Edward Lipinski (orientalist)

Edward (Edouard) Lipiński (born 18 June 1930 in Lodz, Poland) is a Belgian Biblical scholar and Orientalist. His first major work, published in 1965, was a monumental monograph entitled *La royauté de Yahvé dans la poésie et le culte de l’ancien Israël*. In 1969, he was appointed professor at the Catholic University of Leuven, where he taught i.a. the comparative grammar of Semitic languages and history of ancient Near Eastern religions and institutions. He was head of the Department of Oriental and Slavonic studies at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from 1978 to 1984. He directed the publication of the *Dictionnaire de la civilisation phénicienne et punique* (1992) and the *Studia Phoenicia* series (from 1983). He also published *Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (1997, 2001) and dealt extensively with Old Aramaic dialects and history, in particular in his *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics* (1975, 1994, 2010) and in *The Aramaeans: Their Ancient History, Culture, Religion* (2000). Referring to the latter work a reviewer noted that it "embodies the accumulated insights of one of the greatest Semitic scholars of our time". Professor Edward Lipiński was awarded a doctorate honoris causa by the Lund University in 2003. Although he retired from KU Leuven in 1995, he continues teaching and doing research mainly in Aramaic and Phoenician studies.

The WorldCat database lists over a hundred publications by Edward Lipiński in his various fields of expertise. A complete bibliography was published by The Enigma Press. Here is a short list of his major publications:

- Author of volumes 1, 5 and 6 of *Studia Paulo Naster Oblata: Orientalia antiqua* published 1982 Peeters Publishers.[7]
CHAPTER IV
NISIBIS AND THE TEMANITES

Although the Laqê tribes have created an Aramaean-Arabian federation on the Lower Ḥabûr, just south of Dûr-katlimmu, recent research suggests that the Aramaeans did not manage to seize the whole Middle Ḥabûr valley in the period of their greatest expansion in Upper Mesopotamia, between the death of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1205 B.C.) and the reign of Ashur-dan II (934-912 B.C.) in Assyria. Local dynasties, with probable Assyrian roots, are attested then at Tell Tâbân (Tâbête), Tell Bîrî (Dûr-Ašûr-kettî-lêšer), and Tell ‘Ağâğa (Ṣadikannî), while Tell aš-Šayḫ Ḥamad (Dûr-katlimmu) certainly subsisted as an Assyrian provincial centre, though it appears to have been threatened by the Aramaeans in the 11th century B.C., as well as “Magrisu of the [Ri]ver-land”, situated near Hassake\(^1\). On the contrary, the Aramaeans of Bêt-Baḡyân and the Temanites managed to settle and to seize power on the Upper Ḥabûr, with Gôzân, Nisibis, and Gidara as their main centres.

Nisibis, modern Nusaybin, was the centre of an Aramaean state which was conquered by Adad-nirari II in 896 B.C. and annexed to Assyria\(^2\). The Aramaeans of this region are called “Temanites” in Assyrian sources, a name that certainly derives from Aramaic ṭymn, “south”, “southern”\(^3\), and implies a distinction between the clans settled south of

---


\(^2\) RIMA II, text A.0.99.2, p. 150-152, lines 62-81.

\(^3\) É. DHOUME, Recueil Édouard Dhorme, Paris 1951, p. 223, n. 3. It is unlikely that these Te-ma-na-a-a, Te-man-na-a-a, Te-man-na-a-ia have something in common with the
the Türk Abdin and another group, called “northern”. The Temanites seem to have been a large people that settled in the 10th century B.C. and was the most formidable foe of the Assyrians at the time of Adad-nirari II (911-891 B.C.), who names three of their principal leaders, viz. Nūr-Hadad, Mamli, and Mūquru. The same sources seem to indicate, however, that the Temanites did not manage to create a confederation of clans or a kingdom.

