Sennacherib and the Ionians

Author(s): L. W. King

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 30 (1910), pp. 327-335

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/624309>

Accessed: 22/04/2013 07:02

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SENNACHERIB AND THE IONIANS.

WE possess few contemporary records of the Ionian expansion, even in its later stages, and the gradual hellenization of the coast-lands of southern Asia Minor is a process that, in the absence of historical documents, has largely to be inferred from later developments and by archaeological research. At least as early as the eighth century the sea-faring Greeks were known to the Assyrians, under the generic name of Ionians, as pirates and freebooters who troubled the coasts of their maritime provinces. That they should occasionally come into armed conflict with the Assyrian power was to be expected, but it has not hitherto been realized that at the beginning of the seventh century they were sufficiently numerous and powerful within the area of Assyrian control to join other adventurous and discontented elements in conducting a land campaign of some magnitude, and in defying, for a time successfully, the Assyrian forces. That they were capable of doing so may be taken as evidence of a considerable Ionian expansion eastwards at the close of the eighth and the beginning of the seventh centuries, and, though the Assyrians had little difficulty in checking the movement, it is probable that fresh conflicts of a like nature would have been recorded in the later Assyrian annals, were it not that a few years afterwards the centre of Ionian power in Western Asia Minor began to be held in check by Lydia, and later, in company with Lydia, was shaken to its foundation by the Cimmerian invaders. In fact those Ionians, whom Sennacherib met and defeated, achieved little political success, and that of a temporary character. It is possible that the effects of their cultural relations with their conquerors were more lasting.

Our new information is derived from a text of Sennacherib, inscribed upon an octagonal prism of clay, which has recently been acquired by the British Museum.¹ The document is dated in 694 B.C. and includes an account in some detail of Sennacherib's campaign in Cilicia which is not found in other inscriptions of the period. The campaign, we learn from the new text, took place in 698 B.C. and was undertaken with the object of suppressing a revolt which had broken out in the Taurus and had spread to the Cilician plain, involving Tarsus and the neighbouring districts along the

¹ For the publication of its text, with translation and introduction, see King, *Cuneiform*

Texts in the British Museum, Part xxvi.

Cilician coast. To Sennacherib himself, who did not accompany his troops and took no active part in directing the operations, the campaign, when over, was of little interest. In fact, the record of the war was never incorporated in the numbered series of royal expeditions, and, when four years later the king marched to the head of the Persian Gulf, which his army crossed in pursuit of the fugitive Chaldeans, all mention of the Cilician campaign was henceforth omitted from the regular official records of his reign.²

For this purely personal reason we have hitherto been without detailed information concerning the Assyrian operations in Cilicia: the only record from the Assyrian side was on a text at Constantinople, where a conquest of 'the peoples of Khilaku' is mentioned in the course of a brief summary of the expeditions of the period.³ The new prism not only amplifies our information on this head, but, by recording the participation of Tarsus in the revolt, enables us to connect with the campaign certain traditions which have been preserved from the histories of Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenus in the Armenian version of the *Chronicles* of Eusebius.⁴ Polyhistor tells us that Sennacherib, on receiving a report that the Ionians had invaded Cilicia with the purpose of waging war, marched thither and fought a pitched battle with them in which he was victorious, though many of his own army were slain; that to commemorate the victory he erected on the spot an image of himself and ordered an account of his valour to be drawn up 'in Chaldean characters' as a memorial for future ages; and that he founded the city of Tarsus after the likeness of Babylon and called it Tharsis. Polyhistor's comparison of Tarsus to Babylon is explained by the passage from Abydenus, who relates that Sennacherib made the Cydnus traverse the middle of the city in the same way as the Euphrates flowed through the middle of Babylon. His account of the Ionian defeat differs from that of Polyhistor in that he represents it as a naval affair, in which an Ionian fleet was destroyed off the Cilician coast, an additional detail which increases the probability of the traditions.⁵ I think there is little doubt we may identify the Ionians who Polyhistor and Abydenus tell us

