IN HISTORICAL STUDIES, ONE OF THE COMMON MODES OF PERIODIZATION IS THE USE OF CENTURIES. LIKE ANY TYPE OF PERIODIZATION, THIS IS INTENDED TO BE FLEXIBLE, SINCE OBVIOUSLY EVERY TURN OF CENTURY DOES NOT BRING ABOUT A SUDDEN AND RADICAL CHANGE IN MATERIAL CULTURE AND/OR TRENDS IN HUMAN THOUGHT AND PERSPECTIVE. THE GREATEST PROBLEM WITH ANY PERIODIZATION—WHETHER BASED ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERIODS, KINGDOMS, DYNASTIES, AGES, ERAS, NEO-MARXIST CATEGORIES (LIKE PRE-MODERN, MODERN, POST-MODERN)—IS GENERALIZATION. THIS IS OFTEN MANIFESTED IN AN UNAVOIDABLE TENDENCY TO EMPHASIZE CONTINUITY AND UNDERSTATE CHANGES WITHIN PERIODS, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME EMPHASIZING CHANGES AND UNDERSTATING CONTINUITY BETWEEN ADJACENT PERIODS. IN FACT, PERIODS ARE ARTIFICIAL CONCEPTS THAT CAN LEAD AT TIMES TO SEEING CONNECTIONS THAT DO NOT ACTUALLY EXIST. THEY DO NOT USUALLY HAVE NEAT BEGINNINGS AND ENDINGS. NEVERTHELESS, PERIODIZATION IS NECESSARY TO HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND THE USE OF CENTURIES CAN PROVE FUNCTIONAL IN THE PROCESS OF IMPOSING FORM ON THE PAST. IN USING CENTURIES AS A PERIODIZATION SCHEME, SOME MODERN HISTORIANS HAVE RESORTED TO THE CONCEPTS OF 'LONG' AND 'SHORT' CENTURIES TO BETTER REFLECT THE PERIODS AND THEIR SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES.


1. THE PERIOD OF RECOVERY (ASHUR-DAN II–TUKULTI-NINURTA II) (934–884): 50 YEARS,

1 See M. Geller, 'Akkadian Sources of the Ninth Century' in this volume.

the early imperial period (Ashurnasirpal II–Shalmaneser III) (883–824): 59 years,
the inner crisis and the period of autonomous rulers (Shamshi-Adad V–Ashur-nirari V) (827–745): 82 years.\(^3\)

Recently, M. Liverani (2004) has suggested a different periodization for Assyrian history in the ninth century. While the two long and successful reigns of Ashurnasirpal II (883–859) and Shalmaneser III (859–824) represent the first 'peak' in Neo-Assyrian history (i.e. period 2 above), there is a definite contrast between the two. Ashurnasirpal II is 'the end of a long process of recovery of Assyria inside the “historical” borders (between the Zagros and the Euphrates) already reached since the times of Tukulti-Ninurta I;\(^3\) while Shalmaneser III marks the beginning of a quite different process, the imperial conquest of wide lands beyond those borders’ (2004, 213). In his opinion, there are five areas in which there is greater discontinuity than continuity between these two monarchs' reigns: military campaigns, enemy coalitions, extent of the empire, inner organization and subjugated states. He concludes that Ashurnasirpal II's reign is integrally tied to those of the previous three kings,\(^4\) Ashur-dan II (934–912), Adad-nirari II (911–891), and Tukulti-Ninurta II (890–884), so that 'the entire period 934–859 features as quite unitary in the political program in the military activities, and in their literary recording' (2004, 220).\(^5\)

Shalmaneser's political programme, however, was different and more ambitious. Since the previous kings had successfully campaigned in a project of

\(^2\) Kuhrt (1995, 478–93) labels these periods: (1) The Development of Assyrian Strategy (934–884), (2) Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III (883–824) and (3) Problems in Assyria (823–745).

\(^3\) Postgate (1992, 257) notes: 'The [early Neo-Assyrian] kings lovingly record the resettlement of erstwhile Assyrians on erstwhile Assyrian land, and tell us in whose reign recaptured cities had fallen to the Aramean intruders. The years when the Euphrates was the frontier to the west had not been forgotten.'

\(^4\) Liverani 1992, 99. Before any westward expansion could be attempted, these Assyrian kings spent a long time conquering and subduing again the northern territories and the Jezireh, areas that the Middle Assyrian kings had colonized in the thirteenth century and then lost to the Arameans. The Aramean penetrations had established new polities, but there were 'pockets' or 'islands' of Assyrians that managed to endure even in precarious circumstances. One of the strategic outposts may have been Dur-Katlimmu (Tell Sheikh Hamad). See Kühne 1998, 282–84; Liverani 1988, 81–98; but see Postgate 1992. In an important recent discovery, textual evidence of a local ruler subordinate to Assyria c. 1100 has been obtained from Tell Taban (ancient Tabete) and Tell Bderi (ancient Dur-Aššur-ketti-leṣer) on the middle Habur. See Pfälzner 1990, 63–79; Maul 1991; Ohnuma, Numoto and Okada 1999.

\(^5\) The ferocious, yet somewhat irregular, sorties of Ashurnasirpal II were followed by the well-planned annual campaigns of his son Shalmaneser III (Tadmor 1975, 36). In fact, Ashurnasirpal II campaigned more in his first five years of reign than he did in his remaining nineteen years (Lambert 1974, 103–09).
restoration inside of the perceived ‘traditional borders’ of Assyria, Shalmaneser III was able to campaign outside these borders in an attempt to expand Assyrian power (Liverani 2004, 215). This met with great success in various directions—in northern and central Syria, in Babylonia, and on the Iranian plateau.

Moreover, Liverani argues that just as there is an evident continuity from Ashurnasirpal back to the last third of the tenth century, a similar continuity can be traced forward from Shalmaneser to the entire eighth century, especially in the inner organization and administration of the empire. The inner crisis and period of autonomous rulers (827–744) was, at least in part, generated by the very arrangement Shalmaneser had given to the inner structure of the Assyrian state (2004, 217–20). Not until the advent of Tiglath-pileser III almost a century later would the ambitions of the governors to pursue independent politics and personal advantages be curtailed. Thus, Liverani concludes, the difference between Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III ‘deserves to be underscored by a periodization that cuts through the 9th century and sets a major division mark at the succession of the latter of the two kings to the former’ (2004, 220).

Liverani’s essay is important in stressing the discontinuity between the reigns of Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III. Nevertheless, it highlights the inherent problems of periodization6 because it undercuts the significant differences between Ashurnasirpal II and the previous three kings of the early Neo-Assyrian period,7 as well as the substantial contrasts between Shalmaneser III and the monarchs of the period of autonomous rulers.8

6 This can also be seen in the earlier transition from the Middle Assyrian period to the Neo-Assyrian period. See the important study of Roaf 2001, who outlines the difficulties of continuity and discontinuity between these periods.

7 Kuhrt (1995, 482) notes: ‘The reign of Tukulti-Ninurta II (890–884) is usually regarded, with some justification, as rounding off this stage of Assyrian recovery.’ Three points can be noted: (1) Ashurnasirpal II surpassed the earlier three kings politically and militarily in two ways: by getting tribute and locating strongholds beyond the traditional borders of the empire (e.g. Dur-Aššur in Zamua in the East, and Aribua in Patina in the West). (2) There is a very marked increase in documentation from his reign in contrast to previous kings, reflecting his energetic campaigns and building efforts. The earliest known text written completely in Neo-Assyrian dates from his reign. This is a text appointing the official Nergal-apil-kumuya to supervise the move of the royal court from Assur to Kalhu (Deller and Millard 1993; Kataja and Whiting 1995, nos 82–84). (3) Ashurnasirpal II’s building activities at his new capital Kalhu were crowned by the creation of his pleasure gardens which included over forty varieties of trees and plants encountered on his campaigns irrigated by the ‘Canal of Plenty’ (the Banquet Stela—RIMA 2, A.0.101.30, 36b–52). None of the three previous kings had built on this scale and none created such a magnificent garden. Not since the Middle Assyrian kings, Tiglath-pileser I (RIMA 2, A.0.87.1, vii.17–27) and Ashur-bel-kala (RIMA 2, A.0.89.7, v.20–37), had the planting of gardens taken place.

8 From the perspective of the Levantine states, the time between Shalmaneser III and Tiglath-pileser III was distinct in many respects. A most obvious difference is the power wielded by various high officials, such as Shamshi-ilu (see Grayson 1994; 1999; Ikeda 1999; Dalley 2000; Kuan 2001).
Similar problems arise in attempting a periodization of the history of the kingdom of Israel in the ninth century. Like Assyrian history, Israelite history for this century clearly contains three discernible, yet interconnected, periods, two of which overlap into other centuries (the first with the previous tenth century and the third with the following eighth century):

1. the early period (from Jeroboam I to the accession of Omri) (c. 931/928–885/882): 46 years,
2. the Omride period (from his accession to the usurpation of Jehu) (c. 885/882–842/841): 44 to 41 years,
3. the Jehuite period (from Jehu’s usurpation to the death of Zechariah) (c. 842/841–752/750): 91 to 90 years.9

Ashurnasirpal II ruled Assyria from near the beginning of Omri’s reign and throughout much of Ahab’s. In his western campaign (dated c. 875–867—at the very end of Omri’s reign or the beginning of Ahab’s), he received the tribute of the kings of Tyre, Sidon and Byblos (along with other Phoenician city-states such as Arvad). While Israel did not pay tribute at this time, there can be little doubt that the Omride dynasty became acutely aware of the Assyrian threat to its security.

