

THE SATRAPY "BEYOND THE RIVER"

By A. F. RAINEY
University of Tel Aviv

The period of Persian rule in Palestine and Syria was a time of far reaching developments in Judaism. Unfortunately, the sources pertaining to this important stage in biblical history are very meager, especially for the fourth century B.C. However, we may not assume that all was peace and quiet in Palestine. In fact, as the bridge connecting Greece with Persia (via the Phoenician cities), Egypt with Mesopotamia, and Arabia with the West, Palestine became the scene of numerous climactic encounters between the cultural centres of the "classical" world. Thus, the history of the Persian province "Beyond the River" (Palestine-Syria) is of great interest for the student of the Bible.

"Beyond the River" is a geographical term which later assumed specific political and administrative significance. The river is always the Euphrates, and the expression is generally used in Hebrew sources dealing with the Pre-exilic period from the standpoint of a person in Palestine.¹ However, in the description of Solomon's empire the term clearly refers to the region west of the Euphrates, i.e., Palestine and Syria, ". . . all of 'Beyond the River' from Tiphshah to Gaza, and all of the kings of 'Beyond the River'" (1 Kings 4:24). This designation for the area west of the Euphrates corresponds to the cognate Akkadian expression *eber nāri* which makes its first documented appearance during the reign of Esarhaddon. One passage in that king's annals refers to "the kings of Hatti (Syria) and *eber nāri*," which included the rulers of Tyre, Judah, Edom, Moab, Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron, Byblos, Arwad, Samsimuruna, Ammon, and Ashdod. Esarhaddon's treaty with Baal of Tyre invokes the god of *eber nāri* alongside those of Asshur and Akkad. Another text from the days of Esarhaddon seems to associate *eber nāri* with Ashkelon.²

Although the Persians called this area Athura (Assyria)³, the official title on Semitic documents of the satrapy consisting of Palestine and Syria was "Beyond the River". This is reflected in Post-exilic biblical sources, both in Hebrew and Aramaic.⁴ Coins issued at Tarsus by a satrap of the fourth century B.C. include both "Beyond the River and Cilicia,"⁵ and the Gadates Inscription renders the title in Greek "Beyond the Euphrates."⁶ Note also the Minaean references to this region dating from the Persian period.⁷

The Greek historians seem to be oblivious to this term; for them "Beyond the River" was generally referred to as Syria.

The term which the Persians inherited from their Neo-Babylonian predecessors was probably not Assyria but "Beyond the River" (which may have originated with the Assyrians themselves). In any case, when Cyrus conquered Babylon in 539 B.C., he appointed Gubaru (Gobryas) as governor of "Babylon and the land Beyond the River."⁸ The fact that Gubaru's sphere of authority is always described in this manner indicates that he had been placed in charge of all territories formerly belonging to the Neo-Babylonian kingdom since the battle of Carchemish in 605 B.C. The eastern part was named, as is often the custom in the ancient East, after the largest and most important city in it, which was also doubtless the governor's headquarters. It is obvious that the whole Mesopotamian region as far north as the Armenian border must have been included; otherwise the Syrian desert would have stood between the two parts of Gubaru's territory. In other words, for the two halves of his great province to have been contiguous they must have included both northern Mesopotamia and northern Syria (this latter belonging to "Beyond the River"). The extent of his western district cannot be defined with any great degree of precision. It probably consisted of the same territory that had been subject to Neo-Babylonian rule, including Syria, Phoenicia, and the various provinces and principalities in Palestine (cf. II Ki. 24:21). We do not know if the small states in the province "Beyond the River" submitted immediately to Persian rule, though they must certainly have rejoiced at the fall of Babylon.⁹ When Cyrus became lord of Babylon, he also claimed for himself lordship over all of the Babylonian possessions, including those "Beyond the River."¹⁰

Though it is not stated that all of these rulers brought their tribute and paid their homage willingly. Cyrus' generosity in allowing the Jews to return to their homeland¹¹ is paralleled by similar actions in behalf of other peoples in the empire. This new policy of supporting and fostering the religions of the various peoples was doubtless a major factor in winning the loyalty of the provinces to the new government. Important cities such as Tyre and Sidon probably continued to enjoy a considerable measure of autonomy. But Gubaru was evidently in charge of all the territory between the Tigris and the Euphrates as far north as the Armenian border (with perhaps additional districts on the eastern side of the Tigris) and all of Palestine-Syria from the Egyptian border to the foot of the Taurus range. He governed from the fourth year of Cyrus (535/534) until the ascendancy of Cambyses (530 B.C.).¹²

During the reign of Cambyses Egypt was also added to the Persian empire (525 B.C.). Some have assumed, on the basis of a statement in Strabo (XVI, 758), that he mustered his forces at Acco, but this is not at all certain. On his way to Egypt Cambyses sought and received assistance from the Arabian king (probably of Kedar) who exercised control over the coastal region between Gaza and Ienysos, a town farther south on the Mediterranean coast. The Arabs provided the water supply for the Persian army on its invasion of Egypt, and in return their coastal district was exempted from taxes (Herodotus III, 4-5).

The reorganization of the empire by Darius I may have occasioned the establishment of a sub-province in "Beyond the River". Texts from March 21, 520 B.C., and October 31, 519, show that a certain Ushtannu was governor of Babylon and *eber nāri* together.¹³ Meissner thought that Ushtannu (= Hystanes, Herodotus VII, 77) should be equated with Tattenai who is referred to in the Bible only as the governor of "Beyond the River".¹⁴ Meissner thus proposed a correction of the biblical text to read *wstny*.¹⁵ However, it is now clear that Tattenai, whose name appears as Tattannu in cuneiform sources,¹⁶ was a subordinate of Ushtannu. This Tattannu was only governor of "Beyond the River". Several tablets from his personal archive are known, the key one dating to June 5, 502 B.C.

The Gadatas Inscription (cf. *supra*, n. 6) provides another official reference to the province "Beyond the Euphrates" during the reign of Darius I. Nevertheless, the evidence is inconclusive as to whether Darius ever separated the provinces of Babylon and "Beyond the River". In the early years of his reign Tattenai was subordinate to Ushtannu, and probably had his headquarters at Damascus. Concerning this town Strabo (XVI, 2, 20 [756]) says that it was ". . . a noteworthy city, having been . . . even the most famous of the cities in that part of the world in the time of the Persian Empire." Damascus was certainly the capital of the province which Alexander the Great established under the name *Syria* (Curtius Rufus, IV, 1, 4 and 8, 9); therefore, it seems certain that the administrative centre had been there under the Persians as well.¹⁷

Tattenai was still governor of "Beyond the River" in 502 B.C.; he may have been ruling an autonomous province by then. According to Herodotus (III, 89-95), the organization of the empire into 20 satrapies took place at the very beginning of Darius' reign. In the same context he gives the list of the 20 satrapies. "Babylon and Assyria" are subsumed under one province (the ninth) while the territory corresponding to "Beyond the

River" (which title is absent from Herodotus' text), namely Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, and Cyprus, comprises a different province altogether (the fifth) which is not even contiguous to Babylon in the roster.

Five major lists of territories have been preserved from Darius' reign: the inscriptions of Behistun (DB), Persepolis (DPe), Susa (DSe), Naqsh-i-Rustam (DNa), and on a hieroglyphic stele set up by the canal which he opened through the Wady Tumilat (DZd); these are supplemented by a later Persepolis list of Xerxes (XPh).¹⁸ A comparison of the satrapal organization according to Herodotus with these lists is not absolutely decisive against an early date for Herodotus' roster, but it is obvious that the empire is conceived differently in the inscriptions. These latter contain 32 names, slightly less than half of Herodotus' 67. The Persian rosters were designed to give the observer an impression of the vast empire encompassed by Achaemenian rule. Several of the groups listed never constituted independent satrapies themselves; therefore it is not possible to reconstruct the imperial satrapal organization from Darius' inscriptions.

