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ABSTRACT

Skills as Tribute: Phoenician Sailors and Shipwrights in the Service of Neo-Assyria. (December 1999)
Athena Lynn Trakadas, B.A., University of California, Berkeley
Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Cemal Pulak

Presently, there are no known Phoenician texts that refer to ships or seafaring. As a result, nautical scholars interested in Phoenician maritime matters have been limited to the study of iconography and texts of other contemporary groups, such as the Assyrians, that depict or mention the renowned seafarers and their vessels. Conversely, Assyriologists have remained unaware of the importance to nautical history the Neo-Assyrian palatial sculptures that portray Phoenician vessels and texts that record Phoenician maritime matters.

The extension of Assyrian hegemony, and its expansion into the Neo-Assyrian empire in the first several centuries of the first millennium B.C., led to contact with and eventual subjugation of the Phoenician peoples who occupied a portion of the Syro-Palestinian coast. The social and economic relationship that ensued between these two groups has been previously analyzed by scholars. However, through this analysis of the available Neo-Assyrian textual and iconographical sources, the unique role the Phoenicians' skills as shipwrights and seafarers played in this socio-economic association with Assyria can be better reconstructed.
...even the weariest river winds
somewhere safe to sea.

- Odysseus Elytis
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INTRODUCTION

In the first several centuries of the first millennium B.C., the Neo-Assyrian kingdom gradually expanded in territory from its small nucleus in northern Mesopotamia to the coastline of the eastern Mediterranean Sea. This extension of the Assyrian hegemony led to contact with and the eventual subjugation of the Phoenician peoples who occupied a significant portion of the Syro-Palestinian coast. The social and economic relationship that ensued between these two groups for the duration of their contact has been analyzed by a number of scholars. However, there has been no attempt to examine the necessity and extent the Phoenician's skills as shipwrights and seafarers played in their specialized relationship as vassals to Assyria.

As the Neo-Assyrian kingdom began to grow in territory and political strength in the ninth century B.C., it also began to accumulate wealth in the form of valuable trade goods that were channeled into the Mesopotamian trade-networks from the Syro-Palestinian coast. The desire to increase the amount and types of these goods attracted a succession of expansionist- and economically-minded kings to the west, and led to the initial contact with the Phoenicians. Their strategically-located ports along the Syro-Palestinian littoral, seagoing merchant ships, and open-water navigational skills made the Phoenicians renowned maritime traders, who were then forcibly enlisted to act as intermediaries for the Assyrians, and facilitate the importation of raw and finished goods to the Near East from as far away as Spain and Sardinia, but also Egypt, Greece, Asia Minor, and Arabia. As the purveyors of merchandise that brought wealth into the Assyrian empire, the Phoenicians were politically administered by their overlords in an atypical manner.

The ensuing relationship between the two groups, however, was not wholly based on the Phoenicians' role as specialist traders. Due to the fact that the Assyrian
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heartland in the northern Mesopotamian plateau was land-locked, the only native Assyrian vessels were log and inflated skin rafts called *keleks*, reed boats, round skin *quffas*, inflated animal skins, or small planked vessels, which were suitable only for riverine navigation (figs. 1-4). Resultingly, the large Neo-Assyrian empire found itself lacking the ships proper for a seagoing fleet. The limited design and capacity of the native Mesopotamian vessels meant that the Assyrian empire could not engage in its own maritime trade or in military endeavors overseas once it had expanded its borders to the shores of the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. The Neo-Assyrian kings quickly recognized that the Phoenicians were adept at the construction of seagoing and small coastal vessels, and navigation in the open sea, and therefore possessed maritime skills unknown to the Assyrians.

Several depictions of and specific references to Phoenician vessels exist in Neo-Assyrian iconography and texts. These few examples, although fragmentary and incomplete at best, reveal that Phoenician sailors and shipwrights were enlisted to perform nautical services for the Neo-Assyrian hegemony in the Near East and eventually, directly for the kings in Mesopotamia. Thorough analysis and contextualization of the evidence from these two media can help to reveal further the two-fold, atypical nature of the relationship that was established between these two groups.
Fig. 1. A *kelek* depicted in a relief from Nineveh, dating to the reign of Sennacherib. (After A. Paterson, *Assyrian Sculpture: Palace of Sinacherib* [The Hague 1915] pl. 49)

Fig. 2. Reed boats used on the waterways of Mesopotamia. (After A. Paterson, *Assyrian Sculpture: Palace of Sinacherib* [The Hague 1915] pl. 51)
Fig. 3. A round skin and reed quffa, from Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh. (After A. Paterson, Assyrian Sculpture: Palace of Sinacherib [The Hague 1915] pl. 25)

Fig. 4. Inflated animal skins used in the transport of the Assyrian army when crossing a river. (After A. Paterson, Assyrian Sculpture: Palace of Sinacherib [The Hague 1915] pl. 47)
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

At the end of the second millennium B.C., the populations of lands in the eastern Mediterranean were still suffering from the regional collapse that had brought to a close the Late Bronze Age, two hundred years earlier (ca. 1200 B.C.). In Greece, the distinctive material culture of the Mycenaean had all but disappeared, the New Kingdom Period in Egypt had concluded with the last powerful pharaohs of the Twentieth Dynasty, and in Anatolia, the military dominance of the Hittite empire had fragmented, leaving the region in disorder. Throughout the Near East, the lingering effects of this system-wide breakdown were felt by various groups which at one time had been subject to the former international powers. In northern Mesopotamia, the peoples of Assyria would soon rise to fill the geo-political void left by the Mitanni, Hittites, and Hurrians, and in the coastal Levant, the Phoenicians enjoyed a period of commercial prosperity.

THE ASSYRIANS

The last kings of the Middle Assyrian Period (ca. 1500-1076 B.C.) saw opportunity in the collapse and destruction of the Hittite empire, their once-powerful northern neighbor. Seizing the opportunity to fill this new void, the Assyrian kings and their armies pushed to the north from the kingdom’s geographical heartland between the Tigris and Great Zab Rivers in the Mesopotamian plateau. The Assyrians easily subdued their neighbors, and the kingdom quickly acquired valuable farmland as well as access to rich forests and mines in southeast Anatolia. During the Middle Assyrian period, the kingdom reached its greatest extent under the Kings Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207 B.C.) and Tiglath-Pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.); however, this brief period of prosperity due to territorial expansion was short-lived after the death of
King Tiglath-Pileser I. Subsequent Assyrian kings were unable to maintain the long borders, and the kingdom soon succumbed to the threat of other newly emerging and more powerful neighbors. Intimidated by the army of Babylonia to its south and the expanding Aramaean states to its north and west, as well as struggling with internal dissension and famine, Assyria was quickly reduced to a fraction of its former size by the end of the first millennium B.C.

After the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I, Assyria endured over a century of relative obscurity, marked by a lack of written sources. The Assyrian kingdom slowly began to re-emerge from its dark age by the end of the tenth century, when the tentative foundations of what was to become the Neo-Assyrian empire were laid. In the coming centuries, the new Assyrian kingdom would come to dominate the entire Near East until its fall at Nineveh in 612 B.C.

The capital of the rejuvenated Neo-Assyrian kingdom was the traditional cultic center of Assur, which lay on the western bank of the Tigris River in the northern Mesopotamian plateau. As the administrative and religious nucleus of the kingdom, the capital was strategically located at the southern end of a small arable plain, bordered to the south and west by steppes and small expanses of land suitable for dry farming, and to the east by the foothills of the Zagros Mountains (fig. 5). To the north of Assyria lay the fertile Habur region, once part of the Middle Assyrian kingdom, but separated by no natural geographical barriers. The topography of the region initially dictated that the Assyrian kingdom would expand northwards, as it soon did by the end of the tenth century B.C. Propelled by a growing population in need of more arable land, and the desire for natural resources scarce in the Mesopotamian plateau, especially metal, Assyria soon re-occupied the lands of the Habur region.
Fig. 5. Map of the Assyrian heartland.
To Assyria's south, the old Mesopotamian power of Babylonia was also beginning to test its territorial prospects. The military forays of the Babylonians could not be ignored, and King Adad Nirari II (911-891 B.C.) led the Assyrian army in the first of a series of defensive military encounters against the southerners. As a result, neither side gained territory, but secured mutual, if not temporary boundaries. North of Assur, Adad Nirari led his army in several more military campaigns, and successfully incorporated the entire Habur region into the kingdom.

Adad Nirari's son, Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884 B.C.), capitalized upon his father's successful policy of expansion, and habitually demanded payment of textiles and mineral wealth from the "foreign" peoples of the Habur region. The military conquests of Adad-Nirari, and the resulting administration of taxation by Tukulti-Ninurta, in effect laid the foundations for what would become the Neo-Assyrian method of territorial expansion and control, practiced and refined by each successive king.

Ashurnarsipal II (883-859 B.C.) actively continued the now-evident imperial expansionist policy, with military campaigns of annual regularity. Intent on re-defining the borders of the empire to match those of the Middle Assyrian period, Ashurnarsipal also had clear economic designs. Military conquests extended west to the Euphrates River, then north to Syria, where Ashurnarsipal's army first came into contact with the new Neo-Hittite and Aramaean states that had developed since the collapse of the Hittite kingdom three-hundred years earlier. These newly emerging states occupied a geographical bridge between Mesopotamia and the eastern Mediterranean coastal strip, through which trade goods, both finished products and natural resources, flowed. Assyrian administration, or at the very least, military
control, of these territories would introduce valuable economic assets into the Assyrian kingdom.

When Ashurnarsipal set out to the west with his army in 877 B.C., he clearly anticipated reaching the seacoast of the eastern Mediterranean. However, in northern Syria, the prominent and strategic city-states of Guzana (capital of the Bit Bahiani on the Habur River), Til Barsib (capital of the Bit Adini on the Euphrates River), Karkemesh, and Arpad (capital of the Bit Agusi, near the modern city of Aleppo) lay in his path.\(^{20}\) South of Karkemesh, Ashurnarsipal and his army ruthlessly succeeded in destroying several of the allied eastern Aramaean cities’ armies and deported their populations back to the new capital of Nimrud (Kalhu) in the Assyrian heartland.\(^ {21}\) When Ashurnarsipal finally reached the strategically located city-state of Karkemesh on the west bank of the Euphrates River, he met no resistance, and was presented numerous gifts by the city’s king, Sangara.\(^ {22}\) Assured of Karkemesh’s subservience, Ashurnarsipal then pressed westwards to the coast. Here, on the shores of the Mediterranean, he collected placating offerings from other Aramaean- and Neo-Hittite-allied cities, all of whom did not want to endure destruction at the hands of the Neo-Assyrian army.

Encamped with his army near the mouth of the Orontes River, Ashurnarsipal also received gifts from envoys of other city-states that occupied the Syro-Palestinian coast. Recognizing the military might of Assyria, and not wanting to suffer a fate similar to that of the devastated cities in northern Syria, the Phoenicians offered precious items of tribute to Ashurnarsipal. Collectively, the major Phoenician coastal cities of Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, and Arvad gave gifts of silver, gold, lead, copper, ivory, linen and wool garments, and boxwood furniture, all of which were a testament to the cities’ prominence as trading centers.\(^ {23}\) Seemingly satisfied with these gifts, which he
recorded as "tribute" in his annals, Ashurnarsipal returned to his palace at Nimrud. Although successful in gathering numerous and valuable tribute goods, the military campaigns had financially burdened the still-small kingdom and had added little territory to Assyria's overall possessions.24

The still modest-sized Assyrian kingdom was ripe for expansion when Shalmaneser III (858-824 B.C.) ascended to the throne. The remainder of his father's, Ashurnarsipal's, reign had been marked by relative stability, and there was little threat from bordering groups. Shalmaneser diplomatically succeeded in negotiating a treaty of alliance with the powerful kingdom of Babylon, and ultimately was able to give Assyria the upper hand.25 In 859 B.C., however, Shalmaneser, while still a crown prince, desired to retrace his father's steps in the west. Almost repeating Ashurnarsipal's strategy, Shalmaneser pushed on to the Mediterranean coast with his army. He also encountered a new coalition of Neo-Hittite, Bit-Adini and Aramaean armies, which he defeated over the course of several battles.26 Ultimately, however, Shalmaneser was unable to dominate the alliance of city-states as his father had, and could only make sporadic demands of tribute gifts for the remainder of his reign.