1. Territory

Nisibis lies on the borderland between the Türk Abdin range and the plain at the point where the Çağçağ (Çağğağ) passes through a narrow canyon and enters the plain. It occupies a strategic position and, during centuries, it formed a frontier fortress and played the role of a trading town on the main route from Upper Mesopotamia to the West. It is surprising therefore that the name of the city does not appear before the first millennium B.C. This name, ṣNaṣibīna in Assyrian and Naṣibīn in Syriac, is Aramaic and most likely designated something that is “set up”, either “sacred pillars” in the plural or “sacred pillar” with the ending -ēn < -ēyin of place names5, *naṣibīn. This name suggests that the Iron Age city developed around a Semitic shrine with dressed sacred stones, that had to be a meeting point for the Aramaean tribesmen of the region. The site may have been called differently before the Aramaean occupation of the area, perhaps Nawar or Nawali, with a famous shrine of the Storm-god, possibly marked by dressed sacred stones and still reflected in the name Nūr-Hadad of the Aramaean ruler of Nisibis. But it is also possible that the site gained its importance only with the Aramaeans and that

oasis of Taymā in northwestern Arabia, as suggested by J. LEWY, The Late Assyro-Babylonian Cult of the Moon and Its Culmination at the Time of Nabonidus, in HUCA 19 (1945-46), p. 405-489 (see p. 422).

4 The prosperity of the city in the Middle Ages, down to the 13th century, results clearly from writings of Arab authors; cf. G. LE STRANGE, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1930, p. 94-95.


6 LIPINSKI, Semitic, § 29.54 and 67.16.

7 The existence of an original northern Nawar, probably identical with Nawaliů (Hur- rian rā), has to be reckoned with in the vicinity of Nisibis in the late third and the second millennia B.C.; cf. D. MATTHEWS - J. EIDEM, Tell Brak and Nagar, in Iraq 55 (1993), p. 201-207, especially p. 204-205. The identification of Nisibis with Šunā was proposed formerly by W.J. VAN LIERE, Capitals and Citadels of Bronze-Iron Age Syria in Their Relationship to Land and Water, in AAS 13 (1963), p. 109-122 (see p. 120).
Middle Ḥabur.

a nearby town, like Amasaki or Nabula, was the main regional centre in an earlier period.  

2. History

The first explicit mention of the Temanites is encountered in the report of Adad-nirari II’s campaign against Nūr-Hadad, ruler of Nisibis, in 901 B.C. The Assyrian king claims a victory over the Aramaeans “defeated from Pauza (\textit{mw}Pa'-zi) to Nisibis (\textit{mw}Na-śi-pi-na)”\textsuperscript{10}. The name of the first city is spelt \textit{mw}Pa'-za in the annals of Ashur-bēl-kala (1073-1056)\textsuperscript{11} and this name is certainly related to the \textit{Naḥar Bawṣa} of the Syriac sources\textsuperscript{12}. This river corresponds either to the upper course of the Ḷaγdaγdaγ  

\textsuperscript{8} K. Kessler, \textit{Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie Nordnesopotamiens nach keilschriftlichen Quellen des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.} (BTAO B/26), Wiesbaden 1980, p. 208-209. For Nabula, identified tentatively with Nawar and Nawali/u, see below, p. 152 and n. 121.

\textsuperscript{9} RIMA II, text A.099.2, p. 149, lines 39-41.

\textsuperscript{10} RIMA II, text A.099.2, p. 149, line 41.

\textsuperscript{11} RIMA II, text A.089.7, p. 102, lines 8-9a.

(Ḡaḡqaḡ), where about twelve fortified sites have been recognized on either side of the valley\textsuperscript{13}, or to one of the channels formed by the Čaḡčaḡ when it enters into the plain\textsuperscript{14}. In any case, the town was situated not far from Nisibis, where Nūr-Hadad took refuge\textsuperscript{15}. Adad-nirari II’s victory was by no means complete and a new campaign was required in 900 B.C. Adad-nirari II claims again to have gotten the victory, but the concrete results appear to be rather meagre. He only managed to seize the small town of Yaridu and to secure a great quantity of grain\textsuperscript{16}. The name of Yaridu (na-la-ri-di) means “market”\textsuperscript{17}, but its precise location is uncertain\textsuperscript{18}. Then Adad-nirari annexed the town of Saraku, which became an Assyrian supply centre\textsuperscript{19}. Its exact location is unknown.

