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ABSTRACT
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The study of the Transjordanian Iron-Age (ca. 1200–550 BC) state of Ammon is important to students of the Bible because of the numerous references to the Ammonites (בֶּן אָמִּן) included in the historical and prophetic sections of the Hebrew canon. The book of Genesis traces the ancestry of the "Sons of Ammon" to an eponymous ancestor named Ben Ammi—son/grandson of Abraham’s nephew Lot (Gen 39:17).

Chapter 1 points out how Ammon—though often ignored or slighted in studies up to the mid-20th century—increasingly receives scholarly attention. It also shows a need for applying the results of archaeological research to facilitate a fuller understanding of the biblical text.

Chapter 2 outlines recent trends in the relationship between the fields of biblical studies and archaeology. Criteria are set forth for evaluating published works combining emphases on the fields of biblical studies and archaeology, especially as they relate
to the study of the Ammonites. The term "archaeological context" is examined and dif­ferentiated from "archaeological commentary."

Chapter 3 tabulates all references to the Ammonites in the Hebrew Bible and compares key references to those in the LXX. A study of the familial relationships within the courts of David and Solomon suggests interesting possibilities for identifying a number of interrelationships which existed between the royal houses of Ammon and Israel. Many Ammonite references cluster around two important themes—tribal/kindred loyalty and honor for Yahweh's temple (or a lack thereof).

Chapter 4 gives a topographical and archaeological background for selected Ammonite references. Ammon's heartland (near modern Amman) was centered around the head waters of the Jabbok River (Nahal Zarqa), strategically located along important trade corridors—the north-south King's Highway and the east-west routes to Jerusalem and to the Canaanite coast. Districts of Ammonite control are identified, and an archaeological summary is given for each biblical site with Ammonite connections and for individuals identified as being Ammonites. Occupations of Ammonite people, the status of women in Ammonite society, and interrelations between Ammon and other contemporary states are explored. The comparative richness of Ammon's cultural heritage and its rise to relative prosperity as a vassal state are chronicled. Evidence of Ammonite cult and religion—including the existence Ammonite deities Milkom and Astarte—is depicted on seals and figurines, and in the Amman Citadel Inscription which included Milkom's divine oracle to be displayed publicly on the acropolis. Ammon's inclusion in the Hebrew prophetic oracles is briefly mentioned.

Chapter 5 summarizes the interrelationship between biblical references to Ammon and the results of archaeological research. The archaeological evidence is shown to be consistent with the biblical portrayal of Ammon in the Hebrew Bible. However, additional in-depth study of the importance of Ammon in Hebrew prophetic literature is recommended.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of This Study

This dissertation identifies and studies references to יִמּוֹן ('ammon) in the Hebrew Bible and relevant data from archaeological sources. It also compares the Hebrew Bible (BHS) references with those in the Septuagint (LXX), assessing the differences between the readings of the two sources. Through an analysis of archaeological research within the territory of ancient Ammon, this study seeks to clarify the meaning of selected Ammonite references in the biblical text.

General Background

Scholars in the 1990s display increased interest in studying the Iron Age inhabitants of the tribal state of Ammon, whose capital, Rabbah, is located near downtown Amman, capital of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. However, such scholarly interest was not always so evident.

In the mid-1950s, George Landes wrote a Ph.D. dissertation directed by William F. Albright at The Johns Hopkins University entitled "A History of the Ammonites." Although the dissertation is technically identifiable as a "history," it is also based extensively on the archaeological evidence available in the middle of the 20th century. When Landes completed his dissertation (1956), he mentioned in the preface the skepticism with which his choice of a topic was initially received due to the paucity of source material then available regarding the Ammonites.

Landes later augmented his original study with an extensive article (1961) in the Biblical Archaeologist. This article, like the earlier dissertation, emphasizes
archaeological data and is organized around subject headings dealing with architecture, tombs, art, and epigraphic materials. The publication in the *Biblical Archaeologist* was followed a year later by a dictionary article on the Ammonites in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* (Landes 1962).

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, Landes’s works were the standard references on the Iron Age Ammonites. Landes’s doctoral study (though unfortunately never published) remains even today as one of the most complete studies of the Ammonites available. In fact, it was not until the 1990s that scholarly works appeared which match those of Landes in their treatment of the Ammonites. (See for example Hübner [1993], Gregor [1996], and Younker [1994, 1997] for recent examples of dissertations and a dictionary article which update what Landes wrote decades earlier.) Yet Landes’s original study remains as the initial landmark treatment from a historical and archaeological perspective which addresses specifically and systematically the Ammonite kingdom of Iron Age Transjordan within the context of the biblical record, something these more recent works have not attempted.

**Ammon Ignored in Early Studies**

Prior to Landes’s study, the lack of attention paid to the Ammonites was a trend consistently noticeable over much of the previous 90 years of scholarly inquiry. In fact, most of the Transjordanian cultures suffered from similar benign neglect in scholarly circles. Within this context of neglect, it is interesting to note the following query raised by Jordanian archaeologist Moawiyah Ibrahim.

One wonders why Albright, Glueck, Aharoni, Wright and others were so concerned with determining the arrival of the Israelites and not with defining the early Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites. (1978: 124)

Perhaps our modern terminology, including the use of the term "Transjordan" when referring to the territory east of the Great Rift Valley (which presupposes an orientation of facing east while standing on the west side of the Jordan River) is the basis of this fixation on Cisjordan. It would be well to remember that the biblical term...
meaning "Transjordan"—תָּרָם הָעָרְצוֹת—but often used for the land east of the Jordan River (Deut 4:49; Josh 13:27; Isa 8:23 [Eng=9:1])—is also used in the Hebrew Bible to refer to the territory on the west bank of the Jordan River (cf. Deut 3:25, "the good land beyond the Jordan").

During the early decades of the 20th century when scholarly attention was focused on Cisjordan, a corresponding lack of emphasis on the study of the Ammonites is apparent. For example, in his turn-of-the-century study Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, Eduard Meyer (1906 [1967]) devoted a mere two pages to a section which introduced both Moab and Ammon as compared with a more extensive introduction devoted to the other regions which surrounded ancient Israel. Today, however, the increased amount of new archaeological evidence provides data for reviewing the place of the Ammonites in the Bible and history.

Herr (1993b: 28) noted this neglect when he stated, "Despite all these [biblical] references to the Ammonites—the land east of the Jordan was largely terra incognita to Bible students before the 1930s." Herr continued by stating that even after Glueck's landmark survey work of the 1930s, "Our knowledge of the nations east of the Jordan and Dead Sea valleys—Ammon, Moab, Edom, Gilead and others—remained scanty."

Thus, in spite of the steady increase in archaeological activity in Transjordan in the second half of the 20th century, the Ammonites were often slighted as the object of scholarly study. Even when given front-stage billing at the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology held in Jerusalem (1984), the Ammonites (as well as Transjordan in general) did not receive extensive discussion. Note for example that in a session devoted to Transjordan, of the three respondents to a presentation by James Sauer (1985) entitled "Ammon, Moab and Edom," only one, Geraty, addressed issues related to Ammon.

Studies of the ancient Near East from the middle of the 20th century display an absence of in-depth treatment focusing on the Ammonites, an absence similar to that
noted above in Meyer's work published in 1906. Many of these studies—while they may give considerably more emphasis to other Transjordanian Iron Age states—often fail to mention Ammon entirely or give this entity only cursory treatment. (See Bruce [Israel and the Nations 1963], Moscati [The Face of the Ancient Orient 1960] and Wiseman [Peoples of Old Testament Times 1973] for examples of this common omission. Note also Ammon's conspicuous absence from the title of the work by Sawyer and Clines—Midian, Moab, and Edom [1983]—which makes specific mention of Ammon's neighbors to the south but fails to include Ammon, even though the book deals with the history and archaeology of Late Bronze Age and Iron Age Jordan, an era in which the Ammonites featured prominently.)

In a publication as recent as that of Amihai Mazar's Archaeology of the Land of the Bible (1990), a scant three pages of discussion is devoted to Transjordan in a chapter describing Israel's neighbors. Even more recently, Volkmar Fritz's volume An Introduction to Biblical Archaeology (1994) also slights Ammonite evidence. His chapter on "Israel's Neighbors" (pp. 185-207) makes no mention of the excavations of the Madaba Plains Project in Ammonite territory. Although he includes a specialized bibliography for each of Israel's three Tranjordanian neighbors—Ammon, Moab, and Edom—his entries for Ammon include only one in the 1990s, and only five for the preceding decade.

Up to the time of the 1950s, this apparent neglect of the Ammonites may have been explained on the basis of a comparative lack of sufficient archaeological data relative to their culture and history. Landes (1961: 86), in the article updating portions of his earlier dissertation, describes the situation relative to the then current understanding of the Ammonite language in the following terms. "Our knowledge of the Ammonite dialect is thus solely dependent upon a few words, mostly personal names, found inscribed on a small collection of Ammonite seals."
Since 1961, however, numerous epigraphic discoveries have added to the knowledge of the Ammonite language. One of the earliest and most remarkable examples is the Amman Citadel Inscription. One should note the number of publications regarding the Amman Citadel Inscription which appeared in the decades following its discovery and initial announcement and publication (Horn 1967-68, 1969). (See, for example, the discussions by Albright [1970], Fulco [1978], Puech and Rofé [1973] Puech [1985], Sasson [1979], and Shea [1979, 1981].) The ongoing dialogue which this epigraphic find engendered highlights the reality of Albright's statement as the discussion first began.

When I first saw this issue of the Bulletin [1967-68 issue containing Horn's initial publication], I felt that decipherment of the content was virtually impossible, considering the fact that no coherent sense could be made of any context, and that our ignorance of written Ammonite at this period seemed to preclude any certainty about spelling, grammar, or vocabulary. I am, however, much more optimistic now, though I should not care to label any of my proposals as definitive, and it remains quite possible that I have misunderstood vital clues in meaning. (1970: 38)

As with the Amman Citadel Inscription, other important epigraphic discoveries give impetus to Ammonite studies. These include the Amman Theater Inscription (Oded 1969), the Tell Siran Inscription (Thompson and Zayadine 1973a, 1973b), the Ammonite Ostraca from Heshbon (Cross 1975), and the Baalis Seal Impression (Herr 1985a, 1985b). Much of the scholarly attention devoted to the Ammonites in recent decades does, in fact, deal with these items of epigraphic interest. Several important examples of works which utilize the results of important epigraphic finds are the contributions of Jackson (1983b) on Ammonite language, O'Connor (1987) on the Ammonite onomasticon, and Aufrecht (1989) on Ammonite inscriptions.

In the decade of the 1990s, the Ammonites finally have begun to receive the treatment they deserve. Note for example Younker's extensive treatment of the Ammonites in the volume entitled Peoples of the Old Testament World (1994a: 293-316). One of the factors which has brought the Ammonites into the spotlight of scholarly discussion is noted below.
Increased Attention to Archaeological Excavation in Ammonite Territory

Although modern archaeologists have been working for many decades throughout the area of ancient Palestine, it has only been comparatively recently that major excavations have been conducted in the territory formerly occupied by the Ammonite people during the Iron Age. Since the 1960s a number of excavations have been conducted which have provided much archaeological data relevant to the study of the "sons of Ammon" who feature prominently in their relationship with Israel in biblical history.

Preeminent among major excavations in this territory was the Heshbon Expedition initiated by Siegfried Horn in 1968. A symposium commemorating the 20th anniversary of the beginning of the Heshbon excavation, "Ammon and the Ammonites: The Perspective from Tell Hesban and Tell el-'Umeiri," was held at the annual meeting of the American Schools of Oriental Research in San Francisco on November 20, 1988. The Heshbon excavation was also honored by the publication of *Hesban After 25 Years* (Merling and Geraty 1994), a commemorative volume highlighting the presentations at a 25th-year anniversary symposium hosted at Andrews University in 1993.

Other excavations on a limited scale were also conducted. In most instances, however, these excavations were conducted in the immediate vicinity of Amman and primarily involved only single or multiple installations rather than large "major" sites.

Among these small-scale Iron Age excavations were the "Ammonite Tower" excavations at Rujm el-Malfuf South (Thompson 1973b) and Khirbet el-Hajjar (Thompson 1977) as well as excavations at Tell Siran (Thompson 1973d), Tell Safut (Wimmer 1987b), Sahab (Ibrahim 1975), the Baq'ah Valley (McGovern 1980, 1981b, 1986, 1989).

More recently, excavations at the Amman Citadel (Zayadine, Humbert, and Najjar 1989) have continued to add to our knowledge of Ammonite society in antiquity. The excavation at Tell Jawa South (Daviau 1994; 1996), and the Tell el-'Umeiri and Tell Jalul Excavations, as part of the Madaba Plains Project (founded and sponsored by
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Andrews University and which continues the work begun at Tell Hesban), are all examples, on a larger scale, of recent activity in the territory of Iron Age Ammon. Each of these excavations—large scale or small—has contributed to a growing database of knowledge about the ancient Ammonites.

Given the fact that our knowledge of the situation in Transjordan during the Iron Age has increased significantly based on information gathered as a result of conducting these excavations, biblical scholars are obligated to make an application of this information to our understanding of those biblical texts which refer to one of the peoples in closest contact with Israel during this era.

**Statement of the Problem**

This dissertation addresses two interrelated issues:

1. *Discovering what the Hebrew Bible says about the Ammonites.* What is the frequency and distribution of the use of terms for the Ammonites in the MT of the Hebrew Bible, and what do we learn from a comparison of comparable passages in the LXX translation?

2. *Determining how the results of archaeological investigation inform our understanding of the biblical references to the Ammonites.* What is the archaeological context for the biblical Ammonite passages, and how does this background help in illuminating our understanding of the text?

In summary, how often and where is the name יָם and its related forms found in the BHS, and how do we utilize the results of archaeological investigation in the territory formerly occupied by the Ammonites to aid in formulating a better understanding of those biblical passages which make reference to the people of Ammon?
Justification for This Study

The justification for this particular topic which proposes to identify and study the Ammonite references in the Hebrew Bible and to provide an archaeological context for selected passages may be summarized as follows:

1. There is a need to identify and categorize all references in the Hebrew Bible referring to the Ammonites and to correlate these with the parallel uses in the LXX.

2. No existing study of this type is available which systematically coordinates recent archaeological findings in Jordan with the biblical text relating to the Iron Age Ammonites. Block's study (1984a) makes a valuable contribution by surveying the use of the term "sons of Ammon." However, a significant section of this article addresses the use of the above term in comparison with the use of the term "sons of Israel." Furthermore, Block does not attempt to use the archaeological record to systematically illuminate the Ammonite references identified in the study.

3. Until recently a relative absence of in-depth treatment of the Ammonites existed in commonly available scholarly works dealing with Israel/Judah and her neighbors.

4. Although Landes's original comprehensive study of the Ammonites took into account the text of the Hebrew Bible, it was written prior to the discovery of much of the currently available archaeological data which have potential bearing on the illumination of the biblical text.

5. Hübner's work (1992), although it focuses on the history, culture, and religion of the Ammonites, does not seek to utilize the available archaeological evidence to systematically illuminate the biblical text. The more recent archaeological studies by Gregor (1996) and Younker (1997b) approach the study of the Ammonites using sociological and anthropological models while omitting a detailed study of the biblical materials.
Importance of This Study

The need to provide an archaeological context for biblical references to Ammon arises from the biblical text itself. The text presupposes on the part of the reader a prior knowledge of the Ammonites. The modern reader has no such knowledge. This knowledge must be supplied in part by the work of archaeological investigation.

The Madaba Plains Project—both at its initial excavation at Hesban and also at other more recently excavated sites of ‘Umeiri, Jawa South, and Jalul—has produced an abundance of archaeological data. Additional sites excavated by other teams noted above have yielded their data as well, thereby making possible the collation of pertinent findings from numerous sites in the area of ancient Ammon. It is important to utilize this data to provide a better understanding of the Iron Age Ammonites in Transjordan as they are presented in the biblical text.

Methodological Considerations

View of the Biblical Text

Just as one’s orientation determines the meaning of the term "Transjordan" (see p. 3), so one’s view of the biblical text influences the approach one takes in the dialogue between archaeology and biblical studies. Widely divergent opinions are held by scholars today. Note for example the following remarks reflecting the views of two contributors to Levy’s recent volume, The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land (1995).

Finkelstein concludes,

Its [the biblical account of early Israel] relatively late date and its literary-ideological character make it irrelevant as a direct historical source. . . . But although it reflects the history, religious convictions and interests of people who lived centuries after the alleged events took place, some historical data may be embedded in it. (1995: 351)

In a more moderate vein, Dever writes,

Even this rather modest effort [addressing the social context of biblical events] is hampered by the fact that biblical scholars have come to regard most biblical texts in their present form as stemming from the
world of post-Exilic Judaism. They are thus too late and too tendentious to be used as reliable sources for the history of the Monarchy. In our view, that is too extreme, [sic] The proper, critical use of biblical texts, in conjunction with modern archaeological data, can yield a satisfactory socio-economic history, as well as a political and ideological history of ancient Israel. (1995a: 429)

Lapp's insightful comment, made well before this current round of debate began, compares divergent regional-based interpretations of biblical history.

It may be more than coincidence that the more negative view that places the beginning of biblical history about 1200 B.C. developed in Germany, when events there were leading to a great disillusionment about man's humanity. The more positive view developed in a more optimistic American climate. Perhaps it may be said that the approach of the times adopts the historian as much as the historian adopts his interpretive approach. (1969: 94)

This debate has been termed "the minimalists vs. the maximalists" (see Shanks 1997). Obviously, it is impossible to find a common approach to the biblical text. For this reason many scholars have turned in a different direction. Ryou surveys the current state of affairs in biblical studies.

In recent years in Old Testament studies there has been a remarkable shift in the use of exegetical methods for the Old Testament text as far as the English-speaking world is concerned. A new horizon appears to be emerging in the course of the last several decades. . . . Often called 'text-immanent' exegesis, these methods [e.g., canonical criticism, genre criticism, etc.] search for the meaning of the text in its final form. . . . The focus on the text as it stands is definitely a new phenomenon. (1995: 1)

This study follows this more recent approach of dealing with the text of the Hebrew Bible as it is found in the MT and in the LXX version. As a result, it is not drawn into the debate between Dever and McCarter on the one hand and Thompson and Lemche on the other as featured in a cover article for Biblical Archaeology Review (Shanks 1997).

Specification of Source Materials

The primary resources utilized in developing this study include the following two sources:
1. **Biblical references.** The Hebrew text of selected passages in the prophetic and historical books is studied. The *BHS*, the *LXX*, and the *NRSV* are the standard references cited.

2. **Archaeological data.** Data relating to items of Ammonite material culture (architectural, artifactual, and epigraphical) and data collected from hinterland surveys reported by the original excavators and project directors in their excavation and survey reports are included. Many of the preliminary reports are found in such publications as those of *ADAJ, AUSS* and *BASOR*.

   In addition to the primary sources as mentioned above, other secondary sources are also utilized. These include:

   1. Scholarly analyses of and discussions relating to items contained in the excavation reports

   2. Journal articles and other publications containing the *editio princeps* of inscriptional materials. A primary source for this information is Walter E. Aufrecht’s *A Corpus of Ammonite Inscriptions* (1989).

**Selection of Biblical Passages**

Passages have been chosen from the prophetic and historical literature of the Hebrew Bible which contain references to the Ammonites. Although all texts in the Hebrew Bible referring to the Ammonites are listed in the tables which analyze the usages of the Hebrew terms for Ammon, no attempt has been made to include an archaeological context for each such reference, since some references include no more than a cursory mention of the name Ammon.

More specifically, those passages for which a specific context has been developed have been chosen precisely for the reason that they contain elements for which appropriate archaeological data are available, making it possible to utilize the data to illuminate the biblical text.
Chronological Parameters

Some of the biblical texts mentioning Ammon involve incidents or events occurring before the commonly accepted beginning and ending dates of the Iron Age. Since this study has an archaeological focus, the time period investigated is limited to the Iron Age (ca. 1200 BC to 550 BC). In this way, the focus of the study is delimited by parameters for which the dates are commonly agreed to be those during which the Ammonites were undoubtedly in existence in Transjordan. Thus, such issues as the date of the exodus and the subsequent arrival of Israel in Transjordan are not included in this study.

Additional Limiting Factors

This study is not an attempt to trace a history of the Ammonites during their rise and decline as a Transjordanian state. Neither is an attempt made to give an exhaustive evaluation of all areas of Ammonite material culture. Each of the above facets of Ammonite civilization is utilized in the study, but it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to treat either of these as an area to be given specialized analysis. The contribution of these areas as an aid to the illumination of the biblical text was considered the basic criterion for deciding how extensively each area is examined.

Procedural Steps of Research

The basic methodological steps followed in the body of this study are summarized as follows:

1. The Hebrew text is examined for all references to Ammon and Ammonites. The lexicographical variants of these references are noted. Then these variants are enumerated by the number of occurrences in the various books and sections of the Hebrew Bible. This information is tabulated and compared with the LXX readings.
2. The references to the Ammonites are analyzed for variations in usage, distribution in the sections of the Hebrew Bible, and connections with people and events in Cisjordan.

3. Selected Ammonite passages of the biblical text are organized in logical groupings, based on their reference to Ammonite places, persons, or practices.

4. The primary and secondary archaeological sources are studied and analyzed with the purpose of illuminating the passages from the prophetic and historical sections of the Hebrew Bible already classified in step 3.

5. Any difficult customs, words, events, or terminology in the biblical text which might be illuminated by the archaeological record are identified and analyzed.

**Definition of Terms**

*Hebrew Bible:* Since the purpose of this dissertation is to trace the distribution and use of the term יְאוֹם in the text of the Hebrew Bible, we begin with a description of what constitutes the Hebrew Bible. The text referred to in this dissertation is the Masoretic Text of the fourth edition of *Biblia Hebraica*—the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (1983). As with the previous edition of *Biblia Hebraica*—the third edition edited by Rudolf Kittel (BHK)—the BHS is based on the Codex Leningradensis—Leningrad Public Library Ms. B 19A—a medieval manuscript in the Tiberian tradition produced in Cairo about 1008 AD (Scott 1987: 16; Würthwein 1979: 12.) This manuscript is the oldest known complete text of the Hebrew Bible based upon the Ben Asher tradition. The colophon at the end of the manuscript states that it was written, pointed, and supplied with the Masora by Samuel ben Jacob who had in turn prepared his codex "from the corrected and annotated books prepared by Aaron ben Moses ben Asher" (Würthwein 1979: 168).

*The Septuagint:* The Septuagint is the title of the Jewish translation of the Hebrew Bible into the Greek language. This title is traditionally traced to the *Letter of Aristeas* which records the story of how the translation was made by 70 Jewish scholars.
(thus Septuagint)—or actually 72—in Alexandria during the reign of Philadelphus (285-247 BC) (Rahlfs 1979: lvi). In fact, the reference to "the seventy" probably is based on the torah tradition of 70 elders accompanying Moses to Mount Sinai. Rahlfs's critical edition of 1935 (1979) is based primarily on the Codices of Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus with variants from the recensions of Lucian, Origen, and the later Catanae as cited in the apparatus (Wevers 1962).

The text of the Septuagint (LXX) is frequently included in this dissertation along with the text of the BHS. This is done for two reasons: (1) for ease of reference and comparison, and (2) to aid in discerning information which may help explain the meaning or background of a particular Ammonite passage.

Ammonite References: In this section I delineate what constitutes a reference to the Ammonites. Does a reference to the Ammonites require that the text of the Hebrew Bible use the term יָםִם ('ammon) or one of its derivatives? Or is it sufficient to merely refer to a person, place, or event known to have Ammonite origins or connections?

It is assumed in this dissertation that any text which includes a reference to a person, place, event, item, or deity with Ammonite connections constitutes a "reference" to the Ammonites. Likewise, any reference to Ammon as a corporate entity also falls within this category. Furthermore, I also consider the verses found in the context of such references to be part of the passages for consideration. I do not, however, feel obligated to provide an archaeological context for every text which includes such a reference as described above without first considering whether or not sufficient archaeological evidence is available to warrant such a treatment.

Transliteration of Topographic Terms and of Site Names

Several systems of transliterating Arabic into romanized alphabets have been used. Recent standardization has, among other things, eliminated the use of English
"e" in transliteration. This change is reflected in the Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan beginning with volume 38 in 1995. Following the "Instructions for Contributors" is a section entitled "System of Transliteration from Arabic" (p. 6). Although the transliteration of Arabic vowels has been consistently listed for a number of years, a new list of "Common Nouns" is included for the first time in 1995. As a result, many commonly used terms—including topographic terms and geographic place names—are no longer in official use. For example, the Arabic words commonly transliterated in the recent past as Tell, Jebel, Khirbet, and Deir, are now rendered Tall, Jabal, Khirbat, and Dayr.

Thus, Tell el-'Umeiri is now Tall al-'Umayri. Since most of the references cited in this study predate the adoption of this transliteration standard, the older conventional system of transliteration is preserved except where recent publications have adopted the newer official transliteration standard. Every attempt at consistency has been made. However, because different authors utilize different systems (which are retained as in the original), some variation in the transliteration of proper names is unavoidable.

Summary

This study adopts a descriptive approach to defining the frequency and distribution of Ammonite references in the Hebrew Bible and placing these passages in context by analyzing appropriate archaeological data.

Chapter 2 reviews the current interdisciplinary dialogue relevant to the fields of biblical studies and archaeology. It also reviews the previous attempts to utilize archaeology in providing a context for biblical passages, in general, and Ammonite references, in particular.

Chapter 3 lists the frequency and distribution of Ammonite passages in the text of the Hebrew Bible and categorizes these references lexicographically, contextually, and
chronohistorigraphically. Important connections between the royal houses of Ammon and Israel are identified.

Chapter 4 presents a topographical and archaeological introduction to the study of Iron Age Ammon. It then outlines the archaeological data which illuminate the meaning of selected biblical references, particularly as they relate to Ammonite places, people, and their occupations and practices.

Chapter 5 summarizes the interrelation of archaeological data and their implications for understanding the Ammonite biblical passages. Recommendations for future research are presented.
CHAPTER 2

ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL STUDIES IN DIALOGUE:
CURRENT CONTEXT AND A REVIEW
OF RECENT WORKS

Rationale for Using Archaeology in Biblical Studies

Since the late 1960s a lively debate has developed among scholars working in the fields of biblical studies and Syro-Palestinian archaeology—to use the terminology some advocates of the "new archaeology" have chosen to use in preference to the term "biblical archaeology."

An example of this debate during the early 1980s over proper terminology can be seen in the ongoing discussion in the forum provided by the Biblical Archaeology Review. Note for example Hershel Shanks's "Should the Term 'Biblical Archaeology' Be Abandoned?" (1981: 54-57). Shanks argued that although the term is under serious attack it continues to have value. On the other hand, William Dever, one of the champions of the debate and one whose views are critiqued in the above-mentioned article, viewed Shanks's response as "distorted and polemical" (Dever 1984: 34, n. 2).

The twofold debate really addresses two issues—first, issues of hermeneutics, philosophy, and methodology (how we view the Scripture record), and second, issues of practice (choosing the nomenclature a discipline should adopt, setting professional society agendas, and renaming a venerable journal). On the one hand there is debate over the fate of "biblical archaeology" itself. Is it to be a viable independent discipline, a sub-speciality of biblical studies, or should it be (indeed has it already become, at least in name) a separate discipline unhampered by ties to biblical studies? On the other hand, the issue being debated is one dealing with historical and hermeneutical
issues. Is there any correlation between the history portrayed in the biblical text and empirical reality? Or is the biblical text primarily of existential interest to the modern world with little or no concern for life and experience in the ancient past?

Mendenhall has warned that if the Bible is divorced from its historical moorings, exegetes are in danger of espousing "a modern day docetism that treats biblical texts as though they were somehow completely unrelated to the everyday processes of ancient life and experience" (Mendenhall 1987: 9).

This debate has arisen in part due to the process by which each discipline has tended to develop independently, thereby producing somewhat divergent, though still potentially fully compatible, academic agendas. The debate has also been fueled by the stance some scholars have taken which endeavors to maintain a respectable distance from the rhetoric of a past generation of biblical archaeologists whose methodology and research agenda are viewed with skepticism and whose tactics and/or motivation are disparagingly caricatured as a preemptive use of archaeology for its apologetic value.

Since the beginning of the 20th century there has been a tendency among some fundamentalists and more conservative members of the Christian community to assume the need to erect a fortress-like edifice of Christian apologetics which they think would somehow be rendered more impregnable by using the discoveries of the biblical archaeologist as added buttressing. Perhaps it has been this tendency to "use" archaeology as a means of "proving" the authenticity of the biblical record that has engendered a negative reaction on the part of those who viewed archaeology’s role as something other than a device to be utilized primarily for apologetic purposes. In view of such historic realities, it is understandable that some biblical scholars would choose to exercise caution regarding the use of archaeology in biblical studies for fear of misusing it.

As scholars continue to debate how to properly define the relationship which should exist between biblical studies and archaeology, our knowledge about the ancient
Near East concurrently increases. The background of the setting in which the events recorded by the biblical sources took place has been increasingly illuminated through the work of archaeological excavation. There is, therefore, an increasingly greater potential that biblical scholars may benefit from the efforts of their archaeological counterparts, provided they use the archaeological discoveries responsibly.

One should not forget the importance of archaeology’s contribution as summarized by Dever:

It may be sufficient to remind you that nearly every scholarly ‘breakthrough’ which has helped to bring about a revolution in Biblical studies has been the direct result of archaeological discoveries, whether accidental finds or the products of deliberate excavations. (1974: 14)

Archaeologists are not able to predict when and where they will discover artifacts with monumental significance; their contribution to biblical studies is not justified solely in doing so. It does seem prudent, however, for biblical scholars to keep abreast of the current modest increments in knowledge achieved through archaeological discovery and to apply such knowledge to their understanding of the biblical text. Mendenhall’s (1987: 6) observation is appropriate in this regard. "The only empirical reality that is accessible for the biblical period is that made available through archaeological investigation."

Roland de Vaux (1970: 65), writing in his contribution to the Nelson Glueck Festschrift, states that "archaeology of the ancient Near East has become an auxiliary science indispensable for biblical studies." Although some will argue against the appropriateness of the use of the term "auxiliary," one should not lose sight of de Vaux's stress on the indispensable nature of the contribution of archaeology to biblical studies.

Dever (1984: 33, 34) argued that by the 1970s Syro-Palestinian archaeology had become the dominant academic discipline overshadowing "biblical archaeology." In fact, he viewed the later discipline as an "interdisciplinary pursuit," a "sub-branch of biblical studies," a "uniquely American phenomenon," a "chapter in the history of..."
American biblical studies." While this characterization has some validity, it should not be allowed to overshadow or diminish the contribution which has been made by "bibli­cal archaeologists" (quotes à la Dever) to our understanding of the biblical text.

**Need for Works Combining Archaeology and Biblical Studies**

Several works of the 1970s and 1980s (see below) have attempted, with varying degrees of success, to provide an archaeological guide either to the entire Hebrew and Greek Bible or to a limited portion of these ancient texts. Those works which have attempted to treat the whole Bible are forced by the very nature of the task to pick and choose from the available archaeological data. To envision a single-volume exhaustive archaeological commentary on either the Old or New Testaments alone is now an impossible task. Yet, an in-depth and systematic treatment of the biblical text from an archaeological perspective is a benefit which those working in the field of biblical studies should no longer be denied.

Despite the obvious need for archaeological illumination of the biblical text, a persistent void remains. Recently Philip King acknowledged this fact in the preface to his archaeological commentary on eighth-century prophets. He uses as the catalyst for his discussion a lament over "the lack of archaeological commentary on the biblical text" (1988: 11). King continues by quoting H. Darrell Lance's statement:

> Most commentators do not even make use of archaeology where it can contribute best, namely in illustrating the material culture of a given period, either in general or in terms of a specific reference in the [biblical] text. (1981: 48)

Assisting in the task of providing such a context for the biblical text has become a responsibility which those working in the field of biblical archaeology may no longer postpone without running the risk of being indicted for choosing to remain in professional isolation from their colleagues in biblical studies. King would even place the
responsibility for taking the initiative in preparing such material on the shoulders of the biblical scholar:

Biblical archaeology is a biblical, not an archaeological, discipline. Therefore it is the responsibility of biblical scholars, not of archaeologists, to ferret out pertinent information and apply it to the Bible. (1988: 13)

It may be debatable as to whose responsibility it is to engage in the work of producing an archaeological context for the biblical text. Is it the responsibility of the biblical scholar, the archaeologist (Palestinian, biblical, or otherwise), or of a specialist whose training encompasses both areas? The answer perhaps hinges on how one views the current state of affairs in biblical archaeology and whether there is room for the continued existence of the "biblical archaeologist." Placing the responsibility for developing an archaeological context for the biblical text solely on the shoulders of a biblical studies specialist, regardless of training or lack thereof, and expecting him or her to "ferret out" relevant data is a formidable demand at best, and, more likely, a task susceptible of being neglected or misused at worst.

It thus remains to be seen whether or not those trained in archaeology will take the initiative in seeking to combine the insights from both disciplines—biblical studies and archaeology. And will they ultimately be able to derive the full potential of mutual benefit to be gained as a result of the counterpoint of a continued dialogue between these two disciplines as they continue their coexistence in scholarly juxtaposition? The following challenge to biblical scholars voiced in an editorial comment printed in the *Biblical Archaeology Review* is worth remembering.

While Biblical archaeologists have long used the Bible to help guide their endeavors, Biblical scholars have too often neglected the results of archaeology that might otherwise illuminate the text. (Shanks 1988: 2)

During the 1970s and 1980s numerous works on biblical archaeology were published. Yet, until recently, few of these works have been dedicated to the task of illuminating specific portions of the biblical text in a systematic way. Some of these general works are reviewed in the section below. The majority of recent works, however,
have generally dealt with the relationship of archaeology to the Bible in a broad topical manner.

It is the purpose of this study, therefore, to outline an approach whereby this lack of applying the results of archaeological research directly to the treatment of a specific portion of the biblical text may be alleviated.

Review of Works Correlating Archaeological Evidence with the Biblical Text

As mentioned above, the majority of works published in the field of "biblical archaeology" over the past two decades have been organized along a topical approach to the subject. For examples note the works by Schoville (1978), H. Thompson (1987), J. Thompson (1982 [1962]), and Wiseman and Yamauchi (1979). Most of these works would qualify as "introductions" in the technical sense of the term as used in the field of biblical studies.

There are, however, several additional categories of archaeological works that use the term "biblical archaeology" or "archaeological commentary." Some of these works are self-acclaimed examples of this unique genre, while others must be so designated based on their approach and content rather than on their specific claim and design.

Criteria for Reviewing Works

Those works reviewed here have been chosen based on the fact that they meet one of the following three criteria. The first criterion is that they belong to a genre of archaeological works which gives attention to both archaeological data (some focusing on the geographic area occupied by ancient Ammon) and the biblical text. These works thus provide archaeological context without specifically claiming this as their modus operandi.

A second criterion is used to determine whether or not these works themselves claim to provide archaeological context or commentary on the Bible. The final
criterion analyzes works to see if they have proven their value by providing a workable methodological model for producing an archaeological context for biblical passages.

**Types of Works Combining Archaeological Information and Biblical Text**

**Explorer Guides**

Mendenhall (1987: 8) has given a cogent discussion and critique of the current reaction to the Albright school and castigates those who through "chronological provincialism" refuse to "value the experience of the past" and thereby make it "difficult for anyone with academic pretensions to engage in ‘biblical archaeology’." Prior to this era in which disenchantment with much of what the "Albright school" stood for has come into vogue, works dealing with archaeology and the Bible combined archaeological discussion with reference to the biblical text in a most candid manner.

Thus, for example, Nelson Glueck (1970) in his book *The Other Side of Jordan* (originally published in 1940) begins with a chapter entitled "What Is Biblical Archaeology?" in which he intersperses vignettes on Arab hospitality with instruction in archaeological methodology and an occasional reference to the text of the Hebrew Bible. The remainder of the work deals with accounts of Glueck's excavations and survey work, all the while allowing for commentary on modern Transjordanian history as well as ready reference to the biblical text.

Glueck's other similar work (1946), *The River Jordan*, follows a somewhat more geographical arrangement. It guides the reader along the Jordan Rift Valley and provides commentary which uses archaeological data to elucidate various biblical texts.

G. Lankester Harding (1959) produced his work *The Antiquities of Jordan* in which he gives occasional limited commentary on a minimum of biblical texts. And as with Glueck, his volume serves more as a guide to antiquities and historical geography than as a specialized commentary on the Hebrew Bible.
Formal Archaeological Commentaries

Two recent works formally claim to be "archaeological commentary" on the Bible as a whole. One by Comfeld and Freedman (1976), *Archaeology of the Bible: Book by Book*, claims secondarily via a comment on the front cover to be "an up-to-date archaeological commentary on the Bible." This volume then understandably gives a considerable number of references to biblical texts. It is also profusely illustrated. Yet, because of the attempted scope of its coverage, it is unable to do justice to its claim to be a commentary in the sense of thoroughly elucidating passages of biblical text.

A second work in this category, *Archaeological Commentary on the Bible* by Gonzalo Báez-Camargo (1986), is arranged to give "commentary" on specific phrases in selected verses, beginning with Genesis and continuing through the entire Bible. Most of the commentary consists of short summary accounts of archaeological discovery pertinent to the verse from which an important phrase has been printed in the text of the book along-side the commentary which follows. Although such snippets of information are enlightening, they are of questionable value in constructing a complete picture which would result from a thorough treatment of the text.

Text Books on Biblical Archaeology

Another category of archaeological work with a semblance of commentary style includes several volumes with the title "Biblical Archaeology." Most notable of these is that of G. Ernest Wright (1957). For the purposes of this discussion, the label "eclectic commentary" has been chosen to highlight the fact that discussion is given to a variety of biblical issues illuminated by archaeological discovery. These topics are arranged after a canonical-chronological scheme. While not "commentary" in the strict traditional sense of the term, such works do have similarities to other works which lay claim to the title.

Henry Thompson's publication contains a section entitled "Archaeology Illuminates the Bible" (1987: 279-416). Thompson's study, like that of Wright mentioned
above, is arranged according to the canonical arrangement of the Bible and supplies archaeological data which illuminate the biblical text.

Neither of these examples of the "eclectic commentary" approach is exhaustive in its treatment of the biblical text. The goal of such works is more to show the value of utilizing archaeological discovery in one's approach to Scripture than in actually exegeting a designated portion of text. Such works as those mentioned here function well as authoritative handbooks on the archaeology of the Bible.

Correlational Works

Shalom Paul and William Dever collaborated in editing a volume in the Library of Jewish Knowledge entitled Biblical Archaeology. The editors specifically outline their approach as one which follows a topical arrangement.

Instead of presenting the material by a listing of sites excavated or by following chronological criteria, it diachronically examines the plethora of finds by subject matter so that a total picture evolves for each topic under study. (1973: xi)

Thus, this volume, while akin to that of Wright in its eclectic nature (and yet not claiming to be a commentary), endeavors to provide a comprehensive picture of the ancient biblical world. It does not follow the chronological or canonical parameters of the Hebrew Bible, but by setting the stage and painting the backdrop against which the entire narrative of biblical history was played out, it thus serves the purpose of providing a model for illustrating one of the functions of an archaeological commentary.

An even clearer—because of its concentration on a limited chronological period and precise corpus of textual material—model for an archaeological commentary is the volume entitled Amos, Hosea, Micah—An Archaeological Commentary by Philip King. King stresses that his study is intended to meet the need for "works of synthesis that bring the archaeological data to bear on the biblical text" (1988: 13). In his book, King embarks with some trepidation on a task he fears some will label as "downright
brash" in light of the demanding nature of the task of doing research in either one of the two disciplines which he is endeavoring to combine.

King competently utilizes evidence from the Iron Age material culture to illustrate texts from the eighth-century BC Hebrew prophets. As did Paul and Dever, King organizes his material primarily around categories of artifactual materials. He concludes with a final chapter limited more specifically to an archaeological commentary on Amos 6:4-7.

King's work on eighth-century prophets has been joined by a second similar work—*Jeremiah* (1993), which bears the subtitle, *An Archaeological Companion*. King's approach in this work is similar to that in his work on Amos, Hosea, and Micah, although he tends to give more historical background in the later volume. He also focuses on geographical issues, as in his chapters on the "Oracles Against the Nations" and "Cities of Judah."

Having surveyed the above styles of archaeological-related volumes, it is evident that each of the four types falls short of meeting the needs proposed in this study for providing an archaeological context for the passages in the Hebrew Bible relative to the Iron Age Ammonites of Transjordan. The works fall short in one or more of the following ways:

1. The archaeological data which they utilize in illuminating the biblical text are outdated (Glueck 1970 [1940], 1946; Harding 1959).
2. Either the amount of archaeological data used is sketchy, or the extent of references to the biblical text is minimal (Báez-Camargo 1986; Cornfeld and Freedman 1976).
3. The focus is on the importance of archaeological data and their use in a general way as commentary on Scripture rather than on the use of such data to systematically illuminate prescribed passages of Scripture (Wright 1957; H. Thompson 1987).
4. The archaeological content is focused territorially on Cisjordan rather than on Transjordan (Paul and Dever 1973; King 1988, 1993).
Thus far I have surveyed a number of studies, each in its own way attempting to meet the need of providing archaeological commentary on the biblical text. None, however, supplies an archaeological context for the biblical passages dealing with the Ammonites. The task remains, therefore, to decide which approach to adopt in this study—to provide archaeological commentary or to develop an archaeological context.

One must take into account the technical sense which has accrued to the meaning of the word "commentary," realizing that it is more prudent to provide an archaeological context for the Ammonite passages than to attempt to provide an archaeological commentary. The approach adopted must of necessity also take into account the ongoing dialogue engaged in by those involved in the process of combining biblical studies and archaeology.

Some current advocates of Syro-Palestinian archaeology as an autonomous discipline, utilizing sociological and anthropological approaches to archaeological research, see this new discipline as a successor in the so-called post-Albrightian era of an outmoded "biblical archaeology." Note, however, Mendenhall's caution which refutes the existence of an Albright school. Mendenhall defines a "school" as a "breakdown of scholarship into the mutually exclusive parochialisms" characterized by "substantive dogmatic content that must be defended at all costs," which he claims was the "exact opposite to everything that Albright and his scholarship stood for" (Mendenhall 1987: 10).

Archaeology's new approach has attracted scholars from many sub-specialities who make valuable contributions to archaeological research. However, this development has simultaneously resulted in many scholars who—although engaged in the collective archaeological enterprise—yield to the temptation, as Lance puts it, to "retreat into specialization" (Lance 1981: 96). Such specialization is both necessary and inevitable, according to Mendenhall (1987: 13), but it must not be allowed to progress.
to the point where "scholars act and proceed as though their own field of expertise constitutes the entire universe of that which is important."

One purpose, therefore, of a work which provides an "archaeological context" for a portion of the scriptural text should be that it helps to counteract this centrifugal force resulting from the "fragmentation of learning" (Mendenhall 1987: 6). Furthermore, it should generate a measure of cohesiveness to the flow of archaeological data collected in the field and place it in the hands of the biblical scholar. Such a work should help to maintain a mechanism whereby the cumulative results of various disciplines, contributing to the success of archaeological work and yielding information valuable to a better understanding of the Bible, can be focused on the text.

A work providing archaeological context will not be a "mere correlation" of archaeological data with the biblical record, a process King describes as "deceptively simple" (1988: 19). Rather it attempts to synthesize available archaeological data and reconstruct, as much as possible, all aspects of the daily life and civilization of the people whose material remains are under study.

As a study seeking to provide archaeological context, in contrast to one which claims to provide archaeological commentary, this genre does not deal with critical issues of authorship and transmission of the text nor follow a verse-by-verse exegesis of the passage. However, it seeks to facilitate a dialogue between the mute testimony of the artifactual remains and our understanding of biblical passages.

Lance has aptly defined the role of one who undertakes the production of a work which combines archaeological data with biblical evidence.

Archaeology and the Old Testament must be read in dialogue with one another; neither one can give a comprehensive picture. The archaeological results may suggest a new understanding of the documents; the documents may provide a key to understand the archaeology—there is indeed a kind of circularity. But it is a circularity of conversation and constant revision, both on the basis of better understanding of the text and of new archaeological evidence. (1981: 66)
In summary, developing an archaeological context of biblical passages is scholarly work which receives input and impetus from two sources—biblical studies and field archaeology. Informed by archaeological discovery and research, yet remaining sensitive and receptive to the message found in the text which it is attempting to illuminate, the work of providing archaeological context should be a hybrid in the finest sense of the term—a product derived from dissimilar yet compatible sources which, through premeditated and meticulous care, consciously focuses the findings of archaeology on the task of illuminating the biblical text.

Due to the vagaries of the archaeological enterprise and the chance nature of many finds, there is of necessity an unevenness in the amount of archaeological data available and readily applicable to the illumination of any particular passage. Therefore, this study of the archaeological context of Ammonite biblical passages is best organized around the categories of Ammonite places and sites, the people who inhabited them, and their daily and cultural practices, rather than around an arrangement tied to the sequence of chapters in the biblical text.

In this development of an archaeological treatment of the Ammonite texts, an important distinction must also be made. This study is neither an "archaeology" nor a "commentary." That is, this study does not claim to be an "archaeology of the Ammonites" in the sense of being a technical treatise on all aspects of Iron Age material culture. An example of this type of study would be the work of Domemann (1983). Neither does it claim to be a "commentary" in the sense of attempting to comment on the complete text in all passages dealing with the Ammonites. The parameters of this study are delimited by the selected range of items presented in the Iron Age prophetic and historical passages of the Hebrew Bible. Such items are selected based on the fact that they refer to people, events, sites, or circumstances for which significant archaeological data are available.
The Prospects for the Dialogue Between Archaeology and Biblical Studies

Having reviewed various works which attempt to address the relationship of archaeology to biblical studies, we might well ask, What are the prospects for continued dialogue? Have new directions in biblical studies and advances in archaeological constructs ruled out a continuation of the dialogue? And if the dialogue is to continue, what should we expect as a result?

Rose (1987: 57) summarizes four "new approaches to the Bible" which he identifies as the literary, the sociological/anthropological, the canonical/hermeneutical, and the structuralist approaches. Yet, he cautions that these approaches, even though they may signal a rejection of older historical-critical approaches in favor of newer methods, still may "raise serious questions . . . for any attempts to construct a new consensus between Bible and archaeology."

In either of these postures the dominant reasons for relating Bible to archaeology are, for many, undercut. It does not rule out a possible relationship per se, but it does ask for what purpose the relationship is to be established and what it could hope to demonstrate. As an extreme position, it perhaps also questions whether the Bible is of sufficient historical character to allow the correlation in the first place. (Rose 1987: 59)

Clearly, not all scholars who espouse these newer hermeneutical views necessarily accept the value of archaeology’s contribution to biblical studies.

Thus, new hermeneutical approaches do not lead to increased dialogue per se. Note Stager’s caustic remark in reaction to a speech by N. Silberman in which Stager opposes "the fad of post-modernism" that "seeks to ‘democratize’ critical inquiry, leveling it to that of ignoramuses who in their hubris assert that ‘our opinion is just as good as yours’" (quoted in Shanks 1998: 61).

Others scholars are more optimistic regarding the prognosis for further dialogue. Cross comments,

Yet I believe that the historian, or the archaeologist and biblical scholar in tandem, are capable, now and in the future, of penetrating many mysteries and in understanding increasingly the religious and literary
development which produced the Bible. . . . I doubt that biblical archaeology can ever establish that the traditional events of Israel’s early epic are historical, and certainly the archaeologist cannot prove these events were truly interpreted, even if established as historical. (1985: 13, 14)

Dever, although he has faulted the "biblical archaeology" of the 1950s and 1960s on several accounts, nevertheless has drawn the following conclusion.

The crucial issue for biblical archaeology, properly conceived as a dialogue, has always been (and is even more so now) its understanding and use of archaeology on the one hand, its understanding of the issues in biblical studies that are fitting subjects for archaeological illumination on the other—and the proper relationship between the two. (1985: 61)

In the following chapters, my aim is to constructively engage in this type of dialogue between the biblical text and archaeological data.
CHAPTER 3
AMMONITE REFERENCES IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

Introduction

References to the Ammonites appear in all three sections of the Hebrew Bible—in the Torah, the Nebiim (both the Former and Latter), and in the Kethubim (see Table 1). For ease of reference and to facilitate comparisons, biblical quotations provided in this chapter are given in parallel columns using the NRSV, the BHS, and the LXX, where applicable.

The Origin and Meaning of the Term Ammon

The first reference to Ammon in the Hebrew Bible is in Gen 19:38. Here the reference to the Ammonites—literally the "sons of Ammon" (בְּנֵי יְםָמִון [bēnē-‘ammon])—identifies them as a West Semitic people whose lineage is traced to an eponymous individual rendered Ben-ammi by the NRSV (בֶּן-‘אָמִימ ben-‘ammi—"son of my people"—from the root וַיַּעַר, "kinsman" or "people" [BDB 769]). According to the biblical account, this ancestor was born not long after the destruction of Sodom following an incestuous union between Abraham’s nephew Lot and Lot’s younger daughter (Gen 19:36).

