

**THE REBELLION OF AŠŠUR-DA'IN-APLU IN THE
CONTEXT OF ASSYRIAN-BABYLONIAN INTERSTATE
RELATIONS OF THE IX CENTURY B.C.***

RUSLAN TSAKANYAN

Keywords: *Assyria, Babylonia, Šulmānu-ašarēd III, Aššur-da'in-aplu, Šamšī-Adad V, Marduk-zākir-šumi I, campaign, treaty, rebellion.*

In the last period (in 826 B.C.) of the reign of the Assyrian king Šulmānu-ašarēd Shulmanu-ashared (Shalmaneser) III (859-824 B.C.) prince Aššur-da'in-aplu rebelled. The rebellion quickly escalated into a civil war, lasting seven years. In the struggle against his rebellious brother, the new Assyrian ruler Šamšī-Adad V sought the military support of Babylonia. It was with this support that he was able to suppress the rebellion of Aššur-da'in-aplu, but in return he had to make heavy and humiliating concessions in Assyrian-Babylonian relations, temporarily recognizing the supremacy of Marduk-zākir-šumi I the king of Babylonia. The article discusses the reasons for the revolt of Aššur-da'in-aplu, as well as the changes in the Assyrian-Babylonian relations. The article looks at the Aššur-da'in-aplu rebellion from a relative deprivation perspective.

Historical background

In the second half of the X century B.C., the Assyrian State, emerging from a deep socio-economic and political crisis, again experienced an upsurge. In 934-824 years B.C. the ascent of Assyria was marked by the restoration of the territorial integrity of the Middle-Assyrian Period. The kings of the Neo-Assyrian Kingdom managed to overcome the deep political crisis in the country, creating an almost completely militarized state. Thanks to century-long active military campaigns, the Assyrian kings have expanded their borders to all geographical directions. This deprived the state of enormous human and material resources

* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 08.08.2020: Գրախոսվել է 10.08.2020:

and at the same time caused significant changes in the administrative system of Assyria and in the relations between various social strata of the Assyrian society. As a result, in the last quarter of the IX century BC, Assyria's active foreign policy began to decline, and in the first half of the VIII century the country again found itself in political chaos¹.

Source study basis

The sources of the rebellion of the heir to the throne, Aššur-da''in-aplu's against Shalmaneser (*Š/Su/almānu-ašarēd*) III (859-824 B.C.) are the royal chronicle of Šamši-Adad V (824-811 B.C.) and a list of Assyrian Eponyms.

According to the list of Eponyms, the rebellion lasted about seven years.

Year (B.C.)	Eponyms (<i>limmu</i>)	Events
827	Šulmānu-ašarēd (III)	[šarru ₂ ^{māt} Aššur ^{KI} , a-na ^{māt} Man-na-ayu- King of Assyria], to Mannea
826	Dayān-Aššur	^{amēl} [<i>turtānu</i>], [Commander-in-Chief, the commander of Assyrian army ²] <i>sīhu</i> (rebellion, revolt ³)
825	Aššur-būnāya-ušur	^{amēl} [<i>rab šāqê</i> - chief butler ⁴], <i>sīhu</i>
824	Yaḥalu	^{amēl} [<i>rab šāqê</i>], <i>sīhu</i>
823	Bēl-būnāya	^{amēl} [<i>nāgir ekalli</i> - palace herald] ⁵ , <i>sīhu</i>
822	Šamši-Adad (V)	[šarru ₄ ^{māt} Aššur ^{KI}], <i>sīhu</i>
821	Yaḥalu	^{amēl} [<i>turtānu</i>], <i>sīhu</i>
820	Bēl-dān	^{amēl} [<i>nāgir ekalli</i>], <i>sīhu</i> ⁶

¹ Bedford 2009: 39-44.

² Mattila 2000: 107-125.

³ CAD 15/S: *sīhu* - rebellion, revolt, 240f.

⁴ Mattila 2000: 45-60.

⁵ Mattila 2000: 29-43.

⁶ Finkel, Reade 1998: 250, 254; Finkel, Reade 1995:169; Millard 1994: 30f., 57; Reade 1978: 252, 258, 260.

The date of the rebellion is determined with the help of a list of eponyms in the year of the Dayān-Aššur eponym. In his royal inscription, Šamši-Adad V states:

- «39) e-nu-ma^{md} Aš-šur-KAL-in-A ina tar-ši^{md} Šul-ma-nu-MAŠ
40) AD-šu e-pu-šá lim-né-e-ti si-ḥu bar-tu a-mat ḤUL-ti
41) ú-šab-ši-ma KUR uš-bal-kit-ma ik-šu-ra
42) ta-ḥa-zu UN.MEŠ KUR^d Aš-šur e-liš ù šap-liš it-ti-šu
43) ú-šes-ḥír-ma ú-dan-ni-na ta-me-tu URU.URU ú-šam-kir₆-ma
44) a-na e-peš MURUB₄ ù ta-ḥa-zi iš-ku-na pa-ni-šu»

“When Aššur-da’ in-apla, at the time of Shalmaneser (III), his father, acted treacherously by inciting insurrection, uprising, and criminal acts, caused the land to rebel and prepared for battle; (at that time) the people of Assyria, above and below, he won over to his side, and made them take binding oaths. He caused the cities to revolt and made ready to wage battle and war”⁷.

