

## ISRAELITE AND ARAMEAN HISTORY IN THE LIGHT OF INSCRIPTIONS

A.R. Millard

‘Comparisons are odious’ we are told, yet analogies are the historian's staple diet! Ancient Israel is often treated as unique in world history, yet at the same time many scholars try to fit her history into an acceptable mould by adducing analogies from other times and nations. While both approaches can be supported, there should be no doubt that the most positive and most productive essays in understanding the history of Israel will be those which view it in the terms of Israel's contemporaries before attempting any assessment. That is a large task, barely begun. The following paragraphs try to show some lessons from comparison of Israel and Judah with the Aramean states.

### I. Sources

Israel's history can be read in a continuous narrative in Samuel-Kings from the establishment of the monarchy to its fall. In this Israel is unique. Despite the accumulation of monuments and manuscripts from Egypt, Mesopotamia and Syria over the past two hundred years, nothing approaches the Hebrew narrative in its range or variety, the nearest approaches are to be found in the Hellenistic compilations of Manetho and Berossus.<sup>1</sup> For the first millennium BC almost all the extra-biblical texts are contemporary inscriptions, often relating to a single occasion and frequently presented as the speeches of the kings whose names they bear. Through the sack and desertion of Assyrian cities, numerous royal records have been preserved from the Assyrian empire.<sup>2</sup> It should be remembered that for many small states of the Near East those inscriptions are the

---

<sup>1</sup> Manetho: W. G. Waddell, *Manetho*, LCL (London 1940); Berossus: S.M. Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*, Sources from the Ancient Near East 1.5, (Malibu 1978).

<sup>2</sup> Complete translations available in *ARAB* and, to the end of the reign of Ashurnasirpal II, in A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions 2* (Wiesbaden, 1976); extracts relating to Syria and Palestine in *ANET*.

only contemporary sources of historical information (e.g. Tyre, Media). Indeed, it is a salutary exercise to discover how little would be known of ancient Israel and Judah were they the only sources for that history. No text earlier than about 850 BC names either of those kingdoms, and the first to do so, inscriptions of Shalmaneser III of Assyria (858-824 BC), would leave an insoluble puzzle were it not for the complementary biblical reports. Shalmaneser lists Ahab the Israelite among his opponents at the battle of Qarqar, then in subsequent texts reports tribute paid by Jehu, son of Omri. It would be logical to conclude rulers of two different states—Israel and Beth Omri were in view, logical, but wrong. (For these and the following texts see Appendix 1.) Thereafter Joash, Menahem and Hoshea of Israel (called Beth-Omri), Ahaz, Hezekiah and Manasseh of Judah appear in Assyrian royal monuments. The Babylonian Chronicle gives a date for the fall of Samaria, which Sargon of Assyria reports, and the Chronicle notes Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Jerusalem in 597 BC. That is all. David and, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Jeroboam II, Josiah, and many others, are known only from the Hebrew Scriptures; the famous list of Palestinian places Pharaoh Shishak's army visited names neither the state in which they lay nor its ruler.<sup>3</sup> As everyone knows, Hebrew royal monuments are yet to be found; their absence is due to the hazards of survival and discovery.

The situation of the Hebrew kingdoms is not unusual. The neighbouring states are represented in an equally haphazard way in the Assyrian records, and native monuments, though available from some places and hailed with delight by modern scholars, are really very rare. Damascus, sometimes the leader of Aramean leagues, occurs about two dozen times in Assyrian royal inscriptions and related documents, some of them being duplicates.<sup>4</sup> No monument at all can be attributed to any of the kings of Damascus with certainty. There are five

<sup>3</sup> See K. A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (Warminster 1986) 293-302, 432-47, 575, 587.