² That the importance of an Assyrian expedition is not to be judged by its inclusion in the royal annals is well illustrated by Sennacherib's Fifth Campaign, in the neighbourhood of Mt. Nipur, which takes its place beside the wars in Palestine, Babylonia, and Elam. The position of Mt. Nipur has not hitherto been identified. In 1904 I found on the peak of the Jûdi Dagh, above the village of Shakh, some rock-sculptures and inscriptions of Sennacherib, which I am preparing for publication. They were carved in commemoration of this campaign, and enable us to identify Mt. Nipur with the Jûdi Dagh. Thus the Fifth Campaign of Sennacherib proves to have been little more than a raid on mountain villages within three days of Nineveh, and it owes its prominence in the official annals solely to the presence of the king. Operations

of far greater importance at which the king was not present, such as those of 698 and 695 B.C., might for a time be included in the official records as a sort of appendix to the royal campaigns. But they were merely dated and not given a number in the series. After the king had again bestirred himself to accompany his troops, the sections dealing with them were omitted by the scribes, so that the numbered sequence of royal expeditions should remain unbroken.

³ See Rawlinson, *Cun. Inscr. West. Asia*, i., Pl. 43, ll. 17 f.

⁴ *Eusebi chron. lib.* i., ed. Schoene, cols. 27 and 35.

⁵ These probably go back to Berossus, whose history was used by both Polyhistor and Abydenus.

were conquered in Cilicia by Sennacherib with 'the peoples' from Ingirâ and Tarsus, who joined Kirua of Khilaku in his rebellion and shared his defeat.

According to Sennacherib's account the cause of the trouble in Cilicia was in the first instance the revolt of Kirua, a native governor or chief of Illubru, a city probably situated in the neighbourhood of the Taurus: in the words of the text he 'caused the forces of Khilaku to revolt and prepared for battle.' Khilaku, from which the name of Cilicia is derived, was formerly regarded as the western and more mountainous half of Cilicia (Trachea), while 𐤊𐤍𐤁𐤏 undoubtedly includes the Cilician plain. But it is probable that it lay to the north rather than to the west of 𐤊𐤍𐤁𐤏, and may well have included the mountainous regions in and to the north of the Taurus.^{5a} However this may be, the Assyrian text makes it clear that the revolt was not confined to Khilaku, but spread to the coastal regions of the eastern half of Cilicia. The narrative goes on to say that with the support he received from Ingirâ and Tarsus Kirua succeeded in seizing the *girri 𐤊𐤍𐤁𐤏*, or 'Cilician road,' and that he and his allies proceeded to stop all traffic by that route. The statement that Tarsus sided with Kirua and was in consequence captured and sacked by the Assyrians is a point of some importance, as it negatives any theory which would confine the disaffected area to the Taurus mountains.⁶

^{5a} Mr. G. F. Hill has suggested to me the possibility that we should identify Illubru with the classical Lyrbe, on the border of Pamphylia and Cilicia. This would necessitate the inclusion of Western Cilicia in Khilaku; but the text seems to indicate a site nearer the pass.

⁶ In his review of the official edition of the new text of Sennacherib (in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, xiii. (1910), cols. 145 ff.) Prof. Hugo Winckler criticizes my suggestion that the traditions preserved by Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenus may be combined with the Assyrian account of this campaign. He would, in fact, confine the scene of operations to the Taurus, with which, in his opinion, 'a conquest by Sennacherib of a Greek fleet' can have had nothing to do. He also seems to resent the idea of Greek political influence in coastal cities within what was officially an Assyrian province. But, like the Turkish Empire, that of Assyria was often content with a comparatively nominal control over considerable areas within its outlying provinces, so long as its land-communications were not threatened. Besides, with regard to the evidence, he entirely ignores the fact that Polyhistor describes the campaign of Sennacherib against the Ionians as a land campaign in Cilicia. From the resemblance of other points in the extracts quoted by Eusebius, it is clear that both Polyhistor and Abydenus are referring to the same campaign, with which the