This initial reference to Ammon is significant in that it introduces the appellation בְּנֵי יְםָמִון, which is used most frequently in the Hebrew Bible when referring to the inhabitants of Rabbath Ammon and its surrounding territory during the Iron Age. It also clearly claims a resulting close ancestral relationship between the בְּנֵי יְםָמִון (bēnē-‘ammon) and the בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (bēnē-yisra’el).
### TABLE 1

**Ammonite Terminology Used in the Hebrew Bible**

(Lexical Analysis of BHS Forms and Corresponding LXX Translations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew Form Used</th>
<th>Textual Reference in the BHS</th>
<th>Lexical Analysis of Hebrew Form</th>
<th>LXX Translation</th>
<th>LXX Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BDB=p.769 ES=p.896 LIS=p.1652.1</td>
<td>Torah = 8x, Nebhum = 75x, Kethubim = 22x (36x linked with masquef)</td>
<td>masculine singular, (104x = compound form in combination with plural construct of &quot;son&quot;)</td>
<td>οὐδὲ Αμμονος οὐδὲ Αμμονος, οὐδὲ Αμμονος, (8x with no οὐδὲ Αμμονος)</td>
<td>(See Table 6 for a complete list of the 104 BHS references to ΟΥΔΕ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAND=1496 VOT=5680</td>
<td>1 Sam 11:11</td>
<td>masculine singular (with direct object marker)</td>
<td>οὐδὲ Αμμονος</td>
<td>(1 Kings 11:11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ps 83:8 (Eng = 83:7)</td>
<td>masculine singular (with conjunctive)</td>
<td>Αμμονος</td>
<td>(Psalm 82:8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gentilic Noun (Adjective): References to Specified Individuals or Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Site Name]</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Joshua 18:24 (Qere)</td>
<td>feminine singular (with article)</td>
<td>Αμαμανος</td>
<td>(1 Chronicles 18:24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Cross Ref Key
  - BDB = Brown, Driver, Briggs
  - ES = Ewen-Shoshan
  - MAND = Mandelkern
  - LIS = Luzowski
  - VOT = Vocabulary of the Old Test

---

* Raw Text Start*

1 4 2 Chr 26:8 Possible transposition of Hebrew letters [D and 9] results in alternate readings of "Meonites" or "Ammonites.

---

* Raw Text End*
Thus both the daughters of Lot became pregnant by their father. The firstborn bore a son, and named him Moab; he is the ancestor of the Moabites to this day. The younger also bore a son and named him Ben-ammi; he is the ancestor of the Ammonites to this day.

The LXX suggests that the translators may have been referring to a Hebrew vortage which differed from that underlying the Masoretic Text found in BHS. Were they attempting to clarify the meaning of the terms used?

Note specifically that the scribes preparing the LXX translated the name of Lot’s younger daughter’s son—יְהוּדִי (Ben-ammi)—using a direct translation of his Hebrew name. The translators rendered the Hebrew name into Greek as νεός τοῦ γένους μου. However, they also added a transliteration of the second half of the Hebrew name found in the MT—אַבְנַי—using the Greek word Ἀμμαν. The interpretive element—νεός τοῦ γένους μου—then immediately follows the direct partial translation of the Hebrew name. It seems, therefore, that the LXX translators were providing both a transliteration and an explanatory targum of the meaning of the name of Lot’s son/grandson Ben-ammi.

The LXX ends vs. 38 with the phrase οὗτος πατήρ Ἀμμανιτῶν ἦς τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. The vocabulary utilized in this verse includes a hapax legomenon—Ἀμμανιτῶν—a word used nowhere else to translate the commonly used Hebrew name for the Ammonites אֲרָם. This use of the hapax may indicate the translators’ desire...
to stress the uniqueness of this statement of origins. On the other hand, it may be a way of calling attention to a differentiation between the progeny of Lot’s son/grandson and the Ammonites of later times, including those living at the time of the final editor, who are consistently referred to with the terms νιοντας Αμμων/Αμμαν—six times without the use of νιοντας (see Table 1).

Thus, I return to the question posed above. Were the LXX translators following a Hebrew vorlage which differed from that underlying the Masoretic Text? Table 2 (following Landes 1956a: 39) suggests that just such a vorlage may have existed.

According to this proposal, the LXX translators were actually translating ληγουσα from when they apparently inserted the Greek Αμμαν. This suggestion is based on the assumption that the νας associated with ληγουσα was omitted by the LXX translators due to homoiarkton—the νας associated with ληγουσα being overlooked due to its proximity to the νιοντας associated with νιοντας and νιοντας being similar enough to evoke confusion.

As Landes points out, it is significant that in Gen 19:38, when the LXX translators give their transcription (as opposed to their translation) of the Hebrew name, they interestingly omit the νας and only transliterate the ληγουσα or the ληγουσα of the suggested vorlage. However, by way of contrast, in Gen 19:37 the LXX scribes do seem to emphasize the origin of a form of popular etymology for Moab by inserting parenthetically the phrase ληγουσα εξ του πατρος μου, a phrase not found in the MT, but which Landes suggests may have existed in the posited Hebrew vorlage.

Landes concludes that the LXX should not be used to fortify the argument which would use νας νιοντας (bēnē 'ammon) and its Greek translation/transliteration to support an alleged aetiological significance that emphasizes only the popular etymological aspect of this reference while denying any historical value to it. Landes’s BA article also affirms the possible authenticity of the biblical account of the origin of the common appellation for the Ammonites as an actual name (1961: 67).
TABLE 2

Ammon and Moab: A Suggested Hebrew Vorlage of Gen 19:37, 38
(Based on a Comparison of References in the MT and LXX)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis 19:37</th>
<th>Genesis 19:38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moab</td>
<td>Ammon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Masoretic Text**

Moab: הָדוֹר הַבָּכָרָה בַּנָּה בָּכָרָה שֵׁם מַלְאָךְ
Ammon: בִּרְעוֹמָה זָהָב אֲבָר בּוּרְעָם עֵרְוָדִים.

**LXX Translation**

- **Introductory Statement**
  - καὶ ἔτεκεν δὲ καὶ ἡ νεαρότερα νιὸν
- **Personal Name**
  - καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ δῶνα αὐτοῦ
    - Μοαβ
  - καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ δῶνα αὐτοῦ
    - Αμμαν
- **Interpretive Etymology**
  - λέγοντα Ἕκ τὸν πατρὸς μου
  - οὕτως τὸν γένος μου
- **Concluding Statement**
  - οὕτως πατήρ Μωαβιτῶν ἢως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας
  - οὕτως πατήρ Αμμανιτῶν ἢως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας

**Suggested Hebrew Vorlage**

Moab: הָדוֹר הַבָּכָרָה בַּנָּה בָּכָרָה שֵׁם מַלְאָךְ
Ammon: בִּרְעוֹמָה זָהָב אֲבָר בּוּרְעָם עֵרְוָדִים

The above analysis is based on Landes (1956:39). Texts in bold type are LXX additions (based on Hebrew vorlage?).

* In the suggested Hebrew vorlage of verse 38, the word "אֲמֹם" appears twice in the construct state. In the first of these instances it is linked with "יָמָן", and in the second instance which follows closely thereafter, it is associated with "יָמָן". The close apposition of the two occurrences of "אֲמֹם" and the similarity of the words with which "אֲמֹם" is associated suggest that the first occurrence found in the Hebrew vorlage was likely omitted by the LXX translators due to homoioarcton. This explanation supports the view that Αμμαν is to be considered a translation of a personal name rather than evidence only of a popular etymology.

** Alternatively, the Hebrew vorlage may have been exactly as received in the MT. If so, Landes' suggestion is informative. "In this case, "אֲמֹם" was apparently interpreted, not as a personal name, but as a popular etymology of a name which had dropped out, and which is now inserted, thereby bringing the verse into harmony with the preceding one, which contains the personal name followed by the interpretive etymology." (Landes 1956:39)
The question remains, Is the intent of the original author merely to point out the origins of an inherent animosity between these two groups—the נַבִּיא and the לֹאֵם—an animosity which would later lead to rival states/clans, a situation which certainly developed by the period of the Hebrew monarchy in the Iron Age? In other words, was the author's intent merely to trace a nascent enmity to a fictional ancestor? Or might the purpose rather have been to cite an actual eponymous descendant of Lot—גּוֹז—the (along with his cousin/brother Moab) was an actual ancestor of later Ammonites. And might this initial reference to the Ammonites as distantly related to the Hebrews also point to a filial relationship and attendant mutual covenantal responsibility—a concept strong in tribal cultures—which forms the foil for other Ammonite references in the Hebrew Bible?

Figure 1 presents a summary of the biblical account of the ancestral relationship existing between the various tribes of Israel and their Transjordanian counterparts. Interestingly, in each case it is the descendant of the firstborn sons of each of Jacob's wives/concubines who later inhabit territory in Transjordan—Reubenites (Reuben = firstborn of Leah), Gadites (Gad = firstborn of Zilpah), and Mannesites [descendants of Joseph's son Manneseh] (Joseph = firstborn of Rachel). Note also that the Edomites and Ishmaelites were descendants of the firstborn sons of Abraham and Isaac respectively. Moab and Ben-'ammi were also the firstborn sons of their mothers, though not of their father/grandfather. Perhaps there is evidence here of an emphasis on clan responsibility of the firstborn which serves as the background of later references to Ammonite/Israelite relations, particularly in the prophetic literature.

Though it is unlikely that we may ever prove the historical existence of an ancestor of the Ammonites, Landes (1956a: 4-12, 38-41) reminds us that the name גִּנְבַּיְתָה has genuine parallels in the Ugaritic onomastica of the middle of the second millennium BC. In these lists, names are preserved with only the patronymic element (bin 'ammiya). The Ugaritic parallels are found in administrative lists—possibly guild
Figure 1. Ammonite/Israelite ancestry according to Genesis 11-36. This diagram illustrates the biblical account of the shared tribal heritage of Cisjordanian and Transjordanian peoples.
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lists—which omit the personal names common in the Semitic formula of "so-and-so, son of so-and-so." Landes concludes,

There is no longer, therefore, any good reason why cannot be explained as a genuine clan and personal name current when the oral tradition concerning Lot and his daughters was being formed. . . . Furthermore, since the names 'my and bn 'myn are attested as actual personal names in both the West and South Semitic onomastica, and bn 'my and bn 'myn, in addition to being clan names, stand for individual persons in the Ugaritic lists, it is not difficult to see how Ben-'ammi could be identified both with the clan name of the Ammonites and with their ancestral progenitor. (1956a: 10, 12)

Although scholars holding to biblical minimalist views (see chapter 1 above) and other more moderate critical scholars (Miller and Hayes 1986: 76-79) would question the historicity of the biblical claim, other reputable scholars are more supportive.

Block, for example, cautions against giving too much weight to the popular etymology argument—if by doing so one would be appealing to this argument in order to demean the reliability of the biblical record.

Whatever else the significance of these names [mid-second-millennium Hittite examples similar to יִשְׂרָאֵל] may be, their existence should caution against explaining away the personal name of Lot's son in Gen 19:38 as a mere popular etymology for the name of the [Ammonite] nation, devoid of any historical memory of an actual person or clan by that name. (Block 1984a: 210)

Younker's assessment (1994a: 295, 296) also allows for the possibility (though it does not require it) of an historical individual who was the ancestor of the Ammonites.

O'Brien, writing in a sidebar for a BA article on the Ammonites, concludes:

Recently discovered Ugaritic guild lists, however, indicate that the name Ben-'ammi is more than a clever etymology; it appears as a genuine personal name in fifteenth-century onomastica. Ben-'ammi, therefore, may refer both to an original ancestor of the Ammonites named Ben-'ammi and to the clan name used by the Israelites to refer to their neighbors the Ammonites. (1985: 176)
Analysis of Ammonite References

One of the purposes of this chapter is to catalog the citations referring to the Ammonites in the Hebrew Bible by category and form. The results of this categorization are summarized in table format and expanded in the narrative.

Then, those textual references for which there is enough applicable archaeological information to illuminate our understanding and warrant further consideration are examined in chapter 4.

The following questions are addressed in the analysis of this chapter, and the data thus formulated are tabulated in the tables and figures which follow:

- How frequently do the terms referring to Ammon/Ammonites appear in the Hebrew Bible?
- What Hebrew terms (and lexical variants) are used in reference to Ammon and/or Ammonites?
- During what time periods are such references made? Or more precisely, references to Ammonites are included in the Hebrew Bible in contexts which make reference to which chronological time periods?
- What individual Ammonites (male and female) are mentioned?
- What Ammonite place names are mentioned?
- In what type of literary contexts are Ammonite references made?
- What words/phrases occur commonly in construct with references to Ammon/Ammonites?
- What contacts between Ammon and Israel are described?
- What dynastic interrelationships between Israel and Ammon are described?
- What themes, if any, are evident in the corpus of Ammonite references?

More specifically, this study of the references to the Ammonites groups the above questions by category and focuses attention on the following three types of analyses:

(1) lexigraphical analysis—a description of what forms of the Hebrew root words are
used to refer to the people, objects, concepts, and places associated with the
Ammonites, (2) contextual analysis—discovering what genre of literature contain the
Ammonite references (macro analysis) and what types of key words are associated with
the Ammonite terms (micro analysis), and (3) chronohistoriographical analysis—a study
of the distribution through time of the Ammonite references and the mention of specific
named individuals, including an analysis of ties between the royal house of Israel and
Ammon.

Lexigraphical Analysis and Quantification of Ammonite
Terminology Used in the Hebrew Bible

Table 1 (p. 33) indicates that terms containing the Hebrew name גנום and its
gentilic forms occur in the BHS 128 times—106 times in a collective tribal/national
sense, 21 times with a gentilic meaning referring to specific individuals or groups of
individuals, and once as part of a composite site name.

Table 1 also lists the cross references to entries in five important reference
works—the lexicon of Brown Driver Briggs (BDB); the concordances of Even-Shoshan,
Lisowski, and Mandelkern; and the Vocabulary of the Old Testament by Andersen and
Forbes. The form # in Table 1 indicates the number of different lexical variants for
Ammonite terms appearing in the Hebrew Bible. The 14 variants are listed in "diction­
ary" order.

Brown, Driver, and Briggs’s Hebrew and Aramaic English Lexicon (1981: 769-
770) correctly lists the 106 times גנום as a name appears in the BHS. It also identifies
the 21 times when the gentilic form is used.

Interestingly, Even-Shoshan’s comprehensive work A New Concordance of the
Bible (1983) lists only 122 references (rather than 128 as noted above) under two
entries—101 times under the entry for גנום as a proper name and 21 times under the
gentilic entry of גנום. This discrepancy in the number of times the name גנום occurs
is accounted for by the fact that Even-Shoshan (1983: 896, 897) fails to include the five
references (Deut 3:11; 2 Sam 12:26, 17:27; Jer 49:2; and Ezek 21:25 [Eng.=21:20]) which mention Rabbah—רַבָּתָ בְּנֵי־עָם—the capital city of the Ammonites.

Ammon as a Proper Name with Collective Tribal/National Meaning

The references to the people of Ammon as a corporate body in the Hebrew Bible are characterized by the use of the term בְּנֵיִּים עָם (bênê 'ammon). As noted above, the Hebrew name יִשְׂרָאֵל appears 106 times in the Hebrew Bible. In 104 of these instances it occurs in the phrase בְּנֵיִּים עָם (bênê 'ammon—36 times the two elements of this phrase are linked by the use of a maqaf as indicated above). When used as a proper name (as opposed to its use as a gentilic reference), עָם is almost entirely consistent in being combined in the full form of בְּנֵיִּים עָם (bênê 'ammon).

Exceptions to Use of Full Form

**בְּנֵיִּים עָם (bênê 'ammon)**

The vast majority (98%) of references to Ammon as a proper name use the full form of בְּנֵיִּים עָם (bênê 'ammon). There are only two exceptions to the use of this full form as the collective tribal/national designation. The two times when the term יִשְׂרָאֵל (‘ammon) is not preceded by בְּנֵי (bênê) are found in 1 Sam 11:11 and Ps 83:8 (Eng. 83:7, LXX Ps 82:7).

---

**1 Sam 11:11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NRSV</strong></th>
<th><strong>BHS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LXX</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The next day Saul put the people in three companies. At the morning watch they came into the camp and cut down the Ammonites until the heat of the day; and those who survived were scattered, so that no two of them were left together. | יָהּ מָכָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל לְקָרָה עָם יָגְדָּה וְלָקֵם אֵלֶּהָהָה לְכָּרָה אַּלָּא יָהּ מָכָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל לְקָרָה עָם יָגְדָּה וְלָקֵם אֵלֶּהָהָה לְכָּרָה אַּלָּא | καὶ ἐγενήθη μετὰ τὴν αὔριον καὶ ἔδεστο Σαουλ τὸν λαὸν εἰς τρεῖς ἀρχὰς, καὶ εἰσπεράσθησαν μέσον τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἐν φυλακῇ τῇ τροφῇ καὶ ἔτυπτον τοὺς νιόις Ἀμμών, ἐως διεθερμάθη ἡ ἡμέρα, καὶ ἐγενήθησαν οἱ ὑπολειμμαίοι διασκάρσαν, καὶ οὕτω ὑπελείφθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς δύο κατὰ τὸ αὐτό.
In 1 Sam 11:11 Ammon is preceded by the use of the direct object marker
rather than יְהוָה. However, the LXX translates this expression יְהוָה אָמֹן as νιοῦς
Ammon—just as it normally does when translating יְהוָה אָמֹן. In addition to the LXX, a
few Masoretic manuscripts, as well as the Old Latin and Syriac versions, and some
targumic manuscripts also add the equivalent of νιοῦς.

The only other instance in which the full form יְהוָה אָמֹן (bēnē ʿammōn) is not used
occurs in Ps 83:8 (LXX=82:7; Eng.=83:8) where the word יְהוָה is preceded by the
use of the waw conjunctive.

Ps 83:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV (83:7)</th>
<th>BHS (83:8)</th>
<th>LXX (82:8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gebal and Ammon and Amalek. Philistia with the inhabitants of Tyre</td>
<td>הבֵל וְאַמְנֹן וְאַמָלְךָ וְקַעַד</td>
<td>גַּבְּלָ בֵּין אַמְנֹן וְאַמְלָךְ קַאָיִל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason the full form is not used in this verse may be due to metrical con­
siderations. See chapter 4 for more information on the historical background of this
passage.

Significance of the Full Form of
the Name to National Identity

As cited above, when the gentilic Ammonite references are not counted, only two
biblical references do not use the full form of the Ammonite name יְהוָה אָמֹן (bēnē
ʿammōn). Block argues that this long form of the national name is associated with the
tradition of tribal identity which is gradually abandoned as a society moves toward
statehood. With reference to Israel, Block states that the

prominence of the form bny yšp ("sons of Israel") was related directly
to the consciousness of tribal interrelationships and the Israelites’ belief
in their common descent from a single ancestor. The farther back the
traditions go, the more common is the compound form. With the
institution of the monarchy, the minimizing of the significance of these
tribal associations resulted in a drastic reduction in the use of the full
form of the name. (1984a: 202)
I would agree with Block that the degree of tribal cohesiveness may well be reflected in the retention of the long form of the national name. However, I would disagree with Block’s following conclusion relative to Ammon. "Concerning Ammon, on the other hand, the transition from a tribal organization to monarchic structures appears to have had no effect on the form of the name" (1984b: 202). Rather than having "no effect," I would argue that it is precisely because Ammon continued to maintain strong tribal bonds throughout its history (even after developing as a "state") that the terminology naturally persisted in use longer than it did for Israel. Studies by LaBianca and Younker (1995) and Younker (1997b) give evidence for the continued importance of tribal structures in the development of Ammonite society.

Since Ammon seems to have maintained the tribal/clan organization to a greater degree over a longer period of time than did Israel, it is logical to assume that the long form of the name יבש (bênê 'ammôn) would be used more consistently for Ammon than for Israel. Block’s study (1984a) shows that this is in fact the case. Citing the use of the formula bny-GN (i.e., "sons of" + Geographic Name), Block demonstrates that when referring to Ammon, the ratio of bny-GN occurrences to the total number of references to Ammon as a nation (excluding gentilics) is 98.1%. In contrast, the ratio of usage for Israel is only 25.3%.

**Contrast of Terminology Used in the Hebrew Bible for References to Ammon and for References to Israel**

Block’s two studies (1984a: 198-202; 1984b: 301ff.) show that the use of the gentilic is more prevalent when referring to Ammon than to Israel. Ammonite gentilic references occur in over 16.5% of the cases (21 instances out of 128 occurrences); Israelite gentilic references on the other hand occur only in 0.2% of the cases (5 instances—each in the singular—out of 2,517 occurrences). Block concludes that יבש (bênê yisrâ'el) is "employed as the gentilic as well as the simple national name"
for Israel (Block 1984a: 202). See below for the importance of this discussion and its evidence as an indicator of tribal cohesiveness.

Table 3 demonstrates that a number of terms are linked in construct chains with בתנין אמון (bêné ‘amôn). On the contrary, בתנין ישראל (bêné yisrâ‘èl) shows a "general resistance to certain combinations" (Block 1984a: 203). Thus, בתנין ישריל (bêné yisrâ‘èl) is never associated in a genitival relationship with God/god although Ammon is joined this way twice. Only once is Israel linked with a term representing territory, while Ammon is similarly linked seven times—plus four times with the term for boundary. Ammon is most commonly linked in construct with "king." However, neither judges nor kings are designated as the judge(s) or king(s) of בתנין ישראל (bêné yisrâ‘èl).

The Gentilic Usage of Ammon

When used in the sense to identify someone as Ammonite, the name זמך appears in its gentilic forms as both singular (m. = זמך; f. = זמר) and plural (m. = זמה; f. = זמות [K] / זמות [Q]) with masculine and feminine forms. The gentilic appears with both the plene spelling using the mater lectionis (ı) and with the defective holem. Ammon is used both with and without the definite article (ה) in the masculine singular and plural forms. The feminine plural also appears with and without the definite article. The feminine singular occurs only with the article (1 Kgs 14:21, 31; 2 Chr 24:26).

Individual Ammonites

Table 4 lists the textual citations which refer to Ammonites mentioned in the Bible and notes briefly the historical context of each such reference. In addition to Ben-ami (Gen 19:38), seven other male Ammonites are mentioned by name (Nahash, Zelek, Hanun, Shobi, [Jo]Zabad, Baalis, and Tobiah). Deuterocanonical literature also
# TABLE 3

Ammon in the Hebrew Bible and Associated Words
(Terms Used in Connection with בֵּית אמִמָם and לֵאמָל)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Phrase</th>
<th>Times Cited</th>
<th>BHS References</th>
<th>English Translation (NRSV &amp; BDB Definition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אַלֶה בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Judg 10:6; 1 Kgs 11:33</td>
<td>god(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲרוֹן בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deut 2:19, 37; Josh 13:25; Judg 11:15; 2 Sam 10:2; 1 Chr 19:2; 20:1</td>
<td>land, country (territory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גֶּבְרָל בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Num 21:24; Deut 3:16; Josh 12:2, 13:10</td>
<td>boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְדוֹדֵי בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Kgs 24:2</td>
<td>bands (marauding bands; from ?תָּב to penetrate, to make inroads on)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פֶּשֶׁע בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zeph 2:8</td>
<td>taunts, reviling words (from יֵלָה to revile, blaspheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֶּהֶרֶב בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Sam 12:9</td>
<td>(with the) sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רָבִּיד בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jud 10:7</td>
<td>(into the) hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֵר בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Sam 12:31; 1 Chr 20:3</td>
<td>cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פֶּשֶׁע בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amos 1:13</td>
<td>transgressions (rebellion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֵלֶךְ בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deut 2:19</td>
<td>frontier (on the forefront of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֵלֶךְ בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Judg 11:12, 13, 14, 28; 1 Sam 12:12; 2 Sam 10:1; Jer 27:3; 40:14; 1 Chr 19:1; 2 Chr 27:5</td>
<td>king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רָא שֵׂיָת בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dan 11:41</td>
<td>main part of (principal part of; conjectured to equal לש י)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רַבְּהָת בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Deut 3:11; 2 Sam 12:26; 17:27; Jer 49:2; Ezek 21:25</td>
<td>Rabbath (capital city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שְׁבָרֵת בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jer 49:6</td>
<td>restore the fortunes ( captivity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שְׁרִי בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Sam 10:3; 1 Chr 19:3 (cf. Amos 1:15; Jer 49:3)</td>
<td>princes, officials (attendants, i.e. leading —)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֵׁיָת אַפְנוֹת</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:5, 7</td>
<td>abomination (detestable thing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תֵּרָא בִּית בִּית אֲמִמָם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Kgs 23:13</td>
<td>abomination (ritual sense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (BC Approx.)</td>
<td>Israelite/Judahite Contact</td>
<td>Ammonite Terms Name/Description (Person-Position/Status-Relationship)</td>
<td>NRSV Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Ben-‘ammi (Lot’s son/grandson)</td>
<td>Gen 19:30-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Moses/Joshua</td>
<td>“Ammonites” (Lot’s descendants)</td>
<td>Deut 2:19-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Chephar-ammon* (Site name)</td>
<td>Josh 18:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150?</td>
<td>Residents of Jericho</td>
<td>“Ammonites” (Allies of Eglon, king of Moab)</td>
<td>Judg 3:12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>“the king of the Ammonites” (&lt;c&gt;)</td>
<td>Judg 10:6-11:33: 12:1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Period of Biblical United Monarchy in Cisjordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (BC Approx.)</th>
<th>Israelite/Judahite Contact</th>
<th>Ammonite Terms Name/Description (Person-Position/Status-Relationship)</th>
<th>NRSV Reference</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>Nahash (&lt;c&gt;) (King)</td>
<td>1 Sam 11:1-15; 12:12; 14:47</td>
<td>Siege of Jabin Gilead. Saul defeats Nahash and confirmed as king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Zelek (&lt;c&gt;) (Soldier)</td>
<td>2 Sam 23:37; 1 Chr 11:39</td>
<td>Ammonite soldier among David’s Mighty Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>Nahash (&lt;c&gt;)</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 Chr 19:1</td>
<td>Death/succession of Ammonite kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Hanun (&lt;c&gt;)</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 Sam 10:1-11:26; 12:26-31; 1 Chr 19:2 - 20:3</td>
<td>David’s overture rebuffed, Joab defeats Ammonite/Armenian coalition. David captures Rabbah &amp; takes Ammonite crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>Shobi (&lt;c&gt;)</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>2 Sam 17:27</td>
<td>Kindness to David in exile, provisions provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>“Ammonite...women” (&lt;f&gt;) “foreign wives”</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:1</td>
<td>Ammonite women among those loved by Solomon contrary to stipulations of the Lord’s covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>Milcom/Molech*</td>
<td>Deity</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:5 - 8,33</td>
<td>Solomon builds high places for gods of his foreign wives on a hill east of Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>Naamah (&lt;f&gt;)</td>
<td>Wife/Consort</td>
<td>1 Kgs 14:21; 2 Chr 12:13</td>
<td>Solomon fathers son by Ammonite mother (cf. LXX additional clarifying references)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Period of Biblical Divided Monarchy in Cisjordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (BC Approx.)</th>
<th>Israelite/Judahite Contact</th>
<th>Ammonite Terms Name/Description (Person-Position/Status-Relationship)</th>
<th>NRSV Reference</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>Naamah (&lt;f&gt;) (Mother)</td>
<td>1 Kgs 14:21; 2 Chr 12:13</td>
<td>cf. LXX additional references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>Ammonites (Meunites) ***</td>
<td>2 Chr 20:1-30 (note for 10 &amp; 11)</td>
<td>Invaders from Ammon, Moab, Edom defeated (contrasted with Israel’s earlier instruction to bypass their territory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848</td>
<td>Joash</td>
<td>[Jo]Zabad (&lt;c&gt;) - son Shimeath (&lt;f&gt;) -mother</td>
<td>2 Chr 24:26 (cf 2Kgs 12:21); 1 Esdr 9:36 (7)</td>
<td>Court officials [Jo]Zabad &amp; Jehozabad, (son of Shimrith, a Moabite) conspire to kill Joash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>Uzziah</td>
<td>“the Ammonites”</td>
<td>2 Chr 26:8</td>
<td>Ammonites bring tribute to Uzziah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>Amos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amos 1:13</td>
<td>Ammonite sins (occupation of Gilead &amp; mistreatment of pregnant women) condemned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date BC</th>
<th>Israelite / Judahite Contact</th>
<th>Name/Description</th>
<th>NRSV Reference</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750 / 735</td>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>“the king of the Ammonites” (♂)</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 Chr 27:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740 / 700</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 11:10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Asaph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps 83:7</td>
<td>Ammon joins Edom, Ishmaelites, Moab, Hagrites, Gebal (Byblos), Amalek, Philistia, &amp; Tyre in plot to destroy Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zeph 2:8,9</td>
<td>Ammon’s pride, insults and mocking; to be like Gomorrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640 / 609</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>Milcom</td>
<td>Deity</td>
<td>2 Kgs 23:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626 / 587</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Milcom</td>
<td>Deity</td>
<td>Jer 9:25,26; 25:21; 49:1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594 / 593</td>
<td>Zedekiah</td>
<td>“the king of the Ammonites” (♂)</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Jer 27:1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593 / 570</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezek 21:18-32; 25:2-12</td>
<td>Babylon poised to attack Rabbah or Jerusalem. Ammonites in league with Babylonian, Aramean &amp; Moabite invaders of Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586 / 539</td>
<td>Gedaliah/ Johanan</td>
<td>Baalis (♂)</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Jer 40:13-41:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 / 539</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>“leaders of Ammon”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan 11:41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Biblical Post-exilic Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name/Description</th>
<th>NRSV Reference</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>Tobiah (♂)</td>
<td>Neh 2:10,19; 4:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“women of the Ammonites” (♀)</td>
<td>Neh 13:23 (cf Neh 13:1-5; Deut 23:3,4; Ezra 9:1,2)</td>
<td>Ammonites excluded from assembly and marriage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deuterocanonical Post-exilic Period (In LXX Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name/Description</th>
<th>NRSV Reference</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172 / 168</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>“land of Ammon” “country of Ammon”</td>
<td>2 Mac 4:26; 5:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Achior (♂)</td>
<td>Judith 1:12; 5:2,5, 6:5; 7:17,18; 14:5,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Judas Maccabbeus</td>
<td>Timothy (♂) (Ammonite or Seleucid?)</td>
<td>1 Mac 5:5,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ♂ = Male, ♀ = Female.  
** Molech may be derived from combining the vowels of bosheth with consonants of Milcom.  
*** Possible transposition of Hebrew letters [n and v] results in alternate readings of “Meunites” or “Ammonites.”
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contains references to Achior (Judith chaps. 1, 5, 6, 7 and 14) and Timothy (1 Macc 5:6,7)—two additional Ammonite males.

Two females, Naamah, mother of Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14:21; 2 Chr 12:13) and Shimeath, mother of Zabad, a conspirator who killed Joash (2 Chr 24:26), are identified as Ammonites. Two other women, Abigail and Zeruiah (2 Sam 17:25), are identified as daughters of Nahash, presumably the Ammonite king mentioned in 1 Sam 11:1. Although they are not identified specifically as Ammonite, it is possible they were. (See the discussion below.)

Other unnamed individuals include the Ammonite king whose aggression against Jabesh-gilead is countered by Jephthah (Judg 10—12), an unnamed mid-eighth-century Ammonite king who pays tribute to Jotham (2 Chr 27:5), and another unnamed Ammonite king who joins an anti-Babylonian coalition instigated in Jerusalem (Jer 27:1-7).

Ammonite Collective References

Other references to Ammonites mentioned in collective groups include Hanun’s counselors who are referred to as "Ammonite nobles" (1 Chr 19:2 passim) and other Ammonites who bring tribute in the time of King Uzziah (2 Chr 26:8). "Ammonite women" are listed as belonging to the harem of king Solomon (1 Kgs 11:1). "Bands of Ammonites" join Babylonian, Aramean, and Moabite invaders of Judah during the reign of Jehoiakim (2 Kgs 24:2; 2 Chr 36:1-5 LXX). "Leaders of Ammon" are also listed in chap. 11 of the apocalyptic book of Daniel (Dan 11:41).

Ammon as a Component of a Site Name

The one time נַעֲמָן is included in a site name (Josh 18:24) it is prefixed with the definite article—[Q] נַעֲמָן / [K] נַעֲמָן. The site appears in the allotment given to the tribe of Benjamin. Chapter 4 includes further information on this site of Chephar-ammoni.
Josh 18:24

BHS

NRSV

Chephar-ammoni, Ophni, and Geba—twelve towns with their villages

LXX Alex

καὶ Αικαιρεν καὶ Κασθραμμυ καὶ Γαβαια.

πόλεις δέκα καὶ οἱ κώμαι αὐτῶν

LXX Vat

καὶ Κασθρία καὶ Κεφιρα καὶ Μονί καὶ Γαβαια.

πόλεις δέκα δύο καὶ οἱ κώμαι αὐτῶν

Though little can be definitively concluded about this site name, Boling’s comment is worth noting.

But the original Banu-yamin were only one element in the rich social and cultural mix of the towns that were grouped together to consolidate the territory of the Yahwist "tribe." This is clear from the unusually high percentage of gentilic formations and related indicators in the place names. (Boling and Wright 1982: 433)

This may be an indication that tribal peoples were moving both ways across the Jordan River Valley. It may also have implications for the discussion on Ammonite/Israelite interrelations as outlined in Figure 2, discussed below.

Comparisons Between the MT and LXX Readings of Ammonite Passages

We noted above that the LXX inserts an interpretive addition of the term Αμμαν into its translation of the initial reference to the Ammonites in Gen 19:36. Table 5 summarizes other instances where the LXX differs from the MT. Not all of the LXX emendations or interpolations are listed or discussed below. Only those which relate directly to the use of the name Αμμαν/Αμμαν are treated because only these alternatives are necessary for this study. In addition to the interpolation of Gen 19:38, the LXX contains at least seven other interesting additions/emendations when compared to the use of terms related to Ammon in the MT.

The first of these LXX additions is found in 1 Sam 11:1 where the phrase Καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς μετὰ μῆνα (About a month later) is lacking in the MT.
TABLE 5

Ammonite References with Textual Emendations
(Extra-Masoretic References in the Septuagint and Qumranic Literature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX Additions, Repetitions, and Substitutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 19:37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 19:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 12:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 36:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qumranic Literature Addition (supported by Josephus)

| 4QSam* | 4QSam* adds what the NSRV includes in 1 Sam 10:27(b). "Now Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had been grievously oppressing the Gadites and the Reubenites. He would gouge out the right eye of each of them and would not grant Israel a deliverer. No one was left of the Israelites across the Jordan whose right eye Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had not gouged out. But there were seven thousand men who had escaped from the Ammonites and had entered Jabesh—gilead." cf.also Josephus, Antiquities 6.5.1. |

* Although not directly related to the Ammonites, this addition is useful in understanding the use of the full reference יְיִלְדֵיהוּ in the verse which follows. See Table 1 and the discussion related to it.

The LXX also includes references which omit text contained in the Masoretic text. See for example 1 Kgs 11:10; 1 Kgs 14:21, 31; also 2 Chr 20:1 (Ammon: BHS = 2x; LXX = 1x).
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1 Sam 11:1

NRSV
About a month later,³ Nahash the Ammonite went up and besieged Jabesh-gilead; and all the men of Jabesh said to Nahash, “Make a treaty with us, and we will serve you.”

BHS
And he was as though he had been deaf in 10:27b

LXX
καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς μετὰ μὴν καὶ ἀνέβη Ναας ὁ Ἀμμανῖτης καὶ παρεμβάλει ἐπὶ Ιαβές Γαλααδ. καὶ εἶπον πάντες οἱ ἀνδρες Ιαβις πρὸς Ναας τὸν Ἀμμανῖτην Διάδου ἡμῖν διασήκην, καὶ δουλεύσομεν σοι.

[NRSV footnote:] ³ Q Ms Gk:
MT lacks About a month later

Kirkpatrick draws attention to the fact that the last phrase in the MT of 1 Sam 10:27—subject to a simple substitution of a daleth in place of a resh—may account for the reading of this phrase given in the LXX.

There is nothing in the Hebrew text to indicate whether the interval was long or short. But the true reading is doubtless preserved by the Sept. (LXX), which reads, And it came to pass after about a month that Nahash, etc., instead of And he was as though he had been deaf in x.27b. The difference in the consonants in the Heb. text would be very slight—יהיו קמחרש * יהיו קמחרש (1930: 83)

It is also important to point out that the Qumranic literature (4QSam* and also Josephus Ant. 6.5.1) has an addition which is inserted between 1 Sam 10:27 and 1 Sam 11:1 (see Table 5). This addition tells how Nahash, prior to this confrontation (1 Sam 11:1), had oppressed the Gadites and Reubenites, gouging out the right eyes of all but 7,000 men who escaped to Jabesh-gilead (NRSV; Eves 1982; Lippi 1991).

Rofé (1982) on the other hand maintains that MT does not omit this passage by mistake; rather it is evidence of an intentional attempt to transform Nahash’s single act into a constant characteristic—a practice typical of Jewish Midrash in Hellenistic and Roman times.

A second LXX difference between the MT and the LXX is found in 1 Sam 11:10 where the phrase πρὸς Ναας τὸν Αμμανῖτην is included in the LXX but not in the MT.
1 Sam 11:10

**NRSV**

So the inhabitants of Jabesh said, "Tomorrow we will give ourselves up to you, and you may do to us whatever seems good to you."

**BHS**

καὶ εἶπαν οἱ ἄνδρες Ιαβδὶς ἀνθρώπων τῆς Ἰαβδὶς ἔξελενόμεθα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ποιήσετε ἡμῖν τὸ ἁγαθὸν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν.

**LXX**

καὶ εἶπαν οἱ ἄνδρες Ιαβδὶς πρὸς Ναασ τῶν Ἀμμανίτων Αἱρίων ἔξελενόμεθα πρὸς υἱὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ποιήσετε ἡμῖν τὸ ἁγαθὸν ἐνώπιον υἱῶν ὑμῶν.

McCarter observes:

Something seems to have been lost here, and although only a small fragment is preserved, 4QSam* had a longer text at this point. The surviving portion reads: [...] hsw fis 'r [...], "... to you. Open the gate..." This seems to be the remnant of a speech by Nahash... The name is necessary for clarity in English, and it has also been added to the text of LXX; but the shorter text of MT, which omits it, is probably original. Nahash was probably speaking in the lost material at the end of v 9 (see above) and needed no further identification here. (1980a: 201)

As previously noted above under the discussion regarding the use of the full term בֵּנוֹ יָם (bēnē 'ammôn), the LXX rendering of 1 Sam 11:11 (the only case when the MT lacks בֵּנוֹ יָם when citing יָם) includes the phrase τοὺς υἱοὺς Αμμων (the Greek equivalent of the full form in Hebrew), thereby recognizing that the full form of the Ammonite name was the norm.

The third of the LXX additions is found in several verses that are added in a passage which follows the equivalent of 1 Kgs 12:24 in the Hebrew text. This passage in ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΩΝ Γ'—literally "3rd Kings"—includes a total of 23 "verses" labeled "24a-u" and "24x-z" in Rahlfs's edition. The verse relevant to the Ammonites is vs. 24a, which identifies the mother of Rehoboam.

1 Kgs 12:24a

Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλμων κυμάται μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ βάπτεται μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ἐν πύλῃ Δαοῦ. καὶ ἔβασιλευσεν Ραβσαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἐν ἱεροσαλήμ υἱὸς ἐν ἑκατέρεσι ἑτών ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτόν καὶ δώδεκα ζῆ ἐβάσιλευσεν ἐν ἱεροσαλήμ, καὶ δύο μητρῶν αὐτοῦ Ναασ θυγάτηρ Ασαν υἱὸ 
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In 1 Kgs 12:24b the LXX also gives the name of Jeroboam’s mother Σαρία—evidently an influential woman in the eyes of LXX translators since the territory was either named after her or else her influence was strong enough for her to take the name of the district. See for example 1 Kgs 11:26 in the LXX where the city/district name and Jeroboam’s mother’s name are the same. (Also cf. 1 Chr 2:50, 51 where another genealogy lists individuals whose names coincide with the names of later settled villages—e.g., Kiriath-jearim and Bethlehem.) The full account of Rehoboam’s Ammonite lineage in this preceding verse chronicling Rehoboam’s inauguration is in contrast to a corresponding account of Rehoboam’s death in 1 Kgs 14:31. The latter passage in the BHS mentions only Rehoboam’s mother’s name and ethnicity, whereas in 1 Kgs 12 she is identified as the daughter of Hanun, the son of the Ammonite king Nahash.

The fourth instance of a LXX addition or emendation occurs in 1 Kgs 14:21 where Rehoboam’s mother, Naamah, is identified. However, the apparatus in the BHS reveals that the textual evidence for this identification is complicated.

1 Kgs 14:21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now Rehoboam son of Solomon reigned in Judah.</td>
<td>וְרֶהוֹבָא הָעַן נַעַמָּה</td>
<td>Καὶ Ροβοὰμ κὸς Σαλομῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam was forty-one years old when he began to reign, and he reigned seventeen years in Jerusalem, the city that the LORD had chosen out of all the tribes of Israel, to put his name there. His mother’s name was Naamah the Ammonite.</td>
<td>וַיֵּלֹהוֹבָא הָעַן נַעַמָּה</td>
<td>έβασιλεύσεν εἰπὶ Ιουδαὶ κοὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐνός ἑνάκτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ῥοβοὰμ εὖ τὸ βασιλεῖαν αὐτῶν καὶ δέκα ἐπτά ἐτη βασιλεύσεν εὖ ιερουσαλὴμ τῇ πόλει, ἥν ἐξελέξατο κύριος θέσαν τὸ ὅζωμα αὐτῶν ἐκεῖ ἐκ παιδῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· καὶ τὸ ὅζωμα τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῶν Νααμὰ ἡ Αμμανίτις.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actually in 1 Kgs 14:21, the LXX differs from the MT only in the reading found in the apparatus which indicates that LXXB (Vaticanus) refers to Rehoboam’s mother as...
Maacah rather than Naama. This may result from a confused identification of Rehoboam’s mother with his favorite wife—Maacah, daughter of Absalom (2 Chr 11:20,21). The situation is further complicated by the following factors. In 1 Kgs 15:2, the LXX records Maacah (Maacah) as the mother of Abijah(m), Rehoboam’s son, and even lists Maacah as the mother of Abijah’s son, Asa (1 Kgs 15:10). The parallel passage in the MT of 2 Chr 13:2, however, gives Abijam’s mother’s name as מיכהיה בת איריאל מקריבנה (Micaiah, daughter/granddaughter of Uriel of Gibeah).

This identification makes it likely that the reference in 1 Kgs 15:10, therefore, is probably a reference to Asa’s "mother" in the sense of her being a "queen mother" and not a biological one (cf. 2 Chr 15:16 and the notes of the SBL edition of the NRSV on this verse). The LXX of 2 Chr 12:13 also adds an interesting element to the discussion, listing Rehoboam’s mother as Ναωμα rather than the normally expected Ναμα.

The fifth instance of LXX emendation of the Hebrew text is found in 1 Kgs 14:31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Kgs 14:31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRSV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam slept with his ancestors and was buried with his ancestors in the city of David. His mother’s name was Naamah the Ammonite. His son Abijam succeeded him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיִּשָּׁכֶב לָמוּכֶם וַיִּקֹּבֵל לִבְבוֹ וַיִּקֶם אֶלֶֽם אֶלֶֽם בֵּית דָּוִד וַיִּקֹּבֵי לִבְבֵּי רֹבּוּא וַיִּקֹּבֵל אָבִיו אָבִי דֵּית וַיִּקֹּבֵי אָבִיו אֲבֶֽי.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LXX</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Παρθένῳ καὶ ἀπέβη μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπέκειται μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ δανὶ καὶ ἐβασιλεύειν Ἀβιαν αὐτῷ ἡ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in 1 Kgs 14:31 the LXX omits the name of Ναωμα ἡ Αμμανίτις altogether unlike 14:21 where the name Ναωμα is included by LXXA and altered to Μααchai by LXXb.

A sixth case in which the LXX differs from the reading of the MT in an Ammonite context is found in Josh 19:42, a case in which the readings of the Vaticanus and Alexandrinus give two interesting variations.
Josh 19:42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>Joshua 19:42 LXX Vat</th>
<th>Joshua 19:42 LXX Alex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaalabbin, Aijalon, Ithlah</td>
<td>καὶ Σαλαβίν καὶ Αμμών καὶ Σιλαβά</td>
<td>καὶ Σαλαβίν καὶ Ισαλών καὶ Ιεβλά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this instance the Vaticanus preserves the reading of Ammon while the Alexandrinus substitutes a reading of Aijalon as adopted by the NRSV. One can only speculate that perhaps the LXX reflects a tradition that either identified Ammon with the other sites mentioned or that the sounds were somehow confused by the scribe when copying this name.

A final instance in which the LXX gives an alternate reading affecting Ammonite matters is found in 2 Chr 36:5-6. Here the LXX translators include several verses not recorded in the Masoretic Text.

2 Chr 36:5-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36:5</td>
<td>Ὅν εἶχος καὶ πέντε ἐτῶν ἱσαμὶ ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἔνδεκα ἔτη ἐβασιλεύσαν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ ὄνομα τῆς μνήμης αὐτῶν Ζεχωρα θυγάτηρ Νηριον ἐκ Ραμα. καὶ ἔποιησαν τὸ πονηρόν ἑκατέριον κυρίον κατὰ πάντα, ὡσα ἐποίησαν οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:5a</td>
<td>ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἠλθεν Ναβουχοδονοσόρ βασιλεὺς Βαβυλώνος εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ δουλείων τρία ἔτη καὶ ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:5b</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπέστειλεν κύριος ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοὺς Χαλδαίους καὶ Λῃστήρια Σύρων καὶ Λῃστήρια Μωαβίτων καὶ οὐδὲν Αμμών καὶ ὁ τῆς Σαμαρείας, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν μετὰ τῶν λόγων τὸν κατὰ τὸν λόγον κυρίον ἐν χειρὶ τῶν παιδῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν προφητῶν. (verse 5cd not quoted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36:6 Against him King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon came up, and bound him with fetters to take him to Babylon.

Vs. 5 above in the LXX includes a reference to Jehoiakim's mother's name. The LXX also lists Ammonite marauding bands among those who came against Judah in its last days before the Babylonian conquest. Note that the LXX passage in 2 Chr 36:5abcd is a paraphrase of 2 Kgs 23:36b-24:4.

Summary of MT-LXX Comparisons

The translators of the LXX in some cases include words not found in the MT. At other times they appear to omit words included in the MT, or as in the case of 1 Kgs 14:21, provide an alternative reading not found in the MT. As suggested by the discussion on Gen 19:37, 38, the LXX translators may have followed a Hebrew vorlage whose text differed from that found in the MT.

Context for References to יָמִם (‘ammôn) and בנֶה יָמִם (bêné ‘ammôn)

The Hebrew word for Ammon is often found in close relation to other words and/or phrases. The words commonly associated in construct relationship with the Hebrew terms יָמִים and בנֶה יָמִים are listed in Table 3 (p. 46). As previously noted, there is a marked difference in the terms which are associated with Ammon when compared with those found closely related to the term for Israel.

The references to Ammonites in the Hebrew Bible appear in a variety of literary contexts—sometimes in prose, other times in a context of poetic imagery (see Table 6). Some references are in narrative sections of the text, and others appear in prophetic passages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Testament Books/Divisions</th>
<th>Collective Tribal/National References</th>
<th>Gentilic References</th>
<th>Total # of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Times Cited</td>
<td>Number of Verses Cited (Reference: chapter &amp; verse)</td>
<td>Per 10,000 Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O.T. TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(19:31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(21:24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2:19, 2:37, 3:11, 3:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TORAH</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(12:2, 13:10, 13:25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(11:13, 10:6, 7:9, 11:17, 18, 11:4-6, 8:9, 12:13, 14:15, 27:28, 29, 30:31, 32, 34, 36, 12:23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(12:12, 14:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(14:1, 10, 12:3, 6:8, 10, 11, 14:2, 19, 11:1, 12:9, 26, 17:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(11:7, 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(22:13, 24:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORMER PROPHETS</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11:14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(9:25 [Eng. = 9:28], 25:21, 27:3, 40:11, 14, 41:10, 15, 49:1, 2, 49:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(31:25 [Eng. = 21:30], 21:33 [Eng. = 21:28], 25:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2:8, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATER PROPHETS</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(83:8 [Eng. = 83:7] with 1 not &quot;22&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POETRY</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11:41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(18:11, 19:1, 2:3, 6, 7:9, 11:12, 15, 19, 20:1, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(20:1, 10, 22, 23, 27:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER WRITINGS</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Andersen and Forbes (1992:392-393) and Block (1984:199).

*** 2Chr 26:8 Possible transposition of Hebrew letters (י and י) results in alternate readings of "Maonites" or "Ammonites."

NOTE: Numbers with superscripts indicate the number of times a reference to a form of "Yah" is made in a particular verse.
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Prose and poetic variations

Out of the 128 occurrences of the Hebrew terms for Ammon, only eight (6.25%) appear in a poetic context. All but one of these occurrences (7 out of 8) appear in the latter prophets (Isa 11:14; Jer 49:1, 2, 6; Amos 1:13; and Zeph 2:8, 9). None of the poetic contexts for Ammon is found in the former prophets where historical narrative is most common.

Accordingly, the prose usage of Ammonite terms predominates in the former prophets; nearly 50% of all Ammonite references (62 out of 128) are found in the former prophets. The former prophets also have the highest percentage of Ammonite terms used per 10,000 words (8:1,000 for uses of the full collective term, and 1:10,000 for uses of the gentilic references—Table 6).

The only time Ammon appears in a poetic setting outside the prophets is in Ps 83:7 (Eng. 83:8; LXX 82:7), and here the form is used without יָבֵנֶ (bēnē). When comparing the forms used for Israel in similar settings, we note that the full term, יהיれている, likewise occurs only infrequently in poetic contexts—21 out of 617 times (3.4%) with no poetic occurrences in the former prophets. However, the literary genre appears to affect the form of the term used for Israel while it does not seem to do so for Ammon. Block notes that when citing Israel, "in the poetic and prophetic texts, only 7.7% of occurrences use the long form of the name," whereas for Ammon, "the long form of the name remains the only acceptable form" (1984a: 201).

Ammonite/Israelite Contacts at Critical Junctures in Biblical History

Table 4 (see pp. 47, 48) outlines the Ammonite/Israelite interrelations during the biblical period by listing Ammonite individuals and groups, the Ammonite deity, and Ammonite place names along with the Israelite individual(s) with whom contact was made.
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Since the biblical record is written from the perspective of recounting the history of the Hebrew people, the references which mention Ammon are clustered around certain major events in biblical history—beginning with the accounts of the arrival of the Israelites in Transjordan. The key events and the associated references are listed below.

