# Historical and Historiographical Notes on the Pazarcık Stela

Shuichi Hasegawa*

*Abstract*: The texts of the Pazarcık Stela contain some controversial grammatical features concerning verbs used to describe actions of the characters. Because of these features the subjects of the actions look sometimes ambiguous. The present article discusses two of these grammatical features and offer alternative interpretations based both on analogies with similar texts and on historical considerations. (1) The subject of the verb *ušēbirūni* in Obv. line 10 can be interpreted as the third person plural form of Š-stem of *ebēru* plus ventive, and the subject can be identified as Ataršumki and eight kings who caused Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis to cross the Euphrates. (2) *illikūni* in Rev. line 5 has been widely taken as the third person singular form of *alāku* plus subjunctive marker *–ūni*, and its subject has been identified as Šamšī-ilu. Based on this identification, some scholars have suggested that Šamšī-ilu's self-confidence is reflected in the text, who credits to himself the deeds described in the text. However, the verb can alternatively be interpreted as the third person plural form plus ventive, and analogy with other texts suggests that the subject can be identified as both Shalmaneser IV and Šamšī-ilu. These alternative interpretations should be taken into account, when discussing the history of Neo-Assyria as well as the relationship between the Assyrian kings and their high officials at the time of Adad-nērārī III and Shalmaneser IV.

*Keywords*: Neo-Assyria, Pazarcık Stela, Adad-nērārī III, Shalmaneser IV, Šamšī-ilu

The Pazarcık Stela was found during the construction of a dam in the village of Kızkapanlı, in the Pazarcık area near Kahramanmaraş, southeastern Turkey.[1] It has an elongated shape, which measures 140 × 44 × 16.5 cm. Assyrian inscriptions, largely undamaged, are inscribed on two sides. The text on the obverse was engraved during Adad-nērārī III's reign (810-783 BCE), and that on the reverse was carved during the reign of Shalmaneser IV (782-772 BCE). Since texts relating to the two kings are quite limited in number, the stela's historical significance is self-evident. However, there are elusive grammatical features in the texts, which have hindered the accurate interpretation of described events as well as the author's "real" intention. The aim of the present study is to elucidate these grammatical features in order to illuminate the Assyrian history and historiography of the western side of the Euphrates during the reigns of Adad-nērārī III and Shalmaneser IV.

*Obverse*

The obverse inscription consists of twenty-three lines, which can be divided into five sections: 1) the title of the text ("boundary") including the genealogies of Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis[2] (lines 1-7a); 2) Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis's crossing of the Euphrates River

* Department of Christian Studies, College of Arts, Rikkyo University, Nishi-Ikebukuro 3-34-1, Toshima-ku, Tokyo 171-8501, Japan. sekinesh@post.tau.ac.il

1 DONBAZ (1990, 5). Since its acquisition, the stela has been presented in the Maraş Museum.

2 For the role and importance of Semiramis during Adad-nirari III's reign, see TIMM (1993, 62-63 n. 18) with earlier literature.

to battle nine anti-Assyrian kings (lines 7b-10) ; 3) Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis's battle at Paqarhubunu against Ušpilulume and his ally, Ataršumki of Arpad (lines 11-15a) ; 4) the erection of a boundary stone between Kummuh and Gurgum (lines 15b-18) ; and 5) curses (lines 19-23).[3] The text was possibly composed between 805-804 BCE, when Adad-nērārī III led a military campaign against Arpad and Hazaz,[4] or soon thereafter.

Text : Obverse (A.0.104.3)[5]

