position north of the Khoşr, where we locate 14.

16, the gate or muslalu of the Arsenal (ekal mašarti), clearly lies below Nebi Yunis where the arsenal was situated.

17, the gate towards the district of Barhalzu, appears only in the latest text. It must be south-east of Nebi Yunis; Thompson agrees, though there is a misprint (NW for SE) in Iraq VII, 93, line 3.

18, the Desert gate, will be in the same stretch of wall facing the Jezira, between the mound of Nebi Yunis and the south-west corner of town. This
gate does not appear in the 696 text, and is listed before 16 in the 694 text; Thompson prefers to accept the 694 evidence, and therefore locates 18 in the position we have assigned to 15, between Nebi Yunis and the Khosr. room in W-X (AAA XIX, 61). The walls, of mudbricks on stone foot-
6. There are also some records of gates through the citadel wall.
Tiglath-pileser I's bit mušlala (AfO XIX, 142), leading from his palace to what was probably the Khosr, may be one of them on the south-east.
Sargon II (AAA XIX, 103; AfO VII, 280) mentions the great north gate oppo-
site the Nabu temple; this was new when his text was written, about 715.
Sennacherib (OTP II, 402), in or before 700, built a bridge, presumably across the Khosr, opposite the gate within the city (abullu gabal ali); this again should be on the south-east side of Kuyunjik. Esarhaddon (AfÜbh. IX, 95) refers to this gate, and Ashurbanipal (ARAB II, 319) dis-played captives there. On the north of Kuyunjik Ashurbanipal's palace, built between 645 and 640, contained a sloping corridor, rooms A-R-W-S, with scenes of the hunt on its walls; this again would be a mušlalu, probably leading to a gate.

D. The Ishtar Temple Complex

The remains on this site, which require relatively detailed dis-
it represents the Ishtar temple built by Sennacherib. The remains were excavated by Thompson and Hamilton (AAA XIX, 55-116, pl. 9). They divided the area into 50 ft. squares, named A-Z, AA, BB, &c.; these are used for reference below. Elevations are taken from the site by: Kania, of Agade; this other room in too small for serious con-
datum level, though Thompson sometimes employs other criteria, and are
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it represents the Ishtar temple built by Sennacherib. The remains were excavated by Thompson and Hamilton (AAA XIX, 55-116, pl. 9). They divided the area into 50 ft. squares, named A-Z, AA, BB, &c.; these are used for reference below. Elevations are taken from the site by: Kania, of Agade; this other room in too small for serious con-
datum level, though Thompson sometimes employs other criteria, and are
given here in feet (1 ft. = c. 30.5 cm.) to facilitate reference to his plan on which they are marked.

2. The earliest building classifiable as a possible shrine is an oblong room in W-X (AAA XIX, 61). The walls, of mudbrick on stone footings, are 1.5 m. or more thick. The external width of the building is 11 m. and the length at least 19.8 m., with the south-east end, which must have included the door, missing. The base of the building was at -20 ft., with a repair at -15\frac{1}{2}; the highest surviving brickwork was at -9. On or just below the floor were several Uruk bevelled-rim bowls and a painted Ninevite 5 sherd; Thompson first suggested (AAA XVIII, 81) that the bowls were contemporary with the building, subsequently (AAA XIX, 62) that they were earlier. In U-V to the south-west (AAA XIX, 83), plain and incised Ninevite 5 sherds were found "in an ancient cutting" at -4 to -8 ft.; in Q-X, immediately north of the oblong room, there were Uruk bowls at -15 and -16 ft. (AAA XIX, 62), and plain, painted, and incised Ninevite 5 sherds, mixed near the top with Parthian material, at -1 to -10 ft. (AAA XIX, 84). The oblong room stood between these deposits and was founded at a lower absolute level. It might therefore be of Ninevite 5 date; if it was substantially later, it would have stood in a dip in the ground, an unlikely position for a temple. Thompson (AAA XIX, 62) suggests that it represents the Ishtar temple built by Shamshi-Adad I; this suits neither the stratigraphy nor the groundplan. Thompson further identifies a possibly earlier room adjoining the oblong with an Ishtar temple built by Manishtusu of Agade; this other room is too small for serious consideration. What does seem possible is that the oblong may be an old t.
version of the shrine which Manishtushu restored; the actual Agade walls may have been largely destroyed when the platform of the later temple was constructed above it.

3. That Manishtushu worked at Nineveh is in fact known from a description, by Shamshi-Adad I (EAK, II b), of his restoration of Emenue in the precinct (ina qaqar) of Emashmash, the latter being the name of the neo-Assyrian Ishtar temple complex; the text implies that there was both a temple and a ziggurat, belonging to Ishtar of Nineveh, in existence since the Agade period. A construction worth mentioning in this connection is "the containing wall of a raised terrace or platform in the centre of the mound. It is solidly built of rough-hewn stones, 8-9 feet high, and in a layer of debris near its foot were fragments of stone, including black basalt inscribed in very archaic Assyrian characters" (Thompson 1929, 63; cf. Gadd 1936, 72). This quotation refers to King's work on Kuyunjik, very probably to what was found in two wide trenches beside the 32 m. contour-line just south of what was eventually identified as the Ishtar temple (Thompson 1929, plan 2; Iraq I, 97, fig. 1). The trenches cut into the highest point on the entire mound, and it is in this region that we should look for the Ishtar ziggurat which was used by Sennacherib (OIP II, 402), separately from the Ishtar temple proper, as a reference-point for locating one of the western sides of his south-west palace.

The platform found by King may then have belonged to an early version of the ziggurat: Manishtushu's or Shamshi-Adad's. Certainly the main Agade inscription from Nineveh (EAK, I c; AFO XX, 48) derives partly from Kuyunjik (probably not at all from Nebi Yunis), is made of basalt,
and has a conspicuously archaic script; it is normally ascribed to Naram-Sin, who may also have worked here, but the king's name is not preserved and the text might therefore be a version of the Manishtushu inscription seen by Shamshi-Adad I.

4. Some objects which may have derived from Manishtushu's temple, or its immediate predecessor, were found north-west of the later Ishtar temple platform, in A-B-H at -26 or -33 ft. (AAA XVIII, 82, 107, pl. XXXIX). Hutchinson rightly compares the deposit, which contained beads, sherds, and a statuette, with material from the Agade level G of the Ishtar temple at Ashur. The only substantial building which might be associated with the deposit is a vaulted complex in N-BB, which was founded at about -26 ft., above a level containing Uruk bowls, and stood as high as -8 ft (AAA XIX, 78); Thompson suggests the vaults were tombs within which the deposit was originally placed, but the structure looks more like a vaulted complex, of about 2100-2000, at Rimah (Oates: unpublished). It would have acted, like the Rimah structure, as terracing up a slope which is known to have existed at this point. If so the builders would have cut into earlier levels for their foundations, and the vaults cannot be safely dated; only their extreme depth, in relation to the temple platform which is a mere 8 m. away, indicates at least that they are probably earlier than it. They could well be contemporary with the Rimah structure; whether they belonged to the Ishtar temple is quite uncertain.

5. Another Agade object from the temple area was a seal-impression, found in NN at -10 ft. (AAA XX, 142, pl. LXVI, no. 1); this may suggest
that the temple platform is later than the Agade period, as we argue below. A fine bronze head and an inscribed spear-head (AAA XIX, 72; AAA XX, 186, pl. LXXVIII, no. 42; Iraq III, 104) were found in W, the latter at -7 ft.; this was a badly disturbed area. Thompson indeed suggests that the head might have been brought to Assyria by Ashurbanipal after one of his Elamite campaigns; alternatively it may derive from the Agade Ishtar temple.

6. The foundation platform of the final temple (AAA XIX, 65) normally consists of 18-20 courses of red mudbrick; one part, in DD, is deeper, but all the brickwork appeared contemporary. The lowest course of the platform (AAA XIX, 83), which rests on Ninevite 5 levels largely, is at -5 or -6 ft., -13 in DD: the lowest floor-level identified within the temple, Pavement III, is at -2½ ft. (AAA XIX, 67). The platform, where it is well-preserved at the south-western corner, gives the approximate ground-plan of part of the lost superstructure. It encloses an oblong courtyard some 31.5 by 18.5 m. across, and is itself, where available, about 11 m. wide. A projection, 21.5 m. long and 3.5 m. wide, runs along part of the external south-west face of the platform, and probably marks the position of a door, with flanking buttresses, which entered the courtyard in the centre of its long south-western side. The rooms are represented by a single range of "cellars" in the platform, without doors because they are below the level of the original floor; this is an arrangement very similar to that in the early second-millennium temple at Rimah (Iraq XXVIII, 129). The "cellars" were, from the first, intentionally filled with earth; an Ashurnasirpal II text "in the lowest earth" of
cellar 3, TT, does not help in dating the platform, as we know (AAA XIX, pl. LXIX, no. 36) that there was a pit in this area. There are, however, two further features which appear original: a brick pavement in the courtyard, resting on plain earth fill, and a drain running west from the courtyard over cellar 5. The bricks are uninscribed, but an approximate date is suggested by some tablets (Millard 1968: BM 134,533-134,539) found in the courtyard and on or adjoining the platform at about this level: those whose provenance is recorded came from OO at datum, from TT at -1, and from TT-WW at -2. These texts are Old Babylonian, and their presence should mean that the platform is that made by Shamshi-Adad I when he entirely rebuilt the temple of Ishtar and the ziggurat to a new design.

It must be noted that Thompson (AAA XIX, 64, 68) ascribes the platform to Ashur-resh-ishii I and the pavement to Shamshi-Adad IV. This conclusion was based on a misunderstanding of Ashur-resh-ishi’s building inscription concerning the namiryu, discussed below, and the assumption, now shown to be unnecessary by the evidence from Rimah, that cellar 5 must have been significantly earlier than the drain that crossed it. He also states, of two fragments of pavement found at -1 and at datum in the courtyard, that "their area is so very small that they can hardly be considered as a renewal of the pavement, unless we are to believe that wholesale depredations have removed most of the superficies". Wholesale depredations, however, did happen on the east side of the temple, and they account for the fact that most texts, on bricks and sikkate, relating to the Ishtar temple, have been found in post-Assyrian or disturbed areas west of the
platform. What clearly happened is that the floor-level of the temple, like that of the Ashur temple at Ashur, was raised only a few feet between its foundation, about 1800, and its destruction in 612, and that most of the brickwork laid in the Middle Assyrian period was shifted by neo-
and post-Assyrian Assyrian builders. The two fragmentary pavements in the courtyard could then be of almost any date.

8. Away from this south-western court, which was probably a forecourt, the platform was severely damaged. It was at least 100 m. long. Its north-west side, opposite the later Nabu temple, was stepped out 3.5 m. at one point, and there could have been another gate here. There were a few "cellars", but the platform generally appeared solid; this was not, however, the site of the ziggurat, at least in the neo-Assyrian period, as some Ashurnasirpal walls, including one with sculptured orthostats (AAA XIX, 69), survived on top. A fragment of paving in RR, with bricks of the same king, may have belonged to the central courtyard. The shrine of Ishtar might then have been almost vertically above the third-millennium building in W-X, but if so it has disappeared entirely. There are various other traces of Assyrian work here and there in the temple, and a drain (AAA XVIII, 86, 98; AAA XIX, 67), incorporating bricks of Tiglath-pileser I, Tukulti-Ninurta II, Ashurnasirpal II, and Shalmaneser III, which led west into the building regarded by Thompson as a palace of Ashurnasirpal (see below, II,G,1). The development of the building after Shamshi-Adad I, however, can better be followed through the texts.

9. Hammurabi of Babylon (Harper 1904, 6) refers to the glorification of Nana in Emishmish in Nineveh, and the goddess Ishtar of Nineveh gained
wide popularity in the second millennium. The first Assyrian king known to have repaired her shrine is Ashur-uballit I (EAk, iv a; Arch. LXXIX, 121, no. 45-6); this is confirmed by Shalmaneser I (IAK, XxI, 10, 11: eponym circa Ashur-kashid), who rebuilt it, together with the ziggurat, after an earthquake. Tukulti-Ninurta I (AtObh. XII, 39; Smith 1875, 249) has left bricks mentioning his completion of the temple. Ashurresh-ishi I (AtObh. XII, 54; AAA XIX, 97), after another earthquake in the reign of Ashur-dan I, repaired Shalmaneser's work at the great gate ša reš niše (Thompson: "of the Lions' Heads"; Weidner: "am Beginn der Löwen(kolosse)"); he raised the height of the "gate-towers" (namiru) above the roof from fifteen to fifty courses, and surrounded them with rosettes of "stone" (abne) which may be the glazed "pot rims or flanges" (Millard 1968, x, index) the great majority of which, like similar objects of Shalmaneser I, were found on the west side of the temple. Tiglath-pileser I (ARAB I, 102) also worked on the temple, and it has been suggested (Gadd 1936, 123) that a statue of a naked female, dating from Ashur-bel-kala, was erected there. Shamshi-Adad IV's sikkatu texts (EAk, X j; Millard 1968, index) state that he repaired the bit namiru ...... ššurite; Borger restores ša bit Ištar in the gap, and there is no likely alternative; these sikkate were again found round the temple, where perhaps Ishtar of Ashur had a separate shrine. Tukulti-Ninurta II bricks (AAA XIX, 98) from the same vicinity derive perhaps from a minor repair. Two Ashurnasirpal II texts, written after his Mediterranean expedition, deal with his work on the temple. The usual edition (AAA XIX, 99)
II,D

Ascribes the temple to Ashur-uballit, and states that Ashurnasirpal rebuilt the temple of Ishtar of Nineveh ištu tarsi bit nathi adi ..... šu; there are moreover several of Ashurnasirpal's bit nathi bricks from the area. The bit nathi of Nineveh is mentioned also in a caption on the White Obelisk of Ashurnasirpal I (see below, II,N), in connection with sacrifices to Sertu, a form of Ishtar (MAOC VI, pl. III, VI, panels A3 and B3). The panels show a temple on a rise, with a goddess in the door and a scene of sacrifice without. Thompson (Arch. LXXIX, 122; AAA XIX, 102) wished to identify the temple in the picture with the Ishtar temple, and regarded a banquetting kiosk elsewhere in the picture as the bit nathi, which he translates "slaughter-house". Unger, however, (MAOC VI, 57) is clearly right in taking the temple in the picture as the bit nathi (which he transliterates as a name, Enathi or Enatshar), and the bit nathi would then be the part of Emashmash dedicated to Sertu.

Ashurnasirpal's other text (AAA XIX, 107), written on the back of his orthostats, ascribes the old temple of Ishtar of Nineveh in the precinct (ina qagar) of Emashmash to Shamshi-Adad, and states that he entirely reconstructed it. We know from Sennacherib (OIP III, 49) that this was 11. This rebuilding by Ashurnasirpal included, as we have seen, the provision of at least one series of carved orthostats; fragments of another orthostat, which was found in the Nabu temple with a different king's inscription written on its back (Thompson 1929, pls. VI, VII; Arch. LXXIX, 118, pl. LIX, no.4; AAA XVIII, pl. XVIII, nos. 22, 23), had an Ishtar temple inscription between the two registers of carving, and may belong to the same room. Many obelisk fragments from the vicinity
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(Arch. LXXIX, pl. LVI; AAA XVIII, pl. XXVI; AAA XIX, pl. LXII; Iraq IV, 43-46) are also likely to date from Ashurnasirpal, and may have been set up in the Ishtar temple. Since, too, the temple was thought suitable for narrative pictures, it is likely that many if not all of the glazed bricks and tiles from the area to the west (Arch. LXXXIX, pl. LVII; AAA XVIII, pl. XXVI, nos. 2, 4, pl. XXVIII-XXXII), some of which bear Ashurnasirpal's name, were used in the decoration of the Ishtar temple.

12. Shalmaneser III bricks were found in B and C (Arch. LXXXIX, 123), and a sikkatu fragment, probably of this king (AAA XIX, 103; Millard 1968: BM 128379), in LL (presumably beside MM) west of the temple.

Sargon II (Iraq VII, 86) implies that he worked on the temple; a prism of his, from Nineveh (AAA II, 111), refers to work on a ziggurat. Sennacherib (AAA XVIII, 95; Afr VII, 282) also claims to have rebuilt the temple, and Esarhaddon (AfrObh. IX, 66, 94) seems to refer to work on Emashmash. Ashurbanipal's main work on Emashmash (Bauer 1933, 14; Thompson 1931, 30; before 647 or 646) consisted in its redecoration with gold and silver; by the same date he had also rebuilt the temple of Sharrat Kidmuri, but we know from Sennacherib (OIP II, 99) that this was a separate building from the Ishtar temple proper, perhaps to its east, though it may still have formed part of Emashmash. Ashurbanipal also (AAA XX, 79; Arab II, 383; after eponymate of Shamash-daninanni) claims to have worked on the ziggurat, and to have enlarged the kisallu or outer court of the Ninlil (Ishtar) temple, paving it with limestone. It seems possible that this refers to a paved area or street outside the main temple block, joining that outside the Nabu temple (see below, II,E,4).
E. The Nabu Temple

1. This was built, according to Sargon II (AAAB XIX, 103), as a joint Nabu-Marduk temple, opposite (ina tarai) the great new north gate; Thompson translates ina tarai as "at the time of", but Weidner's "gegenüber" (ARAB VII, 280) is preferable, as Sargon can hardly have known that the two buildings were contemporary when he did not even know the name of the king who built them. Sargon adds that the temple decayed and was rebuilt by Adad-nirari III. The eponym canon for 788, as restored (RLA II, 429), states USHU ḫa bit Nabu ḫa Ninua KARRU, translated by Luckenbill (ARAB II, 434) "the foundation of the temple of Nabu in Nineveh was torn up (for repairs)". It seems questionable, however, whether the phrase UŠSU

2. Sargon II (AAAB XIX, 103) claims to have entirely rebuilt it, on much the same plan, seventy-two years later. Thompson, using a reconstruction of the eponym canon text which refers to an UŠSU KARRU event in 719 (ARAB II, 437), suggests that this passage is another dealing with the Nabu temple at Nineveh, and that Sargon started work in 719 and ended in 716. An alternative and perhaps superior reconstruction of this text (RLA II, 433) puts an UŠSU KARRU event in 720, and a god's ceremonial
entrance in 719. There is, however, another ceremonial entrance in 713 (ascribed to Nergal and 714 byLuckenbill); this might concern Sargon's new Nabu temple. If so work might have started in 716 and ended in 713, but any such figures may well be too precise.

3. Later Esarhaddon (AfObh. IX, 94) claims to have repaired a temple of Nabu and Tashmetum, perhaps this building since it is named between two others at Nineveh. Ashurbanipal (Arch. LXXIX, 120; AAA XX, 92; after eponymate of Shamash-daninanni) redecorated the temple, and claims to have enlarged the outer court (kisallu), paving it with limestone blocks. Finally Sin-shar-ishkun (ARAB II, 409; AfO XVI, 305; eponym Daddi) may have rebuilt it; Borger (JGS XIX, 76) brings this text from Kalhu.

4. The remains of the temple, as identified (Arch. LXXIX, 104, pl. LXIII), consisted of a mudbrick platform, about 3.5 m. high, around an oblong courtyard 35 by 26 m. across. The platform was some 10.5 m. wide on the long, north-eastern side of the courtyard; a doorway, with Sargon and Ashurbanipal paving, opposite the centre of the courtyard on this side, may have been the main entrance of the temple. On the north-west the platform, if its limits were correctly defined, was some 6 m. wide; a patch of Ashurbanipal paving (Thompson 1929, 75) was identified as a side-door, but this seems uncertain. The south-east side of the platform was some 10.5 m. wide at the east corner of the courtyard, but thickened as it continued southwards; there is no adequate published evidence for a door on this side. The platform here abutted on a street paved with Ashurbanipal kisallu slabs of limestone; this street may have incorporated a piece of Ashurbanipal sculpture (AfO XVI, 219, fig. 40) ascribed by Thompson to
Sennacherib, but it was overlain at one well-preserved point by a good layer of burning which could be associated with the sack of Nineveh in 612. Thompson first regarded the street as the work of Ashurbanipal, but the stratigraphy is confused and he later expressed doubts (AAA XX, 111); the work, however, is up to Assyrian standards, and fits the neo-Assyrian topography. It could have led from the north-east door of the Nabu temple, and thus have been not unnaturally regarded as an extension of the outer court (kisallu); it might then have joined the similar and contemporaneous pavement built as an extension of the kisallu of the Ishtar temple (see above, II,D,12). The south-west side of the Nabu temple platform seems to have been at least 15 m. wide, with space for the shrines which may have been approached through an extension of the courtyard; there is a suitable gap, 5 m. wide, in the platform near the southern end of the south-western side of the court.

5. Adad-nirari III bricks (Arch. LXXIX, 123) were found on the site, but not in position. Sargon's inscriptions were associated with a well and a latrine in the courtyard, and a paved room in the southern corner of the temple. The position of the latrine suggests that Sargon reduced the size of the courtyard by building inside it, away from the platform, and that the platform itself should therefore be assigned to his predecessor Adad-nirari III.

F. Other Temples

1. It may be convenient to add a mention of one, or possibly two,
buildings, no traces of which have been found in excavation.

2. One is a temple for Sin, Shamash, and their consorts, started by Esarhaddon (Arch. IX, 66: dated 677) and completed by Ashurbanipal (Thompson 1931, 32: before 646 or 645; AAA XX, 92). It stood in the middle of town (ina qabal alî), presumably on Kuyunjik, perhaps west of the Nabu temple.

3. It would appear that there was a bit akitu associated with Ishtar, which Sargon built (Arch. LXXIX, 120) and Ashurbanipal repaired (Thompson 1931, 35: dated Nabu-shar-ahhe-shu, 646 or 645; Arch. IX, 66). Both texts were found beside the temple of Nabu, and Ashurbanipal states that the building was inside Nineveh (ša kirib Ninua). Possibly it was part of the Ishtar temple itself.

G. The Early Palaces on Kuyunjik

1. Copies of all the ekallu bricks mentioned in this section, and fragments of Tiglath-pileser's texts, were found by Thompson in an area between the Ishtar and Nabu temples in the centre of the mound (AAA XVIII, 83); other texts from the area included some from the Ishtar temple, and others such as the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic tablet (Arch. LXXIX, 126) from libraries. The ekallu bricks first led Thompson to believe that there was a palace in this area (Arch. LXXIX, 103), and he persisted in this view (AAA XVIII, 80, 89) even after discovering that most if not all of the walls were post-Assyrian, though partly built around a drain running west from the Ishtar temple. In fact the building materials employed
may have originated anywhere on Kuyunjik where Assyrian architecture was exposed: even if ekallu bricks were reserved for use in palaces, which they are not, there would be no adequate evidence for a palace in this position.

2. Mutakkil-Nusku is named by Tiglath-pileser I (AFO XIX, 142) as restorer of a palace on a terrace beside the Ishtar temple. Tiglath-pileser again restored the building, adding a bit muššala which may have been a ramp down to the gardens on the Khosr, with which the text also deals. Tiglath-pileser I ekallu bricks (Arch. LXXIX, 122; AAA XIX, 115), mentioning work on a quay-wall or protective facing (kisirtu) beside a watercourse and a garden, are likely to derive from this palace or its substructure. Bricks of Ashur-resh-ishi I (AAA XIX, 114), definitely from a palace, are also known; Tiglath-pileser I (AFO XIX, 141) refers to this elsewhere in the same text, and it may be part of the same building. Tiglath-pileser completed its wall and "gate-towers" (namiri), decorating it with glazed bricks and bronze sikkate and putting palm-trees of glazed brick (surri) on the namiri. Ashurnasirpal II slabs from a palace court (tarbas ekalli) may come from this building (AAGC III, heft 1-2, p. 10). It is uncertain whether a palace built by Shamshi-Adad V, whose ekallu bricks are known (Arch. LXXIX, 123; AAA XVIII, 100), and completed by Adad-nirari III whose brick inscription (AAA XVIII, 100) confirms that this was indeed a palace, was situated in the same vicinity.

3. Further information on the pre-Sargonid palace is given by Sennacherib, who states that he built his own palace on the site. His most detailed text (OIP II, 99) shows that the older version had sides facing
the ziggurat area, the bit namari of the Ishtar temple, and the bit namari of the Kidmuri temple; it must also have adjoined the Khosr, as Sennacherib (QIP II, 105) reclaimed land from the Khosr when extending the site towards the Tigris. Clearly this description applies to the site of Mutakkil-Nusku's palace, and it is likely that the remains of a building (Thompson 1929, 63), which incorporated glazed bricks, lay between the Ishtar temple and the Khosr, and had been buried by the terrace of Sennacherib's palace, belonged to this construction.

4. This scheme would appear to leave no place for the Tebiltu river or watercourse. Sennacherib states (QIP II, 99, 105) that the Tebiltu, in flood, had exposed a graveyard, and eroded the foundations of the old palace; he therefore changed its course, confined it to its covered channel (katimtu asurraku), and directed it out of the middle of the city into the plain behind. Thompson (1929, 122) suggests that it was an offshoot of the Tigris which originally reached Kuyunjik through the Nergal gate, and joined the Khosr at the south-west corner of Kuyunjik; Sennacherib would have diverted it near the Nergal gate. It is very questionable whether this course is physically possible; certainly any damage at the confluence would have been done by the Khosr and not the Tebiltu. Thompson, however, is clearly right in distinguishing the Khosr from the Tebiltu, as both are named in the same text, though part of the Khosr's waters were diverted from flowing through Nineveh by a channel cut outside the town-wall on the east. It seems possible, however, that when Sennacherib diverted the Tebiltu, he diverted it not out of the entire walled city, but out of the middle of the city, namely Kuyunjik. In this
case the Tebiltu could be either the meander in the modern Khosr just east of Kuyunjik, which is a course the Khosr may only have followed in times of flood, or a watercourse draining Kuyunjik itself, for which the provision of a covered channel would be eminently suitable.

5. Sennacherib is also given by Ashurbanipal (Arab II, 321) as builder of a palace (bit riṣūti) on the site later occupied by Ashurbanipal’s North Palace on Kuyunjik. If this also was a traditional palace site, it may be that Shamshi-Adad V’s building was located there. Some moulded bricks were found by Rassam (1897, 222) built into a drain below room F.

6. A possibility worth noting is that the old palace by the Khosr may have been decorated with human-headed winged bulls of stone from Tashata across the Tigris. Sennacherib (OIP II, 104) describes how laboriously these were transported, in a passage that seems to parallel another (OIP II, 108) about outmoded methods of bronze-casting. There is no Tashata stone among the numerous raw materials given by Sennacherib as used in his own palace.

H. Sennacherib’s Incomparable Palace

1. This building, ekal šanina la išu, is the south-west palace on Kuyunjik first excavated by Layard. The building is described by Sennacherib in texts dating from 702 to 694 (OIP II, 94-116); a bull inscription (OIP II, 117-125), giving further details, must be later, but perhaps not later than 693 or 692, when two other bull inscriptions with historical information were written (OIP II, 66-78); the palace is said to have
been finished by 691 (OIP II, 128). Its dimensions are given several times; it shrank between the beginning and end of 702, but thereafter grew. The 700 text gives the most topographical details, but the remainder can be related to it: taking one cubit (ammatu) or great cubit as 55 cm. (see above, II,A,2), we have the following approximate measurements.

- The side: 396 m. in 702; 385 m. in 702-694; 503 m. in 692.
- The upper, north front: 89 m. in 702; 97 m. in 700.
- The inner (Ishtar temple) front: 119 m. in 702; 147 m. in 700.
- The inner west front, behind the ziggurat: 211 m. in 700.
- The lower, south (Tigris) front: 224 m. in 702; 212 m. in 702-700; 242 m. in 694-692.

In fact the Tigris front faces more to the south-west, and since the palace is more or less rectilinear, the compass-points have to be adjusted accordingly, but the general shape is clear. The long side is that adjoining the Khosr meander, with the north and south fronts at right-angles to it; the internal front by the Ishtar temple is at right-angles to the north front, and the west internal front behind the ziggurat is at right-angles to the south front; there must have been a third internal front, facing north and connecting the other two, in the neighbourhood of the ziggurat. This arrangement is fully compatible with the architectural remains dug by Layard (NB, plan 1 opposite p. 67) and King (Thompson 1929, 59, plan 3). The maximum dimensions of the excavated area are some 205 m. on the Khosr side, and some 195 m. on the Tigris front. The former figure has to be greatly increased by adding the outer
court, with surrounding rooms, which must have existed north of room I, and the latter figure by completing the unnumbered room in the south-west corner and by adding at least one suite of rooms to face the north-west side of court LXIV. The internal chronology of the palace cannot be deduced from its ground-plan, but we know that when, between 694 and 692, the Khosr side of the palace was extended by 118 m., 63 m. of this consisted of reclaimed land, presumably on the south-west front towards the Tigris (QIP II, 105, 118); the remainder then must have been to the north-east beyond the outer court. We must, however, regard all that has been excavated as part of a coherent unit, largely planned before 702, and built steadily, by the captives taken in 705-700, until it was near completion in 694. The scenes on the carved orthostats, from all over the palace, show events all of which can belong to the campaigns of 705-700 (see below, VIII, M, 4-7).

2. One area that must have been built at the start is the principal bit appate, bit mutirrite, or bit hilani in the "Hittite" or North Syrian style, which is elaborately described in the first 702 text (QIP II, 96). This incorporated eight striding bronze lions supporting between them four columns, and four human-headed winged bulls (aladlamme, see below, II,H,7) of silver, and bronze, with others of stone, facing in all directions at its doors. Clearly there were two lions to each column-base, and the bulls decorated the facade behind. Just such a construction is represented, in a major Assyrian city, on slab H 7 from Ashurbanipal's palace (Hall 1928, pl. XLII; Iraq XXVI, 5). Only one of the lions on each column-base is visible, but the other would have been hidden, as on
the column-base from Tell Tayanat in the Hatay (Frankfort 1954, pl. CLVI). It seems possible that this slab actually shows Sennacherib's bit hilani, since features of this magnificence must have been rare and we know of only three alternatives: Tiglath-pileser III's bit hilani at the old capital of Kalhu, a structure of doubtful appearance which had probably been demolished by Esarhaddon (see below, III,F,7); Sargon II's bit hilani at the old capital of Dur-Sharrukin, which did incorporate double lion-bases supporting columns (ARAB II, 53); and the "Hittite" section of the Arsenal at Nineveh, where there were also lions probably supporting columns (AfOPh. IX, 61). It is unlikely that Ashurbanipal's sculptor drew part of the palace in which he was at work, and the bit hilani in what had been up to then the main palace in Nineveh is therefore the best candidate for that represented in the relief. Now this latter stands above both a town-wall and a citadel-wall, with a river or moat in front and a postern-gate to one side. In Sennacherib's palace the sloping passage LI (west) must have led to a postern-gate, perhaps gate 13 in the town-wall (see above, II,0, 5), and one is led to speculate whether the block of rooms to its south, LI (east) - LIX, which are on the correct side of the postern, might not form part of, or form the building behind, Sennacherib's bit hilani. This is the one excavated area which, in the "Hittite" fashion (Iraq XIV, 120), definitely included columns supporting lintels: there were a pair of stone lion-bases between LI (east) and LIII (NB, 68), and there might have been more in the central door of the facade, which King (Thompson 1929, 61, plan 3) found to be further out than Layard had believed, as the width of the door, judged by King's flanking buttress, must have been very
great to align with the central door of Layard's room LIV. Moreover, the difficulties experienced by both excavators in defining these central doors suggest that they were originally lined, like those in Sennacherib's bit hilani, with colossi of silver or bronze which did not survive the sack of Nineveh. It is also notable that the two sets of orthostats known from this area (NB, 67; Thompson 1929, 61) both showed wars in Babylonia, where Sennacherib campaigned in 705 and 703. This circumstantial evidence is not refuted by the presence, in the relief, of only two bulls on the facade behind the portico, as, whatever the building actually depicted, it must have possessed considerably more of them; the two bulls are in perspective, and it may have been thought that the rendering was unsuccessful. While this discrepancy makes a positive identification of the area with Sennacherib's bit hilani inadmissible, it would be desirable, during the new excavations, to look for traces of columns on the pavement in front of the facade.

3. Three other rooms the completion of which can be approximately dated are XXIX, XXX, and XXXIII (NB, 445). Their walls were panelled with orthostats of a distinctive fossiliferous limestone identifiable, by a text on the back of one (OIP II, 127; NB, 459), as pindu (formerly read ašnann) stone from Mount Nipur (Judi Dagh). Since Sennacherib's expedition to Mount Nipur is not mentioned in a copy of his annals dated to 697 (Smith 1875, 295), the orthostats must have been erected after that year.

4. There is another part of Sennacherib's description of the palace which may be relatively early, as it occurs in the 694 text (OIP II, 106)
just after a mention of the "Hittite" building and before a list of raw materials and colossi used in the palace decoration generally. It states that there were *papahani* and corridors (*biri*) in the *parakku* inside the building, *lamassate* at the doors, painted roofs in the *parakkani*, *sikkate* inside, and glazed bricks outside around the roof. The words *parakku* and *papahu* are normally used of shrines, of which there must have been one in the building, and there are no *lamassate* mentioned elsewhere in the building inscription, though Landsberger (*ZA* XXXVII, 219) wrongly equates them with the *apsasate* which were found elsewhere. In fact the *lamassate* were distinct beings, twinned or two-headed examples of which (*maš-ša-a-te pa-na ša a-he-en-na/u ar-ka i-na-at-ta-la*) were placed between *apsasatu* column-bases in the Nineveh arsenal (*OIP* II, 133; *AfObh.* IX, 61, 63); these ones supported blocks (*askuppu*) of stone, and Sennacherib states that *na-bur-riš u-še-me-na*, a phrase for which no satisfactory translation is available, though it might imply that they reached the roof. The *lamassate* in the Incomparable Palace are described as "carrying a red flower in folded (?) hands" (*CAD*; ša il-ru nu-na ša-a kit-mu-sa rit-ta-šin). There were also *lamassate* forming the legs of the couch of Bel (*Iraq* XII, 40; *Iraq* XXVI, 20), and we should perhaps visualize them as *caryatids* such as appear in Assyrian architecture in a Til-Barsip painting (*BAH* XXIII, plate opposite p. 72), in pre-Assyrian architecture at Guzana (Frankfort 1954, pl. CLVII a), and, in a male form, on much neo-Assyrian furniture (*OIP* XXXVIII, pls. XXXIV, XXXV; *NB*, 150). Nonetheless, while these *lamassate* may have been placed at the doors of the palace shrine, the use of the plural forms *papahani* and *parakkani*, together
with the mention of features such as painted roofs which must have been
found in many parts of the palace, suggest that *nepahu* and *parakkku* could
have a more general meaning, and that these lines refer to the State
Apartments as a whole.

5. Sennacherib deals next with the raw materials used in the palace
(OIP II, 107), and a minor problem is raised by his list of stones. He
omits the Mount Nipur *pindu* stone, and gives three main varieties: *TUR-
NI-MAR-NA-DA*, translated by Luckenbill and *CAD* as breccia, from the Til-
Barsip region; *gišnugallu* or *paritu* from Mount Ammanana in the Syrian
cedar country (*ARAB* I, 289); and *pilu pisu*, the "white limestone" which
is certainly the very variable gypsous limestone known as Mosul marble
(*Arabic farash*), from Balatai (*Eski Mosul*), a little upstream of Nineveh.

*TUR-NI-MAR-NA-DA*, which Sennacherib used sometimes for orthostats, might
be the "close-grained magnesian limestone, almost as hard as flint" found
in room LIII (*NB*, 68). The only other fine type of stone used in the
palace and identified by Layard was what he calls "marble" or "alabaster";
by this he undoubtedly means Mosul marble, and the *gišnugallu* would appear
to be missing. What in fact seems to have happened is that the term
*gišnugallu* was applied to a variety of fine stones; in at least one
instance (*Iraq* XXIV, 91, 94) it is applied, by Shalmaneser III, to a stone
which either is, or resembles exceedingly closely, the finer gypsous lime-
stone of the Mosul region. It seems likely therefore that Sennacherib's
Ammanana stone somewhat resembled the Balatai stone, though evidently
superior; it may have been a true marble, an alabaster, or a good gypsous
limestone. Once burnt, however, it became indistinguishable from, and
II, H

perhaps chemically identical with, ordinary Mosul marble. Layard will then have found colossi and orthostats of both materials, and assumed that they were all the same. 

6. The last section of Sennacherib's building inscription (OIP II, 108) deals mainly with the orthostats and the colossi. The orthostats are treated summarily, though we know from Layard and Thompson that virtually every room, court, and corridor contained them, and that the great majority were carved with scenes of military triumph. The monolithic salaam of line 65 were probably the figures of genies holding lions, which stood between the bulls on the facades of room I (NB, 137) and the room south-west of LIV (Thompson 1929, 61). The animal colossi were listed in greater detail. There were in the end twelve bronze lions, eight of which must have belonged to the original bit hilani and none of which survive. There were also, in bronze, twelve examples of the beast whose name is transliterated by Landsberger as aladlammu (ZA XXXVII, 219; of CAD), and twenty-two of the beast transliterated as apsasatu. Again none survive, though plinths on either side of the south door in room XXXIII (NB, 460) might have supported metal colossi. There were also, however, unnumbered stone aladlamme and apsasate, some of the latter employed as column-bases; both these kinds of beast have been found.

7. The aladlammu is certainly the winged human-headed bull such as is represented, with explanatory captions, on reliefs from court VI (NB, 106; OIP II, 126). Examples were found in the facade and most doors of room I (NB II, 126; NB, 135), in the central doors on each side of court VI (NB, 71, 102, 229), in the south and west central doors of court XIX
and in the central doors of rooms XXXIV and XXXVI (NB, 442, 445), in the
door in the west corner of court LX (NB, 460), and on the facade of the
room south-west of room LIV (Thompson 1929, 61). It seems possible,
though most unlikely, that the term aladlammu was also applied to winged
human-headed male lions, if there were any of these in the palace.

8. The **apsasatu**, at least in the neo-Assyrian building texts, is the
sphinx: a winged lioness with a female human head. Landsberger (ZA
XXXVII, 219) regards it as female human-headed winged bull, an animal to
which he later (1934, 88) gives the name of sphinx, while referring back
to ZA XXXVII; the correct translation is tentatively suggested in CAD.
It is proved by the text on the back of the "winged lions" or "sphinxes"
in the north door of room XXXIII (QIP II, 127; NB, 446, 459). Other
"winged lions", presumably human-headed, and "human-headed lions",
presumably winged, were found in the door-jambs of the main entrances to
rooms XXII (NB, 230), XXVII (NB, 442), and LXV (NB, 584); probably they
were all **apsasatu**. "Four lion sphinxes" apparently forming an entrance
(NR II, 137) in the south-west corner of court H may represent a pair of
**apsasatu** column-bases. Another example of an **apsasatu** column-base is a
model found in the palace by Smith (1875, plate opposite p. 174), showing
a winged beast with a female human head; Smith describes it as a bull,
but there are no bull's ears on the helmet, and the feet, which are mis-
sing, must therefore be restored as the claws of a lion. A clearer pic-
ture of Sennacherib's **apsasatu** column-bases may be obtained by comparing
those set up by Esarhaddon in the south-west palace at Kalhu (TP3, pls.
CVIII-CXI).
9. "To the north of the ruins, on the same level" (NB, 589), probably on the edge of the ravine which now cuts through the outer court of the palace, Layard found four column-bases on a limestone pavement. The bases did not represent animals, but were round, with surface patterning. Sennacherib does not mention column-bases of this type in this building, but he did erect what may have been a similar structure in the courtyard of the Arsenal (OTP II, 133); it stood on a platform (kigallu), and consisted of four bronze columns, with tin capitals (?) (šēš-ša-šu-nu), supporting a roof of cedar overlaid with silver.

10. A later king to work in Sennacherib's palace was Ashurbanipal. The slabs already set up in room XXXIII were carved by him with a series of pictures showing his campaign against Elam and Gambulu in 653 (see below, VIII, P ). The same series appeared in room I of Ashurbanipal's own palace (Iraq XXVI, 6), but in a more stereotyped form, with the dead already stripped in the Til Tuba battle scene (Gadd 1936, pl. XXII), and with the addition of a picture of the Susa ziggurat (Gadd 1936, pl. XXVIII) which could hardly have been made before the Assyrians entered and sacked Susa in 647 or 646. Hrouda (1965, 116) also argues that the room XXXIII reliefs are the earlier, because of a detail in the soldiers' boots. Since Ashurbanipal's palace was built between about 646 or 645 and 640, the changes in room XXXIII should have been made around 650.

11. Another room which had been altered is XXII (NB, 230). An oddity of the slabs in this room is that they had been carved on the back, and Layard believed that the hidden carvings were in the style of Sennacherib, though it is conceivable that they were among the slabs looted from Dur-
Sharrukin (see below, IV,F,2). Layard suggests that the slabs were turned to face the wall after an error had been made in the carving, but this is improbable, as elsewhere the standard procedure was to erase the faulty carving; the best example of this being done by Sennacherib's own craftsmen is on a slab (S. Smith 1938, pl. XLII) in which a group of soldiers, carved on too low a level, has been replaced by duplicates above. Erasure was also the normal practice when recarving other series of slabs in the palace, as discussed below, and it is possible therefore that room XXII had been more substantially changed, with the groundplan altered as well as the slabs; if so it would have been natural to put the old carvings face to the wall. It may be relevant that the colossi in the main door of room XXII were of coarse limestone, a material not otherwise employed by Sennacherib for sculptured decoration; perhaps these colossi too are late. In any event the carvings visible in room XXII after the alterations date to the reign of Ashurbanipal or later. Unger (RLW, VIII, 330) has suggested that the presence of a camel in the triumphal procession which the series depicts, together with a number of people in feathered crowns (MN II, pl. XLIV; Iraq XXIX, 43), indicates that the subject is a celebration following the victories over both Arabs and Elamites, and this may be correct; a date around 640 would be suitable for this event. 12. Slabs in Sennacherib's palace from which the sculptures had been erased were found by Layard in corridor XLII, on the south wall of room XLIX, on either side of the door in room XIV, and in court H (NB, 342, 104, 73; NR II, 137). The work was done methodically, clearly by an Assyrian
monarch. Some of the court H slabs have now been re-excavated, and have traces of a marsh scene at their foot; the carvings which replaced the marsh scene in court H are not visible, but those available in Layard's drawings represent Elamites; other fragments probably from court H show Assyrian soldiers in the uniform worn in Ashurbanipal's reign. The process of recarving is best shown on another slab, of uncertain provenance (Iraq XXIX, 42); this contains, on the left, a marsh dating from Sennacherib, and on the right a fight between a Babylonian and an Assyrian soldier who is, again, in the uniform of Ashurbanipal's army. The criteria by which sculptures of the two periods may be distinguished were first observed and analysed by Falkner (AFO XVI, 247); Hrouda (1965, 116) adds other details. Falkner was thereby enabled to recognize the two main series of reliefs which had been recarved: those from court XIX and corridor XXVIII. Clearly this scheme of redecoration was not completed; reconstruction of which carvings were preserved in Ashurbanipal's new buildings there were two gangs of workmen, one erasing the slabs and the other to Sennacherib (Assyriology 1937, 96); it is not stated recarving them, and the second gang never succeeded in catching up. Falkner and Hrouda regard all these recarved sculptures as indistinguishable from those in Ashurbanipal's palace, and therefore date them born, grew up, and ruled there. It is not certain if the same building to Ashurbanipal's reign. This is most probably true of those in room XXII, but in that instance the technique used to dispose of the old carvings was not erasure; the recarving there may have involved rebuilding. The enemies shown on the recarved slabs from court H were Elamites; those in court XIX, corridor XXVIII, and in the slab without a provenance, were all inhabitants of Babylonia. The presence of Elamites suggests that the attribution to Ashurbanipal is probably correct, and it is supported by
monarch. Some of the court H slabs have now been re-excavated, and have traces of a marsh scene at their foot; the carvings which replaced the marsh scene in court H are not visible, but those available in Layard's drawings represent Elamites; other fragments probably from court H show Assyrian soldiers in the uniform worn in Ashurbanipal's reign. The process of recarving is best shown on another slab, of uncertain provenance (Iraq XXIX, 42); this contains, on the left, a marsh dating from Sennacherib, and on the right a fight between a Babylonian and an Assyrian soldier who is, again, in the uniform of Ashurbanipal's army. The criteria by which sculptures of the two periods may be distinguished were first observed and analysed by Falkner (AFO XVI, 247); Hrouda (1965, 116) adds other details. Falkner was thereby enabled to recognize the two main series of reliefs which had been recarved: those from court XIX and corridor XXVIII. Clearly this scheme of redecoration was not completed: reconstruction of which is described in Ashurbanipal's building inscriptions there were two gangs of workmen, one erasing the slabs and the other recarving them, and the second gang never succeeded in catching up.

Falkner and Hrouda regard all these recarved sculptures as indistinguishable from those in Ashurbanipal's palace, and therefore date them to Ashurbanipal's reign. This is most probably true of those in room XXII, but in that instance the technique used to dispose of the old carvings was not erasure; the recarving there may have involved rebuilding. The enemies shown on the recarved slabs from court H were Elamites; those in court XIX, corridor XXVIII, and in the slab without a provenance, were Assyrians. Ashurbanipal's reconstruction is dated to the oppression of all inhabitants of Babylonia. The presence of Elamites suggests that the attribution to Ashurbanipal is probably correct, and it is supported by
the resemblance between the compositions in corridor XXVIII and that in
court J of Ashurbanipal's own palace (Iraq XXVI, 7). It is nonetheless
odd that the scheme of redecoration should have been abandoned. Perhaps
this happened on Ashurbanipal's abdication or death in 630 or 627. An
alternative would be that the slabs were carved by Ashur-etil-ilani or
Sin-shar-ishkun, both of whom fought the Babylonians and perhaps also the
Elamites; if so the work could have been interrupted by the death of
Ashur-etil-ilani or the sack of Nineveh. It is known that Sin-shar-ishkun
(AFO XVI, 305: eponym Nabu-tapput-ali) worked on the west side of a bit
parutu, most probably this palace, built by Sennacherib.

I. Ashurbanipal's Palace

1. This is the north palace on Kuyunjik, the bit Riduti, the original
construction of which is ascribed in Ashurbanipal's building inscriptions
there were no inscriptions. The bit Riduti has been identified by Weidner
to Sennacherib (ARAB II, 321; Aynard 1957, 60). It is also stated
(ARAB II, 291) that Sennacherib had spent his days as crown-prince and
as king in the bit Riduti, and that both Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal were
colons. Other inscriptions were found between room 5 and 6 and have
born, grew up, and ruled there. It is not certain if the same building
is always involved, as the term bit Riduti was tending to acquire an
almost abstract meaning, like "royal house" (e.g. Pfeiffer 1935, 113).

Ceremonial induction into the bit Riduti meant, for an Assyrian prince,
the official acceptance as heir apparent, mar šarrī.

2. Ashurbanipal's reconstruction is dated to the eponymates of Nabu-
shar-ahhe-shu (646 or 645) and Shamash-daninanni (later, before 639).
None of the carved orthostats show events demonstrably later than the latter's eponymate, but building probably continued for some time afterwards, as the Shamash-daninanni text was built into "the centre of the solid wall" (TSBA VII, 57). Ashurbanipal changed the old plan, enlarged north of the outer court of Sennacherib's palace, and probably the entrance (tallaktu), kept the terrace low so as to avoid dominating the neighbourhood of the Ešilaki temple, kept the terrace low so as to avoid dominating the temples to the south, and provided the usual cedar roof and bronze-bound gates. Otherwise his text is uninformative, mentioning only the columns, overlaid with bronze, which supported the doors of the bit hilani.

3. Parts of the centre and west of the palace have been excavated (Loftus in Gadd 1936, Appendix; Rassam 1897, 25, and TSBA VII, with plans; Thompson 1929, 61, plans 5, 6). It was at least 200 m. long, and 100 m. or more wide. Most of the rooms discovered had been decorated with carved orthostats; Rassam (1897, 28) also found paintings fallen in room C, and Rassam (1897, 24) and Smith (1875, 101) both noted glazed bricks. There were no colossi. The bit hilani has been identified by Meissner and Opitz (1939, 11) with rooms V-T-S-W-R-A-D-E and the lost rooms above room S and its vicinity; this is because room S is a gate-chamber with columns. Other column-bases were found between rooms B and P, and have probably to be restored at either end of room M and in the central outer door of room I. Clearly there could have been many more columns in parts of the palace which have not been excavated or which were destroyed before the nineteenth century. We cannot tell which columned structure is the one mentioned in Ashurbanipal's text, and he may even mean that all the columns in his palace were overlaid with silver. If the bit hilani was indeed one specific group of rooms, it may be those resting on a moulded
plinth (Gadd 1936, Appendix, 11, fig. 7) south-west of the inner court J.

J. The bit nakkapti

1. North of the outer court of Sennacherib's palace, and probably in the neighbourhood of the Kidmuri temple, King and Thompson excavated a room or two incorporating sculptures of Sennacherib (Thompson 1929, 65, plan 7; Arch. LXXIX, 135). Inscriptions showed that the remains belonged to the bit nakkapti, built after the Mount Nipur expedition of 697 or 696. A bit nakkapti is a store-house, but what a bit nakkapti may be remains obscure.

K. The Arsenal (Nebi Yunis)

1. The Arsenal (eskalmārti) or Back Palace (bit kutalli) of Nineveh is now buried beneath the shrine of Nebi Yunis and its surrounding houses. The modern mound, which covers some 15 hectares, must owe most of its height to the solidity of the walls and terrace of the Sargonid building, but there had been an earlier arsenal on the site.

2. Ashur-reshe-ishi I (Afohh. XII, 56; EAK, VIII j) restored and redecorated the bit šahurī of the bit ku-t........., which had been damaged by an earthquake in the reign of Ashur-dan I; Weidner restores bit kutalli. This is plausible, as the two known copies of the text reached the British Museum in 1856, after there had been excavations in Nebi Yunis; there are no apparent duplicates among the numerous Ashur-reshe-ishi texts from Kuyunjik. Another king who may have worked on the site is Adad-
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nirari III, one of whose bricks is said to come from this mound (ARAB I, 265); Gadd (1936, 82) believes that this was Shalmaneser III.

3. The arsenal was enlarged and rebuilt on a raised terrace by Sennacherib (OIP II, 128-134), between 691 and 689. It included suites in both the "Hittite" and the Assyrian styles, and was decorated with aladlamme, and with bronze lamassate between apsasatu column-bases at the doors. In the court there was a platform (kigallu), with four columns supporting a roof above it; some such structure appears in Ashurnasirpal II, but a well-guarded area near the entrance would be suitable. Elamite-Elamite carvings (e.g. Hall 1928, pl. XLIII; see above, II, 9).

Later Esarhaddon (AfObh. IX, 59-63; AfO XVIII, 115) made massive alterations, between 676 and 673. He seems to have claimed some of Sennacherib's work for his own, but he clearly added many other colossi, including lions, and decorated the building with orthostats showing military triumphs and with glazed bricks. He added a bit šarrī or bitanu which, if we take the great cubit (ammatu rabitu) as measuring 55 cm. (see above, II, A, 2), was some 52 m. long and 17 m. wide. These are the approximate dimensions of the main Assyrian thronerooms (see below, e.g. VI, H), and he is probably referring to a room of this type.

4. The inhabitants of Nebi Yunis have successfully prevented up to now any thorough investigations in the mound. Gadd (1936, 82, 91) gives an account of what little was found in the last century, most notably parts of a facade with winged bulls and a genie holding a lion. Rassam (1897, 297) mentions glazed bricks from Nebi Yunis, and we have suggested elsewhere (Iraq XXIX, 43) that one piece of narrative sculpture survives. More recently a gate-chamber containing statues looted from Egypt was dug.
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(Sumer X, 110, fig. 1).

L. Palaces in the Outer Town

1. Near the gardens of Nineveh Sennacherib built a palace for his younger son, Ashur-shum-ushabshi (Thompson 1929, 83; Arch. LXXIX, 103, 125). This was partly excavated by Thompson near some gardens or "a locality which might thus be described"; its precise location seems uncertain, but a well-watered area near the Khozar would be suitable. Tiglath-pileser I (AFO XIX, 142) had previously chosen the vicinity of the Khozar meander for the site of a garden palace of his own.

