

The Relations of the States East of the Jordan with the Mesopotamian Powers during the First Millennium BC

It is not only in the second half of our century that we have come to the realization that the stability and well-being of smaller nations are dependent upon the interests and the resulting political aspirations of the larger powers. This has probably been the case ever since humanity organized itself into nations or nation-like communities. It would, therefore, not be difficult to list examples from modern or ancient history.

As an example, I will restrict myself to calling to your attention the precarious situation of the city and territorial states of Greater Syria (Bilād aš-Šām) during the second half of the 2nd millennium BC when they were in relationship to the larger powers of Egypt, Mitanni and the Hittite empire. This situation was especially difficult when the aforementioned powers were in conflict with each other.

The following will be a discussion of the 1st millennium BC and will focus on the Transjordanian states and their relationship to the powerful nations of their time. In spite of a few incursions into Asia, Egypt could not play a decisive role after the first half of the 12th century. Therefore, the Great Powers in question are the Neo-Assyrian, the Neo-Babylonian and the Achaemenid empires whose power bases lay solely or to a great extent in Mesopotamia. As Transjordanian states, I refer to those countries whose respective geographical centres were situated east of the Jordan river and the Wādī l-ʿAraba—the states of the Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites. Only these states could have engaged in certain political policies as a result of their geographical position between Palestine and the Syrian Desert (Bādiyat aš-Šām), the Yarmūk and the Gulf of al-ʿAqaba. The question which arises is how and to what degree their political policies differed from those of their neighbours to the north and west. Aram-Damascus, Israel and Judah, the other countries which occasionally ruled portions of the Transjordanian territory, cannot be considered in this context. Their histories demonstrate that their political policies were significantly determined by factors which were related to the position of their respective heartlands, outside of the previously described geographical area.

Transjordan and the Neo-Assyrian Empire

The first Assyrian king who appeared with his troops in central

and southern Syria was Shalmaneser III. At first he encountered considerable opposition. In 853 BC Shalmaneser marched against the Central Syrian state of Hamath on the Orontes for the first time. At the city of Qarqara (the modern Qarqūr,¹ about 80 km northwest of Ḥamā) he was confronted with a coalition composed of Syrian and Phoenician states supported by Egyptian and Arabic contingents. This put an early end to his advance.² Shalmaneser's military expeditions in 849, 848 and 845 also foundered as a result of the same or similar defensive fronts.³ Only as coups d'état in Damascus and Samaria⁴ brought about a disintegration of this alliance was Shalmaneser capable of penetrating to Damascus in the years 841, 838 and 837, and of endangering the politically isolated usurper Hazael.⁵ Yet Hazael succeeded in surviving, and, after the departure of the Assyrians, was even able to establish his supremacy in southern Syria. All in all, Shalmaneser's cam-

¹ For the identification and the site, see Dussaud 1927: 242; Noth 1955: 39; 1956: 81; Klengel 1970: 53. 65 fn. 14; Courtois 1973: 88 and pl. II.

² Sources: G. Smith 1870: 7f. rev. 89–102 (the most detailed version); Cameron 1950: 13 (Michel 1952: 464f.) II 26–32; Billerbeck and Delitzsch 1908: 146. 148f., 71–74; Safar 1951: 7f. II 17–25; Layard 1851: 90 (Michel 1955: 148f.), 59–66; Laessøe 1959: 151 B 10'–16'; Hulin 1963: 53f., 29–34; Messerschmidt 1911: no. 30 (Michel 1947: 57. 59f.) I 14–24.

³ Sources: *Campaign of 849* (regnal year 10): Cameron 1950: 14 (Michel 1952: 466f.) II 60–67; Billerbeck and Delitzsch 1908: 147. 149, 87–89; Schroeder 1922: no. 110 (Michel 1947: 67) rev. 9–11; Boissier 1903: 83f. obv. 17'–20'. *Campaign of 848* (regnal year 11): Cameron 1950: 15 (Michel 1952: 466–69) III 3–10; Billerbeck and Delitzsch 1908: 147. 149f., 92–94; Safar 1951: 11 II 57–III 5; Layard 1851: 91 (Michel 1955: 150f.), 88f. *Campaign of 845* (regnal year 14): Cameron 1950: 15 (Michel 1952: 468f.) III 26–33; Billerbeck and Delitzsch 1908: 148. 150, 100–102; Safar 1951: 10 III 17–25; Layard 1851: 91f. (Michel 1955: 152f.), 91f.; Lehmann-Haupt 1907: 34f. (Michel 1964: 152f.), 21–*27. 40f. (Michel 1964: 152), 14–17; Schramm 1973: 75 III b 7 rev. 9'–12'.

⁴ For Damascus (death of Hadadezer/'Benhadad I', accession of Hazael) see Messerschmidt 1911: no. 30 (Michel 1947: 57. 60) I 25–27; compare II Kings 8: 7–15; for Israel (murder of Joram, accession of Jehu) see II Kings 9f.

⁵ Sources: *Campaign of 841* (regnal year 18): Billerbeck and Delitzsch 1908: 150f., 41–51; G. Smith 1870: 5 no. 6; Safar 1951: 11f. III 45–IV 15; Kinnier Wilson 1962: 94, 21–30; Layard 1851: 92 (Michel 1955: 154f.), 97–99; Messerschmidt 1911: no. 30 (Michel 1947: 57f. 60f.) I 27–II 2; Brinkman 1973: 42f. right side. *Campaigns of 838* (regnal year 21; capture of the town of Malahu) and 837 (regnal year 22; capture of the town of Danabu): Ungnad 1938: 433 Cb 4 sub 838 and 837 (entry for 838: a-na KUR(māt) M[a-]l[a]-bi, see Reade 1978: 251f. with fig. 1a); Gurney and Finkelstein 1957: no. 46, 3f. (line 3: [...] M[a-]l[a]-bi, see Reade 1978: 251f. with fig. 1b); Layard 1851: 92 (Michel 1955: 154f.), 102–104; Laessøe 1959: 154 E 9'–19'. See also Schroeder 1924/25: 70f. (Michel 1949: 269f. no. 24) (campaign of 838). On the literary and chronological problems regarding the campaigns against Malahu and Danabu see Reade 1978: 254.

paings against Hamath and Damascus were no more than raids, causing the victims economic losses but without far-reaching consequences.⁶ The Transjordanian states are not mentioned in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser, as they were probably too involved with their internal affairs between 853 and 837 to take part in the larger political arena. It has often been assumed that ¹Bašša mār Ruḥūbi^{kur} Amanāya, who is mentioned as a participant at the battle of Qarqara in 853,⁷ was an Ammonite king.⁸ Emil Forrer, however, demonstrated in 1932⁹ that this name is that of a ruler of Beth-Rehob, the southern neighbour of Hamath, which appears in the Bible and later Assyrian texts under the designation of Zobah.¹⁰ The gentilic ^{kur}Amanāya does not refer to the Ammonite state; rather it refers to Mt Amana, which is situated in the northern half of the Antilebanon mountain range (Ġabal aš-Šarqī).¹¹ We have no *definite* knowledge of why the Ammonites refrained from taking part in the political events of this time. Perhaps their situation was akin to that of the Moabites, who under King Mesha had freed themselves in bloody battles from Israel just prior to 853, winning back previously lost territory, and were consequently occupied with the reconstruction of their country.¹² Finally, Edom had been a Judaeon province until it was able, at some time between 848 and 841, to gain its independence.¹³

After 837 Shalmaneser III and Shamshi-Adad v, his son and successor, were engaged in other regions of the Near East, so that the states of Central and Southern Syria were left to themselves and their internal rivalries and altercations.

