1-1-2009

Corrections and Updates to "Identifying Biblical Persons in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions of 1200-539 B.C.E."

Lawrence J. Mykytiuk
Purdue University, larrym@purdue.edu

CORRECTIONS AND UPDATES TO "IDENTIFYING BIBLICAL PERSONS IN NORTHWEST SEMITIC INSCRIPTIONS OF 1200–539 B.C.E."

LAWRENCE J. MYKYTIUK

PURDUE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

It is now about six years since the August 2004 publication of *Identifying Biblical Persons* (*IBP*) and about eight years since the July 2002 cutoff point for new material, including "new" inscriptions, to be added to its footnotes and back matter. By now, some recent discoveries, several revelations of forgeries, certain reviews, *IBP*'s *errata*, and my rethinking of how the book should present its material all call for this article.[1] Its updates on IDs in newly discovered inscriptions attempt to cover through July 31, 2008, but no later.

---

[1] I dedicate this article to the memory of my father.

In addition to *Maarav*'s standard abbreviations and symbols, the following appear below:

/ divider between lines in an inscription; elsewhere, usually an indicator of alternative nouns

GN geographical name

IBP Lawrence J. Mykytiuk, *Identifying Biblical Persons in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions of 1200–539 B.C.E.* (SBL Academia Biblica 12; Atlanta: SBL/Boston: Brill, 2004).

ID identification

PN personal name

RN royal name

WSS Nahman Avigad and Benjamin Sass, *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, IES, and The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem, 1997).

The *numbers* assigned to IDs or non-IDs 1 through 30 in this article are not intended for use beyond this article, such as in a revised edition of *IBP*. As in *IBP*, in assigning ID

The present article accepts most of the criticisms of its twelve reviews.[2] In particular, it attempts to apply Christopher Rollston's principles to unprovenanced materials with utter thoroughness.[3] Next it "cleans house," correcting and updating parts of the book's content on specific

numbers to father-and-son pairs, the lower number goes to the father.

IBP is a revision of Lawrence J. Mykytiuk, "Identifying Biblical Persons in Hebrew Inscriptions and Two Stelae from before the Persian Era" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998). In *Dissertation Abstracts International* and a few publications whose citations derive from it, the word "Related" erroneously appears in the dissertation title between the words "Two" and "Stelae."

As in the dissertation, the main body of text in *IBP* covers only inscriptions in publications that were actually available in the United States as of the beginning of October 1997. The author continued this limitation from the dissertation into the main body of text in the book in obedience to a rule of the series, that no substantial change from the content of the dissertation should be made in the content of the book. *IBP*'s updates to the dissertation, which attempt complete coverage to mid-July 2002 and mention a few works published in 2003, are confined to its footnotes, appendixes, and bibliography.

Unless noted otherwise, this article uses the following editions of ancient texts: first, for the MT, *BHS*.

Second, for the LXX, this article generally prefers Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum* (or: *Academiae Scientiarum*) *Gottingensis Editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–). In the books of the Bible for which volumes of the Göttingen Septuagint have not yet appeared, this article uses the Larger Cambridge Septuagint: Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean, and (from vol. 2, part 1, 1927, onward) Henry St. J. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts* . . . (9 parts; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1906–1940).

Third, for the Syriac Peshitta version, wherever possible, this article uses Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac, according to the Peshitta Version = Vetus Testamentum Syriacae iuxta Simplicem Syrorum Versionem* (Leiden: Brill, 1972–). In books of the Bible for which a volume of the Leiden Peshitta has not yet appeared, this article uses *Kᵉtābāʾ Qadîšāʾ: Dîatîqî ʿAtîqtāʾ* (Urmiah ed.; London: Trinitarian Bible Society, repr. 1954).

[2] In chronological order, twelve reviews of *IBP* published thus far are: Joseph Cathey, *RBL*, February 2005, accessed: February 26, 2005, available: http://www.bookreviews. org; Paul Sanders, *RBL*, February 2005, accessed: February 26, 2005, available: http:// www.bookreviews.org; repr. *JBL* 124 (2005): 354–359; Adrian H. W. Curtis, in "Book List 2005," *JSOT* 29 (2005): 29–30; Simon B. Parker, *CBQ* 67 (2005): 501–503; Kenneth A. Kitchen, *SEE-J Hiphil* 2 (2005), accessed: September 7, 2005, available: http://www. see-j.net/hiphil, select "Vol. 2 (2005)"; Ronald A. Veenker, *JAOS* 125 (October–December 2005): 544–545; Robert P. Gordon in "Book List," *VT* 56 (2006): 286; repr. *VT* 56 (2006): 430; Cornelius H. J. de Geus, *BO* 63 (2006): cols. 356–358; Richard S. Hess, *JETS* 49 (2006): 394–396; Christopher A. Rollston, *BASOR* 345 (2007): 82–83, modified in idem, *JSS* 52 (2007): 373–376; Joel S. Barnett, *Maarav* 15 (2008): 207–210. *IBP*'s inclusion in "Books Received" in *IEJ* and *JNES* suggests that future reviews might appear there.

[3] These five principles appear in Christopher A. Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs II: The Status of Non-Provenanced Epigraphs within the Broader Corpus of Northwest Semitic," *Maarav* 11 (2004): 71–76.

unprovenanced inscriptions. Then, constructively, it evaluates potential identifications in "new" provenanced and unprovenanced inscriptions. After correcting a point of methodology, it gives page-by-page corrections in *IBP*. At the end is a classified list of all thirty-two IDs or non-IDs in this article (two IDs outside of *IBP*'s scope being unnumbered), followed by an index to them.

The preliminary evaluations which appear below are more thorough for IDs in the more valuable grades S, 3, and 2 if they are made in provenanced epigraphs. For IDs in lower grades or unprovenanced epigraphs, the preliminary evaluations are frequently cursory.

Note: the changes described in the text and notes below are given with reference points to the existing edition of *IBP* only because *these are the reference points that are currently available* to users of *IBP*, and they may wish to note certain changes in their present copies. The page numbers given below, the reassigning of person numbers and inscription numbers, and the plotted relocation of certain material to new pages in *IBP* may tend to give a false impression that some new edition will follow *IBP*'s present pattern of presentation unswervingly. Substantial parts of that pattern, however, are rejected in section I C below, and any new edition would be reorganized as described there.

I. THE BOOK'S PRESENTATION OF UNPROVENANCED EPIGRAPHS

A. THE ATTITUDE OF THE BOOK TOWARD UNPROVENANCED EPIGRAPHS

In writing the dissertation that became *IBP*, I consciously chose to follow the fine and sensible example set by Nili Sacher Fox's handling of unprovenanced materials in her 1997 dissertation, which appeared later as a highly praised book.[4] Accordingly, *IBP* takes the attitude that

---

[4] "Consequently, the following cautious approach is adopted here: 1. Published unprovenienced items will be mentioned in discussions in the dissertation but they constitute a separate category from the provenienced archaeological material. 2. Interpretations of official titles, administrative practices and any other aspects of state-organizations will be based exclusively on evidence from provenienced sources. 3. No conclusions will be drawn from data derived from unprovenienced material" (Nili S. Fox, "Royal Functionaries and State-Administration in Israel and Judah during the First Temple Period" [Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1997]: 45).

The section of her dissertation that includes this quotation appears in its published version, idem, *In the Service of the King: Officialdom in Ancient Israel and Judah* (Monographs

unprovenanced inscriptions are not to be trusted unless their authenticity can be demonstrated; therefore, any identification in an unprovenanced epigraph is *conditional upon demonstration of the authenticity of the inscription*. *IBP* explicitly states this attitude toward unprovenanced epigraphs in each of its main sections.[5] Unfortunately, I learned of Rollston's principles regarding unprovenanced materials much too late in the production process of the book to bring it into complete conformity with them.

Since Rollston's reviews do not happen to mention my repeated cautions and care in handling conditional IDs in unprovenanced inscriptions except to note my flagging of unprovenanced materials, I have enumerated these extensive efforts in the attached note.[6] In section V below, see the addition to *IBP*, p. 41.

---

of the Hebrew Union College 23; Cincinnati: HUC, 2000): 23–32, with an almost verbatim repetition of the quotation above on ibid., 32. Professor Fox's "kindly providing a copy of her dissertation long before it was published" is gratefully acknowledged in *IBP*, xiii.

[5] Richard Hess's commendably thorough and complete reading of the book led him to a correct grasp of *IBP*'s attitude regarding unprovenanced epigraphs (regarding the appendixes, his use of the word "consistent" might refer to their flagging of "Marketed" inscriptions): "A second important contribution is the distinction Mykytiuk consistently makes between provenanced and unprovenanced inscriptions. Except in cases of certainty regarding provenance or authenticity (e.g., seals published in the nineteenth century before there was a developed science of West Semitic paleography), he brackets this out of his grading scheme, which renders it less usable in practice. Even so, his consistent separation of his material into these two groups and his evaluation of each group apart from the other allows for greater respectability in the conclusions he draws regarding how many inscriptional names can likely or certainly be identified with biblical persons" (Hess [N 2]: 395).

[6] As the author, feeling the need to insure that *IBP*'s readers would not come away with a mistaken impression, I chose to risk boring them with redundant statements of the book's attitude toward unprovenanced epigraphs. As a result, there is scattered repetition of such clarifying statements throughout the book's main body of text, as follows:

a. Each of the five chapters and appendixes in which the question of provenance is salient (Appendixes B, C, and F) makes an explicit statement of the attitude stated above. Moreover, in the main body of text, *every* detailed evaluation of a potential ID in an unprovenanced epigraph, all of which are treated in chapters 2 and 4, makes a similar assertion.

b. Chap. 1's discussion of IDs made on grounds of singularity, the strongest grade of ID, includes the following statements: "Of course, such an ID may not be made if there is an overriding consideration against it, such as a lack of provenance for an inscription, hence an objective reason to doubt its authenticity. In such a case, the ID would remain conditional upon demonstrated authenticity of the inscription" (*IBP*, 54).

c. Chap. 2: the introductory paragraph states, "Some of the examples below are in unprovenanced inscriptions . . . the IDs they may offer are conditional on authenticity. . . ." (ibid., 57; nevertheless, see below, section I C 1 a, for corrections in chap. 2's choice of epigraphs used as examples).

Also, chap. 2's first three examples, in which three conditional IDs are made, are its only unprovenanced epigraphs, and each one has a similar caveat. Regarding the first example,

B. A SUMMARY OF ROLLSTON'S EVALUATION ACCORDING TO FIVE PRINCIPLES TO BE USED WITH UNPROVENANCED MATERIALS

The five sound principles for the handling and presentation of unprovenanced epigraphs that appear in Rollston's previous *Maarav* article[7]

---

the end of section 2.2 states, "Therefore, but for the first question, regarding reliability, it would be considered a grade S ID. Because forgery has not been proven, the first question has not been answered in the negative, and the ID has not been disqualified. A convenient way to state suspension of judgment on this ID is to say that it is conditional upon demonstration of the genuineness of the seal. [Unless and] until a verdict is reached on authenticity, this is a *conditional* grade SB ID" (ibid., 67). The evaluation of chap. 2's second conditional ID in the unprovenanced bulla of *Berekyāhû*, the example for grade 3 IDs, contains the similar remark, "(again, depending on the authenticity of the bulla)" (ibid.). The evaluation of the next example, the unprovenanced seal of *ʿĂśayāhû*, begins, "An example of a grade 2 ID (depending on authenticity) is . . ." (ibid., 74).

d. Regarding chap. 4, by its very chap. structure, the book reveals the intention to separate unreliable data from that which is reliable by treating IDs in provenanced inscriptions in chap. 3 and IDs in unprovenanced epigraphs in chap. 4. A. H. W. Curtis's review of the book shows a correct understanding of the general reason for this separation into two chapters. After mentioning the eleven identification criteria, he states, "In a sense a further criterion is added in that the examples examined in the main body of the text (those published before 1997) are considered under the headings 'provenanced' and 'unprovenanced' " (Curtis [N 2]: 30).

e. Chap. 4 regards its first two epigraphs, whose IDs are treated in sections 4.2 and 4.3, as authentic (*IBP*, 153–163). Following those two IDs, it repeats the same phrasing in its treatment of each and every ID: in sections 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 (section 4.5 refers the reader to the first ID in chap. 2, whose treatment is described above). This repeated phrasing is, "Question 3: Provided the seal [or "seal ring" or "bulla(e)" or "inscription"] were authentic, how strongly the specific data . . . would count for or against an identification with the biblical [person]. . . ."

f. Chap. 5 also scrupulously separates IDs in provenanced epigraphs from IDs in unprovenanced epigraphs. The only exceptions are two IDs in unprovenanced epigraphs of demonstrable authenticity (ibid., 197–198). Only after the drawing the book's final conclusions based on data from epigraphs of known authenticity does chap. 5 even begin to mention unprovenanced inscriptions of uncertain authenticity, and at that point, it explicitly mentions that further conclusions based on the conditional IDs in such inscriptions would be valid only if the epigraphs were demonstrated to be authentic. It does so with the explicit caveat, "This section describes *potential* results, provided all six of these unprovenanced inscriptions should be shown to be genuine" (ibid., 200).

g. It seems likely that some readers received a mistaken impression of the book's attitude toward unprovenanced epigraphs from the all-too-handy Appendixes B and C. The easily overlooked caveat tucked away in the key to *IBP*'s Appendix B states, "*Marketed* means unprovenanced, so that evaluations must be considered conditional upon demonstration of authenticity" (ibid., 211–212). Also, the second paragraph of Appendix C explicitly states, "The key to the chart below is at the beginning of Appendix B" (ibid., 244).

[7] Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs II" (N 3): 57–79. The five principles are described on pp. 71–76.

are: 1) separation of unprovenanced from provenanced epigraphs—to which I would add separation of forged epigraphs[8] from all others; 2) "flagging" of unprovenanced epigraphs in instances in which they need to be listed together with others that are provenanced; 3) relegation of unprovenanced epigraphs to a secondary status, in which they do not serve as a basis for any conclusions; 4) categorization of unprovenanced epigraphs according to the degree of likelihood that they are forged or are authentically ancient; and 5) mitigating circumstances in the case of certain groups of epigraphs. These principles are worthy of complete acceptance.

Both of Rollston's reviews of *IBP* are not so much general reviews as they are evaluations of the book according to these five principles regarding unprovenanced epigraphs. Principle 1, as I understand and apply it below, calls for substitution of provenanced exemplars for unprovenanced in chapter 2 and for a complete rearrangement of Appendixes A, B and C, as detailed below. *IBP does* indeed separate provenanced from unprovenanced epigraphs in most places, including chapters 3, 4, and 5 (of five chapters) and Appendix F. Yet it is primarily regarding principle 1, separation, that *IBP* falls short, not because it totally fails to separate provenanced from unprovenanced materials, but because it properly separates the two only in most places, rather than in every place. As for forgeries, *IBP* does not have a separate category for them, because I thought, mistakenly, that I had excluded all forgeries from the book.

Regarding principle 2, *IBP* conscientiously flags all unprovenanced materials with perfect consistency; Rollston's second review observes this "concerted effort."[9] As for principle 3, relegation, Rollston finds *IBP*'s "foregrounding" of unprovenanced materials among the examples in chapter 2 to be a serious flaw.[10] Although his reviews do not mention

---

[8] Strictly speaking, forged epigraphs are a subset of unprovenanced epigraphs, but separating them is a helpful and important safeguard. The category of forged epigraphs includes forgeries, possible forgeries, probable forgeries, and fakes. Of course, any unprovenanced epigraph might be a forgery. Here the term *possible forgery* is used to refer to epigraphs having *particular features* which render them more suspect than most others that are unprovenanced.

In technical use, the noun *fake* properly refers to a genuine ancient artifact later physically altered for the purpose of committing fraud. The term *forgery* normally refers to an entire artifact but can be used in a broad sense to include fakes, also.

[9] "Having said this, though, I should note that Mykytiuk does make a concerted effort to 'flag' non-provenanced data so that the reader, at the very least, knows that the epigraphic data comes from the market, not from a scientific excavation" (idem, review of *IBP*, *JSS* [N 2]: 376).

[10] Idem, review of *IBP*, *BASOR* (N 2): 83. Regarding this same principle, neither of Rollston's reviews mention that in its conclusions (chap. 5), *IBP* scrupulously avoids basing any conclusion on unprovenanced materials.

principles 4 (categorization regarding likelihood of forgery or authenticity) and 5 (mitigating circumstances), corrections according to principle 4 appear in section II, A and B, below. For principle 5, see note 11 below regarding mitigating circumstances.

C. APPLICATION OF ROLLSTON'S FIVE PRINCIPLES TO THE BOOK

1. The Need for Further Separation of Unprovenanced Epigraphs from Provenanced and for Separation of Forged Epigraphs from Both

Within the fuller perspective given in section I A above, this article completely accepts Rollston's criticisms regarding unprovenanced materials. The purpose of the changes here (i.e., in the remaining four sections before section II below) is to remove any suggestion "that these data (i.e., provenanced and non-provenanced) are to be weighted as equals."[11] In order to correct such a mistaken impression, five places in the book must be revised: chapter 2 (specifically, the first three epigraphs treated there), Appendixes A, B, and C, and a sentence on page 4.

a. Replacement of Three Unprovenanced Epigraphs by Provenanced in Chapter 2

First of all, because of the prominence of the examples in chapter 2, provenanced epigraphs, rather than unprovenanced, should illustrate the first three grades of IDs. (The last three grades of IDs and non-IDs in chapter 2 already have provenanced epigraphs as examples.) The purpose of chapter 2 is to provide an initial example of each grade of ID and non-ID, in order to acquaint the reader with how the three questions used to evaluate potential identifications actually work in establishing these grades. In effect, these examples serve as paradigms and must, therefore, avoid giving any mistaken or misleading impressions.

---

[11] Idem, review of *IBP*, *JSS* (N 2): 376.

IBP treats two unprovenanced epigraphs for which authenticity can be established; they appeared long before anyone, including forgers, knew the appropriate paleographic details to include (*IBP*, 153–163, 219, seals [17] and [18] and nn. 23, 24, repeated on 248: seals [17] and [18] and nn.16, 17). Therefore, although the case can be stated in general terms of provenanced vs. unprovenanced, there are at least two exceptional unprovenance epigraphs which are known to be authentic (cf. Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs II" [N 3]: 76–78, "E. Pillaged Epigraphs: The Principle of Mitigating Circumstances").

In writing chapter 2, I labored under the mistaken assumption that be-
cause I intended it to be preliminary, rather than primary, readers would
perceive it in that way. My intent in that chapter was merely to present
patterns of IDs in descending order of strength for use in later chapters.
The examples included there did not even need to be real; they could
have been entirely imaginary. "Fred, son of Eric, the king's Chief of
Staff" could have illustrated quite well the three identifying marks of a
grade 3 ID. Rollston's sound comments in his review in *BASOR*, how-
ever, immediately gained my agreement: "It is difficult to understand the
reason for Mykytiuk's use of the [non-provenanced] Baruch Bulla as the
paradigm for his Grade 3. . . . [N]on-provenanced data should generally
be relegated to a secondary status, not foregrounded as a major illustra-
tive tool for an important research proposal. Similar objections are to be
made against Mykytiuk's Grade 2 exemplar."[12]

Accordingly, in chapter 2, the first three exemplars should be replaced.
First, in order to illustrate IDs made on the basis of singularity, an ID in
a provenanced exemplar should replace the grade SB conditional ID of
Hoshea, son of Elah, king of Israel, in the unprovenanced seal whose text
reads, "Belonging to *ʿAbdî*, the minister of *Hōšēᵃʿ*." One may select a
suitable replacement from among the grade S IDs (i.e., SI, SB, or SI+SB)
in epigraphs marked "Excavated" and "Observed" in *IBP*, 245–248, but
not from those labeled "Marketed." Either person (7) Omri, king of
Israel, or person (69) Mesha, king of Moab, in inscription [3] the Mesha
stele from Dhiban would seem clear enough to serve as a good example.

Continuing in chapter 2, in order to illustrate grade 3 IDs, an ID in
a provenanced exemplar should replace the former conditional grade 3
ID—now disqualified as a probable modern forgery (see section II B
below)—of the biblical Baruch the scribe, son of Neriah (Jer 32:12),
in the bulla whose text is translated, "Belonging to *Berekyāhû*, son of
Nērîyāhû, the scribe." A good replacement is the grade 3 ID of bibli-
cal Shaphan the scribe (2 Kgs 22:3), father of Gemariah the official
(Jer 36:10), in the city of David bulla whose text reads "belonging to
Gəmaryāhû, [so]n of *Šāpān*."[13]

Similarly, in order to illustrate grade 2 IDs in chapter 2, an ID in a
provenanced exemplar should replace the conditional grade 2 ID of
biblical Asaiah (2 Kgs 22:12) in the unprovenanced seal whose text is
translated, "Belonging to *ʾĂśayāhû*, the king's minister."[14] A fitting re-
placement is the grade 2 ID of biblical Shebna, the overseer of the palace

---

[12] Idem, review of *IBP*, *BASOR* (N 2): 83, final paragraph.

[13] *IBP*, 139–146, 228 person (36) in inscription [48] (repeated on ibid., 251: (36) in
[48]).

[14] Ibid., 57–67.

(Isa 22:15–19) in the Silwan epitaph, which has part of a PN in line 1: "[ ]*yāhû*, overseer of the palace."[15] The owner's two identifying marks are his title and ostentatious tomb; the PN's root letters are absent, and its theophoric element is not distinctive.

b. Revision of the Way Appendixes A and B are Organized

Appendixes A and B must sort IDs into separate lists. The first list in both should specify IDs and non-IDs in epigraphs of known authenticity. The second list in both should specify conditional IDs and non-IDs in unprovenanced epigraphs of unknown authenticity.[16] Appendix B needs a third list to specify non-IDs in forged epigraphs.[17]

c. Revision of the Way Appendix C is Organized

Appendix C, as well, must separate IDs and non-IDs in epigraphs of known authenticity[18] from conditional IDs and non-IDs in epigraphs of unknown authenticity, and it must also separate non-IDs in forged inscriptions from both of those groups. Such threefold separation is particularly important in Appendix C, because it provides a summary list of all of *IBP*'s results, that is, all of its IDs and non-IDs in descending order of strength.

As mentioned above, Appendix C states, "The key to the chart below is at the beginning of Appendix B,"[19] and in Appendix B, under the heading "Key to the chart below," in the very first paragraph, the following statement appears: "*Marketed* means unprovenanced, so that evaluations must be considered conditional upon demonstration of authenticity."[20] Perhaps naïvely, the author thought that these statements were sufficient to avoid any suggestion that he were making a blanket affirmation that all unprovenanced inscriptions in Appendix C, sections C.1 through C.4, were somehow to be accepted as if they were authentic.

The following two statements at the very beginning of Appendix C must be deleted or revised to make their applicability more precise: "Sections C.1 through C.4 below contain the first extensive corpus of pre-Persian-era, Northwest Semitic inscriptions that name biblical persons. The reliable identifications (IDs) are found there, i.e., those

---

[15] Ibid., 225, person (25) in inscription [34], repeated on ibid., 253: (25) in [34].

[16] See N 11 second paragraph, above.

[17] See N 8 above.

[18] See N 11, second paragraph, above.

[19] *IBP*, 244.

[20] Ibid., 211–212.

in grades S (including SI and SB) and 3.”[21] It would be futile to argue
that the first sentence's use of the word "contain" should be taken to
mean "include but do not necessarily consist completely of," which is
the intended meaning. This sentence simply gives a wrong impression.
Unfortunately, these two statements, combined with Appendix C's inclu-
sion of conditional IDs in unprovenanced epigraphs in one and the same
list with IDs in provenanced epigraphs can confuse readers. Some read-
ers seem indeed to have received the mistaken impression that Appendix
C regards all IDs in unprovenanced ("Marketed") inscriptions in its sec-
tions C.1 through C.4 as established, rather than conditional. *IBP* does
not at all intend to take such an indiscriminate, "blanket" attitude!

Reflections on how *IBP*'s Appendix C presents its material in light of
Rollston's criticisms and in light of innocent misreadings on the part of
some have led me to the following, clearer pattern of presentation:

First come IDs and non-IDs in inscriptions of known authenticity:

- *The corpus of reliable IDs* is preeminent in its importance. It con-
  sists of those in grades SI+SB, SI, and SB, which are considered
  certain, and those in grade 3, virtually certain to reliable, in inscrip-
  tions of known authenticity. (Strictly speaking, the corpus consists
  of inscribed objects, epigraphs, rather than the IDs found in the in-
  scriptions they contain.) At this time, this corpus includes two un-
  provenanced inscriptions known to be authentic.[22]
- *The penumbra*,[23] composed of reasonable but uncertain IDs (i.e.,
  those in grade 2) in inscriptions of known authenticity, is called the
  penumbra because its IDs are, figuratively, in a "twilight" area. They
  are strong enough to make reasonable hypotheses but not strong
  enough to be considered reliable. Although their uncertain IDs may
  never be resolved, they are second in importance and must not be
  ignored.
- Other grades of IDs and non-IDs in inscriptions of known authentic-
  ity come third, including IDs in grade 1 (doubtful) and non-IDs in
  grades 0 (zero; without a clear basis) and D (disqualified).

Next come *conditional* IDs and non-IDs in inscriptions of *un*known
authenticity (all of these are unprovenanced):

---

[21] Ibid., 244.

[22] N 28 below describes the grades of IDs. On the two, unprovenanced epigraphs of
known authenticity, see N 11, second paragraph, above.

[23] With appreciation, I have borrowed K. A. Kitchen's term *penumbra* from his review
of *IBP* (N 2): last paragraph.

- *Candidates for the corpus of reliable IDs*, i.e., for the first category above in this list, are *conditional* IDs that would be in grades SI+SB, SI, SB, and/or 3 but are not included there, because they are in unprovenanced inscriptions and cannot be considered reliable unless their authenticity has been demonstrated.
- *Candidates for the penumbra* composed of reasonable but uncertain IDs (i.e., those in grade 2) are *conditional* grade 2 IDs that cannot become part of the penumbra unless their authenticity has been demonstrated.
- Other conditional IDs and non-IDs in inscriptions of unknown authenticity, including conditional IDs in grade 1, like those above, are also conditional on demonstration of authenticity of the inscription. Included are conditional non-IDs in grades 0 and D, which are such low grades that, practically speaking, it hardly matters whether the inscription is authentic.