Shalmaneser continued to press west to the Mediterranean coast, and encountered the Phoenician peoples, whose wealth in maritime commerce potentially promised a range of tribute gifts. In his annals, Shalmaneser records his receipt of "silver, gold, lead, bronze and purple stuff" (most likely murex dyed goods) from the Phoenician kings.27 Instead of pushing further south into the lands of Israel, Judah or Philistia, which also promised more booty, Shalmaneser decided to halt this western campaign and consolidate his provincial administration in order to strengthen his newly-acquired western and southern territories.28 Shalmaneser, however, did return to the
sea-coast in 841 B.C., and again received tribute from the Phoenician cities of Tyre, Byblos, and Sidon.²⁹

Subsequent relations with the Phoenician city-states were not sought by Shalmaneser's immediate successors. Instead, the Assyrian kings were faced with pressure from a stronger Babylon in the south, but their royal annals chronicle few military campaigns, and internal dissension as well as plague suppressed further thoughts of territorial expansion. Consequently, the various groups in Syria and along the Syro-Palestinian coast enjoyed a period of relative peace and prosperity, and were temporarily free from the threat of the Assyrian army and not subject to pay the kings' tribute requirements.³⁰

Assyrian foreign relations had been halted for almost a century when administrative intensification and consolidation throughout the kingdom began anew under Tiglath-Pileser III (746-728 B.C.).³¹ The new king spent twelve years campaigning with his army in the west, and by the time he ended this lengthy sojourn in 732 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser was receiving annual tribute from the Aramaean and Neo-Hittite states of northern Syria and the eastern Taurus mountains, in addition to the collective Phoenician cities of Byblos, Tyre, Sidon and Arvad.³² The most aggressive strategist of the Assyrian kings yet, Tiglath-Pileser began a period of definite Neo-Assyrian interest and control over the cities of Phoenicia, indicated now by the annual payment of tribute.³³ The Assyrian policy of political subservience and economic domination over the Phoenicians, as well as other Levantine groups, would last almost until the fall of the Assyrian kingdom at the end of the seventh century B.C.³⁴

The Phoenician city of Tyre, however, chose to rebel under Assyria's yoke when Tiglath-Pileser III's politically weak son, Shalmaneser V (726-722 B.C.), ascended to
the throne in 726 B.C.³⁵ The Assyrian army began a siege of the city, which had
rebelled against absolute Assyrian administrative policy by refusing to pay its annual
tribute. The siege was never completed due to the death of Shalmaneser in battle, and
the situation with Tyre was left unresolved for the next king.³⁶
Sargon II (721-705 B.C.), an usurper from outside the royal house, claimed the
throne in the aftermath of Shalmaneser V's death in battle. The western provinces of
Aramaea, Judah, Philistia, and Phoenicia realized the confusion in Neo-Assyrian
command which Sargon's succession had caused, and almost immediately seized the
opportunity to revolt and remove themselves from the Assyrian yoke of
subordination.³⁷ When the annual Assyrian demand for tribute came, all city-states,
by prior agreement, refused to pay. Moving west with his army, Sargon swiftly
crushed this widespread rebellion, and deported to Mesopotamia the populations of
the more defiant city-states, and immediately placed pro-Assyrian rulers on the empty
thrones.³⁸ Although his retaliation of other western provinces was seemingly harsh,
Sargon treated the Phoenician city-states differently. Byblos, Tyre, Sidon and Arvad
were not attacked by the Assyrian army, and their kings, after tribute payments, were
allowed to remain on their thrones, untouched.³⁹
After Sargon's rapacious western campaign, the direct sphere of Assyrian influence
now extended along the entire coast of the Levant, to the border of Egypt, as Sargon
annexed most of the Syro-Palestinian territories into provinces of Assyria.⁴⁰ To the
south of the Assyrian heartland, Sargon's subsequent campaigns resulted in the
incorporation of Babylon into the ever-expanding kingdom. In essence, the Assyrian
kingdom now included more territory than ever before, spanning from the coast of
the eastern Mediterranean to the ancient shores of the Persian Gulf (fig. 6).⁴¹ Assyria
Fig. 6. Map of the extent of Neo-Assyrian territory under the reigns of Sargon II, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal.
had now entered the final phase of its territorial conquests, and consolidated all subject provinces into a period of stabilized relationships, commonly referred to as the *pax assyriaca*. Such political and administrative achievement led Sargon to make a paean of self-praise in his annals as, "the great king, the mighty king, king of the universe, [the] king of Assyria."  

After Sargon's death in 705 B.C., his son Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.) was faced, yet again, with wide-spread provincial rebellion. The first decade of Sennacherib's reign was spent campaigning in the peripheral territories of the kingdom, suppressing the numerous and sporadic revolts against his rule. The western provinces again collectively refused to pay tribute, while new troubles raged in the south with Babylonia and the kingdom of Elam. Much like his father, Sennacherib was especially harsh in his treatment of many Levantine city-states, and ruthlessly attacked several Judaean cities in 701 B.C. He responded to their insurrection by rearranging their territorial boundaries and placing more amenable, pro-Assyrian kings on their thrones. The Phoenician cities of Byblos, Arvad, and Tyre hurriedly presented large gifts of tribute, and were left unscathed, while King Luli of Sidon, who had openly participated in the revolt, fled to Tyre, and then to Cyprus.

The sedate control over the western provinces was of the utmost importance to Assyria. As made clear by the actions of the kings which followed Sennacherib, Assyria had intentions of invading Egypt, and the strategic location of the Syro-Palestinian provinces could, and did, serve as a base of support for such an invasion. Over the next half a century, Esarhaddon (679-669 B.C.) and Ashurbarnipal (669-627 B.C.) were occupied with military campaigns in northern Egypt that were ultimately unsuccessful. During this time, the royal annals document less and less the affairs of the Phoenicians, and in 645 B.C. their cities are mentioned as subject to Assyria for the
last time. After Ashurbarnipal's death in 627 B.C., and until the fall of the Neo-Assyrian kingdom in 612 B.C., the Assyrians were embroiled in a constant struggle with the Babylonians in the south, and all other affairs of the larger kingdom appear to have been neglected. During this rapid decline of the once-mighty kingdom, the cities in the western provinces seem to have removed themselves unceremoniously from Assyrian economic and social control without any fear of retribution.

THE PHOENICIANS

The Phoenicians, like the Assyrians, also recognized opportunity in the regional collapse that occurred at the close of the second millennium B.C. During the Late Bronze Age, the cities of Phoenicia had developed into production centers for luxury goods that were desirable to and traded with the Hittites, Babylonians, and especially the Egyptians. Once these major Near Eastern powers had dissipated around 1200 B.C., and after the incursion of the 'Sea Peoples' into the Levant, the Phoenicians quickly recovered and were left free to enjoy their own commercial prosperity that developed out of earlier Late Bronze Age foundations.

The Phoenicians occupied a relatively small stretch of the Syro-Palestinian coast, geographically confined by the mountains of Lebanon to the east and the Mediterranean Sea to the west. To the north, the Phoenician sphere of influence reached almost to the ancient city of Ugarit, and extended for a few hundred kilometers to the south, near Mt. Carmel in modern Israel (fig. 7). At this time, there appears to have been no definite territorial boundaries, for the Phoenicians shared this region and interacted with several other emerging groups in the Levant. In northern Syria were the Neo-Hittite states, in Transjordania were the states of Israel and Judah, and even further south was the land of the Philistines, which
Fig. 7. Map of the Phoenician city-states along the Syro-Palestinian coast.
bordered the Negev Desert and Sinai peninsula. The area occupied by Phoenicia at the end of the Late Bronze Age never fluctuated greatly in size, but never needed to. The Phoenicians' influence spread throughout and beyond the Mediterranean primarily by means of extensive trade routes and coastal colonies, measures of their skill as traders and seafarers.

The major cities of Phoenicia emerged from earlier Canaanite coastal settlements of the Bronze Age. Arvad, Byblos, Berytus, Sidon, Sarepta, and Tyre were also ports, some with dual harbors, strategically located along the Syro-Palestinian coast on easily defensible, Rocky promontories. Connected by a common language and material culture, these cities remained independent of one another, with their own separate kings and surrounding territory, which constituted small, autonomous city-states that were free to establish their own military and economic alliances. Beginning in the ninth century, the particular sovereign position of each Phoenician city was also recognized by the Neo-Assyrian kings. As the Assyrian annals attest, specific Phoenician cities were designated as a city or town (URU), as well as a territory or land (KUR).

Sidon was the first dominant city of the region, as the label "Sidonian" was interchangeably used to describe "Phoenician" by Homer and in the Old Testament. The city of Tyre, south of Sidon, seems to have risen to a level of prominence by the tenth century B.C., especially under the leadership of King Hiram I (969-936 B.C.), who provided cedar from the mountains of Lebanon for the successive kings of Israel. Several books of the Old Testament extensively document the Tyrian, and to a limited extent, Sidonian participation in the construction of King David's palace and the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. By the reign of King Ethbaal (889-856 B.C.), Tyre, due to its frequent mention in the Old Testament, seems to have eclipsed Sidon.
as the leading Phoenician city-state. Josephus calls Ethbaal king of both Tyre and Sidon, suggesting that during the ninth century, Tyre may have exercised limited control over its closest northern neighbor.64

Collectively, however, the Phoenicians had gained renown for their skills as traders. The goods they traded included raw materials that were refined in the production centers of Phoenicia, as well as exotic goods that were imported from far-off places. The tribute lists of the Neo-Assyrian kings, as well as the Old Testament book of Ezekial, document the types of goods traded by the Phoenicians.65 Cedar and fir were easily obtainable in the forests that covered the nearby mountains of Lebanon, and continued to be a traded commodity. Raw metals, such as lead, copper, iron, and tin were brought to Phoenicia for working, in order to make bronze items or figurines.66 Silver and gold were also traded in their base form, or as intricately-worked jewelry.67 In addition, furniture of ivory-inlaid boxwood was produced, and carved ivory figurines and plaques were manufactured in a distinctive Phoenician style.68 Textiles dyed purple with murex were popular in antiquity, and eventually lent the Phoenicians their Greek name.69 Imports included exotic animals, such as lions and baboons from Africa, and later, in the seventh century, the Phoenicians began to produce unique glassware.70

In search of more raw materials and trade goods that had sparked desirability in the Near East, the Phoenicians expanded from their eastern Mediterranean homeland. As the men famed for their ships (Φοίνικες ναυσικάλυτοι καθε, described in Homer’s Odyssey), the Phoenicians were the far-reaching sailors, navigators and shipbuilders of the pre-Classical world.71 Their extensive knowledge of navigation and shipbuilding allowed them to sail throughout the Mediterranean Sea in order to collect the raw and precious materials needed for trade or production.72
Already by the twelfth century B.C., the Phoenicians' fore-bearers had expanded overseas, and founded a colony on the north coast of Africa, at Utica (fig. 8). In the far western Mediterranean, Gades (modern Cadiz) in southern Spain, and Lixus (modern Larache) on the Moroccan Atlantic coast, were purportedly also founded in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{73} Archaeological evidence, however, indicates that the Iberian colonies, rich in silver and tin, were most likely settled only in the eighth century, and no archaeological layers earlier than the seventh century have been discovered at Lixus, another source of murex dye.\textsuperscript{74}

Closer to the Levant, the Phoenician traders began to infiltrate the islands of the eastern Mediterranean and Aegean soon after the end of the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{75} Cyprus was an attractive source of copper, and pottery finds indicate a Phoenician presence on the island by the tenth century B.C.\textsuperscript{76} In the tenth century, voyages to the land of Ophir, presumably to the south and adjacent to the Red Sea, resulted in the importation of exotic animals, as well as gold and ivory.\textsuperscript{77} Precious stones used in jewelry and bronze items were exported from or manufactured in the settlements of southern Sardinia, which was colonized by the eighth century.\textsuperscript{78} Centrally located in the Mediterranean was Sicily, which was colonized sometime before the eighth century for its reserves of silver and murex dye.\textsuperscript{79} Also located at an intermediate point in the Mediterranean was Carthage, perhaps the most famous Tyrian colony, founded in the late ninth century. Located on the coast of North Africa, the city soon became a major center of trade for all regions of the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{80}

By the ninth century B.C., the Phoenicians had developed a mixed economy of trade and industry. Their expansion in the Mediterranean initially was instigated in part, but not wholly, by the search for new sources of materials for trade and manufacture. Colonies that were established throughout the Mediterranean were
intended to supply Phoenicia proper with material goods, but these outposts eventually developed into more permanent settlements and localized trade centers.

Operating as middlemen, the Phoenicians facilitated long-distance, maritime trade, and their resulting commercial success is what made them so attractive to the kings of Neo-Assyria. When Ashurnarsipal II first received tribute from the Phoenician cities in 877 B.C., he lists in his annals precious goods that derived from their contacts overseas.\(^{81}\) When the subsequent Assyrian king, Shalmaneser III, campaigned in the west, the carefully documented Phoenician tribute was always given by the wealthy city-states with no opposition.\(^{82}\)

Apparent Assyrian latency with the commercial activities of the Phoenician peoples ended with the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III. In his first campaign of 738 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser encountered a coalition of defiant northern Syrian city-states, including Arvad, which did not pay tribute to the king.\(^{83}\) In his second, more rapacious campaign of 734-732 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser was faced with further insurrection, and came into direct contact with the major cities of Phoenicia. Tyre, and its king, Hiram II, had entered into a treaty with Rezin, the king of the Aram-Damascus peoples in northern Syria. Collectively, all the northern Syro-Palestinian groups refused to make their payments of tribute to Assyria. Both Tyre and some smaller, northern Phoenician cities were eventually forced to pay additional tribute after the Assyrian army defeated the Aram-Damascus-allied army in battle. The Assyrian victory resulted in the dissolution of the political alliance of the Levantine groups, and led to the direct geo-political re-organization of territory along the eastern Mediterranean coast.\(^{84}\) The subsequent king of Tyre, Metenna, was forced to remit the exacting sum of 150 gold talents to Assyria, but the Phoenician city-states were not
directly annexed as Assyrian provinces; instead, Assyrian officials were placed in each city, in order to regulate external trade and internal distribution.\textsuperscript{85}

The reign of Tiglath-Pileser III in the eighth century effectively curtailed the complete commercial freedom that the Phoenicians had experienced during the first centuries of the first millennium B.C. Until the fall of the Assyrian kingdom in 612 B.C., the coastal city-states were subject to the economic inclinations of the Neo-Assyrian hegemony. The Phoenicians' extensive maritime trade of exotic items and raw materials, as well as production of finished goods, certainly continued under the Assyrian dominion, but now their skills served the stronger Mesopotamian power.
METHODS AND NATURE OF CONTACT

The Neo-Assyrian kings' desire for contact with and control over the Phoenician city-states was, in the most basic sense, economically motivated. However, the evidence as to the nature of the Assyrian-Phoenician relationship in the first millennium B.C. exists strictly in the visual and textual forms of Neo-Assyrian propaganda. Although there is a paucity of palatial texts that document the contact between the two groups, some general statements can be made from this evidence as to the nature of the relationship and its uniqueness in the Neo-Assyrian methodological administration. In this section, the atypical Phoenician-Assyrian socio-economic relationship will be examined through analysis of the extant ancient texts, and in the following catalogue, the iconographic examples which document this contact will be further investigated.

