

A HAPPY SON OF THE KING OF ASSYRIA: WARIKAS AND THE ÇINEKÖY BILINGUAL (CILICIA)

Giovanni B. Lanfranchi

Over the course of many years, and in many skilled, stimulating and sometimes very provocative studies, Simo Parpola has examined various aspects of the conceptual constellation structuring and governing the ideology of Neo-Assyrian kingship. His basic assumption was and is the concept that the royal ideology was the most crucial element not only in supporting the tremendous effort of Assyrian military and administrative expansion, but also, and especially, in consolidating the expansion through the transmission of Assyrian culture to both the conquered and the still independent populations. The conscious aim of acculturation was to encourage and to develop a pro-Assyrian attitude in the peripheral, non-Assyrian social elites, a long process which at the end produced a global “Assyrianization” of the whole Near East. I am extremely happy, and I thank the editors very much for inviting me, to dedicate to him a study on this subject, in acknowledgment of his scholarly, social and human merits, and as a poor witness of my esteem and of my personal friendship – both unchanged since we met at the Cetona meeting 28 years ago.

From a methodological point of view, the development of a pro-Assyrian attitude among members of the elites of the peripheral states should be taken *a priori* as a natural and unavoidable phenomenon, to be compared to many other similar examples in different historical and cultural milieus.¹ In the case of Assyria, however, this basic reality is either opposed or still very doubtfully accepted in a large part of scholarly research. The traditional image of Assyria as that of an imperialistic power, endowed with absolutely negative characteristics such as inflexibility, violence and cruelty still persists.

A good number of purely Assyrian texts (mainly royal inscriptions) can be (and have been) taken as attesting that a part of the periphery was favourable to Assyria and to its imperial expansion (either factual, through annexation, or merely ideological, through institutional alliance and political consensus).² They

¹ Cf., e.g., the *lydizontes* or *medizontes*, terms designating groups of Greeks politically and culturally favourable to the Lydian or to the Achaemenid empire and especially prone to adopt their lifestyles, who were negatively depicted and harshly attacked by “nationalistic” Greek literates and politicians.

² Lanfranchi 1997; see now Dion 2007.

might be taken as proving Parpola's main argument, that Neo-Assyrian kingship functioned as an ideological vector of pro-Assyrian sentiments. An objection might be, however, that the Assyrian royal inscriptions are ideologically preconceived texts, and as such they aim at demonstrating, rather than demonstrate, the existence of a pro-Assyrian attitude in the Assyrian periphery. Consequently, only non-Assyrian sources attesting to a pro-Assyrian attitude can definitively confirm this hypothesis.

Texts of this kind, although very few in number, do actually exist. They consist of a Biblical passage and the inscriptions of Kilamuwa (late ninth century) and Bar-rakib (second half of the eighth century), both rulers of the kingdom of Sam'al. In the Bible, the Judaeen king Ahaz is said to have paid the Assyrian king for military help against Aram and Israel.³ In his inscription, Kilamuwa states he has paid the Assyrian king for help against a neighbouring kingdom.⁴ Bar-rakib, in turn, describes his father Panamuwa as a honoured member of the Assyrian army and elite, says he has been enthroned by Tiglath-pileser III, and boasts of having "run at the wheel" of the Assyrian king's chariot together with many other kings.⁵ These texts, however, have different weights in proving the hypothesis. The Biblical passage is not decisive since a negative judgment against the Judaeen monarchy in general, and against Ahaz in particular may have conditioned it. In Kilamuwa's inscription, although a military alliance between Sam'al and Assyria is indubitably in question, the request for help on the part of the Sam'alian king is skilfully veiled through a rhetorical stratagem and is depicted as a payment to the Assyrian king – demonstrating, however, that there was some resistance to overtly declaring a pro-Assyrian attitude. Only Bar-rakib's text is quite clear in celebrating friendship, support and favour towards the Assyrian king and the Assyrian empire.

Another text can now be associated with Bar-rakib's inscription as a good proof of the existence of pro-Assyrian sentiments in the peripheral elites of the Assyrian empire. It is the Neo-Hittite Luwian-Phoenician bilingual inscription engraved on a monument excavated in 1997 near Çineköy, a village not far from Adana (southeastern Turkey).⁶ In this text, Warikas, king of Hiyawa (in Phoenician, *w[rk]* king of [*dnnym*]), celebrates his just reign and his tight and extremely positive relations with Assyria. Warikas is to be identified with Awarikus, king of Adanawa (the ancient name of modern Adana), who is mentioned in the KARATEPE Luwian-Phoenician bilingual (in Phoenician as *mlk dnnym*, *dnnym* being the gentilic of Adanawa), and with Urikki, king of Que (the Assyrian rendering of Hiyawa), who

³ 2 Kings 16:7–8; cf., much shorter, 2 Chron 28:16.

⁴ KAI 1 24:7–8; Fales 1979. For the verb used, which means simply "to pay", see recently Dion 2007: 136–137.

⁵ KAI 1 215:10, 12, 16; 216:8–11.

⁶ The complete edition was published admirably soon after the discovery by R. Tekoğlu and A. Lemaire (Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000). The inscription is listed in Hawkins 2000: 71, *sub* no. 18 (ADANA) but is only briefly commented upon.

is mentioned in Assyrian texts of the times of Tiglath-pileser III (745–727) and Sargon II (721–705) (see below for further details).⁷

In the future, the bilingual will certainly be much studied since it has material dealing with various sets of much discussed problems: the location of (the Mycenaean?) kingdom of Ahhijawa (if Hiyawa is taken as a form of the latter), and consequently the Greek presence in, or the penetration into, Cilicia and into the Near East in the second and first millennia BC. The bilingual, however, has a crucial importance not only because it confirms *in toto* the attitude of Bar-rakib's text, but also and especially because it offers more pregnant details on the ideological background of the pro-Assyrian policy and of the communicational devices employed for soliciting consensus towards the Assyrian empire.

1. THE MONUMENT AND THE TEXT: ASSYRIAN INFLUENCES?

The ÇINEKÖY monument represents a male bearded figure standing on a chariot pulled by two bulls. The male figure represents a god, who must be identified with the Storm-god Tarhunzas who is often invoked in the text.⁸ A god standing on a chariot pulled by two bulls, or more often on a podium formed of or flanked by two bulls, is well attested in the iconography in the Neo-Hittite cultural area; in some cases, this kind of monument bears written texts.⁹ The ÇINEKÖY exemplar is sculptured according to Neo-Hittite standards,¹⁰ but, according to the description given by I. Ipek and A. Kazim Tosun, it shows clear Assyrian influences in the representation of hair, beard and dress like other Neo-Hittite monuments of the eighth century BC.¹¹

The very same contemporary presence of both Neo-Hittite and Assyrian iconographic styles and details suggests that the Assyrian cultural influence was at work in Cilicia when the statue was designed and produced. This phenomenon

⁷ These identifications and the historical setting were skilfully pointed out by Tekoğlu and Lemaire (2000: 981–984, 1003–1006).

⁸ The statue wears a crown with two horns, which is a clear indicator of divine nature. The bull normally is an attribute of the Storm-god, but also of other gods: Orthmann 1971: 258 for a “Schützgott” on a bull (KARATEPE B/3) and 275 (MALATYA B/4) for a goddess sitting on a throne carried by a bull. Description of the monument in Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 966–967, with Figs. 1–3 for the statue and 4–6 for the chariot.

⁹ Bunnens 2006: 128. Uninscribed monuments formed of a statue upon a podium were found at Zincirli and at Carchemish (Hawkins 2000: 255). A colossal ruler-figure from Maraş bearing the text MARAŞ 4, (*ibid.*, no. IV.2., 255–258) may have been standing on a similar podium. A similar, smaller statue bears the inscription MARAŞ 14 (*ibid.*, 265–267).

¹⁰ As far as it may be seen from the photographs, the statue (and the whole composition) is very similar to the statue Zincirli E/1, representing in all probability a ruler of Sam'al (cf. Orthmann 1971: 69, 289, and Taf. 62, c, d, e).

