

# THE MELAMMU PROJECT

<http://www.aakkl.helsinki.fi/melammu/>



**“The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East. Textual evidence and historical perspective (ca. 750-650 BC)”**

**ROBERT ROLLINGER**

**Published in Melammu Symposia 2:**

R. M. Whiting (ed.),

Mythology and Mythologies.

Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences.

Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project. Held in Paris, France, October 4-7, 1999 (Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project 2001), pp. 233-64.

Publisher: <http://www.helsinki.fi/science/saa/>

---

This article was downloaded from the website of the Melammu Project:

<http://www.aakkl.helsinki.fi/melammu/>

The Melammu Project investigates the continuity, transformation and diffusion of Mesopotamian culture throughout the ancient world. A central objective of the project is to create an electronic database collecting the relevant textual, art-historical, archaeological, ethnographic and linguistic evidence, which is available on the website, alongside bibliographies of relevant themes. In addition, the project organizes symposia focusing on different aspects of cultural continuity and evolution in the ancient world.

The Digital Library available at the website of the Melammu Project contains articles from the Melammu Symposia volumes, as well as related essays. All downloads at this website are freely available for personal, non-commercial use. Commercial use is strictly prohibited. For inquiries, please contact [melammu-db@helsinki.fi](mailto:melammu-db@helsinki.fi).

ROBERT ROLLINGER Innsbruck

## The ancient Greeks and the impact of the Ancient Near East: Textual evidence and historical perspective (ca. 750-650 BC)\*

It is now twenty years since Peyton Randolph Helm wrote his comprehensive study on “‘Greeks’ in the Neo-Assyrian Levant and ‘Assyria’ in early Greek writers.”<sup>1</sup> Concerning the evidence of the Ancient Near East, these twenty years have seen an increasing mass of archaeological material. In the meanwhile there have been published some up-to-date surveys presenting the extant material, and even if there are some questions still open for discussion, the outlines drawn by these works seem to be rather sound and uniform and also well accepted. But this quite homogeneous and clear picture is not valid for the textual evidence at all. At one side there are quite different viewpoints interpreting the material and qualifying the contact and the role the Greeks played in the Levant. Some works published not long ago demonstrate this fact. Barbara Patzek in a recently published study stressed especially the commercial dimension of contact:

Der Kontakt der frühen Griechen mit dem Osten hat sich besonders über den Handel entwickelt, den der Phöniker im Westen und den der Griechen im Osten. Östliches Handelsgut sind insbesondere Exotika und Luxusgüter, also typische Produkte des Fern-

handels. Es handelt sich neben erlesenen Rohstoffen um Gegenstände des Kunsthandwerks aus edlen Materialien und Metallen in einem unverkennbaren orientalischen Stil. Wir haben es mit einem besonderen interkulturellen Austausch zu tun, der in der “orientalisierenden Phase” der griechischen Kunst und Literaturgeschichte gipfelte.<sup>2</sup>

R. A. Kearsley especially looking at Al Mina and regarding the early phase of the site as “mercenary encampment” proposed a development beginning with Greek mercenaries and passing *later* to a more commercial role. The textual evidence was treated by him as a main argument for Greek mercenaries in the East:

Unfortunately, the scale of the conflicts involving these men from the Mediterranean cannot be fully reconstructed from such isolated references, nor can their allegiances, if such existed beyond pure self interest, be discovered. But the probability is strong that such outsiders were drawn into the regional conflicts purely by the desire for personal gain and that rewards received for services rendered as military auxiliaries would have been the motivating force. It was, after all, just such a group which supplied mercenaries for Psammeticus in Egypt in the following century and there is no reason to think that a different situation applied for the many states of the Cilician and Syro-

\* I would like to thank Simo Parpola for drawing my attention to ABL 140 and for placing at my disposal an updated transliteration of NL 69 from the State Archives of Assyria database. Further I wish to express my thanks to Bradley J. Parker (Salt Lake City) who was kind enough to let me study his yet unpublished paper Parker

2000. To Jack Lawson and Robert Whiting I am indebted for improving my English.

For another perspective concerning the topic Assyria and the West cf. George 1997.

<sup>1</sup> Helm 1980.

<sup>2</sup> Patzek 1996b, 1f. Cf. also p. 5, 11, 28f and passim.

Palestine regions fighting for their independence against a succession of Assyrian kings.<sup>3</sup>

More recently Marco Bettalli drew a different picture. For him commercial and mercenary attributes went side by side, the latter being limited to a small élite. In contrast to Kearsley he also stressed the importance of Greek piracy:

È comunque possibile affermare con sicurezza che il mercenariato era esercitato da gruppi ristretti: si tratta di un mercenariato aristocratico, di élite, e non di un mercenariato “di massa,” come troveremo in altri periodi della storia greca. ... È inoltre probabile una certa contiguità tra il mercenariato e l’esercizio della pirateria, altra attività svolta notoriamente agli aristocratici.<sup>4</sup>

Beyond these differences and insecurities in assessing and qualifying the extant sources there also exists much confusion about the fundamental problem concerning which texts we are allowed to take into consideration when we deal with the question of possible Greeks in cuneiform sources. The material presented by Bettalli and Kearsley differs significantly in some details, and the problem becomes more obvious when we look at two other recently published articles. Walter Mayer took much more material into consideration than Kearsley and Bettalli did, but did not put forward his reasons for including so much evidence others left aside.<sup>5</sup> On the same level Edward Lipiński even treated the famous Iamani of Ashdod as Greek without giving any hint to the existing discussion on this vexing problem.<sup>6</sup> However these imponderables are quite unsatisfying.<sup>7</sup> Looking for the rela-

tively meager material of Ancient Near Eastern sources mentioning Greeks in historical context has importance for many reasons. It has been argued legitimately that it is necessary to speculate in more detail about the possible circumstances in which the different sorts of influence to the West might conceivably have come about.<sup>8</sup> On the other side it has also been required that more research concerning the different kinds of influence should be done.<sup>9</sup> Considering our sources, we do not have many possibilities to answer these burning questions if we try to stay on the firm ground of evidence. In this respect the relevant written sources get enormous weight. This material originates almost completely from Assyrian documents written in cuneiform and mentioning Greeks from different perspectives. But until now it is not entirely clear which ethnonyms encompass Greeks and which do not.

This paper has two goals. First, it seems convenient to define in a hypothetical way the textual corpus which *could* include Greeks on a very broad level, thus answering the question ‘In which texts *may* Greeks occur?’ At the same time it is important to qualify the relevant material according to the levels of probability that Greeks are in scope. Second, I try to draw historical conclusions especially examining the levels of contact. This includes the aforementioned qualification of the sources. Helm recognized that while working with this material it is not only necessary to show at what time and in which areas the contact between East and West had taken place but also to demonstrate what kind of contact this might

<sup>3</sup> Kearsley 1999, 122.

<sup>4</sup> Bettalli 1995, 52.

<sup>5</sup> Mayer 1996, 470-73.

<sup>6</sup> Lipiński 1991, 64.

<sup>7</sup> See also Braun 1982, Helck 1995, Burstein 1996, Burkert 1992, 9-14 with n. 18 (p. 160), Burkert 1998, 68-70, Burkert 1999, West 1997.

<sup>8</sup> Osborne 1998, 240: “... talk of easterners wandering about the Greek world is not enough.”

<sup>9</sup> Patzek 1997, 435: “Zivilisatorischer, kultureller, gesellschaftlicher und politischer Einfluß werden kaum differenziert, ebensowenig menschliche Begegnungsformen von Formen kultureller und herrschaftlicher Kolonisation.”

have been. This matter has implications, one should add, not only for the question ‘What did the Westerners do in the Levant’ or, of course, vice versa ‘What did the Easterners do in the West,’ but also for the socio-political preconditions for these contacts and for the consequences arising from this development. In defining the chronological framework I follow the way Helm has already chosen. He separated the periods of Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian (i.e. the time-range covered by the ‘dynasty’ of Nabopolassar) domination of the Near East, which at first seem quite similar, and concentrated exclusively on the former.

From the Eastern perspective such a procedure might not be regarded as very useful but it is indeed from the Western one. In recent years it has become more and more obvious that between the end of the so called Dark Ages and the close of the Archaic Period, let us say between the middle of the eighth and the end of the sixth century BC, there did not exist a uniform Greek world – and it did not exist in later times – but different zones of socio-cultural development and that these zones – some stronger some less so – passed through fundamental stages of change during this time. Primarily, it is the impressively growing

archaeological evidence in Greece that demonstrates the existence of different periods, wherein important changes seem to have taken place. Ian Morris has underlined in a recently published article the importance of this observation.<sup>10</sup> He separated Greece into four zones where completely different cultural settings can be observed. This process already started in the Dark Ages.<sup>11</sup> One area, defined by Morris as “Central Greece,” exhibited the most dramatic and basic upheavals and it is this area, starting with the findings of Lefkandi in the tenth century BC, that reveals the strongest connections to the Ancient Near East. Concerning the time between 750 and 500 BC there are two important phases of change. One of these leads to the decades preceding and following the year 700 BC with some distinct phases of development. Another one belongs to the second half of the sixth century. So if we focus on the western perspective and the question of socio-political development it seems methodologically sound to separate these chronological areas strictly. I take the end of the Assyrian Empire as the limit for reviewing the extant sources to gain a working basis for comparing the material from Greece and that from the Levant.

## 1. Textual evidence for Greeks from the Ancient Near East down to the end of the Assyrian Empire

I would like to start with a turning point in the analysis of this problem. Until 1958 it was nearly universally accepted in Assyriology that personal names or ethnonyms consisting of the root *ymn* + *nisbe* were principally identical with Greek \**Ἰάφωες* and were consequently pointing to this ethnic group. In 1958 Hayim Tadmor contested

this conception vigorously focusing on the most prominent example, i.e. Iamani of Ashdod, who in one source also appears as Iadna of Ashdod which was generally seen as a synonym for ‘the Cypriot.’ Tadmor adduced remarkable arguments for his view:

However, the normal Assyrian gentilic for both of these words would be KUR *Iamanâ*

<sup>10</sup> I. Morris 1998.

<sup>11</sup> I. Morris 1997.

and *Iadnanâ* respectively; it is therefore inconceivable that the Assyrian scribes would misunderstand or misinterpret a regular Assyrian gentilic “the Ionian” or “the Cypriot.” Similar names occur in the contemporary Assyrian documents from Nineveh ... It is very improbable that any one of the bearers of these names was a Greek ... On the other hand, the Biblical parallels (a) *Iamîn* in Simeon (II Chr. 4:24) and in Jerachmiel (I Chr. 2:21) and b) *Imnâ* (Gen. 46:17), or *Imna*’ (II Chr. 7:35) point to the probability that *Iamani* was of local Palestinian origin.<sup>12</sup>

This relatively cautious formulation of Tadmor gained support when Josette Elayi and Antoine Cavigneaux turned to the same problem and maintained:

il fait remarquer que *Ia-ma-ni* ne peut en aucun cas désigner un Ionien car le gentilece assyrien normal pour ce mot serait *KUR Iamanâ* (i.e. *Iam(a)nâia*); il est d’ailleurs inconcevable que les scribes assyriens aient commis 5 fois la même erreur et qu’ils ne l’aient pas commise dans d’autres passages.<sup>13</sup>

This view became more substantial when John A. Brinkman consequently adduced more arguments to distinguish between the forms *Iamani* and *Iamnâja*<sup>14</sup> stressing that the last one “has no vowel written between *m* and *n* and ends with the gentilic suffix *-aya*”<sup>15</sup> and referring to the different quantity of the vowel of the first syllable.<sup>16</sup> I myself tried to formulate arguments especially against the view proposed by Brinkman but I confess that the problem of the different forms of the nisbe remains open for discussion.<sup>17</sup> So it seems adequate to stress that the following presentation of the material includes two not quite similar forms of ethnonyms, one for which there is strong evi-

dence including Greeks, i.e. *Iam(a)n-âja*, and another one where this evidence is at least doubtful, i.e. *Iaman+other* suffixes than *âja*. Before I discuss these groups separately, let me make one last preliminary note. Though it is important to separate the extant material of the seventh from that of the sixth century BC, Brinkman has made one important observation from the later texts preserving proper names which might be also valid for the older ones: The terminology used by the Babylonian scribes includes not only Greeks but also non-Hellenic inhabitants of western Asia Minor. One should bear this point in mind because it reminds us that our modern conceptions, influenced by the emergence of the national state since the late 18th century and the linguistically based definition of peoples as well defined entities in the course of history, is to say the least precarious. Recognizing, comprehending and describing larger groups of people often have different causes and there is also historical development that should be reckoned with. So when I speak about Greeks, for brevity’s sake one should be aware that these persons are:

- a) not Greeks in the modern sense, i.e. people originating exclusively from the territory of modern Greece;
- b) not Greeks in the ancient sense, i.e. a relatively homogeneous linguistic group of people in contrast to the barbaroi;
- c) that it is not excluded, but even probable, that Greeks in the ancient sense are included in other ethnic designations used by the Assyrians. This seems rather clear when the Assyrian sources talk about Cyprus, i.e. *Iadnana*, wherein Greeks played an important role.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Tadmor 1958, 80 n. 217.

<sup>13</sup> Elayi/Cavigneaux 1979, 60f.

<sup>14</sup> In both forms the quality of the first syllable remains open for discussion. Cf. Rollinger 1997 (1999). In the following I always write a short vowel for practical reasons.

<sup>15</sup> Brinkman 1989, 56 n. 14.

<sup>16</sup> See also Röllig 1957/71, 644b and Röllig 1976/80, 150b.

<sup>17</sup> Rollinger 1997 (1999). See also below.

<sup>18</sup> Lipiński 1991. Rupp 1998. See generally Aupert 1997. Buitron-Oliver 1997. Buitron-Oliver/Herscher 1997.

### 1.1. Greeks in Neo-Assyrian sources, i.e. Iam(a)n-āja

The earliest known attestations occur in Neo-Assyrian sources originating from the time of king Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 BC). Around the year 730 a certain Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur, an official known as author of

other letters and obviously in some official function around the areas of Tyre and Sidon, addressed a letter to the Assyrian king.<sup>19</sup> Since this letter preserves the earliest attestation of Greeks in cuneiform texts, and since there is more preserved of its content than Saggs' copy shows, the letter is presented here in its entirety.<sup>20</sup>

#### 1.1.1

To the king my lord,  
your servant Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur:  
The 'Ionians' have [a]ppear[ed].  
They have battled<sup>21</sup> at the city of 'Samsim<sup>1</sup>[uruna?],<sup>22</sup>  
at the city of Ḫārī'šū<sup>1</sup>, and at the ci[ty of ...].  
A ca[valryman] [c]ame to the city of 'Dana<sup>1</sup>[bu?] (to report this to me).  
I gathered up regular soldiers and conscripted men  
and went after them.<sup>23</sup> Not anything  
did they (the Ionians) carry away. As soon as they [sa]w  
my soldiers they [fled] on their boats. In the midst of the sea  
they [disappeared]. After my [ .... ]  
.....  
... at the harbor of the city of ...  
Just me (?),<sup>24</sup> before I go up to ...  
The city of Danabu  
I shall accomplish.<sup>25</sup> The Itu'ayans  
who are at my side and the Itu'ayans  
who [are coming?] I shall settle therein.

Childs 1997. Hadjicosti 1997. Reyes 1994. Reyes 1997. Rupp 1997. Smith 1997. Steel 1993. Yon 1997. See also below p. 252 (Addikritišu).