METHODS OF ASSYRIAN EXPANSION

The economic and political structure of the Neo-Assyrian kingdom, initially studied by I.M. Diakonoff, has been reconstructed from Assyrian administrative texts and royal annals. Admittedly biased in nature, and incomplete at best, these texts, as well as the archaeological finds from Mesopotamian palatial excavations, can provide some general characteristics regarding the economic structure of the Neo-Assyrian kingdom.

The Neo-Assyrian kingdom was, in essence, an empire that consistently expanded its territory, while dominating and exploiting surrounding populations. The Neo-Assyrian expansion, and its resulting imperial administration can be compared to that of Rome, as defined in socio-economic terms by M.I. Finley. In the case of Assyria, J.N. Postgate identifies the kingdom's emergence as having two distinct
phases. The first, the "conquest phase," which began with the military campaigns of Adad Nirari II (911-891 B.C.), lasted until the reigns of Tiglath-Pileser III (746-728 B.C.), and even more definitively, Sargon II (721-705 B.C.). The second, or "imperial phase," was the resulting central military administration that ensured relative economic and political stability, or pax assyriaca, throughout the accrued empire. This second phase would last in its relatively unmodified form until the fall of the Neo-Assyrian empire at Nineveh in 612 B.C.

The general method of primary contact and initial acquisition of territory that was first undertaken by Adad Nirari II (911-891 B.C.) and Tikulti-Ninurta II (890-884 B.C.), depended wholly upon the mobile military force that uniquely characterized Neo-Assyria. Psychological intimidation by the Neo-Assyrian army, both imagined and realized, was instilled in populations throughout the Near East, and integral to the expansionist designs of the Assyrian kings. Led by the king, the army of Assyrian soldiers and, later, integrated foreign mercenaries, would attack and raid cities in neighboring and distant territories in search of plunder in the form of finished goods, luxury items, and raw materials (fig. 9). These raids would occur sporadically, until the plagued local rulers acknowledged the superiority and dominance of the Assyrian king, and agreed to a loyalty-oath or treaty of vassalage (adiie). Such a pledge would prevent further harassment, but required the now-weakened states to surrender goods from trade and their own production to Assyria on an annual basis.

The goods, both valuable and practical, were perceived in the Neo-Assyrian ideology as a form of tribute called madattu. The payments of madattu were compulsory, and, for the most part, presented directly to the king or his high officials at the Assyrian capital (fig. 10). From the nucleus of the Assyrian palace, the goods
Fig. 10. Tribute-bearers from the eastern and western provinces of the Neo-Assyrian empire, depicted at Sargon II’s palace. (From P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive I* [Paris 1849] pl. 127)
would then be redistributed to the palatial dependents, temples, and varying ranks of administrative officials and the military.\textsuperscript{94} Failure for any vassal state to pay the \textit{madattu} was a rebellious political statement and almost always resulted in an attack by the Assyrian army, which was highly-skilled in siege warfare.\textsuperscript{95}

The forced diversion of the \textit{madattu} goods was intended by the Assyrian kings to be an economic imposition upon their vassals.\textsuperscript{96} However, the Assyrian ideology, unbalanced as it was, perceived the \textit{madattu} as a form of legitimate reciprocity, or what M. Liverani calls "trade-exchange": wealth was sent to the core of the kingdom, and in return, the peripheries 'received' political and military services, albeit in the actual limited constructs of resident Assyrian officials and army legions. In reality, this type of exchange was a form of non-exchange: the direct acquisition of goods was only one-sided.\textsuperscript{97}

In addition, the client-kings (\textsc{en uru}) of the vassal states further "bore the yoke of Assur" (the dual name for Neo-Assyria's first capital and its patron deity), in the form of resident Neo-Assyrian officials (\textit{qepu}), who imposed duties and levies, as well as in-kind taxation, upon the local trading merchants and their trade relations in the private sector.\textsuperscript{98} The royal inscriptions of Neo-Assyria record the influx of these goods and their origins,\textsuperscript{99} but as J.N. Postgate has noted, no explicit mention is made in the texts as to the division and diversion of these goods once they reached the palace.\textsuperscript{100} Therefore, further knowledge of the re-distributive process must be inferred from whatever archaeological evidence is tenable.

Throughout the hegemony of vassal states, the individual client-kings were free to continue their own form of internal rule and localized economic policies, so long as the annual payments of \textit{madattu} were made and regional taxation endured.\textsuperscript{101} On the whole, the Neo-Assyrian administration did not try to control local or regional
traditions; even at the height of the empire’s domination and exploitation in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., vassal states were always allowed to maintain their own autonomy and culture.\textsuperscript{102}

Despite the social leniency extended to the Neo-Assyrian vassal states, marked dissension over taxation occurred among the local peoples.\textsuperscript{103} As was to be the frequent case in the western territories, a new Assyrian king often faced a coalition of vassal states that opportunistically refused to pay in-kind tax or the year’s madattu upon his ascension. As the dependable influx of goods was resulting disruptively, the Assyrian king was then compelled to campaign in the first years of his rule, so as to forcibly re-demand tribute.\textsuperscript{104}

Generally, if vassal states proved too troublesome and continued to act in this respect, the steps to Assyrian political provincialism were quickly instigated. More amenable, pro-Assyrian local rulers forcibly replaced the previous client-kings of the vassal states, and the surrounding territory entered a new phase in Assyrian administration, that of "puppet state."\textsuperscript{105} If this process also failed to produce the desired administrative results of the procurement of tribute and taxes for the Assyrian king, an Assyrian official was then appointed as governor (\textit{turtanu}), and the former state was annexed completely into Assyria as a province, with the governor’s residence serving as the regional administrative center and military garrison.\textsuperscript{106}

Once annexed, the socio-political makeup of an Assyrian province was modified dramatically. It became common practice during the reigns of Tiglath-Pileser III (746-728 B.C.), Sargon II (721-705 B.C.), and Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.) for the administration to deport large or even entire populations of annexed territories to the Assyrian heartland to serve the kingdom as forced agricultural and construction labor
or as skilled craftspeople. The outlying province was then settled by ethnic Assyrians in order to establish in the region a more homogenous population.\textsuperscript{107}

CONTACT WITH PHOENICIA

Neo-Assyria's system of territorial administration was severely altered, however, when the kingdom expanded to the Levantine coast. By the early ninth century B.C., the Phoenicians had securely established themselves as the purveyors and manufacturers of goods that comprised the basis of the regional trade system in the Near East. The desire to further benefit from the wealthy inter-regional networks and to ensure the flow of valuable goods and raw materials to Nimrud attracted the Neo-Assyrian kings to the west.\textsuperscript{108}

Goods derived from \textit{madattu} and taxation, to which the Assyrian re-distributive economy had become so dependent, were no longer sufficient for the demands of the kingdom and its expensive war machine in the ninth century.\textsuperscript{109} Now, with increasing regularity, Assyrian kings campaigned beyond the provincial borders, and were often placated with extra-ordinary gifts called \textit{namurtu}: non-compulsory gifts freely proffered by local kings who were not vassals of the empire.\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Namurtu}, both in practical and ideological terms, was to become essential in the promotion of luxury good wealth from surrounding, external states to the core of the Assyrian kingdom during the next several centuries.\textsuperscript{111} When Ashurnarsipal II (883-859 B.C.) reached the Mediterranean seacoast in 877 B.C., the collective Phoenician cities of Tyre, Sidon, Arvad, and Byblos presented \textit{namurtu} of several types of metals, distinctive wool and linen garments, boxwood and ivory.\textsuperscript{112}

Although not an automatic imposition like the \textit{madattu}, the presentation of \textit{namurtu} gifts by the Phoenician city-states was an astute political maneuver to
ensure their continued economic freedom. Even though the namurtu could temporarily deplete the states' own coffers, its symbolic presentation as supplication, in addition to its value, would prevent the inevitable assault of the Assyrian army. A military attack could not only potentially destroy the Phoenician city-states, but would certainly interrupt the trade and production on which they had grown increasingly wealthy.\textsuperscript{113}

In the west, the greater potential wealth from goods that could be derived from namurtu, compared with madattu, caused Shalmaneser III (858-824 B.C.) to instigate a replacement of the regular extraction of namurtu in northern Syria with one of outright attack and pillage.\textsuperscript{114} In response to this new, aggressive strategy, the Syro-Palestinian states, which had long been in regional economic cooperation, joined in military alliances.\textsuperscript{115} At one time or another, Neo-Hittite, Aramaean, and Aram-Damascene city-states, as well as Israel and the northern Phoenician port cities of Usnu, Shiana, Arqa, Byblos (assisted by 1,000 Egyptian soldiers), Tyre, and Sidon, formed several coalitions.\textsuperscript{116} Together, the states attempted to halt the economic and political encroachment of Assyria in its desire to control the regional commerce by redirecting its products to the Assyrian palaces.\textsuperscript{117}

Ultimately defeated by the large Assyrian army, several of the coalitions' participants in northern Syria were made vassals, and paid madattu. Sidon and Tyre, however, were not made vassals, even though they participated in the coalition. Instead, they made presentations of namurtu to Shalmaneser during his campaigns, and as a result, remained politically autonomous.\textsuperscript{118} To the Neo-Assyrian king, namurtu provided him with valuable and necessary goods, yet was also a symbolic acknowledgment of his kingdom's sovereignty and ever-increasing dominance throughout the Near East.\textsuperscript{119}
THE NATURE OF ASSYRIAN ADMINISTRATION OVER PHOENICIA

By the ninth century B.C., the trade goods that flowed through Phoenicia's ports, and the items that were manufactured in the local production centers, circulated widely in the Near Eastern trade networks. In Mesopotamia, and in Assyria proper, the archaeological distribution and frequency of Phoenician-traded raw materials, such as metals, as well as high-value items, especially worked ivories, jewelry, dyed cloth and wooden furniture, demonstrate that these goods were in high demand, primarily in the palaces.\(^{120}\) Now, by the reign of Shalmaneser, these goods were received not only through forced-*madattu* and taxation, but directly from the *namurtu* of Phoenician city-states themselves.

The potential wealth that could be derived from Assyrian control over Phoenicia was too great for the ever-growing kingdom to ignore, and the absolute commercial freedom enjoyed by the Phoenician cities was soon halted when Tiglath-Pileser III (746-728 B.C.) campaigned in the west. To this end, Tiglath-Pileser further expanded the borders of his kingdom and forced the entire Syro-Palestinian coast under the Assyrian sphere of political and, hence, economic control.\(^{121}\) For the first time, Assyria directly intervened in the political, social, and economic aspects of the Phoenician city-states, but in what would prove to be a manner unique to any other in the hegemony.\(^{122}\)

New regional political and military alliances formed to check this expansion, but proved ineffectual against the Assyrian army.\(^{123}\) Upon the defeat of Aram-Damascus, Tiglath-Pileser immediately annexed the troublesome state as a province in 739-738 B.C., and gained in administrative control the valuable geo-political bridge of north Syria. Although anti-Assyrian sentiment remained strong along the Syro-Palestinian coast, several city-states that were members of the alliance immediately paid *namurtu*
to Tigrath-Pileser upon the fall of their larger northern neighbor. Both Kings Tubail
of Tyre and Sipatbail of Byblos presented tribute of metals, ivory and purple-dyed
cloth.\textsuperscript{124}

However, as the Aramaean and Neo-Hittite states became sufficiently subdued in
time, Tigrath-Pileser was free to pursue economic control over the flow of wealth in
the Levantine coast.\textsuperscript{125} While Judah paid the tribute demanded by Tigrath-Pileser in
738-737 B.C., in an act of political defiance, Tyre, under the new leadership of Hiram II
(738-734 B.C.), along with Israel, Gaza (of Philistia), and Arabia collectively refused to
remit payment.\textsuperscript{126}

Tigrath-Pileser, with his army, campaigned along the coast in order to terminate
these now-repetitive, littoral-wide rebellions. The end result of this campaign was the
direct and bloody annexation of Israel, which had not been a vassal, as a province in
734-733 B.C., and the incorporation of Judah and Philistia as vassal kingdoms, which
afterwards were to serve continually as buffer states against the growing prowess of
Egypt.\textsuperscript{127}

Instead of ruthlessly attacking Tyre, as he had Aram-Damascus and Israel, Tigrath-
Pileser instead encamped directly across from the island city-state, and demanded a
tribute payment larger in size than ever before. Hiram immediately complied with
this demand, and although allowed to remain on the throne, he was forced now to
recognize Assyrian suzerainty.\textsuperscript{128} Simultaneously, Tigrath-Pileser instigated
payments of annual tribute upon all major Phoenician city-states, making Byblos,
Sidon, and Arvad vassals to the Assyrian kingdom.\textsuperscript{129}

Assyria began to intervene in the economic affairs of its Phoenician vassal city-
states in a direct, but reserved manner. The Assyrian policy in Phoenicia still allowed
for continued maritime commerce and local production, but whose products would now be reoriented back to the Assyrian heartland and any neighboring provinces. S. Frankenstein convincingly argues that these new policies, instigated fully in the eighth century B.C., were therefore directly responsible for the subsequent intensified Phoenician colonization in the far-western Mediterranean, as the maritime traders sought to fulfill the product demands made of them.\textsuperscript{130}