According to the inscription, twenty-seven cities supported Aššur-da’ in-aplu:

“The cities Nineveh (^{URU}Nin(u)a), Adia, Šibanība, Imgur-Enlil, Iššabri, Bī-Šašširia, Šīmu, Šibḥiniš, Tamnūna, Kipšūna, Kurbaīl, Tīdu, Nabulu(a), Kaḥat, Aššur, Urakka, Sallat, Ḥuzīrīna, Dūr-balāṭi, Dariga, Zab(b)an, Lubdu, Arrapha, (and) Arbail, together with the cities Amedu, Tīl-abnī, (and) Ḥindānu⁸, - altogether twenty-seven towns with their fortresses which had rebelled against Shalmaneser (III), king of the four quarters, my father, sided with Aššur-da’ in-apla. By the command of the great gods, my lords, I subdued (them)”⁹.

Causes of the rebellion

E. Frahm distinguishes the events of the rebellion in the history of Assyria according to their political purpose: a) attempts by formally independent vassal rulers to regain their political

⁷ RIMA 3: A.0.103.1., Col. I, ll. 39-44.

⁸ For details on the location of cities, see: Radner 2006-2008: 42-68; Postgate 1995: 1-17.

⁹ RIMA 3: A.0.103.1., Col. I, ll. 39-44.

agency; b) independence movements in recently annexed territories; and c) attempts to gain power by factions operating within the empire's core area¹⁰. However, it should be noted that not all known uprisings in the history of Assyria match to the above-mentioned general distinction of E. Frahm. *In particular, uprisings emerging from dynastic contradictions, the cause and effect relations of which were mainly based on personal discontent and reign ambitions of the Assyrian princes, were excluded from the above scheme, and attempts by certain political groups to gain power were important, but still they were related realities.* This observation also applies to the rebellion of Aššur-da''in-aplu.

There has been little discussion in the Assyriological studies on the rebellion of Aššur-da''in-aplu's. In his voluminous, 84-page article, A. Fuchs does not seem to shy away from the judgments made by A. Olmstead about half a century ago¹¹ and looks for the reasons for the Aššur-da''in-aplu's rebellion behind the curtains of permissiveness of a high-ranking nobility in Assyria. In accordance with this, he tries to draw parallels between the rebellion of Aššur-da''in-aplu's and the revolt in the capital of Kalhu in 746 BC¹², which resulted in the ascension of one of the famous Assyrian kings -Tiglath-Pileser (*Tukultī-apil-Ešarra*) III (745-727 B.C.)¹³. However, one can only partially agree with the comparison of A.Fuchs. Indeed, in both cases, the influence of high-ranking nobility reached to its peak, in both cases the country's leadership almost passed to warlords¹⁴, and in both cases public discontent existed on the situation. Nevertheless, one cannot fail to notice that the political and socio-economic situation of Assyria during the periods of these two revolts were completely different. The revolt of 746 B.C. was the result of the prolonged political and economic crisis in Assyria, while there is

¹⁰ **Frahm 2016:** 76.

¹¹ **Olmstead 1923:** 145-154, see also: **Garelli 1991:** 46-51.

¹² **Millard 1994:** 43; **Zawadzki 1994:** 53f.

¹³ **Fuchs 2008:** 94ff.

¹⁴ A. Fuchs draws parallels between Dayān-Aššur and Šamšī-ilu, which was the most powerful in the middle of the VIII century BC - **Fuchs 2008:** 62, 94ff.:

no reason to believe that Assyria survived the political and economic crisis in 859-824 BC.

In our view, the rebellion of Aššur-da''in-aplu's may have parallels with the events of 681 BC, when Sennacherib (*Sîn-ahhē-erība*) (705-681 BC) bypassed his elder sons to declare his younger son Esarhaddon (*Aššur-aḥa-iddina*) (681-669 BC) the heir to the throne, which prompted them to parricide¹⁵. In both cases, the causal relationship of events developed around the issue of succession to the throne, in both cases, the violation of the traditional order - the denial of the rights of the eldest son, the officially recognized heir to the throne, leads to the dissatisfaction of the latter and to an attempt to protect his rights¹⁶. However, it is also necessary to emphasize the significant difference - in 681 BC, Urdu-Mullissu, who killed Sennacherib, did not receive sufficient support in Assyria, and, having been defeated in the first battle, was forced to flee. Meanwhile, as can be seen from the aforementioned Šamšī-Adad's inscription - Aššur-da''in-aplu received strong support.

Despite the fact that the personal motive for the rebellion of Aššur-da''in-aplu was the protection of the rights of succession to the throne¹⁷, nevertheless, the uprising had deeper reasons that ensured the support. Almost century-old wars caused discontent of the free population of Assyria. Soon the struggle of local nobles were added, small and medium advisers in the inner prov-

¹⁵ **Parpola 1980:** 171ff.; **Grayson 1991:**119ff.; **Frame 1992:** 65ff.

¹⁶ The experts have almost no doubt that Aššur-da''in-aplu was the heir to the throne (there is a rebellious prince and 27 cities, of which Aššur, Arbail, and Nineveh are enough to conclude that the ancient Assyrian nobles joined the Aššur-da''in-aplu rebellion). The fact that the latter could be the heir to the throne may also be evidenced by a letter-report drawn up by the scribe Kabtī - "The scribe Kabtī, a servant of Aššur-da''in-aplu son of Shalmaneser (III), who gave me the Aramaic letter which I gave to the king, my lord, is saying to me: "Regarding the offender about whom I spoke to the king, my lord, his son enters and leaves the Palace. He is telling me: 'If he [...s] these [wo]rds to me, I [will tell them] to you". **Luukko, Van Buylaer 2002:** № 99, l. 8; **Brinkman 1998:** 178; **Olmstead 1924:** 154.

