ASSYRIANS AND ARAMAENS IN THE EUPHRATES VALLEY
VIEWED FROM THE CEMETERY OF TELL SHIUHK FAWQÂNI (SYRIA)

Abstract
Tell Shiukh Fawqâni (Syria) is located on the East bank of the Euphrates near the Turkish-Syrian border. Iron Age levels have been excavated in three areas: a dwelling quarter (F), a productive area (G) and a cremation cemetery (H). This cemetery shares many characteristics with those of Karkemiš and especially of Hama. Almost 150 tombs have been found, shedding new light on cremation practice. The first studies, including radiocarbon dating, show its long-time use, from the beginning of Iron Age to the 8th century B.C. Three main features can be seen: the practice of cremation in itself, the choice of a specific area as necropolis, outside the city, and the increase in the number of iron objects as burial goods.

The paper aims at an examination of Tell Shiukh Fawqâni data, focused on the development of these characteristics in a Syro-Hittite milieu, under the domination of Aramaeans and Assyrians.

Résumé
Tell Shiukh Fawqâni (Syrie) est situé sur la rive est de l’Euphrate près de l’actuelle frontière avec la Turquie. Des niveaux de l’âge du Fer ont été trouvés dans trois secteurs : un quartier domestique (F), un quartier artisanal (G) et un cimetière à cremation (H). Ce cimetière partage de nombreuses caractéristiques avec ceux autour de Karkemiš et surtout ceux de Hama. Presque cent cinquante tombes y ont été découvertes, permettant ainsi un nouvel éclairage sur la pratique de la cremation. Les premières études, y compris des dates C14, montrent sa longue durée d’utilisation depuis le tout début de l’âge de Fer jusqu’au VIIIe siècle av. J.-C. Trois faits majeurs peuvent y être observés : la pratique de la cremation en elle-même, le choix d’un espace funéraire spécifique, hors de la zone habité, et enfin le nombre important d’objets en fer dans les dépots funéraires.

Cet article vise à examiner les données de Tell Shiukh Fawqâni en étudiant chacun de ces aspects, développés dans un milieu syro-hittite sous les dominations assyriennes et araméennes.

Tell Shiukh Fawqâni lies in North Syria, in the Euphrates Valley, near the present border with Turkey (Fig. 1). Between 1994 and 1998 it has been excavated by a French-Italian team, lead by Luc Bachelot and Frederick Mario Fales and then since 1999 by Luc Bachelot only. The cemetery proper is located on the northern outskirts of the tell. Its existence was revealed in September 1997 by the find chance of a complete jar containing human burnt bones. Between 1997 and 2003, almost 150 structures were excavated then studied in Aleppo Museum.¹ The analysis of this very large documentation is still in process, but three main features can be outlined:

- of course, the practice of cremation in itself,
- the choice of a specific funerary space, outside of the inhabited area,
- and finally, the deposit of numerous iron objects.

The dating of the necropolis constitutes one of the most important, but complicated question for two main reasons: first the rather limited corpus of contemporary material and second the fact that

some shapes were obviously reserved for funerary use. As a result the most relevant ceramics *comparanda* come mainly from cemeteries explored long before the Second World War at Hama² and around Karkemiš.³ This material gives a time range between the 12th and the 8th century B.C.,⁴ but four radiocarbon dates provided by burnt bones from Tell Shiukh Fawqâni are surprisingly slightly older, from between 1395 and 936 B.C.

The combined data pertaining to the dating show a long lasting use of the cremation graveyard, partially contemporary with the Assyrian presence in the area, that is during the Middle Assyrian period and after Shalmaneser’s conquest in the second quarter of the 9th century.⁵ At the same time, textual evidence clearly shows the massive presence of Aramaeans, particularly obvious when they conquered two Assyrian cities Pitru and Mutkinu during the reign of Aššur-rabi II (1012-972 B.C.).⁶ The graveyard was clearly in use during the “Aramaean” occupation of the region. The point could then be summarized by this quite naive question: since the part of Assyrian culture is relatively easily to evaluate, could one (or more) features of the cemetery be linked to Aramaeans?