¹¹ Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 967. Assyrian elements (e.g., the sandals) are also present in Zincirli E/1 (Orthmann 1971, *ibid.*). For the Assyrianizing style in Neo-Hittite art, see mainly Orthmann 1971: 471.

is widespread in other Neo-Hittite areas during the late Neo-Hittite period;¹² and it shows at the very least that the Luwian local elites developed positive attention towards, and an active reception of Neo-Assyrian models. It must be admitted, in general, that the reception of foreign iconographic models does not necessarily imply a conscious acceptance of their cultural and especially political background. The fact, however, that Assyrian iconographic details were inserted into a statue of a typically Neo-Hittite *god* like Tarhunzas has great importance. It shows clearly that both a strong Assyrian influence and a strong acceptance of Assyrian elements were at work when the statue was made. They had probably been at work for a long time since, in general, religious iconography seems to be most resistant to the acceptance and adoption of foreign elements, and only a long, possibly peaceful co-existence may lead to exchanges of this kind. Note, for example, that in the İvriz relief, the god Tarhunzas is depicted according to archaic standards while there are many clearly Assyrian elements in the portrait of King Warpalawas.¹³

As anticipated, the inscription is bilingual. It is composed of two strictly similar, albeit not perfectly identical versions of the same basic text, written in Luwian hieroglyphic script and in Luwian language, and in Phoenician writing and language. This same association is found in the more famous KARATEPE bilingual, and in a still unpublished bilingual inscription engraved on a stele found in İvriz near ancient Tyana, northwest of Cilicia.¹⁴ Thus, the ÇINEKÖY bilingual follows what seems to have been a consolidated tradition in southeastern Anatolia during the eighth century BC, according to which royal and non-royal¹⁵ texts were composed in Luwian and in Phoenician.¹⁶ This tradition is not attested elsewhere in the Neo-Hittite cultural area; but mastering foreign scripts and languages was clearly considered a point of honour for kings and rulers, as stated in a royal inscription of Yariris, ruler of Carchemish.¹⁷ Here the “Tyrian”, i.e., the Phoenician writing system seems to be mentioned along with the Assyrian and what might be called the “Arabian” writing.¹⁸ Thus, it may be admitted that the ÇINEKÖY scribes followed

¹² Orthmann 1971: 292 (Zincirli), 322–323 (Carchemish, Sakçagözü and Domuztepe, and perhaps Tell Halaf), for specific Assyrian-influenced iconographic postures and details.

¹³ Orthmann 1971: 114–115.

¹⁴ Hawkins 2000: 526, no. X.46 (İVRİZ 2) with bibliography.

¹⁵ Azitiwatas, the author of the KARATEPE inscription, did not claim to be king.

¹⁶ Due to the scarcity of sources, it is not possible to establish whether the bilingualism of the royal and aristocratic texts actually corresponded to a widespread or even elite bilingualism of the local population and/or ruling classes. King Warikas/Urikki/*wrk* also had an inscription composed in Phoenician only in Hassanbeyli (Lemaire 1983). Almost certainly the *wrk* who is mentioned in the Phoenician Cebel Ires Dağı inscription found near Antalya (Mosca & Russell 1987) is the same king.

¹⁷ In KARKEMiS A15b, Yariris boasts of mastering three foreign writing systems other than his own, and twelve foreign languages (Hawkins 2000: 131, II.24, §§ 19–20).

¹⁸ Hawkins 2000: 133, suggested that the adj. *sù+ra/i-wa/i-ni-ti* (URBS) mentioned in KARKEMiS A15b § 19 together with the adj. *a-sù+ra/i-(REGIO)-wa/i-na-ti*(URBS) (which he takes as meaning “Assyrian”) should refer to Urarṭu. On page 126 *ad* KARKEMiS A6A (II. 22), § 6, he

general Neo-Hittite traditions when they composed a bilingual, and local Neo-Hittite traditions (specific to southeastern Anatolia) when they composed it in Luwian and in Phoenician.

This assumption might be confirmed by the unfortunately still unpublished İNCIRLI inscription.¹⁹ İNCIRLI seems to have been a trilingual, composed in Phoenician writing and language (its main part), in Neo-Hittite Luwian hieroglyphic writing and language, and in cuneiform Neo-Assyrian writing and language²⁰ – although this may be only a fair guess, and it is not clear whether the various versions were identical or not. As far as it is known today, in the Phoenician text, a *mlk dnnym* is mentioned, who must be identified with a king of Adana/Hiyawa (following the equations provided in KARATEPE and in ÇINEKÖY, and in Kilamuwa's inscription²¹), and who might be the Warikas/*wrk*/Urikki who authored ÇINEKÖY. It is not yet clear whether this *mlk dnnym* is the author of the text,²² or is only mentioned in a text composed by another king.²³ If (cuneiform) Assyrian and Neo-Hittite Luwian were present in İNCIRLI along with Phoenician, this multilingualism would seem to follow the ideal model of the “polyglot” king put forward in Yariris's inscription from Carchemish mentioned above, and again would confirm that ÇINEKÖY as well as KARATEPE were composed according to Neo-Hittite models.

In any case, we are not free to take the Luwian-Phoenician bilingualism as an indicator of the acceptance of an Assyrian model, at least as regards Hiyawa / Que / Cilicia (and southeastern Anatolia in general) since we do not possess any Assyrian-Phoenician bilingual composed by Assyrian kings or governors. It is thus not possible to establish whether the Assyrian influences which are clearly recognizable in the iconographical details of the statue were accompanying an Assyrianism in the

connects it to the *KUR.šura/i/u* whose lordship is mentioned in the titulary of the Urartian kings in their inscriptions. R. Tekoğlu (Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 980–981 n. 24) rejects the meaning “Urartian”, and suggests that in KARKEMiS A 15b there is a repetition. The first Luwian adjective, however, should refer to the name of Tyre, which in Neo-Assyrian is constantly rendered *Šur(r)u* (Bagg 2007: 235–236 s.v. *šurru*). For an assessment of the meaning “Assyrian”, see recently Rollinger 2006. For the hypothesis that the last script listed in the text was Arabic, see Hawkins 2000: 133, who quotes an oral suggestion of F. Pennacchietti.

¹⁹ This inscription was found in secondary use in the village of İncirli, ca. 10 km north of Sakçagözü in the Kahramanmaraş valley. The inscription probably originates from the mound KM 50 (Emirler), 3.5 km further north (see the information provided in <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/nelc/stelasite/history.html>). Almost certainly, this area belonged to the kingdom of Sam'al (Emirler lies to the south of the Aksu river which probably functioned as a border between Sam'al and the northern state of Gurgum, which extended around modern Maraş).

²⁰ This hypothesis is somehow dubiously suggested in the Internet site quoted above at <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/nelc/stelasite/zuck.html>.

²¹ Kilamuwa claims to have paid the Assyrian king for military cooperation against the *mlk dnnym* (KAI 1 24:7–8).

²² As it is doubtfully suggested in the above mentioned Internet page <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/nelc/stelasite/history.html>.

²³ Due to the location of the mound where the text may have come from, the author might have been a king of Sam'al.

textual conventions. If it were the case, however, it should be admitted that the monument and the text of the ÇINEKÖY monument formed an extremely powerful complex aiming at transmitting Assyrian fashion and concepts.

2. THE ROLES OF WARIKAS AND OF ASSYRIA IN THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT

In the bilingual, Warikas celebrates his just reign, his enterprises and his achievements, according to the standard model of Ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions. As in many other Neo-Hittite Luwian royal texts, the rather compressed narration is formed of the name and titulary of Warikas, and of a longer section dealing with his achievements (*res gestae*); apparently, there was no curse section at the end. In the titulary, Warikas stresses the legitimacy of his royal role, his lineage and the favour granted to him by the gods. The *res gestae* section is essentially formed of three parts (for a more detailed study of the components of this text, see my recent study on the relations between ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE²⁴), in which king Warikas states that he has:

- a) expanded his country and enlarged his army under Tarhunzas's approval;
- b) established good relations with Assyria;
- c) destroyed foreign fortresses, built fortresses along the borders, installed people (in/around the fortresses?), and brought security, abundance and peace to his country.