No matter how one understands the periodization of Neo-Assyrian history in the ninth century, the reign of Shalmaneser III (859–824 BCE) stands out (Yamada 2002). And it is particularly interesting that his reign provides the initial contact points between the two political entities: in 853 BCE fighting a coalition of western kings at Qarqar that included Ahab, the Israelite; and in 841 BCE extracting tribute from Jehu. Neither of these events is mentioned in the Bible, but is known only from Assyrian inscriptions. Thus Shalmaneser’s reign serves as a bridge between the second and third periods of Israelite history listed above. The remainder of this chapter will investigate the place of Shalmaneser III within these histories. The fact is that, from 853 to the final conquest of Samaria in 720, the history of the Israelite kingdom is inextricably bound to the history of Assyria (as too is the rest of the Levant), and is profitably analysed in this light.

9 For examples of such periodization, see Campbell 1998; Ahlström 1993, 543–638.
THE CAMPAIGN OF 853 AND THE BATTLE OF QARQAR

Shalmaneser III’s 853 campaign is reported in nine of his inscriptions. Far and away the most detailed account is preserved in the Kurkh Monolith. This large inscribed stone stela was discovered at Kurkh (ancient Tidu) in 1861 by J. E. Taylor (along with another monolith belonging to Ashurnasirpal II). The monolith of Shalmaneser is an annalistic text that dates the 853 campaign by eponym; the other five annalistic texts date the campaign by regnal year (i.e. Shalmaneser’s ‘sixth regnal year’). Since the text ends abruptly with the last narrated event being the battle of Qarqar (853 BCE), scholars date it from 853–852 BCE. It was apparently carved in great haste resulting in numerous scribal errors (Tadmor 1961, 143–44). This is unfortunate, since the stela contains the most detailed extant account of the battle of Qarqar.

Although the monolith was originally published in 1870 (Rawlinson and Smith 1870, pls. 7–8), the recent edition of Grayson (RIMA 3, A.0.102.2) and two recent collations (Fuchs 1998; Yamada 2000a) greatly facilitate its study.

The 853 campaign reads (cf. COS 2, 263–64):

**Episode 1** (ii.78b–81a)
In the eponymy of Dayān-A śṣur, in the month of Iyyar, the fourteenth day, I departed from Nineveh. I crossed the Tigris. I approached the cities of Giammu on the River Balīḫ. They were afraid of my lordly fearfulness (and) the splendor of my fierce weapons; and with their own weapons they killed Giammu, their master. I entered the cities of Sahlala and Til-ša-turaḫi. I took my gods into his palaces; (and) celebrated the tašiltu-festival in his palaces. I opened his treasury (and) saw his stored-away wealth. I carried off his possessions (and) property. I brought (them) to my city, Assur.

---

10 Six texts are annals: the Kurkh Monolith (RIMA 3, A.0.102.2, ii.78b–102; Yamada: Annals 3; COS 2.113A); the A śṣur Clay Tablets: (RIMA 3, A.0.102.6, ii.19b–33; Yamada: Annals 5; COS 2.113B); the Calaḫ Bulls (RIMA 3, A.0.102.8, 12’b–19’; Yamada: Annals 6; COS 2.113C); the Marble Slab (RIMA 3, A.0.102.10, ii.13–25; Yamada: Annals 7; COS 2.113D); the Black Obelisk (RIMA 3, A.0.102.14, 54b–66; Yamada: Annals 13; COS 2.113F); the Broken Statue from Nimrud (RIMA 3, A.0.102.16, 28–38a; Yamada: Annals 14). Three texts are ‘Summary Inscriptions’: the Fort Shalmaneser Stone Throne Base (RIMA 3, A.0.102.28, 29–34a; Yamada: Summary Inscription 6); the Engraved Door Sill from Fort Shalmaneser (RIMA 3, A.0.102.30, 22–28a; Yamada: Summary Inscription 9); and the Assur Basalt Statue (RIMA 3, A.0.102.40, i.14–24; Yamada: Summary Inscription 19; COS 2.113G).


12 This version is Recension A (Schramm 1973, 70–72, 87–90), while Yamada (2000a, 14) labels it Annals 3.

13 Hallo (1964, 78) proposed that the city of Sahhala be identified with Tell Sahlan (about 20 km south of Ain al Arus. Also see Yamada 2000a, 151; and Lipiński 2000, 128 n. 57.)
I departed from the city of Sahlala. I approached the city of Kār-Shalmaneser. I crossed the Euphrates in its flood, again in rafts (made of inflated) goatskins. In the city of Ana-ĂŞur-ûtēr-ăşbat, which is by the opposite bank of the Euphrates on the River Sagura (and) which the people of the land of Ḥatti call the city of Pitru, in this city I received the tribute of the kings on the opposite bank of the Euphrates—Sangara, the Carchemishite, Kundašpu, the Kummûljite, Arame, (the man) of Bit-Agûsi, Lalla, the Melûdite, Ḥayânî, (the man) of Bit-Gabbari, Qalparuda, the Patainean, (and) Qalparuda, the Gurgumite: silver, gold, tin, bronze, (and) bronze bowls.

I departed from the Euphrates. I approached the city of Aleppo (Ḩalman). They were afraid to fight. They seized my feet. I received their tribute of silver and gold. I made sacrifices before Hadad of Aleppo (Ḩalman).

I departed from the city of Aleppo (Ḩalman). I approached the cities of Irḫûlēni, the Hamathite. I captured Adennu, Pargā, (and) Arganā, his royal cities. I carried off captives, his valuables, (and) his palace possessions. I set fire to his palaces.

I departed from the city of Arganā. I approached the city of Qarqar. I razed, destroyed and burned the city of Qarqar, his royal city.

1,200 chariots, 1,200 cavalry, (and) 20,000 troops of Hadad-ezer (Adad-ēdri) of Damascus; 700 chariots, 700 cavalry, (and) 10,000 troops of Irḫûlēni, the Hamathite; 2,000 chariots, (and) 10,000 troops of Ahab, the Israelite (Sirîlāu); 500 troops of Byblos; 1,000 troops of Egypt; 10 chariots (and) 10,000 troops of the land of Iqranatu (Iqraqa); 200 troops of Matinu-Ba’al of the city of Arvad; 200 troops of the land of Usanatu (Usnu); 30 chariots (and) 1,000 troops of Adon-Ba’al of the land of Šianu (Siyannu); 1,000 camels of Gindibû of Arabia;

14 Yamada (1998, 92–94) argues that the phrase ša šanûštšu means ‘another time, again’, not ‘for a second time’.

15 Qarqar is usually identified with Tell Qarqur, though the identification has yet not been confirmed by excavations. See Dornemann 2000; 2003; Lippiński 2000, 264–66. Sader (1986; 1987, 223–25) identified Qarqar with the tell of Hama. But the letter of Marduk-apla-usahaan of ‘Anat to Rudamu (Urtamis), king of Hamath, discovered in the excavations of Hama, ends with the invocation: ‘May the city of Anat and the city of Hamath be strong’ (Parpola 1990). Moreover, the epigraphic evidence, in particular the inscribed weights (i.e. the šal qarg weight and the šal hmt, šaly hmt and ša šal hmt weights), argues against Sader’s identification (see Bordreuil 1993, no. 231; Lippiński 2000, 265). Therefore, Tell Hama cannot be Qarqar. Na’aman (1999) has suggested that Qarqar should be identified with Tell Asharna. But see Liverani 1992, 76–77; Grayson 2001, 185–87 and Younger (forthcoming).
[] hundred\textsuperscript{16} troops of Ba'asa, (the man) of Bit-Ruḥubi, the Ammonite—these 12 kings he took as his allies.

(ii.95b–102)
They marched against me [to do] war and battle. With the supreme forces which Aššur, my lord, had given me (and) with the mighty weapons which the divine standard,\textsuperscript{17} which goes before me, had granted me, I fought with them. I decisively defeated them from the city of Qarqar to the city of Qilzau.\textsuperscript{18} I felled with the sword 14,000 troops, their fighting men. Like Adad, I rained down upon them a devastating flood. I spread out their corpses (and) I filled the plain. <I felled> with the sword their extensive troops. I made their blood flow in the wadis(?)[ ]. The field was too small for laying flat their bodies (lit. ‘their lives’); the broad countryside had been consumed in burying them. I blocked the Orontes River with their corpses as with a causeway. In the midst of this battle I took away from them chariots, cavalry, (and) teams of horses.

The narrative structure of the 853 campaign in the Monolith (see Fig. 1) contains five episodes built on the itinerary phrase: TA(iṣtu) URU(âl) X at-ту-muš—‘I departed from X’ (ii.78b; ii.81b; ii.86b; ii.87b; and ii.89b).\textsuperscript{19} The first three episodes (1–3) narrate Phase One of the campaign—the sub-

Phase One: Subjugation of Northern Syria – Non-fighting Phase (ii.78b–87a)

Episode 1 – The Killing of Giammu, Submission and Plunder of Balîḫ (ii.78b–81a)

Episode 2 – The Tribute of the Seven Kings of Ḫatti (ii.81b–86a)

Episode 3 – The Tribute of Aleppo (Ḫalman) (ii.86b–87a)

Phase Two: Subjugation of Central Syria – Fighting Phase (ii.87b–102)

Episode 4 – The Capture, Plunder and Destruction of the Cities of Irḫulēni of Hamath (ii.87b–89a)

Episode 5 – The Battle of Qarqar (ii.89b–102)

Part 1 – Capture and Destruction of Qarqar (ii.89b–90a)

Part 2 – Enumeration of Alliance (ii.90b–95a)

Part 3 – Description of Battle and Results (ii.95b–102)

\textbf{Figure 13.1} The Kurkh Monolith’s Structure of Shalmaneser III’s 853 Campaign.