**Israelite Arrival in Canaan**

Statements in Num 21 and Deut 2 and 3 and Josh 12:2; 13:10 refer primarily to the border or frontier of Ammon and to the Ammonite land or territory. See below for a detailed discussion of Ammonite borders.

**Period of the Judges/Settlement**

The book of Judges records the several accounts of conflict between Ammon and Israel. The Ammonites allied with Eglon, King of Moab, and the Amalekites dominate the Jordan Valley and possess Jericho—the "city of palms" (Judg 3:12-14). The inhabitants of Jabesh Gilead under Jephthah and an unnamed king of the Ammonites also engage in skirmishes during this period (Judg 10-12).

**Beginning of the Monarchy**

The first book of Samuel chronicles how Saul comes to the aid of the inhabitants of Jabesh Gilead who are threatened by Nahash of Ammon (1 Sam 10:27 [4QSam*]; 11:1-15 and passim). Samuel later recalls this incident as the one which precipitated the call for a king to rule over Israel (1 Sam 12:12). Thus, in some sense, the shift from religious ruler to secular king within Israel is blamed on the Ammonites. Note that Saul is also earlier called a "savior" from the Philistines (1 Sam 9:15).

**Rise of the United Monarchy**

Passages in 2 Samuel and 1 Kings (and parallel references in 1 Chronicles record the overtures, conflicts, and intermarriages between the houses of Israel and Ammon
during the reigns of David, Solomon, and Rehoboam. (See below for fuller discussion and references.)

End of Judahite Kingdom

An unnamed Ammonite king is a member of a coalition which resists the incursion of Nebuchadnezer of Babylon and whose envoys meet in Jerusalem in 594/93 BC. A few years later, 2 Kgs 23:13; 24:2 and Jer 40 and 41 record the intrigue involved in the conspiracy of Ishmael to assassinate Gedaliah, the Babylonian-appointed governor in Judea (with the complicity of Baalis, King of Ammon).

Messianic References

Isa 11:14 predicts a time when the "Root of Jesse" will "stand as a banner for the peoples" and the Ammonites will be the subject of a unified and reconciled Judah and Ephraim from whom a remnant will pass through a second exodus experience. Dan 11:41 depicts in graphic style the deliverance of the "leaders of Ammon"—along with Edom and Moab—from the power of the apocalyptic King of the North. Whether this deliverance is based on protective providence or due to alliance with the aggressor resulting in complicity is a matter of considerable discussion.

Post-exilic Period

The deuterocanonical book of Second Maccabees (2 Macc 4:26; 5:7) informs us that Jason, a fugitive Jewish high priest, twice (172-168 BC) sought refuge in "the land/country of Ammon." According to Judith, Achior, "leader of all the Ammonites," recites Israel's history to apocryphal Assyrian invaders, intercedes on behalf of the Jewish people, and discourages an attack on Judah. Later, the account says he is circumcised and joins the house of Israel. 1 Macc 5:6, 7 records how Timothy, leader of a strong Ammonite band, incites the Ammonites to join in the Babylonian conflict against Judahites after the altar in Jerusalem is destroyed. The LXX account in 2 Chr 36:5abcd also amplifies this story.
Ammonite/Israelite Royal Family Interrelations

The record of the Hebrew Bible is clear regarding the ancestry of Rehoboam, son of Solomon. He was of mixed Israelite/Ammonite heritage (1 Kgs 14:21; 2 Chr 12:13; and the LXX account of 2 Chr 36:5*). However, there may be other instances of Ammonite/Israelite royal intermarriage.

The interrelations between Ammon and Israel in the 11th and 10th centuries BC are intriguing as demonstrated by the data included in Figure 1 (see p. 38). Particularly important is the relationship which the biblical text presents as existing between Nahash, Abigail, Zeruiah, and David. Another relationship of considerable intrigue is that which existed between David and Ahinoam. These questions are addressed below in a slightly speculative manner, yet with the intent to treat the extant text as circumspectly as possible.

Nahash, Saul, and David

Clearly, Nahash, king of Ammon, is one of the most prominent Ammonites mentioned in the biblical record of the early Israelite monarchy. His warfare with Saul supplied the catalyst which helped forge the aspiration for kingship in Israel. Samuel’s words record this desire. "But when you saw that King Nahash of the Ammonites came against you, you said to me, 'No, but a king shall reign over us,' though the Lord your God was your king" (1 Sam 12:12). David appears to have had an alliance of sorts with Nahash, likely based on Ammon’s desire to prevent Saul from expanding his hegemony across the Jordan.

According to 2 Sam 17:25, Abigail and Zeruiah are the daughters of Nahash. But who was the Nahash mentioned in this reference? Is he to be identified with the Ammonite king of 1 Sam 11:1 and 2 Sam 10:1 (1 Chr 19:1)? Does his name itself give any clues to his identity and/or ethnicity? Since Abigail and Zeruiah are also identified as David’s (step? or half?—see below) sisters as 1 Chr 2:16,17 indicates, this
by extension would require that they also be Jesse’s (step?) daughters. The word for sister—תִּשְׂרִית—is commonly used in instances where a girl/woman has the same father but a different mother than her siblings. It is also used when either parent, common to both siblings, is the same (cf BDB, p. 27).

Figure 2 proposes two possible explanations of the identity of the Nahash mentioned in 2 Sam 17:25. The first possibility is that Nahash is to be identified as the king of the Ammonites (1 Sam 11:1), in which case his daughters—Abigail and Zeruiah—would be Ammonite princesses. The second possibility is that Nahash is an Israelite. If this is the case, then his daughters would be Israelites—albeit with an ancestor (step-ancestor, as noted below) whose name would be similar to their natural father’s name, i.e., Nahshon (Num 1:7; 2:3; 7:12, 17; 10:14). As 1 Chr 2:10 notes, this Nahshon was נַחְשׁוֹן of Judah (נַהֲשׁוֹן הָעַבְרֵי יהודה)—literally, "prince of the sons of Judah," NRSV). The genealogy of 1 Chr 2:9-14 thus places Jesse and David's family in an important clan within Judah. Furthermore, 1 Chr 2:16 identifies Abigail and Zeruiah as sisters of David and his brothers. Since they are not directly identified as Jesse’s daughters, it is possible that they were his stepdaughters. This suggestion is supported by Keil (Keil and Delitzsch 1982b: 434), although his suggestion that "Abigail and Zeruiah were only step-sisters of David, i.e. daughters of his mother by Nahash and not by Jesse" should likely be emended to read "half-sisters" of David, given his explanation that they have the same mother. I would concur that Abigail and Zeruiah are daughters of Nahash; whether David in fact is their halfbrother (rather than stepbrother as I prefer)—a child of Nahash's widow and Abigail and Zeruiah's mother—is questionable and dubious.

McCarter’s comments on 2 Sam 17:25 and the identity of Nahash are also instructive.
Figure 2. Ammonite/Israelite interrelations of the 11th-10th centuries BC. This diagram provides a suggested outline of possible familial connections and other relationships.
This [designation of Abigail as a daughter of Nahash] is an apparent error, but there is no reliable textual witness to contradict it. As Zeruiah's sister, Abigail was Jesse's daughter (cf 1 Chron 2:16). A number of Greek MSS, including LXXLMN, actually read iessai, 'Jesse,' in place of naas, 'Nahash,' here; but this is a result of secondary correction. It is quite possible that bt nhš, 'daughter of Nahash,' arose from a misplaced duplicate of bn nhš, 'son of Nahash,' in v. 27 below (Wellhausen). The text as it stands makes sense only if Nahash is the mother of Abigail and Zeruiah, which is improbable (Wellhausen), or if Nahash is the name of an earlier, deceased husband of Jesse's wife (Hertzberg). (1984: 392)

Although McCarter later asserts that "Abigail's patronymic may be a scrap of textual flotsam" (1984: 394), I call attention to his first sentence quoted above claiming that "there is no reliable textual witness to contradict" the claim that Abigail is Nahash's daughter. He further admits that the LXX reading which seeks to resolve the identity issue by referencing Jesse as Abigail's father is "a result of secondary correction." Although Levenson and Halpern (1980: 511) argue that Nahash in 2 Sam 17:25 is "at least a dittography from 2 Sam 17:27"—an argument that agrees with McCarter's suggestion (which he attributes to Wellhausen) that Nahash is a "misplaced duplicate"—this explanation seems unnecessary, particularly given McCarter's argument regarding the secondary nature of the other alternative suggestion which substitutes Jesse in place of Nahash.

I agree that "the text as it now stands makes sense only if Nahash is . . . the name of an earlier, deceased husband of Jesse's wife" (McCarter 1984: 392). This is the basis for the first possibility proposed in Figure 2, i.e. that Jesse married Nahash's widow after the latter's death.


Nahash and Abigail

The point must still be addressed, however, whether the Nahash identified as Abigail’s father is in fact the Ammonite king. Or put another way, might we expect that the widow of an Ammonite king would marry an Ephrathite, Jesse, from Bethlehem in Judah? Although direct textual evidence in support of this view is lacking, the following factors support this view.

1. As noted above, Jesse’s family was descended from Nahshon—נַחְשׁוֹן of Judah (נַחְשׁוֹן בֶּן נֵחָשׁוֹן). Since the monarchy in Israel would not yet have established much of a dynasty, claiming descent through this line would likely place Jesse in a favorable social class—one which might welcome the arrival of a member of the Ammonite “royalty.” We should not allow modern notions of European royalty and accompanying class distinctions to color our understanding of the situation in a tribal social milieu of the early first millennium BC.

2. Judg 18:24 lists Chephar-ammoni as one of the towns in the tribal allotment of Benjamin. The allotment list for Benjamin is divided geographically into east and west sectors. Chephar-ammoni is in the eastern allotment, placing it in a position where cultural exchange with Transjordanian territory would be most accessible. As noted above by Boling, there evidently was a “rich social and cultural mix” in this territory. This position supports the possibility that cultural (and marital?) exchanges between other tribal groups may have occurred, including the one suggested here between Judah and Ammon.

3. Although the name Nahash (נָחַשׁ) is related linguistically to Nahshon (נַחְשׁוֹן)—an honorable name in the Judahite genealogy (2 Chr 2:10; Ruth 4:20), some scholars would argue that in the context of the Ammonite/Israelite conflict between Nahash and Saul (1 Sam 11 and 12:12) the term is a pejorative term which Israelite parents would not choose to give to their child. Herr makes this argument, suggesting that “the name must be an Israelite caricature: it means ‘snake’” (1993b: 28). In
response to a letter to the editor of *BAR* (1994: 16, 18, 20), Herr expands his earlier view, citing support from grammarians whose consensus he claims is that "the name derives from the root meaning 'snake' (as opposed to the derived roots meaning 'divination' and 'copper')." Herr continues with the following assertion.

I cannot think of other ancient people who carried names with the word for "serpent" in them. Certainly, there are none among the approximately 200 other Ammonite names we know. I don't think well-meaning parents would have given a child a name like that. (Herr 1994:20)

If Nahash is an epithet used by the writers of the Hebrew Bible, then we should not be surprised if no evidence is found from Ammonite sources corroborating the existence of a king named Nahash. However, based on the contemporary examples of Saul's two sons Ish-bosheth and Mephi-bosheth (names meaning "man of shame" and "from the mouth of shame," respectively) we see that biblical chroniclers adopted a practice of coining names which Israelite parents would not give their children.

This fact lends credence to the assumption that Nahash, the father of Abigail and Zeruiah in 2 Sam 17:25, was likely an Ammonite. Otherwise, why would the Bible writers have given such a derogatory epithet to an Israelite? It makes more sense that such a name would have been reserved for a foreigner—and particularly a king of an opposing power with a record of aggression and cruelty, specifically directed toward the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead whose right eyes he threatened to gouge out (cf. 1 Sam 10:27b in 4QSam*)? As Kirkpatrick observes,

The savage character of the Ammonites is attested by Am i.12 ff. The loss of the right eye was intended to disable them for war, the left eye being covered by the shield, as the amputation of a man's thumbs and great toes (Judg. i. 7,8) was designed to incapacitate him for the use of the bow and destroy his swiftness of foot. (1930: 84)

4. The text of 2 Sam 17:25, as it stands, lists Nahash as Abigail's father. The only candidate for such a person by that name based on available evidence is the one found in the biblical text—the Ammonite king. Thus, although textual evidence is not conclusive in favor of this identification, neither does it preclude the explanation which identifies Nahash the father of Abigail and Zeruiah with Nahash the Ammonite king.
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Chronological Difficulties

There are, however, attendant difficulties with the above explanation which require further investigation.

1. If Nahash's widow married Jesse subsequent to her first husband's death, then when did this marriage take place? The biblical text (2 Sam 10:1, 2; 1 Chr 19:1, 2) mentions that when Nahash died, David was already king, and the conflict with Nahash's heir Hanun then occurred. However, if Nahash's widow married Jesse, satisfying the stipulation of 1 Chr 2:16,17 that Abigail and Zeruiah are David's sisters, this means that Nahash must have died early enough for this marriage to have taken place prior to David's ascension to the kingship.

How should the account of 1 Chr 2:16, 17 be reconciled with the account in 2 Sam 17:27? The first text lists Jesse's children—David's siblings, including Abigail and Zeruiah, daughters of Nahash—and thus assumes (according to my recounting of events) that Nahash has already died (or the reading of the text reflects later editing), and Jesse has taken his widow to be his wife? The second text states that Nahash is still alive during the time of Absalom's revolt, when his son Shobi renders aid at Mahanaim to loyalist troops late in David's reign.

One possible solution to this perplexity, admittedly without direct textual support, is to hypothesize another Nahash, possibly Nahash II. This possibility was already suggested by Kirkpatrick.

If he [Nahash of 2 Sam 10:2] was the king defeated by Saul at Jabesh (1 Sam xi), he must have had a long reign, for the events here recorded seem not to have taken place till David was firmly established as king of all Israel; but he may have been a son or a grandson of the Nahash of 1 Sam xi. (1930: 319) [emphasis supplied]

Josephus (Ant. 6.67) records that Nahash was killed in the battle with Saul. If true, then the existence of a second Nahash is required.

Zayadine and Thompson (1989: 175), in a reprint of their original 1973 BASOR article, list Nahash II in their list of Ammonite kings. Nahash II is not listed in
Zayadine and Thompson's original publication, and no mention is made of the rationale for adding this new Ammonite king. However, the evidence mentioned above shows the logic of such a suggestion.

If we assume the existence of a second Nahash, Hanun's mother (Nahash I's widow) would have become Jesse's wife and may have arbitrated between David and her son, smoothing the way for the friendship shown by her grandson Shobi to David (2 Sam 17:27). Thus, the Nahash whose death is reported in 2 Sam 10:2 would be Nahash I whose son Hanun succeeds him and yields to an anti-Israel faction. His brother, Shobi, on the other hand, appears to have been part of a pro-Israelite coalition.

2. A second chronological issue relates to Nahash's death and an event of kindness previously shown to David by Nahash. After Nahash's death, David contemplates reciprocating this kindness to Nahash's son Hanun. David recalls the previous expression of Nahash's אֵשֶׁד (hesed—covenantal loyalty) and determines to repay it. His resolution is recorded in 2 Sam 10:2. "I will deal loyally with Hanun son of Nahash, just as his father dealt loyally with me" (אֵשֶׁד אֵשֶׁד | עָשָׂה בָּהֵם בַּעֲבוֹדָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵינוּ).

McCarter (1984: 270) associates this act of kindness on the part of Nahash toward David with the events related to David's flight from Absalom. He remarks, "If this was the act of 'loyalty' (hesed) referred to here [10:2], as seems probable, it follows that Abishalom's rebellion, described in chaps. 13-20, was historically prior to the present events [i.e., Nahash's death, siege of Rabbah]" (1984: 270). If we accept this identification, then the order of the text must be restructured to accommodate this view. But is McCarter's claim regarding the timing of this act of אֵשֶׁד accurate? Is not the act of kindness shown during David's flight from Absalom actually provided by Shobi, Nahash's son?

If so, then another explanation of Nahash's act of אֵשֶׁד (hesed) seems equally plausible—identifying it with the support given David during his flight from Saul.
Such an act would be in harmony with Ammon's policy of neutralizing Israelite power. McCarter recognizes that such a relationship existed between Nahash and David without acknowledging that it is the act of הֵסֶד (hesed) which is mentioned in 2 Sam 10:2. McCarter notes, "In all probability, then, the relationship between Nahash and David goes back to the days before David became king of Israel" (1984: 274).

I suggest that it is precisely this display of הֵסֶד (hesed) which is referred to in 2 Sam 10:2 (see also Keil and Delitzsch 1982b: 374). When one assigns this act of הֵסֶד (hesed) to the time of Saul, and not to the time of Absalom, one removes the grounds for McCarter's claim that the author "may have been guilty of an anachronism."

McCarter's charge is based on his proposal that the prophetic writer sought out an historical account of the Ammonite and Aramean war in the royal archives—recorded in 2 Sam 10:1-19; 8:3-8; 11:1; and 12:25-31—and combined it with 11:2-12:24 as a "vehicle for his report of the Bathsheba-Uriah affair" (1984: 275).

Furthermore, McCarter asserts that the author mistakenly confused the chronological sequence of the siege of Rabbah, the Bathsheba affair, and Solomon's rebellion. As a consequence, the writer supposedly used the war chronicles of 2 Sam 10, combined with the Bathsheba/Nathan narrative, as a "kind of theological preface" to the account of Absalom's rebellion. McCarter's interpretation is that Absalom's revolt (2 Sam 10-13) actually occurred before the events of 2 Sam 10, a fact about which the author of 2 Samuel was unaware and for which he may be forgiven since he "was living long after the events" (1984: 275, 276).

However, if we assign Nahash's act of הֵסֶד (hesed) to the era when Nahash lent support to David's struggle against Saul, the charge of anachronistic use of sources no longer stands. If the act of הֵסֶד (hesed), which had already occurred in the sequence of 2 Sam 10:2, refers to the era of the house of Saul, then the account of Absalom's rebellion follows chronologically in the sequence of the text proceeding from chap. 10 on to chaps. 13-20.
One wonders whether the יִשְׁד (heşed) shown by Nahash to David (2 Sam 10:2) might be associated with the initial confrontation (following Saul’s death) at Mahanaim between David and his general, Joab, on the one side and Saul’s son Ish-bosheth (Ish-baal), supported by his uncle (Saul’s former general) Abner on the other side (2 Sam 2:8-10). Did Nahash, perhaps because he was from nearby Rabbah and because he had previously shown interest in the territory of Gilead, exert influence at Mahanaim which he used to undermine the rival monarchy of Ish-bosheth? The conclusion that he might have had such influence appears to be supported by the fact that David later retreats to Mahanaim again when he flees from the revolt led by his son Absalom, this time receiving assistance not from Nahash but from Shobi, his son (2 Sam 17).

Abigail and Zeruiah

Much of the discussion above deals with the identity of Nahash. However, his daughters Abigail and Zeruiah also feature prominently in the biblical narrative. If the interpretation above is correct (i.e., that Abigail and Zeruiah are daughters of Nahash the Ammonite king), then they would be Ammonite princesses. Is there anything which might indicate that such is the case?

We note that the sons of Zeruiah are commonly identified using their mother’s name (2 Sam 2:18—"the three sons of Zeruiah"). The closest the biblical text comes to identifying the father of Joab, Abishai, and Asahel is the disclosure that following his murder by Abner, Asahel is buried with his father in Bethlehem (2 Sam 2:32). This statement, however, only mentions geography and gives no hints of ethnicity. McCarter also calls attention to the fact that the father of Joab, Abishai, and Asahel is never mentioned.

The matronymic, however, is used with consistency—we never learn their father’s name—and this suggests that more might be involved than a narrative reminder of the link with David. . . . It is possible that Zeruiah’s marriage was of a special kind and that her husband was not a member of her household. . . . In such a case it would not seem unusual for the children to be called by the mother’s name, especially if she was a member of the royal family. (1984: 96)
The question which naturally arises from McCarter’s comment above is, “Which royal family?” Is it one described with a proleptic view into the future of the Davidic kingdom? Or one with a nascent allusion to an Ammonite royal heritage? I discuss these questions in more detail below.

Meanwhile, I want to point out that the relationship of Abigail (Zeruiah’s sister) with Ithra/Jether, the father of her son Amasa, also contains unusual nuances of meaning. The father of Abigail’s son Amasa is identified variously as Ithra, an Israelite (2 Sam 17:25 MT=ץורא הָיִשְׂרָאֵל; LXX=Ἰοθὸρ ὁ Ἰσραηλιτής), Jether, an Ishmaelite (1 Chr 2:17 MT=יוֹתֵר הָיִשְׂרָאֵל; 1 Chr 2:17 LXX=Ἰοθὸρ ὁ Ἰσμαηλιτής; 2 Sam 17:25 LXX=Ἰσμαηλιτής), or as a Jezreelite (יוֹרֵא הָיְזְרֵעָל or ὁ Ἰεζερηλιτής).

The Hebrew text describes the relationship of Abigail and Ithra in an extraordinary way. It says, מָאָסָה בְּרֵאשֵׁית נָשָׁמוּת הָיִשְׂרָאֵל אוֹשְׁר יְבָא אֵל: The NSRV translates this as “Amasa was the son of a man named Ithra the Ishmaelite, who had married Abigail daughter of Nahash, sister of Zeruiah, Joab’s mother.” This translation seems to miss the point of the phrase מָאָסָה בְּרֵאשֵׁית —literally “who had gone in to” her. Keil interprets this as a seductive act (Keil and Delitzsch 1982b: 433). Whether or not this is the case, we should note that nowhere is Abigail called Ithra’s wife.

McCarter suggests:

She (Abigail) is not called his wife here or in I Chron 2:17, and it is clear they were not married in the usual sense. Either Amasa was the illegitimate issue of a casual liaison or, more likely, he was the child of a special type of relationship comparable to the sadiqa marriage of the ancient Arabs, according to the terms of which the woman remained with her children in her parents’ home and received periodic visits from the man. (1984: 393)

It is possible, therefore, since the Ammonites preserve the tribal nature of their identity long after they developed as a "tribal state," that Nahash’s widow—after she becomes the wife of Jesse—might have arranged such a marriage as that described above for her daughters. In any case the marital situation of both Abigail and Zeruiah
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indicates that unusual circumstances surrounded their relationship with the fathers of their children.

**Abigail, Nabal, and David**

Levenson and Halpem (1980), in their study on *The Political Import of David's Marriages*, present an interesting case for identifying Ithra of 2 Sam 17:25 with Nabal (חָזֶף = "fool") of 1 Sam 25:3 and passim. The authors of this study present the theory that "marital politics played an essential role in David's climb to power" (1980: 507). Their argument is compelling enough to persuade McCarter to quote it several times in his discussion of 2 Sam 17, though he thinks that "it is unlikely that Ithra can be identified with Nabal, and this lessens the probability that the two Abigails were identical, though it remains possible" (1984: 393, 394). (See Figure 3.)

Levenson and Halpem's case is based on the following points:

1. There are only two times a woman named Abigail is mentioned in the Hebrew Bible—once as the wife of Nabal, a Calebite chieftain (and later wife of David), and once as David's stepsister, daughter of Nahash, and wife of Ithra. The authors put forth the following query. "What is the probability that the only two people of this name would be not only contemporaries but sisters-in-law?" (1980: 511). The authors thus argue that only one Abigail is meant, though they do not identify her as the daughter of the Ammonite king, a possibility I argue for above.

2. It is significant that David assumes the kingship in the "very capital of the Calebite patrimony, Hebron . . . , a process which his assumption of their [Calebites] late chieftain's lady would surely have facilitated, and probably necessitated" (1980: 509).

3. Nabal/Ithra is identified as a Jezreelite, referring "not to the Issacharian city (e.g., Hos 2:2), but to the Judean town about six miles southwest of Hebron" (1980: 512). Part of their argument hinges on the analysis of the various gentilic references
Figure 3. Royal marriages and their possible intertribal implications. Political alliances of David and Solomon resulting from intermarriage with foreign women.
On the other hand, the difference between *hay-yišréêli* (2 Sam 17:25) and *hayyišméêri* (1 Chr 2:17) is serious. The term "Israelite" as a gentilic for an individual makes no sense at all. But where could it have come from, for a *mêm* could never have been easily mistaken for a *rêsh*, nor should an ‘*ayin* have dropped out. The most economical resolution is to read *hay-yižrêêri* (cf. 1 Kgs 21). Here, a simple combination of phonetic and audial lapse (the voicing of the sibilant *z* both being and sounding somewhat attenuated in normal articulation before the guttural *r*) could easily have produced the orthographic anomaly *yšrêly*; this in turn would be corrected secondarily either to *yšmêly*, "Ishmaelite" (*šîn* and *šîn* being indistinguishable) or to *yšrêly*, "Israelite," each correction involving one letter only. (1980: 512)

This argument identifies Ithra/Jether as an inhabitant of the same district in which Nabal resides and thus prompts the following assumption:

Abigail’s husband and Amasa’s father was a man from Calebite country. Now, either David’s sister (Abigail) and his wife (Abigail) each happened to have a husband from the same narrowly circumscribed territory—the one prominent enough indirectly to smooth David’s road into Hebron, the other to produce a principal, more, a survivor of Absalom’s revolt—or, as would seem less far-fetched, Ithra/Jether was the real name of the "Nabal" of 1 Samuel 25, first husband of David’s sister. (1980: 512)

Levenson and Halpem conclude their argument by making the point that David would marry his sister because "he hoped to extend his hegemony over all Judah through a diplomatic marriage with the daughter of a dominant Judean family, a woman in line of descent from Nahshon, nāšit of the House of Judah" (1980:512).

This point would be even more convincing if Abigail is identified not only with the House of Jesse (Judah) but also with her natural father, Nahash, the Ammonite king. Although Levenson and Halpem reject such an identification, I have argued above for its plausibility, for just such an identification is in harmony with David’s monarchical strategy, as presented below.
David and Ahinoam

Levenson and Halpern provide another probing analysis worth noting. They propose that Ahinoam, David’s wife, is actually to be identified with Ahinoam, Saul’s only known wife and mother of Jonathan. David’s marriage to Ahinoam actually precedes the marriage to Abigail, they claim, and serves as additional evidence of the political importance of David’s marriages. The authors further buttress their argument with several salient points.

As in the case with Abigail, there are only two women to bear the name Ahinoam in the Hebrew Bible: (1) Ahinoam of Jezreel (1 Sam 27:3—אֲחִינֹ֖אָם הַיְזֶרֶ֣אלִּיַת), David’s wife, and (2) Ahinoam daughter of Ahimaaz (1 Sam 14:50—אֲחוֹנֹ֖אָם בַּתָּאֵֽי־אֹהִ֖יַ֖אָז), Saul’s only known wife. The two women are contemporaries.

Identifying these two women as the same person helps to explain several problematic texts. The first of these includes Nathan’s pointed rebuke of David following the affair with Bathsheba.

2 Sam 12:7,8

BHS

כְּהַאֲמַר יְהוֹה אֲליָה יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶבֶן מְשַׁחְתּוּךְ
לֹא־לְךָ עַל־יְשֵׂרָאֵל הָגְוָכִי יָבַקִיתֵךְ מִנֶּאֶם
נַעֲמָה לְךָ אֲיִשָּׁה בְּאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל יַרְדֵּכּ
בְּתוֹחַ לְתֹאֲשֵׁהּ לִשְׁכִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל יַרְדֵּכּ
אֶפְרָיָים לְעֵמדּוּ לְךָ כֻּלּוֹ כָּכְבֵּהּ הָעַמּוֹן

NRSV

Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel: I anointed you king over Israel, and I rescued you from the hand of Saul; I gave you your master’s house, and your master’s wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have added as much more.

The editors of the Harper Collins Study Bible make the following point commenting on 2 Sam 12:8.

Errors in transmission of this verse have obscured its main point. Instead of your master’s house [בֵּית אֲלֵיוֹן], we should read "your master’s daughter [בֵּית אֲרִיקָה]," the reference here being to Michal (see 3.13-16). The phrase your master’s wives must refer to Saul’s wives, and entry into a king’s harem was a way of claiming his throne (see 16:21-22). We have no direct report that David took any of Saul’s wives; but the Talmud (Sanhedrin 18a) and a few modern scholars have speculated that David’s wife Ahinoam, the mother of Amnon (see 3.2; 1
Sam 25.43), was the same as Saul's wife, Ahinoam daughter of Ahimaaz (1 Sam 14.50). Rather than *the house of Israel and of Judah*, the Lord says he gave David "the daughters of Israel and Judah"; the point being made is that David was given as many women as he could possibly want, but like the rich man in the parable, he wantonly took something that belonged to someone who had been less generously treated. (Society of Biblical Literature 1993: 484, notes) [emphasis and brackets supplied]

Nathan's pointed words to David make sense in light of David's acquisition of Saul's wife. However, the supporting reference from the Talmud needs to be qualified, for it cites David's act of taking Saul's widow as his wife *after his death*, not while Saul is still alive as noted above. Levenson and Halpem's statement below is also significant.

If the reference [*יהָנָא תְּשֵׁנָה*] were to Michal, one would expect "daughter [*תָּנָא*]" (sg.) for "wives [*תַּנְאָה*]" (pl.) in 12:8. Note, incidentally, that the word translated as "master's" in v. 8 (*דָּוִד הָאִישׁ* [*יהָנָא תְּשֵׁנָה*]) is grammatically plural and may well be semantically so as well—an allusion to both *Nabal* and *Saul*. (1980: 514) [emphasis and brackets supplied]

David's alliance with Saul's wife also helps explain the rivalry between Amnon, the son of Saul's former wife Ahinoam, and his halfbrother Absalom, son of Maacah, daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur (2 Sam 3:3). These two sons of David would each have a heritage attached to territories which were natural geo-political enemies—Israel and Geshur.

We also understand better why Absalom chooses Hebron as the city from which to initiate his mutinous plan when he instigates his rebellion (2 Sam 15:7-10), and why he appoints Amasa, son of Abigail and Ithra/Nabal, commander of his troops (2 Sam 17:25). Absalom's ploy may even have included an enticing promise to Amasa of restoring to him his father's status and land in the district of Hebron.

A second text (1 Sam 20:30), which is illuminated by this analysis of Ahinoam's identity, relates to Saul's remark, made in anger (*יהָה יָעַבְרָה דָּוִיד*), to his son Jonathan.
Levenson and Halpern conclude that this reference to Jonathan’s mother’s nudity (ךַרְכֶּרֶה = nakedness, bareness, pudenda) refers to David’s theft of Saul’s wife, even going so far as to suggest that it is “justifiable to stipulate Ahinoam as the culprit” in initiating the situation (1980: 515). This relation between Jonathan’s mother and David also helps explain his favor in David’s eyes, since Jonathan now had a mediator in the form of his mother. And as Levenson and Halpern conclude,

In all, the idea that David’s wife was first Saul’s wife has much to commend it. . . . It brings together a number of texts and incidents formerly in part obscure. And it provides a precedent, or at least a counterpart, for the story of Abigail’s elopement. (1980: 515)

The point I want to stress here is that David’s alliance with Ahinoam occurred prior to his marriage to Abigail (Levenson 1978) and begins a pattern of royal expediency in the marriage arrangements which follow. This pattern, in turn, strengthens the argument that David’s marriage to Abigail likely represents not only a consolidation of a power base in Hebron, the ancestral home of Caleb, but also represents an alliance with the house of Nahash, the Ammonite king.

Figure 3 (p. 74) focuses attention on the fact that David’s marriages all appear to provide some form of political advantage—Michal (Saul’s daughter) and Ahinoam (Saul’s wife, based on the analysis above) procure support in Israel to the north; Abigail consolidates David’s constituency in Hebron to the south and likely lays claim to support in Ammon to the east (based on my identification of her father with Nahash, king of Ammon); and Maacah symbolizes David’s design to extend his realm east of the Jordan to Geshur.
In light of this background, Nathan's rebuke of David is most interesting. David is not reprimanded for his other marriage alliances. However, when it comes to the affair with Bathsheba, his guilt in the murder of Uriah the Hittite is resolutely condemned.

Solomon and Naamah (Daughter of Hanun) and Their Son Rehoboam

Relations between Ammon and Israel vacillate. Hostilities between Nahash and Saul are the catalyst which initiates the monarchical aspirations of the Israelites (1 Sam 12:12). Nahash and David, on the other hand, seem to have developed a relationship marked by hesed—covenantal loyalty. Following Nahash's death, hostilities redevelop between Hanun and David.

However, when Solomon assumes the kingship, things change. He follows the example of David and uses marriage alliances to enhance his territorial ambitions. Pharaoh's daughter becomes his wife (1 Kgs 9:16). Ammonite women are among his concubines (1 Kgs 11:1), and Naamah, an Ammonite princess, bears his son Rehoboam who will succeed him on the throne (1 Kgs 14:21).

Evidently Solomon's courtesans did have an effect on him for he "built a high place for . . . Molech [Milkom] the abomination of the Ammonites, on the mountain east of Jerusalem. . . . He did the same for all his foreign wives, who offered incense and sacrificed to their gods" (1 Kgs 11:7, 8). These high places persisted down to the time of Josiah. Note the following interesting suggestion regarding the use of these religious facilities and the implication for relations between Israel/Judah and other nations including the Transjordanian tribal states.

From the fact that these places of sacrifice still existed even in the time of Josiah, notwithstanding the reforms of Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, and Hezekiah, which rooted out all public idolatry, at least in Jerusalem, Movers infers (Phöniz. ii. 3, p. 207), and that not without reason, that there was an essential difference between these sacred places and the other seats of Israelitish idolatry which were exterminated, namely, that in their national character they were also the places of worship for the foreigners settled in and near Jerusalem, e.g. the Sidonian, Ammonitish,
and Moabitish merchants, which were under the protection of treaties, since this is the only ground on which we can satisfactorily explain their undisturbed continuance at Jerusalem" (Keil 1983b: 171, 172; note 1).[emphasis supplied]

The biblical record is explicit about the parentage of Rehoboam, Solomon’s successor. He is the son of an Ammonitess—Naamah, daughter of Hanun, the Ammonite king. Thus, Rehoboam’s two grandfathers, David and Hanun, once archenemies, now have their descendants united by a royal marriage. This alliance, however, is short-lived.

Ninth-Eighth-Century Ammonite/Israelite Relations

During the reign of Jehoshaphat, Rehoboam’s great-grandson, Ammonites in alliance with Moabites and Edomites invade Judah (2 Chr 20:1-30). There also appears to be an Ammonite/Moabite connection to the assassination of Joash, king of Judah (2 Kgs 12:21). The parallel passage in 2 Chr 24:26 identifies two of the conspirators as Zabad (Jozabad in 2 Kings) and Jehozabad. The chronicler makes a point of identifying [Jo]Zabad’s mother as Shimeath, an Ammonite, and Jehozabad’s mother as Shimrith, a Moabite. Possibly, Ammonite and Moabite foreign strategy may have included influence peddling and/or infiltration of Judah’s royal household.

In the early eighth century BC, the biblical account records that the Ammonites brought tribute (2 Chr 26:8) to the Judean king Uzziah (Azariah). Again, during the reign of Jotham in the middle of the eighth century BC, an unnamed Ammonite king is defeated by Judean forces. The Ammonites are forced to pay heavy tribute for three successive years (2 Chr 27:5).

Ammonite References and Their Thematic Emphasis

We have noted above that during the reign of David the term "hezad"—covenant loyalty—frequently is used when recording Ammonite and Israelite relations. The related concept of tribal/kindred loyalty is also evident in other Ammonite passages as well.
Tribal/Kindred Loyalty

Note for example the instruction in Deut 2:19. "When you come to the Ammonites, do not harass them or provoke them to war, for I will not give you possession of any land belonging to the Ammonites. I have given it as a possession to the descendants of Lot." Likewise, vs. 37 narrates how this command was carried out.

Similarly, the ban on Ammonite descendants entering the Israelite assembly (Deut 23:4; Eng. = 23:3) for ten generations is covenant-based. The reason given for the ban is the refusal to offer provisions of food and water, essential elements which peoples related by a covenant and/or kindred relationship are bound to honor, particularly in a tribal society.

This loyalty issue is included in the teaching of the Torah. The last book of the Hebrew canon also ties the concept of loyalty together with another concept—the centrality of the temple in Hebrew worship.

Honor for Yahweh’s Temple

The context presented by the chronicler in 2 Chr 20:6-12 places the concept of a temple built as a sanctuary for Yahweh’s name in close juxtaposition with the immanent invasion from the allied forces of Ammon, Edom, and Moab—nations which Israel earlier had been specifically commanded to refrain from attacking. Furthermore, the prophets indict Ammon, Edom, and Moab particularly for their complicity and euphoric attitude when the temple in Jerusalem is destroyed by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar (Ezek 25:2).

The LXX amplifies this account in the supplementary verses following 2 Chr 36:5. 1 Macc 5:6, 7 also recounts Timothy’s role as the leader of a strong Ammonite band and how he incites the Ammonites to join the fray after the Babylonian destruction of the altar in Jerusalem.
After the Babylonian exile, Ammonite opposition to the rebuilding of the temple continues, inspired by Tobiah, the Ammonite (Neh 2:10,19; 4:3).

Likely, it is the combination of the above two thematic considerations—disregard for kindred obligations and tribal allegiance and exhilaration at the defeat not only of Judah but at the destruction of the temple, symbol of Yahweh’s presence—that accounts for the strident denunciation which Ammon, along with its Transjordanian neighbors, receives in the prophetic literature of the Hebrew Bible.
CHAPTER 4
ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND
FOR SELECTED AMMONITE REFERENCES

The Ammonite tribal-state flourished during the Iron Age and reached its zenith during the late Iron II period (Landes 1956a: 267; Herr 1997c: 168; Younker 1994a: 307-312). The approach adopted in this chapter portraying the archaeological setting of selected Ammonite passages in the Hebrew Bible is a comprehensive one rather than an exhaustive one; i.e. an approach that concentrates on the data uncovered by archaeological excavation and topographical research. These data yield information pertinent to specific items (sites, persons, or events) in the biblical text. The focus of this dissertation does not allow me to fully discuss all aspects of Ammonite material culture or survey all Ammonite sites.

Ammon in Its Geographical Setting

The Levant and Palestine

The Ammonite tribal state developed in the geographical area known as the Levant—literally, the rising (of the sun)—an area which refers to the countries located on or near the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea (see Figure 4). Viewed from the opposite perspective, the territory of ancient Ammon was at the western end of the Fertile Crescent. This strip of arable land—called fertile in contrast to the desert and mountainous areas nearby—stretches north from the Egyptian border up along the Mediterranean coast through the mountainous districts of Lebanon and Syria to the upper Euphrates River. Then it turns southeast and follows the Euphrates and Tigris to the Persian Gulf.
A. Map of the Fertile Crescent.

B. Palestine at the center of land and sea trade routes.
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The western portion of the Fertile Crescent is subdivided by Baly (1974: 9-14) into four geographical realms: (1) the Northern Realm—Syria; (2) the Syro-Phoenician Realm—Syria and Lebanon; (3) the Palestinian Realm—Palestine; and (4) the Realm of the Southland—the Negev and Edom.

Furthermore, the Levant is commonly divided into four parallel north-south zones. Listed from west to east they are: (1) the Coastal Plain; (2) the Western Highlands; (3) the Central Rift Valley; and (4) the Eastern Plateau (Baly 1974: 7, 8; Houston 1980: 1140).

Palestine—one of the Levantine west-east realms and the term commonly associated with the biblical promised land—therefore includes sections of the four north-south zones of the western Levant which lie between the Lebanese border in the north and the southern end of the Dead Sea on the south. The name Palestine is derived from the word for the Philistines (פְּלִיסיִים in the Hebrew Bible), one of the important ethnic groups which migrated from the Aegean to the Levant at the end of the Bronze Age. First used by Herodotus (Houston 1980: 1131), the term originally applied to the area occupied specifically by the Philistines. Later, it is used to refer to areas on both sides of the Great Rift Valley through which the Jordan River flows—the western side known as Cisjordan and the eastern side as Transjordan.

Transjordan

At times the Hebrew Bible adds the clarifying phrase מִקְוֵה הַבְּרָרִים (literally "toward the dawning of the sun") to the term translated as Transjordan. An example of this is found in Moses’s designation of three cities of refuge on the east side of Jordan (cf. Deut 4:41).
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Then Moses set apart on the east side of the Jordan three cities...
The Hebrew Bible also uses the term "Transjordan" occasionally (cf. Deut 3:25) in a non-technical/geographic sense to refer to "western Palestine." In such instances, the Hebrew term (ךְָּבֶ֣רֶם הָנֵֽלְגֶּתָּד), as in English, merely means "across the Jordan" and must be interpreted based on the vantage point and orientation of the person using the term.

There are times, however, when the biblical equivalent of "Transjordan" is used when the speaker himself is located on the east side of the Jordan. Notice the interesting example in Num 32:19.

**BHS**

כ לא נבחל אוּמָּה מֵעַבָּד Lebens: We will not inherit with them on the other side of the Jordan and beyond, because our inheritance has come to us on this side of the Jordan to the east.

**NRSV**

We will not inherit with them on the other side of the Jordan and beyond, because our inheritance has come to us on this side of the Jordan to the east.

Here the same term (ךְָּבֶ֣רֶם הָנֵֽלְגֶּתָּד) is used for both Cisjordan and Transjordan, the latter being qualified by the use of יִֽמְרָֽהוּ ("direction of dawn"), while the former is preceeded by the preposition יִֽלְּכַֽדְבא signifying "in relation to."

**Geographical Divisions of Transjordan**

The high plateau of Transjordan (900+ m. above sea level) can be further divided into three sections: (1) the Northern Transjordanian Plateau—between the Yarmuk River and the Wadi Zarqa; (2) the Central Transjordanian Plateau—between the Wadi Zarqa and the Wadi Mujib; and (3) the Southern Transjordanian Plateau—between the Wadi Mujib and the Wadi Zered.

The term *el Belqa*—a more comprehensive term than Central Transjordanian Plateau—refers not only to the highland steppes east of the Great Rift Valley, but also encompasses the area down the steep scarp of the western slopes of Gilead to the bank of the Jordan River and extends to the desert on the east.

The land which the Ammonites occupied during the Iron Age was generally localized in the northern part of the *Belqa*, i.e., a section of the Eastern Plateau Zone within the Palestinian Realm.
Strategic Nature of Ammonite Territory

The territory of ancient Ammon occupied a key location in the area of Syro-Palestine, the land bridge with strategic routes linking Anatolia with Saudia Arabia and the Nile Delta with Mesopotamia (Beitzel 1992). This strategic location was a key factor in determining the destiny of the Ammonite tribal-state. Being located on a vital commercial and military route had great advantages when the state was in a dominant position. It also made it vulnerable to encroachment from other states or desert tribes aspiring to gain advantages for themselves (Baly 1974: 227). Thus, the territory of Ammon was susceptible to expansion and contraction during the ebb and flow of internecine warfare which characterized much of the Iron Age. (See Figures 5, 6, 7.)

The Ammonite Borders

*The northern, western and eastern borders of Ammon*

Precisely identifying the northern and particularly the western border of ancient Ammon is a controversial issue. Just where to draw the border line between the territory of Gad and the territory of Ammon depends on the answers one gives to several complex questions. How are the biblical references to the Jabbok River to be understood? What archaeological indications are there of Ammonite presence near this border area? (Discussion of archaeological evidence follows the individual sites mentioned below.) Interpretations proposed by scholars vary. Some scholars such as Kletter (1991) subscribe to a *minimalist* view, restricting Ammon to an area demarcated by a line of fortresses guarding the northwestern perimeter of Ammonite territory. Others such as Kallai (1986: 297, 298), Oded (1971: 853), Simons (1947b: 89, passim), and Younker (1994a: 296, 297; 1994b: 59-63) are willing to propose a *maximalist* view which extends Ammonite control farther to the west (see discussion below). Merling (1996 and personal communication), sees the borders of Gad (and by implication, the borders of Ammon) as promissory and fluid.
Estimation of the geopolitics of Iron IIA Palestine based on archaeological material culture, historical and other texts, and historical projections inferred from the previous and subsequent geopolitical picture. Borders were probably relatively fluid, never fixed for longer than a few years, and we must illustrate them with degrees of uncertainty. The ambiguities represented here reflect two potential ancient processes:

1) the geopolitical ambitions of neighboring “national” groups as they claimed land as their own; and

2) the change of territorial holdings during the period, that is, two or more groups may have held part of the territory at limited times—as well as our uncertainty based on material culture and/or texts.

Figure 5. Map of Iron Age IIA Palestine. Adapted from Biblical Archaeologist 60:3 (1997): 130. Used by permission of Near Eastern Archaeologist.
Figure 6. Map of Iron Age IIB Palestine. Adapted from Biblical Archaeologist 60:3 (1997): 133. Used by permission of Near Eastern Archaeologist.
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Figure 7. Map of Iron Age IIC Palestine. Adapted from *Biblical Archaeologist* 60:3 (1997): 165. Used by permission of *Near Eastern Archaeologist*.
The northern border is accepted by most scholars as being defined by the east-west stretch of the lower Wadi Zarqa—except for brief excursions by Ammon north of the Jabbok (e.g., Judg 10:17; 11:1 passim). Herr (1997c: 170) also suggests that in Iron II, during the waning of the Aramean state in the north, the Ammonites may have extended their territory north above the east-west stretch of the Zarqa into the northern half of Gilead.

Biblical geographers generally agree on the location of the eastern border of Ammon. Though indefinite and ill-defined, this border is generally acknowledged to parallel the line which demarcates the narrow section of arable land east of the south-north stretch of the upper Wadi Zarqa from the desert region further to the east.

The western border of ancient Ammon is considerably more difficult to isolate. The biblical record identifies the core area of Ammonite control as bordering the Jabbok River. While Ammonite territory, therefore, seems to be tied in some way to the Wadi Zarqa, it is unclear just how that connection should be understood and which part(s) of the circuitous, meandering wadi the references describe. Josh 12:2 states that the territory of Sihon, King of Heshbon, reached "to the Jabbok River, which is the border of the Ammonites" (וֹרֶשׁ יַבְעוֹק הַנָּחַל בְּבֵית בִּבּוֹי אֲמֹם). Deut 2:37 refers to "the land of the Ammonites . . . the whole upper region of the Wadi Jabbok as well as the towns of the hill country" (אֲלָמָה בְּבִירוֹת אֲמֹם . . . כָּלִיָּה הַנַּחַל בְּבֵית בִּבּוֹי אֲמֹם).

Kallai (1986: 297, 298), Oded (1971: 853), and Younker (1994a: 296, 297; 1994b: 59-63) show that the relationship between Ammonite territory and the Jabbok River should not be defined only as that area adjacent to the south-north course of the Wadi Zarqa, which first flows east and then north from Amman before circling west and eventually entering the Jordan River. Ammonite territory—according to the view proposed by Kallai, Oded, and Younker—would also have extended to the area westward from Amman, including the tributary sources of the River Zarqa. (See Figure 8.)
Figure 8. Tributaries of the Wadi Zarqa and the Wadi Mujib. Wadi Zarqa is the modern name of the biblical Jabbok River. Wadi Mujib is the equivalent of the biblical Armon River.
The undulating, hilly area west and northwest of Amman serves as a catchment region, funneling rain runoff eastward through the wadi systems sloping toward Amman where the River Zarqa is traditionally perceived to have its source.

Younker identifies the source of the Wadi Zarqa not with the spring near the center of Amman, but with those tributaries extending into the wadis to the west. The course of the Jabbok would begin, therefore, near its upper tributary source in the vicinity of Dabûq in the Wadi Hannutiya, flowing from there in a southeasterly direction. Younker's data (1996: 88) are a bit confusing in that he locates the source northwest of Amman but lists the site as Umm es-Summaq, obviously a misreading since this site is actually southwest of Amman. Table 7 traces the subsequent course of the wadi system as follows, noting the changes in modern wadi names along the route:

TABLE 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tributaries West of Amman Feeding into the Wadi Zarqa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sequential List of Wadi Names in the Zarqa's Upper Course)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Tributary</th>
<th>Direction of Flow</th>
<th>Appox. Dist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Hannutiya</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>2 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Murba'at Musa</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Deir Ghubar</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi 'Abdun</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Younker (1996)

The Wadi 'Abdun flows due east where it is also fed by the spring traditionally identified as the source of the River Zarqa (Baly 1974: 226). Flowing on past the base of el-Qalah (the site of the modern Citadel and the location of ancient Rabbath
Ammon), the wadi again changes names to Wadi Ain Ghazal before eventually becoming the Wadi Zarqa. This upper course of the Wadi Zarqa flows northeast through the modern city of Zarqa, then assumes a northwesterly direction before beginning its western descent to the Jordan River in the Great Rift Valley—a descent from over 800 m above sea level to approximately 300 m below sea level, covering a distance of 100 km.

Younker's summary comment broadens the definition of what constitutes the Zarqa River.

Even though the upper reaches of this wadi [Wadi Zarqa] presently possess several different names, they are, geophysically, a single feature which ultimately drains into the Jordan River.

The various names the wadi assumes as it winds along are, of course, fairly recent (probably from the 19th century AD), having been acquired from the farmsteads or villages that currently stand adjacent to the various stretches. However, there is no evidence that this contemporary toponomic classification existed in antiquity. Indeed, it is not unlikely that the ancient Ammonites used a single name for both the principal wadi and its tributaries. (Younker 1994b: 61)

The above conclusion is based on a similar analysis of the sources of the Wadi Mujib to the south. Dearman gives the following explanation of the tributaries of the Arnon River.