In all of these rosters the province "Beyond the River" is called Assyria, not only in the Persian editions but in the Elamite, Akkadian and Egyptian as well.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the various texts cited above, including administrative tablets in Akkadian, coins inscribed in Aramaic, and the Greek and south Arabian texts, all demonstrate quite clearly that the official Semitic title was "Beyond the River" in accordance with the biblical usage. Further confirmation of this fact comes from Darius' building inscriptions at Susa (DSf). The phrase, "the Assyrian people", of the Persian text (line 32), is rendered in Akkadian by "the people of (the province) 'Beyond the River'" (line 23). The context of this passage is of the utmost value for defining the area intended by the Persian "Athura" and the Semitic "Beyond the River":

The cedar timber, this—a mountain by name Lebanon—
from there was brought. The Assyrian people [Akkadian:
the people of "Beyond the River"], it brought it to
Babylon.²⁰

The relative position of the Persian "Assyria" in Darius' official lists lends further credence to the view that the province "Beyond the River" is actually meant. Three of these rosters (DB, DNa, DSe) have: Babylon, Arabia, Assyria and Egypt (the order in XPh is so broken up that little value can be derived from it; Babylon and Assyria still stand together, but Egypt and Arabia are both separated by other names). The position of Assyria

between Babylon and Egypt, plus the fact that Arabia could also stand between Assyria and Babylon shows that Assyria was not simply a term for northern Mesopotamia. The Persians may have adopted "Assyria" as a synonym for "Beyond the River" because during the last days of the Assyrian empire its capital had been moved from Ninevah to Harran and later to Carchemish. However, it is unlikely that this Persian usage was inherited from the official terminology of the Neo-Babylonian government. Furthermore, the use by classical writers of Assyria or Syria to denote areas within Mesopotamia (e.g., Xenophon, *Anabasis*, I, 4:19) does not prove that the province "Beyond the River" included territory east of the Euphrates, though it is not impossible that such was the case during certain periods. However, when Herodotus states that his ninth satrapy included "Babylon and the rest of Assyria" (III, 91), he makes it clear that he does not assign any Mesopotamian districts to his fifth satrapy (which corresponds to the province "Beyond the River").

Concerning the Arabia which stands now on one side of Assyria ("Beyond the River") and now on another in Darius' inscriptions, it may be noted that Herodotus' fifth satrapy included a small area under Arabian control, but these Arabs were not a subject people. On the contrary, Herodotus explains that they were exempted from taxes by Cambyses.²¹ It is likely that the Arabia of the official Persian lists corresponded to the territory of those Arabians mentioned by Herodotus as being outside the satrapal framework entirely. These latter brought an annual "gift" of 1000 talents of frankincense every year (Herodotus III, 97). The stretch of coastland south of Gaza, which was controlled by the tax-free Arabians, may very well have been an extension of the Arabia in Darius' rosters, and the probability is very great that the latter was really the kingdom of Kedar. As will be shown below, the king of Kedar exercised his influence not only in the desert east of Trans-jordan but even up to the gates of Egypt.²²

Herodotus' satrap list was most likely modelled after an official roster representing the administrative situation in his own day (ca. 450 B.C.). However, his numbering of the satrapies is from a Greek point of view and certainly does not represent the fixed order of a Persian governmental document. His description of the province "Beyond the River", which he calls the fifth satrapy, is discussed more fully below.

When Darius rose to power, rebellions broke out in various provinces of the empire. A certain Nidintu-bel led Babylon in revolt as Nebuchadnezzar III (October-December 522 B.C.; DB I, 77—II, 5). After his defeat, while Darius was re-establishing his authority in Babylon, other satrapies revolted including "Beyond

the River" (here called "Assyria", DB II, 7) and Egypt. A victory by one of Darius' generals at Izala (DB II, 53-57) probably subdued the recalcitrant leaders from "Beyond the River" as well as Armenia. A second impostor, Arkha, who called himself Nebuchadnezzar IV, led Babylon in another uprising (September-November, 521 B.C.; DB III, 76-92).²³ Gubaru no longer appears in Babylonian records, but perhaps he was the Gobryas who, in Darius' third year, was sent to quell a fresh revolt in Elam (DB V, 1-14).

By March, 520 B.C., Ushtannu was serving as governor of Babylon and "Beyond the River."²⁴ Some degree of internal rivalry between the various elements in "Beyond the River" is reflected in the tensions between Judah and her neighbours concerning the building of a temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 4:1-5). It can hardly be a coincidence that renewed efforts for rebuilding the temple, as urged by the Prophet Haggai (Hag. 1), followed the stabilization of Persian rule after the second Babylonian revolt under Nebuchadnezzar IV; Olmstead's view that the Judean move was closely linked with political events in Babylon is not supported by the texts.²⁵ On the other hand, one could not blame Tattenai, governor of "Beyond the River", and the other members of his administration, including his Iranian secretary, Shetharbozenai, for suspecting the Judeans of aspirations towards political independence (Ezra 5:3-17). The strong temple structure may have appeared to them as the nucleus of a citadel. That Egypt was probably also in revolt most certainly would have influenced their thinking. Two other illuminating details about Persian administration are revealed in this incident. Tattenai expected to find the pertinent records in Babylon, the administrative headquarters for Mesopotamia and "Beyond the River". Of further interest is the fact that the actual record of Cyrus' decree was not found in Babylon but rather at Ecbatana. The officials in charge of the archives at Babylon apparently remembered, to the good fortune of the Judeans, that before his first official year Cyrus had returned to Ecbatana. The actual decree was not found, but a brief memorandum confirming the issuance of the original order was discovered (Ezra 6:1-5). Darius' reply to Tattenai and the consequent completion of the Jerusalem temple indicate that the Persian emperor was convinced that the Jews' aspirations did not constitute a rebellion against his authority. Sometime later a delegation of Jews arrived in Jerusalem from Babylonia (Zech. 6:9-14). They brought funds for the support of the Judean leadership.

Darius I's concern for the welfare of the Jerusalem temple is paralleled by his intervention on behalf of a certain priesthood in

Magnesia. One of his officials there, a man named Gadatas, had imported some fruits from the province "Beyond the Euphrates", but he had also "exacted tribute from the sacred cultivators of Apollo and commanded them to dig unhallowed ground". Gadatas was warned that such conduct might bring a stern punishment from the Persian monarch, and the inscription was evidently set up in the Apollo temple as a memorial.²⁶

In the winter of 519/518 B.C. Darius may have passed through the province "Beyond the River" on his way to Egypt.²⁷ If so, he doubtless took this opportunity to clarify the problems which had arisen between the various elements under Tattenai's supervision. Olmstead's assumption that Zerubbabel was executed as a rebel is opposed by the relevant texts which reveal Persian backing for the Judean governor.²⁸

In the year that King Darius died (486 B.C.) Egypt rebelled again. The suppression of this revolt occasioned the passage of Xerxes I through Palestine.²⁹ Once more a Persian monarch may have had occasion to settle a disturbance among the rival elements in his province "Beyond the River". During his accession year (ca. November, 486—April, 485 B.C.) Xerxes received another written accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem (Ezra 4:6). Nothing is known about this incident beyond the brief biblical reference, but its timing to coincide with the Egyptian rebellion cannot be accidental. Persian control over Egypt was regained by the end of 483 B.C. In the latter half of 482 B.C. Babylon rebelled again and slew the satrap Zopyrus.³⁰ King Xerxes dispatched his brother-in-law Megabyzus to suppress the Babylonian revolt and to afflict her with severe punishment. The estates of the local merchant princes and citizens were confiscated and granted to Persians. Babylonia itself seems to have lost its superior provincial status. It would appear, therefore, that Olmstead is correct in his assumption that the separation of "Beyond the River" from Mesopotamia was carried out at this time.³¹ If so, then the fifth satrapy of Herodotus' list was probably constituted as a separate administrative unit in 482 B.C. According to Herodotus' roster of the contingents comprising the great Persian army that invaded Greece under Xerxes (481-479 B.C.), the peoples of "Beyond the River" supplied a formidable addition to the Persian fleet. He tells us that:

. . . the Phoenicians, with the Syrians of Palestine, contributed 300 [ships]. The crews wore helmets very like the Greek ones, and linen corselets; they were armed with light, rimless shields and javelins. These people have a tradition that in ancient times they

lived on the Persian Gulf, but migrated to the Syrian coast, where they are found today. This part of Syria, together with a country which extends southward to Egypt, is all known as Palestine.³²

It cannot be ascertained whether Cyprus had belonged to the province "Beyond the River" from the very beginning or whether it had previously enjoyed some kind of independent status. In any case, Herodotus lists their naval contingent in third place (doubtless because of its being third largest in size), while the Egyptian contingent appeared second, thus separating the Cypriote group from the Phoenician-Palestinian.