<sup>19</sup> Saggs 1955, 127-31, plates XXX-XXXI (Nimrud letters 12 and 13). Brinkman 1989, 55. See now generally Parker 2000 who also proposes to include NL 21 to the letters written by Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur.

<sup>20</sup> Saggs 1963, 76-78, plate XIII (Nimrud Letter 69). See also Fales 1992, 52-54 (no. 3). There is now a revised transliteration of the text which amends the understanding considerably. Simo Parpola was so kind to provide me with this updated transliteration from the State Archives of Assyria database for which I am very grateful. The translation is my own:

NL 69 (ND 2370):

Obv.1 a-na LUGAL 'EN-ia<sup>1</sup>  
2 ARAD-ka I.qur-di-aš-šur-IGI  
3 KUR.ia-<sup>1</sup>ú<sup>1</sup>-na-a-a 'i-tal-ku-ni<sup>1</sup>  
4 qa-ra-bu ina URU.'sam-si<sup>1</sup>-m[u-ru-na]  
5 ina URU.ḫa-ri-<sup>1</sup>šū-ú ina <sup>1</sup>UR[U x x x]  
6 ú-tap-pi-šū ša-AN[ŠE.BAD-ḪAL]  
7 [i]-tal-ka a-na URU.'da-na<sup>2</sup>.[bi]  
8 [LÚ\*.E]RIM.MEŠ zak-ku-ú ina š[U.2]  
9 [a-š]a-bat a-ta-a[t]-<sup>1</sup>lak<sup>1</sup> mi-m[i-ni]

10 [l]a iš-ši-ú 'a-ki LÚ\*.ERIM<sup>1</sup>-M[ÉŠ-ia]  
11 [e-mu]r-<sup>1</sup>u<sup>1</sup>-ni ina šA-bi GIŠ.MÁ<sup>1</sup>-ME-<sup>1</sup>šú<sup>1</sup>-n[u]  
12 [e-te-li-ú] qab-li ta-an-ti  
13 [iḫ-tal-qu] 'i-da-tú<sup>1</sup>-u-a x[x]  
rest broken away  
Rev. beginning broken away  
1' [ina k]a-<sup>1</sup>a<sup>1</sup>-ri ša KUR x[x x x]  
2' šu-<sup>1</sup>tú<sup>1</sup> [ana-k]u<sup>2</sup>-ma a-<sup>1</sup>di<sup>1</sup> [l]a ina [x x]  
3' e-<sup>1</sup>lu-ni URU.da-an<sup>1</sup>-a-b[i]  
4' a-ra-<sup>1</sup>šip-pí<sup>1</sup> LÚ\*.i-tú-<sup>1</sup>a-[a-a]  
5' 'mar ina [GI<sup>1</sup>-ia [L]Ú\*.i-tú-<sup>1</sup>[a-a-a]  
6' š[a il-la-ku-u-n]i ina šA-bi lu-še-ši-[bi]

<sup>21</sup> For qarābu eppušu 'to give battle' cf. CAD E 216b and AHw 901b ('kämpfen').

<sup>22</sup> I follow the reading already proposed by Brinkman 1989, 55 (cf. Parpola 1970, 303 s.v.). If correctly identified, this location is mentioned together with Sidon. Note the list of tributaries given by Sennacherib (Luckenbill 1924, 30). This would imply that this was a major city, at least in the time of Sennacherib; but, while this identification fits the context rather well, it is far from certain.

<sup>23</sup> For attatlak as Gt(t) Pf. see Parpola 1984, 198f.

<sup>24</sup> See AHw 1293b.

<sup>25</sup> See AHw 959b.

Even if some of the proposed additions remain hypothetical,<sup>26</sup> the general thrust of the context now seems perceivable to a high degree. It is obvious that the ‘Ionians’ were treated as enemies by an official of the Assyrian empire and that they constituted a threat at least for the district Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur was in charge of. It also seems pretty clear from the other letters of this official that this was somewhere nearby the Phœnician coast at the fringe of the empire.<sup>27</sup> The cities of Samsimuruna and Ḫarišū also belong to this geographical area.<sup>28</sup> The text does not say anything about local allies of the ‘Ionians’ but their prominent place in the letter makes it probable that they were the only, or at least the ‘leading,’ enemy in the confrontation with the Assyrians. They seem to have appeared suddenly (*italkūni*) and to have been fairly mobile. It is not totally clear if they fought near the mentioned sites or if they even did not shrink back from attacking these smaller ‘cities.’<sup>29</sup> This question might depend on the actual size of Samsimuruna and Ḫarišū. The determinative URU is not precise enough to decide whether these places might have been smaller villages or towns with some defences. In any case, the way the Ionians are fighting makes it hardly conceivable that these marauders were able to besiege bigger places in a part of Phœnicia which had been at least for some time under Assyrian con-

trol.<sup>30</sup> The letter draws a picture of pirates and plunderers whose strength was the element of surprise, but who were afraid of any direct military contact with the highly developed Assyrian army. The letter also informs us how these Ionians operated in the Levant. Saggs saw in the ships of line 11 a “significant hint,” pointing at least to a connection with the ‘Ionians.’ The new edition makes this assumption highly probable. But another question also touched upon by Saggs is still open for discussion. Saggs speculated that the letter also bore some information as to where these Ionians were coming from:

The broken state of the text at the point at which the mention of ships occurs is fully recognized, but whether the particular ships mentioned belonged to the attackers or to the defenders, ships would hardly have been mentioned at all except in connection with a sea attack. The implication is that the people of Iauna were seafarers, and thus from a coastal region, which must have been some part of the Mediterranean other than the part under firm Assyrian control between Que (Cilicia) and southern Palestine. There appears to be nothing better to settle the identification of Iauna as between Cyprus and some part of the coast of Asia Minor”.<sup>31</sup>

This conclusion goes too far, especially in localizing the ‘Ionians’ in the western part of Asia Minor. For this assumption the letter does not give any hint. Saggs relies

<sup>26</sup> See the discussion by Parker 2000.

<sup>27</sup> See Parker 2000. Concerning Phœnicians in Assyrian sources see now generally Saporetti 1990. Concerning the view of the west see Winter 1995. Liverani 1998.

<sup>28</sup> Parker 2000.

<sup>29</sup> This is implied by the translation Saggs 1963, 77 has proposed: “They have made an attack on the city ....” Brinkman 1989, 55 considered fights in the cities: “They have fought in the cities ....” The same is true of Lanfranchi 2000, 15: “... made battle in the town.”

<sup>30</sup> Sargon’s statement that the ‘Ionians’ “killed the people of the [city of Ty]re and of the [land] of Que since faraway [days]” (Ann. 118) and that he provided peace to these areas (Zyl. 21) might contradict this view but the context of this assertion which deals with Sargon’s fights

against ‘Ionian’ pirates seem to imply that these people mainly threatened the land around the cities and not the cities themselves (see below). In any case the struggles against the Greeks depicted in the reign of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II are clearly connected and have the same character. This becomes obvious not only by the fact that in both cases the ‘Ionians’ are said to operate in Phœnicia but also that in Zyl. 21 and Ann. 117 Sargon II refers to this menace “since faraway days” which he claims to have terminated. Cf. Lanfranchi 2000, who, however, in both cases minimizes the role of ‘Ionian’ pirates and accentuates the involvement of the struggles in international state policy, emphasizing the importance of the Phrygian state. See also Lanfranchi 1996.

<sup>31</sup> Saggs 1963, 77f.

too much on our knowledge that western Asia Minor was part of what the Greeks in *much later* times understood as Ionia. It is obvious that the Akkadian term Ia-ú-na-a has something to do with the Greek \*Ἰόνιοι<sup>32</sup> but it is also clear that these two ethnonyms are not congruent. So it is an open question where exactly the ‘Ionians’ came from, whereas there are now – not only looking at the later texts of Sargon II – plain hints that they came from somewhere in the West and that ships played an important role. The letter gives only one clue to the origin of these Ionians. They came from the midst of the sea (qabli tânti). This is the earliest instance of this terminology, which appears later in the inscriptions of Sargon II and Esarhaddon as a familiar quotation. It is obvious now that the inscriptions picked up an already existing designation concerning the provenance of the Ionians and integrated it in a new ideological concept (see below). In any case the Assyrians seemed to be well prepared for such incursions already in the time of Tiglath-pileser III. They had built up a well-working information

system and had stationed mobile cavalry troops to defend against these plunderers. They also set up local conscription of men who could be mobilized very quickly. The Itu’ayans mentioned at the end of the letter seem also belong to this ‘defence system.’ They look like deportees valued for their military qualities.<sup>33</sup> And they seem to be involved in building up fortifications around the city of Danabu. This means that Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur reckoned with further attacks in the future. And one final point might be important as well. The ‘Ionians’ do not look like unknown plunderers appearing for the first time in this area. Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur mentions the ethnonym like a well-known entity without further explanation, so he very well may have already had some bad experiences with this kind of people.

#### 1.1.2

After some years of silence the ‘Ionians’ are mentioned again in several texts of Sargon II (721-705 BC).

##### 1.1.2.1

(Sargon) ... who in the midst of the Sea as a fisher (does) caught the ‘Ionians’ ...<sup>34</sup>

##### 1.1.2.2

(Sargon) experienced in battles who in the midst of the Sea as a fisher (does) caught the ‘Ionians’ like fish and provided peace for the land of Que and the city of Tyre<sup>35</sup>

##### 1.1.2.3

I (Sargon) caught the ‘Ionians’ who (live) in the mist of the Sea of the Setting Sun like fish<sup>36</sup>

##### 1.1.2.4

(Sargon) who caught the ‘Ionians’ who (live) in the midst of the Sea like fish<sup>37</sup>

<sup>32</sup> This was denied by Röllig 1976/80. But cf. Brinkman 1989, 54. Rollinger 1997 (99). Parker 2000.

<sup>33</sup> Parker 2000.

<sup>34</sup> Gadd 1954, 199, 19 (plate 51): šá i-na MURUB<sub>4</sub> tam-ti KUR.ia-am-na-a sa-an-da-ni-šu i-bar-ru .... For the translation see the following footnote.

<sup>35</sup> Zyl. 21: ša i-na MURUB<sub>4</sub> tam-ti KUR.ia-am-na-a sa-an-da-niš ki-ma nu-ú-ni i-ba-ru-ma ú-šap-ši-ḫu KUR.qu-e ù URU.šur-ri. See Fuchs 1994, 34 (transliteration with apparatus criticus), and 290 (translation) with notes 38

(sandāniš “wie ein Fischer”) and 39 (šupšuhu “einem beunruhigten, geplagten, heimgesuchten Land oder Volk wieder Ruhe verschaffen”). See also Lanfranchi 2000, 14.

<sup>36</sup> XIV.15. LÚ.ia-am-na-a ša MURUB<sub>4</sub> tam-ti e-reb<sup>d</sup>UTU-ši GIM nu-ú-ni a-bar-ma .... See Fuchs 1994, 76 (transliteration), 308 (translation).

<sup>37</sup> S4.34f: ša KUR.ia-am-na-a ša MURUB<sub>4</sub> tam-ti / ki-ma nu-ú-ni i-ba-ru-ma .... See Fuchs, 1994, 262 (transliteration with apparatus criticus), 359 (translation).



1.1.2.5

(Sargon) who caught the ‘Ionians’ who (live) in the midst of the Sea like fish<sup>38</sup>

1.1.2.6

[To subdue the Inonians, whose residences] are in the midst of the Sea, who killed the people of the [city of Ty]re and of the [land] of Que since faraway [days], [interrupted?] the ways(?), out on the Sea I sailed against them [with the ships of ...].? and with the weapon stretched on the ground young and old.<sup>39</sup>

The above mentioned inscriptions of Sargon II have a completely different point of view than the Nimrud-letter of Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur has. Whereas the latter is a report pointing to the emergence of a well-known enemy and to the Assyrian counteractions (also including preventive measures), Sargon shows, in a self-praising style, how such a situation was definitively solved by a brilliant king, opposing an old and well-known enemy operating within well-known areas.<sup>40</sup> There is much ideology in the text, and though Sargon is speaking about an easy and decisive victory, it remains quite doubtful if this was in fact the truth. At least the threat originating from this people seems not to have been terminated as traditions preserved for Sennacherib and the inscriptions of Esarhaddon reveal. This is also true for the geographical localization of these ‘Ionians.’ Hayim Tadmor has demonstrated conclusively how Sargon intended to excel his royal forerunners concerning the extension of his empire, and it obviously was not enough to have reached the shores of the Mediterranean.<sup>41</sup> But it is quite interesting that the ‘Ionians’ functioned now as a kind of marking point of the far West showing the far reaching geographical horizon of the king’s enter-

prises. The added explanation that these ‘Ionians’ come from “the midst of the Sea” (1.2.3-6) picked up an already existing tradition as is shown by the Nimrud-letter discussed above and integrated it into the royal ideology of Sargon II. So this designation should not be understood as an explanatory hint introducing a people which has been unknown until recently,<sup>42</sup> but as a conscious choice of words demonstrating the admirable abilities of the king beyond any borders. As in the Nimrud letter these ‘Ionians’ are explicitly connected with the sea and presented as seafarers living in the far West. The Khorsabad annals not only date Sargon’s victory to the king’s 7th palū (715)<sup>43</sup> but show, in connection with the other texts, the far-reaching radius of action covered by these seafarers. From Que/Cilicia to Tyre/Phœnicia they threaten the local towns and villages, destroying and plundering. The annals stress that this is not a new phenomenon but has happened ‘since faraway days.’<sup>44</sup>

1.1.3

Concerning the reign of Sargon’s successor Sennacherib (704-681 BC), a very similar situation is depicted in two fragments going

<sup>38</sup> Stier 25: ša URU.ia-am-na-a-a ša MURUB<sub>4</sub> tam-ti ki-ma nu-ú-ni i-ba-ru. See Fuchs 1994, 64 (transliteration with apparatus criticus), 304 (translation).

<sup>39</sup> Ann. 117-19: a-n[a ka-šad LÚ.ia-am-na-a-a ša šu-bat-sún] / ina] M[URUB<sub>4</sub> ta]m<sup>1</sup>-ti na-da-at ša ul-tu [UD.MEŠ] ru-ú-[qu-te] U[N.MEŠ URU.šur-r]i [KUR].qu-e i-du-ku-ma ú-[x x] A a-lak x[x] / [ina GIŠ.MÁ].MEŠ<sup>1</sup> [x<sup>1</sup> N]A<sup>12</sup> ME a-na tam-di ú-ri-da-āš-šú-nu-ti-ma š[e]’-her ra-bi [i-n]a<sup>1</sup> GIŠ.

TUKUL ú-šam-qit ... See Fuchs 1994, 109 (transliteration with apparatus criticus), 319f (translation).

<sup>40</sup> Lanfranchi 2000, 14f.

<sup>41</sup> Tadmor 1999, 57. Cf. generally Lanfranchi 1997.

<sup>42</sup> See also above.

<sup>43</sup> Ann. 101-26. See Fuchs 1994, 105-10.

<sup>44</sup> See also Lanfranchi 2000, 15.

back to the Graeco-Babylonian historian Berossos. Both fragments are transmitted through various intermediate stages. The first one is an abridgement of Berossos by Alexander Polyhistor (1st century AD). The

second one is a condensation of Polyhistor's text by Abydenos (2nd century AD). Both are handed over in an Armenian translation of the *Chronicle of the Father of the Church Eusebios*.