1- The cremation practice

The cremation practice represents in itself a very important and disputed question. According to Stefania Mazzoni,⁷ it is one of the most striking features introduced at the beginning of Iron Age. The cremation did not actually appear at that moment,⁸ but this was clearly the moment at which it was the most widespread. The Tell Shiukh Fawqâni cemetery is the second largest after those of Hama, with about 150 tombs. The burnt bones were usually put in a jar then interred. The grave could be very simple: just a jar closed by a cup or bowl, and even a large potsherd, but in some cases, the cinerary urn was covered by a far larger vessel, measuring about 1 m in diameter and 1 m height (Fig. 2). This kind of objects is clearly restricted to funerary use. The deceased was sometimes buried with some belongings: spindle-whorls, astragals, beads in female graves (Fig. 3), iron weapons in male ones (Fig. 4), and some jewellery for children (Fig. 5). These graves are quite similar to those of Yunus, near Karkemiš and especially of Hama (Fig. 6), even if the painted pottery is almost completely absent at Tell Shiukh Fawqâni.⁹

In the Tell Shiukh Fawqâni case, the point is to identify who burnt their dead. The main problem in answering this question is the lack of sources, combined with evidence of various cultural backgrounds. Many scholars have stressed the significant proportion of the Hurrian population, especially near the Levantine Cost but not restricted to it, and the prominent presence of Semites.¹⁰ In addition, the real impact of the imperial Hittite conquest of the 14th century on the local population ought to be discussed, as well as the Luwian component. Thus J. David Hawkins stressed the lack of evidence for a mass migration from central Anatolia to Syria during the Hittite imperial period, but

---

² Hama was explored by a Danish team between 1931 and 1938. Two graveyards were excavated, at about 300 m and 800 m south of the tell (Riis 1948, p. 1-3). More than 1500 deposits, dating from 1200 to 720 B.C. were unearthed (Riis 1948, p. 202).
³ MOOREY 1980; WOOLLEY 1914; 1939. Around the city of Karkemiš three cremation graveyards were excavated. Just North of the tell, le cemetery of Nebe Yunus yielded at least 128 graves. 6 km north of the tell, Merj Khamis cemetery has been plundered for a long time, but Woolley could identify 30 graves, 8 of which were excavated. However, only one has been published (WOOLLEY 1939, p. 12 and 20). A third cemetery lied west of the West Gate. It is only known by objects (unpublished) brought to Woolley and Lawrence (WOOLLEY 1939, p. 12). According to Leonard Woolley, Nebe Yunus graveyard was in use from ca. 1000 B.C to the end of the 7th century B.C. (WOOLLEY 1939, p. 19).
⁵ Both are attested at Tell Shiukh Fawqâni. A Middle Assyrian occupation has been found in Area E, cf. CAPE 2005; and Neo Assyrian levels were excavated in Area F, cf. FALES, RADNER, PAPPI & ATTARDO 2005 for epigraphic finds; MAKINSON 2005 for archaeological report, and in Area G, see LUCIANI 2005.
⁶GRAYSON 1996, p. 19 (A.0.102.2). These cities were established by Tiglath-Pileser I.
⁷ MAZZONI 2000, p. 34.
⁹ See for more detailed comparisons, TENU 2007.
¹⁰ For references, see DION 1995, p. 1284; DION 1997, p. 66 and 74, or HAWKINS, 1995, p. 1297.
considers such a shift took place after the destruction of Hattuša, and the collapse of the Hittite Empire. One of the consequences of this movement would have been the generalized use of Luwian.\textsuperscript{11} Horst Klengel suggests two periods for the arrival of Luwian groups in Syria, the Hittite Empire and on the onset of Iron Age.\textsuperscript{12} But it could be argued that evidence for such migration is inexistent and as a result, the increase of Luwian use would have been essentially a cultural choice, induced by the prominent place of Karkemiš: Aramaean rulers may have ordered for their own Luwian inscriptions, or Neo-Hittite sculptures.\textsuperscript{13} According to Paul-Eugène Dion, the bulk of populations in Northern Syria was Semites and Hurrians, and the Egyptian Conquest, neither the Hittite one, neither the emergence of Neo-Hittite States change this situation.\textsuperscript{14} Hélène Sader goes further, underlining the fact that textual evidence is too scanty to shed light on the population substratum present in Iron Age Syria, with the exception of the Luwians and of the Pre-Aramaean groups themselves.\textsuperscript{15} These references, not exhaustive at all, show how the different components of local population in the area near Tell Shiukh Fawqâni are numerous, various and too interlinked to be easily isolated.\textsuperscript{16}