It was not until 796 that the Assyrians once again made their presence felt in this region.¹⁴ Apparently Adad-nerari III, the successor of Shamshi-Adad v, came to the aid of king Zakkur of Hamath and Luash, who was hard pressed by a confederacy of several North-Syrian states and Aram-Damascus. The campaign, which led to the annihilation of the coalition and the rescue of Zakkur,¹⁵ was exploited by Adad-nerari in order to attack Damascus, besieging King Birhadad, the

son of Hazael.¹⁶ Adad-nerari was persuaded to retreat by a payment of weighty tribute. Here again we are dealing with a predatory expedition, whose primary purpose was to finance the campaign to Hamath. Several of Aram's neighbours, indirect beneficiaries of the weakening of Birhadad, took the opportunity, as did Damascus, to pay a one-time tribute to Adad-nerari. The tributaries which Adad-nerari names in this connection are the Phoenician states of Tyre and Sidon, the Philistine states in the southern coastal plain of Palestine, Israel, and Edom.¹⁷ This is the earliest mention of a Transjordanian state in Assyrian inscriptions, and obviously raises the question as to how the Ammonite kingdom and Moab handled themselves in this situation. An answer cannot be given at present, although it cannot be excluded from consideration that even the more complete enumeration of the tributaries of 796, present on one of Adad-nerari's stone slab inscriptions from Kalḫu (Nimrūd),¹⁸ is selective and does not list every name.

Nothing except the bare fact of the isolated campaign of Shalmaneser IV against Ḥadyān of Damascus in 773, and the reactions which it must have induced from the neighbouring states, is known from incidental information.¹⁹ We do know, however, the effect of his actions on at least one of the South-Syrian states. The weakening of Aram was among the factors which made it possible for Jeroboam II of Israel to fulfil his far-reaching reunion and expansion policy, to which, in the end, the kingdom of Aram-Damascus fell victim.²⁰ Apparently, however, Jeroboam respected the territorial integrity of his Transjordanian neighbours.

After Shalmaneser IV, Assyria underwent a period of weakness resulting in the limitation of its freedom of movement.²¹ Foreign policy of this period was shaped by the rise of Urartu as a rival to the Assyrians in northwestern Iran and northern Syria, while domestic policy was moulded by ever-increasing unrest and rebellion. The situation was radically transformed in 745 when Tiglath-pileser III came to power as the result of a revolt.²² His rule marked a turning point in Assyrian foreign policy. Under his rule, the period of uncoordinated

⁶ See M. Weippert forthcoming.

⁷ ¹Ba-²sa DUMU(mār) Ru-ḫu-bi^{kur} A-ma-na-a G. Smith 1870: 7f. rev. 95.

⁸ See, e.g., Delitzsch 1881: 294; Winckler 1895a: 141f.; Albright 1921: 55 fn. 1; 1953: 136 fn. 26; Kittel 1922: 323. 325 fn. 3; Noth 1946–51: 27 fn. 2 (= 1971: 459 fn. 89); M. F. Unger 1957: 68; Timm 1982: 183; Cross 1985.

⁹ Forrer 1932a: 134; 1932b; compare Tadmor 1961: 245 with fn. 50; Malamat 1973: 144.

¹⁰ M. Weippert 1971: 269. 601 fn. 866; 1972: 159f.; 1982a: 406 fn. 29.

¹¹ M. Weippert 1971: 269f.

¹² Mesha's own report on his achievements in his stela inscription from Dībān, Donner and Röllig 1971: no. 181; translations in van Zyl 1960: 189–192; Donner and Röllig 1968: 168f. (W. Röllig); Pritchard 1969: 320f. (W. F. Albright); Tūqān 1970: 49f.; Gallig 1979: 51–53; Kaiser 1982–85: 646–650 (H.-P. Müller).

¹³ II Kings 8: 20–22; cf. Bartlett 1972: 30f.; M. Weippert 1982b: 294.

¹⁴ For the following, see M. Weippert forthcoming (with bibliography).

¹⁵ Zakkur's own report in his stela inscription from Āfis, Donner and Röllig 1971: no. 202, face A. Translations: Pritchard 1969: 655 (F. Rosenthal); Donner and Röllig 1968: 204f. (H. Donner). According to an unpublished Assyrian stela inscription of Adad-nerari III in the Archaeological Museum of Antakya, which gives ¹Za-ku-ri (line 4, genitive; information courtesy J. D. Hawkins), the name of the king is not *Zakūr, as formerly thought, but Zakkūr.

¹⁶ Sources: Norris 1861: 35 no. 1 (M. Weippert 1971: 55–57; Tadmor 1973: 148f.), 14–21; Page 1968: 142f. (M. Weippert 1971: 486f.; Tadmor 1973: 143), 6–8; E. Unger 1916: 10f. (M. Weippert 1971: 477. 479; Tadmor 1973: 145), 18–20. In the Assyrian texts, this king is called Mari', a designation which still is an enigma. For the problems involved, see M. Weippert 1971: 59; Millard and Tadmor 1973: 63 fn. 22. Birhadad b. Ḥazā'il is also known from the Zakkur stela (Donner and Röllig 1971: no. 202 A 4: *Brhd br Ḥz'l mlk 'rm*), and from the Bible (II Kings 13: 3. 24f.: *Ben-Hādād ben-Hāzā'el*).

¹⁷ Mentioned as KUR(māt) Ū-du-mu in Norris 1861: 35 no. 1 (M. Weippert 1971: 55; Tadmor 1973: 148), 12.

¹⁸ Norris 1861: 35 no. 1 (see fn. 17), 12: Tyre, Sidon, <Beth> Omri (Israel), Edom, Philistaea. The shorter version enumerates only king Joash of Samaria (Israel), the Tyrians and the Sidonians; Page 1968: 142, 8f.

¹⁹ The campaign is mentioned in the inscription on the obverse (lines 1–10) of an unpublished Assyrian stela, found at Pazarcık on the Aksu river, and preserved in the Archaeological Museum of Maraş (information courtesy J. D. Hawkins); the date is provided by the eponym chronicle, Ungnad 1938: 430 Cb 1. 432 Cb 2 *sub* 773.

²⁰ II Kings 14: 25. 28; cf. M. Weippert 1976–80a: 203.

²¹ M. Weippert 1982a: 395f.

²² For the following, see M. Weippert 1982a.

Assyrian raids into southern Syria ceased. He intended, with his military and political undertakings, to dominate permanently the conquered countries, even those in regions far away from the nucleus of the Assyrian state.

The western expansion of Assyria under Tiglath-pileser III was executed in two phases. In the first phase, from 745 until 738, Tiglath-pileser eliminated the potentially large power of Urartu, and conquered all of northern Syria and parts of Asia Minor. The North-Syrian state of Arpad, Pattina/Unqi and Hamath's province Ḥadrik (Ass. Ḥatarikka, Biblical Hadrak) were annexed and transformed into provinces of the Assyrian empire. In 734, after an interval of three years in which he was occupied to the north and east of Assyria, Tiglath-pileser appeared in southern Syria. Here his primary rivals were Aram-Damascus under Raḍyān and Israel under Pekah. Only after three years of bitter fighting was he able to break their opposition and annex Aram and large portions of Israel.²³ At the conclusion of the second phase of the Assyrian western expansion (735–32) the dominion of Tiglath-pileser encompassed all of Syria and stretched to the borders of Egypt. The states which preserved their autonomy, either due to peaceful subservience or to a pro-Assyrian coup d'état at the last minute in order to avoid conquest, were required to surrender annual tribute to the king of Assyria. In a clay tablet from the year 728 Tiglath-pileser mentions the kings Šanib of Beth-Ammon, Salamān of Moab, and Qausmalak of Edom among his tributaries.²⁴

Hardly any historically significant inscriptions concerning the short rule of Shalmaneser V, the successor of Tiglath-pileser III, are extant. We do know, however, both from the Babylonian Chronicle and the Bible, that he conquered the city of Samaria and the remaining portion of Israel not annexed by Tiglath-pileser, turning them into an Assyrian province shortly before his death.²⁵ This province, however, could only be administratively organized by Shalmaneser's successor Sargon II in 720 after he had quelled the resistance which had flared up in several parts of Syria.²⁶ If one may argue from the silence of our sources, the Transjordanian states did not take part in the uprisings of 722–20. Several years later, however, Moab and Edom, in conjunction with Judah and the Philistine states, once again attempted to form a pact against Sargon. The rebellion collapsed without a murmur, when Sargon's Turtan conquered Asdod in 712 and incorporated it into the Assyrian empire.²⁷

²³ M. Weippert 1982a: 397f.