M. The Broken Obelisk

1. Gadd (1936, 123) gives details of how this object was found, and is probably right in saying that it came from the main Ishtar temple in Nineveh. The date of the inscription is uncertain: the most generally accepted view (Brinkman 1968, 383, with references) is that it was written by Ashur-bel-kala, but Weidner (AFO XII, 377; AFOBh. XII, xiii) regards it as probably the work of Tiglath-pileser I, though possibly that of Ashur-bel-kala or Shamshi-Adad IV. Scholars who support Ashur-bel-kala rely on powerful arguments derived from the historical section of the text; the statistics and phraseology in the section on hunting, which argue for Tiglath-pileser, are thought to have been copied from Tiglath-pileser texts. We can deal here only with the public works and buildings which the obelisk mentions (ARAB I, 119, 123).
2. At Ashur it includes the Anu-Adad temple, the Old Palace, the tabira gate, and the town-wall itself; Tiglath-pileser worked on all of these (see above, I, B, 16; I, H, 2; I, M, 10). The author of the obelisk also claims to have completed a palace at Apku which had been left unfinished by Ashur-resh-ishi ("my father" according to Weidner, AfObh. XII, 60); Tiglath-pileser is naturally the more likely candidate for this work. The obelisk also mentions work on the great terrace of Ashurnadin-ahhe; Tiglath-pileser probably worked here while reconstructing the Old Palace, but Ashur-bel-kala (AfO VI, 78) did restore the town-wall adjoining it. Ashur-bel-kala may also be the king responsible for a text (AfO VI, 87) describing work on a gate, built by Puzur-Ashur III, which had been destroyed by floods; though this text was found by the Ishtar temple, it would most easily apply to the Tigris gate at the end of the New Town wall which Puzur-Ashur III built; the Broken Obelisk refers only to the quay-wall by the Tigris gate.

3. These details support the attribution of the Broken Obelisk to Tiglath-pileser, and one would welcome an interpretation of the historical evidence which would allow us to assign the whole text to this king. If this is impossible, Ashur-bel-kala must simply have claimed his father's achievements for his own, just as Tiglath-pileser (ARAB I, 86) appropriated his father's work on the foundations of the Anu-Adad temple.

N. The White Obelisk

1. The original location of this monument is discussed by Gadd (1936,
124); it seems to have stood, in the neo-Assyrian period, between the south-west palace of Sennacherib and the Ishtar temple. There is some dispute about its date.

2. Landsberger (1948, 58) states that, because the obelisk text names an Ashurnasirpal as eponym in the first year of the king who erected it, and because the first campaign described in the text somewhat resembles, despite many differences, the first campaign of Ashurnasirpal II, the obelisk must be Ashurnasirpal II's work. This view has been widely accepted.

3. In fact both Landsberger's arguments were considered and rejected by Unger in his original publication (MAOG VI, heft 1/2), where detailed reasons are given, on historical, epigraphic, stylistic, and iconographic grounds, against dating the obelisk as late as the ninth century; Landsberger answers none of them. Recently Unger has had new support from Moortgat (1969, 124), and it is to be hoped that future scholars will agree with him. The only real question is whether the obelisk is the work of Ashurnasirpal I or of some other king of perhaps the eleventh century; since many kings did hold the eponymate at the start of their reigns, while private citizens seldom used names which had been borne by kings, Ashurnasirpal I must be the most probable author of the text.
CHAPTER III

Kalhu

A. The Town

1. Kalhu, modern Nimrud, lies on the left edge of the Tigris floodplain about 35 km. downstream of Nineveh; the area and its irrigation system are discussed by Oates (1968, 42). It owes its importance to Ashurnasirpal II (ARAB I, 158), who made it in 879 the administrative capital of Assyria, but it has no particular advantages, except in so far as it is surrounded by good farming land and is readily accessible from most parts of the Assyrian heartland. There had been, accordingly, a prehistoric settlement and a Middle Assyrian town, patronized by one of the Shalmanesers (ARAB I, 171: presumably Shalmaneser I), on the site of Ashurnasirpal's citadel, but all this, together with its shrine of Ishtar Kidmuri (ARAB I, 192), is said to have been in ruins by the start of the ninth century. Ashurnasirpal may have seen two further advantages in choosing such a site for his capital: he was giving as little offence as possible to the inhabitants of Ashur, which was inconveniently far south, and he was free to build his own city to his own specifications.

2. The construction of Kalhu extended over four generations, though Ashurnasirpal's successors probably conformed in general to the original plan. Precise dating is seldom feasible; indeed publications of Ashurnasirpal's own texts tend to refer simply to his "standard inscription", without making it clear whether this is a version written before or after his Lebanon campaign, undertaken some time in the period 875-867 (Iraq
When work was complete, the town contained some 360 hectares of land, defended by an approximately square wall. The arsenal stood in the south-east corner of the outer town, and the 20-hectare citadel with the main official buildings adjoined the floodplain in the south-west corner. On the citadel the principal temples were grouped at the north end, with the royal palace to their south overlooking the floodplain. The Nabu temple was close to the south-east corner of the citadel, and there were several other large buildings in town (Iraq XII, 1), and a lesser section of the arsenal at the south-east corner (Iraq XXVII, 119; Brinkman 1968, 390).

3. Tiglath-pileser III later began the construction of a new palace on the citadel, but Sargon II concentrated on his new capital of Dur-Sharrukin. Esarhaddon was responsible for much new building, and it would seem that he intended to make Kalhu once again the administrative capital. His death prevented this, but the town remained important, with the last three Sargonid kings all claiming to have reconstructed the Nabu temple. Finally the town was sacked twice, according to Oates in 614 and 612 (Iraq XXIII, 9); this is plausible, though the civil wars in Assyria between 627 and 623 may perhaps have caused some of the damage.

4. The first serious excavations at Kalhu were conducted by Layard, who found the main palaces and the main temple block; several other archaeologists, sponsored by the British Museum, worked there in the nineteenth century, though none published their discoveries with the same flair. Work on the citadel was continued by Mallowan and Oates; their most important original work was in the outer town. Their preliminary reports in Iraq sometimes include archaeological matter omitted from the
final publication, and have been preferred in the references below.

B. The Walls and Gates

1. The line of the town-wall away from the citadel is everywhere obvious, and clearly represents that founded by Ashurnasirpal II before his Lebanon campaign (ARAB I, 183). A short stretch of its face was cleared near the so-called palace of Ashurbanipal on the south of the town (Iraq XIX, 4), and a longer stretch by the arsenal at the south-east corner (Iraq XXV, 31; Mallowan 1966, II, 374; III, plan VIII). It was found to have been constructed entirely of mudbrick in the first instance. Subsequently Esarhaddon in 676 repaired the wall (Iraq XIII, 197), and added what may have been a šalhu, on stone footings, to the south-west corner of the arsenal (AfObh. IX, 35); the same king was probably responsible, though two phases were detected in the stonework, for continuing this outwork round the most important area of the arsenal to the east. Esarhaddon's work on the arsenal included the reconstruction of a postern gate. Two principal gates can otherwise be seen in the town-wall: one just north of the arsenal, leading eastwards towards Erbil, and another towards Nineveh on the north, the plan of which Layard (NB, 656) tried unsuccessfully to determine.

2. The citadel-wall on the landward side was also of mudbrick. Part of it, near the north-eastern corner, proved to have been at least 15 m. high (Iraq XII, 158); there was an external platform one third of the way up which might, if broad enough, have been a forward defensive parapet,
like that in the Aussenhaken at Ashur (see above, I,B,20). Near the Nabu temple (Iraq XIX, 30) there were signs of later repairs to the wall. The only entrance to have been located with any certainty is just north of the Nabu temple, on the east (Iraq XII, 160; XIV, 3); it incorporated a guard-house, approached from without by a ramp, and a limestone colossus with lion's feet, and bearing a Shalmaneser III inscription of about 855, is still visible on its south side.

3. Investigations on the west of the citadel, by the Tigris plain, showed that the base of the wall had been faced with stone (Iraq XV, 38, fig. 5), and Mallowan gives details of a section cut against the wall-face opposite the north end of Ashurnasirpal's palace. The bottom five courses were rusticated, with reddish clay against the face; Mallowan concluded that these courses were under water, but this is impossible, unless the upper courses of dressed stones were reconstructed later. In fact the lowest of the dressed courses has a slight projection at its foot, and a layer of stone chippings in the section in front; we must therefore regard the clay in front of the rusticated stonework as the fill of a foundation trench, which had been thrown back before the masons began smoothing the exposed face above. If Mallowan is right, as appears probable, in suggesting that the dressed stonework was meant to be visible, he must be wrong in describing this construction as a quay-wall: the Tigris, or one of its off-shoots, can only have been expected to approach the wall during the spring floods at their worst, and there is indeed a layer of red earth, some 60 cm. thick, on top of the stone chippings, which does not seem to be a river deposit. Nonetheless there is above this
1.5 m. of clay, which might have been left by water, and within this there was a further layer of chippings; since it seems unlikely that both layers of chippings were virtually contemporary, the upper layer may derive from Assyrian repairs to the stonework above or from the stone-robbers who left another pile of chippings on top of the surviving structure. The latter solution may be preferable, in which case the Tigris, or its off-shoot, will have washed the citadel in a period long after the fall of Kalhu. The course of stonework immediately above the clay layer was heavily eroded, perhaps by undercurrents and perhaps, as Mallowan suggests, by wind. The debris above consisted of earth washed down from the citadel, and it is likely that some others belonged to them, as the citadel.

4. This account of the wall's history is not supported by Tiglath-pileser III (ARAB I, 288), who claims to have reclaimed additional land for his own citadel palace by building in the Tigris, but he may have meant the Tigris flood-plain. It is even possible that the stonework in question was erected by Tiglath-pileser, but Mallowan observes (Iraq XVI, 111) that it stretched "the full length of the mound on its western side"; this should mean that it enclosed the site of Esarhaddon's palace also, and it is most probably Esarhaddon's work. An older stone face, which we may ascribe to Ashurnasirpal, was found behind and below the rubble core of the wall in a position opposite the inner court of the palace of Ashurnasirpal (Iraq XVI, 111, pls. XIII, XVI); Ashurnasirpal's stonework is comparable in scale with that in the foundations of his quay-wall at Ashur (WDOG XXIII, 85, Taf. XII, 1), though there the superstructure was of baked bricks.
C. The Main Temple Complex

1. Ashurnasirpal II (Iraq XIV, 30) built or planned to build nine shrines at Kalhu: joint shrines for Enlil and Minurta, Adad and Shala, and Ea and Damsina, and individual shrines for Gula, Sin, Nabu, Belit Mati, the Sibitti, and Ishtar Kidmuri. We know that the Nabu temple was in the south-east of the citadel (see below, III,D), and perhaps the Sibitti shrine, like that at Dur-Sharrukin (see below, IV,E), stood in isolation. Three or perhaps four of the remainder, however, have been located in what could be a single building complex at the north end of the citadel, and it is likely that some others belonged with them, as did the ziggurat.

2. The ziggurat itself was at the north-western corner of the citadel, and was some 60 m. square; it was constructed by Shalmaneser III rather than Ashurnasirpal (ARAB I, 252; ARF XVIII, 313). It was investigated by Layard (NB, 123, plan 2), who found it to be the only known ziggurat with a room inside; the purpose of this is unknown. The ziggurat was faced with stone below and baked bricks above, and G. Smith (1875, 75) believed that he had found traces of a staircase on the southern face; this might have been constructed above the corridor, projecting from the middle of the south face behind the Minurta shrine, which Mallowan excavated (Iraq XIX, pl. VII), in which case it would have been approached by wall. Layard (NB, 269) found that it had platforms faced with glazed bricks on either side of the entrance, colossal lions in the doorway, painted walls above, and the usual fittings. This also was built by Layard found simple decorative niches and one half-column in the stone-work.
3. South-east of the ziggurat Layard (NB, 348, plan 2) and Mallowan (Iraq XIX, 49, pl. VII) cleared a complex of rooms of which the most important was the Ninurta shrine. This was a long room entered at one end through an ante-chamber facing a courtyard to the east; it was elaborately decorated, with glazed bricks facing the platforms on either side of the main courtyard door, colossi and genies in stone at the main entrances, and paintings in the ante-chamber. A side-room to the north, connected with both ante-chamber and shrine, had further genies at its courtyard door, and a stela of Ashurnasirpal outside; an independent room to the south, later blocked up, had a niche in its back wall facing the court, and may have been a subsidiary shrine, perhaps that of Enlil, as small shrines in the equivalent position were also found at Dur-Sharrukin (see below, IV,C,2). Room 6 in the complex further south dug by Mallowan had also been blocked off, and had a niche in one back wall; it could have been another of Ashurnasirpal's shrines, and it may be that the entrances to some of these were blocked when Sargon II moved his capital to Dur-Sharrukin. The Ninurta shrine itself had Ashurnasirpal's inscriptions on its walls, and probably all the other rooms should be ascribed to this king.

4. The courtyard east of the Ninurta shrine clearly had the shrine of Belit Mati on its north side; this was entered through a door in one long wall. Layard (NB, 359) found that it had platforms faced with glazed bricks on either side of the entrance, colossal lions in the doorway, painted walls within, and the usual fittings. This also was built by Ashurnasirpal, who erected a statue of himself inside.
5. Air photographs show that the great pit in which Rassam (TSBA VII, plan opposite p. 57; ARAB I, 191-194; Gadd 1936, 130) found the remains of the shrine of Ishtar Kidmuri, had its centre about 100 m. south-east of the shrine of Belit Mati. While the plan does not show mudbrick features such as walls, it is possible to deduce, from the positions of the stones, that Rassam identified the altar correctly, and that this was located at the west end of a room entered, from the north, through a door which had a stone door-slab and the normal stone podium, Rassam's "pillars", on either side outside. The interior (Rassam 1897, 225) was decorated with "beautiful enamelled tiles", "smashed and scattered" when they were excavated. Rassam gathered six baskets' full, but could not put one together: "from all I could make out, each tile was shaped like a Maltese cross, with a knob in the centre bored through for the purpose of hanging a lamp". There can be little doubt that these were in fact lozenge-shaped glazed wall-plaques, like those from the Old Palace at Ashur (see above, I, K, 11), and Rassam's sectarian desire to transform them into Maltese crosses accounts for his inability to reconstruct any. Texts from this shrine too were the work of Ashurnasirpal, and it is quite possible that it opened onto the south-east corner of the same courtyard as that with the shrine of Ninurta at its west end; it is at least likely that it belonged to the same complex of sacred buildings.

6. Mallowan (Iraq XIV, 3), digging apparently just east of the Belit Mati shrine, found two rooms, "probably a temple", which had been "stripped of its contents and packed with mud and mudbrick in antiquity"; this sounding was not continued.
D. The Nabu Temple

1. This building is succinctly discussed by Oates (Iraq XIX, 26).

It occupied an irregular plot of ground, approximately 70 m. square, just south of the east gate into the citadel. The southern half of the temple had twin shrines for Nabu and Tashmetum on its west, facing the inner court on the east; one room opposite the shrines was a library.

The gateway of the inner court was on the north, and opposite it, across an outer court, was the main outer gate of the temple. The north-west corner of the temple complex incorporated two smaller courts, one of which had twin shrines, a smaller pair, on its west side and a residential suite on the north. Oates established that the basic limits of the precinct had been set at an early date, presumably by Ashurnasirpal (Iraq XIV, 31) who claimed to have founded the building. The actual construction of the southern half was the work of Adad-nirari III, to whom Ashurbanipal attributed the foundation (Iraq XXIX, 61), and whose inscriptions were found on a slab from the main shrine and on one of the pairs of genies who flanked the entrances to the inner court and the main shrine. The plan of the northern half of the temple under Adad-nirari is not known, though it was not necessarily much different from what survives. At a later date the external wall behind the main shrines, and the facade of the main outer gate, together probably with much else of the building, this in Ashurbanipal (Iraq XXX, 61; sennacherib), was largely reconstructed. The buildings in the north-west corner were not bonded with the remainder of the temple, but it was not determined whether they were earlier or later than the reconstruction.
2. Oates gives three reasons for assigning the reconstruction to Sargon II, early in his reign before work started on Dur-Sharrukin. The footings of the new walls were built of stone, used by Sargon in his repairs to the palace of Ashurnasirpal. The new facades were decorated with alternating niches and half-columns similar to those at Dur-Sharrukin. The north gate was flanked by a pair of man-fish genies, mermen, such as appear on a bronze band and a sculpture at Dur-Sharrukin. It must be noted, however, that equivalent stone footings are missing at Dur-Sharrukin; Sargon's stonework in the Ashurnasirpal palace may be below ground-level; stonework of this kind is more characteristic of the seventh century, as in the Old Palace at Ashur (WVDG LXVI, 27). Similarly the decoration of temple facades with niches and half-columns is found in the majority of Assyrian temples which were preserved to an adequate height, and was probably a standard feature at most times. The man-fish genie was employed by Sennacherib in his new Ashur temple (see above, I,D,17), and was probably as familiar as the goat-fish genie, which is depicted by a temple facade on a Middle Assyrian seal-impression (Andraez 1938, 111, Abb. 50), throughout neo-Assyrian history; these two examples may have been erected by Adad-nirari III or by any later king.

3. It therefore seems preferable to assign the main reconstruction to the first king after Adad-nirari definitely known to have worked on the building; this is Ashurbanipal (Irae XXIX, 61: eponym Nabu-nadin-ishi, 647 or 646), and it is notable that he does not mention any previous repairs. The buildings in the north-west corner might then be the work of Ashur-etil-ilani, whose Nabu temple bricks were found out of position.
in the debris (Iraq XIX, 11), and Sin-shar-ishkun (Iraq XXVI, 122-124; eponym Daddi; not Esarhaddon, of. JOS XIX, 76). Alternatively we could assign the main reconstruction to Sin-shar-ishkun and the north-west corner to Ashurbanipal, or even regard the north-west corner as part of the original temple. It is unwise in such circumstances to be too precise, but we are reluctant to admit Sargon II as a likely builder when we have a plethora of other definite kings.

4. The dating of the north-west corner of the temple complex after the reign of Esarhaddon should not be taken as refuting the ingenious theory put forward by Oates (Iraq XIX, 34) concerning the function of the smaller pair of twin shrines; equivalent buildings may have existed beforehand. Oates suggests that the movements of Nabu and Tashmetum during annual ceremonies in the reign of Esarhaddon may be explained by reference to this group of buildings. The relevant letters (Pfeiffer 1935, 156) concern the removal of the two gods to the bed-room (bit irši) and the dark shrine of the palace (libbu adru ekalli). The room in the palace would then be earliest, written about 7 (Ass 1, 119), is rather vague. It mentions little more than the bronze sikkate and door-fittings, and the furniture itself. Another, still written before the Lebanon campaign (Ass 1, 150; ASS, 267), lists the varieties of wood used in the different shrines. It is difficult to account for the architecture if this theory is wrong, but one would welcome a clear parallel in some other Nabu temple, or a clear instance, in the texts, of Nabu possessing a palace, ekalli, inside his temple; certainly in the Middle Assyrian period the god Ashur took up occasional residence in the royal palace itself (TAK XX, 11), and a letter from Sennacherib (Ass 1, 17), refers to the glazed bricks at Nabu may have done the same.
E. The Palace of Ashurnasirpal II

1. This is Layard's North-West Palace, on the west side of the citadel just south of the main temple complex; it was over 200 m. long from north to south, and at least 120 m. wide. Major groups of rooms have been examined by Layard (NR, passim), Mallowan (Iraq XII, 160, 176; XIII, 2; XIV, 6; XV, 19; XVI, 66, 94), and Abu es-Soof (Sumer XIX, 66). The main entrance to the palace was clearly from the east, perhaps through a forecourt which has still to be cleared, and led into the great outer court, surrounded by storerooms and offices, at the north of the building. The state apartments, elaborately decorated with carved orthostats, wall-paintings, and glazed bricks, were to the south, round an inner court, and beyond them the palace extended for an indefinite distance round a series of smaller domestic courts. The whole building, so far as we know it, is essentially the work of Ashurnasirpal.

2. The process of its construction can be followed in the texts. The earliest, written about 879 (ARAB I, 175), is rather vague, mentioning little more than the bronze sikkate and door-fittings, and the furniture placed inside. Another, still written before the Lebanon campaign (ARAB I, 186; AKA, 221), lists the varieties of wood used in the different suites, and mentions the apotropaic colossi, "creatures of the mountains and the seas" (umam made u tamat), made of indistinguishable pilu pisu and parutu, (see above II,H,5, and below IV,F,3) at its gates. Finally a commemorative stela, written after the Lebanon campaign and describing the inaugural festivities (Iraq XIV, 30), refers to the glazed bricks at
the doors, and scenes of military narrative drawn in zaginduru which appears to be the blue frit backing colour of the wall paintings.

3. Shalmaneser III (Iraq XIV, 6) was responsible for some repairs and changes, and many eighth-century kings doubtless worked on the upkeep of the building. Sargon II was probably the last monarch to use it as a residence; a text of his, cut into the doorway of room U (Winckler 1889, 170; ARAB II, 138; NR I, 389), states that he rebuilt the juniper suite, presumably in or around room U, and that he opened a bab zigi, whatever this may be, to the left of the door. Mallowan (Iraq XII, 180; XIII, 2) ascribes several new pavements to the same king. Sargon may also have been responsible for mutilating the lower halves of the genies on either side of the throne in room B, slabs 22 and 24; this must have been done when the fittings around the throne were being altered, and it may be that the throne-base was at the same time moved slightly forward away from the facade on the north side of the area. This facade looked south, and wall, into the position in which it was found.

4. After Sargon's move to Dur-Sharrukin the palace seems to have been used largely as a storehouse, gathering dust. Mallowan (Iraq XV, 27) observed that the objects, such as ivories, found in the palace, were normally some 10 cm. or more above the floor; it is also notable that the paint on the feet of the genies on the orthostats is often well-preserved, whereas that above the feet is seldom visible at all. It is even possible, since the palace has not been seriously burnt, that it had lost its roof before the first sack of Kalhu. At some stage many of the orthostats in throneroom B, and in the state apartments west of the inner court, were removed; it is possible that Esarhaddon started this process, but the
only reused slab, found elsewhere, which may tentatively be identified (B 26; *Ira que* XXVII, 130), could have been shifted to the Nabu temple after the first sack of Kalhu. Outside the state apartments Mallowan frequently noted signs of late occupation; much of this may again be dated after the town was sacked.

F. The Palace of Tiglath-pileser III and its Surroundings

1. Falkner (*TP*, 1-7), using published and previously unpublished evidence, discusses the archaeological problems presented by what Layard called the centre palace. This area, in the centre of the mound, incorporated the work of at least four kings, considered below in chronological order. The building, built as having been incorporated into the palace of Tiglath-pileser III, consists of a facade on the north side of the area. This facade looked south, and the remains of one buttress, with sculptures bearing an Ashurnasirpal text, are visible today (*Iraq* XXX, 69). This must have been the eastern buttress. Layard dug a series of painted rooms, the upper 'on the left', with a buttress of a pair, with a central door between them; if we compare the text of Ashurnasirpal III (*ARAB* I, 262; perhaps c. 877), there is a door-dimensions of the surviving figures with those shown on a plan made by Loftus (*TP*, pl. CXXX), it becomes obvious that they are there represented by only the easternmost of the two lines between points A and B; the other, western line must represent the face of the western buttress, the discovery of which is not recorded. Associated with this facade was the "Black Obelisk" of Shalmaneser III, made about 828 (*ARAB* I, 200), which may have stood in front of the central door or the western side-door; a
podium and fragmentary obelisk of Ashurnasirpal II (Gadd 1936, 128), which did stand in front of the eastern side-door; and a statue of a beardless courtier or more probably a woman (Gadd 1936, pl. VIII), conceivably some such figure as Sammuramat, which apparently stood further along the facade to the east. There is no certain record of excavations inside this building, north of the facade, and its function is unknown. It may have been one of the places from which Esarhaddon later collected orthostats for reuse in his palace.

3. South of this facade, perhaps 50 m. away, was a pair of winged bulls set up by Shalmaneser III about 844 (ARAB I, 236); they were in a doorway, facing either west or east. There were carved orthostats north and south of them, and in a room to the east. Layard regarded these bulls as having been incorporated into the palace of Tiglath-pileser III, but this would only be necessary if they really faced east. The function of this building too is unknown.

4. On the west side of the citadel, south of the palace of Ashurnasir-pal, Layard dug a series of painted rooms, the "Upper Chambers", with a text of Adad-nirari III (ARAB I, 262; perhaps c. 800), used as a door-slab. The building was presumably part of a palace, maybe that for which he brought timber from Lebanon (Iraq XXX, 143) though he did build another palace at Nineveh to which this might apply (see above, II, G, 2). The plan appears to be that of a residential suite (Iraq XXX, 143). The paintings included two friezes (NR II, 15; MN I, pls. LXXXVI, LXXXVII); Layard mentions that one was superimposed on the other, but does not say which was which. Simple Assyrian friezes such as these cannot be dated
precisely, but we may guess that the kneeling bulls with tufts of hair represented as volutes in the ninth-century style are earlier, and that those with a colour-scheme reminiscent of paintings at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, pl. XO) are later. That Adad-nirari's originals should have been overpainted by Tiglath-pileser III accords with the fact that Tiglath-pileser's palace (ARAB I, 285) extended to the edge of the Tigris floodplain. Since the "Upper Chambers" virtually cut off the Centre Palace from the floodplain, it is natural to suppose that they were actually incorporated into it.

5. This is confirmed by the positioning of another group of rooms, dug by Loftus (TP2, pl. CXXX), which appear to join the "Upper Chambers" and which complete the barrier. These indeed are accepted by Falkner as part of Tiglath-pileser's palace. They included some winged bulls, probably forming a gateway to the south, and other fragments of bulls and colossal figures in yellow limestone; some of the latter, courtiers, are still visible on the north side of the ravine between the "Upper Chambers" area and the palace of Esarhaddon to the south. It is naturally possible that these sculptures were the work of Adad-nirari, but it seems simpler to ascribe them, like other sculptures from the Centre Palace, to Tiglath-pileser.

6. The southern limits of Tiglath-pileser's palace cannot be defined. It may have covered part of the site later occupied by the palace of Esarhaddon. G. Smith (1875, 80) found that buildings between Esarhaddon's palace and the south-east corner of the citadel were "totally destroyed. Fragments of elaborate carved pavements, wall plaster with paintings in
the Egyptian style, portions of winged bulls and sculpture, were all that turned up: these features suggest a palace, but it may have been Esarhaddon's rather than Tiglath-pileser's, or some otherwise unknown edifice on the east side of the southern Nimrud ravine, where someone has certainly attempted to excavate.

7. We are left with an area at least 80 m. square in the centre of the citadel. This is likely to have contained the majority of the sculptured state apartments of Tiglath-pileser's palace. No architectural plan survives, but there is no shortage of orthostats. These again are fully discussed by Falkner (TP3, passim). Few if any were found in position, and their sequence has had to be reconstructed; errors in the published sequence, which were imposed by Barnett on Falkner's text, have been explained elsewhere (Iraq XXX, 70). The chaos was originally caused by Esarhaddon, who removed slabs from Tiglath-pileser's palace for reuse in his own. We should incidentally note the existence in the British Museum, of some copies of paintings, from the Centre Palace, which were for some reason omitted from the publication.

8. We know more of Tiglath-pileser's palace from the inscriptions. The earliest slab likely to originate in the palace (AIAB I, 280) probably left his name on the back of its tablet (AIAB III, 197). This inscription was presumably 731; it has even been dated to 743 (Brinkman 1968, 229), but includes references to Ulluba and Mount Nal which are unlikely to have started on the palace about the same time. He never finished it, and been written before 739 or 736. The rest of the palace texts can be assigned definitely or provisionally to 729 or early 728, by which time the building must have been almost complete. Some of the orthostats, however, were left without an inscription between the registers of carving.
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(TP3, pl. CXXVIII-CXXIX), and this suggests that work was still proceeding on the king's death in 727.

9. One detailed description exists (Rost 1893, 74; ARAB I, 288). The palace included a bit hitlanni like a "Hittite" palace, obviously a columned bit hitlanni, and a rich admanu ūṣṣi, some type of inner room; four suites and four gates were given specific names. Otherwise there were the standard expensive doors, ceilings, and sikkate. The sculptures included lions (neše) and human-headed winged bulls (šedu lamasse), the head of one of which is in London (TP3, pl. CVII). There were also salam abni massar šut ili rabuti binut apsi (CAD, binutu: "stone statues of fishmen, the guardians of the gods"). The name of binut apsi was applied in fact (AAA XXII, 46) to several types of genies other than "fishmen" or genies in fish-cloaks; two examples of genies survive (TP3, pls. CIV-CVI).

G. The Palace of Esarhaddon

This building, Layard's South-West Palace, occupied the south-west corner of the citadel, and was probably intended to be at least 120 m. square. No Esarhaddon prism mentioning it has yet been found, but he left his name on the back of its colossi (NR II, 197). Esarhaddon was reconstructing the Kalhu arsenal about 672 (AfObh. IX, 35), and may have started on the palace about the same time. He never finished it, and little of the plan has been recovered. Full information on the building, derived from the various dig-reports, is given by Falkner (TP3, 20, pl. OXXX), and only two points need be made here.
2. Falkner (TP3, 23) does not mention that, between the bulls flanking entrance b in the southern group of rooms, "were a pair of double sphinxes - two sphinxes, resembling those already described, being united, and forming one pedestal" (NR II, 26). The sphinxes in this suite are our best examples of the Assyrian apasate (see above, II,H,8). The suite itself is clearly to be reconstructed with a back wall behind walls a and b; it must resemble the suites on the south and west sides of court XIX in Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh.

3. Esarhaddon panelled the walls with orthostats taken from the palace of Tiglath-pileser III and, so it is always stated, the palace of Ashurnasirpal II. Layard did find, in Esarhaddon's building, many orthostats which were indistinguishable from those in Ashurnasirpal's palace, and it is certain that many slabs from the west side of Ashurnasirpal's inner court were removed in antiquity. It would have been more convenient for Esarhaddon, however, to collect slabs from buildings nearer his own palace; just north of Tiglath-pileser's palace there is in fact the sculptured facade of an Ashurnasirpal building (see above, III,F,2), and it may be that this was a major source of the slabs which Esarhaddon reused.

H. The Arsenal (Tulul el Azar)

1. This building, the akal mağarti or "Fort Shalmaneser", occupied an area of some 30 hectares at the south-east corner of town. The principal building within the enclosure, again at the south-east corner, was
basically 300 m. long from north to south, and 200 m. wide; this has largely been excavated, and there are detailed preliminary reports by Oates (Iraq XXI, 98; XXIII, 1; XXIV, 1; XXV, 6; Mallowan 1966, 456, plan VIII). He discusses the many changes undergone by the building during the two and half centuries for which it remained in use, and little repetition is required here.

2. The earliest tablet, found in SW 6 near the place where it was probably first filed, is dated to 857 (Iraq XXI, 104); it deals with wine, and survived perhaps because the wine office was later moved to NE 48-49 (Iraq XXIV, 20). It is likely therefore that work on the arsenal was under way by at the latest 860. Inscriptions of Shalmaneser III from the S and T areas of the building, further south, date to 846-844 (Iraq XXI, 126; XXV, 11), by which time the original plan may have been virtually complete. There were, however, bricks of Adad-nirari III in the earliest pavements of rooms S 35 and NW 3 (Iraq XXIII, 7; XXIV, 18); these rooms might be original, but the ground-plan suggests that they were in fact alterations. The structure was probably neglected after the royal move to Dur-Sharrukin, but Esarhaddon undertook extensive renovations. This king's earliest Kalhu text (Iraq XXIII, 176), dated 676, mentions repairs to the wall, the gates, and the desolate buildings of the town; copies were found in the house of the rab ekalli in the arsenal, where they may have been stored during repair-work in 613, and need not apply specifically, if at all, to the ekal mašarti which is first named in texts of 672 (AfObh. IX, 35; Iraq XXIV, 116). Subsequently the arsenal was sacked and sacked again (Iraq XXIII, 9), in 614 (?), 612, and later;
many texts show that until these sacks it had remained an official build-
ing, with a rab ekalli, ṣakintu, and doubtless other officials in charge.

3. The arsenal contained both glazed bricks and wall-paintings.

Most of the bricks (Iraq XXV, 30), which decorated the outside of the
throne-room suite, can be dated certainly to Shalmaneser III. A small
group, tiles rather than bricks, most of which were found by Layard (NE,
165, AN II, pls. LIII-LV), show Assyrian soldiers in seventh-century
uniform campaigning in Egypt, and can be assigned with equal certainty
to Esarhaddon; Layard found them built into a pavement, whose whereabouts
is unknown, though part of one similar tile was found in 1962 in the fill
of the south doorway of T 25. There are also paintings which can be
securely dated to the same two kings. Shalmaneser's work is represented
by two fragments of wall-plaster discovered underneath the throne-base in
T 1 (Iraq XXV, 28); they are typically ninth century work, and show a
royal review-scene and a hexagonal geometric pattern, both on a blue
ground. Esarhaddon must be responsible for the fragmentary paintings
in R 7, a room which he rebuilt; these were on a white ground, and incor-
porated an elaborate frieze with, underneath, a procession of courtiers
and a wheeled vehicle with a lion's tail hanging from it, the subject
doubtless being a return from the hunt. It is probable that we should
also attribute the paintings in S 5 to Esarhaddon (Iraq XXI, 117, pls.
XXVIII, XXIX); they are on a white ground, and are surmounted by a
frieze with the late lotus and bud motif; the courtiers in the procession
below are given long loose ninth-eighth-century hair in the restored draw-
ing, but the photograph suggests that/bundle of hair behind the neck was
really squared, in the Sargonid style. T 27, on the other hand (Iraq XXV, 29), had paintings on a blue ground with a very simple frieze above; the subject-matter of the paintings themselves suits the ninth century best, and it may be that the simple frieze and the blue ground are characteristic in this building, and to some extent elsewhere, of ninth-century work. If so, the remaining paintings in the arsenal, at least those which incorporate large-scale figures, may be dated by these criteria, and our conclusions thus far coincide entirely with those of the excavator. The one real problem arises in T 1, where lozenge shapes, belonging to a frieze, were visible, possibly incised, on the white wall-plaster; the wall-plaster of this room, where investigated, showed no signs of ever having been painted blue, despite the presence of paintings on a blue ground below the throne-base. The best explanation for this may be that Esarhaddon completely renewed the wall-plaster, but never completed his new paintings. Some support for this view may be found in the two postholes in front of the throne-base; it is difficult to accept Oates' opinion (Iraq XXV, 9) that these were the bases of pillars holding up the roof, and it may be that they were associated with a canopy round the throne. If so the throne-base may have originally been placed slightly further to the south, on the main axis of the room, and would have been moved to the position in which it was actually found at the same time as Shalmaneser's wall-paintings were being scraped away.

The implications of the arsenal ground-plan are also discussed by Oates in his reports. It is essentially divisible, like other Assyrian public buildings, into two sections. The outer area includes not one
really squared, in the Sargonid style. T 27, on the other hand (Iraq XXV, 29), had paintings on a blue ground with a very simple frieze above; the subject-matter of the paintings themselves suits the ninth century best, and it may be that the simple frieze and the blue ground are characteristic in this building, and to some extent elsewhere, of ninth-century work. If so, the remaining paintings in the arsenal, at least those which incorporate large-scale figures, may be dated by these criteria, and our conclusions thus far coincide entirely with those of the excavator. The one real problem arises in T 1, where lozenge shapes, belonging to a frieze, were visible, possibly incised, on the white wall-plaster; the wall-plaster of this room, where investigated, showed no signs of ever having been painted blue, despite the presence of paintings on a blue ground below the throne-base. The best explanation for this may be that Esarhaddon completely renewed the wall-plaster, but never completed his new paintings. Some support for this view may be found in the two post-holes in front of the throne-base; it is difficult to accept Oates' 1. Excavations at Khilu, and at Dur-Sharrukin, have exposed some other opinion (Iraq XXV, 9) that these were the bases of pillars holding up the buildings whose official status is uncertain. They are palaces, in the roof, and it may be that they were associated with a canopy round the Italian sense, but may have been privately owned. For convenience we throne. If so the throne-base may have originally been placed slightly further to the south, on the main axis of the room, and would have been The "Governor's palace" (Iraq XII, 193, pl. XXVI) lay north-west moved to the position in which it was actually found at the same time as Shalmaneser's wall-paintings were being scraped away.

The implications of the arsenal ground-plan are also discussed by Oates in his reports. It is essentially divisible, like other Assyrian inner court with residential suites and offices around it, the building public buildings, into two sections. The outer area includes not one
but four courtyard units (NE, NW, SE, SW), one of which was largely filled with magazines; rooms which could be identified included barracks, stores, and workshops, and there were gates leading out to the north and west.

On the south of the building was a group of state apartments (T), and many lesser residential suites (S). At the south-west corner of the complex was a projection (R), leading to a postern-gate on the south and a gate into the enclosure on the north; this existed in the ninth century, but was extended and improved by Esarhaddon (Mallowan 1966, 466). Above the gates was a massive construction probably approached by a staircase from the east, R 10, and possibly by another from outside on the west; this remarkable building had rooms on top, but no proper attempt was made to examine them; they may have comprised the ekallu to which Esarhaddon's text, written on the walls of the postern-gate through R 1, does refer.

I. Other "Palaces"

1. Excavations at Kalhu, and at Dur-Sharrukin, have exposed some other buildings whose official status is uncertain. They are palaces, in the Italian sense, but may have been privately owned. For convenience we list the six Kalhu examples at once.

2. The "Governor's Palace" (Iraq XII, 163, pl. XXVI) lay north-west of the Nabu temple, on the far side of the street leading up from the citadel east gate; the same street may have turned northwards along its west edge. The area dug was about 50 m. square, and consisted of an inner court with residential suites and offices around it; the building

"Governor's Palace" to the palace of Ashurnasirpal and the east gate of the citadel; its west
certainly extended eastwards, where the outer court and the main entrance were probably situated. The principal rooms were painted with geometrical patterns, in one instance framing holes in the plaster where metal sikkate may have originally been inserted. Tablets (Iraq XII, 184; XIII, 102) showed that the building had been occupied by a series of district officials for the Kalhu region. The earliest text was dated to 808, and Mallowan therefore originally attributed its foundation to Adad-nirari III; it seems safer to regard it as the work primarily of Shalmaneser III, whose baked bricks were in position in many of the pavements. The building was damaged by fire some time after 710, perhaps in 614; there were several phases of reconstruction, some probably post-Assyrian.

The "1950" building (Iraq XII, 174, pl. XXVI) lay midway between the palace of Ashurnasirpal and the east edge of the citadel; its west wall may have bordered the street leading north from the west side of the "Governor's Palace" to the palace of Ashurnasirpal and the main temple complex. Excavations showed that it had been a substantial building, clearly over 65 m. long from north to south, and extending an unknown distance eastwards towards the citadel wall. It was partly decorated with "the usual type of geometric frescoes", probably like those in the "Governor's Palace", but nothing constructive can be deduced from the meagre ground-plan available; Mallowan's statement that it contained a liwan is hard to accept. A courtyard was paved with "reused bricks of Shalmaneser III", in whose reign it may have been constructed.

4. The "Burnt Palace" (Iraq XIV, 15; XV, 5; XVI, 70, pl. XI;
XVIII, 22) lay to the west of the Nabu temple, from which it was separated by a narrow lane; its north end probably adjoined the street at the southwest corner of the "Governor's Palace". If its western limits have been correctly identified, as seems probable, the ground-plan is almost complete; the building was some 80 m. long from north to south, and generally about 30 m. wide. There is an inner residential court at the north end, and a larger outer court, with the main reception suite, on the south; the entrance was through a corridor at the south-west corner. We must, however, note the possibility that there was a further series of courts to the west, incorporating such features as the throneroom suite normal in buildings of any size. The ground-plan, as described, belongs to the phase F, or 2 A, building, which was approximately contemporary with the renewed facade of the Nabu temple to the east (Iraq XVIII, 32); we have ascribed the latter to the reign of Ashurbanipal (see above, III,D,3), and though some fragments of Sargon's correspondence were found in somewhat disturbed debris in the reception suite (Iraq XIV, 16), the "Burnt Palace" could also be seventh-century. It is possible that the preceding phase E building, which was roughly contemporary with Adad-nirari's Nabu temple, had much the same plan (Iraq XVIII, 30); the still earlier phase D, which underlay the Nabu temple, cannot be securely dated in the ninth century. The phase F building was severely damaged by fire, presumably in 614, but some stripes of paint were visible on its walls (Iraq XVI, 81); more elaborate patterns on fallen plaster may have derived from phase E or F. This building contained no stamped bricks in position.

5. The building south of the Nabu temple (Iraq XX, 109, pl. XV) is
relatively unknown; it was separated from the temple by a narrow passage, but seems to have adjoined the citadel-wall on the east; it may also have reached the citadel-wall on the south, where Smith (1875, 76) found some simply painted rooms probably belonging to it, and possibly its west wall was aligned with that of the Nabu temple; if so it would have been some 80 m. square. One group of rooms dug belonged to a reception or residential suite. Smith found drains of Shalmaneser III in the area, and Oates noted bricks of the exceptionally small size used by Ashur-etil-ilani. Oates' conclusion that the building was originally constructed by Shalmaneser and rebuilt in parts by Ashur-etil-ilani is clearly right.

6. The town-wall "Palace of Adad-nirari III" (Iraq XVI, 153, pl. X, XXXV) was situated near the north-west corner of the outer town. The fragmentary plan is obscure, and its size cannot be judged, though we may reconstruct an inner court west of the reception room 11. The most notable feature of the building was its decoration, consisting of stylized painted friezes. A pavement of Adad-nirari bricks gave a reliable date for the foundation; no clearly neo-Assyrian reconstruction was observed.

7. The town-wall "Palace of Ashurbanipal" (Iraq XIX, 21, pl. X) lay on the south side of the outer town between the citadel and the arsenal. A complex of rooms, altogether 60 m. wide and, from north to south, 70 m. long, was partially cleared; we must add also an outer court on the north, where Mallowan found traces of walls 40 m. away. Several late partitions were identified within the building, and there must have been another blocking a door in the south wall of room 10. In this case the building had a standard throneroom suite leading from the outer to the inner court,
and an unusually elaborate system of reception and residential rooms, some of them simply painted, to the south and east. Mallowan found a figurine with an Ashurbanipal inscription under the floor of an earlier building to one side, and concluded that he was dealing with a late seventh-century complex; the figurine might, however, have been buried long after the buildings were complete. While this building cannot be definitely dated from its ground-plan alone, the absence of a bathroom adjoining the throne room is likely to be a pre-Sargonid feature, and the natural assumption is that this was a building constructed while Kalhu was capital of Assyria, and that it was subdivided in the seventh century.

8. The scale of all these buildings, and their decorative features, are intermediate between those of the royal palaces proper and the private houses of ordinary citizens such as have been dug at Kalhu itself (Iraq XVI, 129, pl. XXVIII) and at Ashur (VWDOC LXIV, passim). Clearly they were occupied by grandees some or all of whom may have held official court positions, but we do not know who built the "palaces" and who owned them. It would be satisfactory to be able to use royal bricks as a sign of royal ownership, but Loud (OIP XL, 14) points out that every comparable house, inside and outside the citadel, at Dur-Sharrukin, including one of exceptional size built and occupied by Sinahusur, the king's brother, incorporated royal bricks in its construction; he therefore suggests that nobles could sometimes acquire surplus stocks. The "Burnt Palace" at Kalhu, on the other hand, contained fragments of the royal correspondence, but no royal bricks at all. Obviously there were small palaces, such as
those built by Sennacherib for his sons (see above, I,P; II,L), with which the king was connected, but we cannot tell, even with the "Governor's Palace", whether it was a perquisite of the district governor or whether the officials who used it all belonged to one family. Conceivably we should regard minor palaces built with royal bricks, and perhaps some built without them, as held by nobles under some kind of conditional tenure; but there is no prospect of disentangling such questions of ownership and inheritance until we have a much more intimate knowledge of Assyria's economy and social structure.
A. The Town

1. This city, modern Khorsabad, lies at the foot of Jebel Maghlub, some 20 km. north-north-east of Nineveh, on the road, through Sheikhan or 'Ain Sifni, which now continues directly to Amadiya. This is a position with nothing particular to recommend it, and must have been chosen by Sargon II (Sharrukin) as the site of his new capital for the same kind of reasons as led Ashurnasirpal to the choice of Kalhu, Sargon (ARAB II, 63) mentions that a settlement, Magganubba, already existed there; this is not to Sanjiterate Layard, much of whose work rests unpublished; this may have been the nearest substantial village, the equivalent of Fadhiliya or Tepe Gawra, or a hamlet which was entirely buried beneath the platforms of the palace and the arsenal (OIP XL, 54). Most of the land in the town had been farmed, and Sargon expropriated it.

2. The walls of Dur-Sharrukin, approximately rectangular in plan, enclose an area of some 300 hectares, with a citadel of over 20 hectares on the north-west side. The citadel includes the royal palace, the main temple complex, the Nabu temple, and about five other buildings. In the outer town we know the arsenal in the south corner, the Sibitti temple, and some other remains; there were of course many more (OIP XL, 75).

3. The eponym canon (RIA II, 433) suggests that work may have started in 717, and there were inaugural ceremonies in 706; building texts (ARAB II, 1-68) confirm the latter date. Sargon died in 705 and Sennacherib...
called a halt; the simplest demonstration that work was still proceeding was found at the north-west town-gate (OIP XXXVIII, 10), where the doorposts had never been erected and the gateway itself was blocked. The town retained some importance, as its governors held the eponymate in 672 and 664, but there are no traces of any serious renovations in the official buildings; orthostats from the palace itself were indeed removed, presumably by the Sargonid kings (see below, IV,F,2). The town therefore is essentially a one-period site, and few problems arise.

4. This is one reason for the brevity of the remarks that follow; the other, worth emphasis, is that Dur-Sharrukin has been fortunate in its excavators. The nineteenth-century French work on the site was superb; this is not to denigrate Layard, much of whose work rests unpublished in London, or Andrae at Ashur, who faced far more difficult problems; but one could wish that both scholars had been able to follow the French example. Loud's publications of later work by the Oriental Institute are of the same standard; OIP XL is still the most thoughtful and comprehensive account of a major Assyrian site yet available. The American books are more accessible than the French, and have been used for most plate references below.

B. The Walls and Gates

1. The line of the town-wall is clear on the ground; Botta, Place, and Loud (OIP XL, 18) all investigated stretches. Sargon (ARAB II, 43) gives its circumference, and it would appear that, as at Nineveh, it
incorporated both the duru and the šalhu.

2. Seven gates through the town-wall are known. Sargon (ARAB II, 43) names eight: the gates of Shamash and Adad on the east; the gates of Bel and Belit on the north; the gates of Anu and Ishtar on the west; and the gates of Ea and Belit-ilani on the south. This is confusing, as the corners of the town are directed to the cardinal points of the compass, but it seems likely that Sargon, like Sennacherib at Nineveh (see above, II,H, 1), tended to regard south-west as south. There are two gates on each face of the town-wall but the north-west; perhaps the missing one on this side led directly up to the terrace of Sargon's palace in the citadel.

3. Place numbered the gates from 1-7, starting with the northermost gate, east of the citadel, and proceeding clockwise round the wall. Re-excavation of the north-western gate, no. 7 (OIP XXXVIII, 1-11), threw some doubts on the quality of his recording, but he does seem to have cleared at least gates 1, 3, and 6 (1867, I, 170-181; III, pl. XII). All three had arches faced with glazed bricks, and colossal winged human-headed bulls in one entrance. The bulls in no. 1 were accompanied by genies holding lions, and those in no. 3 by genies holding cones and buckets; there were no genies in no. 6 which had clearly been left unfinished, as the inscription on the bulls themselves had been painted in black ink but never carved. Place states that gates 2, 4, 5, and 7 were all undecorated, but in fact no. 7 did produce glazed bricks and its roof may have been painted red; it too was unfinished.

4. The citadel-wall was relatively thin (OIP XL, 53, pl. LXX). It had two entrances, on the east and south, into the outer town. Both were
decorated with bulls and genies.

C. The Main Temple Complex

1. This stood in the citadel, on the southern corner of the same terrace as the royal palace, with which it shared a party-wall. If we include the ziggurat, which was free-standing, the complex was some 175 m. long, and a maximum of 100 m. wide. The area was originally dug by Place, whose results were greatly clarified by Loud (OIP XXXVIII, 80-128; XL, 55, pl. LXX).

2. The ziggurat, at the north-west end, was over 40 m. square, and was encircled by a ramp separating stages of different colours (Place 1867, I, 137-148; III, pls. XXXVI, XXXVII). The main outer court of the complex was on the east, with entrances from the directions of the Nabu temple, the outer court of the palace, and the ziggurat. The main inner court, to the north-west, had a large shrine of Sin and a small shrine of Adad opposite the entrance; a large shrine of Shamash and a small shrine of Minurta on the left; and a small shrine of Ea on the right. Another inner court to the south contained a large shrine of Ningal; this deity is not mentioned in Sargon's earlier texts about the city (ARAB II, 56-59), and the structure may have been added last.

3. The exterior of the complex, and the main facades, present the finest recorded example of Assyrian temple decoration on a large scale. Loud discusses the remains in detail, and Altman's restoration (OIP XL, pl. XLIV) of the Nabu shrine facade gives a reliable general impression
of how all the major shrine facades must have looked.

D. The Nabu Temple

1. This stood on a terrace of its own in the citadel, south of the main temple complex to which it was linked by a bridge (OIP XL, 56, pl. LXXI). It was at the most 130 m. long and, basically, some 40 m. wide. The outer court, entered from the north-east, included a probable library, room 5, and a substantial shrine, room 14; there were twin shrines of Nabu and Tashmetum in the inner court to the south-west. To the south-east of these courts was a complex of attendant rooms and courts, bringing the maximum width of the building up to 90 m. The main facades of the temple were most elaborately decorated with niches, engaged half-columns, sikkate, and glazed bricks, with the mudbrick elements in an exceptionally good state of preservation.

E. The Sibitti Temple

1. This was situated in the outer town, between the south gate of the citadel and the gate through the north-west face of the town-wall. Partial excavation in room 56 disclosed a single range of rooms of a range or glazed rooms, round a courtyard (Sumer XIII, 219, fig. 1 opposite p. 196 in the Arabic section). Its identity is assured by inscriptions found in position, but the temple is not otherwise mentioned for as alterations to its plan necessary and to restored. Now its is by Sargon.
The Palace of Sargon

1. The platform on which this building rests (OIP XL, pl. LXX, LXXVI) dominates the citadel; it occupies its western side, and extends out across the town-wall. The main temple complex, relatively small, was on the south; the palace itself was roughly 300 m. from south-east to north-west, and 190 m. wide. There were two known approaches from within the citadel, both by means of ramps leading eventually to the main gate: one was on the south-east, facing the east gate of the citadel across an open space, and the other at the south corner of the platform, beside the temples, where one ramp led up from the direction of the south citadel gate and another crossed a bridge from the main gate of the Nabu temple.

2. That the palace was not complete when Sargon died is evident from Place's discovery in room 99, which was not a gate as he imagined (1867, I, 92; OIP XL, 55), of partly worked orthostats of basalt, and in rooms 70 and 82 (1867, I, 89) of stores of glazed bricks. The sculptured orthostats in the state apartments had, however, been set up long enough for some alterations to become necessary and be executed: thus it is clear, from the originals and indeed on some photographs (OIP XXXVIII,
IV, F

(figs. 38-44), that the courtiers in court VIII had originally been provided with headbands which were later transformed into hair. After Sargon's death most of the orthostats in the throneroom and in the state apartments west of it were removed, some perhaps to Nineveh; clearly the removal was an official operation, as other more accessible orthostats were left in place.

3. Sargon's texts (Assur II, 37, 55; Winckler 1889, 70, 157) give a general description of the building, and mention the colossi and the orthostats, though not the glazed bricks and paintings, which filled the state apartments. All the surviving colossi are human-headed winged bulls, described by Sargon as lamamahhe or imami tamšīl binut ṣadi u tāntim, the creatures of the mountains and the seas which Ashurnasirpal had mentioned (see above, III,E,2). There was also a bit hilani, incorporating four columns on double lion-bases; this may be Place's temple (1867, I, 149), a free-standing oblong building on a moulded plinth, with a stepped central approach on one side and wall-slabs of basalt within, which stood in the west corner of the terrace behind the state apartments. The characteristics which we have listed as peculiar to it appear alien to Assyria, but would fit a Syrian palace; it is difficult to see where else in the building a bit hilani could be accommodated.

4. Another group of rooms which should be mentioned here are those around court XVI in the service area of the palace. Turner (Iraq XXX, 65) recognizes a Nabu-Tashmetum shrine in the area. This is just possible from the ground-plan, though the dais and internal cross-walls are missing, and the "ante-chamber" entrances are too wide to be doors. On the whole...
it seems simpler to regard these rooms as intended, from the beginning,
for use as magazines; this is the purpose to which Place (1867, I, 101)
found they had been eventually put. LXXII) occupies the east corner of
the citadel, from the north wall to the open space in front of the royal

G. The Arsenal

...important of this category of buildings. It was used by Dionysos.

1. This building can be identified as Palace F, the plan and position
of which is analogous to the arsenal at Kalhu. The main complex (OIP XL,
75, pls. LXVIII, LXX, LXXV), palace F itself, stands on a terrace occupy­
ing the western quarter of what appears, from the contours, to be a square
enclosure of some 65 hectares filling the southern corner of the outer
town. The terrace is roughly 250 m. square, and the building on it was
constructed around at least two large courtyards. On the south-west,
projecting over the town-wall, was a group of state apartments. Their
decoration included glazed bricks and, in the main throneroom door, a
pair of colossi; the most striking feature was a columned portico (OIP
XL, pl. XXXVIII), the earliest yet excavated in Assyria.