capture and rebuilding of Tarsus were intimately connected. The passage about the fleet also presents no difficulty. Tarsus had its harbour five or six miles below the city, on the lagoon or lake connected with both city and sea by the Cydnus, the channel of which from an early period was improved for navigation (see especially Ramsay, *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 105 ff.). According to Prof. Winckler's theory we must either treat the extracts from Polyhistor and Abydenus as unhistorical legends, for which course there is no justification; or we must assume, against all probability, that there was more than one occasion on which Sennacherib invaded Cilicia and captured Tarsus. On the other hand, all difficulties disappear on the assumption that our three authorities refer to the same campaign, especially as their differences are such as we should expect to find in an Assyrian official record, and the writings of two Greek historians, by whom the participation of the Ionians in the revolt would naturally be emphasized. A further proof of the important part taken by the coastal regions of Eastern Cilicia in the campaign may be seen in the fact that from this time forward the *tenishit 𐤊𐤍𐤁𐤏 u Khilaku*, 'men of 𐤊𐤍𐤁𐤏 and Khilaku' take their place in the slave-gangs at Nineveh. It is significant that 𐤊𐤍𐤁𐤏 is invariably mentioned before Khilaku in the official formula.

In view of the strategic importance of that portion of Cilicia in which Tarsus is situated the rebellion had clearly to be put down with as little delay as possible. The *girri Kue* is clearly the road through the Cilician Gates, some thirty miles to the north of Tarsus, and by holding the pass Kirua and the Ionians cut through the principal commercial route connecting Asia Minor with Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt. Had the revolt been merely that of a local chieftain or freebooter, who for a time succeeded in plundering a few caravans in the pass itself, we might perhaps assume that it was put down by a local Assyrian garrison stationed in Cilicia or to the north of the Taurus.⁷ But the phraseology of the text and the order of the events narrated suggest that the army sent to suppress the revolt reached Cilicia from the east and formed a special expedition organized hastily by Sennacherib for the reconquest of the province. The crisis was one that called for speedy settlement, for, besides the inconvenience entailed by the blocking of an important commercial route, there was danger that the rebellion, if left unchecked, would spread northward into Tabal (which three years later did revolt), and might also affect the recently conquered provinces of Syria and Palestine. It was no time for a leisurely advance such as necessarily characterized an expedition accompanied by the royal baggage-train, and we may conjecture that it was for this reason the king did not lead his troops in person.

It would be tempting to set the subsequent conflict between Ionians and Assyrians on the banks of the Pinarus, where in a later age Greeks and Persians met at the Battle of Issus. But Sennacherib tells us that the battle took place 'in a difficult mountain,' and we may probably set it in one of the passes and not in any part of the Cilician plain. In any case Kirua and his allies would have avoided the faulty strategy of Darius, and, being in possession of the country, would have chosen their ground with some care. From Sennacherib's account it would seem that the capture of Tarsus followed the Assyrian victory, and in this detail we may see an indication that the rebels attempted to hold the Amanian passes, in one of which⁸ they met their defeat. The other alternative is to suppose that they concentrated their forces at the Cilician Gates, trusting that Tarsus and the other cities in the plain would be strong enough to resist the Assyrian attack. In that case we may suppose that Sennacherib's army delayed their capture until they had cleared the northern pass. Of the two alternatives the former seems the more probable. According to Polyhistor the Assyrian army, though victorious, suffered considerable loss; but, after the defeat of the main body of the rebels, Ingirâ and Tarsus appear to have fallen after no long resistance. It was probably at this time that the naval engagement recorded by Abydenus took place. On the Ionian defeat by land Kirua fled to his stronghold Illubru, where he sustained a prolonged siege. But the

⁷ The latter, I take it, is what Prof. Winckler means by his assertion, unbacked by any evidence, that the Assyrian army came

'from the North.'

⁸ Probably the Beilan Pass, which would be the natural route of the Assyrian army.

place was eventually taken by assault and the Assyrian army returned to Nineveh with many Cilician captives and a heavy spoil.

