

TAHARQA, KING OF KUSH AND THE ASSYRIANS*

Dan'el KAHN

ABSTRACT

In this article the relationships between Esarhaddon, king of Assyria (681-669 B.C.) and Taharqa, King of Kush (690-664 B.C.) are surveyed. The years between 690-683 are regarded as years of peace, while Kushite intervention in the Levant from 683 and probably until 679 prompted Assyria to react and gain control over the Levant and finally conquer Egypt. This conquest is reflected in the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions and Annals of Esarhaddon. An extraordinary prayer by Taharqa to Amun, previously dated by P. Vernus to 677/6-674/3 B. C., records Taharqa's defeat and the capture of his crown-prince, Ushanhuru in 671 B.C. and Taharqa's request from Amun to guard the life of his sons and concubines and to return things to their previous state of affairs.

KEY WORDS

Taharqa, Esarhaddon, Ushanhuru, Memphis, Prayer, Amun, Assyrian conquest of Egypt

Historical Background¹

In 721 BC Shabaka ascended the throne of Kush. He conquered Egypt by the beginning of his second year of reign in February 720 BC. In the spring of 720 BC the Kushites fought a pitched battle against the Assyrian army near Raphiah. Shabaka maintained a hostile policy towards Assyria until his death in 706 BC. In 712 Iamani, king of Ashdod, revolted against Assyria and at the arrival of the Assyrian forces he fled to Sargon's opponent, Shabaka. He received asylum from Shabaka until the latter's death, which occurred at the end of 706 BC. Within months after ascending the throne, Shebitku changed his predecessor's hostile policy towards Assyria and, as a gesture of good will, extradited Iamani to Sargon.

The sudden death of Sargon, King of Assyria in battle in the summer of 705 BC ignited a massive revolt throughout the entire Assyrian empire. Shebitku took advantage of this situation and attempted to gain power in the Levant. When Sennacherib, Sargon's heir to the throne of Assyria, was finally able in 701 BC to turn his attention to the revolt in the West, he met Shebitku's forces in battle at Eltekeh. One of the Kushite commanders was Prince Taharqa, who mentioned in his inscriptions that Shebitku recruited him to wage war in the North. The outcome of the battle is not as clear as the Assyrian texts claim it to be. While Sennacherib boasted of a great victory on the Egyptian and Kushite forces, Shebitku adopted expansionistic imperial titles which indicate that the Kushite propaganda also claimed victory.² When Taharqa became king of Egypt and Kush, he did not try to hide his presence on the battlefield as one would expect if he were responsible for a bitter defeat.

After Sennacherib's third campaign in 701, he never returned to the West in person.³ From Assyrian sources, it can be assumed that Assyria ruled firmly in the West at least until 697 BC.⁴ Nothing is known about Assyrian activities or intervention in the West after this year.

In the Kingdom of Egypt-and-Kush Taharqa ascended the throne after Shebitku's death in 690 BC. His reign is commonly divided into two periods: His first decade of reign was generally

assumed to be a peaceful one,⁵ blessed with intensive commerce or other sort of contact with the Phoenician coast,⁶ while the second period was characterized by conflict with Assyria.⁷

A stela from Taharqa's temple at Kawa (Kawa III),⁸ which lists Taharqa's benefactions to the temple of Amun at Kawa from year two to ten, recounts that in year eight (683 BC),⁹ Taharqa donated to the temple of Amun at Kawa a bronze statue of the king smiting foreign countries, alluding to some hostile activity abroad.¹⁰ In Kawa III, 21 pieces of acacia, cedar and juniper wood, which grow in the Levant (particularly in Lebanon), were donated to the temple of Amun. In Kawa VI, 18-21 in Taharqa's year ten (681 BC) cedar and Asiatic bronze were donated to the temple of Amun and gardeners from the *Mnty.w Stti.w* were brought from Asia to cultivate his vineyards.¹¹ These data mark the start of Kushite (commercial or possibly military) activity in the Levant, particularly in Lebanon, between 683-681 BC, the last years of Sennacherib.¹²

Esarhaddon's campaign to the Brook of Egypt

Esarhaddon succeeded Sennacherib in 681 BC. He changed his father's policy and gave urgent priority to the re-affirmation of Assyrian control over Southern Philistia, which was loosened and most probably even lost during Sennacherib's last years.¹³ According to the Esarhaddon Chronicle,¹⁴ he conducted a campaign in his second year (679/8)¹⁵ against the city of Arzâ,¹⁶ which is situated on the Brook-of-Egypt.¹⁷ He plundered the town and took captive Asuhili, its king and brought him in fetters to Nineveh.¹⁸

Eph'al assumes that the "queries" to Shamash, the oracle god, inquiring about the possibility to wage war against the Egyptian army in the vicinity of Ashkelon, should also be connected to Esarhaddon's preparations for a campaign in Southern Philistia during the course of which the city of Arzâ, near the Brook-of-Egypt (*Nahal Musur*) was captured. If this document really refers to the preparations of an Egyptian campaign, Esarhaddon's fear seems incomprehensible since it would be preferable, as far as he was concerned, to encounter his enemy in Palestine rather than to enter into battle at the approaches of Egypt, immediately after a strenuous march along northern Sinai.¹⁹ The campaign against Arzâ is dated to 679 and it seems most probable that the queries to Shamash concerning Ashkelon were asked before a campaign that was not destined to conquer Egypt and should be related to a campaign in Palestine. The only known campaign to the vicinity of Ashkelon before the attempts to conquer Egypt in 671 BC was conducted in 679 BC and reached the Brook-of-Egypt.

Thus, the Kushite activity or Assyrian fear of Kushite presence in the Levant can be dated between 683-679 BC and Esarhaddon's campaign to the Brook-of-Egypt can be understood as a reaction against a Kushite continuous action against the (South)-Western provinces of the Assyrian Empire.

The consequences of Esarhaddon's campaign were as follows: Esarhaddon re-affirmed Assyrian control over the whole Levant up to Southern Palestine after an Assyrian absence of *ca.* four years; Asuhili, ruler of Arzâ, was deposed as was Sharru-lu-dari, the King of Ashkelon. Mitinti, son of Sidqa, the former king of Ashkelon was appointed in his place,²⁰ and the Kushite threat was removed.

In Esarhaddon's 4th year (677 BC) he conquered Sidon. Abdi-milkuti, its ruler, escaped by boat. In the following year (676 BC) Esarhaddon caught Abdi-milkuti and had him beheaded.

According to the Heidel Prism Esarhaddon forced 22 unnamed kings of the land of Hatti, of

the coast and of the islands in 676/5BC to participate in building projects at Nineveh.²¹ This account is again repeated in Nin. A v 54-vi 1,²² dated to 673/2,²³ now comprising a full list of their names.

Egypt's alleged control over the Levant and its loss in a prayer by Taharqa

In 1975 Vernus reconstructed, collated and published a text found on a badly damaged series of blocks which adjoined the bark-sanctuary at Karnak on the back of the Annals of Thutmose III. These blocks were formerly attributed to Shoshenq I or to Osorkon II.²⁴ According to Vernus, this inscription should be assigned to Taharqa and it reflects the Assyrian advance towards Egypt and Egypt's temporary control over the Levant and its loss. The text is written in a mixture of (late) Middle Egyptian²⁵ used for the traditional hymns and royal inscriptions and of Literary Late Egyptian embedded with colloquial Late Egyptian showing early traits of the Demotic dialect.²⁶ The text can be classified as a personal prayer (requesting for god's help after an enemy's invasion or defeat in battle).²⁷

Vernus and Spalinger have noted the special tone of the text and the degree of piety, supplication and personal responsibility expressed by the king. The text has no date, but basing their arguments especially on cols. 5 and 16 of the text, Vernus dated the text to the period between years 14 and 17 of Taharqa (677/6-674/3 B. C.), while Spalinger dated the text to 675 BC.²⁸

“O, the one who will not abandon his work when it has only been half realized”, (col. 5)

“Let me do it with your tribute (*inw*)²⁹ of Khor (Syria-Palestine) which has been turned aside from you” (col. 16).