<sup>4</sup> For a concordance of place-names see S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms, Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 6 (Kevelaer-Neukirchen 1970); the majority of the texts concerning Syrian kingdoms are set out in H. Sader, *Les états araméens de Syrie depuis leur fondation jusqu' à leur transformation en provinces assyriennes*, *Beiruter Texte und Studien* 36 (Beirut and Wiesbaden 1987).

texts which may relate to them. The Melqart Stele was erected by a Bar-Hadad, king of Aram, but his father's name cannot be read, as the disagreement between recent attempts demonstrates, and Aram need not mean Damascus; two ivory plaques engraved 'for our lord Hazael' probably refer to the king of Damascus whom Elisha anointed (2 Kings 8),<sup>5</sup> as do two bronze horse trappings also inscribed 'for our lord Hazael'.<sup>6</sup> (Note that these bronzes were found in Samos and Euboea, far from Hazael's home, and were probably looted from a shrine after an Assyrian attack, then passed from hand to hand until they found their way to two Greek temples. One might compare the stone bead found in Ashur which carries a cuneiform text declaring it is booty from the temple of Shaha in Malaha, a city of Hazael, brought to Assyria by Shalmaneser.<sup>7</sup>) The Bible offers a dozen passages on the history of Damascus in connection with Israel and Judah. Further north, the city of Hamath on the Orontes was the centre of a state which Assyrian texts mention a little more frequently, no doubt because it was slightly nearer to Assyria on the route through the Levant towards Egypt. Thirty or so notices refer to Hamath, again some of them are duplicates. The greater distance from Israel results in the biblical references being fewer, three. Local kings have left a dozen or so inscriptions in Hieroglyphic Hittite, celebrating their construction works or marking their property. One king of Hamath is known by his Aramaic monument, the Stele of Zakkur (which was originally a statue of the king, only the footstool and the text below it now surviving).<sup>8</sup> One more Aramaean state deserves attention here, the principality of Sam'al in the Amanus mountains, with its capital at modern Zinjirli. Five Assyrian inscriptions deal with it, but local documents are more abundant. Three exist in

<sup>5</sup> Treated recently by E. Puech, 'L'ivoire inscrit d'Arslan-Tash et les rois de Damas', *RB* 88 (1981) 544-62.

<sup>6</sup> H. Kyrieleis, W. Röllig, 'Ein altorientalischer Pferdeschmuck aus dem Heraion von Samos', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 103 (1988) 37-75; Fr. Bron, A. Lemaire, 'Les inscriptions araméennes de Hazael', *RA* 83 (1989) 35-44; I. Eph'al, J. Naveh, 'Hazael's Booty Inscriptions', *IEJ* 39 (1989) 192-200.

<sup>7</sup> *ANET* 281; H. Sader, *op. cit.* 237f. VI Aa 2c.

<sup>8</sup> A stele in Aleppo Museum is carved in low relief with a standing male figure whose feet rest on a stool identical with the one on the Stele of Zakkur.

Phoenician, a dozen or so in Aramaic, including ownership labels, and one seal is engraved with a king's name in Hittite Hieroglyphs. The greater number of stone monuments found there is, most likely, the result of light occupation in later centuries. While this survey could be extended further, these three kingdoms provide adequate sources for this study. It can be seen that the Hebrew kingdoms and the Aramean states are treated equally in the Assyrian texts; the focus of this paper is the native recording.

## II. Hebrew and Aramean Records

There is a contrast between the native sources available for Israelite history and those available for the Aramean states. The former are continuous narratives in the third person put in their present form long after the events, the latter are first person recitations composed for a specific moment. A number of simple comparisons of individual points in the Hebrew and Aramaic documents have been made during this century on literary and conceptual levels, but a further step may be taken which, borrowing a term from modern linguistics, may be termed transformational history-writing. An ancient royal inscription may be transposed into a third person narrative in the manner of Samuel-Kings; contrariwise, segments of the Hebrew text may be reconstituted as royal monuments.