Sennacherib does not attempt any racial classification of the captives from Kue, who from this time on formed an important section of the slaves employed for work on his palace at Nineveh. Hittite and Aramean strains were doubtless represented among the Cilician labourers, but, in view of Polyhistor's testimony to the important part taken by the Ionians in the rebellion, it is legitimate to conclude that a considerable body of them were Greeks. Already in the preceding reign the Assyrians had come in conflict with Ionian pirates, probably as a result of the conquest of Cyprus, for Sargon tells us that he caught them 'like fish' and gave rest to Cilicia (Kue) and Tyre.⁹ His action may have freed Cilicia from them for a few years, but we may conclude that by the end of the eighth century they had succeeded in making settlements on the mainland of a more permanent character. It is also probable that since the close of the second millennium traders and settlers of Greek race had added to the mixed character of the population of Tarsus and the other coastal towns, and that any fresh influx of Ionians from the sea would have found there a population largely composed of their own kin. The deportation of considerable bodies of these men to Nineveh, where they were employed upon the royal palace then in course of construction, may well have had important effects, in certain directions, on contemporary Assyrian work.

Proof of the eclecticism which characterized all branches of Assyrian art and activity in the reign of Sennacherib is furnished by the long building-inscription with which the new text concludes.¹⁰ Tradition was cast aside and anything that was new or strange was welcomed, if it could add in any way to the splendour of the royal palace. Sennacherib boasts of his new method of casting bronze (probably derived from Egypt), and contrasts it with that in use in earlier days, when the workmen trusted for success to oil-divination and the making of offerings rather than to their own skill.¹¹ For the supply of water to the palace he describes the installation of the *shādūf*,¹² also undoubtedly borrowed at this time from Egypt. He is careful to record the addition of a Hittite portico to the palace,¹³ and sends far and wide for foreign plants and trees to stock his gardens.¹⁴ When this

⁹ Cf. *Cun. Inscr. West. Asia*, i. Pl. 36, l. 21.

¹⁰ See *Cun. Texts in the Brit. Mus.* xxvi. pp. 21 ff.

¹¹ Cf. Col. vi. ll. 80 ff. This I think is the meaning of the rather obscure phrases (*op. cit.* p. 25).

¹² Cf. Col. vii. ll. 45 ff.

¹³ Cf. Col. vi. ll. 20 ff.

¹⁴ The greatest prizes Sennacherib secured for his gardens, according to the new text, were 'trees that bear wool,' which the Assyrians sheared and shredded for making garments (Cf. Col. vii. l. 56, and Col. viii. l. 64). It is

interesting to note that Sennacherib's description of the cotton-plant is precisely similar to that of Herodotus (iii. 106). Apart from Indian tradition of the use of cotton for the sacred thread of the Brahman, which is referred to in the *Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra* and probably goes back to about 800 B.C. (see F. W. Thomas in Watt, *The Wild and Cultivated Cotton Plants of the World*, p. 9), the references in Sennacherib's text are by far the earliest record of the cultivation of cotton. Since Herodotus refers to cotton-trees as growing wild in India, I suggested, with Dr. A. B. Rendle's approval,

was the spirit animating the king and his builders, we may legitimately look for traces of foreign influence in Assyrian work of this and later periods. In this connexion a phrase used by Abydenus when describing the temple built in commemoration of Sennacherib's victory possibly has some significance. He states that Sennacherib erected a temple of the Athenians, or an Athenian temple, and set up brazen columns, on which he engraved an account of his own deeds. Both Sennacherib and Polyhistor also make mention of memorials erected after the victory in Cilicia, and, in view of Sennacherib's work in bronze at Nineveh, the reference by Abydenus to brazen pillars in the temple is quite convincing. But it is strange that he should characterize an Assyrian temple as Athenian. If the phrase reproduced by Eusebius accurately represents the original text, we must suppose that the tradition as to the character of the building arose from some resemblance to it, or rather parts of it, bore to early Ionian work.