Last come non-IDs in forged inscriptions, including possible forgeries, probable forgeries and fakes. Under grade D, these are grade DF non-IDs, those that are disqualified on grounds of forgery (see section II B below).

d. Making Clear the Relegation of Unprovenanced Epigraphs in the Introduction

A sentence in the middle of page 4 needs to be clarified. Under the subhead "*The Scope of This Study*," the second paragraph begins: "The corpus of inscriptions investigated in the main body of this study consists of eleven Hebrew inscriptions, the Mesha Inscription, and the Tel Dan stele. These thirteen artifacts were chosen both because they exemplify the kinds of conditions (e.g., annalistic content, fragmentation, etc.) that permit a demonstration of the capabilities and limits of the identification system and because they offer identifications whose historical significance makes them too important to ignore" (*IBP*, 4).

The author's intent in the unclear second sentence is not to assert that every inscription investigated in the main body of text *must* have fulfilled *both* reasons listed in order to be chosen. Rather, the intent of the sentence is simply to list some reasons why various inscriptions were chosen, regardless of whether they were chosen for the first reason, the second, or both. In fact, not every inscription was chosen for *both* reasons listed.[24]

---

[24] A pre-defense version of the dissertation (cf. N 1 above) submitted May 15, 1998, and later revised, documents an earlier version of this paragraph: "The corpus of inscriptions

In order to avoid giving a mistaken impression, the second sentence of this paragraph should be split in two. Also, two sentences should be added to the end of the paragraph, so that it reads:

> The corpus of inscriptions investigated in the main body of this study consists of eleven Hebrew inscriptions, the Mesha Inscription, and the Tel Dan stele. Some of these thirteen artifacts were chosen because they exemplify the kinds of conditions (e.g., annalistic content, fragmentation, etc.) that permit a demonstration of the capabilities and limits of the identification protocols. Among the thirteen inscriptions, the two stelae and the other epigraphs of known authenticity were chosen because they offer identifications whose historical significance makes them too important to ignore. Epigraphs of unknown authenticity among them offer only *conditional* IDs and cannot be considered reliable unless authenticity is demonstrated. Because these conditional IDs have *potential* historical significance which makes them *potentially* too important to ignore, they, too, are included.

Such a clarification is necessary to avoid any possible implication that unprovenanced epigraphs of unknown authenticity[25] offer identifications having any historical significance whatsoever.[26] In fact, unless unprovenanced epigraphs are demonstrated to be authentic, any claim that they

---

investigated in this study includes dozens of Hebrew inscriptions plus two non-Hebrew inscriptions. These two are the Mesha Inscription (in Moabite) and the Tel Dan Stele (in Aramaic), which offer identifications whose real or potential historical significance explored below) [*sic*] makes them far too important to ignore" (p. 6).

Here is the actual procedure used in selecting IDs to receive full, explicit treatment (not just listing in an appendix): "The first step in the research for this book was to gather the publications, both of provenanced and of unprovenanced inscriptions. (The dissertation was written and defended without any access to *WSS*; see Preface.) Then it was necessary to evaluate all potential IDs treated in the original version of Appendix B and to classify them in grades S through D, as defined in sections 2.2 through 2.7 above [in *IBP*]. This study took those in grades S and 3 that fit the above parameters [in *IBP*, 93–94, section 3.1] and treated them in Chapter 3 or 4" (*IBP*, 95, section 3.2).

[25] *IBP* treats two unprovenanced epigraphs for which authenticity can be established. See N 11 above.

[26] This paragraph is intended to clarify the sentence so as to preclude the following interpretation: "At that juncture, Mykytiuk subjects eight non-provenanced Old Hebrew inscriptions to his analysis. He states that *all these epigraphs* were selected 'both because they exemplify the kinds of conditions (e.g., annalistic content, fragmentation, etc.) that permit a demonstration of the capabilities and limits of the identification system and because they offer identifications whose historical significance makes them too important to ignore' " (Rollston, review of *IBP*, *JSS* [N 2]: 374, second paragraph, italics mine). Rollston's interpretation demonstrates that this statement does not convey my intended meaning and must be corrected.

have historical significance is indeed, as Walter Aufrecht has stated in a review of another book, "bogus."[27]

II. SPECIFIC UNPROVENANCED INSCRIPTIONS

A. NEW SUBSETS OF GRADE D (DISQUALIFIED)

Arguably the most urgent correction is a purge of IDs in inscriptions now known to be forgeries, because they corrupt the pool of accepted data. For unprovenanced inscriptions, within the grades of evaluation that were used in *IBP* for particular IDs,[28] and more specifically, within grade D (for disqualified), this present correction creates the subset DF (disqualified due to the possibility, probability, or known reality of forgery). Further, it now adopts the three "categories of assessment regarding the antiquity or modernity of (an) inscription(s)" proposed by Rollston which happen to fit within grade D, namely: "(1) Modern Forgery, (2) Probable Modern Forgery, (3) Possible Modern Forgery."[29] His remaining two categories, "(4) Probable Ancient, (5) Ancient" could refine *IBP*'s identification protocols under question 1 regarding authenticity of individual inscriptions. Among *IBP*'s grades, the new shorthand for these designations becomes:

---

[27] This term is selected from the following portion of a review by Aufrecht: "The authors' claim that 'the collection is of historical value and makes an important contribution to our knowledge of the past' ([p.] 7) is bogus. Any 'historical value' attributed to these objects is speculative: the objects lack provenance, and no *sure* identification is possible. It [is] only *possible* that any of these objects is ancient and not a modern forgery; therefore, no historian can use these materials with confidence" (Walter E. Aufrecht, review of Robert Deutsch and André Lemaire, *The Adoniram Collection of West Semitic Inscriptions*, *RBL*, July 2004, paragraph 3, accessed: 20 October 2008, available: www.bookreviews. org/subscribe.asp).

[28] *IBP* uses six grades of strength or weakness of IDs and non-IDs, described briefly in *IBP*, 212, and at length in *IBP*, 57–84. Grade S IDs, which are required on grounds of singular circumstances in which only one individual qualifies, are certain. The particular grade S depends on whether the decisive data come from inscriptions (SI), the Bible (SB), or both (SI+SB). Grade 3 IDs, which are based on at least three identifying marks of an individual, are virtually certain to reliable. Grade 2 IDs, based on two identifying marks of an individual, are reasonable but uncertain. Grade 1 IDs (for one identifying mark) are doubtful. Grade 0 (zero) non-IDs have no clear basis, and grade D non-IDs are disqualified. Now that some inscriptions mentioned in *IBP* have been exposed as forgeries, it is necessary to create within grade D (for disqualified) a subset grade DF to include IDs in forgeries and fakes (for the distinction between the two, see N 8 above). Cf. section IC1c above, "Revision of the Way Appendix C is Organized."

[29] Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs II" (N 3): 71–76.

grade DF1 for modern forgeries

grade DF2 for probable modern forgeries

grade DF3 for possible modern forgeries[30]

B. "HOUSECLEANING" OF EIGHT DISQUALIFIED IDENTIFICATIONS IN FORGED EPIGRAPHS

The first six are former conditional IDs which used to be conditional upon demonstration of authenticity of the inscription, but they are now disqualified, because of evidence which indicates or tends to indicate that the inscriptions in which these IDs were made are forgeries. They are now reclassified within grade D in the new subset grade DF non-IDs, as follows:

1 and 2. Person (47) Baruch the scribe and his father, person (46) Neriah, in two unprovenanced inscriptions: [57 group] the two bullae "of *Berekyāhû*, / son of *Nērîyāhû*, / the scribe," previously classified as *conditional* grade 3 "virtually certain" IDs (i.e., virtually certain *if* the bullae were demonstrated to be authentic), should now both be disqualified as grade DF2, probable modern forgeries.[31] (The disqualification of IDs in the bullae "of *Berekyāhû* . . ." has the additional effect of downgrading the ID of Jerahmeel described in the paragraph beginning "9" below.)

The clearest evidence against authenticity of these two bullae is the relative height of the letter *samek* followed by *pe* in the word *hspr*, meaning "the scribe," in the third register. In these bullae, the top of the *pe* is the same height as or slightly above the near end of the top horizontal of the *samek*. Rollston observes that "[i]n every single case" of the *samek-pe* sequence in *provenanced* inscriptions, however, "*samek* is substantially higher than the *pe* that follows, and normally the *samek* actually towers over *pe*."[32] His case is well established, adducing a dozen examples of

---

[30] Continuing the decades-old, increasingly conservative trend regarding biblical identifications in inscriptions, Rollston very properly attempts to safeguard the purity of the data pool by calling this group not hopefully, "possible genuine, ancient epigraphs," but rather critically, "possible modern forgeries."

[31] *WSS*, no. 417. Neither ID should any longer be considered valid in *IBP*, 67–73, 188–190, 200, 204, or counted in ibid., 205, section 5.5, the first two paragraphs. Their grade must be changed in ibid., 231–232; they should be removed from ibid., 251, and instead added to the list in ibid., 261.

[32] Christopher A. Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs I: Pillaged Antiquities, Northwest Semitic Forgeries, and Protocols for Laboratory Tests," *Maarav* 10 (2003): 161.

the *samek-pe* sequence in Old Hebrew inscriptions from various time periods at six different provenances to support this observation.[33]

As Rollston states, there are three scripts in Old Hebrew inscriptions: 1) the "cursive script" on ostraca, etc., 2) the "lapidary script" found on a very small number of pieces, and 3) the "formal cursive script" on Old Hebrew seals and bullae.[34] He finds "substantial continuity" between 1) and 3), but also "certain differences" between them.[35] In the eighth-century Megiddo seal "belonging to *ʾĀsāp*,"[36] despite the "constrictive nature of seal registers" pointed out by Rollston,[37] *pe* is still much lower than *samek*. Indeed, their relative height is all the more remarkable, because the final *pe* appears at the end of the bottom register, precisely where the upward curve of the line surrounding the seal's face tapers off or "pinches" the space in a way that would tend to push the *pe* upward, but the engraver placed it much lower than the preceding *samek*.

Unfortunately, *specifically in provenanced Hebrew seals and bullae*, I find no other published exemplars of the Old Hebrew *samek-pe* sequence. Nevertheless, the Megiddo seal of Asaph stands as a piece of clear evidence that 1) the "cursive script" on ostraca, etc., and 3) the "formal cursive script," found on Old Hebrew seals and bullae, are in agreement on the particular point of the relative height of these two letters in the *samek-pe* sequence. Because it is only this one seal from Megiddo that stands as evidence in Old Hebrew seals and bullae, and because its indications regarding the *samek-pe* sequence could conceivably be modified by future discoveries of provenanced seals and bullae written in Old Hebrew, it is prudent to be somewhat tentative regarding its status by designating it a *probable* modern forgery, for which the shorthand adopted in this article is grade DF2.

In two other inscriptions, both unprovenanced, Rollston points out similar paleographic aberrations in the *samek-pe* sequence. First, in the ostracon which he refers to as Moussaieff Ostracon I, which *IBP* calls [10] the 'three shekels' ostracon, the top of the *samek* and the top of the *pe* that follows it are of equal height.[38] Second, in the so-called "Jehoash" placque inscription (not mentioned in *IBP*), the top of the *pe* is only

---

[33] Ibid., 160–162 and line drawings of Moussaieff Ostracon I and the "Jehoash" Inscription, ibid., 147, figs. 3 and 4, respectively.

[34] Ibid., 153, 155, especially 155 n. 52. See also idem, "Northwest Semitic Cursive Scripts of Iron II," in *An Eye for Form: Epigraphic Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (Jo Ann Hackett and Walter E. Aufrecht, eds.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, forthcoming).

[35] Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs I" (N 32): 155.

[36] *WSS*, no. 85; labeled inscription [43] in *IBP*, 227.

[37] Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs I" (N 32): 161 n. 63.

[38] Ibid., 160–161; cf. 147, fig. 3, line 3. Below, N 153 changes [10] to [10a].

slightly lower than the top of the *samek*.[39] Besides the aberrant paleography of the *samek-pe* sequence in the two bullae "of *Berekyāhû . . . ,*" in the "three shekels" ostracon, and in the so-called "Jehoash" placque inscription, there is one other fact in common among them: they are all unprovenanced. It seems the forger or forgers were ignorant of the proper relative height of these two letters in sequence.[40]

Because the above-mentioned aberrant paleography reveals the "three shekels" ostracon to be a probable forgery, the former conditional IDs numbered 3 through 6 below are now reclassified as modern forgeries, grade DF1 non-IDs,[41] as follows:

3, 4, and 5. Person (11) J(eh)oash, king of Israel, person (18) J(eh)oash, king of Judah, and person (35) Josiah, king of Judah, were formerly candidates for one "possibly certain" grade SB conditional ID in the above-mentioned inscription [10] the "three shekels" ostracon, lines 1–2, *ʾšy / hw hmlk*. Due to their attribution to modern forgery, all three must now be disqualified as grade DF1 non-IDs, with appropriate changes in various places in *IBP*.[42]

6. Person (19) Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, the priest, also in inscription [10] the "three shekels" ostracon, line 3 [ ]*kryhw*, formerly a doubtful, grade 1 conditional ID,[43] is now disqualified as a modern forgery, a grade DF1 non-ID, and should be added to the list of disqualified IDs.[44]

For the sake of completeness, the following forged inscription, which does not appear in *IBP*, should be added to the lists in the appendixes:[45]

7. and 8. Grade DF1 non-IDs of person (18) J(eh)oash, king of Judah, and person (17) Ahaziah, his father, king of Judah, are to be made in

---

[39] Ibid., 178; cf. 147, fig. 4, line 6.

[40] Asserted by Rollston during his reading of idem, "Writing, Literacy, and Scribal Activity in Ancient Israel" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Washington, D.C., November 19, 2006).

[41] On technical grounds, another article also finds the "three shekels" ostracon to be a forgery: Yuval Goren, Avner Ayalon, Miryam Bar-Matthews, and Bettina Schilman, "Authenticity Examination of Two Iron Age Ostraca from the Moussaieff Collection," *IEJ* 55 (2005): 21–34. The present article emphasizes Rollston's paleographic critique, because readers will find it more readily observable.

[42] Their grade should be changed in *IBP*, 216–217, 218, 228. They should also be removed from their present location in ibid., 247–248; and instead added to the list in ibid., 261. Below, N 153 changes [10] to [10a].

[43] Ibid., 218, 259. The fact that P. Kyle McCarter Jr.'s reading, [M]ǝkāryāhû, was an equally possible alternative to the usual reading, [Z]ǝkāryāhû implicitly called into question whether even one identifying mark of an individual were present, hence whether the ID even rose to the level of its former grade, which was a conditional, doubtful grade 1 ID (for McCarter's reading, see Hershel Shanks, "Three Shekels for the Lord," *BAR* 23, no. 6 [November/December 1997]: 31 n. at asterisk).

[44] *IBP*, 261.

[45] Appendixes B and C, ibid., 218, 261, respectively.

the unprovenanced [16b] so-called "Jehoash" stone placque inscription, extant line 1 and the presumable but missing line before that.[46] The paleographic aberration in the *samek-pe* sequence (see the third paragraph under "1 and 2" above) reveals that this inscription, like the "three shekels" ostracon, is a modern forgery, grade DF1. The existing text on the placque does not name J(eh)oash, but because, via patronym and other content, many thought the first-person references in the inscription referred to him, a grade DF1 non-ID of person (18) J(eh)oash, king of Judah, should be included as a convenience to readers.

---

[46] In *IBP*, 218, 261, labeling the forged "Jehoash" placque as [16b] makes the inscription number of the former [16] seal "belonging to *Yəhōʾāḥāz,* the king's son" into [16a].

Despite its much-heralded initial publication in a popular magazine (Hershel Shanks, "King Jehoash Inscription Captivates the Biblical World," *BAR* 29, no. 2 [March/April 2003]: 22–23), several scholars have shown this inscription to be a forgery, including Frank Moore Cross, "Notes on the Forged Placque Recording Repairs to the Temple," *IEJ* 53/1 (2003): 119–123; Israel Ephʿal, "The 'Jehoash Inscription': A Forgery," *IEJ* 53/1 (2003): 124–128; Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs I" (ℵ 32): 146–150, 175–180.

Chaim Cohen holds the so-called "Jehoash Inscription" to be of uncertain authenticity but contends "that it can not be proven philologically to be a modern-day forgery." In doing so, he fails to discuss or refer to this inscription's paleographic problems that Rollston treats in ibid., even though Rollston's article is in a short bibliography Cohen uses (Chaim Cohen, "Biblical Hebrew Philology in the Light of Research on the New Yehoʾash Royal Building Inscription," in *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean, and Cuneiform* [Meir Lubetski, ed.; Hebrew Bible Monographs 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007]: 223).

Besides being at odds with the conclusions of Cross, Ephʿal, and Rollston, Cohen's philological conclusions also oppose those published by P. Kyle McCarter Jr., Edward Greenstein, Avigdor Hurowitz, and Joseph Naveh. On the other hand, publications by André Lemaire, Ada Yardeni, Ronny Reich, Gabriel Barkay, and the late David Noel Freedman either support authenticity or hold open that possibility, as mentioned in Hershel Shanks, *Jerusalem's Temple Mount: From Solomon to the Golden Dome* (New York: Continuum, 2007): 146–150.

Certain technical experts have advanced arguments for authenticity of the placque on grounds such as the patina on the epigraph, e.g., Shimon Ilani, Amnon Rosenfeld, Howard R. Feldman, Wolfgang E. Krumbein, and Joel Kronfeld, "Archaeometric Analysis of the Jehoash Inscription Tablet," *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35 (2008): 2966–2972; cf. Shanks, *Jerusalem's Temple Mount*, 150. Other technical experts, however, have found it to be a forgery, e.g., Yuval Goren, Avner Ayalon, Miriam Bar-Matthews, and Bettina Schilman, "Authenticity Examination of the Jehoash Inscription," *Tel Aviv* 31 (2004): 3–16. Taking into account only the publications within the purview of Shanks, *Jerusalem's Temple Mount*, the disagreement between the two sets of epigraphers and the parallel disagreement between the two sets of technicians cannot be said to support the authenticity of the inscription on this placque.

C. DOWNGRADING OR DISQUALIFICATION OF THREE
CONDITIONAL IDENTIFICATIONS IN UNPROVENANCED
INSCRIPTIONS

This section now turns from forgeries to inscriptions whose authenticity is simply unknown:

9. The conditional ID of person (48) Jerahmeel in unprovenanced [59] bulla "of *Yərahmə ʾēl*, / the king's son," formerly a conditional grade 3 "virtually certain" ID, must now be downgraded to a conditional grade 2 "reasonable but uncertain" ID, which remains conditional upon demonstration of authenticity of this bulla. One of the three identifying marks of an individual that formerly placed this conditional ID in grade 3 was an association of *Yərahmə ʾēl* with *Berekyāhû* that seemed evident in the fact that it was in the same lot of unprovenanced bullae that contained the first known bulla "of *Berekyāhû*, / son of *Nērîyāhû*, / the scribe."

By way of correction, it should be stated here that in the first place, the fact that bullae are in the same lot of unprovenanced bullae might suggest but does not *necessarily* indicate any ancient association of individuals named in separate bullae. Moreover, there is now a loss of the previously imputed association of the inscriptional *Yərahmə ʾēl* with the inscriptional *Berekyāhû*, due to the probable forgery of matching pair of bullae "of *Berekyāhû* . . ." (see the paragraph beginning "1 and 2" above). This loss reduces the number of marks that support the ID of biblical Jerahmeel from three to two, i.e., name and title, rendering it a conditional grade 2 ID. Because *IBP* lists grade 2 IDs in appendixes but does not treat them in detail in the main body of text, earlier awareness of this downgrading would have meant excluding it from its present place in chapters 4 and 5 of *IBP*,[47] as well as revising its grade[48] and moving it to the list of grade 2 IDs.[49]

The following correction of a simple error in *IBP* results in another grade D non-ID:

10. The former conditional grade 2 ID of person (4) Mikneiah, the Levitical singer and lyrist of 1 Chr 15:18,21, in unprovenanced [5] seal obv. "*Miqnēyāw*, / minister of *Yahweh*," rev. "belonging to *Miqnēyāw*, / minister of *Yahweh*," must be reclassified as grade D, disqualified.[50] The paleographic dating of this personal seal to the first half of the eighth century[51] means that its owner, whose name is inscribed, could not have

---

[47] *IBP*, 191–196, 200.

[48] Ibid., 232.

[49] From ibid., 251, to ibid., 256.

[50] Ibid., 215.

[51] Frank M. Cross, "The Seal of Miqnêyaw, Servant of Yahweh," in *Ancient Seals and*

been a tenth-century biblical person. It should, therefore, have appeared in the list of disqualified IDs.[52]

The following unprovenanced inscription should be moved from a last-minute footnote in *IBP* to the lists in its appendixes:[53]

11. The conditional grade D (for disqualified) non-ID of person (8b) Ahab, son of Omri, king of the northern kingdom of Israel (r. 873–852), 1 Kgs 16:2, in unprovenanced [8b] sixth-century bronze seal ring, whose entire legible text is *ʾAḥaʾ. . .* , should appear on pages 216 and 261 of *IBP*. Previously, this non-ID appeared only in a footnote in *IBP*, with citations in its bibliography,[54] all inserted just before the book went to press. The difference between the biblical name and the name in this seal ring, which displays the name of its owner, and the centuries-wide disagreement between the date of the biblical person and the date of the inscription make it a grade D non-ID.[55]

D. A TURNING POINT, TO NEW CONDITIONAL IDENTIFICATIONS: ONE CONDITIONAL GRADE SI IDENTIFICATION IN AN UNPROVENANCED CLAY TABLET

This article's purge of disqualified IDs (1–8 above) in forged inscriptions and downgrading and/or disqualification of others (9–11 above) in unprovenanced inscriptions is now complete. Now, on a constructive note, preliminary evaluations of three new, conditional IDs (12–14) in unprovenanced inscriptions begin:

12. A conditional grade SI ID of person (75b) Esarhaddon, king of Assyria (r. 680–669[56]), can be made in inscription [87b], the

---

the Bible (Leonard Gorelick and Elizabeth Williams-Forte, eds.; International Institute for Mesopotamian Area Studies Monographic Journals of the Near East, Occasional Papers on the Near East 2/1; Malibu, Calif.: Undena Publications, 1983): 55–63, Pl. IX no. 1 and 2, Pl. X no. 3 and 4; repr. with lightly revised notes in idem, *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook: Collected Papers in Hebrew and West Semitic Palaeography and Epigraphy* (HSS 51; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003): 107–113.

[52] *IBP*, 260, no longer 253.

[53] It should be moved from ibid., 260 n. 54, to Appendixes B and C, ibid., 218, 261, respectively. It should have been listed in Appendix D (ibid., 262).

[54] Ibid., 260 n. 54, 290, 316. The addition of Ahab as person (8a) changes Jezebel from (8) to (8b), and the addition of [8a], the seal ring referred to here, changes the seal of a woman named Jezebel from [8] to [8b].

[55] The great dearth or possibly complete absence of Aramaic, Israelite, and Phoenician epigraphic seals and bullae from the ninth century and earlier is documented in Christopher A. Rollston, "Prosopography and the יזבל Seal," *IEJ* 59 (2009): 88–91, point 4.

[56] A. Kirk Grayson, "Assyria: Sennacherib and Esarhaddon (704–669 B.C.)," in *CAH*, 2nd ed., vol. III, part II, 103–141; ibid., 749, chart.

unprovenanced, Aramaic commercial clay tablet in the Moussaieff collection that begins with the personal name *ʾAyaʿărāʰ* or *ʾAyaʿădāʰ*, published in 2001.[57] This ID remains conditional upon demonstration of authenticity of the tablet; if authenticity is demonstrated, *only then* can this ID be considered certain, a grade SI ID. In this tablet, which Lemaire labels Text 2, lines 16–17 include the date formula: *bymt.srḥdn. / mlkʾ.*, "in the days of *Sarḥaddōn, / the king.*"[58] Summarizing one of Lemaire's points, Younger observes, "The spelling *srḥdn*, apart from the apocopation of the *ʾalep* (which is a common feature), is identical to the biblical spelling *ʾsrḥdn* (Lemaire 2001a: 26, 31)."[59] Lemaire dates this tablet paleographically to ca. 680 B.C.E.[60]

E. TWO CONDITIONAL GRADE 2 IDENTIFICATIONS IN AN UNPROVENANCED BULLA

13 and 14. Conditional grade 2, reasonable but uncertain IDs, of person (58c) Hanan the son of Igdaliah (MT Jer 35:4 *ḥānān ben yigdalyāhû*) and of his father, person (58b) Igdaliah can both be made in [67b] unprovenanced bulla *lḥnnyhw b / n gdlyhw*, "belonging to *Ḥănanyāhû*, so / n of *Gədalyāhû*" (*WSS*, no. 504).[61] The paleography indicates late

---

[57] André Lemaire, *Nouvelles tablettes araméennes* (Hautes études orientales 34; Moyen et proches-orient 1; Geneva: Droz, 2001): 24–32, pl. II, fig. 2b, verso (modified vocalization mine). Text 2 is summarized with a transcription of lines 16–17 by K. Lawson Younger Jr., "Some of What's New in Old Aramaic Epigraphy," *NEA* 70/3 (September 2007): 142–143, 144 photograph.

This conditional grade SI ID should be added to Appendixes B and C in *IBP*, 242, 246, respectively, with footnotes citing Lemaire, *Nouvelles tablettes araméennes*, 24–32, pl. II, fig. 2b, verso. In *IBP*, 242 and 246, as a result of adding person (75b) Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, the person number (75) Sennacherib, king of Assyria, becomes (75a), and, as a result of adding inscription [87b], namely, the Aramean commercial tablet beginning with the PN *ʾAyaʿărāʰ* or *ʾAyaʿădāʰ* (Lemaire's Text 2, in the Moussaieff collection), on pages 241 and 246, the inscription number [87] becomes [87a].

[58] Lemaire (N 57): 26. On other occurrences of this RN and on *bymt* in royal Assyrian date formulas, see ibid., 30–31.

[59] Younger (N 57): 143.