#### 1.1.3.1a (Alexander Polyhistor)<sup>45</sup>

When he (scil. Sennacherib) was informed that Greeks were marching against Cilicia, he hurried against them, confronted them, and, after many of his troops had been struck down, he won the battle. As a memorial of his victory, he had a statue of himself erected on the battlefield and inscribed it in Chaldean script as a remembrance of his bravery and heroic deeds as a memorial for the future.<sup>46</sup>

#### 1.1.3.1b (Abydenos)<sup>47</sup>

(...) On the coast of Cilicia he (scil. Sennacherib) defeated a group of Ionian warships and drove them into flight. He also built the temple \*of the Athenians\*, erected bronze pillars and caused, he said, his great deeds to be inscribed truthfully. He also built Tarson according to the plan and model of Babylon, so that the river Cydnus flows through just as the Euphrates flows through Babylon.<sup>48</sup>

Both fragments have engaged modern scholars' attention to a high degree for many years.<sup>49</sup> In particular, the divergences between the two fragments concerning the Greeks' attitudes and the kind of battle they fought with the Assyrians, have been analysed exhaustively.<sup>50</sup> In an extreme position it has even been argued that the Greek tradition has confused the struggles of Sargon and falsely connected them with Sennacherib.<sup>51</sup> But even if the discrepancies cannot be resolved fully,<sup>52</sup> other studies have adduced considerable arguments proposing that there seems to be little reason to doubt the general outline of the picture the fragments draw,<sup>53</sup> i.e. a confrontation between Greeks and Assyrians in Cilicia in the reign of Sennacherib, especially since we now

have, with high probability, a cuneiform documentation of Greeks from the reign of this Assyrian king (see below). It seems quite likely that these events belong to the year 696 when the revolt of Kirua of Illubru against the Assyrian domination took place. The 'Ionians' who were involved seem to have supported the anti-Assyrian forces in some way. In any case they came from outside Cilicia since the archaeological findings in Tarsos and Mersin do not imply the existence of Greek colonies in this early time.<sup>54</sup> If this Greek participation is to be understood as an informal act, that is, the rebellious forces sought the support of Greek pirates, who were commonly encountered in this region, or whether official agreements and 'diplomatic' relationships with

<sup>45</sup> FGrHist 680 F 7c (31).

<sup>46</sup> Following the translation of Verbrugge/Wickersham 1996, 54.

<sup>47</sup> FGrHist 685 F 5 (6).

<sup>48</sup> Following the translation of Burstein 1978, 34, D.2.b.

<sup>49</sup> See Haider 1996, 86 n. 149 with broad bibliographic references.

<sup>50</sup> The difference in the designation, i.e. Greeks (Polyhistor) and Ionians (Abydenos) quoted since Jacoby's edition might be an error. Consulting the Latin translation of the Armenian text presented by Schoene 1875 the

two versions are depicted the other way, i.e. Iones (p. 27, Polyhistor) and Graecorum (p. 35, Abydenos). In any case one should examine the original Armenian text which I unfortunately do not have at my disposal.

<sup>51</sup> Most recently Fuchs 1994, 440. See also Frahm 1997, 14.

<sup>52</sup> See the comprehensive study presented by Lanfranchi 2000, 24-31.

<sup>53</sup> Jasink 1989, 124-127. Haider 1996, 85-91. Lanfranchi 2000.

<sup>54</sup> Haider 1996, 89. Lanfranchi 2000.

individual towns in the Greek homeland were concluded, remains open for discussion.<sup>55</sup>

Focusing on the question of Greek contacts in the reign of Sennacherib, there is also an original inscription of this king which must be taken into account. In one of

his Bull Inscriptions from the South West Palace in Nineveh, duplicated by a prism fragment, Sennacherib accounts comprehensively the events of his sixth campaign (694 BC). In one episode, ‘Ionians’ also seem to have played a role.

### 1.1.3.2

‘Hittites,’ plunder / of my bows I settled in Nineveh. Mighty ships / (after) the workmanship of their land they built dexterously. Sailors – Tyrians / Sidonians and ‘Io[n]ians’ – captives of my hand, I ordered / at the bank of the Tigris with them. Downstream to Opis / I had them shipped to disembark (there).<sup>56</sup>

The text has caused some confusion since Luckenbill in his edition and translation first read ‘Iadnanai,’ and later proposed ‘Iamanai,’ thinking that the two designations are synonymous.<sup>57</sup> The reading ‘Iamanai’ became forgotten but the equation of ‘Iadnanai’ with ‘Iamanai’ remained under discussion until recent days. It has been both denied<sup>58</sup> and defended.<sup>59</sup> Since some cuneiform texts exhibit a clear distinction between Iadnana and Iaman, I did not take the passage into consideration either.<sup>60</sup> However Eckart Frahm’s collation of T 29 has shed new light on the problem. Frahm has proposed very cautiously to read l. 60 “Ia-[am<sup>17</sup>]<sub>J</sub>-n[a]-a-a” but he did not want to ex-

clude definitely other readings.<sup>61</sup> Though Frahm’s collation, as he himself concedes, has some uncertainties,<sup>62</sup> the reading Iam-nāja seems to stand on quite firm ground as Giovanni Lanfranchi has recently demonstrated. Since the collation has shown five signs and a gentilic – because \*Iadnāja did not exist,<sup>63</sup> in concert with the fact that Iadnanāja would have needed 6 signs – Iam-nāja becomes a highly probable reading which can be used at least as a working hypothesis.<sup>64</sup>

The content of the text seems well understandable. Sennacherib has Syrian, i.e. Hittite, craftsmen, who built seaworthy ships in Nineveh. He also used the skills and

<sup>55</sup> As with the events in Cilicia under Sargon II, Lanfranchi 2000 tends to stress also in this case the importance of interstate relationships including the political affairs in Anatolia as a whole and to minimize the role of Greek piracy. But piracy has a prominent role in the Homeric epics where warfare and piracy seem to be virtually indistinguishable. See Souza 1999, 17-26.

<sup>56</sup> T 29 (Hist., Bull 4), 57-62. See Luckenbill 1924, 73 and the collations by Frahm 1997, 117. T 15 (prism fragment Sm 2093). See Frahm 1997, 102.

<sup>57</sup> Luckenbill 1924, 73. Luckenbill 1926, volume 2, 145 with n. 2. See in detail Lanfranchi 2000, 28.

<sup>58</sup> See Brinkman 1989, 56 n.15.

<sup>59</sup> See Haider 1996, 86 n. 149, 91 with n. 161.

<sup>60</sup> Rollinger 1997 (1999).

<sup>61</sup> Frahm 1997, 117: “Dies wäre die einzige Erwähnung von ‘Joniern’ in den Sannacherib-Inschriften. Es scheint aber auch möglich, statt *am* vielmehr *ad* zu lesen; dann wäre von ‘Zyprioten’ die Rede.” Note that Frahm 1997, 14 seems to prefer the reading “Ia-[ad<sup>17</sup>]<sub>J</sub>-n[a]-a-a.”

T 15 (Sm 2093) l. 7 has only [ ... ]-na-a-a. Cf. Frahm 1997, 102.

<sup>62</sup> Frahm 1997, 117:

Bull 4 ist stark verwittert und daher sehr schwer lesbar. Nicht von ungefähr weichen die Bearbeitungen stellenweise erheblich voneinander ab, in Sonderheit bei der nicht so ohne weiteres durch Duplikate rekonstruierbaren Schilderung des 6. Feldzugs mit ihren zahlreichen Lücken und unklaren Lesungen. Da mit den veröffentlichten Kopien und Fotos allein keine wesentlichen Fortschritte zu erzielen waren, habe ich die im British Museum ausgestellten slabs 1 und 2 im Sommer 1993 kollationiert. Wegen der ungünstigen Lichtverhältnisse und weil es mir an Zeit fehlte, sind die Ergebnisse dieser Kollationsarbeit aber insgesamt unbefriedigend geblieben. Was im folgenden an neuen Lesungen unterbreitet wird, kann nur ein erster Schritt sein auf dem Weg zu einem besseren Verständnis dieses interessanten Textes, der mir, insbesondere was den Abschnitt über die Schiffsexpedition betrifft, nach wie vor zahlreiche Rätsel aufgibt.

<sup>63</sup> See below.

<sup>64</sup> Lanfranchi 2000, 28.

capabilities of ‘Westerners,’ manning the ships. Besides the Sidonians and Tyrians, Iamnāja fits very well into the context because it has been these people who have been known for their maritime skills since the days of Tiglath-pileser III. The crew and their ships sailed downstream to Opis where they were sledged across the landbridge to Sippar<sup>65</sup> to reach the Persian Gulf. From there they attacked the Chaldeans hiding in the region of the lower Ulai, a military campaign which had far reaching consequences for Babylonia.<sup>66</sup> It is clear that the Greeks – in the same way as the Sidonians and Tyrians – are designated as ‘war booty’ (kišitti qātija)<sup>67</sup> and that these people are chosen for their seafaring and military knowledge con-

## 1.1.4

All kings of the midst of the Sea, from the land of Cyprus (and) the land of ‘Ionia’ to the land of Tarsisi, bowed down at my feet. I received [their] heavy tribute.<sup>68</sup>

This inscription has the same ideological connotations as Sargon’s texts. The king demonstrates his far reaching power and the fact of subjugating and receiving tribute from distant lands. Further, the text makes clear that ‘Ionia’ is not the same as Cyprus

## 1.1.5

[ ... ]Ionian [ ... ]<sup>70</sup>

It is not clear in what function this person appears and it has been speculated that he might have been a deportee,<sup>71</sup> but this remains an open question. Apart from Sennacherib’s fragmentary inscription discussed above (1.1.3.2), we do not have any explicit

cerning high sea matters. On the other hand, this testimony is very important because it is to date the only text telling what happened to some Greeks after they had been beaten and taken prisoner by the Assyrians. All the other examples focus on the clashes between Greeks and Assyrians which took place at the fringes of the empire. Besides one other example discussed below (1.1.5) and another one mentioning the Greek Adikritušū (see below, p. 252), this is the only text wherein we learn that Greeks also came into contact with the interior of the Assyrian empire.

Some years later, Esarhaddon (680-679 BC), talking about ‘Ionians,’ focuses again on an area at the fringes of the empire:

and might be searched farther to the West.<sup>69</sup>

Finally, there is an administrative text from Nineveh mentioning silver payments in connection with the Queen mother. In a fragmentary context there also appears one (or more?) ‘Ionian(s).’

hint of ‘Greeks’ as deportees in the Neo-Assyrian empire,<sup>72</sup> even if one might wonder about what Sargon did with the ‘Ionians’ he caught “in the midst of the Sea.” But one fact seems hardly to be doubted: This particular ‘Ionian’ was in the Assyrian capital!

<sup>65</sup> See Frahm 1997, 117 ad l. 63.

<sup>66</sup> See Frahm 1997, 14-16.

<sup>67</sup> Frahm 1997, 117 suggests that these persons had been captured during Sennacherib’s 3rd campaign. Lanfranchi 2000, 28 prefers to suggest one of the Cilician campaigns.

<sup>68</sup> AsBbE 10f: MAN.MEŠ šá MURUB, tam-ti DŪ-šú-nu TA KUR.ia-da-na-na KUR.ia-man a-di KUR.tar-si-si / a-na GĪR.II-ia ik-nu-šú GŪ.UN-[šú-nu] DUGUD-tú am-ḥur. See Borger 1956, 86, 10f and Tafel 1.

<sup>69</sup> For the localization of Tarsisi see Haider 1996, 86-88 n. 151.

<sup>70</sup> Fales/Postgate 1992, 56 Nr. 48, line 6: [(x) x K]UR.ia-man-a-a [x x x x].

<sup>71</sup> Cf. the translation of line 8 by Fales/Postgate 1992, 56 and Haider 1996, 80.

<sup>72</sup> The translation Brinkman 1989, 55 adduces for inscription XIV is misleading since line 16 [as-s]uḥ “I deported” belongs to the next section and not to the ‘Ionians’ mentioned in line 15. Cf. Fuchs 1994, 76.

## 1.2. Greeks in Neo-Assyrian sources? i.e. Iaman+ suffixes other than āja

There are some other references in Neo-Assyrian texts mentioning persons who are called Iamani, Iamaniu (or Iamanūyu) and Iamania. For phonetic and linguistic reasons these individuals have not been con-

### 1.2.1

A Neo-Assyrian legal document, dating from the year 659 BC, and describing the sale of females, has two witnesses called

#### 1.2.1.1<sup>74</sup>

in front of Iamanūyu (or Iamanīu)

The second one is more interesting since he is qualified as a leader commanding 50

#### 1.2.1.2<sup>75</sup>

in front of Iamanūyu (or Iamanīu), commander of fifty (rab ḥanše)

In addition, there is a census tablet (presumably from the Harran area) enumerating different peoples and their households. One

#### 1.2.2<sup>76</sup>

Iamanīa, three sons of his  
in all 4 people; one house

A Neo-Assyrian lexical list of territories also might refer to ‘Ionia,’ but it has a very peculiar form of writing which makes the interpretation difficult and open for discus-

#### 1.2.3<sup>77</sup>

Land of Hilakku, Land of *Ionia*  
Land of Melid, *Phil[is]tia*

sidered as representing the same ethnic element which has been seen behind the expression Iam(a)nāja. Although I have tried to adduce arguments that this might not be a valid conclusion,<sup>73</sup> I am aware that some uncertainties remain and hence I will discuss this evidence separately.

Iamanūyu (or Iamanīu). The first one is presented without profession or further description:

individuals, probably involved in military matters:

of these individuals is a certain Iamanīa with his three sons, obviously living in one house:

sion. Since the place name is located between Hilakku and Melid this geographical environment might favour an interpretation as ‘Ionia’:

<sup>73</sup> See in detail with adducing the older discussion Rollinger 1997 (1999).

<sup>74</sup> Kwasman 1988, 179 (no. 146), line 29: IGI I.ia-man-nu-u  
<sup>75</sup> Kwasman 1988, 179 (no. 146), line 32: IGI I.ia-man-nu-u LÚ.GAL 50.

<sup>76</sup> Fales/Postgate 1995, 145 (no. 220), lines II.4e-5e: I.ia-man-ia-a 3 A.MEŠ-šú / PAB 4 1 É.

<sup>77</sup> Fales/Postgate 1995, 4 (no. 1), lines II.8-9: KUR.hilak-ku KUR.ia-’e’-na / KUR.me-li-di URU.pi-l[’]-’iš’-tú.

<sup>78</sup> Kwasman 1988, 257 (No. 217) with transliteration of the whole text. Line 5’ has [KÚ].BABBAR TA IGI I.ia-a-ma-ni “silver from Iamani,” line 11’ [lu I.ia]-a-ma-ni lu DUMU.MEŠ-šú “[whether I]amani or his sons.”