Several difficult texts presuppose that the Arnon river included more than the main branch of the Wadi Mujib. Judges 11:26 makes reference to the cities on the "extensions" (‘Ṭ) of the Arnon, which is best understood as a reference including the several tributaries of the Wadi Mujib. Similarly, Num 21:14 has a reference to the Ṣūʾaḥa of the Arnon. 2 Sam 24:5, in an apparently confused reference (Wüst 1975: 142-44), describes Aro'er as on the right (i.e. south) side of the city in the midst of the river of Gad. That unnamed city is likely Dibon (cf. Dibon-Gad, Num 33:45) and it can only be in the midst of a river if the river under consideration is understood collectively as the main branch of the Wadi Mujib 3 km south of Dhiban and its main northern tributary (Wadi Heidan and Wadi Wala), ca. 6 km north of Dhiban. Difficulties with the notorious references to the "city in the midst of the river [Arnon]" [Wüst 1975: 133-44] would be lessened considerably if the river in question included not only the main branch of the Wadi Mujib but its main southern tributaries, the Wadi Balu'a and Wadi Lejjun. (1989b: 58)

Younker's maximalist argument (see above) for extending the source of the Jab-
my opinion, be further strengthened by pointing out the similarity of terminology used in the biblical text referring to both the Arnon River and the Jabbok River. References to both rivers utilize a formula which combines the expression יִבְס plus the name of a wadi system (and as shown above, its upper tributaries). Deut 2:37 uses the terminology לֶלֶת לְגוּם in reference to the Jabbok River. This is the same terminology Dearman quotes—לָלְכָה לְגוּם (Judg 11:26)—when making reference to the Arnon River. The same type of formulaic expression—לָלְכָה לְגוּם—is used with the Jordan River in Num 13:24.

Furthermore, since people with a nomadic lifestyle and world view would likely think in more concrete terms than do graphically overloaded and topographically literate westerners of today, the יִבְס ("sides/banks" or literally the "hands") of the Jabbok might figuratively have represented to ancient scribes the wadis and their tributaries reaching out to encompass an entire geographic region (particularly when the dual form יִבְס—"hands"—is used).

Kallai (1986: 298) identifies the western border of ancient Ammon with what he terms "the Ṣuwēlah Line." The site of Ṣuwēlah is located nearly equidistant between Dabūq to its south and Khirbet Abu Marhaf to its north. These sites are located near the sources of two independent tributary wadi systems—each of which flows in the opposite direction before eventually becoming part of the Wadi Zarqa. The one wadi system begins near Dabūq and flows first south through the Wadi Hannutiya, then west-to-east into the upper Zarqa near Amman. The other tributary system flows south-to-north beginning near Khirbet Abu Marhaf, flowing first through the Baq‘āh Valley and through Wadi Umm ed-Dananār before joining the Wadi Rumēmēn and finally emptying into the lower Zarqa.

The above explanation of the relationship between the Wadi Zarqa and the Ammonite border diminishes the gravity of a problem which has perplexed some scholars—the apparent limitation of the territory of Ammon to the narrow strip of land
east of the south-north course of the upper Zarqa. Baly, for one, has voiced his doubts about the feasibility of such a restricted Ammonite territory. "That they [Ammonites] normally remained obediently beyond the Jabbok eastward is clearly impossible, and they must have occupied the hills on both sides of Amman . . . their chief city" (Baly 1974: 221). See also de Vaux (1941) and Landes (1956a).

Thus, based on the preceding observations, we may conclude that the heartland of Ammonite territory would have roughly been encircled by the entire course of the River Zarqa. This territory included the area defined by the extended upper western tributaries of the biblical Jabbok.

The southern border of Ammon

The biblical record as well as the Mesha Inscription are somewhat equivocal about the southern border of Ammon. Likely, this is because the area in question—the Mishor of the southern Belqa’—was a region much sought after because of its fertile agricultural land and because controlling this area was a key factor in maintaining domination of the lucrative trade routes which traversed it. As a result of the value placed on the Mishor, adjacent tribes vied for its control on a recurring basis, more so than for other regions in Transjordan. Commenting on the contents of the Mesha Inscription, Dearman writes:

The northern border of Moab’s claim is nowhere defined. There is no certain mention of sites north of the land of Medeba. . . . They [sites north of Madaba] are not mentioned in the MI [Mesha Inscription] nor is there any reference to the Ammonites whose territorial claims would reach to this northern extension of the mishor. . . . The failure of the MI to deal with this territory more explicitly is at least a silent witness to the fact that there were rival claims to it. (1989a: 190)

As we have seen, textual data are inadequate to clearly define Ammon’s southern border. However, recent archaeological excavation has supplied evidence to help formulate an answer to the question of where the southern Ammonite border was located, at least during one stage of the Late Iron Age. As shown below, recent archaeological findings refute the earlier minimalist claims of those such as Hübner (1992: 141) who
would draw the Ammonite border north of Hesban, el-'Al, Khirbet Masuh, and Umm el-'Amed, and south of el-Yadude, Tell Jawa, and Sahab.

Excavations conducted during the summer of 1996 helped to define Ammon's southern border. The excavations at Tell Jalul and at Khirbat al-Mudayna helped to resolve key issues in the debate between the minimalist (Hübner 1992) and maximalist (Herr 1992b) positions regarding the southern boundary of Ammonite territory during the Late Iron Age.

In the third season of excavation at Jalul, located 5 km east of Madaba, the Madaba Plains Project team discovered two Ammonite inscriptions—one ostracon and one seal—with typical Ammonite onomastic features (Younker 1998). During the previous two seasons, typical Ammonite horse-and-rider figurines and other items in the Ammonite ceramic tradition were also found.

However, at Khirbat al-Mudayna 14 km south of Jalul in the Wadi Thamad, archaeologists from Wilfrid Laurier University discovered an ostracon clearly written in Moabite and containing the name of Chemosh, the Moabite deity, along with a pottery corpus unlike that found at Jalul (Herr 1997c: 169; Daviau 1997). These new discoveries not only help to validate our understanding of Ammon's southern border, they also bolster the case for identifying Hesban as an Ammonite site (contra arguments by Hübner 1992).

The previously excavated inscriptional (Cross 1975; Cross and Geraty 1994) and ceramic (Sauer 1994) evidence from Hesban Stratum 16 (Ray 1998: personal communication) led its excavators to identify that site as Ammonite during Iron IIC. Furthermore, now there is direct evidence that the Ammonite border extended even further south than Hesban. Herr summarizes the case.

I suggest that the border can be plotted on the northern rim of the Wadi Wala drainage of which the Wadi Thamad is a tributary, because Ammonite pottery was found at Kh. al-Hari approximately 11 km south of Jalul and 3.5 km north of Mudayna (personal observation thanks to Andrew Dearman). The conclusion that Hari and Jalul on the one hand and Mudayna on the other were contemporary is based on identical
Ammonite pottery forms found in great numbers at Jalul and Hari, but also (be it in very low frequencies) at Mudayna. (Herr 199c7: 169-170).

Problems in determining the fluctuating border of Ammon

Simons makes a case for distinguishing three periods during which the entire Belqa region was under unified control and successively passed from one power to another. He thus defines

three successive periods in the political history of Middle Transjordan: an Ammonite period, an Amorite period and an Israelite period. In all three periods the territory was a political unity, except for a certain participation of Moab from some date in the first period (the region adjoining the river Amron—Nm. xxi,26 and possibly also the 'arboth mo'ab) and an independent (Ammonite?) principality of Yazer during the second (hence to be conquered separately by the Israelites after their victory over Sihon: Nm. xxi,32). (1947b: 90)

His argument is based on an interpretation of the phrase "from the Arnon to the Jabbok" which limits the meaning of the Jabbok (when used as part of a boundary formula) to its lower east-west section. He goes so far as to state that the "'Yabboq' itself nowhere means anything else than its main east-to-west course" and that "the Old Testament has its own formula for referring to the valley of the Upper Yabboq and its adjoining territory: יְבֹק יְבֹק נֶגֶף (1947b: 101).

Simons's argument claims that

there is the undeniable fact that in the formula 'from Arnon unto Yabboq' the two rivers prima facie stand for two opposite and parallel frontiers, which means that, as 'Arnon' is a southern frontier, 'Yabboq' must be a northern one. . . . Add to this that the two parallel rivers constitute together a very workable, though not four-sided, definition of Sihon's kingdom, hardly less so than the three rivers of Judg. xi.13 which suggested to Flavius Josephus the idea of an island (Ant. iv, 5,2). On the contrary, the description of a territory as contained between an east-to-west river in the South (Arnon) and a south-to north river in the East (w. 'ammān) is as clumsy as it is inadequate. (Simons 1947b: 95)

Simons's conclusion is that the "Ammonite clauses" he identifies in several passages (Num 21:24; Deut 3:16; Josh 12:2; Josh 13:10; Deut 2:37, Judg 11:13) and their border information should be interpreted "not as referring to an actual Ammonite fron-
tier but to the former Ammonite territory (לֶוֶז) contained between the two parallel rivers Arnon and Yabboq" (1947b: 96).

Simons's views are instructive in pointing out the problematic nature of using the south-north section of the Zarqa River to determine the border of Ammonite territory. However, Simons is too rigid on insisting that the entire region between the Jabbok and the Arnon be controlled only by a single power at a time. This definition of territorial control fails to account for the fluidity of the Iron Age "tribal-state" systems (LaBianca and Younker 1995) which would allow for fluctuating borders within the area Simons seems to assign entirely to the control of a single chiefdom.

Evidence from passages in Isa 15–16 and Jer 48–49 also point to the possibility of a fluctuating border late in Iron II, indicating that control of Heshbon (at least its identity as perceived by the author of the Hebrew prophetic message) changed hands.

Simons explains that most exegetes, when attempting to reconcile any discrepancies about the description of the borders, do so in one of the following two ways. The first is by following the lead of Noth, who claims that the "Ammonite clauses" of the border passages are "late additions to texts which themselves do not go back beyond the VIth century B.C. The additions (Zusatze), therefore, belong to a period during which the territory between Arnon and Yabboq constituted a political unit, viz. the Persian province of Ammon." The second is by following the course chosen by de Vaux (influenced by Gleuck's "gap hypothesis") when he resolved boundary complications by regarding them as postérieur which reflect the limite idéal that was the result of posthumous, unhistoric extension of boundaries by the textual redactors (Noth and de Vaux, quoted in Simons 1947b: 91, 93-95).

Combining Younker's suggestion (that the collective tributaries of a wadi system be taken as a unit) with that of Simons (that the east-west section of the Zarqa be used as a boundary marker and that the south-north section of the Zarqa not be a primary factor in determining Ammonite boundaries), the need to adopt the views expressed by
Noth and de Vaux above may be reduced, since some of the textual difficulties would thereby be minimized.

**Ammonite Districts and Typography**

At its greatest extent, Ammonite territory would have included settlements in a number of topographical "districts." These include sites with Iron Age remains which have been identified in the regions included in Table 8. These districts roughly correspond to those listed by Domemann (1983: 6, 194 [fig. 1]).

**TABLE 8**

**List of Ammonite Topographical Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Identification</th>
<th>Biblical Terminology</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Ammonite heartland on the Transjordanian plateau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbah / Rabbath Ammon—capital of the Ammonites</td>
<td>דְבַּה / רַבָּת בָּנֵי שֵׁמַּונים</td>
<td>Deut 3:11; Josh 13:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baq'ah Valley and areas to the northwest and northeast of Rabbah</td>
<td>קֶלְיְיְרָה גַּת יִבְקָה</td>
<td>Deut 2:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The towns of the hill country southwest and southeast of Rabbah</td>
<td>קִרְיָה נְהָר</td>
<td>Deut 2:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The east bank of the Jordan River Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Josh 13:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>עֵפֶר הַנְּגָבָל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The area of the Madaba Plains</td>
<td>מָמֶרֶשׁ מִיזְבָּה</td>
<td>Josh 13:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The southern portion of Gilead</td>
<td>זָאֵז אֶרֶץ בָּנֵי שֵׁמַּונים</td>
<td>Josh 13:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ammonite Heartland

El Qala' / Amman Citadel
and vicinity

The core of the Ammonite heartland centered on its capital Rabbah, which was situated on a dog-leg-shaped hill with a commanding view of the surrounding wadi systems. It was easily defensible, being easily accessible only from the north. The site, just north of the Wadi Zarqa, was an important point along the international trade route of the King’s Highway because its abundant supply of water provided the important commodity needed to sustain camel caravan traffic.

At the site of Rujm el-Mekheizin northeast of Amman, a 12.2 x 12.25 m square building dating to the late Iron II (7th–6th cent. BC) guarded the corridor into Rabbah from the eastern desert (Thompson 1989b).

In the immediate vicinity of Rabbah (e.g., Rujm Malfuf North and South) and farther to the west (e.g., Khirbet Khilda East and West), a number of megalithic structures—some round towers known as malfuf ("cabbage"), others square or rectangular, and still others with a combination of the two types of structures—have been identified with Ammonite occupation. See Figure 9 for a panoramic view of the Amman Citadel and a view of Rujm Malfuf North.

Iron Age tombs were also found on or near the Citadel. Additional Iron Age tombs excavated in the surrounding district (e.g., Khilda, Meqablein, and Sahab to the west, south, and southeast respectively) also provide evidence of Ammonite occupation throughout the heartland in both Iron I and Iron II. See discussion below for fuller implications drawn from these finds.

The Baq‘ah Valley

In times of expansion, the area under Ammonite control would have extended to the Baq‘ah Valley northwest of Rabbah and to the Wadi ed-Dananir which exits the valley at its northwest corner. Khirbet Umm ed-Dananir is located on the southwest side.
A. Panoramic view of the Amman Citadel looking north from the Roman Theater.

B. Circular Ammonite tower adjacent to the Jordanian Department of Antiquities building.

Figure 9. View of Amman Citadel and Ammonite tower at Rujm Malfuf (North). Sources: Photos by James R. Fisher.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
of the wadi at this exit point. Tell Safut, overlooking the valley from its southeastern rim of hills which separated it from the Ammonite heartland, guarded the pass from the valley floor to the higher plateau. Within the perimeter of the valley itself, such sites as Khirbet Mudmar, Rujm el Hawi, and Rujm el-Henu (east and west) were strategically located on bedrock outcroppings to retain maximum use of agricultural land (McGovern 1986: 9).

*Cities of the Ammonite hill country—אררי יגיה*  

Between Amman and Hesban is an intervening range of undulating hills situated along a NE-SW axis. Baly (1974: 220 [map]) provides a good representation of this topographic feature. Since Tell el-'Umeiri and Tell Jawa South are both Ammonite sites and are also located in this hilly region, it is possible that the biblical reference to "the towns of the hill country"—אררי יגיה (Deut 2:37)—may refer to this range of hills southwest of Amman as well as to the hill country west and northwest of Amman bordering on southern Gilead. It is these latter hills which complete the arc connecting the wadi sources of the Jabbok (see above) on the western border of the Ammonite heartland with the lower east-west course of the Jabbok in the north before it descends to the Ghor and enters the Jordan River. Numerous sites, including many of the "Ammonite Tower-sites," are located atop ridges in this mountainous region.

**The Madaba Plains Region**  

Extending southward from Tell Jawa South and Tell el-'Umeiri and southeastward from Tell Hesban and Madaba is the tableland known as the Madaba Plain, a region referred to in the Hebrew Bible as the *Mishor* (מישור). Dearman (1989b: 58) provides a useful summary of biblical terminology used with reference to this general region which stretches from the hill country of Ammon south to the Wadi Mujib (biblical Armon). The dominant site in the region is Tell Jalul, now
shown to have an Iron II Ammonite presence based on the discovery of an Ammonite seal (Younker, in press).

Dearman’s classification of divisions in the Belqa region is listed in summary form in Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

*Biblical Geographic Terminology Used in Reference to the Central Jordanian Plateau*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mishor</td>
<td>מִשְׁור</td>
<td>The Moabite plateau itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboth Moab</td>
<td>עֲרֹבָת מָאוָב</td>
<td>Plains of Moab in the Jordan Valley (across from Jericho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeshimon</td>
<td>יְשֶׁם</td>
<td>&quot;Jeshimon&quot; - same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabim</td>
<td>עֲרָבִים</td>
<td>Mountains of Abarim (mountains and slopes which separate plains of Moab from the NW section of the <em>mishor</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midbar</td>
<td>מִדָּר</td>
<td>Ill-defined steppe areas of the eastern <em>mishor</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahal Arnon</td>
<td>נָהַל אָרְנוֹן</td>
<td>Wadi Mujib—the gorge of the river south of Aro'er</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Dearman 1989b: 58.

Josh 13:9 refers to the area between Madaba and the Wadi Mujib (biblical Arnon) in the following way: יָמָה מְֱעֶשֶׁר פִּיקְדֶה תְּרוּדֵי וֵינָל. Compare the LXX which reads, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Μισώρ ἀπὸ Μαδαβὰ ἕως Δαιβὰν—inserting the preposition ἀπὸ between Madaba and Mishor. This view is adopted by the translators of the NRSV who render the Hebrew phrase יָמָה מְֱעֶשֶׁר פִּיקְדֶה as "and all the tableland from Medeba as far as Dibon."
It is important to realize the strategic location of the Madaba Plains region. Hesban, along with Tell el-Umeiri and Tell Jawa (south), were located on elevated sites which provided a vantage point from which to guard the routes (western, central and eastern, respectively) used when approaching the Ammonite capital from the south. Each of these sites was also situated on the edge of the tableland which had strategic importance both agriculturally and militarily.

Note that the importance of the Mishor was due to at least three factors: (1) The value of the land as a rich agricultural and grazing resource and the strategic view which sites such as Hesban, Jalul, and Jawa (south) commanded over the landscape which provided for its protection; (2) proximity to the trade routes of the King’s Highway and the connecting route from Hesban to Cisjordan; and (3) the topographic nature of the flat plain—Mishor literally means the level place—which became a matter of vital importance with the introduction into the region of military tactics utilizing chariots and cavalry. See for instance 2 Sam 10 where the mercenaries hired to assist the Ammonites chose the Madaba Plain for their point of mobilization. Landes’s suggestion of an Assyro-Ammonite cavalry based on the discovery of horse-and-rider figurines is also worthy of note (1961: 80; see also Hadidi 1992: 190).

Due to the importance thus attached to the Madaba Plains, it would be natural to expect frequent disputes between rival people groups struggling for control of this region in antiquity. According to the biblical record, this in fact appears to have been the case. Amman, Moab, and the Cisjordan states of Israel and Judah—as well as their Transjordanian tribes of Gad and Reuben—all appear to have either occupied or exerted political control over this region in the Iron Age.

For a discussion of the previous contention over this area, see Vyhmeister (1989: 7-9) and Geraty and Running (1989: 61, Appendix A, "Heshbon Through the Centuries").
It is debatable whether the statement in Josh 13:25 assigning to the tribe of Gad an inheritance which included "half the land of the Ammonites" (תְּפִלְיָא אָרָיִם בְּיִסְרָא), may be understood to include the Madaba Plain region—a region which Keil understands as "that portion of the land of the Ammonites which . . . had already been taken from the Ammonites by the Amorites under Sihon" [cf. Judg. xi.13sqq.] (Keil and Delitzsch 1981a: 297)—or whether it should be limited only to the area of southern Gilead.

The Jordan River Valley

When Ammonite influence was strong, their territory extended down to the Jordan Valley and, at times, even across it. Judg 3:12-14 cites an occasion when Ammonites, in league with Amalekites and Moabites, united under the leadership of Eglon, King of Moab, and "defeated Israel" (יִבְשָׂא יִשְׂרָאֵל), and "took possession of the city of palms" (יַעֲרֵ֥שׁ אֲבָדִ֖י לְהָרָ֣קִים; i.e., Jericho).

Again in Judg 10:9, the Ammonites cross the Jordan to fight against Judah, Benjamin, and the house of Ephraim. This incursion into Cisjordan seems to have been only a raid. However, see the discussion below on Cephar-ammoni for the possibility of a more permanent influence resulting from this occurrence.

Excavations in the east Jordan Valley reveal an Ammonite presence during Late Iron II at sites such as Tell es-Sa‘idieh, Tell el-Mazar, Tell Deir ‘alla, and Tell Nimrin. In general, however, when comparing the Jordan Valley with the Jordanian plateau, Ji’s remarks are pertinent:

The eastern Jordan Valley proves to have been a cultural, political, and geographical entity during LBII and Iron I that cannot be treated as a single unit with the Transjordan plateau. If we take into consideration the Egyptian rule over the Jordan Valley and the Ammonite and Israelite presence in the Transjordan plateau, differences between these two regions are even more understandable. Present knowledge, however, shows that during Iron II the eastern Jordan Valley and the Transjordan plateau may be treated as a single entity subject to the Ammonites and their cultural influence. This seems to be the case particularly late in Iron IIB and Iron IIC. (Ji 1997: 34)
What was the Jordan River Valley like in antiquity? Certainly nothing like it is today after decades of irrigation projects which divert the flow of the Jordan and deplete the supply of water reaching the Dead Sea. However, if conditions in the previous century are any indication, then the Jordan Valley (the Jordan River, in particular) was vastly different in the Iron Age.

In an issue of the ACOR Newsletter featuring the 150th anniversary of W. F. Lynch’s expedition to explore the Jordan River and the Dead Sea, the description of the party’s experience in navigating the river is described in terms scarcely believable to modern observers.

The river today [south of Pella] varied from thirty-five to sixty yards in width, and from five to six knots velocity of current, and five to six feet deep. Descended 12 rapids, three of them formidable ones, and passed one small tributary and five islands, one of them large and wooded (Johnson, Abdul Fatah, and Irani 1997: 5).

If similar conditions prevailed in the Iron Age, it would help explain why the Jordan River would have been a more formidable boundary than today. The greater flow of water and attendant luxurious growth would also explain why it was highly valued for agricultural and other resources.

**Biblical References to Ammonite Cities and Sites**

To justify including a site in the following discussion, it must have some association with the Ammonites based on evidence linked to a reference in the Hebrew Bible. The discussion of each city/site name is preceded, therefore, by the citation of a biblical reference which demonstrates or suggests that a connection between the site and the Ammonites does in fact exist. References are listed for the NRSV, BHS, and LXX to facilitate a comparison of the English translation with the two versions. The map in Figure 10 lists sites located in Cisjordan and Transjordan with a particular emphasis on Ammonite sites.
Figure 10. Map of Iron Age Cisjordanian and Transjordanian sites. Selected modern site names in the territory of Ammon are included. Sites mentioned in the Hebrew Bible whose locations are uncertain are printed in italics followed by a question mark.
RABBATH AMMON / RABBAT AMMON

2 Sam 12:26, 27

NRSV
Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the Ammonites, and took the royal city. Joab sent messengers to David, and said, "I have fought against Rabbah; moreover, I have taken the water city."

BHS
בַּלַּחַת חֵיפַת בַּתְּרוֹבֵּנִי לֹא-יָבֵד אֶלְלִיִּים.

LXX
Καὶ ἐπολέμησεν Ἰωάβ ἐν Ραββαθῳδικαῖς. καὶ κατέλαβεν τὴν πόλιν τῆς βασιλείας. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἰωάβ ὁ γενναῖος πρὸς Δαυὶδ καὶ εἶπεν Ἔπολέμησεν ἐν αββαθ καὶ κατελαβόμην τὴν πόλιν τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

References to the Ammonite capital of Rabbah occur 12 times in the Hebrew Bible—five times as רָבָּה בְּנֵי צְפִיּוֹן (Deut 3:11; 2 Sam 12:26, 17:27; Jer 49:2; and Ezek 21:25 [Eng. = 21:20]) and seven times as רָבָּה (Josh 13:20; 2 Sam 11:1; Jer 49:3; Ezek 25:5; Amos 1:14; and 1 Chr 20:1 [2x]). The root meaning of the word is great or populous (BDB 913). In the LXX it appears as Ραββαθ or Ραββαθ αὐτάμανα (see Polybius 5.71.4). A city in Judah, likely near Kiriath-jearim, is also known by the name Rabbah (Josh 15:60).

Biblical Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RABBAH / RABBATH AMMON</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RABBATH AMMON</td>
<td>רָבָּה בְּנֵי צְפִיּוֹן</td>
<td>Ραββαθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROYAL CITY</td>
<td>צְפִיּוֹן</td>
<td>Ραββαθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF THE WATERS</td>
<td>צְפִיּוֹן</td>
<td>Ραββαθ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the word רָבָּה is used as a modifier meaning great or many. It is used to modify abstract objects (Ῥαββαθ "great wickedness" —
Gen 6:5), animate objects ("very many fish"—Ezek 47:9), and as in the case of Rabbath of the Ammonites, it is also used in reference to another great city ("as far as Great Sidon"—Josh 11:8). Perhaps no better suggestion can be made than to acknowledge that Rabbah was the "great" (i.e. chief) city of the Ammonites.

**Location**

Rabbah, the capital of the Ammonite tribal-state, was located approximately 35 km east of the Jordan River on the Central Jordan Plateau at an elevation of 850 m above sea level. This site—known today as the Amman Citadel (Qal‘at ‘Amman)—is about 100–125 dunams in size and is located near the center of the modern city of Amman. The Wadi Zarqa ("Blue River" or Nahal Jabbok in the Bible), a perennial stream, runs by the southern base of the mountain upon which the ancient Ammonite city was built.

**General history**

Archaeological surveys of the ancient site of Rabbah have suggested that the citadel was first occupied in Neolithic times and was continually settled throughout the Chalcolithic and Bronze Ages. After the Iron Age occupation (which is the primary focus of this dissertation) the site was incorporated into the Ptolemaic domain by Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283-246 BC) and renamed Philadelphia, a name which it retained throughout the Roman and Byzantine times.

Subsequently, the city shows signs of a Nabatean presence (cf. the Nabatean tomb (Harding 1946). Eventually, the site came under Roman control when it flourished as an important stop on the Via Nova Traiana—the successor to the biblical King’s Highway. During the Byzantine era, Philadelphia was the seat of at least six bishops. Following the rise of Islam, the city passed into Arab control in 635 AD. A palatial complex was built on the acropolis during the Umayyad period (661-750 AD).
After being abandoned during the Mamluke period, the site fell into ruins, not to be inhabited again until a group of Circassians (adherants to Islam who came from the Caucasus region) resettled the site in 1876. In 1921, Amman was chosen as the capital of the Emirate of Transjordan and later became the capital of the current Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (Burdajewicz 1993: 1243, 1244; Hadidi 1992: 190).

Excavation history

The Citadel was first excavated in 1927 by an Italian team led by G. Guildi. R. Bartoccini, who directed subsequent excavations from 1929-33, reported nothing significant from the Ammonite period (Bartoccini 1930: 15-17; 1932: 16-23; 1933-34: 10-15).

In 1968, F. Zayadine of the Jordanian Department of Antiquities resumed new small-scale excavations in Field A on the lower terrace of Jebel el-Qal'a (the mountain where the Citadel is located), east of the Hercules Temple (see Figure 11). Among the finds relating to the Ammonite period (Stratum V) were stratified pottery of the ninth to sixth centuries BC and a late Iron II inscribed sherd. After discovering a covered channel, excavators decided to temporarily cease digging. Later, after slabs of the channel were accidentally removed, four stones lining the channel in secondary use were discovered to actually be double-faced female sculptures (Zayadine 1973: 27-28). These sculptures, part of an artistic tradition seemingly more prominent in Ammon than in other areas of Palestine, likely decorated an important building in Iron II. Their exact function is a matter of considerable debate (see ‘Amr 1990). They are discussed more fully below.

Later in 1968, R. Dornemann, I. Suliman, and F. Fakharani conducted probes on the southern slopes of Jebel el-Qal’a exposing walls, none of which could be securely dated. The following year, Dornemann conducted limited soundings on the northern exposure of Citadel Hill (Areas I-III) where he identified stretches of an outer fortifica-
A. Site plan of the Amman Citadel.

B. Top plan of excavated area at north end of Amman Citadel.
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tion wall dated to the tenth to ninth centuries BC (Dornemann, 1983: 90-92, 198 [Fig. 5], 199 [Fig. 6]).

Crystal Bennett’s excavations on the acropolis of Citadel Hill from 1975-78 produced results related primarily to later periods, but with few remains (besides pottery and an associated wall) from the Iron Age (Bennett 1975, 1979; Bennett and Northedge 1978).

A decade later, F. Zayadine and M. Najjar teamed up with J.-B. Humbert of the École Biblique to conduct excavations in 1987 and 1988, confirming the dating of the earlier discovered stratum containing the channel with the four double-faced statues exposed in 1968 to be about seventh century BC.

A large official Iron II building—perhaps an Ammonite palace or upper-class residence with a large courtyard measuring 10 m by 15 m—was also exposed in Area A, stratum 7. Polished white plastered floors were found in the four rooms excavated to date to the south of the courtyard. Installations discovered include a lavatory with a limestone seat in one room and a podium or dais on a western wall in another. The complex was multi-storied; two cellar rooms containing objects from the upper story were discovered on the north side of the courtyard (Burdajewicz 1993: 1248).

Objects indicating long-distance trade include lapis lazuli fragments and Phoenician ivories. Bitumen pieces from the nearby Dead Sea were also found. Foreign influence is also exhibited by the presence of luxury goods, including a Phoenician-style green-glass goblet and blue-glass pendants (Burdajewicz 1993: 1248). An Ammonite clay figurine wearing an atef crown is a clear sign of Egyptian influence (Zayadine, Humbert, and Najjar 1989: 362; Younker and Daviau 1993).

Excavators have also reinvestigated the water system just outside the Hellenistic-Roman wall on the north edge of the Citadel. Because of the water system’s association with Iron Age walls, the excavators conclude that it was in use by Ammonites during the Iron Age (Dornemann 1983).
The recent discovery of a proto-Ionic capital along the south edge of the middle terrace on the citadel also lends support to the palatial nature of the Iron Age buildings which once crowned the summit of the Ammon Citadel (Geraty, Herr, and Younker, personal communication, 1996). This discovery also substantiates the foreign influences which must have affected Ammon during its cultural zenith. Certainly, the capital indicates that it was meant to adorn a public building (or temple?) with monumental proportions.

Ammonite tombs

Numerous Iron Age tombs in the vicinity of Amman have also been investigated. They, too, provide evidence of Ammonite occupation of the heartland centered around the ancient Ammonite capital of Rabbah. These tombs, their location site, and details regarding their contents are listed in Table 10. The discussion of their contents provides insight into the nature of Ammonite society and the level of sophistication which developed in the Ammonite tribal-state, particularly by late Iron II—the zenith of Ammonite cultural advancement.

The city of waters

The account of Joab’s siege of Rabbah in 2 Sam 12:26, 27 uses two interesting terms in reference to the Ammonite capital—˪רֵי תֶּֽמֶרֶתָּה ("royal city") and ˪רֵי קָניִּים ("city of waters"). Scholars have explained the phrase "city of water" in a variety of ways. Keil (1983a: 230) describes it as "the city lying on both banks of the upper Jab-bok (Wady Ammān), with the exception of the Acropolis built on a hill on the north side of the city." Simons (1937: 334) noted: "The 'city of waters' which apparently belonged to R[abbah] . . . presumably was a city-quarter on the river (seil 'ammān), separated from the upper city or the city proper on the height and having its own defence-works."
TABLE 10

Ammonite Tombs Dating to the Iron Age
(Iron I and Iron II Tombs by Site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Tomb</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amman                 | Jebel Nuzha Tomb          | Dajani 1966: 48-52, Dornemann 1983:31 | **Date:** 12th - 11th century BC  
**Pottery:** No Cypriote or Mycenaean ware. More sophisticated than other forms in either Transjordan or Cisjordan. |
| Jebel Nuzha Tomb      |                           |                                | **Objects:** bowls, lamps, jar, krater                                                                                               |
| Zarqa                 | Umm el-Jimal Tomb         | Piccirillo 1976, Bloch-Smith 1992:167 | **Date:** 13th -10th century BC  
**Objects:** bowls, lamps, jar, krater                                                                                                           |
| Sahab                 | Sahab Tomb I              | Ibrahim 1972:31                 | **Date:** 1200-1100 BC. Skeletons of 8 adults and 1 child interred in jar burials.  
**Pottery:** bowls, jugs.  
**Objects:** Egyptian alabaster vases and scarab, bronze and iron daggers, arrow heads, bracelets, rings, needles, nails, and 2 gold nose rings. |
| Amman                 | Amman Tomb G              | Dajani [Ed.] 1966:103, Dornemann 1983:31(n.3), 47,146(n.1), Bloch-Smith 1992:160 | **Date:** 10th-7th century BC.  
**Contents:** 5 anthropomorphic coffins and 6 large jar burials containing bangles, rings, and a dagger. Contains both Iron I and Iron II objects. |
| Jebel Qusur (NE of Citadel) |                           |                                |                                                                                                                                              |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Tomb</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Amman Jebel Joffeh** | Amman Tomb A | Harding 1945:67-74, Landes 1962:77, Dornemann 1983:63 | **Date:** 700-520 BC.  
**Type:** "Cupboard-like recesses" on N and S. "Mass of animal bones" (sacrifices?) with many astragali.  
**Pottery:** 40 complete vessels, tripod cups, decanters, trefoil-mouth jugs, lamps.  
**Objects:** horse-and-rider figurine. Ivory stamp seal of Ilyashu. |
| **Amman Jebel Joffeh** | Amman Tomb B | Harding 1945:73, Dornemann 1983:63 | **Date:** Slightly earlier than Amman Tomb A.  
**Pottery:** Similar to Tomb A, including many 8th century flasks, black burnished bowl, stepped bowl, incense stand, a tripod cup, and bull rhyton with Cypriot characteristics (Henschel-Simon 1945:78). |
| **Jebel Amman (13 km N of Roman Tomb)** | Amman Tomb C | Harding 1951:37-40, Dornemann 1983:63, Bloch-Smith 1991:190 | **Date:** 8th-7th century BC.  
**Pottery:** globular bowls, tripod cups, pointed bottles, trefoil-mouth jugs, amphoriskoi, incense stand, lamps.  
**Objects:** bronze fibula, bronze bracelet & iron bracelet fragments, alabaster and limestone palettes, and a shell from the Palestine coast. "Remarkable" figurine combining male/female features, thus possibly the Ashtor-Chemosh deity of the Mesha Inscription. |
| **Amman Jebel Qala' (N slope)** | Amman Tomb D | Harding 1951:37-40, Dornemann 1983:62 | **Date:** 880-760 BC.  
**Pottery:** incense burner, juglets, "drop-shaped" vase, strainer jug, dipper flask, and oil flask.  
**Objects:** None. |
| **Amman Jebel el-Joffeh esh-Sharqi (300 m E of Roman Theater)** | Amman Tomb E | Ma'ayeh 1960:114, Dajani 1966:41-47 | **Date:** 8th-7th century BC.  
**Pottery:** 150 intact vessels, similar to other Amman tombs and Sahab Tomb B. Pinched mouth jugs, tripod cups, trefoil-mouth jugs, mugs, chalices pointed bottles, amphoriskoi, dippers, spouted dippers, lamps, and double-nozzle lamps.  
**Objects:** marble polishing stones, 6 bronze bracelets, 4 bronze finger rings, 1 bone nail, 1 bronze earring, a bronze mirror, and a clay shrine. |
| **Amman Jebel Joffeh (Roman Theater- E foundation)** | Amman Tomb F | Dornemann 1983:47, 63, 277-281 (Unpublished: but registered pottery & objects are referred to in Dornemann, above.) | **Date:** 645-525 BC.  
**Pottery:** large single-handled jar, small dipper juglet, two oil lamps.  
**Objects:** numerous bone and ceramic pendants, clay horse and camel figurines, heads of 3 male and 2 female figurines, 2 human figurine fragments (hand holding tambourine?), 5 terra cotta molds. |
Table 10—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Tomb</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sahab (11 km SE of Amman)</td>
<td>Sahab Tomb A</td>
<td>Albright 1932&lt;br&gt;Harding 1948:92-103&lt;br&gt;Dajani 1966:29</td>
<td>Date: 10th - 9th century BC (Albright). Five tombs discovered at Sahab since 1929, but only 3 are mentioned (Dajani). Tomb A cleared by villagers. Only an anthropomorphic coffin was found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahab (11 km SE of Amman-NW corner of village)</td>
<td>Sahab Tomb B</td>
<td>Harding 1948:92-103&lt;br&gt;Domemann 1983:47&lt;br&gt;Landes 1961:75,76</td>
<td>Date: 8th - 7th century BC. Pottery: 135 intact pots, carinated bowls, tripod cups, pointed bottles, trefoil-mouth jars, decanters, spouted strainer jars, amphoriskoi, cups, lamps, animal’s head. Objects: limestone pallete, 2 shells; Bronze- pair of anklets, anklet with attachment, fibular with iron pin, earrings, silver fibula with bronze pin; Iron- 3 arrowheads, knife handle, 2 points. Misc.- crystal bead and 2 earrings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahab (11 km SE of Amman)</td>
<td>Sahab Tomb C</td>
<td>Dajani 1970:29-34&lt;br&gt;Bloch-Smith 1991: 177&lt;br&gt;Horn 1971</td>
<td>Date: 14th century BC and 9th - 8th century BC. Pottery: Imported Mycenaean ware and local imitations and later forms. Iron II Objects: in Quadrant B= 2 ostrich eggs, toggle pins, arrow heads; Copper- daggers &amp; knives, bracelets, anklets, earrings, finger rings, kohl sticks, bell-shaped pendants; Stone- 3 legged basalt bowl, large white stone plate. Seals, etc.: Egyptian stamp seal of faience, copper signet ring, &amp; copper signet stamp. Figurines: zoomorphic vessel and small “hemaphrodite” figurine similar to that in Amman tomb C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amman (400 m SW of Rujm Um Udain, near Amra Hotel)</td>
<td>Umm Udaina Tomb</td>
<td>Hadad 1984 (Arabic)&lt;br&gt;Hadidi 1987: 101-119&lt;br&gt;Abu Taleb 1985: 23-29.</td>
<td>Date: 8th - 4th century BC. Pottery: Characteristic Iron II forms, including bowls, tripod cups, and lamps; also Greek red and black Attic vases show “active trade relations between Jordan and Greece” in the 6th and 5th century BC. Objects: Silver- Earrings &amp; finger rings; Bronze-fibulae, bracelets &amp; anklets, earrings, finger rings, kohl sticks, bowls, strainers, juglets, mirrors, caryatid cense. Inscribed Moabite seal of pty bn m’s. The luxury goods which the tomb contained suggest a strong Persian influence. (cf. Yassine 1988: 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilda (7 km NW of Amman Citadel)</td>
<td>Khilda Tomb 1 (75 m SW of Qasr Khilda: Tower “A”)</td>
<td>Yassine 1988: 14, 19-20</td>
<td>Date: 7th - 5th century BC. Pottery: 1 jug, 1 small jar, 1 juglet, 3 Assyrian “carrot-shaped” bottles or alabastra, 1 bowl and an Attic ware lekythos. Objects: None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilda (7 km NW of Amman Citadel)</td>
<td>Khilda Tomb 2</td>
<td>Yassine 1988: 14-16, 20-22</td>
<td>Date: 7th - 5th century BC (particularly the later periods). Pottery: alabastron shaped bottle, 2 storage jars, 2 kraters, 1 deep bowl, 1 decanter, 1 juglet, 1 single-spouted lamp, 1 tripod cup, and 2 Assyrian bottles, and 2 Persian period alabaster bottles. Objects: Bronze- strainer, 3 bowls, 7 fibulae, 8 bracelets, 1 armlet, 6 finger rings, and 4 earrings. Seals: 2 stamp seals of Neo-Babylonian period (Iron IIC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hertzberg draws a parallel with Jerusalem’s "King’s garden" located near the site where the Siloam conduit emerges. He concludes,

In Rabbath Ammon the river valley was still more suitable for this purpose. Perhaps the part of the city concerned, which really was a 'city of waters,' bore another name in the capital itself, but Joab avoided the alternative in his dispatch so as not to give a wrong impression. (1964: 318)

McCarter (1984: 312) sees the two phrases—ךִּי־יָהוֹ רָבוֹת and לְוַיִּים לַמָּעָה—as two names for the same place. In so doing, he cites the falacy of "modern critics" who follow previous expositors (notably Wellhausen) in attempting to resolve an apparent contradiction by emending the text and using לְוַיִּים לַמָּעָה in both instances. (See also Barton 1908: 148 for a critique of other attempts to emend the text.)

McCarter makes the following distinction between the use of the term לְוַיִּים לַמָּעָה as a name and its use as a form of description defining the function of the site.

We must suppose that כִּי־יָהוֹ רָבוֹת and כִּי־יָהוֹ לְוַיִּים are two names for the place captured by Joab. Perhaps "the Royal Citadel" was the official name used by the narrator and "the citadel of the water supply" was not a name ("the Citadel of Water") but rather Joab’s descriptive way of identifying its strategic importance to David. (1984: 310)

This intriguing observation seems correct because the normal name for the Ammonite capital is Rabbath Ammon. McCarter continues his observation:

It follows that כִּי־יָהוֹ לְוַיִּים הַמְּלֹאָה, "the Royal City" or "the Royal Citadel," must have been a fortified sector (כִּי־יָהוֹ) of greater Rabbah in the same way that כִּי־דָוִד, "the City (or Citadel) of David," was a fortified sector of larger Jerusalem. The name suggests that it was the district of Rabbah that contained the royal palace. But Joab describes it to David as כִּי־יָהוֹ לְוַיִּים הַמְּלֹאָה, "the citadel of the waters," suggesting that it also protected the city’s water supply. Perhaps Joab captured the royal fortress of Rabbah, which stood atop the steep hill overlooking and protecting the flowing spring fed by the Jabbok (Wadi ʿAmmān), which provided the city’s water. If this is correct, the task left for David must have been a simple one. (1984: 312)

Unfortunately, McCarter, like others I have noted above, seems fixated on a site in the wadi and ignores a more reasonable explanation for what constituted the water supply which the Citadel was designed to protect. Cities in ancient Palestine were not often situated in valleys but on defendable hills or ridges, often with tunneled access to
a water supply from within the fortified walls of the city (e.g., Gibeon, Gezer, Hazor, and Megiddo). Could the Amman Citadel have a similar water source in close proximity and which it was designed to protect?

Barton (1908: 148, 149) reminds us that Rabbah (Philadelphia) was attacked at least two other times of which we have record—once by Antiochus III in 218 BC (Polybius 5.71.9) and again by Herod the Great (Josephus Wars 1.19.5 ff) in 30 BC. In the first case, access to the citadel was obtained when a prisoner revealed an underground passage by which the inhabitants descended to procure water. In the second case, Herod reduced the inhabitants of Philadelphia to submission in the same way, by cutting off their water supply. Barton’s conclusion, based on observations by Condor of a rock-cut cistern, was that this installation, immediately north of the Citadel, was the water source referred to in all three recorded instances of Rabbah or Philadelphia’s capture. Barton further proposes (1908: 152) to emend the text of 2 Sam 12 to read

\[
\text{O 'Sn JQT3} \text{ in place of both } \text{rnV?an T y} \text{ (vs. 26) and CPan T y} \text{ (vs. 27). The word } H3T? \text{ is commonly used in the Hebrew Bible for "cistern/pool" and also used in the Siloam inscription referring to the pool of Siloam. The suggestion to substitute one textual emendation (Barton’s) for another (Wellhausen’s) seems ill-advised, particularly given the dissimilar nature of the shapes of the Hebrew letters postulated in the suggested emendations (McCarter 1984: 310).}
\]

What does seem appropriate, however, is to combine McCarter’s and Barton’s two other main points. To do so one would accept McCarter’s point that \( \text{נָטַפְּס יִעָר} \text{ is an appellation referring to the same place as the } \text{נָטַפְּס יִעָר הַמַּלְאָכָה} \text{ and describing its function of protecting the water supply. Then one would acknowledge Barton’s point that the spot to be protected was not located in the wadi to the south but at the base of the Citadel on the north.}

This view corresponds with the results of excavations near the remains of Hellenistic-Roman walls on the north side of Jebel el-Qalaʕ. Here, Dornemann (1983:}
198 [fig. 5]; 203 [fig. 10]) excavated a tunnel/chamber complex (Area III) in 1969. Though acknowledging the installation’s use during the Iron Age, he concluded that the tunnel is enigmatic since it does not lead to a natural water source (1983: 90). These doubts about the use of the main 16 m x 16 m chamber with 7 m corbeled ceiling as a water reservoir are not shared, however, by members of a second joint excavation team who renewed work at the site in 1988 (Zayadine, Humbert, and Najjar 1989: 357-359, 362, 415). Burdajewicz summarizes their findings regarding the "resevoir/water system" as follows:

Two entrances lead to the cistern. The first, located at ground level and vaulted, connected it with the area outside the citadel. The second entrance—a shaft and then a long triple underground passage—gave access to the cistern directly from inside the fortified zone of the citadel. (1993: 1249)

During the excavations, four statues, including that of Yerah ‘Azar (likely an Ammonite king) were found near entrance 3 of the water system. Both the nature of the installation and the statuary recovered there indicate the sophisticated nature of the Iron Age Ammonite community in Rabbah.

Heshbon / Tell Hesban

Jer 49:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX (30:19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wail, O Heshbon, for Ai is laid waste! Cry out, O daughters (villages) of Rabbah!</td>
<td>حطيل يهصبون ي</td>
<td>ἀλαλάζων, Εσσεβων, ἢι ἀλέτο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location

Hesban is located about 19 km southwest of Amman and 55 km east of Jerusalem. The site is situated at the juncture of two important regions of the Central Jordan Plateau (Table 8, p. 103)—the mishor or Madaba Plain to the southeast and the
Arabah to which the Wadi Hesban sharply descends in the west. Lying just to the north is the highland range which merges into the mountains of southern Gilead to the northwest. This topographical location made it an excellent site for agrarian-pastoral pursuits and provided its inhabitants with access to a varied and abundant food supply (Younker 1994b: 56).

The major drawback of Hesban's location was that the nearest available natural water source, the perennial spring of 'Ain Hesban, is located some 4 km distant from and 180 m lower than the settlement site. This is likely the reason for such extensive evidence of cistern digging and other water catchment plans put into place throughout Hesban's history.

Hesban would have been valued as a settlement site in spite of this shortcoming, however, due to the productive nature of its adjacent arable land and to the intensive pasturage available in the surrounding hill country, an ideal combination for an economy with roots in both agrarian and pastoral pursuits. See for example the significantly greater amount of rainfall around Amman and how it decreases progressively as one moves southward toward Moab (LaBianca and Lacelle 1986: 19).

In addition, strategic geopolitical realities dictated that this would be an important area from which one would be able not only to view but to control the surrounding area. Thus, even more advantageous than the value of Hesban's agricultural land was its location at the juncture of two important trade routes coming from Arabia. These routes extended westward past Hesban to link up with the Via Maris in Cisjordan and continued north via Damascus and on to Anatolia or Mesopotamia. Occupying this site would have been a key element in the strategy of anyone wishing to profit from controlling Transjordanian trade. Hesban would have served as an important commercial hub in this transportation network. This confluence of geographic and economic factors likely played a part in influencing any decision on the part of the Ammonites to extend their area of control into this region.
For these same reasons, Mesha, breeder of sheep (2 Kgs 3:4, 5) as well as King of Moab, may have been interested in the region of Hesban, using it to bolster his pastoral and economic interests in addition to the necessity of occupying the area for the purpose of securing his northern border.

**Biblical and historical nomenclature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>JOSEPHUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heshbon</td>
<td>חֶשְׁבֹן</td>
<td>Ἕσβων</td>
<td>Ἑσβων (Ant. 13. 397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ἑσβωνίτης (Ant. 15. 294)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Iron Age History**

Most scholars agree—based on historical and geographic evidence—that at least during the Roman period (Stratum 14) and later, Hesban is to be identified with Esbus. During this time a fortification crowned the summit of the tell. Two rolling-stone family tombs (in Herodian style) near Hesban testify to the shared cultural practices in Cisjordan and Transjordan during the reign of Herod the Great. At this time, the site likely served as a fortress guarding the border against the Nabateans. A small temple on the acropolis was also built during the Roman period. Hesban’s identification as Esbus is also bolstered by a discovery made in 1973. The so-called "Esbus" coin (minted under Elagabalus [AD 218-222]) depicts a prostyle temple which the excavators identify with Hesban’s acropolis temple (Mitchel 1992: 102).

Two churches—one on the acropolis and the other to the north of the tell—demonstrate a Christian presence at Hesban during the Byzantine era. The site is also included among the medallions found in the Umm er-Rasas mosaics depicting eighth-century cities in Palestine. By the 14th century, the site was known by its Arabic form, Ḥĕsbān, and had become the capital of the Belqa district.

But what about the earlier periods? Where should the Late Bronze age city of Sihon be located? Is Heshbon to be identified with Hesban during the Iron Age?
Site identification

Should Tell Hesban be equated with biblical Heshbon? This question arises from the results of seven seasons of excavation at Tell Hesban. The first five seasons (1968, 1971, 1973 directed by S. H. Horn; 1974 and 1976 led by L. T. Geraty) were conducted by Andrews University. John Lawlor of Baptist Bible College led a subsequent season (1978) excavating the Byzantine church just north of Tell Hesban. In 1997 and 1998, the Madaba Plains Project (successor of the original Hesban excavation team) returned for two more seasons under the direction of Ø. LaBianca.

Although Sauer (1994: 233) identifies some Hesban pottery as Late Bronze, none of the excavations so far have produced stratigraphic evidence of occupation prior to 1200 BC (Geraty 1997a: 20). Because the accounts of Deuteronomy and Joshua list Heshbon as the city of Sihon, this would indicate—if the biblical chronological traditions are taken seriously—that evidence of a Late Bronze Age Hesban should be found. Since such evidence is not readily apparent, scholars reach varying conclusions and respond with different answers to the question posed above regarding the identification of Tell Hesban with biblical Heshbon.

Some scholars (e.g., Miller 1979) propose that the biblical accounts are, after all, not reliable sources of historical information and find it immaterial whether the archaeological evidence correlates with biblical data. Others leave open the possibility that another site—e.g., Tell Jalul (Boling 1988; Horn 1976) or Tell el-’Umeiri (Ibach 1987)—may be a more likely candidate for the biblical Heshbon. However, as Geraty concludes, Hesban does fit well with both the geographical and the biblical identifying data for all periods beginning with the Iron Age:

To very briefly summarize the data from the Hebrew Bible, we might conclude that the site—probably a prominent Iron Age tell with notable pool(s) and gate(s)—should lie near the northern edge of the Mishor, west of the wilderness, in the vicinity of Elealeh (with which it is most often associated) as well as other towns such as Jahaz, Medeba, and Sibmah.

