

⁴ M. E. L. Mallowan, Twenty-Five Years of Mesopotamian Discovery (1932-1956), London 1956, p. 49.

⁵ ND 5550 and ND 5463

⁶ ARU 44, 45 and 464

⁷ K. Deller, The Neo-Assyrian Epigraphical Remains of Nimrud, *Orientalia* 35 (1966), p. 191.

⁸ M. E. L. Mallowan, Nimrud and Its Remains, London 1966, vol. I, p. 85 ff.

⁹ C. H. W. Johns, Assyrian Deeds and Documents, vol. III, Cambridge, p. 336.

¹⁰ C. H. W. Johns, op. cit., p. 341.

¹¹ K. Deller, op. cit., p. 191.

¹² ARU 464:32-34.

¹³ ND 5550:41-42. See the new edition of the text - J. N. Postgate, Fifty Neo-Assyrian Legal Documents, Warminster 1976, Nr 15.

¹⁴ J. V. Kinnier Wilson, The Nimrud Wine Lists. A Study of Men and Administration at the Assyrian Capital in the Eighth Century, B. C., London 1972, p. 80 ff. The author believes that both terms referred to two kinds of bakers, the nuhatimmē being master bakers. I think the former translations of lahhinu should be preserved, namely a "baker", whereas nuhatimmu should be used to mean "a cook". It also seems probable that the social status of lahhinu was higher than nuhatimmu; see chapter IV of The Economic Foundations of Neo-Assyrian Temple by the writer (in Polish, forthcoming).

¹⁵ ND 2332 and ND 2337.

¹⁶ ND 3420.

¹⁷ ND 3423.

¹⁸ M. Streck, Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's, III. Teil., Leipzig 1916, p. 756.

¹⁹ ND 1120 - G. van Driel, The Cult of Aššur, Assen 1969, p. 198 ff.

²⁰ R. Frankena, Tākultu, Leiden 1954, p. 7, col. VI: 11 ff.

²¹ D. J. Wiseman, An Esarhaddon Cylinder from Nimrud, Iraq 14 (1952), p. 58, v. 62: ^dNin-urta apal ^dEnlil ik-ri-bi-šu i-šim-me.

²² ND 3476.

²³ ND 3489.

Zdzisław J. KAPERA

THE OLDEST ACCOUNT OF SARGON II'S CAMPAIGN AGAINST ASHDOD*

The ruins of Nineveh extend on the left bank of the Tigris, opposite modern Mosul and about 300 kilometres north-west of Bagdad. They lie within the famous Assyrian triangle formed by the great rivers Tigris and Zab and their tributaries Chosor and Ghazir. The triangle also embraces two other capitals of ancient Assyria, viz. Dur Sharrukin (Khorsabad) and Nimrud (Calah) ¹.

The area occupied by Nineveh in the Neo-Assyrian period was enormous. The prophet Jonah (8th century B. C.) wrote about Nineveh emphatically as "an exceeding great city of three days' journey" ². Nowadays, the ruins of Nineveh lie under two huge tells called Kouyunjik and Nebi Yunus. Kouyunjik rises about 300 meters above the surrounding plain and is 1000 metres long and 600 metres wide. The hill of Nebi Yunus is half as large.

* This is another part of my Ph. D. dissertation The Rebellion of Yamani in Ashdod: A Study in the History of Philistia Between c. 713-709 B. C. defended at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow, in 1978. (Cf. summary published in the "Folia Orientalia" XX (1979), pp. 313-314). This text was ready for print in 1979 and I deeply regret that it must be presented here in the original form. Nothing but some new bibliographical data could be included.

Excavations at Nineveh, which started 145 years ago, have concentrated mostly on the Kouyunjik tell, where the palaces of Sennacherib, Ashurnasirpal and Ashurbanipal and the temples of Ishtar and the god Nabu have been discovered. The earliest, preliminary and unsuccessful excavations were carried out in 1842/3 by the French consul in Mosul, P. E. Botta. Later the hill found itself under the charge of the British, and it is to the Englishmen A. H. Layard, G. Smith and E. W. Budge that the most credit is due for the uncovering of the ancient city. Owing to A. H. Layard and H. Rassam the most precious items, that is, the reliefs and clay tablets, went to the British Museum. Research in Nineveh in the years 1903-1905 and 1927-1932 was conducted by L. W. King, R. Campbell Thompson, R. W. Hutchinson, W. Hamilton and M. E. L. Mallowan³.