1. *ta-hu-mu šá* $^{m}$10-ÉRIN.TÁH MAN KUR *aš+šur*
2. A $^{m}$*šam-ši*-10 MAN KUR *aš+šur*
3. $^{f}$*sa-am-mu-ra-mat* MUNUS.É.GAL
4. *šá šam-ši*-10 MAN KUR *aš+šur*
5. AMA $^{m}$10-ÉRIN.TÁH MAN KAL MAN KUR *aš+šur*
6. *kal-lat* $^{md}$*šùl-ma-nu*-MAŠ
7. MAN *kib-<rat>* 4-*ti ina* $u_4$*-me* $^{m}$*uš-pi-lu-lu-me*
8. MAN URU *ku-mu-ha-a-a a-na* [6] $^{m}$10-ÉRIN.TÁH MAN KUR *aš+šur*
9. $^{f}$*sa-am-mu-ra-mat* MUNUS.É.GAL
10. ÍD *pu-rat-tú ú-še-bi-ru-u-ni*
11. $^{m}$*a-tar-šúm-ki* A $^{m}$AD-*ra-a-me* URU *ár-pa-da-a-a*
12. *a-di* 8 MAN.MEŠ-*ni šá* KI-*šú ina* URU *pa-qi-ra-hu-bu-na*
13. *si-dir-ta-šú-nu <iš-ku-nu>*[7] KI-*šú-nu am-dah-iṣ uš-ma-nu*$^{sic}$-<<MA>>-*šú-nu*[8]
14. *e-kim*[9]*-šú-nu-ti a-na šu-zu-ub* ZI.MEŠ-*šú-nu*
15. *e-li-ú ina* MU.AN.NA *šá-a-te*
16. *ta-hu-mu šú-a-tú ina bir-ti* $^{m}$*uš-pi-lu-lu-me*
17. MAN URU *ku-mu-ha-a-a ina bir-ti* $^{m}$*qa-al-pa-ru-da*$^{(?)}$[10]

---

3 Publication : DONBAZ, (1990, 5-24) ; TIMM, (1993, 55-84) ; ZACCAGNINI (1993, 53-72) ; WEIPPERT (1992, 58 n. 97 [lines 4-11]) ; *RIMA* 3, A.0.104.3.

4 Eponym Chronicles B1, 13', 14'.

5 For the reference to the earlier literature, see TIMM (1993, 55-56, n. 1.)

6 DONBAZ (1990) interprets this *ana* as a *nota accusativi* based on the Aramaic preposition -ל (*l*$^{e}$). WEIPPERT (1992, 56 n. 82), on the other hand, interprets the phrase as adverbial. The use of *ana* as *nota accusativi* in the Neo-Assyrian texts is supported in HÄMEEN-ANTTILA's study (2000, 77). See also *GAG* §§114e ; 144c ; PARPOLA (1984, 205 n. 29). *ana* as *nota accusativi* appears in the Saba'a Stela too (line 13). It is rather remarkable that the *ana* in the Saba'a Stela is also used in the context of "crossing the Euphrates". The difference is that in the Saba'a Stela, *ana* is put just before ÍD *pu-rat-te*. Is it possible that in the original source of the Pazarcık Stela, this sentence was *ina* $u_4$*-me* $^{m}$*uš-pi-lu-lu-me* MAN URU *ku-mu-ha-a-a a-na* ÍD *pu-rat-tú ú-še-bi-ru-u-ni* and that the names of the king and his mother were later inserted when the stela was written to make the sentence clearer ? If so, did the scribe utilise the *ana*, previously located just before ÍD *pu-rat-tú*, to serve as *nota accusativi* for the names of the two persons, or did he erroneously insert those names in an incorrect position ?

7 Following WEIPPERT (1992, 55 n. 82) and FRAHM (1998, 316).

8 The original copy has MA between NU and ŠU sign. MA must be a scribal error and should be deleted. WEIPPERT (1992, 55 n. 82) and TIMM (1993, 57) read *uš-ma-na*$^{sic}$*-šú-nu*, and PONCHIA (1991, 8) and GRAYSON (*RIMA* 3, 205) read *uš-ma-na*(?)*-šú-nu*. Another text dating to Adad-nērārī III's reign has *uš-ma-nu-šú* (*RIMA* 3, A.0.104.4, lines 7-8) as pointed out by TIMM (1993, 60 n. 8) and FRAHM (1998, 316).