A cuneiform tablet dated to the third year of Artaxerxes (ca. 462) refers to a man named Belshunu, governor of "Beyond the River."³³ On his famous march towards Babylon in 401 B.C. the young Cyrus and his mercenary army came upon the huge palatial estate of a man named Belesys, who had *formerly* ruled Syria.³⁴ The palace of Belesys was located nine days' march (50 parasangs) from Myriandos and three days' march (15 parasangs) from Thapsakos (the biblical Tiphshah). This palatial estate with its well-tended park need not be thought of as the satrapal administrative centre; it was more likely a private retreat maintained by the governor for his own pleasure.³⁵ More precise dates for Belshunu's tenure of office are not available. With great reservations one might suggest that his name appears in corrupted form as Bishlam in Ezra 4:7, but this is only a conjecture. Belshunu was probably replaced as governor of the province "Beyond the River" by Megabyzus some time before 456 B.C.³⁶

Whatever the prior situation, by Herodotus' day "Beyond the River" is definitely an independent unit. The arrangement in his list was evidently that which prevailed during the reign of Artaxerxes I Longimanus (464-424 B.C.). His fifth satrapy is described as follows:

. . . from the town of Poseideion . . . on
the border between Cilicia and Syria, as far as
Egypt—omitting Arabian territory, which was
free of tax, came 350 talents. This province
contains the whole of Phoenicia and that part of
Syria which is called Palestine, and Cyprus (III, 91).

Here Herodotus departs from his usual scheme. While he generally lists ethnic groups which have been ranged together into one tax district, he opens the description of his fifth satrapy with a statement of geographical limits introduced by the formula "from . . . to". The definitions of these two northern and southern

extremities are not comparable. In the north he mentions a city, while in the south he refers to a country; the "from" is inclusive while the "to" is exclusive. That the city of Poseideion is reckoned as part of the fifth satrapy is indicated by the subsequent phrase: "beginning from" On the other hand, Egypt comprises the sixth tax district in Herodotus' list. The fifth satrapy is also unique in that both its boundaries are established by geographical reference points.³⁷

Poseideion (modern Basit) lay on the north Syrian coast just south of the mouth of the Orontes, from which it was separated by the coastal mountains of Mons Casius. When Herodotus states that the city was founded on the border between Cilicia and Syria, he probably means that it was located on the coastal strip where people of Cilician nationality and language had been strongly influenced by and intermingled with those of the Syrian tradition. Administratively it was not assigned to Cilicia but rather to the fifth satrapy; naturally, this included its dependent districts. The precise boundary between the two satrapies was doubtless located not exactly at the city itself but at some point slightly farther north. As will be demonstrated below, Herodotus is only concerned with giving the coastal limits of the satrapy: when one starts from Cilicia, that is, from the north, and goes south along the shore (or sails southward along this coast by boat) then the first town which he will encounter belonging to the fifth satrapy is Poseideion.

Herodotus had already stated at which point on the coast the territory of Egypt began:

The only entrance into Egypt is through this [the "Arabian"] desert. From Phoenicia to the boundaries of Kadytes (Gaza) the country belongs to the Syrians known as "Palestinian": from Kadytes, a town, I should say, not much smaller than Sardis, the seaports as far as Ienysos belong to the king of Arabia; from there as far as Lake Serbonis, near which Mount Casius runs down to the sea, it is once more Syrian territory; and after Lake Serbonis . . . Egypt begins (III, 5).

Lake Serbonis lies very near the coast east of Pelusium, south of the narrow strip of land upon which Mount Casius was located. The lake itself is clearly reckoned as part of Egypt because in III, 91 Herodotus does not say "to Lake Serbonis" but "to Egypt." At first glance one might think that he was giving the southern boundary line of the fifth satrapy. However, the Egyptian border

ran in a north-south direction from Lake Serbonis to the north end of the Gulf of Heroopolis. Therefore, Herodotus was only giving the extent of the coastline belonging to the fifth satrapy. He is describing the province "Beyond the River" from the standpoint of one who had travelled by sea along its Mediterranean shoreline. He furnishes no information that would help to determine the extent of this satrapy's inland territories.

All of the peoples belonging to the other satrapies were required to share in the tax payment. However, in "Beyond the River" there was one exception, namely, the "Arabian district." Herodotus refers to this strip of territory in an earlier passage (cf. III, 5). There it is clear that he means the coastal strip from Gaza to Ienysos and that it was "in possession of the Arabian," not "Arabian territory." The reason for these Arabians being exempt from tax is explained in III, 4-5. This certainly does not include all of the Arabian tribes known to the Persians, such as nomadic groups found at that time in the Middle Euphrates region, and Cambyses' grant to the occupants of a coastal strip can hardly be taken to mean all Arab peoples everywhere. It is probable that the ruler whose sphere of influence extended to this coastal strip was king of Kedar. Herodotus also observes (III, 97) that some Arabian peoples did pay tribute. Though they were not required to pay tax, they were expected to deliver a gift consisting of 1000 talents of frankincense each year. This means that they were in some sense tributary to the Persians; the difference between a tax and a gift was that the former was paid in money, while the latter was in natural products and paid in kind.³⁸

To some extent Herodotus makes up for the absence of ethnic groups in his description of "Beyond the River" by giving several geographical regions which were included within it, viz., "the whole of Phoenicia and that part of Syria which is called Palestine, and Cyprus."

Two passages indicate that Herodotus considered Phoenicia, the territory occupied by Phoenicians, as part of Syria: "Syria borders on Egypt, and the Phoenicians, to whom Sidon belongs, live in Syria" (II, 116). This statement should be compared with his reference to the Phoenician contingent in the Persian fleet (VII, 89). However, Herodotus never calls the Phoenicians Syrians.

The northern and southern limits of Phoenicia as envisioned by Herodotus cannot be determined with precision. He has already stated that the city of Poseideon was situated on the border between the Cilicians and the Syrians (not Phoenicians). Therefore, he apparently considered the coastal strip immediately

south of Poseideion as Syrian and not Phoenician. Perhaps the territory of Phoenicia proper began somewhere in the vicinity of Byblos. Herodotus also fails to indicate the southern boundary of Phoenicia. An attempt to place the Sidonian acquisition of the Sharon Plain, which was awarded to Eshmunazer by the Persian monarch, within the framework of fifth century history would be premature at present.³⁹ Herodotus wished to impress his readers with the magnitude of the Persian Empire; therefore he emphasized the fact that the entire domain of the renowned Phoenicians, with all of their great commercial cities, was included within this one satrapy.

Palestine, as part of Herodotus' fifth satrapy, refers to the country south of Phoenicia, extending as far as Gaza. But this term (Philistia) was evidently known to Herodotus in both a wider and a narrower sense. In III, 5 and 91, he uses the restricted meaning which excludes Phoenicia. But in VIII, 89, he says, concerning the region occupied by the Phoenicians: "This part of Syria, together with the country which extends southward to Egypt, is all known as Palestine." Here the term is more inclusive. Note, however, that in the same paragraph he has distinguished clearly between the Phoenicians and the Syrians of Palestine.⁴⁰

Even though one intermediate strip from Gaza to Ienysos was occupied by Arabs, this does not militate against that region's belonging geographically to Palestine. Note, for example, that Phoenicia is also a part of Syria, although it is not occupied, in Herodotus' view, by Syrians.

Perhaps one may understand the Arab occupation of this strip as a later intrusion into the territory known to Herodotus as Palestine. The position of Gaza in Herodotus' description is significant. When he states that the territory "from Phoenicia to the *border* of the city of Kadytes belongs to the land of the Palestinians", he leaves the impression that Gaza is reckoned outside the limits of Palestine. It apparently belongs to the coastal strip under Arab control. Herodotus' testimony carries added weight since he had visited Gaza himself and mentions how greatly he was impressed by its size and importance. The city had not necessarily lost its essentially Philistine population when it became subservient to the Arabian king. Even if the Persians had reconstituted Gaza as their own naval base, it was to their advantage that commercial intercourse with Arabia be fostered. In the latest stratum at Tell el-Khuleifeh (Ezion-geber) the presence of Aegean ointment vessels testifies to the extensive trade in that period between South Arabia and the West,⁴¹ most of which must have reached the Gulf of Aqaba via seaports on this strip of Mediterranean coast occupied by Arabians.

Information concerning internal affairs of "Beyond the River" during the reign of Artaxerxes is furnished by the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The sending of Ezra, "a scribe skilled in the law of Moses" (Ezra 7:6), to Jerusalem in 458 B.C. (Ezra 7:7) with credentials from the emperor himself (Ezra 7:11-26) may reflect an official attempt to assure the loyalty of various peoples in the province "Beyond the River."⁴² It certainly illustrates the millet system as practised under Persian rule, where every province had its own script and every people its own language (Esther 1:22, *et al*). Ezra was commissioned to "appoint magistrates and judges who may judge all the people in the province 'Beyond the River', all such as know the laws of your god" (Ezra 7:25). Each district or ethnic group was permitted to govern itself according to its own traditional laws or customs. Artaxerxes was officially sanctioning the Torah as the civil code of the Yehud province.⁴³ In the Aramaic letter carried by Ezra, the Hebrew word Torah is translated by the Persian loan word *dāṭā*,⁴⁴ "decree, royal command."⁴⁵ Thus the Torah ("instruction") achieved a status in the Jewish millet comparable to the "laws of Medes and Persians" which could not be altered or changed (Dan. 6:8).