H. Other "Palaces"

1. The status of these buildings is questionable (see above, III, I, 8);
they were probably constructed and occupied by nobles who held official
positions and who transacted official business inside them. Four have
been identified inside the citadel, and there is ample room for a fifth;
one is known in the outer town. They are naturally interesting as
examples of Assyrian architecture in the reign of Sargon, but tell us
little which cannot be deduced from the palace of Sargon itself. We give here a summary list.

2. Residence L (OIP XL, 69, pl. LXXII) occupies the east corner of the citadel, from the north wall to the open space in front of the royal palace; it measures some 250 by 125 m., and is clearly much the most important of this category of buildings. It was used by Sinahusur, brother of Sargon.

3. Residence K (OIP XL, 65, pl. LXXI) is on the other side of the open space to the south; it measures some 140 by 80 m. Its most notable feature was its wall-decoration (OIP XL, 83, pls. LXXXIX-LXXXXI); room 12, which would in a royal palace be the throne-room, included a panel showing the king and an Assyrian, presumably the man who occupied the house, in an act of worship. This Assyrian is restored by Altman as wearing an elaborate head-band (or cap) and a strip of cloth possibly hanging down from it behind his back; if this restoration is correct, he should be the crown-prince (Iraq XXIX, 45), but Altman's earlier drawing of the "existing remains" is not sufficiently definite.

4. Residence M (OIP XL, 71, pl. LXXIII) occupies the west corner of the citadel, and has very approximate measurements of 120 by 110 m. Its position would have suited the priesthood.

5. Residence J (OIP XL, 65, pl. LXXI) stands in the south corner of the citadel, and measures some 80 by 50 m. It is thus the smallest, as well as the least conspicuous, of all the buildings in the citadel.

6. The contours (OIP XL, pl. LXVIII) suggest that there was another such building, about 130 m. square, in the north corner of the citadel.
7. Residence Z (OIP XL, 78, pl. LXXIV) lies in the outer town south of the east gate of the citadel. Part of it, measuring 85 by 60 m., was cleared.

8. Place (OIP XL, pl. LXVII) found traces of substantial regular buildings, G and H, at two points in the outer town.
Residence Z (OIP XL, 78, pl. LXXIV) lies in the outer town south of the east gate of the citadel. Part of it, measuring 85 by 60 m., was cleared.

Place (OIP XL, pl. LXVII) found traces of substantial regular buildings, G and H, at two points in the outer town.
CHAPTER V

Other Towns and Districts

A. Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta (Aqir)

1. This city was situated a little upstream of Ashur on the left bank of the Tigris, and was a new foundation, created by Tukulti-Ninurta I after his conquest of Babylon (Assh. XII, 24). Its northern and western limits are unknown, but it was larger than Ashur, enclosing a minimum of 70 hectares; one of Tukulti-Ninurta's motives may have been to house a growing population. Nonetheless the move is likely to have provoked serious opposition, particularly when the king's plans for his new Ashur temple became known, and the city was virtually abandoned soon after Tukulti-Ninurta's murder. It reappears in the neo-Assyrian period as a town in the province of Ashur (Forrer 1920, 11), but the only archaeological remains of that date were graves. Our knowledge of the Middle Assyrian architecture is derived from Bachmann's earlier progress reports on the excavation (MDOC LIII, 41), and from some plans and drawings published by Andrae; Bachmann's detailed records are said to have been lost. Mallowan (Sumer VI, 60) identified a canal, running parallel with the Tigris to the north-east, which may have been the one dug by Tukulti-Ninurta to irrigate the land around the new capital.

2. The outer wall appears to have been rectangular (Andrae 1938, 122, Abb. 52). One gate in the south wall was dug (Andrae 1938, 63,
Abb. 29); it was flanked by towers which, unlike those along the rest of the wall, projected outwards almost as far as the Ashur bastions (see above, I,B,IV). An inner wall enclosed more than half the area identified as belonging to the town; buildings dug inside it included an Ashur temple and a palace.

3. The Ashur temple (Andrae 1938, 92, Abb. 42) was identified as such by a stone tablet found in the middle of the ziggurat. This ziggurat was some 30 m. square, and formed a backing to the main temple block which was basically 40 m. square and consisted of a courtyard surrounded by a single range of rooms. The northern range consisted of a single room, a gate-chamber with niches round the walls where, according to Andrae (1938, 124), subsidiary divine statues may have been placed; one Tukulti-Ninurta text (AsObh. XII, 24) indeed suggests that Adad, Shamash, Ninurta, Nusku, Nergal, the Sibitti, and Ishtar may have had a place in the Ashur temple. On the east was another gate-chamber, planned so that there was no direct view from outside into the courtyard and the shrine opposite, and on the south a more complicated arrangement of smaller rooms, possibly a double range. The shrine of Ashur was on the west, with its back-wall against the ziggurat; the god's statue was in a recess in the long wall facing the main courtyard entrance. A separate building behind the ziggurat to the west consists of a simple staircase, regarded by Andrae as the approach to the ziggurat, to which it could have been joined by a bridge; this seems not unlikely, as there was no staircase in the temple itself. Walls within the temple had been painted red, with black footings (Andrae 1925, 11). All
doorways were found to have been blocked when the temple was abandoned
(MDOG LIII, 51).

4. This building is very close, in scale and in the essentials of
its plan, to the early second-millennium temple at Rimah (see below,
V,L,2). It is far smaller than the Ashur temple at Ashur, and must
certainly have had an outer temple enclosure, perhaps never finished,
less any other kings. One object originally set up there is a group
of statues or a king Ashur-bani-apli (1938, 127, pi. CLXXIV),
belonging outside Assyrian tradition.

5. Less is known of the palace plan (Andrae 1938, 122, Abb. 52).
One important group of rooms stood on a high mudbrick terrace, measuring
some 60 by 35 m., with a possible approach from the west; the face of
the terrace had originally been decorated with niches and half-columns
which were later walled up, perhaps as a concession to those who pointed
out that such features were more suitable for temples. Elaborate wall-
paintings (Andrae 1925, 1, Taf. I-IV) were found in the debris that had
fallen from the terrace into the plain rooms at its foot. It is not
clear whether this building, which did contain Tukulti-Ninurta's ekallu
bricks and a sikkatu, was in any way linked with a group of five painted
rooms 125 m. to the north; Andrae's plan implies that he regarded them
as part of the palace, though not if they make up the massivartig Bau
to which he refers later (1938, 125); Böhm (MDOG LIII, 57) suggests
that they were part of a temple.
B. Arbailu (Arbela, Erbil)

1. This city was among the most important in Assyria, favoured by Sennacherib with an irrigation project (Sumer III, 23). It contained an ancient shrine of Ishtar, restored by Sargon II (Iraq VII, 88), Esarhaddon (Assyria IX, 33, 95), Ashurbanipal (Assyria II, 377), and doubtless many other kings. One object originally set up there is a bronze statuette of a king Ashur-dan; Moortgat (1969, 121, pl. CXLVIII) believes this to be Ashur-dan I, Unger (RLA I, 141) preferred Ashur-dan III, and it seems to us, though stylistic criteria in cases such as this do not invite definition, that the best bet is Ashur-dan II.

2. There have been no excavations in the populous old town, but Arbailu was represented on slab I 9 from Ashurbanipal's palace at Nineveh (Place 1867, pl. XLI; Gadd 1936, pl. XXVIII). It is identified by a caption, in which the upper two wedges of the sign between URU and AN have been obliterated; there can now be no doubt, however, that Unger's reading of Arba-ilu (RLA I, 142) was right. The slab shows a double town-wall with a road leading through it, past a wayside shrine, to a citadel-wall; on the citadel-wall is Ashurbanipal pouring a libation over the head of Teumman (see below, VIII, P, 2). Behind the king is a building with two poles, capped by rings, in front of its gate-towers; there may be a lion carved on the right-hand gate-tower. Given the context, this can be none other than the temple of Ishtar. There is also a columned portico further to the right, but whether this also belonged to the temple cannot be determined.
C. Kakzu (Qasr Shemamok, Shimmama)

1. This was a walled town some 15 km. south-west of Erbil. The ancient name has been found on several bricks from the site, discussed by Furlani (1935, 119). Furlani has eliminated the previous reading of the name on the surviving bricks as Al-Še, though hesitantly retaining it for a brick from the nearby Qal'a copied by Layard (NB, 225); it seems in fact extremely probable that Layard's copy too should be corrected to read Kak-zi.

2. Ashur-dan II and Sennacherib are the two kings known to have been active builders (Furlani 1933–1935); both worked on a palace, while the latter rebuilt the walls. The palace may be the one, belonging to the queen, which is described as delapidated in a royal letter (Pfeiffer 1935, 90). Both Layard (NB, 223) and Furlani excavated briefly on the Qasr.

D. Ibrahim Bayis (Makhmur)

1. This town, whose ancient name is unknown, lay at the west end of a pass through the Qara Chok hills, about 30 km. south-east of the Tigris-Greater Zab confluence. It is surrounded by a square wall, and occupies almost twenty hectares. Layard (NB, 221) noted the site under the name of Mokhamour, and a sounding was carried out by Mallowan and el-Amin (Sumer VI, 55, pls. II–III). What may have been a small shrine, with traces of fallen wall-painting, was identified; the pottery was neo-Assyrian.
E. Imgur-Enlil (Balawat)

1. This walled town, about 20 km. north-east of Kalhu, contained a temple of Mamu built by Ashurnasirpal II (ARAB I, 195) after his Lebanon campaign. The shrine was discovered by Rassam on the north-east side of the main central mound (1897, 216; TSBA VII, plan following p. 52), and was re-excavated by Mallowan (1956, 79) who found a pair of Ashurnasirpal bronze gates in the ante-chamber door. On the west Rassam (1897, 207-215) had found two other pairs of bronze gates, one set up by Ashurnasirpal II and the other by Shalmaneser III about 847 (ARAB I, 224; King 1915, passim). Rassam says that his two sets were sixty feet apart; presumably they belonged to one building, but it can hardly have been part of the Mamu temple.

F. Lak

1. Layard (NB, 129) found Sargon bricks in "some small artificial mounds near the village of Lak, about three miles to the east of the high road to Mosul" from Nimrud; the site was also four hours' ride, out of twelve, on the way from Nimrud to Khorsabad. If the high road in question passed through Selamiya, following the Tigris more closely than it does today, these mounds may possibly be represented by a conspicuous group, north-east of the modern Mosul-Quweir road, near the modern village of Yarganti. This is a very uncertain identification, and I am not sufficiently familiar with the countryside to assert that the name of Lak does not still exist.
G. Karamleis

This is a small town about 20 km. west of Mosul, south of the modern Erbil road. Its name may well be linked with that of Gaugamela, where Alexander the Great finally defeated Darius, and it might indeed be the Assyrian Kar-Ninlil, towards which led the road through gate 5 at Nineveh (see above, II, C, 3). Layard (NR I, 52) discovered a "platform of brickwork" in the mound, with bricks of Sargon II; Place (1867, II, 169) gives the dimensions of the mound as 96 by 190 m., and mentions finding pavements of Shalmaneser III as well as Sargon.

H. Shibaniba (Billah)

This substantial mound, over 12 hectares in extent, lies some 25 km. east-north-east of Nineveh, at the foot of Jebel Maghlub near the Aqra road; it is the ancient version of Ba'shiqa.

It was dug by Layard (NR I, 52; NB, 133; AN II, pl. LV), who found bricks of Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III, together with fragments of circular glazed wall-plaques. More thorough excavations were undertaken by Speiser and Bache ( BASOR XL-LIV; MJ XXIV, 33), who reached early levels and identified a massive stone fortification of the Agade period; no later equivalent was found, however. There were Middle and Neo-Assyrian tablets (JCS VII, 111), and ekallu bricks ( BASOR XLI, 19) of Ashurnasirpal II, Shalmaneser III, and Sennacherib, but no palace was located. It is further stated ( BASOR XLIV, 32) that an Ishtar temple dedicated by Shalmaneser III was dug in the south-west part of the mound,
but it is not visible in the plan of the Assyrian buildings in the same general area (MI XXIV, pl. XI). It is odd that Sennacherib should have built there, as he was also responsible (OIP II, 114) for diverting a portion of the town's water-supply.

I. Tarbisu (Sherif Khan)

1. This small town lies about 5 km. upstream of Nineveh on the left bank of the Tigris; it is first mentioned by Arik-den-ili (IAK, 54).

It contained a Nergal temple built by Sennacherib (OIP II, 155) and refurbished by Ashurbanipal (ARAB II, 377: before 653), and a palace built by Esarhaddon for Ashurbanipal as crown-prince (ARObh. IX, 72: dated 672). The Medes sacked the town in 614 (ARAB II, 418).

2. Layard started work on the Nergal temple (NB, 598); he found, besides Sennacherib's inscriptions, a number of Mosul marble slabs, glazed bricks, and bricks designed for the Sin-Shamash temple at Dur Sharrukin. He also found Esarhaddon's texts. Rawlinson (Gadd 1936, 82) continued the work, and the site has recently been re-opened.

J. Guérepané

1. This is the name given by Place (1867, II, 152) to a site, about 5 km. south of Dohuk, where he found a number of bricks belonging to an Assyrian king whose name Rawlinson was unable to decipher.
K. Apku (Abu Maria)

1. This town 50 km. west of Nineveh was strategically situated at a cross-roads near the western frontier of the Assyrian heartland. A palace there, begun by Ashur-resh-ishi I, was completed by Tiglath-pileser I or Ashur-bel-kala (ARAB I, 124); the palace and the whole town were reconstructed by Adad-nirari II before his Hanigalbat campaigns (ARAB I, 111). Ashurnasirpal II (JCS VII, 73) also worked on the palace. A fragmentary brick from the site was identified by Laessøe as belonging to Shalmaneser V, but there is no patronymic.

2. Layard (NB, 335) discovered several rooms and slabs of Mosul marble in the mound, together with Ashurnasirpal bricks; Lloyd (Iraq V, 135) saw traces of trenches in and near the old khan. The foundation tablets for Ashurnasirpal's palace, which were found casually during the 1920s, are said to have come from the slope of the main mound above the pond, on the east as one climbs north-eastwards towards the old khan.

L. Zamahu (Rimah)

1. This small neo-Assyrian town occupied the site of an important second-millennium city, Karana or Razama, about 10 km. south of Tel'afar. This had been an independent principality incorporated into the empire of Shamshi-Adad I. It contained at this time a temple and a palace which did not last into the neo-Assyrian period, and do not strictly concern us here. Nonetheless the temple's state of preservation makes
it important for an understanding of Shamshi-Adad's work at Ashur and Nineveh, and deserves a brief discussion. Full preliminary reports have been published by Oates (especially *Iraq* XXIX, pls. XXX-XXXVI, XL; *Iraq* XXX, pls. XXVIII-XXXI).

2. It stood on the levelled summit of an earlier mound whose sides had been extended by terracing where necessary, and had been designed with the greatest care and symmetry. The main temple block was almost square. To its north and south was a narrow platform which broadened on the east to form a forecourt, in which was a well and a pool reminiscent of that in the Ashur temple forecourt (*WVD* LXVII, 35). The forecourt was approached on the east by a long straight staircase leading up from ground-level; on its west was the main temple facade with a central door leading, through a single range of rooms, to the inner court. Two other doors, leading in through the double ranges of rooms on the north and south of the inner court, must have been relatively useless. Two rooms in the north-east corner held a staircase leading to the roof. On the west of the inner court was a great ante-chamber with the shrine behind it; the god's statue probably stood against the centre of a long wall facing the court. A ziggurat, probably reached by the temple staircase, adjoined the temple on the west.

3. The decoration was elaborate. There were stone statues apparently carrying the lintel of the ante-chamber door, and a carved relief of a genie (*Iraq* XXVII, pl. XXXIV), though found on a Middle Assyrian podium in the court, may perhaps have been a door guardian at an earlier stage. All the facades were adorned with niches and
engaged columns of mudbrick, and the more elaborate columns represented spirals and two varieties of palm-tree trunk. This technique was probably employed also in the half-columns in the Ashur temple (WBG XXVII, 34), and is a good example of southern influence on northern architecture; there are late third-millennium parallels from Ur, Kish, and Girsu (Woolley 1939, 42, pl. XXX; Mackay 1929, 99, pl. XXXII; Parrot 1948, 157). When the Rimah columns aged, their decoration vanished through weathering and replastering, and they became the simple half-columns familiar in later Assyrian temples.

4. In the neo-Assyrian period the north edge of the old temple mound was dug away, and some kind of official building, with an Adad shrine at its west end, was built there (Iraq XXX, 123-133, pls. XXXII-XXXIII, XXXVII-XXXVIII). The shrine is of the standard late type. It is entered at one end through a central door flanked by two low platforms, and has the altar, on which the god's throne was set, at the other end. Two cross-walls partly cut the altar area off from the rest of the room. The walls were painted with a simple pattern, and somewhere, perhaps behind the altar, was the relief figure of a genie, made of bitumen which must have originally been overlaid with metal-leaf. In front of this was a low foundation in the courtyard, containing a temple. each cross-wall, by the sanctum entrance, was a podium representing a lion's head; the pair must have supported two cult objects, probably poles. Two more lions' heads may have been placed by the main entrance, but were found out of position. There was a stela of Adad-nirari III beside the altar, and a relief figure of a genie above the thờon of Adad-nirari III beside the altar.

5. This building was presumably the work of Nergal-eresh, governor of Assyrian occupation, and has been chosen for the title of a modern
of Rasappa between at least 803 and 775; the stela, and probably the lions, carried his inscription (Iraq XXX, 139), apparently written after 798 and later partially erased. This man, as discussed by Page (Iraq XXX, 150), must be classed with Bel-Harran-bel-usur who governed the same region, Shamshi-ili of Til-Barsip, Shamash-reshe-usur of Suhi, and probably Mushezib-Shamash of Duru (HLA I, 106) and the author of a text (ARAB I, 20; EAK, IV c) describing the construction of a town on the Tigris near Jebel Hamrin. Nergal-eresh appears to have been virtually independent, erecting public buildings with little or no reference to the nominal authorities in Ashur. We should add, to the list of sources given by Page, another Adad-nirari III stela with a partially erased inscription; it is fragmentary but may also be the work of Nergal-eresh, and was found at Badra on the north side of Jebel Sinjar near the Syrian border; it now stands in the courtyard of the Iraq Museum. The whereabouts of Sab'a, a place south of Sinjar from which another Nergal-eresh stela is said to have come, is not known to me.

M. Dur Bel-Harran-bel-usur

This was a new foundation in the desert, containing a temple, founded by Bel-Harran-bel-usur in the reign of Shalmaneser IV (ARAB I, 295). The stela recording these facts was said to come from near Tell Abta. The modern mound of Tell Abta lies on the right bank of the Tharthar a few miles below the Ibra confluence. It has some signs of neo-Assyrian occupation, and has been chosen for the site of a modern
village. The name of Tell Abta is today more usually applied to the modern administrative centre further upstream, some three miles away. Between the two, on the left bank of the Tharthar, is a walled rectangular enclosure, some 200 by 150 m. in size. The surface sherds are exclusively neo-Assyrian, and the site has been casually robbed for baked bricks. At its south-western corner is a mound 10 m. high, possibly prehistoric in origin but suitable for an official building of a later date. This site is clearly the better candidate for Dur Bel-Harran-bel-usur.

N. Shadikanni (Arban)

1. This large town was situated on the right bank of the Syrian Khabur some 35 km. below the Jaghjagh confluence. If we could accept Unger's reading (Bell. XXIX, 467) of Shasakanni instead of the traditional Shadikanni, it would become a candidate for the site of Washukanni, capital of the Mitannian empire in the second millennium. Unger's identification is supported by the town's political importance later, by the presence there of a Samnuha temple, and by Layard's discovery of several scarabs, among which were probably some of the Amarna period (NB, 280). The claims of Fakhariya, however, remain stronger, and potential excavators of Arban should note that there is an Islamic city on top.

2. The first known ruler, Bel-eresh, who rebuilt the Samnuha temple (MAOG III, heft 1-2, p. 6), controlled land as far as the Euphrates; he
also acknowledged the overlordship of his contemporaries Ashur-rabi II and Ashur-resh-ishi II of Assyria. The main building dug by Layard was more probably a palace, and bore the inscription of Mushesh-Ninurta or Mushezib-Ninurta, a contemporary and vassal of Shalmaneser III (NB, 275-284; BASOR CXXX, 15). The building seems to have incorporated three doors aligned behind one another; the first two were flanked by winged human-headed bulls, and the third by lions (only one of which was found). There was also an uninscribed stela, and glazed bricks with an unpublished inscription. The town's later history is unclear; perhaps its rulers transformed themselves into men such as Nergal-eres (see above, V,L,5).

O. Guzana (Tell Halaf)

It consists of the standard courtyard leading to a series of ante-chambers, off each of which is a smaller shrine with painted half-columns. Ra's-el-'Ain, on the main road from Nineveh to the Mediterranean. It is against its back-wall. There were many sikkas in the debris, but none walls enclose an approximate rectangle some 55 hectares in extent, including a citadel on the river. Its rulers, who were ambitious builders in their own right, probably became tributary to Assyria in the reign of Ashurnasirpal II or Shalmaneser III, but this is not reflected in their architecture, all of which may be earlier. The eponym canon (HIA II, 428) records a campaign against Guzana in 808; this presumably succeeded, as an Assyrian governor of Guzana was eponym in 793.

2. The north-east palace on the citadel (Naumann 1950, 222) was
regarded as pre-Assyrian by the excavators; this would mean that no Assyrian palace was located, since the building just to the south which was identified as such, because of official correspondence found in debris nearby (Naumann 1950, 205), is too small and undistinguished to be more than a private house. In fact the Assyrian palace is clearly represented by the final phase of the north-east palace; one need only compare the suites around the Aussenhof, really an inner court, with those around court C at Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, plan B). Frankfort (1954, 174) observed the Assyrian nature of this palace, though he could not locate the main throneroom suite; this is to be found in rooms c and d, with the staircase at the wrong end, an arrangement which could have been caused by the plan of the pre-Assyrian palace.

3. In the outer town was a neo-Assyrian temple (Naumann 1950, 349). It consists of the standard courtyard leading to a shrine and ante-chamber, off each of which is a smaller shrine with painted half-columns against its back-wall. There were many sikkate in the debris, but none were inscribed. Turner (Iraq XXX, 63) describes this building as a Nabu-Tashmetum temple; this is quite likely on historical grounds, but it is far from implicit in the ground-plan.

P. Fakhariya

This walled town of some 60 hectares lies south of Ra’as-el-'Ain on the Syrian Khabur, and is a good candidate for the site of Washukanni. It was certainly occupied in the Middle Assyrian period and earlier in
the second millennium. The American Sounding IX produced a building with painted walls and a columned entrance which is described as a "palace which ..... can be dated to the Iron Age, within the 9th to 7th centuries" (QIP LXXIX, 6, 20; pls. VI-IX, LXXXVII). This dating is based on the six recorded sherds from its floors (QIP LXXIX, 39, nos. 103-108). Two of these, 105 and 108, are respectively Mitannian and Khabur ware; the remainder are ascribed to the Iron Age, but could also, if we may judge by the photographs, belong in the second millennium. 103 is a zoomorphic spout, the type of object one cannot confidently limit to any one period; 104 could be Khabur ware; and 106 and 107 could belong to Middle Assyrian cups. We may also note that there were Mitannian and Khabur ware levels below the building, and Iron Age levels of this type one day's march from Hatrin (AS VII, 107). Excavations above it; one might expect the building itself to be Middle Assyrian. One is nonetheless reluctant to override Kantor's conclusions, as she had the material to hand and studied the sequence over the entire site more closely than we can; but even if the building is Iron Age, it may still precede the Assyrian occupation, and there is anyhow no need to regard it as an official Assyrian residency.

Q. Harranu (Harran, Carrhae)

1. Ashurbanipal (ARAB II, 353; AAA XX, 93) states that the great temple of Sin in this city had been built by one of the Shalmanesers; it was further patronized by Sargon II (Iraq VII, 88), and there is a possibility that Sargon's family was closely connected with the town.
Ashurbanipal himself, probably early in his reign, rebuilt both the temple of Sin and the temple of Nusku; the extensive decoration included bulls and *lahmu*-genies. Harranu became Ashur-uballit II's capital in 612, and was sacked by the Medes and Babylonians in 610 (ARAB II, 420).

While excavations on the site have not reached Assyrian levels, it seems likely (Iraq XXXI, 166) that the Sin temple was on the site now occupied by the ruins of the principal mosque.

R. Sultantepe

1. This mound is about 24 km. from Harran and 16 km. from Urfa.

Its ancient name may have been Huzurina, though there was another town of this name one day's march from Misibin (AS VII, 137). Excavations produced massive neo-Assyrian walls and traces of wall-painting. Tablets and other finds suggested that there was an important temple on the site, but no coherent plan could be established.

S. Hadatu (Arslan Tash)

1. This town (BAH XVI, 5) is about 36 km., a day's march, north-east of Til-Barsip on the Harran road. Its walls formed an irregular oval, enclosing some 30 hectares of land. It owes its importance, so far as we can tell, to the patronage of Tiglath-pileser III.

2. The west (or south-west) gate of the town, towards Til-Barsip, was guarded by a pair of lions bearing what may be an inscription of Tiglath-pileser (BAH XVI, 86). The gate-chamber contained a series of sculptures,
Assyrian in iconography but local in style, which were attributed to Tiglath-pileser before the texts from the site were known (Unger 1925; BAH XVI, 74, pls. VII-XIII). There were comparable lions at the east (or south-east) gate, which perhaps led towards Harran, but none apparently at the north gate (BAH XVI, 70, pl. VI). Perhaps the wall itself was built by Tiglath-pileser.

3. East of the town-centre was an Ishtar temple (BAH XVI, 54, fig. 19, pls. II-V). No coherent plan could be determined, and the remains belong to more than one period; basically there appears to have been a courtyard with an outer gate to the south and a shrine on the west.

The outer gate was flanked by bulls bearing an inscription of Tiglath-pileser III, and there were lions outside the shrine. Thureau-Dangin (BAH XVI, 66, pl. I) considers that all the free-standing statues of genies from Hadatu stood in this building; he himself found two small fragments that used to be a major road from Harran to the south. A particular wall encloses an area level above the palace-temple. These genies wear horned caps but Assyrian court dress, the kind of solicium which we find in Tiglath-pileser's work at Til-Barsip (see below, V, T, 4); the palace-temple (Shalmaneser Market), with Assyrian scenes of war and processions, may also have been built by Tiglath-pileser, and it is likely that some, if not all, of these figures were in fact erected there.

4. The principal building forming the highest mound at Hadatu is north of the town-centre (BAH XVI, 16, plate at end). It is 150 m. long and up to 60 m. wide. It has an unusual plan (see below, VI, B) and appears to have incorporated a Nabu-Tashmetum temple within a
governor's palace. There are some wall-paintings. Tiglath-pileser seems the likeliest builder, if only because he was responsible for so much else in the town.

5. East of the temple-palace (BAH XVI, 41, plate at end) was a small building, the batiment aux ivoires. It is a convenient example of Syrian and Assyrian architecture amalgamated, but can hardly have had any official status, though occupied by a man who owned furniture looted from Damascus.

T. Til-Barsip (Kar-Shulmanasharidu, Tell Ahmar)

1. Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, 3) lies on the left bank of the Euphrates near the Sajur confluence, some 20 km. downstream of Jerablus or Carchemish, and controls what used to be a major road from Harran to Aleppo and the Mediterranean. The semi-circular walls enclose an area of some 55 hectares adjoining the river. The town, which had been a capital with extensive wall-paintings in reasonably good condition, capital of the Aramaean state of Bit-Adini, was captured by Shalmaneser III in 856 and transformed into the colony of Kar-Shulmanasharidu (Shalmaneser Market), with Assyrian settlers and a royal palace (ARAB I, 218). It became a vital frontier fortress, ruled at one time by Shamsi-ilu, turtanu official during at least 780-752, who set up a pair of lions in the north-east gate (BAR XXIII, 141, pl. XXXVII). A later ruler to take an interest in the town was Esarhaddon, who erected two stelas there (BAH XXIII, 151, pls. XII-XIII); they were left unfinished, perhaps on news arriving of his death.
2. **A number of other Assyrian sculptures have been found at Til-Barsip.** They include (BAH XXIII, 158, pl. XV) a stela of Shalmaneser III, a fragment of a bull with an inscription naming Ashur-.....-apli, possibly also Shalmaneser's work, and a slab showing an Assyrian courtier holding a bow and arrows in a pose normally reserved for the king in triumph; Thureau-Dangin may well be right in identifying this man as Shamshi-ilu, who had omitted to mention the king's name on his town-gate lions.

3. **The principal building to have been excavated (BAH XXIII, plan B) stood on the main central mound beside the river.** It rests on Aramaean levels, to which its ground-plan is not related, and is evidently Shalmaneser's palace. It is the only official Assyrian building to incorporate pebble mosaics (BAH XXIII, 24: room XLIX), with simple patterns like those in the Karawanserai at Ashur (WDOG LXIV, 59, Taf. XXX). It is also, more significantly, the only Assyrian building so far discovered with extensive wall-paintings in reasonably good condition. They consist partly of the friezes common in wall-paintings elsewhere, and partly of panels showing the narrative and apotropaic subjects normal on sculptured orthostats. The date of these paintings is disputed. Thureau-Dangin (BAH XXIII, 42-74, pls. XLIII-LIII; Parrot 1961 for colour illustrations), drew tentative conclusions which are basically valid from a long and careful exposition of the evidence, but some clarification is necessary. For this purpose the paintings are here divided into five groups.

4. **Group 1 includes the narrative and apotropaic panels, with the**
associated friezes, which form the bulk of Thureau-Dangin's "premier style". It comprises all the original paintings on the walls and in the doors of rooms XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVIII, XLIV, and XLV; the frieze and panels a, b, d, and probably e in room XLVII, and all the paintings in its doors; and probably panels c and e, which were later concealed by plaster, in room XXII. These paintings have provincial peculiarities, such as the unique neck-guards on the helmets of the Assyrian soldiery, and the types and disposition of the apotropaic figures. Nonetheless Thureau-Dangin was able to establish, beyond question, that they are to be dated between the Balawat gates of Shalmaneser III, c. 847, and the sculptures of Sargon II at Khorsabad, c. 707. He suggests Adad-nirari III as a possible author, and Tiglath-pileser III as the most probable; alternatives are Shamshi-ili (Moortgat 1969, 141), Shalmaneser V (Reade, Iraq XXV, 46), and Sargon II (Barnett 1957, 187; Hrouda 1965, 114).

5. Adad-nirari III and his predecessors can probably be eliminated. They have received no serious support, and Adad-nirari's crown (Iraq XXX, pl. XXXVIII), though taller than the ninth-century type, is somewhat different from those worn by Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II, and the Til-Barsip king. Shamshi-ili is supported only by the volutes, probably representing lion-heads, on the sheathes of the Assyrian soldiers; they are a ninth-century feature not worn by commoners in the sculptures of Tiglath-pileser III, c. 729, or later. Moortgat believes that panel b in room XXIV shows Shamshi-ili instead of the king; the man in fact wears royal dress, and his hat, though damaged, is more like an Assyrian
crown than a headband. Shamshi-ilu is anyway unlikely to have used all the uniform of kingship except the crown or, if he did, to have shown the king himself on the adjoining panel 3; if he did do all this, it is hardly likely that his picture of himself would have survived the deliberate defacement of his inscription on the town-gate lions. The arguments for Sargon II, on the other hand, consist of minor parallels with Khorsabad; these would be more meaningful if we had a more representative collection of Tiglath-pileser's sculptures, particularly as two of the three points cited by Barnett are refuted by one slab which he had overlooked (TP3, pl. XLIV). The soldiers' old-fashioned sheathes, and the Til-Barsip king's habit of wearing, like Tiglath-pileser III (TP3, pls. LXXXV, LXXXVII), ritual dress on secular occasions, cannot necessarily be attributed to the provincial ignorance of the painters. The Khorsabad parallels do tend to favour a date in the second half of the eighth century, but we are still left with a choice between Tiglath-pileser III, Shalmaneser V, and Sargon II in his early years. If we take the soldiers' sheathes at their face value, we must date the paint- ings, with Thureau-Dangin, to Tiglath-pileser III; they would belong then before his palace sculptures.

6. Group 2 is represented by the narrative fragment, showing a sea-battle, from room I (BAH XXIII, frontispiece); Thureau-Dangin does not date this piece. It would appear that the two Assyrian soldiers who are shown wear helmets with neck-guards similar to those of the soldiers in group 1; certainly their helmets are too squat to be seventh-century in date. It is therefore likely that this fragment is actually
contemporary with group 1, and might help to date it. Tiglath-pileser III, however, in 734-732, Shalmaneser V during his Samaria campaigns, and Sargon II early in his reign, are all likely to have been involved in sea-battles, and no precision is thereby added.

7. Group 3 consists of friezes incorporating the lotus motif; they need not all be of one date. There were examples in room 1, presumably contemporary with the seascape; in rooms XXI and XLVI, which Thureau-Dangin would have attributed to his "premier style" but for the lotus decoration; and in room XXII, where the frieze framed paintings in the "dernier style" and was presumably contemporary with them. In fact the lotus motif was found at Kalhu on ivories from Tiglath-pileser's palace (Barnett 1957, 187), so that there is no need to suppose that it was still unacceptable further west during his reign. We may therefore tentatively class the friezes of rooms XXI and XLVI with group 1, as Thureau-Dangin desired.

8. Group 4 consists of panels c and f in room XLVII. Thureau-Dangin recognized that these were by one hand, and that the soldiers' sheathes show them to be later than paintings in his "premier style". He considered, however, that the soldiers wore their hair long, in the pre-Khorsabad style, and that the panels could not be substantially later than the others in the room. While the hair-style of most of the soldiers seems ambiguous, that of the courtier in front of the procession is definitely not in the earlier style. The composition as a whole, with the king in his chariot preceded by foot-soldiers meeting captives, is not found on Assyrian sculptures before the reign of Sennacherib.
There can be little doubt therefore that these panels were replacements for group 1 paintings, and that the painter, in designing the soldiers' hair, was slightly influenced by the earlier scenes around him. Madhloom (1965, 74) believes that there are technical reasons for dating panel f to the reign of Esarhaddon; this is doubtful, as Madhloom's chronological scheme involves the assumption that Ashurbanipal or later carvings in room XXVIII and court XIX of Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh (see above, II,H,12) are in fact the work of Sennacherib, but his conclusion in this instance may well be correct, as Esarhaddon was certainly active at Til-Barsip. We should note that Madhloom proceeds to date all the Til-Barsip paintings of the "premier style" to Esarhaddon; this is certainly wrong; the three-pronged whip to which he refers in panel a of room XXIV is found at least as early as Sargon (OIP XXXVIII, fig. 87).

Group 5 comprises all the paintings in room XXVII, the repainted panels e, f, and g in room XXII, and the repainted frieze in room XXV. These are all in Thureau-Dangin's "dernier style", ascribed by him to Ashurbanipal. With Madhloom, we would prefer Esarhaddon, on historical grounds, though the paintings might belong anywhere in the seventh century.

U. Western Syria

1. No distinctively Assyrian building has yet been found west of the Euphrates. While the Assyrians freely acknowledged borrowing the column from the Syro-Hittites, Naumann (1955, 374), discussing Syro-
Hittite architecture, picks on only two instances of Assyrian influence; the use of baked bricks at Sak sagözü, and the arrangement of the latest *hilani* group at Sam'al round an inner courtyard. One might add the presence of glazed bricks and at least one fragment of Assyrian narrative sculpture at Carchemish (Woolley 1952, frontispiece and pl. B 61).

Naumann was not of course concerned with examples of Assyrian influence on the sculptured decoration of Syro-Hittite buildings; this is sometimes obvious, as at Sak sagözü, but to define its extent elsewhere would involve the consideration of a wide range of historical and art-historical problems with which we are not now directly concerned. There are, however, two points which deserve mention.

2. One is that the Assyrians are likely to have taken the very concept of stone wall-decoration on a large scale from the Syro-Hittites; Frankfort's arguments to the contrary (1954, 175) are adequately refuted by Albright's demonstration (1956, *passim*) that some at least of the Syro-Hittite sculptures are earlier than Ashurnasirpal's palace at Kalhu. The other point, arising from this, is that the Assyrians were not the only people capable of stylistic innovation; the superiority of Assyrian to Syro-Hittite stone-carving may largely be due to the tractable nature of Mosul marble, and should not be used as a basis for extraneous conclusions. Thus Albright (1956, 156) regards high relief and round modelling as indicative of Assyrian influence; Akurgal (1962, 133) appears to derive Syro-Hittite work of the mid eighth century from Assyrian work of the late eighth century; and Ussishkin (AS XVII, 185) sees "prominent Assyrian influence" in features of the Carchemish
sculptures which might have been imitated by Ashurnasirpal. We are not denying the possibility that in some cases the Syro-Hittites may have learnt from Assyrian work of the ninth century, but it is hard to evade the suspicion that sometimes, as with the bit hilani, the boot was on the other foot (Iraq XXVII, 129).

V. Sur-marrati

1. This was a town on the Tigris through which Sennacherib passed on an expedition to Elam; in 690 he rebuilt its walls (ARO XX, 83). The identification with Samarra seems very plausible, but excavations have not produced Assyrian remains. Sennacherib's fortress may have been below the modern city.

W. Babylonia

1. Assyrian public works in Babylonia cannot be discussed here, as they effected buildings with long separate histories, but they absorbed much energy and a summary account may be useful. Between 709 and 626 there were four main areas generally under Assyrian control: Der (Badra) on the east towards Elam; Uruk in the south-east, with Ur nearby; Nippur in the centre; and, most important of all, Babylon, with Kutha, Sippar, Borsippa, and Dilbat in its vicinity. The inhabitants of the intervening marshes were virtually independent, and seldom inclined to enjoy royal patronage.

2. Sargon II (ARAB II, 18, 20, 101) apparently tried hard to
ingratiate himself with the Babylonians, and his work at Uruk is well
documented (Iraq XXXI, 104). Sennacherib, after severe trouble, sacked
Babylon in 689 and confiscated the Babylonian gods, but Esarhaddon
reversed his father's policy. He returned many statues, began the
complete reconstruction of Babylon, and worked on shrines at Nippur,
Uruk, Borsippa, and no doubt elsewhere (AfObh. IX, 16, 32, 70, 73, 84,
95, 122). Ashurbanipal extended and continued the work. The gods of
Babylon were returned in 668, but furniture for Esagila, the principal
shrine, was still arriving in 653 (Iraq XXVI, 22). Between 669 and
653 (ARAB II, 369-384, 390) Ashurbanipal was responsible for the com­
pletion and decoration of many buildings in Babylon, Sippar, Borsippa,
Nippur, Uruk, and again presumably elsewhere.

3. In 652 Shamash-shum-ukin, Ashurbanipal's brother and nominee king
of Babylon, rebelled; his basic support was in the Babylon area, but he
was obliged to capture Kutha by force (Iraq XXVI, 25). The desecrated
shrine of Nergal at Kutha was consequently one of the buildings restored
by Ashurbanipal after recapturing Babylon in 648 (ARAB II, 356). He is
also likely to have refurbished the Nana shrine at Uruk after his capture
of Susa in 647 or 646 (Thompson 1931, 34). By 639 (Iraq XXX, 108) he
was again at work restoring the shrines of Babylon.

4. Ashur-etil-ilani (ARAB II, 409), between 630 and 627 when he lost
control of the area, worked on the Urash temple at Dilbat; he also
(AFO XIX, 143) worked at Nippur, clearly before 623 when that town too
was lost. In 620, when Sin-shar-ishkun was king of Assyria, the Assyrian
armies were driven out of Babylonia for good.
A. Introductory

1. The ground-plans of both temples and palaces have some characteristics in common, basic elements which appear repeatedly and which clearly met standard requirements. This may best be established by reference to one fairly simple building, the neo-Assyrian palace-temple at Hadatu; the state apartments of the main palaces, and some other questions, are considered subsequently. It has been found convenient, for the purposes of this discussion, to give English names to particular types of room or suite: terms such as throneroom or bathroom. It should not be thought, however, that a room to which one of these names is applied was necessarily used for the same range of functions as its modern equivalent.

B. The Assyrian Building at Hadatu

1. This building (see above, V, S) is divisible into three areas. On the west is a large court, through which the building was entered and to which the term babanu can be applied. On the east is the bitanu area, comprising a series of massive rooms around an inner court. To the north-east, around courts LI and LIV, is a complex of smaller rooms which are likely to have served various domestic and residential functions.
2. It is doubtful in this instance which was the main gate into the outer court. There is a small entrance, with a devious approach, through room VIII, but this may have led back to the domestic wing. The excavator, Thureau-Dangin, in a lucid discussion of the ground-plan (BAR XVI, 17) preferred to regard room I as the main gate, but room XI, a respectable oblong facing the centre of the town, suits the present contours of the ground best. The west side of the outer court contains alternating large and small rooms; two at least of the latter (IV and XV) had drains running out of them. The pattern is one of successive suites each consisting of a small bathroom and a larger oblong room for occupation; this function is documented most abundantly in the Kalhu arsenal (see above, III,H,4), where some similar sets of rooms were employed as barracks. Where the smaller room is water-proof, with a brick pavement and a brick or bitumen dado, its identification as a "bathroom" is reasonably certain; there is normally a niche in one wall, with a drain at its foot. Other rooms, large and small, could have been used as offices, storerooms, or workshops; these would naturally belong in the outer court of a public building. Room IX is a type of niche, or miniature iwan, often found in courtyard corners; the equivalent in Ashurnasirpal's palace at Kalhu contained a stela commemorating the building's foundation and official opening, and may possibly have been a small shrine (Mallowan 1966, fig. 101). Room X opposite appears to connect with XXX, a corridor that in turn seems to lead to room XXXI and the inner court; the doorways, however, are not definite, and it would be unusual for a corridor to lead into the narrow
end of a sizable room instead of, whether directly or through an antechamber, into the corner of a court.

3. A more striking approach to the inner court was through room XVIII on the east side of the outer court, the largest room in the whole structure and the principal component of what was called by Loud at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, 11) "the standard reception suite" which occurred there "without major variation in every building yet excavated". It is characterized partly by its position, opening onto an outer court and separated from an inner court by a smaller parallel room (here XXI), and partly by the presence, at one of its narrow ends, of a ramp (XVI) which wound up anti-clockwise round a solid central square of brickwork to an upper storey or the roof; the Hadatu example is peculiar in having the ramp placed, like that at Guzana (see above, V,0,2), to the left rather than the right of the door from the outer court. The south end of room XVIII, opposite the ramp, is connected by a small chamber to a bathroom (XX), equivalents of which, entered directly from the main room, are regularly found in buildings of palatial size of the eighth century and later. The only fitting (apart from the capstone of a door-socket) on the floor of room XVIII was a rectangular ablation-slab with raised edges and with incised diagonal lines converging from its corners to a central hollow (BAH XVI, 20); it was placed against the spine-wall of the suite, at the end of the room furthest from the ramp; there are equivalent slabs in ninth-century palaces, where no bathroom was available nearby for the necessary ablutions. More complete or elaborate examples of this type of room, such as T 1 in the Kalhu arsenal (Iraq XXV, 10),
show that it could also contain a dais at one end, close to the ablution-slab, and a series of stone slabs in the middle of the floor in front of the dais. The dais itself was intended to hold a throne and footstool, round holes for which were cut into the upper surface of the carved dais in the Kalhu arsenal, and the stone slabs in the floor were occasionally grooved so as to resemble tram-lines; the purpose of these latter was demonstrated, at Guzana (Naumann 1950, 45), by the remains of a movable hearth in position upon them.

4. A description of an Assyrian court ceremony (MVAG XLI, heft 3, 61) includes references to all three of these floor features, with the king taking his seat on the throne, a courtier stoking the hearth, and another courtier holding a towel and washing water. These factors, together with the size and location of the room, clearly justify Thureau-Dangin's description (BAH XVI, 20): "c'était la grande salle d'apparat, la salle du trône.......c'est là que le roi donnait ses audiences".

At Hadatu, of course, the local governor will normally have taken the place assigned by Thureau-Dangin to the king, but the name "throne-room" is used, throughout this study, to refer to rooms of this type. They are to be distinguished from other, less grandiose "reception-rooms", which may contain similar floor-fittings but which belong to entirely different architectural units and occupy different positions. The throneroom suite can always be recognized because it divides an inner from an outer court.

5. Room XXVIII, north of the inner court at Hadatu, is one of the lesser "reception-rooms". This example contains hearth-lines and an
ablution-slab near its west end. Behind the west door is a small room (XXIV) which connects in its turn, via the corridor (XXIII) opening into an alcove in the corner of the court, with a typical Assyrian bathroom (XXII). This is well protected against water, and includes a stone floor-slab shaped to hold a hip-bath; other bathrooms, as discussed by Mallowan (Iraq XVI, 159), have contained additional slabs, loose water-jars, and small containers sunk into the floor beside the drain. Presumably the side-entrance from the corridor into the court was for the use of servants, though it could have allowed anyone in the inner court to use the bathroom. Behind the reception-room XXVIII is another moderately large room (XXVII), again with a small attached chamber (XXVI) leading from it into a bathroom (XXV); the set of three rooms could only be reached through room XXVIII. The principal one (XXVII) invites classification as a bedroom, and rooms of this type are given this name below, though the tentative nature of such identifications should again be emphasized; other "bedrooms", such as room XXV at Til-Barsip (BAR XXIII, plan B), could be equipped with simple hearths. The whole pattern of two large parallel rooms, with the outer and longer room (reception-room) sometimes and the inner room (bedroom) always connected to a bathroom, is one that occurs repeatedly. It may be considered, not impractically, as a residential suite. This again was recognized by Thureau-Dangin; Frankfort (1954, 81) regarded rooms XXIV and XXVI as bedrooms, an arrangement which is also clearly possible.

6. Room XLIII, which eventually became another small apartment with a paved bathroom attached, originally led out of the inner court to a
ramp or sloping corridor (LVI), and thereby, perhaps, right out of the building. This could have been, as Turner suggests (Iraq XXX, 63), a separate entrance for visitors to the temple block on the east of the inner court, or simply a private back-door. Certainly there are other, more elaborate or better preserved, examples of such back-doors; particularly handsome examples are at Til-Barsip and Guzana (see above, V,T,3 and V,0,2). At Guzana, in the north-east palace, a corridor, partly concealed by accretions on the plan but precisely equivalent in position to corridors XXIX-XLIX at Til-Barsip, led from the south-west corner of the inner court, and sloped round the end of the eroded residential suite to communicate, very probably, with a postern-gate in the town-wall.

7. The plan of the foundations on the east side of the inner court at Hadatu is exceptional. The excavators (BAH XVI, 30) suggested that they may have been used for cooking and storage, but there is nothing similar in equivalent positions elsewhere. A possible fragment of a drain in room XLI might be thought to indicate that the wing consisted entirely of various residential suites, with rooms XXXV and XXXVI as bathrooms from which the paving and drains had been lost; but this would be a repetition of the mistake made by Place in the last century, when he interpreted the temple area at Dur-Sharrukin as the royal harem. The only Assyrian buildings really close in plan to rooms XXXII-XLI at Hadatu, as pointed out elsewhere (Iraq XXX, 70) and argued at length by Turner (Iraq XXX, 63), are the shrines of the Nabu temples at Kalhu.
(Mallowan 1966, fig. 193), Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, pl. LXXI), and Ashur (Andrae 1938, Abb. 69), which date from the end of the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries respectively. At Hadatu XXXIV would be the main North-east of the inner court, on a lower level, and beside another ante-chamber, XXXV and XXXVI additional ante-chambers to the twin shrines XXIX and XXXII, as well as of relatively small shrines XXXVII and XXXVIII, and XXXIX a shared holy of holies or attached room; rooms XXXIII, XL, and XLI would then constitute the corridor which acted as a cordon sanitaire between shrines and the outside world, while room XXXII, like perhaps room 28 at Dur-Sharrukin, would have served as a staircase to the roof. The lack of buttresses on the courtyard facade is strange, but is more than compensated for by the presence, among the Hadatu sculptures, of several free-standing genies of a type only found in temples (see above, V, 8, 3).

8. The existence of this temple block naturally raises the question of whether the Hadatu building was a palace at all. Its inner court does partly resemble the western court in the Nabu temple at Kalhu, where there were also twin shrines and a reception or residential suite. Though palaces and temples in the Assyrian capitals are usually close to each other, the distinction between sacred and secular territory is preserved. Nonetheless some palaces and private houses are known to have incorporated shrines, though these tend to elude identification on the ground; temples, on the other hand, did not incorporate throneroom suites of the kind found at Hadatu. It seems therefore not unreasonable to suppose that, in a small provincial town such as Hadatu,
where the god Nabu can hardly have been popular, the Assyrians found it sensible to join the temple and the governor's palace together.

9. North-east of the inner court, on a lower level, and approached through rooms XLII and XLW-XLVI, is a complex of relatively thin-walled rooms and courts; in date they are secondary, but could have been added during the same operation as produced most of the building. There are two pairs of small and large rooms like those in the outer court: XLVII and the bathroom XLVIII, and L and XLIX. Room LIII, judged by a trace of paving in its south-west corner, was also a bathroom, comparable in position to room XXII and only a little smaller. This part of the temple-palace could have covered quite an extensive area northwards, and may have served a multiplicity of purposes; there are corresponding groups of rooms in all sizable Assyrian houses. These areas do not conform in detail to any standard pattern; in general they are linked directly to the inner court, and indirectly to the outer court; they may have their own outer doors. Individual types of room can be recognized within them, but the disposition of these is more variable than that of the more distinguished suites; the groundplans appear convenient rather than conventional, and much of the inner life of the house must have been carried on within them. They may be termed domestic wings.
C. Ashurnasirpal II's Palace at Ashur

1. This is the earliest version of the Old Palace (see above, I.M.11) to be readily comprehensible, though only a fragment survives. The absence of an outer court appears to reflect earlier practice, but room 22 is recognizable as the stub of a throne room, with an inner court ("Haupthof") behind it to the south. Rooms 1-5 are clearly a residential suite, and the bedroom is linked, through room 6, with a second inner court forming part of the domestic area. It may be suggested that this second court may have been occupied by the king's wife and concubines, as a direct connection between their quarters and the king's might frequently have been found convenient. Certainly the women of the household had areas to themselves, where they could be secluded if necessary. There is a series of Middle Assyrian court regulations which often say how women were to be treated (AFO XVII, 261); the Achaemenid procedures described in the biblical book of Esther are similar in spirit, and despite their late date probably little changed from those current in Assyria.

D. Ashurnasirpal II's Palace at Kalhu.

1. The basic design of this building (see above, III,E) is clear. The outer court extended from the throne room facade ("rooms" D and E) on the south to the series of offices known as ZT on the north. The
west side, above the citadel wall, has almost entirely disappeared, but there was probably a range of rooms stretching south from the vicinity of ZT 19; the thin wall reaching northwards from room C opposite need be no more than a late addition. The main gate from inside the citadel can only have been on the east, though there was also a passage on the north (ZT 2) leading to the temple complex. Whether there was yet another outer court to the east is uncertain; walls found by Layard east of rooms I and L led him to conclude that the palace extended "considerably beyond the limits" shown on his original plan (NR II, 13), and Mallowan's plan includes a stub of wall projecting east from room K. If there was a forecourt here, however, it may have been as closely connected with the temples to the north as with the royal palace itself.

2. Y is recognizable as the inner court, with a throneroom suite (B, C, ramp, F) on its north side and a residential suite (S, T, V, W, X) on its south. To the south-east, and suitably accessible from room S, is a second inner court, and there is a complex of domestic rooms behind it. On the east of the main inner court is a suite (G-O) which might be considered residential, but the presence of two vast "bathrooms" (I and L) entered through the inner reception room (H) imply rather that the suite was used for ceremonial purposes; Brandes, in an unpublished discussion (Rencontre Assyriologique, 1969), has suggested that room G was designed for a specific religious ceremony, but if this were so one would expect specifically religious decoration. A fourth range of rooms existed on the west of the inner court, but their plan has not been fully recovered. The limits of the suite are effectively indicated
by two corridors: Z-BB, which had a pair of colossi at its western end looking out, almost certainly, onto a court on that side; and the north-south corridor, just west of the throne-room ramp, which should also, by analogy with the arrangements in the Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin arsenals, emerge through a porch into an open space. This leaves the range as consisting essentially of three rows of north-south rooms, as Layard tentatively restored it in his final plan (NB, plan 3 opposite p. 653); it then corresponds, in position relative to the throne-room and in approximate plan, to the projecting wings of the two arsenals (see below, VI,E,4), which are better preserved and more comprehensible.