9 The KIM sign lacks the initial Winkelhaken. See DONBAZ (1990, 10).

10 Here the sign does not look like normal DA sign ; cf. line 11. See DONBAZ (1990, 10) ; TIMM (1993, 60).

18. A $^{m}$*pa-la-lam* MAN URU *gúr-gu-ma-a-a ú-še-lu-ni*[11]
19. *man-nu šá* <TA>[12] ŠU-*at* $^{m}$*uš-pi-lu-lu-me*
20. DUMU.MEŠ-*šú* DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-*šú e-ki-mu*
21. *aš+šur* $^{d}$AMAR.UTU $^{d}$IŠKUR $^{d}$30 $^{d}$UTU
22. *a-na di-ni-šú lu la i-za-zu*
23. *ik-kib aš+šur* DINGIR-*ia* $^{d}$30 *a-šib*
24. URU.KASKAL

Translation : Obverse

1-7a) Boundary (stone)[13] of Adad-nērārī (III), king of the land Assyria, heir of Šamšī-Adad (V), king of the land Assyria, (and of) Sammuramat (Semiramis), the palace woman, of Šamšī-Adad, king of the land Assyria, mother of Adad-nērārī (III), strong king, king of the land Assyria, daughter in law of Shalmaneser (III), king of the four quarters.

7b-10) In the days of Ušpilulume,[14] king of the city Kummuh, they caused Adad-nērārī (III) king of the land Assyria, (and) Sammuramat (Semiramis), the palace woman, to cross the river Euphrates.[15]

11-15a) Ataršumki, heir of Abirāmu, of the city of Arpad, together with eight kings who were with him at the city of Paqi(/a)rahubunu. Their lines with them, I have beaten. Their military camp, I took away. To save their lives, they went away.

15b-18) In this year[16] this boundary (stone), between Ušpilulume, king of the city Kummuh, and (between) Qalparunda, heir of Palalam, king of the city Gurgum, they installed.[17]

19-23) Whoever that <from> the hand of Ušpilulume, his sons, his grandsons takes (it) away, Aššur, Marduk, Adad, Sîn (and) Šamaš, may not stand in his lawsuit. The anathema to Aššur, my god, (and) Sîn, who dwells in the city Harrān.

---

11 I translate the verb *ušēlūni* "to post, to install". However, the Š-stem of the verb *elû*, when connected with "borders", generally means "to remove" or "to do away with" (cf. *CAD* E, 134a ; *AHw* A-H, 210a), which does not accord with the context. The general verb employed in the meaning of "setting" a stela is *izuzzum* (Š-stem) or *šakānu* (see for example, the Antakya Stela, line 6). On the reverse of the Pazarcık Stela, the verb is *nadānu* "to give" (line 13).

12 Following DONBAZ (1990) ; PONCHIA (1991) ; TIMM (1993).

13 On the meaning of *tahūmu* as "boundary stone", see DONBAZ (1990, 6-7).

14 Following TIMM (1993, 64), I interpret *ina ūmē Ušpilulume* as construct state. Generally, *ina ūmēšu(-ma)* is used in the meaning "at that time" in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. DONBAZ (1990) and WEIPPERT (1992, 55-56 n. 82) translate : "when Ušpilulume ..."

15 For the translation of this sentence, see below.

16 For this chronological interpretation, see TIMM (1993, 66-67), who regards this expression both as chronological and as causal.

17 The form of the verb *ušēlūni* in Neo-Assyrian can be construed either as third person plural of *elû* (Š-stem) plus ventive *–nim*, or as first or third person singular of the same verb plus subjunctive marker *–ūni*. See *GAG* §83b ; HÄMEEN-ANTTILA (2000, 92-93). DONBAZ (1990, 9) translates : "In this (same) year this boundary stone was *set up* between Ušpilulume, king of the people of Kummuh, and Qalparuda, son of Palalam, king of the people of Gurgum." TIMM (1993, 58) interprets this verb as the third person plural plus ventive, and translates : „In jenem Jahr stellte man diese Grenzstele zwischen Ušpilulume, dem König der Stadt der Kummuhäer, (und) zwischen Qalparu(n)da, dem Sohn des Palalam, dem König der Stadt der Gurgumäer, auf."