From the ideological point of view, this series of episodes is constructed so as to form a true progression, in which each part constitutes the basis for the next one. Warikas's military enterprises listed in part a) are preparatory for the establishment of the friendly relations with Assyria celebrated in part b): the implication is that Warikas's military successes make him a king worthy of attention and alliance on the part of Assyria. Warikas's friendly relations with Assyria are preparatory for his further successes outside and inside his kingdom, which are listed in part c): the implication is that the friendship and the alliance with Assyria strengthen Warikas so as to allow him to make territorial conquests and to further benefit his own country.

This interpretation is strictly cogent with the characteristics of the episodes and with the order in which they are listed. If any of the three parts were not present, or if another kind of order were given to them, totally different implications would have followed – this is clearly an *argumentum e silentio*, but it is useful for understanding how much different implications may stem from a specific textual sequence. If, e.g.,

²⁴ Lanfranchi 2007.

the alliance with Assyria were not considered crucial for the last set of Warikas's enterprises, it might have been simply omitted; conversely, if it were put in the first position, it would have implied that *all* Warikas's enterprises were enabled by that alliance, and this would have largely diminished his own role in the story.²⁵ On the other hand, it can be noted that in part a) Warikas's enterprises are described without detail, i.e., without any explicit mention of any positive consequences for him and for his own country. They are left "waiting", so to say, for an acknowledgment of whatever kind – which will take place in the second part. Secondly, it can be noted that part b) (the alliance with Assyria) also leaves Warikas devoid of the "prize" he deserves for his achievements. These (the prosperity of Hiyawa and the benefits deriving to Warikas from this) are mentioned only at the end of the text.

The part of the bilingual dealing with the friendship and alliance with Assyria (part b) is formed of two components, corresponding to two full sentences:

b.1) the Assyrian king and the Assyrian "house" turn into "mother and father" for Warikas ("So the Assyrian king and the whole Assyrian 'house' were made a fa[ther and a mo]ther for me", § 6);

b.2) Hiyawa and Assyria turn into "one house" ("and Hiyawa and Assyria were made a single 'house'", § 7).

At first glance, these two sentences may seem to represent a rhetorical reduplication (or better, amplification) of the main theme of the good relations between Assyria and Hiyawa.²⁶ At closer analysis, however, it is easy to detect subtle ideological differences which originate from important institutional and political concepts lying in the background. In part b.1), the active party is only one, Assyria (albeit represented by its king and its "house"); in part b.2), however, there are *two* active parties, Hiyawa and Assyria.²⁷

Part b.1), rhetorically depicting the action as the development of a benevolent, parental attitude towards Warikas, definitely attributes the initiative to Assyria (to the Assyrian king and to the Assyrian "house"). The phrasing and the logic of this sentence are designed so as to suggest that the Assyrian king and his "house", being informed of Warikas's enterprises, were positively impressed, "turned their attention" towards Warikas, and then assumed a benevolent attitude towards him. Conversely, in this sentence Warikas does not play any other role than that of being the object of the attention and then of the benevolence of the Assyrian king and "house". If we develop the image which is suggested by the literal wording of this passage, we are induced to image a sequence like this: the Assyrian king "inspects" its own periphery, then "notices" Warikas's enterprises, then assumes

²⁵ See for further detail Lanfranchi 2007: 188–195.

²⁶ This is suggested by Dion (2007: 141), who explains both sentences as metaphors, respectively of "benevolent authority" and of "friendly relations between countries".

²⁷ In both sentences, the verbal form seems to have a (medio-)passive meaning, "to be made, to be turned into" (see the discussion in Lanfranchi 2007: 188–189 n. 23, and basically Hawkins 2000: 64).

the initiative of establishing a (benign) relation with Warikas, and finally develops a positive sentiment towards Warikas like that of a parental couple towards their son. A strictly hierarchical conception of the international role and dignity of the kings and of the countries of Assyria and Hiyawa conditions the whole structure of this passage. Initiative and moral superiority, both characteristics and privileges typical of international pre-eminence, are ascribed to one of the two parties only, Assyria. The role and the dignity of Hiyawa, consequently, are decidedly – albeit not directly – depicted as lower than those of Assyria, and Assyria finally emerges as the true international power, ranking at a higher level than all other countries.

In part b.2), as stated above, the parties involved and “active” are both Hiyawa and Assyria. First of all, it must be noted that in this part Hiyawa replaces Warikas. This shift is a subtle rhetorical device aimed at demonstrating the positivity of Warikas’s behaviour in favour of his own country. Warikas’s initial enterprises were worthy of the consideration and of the “parental love” of the Assyrian king; but the immediate effects of this Assyrian attitude towards Warikas – which, due to the general tone of the text, can only be productive of positive effects – are in respect to Hiyawa rather than Warikas himself. In other words, the shift helps in presenting Warikas as a king who has duly operated for the benefit of his own country, and not for the personal advantages possibly stemming from Assyrian benevolence.

From this perspective, it is remarkable that in this second sentence Hiyawa is listed *before* Assyria. This order might appear to contradict the hierarchy between countries which was in the background of the previous sentence, at least if we attribute a major role to the first in a list. But there are good reasons for rejecting such doubt. Putting Assyria first would have meant to rhetorically detach the person of Warikas from his own country, and to disconnect the effects of his enterprises from their ideologically necessary addressee, the people of Hiyawa. On the other hand, it would have also meant to suggest that a major country – Assyria is depicted in this way in the previous sentence – was the first to initiate a process of transformation which in the end would have modified its original nature, from a state of institutional isolation into a state of institutional “merging”. Such transformation, albeit positive as it is implied in the text, is a duty of the lower party; and this is actually the role which Hiyawa played in this context. From the point of view of correct (international) etiquette, it is for Hiyawa to begin to turn into something new after the acknowledgment of Warikas’s enterprises, and Assyria takes action only after Hiyawa. Finally, it must be noted that putting Hiyawa in the first place in part b.2) makes it the obvious object of the action of “inspecting (the periphery) and acknowledging (the valour of peripheral kings)” which is reserved for the Assyrian king and “house” in the previous sentence. In other words, this action of the Assyrian king has the power to transform the periphery and to “assimilate” it into Assyria.

A final observation must be made on the notably rigid respect of formal (institutional) etiquette which is in the background of this short part. In part b.1), where the Assyrian party assumes the initiative, the Assyrian king precedes the “whole Assyrian house” as subject of the verb. This order clearly respects the concept of the superiority of the king over any other institution in his country, which is typical of the ideological background of the royal inscriptions in the whole of the Ancient Near East. In this conception, the privilege of taking whatever kind of (positive) action is always reserved for the top of the institutional and social pyramid, and any initiative originating from lower institutional or social levels must always be presented as originating from the top level.²⁸ On these premises, it is easy to deduce that in part b) taken as a whole, the order of the subjects involved in the process (Assyrian king – Assyrian “house” – Hiyawa – Assyria) bears implications regarding the role of Hiyawa. This order is clearly a chiasm where the lower level subjects (Assyrian “house” and Hiyawa) are placed side by side in the centre, and the two top level subjects (Assyrian king and Assyria) are placed at the two extremities. This chiasm has the unavoidable effect of suggesting a parallelism between the Assyrian “house” and Hiyawa, and this in the end suggests that, although respecting the hierarchy lying in the background, Hiyawa and the Assyrian “house” play the same role with respect to the higher levels: both are components of a single unity, and lie at a level immediately below that of the top institution (Assyrian king and Assyria). In other words, finally, Hiyawa is turned into a component of Assyria, and represents for Assyria what the Assyrian “house” represents for the Assyrian king: the highest institutional level immediately below the top. Anyone can easily conclude that Warikas’s enterprises had the final effect of a positive, radical transformation of his own country.