Finally, there are some texts mentioning persons called Iamani. Two of them appear in Neo-Assyrian legal documents from Nineveh. In one of them a certain Iamani is selling a female for 35 shekels of silver to Ninuāya, the king's eunuch:<sup>78</sup>

## 1.2.4

Ninuāya, the king's eunuch, [contr]acted and bought her for 35 shekels of [sil]ver from Iamani. The money is paid completely. That woman is purchased and acquired. Any revocation, lawsuit, or litigation is void. Whoever, at any time in the future, lodges a complaint or breaches the contract, [whether Ia]mani or his sons [or his brothers, whoever (repeatedly seeks a) la]wsuit or litigation (against Ninuāya) ... [He shall place ... ] in the lap [of DN]. He shall return the money tenfold to its owner. He shall contest for his lawsuit and not succeed.<sup>79</sup>

The date of the document is post-canonical, i.e. after 648 BC. Kwasman speculated that this Iamani might be identical with another one referred to as witness in a debt-note from the time of Aššurbanipal (i.e. 14.II.654 BC)<sup>80</sup>:

1.2.5<sup>81</sup>

in front of Iamani

The most prominent attestation of this name deserves special attention. In several texts Sargon II depicts a revolt provoked by a certain Iamani of Ašdod:<sup>82</sup>

1.2.6.1<sup>83</sup>

On account of [the misdeed he (scil. Azuri, king of Ashdod) committed ... I had him leave] the city of As[h]dod], I elevated Ahimiti, (...) his *favorite brother* to rule over [the people of Ashdod] and I [had him sit on his father's throne]. I established for him tribute, tax, [compulsory work and *military service*] like [my] royal [ancestors imposed upon them]. But [these] accursed [Hittites], in front of [...], in order not to deliver the tribute they conceived bad ideas [in their heart]. [Against] their ruler [they started] rebellion and insurrection; they expelled him out [of Ashdod] like someone who had shed blood. ... [...] Iamani, commoner [without claim to the throne they made] king over them, they made sit [him] down [on the throne] of his master. [ ... ], their city ... [ ... ], the battle [ ... ], ... (lacuna of three lines) in its neighborhood, [their] moats [ ... ] a depth of 20 cubits [they digged] until they reached the underground water. To the rulers of Palestine, Judah, Edom, Moab (and) to those who live in/at the sea, who had to bring tribute and gifts to my lord Ashur, hey sent (letters) full of countless evil lies to alienate (them) from me. They sent bribes to Pir'u, king of Egypt – a potentate unable to save them – and asked him to be an ally. But I, Sargon, the rightful ruler, devoted to the pronouncements (uttered by) Shamash and Marduk (carefully) observing the orders of Ashur, led my army over the Tigris and the Euphrates, at the peak of the(ir) flood, the spring flood, as (if it be) dry ground. This Iamani however, their king who had put his trust in his own power and (therefore) did not bow to any rulership, heard about the approach of my expedition (while I was still) far away, and the splendor of my lord Ashur overwhelmed him and ... [his

<sup>79</sup> Following the translation of Kwasman 1988, 257.

<sup>80</sup> Kwasman 1988, 258.

<sup>81</sup> Kwasman 1988, 375 (No. 324), line 11: IGI I.ia-man-ni.

<sup>82</sup> Beside the texts adduced below there is also the fragmentary VA 8424 from Assur, which in its preserved parts does not mention Iamani by name, but which ob-

viously describes his revolt and originally also preserved his name which is now lost. See Weidner 1941/44, 40. See also Isaiah 20.

<sup>83</sup> Nineveh-prism (Annals of the year 711 BC), VII.b: K.1668+IV'. See Fuchs 1998, 44-46 (transliteration), 73f (translation). Lines 15 and 37 each have I.ia-ma-ni. See also Pritchard 1969, 287a. Borger, 1982/85, 381.

feet lost firm ground like roots] at the river's bank. ... [Like fish] they chose the depth of [faraway] waters as hiding-place. ... faraway [ ... ] he fled [...] Ashdod [ ...].

1.2.6.2<sup>84</sup>

Azuri, king of Ashdod – his ... had schemed not to deliver tribute (any more) and he sent messages (full) of hostilities against Assyria to the kings (living) in his vicinity. On account of the misdeed which he (thus) committed, I abolished his rule over the inhabitants of his country and made Ahimiti, his *favorite brother*, king over them. But the(se) Hittites, (always) planning treachery, hated his (scil. Ahimiti's) reign and elevated to rule over them Iadna who, without claim to the throne, knew, just as they (themselves), no respect for authority. With a rage in my heart I marched quickly – (even) in my state-chariot and (only) with my cavalry which never, even in friendly territory, leaves my side – against Ashdod, his royal residence, and I besieged and conquered the cities of Ashdod, Gimtu (and) Asdudimmu. I declared the gods residing therein, himself, as well as the inhabitants of his country, the gold, silver (and) his personal possessions as booty. I reorganized these cities. I settled therein people from countries which I had conquered personally. I placed an officer of mine as governor over them and declared them Assyrian citizens and they bore (as such) my yoke.

1.2.6.3<sup>85</sup>

Azuri, king of Ashdod – his heart had schemed not to deliver tribute any more and he sent messages (full) of hostilities against Assyria, to the kings (living) in the vicinity. On account of the misdeed which he (thus) committed, I abolished the rule over the people of his country and made Ahimiti, his *favorite brother*, king over them. But the(se) Hittites, always planning evil deeds, hated his reign and elevated to rule over them Iamani who, without any claim to the throne, had no respect for authority – just as they themselves. With a rage in my heart, I did not (wait to) assemble the full might of my army (or to) prepare the camp(ing equipment), but started out towards Ashdod (only) with those of my warriors who, even in friendly areas, never leave my side. But this Iamani heard about the advance of my expedition, from afar, and he fled to the *frontier* of Egypt – which belongs (now) to Meluhha – and his (hiding) place could not be detected. I besieged (and) conquered the cities Ashdod, Gimtu (and) Asdudimmu; I declared his images, his wife, his children, all his possessions and treasures of his palace as well as the inhabitants of his country as booty. I reorganized these cities. [I settled] therein people from the countries which I had conquered personally, from [ ... ] of sunrise. [I installed an officer of mine as] govern[or] over [them] and declared them Assyrian citizens and they pulled (as such) the straps of my yoke. When the king of Meluhha who in ..., (in) the land of Urişsu, in an inapproachable region, the road [to which is ... ], whose fathers never – [from] remote [days] until now – had sent messengers to inquire after the health of my royal forefathers, he did hear, even (that) far away, of the might of Ashur, Nabû (and) Marduk. The awe-inspiring glamor of my kingship blinded him and terror overcame him. He threw him (scil. Iamani) in fetters, shackles and iron bands, and they brought him to Assyria, a long journey.

1.2.6.4<sup>86</sup>

Iamani from Ashdod, afraid of my weapons, left his wife and children and fled to the *frontier* of Egypt which belongs to [Meluhha] and stayed there like a thief. I installed an officer of mine as governor over his entire large country and its *prosperous* inhabitants, (thus) aggrandizing (again) the territory belonging to Ashur, the king of the gods. The terror(-inspiring) glamor of Ashur, my lord, overpowered (however) [the king of] Meluhha and they threw him (scil. Iamani) in fetters on hands and feet, and he sent him to me, to Assyria.

<sup>84</sup> Ann. 241-54. See Fuchs 1994, 132-35 (transliteration), 326 (translation). Line 246 has I.ia-ad-na. The translation follows Pritchard 1969, 286a with minor variations.

<sup>85</sup> Prunk 90-111. See Fuchs 1994, 219-22 (transliteration), 348f (translation). Line 95 and 101 have I.ia-ma-ni.

The translation follows Pritchard 1969, 286 with minor variations.

<sup>86</sup> XIV 11-14. See Fuchs 1994, 76 (transliteration), 308 (translation). Line 11 has I.ia-ma-ni. The translation follows Pritchard 1969, 285a with minor variations.

1.2.6.5<sup>87</sup>

I plundered the city of Ashdod. Iamani, its king, feared [my weapons] and ... He fled to the region of the land of Meluhha and lived (there) stealthfully (literally: like a thief). Šapatku' (Shebitku) king of the land of Meluhha, heard of the mig[ht] of the god Aššur, *Nabû*, (and) Marduk which *I had [demonstrated]* over all lands, ... He put (Iamani) in manacles and handcuffs ... he had him brought captive into my presence.

From a historical point of view, the course of events is rather clear and has been described many times.<sup>88</sup> There was some anti-Assyrian sentiment in Ashdod which caused king Azuri to stop delivering tribute. Sargon tried to solve the problem by choosing a loyal king called Ahimiti but he was overthrown by a nobody, a certain Iamani. The texts stress the ominous descent of Iamani.<sup>89</sup> While Ahimiti's government is regarded as legitimate, not only because he was installed by Sargon, but also because he was a member of the royal family, the aḫu tālimu of Azuri, Iamani had no right to the throne (lā bēl e<sup>is</sup>kussî) and no awe of rule (palāḫ bēlūti lā idû) and was made king by the inhabitants of the town (urabbû). He is introduced as a commoner (šāb ḥupšî)<sup>90</sup> and described as a thief (šarrāqîš).<sup>91</sup> He had a wife and children with him, and when Sargon advanced, he fled to Egypt. However, the king of Nubia ruling at this time over Egypt handed Iamani over to the Assyrian king. He was sent to Assyria in fetters and

details of his further fate are unknown.

Other attestations that could possibly be relevant remain rather unclear.<sup>92</sup>

Reviewing the material just presented, some substantial conclusions can be drawn. First, if someone is of the opinion that Greeks are concealed behind the name form Iaman+other suffixes than āja, then *all* concrete instances of these forms must be taken into consideration. For instance, there is no reason to include the Iamani of the legal documents, but to exclude the one in the royal inscription<sup>93</sup> or vice versa.<sup>94</sup>

Second, besides the philological differences between the forms Iam(a)n+āja and Iaman+suffixes other than āja, there is a difference on the semantic level. Whereas all forms of Iam(a)n+āja denote collectives the forms Iaman+suffixes other than āja point at individuals. This could be an explanation for the different forms of the nisbe but of course this stays hypothetical.

Third, the name variant for Iamani (i.e. Iadna) remains enigmatic and does not real-

<sup>87</sup> Inscription of Tang-i Var, line 19-21. See Frame 1999, 36 (transliteration), 40 (translation). Line 19 has I.ia-ma-ni. The translation is Frame's.

<sup>88</sup> See e. g. Grayson 1991. At last Fuchs 1998, 124-31, whose considerations concerning the identity of the ruler of Meluhha sending the fugitive Iamani to Sargon for punishment have yet to be corrected in the light of the only recently published inscription of Tang-i Var (Frame 1999) where in this context the first time the Nubian king I.šā-pa-ta-ku-u<sup>91</sup> (line 20), that is Shebitku, is mentioned. Since the Tang-i Var inscription is presumably to be dated to the year 706 and since Shebitku's reign was generally believed to be dated to 702-690 BC this has important implications on the chronology of the 25th dynasty. Cf. Frame 1999, 53f. Redford 1999.

<sup>89</sup> This is not true for the new Tang-i Var inscription where Iamani simply appears as king (line 19: MAN /

šarru) without mentioning any further details on his accession to the throne. This might be the case due to reasons of shortness and compression. In any case, the Nineveh-prism also calls Iamani a king.

<sup>90</sup> Nineveh-prism VII.b: K.1668+IV', 15. Fuchs 1998, 73 translates "einer aus dem niedern Volk."

<sup>91</sup> This picture is also present in the Tang-i Var inscription (line 19).

<sup>92</sup> Cf. ADD 801, Rev. 14: a-a-i-man-ni. The suggestion by Parpola 1970, 186f that the lines of Nimrud letter 12 (Saggs 1955, 127, plate XXX) also contain references to 'Ionians' seems to be implausible for line 44 and not to be very probable for line 41. See Brinkman 1989, 55 with n. 6.

<sup>93</sup> Mayer 1996, 470-73.

<sup>94</sup> Haider 1996.



ly help to get us further. It is in any case problematic to interpret Iadna as Iadnāya, i.e. Cypriot, which is expected to be Iadnāya, as Tadmor rightly stressed. This problem needs further investigation. But it seems on the same level problematic to propose that the reading Iadna might have been an error by Botta in copying the cuneiform text, because it does not fit the picture one has about the historical events and their relationship to each other.<sup>95</sup> At first sight it looks as if Iamani was not a fixed personal name, but a designation from outside for which also another term could be used. This might indicate that behind the two names there are hidden ethnic designations. However, this remains speculative.<sup>96</sup>

Fourth, Tadmor's observation remains valid and we cannot rule out that the forms Iaman+suffixes other than āja have a semitic origin and go back to the semitic root \*ymn, 'right.' But on the other hand I think this view also has some hypothetical aspects. It is true that the Neo-Assyrian nisbe is -āja and not -ī,<sup>97</sup> but a Western-Semitic influence does not seem completely inconceivable. So the discussion about this question should not be closed as J. Elayi and A. Cavigneaux were arguing apodictically.

Fifth, and I think this is a very important point, the problem has remarkable historical implications concerning the question of what the Greeks were doing in the Ancient

Near East around the year 700 BC. Looking at the Iam(a)nāja only, there is no clear hint for Greek mercenaries in the Near East at the time of the Neo-Assyrian empire. This is – and contrary to the view Kearsley recently expressed – also true for the substantial texts from the time of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II. But what these texts obviously show are other important facts. Barbara Patzek, having the Greek point of view in mind, has defined the relationship between Greece and the Levant as "Fernverhältnis," as a relationship of far distance. This is also valid for the Assyrian point of view. As already stressed it is quite remarkable that Sargon II has chosen these Greeks "in the midst of the Sea" to act as the most western limits of his huge empire which should even exceed the dimensions Tiglath-pileser III had reached. Esarhaddon could only repeat this topos. So it is highly improbable that Sargon used the expression "in the midst of the sea" to point at Cyprus/Iadnana<sup>98</sup> but it is more likely that it was used to mark a region farther to the West which was primarily reached on the sea route. But it is also problematic to identify these 'Iam(a)nāja' with the Ionians of the later Greek sources and to look only at the coast of Western Asia.<sup>99</sup> The conception of an Ionian identity might have come into being only in the second half of the 6th century<sup>100</sup> and it might have used an old expression which origi-

<sup>95</sup> So Elayi/Cavigneaux 1979, 61. Lanfranchi 2000, 13, n. 20 proposes an emendation ia-am<sup>11</sup>-na.

<sup>96</sup> But cf. also Lanfranchi, *ibid.*, who emphasises the fact that all examples which have Iaman+other suffixes than āya are preceded by the proper name indicator "I" (also Iadna) whereas the forms with Iam(a)nāja are preceded by the determinative "LÚ" "KUR" or "URU." Lanfranchi concludes that the forms Iaman+other suffixes than āya are consequently not ethnonyms. This is certainly true, but does this consideration completely deny the possibility that the personal names of this type might be connected etymologically with Iam(a)nāja?

<sup>97</sup> See e. g. Radner 1998, s. v. Arbailāiu [I.(URU)arba-īl(KI)-a-a]; Arbāiu [I.ar-ab-a(-a)(-u); I.(LÚ\*)ār-ba-a-a; I.ār-ba-īā]; Arraphāiu [I.(URU.)arrap-ḥa-a-a]; Aššūrāiu [I.<sup>(d)</sup>(URU.)aš-šur-a-a]. Radner 1999, s. v. Bābilāiu [I.

(URU).KÁ.DINGIR.(RA)-a(-a)/TIN.TIR.KI-a-a]; Barḥalzāiu [I.bar-ḥal-za-a-a]; Belāiu [I.bé-la-a-a]; Birtāiu [I.bir (bi-ir)-ta-a-a/ḤAL.ŠU-a-a]; Burnukkāiu [I.bur-nu-ka-a-a]; Būrtāiu [I.bu-ur-ta-a-a]; Būšāiu [I.bu-ša-a-a]; Dērāiu [I.(URU.)de-ra-a-a]; Dū'āiu [I.du-u-a(-a)]; Eridāiu [I.ERI.DŪG-a-a]; Gambūlāiu [I.gam.bu-la-a-a]; Gurrāiu [I.gur-ra-a(-a)]. See also Bābāia; Bānāia; Bāzāiu; Bēlāiu; Buṭunāiu; Damqāia; Dannāia; Dunnāia; Ebūrāiu; Ēqāiu; Esinnāiu; Ešrāiu; Ešidāiu.