Parts of this text are syntactically problematic, which have rendered the historical evaluation of this stela disputable. Lines 7-10 are the first example ; it is not entirely clear who caused whom to cross the Euphrates. Three interpretations have been proposed. M. WEIPPERT (1992, 56 n. 82) suggests that Ušpilulume was forced to cross the Euphrates. This interpretation raises another question : Was Ušpilulume deported eastward, to the other side of the Euphrates, by Ataršumki and his allies ? Or was he forced to cross the Euphrates with them, in order to join their military action against Assyria ? The first possibility should be regarded as quite exceptional, because "crossing the Euphrates" is commonly associated with successful or heroic military action in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions.[18] The second possibility is likewise puzzling because the Assyrians did not subsequently punish Ušpilulume for participating in a rebellion. The curses in lines 19-22 clearly indicate that this border treaty was made in favour of Kummuh, suggesting the Assyrians rewarded Ušpilulume for his loyalty.[19] The geographical location of Pazarcık, where this boundary stela was found, also supports this view. Another interpretation was suggested by V. DONBAZ (1990, 9) who published the stela. He takes *-ūni* of *ušēbirūni* as a subjunctive marker of the third person singular verb *ušēbir*, and regards Ušpilulume as the subject of the verb : "when Ušpilulume ... caused Adad-nērārī ... to cross the Euphrates."[20] This interpretation is based on the reasonable assumption that the subject (Ušpilulume) of the verb should be sought before the appearance of the verb.

However, the following analogy may show that this is not the case here. Line 18 relates to the setting of the boundary. The subject of the verb *ušēlūni* here is not named but can safely be identified with Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis,[21] because lines 1-5 evidently state that this "boundary stone" belongs to them. Accordingly, the verb *ušēlūni* should be construed as the third person plural form of Š-stem of *elû* plus ventive.[22] This example shows that the subject of a verb in this text must be sometimes sought outside the sentence.

In light of this analogy, we may search the subject of the verb *ušēbirūni* in line 10 outside of the sentence. As in line 18, the verb can be regarded as the third person plural form of Š-stem of *ebēru* plus ventive, as suggested by S. TIMM (1993, 63-64).[23] It was then this unspecified "they" who caused Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis to cross the Euphrates. TIMM (1993), however, suggests that it was the anti-Assyrian coalition that crossed the Euphrates, not Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis. This interpretation is in conflict with the inscription in the following three points : 1) *ana* in this sentence can be best understood as *nota accusativi* ;

---

18 Crossing the Euphrates might be expressed as a heroic action also in the Aramaic inscriptions of Hazael of Damascus. For the texts and discussions, see CHARBONNET (1986) ; KYRIELEIS and RÖLLIG (1988) ; BRON and LEMAIRE (1989) ; EPH'AL and NAVEH (1989).

19 See TIMM (1993, 71-72). He also draws attention to the fact that the father of Ušpilulume is not mentioned, though the father of Qalparunda is.

20 Also YAMADA (2000, 93).

21 It is clear that the *persona(e)* who established the border was/were Assyrian(s), and not Ušpilulume and Qalparu(n)da, who appear in the sentence.

22 If we took *ušēlūni* as the first or third person singular plus subjunctive marker, we should interpret that the sentence begins from line 15b with *ina* MU.AN.NA and thus the translation would be : "Boundary, which I (Adad-nirarī III) set, in this year, between ..." The possibility of third person "he" will be discarded.

23 If so, the use of the subjunctive marker suggests that we should regard Obv. lines 1-10 as one block, and thus : "Boundary stone ... when Ušpilulume caused ... to cross the Euphrates."

2) the expression "to cross the Euphrates" in the Assyrian royal inscriptions is normally associated with the great achievements of the Assyrian kings, and thus it is employed to emphasise the kings' enterprises ;[24] 3) the site of the battle in/near Paqarhubuna indicates that Adad-nērārī III crossed the Euphrates westward, and it is thus reasonable that this achievement is marked in his inscription. It is thus more plausible to interpret that it was Adad-nērārī III and Semiramis, whom "they" caused to cross the Euphrates. The anonymous "they" can be identified with Ataršumki and the eight kings,[25] who fought against Adad-nērārī III at Paqarhubuna,[26] as depicted in lines 11-13.