\textsuperscript{16} Or [ ],000, if it is [L]LM instead of ME. See Yamada 2000a, 368.

\textsuperscript{17} Yamada (2000a, 368, 383) notes that \textit{RIMA} 3, A.0.102.2, ii.96b should read: \textit{Ur.[GAL}. As protective divine standard, Nergal accompanies the Assyrian army on campaigns. See Pongratz-Leisten, Deller and Bleibtreu1992.

\textsuperscript{18} For this possible reading of the toponym, see the discussion below and Younger (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{19} For this clause as an excerpt from the itineraries, see Liverani 1988; 2004.
jugation of northern Syria, and the last two episodes (4–5) relate Phase Two, the subjugation of central Syria. Phase One sets the stage for Phase Two, narrating the campaign in terms of the easiest (no fighting of the Assyrian army is necessary to subdue northern Syria) to the most difficult (the Assyrian army must capture and destroy cities and fight a twelve-king alliance in central Syria). This order creates a literary effect, slowly increasing the tension by progressing from the easy to the difficult. A similar narration is observable in Sennacherib’s third campaign (Tadmor 1985; Younger 2003, 235–36). This is good to keep in mind as one comes to the longer, climactic account of the battle of Qarqar at the end of the narrative.

Throughout the account, religious aspects are stressed: seven deities are mentioned in the prologue (Aššur, Anu, Enlil, Ea, Sin, Šamaš, and Ištar, i.1–4); Shalmaneser’s gods are taken into Giammu’s palaces for a celebration; through sacrifices the support of Hadad of Aleppo (a major Syrian deity, also known to have been worshipped in the city of Assur [Menzel 1981, 128, T 154 116]) is obtained; and in the battle of Qarqar, three deities (Aššur, Nergal and Adad) ensure Assyrian victory. Since the iconography includes a depiction of the Great King and various divine symbols, either independent of the figure of the king or engraved as components of his necklace, the Neo-Assyrian royal stela portrayed ‘visible religion’ to its onlooker (Holloway 2002, 68–69). In this regard, it is important to note the presence on Shalmaneser’s necklace the depiction of the symbolic cross of Ninurta/Nabû, which emphasizes the importance of this deity to the early Neo-Assyrian kings (especially Ashurnasirpal II, Shalmaneser III and Shamshi-Adad V). In fact, not only did Shalmaneser III build the ziggurat for the temple of Ninurta in Kalju (RIMA 3:136, A.0.102.56, line 3b-11), but the Kurkh Monolith contains important epithets of Ninurta in its opening lines (i.11–12a).

Since the monolith was discovered at Kurkh, the stela falls into Morandi’s class 1 (1988, 113–17), that is, stelae that were placed along the routes taken by the Assyrian army on campaigns. Thus it is not surprising that the account of year 853 in the monolith is the most detailed and propagandistic of all of Shalmaneser’s inscriptions narrating the events of his sixth regnal year. This is in complete agreement with the fact that, as J. Reade (1979b, 342) points out, the royal stela was ‘the Assyrian equivalent of a political poster’.

---

20 In very recent excavations of the citadel of Aleppo, a series of large blocks with reliefs were uncovered that were part of the temple of the famous god Hadad of Halab (modern Aleppo). See Kohlmeyer 2000. Eleven blocks were published in this volume. Twenty-six have been discovered as of 2004 (personal communication J. D. Hawkins).

In episode 1, by simply marching to the Bali River, Shalmaneser removed a pocket of insubordination in north Syria—specifically a group of cities that were under the rule of an individual named Giammu. In order to ward off a hopeless conflict, a pro-Assyrian opposition group in the country killed Giammu\textsuperscript{22} and submitted to Shalmaneser without a fight. Shalmaneser celebrated in the deceased king’s palaces and carried off his wealth.

In episode 2, Shalmaneser departed and marched to Til-Barsip, a city that he had renamed after himself, K\textsuperscript{a}r-Shalmaneser. Crossing the Euphrates, he marched to the city of Pitru (biblical Pethor), another city that he had renamed, Ana-Aššur-utēr-āšbat. Here he received the tribute of seven kings of ‘the land of Ḥatti’ (see Table 13.1).

In episode 3, Shalmaneser advanced through the territory of Bīt Agusi, arriving at the city of Aleppo (Ḥalman). He received that city’s tribute and sacrificed to the important Syrian deity, Hadad of Aleppo. At this point, the narrative has demonstrated the utter suzerainty of Shalmaneser III over north Syria, especially the ease with which he has accomplished this.

In Phase Two, in episode 4, the Assyrian army fights for the first time during the campaign, though it appears to easily capture, plunder and destroy three of Irḫulēnī’s cities. The capture of the Hamathite cities of Pargā, Adā (=Adennu) and Qarqar (along with the city of Aštammaku captured in the 848 campaign) are represented in the reliefs on Shalmaneser’s bronze gate bands from Balawat (Imgur-Enlil).\textsuperscript{23}

While in episode 2 Shalmaneser had, without a fight, received the tribute of seven kings, in episode 5 he faces the greatest challenge to Assyrian suzerainty—the twelve-king alliance, headed surprisingly not by Irḫulēnī, the king of Hamath, whose land is being invaded, but by Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri) of Aram-Damascus.\textsuperscript{24} The challenge is heightened by the enumeration of the

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
Ruler & Nation & Formulation \\
\hline
Sangara & Carchemish & m\textsuperscript{a}sa-an-ga-ra URU gar-ga-mīš-a-a \\
Kundasu & Kumumu & m\textsuperscript{k}u-us-da-ē-pi URU ku-mu-ḫa-a-a \\
Arame & Bit Agusi (Yaḥanūn; Arpad) & m\textsuperscript{a}ra-me DUMU gu-si \\
Lalla & Melid & m\textsuperscript{l}al-li URU me-li-da-ā-a \\
Hayāni (Ḫayya) & Bit-Gabbari (Sam'al) & m\textsuperscript{h}a-ia-ni DUMU ga-ba-ri \\
Qalparunda & Putina (Unqi) & m\textsuperscript{q}al-pa-ru-da KUR pa-ti-na-ā-a \\
Qalparunda & Gurgum & m\textsuperscript{q}al-pa-ru-da KUR gu-r-gu-ma-ā-a \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The Seven Tributary Kings of Hatti (853 BCE) (Kurkh Monolith ii.82b–86a).}
\end{table}

\footnotetext[22]{For a discussion of the variants concerning the death of Giammu, see Younger 2005.}
\footnotetext[23]{See Marcus 1987; Reade 1979a, 66–68; Bār 1996, 113–30; and Hertel 2004.}
\footnotetext[24]{For a possible reason for the organization of this coalition at this time, see Grayson 2004, 5.
extent of participation, size and military hardware exhibited by the coalition forces (see Table 13.2). The severity of the alliance’s defeat, graphically described in great detail, reinforces the climactic message of the monolith: since Shalmaneser III, on account of his armed forces and powerful deities, exercises complete sovereignty over those who might oppose him, humble submission (as with the seven kings in Phase One) is preferable to the utter destruction suffered when he is opposed (as with the twelve kings in Phase Two).

At this point, some observations on the other texts of Shalmaneser III that narrate the 853 campaign should prove helpful. Two of the five other annalistic texts (the Assur Clay Tablets [842 BCE] and the Calah Bulls [841 BCE]) contain all five episodes of the Kurkh Monolith, although episodes 2, 4 and 5 are significantly truncated. In episode 5 (the battle of Qarqar), these two ‘Annals’ change the number of dead for the coalition forces from 14,000 to 25,000. They also add three sentences at the end of the episode:

In order to save their lives they ran away.
I boarded ships (and)
I went out upon the sea.

None of the other texts (including the three ‘Summary Inscriptions’) has any of these sentences at the end of episode 5, except the Assur Basalt Statue (a Summary Inscription) which contains only the sentence: ‘In order to save their lives they ran away.’ Thus, the last two sentences were added to inscriptions composed over a decade after the battle.

The remaining three ‘Annals’ (the Marble Slab Inscription [839 BCE], the Black Obelisk [828–827 BCE], and the Broken Statue from Nimrud [828–827 BCE]) narrate only episodes 1, 2, and 5, though these are shortened in similar ways to these episodes in the Assur Clay Tablets and the Calah Bulls. The number of allied dead are 25,000 (Marble Slab), 20,500 (Black Obelisk), and 29,000 (Broken Statue from Nimrud).

The Summary Inscriptions (the Fort Shalmaneser Throne Base [846 BCE], the Fort Shalmaneser Door Sill [844 BCE], and the Assur Basalt Statue [833 BCE]) narrate only episode 5 in truncated form. Since the first two of these predate all of the annalistic texts, except, of course, the Kurkh Monolith, the truncated form of episode 5 in these Summary Inscriptions probably served as the base text for the truncated forms in the later Annals. Line ii.97b of the monolith has been read ‘I decisively defeated them from the city of Qarqar to the city of Gilzau (URU gil-za-ú)’. The two Summary Inscriptions from Fort Shalmaneser (the Throne Base and the Door Sill) read: ‘I decisively defeated them from the city of Qarqar to the city of Dilziau (URU di-il-zi-a-ú)’. It is possible that the monolith’s toponym should be read URU qil-za-ú and that
the different spellings reflect the same place.²⁵ Finally, the Assur Basalt Statue credits Shalmaneser with slaying 29,000 allied troops, a reading that is followed in the Broken Statue from Nimrud.