The "treasurers of the province 'Beyond the River'" were commanded to co-operate with Ezra in fulfilling his mission (Ezra 7:21-24). It would be interesting to know what connection, if any, there may have been between this act of munificence on the part of Artaxerxes and the Egyptian revolt under Inarus which had broken out the previous year (459 B.C.). At that very time an Athenian fleet was operating in Egypt to help that province break away from Persian authority.⁴⁶ There is certainly some connection between these events and the correspondence preserved in Ezra 4:7-23.

The letters sent by Rehum the commander and Shimshai the scribe permit a small glimpse into the varied ethnic composition of the province "Beyond the River" and its administrative bureaucracy: ". . . the judges, the governors, the officials, the Persians, the men of Erech, the Babylonians, the men of Susa, that is the Elamites, and the rest of the nations whom the great and noble Osnappar deported and settled in the cities of Samaria and the rest of the province 'Beyond the River'" (Ezra 4:9-10). This letter and the subsequent reply (Ezra 4:17-22) stand in the biblical text without a date formula, but they evidently have to do with events after the arrival of Ezra. The officials of the province "Beyond the River" made the following accusation:

And now be it known to the king that the Jews who came up from you to us [viz. Ezra and those who came with

him] have gone up to Jerusalem. They are rebuilding that rebellious and wicked city; they are finishing the walls and repairing the foundations (Ezra 4:12).

It is not known what part, if any, Ezra may have played in the reconstruction of Jerusalem's walls. But the allusions to Jerusalem's history as "a rebellious city, hurtful to kings and provinces" (Ezra 4:15, 19) seem to imply some relationship to the political threat posed by the Egyptian rebellion. The Persian king's reply that "mighty kings have been over Jerusalem, who ruled over the whole province 'Beyond the River'" (Ezra 4:20), brings to mind the kingdom of Judah's role in previous struggles between Egypt and Mesopotamia. Judean rebellion against Mesopotamian control in 701 B.C. under Hezekiah and in 587 B.C. under Zedekiah were occasioned by offers of Egyptian support. Therefore, the refortification of Jerusalem at the very time when Egypt was seeking to gain its independence from the Persian Empire must have seemed to be an act of sedition; the Judeans were probably suspected of a league with the Egyptian rebels.

Most of the districts and peoples of the province "Beyond the River" remained loyal to Persia and were unsympathetic to the Egyptian cause. Olmstead associates the correspondence in Ezra 4:7-23 with events surrounding the revolt of Megabyzus, satrap of "Beyond the River", in ca. 448 B.C.⁴⁷ However, the fact that in Ezra 4:7-23 the officials of the province appear as supporters of the Persian monarchy militates against any connection with Megabyzus' rebellion, while resembling the situation during the Egyptian uprising (459-454 B.C.).

The mighty Phoenician fleet remained loyal to the Persians and supported Megabyzus in his campaign to restore Persian authority over Egypt (456-454 B.C.). The situation in Cyprus is not clear. The Greek cities on the island had been supported by an Athenian fleet in the strife prevailing between them and the rival Phoenician cities of Cyprus. After the disaster inflicted upon the Athenian fleet which was supporting the Egyptian revolt (454 B.C.), the Phoenician navy transferred its operations to Cyprus. Consequently, a new Athenian squadron of 200 vessels under Cimon's leadership sailed to Cyprus and laid siege to Citium. When their supplies ran short and Cimon died, the Greeks abandoned the siege; but at Salamis they scored a double victory on sea and land against the Phoenician and Cilician forces arrayed against them. Nevertheless, the Athenians no longer wished to pursue their conflict with Persia, so in ca. 448 B.C. the "Peace of Callias" was negotiated. The specific terms of this armistice are

unknown, but it would appear that Cyprus remained under Persian domination.⁴⁸

A short time later the same Megabyzus, angered over certain royal policies with regard to Egyptian affairs, retired to his own satrapy "Beyond the River" and revolted against Persian authority, with the support of his sons, Zopyrus and Artyphius. The force commanded by an Egyptian named Usiris was unsuccessful in subduing Megabyzus. A second force under the command of Menostanes, who was the king's brother and satrap of Babylon, achieved even less. Megabyzus was subsequently reconciled to the Persian king but probably did not remain as satrap of the province "Beyond the River."⁴⁹

The freshness and vividness of the report given to Nehemiah in 446/445 B.C. (Neh. 1:3) to the effect that "the wall of Jerusalem is broken down, and its gates are destroyed by fire" suggests that after Rehum and Shimshai and their associates "went in haste to the Jews at Jerusalem and by force and power made them cease [building the walls and repairing the foundations]" (Ezra 4:23) more severe steps were taken in the aftermath of Megabyzus' revolt (448 B.C.). In 445/444 Nehemiah arrived in the satrapy "Beyond the River" with official credentials from King Artaxerxes; acting by virtue of his new authority as governor of the Yehud province, he set about to repair the fortifications of Jerusalem in spite of opposition by governors of the neighbouring districts. From all indications these districts conform to those established earlier by the Assyrians. Ezekiel's vision of the promised land (47:13-48:29) makes reference to several such provinces, e.g., Hamath, Damascus, Hauran, thus indicating that the Assyrian pattern of districts was still in force under the Neo-Babylonian kingdom.⁵⁰ The internal organization of "Beyond the River", which was probably taken over by the Neo-Babylonian rulers, was evidently passed on to the Persians virtually unchanged. Other provinces referred to in the book of Nehemiah reveal its continuation into the Persian period.

Of the provinces mentioned by Nehemiah, Samaria is the oldest, having been created by Sargon II.⁵¹ It was probably bounded by the Jezreel Plain in the north, the Jordan River in the east, and the province of Yehud in the south.⁵² The recently discovered Samaria Papyri have made it possible for F. M. Cross to propose a hypothetical reconstruction for the dynasty of governors who ruled the province of Samaria.⁵³ At least three of these men bore the name Sanballat, the first of whom was a contemporary of Nehemiah.⁵⁴ Control of the province was evidently passed on to Sanballat's sons, Delaiah and Shelemiah, as indicated by the Elephantine Papyri.⁵⁵ The next in line was a

Sanballat, doubtless the son of either Delaiah or Shelemiah and the father of Hananiah. This Hananiah was ruling in Samaria in 354 B.C. according to the Samaria Papyri. His son was the Sanballat appointed by Darius III in ca. 334 B.C.⁵⁶ It may be necessary to insert in this list another personage known from the Samaria Papyri, viz., Yeshu'a bar Sanballat, perhaps a brother of Hananiah.

Tobiah "the Ammonite slave" is another district governor who plays a prominent role in the book of Nehemiah. His province in southern Gilead was governed by a dynasty of rulers from the famous Tobiad family. Their headquarters was located at the Tyre in Transjordan.⁵⁷

The third region whose ruler is mentioned in the book of Nehemiah was apparently known to the outside world as "Arabia." The enigmatic Gashmu "the Arab" was evidently its king. A. Alt believed that Idumea, the Judean hill region south of Beth-zur, was a part of Gashmu's realm.⁵⁸ His name has been found on a silver bowl from the temple at Tell al-Maskhûta, 12 miles east of Ismailia in Lower Egypt.⁵⁹ The inscription reads: "That which Qainû bar Geshem, king of Qedar, offered to han-'Ilat."⁶⁰ This same Geshem may be equated with Jashm son of Shahr in a Lihyanite inscription from al-Ulâ.⁶¹ Thus, the evidence is slowly emerging for the existence of an influential Arab kingdom, the biblical Kedar, which had gained possession of a strip along the Mediterranean coast from Gaza to Ienysos.⁶² At least as early as Darius I they had also been permitted to establish colonies in the eastern Delta⁶³ (the biblical land of Goshen).⁶⁴

The whole question of Arabian relations with the Persian empire requires further elucidation. Two later allusions to joint Egyptian and Arabian hostilities against the Persians in Phoenicia suggest that the "kingdom" of Gashmu may not have been particularly loyal to Persia.⁶⁵ In the latter part of the fifth century one of the Persian satraps in Asia Minor sent a fleet of 300 triremes to Phoenicia, because he had received information that the king of the Arabians and the king of the Egyptians were entertaining designs upon Phoenicia.⁶⁶

Other districts within the province "Beyond the River" may be deduced from the previous arrangement under the Assyrians and the later situation under the Hellenistic monarchs. However, the precise delineation of these provinces would require contemporary sources from the Persian period. Each district was subdivided into precincts and subprecincts as revealed by Nehemiah 3:1-32.⁶⁷

The year 404 B.C. marks the beginning of a chain of events bearing far-reaching consequences for the satrapy "Beyond the River" during the ensuing century. The death of Darius II was marked by the successful revolt of Egypt who managed to maintain her independence for the next 60 years, in spite of numerous Persian attempts to reconquer what they considered to be simply a rebellious province. The accession of Artaxerxes II Memnon and the resultant clash between him and his brother, the so-called "Cyrus the younger," not only brought an insurrectionist army to the soil of northern Syria (i.e. "Beyond the River"), it shook the great Persian monolith to its very foundations and taught the Greeks that Asia might be easily penetrated by a small but well-disciplined force.