3. An important problem concerning the ground-plan of this palace is whether or not the throne-room facade incorporated a central door. The evidence is both archaeological and comparative, and both varieties are self-contradictory. There was, when Layard first examined the ground between the side-doors e and f, "a peculiar depression" in the area, from which he concluded that "when the slabs of the northern wall of" room B "were carried away for the construction of the southwest palace, excavations were made to reach them" (NR II, 203); this conclusion is implausible, but excavations to remove slabs might well have been made at a more recent date. Elsewhere Layard describes how the wall appeared to someone standing near slab B 27: "further on there are no traces of wall, although a deep trench has been opened" (NR II, 111). This situation is contrasted with that on the "opposite side of the hall" which "has also disappeared, and we only see a high wall of earth. On examining it attentively, we can detect the marks of masonry;
and we soon find that it is a solid structure built of bricks of unbaked clay, now of the same colour as the surrounding soil; and scarcely to be distinguished from it". It is clear therefore that at this time Layard was aware of the distinction between fill and mudbrick, and that the brickwork of the north wall was in very poor condition if he could not discern it; it follows that a central door, if it existed, would have been invisible to him, and that Layard's early plans (NR I, plan opposite p. 62), which show the north wall as stretching between the side-doors without interruption, represent in this instance not what he saw but what he thought likely at the time. Some years later, however, when he was more familiar with Assyrian planning, he changed his mind, and wrote that doors 2 and 3 "appear to have flanked a grand central portal to which they were united on both sides, as in Sennacherib's palace, by colossal figures of human-headed bulls and lions and winged priests" (NE, 654). Maybe this change was prompted more by what Layard had seen at Khorsabad and Kuyunjik than by investigations on the spot at Nimrud, but it was the final judgement of a painstaking scholar.

Though Moortgat (1939, 146) also pleaded for a central door, modern scholars have generally relied on the validity of Layard's earlier plan. The area has never been systematically examined for an answer to this particular question, but it has been gradually cleared, until now only one patch of possibly undisturbed soil in which the answer may be concealed remains; this has been given a concrete facing during restoration work, and is at present inaccessible. All those
members of the British expeditions to Nimrud and of the Iraq Directorate General of Antiquities who have been consulted are agreed that the mud-brick in the area was mostly decayed beyond recognition, and that the wall was always assumed to be continuous. The one definite wall found near where a central door may be postulated was the odd corner which appears on Mallowan's final plan of the palace (1966, fig. 42); this was not investigated to any substantial depth, and may have been a late or irrelevant construction. Two other significant discoveries have been, in publication, either overlooked or over-developed. The first of these is a magnificent door-socket capstone, unpublished, which was found broken against the north wall of the throneroom, approximately where it would have been placed had a central door existed; no hole for a door-socket was noted, but the area had been disturbed by Layard's old trench and what was left of the floor was not scrutinized. The second discovery was of a mass of rough limestone foundations between the two buttresses surviving on the north side of the wall, towards the outer court. These foundations underlay the brickwork of the buttresses where this was visible, and if they really stretched without interruption from one buttress to the other, as they are represented as doing on the published plan (Sumer XII, Arabic section, pl. II following p. 132), this would imply that the buttresses were indeed originally the two ends of a single mass. On the ground, however, the central stretch, some 20 m. wide, between the two buttresses, is entirely devoid of visible limestone foundations. This suggests, since they have certainly not been removed, either that they did not exist in the middle
at all, and owe their existence in Ainaohi's drawing to Layard's imagination, or that they were, in the middle, laid at a lower level, perhaps with a different function from the remainder, and have since been covered unintentionally. 

5. The extant decoration of the buttresses themselves is not easily compatible with the belief that they joined each other. That on the west retains a colossal bull facing west, that on the east a colossal bull facing east; the latter also has, lying in front of it, some fragments of an equally colossal lion which, if it were replaced in its natural position, would face west (Sumer XII, Arabic section, pl. XII following p. 134; Iraq XXX, pl. XVIII c). The eastern buttress was thus faced with two colossi back to back, and it is likely, as the Assyrians had a predilection for symmetry, that the western buttress echoed this arrangement though there the lion is not preserved. Now all the surviving Assyrian colossi of the ninth century face straight ahead, and were normally equipped with five legs; four were the legs of a striding animal, as seen by a spectator from the side, and the fifth was an extra fore-leg for the benefit of the spectator standing face to face with the monster. Obviously these alternative views were only possible when the colossus was situated at the outside corner of a wall, as the bulls on the facade buttresses both were; in order that the lions should have done the same, however, the buttresses must have been separated by a recess, across which the lions would have faced each other directly. This is not in itself an immediate argument for a central door in the recess, but it may be questioned what other
feature the two buttresses are likely to have framed. Buttresses framing central doors were a commonplace of Assyrian architecture, but ones with sculpture were expensive and correspondingly scarce. There is one other ninth-century example, in which a bull and a lion stood back to back on a buttress with a genie between them (see above, III,F,2), but it cannot be proved that there was a door connected with them. Better parallels exist in Sargon's palace at Dur-Sharrukin (see above, IV,F,3), on the facades of the main gate, the throne room, and room 8; the first two had genies between the back-to-back colossi on each buttress, but there were colossi alone on the third. There are further examples at Nineveh (see above, II,H,7). These later facades are those of which Layard was thinking when he postulated a central door to Ashurnasirpal's throne room.

7. Another feature of the decoration, also suggesting that a central door existed, is the sculpture on the south wall of the throne room (Iraq XXVII, 122, pl. XXVII a; slab B 13). The main slab shows a scene similar to that behind the throne (B 23), and is the centrepiece of a small group of pompous single-register reliefs which break the continuity of the narrative reliefs on this wall. The group is not, geometrically, half-way along the wall; but it is opposite the position which a central door would have occupied. Now the throne rooms of both Sargon and Ashurbanipal (OIP XXXVIII, fig. 71; Iraq XXVI, 9, 13) had, on the walls opposite their central doors, large plain slabs differing from those on either side; the slabs in the equivalent part of Sennacherib's palace may well, judged by Layard's reference to "the extremities of a human
figure" (NR II, 127), have shown life-size figures rather than the narrative scenes of the surrounding slabs. It may be deduced that the portions of wall opposite the central doors of these later thronerooms were intended to be peculiarly impressive when viewed from without, and the same motive may have accounted for the choice of subject for slab B 13 in the throneroom of Ashurnasirpal. It should also be noted that the slabs removed from the north wall of Ashurnasirpal's throneroom were all situated on either side of the possible central door; though they may have been removed through door q, the most natural explanation for their loss is that the workmen responsible took the slabs nearest to hand while using the widest entrance, one in the middle.

8. The trend of this circumstantial evidence is to favour a central door, but there is another throneroom facade at Kalhu, built in the ninth century, which seems to have had side-doors only. This is in the arsenal, where, though excavation at the relevant point was confined to scraping the surface, the north wall of T 1 was seen to continue uninterrupted from its eastern to its western door (Iraq XXV, 8, 35); F 16, a possible reception-room in the Dur-Sharrukin arsenal (OlP XL, pl. LXXV), has the same arrangement. There is no indication that Shalmaneser's facade was sculptured, and the architects of the arsenal may have been working to different specifications; nonetheless this is the one roughly contemporary throneroom in an adequate state of preservation. It could be suggested that Ashurnasirpal's throneroom only acquired a central door during Sargon's repairs to the building, but this would not account for the features of the decoration on which
the arguments for the door's existence are largely based. On the whole, despite the anomalous groundplan of the arsenal, it seems most likely that Ashurnasirpal's throneroom, like those of Sargon, Sennacherib, and Ashurbanipal, did have its central door all along.

E. The Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin Arsenals.

1. The identification of Sargon's Palace F as an arsenal depends on its resemblance in size, siting, and plan to Shalmaneser's arsenal (Iraq XXV, 36), and the two can be discussed together. The room-numbers cited below belong to the Kalhu arsenal unless they begin with the letter F.

2. Both buildings (see above, III,H and IV,G) had more than one outer court, with store-rooms, workshops, barracks, and other residences around them. The Kalhu arsenal also had a large domestic wing (S), separate from the military area, and a postern-gate in its south-west corner. The arrangement of the state apartments requires some explanation.

3. The throneroom suites are identifiable as T 1, 3, and 7-9, and F 20-25; only at Dur-Sharrukin was there a central entrance to the main room, and a bathroom beside the throne. Behind these throneroom suites there is, in both instances, an open space adjoining the city-wall instead of an inner court proper; a visitor emerging from the throneroom suite would have found a palatial wing projecting on his right, but little or nothing on his left. The situation at Kalhu is unclear, as there was a postern at either end.
a suite or residence (T 2, 4-6) east of the throneroom, and this may have been accessible from the inner area rather than from the battlements (Iraq XXV, 23); at Dur-Sharrukin there was merely a group of rooms, F 27-30, which were probably used for storage, and the equivalents of which at Kalhu (T 10, 20) were fitted into the projecting wing on the right.

4. The projecting wing at Dur-Sharrukin consisted of three rooms (F 16-18) parallel with each other and interconnecting; a fourth room (F 19), at right angles to the rest, could only be reached through a door in the narrow end of the middle one of the three. The plan at Kalhu was more elaborate, but the wing also consisted essentially of three parallel rooms (T 25-27). F 18, T 25 and T 27, all outer rooms, had buttressed facades; T 25 had a niche in one of its end-walls, as if a throne or dais had been set in front of it, and T 27 had an ablution-slab against one wall. These are features associated with reception-rooms, and the absence of other such features, at least at Kalhu, is insignificant, as the places where they would naturally belong were not cleared. Oates' conclusions therefore seem valid (Iraq XXV, 35): since T 25 and 27 are reception-rooms, T 26 may be regarded, with its attached bathroom T 22 and private egress through T 24, as a bedroom or retiring-room between them. Indeed T 27 was accessible from T 26 only at its upper, western end, where the ablution-slab was placed; thus the king, entering or retiring, would not have been obliged to walk in public the length of the room. T 25, however, could be entered from T 26 at either end. T 28 may have been a corridor linking the two
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reception-rooms, and need have had no doorway into T 26. It may be suggested that T 27, facing the space behind the throne-room, was used for rather more private receptions than T 25, which could be approached from the outer court through the corridor S 76 and the porch S 74. At Dur-Sharrukin F 18 takes the place of T 27, F 17 or 19 might be retiring-rooms though no bathroom is attached, and F 16 may have been used, like T 25, for public business; F 13 and 15 correspond to S 76 and 74.

It is clear that the rooms on the west side of Ashurnasirpal's palace at Kalhu, adjoining the inner court but connected by a corridor and probable porch with the outer court, had a similar nature (Sumer XIX, plan following p. 68; Iraq XXVII, pl. XXXII). Oates (Iraq XXV, 36) also adduces a group of rooms at Til-Barsip, but this seems less certain (see below, VI,F).

5. Beyond the projecting wing, to the right of a visitor entering the inner side of the entrance to the palace, there was in each building a group of rooms (S 3-7, 10, 16-19, 28-30 and F 5-8, 12) making up a separate residence or residences. At Kalhu a group of documents dealing with the affairs of the housekeeper (šakintu) was found in one of the rooms (Iraq XXI, 121), and they suggest that these side-quarters were assigned to resident officials administering the palaces. The same could have been true of the rooms west of the throne-room ramp in Ashurnasirpal's Kalhu palace (Sumer XIX, plan following p. 68), and rooms 13 and 14 of Sargon's palace at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, pl. LXXVI).
F. The Til-Barsip Palace.

This town was an important military base, and the palace (see above, V,T,3) had two outer courts, A and B, like the metropolitan arsenals. The throneroom must be room XXII; whether this had a central door in its facade is not known. The inner court, C, had a residential suite on its north side. On its east, opposite the throneroom should have been another residential suite. Oates, on the other hand, (Iraq XXV, 36), compares it with the projecting wing of the Kalhu arsenal, as the inner reception-room has a further door leading inwards from it. Perhaps we should also compare it with the group of rooms on the east side of the inner court of Ashurnasirpal's Kalhu palace (see above, VI,D,2). The southern side of the inner court is eroded, so that none of these possibilities can be eliminated; this building moreover can seldom have been used by the king himself, and the plan may have been designed to suit other official requirements.

G. Sargon's Palace at Dur-Sharrukin

Here (OIP XL, pl. LXXVI, corrected by pls. LXX and LXXXVI) there were two outer courts, XV and VIII. The principal entrance was through room 98 (with no adjoining side-doors); this led into court XV around which was grouped a series of rooms and on one side courtyards which Place described, no doubt justly, as "dépendances". A side-door led
from the court to the block of temples to the south-west, and a single door linked it with the domestic quarters to the north-west. Larger gate-chambers, 80 and 81, led to court VIII, which was dominated by the facade of the throneroom, Place's court VII. The throneroom suite consisted basically of court VII and rooms 22-24 and 27, as restored by Loud (OIP XL, 54); the adjoining court V and room 21 are enigmatic, though the room may conceivably have been a domestic shrine. The inner court VI was ringed by suites of which only the south-eastern, which merges into the domestic quarters, can possibly be considered as residential; even this has no bathroom, and could merely consist of two reception-rooms, 33 and 37. The south-western suite does consist of two rooms only, 25 and 26, and is not connected with the domestic wing. The remaining suite, on the north-west, incorporated three large parallel rooms, 19, 20, and court IV, recalling the western side of Ashurnasirpal's inner court at Kalhu and the projecting wings in the arsenals; they may have served a similar function. It is possible that Place's plan of these three suites in the inner court is misleading, as was his plan of the throneroom suite; there is, however, another set of state apartments in the palace, and this incorporates many of the required types of room.

This other complex was in a wing situated to the west, and was approached from the palace either through the triple range of rooms adjoining the inner court VI or through a corridor (room 10) from the outer court VIII. Like the projecting wings in the arsenals, it overlooked the city wall; there were again three long rooms along its main
axis. There was a residential suite at the stub of the wing, at right-angles to the projecting axis; it consisted of a bathroom (12), a bedroom (11), a reception-room (6), and an ante-chamber (9), much resembling Ashurnasirpal's residential suite at Kalhu (rooms S, T, and V-X). The north-western or outer wall of room 6 contained two doors. One led into a room (2) in which no floor-fittings were recorded, but which should by analogy with T 27 in the Kalhu arsenal be a moderately private reception-room, opening onto the more secluded side of the wing. The other door led into the central room (5), from which another door opened directly onto a throne-base at the end of room 8; this latter was a more public reception-room, like T 25 in the Kalhu arsenal; it was equipped at least with a dais and ablution-slab, and was accessible from the outer court through corridor 10. Rooms 2 and 8 themselves were linked by a pair of doors passing through the north-western end of room 5, which may have been little more than a passageway or waiting room. At the far end of the wing, at right-angles to the main axis, is yet another reception-room (4), with a small passage at one end (3) leading to a bathroom (1); the door between rooms 3 and 1 has to be restored. Room 3 connects also with room 2, so that the bathroom 1 could have been reached from both reception-rooms 2 and 4. There was no bathroom attached to room 8, though this itself shared a door with room 4. Another door in room 4 led into 7, a small square room which was otherwise secluded.

3. It is clear that the ground-plan of this wing, unprecedented in Assyria, was the result of careful thought. It combines an unusually private residential suite with an unusually large number of reception-
rooms themselves graded for privacy. Internal communications are neat and economical, external doors abundant and impressive, and the whole unit is conveniently compact. The "inner court" is around the building instead of inside it. The genesis of the idea may perhaps be seen in the projecting wing of the Kalhu arsenal, but it has been transformed; Sargon might have designed the wing personally as an improvement on the older types of state apartment with which he was familiar. This might account for the confusingly vague character of the true "inner court" area, which was not perhaps intended for regular royal use and where the rooms, though grand, were of slightly smaller proportions.

4. On the battlements to the south-west of the projecting wing was the free-standing building tentatively identified as a bit hilani (see above, IV,F,3); this also must have been for private use. To the north of corridor 10 are the stubs of two rooms, 13 and 14, which are perhaps the remains of the residence of a palace official. The paved rooms 16-18, beyond the "bit-hilani" to the south, might have been store-rooms, or stables for the king's own use.

H. Seventh Century Palaces

H. Seventh Century Palaces

These explain each other, and the latest but clearest is therefore in the neighbouring suites which suggest that rooms existed between them, discussed first. The main obstacle to understanding them has been that none has been generally recognized as containing the traditional throne-room suite. Ashurbanipal's palace at Nineveh, however, (see above, II, I,3), is well enough preserved to be related to pre-Sargonid buildings.
2. Courtyard J in that building has the following characteristics:

There is a building on a moulded plinth on its western side (Gadd 1936, Appendix, 11). The only parallel for this is the free-standing structure at the western corner of Sargon's palace, on the more private side of the projecting wing.

On its northern side is a building with a columned entrance. This contains two parallel rooms (I and H), the inner of which connects, through room G, with a bathroom (F); it may therefore be a residential suite.

In the north-eastern corner there was, probably, a doorway leading into a corridor (C), and thence down a ramp to a postern (S). The door between court J and corridor C is hypothetical, but it is remarkable that no trace of wall-decoration was found between slabs 8 and 9 in court J or between slabs 17 and 18 in the corridor; this is the space where a door, had it escaped Rassam's notice, would have had to be placed. Room C, though eventually used as a tablet depositary, is incomprehensible except as a corridor with doors at either end.

To the south there may have been a range of rooms facing the F-I suite; this was undug or eroded out of recognition, but space for it was available. At both ends of this space there are jambs and set-backs in the neighbouring suites which suggest that rooms existed between them.

On its east side is a suite (L, M, N) separating it from the larger court O. The one feature of these rooms not compatible with their interpretation as a standard throne-room suite is the open-ended appearance of M, which would have to be the throne-room itself. Both Sennacherib
and Esarhaddon, however, built large and obviously grand rooms with open ends, and it is reasonable to suppose that the same design may have become finally acceptable in throne rooms also. The standard position of the throne may also have shifted away from one end-wall to a spot against the wall immediately opposite the central door; the placing at this point, however, of large plain slabs (8-9) which broke the continuity of carved orthostats, is no more necessarily than a continuation of previous practice (see above, V,D,7). If M was the throne room, then a ramp should have been situated beyond the north door of room N; the discovery of a solid mass of brickwork in this area, without any wall-slabs, would have accounted for the failure of Rassam and Loftus to excavate it fully or obtain a satisfactory plan. Another throne room feature which can be restored with some plausibility is a bathroom in the unplanned space behind slabs 2-7; no traces at all were found of "slab 6", though those on either side existed, and a small door could easily have been fitted into the interval.

3. These five points, none by itself conclusive, combine to indicate that court J was the equivalent of the inner court in pre-Sargonid palaces, with O as the outer court. An identifiable inner court may therefore be sought in Sennacherib's palace also, despite the incomplete plan available and the many complications and innovations which this exhibits (see above, II,H). Court VI appears to qualify for the following reasons:

- Rooms VII and VIII to the north are a residential suite. It is clear from the carved decoration, and from the difficulties which Layard
obviously had with the plan, that a partition-wall must be inserted at
the east of the bedroom (VIII), between slabs 2 and 3; slab 10, oppo-
site, is a doorjamb, and slab 4 occupies the niche normal above bathroom
drains.

The suite on the south side consists of three parallel rooms with
subsidiary adjoining chambers. The whole block could be understood as
two residential suites back to back: XV-XVI and XLVI would be the bed-
rooms, each connected to its own bathroom and reception-room. Altem-
atively we may regard the block as corresponding to the triple range of
rooms in the Kalhu arsenal (see above, VI,E,4) and elsewhere: room XIII
would then be a relatively private reception-room and XLIII a more public
one.

The suite on the western side includes two large rooms and one smaller
(IX-XI); the plan may be incomplete. They might correspond to the
rooms on the east side of Ashurnasirpal's inner court, or on the south-
west side of Sargon's. This is highly uncertain.

In its south-western corner is a corridor (XII) leading, through the
open passage XLIX, to the descending ramp LI; this latter was dug as
far as a stone-arched room (NB, 340). Such arches belong to postern
gates, as in Ashurbanipal's room W (Gadd 1936, Appendix, 6) and Esar-
haddon's addition to the Kalhu arsenal (Mallowan 1966, figs. 379-380).
The ramps leading to them were indeed accessible from other areas, but
they could always be reached from the more private courts; inner courts
in the provincial palaces also had them (see above, VI,B,6).

The suite on the east side of court VI includes the largest room in
the palace (I), the facade of which (again the palace's largest) gave onto an enormous court (H); there were also a bathroom (IV) leading off one end of room I, a small chamber (III) entered through colossi at the other end of room I, and a long intermediate room, with colossi at both entrances, between room I and court VI. These are features regularly found together in throneroom suites but not elsewhere. There is no real evidence for a ramp on the far side of room III, of which Layard wrote that it "had no other entrance" except into room I, and that "one side of it was completely destroyed" (NR II, 137). If destruction was so extensive, however, it may be that Layard's confidence in the existence of only one entrance was misplaced; certainly the present mound rises to a distinct peak just beyond room III, suggesting that there may exist here the solid mudbrick core round which a ramp could have ascended. The approach to any such ramp, however, would have had to be in an anomalous position, to the left of a visitor entering room III from room I; there were sculptured slabs blocking the way on the right. But even if no such ramp existed, the remaining rooms in the group are sufficiently distinctive to be classified as a throneroom suite.

Court VI, with such surroundings, must therefore correspond to the main inner court seen in older and simpler buildings, and court H to the main outer court. The area to the west, accessible probably from both inner and outer courts by corridors in their north-eastern and north-western corners respectively, should be the domestic wing. Some of the rooms, however, namely LXV-LXXI, look to belong to residential
suites as grandiose as that in court VI itself. Their position on the edge of the citadel, overlooking the postern-gate, was copied later in rooms behind the inner court of Ashurbanipal's palace; there they formed an upper storey, approached by corridor E, and slabs fallen from them were found in the debris of rooms W, S, and T (Gadd 1936, Appendix, 9). In both palaces these rooms were far removed from the outer court and were presumably private; they were situated on the airy edge of the citadel, like Sargon's projecting wing at Dur-Sharrukin, and may have been envisaged, by the kings who commissioned them, as residences more to their taste than the traditional inner courts.

5. South of Sennacherib's inner court is another large court, XIX. This has the reception-room XLIII on its north side, and a little-known block, which probably incorporated a corridor to court H, on the east. On the south was a poorly preserved block mainly consisting of two large parallel rooms (XXIV and XXVII); these had magnificent doors in the centre of their long axes, both lined with colossi facing towards court XIX. A more elaborate or better preserved version of this basic pattern was to be found in the block on the western side of the court, comprising rooms XXIX-XLI. The large parallel rooms XXIX and XXXIV both have colossi, facing court XIX, in their central doors; a third pair of colossi, in line behind the others, lead to a smaller innermost room (XXXVI) such as might also have existed at the now eroded back of the southern block. There were two additional groups of rooms at the western block's north and south ends. The northern end produced many fragments of tablets, probably fallen from an upper storey (Smith 1875,
144); one (NB, 346 right; ARU, no. 64) may deal with the affairs of the royal bodyguard. In the southern group, if we assume that LX was one magnificent room rather than two rooms or a courtyard, was another room (LXI) which seems to have been a depositary for documents (NB, 460). It contains a ramp running round a central square of brickwork, and its walls incorporated, besides some pigeon-holes, a number of projections which could have supported shelves; on its floor were many bullae from documents, stamped and with the string-holes still visible.

6.11. The ground-plan of both southern and western blocks, with the main external gateways leading not to blank walls but to internal doorways of equal grandeur, is new to Assyrian architecture; something of a parallel may be read into the suite east of Ashurnasirpal's inner court, but there the outermost door is out of line. Two axial doors were normal in Syrian palaces, but three appear, somewhat dubiously, at ninth-century Shadikanni (see above, V,N,2). Both Sennacherib blocks must have been of great importance, and the quantity of tablets and documents in the neighbourhood suggest that they may have served an administrative purpose. Sargon's conquests had enlarged the empire with which Sennacherib had to cope to such an extent that the latter may well have decided that the office space provided in the outer courts of the traditional palaces, and perhaps in the smaller palaces, was inadequate and insecure. The natural solution would have been to include within his new palace an area designed specifically for his civil service; this could have centred on court XIX. The further group of rooms to the west (LI-LIX), the possible bit hilani (see above,
II, H, 2), may have had some distinct function; they could have been an extension of the king's apartments.

7. Esarhaddon's palaces are hardly known. That at Nineveh was an arsenal (see above, II, K), and may have borne some resemblance to those at Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin. The same king's palace at Kalhu (see above, III, G) includes one identifiable unit. Three successive doors in line, each flanked by colossi all of whom faced north, led from a courtyard, through two long rooms, into a smaller inner room; the back wall of the latter was not found, but the pattern of the block is clearly that of the buildings on the west and south sides of Sennacherib's court XIX.

I. Shrines

1. The shrine-area of the temple, with its attached vestries, treasuries, and other rooms, corresponds to the state apartments of a palace. The internal arrangements of typical neo-Assyrian shrines are familiar; that at Zamahu has been briefly described above (V, L, 4). One other matter, of somewhat dubious significance, has been raised by scholars, and merits brief consideration.

2. The positioning of the divine statue on its dais within the shrine, and the means of approach to it, differed in Assyria and Babylonia. Petty shrines could probably be arranged in any number of ways, but in the major temples there is a contrast between the southern "Breitraum", in which the god stood with his back to the centre of a
long wall and faced the main entrance opposite him, and the Assyrian "Langraum", in which the god was secluded at one end of his shrine.

3. The true "Breitraum" only appears in Assyria under Babylonian influence. There are examples in the early Rimah temple (see above, V,L,2), the Ashur temple at Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta (see above, V,A,2), though there the statue was recessed in a substantial niche, and Sennacherib's bit akitu at Ashur (see above, I,L,3). The principal shrine in the Ashur temple at Ashur (see above, I,D,7 and 19), as originally planned by Shamshi-Adad I, may conceivably have qualified, and the shrines on either side of the smaller central court seem to have been similar.

4. The door of the "Langraum" could be situated either in the end-wall at the far end of the shrine opposite the dais, or in one of the side-walls. The former scheme is seen in Ninevite 5 shrines at Gawra (Speiser 1935, pl. X), but the latter in early historical shrines such as those of Ishtar at Ashur (see above, I,I,1), and at Gawra (Speiser 1935, pl. VI), Nuzi (Starr 1937, II, pls. V, VI), and Taya (Iraq XXX, pl. LXXVIII), in all of which the dais was to the left of the door. The Ashur shrine at Ashur was similar, though Shamshi-Adad may have had other intentions; there was an ante-chamber adjoining it.

5. The Anu-Adad and Sin-Shamash temples at Ashur (see above, I,G; I,H), both of whose ground-plans may go back to Shamshi-Adad I, have an arrangement which Lenzen (ZA XLI, 35), perhaps rightly, regards as a compromise between the "Breitraum" and the "Langraum". The doorways have to be restored, but this presents no difficulty. The door of each
shrine must have been at the end opposite the dais; in front was an ante-chamber, at right-angles to the shrine, with a central courtyard door opposite that into the shrine itself. This is the basic plan adopted for almost every pretentious neo-Assyrian shrine yet excavated; the Ashur shrine at Ashur was converted to this arrangement by Sennacherib. It can safely be said that a god for whom a shrine of this type was built was regarded with particular respect at the time, but it is possible or likely that the same god could be housed more simply elsewhere. It need only be noted that the three known temples of Sin and Shamash, at Ashur and Dur-Sharrukin (see above, I,G; IV,C), always have shrines of this type; so do those of Nabu and (?) Tashmetum at Kalhu, Hadatu, Dur-Sharrukin, and Ashur (see above, III,D; VI,D,7; IV,D; I,I,8), though the smaller pair of twin shrines at Kalhu have no ante-chamber.

6. Tukulti-Ninurta I's Ishtar of Ashur shrine at Ashur (see above, I,I,5), and the shrine, which may possibly have replaced it, in the outer court of Sin-shar-ishkun's Nabu temple (see above, I,I,8), have side-doors with the dais to the right, and ante-chambers in front. Perhaps the rule, if there was one, that the dais should be to the left of a side-door, was relaxed after the introduction of shrines with end-wall doors. Tukulti-Ninurta's Dinitu shrine and Ashur-resh-ishi I's (?)Ishtar shrine at Ashur (see above, I,I,5 and 6), together with the shrines of Belit Mati and Ishtar Kidmuri at Kalhu (see above, III,C,4 and 5), were also entered through side-doors, with the dais on either side; these had no ante-chambers. It may be that manifestations of
Ishtar always had shrines entered through the side, but again the evidence is insufficient.

7. Other neo-Assyrian shrines without ante-chambers could be entered either through a side-wall, in which case the area of wall opposite the door might be given special treatment (OIP XL, pl. XVIII), or through an end-wall. It seems most unlikely that the different arrangements had any ritual significance. Indeed the groundplan may often have been decided by practical criteria, by architects calculating the most convenient or economical way of fitting one or more shrines into a whole complex of temple buildings. There is a possible instance of this at Dur-Sharrukin, in court XXVII of the temple complex (OIP XXXVIII, fig. 98), where the great shrines of Sin and Shamash have room for the smaller parallel shrines of Adad and Ninurta beside them, while the Ea shrine on another side of the court is the only one entered through a side-door; there is a comparable scheme, with Ninurta occupying the large shrine, at Kalhu (Iraq XIX, pl. VII). More abstruse explanations seem unnecessary.

J. Ziggurats

1. Shamshi-Adad I (EAK, II b) states that at Nineveh he built a ziggurat bigger and better than before; the implication is that a ziggurat built by Manishtushu had existed previously. If so it would be the earliest structure of its kind recorded in Mesopotamia, but even so Manishtushu was a southern king and it is in the south that the ori-
gins of the Assyrian ziggurat clearly lie. There are southern examples from the Ur III period on, and they became an important or essential feature in Babylonian temple architecture: by the neo-Assyrian period every major southern city probably had one.

2. Eight ziggurrats are known in Assyria. Shamshi-Adad I, apart from building or rebuilding that at Nineveh (see above, II,D,3), was responsible for the original foundation of one or both of those in the Anu-Adad temple at Ashur (see above, I,H,1); that at Rimah (see above, V,L,2) may also be his, and the Ashur-Enlil ziggurrat at Ashur (see above, I,F,1) though first mentioned later, may go back to him. The new capitals of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, Kalhu, and Dur-Sharrukin (see above, V,A,2; III,O,2; IV,C,2), each had one apiece, though Kalhu's was only constructed by Shalmaneser III. Their plans vary greatly. The main Ashur ziggurrat and that at Dur-Sharrukin were free-standing, without immediate access from temples; the Nineveh ziggurrat may have been similar. That at Kalhu abutted on a temple complex, and the remainder, though fitting more neatly onto temple units, were nonetheless distinct appendages without which the architecture would still make sense. We assume that, as in Babylonia, there were ways up all of them; the Dur-Sharrukin ziggurrat had a ramp running round it, and various arrangements are possible elsewhere. Babylonian ziggurrats had separate stages, and shrines on top; it is quite uncertain whether this was true of Assyrian ziggurrats, and if so what rituals would have been performed upon them.

3. The early ziggurrats in Assyria can be regarded as Babylonian features introduced by architects and rulers for whom such imposing
structures had a natural appeal. Perhaps the same motive prevailed throughout: an Assyrian familiar with Babylonia could hardly approve of a capital city with no ziggurat at all. The strange positions some Assyrian ziggurats occupy, their devious means of access, and even the delay in building the example at Kalhu, would all be compatible with a theory that they were of little practical use. Place interpreted the Dur-Sharrukin ziggurat as an observatory; it would be too much to say that this is plausible, but it is one use to which at least the late ziggurats might have been put; perhaps a ritual text will eventually enlighten us.

K. Architectural Theory

1. Assyrian architects, far from having to conform to adamant traditions, were well able to think for themselves and design accordingly. Here the interest which different kings took in their favourite projects must have been of great importance, for they liked to outdo their predecessors and are likely to have made quite sure that inadequacies noted in previous designs were not repeated in their own. Nonetheless their practical requirements did not change fast, and some innovations, such as the bit hilani, were merely introduced from abroad. The average building can fairly be described as unimaginative, an agglomeration of familiar units assembled together with or without finesse. Symmetry was obviously admired, but surveying techniques were rudimentary and irregularities abound; walls were often thicker than would seem necessary,
so as to ensure their strength.

2. The town-plan of Dur-Sharrukin is odd. In some ways, though a new foundation on a fresh site, it seems to resemble Kalhu, which in turn incorporates few discernible improvements on the haphazard arrangement of Ashur. But the town-wall of Dur-Sharrukin looks suspiciously as if it was intended to be square, and the two gates in each of its sides may, though some lead nowhere, indicate that the architects wished to introduce logic, and even perhaps a street-grid, into the design of their new capital. The attempt, if made, was a failure (OIP XL, 10).

The sophisticated architect of the main Rimah temple, over a thousand years earlier, could have done far better; he was probably trained in the south (Iraq XXIX, 94). Generally Assyrian architects seem to have been concerned more with practical than with theoretical considerations.
CHAPTER VII

Types of Decoration

A. Techniques

1. The idea of decorating walls naturally existed, in Mesopotamia as elsewhere, from a very early date. Mudbrick, the standard building material of the area, does not readily lend itself to ornamental effects, and must in any case be covered by a protective coating of plaster. Baked bricks and stone are more amenable, but were too expensive to be used frequently except at vulnerable points such as the tops and bottoms of walls. Even there they can be superfluous, and most neo-Assyrian architectural decoration is applied rather than structural. The occurrence of particular techniques in different buildings has generally been noted above (chapters I-V), but the main types are listed briefly below. Detailed methods of construction and similar technicalities have not been considered; Loud's careful remarks on the methods in use at Dur-Sharrukin (OTP XL, 35) are mostly applicable to neo-Assyrian buildings elsewhere too.

2. Most familiar are the stone orthostats carved in low relief. The material of which they were made, and their position at the base of walls, has enabled large numbers to survive, but they were rare outside the great royal palaces. They were normally two to three metres high, and, though combined with some plain examples, clearly decorative rather than functional (except in so far as the decoration itself performed a
function); they are of course distinct from, though related to, the smaller stone orthostats, or baked bricks on edge, which were used by themselves for protection. It is doubtful even whether the brickwork above rested on top of the carved orthostats, though obviously it may have done so to some small extent. The carving itself was normally done when the orthostats were in position; probable exceptions are Sargon’s small basalt orthostats (Flace 1867, I, 92), and the slabs from Hadatu (BAH XVI, pls. VII-XIII). An early stone orthostat from Assyria may be the Rimah demon (Iraq XXVIII, pl. XXXIV b), but this could be a cult-object. Ashurnasirpal II was the first Assyrian, so far as we know, to erect substantial series of orthostats; fragments of earlier series, had they existed, would surely have been found at Ashur. It seems likely that Ashurnasirpal, in so doing, was influenced by what he had seen and heard described in Syria, where the Hittite tradition of carving the stone footings of mudbrick walls had never been forgotten: at Carchemish, for instance, (Woolley 1952, 240,) many stone wall-footings and orthostats were carved with elaborate compositions, and though the dates of these are much disputed, there is no doubt that some at least existed before the foundation of Kalhu. There may have been Assyrian wall-paintings, visible in Ashurnasirpal’s time, which covered internal walls as extensively as his orthostats were to do, but none of these are now known. Tiglath-pileser III, and thereafter Sargon and his dynasty at closer intervals, all put carved orthostats in the principal rooms of their grand new palaces.

3. Colossi are really large orthostats carved, except under Tiglath-
pileser III (TP3, pl. CVII), in exceptionally high relief; they were, however, incorporated into the walls, and supported the facing brickwork above (OTP XL, pl. X c). They were roughed out in the quarry, probably to reduce their weight, and finished in position (MN II, pls. XII-XVII; Iraq X, 16). They also may owe something to Syrian prototypes, but they have more direct or conventional ancestors in the figures of terracotta or stone which guarded Mesopotamian temple entrances throughout ancient history. Early Assyrian protective figures, which were free-standing, are the small Old Assyrian or earlier lion from the Ashur temple (WDOG LXVII, Taf. XXV b), and a goat-fish by a temple door on a Middle Assyrian seal (Andrae 1938, 111, Abb. 50); the "lion's head" gate in the Ishtar Temple at Nineveh (see above, II, D, 9), mentioned by Ashur-resh-ishi I, may have had lion-heads projecting from stone orthostats or footings. Tiglath-pileser I (see above, I, M, 10) placed lions and other figures at the entrances of his palace in Ashur, but they too may have been free-standing. Ashurnasirpal II was again the first king to use this form of decoration methodically on a large scale, and he was followed by Shalmaneser III; when Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon, and the Sargonids recommenced extensive public building, they naturally erected colossi. Sennacherib mentions some of metal (OTP II, 108), as do Esarhaddon (ARAB II, 269) and Ashurbanipal (ARAB II, 353); Ashurbanipal's palace, however, has no colossi at all, even in the throne room area. A pair in Senna­cherib's palace may be ascribed to Ashurbanipal, if very tentatively (see above, II, H, 11), and it is hard to believe that he did not have the resources to manufacture them in stone; most probably the absence of such
figures in the king’s own palace reflects religious developments in Assyria at this time (see below, VII,F,1).

4. Mosul marble, the stone most commonly used for orthostats and colossi, varies in colour from white to grey. Certain specific details of the carving, at least at Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin (Botta 1849, V, 177; NR II, 306; Iraq XXIV, 91) and some genies at Nineveh (e.g. BM 118932), were picked out in paint; this was done both indoors and out. The main colours found are black, white, red, and blue; Layard noted green and yellow at Dur-Sharrukin, but these seem to be excluded by Botta’s comments; Place mentions violet (1867, II, 252). The same four colours predominate in neo-Assyrian wall-paintings, and we should expect other colours, if there were any more, to be equally restricted to specific details. No traces of paint have ever been found as background colouring, and most carved surfaces are plain even on those orthostats which were partly coloured. We must conclude that paint was only used for special effect. Coloured inlay was also employed, but seldom, for the eyes of a few stone figures (see above, I,M,11); probably exceptional figures such as metal colossi, like statues of gods, were inlaid in part. We may see a reflection of this practice in some actual paintings where odd details are emphasized (e.g. OIP XI, pl. XQ), and there is a stone face (NB, 640, text-figure; Gadd 1936, 164), broken but with its main features unexpectedly complete, which might have belonged to a large sphinx (apsarasatu) with a metal body.

5. Paint applied directly to the plaster walls was a cheaper and commoner means of decoration, but is seldom found in good condition. There
is Middle Assyrian work from Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, and fragments of paint were present inside almost every large building at Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin; few major neo-Assyrian buildings can have been without it in their principal rooms. In the palaces, when the walls were lined with orthostats below, there were sometimes, perhaps always, paintings above (e.g. Rassam 1897, 28; *Sumer* XIX, 67; *OIP* XXXVIII, 67). Ceilings too were often painted (e.g. *OIP* XXXVIII, 68), though there happens to be no mention of this in the otherwise extensively painted palace at Til-Barsip. Out of doors painted decoration was hardly practicable, except large masses of colour which could be easily renewed; the Dur-Sharrukin ziggurat was painted in this way, with the lowest stage white, the second black, the third red, the fourth perhaps blue, and so on perhaps to precious metal at the top (Place 1867, I, 141); stone, which did not need continual renewal, might also be painted, and there are examples, striped red, blue, and plain (white), which probably decorated the battlements above the Adad and Shamash gates at Nineveh (unpublished). The number of colours used in neo-Assyrian wall-paintings obviously depended on the palette and imagination of the painter, and perhaps his patron's means. The background colour is usually white, but the more expensive blue replaced it in parts of buildings such as Ashurnasirpal's palace (*NR* II, 40), Shalmaneser's arsenal (*Iraq* XXV, 29), and sometimes at Dur-Sharrukin (*OIP* XL, 83). The other standard colours are black and red, the former of which was ordinarily used for outlines. Other colours which survive include green, orange, brown, and pink (*OIP* XL, pl. XCI, 30; Parrot 1961, figs. 115-120), and we may expect others; Place (1867,
II, 252), Smith (1875, 78), and tentatively Layard (NR II, 16), all mention yellow.

6. Glazed bricks provided colour out of doors. They fall into three categories: bricks which were glazed like tiles on the square side, those which were glazed on one edge (and sometimes part of the adjoining square side), and those one edge of which was first moulded and then glazed. The tiles are known mainly from the reigns of Tukulti-Ninurta II (Andrae 1925, pls. VII-IX), Ashurnasirpal II (AAA XVIII, pls. XXVIII-XXXII), and Esarhaddon (NN II, pls. LIII-LV); none were found in position, but they all belong to series showing small-scale events, and they probably acted as orthostats. The earliest Assyrian edge-glazed bricks date from the reign of Adad-nirari I (IAK, xxx, 28 B, 29 E), and others may have been mentioned by Tiglath-pileser I (APO XIX, 141).

There are numerous examples from ninth-century buildings, and many more from Dur-Sharrukin; Sargonid examples are scarce, but the technique in fact survived and flourished down to the Seleucid period. The edge-glazed bricks were used most commonly to frame architectural units; thus they regularly formed the crenellations, not necessarily defensive, which crowned important walls and facades (e.g. WVDG XXIII, Taf. LXXVIII), and the slight projections would account for the presence of glaze off the brick-edge itself; at Dur-Sharrukin they provided a protective skin for the brickwork of arched doorways (Place 1867, III, pl. XIV), more elaborate than the plain baked bricks employed for this purpose by Sennacherib in the Adad gate, and doubtless other gates, at Nineveh. There are also more substantial groups: the arched panels above some lintel
doors in palaces at Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin (Iraq XXV, 41); the facings of the platforms adjoining entrances to shrines at Kalhu and Dur-Sharrukin (see above, III, C, 3-4; OIP XL, 41); the facings of both the platforms and the gate-towers in the Ashur temple at Ashur (see above, I,D, 14-16); and a podium in the inner Nabu temple courtyard at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, pl. XXII). Comparable functions can be assigned to most of the glazed bricks found by Thompson at Nineveh (II,D,11), though the presence of some, alternating with courses of stone in the bridge between the temple-palace terrace and the Nabu temple at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, pl. XII D), indicates that glazed bricks could be used in many unpredictable positions. We should note that Botta (1849, V, 59) believed that many edge-glazed bricks found by him at Dur-Sharrukin had formed friezes above the orthostats, both indoors and out; we would welcome outdoor friezes of this kind, with processions of courtiers much like those on the orthostats below, but indoors there were paintings above the orthostats and we doubt if glazed bricks would have been thought necessary or desirable (cf. OIP XL, 15). Some of Thompson's glazed bricks from Nineveh were moulded, and Rassam (1897, 222) found other moulded bricks which we expect were coloured. The technique of moulding bricks goes back to Kassite Babylonia (e.g. Frankfort 1954, pl. LXX), but these are the only Assyrian examples; they may have formed the facings of platforms beside shrine doors. The glaze colours on the bricks vary according to the expertise of their manufacturers, and probably the price of the raw materials required: in the Kalhu arsenal, for instance, the blue in the great arched panels is obviously superior in quality to that on bricks, designed for
the crenellations, which must be roughly contemporary. The standard background colour was blue, though it was sometimes replaced by white or olive-green (e.g. NB, 166; AAA XVIII, 82). Other standard colours are black, white, and yellow. We know also of green (e.g. Iraq XXV, 40), another yellow (Andrae 1925, 6), a buff which may have been originally another blue (WVDOG LXVII, 55), and if we follow Botta (1849, II, pl. 155; V, 171), red, purple, and grey. There is no chronological significance in these and other variations; there is nothing new in the obstinacy with which a modern Mesopotamian potter guards his formulas for glaze, and though the Assyrian kings could afford to employ the most skilful of their subjects, the contract may not always have gone where it should have.

7. A peculiar form of indoor glazed decoration, often imitated in wall-paintings, is the lozenge- or cushion-shaped plaque, a quadrangle with slightly concave sides; other glazed plaques, less common, may be circular. Each plaque was fixed to the wall by a large central nail, the glazed head of which projected to form a boss; often the plaque and the nail were a single object. Hansen (JNES XXII, 152) has shown that the quadrangular plaques are remote descendants of square Sumerian door-fittings, to which ropes may have been attached. They eventually lost their association with doors, though they would still have been suitable as pegs with wall-hangings attached to them, and possibly this is the reason why, between the thirteenth and ninth centuries, they developed concave sides. In the ninth century, to which all extant examples can be ascribed (e.g. Andrae 1925, 63), they were fixed, at head- or shoulder-height, around long stretches of wall at intervals. The bronze facings
for similar objects of wood were found at Daim in the Dokan (Sumer XVI, Arabic section, 107, pl. IX); these may be Achaemenid.

8. The nails in the centres of these plaques may have been known, despite their distinctive origin, as sikkate. These are objects, frequently mentioned in the texts, which were made usually of baked clay or bronze and which, from a very early date, were inserted into the superstructure of external walls and seem to have provided some measure of divine protection. They come in many shapes and sizes (Andrae 1938, 145, Abb. 64); some particularly plain and unattractive examples were found in position round the Nabu temple at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, 43); others could have glazed heads, and many were inscribed. Sargon II used them, in conjunction with glazed bricks, in the middle of the rosettes a row of which probably ran just below the crenellations in the Ashur temple at Ashur (NDOG XXVI, 22); the rosettes themselves have thick circles drawn around the petals, as if to resemble roundels, much like the rosettes in glazed brick from Shalmaneser's Kalhu arsenal though there the centres of the rosettes were formed by the bricks themselves. Paintings inside the "Governor's Palace" at Kalhu (see above, III,1,2) form concentric circles round holes in the plaster, where comparable sikkate of metal may have been inserted. The wall-pgs, sometimes glazed, with open trumpet-mouths, which were used in the Middle Assyrian Ishtar temple at Nineveh (see above, II,D,9), though possibly described as vera (rosettes), must be closely related to the sikkate.

9. Panels of niches and engaged columns in mudbrick are a form of decoration which may have been especially characteristic of temples;
they were placed on external facades, and sometimes indoors opposite entrances. We have suggested above (I,D,13) that the word namaru may have been applied to facades of this kind. The half-column mudbricks had originally been embellished with surface patterns, as at Rimah (see above, V,L,3); these recall the Sumerian columns with cone-mosaic patterning, and moulded baked bricks may have derived from them. Middle Assyrian and later examples all seem to have had plain surfaces. Both half-columns and niches were especially well preserved at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, 37), where niches were in fact found in the main palace as well as the temple areas. There were also mudbrick pillars, with rabbeted sides, in a courtyard of Residence L (OIP XL, 31), though these perhaps are merely an elaboration of the common doorway reveals.

10. There are various kinds of structural decoration. Corbels, or perhaps pseudo-corbels, wall-pegs which ended in clenched fists, sometimes glazed, were common in the ninth century (see above, I,M,11), at Dur-Sharrukin (Botta 1849, V, 59), and possibly later too. Towards the end of the eighth century columns, with carved or cast bases and capitals (e.g. NB, 232), were introduced from the west. Moulded stone plinths and cornices (Gadd 1936, Appendix, 11; OIP XL, 40) appear at about the same time, and may also reflect western influence. Other structural features may be expected: the stone impost blocks, carved in front, from for Shalmaneser III's visit to the sources of the Tigris. The new second-millennium Rimah (Iraq XXIX, 75), indicate the kind of range possible.

11. Courtyards and bathrooms in neo-Assyrian buildings can be paved with brick or stone, sometimes pebble mosaics (see above, V,Y,3), but most...
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floors are simple earth; we must imagine them covered with reed-matting and carpets. Stone door-sills are often inscribed, but they may also, at least from the reign of Sargon II on, have floral patterns which probably imitate carpets; there is a comparable pattern of hexagons on top of Shalmaneser III's Kalhu thronebase (Iraq XXV, 11).

12. There are numerous permanent or semi-permanent fittings of some significance. Single plaques of stone or glazed terracotta (e.g. Andrae 1938, frontispiece, Taf. XXI c, XXII b, XXIII a), with religious scenes, would belong on the walls of petty shrines. Wooden doors, and the shafts adjoining temple entrances (OIP XL, 4b), could be covered with embossed bands of bronze or other metals. Obelisks, altars, stelas, free-standing statues, and other features were often highly ornamental, and could be regarded as part of the architectural ensemble. Opportunities to decorate were seldom neglected.

B. Execution

1. We have two illustrations of Assyrian masons at work. One (MM II, pl. XIV) shows a Sennacherib colossus being roughed out in the quarry, with an army of workmen and several overseers. The other, more enlightening (King 1945, pl. LIX), shows the carving of two commemorative panels for Shalmaneser III's visit to the sources of the Tigris. The upper panel is a text, for which three men are responsible: the first wears court dress, and stands a little detached from the others on a bench in mid-stream, waving towards them as if in general charge of the operation; the main outlines, but are found in subsidiary details such as jewelry
the second, also in court dress, holds a tablet and stylus, and is clearly giving instructions to the third man, wearing a common kilt, who is actually chipping the signs on the rock-face with hammer and chisel. The lower panel is a royal stela, executed by another mason standing on a rock in the water; he seems to be taking his orders from a courtier who is in turn drawing the king's attention to the work. There is no evidence in this scene for the existence of preliminary sketches, drawn or incised, but they would obviously have been convenient. Certainly painters experimented with outlines before filling in with colour (e.g. BAH XXIII, 64, pl. XLIV; Iraq XXV, 39), and the text on one pair of colossal at Dur-Sharrukin (Place 1867, I, 184) was found written simply in black ink, whereas it should eventually have been carved.

2. The way in which the Assyrians set about large-scale schemes of decoration is best demonstrated by the carved orthostats from Ashurnasirpal's palace at Kalhu. Over two hundred of these survive, and most of them show formal repetitive scenes which can be compared directly with one another. The subject-matter clearly conforms to an overall design for the entire palace, but there are major variations, in items such as dress and proportions, between figures, in otherwise identical circumstances, on orthostats from different parts of the building (Iraq XXVII, 124). The variations, though they may exceptionally have some ulterior significance, must normally reflect the personal styles of the artists assigned to the different rooms; the transitions are always abrupt and clear. There are also, however, minor variations which do not affect the main outlines, but are found in subsidiary details such as jewellery
and musculature, and in the quality of execution; they cannot be categorized so neatly, and may appear between two figures on a single slab (Iraq XXVII, pl. XXVIII; JDAI LXXIII, 1). These details must be attributed to the artisans who did the final carving, and to the efficiency with which their work was supervised and checked. As Layard observed (NR II, 78), "the work of different artists may be plainly traced in the Assyrian edifices. Frequently where the outline is spirited and correct, and the ornaments designed with considerable taste, the execution is defective or coarse; evidently showing, that whilst the subject was drawn by a master, the carving of the stone had been entrusted to an inferior workman. In many sculptures some parts are more highly finished than others, as if they had been retouched by an experienced sculptor...." There were then at least three tiers of responsibility: first a man or committee decided on the general nature of the palace decoration, then a number of draughtsmen made preliminary sketches in the areas assigned to them, and finally a mass of artisans transformed and elaborated the sketches into the bas-reliefs we see today.

3. Other monuments embody comparable variations. The carvings on Shalmaneser III's Kalhu thronebase, a small unit carefully designed, are the work of at least two men (Iraq XXV, 14). The same king's Imgur-Enlil gates are extremely complex, as shown by Pinches' analysis (1902, 1). "The predominant style, and that which shows the most technical knowledge, is exhibited by strips I, II, III, V, VI, VII, IX, X, XI and the fragment N; the others being represented by VIII (amateurish, with tall slim figures), XII (similar, but better work), IV (similar in style, but
showing improvement, the figures well grouped, and three figures superimposed), and XII (also similar, and showing less sameness, especially in the indications of the country traversed). It may therefore be supposed that the artists employed upon it consisted of a master-workman and two assistants, or, perhaps one assistant, who improved greatly in his work with the practice he obtained. The four strips IV, VIII, XII, XIII, however, may not be the work of an apprentice, but of a successor or successors to the original artist? Even this statement, however, may be an oversimplification, since almost every band has its own consistent peculiarities of style and grouping. There may then have been many more than two or three workmen employed on the project at once, though Pinches' attribution of IV and VIII to a possible apprentice may be supported by the appearance, on IV a, of incised figures never hammered into relief, and, on VIII b, of a besieged town without any defenders (King 1915, pls. XXI, XLIV). A glance at any selection of orthostats from one of the great royal palaces will produce many examples of workmanship that can be ascribed, more or less confidently, to different hands, and other examples of work left incomplete even on "finished" slabs. We note only, as an extreme, the variant coats of mail worn by Sennacherib's soldiers (e.g. S. Smith 1938, pls. XXXVIII, XXXIX, XLI, XLII), Nagel (1967, 15) points to a number of other variations and oversights in the Sargonid palaces. We discuss separately, below (VII, I), some particular anomalies.