This specific mix of cultural influences complicates the interpretation of the few remains at our disposal as Aramaean burial practices. Paul-Eugène Dion\textsuperscript{17} focused mainly on the Zencirli Stela, underlining the difficulties of understanding this Neo-Hittite funerary monument, without further available information. Edward Lipiński pointed out the role of cremation for princely burials at least in Guzana in the 10th-9th century,\textsuperscript{18} but elsewhere links the cremation burials at Hama to a non-Semitic occupation.\textsuperscript{19} Unfortunately, the data relating to funerals and the treatment of the deceased are too meagre to infer definitive information, but the presence of large cemeteries at Tell Shiukh Fawqâni, Karkemiš and Hama could shed new light on this question. The origins of cremation are still obscure.

The importance of Karkemiš leads some scholars to attribute it to the Hittites,\textsuperscript{20} but Stefania Mazzoni rejected even late Hittite influence because of the southwards extension of the cremation burials and their development, mostly during the 8th century.\textsuperscript{21} More precisely, the cremation cemetery at Hama began at level F2 on the Citadel around the 1200-1075 B.C.,\textsuperscript{22} after the Hittite empire had lost its Syria territories. Since the best parallels for Tell Shiukh Fawqâni are to be found on that site, it seems to constitute a good argument for down-playing Hittite influence. On an other hand, Volkert Haas does not exclude an Hurrian origin for the Hittite practice itself\textsuperscript{23} particularly well documented with the royal ritual\textsuperscript{24} and the Osmankayesı graveyard.\textsuperscript{25} The question is thus very complicated, and the problem I would raise is its possible link to Aramaean groups. As I just recalled, our knowledge of Aramaean burial practices are very scanty, mainly focused on the cult of Ancestors. But many important sites where cremation is attested are clearly tied to Aramaean presence, such Hama, Tell Halaf\textsuperscript{26} or Tell Shiukh Fawqâni itself which yielded a bilingual archive.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{11} HAWKINS 1995, p. 1297.
\textsuperscript{12} KLENGEL 2000, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{13} BUNNENS 2000, 17; BUNNENS 2006, p. 97-99.
\textsuperscript{14} DION 1997, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{15} SADER 2000, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{16} A probable discrepancy between language spoken by the population and by their rulers ought to be considered (SCHWARTZ 1989, p. 281).
\textsuperscript{17} DION 1997, p. 267-270. In his synthesis, he tackles the Aramaean funerary practices only with the question of the king’s death. The topic is not even evocated for population: it clearly reveals how unknown it is.
\textsuperscript{18} LIPiŃSKI 2000a, p. 636-637.
\textsuperscript{19} LIPiŃSKI 2000b, p. 125.
\textsuperscript{21} MAZZONI 2000, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{22} RiS 1948, p. 202. FUGMANN 1958, p. 275. On the basis of comparison with Tell Afis material, Stefania Mazzoni suggests rather a 11th date, more than a 12th one (MAZZONI 2000, p. 34).
\textsuperscript{23} HAAS 1995, 2023. On this question, see also TENU 2005, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{24} CHRISTMANN-FRANCK 1971; HAAS 1995, p. 2024-2027.
\textsuperscript{25} BITTEL 1958.
\textsuperscript{26} NAUMANN 1950, p. 159; OPPENHEIM 1939, p. 244-245.
\textsuperscript{27} FALES, RADNER, PAPPI & ATTARDO 2005.
The origins of Aramaeans tribes remain a very disputed topic,28 but more and more scholars share nowadays a convergent opinion. In Northern Syria,29 Aramaeans would not have been “newcomers,” but agro-pastoralist groups living in North Mesopotamia long before their presumed “arrival” at the end of the Late Bronze Age. The shift was not a migration, but a change in the political and social fabric, local rural communities, perhaps with nomadic tribes or uprooted groups, becoming its nodal element.30 One of the arguments could be found in their name itself, connected to the land of Aram, which extended from the Habur to the foot of Mount Lebanon.31 Even if this etymology is contested,32 some tribes, later clearly Aramaean, are already mentioned in Middle Assyrian record, as living in Upper Mesopotamia.33 Edward Lipiński suggests confederations of Aramaic-speaking tribes appeared in the 13th century, and are acknowledged as a new entity by Assyrians at the end of the 12th century.34