The celebration of Warikas’s role seems to reach its highest level with part b), where Hiyawa is turned into a component of Assyria. But the narration does not end at this point, and it is necessary to explore the ideological background of the events described in part c) and especially of the relations between parts b) and c).

Part c) is entirely devoted to celebrating further accomplishments of Warikas. As anticipated, they are military victories, notable building operations along the borders, and the installation of (very probably Hiyawean²⁹) people in new places. Unfortunately, the end of part c) is very fragmentary; but clearly here it is stated that peace, richness and abundance were granted to Warikas and to Hiyawa.³⁰

²⁸ Ponchia 1989, Fales 2001: 122–133.

²⁹ Here (§ 10) the Luwian text is damaged, and in the corresponding fragmentary Phoenician text (13–16) it is stated that people “oppressed” or “in distress” were “settled” in the new fortresses built by Warikas. These people may well have been people of Hiyawa oppressed by the enemies fought by Warikas.

³⁰ Here the Luwian text is badly broken, but it is clear that there is allusion to Warikas and to his country (§§ 11–12: “I, for me, in the land [... all] good things [...]).” The Phoenician text too is fragmentary (lines 16–18: *Ba’al* of KR [...] quietness, richness, abundance and [*all(?)*] good to

Warikas's achievements are obviously those that are normally to be expected from a king: conquests in enemy territory, reinforcement of his own country's defences, installation of citizens in places (inside or outside their country) better than before, providing peace and abundance. This part perfectly mirrors the common Near Eastern conception of kingship. Its most interesting aspect, however, is represented by its relations with the previous section dealing with the alliance of Hiyawa with Assyria.

At first glance, the textual sequence already makes evident to the reader that the background of Warikas's ultimate accomplishments is essentially the special relation established with Assyria. Thus, it is suggested to the reader that the new, higher status achieved by Hiyawa has allowed its king to undertake further enterprises. Note that this suggestion is instilled through a masterly rhetorical strategy, that of listing in detail and numbering precisely the new conquests and buildings, in contrast to part a) where Warikas's enterprises are only briefly summarized using concise idiomatic phrases. Naturally, this association does not diminish the personal credits of King Warikas since the starting point of the whole ascension of Hiyawa to a major rank and role remains firmly anchored in the initial enterprises of Warikas.

The main concept in the background of the progression from part b) to part c) is that the establishment of special relations with Assyria is productive of substantial advantages, such as conquests, security, peace, and abundance. These advantages extend both to the country and to its king, and in a certain sense are a reward for both of them for the disadvantage of being forced to acknowledge a lower status beneath that of Assyria. In other words, entering in a friendly and quasi-parental relationship with Assyria will produce well recognizable material and immaterial advantages in exchange for a formal acknowledgment of a lower institutional position – no other duty of the lower country obviously being mentioned here at all.

It should be noted that stressing with such a rhetorical copiousness the positivity of the special relationship with Assyria is also an index of a cogent necessity *to convince* that this positivity may be obtained factually. As a matter of fact, and again putting forward an *argumentum e silentio*, it might have sufficed to end the story before this part, or to insert this part in part a). Consequently, it can be clearly and easily understood that Warikas *needed to demonstrate* that the special relationship with Assyria produced beneficial consequences for Hiyawa. This need is certainly to be attributed to the unavoidable existence of political and/or social components who were not satisfied with, or even opposed, the new special relations with Assyria. It is this political or social group that needs to be convinced that many advantages were really obtained. This was certainly true both for those who simply opposed, for whatever reason, the establishment of special relations with Assyria, and for those who may have opposed Warikas himself, either as a sovereign or due

this king *and also in this* [...]); very probably Hiyawa was mentioned at the end of the sentence in grammatical connection to the adjective "this".

to his internal or external policy. In sum, the rhetorical ampleness of part c) is due to the need for legitimating Warikas's political decisions, and finally his own right to exert kingship in his country.

Concluding this section, I schematically reassume the ideological structure of the narration as follows:

1. Warikas's enterprises solicit Assyrian attention;
2. The Assyrian king and his "house" appreciate Warikas's enterprises and assume a favourable attitude towards him;
3. Hiyawa and Assyria merge into a single "house";
4. The merging gives new strength to Warikas;
5. Warikas undertakes more substantial enterprises;
6. Warikas's new enterprises give Hiyawa peace, richness, and abundance.

Even with a superficial reading, the episode of establishing a relationship with Assyria appears to be crucial in the development of the narration. The conciseness of the description of the first set of Warikas's enterprises contrasts with the ampleness of that of the second set, and thus gives sharp prominence to the story of the new relationship with Assyria as a powerful and essential accelerator of the triumphal story told by Warikas. We may safely conclude that, in spite of the space given to the description of his enterprises, Warikas's main aim in having this text produced was that of exalting and legitimating the new political situation introduced by the special relationship with Assyria. This he did, obviously, when the political and military goals of his policy were achieved, i.e., after the conquests, the buildings and the installations of people described in the final part of the text. Thus, in the end, this text represents a full-fledged justification and celebration of Warikas's political choices leading to the establishment of a pro-Assyrian policy resulting in the special relationship mentioned in the text.

3. METAPHORS AND IDEOLOGY

The institutional and political characteristics of the relationship with Assyria can be determined only very roughly because only two sentences are devoted to its description, and they are very concise and formulated as metaphors using terms of common language. In the first sentence, the verbal form "to be made, to be turned into"³¹ is associated with "father and mother (for me)" and produces what I will call a "parental" metaphor; in the second, the same verb is associated with the expression "one (i.e., single) 'house'" and forms what I will call the "merging of houses" metaphor.

³¹ See n. 27, above.

The “parental” metaphor appears twice in both versions of KARATEPE. In the first instance, Azitiwatas is “mother and father” (with an inversion) with respect to his country, but in the second he is only “father” with respect to all foreign kings.³² The “parental metaphor”, with the addition of brotherhood, is used in the (exclusively) Phoenician inscription of Kilamuwa mentioned above, and refers to Kilamuwa’s attitude towards a group of his subjects: “but for some (*muškabim*) I was a father, for some a mother, for some a brother”.³³ P. E. Dion recently stressed that a similar metaphor is used in the Bible referring to the attitude of King Ahaz of Judah towards the Assyrian king, although here the relationship is that of a son towards his father (“I am servant and son of the king of Assyria”).³⁴ From these few examples, it might be deduced that the parental/paternal/filial metaphors were applied generally to the relations between kings, and consequently that they might have hinted at some specific institutional and/or political relationship (such as, e.g., dynastic ties, institutionalized alliance, tribute, political agreement or consonance). The KARATEPE example, which points at the relationship between Azitiwatas and his country, together with the text of Kilamuwa which points at his subjects, however, demonstrate that kings were not the only partners hinted at in the metaphor. Accordingly, the latter proves to be more general than specific in its (institutional or political) meaning.

On the other hand, it is difficult to single out a fitting Assyrian parallel clearly attested in the Neo-Assyrian texts. The parental relationship is never attested *expressis verbis* in the various protocols described in the relations between the king of Assyria and other kings; the most widespread metaphor was that of “master vs. servant”, which probably was compulsory in daily court practice.³⁵ A passage in Assurbanipal’s Prism A, however, aptly describes the humble attitude which is expected from a foreign king towards the Assyrian king, i.e., that of a son towards his father: “Like a son should correspond with his father from (a position of) inferiority, so he (the king of Urartu) constantly wrote to me (addressing me in this way): ‘Good health to the king, my lord’”.³⁶ Conversely, Assurbanipal compares his attitude towards the Elamite prince Tammaritu to that of a father towards his son: “What (even) a father does not do for a son, I have [done] and given to you!”³⁷ It follows that, in the Assyrian etiquette rules, the usual “servant vs. master” metaphor for relations between non-Assyrian kings and the Assyrian king

³² Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 978–980.

³³ KAI 1 24:10–11.

³⁴ 2 Kings 16:7–8, cf. 2 Chron 28:16.

³⁵ Dion 2007: 137, quoting Cogan & Tadmor 1988: 187.