¹⁷ **Lambert 1974:** 108-109.

inces of Assyria against the large nobility of the outer provinces. At the end of the reign of Šulmānu-ašarēd III, royal power began to weaken.

In the country, while the central apparatus was weakening, the high nobility grew in power, going beyond its official status¹⁸. Naturally, weak royal power was the main precondition for maintaining the influence of high-ranking nobility. Meanwhile, it is clear that the local nobility of the inner provinces of Assyria had other sentiments. For them, strong royal power was the only guarantee of their role in the strategic life of the country and protection from the high-ranked nobility. All kings of Assyria, at least since Adasi (last quarter of the XVIII? BC) without, exception, were members of the same family from the city of Aššur, regardless of whether they were originally the crown prince and came to power legally or by seizing the throne¹⁹. In the context of the "*family*" perception, as the royal power, the clash of political visions of high-ranked and other categories of aristocracy around their own future, of course, would be localized within the issue of succession, since each of the opposing camps in the future desired to see a king on the Assyrian throne that meets its interests: the high-ranked being weak and manageable, and the lower categories - strong.

Around 832 BC Šulmānu-ašarēd III, while remaining in the capital city of Kalhu²⁰, transferred the leadership of the Assyrian military invasions to the Commander-in-Chief (*turtānu*²¹) Dāyyan-Aššur, who held this position from 855 BC²². Starting from

¹⁸ Lambert 1974: 105; Grayson 1982: 268; Roux 1992: 300; Khurt 1995: 489-490.

¹⁹ Radner 2016: 43; Radner 2010:26f.

²⁰ The two inscriptions (RIMA 3: A. 0. 102. 14, ll. 141-190; A. 0. 102. 16) were obviously written by order of Dāyyan-Aššur. In this regard, A. K. Grayson writes - "This unusual circumstance caused some confusion for the scribe, as it did for the scribe of A.0.102.16, who fluctuated between third person (Daiiān-Aššur) and first person (the king) in the narrative", RIMA 3: 63; Grayson 1982: 268.

²¹ Mattila 2000: 107-125.

²² Grayson 1993: 41; Mattila 2000:171; Fuchs 2008: 65 N. 15.

around 830 BC Aššur-da''in-aplu became the *de facto* ruler of the country. The latter's reputation in the country and its influence on the king became apparent, causing discontent of the royal family and the heir to the throne of Aššur-da''in-aplu²³. However, the latter, apparently, reconciled with this situation. A. Fuchs writes that in 830-827 BC Aššur-da''in-aplu did not take any action against the growing power of Dāyyan-Aššur. Probably because of the ill health of his father, Šulmānu-ašarēd III did not consider it impossible his enthronement. However, as it turns out, Dāyyan-Aššur's visions about the future were different. Before the rebellion, Aššur-da''in-aplu enjoyed a high reputation in the country, which was hardly connected only with the status of his heir to the throne²⁴. It was this reality that made Aššur-da''in-aplu an undesirable candidate for the throne, not only for the most powerful Dāyyan-Aššur, but also for the high-ranking Assyrian nobility as a whole. From the point of view of the latter, the rule of Aššur-da''in-aplu was considered as a serious threat to its own influence. Therefore, in order to eliminate it, before the invasion of the western regions of the Iranian highlands in 826 BC, Dāyyan-Aššur probably managed to influence Šulmānu-ašarēd III, and Šamšī-Adad was proclaimed heir to the throne instead of Aššur-da''in-aplu.

It is clear that Aššur-da''in-aplu did not tolerate a violation of his rights. The absence of Dāyyan-Aššur and Assyrian troops from the country gave him the opportunity to prepare a rebellion. A. Fuchs believes that an important signal for the beginning of the uprising was the death (or murder) of Dāyyan-Aššur in the same year – 826 BC²⁵. However, given the fact that the Assyrian army unequivocally supported Šamšī-Adad V, it can be assumed that the uprising began after the return of Dāyyan-Aššur.

In terms of the legal and ideological basis and political goal of the Aššur-da''in-aplu's rebellion, the observations of K. Rad-

²³ Fuchs 2008: 65-68.

²⁴ Fuchs 2008: 67-69.

²⁵ Առյ՛ն տեղում, 66:

ner regarding the periodically occurring royal crises in Assyria are interesting. K. Radner notes: “the Assyrian monarchy was most vulnerable at the moment when the king died or when he was considered too frail or otherwise unfit for rule (abdication was not an option) ... Parricide and fratricide did not disqualify from kingship ...”²⁶. Continuing his thought, K. Radner writes: “*The death of a king, his old age or perceived lack of divine support could all prompt such uprisings that were generally ideologically justified. The only possible response to an usurpation attempt was the eradication of the rival and his supporters*”²⁷.

It is natural that during the rebellion of Aššur-daʾin-aplu, the newly appointed Crown Prince of Šamšī-Adad was defended not only by Dāyyan-Aššur and the Assyrian army, but also by the provincial governors outside of indigenous Assyria and four senior officials. Later, Šamšī-Adad V thanked the high-ranking nobility for supporting him, restoring them to their positions, and some of them became eponyms for the second and even third time²⁸.