The hill of Nebi Yunus ("tomb of Jonah") has not been examined to this day. This is because it has been impossible to remove the Arab village, mosque, cemetery and the local holy place, the so-called tomb of Jonah. Yet in 1852 the sultan's governor in Mosul Hikmi Pasha secretly conducted successful excavations and the research done by the Iraqi Department of Antiquities in 1954 produced the remains of a palace, possibly from the time of Ashurbanipal⁴.

The items in the British Museum which contain texts about Yamani's rebellion all come from the Kouyunjik hill⁵. Nothing certain is known about their exact origins. The prism fragment No. 81-7-27,3 and the so-called 'Azeqah fragment were brought among thousands of other tablets and deciphered many years after their discovery⁶. All we know about the fragment of Prism A is that it comes from the excavations of G. Smith (see below). Thus the provenance of the Nineveh texts cannot contribute anything important to their interpretation.

The Broken Prism A of Nineveh

In the course of excavations on the Kouyunjik hill in ancient Nineveh in the years 1873-4 G. Smith discovered fragments of two cylinders⁷. H. Winckler introduced the fragments into literature as recensions of two octo-

gonal prisms marked A and B and he did not exclude the possibility of their representing an even larger number of copies of some standard text⁸. That view was shared by A. T. Olmstead⁹ and upheld by C. J. Gadd¹⁰. The latter two scholars, and also E. F. Weidner¹¹, tried to reconstruct the original arrangement of the fragments. H. Tadmor, who further developed the findings of C. J. Gadd, analysed the several fragments of prisms kept in the British Museum and reached the following conclusions:

- a) Recension A was made after palû 9, i. e., in 712 B. C.
- b) Recension B was made after palû 10, i. e., in 711 B. C.
- c) Although as many as 430 lines of the text of the two prisms are preserved, there are no repetitions.
- d) There are no differences in the style of narration, the handwriting, the incidence of corrections, the spelling of the names of Shamash and Ashur.

These facts would suggest that the two versions were made by the same person within one or two years, and H. Tadmor did not think that to have been very likely¹². Therefore, he collated the British Museum fragments and concluded that they were parts of a single octagonal prism. It had originally stood 45 cm high and contained about 1200 lines of text, of which 432 have been preserved.

H. Tadmor proposed a new arrangement of the fragments and carried out a full chronological analysis¹³. The prism described the events of Sargon II's reign starting from his second year and his first palû, i. e., from 720 B. C. The last campaign related in the prism was the campaign against Gurgum in 711 B. C.; the prism, then, must have been composed in 710 B. C., four years prior to the Dur Sharukkin annals¹⁴.

Column VII of the Nineveh prism contains the oldest known account of Sargon II's campaign against Ashdod. Unfortunately, the column is very fragmentary. The events that interest us take up three lines of text within palû 9, in the lower section of the fragment Sm. 2022 and forty-eight lines on the fragment k. 1668 + D. T. 6 III (also known in the literature as No. 251 + y3)¹⁵.

The two fragments were included in the literature of the Ashdod revolt immediately after the publication of the first account of their contents by G. Smith¹⁶. They were taken into consideration by E. Schrader¹⁷ but

were published by H. Winckler only in 1889¹⁸. H. Winckler's edition provided not only drawings of the cunei but also a transcription and translation. He later dealt with the text on two more occasions, his last corrected transcription and translation being included in a selection of cuneiform texts for people interested in biblical studies¹⁹. Drawings of the cunei and a glossary to the text were published in 1911 in a collection of cuneiform documents edited by A. Sarsowsky and M. Schorr²⁰. Further translations of the Ashdod campaign were published by A. Ungnad²¹, E. Ebeling²², D. D. Luckenbill²³, M. Oppenheim²⁴ and D. J. Wiseman²⁵. A new transcription and translation of the part of fragment S. 2022 referring to palu 9 (11.12-14) was presented by H. Tadmor in 1959²⁶.