<sup>98</sup> So Elayi/Cavigneaux 1979.

<sup>99</sup> See also Burkert 1992, 13. Burkert 1998, 69 who proposes to identify the Assyrian 'Ionians' with "Greci dell'Eubea e forse anche delle altre isole e di Atene che esercitavano con successo il commercio."

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Ulf 1996. Ulf 1997.

nally had other implications. Taking into consideration that the highest quantities of Greek pottery unearthed in the Levant – see below – originate from about the Aegæan Sea including Eubœa, (Dorian) Rhodes and later Corinth, it might be a good working hypothesis to identify the area the ‘Iam(a)nāya’ came from with a zone of “central Greece” Ian Morris defined, and which also has the highest level of oriental imports in the Greek world.<sup>101</sup> Concerning the activities of the ‘Iam(a)nāya,’ piracy and plundering, combined with very mobile ships are clearly referred to by the Assyrian texts. Trade does not play any role in the inscriptions, but this does not mean that plundering and robbing were the only activities of Greeks in the Near East.

Here we have to take into consideration the special focus of the Assyrian royal inscriptions which are concentrated on warfare and the amazing deeds of the Assyrian king. They are ideological statements about the Assyrian king and about the Assyrian national god, Aššur. It is the archaeological evidence which broadens the picture considerably. Concerning the possible presence of Greeks from the archaeological point of view, recent years have shown that it is not without problems to regard every piece of Greek pottery as evidence for Greeks in the Levant.<sup>102</sup> Such pottery has been uncovered in Tyre covering a period from about 950 until the 7th century, mainly Eubœan table-ware with declining quantities after the middle of the 8th century.<sup>103</sup> In late 10th and early 9th century Ras el-Bassit, there is a similar situation. But the picture changes here at the end of the 8th century when Greek pottery increases con-

siderably (from Eubœa, the Aegæan islands, Rhodes and Corinth) and there are some houses where this Greek table-service dominates. This might indicate Greek presence with high probability.<sup>104</sup> The findings from Tell Sukas/Shuksu make a similar impression, where there is some, but not too much, Greek pottery between 800 BC and the time around 670 BC. Beginning with this time of reconstruction, obviously after a destruction caused by the Assyrians, Greek presence seems indicated by the increasing mass of pottery, a Greek sanctuary on the acropolis and Greek inhumations.<sup>105</sup> Ras Ibn Hani has Eubœan and Ionian pottery since the 8th century and in the 7th century Rhodian ware appears.<sup>106</sup> For Al Mina there are still some open questions concerning the time and circumstances of the beginning of the place. Peter Haider among others has argued for a native Syrian establishment around the 820’s where very soon Greek pottery appears. But only after Greek weapons, tools and fibula have occurred around 750 BC (level 8), does he propose the existence of a Greek settlement.<sup>107</sup> R. A. Kearsley, analysing new pottery from the British Museum, stated that level 9 was predominated overwhelmingly by Greek pottery, whereas this dominance declines in level 8. For this reason he regarded the site as a Greek establishment which he interpreted as a mercenary encampment followed by a period of increasing Phœnician influence wherein trade becomes more important.<sup>108</sup> But this picture is very hypothetical. This is certainly true for the so-called mercenary encampment where the textual evidence is by no means as conclusive as Kearsley thought.<sup>109</sup> And it seems also valid for the

<sup>101</sup> I. Morris 1998, 13-36.

<sup>102</sup> Waldbaum 1994. Waldbaum 1997. Haider 1996.

<sup>103</sup> Haider 1996, 60-62.

<sup>104</sup> Haider 1996, 62f.

<sup>105</sup> Haider 1996, 64.

<sup>106</sup> Haider 1996, 66.

<sup>107</sup> Haider 1996, 66f.

<sup>108</sup> Kearsley 1999.

<sup>109</sup> See above.

archaeological interpretation taking into account Waldbaum's observation that the material preserved in the many collections might not represent an adequate picture since it was primarily the Greek pottery which was collected whereas the local ware disappeared to a high degree.<sup>110</sup> In Tell Tainat, Eubœan table ware appears since the late 9th century. This material increases in the 8th century. This might include Greek presence, but the question remains open. The same is the case with the remains of Çatal Hüyük and Judeideh and to a lesser degree of Hama/Hamath and its harbour Tabbat al-Hammam, where only after 700 BC the Greek imports become more considerable.<sup>111</sup> In South-Syria and Palestine there are also some sites with Greek pottery from the 8th and 7th century but the native ware remains quite dominant and a Greek presence is fairly speculative. This is true for Khaldé, Tamburit, Sarepta, Tell Kabri, Tell el-Fukhar/Akko, Tell Abu Hawam, Dor, Ascalon, Tell Migne/Ekron, Megiddo, Samaria, Tell es-Safi/Gath.<sup>112</sup>

In Cilicia, Tarsos plays an important role. There is already Greek pottery between 850 BC and 700 BC and an obvious accumulation of this material in one house (house H). At least some Greeks might have stayed there. The material obviously increases in the 7th century and a greater Greek presence is very probable.<sup>113</sup> A similar picture is valid for Mersin, where at least for the 7th century a Greek settlement might be reckoned with, obviously with strong connections to Rhodes.<sup>114</sup> Finally Soloi is attested as a Greek colony by Hesiod and the foundation of the Samian colonies Nagidos and Kelenderis might have originated in the 7th century.<sup>115</sup>

In general, the historical outline gained from this picture might be summarized in the following way: Luxurious Greek table-service appears in the Levant in the second half of the 10th and in Cilicia after the middle of the 9th century. This ware is dominated until the end of the 8th century by Eubœan pottery whereas after the 7th century, Ionian and Rhodian ware becomes more important. But it is not until about 750 BC that we have evidence for a Greek presence in Al Mina, followed by Ras el-Bassit at the end of the 8th and by Tell Sukas at the beginning of the 7th century. For Tarsos and Mersin some Greeks might have already settled in the late 8th and with much higher probability in the 7th century. The last date is also true for Soloi. Looking at the Greek findings from these sites, commerce seems to have played the dominant role. Only for the very late 7th century and the following period is there evidence for Greek presence at Ras el-Bassit/Posideion, Tabat al-Hamam and Tyre. And it is for this time that Greek mercenaries are attested in some fortresses in central and southern Palestine like Tell Kabri, Meshad Hashavyahu, Tell Batash/Timnah, Tell Sera'/Ziklag and Arad.<sup>116</sup> There Greek pottery, lamps, weapons and tools were in daily use, and it seems that these mercenaries were provided with their local wine products and had their own armourers.

So the historical picture becomes more precise. It is the activities of commerce, robbing and plundering, with ill-defined boundaries between each other, which dominated the Greek presence in the Ancient Near East at the time of the Assyrian empire, and this activity concentrated mainly on the western fringes of the empire.

<sup>110</sup> Waldbaum 1997.

<sup>111</sup> Haider 1996, 67-69.

<sup>112</sup> Haider 1996, 69-74. Waldbaum 1994.

<sup>113</sup> Haider 1996, 82-84.

<sup>114</sup> Haider 1996, 84.

<sup>115</sup> Haider 1996, 85.

<sup>116</sup> Haider 1996, 71, 75-79.

There were some Greeks in the Assyrian capital but it remains unclear in what role. The existence of mercenaries seems to be an open question during this early time.

Now if we have a look at the texts mentioning Iaman+suffixes other than *āya*, then the picture changes considerably. It is the inner parts of the empire where these people are acting and the fringes seem to be the exception. They are not outsiders, but ‘citizens’ living in houses and having families. Robbery and plunder do not play any role. These persons seem to have reached distinguished positions in the local societies. They are involved in legal transactions, using documents and formulas common in the Assyrian Empire. They are selling and buying, and are acting as witnesses. In one case, such a person might have had an official function. The *rab ḥanše* (see above 1.2.1.2) might be a military leader,<sup>117</sup> but it is by no means clear if he was a mercenary in a higher position or a regular commander. Also here our interpretation depends to a large degree on where we think this *rab ḥanše* was coming from. Is the relatively homogeneous picture of these persons, and the remarkable dissimilarity to persons called *Iam(a)nāya*, an argument for the difference of both groups? I think not really, because the view-point of

the relevant texts has to be considered as well. There are mainly legal texts which have a completely different focus than the royal inscriptions. And it is interesting to note that the only person who makes another impression of his social background is *Iamani* of Ashdod, appearing in the inscriptions of Sargon. His behaviour and his career have much more in common with the *Iam(a)nāya* than with the persons who bear a similar type of name as his, i.e. *Iaman*+suffixes other than *āya*.<sup>118</sup> But what becomes obvious from this discussion is that the historical picture we have about the contacts between the early Greeks and the Neo-Assyrian empire depends to a large degree on the sources we use, and it is the quality of contact which differs considerably depending on which of these lenses we view it through. However, I do not want to close with this somewhat naïve statement, and I want to add two further observations.

First, beyond the difficult question concerning which cuneiform texts we use for historical reconstruction, there are at least some small hints that Greek mercenaries might have been in service in the Ancient Near East even in Neo-Assyrian times.<sup>119</sup>

Apart from later evidence in Greek sources, there is one important cuneiform testimony shedding light on the scale of contact

<sup>117</sup> Cf. AHW 318b.

<sup>118</sup> There might be one additional point which could connect *Iamani* of Ashdod with the ‘Ionians.’ Nineveh-prism (Annals of the year 711 BC), VII.b: K.1668+IV, 25-30 describes the attempts of the rebellious *Iamani* to gain some allies against Sargon. Besides Palestine (*Pilište*), *Juda* (*Iaudi*), *Edom* (*Udume*) and *Moab* (*Mabi*) I. 27 adduces the anonymous *āšibūt tāmti* which literally means “the one living in/near the sea.” If one understands the line as “the one living in the sea” we could really think about the Ionians who Sargon himself qualifies in other texts as coming from the midst of the sea (see above). In this case *Iamani* would have looked for contact with Ionians from the West, possibly the same pirates Sargon fought against some years earlier in Cilicia in his 7th *palū*, i.e. 715 according to his *Khorsabad Annals* (for the chronological framework of the *Iamani*-episode see Fuchs 1998, 85-96). Fuchs 1998, 73 n. 103 argued that it

is highly improbable to understand *āšibūt tāmti* as “Meeresbewohner,” “da die von den Rebellen Umworbene allesamt Tributlieferanten Assyriens gewesen sein sollen, was auf die Jonier nicht zutrifft.” He prefers to understand the expression as “the one living near the sea”: “Die Angabe wird sich eher auf die am Meer gelegenen Nachbarstädte Ašdods beziehen, was Pilište einschliesse.” It is true that lines 27f add to the list of the possible allies “*nāš bil[ti ū / t]āmarti ša Aššur bēlij[a]*,” “who had to bring tribute and gifts to my lord Ashur” but principally these words need not necessarily encompass all members of the list as Fuchs’ translation suggests (“die (allesamt) Assur, meinem Herrn, tribut- [und] abgabepflichtig waren”). In this case it remains unclear why *Pilište* is mentioned twice (*Pilište* and “the one living near the sea”). So the problem remains open.

<sup>119</sup> Besides, there might also be some archaeological evidence. See Bettalli 1994, 44-46.

between Greece and the Ancient Near East in the first half of 7th century BC. The undated Assyrian letter ABL 140, originating for prosopographical reasons from the time of Esarhaddon (680-669 BC), refers to 15 persons who were sent from the governor of Der to Nabû-râ'im-nišê-šu and Salamānu. These 15 persons are qualified as LÚ.maqtûte (obv. 6, rev. 5) which seems to be a kind of fugitive.<sup>120</sup> Partly they are adduced by their names and there is one of them called Addikritušu (I.ad-di-ik-ri-tú-šú; rev. 2) who is obviously a Greek Ἀντίκριτος.<sup>121</sup> Though there is never absolute certainty that the bearer of a given name belongs to the ethnolinguistic community which stands behind the language of the name, it seems undoubtedly to be so in this case, because there is no reason why an oriental individual should adopt a Greek personal name. It is a pity that we do not learn further biographical details about the 15 LÚ.maqtûte. This is related to the question of the motives for these individuals to have been included in this group, and concerning Ἀντίκριτος especially, one questions his reasons for coming to Assyria. We cannot exclude the possibility that he was a mercenary.<sup>122</sup> But what is more important is the fact that for the first time we have the unquestionable example of a Greek individual moving in the eastern parts of the Assyrian Empire in the first half of the 7th century BC. This means that the existence of Greeks at this time is not restricted to the western fringes

of the empire,<sup>123</sup> and we can reckon that at least some of them have seen parts of inner regions, including the capitals.<sup>124</sup> Even if there seem to exist hardly any early Greek sources mentioning Ninos-Nineveh,<sup>125</sup> it is these Greek sources which exhibit further pieces of information about Greek mercenaries in the Ancient Near East.

A fragment of the lost Aigyptiaka of Aristagoras from Milet preserved in the Strategemata of Polyæn (VII.3) mentions Carian mercenaries fighting with Psammetichos against Tementhes, i.e. Tanutamun. Since Psammetichos was at this time still in Assyrian service he may have operated with an Assyrian army, and since the Carians belonged to a milieu of western Asians it is plausible that some Greeks might also have played a role.<sup>126</sup>

Further, in a fragment of Abydenos (FrG Hist 685 F 5 (7)) there appears a certain Pythagoras who allegedly supported Esarhaddon with troops from Byzantion. Abydenos equates this Pythagoras with the famous philosopher, but this might have been an error.<sup>127</sup> And if the supposition is valid that Byzantion should be understood as Buzanta in Cilicia, then we gain a useful piece of historical geography. It has also been proposed that this Pythagoras might be identical with Pilagura of Kitrusi (Chytros), one of the ten kings of Cyprus mentioned in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon,<sup>128</sup> and that the Assyrian king might have rewarded a Greek mercenary with the rule over a Cyp-

<sup>120</sup> AHW 608: "Entlaufener, Überläufer." CAD M/I 255b: "fugitive."

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Radner 1998, 52a where Lipiński interprets the name as Ἀδάκρυτος (without any accent mark) which he understands as "not moving to tears." But this interpretation is not tenable. Cf. Rollinger/Korenjak 2001.

<sup>122</sup> Lipiński interpreting I.ad-di-ik-ri-tú-šú as Ἀδάκρυτος, i.e. "not moving to tears" might have had a mercenary in mind because the name seems to fit a soldier perfectly.

<sup>123</sup> As is also shown by the texts 1.1.3.2 and 1.1.5 discussed above.

<sup>124</sup> From the archaeological point of view there is only one very scanty hint which might refer to a Greek presence in the Assyrian heartland: a small sherd from Nineveh. See Boardman 1997.

<sup>125</sup> The generally accepted view that Phoc. Fr. 4 Gentili-Prato represents the earliest Greek reference to Ninos-Nineveh (cf. Kuhrt 1982, 539-41) is not based on solid ground. The fragment probably originates from late Hellenistic times. See Korenjak/Rollinger 2001.

<sup>126</sup> Haider 1996, 93.

<sup>127</sup> Haider 1996, 91f.

<sup>128</sup> Lipiński 1991.

riot town. In this case, Abydenos' source (which should have been Berossos) might have confused the two names, and the mercenary is in reality a Philagoras.<sup>129</sup> But there is much speculation and the evidence remains at best meagre.