[60] Lemaire (N 57): 31–32.

[61] These two conditional grade 2 IDs should be added to Appendixes B and C in *IBP*, 234, 258, respectively, with footnotes citing Peter G. van der Veen, "Two/Too Little Known Bullae: Some Preliminary Notes," in *Shlomo: Studies in Epigraphy, Iconography, History, and Archaeology in Honor of Shlomo Moussaieff* (Robert Deutsch, ed.; Tel Aviv: Archaeological Center Publications, 2003): 250–253. In *IBP*, 234 and 258, as a result of adding person (58c) Hanan the son of Igdaliah and person (58b) Igdaliah, father of Hanan, the person number of (58) Hananiah the false prophet, son of Azzur of Gibeon, becomes

seventh to early sixth century,[62] when the prophet Jeremiah lived, but these IDs are conditional upon demonstration of authenticity of the bulla. Peter van der Veen was the first to propose these IDs after he examined this bulla (BM 134695) in the British Museum. As he observes regarding LXX Jer 42:4 (which corresponds to MT 35:4), "The same pair of names is rendered in the Septuagint . . . as Ἀνανιου υἱου Γοδολιου,' in other words as Ḥananyahu, the son of Gedalyahu, i.e., the very names found on our seal impression."[63] This rendering indicates that the LXX translators used a Hebrew *Vorlage* having names whose consonants are matched by those of this bulla.

III. SPECIFIC PROVENANCED INSCRIPTIONS

A. TWO GRADE 3 IDENTIFICATIONS IN A PROVENANCED STELE

15 and 16. One can make two grade 3, reliable IDs of Damascene kings of Aram in [77] the Melqart stele: Hadadezer (*hădadʿezer*), called only "the king of Aram" in 1 Kgs 22:4,31; 2 Kings chapter 5; 6:8–23, and his son, Ben-hadad (2 Kgs 6:24; 8:7–15), who was assassinated by Hazael.[64]

(58a), and, as a result of adding inscription [67b], on pages 234 and 261, the inscription number of [67 group] becomes [67a group].

[62] The *he* in line 1, the penultimate letter in Ḥananyahu, has horizontal strokes that converge, and its top horizontal extends to the other side of the vertical stroke. These two traits indicate a late seventh- to early sixth-century date (Andrew G. Vaughn, "Palaeographic Dating of Judaean Seals and Its Significance for Biblical Research," *BASOR* 313 [1999]: 47, 52–53).

[63] van der Veen (N 61): 253. Several LXX renderings are equivalent to MT (Syrohexaplar and Ethiopic versions). Sinaiticus, some Lucianic MSS, and one Armenian MS are congruent with MT *ḥānān*, which even the patronym resembles in Sinaiticus and in the Ethiopic version. These and a few other renderings, however, yield to the remaining uncials and many minuscules which support the reading quoted by van der Veen (Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae* [2nd, thoroughly rev. ed.; Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976]).

[64] In a preliminary adjustment in *IBP*, 237, at person number (68), delete the phrase "I or II" from "Ben-hadad I or II" and in place of those numbers, insert ", son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion." After the next phrase, "king of Aram at Damascus," delete the regnal period "(r. early ninth century to 844/842)" and substitute "(r. ca. 885–ca. 870)." There is still a grade D non-ID of person (68) Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion, in inscription [77] the Melqart stele. These changes signify abandonment of *IBP*'s noncommital view on whether one Ben-hadad or two were kings of Aram at Damascus before Hazael. I am now convinced that two preceded him.

Description and background: The Melqart stele is a basalt monument just over 1 m. high, dedicated to the Phoenician deity, Melqart, who is depicted on the upper part, with a five-line inscription on the lower part. It was discovered near Aleppo in 1939.

Since the 1940s, IDs of the author of this stele and his father have been the subject of dispute for two main reasons: first, difficulties in reading line 2 of the stele and second, the lack of an early ninth- to early eighth-century king list of the Damascene kingdom of Aram that is known to be accurate and complete—or at least widely agreed upon as being fairly accurate and complete. This treatment, therefore, will begin with the transcription, then it will treat the matter of the king list. *These two discussions are intended solely to lay the basis for these two IDs in my own correction of IBP, not to conclusively settle all controversies regarding the reading of the stele and the king list.*

Transcription and translation: the perennial difficulty of reading the heavily effaced middle and end of line 2 of the Melqart Stele, which contains the patronymic, has proven to be a major problem in identifying the author and his father.

This discussion begins with Wayne T. Pitard's reading, used in *IBP*, 237, and associated with 237–238 n. 89. Basing his transcription on hours spent examining the Melqart stele itself during the summer of 1985, rather than photographs of it used by most other scholars who published on it before 1985, Pitard reads:

1	*nṣb ʾ . zy . śm brh⌈d⌉*	The stele which Bir-ha / dad
2	*dd . br ʿtrhmk .* [vacat]	the son of ʿAttar-hamek, [*vacat*]
3	*mlk ʾrm lmr ʾh lmlqr*	king of Aram, set up for his lord Melqar / t,
4–5	*t . zy nzr lh wšm ʿlql / h*	to whom he made a vow and who heard / his / voice[65]

Pitard dates this king's Aramean kingdom between 850 and 770 and locates it in northern Syria, in an area not governed from Damascus.[66]

To be sure, the disagreements between Pitard's reading and the readings

---

[65] Wayne T. Pitard, *Ancient Damascus: A Historical Study of the Syrian City-State from Earliest Times until its Fall to the Assyrians in 732 B.C.E.* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987): 141–143; idem, "The Identity of the Bir-Hadad of the Melqart Stela," *BASOR* 272 (1988): 4. In the transcription, slash marks indicating line changes and the combining of lines 4 and 5 into line "4–5" are mine.

[66] Ibid., 10–11; cf. Pitard, *Ancient Damascus* (N 65): 143–144, 152–158.

of Frank Moore Cross[67] and Gotthard G. G. Reinhold[68] treated below (the last two largely agree with each other), as well as disagreements with several other competing readings,[69] may appear to many skillful, experienced scholars to be in an unresolved deadlock. Yet, despite Pitard's widely acknowledged qualifications and much-cited works, by comparing Cross's 2003 defense of his 1972 reading with the photographs in Pitard's article, as well as the photographs and discussion provided by

[67] Frank Moore Cross, "The Stele Dedicated to Melqart by Ben-Hadad of Damascus," in *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook* (N 51): 173–177, which lightly revises and defends idem, "The Stele Dedicated to Melcarth by Ben-Hadad of Damascus," *BASOR* 205 (1972): 36–42. Unfortunately, Cross's revised "Stele Dedicated to Melqart" was published at a point in 2003 when it was too late in the production process of *IBP* to do anything more than include it in the bibliography.

[68] Gotthard G. G. Reinhold conducted a firsthand examination of the stele at the National Museum of Aleppo in the summer of 1986. He examined four photographs provided by Jean Starcky in 1977 and three provided in 1979 by Wahid Khayata, Director of the National Museum of Aleppo, as well as two drawings by R. Bowman and H. Klengel. Reinhold also made new photographs. Comparison of these sources resulted in this reading (Gotthard G. G. Reinhold, "The Bir-Hadad Stele and the Biblical Kings of Aram," *AUSS* 24/2 [Summer 1986]: 115–126, esp. 117–121, 123; ibid., accessed: September 30, 2008, available: via the left-margin "Archives" link at http://www.auss.info/index.php; idem, "Die Beziehungen Altisraels zu aramäischen Staaten in der israelitisch-judäischen Königszeit" [Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Frankfurt am Main, 1989]; idem, *Die Beziehungen Altisraels zu aramäischen Staaten in der israelitisch-judäischen Königszeit* [Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII, Theologie, Band 368; Frankfurt am Main/Bern/New York/Paris: Peter Lang, 1989]; idem, "Zu den Stelenbruchstücken der altaramäischen Inschrift von Têl Dân, Israel," in *Bei Sonnenaufgang auf dem Tell, At Sunrise on the Tell: Essays about Decades Researches in the Field of Near Eastern Archaeology* [Remshalden: Greiner, 2003]: 121–129, esp. 128–129 and 129 Abb. 1; idem, "Forschungen über Personen und Gottheiten der Aleppo-Stele/ Syrien und der Têl Dân-Stelenfragmente/Israel" [paper presented at the Wort und Wissen 12. Fachtagung für Biblische Archäologie (Schwäbisch Gmünd, Germany, November 4–6, 2005)]). I offer Dr. Reinhold my most sincere apology for not giving his diligent, painstaking work on the Melqart stele the attention in *IBP* that it has well merited.

[69] For other readings, see the bibliography in Cross, "Stele Dedicated to Melqart" (N 67): 173, 174 n. 12; Reinhold, *Beziehungen Altisraels zu aramäischen Staaten* (N 68): 221–249, idem, "Forschungen" (N 68): 2, chart of readings and bibliography. The synopsis in S. Hafthórsson's published Uppsala University dissertation does not cover as many scholars or publications as Reinhold's works do, nor, unfortunately, does it mention Reinhold's own publications. It does, however, along with other advantages, offer a list of the medium(s) of the text used by each researcher, e.g., autopsy or any of three sets of photographs (S. Hafthórsson, *A Passing Power: An Examination of the Sources for the History of Aram-Damascus in the Second Half of the Ninth Century B.C.* [Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 54; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2006]: 39 Table 1). See Wayne T. Pitard's photographs and drawings of the Melqart Inscription in Bruce Zuckerman et al., *Puzzling Out the Past: Making Sense of Ancient Inscriptions from Biblical Times: An Exhibition at the Dubin/Wolf Exhibition Center, Wilshire Boulevard Temple, April 5th to November 15th, 1987* (Los Angeles: West Semitic Research Project, 1987): 12 Pls. 3 and 4; 14 Fig. 5; 16 Pl. 5 and Fig. 6.

Reinhold, I find myself persuaded to accept the readings of two letters of
decisive importance, discussed immediately below, on which Cross and
Reinhold agree.

The two crucial letters on which Cross's and Reinhold's readings de-
pend are both in the portion that Pitard reads as the patronym *'trhmk*: 1)
zayin instead of *taw* and 2) *šin* instead of *kap* plus word divider.

Regarding *zayin* instead of *taw*, the horizontal line that Pitard interprets
as the crossbar of *taw* tilts from upper right to lower left, but, as Pitard
himself acknowledges, in Old Aramaic the crossbar of *taw* normally tilts
from upper left to lower right.[70] Also, as Cross observes, Pitard's *taw* is
itself too short and mistakenly incorporates the high arm of the *lamed*
below it. After eliminating the incorporation of part of the *lamed*, one
can see that the short vertical line from the center of the lower horizontal
of Cross's *zayin* downward—however it may be explained (erosion? a
crack?)—does not make this letter a *taw*. The two pockmarks at the top
of Cross's *zayin* that Pitard observes are obviously present,[71] but in the
worn surface of the stele, their presence does not preclude the existence
of an upper crossbar of a *zayin* before the pocks abraded it. It is entirely
possible that such a crossbar might have provided a crevice in which ice,
not unknown in present-day Syria or in ancient Aram, was able to form
and create the pocks at weak spots in the stone. All told, the wrongly
tilted crossbar, the anomalous shortness of the supposed *taw* (after omit-
ting the arm of the *lamed* below), and the pocks being inconsequential
or even possible *indicators* of an upper crossbar of *zayin* all combine to
make the reading of *taw* unlikely.

Zayin emerges as the reading to be preferred. Far from being a strained
taw with a wrongly tilted horizontal and inadequate height, the *zayin*
in line 2 displays a good fit within the typological development of the
letter. This *zayin* and the first one in line 4 display what Cross terms "a
rudimentary tendency toward the 'Z'-form," whereas the *zayin* in line 1
and the second one in line 4 are "the archaic form."[72]

Other epigraphers who have read this letter on the stele as *zayin* rather
than *taw* are E. Lipiński (1975, 1979, using photographs), W. H. Shea
(1979, using photographs), and P. Bordreuil & J. Teixidor (1983, using
autopsy and photographs).[73] All of these read the three letters following

---

[70] Pitard, "Identity of the Bir-Hadad" (N 65): 6.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Cross, "Stele Dedicated to Melqart," in *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook* (N 67): 175.

[73] Eduard Lipiński, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics, I* (OLA 1; Leuven: Leuven University, 1975): 15–16; the same reading is in idem, *Acta antiqua Academiae scientarum Hungaricae* 27 (1979): 49–201, esp. 75–76; William H. Shea, "The Kings of the Melqart Stela," *Maarav* 1 (1979): 159–176, esp. 166; and Pierre Bordreuil and Javier

the first *br* in line 2 as *ʿzr*. Lipiński and Shea each render the PN *ʿEzer*. Bordreuil and Teixidor read an *ʾalep* at the end and render it *ʿEzraʾ*.

The second crucial point regarding Pitard's reading concerns the rendering of the last letter of his reading *ʿtrhmk* as the letter *kap*, followed by a word divider, oddly followed by an empty space at the end of the line (*vacat* in the transcription above). Where Pitard reads a *kap* plus a word divider, Cross interprets the marks instead as a *šin*. Following *šin*, he finds traces of other letters. As I view Pitard's photograph,[74] along with other lines, it does show the worn remnant of a line connecting the lefthand stroke of a *šin* with the strokes that precede it, supporting Cross's reading.

Other epigraphers who have read this letter on the stele as *šin* rather than *kap* plus a word divider are Lipiński (1975, 1979, using photographs) and Shea (1979, using photographs).

Further, where Pitard admits that it is "quite troubling to find a *vacat* of this size in such a short inscription,"[75] one can plainly state that a word divider would seem to make no sense if it is followed by a vacant space. Pitard's argument, that the engraver had intended "to put something in the remaining space," but "for some reason" failed to do so,[76] does not reckon with the fact that precisely in Pitard's *vacat*, most other epigraphers who have published transcriptions of the text of the Melqart stele have indeed found remnants of other letters. It is true that, as Pitard observes, letters appear above and below the space he sees as vacant, but this fact does not preclude the partial effacing of letters in the remainder of line 2. Among these, Cross finds traces of letters consistent with his reading (1972, 2003), such as a relatively clear *bet* near the end, which others note:

Teixidor, "Nouvel examen de l'inscription de Bar-hadad," *Aula Orientalis* 1 (1983): 271–276, esp. 271.

Various readings of this stele appear both in the works cited by Cross and Reinhold (N 67, N 68) and in Hafthórsson (N 69): 39 Table 1. Ibid., n. 166, states, "Note that in *KAI*, this part of the inscription [i.e., everything on line 2 after the first *br*, where Pitard reads ' *ʿtrhmk*. (vacat)'] is blank. I did not include Lemaire's suggestion in the table, as it was not based on his reading of the inscription, but rather the historical circumstances. Lipiński's third reading (2000) is not included due to a similar reason: he did not read the text again, simply accepted Puech's (1992) reading." Puech read *ʿAttar-sumki* (without a final *yod*), which includes the *taw* and *kap* against which I argue here (É. Puech, "La stèle de Bar-Hadad à Melqart et les rois d'Arpad," *RB* 99 (1992): 311–334.

[74] Pitard, "Identity of the Bir-Hadad" (N 65): 7, fig. 9.

[75] Ibid., 7.

[76] Ibid.

1	*nṣb ʾ. zy . śm br* ⌈.⌉ *h*	The stele which Bir-ha / dad.
2	*dd . br ʿzr* [.] ⌈*d*⌉*mš .* ⌈*qy*⌉ *b*[*r*]	son of ʿEzer (ʾIdr), the Damascene, son
3	*mlk ʾrm* ⌈.⌉ *lmr ʾh lmlqr*	of the king of Aram, set up to his lord Milqar / t
4–5	*t . zy nzr lh wšm ʿlql / h*	to whom he made a vow, and who heard / his / voice [77]

Cross's reading has the independent agreement of the reading of Reinhold (cited in note 68 above), derived from Reinhold's own examination of the stele itself, as well as his own photographs and use of the photographs and drawings of others:

1	*nṣb ʾ. zy . śm br* ⌈.⌉ *h*	The stele which Bar-ha / dad,
2	*dd . br ʿzr.dmšqy* ⌈*ʾ*⌉*br*	son of ʿEzer the Damascene, son of
3	*mlk ʾrm* ⌈.⌉ *lmr ʾh lmlqr*	the king of Aram, erected to his lord, Melqar / t,
4–5	*t . zy nzr* ⌈.⌉ *lh wšm ʿ. lql / h*	to whom he made a vow, and who heard / his / voice[78]

While others are, of course, free to debate alternative readings or to conclude that no conclusive reading is discernible, yet along with H. Sader, I find Cross's reading to be not only "sufficiently plausible," but moreover, "the most acceptable," and I, too, have "no better reading to propose."[79] I find it especially so, because it has been confirmed by the

---

[77] Cross, "Stele Dedicated to Melqart" (N 67): 174 (slash marks indicating line changes and the combining of lines 4 and 5 into line "4–5" mine).

[78] Reinhold, "Bir-Hadad Stele and the Biblical Kings of Aram" (N 68): 120, pl. II; idem, *Beziehungen Altisraels zu aramäischen Staaten* (N 68): 239, 242; idem, "Zu den Stelenbruchstücken" (N 68): 129, Abb. 1; idem, "Forschungen" (N 68): 6 (slash marks indicating line changes and the combining of lines 4 and 5 into line "4–5" mine).

[79] Hélène S. Sader, *Les états araméens de Syrie depuis leur fondation jusqu'à leur transformation en provinces assyriennes* (Beiruter Texte und Studien 36; Beirut: Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, and Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1987): 255, 257 *bis*, respectively, translations mine. Strictly speaking, it is Cross's 1972 reading that she accepts in ibid., 255–260 (cf. 246, 288) after having examined S. Birnbaum's photograph (ibid., 257). Even then, Sader adopts "another interpretation," reasonably restoring

independent, truly exhaustive work of Reinhold and also has particular support for the letters *'zr* in line 2 from Lipiński, Shea, Bordreuil, Teixidor, and Sader.

King list: The basic problem in dealing with the question of IDs in the Melqart stele is the lack of a king list that is either known to be accurate and complete or at least widely agreed upon as being fairly accurate and complete. The disputed segment of such a list that concerns the IDs in question here is the Damascene kings of Aram between the reign of "Ben-hadad the son of Tabrimmon, the son of Hezion, king of Aram, who resided at Damascus" (1 Kgs 15:18, etc.) and the beginning of the reign of "Ben-hadad, the son of Hazael" (2 Kgs 13:3,24–25, etc.).

The inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (r. 858–824) regarding the battle of Qarqar in 853 state that there he defeated "^{md}IŠKUR-*id-ri ša*-KUR. ANŠE-[*šú*] (*Adad-idri*, the Damascene)" along with other kings in the coalition, including Ahab the Israelite.[80] Yet 1–2 Kings, though they certainly mention Ahab, do not mention a king of Aram *at Damascus* named *Adad-idri*, or, in its original Aramaic form, *hădad'ezer*.[81] Do these two sources disagree, or do they fit together, perhaps in a way that does not contradict either?

With Cross and others, I understand Bar-/Bir-hadad to be a royal title designating a crown prince and/or coregent and sometimes used as a RN.[82] Nevertheless, it is clear from both Scripture and inscriptions that

---

the patronym in line 2 as theophoric, either *br 'zr*[*š*]*mš* or *br 'zr*[*k*]*mš* (ibid., 257, translation mine). At the same time, however, she introduces a difficulty by considering the remaining "*q y 'b*" in line 2 to be "the title or office of Bar-hadad" without translating or defining this problematic letter sequence ("word"; ibid., 257, translations mine). I find no solution in *DNWSI* (1995).

Significantly, Sader takes the view that "only two kings of Aram call themselves Ben-hadad in the O.T.: the one is Ben-hadad, son of Tab-rimmon, and the other is Ben-hadad son of Hazael" (ibid., 259, translation mine; cf. 287–288). In my opinion, the lack of a third biblical Ben-hadad in this view explains why Sader finds no suitable Bar-hadad, king of Aram, to identify as the one to whom the Melqart stele refers. She concludes that "the identity of this Bar-hadad remains obscure" (ibid., 258, translation mine).

[80] A. Kirk Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC)* (Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 3; Toronto/Buffalo/London: Univ. of Toronto, 1996): 118, A.0.102.40, col. i line 14; cf. ibid., col. 1 line 25; cf. ibid., 23, A.0.102.2, lines 90–92.

[81] To be sure, Hadadezer is a biblical RN for the son of Rehob who was an Aramean king of Zobah during the reigns of David and Solomon (2 Sam 8:3–8; 1 Kgs 11:23–25). Bordreuil and Teixidor (N 73) adopt precisely an ID that makes the so-called *'Ezra'* of the Melqart stele a king in the dynasty of Rehob and situates him at Zobah. But the connection of that RN to the kings at Damascus, rather than Zobah, and the mid-ninth-century date of the Melqart stele, rather than a tenth-century date, certainly seem to preclude a reference to the dynasty of Rehob in the Melqart stele.

[82] Cross, "Stele Dedicated to Melqart" (N 67): 176. Cf. Albrecht Alt, "Menschen ohne

not every king of Aram was qualified or, if all were qualified, not all chose to be called by this title. On this point, the alternating pattern in 1–2 Kings is: a Ben-hadad (son of Tabrimmon,[83] son of Hezion), followed by an unnamed king(s) of Aram, followed by a Ben-hadad, then Hazael, then Hazael's son Ben-hadad.

Beginning with "Ben-hadad the son of Tabrimmon, the son of Hezion, king of Aram, who resided at Damascus" (1 Kgs 15:18), the books of Kings consistently refer to the king of Aram as Ben-hadad in the first chronological phase (cf. 1 Kings 15, 20). Subsequent references to the king of Aram (1 Kings 22; 2 Kings 5; 6:8–23) consistently do not name him, but refer to him only by his title, "the king of Aram." In 2 Kgs 6:8–23, following the humiliating capture of this king's entire attack force (a bit of a discouragement for the king), the last comment on this unnamed king of Aram is that his warring "bands of Aram no longer entered the land of Israel" (2 Kgs 6:23). In contrast, the very next verse refers to "Ben-hadad, king of Aram" gathering his forces and besieging Samaria, obviously indicating a complete change of policy. By the fact that the king is named, rather than anonymous, the text seems to suggest that the reversal in policy toward Israel came with a new king of Aram. This Ben-hadad's siege of Samaria continues through 2 Kgs 7:20, then he becomes ill (8:7) and is assassinated by Hazael in 8:15.

What was the name of the unnamed king(s) of Aram in 2 Kings whose reign(s) apparently succeeded that of Ben-hadad the son of Tabrimmon and apparently came before the reign of the Ben-hadad, king of Aram, whom Hazael assassinated? Here Assyrian inscriptions help fill in the Aramean king list for the period between the last reference to an earlier Ben-hadad (presumably the son of biblical Tabrimmon) in 1 Kgs 20:33, during Aram's siege of Samaria in the reign of Ahab (r. 873–852) and the first reference to a later Ben-hadad in 2 Kgs 6:24, during Aram's siege of Samaria in the reign of Joram (r. 851–842/1). Hadadezer the Damascene, king of Aram, named in Assyrian inscriptions but unnamed in Scripture, who led the coalition that fought Shalmaneser III at the battle of Qarqar in 853, can be presumed on the basis of chronology with the permission of biblical anonymity to have been the "king of Aram" who is nameless in 1 Kgs 22:4,31 at the battle at Ramoth-Gilead, ca. 852, in which Ahab died. During part or all of the time between the reigns of Tabrimmon's son and

---

Namen," *ArOr* 18 (1950): 9–24; repr. in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. 3 (Munich: Beck, 1959): 198–213; David J. A. Clines, "X, X ben Y, ben Y: Personal Names in Hebrew Narrative Style," *VT* 22 (1972): 282–287; Joseph Naveh, "Nameless People," *IEJ* 40 (1990): 108–123.

[83] The Hebrew Bible points so as to render it as "(A) pomegranate is good." His actual name was *Ṭābrammān* or the like.

the Ben-hadad whom Hazael assassinated, Hadadezer was king of Aram at Damascus. In the absence of any other RNs to fill in this period, the simplest choice is to attribute the entire "anonymous period" of the biblical "king of Aram" to Hadadezer, while remaining open to the potential addition of other kings between "Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion" and Hadadezer, "the king of Aram" at Damascus, if future inscriptional discoveries warrant it.

Further, the above reading of the Melqart stele informs us that Hadadezer, designated by the hypocoristicon Ezer, had a son who called himself Bar-hadad and, as crown prince or coregent, very likely succeeded him. In the absence of other candidates, the Bar-hadad named in the Melqart stele was most likely the one whom Hazael assassinated.

Thus the terms used to refer to Damascene kings of Aram in Shalmaneser III's inscriptions, in the books of 1–2 Kings, and in the above reading of the Melqart stele, when placed side by side, reveal a pattern that suggests a king list on which all three ancient sources agree.[84] Such a pattern of specific agreements with a lack (or scarcity)

---

[84] The chronological succession of the Damascene kings of Aram by name during the ninth and early eighth centuries as presented in three known sources: Hebrew: 1–2 Kings; Assyrian: the inscriptions of Shalmaneser; and Aramean: the Melqart stele, fits together as follows. (On Aramean political entities and Damascene rulers from earliest times through Rezon, the son of Eliada [1 Kgs 11:23–25] and before Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion, see Pitard, *Ancient Damascus* [N 65]: 1–99, 101–107.)

a. The reign of Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion, king of Aram at Damascus:

in 1 Kings 15, re: bribery by Asa, king of Judah (r. 911–870) vs. Baasha, king of Israel (r. 908–805):

v. 18 "Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion, king of Aram, who resided at Damascus"; v. 20 "Ben-hadad."

in 1 Kings 20, re: Aram's siege of Samaria during the reign of Ahab, king of Israel (r. 873–852):

vv. 1,20 "Ben-hadad, the king of Aram"; vv. 3,5,9,10,16,17,26,30,33 "Ben-hadad"; vv. 22,23 "the king of Aram"; v. 32 "thy servant Ben-hadad"; v. 33 "thy brother Ben-hadad."

b. The reign of Hadadezer, king of Aram at Damascus:

in Shalmaneser III's inscriptions referring to the battle of Qarqar in 853 against the coalition that included the forces of "Ahab the Israelite" (r. 873–852) and describing Aram's royal succession:

A.0.102.2, the Kurkh stele: col. 11, line 90 "Adad-idri (Hadadezer), the Damascene" (Grayson [N 80]: 23).