PROBLEMS

There are at least four remaining interpretive problems in reconstructing the 853 campaign. These include Shalmaneser’s claim to victory, the total of twelve kings, the identification of the coalition partners, and the number of chariots, cavalry and troops ascribed to the different coalition kings.

SHALMANESER III’S CLAIM TO VICTORY

From the detailed, gory narration of the Kurkh Monolith, it would certainly seem that Shalmaneser III won a great victory at the battle of Qarqar in 853 BCE. A few scholars reserve the possibility of a real victory by Shalmaneser, though the coalition remained intact and continued to offer resistance (e.g. Grayson 1992, 742; Lambert 2004, 359). Y. Ideka (1984–85, 27–28) suggests a draw that resulted in the retreat of the Assyrian army from the battlefield to the Mediterranean coast, since Shalmaneser claims ‘I boarded ships (and) I went out upon the sea’.²⁶

However, while Shalmaneser may have captured the city of Qarqar along with the other three cities listed in the Monolith and Balawat Bronzes, most scholars believe that his claim to victory over the coalition in the ensuing battle of Qarqar was in reality an Assyrian defeat, since he returned in 849 (his tenth year), 848 (his eleventh year) and 845 (his fourteenth year) to fight against the same coalition with little greater success (Hawkins 1972–75, 67; Dion 1995b, 482–89). The two rock face inscriptions at the source of the Tigris refer to the ‘fourth time’ in which Shalmaneser faced this coalition (RIMA 3, A.0.102.23 and A.0.102.24). Of course, there may have been some limited successes: for example, in 848 he was apparently able to capture the royal city of Aštammaku²⁷ from the Hamathites and the city of Aparāzu

²⁵ For the q/d interchange in Neo-Assyrian spelling of an Aramaic toponym, see Millard 1980, 369; Weippert 1973, 46 n. 83; and Younger (forthcoming).
²⁶ Grayson (2004, 6) states: ‘Assyria did not win a great victory on this occasion but neither did she suffer a great defeat; the result was uncertain’.
²⁷ For the identification of Tell Mastuma (modern Stumak) with Aštammaku, see Ikeda 1979, 79. For excavations at Tell Mastuma and its possible function as ‘a royal city of Hamath’, see Wakita, Wada, and Nishiyama 2000, 555–56. The Iron Age settlement was about 10,000 square metres in size (ibid., 538 n. 4).
### Table 13.2  Coalition Members at the Battle of Qarqar 853 BCE (Kurkh Monolith ii.86b–102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Formulation</th>
<th>Chariots</th>
<th>Cavalry</th>
<th>Soldiers</th>
<th>Camels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri)</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>KUR·i-id-ri [ša KUR] ANŠE-šu</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Irhuleni (Urhilina)</td>
<td>Hamath</td>
<td>KUR a-ma-a-a</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ahab</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>KUR sīr-ā-lu-ā-a</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Byblos</td>
<td>KUR gu-&lt;bal&gt;-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>KUR mu-š-ra-ā-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Iqanatu/Iraqata/Arqâ</td>
<td>KUR ir qa-&lt;nu&gt;-ta-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Matinu-Ba’al</td>
<td>Arvad</td>
<td>KUR u-sa-na-ta-ā-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Usanatu/Usnu</td>
<td>KUR u-sa-na-ta-ā-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adon-Ba’al</td>
<td>Sianu</td>
<td>KUR ši-a-na-a-a</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gindiblu’</td>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td>KUR ar-ba-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 + 12?</td>
<td>Ba’asa</td>
<td>Bit Rehob? (+?)</td>
<td>KUR a-ma-na-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ammon</td>
<td>KUR r-su-bi KUR a-ma-na-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals | 3,940 | 1,900 | 53,000* | 1,000 |

*Reading could be either ME or LIM (Yamada 2000a)

*minimum: 51,900 + [1],000 + [1]00 = 53,000

*maximum: 51,900 + [9],000 + [9],000 = 69,900

De Odorico (1995, 103–04) estimates 62,900 infantry (+ 3,940 chariots + 1,900 cavalry) = 75,000 fighting men.

If the 14,000 casualties figure is correct, then slightly less than 20% (actually 18.7%) of the coalition troops would have been killed during the battle.
from Arpad, but the Assyrians never once claim to have conquered Hamath or Damascus while this coalition remained intact. Since there was no further advance into the territory of Hamath (Yamada 2000a, 163), there is significant doubt about the kind of success claimed by Shalmaneser in the monolith. That text does not narrate the pursuit of the enemy, extraction of tribute, or capture and punishment of any of the coalition kings (Elat 1975, 26), all typical motifs narrated after a victory. The literary structure as outlined above also raises doubts about the success. In fact, if the coalition's goal was to halt the Assyrians' southward advance and prevent their domination over the West, this goal was achieved.

Another indication of Assyrian overall failure is the fact that opposition to Assyria increased after the 853 campaign among some of the northern states that had previously paid tribute. In both 849 and 848, even Carchemish and Arpad fought against Assyria, and consequently the Assyrian army was forced to reconquer cities and territories that on the eve of the battle of Qarqar were submissive to Assyria. It is important to note that Sangara, the Carchemishite, and Arame of Arpad (Bit-Agusi) were kings who paid tribute in 853, but are still on the throne and fighting Assyria in 849 and 848.

According to two annalistic texts (the Assur Clay Tablets [842 BCE] and the Calah Bulls [841 BCE]), after the battle of Qarqar, Shalmaneser boarded a ship and took a boat ride in the Mediterranean. While some scholars accept Shalmaneser's claim of maritime entertainment (e.g. Yamada 2000a, 163), this event is missing in the earliest Assyrian record of the battle and its addition to the narrative is only found in these two annalistic texts dating from over a decade later. And these are the texts that begin the pattern of inflation of the number of allied dead from 14,000 in the monolith to 25,000, finally culminating in the figure of 29,000 found in the Broken Statue from Nimrud and the Assur Basalt Statue. Of course, even the 14,000 figure may be exaggerated. Thus some scholars (e.g. Galil 2002, 46) see Shalmaneser's cruise as a rhetorical device used to disguise the Assyrian army's failure to gain its objectives in this battle.

Another indication of Shalmaneser's failure, as W. W. Hallo has pointed out, may be the total silence of the Bible. He puts it this way: 'Had Ahab and his allies really suffered the massive defeat which the Assyrian annalists inflicted on them, an account of the battle would certainly have served the

---

28 See the Assur Clay Tablets (COS 2.113B, ii.68–iii.15).
29 Assur Clay Tablets, ii.55–iii.15; Calah Bulls, 29'-41'; Marble Slab ii.51–iii.5. See n.10 above for references.
30 It seems doubtful that one would go on a boat ride after being defeated in battle. Since the two texts containing the claim date from 842 and 841, perhaps Shalmaneser sailed the sea after one of the later Syrian campaigns (i.e. 848 or 845).
didactic purposes of the canonical Book of Kings’ (Hallo 1960, 40; and Hallo and Simpson 1998, 127–30).

But by 841 BCE, the coalition had disintegrated, partly the result of the repeated Assyrian campaigns, and partly the result of changes in ruler in two of the most powerful states, Damascus (the usurpation of Hazael) and Israel (the usurpation of Jehu).

THE TOTAL ‘TWELVE KINGS’

Another problem is the number of coalition forces. The Monolith (ii.95) inscription states: ‘these twelve kings he took as his allies’ (12 MAN.MEŠ-ni an-nu-ti a-na ÊRIN.TAH-ti-ša il-qa-a), implying that Irḫulēnī was the one who organized a coalition of twelve kings to assist him. Oddly, there are only eleven members listed, not twelve; and Irḫulēnī is included in the eleven (though not listed first, but second); and only the names of seven kings are entered!

This has given rise to a number of different proposals. Grayson (RIMA 3, A.0.102.23, note to ii.90–95) suggests that this is an erroneous addition since only eleven kings are listed. Tadmor (1961, 144–45) concludes that this is one of many scribal errors in the monolith: in this case, the name and country of the twelfth participant were erroneously omitted. A number of scholars think that the last entry ‘Ba’asa, (the man) of Bit-Ruḫubi, the Ammonite’ is really a reference to two entities, Beth-Rehob and Ammon, and that the name of the ruler of the Ammonites has been lost. Among those that hold this view, there is disagreement on the identification of the last entity (is it Ammon or Amanah? see discussion below). Finally, it is also possible that the Assyrian scribes are simply rounding off the number to an even dozen, a conventional number with symbolic significance (de Odorico 1995, 133–36). This last option seems preferable.