²⁴ Norris 1866: 67 (M. Weippert 1971: 69; 1973: 52) rev. 10'. 11'. For the reading of the name as Šanib (*Sa-ni-bu*), see Zayadine 1974: 134f.

²⁵ Grayson 1975: 73, 28; II Kings 17: 4–6. For the interpretation of the sources accepted here, see Tadmor 1958: 33–40.

²⁶ Tadmor 1958: 37–39.

²⁷ M. Weippert 1971: 99–101 VII A 12'-B 48' (correct reading of A 29': Na'aman 1974: 32 fn. 30). 106 (see especially B 26'–33'); Isa. 20: 1. The other main sources for the campaign against Asdod are: Lie 1929: 38–41, 249–262; Winckler 1889: 114–116, 90–109; Weißbach 1918: 178f., 11–13; Weidner 1941–44: 49f. B 1–11; see also Winckler 1889: 148f., 33. The date of the campaign has been established by Tadmor 1958: 92–94. For the founding of the Assyrian province of Asdod by Sargon

It cannot be gleaned from our sources if the failure of the operation had any negative consequences for the allies of Asdod. It is possible that they were able to abandon the sinking ship in time and therewith avoid sanctions from Assyria. After this the Transjordanian states do not seem to have become involved in any hazardous adventures against Assyria. In 701, during Sennacherib's campaign against Hezekiah of Judah and Judah's confederates, the Phoenician and Philistine states, the Ammonite king Pedael, Kamoshnadab of Moab and Ayyaram of Edom refused to become involved in the anti-Assyrian league and rendered tribute to Sennacherib as proof of their loyalty.²⁸ In the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, Pedael and his successor Amminadab I, Mušur of Moab and Qausgarab of Edom appear as loyal vassals.²⁹ These kings, along with other Palestinian, Phoenician and Cypriot rulers, provided both the manpower required by their suzerain for building Esarhaddon's armory (*ekal māšarte*) in Nineveh (about 673) and troops for Ashurbanipal's first campaign against Egypt (669 or 667).

During Ashurbanipal's reign, raids were instigated by the Qedarean Arabs along the whole eastern fringe of Assyria's Syrian dominion from Hawwarīn in the north to aš-Šarā' in the south.³⁰ The Assyrians, with their garrison troops, and Assyria's vassal kings, with their own armies, attempted to combat these incursions. According to Cylinder A of Ashurbanipal, Beth-Ammon, Moab and Edom were affected.³¹ Other sources report the unique piece of information that king Kamōš-āšā³² of Moab, during one of the Qedarean *gāzawāt*, captured the Sheik Ammulad(d)i(n),³³ and sent him to Nineveh in bonds.³⁴ All of these events can be dated before 651, even though the authors of the younger Ashurbanipal inscriptions took great pains to establish a connection between these occurrences and the 'brothers' war' between Ashurbanipal and Sha-

II see especially Alt 1944/45: 138–146 (= 1959: 234–241); Tadmor 1966: 94f. Fragments of a victory stela of Sargon were discovered in the excavations of Tell Isdūd; see H. Tadmor in Dothan 1971: 192–197, pls. xcvi, xcvi 1.

²⁸ Luckenbill 1924: 30 (Borger 1979: 73) II 55–57; cf. Pritchard 1969: 287 (A. L. Oppenheim); M. Weippert 1971: 112f.; Galling 1979: 67 (R. Borger).—For the names of the Transjordanian kings, see Cross 1974: 494 (Pedael); M. Weippert 1976–80b (Kamoshnadab); 1971: 120 (Ayyaram).

²⁹ Esarhaddon: Borger 1956: 60 v 56. 62; cf. Pritchard 1969: 291 (A. L. Oppenheim); M. Weippert 1971: 127f.; Galling 1979: 70 (R. Borger).—Ashurbanipal, Prism C: M. Weippert 1971: 141 II 28'. 29'. 36' = Freedman 1975: 68–71 II 40. 41. 48; cf. Pritchard 1969: 294 (A. L. Oppenheim).

³⁰ M. Weippert 1973/74: 61–63; Eph'al 1982: 149f. fn. 514; Knauf 1985: 103 fn. 562.

³¹ Prism A VIII 109 (Edom). 110 (Beth-Ammon). 112 (Moab, Seir), Streck 1916: 64–67; M. Weippert 1971: 176. 184; 1973/74: 41.

³² Written in Assyrian orthography as *Kamāšhāltā*; explanation courtesy E. A. Knauf.

³³ Proto-Arabic *'mld(n)*, cf. Thamudic *'mld*, Knauf 1982: 107f. no. 1 with fns 5–7. The name is still partly unexplained.

³⁴ Prism B VIII 39–50 (Piepkorn 1933: 84f.; Thompson 1940: 119 no. 14 VIII 33–43); Cx 10'–17' ... (M. Weippert 1971: 154; Freedman 1975: 122–124 IX 15–24); K 4459 rev. 1'–8' (Winckler 1895b: 75). In later editions of the annalistic text the capture of "King" Ammulad(d)i(n) is ascribed to the vassal kings in the west (Prism A VIII 15–29, Streck 1916: 68f.; M. Weippert 1971: 177. 185; 1973/74: 42) or to Ashurbanipal himself (VAT 5600+ II 34–44, M. Weippert 1973/74: 77. 83; K 4687 rev. 1'–4', Winckler 1895b: 74; Rm 2. 120 obv. 9–11, Bauer 1933: 97f.). See M. Weippert 1973/74: 57f.

mash-shumu-ukin between 651 and 648.³⁵ There is no available information concerning the relationship of the Transjordanian states to Assyria after the ‘brothers’ war’. Assyria’s power began to decline in the later years of Ashurbanipal’s reign and Assyria became more and more a colossal image with clay feet.

Before we turn to the Neo-Babylonian period let us glance at the day to day relationship between Assyria’s subject states and their overlord. Only scant information about this relationship can be ascertained from the official royal inscriptions which restrict themselves to recounting the larger military and political occurrences. More information can be gleaned from the administrative archives of the empire. Here several texts have come to light concerning the annual tribute of dependent states. For this purpose envoys, headed by high officials (Ass. *širānu*), were sent to the king of Assyria. In fact, at times the king of a vassal state appeared personally at court. Two letters, found at the Neo-Assyrian capital of Kalhu (Nimrūd), exist in which Assyrian governors inform the king of the arrival of such delegations, among them those of the Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites.³⁶ These delegations were cared for by the Assyrian administration, as two extant wine lists from Kalhu citing wine deliveries to the Ammonite, Edomite and Moabite delegations, testify.³⁷ It seems that these envoys were also presented with gifts. A document was found in Nineveh

(Quyunġiq) enumerating, among other gifts, gold and silver rings given by the king of Assyria to Pedael of Beth-Ammon and his attendants.³⁸ This text also serves as proof that Pedael already ruled under Sargon II.³⁹ Gold and silver,⁴⁰ and most probably horses,⁴¹ are named as being among the tribute of the Transjordanian states.⁴²

Transjordan and the Neo-Babylonian Empire

The Neo-Assyrian empire collapsed around the end of the 7th century under the impact of the Medes, led by Cyaxares, and the Babylonians, led by Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar II. At first the Assyrian provinces west of the Euphrates were subjugated to Egyptian rule. The manner in which the political transformation took place in each of the territories is not definitely known. The only information we have concerning this time is from Judah, where Pharaoh Necho deposed and deported the reigning monarch and enthroned a king of his choice.⁴³ This was probably the exception rather than the rule, as Judah, under King Josiah, had attempted to oppose

³⁵ M. Weippert 1973/74: 69–73; Knauf 1985: 96–103.