A.0.102.40, the Aššur statue of Shalmaneser III: col. i (= front), line 14 "Adad-idri (Hadadezer), the Damascene;" col. i, lines 25–27, "Adad-idri (Hadadezer) passed away (and) Haza'el, son of a nobody, took the throne" (Grayson [N 80]: 118) (see John D. Davis' observation in the next note).

Note: Hadadezer, king of Aram at Damascus, is not given any name in the books of 1–2 Kings, 1–2 Chronicles in MT; 3–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Paraleipomenon in LXX; or 1–2

of contradictions tends to support the veracity of all three independent sources, which originate from three emphatically separate kingdoms.[85] It certainly seems to be stronger than any differing view which cannot find support in as many independent sources. The resulting chronological list of kings of Aram at Damascus during the ninth century, plus the earliest one in the eighth century, using Cross's regnal dates for all, is as follows:

Kings, 1–2 Chronicles in the Syriac Peshitta (*BHS*; Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. J. Thackeray, eds.; *The Old Testament in Greek*, Volume II: *The Later Historical Books*, Part II: *I and II Kings* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1930] [cf. N 1]; idem, *The Old Testament in Greek*, Volume II: *The Later Historical Books*, Part III: *I and II Chronicles* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1932] [cf. N 1]; Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac*, part II, fascicle 4: *Kings* [Hans Gottlieb and E. Hammershaimb, eds.; Leiden: Brill, 1976] [cf. N 1]). *Kᵉtābāʾ Qadîšāʾ: Dîatîqî ʿAtîqtāʾ* [N 1]). In 4 Kgdms 6:8, the isolated reading ο υιος αδαρ in MS 246 (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, *I and II Kings*) can hardly be anything but an extraneous insertion.

in 1 Kings 22, re: the battle at Ramoth-gilead in 852, in which Ahab died: the king of Aram vs. Ahab, king of Israel (r. 873–852) and Jehoshaphat, king of Judah (r. 870–845):

vv. 4,31 "the king of Aram."

in 2 Kings 5, re: Naaman the leper:

vv. 1,5 "the king of Aram."

in 2 Kgs 6:8–23, re: Aram's war against Israel and attempt to capture Elisha during the reign of Joram (r. 851–842/1):

vv. 8,11 "the king of Aram."

in the Melqart stele:

lines 1–2: "Bar-ha/dad, son of ʿEzer the Damascene, son / of the king of Aram."

c. The reign of Ben-hadad, son of Hadadezer, king of Aram at Damascus (r. ca. 844/842):

in 2 Kgs 6:24–7:20, re: Aram's siege of Samaria during the reign of Joram (r. 851–842/1):

v. 24 "Ben-hadad, king of Aram" (supported by MT, LXX, and Peshitta in the editions cited above in this note under "b. Hadadezer . . . ," "Note")

in 2 Kgs 8:7–15, re: the assassination of Ben-hadad in Damascus (8:7) and ascent to the throne of Aram by Hazael (r. 844/42–ca. 800):

v. 7 "Ben-hadad, the king of Aram"; v. 9 "thy son Ben-hadad king of Aram."

[85] After working out this interlocking pattern, through interlibrary loan I received a copy of an article that long ago, unknown to me, had made essentially the same argument using two sources, the Hebrew Bible and the Aššur statue of Shalmaneser III now designated A.0.102.40 in Grayson (N 80): John D. Davis, "Hadadezer or Ben-hadad," *Princeton Theological Review* 17 (April 1919): 173–189. "Hadadezer is the king of Syria of whom the Hebrew writer speaks, without mentioning the king's personal name, in the narrative extending from I Kin. xxii. 3 to 2 Kin. vi. 23" (ibid., 177, cf. 182).

Regarding the statement on the statue of Shalmaneser III, col. 1, lines 25–27, "Adad-idri (Hadadezer) passed away (and) Hazael, son of a nobody, took the throne," Davis observes that the first statement is the end of one paragraph, and the second is the beginning of another, not in a continuous history, but in a topical list of Assyria's most formidable enemies in the west (ibid., 178–180) whom Shalmaneser III defeated.

1st: Bar-hadad,[86] son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion (r. ca. 885–ca. 870): 1 Kings 15, 20; 2 Chronicles 6: to become *IBP*'s now more clearly dated person (68) Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion (cf. *IBP*, 237, 260, 261).

2nd: Hadadezer[87] (r. ca. 870–844): inscriptions of Shalmaneser III; the hypocoristicon *'Ezer* which is the patronym in line 2 of the Melqart stele; anonymous in 1 Kgs 22:1–40; 2 Kgs 5:1–19; 6:8–23: now to become *IBP*'s "new" person (68a) (cf. *IBP*, 237).

3rd: Bar-hadad, son of Hadadezer (r. ca. 845?–844? as coregent only? initially crown prince, then coregent? and then king), the author of the Melqart stele; 2 Kgs 6:24–7:20; 8:7–15: now to become *IBP*'s "new" person (68b) Ben-hadad, son of Hadadezer, in *IBP*.

4th: Hazael (r. ca. 844?–ca. 796): inscriptions of Shalmaneser III; named in the patronym in Zakkur stele, line 4; 1 Kgs 19:15–17; 2 Kgs 8:8–15 and passim to 13:22–25; 2 Chr 22:5–6; Amos 1:4: person (71) in *IBP*.

5th: Bar-hadad, son of Hazael (r. ca. 796–?): possibly mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions as "Mari"; Zakkur stele, lines 4–5; 2 Kgs 13:3,24–25; Amos 1:4[88]: person (72) Ben-hadad, son of Hazael, in *IBP*.

The alternating reigns of kings who used the royal title Bar-hadad as a RN suggest that it was used an explicit claim to legitimacy based on descent and selection from among other sons, confirmed by designation as crown prince and signified by this title, which they proudly adopted as their personal RN. In this sequence, there might also be a hint that either 1) each RN preceding a Bar-hadad might potentially have belonged to a usurper or 2) the lack of consecutive Bar-hadads might be the result of an ancient intent to avoid confusion.

Note: Because of the scarcity of material that is suitable for use in constructing such a king list, it is necessary to use biblical data. In turn, the use of biblical data creates potential for circularity in making IDs, a potential which should be explicitly recognized. For the present, at least,

---

[86] I agree with Hafthórsson that it is confusing to include numbers of the Ben-hadads, so I, too, have omitted the numbers, instead using patronyms, which are clearer (Hafthórsson [N 69]: 180, 180 n. 662).

[87] I find no ancient reference to any Hadadezer as Bar-/Bir-/Ben-hadad, nor vice versa.

[88] This list of RNs in this order agrees with that in Hafthórsson (N 69): 181, but it assigns different biblical texts to four of the five RNs, finding agreement only in the biblical passages for Hazael.

this situation cannot be helped, because, unlike the Assyrian king list, there is no extant, ancient, complete list of the kings of Aram who ruled at Damascus that is entirely independent of Scripture.

Having adopted a transcription based on agreements in several modern epigraphers' observations of the Melqart stele, and having arrived at a sequence in the king list that is grounded on the way sources from three ancient kingdoms fit together without forcing or need of adjustment, this study has now prepared the way for the three questions in *IBP*'s identification protocols. These will evaluate potential IDs in the Melqart stele of a biblically unnamed "king of Aram" and the biblical Ben-hadad who was his son:

Question 1, authenticity: are the data known to be reliable in the sense that a) the epigraph is authentic, not forged or faked, and b) the biblical data are well based in the ancient manuscripts through sound text criticism?

1a. The Melqart stele is authentic, having been discovered in 1939 at the village of Bureij, 7 km. north of Aleppo. During that same year, Maurice Dunand was the first to publish it.[89] The stele, in secondary use as part of Roman-era ruins, is a large, heavy basalt stone 1.15 m. high and 0.43 m. across, so it was very likely robbed from nearby.

1b. Regarding biblical text criticism[90] on the ninth-century Hadadezer, king of Aram at Damascus, neither the MT, nor the LXX, nor the Peshitta give the full name or hypocoristicon (ʿEzer).[91]

As for text criticism on the name Ben-hadad in 2 Kgs 6:24–7:20; 8:7–15, first, the MT (*BHS*) offers no significant variants.

Second, as to LXX renderings of Ben-hadad, "the name appears throughout in the Grr. [Greek versions] as 'son of Αδερ,' supported by 3 Heb. MSS, בן הדר. . . ."[92] At first sight, the letters in Αδερ appear similar to Akkadian ʾi-id-ri in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III[93] and thus may seem to represent ʿEzer. But LXX practice is perhaps surprising in that the LXX never uses Αδερ to represent the PN ʿEzer or, in compound

---

[89] Maurice Dunand, "Stèle araméenne dédiée à Melqart," *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 3 (1939): 65–76.

[90] Explicit treatment of the biblical text-critical basis is my cooperative response to a reviewer's comment, ". . . [T]he next step should be to establish the historical authenticity of the biblical name. Mykytiuk refers us now too easily to Old Testament-textbooks, etc." (de Geus [N 2]: col. 357).

[91] See the editions cited in n. 84 above, b. The reign of Hadadezer . . . , Note.

[92] James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (Henry S. Gehman, ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, and New York: Scribner's, 1951, 1960): 280.

[93] See section b of N 84 above.

names, -ʿezer.[94] Instead, the LXX uses Αδερ, with or without a rough breather, as its usual way of rendering the RN *Hădad* (sometimes written *Hădar*- in compound PNs). Among E. Hatch and H. Redpath's lists of renderings of *Hădad*, Αδερ appears two-and-a-half times as often as Αδαδ.[95] That Αδερ renders *Hădad*/*Hădar*-, rather than *ʿEzer*/-*ʿezer*, is

[94] Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998): Appendix I Greek Proper Names, 6. In its 3 vol. ed., see vol. 3: *Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906; repr. 3 vols. in 2, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983): 6.

[95] In Hatch and Redpath (N 94): Appendix I, 5,6, the LXX renderings of *Hădad* with Αδερ total approximately thirty, compared to approximately twelve occurrences of *Hădad* rendered Αδαδ. (For a more complete treatment, see Hatch and Redpath [N 94]: Appendix 1, 5–8. LXX editions used below are Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, eds., *I and II Kings* [N 84]; idem, *I and II Chronicles* [N 84]; Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim prophetae* [Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943]; idem, *Jeremias* [N 63].) Lists of such occurrences of Αδερ compared with those of Αδαδ are as follows:

Αδερ for *Hădad*: approximately thirty occurrences:

• In the RN of Hadad the Edomite, who fled to Egypt: Αδερ in 3 Kgdms 11:17,19,21 *bis*. Codex Vaticanus has these and adds Αδερ in 11:14 (25 in MT).

• In the RN of the Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion, who received a bribe from Asa, king of Judah: υἱὸν/υἱὸς Αδερ in 3 Kgdms 15:18,20; 2 Chr 16:2,4 (in v. 4, a few minor MSS omit υἱὸς).

• In the RN of the Ben-hadad who with thirty-two kings besieged Ahab's Samaria: υἱὸς Αδερ in 3 Kgdms 21 (MT chap. 20):1,2,5,9,10,16 (17 in Codex Alexandrinus), 20,26,30,32,33 *bis*.

• In the RN of the Ben-hadad who changed the policy of Damascus toward Israel and besieged Joram's Samaria: υἱὸς Αδερ in 4 Kgdms 6:24.

• In the RN of the Ben-hadad whom Hazael assassinated: υἱὸς Αδερ in 4 Kgdms 8:7,9.

• In the RN of the Ben-hadad who was Hazael's son: υἱὸυ /υἱὸς Αδερ in 4 Kgdms 13:3 plus 24,25 in Vaticanus. Alexandrinus has υἱὸς Αζερ in 13:24 but υἱὸυ Αδαδ in 13:25. Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and the Syro-hexaplar version place υἱὸς in 13:24 and υἱὸυ Αδερ in 13:25 under an asterisk, and indeed υἱὸς and υἱὸυ (only) are absent from 13:24,25 in a dozen or more Greek MSS. In Amos 1:4, υἱὸυ Αδερ, without significant variant, also seems to refer to the Ben-hadad who was Hazael's son; cf. 4 Kgdms 13:3.

• In the RN of an unspecified or generic Ben-hadad whose palaces, Jeremiah prophesied, were to be burned: υἱὸς Αδερ in Jer 30:16 (MT 49:27), where minor variants of Αδερ are Αδηρ and Αδαδ.

Αδαδ for *Hădad*: approximately twelve occurrences:

• In the RN Ἁδὰδ (son of Βαράδ or possibly Βαράκ) in an Edomite king list: 1 Chr 1:46,47,50; in Alexandrinus: 1 Chr 1:51. In Alexandrinus & Cottonianus: Gen 36:35,36.

• In the RN of the υἱὸς Αδαδ who with thirty-two kings besieged Samaria: in a MS included by Hatch and Redpath but later apparently deselected by Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, eds., *I and II Kings* [N 84]: 3 Kgdms 21:9,10,16 (MT chap. 20).

• In the RN of the υἱὸς Αδαδ whom Hazael assassinated: in Aquila, Symmachus, & Hebraeus: 4 Kgdms 8:7.

demonstrable, in that Αδερ is given as the RN of several persons whose RNs consist of or include the component *Hădad*, but who have no known association with the PN or PN component *'Ezer/-'ezer*, as in the RN *Hădad'ezer*.[96] An example of particular interest is 3 Kgdms 11:14, which has the phrase Αδερ τον Ιδουμαιον reflecting MT *hădad hā'ĕdōmî*. This same verse also has Αδρααζαρ[97] βασιλεα Σουβα for *hădad'ezer melek-ṣōbāʰ* (MT 11:23; in this section, the LXX has a different order of phrases[98]). This verse provides examples of LXX manuscripts of 3

• In the RN of υἱὸν Αδαδ, son of Hazael: in Alexandrinus: 4 Kgdms 13:25.

• In the RN of an unspecified or generic υἱὸν Αδαδ whose palaces, Jeremiah prophesied, were to be burned: in Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and one Vatican MS: Jer 30:16 (MT 49:27).

How did Αδερ come to be used for *Hădad*? A precondition was that ease in pronunciation, especially in compound PNs, helped make substitution of *reš* for the second *dalet* common. Αδερ might have arisen in at least three ways, some possibly working in combination. First, Αδερ might simply have been inferred from a compound form, such as Αδρααζαρ (which occurs approximately eighteen times), by removing the second component and expanding Αδρ- into Αδερ.

A second possible explanation is that the PN *Hădad*, after a *dalet-reš* interchange in the final consonant, might have been confused with the Aramaic common noun *hădār*, "honor, majesty," or with the Hebrew common noun *hādār*, "ornament, splendor, honor" (BDB, 1089, 214, respectively). The Hebrew ear could have accepted the second vowel in Αδερ through familiarity with the sound of the segholates *heder*, "ornament, adornment, splendor," and *'eder*, "glory, magnificence; cloak" (BDB, 214, 12, respectively). In view of the Hebrew PNs *'Addār*, *'Adrammelek*, and *Hădōrām* (BDB, 12 *bis*, 214, respectively), associated with the lexical roots of these common nouns having to do with honor or glory, did Hebrew speakers and hearers eventually come to think of the PN *Bar-hădad* as "son of (RN) Honor," or perhaps even "son of honor," meaning "honorable/honored son"? Was Αδερ adopted as a way to make this RN distinctive, in order to avoid associating him with honor?

A third possible explanation for Αδερ arises from possible intentional association with the Aramaic verb *hădār*, "to return, be restored, surround, complete a cycle, repeat, repent" (Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash and Targum 3 and Publications of The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project; Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar Ilan Univ.; Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins Univ.): 363–367, s.v. הדר, חדר). As time passed, did the name Ben-hadad come to mean "son of 'he-goes-back,' " to ridicule both fathers and sons? That could mean to go back on his word, as in breaking an alliance (cf. 1 Kgs 15:18–20); for the sense "to retract, renege," see Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, 365, no. 9. "Going back" could also refer to military reversals, as in Elisha's leading a blinded army back to Damascus in 2 Kgs 6:8–23 and as in two reversals of Aramean military policy in 2 Kgs 6:23,24.

[96] See preceding note, under its headings "Αδερ for *Hădad*" and "Αδαδ for *Hădad*."

[97] Although the Greek alphabet has no guttural letters, the LXX evidently sought to indicate the internal *'ayin* in *hădad'ezer* by using the double *alpha* in Αδρααζαρ to invite at least a glottal stop or pause.

[98] On the displacement of text in this instance, see Gary N. Knoppers, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*, vol. 1: *The*

Kgdms using Αδερ to represent *hădad* or, in compound names, Αδρα- for *hădad-* (except for about four places, the LXX is generally consistent in representing *Ben-hădad* as υἱὸς Αδερ; see note 95 above). This verse also exhibits, in Αδρααζαρ, for example, the use of *zeta* for the *zayin* in *ʿezer* without resorting to *delta*, a consistent LXX trait in rendering of this RN.

Third, the Syriac Peshitta's references to Ben-hadad, son of Hadadezer, king of Aram at Damascus, have *brhdd*, exactly mirroring MT *ben-hădad* (*BHS*).[99]

Question 2, setting: a) is the inscriptional person within about fifty years of the biblical time frame of the person, and b) did the two belong to the same socio-political group?

2a. In Roman-era, secondary use, being without its original stratigraphic context, this discovery can only be dated by non-stratigraphic means, particularly its paleography and historical references. In brief, I follow Cross's paleographic analysis and dating of the Melqart stele to between 860 and 840 as the most likely.[100] Line 2's patronymic, the hypocoristicon *ʿezer*, short for Hadadezer, links this inscription to the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III regarding the battle of Qarqar in 853, in which "*Adad-idri* (Hadadezer), the Damascene" led the western coalition against Assyria. Thus the paleography and the linked historical reference, which are two independent sources of data, provide mutually confirmatory dating.

2b. The socio-political setting of the inscription is resoundingly Aramean, as is evident in the title of the author's father, "the king of Aram," in the explicit theophoric element -*hădad*[101] of the first RN, in the Old Aramaic language and early Aramaic paleography of the inscription, in the mention of Damascus as the home city of the father, in the provenance near the Aramean city of Aleppo, and in the explicit theophoric element *Hădad-* in the full form of the patronym, rendered as *Adad* in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III.

Question 3, identifying marks of an individual: are these sufficient to insure that the inscription and the biblical text are not referring to two different individuals?

Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam (HSM 52; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993): 160–161.

[99] Gottlieb and Hammershaimb, eds. (N 84); Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac*, part III, fascicle 4: *Dodekapropheton—Daniel-Bel-Draco* (A. Gelston and Th. Sprey, eds.; Leiden: Brill, 1980) (cf. N 1); *Kᵉtābāʾ Qadîšăʾ: Dîatîqî ʿAtîqtāʾ* (N 1).

[100] Cross, "Stele Dedicated to Melqart," in *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook* (N 67): 174–175.

[101] "The weather/fertility god, Hadad, appears to have been the head of the pantheon in several of the Aramean states . . . " (Wayne T. Pitard, "Arameans," in *Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, vol. 1 [Eric M. Meyers, ed.; New York: Oxford Univ., 1997]: 186.)

If the reader will kindly pardon the repetition below, these are the spe-
cific identifying marks of an individual, first of Bar-hadad, then of his
father Hadadezer:

√ The most distinctive identifying mark of an individual for Bar-hadad
in the Melqart stele is the patronymic hypocoristicon *'Ezer*, for
Hădad'ezer. Since the Bible does not name his father, but refers to
the father only as "the king of Aram," one is left to discover his fa-
ther's name via a link between the book of 2 Kings and the inscrip-
tions of Shalmaneser III. Line 2 of the Melqart stele refers to him by
the hypocoristicon *'Ezer*, and his title is "the king of Aram" in lines
2–3. The inscriptions of Shalmaneser III provide a link by refer-
ring to "*Adad-idri* (Hadadezer), the Damascene" among other kings
who fought alongside "Ahab the Israelite" at Qarqar in 853. This
link supplies the name of the king in 2 Kgs 6:8–23, which describes
the second siege of Samaria in the books of 1–2 Kings, where the
anonymous, immediate predecessor of the Ben-hadad of 2 Kgs 6:24
is called only "the king of Aram."

Marks of an individual for Bar-hadad in the Melqart stele that find
matching marks directly in the Hebrew Bible are as follows:

√ use of the Aramaic royal title Bar-hadad as a RN in lines 1–2 of the
stele. Not all Damascene kings called themselves Bar-hadad, but the
crown prince and/or coregent who authored the stele chose to use it
as his RN. He might have become the sole monarch soon after it was
engraved. Yet even if he were still only coregent when he died, if his
father were incapacitated, then 2 Kgs 8:7,9 could still refer to this
Bar-hadad in a *de facto* sense as "the king of Aram."

√ his self-designation "the Damascene" (line 2), which according to
the grammar of the inscription could be an appositive to father or
son and in fact could have described either. Its biblical counterpart
is in 2 Kgs 8:7, in which it is implicit that this king's capital city was
Damascus. Probably in view of the effacement of the letters in line 2
between *'ezer* and the relatively clear letter *bet* near the end of line
2 (in line 2's second *bar*) and consequent alternative readings, Cross
offers a comment that buttresses his reading. He points out that the
use of the title Bar-hadad as a RN was, as far as we know, solely
the custom of *Damascene* kings of Aram, one which persisted even
through successive dynasties in that capital city. Although other dy-
nasties in other capitals could conceivably have used this title, there

is no evidence for such use elsewhere. "It is thus prudent . . . to assign our Bir-Hadad to Damascus."[102]

Marks of an individual for Hadadezer in the Melqart stele that fit with data in the Hebrew Bible and match data that supplement it are as follows:

√ his name as expressed by the hypocoristicon *'Ezer* in line 2 of the Melqart stele, which stands for the RN Hadadezer, matching the actual name of the anonymous "king of Aram" in 2 Kgs 6:8–23, as supplied by Shalmaneser III's references to enemy kings at the battle of Qarqar in 853: "ᵐᵈIŠKUR-*id-ri ša*-KUR.ANŠE-[*šú*]" i.e., *Adad-idri*, alias Hadadezer, the Damascene.

Marks of an individual for Hadadezer in the Melqart stele that find matching marks directly in the Hebrew Bible are as follows:

√ his son's throne name, the royal title Bar-hadad used as a RN in lines 1–2 of the stele, matching the name of Hadadezer's successor in its Hebrew translation, Ben-hadad, in 2 Kgs 6:24. (See the second mark among the preceding marks of Bar-hadad.)

√ his son's self-designation as "the Damascene" in line 2 of the stele (see the third mark among the preceding matching marks of Bar-hadad) and such biblical passages as 2 Kgs 8:7 (cf. also the suggestion in 5:12), which name Damascus with the clear implication that it was the capital city of this dynasty.

Since there are three identifying marks of an individual for both IDs, that of Hadadezer and that of his son Ben-hadad in the Melqart stele, and because they are based on agreement between Aramean, Assyrian, and Hebrew sources, I find both to be reliable grade 3 IDs.

B. FOUR GRADE 2 OR HIGHER IDENTIFICATIONS IN TWO PROVENANCED BULLAE

Perhaps of greatest interest are four IDs in two "new" city of David bullae. As above, the following are preliminary evaluations.

17 and 18. Grade 2 or higher IDs of person (58e) the biblical Jehucal or Jucal (Jer 37:3 *yəhûkal*; 38:1 *yŭkal* [*BHS*]),[103] and of person (58d), his

---

[102] Cross, "Stele Dedicated to Melqart" (N 67): 176.

[103] Possibly a contraction of *yəhōyōkal*, "Yahweh is able" (BDB 220).

father, the biblical Shelemiah or Shelemyahu (Jer 37:3 *šelemîa^h*; 38:1 *šelemyāhû* [*BHS*]), can be made in [67c] city of David bulla *lyhwkl b* / [*n*] *šlmyhw* / *bn šby*, "belonging to *Yəhûkal*, so / [*n*] of *Šelemyāhû*, / son of *Šōbî*."[104]

Description, transcription, and translation: the bulla of *Yəhûkal* is a horizontal oval impressed by a seal having a nearly circular face. A chip is missing from the edge at the (reader's) right, so that at the beginning of line 2, the upper half of the first letter is missing. Fortunately, it can hardly be anything but the *nun* in *ben*, which can be restored with complete confidence. Judging from the available text and from the overall shape of the field in which the text appears, no other letters are missing, and none are damaged to the point that they are rendered illegible. As for the precise dimensions, the *BAR* article, in the caption beneath the photograph, calls it "this .4-inch-wide bulla."[105] There is no line circumscribing the face of the bulla, and its three-line inscription contains five words without dividers between them.

In both patronyms, *Šelemyāhû* and *Šōbî*, the reading presented here chooses *šin* rather than *śin* on the basis of known, biblical PNs:[106] Shelemyahu or its alternate form, Shelemiah in ten biblical occurrences, of which half refer to preexilic persons, and Shobi in 2 Sam 17:27. The latter's alternative form, Shobai, appears in biblical texts that refer to postexilic persons: Ezra 2:42; Neh 7:45 (*BHS*).[107]

---

[104] Eilat Mazar, "Did I Find King David's Palace?" *BAR* 32, no. 1 (January/February 2006): 16–27, 70 (photograph of the bulla of Yehukal is on p. 26); idem, *Preliminary Report on the City of David Excavations 2005 at the Visitors Center Area* (Jerusalem/New York: Shalem, 2007): 67–69 (photograph and drawing of the bulla of Yehukal is on p. 68); idem, "The Wall that Nehemiah Built," *BAR* 35, no. 2 (March/April 2009): 24–33, 66 (photographs and drawings of the bulla of Yehukal and the bulla of Gedalyahu are on p. 29); idem, *The Palace of King David: Excavations at the Summit of the City of David: Preliminary Report of Seasons 2005-2007* (Jerusalem/New York: Shoham Academic Research and Publication, 2009): 66–71.