It was also natural that Aššur-daʾin-aplu joined the inner provinces of Assyria. At least a significant portion of the twenty-seven cities that took part in the rebellion were located in the inner provinces. It is noteworthy that the capital of Kalhu is not mentioned among the cities supporting Aššur-daʾin-aplu. According to K. Radner “*The imperial centre’s lack of support for Aššur-daʾin-apla’s faction may have been a key reason why the prince failed to take the throne*”²⁹. However, we can partially agree with this opinion, because, as we will see below, the support of Babylonia played an important role in the victory of Šamšī-Adad V.

²⁶ Radner 2016: 48.

²⁷ Radner 2016: 54.

²⁸ For example: (*rab šāqê*) *Aššur-būnāya-ušur* was an eponym in 855 BC, 825 BC and 816 BC, (*nāgir ekalli*) *Bēl-būnāya* 850 BC 823 BC, (*turtānu*) *Yaḥalū* - 833 BC, 824 BC and 821 BC, and etc. Millard 1994: 27-32; Mattila 2000:170f.

²⁹ Radner 2016: 48; cf. Grayson 1982: 269.

**Assyrian and Babylonian relations
Adad-nērāri II (912-891 BC) and Nabû-šuma-ukīn I
(900-888 BC)**

Although the "Aššur-da''in-aplu's rebellion" was the result of a crisis in internal relations, it had consequences for foreign policy as well. Šamšī-Adad V succeeded in suppressing the rebellion in the fourth year of his reign, in 820, with the support of Marduk-zākir-šumi I (855-819 BC), King of Babylonia. However, it appears that Šamšī-Adad V received Babylonian aid at the cost of significant concessions in traditional Assyrian-Babylonian relations in favor of Babylonia.

With the exception of a few episodes, Assyria's relations with Babylonia were friendly. Still, about a century ago, around 892 BC³⁰ Nabû-šuma-ukīn I (900-888 BC³¹) the king of Babylonia, managed to organize serious resistance to the Assyrian king Adad-nērāri II (912-891 BC), restoring the northern border of Babylonia, after which a friendly treaty was signed between the two kings³². The latter marry each other's daughters. They conclude a mutual agreement on total peace, after which, according to the "Synchronistic history", the peoples of Assyria and Akkad were brought together («UN (nišū)^{mes} [^{KUR}Aš]-šur ^{KU-^RURI(Akkad)^{ki}} it-ti a-ḥa-meš ib-ba-[al-lu]»). Both sides confirm and establish a permanent border from Til-Bīt-Bār³³, which flows up the Zāb River, to Til-ša-Ab/ptāni (Til-ša-Batani³⁴) and Til-ša-Zabdāni³⁵.

³⁰ Brinkman 1982: 302; Brinkman 1968: 181.

³¹ See: Brinkman 1968: 76 - the Chronology of the Post-Kassite Period.

³² Beaulieu 2018: 180; Brinkman 1982: 302.

³³ Parpola 1970: 66.

³⁴ ABC, № 21, Col. III, l. 20; Parpola, Watanabe 1988: XVIII.

³⁵ «17. DUMU.MUNUS(mārāti)<MEŠ>-šū-nu a-na aḥa-meš id-[di-nu] ([iš-ku-nu]) 18. [tu-ub-ta s]u-lu-um-ma-a ga-ma-ra it-ti a-ḥa-meš [iš-ku-nu] 19. UN(nišū)^{mes} [^{KUR}Aš]-šur ^{KUR}URI(Akkad)^{ki} it-ti a-ḥa-meš ib-ba-[al-lu] 20. iš-tu ^{URU}DU₆.Ē-ba-ri (Til-Bīt-Bāri) šá el-la-an ^{URU}Za-[ban] 21. a-di DU₆-šá¹Ba-ta-a-ni (Til-šá^mAb/ptāni) ù <DU₆>^{-sá}^{URU}Zab-da-ni (Til-šá^{URU}Zabdāni)ku-dúr ú-ki[n-nu]» - ABC, № 21, Col. III, ll. 17-21; GMC, № 10, Col. III, ll. 17-21. For

Šulmānu-ašarēd III (859-824 BC) and Nabû-apla-iddina (887-855 BC?)

Later, at the end of his reign, Nabû-apla-iddina (887-855 BC), the son of the Babylonian king Nabû-šuma-ukīn I, signed a new treaty with the new Assyrian king Šulmānu-ašarēd III - «[*tu-ub-ta s]u-lu-um-ma-a ga-ma-ra it-ti a-ḥa-meš [iš-ku-nu]*» - “they concluded a mutual agreement and a total peace”³⁶, or renewed previously concluded agreement. Interestingly, A. K. Grayson suggests that a similar agreement existed between Aššur-nāšir-apli II (884-859 BC) and Nabû-apla-iddina³⁷. **This gives reason to believe that we are not dealing with unique realities, but with a regularly occurring phenomenon, according to which the king of Babylonia either confirmed the previous agreement with every new Assyrian king ascending to the throne, or concluded a new agreement.** In this regard, J. A. Brinkman notes that diplomatic relations between Assyria and Babylonia had opened an era of goodwill for both countries, enjoying unprecedented peace and cooperation in the military and cultural spheres³⁸. The fact that these agreements also included mutual military assistance can only be assumed from a sequence of events.

Both the last years of the reign of Šulmānu-ašarēd III and, apparently, the last years of the reign of king Nabû-apla-iddina of Babylonia were not calm. Apparently, the latter chose the Assyrian king as the guarantor of the legitimate transfer of the Babylonian throne. After the death of Nabû-apla-iddina, or from the last period of his reign, there was a struggle for the throne of Babylonia between his sons Marduk-zākir-šumi and Marduk-bēlusāti. Soon, at the request of Marduk-zākir-šumi, the Assyrian

location of toponyms see: **Parpola-Porter 2001**: 10, E2; **ABC**: 264; **Parpola 1970**: 66, 352, 355; **Forrer 1921**: 42f.