However, a contemporary text from Nimrud reveals that although long-distance and local maritime trade were encouraged, continued full-scale exportation from Phoenicia was not. In a dispatch to Tiglath-Pileser, an Assyrian official stationed at Simurra (on the Phoenician coast), explains his difficulties in extracting a new, substantial tax on Lebanese timber, intended for Tyrian trade with Egypt. The Tyrians, furious with the intervention in their trade, had killed another Assyrian tax collector earlier, and attacked yet another in Sidon.\textsuperscript{131} Unfortunately, no response from Tiglath-Pileser has been identified, but it appears that no large-scale retribution took place against the cities, and a healthy income from harbor dues and maritime levies began to supplement the \textit{madattu} payments.\textsuperscript{132}

These events in Sidon and Tyre, and the Phoenician city-states' continual refusal of \textit{madattu} demands, were an indication of the Phoenician sentiment in response to their new political and economic situation. Shalmaneser V (726-722 B.C.) briefly tried to siege Tyre for its refusal of \textit{madattu}, but was unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{133} Again, during the reign of Sargon II (721-705 B.C.), the collective Syro-Palestinian states refused to make their tribute payments. As a consequence, Sargon made the Philistine cities of Ashdod and Gaza into puppet states in 720 B.C., and fully annexed Hamath as an Assyrian province, as he had done previously to Samaria in 722 B.C. Tyre, however, remained unscathed, and eventually paid that year's \textit{madattu}.\textsuperscript{134}
Despite Assyrian attempts at a steadfast political hold over neighboring Syro-Palestinian states, the kingdom's vassalage policy with the Phoenician city-states remained the status quo. Even when Luli, King of Sidon, refused Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.) his tribute payment in 701 B.C. and fled to Cyprus, the city-state, in light of previous examples of Assyrian administration, should have been annexed. Instead, a new Phoenician king, Ethbaal, ascended to the throne, and the Phoenician city-states all remained vassals. This treatment was quite a contrast to Sennacherib's ruthless campaigns against Judah, Ashdod and Ashkelon for their insurrection.

Finally, however, the ever-rebellious Phoenician city-states were annexed by Esarhaddon (679-669 B.C.) in 677-676 B.C. (fig. 11). After Abdi-milkutti, King of Sidon revolted, Esarhaddon attacked the city, killed its king, and deported most of the city's skilled craftspeople to Assyria. He established a new port, called Kar-Ashur-ah-iddina (Port of Esarhaddon), and placed an Assyrian governor in the city. Although he annexed the whole Phoenician littoral as the province of Sidon (some sixty years after the neighboring provinces), Phoenician kings of the local dynasties were allowed to remain on their thrones in the other city-states.

As Phoenicia was now a province, Esarhaddon further regulated the commerce of the cities in addition to the madattu and port taxation. In a treaty with Baal, King of Tyre, Esarhaddon provided that if a Tyrian ship wrecked off the coast of Assyrian territory (which now included the entire Syro-Palestinian coast), then its contents belonged to Esarhaddon. Baal was also allowed to trade freely in the ports of Akko, Dor, Byblos, or any Philistine port city, but most important, perhaps, was the pledge of Assyrian protection to Tyrian sailors, and the threat that "nobody will harm their ships."
Fig. 11. Map of the Neo-Assyrian administrative divisions within Syro-Palestine.
(Adapted from B. Otzen, "Israel Under the Assyrians," in M.T. Larsen, ed., Power and
Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires [Mesopotamia 7,
Copenhagen 1979] 252)
Immediately after Esarhaddon’s successor, Ashurbarnipal (669-627 B.C.), ascended the throne, the Kings Baal of Tyre and Iakinlu of Arvad again refused their madattu payments to their new Assyrian overlord in 668-667 B.C.141 Although this rebellion, and its subsequent settlement, were documented in the royal annals, a local Assyrian tax official stationed in the vicinity of Arvad portrayed the incident quite differently in a letter to Ashurbarnipal, found at Nineveh.142 In the official’s confidential report, which lacks the Assyrian ideological pretenses of the king’s propagandistic annals, we learn that the official was stationed just outside the city of Arvad, at an Assyrian port called Amurru, probably established much in the same vein as Esarhaddon’s port at Sidon.

However, this local tax official was not allowed in the city of Arvad itself, and describes in detail the absolute power wielded by King Iakinlu over his city’s officials and merchants: "they cannot anchor at the wharf of the king my lord [Amurru], ...whoever comes to the wharf of the land of Assyria he kills, his ship he destroys."143 The official further reveals that even the local, independent Assyrian merchants in Amurru are forced to pay bribes to Iakinlu. No response to this dispatch by Ashurbarnipal has been found, but the extant royal annals document a military campaign to the west, where the king and his army were able to inspire enough fear in Iakinlu to cause him to remit his madattu of traditional Phoenician goods of metals and cloth, but also surrender to the Assyrian king his daughter as a concubine.144 A short time later, the annals record the death of Iakinlu, and Ashurbarnipal allows a son of the king, Azi-baal, to ascend the throne, instead of appointing an Assyrian governor.145 Unfortunately, this is one of the last Assyrian records that documents the imperial administration over Phoenicia. In 645 B.C., as problems of incursion in Egypt, Babylonia, and other regions of the empire began to
escalate, the coastal city-states were mentioned for the last time in the Assyrian annals.146

SUMMARY

The ideology behind the Neo-Assyrian empire's expansion to, and the ensuing control over, the Phoenician city-states was similar to that expressed throughout the advent of the kingdom's domination of the Near East. The king, as head of the palace and the palace-based system of re-distribution, came to depend not only on raw materials for his kingdom, but also on the material wealth of the symbolic presentation and display of trade-exchange and tribute items.

As a result of the Phoenicians' skills as craftspeople and as facilitators of local and long-distance maritime trade, the methodology of the Assyrian empire's exploitation was drastically different than any other population with which they were in contact. Despite their frequent rebellions, political and social favoritism was clearly extended to the Phoenician city-states, as they remained vassals until almost the disintegration of the empire. At times, these vassal city-states even appear to be almost independent of their overlords, as Iakinlu of Arvad demonstrates in his regulation of ships to Amurru. The cities' collective role as ports of maritime-based trade, and their extant fleet of merchantmen vessels, were of the utmost significance to Assyria, as Esarhaddon's treaty with Baal of Tyre attests, for the ships and proficient maritime skills of the Phoenicians were able to propagate the influx of goods which brought wealth to the empire.
CATALOGUE OF PHOENICIAN SHIPS IN NEO-ASSYRIAN ART

Presently, there are no surviving Phoenician texts that mention maritime matters, and only a few native representations of their ships exist.\textsuperscript{147} As a result of this lacuna, general knowledge of the Phoenicians' vessels, and their skills as sailors, navigators, and shipwrights can only be derived from the texts and iconography of contemporary groups that had contact with these renowned seafarers and maritime traders of antiquity. During the ninth through seventh centuries B.C., as the Neo-Assyrian empire reached its pinnacle of political and economic power in the Near East, a unique relationship with the Phoenicians developed, the history and nature of which can be traced in Assyrian texts and art.

When relying on evidence external to Phoenicia, however, problems arise due to the incomplete nature of the references, specific socio-political and ideological biases, and, in the case of iconography, respective artistic conventions. In the Neo-Assyrian kingdom, the kings' annals and palatial iconography served largely to promote imperial propaganda. Throughout Assyrian history, traceable patterns of ideology emerge, as each individual king was intent on justifying his own superiority through not only his annals, but also conspicuous visual display in palatial reliefs and sculpture.\textsuperscript{148} Certain undesirable elements or events that did not further this ideology were left out of the records completely, and in some instances, transformed into alternate perceptions. Such was the case when King Sennacherib, on his campaign to Judah in 701 B.C., attacked Jerusalem and failed.\textsuperscript{149} In his records and palatial art, however, he had an earlier Assyrian victory at Lachish depicted as the decisive defeat of the Judaeans.\textsuperscript{150}

Due to the existence of a largely illiterate population, great care was taken by Assyrian artists to depict distinctively the foreign peoples that were subject to
Assyrian control. This attention to detail was included in the few representations of Phoenicians, who, for reasons already discussed in the previous chapter, occupied a level of certain importance as highly-skilled vassals. Depictions of the Phoenicians’ ships, catalogued below, were placed in prominent locations, and, as such, it is reasonable to assume that attempts were made to convey their distinct features with a degree of accuracy. Oftentimes, however, features were completely omitted for the sake of simplicity or artistic convention, and reveal that the intended propagandistic message of each scene was more important than correctly portraying particular details.

SHALMANESER III (858-824 B.C.)

Tell Balawat (Imgur Enlil), located in what was the Assyrian heartland sixteen kilometers from Nimrud (Kalhu), was a provincial administration center during the reign of King Shalmaneser III. A day’s march from Nineveh and Nimrud, the site, on the Great Zab River, was first occupied during the reign of Ashurnarsipal II (883-859 B.C.), and was used as an occasional royal residence by the king and crown prince. Briefly excavated in 1878 by H. Rassam, the small palace at Tell Balawat yielded a pair of badly decomposed wooden monumental gates, each decorated with sixteen bronze bands. One pair, erected by Ashurnarsipal II, documents the king’s military campaigns and hunting expeditions. The other pair was commissioned by Shalmaneser III, and dates to approximately 845 B.C. (fig. 12).

The bands on the gates of Shalmaneser depict, in bronze repoussé, the military campaigns undertaken by the king during the first eleven years of his reign: the march to Armenia and Urartu in the north, and his western expeditions to Karkemesh, Syria, and the Mediterranean seacoast. It was during his western
Fig. 12. The Gate of Shalmaneser III from Tell Balawat. (Photo Courtesy Trustees of the British Museum)
campaign of 859 B.C. that Shalmaneser first came into contact with the Phoenicians, and received namurtu tribute from the kings of Tyre and Sidon. This event depicted on the two bands of the Balawat Gate is corroborated by two contemporary inscriptions from Nimrud, the so-called Monolith and Gate Inscriptions.\textsuperscript{158} These representations are the first in Neo-Assyrian iconography that depict the distinctive boats of the Phoenician peoples.\textsuperscript{159}

The bronze bands each measure 2.4 meters in length and 0.28 meters in height, and are divided into two long registers, separated and bordered by three narrow bands of alternating bolts and rosettes.\textsuperscript{160} In the top band of the left door (Band N),\textsuperscript{161} in the bottom register, the scene moves from right to left: a small boat with an animal-head-shaped stem and sternpost decoration is loaded with goods from the shore (fig. 13).\textsuperscript{162} In the vessel, one man stands and receives the goods, while another man holds an extended oar. By the position of his hands on the oar loom, this rower could possibly hold a second oar on the far side of the boat, but which is not discernible. To the left, an identical second vessel, loaded with goods, is towed across a body of water by four men. These men on shore pull the boat with ropes positioned over their shoulders that are attached to the neck of the animal-headed post nearest them. In this second boat, a man stands on the left side, and holds one oar, and possibly another, in the same manner as his fellow rower in the first boat. On shore to the left, at least seven men carry bolts of cloth and shoulder square articles, which might be metal ingots.\textsuperscript{163} Above the scene, the cuneiform epigram specifically describes the event: "The tribute of the city of the Tyrians [and] the city of the Sidonians: silver, gold, lead, bronze, purple stuff I [Shalmaneser] received."\textsuperscript{164}

The sixth band (Band III) on the right panel of the gate depicts an almost identical scene of Phoenicians transporting tribute (fig. 14). In the upper register, from left to
Fig. 13. Band N from the Gate of Shalmaneser III from Tell Balawat. (After L. Basch, *Le musée imaginaire de la marine antique* [Athens 1987] fig. 648)
right, two boats float on water in front of a fortified city. Although both vessels have similar animal-head stem and sternpost decorations as those in Band N, they are not depicted in the same vertical position, and instead the posts are slightly raked. Moreover, the animal heads at the stern are shown slightly smaller than those of the stem. To the left, in front of the city, two men on the shore carry bowls to the first laden boat, in which two men, one at each end, hold oars. The boat on the right is towed by two men on the shore, who pull the tow rope under their arms, although it is attached to the stem in the same manner as in Band N. In this second boat, the man at the bow on the right appears to be assisting the towers by rowing, as indicated by his pull on the oars. The other man at the stern, so as not to counter his fellow crew member's efforts, instead steers the vessel with his oars. There are at least five tribute bearers on the shore, who again shoulder square articles and move off to the right. The cuneiform epigram above clearly narrates the scene: "I received the tribute of the ships of the men of Tyre and Sidon."165

C. Torr was the first to notice that the distinctive small boats with animal-head posts depicted on Shalmaneser's gate might be the hippoi (ἱπποι) of the Phoenicians,166 which are referenced in ancient texts. Strabo relates the story of Eudoxus of Cyzicus of the second century B.C., who finds a horse protome from a shipwreck in Ethiopia. When he returns to Egypt, he is told by shipwrights that it came from a small seagoing fishing boat used by the people of the Phoenician colony of Gades (Cadiz).167 Pliny, on the other hand, claims that the hippoi were the large, seagoing Phoenician merchant vessels named after their master shipwright, Hippos of Tyre.168 Of the few native Phoenician ship depictions, several coins have horse protomes, which give Strabo's account of the etymology of hippos some credibility.
Coinage from the city of Byblos, although struck much later, in the fourth century B.C., depicts, instead of fishing boats, Phoenician war galleys with horse protomes (fig. 15).\(^{169}\)

Although no known cognate for the term *hippos* is found in Phoenician or Canaanite texts,\(^{170}\) the Greek word seems applicable to ships or vessels in general, or a particular type, that was strictly Phoenician. In two other scenes depicted on the Balawat Gate bands, boats of the Dakurians (of southern Babylonia),\(^{171}\) and the Unquians (of northern Syria),\(^{172}\) are represented without any figureheads (fig. 16). The protomes on the four, clearly-labeled Phoenician vessels depicted in the Balawat Gate bands appear to be those of horse heads, thereby confirming their ethnicity as Phoenician, and further identifying them as true *hippoi*.