In Appendixes B and C (*IBP*, 234, 258, respectively), there should be added grade 2, IDs of person (58e) J(e)hucal, son of Shelemiah; Jer 37:3 *yəhûkal,* 38:1 *yŭkal* and of person (58d) Shelemiah, father of Jehucal; Jer 37:3 *šelemîa^h*; 38:1 *šelemyāhû* both in inscription [67c] city of David bulla *lyhwkl b* / [*n*] *šlmyhw* / *bn šby*, "belonging to *Yəhûkal*, so / [*n*] of *Šelemyāhû*, / son of *Šōbî*," unless they turn out to be a higher grade.

[105] Mazar, "Did I Find" (N 104): 26.

[106] I credit Tyler F. Williams with being the first to adopt and defend this approach to orthography explicitly in the instance of the two patronyms in this bulla. One reaches more reliable conclusions by giving preference to known ancient usage instead of modern orthographic guesses which produce PNs that are *hapax* (cf. *IBP*, 37, point 1).

[107] The rendering of the second patronymic as *Šōbî* beginning with *šin* is the only choice among biblical PNs; there is no biblical PN *Śōbî beginning with *śin*.

The rendering of the first patronymic as *Šelemyāhû* beginning with *šin* is more likely to be accurate than *Śelemyāhû* beginning with *śin*. The first, *Šelemyāhû*, appears in Jer

The following three questions evaluate potential IDs of the biblical Jehucal/Jucal and Shelemiah of Jer 37:3; 38:1 in the city of David bulla *lyhwkl b* / [*n*] *šlmyhw* / *bn šby*:

Question 1, authenticity: are the data known to be reliable in the sense that a) the epigraph is authentic, not forged or faked, and b) the biblical data are well based in the ancient manuscripts through sound text criticism?

1a. This bulla is to be accepted as authentic, because it was unearthed by an excavation conducted under controlled conditions. The director of this excavation, Eilat Mazar, announced its discovery on August 4, 2005. The bulla's provenance within the site's excavation area is a known, exact findspot, precisely where Area A Supervisor Yoav Farhi located the bulla between two large stones.

1b. As for the biblical data regarding the name *yəhûkal* and its syncopated form, *yŭkal*, textual variants of the MT are insignificant (*BHS*).

36:14,26; 38:1; Ezra 10:41; 1 Chr 26:14, and its alternate form, *Šelemyāh*, appears in Jer 37:3,13; Ezra 10:39; Neh 3:30; 13:13. The second alternative, *Šelemyāhû*, and its hypothetical alternate form, *Šelemyāh*, do not appear in the Hebrew Bible.

To present a complete picture: PNs formed from the lexical root ŚLM are *Śalmā'* (1 Chr 2:11,51,54) *Śalmāʰ* (Ruth 4:20), *Śalmōn* (Ruth 4:21), and *Śalmay* (in pause, *Śalmāy*). *Śalmay* does not appear in the HB's references to preexilic persons, but rather as the name of the head of a postexilic family, in the preferable *qere'* in Ezra 2:46 and as the *ketib* in Neh 7:48.

In the biblical PN *Śalmay*, the final *yod* can be seen as theophoric, implying the hypothetical full form *Śelemyāhû*, which would make sense as "the robe of Yahweh" (cf. Ps 104:2). Regarding final *yod* as representing a theophoric element, Noth observed that it does so in customary postexilic usage (Martin Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* [Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament 3/10; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928; repr. New York: Olms, 1980]: 105). But cf. final *yod* as a root letter in Ran Zadok, *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponomy and Prosopography* (OLA 28; Leuven: Peeters, 1988): 156–157, section 22112.

The text of the Septuagint,[108] with its variants,[109] and the text of the Syriac Peshitta version[110] indicate no likely alternative name. Similarly, the biblical data regarding *šelemyāhû* and its shorter form, *šelemîaʰ*, indicate no likely alternatives[111] in the MT, LXX, and Peshitta (same editions).

Question 2, setting: a) is the inscriptional person within about fifty years of the biblical time frame of the person, and b) did the two belong to the same socio-political group?

2a. Regarding the temporal setting, the stratigraphic context of this discovery is sharply debated[112] and in any event might not match the clear paleographic date. This phenomenon[113] can be caused by humans

---

[108] LXX Jeremiah 44 and 45 correspond to MT chaps. 37 and 38. LXX Jer 44:3 has τον Ιωαχαλ υιον Σελεμιου, and 45:1 has Ιωαχαλ υιος Σελεμιου. In both places, Ιωαχαλ is supported by Codex Vaticanus and other important MSS. Vaticanus' original text in 45:1 is ωαχαλ (Ziegler, *Jeremias* [N 63]). The *omega* in Ιωαχαλ appears to be the result of reading a *waw* (MT *šûreq*, *û* [BHS]) as *ḥôlem-waw*, ô. In 44:3, Aquila and Symmachus, however, perfectly reflect the *šûreq* in *yŭkal* by rendering Ιουχαλ (ibid., 400, bottom register).

The first *alpha* in Ιωαχαλ appears to have helped bring about some LXX textual variants, but it is difficult to arrive at a conclusive explanation for its presence. Does it reflect the preference of the ear of speakers of Northwest Semitic languages for a-class vowels with guttural-sounding consonants? Even though *chi* in this instance represents *kap*, not *ḥet*, the sound of *chi* might have been close enough to *ḥet* to invoke the preference for an a-class vowel. Indeed, the LXX in general commonly represents *ḥet* with *chi*, e.g., Αχαζ in Isa 7:1, as does the LXX book of Jeremiah in particular, e.g., Αχικαμ in Jer 33:24, 46:14; 47:5,11; 48:10; 50:6. Another explanation for the first *alpha* which could work in combination with the preference just mentioned is the possibility that this name in Greek, Ιωαχαλ, might represent a scribal transformation of *yǝhûkal* or perhaps *yŭkal* in Hebrew to *yō ʾākal*, "Yahweh has consumed" in order to register disapproval; for the concept see Jer 49:27. There is no PN *yō ʾākal* in MT (cf. *ʾUkāl*, if it is a PN, in Prov 30:1). If the LXX rendering represents an intentional scribal change applied to the PN of someone who advocated killing a true prophet (Jer 38:4), then its amendment to express disapproval would parallel *ʾîš-bōšet*, "man of shame" in 2 Sam 2:8,10,12,15, etc., a MT rendering (BHS) of *ʾešbāʿal*, "fire of Baal," or "man of Baal" (1 Chr 8:33; 9:39 [BHS]).

[109] The LXX variants are not significant. In Jer 44:3, variants of Ιωαχαλ are, according to Ziegler, ed., *Jeremias* (N 63), as follows: 1) Ιωαχαζ in Codex Alexandrinus, which seems an implausible alternative, has no extant Hebrew variant to support it, and might perhaps be an attempt to "correct" an unfamiliar name to one that was more familiar, as the name of several Hebrew kings, and 2) Ιωαχας, the correction in Codex Sinaiticus, which provides an ending that is appropriate for a man's name in Greek.

[110] Jer 37:3 *lywkl br šlmyʾ* and Jer 38:1 *wywkl br šlmyʾ* (*Kʿtābāʾ Qadîšāʾ: Dîatîqî ʿAtîqtāʾ* [N 1]).

[111] See N 108 above, first paragraph, for the first patronym as rendered in the LXX, which has no significant variants in either verse. For the Peshitta rendering, see N 110.

[112] Israel Finkelstein, Zeʾev Herzog, Lily Singer-Avitz, and David Ussishkin, "Has David's Palace in Jerusalem Been Found?" *Tel Aviv* 34 (2007): 142–164; Mazar, "Did I Find" (N 104); idem, *Preliminary Report* (N 104): 44–76; idem, "Wall" (N 104); idem, *Palace of King David* (N 104).

[113] E.g., regarding discoveries at ʿIzbet Ṣarṭah, where a mismatched stratum was about

disturbing lower layers, perhaps to dig dirt to be used in building up the ancient city's defenses or perhaps to lay a foundation for an ancient building or wall. Stratigraphic displacement might also be due to vertical movement of the bulla, caused by earthquakes jostling the soil. Future publication(s) by Eilat Mazar may create a better understanding of the bulla's archaeological context.

Paleographic details of the bulla are appropriate to the late seventh to early sixth century, as indicated especially by the *he* in line 2, the penultimate letter in the name *Šelemyāhû*. Because its horizontal strokes converge and its top horizontal extends to the other side of the vertical stroke, it is a diagnostic letter indicating a late seventh- to early sixth-century date.[114] This date matches the biblical time frame in chapters 37 and 38 of the book of Jeremiah, which mention the biblical persons identifiable in the bulla.

2b. The socio-political setting of the three named persons is Hebrew, and specifically Judahite, as indicated by the combination of the City of David provenance, the Hebrew paleography, the deity explicitly indicated by the theophoric element of the owner's name and first patronym, and the non-syncopated form of the Yahwistic theophoric ending on *Šelemyāhû* (not /-yaw/).[115]

Question 3: are the identifying marks of an individual sufficient to insure that the inscription and the biblical text are not referring to two different individuals?

√ The name of the seal owner, *Yəhûkal*, provides the first identifying mark.

√ The first patronym, *Šelemyāhû*, provides the second identifying mark.

Therefore, both IDs are at least grade 2. At this point, however, it would be premature to draw a firm conclusion that these are grade 2 IDs,

one century too young for the ostracon it contained, "It is important to remember that the contents of Stratum II silos do not necessarily belong to this stratum, particularly as no complete vessels were found in them. It is possible that in one way or another older sherds penetrated into the silos, and even more likely that sherds from Stratum I fell into them, particularly since some of them may have been reused at that time" (Israel Finkelstein, *ʿIzbet Sartah: An Early Iron Age Site Near Rosh HaʿAyin, Israel* [BAR International Series 299; Oxford: B.A.R. (British Archaeological Reports), 1986]: 20.)

[114] Vaughn (N 62): 47, 52–53.

[115] On the socio-political indication of /–yāhû/ as opposed to /–yāw/ during the seventh and sixth centuries, see *IBP*, 142–143 n. 136. On the term *Judahite*, see *IBP*, 26 n. 60, 47 n. 113.

i.e., reasonable but uncertain,[116] before all of the data from the current excavation have been recovered, assembled, and thoroughly understood, possibly resulting in a better interpretation of the bulla. Until now, this bulla has only been published in a preliminary manner. It is possible that a third identifying mark for both IDs might emerge from a better understanding of the archaeological context in which it was discovered. If such a third mark were to become evident, then these IDs would be grade 3, either reliable or virtually certain. Currently, the most accurate way to describe these two IDs is: grade 2 or higher.

For example, if the Large-Stone Structure, where the bulla of *Yəhûkal* was discovered, could be *clearly* associated with the presence of the king of Judah or his royal court, especially during the late seventh to early sixth centuries, then the findspot might, potentially, provide a third identifying mark of an individual. Like "the house of the bullae," Locus 967 in Area G of Shiloh's excavations, where the bulla "of *Gəmaryāhû*, [so]n of *Šāpān*" was discovered,[117] the Large-Stone Structure in Mazar's Area A, where the bulla of *Yəhûkal* was discovered, is also within 250 meters of the southern edge of what was formerly the Temple precincts. For the late seventh to early sixth centuries, Scripture does refer to the physical location within Jerusalem of the palace of the king of Judah, specifically to the king who immediately preceded Zedekiah, i.e., Jehoiachin (r. 598–597). Referring to the period of Jehoiachin's reign, Jer 36:12 states that Micaiah, the son of Gemariah, "went down" (*wayyēred*, Jer 36:12) from the temple to the royal palace.[118] Scripture also depicts Jehoiachin sitting with his court "in the winter (lit., autumn) palace (*bêt haḥōrep*) in the ninth month" before an open fire (Jer 36:20–22). Presumably, the winter palace would have been somewhat sheltered from cold winds within the walls of Jerusalem and, by precedent, located in the city of David, below and south of the Temple.

The presence of the Large-Stone Structure, a relatively spacious building in that narrow area, seems to make it, at the very least, an obvious candidate for association with the king. Appropriate dates for various portions of the Large-Stone Structure are a necessary condition before such a royal association can be established.[119]

---

[116] In Jerusalem during the late seventh to early sixth century, there could have been more than one father-and-son pair consisting of a father named *Šelemyāhû* and a son named *Yəhûkal/Yŭkal*; see point 7 in *IBP*, 51–52, esp. n. 117.

[117] *IBP*, 140 n. 125, 145.

[118] *IBP*, 145.

[119] The dating of the portions of the Large-Stone Structure continues to be debated between Eilat Mazar and the critics of her analysis of the site, as well as the dates she assigns to each component of the site and its environs (see N 112 above and the bibliography contained in the cited publications).

Remarks: three other possible marks of an individual would have raised these two grade 2 IDs to grade 3, but they are either absent or not clearly present:

First, in contrast to the bulla containing these grade 2 IDs, the Hebrew Bible names no counterpart to the inscriptional *Šōbî* or *Šōbay* as a progenitor of the J(eh)ucal and Shelemiah/Shelemyahu of Jeremiah chapters 37 and 38. That is why there is no third biblical ID in this bulla. If Scripture had contained a reference to such a progenitor having this name, then the degree of specificity provided by the family connections between these three persons would have made all three IDs into grade 3 virtually certain IDs.[120]

Second, if the bulla of *Yəhûkal* had been discovered in a government archive, as the city of David bulla "belonging to *Gəmaryāhû*, [so]n of *Šāpān*," was discovered in an archival hoard of fifty-one bullae,[121] then there could have been a third identifying mark, i.e., clear association with the royal bureaucracy. Government archives are kept in government repositories having specific locations. A government archive would have associated *Yəhûkal* with the royal bureaucracy as someone who affixed his bulla to a government document. Scripture places the biblical Jehucal in the royal bureaucracy by describing the king's orders to Jehucal and his colleagues (Jer 37:3) and their report to the king as *śārîm* (Jer 38:1,4).

---

[120] For a brief description of each grade of ID, see n 28 above.

IDs of non-royals, such as these, are sometimes not readily accepted, if at all. Two reviews of *IBP* express confidence in the biblical king-list but diffidence in the biblical presentation of persons besides monarchs. The clearer review states, "With the introduction of other biblical characters [besides rulers], however, other criteria need to be devised, and not just those related to textual criticism (p. 40 [of *IBP*])" (Parker [n 2]: 502).

It is difficult to respond with precision to objections whose basis is not stated and whose specifics are vague. Still, I would emphasize two facts: 1) The Hebrew Bible, buttressed by the ancient versions, specifies a particular individual in a specific historical context, including time and place. 2) There is independent, primary-source evidence in the form of one or more written documents which are in almost all cases contemporary with that person and which can be demonstrated, with varying degrees of likelihood or in some instances with complete certainty, to refer to the very same individual at the same time in the same place. Whether that person is named in a king list does not change this match.

Depending on the exact nature of the unstated objections, another apt response might be to argue in a way similar to this statement from a review of a dictionary: "Avi Hurvitz is absolutely correct when he states that 'a linguistic study whose central purpose is to seek facts and avoid conjectures, should base itself on actual texts—difficult though they may be—rather than depend on reconstructed texts' " (Gary A. Rendsburg, "Review Essay: The Sheffield Dictionary of Classical Hebrew," *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 21 [1996]: 115, quoting Avi Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* [Cahiers de la Revue biblique 20; Paris: Gabalda, 1982]: 19.)

[121] *IBP*, 139–147.

In contrast with the city of David bulla "belonging to *Gəmaryāhû*, [so]n of *Šāpān*," which was discovered in what was most likely a government archive, the bulla of *Yəhûkal* was discovered in a context which is not necessarily archival at all. No one knows how or why it came to rest in its findspot.[122] The chaos produced during the building-by-building capture, looting, and burning of Jerusalem might be a partial cause of its coming to rest between two large stones.

Third, regarding the possibility that two IDs in another bulla from this same site might strengthen these two IDs, see the treatment of the next bulla below (beginning under question 3 at the fourth paragraph, that starts with "Should the fact . . .").

19 and 20. Grade 2 or higher IDs of person (59b)[123] the biblical Gedaliah, son of Pashhur (Jer 38:1 *gədalyāhû ben-pašḥûr* [*BHS*]) and of person (59a)[124] his father, the biblical Pashhur, can be made in inscription [67c] city of David bulla *lgdlyhw. / bn* [*p*]*šḥwr.*, "belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, son of [*P*]*ašḥûr*."[125]

Description, transcription, and translation: the bulla of *Gədalyāhû*, son of [*P*]*ašḥûr* (the *pe* in [*P*]*ašḥûr* being very uncertain at first sight but less so after investigation), is aniconic and has a horizontal ellipsoid shape. The exact dimensions of this bulla do not seem to be available, but news reports give its length as about 1 cm. A single line surrounds its face, and a double horizontal line divides it into two long registers. Following the last letter in each register, where each name ends, is a dot. The word *bn* abuts the patronym with no extra space, as if the two words were one. In the center of the bulla, diagonal scratches run in an upper right-lower left direction, mostly crossing the two horizontal dividing lines and breaking them in at least three places. In the upper register, one of these scratches

---

[122] Mazar, *Palace of King David* (ɴ 104): 69, map at upper right showing findspots.

[123] In *IBP*, 235, 260, the number of person (59), Gedaliah, son of Pashhur, should be changed to (59b), because of the addition of person (59a), his father Pashhur.

[124] On ibid., 235, before person (59b), Gedaliah, son of Pashhur, insert person "(59a) Pashhur, father of Gedaliah; Jer 38:1" and the grade 2 or higher ID of Pashhur in inscription "[67c] city of David bulla *lgdlyhw. / bn* [*p*]*šḥwr*, "belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, son of [*P*] *ašḥûr*."

[125] Mazar, "Wall" (ɴ 104); photographs and drawings of the bulla "belonging to *Yəhûkal*, so / [n] of *Šelemyāhû*, / son of *Šôbî*" and of the bulla "belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, son of [*P*] *ašḥûr*" are on p. 29; idem, *Palace of King David* (ɴ 104): 66, 68 for photos; 69, map upper right for findspot.

In *IBP*, 258, person "(59a) Pashhur, father of Gedaliah; Jer 38:1" and person "(59b) Gedaliah, son of Pashhur; Jer 38:1" should be inserted, both followed by a grade 2 or higher ID in inscription "[67d] city of David bulla *lgdlyhw. / bn* [*p*]*šḥwr.*, 'belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, son of [*P*]*ašḥûr*'." Along with these grade 2 or higher IDs of persons (59a) and (59b) added to Appendixes B and C in ibid., 235, 258, respectively, there should also be footnotes referring to this article and/or future scholarly publication(s) on this bulla.

is deep and seems to have removed the foot of the still-identifiable *yod* in -*yāhû*. In the lower register, scratches have also made the *šin* or *śin* less distinct, but it, too, is still reliably recognizable.

Also in the lower register, following *nun*, the letter that my transcription renders as *pe* is missing the left part of its head, which seems to have been scraped off, so that it approximately resembles *kap*, *mem*, *nun*, and *pe*. *Kap* seems to be ruled out by the visible right side of the head, which has no "finger" atop it. *Nun* perhaps cannot be ruled out completely, but it seems unlikely, because the line that connects with the vertical rises steeply, so that the angle formed at the head is sharper than that of the preceding letter *nun* in *ben*. In that preceding *nun*, the connecting line between the two verticals is closer to horizontal. As for *mem*, the available space between the vertical stroke and the next letter appears too narrow to accommodate the wide head of a *mem*. Of the four options for the first letter of the patronym, *pe* seems most likely. Besides this likely *pe* and the *yod* in the upper register, no other letters are significantly damaged or missing.

The following three questions evaluate potential IDs of the biblical Gedaliah and Passhur of Jer 38:1 in the city of David bulla *lgdlyhw. / bn* [*p*]*šḥwr.*:

Question 1, authenticity: a) is the epigraph authentic, and b) are the biblical data well based in the ancient manuscripts?

1a. Since this bulla was excavated under controlled conditions, it should be accepted as authentic. The director of the excavation, Eilat Mazar, announced its discovery on July 31, 2008. The absence of aberrant paleographic details in the bulla and the absence of any other discernible, serious anomalies in the available data buttress the bulla's authenticity.

1b. The biblical data in the MT (*BHS*), LXX, and Syriac Peshitta offer no alternative to *gədalyāhû* that should be adopted. The corresponding LXX verse, Jer 45:1, has Γοδολιας υἱὸς Πασχωρ. Culture probably accounts for the sigma at the end of the seal owner's name; it simply creates a common Greek ending for a man's name: –ας. The rendering of the patronym as φασχωρ in some LXX manuscripts reflects a Hebrew *pe* quite as much as Πασχωρ.[126]

In the Peshitta's *wgdly ʾ br pšḥwr* at Jer 38:1,[127] the only variance from the MT consonants of the seal owner's name is the characteristic Syriac final *ʾalap* instead of the Hebrew *he-waw* at the end of *gədalyāhû*, which is as negligible a difference as the Hebrew alternative, *gədalyā*[h].

Question 2, setting: a) is the inscriptional person within about fifty

[126] Ziegler, *Jeremias* (N 63).

[127] *Kᵉtābâ ʾ Qadîšâ ʾ: Dîatîqî ʿAtîqtā ʾ* (N 1).

years of the biblical time frame of the person, and b) did the two belong
to the same socio-political group?

2a. Date: As with the bulla of *Yəhûkal* treated above, the findspot of
this bulla lies in an archaeological context whose date is disputed,[128] and
in any event, as with the bulla of *Yəhûkal*, the stratigraphy might not
match the clearer date of this bulla. Again, future publication(s) by Eilat
Mazar are expected to create a better understanding of the bulla's physi-
cal context. Until then, the remaining alternative is paleographic dating.

In the clearly Hebrew paleography of this bulla, the *he* in *gdlyhw* has
converging horizontal strokes, but the question is whether the top hori-
zontal crosses the vertical stroke. What looks like the top horizontal pos-
sibly crossing the vertical is made uncertain by the fact that it is much
narrower on the right side of the vertical stroke than on the left. Viewed
in isolation, the narrower mark on the right side might potentially be
explained as simply a tapering, pointed gap in the clay, possibly created
by a piece of grit that was pulled upward as the hard seal was lifted from
the clay. But in the available photograph, similar marks, beginning at the
strokes that form the letters and projecting outward from the letters, are
observable in two other letters in *gdlyhw* and nowhere else. Both of these
marks are precisely at the upper right corner of the letters. The *yod* has
such a mark, created by the separate tapering of the two strokes which
meet at that corner. The fact that the *yod*'s upper horizontal stroke is ta-
pered suggests that the engraver of the hard seal might taper the top mark
of other letters, too. Sure enough, *dalet* also has a narrow line projecting
from the upper right corner of its head. The fact that these similar marks
are found in similar places, namely, a tapering horizontal line beginning
at the upper right corner of *yod*, *dalet*, and *he* and extending rightward, is
an indication that these marks are not random accidents, but rather, were
intentionally placed by the engraver in the hard seal that made the im-
pression. Viewed with these similar marks in mind, the narrow, tapering
mark on the right side of the vertical shaft of the *he* in *gdlyhw* is better
interpreted as the tapered end of the top horizontal stroke on the right
side of the vertical stroke, rather than as an accidental imperfection in
the clay. In hope of further clarifying the paleography, a high-resolution
photograph of this bulla would be most welcome. Until such clarification
is possible, or if attempts to clarify are inconclusive, one should consider
this *he* to be a diagnostic form that limits the date to the late seventh to
early sixth century.[129] That period includes the biblical time frame for
the Gedalyahu ben Pashhur to whom Jer 38:1 refers and to whom 38:4

---

[128] See N 112 above.
[129] Vaughn (N 62): 47, 52–53.

implicitly refers as a *śar* during the administration of Zedekiah, king of Judah (r. 597–586).

The bulla has no other clearly distinctive forms that would indicate a time frame narrower than early seventh to early sixth century.[130]

2b. Socio-political group: the clearly Hebrew paleography, the provenance in the City of David, and the -*yhw* ending on the name of the seal owner (indicating the southern kingdom of Judah rather than the northern kingdom of Israel[131]) all indicate that the bulla belonged to a Judahite.

Question 3: Are there sufficient marks of an individual to avoid confusing two different persons?

Well-established usage in Hebrew seals and bullae calls for the word *ben* to be followed by a personal name or, very infrequently, by the word *hammelek* (written *hmlk*). If the first letter after *ben* really is a *pe*, then the name and patronym exactly match the consonants of their counterparts in Jer 38:1. Readings of this word beginning with *nun* and *kap* exist neither as common nouns nor as personal names. As for a possible *mšḥwr*, which can be read as *mišḥôr*, meaning "darkness,"[132] this word exists as a common noun, but in Hebrew usage, it is not known as a PN (cf. note 106 above). Another possible but previously unattested meaning for *mišḥôr* as a PN is a "grandiose" one that Christopher Rollston seems to have hinted at without stating:[133] "he who dawns." If better photographs of the bulla should somehow reveal a PN beginning with *mem*, then that PN would be *hapax*. Although that possibility currently exists, at this early point in modern awareness of this bulla's existence, the very damaged condition of the bulla precisely in the location of the head of the letter in question makes it seem unlikely that it is able conclusively to reveal the patronym to be any name other than *Pašḥûr*. Further, according to reference sources listing previously known PNs, the patronym can only be *Pašḥûr*.

This process of elimination arrives at the following two marks of an individual:

---

[130] If, instead of a date limited to the *late* seventh to early sixth century, the narrowest span of dates that could be assigned to this bulla had been *early* seventh to early sixth century, that would have made the ID so extremely uncertain as virtually to invalidate it. It would have made it impossible, as question 2 (setting) requires with good reason, to securely date the bulla within about fifty years of the biblical time frame of the Gedaliah, son of Pashhur, of Jer 38:1.

[131] See *IBP*, 142–143 n. 136.

[132] D. J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (5 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993–): 5.519, s.v. *mišḥôr*.

[133] Christopher A. Rollston, private communication, August 13, 2008.

√ the seal owner's name, *Gədalyāhû* and
√ the patronym, most likely *Pašḥûr*.