More precisely, Tell Shuikh Fawqâni is located in the area where Aramaean presence is well documented in cuneiform texts. At the beginning of the 11th century, Aramaeans are fought by Tiglath-pileser I in the Euphrates Valley “from the edge of the Land of Suhu to the city of Karkemiš”,35 and later the sector of Pitru and Mutkinu is conquered by them at the transition of the 11th-10th centuries.36 Moreover, on the basis of philological arguments, Edward Lipiński suggests that the surroundings of Marina (name of Tell Shuikh Fawqâni in a Middle Assyrian letter found at Tell Sheikh Hamad)37 were occupied by Aramaeans, perhaps designated by the general term “Sutû,” as early as the 14th-13th centuries BC.38 This dating corresponds to the oldest radio carbon dates from Tell Shuikh Fawqâni cemetery.

More generally, the presence of Aramaean groups in northern Syria could be an accurate explanation for the isolated cremation graves dated as early as the 13th century in Assyrian contexts at Tell Mohammed Diyâd39 and Tell Sabi Abyad.40 Actually, the Mesopotamian conception of afterlife41 seems so incompatible with cremation that attributing these graves to another population

---

29 The situation in Babylonia and along the Middle Euphrates Valley seems very different (LIPiŃSKI 2000, p. 409-422). The place of the Aramaeans in Babylonia proper occupies only a few pages in P.-E. Dion’s book (DION 1997, p. 22-25). This choice obviously indicates he considers this question irrelevant for his study focused on North.
30 BÜNNENS 2000, p. 16; KLENGEL 2000, p. 25.
31 SADER, 2000, p. 65.
32 Edward Lipiński proposed as etymology for Aram “wild bulls” (LIPiŃSKI 2000a, p. 52). See also ZADOK 1991, p. 106.
33 LIPiŃSKI 1997, p. 49. Moreover Nahor Abraham’s brother and Aram’s grandfather (Gen 22, 21) was named after the city Naharû located near Harran in Upper Mesopotamia. The last attestation of this city goes back to the 13th century B.C. in Middle Assyrian record (LIPiŃSKI 2000, p. 65, note 68; 76). See also LEMAIRe 1984. For a point concerning the tradition of an Aramaean origin in the Land of Qîr (near Emar?), see LIPiŃSKI, 2000a, p. 40-45. and 2000b, p. 131.
34 LIPiŃSKI 1997, p. 50.
35 GRAYSON 1991, p. 23. This passage is the first one where ‘Aramaean’ proper is written (Ahlamû-Aramaean). According to Edward Lipiński, the term ‘Ahlamû’ does not designate a peculiar ethnic group or a specific tribe, but pertains more generally to roaming nomads. Etymologically, the word means “lad” or “boy” (LIPiŃSKI 2000a, 38). This opinion is shared by Paul-Eugène Dion (DION 1997, p. 16). G. Schwartz considers Aramaeans as an ethnic group, associated with a specific language, the Aramaic (SCHWARTZ 1989, p. 281). See also HERLES 2007, esp. p. 339 and MASETTI-ROUAULT this volume. Ahlamû/Aramaean could be understood as “enemy” in Assyrian record.
38 LIPiŃSKI 2000a, 176, note 75. The Sutû constitute a confederation of nomadic tribes, and an ethnic entity (HELTZER 1981, p. 83; LIPiŃSKI 2000, p. 39). At the beginning of the 1st Millennium, the name lost this precise meaning and concerns nomads or robbers in general, which was not the case before (HELTZER 1981, p. 90; LIPiŃSKI 2000a, p. 40). For a brief presentation of Suteans in the Mari Texts, see JOANNEs 1997, p. 408-411.
39 SAUVAGE 2005.
40 AUKERMANS and ROSSMEISL 1990, p. 17 et AUKERMANS et WIGGERSMANN 1999, p. 65. Andrzej Reiche kindly informed me he has found a Middle Assyrian cremation jar at Nemrik.
41 See JOANNEs 2005, esp. p. 82 and ABRAHAM 2005, p. 88.
seems to be the best solution. In this case, pre-Aramaeans people could be good candidates, even if not the only ones.