³⁶ Borger 1996: 71, Prism A x 45–47: *kīma ša māru ana abīšu ištānappara bēlūtu u šū kī pī annimma ištānappara umma lū šulmu ana šarri bēlīya*. I follow Borger’s translation *ad sensum*: “und korrespondierte auf der Ebene der Untergebenheit, wie ein Sohn mit seinem Vater”. This is the formally required introduction in the letters addressed to the Assyrian king by all his subjects, whatever may have been their institutional roles.

³⁷ ABL 1022 r.19–20 (quoted according to Parpola & Watanabe 1988: XXI).

was ultimately envisaged as that of a son with his father, which requires moral respect and full obedience in addition to affection and love. Furthermore, it cannot be forgotten that the Median kings who swore the loyalty oath to Assurbanipal (672 BC) were authoritatively required to “love Assurbanipal” like themselves.³⁸ On the other hand, it must be noted that the father vs. son metaphor was practically never used for describing the relations between the king and his subjects in the whole Mesopotamian tradition.³⁹

From a purely Assyrian point of view, the parental metaphor can be reasonably connected with the institution of the *adê*, the unbalanced sworn treaty through which all non-Assyrian kings were expected to obligate themselves to respectfully obey the Assyrian king and to recognize their submission by delivering their annual tribute. On the ideological level, this seems to be the only possibility as regards Hiyawa since the *adê* is the only institution admissible when the Assyrian king relates to the other, lower level kings – and it is doubtful that Hiyawa was considered at the same level as Assyria in Neo-Assyrian ideology.⁴⁰ It has been aptly demonstrated, however, that in the daily political praxis other kinds of balanced and unbalanced agreement existed and were applied, such as, e.g., bilateral treaties, nonaggression pacts and peace pacts.⁴¹ The tendency to depict all kinds of international agreements as *adê*, as is well known, is a product of the ideological attitude of the royal inscriptions and the epistolary etiquette. Thus, it is possible that in ÇINEKÖY there is metaphorical allusion to another kind of agreement.

On the historical level, it is known from texts of Tiglath-pileser III that Urikki of Que paid tribute to the Assyrian king upon at least two occasions.⁴² Most reasonably, paying tribute to the Assyrian king seems to have been the basic prescription for kings who swore the *adê* agreement. The tribute would have been abolished only upon the annexation of their country to the Assyrian empire and its reduction to the status of a province. Afterwards, it would have been replaced by ordinary taxes to be collected by the Assyrian governors to be forwarded to the central Assyrian administration. According to this pattern, which seems to have

³⁸ SAA 2 6: 266–268: *šumma attunu ana Assurbanipal (...) kī napšātekuunu tara” amāni*, “Swear that you will (always) love Assurbanipal (...) like yourselves”; for the solemn swearing formula introduced by *šumma*, see Parpola & Watanabe 1988: XXXVIII–XLI. Contemporarily, the Median kings were required to behave as reliable servants towards him and his brother Šamaš-šumu-ukin: (*šumma ...*) *ina kēnāte taršāti lā tatanabbalaššanūni*, “you shall always serve them in a true and fitting manner”, SAA 2 6:97–98.

³⁹ Seux 1967: 34 lists only one example (in Akkadian), regarding Hammurabi (“Like a true father”), but the relationship is with those who will approach Hammurabi’s stele in order to read the article of his laws regarding his case. No examples are given for the inverse, filial relationship. It is possible that in Neo-Assyrian etiquette and ideology the respect-and-love relationship was reassumed under the widespread metaphor of royal shepherdship.

⁴⁰ Liverani 1979, 1990; Fales 2001: 212–214.

⁴¹ Parpola in Parpola & Watanabe 1988: XV–XXII.

⁴² Tadmor 1994: 54 (Ann. 21:8’), 87 (Ann. 3:4), 89 (Ann. 27:3), 68 (Ann. 13:11), 108 (St. IIIA:8), 170 (Summ. 7 r.7’). For the chronology of the two sets of tribute, pp. 232–235.

been totally coherent in its application, Warikas might have sworn an *adê* to the Assyrian king in the framework of the stipulation of an alliance with Assyria (in all probability with king Tiglath-pileser III, in whose inscriptions the tribute of Urikki of Que is mentioned). Accordingly, the political background of ÇINEKÖY might have been Warikas's celebration of his alliance with Assyria through the *adê*, keeping in mind, however, that the inscription does not necessarily have to be considered as a celebration of the *adê* itself or as a text composed shortly after the *adê* went into effect. As a matter of fact, the wording of the text seems to imply that there was enough time after the alliance for Warikas to conquer and to (re)build fortresses and to install his subjects in new locations.

Moving a step further, we may examine the parental metaphor of ÇINEKÖY from the point of view of the action which is attributed to the Assyrian king, i.e., that of "turning" into "a father and a mother" for Warikas.⁴³ The imagery suggested in this sentence subtly induces the reader to suppose that Warikas was in a condition similar to that of an orphan before the Assyrian king turned his benign attention to him. He had neither father nor mother; and only the benign attitude of the Assyrian king, who had noted Warikas's prowess, turned him into a respectful and loving son of the latter.

The unstated but rather evident imagery of the orphan can find an efficacious parallel in the imagery suggested by a topical term used in the Assyrian royal inscriptions for describing some foreign kings – thus fitting Warikas's status as seen from the Assyrian side. This term is *mār lā mamman*, "son of nobody", which, as it is immediately evident, suggests the status of someone who has neither father nor mother, i.e., an orphan. In Assyrian royal inscriptions, this term is used for describing the status of some individuals who either grasped the throne of their own country after having expelled the legitimate king by their own initiative or were enthroned in the place of the legitimate king by the Assyrian king himself, generally by force. This term is usually understood as implying a non-royal, even a low social status: hence the frequently adopted translations "commoner", "private citizen", etc.⁴⁴ This may have been true in some or in many cases, but, in my opinion, (low) social status is only one among the various situations which could have been described through the compound "son of nobody", and such translations seem to be too restricted, albeit in some cases they may seem fitting in the historical context. The term *mār lā mamman*, in general, must be understood according to its strong metaphorical meaning, and taken so as to imply the lack of a familial background

⁴³ The inchoative meaning is suggested both by the medio-passive form of the verb *iziya-*, "to make", of the Luwian version and by the verbal+preposition form *kn l*, "to become", of the Phoenician version. See the discussion in Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 980 and 997–998, Lanfranchi 2007: 188–189 n. 23.

⁴⁴ AHw. 601 s.v. *mammāna* 4a) has "Sohn von Irgendwem". CAD M/1: 200 s.v. *mamman* i) does not offer a specific translation other than that of the term itself ("nobody").

– the parents – which helps and drives, loves and instructs, and finally makes an individual a full member of his society.

This general metaphorical meaning can be best applied to those kings who were installed on, or were assisted in seizing the throne by the Assyrian king. The imagery clearly suggests that, before the Assyrian king's intervention, those individuals did not enjoy any support comparable to that of solicitous parents; and that the Assyrian king transformed them into dignified individuals – into legitimate kings according to the development of the narration. It is easy to apply such a metaphorical pattern to Warikas and to the story he tells in ÇINEKÖY from the Assyrian ideological point of view, albeit with some necessary differences. Warikas benefits from the parental attitude of the Assyrian king, and obtains victories and abundance for him and for his country: in the Assyrian “version”, Warikas is like an “orphan”, but he receives the parental attention of the Assyrian king and finally turns into a true king who is able to benefit his own country with military successes and abundance.

The combination and the comparison of the imageries lying in the background of the metaphors used in ÇINEKÖY and in the Assyrian royal inscriptions does not help in determining what institutional and political agreement was in the background of the story told by Warikas. As already stated, we are free to suppose any kind of agreement among those which were stipulated in the Neo-Assyrian period. Nevertheless, the parallelism between the metaphors suggests that there was at least a basic common terrain between the Luwian-Phoenician and the Neo-Assyrian depiction of the king who has not yet reached the full deployment of his institutional role and the full control of his own country, and needs an external acknowledgment (or help) for completing his institutional itinerary. The different parental metaphors may perhaps be attributed to an influence of one part on the other in the complex relations between the western and the eastern cultural worlds in the Near East of the first millennium BC; but at the moment it is impossible to establish if this is true, or, if true, what party was active in the transmission.