This interpretation of lines 7-10 reinforces the restoration of lines 14-15 of the Saba'a Stela, which I have suggested elsewhere.[27] According to the restoration, Adad-nērārī III considers his enemies' action ("organised their [army]") during his father's reign as a *casus belli*.[28] This military campaign against Paqarhubuna probably happened in 805-804 BCE, when the Assyrian western frontier was significantly endangered.[29]

*Reverse*

The text of the reverse of the stela consists of twenty lines, which can be divided into four sections : 1) Shalmaneser IV's genealogy and the introduction of Šamšī-ilu (lines 1-4a) ; 2) the campaign against Damascus and the tribute from Hadiyānu of Damascus (lines 4b-10) ; 3) the granting of this boundary stone to Ušpilulume of Kummuh (lines 11-13a) ; and 4) curses (lines 13b-21). The composition of the text can be dated to 773 BCE, when the Eponym Chronicles mentions *a-na* URU *di-maš-qa* in the entry,[30] or shortly thereafter.

Text : Reverse (A.0.105.1)

1. $^{md}$*šùl-ma-nu*-MAŠ MAN KAL MAN KUR *aš+šur*
2. A $^{m}$10-ÉRIN.TÁH MAN KAL MAN ŠÚ MAN KUR *aš+šur*
3. A $^{m}$*šam-ši*-10 MAN *kib-<rat>* 4-*ti*
4. $^{m}$*šam-ši*-DINGIR LÚ *tar-ta-nu*
5. *ki-i a-na* KUR.ANŠE-*šú i-lik-ú-ni*
6. *ma-da-tú šá* $^{m}$*ha-di-a-ni* KUR.ANŠE-*šú-a-a*
7. KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI URUDU GIŠ.NÚ MAN-*ti-šu*
8. GIŠ *né-mat-tú* MAN-*ti-šú* DUMU.MUNUS-*su*
9. KI *nu-du-ni-šá ma-'-di*
10. NÍG.GA É.GAL-*lim la ma-ni am-hur-šú*

---

24 It is also possible that the anti-Assyrian coalition did cross the Euphrates and endangered the western frontier of Assyria. However, there is no reason to assume that this enemy's "achievement" was recorded by the Assyrian scribe.

25 For the identification of the eight kings, see HAWKINS (1982, 400). He includes the kingdoms of Que, Unqi, Gurgum, Sam'al, and Melid. Cf. the Zakkur Inscription.

26 For the identification of this city in the region of Gaziantep, see YAMADA (2000, 92-93 n. 59) with earlier literature.

27 HASEGAWA (*in press*).

28 The general restoration of the action is "withholding [of] tribute". See *RIMA* 3, A.0.104.6, line 15.

29 WEIPPERT (1992, 55-56).

30 Eponym Chronicles B,1:46'.

11. *ina ta-a-a-ár-ti-ia ta-hu-mu šú-a-tú*[31]
12. *a-na* $^{m}$*uš-pi-lu-lu-me* MAN URU *ku-mu-ha-a-a*
13. *a-din man-nu šá* TA ŠU-*at* $^{m}$*uš-pi-lu-lu-me*
14. DUMU.MEŠ-*šú* DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-*šú e-ki-mu*
15. *aš+šur* $^{d}$AMAR.UTU $^{d}$IŠKUR $^{d}$30 $^{d}$UTU
16. *a-na di-ni-šú lu la i-za-zu*
17. *pi-ti up-ni-šú la i-šá-me-u-šú*
18. KUR-*su ki-i* $SIG_4$ *lu-šá-bal-<ki>-tú*$^{(?)}$[32] *ur-ru-uh*[33]
19. *mim-ma ina* UGU KUR$^{(?)}$[34] *la i-ma-lik*
20. *ik-kib aš+šur* DINGIR-*ia* $^{d}$30 *a-šib*[35]
21. URU.KASKAL

Translation : Reverse

1-4a) Shalmaneser (IV), strong king, king of the land Assyria, heir of Adad-nērārī (III), strong king, king of the world, king of the land Assyria, heir of Šamšī-Adad (V), king of the four quarters (and) Šamšī-ilu, the field marshal :

4b-10) When they went to Damascus, the tribute of Hādiāni of the land of Damascus, silver, gold, copper, his royal bed, his royal couch, his daughter with her abundant dowry, the property of his palace without number, I received from him.

11-13a) On my return, this boundary (stone) to Ušpilulume, king of the city Kummuh, I gave.