However, the term *hippoi* has been used with more regularity by modern scholars to describe a type of Phoenician ship represented with any zoomorphic protome.\(^{173}\) During the later reigns of Tiglath-Pileser III (746-728 B.C.) and Ashurbarnipal (669-627 B.C.), two examples of this vessel type, which are discussed below, do indeed have distinct, non-equine protomes. However, Shalmaneser's bronze reliefs and their inscriptions are the only Neo-Assyrian representations that clearly document the unique correlation between the Phoenicians and horse-protome boats, a clarification that is important in the identification of vessels represented during the reign of Sargon II (721-705 B.C.).

These vessels depicted on the Balawat Gate, which are labeled by the generalized term *hippoi*, and might, therefore, be interpreted as small coastal vessels with horse protomes. These vessels were then rowed and towed along the shores of the cities of Sidon and Tyre, and possibly the Syro-Palestinian coast, and were not the seagoing fishing or merchant vessels mentioned by Strabo and Pliny. If native Phoenician clay
Fig. 15. Three coins from Byblos that depict horse-protome galleys. These examples date from the fourth century B.C. (From E. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines* II [Bologna 1910] 535; pl. CXII, figs. 24-25)
Fig. 16. A Dakurian boat depicted on the Gate of Shalmaneser III. (After L. Basch, *Le musée imaginaire de la marine antique* [Athens 1987] fig. 673)
models are any indication, small coastal vessels with zoomorphic protomes certainly did exist at this time.\textsuperscript{174}

Although the slight differences between the two bands indicate a possibility of two artists, an attempt was probably made by the Assyrian craftsmen to depict these boats accurately. However, as these representations were made at Balawat, in the middle of the Assyrian heartland, the artists would have a familiarity not with coastal vessels, but riverine craft. Paddling such small vessels, although possible, is not represented in the Balawat bands. Instead, the manner of propulsion represented is similar to that of contemporary native Assyrian quffas, where the two crewmen sit opposite in a round vessel, and row. The artisans most likely copied this local manner of locomotion, and created the Phoenician ethnicity by adding horse protomes to the boats.

TIGLATH-PILESER III (746-728 B.C.)

The site of Til Barsib (Tel Ahmar) is located on the eastern shore of the Euphrates River, approximately 25 kilometers southeast of Karkemesh. The city was originally a Bit Adini settlement when Shalmaneser III began his western campaign of 859 B.C., in which he defeated the local army of allied Bit Adini and Aramaean tribes. By 856 B.C., Shalmaneser had re-populated Til Barsib with Assyrians and given the city a new Assyrian name: Kar-Sulmanu-asaredu, "The Harbor of Shalmaneser."\textsuperscript{175} The use of karu (trading station, port, harbor or quay) in the city's new name signified the importance of Til Barsib as a point of convergence in the newly annexed western Assyrian provinces not only for overland transport, but riverine trade routes.\textsuperscript{176}
A century later, Tiglath-Pileser III began to re-fortify cities throughout his kingdom's western provinces in the early years of his reign, including Til Barsib. A new palace was built in the middle of the eighth century B.C., and was the residence of the local Assyrian governor, who was also the army commander (turtanu).\textsuperscript{177} A fragment of a polychrome fresco that depicts a partial galley was found in the main hallway of the palace, which leads to the main courtyard (Courtyard A).\textsuperscript{178} Originally, the site's excavators, F. Thureau-Dangin and M. Dunand, could not assign an exact date to the fragment,\textsuperscript{179} but recent comparative analysis of the palace wall-paintings' composition and style has prompted L. Abbate to date the frescoes to the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III.\textsuperscript{180}

Now in the Aleppo Museum, the fresco fragment, 0.74 meters in height, consists of several layers of clay-plaster and white lime, over which the ship's image was painted (fig. 17).\textsuperscript{181} The light yellow 'ram' or cut-water, which protrudes on the right from the red hull, as well as oars, identify this ship as a single-bank galley. On top of the yellow-colored prow sits a helmeted man, while another man stands above on what appears to be a deck or platform at the ship's bow. Although no rowers are visible, five oars with blades project from the five oarports, while the identification of a sixth oar-loom-like feature is unclear, as it extends in the opposite direction as the oars. A circular shield with concentric circles of red and blue is affixed to the caprail.

M.-C. De Graeve has described this as a "war scene," and believes an enemy ship was originally painted to the right of the galley.\textsuperscript{182} The man at the bow who stands at deck level, grabs an arm that has been disarticulated by the edge of the fragment, and in the lower right are the blades of two other oars. The presence of these features supports the proposal that another vessel was originally painted to the right of the extant galley.
Fig. 17. Fresco of a galley from Til Barsib.
The purpose of the helmeted man, 'sitting' on the bow projection, is unclear in this small fragment, but at least three other parallels exist in contemporary iconography from the Mediterranean. On a Geometric krater from Attica, a warrior with a Dipylon shield appears to stand on the pointed prow of a long galley. From the late seventh-century B.C., a votive ivory plaque from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta depicts a man squatting on the bow of a galley, perhaps defecating. On a fourth century Attic black-figure juglet a man, possibly forced, stands on a zoomorphic prow of a galley.

In the Til Barsib fresco, the yellow bow projection on which the man sits, appears to be attached to the red hull by three painted black fasteners. The distinction in color suggests that in this fresco, the bow and hull were to be understood as being made of different materials. F. van Doorninck, L. Basch and M.-C. De Graeve propose that this distinction represents a sheath of metal that would fit over the wooden bow projection, a feature which will be further discussed below in relation to the Phoenician war galleys depicted during Sennacherib's reign. L. Basch also appears to re-construct the bow projection with an indented end, a detail, which is difficult to ascertain due to the fragment's damaged edge.

Whether this bow projection was intended for use as a protected water-line ram or as a cutwater remains unclear from this partial example. Several scholars have presented arguments as to the technical use of such a projection, but their analysis has only included contemporary Greek galleys that are depicted in the iconography of the Geometric and Archaic Periods, and will not be treated in the scope of this thesis.

However, in order to identify and possibly contextualize this scene, attention must be given to several other details in this small fragment. The yellow, pointed headgear worn by the two men is indicative of helmets that were worn by Neo-Assyrian
soldiers throughout the first millennium B.C. This type of helmet does not vary greatly in Neo-Assyrian iconography from the ninth century onwards, and contemporary depictions from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser, at Til Barsib and elsewhere, attest that these two men are clearly intended to represent Assyrian soldiers (fig. 18).\textsuperscript{191} When depicted in Neo-Assyrian art, Phoenicians usually wear small skull caps, some with a rounded tip, but never a helmet.\textsuperscript{192}

In addition, the presence of the blue and red shield on the bulwark is indicative of later Neo-Assyrian representations of Phoenician galleys, specifically from the reign of Sennacherib.\textsuperscript{193} In Phoenicia as well, galleys on coins from Byblos, Arvad, and Sidon, also are depicted with a row of shields along their bulwarks.\textsuperscript{194} From comparative iconographic analysis, then, this scene, of which this fragment is a part, most likely meant to portray Assyrian soldiers on a Phoenician single-bank galley.

The location of this scene, however, is even more difficult to identify, and any assignment can only be speculative in light of this meager evidence. Due to Til Barsib's location on the bank of the Euphrates River, this scene might have meant to portray a galley on the river.\textsuperscript{195} Arrian ascertains that in the fourth century B.C., Phoenician-built quinqueremes, quadremes, triremes and triaconters were used on the Euphrates to transfer Alexander the Great's army to Babylon during his Mesopotamian campaign.\textsuperscript{196}

However, if not the Euphrates River, Phoenician galleys certainly had plied the Mediterranean waters for some time, as the works of Homer confirm. Although no Phoenician ships are documented in contemporary Assyrian texts to make certain this assumption, the burgeoning extension of the Neo-Assyrian hegemony along the Syro-Palestinian coast, which increased dramatically during Tiglath-Pileser's reign, might require Assyrian soldiers to requisition a Phoenician seagoing galley.
Fig. 18. Neo-Assyrian soldiers wearing their distinctive, pointed helmets. This example is from Nimrud and dates to the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III. (After T.A. Madhloom, *The Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art* [New York 1969] pl. XXIX, no. 2)
For four years, from 742 to 738 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser and his army were continually engaged in military forays and full-scale battles against the armies of northern Israel and Aram-Damascus, which formed the Syro-Ephraimitc coalition, of which Tyre was part. Once the allied armies were defeated in 738 B.C., Aram-Damascus was annexed as the Assyrian province of Hamath, and a period of increased Assyrian control over the Phoenician cities began. Although Tyre, under the leadership of King Hiram II, had been part of the Syro-Ephraimitc coalition, the Phoenician city was not punished for its participation, as the other participating kingdoms were. Instead, Hiram was allowed to remain on the throne, and required to pay tribute to Tiglath-Pileser, whom he recognized now as overlord. At the same time, Tiglath-Pileser also instigated payments of annual tribute from the other major Phoenician city-states of Byblos, Sidon, and Arvad.

Now in the territory of a subdued northern Phoenicia by 734 or 733 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser and his army began the campaign south to Philistia in 734 B.C., in an attempt to control the seaport of Gaza, and possibly prepare for a foray against Egypt. A fragmentary text from Nimrud fortuitously gives a more detailed account than the royal annals of this campaign. The text documents the movements of the Assyrian army along the Syro-Palestinian coast, beginning in northern Phoenicia, where several peripheral cities had been annexed into the Assyrian province of Unqi. B. Oded has interpreted the opening lines of this text (lines 1-7) as referring to Arvad, where, in a battle, "...in the midst of the sea I trod them [people of Arvad] down." In the next several lines is the description of Tiglath-Pileser's subjugation of the peoples of Kashpuna and Simirra, north of Tyre. From northern Phoenicia, the Assyrian army moved south; and, the end result of this campaign was control over Israel as a vassal, and Judah and Philistia as client states by 732 B.C. 
During and after these campaigns of 734 to 732 B.C., Assyria began to exercise more control over the Phoenician cities, especially Tyre. This domination included some regulation in Phoenician external trade in timber, as another text from Nimrud reveals.²⁰⁶ However, the importation of valuable trade goods to the Phoenician ports was also attractive to the Assyrians. With a strong fleet the coastal cities, such as Tyre, were able to continue their maritime trade, but the outflow of some goods was now regulated on site by the newly-stationed Assyrian officials.²⁰⁷

As a result of the new control Neo-Assyria exercised over its territories and client-states, its army could conceivably requisition Phoenician vessels for use along the eastern Mediterranean coast. Although under different political circumstances, Phoenician cities had allowed their vessels to be used by other kingdoms on several occasions in antiquity. The ships of Tyre, in the tenth century, had been lent along with their crews, to King Solomon for his trade expeditions to the land of Ophir,²⁰⁸ and although this early loan was between allies, it demonstrates that the Tyrians, at least, had previously provided their ships for service to others. Later, in the fifth century B.C., Phoenician cities again provided three hundred outfitted triremes for Xerxes' allied fleet during the Persian War.²⁰⁹ In the eighth century, however, in order to preserve their delicate political position within the Assyrian system, the new client city-states of Phoenicia were inclined to provide their ships, and probably their crews, for service.

Since Til Barsib is only 200 kilometers from the seacoast, it is not unlikely that a scene of a naval engagement or patrol would be displayed at the governor's palace. Such a scene, whether real or imaginary, was a form of visual propaganda used to display the new Assyrian dominance in the west.
Simultaneously, while Tiglath-Pileser was campaigning in the west, he also was building his own palace at the Neo-Assyrian capital city of Nimrud. Unfortunately, the palace was destroyed in antiquity by Esarhaddon (679-669 B.C.), who had planned to re-use the stones of Tiglath-Pileser's reliefs in the decorations of his new royal residence. As a result, the panels that once adorned Tiglath-Pileser's palace were found damaged and stacked by Nimrud's first excavator, A.H. Layard. One relief, however, although fragmentary and found out of context, depicts a boat with zoomorphic stem and sternpost (fig. 19).

In the right of the scene, a vessel with a bird protome and smaller feline-head sternpost move to the right with a crew of two who also face to the right, and appear to stand and hold only one oar or paddle each. This vessel has a central mast, with a square crow's-nest and stays from fore and aft. A second, smaller boat with no decorations, but high ends, also moves to the right with its forward-facing crew of three, while a fortified city or palace is in the top left of the scene. Surrounding the boats are various aquatic creatures and in the upper right stands a large bird.