... the literary and archaeological data correlate well—both for the geographical location of the site as well as the nature of its occupation.
for just about every period till we get back to the earliest period. The only substantive non-correlating data appear to be the biblical allusions to the date, nature, and location of Sihon’s Amorite capital, and the archaeological evidence that the earliest stratigraphic structures at Tell Hesban did not antedate ca. 1200 BC. (1994: 45, 47)

Geraty further summarizes eight possible explanations of the seeming variance between the archaeological and biblical evidence regarding Late Bronze Age Hesban/Heshbon (1994: 47-52). However, the important issue for this dissertation is not to precisely settle the issue of the site of Sihon’s Late Bronze city, but rather to examine the evidence of Hesban as a site controlled by Ammon during the Iron Age, a topic I now address.

**Iron Age History**

The excavators of Tell Hesban unearthed 19 strata of nearly continuous occupation ranging from Iron I to the Mamluke period (1200 BC to 1500 AD). Only two periods of abandonment (or at least non-sedentary occupation) were noted: Persian/Early Hellenistic (ca. 500–250 BC) and Ottoman (ca. 1500–1870 AD) (Geraty 1993: 627). However, one should note Sauer’s revised beginning date and dissenting view regarding gaps in Hesban’s occupational history.

Gaps cited by me in previous reports have sometimes been taken by others to mean total absences of occupation, and I have usually intended them to mean lack of evidence in a particular area of a site, or lack of knowledge by us of their ceramic or other evidence (e.g. UD sherds). . . . Overall, in my opinion, the site was probably fairly continuously occupied from at least as early as ca. 1250 BC to ca. AD 1500, but with some periods better represented in most areas (e.g. Ayyubid-Mamluk) than others. (1994: 275, 277)

The Iron I and II remains at Hesban are found in strata 19-16. Ray (1998: personal communication), in his forthcoming dissertation studying the Iron Age at Hesban, subdivides stratum 19 into phase A and phase B. This plan harmonizes the prevailing view of previous Hesban dissertations (cf. Mitchel [1980] and Storfjell [1983]) which assign four strata to Iron Age Hesban with Herr’s schema of five Iron Age strata (1979). I previously correlated Herr’s strata with Hesban strata as follows: Herr’s
Strata 5-4 = Hesban Strata 19; Herr's Strata 3-1 = Hesban Strata 18-16 respectively (Fisher 1994: 94, note 1). Ray (personal communication) suggests the likely identification of the occupants of the Iron Age strata as shown in Table 11.

**Evidence of Ammonite presence**

Ammonite presence at Hesban is demonstrated primarily by two converging lines of evidence. Each of these types of evidence—ceramic and inscriptional—help to identify the inhabitants of Hesban during the Iron II Period.

**Ammonite ceramic evidence.** Hesban pottery from the Iron IIC period included wares such as the red-burnished and black-burnished bowls with "offset rims," tripod cups, and other forms typical of the Ammonite ceramic corpus. Excellent parallels are found at Ammonite sites including the Amman Citadel (Domemann 1983: 47-62, 178-84), Tell el-‘Umeiri (Herr 1989: 302-309), and Khirbet al-Hajjar (Thompson 1972). Based on these and other parallels, Sauer draws the following conclusion regarding the ceramic evidence at Hesban.

The many parallels with Amman make it clear that this [Hesban Iron IIC/Persian] pottery is late Ammonite in character, and thus, the control of Hesban and other nearby sites may have changed from Moabite in the *ca.* ninth-seventh century to Ammonite in the *ca.* sixth-fourth century. (1994: 247)

**Ammonite inscriptional evidence.** A second line of archaeological evidence also points to an Ammonite presence at Hesban during the Iron II period. From within the fill of the Iron Age reservoir ten ostraca were recovered. See Table 12 for a list and discussion of the six decipherable ostraca, four of which are discussed below. (See Cross and Geraty 1994 for a summary of all excavated ostraca.)

The earliest of these inscribed, broken pottery sherds were written in the Ammonite script, while the later ones, although they were composed in the Ammonite *language*, were inscribed using an Aramaic *script*, which had been adopted by the sixth


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Main Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hesban = 20</td>
<td>Small unfortified village with water channel (dry moat?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herr = 5</td>
<td>LB/Iron IA Transition: Israelite Tribe (Reuben?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray = 19A</td>
<td>Subsistence economy and mixed agro-pastoral activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesban = 19</td>
<td>Larger village with improved water system and small cottage industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herr = 4</td>
<td>Iron IA: Reubenites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray = 19B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesban = 18</td>
<td>Solomonic city with public works including the large reservoir and some evidence of commerce and long-distance trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herr = 3</td>
<td>Iron IB—IIA: (ca. 925 BC) Reubenites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray = 18</td>
<td>(100 yr. gap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesban = 17</td>
<td>Pastoral village and station for toll collection with sparse population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herr = 2</td>
<td>Iron IIB: (ca. 825—712 BC) Moabites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray = 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesban = 16</td>
<td>Completely new settlement with new ceramic horizon, evidence of wine production, and ten Ammonite ostraca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herr = 1</td>
<td>Iron IIC/Persian: Ammonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray = 16</td>
<td>(including Stratum 15 fill material from the reservoir)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Boraas and Geraty 1978; Herr 1979, 1997c; and Ray (personal communication).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New#</th>
<th>Old#</th>
<th>Tracings by F. M. Cross</th>
<th>Translation (CAI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date, Discussion, &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: About 600 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Script: Ammonite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field#: 73:1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAI#: 80, pl. XXX, 80a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. M. Cross, AJSS 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1975): 1-20, pl. EIV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: About 600 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Script: Ammonite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field#: 73:1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAI#: 80, pl. XXX, 80a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. M. Cross, AJSS 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1975): 1-20, pl. EIV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>(XI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: Early 6th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ca. 575 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Script: Ammonite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field#: 74:2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAI#: 94, pl. XXXVI, 94a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size: 8.4 x 5.4 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. M. Cross, AJSS 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: Mid-6th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or 3rd quarter of the 6th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Script: Ammonite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field#:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAI#: 137, pl. XLVIII, 137a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in The Archaeology of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan and Other Studies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eds. L. T. Geraty and L. G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herr. Berrien Springs, MI:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrews University Press,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1986.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New#</th>
<th>Odd#</th>
<th>Tracings by F. M. Cross</th>
<th>Translation (CAI)</th>
<th>Date, Discussion, &amp; References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>(II)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAI:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. ] n[</td>
<td>Date: End of the 6th century BC (ca. 550-525 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Succoth of the route</td>
<td>Script: Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Tamak 'il [</td>
<td>Field #: 71:0803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Men of Gebal [</td>
<td>CAI #: 76, pl. XXVII, 76a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. ] m ' [</td>
<td>Size: 3.25 x 4.20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shea:</td>
<td>Publications:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. ] n[</td>
<td>F. M. Cross, AUSS 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Tamak 'il [</td>
<td>W. H. Shea, AUSS 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. ] m ' [</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. son of l [</td>
<td>Date: End of the 6th century BC (ca. 500 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Uzziya ' [</td>
<td>Script: Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. son of Rapa ' [</td>
<td>Field #: 68:0309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. son of Psmum [</td>
<td>CAI #: 65, pl. XXI, 65a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Nanayadin l [</td>
<td>Size: 5.4 x 5.3 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. M. Cross, AUSS 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1969): 223-229, pl. XXV-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions the following important terms:</td>
<td>Date: End of the 6th century BC (ca. 550-525 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ngyd = “commander”</td>
<td>Script: Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qšmlk = Edomite name</td>
<td>Field #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished and not included in CAI. To be published in the Hesban final publication series on small finds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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century BC, characteristic of the Persian period. These ostraca provide us with strong
evidence, therefore, of an Ammonite presence at Hesban.

The Heshbon ostraca were originally numbered with Roman numerals indicating
the sequence in which they were discovered. Subsequently, in preparation for final
publication, they have each been assigned a new alphanumeric designation (e.g., A1,
A2, etc.)—the "A" standing for Ammonite and the numeral representing the epigraphic
dating sequence ("1" representing the earliest of the ostraca, "2" representing the next
in epigraphic sequence, etc.)

Evidence supporting two interesting aspects of life at Hesban may be gleaned
from these broken sherds with their otherwise lackluster lists of personal names and
commodities used in commerce. These Ammonite ostraca reveal to us something about
both the prosperity of the community and the presence of an international element
within the community.

Ostracon A1 (=IV), which Frank Cross (1975) has dated to ca. 600 BC, contains
what is likely a royal steward’s distribution list, complete with the names of recipients
and the commodities to be disbursed to them. Some of the individuals named in this
ostracon have good Ammonite names and the commodities listed are indicative of a
settled and prosperous community. For example, grain, cattle, and wine appear on the
list of items distributed. Even luxury goods such as silver, fine flour, and gum—an
item originating in Gilead and being transported to a man in Elath on the Gulf of
Aqaba—are included in this list. In addition, two- and three-year-old cows—often
associated with cult offerings—are also listed.

Ostracon A2 (=XI), nearly contemporary with the one noted above, further sub­
stantiates the nature of Hesban’s settled economy. It includes references to figs and
beasts of burden (Cross 1976).

Ostracon A3 (unnumbered in the original Hesban series) contains a number of
personal names with corresponding numbers. Of particular interest is the reading of
the first line. Cross (1986: 476) gives two possible readings: (1) 𐤋𐤃𐤇𐤃𐤄𐤃𐤇𐤃Авто son of . . ." cf. Neh 3:12; 10:25 [Eng. =10:24] שַׁלְוָא (to Heshbon). Cross says his initial impulse was to take the second reading. However, he concludes, "evidently the more banal reading is to be preferred" (1986: 476). If more weight is given to the second reading, it would provide evidence—in addition to the Iron Age pools matching the description of Cant 7:4—to corroborate identifying Tell Hesban with biblical Heshbon (Geraty 1993: 626).

Finally, Ostracon AS (=1), dating ca. 500 BC, a century later than those just mentioned, also provides evidence of the cosmopolitan nature of Hesban's trade practices if not of its inhabitants themselves (Cross 1969a). Included on the list of this ostracon are individuals with Egyptian and Babylonian names as well as those with names of West Semitic origin. Evidently, either the society of Hesban had adopted a more cosmopolitan character, which included the presence of foreign traders, or else its inhabitants had adopted foreign names, thus stamping an international identity on the late Iron II/Early Persian period community of Hesban. See also Shea's reading of Heshbon Ostraca II for a possible connection with Byblos (Shea 1977).

Additional finds

In addition to the pottery and ostraca found at Hesban, other finds shed light on the nature of Ammonite occupation of Hesban in the late Iron II period. The large reservoir (B.1:121 = 143) measures 17.5 m x 17.5 m with a depth of 7 m. Originally built in Iron IC (Stratum 18) (Sauer 1994: 241-243), it was replastered and continued in use during Iron IIC (Ray personal communication). The reservoir's estimated capacity is 2,200,000 liters (Merling 1994: 215). Herr notes that this is "five times the amount of water that could possibly have run into it during any normal rainy season. It demanded that inhabitants import water from elsewhere to fill it, possibly by donkey" (1997c: 150). Both Sauer (1994: 235) and Ray suggest that the explanation for this phenomenon lies in the fact that Hesban served as an important way station on the
King's Highway, thus requiring a large quantity of water to meet the needs of merchants with their caravans. This reconstruction is substantiated by the number of camel bones (36 compared to 3 or 4 in Strata 19A and 18 respectively) found in Stratum 16 (Ray, personal communication, 1998). A fish bone of a species \( \textit{polyprion americanus} \), stone bass) likely brought from the Mediterranean Sea also suggests trade with Judah during this period (Ray, personal communication, 1998).

**Summary of Ammonite Hesban**

Thus, each of the above lines of evidence—ceramic, ostraca, faunal, architecture, and small objects—point to Hesban as being a prosperous site with thriving trade in the late Iron II/Persian period. Furthermore, the lack of any ostraca in the Moabite script lends greater credence to the proposition that, during this period at least, Hesban was an Ammonite city, not a Moabite one (contra Hübner 1992).

Hübner's claim that the Hesban Ostraca are in fact Moabite must now be rejected based on the findings at Tell Jalul (Younker, in press) and Khirbet Mudayna (Daviau 1997; Herr 1997c) on the Wadi Thamad. Several lines of converging evidence—ceramic as well as epigraphic and palaeographic—now point to the fact that in late Iron Age II Ammonite control extended as far south as Jalul. Younker's publication of the Jalul Seal includes this important appraisal.

This seal from Jalul, goes along with the distinctive corpus of pottery and figurines found there and at neighboring sites to the north including Hesban, Jawa (South), Umayri, and even Amman, a corpus that has been identified by excavators in the region as Ammonite. (in press)

To claim that the Hesban Ostraca are Moabite—as Hübner (1992) does—when the evidence that the site where they were found was most likely under Ammonite control during the time they were written, is no longer tenable.
Aroer, Minnith, and Abel-keramim

Judg 11:33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He inflicted a massive defeat on them from Aroer to the neighborhood of Minnith, twenty towns, and as far as Abel-keramim. So the Ammonites were subdued before the people of Israel.</td>
<td>베סת ממשק עיר נוף ארון עד אום מנוית עיר ערים כ gratuits כ הרמה בני צאן נפשי בני ישראל.</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπέτατεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ Ἀροὴρ καὶ ἔως τὸν ἐλθεῖν εἰς ΣαμουΗ εἶκοσι πόλεις ἕως Ἀβελ ἀμπελῶνων πληγὴν μεγάλην φόδρα ἑαυτοῦ αἱ ἀμμων ἀπὸ προσώπου υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The struggle of the Gileadites with Ammon and their victory as recorded in the book of Judges reports that the raid led by Jephthah into Ammonite territory followed the itinerary listed above. Three towns—Aroer, Minnith, and Abel-keramim—are mentioned by name, and 20 more settlements are listed between Aroer and Minnith.

Mizpah-Gilead (in south Gilead)
and Mizpah (in north Gilead)

The bivouac point from which the Gileadite advance toward Ammon originated, however, is Mizpah-Gilead (Judg 11:29)—a site which McGovern tentively identifies (with a question mark) as Rujm al-Henu East (1989: 134). Mizpah-Gilead (in south Gilead) is to be distinguished from the Mizpah of the Jacob-Laban covenant in north Gilead, also likely identified with the Mizpah of Judg 10:17 from whence the negotiations between the Ammonites and the Gileadites commenced (Kallai 1986: 300, n. 39).

Although McGovern does not state the basis for his identification of Mizpah-Gilead, perhaps it is because he believes the Gileadites would likely rally at an intermediate site with religious significance (Mizpah in south Gilead) just as they had done at Mizpah in north Gilead. Furthermore, he views Rujm el-Henu, along with Khirbet Umm ed-Dannanir, and another Quadrabau-style building at Shechem, as parallels of the Amman Airport Building, all of which belong to a "related group of cultic
structures" along a trade route from Transjordan to Cisjordan (McGovern 1989: 134).
According to this view, Rujm el-Henu would qualify as a site with cultic/religious
importance. If McGovern's proposed identification of Mizpeh-Gilead is correct, it
would have been in the middle of the Baqa'ā' Valley and indeed very close to the ascent
to the Ammonite heartland. However, since it was the penetration of the Ammonites
into Gileadite territory that precipitated the counter response from Jephthah, it is more
likely that Kallai (1986: 301) is correct in stating that Mizpeh-Gilead must "at any rate
[be] a site outside the Ammonite area in the Jabbok arc," a site he tentively identifies
as Khirbet Gal'ad, west of his so-called "Suweileh Line" (see above).

'Aro'er (by Rabbath Ammon
or by the Arnon River?)

Judg 11:33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He inflicted a massive defeat on them from Aroer to the neighborhood of Minnith</td>
<td>נקם מעריסר וגרר-באות מינת מכה גונהל מאר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identification of 'Aro'er is problematic. Is it the town by this name located
at the southern edge of the mišor on the north rim of the Wadi Mujib (biblical Arnon)?
Or is it another site located nearer to Rabbath Ammon? Scholars are divided on this
issue. Glueck (1939: 249) and Younker (1992a: 842) favor the southern 'Aro'er view-
point, while others (e.g., Landes 1956a: 198) favor the northern 'Aro'er. At first
glance, the LXX (Vaticanus) reading—by substituting Ἀρνων (Arnon) for Μνων (Min-
nith)—seems to link the 'Aro'er of this verse to the Wadi Mujib 48 km south of Rab-
bah. However, the qualifying phrase ἐως ἐλθεῖν ἐχρίς Ἀρνων indicates a separation
and some distance between 'Aro'er and the Arnon.
Comparison with the LXX rendering of Judg 11:26 may also help explain the location of ‘Aro’er. The LXX A substitutes Ya’zêr for ‘Arô’êr. Both LXX A and LXX B replace Arnon with Jordan.

LXX A
καὶ ἐν Ἰαζήρ καὶ ἐν ταῖς θυγατράσιν αὐτῆς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς παρὰ τὸν Ιορδάνην.

BHS
כַּאִר אֶרֶץ בֵּבְלוֹת וּבֵכֶלְכֶל יַעַר אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל.

On the basis of this reading, the LXX translators place the ‘Aro’er (or Jazer) of Judg 11:26 somewhere in the northwest, in proximity to the Jordan valley. Thus, I conclude that ‘Aro’er is not located in the south.

Josh 13:25 strengthens this conclusion. In the allotments which the Gadites received, the location of ‘Aro’er is placed before Rabbah. The text reads:

Although the NRSV translates this as "to Aroer, which is east of Rabbah," Boling (1982: 345) translates יָאָרֶץ as "west," citing the fact that "Hebrew לִפְנֵי, literally, [means] ‘opposite,’ and not always ‘east.’" Landes agrees (1956a: 91, 92). Citing Elliger, he states that "the fundamental meaning of the Hebrew expression יָאָרֶץ, which is used a number of times in descriptions of place identifications . . . is not ‘east of’, but ‘over against.’" The use of this expression, therefore, lends support to identifying a northern ‘Aro’er (to the west of—יָאָרֶץ—Rabbah) with which the ‘Aro’er of Judg 11:33 may be linked.

Commenting on the Gadite allotment of territory in Josh 13, Landes points out that

in Josh. 13, therefore, where the Hebrew author takes special pains to distinguish a Reubenite ‘Aro’er, "which is on the edge of the valley of the Arnon," from a Gadite ‘Aro’er, "which is over against Rabbah," it seems rather evident that two ‘Aro’ers are inferred, and they are not to be identified. Moreover, in the description of the extent of Gadite territory (Josh. 13:25), the direction of movement appears to be from west to east, Ya’zêr representing the most western point, ‘Arô’êr, the point farthest east. To make a sudden jump to the south does not seem to fit the context. (1956a: 94)

Identifying the ‘Aro’er of Judg 11:33 with a northern site also fits better with the description of the direction of Jephthah’s campaign, generally from north to south.
rather than the reverse, which would be necessary if he began the campaign from 'Aro'er near the Arnon River.

Minnith
מִינִית

Judg 11:33

NRSV
He inflicted a massive defeat on them from Aroer to the neighborhood of Minnith

BHS
יִכְּחַ רַמְרָם לְצֵרֵד צְנָקָה מִינִית

This site is one of the 20 towns which Jephthah overran in the campaign from 'Aro'er to Abel-keramim. Although no site can be identified with Minnith with certainty (Kallai 1986: 301), it has been linked to the modern Umm el-Basatin (also formerly known as Umm el-Hanafish) on the Naur/Umm el-Amad road (Younker 1992a: 842). This is partly based on the record of Eusebius (Onomastica 140.3) which identifies the site with a village known in Greek as Μακμ', 4 Roman miles from Esbus (Hesban) on the way to Philadelphia (Amman).

The LXX provides little assistance with identifying נַיִם (Minnith). The Alexandrinus rendering of Σεμωθ does not represent a translation of the MT. And as Landes points out,

the LXX Vaticanus text for this verse reads ἀριθμόν for נַיִם, which possibly represents an attempt to translate some form of the Hebrew root בָּהֲסִמ, as interpreted by the Greek translators from the Hebrew Vorlage; the LXX reading for נַיִם in Ezek. 27:17 is either πρόςαρ or μύρων [perfume or ointment], and if the latter, it possibly establishes a basis for emending the Hebrew text to read בָּהֲסִמ instead of נַיִם, (1956a: 197, 198)
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The reference in Ezek 27:17 lists Minnith as the site where wheat was grown for trade with Tyre. But as Landes shows, there are reasons for suggesting an alternative reading of "olives" instead.

Thus, although Minnith cannot positively be identified with Umm el-Basatin, recent survey results do not rule out the possibility. Iron I sherds collected at the site indicate that the site is at least a potential candidate to be identified with biblical Minnith (Ibach 1987: 24).

**Abel Keramim**

Judg 11:33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and as far as Abel-keramim. So the Ammonites were subdued before the people of Israel.</td>
<td>ובר אbel כרמim . . . וַיֶּכֶב בֵּית עִמּוֹ אֶשְּרֵי יָהֲעִיר:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as with previous towns mentioned in Jephthah's itinerary, the LXX gives two varying translations. The Vaticanus gives a straightforward transliteration of the Hebrew, whereas the Alexandrinus splits the Hebrew original into two parts—the first part transliterated as Αβελ (Abel) and the second part of the name translated as ἀμπελώνων (vineyard or orchard). Thus, the Hebrew ("meadow of vineyards") suggests that in antiquity the site was identified as a fertile area for growing trees and vines.

As Knauf also writes,

Place names containing the *abel* element have a high frequency in the OT and in the present toponymy of S Syria, Jordan, and Palestine. These names seem to have originated among the nonurban population of
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this area in the course of the LB and Early Iron Age transition. These names may indicate the sociopolitical change which took place in this period, i.e. the demise of the city-states and the formation of the Aramean, Israelite, and Ammonite tribal states. (1992: 10)

Suggestions for identifying biblical Abel Keramim with modern sites have varied: Glueck (1939: 249) and Baly (1974: 227) identify it with Naur; Knauf (1984; 1992: 10) and Hübner (1992: 141) with Sahab. Redford (1982b), on the other hand, suggests that the site be identified with Tell el-"Umeiri West, a 16-acre tell rising 60 m above the wadi to an elevation of ca. 900 m. The site is located about 12 km southwest of Amman on the freeway leading to the international airport. At the base of the northern side of the tell is a water source which was productive until recently. Redford’s identification of Tell el-"Umeiri with Abel-keramim is based on his study of Thutmosis III’s list of Asiatic toponyms which include krmm—a place name phonetically resembling the "vineyard" portion of Tell el-"Umeiri’s proposed biblical site name.

Seven seasons of excavation (1984, 1987, 1989, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998) show that ‘Umeiri was occupied from EB III (ca. 2500 BC) to the Early Roman Period (ca. 1st century AD) (Geraty and Herr 1992: 722). Herr’s outline of the LB IIB to Iron IA transition (1998) identifies a "spectacularly preserved" Phase 12. This early Iron I phase includes a western defensive system comprised of a casemate wall, an earthen rampart (2 m thick), and a dry moat (4 m deep) originally carved from bedrock during the Middle Bronze period (Clark 1997). This phase was destroyed in a massive conflagration which produced as much as 2 m of destruction debris.

A strong Ammonite presence during Iron II is indicated by impressive administrative architecture and typical material culture (including nine inscribed seals or seal impressions; see discussion below and consult Table 16 and Figure 18, pp. 173-75) unearthed in the western acropolis area (Fields A, B, and H) and on the eastern shelf (Field F). However, the Ammonite presence during Iron II does not necessarily
qualify the site to be identified with the Abel-keramim of Judg 11, the object for this study's immediate concern.

Herr's (1998) discussion of the Iron I tribal settlers who established the site favors identifying them as Reubenites. If this indeed is the case, then it is suspect whether Jephthah would have included ʿUmeiri (Abel-keramim = Ammonite based on Judg 11:33) as one of the cities which he attacked. Although, if tribal loyalty and allegiance were still in a fluid state at the time, and if Reubenite ʿUmeiri was possibly allied with Ammon, it is conceivable that the Gileadites might have considered it Ammonite by association and included ʿUmeiri in the הַמַּגְּכָּא נֶאֶבֶל כָּרָם ("massive defeat" [NRSV] or as Boling [1975: 206] translates it, "one great slaughter") of the Ammonites. After all, Judg 12 (the next chapter) records a contemporary example of an intertribal conflict between these same Gileadites and the Cisjordanian Ephraimites, which indicates that the above suggestion is indeed a possibility. In any event, the "massive defeat" of Judg 11:33 does not necessarily imply complete destruction; perhaps the significance is in the large number of sites defeated—the נֶאֶבֶל עֶרְיִים (20 cities).

Whatever the case, we have no conclusive archaeological basis for identifying ʿUmerii with the Abel Keramim of Jephthah's time. However, the excavation in 1994 of ʿUmeiri Survey Site 84 (a contemporary hinterland site 2 km south of ʿUmeiri) revealed that at least in Iron II, ʿUmeiri was an administrative center overseeing farmsteads involved in producing grapes used to supply wine exported as tribute to Babylon (Herr 1995b). This hypothesis is supported by the discovery at ʿUmeiri of two "Shuba, governor of 'Ammon" seal impressions, similar in function to the yehud seals of Cisjordan (Herr 1992a). Thus, this analysis demonstrates (at least if ʿUmeiri truly is Abel-keramim) that the ʿUmeiri region was capable of living up to the reputation of its name—"meadow or valley of vineyards."

Countering Redford's identification of Abel Keramim with Tell el-ʿUmeiri, Younker (1997c) makes a case for identifying Abel Keramim with Tell Jawa (south), a
site excavated initially by Younker and Daviau in 1989 (Younker et al., 1990). This latter site—within line of sight to the east of ‘Umeiri—was first identified with Tell Jawa by DuBuit (1958: 135). Younker argues that the wider, more spacious wadi beds near Tell Jawa (in contrast to the more restricted valleys around ‘Umeiri) make it a more likely candidate for a site with greater justification for bearing the name "valley of vineyards."

Jazer / Yaʿzer
ירז語 יבנבות

Num 21:24

NRSV
Israel put him [Sihon] to the sword, and took possession of his land from the Arnon to the Jabbok, as far as to the Ammonites; for the boundary of the Ammonites was strong [Jazer].

BHS
וַיָּעַל אֵלְיוֹן לְשֹׁב וַיִּשָּׂרֵף וַיַּעֲשֵׂה יִשְׂרָאֵל לְרֹאשׁ עַמִּים מֵאֲרִinine וַיִּעַבֵּד הָעָרָה שְׁמָנָה: יִשְׂרָאֵל לְרֹאשׁ עַמִּים מֵאֲרִinine רֹאשׁ עַמִּים מֵאֲרִinine

LXX
καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν Ἰσραήλ φόνῳ μαχαίρας καὶ κατεκυρίευσεν τὴς γῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἄρνων ἕως Ἰαβόκ ἕως νιῶν Ἀμμῶν ὑπὸ Ἰαζῆρ ὑπὲρα νιῶν Ἀμμῶν ἐστιν.

According to the account in Num 21:32, the city of Jazer (or Yaʿzer) was originally an Amorite town. It was part of the allotment given to the tribe of Gad, and later became the fourth Levitical city. Though its identification with an exact modern site cannot be made with absolute certainty, we do know its approximate location based on several lines of evidence: (1) Eusebius located Jazer 8-10 Roman miles west of Philadelphia and 15 Roman miles from Heshbon, (2) Num 21:32 describes it as Jazer and its "villages," thus signifying that it is a region as well as a town, (3) 1 Chr 26:31 uses the designation יָרֹץ אֱלֹהֵי גִּילָּאָד — "Jazer in Gilead," (4) Isa 16:8 and Jer 48:32 associate it with Moab and the city of Sibmah, (5) Num 21:24 in the LXX associates Jazer with the border of the Ammonites, and (6) Num 32:1 describes Jazer along with the land of Gilead in the following way:
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Thus, Jazer is identified as a town/region suitable for grazing in Gilead near the ancient border of Ammon, Moab, and Gad and on the route between Hesban and Amman.

Suggestions for Jazer's actual identification with a modern site are numerous. Sites north of Amman include Mazar's choice of Tell Safut near Suweilah (orally to Kallai [1986: 270, n. 356]) and Yajuz/Kom Yajuz located 7 Roman miles north of Philadelphia (a view supported by Oliphant and Cheyne—see Peterson 1992: 651). Both of these sites fail to meet the identifying criteria noted in numbers 1-6 above.

Kallai refutes another identification of Jazer as Yadudeh with the following reminder:

Too, the Amorites dwelled in Jazer and it was beyond the boundary of the Ammonites. The identification of Jazer should, therefore, be sought outside 'half the land of the sons of Ammon,' whose western border is delineated by a line of fortifications that were discovered by Glueck, Gese, Hentschke and also Fohrer. . . .

Finally, it should be noted that the continued research, which provided additional particulars with regard to the further extension of the boundary line of half the land of the sons of Ammon (and Jazer must be outside this area), completely rules out this possibility [identifying Jazer with el-Yadūdeh]. It would, therefore, be better to look for Jazer further north. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that in 1 Chronicles xxvi:31 this city is mentioned by the name of Jazer-Gilead. (1986: 269; 270, n. 356)

Landes (1956b: 30-37) identifies Jazer with Khirbet es-Sīreh, northwest of Qaṣr es-Ṣār, primarily on the basis of the references in Isa 16 and Jer 48 to "springs/fountains" (דְּרוֹד) associated with Jazer and a similar association presented in Eusebius's account. However, later surveys of this site showed that no pottery earlier than Iron Age is found at the site.

Abel (1933: 2:69) and de Vaux (1941: 25-27) make the case for identifying Jazer with Khirbet Jazzir, located 4 km south of es-Salt at the source of the Wadi Šu‘eib and near 'Ain Hazer. This view is also advocated by Peterson (1992: 651). Baly, once an
advocate of this view, retracts this identification as being "much too far west" and places Jazer near the Amman-Naur district based on the LXX reading of Num 21:24 (1974: 221, n. 12). Thus, perhaps the view from the previous century put forth by Seetzen and Merrill (see Peterson 1992: 651)—suggesting that the area near Khirbet es-Sar with its rolling, fertile hills should be identified with Jazer—is a viable option.

Given the parameters for the general location of Jazer, i.e., north of Heshbon (Hesban), west of Amman (Rabbah), near the border of Gilead and Ammon, Kallai's summary is well stated. "It would appear that although the identification of Jazer has not as yet been definitely established, its general location is sufficiently clear" (1986: 270, n. 356).

A final note about Jazer relates to an incident recounted in 1 Macc 5:8. The account recalls how Judas Maccabeus and his son Jonathan cross over to Gilead to defend Jews living there. They retake Jazer from the Ammonites who are under the leadership of Timothy. This incident would indicate that Jazer must have been in Ammonite control again by Hasmonean times. It is also interesting to note the context for this particular rescue mission. 1 Macc 5:1, 2 says, "When the Gentiles all around heard that the altar had been rebuilt and the sanctuary dedicated as it was before, they became very angry, and they determined to destroy the descendants of Jacob who lived among them. So they began to kill and destroy among the people." It was noted above that this attitude of opposition to Yahweh's temple is a common theme in Ammonite references included in the Hebrew Bible.
Jer 49:2, 3 (LXX = 30:18, 19)

NRSV
Therefore, the time is surely coming, says the LORD, when I will sound the battle alarm against Rabbah of the Ammonites; it shall become a desolate mound, and its villages shall be burned with fire; then Israel shall dispossess those who dispossessed him, says the LORD.

BHS
לָכֵי תַּנִּי יִרְמָי בַּאֲדָם
בֵּרָי מְרָנִית הֵרָדָת
כַּלְּךָ הַלְּיָלָה סֶפֶּקְה
בָּנָנִים בָּאֲדָם
רָוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל אַרְּרִיָּה
אָרֵי נַרְוָה

LXX
dia toûtô idou ëmêrai
ξειροιται, φησιν κῦρως, καὶ
άκουτων ἐκτε Ραββάθ θώρυσιον
τολῆμων, καὶ ἔσονται εἰς
ἀβατόν καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν, καὶ
βωμοὶ αὐτῆς ἐν πυρὶ
catakathēsontai, καὶ
taralēmpsetai Israēl tēn
ἀρχὴν αὐτῶν.

Wall, O Heshbon, for Ai is laid waste!
Cry out, O daughters [villages] of Rabbah!
Put on sackcloth, and slash yourselves with whips!
[Meaning of Heb uncertain]
For Milcom shall go into exile,
with his priests and his attendants.

Jer 49:2, 3 associates a place called 'Ai with Heshbon, and both sites are associated with the Ammonites. Since 'Ai literally means a "ruin" and many sites fit this description, no modern site can positively be identified with Jeremiah's 'Ai. Two other interesting terms are used to describe Rabbah in this section—one, the archaeological term "tell" or "desolate mound" (נַנָּת), and the other a figurative term, "daughters" (בְּנוֹת רַבָּה) meaning villages. Shea (personal communication, 1998) interprets the above passage as a play on words, using the condition of the Cis-jordanian counterpart ('Ai [ד] near Bethel) as a foil against which to paint the poetic picture of what awaits the city of Rabbah. The juxtaposition of references to Rabbah's "daughters" (villages) with 'Ai in vs. 3 seems to lend credibility to this explanation.
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Cephar-ammoni is a Cisjordanian town listed in the allotment given to the tribe of Benjamin. How and when did this town receive its name? Though no archaeological evidence is available to answer this question, there is a textual reference which may yield some light on the origin of Cephar-ammoni. Judg 10:9 records events leading up to the confrontation of Jephthah's Gileadites and the Ammonites in this way. "The Ammonites also crossed the Jordan to fight against Judah and against Benjamin and against the house of Ephraim; so that Israel was greatly distressed." Apparently, this invasion did not last long, at least no record of its length (only its severity in terms of Israel being greatly distressed) is given. Landes (1956a: 135, 136) suggests that "this settlement (Cephar-ammoni) conceivably could have been founded or at least occupied by Ammonites at this time." The feasibility of this happening is increased when we remember that Ephraimites also migrated the opposite direction to settle in Transjordan, albeit not in Ammonite territory, but in northern Gilead.

Unnamed Ammonite Cities

Other unnamed Ammonite towns are also mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. For completeness, I list them here with their references. See also Table 13 for a list of major excavated Ammonite sites and the important finds at each site.
### TABLE 13

**Excavated Ammonite Sites in the Iron II Period**

*Primary Sites Listed by Sub-periods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Geographic Region</th>
<th>Archaeological Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iron IIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth Century BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heshbon</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbath-Ammon</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>tomb; pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahab</td>
<td>Amman (South)</td>
<td>tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iron IIB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth and Eighth Centuries BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heshbon</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>water reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa</td>
<td>Madaba Plains / Amman</td>
<td>houses; casemate wall; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalul</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>paved road; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbath-Ammon</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>walls; pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safut</td>
<td>Beqah Valley / Amman</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahab</td>
<td>Amman (South)</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’idiyeh VII-V</td>
<td>Jordan Valley</td>
<td>block of houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umayri</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>wall fragments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Geographical Region</th>
<th>Archaeological Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajjar, Kh.</td>
<td>Amman (South)</td>
<td>circular tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heshbon</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>16 wall fragments?; reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Iraq al-Emir</td>
<td>Wadi Sir</td>
<td>unpublished pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalul</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa</td>
<td>Madaba Plains / Amman</td>
<td>casemate wall; houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazar</td>
<td>Jordan Valley</td>
<td>tombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrin</td>
<td>Jordan Valley</td>
<td>pottery; wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Nebo</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbath-Ammon</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>palace?; wall fragments; tombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rujm al-Malfuf (North)</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>circular tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rujm al-Malfuf (South)</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>circular tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safut</td>
<td>Beqah Valley / Amman</td>
<td>houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahab</td>
<td>Amman (South)</td>
<td>wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'ideyeh IV</td>
<td>Jordan Valley</td>
<td>pits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Tower Sites&quot;</td>
<td>Amman &amp; vicinity</td>
<td>fortresses; agricultural sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umayri</td>
<td>Madaba Plains</td>
<td>administrative buildings; houses; monumental entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm ad-Dananir</td>
<td>Beqah Valley</td>
<td>cobbled courtyard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Twenty [Ammonite] towns**—Judg 11:33. These towns include settlements between Aro‘er and Minnith which the Gileadites, under Jephthah’s leadership, attacked.

2. **All the cities of the Ammonites**—2 Sam 12:31. These are the cities conscripted into forced labor after David’s victory over the Ammonite capital of Rabbah.

3. **[Ammonite] towns of the hill country**—Deut 2:37. Settlements in the mountainous head waters district of the Jabbok River and in the hilly district (where Jazer was located) southwest of Amman which separated the Madaba Plain from the mountains of Gilead. Tell el-Umeiri also probably fits this description.

4. **Daughters of Rabbah**—Jer 49:2, 3. In Jeremiah, the word “daughters” is used figuratively of the villages surrounding Rabbah (see above). These may likely refer to such excavated sites as Khilda and Khirbet el-Hajjar as well as the many farmsteads and fortresses which the archaeological surveys have located in Ammonite territory.

5. **[Cities of] the Ammonites**—Ezek 25:5. In the apparatus of the BHS, an alternative reading is given for the phrase אֱלֹהִים אָרֵי שָׁמְרָה, which proposes to add יָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים שָׁמְרָה (cities) before or in place of יָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים resulting in יָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים שָׁמְרָה (cities of Ammon) or יָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים שָׁמְרָה (cities of the Ammonites). This emendation—reading “cities of Ammon” in place of “sons of Ammon”—helps clarify the somewhat enigmatic Masoretic text which reads יָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים שָׁמְרָה, literally stating that Ammon (the “sons of Ammon”) will be made a “fold for flocks.”

### Summary of Ammonite Cities

It is tempting to speculate on the identify of more of the unnamed cities mentioned above, particularly the "twenty cities" of Judg 11:33 and the villages mentioned as "daughters of Rabbah" in Jer 49:2, 3. Although a case could probably by made for including sites such as Sahab, Safut, Jawa South, and even Jalul as sites referred to in one of these two references, I choose not to attempt any additional identification of...
archaeological sites with cities cited in the biblical text as being Ammonite. I do so for two reasons: (1) no clear archaeological evidence is available to bolster such claims, and (2) the text of the biblical references does not contain information with enough specific detail to justify absolute identification.

However, there are clear references in the Hebrew Bible to the following sites as being Ammonite cities at some time during their history: Rabbah (continuously during the Iron Age) in the Ammonite heartland; Heshbon (Tell Hesban, Stratum 16) on the Madaba Plain; Arø'er, Minnith, Abel Keramim (during Iron I) in the Ammonite hill country. Other sites have been clearly shown by archaeological excavation to be Ammonite sites, without being so identified in the Hebrew Bible. Prime examples are Sahab and Jawa South (in the vicinity of Rabbah); Jalul (on the Madaba Plain); and Tell Mazar, Tell es-Sa‘ideyeh, and Tell Deir ‘Alalah (in the eastern Jordan Valley).


Ammonite Persons Mentioned in the Hebrew Bible

Individual Ammonite Males

As noted in chapter 3 and summarized in Table 4 (pp. 47-48), at least seven Ammonite males (Nahash, Zelek, Hanun, Shobi, [Jo]Zabad, Baalis, and Tobiah) are mentioned by name in the Hebrew Bible. This number could be increased, if, as I have hypothesized, a second Nahash (Nahash II) existed (see Figure 2 [p. 64] and Kirkpatrick 1930: 319; Landes 1956a: 209; Zayadine and Thompson 1989: 175). To this number we may also add Rehoboam whose mother was Ammonite, and as I suggested above (see Figure 2), perhaps also Joab, Asahel, Abishai, and their cousin Amasa, (if indeed their mothers—Zeruiah and Abigail—were daughters of Nahash, the Ammonite king (2 Sam 17:25). There is also the intriguing possibility that Balaam was an Ammonite. (See below for a discussion of Num 22:5.) Thus, potentially as many
as 14 individual Ammonite males are mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, as well as two others (Achior and Timothy) in the LXX books of Judith and 1 and 2 Maccabees.

Individual Ammonite Females

Two Ammonite women are mentioned by name—Naamah, who bore Solomon’s son Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14:21), and Shimeath, whose son [Jo]Zabad was an official in Josiah’s court who conspired to assassinate the Judahite king (2 Chr 24:26). Other unnamed Ammonite women were part of Solomon’s international harem (1 Kgs 11:1). And in addition, as pointed out above, Abigail and her sister Zeruiah were possibly Ammonite princesses, daughters of Nahash, king of Ammon.

Do we have any evidence, however, from extra-biblical sources for the existence of any of these individual Ammonites? Do the results of archaeological excavation provide any corroboration that the individual Ammonites mentioned in the books of the Hebrew Bible actually lived during the Iron Age?

Hanun—Ammonite King

Hanun, the crown prince, succeeded his father Nahash (I or II—see chapter 3 and Figure 3) to the Ammonite throne during the reign of David (2 Sam 10:1). The biblical narrative recounts the ensuing rebuff which David’s envoys received when they
arrived in the Ammonite capital to repay the kindness (raud) which Hanun's father Nahash had earlier shown to David.

The confrontation eventually resulted in the defeat of the Ammonite/Aramean coalition by the Israelite forces commanded by Joab (2 Sam 12:26) and David's subjugation of "all the cities of the Ammonites" (2 Sam 12:31).

*The Beth-Shemesh Ostracoon*

In May 1930, at excavations conducted by Haverford College at 'Ain Shems (Tell Roumeileh = Beth Shemesh), workers in Area Y found an ostracoon with writing in ink on both sides of the sherd (Grant 1930; Grant and Wright 1939: 46). Albright's initial paleographic analysis determined that the characters were "Old Hebrew" with links to the Sinai alphabet of the proto-Sinaitic inscriptions. He dated the find no later than the 14th century BC, and claimed it as evidence of writing predating the time of Moses (Albright 1933b: 50, 186, n. 74). Two years later, Albright included "the Beth-shemesh ostracoon" in a list of the earliest "Hebrew" inscriptions, giving a date of 15th–13th centuries BC (1935: 29).

Others challenged this early date. Dussaud (1930) lowered the date to the tenth–ninth centuries BC. Gaster (1935: 134, 135) concluded that the script was closer to Phoenician than to Sinaitic and seems to choose a date between Albright and Dussaud, without giving a specific date.

Yeivin, in an article critical of both the digging technique and recording procedures of the Beth Shemesh excavators, challenged the dating assigned to the ostracoon and proposed a date for the ostracoon of 1200–1180 BC (1937: 193). Interestingly, Yeivin's critical comments may have prompted Grant to include in his final report a letter confirming the recollection of a visitor from the Palestine Institute who claims to have been present when the find was made and confirmed the circumstances of its discovery (Grant and Wright 1939: 47).
More recently, Cross (1967: 17-19) asserts that the script dates to a period when writing was in the process of altering the stance of letters (a 90 degree shift). As a result, he reads the columns "vertically" rather than "horizontally," and concludes that "the script fits into the typological sequence between the thirteenth-century Lachish forms and the late twelfth-century El-Khadr script." It is also possible, however, that the content of the text should also be allowed to contribute to the dating of the ostracon (see below).

Though the above studies differ on dating, stance, and translation of the text, many of them have one thing in common. Nearly all agree that the name פְּנֵן (Hanun or Hanun) is found on the reverse side.

Shea (1987; 1990) wrote two articles studying the Beth Shemesh ostracon, citing Driver’s plate (1976: pl. 42) as the "most convenient photographic plate" of the ostracon (1990: 116, n. 7). However, it seems to me that the plate in the Haverford publication series (Grant 1931: pi. X) is not only clearer, but also oriented correctly (Driver’s photo is upside down!).

In the second of his two studies, Shea claims to have identified four individuals whose names are mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, including that of Hanun. Shea’s interpretation of the obverse side of the ostracon makes reference to Abinadab of Kiriath-Jearim and his two sons—Uzzah (2 Sam 6:3-6) and "his brother" Eleazar (1 Sam 7:1). Shea reads יִתְנָה of vs. 3 as a noun plus a pronominal suffix and not as a proper name; cf. NRSV footnote. However, what is of particular interest in the setting of Ammonite connections to the biblical text is Shea’s reading and transliteration of the reverse side of the ostracon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ב</td>
<td>1. $b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. נ מ נ</td>
<td>2. ene 'Ammôn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. נ נ ה</td>
<td>3. Hanun - l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shea reads lines 2 and 3 in boustrophedon style (a concept also used by Grimme 1935-36) with the resultant meaning of the three lines as "1) b- 2) -enē ‘Ammon: 3) Hanun- 1" (1990: 123). The reading of "Ammon" in line 2 is attributed to a suggestion by Colless (1988). The reverse side of the ostracon thus appears to be a trade docket meaning "[To] Sons of Ammon: Hanun - 1" which identifies Hanun as the recipient of one measure of some unknown commodity. Shea (1990: 124) concludes, "For an Ammonite to have sent as far as Beth Shemesh on the western slope or Shephelah of Judah to trade or purchase, he must have been a figure of some importance in his own country, as Hanun was."

Scholars have seldom agreed on the interpretation of this ostracon. As G. Driver remarks, "Interpreters who have attempted to read it agree over scarcely a single letter" (1976: 101). Reasons for such diversity of opinion may be due to the fluctuation in style, stance, and direction of writing at this time, as well as the poor state of preservation of the sherd itself. Yet, as noted above, there is remarkable agreement on the reading of Hanun on the reverse of the ostracon.

Thus, if Shea's reconstruction of the Beth Shemesh Ostracon is correct, we have an extra-biblical reference which not only identifies an individual by the name of Hanun, but specifies that he is an Ammonite. Though not all scholars would agree, this may be one of the earliest correlations unearthed to date between a biblical figure and an archaeological artifact.

**Ammonite royal crown**

After Hanun's defeat by Joab and David, he is not heard of again. However, at the conclusion of the conquest of Rabbath Ammon (2 Sam 12:26-29), the Ammonite crown (presumably the one worn by Hanun) is claimed by David. If David's mother or stepmother is to be identified as the former wife of the Ammonite king, Nahash (see chapter 3 and Figure 3), then this act had great significance—i.e., it represented a
claim of David’s right to the Ammonite throne. The text of 2 Sam 12:30 describes the Ammonite crown taken as booty (ָּלָּךְ) after the sack of Rabbah.

2 Sam 12:30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He [David] took the crown of Milcom [LXX, See 1 Kgs 11.5, 33] from his head; the weight of it was a talent of gold, and in it was a precious stone; and it was placed on David’s head. He also brought forth the spoil of the city, a very great amount.</td>
<td>נָּמָּה אֶֽשְׁפְּרָה מְלֵכָּה מִלְכָּו</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν στέφανον Μελχολ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ σταθμὸς αὐτοῦ τάλαντον χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθον τιμίου, καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς Δαυὶδ καὶ σκῦλα τῆς πόλεως ἐξῆγεν· κατὰ σφόδρα.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MT reads מִלְכּ ("their king"), whereas the LXX translates the word as if it were מִלְכָּה (Milkom, the Ammonite deity). Furthermore, the LXX contains the explanatory phrase τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν in addition to the name Μελχολ—suggesting to Horn (1973: 171) that the Hebrew vorlage of the LXX was a repetetive מִלְכּ מִלְכָּ. Landes (1956a: 220) suggests that the LXX translation—Μελχολ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν—which implies this repetition, is due to dittography in the Hebrew vorlage.

And why is the transliteration of the Hebrew מִלְכָּह seemingly mispronounced in Greek as Μελχολ? Landes again points out that this confusion of the sound of the name for the Ammonite deity (Melchol instead of Milcom) likely arose from a mistake using the Greek uncials ΜΕΛΧΟΛ for ΜΕΛΧΟΜ—i.e., a failure to make the last two strokes on the Greek letter M (1956: 220). However, the Masoretes themselves seem to have had difficulty vocalizing the consonants מִלְכּ whenever they occur in an Ammonite context. The translators of the LXX must have been similarly perplexed, for their transliterations of the name for the Ammonite deity display a wide variety of forms: Μελχοου, Μελχολ, Μελχο, Αμελχου, and Μολοχ (Horn 1973: 171).

Kirkpatrick, also citing the fact that Milcom is the intended original Hebrew form from which the LXX translation was made, explains the translation as follows.
The word *Malcām*, rendered *their king*, may also be taken as a proper name. Many commentators prefer this explanation, remarking that the king of Rabbah has not been mentioned, and that there is no antecedent for *their*. It occurs in Zeph. i.5; Jer. xlix. 1,3, as a form of the name of the Ammonite deity, Molech or Milcom (I Kings xi. 5). The Sept. reads, "Melchol their king," "their king" being a duplicate rendering and "Melchol" (for "Milcom"), the original reading. A Jewish tradition recorded by Jerome tells how the crown was snatched from the head of Milcom by Ittai the Gittite, because it was unlawful for a Hebrew to take spoil from an idol (Quaest. Hebr. on I Chr. xx.2). (1930: 339)

Josephus records the tradition that identifies the type of stone the crown contained. "He [David] himself took the crown of the Ammanite [sic] king, which weighed a talent of gold and had in its centre a precious stone, a sardonyx; and thereafter David always wore it on his own head" (Ant. 7. 230).

Since the weight of the crown was a talent (ca. 75 lbs), it is argued that the crown was too heavy to be worn by a human king; rather, it must have been intended to adorn a statue of Milcom (Landes 1956a: 221). 2 Sam 12:30 also mentions a precious stone (*תֵּורָה יִשָּׁלְמֹל*) in connection with the crown. The enigmatic phrase which follows—*וְאָנָה לְאַלִּילֵי אֲרֻבְּאָה וְאָרֶבּוֹ ("and it was [placed] on David’s head") is subject to various interpretations, depending on how one defines the antecedent of "it." Does it refer to the *תֵּורָה יִשָּׁלְמֹל* or to the *לְאַלִּילֵי אֲרֻבְּאָה ?* Given the extreme weight of the crown, it is suggested by some that David merely added this precious stone as "a new jewel in his royal crown" (Landes 1956a: 151, 221). Horn, however, appeals to the use of *נַבִּי* ("in it") in the parallel passage of 1 Chr 20:2, and concludes, "so ... the assumption must be that the antecedent to ‘it’ in the Chronicle passage is the crown containing the stone" (1973: 173).