³⁶ ND 2762 (NL 50, Saggs 1959: 159f., to be dated late in the reign of Tiglath-pileser III, or early in that of Sargon II); ND 2765 (NL 16), 33–46 (Saggs 1955: 134f.; cf. Donner 1957: 159; Tadmor 1966: 92f.; M. Weippert 1971: 213; Cogan 1974: 118; Postgate 1974: 117f. §1.20; Galling 1979: 65 no. 36A [R. Borger]; Deller 1985: 329f.; to be dated early in the reign of Sargon II, probably around 716, see Postgate 1973: 11 fn. 29a; 1974: 118). For the time being, I suggest the reading of ND 2765, 33–46, as follows (not collated):

33 45 ANŠ[E.KU]R.RA.MEŠ(*sīsē*) ša [x] a²t-ta-bar

34 ^{lu}MAH.MEŠ(*širānu*) ^{kur}M[*u-s*]ur-a-a

35 ^{kur}[H]a-za-ta-a-a ^{kur}Ia-ū-da-a-a

36 ^{kur}Ma-a-ba-a-a ^{kur}Ba-an-am-ma-na-a-a

37 U₄.12.KĀM AŠ(*ina*) ^{uru}Kal-he e-tar-bu-u-nē

38 m[*a*]-da-na-l^e-šū-nu AŠ(*ina*) ŠU.2(*qātī*)-šū-nu

39 24[A]NSE.KUR.RA.MEŠ(*sīsē*)

40 ša ^{kur}Ha-za-ta-a-a AŠ(*ina*) ŠU.2(*qātī*)-šū

41 ^{kur}Ū-du-m[*u*]-a-a ^{kur}[As/Sa-d]u-da-a-a

42 ^{kur}An-q[*a*]-ru-na-a-a [x (x)]x

43 [e-tar-bu]-ū-n^e ^{lu}MAH(*širu*) [^{kur}Mu-š]ur-a-a

44 [x x x] x x ū-ša-a

45 [DİŠ/a-na ^{uru}]Zab-ban il-la-ka

46 [x x] x x ša ^{lu}tar-ta-ni Kl(*issī*)-šū

Translation: ‘45 horses of ... I received. The magnates of Egypt, Gaza, Judah, Moab, Ben-Ammon entered Kalhu on the 12th. Their tributes are in their hands. 24 horses (the magnate) of Gaza has in his hands. Those of Edom, Asdod, Ekron ... arrived. The magnate of Egypt ... departed. To Zabban he will come ... of the Tartan is/are with him.’

In line 41, Deller 1985: 329f. opts for the restoration [^{kur}Sa-d]u-da-a-a (cf. ND 10078 obv. 10, Dalley and Postgate 1984: 246 no. 135) and notes: ‘... Lokalisierung noch unbekannt ...’. I still believe that the city of Asdod is meant even though ND 10078 obv. 6 also gives [^{kur}As-du-da-a-a]. But the latter tablet may perhaps be interpreted as a *Sammeltafel* collecting in obv. 6–14 information about several delegations of foreign magnates present at Kalhu on different occasions. Lines 6–9 may thus list earlier missions (cf. ^{kur}Ya-ūdāya pāniute line 9), lines 10–12 later ones (cf. ^{kur}Ya-ūdāya/[^{kur}Udūmāya(?) *urkiūte* lines 11f.), lines 13f. still others. The difference between [^{kur}As-du-da-a-a] line 6 and ^{kur}Sa-du-d[*a-a-a*] line 10 may be due to different scribes preparing the original tablets from which the information was gathered. The context in ND 10078 as well as in ND 2765, 33f. is strongly in favour of Asdod.—In line 43, Postgate 1974: 117 reads LÜ.[M]AḪ *aš-du-ud’-a-a*. This cannot be correct for orthographic reasons; therefore I continue to adhere to my original suggestion (M. Weippert 1971: 213. 216; see above).

³⁷ ND 10030 II 11’–13’ (Dalley and Postgate 1984: 253 no. 143, perhaps to be dated

in the reign of Sargon II); ND 10078 (*ibid.*: 246 no. 135; cf. Deller 1985: 328, to be dated in the reign of Sargon II).

³⁸ Johns 1901: 319 no. 1110 + A I 4’–10’; cf. Postgate 1974: 337 (in line 10’ read PAP KUR É *Am-man-a-a* with copy and photograph).

³⁹ The text mentions Nabū-bēl-šumāte, the prefect of Bīrāte (B III 21, Postgate 1974: 342), and may therefore be dated in the reign of Sargon II; that Nabū-bēl-šumāte was Sargon’s contemporary, is known from the letter Harper 1892: no. 88, 6f. (for the date of the letter see Parpola 1981: 137). Cf. Streck 1916: ccciii fn. 3. The attempt by Zadok 1977/78: 35–37 to date this document is not convincing.

⁴⁰ Gold as tribute (*tāmartu*?) of the Ammonites and Moabites: Harper 1902: no. 632 obv. 1–4. Perhaps the text also listed a quantity of silver as tribute of the Edomites (obv. 7f.; the gentilic is broken). Silver objects from a tribute of the Moabites are mentioned in Johns 1901: 161 no. 928 III 4’; cf. Postgate 1974: 310 (*terminus a quo*: 706 BC).

⁴¹ ND 2765 (NL 16), 33–43 (see fn. 36 above).

⁴² For the sake of completeness, two other Neo-Assyrian texts concerning Transjordanian affairs should be mentioned here. One is K 4384 (Norris 1866: 53 no. 1; Forrer 1920: 52–54), an administrative document (or writing exercise?) enumerating various political units connected in some way with the Assyrian empire. In II 10–12 Ammon (^{uru}*Am-ma-a’[-na/nu]*)—in this shortened form in Assyrian sources only here, line 12), Moab (^{uru}*Ma[-. . .]*, line 10?), and Edom (^{uru}*U-du-u-mu*, line 11) are listed. A new edition of this text in Weippert 1971: 216–219; *ibid.*: 223–226 some remarks regarding its interpretation.—The other text is ND 2773 (NL 14; Saggs 1955: 131f.), a letter to the king by a certain Qurdi-Aššur (perhaps the Assyrian official Qurdi-Aššur-lāmur known from other Nimrūd texts as an Assyrian resident [*qēpu*] in Tyre) written to introduce the messenger of an Ayya-nūri (probably a colleague of Qurdi-Aššur’s) to the Court. In translation the letter reads as follows:

¹To the King my lord: ²your servant Qurdi-Aššur. ³May it be well with the King my lord!

⁴The messenger of Ayya-nūri ⁵of Tapilu, ⁶Ezāzu by name, ⁸brings ⁶a sealed document ⁷with himself to the Palace. ⁸The contents ⁹of his sealed document ^{10/11}concern the City of the Moabites, ¹¹where the Gidiraean ¹⁵made a slaughter ^{13/14}when they invaded the country of Moab. ¹⁶Concerning him (*scil.* Ayya-nūri’s messenger): ¹⁷Just now ¹⁹I appointed him ¹⁸into the hands of my messenger. ²⁰He will bring him to the Palace. ²¹On the 9th ²²of Šabaṭu they set out (read *i-tū¹-[š]u¹-nē*).

The letter has been commented on by several scholars (Saggs 1955: 131–133; Albright 1955; Vogt 1956; Donner 1957: 156–159. 170–178; Mazar 1957: 237; Cazelles 1959; van Zyl 1960: 36f.; Olávarri 1962; Mittmann 1973). In general, I accept Mittmann’s interpretation, although I still have some doubts about the identity of the Gidiraean (but see also Knauf 1985: 41 fn. 185). Ayya-nūri may have been the Assyrian *qēpu* at Tapilu, modern *aṭ-Tafilah*, probably the capital of the Edomite province of Seir (Ass. *Sārri*). The ‘nationality’ of Ayya-nūri cannot be determined. Although his name may be Akkadian and not Northwest-Semitic (Zadok 1977/78: 48 no. 3; Tadmor 1982: 464 fn. 42), an Assyrian official with a Northwest-Semitic name would not be inconceivable.