At the end of the fifth century "Beyond the River" was in the charge of a satrap named Abrokomas, as indicated by Xenophon's account of the "ascent" by Cyrus the younger.⁶⁸ On his arrival in Cilicia Cyrus pretended that his principal objective was to attack Abrokomas, whom he expected to be waiting for him beyond the Cilician gates (Xenophon, *Anabasis*, I, 3:20). When dealing with this same episode Diodorus (XIV, 20:5) does not mention Abrokomas by name but refers to "some satrap of Syria."⁶⁹ Four hundred Greek soldiers who had been in Abrokomas' hire transferred their allegiance to Cyrus; nevertheless, it was reported that the satrap had a strong force at his command (Xenophon, *Anabasis*, I, 4:3, 5).

This large army, reportedly 300,000 men, was probably being mustered in Phoenicia preparatory to an attack on Egypt. But these plans were interrupted by Cyrus' invasion (Xenophon, *Anabasis*, I, 5). Instead of attempting to block Cyrus' advance Abrokomas retreated across northern Syria to the Euphrates (*Ibid.*, I, 4:18).

As a final proof that Abrokomas was the satrap of "Beyond the River", it should be noted that he was a field commander on a par with the other three officers who supported the king at Cunaxa (Xenophon, *Anabasis*, I, 7:12). None of the four are explicitly called satrap by Xenophon; however, Tissaphernes was well known as satrap of southwest Asian Minor, Arbakes was satrap of Media,⁷⁰ and Gobryas (Gubaru) is known from a cuneiform tablet dating to the seventh year of Darius II (416 B.C.) to have borne the title "governor of Akkad."⁷¹

Unfortunately, Xenophon does not give a precise definition of Abrokomas' province. In fact, throughout his entire narrative he simply recorded the various peoples encountered by Cyrus'

army on its "ascent" without reference to the satrapies to which they belonged. The land which Xenophon called Syria included Phoenicia and the Mediterranean coast as far north as Myriandos and extended eastward to the Euphrates. One cannot say where Xenophon reckoned the border between Syria and Cilicia to be; he records that Cyrus expected to find Abrokomas blocking the Cilician gates, but this does not prove that the latter's province necessarily extended that far. When Cyrus was marching from Thapsakos to the mouth of the Khabur, he is said to have been marching through Syria; but from there to Pylae he was in a region called Arabia. It is not clear whether this area was attached to the Babylonian province or to the Syrian. After Pylae begins what Xenophon calls Babylonia.⁷²

Nepherites (founder of the 29th Dynasty) became king of Egypt in 398 B.C. A stone slab and a scaraboid bearing his name found at Gezer suggest that he may have extended his control to include southern Palestine.⁷³ He was followed by Achoris (393-380 B.C.), who soon found an able ally against the Persians when King Evagoras of Cyprus openly threw off the Persian yoke in 391 B.C. The "Peace of Antalcidas" (also called the "King's Peace"), in which the Persian monarch dictated terms to the Greek cities (386 B.C.), deprived Evagoras of his Athenian support.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, a Greek general was dispatched to aid in preparing the Egyptian armies for an eventual Persian attack.

Meanwhile, Abrokomas had probably continued to function as satrap of "Beyond the River". During the years 385-383 B.C. he joined Pharnabazos and Tithraustes in a concerted drive to reconquer Egypt (Isocrates, *Panegy.*, 140). While the Persian armies were thus engaged, Evagoras captured Tyre and won a large part of Phoenicia and Cilicia. Besides his alliance with Achoris, he had ample financial support from Hecatomnus, dynast of Caria. If the suggested emendation of *barbaron* to *Arabon* in Diod. XV, 2:4 be accepted, then Evagoras' forces also included not a few soldiers sent by "the king of the Arabians."⁷⁵ Thus the province "Beyond the River" once more assumed a role of strategic importance in the ever-recurring conflict between Egypt and the East. The Persian troops, their supply lines doubtless threatened by the defection of Phoenicia, were severely beaten and forced to withdraw from Egypt. As a symbol of his apparent control over Palestine and southern Phoenicia, Achoris left an inscription at the Eshmunazer temple north of Sidon⁷⁶ and an altar stand of polished grey granite (imported from Syene) at Acco.⁷⁷

Cyprus was invaded by a Persian force supported from

Cilicia, and after a two-year struggle (381-379) Evagoras was forced to surrender, though he was allowed to remain as king. Meanwhile, Nectanebes became king of Egypt (380 B.C.) and founder of the 30th Dynasty.

As early as 379 Pharnabazos, satrap of Cilicia, had begun collecting mercenaries for another attack on Egypt. By 373 B.C. he had finally mustered at Acco a force of 300 warships, 12,000 Greeks, and a huge contingent of Orientals. However, he had difficulties in obtaining supplies; some men also died in the camp (Isaeus, *Nicostrat.*, 7). After establishing a small bridgehead near the Mendesian mouth of the Nile, being unable to enter via Pelusium, the Persians had to withdraw in the face of a counter attack by the rallying Egyptians.

The Phoenicians had done their part in this invasion by providing naval support for the Persians, but even from the beginning of the campaign they had not been overly sympathetic. Within a few years Phoenicia was to take part in the "satraps' revolt", this time in league with the Egyptians against the Persians. The cities of Arvad, Sidon and Tyre had united three small villages⁷⁸ to form Athar, known to the Greeks as Tripolis. When occasion demanded the three major Phoenician cities would send 100 delegates each to Tripolis, where they would sit in council as the *synedrion*.⁷⁹

Phoenician colonization of the Mediterranean coast belonging to the satrapy "Beyond the River" is illustrated by a passage from the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Scylax.⁸⁰ This is a catalogue of seaports, river mouths, and other geographical aids to navigation around the Mediterranean Sea. The text, though purporting to come from the pen of the fifth-century Greek navigator is assumed by most scholars to reflect the situation in the mid-fourth century B.C. While it is of no value for determining the political limits of "Beyond the River" nor of the native Phoenician seacoast (being concerned only with registering the various ethnic groups occupying the respective seaports of the Mediterranean without reference to their political or administrative affiliations), it does illustrate the influence of Tyre and Sidon in all of the maritime communities along the entire Levantine coast. Chapter 104 begins: "After Cilicia there are the Syrian people. And in Syria the Phoenicians dwell along the shore." A few remarks about the narrow limits of the Phoenician-occupied coastal strip are followed by a roster of coastal towns and other landmarks beginning with the Thapsakos River (probably the Orontes) and going south. The text of this section is very poorly preserved; some words have been omitted while numerous glosses have evidently been inserted

by later copyists. In the later part of this chapter the ends of many lines have been lost due to mutilation of the page. The number of towns occupied by people of either Tyre or Sidon is most impressive. Nevertheless, the author did not envisage the entire coast from the Thapsakos to Ashkelon as belonging to Phoenicia but rather to Syria. It was the Syrian people, not the Phoenician, that one encountered first after Cilicia. This same situation is also reflected in other sources.⁸¹ The northern border of Phoenicia cannot be determined from Pseudo-Scylax; neither can its southern limits. However, it is clear that, just as in the north, there was a strip of coast south of Phoenicia reckoned as the coast of Syria. This viewpoint is also found in other classical writers:⁸² though Herodotus, unfortunately, did not give the boundary between Phoenicia and Syria-Palestine, it is certain that he assigned the three Philistine cities of Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Gaza to the latter. In Pliny and Ptolemy the southern border of Phoenicia lay between Dor and Caesarea; Ptolemy gives as the boundary the mouth of the Chorseas River which lies between the two towns. Neither Joppa, Ashdod, nor Ashkelon was reckoned by them to Phoenicia.