Interestingly, one text of Shalmaneser III, carved along with a second inscription into a rock face at the Tigris’ source, gives the number of the allied enemies as ‘fifteen cities of the seashore’. Moreover, the locution found in three of the Annalistic texts and one Summary Inscription is: ‘Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri), the Damascene, (and) Irḫulēnī, the Hamathite, together with

31 Weidner suggested this (apud Michel 1947, 70 n. 13). Na’a’man (1976, 98 n. 19) states: ‘It should be noted that this combination of names does not appear elsewhere in the Assyrian inscriptions, so Weidner’s proposal to complete the number of allies to 12 makes very good sense.’ See also Kuan 1995, 32–34; Ikeda 1999, 278; Yamada 2000a, 160–61; Galil 2002, 42, 46.
32 Na’a’man (1976, 98 n. 19) recognized this possibility.
33 Tigris Rock Face Inscription 2: RIMA 3, A.0.102.23, line 21. Grayson notes: ‘The numeral 15 is clear, according to Lehmann-Haupt, although one expects 12’ (RIMA 3, 95, n. 21).
twelve kings of the shore of the sea, trusted in their combined forces’, while the formulation in two Summary Inscriptions is: ‘Hadad-erzer (Adad-idri), the Damascene, (and) Irhlēni, the Hamathite, and twelve kings along the seashore trusted in their combined forces’ (the emphasis is mine). All these texts imply two major named kings plus twelve others, giving a total of fourteen. Hence, it would seem that the number twelve is used in a figurative, conventional way. It is noteworthy and, not fortuitous, that there are seven named kings in this list of twelve (Hadad-erzer, Irhlēni, Ahab, Matinu-Ba’al, Adon-Ba’al, Gindibu’ and Ba’asa)—a number that corresponds to the number of tributary kings listed earlier in the account of the 853 campaign (episode 2). Of course, the number seven is also a conventional figure.

Finally, it is noteworthy that in various literary texts praising Ninurta or describing his mythological combats, there occur lists of monsters defeated by him. In the Sumerian myths, the victor who subdued the enemies is exclusively Ninurta or Ningirsu, while in the Assyrian and Babylonian sources the victor is sometimes identified as Marduk or Nabû. While their identities were not fixed, their number appears to have been: namely, it is always eleven (see Lambert 1986, 58; Annus 2002, 119–20). These monsters appear to have been personifications of the enemies of the state, symbols of disorder, and feature in royal inscriptions and iconography, rather like the Nine Bows in Egyptian military propaganda. The divine victory over them was replicated in the king’s victories over political enemies. Thus Assyrian royal ideology interpreted politics as acts of creation in the sense of defeating chaos, stimulating the politics of imperial expansion. It postulated war and chaos, not war and peace as antithetical. Thus to Assyrians,

war was a kind of creatio continua. Assyrian rule over the world was expected to be the only way for all nations to live in peace, concord and social justice—the paradox of this ideology was that the vassal states’ payment of tribute to the Assyrian state was an expression of their acknowledgment of a just world order (Otto 1999, 7).

Therefore, could it be that the eleven political entities comprising the enemy coalition listed in the monolith is a subtle literary allusion to this?

34 In the Annals (Assur Clay Tablets, Calaḫ Bulls, Marble Slab): a-di 12 MAN.MEŠ-ni; in a Summary Inscription (Assur Basalt Statue): a-di 12 mal-ki.MEŠ.
35 Fort Shalmaneser Throne Base and Fort Shalmaneser Door Sill read: ū 12 MAN.MEŠ-ni.
IDENTIFICATION OF THE COALITION PARTNERS

Interrelated to the question of the twelve kings is the issue of the identification of the coalition partners (see Table 13.2 above). These identifications give rise to the question of whether there is a discernible arrangement in the presentation of the participants.

While the first participant seems straightforward, Hadad-ezer (lit. Adad-idri) of Damascus (see Schwemer 1998, 46), there is, in fact, a problem. Since Ahab, the Israelite, is mentioned in the monolith (third participant), it is evident that the two kings were contemporaries. However, the only king of Damascus during the reign of Ahab that the Hebrew Bible mentions is Ben-Hadad. In reconstructing the history of the period, two different possibilities have been proposed. One option is to equate Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri) with Ben-Hadad of 1 Kgs 20 and 22 (since an earlier Ben-Hadad is mentioned in 1 Kgs 15.18–20 in the days of Asa and Baasha, the Ben-Hadad of 1 Kgs 20 and 22 is often designated Ben-Hadad II by those following this option) (Hallo 1960, 39–40; Wiseman 1972–75; Elat 1975, 30–31; Mitchell 1982, 479; Ikeda 1999, 277; Rainey 2001, 140–49; Cogan 2001, 471; Galil 2002, 46–48; Lambert 2004, 369 [Ben-Hadad I]). One fundamental problem is that the name in the monolith, Adad-idri, does not equate with Ben-Hadad (other than the theophoric element). Some (e.g. Mazar 1962, 101) have suggested that the name, Ben-Hadad, may have been a dynastic title, but there is no clear evidence to support this.

The second option, which has gained wide endorsement in recent years, understands 1 Kgs 20 and 22 as reflecting a later political situation in the days of Jehoram, Jehoahaz, or Jehoash (Jepsen 1941–45; Whitley 1952; Miller 1966; 1967a; 1967b; 1982; Pitard 1987, 114–25; 1992; 1994, 207–30; H. Weippert 1988; Halpern and Vanderhooft 1991, 230–35; Kuan 1995, 36–38; Dion 1997; Lipiński 2000). Consequently, Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri) should not be equated with Ben-Hadad of 1 Kgs 20 and 22. According to this view, the only Ben-Hadad (Aramaic: Bar-Hadad) known from extra-biblical sources is Ben-Hadad/Bar-Hadad, the son of Hazael, who ruled over Damascus in the early eighth century and who is mentioned in 2 Kgs 3.3, 24–25 and the Zakkur Inscription. Thus in the stories that describe the Israelite wars with Damascus in 1 Kgs 20 and 22 the name of Ahab has been erroneously inserted by the biblical writer; and so these narratives really belong to Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 13.10–25).

While the arguments concerning these two options are too complex to enter into here, it should be pointed out that the second option may ultimately create ‘more problems than it solves’ (Glatt 1993, 110 n. 135). Lambert (1994, 52) correctly asserts: ‘the matter cannot be considered finally settled’.
The second participant is identified in the monolith as Irḫušēni of Hamath. This is none other than Urḫišilina of some of the hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions from Hama, an important king of the Neo-Hittite dynasty that ruled over Hamath (c. 860–840 BCE). All nine of Shalmaneser’s inscriptions that narrate the battle of Qarqar mention him, and, along with Hadad-ezer, he forms the leadership for the united front against the Assyrian king, not only in 853, but in 849, 848 and 845. After 845, the coalition disappears and Hamath does not participate in resistance to Shalmaneser in 841 or 838–837 BCE.

The third participant is Ahab, the Israelite. This is the only occurrence of the term ‘Israelite’ in the Assyrian inscriptions. The first three participants supply the largest number of troops, chariots and cavalry to the alliance.

The fourth participant poses a difficulty. The text of the Monolith reads: KUR gu-a-a and many early translations understood this to be a variant spelling of Que/Quwe, that is, Cilicia. However, in 1961, H. Tadmor argued that it is improbable that gu-a-a is a variant spelling of the gentilic form on phonetic grounds. He suggested the emendation: KUR Gu-<bal>-a-a, the gentilic form for ‘Byblos’. It has also been argued that Que’s participation in the coalition of central Syrian states was unlikely since neither Patina/Unqi or Sam’al/Bit Gabbari were involved, making it difficult to supply troops from Que to Qarqar (Yamada 2000a, 158).

Recently, some scholars have opted once again for understanding the monolith’s KUR gu-a-a as Que/Quwe. In fact, G. Galil (2002, 42) has recently argued that since only 500 troops were sent to the battle, it is possible that they sailed from Que to the land of Hamath.

But none of these scholars has addressed the cuneiform spelling issue raised by Tadmor. While it is possible to read the sign GU with the value QU, Que/Quwe is not once spelled with this sign in any of Shalmaneser’s inscriptions (Yamada 2000a, 157 n. 279). It is always spelled with the signs QU, or

---

37 Hawkins 2000, 400. The name Urhilina is Hurrian (Wilhelm 1998).
38 Irḫušēni may be pictured lying on his couch within a city of Hamath on the Balawat gates. See King 1915 plate 77; and Barnett 1963, 83.
39 The spelling of sir-a-la-a-a may be the result of metathesis of the first two letters in the name of Israel (ysr’l → syr’) by the Assyrian scribe. See Lipiński 1979, 74 n. 77. Alternatively, it could be simply an apheresis of the y. The spelling of the gentilic form of yisrā’el would have presented the Neo-Assyrian scribe(s) with a challenge since toponyms starting with yē were not commonly encountered (ye is more typical). Of course, the name of Israel occurs in the Mesha and Tel Dan inscriptions. See A. Lemaire's essay in this volume.
40 For example, see Oppenheim 1950 (ANET), 279; Wiseman 1958 (DOTT), 47; Garelli 1971.
42 But Byblos is spelled with the GU sign (see e.g. Black Obelisk, 104 and Broken Statue from Nimrud, 162).
In fact, the gentilic form for Que/Quwe occurs in the monolith (i.54): QU'-Ú-A-A. There is not one instance throughout all the Neo-Assyrian texts of Que/Quwe being spelled with the QÙ sign (Parpola 1970, 288–89). Therefore it is highly unlikely that Que/Quwe is the entity involved in the battle of Qarqar. Tadmor’s emendation (1961, 144–45) makes the best sense. 43

The fifth participant was Egypt (kur mu-us-ra-a-a ‘Egyptian’). Egypt is referred to in some other contexts in Shalmaneser’s inscriptions and it makes good sense here (Tadmor 1961, 144–45; Borger TUAT 1/4, 361 n. 92a; Kitchen 1986, 325; and Redford 1992, 339–40). It is interesting to remember that Osorkon II demonstrated ‘a lifetime preoccupation with affairs in Asia’ (Redford 1992, 339), which the gifts of alabaster (presumably sent to Ahab) discovered in excavations at Samaria illustrate (Reisner, et al. 1924, fig. 205, 2, pl. 56g).