13b-20) Whoever, from the possession of Ušpilulume, his sons, his grandsons, takes (it) away, Aššur, Marduk, Adad, Sîn (and) Šamaš, may not stand at his lawsuit. May not listen to his prayers (and) may his land be hastily(?) overturned as brick. May he never rule over the land.[36] The anathema to Aššur, my god (and) Sîn, who dwells in the city Harrān.

---

31 *šú-a-tú* is illegible both in the photo and copy. DONBAZ (1990, 9), TIMM (1993, 58), and GRAYSON (*RIMA* 3, 240) read : *šú-a-tu*, while FRAHM (1998, 316) reads : *šu-a-tú*.

32 Following FRAHM (1998, 317). BAL sign is visible in the photo. GRAYSON (*RIMA* 3, footnote) reads *lu-šá-*⌜*bi*$^{(?)}$-*ru*$^{(?)}$⌝ and ZACCAGNINI (1993, 55-56) reads *lu-ṣa*$^{!}$(*šá*$^{(?)}$)-⌜*her*⌝.

33 DONBAZ (1990) and ZACCAGNINI (1993, 56, n. 9) suggest that *ur-ru-uh* presumably stands for *urruhiš* and suppose a scribal error or a dialectical form. FRAHM (1998, 317) offers the reading *lik-ru-ru*$^{(?)}$, and states that the first RU sign is a Babylonian sign and the second one Assyrian. According to him, the fact that the second RU is not written directly after the first RU, may support this view. He translates this sentence : „Mögen (die Götter) sein Land wie einen Ziegel umwenden und niederwerfen."

34 Following FRAHM (1998), who restores KUR$^{(?)}$ instead of MAN.

35 DONBAZ (1990, 10) states that this idiom *ikkib aššur ilīya* can refer only to the king, not to the *turtānu* Šamšī-ilu, and he therefore attributes all the verbs in lines 10-20 to the king. TIMM (1993, 73-74, n. 56) criticises this view and suggests that here the text indeed refers to Šamšī-ilu, because, in the entire text, it is Šamšī-ilu who speaks in the first person singular. There is a text that refers to Aššur as a lord of Šamšī-ilu : *ana aš+šur* UMUN-*šú* (*bēssu*) $^{md}$UTU-DINGIR (Šamšī-ilu) ... "To Aššur, his lord, Šamšī-ilu..." (*RIMA* 3, A.0.104.2013). In another text, Šamšī-ilu mentions Aššur as AD (*abu*) "father" (*RIMA* 3, A.0.104.2010, line 13).

36 On the meaning of the verb *ma-la-ku* for "to reign", originally a West Semitic meaning, see ZACCAGNINI (1993, 56-57) ; GRAYSON, (*RIMA* 3, footnote).

This text, too, bears a syntactical problem. In line 5, an appropriate subject of the verb *illikūni*, which could be either in the third person plural form plus ventive or in the third person singular form plus subjunctive marker *-ūni*, seems to be missing. DONBAZ (1990, 10), dismissing the first possibility, suggests that the subject may be Šamšī-ilu, who appears in the previous line (line 4). According to him, a plural subject cannot be considered here because, in that case, the verb would be in the first person plural : *nillikūni*. TIMM (1993, 72-73) suggests that the subject of the verb is in fact Šamšī-ilu, which should be expressed in the first person singular form as in lines 11-13 of the text. It is indeed not unusual for the Assyrian royal officials in this period to make their own inscriptions, and Šamšī-ilu was no exception. In an inscription on two colossal stone lions found at Til-Barsip, he describes his war against Urartu without mentioning his sovereign (*RIMA* 3, A.0.104.2010). TIMM (1993, 74) explains this phenomenon as a reflection of the growth of Šamšī-ilu's self-confidence over the years. A.K. GRAYSON (*RIMA* 3, 240) suggests that this ambiguity of the subject in the text stems from Šamšī-ilu's deliberate intention to blur it. If we accept this line of argument, the name of Shalmaneser IV in lines 1-3 was included by Šamšī-ilu only to keep to the format of this style of royal inscription and to express minimal respect for his king.[37]

Before drawing conclusions, however, this text must be compared with those of the Antakya Stela and the obverse of the Pazarcık Stela, whose stylistic features are quite similar to the present text. The Antakya Stela describes the setting of a boundary (*tahūmu*) by Adad-nērārī III and Šamšī-ilu (lines 4-6a). The verb employed in the section is presumably restored as [*išku*]*nūni*, which is understood as the third person plural. The verbs following [*išku*]*nūni* are in the third person plural (*ušamšilūma* [line 8], *izūzū* [line 8], *uzakkiūma* [line 9], *irimū* [line 10]), but, at the end, the verb changes to the singular (*ukīn* [line 11]). This change of pronoun styles may be explained either by various sources available to the scribes,[38] or by scribal error. It seems reasonable to conclude from this observation that the actions of setting the boundary are in principle attributed to both Adad-nērārī III and Šamšī-ilu.