³⁶ **ABC**, № 21, Col. III, ll. 24-25; **GMC**, № 10, Col. III, ll. 24-25. This agreement line actually repeats the 18th line of the previous agreement, see Footnote. 35.

³⁷ **Grayson 1982**: 266.

³⁸ **Brinkman 1982**: 302.

army led by Šulmānu-ašarēd III first in the year 851 BC of the eponymy of Šamaš-bēlu-ušur, then in the year of the eponymy of Bēl-būnāya - 850 BC³⁹, conducted a campaign to Babylonia⁴⁰. Interestingly, the "Synchronistic History" states that Šulmānu-ašarēd III went to the aid of the King of Babylonia - «31. *ana ni-ra-ru-ti*⁴¹ ša⁴² AMAR.UTU.MU.[MU] (^{md}*Marduk-zākir-šumi*) 32. *šar*₄ KUR*Kar-du-ni-áss il-l [ik]*»⁴²:

And only with the support of Assyria, Marduk-zākir-šumi I managed to ascend the throne of Babylonia.

The growing increase in the power of Assyria and the expansion of territories could not but cause concern in Babylonia. In such circumstances, Babylonia would have to either oppose Assyria or try to take advantage of it. Apparently, they preferred the second way and, having established contractual relations with Assyria, tried to preserve the peace in Mesopotamia in this way.

Šamšī-Adad V (824-811 BC) and Marduk-zākir-šumi I (855-819 BC?)

About 822 BC⁴³, the new king of Assyria, Šamšī-Adad V, appealed to the same Marduk-zākir-šumi I for help, about which, however, he remained silent. This can be explained by the fact that before assisting Assyria, the king of Babylonia, with the participation of a third party, Marduk-rēmanni, signed a new humiliating treaty with Assyria, the character of which was almost entirely military. According to the Treaty, the king of Assyria was obliged to surrender fugitives to Babylonia and furnish reports on anti-Babylonian plots, he should not have been hostile to Babylonia, and etc.

³⁹ Millard 1994: 27; RIMA 3: A.0.102.5, Col. IV, l. 1, Col. IV, l. 1. 5.; *ḫūšumtu ḫulu* RIMA 3: A.0.102.59; A.0.102.25, ll. 9-20, *ḫ uḫḫur*:

⁴⁰ RIMA 3: A.0.102.5, Col. IV, l. 1- Col. VI, l. 1; ABC, № 21, Col. III, ll. 27-34; GMC, № 10, Col. III, ll. 27-34; Beaulieu 2018: 180f.

⁴¹ *nārāru, nērāru* - 1. military aid, auxiliary troops, 2. help; CAD 11, N/1: 346.

⁴² ABC, № 21, Col. III; GMC, № 10, Col. III.

⁴³ Parpola 1987: 186; Radner 2019: 313, 318: The latter has a typographical error, it is mentioned in 882 BC.

The Treaty between Assyria and Babylonia attracted the attention of many well-known scholars, whose opinions, however, are very different. Thus, A. Olmstead considers the agreement between Šamši-Adad V and Marduk-zākir-šumi I humiliating for Assyria. Among other signs of the subordination of Assyria to Babylonia, the author points out the fact that Akkad (that is, Babylonia - R.Ts.) was mentioned before Assyria and that the title "king" was not used in front of the name Šamši-Adad V⁴⁴. A. K. Grayson and J. Brinkman agree with the opinion of A. Olmstead⁴⁵. Meanwhile, S. Parpola and K. Watanabe, editors of the agreement believe that the help from Marduk-zākir-šumi I was nothing more than the return of debts in favor of him in the past. They see no reason to believe that this treaty ensured the supremacy of Babylonia with regard to Assyria and believe that it implies complete equality between the two contracting parties⁴⁶. To justify their opinion, S. Parpola and K. Watanabe refer to a rather damaged part of the "Synchronistic history":

«1. [. . .] UM(?) 2. [tu-ub-ta su-lu-um-ma-a ga-ma-ra it-ti a-ḥa-meš iš-ku]-nu 3. [UN^{MEŠ KUR} Aš-šur^{KUR} Kar-du-ni-áš/URI^{KI} it-ti a-ḥa-meš ib]-bal-lu 4. [. . .] . . . MEŠ 5. [mi-iš-ru ta-ḥu-mu an-na-ma ú]-kín-nu»

“[. . . They conclu]ded [a mutual agreement and a total peace. The peoples of Assyria and Akkad were br]ought [together. . . . Together they establi]shed [a permanent boundary line]”⁴⁷.

In the 2nd line of “Synchronistic history”, after the pronoun “they” editors of the agreement add (restore?) “[Šamši-Adad and Marduk-zākir-šumi] established [perfect friendship and peace with each other]”⁴⁸.

However, it is difficult to agree with the approach of S. Parpola and K. Watanabe, like D. Galter, we also consider it more

⁴⁴ Olmstead 1924: 154.

⁴⁵ Grayson 1982: 270; Brinkman 1982: 308.

⁴⁶ Parpola, Watanabe 1988: XXVI.

⁴⁷ ABC: 167, № 21; GMC: 182f, № 10.

⁴⁸ Parpola, Watanabe 1988: XXVII.

likely that the above lines of “Synchronistic history” relate to the agreement concluded by Šulmānu-ašarēd III in the period after Marduk-zākir-šumi I had ascended on the throne⁴⁹.