The seal owner's name matches the biblical name, and the patronym in the bulla most likely matches the biblical patronym. There is no title, second patronym, or other mark of an individual available. Therefore, both IDs are at least grade 2. As with the two IDs in the bulla of *Yəhûkal* treated above, however, it would be premature to draw a firm conclusion that these are grade 2 IDs, reasonable but uncertain, before all the data from the ongoing excavation have been recovered, assembled, and understood. In the instance of this bulla, as with the bulla of *Yəhûkal*, it is possible that a third identifying mark might emerge from a better understanding of this bulla's archaeological context. In this way, future publications by Eilat Mazar might potentially strengthen the four IDs in these two bullae. Currently, the most accurate way to describe these IDs, as well, is: grade 2 or higher.[134]

Should the fact that the findspots of the bulla of *Yəhûkal* and the bulla of *Gədalyāhû* are within a few meters of each other in the same city of David site and are in the same stratum, or approximately so, raise the grade 2 IDs 17 through 20 above to grade 3? If one starts with a sense that the owners of the two seals that created these bullae are, or probably are, the biblical persons having the same names and patronyms, then the findspots seem to be obvious evidence that they were associates.[135] This association of the seal owners, in turn, seems to deserve to be counted as an additional identifying mark of each individual, able to raise all four IDs, 17 through 20 above, to grade 3. The nearness of the findspots to each other appeals to deductive reasoning and clear intuition to make quick IDs. Such assessments tend to say or imply, deductively: assuming the seal owners were most likely the biblical persons who were close

---

[134] See the discussion of the IDs in the bulla of *Yəhûkal* above, under question 3. Cf. *IBP*, 145–147, for similarities and differences.

[135] This way of thinking hearkens back to Nahman Avigad, who reasoned in a similar way even without findspots, regarding his IDs of the biblically associated adversaries, Baruch and Jerahmeel (Jer 36:26), in two unprovenanced bullae that appeared together in the same purchased lot: "With the discovery of these bullae, Berekyahu and Jerahmeel became the first men and Judahites (except for the kings mentioned above) whom it was possible to identify with complete certainty, because besides their names we required also their titles, and here the fact is that both of them are mentioned in the same biblical account and their bullae were found together" (Nahman Avigad, "On the Identification of Persons Mentioned in Hebrew Epigraphic Sources," *ErIsr* 19 [Michael Avi-Yonah Volume, 1987]: 236 [Hebr., translation mine], English summary 79*; see *IBP*, 72, under the heading "√ Other," first paragraph). Although Rollston later exposed the first and second-known bullae of *Berekyāhû* as forgeries (see section II B above), whatever validity or illogic may be found in Avigad's reasoning *per se* is independent of the instance to which it was applied.

associates, of course their bullae would likely be found together! Such a thought can be experienced as a sudden recognition of a vivid, "obvious" case for grade 3 IDs, counting the name, the patronym, and the nearness of the findspots to each other as three identifying marks of both father and son, before one has a chance to examine the evidence more closely, more carefully, and inductively rather than deductively. The following discussion is precisely an attempt to make such a close, inductive examination.[136]

---

[136] Rollston's reviews show that he fails to take into account complicated situations such as this in his estimate of the need for identification protocols. "That is, specialists within the field today do not need an intricate system to reveal that any such identification is precarious at best" (Rollston, review of *IBP*, *JSS* [N 2]: 375). In this quoted instance, he was speaking of a grade 1 ID, used as an introductory example, which was based only on one very common name. Rollston's two reviews mention only a few fairly obvious IDs and non-IDs, those in the highest and lowest grades, while ignoring the subtle situations and brain-teaser questions that arise in the middle range, exemplified by IDs 17 through 20 in this discussion.

The net effect of both of Rollston's reviews is to find *IBP*'s identification protocols unnecessary without giving due consideration to the value of the middle range of IDs (grades 2 and 3), as if all IDs and non-IDs were somehow quite obvious, either black or white, with no shades of gray between them. Such a perception does not acknowledge the complex realities of epigraphy, nor does it recognize the subtleties involved in the making of a significant number of IDs in grades 2 and 3 (counting those here and in *IBP*). Also, one person's "obvious" ID might not be obvious to others, and *IBP*'s protocols provide an objective scale for determining such things.

Rollston's complaint also overlooks the fact that *IBP* provides the first-ever set of identification protocols applicable "to any case" that can "yield a measured judgment" (Parker [N 2]: 502). The goals of *IBP* are 1) to establish a well-founded basis for determining IDs and non-IDs, 2) to provide a way to calibrate the degree of reliability or unreliability of a particular ID or non-ID, 3) to gather, as much as possible, all published instances of potential IDs in Northwest Semitic inscriptions from the given time period, and 4) to render at least a preliminary evaluation on all such potential IDs. In its attempt to provide complete coverage and at least one example of each grade of ID and non-ID, in order to acquaint readers with these grades, *IBP* does not always happen to avoid treatments of the sort that Rollston finds unnecessary.

Further, grade S, 3, and 2 IDs do have some bearing on the ongoing debate regarding the historical value of the Hebrew Bible, and this gradation into three degrees of strength is useful in determining the degree of impact that certain IDs should have on historical deliberations. This usefulness is evident in, e.g., Bob Becking, "Gedaliah and Baalis in History and as Tradition: Remarks on 2 Kings 25:22–26, Jeremiah 40:7–41:15, and Two Ammonite Seal-Inscriptions," in *From David to Gedaliah: The Book of Kings as Story and History* (OBO 228; Fribourg: Academic; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007): 157 n. 43, 160, 162, 169, 171, 171 n.141, 172; Lester L. Grabbe, *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (New York and London: Clark, 2007): 182–184.

Rollston is correct, however, in finding the intricateness to be unnecessary in some instances. For example, Becking avoids the "intricate" aspect of *IBP*'s protocols and just uses *IBP*'s three questions to arrive quickly at an ID on pp. 38–39 of Bob Becking, "The Identity

The archaeological context suggests a relationship between the two bullae. How realistic is this suggestion? The bulla of *Yəhûkal* was discovered between two large stones of the wall of the Large-Stone Structure, and the bulla of *Gədalyāhû* was discovered just outside that part of the wall, at its foot.[137] Although some observers think that these bullae must have come from an archive in that location, their two findspots do not at all demonstrate that an archive existed in that location; compare the greater number and single findspot of the hoard of fifty-one bullae discovered in Shiloh's city of David excavation.[138] If these two bullae had clearly come from an archive, such a provenance would have strengthened the claim that the bullae belonged to two *śārîm* who by virtue of their office would have known each other, and this strengthened claim would have increased the likelihood that they are the ones mentioned in Jeremiah chapters 37 and 38. Instead, however, the observable fact of proximate but separate findspots, neither of which is inside the habitable space of Large-Stone Structure, vaguely suggests that the bullae came to rest in their findspots by a completely unknown event or series of events that was literally external to possible administrative activities inside the Large-Stone Structure. The unknown nature of the event(s) becomes clear when these two findspots are compared with the public[139] archive containing the fifty-one bullae discovered in Shiloh's excavations,

---

of Nabu-sharrussu-ukin, the Chamberlain: An Epigraphic Note on Jeremiah 39,3. With an Appendix on the Nebu⁽¹⁾sarsekim Tablet by Henry Stadhouders," *Biblische Notizen* NF 140 (2009): 35–46. (On this ID, see section V below, regarding *IBP*, 242.)

[137] "On one of the bullae found in the First Temple period layer, it was possible to clearly read the name Gedalyahu ben Pashḥur. This bulla was found only a few feet from the palace, where we had found another bulla during our first excavation season. . . . [The bulla discovered earlier was that of] Yehuchal . . . ben Shelemyahu . . . [T]heir bullae were found in our excavations at a very short distance from each other, one inside the Large Stone Structure (the palace) adjacent to its external wall and the other in the dumps at the foot of the other side of that same external wall" (Mazar, "Wall" [N 104]: 32–33).

[138] "Investigation within the excavation locus itself enabled the archaeologists to determine the exact location of the bulla cache, so that subsequent bullae were found in situ, within a 1-meter-square area in the northwest corner of the bullae house" (Yigal Shiloh and David Tarler, "Bullae from the City of David: A Hoard of Seal Impressions from the Israelite Period," *BA* 49 [1986]: 201).

[139] "Had the papyri from area G belonged to a private, family archive, a repetition of names or evidence for a genealogical line might have been expected within the onomasticon of the bullae. Instead, the overwhelming majority of singly occurring, unrelated names, including that of Gemaryahu son of Shafan, may indicate that the archive was of a public nature. Situated as it was in the area forming the juncture of the lower city with the upper city, or *ophel*, of the City of David—site of the citadel and the center of the administration— the bullae house could plausibly have been part of a compound that housed a chancellery similar to the one connected with Gemaryahu son of Shafan the scribe" (Ibid., 208).

which, it is obvious, someone assembled and stored in that location quite intentionally.

One must keep in mind the real possibility that one or both bullae could refer to a father-and son pair besides those to which Jeremiah chapters 37 and 38 refer. In the two bullae, we encounter two uncertainties: 1) Two pairs of names match names in the book of Jeremiah but do not necessarily refer to the same persons. 2) Precisely because of their different findspots, one between the stones of the wall and the other outside that same wall, it is not at all certain whether these two inscriptions should, in turn, be associated with each other, as the two pairs of names are associated in Jer 38:1.

As royal officials, the biblical Jehucal and Gedaliah likely did possess personal seals, but a non-biblical *Yəhûkal* and *Gədalyāhû* might also have owned personal seals. Further, the fact that the biblical Jehucal and Gedaliah were acquainted has no necessary relation to the location of the findspots of the bullae. After being sealed, then stored for an indeterminate period of time, and later retrieved from storage, the documents bearing the bullae might easily have arrived at their findspots long after the seal owners had pressed their seals into the clay. Between the paleographically determined *terminus post quem* ca. 630 and the historically determined *terminus ante quem* 586, there was plenty of time within a possible forty-four-year span for seal owners who were not acquainted to produce bullae that ended up near each other. From this perspective, it is equally likely that the bullae of two *non*-biblical persons having these names would be found near each other as the bullae of the biblical persons.

For the sake of a hypothetical example, let us say that in Jerusalem ca. 600 B.C.E., there were only two father-and-son pairs in which the son was named *Yəhûkal* and the father *Šelemyāhû*, one the pair in Jeremiah and the other not. Let us also say, again hypothetically, that there were only two father-and-son pairs having a son named *Gədalyāhû* and a father named *Pašḥûr*, again one mentioned in Jeremiah and one not.

On these two hypothetical premises, the possible IDs in our two discovered bullae are as follows (this article uses the spellings in the English Bible [NRSV] for biblical persons and italicized transliterations with diacritics for the names that appear on the bullae):

> a. Non-biblical *Yəhûkal ben Šelemyāhû* and non-biblical *Gədalyāhû ben Pašḥûr*

> b. Non-biblical *Yəhûkal ben Šelemyāhû* and biblical Gedaliah ben Pashhur

c. Biblical Jehucal/Jucal ben Shelemiah/Shelemyahu and non-bib-
lical *Gədalyāhû ben Pašḥûr*

d. Biblical Jehucal/Jucal ben Shelemiah/Shelemyahu and biblical
Gedaliah ben Pashhur

The possibilities for one or both bullae referring to *non*-biblical per-
sons are three out of four (75%) in the hypothetical example above. If
just one of these two bullae should happen to refer to non-biblical per-
sons, then the two bullae would lack the association required for a stron-
ger ID based on a supposed similarity to the association of the two seal
owners named in Jer 38:1, a premise discussed above. The possibility of
such an association of seal owners turns out to be quite tenuous.

Using inductive reasoning, the two findspots offer neither clear, un-
equivocal support nor likelihood for the four names in the bullae to
be referring to the corresponding four persons named in Jer 37:3 and
38:1. The fact that the bullae were discovered close to each another only
suggests, via assumptions and deductive reasoning, but does not at all
demonstrate, that the matching names are likely to refer to the biblical
persons. Therefore, IDs in these bullae do not necessarily deserve any
"extra credit" for such an association, and there is no resulting upgrading
of their IDs to grade 3. The association of the bullae by the proximity of
their findspots to each other and a consequent strengthening of the case
for identification with biblical persons may be said to seem initially rea-
sonable, but after examination, such an association turns out to be quite
uncertain.

Despite the above arguments, one cannot ignore the fact that Shiloh's
excavations unearthed two bullae *nearby* which yield virtually certain
grade 3 IDs of the biblical Gemariah and Shaphan (see 26 and 27 below)
and IDs of the biblical Hilkiah the high priest and his son Azariah which
are almost as strong.[140] The proximity of that findspot to these, during the
same time period, undeniably strengthens the plausibility of biblical IDs
in these instances.

Note: ironically, those who argue for a relatively small population in
Jerusalem are seeking a conclusion that would, as a byproduct, create
an inversely proportional, greater likelihood that these are the biblical
persons, because there would likely be fewer such father-and-son pairs.
For example, in a Jerusalem having a population estimated at one-tenth
the size of previous estimates, grade 2 IDs such as these would be ten
times as likely to be correct.

---

[140] *IBP*, 139–152.

C. TWO GRADE 1 IDENTIFICATIONS IN PROVENANCED INSCRIPTIONS: A STELE FRAGMENT AND A BULLA

21. A grade 1 ID of the biblical Hazael, king of Aram at Damascus (1 Kgs 19:15, etc., *ḥăzāʾēl*; 2 Kgs 8:8, etc., *ḥăzāhʾēl*), should be made in a fragment of a stele in Old Aramaic excavated in 2003 at Tell Afis and analyzed by Maria G. Amadasi Guzzo.[141] Similarities to the pale-ography of the Zakkur stele indicate a date within the last third of the ninth century, so the setting (date and socio-political context) presents no obstacle to the ID. The problem is that the potential ID is found in a small fragment (24 cm. tall, 7.8 cm. wide, and 5 cm. thick) that presents to the reader's view a narrow, *vertical* portion of the stele's face. As a result, each of the seven lines contains only a short segment of a word or the end of one word and the beginning of the next. With only one to four letters available on each line, it is impossible to know most of the words that are represented, much less the syntax of the presumed sentences that contained them.

Line 5 of the fragment begins with the left side of the first letter, which should be read as *lamed*, rather than *ʾalep*, because, like the three clear *lamed*'s on the fragment, its curve is larger and lower than that of the noses of the three *ʾalep*'s on the fragment. The next two letters are plain-ly *ḥet* and *zayin*. The right side of the last letter in line 5 consists of the "horns" of an *ʾalep*. The result is the four-letter sequence *lḥzʾ*. Because these letters are evenly spaced and have no word divider between them (three word dividers appear elsewhere on this stele fragment), they should be read as part or all of a word.

In Old Aramaic, although there is a verb *ḥzy*, whose basic meaning is 'to see', and whose participle *ḥzh* is used as a substantive, meaning 'seer' or 'prophet',[142] inflections of the verb *ḥzy* do not place an *ʾalep* imme-diately after the *zayin*. Also, Old Aramaic has neither a lexical entry be-ginning *lḥzʾ*, nor, reading the *lamed* as a preposition, does Old Aramaic have any complete word beginning *ḥzʾ*.[143] Therefore, it seems clear that these letters do not form a complete word.

In attempting to explain the initial *lamed*, one finds that hypothetical

---

[141] Maria G. Amadasi Guzzo, "Area I: il frammento di stele in basalto con iscrizioni," in *Tell Afis (Siria) 2002/2004* (Stefania Mazzoni et al., eds.; Storia del mondo antico e ar-cheologia; Pisa: Edizioni PLUS, Università di Pisa, Missioni archeologiche in Siria, 2005): 21–23, cover photograph in color, summarized with a sketch and transcription in Younger (N 57): 139. I wish to thank K. Lawson Younger for very kindly providing me with access to this chapter and to the book cover containing a photograph of this stele fragment, at a time when this book was completely unavailable in North American libraries.

[142] *DNWSI*, vol. 1, s.v. ḥzy, 358–359, OldAr, 360 no. 7.

[143] Ibid., 570 (no *lḥz–*); 357, 361 (no *ḥzʾ* in OldAr).

DNs and PNs having an initial theophoric element ending in *lamed*, such as *ʾl–*, *bʿl–*, or *nrgl–*, are unattested in Old Aramaic as a prefix to any element beginning with *ḥz–*. By process of elimination, the *lamed* seems most likely to be a preposition (in at least one instance, this preposition appears as an integral part of a PN[144]). Since there are no attested alternatives that might have supported other readings, the last available letter in line 5, *ʾalep*, appears to be the decisive element in making a fairly strong case that this word should be read as *lḥz ʾ[l]*. In view of the absence of alternatives to this name on the basis of the available ancient evidence, I can only agree with Amadasi Guzzo that this word most likely consists of the preposition *lamed* prefixed to the PN *ḥz ʾl*.

The fragmentary nature of the text makes it impossible to observe possible additional identifying marks of an individual, leaving this ID at grade 1. Yet it is impossible to ignore the salient fact that the Zakkur stele, which was also discovered near Afis, names *brhdd . br . ḥz ʾl . mlk . ʾrm*, "Bar-hadad, son of Hazael, king of Aram" (side A, line 4 [*KAI* 202]). Besides provenance and the name Hazael, the paleographic similarities between this stele inscription and the Zakkur inscription are a third indication of a close relationship between these two stelae. Amadasi Guzzo finds an especially close resemblance between the letter *zayin* in this tiny fragment of a stele from Afis, the letter *zayin* in the Zakkur stele, and the letter *zayin* in Hazael's booty inscriptions from Eretria and Samos (for bibliography see *IBP*, 119–120, 238–239). These three factors suggest but do not demonstrate that the Hazael who is apparently named in this stele fragment is the same as the Hazael of the Zakkur stele, whom *IBP* identifies as the biblical Hazael.[145] The ID of Hazael in the 24-cm. fragment of an Old Aramaic stele from Tell Afis remains at grade 1.

Note: The letter sequence *yhw* in line 6 of this same small fragment of a stele from Afis has occasioned Amadasi Guzzo's very reasonable suggestion that it might form the theophoric element in the name of a contemporary Hebrew king, such as Jehu or Jehoram of the northern kingdom of Israel or Ahaziah, king of Judah. It is true that when speaking of persons who are foreign to the socio-political group of the author, Northwest Semitic monumental inscriptions as a rule mention only monarchs, rather than non-rulers. Nevertheless, if specific IDs such as these

---

[144] "*La-aḫ-ze-ilu*" appears as a PN in Jeaneane D. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study* (JSOTSup 49; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988): 214. Fowler's source is "La-aḫ-ze-DINGIR," which appears in Frederick M. Fales, "L'onomastica aramaica in età neo-Assira: raffronti tra il corpus alfabetico e il material cuneiforme," *Orientis Antiqui Collectio* 13 (1976): 207 no. 69.

[145] Person (71) in inscription [78] (*IBP*, 238), etc. With the addition of the stele fragment discussed here, inscription [82] becomes [82a], and this fragment is [82b] to be inserted in *IBP*, 239, 260, with a grade 1 ID of person (71) Hazael.

were ever seriously proposed in this stele fragment, lack of any identifying marks of an individual, including a specific name, would leave any such speculative IDs at grade 0 (zero).[146]

22. As an upgrade, a grade 1, somewhat doubtful but possible ID of person (60) Gedaliah, governor of Judah and son of (39) Ahikam et al. (2 Kgs 25:22), should be made in inscription [68] Tell ed-Duweir (Lachish) bulla *lgdlyhw* / *ʾšr ʿl hbyt*, "Belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, overseer of the palace." The only identifying mark of an individual in common with the marks of the Hebrew governor of Judah after the Babylonian conquest in 586 is:

√ the name of the seal owner, *Gədalyāhû*.

This is an upgrade in the left column of *IBP*, 235, at person (60) in inscription [68], from "Disqualified D" to "Doubtful 1," because the paleographic dating of the bulla does not disqualify it, but rather permits it.[147] On that page, footnote 80 should now be attached to the "1" in "Doubtful 1." The entire content of note 80 should be deleted, and the following paragraph (without the quotation marks) should be substituted:

> [80] The *he* in *hbyt*, line 2, is a diagnostic letter that indicates a date in the late 7th to early 6th century (Vaughn, 'Paleographic Dating of Judaean Seals,' 47, 52–53). Herr's use of a mid-seventh-century date as an indication that the bulla 'most likely does not belong to the Gedaliah who ruled Judah from 586 to 582' (Larry G. Herr, 'Seal,' *ISBE* 4:374; in accordance with *SANSS*, 91, no. 18) must be understood within Herr's view of dating, namely, that the date he assigns is the center of a horizon that extends before and after it, and the likelihood decreases as the distance from the center

---

[146] Similarly, the fragmentary, paleo-Hebrew inscription from the city of David published in 2008 occasioned the mention of possible PNs in its first line, very properly without proposing an ID. The entire inscription is: line 1:]*qyh*[, line 2:]*bh . b*[(Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron, "A Fragmentary, Palaeo-Hebrew Inscription from the City of David," *IEJ* 58 [2008]: 48–50).

Possible PNs from eighth- and seventh-century Judah that Reich and Shukron mention for line 1 are *ʿĂmaqyāhû, Ḥizqîāhû, Ḥilqîāhû, and Ṣidqîāhû*. Again, if any IDs were ever seriously proposed in this fragment, lack of any identifying marks of an individual would leave any attempted IDs at grade 0 (zero).

[147] For this correction regarding paleography, based on Vaughn (N 62): 47, 52–53, I wish to thank Oded Lipschits, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005): 86 n. 186. While the new date does *permit* the particular ID that Lipschitz affirms in ibid., 86–87, it also permits other candidates for the ID. Cf. Lester L. Grabbe, " 'The Lying Pen of the Scribes'? Jeremiah and History," in *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Naʾaman* (Yaira Amit, Ehud Ben Zvi, Israel Finkelstein, and Oded Lipschits, eds.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006): 190.

increases. In this instance, all Herr asserted was unlikelihood, not
a denial of the possibility of an ID of Gedaliah, governor of Judah
and son of Ahikam, in this bulla.

This Tell ed-Duweir (Lachish) bulla [68] dates to the lifetime of
Gedaliah, son of Ahikam, who became governor of Judah in 586, and
the Neo-Babylonian conquerors might reasonably have selected the
Gedaliah who had served as overseer of the palace to act as governor.
This bulla might also be that of person (59) Gedaliah, son of Pashhur (Jer
38:1), who was an official (*śar*) during the closing years of the kingdom
of Judah. Avigad pointed out these same two persons as candidates for
the owner of another bulla,[148] and in bulla [68] they are both candidates
as well.

D. THREE GRADE 0 AND ONE GRADE D NON-IDENTIFICATIONS IN PROVENANCED INSCRIPTIONS

23. A grade 0 non-ID of Immer the priest (Jer 20:1 *ʾimmēr*), father of
Pašḥûr, a priest of the First Temple, must be made in a bulla bearing the
text / –*lyhw* / *ʾmr* that was discovered in soil from the Temple Mount
or Jerusalem area, despite the slim possibility that this bulla might refer
to the *ʾImmer* of Jer 20:1.[149] The soil which held it was removed either
from the Temple mount in 1999 or elsewhere in or around Jerusalem and
dumped on slopes of Mt. Scopus, east of Jerusalem. In their valuable
work of sifting, Gabriel Barkay's team of workers discovered this bulla
on September 27, 2005.[150]

---

[148] The bulla "belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, the king's servant" (*WSS*, no. 409; Nahman
Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah: Remnants of a Burnt Archive*
[Jerusalem: IES, 1986]: 24–25 no. 5).

[149] I wish to thank Peter van der Veen for providing me on November 6, 2005 with a
large printout of a digitized photograph that magnifies the face of this bulla, received elec-
tronically from Gabriel Barkay.

In *IBP*, 233, 260, insert person "(53b) Immer the priest, father of Pashhur; Jer 20:1"
having a grade 0 non-ID in inscription "[62b] Jerusalem-area bulla / –*lyhw* / *ʾmr*, ' / –lyahu,
/ (son of) ʾImmer'." Because of this insertion, in *IBP*, 233, 257, person (53) Pedaiah be-
comes (53a), and inscription [62] becomes [62a].

[150] Gabriel Barkay and Yitzhaq Zweig, "New Light on the Temple Mount," *Ariel* 175
(2006): 6–46 [Hebr.]; Gordon Franz and Stephanie Hernandez, " 'The Most Important
Discovery was the People': An Interview with Dr. Gabriel Barkay," *Bible and Spade: A
Journal of Archaeology and Biblical Research* 22/1 (Winter 2009): 7–8, photograph of
bulla on 6; Shahar Ilan, "Gems in the Dirt," Haaretz.com, paragraphs 1–13; accessed:
October 13, 2005, available: http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/634550.html. In ibid.,
paragraph 11, Barkay confirms the possibility that his team is sifting earth that is not from

The (reader's) right edge and part of the right side of the face of the bulla is broken off. Within a double line around its face, the bulla has three registers separated by double lines. The top register contains no recognizable iconography or epigraphy. The remaining text on the bulla, / –*lyhw* / *ʾmr*, is translated " / –*lyāhû*, / (son of) *ʾImmēr*."

For questions 1 and 2, the bulla should be considered authentic and its socio-political setting Hebrew, according to its provenance and its Hebrew script. Its paleography indicates the late eighth to late seventh century, a span of years which is too broad to establish a reliable ID of the person in question. Yet regarding question 3, although the seal owner's name cannot be known from its one remaining root letter, still there is one identifying mark of an individual:

√ the patronym *ʾImmēr* in the bottom register. Granting the reasonable assumption that the same *ʾImmēr* might have had a son besides the seal owner, if the temporal limits were narrow enough (but they are not), then an attempt to arrive at an ID of the biblical Immer the priest, father of Pashhur, would arrive at a grade 1, doubtful ID.

Although the possibility does exist that this *might* be the biblical Immer of Jer 20:1, there is no firm basis for such an ID. There could easily have been another father in Jerusalem (or among worshippers in Israel) who bore the name *ʾImmēr*. Although it is possible that the *ʾImmēr* of this bulla might have been a priest, the absence of a title on the bulla means there is no evidence that the seal owner's father was a priest at all, let alone a priest to whom Scripture refers. This bulla might also have belonged to the son of a priest not referred to in Scripture. No data are available to specify which *ʾImmēr* this is.