4. It would seem that in the seventh century, when small-scale narrative pictures were being mass-produced as never before, preliminary sketches were sometimes omitted. A fragment of one Sennacherib orthostat
(S. Smith 1938, pl. XLI) shows the feet of some soldiers taking part in a siege; their bodies, however, have been recarved, and they reappear above, in identical poses, standing on a groundline that runs across the knees of the lower figures. Though there might be other explanations, the reason for this change may have been a failure of co-ordination: two sculptors, working on adjoining sections of wall, failed to agree on a common ground-line, and therefore met each other at different levels and at a slight angle. Ludicrous as this may seem, the same error was apparently made in unpublished slabs from room L of Ashurbanipal's palace; there the angle needed only a slight change, but the tidy succession of palm-trees in the background was sadly disturbed. We also have one specific incident, the death of Ituni during Ashurbanipal's Teumman campaign, two versions of which survive: one in room XXXIII of Sennacherib's palace, and another in room I of Ashurbanipal's palace (compare Barnett 1960, figs. 119, 128). In both the Assyrian officer and his victim Ituni are in approximately the same poses, but the surrounding details are entirely different. In room XXXIII the landscape is packed with figures in action against a backdrop of dwarf oaks, and the other Elamites are shown falling naturally in battle. In room I, which is later, the dwarf oaks (so far as the slab is preserved) are limited to two, on either side of the main figures, and the area around is littered with Elamite corpses, stripped and often beheaded, who lie as they must have laid long after the battle was finished and Ituni dead. Apparently the later sculptor followed the same prototype for the Ituni group as his predecessor had done, but was free to fill in the rest of the scene with his own,
somewhat unimaginative, conception of what an Assyrian victory ought to look like.

5. Barnett (1960, 18), noting the number of recurrent motifs such as "man-leading-a-horse" and "two-soldiers-marching" in seventh-century work, has suggested that master's "copy-books" were employed at Nineveh; Nagel (1967, 15) lists many such motifs, but prefers to regard them as part of the artists' stock-in-trade, for which no "copy-books" would be required. This seems generally more likely, but not when specific details and incidents, such as the death of Ituni, were being represented. This was done increasingly from the reign of Tiglath-pileser onwards, and from the same date we sometimes see Assyrians in court dress holding tablets and scrolls; they usually appear together, and are evidently engaged in recording the booty. It used to be thought that the man with the scroll was writing Aramaic but, though the Assyrians had Aramaic script, an Akkadian version would surely have been sufficient.

Madhloom (1965, 346) has therefore suggested that the man with a scroll may really be a draughtsman, copies of whose scroll drawings would have been available to the sculptors.

6. Scroll drawings, if indeed they existed, were apparently supplemented by models in unbaked tablet-clay. Several of these survive, probably all seventh-century (WDOG X, 108, Taf. XLVIII; Hall 1928, pl. LVII; AAA XX, pl. LXXVIII, no. 22; Andrae 1938, Taf. LXXIV; Ashmolean 1923, 750); though they may have been preserved after use for their own sake or for future reference, it is hard to see what other function, except as models, they could originally have served. A Sargonid
letter (Waterman 1930, I, no. 151; Pfeiffer 1935, 109) mentions a scribe who is responsible for the design of a royal image for dispatch to Arrapha; perhaps he started with a model of clay.

7. We doubt if ninth-century sculptors used aids of this kind, though it is far from impossible and the two orthostats, from Kalhu and Nineveh, which show lion-hunts above and libations below (Budge 1914, pls. XII b, XIX b; Thompson 1929, pls. VI, VII) are strikingly similar to each other. Most probably the sculptors, given a subject, developed familiar motifs to taste. This would help explain the diverse ways in which genies of a single type are represented by Ashurnasirpal's sculptors; specific seventh-century genies are represented far more consistently.

C. Subject-Matter: General Observations.

1. The basic themes of neo-Assyrian wall-decoration go back to the third and fourth millennia in Sumer. Life in ancient Mesopotamia, at least according to official sources, largely depended on a beneficial alliance of kings and priests, operating against a confused but insistent background of supernatural forces. Work commissioned by the Assyrian king, who was himself high-priest, primarily recorded the ways in which he performed or celebrated the performance of the duties owed both to Ashur and to the chosen people of Ashur's country. At the same time danger was evaded, and favour curried, by the representation of appropriate supernatural beings with apotropaic powers; even motifs which look purely ornamental may sometimes have retained a residue of mystic significance.
2. Despite the obvious overlaps, we distinguish here five main classes of subject-matter: narrative, mainly consisting of small-scale action pictures; formal, mainly consisting of large-scale pictures sometimes narrative in content; apotropaic, consisting of large-scale genies and colossi; decorative, which includes all repetitive painted friezes; and hieroglyphic, which is virtually confined to Sargon's temple facades. The rules, such as they are, which govern the positioning of particular items in their architectural context, are discussed elsewhere (chapter IX), but it may be noted that different categories predominate in different palaces. The majority of Ashurnasirpal's orthostats are apotropaic, or include apotropaic figures; narrative scenes, even large-scale formal ones, are scarce. Tiglath-pileser's surviving orthostats mostly show small-scale narrative, but this may be because other categories were hardly preserved. At Til-Barsip most of the paintings are large-scale formal scenes, with decorative friezes above, and apotropaic figures were mostly reserved for doorways. Most of Sargon's orthostats show formal scenes, though there is small-scale narrative in about half the principal rooms; there are apotropaic figures in external doors. The palace of Sennacherib has formal processions in a few corridors, and apotropaic figures at the doors; but small-scale narrative is predominant both indoors and out. Ashurbanipal's palace is similar, but the apotropaic figures do not include colossi.

3. Private houses or small palaces have decorative paintings and little more. Most elaborate is Residence K at Dur-Sharrukin, with a vast formal painting in the "throne room" 12 and a "hieroglyph" in room 15.
There was nothing to stop a subject embellishing a royal palace or temple at his own expense (e.g. Iraq XXV, 55), but he wisely kept his own house simple.

D. Subject-Matter: Narrative.

Small-scale narrative, the development of which is discussed at length with references below (chapter VIII), deals chiefly with the events and consequences of the Assyrian campaigns. Naturally many compositions are incompletely preserved, fragments can be interpreted in more than one way, connections between compositions may be dubious, and there are variations of emphasis. Nonetheless six main themes are identifiable: the conquest of natural obstacles on the march, the defeat of enemies, the review and sometimes punishment of captives and the more placid review of tributaries, the triumphal procession, the celebrations at a feast, and worship. In each of these the king is usually present, though not necessarily: in the seventh century, for instance, he is not directly involved in the fighting. All six themes appear on the early White Obelisk, but fights and reviews predominate, occupying sixteen panels out of thirty-two; these two subjects retain their pre-eminence later, and are much the commonest in the surviving small-scale work of the White Obelisk only shows the all the neo-Assyrian kings. The other subjects continue to appear, however, even if sometimes missing: Ashurnasirpal has no scenes of worship, though compensating for this on large-scale formal reliefs nearby; Shalmaneser III has no triumphal marches, though they are perhaps replaced...
by the carving of steles and the collection of timber in enemy territory (King 1915, pls. I, LXX; Unger 1920, Taf. I); Tiglath-pileser's known orthostats do not include the conquest of natural obstacles, the feast, or any scene of worship in which the king participates; triumphs and worship are not found under Sargon; Sennacherib neither feasts nor worships; Ashurbanipal and his army, however, between them do everything. These themes are comprehensive, and there was little need to innovate; we have only Shalmaneser III's scene of a meeting between him and the king of Babylon (Iraq XXV, pl. VII c), and Ashurbanipal's scenes showing the capture and installation of various Elamite kings (e.g. Iraq XXVI, pl. III b; Barnett 1960, fig. 117). Obviously no significance can be attached to the absence of particular themes at particular times; our evidence is defective, and the same themes reappear later. Perhaps we may find, in the reduced emphasis on worship, a reflection of the dropping of the title "priest of Ashur" from the regular neo-Assyrian royal titulary; but it seems more likely that scenes of action were preferred because they underlined the king's positive achievements and, especially in the seventh century, were more easily expanded into elaborate and detailed compositions.

2. Wild animals suffered the same fate as the king's enemies, and the hunt is a campaign in miniature. The White Obelisk only shows the actual pursuit, with gazelle, onager, wild cattle, and conceivably lions as victims. Ashurnasirpal II hunted bulls and lions, and separate compositions showed him pouring libations over them. The next surviving scenes of the hunt, at least in architectural decoration, are in Sargon's
room 7, and the same king's ḫit hilani, where the victims are birds; in room 7 there are processions to and from the hunt, and a feast which probably took place afterwards. Sennacherib's large-scale orthostats in his room LI north, which have to be compared with those in Ashurbanipal's rooms A and R, showed processions to and from the hunt; there had no doubt been other objectives than the variety of fruit, flowers, and small game on the extant slabs. There are large-scale paintings ascribed to Esarhaddon (see above, III,H,3; V,T,9) with lion-hunts and a procession back. Ashurbanipal's hunting scenes, which feature lions above all but also gazelle, onager, and deer, are mostly small-scale, though there are large-scale lion-hunts in room C; libations were poured over the lions. There are also orthostats, mostly large-scale, showing the preparations for the hunt, processions out, processions home with dead lions and smaller trophies, and perhaps the festivities afterwards in a park or zoological garden. A feast scene shows the king relaxing after triumphs both in war and in the hunting field.

3. Civic achievements spoke for themselves, and were seldom shown. The earliest example, if we except Shalmaneser III's collection of timber on campaign, is the transport of timber by sea at Dur-Sharrukin. Sennacherib has one composition showing the movement of what may have been a giant obelisk, and a series showing the adventures of a colossus.

4. Civic processions, with the king on the move in a rickshaw, are shown in an unpublished bronze of Ashurnasirpal II from Imgur-Enlil, and in a series of Sennacherib's large-scale orthostats (Iraq XXIX, 48). The Sennacherib slabs were found between the Ishtar temple and the outer
court of the palace, and Gadd (1936, 215) suggested that they showed a procession from one to the other. A very damaged Tiglath-pileser painting at Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, Text-figure 15) probably showed the king in a rickshaw; he too may have been moving, but it seems more likely that he was simply receiving captives while seated in his rickshaw, as in another composition from the same building (BAH XXIII, pl. LI).

5. This relatively simple framework of compositions is transformed by the addition of innumerable details. Many of these are genre items, such as camp-scenes (from the reign of Ashurnasirpal II on) and fishing (e.g. TP3, pl. CXX: Ashurnasirpal; NB, 231, text-figure: Ashurbanipal). Others are specific incidents, such as Ashurnasirpal II's attack on an enemy water-supply (TP3, pl. CXXII), Shalmaneser's triumph at the sources of the Tigris (King 1915, pl. LIX), Tiglath-pileser's procession of captured gods (TP3, pl. XCI), the activities of Sargon's soldiers at Musasir (Botta 1849, II, pls. CXL, CXLI), Sennacherib's arrival at Dilbat (MN I, pl. LXXII), and, most notably, the events of Ashurbanipal's victory at Til-Tuba (MN II, pls. XLV-XLVII). At all times too, though most conspicuously in the seventh century, the scene can be set by the representation of the relevant landscape. The most straightforward and effective way, however, of making a picture both interestingly relevant and self-explanatory, was to ensure that all the participants were recognizable, with the right dress, the right hair, and the right objects associated with them. This is done at all times, though in a somewhat general manner in the ninth century and on earlier monuments such as the Broken Obelisk (Frankfort 1954, pl. LXXIII a); in the eighth century,
and especially under Ashurbanipal in the seventh, perhaps because professional artists were employed on campaign (see above, VII,B,5), circumstantial details are abundant. Ashurbanipal's sculptors can even represent the facial characteristics of a nation or an individual (AFO XVI, 256, text-figure: Egyptians; Frankfort 1954, pl. 0V: Teumman).

Falkner indeed saw an instance of this naturalism in the faces of some Tiglath-pileser scribes (TP3, 36), but this seems questionable; similarly, though Flandin gave negroid features to one of Sargon's enemies near Gaza (a name he could not have read), Layard (NR II, 398), who had seen the slab, regarded the drawing as wrong. Though Flandin may have been right, Ashurbanipal's sculptors were the men who, in this as in many other ways, first used the technique seriously and effectively. In Ashurbanipal's reign even the most conventional military composition can be considered as an illustration of a specific event. At the same time we must observe that there was no whole-hearted trend towards realism, though on contemporary artforms in which the king appears alongside or alone on horseback, many details of the landscape are equally conventional. Though the god in the winged disc, who flies across the battlefield on Ashurnasirpal's orthostats, disappears in the eighth century, the Assyrian army never suffers the slightest casualties. Though the supernatural beings who swim through Sargon's seascape (Parrot 1961, fig. 267) are absent from Sennacherib's comparable scenes, fish are always represented on top of the water rather partially submerged; so are boats and most men. The colouring of the Til-Barsip paintings is sometimes reminiscent of Dufy (Parrot 1961, figs. 345, 347), and we doubt if the Assyrian kings really dyed their horses blue. Mountains and rocky ground are always represented by the conventional pattern of scales.
6. Narrative subjects are sometimes given captions. There is an early example of this on the White Obelisk (MAOC VI, 57), and there are many captions on the bronzes and other monuments of Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser. Tiglath-pileser and Sargon frequently identify enemy towns shown on their orthostats; Sargon sometimes, Sennacherib, and chiefly Ashurbanipal, give more extensive details. Conceivably the absence of captions from Ashurnasirpal’s orthostats, and the brevity of the eighth-century ones, is due to the presence of cuneiform inscriptions between the registers of carving; since few people could read, it may not have mattered that these texts were in no way affected by what the subject of the carving happened to be.

E. Subject-Matter: Formal.

1. We include under this heading mainly those large-scale compositions in which the king appears standing or sitting in a thoroughly dignified pose. Some of these scenes are duplicated in small-scale narrative, and no precise distinction can be drawn, out of context, between "small" and "large" scale; but it is generally true that the larger the scale, the more formal the action becomes.

2. Ashurnasirpal II’s palace had many such compositions, distinguished by the king’s clothes, accoutrements, and companions. The king’s basic garment, apart from the royal crown, slippers, and jewellery, is an ankle-long dress, closed at the front and belted; this is seen on the small-scale narrative pictures, where it is sometimes combined with a short
apron, conceivably related to the genie's kilt, which covers the buttocks and has angle-long pendant tassels attached (e.g. Budge 1914, pl. XIII, 1). Both these are worn on the majority of formal orthostats, though the relationship of the apron to the genie's kilt is more obvious; over them is another ankle-long robe, also as worn by genies. The robe is shown in several ways, with the greatest variety on figures facing left (e.g. Iraq XXVII, pls. XXIX, XXX), but is always recognizably the same garment. It was a rectangular piece of cloth with tasseled ends and fringed sides; one corner of it was fixed on or near the left hip, it was pulled round the back and under the right arm, and what remained was thrown over the left shoulder. Wearing this robe the king appears in various contexts. In D (cf. Iraq XXVII, 130, for the positions of Ashurnasirpal slabs), when receiving tributaries, and in half the scenes on the long walls of room G and in the room N slabs visible from room G, when flanked by genies in horned caps, he holds a bow in his left hand and arrows in his right. In half the scenes on the eastern long wall of room G, when flanked by courtiers, and in all the room H scenes, when flanked by genies in head-bands, he holds a cup in his right hand and a bow in his left; once at least, perhaps on the northern end-wall of room H, he wears a sword too (AfObh. IV, Abb. 79). In half the scenes on the western long wall of room G, when flanked by courtiers, he holds a cup in his right hand and rests his left on a sheathed sword. On the end-wall of room G, when seated and flanked by courtiers with genies behind them, he holds a cup in his right hand while his left is empty. On the end-wall of room S, when flanked by courtiers, he holds a staff
in his right hand and rests his left on a sheathed sword; on slabs B 12 and B 14, and on the wall of room C visible from B, when accompanied by courtiers who can have genies behind them, he is provided in Layard's description with the cup and bow (NR I, 382, 384), but remains in position show that he carried a staff, almost certainly in his right hand, while since he wears a sword, at least on B 12 and B 14, and there is no place for a cup, his left hand probably rested again on the hilt of the sword. Finally, on the eastern end-wall of room F, when flanked by eagle-headed genies, he holds out an open right hand and rests his left on a sheathed sword. He also wears, on B 12, B 14, and in room F, a necklace incorporating divine symbols and usually associated with another garment, the "ritual" robe, as on B 13. Clearly, though some of these differences may be due to chance, the sculptors had some firm views on how to represent the king in particular circumstances. Obvious deductions are that this outer robe was the standard dress for secular state occasions at this date, that the bow symbolizes the king as a warrior, and that the cup symbolizes peaceful celebrations; perhaps the hand on the sheathed sword indicates strength in reserve, the open hand gives a general welcome, and the staff is connected with the king's role as shepherd of his people. It is equally obvious that interpretations of this kind, or stated in this way, may never have crossed the minds of the Assyrians, but we do have what can only be a conscientiously calculated picture of the diverse personae of Ashurnasirpal.

3. Another form of outer robe, worn over the basic garment but hiding, if they were present, the tassels of the apron, is the "ritual" robe.
This is an ankle-long cloak, apparently a rectangle of cloth supported on the shoulders but partly cut away on the right-hand side above the waist: all that crosses the right shoulder is a corner of cloth that has been pulled round the back from the left hip and secured, in front, by a cord which crosses the chest and joins an outer belt; the robe is decorated with two fringes which spiral round the body and which must have been separate attachments. It is worn on the symmetrical orthostats B 13 and B 23 (Budge 1914, pl. XI), where the king, backed by genies in horned caps, appears on either side of a sacred tree with a god in a winged disc above in the middle; there is a mace in the king's left hand, and his right is raised towards the god in a conventional "finger-flicking" gesture. Tukulti-Ninurta I was represented in the same uniform and with same gestures (Andrae 1938, Taf. II), and nearly all free-standing statues, stelas, and ritual scenes show the king with a mace in his left hand and wearing the same dress. There are exceptions, such as the plain robe worn by Adad-nirari III on the Zamahu stela (Iraq XXX, pl. XXXVIII), and objects, such as staff or sickle (Mallowan 1966, I, fig. 101; Frankfort 1954, pl. LXXXII), can be held in the right hand; or both hands can be empty (Iraq XXIV, pl. XXX). But these in no way reduce the likelihood that Ashurnasirpal is represented, on these orthostats, in the standard dress and posture of a high-priest of Ashur.

4. Shalmaneser III, in a glazed-brick panel from the Kalhu arsenal (Iraq XXV, pl. IX), appears twice in a composition very like those on Ashurnasirpal's orthostats B 13 and B 23; only the genies are missing.

5. Sargon II probably appeared on similar panels (Botta 1849, II,
though there seem to have been gods on each wing as well as in the middle of the winged disc. Another ritual scene, the painting from Residence K at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, pl. LXXXIX), shows the king and a courtier in front of a divine statue. The numerous other formal pictures of the late eighth century, however, from Tiglath-pileser’s palace, Til-Barsip, and Dur-Sharrukin, show review scenes. The king receives processions of courtiers, prisoners, and tributaries, presides over executions, or stands accompanied by a few courtiers only; his accoutrements differ, but the nature of his surroundings leave no doubt as to which aspect of his kingship is concerned.

We have no formal compositions of this sort from the great palaces of the seventh century; perhaps they were thought too dull. An Esarhaddon painting from the Kalhu arsenal, however, shows a large-scale procession of courtiers (Iraq XXI, pl. XXVIII), and there are further review scenes, probably replacing earlier ones of the eighth century, at Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, pls. LII, LIII).

F. Subject-Matter: Apotropaic.

1. We include here only those figures which appear on the sculptures and in large-scale paintings; some re-appear in the decorative friezes mentioned below (VII,G,4). These figures were, without question, designed to exclude or expel the malign influences, sickness or misfortune, which people, the living, certain divinities and lucky genies (see above, LIII,4) in the guise of devils haunted ancient Mesopotamia. They are described individually, as Assyrian types, with little reference to the comparable
figures which were at home elsewhere, especially in Babylonia. It will be observed, however, that the winged figures with an Assyrian hairstyle tend to go out of fashion in the seventh century, and are replaced by others which must have seemed more potent or acceptable to members of a cosmopolitan empire with a profound respect for southern cultural traditions.

2. There is a similar evolution, as discussed by Mallowan (1966, I, 227), in the types of figurine which were buried, also for apotropaic purposes, beneath the floors of many Assyrian buildings. There are texts (AAA XXII, 31), one dated 750, which describe these figurines, and Woolley attempted to correlate the two (JRAS 1926, 689). There is sometimes also a clear relationship between the figurines, whether found or mentioned in the texts, and the figures on the orthostats; various names for the orthostat figures have therefore been suggested below: the iconographical parallels are not always exact, but we should hardly have expected them to be. It must be noted, however, that figures bearing different names may have been iconographically identical, that one name could perhaps be used, in different places or over a period of time, to describe differing figures, and that some names may have been interchangeable. Some genies mentioned as existing on the sculptures, moreover, are not mentioned among the apotropaic figurines; among them are the lamassatu (see above, II,H,4), and, from the Sargonid Ashur temple, the lahmu, kuribu, UR-EE and abubu genies (see above, I,D,17). Unger (RIV VIII, 195-216) discusses the composite genies.
3. The most familiar Assyrian genie (Stearns, ApObh. XV: types A-II-a, A-IV-a, B-II-a) is a standing figure with a man's body and the standard ninth-century coiffure. He usually has two wings, though occasionally four or none, and wears a knee-long dress covered by the same apron and outer robe as is worn by Ashurnasirpal II on the formal secular orthostats; there is a rounded horned cap on his head, a fircone in his raised right hand, and a bucket in his left. These genies are especially common in the reign of Ashurnasirpal; in his palace they occur, as analysed by Stearns (ApObh. XV, 62), beside colossi on facades, in and beside doors, beside the king or groups centring on the king, and most frequently beside sacred trees. At Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, pl. XLVII) and at Dur-Sharrukin (e.g. OIP XXXVIII, fig. 45) they are sometimes found by doorways, accompanied by genies in head-bands; they are also associated with colossi on facades and in gates (e.g. OIP XL, pl. XLVI). Layard refers to similar figures beside the colossi and main gates of Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh (NB II, 137; NB, 136, 229, 442), and once perhaps in an internal door (NB, 586); there were more at the Nergal gate (Gadd 1936, pl. XXIV). A dubious Esarhaddon example (TP3, pl. CXII: centre left), carved behind a colossus at Kalhu, seems to wear a kilt only, and holds an angular object instead of the cone; we know that this object replaced the cone held by other genies in Sennacherib's reign (Parrot 1961, fig. 82), so that this may be a normal development. Some Ashurnasirpal genies from beside doors resemble those with the cone and bucket, but have instead the right hand empty and a mace in the left (A-II-b); or the right hand empty and a sprig in the
left (A-II-c, B-II-b; also Gadd 1936, pl. V); or a sprig in the right hand and a mace in the left (A-II-d). There are also related figures, from Ashurnasirpal's room I, who kneel beside sacred trees and who wear, instead of the usual outer robe, a sheepskin which is attached either to the left shoulder or to the right; most of these have both hands empty (B-II-d), but some have the cone and bucket (B-II-e). It seems not impossible that some of these figures in horned caps may have been related to one anthropomorphic group of "weapon-men", šut kakke (AAA XXII, 46, 66); in the text their left hands hold sticks and their right hands something else, and they are provided with horned caps.

4. Ashurnasirpal also has female winged genies in horned caps and long dresses with sheepskins hanging from the waist (A-II-e, B-II-c); they guarded drains in rooms I and L. The right hands are empty, but they hold bracelets in the left. This recalls the female Narudu (AAA XXII, 46, 66), who, though wearing a headband, does have a "seal-ring (?)" (tal-lal) in the left hand.

5. A male anthropomorphic genie in a horned cap, unwinged, empty-handed and wearing a kilt, is fashionable in the seventh century. He is found in doorways in Sennacherib's palace (Gadd 1936, pl. XVII), probably in Esarhaddon's at Kalhu (TP3, pl. CXII: bottom right), and frequently in Ashurbanipal's (Hall 1928, pl. XXXVI, 1; Iraq XXVI, 4). He is always associated with the lion-headed genie (see below, VII,F,14). His most notable characteristic is his hair, consisting of long tresses twisted up and held in by a band at the back of his cap; this is a fashion of great antiquity, used by some third-millennium heroes (Frankfort
1939, pl. XXII b), and presumably associated, by purists, with a particular supernatural being or group of beings, 237.

6. Flat horned caps are worn by three genies on an exceptional Ashurbanipal orthostat from the throne room door (Hall 1928, pl. LV, 2). They all have long simple dresses, an axe in the right hand, and a dagger in the left. These may be the Sibitti, mentioned in the texts as wearing horned caps and holding hatchets and daggers (AAA XXII, 44, 66); the texts give them quivers too.

7. The free-standing statues of unwinged anthropomorphic genies in horned caps, which were set up at temple entrances, also deserve mention. A gigantic Adad-nirari III pair from the Nabu temple at Kalhu are dressed much like the standard figures with cones and buckets; these, however, have their hands folded, and their basic dress reaches the ankles (Gadd 1936, pl. VII). Other pairs from the same building wear the long basic robe alone (Gadd 1936, pl. VI; Smith 1938, pls. III-IV; Mallowan 1966, I, figs. 196, 243); their hands are either folded, or carry boxes.

There are more from Hadatu, some at least carrying boxes and wearing court dress (BAH XVI, pl. I; see below, VII,1,2). Several of these statues, with flat horned caps used as supports, probably for pots, were found at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XXXVIII, figs. 107-108; OIP XL, pls. XLVII–XLVIII); they have plain long robes, and carry vases with water flowing out of them. There are more figures of this kind with the flowing vase on Sennacherib's basin from the Ashur temple (Parrot 1961, fig. 82). There was also one painted on a bathroom wall at Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, pl. LII), but this is exceptional. Presumably many of these genies had
precise names, which depended on the god on whom they attended; conceivably the figure with a flowing vase is _abubu_, the flood.

8. An alternative to the horned cap was the head-band or tiara. It is worn by many Ashurnasirpal genies whose other attributes, apart from what they hold, resemble those of the standard figure with the cone and bucket. Some of them, standing beside the king or doorways, have buckets in the left hand and their right hands empty (A-III-a, A-V-a); others, by doors, have sprigs instead of buckets in the left hand (A-III-b, A-V-b, B-III-a; also NB, 350, 352), or buckets in the left hand and sprigs in the right (A-III-c). One pair, by a door, had palmette sprigs in one hand and carried dappled deer on the other arm (A-III-d), and another, in an equivalent position, had ears of corn in one hand and a wild goat on the free arm (A-III-e); there is also one, from the centre of a facade buttress between colossi, which wore a sheep-skin hanging from the waist and had a deer or gazelle on its arm and a sprig in the other hand (TP², pl. CXXVII). We then have a probable example, with a sprig, from Shalmaneser's Kalhu arsenal (Iraq XXV, 30); fragments of two Tiglath-pileser figures, one winged and one carrying a sprig (TP³, pls. CIV-CVI); and several unwinged genies with sprigs, one of which leads a bull while another is accompanied by a human-headed bull, at Til-Barsip (BAU XXIII, pls. XLVIII, LII). At Dur-Sharrukin all these genies are unwinged and carry sprigs; some accompany genies in horned caps, as noted above, and others come in pairs, with a larger one in front with a wild goat on its free arm (Frankfort 1954, pl. XVII); there are smaller figures beside colossi on facades (e.g. Botta 1849, I,
Some of these genies may perhaps be identical with the anthropomorphic apkalle, described in the text as wearing the "proper headdresses and ... garments", and as carrying sticks in their right hands while the left hands are empty (AAA XXII, 64).

This type of genie is not recorded in the seventh-century palaces, but bare-headed genies may replace him. There were bare-headed figures, with the traditional Assyrian dress and coiffure, but carrying lions and curved sticks, in the centre of the throneroom facade buttresses in Sargon's palace (OPP XXXVIII, fig. 45), and probably Sennacherib's also (NB, 137, text-figure). Other such facade genies, however, on the main gate to Sargon's palace (Parrot 1961, fig. 36) and in the Nineveh arsenal (Gadd 1936, 92), wear only a tasselled kilt; the former, at least, had hair arranged in large spiral ringlets. It is notable that a winged genie carrying a deer and sprig, which is carved on the embroidery of an Ashurnasirpal orthostat (MN I, pl. L, 7), also has these elaborate ringlets; and the facade position is similar to that occupied by Ashurnasirpal's head-band genie with the deer and sprig. Since the ringlets are another hair-style of heroic ancestry (Frankfort 1939, pl. XVII a), the native genie in the head-band may have been transformed into something more respectable. The curved stick held by the figures with lions recalls the gamlu held by the house-god (AAA XXII, 68), though the figurine's other hand is empty.

Other seventh-century genies, with the same hair-style and tasseled kilt, carry gigantic spears or posts, and are reminiscent of those on a Tukulti-Ninurta I altar (Andrae 1938, Taf. LI a). There are examples
from the reigns of Sennacherib (Smith 1938, pl. XXXV), Esarhaddon (TP3, pl. CXII), and Ashurbanipal (Hall 1928, pl. XXXVI, 1). All are in doors, and Ashurbanipal's are always placed behind the lion-headed genie.

11. A type which is virtually anthropomorphic has a fish-cloak on its back, with the fish-head as a cap; he carried the cone and bucket. Ashurnasirpal examples, from a door near the Ninurta shrine, also have the horned cap, and wear a sheep-skin cloak hanging from the waist; the fish-tail reaches only to the thighs. Fragments of other such figures, with the fish-cloak reaching the lower leg, and once scales on the legs, were found among Shalmaneser's paintings in the Kalhu arsenal (Iraq XXV, 29), possibly at Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, pl. LII), in Sennacherib's palace (NB, 343, with text-figure opposite, 442, 460), and probably in Esarhaddon's palace at Kalhu (TP3, pl. CXII: top left). There are several of them on Sennacherib's basin in the Ashur temple (Parrot 1961, fig. 82), though they carry an angular object rather than the cone. These genies are definitely apkalle (AAA XXII, 52, 66).

12. A common composite genie has a man's body, but the head and wings of a bird. In Ashurnasirpal's palace he is dressed like the standard genie in the horned cap, holds the cone and bucket, and is found beside the sacred tree, doorways, and once the king (A-VII-a, B-VII-a). The figure is similarly dressed in a Til-Barsip doorway, where he is leading a bull (BAH XXIII, pl. XLVIII), but at Dur-Sharrukin, where he occasionally appears by doors or on a small scale near colossal, he has a kilt alone (Pottier 1924, pl. XI). Layard (NB, 72, 73) twice mentions doorway figures in Sennacherib's palace which were apparently given the heads of
birds, but this seems uncertain as their upper parts were destroyed. These genies too are definite apkalle (AAA XXII, 50, 64).

13. One ninth-century genie from Kalhu, found out of position, shows a genie with the hind-quarters of a bird, a scorpion's tail, a fish-head penis, and four wings; it is otherwise human, wears a horned cap, and has its right hand raised and seems to have carried a sprig in the other (Pottier 1924, pl. IV). It is presumably a version of the girtabililu (AAA XXII, 70).

14. The commonest composite genie in the seventh century is a figure with the head of a lion, the ears of a bull, the ruff of a bird (sometimes painted red), a man's body, and claws for feet; it brandishes a dagger in its right hand, grips a mace in its left, and wears a simple kilt. It is found in doorways in Sennacherib's palace (NB II, 124, 134; NB, 73, 104, 460, 462; Gadd 1936, pl. XVII), Esarhaddon's at Kalhu (TP3, pl. CXII: bottom left), and Ashurbanipal's (JAOS IV, 480; Hall 1928, pl. XXXVI, 1; Gadd 1936, 185; Iraq XXVI, 4-8); once in Ashurbanipal's palace it is beside a drain. This figure is always accompanied in doorways by the genie in the horned cap; door-jambs in Ashurbanipal's room 3 have three lion-headed genies, two facing each other as if fighting. This genie, as suggested by Woolley (JRAS 1929, 711), could be the ugallu (?), "great lion", described as having a weapon or mace (kakku) in the left hand and a dagger in the right (AAA XXII, 68); but it also recalls the lahmu (Thompson 1903, II, frontispiece).

15. A genie who was a lion from the waist down and a man, with a horned cap, above, was found in Sennacherib's palace (NB, 72) and again in
Ashurbanipal's (Iraq XXVI, pl. II); in the latter he holds, once at least, a post capped probably by a ring. This is likely to be the lion-man, urmahilu (AAA XXII, 72); he may be closely related to the lion-centaur (see below, VII,F,24).

16. A genie who was a bull from the waist down and a man, with a horned cap, above, though common as a foundation figurine, is absent from the surviving sculptures. We should not be surprised to find him, however, as he did occupy orthostats at Pasargadae (Godard 1962, pl. XL), and we have suggested above (I,D,17) that these genies are the kusarikke used as caryatids in the bit hilani of Sennacherib's Ashur temple.

17. A figure which is human above the waist, with a horned cap, and has a fish's tail, is best illustrated on Sargon's Mediterranean pictures (Parrot 1961, fig. 267). There was at least one damaged free-standing figure of this type, and probably two, outside the Nabu temple at Kalhu (Mallowan 1966, I, fig. 198); the better figure was holding a box. This genie is definitely the merman, kulilu, one of whom formed a column-base in Sennacherib's bit hilani in the Ashur temple (see above, I,D,17).

18. A pair of related figures, but with the fore-quarters of a goat, are illustrated on a Middle Assyrian seal (Andrae 1938, Abb. 50). This goat-fish, the Ṣuhurmašu, was paired with the kulilu as the other column-base in the Ashur temple bit hilani, and two foundation figurines, illicitly excavated but surely found together (Lutz 1930, 383), also represent one of each type. It may therefore be that the damaged genie outside the Nabu temple at Kalhu was a goat-fish, rather than a duplicate
19. An unpublished Ashurbanipal orthostat represents a figure identified by Gadd (1936, 185) as a *muššušu*, the Babylonian dragon.

20. Esarhaddon has a Kalhu genie which seems, judged by the drawing (TP3, pl. CXII: top right), to have had a reptilian body and the head, wings, and claws of a bird. It is tempting to identify this with the *baššu*, a mythical snake named before the *muššušu* in the texts (AAA XXII, 52, 70).

21. The drain in Ashurbanipal’s room F had above it a figure described briefly by both Lobdell (JAOS IV, 478) and Rassam (1897, 33): it had a defaced, perhaps leonine head, a lion’s body, a bird’s wings and claws, and a scorpion’s tail, and reminded Rassam of the Tiamat figure at Kalhu (Budge 1914, pl. XXXVII). This could be Pazuzu (e.g. Iraq XXVII, 34, pl. VII), except at Til-Barsip (AAA XXIII, 69), though none broken.

22. The typical colossus is the human-headed winged bull, with bull’s ears and a horned cap, which was erected at important palace facades and entrances. Kings who employ them usually mention the fact in their building inscriptions, which have been discussed above: they include Tiglath-pileser I (I,M,10), Ashurnasirpal II (I,M,11; III,B,2; III,F,2), Shalmaneser III (III,F,3), Tiglath-pileser III (III,F,5; III,F,9), Sargon II (IV,B,3; IV,F,3; IV,G,1), Semachrib (II,G,4; II,H,7; II,J,1; II,K,3), and Esarhaddon (II,K,3; III,G,2): there are also two in a Til-Barsip doorway (BAH XXIII, pl. XLVIII). Ashurnasirpal’s Kalhu figures have rounded caps, and each of the pair on his throneroom facade has a fish-cloak covering part of its head and body; but all others have...
flat caps, and no other fish-cloaks are known. These genies are cer-
tainly included among Ashurnasirpal's and Sargon's "creatures of the
mountains and the sea"; they are also šedu lamasse, lamamahhe, or
aladlamme.

23. Some of the same names may also have been applied to the human-
headed winged lions in horned caps also used by Ashurnasirpal at Kalhu
(NR II, plate opposite p. 70; NB, 34.9, text-figure; Iraq XXX, pl.
XVIII); they are found in facades and doorways in both his palace and
the Ninurta shrine. A peculiarity of these figures is the rope round
their waists; this is probably derived from the ropes round the waists
of heroic figures in the third millennium (Frankfort 1939, pl. XVII),
and may be related to the tassels hanging from the aprons or kilts of
many Assyrian genies. There are no other human-headed lions of this
type known, except at Til-Barsip (RAH XXIII, 67), though some broken
figures with lion's feet obviously may have qualified, and we may suspect
that when Tiglath-pileser III mentions "lions, winged bulls" (nešē šedu
lamasse) in the doors of his palace (Rost 1893, 74), the nešē may have
been more than simple lions.

24. Ashurnasirpal also employs the lion-centaur, winged with a horned
cap and a rope round the waist, in the side-doors to his Kalhu throneroom
(Sumer XII, Arabic section, pls. after p. 134); one has folded hands,
while the other carries an animal in one hand and a sprig in the other.
The lion-centaur, still wearing the horned cap, but unwinged, with empty
hands, and without the rope, reappears on a small scale and in a subor-
dinate position, beside doors and a drain, in the palace of Ashurbanipal
25. The winged lion with a female human head and a flat horned cap is used in palaces, in doors, or as a column-base, by Sennacherib and Esarhaddon (see above, II,H,8; II,K,3; III,G,2). This is the apsasatu, and its association with columns suggests that it owes more to Syrian parallels, such as the Sakcetzu column-base (Frankfort 1954, pl. CLV), than to the old male winged lion.

26. Among real animals with apotropaic functions, the lion predominated from an early date, and Middle Assyrian examples are recorded (see above, VII,A,3). Ashurnasirpal erected a pair in the entrance to the Belit Mati shrine at Kalhu (NB, 360, text-figure), and Shalmaneser may have put them at the east gate of the Kalhu citadel (see above, III,B,2). Tiglath-pileser III, as we have seen, mentions nēgē in his palace, and in Syria, where lions were abundant on sculpture before the Assyrian conquest, we have eighth-century examples from the town-gates and Ishtar temple of Hadatu (BAH XVI, pls. III, VI, XIV) and a pair from a town-gate of Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, pl. XXXVII). Syrian influence (e.g. Frankfort 1954, pl. CLVI) was undoubtedly responsible for the use of lions as column-bases by Sargon and Sennacherib (see above II,H,2; IV,F,3).

27. The aurochs or wild bull is probably mentioned by Tiglath-pileser I as erected in his palace at Ashur (AfO XVIII, 356), and Tiglath-pileser III put some in the main gate of the Ishtar temple at Hadatu (BAH XVI, pls. IV-V). There is also one in a Til-Barsip doorway (BAH XXIII, pl. XLVIII), and Ashurbanipal mentions putting them in the Sin temple at Harran (ARAB II, 353). The only surviving example from Assyria itself,
except in a decorative position, comes from the Ashur temple (WDOG LXVII, 65) and may be Sargonid. This figure again seems more at home in Syria.

28. Another animal set up at a palace entrance, by Tiglath-pileser I, was a nahiru, identified by Weidner as a sword-fish (APO XVIII, 356). This, perhaps, like Esarhaddon's Egyptian statues erected in the Nineveh arsenal (Sumer X, 110), was more a trophy than an apotropaic figure.

29. One Ashurnasirpal group of supernatural figures (Budge 1914, pl. XXXVII) is perhaps as much narrative as apotropaic in intent. It shows a figure with four wings, a horned cap, a sheep-skin robe, and a long scabbard, rushing forward with thunder-bolts in his hands. In front is a monster which seems to be pursued. Sennacherib (OTP II, 140) mentions a bronze relief on a door of the bit akitu at Ashur, on which was depicted the triumph of the good gods, Sennacherib supporting them, against the evil Tiamat and her children. Since this subject was found in neo-Assyrian work, there is no reason to doubt that the Ashurnasirpal group, which comes from a doorway near the Ninurta shrine, shows Ashur-Marduk-Ninurta disposing of Tiamat. Layard (NB, 656) refers to a building in the centre of Kalhu where the orthostats showed genies struggling against monsters. These are lost, but we may compare the struggles between genies (not kings, who anyway would require inlay on their robes) and monsters in the Treasury at Persepolis (Godard 1962, pl. LXXII).

30. A feature closely associated with apotropaic genies, especially in Ashurnasirpal's palace, is the "sacred tree". This has a thin trunk crowned by a palmette, and is surrounded by tendrils with palmettes and
other fruit growing out of them; it can be compared with formalized
trees from outside Assyria, but has its distinctive neo-Assyrian shape.
In Ashurnasirpal's palace it frequently alternates with bird-headed or
horn-capped genies, behind and in front of them; it also occupies many
corner-orthostats, and appears, on the ritual slabs B 13 and B 23, under
the winged disc. It also occupies some corner-orthostats in Sargon's
palace (Place 1867, III, pl. XLIX). Frankfort (1939, 205-214) shows
straightforwardly that the tree symbolizes "vegetal life"; it is, to
bring the wheel full circle to Layard, a "Tree of Life". No doubt its
precise meaning was somewhat obscure to the Assyrians themselves, as
discussed by Stearns (AfObh. XV, 70), and it should be a beneficiary of
the apotropaic and other rituals going on around it rather than a source
of strength in itself.

G. Subject-Matter: Decorative.

1. We apply this term to the repetitive patterns, generally small-
scale and coloured, which are found in both large and small palaces.
Though consisting largely of motifs apotropaic in origin or intent, they
seem to have been used as conventional decoration without any special
significance. Some support for this view may be found in remarks such
as that of Esarhaddon (AfObh. IX, 62), who compares crenellations and
arches of glazed brick to crowns and rainbows.

2. There is a good collection of ninth-century motifs on the glazed-
brick panel of Shalmaneser III from the Kalhu arsenal (Iraq XXV, pl. IX).
On its sides, and curving to form an arch above, are five registers of decoration, separated by plain bands; the subjects are wild goats kneeling in front of palmettes, arcaded buds and pomegranates, the latter with target centres, large rosettes like sunflowers, guilloches, and small rosettes like daisies. The top central panel shows wild bulls prancing in front of a sacred tree, the trunk of which is decorated with chevrons while its arcaded tendrils are fitted with alternating buds and palmettes or pomegranates and palmettes. At the bottom are horizontal rows of small rosettes and "mountain" scales. Other glazed bricks, from the crenellations of the same building, represent large rosettes with circles round the petals (Iraq XXV, 26); some have guilloche. The crenellations of Shalmaneser's town-wall at Ashur were decorated instead with glazed bricks bearing a horizontal stripe of chevrons (NVDOG XXIII, Taf. LXXVIII).

3. These motifs, which of course recall those on the Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta wall-paintings (Andrae 1925, pls. I-IV), are normal on wall-paintings of the ninth and early eighth centuries. If we exclude the simple bands of paint or bitumen at the feet of walls, such as are found at all times (e.g. Iraq XXV, 29; Mallowan 1966, I, 207), the standard form of decoration is a frieze at or above head-height. The frieze consists of a main central register with, duplicating each other on either side, subsidiary registers of some simple motif. In the main register are bulls or winged bulls prancing or kneeling opposite each other, with a rosette roundel or a quadrangle with curved sides, imitating the glazed plaques which sometimes occur alone (see above, VII,A,7-8),
On its sides, and curving to form an arch above, are five registers of decoration, separated by plain bands; the subjects are wild goats kneeling in front of palmettes, arcaded buds and pomegranates, the latter with target centres, large rosettes like sunflowers, guilloches, and small rosettes like daisies. The top central panel shows wild bulls prancing in front of a sacred tree, the trunk of which is decorated with chevrons while its arcaded tendrils are fitted with alternating buds and palmettes or pomegranates and palmettes. At the bottom are horizontal rows of small rosettes and "mountain" scales. Other glazed bricks, from the crenellations of the same building, represent large rosettes with circles round the petals (Iraq XXV, 26); some have guilloche. The crenellations of Shalmaneser's town-wall at Ashur were decorated instead with glazed bricks bearing a horizontal stripe of chevrons (WDOG XXIII, Taf. LXXVIII).

3. These motifs, which of course recall those on the Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta wall-paintings (Andrae 1925, pl. I-IV), are normal on wall-paintings of the ninth and early eighth centuries. If we exclude the simple bands of paint or bitumen at the feet of walls, such as are found at all times (e.g. Iraq XXV, 29; Mallowan 1966, I, 207), the standard form of decoration is a frieze at or above head-height. The frieze consists of a main central register with, duplicating each other on either side, subsidiary registers of some simple motif. In the main register are bulls or winged bulls prancing or kneeling opposite each other, with a rosette roundel or a quadrangle with curved sides, imitating the glazed plaques which sometimes occur alone (see above, VII,A,7-8),
in between each individual animal. Several examples are known (e.g. 
_Iraq XVI, 158; XXV, 30_); one of Layard's two drawings (_MN_ I, pls. 
LXXXVI, LXXXVII) shows two bulls with nothing between them, but this may 
be an error. Wild goats with palmettes, and a simple register above 
and below, are seen on early Til-Barsip paintings (Parrot 1961, figs. 
336, 337).

4. Most late eighth-century and seventh-century friezes are more 
elaborate, and have many more subsidiary registers of decoration; a 
major additional motif is the arched bud and lotus. The figures in 
the central register include, at Til-Barsip (_BAR_ XXIII, pls. XLV- XLVII; 
Parrot 1961, figs. 342, 343), the bull; a figure with lion's feet (_BAR_
XXIII, 57, 68); the human-headed winged bull, with a roundel (normally 
reserved for gods) on top of his flat horned cap; and beardless genies 
in headbands, winged and kneeling, who carry either sprigs in both hands 
or, apparently, nothing at all. More conventional genies, winged, with 
horned caps, and carrying the cone and bucket, are found in friezes, and 
other decorative contexts, at Dur-Sharrukin; in residence K is a three-
tiered frieze, with bulls beside quadrangles in a central register, 
kneeling genies beside roundels in registers above and below, and many 
subsidiary registers around them (_OIP_ XL, pl. LXXXIX). The Esarhaddon 
paintings in the Kalhu arsenal (III,H,3) also had elaborate friezes.

5. Some fallen fragments of painting have patterns (_MN_ I, pl. LXXXIV; 
_OIP_ XXXVIII, pl. 1; _Iraq_ XXV, 28) which probably decorated the ceiling; 
they include the hexagon.
H. Subject-Matter: Hieroglyphic.

Esarhaddon (A.O.l, IX, 28, note) states that "lumahu-Sterne, das Ebenbild meiner Namenschrift," were represented on his foundation-deposits for the Marduk temple at Babylon, and some of these have been found.

The best (HIA I, Taf. III b) has two registers of decoration, clearly read from left to right as the figures face left. Above is first an object which can only symbolise the temple, then the king, then a sacred tree and a bull; below is a mountain, followed by a plough and a palm-tree. Presumably the temple and the king are essentially one group, and the last five symbols represent in some way the name of Esarhaddon.

A similar explanation must be applied to the symbols which, within a frame of rosettes, decorated the glazed-brick platforms in front of the temple entrances at Dur-Sharrukin (Place 1867, III, pls. XXV-XXXI); these balanced each other on either side of the entrances, and could be read in either direction. At the front is the king or high official, on the side of the platform near the door; behind this figure, on the face of the platform, there are either a lion, a fig-tree, and a plough, or the same symbols with a hawk, followed by a bull, inserted between the lion and the tree. The fig-tree and the bird were also featured on paintings from room 15 of Residence K (OIP XL, 66), besides other unidentifiable fragments. Presumably these three or five symbols represented the name of Sargon. Yet a third royal name may perhaps have been represented on some glazed and moulded bricks found by Thompson (1929, 81) between the Nabu and Ishtar temples at Nineveh, and ascribed
tentatively to Ashurnasirpal II; these showed "a winged bull, a figure holding the usual pannikin, a frieze of rosettes or daisies, and the representation of vines with grapes". Comparable speculations are possible about other groups of glazed bricks, but real evidence is missing.

I. Anomalies.

1. Whatever the subject, small errors and inconsistencies which it was worth no one's trouble to correct were frequent (see above, VII,B,3): when a correction was made, such as the shortening of an Ashurbanipal lion's tail noted by Nagel (1967, 13, Taf. III), it would presumably, in most cases, be undetectable today. There is one instance, however, in which a solecism seems to have been committed, violating some canon of decorum. This is found outside Sargon's throne-room-suite at Dur-Sharrukin, where a procession of courtiers carrying furniture was represented (OIP XXXVIII, figs. 39-44). These courtiers were originally equipped with head-bands, the remains of which are perfectly clear on the slabs themselves and indeed just discernible on the published photographs; but fashions changed, or the artist had been wrong throughout, for the head-bands were later erased, partly recarved with strands of hair, and entirely covered with the black hair paint.

2. Elsewhere, when an anomaly has been left unaltered, we cannot of course be certain that any mistake has been made. The most plausible examples come from the provinces, and a Sargonid letter (Waterman 1930, II, no. 1051), though the translation is insecure, apparently deals with
difficulties of this kind. "An image of the king in outline I have drawn. An image of the king of another sort (?) they have prepared. May the king see (them) and whatever is pleasing before the king, we shall make instead (?). May the king give attention to the hands, the elbows (?), and the drapery (?). Regarding the image of the king which they are making, there is a staff fastened in front of its side. Its hands rest upon its knees. Since they are not favourable, I am not doing the work. Whenever I speak to them regarding the form, (or) regarding anything whatever, they will not hearken. According as their own artisans...." Clearly native or expatriate workmen were being employed, as they had been by Tukulti-Ninurta II (Moortgat 1969, pls. CCLIV, CCLI), but they were now expected to conform to metropolitan rules which they themselves did not appreciate or understand. At Hadatu, for instance, we not only have Assyrians with Syrian proportions (BAH XVI, pls. VII-XIII), which is comprehensible, but also genies wearing horned caps but court dress (BAH XVI, pl. I); the artist can hardly be telling us that the main Hadatu building is really a temple-palace, and the peculiarity can only be attributed to his ignorance. There are several oddities in the Til-Barsip paintings (e.g., above, V,T,4; VII,F,7; VII,G,4), while Ashurbanipal as crown-prince on the Esarhaddon stela from Sam'al (Fritschard 1954, fig. 449) wears what can only be an extraordinary version of the king's ritual robe. This same garment, which has a precise and logical form (e.g. Iraq XXV, pl. IX; see above, VII,E,3), is again misrepresented on Shalmaneser III's stela from Kurkh (?Tushkan, near Diyarbekir), where two fringes on the right side slope in the wrong
direction. We should also note that one fringe of the same robe is missing from the left-hand figure on the orthostat which stood behind Ashurnasirpal's throne at Kalhu (Budge 1914, pl. XI); this is by no means provincial work, but errors of omission need not matter.

3. Other anomalies seem to show us what happened in practice rather than in theory. On Shalmaneser III's Imgur-Enlil bronzes, for instance, when the king is wearing his standard outer robe in conjunction with a sword, the robe tends to catch on the scabbard and billow out behind (King 1915, pls. XV, XX, XXVIII); but on ninth-century orthostats and other monuments (e.g. Gadd 1936, pls. III, VI) the scabbard finds its way through or around the robe, and it is evident that this less natural but more becoming effect was the one preferred. There are similarly occasions, on the same bronzes (King 1915, pls. XV, XLIII), at Til-Barsip (BAR XXIII, pl. I), and on some Tiglath-pileser III orthostats (TP3, pls. LXXXV, LXXXVII), when the king wears ritual dress in secular surroundings. Perhaps the artists were mistaken, as Imgur-Enlil was a small town and bronze-working a minor art, Til-Barsip was provincial, and Tiglath-pileser often represents items of dress in wholly implausible ways (TP3, pls. VIII, XLIV, LXXX). Nonetheless a possible inference is that the ritual robe was worn more often than purists would have approved. Ashurbanipal too, sometimes in duplicate compositions (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. III, XV), when hunting, wears either his normal crown or a head-band alone; the head-band by itself is exceptional, but obviously more true to life.

4. There is an anomalous development, away from realism, in the treatment of the standard ninth-century outer robe (see above, VII,E,2).
when worn by late eighth-century genies at Dur-Sharrukin (Frankfort 1954, pl. XCVII). Genies facing right have it hanging from the left shoulder, as usual; but those facing left tend to have it hanging from the right shoulder, a method suitable for left-handed genies but never found in practice on ninth-century orthostats. The fringes, too, can become improbably complicated (Smith 1938, pl. XXVIII). The reason for these changes seems to be that, by the reign of Sargon, (e.g. OIP XXXVIII, fig. 28) the king no longer wore this kind of robe, and the sculptors did not know exactly what it looked like.

5. In Ashurnasirpal II's palace standards were sometimes relaxed for aesthetic reasons, to fit difficult situations. Thus the ordinary anthropomorphic genie has a single pair of wings behind his back; some, however, have an extra pair in front, and others have none at all. Weidner (AfObh. IV, 119) supports the view that the genies are therefore priests dressed up, but it is hard to see why priests impersonating genies should have been preferable to genies themselves. In fact the wingless genies whose original positions can be ascertained (Iraq XXVII, 130: types A-IV, A-V; NB, pl. opposite p. 351) were located, like the four-winged figures, in or adjacent to doors, in narrow and large spaces respectively. There is also a slab (AfObh. IV, Abb. 93) which shows one winged genie and one unwinged, with no space for an extra pair of wings; there was probably a door nearby, but in any case ninth-century sculptors were reluctant to draw figures partly on one slab and partly on another, and the man responsible clearly chose to omit the wings rather than squash the two figures together. It is true that other figures in
comparable positions can have wings, but this is what we would expect in a building where so many individuals were separately at work. We know that they had their idiosyncrasies, as in the number of horns they gave to the horned cap and whether or not it had a bud on top, and it seems simpler to allow them the freedom also occasionally to dispense with wings than to look for a deeper significance in an anomaly such as this.
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1. This chapter is concerned with how Assyrian narrative developed, and with the reasons for those changes which we regard as significant; some related matters have been discussed in the previous chapter, but others, such as artistic merit and aesthetic theory, which have no place in our train of thought, must be studied elsewhere (e.g. Groenewegen-Frankfort 1951; Nagel 1967, 40). Since every scholar who has written a book on Mesopotamian art has necessarily discussed the Assyrian sculptures, there are naturally many familiar generalizations, and more or less obvious observations, which we have repeated below without feeling conscious of any specific debt. There are no acknowledgements of this kind, nor the qualifications and other arguments which would have had to accompany them; but a protest must be entered against the common and continuing ascription, in general art-books (e.g. Moortgat 1969, 154, pl. CCLXXIX), of important groups of Ashurbanipal or later sculptures to a date, proved false by Falkner in 1952 (AFO XVI, 247), in the reign of Sennacherib.