I shall treat this text more thoroughly below and suggest an additional venue.

The Assyrian defeat in Egypt in March 673 BC

The Babylonian Chronicle mentions an expedition to Egypt in the month of Adar of the year 673 BC. From the description of the Kushite meddling in the Levant during the previous decade it becomes clear that the invasion of Egypt was a reaction to this ongoing hostile activity in the Levant. However, the Assyrians did not succeed to overpower the Kushite threat and were defeated in Egypt on the 5th of Adar (March 673 BC).³⁰ This defeat was not reported in the Esarhaddon Chronicle.³¹

Ashkelon, Tyre and Taharqa are mentioned in a broken section of Esarhaddon's Stela at Nahr el-Kalb.³² In a fragment from Esarhaddon's annals, describing the events of 671, he states that his armies besieged Ba'al, King of Tyre, because Ba'al trusted Taharqa, his friend, and freed himself from the yoke of Assyria.³³ After Esarhaddon's military setback in March 673 Ashkelon and Tyre (and probably other Philistine and Phoenician cities as Arvad?)³⁴ rebelled against him. It is possible that the kings of Tyre and Ashkelon were punished for their disloyalty between March 673 and the summer of 671 since they are mentioned in the account of 671. Taharqa, according to Vernus' interpretation of the Taharqa's prayer, lamented the loss of tribute (*inw*) from the land of *H3rw* (Syria-Palestine).³⁵ This situation might reflect the period between 679, the campaign to Arzâ, and 673, the Assyrian defeat in Egypt, or the period after the summer of 671 when the Assyrians invaded Egypt and the Egyptians lost their territorial achievement gained in March 673.

701-671: An overview

After Sennacherib's third campaign in 701, in which he quelled the massive revolt in the West, he never returned there in person. From Assyrian sources, it can be assumed that Assyria ruled

firmly in the West at least until 697 and without any contradicting Assyrian or Egyptian evidence this date can be lowered to 684/3 BC.³⁶ It seems that Sennacherib lost control over the Levant to the Kushites at the close of his rule. As far as we know, this rebellion in the West cannot be compared with the rebellion following Sargon's death. We know only that Tyre, Ashkelon and Arvad, relatively protected cities, showed resistance against the Assyrians. The Kushites just slipped into a power-vacuum created by a temporary Assyrian weakness. When Esarhaddon came to power he anticipated a clash with Kushite and Egyptian forces in Southern Palestine during his first campaign to the Levant, but when his forces arrived at the vicinity of Ashkelon and later on at the Brook of Egypt, there were no Egyptian and Kushite forces in sight. Thus, again, Assyria ruled the West firmly reaching the Egyptian border. In 677 and 676 Esarhaddon quelled a rebellion (backed by Egypt?) in Phoenicia. Esarhaddon decided to deal with the Kushite-Egyptian ongoing threat and marched against Egypt. In March 673 Esarhaddon's army was defeated in Egypt. Consequently, Taharqa gained control over Philistia and Tyre aligned again with the Kushites. By 671 Esarhaddon had recovered from his defeat in 673 on Egyptian soil and tried again to eliminate the Kushite threat.

The Assyrian conquest of Egypt

In late spring of 671 BC Esarhaddon mustered his troops in an attempt to conquer Egypt and defeat Taharqa once and for all. In the summer of 671 BC he invaded Egypt. Three fierce pitched battles were fought on the 3rd, 16th and 18th day of the month of Du'uzu (Tammuz). On the 22nd of the same month Memphis, Taharqa's capital, was conquered and sacked. Taharqa was wounded five times by Esarhaddon's arrows and fled³⁷, but his son and brothers were captured alive. Esarhaddon entered Memphis in joy and sat on Taharqa's [throne]. Taharqa's gods and goddesses together with all the palace possessions, Taharqa's queen and secondary wives and Ushanuru, the Nubian crown prince (*mâr ridûtîdu*) were brought out of the city, counted as spoil and taken back to Assyria.³⁸

After the cessation of fighting Esarhaddon appointed anew officials and administrators over the captured towns of (Lower) Egypt. Some of these officials had Egyptian names and some had Assyrian names.³⁹

Taharqa's prayer concerning the conquest of Egypt

As we have seen, Taharqa's inscription reflects the Egyptian dominion in the Levant (between March 673 and 671) and the loss of it. A closer look at this inscription reveals Taharqa's view of the Assyrian conquest of Egypt in 671 and possibly in 667. I have divided the text into paragraphs that deal with specific subjects.

The text is composed of an introduction (§ 1), 2 sets of 3 similar paragraphs, namely: § 5 (past promises and their realization), § 6 (Taharqa's complaint) and § 7 (Taharqa's request) are respectively similar in content with § 2 (Amun's favors in the past), § 3 (Taharqa's distress) and § 4 (Taharqa's request). § 8 and § 9 are an elaboration and deal with foreign affairs and Taharqa's family's safety. These requests are not mentioned in § 4. These paragraphs deal with the situation in Egypt in the past, in the present and what has to be done to correct the situation in the future. § 10 ends the prayer with a Glorification of Amun and the hope for a better future.

In the following pages I will give the transliteration, translation and comments on the relevant paragraphs.⁴⁰

§ 1. Beginning of king's speech

(3) *h[r].fn s3.k mri.k nsw bity () s3 R^c () Imn R^c nb nswt t3.wy [mry ...] i[w^c] n šm^cw mhw di ^cnh nb dd w3s nb snb nb 3w ib nb mi r^c dt (4) [...] md.t mi ^c3.s*

(3) "...Thus he says, namely, your (i.e., Amun's) son, whom you love, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, (empty cartouche), Son of Re (empty cartouche), [beloved of] Amun-Re, Lord of the thrones of the two lands, h[eir] of Upper and Lower Egypt, given all life, stability and all dominion, all health, all happiness like Re forever. (4) [...] affair according to its importance."

§ 2. Amun grants Taharqa with the rule over Egypt

di.k n.i šm^cw mhw stp.k wi m hnw.[sn di.]k dd.w t3.wy.i is⁴¹ i.iri Imn ir pr ^c3 n p(3) nty mri.f sw

"You gave me Upper and Lower Egypt, you chose me among [them and] you [caused] to be said: '(These are) my two lands, indeed'. It is according to what he desires, that Amun makes a Pharaoh".

Amun granted Taharqa rule over Egypt. He gave him Upper and Lower Egypt⁴² and caused the people of the land to recognize his sovereignty. By mentioning the fact that Amun chose Taharqa and bestowed favors upon him in the past, Taharqa intended to stress his divine legitimacy and expected for continuity in Amun's deeds.

§ 3. The actual situation in Egypt: a description of Taharqa's distress

di.k gm.i s dd p(3) i di.k ^ck.f⁴³ p[... ...] rmt i wn bw rh.w⁴⁴ s hr.i

"You caused me to discover this, namely: He, the one, whom you have caused to enter [...] men, who did not know it about me".