⁴³ II Kings 23: 33f.; cf. Jer. 22: 10–12.

Necho's advance into Asia⁴⁴ and could subsequently be viewed by Necho as 'rebellious'.

The Egyptian suzerainty over Syria was short-lived. In early 605, Nebuchadnezzar, while still the crown prince, forced the Egyptian army out of Carchemish and completely annihilated the retreating troops in the province of Hamath.⁴⁵ In this year and the next, after his accession to the throne, Nebuchadnezzar subjugated all of Syria up to the border with Egypt.⁴⁶ In general it seems that all that was necessary was the demonstration of Babylonian military might. Only of the Philistine city of Ascalon is it reported that she barred her gates against Nebuchadnezzar, who subsequently conquered and destroyed her at the close of 604.⁴⁷ To be sure, the Neo-Babylonian domination was only accepted with dissension in the other dependent states. Despite the paucity of sources, we hear of several attempts to rebel in the subsequent period.

In this spirit, probably in the year 594/3, the ambassadors of Judah, Edom, Moab, the Ammonites, Tyre and Sidon gathered in the Judean capital of Jerusalem,⁴⁸ several years after the disastrous rebellion instigated singlehandedly by Jehoiakim of Judah (597).⁴⁹ In view of Nebuchadnezzar's difficulties with foreign and domestic policy and responding to the accession of a new Egyptian king, Psammetichus II (595), they discussed the means by which the Babylonian yoke could be thrown off. The available sources do not inform us if these consultations bore fruit, or if the sudden appearance of Nebuchadnezzar in Syria at the beginning of 593⁵⁰ thwarted any action. It is certain, however, that the Ammonites, under king Baalis, and Tyre, took part in Zedekiah of Judah's anti-Babylonian rebellion in 589.⁵¹ If we can believe Flavius Josephus,

they and Moab, which had also taken part in the insurrection, were only brought back under the dominion of Babylon in 582/1 five years after the fall of Jerusalem.⁵² We cannot say if this resulted, as with Judah in 586, in the removal of the native king and annexation of the country by the Babylonian empire. I will return to this at a later point.

From the following period we are only in possession of the sparse information that the last Babylonian king Nabonidus laid siege to the 'City of Edom' and probably captured it in the second half of the 3rd year of his reign.⁵³ In Babylonian usage the term 'City of ...' designates the capital of a country. In the case of Edom this would most probably be Bozrah (modern Buṣērah). It is unclear what moved Nabonidus to undertake this violent action. He does seem, however, to have encountered resistance from several quarters in the west (Cilicia, Hamath, the Antilebanon region, Edom) in the first three years of his reign.⁵⁴ We cannot draw any conclusions about Edom's fate during the subsequent final years of the Neo-Babylonian empire, as the Chronicle text to which we are indebted for our information is badly damaged.

Transjordan and the Achaemenid Empire

The uncertainty about the political status of the three Transjordanian states after 580 makes conjecture about their reaction to the take-over of the Neo-Babylonian empire by the Achaemenid king Cyrus II difficult—if any reaction could be expected at all. It appears that the change of rulers in Babylon was not noticed immediately in the territories west of the Euphrates. There are even good reasons for the hypothesis that this area only came into closer contact with the Persian king in the year 525 during Cambyses' campaign against Egypt.⁵⁵ Until that time those territories were probably to a great extent left to themselves and would have been administered by those authorities already present during the Babylonian period. Exactly which type of authorities these were cannot be ascertained in the case of Beth-Ammon, Moab and Edom due to the lack of written evidence. One could imagine that here, as in the Phoenician cities, local rule continued. This hypothe-

⁴⁴ II Kings 23: 29f. (probably in May/June, 609 BC).

⁴⁵ Grayson 1975: 99, Chronicle 5 obv. 1–8.

⁴⁶ Grayson 1975: 100, Chronicle 5 obv. 12f. 15–17; cf. II Kings 24: 7.

⁴⁷ Grayson 1975: 100, Chronicle 5 obv. 18–20. D. J. Wiseman's reading of the place-name in line 18 as ^{uru}IS-qi-il-lu-nu was confirmed by collation by W. F. Albright; see Quinn 1961: 20 fn. 5. The capture of Ascalon by Nebuchadnezzar II is also mentioned by the Lesbian poet Alcaeus (fragments 303 + 350, Lobel and Page 1955: 236. 272); see Quinn 1961.

⁴⁸ Jer. 27. For possible dates for this conference, see M. Weippert 1971: 349–377.

⁴⁹ According to II Kings 24: 1f. the earliest date for the outbreak of the rebellion is 602/1, the 7th year of Jehoiakim. The latest date possible is 598, as the king died in December, 598 (cf. II Chron. 36: 9; II Kings 24: 8). Jerusalem, under Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim, surrendered to the Babylonian army on March 16, 597 (Grayson 1975: 102, Chronicle 5 rev. 11–13; cf. II Kings 24: 10–16).

⁵⁰ Grayson 1975: 102, Chronicle 5 rev. 25f.

⁵¹ Ezek. 21: 23–29; Jer. 40: 14; 41: 10–15.—Recently, the impression on a clay stopper of the stamp seal of *Mlkm'ur 'bd B'lyš'* (*Milkom'ur servant of Ba'lyšaš') was published by L. G. Herr (Herr 1985: 169f.). The author suggested, on paleographic grounds, to date the seal at 'about 600 BC'. He correctly identified its owner as an official of an Ammonite king named Ba'lyšaš' (*ibid.*: 171f.) whom in turn he attempted to equate with King Baalis (Hebrew *Ba'āliš*) known from the Book of Jeremiah (*ibid.*: 172). The latter name might be explained as a hypocoristic for the former one, if the problem of the correspondence of the sibilants could be solved satisfactorily. There is, however, in Ugaritic a personal name *B'ls* (Vroilleaud 1957: 83 no. 58, 3', read *B'ly* by Vroilleaud and by Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin 1976: 216 no. 4. 116, 3', but *B'ls* by Gordon 1955: 248 §20.340; Gröndahl 1967: 16. 102. 116. 379; the sign in question looks like Babylonian cuneiform <A> in Vroilleaud's copy, which is precisely the way in which Ugaritic alphabetic cuneiform <s> is written in the abecedaries Vroilleaud 1957: 199 no. 184, 2 [according to a cast; the copy is 'normalized']; Herdner 1978: 63 no. RS 24. 281, 1) which probably is related to Hebrew *Ba'āliš*. If this is the case, the <s> in *Ba'āliš* would represent the phoneme /s₃/, while the <š> in *B'lyš'* can only

be derived from /s₁/, /s₂/, or /t/ (in fact from /t/). The identity of the names and the persons would then be rather unlikely.

⁵² Josephus, ant. 10, 9, 7 §§181f. This statement may however be based on Jer. 44–49; 52: 30. See the discussion in Lindsay 1976: 27–29.

⁵³ In December, 553, or the beginning of 552: Grayson 1975: 105f., Chronicle 7 i 14ff. The year of the campaign can be restored from Lambert 1968/69: 5 III/IV 57. 60 (December, 553). In line 17, we have to read, with Lambert 1972: 55: [... AŠ(ina) UGU(*mubbi*) ^{uru}U-d]u-um-mu it-ta-du-ū (collated) 'he encamped against the City (of) Edom.' For the meaning of *nadû + ina mubbi* ... (place-name) see Grayson 1975: 93. 96, Chronicle 3, 26. 35. 68. If we can rely on the 'Persian Verse Account' of Nabonidus' reign, then Nabonidus went to Teima in his 3rd year; see S. Smith 1924: 84f. II 17–34 with the improvements of Bauer and Landsberger 1927: 91, and Lambert 1972: 56 (according to Bauer-Landsberger and Lambert the second half of line 17 reads *ša-lul-ti MU(šatti) AŠ(ina) ka-ša-d[i]* 'when the third year arrived'). So the possibility cannot be excluded that Nabonidus took the 'City of Edom' on his march to Teima. See Lindsay 1976: 31–39; Eph'al 1982: 185–188; differently Röllig 1964: 243f., who believed that Nabonidus went to Teima in his 6th year.