After the campaigns of 901 and 900 against Nūr-Hadad of Nisibis, Adad-nirari II made a deep westward thrust in 899 to Ḥuzirīna, across the Balīh\textsuperscript{20}. The annals recount the capture of the city and the repair of its walls, along with the submission of towns at the foot of the Tūr ‘Abdīn (Mount Kašiyari), which had been seized previously by Mamli the Temanite. They also record that Adad-nirari has taken over the latter’s “palaces” for himself.

A doubt has been cast on the identity of this city of Ḥuzirīna with Sulṭantepe\textsuperscript{21}, 16 km southeast of Urfa, because it is situated some 200 km to

\textsuperscript{13} H. ErkanaIl, Mardin, in RLA VII, Berlin 1987-90, p. 358-359 (see p. 358a).

\textsuperscript{14} W. Wright, op. cit. (n. 12), identifies Nahar Bawṣa with the Zergān river (Ἀρξιάμον), but his only argument is the passage of Thεοφυλακτ Σμοκάττες, Historiae II, 1, επί τό Βίβας παραγίνεται ένθα δ ποταμός παράρρει τοῦ Ἀρξιάμον. This argument not only implies the identification of Bībaš with Bawṣa, but also assumes that the clause ένθα... belongs to the original text and gives the correct localization of Bībaš. Now, the correctness of these assumptions is highly problematic, as shown by L. Dillemann, Haute Mésopotamie orientale et pays adjacents (BAH 72), Paris 1962, p. 294.

\textsuperscript{15} RIMA II, text A.099.2, p. 149, line 41.

\textsuperscript{16} RIMA II, text A.099.2, p. 149, lines 42-44.

\textsuperscript{17} Jastrow, p. 596b.

\textsuperscript{18} J. Seidmann, Die Inschriften Adad-nirariis II. (MAOG 6/1), Leipzig 1935, p. 65-66, suggests an identification with Redwān, which I don’t manage to find on a map. Instead, K. Kessler, op. cit. (n. 8), p. 215-217, proposes to identify Yaridu with Arīdu, later known as a town of the Gōzān province (SAA I, 233, r. 1; SAA XII, 1, 16). In fact, the apheresis of yt- is attested, but Arīdu is usually located about 65 km west of Nisibis (see here below, p. 126), which seems to be a too big distance in the context of Adad-nirari II’s campaigns against Nisibis.

\textsuperscript{19} RIMA II, text A.099.2, p. 149, line 44.

\textsuperscript{20} RIMA II, text A.099.2, p. 149-150, lines 45-48.

\textsuperscript{21} The question has been discussed in detail and solved in a positive sense by E.L. Gordon, The Meaning of the Ideogram "KASKAL.KUR = "Underground Water Course" and Its Significance for Bronze Age Historical Geography, in JCS 21 (1967[1969]), p. 70-88 (see p. 85-88). J.N. Postgate, Ḥuzirīna, in RLA IV, Berlin 1972-75, p. 535-536, still seems to consider this identification as not finally proven.
3. Eastern Gazira.
the west of Nisibis, the focus of Adad-nirari II’s military activity in the years 901-896 B.C. While the existence of two cities called Ḫuzirīna is a possibility, the immediate connection established by the Assyrian annals between the capture of Ḫuzirīna by Adad-nirari II and the gift of two apes received by him from Bēt-‘Adīnī suggests a North Semitic or West Semitic origin of the toponym Ḫuzirīna, but this ending is missing in Old Babylonian Ḥa-zi-ri, referring most likely to the same place, and it is replaced later by the Aramaic ending -ā, echoed in the Latin form Hostra of the Peutingers Table. It does not result from Adad-nirari II’s annals that Ḫuzirīna was one of the towns occupied by the Temanites. Its political status is thus uncertain.