2 - A new funerary space

The use of a specific area to bury the dead seems rather new at the beginning of the Iron Age in Syria. During the Late Bronze Age, by far the most widespread practice was to bury the dead under houses (or palaces) floors. At Tell Shiukh Fawqâni itself, the necropolis is located North-East of the tell, about 70 m from its base (Fig. 7). The graveyard was clearly delimited by a wadi, which deeply cut the Holocene terrace. The very hard earth and pebbles which constitute it did not allow for the easy and quick diggings of burial pits. On the contrary, it was far harder to bury cinerary urns here than in the tell. The nature of the burial ground precludes any micro-stratigraphic analysis, but we can suppose that the summit of some (if not all) burials were intentionally kept visible. The existence of signalling stelae or stones is not attested at Shiukh, but is known at Hama and Karkemiş.

The development of necropolis on the outskirts of cities is parallel to a wider use of cremation during Iron Age at Karkemiş, Hama, Sukas, Bassit, but the two phenomena do not overlap completely. Actually some cremation burials go back to the Late Bronze Age, notably at Alalakh, Tell Mohammed Diyab or Tell Sabi Abyad. Alalakh, modern Atchana, situated in the Orontes Valley, was excavated by L. Woolley. Thirteen cremation graves were published. Dated between the 15th and the mid 12th centuries, they were interred under houses floors. At Tell Mohammed Diyab, one cremation burial, and seven inhumations as well, were excavated in association to domestic architectural remains. Unfortunately, the archaeological deposits were to eroded too know if the graves were interred under houses floors or after their abandonment. Concerning Tell Sabi Abyad, only little information has so far been published, but the cremation graves were usually buried in collapsed houses. Generally speaking, they were interred on the tell itself, not placed outside the inhabited area. Even in the two last cases in which a strict relation between houses still occupied and burials under them is less obvious, the point is that the burial ground is not separated from the living quarters. Some ruined houses have been used for funeral purpose, but the site was still wholly occupied.

The cremation is striking and unusual; we focus on its significance especially as opposed to inhumation, and ultimately pay less attention to the consequences of change in funerary space. Moreover the non-systematic association cremation/cemetery become striking by considering precisely also inhumations. At Karkemiş, with the exception of the ‘Gold Tomb’, no grave were found inside the city: inhumations were rejected as well as cremations beyond the walled area. In Tell Shiukh Fawqâni graveyard, five inhumation graves were identified as well as a bi-ritual one, in which
burnt bones of a deceased were placed on the legs of a non-cremated person. The other inhumations were very badly preserved, and according to Isabelle Le Goff, it could be explained by an anteriority of this practice gradually replaced –certainly even not completely– by cremation. It seems likely that the change in funerary space preceded the widespread of cremation.

The interpretation of the choice of burying the deceased on the outskirts of the inhabited space remains conjectural, but it certainly did signal an important shift in the relationships between the dead and the living. It clearly implicates major changes on the social behaviour linked to the funerals. Instead of a rather intimate setting provided by the house, the burials took place in an open area, visible from the site. Even if the pyre could be relatively plain and limited, the cremation proper was certainly conducted in a public sector, outside the site because of its duration (sometimes 19 hours for an adult) and its specific nature. As far as we know the importance of appropriate funeral rituals to allow for rest in afterlife, it is hardly conceivable such events were unimportant. We can also infer that these new practices shaped new ancestors cults which seem still very important according to Dominik Bonatz. Could this shift be related to the relative decline of the urban way of life that followed or accompanied the end of Late Bronze Age? I am unable to answer, but the strong ties that linked a family to their house (and the problems raised by its eventual sale) were thus broken. The Tell Shiukh Fawqâni analyses are still in process, but we hope to find schemes in the organization of the different tombs. For instance we wonder whether the bath tubs tombs were not attraction points for later burials.

3- The increase of iron objects in graves

The third hallmark to be discussed is the importance of iron deposits in the tombs. At Hama too, the level F2 (ca. 1200-ca. 1075 B.C.) is marked by new elements, two of which are iron and cremation.

At Tell Shiukh Fawqâni, of the 95 tombs found in 2000, 41 contained burials goods and 15 included iron objects. Iron is not restricted to men; some tools, maybe tied to wool work, and tweezers were found in female graves (Fig. 8). In one grave, more than 30 arrowheads were deposited: some above the bones, some at the bottom of the jar (Fig. 9). For two graves containing iron objects, we have radio carbon dates at our disposal.