So the question of Greek mercenaries seems closely connected to the question regarding who Iamani of Ashdod and Iamani rab ḥanše might have been. But there is another point. Apart from the question concerning the identity of Iamani of Ashdod, the information we have about him reveals both the basic historical conditions and illustrates the possibilities open to an individual at that time. Iamani is introduced as a nobody whose rise is connected with the special circumstances of his time. It was a situation dependent on the Assyrian advance into Syria and Palestine since the days of Tiglath-pileser III, which produced new conditions of warfare, changing alliances and growing possibilities of personal success. This was the hour of underdogs and adventurers, both from the local milieu and outside, to play an important role. According to this view it seems not so important to answer who Iamani was, but to exhibit that there was a fairly new historical situation wherein such persons could have gained importance.<sup>130</sup>

Second, the evidence from the Ancient Near East, textual and archaeological, should not be looked at in isolation but it should be integrated into a Greek scenario. Many studies have the tendency to view the

Greek material as a phenomenon settled at the fringes of the empire, neglecting to look for its historical setting and origin. On the other side, the Greek perspective often omits important data from the Ancient Near East which could help to focus the picture. This seems a broad area for further research and I would only like to touch upon some possible questions where such an interdisciplinary approach might prosper.

The problem starts with the 10th century when the findings from Lefkandi and their relationship to the orient gain significance. At the same time there appears Eubœan table-service in some households of the Levant. This pottery has been interpreted convincingly as a luxury used by a local upper class. John Boardman even thought that this pottery had been shipped by Eubœan traders and not by Phœnicians.<sup>131</sup> Even if we do not touch upon this problem, the question remains as to what this means for the Greek world, or let us better say, for some parts of the Greek world. The archaeological evidence for central Greece in this time points out that what happened in Lefkandi was unusual for Greece. What role did contact with the orient play in this apparently uncommon development? How was the society in Lefkandi organized? Is it conceivable that relatively small, basically-formed political entities could support such far-reaching relationships? How do we explain the circumstance that such societies' luxury wares were delivered to more highly developed cultural regions in the Levant?<sup>132</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Lipiński 1991, 59. Bettalli 1994, 48f.

<sup>130</sup> So I do not agree with Bettalli 1994, 47 who stated concerning the identity of Iamani: "Allo stato attuale delle nostre conoscenze, anche se la questione resta aperta, non ci sono sufficienti elementi per includere la rivolta di Ashdod nella storia della relazioni tra Greci e Assiri e, quindi, nella storia del mercenariato greco nella regione."

<sup>131</sup> Boardman 1990. Popham 1994, 28f. See also Boardman 1996. Boardman/Popham 1997. But cf. now the radiocarbon dates presented by Aubet <sup>2</sup>1994, 317-23, which seem to reach back to the 9th century BC. See also Niemeyer 1999, 158-65. Papadopoulos 1996. Gauer 1996,

1996, 516 even considers the 'Heröon' as the grave of a Phœnician 'prince.'

<sup>132</sup> In a general way Sherratt/Sherratt 1993 focus on this problem arguing also the conception of 'secondary state formation' and proposing that only in a second step – after Orientals (Phœnicians) had been looking for and trading with raw materials – Greek societies explored the oriental market delivering special products. Concerning the picture of changing economic parameters in the Mediterranean of the first half of the 1st millennium BC which plays a fundamental role in the article of Sherratt/Sherratt, see also Liverani 1997.

Here another point begins to gain prominence. Lefkandi is remarkable not only for the enormity of the ‘monumental’ building erected there at the Toumba cemetery, but also for the character of this building. It looks like a herōon and Ian Morris has pointed to the fact that Lefkandi was also special for its relationship to the past, giving old artefacts a present meaning and searching for a new identity in the context of a changing world.<sup>133</sup> What role did oriental culture play in this connection – with its impressive mythic-historic traditions reaching far into the past – such that those who came into contact with them were confronted with the question “Who are we?”<sup>134</sup>

This development seems to have reached dramatic dimensions in the years around 700 BC. At least at this time the question of transfer becomes more concrete because now there are certainly Greeks present in the Ancient Near East. Concerning what Ian Morris defined as central Greece, there are several waves of change which give an impression of the upheavals. Oriental imports increase considerably at this time, beginning in the houses and graves, and after 700 BC, in the now appearing sanctuaries. Even

though there are important studies concerning several aspects of this oriental import<sup>135</sup> it is still a desideratum to treat this material as a whole, looking for its geographical epicenters of expansion and interpreting its historical value.<sup>136</sup>

The same is true for the borrowing and adaptation of the script from the Ancient Near East. Recent years have yielded many studies concerned with these questions, with special attention paid to the actual areas of contact in the Levant and Asia Minor<sup>137</sup> as well as the culture-transfers themselves.<sup>138</sup> But it is still desirable to embed these observations in a more cross-cultural view, to connect them with the broader context of all the other orientalia in Greece taking into account local diversifications and asking for the social and cultural preconditions and consequences for such phenomena.

Combining inter-cultural perspectives and socio-political implications might be fruitful in other fields of research too. So it is, for example, clear that commerce has to be organised in some way and that this organisation became more important, the more the Greeks had fixed localities, beginning with Al Mina. Contact with local political en-

<sup>133</sup> I. Morris 1997, 543.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Lorenz 1996 who proposes to explain the emergence of heroic cults by the stimulating influence of the Ancient Near East and its far reaching past.

<sup>135</sup> See Kilian-Dirlmeier 1985. Matthäus 1993. See also Niemeyer 1999, 161.

<sup>136</sup> See Haider 1996, 95.

<sup>137</sup> Röllig 1992. Röllig 1996. Röllig 1998. See also Caruba 1993.

<sup>138</sup> Heubeck 1986. Powell 1991. Marek 1993. Ruijgh 1997. Ruijgh 1998. Slings 1998. Neu 1999. See also Osborne 1996, 110-11. Concerning the connection between writing and state-formation see Haude 1999.

<sup>139</sup> It seems obvious that the so-called Greek ‘colonisation’ was a very varied and complex phenomenon, changing according to the various regions and their cultural features. So this ‘colonisation’ had completely different characteristics in the Levant with its oriental city states than in agricultural areas like the shores of the Black Sea or Sicily. For this reason we are not dealing with all aspects if we treat this historical phenomenon in a uniform way and with strong hellenocentric tensions like

Gauer, 1998, 44, recently did in a quite extreme manner:

Denn nur durch die Bereitschaft, in einem größeren Rahmen und unter fremder Herrschaft zu ‘dienen,’ konnten die Griechen auch in aller Welt ihre befruchtende politische und kulturelle Wirksamkeit entfalten. Sie haben dies mit der gleichen Bereitschaft getan, mit der, um ein uns näherliegendes Beispiel zu nennen, vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert die italienischen Musiker, Schauspieler und Künstler an unseren Fürstenthöfen gedient und die Städte Frankreichs, Deutschlands, Polens und Rußlands durch ihre Bauten verschönert haben. Wie die Hellenen der Antike haben die Italiener dies im Dienst einer überlegenen Kultur getan, nicht aber als Sendboten einer beherrschenden politischen Macht. Was die Einsatzbereitschaft angeht, bietet sich der Vergleich mit den Missionaren und Nonnen früherer Jahrhunderte und mit den Entwicklungshelfern an, die in unserer Zeit in der dritten Welt ‘dienen,’ mit der ‘Demut’ beispielsweise eines Albert Schweitzer und einer Mutter Theresa.

Cf. generally the contributions in Descoeudres 1990. Miller 1997. Coleman/Walz 1997.

tities must have taken place in some way.<sup>139</sup>

This touches the question of ‘diplomacy,’ including treaties, agreements, stipulations and the possible influence of oriental traditions in this field.<sup>140</sup> Peter Karavites has treated this topic, looking for parallels in structure and content, but he restricted his work to the Late Bronze Age not taking into account the abundant evidence from Neo-Assyrian times.<sup>141</sup> It is these times where on many levels contacts expand which cannot be observed earlier. Certainly this might not only include writing and stipulating but also the broader context of law-giving.<sup>142</sup> Furthermore, during these times, new dimensions of ‘Staatlichkeit’ are observable not only in Greece but also in the Assyrian empire. Peter Machinist has demonstrated how an Assyrian conception of state and its people came into being since the times of Tiglath-pileser III.<sup>143</sup> This conception was presented in highly developed terminology as a supranational one, encompassing the elements of state (empire) and membership (people). Such conceptions must have made their impression on newcomers from outside and they must have changed their world view vigorously.<sup>144</sup> In addition to

these observations, even the phenomenon of secondary state formation should also be taken into account for the Greek world where new conditions occur.<sup>145</sup> At least some regions at the western and eastern periphery of the empire show rapid changes in political structure, demography, settlement patterns and economic matters when they came into contact with the highly developed Assyrian state.<sup>146</sup> And the stimulating influence of the “Assyrian international trading network”<sup>147</sup> might even have reached as far west as Spain.<sup>148</sup>

On the other side we own an extraordinarily important source with the Homeric epics reflecting a Greek society in transition. We do not know exactly when these epics came into being, but it seems clear that their place in history are the years around 700 BC, even if epic distance and conscious archaization create a somehow fictional world.<sup>149</sup> These epics not only show a panhellenic dimension creating a special form of identity,<sup>150</sup> the emergence of new perspectives in politics and inter-state relations,<sup>151</sup> new horizons in commerce<sup>152</sup> and warfare,<sup>153</sup> but also a desire to have an ‘own past’ and history<sup>154</sup> which in my opinion cannot be explained

<sup>140</sup> Matthäus 1993, 168.

<sup>141</sup> Karavites 1992. See also Karavites 1986. S. Morris 1997, 610. For the Neo-Assyrian material see Parpola/Watanabe 1987. See generally Baltrusch 1994.

<sup>142</sup> Hölkeskamp 1992 [1995]. Hölkeskamp 1999. See also the contributions in Gehrke 1994. Fadinger 1996. Raaflaub 1997b.

<sup>143</sup> Machinist 1993.

<sup>144</sup> See now also Lanfranchi 2000.

<sup>145</sup> Raaflaub 1997a. Raaflaub 1997c.

<sup>146</sup> See for the West Gitin 1997, concerning especially the region of modern Israel, and Rupp 1998, 216-18 for Cyprus. For the East, especially the regions of the central Zagros and Färs see Brown 1986, Brown 1988 and Rollinger 1999.

<sup>147</sup> Gitin 1997, 85. Rupp 1998, 217. But cf. Niemeyer 1999, 170-75, who modifies the role the Assyrian Empire played concerning the Phoenician expansion: “Das aufstrebende neuassyrische Reich hat sich sehr wohl diese Entwicklung im Laufe der Zeit erfolgreich zunutze zu machen verstanden, aber ausgelöst hat es sie nicht.” (p. 175). See generally Sherratt/Sherratt 1993.

<sup>148</sup> Aubet 1993, 45-76, 266-73. Niemeyer 1999.

<sup>149</sup> Raaflaub 1998. See also Ulf 1990. Ulf 2001.

<sup>150</sup> Raaflaub 1998, 177.

<sup>151</sup> Raaflaub 1997a. Raaflaub 1997c. See also Kistler 1998, esp. 147-80, who describes the emergence of a new political “constitution” in Athens at the turn from the 8th to the 7th century BC, the existence of a “bürgergemeinschaftlicher Gesamtverband” and a new élite with a new ideology who adopted an oriental practice of self-representation, a “Lebensstil, der sich im aktiven Partizipieren am Gelage der Müssiggänger, dem *marzeah*, zentrierte” (p. 178). Niemeyer 1999, 168 generally sees in the Mediterranean world the emergence of a “Elite-Horizont ..., dessen Mitglieder sich durch gemeinsame Ideale und Verhaltensweisen, z.B. das aristokratisch-ritualisierte Symposion, unabhängig von den jeweils eigenen kulturellen Traditionen sozialisiert haben.” See also Rupp 1998, 216.

<sup>152</sup> Donlan 1997.

<sup>153</sup> Wees 1992. Wees 1997.

<sup>154</sup> Bichler/Sieberer 1996.



plausibly without the stimulating influence of the Ancient Near Eastern culture where these things already existed.<sup>155</sup>

But let us come back to our point of departure, i.e. the roles in which Greeks were appearing in the Levant around this time. The roles of commerce and piracy are well attested in the epics, and some episodes in the cuneiform texts and in the epic traditions have striking parallels.<sup>156</sup> The amazing orient with its technical skill, craftsmanship and famous goods is reflected many times and reveals the importance of commerce.<sup>157</sup> But the other side is also attested, exhibiting plunder and piracy. Philip de Souza has discussed the relevant passages recently but he completely omitted the oriental material which broadens our picture considerably.<sup>158</sup>

It is interesting to note that, contrary to commerce and piracy, there is no explicit reference to mercenaries in the epics.<sup>159</sup> One might think of the 'Cretan' Odysseus, staying at the court of the Egyptian king for seven years after he and his companions failed in marauding the country (Odyssey 14.259-286). But it is not mentioned explicitly what Odysseus did at the Pharaoh's side, and his sojourn in the land of the Nile seems more to follow the rules of hospitality. It is much the same picture that the cuneiform sources present if we only look at the ethnonym *Iam(a)nāja*. As already

stated, Greek mercenaries might have existed with a certain probability at this time, but it looks like a rather new phenomenon originating in the new situation when the Assyrian army appeared in Syria and Palestine.<sup>160</sup> Maybe the silence of the epics about this form of activity has to be interpreted as an element of the "archaizing patina" typical to the poet's attitude of "ideological distortion."<sup>161</sup> This might be a consideration to ponder. If this is true, Greek mercenaries might have developed in larger quantities and on a broader scale only in the time after 600 BC when the oriental sources, without doubt, witness to this phenomenon.<sup>162</sup>

Does this have relevance for the genesis of the Greek society? It must have in some way, because a society whose members show several activities far afield, including commerce, piracy and the mobilization of mercenaries, should exhibit some characteristic features. In any case these activities are in no way only a field of aristocratic behaviour like Marco Bettalli meant<sup>163</sup> but more a broader phenomenon, which not only has its roots in searching for adventure and honour on a somehow heroic level, but also must have been caused by some kind of compulsion tearing individuals out of their social framework and forcing them to look for their luck in other fields.<sup>164</sup>

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Polignac 1992.

<sup>156</sup> It also fits very well to the new economic conditions of the beginning Iron Age described by Sherratt/Sherratt 1993. See esp. p. 362, 366.

<sup>157</sup> Patzek 1996b. Bichler/Sieberer 1996.

<sup>158</sup> Souza 1995. Souza 1999, 17-26. See also Souza 1998, 272f who points at the development of Greek 'warships' in the late eighth century.

<sup>159</sup> For the organisation and "common identity" of Greek mercenaries according to Greek literary sources see Trundle 1999. For a possible echo in the Iliad of the problems of a multilingual army of the Ancient Near East see Patzek 1996a, 223f. Cf. also McKechnie 1994.

<sup>160</sup> Another point is to be also aware of indirect evidence which might indicate Greek mercenaries at this time, i.e. descriptions of battling in the epics with close parallels to Assyrian Royal inscriptions (see Rollinger 1996, 159-

77), and depictions of fighting warriors and dead ones (e. g. the so called 'Leichenstapel') in Greek vase painting (see Kistler 2001). Although the 'warrior graves' of the 8th century might be taken into consideration in this respect (see I. Morris 1998, 15-19).

The famous 'Söldnerlied' of Hybrias of Kreta, handed down by Athenaios XV 695f-96a seems to belong to the Archaic Age. But it is more probable that this is the 6th century BC where also Archilochos, the famous brother of Alkaios, is well attested as a mercenary in the East.