There is, however, an important point in common between the *purposes* which oriented the choice of such metaphors in the ÇINEKÖY bilingual and in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. The final purpose was that of depicting the Assyrian king as a good and solicitous father, or even as a full pair of parents in ÇINEKÖY. Whether addressed to the (ideal) Assyrian audience, or to the (ideal) Hiyawean audience, both metaphors aimed at presenting a good, benevolent image of the Assyrian king, as a king who cares for foreign rulers and helps them in obtaining what they were not able to achieve, and favours the development and the enrichment of foreign countries. This image would obviously be normal in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions; it is, however, most important and crucial to find it in an inscription of a non-Assyrian king. Its appearance in a non-Assyrian text not only implies the pro-Assyrian sentiments of the composer(s) of the text, but also and especially

the fact that the very same ideological message that permeates the Assyrian royal inscriptions is reproduced in a non-Assyrian text.

I think it is not too hazardous to state that in this “parental” metaphor of ÇINEKÖY we may see the full deployment of one of the main Assyrian ideological messages addressed to the peripheral elites. The Assyrian king, in principle, is always positively disposed towards all those who need help of any kind; he is always able to notice all those who excel in their own activity, he acknowledges their merits and wishes to reward them; he is always ready and willing to take action in their favour if and when necessary; finally, his intervention is always decisive in granting further successes to those he decided to help. In other words, the Assyrian king is and acts like a good father, who looks after his son attentively, is always ready to defend him and always desires him to obtain the successes he wishes – and this is especially valid for those foreign kings who correctly exercise kingship in their countries.

A last point still needs to be touched upon as regards this metaphor, and consists in the fact that only parental (father and mother) figures are taken into account both in the ÇINEKÖY text version and in the Neo-Assyrian *mār lā mamman* version. Here there is a contrast with the above-mentioned metaphors used in Kilamuwa’s text, where also brotherhood is introduced as an attitude of Kilamuwa towards his people (see above). The limitation to the parental figures is clearly an indicator that Warikas (in ÇINEKÖY) and the foreign kings (in the *mār lā mamman* topos) are not acknowledged as having the role of peer to the Assyrian king. Actually, brotherhood *per se* implies a peer level, especially when no space is given to the aspect of primogeniture or of age difference. Thus, the Assyrian king remains in any case at a higher level than that of Warikas and of the *mār lā mamman* kings: like a father and a mother, he must be respected, honoured, listened to and especially obeyed; and finally he has full authority over all of them.

It is clear at this point that the ideological message aimed at extolling the paternal attitude of the Assyrian king towards the foreign kings is presented so as to preserve the Assyrian king’s higher position in institutional role, in international etiquette and in the balance of forces in the field. The Assyrian king, in the end, is a benign authority: he is benign because he is affectionate and helpful, but he is authoritative because he has an inherited, dominant role which distinguishes him from other rulers.

4. METAPHORS AND IDEOLOGY: MERGING WITH THE EMPIRE

Regarding the “merging into one house” metaphor (“Hiyawa and Assyria were made a single ‘house’”⁴⁵), it is difficult to establish what institutional developments are

⁴⁵ ÇINEKÖY § 7, cf. Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 980–984.

alluded to in the text. The metaphorical meaning can be determined only by starting from the term “house”, and in general, it is clear that in Luwian, in Phoenician and in Assyrian it was used to designate whatever kind of state (kingdom, chiefdom, tribe, etc.), a family of whatever social importance and extension (royal dynasty, noble and common family, etc.), a bureaucratic apparatus of whatever importance (royal administration, peripheral offices, etc.), a public or private commercial enterprise, and even an estate of whatever kind.⁴⁶ On the other hand, ÇINEKÖY has the only occurrence of this kind of metaphor in Luwian, and consequently it is not clear whether it is a borrowing from the Phoenician or from elsewhere. A. Lemaire, stressing that this metaphor is an *unicum* in Phoenician, suggested that it should be interpreted according to the meaning of the Akkadian compound term *bītu ištēn*, which would refer to an alliance between two peoples or two kingdoms.⁴⁷

There is no way, in my opinion, to establish whether this metaphor referred to a specific institutional action or status, and, if it did so, to what action or status it referred – or was it only a generic allusion to friendship and alliance? On the one hand, the extremely generic and wide meaning of the term “house” in both languages is a serious obstacle for any inquiry. On the other hand, there is a notable discrepancy between the Luwian and Phoenician versions. In the Luwian version, the parties merging into a single “house” are definitely countries, Hiyawa and Assyria. Thus, it seems evident that in Luwian the metaphor alluded to true territorial entities, and to a territorial fusion between the two countries. In the Phoenician version, however, the merging parties are designated through gentilics, *dnnym*, the Phoenician form for “Adanaweans” (see above), and “Assyrians”; thus, here the allusion was to the populations of the two countries.

It is very difficult, if not impossible, to explain coherently this contrast due to the scarcity of texts available. The contrast might depend on basic differences in the linguistic and semantic conventions of Luwian and Phoenician. This, however, is not certain, and in any case it cannot be established on the basis of the examples available in the bilinguals of ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE, where in other instances, Phoenician gentilics and toponyms correspond to Luwian toponyms, and *vice versa*.⁴⁸ Alternatively, the contrast can be attributed to the difference in the

⁴⁶ See simply the list of basic meanings given in CAD B: 282 s.v. *bītu*, for the Akkadian language. In general, these meanings may be considered valid also for the Phoenician and Luwian languages.

⁴⁷ In Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 988 with n. 79. All the examples quoted (see also those listed in CAD B: 293 s.v. *bītu* 6b) stem from texts of the second millennium BC; as far as I know, this expression does not occur in Neo-Assyrian texts.

⁴⁸ In KARATEPE the Luwian toponym Adanawa (= Adana) corresponds in Phoenician both to the gentilic *dnnym* (e.g., Hawkins 2000: 49, § III and VI) and to the true toponym *'dn* (= Adana), albeit in the latter case only in the toponymical expression *'mq 'dn*, “plain of Adana”, corresponding to Luwian “country of Adanawa” (e.g., *ibid.*, § V: “plain of Adanawa” vs. “plain (*'mq*) of *'dn*”). The latter expression was correctly reconstructed in the fragmentary line 4 of ÇINEKÖY by A. Lemaire in Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 997: *'rṣ 'mq ['dn]*.

imageries which were to be suggested in each version of the metaphor. Accordingly, the Luwian version would have been aimed at stressing the territorial aspect of the merging, the Phoenician version at stressing the “population” aspect.

If we try to connect the two forms of the “merging” metaphor to the well known historical phenomena prevailing in this period, the “territorial merging” of the Luwian version might be taken as implying that Hiyawa was annexed to Assyria. The annexation, however, seems very improbable according to the patterns known from the Assyrian royal inscriptions and from other texts such as letters and administrative documents. When Assyrian annexations were effected, the monarchical institution of the annexed country was annihilated; the Assyrian kingship “absorbed” the kingship of the annexed country, and an Assyrian governor was installed to function as the only representative *in loco* of the Assyrian king. In ÇINEKÖY, however, Warikas is described as having continued to be the legitimate king of Hiyawa well after the merging, and this does not fit at all with the picture given above.

There is, however, an Assyrian background for the “merging of populations” metaphor of the Phoenician version. The mingling of populations is mentioned in an historiographic text, the “Synchronistic History”, as the immediate consequence of some of the peace treaties and border agreements stipulated between the kings of Assyria and Babylonia.⁴⁹ Admittedly, in the Assyrian royal inscriptions, there is no technical term for an activity which would specifically imply the merging of peoples; *mutatis mutandis*, the only candidate might be the deportation, which obviously cannot be taken into account unless the narration of ÇINEKÖY is considered a full-fledged forgery of the historical developments. The “Synchronistic History”, however, seems to be a sufficient witness of the diffusion in the Neo-Assyrian period of an imagery which had the “merging of populations” as the product of treaties and agreements between kings.