The fact that various cities are said by Pseudo-Scylax to have been occupied by Sidonians or Tyrians does not mean that they were within the political bounds of Phoenicia; numerous other places which are definitely known to have been independent were called by him "city [or: harbor] of the Phoenicians" (e.g., Carthage and Myriandos). Along the shore of the eastern Mediterranean one would find a considerable segment belonging to Syria, but in the middle of this Syrian seacoast there was a subdivision belonging to Phoenicia. That ancient writers such as Pseudo-Scylax assigned these various cities to either Tyre or Sidon simply indicates that in the middle of the fourth century they were being occupied by colonies from their respective mother cities.

The absence in Pseudo-Scylax of any reference to the Tower of Straton (New Testament Caesarea) would indicate that this text was composed before that city was founded by Straton (Abdashtart), king of Sidon (370-358 B.C.). Sidonian suzerainty over Dor, Joppa, and the Sharon Plain, as reflected in the Eshmunazer Inscription (line 9), evidently dates to the fifth century B.C. and provides a background for the situation reflected in Pseudo-Scylax.⁸³

From approximately 368-360 B.C. the "revolt of the satraps" threatened to destroy the Persian empire altogether. Syria was involved in this turmoil, but to what degree is impossible to

ascertain. Most of the rebel satraps controlled various districts of Asia Minor.

When Tachos (Teos) became king of Egypt (362 B.C.), he mobilized a great native force and hired 10,000 Greek mercenaries (361). An elaborate plan of attack against Persia was worked out in conjunction with the rebel satraps. Tachos secured nearly all of the seaports in Palestine and Phoenicia. He was then to join another satrap, Aroandas, in Syria, and the united forces were to march eastward in support of Datames, who was crossing the Euphrates with the advanced guard. Ochus, a younger son of King Artaxerxes, was vainly trying to hold Phoenicia against the Egyptian attack, but he was steadily losing ground before the Greek mercenaries. A revolt on the part of Tachos' nephew Nectanebos drove Tachos to surrender himself to Ochus at Sidon. Further disturbances in Egypt forced Nectanebos to withdraw and return to his homeland. Persian authority in the West was gradually restored as many of the leading rebels were betrayed or captured, one by one. Ochus (as Artaxerxes III) succeeded his father (358) and spent the next several years dealing with various disturbances in the empire, especially in Asia Minor. By 351 he regained control of his western provinces, including Phoenicia, and was in a position to launch new invasion of Egypt.⁸⁴

According to Diodoros (XVI, 42:1) the satrap of Syria at this time (ca. 351) was another Belesys (Belshunu, possibly a grandson of the one who had ruled Syria during the fifth century).⁸⁵ His satrapy reached at least as far as the neighboring province of Cilicia in the north and included Phoenicia and north Syria as far as the Euphrates; Palestine must have also been a part of his domain. In other words, the satrapy of Syria still comprised the same general territories included in the traditional province "Beyond the River".⁸⁶

Artaxerxes III's invasion of Egypt was unsuccessful. After a year (ca. 351-350) of hard fighting, he was forced to retire. This failure was a signal for an extensive revolt by the Phoenician cities. Their deputies met at Tripolis and voted that all Phoenicia should throw off the Persian yoke. The enormous Sidonian wealth was used to collect a large fleet of warships and a considerable force of mercenaries. The nine kings of Cyprus soon followed the Phoenician example and proclaimed their independence; parts of Cilicia also joined in the revolt. As satrap of "Beyond the River", Belesys had the responsibility of bringing the defectors back into line. Accompanied by Mazaios, the satrap of Cilicia, he made an unsuccessful attack on Phoenicia (Diod. XVI, 42:1). This attempt

must have been made shortly after the initial revolt, though its exact date cannot be determined. The failure of his two satraps to restore order convinced Artaxerxes that he must intervene personally. At the beginning of 345 he collected a huge army in Babylon and marched against Sidon. The citizens had prepared for an intensive siege but were betrayed to the enemy by their leaders. They set fire to their ships as well as their homes in order to escape capture. The Persian monarch sold the ruins to speculators who paid a large price for the right to search for melted gold and silver.⁸⁷

It is not known what became of Belesys. Mazaios, who retained his satrapy in Cilicia, was also put in charge of "Beyond the River". Many of his coins are of Phoenician, more particularly Sidonian, style and are numbered from 16 to 21, representing the five last years of Ochus' reign (345-339).⁸⁸ Proof that Mazaios ruled both Cilicia and Syria together is furnished by another series of his coins bearing the inscription "Mazdai who is in charge of 'Beyond the River' and Cilicia".⁸⁹

Egypt was again conquered by Artaxerxes III (343 B.C.), which resulted in a strengthening of the Persian position in the West, so much so that even the rulers of Cyprus were forced to yield. But the assassination of Ochus and the enthronement of Arses (338) brought an end to all hopes of a great Persian revival and resulted in another Egyptian revolt (ca. 337 B.C.). By 336 Arses was also murdered and replaced by Darius III. This king set about energetically to recoup the losses sustained since Ochus' demise, and by 334 he had regained control over Egypt.

Through these final years of Persian rule Mazaios seems to have maintained his position as satrap of "Beyond the River". This is indicated by the later series of his Sidonian coins which bear numbers from 1 through 4. Numismatic experts, after a detailed examination of these coins, believe that Mazaios struck them during the three years of Arses' short-lived reign (338-336) and through the first four years of Darius III (336-333).⁹⁰ Scholars have questioned whether Mazaios was still satrap of Cilicia at this time because some classical sources⁹¹ refer to a certain Arsames who was evidently in charge of Persian forces at Tarsus in 333. Arrian's account of the Persian commanders at the battles of the Granicos (I, 12:8; in 334 B.C.) and at Issos (II, 11:8; in 333 B.C.) includes an Arsames who was a high-ranking cavalry officer. He was killed in the battle of Issos. Although it is not absolutely certain, it seems most likely that this is the same Arsames who had been in charge of Tarsus. Diodoros (XVII, 19:4) mentions a certain

Arsamenes at the battle of the Granicos who was a satrap, having his own cavalry. If this is really a variant spelling of Arsames, then the reference may be explained in one of two ways. Either the term satrap here refers to a lower-ranking officer than the ruler of a province⁹² or else there has been a transposition of names by which the next officer, Arsites, has been displaced by Arsamenes in this text.⁹³ The probability remains that Mazaois was still satrap of both Cilicia and "Beyond the River" while Arsames was serving as his deputy in the northern province. Mazaois is not referred to at any stage during the Macedonian conquest of Cilicia, Phoenicia, or Syria. However, he was a field commander in the battle of Gaugamala (331 B.C.); after the Persian defeat he withdrew to Babylon with a remnant of his troops and surrendered the city to Alexander (330). As a reward, he was appointed satrap of Babylonia, where he governed until his death in 328.⁹⁴

Meanwhile, Alexander had driven southward from Issos and received the surrender of the Phoenician cities Arvad, Byblos, and Sidon as he marched along the coast. When Tyre refused him entrance, he carried out the famous seven-month siege, building a mole to connect the island to the mainland.⁹⁵ Gaza also resisted his advance for two months but was finally overcome. While Alexander was "liberating" Egypt from Persian rule, he entrusted the conquest of the rest of the Syrian province to his generals. The province "Beyond the River" was then reconstituted as his province of Syria. During that time it was probably also known as "Hollow Syria" (*Koile Syria*), which may have been a Hellenic form of an Aramaic phrase in which the Greek *koile* came to be substituted for the similar-sounding Semitic word *kulla*, "all" Shalit has shown that *koile Syria* is evidently the semantic equivalent to "all Syria",⁹⁶ and Mazar has observed that the Sfire Stele (A, I, 5) contains the Aramaic original: "all Aram".⁹⁷ The province "Beyond the River" apparently maintained its identity as an administrative unit till after the death of Alexander of Macedon, when the southern part was joined to the Ptolemaic kingdom.

REFERENCES

1. Josh 24:2-3, 14-15; 2 Sam. 10:16; 1 Kings 14:15; Isa. 7:20; 1 Chron. 19:16.
2. *The Assyrian Dictionary*, Vol. IV (Chicago, 1958), p. 8.
3. Cf. *infra*, nn. 19, 20.
4. Hebrew: Ezra 8:36; Neh. 2:7, 9; 3:7; Aramaic: Ezra 4:10-11, 16-17, 20; 5:3; 6:6, 8, 13.