Translation:

- (12) 1. In my 9th palû against (...)
 (13) 2. the great 'sea' of the w[est...]
 (14) 3. [the city] of Ashdod [...] ²⁷
 4. on account of (...) ²⁸
 5. from (...)
 6. Ahimiti (...) ²⁹
 7. his own brother, over [them] I raised to rule ³⁰. This (...)
 8. tribute ³¹ (...)
 9. as on [former] kings
 10. on him I imposed (...)
 11. [But these] wicked [Hittites] (...conceived)
 12. not to bring tribute
 13.
 14. their princes, started a rebellion (?) (...) ³²
 15. (...) as (...)
 16. they expelled him (...) ³³
 17. Yamani, a com[moner] without claim to the throne (...) ³⁴
 18. to sovereignty over them [on the throne]
 19. of his [former] master they made sit d[own]

20. their city (...)
 21. of b[attle...] ³⁵
 22. }
 23. } (lacuna)
 24. }
 25. (...) [in] its [city?] environs, a moat (...)
 26. [... 20 + x] cubits ³⁶ in depth [they] [dug]
 27. which reached the underground waters, [in order to...] ³⁷
 28. Then [to] the rulers of Philistea, Judah, Ed[om]
 29. Moab, [and those who] live [on islands] by the sea [and bring]
 30. tribute [and] tâmartu-gifts to my lord Ashur
 31. He spread countless evil lies
 32. to alienate them from me. [Then] to Piru,
 33. king of Musru ³⁸, a prince who was not capable of saving them
 34. sent bribes, asking him
 35. to be an ally. But I Sargon the rightful ruler
 36. devoted to the pronouncements [uttered by] Nebo and Marduk, [ca-
 refully] observing the orders of
 37. Ashur, over the Tigris and the Euphrates
 38. at the peak of their spring flood ³⁹, my troops
 39. led, as [if it were] dry ground. However, Yamani
 40. their king, in his own power
 41. put his trust and [therefore] did not bow to my rule.
 42. The advance of my troops from afar he heard of,
 43. and the splendor of my lord Ashur overwhelmed him ⁴⁰ and ⁴¹
 44. [to...], which is on the Bank of the River ⁴²
 45. [...] deep (?) water ⁴³
 46. [...] [from] his (?) country
 47. [...] far away
 48. [...] he fled
 49. [...] A]shdod
 50. [Ash]dod [-Yam?...] ⁴⁴

Prism A is of fundamental importance for the reconstruction of Yamani's revolt. In the first place, it is the oldest extant document of Sargon II's times to deal with the Ashdod events at some length. It was written just two years after the rebellion and is four years older than the extensive accounts of the Display Inscription and the Annals. Although it has come down to us in fragments, it can contribute greatly to the reconstruction.

The relation of the events in Ashdod falls into three clearly marked sections. Part I (II. 1-27) tells of the circumstances of the outbreak of the rebellion, the raising of Yamani to the throne and his defensive works. It gives the date of the rebellion, recounts the elevation of Ahimetu to his brother's throne, the Ashdod princes' refusal to pay tribute and the enthronement of a man of dubious origin named Yamani, and describes the fortifications of the city (either of Ashdod proper or of Ashdod-Yam).

Part II (II. 27-40) contains an account of Yamani's political moves and Sargon II's military reaction. It tells of Yamani's envoys being dispatched to the other Philistine rulers, to Judah, Edom, Moab and to the "sea dwellers" and of his bid for alliance with Pir'u, ruler of Egypt. It stresses the rapidity of Sargon's reaction in sending his troops from Assyria to Philistia.

Part III, the most difficult to interpret (II. 40-51) relates Yamani's escape and probably the destruction of Ashdod and Ashdod-Yam (since that is the most likely interpretation of the double occurrence of the city's name; let us note that in the Annals - II. 224-225, ed. by Winckler - and in the Display Inscription - I. 104 - the conquests of the two cities are mentioned very near each other).

The lost part of the text most probably contained an account of the punishment inflicted upon the rebellious city and of the subjection of the city to the power of a governor appointed by the Assyrian ruler. That suggestion is contained in the text of the prism 81-7-27 (II. 6-11) and in the Annals (II. 225-228, ed. by Winckler)⁴⁵.

Notes

¹ Cf. E. A. Speiser, Niniveh [in:] The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 3, Nashville-New York 1962, pp. 551-553 and fig. 18 (Map of Niniveh today).