However, the situation mentioned in § 2 did not last. Amun caused Taharqa to discover that whatever was promised and granted to him in § 2 changed. Amun has given Taharqa the two lands and caused them to acknowledge his rule, but in par. 3 he caused someone to enter (name of place not preserved in the text),⁴⁵ with people who did not know what Amun had ordained for Taharqa.⁴⁶ According to the theological ideology presented in Taharqa's prayer, it was Amun who caused the enemy to invade Egypt and desecrate places either as part of a plan to glorify Taharqa's accomplishments⁴⁷ or because Amun was angry with him.⁴⁸

§ 4. Taharqa's request

(5) *i [Imn] i p3 nty bw iri.f h3^{c49} t3 i.iri.f⁵⁰ iw.s n gs⁵¹ i Imn m [...].k n-im.w iw.k (r) sdm.w⁵² n.i mtw.k [... (6) ... md.t (?)⁵³ b]in.t m iri di.t ^ck.i r md.t iw msd.k s p(3) [... ...] m*

*iri di.t iri.i p3 ntt ms[d.k s (7)] m di.k hr(i)-r-m [in]k⁵⁴ (r) ntt ink p3y.k šri⁵⁵ iw ntk i
[wt t h p]r.t nbt mn nk.t iw [... (8) ...] hnw n Imn n3y*

“Oh, (5) [Amun ...]. Oh, You who did not abandon what he has created, while it is half realized. Oh Amun, don't [... ...] with them. You shall hear them for me,⁵⁶ and you shall [turn back (?) (6) the e]vil (words?). Do not let me enter an affair that you hate. [...]. Do not let me do what [you h]ate [... (7) ...] from you together with me. I am your little child, while it is you [who begot?] all [that comes into be]ing.⁵⁷ There is nothing which [...] (8) [... ...]. It is the residence of Amun.”⁵⁸

Taharqa's request is construed in the imperative mode. Amun is addressed as a god who finishes what he has started. Thus, Taharqa demanded continuity in Amun's deeds. Amun has given Taharqa the rule over Egypt and Taharqa's wish is that the people who did not know Amun and entered his realm would recognize his legitimacy and his divinely decreed sovereignty over Egypt. Taharqa asked Amun to prevent him from doing things, which Amun detests. He claimed that something was taken (?) from Amun's hand together with his.⁵⁹ In these sentences Amun is described as an omnipotent creator god, a father who has to take care of his child, Taharqa, and protect him from getting into danger. Furthermore, the close relationship between Taharqa and Amun stresses the identity of cause between god's affairs and those of the king. Amun acts on behalf of Taharqa.

§ 5. Amun's promises before Taharqa assumed kingship and their realization

*sr.k n.i nn iw bw-r-^c.tw.k⁶⁰ di.t h^c.i [... (9) ...] H^cpy ^c3 n p3y.i h3w i3w⁶¹ n.i t3 pt iw.s n (= m)
^cd iw.s ^cš3 (10) [m h w ...]*

“Before you crowned me you have foretold these to me: (9) [...] a great inundation in my time. The sky was extended for me, being thick and abundant (10) [with rain].”

Taharqa reflected on past events and reminded Amun of the wonders, which he foretold him before his crowning and bestowed upon him during his reign. In Kawa V Taharqa recorded the wonders that happened in his sixth regnal year. The text mentions an abundant inundation in Upper and Lower Egypt and rainfall in Nubia.⁶²

§ 6. Taharqa's complaint: The actual situation in Egypt is not as promised

[... ... n]n ink sw iwn(3)y⁶³

“[...]It does not belong to me.”⁶⁴

Taharqa complained that the areas, which enjoyed abundant rain and inundation [i. e. Egypt and perhaps parts of Nubia (?)⁶⁵], are not in Taharqa's control (anymore).⁶⁶ Consequently, Taharqa expected that Amun would come to his aid at the present in the same manner as he did in the past when he proclaimed these wonders and caused them to happen.

§ 7. An elaboration of Taharqa's request to regain control over Egypt and its population

imi st hr.i dr.w [iw] (11) [... ...] nw r.f [...r T]mn ntf p3 i.iri nf[r] (12) [... n]hm wi r šnw nhm wi r mdt bin.t nb imi dd.w r-r.[i ... (13) ...] t hnk̄t k3.w 3pd.w iw h3ty.i ndm imi f3i.i n.k nkt nb n p3 ntt p[3 ... (14) ...] mri iri⁶⁷ p3 nty bw-pw pr ʕ3 nb iri.f iw.i m di.k n b3k iw.k (r) šn^c n.i n3 [...] (15) [...] mn p3 nty iw.f ʕmd.w

“Place them all under me ... (11) [... ... which (?) lo]ok at him [with respect (?)] to A]mun. It is he who does well, [... (12)...] save me from pain,⁶⁸ save me from every evil word, let them say about [me (?) ... (13) ...] bread, beer, oxen, birds, my heart being sweet. Cause me to carry to you anything of that which [... (14) ...] loves (?). Do what no Pharaoh has (ever) done, while I am with you as servant. You will repel for me the [...]⁶⁹ (15). There is no one who will keep them away.”

Taharqa, again, forwarded a request in the imperative mood. He asked Amun, his patron god, to enable him to repel the intruders and regain control over the lost territories of Egypt (and Kush?) and their people, and renew their loyalty towards him. Taharqa also requested to repulse evil for him. One of the reasons for being in an evil state is Amun's disfavor towards Taharqa. Taharqa inquired if the evil state, in which he is, was caused by his neglect of the cult of Amun, and he immediately proposed to offer and bring to Amun anything, which may change the evil state.⁷⁰ He asked Amun to act as Pharaoh⁷¹ (evidently, a task too great for Taharqa to perform at the moment) and to show loyalty as Amun's servant.

§ 8. Restoring foreign affairs

i Imn p3 i.iri.i⁷² n p3 t3 nhsy i.di [... (16)... ...] imi iri.i sw n p3y.k inw n p3 t3 n H3rw T. ʕmd r-r.k

“Oh Amun, what I did in the land of Nubia,⁷³ let [... (16)], let me do it with your tribute (*inw*) of Khor (Syria-Palestine) which has been turned aside from you.”

Only after asking Amun to help him gain power over the lost parts of Egypt, Taharqa wished to be able to restore the lost tribute of *H3rw* (Syria-Palestine). This is the first time in the text that Taharqa refers to Egypt's relations with its neighbors. The tribute from the Levant had been lost either between 677 and March 673 as Vernus and Spalinger have postulated,⁷⁴ or after 671.

§ 9. Guarding Taharqa's family

i Imn (17) [... ... n3y.(?)]i hmwt imi ʕnh n3y.i hrd.w ʕmd n.i p3 mwt r.w nhm wi r-r [... (18) ...] n r.w mtw.k pn^c.w r d3d3.w h^c.w⁷⁵

“Oh Amun, (17) [... ... m]y wives, let my children live. Keep death away from them for me. Save me from [... (18) ... evil words(?)] of their mouths,⁷⁶ and turn them over (the evil words?) back on them.”⁷⁷

This paragraph embodies an additional key theme enabling us to date this text, whose significance both Spalinger and Vernus overlooked in their treatment of the text.⁷⁸ A fragmentary cuneiform tablet (K 8692) informs us about a campaign against a ruler and land that were not preserved in the text. Lines 22-23 provide the key to the problem:

(22) *aššâtîðu mârçšu u mârât[išu]* (23) [*ša*] *kîma šâšûma kîma ittê salmu šîrûðu[nu]*

(22) “His wives, his sons and [his] daughters (23) [who]se bodies like his, have skins as black as asphalt (he counted as booty)”⁷⁹.