5. G. A. Cooke, *A Text Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1903), pp. 346-347.
6. W. Dittenberger, *Sylogae Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3d. 3 (Leipzig, 1915), No. 22; cf. E. Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums* (Halle, 1896), pp. 19-21.
7. E. Glaser, "Das Alter der minäischen Inschriften und der Ursprung des Names der Ebraer," *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Aegyptischen Gesellschaft*, II (1897), pp. 248-257.
8. A. Pohl, ed., *Neubabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus der Berliner staatlichen Museen, Analecta Orientalia VIII* (Rome, 1933), Nos. 45:3, 46:2-3, and 61:12-13.
9. Isa. 13; 14:4-21; 21:1-10, 46 ff; Jer. 50, 51.
10. From the translation of L. Oppenheim, *apud Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. by J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, N.J., 1955), p. 316.
11. 2 Chron. 36:23; Ezra 1:1-4.
12. C. E. Keiser, ed., *Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies*, Vol. I (New Haven, 1918), No. 169:22-23; J. B. Nies and C. E. Keiser, eds., *ibid.*, Vol. II (1920), No. 114:14-16.)
13. J. N. Strassmaier, *Inschriften von Darius König von Babylon (521-485 v. Chr.)*, Vol. X of *Babylonische Texte* (Leipzig, 1892), Vol. I, Nos. 27:3 and 82:2; A. T. Clay, ed., *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan* (New York, 1912), No. 101:5.
14. Ezra 5:3, 6; 6:6, 13.
15. B. Meissner, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XVII (1897), pp. 191-192.
16. A. T. Olmstead, "Tattenai, Governor of 'Across the River,'" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, III (1944), p. 46.
17. Cf. M. Ayi-Yonah, *The Holy Land* (Grand Rapids, 1966), pp. 11-12.
18. The first three were discussed at length by O. Leuze, *Die Satrapeneinteilung in Syrien und im Zweistromlande von 520-320* (Halle, 1935), pp. 242-255 [86-99]; cf. a more complete treatment by R. G. Kent, "Old Persian Texts: IV," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, II (1943), pp. 302-306, whose abbreviations are adopted in the discussion above. In Kent's basic textbook, *Old Persian*, vol. XXXIII of *American Oriental Series* (New Haven, Conn., 1950), is included the complete texts of each Persian inscription plus a thorough bibliography. The fifth list, DZd, was published by G. Posener, *La premiere domination Perse en Egypt* (Cairo, 1936), pp. 48 ff. The information from these lists has been presented in tabular form by A. Toynbee as adjunct to his essay on "The Administrative Geography of the Achaemenian Empire", in *A Study of History* (London, 1954), vol. VII, Table V, folding out opposite p. 772.
19. Persian *Athura*; Elamite *Assura*; Akkadian *Assur*; cf. Kent, *Old Persian*, p. 116b, for text references; also W. Hinz, "The Elamite Version of the Record of Darius's Palace at Susa," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, IX (1950), p. 2, line 28 and p. 3; Egyptian 3-s-w-r, Posener, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 84, 185-186.
20. Kent, *op. cit.* (n. 18), p. 144, par. 3g. This correspondence between *kara*; *hya*: *Athuriya* and *sabe sa eber nari* was pointed out to Toynbee by G. G. Cameron in private correspondence cited by the former,

- op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 656, n. 3, and p. 657, n. 3. Toynbee's opinion that the province "Beyond the River" included territory east of the Euphrates is based largely on Xenophon's statement, *Anabasis*, I, 4:19, the Cyrus the Younger's advancing army entered Syrian territory again after crossing the Euphrates. However, it will be noted below that Xenophon is listing ethnic groups and not administrative districts (cf. *infra*). His own use of "Syrian" simply reflects the common usage which was bound to occur in Greek sources as a result of the double meaning attached to "Assyria" when it became the official title for "Beyond the River". On the other hand, Toynbee's opinion that *eber nari* was simply popular as distinct from official usage is manifestly incorrect, *op. cit.*, pp. 656-657. Business documents, coins and, above all, royal inscriptions such as DSf and Gadatas (cf. *supra*) could hardly have utilized a "popular" expression!
21. Cf. *supra*, p. 53.
 22. Cf. *infra*, pp. 59f.
 23. A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago, 1948), pp. 112, 115.
 24. Cf. *supra*, n. 13.
 25. *Op. cit.* (n. 23), pp. 135-141. If such had been the case, then Darius would hardly have granted them permission to renew their work.
 26. Cf. *supra*, n. 6.
 27. R. A. Parker, "Darius and His Egyptian Campaign", *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, LVIII (1941), pp. 373-377; C. G. Cameron, "Darius, Egypt and the 'Lands beyond the sea,'" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, II (1943), pp. 307-313.
 28. Ezra 6:7; cf. Hag. 2:23; Zech. 4:6-10; Olmstead, *op. cit.* (n. 23), p. 142.
 29. J. Morgenstern has put great emphasis on this date as a focal point in Jewish history, "Jerusalem—485 B.C.," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXVII (1956), pp. 101-179; XXVIII (1957), pp. 15-47; XXXI (1960), pp. 1-29; also by the same author, "Further Light from the Book of Isaiah upon the Catastrophe of 485 B.C.," *ibid.*, XXXVII (1966), pp. 1-28. It is clear that this was a time of great disturbances in Palestine, cf. G. E. Wright, *Shechem* (New York, 1965), pp. 167-169.
 30. Ctesias, *Pers.* xiii, Epti. 52, who alone of the classical sources dates this revolt before the expedition against Greece; Olmstead, *op. cit.* (n. 18), p. 237, n. 23.
 31. Olmstead, *op. cit.* (n. 18), p. 237.
 32. Herodotus, VII, 89; cf. VIII, 67. All quotations from Herodotus are according to A. de Selincourt, *Herodotus, the Histories* (Penguin Classics; Middlesex, 1954). The "migration" tradition preserved in this passage may be compared with Ezra 4:9-10, which probably refers to Ashurbanipal's conquest of Susa and subsequent repression of a rebellion in Arabia and even Acco (ca. 641-642 B.C.; ANET, pp. 299-300); cf. B. Mazar, "Osnappar", *Ensiqlopedia Miqra'it*, vol. I, cols. 480-481 (Hebrew).
 33. J. N. Strassmaier, "Einige kleinere babylonische Keilschrifttexte aus dem Britischen Museum," *Acts du huitième congrès international des orientalistes*, Part II (Leiden, 1893), Beilage, pp. 26-27, No. 25:2. Cf. Bilshan, Ezra 2:2, Neh. 7:7.

34. As indicated by the aorist particle, Xenophon, *Anabasis* I, 4:10. Concerning the reference to Belesys in VII, 8:25, cf. *infra* n. 72.
35. The younger Cyrus, whose own official headquarters was in Sardis, maintained such an estate at Celaini in Phrygia, as did the Great King himself (Xenophon, *Anabasis* I, 2:7-8); the satrap of Armenia also owned a castle in a town near his own border (Xenophon, *Anabasis* IV, 4:2) which certainly could not have been his administrative capital.
36. Cf. *infra*, pp. 63f.
37. Cf. the 12th satrapy where the formula "from . . . to" is also adopted but where the borders are defined in terms of ethnic groups whose exact geographical location is not stated (III, 92).
38. Cf. Leuze, *op. cit.* (n. 18), pp. 259-260 [103-104]; for the kingdom of Kedar, cf. *infra*, pp. 67f.
39. The fifth century date for this inscription has recently received both philological and archaeological support. It has been thought by many scholars that Eshmunazer's reference to his overlord as 'dn mlkm (line 18) was the Phoenician reflex of the Ptolemaic title *kurios basileion*, "Lord of kingdoms," which would put Eshmunazer in the Hellenistic age, but K. Galling has pointed out that the Akkadian phrase *bel sarrani*, "Lord of kings", was already well known in the late Assyrian period, "Eshmunazer und der Herr der Könige," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina Vereins*, LXXIII (1963), pp. 140-151; it is also attested for the Neo-Babylonian period, H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* (Wiesbaden, 1964), vol. II, p. 21. A translation of Eshmunazer's text is given by F. Rosenthal *apud* Pritchard, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 505. Meanwhile, J. Ch. Assman has concluded a thorough examination of the catacomb in which the Eshmunazer sarcophagus was found. His comparison of the order in which various vaults were added with the dynastic tree of the Sidonian royal family has led him to posit an early fifth century date for King Eshmunazer, "Zur Baugeschichte der Königsgruft von Sidon," *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 1963, p. 715.
40. Cf. also II, 104 where he states that the Phoenicians and the Syrians of Palestine had learned the custom of circumcision from the Egyptians.
41. N. Glueck, *Rivers in the Desert* (New York, 1959), p. 172.
42. Many scholars prefer a later date for Ezra's mission to Judea, e.g., ca. 398 B.C. in the reign of Artaxerxes II Memnon, cf. W. F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XL (1921), pp. 104-124; H. H. Rowley, "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," *Ignace Goldzieher Memorial Volume* (Part I, edited by S. Löwinger and J. Somogy; Budapest, 1948), pp. 117-149; *idem*, *The Servant of the Lord* (London, 1952), pp. 131-159; N. H. Snaith, "The Historical Books," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. by H. H. Rowley (London, 1952), pp. 112-114; John Bright, *A History of Israel* (London, 1960), pp. 375-386.
43. Rather he was augmenting a policy which may date back to the time of Cyrus the Great.
44. Ezra 7:12-14, 21; cf. W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Ludwig Koehler, ed. (Leiden, 1951), p. 1067.