2. Two warnings also are necessary. We have generally discussed the work of each reign as a unit; this seems to give an essentially correct impression, but there are minor inconsistencies. It must be remembered that many workmen, with divergent ideas, were employed...
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1. This chapter is concerned with how Assyrian narrative developed, and with the reasons for those changes which we regard as significant; some related matters have been discussed in the previous chapter, but others, such as artistic merit and aesthetic theory, which have no place in our train of thought, must be studied elsewhere (e.g. Groenewegen-Frankfort 1951; Nagel 1967, 40). Since every scholar who has written a book on Mesopotamian art has necessarily discussed the Assyrian sculptures, there are naturally many familiar generalizations, and more or less obvious observations, which we have repeated below without feeling conscious of any specific debt. There are no acknowledgements of this kind, nor the qualifications and other arguments which would have had to accompany them; but a protest must be entered against the common and continuing ascription, in general art-books (e.g. Moortgat 1969, 154, pl. CCLXXIX), of important groups of Ashurbanipal or later sculptures to a date, proved false by Falkner in 1952 (AFO XVI, 247), in the reign of Sennacherib.

2. Two warnings also are necessary. We have generally discussed the work of each reign as a unit; this seems to give an essentially correct impression, but there are minor inconsistencies. It must be remembered that many workmen, with divergent ideas, were employed
simultaneously. We have also treated the developments in narrative as interdependent, with one leading to another: again we believe this gives the correct impression, and that some missing links may have been found in wall-painting, but two other factors are significant. One is that the construction of a new royal palace was an exceptional event, and the king probably did his utmost to ensure that the designers were clever men, willing to step outside convention; this helps account for abrupt changes, as between the reigns of Sargon and Sennacherib. At the same time it is likely that the minor arts were a rich source of innovations; men working in materials such as ivory, bronze, and wood had ample scope to experiment, and their successes might eventually appear on palace-walls. This is best shown by the compositions on the bronze gates of Shalmaneser III: in some ways these are closer to Tiglath-pileser's orthostats than to Ashurnasirpal's, and in others they anticipate Sargonid work; Shalmaneser's stone carvings are far more conventional.

B. Middle Assyrian Work: General Observations

1. The sources on which Middle Assyrian painters and sculptors drew are to be sought in the Kassite and Mitannian periods, but their products are already distinctive. A useful compendium of compositions, which would probably have seemed in place in the thirteenth century, is found in the later White Obelisk, discussed below, and there is little else to detain us.
2. If we exclude cylinder seals, most of which show simple episodes of types either duplicated on the White Obelisk or absent from wall-decoration of any date in Assyria, we have only a fragmentary plaque or lid (Andrae 1938, Taf. XLIX b) and two Tukulti-Ninurta I altars (Andrae 1938, Taf. LI). The plaque has two registers: in the upper are two corpses, and a third enemy about to be slaughtered by a lost figure, probably the king, who holds him by the hair as an Egyptian pharaoh might have done; in the lower the king stands in front of his chariot, pouring a libation. One altar has a formal scene of the king between genies on its main face, and an indecipherable scene in a mountainous countryside on the podium below. The other altar shows the king in two postures in front of an altar, and is thus an early example of the strip-cartoon effect which, while appearing sporadically throughout the neo-Assyrian period, only became prominent again under Ashurbanipal (Unger, Assyria I, 127). One cylinder seal worth mention (Moortgat 1969, Pl. 0, 9) shows the king hunting, and his upright pose in his chariot, with rearing horses, again recalls the Egyptian convention. But there was obviously enough Assyrian work being done to submerge influences such as this: one Tukulti-Ninurta text, for instance, (Assyrian 1, 307,) mentions pictures of the king, towns, and animals in an embroidery. Another Egyptian motif, twelfth-century in date (Breasted 1932, 267), which may have reached Assyria shortly afterwards, shows the king in his chariot attacked by a lion from behind; but when this motif surfaces in Assyria, in the ninth-century palace of Ashurnasirpal II at Kalhu (Budge 1914, pl. XII), there is nothing in
the carving to denote an Egyptian origin, and the subject had probably been represented in the interval on numerous objects more perishable than stone.

C. The White Obelisk: Basic Considerations

1. This object, ascribed to Ashurnasirpal I (see above, II, N), is carved with small-scale narrative reliefs in eight registers on all four sides. It is fully illustrated in Unger's original publications (MACG VI, heft 1/2), and Unger's numbering of the panels from top to bottom, with the sides as A-D, is followed here.

2. D 1, with the adjoining left edge of A 1, shows the king crossing mountains. He himself has dismounted and moves right, supported by attendants, while behind him his chariot is carried and his horses are led.

3. C 6 shows a city behind the king's chariot, as if he has just emerged to do battle in the open. The king, as in all the scenes of violent action, charges rightwards in his chariot, loosing an arrow while his horses rear and a charioteer controls them. The enemy are represented by two foot-soldiers, one of whom raises a hand, perhaps to grasp the reins, as he falls beneath the king's horses, while the other stands further to the right and fires an arrow at the king.

A 1, B 1, C 1, D 2, and D 3 show sieges; the enemy towns are on the right, with the king charging towards them. In C 1 there are two towns, in flames with a body falling from the battlements, but the rest
have single towns with the inhabitants still resisting. There are also pairs of Assyrian archers on foot between the chariot and the town in A 1 and B 1, and a corpse beneath the horses in C 1.

4. B 8, C 8, and D 8 show a bull, onager, and deer falling or in flight before the royal chariot. A 8 is unfinished or erased; on the right there are some empty battlements, in the centre a sloping projection that could have represented the rearing bodies of the king's horses, and to the left is what may be the raised open paw of a lion erect on its hind-feet; if so the panel could have shown a lion-hunt, with the king turning to kill a lion that had attacked him from behind.

5. Two series of four consecutive panels, A4-D4 and A5-D5, show the king reviewing captives or tributaries. In register 4 the king is on foot facing right, surrounded by his bodyguard and courtiers. The last courtier in front of him looks backwards, and waves an arm at the foreigners in a gesture characteristic of such scenes. The procession approaches from the right, and consists of a suppliant, a cart, an Assyrian guard, five tribute-bearers, and half a dozen horses. In register 5 the king faces left and reviews a rather similar procession. A 2 and B 2 may show a comparable subject. There is a backdrop of trees, water underfoot, and, on the left edge of A 2, a building or town on an island. A 2 shows the king facing right, with a courtier holding a fly-whisk behind him and two or three individuals in front; B 2 is perhaps comprehensible as showing two or three figures moving left with a cart while someone waves back towards them from the left edge. This interpretation is dubious, however; A 2 might even
be a meeting between two kings on equal terms, and B 2 could be a feast celebrating the alliance. There is another, more casual, review on B 7 and C 7. The king, as his chariot is led to the right, encounters a group of Assyrians with some captives and livestock moving to the left; on the right are some tents, which could belong to the Assyrians or their captives. C 2, though not a review as the king does not appear, also concerns the transport of booty, this time towards a city on the right; the wheels of what is indubitably a cart have been left uncarved.

6. D 6, A 6, and B 6 show what can only be, in the light of other examples (e.g. Budge 1914, pls. XVII, 1 and XVI), a triumphal return from the field. On the left is a building or town on a rise. It is approached from the right by six men in pairs, raising their hands to clap, and by two more with lowered hands; next by a chariot whose drivers grip the winged-disc standard which the Assyrians took into battle; then by the king driving his own chariot; and finally by a chariot containing a tall oblong object on top of which a wild goat is perched. Since decorative wild goats crowned the pillars of Ashurnasirpal II's royal pavilion in camp (Budge 1914, pl. XVI, 1), this last chariot may have held a concubine, the king's personal baggage, or possibly the fittings of a portable shrine.

7. There are two banquets, largely similar, on B 3 and C 3 and on D 7 and A 7. In both scenes the king is on the left, and the other guests on another panel to the right; they sit on chairs and stools, with heaped tables in front of them and attendants standing around.
The very left edge of B 7 shows two musicians facing left, and entertaining the feasters on A 7. Subjects which can even out the narrative. A 3 and part of B 3 show a religious ceremony. On the left, visible through the open door of a towered building, is the seated statue of a goddess with a vast crown; in front of her is a bare-headed worshipper. Outside the temple is an altar at which the king officiates, and behind him to the right is a row of attendants one of whom is twisting the horns of a sacrificial bull to bring it to its knees. A caption states that the ceremony took place at the temple of Sertu in Nineveh.


1. Each of these compositions, except C 2, shows the king once, and usually emphasizes his position as protagonist. There is a practical but unambiguous disregard for time, space, and plausibility. Some represent a single moment in time, but others, especially the reviews, incorporate continuous narrative, with movement through both time and space: we see what would have been seen by someone starting at the back of the procession of captives, and gradually overtaking it. Time is drastically telescoped in C 1, where the king charges a burning town.

2. The natural decorative unit on the obelisk was the single panel, between two and four times as wide as it was high. This was employed for simple action scenes, but infinitely extensible types of composition,
such as the review, were carried horizontally round the corners from one panel to the next; animals can even cut the corners. Subjects which could not sensibly be fitted into one panel, nor stretched to four, were accommodated on two or three; one panel can include parts of two separate compositions. This blurred the distinctions between the compositions, but a virtue could be made of necessity by placing related compositions side by side and transforming them into a strip-cartoon. A link of this kind may exist between the mountain and battle scenes in register 1, and between the scenes of feasting and worship in register 3.

Unger indeed suggested that the entire obelisk was a strip-cartaon. The best sequence seems to be that obtained by reading the registers boustrophedon from top to bottom, with a slight irregularity in register 5. This gives, in order, the mountain scene (D 1); three sieges (A 1, B 1, C 1); escort of booty (C 2); review of booty, if correctly understood (B 2, A 2); three more sieges (D 2, D 3); sacrifice at Nineveh (A 3, B 3); banquet (B 3, C 3); great review of booty (C 4, B 4, A 4, D 4); second great review (C 5, D 5, A 5, B 5); battle, with city behind king (C 6); triumphal procession (B 6, A 6, D 6); banquet (D 7, A 7); casual review of booty (B 7, C 7); hunting (C 8, B 8, ?A 8, D 8). Since two campaigns are described in the inscription on the obelisk, this sequence, with celebrations after each campaign, makes some sense. Nonetheless it ignores the direction in which the figures, moving within each composition, would be followed by the spectator's eye, and the casual review in register 7 may be
inappropriate. There is at least some intentional grouping, with the sieges at the top, the hunts at the bottom, and the two great reviews circling the obelisk in different directions in the middle.

4. Assyrian sculptors, down to the seventh century, were reluctant to leave spaces blank; the panels on the White Obelisk were so small that some gaps could be and were left, but others were eliminated in two ways. The simplest was to vary the scale to suit the space: the obelisk uses the ordinary pre-Sargonid convention that little or no sky is left above the principal figures and features in the composition. This is not carried to an extreme, as closely associated figures are usually drawn on the same scale, but there is an instance, on D 1, of the king at the bottom of a mountain being taller than his attendants on top of it; perspective can hardly be intended. There is a clearer distinction between "foreground" people and "background" buildings. This resembles a perspective effect, and is not incongruous; the buildings, however, except in D 7, are to one side of the people rather than behind them, and the people in the buildings themselves are unnaturally large as otherwise they would have tended to disappear.

The other method of filling blanks was to place independent features in mid-air or beside the "foreground" groups. Static features with implied groundlines of their own, such as the plants on C 5 and elsewhere and the tent on C 7, were especially suitable for this position. Active beings would tend to impinge more drastically on the groups below their feet. Animals are shown in mid-air only when the upper and lower groups were of equal importance: there are livestock, divided
by a subsidiary groundline, on C 7, and gazelle, with a wider space between them, on D 8. Both methods are employed in the feast scene on C 3, where additional guests, drawn on a smaller scale than the main figures, are seated at tables in mid-air. It may be doubted whether the man responsible for these compositions argued with himself in this manner, but his techniques are continuously reflected in later work.

E. Tukulti-Ninurta II: General Observations.

We have some glazed tiles from this king's reign (Andrae 1925, pls. VII-IX). Each seems to show one element, such as a chariot, in a longer group, probably a procession. The likeliest position for these tiles (see above, I,H,3) may have been as a facing for a platform outside the main door of the Adad shrine at Ashur, but they are useful in indicating the sort of internal wall-decoration, presumably painted, which may have existed in buildings such as the Old Palace at Ashur before Ashurnasirpal II. The tiles are accomplished work, products of a developed tradition, and the existence of equivalent paintings would mean that the introduction, by Ashurnasirpal II, of narrative pictures carved on stone orthostats, which were themselves partly painted, may not have seemed such an innovation then as it does in retrospect.

F. Ashurnasirpal II: Basic Considerations.

This king's narrative work is best preserved on orthostats, in
the British Museum, which come from the south wall of his throneroom at Kalhu; each orthostat had an upper and a lower register, separated by a standard band of text describing the king's achievements in general. The following discussion concentrates on this series.

There are also other scattered orthostats, both of stone and glazed brick, parts of several "obelisks", small fragments of wall-painting, and the bronze bands, mostly unpublished, from two sets of Imgur-Enlil gates; these show scenes which seem to belong, unless otherwise noted, to compositions similar to those in the throneroom. The Roman numerals used outside brackets in this section and the next refer to Budge's 1914 publication of the throneroom slabs.

2. The composition in XXI-XXIIa, covering three orthostats though of course only one of the registers into which they were divided, shows a novel conquest of nature: the king crosses a river by boat, his chariots are ferried, and the soldiers swim. The crossing of mountains is represented on a single corner-slab, XXV, from somewhere in the west wing of the palace; this has the king in his chariot with an escort behind him, and is a simple variation on D 4 of the White Obelisk.

3. XIV-XV, across four orthostats, shows a battle in the open. One basic unit, XIVa, is very like C 6 on the White Obelisk: the king charges right in his chariot, drawing his bow as his horses rear, while one enemy falls back before the horses with one hand lifted towards them and another fires back at the king; the subject is amplified, however, in that there is another pair of enemy archers firing back, a man fallen under the horses' bellies, a corpse in mid-air attacked
by a scavenging bird, and a winged disc with a god inside firing his arrows beside the king's. XIIb, to the right, shows the two standard-bearing chariots of the army; they overlap, but their riders fire to their right like the king, and they also have an enemy below the horses' bellies, another recoiling at the horses' heads, and a pair firing backwards. The next, XVa, has a pair of Assyrian mounted archers instead of chariots, but each of these has a corpse below his horse while the foremost has an enemy with lifted hand at his horse's neck; the pair of enemy archers firing back, however, is placed on the next slab, XVb, and the space they leave is filled on XVa by two advancing Assyrian foot-soldiers and a vulture, in fact behind the horsemen. Xvb contains, to the right of the two enemy archers, another Assyrian in a chariot accompanied by a vulture, a corpse below the horses, and an enemy at the horses' heads; at the right, on a hill which closes the composition, there are two more enemies, this time being killed by Assyrian foot-soldiers. Siege compositions are not dissimilar. XVIIIa has a town on its right edge with the defenders firing to their left at the Assyrian army; several soldiers are present, but the main component of the army is again the king in his chariot charging right and discharging an arrow. A new detail is that the occupants and horses of an enemy chariot are collapsing in front of the king, but the panel is basically one White Obelisk unit. This is not, however, the whole picture: XVIIb shows the remainder of it to the left, with the standard-bearing Assyrian chariots also charging, overlapping as in the open battle, and
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firing right; an enemy chariot is again collapsing in front of them, and there are again some other details. These two panels complete the composition, leaving it less monotonous than the open battle on XIV-XV. There is a plain siege on XIIIa, with the king on foot as he draws his bow against a town on the right; a more practical siege-engine stands between him and the walls. The adjacent slab to the right, XIIIb, has an isolated incident from a siege: the king is absent, and two Assyrian archers are firing from a river-bank at some fugitives who are swimming towards a fortress on the other side. It is possible that XIIIa and XIIIb are somehow connected, but each is a distinct composition. The siege scene in XXIIIb-XXIVa-XVIIIb is more elaborate. On the left the king appears on foot, firing at a besieged town to the right; this is simultaneously undergoing a series of attacks by infantry and there is a most elaborate fight around a siege-engine. The town is shown as complete, and to its right is a further force of Assyrians, led by the crown-prince (?: Iraq XXIX, 46), firing to their left; this added group changes the balance of the whole composition, transforming the town into a centre-piece instead of a counter-weight. One of Ashurnasirpal's bronze bands (King 1915, pl. LXXIX-LXXX) is somewhat similar.

5. XII shows two hunting scenes which adjoined each other on separate orthostats. In both the king charges right in his chariot, with dead animals below his horses, and a pair of foot-soldiers or a horseman following him; he himself turns to dispatch survivors which are attacking him from behind. Again there is little advance upon the
White Obelisk hunts, virtually none if our restoration of A 8 be correct. Other orthostats contain fragments of comparable compositions which must have been continued to one side: one such (TP², pl. CXV) is not unlike the left half of XIIa, and another, in XLII, which shows a figure who may be the crown-prince firing right while a lion expires beneath his horses, presumably had another lion or lions in the panel to its right. The basic unit has been split on separate panels, but the reason is simply that these orthostats were unusually narrow.

6. XX, occupying two panels, shows a review of captives much like registers 4 and 5 on the White Obelisk. The king’s chariot waits behind the king, and there is a group of Assyrians in front of him, including a soldier (sometimes misunderstood as a captive: Iraq XXIX, 46) kneeling at his feet; the last of the Assyrian courtiers is a figure, now as subsequently beardless, who waves an arm backwards at an approaching group of prisoners; the booty is in mid-air above their heads. There is another review on the series of panels XXIIb, XXIIIa, AfObh. IV, fig. 58, and XXIIIb. This is less clearly differentiated from the compositions on either side, as the right edge of XXIIIb shows the king attacking a city, and XXIIb, which represents the standard-bearing chariots behind the king, has in its background an apparently Assyrian city with women celebrating on the battlements but looking left towards the river-crossing on XXIIa. Lost orthostats from elsewhere (TP², pls. CXVIII, CXIX) also juxtaposed a siege and a procession of captives; the king may have appeared both to left and to right of this group, making a strip-cartoon of the two compositions,
or only once, thus directly linking the two themes, siege and review, in one continuous narrative. There is indeed a minor scene, of the review type, showing captives inspected by a courtier or accountant in camp, which is incorporated into the triumphal procession scene on XVI. Other notable fragments of reviews are found on a glazed brick (AAA XVIII, pl. XXXII, no. 5), with animals being driven through a landscape, and on a lost orthostat (TP3, pl. CXIV) which shows men cutting down trees beside a mountain stream, presumably for dispatch to the king as in panel Na of Shalmaneser III's Balawat gates (Unger 1920, Taf. I). Obelisk fragments (e.g. Gadd 1936, pl. VII) generally show reviews, though the example cited once inserts a detail of civilian life, with a man hunting a deer, into a landscape behind the king. Ashurnasirpal's most impressive review, showing the king receiving a selection of tributaries rather than captives, was carved on large-scale one-register orthostats on the outer facade of the throneroom (Sumer XII, Arabic section, pls. after p. 132): to the right, on wall D, the tributaries are divided from the king by a door; to the left, on the short wall E, there were more tributaries facing each other across a door without the king, whose presence must have been deduced from the position of his throne just through the door inside the room.

7. XVI-XVIIa show a triumphal return from battle, the equivalent of D 6, A 6, and B 6 on the White Obelisk. There is a mounted soldier with a spare horse, the king in his chariot, the two standard-bearing chariots, foot-soldiers some of whom are holding enemy heads or clapping, corpses, musicians, the god in his winged disc, and a row
of captives and livestock. Their objective, on the left, is the royal tent and a fortified camp, where horses are being rubbed down and food prepared.

8. A group of three large-scale orthostats, XXX-XXXII from the north wall of room G, shows the king drinking, attended by courtiers and genies; this is a formal rather than a narrative picture. Ashurnasirpal is also shown, possibly refreshing himself, on two glazed tiles, from Kalhu (NN II, pl. LV) and Nineveh (AAA XVIII, pl. XXXI); in the latter, though his identity seems to be secure, he wears an exceptional crenellated crown related to the type worn by Assyrian queens (AAA, Taf. XXXVI) and perhaps reserved for some particular occasions. No example of a general feast, as on panels A 7 and C 3 of the White Obelisk, is known.

9. XIX shows two compositions, from adjacent orthostats, in which the king appears to be pouring libations over animals killed in the hunt. He is surrounded by attendants, and musicians celebrate his success; there are minor differences of grouping between the two scenes, but in both the king rests one hand on his bow and holds a cup in the other. The atmosphere seems somewhat informal, and there is no altar as in other libation scenes over dead animals (e.g. Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. XV) of a later date. Though the idea of a libation must be predominant, that of refreshment after victory, as in the banquets, may not be far away. There are of course more indefinite ritual scenes, with the king carefully posed, on the large-scale formal reliefs.
10. One fragment of a lost orthostat (TP3, pl. CXX) is difficult to classify precisely. It was a corner-slab: on the left is a town on a river, with a man fishing beside the walls and a single woman on the battlements; on the right, beyond the angle, the river is extended over more of the surface, two men are seen carrying buckets towards the city, and the steering oar of a boat projects from behind them. All the figures face left; the men wear simple headbands. The subject may be peaceful life in Assyria; the town then would fit at the right-hand end of a composition either showing the king returning in triumph, or showing the king with his back to the town reviewing a procession of captives advancing from the left.

11. One of the unpublished bronze bands found by Mallowan at Imgur-Enlil shows the king in his rickshaw, attended by courtiers. The subject may be a peaceful procession in Assyria, or possibly a review. Certainly scenes at home were represented in this series, as another fragment shows a towered building with colossi on the facade, three of which are variations on the theme of the charging chariot (TP3, pls. XIV-XV). Minor details are carried over from panel to panel, but only one of the fragments on the White Obelisk. All those which are complete, except XIIIa, are comprehensible as units showing the king once. There is the same tendency to disregard time and space: once indeed a single object, a bucket seized while the enemy were drawing water, appears twice inside the walls of the town, or as in XXIIIa, by including an open battle before a single composition (TP3, pl. CXXIII), producing an internal strip-
cartoon reminiscent of the double appearance of Tukulti-Ninurta I on an Ashur altar (Andrae 1938, pl. LI b). Extra details, however, reducing the king’s prominence, make the scenes more generally plausible.

2. Developments seem to depend on the medium. Each of the two panels or registers on a throne room orthostat had roughly the same proportions as an average obelisk panel, but it was separated from adjacent panels only by a miniscule slit. This suited extensible compositions, but not the old shorthand battle-scenes; battles were nonetheless required. Rather than continually change the subject, the sculptor chose to extend them to the proportions of a review; he still tended, however, to visualize one panel of one orthostat as a unit. Now the old method of representing, say, a chariot charge against infantry, was that seen on C6 of the White Obelisk; all that had to be done to expand the scene was to repeat the prototype as often as desired and vary the identity of the individuals in the chariots. This kind of repetition is best exemplified in the four panels XIV-XV, three of which are variations on the theme of the charging chariot while the fourth shows charging horsemen and is largely similar. Minor details do overlap from panel to panel, but only one of the four main groups encroaches seriously on its neighbour. Moortgat (1969, 137) sees artistic genius at work in this composition, but it may be more simply regarded as a neat improvisation. Siege scenes are extended in the same way, as in XVIIb-XVIIIa, by including an open battle before the walls of the town, or as in XXIIIb-XXIVa-XVIIIb, by putting Assyrians on both sides of the town. In the former instance the open battle
and the siege types of composition, marginally distinct on the White Obelisk, have coalesced.

3. Enemies on the south wall of the throneroom wear headbands, whereas those on surviving orthostats from the north wall have turbans as in XXIVb. This suggests that different campaigns, on the Euphrates and further west, were shown on the two walls, but no overall strip-cartoon relationship between the compositions on the south wall can be established. This is shown by the following schematic diagrams of the two well-preserved groups of narrative scenes; slabs 17-20 were divided from 3-11 by a door and several large-scale figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper register</th>
<th>Bull-hunt</th>
<th>Lion-hunt</th>
<th>Siege</th>
<th>Siege (no king)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>register</td>
<td>XIIa</td>
<td>XIIb</td>
<td>XIIIa</td>
<td>XIIIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower register</td>
<td>Libation</td>
<td>Libation</td>
<td>King reviewing procession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>register</td>
<td>over bull</td>
<td>over lion</td>
<td>of captured enemies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIXa</td>
<td>XIXb</td>
<td>XXa</td>
<td>XXb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the scenes of action are above and the celebrations below, and the review may be linked with the sieges as the libations are certainly linked with the hunts vertically above them; but these orthostats stood in a limited space beside the throne, and the subjects may have been chosen to appeal to the king, and to summarize his achievements.
The triumph and the review may possibly be regarded as the results of the victories to their right, especially as the lower register of slab 5 contains parts of two compositions. The review may also be linked with the river-crossing, as the people in the town in slab 8, where the king's review entourage occupies the foreground, are looking towards the river-crossing instead; Moortgat (1930, 149) takes it for granted that the two scenes are consecutive. Perhaps the review is linked with the scenes on both sides at once, and represents the crossing of a river to reach a tributary town outside which captives from the subsequent siege are reviewed. If so the upper register might be similar, with the open battle preceding the siege, and the triumphal procession celebrating both. Other arrangements are possible, however, and the suggested sequence is too abstruse to be convincing. Probably the reliefs were intended to give a generalized picture of the campaign or campaigns by the representation of what may or may not have been specific episodes. It may equally be chance or design that the procession and the review are central, framed by the more violent scenes on either side.
4. Goossens (BMAAH XXVIII, 38) has gathered the references to fragments of "obelisks" many of which must be Ashurnasirpal's work. The best-preserved example (Gadd 1936, pl. VI; Fritscher 1954, fig. 350) is flat-topped and far broader than the White Obelisk, and may have acted as a podium. Its sides, framed by plain bands at each corner, show review scenes in several registers. These compositions suit the medium well, but so might others have done; it seems that more violent action was not represented on these monuments in the ninth century. In other media no such restrictions can be observed. We should note that in the published bronze bands at least (King 1915, pls. LXXVIII-LXXX) the compositions are so arranged that the king is placed on the face of the door rather than inconspicuously on the door-post.

5. Because the registers on the orthostats were far larger than those on the White Obelisk, so were the spaces between and above the principal figures; they were usually filled with the mass of realistic details characteristic of Assyrian narrative sculpture. Problems of proportioning at once arose, more of them than before and with more chaotic results. Occasionally the principal "foreground" figures varied in scale according to the space available; this even affects the king in his boat in XXI-XXIIa, when he is smaller than his attendants on shore two panels away, and the king in his chariot in XXV, but the effect is not extreme. Normally the king, his companions, and their principal victims in the "foreground" are contrasted with "background" structures inside and around which smaller figures are engaged in subsidiary activities; the background, except in XXIIb, is always
to one side. The smaller figures themselves also vary in scale, as if sketched in to fill the spaces available after the main outlines had been determined. There is an irregular tendency for minor figures close to the "foreground" to be larger than others, but there is no logic in the scales to which the enemy in XVIIIa or the figures in XXIVa have been drawn; besieged inhabitants indeed are larger in relation to their surroundings than those on the White Obelisk. The size and even the choice of the features in mid-air also depend on their surroundings. There were none, except captions, in the small bronzes. In the orthostats mid-air features which needed no ground-lines were birds in flight and the god in the winged disc in XVIIb-XVIIIa; the same composition also has corpses and bushes, which were motionless and hardly impinge on the principal figures below except as symbols of the panorama, much like the captured livestock in mid-air in XXIIIb and the articles of tribute above the review in XXb. It is evident, however, that the sculptor was indifferent to the considerations which, through chance or good judgement, control mid-air features in the White Obelisk, as there are also human figures in action, drawn without groundlines and without regard for scale, who trample firmly over the figures below; examples are on XVIIa and XVIIIa. The scenes of camp-life in XVIa are especially unsystematic. Nonetheless there was one way in which a more convincing relationship between "foreground" figures and those above them was achieved. The convention by which water was represented as spirals, which could be freely extended over the surface of the register, allowed figures such as those on XXIb to
rest secure on more than one level. A potentially comparable device was the scale-pattern traditionally used to signify rocky or mountainous terrain, though in Ashurnasirpal's surviving compositions this was still employed only as a rolling groundline on which figures stood as in XXV, or as a backing for figures with their feet on groundlines below (TP3, pl. CXIX; AAA XVIII, pl. XXXII, no. 5). The use in XIIIb of both water and rocks to represent the bank of a stream, with a small-scale palm-tree in the distance, even creates a perspective effect.

three subjects can also be combined, but map classification is pos-

H. Shalmaneser III: Basic Considerations.

1. The embossed bands from Imgur-Enlil, made about 848, are of prime importance. These are strips of bronze which were fastened, by means of nails driven through triple rows of rosettes, to the cross-brace struts on one face of each leaf of a double door, and continued halfway round the door-posts at either end; on each band, between the rosettes, were two registers of narrative decoration. The majority of the reliefs, bands I-XIII, were illustrated by King in 1915; the gates as a whole were fully discussed by Unger (1920, superseding 1913), with illustrations of the remainder, bands N-O and part of VIII. The bands are referred to, in this section and the next, by these numbers and letters; the upper and lower registers in each band are designated as a and b respectively. Other monuments are the Kalhu throne-base of about 845, with a single register of reliefs on its front and sides (Iraq XXV, pls. III-VII), and the Black Obelisk of about 826, also from Assyria.
Kalhu, which has five registers of reliefs around it (Pritchard 1954, figs. 351-354). There is one fragment of narrative wall-painting (Iraq XXV, 28) to remind us that this type of decoration may have been the commonest of all, not only at this date.

2. The extant compositions all represent scenes on campaign. The basic White Obelisk units are still visible, but are no longer so distinct. The conquest of natural obstacles, for instance, as in Ia and XIIb, is directly associated with fights, reviews, and worship; these three subjects can also be combined, but some classification is possible.

3. Open battles are shown in the incomplete bands Pa and Pb. The Assyrian chariots and infantry attack from the right in Pa and from the left in Pb. We should naturally regard all figures attacking from the other direction as belonging to the enemy army, but among them are chariots which not only have dead bodies below their horses but even emerge, in Pb, from a camp containing two Assyrian foot-soldiers indistinguishable in posture from those in the indubitably Assyrian Pa camp just above. Perhaps we are to imagine a second Assyrian attack from the rear, as the chariots too are indistinguishable from those of the Assyrians, but the enemy foot-soldiers, whose uniform is distinctive, are entirely unperturbed; moreover, if the extra chariots are Assyrian, there are very few enemy left at all. If the chariots do belong to the enemy, then the corpses below them, though indistinguishable from those below the Assyrians' own chariots, should be Assyrian casualties, but these are never represented elsewhere. The simplest explanation
may be that the artist fitted conventional motifs together without proper consideration.

4. Bands IVa, VIIIa, XIIa, and Oa show the Assyrians, with the king either participating or watching, as they attack a town from two sides; in IXa there are two such scenes, separated by a camp, but the king, as usual in these bands, only appears once. In XIIIa three enemy towns are attacked; there is a dominant Assyrian movement from left to right, and the last town has a despairing ruler on its walls, as if the three attacks are consecutive. This implied motion through both time and space is common. Ob, recalling the less closely linked scenes on two Ashurnasirpal orthostats (Budge 1914, pl. XIII), shows the enemy, as one city is captured, swimming across a river and retreating through a palm-grove to a second stronghold. VIIa has first a battle, with Assyrians attacking from the right; then a town set on fire, and finally on the left a resumption of the battle, with the enemy resisting from a mountain. Ib, IIb, IVb, and VIIIb join scenes of battle and siege with the escort of prisoners back to base; the Assyrians advance from the left with the king to storm a town, and then a procession of captives moves on right to be received by Assyrian officials. There is a siege scene and an escort scene in XIIb also, divided by a camp; the figures are moving in the same directions, but the fighting is on the right, so that the prisoners must here be ascribed to a previous victory, possibly that shown in the upper register. IIa has a burning town in the middle, and booty from it escorted to the left; but the king and his army are moving on rightwards to deal
with enemy survivors in the hills. The escort scenes in these bands, like panel C 2 on the White Obelisk, do not include the king as he is engaged in fighting, but their essential design is that of the royal review. IIIb is exceptional in showing the king in person and his entourage reviewing a procession of captives who march left towards him from the walls of a town which the Assyrian army, after a battle on the right, have just set on fire; this type of composition was to become commonplace in the seventh century.

5. More peaceful reviews, with foreigners or enemies bringing tribute to the king as in registers 4 and 5 of the White Obelisk, occur on bands IIIa, Va, Vb, VIa, VIIb, IXb, XIa, XIIIb, and Nb. The scene is more elaborately set than previously, and the presence of Assyrian escorts may distinguish those instances in which the foreigners had waited too long to volunteer their homage. There are deserted cities behind or among the tribute-bearers, and indications of the landscape they had to traverse to reach the king. The king's entourage is extensive; he himself stands or sits, usually by a kiosk, while the Assyrian camp is behind his followers; sometimes there is no camp, in which case the Assyrian army behind the king may be shown overcoming natural obstacles on its outward march. The most complicated of such scenes is XIa, where both sides have to cross canals among palm-groves, the Assyrians by bridge and the enemy by boat, in order to meet in the middle. XIb is a more casual review, recalling B, C 7 on the White Obelisk: the king and his army emerge from camp and, as they cross a bridge, receive tribute from the occupants of a town on the further bank;
beyond the tributaries there is an additional scene in which a courtier supervizes the construction, under fire, of the next bridge the king will cross. There are simpler reviews on the Black Obelisk where the king appears in the top two registers only, and on the sides of the throne-base; one panel on the obelisk shows native fauna in the wild.

6. Bands Ia and Na show other activities in enemy terrain. In Ia the Assyrian army advances through mountains from its camp at the far right. The advance ends with the king's empty chariot, and a procession of sacrificial animals, priests, and musicians leading up to the king who stands, still facing left, in an attitude of worship. In front of him are a jar on a folding stand, a censer, an altar-table, and two standards taken from the standard-bearing chariots and set up on tripods before a rock-carved royal stela; beyond are soldiers throwing joints of meat from the sacrifice into Lake Van. The details are remarkable, but the principles of the composition are no different from those of XIIb or XIIIa. The damaged band Na has, on the left, the king sitting drinking surrounded by courtiers in a mountain grove; he faces right and watches, as in a review, a procession of Assyrian soldiers carrying cedar-trunks through the hills towards him. At the far right is a royal stela with ritual paraphernalia in front and several courtiers facing right towards it; it is just possible that the king appeared a second time on the band, in front of the courtiers where a fragment is missing, but there is no chariot for him. The time-sense in this band is not clear.

7. Band X is unique, as the king appears altogether three times in
the two registers and part of one composition appears in both. The left end of Xb shows the king and a small entourage advancing out of camp and inspecting an incidental massacre; the army then continues right, in or alongside a stream, and is headed by the empty chariot of the king. The king himself, on horseback, and his attendants, are further right, on what may be the further bank as the water is now below their feet instead of behind their legs. At the front of the procession are sacrificial animals, and men carving a royal stela on a vertical rock-face; beyond are three square cavities in the rock, and in each, waist-deep in water, is a man holding a long stick or torch and looking left towards the king; one Assyrian soldier, also looking left, stands on the rocks at the far right. Vertically above this scene, at the right end of Xa, are more sacrificial animals facing right, Assyrians carving an inscription on the rocks, and a native probably running in amazement towards a distant town. Behind the sacrificial animals in Xa the king's entourage again appears, now facing left; this is the back of a review composition in which the king, facing left, receives a procession of figures whose leaders, in Assyrian court dress, are falling to their knees to kiss his feet; they may be men welcoming him on his safe return from the hills, as there is a camp behind them, or possibly the inhabitants of an old Assyrian colony in the area which Shalmaneser has liberated. The rock scene, as we know from the caption (ARAB I, 226), represents the sources of the Tigris at Sebeneh Su or Bilkale, and some concordance has been noted (Unger 1920, 54) between the remains as they are and as they are represented;
this would account for the division of the scene between two registers.

The caption also states where the massacre at the left end of Xb took place, obviously just beforehand, while the review on Xa seems likely to have happened just afterwards. These are then three items from a strip-cartoon, starting at the left end of Xb and ending at the left end of Xa, with the king appearing once in each. There is a contrast with the continuous narrative of the other bands, where the king appears once in each register, and where the upper and lower registers are clearly related only in so far as they always deal with the same campaign only in Xa, where he is shown a second time in the face of the

8. One other type of composition is represented on the foremost projection of the thronebase (Iraq XXV, 20, pl. VIIc). It shows Shalmane-
ser and the king of Babylon, whose throne he had safeguarded, meeting with three attendants each, and shaking hands. Weidner (AbO XXI, 151) is unable to accept that this is really the subject, and suggests it may show the Assyrian king in different uniforms, but the dress of the Babylonians is tolerably recognisable and there is in fact a somewhat distant caption dealing with the alliance. The subject of two kings meeting, though seemingly new in Assyria, had been known centuries before in Syria (Pritchard 1954, fig. 608), so there may have been extant pre-
odu of the composition was to anticipate the numbers following, which are both well and unfinished. The other odd and unusual way was to introduce previous events taking place behind the king. This, for
I. Shalmaneser III: Further Observations

1. The experiments in the unification of different compositions, as seen in the bronze bands, and the consequent increased fluidity of time and space, can be ascribed partly to the demands of the medium. Each band, like Ashurnasirpal's though Shalmaneser's are far longer, was divisible into two sections: one on the face of the door, where it was novel combinations, as far as we know impossible though it would not be surprising to find parallels in some of Ashurnasirpal II's bands, another on the door-post to one side. The king is shown on the door-post only in Xb, where he is shown a second time on the face of the door, in Na where he may have been shown a second time, and probably in Nb. When the king was in his commonest position, near the centre of the face and looking towards the door-post, there was ample room for the figures behind him such as his personal entourage, and enough space therefore on the door-post, beyond the focus of the king's immediate attention, for the development of a related theme such as the escort away from a captured town. When the king looked away from the door-post or was situated near the junction of post and face, the extra space behind him could be filled in two ways. One, which asserted the unity of the composition, was to expand the numbers of those following him in the same procession; the results, as in IIIa and probably Pb, are both dull and unbalanced. The other and more usual way was to introduce previous events taking place behind the king; in Ia, for
instance, his followers are passing through mountainous country, and in XIIb there is a disconnected escort scene. In other words the artist was encouraged, whichever the direction in which he chose that the king should face, to put one unit of his composition on the face of the door and another, in the same landscape but either preceding or subsequent, on the door-post. What emerged was a great variety of novel combinations, so far as we know unprecedented though it would not be surprising to find parallels in some of Ashurnasirpal II's unpublished bronzes. Gütterbock (AJA LXI, pl. XXII) gives a schematic picture of the gates, with the king's positions marked, and this may perhaps be helpful.

2. It is virtually certain, from the captions and other details, that both registers in each band showed incidents from one campaign; sometimes there are similar scenes in the upper and lower registers of a band, but they are not demonstrably linked except in the triple strip-cartoon of band X. The relationship of the different bands to one another was not recorded by Rassam, who excavated bands I-XIII, but can be reconstructed on the assumption, which fits the remaining evidence, that the door-posts, cut from tree-trunks, tapered towards the top, so that the greater the circumference of that part of the band encircling the door-post, the lower the band was originally placed. This reconstruction was satisfactorily done by Unger (1920, 96), though Barnett (1960, 25) uses another unexplained system; the only real uncertainty concerns the damaged bands N and P, whose post-circumference is not known. Unger put P at the top, believing that it was the first to be
found by the villagers who preceded Rassam, but the de Clercq collection, to which most of the P fragments went, also contained parts of N, O, and VIII; probably these were all on the market at once, together with the fragments of N in Rassam's private collection. Since slightly more of P survives than of N, it is perhaps very slightly more likely that P was buried deeper than N and had therefore been below it on the gate; but whichever was top does not matter much. The following table shows Unger's arrangement of the bands, and where and when the campaigns they represent took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left-hand door</th>
<th>Right-hand door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. West, ? 853.</td>
<td>O. South, 850.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. West, 858.</td>
<td>VIII. West, 854.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. West, ? 857.</td>
<td>III. West, 858.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. West, ? 857.</td>
<td>IV. West, 857.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. West, 853.</td>
<td>XI. South, 850.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. North, 852.</td>
<td>II. North, ? 856.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. North, 856.</td>
<td>I. North, 859.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. West, 849.</td>
<td>XIII. West, 848.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only historical logic in this scheme seems to be that the two latest campaigns are on either side at the bottom, with the four northern campaigns symmetrically above them. V and VI are very close in style and composition, and are adjacent; O, IV, and VIII, too, which are somewhat crudely executed, are all in the top right-hand corner; N and P at the top on the left show, respectively, the king on the doorpost instead of the face, and the peculiar scene of open battle.
Perhaps then the criterion by which the positions of the bands was
determined was an aesthetic one, with the anomalous or less successful
ones placed high above eye-level where they would be as inconspicuous
as possible. Certainly the workmen failed to allow for the attachment
of the bands to the framework of the doors, as some of the carving was
destroyed or concealed in the final assembly: examples are the Tigris
source scene on X, which must have been partly covered by the vertical
bronze sheath on the edge of the door, and the door-post ends of all
the uppermost reliefs which, because of the taper of the door-post, had
to be cut away. This is not the work of men who knew exactly how
their productions were to be treated, and the precise destination of
the bands was probably decided at the last moment.

3. The compositions on the stone monuments were far more formal,
coherently organized, and fully captioned. At the corners were plain
vertical bands separating the panels and breaking up the reviews, but
each panel held a balanced group of figures. On the throne-base each
review covers three panels, with the king in the longest nearer the
wall; one review mixes two groups of tributaries, but both leaders
are in the same panel as the king (Iraq XXV, 18). The king only appears
twice on the obelisk, in two attitudes in the top two registers on one
side, but the rows of tributaries in all five registers obviously lead
up to him. The two sides of the throne-base, with Chaldaeans on one
and men from the Hatay on the other, could represent the two ends of
Shalmaneser's empire, while the panel in front, with his meeting with
the king of Babylon, suggests harmony at the centre. The obelisk shows,
from top to bottom, tributaries from Gilzanu, Israel, Egypt, Suhi, and the Hatay (WO II, 138); there is no clear logic in this.

4. Though some human figures in Shalmaneser's work are shorter than their neighbours, the majority tend to occupy almost as much space as the height of the register permits. Men in chariots and on horseback have therefore to be smaller than the foot-soldiers close to them; the king is not excepted, at least on the bronzes, and is indeed conspicuous as the dwarf on the pony near the right end of Xb. The treatment of the king on the throne-base, however, as observed by Oates (Iraq XXV, 14, pls. IV, VI), indicates that some sculptors were worried by this kind of effect: in one scene the king, because of the height of his crown, is physically just shorter than the man in front of him, but in the scene opposite there is a decided overcorrection; nor are there any mounted figures on the stone reliefs, though they do include, among the tribute, items of jewellery magnified for clarity. In the bronzes the figures associated with buildings and camps are naturally much smaller than the rest; they are better proportioned to their immediate surroundings than Ashurnasirpal II's had been, and the contrast between the two is well brought out by the black Obelisk (pls. VII-VIII) with incised ground-lines above or between figures were generally left empty or used, in the bronzes, for captions; there are also divine symbols in front of the king on the Black Obelisk. In the camps, which are represented like Ashurnasirpal's as seen from above and framed by towers and crenellations, have been published, seems to belong to Sargon (see above, 3). At all angles, there can be upper rows of figures on the same small scale as those nearer the base-line, but incised ground-lines
and the surrounding architecture prevent them from appearing suspended in mid-air. The conventions for water and rocky ground are also used to anchor figures in this way, and are sometimes associated with what could be intentional attempts at perspective recession; examples are at the left end of IIIa and the right end of Nb, with tributaries crossing the sea from islands, and at the right end of Xa, with Assyrian workmen in the middle distance and a native approaching a building farther away.

J. Tiglath-pileser III: General Observations

1. This king's work is chiefly represented by orthostats which were originally placed in his palace at Kalhu; some one-register review-scenes existed, but the great majority were divided like Ashurnasirpal's into two narrative registers separated by a band of inscription.

These sculptures have been fully published by Barnett and Falkner (TP3), and are referred to in this section primarily by their TP3 plate-numbers.

There are also small one-register orthostats of about this date from the town-gates of Hadatu (BAH XVI, pls. VII-XIII) and Til-Barsip (BAH XXIII, pl. XV), and the numerous paintings, mostly showing one-register review-scenes, from Til-Barsip (see above, V, T, 5-8). Some of the glazed brick panels from the Ashur temple at Ashur were also Tiglath-pileser's work, but the only one of which a copy, rather than a description, has been published, seems to belong to Sargon (see above, I, D, 15).
2. The longest series of connected palace orthostats comprises, from right to left, as illustrated in CXXVIII-CXXIX, slabs 2, 3, 4, 6, "7", 8, and 9; slabs 10 and 14, as demonstrated elsewhere (Iraq XXX, 70), belong at the left end of this group. The inscription between the two narrative registers in this series has never been added, and other uninscribed orthostats, found at the same time and in the same place, and illustrated on the same plate, probably derived from the same room also. We have a series of three, slabs 7, 5, and 4 from right to left, to the lower register of which slab "17a" should perhaps be added, and the isolated slabs 12, 13, and LVI.

3. Another group, found re-used in Esarhaddon's palace (Iraq XXX, 71), consists of unusually large, well-carved slabs, with a 12-line inscription between the registers. There are LXXI-LXXV, two and a half joining orthostats; LXXXVIII-CCXI, two orthostats with a small gap between them; and the isolated slabs LXV, LXVII, and LXXXVI. LXV could belong a little to the right of the LXXI-LXXV group, if the upper register showed standing chariots on the left and an open battle on the right; this is confirmed by Layard's remarks on the lost upper register of LXXV (TP3, 27), though it is odd that the LXXI chariots should be motionless.

4. Other established relationships are between slabs 15, 16 and 17b in CXXVIII-CXXIX, and between XCVII and XCVIII. The top and bottom registers of single slabs are preserved in LXII-LXIII, in LXIX, and in LXXII-LXXIII. Three panels found and drawn at one time, LVII-LIX, could well derive from one room. Some other single fragments which
resemble each other are grouped together in Barnett's plate-order, and might well have been adjacent; but nothing further can be proved.

5. The compositions on these orthostats, and on Tiglath-pileser's other work from Hadatu and Til-Barsip, while naturally including novel details, are basically traditional: we have open battles, sieges, triumphal processions, and reviews of booty, all represented so far as can be seen in a way which would have been familiar to Ashurnasirpal II. There are, however, some changes in the relationships between adjacent orthostats, and substantial changes in the relationships between adjacent compositions and in the treatment of space.

6. The panels on many of Tiglath-pileser's orthostats were less than twice as wide as they were high, and it was less easy to fit into single panels the individual units which had been the building-blocks of Ashurnasirpal's compositions. Parts of objects, therefore, and now human figures as in IX-X, frequently overlap from one orthostat to another. Nonetheless there are signs of the traditional unit-thinking. Whereas XVII, with the enemy fleeing back home, is clearly dependent on the Assyrian attack to its left, the panels showing this attack, XIV and XVI, are not far from being independent entities; the absence of either would have had little effect on the sense of the composition. LIV is another typical unit which could be added or subtracted to taste. Similarly X is potentially a complete scene in itself, except for the overlap of an archer's body on the left, and the defenders of the besieged town, so far as they are preserved, are all firing at the Assyrians on the same orthostat as themselves; it
is only on XI, immediately to the right, where the same town is contin-
ued, that a defender is seen to fire in the other direction, at a far larger Assyrian force. The only besieged enemies to fire at tar-
gets off their own orthostat are some on XC, one of the well-executed slabs with a twelve-line inscription. Tiglath-pileser's smaller one-
register orthostats from Syria are all clearly divided into separate panels.

7. The one group of adjoining compositions which can be satisfac-
torily restored, almost in full, is the series illustrated in the top right-hand and bottom left-hand ends of CXXVIII-CXXIX. This can be shown schematically as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 10 9 8 &quot;7&quot;</td>
<td>6 4 3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower register. Town, tribute reviewed by king. Camp. King reviewing captives and live-
stock.

The upper register is entirely concerned with events in Babylonia. We should probably restore a short procession of captives moving right from the siege on the left towards the empty town, but even without this link the siege would seem to precede the review; the balancing siege on the right could be contemporary with the review, or later.

The king himself only appears in the review scene. In the lower register there are Syrian tributaries advancing from the left, and Arab captives from the right; they are received by the king who appears twice, on either side of the central tent representing his camp, or
While neither register has the plain continuity of a Shalmaneser bronze strip, the scenes are organized more neatly than Ashurnasirpal's, and there has clearly been an effort to make each register a coherent whole. The other series from this room, slabs 1, 5, and 7, shows in its lower register an Assyrian force charging from the left, and chasing some Arabs into their camp on the right; this could well have belonged somewhere to the right of slab 2, as an earlier strip-cartoon incident, probably after a gap such as a doorway. The orthostats with the 12-line inscription are also consistently organized in so far as they all show battles or sieges in the top register and reviews below, but this may be chance; elsewhere, as in XL and L-LII and in LXXII-LXXIII, there is fighting in both the registers, and it may be that sieges were often inserted to fill spaces at the ends of long series of orthostats.

Though space is often left above the heads of figures standing in the "foreground", those who are mounted may still suffer from being disproportionately small. The king himself, as in LXXI, is again no exception; he even appears in camp in LXIII, on the same scale as the main figures around him but far smaller, presumably, than the figures in the lost portion of the composition to the right though this need not have mattered if he appeared there a second time. Usually there is the traditional contrast between the "foreground" figures, including the king, and the "background" figures engaged in violent activity round the besieged buildings to which, as in the Shalmaneser bronzes, they are better proportioned than they had been under Ashurnasirpal.
There is no real logic, however, as important "background" details, as in XXXII and XXXIX, are quite capable of obscuring parts of the "foreground". Features which belong in mid-air are birds, as in XLI, and the divine symbols in VIII; but though, as in LI, spaces which would have been filled under Ashurnasirpal are often left blank under Tiglath-pileser, others, as in XXXIV and LXII, are occupied by figures drawn, in order to fill the space available, to a scale larger than that of those vertically below them. We find this even in the III-VII series, where the mid-air figures of the Assyrian scribe and his companion do their best to prevent the rows of livestock in mid-air behind them from appearing at a greater distance than the figures on the base-line of the register. Similarly, in XXX, the Assyrian soldier in mid-air on the right removes any impression of perspective which we might have deduced from the varying scales of the rows of livestock in front of him. It is apparent that the sculptors were simply concerned to knit together masses of disparate details by using the full height of the register. When therefore we find, in XXXVIII, a soldier securely anchored, above the base-line, by the scale-backing of rocks behind his front leg, we can attribute the success of the effect to chance; likewise the scattering of boats over seas represented not by a spiral backing but by fish and other animals, such as we find in LVI and a Til-Barsip painting (BAH XXIII, frontispiece), need not be taken as showing any substantial appreciation of the way in which a backing of water allows boats to rest on different levels, in one register, without looking silly. There may possibly be attempts
to represent distance, in the curving line joining the town-gate to the cart in IV and in the bottom row of cattle in V, but the evidence is not convincing.

K. Sargon II: Basic Considerations

1. This king's work consists of a few glazed bricks from Ashur and a mass of material, mostly carved orthostats, from his palace at Dur-Sharrukin. Nearly all the orthostats were found by Botta and drawn by Flandin, and are referred to, in this section and the next, primarily by the plate numbers in their 1849 publication. Many of the orthostats showed one-register review-scenes, but several rooms contained two-register scenes of more active narrative. Many series were damaged, and since knowledge of Assyrian sculpture is needed for an understanding of the gaps, they are described below in detail, room by room. The captions attached to some of the orthostats were studied by Amin, references to whose work in Sumer are also included; I know of no reason to question his conclusions.