The zoomorphic vessel in the upper right of the scene, and the one under discussion here, has been classified by M.-C. De Graeve as belonging to the hippos type, described above. This vessel does appear to be similar to those depicted on the Balawat Gate of Shalmaneser III, in that the distinct finials on the ends are animal heads. Although not horse-heads, the presence of the decorated protome and sternpost suggests that the vessel represented was intended to be Phoenician. In this relief from Nimrud, the vessel appears larger than the small coastal vessels depicted in the Balawat scene, but the extant relief is so fragmentary that any speculation as to its intended location would be difficult.
Also similar is the mast and crow's nest in relation to a later relief belonging to Sargon II (721-705 B.C.) at Khorsabad. Since the vessel at Nimrud is almost identical in its details to the later boats of Tiglath-Pileser's successor, the distinguishing technical features of the vessel, and its possible methods of propulsion, will be discussed in the next section.

SARGON II (721-705 B.C.)

In 1843, the remains of a large palace were excavated near the eastern bank of the Tigris River in modern Iraq. Identified as Khorsabad (Dur Sharrukin), the city served as the capital of the Neo-Assyrian kingdom only during the reign of King Sargon II, from 721 to 705 B.C. After several campaigns, the excavators, P. Botta and E. Flandin, had removed seven large congruent stone panels, which depict the water-borne transport of timber.214

This fragmentary relief of only five now-extant panels, presently in the Louvre, shows fifteen distinctive boats with horse protomes on their stems, similar to the hippoi depicted on the Balawat Gates of Shalmaneser III (figs. 20-24).215 Although the scene from Khorsabad is not labeled with a cuneiform epigram, the boats are part of a larger, tributary episode. This scene of timber transport originally walled the main courtyard adjacent to Sargon II's throne room in the king's residence.216 In this reception wing, all the major panels that line the entry halls, courtyard, and throne room depict attendants, foreign viziers and vassals offering tribute directly to the king.

P. Albenda, in her reconstruction of the panels, has followed Botta and Flandin's original notes and drawings of the entire seven panels, so that the movement of the water-borne transport scene is from right to left (fig. 25).217 In the far right panel of the
Fig. 20. The first slab of the Khorsabad relief: men off-loading timber onto the bank of a river. (From P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive* I [Paris 1849] pl. 31)
Fig. 21. The second slab of the Khorsabad relief: *hippoi* involved in the transport and off-loading of timber. (From P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive I* [Paris 1849] pl. 32)
Fig. 22. The third slab of the Khorsabad relief: hippoi navigating in front of an island city. (From P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive I* [Paris 1849] pl. 33)
Fig. 23. The fourth slab of the Khorsabad relief: *hippoi* navigating to the left in front of an island city. (From P.E. Botta and F. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive* I [Paris 1849] pl. 34)
Fig. 24. The fifth slab of the Khorsabad relief: men hauling timber to the banks of a river. (From P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive* I [Paris 1849] pl. 35)
Fig. 25. P. Albenda's reconstruction of the timber transport scene from Khorsabad. Panels 5 and 6, although removed from the site, have been lost. (Adapted from P. Albenda, "A Mediterranean Seascape from Khorsabad," Ashur 3 [1983] fig. 1)
extant relief, teams of men drag timber down from mountains and then stack them on shore, ready for transport. In the middle four panels, the hippoi tow and carry timber to the shore on the left. The cargo, however, appears to be transported in a precarious manner: the timbers lie well above-deck and crew, and span from the top of the horse protomes of the stem to the top of the tall sternpost. The timbers towed behind the hippoi are secured with ropes to the sternposts. In the two left panels, the timber is being off-loaded from the boats and stacked on shore by other teams of laborers.

Three hippoi face right, in the opposite direction of the movement of the scene, with presumably a fourth whose direction is only indicated by the curved blade of the paddles or oars. These vessels are the same size and shape as the others, but have no cargo of timber. Instead, three of these hippoi have a centrally positioned mast, with a box- or bell-shaped crow’s nest, secured in place by stays fore and aft. The fourth cargo-less boat, near the shore on the right, has no such discernible rigging. Every boat under way has a crew of three to five men, who all stand on the near side, face the bow and hold golf-club shaped paddles or oars. In the upper register of the entire scene, there are two island cities or palaces, and in the water amongst the boats are aquatic animals, limassu (winged bulls), and mer-men genies.

A. Jal’s early reconstruction of the hippoi, in which he kept the timber load where it was displayed above-deck is obviously dangerous and impractical (fig. 26). Since tribute was the theme of the relief, the commodity is one of the most important items displayed, and the high-load timber was simply meant to show the cargo carried in the vessels. This flattened depiction style was a particular Assyrian artistic convention, and is readily seen in the contemporary representations of cities and encampments (fig. 27).
Fig. 26. A. Jal's reconstruction of a Khorsabad hippos. (From A. Jal, "Note relative aux naivres représentés sur un des bas-reliefs apportés de Ninive," Revue archéologique 4 [1874] 187)
Fig. 27. An example of the Neo-Assyrian artistic convention of "flattening" a scene; from the reign of Sargon II. (From P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive I* [Paris 1849] pl. 146)
Previously, many scholars have placed the Khorsabad scene either along the coast of Phoenicia, or in the Mesopotamian river system. Their arguments, however, are mainly based on respective iconographic interpretation and generalization regarding timber sources in the ancient Near East. Soon after the relief was excavated, A. Jal, by comparing the sizes of the crew to the boats, speculated that the *hippoi* depicted could only be river boats.\(^{221}\) P. Albenda, echoing earlier interpretations made by R. Barnett,\(^{222}\) W. Smith,\(^{223}\) and M.-C. De Graeve,\(^{224}\) follows the original interpretation presented by Botta and Flandin, and locates the scene along the Phoenician coast in front of the cities of Tyre and Sidon.\(^{225}\)

However, the scene depicted in the Khorsabad relief should actually be in the Mesopotamian riverine system.\(^{226}\) As a natural resource not native to the Mesopotamian plateau, timber was a viable and valuable form of tribute from Neo-Assyria’s vassals. Additionally, Sargon was in the middle of a monumental building campaign at his new capital of Khorsabad and required the necessary component of timber for his construction projects.\(^{227}\)

The reserves of oak, cypress, pine, but most especially, cedar, in the mountains of Lebanon, were controlled by the nearby Phoenician cities of Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, and Arvad. Although obviously appealing to the Assyrians, Phoenicia was not the sole supplier of timber in the eastern Mediterranean or Near East.\(^{228}\) The numerous Old Testament references to the "cedars of Lebanon," and the well-documented Egyptian cedar trade with Phoenicia, have wrongly generalized Lebanon as the *only* source of valuable timber in the Near East in antiquity.\(^{229}\) Such an over-simplification has been accepted by many scholars, who have thus confirmed their identification of the Khorsabad scene, and thereby limited its placement to the Levant.
The extant Assyrian administrative texts from Sargon's reign, however, reveal that the Lebanese timber sources were of little importance to the heartland of Assyria. In actuality, numerous forests of equally desirable timber were located much closer to Khorsabad, which made river-borne transport through Mesopotamia much easier. The Zagros Mountains, which divide modern Iraq and Iran, were a source of oak, cypress, and juniper, and the vassal kingdom of Urartu, to Assyria's north, supplied oak, cypress, pine and juniper, which grew in the eastern Taurus and Amanus Mountains and northwestern Zagros Mountains. Sargon's administrative texts document not only the repeated procurement of timber from these mountains, but also the steps illustrated by the relief, that were taken to transport such a cargo directly to Khorsabad via the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers and their tributaries.

That this task of timber transport in Mesopotamia could be performed by the Phoenicians for the Assyrians is not extraordinary. The Phoenicians had long before established a system of land and water transport for timber from the mountains of nearby Lebanon to their port cities in Phoenicia. In addition, the Tyrians had previously towed timber down the Phoenician coast to Palestine for King Solomon in the tenth century B.C. It is not unlikely, then, that the Phoenicians were enlisted or, more likely, forced as vassals, to perform the same service in Assyria during Sargon's building campaigns in the late eighth century B.C. The conscription of vassals for labor was not a new method of provincial administration during Sargon's reign. Ashurnarsipal II (883-859 B.C.) already had deported Tyrians and Sidonians, as well as workmen of other groups throughout the provinces, to Mesopotamia as forced labor for the construction of his new palace at Nimrud. In light of his administrative policy, as discussed above, Tiglath-Pileser III (746-728 B.C.) could also
have easily requisitioned Phoenician ships for his use along the Syro-Palestinian coast.

As the location of the Khorsabad scene is in a riverine environment, the methods of propulsion for the hippoi may differ from those proposed by scholars who place the scene in the ocean along the eastern Mediterranean coast. In practice, the rowers or paddlers most likely stood on both sides of the vessels, but were depicted on only one side for compositional simplification and effect. Since the hippoi crews face towards the bow of each vessel, A. Tilley234 and M.-C. De Graeve235 cite the Khorsabad relief as an example of "push-rowing," a method of propulsion used in parts of the Mediterranean in modern times. In addition, the zoomorphic vessel from Tiglath-Pileser's palace at Nimrud (discussed above), can also be considered a comparative example, since it is so similar to those at Khorsabad. Considering the fluvial nature of the Khorsabad scene, however, it may be that the hippoi here are propelled by paddling rather than rowing. Moreover, there does not appear to be other instances in Neo-Assyrian art that show other examples of "push-rowing."

In the Khorsabad relief, the vessels towing logs move down-river from north to south, with the current of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers and the prevailing winds of the Mesopotamian basin.236 It seems that their masts were unstepped for taking logs on board for the journey down-river, but stepped for the return journey up-river, as shown on the three unladen vessels at Khorsabad, and the one hippos vessel from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser at Nimrud. However, no sail is depicted in the rigging, as it is not depicted on any Mesopotamian vessels in Neo-Assyrian art. In addition, the natural limitations of current and wind would make sailing up-river almost impossible. Unlike those on the Phoenician galleys depicted during the reign of Sennacherib (discussed below), the posts depicted on the three hippoi, then, are most
likely not traditional masts, as M.-C. De Graeve\textsuperscript{237} and L. Basch\textsuperscript{238} assert. The "masts" in the relief, however, are located amidships, and, if intended to represent tow-posts, their central location would make it nearly impossible to tow a vessel.

However, as several contemporary Assyrian texts reveal, vessels were frequently towed up-river and along canals in Mesopotamia, as they had been for several centuries.\textsuperscript{239} The paddles depicted in the relief, therefore, might be oars, used to steer or regulate the direction of the boats when floating with the rivers' currents, and as punting poles when towed up-river.\textsuperscript{240}

Phoenician hippoi appear in another, albeit small, relief from the palace at Khorsabad. The scene is located in the lower register in a corner of Room 7, one of the innermost private chambers of Sargon’s palace that faces out onto a large open terrace with a small pavilion or temple (fig. 28).\textsuperscript{241} In the relief, two hippoi float unattended on a body of water in front of a dual-columned building, surrounded by hills, trees, and animals.\textsuperscript{242} The building on the terrace outside Room 7, as well as the one with columns in the relief, is thought to be one in the same, and frequently is referred to as a bit-hilanni.\textsuperscript{243} In Sargon’s construction inscriptions from Khorsabad, he frequently referenced “a portico, patterned after a Hittite (Syrian) palace, which in the tongue of Amurru they call a bit-hilanni.”\textsuperscript{244} These hippoi appear very small, but there is no real indication of scale in the scene. If the portico depicted behind the boats is indeed the bit-hilanni that Sargon mentions so often in his texts, than these hippoi would appear to be in a pleasure garden, for his personal use at Khorsabad. The hippoi, as well as the bit-hilanni, would be a private reminder to the king, much like the public, propagandistic display of the timber transport scene, of his perceived dominance over the peoples of his western provinces.
Fig. 28. Two small hippoi floating in front of the bit-hilanni; from the palace of Sargon II at Khorsabad, Room 7. (From P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive II* [Paris 1850] pl. 114)
SENNACHERIB (705-681 B.C.)

Reliefs of complete war galleys, and for the first time, round merchant galleys, were found in two rooms of Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh. Like the relief from Sargon II's palace, both Nineveh reliefs lack epigraphs which definitively label the location and event of each scene. G. Maspero\textsuperscript{245} first postulated that these scenes represented Sennacherib's sixth military campaign to Elam in 694 B.C., in which Phoenician shipwrights built ships at Til Barsib and Nineveh for the Assyrian army, and will be discussed in greater detail below. However, it is now understood that soon after Sennacherib's third campaign, no monumental sculptures were added to the palace, and this scene could not be that of the later campaign to Elam.\textsuperscript{246} Another passage in Sennacherib's annals, however, led R. Barnett\textsuperscript{247} to identify conclusively the larger relief as the depiction of King Luli's escape from the city of Tyre in 701 B.C. Barnett's identification, now generally accepted by scholars, came from several passages in which Sennacherib boasts that: "In my third campaign I went against the Hittite land. Luli, king of Sidon,—my terrifying splendor overcame him, and from Tyre he fled to Iadnana [Cyprus] in the midst of the sea, and died."\textsuperscript{248}

The first relief of this scene, most likely executed immediately after the third campaign, was excavated in Room I of Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh, and although its record is preserved in detailed drawings and photographs, the panels are now lost.\textsuperscript{249} A.H. Layard, the first excavator of Nineveh, mentioned similar sea-scenes in Rooms VIII, XXIV, XXXIV, and XLI, three of whose whereabouts are now unknown.\textsuperscript{250} The relief from Room VIII, however, is preserved in the British Museum, and will be discussed below.