⁵⁴ Grayson 1975: 105f., Chronicle 7 i; cf. Lambert 1968/69: 5. 7 III/IV 50–65 ... (year 3).

⁵⁵ Galling 1964: 39f.

sis is somewhat contradicted by the only information we have about Transjordan during Persian times. This information allows us to recognize that in the 20th year of the reign of Artaxerxes I—which is, to be sure, only 445/4—at least the Ammonite territory was administered by a Persian governor⁵⁶ indicating that it had the status of a province. Sadly, our source does not give us information as to how and under which circumstances the Ammonite kingdom lost its independence. Because a large Achaemenid military-political encroachment into Palestine and Transjordan is not known, it is plausible that the change had already occurred during the Neo-Babylonian period. Perhaps this was a result of King Baalis' rebellion against Nebuchadnezzar II, which according to Josephus was in about 582/1. It is also possible, of course, that Nabonidus only put an end to the Ammonite independence during his expedition to Syria in the year 553/2. Finally it is also possible that an occasion unknown to us, occurring between 586 and 539, comes into question. As regards Moab, we only have the not completely trustworthy information from Josephus that Nebuchadnezzar subdued Moab along with the Ammonites in the year 582/1. Finally Edom, which did not take part in the anti-Babylonian uprising of 589 and was probably more on Nebuchadnezzar's side,⁵⁷ certainly existed until 553/2. If Edom was annexed at all, it was annexed in that year by Nabonidus. The cuneiform business document discovered at Ṭawilān near Wādī Mūsā, but written at Ḥarrān in the accession year of one of the Achaemenid kings named Darius, gives evidence of the business dealings in northern Syria of an Edomite businessman by the name of Qōššama' b. Qōsyada' living in Ṭawilān.⁵⁸ These business dealings can be most easily explained if they took place within the Persian satrapy of 'Beyond the River' (*Eber nāri*, Aram. 'br nhr') indicating that Edom was a Persian province. All of these suggestions are, however, only possibilities as we do not possess any information of certainty at this time.

Conclusion

If one compares the behaviour of the Transjordanian states in response to the Mesopotamian powers, as sketched in our survey, with that of their South-Syrian and Palestinian neighbours, one notices hardly any perceivable differences. Ostensibly, a specific Transjordanian policy in relationship to the larger powers was non-existent.

A different picture is gained if we do not restrict ourselves to the written sources but also glance at the archaeological finds from the 8th–6th centuries. As this would comprise

another lecture I will restrict myself to making a few suggestions.

It can be demonstrated that the development which took place in the territories transformed into Assyrian provinces between 734 and 712, took a different path from that of the states that were able to retain their independence until the 6th century: stagnation, commercial and cultural poverty there; commercial and cultural prosperity here.⁵⁹ This is true to the same extent for the areas both west and east of the Jordan. But it is also clear that the Transjordanian states were much more open to the influence of the Assyrian culture than were their western neighbours, especially Judah. This has been shown by Crystal-M. Bennett in a paper prepared for the First International Conference on the History and Archaeology of Jordan in 1980 and published in its proceedings.⁶⁰ The evidence adduced by Mrs Bennett can now be supplemented with more recent discoveries. Those from the excavations at Tell al-Mazār are especially significant for our subject. In terms of the current typological and chronological schemes, the Tell al-Mazār graves contained Assyrian pottery⁶¹ along with seals⁶² and metal objects⁶³ from the Persian period. As nearly all the graves had been used only once, and burials were accompanied by rather small selections of funerary gifts, this can only mean that the Assyrian pottery was adopted by local potters, and was still being produced long after the collapse of the Neo-Assyrian empire. In this respect there is a marked difference between Transjordan and Palestine. Again we are warned that political and cultural developments may not necessarily be congruent, and that it may be dangerous, as Henk Franken reminded us some time ago,⁶⁴ to view 'the Other Side of the Jordan' with only the western side in mind.⁶⁵

The author's thanks are due to his doctoral student, Mrs. Mary C. Nebelsick, who translated the text of this paper into English.

Bibliography

- Albright, W. F. 1921. A revision of Early Hebrew orthography. *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 1, 49–79.
 ——— 1953. Notes on Ammonite history. In: *Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach* (Scripta et Documenta, 1; Montserrat), 131–136.
 ——— 1955. The son of Tabeel (Isaiah 7: 6). *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 140, 34f.

⁵⁹ See Sauer 1985: 212–214; H. Weippert forthcoming: §§4.5 *passim*, especially §§4.5.1, 4.5.3.1, and 4.5.7.2.

⁶⁰ Bennett 1982; see also Bennett 1978.

⁶¹ Yassine 1984: 67, 68f.; 3: 3, 4, 6, 7, 5; 45: 1, 2, 6, 7.

⁶² Yassine 1984: 77f; 7; 8; 50: 48–54; 51.

⁶³ Yassine 1984: 103–107; 9; 57.

⁶⁴ Franken 1970.

⁶⁵ This paper itself gives evidence of this point of view. There are no convenient English equivalents of the neutral German terms Westjordanland and Ostjordanland, so I had to fall back on Transjordan which by its prefix *trans-* betrays the 'Jerusalem' point of view of those who coined it. Composite terms like The country east of the Jordan or The East Bank of (the) Jordan are too clumsy for practical use.

⁵⁶ Nehemiah, the governor of Judah under Artaxerxes I, mentions a certain Tobiah (most probably a fellow-Jew) whom he calls 'the Ammonite *'ēbed*' in Neh. 2: 10, 19 as one of his enemies among the rulers of the neighbouring countries. It is widely accepted that the term *'ēbed* means 'servant (of the king)' in this context, and that it is to a certain degree a derogatory designation ('slave') of the Persian governor of the country of the Ammonites. Cf. Alt 1931: 70f. = 1959: 341f.; Mazar 1957: 143–145.

⁵⁷ This is far from certain, as all evidence comes from Judahite sources (the Bible). Since Edom and Judah had been long standing enemies, the picture may be biased. For a critical evaluation of the Old Testament reproach against Edom see Bartlett 1982.

⁵⁸ Dalley 1984: 21, with commentary *ibid.*: 19–22.