Tablet Bu 91-5-9, 218, obv. 6' lists tribute from Egypt brought back to Nineveh: “[... together with] the offspring of his father’s house, sons of earlier kings ...”⁸⁰ Furthermore, the Senjirli stela preserves a literary account as well as a relief of Esarhaddon holding a king, who is commonly identified with Ba’al king of Tyre, together with the Nubian crown prince Ushanhuru (Ns-ini-Hr.t),⁸¹ a rope piercing his lips.⁸² This is clearly a depiction of one of the sons of Taharqa who are mentioned in line 17 of Taharqa’s prayer.



Fig. 1: Esarhaddon with Ba’al, king of Tyre (?), and the Kushite Crown prince Ushanhuru (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin (ed.), *Das Vorderasiatische Museum* (Mainz 1992) 180, cat. 116.)

According to the various inscriptions it can be assumed that § 9 deals with the sack of Memphis by the Assyrian king and the capture of Taharqa's women, concubines, relatives, and most important, Taharqa's crown prince Ushanuru.⁸³ Taharqa petitions Amun to safeguard his family, which have been taken captive.⁸⁴

§ 10. Glorifying Amun and future hope

hry i.iri di ʿnh p3y.f b3k i[... (19) ...] iw nb sp sn i Imn mn p3 nty iw.f w3h n.k shn ntk p3 ntt w3h [(20) shn] p3 nty iw.k dd n.i m sm n-im.k sp sn iw.i sm t3 [... (21) ...] i Imn mn iri.t bin.t n t3 md.t i.iri.k p3 nty [...]

“It is the master who causes his servant to live [... (19) ...] all. Oh Amun, there is no one who gives you orders. It is you that gives (20) [orders ...]. That which you say to me: “Go forth, go forth”, I shall go forth [... (21)...]. Oh Amun, there is no evildoing in the affair, that you have done which [...].”

Taharqa glorified Amun, showed absolute loyalty and hoped for a better future relying on the guidance of Amun. Vernus and Spalinger date this inscription to a period before the Assyrian setback of 673, and thus give an optimistic outlook to this inscription. According to their dating, Taharqa would in a few months repel the Assyrians and delay their conquest of Egypt by two years.

Unfortunately, the pain and despair demonstrated in the beginning of the text would accompany Taharqa until his death. The counterattack, so anxiously anticipated by both scholars (and by Taharqa as well) had already occurred and did not save Egypt from Assyrian conquest. After praying to Amun for delivery, setting up this stela and seeing the Assyrians defy Amun's decree, Taharqa realized that he could not avenge Amun's desecration and his own defeat.⁸⁵ He deserted the dynastic family necropolis at El-Kurru and built his tomb, imitating the form of the Osireion at Abydos, at Nuri. Taharqa's tomb is situated East-Northeast from Gebel Barkal. Looking from Gebel Barkal eastwards at the beginning of the New Year, the sun rose directly over the summit of Taharqa's pyramid. This would ensure that Taharqa would be reborn as Osiris, who was slain by Seth, and that his heir the living king, the embodiment of Horus, would avenge his defeat. Unfortunately, but even his dying wish was not carried out by his successors.⁸⁶

Department of Jewish Studies,
Haifa University

NOTES

* I would like to thank Prof. M. Cogan and E. Weissert of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem for reading and commenting on an earlier draft. Special thanks go to Prof. H. Tadmor for his patience, valuable advice and for enabling me to read a preprint of his article “An Assyrian Victory Chant and Related Matters”, in: *Fs. Grayson*. This article changed my reconstruction of events between 701-675. All remaining errors are, however, my responsibility.

¹ For this reconstruction of the relations between Egypt and Assyria see D. Kahn, “The Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var and the Chronology of Dynasty 25”, *Or* 70 (2001) 1-18.

² D. Kahn, *Or* 70 (2001) 2, notes 10, 11.

³ Contra W. H. Shea, “Sennacherib’s Second Palestinian Campaign”, *JBL* 104 (1985) 401-418; A. K. Grayson, “Assyria’s Foreign Policy in Relation to Egypt in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.”, *JSSEA* 11 (1981) 87; idem, “Assyria: Sennacherib and Esarhaddon (704-669)”, *CAH III/2*, 2nd ed. 1991 109-111.

⁴ In 699 Padi, King of Ekron, paid taxes to Assyria. See J. N. Postgate, *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire* (Studia Pohl, Series Maior; Rome 1969) 21. In 698/7 a legal transaction was carried out between Babylonian deportees in Neo-Assyrian at Tel Hadid: See N. Na’aman - R. Zadok, “Assyrian Deportations to the Province of Samerina in the Light of Two Cuneiform Tablets from Tel Hadid”, *Tel Aviv* 27 (2000) 162. In the year 697 BC (eponym of Nabû-dûru-usur) Sennacherib reports in a building inscription from Nineveh that he has deported among others the people of Philistia and of Tyre. See E. Frahm, *Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften* (BAfo 26; Horn 1997) 72-3: T 10, lines 27-29.

⁵ K. A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 BC.)*, 2nd rev. ed., (Warminster 1996) 388 ff. (henceforth *ThIP*); cf. D. B. Redford, “Taharqa in Western Asia and Libya”, *Eretz Israel* 24 (1994) 188*-191*.

⁶ A. J. Spalinger, “The Foreign Policy of Egypt Preceding the Assyrian Conquest”, *CdE* 53 (1978) 26-28.

⁷ Kitchen, *ThIP* 391-393.

⁸ M. F. L. Macadam, *The Temples of Kawa I, The Inscriptions* 2 vols (texts and plates) (London 1949) [Text] 8 and [plates] pl. 6: Kawa III.

⁹ And not 682 as Spalinger, *CdE* 53 (1978) 26, wrote; Cf. P. W. Pestman, *Les papyrus démotiques de Tsenhor (P. Tsenhor): les archives privées d’une femme égyptienne du temps de Darius I^{er}* (Leuven 1994) 175.

¹⁰ Macadam, *Temples of Kawa I*, [plates] pl. 6: Kawa III, 15.

¹¹ Macadam, *Temples of Kawa I*, [plates] pl. 6: Kawa III, col. 21 and [text] 9, n. 73; [plates] pl. 12: Kawa VI, 18-21 and [text] 36, n. 49, 67; [plates] pl. 14: Kawa VII, 4 and [text] 42.

¹² It seems to me that we should prefer to understand the Kushite activity in the Levant as a military one since Taharqa was during the whole of his lifetime hostile towards the Assyrians, who were the masters of every commercial activity in the Levant. However, a commercial Kushite activity in the Levant cannot be ruled out entirely. The information given by Taharqa, that he had contact with the Levant for the first time in 683 contradicts the hypothesis of a

postulated second campaign of Sennacherib to the Levant between 690-686, when king Hezekiah of Judah (727-698 or alternatively 715-686) was, according to the low chronology, still alive and Sennacherib, allegedly, met Taharqa (690-664) already as King of Kush (cf. 2 Kings 19.9) on the battlefield.

¹³ H. Tadmor, "Autobiographical Apology in the Royal Assyrian Literature", in: H. Tadmor - M. Weinfeld (eds.), *History, Historiography and Interpretations* (Jerusalem 1983) 42.