In the two adjoining panels from Room I are the only Assyrian representations of Phoenician merchant galleys (fig. 29). Five of the six ships, in addition to five war
Fig. 29. King Luli’s flight from the city of Tyre. (After R.A. Barnett, "Ezekial and Tyre," Eretz-Israel 9 [1969] pl. I, 2)
galleys with high curving sterns, face left, presumably towards Cyprus, their decks filled with passengers. The prow of a sixth war galley is just visible on the top right of the scene. In front of the city of Tyre on the right, a man hands a small child to a woman aboard a waiting merchant galley, facing right. Two of the war galleys in the lower left face the city. Unlike the merchant galleys, the war galleys have masts, secured by stays, and sails furled along the yards held by braces and sheets. All the galleys are biremes, in which the top level of four or five rowers are visible. The lower levels of four to six rowers are seated within, and therefore concealed by, the hull, their oars protruding through oarports cut into the side of the vessel. Similar to the Til Barsib fresco and the numerous representations from Phoenician coins, the bulwarks of the fighting decks of all these galleys are lined with shields.

The Phoenician round galleys, which share this scene, confirm the distinctive wide, curved hull attribute of merchantmen described by later Greek writers. From the fifth to the third centuries B.C., Phoenician merchantmen were frequently likened to "tubs" (γυδαλαῖς) in various ancient texts.251 Additionally, in Cyprus, which had a number of Phoenician settlements, excavated clay models of merchantmen dating to the eighth and seventh centuries also give the appearance of wide, beamy hulls.252 Although the merchantmen in the Nineveh relief are galleys, they are similar in the shape to the roundships of the Greek label.

In Room VIII, a second relief depicts one partial and three complete biremes of similar execution (fig. 30).253 Although the scene is separated into three fragments, it is thought to be contiguous and, in the upper right, depicts Assyrian foot soldiers on campaign. The remainder of the fragments depict a body or bodies of water, in which the four galleys move to the right. The two galleys directly below the Assyrian soldiers are much smaller than the two on the left. Although similar in style to those
Fig. 30. Three panels which depict Phoenician biremes; from Sennacherib’s palace at Nineveh. (After M.-C. De Graeve, *The Ships of the Ancient Near East (c. 2000-500 B.C.)* [Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 7, Leuven, Belgium 1981] figs. 88-90)
in Room I, the biremes in Room VIII have a greater number of rowers: eight on the
top level, and nine oars project from the square oarports below.

The bireme in the far left of the scene is reminiscent of the Til Barsib galley, in that
it also appears to have a pointed bow distinct in composition from its hull. Similar to
the three fasteners painted on the Til Barsib fresco, the prow from this Nineveh relief
has a series of horizontal lines which suggests the attachment of a covering to the
hull (fig. 31). In less detail, the same fasteners are visible on the galley second from
the right. This duplication of a feature in two different depictions, separated
geographically and chronologically, suggest that such a bow attachment or bow sheath
was a distinctive feature in Phoenician galleys. L. Basch and F. van Doorninck suggest that the Phoenician prows depicted in both the Nineveh and Til Barsib scenes
serve as rams, sheathed in metal for re-enforcement and nailed to wooden cores.
However, S. Mark believes that this sheathing was instead intended to protect the
wood of what was a cutwater, added for better hydrodynamics, and not a ram.

Since the reliefs from Nineveh are the only complete and clear depictions of
Phoenician galleys, several scholars have cited these examples in their attempts to
reconstruct ancient biremes and their arrangement of rowers. In his early study, T.
Lethbridge reconstructed the Phoenician galley's rowers at two levels, using the
terminology of Greek galleys: the zygites sat on top, and the thalamites sat on the
bottom level, and each rower held two oars. B. Landström perceived the galleys as
large dugouts, heavy in construction with wide outriggers. In Landström's
reconstruction, which is echoed by A. Tilley, a single level of thalamite rowers
with two oars would sit nearest the waterline, while alongships, two rows of zygite
oarsmen with one oar would sit in the outrigger at the upper level. More recently, L.
Basch has presented a reconstruction in which there is no outrigger. In order to
Fig. 31. Two Phoenician prows depicted in Neo-Assyrian art. The top example is from the reign of Sennacherib, and the bottom one dates to the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III. (From figs. 17 and 30, this thesis)
facilitate the two levels of rowers on each side, the ships, according to Basch, would need to be much bigger and broader than Lethbridge's interpretation. L. Casson also postulates that no outrigger existed on these galleys, but reconstructs a vessel that is wide and beamy at midships, but narrow at the waterline.\textsuperscript{261} Contra these arguments, A. Sleeswyk cites that the horizontal line on the hulls underneath the rowers, which differs from ship to ship, was intended to represent outriggers and "inriggers."\textsuperscript{262} In his interpretation, Sleeswyk reconstructs several ships with an "inrigger," and two different types of outriggers that alters the zygites' position.

L. Basch further believes that the vertical posts which emerge from the level of the caprail on some galleys are stanchions for the upper fighting deck.\textsuperscript{263} However, these "stanchions" appear on only a few of the Nineveh galleys, and there are discrepancies between depictions: some rowers' arms appear to rest on the caprails, but both inside and outside of these stanchions. L. Casson,\textsuperscript{264} as well as B. Landström,\textsuperscript{265} reconstruct the vessels with only a central deck, while M.-C. De Graeve\textsuperscript{266} and L. Basch argue that these vessels were fully decked.\textsuperscript{267}

Directly above these stanchions, the war galleys have their fighting decks fenced in with square panels below the bulwarks bearing shields. This feature makes the ships appear dangerously high in the water. Basch suggests that this space, with alternating blank panels and those of lattice-work, was a pavesade that protected the rowers at their stations, but was conventionally represented above.\textsuperscript{268} The second ship from the right in the relief from Room VIII does not have the level of lattice-work panels above the rowers, which makes the ship not as high above the water-line as the others. However, there is no indication of any lattice-work pavesade behind the rowers.\textsuperscript{269} In his re-reading of the Old Testament book of Ezekial 27, E. MacLaurin
suggests that the Tyrian ship described in the passage has such a pavesade, made of tamarisk from Cyprus, but was intended to protect bowmen, and not rowers.270

Even though the respective arguments briefly summarized above are largely based on the meager evidence of the Nineveh reliefs, Sennacherib did have more than a passing familiarity with Phoenician vessels during his reign. In 694 B.C., Sennacherib planned to attack the southern kingdom of Elam from the sea, rather than instigating the usual pitched battle on land. He records in the annals of his sixth campaign that he summoned Phoenicians to Nineveh and Til Barsib to build "mighty ships after the workmanship of their land," so that he might transport his army down-river.271 Employing Tyrian, Sidonian, and Cypriot sailors, Sennacherib then sailed with his army down the Tigris to the city of Opis. Since the lower Tigris was controlled by the Elamites, the boats had to be "dragged...on sledges" overland for a distance of 40-50 kilometers to the Arahtu canal on the Euphrates river, from where they proceeded to the Persian Gulf.272 After placating Ea, the god of the deep, with sacrifices of golden boats and fish, Sennacherib and his army sailed across the gulf and successfully attacked Elam.273

Close parallels to this event of requisition are also described by Diodorus, Strabo and Arrian. Diodorus records that Phoenician shipwrights were demanded by the Assyrian Queen Semiramis (mother of Adad-Nirari III; 810-783 B.C.), so that proper vessels could be built when the Assyrian army desired to cross the Indus River on campaign.274 Later, after Alexander the Great had subdued the peoples of the Levant and Mesopotamia in the late fourth century B.C., he had boats built for him in Phoenicia and Cyprus, so his army could amass with Nearchus' Persian Gulf fleet at... Babylon. Strabo, citing Aristobolus, writes that these ships were constructed with bolts and disassembled so as to be carried in pieces overland by pack animals and carts, and
reaassembled at Thapsacus, the closest meander of the Euphrates River to the
Mediterranean, a distance of approximately 200 kilometers. In this passage, Strabo
does not give the size or type of vessel utilized by Alexander. However, Arrian, who
also echoes Aristobolus, claims that the Phoenicians built two quinqueremes, three
quadremes, twelve triremes, and thirty tricenters for the campaign.

If galleys were utilized on the Euphrates River by Alexander the Great in the
fourth century B.C., then similar vessels could have been used to transport
Sennacherib's army to the land of the Elamites in 694 B.C. As the annals of the king
reveal, the boats navigated the Mesopotamian rivers and sailed across the Persian
Gulf, and would therefore require a shallow draft for riverine navigation, preferably a
keel for navigation in the gulf, and still have the capacity to carry troops and their
weapons.

Although the type or types of ships utilized by Sennacherib and his army remain
conjecture, the passages from the king's annals reveal that he was well aware of his
own native boats' limitations for such a maritime endeavor. Sennacherib required
and, as king, obtained the Phoenicians' shipbuilding, sailing, and navigating skills in
order to transport the Assyrian army, much like Tiglath-Pileser could have done
along the Syro-Palestinian coast. The prominence and detail in which the galleys at
Nineveh were depicted was a testament to the importance and desirability of the
skills of the Phoenicians, and the Assyrian desire to control them.

ASHURBARNIPAL (669-627 B.C.)

The final Neo-Assyrian depiction of a Phoenician vessel is that from a relief
evacated at Ashurbarnipal's palace at Nineveh. Ashurbarnipal, the last recognized
king of Assyria, built his palace in the north of the city, and filled its rooms with
numerous scenes of himself not only on military campaign, but at leisure.
Throughout the palace, a dominant motif of lion-hunt scenes were found in almost
every room by the excavators, and in Room S, the same motif was expanded to
include a riverine environment.277

In a lower corner of Room S, two fragmentary slabs depict a boat with a
zoomorphic protome and sternpost on a river whose banks are covered with
vegetation and soldiers (fig. 32).278 From near the bow of the boat, Ashurbanipal
aims a bow and arrow at a lion attacking the vessel. Near the king, three men hold
long spears and stab the lion. A second, dead lion is tied to the caprail near the
stern, while four of the king’s attendants stand ready on the deck. A third lion jumps
from the shore into the river in the upper right of the scene.

The heads of the upper level of eight rowers can be seen just above the caprail,
while the seven oars of the lower level of rowers extend from the round oar-ports in
the hull. A helmsman stands near the stern, directing the vessel by means of two
large quarter rudders, one on each side of the hull. Adjacent to this slab is the
continuation of the riverine scene, and another vessel, with high ends follows the
king’s boat, with horses on its deck. Four oars, two on either side, project from over
the caprails near the bow.

The first vessel depicted in this hunting scene, and which is the subject under
discussion here, has a horse protome on its stem, but a sternpost of what appears to be
an inward-facing bird’s head. Unlike the other Neo-Assyrian depictions of
Phoenician galleys, these distinctive zoomorphic attributes, which are similar to the
previously discussed hippoi depictions of Shalmaneser III at Balawat and Tiglath-
Pileser III at Nimrud, and similar to native Phoenician galley representations on
coins from Byblos,279 suggest that this boat is a hippos and, therefore, presumably a
Fig. 32. A *hippos* depicted in a lion-hunt scene. From Ashurbarnipal’s reign, at Nineveh. (After R.D. Barnett, *Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh* (668-627 B.C.) [London 1976] pl. LIV)
Phoenician craft. The horse-head on the prow appears similar in execution to those depicted in the Khorsabad relief of Sargon II, but the sternpost bird's head, facing inwards towards the bow, resembles a feature found in Greek galley depictions on vases and kraters from the Archaic and Geometric Periods. L. Basch also points out that the lack of a ram or pointed prow on this galley indicates its status as a royal pleasure boat, and therefore, may not be a true war galley.

Ashurbanipal spent many years of his reign campaigning in northern Egypt, as had his father Esarhaddon, and had contact with the Phoenician city-states. However, this relief was most likely meant to depict a scene of Mesopotamia provenance, as lions, at this time, were apparently plentiful in the low foothills of the Zagros Mountains. Ashurbanipal labels the major lion-hunt scenes in Room C of his palace and, in describing these expeditions, mentions that they took place near Elam, in southern Mesopotamia. This fanciful riverine scene, then, whether real or imagined, suggests that Ashurbanipal, even as the Assyrian empire was beginning to disintegrate, still followed the artistic ideology of his predecessors, and sought to depict a Phoenician vessel in a pleasure scene at his palace, much as Sargon II had in his small bit-hilanni scene with hippoi at Khorsabad.

Ashurbanipal's administration of his Phoenician vassals at this time was very much a continuation of the indicative lenient Assyrian policy towards the coastal city-states. Although madattu tribute was refused again to the king during his third campaign in the west in 668-667 B.C., Baal of Tyre and Iakinlu of Arvad eventually remitted payment and, aside from the usual items of cloth and metal, gave to Ashurbanipal their respective daughters as his concubines. The collective Phoenician city-states, as the province of Sidon, were still under the Assyrian yoke of vassalage and required tribute payments. However, as the Phoenician kings had by
now made common practice, they continued to refuse their tribute payments to Assyrian kings. By 645 B.C., as the Assyrian empire was crumbling, the Phoenician city-states were completely free of Assyrian administration and economic interference.²⁸⁶

This scene from Ashurbanipal's palace at Nineveh is singular in the Neo-Assyrian corpus in that it depicts a Phoenician-type galley in the Mesopotamian river system. Locating this scene on the Tigris or Euphrates Rivers, or one of the many tributaries, lends a certain amount of credence to Arrian's later description of multi-banked galleys plying the local inland waterways.²⁸⁷ Although larger ships are mentioned in Arrian's catalogue of Alexander's Babylonian-based fleet, the bireme depicted in the aquatic lion-hunt scene at Nineveh is very much a form of visual ideology that illustrates his perceived dominance, albeit waning, over the skilled maritime peoples of his far-western provinces.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

At the present, no Phoenician texts that refer to maritime matters are known to exist and only a few native iconographic depictions of their vessels have been identified. As a result, nautical scholars interested in the Phoenicians' role as the pre-eminent seafarers of the pre-classical world are limited to the study of iconographic and textual records of other groups that depict or mention them, the largest corpus of which was left by their contemporaries, the Assyrians. Conversely, Assyriologists, in their specialized studies, have remained largely unaware of the extent to which these particular Assyrian artistic representations and texts can be applied in the analysis of the basis and nature of the interaction between the Phoenicians and Assyrians in antiquity.