It is thus very reasonable to come back to the stipulation of an *adê* to the Assyrian king which has already been suggested above for the first metaphor. For the sake of precision, however, it must be noted that the territorial merging mentioned in the Luwian version contradicts what is known about the institutional consequences of the *adê*. The Neo-Assyrian *adê* did not imply a formal merging of territories or of peoples. When a ruler stipulated an *adê* with the Assyrian king, he kept his institutional status of reigning king, which implied full sovereignty over his country, and the legal and fiscal distinction of his territory from that of Assyria.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Grayson 1975 no. 21 ii 36'–37' (alliance between Aššur-bel-kala of Assyria and Adad-apla-iddina of Babylonia), iii 19 (Adad-nerari II and Nabû-šuma-iškun), col. iii 3' (broken context, but the Assyrian king should be Shalmaneser III). The verb used is *balālu*, and the populations are clearly indicated with the term *nišē*, “people”.

⁵⁰ Postgate 1992.

The various duties imposed on the king who subscribed to the *adê* did not exclude *per se* the survival of his institutional territorial authority.

There is no other solution for all these contradictions than either invoking a kind of treaty or agreement between Hiyawa and Assyria different from the *adê*, or acknowledging that the “merging” metaphor has a mere ideological value, and is only vaguely related to the substantial form of the institutional event alluded to in ÇINEKÖY. A peer-to-peer treaty or agreement is *per se* possible, although it would not correspond to what we know about the difference in rank between Hiyawa and Assyria according to the ideology of the Assyrian royal inscriptions (see above). Consequently, we would be forced to admit that the tribute by Urikki of Que mentioned in Tiglath-pileser III’s texts was either an Assyrian ideological deformation or was an event other than that mentioned in ÇINEKÖY. On the other hand, it is equally reasonable to suggest that it was not expedient for Warikas to depict in ÇINEKÖY the true institutional and political consequences of the *adê* stipulated with the Assyrian king (political obedience, lower royal rank and payment of tribute). Accordingly, he would have preferred to provide only a rather vague and generic description of the consequences of the *adê*, subsumed under the metaphor of the merging of both countries and populations.

Further study is needed as regards the first hypothesis, aimed at better understanding both the historical context of the stipulation of an agreement other than the common *adê* and the institutional framework of the international treaties during the Neo-Assyrian period. It is interesting, however, to investigate the quality of the metaphorical image of the merging from the ideological and communicational point of view.

It is immediately evident that the merging (of countries and/or populations into a single “house”) is considered and presented as a totally positive event. On the one hand, it is the logical prosecution of the positivity put forward in the “parental” metaphor. On the other hand, it is obviously the necessary basis for the following positive developments, consisting of conquests and building activities. Due to the impossibility of establishing what exactly the “merging into a single house” might have meant from the institutional point of view, we must ask at this point *how* and *why* the merging is presented here as a positive event.

We may begin by considering the positive characteristics of the concept “one (single) house”, which is the final result of the transformation of Hiyawa and Assyria alluded to in the metaphor and is present in both versions. It is immediately evident that the imagery behind the term “house” taken in its basic meaning has *per se* a high degree of positivity. “House” is instinctively associated with family, and consequently, with love, intimacy and cohesion. It also conjures images of mutual protection and cooperation, shelter, and privacy. In general, “house” is the place where one can find rest and quietness, separating oneself from the anxieties of the external world. Even the more specialized meanings so often given to this

term in the Near Eastern languages, such as “lineage, family, dynasty”, “social and ethnic conglomerate, tribe, people”, and “property, estate, holding”,⁵¹ have a basically positive meaning, insofar as they designate entities which are supposed to be coherent and united and which one hopes will never be dispersed or fractured.

The other component of the merging metaphor, “one”, has also a definitely positive aspect. “One” obviously recalls uniqueness, individuality and (chronologically) a beginning or starting point, but also and especially unity, cohesion and invariability. In any language, “to be (as) one” implies concord, solidarity and mutual help. In parallel, “to be turned into one”, or “into a single entity” means to have moved to unity from diversity, to cohesion from division, to concord from dissension and strife, to solidarity from conflict. This wide set of meanings centred on the concept of unity is also to be found in a rhetorical topos often used in the Assyrian royal inscriptions for describing the positivity of the *reductio ad unum* constantly espoused by the Assyrian king. This is the topos of the imposition of “a single ‘mouth’” to the conquered and annexed countries and peoples (*ištēn pā šakānu*, most often in the Š-stem *šuškunu*).⁵² In Akkadian, the imagery connected with *pū*, “mouth”, may point at a meaning of “talk, discourse, speech” and also to the more specialized meaning of “tongue, language”; the former meaning has other, more abstract implications, centred around the moral and philosophical concepts of “opinion, thinking, will”. It is not yet possible to establish whether the topos of the Assyrian royal inscriptions referred specifically to the linguistic aspect (pointing at the unity of language as the product of Assyrian annexations) or to a more abstract meaning implying unity in thinking and will – concord and solidarity – as the product of the common submission to a unified government centre embodied in the Assyrian king. It is important to note, however, that in the Assyrian royal inscriptions the tendency towards unity (although induced passively in historical reality) is presented as one of the positive achievements of the king. The king worked for extending universally the power and the dominion of his god Aššur in order to turn the chaotic periphery into a coherent unity submitted to his divine will.

The *reductio ad unum*, thus, has a totally positive value in ideologically oriented texts such as the royal inscriptions; and it may assume further positivity if it is associated with a positive concept like “house”. “To be turned into a single house”, consequently, means to achieve the highest degree of unity and concord, of cohesion and love, and at the end it substantially means to be turned into a single, united, protective and loving family sheltered by defensive, friendly walls.

⁵¹ See the various meanings given in AHW. 132–133 s.v. *bītu(m)* and CAD B: 282–295 s.v. *bītu*.

⁵² See, e.g., Tadmor 1994: 44 (Ann. 9: 11 [Annals of Tiglath-pileser III]); Fuchs 1994: 43, l. 73 (Cylinder of Sargon II from Khorsabad). Sometimes the numeral adjective is expressed through *ēdu*, “sole, unique”: cf. AHW. 873a s.v. *pū* D.1.c), where the topos is translated as “(Länder) eines Sinnes machen”. Cf. also the phrase *ana ištēn pī turru*, “to turn into a single ‘discourse’”, AHW. 873a, sub D.4.

5. CONCLUSION

The association of the “parental” and of the “merging into one house” metaphors in a close and strict sequence has a crucial ideological cogency and produces a powerful message. Put together, the metaphors aim at demonstrating that the political alliance with Assyria was structured and developed according to the positive patterns of parental care and love, and of familial mutual shelter. This parental and familial environment mitigates and softens the unavoidable hierarchical difference between the Assyrian king and Warikas, and between Assyria and Hiyawa, which is, however, carefully respected both in the distribution of the familial roles and in the order in which the two parties are mentioned (see above). Consequently, the metaphors tend to communicate that the agreement stipulated between Assyria and Hiyawa, hierarchical differences notwithstanding, had as a final effect the sharing of common interests and the development of a concordant will.

The relation of the metaphors with the previous and the following parts of the text, i.e., their position in the progression of the story, also has positive aspects. The first place given to enterprises of Warikas in the sequence of the narration suggests that the agreement between Hiyawa and Assyria did not depend on a one-sided imposition by a superior party on a lower party. The stipulation of the agreement, instead, depended basically on the fact that Warikas’s prowess, like the correct behaviour of a good son, ultimately found its due acknowledgment in the benign attitude of the Assyrian king, that of a good father who is always willing to reward his son’s merits. Furthermore, as already stated, the fact that the metaphors are followed by a second set of Warikas’s accomplishments suggests that the agreement produced positive effects for his country Hiyawa. In conclusion, the ideological message conveyed in ÇINEKÖY through the “parental” and “merging into one house” metaphors is totally devoted to framing the agreement with Assyria in an uninterrupted positive sequence characterizing the royal “career” of Warikas as a whole and to describing in detail the benefits enjoyed by his country Hiyawa.