That the Ionic capital was ultimately derived from Egypt, and may have been influenced at some stage of its evolution, indirectly, by Mesopotamia, has long been recognized.¹⁵ It is true there appears little resemblance between the composite capital of an Egyptian column of the Middle Empire and the Attic type of the fifth century, but the connexion is sufficiently attested by intermediate forms. From the variety these present it is obvious that the Ionic capital was the immediate descendant of one of several lines of parallel development. The ancestry of one class is clear from the retention and exaggeration of features peculiarly Egyptian. The so-called Cypriote palmette, even as a capital, retains in conventionalized form both the papyrus-flower and the Egyptian lily. Its most striking feature is the triangular ornament at the base of the lily, from which the volutes spring, obviously an exaggeration of the conventionalized calyx of the lily in Egyptian art: a characteristic example is furnished by a pilaster from a grave at Tamassos.¹⁶ In a rather more simplified form it occurs on a capital from Tell el-Mutesellim,¹⁷ and M. Dussaud would regard this as evidence of Cypriote influence in Syria.¹⁸ But his Cypriote examples are not early, and it is more probable that Syria, and not Cyprus, was originally the centre from which this particular type spread. A quite distinct line of development is represented by the Neandrian and Lesbian

the identification of the tree imported by Sennacherib with *Gossypium arboreum* (see *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* xxxi. pp. 339 ff.). But Sir George Watt places little reliance in the details mentioned by Herodotus, since the later account given by Theophrastus exactly corresponds to cotton-growing in India today. He writes to me that he has little doubt Sennacherib's cotton was not tree-cotton but the annual plant botanists now call *G. herbaceum*, which, in his opinion, originated in Arabia, whence it eventually spread northwards to the shores of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.

¹⁵ See Puchstein, *Das ionische Capitel* (1887), *Die ionische Säule* (1907), and Perrot and Chipiez, *Hist. de l'art*, vii. pp. 611 ff.; and cp. Meurer, *Vergleichende Formenlehre des Ornamentes und der Pflanze*, pp. 488 ff.

¹⁶ Cf. Meurer, *op. cit.* p. 493, Fig. 4.

¹⁷ See Schumacher, *Tell el-Mutesellim*, i. p. 118, Fig. 178; the circumstances of its discovery do not admit of an accurate date (cf. p. 119 f.).

¹⁸ Cf. *Les civilisations préhelléniques*, p. 190 f.

capitals.¹⁹ Here, so far from being exaggerated, the calyx of the lily is entirely absent, and the volutes are set back to back with no space between them. The resulting capital is still more unlike the later Ionic form.

In Babylonia and Assyria the column was never a structural feature during the earlier periods, though we have evidence of its use as early as the ninth century. In Nabû-mukîn-apli's tablet from Sippar the shrine of the Sun-god is supported by a column in the form of a palm-stem, and the lily is employed both for its capital and base.²⁰ Here there is no triangular ornament, though the heart of the lily is retained between the volutes. Under the Sargonids the lily was a favourite form of ornament, and it is possible to trace its simplification until it consisted of two volutes only. At this period, too, the column was extensively adopted as an internal architectural feature. The fact that it was generally set upon the back of some animal or mythological creature as its base, taken in conjunction with acknowledged Hittite borrowings in other directions, suggests that its adoption in Assyria was ultimately due to Anatolian influence. It is possible that we must look to a like source for the more immediate ancestry of the Ionic capital.

For the purpose of comparison with the temple described by Abydenus we possess no early coins of Tarsus or any other Cilician place with represen-

FIG. 1.

tations of buildings, and Sennacherib's own reliefs furnish little help in this connexion. But we do possess representations of two buildings of the Sargonid epoch, which throw some light upon the problem. One of these is a small building or shrine upon a slab from Sargon's palace at Khorsabad (Fig. 1);²¹ the other is a temple on a relief from Kuyunjik in the British Museum, and is of the period of Ashur-bani-pal (Fig. 2).²² Both are sculptured on a small scale and in low relief, so that few details are given, but even so they reproduce architectural features of some interest. It is true that both are flat-roofed buildings, as we should naturally expect, and

¹⁹ See Koldewey, *Neandria*, pp. 34, 36, 38, and *Lesbos*, Tafel 16; and cf. Perrot and Chipiez, *op. cit.* vii. Pl. LII.

²⁰ See *Cun. Inscr. West. Asia*, v. Pl. 60, and cf. Perrot and Chipiez, *op. cit.* ii. p. 211.