² Jon 3,3. Cf. A. Jones, ed., The Jerusalem Bible, Paperback edition, London 1971, p. 1296. The text of the book was written down after the Babylonian exile, probably in the 5th-3rd cc. B. C.

³ A. Parrot, Archéologie mésopotamienne. Les étapes, Paris 1946, pp. 37-39, 45 f, 57-59, 85 f, 95-99. Cf. the detailed chronicle of the excavations and the list of official publications on Niniveh in S. A. Pallis, The Antiquity of Iraq. A Handbook of Assyriology, Copenhagen 1956, p. 341, 345-348.

⁴ A. Parrot, Archéologie..., p. 101; E. M. Blacklock, Niniveh [in:] The New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology, ed. by E. M. Blacklock, R. K. Harrison, Grand Rapids 1983, p. 338.

⁵ Cf. catalogue of the Kouyunjik collections: C. Bezold, Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection, London 1889-1896, vols. I-V.

⁶ It is notable that the editors of the texts do not comment on their origins, for lack of sufficient data.

⁷ G. Smith, Assyrian discoveries: an account of explorations and discoveries on the site of Niniveh, during 1873 and 1874, London 1875, pp. 288 ff.

⁸ H. Winckler, De inscriptione Sargonis regis Assyriae que vocatur Annalium, Berolini 1886, pp. 8 f and his: Die Keilschriftlitexte Sargons nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen (= KTB), vol. 1, Leipzig 1889, p. XI f.

⁹ A. T. Olmstead, Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria, 722-705 B. C., New York 1908, pp. 11-14, note 42.

¹⁰ C. J. Gadd, Inscribed Prisms of Sargon II from Nimrud, "Iraq" 16, 1954, p. 174.

¹¹ E. F. Weidner, Šilkan(he)ni, König von Musri, ein Zeitgenosse Sargons II., "Archiv für Orientforschung" 14, 1941-1944, pp. 51 ff.

¹² H. Tadmor, The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study, "Journal of Cuneiform Studies" 12, 1958, p. 22, note 1 and pp. 87 f.

¹³ H. Tadmor, Campaigns, table on pp. 90 f.

¹⁴ H. Tadmor, Campaigns, p. 89.

¹⁵ H. Tadmor, Campaigns, p. 91 and notes 296 f.

¹⁶ Cf. note 7.

17 E. Schrader, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, vol. II, London 1888, p. 93, note 1.

18 H. Winckler, KTS I, pp. 186-189 and II, pl. 44 D.

19 He repeated a part of the text, based upon the publication mentioned above in note 12, in the article Musri. Meluhha. Ma' in. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Arabien und zur Bibelkritik, "Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft" 3, 1898, p. 55. Cf. also his: Keilschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament, 3rd ed., Leipzig 1909, p. 41.

20 A. Sarsowsky, Keilschriftliches Urkundenbuch zum Alten Testament. In Urschrift zusammengestellt, autographiert und herausgegeben. Mit einem Wörter- und Eigennamenverzeichnis von M. Schorr. I. Historische Texte, Leiden 1911, p. 31.

21 H. Gressmann, ed., Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament, vol. 1, Texte, Tübingen 1909 (Die akkadischen Texte übersetzt von A. Ungnad), pp. 118 f.

22 H. Gressmann, ed., Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament, 2nd ed., Berlin-Leipzig 1926 (Reprinted: Berlin 1965), (Babylonisch-assyrische Texte übersetzt von E. Ebeling), p. 351.

23 D. D. Luckenbill, Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia, vol. II, Chicago 1926 (reprinted: New York 1975), §§ 193-195.

24 A. L. Oppenheim [in:] J. B. Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Princeton 1950 (and subsequent reprints), p. 287. Cf. also J. B. Pritchard, ed., The Ancient Near East. Vol. 1. An Anthology of Texts and Pictures, Princeton 1973⁵, p. 198 with the same translation on p. 198.

25 D. J. Wiseman, Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia [in:] D. Winton Thomas, ed., Documents from Old Testament Times, New York 1961/Edinburgh 1958, p. 61.