In a recent article, A. Lemaire suggests that there was a metathesis of the first two signs so that the proper reading is kur šu-mu-ra-a-a — ‘Šumuraean’ (Lemaire 1993, 152*). Some other scholars have followed in this interpretation (Dion 1997, 164–65; Lippiński 2000, 303). While this is appealing, since it yields another Phoenician coastal ally, it seems completely unnecessary (see the objections of Na’aman 2002, 207 n. 29). Good sense of the text can be made without it. Therefore, reading the text as is (kur mu-us-ra-a-a ‘Egyptian’) seems best.

The next four (participants 6–9) are all northern Phoenician coastal states: Irqanatu/Irqata/Arqâ, Arvad, Usanatu/Usnu, and Sianu/Sianu. The names of two kings are given: Matinu-Ba’al of Arvad and Adon-Ba’al of Sianu/Sianu. The sequence of names follows a south to north order. The identity of participant 10 is clear: Gindibu’ of Arabia (see Eph’al 1982, 75–77).

The last participant listed reads ba-a-sa DUMU ru-hu-bi KUR a-ma-na-a-a. The debate concerning this participant has centered primarily on the word KUR A-ma-na-a-a. Commonly scholars have understood this to refer to Ammon, the small Transjordanian state (Luckenbill 1926, 1, §611; Oppenheim 1950, 279; Na’aman 1976, 98 n. 20; Millard 1992, 35). Some scholars have understood the word to refer to Amanah, the Anti-Lebanon

44 Some scholars have proposed a country named Muṣri located in Cilicia (Garelli 1971). For Muṣri in the third register of the Black Obelisk, some scholars have proposed a location in north-western Iran (e.g. Marcus 1987; the 2001 British Museum exhibit sign). While the two-humped camel is a problem for an Egyptian location, note the other animals pictured: a rhinoceros, water buffalo, antelope, elephant, monkeys and apes. In addition, in the epigraph for this register, the Akkadian words for ‘rhinocero’ and ‘antelope’ are Egyptian loan words: saēya ‘rhinoceros’ and sīšu ‘antelope’. See Deller 1983; CAD, S, 418.
mountain range (cf. 2 Kgs 5.12Q, Song 4.8) (Cogan 1984, 255–59; Dion 1997, 176, 186; Na’aman 1995, 385–86; 2002, 204–05). Moreover, beside the similarity of place-name, Forrer equated the patronym with Rehob, father of Hadad-ezer, of Şobah, named in 2 Sam. 8.3, suggesting Rehob was the dynastic name of the kings of Şobah (Forrer 1928, 328).

The spelling of KUR A-ma-na-a-a does not automatically point to Ammon or Mt Amanah, since KUR can be the determinative for land or mountain. The name Ba’asa is West Semitic (bâṣ) and is known from the name of an Israelite king (1 Kgs 15.16). It is also found in Ammonite,45 as well as in Punic (Benz 1972, 101). Consequently, it is impossible from this name to identify the ruler’s ethnicity. But Mt Amanah is never attested as a state in any other source; and here, in this context—compare the formulation of the preceding allies (Table 13.2 above)—it is clearly a gentilic form which points to a political entity. Therefore, it seems most probable that KUR A-ma-na-a-a should be understood as ‘Ammonite’ (see Rendsburg 1991).

However, no other individual in the list has a double attribution (whether one understands DUMU ru-hu-bi as a gentilic or a patronymic).46 Thus quite a few scholars have followed Weidner’s suggestion that these are really two entities: Beth-Rehob and Ammon (see n. 31).

THE NUMBER OF CHARIOTS, CAVALRY AND TROOPS ASCRIBED TO THE DIFFERENT COALITION KINGS

There is debate over the accuracy of the numbers in this passage and especially the number of chariots attributed to Ahab. Some scholars argue that this is an accurate number (e.g. Elat 1975, 29; Briquel-Chatonnet 1992, 80–81; Kuan 1995, 34–36). Some suggest that Ahab’s force may have included auxiliaries from Jehoshaphat of Judah and from vassals such as Moab and Edom (Malamat 1973, 144; Miller and Hayes 1986, 270). But other scholars argue that the number 2,000 is an error for 200 (e.g. Na’aman 1976, 97–102; Mitchell 1982, 479).

Regarding the number of infantry mustered by the coalition, M. de Odorico (1995, 103–07) concludes that the scribe decided on what had to be the approximate size of the Syro-Palestinian army (≈70,000) and multiplied some numbers by ten until he got this value. It was the first three contingents

46 Interestingly, an epigraph on a bronze band from Imgur-Enlil (Balawat) reads: ‘Adinu, (the man) of Bit-Dakkuri, the Chaldean ’ (mâ-di-ni âmâmâ KUR [kal]-da-ru-a). See RIMA 3, A.0.102.79.
(i.e. Damascus, Hamath and Israel), as well as those referring to the camels of the Arabs and to the troops of Arqā, that were all intentionally multiplied by a factor of ten.

But two recent studies have argued for the basic accuracy of the numbers. A thorough quantitative study of the Assyrian musters for war found by F. M. Fales (2000, 52–53) primarily in the ‘Horse Lists’ has demonstrated that the size of the Assyrian army at the battle of Qarqar was approximately 86,000 men (excluding all civilian and auxiliary personnel). Fales also concludes that the numbers given for the coalition forces at Qarqar may, in fact, reflect roughly accurate numbers.\(^47\) Contrasting the coalitions that Shalmaneser III faced with those faced by Ashurnasirpal II, Liverani (2004, 215–16) concludes that ‘we can reasonably maintain that Shalmaneser had to venture into Syria with armies of the size of 60,000 soldiers or more’ (about three times the size of Ashurnasirpal’s army).

Regarding the number of casualties (see Millard 1991, 219; de Odorico 1995, 107; and Mayer 1995, 46–47), the monolith’s 14,000 appears to inflate to 25,000 in the Assur Clay Tablets, the Calaḫ Bulls, and the Marble Slab, and then to 29,000 in the Broken Statue from Nimrud and the Assur Basalt Statue,\(^48\) unless these are ‘running totals’ of all of Shalmaneser’s campaigns. Since 14,000 may already be an exaggeration, the other figures likely are. This inflation of the casualties’ number is one of the items that point to the Assyrian failure at Qarqar.

\(^47\) A ‘Horse List’ (TFS 103) from the reign of Sargon II constitutes a BE-qu muster, ‘a record of all the horses and mules in the chariotry and some, if not all, of those in the cavalry, of the army gathered by Sargon for one of the years of his Babylonian campaign’ (Dalley and Postgate 1984, 200). It gives totals for different musters (like that for Borsippa, lines iii.7–8) as well as a grand total: ‘3,477 (horse and mules)’. In Shalmaneser’s Assur Clay Tablets (RIMA 3, A.0.102.6, iv.47–48), he claims to have ‘hitched up teams of horses to 2,002 chariots and 5,542 cavalry for the forces of my land’ (cp. RIMA 3, A.0.102.11, left edge ii.1–2a). In the Marble Slab (RIMA 3, A.0.102.10, iv.34b–40a), Shalmaneser gives grand totals for his campaigns through his twentieth year: ‘110,610 prisoners. 82,600 killed, 9,920 horses (and) mules, 35,565 oxen, 19,690 donkeys, (and) 184,755 sheep—booty from the beginning of my reign up to my twentieth regnal year’.

\(^48\) The Black Obelisk reads 20 LIM 5 ME ‘20,500’, instead of the 20 LIM 5 LIM ‘25,000’ of the other annalistic texts. Thus it can be treated as an error for 25,000.
THE CAMPAIGN OF 841 BCE AND THE TRIBUTE OF JEHU

Shalmaneser III’s 841 campaign is preserved in five annalistic texts and two Summary Inscriptions.49 The Marble Slab, even though it dates two years later than the Calah Bulls, preserves the fullest account. It reads:

**Episode 1 (iii.45b–iv.4a)**

In my eighteenth regnal year, I crossed the Euphrates for the sixteenth time. Hazael of Damascus trusted in the massed might of his troops; and he mustered his army in great number. He made Mt Saniru/Senir, a mountain peak, which (lies) opposite Mt Lebanon, his fortress. I felled with the sword 16,020 troops, his fighting men. I took away from him 1,121 of his chariots, 470 of his cavalry, together with his camp. In order to save his life he ran away. I pursued after him. I confined him in Damascus, his royal city. I cut down his orchards. I burned his shocks.

**Episode 2 (iv.4b–7a)**

I marched to the mountains of Haurānu. I razed, destroyed and burned cities without number. I carried away their booty.

**Episode 3 (iv.7b–10a)**

I marched to the mountains of Ba’li-ra’si at the side of the sea and opposite Tyre. I erected a statue of my royalty there.

**Episode 4 (iv.10b–12a)**

I received the tribute of Ba’al-manžēr, the Tyrian, and of Jehu (Ia-a-u), (the man) of Bit-Ḥumri (Omri).

**Episode 5 (iv.12b–15a)**

On my return, I went up on Mt Lebanon. I set up a stela of my royalty with the stela of Tiglath-pileser (I), the great king who went before me.