On the obverse of the Pazarcık stela, the text begins with verb in the third person plural (*ušēbirūni*, [Obv. line 10, see above]), changes to the first person singular (*amdahiṣ* [Obv. line 13], *ēkimšunūti* [Obv. line 14]), and then returns to the third person plural (*ušēlūni* [Obv. line 18, see above]). Thus, the military expedition is narrated in the first person singular in the middle part of the text (lines 11-15a), and the erecting of the boundary stone is, as in the Antakya Stela, narrated in the third person plural. The introduction to the description of the expedition (lines 7b-10) is also written in the third person plural. This alteration of singular/plural in subjects in the same text can best be explained as a conflation of different sources. Therefore, the military expedition described in Obv. lines 11-15 may have originated either from a royal inscription, or from one of its source materials. In light of this comparison, it may be concluded that Rev. lines 6-10, in which the first person singular style is employed, may also have been copied from a similar royal inscription.

---

37 FUCHS (2008, 79).

38 Cf. TADMOR (1973, 141-144).

Rev. line 5 *kī ana māt imērīšu illikūni*, however, does not belong to the original account of the military expedition but seems to have been inserted into the text, in order to associate the border setting with the chronological context, i.e. the campaign against Damascus. This anchoring of the main theme of a text to a certain chronological point is also observed in lines 11-13a and in the obverse of the stela (lines 7b-10, 15b-18).

In view of the above discussions, it is proposed here to interpret the verb *ilikkūni* as the third person plural form plus ventive, whose unspecified subject can be identified as Shalmaneser IV and Šamšī-ilu. The subject of the verbs in the first person singular form in the following part (lines 6-13a) should be, in terms of context, ascribed to Shalmaneser IV alone, and there is no indication of Šamšī-ilu's presumptuous intention to blur the subject in this inscription. It is remarkable that, in the description of the battle inscribed on the two lions, the third person singular form is employed (lines 13b-18), but the erection of the stone lions is described using the first person singular (line 19). It is puzzling that Šamšī-ilu did not employ the first person singular form for the entire text that commemorates only his achievements, if he was capable of deliberately blurring his presumptuous intent to aggrandise his exploits by using the ambiguous verb form in the Pazarcık Stela. It seems thus more reasonable to attribute the "I" in the reverse of the Pazarcık Stela to Shalmaneser IV and the change between the third plural and first singular forms there to the conflation of texts.

The following two points seem to contradict the assumption that the development of Šamšī-ilu's self-confidence is reflected in his stelae : 1) no self-aggrandisement of Šamšī-ilu can be found in the Pazarcık Stela ; 2) the inscriptions on the two lions from Til-Barsip can be dated approximately to the same period as the Pazarcık Stela.[39] Šamšī-ilu might have indeed conducted the campaign against Damascus, as other Assyrian royal officials led military expeditions on behalf of their sovereigns,[40] but he did give the credit of this accomplishment to his king. This might have been the reason that, unlike his inscriptions from Til-Barsip, the text on the Pazarcık Stela was not chiselled out later.

The present study demonstrates the significance of thorough and careful reading of relevant inscriptions, especially from peripheral regions, before drawing any conclusions about the history of Assyria during the period under discussion. Only in this light can one discuss the relationship between the Assyrian kings and their high officials in the ninth to eighth centuries BCE.[41]

---

39 The Urartian king Argištu is said to have lived between *ca.* 785 and 765 BCE. In light of the mention in the Eponym Chronicles of the campaigns against Urartu in 781-774, the text can be dated to Shalmaneser IV's reign. See SCHRAMM (1973, 120-121) ; GRAYSON (1982, 276) ; HAWKINS (1982, 405).