26 H. Tadmor, Campaigns, p. 79 f.

27 The translation of lines 1-3 is based on H. Tadmor's findings (cf. note 26). Other investigators propose the following readings: Ungnad and Ebeling: "In meinem neunten Regierungsjahre zog ich nach /2/ gross /3 Asdods /grosse Lücke/"; Oppenheim: "/Azuri, king/ of Ashdod /lacuna/..."; Wiseman: "In my...th year of rule /... Aziru, king/ of Ashdod...". J. K. Aplan, The Stronghold of Yamani at Ashdod-Yam, "Israel Exploration Journal" 19, 1969, p. 148, note 26 reads the text in l. 3 /14/ not as "Ashdod" but as "Ashdod-/Yam/".

As we can see there is no agreement as to the reading and interpretation of the preserved fragment of the prism.

28 A. L. Oppenheim translates ll. 4-5 as "on account of (this crime ...) from..." believing probably that lines 1-5 deal with Azuri's refusal to pay tribute.

29 Concerning the term talīmu - brother, cf. C. Bezold, Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar, Heidelberg 1926, p. 293, s.v. talīmu; W. F.

Albright, Notes on Assyrian Lexicography and Etymology, "Revue d'Assyriologie" 16, 1919, p. 193 and his review of Bezold's dictionary in the "Journal of Near Eastern Studies" 48, 1928, p. 182.

30 That is, "I made him king".

31 Concerning the expression biltu ma-da-at-tu cf. W. J. Martin, Tribut und Tributleistungen bei den Assyriern, Helsinki 1936 (= "Studia Orientalia" 8, 1) and J. Zabłocka's extensive commentary in Stosunki agrarne w państwie Sargonidów, Poznań 1971, p. 49 and note 160. W. J. Martin believes that biltu had the general sense of income, revenue, but not that of tribute. In the Neo-Assyrian period it denotes a special kind of tribute. W. J. Martin further believes that the terms maddatu, tamartu and others had an identical meaning (cf. pp. 15-17). That view cannot easily be reconciled with the opinion of H. W. Saggs (The Nimrud Letters, 1952, "Iraq" 17, 1955, p. 49) that maddatu was a regular tribute paid by vassals. It can be supposed that in the case at hand biltu maddatu denotes the regular yearly tribute paid to Sargon II by the ruler of Ashdod.

32 H. Winckler translates so twice. E. Ebeling does not translate the second part of the line but only the beginning: "ihre Fürsten[". Concerning st-hu cf. The Assyrian Dictionary, vol. 15, Chicago 1984, pp. 240 f.

33 This probably referred to Azuri. That is the view held by H. Winckler, Keilschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament, 3rd ed. (= KTAT³), Leipzig 1909, p. 41 note 2.

34 H. Winckler originally transliterated line 17 as lamani amil ša-bi and translated it as "lamani einen Kriegsmann" (KTS I, p. 186). Then he corrected the transliteration to give it the form quoted here and modified the translation to "Ja-ma-ni einen Bauern" (KTAT³, p. 41). A. Ungnad reads only the name Yamani. E. Ebeling had fewer objections to H. Winckler's reading of the text and translated the line as "Jamani, einen Bauer (?), (...)". D. D. Luckenbill, and A. L. Oppenheim after him, translated it as "(la-ma-ni) a Greek, com(moner without claim to the throne)", while D. J. Wiseman's version was "Yamani ("Greek"), a commoner..." (Cf. D. Winton Thomas, ed., Documents from Old Testament Times, New York 1961, p. 61). A detailed analysis of the line has been given in my article Was Yamani a Cypriot?, "Folia Orientalia" 14, 1972-1973, pp. 215-218.

35 Initially H. Winckler transliterated this as ša-mit-hu(?)-si and translated it as "des Kampfes" (KTS I, pp. 118 f), but he later gave up that interpretation (KTAT³, p. 41). On the other hand, it seems that A. L. Oppenheim upholds it, translating the line as "their city of (or: for) the at (tack) (cf. his: Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts in: J. B. Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Princeton 1950, p. 287). D. J. Wiseman does not consider line 21 at all.

36 The numerical appearing at this point is illegible. The version given here was first proposed by H. Winckler as (2 [0 + X]) (cf. KTS I, p. 188) and although he later gave it up it was adopted by A. L. Oppen-

heim and D. J. Wiseman. A. Ungnad translates line 26 as "/x/ Ruten (?), 1 Elle tief"; similarly, E. Ebeling has "...Ruten, eine Elle tief". (Cf. footnotes 21-22 above).