P-A. Beaulieu also drew attention to the political and legal details of the treaty concluded between Šamšī-Adad V and Marduk-zākir-šumi I. Based on the mention of the name of Šamšī-Adad V in the Treaty without the title "King", the author thinks that it was concluded in the first years of the Aššur-da''in-aplu's rebellion and therefore Šamšī-Adad V does not act as a king⁵⁰.

This view is also quite vulnerable, we are not aware of any treaty in the history of the ancient Near East concluded in the name of the prince. The Prince may act in the name and place of the king-father, but the treaty was made in the name of the father, not the son. Therefore, if the contract was concluded before 824 BC, then there should have been not the name of Šamšī-Adad V, but his father Šulmānu-ašarēd III, regardless of who was on the side of concluding the treaty. Therefore, it would be more logical to date the conclusion of the contract after 824, when Aššur-da''in-aplu's rebellion had already achieved tangible success, and Šamšī-Adad V, being unable to suppress the uprising, was forced to ask Babylonia for help.

In order to identify the nature of the Assyrian and Babylonian Treaty under consideration, due attention must be paid not only to its details, but also to its historical context. In this regard, first of all, there is a very interesting circumstance specified by A. Olmstead in the treaty, that is a pre-written inscription after Babylonia. From the point of view of this unprecedented reality, a completely different meaning and explanation is given to the fact that in the treaty after the name of Marduk-zākir-šumi I the title “LUGAL” was put - the king «[...^{md}AMA]R.UTU-MU-<MU> LUGAL»⁵¹, while the ruler of Assyria acted without the

⁴⁹ Galter 1999: 32.

⁵⁰ Beaulieu 2018: 184.

⁵¹ Parpola, Watanabe 1988: № 1, l. 10.

title of king⁵². This reality of disproportionate relations in the sphere of diplomatic etiquette of the Ancient and Medieval World clearly shows the subordinat status of Šamšī-Adad V in political and legal relations to Marduk-zākir-šumi I. And finally, its indirect expression can be seen in the final part of the treaty. It contains the traditional curse against crime: (*šá ina ŠÀ a-de-e an-nu-ti*] [*i*]-*haṭ-ṭu-ú la il-ka-šu* - [*Whoever*] sins [*against this treaty and does not [carry out] his duty*⁵³, may ...), and the treaty oath is sworn by Babylonian gods alone⁵⁴.

From the above-mentioned, it can be concluded that Šamšī-Adad V has gained the support of Babylonia at a rather high price. Šamšī-Adad V, in addition to humiliating for him etiquette manifestations, apparently was forced to make some territorial concessions to Babylonia. Although there is no direct information about this, such a assumption seems probable to us in the context of changes in future Assyrian-Babylonian relations. Thus, the fact that a new border was drawn between Assyria and Babylonia in accordance with the “Synchronistic History”, we assume that during the invasion of Šulmānu-ašarēd III into Babylonia, the latter lost some northern territories. This circumstance could be considered by Marduk-zākir-šumi I as violation of the former treaty of friendship, since this meant that Assyria assisted him not in accordance with the Treaty of Mutual Assistance, but in exchange for territorial concessions. In a diametrically opposite political situation, now Babylonia tried to value its “friendly support” as expensive as possible. Apparently, Marduk-zākir-šumi I demanded the restoration of the former border, which, one way or another, meant territorial claims to Assyria. In any case, it is indisputable that the military support

⁵² Parpola, Watanabe 1988: № 1, l. 8.

⁵³ Parpola, Watanabe 1988: № 1, l. 15: In case of failure to fulfill the terms of the contract, among other curses and threats, the following shall be indicated: r. 3. «^d*A-num a-b*]i DINGIR.MEŠ GIŠ.PA-šú *liš-bir*» - “[May Anu, fat]her of the gods, break his scepter ...”

⁵⁴ Parpola, Watanabe 1988: № 1.

of Babylonia to Šamšī-Adad V substantially changed the previous picture of legal relations between two neighboring countries and their rulers. A direct expression of this is that Marduk-zākir-šumi I in his inscription bears the title "LUGAL ŠÚ - King of the World.

The fact that the dignity of Assyria had suffered a huge blow is also evident from the changes in Assyrian-Babylonian relations after the death of Marduk-zākir-šumi I. In 814-811 BC⁵⁵, Šamšī-Adad V conducted four campaigns against the kings of Babylonia, Marduk-balāssu-iqbi (c. 818-813 BC) and Bābu-aḥu-iddina (c. 812 BC), and deported them to Assyria⁵⁶. After this for more than half century Babylonia appeared in political crisis or as J. Brinkman calls it, in chaos⁵⁷. After the Babylonian invasions, Šamšī-Adad V, in addition to the title "King of Assyria, a strong king", also adds "LUGAL ŠÁR ... LUGAL KUR Su-me-ri URI.KI "- titles "king of the Universe, ... king of Sumer (and Akkad)"⁵⁸. Thus, the king of Assyria avenged his previous humiliation. However, it should be noted that Assyria was not able to establish long-term control over Babylonia⁵⁹.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABC** - Grayson A. K., *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (Texts from Cuneiform Sources)*, Lucust Valley - New York, 1975, pp. XVI+300+XI Pl.
- Beaulieu P.-A. 2018**, *A History of Babylon 2200 BC-AD 75*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Blackwell History of the Ancient World, Wiley-Blackwell, 312 p.
- Bedford P. 2009**, *The Neo-Assyrian Empire, The Dynamics of Ancient Empires: State Power from Assyria to Byzantium*, Ian Morris and Walter Scheidel (eds.), Oxford, pp. 30-65.