40 For example, Dayyan-Ashur. See YAMADA (2000, 221-224, 321-334).

41 This topic has been discussed in detail and a variety of conclusions has been drawn. See READE (1981, 156-159) ; GRAYSON (1993) ; (1999) ; BLOCHER (2001) ; FUCHS (2008).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


BLOCHER, F., 2001 : « Assyrische Würdenträger und Gouverneure des 9. und 8. Jh. : eine Neubewertung ihrer Rolle », *AoF* 28, 298-324.

BRON, F. and LEMAIRE, A., 1989 : « Les inscriptions araméennes de Hazaël », *RA* 83, 35-44.

CHARBONNET, A., 1986 : « Le dieu aus lions d'Erétrie », *Annali del Dipartimento di Studi del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico, Sezione di Archeologia e Storia Antica* 8, Napoli, Pisa, 117-156.

DONBAZ, V., 1990 : « Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae in the Antakya and Kahramanmaraş Museums », *ARRIM* 8, 5-24.

EPH'AL, I. and NAVEH, J., 1989 : « Hazael's Booty Inscriptions », *IEJ* 39, 192-200.

FRAHM, E., 1998 : « Review : Grayson, A. Kirk : Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC. II (858-745), Toronto, Buffalo, London : University of Toronto Press 1996 », *OLZ* 93, 304-318.

FUCHS, A., 2008 : « Der Turtān Šamšī-ilu und die große Zeit der assyrischen Großen (830-746) », *WdO* 38, 61-145.

GRAYSON, A.K., 1982 : « Assyria : Ashur-Dan II to Ashur-nērāria V (934-745 B.C.) », *The Cambridge Ancient History* 3/1, Cambridge, 238-281.

GRAYSON, A.K., 1993 : « Assyrian Officials and Power in the Ninth and Eighth Centuries », *SAAB* 7, 19-52.

GRAYSON, A.K., 1996 : *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858-745 BC)* (= *RIMA* 3), Toronto.

GRAYSON, A.K., 1999 : « The Struggle for Power in Assyria : Challenge to Absolute Monarchy in the Ninth and Eighth Centuries B.C. » *in* WATANABE, K. (Ed.), *Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East : Papers of the Second Colloquium on the Ancient Near East — The City and Its Life Held at the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan (Mitaka, Tokyo)*, Heidelberg, 253-270.

HÄMEEN-ANTTILA, J., 2000 : *A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar*, *SAAS* 13, Helsinki.

HASEGAWA, S., *in press* : « Adad-nērārī III's Fifth Year – Historiographical Background », *RA* 102.

HAWKINS, J.D., 1982 : « The Neo-Hittite States in Syria and Anatolia » *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3/1, Cambridge, 372-441.

KYRIELEIS, H. and RÖLLIG, W., 1988 : « Ein altorientalischer Pferdeschmuck aus dem Heraion von Samos », *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 103, 37-75.

PARPOLA, S., 1984 : « *likalka ittatakku* : Two Notes on the Morphology of the Verb *alāku* in Neo-Assyrian », *StOr* 55, 185-209.

PONCHIA, S., 1991 : *L'Assiria e gli stati transeufratici* (= *History of the Ancient Near East. Studies* IV), Padova.

SCHRAMM, W., 1973 : *Einleitung in die Assyrischen Königsinschriften.* Zweiter Teil, *934-722 v. Chr.*, Leiden, Köln.

TADMOR, H., 1973 : « The Historical Inscriptions of Adad-nērāria III », *Iraq* 35, 141-150.

TIMM, S., 1993 : « König Hesion II. von Damaskus », *WO* 24, 55-84.

WEIPPERT, M., 1992 : « Die Feldzüge Adadnararis III. nach Syrien Voraussetzungen, Verlauf, Folgen », *ZDPV* 108, 42-67.

YAMADA, S., 2000 : *The Construction of the Assyrian Empire — A Historical Study of the Inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (859-824 B.C.) Relating to His Campaigns to the West* (= *CHANE* 3), Leiden, Boston, Köln.

ZACCAGNINI, C., 1993 : « Notes on the Pazarcık Stela », *SAAB* 7, 53-72.