¹⁴ A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TCS V; Locust Valley, New York 1975) (henceforth *ABC*) 125, Chron. 14, 7-8. The Babylonian Chronicle (Grayson, *ABC* 82, Chron. 1 48-50 is unfortunately destroyed at this point and does not preserve the accounts of Esarhaddon's second year).

¹⁵ The sources for the reign of Esarhaddon are difficult to date and are not reliable with regard to details of campaigns and to their chronology. There are considerable differences in the recorded order of events between the Esarhaddon and the Babylonian chronicles and Esarhaddon's prisms. Eph'al has questioned the reliability of the Esarhaddon and Babylonian Chronicles. He challenged the date of the conquest of the town of Arzâ (679 according to the "Esarhaddon Chronicle") and concluded that this event should be dated according to the Esarhaddon Prisms, where this episode immediately follows Abdi-milkuti's and Sanduari's decapitation (which the Chronicles place in Esarhaddon's 5th regnal year, i.e. 676/5 BC). Cf. I. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent 9th-5th Centuries B.C.* (Jerusalem 1982) 45, n. 126, 52-54. Opting for Eph'al's reconstruction and the relative order of events in the prisms, places the conquest of Arzâ close in time after the conquest of Sidon. Esarhaddon advanced along the Phoenician and Philistine coast in a geographic sequence from North to South from Sidon and Tyre to the border of Egypt. In this case, the Kushite presence in the Levant could have lasted for almost a decade. However, Cf. H. Tadmor, "An Assyrian Victory Chant and Related Matters", in: G. Frame (ed.), *From the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea: Studies on the History of Assyria and Babylonia in Honour of A. K. Grayson* (Leiden, 2004) 269-272. Tadmor postulates that Esarhaddon's Annals were ideologically edited and thus are less valid for chronological reconstruction than the Esarhaddon and the Babylonian chronicles. However, note that some events in the Chronicles were also wrongly placed. Tadmor, "Autobiographical Apology", 272.

¹⁶ Cf. J. A. Spalinger, "Esarhaddon and Egypt: An Analysis of the First Invasion of Egypt", *Or* 43 (1974) 299.

¹⁷ For the location of the Brook of Egypt see P. K. Hooker "The Location of the Brook of Egypt", in: M. P. Graham et. al (eds.), *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes* (JSOT Supplement Series 173; 1993) 203-214 with earlier literature cited there.

¹⁸ R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien*, (BAfO 9; Graz 1956) 50.

¹⁹ For the queries to Shamash about Ashkelon see I. Starr, *Queries to the Sun-god* (SAA IV; Helsinki 1990) 94-98, nr. 81-83. For Eph'al's analysis see I. Eph'al, "On Warfare and Military Control in the Ancient Near Eastern Empires: A Research Outline", in: H. Tadmor - M. Weinfeld (eds.), *History, Historiography, and Interpretations* (Jerusalem 1983) 98. Eph'al dates these queries to Esarhaddon's campaign against Arzâ which he dated to 676/5. However, the date of 679 for the campaign against Arzâ should be maintained (see Tadmor, *Fs. Grayson* (forthcoming)). The queries to Shamash about Esarhaddon's intentions to fight against Taharqa and the queries to Shamash about Esarhaddon's planned campaign against Ashkelon should not be related to the same event and reflect two different campaigns. See Starr, *SAA IV* 94-98: Query nr. 81-83 (Ashkelon); 98-102: nr. 84 (against Taharqa), and possibly nr. 85-87. In nr. 82, lines 2' and rev. 6' the troops of Egy[pt] and the troops of [...] are mentioned, while in 84, lines 4, 6, 12, rev. 12, 14-15 "Taharqa, King of Kush and the troops which he has" are mentioned, using a different phrasing. Eph'al, (oral communication) further notes that in *SAA IV* 94, nr. 81, 2-3 the duration of the query about Ashkelon is valid until the 21st day of Sivan, while in *SAA IV* 98, nr. 85, 2-3 the duration of the query about [Egypt?] is valid until the month Tammuz. Since the validity of queries to Shamash does not extend 100 days, it is clear that the queries relating to Ashkelon were written at the earliest in Nisan (cf. Starr, *SAA IV*, p. xvi-xviii). Thus, if they pertain to a known campaign against Egypt, the dates could only fit Esarhaddon's 2nd campaign in 671. This is possible only if Esarhaddon was concerned that the encounter against Kushite and Egyptian forces near Ashkelon would delay his conquest of Egypt well into the inundation season and thus make the Assyrian advancement in Egypt harsher. For dating the queries to Shamash concerning Ashkelon (*SAA IV* 81-83) to 671 BC cf. J. A. Spalinger, *Or* 43 (1974) 301-302.

²⁰ Eph'al, (oral communication) notes that in Starr, *SAA IV* 83 rev 5 [Sharru-lu-dari s]on of Rukibti is mentioned in a very broken context. In 673 at the latest Mitinti was engaged in building Nineveh together with the kings from Hatti, transpotamien (*eber nâri*) and Cyprus (*Iadnana*). Borger, *Inschriften Asarhaddons* 60 (Ninive A 57). If Mitinti was one of the 22 unnamed kings mentioned in the Heidel Prism (see following note) then Sharru-lu-dari must have been deposed before 676/5 BC. Furthermore, since no other Assyrian campaign to Ashkelon is known between 679 and 673, one can postulate that Sharru-lu-dari was deposed during Esarhaddon's campaign to the Brook of Egypt in 679. For the relations between Sharru-lu-dari, Mitinti, and Sidqa, Kings of Ashkelon, see H. Tadmor, "Philistia under Assyrian Rule", *BA* 29 (1966) 98-99.

²¹ A. Heidel, "A New Hexagonal Prism of Esarhaddon" *Sumer* 12 (1956) 28-31: Heidel Prism, iv 54-v 12. Thus, claiming full control over the Levant and the Mediterranean Sea in 676/5.

²² Borger, *Inschriften Asarhaddons* 60-1; *ANET* 291.

²³ For the date of the text see Borger, *Inschriften Asarhaddons* 64. The date is a year after the Assyrian defeat in Egypt (see below n. 30). One would expect that Esarhaddon's control over the Levant would weaken after such a defeat. Instead, Esarhaddon lists his western vassals by name, thus giving the impression that he did not lose control in the Levant. Ba'al, king of Tyre and

Mitinti, king of Ashkelon, are also listed. It is possible that the elaborated list is reflecting the efficiency of the Assyrian rule even after the severe defeat in Egypt. Furthermore, in 671 the Arabs supported Esarhaddon in his invasion of Egypt. Would they be on the Assyrian side, had the Assyrians lost control over the area? On the other hand, according to Esarhaddon's Nahr el Kalb stela and Frg. F of Esarhaddon's annals (see respectively notes 32, 33 below) a rebellion in Tyre and in Ashkelon was quelled during Esarhaddon's campaign of 671. Thus, at least some of the Levantine kingdoms rebelled sometimes after the Assyrian defeat in Egypt and the elaborated list might have preceded the rebellion or could be understood as a literary compensation for the loss of control over territories in the Levant (cf. the list of Egyptian vassals in Ashurbanipal's prism A, i 90-109, long after the Assyrian conquest of Egypt ended. H. –U. Onasch, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens, Teil I: Kommentare und Anmerkungen* [ÄAT 27/1; Wiesbaden 1994] 118-119).