This same kind of positive progression is present also in the inscriptions of Kilamuwa and Bar-rakib of Sam’al. In both of them, the agreement with Assyria and with the Assyrian king – of whatever kind it may have been – produces positive effects for the king stipulating the agreement and for his country. Kilamuwa “pays” the Assyrian king, and then is able to free his country from foreign oppression (by the *mlk dnyym*), and to benefit his people with unprecedented wealth.⁵³ Bar-rakib states that his father Panamuwa’s staunch loyalty to the Assyrian king allowed him to annex some towns of the bordering kingdom of Gurgum,⁵⁴ and that his own “running at the wheel” of the Assyrian king finally allowed him to restore the Sam’alian royal palace so as to impress all other kings with his well-being and

⁵³ Celebrated at length in the central section of his inscription: KAI 1 24:9–13.

⁵⁴ KAI 1 215:14–15; for comments on some rare and difficult passages, KAI 2: 228–229.

wealth.⁵⁵ This common aspect is obviously due to the fact that all three kings – Kilamuwa, Warikas and Bar-rakib – needed and wished to legitimate their political action through a clear-cut demonstration of its positive effects. All three kings were evidently faced with the same internal problem of explaining and justifying their relationship with a major power like Assyria because it was well known that such a relationship might yield unpleasant consequences, and in this situation they were all forced to stress as much as possible the positive consequences of that agreement.

It must be noted, however, that amongst the three kings, only Warikas stresses with so much clarity and intensity the aspects of parental relationship and of merging in his agreement with the Assyrian king. Kilamuwa limits himself to stressing the positive consequences of the agreement, but he does not proceed further in qualifying his relationship with the Assyrian king. Bar-rakib, however, although celebrating his father Panamuwa's dignity in the eyes and in the court of the Assyrian king, strongly and overtly stresses his father's lower role in etiquette and in institutional rank (he states, e.g., that Tiglath-pileser III installed his father as king, and he often designates him his father's lord). Bar-rakib proudly declares himself a servant of the Assyrian king, not even attempting to veil his definitely lower rank and position.⁵⁶ It is not possible in this context even to attempt to single out the historical developments and the political conditions in the international and internal sceneries which may have favoured and suggested such different outcomes in the choice of the "tuning" of the ideological message. It is, however, important to notice that Warikas, differently from his colleagues, stressed energetically the motif of union and merging of countries and peoples.

This uniqueness reveals the basic, specific characteristic of the ideological message conveyed in ÇINEKÖY. Through the "parental" and "merging into one house" metaphors, and through their insertion in a progression towards better achievements, Warikas aims at demonstrating that international cohesion and unity, respectful of institutional roles, is the most rewarding policy to be followed. Unity implies mutual respect, concord and peace, and is always fruitful; as such, it must be opposed to division and fragmentation, which evidently are to be considered the main causes of strife, conflict and negativity. If we insert this message into the historical reality of Warikas's times and to the mechanisms at work in the international scenery, we cannot avoid the conclusion that, in his inscription, Warikas celebrates in general the nature and the structure of a supranational empire, and in particular that of the Assyrian empire. If the tight union of his country with Assyria produced such strongly positive effects, the insertion into the Assyrian empire is to be seen positively for every country and for every king, obviously provided that the institutional role of the "lower" king is acknowledged and respected, and that the "lower" king respects the higher role of the Assyrian king. The expansion

⁵⁵ KAI 1 216:11–20.

⁵⁶ KAI 1 216:3.

of Assyrian empire, thus, is turned into and presented as the positive, natural development of an ideal, cooperative family, where a good and valiant son like Warikas is duly recognized, rewarded and loved by an attentive and caring father like the Assyrian king.

This pro-imperial and pro-Assyrian message deployed by Warikas perfectly coincides with that which was constantly produced and transmitted by the king and by the elites of the Assyrian empire by means of the most varied types of texts and monuments, and through political and social practice. As I have suggested some years ago, the Assyrian empire constantly deployed a strong and variegated apparatus of ideological messages aimed at soliciting consensus among foreign kings and elites. Such consensus was to be directed not only towards the very person of the Assyrian king and towards the various policies he employed in the course of military and political expansion, but also and especially towards the imperial structure itself, in which the peripheral elites might have found ample justification for renouncing the institutional and political autonomy of small-scale dominions.

Finally, the ÇINEKÖY bilingual suggests that the Assyrian messages aimed at soliciting consensus towards the empire might have been spoken and transmitted in peripheral countries by local rulers still enjoying independence and full institutional authority. In the end, these rulers, on the condition that some of their privileges were maintained, might “happily” (in P. Dion’s fitting words⁵⁷) turn into true local agents of the Assyrian ideological messages and propaganda, thus unconsciously, but in some instances probably consciously, feeding and strengthening the mechanisms driving the expansion of the empire – and, ironically, in some cases crafting their unhappy end with their own hands. It must be noted, however, that such staunch pro-Assyrian sentiments and activity might have clashed with the opinions of a part of the local population and elites, so that the cooperation with the imperial mechanism was not devoid of heavy risks and required a solicitous political stratagem and, overall, an intense ideological communication.

Soliciting consensus is a mechanism which must be considered structurally connected and bound with the very same nature of an expanding empire – or of whatever structure which functions on the premises of a political project aiming at absorbing the external political structures. Military superiority in the field, economic oppression, and any coercive activity or measure represent the other, generally most impressive side of the coin, but they absolutely cannot be considered the exclusive means of deployment of an imperialistic policy. As for the Assyrians, it must be reasonably acknowledged that in all periods, and especially during the dramatic expansion of the eighth and seventh centuries BC, both mechanisms – the search for

⁵⁷ P. Dion (2007) labels these rulers as “willing servants” of the Assyrian king. According to the approach put forward in this article, such an adjective is fully justified and well suited; I wonder whether there is some irony in Dion’s words about the amazement that such a definition may raise among those who are convinced of the absolute negativeness of the Assyrian empire.

consensus and conviction by force – were constantly at work, mutually integrated in a complex political action which produced dramatically effective success – the unification of the whole ancient Near East. In some periods, the ideological stress on the search for consensus might have been softened or even silenced, while the stress on the conviction by force was maintained and increased.⁵⁸ The mechanism, however, was always at work. The end of this process was – I adapt here a statement recently put forward by Simo Parpola⁵⁹ himself – that the peripheral elites “had so long been accustomed to the Assyrian politics that they no doubt regarded it as their own; and at the very end, they definitely belonged to the ruling *élite* of the Empire”.

⁵⁸ As I suggested some years ago, the stress on consensus was especially strong in Sargon’s inscriptions, after that the crisis of the empire which had exploded in the first half of the eighth century had been softened and solved by the aggressive and energetic policy of Tiglath-pileser III. Such stress, however, is not found in the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, an absence clearly due to the political urgency of exhibiting an exclusively “strong” image of the Assyrian king. This is exactly what I stated in Lanfranchi 1997, which Dion 2007: 138–139, however, takes as a statement that Tiglath-pileser III did not have or develop the same benevolent attitude towards his vassals as Sargon did. It is always necessary to distinguish between the ideological stress on royal benevolence (aimed at soliciting consensus) which may be expressed in the Assyrian royal inscriptions and the factual deployment of a benevolent attitude (which factually solicited consensus) in the daily political activity. Stressing benevolence in texts of official character like the royal inscriptions is an indicator that the political situation does not require (any longer) showing exclusively a fierce image of the king in the urgency of the opposition to his enemies.

⁵⁹ In the paper “Neo-Assyrian Concepts of Kingship and their Heritage in Mediterranean Antiquity” delivered at the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop “Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity”, Padua, November 29, 2007.