The first one (tomb 2528) was the first covered by a bath tub we found: it contained arrowheads and an axe blade. It belongs to a man of about 40 years old and is dated between 1251-1051 or 1306-981 (Fig. 10).

The second (tomb 2584) is a double burial with a male adult and a child (Fig. 11). Eight arrowheads were deposited with beads. The radiocarbon dates gives a time range comprised between 1192 and 1008 or 1260 and 936 B.C. (Fig. 12).

In the Tell Shiukh Fawqâni case, the iron deposits could betray the relative wealth of the deceased. Such weapons would have been still rare, since the generalized use of iron objects is dated to the 9th century B.C. However the presence of relatively large quantity of this metal (putting to one side its ancient date) is not really puzzling in the cemetery since Area G on the eastern slope of the tell yielded

52 Le Goff, personal communication. The radio carbon dates provided by this tomb (2592) are the oldest we got: 1367-1124 B.C. or 1395-1041 B.C.  
53 P. J. Riis signals some graves containing non burnt remains of babies (Riis 1948, p. 4).  
54 For some practical information concerning the construction of the pyre, and the conduct of cremation, see Grevin 2005.  
56 At Tell Sheikh Hamad, cremation burials were found inside houses. More precisely the pyre was dug into the floor, and after cremation had taken place, fully buried (personal communication of Hartmut Kühne). Some similar structures were also found at Ziyaret Tepe and preliminary interpreted as kilns or metal-working facilities (Matney et alii 2002, p. 55-56). To my knowledge, this type of tomb is still very rare: it is later, dated to the 7th century B.C.  
57 Bonatz 2000.  
58 Fugmann 1958, p. 275; Riis 1948, p. 200.  
59 Waldman 1980, p. 82.
a production area, particularly devoted to iron metallurgy. This activity seems contemporary with the end of the cemetery and clearly reveals, as Marta Luciani stressed, the connection of the site – via the Sajour and Euphrates waterway system – to the numerous iron deposits north of Karkemiş, Maraş, Diyarbakır and Amanus Mountains. The iron metallurgy is not new at the onset of Iron Age but was, so far, mainly devoted to non utilitarian purposes. Effectively, due to its physical property, wrought iron is softer, less attractive than bronze and the reasons of such a change ought to be mostly found in socio-economic context, even if discovery of carburization clearly changed the deal. Two main explanations are no longer credited: the collapse of Hittite empire would have broken their monopoly or the metallurgy was introduced by the Philistines, iron smith, arrived with the “Sea Peoples”. Mario Liverani proposed to explain the emergence of iron metallurgy in the larger context of the collapse of the LBA socio-economic structures. Tin supplies were disrupted, and at the same time “a centrifugal expansion of the nomadic element” finding new routes, linked to the domestication of dromedary, gave conditions both for prospecting and technological experiences. In addition, iron ores deposits are locally present throughout the Near East and far more easily to spot and to exploit than those of copper. To sum up, all the conditions were gathered to make the wider use of iron possible. Many reservations about this theory ought to be brought. The importance of the shift in the economic fabric is certainly less important than continuities and the dozens of bronze objects found in the Levant contradict also this