*Atef-style crowns.* Is there any archaeological evidence to shed light on the nature of the Ammonite crown which adorned either the head of Hanun (*מְלִילְכָּם* = their king) or Milcom (*מְלִילְכָּם* = Ammonite deity)? Horn (1973: 171ff.) calls attention to eight stone sculptures found in the Amman area—seven crowned stone heads (five are located in the Amman Museum, one in the British Museum, and another in the Archaeological...
Museum of the American University of Beirut) and an eighth stone statuette of a complete standing figure wearing the atef crown and measuring 0.81 m high. This statue—along with another full-figure sculpture known as the Yerah-‘azar statue (see Figure 12), a male head, and a male torso—was found in 1950 by a landowner just outside the Hellenistic-Roman wall north of the Amman citadel (Barnett 1951: 34-36, pls. 10-13). Each of the eight sculptures in Horn’s study is wearing a conical-shaped crown (characterized by stylized feathers or plumes) known in Egypt as the ‘atef-crown of Osiris. Note the examples of stone head sculptures with the atef-style crown shown in Figure 13. Typically, such a crown is worn only by Egyptian gods and non-Egyptian goddesses (Horn 1973: 175), but the Ammonites seem to have departed from this tradition (see below).

Since the publication of Horn’s article, other examples of heads with the atef crown have been discovered. Note for example the fine detail of the stone head (see Figure 14) from the Moshe Dayan collection in the Israel Museum (Orman 1986: 38). This stone head is from Abu ‘Alanda, just south of Amman, but was unpublished in Horn’s article. Two additional statuettes (a male and a female; see Figure 15) were discovered at Khirbet el-Hajjar, 7 km southwest of Amman (Ibrahim 1971). The male statuette wears the atef crown, and like the two standing statues found north of the Amman citadel—one with the atef crown and the other with the Yerah-‘azar inscription—it is barefooted.

Thus far, 12 examples of Ammonite stone heads wearing the atef-style crown have been discovered (see Table 14). Of this total, one is the bust of a female (see Figure 16).

In addition to the stone sculptures whose heads are wearing the atef crown, three male figurines depicted with the same headdress have been found—one at the Amman Citadel (Zayadine, Humbert, and Najjar 1989: 362), one at Tell Jawa South...
Figure 12. Yerah 'Azar Statue from the Amman Citadel. Statue is of an 8th century BC Ammonite king standing on an inscribed pedestal. Total height of the statue is 81 cm. Source: Photo by James R. Fisher of poster display at the Jordanian Department of Antiquities.
A. Bust of a woman from the site of Abu 'Alanda (42 cm x 26 cm).

B. Male or deity with a'ef-style crown from Abu 'Alanda (43.8 cm x 24.5 cm).

Figure 14. Ammonite statues from Abu 'Alanda. The site of Abu 'Alanda is located south of Amman. Source: Tallay Orman, A Man and His Land: Highlights from the Moshe Dayan Collection. Jerusalem: The Israel Museum, 1986 (pp. 36, 39).
A. Male Statue with *atef*-style crown.
(57.6 cm high including pedestal.)

B. Female statue.
(56 cm high including pedestal.)

Figure 15. Ammonite statues from Khirbet el-Hajjar. Source: Photos by James R. Fisher of a display in the Jordanian National Archaeological Museum.
Figure 16. Female bust with *atef*-style crown. Iron Age female bust with *atef*-crown and necklace of four raised rows of beads. The head measures 22 cm x 10.5 cm; 26.5 cm at the shoulders. Source: Abdel-Jalil 'Amr. Four Ammonite Sculptures from Jordan. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 106 (1990): 114-18, pl. 8B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Date/ Provenance</th>
<th>Location/ Identification</th>
<th>Reference Sources</th>
<th>Dimensions Description/Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>1921 British Amman</td>
<td>British Museum #116739</td>
<td>A = VII (Pl. 5)</td>
<td>43.5 cm x 23 cm x 24 cm. Gray basalt. (Harding’s note [see B at left] says 60 cm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>1920s Amman</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.2801</td>
<td>A = VI (Pl. 4)</td>
<td>28 cm high. (Harding’s note [see B at left] says: “with a mustache and beard and a long neck.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Standing Male Statue of Yerah-'Azar</td>
<td>1950 Amman Citadel (North)</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.1656</td>
<td>A = IX (Pl. 6)</td>
<td>45 cm high (pedestal = 8 cm with inscription). Limestone. Jutting, bearded chin. Hair in corkscrew curls; bound with cord. Long tunic of crinkly material; girdle and fringed shawl diagonally draped. Left arm bent at 90°; hand holds lotus flower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male Head (with full beard and coifed hair)</td>
<td>1950 Amman Citadel (North)</td>
<td>Amman Museum J. 1654</td>
<td>A = XVII (Pl. 10)</td>
<td>20 cm x 14 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Statue Fragment (torso)</td>
<td>1950 Amman Citadel (North)</td>
<td>Amman Museum J. 1655</td>
<td>A = X (Pl. 7)</td>
<td>35 cm x 37 cm. Almost life-size figure wearing shawl. Scale-like decoration in alternating red and black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>1950(?) Amman</td>
<td>Museum at the American Univ. in Beirut</td>
<td>A = XX (Pl. 11)</td>
<td>11.3 cm x 10.8 cm x 9.8 cm. Labeled as found in Moab but probably misleading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>1953 Unknown</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.4767</td>
<td>A = XLIX (Pl. 11)</td>
<td>25 cm x 17 cm. Steatite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Identifies sculptures which have the Atef-style crown signifying a status of a deity or royal figure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Date/Provenance</th>
<th>Location/Identification</th>
<th>Reference Sources</th>
<th>Dimensions Description/Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Headless Statue</td>
<td>1959 (?) Amman</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.8124</td>
<td>A = XI (Pl. 7) D = Fig. 92.4</td>
<td>33 cm. high. Cf. Farah Ma’ayeh, ADAJ 4-5 (1960): 114-115, Pl. 4.1. Standing statue with left arm bent at 90° holding a flower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>1960 Unknown</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.8882</td>
<td>A = IV (Pl. 4) H = 6 (Pl. 19.6)</td>
<td>38.5 cm x 21 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Standing Male Plaque Statue</td>
<td>?? 'Aragan (S. of Amman)</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.11260</td>
<td>A = XII (Pl. 8) D = Fig. 90.1</td>
<td>44 cm high. With back pillar. cf. N. Khairi ADAJ 15(1970): 15-18, pls. 1, 2. (In Arabic.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male Head (with striated hair)</td>
<td>?? ??</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.4754</td>
<td>A = VIII (Pl. 5) D = Fig. 90.2</td>
<td>22.5 cm high. Unpublished according to Dornemann.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Double-faced Female Head</td>
<td>1968 Amman Citadel</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.11688</td>
<td>A = XXI (Pls. 12, 13) D = Fig. 93.A C = 73.1</td>
<td>Ammonite letters inscribed on the backs of the eyes of Dornemann’s 93.A, B, &amp; C and on the necklace of C. Average dimensions are 30 cm x 24 cm x 16 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Double-faced Female Head</td>
<td>1968 Amman Citadel</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.11691</td>
<td>A = XXIV (Pls. 12, 16) D = Fig. 94.C C = 73.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Double-faced Female Head</td>
<td>1968 Amman Citadel</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.11690</td>
<td>A = XXXIII (Pls. 12, 15) D = Fig. 94.D</td>
<td>Broken and fragmented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Standing Male Statue with Atef Crown</td>
<td>1971 Khirbet el-Hajjar</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.12953</td>
<td>A = I (Pl. 1)</td>
<td>51 cm high. Pedestal = 6.6 cm x 12.3 cm x 15.4 cm. Head = 16 cm high x 20 cm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 14—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Date/Provenance</th>
<th>Location/Identification</th>
<th>Reference Sources</th>
<th>Dimensions Description/Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Standing Female Statue</td>
<td>1971 Khirbet el-Hajjar</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.12945</td>
<td>A = II (Pl. 2)</td>
<td>56 cm high with pedestal. Pedestal = 10 cm x 24 cm x 21 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>1971 Abu ’Alanda</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.12465</td>
<td>A = XVIII (Pl. 11) H = 7 (Pl. 20) A2 = 2 (Pl. 7B)</td>
<td>32.5 cm x 17.5 cm. Abu ’Alanda is located ca. 7 km south of Amman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>?? Bought in Amman</td>
<td>Amman Museum A2 = 1 (Pl. 7A)</td>
<td>31 cm x 24 cm. Incised eyebrows, inlaid eyes, high cheek bones, wide mouth and narrow chin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female Head</td>
<td>?? Bought in Amman</td>
<td>Amman Museum A2 = 3 (Pl. 8A)</td>
<td>39 cm x 20 cm. Hair enveloped in rounded wig which stands out from forehead. Inlaid eyes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Atef-crowned Female Bust</td>
<td>?? Bought in Amman</td>
<td>Amman Museum A2 = 4 (Pl. 8B)</td>
<td>22 cm x 10.5 cm (26.5 cm at the shoulders). Pronounced horizontal ridge at juncture of crown and forehead. Hair falls behind ears and in front of shoulders. Comparatively thick lips with lower turned out in pronounced smile. Necklace consists of 4 raised rows of beads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Atef-crowned male head</td>
<td>?? Abu ’Alanda</td>
<td>Israel Museum #82.2.228</td>
<td>Ornan p. 38, 39.</td>
<td>43.8 cm x 24.5 cm. With diadem of 7 rosettes. Beard is flat incised curls reminscent of Assyrian style. Back is flat. Part of the Moshe Dayan Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female Bust</td>
<td>?? Abu ’Alanda</td>
<td>Israel Museum #82.2.168</td>
<td>Ornan p. 36, 37.</td>
<td>42 cm x 26 cm. Short-sleeved garment similar to ivory plaques from Nimrud in Assyria. Back is unfinished. Part of the Moshe Dayan Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Date/Provenance</th>
<th>Location/Identification</th>
<th>Reference Sources</th>
<th>Dimensions Description/Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1971 Abu 'Alanda</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.12470</td>
<td>A = Pl. 9, Kopf XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1971 Abu 'Alanda</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.12467</td>
<td>A = Pl. 9, Kopf XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1971 Abu 'Alanda</td>
<td>Amman Museum J.12466</td>
<td>A = Pl. 9, Kopf XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Statues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27 (+ 2 headless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atef-Crowned</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Sources:
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(Dabrowski 1997: 343, 344), and one at Bethsaida (el-‘Arag) (Arav 1995: 26; Daviau and Dion 1994: 162).

Does the fact that the three full-figure, standing statuettes (the male from Khirbet el-Hajjar and the two standing statuettes from the Amman citadel) are all barefooted indicate that they represent human figures (Ammonite kings standing on holy ground [Horn 1973: 179]) rather than deities? Aharoni (1950) and Daviau and Dion (1994: 164) believe those wearing the atef-style crown represent deities. On the other hand, Barnett (1951: 34), Horn (1973: 173), and Ibrahim (1971: 96, n. 40) believe they represent human figures. Ibrahim cites two reasons for holding this view. First, Zayadine’s translation (1974b) of the small, defaced inscription on one of the statuettes from the Amman Citadel identifies the figure as an Ammonite king, Yarah-‘Azar, the son of Zakir, the son of Shanib (or Shanip, ca. 733 BC). Second, citing Barnett’s observation (1951: 34), he states that "Kings used to dress themselves as deities. Perhaps we could add a vice versa to that, that deities were clothed as royalty." Thus, in the case of the Ammonite tradition, the custom of using the atef crown only to adorn deities is altered to include royalty as well.

It is interesting to note the evolution in Ibrahim’s thinking on the subject of the Ammonite stone statues and what they represent. In his original ADAJ article on the Khirbet el-Hajjar statues in 1971, Ibrahim’s conclusion was, "The question remains open [as to who they represent]" (emphasis supplied). However, when the article was reprinted in Thompson’s Archaeology in Jordan, the conclusion now reads, "The question may be settled by Zayadine’s new translation [of the Yarah-‘azar inscription]" (Ibrahim, 1989: 69, n. 40; emphasis supplied). His position, thus, develops from a tentativeness about whether they might represent deities to a positive assertion that they in fact do represent the human king.

In fairness, however, I should also note Daviau and Dion’s position that in actuality the atef crown symbolizes the depiction of Ammonite deity. Furthermore,
they propose that the god so depicted is the chief god of the Ammonites whom they identify as El rather than Milkom. They do so based on what they claim as overwhelming onomastic data from Israel's study (1991: 333, 334) showing that El is the theophoric element in 54 out of 73 names found on Ammonite seals. As for Milkom, they suggest that "the transparent royal connotations of this name . . . might authorize the hypothesis that Milkom originated as a hypostasized epithet for El himself, the head of the pantheon" (Daviau and Dion 1994: 164, n. 17). Younker also suggests, based on a study of seal iconography, that Milkom may in fact be the Ammonite version of the Canaanite god El (1989: 378).

Date and function of stone sculptures. None of the Ammonite collection of stone sculptures were found in stratigraphically controlled locations. Therefore, they cannot be precisely dated. However, these atef crowned heads are part of an Ammonite sculptural heritage representing an art form which flourished in Ammon during its cultural zenith in Iron II. (See Table 14 for a complete listing of Ammonite stone sculptures.) Both male and female sculptures display the richness of this cultural tradition. Except for the Balu'a Stele and the atef-crowned head from Moab on display in the Archaeological Museum of the American University of Beirut, all the sculptures come from the area of Amman (Dornemann 1983: 153). Do we know anything about the function of Ammonite stone figures? Dornemann, citing the long tradition of parallel Sumerian sculptures in Mesopotamia, suggests

The attitude of most of the figures, the fact that the feet, where preserved, are bare, and the portion of an inscription on one statue, indicate that they were used as votive offerings in temples or shrines. Thus, unlike much of the North Syrian sculpture, the Amman pieces would seem to have had greater religious significance and were employed more directly with religious structures or areas. (1983: 163)

This may help explain why statues similar to those in the Ammonite tradition have not been found elsewhere in Palestine—due to the biblical injunction against portraying the human form (Exod 21:5; Lev 26:1, Deut 4:16-19). Yet, it was a tradi-
tion so remarkable that, when plundering Rabbah, David selected Hanun's (or Milkom's) solid gold Ammonite crown to be part of his own royal treasury.

[Anonymous] Ammonite King (1)
Shanip/Shanib/Sanipu

2 Chr 27:5

NRSV
He [Jotham] fought with the king of the Ammonites and prevailed against them. The Ammonites gave him that year one hundred talents of silver, ten thousand cors of wheat and ten thousand of barley. The Ammonites paid him the same amount in the second and the third years.

BHS

LXX

The last book in the Hebrew Bible (2 Chronicles) contains several references to interaction between kings of Judah and the Ammonites which are not contained in the parallel accounts in the book of Kings. 2 Chr 26:8 records that "the Ammonites paid tribute to Uzziah" (ca. 790-739 BC). His son and successor Jotham (ca. 750-731 BC) "fought with the king of the Ammonites and prevailed against them" (2 Chr 27:5).

The text of the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser III (Pritchard 1969b: 282), dated about 735 BC, mentions an Ammonite king by the name of Shanip. Though not directly linked to the biblical "king of the Ammonites," the general background of the Syro-Ephramite wars waged by Tiglath-pileser provide a setting at least consistent with the identification of the anonymous king in 2 Chr 27:5 with Shanip. Landes (1956a: 257) also suggests identifying Shanip, who paid tribute to the Assyrians, as the same Ammonite king who fought with Jotham, king of Judah. As Myers notes,

It has been affirmed that there could have been no war between Judah and Ammon since their borders were not contiguous at the time. But Israel was rapidly losing prestige and power after the death of Jeroboam II, in the wake of which the border peoples spilled over, as they always did, into the territory where the power vacuum existed. Moreover the
Syro-Ephraimitic wars, which would have offered ample opportunity for Ammonite expansion, may already have been in progress. It was doubtless such a movement that brought Jotham into conflict with them. (1965: 157)

Thus, we have the confrontations recorded in 2 Chr 27:5 between Ammon and Judah and the Syro-Ephraimite wars being conducted at approximately the same time. It seems logical, therefore, to suggest the possibility that the Ammonite king of the former be identified with the king mentioned in the chronicles of the Assyrian king who conducted the latter, in which case we have an indirect biblical reference to an Ammonite king by the name of Shanip who is also mentioned in Zayadine’s reading of the Yerah-azar statute inscription (1974b: 131).

The amount of tribute paid by the Ammonites to Jotham—100 talents of silver, 10,000 cors of wheat, and 10,000 of barley—is indicative of their rise in material prosperity. It also suggests a considerably advanced system of social organization to manage the collection and delivery of such a heavy taxation.

[Anonymous] Ammonite King (2)
Amminadab II or III

Jer 27:1-7

NRSV

Thus the LORD said to me: Make yourself a yoke of straps and bars, and put them on your neck.

Send word to the king of Edom, the king of Moab, the king of the Ammonites, the king of Tyre, and the king of Sidon by the hand of the envoys who have come to Jerusalem to King Zedekiah of Judah.

Give them this charge for their masters: Thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: This is what you shall say to your masters: It is I who by my great power and my outstretched arm have made the earth, with the people and animals that are on the earth, and I give it to whomever I please.

Now I have given all these lands into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, king of kings. 

BHS

כִּהְגַּם יְהֹה יְהָעַל עָשָּׂה לָּךְ
מְמָשׁת תּוֹם בְּנֵיה
עֲלֵי בְּאֶפֶק מָלָא צָרִים
ִּלְהַקְבָּר
בַּל אָלֶּמָא רַאִים
וֹמַש עֲלֵי בָּרַע יְרַע
ַיְרַי בִּדּ פַּלֶּחֶם בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּל פֹּקָק וְלָּל
יִתְנַד

LXX (Jer 34:1-7)

Οὕτως ἐπέπεμψεν βασιλεὺς Ποιῆσαι διαμοίρας καὶ κλονίας καὶ τερίδον περί τοῦ τραχύτατος σου—καὶ ἀποστεὶλείς αὐτοὺς πρὸς βασιλέα Ισσωμαίας καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα Μωαβ καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα Βασσαλίκης καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα Τύρου καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα Σιδώνου ἐν χερσὶν ἄγγελων αὐτῶν τῶν ἐρχομένων εἰς ἀπαίτησιν αὐτῶν εἰς ἱεροσαλήμ πρὸς Σεδεκίαν βασιλέα Ιουδα. καὶ συντάξεις αὐτοῖς πρὸς τοὺς κυρίους αὐτῶν εἰπέτε Οὕτως ἐπέπεμψεν βασιλεὺς ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ Οὕτως ἐπέπεμψεν διαμοίρας καὶ κλονίας καὶ τερίδον περί τοῦ τραχύτατος σου—καὶ συντάξεις αὐτοῖς πρὸς τοὺς κυρίους αὐτῶν εἰπέτε Οὕτως ἐπέπεμψεν βασιλεὺς ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ Οὕτως ἐπέπεμψεν διαμοίρας καὶ κλονίας καὶ τερίδον περί τοῦ τραχύτατος σου
A second unidentified Ammonite king is listed among the allies whose ambassadors convene a conference in Jerusalem to strategize how to resist the attempts of Nebuchadnezzar to impose the hegemony of the Neo-Babylonian empire on Palestine. This consultation in 594/93 BC came several years after the single-handed rebellion of Jehoiakim of Judah in 597 and the equally disastrous anti-Babylonian rebellion, led several years later by Zedekiah, in 589 (Weippert 1987: 101). In this latter event, Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, was again joined by the Ammonites—this time most likely under King Baalis (see below). However, do we have any idea who the Ammonite king was who sent envoys to Jerusalem during the events narrated in Jer 27:1-7?

Reference to Table 15 shows that three Ammonite kings are listed on the Tell Siran Bottle Inscription (see Figure 17). Cross dated the inscription paleographically to "ca. 600 BC or slightly later" (1975: 11). The last of the three Ammonite kings mentioned—the one reigning at the time the inscription was placed on the bottle—is identified as either Amminadab II (Cross 1985a: 171; yet see his earlier identification as Amminadab III, 1975: 11) or Amminadab III (Zayadine 1986: 94). It is tempting, therefore, on the basis of the fact that the date of the Jerusalem conference coincides nearly exactly with Cross's palaeographical dating of the inscription containing the names of three Ammonite kings, to view Amminadab (II or III) as the anonymous "king of the Ammonites" mentioned in Jer 27:3. Sauer's comment regarding "an uncalibrated radiocarbon date of ca. 400 ± 50 BC from the organic contents of the sealed Tell Siran Bottle" also must be taken into account (1985: 213). However, the
## TABLE 15

### Published Lists of Ammonite Kings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Kings and Dates</th>
<th>Sources and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albright (1953)</td>
<td>Nahaš (ca. 1000 BC)</td>
<td>1 Sam 11:1-2, 12:12 Time of Saul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross (1985)</td>
<td>Nahash I (10th cent BC)</td>
<td>2 Sam 10:2 Time of David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine (1986)</td>
<td>Hanun (10th cent BC)</td>
<td>2 Sam 10:1-4; 1 Chr 19:1-6 Time of David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine &amp; Thompson (1989)</td>
<td>Shobi? (time of David)</td>
<td>2 Sam 17:27; Time of David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine &amp; Thompson (1989)</td>
<td>Hanun II (time of David)</td>
<td>N.... son of 'Amminadab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine &amp; Thompson (1989)</td>
<td>Hanun II (time of David)</td>
<td>N.... son of 'Amminadab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine &amp; Thompson (1989)</td>
<td>Hanun II (time of David)</td>
<td>N.... son of 'Amminadab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine &amp; Thompson (1989)</td>
<td>Hanun II (time of David)</td>
<td>N.... son of 'Amminadab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine &amp; Thompson (1989)</td>
<td>Hanun II (time of David)</td>
<td>N.... son of 'Amminadab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayadine &amp; Thompson (1989)</td>
<td>Hanun II (time of David)</td>
<td>N.... son of 'Amminadab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources:
A. Bronze Bottle (copper, lead, and tin) from Tell Siran (10 cm).

B. Drawing of the Tell Siran Bottle Inscription.

date of the bottle’s contents does not dictate the date of manufacture or alter the reliability of the inscription itself.

**Baalis / Ba‘lyisha—Ammonite King**

ились / בַּעַלְיִשָּׁה מֶלֶךְ בָּעַל יִשָּׁהׁוּ

---

Jer 40:13, 14

**NRSV**

Now Johanan son of Kareah and all the leaders of the forces in the open country came to Gedaliah at Mizpah and said to him, “Are you at all aware that Baalis king of the Ammonites has sent Ishmael son of Nethaniah to take your life?” But Gedaliah son of Ahikam would not believe them.

**BHS**

Now Johanan son of Kareah and all the leaders of the forces in the open country came to Gedaliah at Mizpah and said to him, “Are you at all aware that Baalis king of the Ammonites has sent Ishmael son of Nethaniah to take your life?” But Gedaliah son of Ahikam would not believe them.

**LXX** (= 47:13,14)

On the first day of the Madaba Plains Project’s initial season of excavation at Tell el-‘Umeiri in 1984, a small conical clay object (jar stopper?) with a flat surface containing a seal impression was discovered near Field A on the acropolis (Herr 1985b). The seal is known as the Baalis Seal—named after the Ammonite king of Jer 40:14 whose servant, Milkom’or, was the seal’s owner.

This seal is the first of a total of eight inscribed Ammonite seals found at ‘Umeiri. Consult Table 16 and Figure 18 for a complete list of the seals/impressions and drawings of the inscriptions they contain.

Prior to the discovery of the ‘Umeiri seal in 1984, the Ammonite king Baalis (בָּנָל), who assisted in plotting the murder by Ishmael of the Babylonian-appointed governor of Judah, Gedaliah, was unattested in historical records. However, Herr’s claim (1989a: 369, 370) that the theophoric element of Milkom is found only in two seals (the Baalis seal and another seventh century BC seal) and on the name list of the...
### Ammonite Inscribed Seals and Seal Impressions
*From Tell el-'Umeiri and Tell Jalul*

#### Tell el-'Umeiri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Obj. #</th>
<th>Field/Square</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
*Inscription:* *ilmk wwr б т б’lyš*  
*Reading:* Belonging to Milkom’or, servant of Ba’alyifa’  
*Meaning:* Milkom’or/Milkom’ur = “Milkom’s flame/light”  
Ba’alyifa’ = “Baal saves” or “Baal is saviour.”  
*Description:* Conical-shaped clay jar stopper (?) with seal impression on flat end.  
*Iconography:* Contains three registers with a four-winged scarab and astral symbols in the middle one.  
| **1987**    | Field F 7L08 | Herr *MPP2*: 377-78 | Date: Early 6th century BC.  
*Inscription:* *bm 'аз*  
*Reading:* Belonging to Shim’az  
*Meaning:* Shim’az = “the [divine] name is strong.”  
*Description:* Stamp seal made of red limestone discovered *in situ* by Ann Fisher.  
*Iconography:* Simple horizontal line with drill holes. |
*Inscription:* Top = *l’ymš*; Bottom = *l’mš bn tnk*l  
*Reading:* Belonging to *’Imš, son of Tamak’il*  
*Meaning:* *‘Imš = “It is strong”* Tamak’il = “’Il sustains”  
*Description:* Two-sided scaraboid stamp seal. *Iconography:* Top Side (rounded) = Bovine or Ram; Bottom Side (flat) = Bird and (lotus?) flower.  
*Importance:* Bird/mamimal combination is well attested and shows this seal is in the Ammonite glyptic corpus. |
*Inscription:* *šb ’mn*  
*Reading:* Shuba [provincial governor of] ’Ammon  
*Meaning:* Shuba = “Exile”; ’Ammon = “Province of”  
*Description:* Two nearly identical seal impressions (similar to *yw’l* seals) on sherds from the neck of large storage jars. Written in Aramaic script.  
*Importance:* Evidence of continuation of Ammon after 586 BC as a Persian province. First examples of Persian provincial seals for the province of Ammon. |
Table 16—Continued.

**Tell el-'Umeiri (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Obj. #</th>
<th>Field/Square</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1989</strong></td>
<td>Field A 7K42</td>
<td>Herr AUSS 30 (1992): 193-195 [fig. 7-9; p. 199]</td>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> Late 6th or early 5th century BC. <strong>Inscription:</strong> b’l // y’[z] <strong>Reading/meaning:</strong> “Ba’al strengthens.” <strong>Description:</strong> Seal impression (partially broken) in Aramaic script on rim of large necked storage jar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#1699</strong></td>
<td>Locus 2</td>
<td>Herr MPP 3: 328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1992**   | Field F 7L08 | Herr ADAJ 38 (1994): 157, 159 [fig. 11, 12] | **Date:** 7th century BC. **Inscription:** lns’l b // n 'lmšl **Reading:** “Belonging to Našar’îl, son of ‘Ilmashal” **Meaning:** Našar’îl = “Il [(my) god] has guarded.” ‘Ilmashal = “Il [(my) god] rules.” **Description:** Faience stamp seal. **Iconography:** Simple iconography with disc & crescent. |
| **#3008**  | Cleanup      |            |            |

| **1994**   | Field H 7K32 | Herr ADAJ 40 (1996): 70, 71 | **Date:** Late Iron II. **Inscription:** ‘Iln bn // brk’l **Reading:** “Belonging to ‘Ilan, son of Barak’îl” **Meaning:** ‘Ilan = “Il [(my) god] is just.” Barak’îl = “Il [(my) god] has blessed.” **Description:** Scaraboid seal. **Iconography:** None. |
| **#5009**  | Locus 1      | Younker AUSS 34 (1996): 78, 92 |            |

| **1994**   | 'Umeiri Survey Site #84 A:1 | Herr ADAJ 40 (1996): 76, 77 | **Date:** Late Iron II. **Inscription:** Written in Ammonite script. **Description:** Scaraboid “abecedary” inscription. **Importance:** Evidence of fairly sophisticated societal development in satellite sites in vicinity of Tell el-'Umeiri during period of Ammonite control. |
| **#5238**  | Locus 6 (forthcoming) |            |            |

**Tell Jalul**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Obj. #</th>
<th>Field/Square</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1996</strong></td>
<td>North of Field C (On the surface near 1994 sift pile)</td>
<td>Younker Eretz Israel (Frank Moore Cross volume, in press)</td>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> 7th century BC. <strong>Inscription:</strong> l’ymbb // b // n šdq ’l <strong>Reading:</strong> “Belonging to ‘Aynadab, son of ‘Şedek’il” <strong>Meaning:</strong> ‘Aynadab = (1) “Where the noble?” or (2) “‘Ayya [Mesopotamian goddess] is noble,” or (3) “My [brother/father] is noble. ‘Şedek’il = “Il [god] is just.” <strong>Description:</strong> Red-brown (lime?) stone. <strong>Iconography:</strong> Three registers with a winged griffin/cherub in the center register. ‘Şedek’il appears on this seal for the first time in the Ammonite onomasticon. <strong>Importance:</strong> This seal indicates Ammonite presence at least as far south as Jalul during Late Iron II Period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#0100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 18. Impressions of Ammonite inscribed seals. Drawings of impressions from seals found at Tell el-'Umeiri and Tell Jalul. See Table 16 for more complete descriptions. Not reproduced to exact scale.
Tell el-Mazar Ostracon VII is misleading. Aufrechter’s *Corpus of Ammonite Inscriptions* (1989) lists a total of nine occurrences for Milkom. The first seal listed in Aufrechter’s *CAI*, published in 1847 by Layard, contains the theophoric element Milkom. This seal was originally classified as Aramaic and only relatively recently reclassified as Ammonite by Cross (1973a: 128, n. 6). Studies by Herr (noted above) and Shea (1985) on the spelling of the Ammonite king’s name, and by Younker (1985) on the iconography of the seal discuss these relevant issues in detail.

**Seal of Milkom’or**

The so-called Baalis Seal is actually the seal of Milkom’or ("Milkom is light"), a high official in the service of the Ammonite king. Evidence of this official’s position is found in his title which begins in the middle of the three registers on the seal. Herr (1989a: 370) notes that the title—literally ‘*ebed* (הֵבֶד) or servant—is actually an honorary title, usually reserved for royal officials and which appears on about 5% of Hebrew, Moabite, and Ammonite seals. See also Albright’s (1932b: 80) discussion on the meaning of the term ‘*ebed* (servant) which he elsewhere describes as "ancient legal fiction." The title receives additional authority on this seal by its positioning in the central decorative zone, its first two letters appearing immediately above two vertical standards which are capped by sun discs and crescent-shaped symbols. The title should more accurately be translated as "minister" and is usually followed by the name of the royal personage whom the seal owner "serves."

In this case, the one to whom the seal owner ministers is identified with the Ammonite king of the Hebrew Bible, יִרְיבֵיָה. However, the name on the seal is equivalent to יְבאל־ן—"Baal saves" or "Baal is salvation." Shea (1985) contends that the spelling variation is due to deliberate mutilation of the name by Jeremiah because of its impious meaning. Herr (1985a), following the lead of Pardee, prefers to explain the variation on the basis of phonetic spelling rather than consonantal spelling, i.e., that the
biblical spelling reflects the way Judeans would have heard the name being pronounced.

Younker (1985; 1989) draws attention to the use of the four-winged scarab on this seal as well as on two other Ammonite seals which share common iconographic elements and are also divided into three registers. These other two seals also share connections to Ammonite royalty. The first—a seal of Menahem—came from the tomb of Adoni-nur in which two additional seals belonging to Adoni-nur and Adoni-pelet, servants of an earlier Ammonite king, ‘Amminadab, were found (Avigad 1952: 164). The second seal bearing the four-winged scarab is that of Shoher, the "standard-bearer"—a military attaché in charge of cultic standards in the Ammonite court or temple (Avigad 1970: 287).

Based on this evidence and a comparison with the use of the four-winged scarab in Cisjordan, Younker concludes that the same motif was adopted by the Ammonites as their royal symbol as had been adopted earlier by the kingdoms of Israel and Judah (Younker 1989: 376, 377). Other astral symbols (crescent or lunar motifs) also appear on the Baalis seal. Interestingly, the juxtaposition of these symbols with the name of the seal’s owner (translated as "light or flame of Milkom") is hardly coincidental and indicates that Ammonite religion and its central deity were connected with the veneration of celestial bodies (cf. Zeph 1:5).

Seal of Gedaliah

Although Gedaliah—the exilic Judean governor appointed by Nebuchadnezzar—is not an Ammonite, his demise was orchestrated by plots conceived in the Ammonite capital and approved by Ba‘alyaša‘/Baalis, the Ammonite king just discussed above. During the excavations of Tell ed-Duweir (biblical Lachish), five clay seal impressions were discovered with the impress of papyrus fibre still visible on their undersides (Tufnell 1953: 347, 348, pl. 45). Among them was one bearing the inscription
Tran by "» E 7 [X \] ("[belonging] to Gedaliah, who is over the House") (Diringer 1941: 103). The excavator, Olga Tufnell (1953: 347), and others (Hooke 1935: 196) indicate that the seal that made this impression likely belonged to the individual identified in Jer 40:5 as "Gedaliah son of Ahikam son of Shaphan, whom the king of Babylon appointed governor of the town of Judah."

Interestingly, another seal bearing the name of Hannaniah, son of Gedaliah, is found in the British Museum (Mitchell 1988: 76). Although there is no way to prove that the identity of the Gedaliah of this seal is the same as the contemporary of Baalis who was appointed by Nebuchadnezzar as exilic governor of Judah, it is a distinct possibility that he was.

Tobiah, the Ammonite Official
נפביה הנטבר הסק시키י (Tobiaae)

Neh 2:19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>BHS</th>
<th>LXX (2 Esdras 12:19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But when Sanballat the Horonite and Tobiah the Ammonite official, and Geshem the Arab heard of it [the rebuilding of Jerusalem's walls], they mocked and ridiculed us, saying, “What is this that you are doing? Are you rebelling against the king?”</td>
<td>נַשְׂפִּיתָ נָבָלַת הָרֹנִי הָאָמוֹרִי</td>
<td>καὶ ἢκουσαν Σαναβαλατ ὁ Ἀρων καὶ Τῶβια ὁ δοῦλος ὁ Ἀμμωνι καὶ Γῆσαμ ὁ Ἀραβὶ καὶ ἔξεγελον ἡμᾶς καὶ ἠλθον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ εἶπαν Τῇ τῷ βῆμα τότε, δ' ἤμεις τωτε: ἕκτος τὸν βασιλέα ὑμεῖς ἀποστάτητε;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tobiah—along with Sanballat from Samaria and Geshem the Arab—was a prominent antagonist of Nehemiah during the post-exilic reconstruction of Jerusalem.

Nehemiah clearly views Tobiah as a threat, and prefaces his expulsion from the temple precincts with admonitions to separate from foreigners (including Ammonites; Neh 13:1-3), thus seemingly identifying Tobiah as one of them. Yet, his name ("Yahweh is good"), and the name of his son, Jehohanan ("Yahweh is gracious"), indicate a Yahwist connection. Tobiah is called דֶּנְבֵּי הָאָמוֹרִי (the Ammonite official). This title has
three possible meanings: (1) a reference to Tobiah's Ammonite ancestry, (2) a reference to his status as a Persian official over the Ammonite region (Mazar 1957: 144), or (3) a reference to his ties with Transjordanian estates occupied by Judean families, possibly implying mixed Judean-Ammonite descent (Horn 1979: 1130).

Whether Tobiah was an Ammonite by descent, a Judean governor in a residence on an estate near Ammonite territory, or a Persian appointee (the counterpart of Sanballat in Samaria and Nehemiah in Jerusalem), he clearly wielded a great deal of influence in the Judean capital and had close ties with Jewish aristocracy (Neh 6:18; 13:7).

Mazar describes how this influence may have originated.

As a result of marriages between the nobles of Judah and those of Gilead, the great Gileadite estates passed into the possession of the Judeans. As an example we may cite the case of Hezron, the son of Pharez, the son of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 21-22). It appears that the families of the 'great men' in Judah held big estates, and sometimes even whole districts in Gilead in the tribal areas of Gad and Reuben. The Tobiads, who were certainly 'great men', were in the First Temple period already connected with Jerusalem and with the 'Land of Tobiah' in Gilead.

   At the time of the destruction of the First Temple there was a considerable Judean-Israelite population in the part of Gad which had been taken over by the Ammonites.... The inhabitants of the Tobiad territory remained Judean-Israelite even under the Ammonite occupation in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., though their area was officially included in 'The Land of Ammon.' The name persisted after Ammon had become a Persian province and even later, when Rabbath-Ammon had become the Greek city of Philadelphia. (1957: 234, 143)

Textual and archaeological evidence indicates that the Tobiad family continued to exercise influence down into Hasmonean times. The Tobiads of the third century BC appear in the Zeno Papyri documenting correspondence between Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 BC) and a certain Tobiah who has autonomous status in the district of ἐν τῇ Τοβία (the land of Tobiah). A contract dated in 259 BC was executed in Βίρτθα τῆς Ἀμμονίτες—"the Birtha (fortress) of the Ammonites" (Pap. Zen 59003; Mazar 1957: 140, 143). In the works of Josephus, the Tobiads are known as "powerful Jewish landowners in the Ammonite region of Transjordan" (Eskenazi 1992: 584).
Tobiads are best known for their connection with the settlement and caves at 'Iraq el-Emîr (17 km west of Amman), the site Josephus called Tyros. Τύρος is a grecized form imitating the Greek name for Tyre (Σωρ or Σουρ) which is also preserved in the modern Arabic name of Wadi eș-Šîr.

Ruins of an impressive estate in Wadi eș-Šîr, complete with a lake and an irrigation system, have been dated to the time when Hyrcanus built a fortress (Greek = βάρης; Hebrew = birah; Aramaic = bîrthā) here in the first quarter of the second century BC (Lapp 1993). The Arabic name of the marble structure—Qaṣr el-'Abd ("Castle of the Servant")—reminds us of the title given to Tobiah (עָבָד יְהוֹאָש = "Ammonite servant") in Neh 2:19.

In the cliffs north of the Qaṣr, two one-word inscriptions of the name "Tobiah" are carved in Aramaic letters above the entrances to caves or carved chambers (see Figure 19). Mazar (1957: 141,142) recounts the various dates assigned to these inscriptions as follows: the second century BC (Clermont-Ganneau), the third century BC (Vincent), ca. 400 BC (Albright), and the beginning of the fifth century BC (Mazar). Lapp (1993: 647), who excavated the site in 1961 and 1962, doubts the validity of the fifth-century BC date proposed by a majority of scholars on paleographic grounds. He even declines to accept the date of about 300 BC assigned by Cross on epigraphic grounds, choosing rather to date the cave inscriptions to the era of Jewish occupation under Hyrcanus whose Jewish name he identifies as Tobiah.

Scholars may never arrive at a consensus regarding the date of the "Tobiah inscriptions." They may be unable to determine whether Tobiah was Jewish or Ammonite. However, one thing is certain, the Tobiah account—reinforced by the inscribed name of Tobiah in the sandstone cliffs of 'Iraq el-Emîr—underscores the important connection which existed between the territory of Ammon and the states of Cisjordan.
Figure 19. Tobiah cave and inscription at 'Iraq el-Emir. Source: Photos by James R. Fisher.
Num 22:5 describes the call extended to Balaam from the Moabite king Balak imploring him to come and curse the Israelites. The NRSV relates that the call was extended to Balaam "at Pethor, which is by the Euphrates, in the land of Amaw."

Note, however, that the MT does not say the "land of Amaw," but יָאֵר הָאָמֹן ("land of the sons of Amaw"). Does this land of Amaw exist, and if so, where? A note in the apparatus of the BHS suggests "between Aleppo and Carchemish." Another suggestion in the apparatus, however, presents an even simpler answer to this question. It notes that the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Syriac text, and the Vulgate emend the last phrase of this verse to read יָאֵר הָאָמֹן simply by adding a nun to the end of Amaw to make יָאֵר הָאָמֹן. This of course, becomes the common name by which the Ammonites are known in the Hebrew Bible—the בֵּית אָמֹן (bêné ‘ammon).

In a short note, Lust (1978) makes the following observation.

Where did Balaam come from? The best factual information given by the Bible is in Num. 22:5. He comes from Pethor, near the river. In order to make it clear which river is intended, an explaining note is added. It tells us that it is the river of the land of the Ammonites. . . . The author of the note obviously wishes to avoid any confusion with the Eufrates [sic], ‘the River’ par excellence. . . . The so called Ammawites are an invention of the exegetes. The literal translation: ‘sons of his people’ is too vague. The notion ‘the land of the sons of his people’ or
shorter 'his homeland' does not help us to localise the river, which is the purpose of the note (comp. *I Kings* 5:1). Moreover, it is fully unusual in the Bible. The current biblical expression for 'homeland' is *rs mwltdw* [and not *rs bnj mw*]. (1978: 60)

The river frequently associated with Ammon—particularly when describing its border—is the Jabbok River. Although the term *רֹּאֶשׁ* often refers to "the river" (usually meaning the Euphrates), in this context it is modified by the phrase which follows: *ךָּנֶהֶר אָרָּמִי בֵּין-יַעֲמִיסִים* (the river of the land of the Ammonites). The LXX reading supports this dissociation with the river Euphrates. It reads *ἐξὶ τοῦ ἱεραρχοῦ γῆς*, which the apparatus of the *BHS* again suggests represents *צליל פָּרָת*, without the definite article ה appended to it.

Commenting on the phrase "the land of the children of his people" (NRSV = "land of Amaw"), McNeile writes,

This must mean 'his native land'; but it is a very awkward periphrasis. The Sam., Syr., Lucianic LXX., Vulg. and some Heb. MSS. read 'Ammon, for 'ammo 'his people.' If this is correct, J and E contained different traditions as to the country from which Balaam came. This reading is supported by the narrative of J (vv. 22—34) which relates that Balaam rode upon an ass, with two servants, suggesting a short journey through cultivated country rather than a long desert journey for which camels and a tent caravan would be required. (1931: 125)

Thus, a case may be made for identifying Balaam as an Ammonite, hailing from a place near the "river of the land of the Ammonites," who has not traveled a long distance but who meets Balak at the northern boundary of his territory formed by the Arnon River. As Lust concludes, "Although this text [Num 22:5] does not confirm explicitly that Balaam was an Ammonite it rather seems to imply it and certainly does not contradict it" (1978: 60, 61).

Were it not for the reference in Deut 23:4 (Heb = 23:5) to *דַּבְּרַה פֶּתֶּרֶת אָרָם נַחוֹרַיִם*—"Pethor of Aram-naharaim"—identifying a "Pethor of Mesopotamia" (NRSV), the above identification of Balaam as an Ammonite would be most convincing. It is still possible to conjecture that the *naharaim* (rivers) referred to are the two whose confluence meets near the Jordan Valley site of Deir ʿAlla—namely the Jabbok and the
Jordan rivers—in which case the suggestion that Balaam was an Ammonite is granted greater credibility.

Even so, with the above information as a background, it is interesting to note the discovery of plaster fragments containing the name of Balaam at Deir ʿAlla (van der Kooij and Ibrahim 1989).

In 1967, workmen at Tell Deir ʿAlla discovered fragments of plaster containing letters written in red and black ink (see Figure 20). The largest triangular-shaped fragment measured 34 x 34 cm. The plaster was originally part of a "wall book" which consisted of text and illustration. The preserved portions of plaster come from the upper and lower parts of the wall. The upper portion is called Combination I and consists of a prophecy by Balaam the son of Beor which begins, "[This is the history / the book of Balaam the son of Beor, the visionary of the gods. As far as he is concerned: the gods appeared to him in the night" (van der Kooij and Ibrahim 1989: 67). The lower portion of the text (Combination II) is less clear, but contains many curses. It consists partly of prose (the narrative framework) and partly of poetry (prophecy, proverbs, and curses).

The text is assigned various dates, even by the excavators. Hoftijzer and van der Kooij (1976: 96) date it to ca. 700 BC. However, in van der Kooij and Ibrahim’s popular summary of work at Deir ʿAlla the date given is 800 BC (1989: 63). Cross gives a date of early seventh century BC (1975: 12) while Naveh’s date is the middle of the eighth century BC (1967). The language of the text also remains a matter of considerable debate. It is considered to be Ammonite (Cross 1986), Aramaic (Hoftijzer and van der Kooij 1976), or an unknown dialect (Hackett 1984). In a more recent evaluation, van der Kooij and Ibrahim call arguments over the dialect of the Balaam fragments "pointless," stating that

it is perfectly clear that in this early period such subdivisions of Semitic languages spoken or written in the Levant do not work. Should one wish to draw up boundary lines, it is better to acknowledge that between the 'true' Canaanite and the 'true' Aramaic languages, there was a group
of languages or dialects which cannot be ascribed to either, and that the
language of this text belongs to this group. (1989: 69)

At the least, we know that Deir ‘Alla contained a prominent religious center with
a strong tradition regarding Balaam which persisted into the eighth century BC. It is
also interesting to note that this tradition exists at a site which is near the confluence of
two rivers (naharaim) and at a site which is known to have evidence of Ammonite
material culture. Furthermore, the text which records this Balaam tradition is written
in a script which has distinct affinities with the Ammonite language.

Ammonite Individuals: Their Position and Professions

Based on the detailed workmanship of the full-figure statues available from the
area of Ammon, we are able to gain a glimpse of what the people who inhabited the
city of Rabbath Ammon and its surrounding towns during the Iron Age must have
looked like and what styles of clothing they wore. The statues are sculpted in enough
detail that some investigators are even willing to propose that the garment worn by at
least one of the statues is made from a particular type of cloth.

Referring to the statue of Yerah-‘azar (Figure 12, p. 156), the following is a
portrayal of the apparel of a wealthy member of Ammonite society.

He is wearing a pleated garment which has short sleeves. The
appearance of this garment is similar to the Egyptian mss or ‘bag tunic'
which was made out of a large rectangle of cloth folded in half. A hole
was cut out at the top for the head and the sides were sewn up, apart for
gaps left for the armholes at the sides. One interesting detail about the
gown is that it is pleated. This would suggest that the artist was trying
to depict a linen rather than woollen [sic] garment, as it is difficult to
pleat wool in this way. . . . The gown was fastened around the waist with
a long, fringed girdle similar to that worn by the woman. Over the
gown and girdle, however, the man wore a mantle (some 4 metres long
and about 80 cm wide) which was wrapped around his waist and flung
over his left shoulder. A corner of the loose end of the mantle was then
draped over his right shoulder so that the tasselled end was decoratively
placed on, and perhaps fastened to, the mantle. Many metal brooches or
fibulae have been found at Deir Alla, and it is more than possible that
these had originally been used to fasten such a mantle. (van der Kooij
and Ibrahim 1989: 61)
Although the figure just described is likely a member of Ammonite royalty, van der Kooij and Ibrahim also conclude that the Ammonite statues may in fact "depict the basic range of garments worn by all classes of people at this time, namely, long, short-sleeved garments which were worn with either a shorter tunic or a decoratively wrapped mantle over the top" (1989: 61). We, therefore, have some indication of what an Iron Age Ammonite male may have dressed like. Is there similar information available regarding what types of activities and occupations they may have pursued?

Professions and Occupations

Inhabitants of Ammon inherited a culture rooted in a pastoral heritage. Yet, as LaBianca reminds us, they were superbly adaptable to changing conditions and were able to adjust their lifestyle accordingly.

Side by side throughout this [first] millennium transhumant pastoralists and sedentary cultivators pursued their interdependent quests for food, expediently adjusting their variously constituted agropastoral livelihoods in response to an on-again off-again power drive whereby the center of political gravity was gradually shifted in the direction of urban-oriented intensive agriculture, only to revert back from whence it had been moved away, to the ever-present, ever-ready hands of the nomadic pastoralist tribesmen. (1990:137)

Arts and crafts

In addition to the normal occupations associated with food and clothing production in an agricultural and pastoral-based economy, artifacts recovered through archaeological excavation remind us of other crafts and industries in which the Ammonites participated. Closely associated with the care of sheep and goats in a nomadic economy was the use of animal by-products—hair and wool—which were spun and woven into articles of clothing, shelter, and transport. During the Iron Age, the emergence of a pattern of rural-based (rather than urban-based) economy such as the textile craft specialization at Hesban is one of the key elements in fueling the development of a flourishing tribal state in Ammon (LaBianca 1990: 235).
Potters, whose individualized marks can still be found on their wares, worked alone or as part of a workshop, possibly in consortium with a multi-generational team in supplying wares to a central site such as Tell el-‘Umeiri and its associated hinterland sites (London 1991: 402). Even the potter’s broken wares were reused and recycled as jar stoppers, spindle whorls, and ostraca.

Seals, as we have seen, played an important part in the economy of the Iron Age. Though not all seals are made with the same care, some are exquisitely designed, requiring specialized skill to engrave the script in mirror image so that the letters would read correctly when impressed. Figure 18 (p. 175) depicts seals and impressions found at Tell el-‘Umeiri and Tell Jalul. Among these seals is a stamp seal belonging to 'Il‘amas, son of Tamek’il. It is carved on both sides in such fine detail that even the species of bird depicted can be identified (Herr 1997b: 323).