The stele of Zakkur, (Appendix 2) set up soon after 800 BC,<sup>9</sup> could be transformed along the following lines:

Zakkur was king over Hamath and Lu'ash. He was a man of 'Anah (or a humble man<sup>10</sup>) whom Ba'lshamayn [chose] and supported. He made him king in Hadrach. Then Bar-Hadad, son of Hazael, king of Aram, leagued against him with [1]7 kings, Bar-Hadad and his army. . . Then Zakkur prayed to Ba'lshamayn and Ba'lshamayn answered him, speaking through seers and diviners. Ba'lshamayn said to him, 'Do not be afraid. It was I who made you king and I shall support you and deliver you from all [these kings who] have laid siege to you...'

Regrettably, the sequel is destroyed. Zakkur obviously saw his enemies retreat, for the remainder of the stele describes

<sup>9</sup> For the date see H. Sader, *op. cit.* 216-20.

<sup>10</sup> See A. R. Millard, 'The Homeland of Zakkur', *Semitica* 39 (1989) 60-66.

the defences and shrines he built, and curses anyone who should damage his memorial. Nevertheless, the text which remains is, as presented, little different from passages in the Bible: divine selection and support, raising to the throne, prayer when enemies threatened, divine response through prophetic oracles, the enemy defeated and the triumphant king strengthening and beautifying his realm. Viewing this monument in biblical terms, Zakkur may be compared with David. Neither was heir to a throne—Zakkur does not name his father, which may suggest he was not a member of a royal line—each was selected by his god, and gained his throne with divine aid, each ruled a composite state, Zakkur over Hamath, Lu‘ash and Hadrach, David over Judah, Israel and principalities to the east and north. Oracles encouraged Zakkur to resist his powerful foes, and David was likewise emboldened to face the Philistine attack (2 Sam. 5:17-25). Other parallels could also be produced.

Further north, the state of Sam'al provides a most interesting illustration of the politics of the time through its monuments. The dynastic line can be followed from the ancestor Gabbar about 900 BC through perhaps nine other kings to Bar-Rakib about 730 BC. A man named Kilamu who became king about 835 BC, left a Phoenician inscription as his memorial (Appendix 3). It opens with a list of preceding kings, each dismissed as 'ineffectual' (*bl p 'l*). Notice in passing that the second one, Hayya son of Gabbar, can be identified with Hayan, son of Gabbar, 'living at the foot of the Amanus' listed as a tributary of Shalmaneser III of Assyria. Kilamu makes no secret of his land's weakness among its neighbours and the way he overcame it by buying the king of Assyria's aid to fight his foes. Consequently Kilamu's kingdom prospered, he became a father to his people 'a man who had never seen the face of a sheep I made the owner of a flock. . .'

Again, comparisons with Hebrew texts become more striking when the first person account is transformed into the third person. There is a row of unsuccessful kings, maybe like those who 'did evil in the Lord's sight' (although failure or success were not rigidly decided by conduct), there is a new king who changes policy, preferring distant Assyria's suzerainty to domination by a nearby bully, and then there is prosperity.

The alliance of Ahaz with Tiglath-pileser III is comparable, when Damascus and Samaria threatened Jerusalem (2 Kings 16; Is. 7,8). Is the picture of prosperity to be likened to Isaiah's oracles at that time? Kilamu's descriptions of the prosperity of his rule recall the comment on Solomon's reign, 'silver was not reckoned valuable in the days of Solomon' (1 Kings 10:21). They are notable as typical hyperbole and as the realization of blessings the gods were expected to pour on their devotees, in contrast to the curses commonly listed which wish want and hardship on enemies. The curses which close this text associate the gods of the city with specific ancestors. Such allocation of gods to different ancestors was not possible for Israelite historians, but the attitude revealed in Kilamu's inscription is comparable to the expression 'the God of your father David' used in oracular contexts to kings of Judah (2 Ki. 20:5; 2 Ch. 21:12; cf. 2 Ch. 34:3).