37 On the basis of lines 26-27 J. Kaplan argues very persuasively that the text referred not to Ashdod but to Ashdod-Yam (Ashdudimmu). In areas immediately adjacent to the sea-shore the underground water level is very high. When the moat at Ashdod-Yam was being dug water must have appeared at a depth of about 8 metres, which corresponded to the 20 cubits suggested in the account. The fact that no moat was discovered in the course of J. Kaplan's excavations does not contradict that supposition, since the moat may have existed only on that side of Ashdod-Yam's fortifications from which attack was expected. J. Kaplan's excavations have so far covered only a small part of the old Ashdod-Yam (cf. "Israel Exploration Journal" 19, 1969, p. 148).

38 Concerning the identification of Pir'u king of Musri with the Pharaoh Bocchoris, cf. pp. 205-212 of my dissertation. More recently, cf. J. Bright, *A History of Israel*, 3rd ed., Philadelphia 1981, p. 281.

39 This is an important chronological clue. The flood waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates reach the highest level in April and May. Cf. A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, Chicago 1972⁵, p. 41.

40 H. Winckler has a very expressive translation for the line 44: "Die Furchtbarkeit (Assur, meines Herrn), warf ihn nieder". M. Weippert uses similar terms: "(Der Schreckenglanz A(ssurs), m(eines Herrn), wa(r)f ihn nieder". In M. Weippert's opinion, the text of line 44 presents a very characteristic aspect of the Assyrian view of warfare (which was in fact common to the entire ancient Middle East); war undertaken by a ruler was regarded as a cultic action in which deity sided with his supporters and believers. That explains the overwhelming splendour of the god Ashur, which brings Sargon II's enemies to their knees. The expression in line 44 has an exact parallel in the text of the Annals of Adad-nirari III (810-783 B. C.). Cf. M. Weippert, "Heiliger Krieg" in *Israel und Assyrien*, "Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft" 84, 1972, pp. 478 f.

41 The remaining lines are scarcely legible. A. L. Oppenheim and D. J. Wiseman translate only line 49, in a manner similar to H. Winckler's original version (*KTS* I, pp. 188 f). A. Ungnad, who tried to reconstruct the damaged lines, came up with the following translation: "[⁴⁵] am Ufer des Stromes [⁴⁶] ... Wasser [⁴⁷] ... seines (?) Landes [⁴⁸] ferne [⁴⁹] er floch [⁵⁰] Asdod" (Rest abgebrochen). This interpretation was more or less followed by H. Winckler in the *KTAT*³ version of the text (p. 42) and then repeated by E. Ebeling.

42 H. Winckler renders line 45 as follows: "nach..., welches ist am Ufer des Flusses", and regards it as referring to *nahal Musri* (the Brook of Egypt). Cf. *KTAT*³, p. 42 and note 3.

43 A. Ungnad and E. Ebeling read only "...Wasser" and H. Winckler "...Tiefe (?) der Wasser".

44 The text of the prism breaks off at line 51. E. F. Weidner tried to match with it with the fragment 81-7-27,3 of the British Museum

(cf. his article quoted in note 11, p. 52) but C. J. Gadd (*op. cit.*, "Iraq" 16, 1954, p. 174) excluded that possibility. C. J. Gadd's view was supported by H. Tadmor (*op. cit.*, "Journal of Cuneiform Studies" p. 88 note 274), who did not take the fragment 81-7-27,3 into account in his reconstruction of Prism A.

45 An interesting series of articles on Philistia and Neo-Assyrian foreign policy, including the problem of Yamani's rebellion was published by G. L. Mattingly in the "Near East Archaeological Society Bulletin" (New Series). Cf. his contributions: *The Role of Philistine Autonomy in Neo-Assyrian Foreign Policy*, no. 14, 1979, pp. 49-57; *Neo-Assyrian Influence at Tel Jemmeh*, Nos. 15-16, 1980, pp. 33-49; *An Archaeological Analysis of Sargon's 712 Campaign Against Ashdod*, No. 17, 1981, pp. 47-64.