A rich cache of Iron II objects, including 11 seals (three of which were inscribed), was found in Amman Tomb N on the south slope of Jebel Qal‘ah. Among the inscribed seals was the Adoni-nur seal (see Figure 21), fitted in a silver ring (Harding 1953: 57; Tufnell 1953: 66; Landes 1961: 78). Skilled artisans must have been employed to produce these fine examples of Ammonite artistic expression. Aufrecht’s list of Ammonite inscriptions includes a seal of Naṣar-‘il (My god has guarded) who is identified as a goldsmith (ḥsrp) (1989: 27, 28). The seal was found at Kerak in southern Jordan, possibly indicating that in the eighth century BC the reputation of this artisan took him outside of Ammonite territory. However, the seal may have been transported there after the death of the owner. Table 17 lists Ammonite inscriptions by provenance or by purchase site. (See also Figure 22 for a map showing the locations where Ammonite seals and other inscriptions were discovered or purchased.)
Figure 21. Adoni Nur seal from Tomb N in Amman. Stamp seal of 7th century BC minister of the Ammonite king Amminadab. Found among grave goods of Tomb N on south slope of the Amman Citadel. Seal is fitted in silver ring. Source: Photo by James R. Fisher of poster display at the Jordanian Department of Antiquities. Photo is reversed to show script in the orientation of an impression.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Provenance Known</th>
<th>Purchase Site Known</th>
<th>CAI Identification Comments</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Provenance Known</th>
<th>Purchase Site Known</th>
<th>CAI Identification Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Ain el-Basha</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nimrud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8, 13, 20, 34</td>
<td>14 &amp; 20 = Possible Ammonite</td>
<td>Sahab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5, 11</td>
<td>17, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tell el-Mazar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116, 117, 144, 145, 146, 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32, 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tell el-'Umeiri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CAI#123, U156, U1749, U1799, U19228, U19499, U19868, U19909, U19528, U-Ostraca</td>
<td>116 = Possible Ammonite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir 'Alla</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106, 112</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tell Jalul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J #0100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es-Salt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tell Siran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37, 128</td>
<td>128 = Possible Ammonite</td>
<td>Ur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65, 76, 80, 81, 94, 137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irbid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jebel el-Husain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (Nomad type)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67(?) 68(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Numbers for Tell el-'Umeiri and Tell Jalul are excavator's object numbers. Purchase sites are listed for completeness and do not necessarily indicate Ammonite presence at the site. * = Seal of Ammonite female dignitaries.
Figure 22. Provenance of Ammonite inscriptive finds. Map shows the sites of discovery or purchase of inscriptive finds. Numerals indicate the number of items from a particular site. The figures presented are based on data in W. Aufrecht's *Corpus of Ammonite Inscriptions* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1989). The CAI data are supplemented with more recent information from Tell 'Umeiri and Tell Jalul. Sites where Ammonite seals or inscriptions were purchased (i.e. sites where items have no indication of discovery location or any indication of provenance other than place of purchase) are shown in italics and within parentheses.
In addition to the items included in the Ammonite corpus of seals, several examples of monumental inscriptional fragments have been found in the area of Amman (see Figure 23). The Amman Citadel Inscription, inscribed on a 24 x 19 cm slab of white limestone, was discovered in 1961 (Horn, 1967-1968). Its eight lines of text represent less than half of the original and are interpreted variously as (1) a building inscription for the citadel (where it was found) or for a temple built on that site (Horn 1969; Cross 1969b), (2) a divine call issued by the Ammonite deity Milkom to prepare for battle (Albright 1970), or (3) a description of the construction of a system of round defensive towers around Amman at the behest of Milkom (Shea 1979, 1981). The text includes curses and blessings from Milkom and is dated by Cross to about 850 BC (1969b).

Shea’s latter article (1981) views the last word of line one and a reconstructed word in the middle of the fourth line (sbbt) as the Ammonite designation for the round towers commonly found in the Ammon area. Shea interprets the text as an oracle from the Ammonite deity Milkom to the Ammonite king which was displayed publicly as a means of theological motivation (Shea 1981: 109).

In 1961, the same year the Amman Citadel Inscription was found, another inscription was uncovered during excavations of the Roman theatre at the base of Jebel Qal’a (Dajani 1967-68). The Amman Theater Inscription, inscribed on a fragment of black basalt measuring 26 cm x 17 cm, includes two legible lines: "Ba’il. I shall build[ / ]sons of ‘sh." It is dated palaeographically to the sixth century BC (Cross 1975: 11).

These two monumental inscriptions—the Amman Citadel Inscription and the Amman Theatre Inscription—provide us with evidence that skilled masons and builders were employed to erect the structures, and that engravers were needed to produce the inscriptions which originally adorned the monumental structures to which they were attached.

The Tell Siran Bottle Inscription (see Figure 17, p. 171) also testifies to the craftsmanship of Ammonite artisans. This bronze-colored bottle (actually made of
A. Amman Citadel Inscription (24 cm x 19 cm).

B. Amman Theater Inscription (26 cm x 17 cm).

copper, lead, and tin) was unearthed on the campus of the University of Jordan in the spring of 1972. It measures 10 cm in length and contains an eight-line inscription—the only complete Ammonite inscription yet found (Thompson 1973b; Zayadine and Thompson 1973). The inscription includes references to three Ammonite kings—two by the name of Ammīnādab and one named Ḥassāl'il—and uses the term for the Ammonites commonly found in the Hebrew Bible, ḥānîn ammôn (bēnē 'ammon). The text of the inscription also includes terms such as vineyard, garden, and cistern. Scholars, therefore, have interpreted the inscription to be either a commemorative/building inscription (Zayadine and Thompson 1973) or a poetic inscription (Shea 1978). The inscription also implies the existence of servants and courtiers to provide for the upkeep of the gardens and vineyards of the royal estate. Cross dates the script palaeographically to ca. 600 BC (1975: 11).

Industries

Iron industry. In 1983, evidence of a metal industry which was active during the Iron Age in Ammon was documented during a preliminary survey of Abu Thawab, 7 km north of the Baq‘ah Valley (see Figure 10, p. 108). Three caves were investigated, in front of which iron slag, along with probable Iron Age sherds, was found. The site is in a fertile area and near extensive tracts of oak forest, a source of high-energy fuel and a high-priority item for an iron industry (McGovern 1987: 271). Glueck (1939: 225, 237, 238) earlier had noted abandoned iron mines about 10 km north of this site in the Ajlun district of northern Gilead at Mughāret el-Wardeh. However, the closest evidence of iron smelting Glueck could find was at the same three caves mentioned above—at a site which he identified by the name Dhaharet Abū Trāb. From an Ammonite perspective, this smelting site is located as close as possible to the source of iron ore while still remaining within the territory controlled by Ammon.
Commenting on the quality of the iron found in the Jebel al-Hawāyah caves in the Baq'ah Valley, McGovern writes,

The number of artifacts of Iron IA date and their very uniform carbon composition demonstrate that metallurgical expertise in smelting and working iron (steel) was well developed in the early Iron Age. Specially designed furnaces, which were capable of achieving temperatures over 1400 degrees C and of protecting the bloom from oxidation, would probably have been employed to smelt the ore. Even though the artifacts had not been quenched or tempered, the iron (steel) would have had mechanical properties (specifically, strength) that would have made them equal if not superior to the bronze artifacts in the tomb. (1986: 338)

These findings regarding iron production have several important implications. First, as McGovern indicates,

at a minimum, the finding of material evidence for iron production in an early Iron Age site in central Transjordan would seriously weaken the argument of most investigators that the Philistines introduced iron metalworking into Palestine. (1987: 271)

Second, as Younker concludes, "it attests to an early and independent iron technological tradition in Ammon, separate from that of Cisjordan." Not only does it speak to the issue of technology, "it also testifies to population continuity [of LB people] with the Iron Age people in that this indigenous technological tradition continues throughout the Iron Age without break" (1997b: 135).

**Lime plaster industry.** Another Iron Age industry was identified by the regional survey at Tell el‘Umeiri in 1987. The survey concentrated on identifying the numerous limekilns located within 5 km of the site. The production of lime plaster requires large investments of both labor and raw materials. Christopherson points out the importance of limekiln technology and the impact it must have had on the Ammonite economy.

In order to produce 1.00 ton of lime plaster, 1.50 to 2.00 tons of limestone and 2.00 tons of wood are necessary (William Kingery 1988, personal communication). Add to this the manpower involved in building the kiln, collecting the tons of limestone and fuel, firing of the kiln, removing the burned lime, mixing the lime with water and temper, and finally using the plaster in construction. It is obvious that the lime plaster industry was a very labor/energy intensive operation and its product would have been expensive. In fact, the amount of labor involved makes it likely that lime plaster was in some respects a luxury item, especially during the earliest periods of its use. (1991: 344)
The survey discovered three types of shaft kilns, nearly all located on or near slopes or terraces in proximity to agricultural land. At Site 70, one of the kilns was excavated exposing a huge quantity of slag, indicating the raw material contained substantial amounts of soil—probably from uncleaned field stones (Christopherson 1991: 349). The association of the lime plaster industry with agriculture was likely a reciprocal one.

Not dependent on a seasonal schedule, lime could be burnt during times when strictly agricultural pursuits were at a standstill. Thus, limekilns would not only produce off-season income for the landowner, but also provide off-season employment for laborers. (Christopherson 1991: 351)

Though the survey team tentatively dated the majority of kilns to the Roman and Byzantine periods, they could not date the kilns precisely, concluding, "In fact, the temporal context for all kilns remains open to question" (Christopherson 1991: 352). Thus, although these discoveries do not provide direct evidence of Iron Age activity, they give us a reasonable idea of what conditions were like based on the findings that the same basic techniques have been used during all periods when the limekilns were in use. They also remind us of the back-breaking work that went into building Ammonite cities such as Rabbah, ‘Umeiri, and Heshbon, with its large plastered reservoir.

The importance of plaster in the intensification-abatement cycle is also noted by LaBianca.

A fourth factor which played a role in facilitating the establishment of farmsteads and villages on natural hills and slopes away from readily available sources of water, such as springs and streams, was the spread within the [Hesban] project area sometime early on in the Iron Age millennium of plastering techniques whereby cisterns could be effectively sealed for use in year-round water storage. (1990: 236)

**Forced Labor**

The description of the lime plaster and iron industries given above—and the intensive labor force and raw materials required to sustain them—provides a back-
ground for the extent of the action David took after the capture of Rabbath Ammon and for the source of the iron tools used to carry out the action (2 Sam 12:31).

Commentators are divided as to how they interpret the terms for iron implements in this verse—as instruments of labor or as instruments of torture. Some scholars seem to be influenced by the parallel account in 2 Chr 20:3 which substitutes the verb רָסַּף (to saw) for בָּשַׁל (to set). Such may have been the case with Jerome. His Latin Vulgate rendition of this verse is not so much a translation or even a paraphrase as it is "a wholly baseless invention." O'Ceallaigh's rendering of the Vulgate reads, "He sawed them and drove over them chariots armed with iron, and divided them with knives and made them pass through brick-kilns" (1962: 182). Other translators and commentators (Driver 1913; McCarter 1984) do not impute to David such barbaric intentions. David merely subjected the inhabitants to hard labor (with tools of iron) developing various public works, perhaps also requiring the labor-intensive lime plaster industry as mentioned above.

Part of the translation difficulty hinges on the meaning of the words קְטִיב (Kethib) and קְרֵא (Qere). The latter has been consistently used by most versions since the LXX and means "brick kiln or mold." Those who view David's actions as vindictive acts have seen in the Kethib some form of reference to the Ammonite god.
Milkom to whom children were offered in sacrifice. This view, however, can not be substantiated (Keil 1983b: 170).

O’Ceallaigh offers an interesting interpretation which absolves David of malicious conduct and yet does not require a public works sort of explanation. His view is tied to the vocalization of the word rendered by the Masoretes as נְעָמָה . His explanation is as follows:

Our author had deliberately placed the object first in the sentence so that he could use the contiguous and intimately related verbs: הַשְּׂרָפָה וֹשֶׁרֶפֶּה to introduce their complement—the most important active verb in the sentence, מָגַר , meaning to "drag down" (tear down, overthrow). It is this dramatic verb of action that has been misread, because [it was] mispointed. Instead of הבָּמְמַרְרָה (with, or at the saw), it should have been vocalized נְעָמָה , הבָּמַרְרָה, "at tearing her (the city) down." (O’Ceallaigh 1962: 183)

The inhabitants are forced to destroy their own city. Since the Ammonites are known for their megalithic construction technique, the use of iron tools to dismantle the stone walls and buildings is highly significant. Also, the use of the piel infinitive heightens the sense of action involved in the activity. O’Ceallaigh also points out that the verb used here for tearing down (ָבְּרָה = to break or tear down) is different than the one used when Joab overthrew the city (_genre = to cast or throw down, 2 Sam 11:25).

In addition, this explanation which has David employing forced laborers to break down the city of Rabbah makes sense of the final phrase in the verse (12:31)—"Thus he did to all the cities of the Ammonites." Prior to the statement about the activity with the instruments of iron, attention was centered on the city of Rabbah. If the middle part of the verse refers to the treatment of the inhabitants of the city, and the verse concludes with mentioning the fate of other cities, whatever happens to Rabbah itself? The explanation outlined above draws attention back to Rabbah’s fate, which, in turn, is the prototypical example of what happens to the other cities of Ammon.

O’Ceallaigh’s translation of 2 Sam 12:31 reads: "And the people who were in her (the city) he brought out and set at tearing her down, even with iron crow[bar]s and iron mattocks" (1962: 184).
Government/Cultic Service

As mentioned above under the discussion of the four-winged scarab and the Baalis Seal, the seal of Shohar/Sawhir identifies its owner as the hnss or "standard bearer," a title which presupposes service in a military or cultic setting. In addition to the numerous seals of individuals containing the title of 'ebed (servant/minister), another Ammonite seal employs the title of na'ar (steward) for 'Abda', the steward of 'Ilram (Aufrecht 1989: 53, 54). Other seals listed in Aufrecht's CAI which use titles signifying their occupation are: spr (scribe—#139), shr (ruler—#48 and #68), pr (commander—#34), and h'd (witness/messenger—#66) (Aufrecht 1989: 356-376).

Until Zayadine's reading of the Yarah-'azar Statue Inscription identifying the figure as "son of Zakir, son of Sanib/p" (1974b), the inscription had been used to identify Yarah-'azar as "chief of the horse" (Landes 1956a: 268; Albright 1986 [1953]: 508). Each of these above titles found on Ammonite seals or on the Ammonite Statue Inscription provides evidence of persons employed in governmental and/or cultic service.

Position of Women

As noted in chapter 3, Abigail and Zeruiah may possibly be identified as princesses whose father Nahash was king of the Ammonites (2 Sam 17:25). Do we have any information on the status of women in Ammonite society? And though styles admittedly change over time, is there any indication of women's appearance and style of dress?

Sculpture reveals style

Recent discoveries of statuettes have included female as well as male examples. The female statuette from Khirbet el-Hajjar (see Figure 15, p. 159) is 0.46 m in height, with shoulder-length hair set in 16 curls or strands (shorter on the sides than in the back), and displays a slight smile (Ibrahim 1971). Both ears are exposed and adorned
with earrings—each having three balls hanging from a ring. A partially-broken necklace shows under the hair of the left shoulder. The figure is clothed with a simple two-piece design—a loose short-sleeved blouse and a full-length lower garment with two wide ribbons or tassels down the front.

'Amr studied four Ammonite statues which included the head of a female wearing an atef-style crown (see Figure 16, p. 160). Above, we noted the significance of this crown as a sign of royalty and/or deity. 'Amr concludes his study with the remark that "two female statues among the four examples studied, Nos. 3 and 4, show the honoured status occupied by ladies (of the upper classes) in Ammonite society" (1990: 117, pl. 8).

Seals Display Status

Aufrecht's CAI (1989: 21, 55, 289, 295, 304) lists five seals with the formula "A daughter of B" (nos. 9, 23, 117, 121, 126) and two seals (1989: 85, 110) with the formula "A amah [servant/wife?] of B" (nos. 36, 44). Photos of these two seals and their impressions are reproduced in Figure 24. In Hestrin and Dayagi-Mendels's Inscribed Seals (1979: 43-51) a chapter is devoted to "Seals of Women." Of the seven seals presented, three are Hebrew, two Ammonite, and two Phoenician. With the additional three Ammonite examples from Aufrecht's CAI, there are nearly twice as many examples of Ammonite seals of women as there are of Hebrew or Phoenician examples (at least in the corpus of seals presented).

Cross, in his Ammonite King List (1985a: 171), includes a note stating that some scholars have argued for adding to the list of Ammonite kings the names of the males found on the two seals mentioned above which contain the title "maid servant," 'amah (אָמָא). On what basis is this suggestion made? Cross states, "On the basis of Ammonite seals owned by women using the title 'mt, 'maidservant of . . . ,' which on the analogy of the title 'bd could be taken as the title of female royal functionaries."
A. Seal of 'Alyah (CAI no. 36 [plate up-side-down]) from Amman.
   (L = Seal impression; R = Seal photo.)
   Transcription: / 7
   Translation: (Belonging) to 'Alyah, maidservant/minister of Hanan'il.

B. Seal of 'NMWT (CAI no. 44) from the Irbid area.
   (L = Seal impression; R = Seal photo.)
   Transcription: I 'nmwt '7 /mt dblbs.
   Translation: (Belonging) to 'Anamawt, maid servant/minister of dblbs.

Avigad (1946-47: 126ff.), on the other hand, claims the seals with the formulae containing the word *amah* actually represent an unusual social class of the slave wife who was granted special privilege. Albright, however, disagrees.

There can, in my opinion, be no doubt whatever that they belonged to officials or other magnates who were women, just as in the case of the corresponding formula on Accadian seals, "A *ardat* B," "A maid-servant of B." However, they are important as illustrating the superior relative position of women in the land of Ammon, which was strongly influenced by nomadic practice. And well-known, contemporary Assyrian records list many women as queens of Arab states or tribes in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. (1986 [1953]: 507)

Landes (1956a: 301) concurs with Albright's conclusion, adding that the biblical tradition of the queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon at an earlier time (1 Kgs 10:1-13) also suggests the importance of women in cultures influenced by Arabia and the desert tribes of the East.

In fairness to Avigad, whose discussion is quoted above rejecting the view equating the term *'amah* with the status of a royal functionary, I should note that his position has altered slightly. In his study on *Bullae and Seals from a Post-exilic Judean Archive* (1976: 11-13), he modifies his view based on the finding of the seal impression of "Shelomith, maidservant of Elnathan the Governor." Since the bulla "was found in context with an official seal and official bullae" and since the term *'amah* now is shown to be associated directly with the "title of the 'master' of the *'amah*," he is willing to allow that the owner of the seal was in fact "a functionary of the governor." However, Avigad still adds the caveat, "This appears reasonable, but absolute proof is not forthcoming" (1976: 13).

Since owning a personal seal was an indication of significant importance, the relatively high number of seals belonging to Ammonite women (compared to the number of seals belonging to Hebrew and Phoenician women—see above) suggests that women may have played a key role in the economic and governmental functions of Ammonite society.
This understanding of women's role in Ammon may also help to explain two somewhat enigmatic matters related to Abigail and Zeruiah (see chapter 3), who according to 2 Sam 17:25 are daughters of Nahash and also "sisters" of David (1 Chr 2:16). First, when Zeruiah's notorious sons—Joab, Asahel, and Abishai—are referred to, they are called sons of their mother, rather than by using the normal formula which would introduce a son as Joab ben xxx, where xxx stands for the father's name. In fact, their father is nowhere mentioned by name. In the case of Abigail, nowhere is she called the wife of her husband. Her marriage possibly was of a special kind (McCarter 1984: 96), one in which the father was not a member of her household, as indicated in chapter 3. Thus, if the two sisters, Abigail and Zeruiah, indeed came from a society where women were held in high regard, the above circumstances are more easily explainable. Second, Abigail's willingness and confidence in approaching David (1 Sam 25) is not so inexplicable when we realize that not only was she David's stepsister, she may also have been influenced by the important role women played in the Ammonite court, where in her youth, she may have had excellent role models for developing her negotiating skills.

The explanation proposed in support of Abigail's and Zeruiah's Ammonite heritage is at least consistent with the testimony borne by the archaeological record as to the role of women in Ammonite society.

**Ammonite Cult and Religion**

**Archaeological Evidence**

Though not extensive, the artifactual evidence from the Iron Age aids our understanding of Ammonite cult and religion to a limited degree. Information gleaned from small finds such as figurines, seals, statues, and inscriptions along with the results of stratigraphic excavation help to enhance our insight into the everyday life of Ammon's inhabitants.
Figurines, Seals, and Statues

Numerous figurines depicting fertility goddesses have been found at sites in Ammon (Herr 1997c: 172). Though their function is not clearly defined, the ubiquitous nature of the finds reminds us that religious aspects of life must have been influential throughout Ammonite territory. These nude figurines likely depict the goddess Astarte—the consort of the Ammonite deity Milkom. An Ammonite seal of 3Abinadab calls for Astarte’s blessing on the owner who made a vow to the goddess in Sidon, the Phoenician city (Aufrecht 1989:145-148, pl. 19:56).

A small fragment of a model shrine from Tell el-‘Umeiri (Geraty, et al.: 1989: 419, fig. C.6) also indicates that cult activity at designated “cultic corners” was a recognized religious practice in ancient Ammon. Such practice is demonstrated by the discovery of such a site—with a basin and standing stone—at the entry way to ‘Umeiri in Field F (Herr, et al., 1991a: 187).

The use of the theophoric element 3El predominates in the onomasticon found on Ammonite seals (Aufrecht 1989). Most names found on ancient seals are sentence names with the name of a deity included as part of the name. Though the name of the Ammonite deity Milkom is occasionally found on Ammonite seals, the almost universal use of the element 3El suggests that Milkom was an Ammonite version of the Canaanite deity symbolized with bull imagery—an element found on six Ammonite seals (Aufrecht 1989: 351). Herr’s comment is instructive regarding the use of artifactual items in informing our understanding of ancient religion. "Archaeological finds cannot confirm or disconfirm the emotional or supernatural aspects of religious expression, but they can illustrate some of the material culture connected with religious behavior" (1997c: 161).

Some of the stone statues mentioned earlier in this chapter may also possibly depict Ammonite deities, according to some interpretations. The meaning of the atef-style crown in Ammonite statuary is still not clear. As Hübner notes,

No matter how they are to be interpreted, the number and quality of the atef-crowned figures found in and near Amman shows that the Iron Age Ammonites either highly revered the deity thus depicted, closely identified with the divinity and depicted their king as divine, or—as Hübner notes above—depicted themselves in a priestly role.
If the latter function of the stone sculptures is accepted (namely, humans serving as priests), one likely site for their temple in which they served is the location atop the Amman Citadel.

Ammonite Citadel Excavation and Inscription

The most prominent ruin atop the Amman Citadel is the Roman Temple of Hercules. Though the Iron Age remains from the acropolis area are relatively scarce, excavations conducted there have led some scholars to propose that the site was considered sacred long before the time of the Ammonites.

The temple was built on the site of a sacred rock, the history of whose veneration, as pottery finds may indicate, goes back to the Early Bronze Age (c. 3000 BCE). A fragmentary Ammonite inscription from the ninth century BCE attests to the sanctity of that area and suggests the existence here, in the Iron Age, of an altar and/or a temple dedicated to the Ammonite god Milkom. (Burdajewicz 1993: 1248)

However, such an opinion is not universally accepted. Dornemann, countering the claims of the first excavators—the Italian expedition led by Bartoccini who had suggested that temple remains existed in what was later the precinct of the Roman temple—states that "the ‘temple’ was badly destroyed by the Roman construction, making the designation questionable" (Dorneman 1997: 99). Despite Dornemann’s reluctance, it does seem highly probably that successive generations would value a site with such a commanding view of the area (see Figure 9, p. 102) and venerate it as a
site with religious significance. Recent excavations have borne out the existence of Iron Age remains beneath the Roman temple (Geraty, personal communication, 1998).

The text of the Amman Citadel Inscription (see Figure 23, p. 193) also supports accepting the cultic importance of the citadel location and the important role of religion in daily life. As Herr (1997a:148) points out, this inscription is one of only three monumental royal inscriptions found in the southern Levant—the others being the Mesha Inscription (from Moab) and the inscription from Tel Dan in Israel. If reconstructions of the initial line of text are secure, this inscription records an oracle from the Ammonite deity Milkom. Scholars are divided over how to interpret the injunction which the text enjoined on its original readers—either to build a temple on the citadel (Horn 1969; Cross 1969b) or to build a system of round towers (Shea 1981).

Regardless of what was to be built, Shea’s observation sums up the religious importance of this text as a motivational tool.

Originating with the national god, this order would thus have provided a strong theological stimulus to the workmen who were to erect those defenses and the soldiers who were to man them [or the temple builders proposed by Horn and Cross]. There would have been good reason, therefore, to have displayed this oracle publicly. (1981: 109)

Textual Evidence

*Milkom and/or Molech*

The Ammonite deity Milkom is mentioned in 1 Kgs 11. In this chapter Solomon’s relations with foreign women are chronicled with details of how their religious practices affected the Israelite king. The text actually uses two terms for the Ammonite deity—Milcom (מִלְכּ) in vs. 5, and Molech (מֹלֵךְ) in vs. 7. Scholars have long debated whether or not the two terms refer to the same deity. Some (Herr 1997a: 105; Day 1989:74) suggest a scribal error accounts for the two different appellations.
In the unpointed Hebrew text, the difference between the two words is minimal. Milkom has an additional final mem (ם).

Day (1989), in his monograph on *Molech: A God of Human Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, surveys the biblical and extra-biblical evidence for Molech. The term Molech is similar to the *molk* of Punic texts with whom the child sacrifices of ancient Carthage are associated. Though the cult of both deities involved child sacrifice, the terms are not identical. Likewise, Day concludes that Milcom and Molech are not to be identified, the latter closely linked to the Canaanites rather than the Ammonites. Day writes,

Moreover, there are good grounds for believing that Molech is not simply to be equated with Milcom. First, it should be pointed out that the Old Testament clearly distinguishes the two deities: it speaks of Milcom when referring to the national god of the Ammonites and Molech when alluding to rites of human sacrifice. Moreover, 2 Kgs. 23:10, 13 mention both deities within the space of a few verses and clearly distinguish them, since verse 10 refers to Molech with his rites of human sacrifice as having his cult centre in the Hinnom valley, whereas verse 13 speaks of Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites, as having his cult centre to the south of the mount of corruption, east of Jerusalem.

(1981: 109)

Dearman (1992b: 43), writing in a review of Day's monograph, notes how Day reasserts an older view that "Hebrew molek is really the word for 'king' (*melek* in Hebrew) with its vowels replaced by the vowels from the Hebrew word for 'shame' (*bosheth*). This practice is reminiscent of the mutilation of other names by biblical writers. See for example, *Mephibosheth*, in place of *Mephibaal* (2 Sam 19:24).

**Connection with Astral Symbols**

In the discussion of the Baalis seal above, it was noted that the iconography contains astral elements that were likely linked to Ammonite religious practice. In this context, it is interesting to also note the name of the king/deity inscribed on the Yerah-‘azar statue. The meaning of this name, "the moon [god] helps," indicates that in the view of the Ammonite cult, reliance on astral deities was an accepted practice. Thus, this background helps explain the denunciation of Judahite worshipers in Zeph 1:5.
Condemnation is linked to their denunciation of allegiance to Yahweh as a source of help, turning instead to Milkom, whose worship is here associated with veneration of celestial bodies.

**Ammonite Cultural and Trade Relations, Wealth, and Prosperity**

**Foreign Cultural Influences on Ammonite Society**

Beginning in the Iron I period and extending into Iron II, Egyptian influence is seen in the adaptation of anthropoid coffins for local use. Though similar in basic design to the clay coffins with "face plates" found in Egypt and in western Palestine at places such as Deir el-Balah, the Ammonite variety is distinct not only from the Egyptian but also from the Philistine styles which utilized grotesque features (Dothan 1982; Dornemann 1983: 148, 149). Six examples from Ammon have been found; one from Sahab Tomb A (Albright 1932b; Dornemann 1983: 146), and five from the Raghdan Royal Palace Tomb (Amman Tomb G) (Yassine 1975: 57-60; Dornemann 1983: 146-149).

Other Egyptian influences include the adoption of the atef-style crown of Osiris as a motif for the Ammonite crown preserved on the statues and figurines found in Ammon (see above). The four double-faced female heads found in secondary use on the Amman citadel have been interpreted to represent a number of spheres of foreign influence (see Figure 25). In his study of these unique objects, 'Amr (1988: 55) cites a number of foreign sources which scholars claim influenced the form of the limestone female sculptures: Cyprus and Syro-Phoenicia (Zayadine), Syria (Tell), Ashur (Abu-Assaf), and Greece (Prag). 'Amr's own conclusion is that they were not intended as capitals after either the Hathor style (Dornemann and Zayadine) or proto-Aeolic style (Prag), because— (1) they are made of soft, non-weight-bearing limestone, (2) they are rounded on top with braids (rather than flattened) as if they were intended to be viewed from above, and (3) they show no evidence of calcite deposits of plaster which
Figure 25. Double-faced female head from the Amman Citadel. Iron Age double-faced female head was found at the Amman Citadel. Reverse side of head is reflected in mirror. Backsides of inlaid eyes are inscribed. Source: Photo by James R. Fisher of display at the Jordanian National Archaeological Museum.
would have resulted from loading if they had been used as caryatids. "Amr instead identifies them with the Egyptian sister goddesses Isis and Naphthys. He claims as evidence for this identification the fact that the female heads have holes bored in the top which would have held "festal cones" as used in the Egyptian funerary services associated with the two Goddesses (1988: 55).

Later in Iron II when Assyria begins to dominate the Levant, Ammonite ceramic goods like examples in the Meqabelein and Adoni-Nur Tombs, including bowls and jars, exhibit a high quality influenced by Assyrian and Phoenician styles (Harding 1950; 1953). The horse-and-rider figurines, with conical helmets typical of Assyrian warriors during the eighth and seventh centuries BC (see Figure 26), and the exceptionally fine "Assyrian dinner ware" also exhibit the impact of foreign influence (Landes 1956a: 282).

**Ammonite Trade Relations**

*Importance of King's Highway*

We have already noted the strategic location of Rabbath Ammon on the route of the King's Highway—the major link between Arabia in the south and Mesopotamia and Asia Minor to the north (see Figure 4, p. 84). It was certainly in Ammon's best economic interest to exercise control of this caravan route. Bikai, on the other hand, points out that at times it was extrinsic factors beyond Ammon's direct control, rather than astute Ammonite political maneuvering, which fortuitously worked to their benefit. Specifically, Bikai notes that the expansion of Ammonite settlements in Late Iron II was due to disruption in trade along the normal east-west commercial routes from the Persian Gulf up the Euphrates valley.

Those routes were sometimes disrupted by political events, however, and what is suggested here is that when there were disruptions, the trade route shifted and Aqaba became the gateway to the Mediterranean and Syria. (1993: 526)
Figure 26. Ammonite horse and rider figurines. Riders shown with typical, conical Assyrian-style head gear. Source: Photo by James R. Fisher of display at the Jordanian National Archaeological Museum.
Such a disruption may have occurred during Iron I and was again repeated during the period of *pax assyriaca* in Iron II (Bikai 1993: 526). This led to an increase in traffic along the King’s Highway and correspondingly greater prosperity for Ammon and other sites along the route. It also was a contributing factor that led to an increase in the number of farmsteads around Rabbath Ammon. Evidence in support of this suggestion is found in the discovery by McGovern’s team in the cave tombs (A4) of the Beq’ah Valley that the number of Red Sea shell species, particularly cowrie shells (*Cypraea annulus*), increased markedly during Iron I (McGovern 1986: 331).

**Secondary trade routes**

In addition to the King’s Highway, there were also other important secondary trunk routes that branched off from the main north-south caravan corridor. One of these passed southwest from Rabbath Ammon through Hesban and across the Jordan Valley to Jerusalem (Ibach 1994). Another route linking the highlands of Ammon with Samaria descended through Wadi Umm ad-Dananir (with intermediary stops at Rujm al-Ḥenū East and Khirbet Umm ad-Dananir) to the Jordan Valley (see Figure 27). From there the ancient route reascended via the watershed west of the Jordan River through Wadi el-Farāh to Shechem and on to the Canaanite coastal cities (McGovern 1989: 134).

In an insightful article on the Song of Deborah in Judg 4 and 5, Schloen (1993) describes an alliance between Kenites and Midianites of Transjordan with highland Israelite tribes who together operated and profited from caravan traffic over the route mentioned above and its extensions through the hills of central Palestine and across the plain of Jezreel to the Mediterranean coast. The author cites this alliance—and its attendant threat of economic loss due to disruption by urban Canaanites under Sisera of the lucrative trade which the cooperative agreement protected—as the *casus belli* which drove the hill tribes to defy the lords of the city-states in the Jezreel plain.
Figure 27. Map of Palestine roadways. Includes caravan route from Rabbah via Umm ad-Dananir and the Jordan Valley to the hill country of Ephraim and on to the Canaanite coast. Source: Adapted from *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Vol. 5* (1992): 780.
Part of the historical reconstruction of this scenario is based on two key words in
Judg 5:6, 7—

In the days of Shamgar son of Anath, in the days of Jael, caravans ceased and travelers kept to the byways. The peasantry prospered in Israel, they grew fat on plunder, because you arose, Deborah, arose as a mother in Israel.

Stager (1988: 221) has argued that the נירים is to be translated "villagers" rather than "warriors." Others (see Schloen 1993) present persuasive reasons for repointing נ途径 as נ途径 so as to read "caravans" instead of "paths." In Schloen’s explanation, the highland villagers are allied with Transjordanian caravan entrepreneurs—Midianites, Kenites, and Amalekites—who join in celebrating the victory of Yahweh over the Canaanites, who in turn were responsible for the blockade of caravan traffic on the lucrative trade route.

Prior to the conflict, however, four of the ten Israelite tribes mentioned are portrayed as neutral, namely those of Dan and Asher near the Mediterranean coast and Reuben and Gilead/Gad in Transjordan. Stager suggests that this is because the former served the Canaanites as maritime client workers, while the latter, as specialized pastoralists, were economically dependent on trade with the Canaanites (1988: 221). It is understandable why the tribes of Dan and Asher on the maritime coast might resist the call to join in the alliance because of their proximity to the Jezreel Valley. But the question remains whether there is any evidence to suggest why the Reubenites and Gadites should not respond to Deborah's call to arms.
Schloen, commenting on the caravan routes which crossed the Jordan Rift Valley, remarks,

Only those caravans that crossed the Jezreel Valley and Lower Galilee on their way to the northern Canaanite coast were affected by the Canaanite blockade. Caravans that kept to the east of the Jordan, where Reuben and Gilead sat astride the King’s Highway, presumably carried on unmolested. Zebulun, Issachar, and Naphtali are by contrast especially prominent in the battle in both the poem and the prose account, because of their pivotal location on the main route across the Jezreel Valley and Lower Galilee. (1993: 29, 30)

This situation may even have led the Reubenites to develop a counter "trade network" by creating a treaty (or covenant in biblical terms) with Ammonites or Moabites. If such were the case, this would lend support to the suggestion made above that Tell el-‘Umeiri (biblical Abel-Keramim), if Reubenite at the time of Jephthah’s attack on Ammonite territory (Judg 11), was nevertheless punished for its alliance with Ammon.

When international maritime trade was disrupted, inland routes such as the one described above became even more valuable. Thus, states such as Ammon were strategically located to take advantage of and profit economically from increased trade on both the main north-south route of the King’s Highway and on the branch route over which the caravan traders transported their luxury goods to the Canaanite coast.

**Ammonites and Their Influence Abroad—Evidence of Reciprocal Interaction**

It is only natural to expect a population at the crossroads of the Levant to be influenced by invading mercenary forces, travelling merchants, and other international itinerant individuals. With ready access to the major caravan routes of the time, Ammonites also would have had some impact on the world of their day as they interacted with other contemporary Iron Age states. Ps 83:4 indicates that in at least one instance, as a result of such international negotiation, Ammon seems to have joined with nearby states in a coalition conspiring against their neighbor Israel.
Ps 83:4-8

NRSV
They say, “Come, let us wipe them out as a nation; let the name of Israel be remembered no more.”
They conspire with one accord;
against you they make a covenant—the tents of Edom and the Ishmaelites, Moab and the Hagrites, Gebal and Ammon and Amalek, Philistia with the inhabitants of Tyre; Assyria also has joined them; they are the strong arm of the children of Lot. Selah

BHS (Ps 83:5-9)
פָּרֶס לְפָּרֶס שֶׁמֶן נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי

LXX (Ps 82:5-9)
ἐκίσαν Δαὐτεὶς καὶ ἔξολοθρεύσωμεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ ἑθνῶν, καὶ οὐ μὴ μηθή τὸ ὄνομα Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ ὅτι ἐβουλεύσαντο ἐν ὑμνοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, κατὰ σοῦ διαθήκην διαθέσατο τὰ σκηνώματα τῶν ἰδομείων καὶ οἱ ἰσμαήληται, Μωαβ καὶ οἱ Ἀγαρηνοὶ, Γέβαλ καὶ Αμμων καὶ Αμαλκή καὶ ἀλλόφυλοι μετὰ τῶν κατοικιάων Τύρων καὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἀσσοῦρ συμπαρεγένετο μετὰ αὐτῶν, ἐγενήθησαν εἰς ἀντιλήψιν τῶν οὐσίων τῶν ἰσωτ. διάφασαν.

Landes (1956a: 259, 349-361) summarizes the suggested dates for a historical background to this Psalm. Two primary suggestions emerge—the mid-ninth century BC Ammonite-Moabite-Meunite war against Jehoshaphat of Judah (2 Chr 20:1-30) and the latter half of the seventh century BC during an undocumented yet formal conspiracy hinted at in Amos 1:1-2:3. Landes supports the latter (1956: 356), while Wiener (1928) favors the former.

We learn of other reciprocal interchanges between Ammon and foreign powers or persons (some of them related to rather mundane issues of trade or commerce) from other sources in addition to the biblical references. Evidence regarding these interchanges comes from several sources.

Evidence from seals

Seals are an extension of the authority and personal presence of their owners. They are easily transportable, and although the presence of a seal in a given locale is not proof of its owner having been there, it is—if found in a contemporary archaeological context—in all probability a likely sign that he or she was there. Or it is also pos-
sible that the owner of the seal wished the seal to authorize an action in a particular place. Therefore, seals may tell us about inter-state influence of individuals and possibly something of their travel itinerary (see Figure 22, p. 191).

For example, Younker cites the discovery of a seal which Herr identifies as Hebrew and dates to mid-eighth century BC (based on similarities to the Samaria ostraca) as evidence that its owner—someone with unofficial title—was present in Rabbah. "Thus, this seal could possibly represent influence of the northern kingdom of Israel in the Ammonite court" (Younker 1989: 379, n. 2). Similarly, another Hebrew seal was found at Tell Safut, also indicating interaction between Ammon and her western neighbor (Weippert 1979a).

A Moabite seal and a crescent-shaped silver pendant were also found in the Umm Udaina tomb in western Amman (Abu Taleb 1985). The scaraboid seal was pierced, indicating that the owner likely carried both the pendant and the seal hanging around the neck. Either the Moabite was living in Ammon at the time of death, or an Ammonite had obtained Moabite specialty goods through some form of cultural/commercial or military exchange.

Table 17 (p. 190) indicates the provenance where Ammonite seals have been found or purchased. Though not totally reliable as a witness of Ammonite influence, it gives some indication of how extensive Ammonites may have traveled. It is recognized that some seals may have reached the sites listed in this table through means other than being transported by their owners.

Hübner, recognizing the value of seals as a sign of interrelations, writes, "Dürften Belege für wirtschaftliche und diplomatische Beziehungen zwischen Ammon auf der einen und Juda, Israel und Moab auf der anderen Seite sein" (1992: 123).
Evidence from Ostraca

Ammonite ostracon in Nimrud. We gain a glimpse into Ammon/Assyrian relations in the late eighth or seventh century BC through the inscription on a sherd from Nimrud (biblical Calah). The ostracon was first published as Aramaic by Segal in 1957, but it was later identified as Ammonite by both Bordreuil (1979) and Naveh (1980).

Naveh points to three elements which identify this ostracon as Ammonite: (1) the use of the theophoric element 'El which is found in 11 of the 20 different names used, (2) the appearance of five names which are very common in the Ammonite onomasticon, and (3) the use of the word bn and composition in Aramaic script (1980: 170). He also gives a summary of its significance.

This ostracon is a humble addition to our knowledge of the relationships between Assyria and Ammon. The Assyrian records tell us about three Ammonite kings who were vassals of the contemporary Assyrian kings and paid tribute to them: Sanipu to Tiglath-pileser III, Puduilu to Sennacherib and Assurbanipal, Amminadab to Ashurbanipal.75 [ANET: 282, 287, 291, 294] . . . It is difficult to say whether the fifteen Ammonites listed on the ostracon were prisoners, soldiers or workmen. Perhaps there is some clue in the penultimate person listed on the ostracon, namely 'ltmk kbs, which I translated as 'Eltamak (the) fuller.' The professional designation 'fuller' or 'launderer' is well known in ancient texts: aššakā in Akkadian and kbs in Ugaritic are quite frequent professional terms. . . . As the vassal-kings, presumably, supplied professional workers to the Assyrians, it may perhaps be suggested that the Nimrud ostracon lists fifteen Ammonite workmen who served the Assyrians in Calah in the late eighth century B.C.E. (Naveh 1980: 170-171)

Heshbon Ostraca. The Heshbon Ostraca, discussed above (see Table 12, p. 128) also provide insight into the relationship of Ammonites with other Iron Age states. Particularly noteworthy are Ostraca A1, which mentions trade between Gilead and the coastal city of Elath on the Gulf of Aqaba, and Ostraca A5, which lists names of individuals (either inhabitants or traveling merchants) with Babylonian and Egyptian names.
Ammonite Wealth and Prosperity

Tribute Payments

2 Chr 27:5

NRSV
He [Jotham] fought with the king of the Ammonites and prevailed against them. The Ammonites gave him that year one hundred talents of silver, ten thousand cors of wheat and ten thousand of barley. The Ammonites paid him the same amount in the second and the third years.

BHS
The record of the Hebrew Bible ascribes to the Ammonites considerable wealth by enumerating in 2 Chr 27:5 the amount of tribute paid to the Judahite king Jotham by the Ammonite king—possibly Shanip as suggested above. Landes (1956a: 347, 348) cites this heavy amount of tribute as evidence of Ammonite prosperity in the eighth century BC resulting from expansion into the fertile hill country of southern Gilead where Ammonite farmers would be able to produce large quantities of wheat and barley to pay the annual tribute for three consecutive years. It may be just as likely that the Ammonites expanded their agricultural holdings south into the agriculturally-rich Madaba plain which was "ideal for large tracts of grain" (Herr 1997c: 148). To raise the 100 talents of silver the Ammonites were also required to give as tribute, they likely concentrated on control of the caravan traffic along the King's Highway running by Heshbon and Rabbath Ammon and the lucrative caravan route via Wadi Umm ed-Dananir as described above.

A letter written to the Assyrian king Esarhaddon in the seventh century BC also indicates the comparative wealth of the Ammonites. From this letter we learn that the Ammonites paid a tribute to the Assyrians of two minas of gold (= 20 minas of silver).

LXX

The reproduction of the text is as follows:
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In comparison, the people of Moab and Judah paid only one half this amount or one mina of gold and ten minas of silver respectively. For these figures, see Landes’s (1956a: 264, 363) reference to B. Meissner. It is evident that the Ammonites were perceived either as having greater resources or as subjects needing greater coercion, or both.

Archaeological indications of Ammonite wealth and prosperity

A number of individual artifacts indicate in some measure the degree of Ammonite prosperity—the Tell Siran Bronze Bottle, the stone monumental inscriptions of the Amman Citadel and Theater. The collection of Ammonite statues—unparalleled in all of Palestine—also signifies a sophisticated society which had the wealth to produce objects for decorative and/or ritual use (see Table 14, p. 161).

The distinctive Ammonite pottery of Iron IIC includes tripod cups, black burnished bowls, and several types of other bowls with characteristic offset rims. A number of fine wares used by the wealthy, such as the elegant shallow bowls or plates, rivaled the much later Nabatean ware for elegance and fineness (Herr 1997c: 171). Dornemann also notes that some Ammonite wares were "very sophisticated . . . with examples that rival the best production in neighboring lands, particularly the Phoenician coast, if they are not examples of imports" (Dornemann 1997: 99, 100).

Wealth accumulated at Rabbath Ammon through prosperous trade on the caravan routes controlled by Ammonite merchants. This prosperity reached a peak during the pax assyriaca of the eighth and seventh centuries BC and extended even into the Achaemenid period. The wealth of Ammon enabled its upper classes to trade on the international market. Herr reminds us that "the imported items found in the palace at Rabbath-Ammon as well as the Ammonite black-burnished bowl retrieved from Batash in Judah indicate active trade patterns for Ammon" (Kelm and Mazar 1985: fig. 16:4; Herr 1997c: 171). And Hadidi—writing of the Umm Udaina Tomb finds—states,
This tomb must have belonged to one of the Ammonite ruling families and can be closely compared with the tomb of Adoni Nur at Amman. Most notable among the finds is the great number of artifacts which date to the Achaemenian period in the fifth century B.C., including the bronze caryatid censor and other bronze vessels and ornaments. The presence of Greek vases of both Black and Red Attic types in this tomb indicates active trade relations between Jordan and Greece in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. (1987: 101, 102)

Through wealth earned from the products of its land and the profits from tarrif imposed on caravan traffic, Ammon was able to develop a successful society. Though the Iron Age strata on the Amman citadel have not been well preserved, due to the robbing and rebuilding activities of later inhabitants, the few remains that are there speak of a capital city adorned with monumental and ornamental architecture, whose artisans and merchants could afford some of the luxury goods available from the world’s leading centers with which Rabbath Ammon was connected by important caravan routes.

Sauer’s summary of the flourish of Ammonite development aptly describes the situation in the Late Iron II/Persian Period and shows that the prosperity enjoyed under the pax assyriaca continued with at least modest wealth (for a vassal state) under Neo-Babylonian rule as well.

Turning to the literary sources, it is feasible to interpret this archaeological evidence as a major flourishing of culture in the Ammonite region of Transjordan during the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods. It was to Transjordan that people from Jerusalem fled during the ca. 586 B.C.E. destruction, implying that Transjordan was then a place of safety (2 Kings 24–25, Jeremiah 39–41). It was the people of Ammon, Moab and Edom, as well as others, who were castigated in Israelite prophetic and apocalyptic literature for rejoicing in the destruction of Jerusalem (for example Psalm 83; Isaiah 11; Jeremiah 49; Ezekiel 25; Zephaniah 2). Transjordan would have prospered during the time that Nabonidus maintained his residence at Teima in northwest Arabia, since the route through Transjordan would have then been especially important to the Neo-Babylonians. (1985: 214)
Ammon and the Hebrew Prophets

Ezek 25:3, 4

NRSV
Say to the Ammonites, Hear the word of the Lord GOD: Thus says the Lord GOD, Because you said, “Aha!” over my sanctuary when it was profaned, and over the land of Israel when it was made desolate, and over the house of Judah when it went into exile. . . . For thus says the Lord GOD: Because you have clapped your hands and stamped your feet and rejoiced with all the malice within you against the land of Israel.

BHS

LXX
καὶ ἐρείς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἁμμων
'Ακούσατε λόγον κυρίου Τάδε λέγει
κύριος 'Ανω ἄν ἐπεχάριστε ἐπὶ τὰ ἐςμαί μου, ὅτι ἐβεβηλώθη, καὶ ἐπὶ
τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ἡφανίσθη,
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ιουδα, ὅτι
ἐποροῦθησαν ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ, . . .
διὸ τάδε λέγει κύριος 'Ανω ἄν
ἐκράτησας τὴν χειρά σου καὶ
ἐπεψόφησας τῷ ποδί σου καὶ
ἐπέχαρας εἰς φυσής σου ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
toῦ Ἰσραήλ,

As Sauer points out above, Ammon did not fare well in the view of the prophetic and apocalyptic writers of Israel and Judah. One of the chief reasons for their view—the antipathy Ammon displayed toward the Jerusalem temple as a symbol of Yahweh’s presence and the divine calling of a special people—is mentioned above in chapter 3 under "Ammonite References and Their Thematic Emphasis." Keil underscores this point.

This reviling, in which their hatred of the divine calling of Israel found vent, was the radical sin of Ammon. On the occasion of Judah’s fall, it rose even to contemptuous and malicious joy at the profanation of the sanctuary of Jehovah by the destruction of the temple (a comparison with ch. xxiv.21 will show that this is the sense in which הַנִּזָּה is to be understood), at the devastation of the land of Israel, and at the captivity of Judah,—in other words, at the destruction of the religious and political existence of Israel as the people of God. The profanation of the sanctuary is mentioned first, to intimate that the hostility to Israel, manifested by the Ammonites on every occasion that presented itself (for proofs, see the comm. on Zeph. ii. 8), had its roots not so much in national antipathies, as in antagonism to the sacred calling of Israel.

(1982: 361)

Since Ammon is capable of participating in a political coalition with Judah just prior to Jerusalem’s destruction (Jer 27), it seems Keil’s analysis of Ammon’s contempt
as a spiritual issue is correct. This view is also emphasized in Exek 25:6 where יָרָה יִתְנַפָּשׁ ("with all your contempt") is strengthened by the use of קַנּוּנָה ("in the soul")—i.e., with all the contempt which the soul could muster (1982: 361).

Although the archaeological evidence does not inform us directly as to spiritual issues such as this, it may provide some hints into why certain Ammonite attitudes may have been cherished. The wealth of artifacts from Ammonite territory does not directly correlate with the attitudes of the population inhabiting it. Nor can elegance of pottery style be used as a predictor of the owner's pride. However, the archaeological evidence regarding the people of Ammon (including their land, cultural heritage, and control of lucrative trade routes) presents a picture of them which does not deny the one portrayed in the prophets of the Hebrew Bible—a people whose accomplishments would be consistent with, if not in fact capable of engendering pride and boastfulness (see Zeph 2:10). The prophets portray the Ammonites as willing to align themselves in contempt against their Cisjordanian neighbors with whom they shared kinship ties and to whom they were bound by mutual covenantal obligations (Deut 2:37, 19; 23:3, 4; Neh 13:1, 2).