2. In room 1, on XLVIII, most of the sculptures were destroyed, but there were fragments from the lower register on either side of the southern door: one showed a siege, and the other a row of captives proceeding away from it. If this room conformed to practice elsewhere, the two scenes were linked: the events preceding the siege would have been shown to the left of the southern door, and subsequent events to the right, the whole series being read from left to right.
room. The series would have begun on one side of the door which must be restored in the north-east wall (see above, VI,G, 2), and culminated, probably with the king in a review-scene, on the other side.

3. In room 2, on LII (Sumer IX, 47), much of both registers survived. The lower should be read from right to left, starting by the jamb of the northernmost door. The beginning is damaged, but slabs 1, 35, and door B, 1, showed horses walking and galloping to the left; they could be understood as belonging to the Assyrian army, and there is another Assyrian horseman on door B, 2, immediately behind the king's chariot on slab 34; the next three slabs were destroyed, but 30 had the feet of a figure moving left, and there is then another door.

All that remains of this group suggests that it showed the outward procession of the king's army. Slabs 29 and 28 beyond the door show a siege, and after two more defaced slabs there are on 25 some archers firing back right from behind shields, presumably at another besieged city as the first is too far away. Slab 24, after another door whose jambs probably belonged partly in the series, showed captives being driven leftward towards 23, 22, and door H, 2 where there is another siege. All these slabs continue the dominant movement left, though the towns are attacked from both sides. The same direction is maintained on door H, 1, with a chariot charging left from a burning castle, and on 21-17 which show a mass of charging infantry and chariots, among them the king. The momentum is arrested on 17, where the inhabitants of an enemy town are surrendering to the king who faces back, rightwards, on 16. There is another siege on 15-14, with no clear direction of
attack. After another door there are Assyrian chariots, including the king and his standard-bearers, charging left on 12–8, and arriving at a town, on 7, which is also attacked from 6 further to the left. On 5 there are captives moving left, 4 is lost, 3 shows scribes facing left to count a pile of heads in front of the king, and the king himself appears in his chariot, reviewing the scene, in 2, with attendant soldiers behind him on the jamb of door C.

The upper register sculptures fall into two groups, though the second may be consequent on the first. We start at 34, which shows the siege of a town on a hill, with a ramp raised against it and a stream running below. The adjacent panels are destroyed, but 29 and 28 beyond a door to the left show another siege, and the leftward movement is clear in some captives on 26. There is a chariot facing right in 25, and this would most probably have shown the king reviewing the captives from the sieges to his right. There are more captives moving left on 22, and a town on door H, 2; the two slabs are connected by a stream running along the bottom of the register, and the composition is much like that in the register below. Beyond door H the second group starts. On door H, 1, there are courtiers carrying rhytons away left from a huge urn at which they have been filled. 21 to the left shows bearded musicians, 20 is lost, 19 shows armed soldiers standing and drinking, and 18 has another pair of soldiers; there is then a series of courtiers either drinking at tables or standing in attendance, and continuing as far as the door beyond slab 13. After the door 12 is lost, but 11 has soldiers standing and seemingly slicing food, while
approached from the right by a courtier. 10 and 9 have more courtiers at tables, 8 and 7 are destroyed, 6 shows three courtiers facing left, and the remainder are destroyed, except for some feet facing right on door B, 1, at the very end, after another door. Obviously the king will have been represented banquetting on, approximately, slab 2 in the middle of the short northern wall, where he is also present in the lower register. The men facing towards him on slab 6 would be his attendants, and so possibly may be the figures on door B, 1; but the latter could also belong with the military series on 34.

5. The one panel recorded from room 3, on LXXVIII, belongs in the lower register beside a door, and may be at one end of a composition. It shows a soldier moving right, past an empty castle, towards a hill with a monument on top and a stream flowing down its side. There is a vague resemblance to CXIV, from the end of the hunt series in room 7, and perhaps hunts were also shown in room 3, wall, while on 5 there are.

6. In room 4, on LXXX, there were review-scenes in one register, with the punishment of captive rebels. The king received the different groups while standing himself on either side of the door to room 8, and in the centre of the short western wall. There are the same scenes, better preserved, in room 8.

7. Room 5, on LXXV (Sumer IX, 35), has military narrative in both registers, the upper apparently being read from left to right and the lower from right to left; it is convenient though not compulsory to start both registers at door S, between slabs 13 and 14. In the lower register slabs 14-17 were not drawn in detail, but seem to have shown
two sieges with no positive movement from one to the other. Beyond door U, had another siege, and then there were two destroyed slabs; both 21 and 22, and 24 and 25 further on, had more sieges. The next slab 1 was destroyed, 2 had a siege, 3 and 4 cavalry charging left, and 5 another siege with more Assyrians on its left edge participating in a further siege on 6 and 7. There are captives moving left on 8, leading up to door 0, 2 where the king is shown in his chariot, facing right to review them. This last composition is repeated beyond the doorway, with a symmetrical siege on door 0, 1, and 10 and 11, captives moving left on 12, and the king facing right to review them on 13.

8. In the upper register slabs 13-10, door 0, 1 and 2, and slabs 9 and 8 all show Assyrian horse and chariotry charging right against infantry. 7 is lost but must have shown a siege, as on 8 the defeated infantry seem to have had their backs to the wall, while on 6 there are Assyrians firing to their left. There are further men, presumably engaged in the same siege, facing left on 5, and others moving right; the latter clearly belong with the procession on 4 and 3 carrying loot away from the town. On 2 is a pair of chariots facing back left; one of these must of course have been occupied by the king reviewing the loot. Beyond door E is another chariot-charge, partly preserved on 25, 24, and 22; on 21 is a chariot which may be stationary, as if its occupant had paused to fire at a town under siege further to the right. Any such town has disappeared with the entire upper registers of slabs 20-14; it is possible that there were no more sieges or reviews, and
that instead the chariot-battle carried right through to join the one described as starting on slab 13.

9. Room 6, on CII-CIII, has three one-register review-scenes, with the king receiving tributaries; he stands himself by the doors into rooms 9 and 11, and in the centre of the narrow eastern end.

10. Room 7, on CIII (OIP XXXVIII, 71), has relatively peaceful narrative in two registers. Underneath is a bird-hunt, starting at the only door, and moving from left to right in three main groups. There is the procession into the woods on the north-east wall, the principal shoot on the south-east opposite the door, and on the south-west a procession towards an ionic lodge beside a stela-topped hill reminiscent of the hill in an Ashurbanipal hunt (Barnett 1960, fig. 79). Perhaps the lodge is to be regarded as the site of the banquet in the upper register. To the right of the door, on the south-west, are courtiers seated at tables with various attendants, and to the left are the feet of several men either standing and working at tables or carrying objects to their right; attention is clearly focussed on the destroyed slab opposite the door, where the king will undoubtedly have been placed.

11. In room 8, on CXVI (Sumar X, 23), there were one-register orthostats resembling those in room 4. The king appeared at least three times, twice beside doors and once on the narrow wall behind the throne-base. It is with the Assyrians going off leftwards, perhaps in be

12. In room 9, on CXXI, the king and his courtiers appeared alone on one-register orthostats. The king was opposite the courtyard door.
13. In room 10, on CXXII (OIP XXXVIII, 40), a corridor, there were two registers of tributaries on each side, northerners in the lower registers and westerners in the upper. The king is absent; instead each register has at its inner, north-eastern end, a courtier waving his arm as if to introduce the tributaries into the king's presence.

14. Room 11, on CXXXVI, has two one-register review-scenes, with tributaries leading up to the king by the door in the narrow north-eastern wall.

15. Room 12, on CXXXVIII (OIP XXXVIII, 20), like room 9, simply showed a one-register composition of the king and his courtiers; the king was placed opposite the only door.

16. The surviving slabs from room 13, on CXXXIX (Sumer IX, 224), showed part of a lower register of military narrative, read from right to left. Slab 9, east of the only known door, showed hill-country; 8 is lost, but the same landscape recurred on 7, with Assyrian horsemen moving left and a single enemy falling before them. 6 had the king in his chariot, also proceeding left over hills, and 5, which is lost, must have shown the surprise arrival of the army at its destination, Musasir. On 4 are the inhabitants surrendering in the direction from which the Assyrians have come, and soldiers swarming over the town and its temple. The disposal or removal of the booty, including apparently a bronze statue shown set up originally in front of the temple, appears on slabs 3-1, with the Assyrians moving off leftwards, perhaps to be reviewed by the king on a lost slab further along the wall; alternatively the Assyrians moving left may form the rear of a triumphal procession.
17. In room 14, on CXLIV (Sumer IX, 214), there were both one-register and two-register orthostats, the former being placed at the narrow western end of the room and showing the king flanked by attendants. Little was left of the two-register narrative on the long walls. Slabs 1 and 2, at the end of a stretch of wall, had sieges in both registers. The isolated group of slabs 12-10 had a siege preserved in the lower register, with captives moving left from it to be received by an Assyrian official outside an encampment. The king does not seem to have appeared in these panels.

18. The orthostats in the throneroom, "Court VII", were mostly removed in antiquity. We have only one fragment, from the top of a lower register, with men hauling a boat (OIP XXXVIII, fig. 72); the excavators suggested that the subject should be Sargon's Babylonian campaigns, missing elsewhere in the palace, as these are mentioned in the fragment of inscription above the carving, but we should note that this is not necessarily so, as the inscriptions between the registers in the two-register rooms record all the king's campaigns and have no immediate bearing on the adjacent pictures. We also have the sculptures from either side of the throne-base in this room (OIP XXXVIII, figs. 79, 80): in one the king in his chariot reviews a pile of heads brought from a siege in front, and in the other there are Assyrians on foot, probably including the king, firing at a besieged town; in both the king faces into the room from near the wall, and we should perhaps imagine another scene featuring him, as on Shalmaneser's Kalhu throne-
base, on the front panel. We also know of fragments of paintings, with figures who may be in court-dress, fallen into the throneroom from the walls above the orthostats (OIP XXXVIII, fig. 70, pl. III).

Place too (1867, III, pl. XXXII), in one of the rooms round the inner court, found a fragment of narrative painting showing a row of captives or tributaries. (If this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could the rest; even if this is correct the penis could).

19. The bit hilani, Place's "temple" (see above, IV, F, 3), has produced two basalt slabs showing scenes from hunts (S. Smith 1938, pl. XXXI; Parrot 1961, fig. 66). Place (1867, I, 92) also found basalt slabs, not apparently in position, in room 99, and it may be that these were to be set up in the bit hilani.

20. There were several formal narrative facades, illustrated in X, XI, XXIX, XXX, and XLIII, with some later corrections (OIP XXXVIII, figs. 28-47): in court VIII on the front of the throneroom suite and on either side of the entrance to corridor 10; around the inner court VI; and on the walls of courts I and III, on either side of the projecting wing. There are some apotropaic figures, but the main compositions are long large-scale one-register review-scenes, four of which are adequately recorded. Outside the throneroom suite, and outside room 2 of the projecting wing, the king received processions of courtiers carrying objects such as furniture; outside room 2 his horses and chariot brought up the rear. The courtiers in court VIII ended at the west corner of the court, where there was a slight recess which helped to divide the compositions (AJSL LII, 114). The other wall, on either side of the entrance to corridor 10, was occupied by two processions
leading up to the entrance. On the left the king was approached by a procession of tributaries, and on the right by figures, drawn on a small-scale, bringing timber from the Mediterranean. The king and his courtiers are separated from the small-scale figures, according to Flandin's drawing, by a genie which occupied an intervening slab at right-angles to the rest; even if this is correct the genie would only have been visible from an angle, and it cannot detract seriously from the unity of this composition. We should also note the possibility that there were further processions of courtiers in glazed brick above the orthostats, as believed by Botta (1849, V, 59, 171); some of the bricks found by him may show figures in court dress, though the majority belong in formal panels placed above doors (Iraq XXV, 42).

More of Sargon's military narrative was to be found on the glazed-brick facings of the Ashur temple at Ashur, which included sieges, reviews, and processions (WDOG LXVI, 55-62). The one surviving illustration (Andrae 1925, pl. VI) shows the king in his chariot crossing mountainous country.

L. Sargon II: Further Observations

1. Had Sargon's narrative orthostats been re-used in antiquity like Tiglath-pileser's, and preserved only as pell-mell fragments, there would be little in the way the compositions are arranged to distinguish them from the earlier work. There is still a tendency, for instance, for the figures on a single slab to be self-sufficient, dispensable
units of the total composition; this is particularly notable in the scenes with charging chariots in rooms 2 and 5, and of course in the one-register scenes, where figures seldom overlap. Similarly the siege appears to have been used often as a stand-by motif, to fill a gap at the end of a series of orthostats, and we may find them in the vicinity of doors monotonously arranged almost directly above one another in both registers at once. Nonetheless there are developments under Sargon, even if they may have been anticipated in some rooms, such as that from which the orthostats with a 12-line inscription derive, in Tiglath-pileser's palace.

2. The military narrative in two registers is consistently arranged, so far as we can tell, to show scenes from one area in one room. The next logical step was to make the scenes consecutive. In fact, as Amin argues, the order does not seem to correspond exactly to the historical facts, but the way in which one scene leads on to another clearly indicates that the sculptors meant to impose a strip-cartoon impression on whole series of compositions, in each of which the king appears once. At the same time the distinction between the compositions may be blurred, and progression through time and space emphasised, by retaining a single continuous background of landscape and other features as in the Musasir series from room 13, or the hunt in the lower register of room 7. Doorways provide natural breaks in the sequence, but even these are ignored when no break is desired. The frequency with which the king appears was natural so long as the king had to take part in the fighting as well as in the reviews of prisoners, but in
room 5, on slabs 0, 1, and 10-13, the two are combined: the king seems to be absent from the siege, but does review the captives. This is the arrangement on Shalmaneser's bronze band IIIb, and is partly reflected in the upper register of Tiglath-pileser's main surviving series.

3. The "foreground" figures in Sargon's orthostats still tend to occupy the full height of the register, and those, including the king, as in LIII and C, who are mounted in chariots, can again be smaller than their attendants on foot. There is a sharper contrast than in the previous reign between "foreground" figures and those in action around "background" buildings. Sometimes, as in LV, LXIII, and XCIII, figures seem to diminish in size as they approach the "background", but important "background" details, as in CXLV, can obscure the "foreground" at the same time as a curving line, connecting a town-gate to a larger siege-engine, might have seemed to represent distance. The contrast between "foreground" and "background" grew, apparently, because of a reluctance to include figures on an intermediate scale in mid-air between them: one incongruous effect was eliminated by accentuating another.

The only mid-air features, apart from birds and men falling from battle-ments, are corpses as in LVIII-LX, men apparently pinned to the ground for flaying as in CXX, and vegetation as in CXIV: though the executioner is partly obscured by his victim in CXX, these are features which, like those on the White Obelisk, are fundamentally earthbound in a way which moving figures are not, and which do not seem to be trampling down the "foreground" figures below them. The avoidance of this latter effect was probably encouraged by an appreciation of its unsatisfactory
appearance in Tiglath-pileser's work. At the same time, however, Sargon's sculptors observed that figures and features could be placed on different levels in one register, even without distinct groundlines of their own, if they were placed against an overall backing of scale-mountains or spiral-water. The mountain convention is sometimes used, as in LXV, merely to separate groups of figures drawn to different scales: the larger "foreground" figures stand on top of the backing, and there are smaller corpses, or in CXL more active figures, silhouetted against the backing at the bottom of the register. But the backings could also reach from the bottom of the register to the top: a fragment from the throne room (OIP XXXVIII, fig. 72) shows figures, from the top of a lower register, hauling a boat against a backing of water, and there probably were similar groups vertically below them. The possibilities of this technique, as observed by Groenewegen-Frankfort (1951, 260), were more fully exploited in the XXIX, XXXI-XXXV series, where for the first time we find small-scale figures on large single-register orthostats: on the left the king and his courtiers occupy the full height of the orthostats, but the scene which they are reviewing comprises many small-scale figures on different levels, on backings of water and rocky ground, transporting timber for the king's palace. Strictly this way of relating figures to one another is no different to that achieved in Shalmaneser's bronzes, where a backing, for figures on different levels, was provided by the surrounding architecture of military camps drawn, schematically, as viewed from vertically above; the effect, however, is far easier on the eye when an overall backing
of water or mountains is provided, and it is evident, from the difference between the work of Tiglath-pileser and Sargon, that the later sculptors were conscious of this. Another way, of course, of relating figures to one another is by making them recede into the distance: there is a clear instance of this on one of Sargon's basalt orthostats (Parrot 1961, fig. 66), where a small figure's spear is obscured by a background tree, but we have seen that the treatment of "background" figures in the scenes of military narrative is too inconsistent to be regarded as a calculated exercise in perspective. Distance is indicated on one slab, LXXVIII, where a stream rises on one hill and flows down past another; but here we see the distance because we recognize the subject, and know how water must behave even when it is represented as cavorting through mid-air.

M. Sennacherib: Basic Considerations

1. A thorough study of the carved orthostats from Sennacherib's extensive palace at Nineveh will not be practicable until more of Layard's drawings have been published or the building itself re-excavated. We deal, in this section, only with the way in which the compositions are divided on the orthostats, and with the nature of the narrative in the different rooms. Some further general observations are made later.

2. An important innovation under Sennacherib is that there are no longer inscribed bands of text dividing the narrative carvings into...
two distinct registers. Layard, relying on information in a letter, says in his first book that there were such inscriptions in what may have been room LI south (NR II, 140), but later (NR, 68) "not a vestige of inscription" was to be found there. Perhaps his correspondent was confused by a long caption explaining the action, or he may even have found some re-used slabs from Dur-Sharrukin; it seems possible that some rooms, perhaps the earliest to be carved, did have long expensive bands of inscription between registers, but we have no more reliable record of any. It is sometimes difficult therefore to identify the number of registers on the isolated orthostats that survive, especially as several rows of figures can be super-imposed inside single compositions. Nonetheless it is clear that most orthostats, like those showing Sargon's sea composition, had one register alone.

The two-register scheme was retained in rooms III, where a narrow strip of water divided the related scenes above and below (MN I, pls. LXXII, LXXIII); X, with two mountain scenes (MN II, pl. L); XLVII, where the captives in the upper register move in the opposite direction to those below (Gadd 1936, 176; BM 124947); LXX, where there was a plain band and a stream between the registers, and Assyrians facing in different directions in each (Gadd 1936, pl. XIX); and probably LI south and LXIX (NR, 68, 588). In room VII there were even three registers, each with a composition incorporating the king (MN II, pl. XXIX). There are no other reliable instances in the published material, but we should note two in which appearances may be deceptive: in room V, on the north wall (NR II, 133; MN I, pl. LXXX), where some slabs are divided in half
by a horizontal stream, with figures above and below, the lower group is probably subsidiary to the upper as there is only one register in the rest of the room; and in court VI, on the south wall (MN II, pls. XXXVII-XXXVIII), the skirmishes at the top and bottom are perhaps subsidiary to the review scene in the middle.

3. Most of the rooms probably showed Sennacherib’s campaigns, but our information is by no means as abundant as the number of rooms counted by Layard, seventy-one, may imply. He states (NB, 651) that "nearly every chamber explored was panelled with alabaster slabs carved with numerous figures and with the minutest details", and though there were rooms "whose walls were simply coated with plaster", all but one, LXI, were left unnumbered. But of the numbered rooms II, XV, XX, XXI, and XXXV were hypothetical (NB, plan opposite p. 67); XXIX, XXX, and LIII were lined with plain slabs (NB, 445, 69); H (the facade of room I), XIX, XXII, XXVII, XXXIII, XLII, and the south wall of XLIX had slabs whose faces were either roughly chiselled or carved with reliefs of a later date (see above, II, H, 10-12); there seems to be no record of the carving which may have existed in rooms XI, XIII, XVI, XXIII, XXXVII, L, LII, LV-LIX, LXII, LXIII, LXVIII, and LXXI; there were certainly carvings in rooms XXV, XXVI, and LXVI (NB, 442, 586), but their subject is not known; and the slabs from the north and east of court VI, from XXVII, from XLIII-XLIV and XLVI-XLVII, from the north wall of XLIX, and from the northern room LXII are discussed below in other categories. The only published evidence for twelve of the remaining thirty-two rooms, namely IV, VIII east, IX, XVII, XXIV, XXXI,
XXXIV, XXXIX, XL, XLI, LX, and LXV, consists of Layard's often cursory descriptions (respectively NR II, 124–125; NB, 229–230, 228; NR II, 136; NB, 442, 462, 445, 347, 344, 460, and 586); perhaps some of these sculptures also were recarved after Sennacherib's death. We do have published drawings or identified fragments of the orthostats from twenty more rooms: I, III, V, the south and west of court VI, VII, VIII west, X, XII, XIV, XVII, XXXII, XXXVI, XXXVIII, XLV, XLVIII, LI south, LXIV, LXVII, LXIX, and LXX (see below, passim); but even this information seldom covers more than a few isolated slabs; their subjects are military, but the context is often far from clear; some might conceivably be the work of Esarhaddon. Other groups of slabs are those from the "Ishtar Temple" procession originally found by Rassam, and the Babylonian scenes mentioned by Thompson (1929, 61) on the facade of a room west of Layard's LIV. Thompson also states that King cleared several of Layard's rooms, but reburied the slabs without apparently recording them further; Madhloom (Sumer XXIII, 78, pls. VIII-XII) gives a brief report on his work during which all of rooms I, III, IV, and XVIII, and part of courts H and VI, had been re-excavated by the spring of 1969. It would seem that no set of reliefs from any one room apart from LXIV, a courtyard, and possibly the throne room I, showed events from campaigns in more than one area. This was Layard's own observation (NB, 651), and it is supported by the evidence from rooms, such as V, XII, XIV, XXXVI, and XXXVIII, from which slabs belonging to almost every stretch of wall, with no significant change of landscape between
them, have been recorded. There is much doubt about the precise locations depicted, but a preliminary discussion of the probabilities may prove helpful. We adopt for this purpose Sennacherib's own schematic view of his first "five" campaigns, and assume provisionally that Sennacherib rather than Esarhaddon was responsible for all these carvings.

5. Babylonia was invaded by Sennacherib in his first and fourth campaigns. Scenes in this region are characterized above all by an abundance of palm-trees and reedy marshes, which can hardly represent anywhere else. This is the type of landscape found in room III (\textit{AM I}, pls. LXXII-LXXIII; NR II, 137), where a caption referred to Dilbat, probably captured in the first campaign; in room LI south (NB, 68, with text-figure); south of door a in court LXIV (AM II, pl. XXVII; NB, 584-585, with text-figure); in room LXXIX (NB, 586-588; Gadd 1936, pl. XIX), where a caption mentioned Sahrina, another objective of the first campaign (ARAB II, 131); and in the series dug by King west of room LIV (Thompson 1929, 61), if this was indeed Sennacherib's work. Part of another marsh-scene, later defaced, may have originated in room XVIII (Iraq XXIX, 44, pl. XII); an alternative is the facade of court H, where Madhloom has recently uncovered more defaced slabs with reeds surviving at the bottom. It is further possible, since Sennacherib's Babylonian scenes are both inelegant and uncommon, that others of the defaced orthostats originally contained them; those in room XXVIII and court XIX, which were recarved with later Babylonian scenes, are natural
candidates. The south and west sides of a court VI [MN I, pl. XXXI].

6. Sennacherib's third campaign was directed at Greater Syria. Some scenes showing this are instantly recognizable, as they include towns beside a sea, thick with galleys, which can only be the Mediterranean: there are extant pictures of this subject from rooms I and VIII west (MN I, pl. LXXI; S. Smith 1938, pl. XL), and it is mentioned as occurring in rooms XXIV, XXXIV, and in one or both of rooms XL and XLI (NB, 442, 445, 344). Room XXXVI certainly showed the third campaign, as a caption names the besieged town as Lachish in Palestine (MN II, pls. XX-XXIV; NB, 148-153). A peculiarity of the Syrian women in some of the sea pictures is the high rounded mitre they occasionally wear; this is also found on the women in room XII (MN II, pl. XVIII), and since the men there have long tasselled cloaks open in front, such as were worn by Sargon's western prisoners and tributaries, these may also be victims of the third campaign. The same two arguments apply to the men and women in the very fragmentary procession of captives north of door a in court LXIV (MN II, pl. XXX). A characteristic of the Syrian towns in rooms I and XXXVI is the row of shields crowning their battlements; this is also visible in room X (MN II, pl. I); though the dress of the room X men is not distinctive, they possessed camels which are never shown among loot from the north or east, and the local flora included the prickly pear which was also at home near Lachish; a room X too therefore is likely to represent Syria.

7. In his second campaign Sennacherib attacked the inhabitants of the Zagros, in the direction of Media and Elam. This seems to have
appeared on the south and west sides of court VI (MN I, pl. LXXXI; MN II, pls. XXXVII-XXXVIII), a country reached through difficult terrain and inhabited by men using odd round-headed quivers such as are also carried by captives, in the deportation scenes of rooms XLIII and XLVI (MN I, pls. LXXXII-LXXXIII; MN II, pls. XXXIII-XXXIV), whose apparel is reminiscent of fashions in Elam under Ashurbanipal (NB, 584). The same campaign was represented in LX (NB, 460), where a caption mentioned Bit-Kubatti, which was certainly attacked at this time (ARAB II, 117). There are several other rooms which could have shown either this campaign or the fifth, which was also directed against the northern mountains: these are rooms V, XIV, XXI, XXXII, and XLV (MN I, pls. LXVIII and LXXVIII-LXXX; NB, 72; NB, 462 and MN II, pls. XIX and XXXI; and NR II, 135-136, and MN I, pls. LXXV-LXXVI respectively), where some of the enemy wear skin-cloaks which had been, in Sargon's palace, characteristic of the inhabitants of Iran and Armenia. All the inhabitants of these northern and eastern regions seem to have depended for their defence mainly on archery; the battles in room VII (MN II, pl. XXIX) were against more archers whose clothes, though hardly striking, were identical with those of the court VI people, and who probably also featured therefore in the second or fifth campaign. Another subject, closely related to the traditional review, is 8. Layard considered (NB, 341-342, with text-figure; Gadd 1936, pl. XVIII) that room XXXVIII, with a river flowing through hills and vineyards, represented the same country as LX, Bit-Kubatti in the east; but the enemy wore turbans which are normally associated with the west.
The landscape is similar in room XLVIII (MN II, pl. XL), where the enemy wore ankle-length robes which again suggest the west. The architecture in room XLVIII included columns which Barnett (1957, 145) has compared with the "Tyrian" windows on western ivories, but the furniture looted by the Assyrians has magnificent finials of a type that seems to be missing on the ivories. Ashurbanipal's Armenians wear long robes and caps not unlike turbans (NB, 458: on the left, identified by a caption), so perhaps these are all scenes from the fifth campaign to the north. The problem is additionally complicated by the appearance in room I, which also included a Mediterranean town, of enemy archers, one at least of whom wore a turban while most did not, in an open battle among mountains (MN I, pl. LXX); since other thronerooms showed a mixture of campaigns, perhaps Sennacherib's did also, in which case the turbaned archer may have been encountered in a campaign other than the second.

9. Rooms IV, VIII east, IX, XVII, XXXIX, LXV, and LXVII (see above, VIII, M, 3; Gadd 1936, 251) all represented campaigns in mountainous country. This cannot be Babylonia, but there seems no way of determining at present whether any particular room showed western, northern, or eastern regions.

10. Another subject, closely related to the traditional review, is the deportation. Rows of prisoners, doubtless bound for deportation, are of course included in the above landscaped military compositions, but in rooms XLIII, XLI, and perhaps XLIV and XLVII, deportations may have appeared by themselves (NB, 582-584). This is not entirely
certain, as some slabs were not preserved or recorded, but it is notable that in rooms XLIII and XLVI not only was there no landscape but there were also captives from more than one region. Some wore headbands with ear-flaps or Layard's "reversed Phrygian bonnet", headgear typical of the west as in the Lachish scene (Barnett 1960, fig. 46), while others were recognised by Layard as resembling Ashurbanipal's Elamites. Room XLIV (NB, 583) showed captives, clothed in skins, from the north; we do not know if fighting was represented. Room XLVII had in the lower register captives from a western town, against a mountainous background, reviewed by the king, and Layard again does not mention fighting (NB, 584; Gadd 1936, 176, pl. XX); there were more captives in the upper register, moving in the other direction. Another room which may possibly have excluded scenes of battle is XXVII, where Layard noted "part of a procession of captives and warriors" (NB, 442).

11. Civic works were shown in slabs 43-68 of the inner court VI (NB, 105-118; Gadd 1936, 171), and slabs 1-7 in the passage XLIX (NB, 104-105); they dealt, respectively, with the quarrying and transport of a winged bull, and the transport of a huge object, perhaps an obelisk, by water.

12. We have also two sets of orthostats showing large-scale one-register figures moving in procession. In the sloping corridor LI north, there are grooms with horses descending from left to right, and on the opposite wall, ascending from left to right, men carrying fruit, flowers, and small game (Smith 1938, pls. LXV-LXIX). Clearly these are processions to and from the hunt, comparable with those in
Ashurbanipal's equivalent corridor (Gadd 1936, 188), and perhaps we should look for Sennacherib's hunting sculptures, which are otherwise unknown, in this part of the palace. The other procession is shown on a large group of orthostats found out of position by Rassam (1897, 8), on the north side of the outer court H; they must derive from one or both sides of a sloping bridge or passage leading towards the Ishtar temple area, and the figures represented include the king, his attendants, courtiers one of whom seems to be the crown-prince, priests, musicians, and foot-soldiers. The relevant orthostats are listed elsewhere in order (Iraq XXIX, 48); a further piece from this group has since appeared (Sotheby's Catalogue, 26/11/1968, pl. XXXIX); see also below, Appendix B.

N. Sennacherib: Further Observations

1. It must first be noted that the vertical divisions between orthostats no longer have any significant effect on the arrangement of the compositions. They may coincide with natural breaks inside compositions, as they still sometimes do under Ashurbanipal (Gadd 1936, pl. XLIII), but even in Sennacherib's large-scale processional scenes (Gadd 1936, pl. XXIII), figures can overlap from one orthostat to another. This was an automatic development once Sennacherib's sculptors had decided, as they did, to draw their narrative scenes on a generally smaller scale than had previously been done.

2. Few military compositions can be reconstructed entirely, but almost all seem divisible into two closely related classes. When the
storming of towns in mountainous country was depicted, the Assyrian army was drawn up on one side of the town and on the other, after a few more besiegers, were the captives led from the town into the presence of the king at his camp. The sieges of alamu and Lachish in rooms XIV and XXVI (MN II, pls. XX-XXIV; Smith 1938, pls. XLII, XLIII, LVI, and LX) are the clearest examples of this scheme. In corridor XII (MN II, pl. XVIII; Gadd 1936, pl. XV) the attack and the siege are on one wall, and the king opposite, but the two are probably linked, as a door also interrupted a composition of this type in room XXXII (MN II, pl. XXXI, to the left of MN II, pl. XIX). There is a variation of this type in room XLVIII (NB, 118), where the difficult country traversed by the Assyrian army before the attack, and the amount of booty collected afterwards, occupy far more space than the sacked city itself. The other class of compositions showed the conquest of enemies who either fought in the open or had an open line of retreat. Here the nature of the battle or siege could only be made clear by having the scenery behind the enemy reach to the end of the composition, and the Assyrians are only shown as attacking from the same side as that on which the captives are marched away (NB, 585, text-figure, to left of MN II, pl. XXVII): the enemy retained their natural advantage behind them, the sea in campaigns against the Syrian coastal cities, or the reeds and marshes of Babylonia, or, sometimes probably, an expanse of mountain-side.

3. These compositions are reminiscent of Shalmaneser's bronze band IIIb, and in each the king appears once, reviewing the loot. Movement
through both time and space is united in one coherent composition, often filling one room in one-register orthostats. Sometimes, however, in large rooms or on long expanses of wall, several compositions of this kind were combined, and linked by a continuing landscape background. This is especially clear in room V, as re-excavated: on slabs 1-20 there are two siege compositions, reviewed by the king facing left on or about slab 9 and right on or about slab 11, with his camp in the middle as in the lower register of the main Tiglath-pileser group, and on slabs 21-47 there are, from left to right, on another stretch of wall, a series of advances, sieges, and reviews. Similarly in room XXXVIII (NB, 342) the king participates in the advance through difficult country-side, before a series of sieges which probably culminated in a review. It may be questioned, however, whether these strip-cartoon episodes, though concerned with single campaigns, were arranged any more chronologically than Sargon's had been. Yet there is one indubitable strip-cartoon, with one scene following another against a continuous landscape background, in the court VI series showing the king, again and again, inspecting the progress of a colossus from the quarry to the river and downstream. This encourages us to look for other strip-cartoons among the military scenes, and the two-register compositions from room III (MN I, pls. LXXII, LXXXIII), in one of which the king appears on an unusually small scale in front of a building (or ziggurat?) at Dilbat, perhaps after a triumphal entry, are likely candidates; the king's double appearance in this scene, if correctly postulated, would constitute an internal strip-cartoon also.
Extreme disproportions between juxtaposed figures, such as had plagued scenes of violent activity in the past, do exist under Sennacherib: the effect in the room I camp (MN I, pl. LXXVII) is as absurd as ever. Often, however, abrupt contrasts are avoided or disguised. Room LXIX has the traditional treatment (NB, 588, text-figure): there are large figures, in what is probably a two-register orthostat, directly adjoining a small-scale city occupied by small figures. Room III (MN, pl. LXXIII), again decorated in two registers, has a similar effect, though there the large figures are superimposed in two rows rather than one. The king himself appears among the small-scale figures on both slabs (apparently in the chariot in the top right-hand corner of NB, 588), but could also have been shown on the larger scale nearby in the same compositions. Elsewhere there was the unavoidable contrast (so long as true perspective was not used) between the large-scale "foreground" figures (MN I, 78), marching to the attack or marching away, and the small-scale "background" figures (MN I, pls. LXVIII-LXXI) in action in or by towns or boats, or among mountains. This contrast was either alleviated by gradually changing the scale as in room V (MN I, pl. LXXVIII), or by the addition of an over-all backing, such as scale-mountains, which accentuated the distinction between different groups as in room XLV (MN I, pl. LXXV). In other cases (MN II, pls. XX-XXIV) where neighbouring figures are painfully ill-proportioned to one another, the action is altogether so complicated that the inept details are lost in the crowd. Usually the king is among a larger group in a review, or dominates the scene in some other way (NB, 111,
text-figure) by his position alone. In room XII (Gadd 1936, pl. XV) the king in his chariot is on a larger scale than his escort; maybe this is Esarhaddon.

5. The predominant reason for the improved proportions of the figures on most of Sennacherib's reliefs is that landscape backings enabled sculptors, not merely to distinguish separate groups on different scales in one composition, but also to place several rows of figures, on one scale, above one another in one composition without mid-air implausibilities; the use of conventional motifs, simplified as they were, for water and rocky ground, and of static features such as plants and trees, obviated much of the need for obtrusive ground-lines, and important figures not engaged in violent action could be rendered without undue magnification and without unduly large empty spaces around them. This technique, anticipated in Sargon's timber scene, obviously appealed to Sennacherib's sculptors, and their appreciation of its usefulness may have been a major factor in their abandonment of the old two-register stereotype. It is particularly notable that compositions incorporating rocks, water, and small plants tend to be one-register, as these could extend across the entire surface of an orthostat without tiring the eye; but that those Babylonian compositions in which the landscape could be represented only by rows of palm-trees, too many of which would undoubtedly have sagged, tend to retain the old two-register design, with corresponding problems of scale. We must not ignore slabs such as those in room XII (Gadd 1936, pl. XV), on one wall of which the king's escort is arranged in three rows on firm
ground-lines with no landscape backing at all, but this unprecedented scheme (unless it was Esarhaddon's work and influenced by Egyptian practice) could be an experiment made after the super-imposition of figures in landscape had been judged successful. The same argument may apply to the figures, on an empty ground but often sandwiched between landscape elements at top and bottom, on slabs from court VI (NB, 111, text-figure) in the colossus series.

6. The interest taken by Sennacherib's sculptors in the portrayal of landscape as such is evident in the same series, as there are figures engaged in quite extraneous activities both above and below the groups concerned with the colossus itself: presumably, though the scale is unhelpful, the figures in the upper landscape are to be regarded as behind the main groups, and those in the lower landscape as in front of them. This is the traditional "bird's eye" view of Ashurnasirpal II's camp-scene; it is carried to extremes in other orthostats. Plants, for instance, can grow horizontally out of marshes or out of a scale-mountain which is also on its side (MN I, pl. LXXXI; NB, 565, text-figure). Mountain valleys can be odder still: there will be a central stream meandering roughly horizontally, with men proceeding along or through it, and a horizon of hills above; but the hills on what we may envisage as the hither side can either be shown standing upright on the base of the slab, with their peaks pointing at the stream above (MN I, pl. LXXXI), or they can be upside down, pointing vertically downwards together with the trees that clothe them, and even giving rise to a rivulet which leads, from the central stream,
downwards to a source in the sky at the very bottom of the slab (NB, 341, text-figure). One cannot imagine the Assyrians taking such liberties with human subjects, though some figures on siege ramps are tilted dangerously backwards (MN II, pl. XXI). Clearly the object of the sculptors was to portray unambiguously the natural features of the country. There is no convincing perspective.

0. Esarhaddon: General Observations

1. This king's narrative work is hardly known, though he undoubtedly had military narrative carved in the Nineveh arsenal (AfObl. IX, 62); nor we can exclude the possibility that some rooms in Sennacherib's palace, such as XII (see above, VIII,N,4-5), and XXIV, which Layard noted as unusually well carved (NB, 442), may have been carved for Esarhaddon. One small fragment (AfO XVI, 29, Abb. 4), which may be of pindu stone, shows Assyrian soldiers, neatly carved in the armour of Sennacherib's reign, in rows on a plain background recalling Ashurbanipal's Til-Tuba composition (MN II, pl. XLIV); this could be Esarhaddon's work. More reliable are some glazed tiles, partly showing campaigns in Egypt, which were found out of position in the Kalhu arsenal (NB, 165; MN II, pls. LIII-LIV). We also have large-scale one-register paintings from the Kalhu arsenal (see above, III,H,3) and, less certainly attributed, from Til-Barsip (see above, V,T,9).

2. The paintings in one Kalhu room (Mallowan 1966, II, figs. 307, 308) simply showed the king standing with courtiers in front of him;
this at least is the type of composition which must be restored there.

Another room (Mallowan 1966, 467) may have shown a procession of courtiers returning from a lion-hunt. At Til-Barsip there are standing soldiers with horses, perhaps from the king's bodyguard in a review-scene (BAH XXIII, pl. LIII), and another smaller-scale review with the king in a chariot (BAH XXIII, pl. LII). There were lion-hunts in Til-Barsip rooms XXVII and XLIV, though only the latter survived (BAH XXIII, pl. LIII): each panel contains a single composition, with the king disposing of a lion; once the king's chariot is followed by two others carrying dead lions, apparently added to fill the extra space without changing the subject. These are first representations of lion-hunts in wall-decoration since Ashurnasirpal, but neither they nor the other compositions exhibit any significant new characteristics.

3. The small-scale narrative scenes on the glazed tiles cannot be restored, but it is noticeable that the figures are scattered at different levels over a background plain but for the overall colouring. There seems to be no comparison with the occasional mid-air groups seen on some orthostats of Ashurnasirpal II and Tiglath-pileser III; one has the impression that Esarhaddon's mid-air figures covered extensive areas of the composition, as in some Ashurbanipal scenes. The painter may perhaps in this case have been influenced by the scenes of royal reviews and open battles, with many rows of figures but no landscape backing, which he may have seen in Egypt.
P. Ashurbanipal: the Teumman-Dunanu Relief-Cycle.

1. This series of compositions represents what was to become Ashurbanipal's "fifth" campaign, against Teumman of Elam and Dunanu of Gambulu; parts of two or three versions survive. One was carved about 650 on two-register orthostats in room XXXIII of Sennacherib's palace (NB, 446; MN II, pls. XLV-XLIX). Room XXXIII orthostats were of the distinctive fossiliferous pindu stone from Mount Nipur (see above, II, H, 3), fragments of which can often be recognized in photographs (Iraq XXIX, 43). Some fragments in Istanbul (Bell. XVIII, 50; AFO XVII, 416, Abb. 9), possibly found by King in Sennacherib's palace, are described by Kalaaq as basalt, but seem to resemble pindu stone; they may then come from room XXXIII, as their subject-matter would suit this series, or they may show the same (or another) series depicted in yet another room. The other principal version was carved in room I of Ashurbanipal's own palace after 647 (Iraq XXVI, pls. III, IV a; Place 1867, III, pl. XLI; Gadd 1936, 197, pls. XXVII, XXVIII); it too is discussed here, though naturally contemporary with the orthostats considered in the next section. Ashurbanipal never, in this series or elsewhere, put bands of inscription between registers, but many incidents, especially in room XXXIII, were carefully captioned, normally on the orthostats themselves though we have one caption on a plaque (AFO VI, 107) which must have been attached separately.

2. There are also tablets bearing lists of captions some of which are virtually identical with those on the reliefs in this series.
clearly these texts describe the series as a whole. These were published by Weidner (AfO VIII, 176-191: on 177, in footnote 9, read E for D, D for E, F for G, and G for H; and omit "83-1-18, 442 = F"), who gives a list of thirty-eight captions based on his text A. The situation is not quite so simple, as A itself is partly broken and some other texts have captions which A omits. Even so the discrepancies are limited, and the captions in A follow a logical order which can be correlated to some extent with the surviving orthostats. This enables us to reconstruct the cycle very nearly in its entirety.

1-3 (using Weidner's numbering of the captions) describe the advance of Ashurbanipal's army and the surrender of various Elamite officials; captions in another text (AfO VIII, 186) mention the appointment of Tammaritu as vassal king of Hidalu. This is apparently one composition, essentially similar to that described in 17; it does not survive on the orthostats.

4-6 describe the beginning of the rout of the Elamites in the battle of Til-Tuba. The lower register of slabs 1-3 in room XXXIII and slabs 1-6 in room I show the end of the battle, with the Assyrians attacking from the left past a mound which must be Til-Tuba itself. The incidents in 4-6 must have been shown further to the left.

7-9 describe the flight and death of Teumman, incidents shown in the battle on slabs 2 and 3 in room XXXIII. Slab 1 in room XXXIII further shows the identification of Teumman's head in a tent and an Assyrian carrying it off in an Elamite cart; this subject is dealt with in 10a, written on slab 1, and probably in the lost caption on one of the slabs.
left of slab 5 in room I (Gadd 1936, 195). These captions may have been included in A, which is broken between 8 and 10.

10-12 describe the presentation of Teumman's head to Ashurbanipal at Nineveh, the king's mutilation of it, and the reaction of Teumman's ambassadors. Probably this composition was distinct from the battle of Til-Tuba, where it could hardly be accommodated; nothing of this scene survives.

13-14 describe yet another composition, in which Ashurbanipal marches into Nineveh with Teumman's head and displays it on the battlements, pouring a libation on top. This is shown in the upper register of slabs 5-9 in room I, where the king proceeds in his chariot from left to right, surrounded by a triumphal procession and preceded by an Elamite cart which doubtless held Teumman's head; the king then reappears on the battlements, pouring his libation over the head. This entry into Nineveh is also described in the annals (ARAB II, 334). There is a problem, however, as a study of the city's name, preserved in the relief in the Louvre, leaves no doubt that it is not Nineveh but Erbil. In caption 34, moreover, and in another text (Afr VIII, 188), Erbil is the city into which Ashurbanipal enters with Teumman's head. Probably both cities were entered in triumph; perhaps there were originally two compositions, conflated in room I.

15-16 return to the battle of Til-Tuba and describe two minor incidents, the deaths of Urtaku and Ituni. The former appears with a caption on slab 2 in room XXXIII, and the latter with a caption on slab 1 or 2 of room I and without one between slabs 2 and 3 of room XXXIII.
17 describes the installation of Ummanigash as Assyrian nominee on
the Elamite throne, as king of Susa and Madaktu. This composition
appears, with a caption naming Madaktu, in the lower register of slabs
4-6 in room XXXIII. It also appears in the lower register of slabs
6-10 in room I, but there the Elamite town has a ziggurat which is
obviously that described by Ashurbanipal as existing in Susa itself
(Arab II, 309). Probably the Assyrians had only reached Madaktu in
the Teumman campaign, but after the sack of Susa, in 647 or 646, they
knew what the more important city looked like, and carved it rather
than Madaktu in room I.

18-19 describe the siege and capture of Shapi-Bel, Dunanu's capital
in Gambulu. This is not found on the extant orthostats.

20 describes how the captured Dunanu was brought before Ashurbanipal
during a religious festival at Milkia. The Istanbul fragments show
Assyrians, including the king, wearing feathered caps which may have
been suitable for celebrations of this kind. Another fragment from
an upper register, tentatively assigned by Gadd to room I (1936, 194;
Hall 1928, pl. XXXIX, 2) where it would have to have been somewhere left
of slab 5, also has Assyrians in feathered caps. Possibly, then, these
belong to Milkia compositions. Assyrians and Elamite allies are also
shown in feathered caps in a series of Ashurbanipal slabs (Iraq XXIX,
43), from the tops of orthostats, which may have originated in room XXII
of Sennacherib's palace; if this provenance is correct, the slabs may
have been one-register like others in the room, but this is not essen-
tial. Other provenances are feasible (including room I if Gadd's piece
is shifted elsewhere), in which case the figures could belong in the Milkia procession.

21-27, and presumably missing captions between 22 and 23, describe some of Ashurbanipal's dealings with Dunanu and his adherents. There is a longer gap between 27 and 28; the latter describes the tearing out of some Gambulean tongues. A caption in another text (AFO VIII, 188) describes how ambassadors from Urartu inspected a rude message brought by Teumman's ambassadors to Ashurbanipal, and watched the Gambuleans' tongues being extracted. Both and other scenes appear in the upper register of slabs 4-6 in room XXXIII, a review presided over by Ashurbanipal and incorporating several incidents identified by a caption as taking place at Erbil. The Urartians are the short men, one bearded and one not, who wear floppy tasselled hats and are represented three times. It is notable that, as a caption on the orthostat makes clear, Dunanu is alive in this scene (with Teumman's head hanging at his neck), and is not one of the Gambuleans who are being flayed nearby. It is not clear whether there are enough incidents in this composition (which may itself be incomplete) to occupy all of captions 21-27. A triumphal entry into Erbil could belong here.

29 describes the execution of Dunanu. This is not visible on any of the surviving orthostats.

30 returns us to the start of the campaign.

31-33 are brief general headings for the armies engaged in the battle of Til-Tuba.

34 describes Ashurbanipal's triumphal entry into Erbil with Teumman's
head, after a religious festival where feathered caps might again have been appropriate. He is accompanied by some Gambulean captives, who could have been represented, though if so they are lost, in the Erbil procession in room I; there are, however, no men in feathered caps in this part of room I.

35 describes how the river Ulai was filled with the dead from Til-Tuba. This river, with corpses, closes the right-hand end of the Til-Tuba compositions in both room XXXIII and room I.

36 describes the fall of Shapi-Bel and the submission of Dunanu at the feet of Ashurbanipal.

37-38 concern the arrival of Dunanu at Nineveh, and name several Gambulean captives. Two of them were the sons of Nabu-shum-eresh, who were compelled, according to the annals (ARAB II, 335), to grind up their father's bones in Nineveh. This pair is clearly represented by the captives kneeling in front of querns in a fragment of the upper register of slab 1 in room XXXIII. Since there is also a procession of captives in Gambulean dress in the upper register of slab 3, this must be the composition described in these captions.

The text is subscribed "copy of the tablet read before the king", but it may have been carelessly copied at the beginning or represent one stage in the development of a neater text. What is clear is that 30-38 describe the same compositions, in the same order, as 1-29. This can be shown as follows:


Til-Tuba battle: 4-9, 31-33.
Nineveh review (Teumman): 10-12.
Erbil/Nineveh procession: 13-14, 34.
Til-Tuba battle: 15-16, 35.
Madaktu/Susa installation: 17.
Shapir-Bel, Milka: 18-20, 36.
Nineveh review (Dununu): 29, 37-38.

30-38 do not duplicate 1-29, nor are the incidents they describe important enough to have been the only captions in a separate series; rather they fill gaps in the narrative, and are what might have been added by someone who, having written 1-29 in a first circuit of the orthostats in one room, found himself back at the beginning and went round again, checking.

4. The precise order of the captions in the other texts is somewhat different, but the same general sequence is discernible. In text B, there are equivalents of 287, 34, and 1-3; in C, 2, 3, and 37; in D, 7-9; in E, 31, 32, 10, and 12, and after a gap 34, 26, 34, and 28; in F, 167 and 35; and in G, 21, 37, and 34. Since of course the beginning of the series adjoins the end, the anomalies concern the versions of caption 34 (sometimes Weidner's 33a); this is the one that names Erbil rather than Nineveh as the object of Ashurbanipal's triumphal procession, and can mention Gambuleans among the captives. Though the different texts may describe rooms in which the scenes were arranged somewhat differently, there seems to be no totally satisfactory explanation for the discrepancies. Nonetheless text A makes good sense if
we assume that the scribe was describing one room decorated with two-register orthostats, that he made two circuits, and that the battle of Til-Tuba and the Elamite installation were both represented, as in rooms XXXIII and I alike, in the lower register.

5. He started (1-3, 30) with the advance to Hidalu, probably in the lower register with a direction of movement from left to right. He proceeded right to the next event, also in the lower register, the battle of Til-Tuba (4-9, 31-33). 7-9 describe the death of Teumman, and in 10-14 and 34 he followed up the fate of Teumman's head, moving to the upper register above Til-Tuba where there would be two compositions: the reception of the head, and the march into Erbil/Nineveh. Having dealt with the head, he returned to Til-Tuba and inserted two minor incidents (15-16, and 35 at the right edge). He then moved on right to the Elamite installation at Susa/Madaktu, again in the lower register (17). Next is the siege and surrender of Shapi-Bel, with which the history of Dunanu begins (18-19); this should be further right, still in the lower register. Perhaps the reception of Dunanu at Milkia (20, 36) formed part of the same composition, but it could also belong in the upper register. There are then two compositions, at Erbil (21-28) and Nineveh (29, 37-38), during which Dunanu and his followers are gradually killed; these must belong in the upper register, above Shapi-Bel and perhaps above Hidalu. An associated composition, which may sometimes have belonged in the upper register beside this pair, may be the march into Erbil. This gives the following scheme:
Nineveh (Teumman). Erbil/Nineveh march. Nineveh (Dunanu). Erbil (Dunanu).


The relative positions of the upper and lower register compositions, and
the relative sizes of the compositions themselves, are uncertain, and
we have of course been guided to some extent by the extent remains in
rooms XXXIII and I; but text A alone might have suggested this recon-
struction.

Room XXXIII shows: Nineveh (Dunanu). Erbil (Dunanu).

Til-Tuba battle. Susa/Madaktu.

Room I shows: Erbil/Nineveh march.

The similarity between the arrangements in text A and room I is clear,
and it is possible that this is the very room described in the text.

Certainly lists of captions were made for other, less well-preserved,
rooms in Ashurbanipal's palace, specified as the bit riduti (ARAB VIII,
200).

Q. Ashurbanipal: North Palace Orthostats

1. Ashurbanipal's later annals (ARAB II, 291) organize his campaigns
as follows: the first and second, against Egypt; the third against the
Mediterranean; the fourth, against the Mannseans; the fifth, against
Elam (Teumman) and Gambulu (Dunanu); the sixth against Shamash-shum-ukin
in Babylon; the seventh and eighth against Elam (Ummaldash); and the
ninth against the Arabs and the Mediterranean. The capture of Ummanaldash, who had been dethroned, is mentioned at the end. Nearly all these campaigns are represented in Ashurbanipal's own palace, and the various enemies are easily identified. There are also rooms showing scenes connected with the hunt and peaceful festivities. It is to be hoped that a full publication of orthostats from this palace will appear shortly under Barnett's name; at present, though many individual pieces have been illustrated separately, our most useful sources are Meissner and Opitz (1939), Gadd (1936), and Iraq XXVI, pls. I-V. It is essential, primarily, to distinguish the different compositions, which can be placed in one, two, or three registers.

2. Room A (Gadd 1936, 202; Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. V) had large-scale one-register reliefs on both sides, showing the royal procession to the hunt and the return. All the figures move from left to right.

3. There were narrative reliefs, virtually destroyed, in room B.

4. Room C (Rassam 1897, 28; Gadd 1936, 181; Barnett 1960, figs. 56-80) showed one-register scenes of the king hunting lions; the majority are large scale, though in some instances rows of people are superimposed or otherwise reduced in scale. Above the orthostats were painted "hunting and war scenes".

5. There were narrative reliefs, virtually destroyed, in room D.

6. Room E (Gadd 1936, 190; Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. X-XII) had large-scale one-register reliefs, largely destroyed. On the north side were men leading dogs, apparently on their way to the hunt, and on the
south side tame lions and musicians, one with a feathered cap, in a garden. There may just be a connection with room A, in which case the garden scene would show festivities after the return from the hunt, with the left to right movement continued. If so, we should probably have to restore this procession in room D also, though this may be too logical.