²⁴ P. Vernus, "Inscriptions de la troisième période intermédiaire (I), *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 1-72.

²⁵ On the terms "Spätmittelägyptisch" or "égyptien de tradition" denoting the artificial language used in the third intermediate period see J. Winand, "Review of Karl Jansen Winkeln, *Text und Sprache in der 3. Zwischenzeit. Vorarbeiten zu einer spätmittelägyptischen Grammatik.* (ÄAT 26; Wiesbaden 1994)", *LingAeg* 6 (1999) 224-5.

²⁶ For the use of grammatical forms from older phases of the language (i. e. Middle Egyptian) combined with the spoken Language (non-literary late Egyptian) and literary late Egyptian in Egyptian Ramesside texts see: O. Goldwasser, "On the Choice of Registers – Studies on the Grammar of Papyrus Anastasi I", in: S. Israelit-Groll (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim* (Jerusalem 1990) 200-240. For a division of texts into registers (Sprachstufe) and text-categories in the Third Intermediate Period see: K. Jansen-Winkeln, *Text und Sprache in der 3. Zwischenzeit: Vorarbeiten zu einer spätmittelägyptischen Grammatik* (ÄAT 26; Wiesbaden 1994).

²⁷ This sort of personal prayer by the king during a setback in battle is known from Ramesses II's accounts of the battle of Kadesh. However in Ramesses' case the god Amun heard his prayer and came to his aid. Cf. K. A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical II* (Oxford 1979) 34-42. For convenience see the translation in M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, vol. II (Berkeley 1976) 65. For prayers in Ancient Egypt see H. Brunner, *Gebet* *LdÄ* II, 452-9. This category of personal prayer is, however, better known from the Bible. The basic (although not always mandatory) components of the personal prayer are: Addressing god repeatedly, usually using epithets of the god as well. The worshiper expresses his relationship with god and his humility towards the greatness of his god. A complaint or a description of the distress is forwarded. Then, a request is made in the interrogative or in the imperative mode. The reason for the request is expressed as an identity of cause between the worshiper's needs and god's affairs. Sometimes a promise by god or earlier actions in favor of the worshiper are recalled. A request from god to show his true nature and potency is also very common. The supplicant then reminds god of a previous favor bestowed on him by god. A promise to continue worshipping god is mentioned at the end. See: M. Greenberg, "Prayer", in: *Encyclopaedia Biblica*

vol. 8 (Jerusalem 1982) 898-904 (Hebrew). All these components of the personal prayer can be found in Taharqa's prayer.

²⁸ Vernus, *BIFAO* 75, 45-46; Spalinger, *CdE* 53 (1978) 43 narrows this date to 675, preceding the Egyptian counterattack and Assyrian setback of 674/3 (Grayson, *ABC*, Chron. 1 iv. 16). The fifth day in the month of Adar falls actually on March 673.

²⁹ Wb. I, 91. 12-15 "herbeigebrachte Gaben, Lieferungen, oft im Sinne von Abgaben, Tributgaben, Geschenk". For *inw* see D. A. Warburton, *State and Economy in Ancient Egypt: Fiscal Vocabulary of the New Kingdom* (Fribourg/ Göttingen 1997) 221-226. Cf. M. Liverani, *Prestige and Interest: International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 B.C.* (Padova 1990) 256-257. Liverani thinks that vassal as well as independent states in Egypt's sphere of influence or control delivered the *inw* to Egypt.

³⁰ Grayson, *ABC*, Chronicle 1, iv, 16. Cf. H. Tadmor in: *History, Historiography and Interpretations* 42. Tadmor assumes that this battle was fought at the vicinity of Ashkelon, cf. H. Verreth, "The Egyptian Eastern Border Region in Assyrian Sources", *JAOS* 119 (1999) 235. An illusion to the Assyrian defeat in Egypt can be found in the Pedubast cycles where Pemu of Heliopolis caused a foe *3slstny*, chief of the land [...] to retreat eastwards, after the latter had tried to wrest Egypt from the rule of the Pharaoh Pedubast. See Kitchen, *ThIP* 458.

³¹ Grayson, *ABC* 126, Chron. 14, 20. In the Esarhaddon Chronicle a campaign against *ša-amîlç* is mentioned, previously thought to be Sile-*T3rw* on the Egyptian border. It is now commonly accepted that *ša-amîlç* lay in Southern Babylonia. The report about the failed campaign against Egypt was substituted in the Esarhaddon chronicle with an insignificant campaign in Southern Babylonia, which started approximately at the date, that the battle in Egypt took place. See Spalinger, *Or* 43 (1974) 300-301.

³² Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 102.

³³ Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 112: Frg. F 12-15.

³⁴ I. Starr, *SAA* IV, pp. 104-105, nr. 89. For additional possible rebel states in the Levant cf. H. Hirschberg, *Studien zur Geschichte Esarhaddons, König von Assyrien (681-669)*, (Berlin 1932) 61-72.

³⁵ See Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 1-72.

³⁶ If one accepts the reconstruction of Esarhaddon's chronology as proposed by Eph'al (*The Ancient Arabs*, 45, n. 126, 52-54) it would seem that in the last years of Sennacherib Assyria lost control in Philistia, Phoenicia (and probably in other Levantine Kingdoms as well). Egypt-and-Kush might have controlled the Levant firmly for almost a decade. Esarhaddon had to conquer Tyre and Sidon, which could have been allied with Kush between 683-675. Only then he proceeded to Philistia and arrived at the Brook of Egypt, preparing the invasion to Egypt.

³⁷ Esarhaddon's fight with Taharqa was described in heroic metaphors, transported to the mythical sphere. H. Tadmor, "World Dominion: The Expanding Horizon of the Assyrian Empire", in: M. Milano et. al., *Landscapes: Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East*, (CRRA 44 Padova 1999) 60.

³⁸ Grayson, *ABC* 85-86, Chron 1 iv 23-28; 127: Chron. 14, 25-26; Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 98-99: Sendjirli Stela 37-50; 101-102: Nahr el-Kalb Stela. Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen I*, 25-26: K 8692; 31-32: Bu-91-5-9, 218.

³⁹ Spalinger, *Or* 43 (1974) 303; the new administration in Egypt was organized within a month of the conquest at the latest if the date on prism Nin. S is reliable. However, this date is most certainly an "ideologically motivated pseudo dating" See H. Tadmor, "An Assyrian Victory Chant", 276.

⁴⁰ For convenience consult Vernus' collation and excellent lexicographical study of this text in *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 1-72. My grammatical analysis and translation differs only in minor points.

⁴¹ *is* should not be understood as the particle *is* with an emphasizing function. Cf. Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 37, n. ae. Vernus translates *is* as 'ainsi que' based on a wrong translation of Piankhy stela 137-8. *ḥ3wtyw is nw smsmw* does not mean "ainsi que l'élite des chevaux" but "(and) the elite (indeed) of the horses". The particle *is* is used as a strengthening of the fact just stated before. This emphasis was necessary after Padiese promised to give Piankhy the best of his horses but hoped Piankhy would be reconciled with inferior horses (Piankhy stela 109-113). This function of *is* can explain the unusual place of the particle after a one-memberal sentence.

⁴² By specifying the terms *šm^cw* and *mḥw* Taharqa stressed that his sovereignty included both parts of the country, although these signs might be a special orthography of *t3.wy*. See K. Jansen-Winkel, *Spätmittelägyptische Grammatik der Texte der 3. Zwischenzeit*, (ÄAT 34; Wiesbaden 1996) 12.