Later Sam'al experienced a palace revolt. A king and seventy 'brothers' or 'kinsmen' (*yhy 'bh*) were killed, but one of the royal line survived to secure the throne with Assyrian help as Panammu II. Sustaining the local dynasty so long as it remained loyal may have been an Assyrian promise in the agreement setting out the relationship of the two states. That would let the local kings continue to rule in their own right, erecting monuments in their own names and retaining their own royal seals. As vassals, they were required to support the Assyrian king against his enemies and it was in that role, fighting beside his master, Tiglath-pileser, against Damascus, that Panammu II of Sam'al died, as his son unashamedly recorded. That son, Bar-Rakib, tells in his own inscription of his greatest moment when, like his father, he ran beside the chariot of his Assyrian overlord. Since the Assyrian texts concentrate on triumphs over enemies and rebels and listing the submissive, sources like these which illuminate the behaviour and attitudes of acquiescent kings are most valuable complements.

As always, the first person recitations need critical reading no less than the third person narratives. Biblical historians may observe the scepticism expressed about one of Kilamu's claims, that he 'hired (*skr*) the king of Assyria'

against the king of the Danunim who was dominating him.<sup>11</sup> Surely the prince of so small a state as Sam'al would not have expected so powerful a ruler to do as he asked! That opinion, in fact, seems to show too narrow an appreciation of the politics of the time, for obviously the Assyrian emperor would only comply if it suited him to do so, which it evidently did. Assyrian intervention need not mean the king himself appeared in Sam'al; his generals customarily acted for him and, as they were extensions of his power, their successes were reckoned as his. Another objection is raised, that Kilamu's admission of his need for external help would belittle him in the eyes of his own subjects. The way Bar-Rakib who ruled the same state about a century later proudly proclaimed how his father and he had places in the Assyrian emperor's retinue shows such an objection is groundless. If the Danunim were a longstanding hostile neighbour, as appears to be the case, obtaining decisive intervention against them could be a matter for congratulation. The ancient context gives the proper perspective for interpreting these records.

At first glance, the contemporaneity of the Aramaic monuments might appear to ensure their accuracy as records of their times and the events that took place in them. Consideration of their nature may throw some doubt on that impression, quite apart from ill-founded objections of the type noted already. These inscriptions are bombastic public declarations designed to ensure continued respect for the kings and veneration of their names by subsequent generations. Now the names of several of the kings and their realms are attested independently, so they cannot be dismissed as inventions, nor is there any reason to suppose they did not build the defences or palaces or shrines they boast about. Yet several of them happily speak of their gods placing them on their thrones, saving them, and giving them success. In cases like the Zakkur Stele the expressions are more than polite piety—all is due to Ba'lishamayn. Such an inscription is religious propaganda; its aim is to glorify the gods of Zakkur as well as the king. He and

---

<sup>11</sup> For the objections and discussion of them and the themes of Kilamu's monument, see F. M. Fales, 'Kilamuwa and the foreign Kings: Propaganda vs. Power', *Die Welt des Orients* 10 (1979) 8-22.