<sup>161</sup> Raaflaub 1998, 182.

<sup>162</sup> Brinkman 1989. Bettalli 1994. Haider 1996.

<sup>163</sup> Bettalli 1994, 52.

<sup>164</sup> There is also the problematic question concerning at what period we are allowed to talk about 'élites' or 'aristocrats' in Greece. For an extensive critique concerning the idea that these social groups were already in

Of course there must have been special and also autochthonous preconditions which lead to such a situation. Snodgrass interpreted the archaeological evidence in the light of a dramatic increase of population between 750 and 700. He also thought that this development was connected with a shift from pastoralism to arable farming, political centralization, more intense warfare and the emergence of cultural elements linked with the city-state.<sup>165</sup> Ian Morris pointed out that the population increase in this dimension might have been exaggerated, but agreed that there must have been a significant change. He regarded this change as a sign of a “social revolution - no other expression does justice to the breadth and depth of the changes” and, “however we interpret the details, we cannot doubt that in the second half of the eighth century the old Dark Age order collapsed.”<sup>166</sup> But the reasons for this dramatic change still are not very clear. Morris speculated about “economic causes,” confessing that “so far there is little concrete archaeological evidence to support Snodgrass’ suggestion to a shift toward more intensive arable farming,” but this seems only one, very hypothetical, proposition. So many questions remain unanswered.

At the same time, it would be desirable to bring into greater focus the role which the Ancient Near East played in the above-mentioned connections, as well as the more precise characterization of East-West influences – direct or indirect – which led to the Greek culture adopting practices from the Orient. Much work remains to be done and one should focus on these problems from both Oriental and Western perspectives. If we agree that “the more we learn about it the clearer it becomes that knowledge of Near Eastern events, traditions, objects, and motifs has substantially influenced the epic narrative and picture,”<sup>167</sup> we should also take the framework of social, economic and political structures into the calculation.<sup>168</sup>

It was not the aim of this paper to present definite and absolute solutions to problems that have been discussed for a long time in scholarship. It principally intended to focus on these problems *including* a Near Eastern perspective, which might in the future lead to a better understanding of what we call the development of Greek society. And there is one final point we should not pass over: In recent years it has been postulated more and more that the Homeric epics should date to the first half of the 7th rather than to the end of the 8th century.<sup>169</sup> If this is true, then the

---

existence in the Dark Ages, cf. Ulf 1990. In Ulf’s opinion, it is the second half of the 8th century when contacts with the East evolved complex stratifications in Greek societies, whereas he prefers to qualify the Dark Ages’ societies as “Big-man-Gesellschaften.” Ulf 2001, 171:

Eine Surplus-Produktion ist in big-man-Gesellschaften dann nicht ungewöhnlich, wenn die big men miteinander in Konkurrenz stehen. Sie wird insbesondere dann noch gesteigert, wenn die für big-man-Gesellschaften charakteristische Gabenökonomie mit einer bisher außerhalb des eigenen Gesichtsfeldes liegenden, anders gearteten Ökonomie in Kontakt gerät. Eben das ist bei der Begegnung der Griechen mit den Kulturen des Orients bzw. Ägyptens, aus denen die Importgüter stammen, der Fall. Erst als mögliche Folge solchen Kontakts wird in der Anthropologie/Ethnologie eine sich verstärkende soziale Distanz unter denen, die im Bereich der Gabenökonomie leben, genannt. Gerade diese Möglichkeit fügt sich gut zu dem Sachverhalt,

daß die Griechen selbst den Kontakt zum Orient erst nach der Mitte des 8. Jh. aktiv gesucht haben. Eine Motivation hierfür mag darin liegen, daß durch die jetzt einsetzende klarere soziale Differenzierung der Bedarf an solchen Gütern gestiegen ist.

Concerning Cyprus see also the model presented by Rupp 1998.

<sup>165</sup> Snodgrass 1977. Snodgrass 1980, 20-24. Snodgrass 1987, 170-210.

<sup>166</sup> I. Morris 1997, 548. See also Osborne 1996, 70-136.

<sup>167</sup> Raaflaub 1998 176.

<sup>168</sup> See also Sherratt/Sherratt 1993, 375 who are concluding for the whole Mediterranean of the first millennium BC: “Neither diffusion nor autonomy can adequately describe the nature of this process of growth; rather, the pattern of development can best be described as co-evolution within the extending limits and zonation of a growing world-system.”

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Raaflaub 1998, 187f with n. 71.

cuneiform texts from the times of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II mentioning Iam(a)nāya are the earliest written evidence for Greeks since the Bronze Age!

### BIBLIOGRAPHY\*

- Aubet 1993 = M.-E. Aubet, *The Phoenicians and the West. Politics, colonies and trade*. Cambridge.
- Aubet <sup>2</sup>1994 = M. E. Aubet, *Tiro y las colonias fenicias en Occidente*. Barcelona.
- Aupert 1997 = P. Aupert, Amathus during the first Iron Age, *BASOR* 308, 19-25.
- Baltrusch 1994 = E. Baltrusch, *Symmachie und Spondai: Untersuchungen zum griechischen Völkerrecht der archaischen und klassischen Zeit, 8.-5. Jh. v. Chr.* Berlin.
- Bettalli 1995 = M. Bettalli, *I mercenari nel mondo greco I: Dalle origini alla fine del V sec. a. C.* Pisa.
- Bichler/Sieberer 1996 = R. Bichler/W. Sieberer, *Die Welt in Raum und Zeit im literarischen Reflex der episch-früharchaischen Ära*, in: Ulf (ed.) 1996, 116-55.
- Boardman 1990 = J. Boardman, *Al Mina and history*, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 9, 169-90.
- Boardman 1996 = J. Boardman, *Euboean overseas: a question of identity*, in: Evely et al. 1996, 155-60.
- Boardman 1997 = J. Boardman, *An early Greek sherd at Nineveh*, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 16, 375.
- Boardman/Popham 1997 = J. Boardman/ M. Popham, *Euboean pottery, East and West*, *Pact* 40 (194), 15-25.
- Borger 1956 = R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien*. Wien (AfO Beiheft 9).
- Borger 1975 = R. Borger, *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur. Band II*. Berlin-New York.
- Borger, 1982/85 = R. Borger, *Historische Texte in akkadischer Sprache aus Babylonien und Assyrien. Güterloh (TUAT I)*, 354-410.
- Botto 1990 = M. Botto (ed.), *Studi storici sulla Fenicia l'VIII e il VII secolo A.C.* Pisa.
- Braun 1982 = T. F. R. G. Braun, *The Greeks in the Near East*, *Cambridge Ancient History* <sup>2</sup>III.2. Cambridge, 1-31.
- Brinkman 1989 = J. A. Brinkman, *The Akkadian words for 'Ionia' and 'Ionian.'* in: R. F. Sutton (ed.), *Daidalikon. Studies in memory of Raymond V. Schoder, S. J., Wauconda, Illinois*, 53-71.
- Brown 1986 = S. C. Brown, *Media and secondary state formation in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros: an anthropological approach to an assyriological problem*, *JCS* 38, 107-19.
- Brown 1988 = S. C. Brown, *The Medikos Logos of Herodotus and the evolution of Median state*, in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg/A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Method and theory (Achaemenid History III)*. Leiden, 71-86.
- Buitron-Oliver 1997 = D. Buitron-Oliver, *Kourion: The evidence for the kingdom from the 11th to the 6th century B.C.*, *BASOR* 308, 27-36.
- Buitron-Oliver/Herscher 1997 = D. Buitron-Oliver/E. Herscher, *The city-kingdoms of Early Iron Age Cyprus in their eastern Mediterranean context*, *BASOR* 308, 5-7.
- Burkert 1992 = W. Burkert, *The orientализing revolution. Near eastern influence on Greek culture in the early Archaic Age*. Cambridge, Massachusetts (Revealing Antiquity 5).
- Burkert 1998 = W. Burkert, *La via Fenicia e la via Anatolica: ideologie e scoperte fra Oriente e Occidente*, *Saggi di Storia Antica* 13, 55-73.

---

\* Abbreviations follow Borger 1975, XI-XXXII.

- Burkert 1999 = W. Burkert, *Da Omero ai Magi. La tradizione orientale nella cultura greca*. Venice.
- Burstein 1978 = S. M. Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossos*. Malibu 1978 (Sources and Monographs on the Ancient Near East 1/5).
- Burstein 1996 = S. M. Burstein, Greek contact with Egypt and the Levant: ca. 1600-500 BC: an overview, *The Ancient World* 27, 20-28.
- Carruba 1993 = O. Carruba, *Contatti linguistici in anatolia*, in: R. B. Finazzi/P. Tornaghi (eds.), *Lingue e culture in contatto nel mondo antico e altomedievale*. Brescia 1993 (Atti del' VIII convegno internazionale di linguisti), 247-272.
- Childs 1997 = W. A. P. Childs, The Iron Age kingdom of Marion, *BASOR* 308, 37-48.
- Coleman/Walz 1997 = J. E. Coleman/C. A. Walz (eds.), *Greeks and barbarians. Essays on the interactions between Greeks and Non-Greeks in antiquity and the consequences for Eurocentrism*. Bethesda.
- Cogan/Eph'al 1991 = M. Cogan/ I. Eph'al (eds.), *Ah, Assyria ... Studies in Assyrian History and ancient Near Eastern historiography presented to Hayim Tadmor*. Jerusalem (Scripta Hierosolymitana 33).
- Descœudres 1990 = J.-P. Descœudres (ed.), *Greek colonists and native populations*. Oxford.
- Donlan 1997 = W. Donlan, The Homeric economy, in: Morris/Powell 1997, 649-667.
- Elayi/Cavigneaux 1979 = J. Elayi/A. Cavigneaux, Sargon II et les Ioniens, *OA* 18, 59-75.
- Evely et al. 1996 = D. Evely/I. S. Lemos/S. Sherratt (eds.), *Minotaur and Centaur. Studies in the archaeology of Crete and Euboea presented to Mervyn Popham*. Oxford (BAR International Series 638).
- Fadinger 1996 = V. Fadinger, Solons *Eunomia* Lehre und die Gerechtigkeitsidee der altorientalischen Schöpfungsherrschaft, in: H.-J. Gehrke/A. Möller (eds.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt. Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein*. Tübingen, 179-218.
- Fales 1992 = F. M. Fales, *Lettere dalla corte assira*. Venice.
- Fales/Postgate 1992 = F. M. Fales/J. N. Postgate, *Imperial Administrative Records, Part I: Palace and Temple Administration*. Helsinki (SAA VII).
- Fales/Postgate 1995 = F. M. Fales/J. N. Postgate, *Imperial Administrative Records, Part II: Provincial and Military Administration*. Helsinki (SAA XI).
- Fisher/van Wees 1998 = N. Fisher/H.van Wees (Eds.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and new evidence*. London.
- Frahm 1997 = E. Frahm, *Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften*. Wien (AfO Beiheft 26).
- Frame 1999 = G. Frame, The inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var, *OrNS* 68, 31-57.
- Fuchs 1994 = A. Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad*. Göttingen.
- Fuchs 1998 = A. Fuchs, *Die Annalen des Jahres 711 v. Chr. nach Prismenfragmenten aus Ninive und Assur*. Helsinki (SAAS VIII).
- Gadd 1954 = C. J. Gadd, Inscribed prisms of Sargon II from Nimrud, *Iraq* 16, 173-201.
- Gauer 1996 = W. Gauer, Überlegungen zum Mythos vom Krieg um Troia und der Heimat Homers, *Gymnasium* 103, 507-34.
- Gauer 1998 = W. Gauer, Die Aegaeis, Hellas und die Barbaren, *Saeculum* 49, 22-60.
- Gehrke 1994 = H.-J. Gehrke (ed.), *Rechtskodifizierung und soziale Normen im interkulturellen Vergleich*. Tübingen (Scripta Orolia 66).
- George 1997 = A. R. George, Assyria and the western world, in: Parpola/Whiting 1997, 69-75.
- Gitin 1997 = S. Gitin, The Neo-Assyrian Empire and its western periphery: The Levant, with a focus on Philistine Ekron, in: Parpola/Whiting 1997, 77-103.
- Hadjicosti 1997 = M. Hadjicosti, The kingdom of Idalion in the light of new evidence, *BASOR* 308, 49-63.
- Haider 1996 = P. W. Haider, Griechen im Vorderen Orient und in Ägypten bis ca. 590 v. Chr., in: Ulf (ed.) 1996, 59-115.
- Haude 1999 = R. Haude, Aphabet und Demokratie, *Saeculum* 50, 1-28.

- Helck 1995 = W. Helck, Die Beziehungen Ägyptens und Vorderasiens zur Ägäis bis ins 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Darmstadt.
- Helm 1980 = P. R. Helm, 'Greeks' in the Neo-Assyrian Levant and 'Assyria' in early Greek writers. Pennsylvania (Photocopy).
- Heubeck 1986 = A. Heubeck, Die Würzburger Alphabettafel, Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft 12, 7-20.
- Hölkeskamp 1992 [1995] = Hölkeskamp, Arbitrators, lawgivers and the 'codification of law,' *Metis* 7, 49-81.
- Hölkeskamp 1999 = K.-J. Hölkeskamp, Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland. Stuttgart (Historia Einzelschriften 131).
- Jasink 1989 = A. M. Jasink, I Greci in Cilicia nel periodo Neo-Assiro, *Mesopotamia* 24, 117-28.
- Karavites 1986 = P. Karavites, Philotes, Homer and the Near East, *Athenaeum* n.s. 64, 474-81.
- Karavites 1992 = P. Karavites, Promise-giving and treaty-making: Homer and the Near East. Leiden (Mnemosyne Suppl. 119).
- Kearsley 1999 = R. A. Kearsley, Greeks overseas in the 8th century B.C.: Euboeans, Al Mina and Assyrian imperialism, in: Tsetskhladze 1999, 109-34.
- Kilian-Dirlmeier 1985 = I. Kilian-Dirlmeier, Fremde Weihungen in griechischen Heiligtümern vom 8. bis zum Beginn des 7. Jhs., *Jahrbuch des römisch-germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz* 32, 215-54.
- Kistler 1998 = E. Kistler, Die 'Opferrinne-Zeremonie.' Bankettideologie am Grab, Orientalisierung und Formierung einer Adelsgesellschaft in Athen. Stuttgart.
- Kistler 2001 = E. Kistler, Kriegsbilder, epische Aristie und aristokratische Ideologie im spätgeometrischen Athen, in press.
- Kopcke/Tokumaru 1992 = G. Kopcke/I. Tokumaru (eds.), Greece between East and West: 10th-8th centuries BC. Papers of the Meeting at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, March 15th-16th, 1990. Mainz.
- Korenjak/Rollinger 2001 = M. Korenjak/R. Rollinger, καὶ τὸδε Φωκυλίδεω? Phokylides und der Fall Ninives, *Philologus*, in press.
- Kuhr 1982 = A. Kuhrt, Assyrian and Babylonian traditions in classical authors: a critical synthesis, in: H.-J. Nissen/J. Renger (eds.), Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn. Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis zum 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Berlin (CRRAI XXV = BBVO 1), 539-53.
- Kwasman 1998 = Th. Kwasman, Neo-Assyrian legal documents in the Koujunjik Collection of the British Museum. Rom (Studia Pohl: Series Maior 14).
- Lanfranchi 1996 = G. B. Lanfranchi, Dinastie e tradizioni regie d'Anatolia: Frigia, Cimmeri e Lidia nelle fonti Neo-Assire e nell'ottica Erodotea, in: A. Aloni/L. de Finis (eds.), Dall'Indo a Thule: i Greci, i Romani, gli altri. Trento (Labirinti. Collana del Dipartimento di scienze Filologiche e Storiche dell'Università di Trento 24), 89-111.
- Lanfranchi 1997 = G. B. Lanfranchi, Consensus to empire: Some aspects of Sargon II's foreign policy, in: H. Waetzoldt/H. Hauptmann (eds.), Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten. Heidelberg (CRRAI 39 = Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient 6), 81-87.
- Lanfranchi 2000 = G. B. Lanfranchi, The Ideological and Political Impact of the Assyrian Imperial Expansion on the Greek World in the 8th and 7th centuries BC, in: S. Aro/R. Whiting (eds.), The Heirs of Assyria. Proceedings of the Opening Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project Held in Tvärminne, Finland, October 7-11, 1998. Helsinki (Melammu Symposia 1).
- Lipiński 1991 = E. Lipiński, The Cypriot vassals of Esarhaddon, in: Cogan/Eph'al 1991, 58-64.
- Liverani 1997 = M. Liverani, Ramesside Egypt in a changing world. An institutional approach, *Vicino Oriente*, Quad. 1 (L'impero Ramesside. Convegno internazionale in onore di Sergio Donadoni), 101-15.
- Liverani 1998 = M. Liverani, L'immagine dei Fenici nella storiografia occidentale, *Studi Storici* 39, 5-22.
- Lorenz 1996 = G. Lorenz, Die griechische Heroenvorstellung in früharchaischer Zeit zwischen Tradition und Neuerung, in: Ulf 1996 (ed.), 20-58.