- Alt, A., 1931. Judas Nachbarn zur Zeit Nehemias. *Palästina-Jahrbuch* 27, 66–74.
- 1944/45. Neue assyrische Nachrichten über Palästina. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 67, 128–159.
- 1959. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II (2nd edition, Munich).
- Bartlett, J. R. 1972. The rise and fall of the kingdom of Edom. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 104, 26–37.
- 1982. Edom and the fall of Jerusalem, 587 BC. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 114, 13–24.
- Bauer, Th. and Landsberger, B. 1927. Zu neuer veröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen der Zeit von Asarhaddon bis Nabonid. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 37, 61–98.
- Bauer, Th. 1933. *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals vervollständigt und neu bearbeitet* (Assyriologische Bibliothek, N.F., 1.2; Leipzig).
- Bennett, C.-M. 1978. Some reflections on Neo-Assyrian influence in Transjordan. In: R. Moorey and P. Parr (eds), *Archaeology in the Levant: Essays for Kathleen Kenyon* (Warminster), 164–171.
- 1982. Neo-Assyrian influence in Transjordan. *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan* 1, 181–187.
- Billerbeck, A. and Delitzsch, Fr. 1908. *Die Palasttore Salmanassars II von Balawat: Erklärung ihrer Bilder und Inschriften. Nebst Salmanassars Stierkoloß- und Throninschrift* (Beiträge zur Assyriologie, 6: 1; Leipzig and Baltimore).
- Boissier, A., 1903. Deux fragments des annales de Salmanasar II. *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 25, 81–86.
- Borger, R. 1956. *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien* (Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft 9; Graz).
- 1979. *Babylonisch-assyrische Lesestücke*, 2. neubearbeitete Auflage (Analecta Orientalia, 54; Rome).
- Brinkman, J. A. 1973. Additional texts from the reigns of Shalmaneser III and Shamshi-Adad V. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, 40–46.
- Cameron, G. G. 1950. The Annals of Shalmaneser III, King of Assyria: a new text. *Sumer* 6, 6–26.
- Cazelles, H. 1959. Tophel (Deut 1 1). *Vetus Testamentum* 9, 412–415.
- Cogan, M. 1974. *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 19; Missoula, Montana).
- Courtois, J.-C. 1973. Prospection archéologique dans la moyenne vallée de l'Oronte (El Ghab et Er Roudj—Syrie du nord-ouest). *Syria* 50, 53–99.
- Cross, F. M. 1974. Leaves from an epigraphist's notebook. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36, 486–494.
- 1985. An Ammonite King List. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 48, 171.
- Dalley, S. (see also: Page, S.) 1984. The cuneiform tablet from Tell Tawilan. *Levant* 16, 19–22.
- Dalley, S. and Postgate, J. N. 1984. *The Tablets from Fort Shalmaneser* (Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud, 3; London).
- Delitzsch, Fr. 1881. *Wo lag das Paradies? Eine biblisch-assyriologische Studie, mit zahlreichen assyriologischen Beiträgen zur biblischen Länder- und Völkerkunde und einer Karte Babyloniens* (Leipzig).
- Deller, K. 1985. SAG.DU UR.MAH, 'Löwenkopfsitula, Löwenkopfbeker'. *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 16, 327–346.
- Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. and Sanmartín, J. 1976. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, einschließlich der keilalphabetischen Texte außerhalb Ugarits*, I. *Transkription* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 24; Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn).
- Donner, H. 1957. Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Staates Moab in der zweiten Hälfte des 8. Jahrh. v. Chr. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 5, 155–184.
- Donner, H. and Röllig, W. 1968. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, II. *Kommentar* (2nd edition, Wiesbaden).
- 1971. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, I. *Texte* (3rd edition, Wiesbaden).
- Dothan, M. 1971. *Ashdod II–III: The Second and Third Seasons of Excavations, 1963, 1965; Soundings in 1967* ('Atiqot, English Series, 9/10; Jerusalem).
- Dussaud, R. 1927. *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale* (Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique [Beyrouth], 4; Paris).
- Eph'al, I. 1982. *The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent, 9th–5th Centuries B.C.* (Jerusalem and Leyden).
- Forrer, E. 1920. *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches* (Leipzig).
- 1932a. Aramu. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, I (Berlin and Leipzig), 131–139.
- 1932b. Ba'asa. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, I (Berlin and Leipzig), 328.
- Franken, H. J. 1970. The other side of the Jordan. *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 15, 5–10.
- Freedman, R. D. 1975. *The Cuneiform Tablets in St. Louis* (Diss. phil. Columbia University).
- Galling, K. 1964. *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen).
- 1979. *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (3rd edition, Tübingen).
- Gordon, C. H. 1955. *Ugaritic Manual: Newly Revised Grammar, Texts in Transliteration, Cuneiform Selections, Paradigms—Glossary—Indices* (Analecta Orientalia, 35; Rome).
- Grayson, A. K. 1975. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Texts from Cuneiform Sources, 5; Locust Valley, NY).
- Gröndahl, F. 1967. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Studia Pohl, 1; Rome).
- Gurney, O. R. and Finkelstein, J. J. 1957. *The Sultantepe Tablets*, I (London).
- Harper, R. F. 1892. *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum*, I (London and Chicago).
- 1902. *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum*, VI (London and Chicago).
- Herdner, A. 1978. Nouveaux textes alphabétiques de Ras Shamra—xxiv^e campagne, 1961. In: *Ugaritica VII* (Mission de Ras Shamra, 18; Paris).
- Herr, L. G. 1985. The servant of Baalis. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 48, 169–172.
- Hulin, P. 1963. The inscriptions on the carved throne-base of Shalmaneser III. *Iraq* 25, 48–69.
- Johns, C. H. W. 1901. *Assyrian Deeds and Documents Recording the Transfer of Property, including the so-called private contracts, legal decisions and proclamations, preserved in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum, chiefly from the 7th Century B.C.*, II. *Additional cuneiform texts, introduction, officials, metrology* (Cambridge).
- Kaiser, O. (ed.) 1982–85. *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments*, I. *Rechts- und Wirtschaftsurkunden, Historisch-chronologische Texte* (Gütersloh).
- Kinnier Wilson, J. V. 1962. The Kurba'il statue of Shalmaneser III. *Iraq* 24, 90–115.
- Kittel, R. 1922. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II. *Das Volk in Kanaan: Geschichte der Zeit bis zum babylonischen Exil* (Handbücher der alten Geschichte, 1.3.2; 5th edition, Gotha).
- Klengel, H. 1970. *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v.u.Z.*, III. *Historische Geographie und allgemeine Darstellung* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientalforschung, Veröffentlichung 40; Berlin).