the other ancient kings believed the gods were on their side, and they said so! If a calamity befell one of these rulers, he would only report it when it was overcome, as the Panammu I inscription shows. The statements about divine aid need to be taken seriously, for to dismiss them as the clothing of an antique ideology which modern scientific investigation can ignore is to throw away some of the ancient evidence which is always a rare and precious heritage. Zakkur's Stele is damaged at the point where it might have related how Ba'lshamayn answered his prayer and saved him from the coalition of hostile kings. Possibilities can be multiplied: the leaders of the coalition quarrelled (cf. 2 Kings 3:23); plague broke out in the armies of the besiegers; rumour of an Assyrian advance sent each king to secure his own capital (cf. 2 Kings 7:6). (The possibility of Assyrian intervention, long ago suggested, is strengthened if Zakkur's home was at 'Anah on the mid-Euphrates, a region under Assyrian control. That intervention may then be identified with the saving of Israel from Aramean oppression, 2 Kings 13:3-5.) Whatever explanations may be advanced, the fact is to be accepted that something did happen which released Zakkur from his predicament, and which he attributed to the action of his god on his behalf. In contrast, the inscription of Kilamu has no religious element, except in the closing curses. He claims the credit for his success through his own policy of buying Assyrian aid. There is no reason why ancient kings should have had a uniform attitude. Later, it may be mentioned, Panammu I of Sam'al believed the god Hadad and the other gods of Sam'al had placed him on the throne and established his rule, while Panammu II was saved from the slaughter of the royal family by the city's gods, yet placed on the throne by Tiglath-pileser of Assyria, according to the memorial his son Bar-Rakib composed for him. Fluctuations in acknowledging divine guidance or support can be traced in the biblical records, too. Near the beginning of his reign, David asked for oracles in the face of the Philistine threat, as quoted above, although reports of later campaigns are silent on this matter, as if the king acted on his own initiative and in confidence of his own ability. That is a possible reading of the text; the insult offered by Hanun the Ammonite and the coalition he formed may have provided a



sufficient *casus belli*, yet here divine aid might be thought essential for David with so extensive an opposition (2 Sam. 10). More plausible is the supposition of narrative economy; the king habitually sought his god's direction and blessing, but the narrator included only those occasions when the detail was appropriate for the sake of the story, or the circumstances required the explanation.<sup>12</sup> (In 2 Samuel 2 it is important that David's move to Hebron had divine sanction and was not solely a human decision.)

Zakkur not only reported that his god responded to his appeal, he gave the words of the response, commencing 'Do not be afraid!' That encouragement and the following phraseology have much in common with oracles and religious poetry in Hebrew.<sup>13</sup> If a greater amount of Aramaic literature survived, these would almost certainly be seen to belong to a common tradition shared by both languages, a tradition also embracing Mesopotamia.

These religious expressions join other idioms and phrases which are not unique to a particular monument or narrative. When Panammu I tells of the killing of his father Bar-Sur and seventy of his kinsmen, Jehu's massacre of the seventy sons of Ahab comes to mind (2 Kings 10), and the survival of Panammu is reminiscent of the rescue of Joash when Athaliah slaughtered the Judean royal house (2 Kings 11). The motif of a king threatened by stronger neighbours, shared by Zakkur and Kilamu, is common elsewhere, and with the triumph of the weak. Such features may be part of a scribal or court tradition, with set phrases learnt in training. Certainly old royal inscriptions were used in this way in Babylonia a millennium before, and the inclusion of stock titles and phrases in Babylonian and Assyrian royal inscriptions is obvious. If the interpretation of Ostrakon 88 from Arad as a pupil's copy of a

<sup>12</sup> The same economy may be observed in the matter of interpreters. One is specified in the account of Joseph meeting his brothers because the story demands mention of an intermediary, Gn. 42:23. In other cases the reader can assume interpreters were operating although they are not introduced in the text to avoid unnecessary complication. Thus, the Rab-shakeh is likely to have employed an interpreter to speak Hebrew to the people of Jerusalem, 2 Ki. 18:19ff, and so is Solomon in negotiating his alliances, e.g. 1Ki. 3:1.

<sup>13</sup> See J. C. Greenfield, 'The Zakir Inscription and the Danklied', *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies I* (Jerusalem 1972) 174-91.

Judean royal report is correct,<sup>14</sup> then the same process may be assumed for Judah. The arrangement of set phrases, the repetition of certain acts by one king after another, or the recurrence of certain situations is not necessarily a sign of scribes or historians lazily copying the work of their forbears. Protocol would demand certain formulae, no king would deprecate his own achievement, and each monument should end on a note of success. Yet when these stereotypes present themselves in the Aramaic royal monuments, they stand in unique settings, which gives reason to suppose they were deliberately selected as the most apt expressions of the actual activities of the various rulers. These are episodic and isolated texts, as already remarked, so there is little repetition within them. Where there is a long series of inscriptions, as in Assyria, or a continuous narrative, as for Israel and Judah, repetition is likely to occur as successive kings faced the same enemies in the same areas, or repaired the same temples in the same towns. Attempts to reduce to single incidents accounts of different kings doing the same things (as some commentators do with biblical narratives) are misconceived.