An important centre of the Temanites was Gidara, which had been conquered by the Aramaeans under the reign of Tiglath-pileser II (967-935 B.C.) This city is usually located southwest of Mardin, but no evidence seems to support this assumption. Instead, a German military map from the time of the First World War records a place name Bughēdrā, apparently *Abū-Gidarā, about 20 km south of Mardin and some 35 km northwest of Nusaybin. Bughēdrā may preserve an ancient toponym, since the place is close to several mounds called, on the same map, Tell Dekūk, Muqbil al-Fawqānī and al-Taḥtānī, Tell Šehīr, Tell al-Helīf, all within a radius of about 5 km from Bughēdrā. The city name Gidara is West Semitic, but the Aramaeans were calling it Ra-qa-ma-tu or Ra-dam-ma-te according to the Assyrian annals. These variants cannot go back to a name *Radamat, as it has been suggested, because a

---

22 Cf. here below, p. 187.
23 Lipiński, Semitic, §29. 54.
25 This is apparently the opinion of Dion, Araméens, p. 33.
26 RIMA II, text A.0.99.2, p. 150, lines 52-53. The clause TA ʼGISKIM-A-ē-šār-ra... ina da-na-ni e-ki-mu-ni does not mean “they had taken by force after the time of Tiglath-pileser”, as translated in RIMA II, p. 150, but “they had taken by force from Tiglath-pileser”.
27 This location was proposed by E. Forrer, in RLA I, Berlin-Leipzig 1928, p. 290a.
28 To the best of my knowledge, none of these mounds has been examined by archaeologists.
30 RIMA II, text A.0.99.2, p. 150, lines 52 and 57.
root *rdm* is so far unknown in Semitic\(^{32}\). *Raqamat*, related to the Semitic name *Rgm* of Petra\(^{33}\) and of some other sites\(^{34}\), should be considered as the correct form, while the sign *dām* must result from a confusion\(^{35}\). The double name of the city, recorded by the Assyrians, probably implies the coexistence of two population groups at Gidara, viz. the ancient urban population and the Aramaeans who have seized the city at the time of Tiglath-pileser II. The Assyrian annals seem also to distinguish the troops of the ruler of Gidara from the *kruA-ri-me*\(^{36}\). Since this ruler is Müquru the Temanite, who bears an Aramaic name as we shall see, one cannot assume that the city has hired Aramaean soldiers to oppose the Assyrian forces, as it has been suggested\(^{37}\). The *kruA-ri-me* are probably tribesmen not living in the city but still pursuing a nomadic or seminomadic way of life and depending somehow from Müquru.

Müquru’s name has been regarded as probably Arabian and analyzed as *mawqir*, i.e. “(a man) bearing a heavy burden, dull of hearing, deaf”\(^{38}\). This interpretation would imply a composite Aramaeo-Arabian constitution of the Temanite people, like in the case of the Lāqaean confederacy\(^{39}\). However, one may doubt that a ruler would bear a name meaning something like “overloaded” or “deaf”. Therefore, a more suitable interpretation will consider this name as an Aramaic passive participle of the causative stem of *wqr*, thus *mawqar < mḥawqar*, meaning “hardened” or “honoured”, “venerable”, like Arabic *muwaqqar* derived from Stem II (intensive). In fact, the h'afel of *yqr < wqr* has the notation “to honour” in Aramaic\(^{40}\). The vocalization *Mu-qu-ru* (*Müquru*,

\(^{32}\) ZADOK, *WSB*, p. 434.


\(^{35}\) This sign is almost identical with the juxtaposed signs *raq-*ma, which suggest a conflated reading *Ra-raq-ma(l-)*-ma-te.

\(^{36}\) RIMA II, text A.0.99.2, p. 150, line 51.


\(^{38}\) ZADOK, *WSB*, p. 312-313.

\(^{39}\) Cf. here above, p. 99-100.

attested again in 744 and 687 B.C.\textsuperscript{41}, reflects the monophthongization \(aw > ù\) and the Assyrian vowel harmony \(a > u\).\textsuperscript{42} The same name, possibly borne by the same Temanite ruler, is written in Aramaic \(Mwqr\) on a tripod from Nimrud\textsuperscript{43}, belonging certainly to the booty of an Assyrian campaign in the West.