⁴³ Defined past relative form in apposition of a noun with *ḥk.f* as a non-initial prospective *sdm.f* after the verb *rdi*.

⁴⁴ A *bw stp.f* literary Late Egyptian formation denoting the negative past or preferably the successor of Middle Egyptian negated aorist *n sdm.n.f* with a *wn* converter of the past. See: S. Groll, "The Literary and the Non-Literary Verbal Systems in Late Egyptian", *OLP* 6 (1975-6) 243. For the converter *wn* see: J. Černý-S. I. Groll, *A Late Egyptian Grammar*, 3rd ed. (Roma 1993) (henceforth *LEG*) 294 ff., 488.

⁴⁵ Wb. I 230 ff. One can enter to a place, a palace, temple, a house, a gate but not a district, nome or country.

⁴⁶ *rmṯ i wn bw rh.w s ḥr.i*. It is not clear whether the individual, designated by the 3rd person masculine singular definite article *p3*, or all the *rmṯ* men did not know (a negated aorist) what Amun has ordained for Taharqa. It seems that the plural strokes (Z1) following the papyrus roll

determinative of the verb *rh* (Y1) [⏟] | | | points to the latter.

⁴⁷ Cf. N. -C. Grimal, *La stèle triomphale de Pi('ankh)y au musée du Caire* (PIFAO 105; Cairo 1981) 101: Piankhy Stela 92-93. *gm.n.i hr nn hr.s m wd nt Imn nn pw dd rmt (93) [sp3wt nw T3 Mhw] hn^c sp3.wt rswt wn.sn n.f m w3 n rdit.n.sn Imn m ib.sn n rh.sn wd.n.f iri.n.f sw r rdi.t b3w.f r rdi.t m33.tw sft.f* “I have discovered that this happened to it (Memphis) according to the command of Amun. This is what people say: ‘[The nomes of the North?] together with the nomes of the South opened to him (=Tefnakht) beforehand because they did not put Amun in their hearts.’ They did not know what he had commanded. He (Amun) did it in order to show his wrath, to let his (Amun’s and consequently Piankhy’s) splendor be seen...” Tefnakht’s military successes were enabled and even commanded by Amun in order to magnify Piankhy’s achievements. According to Grimal (ibid. 121 n. 356), however, the dative *n.f* refers to Piankhy and not to Tefnakht as I have suggested.

⁴⁸ For a similar concept in the Ancient Near East see Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 13: Bab. A 34-37; cf. Isaiah 10, 5; 36, 10.

⁴⁹ *i p3 nty bw iri.f h3^c* – L. E. vocative + negative relative simple present tense. J. Černý-S. I. Groll, *LEG*, 315 ff.

⁵⁰ *b3 i.iri.f* – Fem. relative form serving as direct object. It is not clear to which noun this pronoun is referring. It might refer to the situation that Taharqa discovered in Egypt: (4)... *di.k gm.i s* (feminine/neutral dependent pronoun).

⁵¹ *iw.s n gs*-circumstantial adverbial first present. The suffix pronoun relates to a feminine noun as in the previous note. The adverb *n (=m) gs* refers to the realization of Amun’s promise to give the two lands to Taharqa. At the moment of composing the prayer this promise was not fully realized.

⁵² The plural suffixes *.w* possibly refer to the men who did not know Amun, since there is no other noun in the plural. Amun is requested to hear them, so clearly they have said something.

⁵³ Cf. l. 12 below for this reconstruction.

⁵⁴ The adverb *m di.k* refers back to the hand of Amun, while *hr irm (?) ink* is a bit unusual. One would expect *hr mdi.i*. Černý-Groll, *LEG* 142. Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 40 notes that it emphasizes a part of the sentence. He does not translate [*m*] *di.k* and translates *hr irm ink* as “...avec moi”.

⁵⁵ Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 41. Vernus rightly analyses *ntt* as *r-ntt* marker of initiality followed by a nominal bi-memberal sentence *ink p3y.k šri*. Cf. Černý-Groll, *LEG*, 165, 518 ff.

⁵⁶ It seems to me that Taharqa requests Amun to hear the (devious) words of the intruders, the only persons designated in the plural, and protect (?) him from them. Similar requests can be found in Psalms. Cf. Psalm 38; 13 ff. The supplicant (allegedly King David) does not hear the

evil words of his enemies. He expects God to react against his enemies.

⁵⁷ These two sentences show the close relationship between god and king and the greatness of god. These two elements are common in personal prayers. See: M. Greenberg, *Encyclopaedia Biblica* 903, 904.

⁵⁸ [...] *hnw n Imn n3y* “It is the residence of Amun”. It is possible that this sentence refers to the temple of Amun at Karnak. If this is so, this is of great importance, since the Assyrian troops marched towards Thebes in 667 for a month and ten days. Taharqa heard about the Assyrian advance and escaped to the opposite bank (Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen I*, 104-105: LET Vs. 34'-36'). Ashurbanipal had to abort that mission because of the revolt of the Delta rulers (Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen I*, 106-109: LET Vs. 37'-69'). Thebes was finally conquered on Ashurbanipal's second campaign against Egypt in 664, when Tanutamun succeeded Taharqa. See Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen I*, 108-109: LET Vs 71'-Rs 11. Two additional texts might be dated to 667 after the abortive campaign of Ashurbanipal to Thebes: J. Leclant, *Montuemhat: quatrième prophète d'Amon, prince de la ville* (BdE 35; Cairo 1961) 199, 202-203; Cf. J. Goldberg, “Legends of Iny and ‘Les brumes d'une chronologie qu'il est prudent de savoir flottante’”, *JSSEA* 26 (1996) 23. The second text is very fragmentary and is dated by scholars to the early years of Taharqa. See Redford, *Eretz Israel* 24 (1994) in n. 5 above. Numerous forces, horses and chariots of *dmy pn*, identified with Thebes were recruited; Someone defended the domain of Amun after they (the enemies) have descended to the south and caused the king (Taharqa) to rescue (?)... (l. 4: ... *dmy pn r iri ssmw wr[ryt] r ht nb s3w [...]* *r pr Imn m ht h3.n.w r rdi.t n.i šd ...*). The temple of Amun was as an enclosing wall (l. 5: *Pr Imn m šhr n dr*) Taharqa sailed southwards and (then) hastened to where they were, while his enemies were on the roads (l. 7: *iri.sn nn r 3w m hr.w iw.i hr hnty m sin r bw hr.w*). The enemy was finally defeated and they ran away in fear of Taharqa (l. 10: ... *wth r h3t.i iw.sn snd.i*). The final sentences concern the high inundation of year 6 as is also the case in the prayer of Taharqa discussed in this section. No Libyans or Libyan enclave is mentioned in this section and the mentioning of the inundation dates this text after Taharqa's regnal year 6. This text awaits a more thorough publication by Redford. See Redford, *Eretz Israel* 24 (1994) note 13.

⁵⁹ (6) [... ...] *m di.k hr <i>-r-m [in]k*. For the preposition *irm* see Černý-Groll, *LEG*, 107 ff.

⁶⁰ Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 41. Vernus analyzes this construction as $\bar{\text{N}}\text{P}\text{A}\text{T}\text{E}\text{Q}\text{C}\text{O}\text{T}\bar{\text{M}}$.

⁶¹ Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 31 has “Donne-moi le ciel” as an imperative. However, *i3w* can be interpreted as a past indicative *sdm.f* as *sr.k* in the beginning of the sentence. This enables us to associate both inundation and rainfall with real events that occurred in Taharqa's sixth year of reign. See below.