Being contemporary records, the Aramaic monuments may have had no sources except the memories of the kings and their officers. The compilers of Samuel and Kings refer to some earlier records which were at their disposal, whether or not they also drew on royal stelae written in Hebrew it is impossible to say. Nevertheless, much of their writing resembles quite closely portions of the Aramaic inscriptions from Syria, a resemblance which suggests Samuel-Kings is a compilation drawn from contemporary records, not a largely theological fabrication to establish a particular ideology.

Here is a matter of method. Comparing the Aramaic monuments with the records of Israel's history seems to indicate that both describe the same sort of politics and similar attitudes to events. In assessing either, proper regard to the context is essential, as this essay has begun to show. With those, and other, ancient texts available, it is, surely, unscientific and very subjective to treat the Hebrew records

---

<sup>14</sup> A.R. Millard, 'Epigraphic Notes, Aramaic and Hebrew', *PEQ* 110 (1978) 232-6.

from the start as if they are totally different creations. Only when indubitable inconsistencies or errors are traced and found to be contrary to ancient practices should the suspicion of later editorial shaping be entertained. Whatever the presuppositions of the modern reader, whatever the religious beliefs, or lack of them, the biblical writings demand a readiness to read them in their own terms, and extensive study of the ancient Levant and adjacent cultures leads to a clearer understanding of those terms.

### Appendix 1

#### Kings of Israel and Judah in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions

*Ahab* at the Battle of Qarqar (c. 853 BC)

<sup>1</sup>*a-ha-ab-bu* <sup>māt</sup>*sir-i-la-a-a* 'Ahab the Israelite'  
Shalmaneser III (c. 858-824 BC), Kurkh Stele, III R 8 ii 92; English Translations *ARAB* I § 611, *ANET* 279, *DOTT* 47(a).

*Jehu* a tributary (c. 841 BC)

<sup>1</sup>*ya-ú-a mār hu-um-ri-i* 'Jehu the Omride'  
Shalmaneser III, Black Obelisk, A.H. Layard, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character* (London 1851) pl. 98. ii, *ARAB* I § 590, *ANET* 281, *DOTT* 48(c); Kalah Fragment, III R 5. 6 25; *ARAB* I § 672, *ANET* 280, *DOTT* 48(b); Kurba'il Statue, J.V. Kinnier Wilson, *Iraq* 24 (1962) 94, pls. xxxiv, xxxv 29, 30; <sup>1</sup>*ya-a-ú mār hu-um-ri-i*, Ashur Stone, F. Safar, *Sumer* 7 (1951) 12 iv 11, cf. E. Michel, *WO* 2 (1954-59) 38.11.

*Joash* a tributary (c. 796 BC)

<sup>1</sup>*ya-'a-su* <sup>māt</sup>*sa-me-ri-na-a-a* 'Joash the Samarian'  
Adad-nerari III (c. 810-783 BC) Tell al-Rimah Stele, S. Dalley, *Iraq* 30 (1968) 142, 143, pl. xxxix 8. a tributary state <sup>māt</sup>*hu-uā-ri-i* 'Omri-land' Nimrud Slab, I R 35 1 12, H. Tadmor, *Iraq* 35 (1972) 148f, *ARAB* I § 739, *ANET* 281f, *DOTT* 51(a).