⁵⁵ **Grayson 1982**: 269.

⁵⁶ **RIMA 3**: A.0. 103.1, Col. III, l. 70-Col. IV; A.0. 103.2, Col. III-IV; A.0. 103.4; **ABC**: 168f., № 21, Col. IV, ll. 1-14; **GMC**: 182f., № 10, IV, ll. 1-14.

⁵⁷ **Brinkman 1968**: 213ff.

⁵⁸ **RIMA 3**: A.0. 103.9, l. 2.

⁵⁹ **Brinkman 1982**: 309.

- Brinkman J. A. 1982**, Babylonia c. 1000-748 B.C., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3/1, pp. 282-313.
- Brinkman J. A. 1968**, A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia 1158-722 BC., *Analecta Orientalia* 43, Rome, pp. XV+431.
- CAD 11, N/1**, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, J. A. Brinkman, M. Civil, I. J. Gelb, A. Leo Oppenheim, E. Reiner (Eds.) 1980, XXI+357.
- CAD 15/S**: *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, J. A. Brinkman, M. Civil, I. J. Gelb, A. Leo Oppenheim, E. Reiner (Eds.) 1984, XXV+428.
- Finkel I. L., Reade J. E. 1995**, Lots of Eponyms, *Iraq*, LVII, pp. 167-172.
- Finkel I. L., Reade J. E. 1998**, Assyrian eponyms, 873-649 BC., *Orientalia, Nova Series*, Vol. 67, № 2, pp. 248-254.
- Forrer E. 1921**, *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches*, Hinrichs, Leipzig, S. 150 + Karte.
- Frahm E. 2016**, Revolts in the Neo-Assyrian Empire: A Preliminary Discourse Analysis, in *Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East: In the Crucible of Empire*, Edited by John J. Collins and J.G. Manning, Brill, London-Boston, pp. 76-89.
- Frame G. 1995**, Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157-612 BC), *Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Babylonian Periods*, Vol. 2, Toronto-Buffalo-London, pp. XXV+350.
- Frame G. 1992**, *Babylonia 689-627 B.C.: A Political History*, Nederlands Historisch-Archeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten Istanbul, 358p.
- Fuchs A. 2008**, Der Turtān Šamšī-ilu und die große Zeit der assyrischen Großen (830-746), *Die Welt des Orients*, Bd. 38, pp. 61-145.
- Galter D. H. 1999**, Die Synchronistische Geschichte und Die Assyrische Grenzpolitik, *HANE/M III/2*, Padova, pp. 29-37.
- Garelli P. 1991**, The Achievement of Tiglath-pileser III: Novelty or Continuity?, in *M. Cogan - I. Eph'al (Eds.), Ah, Asyria ... Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor*, Jerusalem, pp. 46-51.

- GMC** - Glassner J.-J., *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, Society of Biblical Literature (Writings from the Ancient World, №19), Atlanta, 2004, 388 p.
- Grayson A. K. 1982**, *Assyria: Ashur-dan II to Ashur-nirari V (934-745 B.C.)*, The Cambridge Ancient History, 3/1, pp. 238-281.
- Grayson A. K. 1991**, *Assyria: Sennacherib and Esarhaddon (704-669 B.C.)*, The Cambridge Ancient History, 3/2, pp. 103-141.
- Grayson A. K. 1993**, *Assyrian Officials and Power in the Ninth and Eighth Centuries*, State Archives of Assyria Bulletin, № VIII/1, pp. 19-52.
- Khurt A. 1995**, *The Ancient Near East, c. 3000-330 B.C.*, London-New York-Routledge, 782 P.
- Lambert W. G. 1974**, *The Reigns of Aššurnāširpal II and Shalmaneser III: An Interpretation*, Iraq, XXXVI, Pt. 1-2, 103-110.
- Luukko M., Van Buylaere G. 2002**, *The Political Correspondence of Esarhaddon*, State Archives of Assyria, XVI, Helsinki, pp. LV + 221.
- Mattila R. 2000**, *The King's Magnates: A Study of the Highest Officials of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, State Archives of Assyria Studies, XI, Helsinki, 201p.
- Millard A. 1994**, *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910-612 BC*, State Archives of Assyria Studies, II, (with a contribution by Robert Whiting), Helsinki, pp. xvi + 153 + 20 Plates.
- Olmstead A. T. 1923**, *History of Assyria*, New York, London, pp. XXX+ 695.
- Parpola S. 1970**, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 6, Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn, pp. XXIX + 408.
- Parpola S. 1980**, *The Murder of Sennacherib*, in *Extrated from Death in Mesopotamia*, ed. by Professor B. Alster, CRRA XXVI = Mesopotamia 8, Copenhagen, 171-182.
- Parpola S. 1987**, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties from the Royal Archives of Nineveh*, Journal of Cuneiform Studies, Vol. 39, № 2, pp. 161-189.
- Parpola S., Watanabe K. 1988**, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*, State Archives of Assyria, II, Helsinki, pp. LXII + 123 + IX Plates.
- Parpola S., Porter M. 2001**, *The Helsinki Atlas of the Near East in the Assyrian Period*, Casco Bay Assyriological Institute and Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki, pp. XVI+47.