When Adad-nirari II attacked Gidara in 898 B.C., the Aramaeans led by Mūquru offered a stiff resistance and the Assyrians had to use redoubts for the siege\textsuperscript{44}. Mūquru surrendered himself, his palace was plundered, and he was carried captive to Assyria together with his brothers\textsuperscript{45}. This campaign was obviously a success, for in 897 Adad-nirari II could march through the area collecting tribute without any sign of resistance\textsuperscript{46}. The situation changed already in 896, when Nūr-Hadad decided again to oppose the Assyrians in his stronghold of Nisibis. The city was besieged and Nūr-Hadad apparently gave himself up without further fight and was carried captive to Nineveh\textsuperscript{47}. The use of redoubts for the siege, already employed in 898 at Gidara, was claimed by Adad-nirari II to be a new tactic\textsuperscript{48}. This campaign of 896 was a significant success, for in 894 Adad-nirari II could march again through the whole area collecting tribute without having to fight\textsuperscript{49}.

The gentilic Tēmanaya still occurs after Adad-nirari II’s campaigns against the Aramaean tribe in a note on “four Temanite (\(kur\text-\text{Te-\text{-man-\text{-a-a}}\)) sheep”\textsuperscript{50}, and the name of the area at the foot of Tūr ‘Abdin may possibly appear as \(kur\ Te-me-ni\) in the legend of the seal of Bēltarši-ilumma, governor of Calah under Adad-nirari III\textsuperscript{51}, although \(māt\ Temen\) may correspond to the Neo-Assyrian province of Tamnūna as well.

\textsuperscript{41} K. Deller - A. Fadhil, Neue Nimrud-Urkunden des 8. Jahrhunderts v. Chr., in \textit{BaM} 24 (1993), p. 243-270 and Pl. 55-114 (see p. 262, No. 18, 2.9.15); SAA VI, 151, r. 9', with a wrong transcription “Mugqurru”.
\textsuperscript{42} GAG, §10c and §11a. Compare Amorite \(Mu-qè-ra-ru-um / Mūqorānum\).
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{RIMA} II, text A.099.2, p. 150, lines 54-55a.
\textsuperscript{45} \textit{RIMA} II, text A.099.2, p. 150, lines 59-60a.
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{RIMA} II, text A.099.2, p. 150, line 61.
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{RIMA} II, text A.099.2, p. 150-152, lines 62-81.
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{RIMA} II, text A.099.2, p. 151, line 63; cf. p. 150, lines 54-55a.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{RIMA} II, text A.099.2, p. 152-153, lines 97-104
\textsuperscript{50} SAA XI, 85, 1.
It is doubtful, instead, whether the Temanites are alluded to in a Luwian hieroglyphic inscription of the ruler Yariris at Carchemish, in the early 8th century B.C., and whether the Neo-Assyrian province of Tamnūna preserves the name of this Aramaean population. When Yariris mentions “the script of the city, the script of Ashur, the script of Tyre, and the script of Taiman”\(^{52}\), he refers to the Luwian hieroglyphs used at Carchemish, to the cuneiform script, to the Phoenician alphabet, and probably to the “South-Arabian” script type designated by the Aramaic word “southern”, taymān. This script was known in Syria in the 8th century B.C., as shown by the Hamā graffitis\(^{53}\). As for the Assyrian province of Tamnūna, there is an objection against the identification of its name with that of the Temanites, since ura Tamnūna appears in the same period as kur Tēmanuia, that continues to be used in the 7th century B.C.\(^{54}\). Besides, Tamnūna was near the Neo-Assyrian province of Ḥalṣu\(^{55}\), which lay on the east bank of the Tigris, between Nineveh and Calah\(^{56}\). This area, not far from the Assyrian heartland, is quite distant from the region occupied by the Temanites in the 10th-9th centuries B.C.


\(^{53}\) See here below, p. 276-278.

\(^{54}\) SAA XI, 85, 1. The identification is nevertheless considered as very probable by A.K. Grayson, *The Assyrian Province Tamanunna/Tamanunu*, in *BiOr* 39 (1982), col. 354-356, with references to the sources.


\(^{56}\) J.N. Postgate, *Ḥalṣu*, in *RLA IV*, Berlin 1972-75, p. 64 (see §2).