*Menahem* a tributary (c. 738 BC)

<sup>1</sup>*me-ni-hi-im-me* <sup>al</sup>*sa-me-ri-na-a-a* 'Menahem the Samarian'

Tiglath-pileser III (c. 744-727 BC), 'Annals' III R 9.3 50, *ARAB* I § 772, *ANET* 283, *DOTT* 54(a); <sup>1</sup>*mi-ni-hi-im-me* <sup>māt</sup>*sa-me-ri-na-a-a* Stele, L.D. Levine, *Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae from Iran* (Toronto 1972) 18, fig. 2, pl. v ii 5.

*Pekah and Hoshea* (c. 732 BC)

[The people of Beth-Omri] *pa-qa-ha šarru-šú-nu is-ki-pu-ma* <sup>1</sup>*a-ú-si-* '[ana šarrūti ina muh<sup>h</sup>il-šú-nu áš-kun 'They overthrew their king Peqah, and I set Hoshea as king over them'

Tiglath-pileser III, Nimrud Tablet, III R 10.2 28,29, *ARAB* I §§ 815,816, *ANET* 283, *DOTT* 55(b)

*Ahaz* a tributary (c. 732 BC)

<sup>1</sup>*ya-ú-ha-zi* <sup>māt</sup>*ya-ú-da-a-a* 'Jehoahaz the Judean'

Tiglath-pileser III, Nimrud Slab, II R 67 r. 11, *ARAB* I § 801, *ANET* 282, *DOTT* 55(c)

Sargon II (c. 721-705 BC) refers to the revolt and capture of Samaria often, without naming a king, note, among others,

<sup>al</sup>*sa-me-ri-na al-me ak-šud* 27,290 *nišē ašib libbi-šú-áš-lu-la* 'I surrounded and conquered Samaria and carried away 27,290 people living in it'

Display Inscription, H. Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, II, (Leipzig 1889) 30 23-25, *ARAB* II § 55, *ANET* 284f, *DOTT* 60(c).

Sargon. . *ka-šid* <sup>al</sup>*sa-me-ri-na* *ù gi-mir* <sup>māt</sup>*bit* (1) *hu-um-ri-a* 'conqueror of Samaria and all the land of Beth Omri'

Pavement Slab iii 31, 32, H. Winckler, *op.cit.* 38, *ARAB* II § 99, *ANET* 284, *DOTT* 60(d).

He also calls himself *mu-šak-nis* <sup>māt</sup>*ya-ú-du ša-šar-šú ru-ú-qu* 'conqueror of Judah which is far away'

Nimrud Inscription 8, H. Winckler, *op.cit.* 48, *ARAB* II § 137, *ANET* 287, *DOTT* 62(i), and lists <sup>māt</sup>*ya-ú-di* as a tributary state, Winckler, *op. cit.* 44 D 26', *ARAB* II § 194, *ANET* 287, *DOTT* 61(f).

*Hezekiah* a tributary (c. 701 BC)

<sup>1</sup>*ha-za-qí-ya-ú<sup>māt</sup>ya-ú-da-a-a* 'Hezekiah the Judean'  
Sennacherib (c. 704-681 BC), 'annals' iii 37ff and other  
texts, D.D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib*  
(Chicago 1924) 33 etc., *ARAB* II § 240 etc., *ANET* 287f.,  
*DOTT* 66f.

*Manasseh* a tributary (c. 674 BC)

<sup>1</sup>*me-na-si-i šar<sup>al</sup>ya-ú-di* 'Manasseh king of Judah'  
Esarhaddon (c. 680-669 BC) R. Campbell Thompson,  
*The Prisms of Esarhaddon and of Ashurbanipal*,  
(London 1931) v 55, pl. 11, *ANET* 291, *DOTT* 74.  
<sup>1</sup>*mi-in-se-e šar matya-ú-di* 'Manasseh king of Judah'  
Ashurbanipal (c. 668-627 BC) Prism C ii 27, M. Streck,  
*Assurbanipal*, II (Leipzig 1916) 138, *ARAB* II § 876,  
*ANET* 294, *DOTT* 74.