24. Downgraded to a grade 0 non-ID is the former grade 2 ID of person (57) Azzur of Gibeon, father of (58) Hananiah the false prophet (Jer 28:1, etc.), in (66 group) seven Gibeon jar handles, whose text is *gbʿn* / *gdr* / *ʿzryhw*, "Gibeon. / Wall of / *ʿĂzaryāhû*" (the full name whose hypocoristicon, *ʿAzzûr*, appears in Jer 28:1).[151]

The early part of the range of dates of these jar handle inscriptions, late eighth to early seventh century,[152] is too early for this person. Jer

---

the Temple Mount, but states, "that has been taken into account." He elaborates this statement in paragraph 14.

[151] In *IBP*, 234, to the left of "[66 group]," delete "Reasonable but uncertain 2" and insert "No clear basis 0." In *IBP*, 257, delete the entry for this ID in [66 group]. In *IBP*, 260, insert the following entry: "(57) Azzur of Gibeon, father of (58) Hananiah, the false prophet, in [66 group]."

[152] Christopher A. Rollston, private communication, February 2, 2009, on the basis of his work on "a new edition of the Gibeon inscribed jar handles, based on new collations,

28:1 places the biblical Azzur's son Hananiah prophesying falsely in the temple during the fifth month of the fourth year of the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah (r. 597–586), i.e., early in 593. On the assumption that Hananiah was then probably between thirty and sixty years old, he could have been born as early as 653. If Azzur had fathered him while between the age of twenty and, generously speaking, seventy, then Azzur would have been born as early as 723. But the late eighth century commences at about 733. Therefore, even placing Azzur's birth a generous number of years before Hananiah's prophecy in Jeremiah chapter 28, the jar handle inscriptions could have existed for a decade or more before the biblical Azzur was born and might well refer to an older relative of his, especially in view of possible papponomy. The inscribed jar handles do not necessarily place the ʿĂzaryāhû, to whom they refer, within fifty years of the biblical Azzur, father of Hananiah, as required in answer to question 2, regarding setting. Therefore, this ID is without a clear basis, i.e., grade 0, on the ground of the inscription's date.

25. A grade 0 non-ID of J(eh)oash, king of Israel (r. 805–790 [or 802–787, as McCarter states]; 2 Kgs 13:9 yōʾaš; 13:10 yəhōʾaš, etc.) should be made in Kuntillet ʿAjrud pithos 1 inscription [10b].[153] Line 1 of the text begins: ʾmr ʾ . . . hm . . . k, transcribed by P. Kyle McCarter Jr. as ʾmr ʾ[šyw] hm[l]k, "ʾA[šyaw] the ki[n]g says." Although the mem in hm[l]k is not discernible in visible-light photographs, McCarter was able to identify this letter by using infrared images. His case for this ID is based on two things: 1) the suitable chronology of the reign of the biblical J(eh)oash vis-à-vis the archaeological dating of the buildings in which the pithoi were discovered: "the end of the ninth to the beginning of the eighth century," with which the paleographic date of the inscription agrees, and 2) a transposition of theophoric and verbal elements in the putative RN, as well attested in other RNs. Additional support comes from 3) the reference to "Yahweh of Samaria." McCarter makes a most reasonable case for this reading and identifies J(eh)oash/Ashyaw, king of Israel, in line 1.[154]

---

new photographs, and high-resolution digital images" (idem, "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel: The Old Hebrew Epigraphic Evidence," *BASOR* 344 [November 2006]: 52 n. 19).

[153] This non-ID should be inserted into Appendixes B and C on *IBP*, 217, 260, respectively. The addition of inscription [10b], the Kuntillet ʿAjrud pithos 1 inscription, means that inscription [10], the "three shekels" ostracon, should be re-numbered as inscription [10a] in *IBP*, 216, 218 (bis), 228, 248, 259.

[154] P. Kyle McCarter Jr., "Kuntillet ʿAjrud: Inscribed Pithos 1," in *Context of Scripture* (3 vols.; William W. Hallo, ed.; Boston: Brill, 1997–2002): 2.171 no. 2.47A; cf. 2.174–175 n. 3. G. I. Davies has a similar transcription, except that presumably without an infrared view of *mem*, his transcription renders the title as h[ml]k (G. I. Davies, *Ancient Hebrew*

Indeed, McCarter's treatment establishes that this reading and this ID are both strong, logical possibilities. Yet the data are not clear enough to make an "airtight" case, and a point of methodology argues against complete certainty for this ID. The inscription, which is missing the upper fragment from an unfortunate horizontal break through part of the first line, does not provide enough clear data to demonstrate that this reading and ID are certain. Of the putative RN, only the first letter, *ʾalep*, is clearly identifiable. A left-leaning, vertical mark just before *hm*[ ]*k* has been identified as a *waw* by Meshel (the same final letter of the putative RN which McCarter supplied), as the vertical shaft of a *reš* by Aḥituv, and as a word divider by Zevit.[155] Also, *lamed* is not visible in the putative title, *hm*[*l*]*k*, making possible an alternative transcription, which yields not a title but an epithet: "*hm°k*, /*hammak*/ (<*m-k-k*/*m-w-k*, cf. Ps 106:43; Lev 27: . . . [8]), with a sense of 'the low/humble one'."[156] Such uncertainties arise from the lack of clear data and result in a lack of any clear identifying mark of an individual, therefore it is best to consider this a grade 0 (zero) non-ID.

A methodological point also argues for possibility and against certainty. *IBP* insists that the inscription has its own voice and attempts to preserve that voice.[157] To claim that it must be in accord with biblical content, with no other options, would be at least to risk its independence as a witness, and possibly to deprive it of its validity and significance as a separate source. *IBP*'s method of separating inscriptional data as much as possible from biblical data in the examination and interpretation phases, comparing them only in the final evaluation phase, means that one cannot simply bring in biblical data to complete a partial PN and arrive at certainty in an ID.

To inject biblical data into the interpretation of extrabiblical sources also exposes one's logic to possible circularity. A proper conclusion would be that the name in the inscription is a possible reference to a biblical person, perhaps even a likely reference, but that the inscription might still be referring to another person.

In this instance, even if *hm*[*l*]*k* is the correct transcription of that part of line 1, the attempt to preserve the independence of the testimony of that inscription requires maintaining that it does not necessarily follow

---

Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance [2 vols.; New York: Cambridge Univ., 1999–2004]: 1.81 no. 8.017). Ze'ev Meshel, "Kuntillet 'Ajrud," *ABD* 4.107, suggests this ID as possible.

[155] Meshel (N 154): 4.107; Shmuel Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past* (Anson F. Rainey, ed.; Jerusalem: Carta, 2008): 315; Ziony Zevit, *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches* (New York: Continuum, 2001): 390.

[156] Zevit (N 155): 390.

[157] See *IBP*, 84–85, section 2.8, "The place of explanatory hypotheses in evaluation."

that the RN that precedes the title is *ʾ[šyw]*, though that is a possibility and seems a likely one. What the complete inscription said before it was damaged is not known, and its voice is separate from Scripture.

26. A grade D non-ID of the biblical Goliath of Gath should be made in a recently discovered Philistine ostracon.[158] On November 10, 2005, the online edition of the *Jerusalem Post* announced a discovery at Tel eṣ-Ṣafi, identified as biblical Gath, by excavators under the direction of Aren M. Maeir of Bar-Ilan University. The discovery is a potsherd about 7 cm. long on which are scratched from right to left, in Proto-Canaanite letters, *ʾlwt* followed by a vertical line word divider, followed by *wlt*[ ], whose letter *taw* is partly cut off at the edge of the jar fragment. A secondary line of writing contains remains of a sign or signs that are not clearly legible.[159]

In answer to question 1, the inscription is authentic, having been excavated under controlled conditions, and the biblical data are well based on the ancient manuscripts. The PN of the biblical Goliath, *gŏlyāt* in MT 1 Sam 17:4,23; 21:10; 22:10: 2 Sam 21:19; 1 Chr 20:5 (*BHS*), has no significant variant. Nor does the LXX offer any practical alternative.[160] Except for *gwlyt* in 2 Sam 21:19, the Peshitta has *gwlyd*, in which the representation of the Hebrew unvoiced *taw* by the Syriac voiced *dalat* appears to indicate a pronunciation preference but has no particular significance for text criticism.[161] For the name, the text is not problematic.

To answer question 2, setting, the site is Philistine and the inscription

---

[158] In *IBP*, 236, 261, insert person "(65b) Goliath of Gath; 1 Sam 17:4ff" having a grade D non-ID in inscription "[73b] Tel eṣ-Ṣafi ostracon in proto-Canaanite letters, *ʾlwt* [vertical line word divider] *wlt*." Because of this insertion, in *IBP*, 236, 261, person (65) Achish becomes (65a), and inscription [73] becomes [73a].

[159] Aren M. Meir, Stefan J. Wimmer, Alexander Zukerman, and Aaron Demsky, "A Late Iron Age I/Early Iron Age II Old Canaanite Inscription from Tel eṣ-Ṣafi/Gath, Israel: Palaeography, Dating, and Historical-Cultural Significance," *BASOR* 351 (2008): 39–71. The transcription is on p. 54.

[160] Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. J. Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek*, Volume II: *The Later Historical Books*, Part I: *I and II Samuel* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1927); idem, I and II Chronicles [א 84]. LXX variants include the slightly different spelling Γολιαδ and an apparent reworking of it into Γοδολιαν (the Hebrew PN *Gədalyāʰ*) in 2 Kgdms 21:19. LXX 1 Kgdms 17:4; 21:9; 1 Chr 20:5 have Γολιαθ; the only variant noted is Γολιαδ (Codex Vaticanus has it at 1 Kgdms 22:10). This replacement of the final sibilant with a corresponding stop is insignificant. Also in Vaticanus is τον Γοδολιαν τον Χετταιον in 2 Kgdms 21:19, which might represent an attempt to differentiate and therefore "free" this verse from its textually troubled background (cf. parallel in 1 Chr 20:5). (It is inconsequential for this study that γολιαθ in 17:23, presented without any variant, is in 1 Kgdms 17:12–31, which is absent in most LXX codices and manuscripts.)

[161] Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac*, part II, fascicle 2: *Judges—Samuel* (P. B. Dirksen and P. A. H. de Boer, eds.; Leiden: Brill, 1978) (cf. א 1); *Kᵉtābā ʾ Qadîšā ʾ: Dîatîqî ʿAtîqtā ʾ* (א 1).

indicates a non-Semitic onomasticon that is appropriate for Philistine culture (see question 3 below). The date of the epigraph is clearly late Iron Age I to early Iron Age IIA, or in absolute dates, "from the late eleventh until the first half of the ninth century B.C.E. according to the modified conventional chronology, and from ca. the mid-tenth until the first half of the ninth century B.C.E. according to the low chronology."[162] The date in the modified conventional chronology includes the biblical time frame for Goliath, i.e., late eleventh century. Neither the stratigraphy nor current knowledge of early Philistine paleography permit dating that is precise enough to answer question 2 satisfactorily, that is, with a date known to be within about fifty years of the date of the biblical person.

Regarding question 3, identifying marks of an individual, the only such information that seems available on the ostracon is what are likely two PNs, one that is complete and one that might be partial. The article by several of the excavators and translators on the team that discovered it suggests interpreting this inscription as two non-Semitic PNs "known from the Greek or Anatolian onomastica (Mycenaean, Lydian, and possibly others)."[163] But their article stresses "that these two names are not to be seen as examples of the biblical name Goliath," because it finds the "*Alyattes* = Goliath interpretation . . . on close examination . . . to have no linguistic basis."[164] To state a significant part of the case briefly: a mismatch between these two PNs concerns the Greek letter *upsilon* in *Alyattes*, "which during this period had a *u/w* sound."[165] (The fact that *upsilon* is transcribed into English by the letter *y* causes confusion.) *Upsilon* would have been represented by the Hebrew letter *waw*, instead of the *yod* in the PN of the biblical *gŏlîat*. Therefore, because *Alyattes* and Goliath are not equivalent, the observation that " *ʾalwt*" forms an "almost perfect match" with the PN *Alyattes*[166] does not establish any connection with the PN of Goliath. In the absence of a matching name, and because this epigraph provides no other identifying marks of an individual, A. Maeir, S. Wimmer, A. Zukerman, and A. Demsky quite rightly make no biblical identification.

---

[162] Meir et al., "Late Iron Age I" (N 154): 48.
[163] Ibid., 62 paragraph (5).
[164] Ibid., 62–63 paragraph (6), supported by detailed examination on 56–58.
[165] Ibid., 58.
[166] Ibid.

E. MORE EVIDENCE FOR TWO GRADE 3 IDENTIFICATIONS IN
A PROVENANCED BULLA

27 and 28. Biblical persons (50) Gemariah, son of Shaphan the scribe,
and his father, (36) Shaphan, son of (34) Azaliah, son of (33) Meshullam,
both remain correctly identified in a grade 3 ID in inscription [48] city
of David bulla *lgmryhw / [b]n špn*, "Belonging to *Gəmaryāhû*, [so]n of
Šāpān." As P. van der Veen rightly points out, however, *IBP*'s discussion
of its dating by paleography omits important evidence for the correct
date assigned to it: 1) within this bulla, the first *nun* in the second regis-
ter, a form that is distinctive to the late seventh and early sixth century,
which broke off some time after the bulla was initially photographed and
2) in the city of David hoard of fifty-one bullae discovered in Shiloh's
excavations, all of Vaughn's "pegs" for that period.[167]

In *IBP*, 140, at the beginning of the second paragraph under "Date,"
the following sentence is incorrect and should be deleted: "Epigraphic
examination of the bulla of Gemaryahu reveals no letter traits that date
it more precisely than the eighth to early sixth centuries." The following
five sentences should be substituted where the deleted sentence stood:

> The first *nun* in the lower register of the bulla of Gemaryahu, which
> originally followed a letter *beth* that broke off earlier, broke off
> after the bulla was excavated, but an early photograph(s), taken
> before this first *nun* broke off, documents that it was originally
> present.[168] Paleographic analysis reveals that it clearly exhibited a
> distinctive set of traits that date this bulla to the late seventh cen-
> tury. These traits are:
>
> 1. The two vertical shafts of the *nun* are approximately parallel.
>
> 2. The crossbar that joins these two verticals is fairly perpendicular
> to both.

---

[167] Pieter Gert van der Veen, "The Final Phase of Iron Age IIC and the Babylonian
Conquest: A Reassessment with Special Emphasis on Names and Bureaucratic Titles on
Provenanced Seals and Bullae from Israel and Jordan" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Bristol, 2005):
101–102, especially 101 n. 476 (a revision of this dissertation is expected to appear in
AOAT). In that note, van der Veen adduces further paleographic evidence for a late sev-
enth-century date based on the diagnostic letters first discerned and published in Vaughn (N
62): 43–58. Within the hoard of fifty-one bullae discovered in Shiloh's excavation Area G,
the "pegs" that mark a late seventh to early sixth century date are the developed, distinc-
tive forms of the letters *he* (ibid., 47, 52–53), *waw* (ibid., 53–54), and *nun* (ibid., 54–55).

[168] The author's mistake in using a photograph taken after this *nun* broke off the recov-
ered bulla led to the quoted erroneous sentence beginning "Epigraphic examination . . . "
in *IBP*, 140. A drawing that has this *nun* is on ibid., 141.

3. The left vertical extends downward past the end of the crossbar.

This is the strongest evidence within this bulla of Gemaryahu for dating it to the late seventh or early sixth century.

The above substitution necessitates changes of wording in nearby sentences.[169]

F. A TRANSFER TO A NEW, FOLK-TRADITION CATEGORY FOR TWO LEVEL 3 IDENTIFICATIONS IN A PROVENANCED INSCRIPTION ON PLASTER

29 and 30. Biblical persons (63) Beor (*Bə ʿôr* or *Bə ʿōr*) and his son (64) Balaam (*Bilʿām*) cannot be considered grade 3 IDs in [72], the Tell Deir ʿAllā inscription on plaster, combination 1, but their IDs deserve to be placed in an entirely new category. This inscription mentions *birbuʿur*, "the son of Buʿur," in line 2; *bilʿām*, "Bilʿām," in line 3, and *bilʿām birbuʿur*, "Bilʿām, the son of Buʿur," in line 4.[170] The treatment of them in *IBP*, 236, 252, needs correction, because it fails to give adequate consideration to question 2, historical setting.

Regarding question 1, the inscription, discovered in 1967, is authentic, because it was recovered in an archaeological excavation under controlled conditions.[171] As for text criticism, the MT (*BHS*) uses *Bə ʿôr* or *Bə ʿōr* and *Bilʿām* uniformly as the names of father and son.[172] The LXX quite consistently renders Balaam's name as Βαλααμ[173] and Beor's name as Βεωρ (infrequently Βαιωρ), with only insignificant variants,

---

[169] In ibid., 140, the word "also" should be inserted at the beginning of the following sentence, before the current beginning, "At least two" so as to read, "Also, at least two." On the top line of text on ibid., 142, the word "however," with its enclosing commas, should be deleted.

[170] Jo Ann Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir ʿAllā* (HSM 31; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1984): 27.

[171] J. Hoftijzer, G. van der Kooij, and H. J. Franken, *Aramaic Texts from Deir ʿAlla* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 19; Leiden: Brill, 1976): 3–16.

[172] Both father and son are named in Num 22:5; 24:3,15; 31:8; Deut 23:5; Josh 13:22; 24:9; Mic 6:5. Balaam is more frequently named alone: Numbers 22–24 passim; 31:16; Josh 24:10; Neh 13:2.

[173] Referring to Balaam, son of Beor, who is featured in Numbers 22–24, Hatch and Redpath (N 94): Appendix 1, 34, accurately lists Βαλααμ in fifty-seven places (Alan E. Brooke and Norman McLean, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek*, Volume I: *The Octateuch*, Part III: *Numbers and Deuteronomy* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1911] [cf. N 1]; Alan E. Brooke and Norman McLean, eds., Volume I: *The Octateuch*, Part IV: *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1917] [cf. N 1]; Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. J. Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek*, Volume II: *The Later Historical*

mostly alternate spellings, for each.[174] The Syriac Peshitta consistently renders Balaam's name as *bl'm* and Beor's name as *b'wr*.[175]

IBP's question 2 requires the date of the inscriptional person to be within about fifty years of the biblical person.[176] Although biblical chronology places Balaam within a particular time frame, the Tell Deir ʿAllā inscription does not mention any time frame for him,[177] and the date of the epigraph, 700 B.C.E., is several centuries after the biblical date of Balaam. Therefore, this inscription neither establishes nor disproves historicity for the biblical Balaam and his father Beor.[178]

It is noteworthy regarding question 2, setting, that there is one indication in the direction of historicity. It relates to the region and its peoples that are consistently associated with the Balaam traditions: the inscription "is a Transjordanian inscription written by a non-Israelite group, which focuses on Balaam son of Beor who was in the Hebrew Bible, of course, a prophet of a non-Israelite people who lived in that area east of the Jordan."[179] The epigraph itself was recovered from Trans-Jordan, where the book of Numbers indicates that Balaam prophesied regarding Israel (Num 22:39; 23:14,28). Although this geographical overlap of data can be understood as a necessary part of the picture required for historicity, alone it is not sufficient to establish the requisite historical setting.

Still, the question of an ID or a non-ID *per se*, although normally used in historical study, is also applicable in the literary realm, which includes folk traditions.[180] In a new, folk-tradition category, one may ask question

---

Books, Part IV: *I Esdras, Ezra-Nehemiah* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1935], in which Neh 13:2 = Εσδρας B 23:2 [cf. N 1]; Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim* [N 95].

[174] When referring to the father of Balaam, βεωρ is the consistent LXX rendering. Codex Alexandrinus has βαιωρ in Num 24:3 (where Lugdunensis has βεχωρ), 15,22; 31:8.

[175] Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac*, part I fascicle 2, part II fascicle 1b: *Leviticus—Numbers—Deuteronomy—Joshua* (D. J. Lane, A. P. Hayman, W. M. van Vliet, J. H. Hospers, H. J. W. Drijvers, J. E. Erbes, eds.; Leiden: Brill, 1991) (cf. N 1); A. Gelston (N 99); *Kᵉtābā ʾ Qadîšā ʾ: Dîatîqî ʿAtîqtā ʾ* (N 1).

[176] *IBP*, 43. On question 2 in general, see *IBP*, 39, 43–49, and examples above.

[177] Although I suspect that the genre of the inscription is probably responsible for the absence of a date, I leave to others to research whether its genre omits a date or permits but does not require a date.

[178] In this instance, the lack of a date supersedes the problem of the long gap between the date of this inscription and the biblical date several centuries earlier. Some scholars have argued that lengthy gaps between inscription and referent are not to be considered automatic refutations of historical claims, e.g., Jens B. Kofoed, *Text and History: Historiography and the Study of the Biblical Text* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005): 83–104.

[179] Hackett, *Balaam Text* (N 165): 125.

[180] On one hand, some scholars consider any biblical ID of such early figures in the realm of *history* to be impossible. On the other hand, some scholars have taken the step of *assuming* the IDs of the *literary* Balaam and Beor of Numbers 22–24 in the Tell Deir

2, regarding setting but not require a satisfactory answer to it, thereby obviating any assertion or implication of historicity. Such a category seems well suited to the folk-tradition IDs in this inscription.

In answer to question 3, the instance of Balaam, the three identifying marks of an individual are name, patronym, and occupational ability: seer of divine visions. These same data provide three identifying marks of Beor: name, son's name, and son's occupational ability. A fourth aspect in common is that Numbers 22–24 and the Tell Deir ʿAllā inscription show what P. K. McCarter observes to be "[t]he *modus operandi* of the seer," which is "the same in both reports. God/the gods (*ʾĕlōhîm*/ *ʾilāhīn*) come to him at night and give him messages which he reports to his clients in the morning."[181] A fifth aspect in common is the set of similarities in the terms used in the report of his vision.[182] Thus, according to all categories of available data (the minimum of three marks of an individual required for each reliable literary or folk-tradition ID, plus the seer's *modus operandi*, plus similarities in the report of the vision), the portrayals in Numbers and in this inscription are reflexes of the same tradition.[183] Whereas the book of Numbers purports to present Balaam and Beor as historical figures, and by including them makes them figures in the realm of Israelite religious literature, this inscription establishes them as folk-traditional figures in the realm of a parallel religious literature, while bypassing the question of historicity. Therefore, in this instance, the three identifying marks of an individual establish not grade 3 IDs that would indicate the historicity of these two biblical persons, but rather, two folk-tradition *level* 3 IDs, i.e., IDs based on three or more identifying marks of each of the individuals but lacking the historical setting that would have been required to establish their historicity.

ʿAlla inscription. From its initial publication during the period when a comprehensive set of protocols for establishing IDs and non-IDs of biblical persons in ancient inscriptions had not yet been formulated, editors and authors simply assumed the IDs of the *literary* figures in this inscription and in Numbers 22–24, e.g., ibid., 33–34; idem, "Some Observations on the Balaam Tradition at Deir ʿAllā," *BA* 49 (1986): 216. Although *IBP*, 236, 252, is flawed regarding historical setting, yet it avoids both immediate rejection and simple assumption of such IDs by providing brief, preliminary evaluations based on orderly analysis, with the result that validity or invalidity can be judged by objective criteria.

[181] P. Kyle McCarter Jr., "The Balaam Texts from Deir ʿAllā: The First Combination," *BASOR* 239 (1980): 57.

[182] Ibid.

[183] Ibid., 49, 57–58; similarly Hackett, *Balaam Text* (N 165): 25–89 passim, 125.

IV. METHODOLOGY: A CORRECTION

It is necessary to delete statements about "matching seal-bulla and bulla-bulla pairs." In *IBP*, 41, point 2, numbered paragraph 2), an unguarded statement fails to consider the possibility that forgeries which mimic authentic inscriptions can be made after authentic inscriptions are discovered. It reads, "Also, if a seal and bulla match, or if two bullae were made by the same seal, and one is provenanced and one not, then unless disqualified, the unprovenanced exemplar is presumably authentic."[184] An appropriate correction appears in the unpublished dissertation of van der Veen: "[But] if the unprovenanced specimen appears on the market [after] the provenanced example had come to light . . . . a forger can . . . use the provenanced item as his model to work from, and hence the authenticity is not guaranteed."[185]

V. PAGE-BY-PAGE CORRECTIONS NOT MENTIONED ABOVE WHICH ARE RELATED TO MAKING IDENTIFICATIONS

In addition to the corrections mentioned above, the following corrections to *IBP* are important. Most relate to outcomes in terms of IDs:

Page Correction and Explanation

20   Lines 4 and 5 of the top paragraph and the second line of the paragraph quoted from Nelson Glueck immediately below it all refer to a "ring." The artifact in which the seal of Yatom is set, however, is best described as a "pendant."[186] *WSS* states that the seal, 11 mm. long, is in a "bronze swivel mount, c. 22 mm. in length, to be worn on a chain."[187] On page 20, line 4, delete "ring" and substitute the phrase "in a bronze swivel mount pendant." On line 5, delete the word "ring."

41   Under the heading "1.23 Criterion 3 . . . ," at the end of the first

---

[184] In *IBP* and this article, a seal is defined as "the hard object which makes the impression in the softer material" (ibid., 1 n. 1).

[185] van der Veen, "Final Phase of Iron Age IIC" (N 162): 74–75 n. 354. This error is unfortunately illustrated in Robert Deutsch, "Tracking Down Shebnayahu, Servant of the King: How an Antiquities Market Find Solved a 42-Year-Old Excavation Puzzle," *BAR* 35, no. 3 (May/June 2009): 45–49, 67. See N 27 above.

[186] For this correction, I wish to thank Robert Deutsch, private communication, May 3, 2007, accompanied by an image of the seal in its mount.

[187] *WSS*, no. 1054.

paragraph, insert the following continuation of that paragraph:

No inscription whose authenticity is unknown can be said to contain a valid ID, precisely because the data that would form the basis for any ID in such an inscription might be false. Infrequently, the authenticity of an unprovenanced inscription can be established, as in the instances of the logically presumable authenticity of the seal of Abiyaw and the seal of Shubnayaw/Shebanyaw (see each below in chapter 4, under their respective headings "Authenticity"). But almost all unprovenanced inscriptions fail to meet the requirement of known authenticity that is set up in question 1. Even if the data in an inscription of unknown authenticity were to meet the general setting requirements of question 2 and question 3's requirement of identifying marks of an individual, still any potential ID in an inscription of unknown authenticity can never be more than a conditional ID, i.e., would-be ID, instead of an ID. A conditional ID is conditional upon demonstration of the authenticity of the inscription and cannot be considered established.