- Luckenbill 1924 = D. D. Luckenbill, *The annals of Senacherib*. Chicago (Oriental Institute Publications 2).
- Luckenbill 1926 = D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient records of Assyria and Babylonia*. 2 volumes. Chicago.
- Machinist 1993 = P. Machinist, *Assyrians on Assyria in the First Millennium B.C.*, in: Raaflaub 1993a, 77-104.
- Marek 1993 = Ch. Marek, *Euboia und die Entstehung der Alphabetschrift bei den Griechen*, *Klio* 75, 27-44.
- Mathäus 1993 = H. Mathäus, *Zur Rezeption orientalischer Kunst-, Kultur- und Lebensformen in Griechenland*, in: Raaflaub 1993a, 165-86.
- Mayer 1996 = W. Mayer, *Zypern und Ägäis aus der Sicht der Staaten Vorderasiens in der 1. Hälfte des 1. Jahrtausends*, *UF* 28, 463-84.
- McKechnie 1994 = P. McKechnie, *Greek mercenary troops and their equipment*, *Historia* 43, 297-305.
- Miller 1997 = T. Miller, *Die griechische Kolonisation im Spiegel literarischer Zeugnisse*. Tübingen.
- Mitchell/Rhodes 1997 = L. Mitchell/P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *The development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*. London.
- I. Morris 1997 = I. Morris, *Homer and the Iron Age*, in: Morris/Powell 1997, 535-59.
- I. Morris 1998 = I. Morris, *Archaeology and archaic Greek history*, in: Fischer/van Wees 1998, 1-91.
- S. Morris 1997 = S. P. Morris, *Homer and the Near East*, in: Morris/Powell 1997, 599-623.
- Morris/Powell 1997 = I. Morris/B. Powell (eds.), *A new companion to Homer*. Leiden-New York-Köln (Mnemosyne Suppl. 163).
- Neu 1999 = E. Neu, *Altanatolien und das mykenische Pylos: Einige Überlegungen zum Nestorbecher der Ilias*, *ArOr* 67, 619-27.
- Niemeyer 1999 = H. G. Niemeyer, *Die frühe phönizische Expansion im Mittelmeer. Neue Beiträge zu ihrer Beschreibung und ihren Ursachen*, *Saeculum* 50, 153-75.
- Osborne 1996 = R. Osborne, *Greece in the making, 1200-479 BC*. London/New York.
- Osborne 1998 = R. Osborne, *Review of Ulf (ed.) 1996*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 118, 240.
- Papadopoulos 1996 = J. K. Papadopoulos, *Phantom Euboeans*, *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 10, 191-206.
- Parker 2000 = B. J. Parker, *The earliest known reference to the Ionians in the cuneiform sources*, *Ancient History Bulletin* 14, 69-77.
- Parpola 1970 = S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*. Neukirchen-Vlyun (AOAT 6).
- Parpola 1984 = S. Parpola, *Likalka ittataku: Two notes on the morphology of the verb aläku in Neo-Assyrian*, in: *Memoriae Jussi Aro dedicata*. Helsinki (Studia Orientalia 55), 185-209.
- Parpola/Watanabe 1988 = S. Parpola/K. Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. Helsinki (SAA 2).
- Parpola/Whiting 1997 = S. Parpola/R.M. Whiting (eds.), *Assyria 1995. Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project*. Helsinki.
- Patzek 1996a = B. Patzek, *Homer und der Orient*, in: U. Magen/M. Rashad (eds.), *Vom Halys zum Euphrat. Thomas Beran zu Ehren*. Münster (Altertumskunde des Vorderen Orients 7), 215-25.
- Patzek 1996b = B. Patzek, *Griechen und Phöniker in homerischer Zeit. Fernhandel und der orientalische Einfluß auf die frühgriechische Kultur*, *Münstersche Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte* 15, 1-32.
- Patzek 1997 = B. Patzek, *Review of Ulf (ed.) 1996*, *Historische Zeitschrift* 265, 434f.
- Polignac 1992 = F. de Polignac, *Influence extérieure ou évolution interne? L'innovation culturelle en Grèce géométrique*, in: Kopcke/Tokumaru 1992, 114-27.
- Popham 1994 = M. Popham, *Precolonization: Early Greek contact with the East*, in: Tsetschladze/De Angelis 1994, 11-34.
- Powell 1991 = B. B. Powell, *Homer and the origin of the Greek alphabet*. Cambridge.

- Pritchard 1969 = J. B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton 1969.
- Raaflaub 1993a = K. Raaflaub (ed.), *Anfänge politischen Denkens in der Antike: Die nahöstlichen Kulturen und die Griechen*. Munich (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs. Kolloquien 24).
- Raaflaub 1997a = K. Raaflaub, *Homeric Society*, in: Morris/Powell 1997, 624-648.
- Raaflaub 1997b = K. Raaflaub, *Politics and interstate relations in the world of early Greek Poleis: Homer and beyond*, *Antichthon* 31, 1-27.
- Raaflaub 1997c = K. Raaflaub, *Soldiers, citizens and the evolution of the early Greek polis*, in: Mitchell/Rhodes 1997, 49-59.
- Raaflaub 1998 = K. Raaflaub, *A historian's headache: how to read 'Homeric society'?*, in: Fisher/van Wees 1998, 169-193.
- Radner 1998 = K. Radner (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. Volume 1, Part I: A*. Helsinki.
- Radner 1999 = K. Radner (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. Volume 2, Part II: B-G*. Helsinki.
- Redford 1999 = D. B. Redford, *A note on the chronology of Dynasty 15 and the inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var*, *OrNS* 68, 58-60.
- Reyes 1994 = A. T. Reyes, *Archaic Cyprus. A study of the textual and archaeological evidence*. Oxford.
- Reyes 1997 = A. T. Reyes, *Notes on the Iron Age kingdoms of Cyprus*, *BASOR* 308, 65-68.
- Röllig 1957/71 = W. Röllig, s. v. *Griechen*, *RIA* 3, 643-647.
- Röllig 1976/80 = W. Röllig, s. v. *Ionier*, *RIA* 5, 150b.
- Röllig 1992 = W. Röllig, *Asia Minor as a bridge between East and West: The role of the Phoenicians and the Aramaeans in the transfer of culture*, in: Kopcke/Tokumaru 1992, 93-102.
- Röllig 1996 = W. Röllig, *Das Alphabet und sein Weg zu den Griechen*, in: *Die Geschichte der hellenischen Sprache und Schrift. Vom 2. zum 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.: Bruch oder Kontinuität?*. Ohlstadt/Oberbayern 03.-06. Okt. 1996. Verein zur Förderung der Aufarbeitung der Hellenischen Geschichte.
- Röllig 1998 = W. Röllig, *Nordsemitisch – Südsemitisch? Zur Geschichte des Alphabets im 2. Jt. v. Chr.*, in: Sh. Izre'el/I. Singer/R. Zadok (eds.), *Past links. Studies in the languages and cultures of the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake (Israel Oriental Studies XVIII).
- Rollinger 1996 = R. Rollinger, *Altorientalische Motive in der frühgriechischen Literatur am Beispiel der homerischen Epen. Elemente des Kampfes in der Ilias und in der altorientalischen Literatur (nebst Überlegungen zur Präsenz altorientalischer Wanderpriester im früharchaischen Griechenland)*, in: Ulf (ed.) 1996, 156-210.
- Rollinger 1997 (1999) = R. Rollinger, *Zur Bezeichnung von 'Griechen' in Keilschrifttexten*, *RA* 91, 167-72.
- Rollinger 1999 = R. Rollinger, *Zur Lokalisation von Parsu(m)a(š) und zu einigen Fragen der frühen persischen Geschichte*, *ZA* 89, 115-39.
- Rollinger/Korenjak 2001 = Robert Rollinger/Martin Korenjak, *Addikritušu: Ein namentlich genannter Grieche aus der Zeit Asarhaddons*, in: *AoF*, in press.
- Ruijgh 1997 = C. J. Ruijgh, *La date de la création de l'alphabet grec et celle de l'épopée homérique*, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54, 533-603.
- Ruijgh 1998 = C. J. Ruijgh, *Sur la date de la création de l'alphabet grec*, *Mnemosyne* 51, 658-87.
- Rupp 1997 = D. W. Rupp, *Constructing the Cypriot Iron Age: present praxis; future possibilities*, *BASOR* 308, 69-75.
- Rupp 1998 = D. W. Rupp, *The seven kings of the land of Ia', a district on Ia-ad-na-na: Achaean Bluebloods, Cypriot Parvenues or both*, in: K. J. Hartswick/M. C. Sturgeon (eds.), *ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ. Studies in honor of Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway*. Philadelphia (University Museum Monograph 100), 209-22.
- Saggs 1955 = H. W. F. Saggs, *The Nimrud letters, 1952 – Part II*, *Iraq* 17, 126-60.
- Saggs 1963 = H. W. F. Saggs, *The Nimrud letters, 1952 – Part VI*, *Iraq* 25, 70-80.
- Saporetti 1990 = C. Saporetti, *Testimonianze Neo-Assire*, in: Botto 1990, 111-243.

- Schoene 1875 = A. Schoene (ed.), Eusebi Chronicorum. Liber prior Armeniam versionem Latine ad libros manuscriptos recensuit H. Petermann. Zürich 1875 (reprint 1967).
- Sherratt/Sherratt 1993 = S. Sherratt/A. Sherratt, The growth of the Mediterranean economy in the early first millennium BC, *World Archaeology* 24, 361-378.
- Slings 1998 = S. R. Slings, Tsadē and Hē: Two problems in the early history of the Greek alphabet, *Mnemosyne* 51, 641-57.
- Smith 1997 = J. S. Smith, Preliminary comments on a rural Cypro-Achaic sanctuary in Polis-Peristeries, *BASOR* 308, 77-98.
- Snodgrass 1977 = A. M. Snodgrass, *Archaeology and the rise of the Greek state*. Cambridge.
- Snodgrass 1980 = A. M. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece: The age of experiment*. London.
- Snodgrass 1987 = A. M. Snodgrass, *An archaeology of Greece*. Berkeley.
- Souza 1995 = Ph. de Souza, Greek piracy, in: A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek world*. London-New York, 179-98.
- Souza 1998 = Ph. de Souza, Towards Thalassocracy? Archaic Greek naval developments, in: Fisher/van Wees 1998, 271-93.
- Souza 1999 = Ph. de Souza, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman world*. Cambridge.
- Steel 1993 = L. Steel, The establishment of the city kingdoms on Iron Age Cyprus: an archaeological commentary, *Report of the Department of Archaeology of Cyprus*, 147-56.
- Tadmor 1958 = H. Tadmor, The campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A chronological-historical study (Conclusion), *JCS* 12, 77-100.
- Tadmor 1999 = H. Tadmor, World dominion: the expanding horizon of the Assyrian Empire, in: L. Milano/S. de Martino/F. M. Fales/G. B. Lanfranchi (eds.), *Landscapes. Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East. Part I: Invited Lectures*. Padova (CRRAI 44 = HANE/Monographs III/1), 55-62.
- Trundle 1999 = M. F. Trundle, Identity and community among Greek mercenaries in the Classical World: 700-322 BCE, *Ancient History Bulletin* 13, 28-38.
- Tsetschladze 1999 = G. R. Tsetschladze (ed.), *Ancient Greeks. West and past*. Leiden-Boston-Köln (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 196).
- Tsetschladze/De Angelis 1994 = G. R. Tsetschladze/F. De Angelis (eds.), *The archaeology of Greek colonisation. Essays dedicated to Sir John Boardman*. Oxford.
- Ulf 1990 = Ch. Ulf, *Die homerische Gesellschaft. Materialien zur analytischen Beschreibung und historischen Lokalisierung*. München 1990 (*Vestigia* 43).
- Ulf (ed.) 1996 = Ch. Ulf (ed.), *Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität. Die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit*. Berlin 1996.
- Ulf 1996 = Ch. Ulf, Griechische Ethnogenese versus Wanderungen von Stämmen und Stammstaaten, in: Ulf (ed.) 1996, 240-80.
- Ulf 1997 = Ch. Ulf, Überlegungen zur Funktion überregionaler Feste im archaischen Griechenland, in: Eder/Hölkeskamp 1997, 37-61.
- Ulf 2001 = Ch. Ulf, Gemeinschaftsbezug, soziale Stratifizierung, Polis – drei Bedingungen für das Entstehen aristokratischer und demokratischer Mentalität im archaischen Griechenland, in: D. Papenfuß/V. M. Strocka (eds.), *Gab es das griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Mainz, 163-86.
- Verbrugge/Wickersham 1996 = G. P. Verbrugge/J. M. Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho. Introduced and translated. Native traditions in ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt*. Ann Arbor.
- Waldbaum 1994 = J. C. Waldbaum, Early Greek contacts with southern Levant, ca. 1000-600 B.C.: The eastern perspective, *BASOR* 293, 53-66.
- Waldbaum 1997 = J. C. Waldbaum, Greeks in the East or Greeks and the East? Problems in the definition and recognition of presence, *BASOR* 305, 1-17.
- Wees 1992 = H. van Wees, *Status warriors: War, violence and society in Homer and history*. Amsterdam.
- Wees 1997 = H. van Wees, Homeric warfare, in: Morris/Powell 1997, 668-93.



- Weidner 1941/44 = E. F. Weidner, Šilkan(he)ni, König von Musri, ein Zeitgenosse Sargons II. Nach einem neuen Bruchstück der Prisma-Inschrift des assyrischen Königs, AfO 14, 40-53.
- West 1997 = M. L. West, *The east face of Helicon. West Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth.* Oxford.
- Winter 1995 = I. J. Winter, *Homer's Phoenicians: History, ethnography, or literary trope? [A perspective on early orientalism]*, in: J. B. Carter/S. P. Morris (eds.), *The ages of Homer. A tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule.* Austin, 247-71.
- Yon 1997 = M. Yon, *Kition in the tenth to fourth centuries B.C.*, BASOR 308, 9-17.