The picture of a proud and boastful Ammon cannot be proved archaeologically. A specialized study of references to Ammon in the Hebrew prophetic writings lies beyond the scope of this dissertation and awaits further investigation. Such a study may yet shed additional light on the rationale for including the Ammonites in the denunciatory oracles of the Hebrew prophets.

**Summary of Ammon’s Rise to Prosperity**

Given the level of prosperity and wealth described above, elite members of Ammonite society had many reasons to grow accustomed to a relatively comfortable lifestyle. Fine wares from Assyria, spices from Arabia, luxury goods from Greece, Egyptian textiles—all would have been available for the rich who could afford them. With the richness of their agricultural land and other natural resources, it would have
been easy for the Ammonites of the late Iron Age II/Persian Period to develop a level of self-sufficiency.

*Strategic location and flexible tribal society*

Ammon was strategically located on the western edge of the "Fertile Crescent." Major north-south and east-west trade corridors traversed its territory. This provided both political and economic advantages. Ammon was also close enough to the desert to be able to enjoy the flexibility of freedom of movement between the "desert and the sown"—retreating to the east when threatened by external invasion but returning to the settled Ammonite heartland when peace returned. This is partially due to the tribal form of social organization. As Albright notes,

Unlike the two other Transjordan states to the south, Moab and Edom, Ammon had no clearly demarked geographical territory, but clung rather insecurely to the edge of the Sown, between the rolling hills of Gilead and the Syrian Desert. But for the great natural strength of the capital, Rabbath-ammon, and the extreme fertility of the valley of the upper Jab-bok River, it is very unlikely that such a state could have come into existence, much less have maintained itself. More than any other Syrian state, Ammon was dependent on caravan trade for its continued prosperity. We find, accordingly, that the Ammonites remained at all times in close touch with the desert and that their social organization was essentially of the nomadic type (at least in part) as late as the seventh century B.C. (1986: 504)

*Rich in resources*

The Ammonite heartland, particularly the capital of Rabbath Ammon, was blessed with a perennial supply of water, a valuable commodity along the caravan routes which passed through territory under Ammon’s control. Rich grazing lands and farming districts for vineyards and orchards spread throughout the hill country of Ammon. To the north were sources of iron ore; to the south, rich agricultural land in the Madaba plain supplied the grain to feed the Ammonite population and provided a surplus for export (Ezek 27:17). Abundant supplies of limestone were available for building purposes and for making into limestone plaster. Furthermore, the society had
a rich cultural heritage—human resources with gifted artisans and people devoted to various craft specializations.

Ammonite achievements

The richness of epigraphic finds as well as the number of examples of Ammonite "Rundbildkunst" (Abou Assaf 1980)—including complete male and female statues, as well as other sculpture fragments—remind us that the Ammonites were both remarkably literate and artistically gifted. And, as Geraty observes, such achievements by the Ammonites are "out of proportion to their numbers or territorial extent" (Cross and Geraty 1994: 174).
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Ammonite tribal state of the Iron Age (ca. 1200–550 BC) is important to students of the Hebrew Bible because of the close relationship which existed between the Ammonites (םֵעֲרָיָה, bēnē ‘ammon) and the descendants of Israel (םֵעֲרָיָה, bēnē yisrael). The biblical text often presupposes prior knowledge of the Ammonites on the part of the reader—a knowledge which the modern reader seldom possesses. Therefore, this study addresses the twin themes of what the Hebrew Bible says about the Ammonites (along with associated issues of where and in what terms it says it), and what archaeological research can provide to illuminate selected passages which refer to Ammon or the Ammonites.

Ammonite Studies in the Last Decade
of the 20th Century

Ammon—though often ignored or slighted in studies prior to the middle of the 20th century—has increasingly received scholarly attention. The Heshbon Expedition, organized by Siegfried Horn in 1968, pioneered the way for many "daughter" excavations—including the Madaba Plains Project, Hesban’s immediate successor—to expand the work of archaeological investigation conducted earlier on a smaller scale at sites primarily located in the Amman region. These more recent excavations (Baq‘ah Valley, Khirbet Hilda, Sahab, Tell el-Mazar, etc.) augment those conducted at the Amman Citadel by Italian, British, and combined Jordanian-French expedition teams and help to expand the knowledge of the Ammonite tribal state in the Iron Age.

Publications on issues related to the Ammonites have also increased. Landes completed his Ph.D. dissertation on the Ammonites in 1956. Beginning in the 1960s and 1970s many publications concentrated on Ammonite epigraphic studies, following
the discovery of Ammonite monumental inscription fragments and numerous seals. More recently, publications have also branched out into broader areas including Ammonite society and culture. The Hesban final publication series includes an emphasis on food systems, while recent dissertations study Ammon from sociological and anthropological perspectives.

**Ammonite Studies: Combining Biblical Studies and Archaeology**

Recent trends in the relationship between the fields of biblical studies and archaeology have led to increased specialization—often accompanied by a retreat from interdisciplinary dialogue. This study has been a conscious effort to counteract the centrifugal force of this phenomenon and its attendant fragmentation of learning.

Published works combining emphases on the fields of biblical studies and archaeology were evaluated, especially for their treatment of the Iron Age Ammonites of Transjordan as they are portrayed in the Hebrew Bible. Four types of works combine a dual emphasis on archaeological information and the biblical text: (1) explorer guides such as Glueck's *The Other Side of Jordan*; (2) formal archaeological commentaries such as Cornfeld’s *Archaeology of the Bible: Book by Book*; (3) text books on biblical archaeology such as Thompson’s *Archaeology Illuminates the Bible*; and (4) correlational works such as King’s *Jeremiah—An Archaeological Companion*.

Publications in each of the above categories were shown to fall short in one or more of the following ways in meeting the need to use archaeological information to inform us about the Ammonite references in the Hebrew Bible: (1) the archaeological data are outdated; (2) the archaeological data are sketchy or the biblical references are minimal; (3) the focus is on the interrelation of archaeology and the Bible rather than on systematically addressing a selected portion of the biblical text; or (4) the archaeological content of the work is focused on Cisjordan rather than on the homeland of the Ammonites in Transjordan. Furthermore, in the case of recent dissertations,
they approach the Ammonites from the historical, sociological, or anthropological vantage points, rather than from a text-oriented standpoint. Therefore, rather than simply following the style of any one of the works listed above, the methodology adopted in this dissertation has been to develop an "archaeological context" for specific biblical Ammonite passages selected on the basis of sufficient archaeological evidence available to warrant their inclusion in this descriptive study.

References to the Ammonites in the Hebrew Bible: Textual Analysis and Tribal Interrelations

In an early biblical reference to the Ammonites, the book of Genesis traces the ancestry of the "Sons of Ammon" to an eponymous ancestor named Ben Ammi—son/grandson of Abraham's nephew Lot (Gen 39:17). Genuine parallels to ʼbin ʼammiya in Ugaritic sources—appear in mid-second-millennium guild lists, indicating that the biblical claim of Ammonite ancestry—though unprovable—is indeed plausible.

The Hebrew term for Ammon, or its gentilic form, appears a total of 128 times in the Hebrew Bible—106 times as the construct chain ʼbën ʻāmmôn. The retention of this long form of national identity reflects tribal cohesiveness and the persistence of Ammon as a tribal-centered "state."

The Ammonites are mentioned in Qumran scroll 4QSama where they are included in 1 Sam 10:27b, a section missing in the Masoretic Text but supported by Josephus. References to the Ammonites also appear several times in the deuto-canonical books of Judith and Maccabees.

A comparison of references to Ammonites in the Hebrew Bible with references in the LXX reveals that the Greek translation of the third century BC pays careful attention to at least two details. First, the LXX includes several references (not found in the MT) to the names of the mothers of the Cisjordanian kings Jeroboam and Rehoboam. This is particularly true for Naamah (נהם), Rehoboam's mother, who was the daughter of the Ammonite king Hanun (חנון) and married to Solomon. Second, the
LXX uses the Greek equivalent of the full form of the term יִבְנֵי אֲמֹם (bēnē ‘ammon) in several instances where the first portion of the term is missing in the MT.

The study of the familial relationships within the courts of David and Solomon suggests interesting possibilities for identifying a number of Israelite courtesans as Ammonites. It is possible that the widow of the Ammonite king Nahash later married David’s father Jesse. If correct—and assuming that the Nahash of 2 Sam 27:5 is the same as the Ammonite king—then Nahash’s daughters Zeruiah and Abigail (David’s stepsisters) would be Ammonite princesses. Thus, Zeruiah’s sons, Joab, Asahel, Abishai, and their cousin Amasa, would also be half Ammonite.

Equally intriguing is the possibility that Abigail (David’s stepsister according to 1 Chr 2:13-16) and Abigail the wife of Nabal—identified as a derogatory nickname for Ithra, father of Amasa—are one and the same person. Identifying Abigail (1 Sam 25), the wife of Nabal/Ithra, and Abigail (2 Sam 17:25), the daughter of Nahash (also David’s stepsister [1 Chr 2:16]), as the same person, and further identifying her as the woman whom David later married (1 Sam 25:42), helps explain why she was bold in her approach to David and hints at how and where she may have acquired her negotiating skills—in the Ammonite court.

With a background of such potential interrelationships between the royal houses of Ammon and Israel, events such as Joab’s appointment as commander of the siege of Rabbah and David’s seizure of the Ammonite crown acquire added import.

A number of other Ammonite references cluster around two important themes—tribal/kindred loyalty (Deut 2:19) and honor for Yahweh’s temple (or a lack thereof [Ezek 25:2]). Likely, it is a combination of these two elements of Ammonite interaction with their Cisjordanian kinsfolk—disregard for kindred obligations and exuberance at the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, symbol of Yahweh’s presence—which calls forth such strident denunciation of Ammon from the prophetic writers of the Hebrew Bible.
Ammonite Places and People During the Iron Age

Ammon’s heartland (near modern Amman) was centered around the headwaters of the Jabbok River (Wadi Zarqa), strategically located along important trade corridors—the north-south King’s Highway and the east-west routes to Jerusalem and to the Canaanite coast. The Ammonite border fluctuated through time, floating north and south within the Madaba Plain with the ebb and flow of Moabite and Israelite relative strength. Ammonite control extended north and west into Gilead and even down into the Jordan Valley during the time when Ammon enjoyed relative freedom during the *pax assyriaca* of the Late Iron II period.

A survey of Ammonite sites such as Rabbah and Heshbon revealed the existence of monumental architecture, sculpture in the round, and luxury imported goods at Rabbah, evidence of extensive public works (large, plastered cistern), and documentation of foreign commercial transactions as well as cosmopolitan inhabitants (Heshbon ostraca) at Heshbon. Other Ammonite sites mentioned in the Hebrew Bible were identified, where possible, and an archaeological summary given for each biblical site with Ammonite connections.

As many as 14 individual Ammonite (or part Ammonite) males—including Hanun, Baalis, and Tobiah—are identified by name, along with three unidentified Ammonite kings, two of whom are tentatively identified in this study. One is the Shanip/Shanib/Sanipu mentioned in Assyrian records as contemporary of Jotham, king of Judah, whom the biblical text records "prevailed against" the Ammonites (2 Chr 27:5). The second is identified as Amminadab II or III mentioned on the Tell Siran Bottle Inscription and whom the Hebrew Bible states was a member of the anti-Babylonian coalition (Jer 27:1-7) which met in Jerusalem in 594/93 BC.

Based on archaeological findings, during the Iron Age the Ammonites acquired specialization in various crafts and industries, including potters whose wares rivaled in quality the fine imported "Assyrian dinner ware." Lime plaster making and iron
smelting were developed. Gifted artisans also created numerous examples of fine sculpture and seals. From the inscribed seals of two women, we learn that at least some women held high places in Ammonite society as government officials.

Evidence of Ammonite Prosperity During the Iron Age

At least 21 tombs dating to the Iron Age in the Amman region contain grave goods which testify to the relatively high standard of living of the elite levels of Ammonite society. From the imported goods in these burials, we discovered something of the interrelations between Ammon and other contemporary states. The comparative richness of Ammon's cultural heritage and its rise to relative prosperity as a vassal state is chronicled in the pottery, seals, and luxury goods found in the Iron Age tombs.

Another evidence of Ammon's relative wealth was found in the biblical account of extensive tribute paid to the Judahite king Jotham in the mid-eighth century BC. Assyrian documents indicated that Ammon was required to pay tribute amounts double those of other neighboring nations in the seventh century BC.

Rabbath-Ammon's strategic location on the main north-south trade route of the King's Highway is linked to increased opportunity for wealth derived from taxation revenue in both the LB/Iron I transition period and again in the Late Iron II period. At these times, disrupted traffic along the direct trade route from the Persian Gulf to Asia Minor would have redirected lucrative trade to the Red Sea port of Elath, where caravans would begin the overland trek north through Amman to Damascus. The Ammonites were in an ideal location to capitalize on their good fortune of having their capital Rabbah, with its abundant source of water, located along this route.

At the crossroads of east-west trade corridors as well, Ammon was well connected to take advantage of trade opportunities with many nations. Under the relative security of the pax assyriaca of the eighth and seventh centuries BC, Ammon
flourished as a prosperous vassal state. Ammonite society developed features indicative of a sophisticated "state," albeit a secondary one (Younker 1996: 387; 1997b: 191). These traits included: (1) urban centers with administrative documents (inscriptions and seals), (2) intensive agriculture, (3) monumental architecture (palatial buildings, towers, and fortifications), (4) public works (water systems [Hesban and Rabbah] and roads), and (5) craft and industry specialization (ceramics, statuary, iron, and plaster).

Evidence of Ammonite cult is attested by scores of Astarte figurines and possibly by the depiction of deities wearing the aterf-style crown. Numerous Ammonite seals also bear witness to the Ammonite deity who is known by the epithet of ʿEl. Though evidence of an Iron Age Ammonite temple on the acropolis in Amman is lacking, it is likely that such a structure once was located at this spot venerated by occupants of the site long before Ammon became a state. The Amman Citadel Inscription, which contains blessings and curses as an oracle from the Ammonite deity Milkom, may have made reference to construction of such a temple. Or, on the other hand, if the inscription's contents refer to building defensive structures (instead of a temple), the limestone slab may have been publicly displayed at a temple on the citadel site. Displaying such an oracle at this location would have increased its religious motivational impact.

As a result of Ammon's key location in the Levant, the state increased in influence and wealth out of proportion to the number of its people and the extent of its area of contiguous control. According to the archaeological record, the people of Ammon—literate and moderately wealthy—enjoyed this status even when they were reduced to being vassals under Assyrian rule. According to the Hebrew prophets, this rise in power was accompanied by the adoption of an attitude of pride and arrogance and by a disdain for the worship of Yahweh and the symbol of His presence—the temple in Jerusalem.
Conclusions

Based on the above evidence, we may draw the following conclusions regarding the Iron Age Ammonites of the Transjordanian plateau. First, the analysis of the text of the Hebrew Bible in its present form indicates that close interrelations existed between Ammon and Israel/Judah, closer than previously commonly believed, including the distinct possibility that these ties included closer relations between the two royal houses—even familial ties. Second, the Iron Age "state" of Ammon emerges from the archaeological record as a tribal-oriented society, with moderate wealth derived primarily from taxation of caravan trade and which equaled or exceeded that of its neighboring states. Third, that the Ammonite population included literate individuals, gifted artisans, merchants who traded on the international market, and women who played significant roles in society and government.

Items for Further Investigation

Ammon's inclusion in the Hebrew prophetic oracles is only briefly mentioned in this dissertation. The archaeological evidence is shown to be consistent with the biblical portrayal of Ammon in the Hebrew Bible. However, additional in-depth study of the importance of Ammon in Hebrew prophetic literature is recommended. Such a study would include additional aspects of Ammon's religious practices, the importance of the national deity Milkom, and other related issues. Of particular interest is the potential for studying the relationship of the tribally inclusive language of the Hebrew prophets as the concept of "Israel"—in its non-ethnically restricted meaning—is expanded to include the nations (דוא). A good starting point for such a study is the concept presented by Diop.

The name 'Israel' in the books of Amos and Hosea is also linked to the destiny of non-Israelite peoples. Theologically, it becomes clear in both books that God's concern with 'Israel' is parallel to His concern for the non-Israelite peoples. . . . When the fate of the former is envisioned as the transition from a state (i.e., a socio-political entity) to a purely religious entity (a remnant of Jacob, sifted along ethico-religious lines), it follows that a remnant from the non-Israelite peoples becomes part of God's people.
This phenomenon is perfectly understandable within the context of a tribal society, where a whole clan or group can be incorporated and share in the identity of the nucleus 'tribe.' The various names and expressions in construct with the name 'Israel' and related names, such as 'sons of,' 'house of,' and so on are actually 'tribal language,' and point to the particular social structure of ancient Israel. The designation of 'Israel' as a family in Amos 3:1 concurs with this perspective" (Diop 1995: 386, 387).

Another area of important research awaiting study is that of Ammonite/Israel relations as presented in the Hebrew Bible and their impact on the issue of land tenure, particularly as this informs Arab-Israeli relations at the threshold of the 21st century.
APPENDIX A

AMMONITE REFERENCES IN HEBREW

CANONICAL ORDER
## Ammonite References in Hebrew Canonical Order

(Prose and Poetic References in the BHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew Form and Comments</th>
<th>Poetic Context</th>
<th>Hebrew Form and Comments</th>
<th>Poetic Context</th>
<th>Hebrew Form and Comments</th>
<th>Poetic Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 19:38</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>2 Sam 8:12</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amos 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 21:24</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zeph 2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 2:19</td>
<td>וחשבונם</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zeph 2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>וישכון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:3</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ps 83:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:37</td>
<td>והحساب</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dan 11:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>והحساب</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:8</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ezra 9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>והحساب</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:4</td>
<td>והحساب</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:11</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 2:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh 12:2</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>10:14</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 2:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:10</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>10:19</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:25</td>
<td>והحساب</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 13:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:24</td>
<td>והحساب</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12:9</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 13:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg 3:13</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>12:26</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>12:31</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:7</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>17:27</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:9</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>14:21</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:11</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>14:31</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>23:13</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:18</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>23:25</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:4</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>25:1</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:5</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>25:21</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>27:3</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:8</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>40:11</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:9</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>40:14</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>41:10</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:13</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>41:15</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:14</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>⸙</td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>בכרעמון</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh 14:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11:14 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 49:2 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעו
| 11:15 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 49:6 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:16 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:1 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:27 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:2 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:28 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:5 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:29 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:10 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:30 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:15 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:31 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:20 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:32 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:25 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:33 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:30 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 11:36 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:35 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 12:1 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:40 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 12:2 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:45 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 12:3 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 52:50 | בכרעמון | 2 | Neh 14:26 | בכרעמון |
| 1 Sam 11:1 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 21:25 | בכרעמון | 2 | Ezek 21:13 | בכרעמון |
| 11:2 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 21:33 | בכרעמון | 2 | Ezek 21:19 | בכרעמון |
| 11:11 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 25:3 | בכרעמון | 2 | Ezek 21:22 | בכרעמון |
| 12:12 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 25:5 | בכרעמון | 2 | Ezek 21:26 | בכרעמון |
| 14:47 | בכרעמון | ⸙ | 25:10 | בכרעמון | 2 | Ezek 21:30 | בכרעמון |

# = Number of occurrences in a verse. Only 8 of 128 occurrences are in a poetic context (p). In verses where the Hebrew form is not given, the reading of the BHS is understood (104 times out of 128).
CONCORDANCE OF AMMONITE REFERENCES IN THE HEBREW BIBLE (BHS)

Summary of References in Which the Roots עִמּוֹנֵי are Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Form (without article)</th>
<th># Occurrences</th>
<th>Hebrew Form (with article)</th>
<th># Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>עִמָּוָן</td>
<td>[105]</td>
<td>עָמָוָן</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עִמּוֹנֵי</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>עָמָוָנֵי</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Words preceded by ** indicate Qere; words preceded by * indicate Kethib. Figures in brackets indicate the number of times a lexical form is used.)

Used without the Article or Waw Conjunctive:

— עִמּוֹנִים [1] —

1 Kgs 11 1  רָבָּה (אָמֹנֵי) — פֹּרָה מִנְמֵאָנִים עִמְנִית אֲרֻםִית אִדְּנִית הָעָי: 1
Neh 13 23 אָשְׁדוֹרִית **אסְדוֹרִית — עִמְנִית **עִמְנִית מֹאֵבִית: 3

— עִמּוֹב [1] —

Neh 13 1  כִּי בֹּי אֲשֶׁר לֹא יְבָאוּ עָמָבִים וַעֲבֹרִים מַכֹּל הָעָי: 1

— עִמּוֹנֵית [1] —

1 Kgs 11 5  שֵׁלָלָה אֶתְּרִי עִשְׂרֵית אֲלָלָיָה עִדְּנִית מַכֹּלָה — שְׁלָמִים: 5
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Chr 24 26

(Possible transposition of two letters: cf. Landes & LXX)

Used with the Waw Conjunctive:

Psalm 83 8
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CONCORDANCE OF AMMONITE REFERENCES
IN THE SEPTUAGINT (LXX)
CONCORDANCE OF AMMONITE REFERENCES
IN THE SEPTUAGINT (LXX)

Concordance of References to Αμμαν* and Αμμων* in the LXX

(* indicates all forms of these two roots as they appear in Rahlfs edition [1935,1979] as incorporated in the CCAT electronic version. Figures in brackets indicate the number of times a particular lexical form is used. English references given are the equivalent of the Greek titles.)

— AMMAN [6]

Gen 19 38 οίδον καὶ ἑκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Αμμαν υίὸς τοῦ γένους μου
Num 21 24 Αρνων ἐξα το Ιαβοκ ἔως υίων Αμμαν· ὅτι Ιαβοκ ὅρια υίων Αμμων
Deut 2 19 καὶ προσάξετε ἑγγὺς υίων Αμμαν· μὴ ἐχθραίνετε αὐτοὺς καὶ μὴ
2 19 οὐ γὰρ μὴ δῶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς υίων Αμμαν σοὶ ἐν κλήρῳ, ὅτι τοῖς
3 16 καὶ ἔως τοῦ Ιαβοκ· ὁ χειμάρρους ὄριον τοῖς υἱῶν Αμμαν·
2 Sam 2 24 καὶ αὐτοὶ εἰσῆλθον ἐως τοῦ βουνοῦ Αμμαν, ὃ ἔστιν ἐπὶ

— AMMANITAI [3]

Deut 2 20 τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ οἱ Αμμανῖται ὄνομάζουσιν αὐτοὺς Ζομζομμιν
2 Esd 14 1 καὶ οἱ Ἀραβές καὶ οἱ Αμμανῖται ὃ ἐνέβη φυὴ τοῖς τείχεσιν
23 1 αὐτῷ ὅτις μὴ εἰσέλθωσιν Αμμανῖται καὶ Μωαβῖται ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ

— AMMANITHN [3]

Jdt 14 5 τρὸ δὲ τοῦ ποτήσαι ταῦτα καλέσατε μοι Αχιωρ τὸν Αμμανίτην
1 Sam 11 1 οἱ ἄνδρες Ιαβίς πρὸς Ναας τὸν Αμμανίτην Διάθου ήμῶν διαθήκην
11 10 Ιαβίς πρὸς Ναας τὸν Αμμανίτην Αὔριον ἐξελεύσόμεθα πρὸς υμᾶς

— AMMANITHE [6]

Deut 23 4 οὐκ εἰσελθεύσεται Αμμανίτης καὶ Μωαβίτης εἰς ἐκκλησίαν
2 Sam 23 37 Ελιε ὁ Αμμανίτης, Μελωραὶ ὁ Βηρουβαῖς σιρών τὰ σκεύη Ισαβ
2 Chr 24 26 Ζαβεδ ο του Σαμαθ ο Αμμανίτης και Ίωζαβεδ ο του Σομαρωθ ο
2 Esd 13 35 και Τωβίας ο Αμμανίτης ἐχόμενα αὐτοῦ ἤλθεν, καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς
1 Sam 11 1 μήνα καὶ ἀνέβη Ναας ο Αμμανίτης και παρεμβάλλει ἐπὶ Ιαβής
11 2 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Ναας ο Αμμανίτης ἐν ταύτη διαβῆσομαι ἵμιν
— AMMANITIDAS [2] —
1 Kgs 11 1 θυγατέρα Φαραώ, Μωαβίτιδας, Αμμανίτιδας, Σύρας καὶ Ιδομαιάς
2 Esd 23 23 οἱ ἐκάθισαν γυναίκας Ἀζωτίας, Αμμανίτιδας, Μωαβίτιδας
— AMMANITIN [2] —
2 Macc 4 26 υφ' ἐτέρου φυγάς εἰς τὴν Αμμανίτιν χώραν συνήλαστο
5 7 λαβὼν φυγάς πάλιν εἰς τὴν Αμμανίτιν ἀπήλθεν
— AMMANITIS [2] —
1 Kgs 14 21 τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· καὶ τὸ ἄτομο τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Νααμα ἡ Αμμανίτις
2 Chr 12 13 νιών Ἰσραήλ· καὶ ἄτομο τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Νοομα ἡ Αμμανίτις
— AMMANITON [2] —
Gen 19 38 τοῦ γενός μου· οὗτος πατήρ Αμμανίτων ἐως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας
— AMMON [133] —
Num 21 24 ἐως Ιαβόκ ἐως νιών Αμμων· ότι Ἰαβόκ ὀρα νιών Αμμων ἑστίν
Deut 2 37 πλὴν εἰς γῆν νιών Αμμων οἱ προσήλθομεν, πάντα τὰ συγκρούοντα
3 11 ἵδον αὐτὴ ἐν τῇ ἄκρᾳ τῶν νιῶν Αμμων, ἐνέδειπνεν τὸ μῆκος
Josh_V 12 2 φάραγγος καὶ τὸ ἥμιυν τῆς Γαλαάδ ἐως Ιαβόκ, ὀρα νιών Αμμων
13 10 ὡς ἔβασινεν ἐν Εσσαβῶν, ἤς τῶν ὀρίων νιῶν Αμμων
13 25 πάσαι αἱ πόλεις Γαλαάδ καὶ τὸ ἥμιυν γῆς νιῶν Αμμων ἐως Ἀρωπή
19 42 καὶ Σαλαβιω καὶ Αμμων καὶ Σιλαβά
Judg_A 3 13 αὐτοῦ πάντας τοὺς νιῶν Αμμων καὶ Αμαλκη καὶ ἐπορεύθη καὶ
10 6 Μωαβ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς νιῶν Αμμων καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν ἄλλοφύλων
10 7 ἀπέδοτο αὐτοῖς ἐν χειρὶ ἄλλοφύλων καὶ ἐν χειρὶ νιῶν Αμμων
10 9 καὶ διέβησαν οἱ νιῶν Αμμων τὸν Ἰιρδάνην ἐκπολέμησαν καὶ ἐν
10 11 καὶ οἱ Αμορραιοί καὶ οἱ νιῶν Αμμων καὶ Μωαβ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοφύλοι
10 17 Καὶ ἀνέβησαν οἱ νιῶν Αμμων καὶ παρενεβάλον ἐν Γαλαάδ, καὶ
10 18 ἀνήρ, ὃς ἀρξηται πολεμήσαι ἐν τοῖς νιῶν Αμμων· καὶ ἐσται εἰς
11 4 ἐγένετο μιθ' ἡμέρας καὶ ἐπολέμησαν οἱ νιῶν Αμμων μετὰ Ἰσραήλ
11 5 καὶ ἐγενήθη ἡνίκα ἐπολέμησαν οἱ νιῶν Αμμων μετὰ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ
11 6 ἔστιν ἡμῖν εἰς ἵγον ὡμοιον, καὶ πολεμήσωμεν ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀμμων
11 8 πολεμήσωμεν ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀμμων καὶ ἔστιν ἡμῖν εἰς κεφαλήν
11 9 ὑμεῖς πολεμήσαι ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀμμων καὶ παραδώ κύριος αὐτούς
11 12 ἀγγέλους πρὸς βασιλέα υἱῶν Ἀμμων λέγων Τί ἐρεῖ καὶ σοί, ὅτι
11 13 καὶ εἴπεν βασιλεὺς υἱῶν Ἀμμων πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους Ἰεφθαῖος
cαι ἀπέστειλεν Ἰεφθαῖος ἀγγέλους πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 15 Ἰεφθαῖος Οὐκ ἠλαβεν Ἰσραήλ τὴν γῆν Μωάβ καὶ τὴν γῆν υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 27 σήμερον ἀνά μέσον υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 28 εἰσῆκουσεν βασιλεὺς υἱῶν Ἀμμων καὶ οὐκ εἰσῆκουσεν τῶν λόγων
11 29 Γαλααδ καὶ ἀπὸ σκοτάς Γαλααδ εἰς τὸ πέραν υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 30 Ἐὰν παραδώσῃ παράδοσι μοι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων ἐν χειρὶ μου
11 31 μοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέφαται με ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμων, καὶ
dιέβη Ἰεφθαῖος πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων τοῦ πολεμήσαι τρός αὐτούς
11 32 καὶ ἐνερτάτησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων ἀπὸ προσώπου υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ
11 33 οἱ υἱοὶ Ἐσσωρ ἔκδικησεν ἐκ τῶν ἕχθρων σου ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 38 πολεμεῖν ἐν τοιούτοις Ἀμμων καὶ ἡμᾶς οὐ κέκληκας πορευθῆναι
11 2 καὶ ὁ λαός μου, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων ἐπατείνουν με σφόδρα· καὶ
11 3 ψυχήν μου ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μου καὶ διέβη τρός τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων

Judg_V 3 13 ἐαυτὸν πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ Ἀμαλήκη καὶ ἑπορεύθη καὶ
11 6 θεοὶ Ἔσσωρ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς υἱῶν Ἀμμων καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς Φυλιστιμ
11 7 ἀπέδωτο αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ Φυλιστιμ καὶ ἐν χειρὶ υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 9 καὶ διέβησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων τὸν Ἰορδάνην παρατάξασθαι
11 11 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀμορραίου καὶ ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἀμμων καὶ ἀπὸ Φυλιστιμ
11 17 καὶ ἀνέβησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων καὶ παρενεβαλοῦν ἐν Γαλααδ, καὶ
11 18 ὅτις ἐν ἀρξῇ παρατάξασθαι πρὸς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων; καὶ ἐσταί
11 5 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ ἡμέρα παρατάξαντο οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων μετὰ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ
11 6 καὶ ἔστιν ἡμῖν εἰς ἀρχηγόν, καὶ παρατατέσθαι πρὸς υἱῶς Ἀμμων
11 8 ἡμῶν καὶ παρατάξῃ πρὸς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ ἔστιν ἡμῖν εἰς ἀρχηγόν
11 9 υἱῶν Ἐσσωρ παρατάξασθαι ἐν υἱοῖς Ἀμμων καὶ παραδώ κύριος αὐτούς
11 12 ἀγγέλους πρὸς βασιλέα υἱῶν Ἀμμων λέγων Τί ἐρεῖ καὶ σοί, ὅτι
11 13 καὶ εἴπεν βασιλεὺς υἱῶν Ἀμμων πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους Ἰεφθαῖος ὃ ῥήτω·
11 14 ἔτι Ἰεφθαῖος καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸς βασιλέα υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 15 Ἰεφθαῖος Οὐκ ἠλαβεν Ἰσραήλ τὴν γῆν Μωάβ καὶ τὴν γῆν υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 27 σήμερον ἀνά μέσον υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 28 καὶ οὐκ ἠκουσεν βασιλεὺς υἱῶν Ἀμμων τῶν λόγων Ἰεφθαῖος, ὃν
11 29 καὶ παρῆλθεν τὴν σκοτάν Καλααδ εἰς τὸ πέραν υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 30 καὶ εἴπεν Ἐαύν διδοὺς ἡμῖν υἱῶν Ἀμμων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μου
11 31 συνάνησαν μοι ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέφειν με ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀμμων
11 32 καὶ παρῆλθεν Ἰεφθαῖος πρὸς υἱός Ἀμμων παρατάξασθαι πρὸς αὐτούς
11 33 καὶ συναντήσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων ἀπὸ προσώπου υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ
11 36 σοι κύριον ἐκδίκησεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμων
11 2 καὶ ὁ λαός μου καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων σφόδρα·
11 3 τῆς ψυχῆς μου ἐν χειρί μου καὶ παρῆλθεν πρὸς υἱῶς Ἀμμων
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2 Sam 8 12 γῆς Μωσαβ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλοφύλων καὶ ἔξ
10 1 Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἀπέβαλεν βασιλεὺς ὕδων Ἀμμων, καὶ
10 2 αὐτοῦ. καὶ παρεγένοντο οἱ παῖδες Δαυὶδ εἰς τὴν γῆν ὕδων Ἀμμων
10 3 καὶ εἶδον οἱ ἄρχοντες ὕδων Ἀμμων πρὸς Ἀμων τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν
10 6 καὶ εἶδον οἱ ἦν Ἀμμων ὦτι καθησυχύσησαν ὦ λαὸς Δαυὶδ, καὶ
10 6 καὶ ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἦν Ἀμμων καὶ ἐμισθώσαντο τὴν Συρίαν
10 8 καὶ ἔξηλθαν οἱ ὦτι Ἀμμων καὶ παρετάξαντο πόλεμον παρὰ τῇ
10 10 τῆς ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρετάξαντο ἐξ ἐναντίας ὕδων Ἀμμων
10 11 εἰς σωτηρίαν, καὶ έδαν οἱ ἦν Ἀμμων κραταῖσαν ύπερ σέ, καὶ
10 14 καὶ οἱ ὦτι Ἀμμων εἶδον ὦτι ἔφυγεν Συρία, καὶ ἔφυγαν ἄτο
10 14 ἰωάν ἀπὸ τῶν ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ παρεγένοντο εἰς Ιερουσαλήμ
10 19 αὐτοὺς. καὶ ἐφοβήθη Συρία τοῦ σώσαι ἐτὶ τοὺς ὦτὶς Ἀμμων
11 1 καὶ διέφθειραν τοὺς ὦτὶς Ἀμμων καὶ διεκάθισαν ἐτὶ Ραββαβή·
12 9 εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπέκτεινεν ἐν ρομφαίᾳ ὕδων Ἀμμων
12 26 ἐπολέμησαν ἰωάν ἐπὶ Ραββαβ ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ κατέλαβεν τὴν τόλμην
12 31 καὶ οὕτως ἐποίησαν τάσας ταῖς τόλμαις ὕδων Ἀμμων. καὶ
17 27 Οισεβαδ ὦτὶς Ναας ἐκ Ραββαβ ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ Μαχιρ ὦτὶς Ἀμιλ ἐκ
1 Kgs 11 5 τῷ Χαρμο ἐδίδαξε Μωαβ καὶ τῷ βασιλεῷ αὐτῶν ἐδίδαξε ὕδων Ἀμμων
11 33 αὐτῶν προσοχθίσματι ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν ταῖς
12 24α Ἀναν ὦτὶς Ναας βασιλέως ὕδων Ἀμμων· καὶ ἐποίησαν τὸ τονηρόν
2 Kgs 23 13 Χαρμο προσοχθίσματι Μωαβ καὶ τῷ Μολχοδ βδελύγματι ὕδων Ἀμμων
24 2 καὶ τοὺς μονοζύγους ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ ἅξαπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ
1 Chr 18 11 καὶ Μωαβ καὶ έξ ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλοφύλων καὶ ἔξ
19 1 Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπέθανεν Ναας βασιλέως ὕδων Ἀμμων
19 2 ἦλθον παῖδες Δαυὶδ εἰς γῆν ὕδων Ἀμμων τοῦ παρακάλεσαν αὐτῶν
19 3 καὶ εἶπον ἄρχοντες Ἀμμων πρὸς Ἀμων Μὴ δοξάζων Δαυὶδ τὸν
19 6 καὶ εἶδον οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων ὦτις ἔστησαν λαὸς Δαυὶδ, καὶ
19 6 ἀπέστειλεν Ἀναν καὶ οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων χίλια τάλαντα ἀργυρίου τοῦ
19 9 καὶ οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων συνήχθησαν ἐκ τῶν τόλμαις αὐτῶν καὶ ἦλθον
19 9 καὶ ἔξηλθον οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων καὶ παρατάσσοντο εἰς πόλεμον παρὰ
11 19 Αβέας ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρετάξαντο ἐξ ἐναντίας ὕδων Ἀμμων
12 μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν, καὶ δὰν ὦτις Ἀμμων κρατήσωσιν ύπέρ σέ, καὶ
15 καὶ οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων εἶδον ὦτις ἔφυγεν Σύρος καὶ ἔφυγαν καὶ
19 καὶ οὐκ ἰδέασαν Σύρος τοῦ ἐποίησαν τοὺς ὦτις Ἀμμων ἐτὶ
20 1 ἐφθασαν τῇ χώρᾳ ὕδων Ἀμμων· καὶ ἦλθεν καὶ περιεκάθισαν
20 3 καὶ οὕτως ἐποίησαν Δαυὶδ τοὺς πᾶσαν ὦτὶς Ἀμμων· καὶ
2 Chr 20 1 οἱ ὦτις Μωαβ καὶ οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων καὶ μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν Μυκαίων
20 10 καὶ νῦν ἐδόξος τοῦ Ἀμμων καὶ Μωαβ καὶ ὅρος Σημ, εἰς ὅς ὦτις
20 22 κύριος τολμεῖν τοὺς ὦτις Ἀμμων ἐπὶ Μωαβ καὶ ὅρος Σημ τοὺς
20 23 καὶ ἀνέστησαν οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων καὶ Μωαβ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας
27 5 ἐμαχάζετο πρὸς βασιλέα ὕδων Ἀμμων καὶ κατέσχεσαν ἐτὶ αὐτῶν·
27 5 καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτοὺς οἱ ὦτις Ἀμμων καὶ έναυτὸν ἐκατὸν τάλαντα
27 5 ταῦτα ἔφεραν αὐτῷ βασιλεὺς Ἀμμων κατ’ ἐναυτὸν ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ
36 1 Σύρων καὶ Ληστῆρια Μωαβίτων καὶ ὦτις Ἀμμων καὶ τῆς Σαμαρείας
Jdt 1 12 ἐν γῇ Μωαβ καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ τάσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ
5 2 Μωαβ καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ τάντας στρατάτας τῆς
5 5 ὁ ἤγοιμονος πῶς τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμων Ἁκουσάτω δὴ λόγου ὁ κύριός
6 5 δὲ, Ἀχωρ μισθωτε τοῦ Ἀμμων, δὲ ἐλάλησας τοὺς λόγους τούτους
7 17 καὶ ἀπήρρην παρεμβολὴ υἱῶν Ἀμμων καὶ μετ’ αὐτῶν χιλιάδες τέντε
7 18 οἱ νῦν Ἰασαν καὶ οἱ νῦν Ἀμμων καὶ παρενέβαλον ἐν τῇ ὅρειν
1 Macc 5 6 διετέρασαν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ δύρεν χείρα κραταίαν καὶ
Ps 82 8 Γεβαλ καὶ Ἀμμων καὶ Ἀμαληκ καὶ ἀλλόφυλοι μετὰ τῶν
Amos 1 13 ταῖς τρισίν ἀσβεστίᾳς υἱῶν Ἀμμων καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς τέσσαραν οὖκ
Zeph 2 8 Ηκουσαν ἄνειδομοις Μωαβ καὶ κονδυλισμοῖς υἱῶν Ἀμμων, ἐν οἷς
2 9 δότι Μωαβ ὡς Σοδομα ἔσται καὶ οἱ νῦν Ἀμμων ὡς Γομορρα, καὶ
Isa 26 17 Τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀμμων. Οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος Μὴ υἱοῦ ὦκ εἰς
32 21 καὶ τὴν Ἰδομαίαν καὶ τὴν Μωαβίτην καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων
34 3 Μωαβ καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα υἱῶν Ἀμμων καὶ πρὸς βασιλέα Τύρου καὶ
47 14 ὅτι Βελουσα βασιλεὺς υἱῶν Ἀμμων ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς ἧ τον Ἡσαμηλ
48 10 τῷ Γοδολία υἱῷ Αχικαμ, καὶ ἤκατο εἰς τὸ πέραν υἱῶν Ἀμμων
48 15 ἐσώθη σὺν ὅκτῳ ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἤκατο πρὸς τούς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων
Ezek 21 25 ῥομφαίαν ἐπὶ Ραββαβ ὑιῶν Ἀμμων καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἐπὶ
21 33 λέγει κύριος πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὄνειδισμόν
25 3 καὶ ἔρρεις τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων Ἁκούσατε λόγου κύριον Τάδε λέγει
25 5 καὶ δῶς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ Ἀμμων εἰς νομᾶς καμήλων καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς
25 5 εἰς νομᾶς καμήλων καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων εἰς νομῆν προβατῶν·
25 10 Κεδεμ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων δέδωκα αὐτούς εἰς κληρονομῖαν
25 10 αὐτοὺς εἰς κληρονομίαν, ὅτασι μὴ μνεία γένηται τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμων·
Dan_Th 11 41 ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, Εδωμ καὶ Μωαβ καὶ ἀρχὴ υἱῶν Ἀμμων
1 Sam 11 11 παρεμβολὴς ἐν φυλακῇ τῇ πρωινῇ καὶ ἐτυπτὸν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων
12 12 καὶ εἶδεν οἳ ἦκαν βασιλεὺς υἱῶν Ἀμμων ἢλθεν ὁ ὁ ὅμας, καὶ
47 τὸν Μωαβ καὶ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Εδωμ καὶ

— ἈΜΜΩΝΙ [4] —

1 Chr 11 39 Σελήν ὁ Ἀμμωνι, Ναχωρ ὁ Ἡρεθισιρ σκεῖπη Ιωαβ υἱὸν Σαρουνα
2 Esd 9 1 Εβι, ὁ Φερεζί, ὁ Ιεβουσι, ὁ Ἀμμωνι, ὁ Μωαβικ, ὁ Μοσερι, καὶ ὁ
12 10 καὶ ἦκαν σαβααλλαχ ὁ Ἀρων καὶ Τωβία ὁ δοῦλος ὁ Ἀμμωνι
12 19 ὁ Ἀρων καὶ Τωβία ὁ δοῦλος ὁ Ἀμμωνι καὶ Γησαμ ὁ Ἄραβι καὶ
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APPENDIX D

CONCORDANCE OF AMMONITE REFERENCES IN THE NEW REVISED STANDARD VERSION (NRSV)
Concordance of References to Ammon* and Ammonite* in the NSRV

(* indicates all forms of these two roots. ← O signifies that reference is in a poetic section and a new line begins at this point.)

--- AMMON [6] ---

2 Chr 20 10 See now, the people of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, whom you
Neh 13 23 I saw Jews who had married women of Ashdod, Ammon, and Moab
Ps 83 7 Gebal and Ammon and Amalek, ← OPhilistia with the
Ezek 25 5 Rabbah a pasture for camels and Ammon a fold for flocks.
25 10 I will give it along with Ammon to the people of the East as
25 10 Thus Ammon shall be remembered no more among the nations

--- AMMONI [1] ---

Josh 18 24 Chephar-ammoni, Ophni, and Geba—twelve towns with their

--- AMMONITE [14] ---

Deut 23 3 No Ammonite or Moabite shall be admitted to the assembly of
1 Sam 11 1 Nahash the Ammonite went up and besieged Jabesh-gilead; and
11 2 But Nahash the Ammonite said to them, “On this condition I
2 Sam 23 37 Zelek the Ammonite; Naharai of Beeroth, the armor-bearer of
1 Kgs 11 1 of Pharaoh: Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian, and
14 21 his name there. His mother’s name was Naamah the Ammonite.
14 31 name was Naamah the Ammonite. His son Abijam succeeded
1 Chr 11 39 Zelek the Ammonite, Naharai of Beeroth, the armor-bearer of
2 Chr 12 13 his name there. His mother’s name was Naamah the Ammonite.
24 26 against him were Zabad son of Shimeath the Ammonite, and
Neh 2 10 the Horonite and Tobiah the Ammonite official heard this, it
2 19 when Sanballat the Horonite and Tobiah the Ammonite official
4 3 Tobiah the Ammonite was beside him, and he said, “That stone
13 1 it was found written that no Ammonite or Moabite should ever
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Ben-ammi; he is the ancestor of the Ammonites to this day.

Jabbok, as far as to the Ammonites; for the boundary of the Ammonites was strong.

When you approach the frontier of the Ammonites, do not give the land of the Ammonites to you as a possession inhabited it, though the Ammonites call them Zamzummim them from before the Ammonites so that they could dispossess however, on the land of the Ammonites, avoiding the whole be seen in Rabbah of the Ammonites. By the common cubit it up to the Jabbok, the wadi being boundary of the Ammonites

the boundary of the Ammonites, that is, half of Gilead

reigned in Heshbon, as far as the boundary of the Ammonites and half the land of the Ammonites, to Aror, which is east

In alliance with the Ammonites and the Amalekites, he went

The Ammonites also crossed the Jordan to fight against Judah the Amorites, from the Ammonites and from the Philistines

Then the Ammonites were called to arms, and they encamped in Who will begin the fight against the Ammonites? He shall be

After a time the Ammonites made war against Israel.

And when the Ammonites made war against Israel, the elders be our commander, so that we may fight with the Ammonites.

so that you may go with us and fight with the Ammonites, and

If you bring me home again to fight with the Ammonites, and sent messengers to the king of the Ammonites and said, "What

The king of the Ammonites answered the messengers of again Jephthah sent messengers to the king of the Ammonites not take away the land of Moab or the land of the Ammonites judge, decide today for the Israelites or for the Ammonites.

But the king of the Ammonites did not heed the message that and from Mizpah of Gilead he passed on to the Ammonites.

LORD, and said, "If you will give the Ammonites into my hand when I return victorious from the Ammonites, shall be the

Jephthah crossed over to the Ammonites to fight against them

So the Ammonites were subdued before the people of Israel.

has given you vengeance against your enemies, the Ammonites. Why did you cross over to fight against the Ammonites, and

and crossed over against the Ammonites, and the LORD gave
Now Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had been grievously
eye Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had not gouged out. But
who had escaped from the Ammonites and had entered Jabesh
camp and cut down the Ammonites until the heat of the day
you saw that King Nahash of the Ammonites came against you
against Moab, against the Ammonites, against Edom, against
from Edom, Moab, the Ammonites, the Philistines, Amalek, and
afterward, the king of the Ammonites died, and his son Hanun
the princes of the Ammonites said to their lord Hanun, “Do
When the Ammonites saw that they had become odious to David
the Ammonites sent and hired the Arameans of Beth-rehob and
The Ammonites came out and drew up in battle array at the
brother Abishai, and he arrayed them against the Ammonites.
shall help me; but if the Ammonites are too strong for you
When the Ammonites saw that the Arameans fled, they likewise
Then Joab returned from fighting against the Ammonites, and
So the Arameans were afraid to help the Ammonites any more.
him; they ravaged the Ammonites, and besieged Rabbah. But
wife, and have killed him with the sword of the Ammonites.
Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the Ammonites, and took
to all the cities of the Ammonites. Then David and all the
Shobi son of Nahash from Rabbah of the Ammonites, and Machir
the Sidonians, and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites.
and for Molech the abomination of the Ammonites, on the
and Milcom the god of the Ammonites, and has not walked in
of Moab, and for Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites.
Moabites, and bands of the Ammonites; he sent them against
from Edom, Moab, the Ammonites, the Philistines, and Amalek.
King Nahash of the Ammonites died, and his son succeeded
David’s servants came to Hanun in the land of the Ammonites
the officials of the Ammonites said to Hanun, “Do you think
When the Ammonites saw that they had made themselves odious
Hanun and the Ammonites sent a thousand talents of silver to
And the Ammonites were mustered from their cities and came
The Ammonites came out and drew up in battle array at the
Abishai, and they were arrayed against the Ammonites.
shall help me; but if the Ammonites are too strong for you
When the Ammonites saw that the Arameans fled, they likewise
Arameans were not willing to help the Ammonites any more.
ravaged the country of the Ammonites, and came and besieged
to all the cities of the Ammonites. Then David and all the
2 Chr 20:1 After this the Moabites and Ammonites, and with them some of some of the Meunites [FN1 Compare 26.7: Heb Ammonites]

20:22 For the Ammonites and Moab attacked the inhabitants of Mount

20:8 The Ammonites paid tribute to Uzziah, and his fame spread

20:5 fought with the king of the Ammonites and prevailed against

20:5 The Ammonites gave him that year one hundred talents of

20:5 The Ammonites paid him the same amount in the second and the

Ezra 9:1 the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians

Neh 4:7 and the Arabs and the Ammonites and the Ashdodites heard

Isa 1:14 against Edom and Moab, O and the Ammonites shall obey them.

Jer 9:26 Egypt, Judah, Edom, the Ammonites, Moab, and all those with

25:1 Edom, Moab, and the Ammonites

25:3 of Moab, the king of the Ammonites, the king of Tyre, and

40:11 in Moab and among the Ammonites and in Edom and in other

40:14 that Baalis king of the Ammonites has sent Ishmael son of

41:10 them captive and set out to cross over to the Ammonites.

41:15 from Johanan with eight men, and went to the Ammonites.

49:22 Concerning the Ammonites. Thus says the LORD:

49:2 against Rabbah of the Ammonites; O it shall become a

49:6 But afterward I will restore the fortunes of the Ammonites

Ezek 21:20 come to Rabbah of the Ammonites or to Judah and to Jerusalem

21:28 say, Thus says the Lord GOD concerning the Ammonites, and

25:2 your face toward the Ammonites and prophesy against them.

25:3 Say to the Ammonites, Hear the word of the Lord GOD: Thus

Dan 1:41 and the main part of the Ammonites shall escape from his

Amos 1:13 For three transgressions of the Ammonites, O O and for

Zeph 2:8 and the revilings of the Ammonites, O how they have

2:9 like Sodom O and the Ammonites like Gomorrah, O a land
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