The narrative structure of the campaign divides into two phases (see Fig. 13.2). The first phase is a fighting phase in which the primary enemy, Hazael, and his land are subjugated. This phase is narrated in two parts: the defeat of Hazael (episode 1) and the continuation and conclusion of the campaign in the mountains of Hauran (episode 2). The second phase is a non-fighting phase in which there are two instances in which a statue is set up on a

---

49 The annals are: the Calah Bulls (RIMA 3 A.0.102.8, 1’-27’; Yamada Annals 6; COS 2.113C); the Marble Slab (RIMA 3, A.0.102.10, iii.45b–iv.15a; Yamada: Annals 7; COS 2.113D); the Kurbail Statue (RIMA 3, A.0.102.12, 21–30a; Yamada: Annals 9; COS 113E); the Black Obelisk (RIMA 3, A.0.102.14, 97–99; Yamada: Annals 13; COS 2.113F); the Broken Statue from Nimrud (RIMA 3, A.0.102.16, 122’-137’; Yamada: Annals 14). The two Summary Inscriptions are: Walters Art Gallery Stela (RIMA 3, A.0.102.9, 1’-15’; Yamada: Summary Inscription 16); and the Assur Basalt Statue (RIMA 3, A.0.102.40, i.14–35; Yamada: Summary Inscription 19; COS 2.113G).
mountain and the extraction of tribute from two non-combatant kings, Ba‘al-manzēr of Tyre and Jehu of Bit Ḫumrī. The receipt of the tribute from the two kings (episode 4) is framed on either side by the erection of a statue at a specific location on a mountain (episodes 3, 5). Most of the narration of the 841 campaign in the slab is devoted to the description of the defeat of Hazael. This gives the feeling that episodes 2–5 are somewhat anticlimactic. Nevertheless, by framing the tribute of the two kings with the erections of the two statues, Shalmaneser is able to depict effectively his sovereignty over the entire region.

The Fighting Phase: Subjugation of Aram-Damascus (iii.45b–iv.7a)

   Episode 1 – The Defeat of Hazael of Damascus (iii.45b–iv.4a)

   Episode 2 – Continuation and Conclusion of the campaign in the Mountains of Hauran (iv.4b–7a)

The Non-Fighting Phase: Setting Up of Stelae and Extraction of Tribute (iv.7b–15a)

   Episode 3 – Erection of a Statue on the Mountain of Ba‘ali-ra‘i (opposite Tyre) (iv.7b–10a)

   Episode 4 – Receipt of Tribute from Ba‘al-manzēr or Tyre and Jehu of Bit Ḫumrī (iv.10b–12a)

   Episode 5 – Erection of Statue on Mount Lebanon beside that of Tiglath-pileser (I) (iv.12b–15a)

Figure 13.2 The Marble Slab’s Structure of Shalmaneser III’s 841 Campaign.

The Marble Slab and Broken Statue from Nimrud seem to follow the same version (with five episodes); the Calah Bulls and the Kurbail Statue give a slightly different version (with only four episodes). The Black Obelisk gives a significantly truncated version, but it also includes the relief and epigraph detailing the precise tribute of Jehu of Bit Ḫumrī.

Regarding the Summary Inscriptions, the Walters Art Gallery stela is a fragmentary description of the 841 campaign, much of which can only be restored from parallels. The Assur Basalt Statue (COS 2.113G) contains a brief passage describing the death of Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri), the usurpation of Hazael, and a telescoped version of the campaign.

(i.25–ii.6)

Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri) passed away.Ḥazael, son of a nobody, took the throne. He mustered his numerous troops; (and) he moved against me to do war

50 KUR-šū e-mi-id / šadāsū ʾēmid. Lit. ‘he reached his mountain’. The phrase is simply a euphemism for ‘to die’ and, in and of itself, does not specify whether the death was the result of natural or unnatural causes.
and battle. I fought with him. I decisively defeated him. I took away from him his walled camp. In order to save his life he ran away. I pursued (him) as far as Damascus, his royal city. I cut down his orchards.

Although the chronological context is not indicated, the account is obviously tied to the 841 campaign. It clearly notes that Hazael was a usurper—this is what the phrase ‘son of a nobody’ means in the Mesopotamian context (Younger 2005). In 2 Kings 8.7–15, Hazael murders Ben-Hadad and seizes the throne. While it is impossible to confirm the historicity of the murder, the Assyrian text asserts that Hazael was not the legitimate heir to the throne of Damascus. Thus sometime in 844 or 843 Hazael became king in Damascus.51

This certainly had a negative impact on the coalition that Hadad-ezer had led from 853 to 845 BCE. As Yamada points out (2000a, 189–90), it is plausible that the allies had been bound to each other by an oath of loyalty, since this was common practice in the ancient Near East. If so, it is plausible that they would have been required to maintain loyalty to the royal family of Hadad-ezer (Adad-idri) and to oppose any usurper. Thus with the change in dynasty in Damascus, the new political situation would have caused the disintegration of the coalition.

Shalmaneser’s inscriptions do not relate an encounter with Hamathite troops during the 841 campaign, nor later in the campaign of 838–837. Between 844 and 841, the relationship between Hamath and Assyria had obviously changed. More than a century later, Sargon II claimed that his predecessors had imposed tribute on Irḫušu (see the Borowski Stela, Lambert 1981, 125; COS 2.118B; Hawkins 2004). But since Shalmaneser himself never claimed this, some scholars feel that it is more likely that Shalmaneser brought Hamath over to an Assyrian alliance by diplomatic means, perhaps even some type of bilateral agreement with Assyria that allowed Shalmaneser to pass through its territory (Astour 1971, 384; Green 1979, 36 n. 10; Yamada 2000a, 190 n. 387). One thing is sure: items from Hamath are found at Kalhu (modern Nimrud), the capital city of Shalmaneser III. For example, there is an ivory with the name of Hamath incised on it.52 In addition, sixteen burnt shell ornaments (that were perhaps clappers or castanets) have been discovered at Fort Shalmaneser (room T 10) (Barnett 1963, 82–84; Oates and Oates 2001, 181; Hawkins 2000, 410–11). Seven of these are inscribed in hieroglyphic Luwian: ‘Urḫilana, the king’ (Hawkins 2000, 411). Excavations at Hama (ancient Hamath) have produced a similar shell inscribed with the same name (with the same orthography) (Riis and Buhl

52 Possibly dating to the ninth century on paleographic grounds (note esp. the mem). See Millard 1962, 42.
1990, 213, 215, no. 800). Also found in the same room (T 10) were some ivories, one of which belonged to Hazael (see below).\(^{53}\)

Interestingly, an inscription of Irḫulēnī/Urḫilīna was discovered in the Iraqi village of Hīnes (1 km from Bavian) about 70 km north of Kālḫu (Nimrud). The inscription, reported in 1935 by T. Jacobsen (Frankfort and Jacobsen 1935, 101–03, fig. 107 [photo]), is a duplicate of two other Irḫulēnī/Urḫilīna building inscriptions found in Syria (Restan and Qalʿat el Mudiq) (Hawkins 2000, 408–09). But the stone and incised style of the inscription differ markedly from the basalt and relief script of its duplicates and the other Hamath inscriptions (Hawkins 2000, 409). Because of these differences, Hawkins speculates that it is a copy made in antiquity of an original inscription taken to Assyria by Shalmaneser III, Irḫulēnī’s/Urḫilīna’s contemporary, or Sargon II, the conqueror of Hamath.\(^{54}\)

On the other hand, Dion speculates that the reference in the Borowski Stela to Irḫulēnī’s final submission to Sargon’s forefathers favours the reign of Shalmaneser for the time when the Hīnes inscription was made (Dion 1995b, 487–88).

In his attack on Hazael, Shalmaneser apparently took the route through the Beqa Valley between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon Mountains. In episode 1, he claims to have fought Hazael at ‘Mt Sanir, a mountain peak, which (lies) opposite Mt Lebanon, his fortress’. Mt Sanir is the biblical Mt Senir, which has been identified with the Anti-Lebanon range. He claims to have killed 16,000/16,020 of Hazael’s troops and to have confined him in Damascus.

In episode 2 of the Marble Slab, Shalmaneser continued the campaign, moving southwards to plunder the towns in the Hauran, the modern Jebel ed-Druz, which rises to the east of biblical Bashan. He states: ‘I razed, destroyed and burned cities without number. I carried away their booty.’ This concludes the fighting phase of Shalmaneser’s campaign.

Two pieces of booty from this campaign (or possibly from a later one against Hazael in 838–837) have been discovered. One was an ivory found in the excavations of room T 10 at Fort Shalmaneser incised with a fragmentary inscription (Millard as cited in Mallowan 1966, 598; \textit{COS} 2, 163):

\[
\begin{align*}
[ &mr]n \ hz/l \\
&\text{our lor}d Hazael.
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{53}\) Barnett (1963, 81, 85) argued that all of the ivories and other objects from Hamath found in the excavations at Fort Shalmaneser were part of booty that Sargon II carried off after his 720 BCE campaign. A recent study on the Neo-Assyrian attitude towards the use of ivory may explain the storage of ivories of this sort. See Herrmann and Millard 2003.

\(^{54}\) Hawkins 2000, 409. Landsberger (1948, 33 n. 66) went so far as to speculate that Irḫulēnī had somehow penetrated deep into Assyria and had written this inscription commemorating this event.
The other piece is a small, black and white marble cylinder (1.5 × 4.1 cm) discovered on the north-east side of the small ziggurat in Assur (i.e. the Anu-Adad temple) (*RIMA* 3, 151; *COS* 2.113H). It was brought to Assur by Shalmaneser as booty from Hazael, and was perhaps used as a foundation deposit for the city wall. It has a short inscription, obviously incised after its capture:

Booty from the temple of the god Šēru (Aram. šhr) of the city of Malaḫa, a royal city of Hazael of Damascus, which Shalmaneser, son of Ashurnasirpal, king of Assyria, brought back inside the wall of the Inner City (Assur).