²¹ Cf. Botta, *Monument de Ninive*, ii. Pl.

H.S. VOL. XXX.

114. The sketches reproduced in the text are from the pen of my colleague Mr. P. D. Scott-Moncrieff.

²² Assyrian Saloon, slab No. 92; cf. Perrot and Chipiez, ii. p. 143.

the heavy parapet or cornice is in each case surmounted by characteristic Assyrian crenelations. But the columns, their most striking feature, furnished with bases and voluted capitals, quite give an impression of proto-Ionic work. In Fig. 1 the volutes are joined above, and there is a space below which would correspond to that occupied by the echinus. If the volutes were not duplicated (for which there are parallels in proto-Ionic work), the resemblance in this point to the later form of Ionic capital would be still more striking. It will also be noted that the shrine in Fig. 2, to judge from its façade,²³ resembles a temple *in antis*, without peristyle. The latest of the three primitive temples discovered by Mr. Hogarth at Ephesus, within the space occupied by the *cella* of the sixth-century Artemisium, was of this form.

Sennacherib's temple at Tarsus may well have been a flat-roofed building such as those represented on the reliefs. But when in ruins, with only a few columns still intact, the imagination of a Greek could have supplied a gabled pediment, and so the tradition may have arisen which Abydenus has preserved. The resemblance to early Ionian work may in

FIG. 2.

part be explained by the probability that in certain points Assyria and Ionia borrowed from the same source, as may perhaps be proved by future excavation on Anatolian sites. It is also possible that, in the case of Sennacherib's temple, a general resemblance was materially increased by the employment of Ionian workmen from among the prisoners taken during the Cilician Campaign.

At first sight the latter possibility may seem to give colour to the theory that the Nimrud ivories are of Ionian workmanship,²⁴ a theory based on an undoubted general resemblance to the Ephesian ivories, which was

²³ The horizontal lines between the columns are probably not intended to represent a wall immediately behind them; they are rather to be regarded as a naive device of the sculptor, faced with a comparatively unfamiliar subject, to indicate an interior. Similarly the stele engraved with the royal figure, which is set to

the left of the temple, stood probably within it; the memorial tablet on which Sennacherib commemorated his victory undoubtedly was of this form.

²⁴ See Sir Cecil Smith's description in *Ephesus*, pp. 182 ff.

first pointed out by Professor Sayce.²⁵ M. Dussaud²⁶ has recently revived the theory of their Cypriote origin, and it is true that in the single example he cites (the gryphon-panel) the triangular decoration is found at the base of the palmette or sacred tree. But this, as has already been noted, is probably a Syrian characteristic and its occurrence is entirely in accord with Mr. Hogarth's view that many of them are the work of Hittite craftsmen domiciled in northern Syria. Against the Ionian theory, as Mr. Hogarth has pointed out, there are difficulties both of style and of chronology. Moreover, it is a mistake to deduce from a single specimen any general theory to include the whole of the Nimrûd ivories. For they are far from being homogeneous, and they represent a collection of more than one class of work and possibly of more than one period. While some are of a strongly Egyptizing character, others are purely Assyrian, and others again betray a distant relationship with some of the ivories of the Ephesian find.

Unfortunately we do not possess similar specimens from Assyria which can be dated after the beginning of the seventh century, so that it cannot be seen how far direct Ionian influence may have been reflected subsequently in work of this class. The archaic character of Ionian sculpture, even in the sixth century, renders it difficult to trace to Ionian inspiration the sudden and striking improvement in Assyrian composition in sculptured relief, which took place in the reign of Ashur-bani-pal; and the lion-hunt reliefs from the northern Palace at Kuyunjik, although so distinct in spirit from all earlier and much contemporary native work, may still be credited to the Assyrians. On the other hand, in tracing the Oriental affinities of Ionian art, some weight should be given to the possible results of Sennacherib's Cilician campaign.

L. W. KING.

²⁵ Cf. Hogarth, *Ionia and the East*, p. 60.

²⁶ *Les civilisations préhelléniques*, p. 186 f.