62 Lists of iron artefacts earlier than Iron Age can be found in McNutt 1990, (5th-3th Millennia) p. 118-120; (MBA) p. 122; (LBA) p. 124-126. See also Waldbaum 1978, p. 17-23.
64 The wrought iron is obtained after the bloom (produced by reduction of parent ore) is reheated in a forge and hammered (McNutt 1990, p. 113).
66 McNutt 1990, p. 112.
69 Moorey 1994, p. 286.
70 McNutt 1990, p. 152.
71 A synthesis on Hittite (and more generally Anatolian) contribution to iron metallurgy has been proposed by Muhly, Maddin, Stechi and Özgen in 1985. They conclude: “A significant change in ironworking took place after 1200 B.C. and there is little evidence to show what, if anything, the Hittites could have contributed toward this change.” (p. 82).
73 Liverani 1987, p. 70.
74 The evidence for a widespread use of dromedaries by Aramaeans is scanty, Dion 1997, p. 342-344; Schwartz 1989, p. 282.
75 Liverani 1987, p. 70-71.
hypothesis. Nevertheless, the place Mario Liverani grants to mobiles groups in the emergence of iron as basic utility metal is maybe not to be denied, since they may have been involved in prospecting and trade of iron. Assyrian records of booty, even slightly later, revealed the place of iron in Aramaean states. The most important quantities of it given as booty pertain to North-West states, such as Supru, Yahan, Sam’al and especially Bit-Zamani. At once Aššurnasirpal II received from this last state 300 talents of iron. Later Damascus was able to pay to Adad-nirari III 2000 or 5000 talents of iron. This huge quantity does not only betray the privileged place of the state on major trade routes but also revealed its own mining activity. To a lesser extent, Lower Habur states were also able to deliver iron, likely previously obtained by trade, perhaps partly fluvial. In this geography the preeminent place of the region north of Karkemiš could easily be explained by numerous iron ores. Unfortunately evidence for ironworking in Anatolia at the Early Iron Age is very rare, contrary to Palestine sphere where material is very rich. Once again, the numerous iron objects found in Tell Shiuq Fawqâni graveyard could not be only explained by the Hittite influence on ironworking. But the site seems to be in a privileged position: closed to iron ores, and on routes allowing for a quick diffusion of technologies. Recent excavations gradually bear new attestations of iron utility objects, bridging the gap between the LBA and the EIA in Syria and South-Eastern Anatolia. Thus we might recall the iron items found on sites located in the Upper Tigris Valley. At Giricano A. Schachner found iron bracelets in cremation burials dating after the end of the Middle Assyrian occupation. At Kenan Tepe an iron working activity is also attested in Early Iron Age levels. On the neighbouring site of Grê Dimê a warrior grave yielded a sword (70cm in length), six arrowheads and a ring, all in iron. Norbert Karg proposed a date between 1150 and 1000/950 B.C., but the context is clearly not Assyrian because of the find of potteries belonging to “Eastern Anatolian EIA” corpus, including Groovy Pottery.

Thus due to the non-Assyrian context of these different attestations it seems rather clear that appearance of iron dated after Aramaeans had overwhelmed the Assyrians, probably short after the date of Giricano Archive (1069 B.C.). Groovy ware is usually not considered as a “marker” of Aramaean presence, but Jeffrey Szuchman sees no inconvenient to correlate this pottery type to Aramaean groups leaving in this area. Consequently in these cases as well, the ironworking is attested in connection (chronologically and spatially) with Aramaean occupation.

Available data are still scanty but we can put forward the theory that Aramaeans could have been involved in the transport, prospecting, and perhaps in the working of iron. In the 11th century, having

---

80 Hélène Sader notices that Ahlamû-Aramaeans may have controlled trade routes as soon as the reign of Aššur-bêl-kala. Consequently they were able to accumulate raw materials and became considerably wealthy (Sader 2000, p. 69).
83 Waldbaum 1978, p. 64.
84 Waldbaum 1978, p. 35. At the time she wrote her book, only sixteen iron objects dating from the 11th to the 10th century could be securely mentioned, yielded by only four sites: Assarlik, Tarsus, Sardis and Iassos. See also Waldbaum 1978, p. 24-27. In Syria proper, the only site which yielded iron is Hama (Waldbaum 1978, p. 27-29).
85 Moorey 1994, p. 289. See also Waldbaum 1978, p. 24-27. In Syria proper, the only site which yielded iron is Hama (Waldbaum 1978, p. 27-29).
86 Iron objects such as knives, points, blades, and tweezers were also found in Nebe Yunus (Woolley 1939).
88 Parker 2004, p. 591. No Middle Assyrian level has so far been excavated on the site. However few sherds belonging to Middle Assyrian assemblage were found (Parker 2004, 591).
89 Karg 2001, p. 676.
90 Middle Assyrian pottery as well as Neo Assyrian is attested on the site, Karg 2001, p. 681-682; Karg 2002, p. 728-733.
91 Karg 2001, p. 678-680. However Groovy Pottery could be contemporaneous with the latest phases of Middle Assyrian occupation, see for references Szuchman this volume, note 38
92 Radner 2004, p. 115-117; Tenu in press b, Szuchman this volume.
93 Schachner 2002, p. 26; Schachner and Roaf 2005, p. 120.
94 Szuchman this volume.
taken control in southern Anatolia over iron supplies situated in area previously disputed between the Hittites and Assyrians, they would have widely spread objects and technology linked to them. The evidence for a more ancient widespread iron metallurgy than previously thought is more and more numerous with the increase of excavations in the Euphrates and Tigris Valley.