- Knauf, E. A. 1982. Vier thamudische Inschriften vom Sinai. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 98, 170–173.
- 1985. *Ismael: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Palästinas und Nordarabiens im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins; Wiesbaden).
- Læssøe, J. 1959. A statue of Shalmaneser III, from Nimrud. *Iraq* 21, 147–157.
- Lambert, W. G. 1968/69. A new source for the reign of Nabonidus. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 22, 1–8.
- 1972. Nabonidus in Arabia. *Proceedings of the fifth Seminar for Arabian Studies held at the Oriental Institute, Oxford, 22nd and 23rd September, 1971* (London), 53–64.
- Layard, A. H. 1851. *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments* (London).
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F. 1907. *Materialien zur älteren Geschichte Armeniens und Mesopotamiens* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., N.F., 9: 3; Berlin).
- Lie, A. G. 1929. *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria*, I. *The Annals* (Paris).
- Lindsay, J. 1976. The Babylonian kings and Edom, 605–550 BC. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 108, 23–39.
- Lobel, E. and Page, D. (eds) 1955. *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta* (Oxford).
- Luckenbill, D. D. 1924. *The Annals of Sennacherib* (Oriental Institute Publications, 2; Chicago).
- Malamat, A. 1973. The Aramaeans. In: D. J. Wiseman (ed.), *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (Oxford), 134–155.
- Mazar, B. 1957. The Tobiads. *Israel Exploration Journal* 7, 137–145, 229–238.
- Messerschmidt, L. 1911. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts*, I (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, 16; Leipzig).
- Michel, E. 1947. Die Assur-Texte Salmanassars III. (858–824). *Die Welt des Orients* 1: 2, 57–71.
- 1949. Die Assur-Texte Salmanassars III. (858–824), 3. Fortsetzung. *Die Welt des Orients* 1: 4, 255–271.
- 1952. Ein neuentdeckter Annalen-Text Salmanassars III. *Die Welt des Orients* 1: 6, 454–475.
- 1955. Die Assur-Texte Salmanassars III. (858–824), 7. Fortsetzung. *Die Welt des Orients* 2: 2, 137–157.
- 1964. Die Assur-Texte Salmanassars III. (858–824), 10. Fortsetzung. *Die Welt des Orients* 3: 1/2, 146–155.
- Millard, A. R. and Tadmor, H. 1973. Adad-nirari III in Syria. *Iraq* 35, 57–64.
- Mittmann, S. 1973. Das südliche Ostjordanland im Lichte eines neuassyrischen Keilschrifttextes aus Nimrud. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 89, 15–25.
- Na'aman, N. 1974. Sennacherib's 'Letter to God' on his campaign to Judah. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 214, 25–39.
- Norris, E. 1861, (H. C. Rawlinson) *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, I. *A Selection from the Historical Inscriptions of Chaldaea, Assyria, and Babylonia* (London).
- 1866, (H. C. Rawlinson), *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, II. *A Selection from the Miscellaneous Inscriptions of Assyria* (London).
- Noth, M. 1946–51. Die Nachbarn der israelitischen Stämme im Ostjordanlande. *Beiträge zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde* (= *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 68), 1–50.
- 1955. Das Deutsche Evangelische Institut für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes: Lehrkursus 1954. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 71, 1–59.
- 1956. Das Deutsche Evangelische Institut für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes: Lehrkursus 1955. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 72, 31–82.
- 1971. *Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde*, ed. by H. W. Wolff (Neukirchen-Vluyn).
- Olávarri, E. 1962. Moab en nuevo documento asirio del s. VIII a.C. *Estudios Bíblicos* 21, 315–324.
- Page, S. (see also: Dalley, S.) 1968. A stela of Adad-nirari III and Nergal-ereš from Tell al Rimah. *Iraq* 30, 139–153.
- Parpola, S. 1981. Assyrian royal inscriptions and Neo-Assyrian letters. In: F. M. Fales (ed.), *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New horizons in literary, ideological, and historical analysis* (Orientalis Antiqui Collectio, 17; Rome), 117–142.
- Piepkorn, A. C. 1933. *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal*, I. Editions E, B₁₋₅, D, and K (Assyriological Studies, 5; Chicago).
- Postgate, J. N. 1973. *The Governor's Palace Archive* (Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud, 2; London).
- 1974. *Taxation and Conscriptio in the Assyrian Empire* (Studia Pohl, series maior, 3; Rome).
- Pritchard, J. B. (ed.) 1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (3rd edition, Princeton, NJ).
- Quinn, J. D. 1961. Alcaeus 48 (B 16) and the Fall of Ascalon (604 BC). *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 164, 19f.
- Reade, J. 1978. Assyrian campaigns, 840–811 BC, and the Babylonian frontier. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 68, 251–260.
- Röllig, W. 1964. Erwägungen zu den neuen Stelen König Nabonids. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 56, 218–260.
- Safar, F. 1951. A further text of Shalmaneser III, from Assur. *Sumer* 7, 3–21.
- Saggs, H. W. F. 1955. The Nimrud letters, 1952—Part II: relations with the West. *Iraq* 17, 126–154.
- 1959. The Nimrud letters, 1952—Part V: administration. *Iraq* 21, 158–179.
- Sauer, J. A. 1985. Ammon, Moab and Edom. In: A. Biran a.o. (eds), *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (Jerusalem), 206–214.
- Schramm, W. 1973. *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften*, II. 934–722 v. Chr. (Handbuch der Orientalistik, I, Ergänzungsband 5: 1, 2 (Leyden and Cologne).
- Schroeder, O. 1922. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts*, II (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, 37; Leipzig).
- 1924/5. Zwei historische Assurtexte nach Abschriften Friedrich Delitzschs. *Archiv für Keilschriftforschung* 2, 69–71.
- Smith, G. 1870 (H. C. Rawlinson). *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, III. *A Selection from the miscellaneous Inscriptions of Assyria* (London).
- Smith, S. 1924. *Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon* (London).
- Streck, M. 1916. *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Nineveh's* (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, 7; Leipzig).
- Tadmor, H. 1958. The campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: a chronological-historical study. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 12, 22–40, 77–100.
- 1961. Azriyau of Yaudi. *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8, 232–271.
- 1966. Philistia under Assyrian rule. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 29, 86–102.
- 1973. The historical inscriptions of Adad-nirari III. *Iraq* 35, 141–150.
- 1982. The Aramaization of Assyria: aspects of western impact. In: H.-J. Nissen and J. Renger (eds), *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis zum 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*; xxv. *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Berlin 3. bis 7. Juli 1978* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient, 1; Berlin), 449–470.
- Thompson, R. C. 1940. A selection from the cuneiform historical texts from Nineveh (1927–32). *Iraq* 7, 85–131.

- Timm, S. 1982. *Die Dynastie Omri: Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Israels im 9. Jahrhundert vor Christus* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 124; Göttingen).
- Ṭūqān, F. A. 1970. مسلة مشع ملك موآب. حولة مديرية الآثار العامة (المملكة الأردنية الهاشمية) ١٥ ص ١٩-٥١
- Unger, E. 1916. *Reliefstele Adadniraris III. aus Saba'a und Semiramis* (Publicationen der Kaiserlich Osmanischen Museen, 2; İstanbul).
- Unger, M. F. 1957. *Israel and the Aramaeans of Damascus (a Study in Archaeological Illumination of Bible History)* (Grand Rapids, MI).
- Ungnad, A. 1938. Eponymen. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, II (Berlin and Leipzig), 412-457.
- Violleaud, Ch. 1957. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, II. *Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales* (Mission de Ras Shamra, 7; Paris).
- Vogt, E. 1956. 'Filius Ṭāb'ēl' (Is 7, 6). *Biblica* 37, 263f.
- Weidner, E. F. 1941-44. Šilkan(he)ni, König von Mušri, ein Zeitgenosse Sargons II., nach einem neuen Bruchstück der Prisma-Inschrift des assyrischen Königs. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 14, 40-53.
- Weippert, H. forthcoming. *Palästina* (Handbuch der Archäologie; Munich [scheduled for 1987]).
- Weippert, M. 1971. *Edom: Studien und Materialien zur Geschichte der Edomiter auf Grund schriftlicher und archäologischer Quellen* (Diss. theol. University of Tübingen).
- 1972. Review of S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms* (Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970). *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 224, 150-161.
- 1973. Menahem von Israel und seine Zeitgenossen in einer Steleninschrift des assyrischen Königs Tiglathpileser III. aus dem Iran. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 89, 26-53.
- 1973/74. Die Kämpfe des assyrischen Königs Assurbanipal gegen die Araber: Redaktionskritische Untersuchung des Berichts in Prisma A. *Die Welt des Orients* 7, 39-85.
- 1976-80a. Israel und Juda. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, v (Berlin and New York), 200-208.
- 1976-80b. Kammūsu-nadbi. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, v (Berlin and New York), 335f.
- 1982a. Zur Syrienpolitik Tiglathpilesers III. In: H.-J. Nissen and J. Renger (eds), *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*; xxv. *Recontre Assyriologique Internationale Berlin 3. bis 7. Juli 1978* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient, 1; Berlin), 395-408.
- 1982b. Edom und Israel. *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, IX (Berlin and New York), 291-299.
- forthcoming. Die Feldzüge Adadniraris III. nach Syrien: Voraussetzungen—Verlauf—Folgen. *Die Welt des Orients*.
- Weißbach, F. H. 1918. Zu den Inschriften der Säle im Palaste Sargon's II. von Assyrien. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 72, 161-185.
- Winckler, H. 1889. *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen neu herausgegeben* (Leipzig).
- 1895a. *Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen*, I (Völker und Staaten des alten Orients, 2; Leipzig).
- 1895b. *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten*, III. *Die Keilschrifttexte Assurbanipals* (Leipzig).
- Yassine, Kh. 1984. *Tell el Mazar 1: Cemetery A* (Amman).
- Zadok, R. 1977/78. Historical and onomastic notes. *Die Welt des Orients* 9, 35-56.
- Zayadine, F. 1974. Note sur l'inscription de la statue d'Amman J. 1656. *Syria* 51, 129-136.
- Zyl, A. H. van 1960. *The Moabites* (Pretoria Oriental Series, 3; Leyden).