## Appendix 2 The Stele of Zakkur

Face A

The monument which Zakkur, king of Hamath and  
Lua'sh, set up for El-wer [in Hadrach (?).] I am Zakkur,  
king of Hamath and Lu'ash. I was a man of Anah<sup>15</sup> and  
Ba'lishamayn [raised] me and stood beside me, and  
Ba'lishamayn made me king over Hadrach. Then Bar-  
Hadad, son of Hazael, king of Aram, united against me  
s[even]teen kings: Bar-Hadad and his army, Bar-Gush  
and his army, the king of Que and his army, the king of  
'Amuq and his army, the king of Gurgum and his army,  
the king of Sam'al and his army, the king of Melid and  
his army [ ] seven[teen], they and their armies.  
All these kings laid siege to Hadrach. They raised a  
wall higher than the wall of Hadrach, they dug a  
ditch deeper than [its] ditch. Now I raised my hands  
(in prayer) to Ba'lishamayn, and Ba'lishamayn  
answered me. Ba'lishamayn [spoke] to me through seers  
and diviners (?). Ba'lishamayn said to me, 'Do not be

<sup>15</sup> Or 'a humble man', see n. 10.

afraid! Since I made [you king, I will stand] beside you.  
I will save you from all [these kings who] have  
besieged you'. [Ba'lshamayn] also said to [me ' ] all  
these kings who have [besieged you ] and this wall  
[ ]

## Face B

[ ] Hadrach[ ] for chariot [and] horseman  
[ ] its king within it(?) I [built] Hadrach and  
added [to it] all the surrounding [ ] and I set it up  
[ ] these defences on every side [I] built shrines  
in [every place (?)] I built [ ] Apish and [ ]  
the house [ and I set up this monument before [El-  
wer] and wr[ote] on it my [achievements. In future (?)  
whoever removes (?) from this monument what Zakkur  
king of Hamath [and Lu'ash] has [accomplished] and  
who[ever re]moves this monument from [before] El-wer  
and takes it away from its [place], or whoever throws it  
[ ] May Ba'lshamayn and El[wer ] and  
Shamash [and Shaha[r ] and the gods of heaven  
and the god]s of earth and Ba'lX [ ] x and x [ ]  
xx[ ]

## Face C

[ ] the name of Zakkur and the name of [ ]

### Appendix 3 The Inscription of Kilamu of Sam'al

I am Kilamu son of Hayy[a']. Gabbar was king over Ya'udi and he achieved nothing. Then there was Bamah, and he achieved nothing. Then there was my father Hayya', and he achieved nothing. Then there was my brother Sha'al, and he achieved nothing. Now I, Kilamu son of Tam[ ]<sup>16</sup>, whatever I have achieved none of my predecessors had achieved. My father's house was among mighty kings and each undertook to make war, so I was under the control of the kings like one who chews his beard, and like one who gnaws his hand, for the king of the Danunites was stronger than me. Then I hired the king of

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps his mother's name.

Assyria for my side, who can give a maiden in exchange for a sheep and a warrior for a robe.

I, Kilamu son of Hayya', sat upon my father's throne. The *mushkabim*<sup>17</sup> were treated badly (?) like dogs before the previous kings, but I became a father to one and a mother to another, and a brother to a third. One who had never seen a sheep I made owner of a flock, and one who had never seen an ox I made the owner of a herd of cattle, and of silver and of gold. He who had never seen a tunic of linen from his childhood, in my days he was clad in byssus. I supported the *mushkabim* and they looked on me as an orphan to his mother. Whoever among my sons succeeds me, should he damage this inscription, may the *mushkabim* not respect the *ba'ararim*, and may the *ba'ararim* not respect the *mushkabim*. Whoever destroys this inscription, may Ba'al-semed who belongs to Gabbar destroy his head, and may Ba'al-hamman who belongs to Bamah destroy his head, and Rakab-el, the lord of the dynasty, too!

---

<sup>17</sup> *mushkabim* and *ba'ararim* were apparently social classes.