⁶² Macadam, *Temples of Kawa*, pl. 10: Kawa V, 3-4, 6-9. In Kawa V the inundation in Egypt and rainfall in Nubia were not foretold before Taharqa assumed kingship.

⁶³ There is a long gap. It is not clear what is missing. However it is clear that it negates the former paragraph of things that were promised to Taharqa. This is a negated adjectival sentence in which the independent pronoun expresses possession and refers to what is mentioned previously. Černý-Groll, *LEG* 13; S. I. Groll, *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian* (London 1967) 111. There is no physical space to restore the negation *bn* in the line, so it is assumed that the classical counterpart *nn* was written instead.

⁶⁴ Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 31, 43-44 (aab) reconstructs the meaning of the sentence as follows: “fais qu’il n’y ait aucun pays qui ne m’appartienne pas”; Spalinger, *CdE* 53 (1978) 30: “... the lands (??), which do not belong to me, place them under my dominion”. It should be noted that in the previous paragraph the subject is the abundant rainfall in Nubia and the inundation in Egypt. No foreign country is mentioned in any of the preceding paragraphs!

⁶⁵ Cf. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons* 36: Klch. D; 72: Trb. B; 101: Nahr el-Kalb stela partly reconstructed. The titles of Esarhaddon are *šar šarrânî mât Musur (mât) Paturisu mât Kusi*. In AsBbE 8-9 Esarhaddon claims to have conquered (*akšud*) Egypt, Patros and Kush. There is no evidence that Assyria ever conquered parts of Kush in the days of Esarhaddon, or even went south of Memphis. For a probable Assyrian threat on Thebes in 667 see n. 58.

⁶⁶ Vernus and Spalinger have misunderstood the importance of this sentence for the dating, and thus, have dated the text before the Assyrian invasion to Egypt. See note 64 above.

⁶⁷ It seems to me that *mry* belongs to the previous sentence. The verb *iri* would start a new sentence. There is no suffix pronoun or noun to act as the subject of the sentence, thus even though I would expect the form *i.iri* to act as the Late Egyptian imperative following the sequence of imperatives in this sentence, only *iri* is written. Thus, I conclude that this is the (late) Middle Egyptian imperative form without a prefix. Cf. Jansen-Winkel, *Spätmittelägyptische Grammatik* 73. It should be remembered that this text is written in the literary Late Egyptian style, which incorporates earlier phases of the language. Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 31 omits the translation of *mry* and translates *iri* as an infinitive “...faire” without anything in front of it.

⁶⁸ Wb. IV, 494.15. If we translate the sentence literally, it might be a further indication of the wounds afflicted to Taharqa during the pitched battles that were conducted during the Assyrian advancement from the Egyptian border to Memphis. Cf. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons* 99: the Sendjirli Stela lines 40-41 where Taharqa is allegedly wounded five times by Esarhaddon’s arrows. However, the verb *šni* can be translated in a more general sense such as “sorrow, trouble, suffering” and need not indicate a physical wound. Wb. IV, 495.1. For both physical and moral suffering see already Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 44, n. (aae).

⁶⁹ This sentence can also be analyzed as a Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction *iw.f (hr) sdm* and translated “while you are repelling for me the [...]”. The plural definite article *n3* and the suffix pronoun *.w* at the end of the sentence might refer to the evil words or, preferably, to the men who did not know Amun, since the verb *šn^c* “abweisen”, “abhalten” “abwehren” (Wb. IV

504 ff.) mainly refers to people.

⁷⁰ Another way to understand Taharqa's wish to bring Amun everything he loves is reciprocity. Amun will cause the population of Egypt to worship Taharqa to his satisfaction, and the king, on his part, will satisfy Amun's needs.

⁷¹ It is not uncommon in hymns to designate the addressed god as king, ruler of the two lands etc. See H. Brunner, "König" *LdÄ* III, 463.

⁷² Defined past relative form without antecedent functioning as a substitute for a noun. Černý-Groll, *LEG* 177. It is possible that this form is wrongly (!) used as a future relative form. It could be suggested that Taharqa is promising Amun to dedicate Temples for Amun in Nubia from the future tribute of *H3rw* as he did in his first decade in Kawa.

⁷³ Cf. Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 49 ff; Kitchen, *ThIP* 388-391. For the building activities of Taharqa in Nubia see: P. Wolf, *Die archäologischen Quellen der Taharqozeit im nubischen Niltal* (unpublished diss.; Berlin, 1990).

⁷⁴ See above n. 28. Cf. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs* 45, n. 126. Eph'al dates Esarhaddon's campaign against Arzâ (located at the river of Egypt) to 676/5 BC.

⁷⁵ Wb I, 508, 12. Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 46-7.

⁷⁶ It is not clear whom the 3. pl. suffix pronoun *w* denotes. It probably refers to the persons who harmed the wives and children of the king, the same people that are mentioned in line 4. It is clear that something came out of their mouths, presumably words. Note also that some people (plural) were supposed to be heard by Amun in l. 5. The only people that were mentioned in lines 4-5 are the people who did not recognize Amun.

⁷⁷ The tragic events that occurred to Taharqa's family were perceived as a magical incantation uttered by his enemies' (?) mouths (*r.w*) and could be returned to their initiator. For reversing the evil eye and other magical evil forces and sending them back to their place of origin in the ancient Near East see J. N. Ford "Ninety-Nine by the Evil Eye and One from Natural Causes" *UF* 30 (1998) 248-251.

⁷⁸ Vernus, *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 46; Spalinger, *CdE* 53 (1978) 31.

⁷⁹ W. G. Lambert, "Booty from Egypt? ", *JJS* 33 (1982) 65-66.

⁸⁰ Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen I*, 31.

⁸¹ R. G. Morkot, *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers* (London 2000) 265, n. 20.

⁸² H. Schäfer, "Eine Bronzefigur des Taharka", *ZÄS* 33 (1895) pl. VII:4. Note that the Nubian kneeling figure has only one uraeus on his head befitting a member of the royal family and not

two, as was the practice with Kushite royal crowns. I thank Prof. Török for this note.

⁸³ Whether Ushanhuru was Taharqa's son, or the son of a former king cannot be determined. For the problem of succession in the Kushite kingdom see L. Török, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (Leiden 1997) 255-262; Cf. R., Morkot, "Kingship and Kinship in the Empire of Kush", *Meroitica* 15 (1999) 188-229.

⁸⁴ A similar motive of guarding the queen and offspring of the king can be found in a text of Osorkon II: H. Jacquet-Gordon, "The Inscriptions on the Philadelphia-Cairo Statue of Osorkon II", *JEA* 46 (1960) 16, lines 11-15, 17, 20, 22-23. In this case too the children of the king died prematurely and it is not clear if his successor Takeloth II was Osorkon II's offspring. See D. A. Aston, "Takeloth II-A King of the 'Theban Twenty-third Dynasty'?", *JEA* 75 (1989) 139-153.

⁸⁵ One would expect that the text would end with Kushite retaliation to the Assyrian actions, as was the case in the description of the battle of Kadesh. However, even though Taharqa regained his rule over Lower Egypt (from the end of 671 BC at the earliest until 667), he never regained control over the Levant and Ushanhuru is never mentioned in Egyptian inscriptions.

⁸⁶ T. Kendall, "The 1997 Season of the MFA Boston at Gebel Barkal, Sudan", *NARCE* 173 (1997) 12-13. I thank Dr. Kendall for most kindly sending me an offprint of his article.