45. Cf. Esther 1:8, *et passim*; Ezra 8:36.
46. Cf. J. B. Bury, *A History of Greece* (London, 1955), pp. 354-355, 357-358.
47. Olmstead, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 18), p. 313.
48. Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-361.
49. Ctesias, *Pers.*, Epit. 68-70.
50. Y. Aharoni, *Carta's Atlas of the Bible* (Jerusalem, 1964), p. 106, map 166 (Hebrew—an English translation is now available); the English reader may refer to *Views of the Biblical World*, B. Mazar, *et al.*, eds., Vol. III (Jerusalem, 1960), p. 203.
51. Oppenheim, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 10), p. 285. However, there is some question about the permanence of his situation since we find a king reigning again at Ashdod during Sennacherib's campaign, *ibid.*, pp. 287-288.
52. It is not clear whether the Sharon Plain on the west was part of the Samaritan province; under Tiglath-pileser III it had become a separate administrative unit with headquarters at Dor (ca. 733 B.C.), cf. Mazar, *op. cit.* (n. 50), p. 32; but Esarhaddon mentions Aphek as belonging to Samaria (699 B.C.), cf. A. L. Oppenheim's translation of Esarhaddon's annals *apud* Pritchard, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 292; during the fifth century B.C. the Sharon Plain from Dor to Joppa was awarded by the Persian monarch to the king of Sidon, Eshmunazer, cf. *supra*, n. 39.
53. "The Discovery of the Samaria Papyri," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXVI (1963), pp. 120-121. "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," *Harvard Theological Review*, LIX (1966).
54. Neh. 2:10, 19; 3:33; 4:1; 6:1-2, 5, 12, 14; 13:28.
55. Nos. 30 and 32; translated by H. L. Ginsberg *apud* Pritchard, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 491-492.
56. Josephus, *Antiquities* IX, 302-303; cf. Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
57. B. Mazar, "The Tobiads," *Israel Exploration Journal*, VII (1957), pp. 137-145, 229-238.
58. "Judas Nachbarn zur Zeit Nehemias," *Palästina-Jahrbuch*, XXVII (1931), p. 73 (= *Klein Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. II [München, 1953], pp. 343-345).
59. F. M. Cross, "Geshem, the Arabian, Enemy of Nehemiah," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XVIII (1955), pp. 46-47.
60. I. Rabinowitz, "Aramaic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.E. from a North-Arab Shrine in Egypt," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* XV (1956), p. 2.
61. A. J. Jaussen and R. Savignac, *Mission archeologique en Arabie* (3 vols., Paris, 1909-1921), II (1914), p. 506, No. 277.
62. Cf. *supra*, pp. 58f; also W. F. Albright, "Dedan," in *Geschichte und Altes Testament (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie*, 16; Tübingen, 1953), pp. 4, 6.
63. Rabinowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 9, cites an inscription of Darius I which mentions a *sb* (Sabaeen?) grandee obedient to Darius' orders, No. 8 in G. Posener, *op. cit.* (n. 18), pp. 50 ff.

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

64. Rabinowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 6, also notes that the Hebrew "land of Goshen" is rendered in the Septuagint as "the land of Gesem the Arabian" (Gen. 45:10).
65. Note the position of Arabia in Darius I's inscriptions, *supra*, pp. 55f.
66. Diodoros, XIII, 46-6; though this may have been something of a pretence, cf. Diodoros, XIII, 37:4-5.
67. Cf. discussions by A. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible* (London, 1966), pp. 362-365.
68. A convenient edition is that by C. L. Brownson, *Xenophon* (The Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass., 1921), 2 vols.
69. Leuze, *op. cit.*, p. 312 [156].
70. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, VII, 8:25 though the integrity of this passage is questioned, cf. *infra*, n. 66.
71. W. Schwenzler, "Gobryas", *Klio*, XVIII (1923), p. 242.
72. The concluding passage in Xenophon's *Anabasis* (VII, 3:25-26) is considered by many to be a later edition. Its style and presentation show divergencies which mitigate against its authenticity. The "rulers" in the list were not necessarily satraps but merely the leaders of various peoples encountered in Cyrus' march, and the geographical nomenclature reflects ethnic regions rather than administrative districts. Phoenicia and Arabia are grouped together and associated with a man named Dernes; Syria and Assyria are assigned to Belesys; Babylon is listed with a certain Ropares. This arrangement cannot possibly be reconciled with the administrative set-up reflected in the *Anabasis*: Leuze, *op. cit.*, pp. 322-339 [166-183].
73. R. A. S. Macalister, *The Excavations of Gezer* (London, 1912), Vol. II, p. 313, fig. 452; A. Rowe, *A Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs* (Cairo, 1936), pp. 230-231.
74. Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 551-554.
75. According to Latin variant, cf. C. H. Oldfather, *Diodorus of Sicily* (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass., 1954), Vol. VI, pp. 332-333, n. 1.
76. W. F. von Landau, "Vorläufige Nachrichten über die im Eshmuntempel bei Sidon gefundenen phöanizischen Altertümer." *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, V (1904), pp. 342-347.
77. Rowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 295-296; the correct provenience for this item is given by B. Porter and R. L. B. Moss, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings*, vol. VII (Oxford, 1951), p. 382. This correction was brought to the writer's attention by Mr. Ephraim Stern of the Tel Aviv University.
78. Known to the Assyrians as Mahalata, Maisa, and Kaisa; D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (Chicago, 1926), Vol. I, pars. 479, 518.
79. Olmstead, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 23), p. 434.
80. C. Müller, *Geographi graeci minores* (Paris, 1855-1882), Vol. I, pp. 78-80; cf. K. Galling, "Die syrische u. palaestinische Kueste nach der Beschreibung bei Pseudo-Skylax," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, LXI (1938), pp. 66-87.

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

81. Herodotus, III, 91; Xenophon, *Anabasis* IV, 4:6; Strabo, XIV, 676; Pliny, V, 79; and Ptolemy, V, 14.
82. Herodotus, III, 5; VII, 89; Pliny, V, 69; Ptolemy, V, 14:3, 15:2; Arrian, *Anabasis*, II, 25:4; and Diodoros XIX, 93:7.
83. Cf. *supra*, n. 39.
84. Olmstead, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 18), pp. 424-433.
85. Cf. *supra*, nn. 33 and 34.
86. As confirmed by inscriptions on coins minted by Belshunu's successor, cf. *infra*.
87. Olmstead, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 23), pp. 436-437. The possibility of relating certain archaeological destruction levels in Palestine to this revolt have recently been discussed by D. Barag, "The Effects of the Tennes Rebellion on Palestine," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 183 (1966), pp. 6-12.
88. Leuze, *op. cit.*, p. 386 [230].
89. Cf. *supra*, n. 5.
90. Leuze, *op. cit.*, pp. 392-393 [236-237].
91. Curtius, III, 4:3; Arrian, II, 4:5.
92. As elsewhere in Diodoros, XVII, 21:7.
93. Leuze, *op. cit.*, p. 405 [249].
94. Olmstead, *op. cit.* (n. 23), pp. 517-518.
95. Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 763-771. Alexander's purported visit to Jerusalem (Josephus, *Antiquities*, XI, 322 ff.) is simply a legend.
96. A. Shalit, *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, vol. I (Jerusalem, 1954), pp. 64-77.
97. B. Mazar. "The Aramean Empire in its Relations with Israel," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXV (1962), pp. 119-120.