7. Room F (Iraq XXVI, 5) has two-register military narrative showing the attacks on two Elamite towns, one of which is Hamanu which featured in both the seventh and the eighth campaigns.

8. Room G (Iraq XXVI, 4) also showed wars in Elam. The bottom three rows of figures clearly belong in one register, and the top surviving row seems to belong with them. These may then be one-register reliefs.

9. Room H (Iraq XXVI, 5; JAOS 479; Nagel 1967, 19) contained one group of reliefs with three rows of Elamites at the bottom and at the top a series of buildings and gardens; there may also have been a massacre among palm-trees on another stretch of wall. The slabs may have been one- or two-register, as the upper (architectural) scene is slightly smaller than the action below, while a narrow stream crosses the dividing line between them. Though we have preferred the two-register arrangement, Nagel's belief that this affects the location of the architecture is incorrect. There can be no doubt at all that the architecture and the park are located in Assyria; this is so even if the orthostats are one-register, as the Elamites below are not "in flight" but moving, probably into battle, in excellent order. This probably means that they
are some of the Elamite refugees whom Ashurbanipal took with him, at
least in his fifth and seventh campaigns against Elam, and possibly in
his sixth against Babylon; possibly this room contained the relief-
cycle, dealing with the sixth campaign, which is described in Weidner's
captions 51-76 (*APO VIII, 193*).

10. Room I showed the fifth campaign in two registers, as discussed
above.

11. Court J (*Iraq XXVI, 7*) had one-register compositions with battles
against the marsh-dwellers of Babylonia. They could belong in the sixth
campaign.

12. No orthostats survived in room K, if it was completely dug.

13. Room L (*Iraq XXVI, 8*) showed the ninth campaign, against the
Arabs, to which some captions (*APO VII, 204; nos. 78-82*) may refer.
One register, with three rows of figures, is all that survives, but
there could perhaps have been a second register above.

14. Room M (*Iraq XXVI, 9*), the throneroom, shows several campaigns,
all in two registers. Slabs 1-5 and 7 ("6" probably being a door),
only the last of which is partly recorded, had mountainous country in
both registers; they may show the fourth campaign, or possibly the
third. Slabs 8 and 9 were plain. 10 and 11 clearly belonged with
12 and 13 which survive: in the lower register is the sixth campaign,
to which a fuller series of compositions must have been devoted else-
where: *APO VIII, 193, captions 51-76*), and in the upper register a
campaign in Elam, perhaps connected with that below. Slabs 17-21 showed
the first or second campaign, against Egypt; there were clearly two
registers to these slabs, but only the lower survived. Slabs 22-23, part of the lower register of which survives, show courtiers and men with spare horses; the subject may be a hunt rather than a review.

15. Rooms N, O, P, and Q had plain orthostats.
16. Room R (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. II, IV) was a continuation of room A, and showed the same large-scale one-register processions to and from the hunt.

17. Room S (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. III, VI-IX) showed small-scale hunting reliefs; slabs 6-16 were in three registers, but there is also a one-register boating scene on 3-5 and possibly a one-register landscape on 17-20 and 21.

18. Rooms T and V were plain; W was virtually destroyed.

19. There were also several groups of orthostats found in the debris of rooms R, S, T, and V, and clearly fallen from rooms above. Two room S groups seem to belong together (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. XV-XVI, and XVII): one shows lion-hunts in three registers, and the other, which has one register divided into three rows, shows the king relaxing in a landscape. There is also a military group from room S (Gadd 1936, pl. XXXVI), again in three registers: the lower two show Elamite and Babylonian campaigns, and the upper the submission of an Elamite king, possibly Ummnaldash whose capture, some time after the "ninth" campaign, is represented on a fragment of unknown provenance (Gadd 1936, 179; Barnett 1960, fig. 117). Another member of this three-register group is restored incorrectly in Boutcher's drawing (Gadd 1936, pl. XLIII): the top register shows Assyrian guards and an Elamite chariot, perhaps
Ummanaldash's; the middle register shows the sack of Hamanu in Elam; and the bottom register shows Babylonian captives under guard. There must, however, (as in Gadd 1936, pl. XLIV), have been two other rows of captives to make the bottom register a reasonable size. Two-register military narrative was found in slabs fallen into rooms T and V (Gadd 1936, pls. XXXIV, XXXV, XLIV; Place 1867, III, pl. LXVI), with the Elamite town of Din-Sharri below and another Elamite town above. A single slab fallen into room R (Gadd 1936, 204, no. 66; Pottier 1924, pl. XXIII) again has two registers, with a triumph above and a battle below.

20. Many other small fragments of Ashurbanipal's sculptures have no certain provenance and show conventional subjects, usually wars in Elam. One unusual piece (Gadd 1936, pl. XLVI b) probably shows preparations for a feast.

R. Ashurbanipal(?): South-West Palace Orthostats.

1. Ashurbanipal, or possibly one of his successors (see above, II,H, 11-13), left several carvings in Sennacherib's palace apart from those in all these scenes, but there are no captions and no recognisable inscriptions in room XXXIII; they are probably later than those in the North Palace, though there is no definite evidence for this. The different compositions which we should prefer to ascribe to Ashur-Shamash or Assur-Nadin can be distinguished without much difficulty.

2. In court H was a cavalry battle against Elamites (Iraq XXIX, 44), but only individual figures survive.

3. Room XXII (Iraq XXIX, 43) includes a one-register landscape scene like those in Ashurbanipal's court, on both sides. These scenes are
in Assyria. Other fragments show rows of figures, some in feathered caps, moving left; among them is a camel, perhaps captured in the "ninth" campaign. Some other fragments showing Assyrians and Elamites in feathered caps, moving right, may also derive from this room (see above, VIII,P,2); if so they may belong to an upper register above the figures moving left, as they themselves are certainly from the tops of orthostats.

4. Court XIX (MN II, pls. XLII, XLIII; BMFA LVIII, fig. 4) has two-register scenes of an unusual type. The registers are separated, not by a thin plain strip, but by a river as wide as the bands of inscription which had separated registers in pre-Sargonid work; the idea for this could well have come from one of the older palaces. On the west of the court the upper and lower compositions are clearly distinct, but on the south there are some Assyrians in the water; they could be crossing to the upper register, thereby unifying the scenes above the river and below, but the rest of this series is destroyed or unpublished. Another slab (Iraq XXIX, pl. XIII), of uncertain provenance, has the same river between the registers. Babylonians are the enemies in all these scenes, but there are no captions and no recognizable incidents from Ashurbanipal's own campaigns in Babylonia. These are orthostats which we should prefer to ascribe to Ashur-esh-ilani or Sin-shar-ishkun.
again Babylonians, datable anywhere between 646 and 612.

S. Ashurbanipal: Further Observations

1. The majority of the military compositions are of the same two synoptic classes found in Sennacherib’s work: the king receives a line of prisoners either from a besieged town or from a battle-field. There are numerous examples in room M, and more in room F, court J, on the fallen slabs from rooms T and V, and in court XIX and room XXVIII in Sennacherib’s palace. Sometimes, too, as in slabs 17-20 in room M (Iraq XXVI, 9), more than one besieged city could be shown before the king was reached. A further detail, added behind the king, is the encampment not of the Assyrians but of the deported captives under guard; scenes of this type (Gadd 1936, pl. XXIX + Iraq X, pl. V; Gadd 1936, pls. XLIII, XLIV), when adequately preserved, have the ends of other compositions in the registers above, and it is clear therefore that they are at the ends of compositions themselves: perhaps the captives marching onwards below the royal chariot in the review scene in M, slab 13 (Gadd 1936, pl. XXVI), reach an encampment on slab 14. The standard arrangement on series of two-register orthostats, as shown most completely in room F (Iraq XXVI, pl. I a; remainder unpublished), is to have two compositions of this type, one above the other, moving in opposed directions: the king is above the siege at one end, and below it at the other. When this scheme is employed, we either see Elamites in both registers, or Elamites above and Babylonians below; no definite
strip-cartoon relationship between them can be established. Other military compositions, used perhaps without strip-cartoon connotations, are the straightforward review in the uppermost register of slabs fallen into room S (Gadd 1936, pls. XXXVI, XLIII), and the open battles against the Arabs, who are chased from the field to their encampments, in room L (Iraq XXVI, 8); the context of the river-crossing in court XIX of Sennacherib’s palace (AN II, pls. XLII, XLIII) is not clear.

2. The three-register and three-row slabs fallen into room S may derive from a single upper room with lion-hunts on one wall, synopses of Elamite and Babylonian campaigns on another, and a banquet on a third. Between them the series summarize the king’s activities, much like slabs 17-20 in Ashurnasirpal’s throneroom at Kalhu. Elsewhere entire rooms could be occupied by compositions showing specific incidents from one campaign. Our best example of this, the Teumman-Dunau relief-cycle, has compositions which, while freely drawn, conform basically to the traditional scenes of battle, review, and triumphal procession. They are linked, however, partly by landscape features such as the river with floating corpses in room I, into a clear strip-cartoon: in the lower register the scenes of action move from left to right, and the triumphs are depicted, in no particular order, above. The slab below fallen into room R also has a triumph above and a battle (Pottier 1924, pl. XXIII), and may also belong to a strip-cartoon series rather than to a conventional group of siege-reviews. So perhaps do the slabs in Sennacherib’s room XXII (Iraq XXIX, 43). The two (?)-register slabs in room H (Hall 1928, pls. XLII, XLIII), with the advancing Elamites
below and the picture of Nineveh, perhaps part of a triumph, above, must too be part of a strip-cartoon. One feature of these cycles, at least the Teumman-Dunanu one, is the further use, within compositions, of the internal strip-cartoon. We have observed sporadic instances of this previously, but here it is extremely common: we note the appearance of Teumman, or his head, at least six times, and doubtless more, in the Til-Tuba battle in room XXXIII; the triple appearance of the Urartian ambassadors in the Erbil review in room XXXIII; and the double appearance of Ashurbanipal in the triumphal march in room I. One small isolated fragment from an upper register (Barnett 1960, fig. 117) shows Ummanaldash first led through mountains by his Assyrian captors, and then deposited in a chariot; his capture previously, and his journey to Assyria afterwards, were probably shown to left and right respectively. These incidents could be regarded as separate compositions, or as parts of an internal strip-cartoon in what is essentially a review-scene; but the distinction is dubious; the closest parallel for this experiment, outside Ashurbanipal's own work, is the Tukulti-Ninurta I altar showing the king in two attitudes of worship (Andrae 1938, Taf. LI b), while the small size of each incident recalls the "panel" treatment of the White Obelisk.

3. Ashurbanipal's hunt scenes are equally varied. The simplest is a lion-hunt from a chariot, shown on a stela in the landscape background of a longer composition; this is virtually identical (compare Barnett 1960, figs. 26 and 80) with an Ashurnasirpal II "panel" scene. Other lion-hunts from chariots on three-register slabs (Meissner-Opitz 1939,
extend the composition by showing the king surrounded by whole
prides of dead and dying lions; the king's posture changes in each
register. On the large-scale one-register orthostats of room C the
same subject is extended into a strip-cartoon: on slabs 1–4 (probably)
and 5–8, we have the king arming himself (Barnett 1960, figs. 56–58,
76–77, 79; BM XVIII, pl. XVI); on slab 9, between the compositions,
are spectators taking up position on a hill (Barnett 1960, figs. 79, 80);
on slabs 10–17 is an enclosure, surrounded by soldiers, with a lion
being let out of a cage at the far end and the king himself, surrounded
by dead lions, riding around in the middle (Frankfort 1954, pl. CX);
and on slabs 20–28, after a gap which included probably a door, is
another similar enclosure with a caged lion being released at one end
while the king is represented twice among the dead lions (Paterson 1904,
pls. XL–XLII; Hall 1928, pls. XLVII–XLIX). One large fragment showing
a dead lion being carried (Barnett 1960, fig. 78) might belong between
the two enclosures, though this is uncertain. This therefore is a strip-
cartoon, with one internal strip-cartoon in the second enclosure. Other
single episodes from the king's lion-hunts, with the king, mounted or
on foot, appearing once among attendants, are found in the one-register
boat-scene on slabs 3–5 in room S (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. IX); in
the middle of three registers on slabs 6–16 in room S, and in the top
register on slab 10 (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. III); and on the left
of the middle register in some slabs fallen into room S (Meissner-Opitz
1939, Taf. XV). The episodes run into each other without clear breaks.
They are accompanied by other episodes in strip-cartoons, shown best
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(though partly present in room S itself) on the slabs fallen from above. In the lower register of this group are attendants bringing dead lions, over which the king then pours a libation; this could be one episode, if all the lions are different. In the middle register is an attendant provoking a sleepy lion, presumably the same one as that which the king to one side is holding by the tail. And in the upper register what is certainly one lion is shown four times, while the king appears twice.

4. Hunts against other animals, onager and gazelle on slabs 6-16 and deer on slabs 17-20 in room S (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. III, VII), occupy the lowermost of the three registers. The figures in the onager and gazelle scenes overlap, but the compositions are distinct; there is a door between the gazelle and deer scenes. In each group the king attacks or waits in ambush on one side, the victims are in the middle fleeing from the attack, and there are attendants beating animals towards the king, or trapping them, on the other side. There was also a deer-hunt in the lower register of slab 21 (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. VIII), all that survives on another stretch of wall; the composition is unclear.

5. Other scenes connected with the hunt are the processions to and from it in rooms A, R, and perhaps E (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. II, IV, V, X-XII); these have large-scale figures in one register. There is nothing intrinsically novel in rooms R-A, which have equivalents in Sennacherib's room LI north and probably in Esarhaddon's annexe to the Kalhu arsenal (see above, VIII,M,12; III,H,3), but the garden with
lions which seems to close the procession in room E is not known elsewhere. However, they may also be smaller than those beside them in the room. 

6. There is also a one-register composition, in three unusually distinct rows, among the slabs fallen into room S (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. XVII). In the top row, against a background of trees, plants, and birds, there are from right to left Elamite kings bringing refreshments and urged on by courtiers, a group of female musicians, waitresses (with Teumman's head hanging from a tree behind), the queen on a chair and Ashurbanipal on a couch, women with fans, a table with the king's bow on it, the king's horse feeding beside a groom, more figures including musicians, and the end of the enclosure with two guards; in the middle row, against the same background, are courtiers bringing food on the left, courtiers picking flowers below the king, and an empty area of garden on the right leading up to the guarded end of the enclosure; in the bottom row is a landscape of reeds, through part of which a wild pig is moving. We could classify this scene as a feast after a hunt, like that in room 7 of Sargon's palace at Dur-Sharrukin, but what it recalls above all is a Friday lunch-party in the countryside round modern Mosul. It is described here in some detail because it exemplifies the freedom and ingenuity, implicit in many of our previous remarks, with which Ashurbanipal's sculptors were sometimes able to transform traditional kinds of composition.

7. There are some discrepancies of scale between adjoining figures in Ashurbanipal's orthostats, especially in the earlier Til-Tuba composition (MN II, pl. XLV) and, to a lesser degree, in the late marsh-scene
in Sennacherib's room XXVIII (Smith 1938, pl. XLIX); men in chariots and on horseback may also be smaller than those beside them (Iraq XXVI, pl. I a). These effects, however, are even less conspicuous than they had been under Sennacherib. There is also of course the necessary contrast between "foreground" figures and those in close contact with architectural or other features, for which they are nonetheless too large, in the "background". Here again extremes are generally avoided, though the soldiers guarding the enclosure, and some other figures, in the room C lion-hunts are notably smaller than figures in the "foreground" nearby; the treatment usually is much the same as Sennacherib's.

A more important innovation is that Ashurbanipal himself is nearly always represented either as taller than his attendants or on a much larger scale. We have seen odd examples of this on Shalmaneser III's throne-base (Iraq XXV, pl. IV b), and in the Sennacherib (or ?Esarhaddon) review-scene in room XII of Sennacherib's palace (Gadd 1936, pl. XV), but in Ashurbanipal's palace it becomes standard practice. This convention, which is most striking in a room M review-scene (Gadd 1936, pl. XXVI), may have been brought back from Egypt by Esarhaddon.

8. Rows of figures on different levels in one composition are often related to each other, as under Sennacherib, by means of a continuous landscape backing which may either be directly behind the figures or at the top and bottom of the register. Since the campaigns shown in Ashurbanipal's sculptures mostly took place in flat country, the scale-pattern (Iraq XXVI, pl. IV b) is relatively scarce, but there are many examples of palm-trees, water, and reeds (e.g. Smith 1938, pl. XLIX).
Where no natural features of this kind were available, the sculptors, unwilling to make drastic changes in scale or to arrange figures indiscriminately in mid-air, had two choices. One was to treat standing human beings as pre-Sargonid and sometimes Sargonid sculptors (e.g. the unpublished slab 18 in Ashurbanipal's room M) had sometimes treated small livestock such as sheep, and put them, even without a landscape, in rows one above the other on horizontal ground-lines. We have noted the appearance of this technique in room XII of Sennacherib's palace, and suggested that it may reflect Egyptian influence. Ashurbanipal uses it extensively. A good example is the room XXXIII Til-Tuba battle (MN II, pls. XLV-XLVII), where some of the combatants are in three rows, separated by ground-lines and some mid-air corpses; where there are landscape features, however, the mound of Til-Tuba on the left and the trees and river on the right, the different rows tend to merge. The ground-lines between rows of figures in one composition are usually little more than incisions, but sometimes there is a raised plain band as between separate registers; the raised band (e.g. Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. XVII) is used when the different rows in the composition never merge into one. The alternative was to scatter figures all over the composition, with or without occasional hints at ground-lines; this is done, principally with animals, in some of the more extensive hunt scenes (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. III, XVI; Hall 1928, pls. XLVII-XLIX). This technique recalls the old, rejected expedient of filling spaces in mid-air with any subject that would fit; but it is entirely different because the sculptor had discovered that, if enough empty space was left
between and around the individual figures on the different levels, they can naturally be visualized not as resting on each other's heads but as moving or lying at intervals across an empty plain. In these compositions, for once, a vacuum is welcomed.

9. The "bird's eye" view of landscape, prominent in Sennacherib's carvings, with the natural surroundings sometimes represented both above and below the main scene in the centre, is retained by Ashurbanipal (Gadd 1936, pl. XXXVI; Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. IX). The more extreme effects are not found on the surviving reliefs: in the room XXXIII Madaktu scene, for instance (MN II, pl. XLIX), some buildings are at angles or on their sides, but the town-wall in front is not upside-down but the right way up; the Egyptian town in room M (Iraq XXVI, pl. VA) is treated similarly. As usual, therefore, we cannot see in any of these military landscapes, despite the varying scales of "foreground" and "background" figures, any examples of perspective recession: as Frankfort points out (1954, 96, pl. CVII), particular items may seem to recede, but in fact the recession can be explained otherwise. Perspective may occur, exceptionally, in some hunt scenes. But the distant deer in a landscape (Meissner-Opitz 1939, pl. VIII) is probably a foal, and the relatively small horseman in a lion-hunt (Frankfort 1954, pl. CX) could possibly be regarded as bridging the gap between the large-scale hunt itself and the small-scale men on the edge of the enclosure. In the lower register of slabs 12-13 in room S (Meissner-Opitz 1939, Taf. III) the king on horseback and his spare horse behind are substantially larger than the two mounted courtiers partially concealed behind them;
but one of the courtiers is leading the spare horse, so that this may merely be an example of the king being shown on a larger scale than his attendants. It would be satisfying to find perspective used in these hunts, as they are remarkable both for the other novelties noted above and for the sympathetic realism with which the victims are drawn, but the examples we have cited do not seem adequate as evidence.
CHAPTER IX

The Place of Decoration in Architecture

1. Since architectural and decorative techniques changed little, the general appearance of an imaginary, composite palace can be visualized without much difficulty. The external walls, varying in height according to the importance of the rooms within, with buttresses or higher towers at intervals, are largely monochrome, plastered white or brown. At their base, or even to a higher level, there may be limestone foundations; at some level there may be a horizontal row of projecting knobs, *sikkate*, but probably no windows; and on top are crenellations, partly consisting of blue glazed bricks. More elaborate effects are naturally restricted to important facades and entrances. Principal courtyard walls are faced, additionally, with carved orthostats of Mosul marble, possibly surmounted by pictures in glazed brick, and the figures in the compositions direct the eye towards the principal doors. In the doors, and sometimes on the towers flanking them, are colossal orthostats; each door is capped by an arch edged with glazed bricks, or by a lintel surmounted by an entire panel of glazed bricks in the shape of an arch. Exceptionally there are columns, with carved bases and capitals, either supporting the lintel or forming a portico in front. The door itself is wooden, with metal overlay, and a stone door-slab, decorated with inscriptions or other patterns, replaces the baked-brick flooring of the courtyard. Inside there are more orthostats, with compositions directing the eye to the head of the room or on to another
internal entrance; those visible through doorways may also be especially impressive. Paint covers the wall above the orthostats, and the wooden ceiling, which is apparently supported by coloured fists projecting from the brickwork, is also painted, with patterns reflecting the carpets underfoot. Simpler rooms can have paintings instead of orthostats on the walls, or mere painted friezes like those in smaller palaces, or friezes of terracotta plaques. Even the simplest rooms, which are of course most numerous, will have a band of black paint at the foot of a wall, or some other protection; but this is hardly ornamental.

2. This description can also be applied to temples, except that stone orthostats and colossi are much less common; they may partly be replaced by free-standing objects such as obelisks and statues. Temple entrances also had ritual features of their own, such as tall posts on either side, and, in front of the flanking towers, low platforms frequently faced with glazed bricks. Panels of niches and engaged half-columns of mudbrick are particularly characteristic of temple facades, and the half-columns sometimes appear on internal walls visible through doorways.

3. The extent to which the choice of subject-matter for these varieties of decoration was affected by their architectural context is less easily established. Obvious relationships are that apotropaic figures tend to be concentrated at entrances, and that, whereas repetitive decoration can be at any level, small-scale narrative pictures are usually low enough to be seen. There are also distinctions between different kinds
Almost any subject, so long as it redounded to the glory of the king, was acceptable in the great royal palaces, and indeed in some of the arsenals. The minor palaces, however, seldom have anything more than commonplace friezes in their principal rooms, and we can ascribe this to discretion rather than poverty; the most elaborate is the huge Residence K at Dur-Sharrukin (OIP XL, 66), with fine door-slabs, some plain orthostats, a great formal painting and frieze in the main room, other friezes elsewhere, hieroglyphic paintings in a staircase which may be perhaps be regarded, because of them, as the approach to a shrine on the roof, and in the same staircase, piled as if ready for use in the same shrine, some glazed bricks and column-bases.

Temple decoration, we suspect, though the evidence is far from adequate, tended to be chosen and arranged on clear traditional principles, but innovations, over and above what tradition required, were also admissible. Hieroglyphic motifs, used at Dur-Sharrukin instead of narrative on the glazed platforms, are apparently confined to temples and the Residence K staircase. Attendant genies with boxes, and battles between gods and demons, are not known outside temples. There are no certain instances of the human-headed winged bull appearing in temples, but temples, and town-gates, are the only places where we may normally expect to find lions and bulls used as colossal orthostats.

In the major palaces we can occasionally observe some correlation between the status or function of a particular room and the way in which it has been decorated. There is of course a general shift of emphasis, from apotropaic figures in the ninth century, through formal scenes in
the eighth, to small-scale narrative in the seventh. This means that correlations between equivalent rooms in different palaces are elusive, but a few examples or possible examples of this too can be found.

5. There are notable similarities in the decoration as in the ground-plan of the four great royal thronerooms (see above, VI,B,3; D,3-7; G,1; H,2-3): Ashurnasirpal's room B, Sargon's "court" VII, Sennacherib's room I (originally B), and Ashurbanipal's room M. The thronerooms of Sargon, Sennacherib, and presumably Ashurnasirpal, all had seven pairs of colossi associated with them: two pairs inside, lining the doors to the ramp-antechamber at one end and to the next inner room; a pair in each of the three external doors; and a pair, back to back, on the face of the projecting towers which flanked the central external door. Ashurnasirpal's colossi included types other than the human-headed winged bull, and Ashurbanipal had no colossi at all, though genies in the doors; this merely conforms with fashion in the two reigns. Between the colossi on the towers Sargon and Sennacherib have genies; each carries a lion, and wears a long robe rather than a kilt alone. There were no equivalent figures on Ashurnasirpal's throneroom facade, though facades of this basic type were known at the time (TF3, 4). There were winged genies, probably always anthropomorphic and carrying the cone and bucket, on the sides of the towers; Ashurbanipal has some unusual genies on a low orthostat in the equivalent position (see above, VII,F,6). Sargon's throneroom facade was approached by figures in a large-scale review scene of courtiers leading up to the king by a side-door; this arrangement is common in his palace, but it is noticeable that the equivalent
slabs in Ashurnasirpal's palace are the only ones of his reign to represent a large-scale review, with tributaries from different areas. Sennacherib's equivalent slabs showed small-scale narrative, as is usual in his palace; Ashurbanipal left his uncarved, and defaced Sennacherib's, only recarving those at a distance from the door though he may have intended to recarve them all. The internal orthostats opposite the central door, and on the end-wall behind the throne, were decorated in Ashurnasirpal's throneroom with particular ritual scenes; the same positions in Sargon's throneroom were occupied by large plain slabs, left in position when the other orthostats in the room were removed by his successors; the situation in Sennacherib's palace is not known, but in Ashurbanipal's, where there was apparently no end-wall, there were again exceptional plain orthostats opposite the central door. The apotropaic genies, other than colossi, in Ashurnasirpal's throneroom are unusually diverse, and include examples of almost all the genies, and genies' attributes, found elsewhere in the palace; he may have wished to ensure as much supernatural protection as possible, but in later thronerooms, when genies were anyhow less fashionable, there is no such conspicuous variety. Ashurnasirpal's small-scale narrative orthostats also have a variety of subject-matter, with enemies in headbands on one stretch of wall, enemies in turbans on another, and a summary of the king's achievements, including hunts, on a stretch of wall adjoining the throne. We cannot be sure that this diversity is uncharacteristic, as too few narrative orthostats from other rooms have been found in position. There was certainly more
than one campaign represented on the best-preserved series of Tiglath-pileser orthostats, though the quality and size of these makes it unlikely that they derived from a throneroom (see above, VIII, J, 2-3, 7), but Sargon, Sennacherib, and Ashurbanipal seldom included scenes from more than one campaign in a single room. The narrative orthostats from Sargon's actual throneroom are lost, with one small exception, and those in Sennacherib's throneroom are largely lost or unpublished. Maybe they too showed a selection of campaigns, as this does happen again in Ashurbanipal's throneroom; Ashurbanipal may even show, in addition, a hunting scene at the end of the room near what would have traditionally have been the position of the throne. We are obviously dealing, in all these thronerooms, with decoration specifically chosen to suit the most important public room in the palace, and characterized especially by the strength of the supernatural figures and the wide range of subject-matter; presumably too the area opposite the central door had a particular significance, reflected in the decoration, though the throne itself, so far as we know, at least down to the reign of Sennacherib, was at one end of the room in Assyria. In such respects the later designers found themselves unable to improve on Ashurnasirpal's concept of what decoration a throneroom required.

6. The sloping passage or pathway is another architectural feature with which a particular form of decoration is associated; examples are Sennacherib's room LI north, probably Esarhaddon's room R 7 in the Kalhu arsenal, Ashurbanipal's rooms A/R, the ramp lined with glazed bricks between the platforms on the facade of Sargon's Ashur temple, and the
place where Sennacherib's "Ishtar Temple" slabs were originally erected. The walls in all these passages showed large-scale processions, distinct from review-scenes because the king himself is, or must have been, on the move, proceeding in the same direction as his attendants. The first three examples are all corridors leading to postern-gates, and the orthostats, in so far as they survive, show descending processions out to the hunt and ascending processions back from the hunt. We cannot avoid Gadd's conclusion (1936, 215) that these scenes represent what actually happened in these corridors, and that the postern-gates were used, no doubt among other purposes, as private back-doors through which the king passed on his way to a day's sport. Similarly the "Ishtar Temple" slabs were found on the side of the royal palace close to the temple quarter of Nineveh; priests are included in the procession, and Gadd's suggestion that the king is represented on his way to or from worship seems most probably correct.

7. Orthostats bearing small-scale military narrative are found, in Ashurnasirpal's palace, only in the throneroom and the reception wing west of the inner court. Scenes of this sort appear, at Til-Barsip, in the main gate and perhaps the throneroom (BAR XXIII, frontispiece, and fig. 16), and at Dur-Sharrukin they are found in several reception areas. Sennacherib and Ashurbanipal have them virtually everywhere. Apparently such scenes were originally designed for public edification, and then spread. Orthostats showing hunts, on the other hand, which are again found in Ashurnasirpal's throneroom and west wing, and possibly in Ashurbanipal's throneroom, tend otherwise to occupy somewhat
secluded positions. At Til-Barsip painted hunt-scenes are in the bathrooms XXVII and XLIV. At Dur-Sharrukin there are hunts in the small room 7 (with a feast), possibly in room 5, and in the free-standing building, west of the reception wing, which must surely have been erected for the king's own amusement. Hunts in Ashurbanipal's palace fill room S, the gate-chamber at the foot of the ramp with the processions, and clearly represent what occurred between the procession out and the procession back. There are more in corridor G, connecting the ramp with the inner court, and in corridor E, which seems indeed to continue the processions and which leads, or must have led, to a group of rooms above the postern-gate. Orthostats fallen from above into the postern include military and hunting scenes of exceptional quality, and the scene of the king and queen feasting in a garden, and it seems most likely that these upper rooms, at the west corner of the palace, were used by the king in person (see above, VI, H, 4). Even in throne-rooms the hunts are at the end near the throne, and we may suspect the kings liked to be surrounded by scenes showing their personal prowess in this way.

There may possibly be some correlation between, on the one hand, Sargon's corridor 10, with processions of tributaries, and the outer reception-rooms 4 and 8, to which it led, with scenes of rebels punished, and on the other hand Sennacherib's rooms XLIII and XLVI, possibly belonging to an equivalent outer reception suite, with unusual scenes showing only deported captives. In both instances the subject-matter may have been planned to impress visitors from abroad with the more
secluded positions. At Til-Barsip painted hunt-scenes are in the bathrooms XXVII and XLIV. At Dur-Sharrukin there are hunts in the small room 7 (with a feast), possibly in room 3, and in the free-standing building, west of the reception wing, which must surely have been erected for the king’s own amusement. Hunts in Ashurbanipal’s palace fill room 8, the gate-chamber at the foot of the ramp with the processions, and clearly represent what occurred between the procession out and the procession back. There are more in corridor C, connecting the ramp with the inner court, and in corridor E, which seems indeed to continue the processions and which leads, or must have led, to a group of rooms above the postern-gate. Orthostats fallen from above into the postern include military and hunting scenes of exceptional quality, and the scene of the king and queen feasting in a garden, and it seems most likely that these upper rooms, at the west corner of the palace, were used by the king in person (see above, VI,H,4). Even in throne-rooms the hunts are at the end near the throne, and we may suspect the kings liked to be surrounded by scenes showing their personal prowess in this way.

8. There may possibly be some correlation between, on the one hand, Sargon’s corridor 10, with processions of tributaries, and the outer reception-rooms 4 and 8, to which it led, with scenes of rebels punished, and on the other hand Sennacherib’s rooms XLIII and XLVI, possibly belonging to an equivalent outer reception suite, with unusual scenes showing only deported captives. In both instances the subject-matter may have been planned to impress visitors from abroad with the more
unpleasant consequences of rebellion.

9. We might expect to find further correlations in the positioning of the apotropaic figures on the walls of the different palaces. Certainly apotropaic figurines had to be buried in particular groups in particular places (AAA XXII, 65), but though the right kinds of group are sometimes excavated, there is no clear relationship between the positions in which the figurines are actually found and those designated in the text. Presumably the positioning depended partly on the nature of the evil to be averted and on the personal or religious prejudices of the priest responsible for the arrangements. The same would apply to apotropaic wall-decoration, with each building protected in its own way; correlations are scarce.

10. Facades, and grand entrances with colossi and attendant genies, arranged on much the same principles as in the thronerooms discussed above, are not uncommon: the number of ways in which colossi could be employed for colossal effects was obviously limited. When Sargonid colossi are aligned in series of doorways (see above, VI,H,5-7), the outermost pair are human-headed winged bulls, and there can be a pair with lion's feet within. A pair of orthostat genies found together at both Til-Barsip and Dur-Sharrukin are the winged figure with the horned cap, carrying cone and bucket, and the genie in a head-band carrying a sprig (see above, VII,B,3,8); but both can appear in other contexts. In the palaces of Sennacherib, Ashurbanipal, and probably Esarhaddon, the empty-handed genie in the horned cap is regularly accompanied by the lion-headed genie, who stands behind him (see above,
These are hardly impressive relationships. Another oddity, suggesting that drains could require special protection, is that those in the sculptured portions of Ashurnasirpal's and Ashurbanipal's palaces are guarded by exceptional figures, the female genie and Pazuzu (see above, VII,F,4,21); but there are only three of these drains altogether, and those of Sargon and Sennacherib were not protected at all.

The only orthostat figures, apart from those on facades, who seem to occupy almost directly equivalent positions in different palaces, are Ashurnasirpal's and Sargon's genies carrying wild goats (see above, VII,F,8). These appear at Kalhu in the north door of room T, at the end of room S which is the reception-room of the king's residential suite; at Dur-Sharrukin they are found by the outer door of room 9, at the end of room 6 which is again the reception-room of the king's residential suite in the projecting wing, and by an entrance into room 33, the reception-room of the only suite in the inner court which may qualify as the traditional residential suite (see above, VI,G,1); the slabs in the equivalent part of Sennacherib's palace showed "colossal winged figures" (NB, 229), perhaps too poorly preserved for Layard to see what if anything they were carrying. We may at least infer that genies with goats were placed where they were for definite though now indeterminable reasons.

When therefore the ground-plan in two palaces corresponds, the decoration may correspond also; but not very often. If, however, we consider the decoration of any single palace, it is immediately apparent that it was designed according to one consistent theory. Sennacherib's
palace is simple: apart from apotropaic figures in the entrances, processions in the sloping corridors, and occasional scenes of civic achievement out of doors, virtually every surviving decorated wall, indoors and out, showed victories in war. Ashurbanipal's palace is somewhat more enlightening: there are the same apotropaic figures and processions, but also a distinction between the areas where military scenes predominated, with the Tammun-Dunnu cycle occupying a particularly important room, and the more private area where there were several scenes of hunting as well. Far more elaborate are the earlier palaces, of Ashurnasirpal and Sargon. Til-Barsip too seems to have a sensible scheme, with small-scale narrative in the gate, more than one subject in the throne-room, reviews in the reception-rooms, hunts in the bathrooms, and apotropaic figures at the doors, but not all this work is contemporary and some was plastered over (see above, V,T,4-9).

12. The orthostats in Ashurnasirpal's palace, outside the throne-room area and the west wing, all represent genies, the sacred tree, or the king, sometimes with a pair of attendant courtiers. We have suggested above (VII,E,2) that different aspects of the king's majesty are emphasized in the different contexts in which he appears; he is often placed on an end-wall, and some distinctions are clearly drawn, which may be relevant to the function of the distinct rooms, but only once, in room G where the king appears seated and drinking on the end-wall, do we see him positively doing something which he certainly did do in the palace. We may deduce that the room was used for banquets, but this is not implicit in the plan. The logic behind the choice of genies is equally
obscure. We have noted the genie with the goat in room T, and a somewhat comparable position is occupied by the genies and lion-centaurs carrying animals in one side-door of the throneroom (see above, VII,F,8, 24). We have also seen that the throneroom has an almost comprehensive selection of genies. Genies with sprigs and with maces (see above, VII,F,3,8) are especially conspicuous, respectively, in the doors of room S and at important entrances throughout the palace. Rooms G and H have carefully arranged scenes incorporating genies and the king along their walls, and rooms G, F, I, L, N, S, and T all have their walls entirely occupied, except in special positions, by consistent types of genie combined with sacred trees. This is undoubtedly a methodical scheme of decoration, even though we cannot interpret it.

13. Sargon's palace at Dur-Sharrukin is more readily comprehensible, and there is sometimes a close relationship between the subject-matter of the decoration (see above, VIII,K) and the uses, as deduced from the ground-plan alone (see above, VI, G), to which the rooms were put. The visitor from without, after passing a magnificent facade at the entrance to the outermost court XV and leaving the court through another door guarded by colossi, found himself faced in court VIII with at least three review-scenes representing different subjects. One had a procession of courtiers carrying furniture and leading up to the great facade of the throneroom, described above, where they were received by the king near one side-door; the other side-door could well have been approached by a balancing procession, though nothing now survives of it. We do not know if courtiers carrying furniture would really have come this way, but
furniture has generally been found in store-rooms rather than in state apartments, so that courtiers are likely to have been seen shifting it. The other two review-scenes showed tributaries and the transport of timber, and both led up to the king by the entrance of corridor 10. The corridor was guarded by colossi facing outwards at both ends, and was lined with processions of tributaries moving on towards court III. Here there was a projecting wing with a smaller grand facade on the left, and a subsidiary suite of rooms 13 and 14 to the right. The outer reception-room of this suite had two-register military narrative on what was left of its long walls, but a single-register formal scene of the king and courtiers at the narrow end where the presiding dignitary would have sat; the internal room 13 had two-register military narrative throughout, so far as is known. Turning left from corridor 10 and entering through the facade, one arrived in the public reception-room 8, with the pictures of the king dealing with rebels in ways intended to intimidate men such as visiting foreigners. All the compositions directed the eye to the head of the room on the left, where there was a throne-base with another picture of the king behind it, and a private door to one side. At the other end of room 8 was a wide doorway to the slightly less public reception-room 4, with the same decoration as room 8; the subject-matter may still have been suitable as the room could conveniently have been used for the entertainment, rather than the public reception, of those who might profit from intimidation. At the same time, however, room 4 must also have been used on more intimate occasions, as it provided the only access to the small room 7, decorated with scenes of
hunting and feasting; Loud (OP XXXVIII, 71) pointed out that room 7, with no direct link to the exterior of the palace, would have been suitable for the king's use in summer, and the feast shown on the orthostats, though apparently taking place in a hunting lodge, may reflect what happened in room 7. A bathroom, 1, approached by a corridor, 3, was provided at one end of room 4; both had poorly preserved narrative reliefs in two registers, showing war and possibly a hunt. The same bathroom and corridor served also the more private reception-room 2, on the other side of the projecting wing. The facade of this showed more courtiers with furniture, while the orthostats showed fighting and a banquet; it would entirely suit the position of the room if furniture was indeed brought there from outside and if banquets took place within. Both registers of decoration direct the eye, eventually, to the end-wall by room 3, and this is presumably where the king would have been seated, below two pictures of himself. Room 5, between the reception-rooms 2 and 8, and connecting both with them and with the king's residential suite, may have functioned largely as an ante-chamber or waiting-room; there is military narrative on the walls, aptly moving in opposed directions in each register. The king's residential suite was in the stub of the wing. Its reception-room, 6, showed peaceful rows of tributaries, with one procession leading up to the bedroom door, and the others towards the eastern end where the king might have been enthroned. Beyond was the small room 9, communicating with court III through a door guarded by a genie with a goat; it showed the king surrounded by courtiers, the king being visible from court III. The bedroom, 10, had
more peaceful processions of tributaries, leading up to the eastern end
where there was a door through to the bathroom 12; this again showed
the king and courtiers, with the king opposite the door. Other parts
of the palace whose decoration was partly preserved include the inner
court, with more courtiers who could have belonged anywhere, and the
$qbit hilani$, near the projecting wing; the latter, as mentioned, has
a fairly private site and included hunting scenes which may have been
especially welcome in places used informally by the king.

14. An account like this of Sargon's palace is of course almost bound
to be an oversimplification, and we cannot of course prove that it is
not seriously misconceived. We must explain the absence of hunting
scenes from the residential apartments by the assumption that they
would, at the time, have seemed too informal, and we must bear in mind
that "reception-rooms" could have been employed for committee-meetings,
courts of law, and any number of additional purposes. What is impres-
sive, however, is that the relationships we postulate between the
architecture and the decoration do not require any laborious manoeuvring
of the evidence; they virtually suggest themselves, and they cannot all
be coincidences.

15. We have then three main ways in which, in some palaces at least
and probably in all Assyrian public buildings, the subject-matter of the
narrative decoration was affected by its surroundings. Some pictures
represent what happened in front of them: a procession or formal review,
the king standing at the head of a room, sometimes perhaps a feast.
Others show scenes which reflect the room's function in a less direct
way, such as the placid dignity of Sargon's residential suite or the sporting activity in Ashurbanipal's postern-gate S. There are other series which were calculated to please or impress likely users of the room: the king, especially when in informal surroundings, and visitors to the court, in throne-rooms and reception-rooms especially. There were also many places, most conspicuously in Sennacherib's palace, where no special effect was thought to be necessary, and then the fashionable decoration seems to have been applied indiscriminately. It seems most unlikely that the arrangement of the apotropaic figures was ever indiscriminate. The positions occupied by colossi are fairly consistent at different times, but they would hardly have belonged anywhere else. The orthostat genies, however, at least in Ashurnasirpal's palace where they are best known, seem to have been carefully arranged, and it is probable that each building was protected by genies sited according to a specific apotropaic formula of its own.

16. Developments tend to be sudden rather than gradual. We have seen, however, comparable abrupt transitions in palace ground-plans of different dates, in the types of decoration successively predominant, and in the composition of narrative scenes. It is evident that the ingenuity of individual designers, encouraged by kings who wished to improve on their predecessors, should never be underestimated. Basic requirements remained much the same throughout the neo-Assyrian period; but the men who provided for them were well able to combine novel and traditional ideas.
Numerous problems are involved in calculating the absolute chronology of the Assyrian rulers; Rowton (1962) summarizes the situation, and gives extensive references. The following list is unavoidably controversial, and is provided only as a framework for convenient reference. It happens to follow Sidney Smith's general scheme for the early second millennium and beforehand, and the dates given by Brinkman (apud Oppenheim 1968, 346) for the kings between Enlil-nasir II and Ashurbani-pal; for 630-612, see JCS XXIV, forthcoming. Accession-years are here included in the reigns; we also give in most cases the relationship of each king to his predecessor, though these details too can sometimes be disputed.

Agade governors
including Azuzu c. 2300-2200
Ushpia c. 2260
Apiashal
? Sulili, ?Ur-\(\text{?}\)
Kikkia
Akia
Ur III governors
including Zariqum c. 2100-2025

C. 2045
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>? Izi-Dagan of Mari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzur-Ashur I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalimahum, son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilushuma, son</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erishum I, son</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td>c. 1940-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikumum, son</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargon I, son</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzur-Ashur II, &quot;son&quot;</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narsam-Sin, &quot;son&quot;, ? of Eshnuna</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erishum II, &quot;son&quot;</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshi-Adad I, foreign usurper</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td>c. 1814-1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmes-Dagan I, son</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td>c. 1781-1741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut-Askur, son</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimu-?</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asinum, family of Shamshi-Adad I</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzur-Sin, native usurper</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-dugul</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-spla-idi</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasir-Sin</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin-namir</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipqi-Ishtar</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adad-salulu</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Adasi</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belu-bani, son of Adasi</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libaya, &quot;son&quot;, ?brother</td>
<td>Shalimahum</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma-Adad I</td>
<td>&quot;son&quot;, ?brother</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iptar-Sin</td>
<td>&quot;son&quot;, ?brother</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazaya, &quot;son&quot; of Belu-bani</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 75-1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lullaya, usurper</td>
<td></td>
<td>6  85-1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidin-Minua, son of Bazaya</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma-Adad II</td>
<td>&quot;son&quot;, ?brother</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erishum II, son of Kidin-Minua</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshi-Adad II</td>
<td>&quot;son&quot;, ?brother</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishma-Dagan II</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshi-Adad III</td>
<td>&quot;cousin&quot;, ?son</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nirari I</td>
<td>?brother</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzur-Ashur III</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlil-nasir I</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur-ili, &quot;son&quot;, ?brother</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-shaduni, &quot;son&quot;, ?brother</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-rabi I, son of Enlil-nasir I</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nadin-ahhe I, &quot;son&quot;, ? brother</td>
<td></td>
<td>1433-1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlil-nasir II</td>
<td>&quot;brother&quot;, ?nephew</td>
<td>1433-1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nirari II</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>1427-1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-bel-nisheshu, son</td>
<td></td>
<td>1420-1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-rim-nisheshu, brother</td>
<td></td>
<td>1411-1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-nadin-ahhe II, &quot;son&quot;, ? brother</td>
<td></td>
<td>1403-1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriba-Adad I, son of Ashur-bel-nisheshu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1393-1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur-uballit I, son</td>
<td></td>
<td>1366-1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlil-nirari, son</td>
<td></td>
<td>1330-1320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arik-den-ili, son 1320-1308
Adad-nirari I, son 1308-1275
Shalmaneser I, son 1275-1245
Tukulti-Minurta I, son 1245-1208
Ashur-nadin-apli, son 1208-1204
Ashur-nirari III, son 1204-1198
Enlil-kudurri-usur, uncle 1198-1193
Ninurta-apil-Ekur, family of Eriba-Adad I 1193-1180
Ashur-ñan I, son 1180-?
Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur, son 1180-?
Mutakkil-Nusku, brother 1134-?
Ashur-resh-ishi I, son 1134-1116
Tiglath-pileser I, son 1116-1077
Asharid-apil-Ekur, son 1077-1075
Ashur-bel-kala, brother 1075-1057
Eriba-Adad II, son 1057-1055
Shamshi-Adad IV, uncle 1055-1051
Ashurnasirpal I, son 1051-1032
Shalmaneser II, son 1032-1020
Ashur-nirari IV, son 1020-1014
Ashur-rabi II, uncle 1014-973
Ashur-resh-ishi II, son 973-968
Tiglath-pileser II, son 968-935
Ashur-ñan II, son 935-912
Adad-nirari II, son 912-891
Tukulti-Ninurta II, son 890-884
Ashurnasirpal II, son 883-859
Shalmaneser III, son 859-824
Shamshi-Adad V, son 824-811
Adad-nirari III, son 811-783
Shalmaneser IV, son 783-773
Ashur-dan III, brother 773-755
Ashur-nirari V, brother 755-745
Tiglath-pileser III, "son" of Adad-nirari (? III) 745-727
Shalmaneser V, son 727-722
Sargon II, "son" of Tiglath-pileser (? III) 722-705
Sennacherib, son 705-681
Esarhaddon, son 681-669
Ashurbanipal, son 669-630
Ashur- velit-ilani, son 630-623
Sin-shar-ishkun, brother 623-612
Ashur-uballit II c. 612-609
APPENDIX B

Sennacherib's "Ishtar Temple" Procession

The slabs comprising this one-register procession or pair of processions were found on the northern side of the outer court of Sennacherib's palace, and seem to have derived from a ramp or bridge leading from the palace to the temple area. Some were brought to Europe after Rassam's excavations (1897, 96), and Gadd (1936, 172, 176, 215) discusses those known to him; more have since become available. We now have records of approximately twenty: seven in Berlin, four in London, three divided between London and the Nergal Gate Museum at Mosul, two at the Nergal Gate and one fragment in the Mosul Museum garden, one fragment recently sold at Sotheby's, one fragment, which may belong, in New York, and drawings of two slabs which are now lost. All the slabs show Assyrians, moving from right to left, sometimes up or down a slight gradient. The order in which two major groups may have been arranged is given elsewhere (Iraq XXIX, 48), but since not all the slabs have been published, and the numbers there assigned to the Nergal Gate pieces are not definitive, some further details may be desirable.

Five slabs clearly show figures ascending a slope. Two of these, Berlin 956 and BM 124900, certainly join (Gadd 1936, pl. XXI); they represent five bearded men in long dress wearing swords and carrying maces, and there is part of a sixth such figure on the left. There are no traces of any other figure on the right, and this could be the end of the procession. Possibly the Mosul Museum fragment, which shows
the feet of men in long dress who may be ascending, belongs to the left. The figure on the Sotheby's fragment may also be ascending; he is bearded, with a mace and sword, and the mace of the (swordless) figure in front of him is also visible, but he differs from those on the first two slabs in wearing a long shawl typical of court dress. There may have been a change of dress at this point, in which case the Sotheby's and Mosul Museum pieces may come from one slab. The Sotheby's piece is clearly associated with an ascending slab which is now divided between the Nergal Gate Museum and the Royal Geographical Society in London (AfObb. IV, Abb. 70). On the right-hand edge, which is damaged, is a figure in court-dress certainly holding a mace and presumably wearing a sword; then another such figure, adequately preserved; then two more, who carry bows and quivers in addition; then a bearded man in court dress, wearing a sword and carrying a spear and large round shield; and finally part of a figure, apparently swordless, in a long dress. This last figure may be completed on another joining pair of ascending slabs, Berlin 955 and one known only from a drawing (Gadd 1936, pl. XXIII); on the right are two beardless figures in court dress (one of whom projected onto the slab behind), and they carry the umbrellas, fly-whisk and towel for the king who precedes them in his rickshaw; the rickshaw is pulled by two beardless men in long dress, and guided by a pair of bearded men wearing swords and court dress; they are preceded by the crown-prince, in front of whom, on the next slab, was another figure, perhaps swordless, in a long dress. This group, then, shows the king, his attendants, and his bodyguard; it would of course be
possible, if we accept that many more slabs are lost, to put some or all of the bodyguard in front of the king. We have also another fragment in New York showing the crown-prince (Iraq XXIX, pl. XIII), and if this belongs to the same set of slabs it must come from a balancing procession on the other wall; other slabs may also have come from the balancing procession, if it existed, but the New York fragment, whose provenance is unknown, is the only clear duplicate.

Eight slabs show figures descending a slope. The first, most probably, is one in the Nergal Gate; it contains, from right to left, three bearded courtiers with crossed hands, a beardless courtier with two staffs, and a fifth, bearded with crossed hands. On the left is part of the fish-tail hat of a priest, and the back of his body. There is apparently a direct join with BM 124948 which, together with another lost slab (Gadd 1936, pl. XXII), showed two priests, each with a companion, playing music, and three female musicians in front. There are five more musicians on Berlin 953, a series of three slabs (AfObh. IV, Abb. 71; KV VII, Taf. CLVIII c), which must have been a little to the left. After the musicians, on the same slabs, were four barefoot soldiers with Assyrian beards and hair, holding spears and large round shields, and wearing swords and short dresses with pendant fringes between the legs; then three similarly armed, but with short beards and hair, head-bands with ear-caps, no fringes, and long greaves. A Nergal Gate slab has three more soldiers of this type, and could have joined the left edge of Berlin 953; the figures' feet are lost, however, and it does not seem certain that they are all moving down the gradient.
There is yet another soldier of this type on BM 124901 (Barnett 1960, fig. 53), which may have stood further to the left; in front is an archer with Assyrian beard and hair, a head-band, long greaves, and his right hand empty and lowered in front of his body.

Level slabs continue the procession of soldiers. Berlin 957 (RLV VII, Taf. CLVIII a) has two archers virtually identical with the one just mentioned, but wearing sandals instead of stocking greaves; the latter feature, on the BM 124901 archer, may have been carved in error, under the influence of the spearmen behind. The lowered right hand of what may have been another of these archers appears on the right edge of BM 124951 (Barnett 1960, fig. 51), which should then belong to the left again; otherwise BM 124951 represents one and a half archers differing from the others in having armlets, simple incisions on their kilts, and elaborate quivers. The half-archer is on the left, and may have been completed on the right edge of a Nergal Gate slab of which only the lower part is preserved; BM 124949 may be part of the top; the complete slab added three more archers of the same type. Two other slabs showed spearmen, like those first described but wearing crested helmets; Berlin 958 has two (Andrae 1938, Taf. II a), and a Nergal Gate piece could be joined with BM 124950 to give two more.

Probably this procession, with the king's bodyguard, the king and chief court officials, priests, musicians, and a typical selection of soldiers from the Sargonid army, is virtually complete. Even if the slabs really derive from two sides of a single corridor, we must have the back of one procession and the front of the other, so that the two
are complementary. The themes of two such processions may have been somewhat different, but the figures represented may not have changed much. As combined, whether rightly or not, the slabs give a convincing picture of a royal progress through Nineveh.
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I, D, 14. An Ashurnasirpal II brick (IAK, 131, n.6) mentions work on the KALCAD gate, which was by the Ninnamir court.

I, M, 5. A closer parallel is provided by Ibiq-Adad II's southern building at Eshnunna (CIP XLIII, pl. VII); this would suggest a nineteenth-century date for the Old Palace.

II, F. Mr. J. N. Postgate will be publishing an altar, now in the Mosul Museum, which was set up by Shalmanesser III in the Sibitti temple at Nineveh.

II, H, 2. The door between rooms XLVIII and XLIX was also columned.

V, E, 2. There is a glazed wall-plaque too from Imur-Enlil (Iraq XIII, 119).

VI, J, 1. There are apparently the remains of two Early Dynastic ziggurats at Kish (Iraq XXVIII, 25; XXXI, 42).
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