Conclusion

To sum up, and to return to the question asked by this workshop’s proponents, the cremation necropolis does not seem to be tied to the Middle or Neo Assyrian presence, even if it is contemporary with it. More precisely, the necropolis material—notably the burial jars—has no parallel on Area F, in Še-ušnī’s house, and only a few in production Area G (Fig. 13)95. This discrepancy could be explained by chronology, but it does not seem random, if the cremation necropolis uses stop before the occupation of Še-ušnī house. Martin Makinson who studied the material provided by Area F, where the Assyro-Aramaic archive was found, stressed the almost complete absence of Assyrian influence in the local culture before the Middle of the 8th century and the Sargonic period. We can suppose that the reinforcement of Assyrian presence and control, during Sennacherib’s reign, put an end to the cremation graveyard. But we may also consider that people who cremated their dead were perhaps not “Assyrianized” enough to adopt Assyrian material culture, and moreover their burial practices.

If the weight of Assyrian presence seems relatively easy to perceive, the question of the Aramaean one is far more complicated to tackle since Aramaeans still remain elusive in many respects, and more particularly in their material culture. The situations, settings and archaeological sites associated with them could be so different, so distant in time, and so far apart, that they resist all attempts to define common cultural traits. The very cautious use of the term ‘Aramaean’ for archaeological matters is fully justified precisely by this lack of features widely shared by Aramaean groups. Actually the inexistence of ‘one’ material culture associated to them could stem from their own nature. Indeed, one may point out the inaccuracy of the idea of an ‘sentiment national araméen,’ or of a cultural entity clearly identified since even Aramaean rulers never use the term ‘Aramaean’ to designate themselves, but the expression ‘son of PN’.96 There is finally no reason to search a cultural or ethnical entity which might not have existed to them. But the consequence of that is the almost complete reluctance of scholars to envisage a possible link between archaeological remains and Aramaeans population. In this paper, I don’t intend at all defining Aramaean material culture, but it seemed relevant to me not systematically deny all archaeological visibility to Aramaeans. The lack of a unique and homogenous Aramaean material culture does not involve nothing could be tied to them. At Tell Shiuuk Fawqâni, the development of the cremation cemetery may be associated with Aramaeans groups living in the area. Apparently Aramaeans inclined to adopt other cultural features, as proposed also by Jeffrey Schuzman. If so, it is irrelevant to search common cultural characteristics or “universal” Aramaean hallmarks as well as to deny any accuracy in connecting archaeological sites to Aramaean groups (especially during the EIA) just because it is not attested in all cases, everywhere at any time.
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Fig. 1 - Map
Fig. 2 - Cremation graves at Tell Shiukh Fawqānī: 4051: cinerary jar covered by a plate, 4052: cinerary jar with burial goods (4054 and 4055), 4048: empty crater in secondary context, 4026: bath tub covering two cinerary jars and other deposits (photo by A. Tenu).
Fig. 3 - Material from a female grave (2441-3) (photo by A. Pelle)

Fig. 4 - Burial goods from a male burial (2441-1) (photo by A. Pelle)
Fig. 5 - Bronze bracelets from a child burial (2444) (photo by A. Pelle)

Fig. 6 - Funerary jar from TSF (1306-1094 B.C. or 1383-1016 B.C.), very similar to one of Hama (Riis 1948, 7) (photo by Mission archéologique de Tell Shiukh Fawqâni).
Fig. 7 - The cremation cemetery seen from South East (photo by A. Tenu).

Fig. 8 Tweezers from a female grave (2447-1) (photo by A. Pelle)
Fig. 9 - Iron tools and weapons from a male burial (2443) (photo by A. Pelle)
Fig. 10 - Complete assemblage of grave 2584 (1192-1008 B.C. or 1260-936 B.C.) (photo by A. Pelle). The child remains are visible close to the head of the adult (photo by A. Pelle).
Fig. 11 - Iron arrowheads *in situ* (grave 2584) (photo by Mission archéologique de Tell Shiukh Fawqâni).

Fig. 12 - Iron weapons from grave 2528 (photo by A. Pelle).
Fig. 13 Very low carinated plate (photo by A. Pelle).