- Postgate J. N. 1995**, Assyria: the Home Provinces, in M. Liverani, Neo-Assyrian Geography, Quaderni de Geografica Storica 5, Rome, pp. 1-17.
- Radner K. 2019**, Neo-Assyrian Treaties as a Source for the Historian: Bonds of Friendship, the Vigilant Subject and the Vengeful King's Treaty, Writing Neo-Assyrian History: Sources, Problems, and Approaches, Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Helsinki on September 22-25, 2014, G.B. Lanfranchi, R. Mattila and R. Rollinger (eds.), SAAS, XXIX, pp. 309-328)
- Radner K. 2016**, Revolts in the Assyrian Empire: Succession Wars, Rebellions Against a False King and Independence Movements, in Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East: In the Crucible of Empire, Edited by John J. Collins and J.G. Manning, Brill, London-Boston, pp. 41-54.
- Radner K. 2010**, Assyrian and non-Assyrian kingship in the First Millennium BC, in Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity, Ed. G.B. Lanfranchi and R. Rollinger, Padova, 15-24.
- Radner K. 2006-2008**, Provinz. C. Assyrien, in: Michael P. Streck: Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie, 11, 1./2. Lieferung: Prinz, Prinzessin - Qaṭṭara. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 42-68.
- Reade J. E. 1978**, Assyrian Campaigns, 840-811 B.C., and the Babylonian Frontier, ZA, № 68, 251-260.
- RIMA 3** - Grayson A. K. Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858-745 BC), The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Assyrian Periods, Volume 3, Toronto - Buffalo - London, 1996, XXIII+267 p.
- Roux G. 1992**, Ancient Iraq, Penguin Books, London, 576 p.
- Zawadzki S. 1997**, The Question of the King's Eponymate in the Latter Half of the 8th Century and the 7th Century BC, in Assyria 1995, S. Parpola and R. M. Whiting (ed.), pp. 383-389.
- Zawadzki S. 1994**, The revolt of 746 BC and the coming of Tiglath-pileser III to the throne, State Archives of Assyria Bulletin 8, pp. 53-54.

Ruslan Tsakanyan - *PhD*,
Institute of Oriental Studies NAS RA,
Department of Ancient Orient, Senior Researcher,
 rooslantsakanyan@yahoo.com

ԱՇՇՈՒՐ-ԴԱՆ-ԱՊԼՈՒԻ ԱՊՍԱՄԲՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ
Մ.Թ.Ա. IX ԴԱՐԻ ԱՍՍՈՒՐԱԲԱԲԵԼԱԿԱՆ
ՄԻՋՊԵՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՐԱԲԵՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ
ՀԱՄԱՏԵՔՍՈՒՄ

Բանալի բառեր՝ *Ասորեստան, Բաբելոնիա, Շուլմանու-աշարեդ III, Աշշուր-դան-ապլու, Շամշի-Ադադ V, Մարդուկ-զակիր-շումի I, արշավանք, պայմանագիր, ապրս-տամբություն:*

Ասորեստանի արքա Շուլմանու-աշարեդ (Սալմանասար) III-ի (մ.թ.ա. 859-824 թթ.) կառավարման վերջին շրջանում՝ մ.թ.ա. 826 թ., ապստամբեց արքայազն Աշշուր-դան-ապլուն: Ապստամբությունն արագորեն վերանց քաղաքացիական պատերազմի՝ տևելով յոթ տարի: Ապստամբ եղբոր դեմ պայքարում Ասորեստանի նոր գահակալ Շամշի-Ադադ V-ը (մ.թ.ա. 824-811 թթ.) հայցեց Բաբելոնիայի ռազմական աջակցությունը: Թեև նա այդ օժանդակության շնորհիվ կարողացավ ճնշել Աշշուր-դան-ապլուի ապստամբությունը, բայց ստիպված էր դրա դիմաց ասորա-բաբելական հարաբերություններում ծանր և նվաստացուցիչ զիջումների գնալ և ժամանակավորապես ճանաչել Բաբելոնիայի արքա Մարդուկ-զակիր-շումի I-ի (մ.թ.ա. 855-819 թթ.) գերագահությունը:

Հոդվածում քննարկված են Աշշուր-դան-ապլուի ապստամբության պատճառներն ու առիթը, ինչպես նաև ասորա-բաբելական հարաբերություններում կատարված տեղաշարժերը, որոնք միտված էին հնարավորինս պահպանել Միջագետքի անդորրը:

Աշխատանքում Աշշուր-դան-ապլուի ապստամբությունը դիտարկված է հարաբերական դեպրիվացիայի հայե-

ցակետից, որտեղ առաջնային դիրքում է արքայազնի անձնական վերաբերմունքը երկրում տիրող իրավիճակի և իր իսկ կարգավիճակի հարցում: Մեր դիտարկման համաձայն՝ Ասորեստանում ներդինաստիական հակասությունների հողի վրա ծագած ապստամբությունները, որոնց պատճառահետևանքային հարաբերությունների հիմքում գերազանցապես ասորական արքայազների անձնական դժգոհություններն ու գահակալական հավակնություններն էին, իսկ առանձին քաղաքական խմբավորումների՝ իշխանության հասնելու փորձերն ապստամբության կայացման կարևոր, բայց, այնուամենայնիվ, ուղեկցող իրողություններ էին: Այս դիտարկումը վերաբերում է նաև Աշշուր-դան-ապլուի ապստամբությանը:

Ռուսլան Ցականյան - պ.գ.թ.,
«ՉԱԱ արևելագիտության ինստիտուտ»,
Հին Արևելքի բաժին, ավագ գիտաշխատող,
rooslantsakanyan@yahoo.com