This cylinder, however, probably dates to Shalmaneser’s 838–837 campaign rather than the 841 campaign, since Malaḫa is mentioned in the Broken Statue from Nimrud (*RIMA* 3, A.0.102.16, 152’-162’a). Yamada (2000b) published P. Hulin’s hand copies of this text confirming this reading on the statue. Moreover, ‘to Malaḫi’ is the entry for year 838 in the Eponym Chronicle (Millard 1994, 29).

In the next episode, Shalmaneser marched to the mountains of Ba’li-raʾsi at the side of the sea and opposite Tyre and erected a statue of himself there. The identification of Ba’li-raʾsi is debated. Three locations have been proposed: (1) in the vicinity of the Nahr el-Kelb (Honigmann 1929; Wiseman 1958, 49); (2) Mt Carmel (Astour 1971, 384–85; Green 1979, 36) and (3) Ras en-Naqura, the mountain demarcating the modern Lebanese-Israeli border (Borger *TUAT* 1, 366 n. 21a; Dion 1997, 196–97; Yamada 2000a, 192). The last option seems best in the light of the fact that the texts of the Marble Slab and the Broken Statue from Nimrud read ‘opposite the land of Tyre’ (ša pūt māt šurri).

In his march from Hauran to Ba’li-raʾsi, it is possible that Shalmaneser crossed Israelite territory. Some scholars have attempted to understand the enigmatic verse in the book of Hosea Hos. 10.14, ‘The ravaging of Beth-arbel by Shalman on the day of battle’, as a reference to an attack on the Israelite town by Shalmaneser III in connection with this campaign. It is possible that this is a reminiscence of the town’s destruction, but it might date from the 838 campaign.

In episode 4, Shalmaneser receives the tribute of Ba’al-manzēr of Tyre and of Jehu of Bit Ḫumri (Marble Slab and Broken Statue from Nimrud). The Calaḫ Bulls and Kurbaḷ Statuette state this somewhat differently:

At that time, I received the tribute of the Tyrians and the Sidonians, and of Jehu (man of) Bit-Ḫumri (Omri) (*ma-da-tu ša KUR šur-ra-a-a KUR ši-du-na-a-a ša ša ū-ta-a DUMU šu-um-ri-i*).

55 Beth-Arbel is identified with Irbid. See Aharoni 1979, 341; Astour 1971, 385.
Some scholars (e.g. Yamada 2000a, 194) have concluded from the difference in wording between the Marble Slab and these two other inscriptions that Tyre and Sidon were unified under one ruler, i.e. Ba‘al-manzēr of Tyre.⁵⁶

There can be no doubt that the Assyrian cuneiform spelling iā-ū-a (the Marble Slab mistakenly writes iā-a-ū) is an accurate reflection of the Hebrew name of the Israelite King Jehu (יְהוּעַ) (Zadok 1997; Na‘aman 1997; Brinkman and Schwemer 2000; and Younger 2002, 207–18). The following cuneiform sign DUMU (מר) is used in this construction with "יהו-ע-ר-י-י to form a type of gentilic for a nation that the Assyrians have designated as a bītu ‘house’.⁵⁷ Postgate has noted that the bītu has principally a political meaning, but also carries a geographical connotation. ‘The bītu is more than a mere tribe, which might move at any time from one district to another, but its association with a personal name brings home the fact that the political and geographical entity is founded on a tribal system’ (Postgate 1974, 234).

It seems very likely that the battle of Ramoth-Gilead (where Jehoram of Israel was wounded) and Jehu’s later coup d’état occurred between Tishri 842 and Nisan 841 BCE. Shalmaneser’s attack on Damascus and Jehu’s submission took place later in 841 BCE.

The Black Obelisk, the latest of all known obelisks, provides a visual of Jehu’s tribute with an epigraph identifying the particulars.⁵⁸ Sculpted from black alabaster, the famous monument is 1.98 metres in height and contains the longest account of Shalmaneser’s reign, stretching down to the king’s thirty-first year. Discovered by A. H. Layard at Kalhu (Nimrud) in 1846, the text dates to 828–827 BCE. The top of the obelisk is formed in the shape of a ziggurat, having four sides with five registers or tiers on each side containing reliefs of the tribute being brought to the king (ANEP 120–21).⁵⁹ This form may reflect the special appeal which these temple towers appear to have had for the Assyrians (Porada 1983, 16). While each register has an epigraph, the main text is found above and below the five registers on all four sides.

---

⁵⁶ However, see the formulation in the Black Obelisk 103b-04a (ia KUR šur-ra-a-a KUR ši-du-na-a-a KUR gu-bal-a-a). Cf. also lines 180b–83a.
⁵⁷ Schneider (1995; 1996) has suggested that the phrase DUMU(mär) "יהו-ע-ר-י means ‘son (descendant) of Omri’ and that Jehu was a descendant of the Omride dynasty, perhaps by a different branch than the ruling descendants of Ahab. But see the criticisms of Dion 1997, 231 n. 36. The Assyrians often denoted countries by the name of the founder of the ruling dynasty at the time of their first acquaintance with it (e.g. ‘Bit Bašiani, Bit Agusi, Bit Ḫumri’), regardless of which dynasty was currently in power.
⁵⁸ See Ch. Uehlinger’s essay in this volume. The known examples of obelisks date to the period from Ashur-bel-kala to Shalmaneser III (Russell 2003, 4).
⁵⁹ Register 4 contains an epigraph that identifies the tribute in the relief as that of Marduk-apla-šuṣur of Suḫu. Interestingly, a letter from this ruler to the Hamathite king Rudamu/Uratamis, the son of Irḫulēni/Urḫilina, was discovered in excavations at Hama. See Parpola 1990. See n. 15 above.
All Assyrian obelisks have apparently been found in the vicinity of temples, suggesting that their function was to display to the gods the economic success of the king—in pictures depicting the flow of wealth into the empire and in text describing how this wealth was obtained (Russell 2003, 6). On the other hand, their four-sided portrayals imply mobile viewers and a free-standing setting, suggesting that they were also intended for a human audience (ibid., 6).

On the front side, the second register contains the famous relief of Jehu of Israel (or his envoy) paying his tribute to Shalmaneser. The first register holds a scene of Súa, the ruler of Gilzānū, a land near Lake Urmia, paying his tribute. Through parallelism of the portrayals of the tribute from these two countries—the first being in the north-easternmost area of the empire and the second being in the south-westernmost area—the obelisk creates a pictorial merism stressing the gigantic extent of Shalmaneser’s Assyrian empire (see Keel and Uehlinger 1994; Green 1979, 385; Porada 1983, 13–18; and Lieberman 1985, 88). The epigraph (RIMA 3, A.0.102.88) reads:

I received the tribute of Jehu (Ia-ú-a) (the man) of Bit-Ḥumrī: silver, gold, a golden bowl, a golden goblet, golden cups, golden buckets, tin, a staff (ḫuṭārtu) of the king’s hand, (and) javelins(?).60

M. Elat (1975, 33–34) notes that Súa, king of Gilzānū, is pictured on the obelisk giving Shalmaneser ḫuṭārētelḫuṭārtē ‘staffs’. He argues for a distinction between ḫuṭārētuḫuṭārtu and ḥaṭṭu, with the former being a symbol of protection or ownership of property, and the latter a symbol of royal authority (i.e. a sceptre). Thus Jehu and Súa, in handing over the ḫuṭārtu to Shalmaneser III, ‘wished to symbolize that their kingdoms had been handed over to the protection of the king of Assyria’.61 This ḫuṭārtu-staff may be pictured on the recently discovered alabaster vase from the Jezireh attributed to Shalmaneser III (Abu Assaf 1992; Fortin 1999, 111; Heintz 2001, 473). The vase pictures Shalmaneser and an unidentified king ‘shaking hands’, a motif seen on Shalmaneser’s throne base from Fort Shalmaneser.62

CONCLUSION

In whatever scheme of periodization used for Neo-Assyrian history in the ninth century, the reign of Shalmaneser III stands out. His rule had great impact on most of the states of the Levant as the Assyrian empire expanded

---

60 In terms of the number of items delineated, Jehu’s tribute is the most (nine items).
61 See CAD H 265 s.v. ḫuṭārtu A.
62 For the theme of two kings ‘shaking hands’, see Reade 1979a, 69–70.
K. Lawson Younger, Jr.

beyond its traditional borders. Moreover, in the history of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, Shalmaneser’s reign serves as a bridge between two important periods, impacting the Omride and Jehuite periods through his 853 and 841 campaigns. This study has analysed these campaigns and investigated some of their problems. The resistance offered by Ahab in conjunction with the western alliance that fought Shalmaneser at Qarqar in 853 gave way to the tribute gift of Jehu towards the conclusion of Shalmaneser’s 841 campaign. Ahab was a participant in ‘a grand alliance’ that was able to resist Assyrian expansion; Jehu became an Assyrian paragon for the submissive client king, helping to define the vastness of the Assyrian state at the end of Shalmaneser’s reign. While many years would pass before the Assyrians would accomplish the conquest of Israel, these initial contacts between Shalmaneser III and Ahab and Jehu demonstrate the two options that the Israelite monarchs would implement throughout the stormy relationship with the ‘Great King(s) of Assyria’ until the fall of Samaria and the land’s incorporation into the Assyrian provincial system.
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