The study of the Phoenicians by nautical scholars seemingly falls into two categories. First, there are those who examine the generalized aspects of the Phoenicians as seafarers in the Mediterranean and beyond, and who make no or only passing reference to the interaction of the Phoenicians with the dominance of the Assyrian empire in the Near East. Other nautical scholars, who are interested in the details of ancient ship construction, have made attempts to reconstruct the galleys and smaller vessels of the Phoenicians. These technical endeavors draw their evidence largely from the iconographic representations of Phoenicians ships found in Neo-Assyrian art, as they are the clearest, and most-detailed contemporary examples. These efforts, however, are strictly derived in the iconographic vein, and little attention is paid to the artistic conventions utilized in the ship representations. Additionally, this etic scholarship tends to downplay the historical context in which these ship-representation scenes were made, and due to their general nature, the few texts which mention the Phoenicians and their ships go unreferenced.
Assyriologists, alternatively, approach the treatment of Phoenicians in Neo-Assyrian documentary media in the more encompassing manner of a larger, socio-economic framework. In their archaeological and historical analyses, these scholars tend to focus on the interaction between the two groups, and specifically Assyria's dominance of Phoenicia, but only refer to its nautical orientation in ecumenical terms. As a result, these scholars remain largely unaware of the specific maritime facets which define the particular nature of the relationship between the two groups.

This present study is aimed at re-evaluating the Phoenicians' roles in their contact with the Assyrian empire in light of the extant Neo-Assyrian textual and iconographical evidence. As a result, a clear, dual maritime dynamic is now tenable in defining the nature of the relationship between the two groups. The Phoenicians were a highly skilled, maritime-oriented group who traded throughout the Mediterranean, and brought back valuable raw and finished goods to their home ports along the Syro-Palestinian coast. As a result of these voyages, the Assyrian kings of the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. desired to economically control the city-states of Phoenicia, and make their seafarers trade middlemen, in order to redirect the influx of goods from the western sea back to Assyria. In addition, the ships and crew of these vassal city-states, for definitive ideological but also practical reasons, were directly appropriated for service to the empire, first along the peripheral eastern Mediterranean coast, and then at Assyria's core, within the Mesopotamian riverine system.

The primary and most explicit interaction between the Phoenician and Assyrian peoples occurred on an economic level. The Phoenicians, in the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., were able to procure local and distant trade goods such as raw metals from as far afield as Spain, exotic animals from Africa, and textiles from Egypt.
When the Kings Ashurnarsipal II (883-859 B.C.) and Shalmaneser III (858-824 B.C.) first encountered the Phoenician peoples during their western military campaigns in the ninth century, they were exposed to the products of the Phoenicians' trade when they accepted their placating gifts of namurtu. As the Assyrian kingdom expanded outwards from Mesopotamia, its kings desired to further their accumulation of material wealth in finished goods and raw materials, and sought to control those who traded such items.

The Phoenicians were able to obtain these diversified goods from distant sources due to their renowned skills as seafarers and navigators, which enabled them to penetrate the far corners of the Mediterranean and beyond. Tiglath-Pileser III (746-728 B.C.), who first incorporated the Phoenician city-states as vassals to the empire in 734-33 B.C., was resolutely intent on gaining profit from the Phoenician trade, but also clearly recognized the manner in which it was to be facilitated.

As an originally land-locked kingdom in the northern Mesopotamian plateau, the Assyrians did not possess the nautical skills necessary for any large-scale maritime endeavors. Therefore, as the textual evidence reveals, the Assyrian atypical administrative policy instigated by Tiglath-Pileser, and refined by each of his successors, was one of limited interference into the infrastructure of Phoenician trade, but direct acquisition of its products. In return, the Assyrian ideology provided that the cities would remain relatively autonomous and receive protection from hostile foreigners, in the constructs of an occasional military patrol. In reality, this policy was an unbalanced pseudo-exchange, as there were no other obvious political or economic threats to Phoenicia from anywhere in the eastern Mediterranean, except that of Assyria.
The collective Phoenician city-states clearly resented this new interference in their economic affairs. As a result, they continually attempted to revolt against the "yoke of Assur" by refusing to pay their madattu and, in one instance, killing the Assyrian tax collector in Sidon, a crime for which there does not appear to have been any noticeable retribution. After each refusal of madattu payments (which were recorded in the extant Assyrian annals as occurring in 738-737, 726, 721-720, 701, and 668-667 B.C.), the large and mobile Assyrian army, led by the king, would campaign in the west in order to quell these revolts. As the Phoenician city-states all lacked any substantial military force, they were intimidated into remitting the madattu. However, the fact that these so-called rebellions continued to occur throughout the century of Assyrian imperial administration over Phoenicia, belies the fact that the kings of the city-states, as well as the Assyrian monarchs, knew that any military attack would disrupt the complex trade infrastructure that existed.

When the Assyrian empire attempted to tighten its political grip on Phoenicia, with the complete annexation of the city-states in 677-667 B.C. by Esarhaddon (679-669 B.C.), it was for further economic gains. Esarhaddon's ensuing treaty with Baal, King of Tyre, however, reveals just how dependent the Assyrians truly were on their Phoenician facilitators for the transport and procurement of goods. In the treaty, Esarhaddon claimed ownership of the contents of any Tyrian ship that wrecked on the Syro-Palestinian coast, no matter its destination or nature of its voyage. However, the king did not want to curtail any profitable trade, so he allowed the ships of Baal to move freely through many local ports, and offered special protection to the Tyrian ships, as the vehicles of maritime trade.

An administrative text from Nineveh reveals, the economic dependence of the Assyrian empire on the Phoenician traders was even more concretely realized by the
reign of Ashurbarnipal (669-627 B.C.). When an Assyrian tax official, stationed outside Arvad, is refused entrance into the Assyrian-annexed city, and King Iakinlu stops all influx of goods through the channels back to Assyria, the local administrator is helpless to take action until the Assyrian army arrives.301

Although the Assyrian kings were able to subject the Phoenician city-states into redirecting their profitable trade goods into the empire, they never chose to exercise absolute dominion. If the traditional system of Neo-Assyrian administration was practiced on these city-states, then the established, highly-refined system of maritime-based trade of the Phoenicians would be severely modified, and to that effect, not as profitable. The Phoenician city-states, then, experienced relative autonomy for a majority of their enlisted service to the empire, and as a result, were politically free to try to remove the limited imperial constraints placed upon them. As the core of the Assyrian empire had come to depend largely on the goods procured from this trade, its kings had to accept the regional political instability of constant, but manageable peripheral rebellion that inevitably followed. The fact that the interaction between the two groups retained this character for over a century demonstrates that the Assyrian kings were aware of the empire’s dependence on the Phoenicians as purveyors of trade, to such an extent that any disruption of its flow from the far west made the dependent center economically and, therefore, politically vulnerable.

The secondary level of simultaneous interaction between the Phoenicians and Assyrians is realized by the contextualization of the corpus of iconographic examples of Phoenician vessels, which span the reigns of five Assyrian kings, and one specific textual reference to the seafarers. The Assyrian imperial administration was, in a very basic sense, entirely practical. In exercising their power, the Assyrian kings often directly requisitioned the skilled labor from the populations of their vassal-states for
service in that respective territory or in the Assyrian heartland. After Tiglath-Pileser's extensive campaign along the coast of the Levant in 739-738 B.C., the practice of this policy of enforced vassal labor was extended to this region. Since the Assyrian peoples lacked any specialized maritime skills, Tiglath-Pileser immediately saw advantage in the requisition, and further exploitation, of the skills of his now-vassals, the Phoenicians. Beginning in the eighth century B.C., the Phoenicians, as sailors and shipwrights, served Assyria first along the eastern Mediterranean coast, but also on the waterways of Mesopotamia.

The fresco at Til Barsib of a Phoenician seagoing galley transporting Assyrian soldiers dating to the reign of Tiglath-Pileser, is the first visual display of this newfound imperial method of exploitation. In this fragmentary scene, which cannot be positively identified as documenting any particular historical event, the display of the requisition of a Phoenician galley for Assyrian service indicates, in ideological terms, the abrupt and unchecked political dominance of Assyria over the Phoenician peoples in Syria-Palestine in the eighth century B.C. After the Phoenician city-states were made vassals to Tiglath-Pileser in 734-733 B.C., the king utilized his vassal's maritime skills as a specific form of service in transporting the most visible personification of the power of the empire: the army.

In addition to utilizing Phoenician vessels for his own military purposes on the Mediterranean, Tiglath-Pileser exercised his imperial authority in requisitioning the use of at least one Phoenician vessel in Mesopotamia. The second example from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser, found in a relief at Nimrud, depicts a hippos vessel, a type that was first introduced into the Neo-Assyrian corpus of iconography during the reign of Shalmaneser III. This distinctive type of vessel was unusual in that it uniquely characterized Phoenicia and, therefore, came to serve as a visual identifier
of the other Phoenician boats that were depicted during the reigns of subsequent kings.

This small display from Nimrud of such a far-reaching, cross-Mesopotamian requisition, is more readily seen as an expanded, ideological message in the large relief of hippoi involved in timber transport at Khorsabad, as well as the small scene of the bit-hilanni, from the reign of Sargon II. Here, the distinctive vessels are displayed prominently for all foreign tributaries and domestic courtiers to see in the palace of the king, a method of show that was exercised again during the later reign of Ashurbarnipal, with the depiction of a hippos-type vessel at his palace at Nineveh.

The presence of the Phoenicians, identified by their distinctive hippoi, whether performing a specific act of forced labor, or serving the king in his enjoyment of leisure activities, served to visually re-enforce to the king, as the chief propagator of imperial ideology, and his subjects, his far-reaching power. This power-display occurred in two forms during the reign of Sennacherib, who depicted his ability to instill fear in his rebellious vassal, King Luli of Sidon, who fled from his city first to Tyre and then to Cyprus in 701 B.C. Additionally, Sennacherib specifically recorded in his annals his perceived ability to dominate the Phoenicians, when he documents his requisition of the skills of Phoenician shipwrights and sailors directly for his immediate needs of transporting the Assyrian army on campaign in 694 B.C. to Elam in the south.

This alternate, yet additional form of interaction between the Assyrians and the Phoenicians was mainly recorded in the palatial display iconography of the empire, the nature of which was to re-enforce the most basic Assyrian imperialistic concepts. As the catalogue in the previous section discusses, the visual representations of service by the skilled Phoenicians for the Assyrian empire and, in particular, the king
were prominently and distinctively displayed in the palaces. As such, it becomes clear that the perceived ideology behind the display was that of distinct vassalage tribute, uniquely modified as a performed, specialized skill, rather than a commodity. Since the Phoenicians' skills were so unique, yet necessary to the Assyrian empire, their service was quite worthy of depiction.

The further ideology behind these displays, whether specific (as in the examples from the reign of Shalmaneser at Tell Balawat, or Sennacherib's depiction of Luli's flight from Tyre) or generalized (Ashurbarnipal's lion hunt scene), indicates how the Assyrians perceived themselves: they had control over skilled vassals of their peripheral territories, whom they could force to the core for service and, in this domination, they themselves were made more powerful.\textsuperscript{305}

However, the sub-strata of this aspect of the interaction between the groups are harder to elucidate. The two different forms of interaction, that of Assyrian core's parasitic dependence on the Phoenicians' peripheral acquisition of trade goods, and the requisition and exploitation of specialized maritime skills for service to the Assyrian king, are intrinsically linked. As much as the propagandistic message of Assyrian art displayed the empire's absolute dominance and control over the Phoenicians as vassals, this was simply not the case, as even Assyrian administrative dispatches demonstrate. Perhaps a motivation for displaying Phoenicians at work was a visual way in which the Assyrians could deny their dependence on the traders; or, these instances of forced maritime service were a non-destructive punishment for the constant rebellions of the Phoenician city-states in their refusal to pay \textit{madattu}. Since the fact remains that the Assyrian forms of evidence for this contact are riddled with socio-political and ideological biases, it may be truly impossible to know all the specific underlying motivations.
This more detailed analysis, however, reveals that the Assyrian empire, although a major political power in the Near East in the first half of the first millennium B.C., was largely dependent on the Phoenicians as intermediary traders to bring them materials from all corners of the Mediterranean, that formed the core of their wealth. In order to not curtail this developed system of acquisition, the Assyrians extended only limited political control in exchange for economic reorientation of goods and profit. As a result of this un-characteristic and un-imperial dependence, however, the Assyrians directly requisitioned the Phoenicians' maritime skills at the core of the empire, and prominently displayed this forced service to assert the appearances of uniform imperial control. The Assyrian kings, in their palatial iconography, idealized the relationship as one of complete control in the policy of forced conscription of skilled vassals. However, the extant administrative texts reveal that this absolute control was clearly not the case. The ships depicted in the imperial iconography, then, were not as important to the non-maritime oriented Assyrians, as was the intended propagandistic message of each scene. The key to the definition of this complicated relationship was the Phoenicians' skills as seafarers and navigators, which the Assyrians lacked and therefore needed, in order to control and further their apparent economic and political dominance in the Near East.
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