58   On the seventh line from the top of the page, between "ancient evidence." and "Grade S," insert without quotation marks: "The fact that in modern times, we know of no other person who could be identified in a particular inscription does not establish that no such person existed. Grade S IDs proceed on knowledge, rather than lack of knowledge or absence of evidence."

Also on p. 58, near the bottom, after the word "Authenticity": delete the rest of the line and insert without quotation marks: "5) Unknown."

On the same page, in the second-to-last line of text (above footnotes), delete the word "an" and replace the poorly chosen word "inscription" with "paleography." Because this seal appeared on the antiquities market and has no demonstrated authenticity, it is impossible to affirm it to be an eighth-century inscription.

82   In the fourth and fifth lines under the heading "2.7 Grade D non-identifications: disqualified," delete the word "ring" (see the correction on page 20, listed above). In the seventh line below that heading, after the words "Description: This", delete the words "copper signet ring" and substitute the words "bronze swivel mount pendant." Also, at the end of that paragraph, insert the

following, including a footnote referencing Kitchen's review: "It could represent a copper ingot of the ox-hide type, as a symbol of the local copper-smelting industry.[188] It could also depict a vessel made of a ewe's skin to express the fate of the ram's mother, as a play on the name *Yātôm*, which means 'orphan'. Cf. the unprovenanced stone seal 'of *ʾŎnîāhû*, so / n of *Mêrab*' (*WSS*, no. 84), which depicts a ship (*ʾŏnîyāʰ*)."

83   In the heading, immediately under the words "Fig. 6," delete the word "Ring" (see the correction on page 20, listed above).

84   On the second line, delete the word "ring" (see the correction on page 20, listed above).

88   As K. A. Kitchen's review of *IBP* points out, *IBP*, 87–88 n. 57, point 3, reveals ignorance of the fact that in Assyrian terminology referring to rulers, " 'son' of X means merely a successor of X as its ruler, and *not* necessarily implying any physical/family relationship at all—this was all solved by E.[ckhard Axel Otto] Unger . . . ."[189] In point 3, delete all from "But the Bible . . ." to "107." Insert a footnote referencing Unger and including my statement: "In Assyrian inscriptional treatments of relationships between rulers, the term *son* can refer to a successor who is not a descendant."

121 In note 63, from the phrase "ביתדוד as 'kitchen' could be a similar GN, but no such GN" delete the word "such." In that phrase, immediately after "GN", insert: "having such a meaning."

122 Kitchen's review corrects a different point 3, in the text: "Bit-Dawid (like Bit-Khumri [Omri]) is the name of a state, *and therefore is also a geographic entity*. Freedman and Geoghegan err here.[190] In my *JSOT* 1997 paper,[191] I listed a whole series of Bit-names all round the 1st-millennium Near East in various geographical locations; [*IBP*] p. 195 [*sic*, actually 125–126] catches

---

[188] Kitchen (N 2): third from last paragraph.

[189] Ibid.

[190] David N. Freedman and Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, " 'House of David' Is There!" *BAR* 21, no. 2 (March/April 1995): 78–79.

[191] K. A. Kitchen, "A Possible Mention of David in the Late Tenth Century B.C.E., and Deity *Dod as Dead as the Dodo?" *JSOT* 76 (1997): 29–44, esp. 38–39.

up on the reality via Rendsburg.[[192]]”[193] On *IBP*, 122, under point 3, delete the words "entirely" and "completely." At the end of that same sentence, add the phrase, "unless it refers to the territory belonging to the state whose dynasty was founded by a ruler named David (see point 7 below in this list)." Delete note 67.

125   Delete the following sentence: "Since דוד and ביתדוד have already been shown above not to be clearly identifiable as GNs or DNs, the remaining category of proper nouns is that of PNs, which include RNs." Substitute this sentence: "Since דוד has already been shown above not to be clearly identifiable as a DN, and since ביתדוד is a phrase that follows the Aramaic usage for the name of a state of which a prominent dynasty was founded by the ruler whose RN follows the word בית, the remaining category of proper nouns is that of PNs, more specifically, RNs."

126   In accordance with the above change made on p. 122, on the fifth line from the top of the page, delete the phrase "as a GN."

134   On the second line of the third paragraph, in the Megiddo seal "belonging to Asaph" (*WSS*, no. 85), his Hebrew name should be spelled ʾalep samek pe, not ʾalep šin pe.[194]

153   At the beginning of the title of ch. 4, insert without quotation marks: "Would-Be." Include this insertion at the beginning of running heads on recto pages from pp. 155–195.

164   In relation to Fig. 14, Kitchen's review observes that "The Egyptian crown is not loaded with pomegranates! The whole thing is the *hmhmt*-crown which sports three *Atef*-type crowns (M.[ykytiuk]'s pomegranates) upon horns, as here."[195] On *IBP*, 164, in the third line from the top of the page, after the word "iconography," insert the phrase "depicting a *hmhmt*-crown." In the third and fourth lines from the top of that same page, delete the phrase "an Egyptian crown on which rest three pomegranates" and substitute the phrase "horns upon which rest three *Atef*-type crowns."

---

[192] Gary A. Rendsburg, "On the Writing ביתדוד in the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan," *IEJ* 45 (1995): 22–25.

[193] Kitchen (N 2): third from last paragraph, emphasis his.

[194] For this correction, I wish to thank Robert Deutsch for his private communication, May 8, 2007.

[195] Kitchen (N 2): third from last paragraph.

164 Under "Question 1: reliability of inscriptional data," after "Authenticity:" delete the rest of that line and insert: "5) Unknown."

169 Under "Question 1: reliability of inscriptional data," after "Authenticity:" delete the rest of that line and insert: "5) Unknown."

179 Under "Question 1: reliability of inscriptional data," after "Authenticity:" delete the rest of that line and insert: "5) Unknown."

191 Under "Question 1: reliability of inscriptional data," after "Authenticity:" delete the rest of that line and insert: "5) Unknown."

200 Delete the conditional IDs of persons (46) Neriah and (47) Baruch in two bullae now exposed as probable forgeries (see the paragraph above beginning "1 and 2" and the following paragraph). Also delete the ID of person (48) Jerahmeel, which is now downgraded from grade 3 to grade 2 (see the paragraph above beginning "9"). Three effects of deleting these three IDs are 1) to reduce the number of "Virtually certain to reliable [grade] 3" IDs in unprovenanced inscriptions to zero (not counting IDs affirmed in the present article), 2) to reduce the "Total number of conditional IDs in four [not six] inscriptions" to 4, not "7," and 3) to reduce the "Total number of persons conditionally identified in these inscriptions" to 4, not "7."

In the paragraph at the foot of *IBP*, 200, "six" should be changed to "four," and "seventeen" should be changed to "fourteen," keeping in mind that an ID is an *instance* of identifying a biblical person, so this total is not a count of *persons* identified. On the bottom line of page 200, insert "and" between "kings," and "the."

201 At the top of the page, delete ", two more royal officials and Baruch's father, Neriah, who might have been a commoner." In the third paragraph on this page, delete the sentence, "But there would also be added IDs of Neriah, Baruch, and Jerahmeel."

204 In the paragraph beginning "Episode 5," delete the sentence beginning, "If the [57 group] bullae of Baruch . . ." and ending "and (48) Jerahmeel."

205 On the second line under "5.5 Promising directions for further investigation," change "nine to sixteen" to "nine to twelve." In the

first place, "nine to sixteen" originally should have been "nine to fifteen," because in chapter 5, Hilkiah the high priest appears both in the list of IDs in provenanced inscriptions and in the list of IDs in marketed (i.e., unprovenanced) inscriptions. This double listing occasioned my mistake of counting him twice, but a double listing does not make him two persons. Also to be subtracted from "sixteen" are the conditional IDs of persons (46) Neriah and (47) Baruch in two bullae now exposed as probable forgeries (see the paragraph above beginning "1 and 2" and the following paragraph). Further, the ID of person (48) Jerahmeel has been downgraded from grade 3 to grade 2 (see the paragraph above beginning "9"), so it is not to be counted. Because of these four subtractions, the ceiling, i.e., the maximum number of possible IDs if the remaining four unprovenanced inscriptions in *IBP*, 200, were demonstrated to be authentic, is not sixteen but twelve persons.

214 In note 3, delete the phrase "might also be named" and substitute the phrase "has a grade 2 ID." At the end of that same paragraph, insert the following paragraphs without the footnotes here:

> Kitchen's review makes effective use of *IBP*'s protocols and brings to bear his expertise in the chronology of ancient Egypt for the inscriptional date of 924 B.C.E., two years after Pharaoh Shoshenq I's invasion of Palestine and within about forty-five years of the biblical King David. It proposes a grade SI+SB ID, or at least a grade 3 ID, based on the fact that we know of no other David in that time and place (K. A. Kitchen, *SEE-J Hiphil* 2 [2005]: fourth paragraph from the end, accessed: September 7, 2005, available: http://www.see-j.net/hiphil; select "Vol. 2 [2005]"). The fact that we know of no other person having that particular name from the same time and place, however, does not establish that there was, in fact, no other to whom the inscription might refer.[196] Therefore, on that point I cannot find grounds for an ID based on singularity.

> The more reliable of the two identifying marks of an individual is:

---

[196] Unfortunately, *IBP* does not clarify this point in chapter 2, hence the first of two corrections above for *IBP*, 58. I myself made precisely the same kind of miscalculation with different IDs in the early stages of the development of *IBP*'s identification protocols and had to correct them. I appreciate Kitchen's use of the protocols in *IBP* to evaluate this ID and its classification pattern for expressing results. That pattern of six grades is partly intended to provide a set of terms in common for convenient use in discussions.

√ the PN David, based on Kitchen's argument for the Egyptian hieroglyphic spelling *dwt* for the Hebrew *dwd* (in the fourth paragraph from the end of his review cited in N 2 above).

Under criterion 10, the other mark of identification of an individual is:

√ a match—more likely than not—between the geographic area where the biblical David hid from King Saul, namely the Negev, and the area which the Egyptian royal inscription that Kitchen treats refers to as *hadabiyat-dawit*, "the heights (or highland) of David." According to the geographically organized sequence in the inscription, this area should be in the southern part of Judah or the Negev. The following considerations tip the scale toward a GN that plausibly incorporates the PN of the biblical David, rather than the name of some other person named David:

1. The Hebrew phrase *ʿîr dāwid* or, spelled with a *yod*, *ʿîr dāwîd*, "the city of David" (2 Sam 5:7,9; 6:10, etc.; 1 Kgs 2:10, etc.; Isa 22:9; 1 Chr 11:5,7, etc. [*BHS*]) incorporates his RN into a phrase that is a GN, establishing the plausibility of his RN being incorporated within other GNs, as well.

2. The Hebrew term *bêt dāwid* can refer to the particular dynasty founded by David by incorporating his RN into the phrase. Isa 7:13 illustrates this meaning as the prophet Isaiah addresses the contemporaneous representative of that dynasty, Ahaz, king of Judah. In Aramaic usage, which became internationalized partly through Akkadian, the phrase *bytdwd* in the Tel Dan stele incorporates David's RN into an Aramaic phrase pattern which designates, as Kitchen observes,[197] the name of a state. Because a state possesses a particular territory, this phrase also functions as an Aramaic GN which incorporates David's RN. (On "The Use of *bayt*-names for Kingdoms, Early 1st Millennium BCE" [Kitchen's heading in the following article], see K. A. Kitchen, "A Possible Mention of David in the Late Tenth Century B.C.E., and Deity *Dod as Dead as the Dodo?" *JSOT* 76 [1997]: 38–39; Gary A. Rendsburg, "On the Writing ביתדוד in the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan," *IEJ* 45 (1995): 22–25, quoted and applied in *IBP*, 125–126.)

3. Keeping in mind that the Hebrew Bible finds no need to distinguish the David who became king from any other, and translating the Egyptian inscriptional GN *hadabiyat-dawit* into an

---

extrabiblical Hebrew phrase *rāmôt dāwid, "the heights of David" (parallel to the biblical *rāmôt gilʿād*, of 1 Kgs 22:3, etc.), from which the Egyptian GN might reasonably have been derived, it would certainly seem forced to posit another individual named David whose PN is incorporated into this Egyptian phrase.

220   On the first line, delete the word "ring" (see the correction on page 20, listed above).

242   In the entry for Nebuchadnezzar, after "2 Kgs 24:1ff," append a footnote on an ID of a biblical person in an East Semitic inscription, which, like several other items already footnoted in Appendix B, is peripheral to *IBP*'s focus on Northwest Semitic inscriptions. This footnote or an appendix may include the following information:

> On July 10, 2007, the British Museum announced that a visiting researcher, Assyriologist Dr. Michael Jursa, a professor at the University of Vienna, in the course of translating a small Babylonian cuneiform clay tablet, discovered that it mentions the name and title of one of Nebuchadnezzar II's high officials who also seems to be mentioned in the book of Jeremiah. The 2.13 in. (5.5 cm.) wide tablet is reported to have been excavated at the site of the ancient city of Sippar, near Babylon, as part of a large temple archive excavated for the British Museum in the 1870s.[198] The tablet's acquisition number and parenthetical date, BM 114789 (1920-12-13, 81), reveal that it was acquired by the Museum in 1920. It is a receipt for gold sent to a temple, dated to the tenth year of Nebuchadnezzar II's reign, i.e., 595–594 B.C.E.
>
> The initial peer-reviewed article on this inscription is Bob Becking, "The Identity of Nabu-sharrussu-ukin, the Chamberlain: An Epigraphic Note on Jeremiah 39,3. With an Appendix on the Nebu[(1)]sarsekim Tablet by Henry Stadhouders," *Biblische Notizen* NF 140 (2009): 35–46.[199] After mentioning Jursa's preliminary translation appearing on the Internet, Stadhouders is surely right in

---

[198] Dalya Alberge, "Museum's Tablet Lends New Weight to Biblical Truth," *The Times Online*, July 11, 2007, accessed: December 15, 2008, available: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article2056362.ece.

[199] I appreciate Bob Becking's making use of *IBP*'s three questions to evaluate this ID and also its classification scheme to grade the ID's strength. As mentioned above, one intent behind the book is to provide a set of terms in common for convenient use in discussions.

observing that Jursa's coming edition, which does not yet seem to
have appeared in print, "will become the scholarly *textus receptus*
as a matter of course" (ibid., 42).

According to Stadhouders' Appendix, the official's name,
which appears in line 1, is "ᵖ.ᵈ⁺AG-LUGAL-*su*-GIN," i.e., *Nabû-
šarrussu-(u)kīn*, and his title, in line 2, is: "LÚ.GAL.SAG," i.e.,
rab ša-rēši (ibid., 41–42). The biblical name and title that seem to
correspond are *-nəbû śar-səkîm rab-sārîs*, in Jer 39:3 (*BHS*). The
series of names and the information that accompanies each in that
verse, however, are divided up in various ways in the Hebrew Bible
and the ancient versions.

Regarding the potential ID of *Nabû-šarrussu-(u)kīn*, *rab ša-rēši*
in the clay tablet BM 114789 (which Jursa examined) as the bib-
lical official *-nəbû śar-səkîm rab-sārîs*, "Nebo-sarsekim the Rab-
saris," of Jer 39:3 (*BHS*):

As for question 1, reliability of data, this provenanced, excavated
tablet must be considered authentic (ibid., 38). Regarding Jer 39:3,
centuries of confusion about how its text should be divided into
names and their associated information can be resolved through the
data supplied in the Nebu⁽¹⁾sarsekim Tablet (ibid., 35–36, 40). The
limited potential for circular reasoning from the inscriptional side,
rather than the biblical side, which arises from the tablet's role in
interpreting this verse, does not withstand the clear advance in the
interpretation of Jer 39:3. It would seem strange to object that our
understanding of the names and titles of Babylonian officials in that
verse is too Babylonian (and too clear), especially in view of the
chronic misunderstanding of Jer 39:3 on the part of many genera-
tions of Bible translators and interpreters. The bewildering variety
of renderings of this verse in ancient biblical manuscripts has now,
as if mercifully, been rendered passé (ibid., 40, last paragraph).

Regarding question 2, the setting of the inscriptional person
matches the setting of the biblical person. Despite questions of fine
points in chronology, the date of the tablet and the final Babylonian
conquest of Jerusalem are separated, as an outer limit, by little
more than a decade during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II (within
the eleven years from 597 to 586 according to Zedekiah's regnal
dates in Gershon Galil, *The Chronology of the Kings of Israel and
Judah* [Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
9; New York: Brill, 1996]: 147). Becking's dates imply a gap of
only about four years, using Babylonian documentation for both
events (Becking, "Identity," 39, esp. n. 21). The socio-political set-
ting of the potentially identifiable person is not only Babylonian,

but that of a member of the court elite, as can be seen both in the Babylonian tablet and in Hebrew Scripture (ibid., 39).

Regarding question 3, only two marks of the inscriptional person match those of the biblical person: name and title, but the latter introduces a high degree of exclusivity which makes this ID higher than grade 2 (the ultimate example of an exclusive title is *melek* plus name of kingdom). The title "LÚ.GAL.SAG," i.e., *rab ša-rēši*, is not a generic title that applies to a whole class of officials, analogous to *'ebed* and *śar* in the royal hierarchies of the Levant. Rather, one can make a reasonable argument that when *rab* is the first of two or more elements in a Neo-Babylonian title, it designates one who holds a high office over others.[200] In particular, the extant evidence regarding *rab ša-rēši* indicates that this office and title belonged to only one person at a time.[201] Northwest Semitic usage also supports the use of *rab* as an element in titles held by only one individual at a time.[202]

That one official in this position could be succeeded by one or more others within a short time is possible, but that two different, consecutive or nearly consecutive office-holders would both have the precisely the same name is highly implausible.[203] Even if it

[200] Having shown that *rabbātî baggōyim* in Lam 1:1 (*BHS*), usually translated "great among the nations," is better rendered as "noble among nations," Adele Berlin observes, "An alternate source that may account for the pair *rbty/šrty* is Akkadian, which has the words *rubû*, 'prince' (derived from *rabû*, 'to be great') and *šarru*, 'king'. These Akkadian cognates, perhaps even more than Hebrew *rb* and *śr*, designate majesty and high station" (Adele Berlin, "On the Meaning of *rb*," *JBL* 100 (1981): 90).

[201] "The title *rab ša-rēši* (Hebrew *rab-śariś*) is best attested as a Neo-Assyrian title. The Sumerogram is LÚ.GAL.SAG. It is sparsely attested in the Neo-Babylonian letters and in the Nabopolassar Epic ii 12 (*CAD*, *R*: 289–290, s.v. *Rab ša-rēši*). Though it is arguable, I think that the Neo-Babylonian monarchs clearly used Neo-Assyrian governmental forms and titles, creating Neo-Babylonian usage that is probably analogous to that of the Neo-Assyrian period. In both cases, I see no evidence that the title is anything other than a term used for a single individual. In fact, there is no hint that it is anything but a singular person" (Mark W. Chavalas, private communication, April 24, 2009). I wish to thank Mark Chavalas for guiding me through the evidence.

[202] Analogous titles or epithets beginning with *rab* which imply or seem to designate only one person at a time appear in *KTU* and *KAI*. Perhaps the clearest example illustrating a single office-holder is the title *rb khnm*, "high priest," found in *KTU* 1.6 (in the colophon) and 2.4. More distant examples are five provenanced, Punic inscriptions treated in *KAI* 65 line 10; *KAI* 81 lines 8, 9; *KAI* 93 lines 3, 4; *KAI* 95 line 1; and *KAI* 96 line 8. Unprovenanced *KAI* 59 is a "bilingual inscription (Greek and Phoenician) [which in line 2] speaks of a high priest (*rb khnm*) of Nergal" (*TDOT*, s.v. כֹּהֵן *kōhēn*, 7:64–65). Though unprovenanced, *KAI* 59 was discovered in 1841, long before anyone, including potential forgers, could have known the appropriate paleographic details for such an inscription, therefore, is demonstrably authentic; cf. note 11, second paragraph, above.

[203] This argument has already been tersely stated by Becking, "Identity" (ɴ 136): 39. Cf.

were theoretically possible for two or more officials to hold the title *rab ša-rēši* simultaneously, for two of these to have had exactly the same name would still be highly implausible. Therefore, it is most unlikely that we would have here two individuals bearing the same name and title, Jeremiah 39:3 referring to one and the tablet referring to some other. It is safe to conclude that the *Nabû-šarrussu-(u) kīn rab ša-rēši* in the clay tablet BM 114789 of 595–594 B.C.E. and -*nəbû śar-səkîm rab-sārîs*, "Nebo-sarsekim the Rab-saris," named in Jer 39:3's description of events of about 586 B.C.E. are one and the same person.

At the same time, however, because this ID relies on reducing the chances of misidentification,[204] rather than an utterly inescapable case, and because this ID rests partly on modern reasoning regarding Neo-Babylonian usage (see N 201 above), I hesitate to classify it as a grade SI ID, which amounts to an assertion of fullest certainty. Instead, I agree with Becking, "Identity," 39, that because of the exclusivity of the official's name combined with the high degree of exclusivity built into the title, it should be classified as a grade 3, virtually certain ID.

On a separate but related matter, in his Appendix, Stadhouders observes, "Not only the question of whether our *Nabû-šarrussu-(u) kīn*, the *rab ša-rēši* is likely to be identical with the biblical figure of נְבוּ שַׁר־סְכִים, the רַב־סָרִיס also deserves scholarly debate; also worth considering is the possibility that he and his namesake who held the office of *ša rēš šarri* under Amel-Marduk [in the year 561] are one and the same individual" (ibid., 42). On this question, both Becking (ibid., 36–37) and Stadhouders refer to David S. Vanderhooft, *The Neo-Babylonian Empire and Babylon in the Latter Prophets* (HSM 59; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999): 151 and n. 115. There Vanderhooft suggested a possible identification of the person in BM 31491, dated to 561, with the one in Jer 39:3, but thought it impossible to prove. This second tablet was published in Ronald H. Sack, *Amel-Marduk 562-560 B.C.: A Study based on Cuneiform, Old Testament, Greek, Latin, and Rabbinical Sources, with Plates* (AOAT 4; n.p.: Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1972): 68 no. 23.

278–285 Replace Appendix F's six complicated tables with the following simpler list of biblical persons identified:

---

the unlikelihood of more than one Mesha in *IBP*, 108, fourth paragraph, in which the length of time required to bring about a full-scale rebellion is taken into account.

[204] *IBP*, 58.

In inscriptions of known authenticity, in *the corpus of reliable IDs*, there are sixteen biblical persons in two grades, S and 3 (person numbers in *IBP* are in parentheses):[205]

In grade S (including grades SI+SB, SI, and SB) are ten biblical persons: *IBP*'s persons (2) David, king of Israel, (7) Omri, king of Israel, (12) Jeroboam II, king of Israel, (20) Uzziah/Azariah, king of Judah, (69) Mesha, king of Moab, (71) Hazael, king of Aram at Damascus, (72) Ben-hadad, son of Hazael and king of Aram at Damascus, (73) Tiglath-pileser III, king of Assyria, (74) Sargon II, king of Assyria, and (75) Sennacherib, king of Assyria.

In grade 3 are six biblical persons. The seventh, Hazael, is not counted, because he is also in grade S. The eighth and ninth mentioned here, Balaam and Beor, cannot be considered grade 3 IDs, because they are named in an inscription that records an undated religious tradition:

Grade 3 includes *IBP*'s persons (36) Shaphan the scribe and his son, (50) Gemariah; (37) Hilkiah the high priest and his son, (38) Azariah; plus a pair added in this article: (68a) Hadadezer, "the king of Aram,"[206] and his son (68b) Ben-hadad.[207] Listed above in grade S, as well as here, is (71) Hazael, king of Aram at Damascus. Folk-tradition level 3 IDs which do not include historicity of the person are (63) Beor and his son, (64) Balaam.[208] [Outside *IBP*'s stated scope and therefore not counted is the grade 3 ID of Nebo-sarsekim the Rab-saris in a Neo-Babylonian clay tablet, above in section V at p. 242.]

In the penumbra composed of reasonable but uncertain IDs, that is, all grade 2 IDs in inscriptions of known authenticity, currently there are seven biblical persons:

IBP's persons (25) Shebna, the overseer of the palace, (61) Jaazaniah/Jezaniah, son of the Maacathite, and (77) Baalis, king of the Ammonites, plus two pairs [added in this article] which are currently considered to be at least grade 2 but might, potentially, be placed in a higher grade: (58d) Shelemiah and his son (58e)

---

[205] This number adds seven reliable, historical IDs in authentic inscriptions to the nine listed in *IBP*'s chap. 5, "Conclusions," by gathering other such IDs from *IBP*'s Appendix B (which covers more inscriptions than *IBP*'s five chapters) and by adding others treated in this article. These sixteen IDs and nine others mentioned in the rest of this section are briefly described in my "Sixteen Positively Identified Biblical Persons et al. in Authentic Northwest Semitic Inscriptions from before 539 B.C.E.," in *New Inscriptions and Seals Relating to the Biblical Word* (Meir Lubetski, ed.; Atlanta: SBL, forthcoming).

[206] Referred to anonymously as "the king of Aram" in 1 Kgs 22:1 through 2 Kgs 6:23.

[207] Assassinated by Hazael, mentioned in 2 Kgs 6:24 through 8:15.

[208] See IDs 29 and 30 above.

J(eh)-ucal; (59a) Pashhur and his son (59b) Gedaliah. [Outside *IBP*'s stated scope and therefore not counted is the grade 2 ID of King David in an Egyptian inscription, above in section V at p. 214.]

Counting the corpus of sixteen reliable IDs in authentic Northwest Semitic inscriptions listed above as a firm minimum, these seven grade 2 IDs in the penumbra create a maximum *potential* of twenty-three biblical persons identifiable in authentic Northwest Semitic inscriptions from before the Persian era.

Grade 1 IDs and grade 0 and D non-IDs in inscriptions of known authenticity are usually insignificant. Also, "candidate" IDs, i.e., those in grades S, 3, and 2 in inscriptions of unknown authenticity, have only potential significance. Both of these groups are omitted here.

VI. A CLASSIFIED SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THIS ARTICLE[209]

The following is a list of all IDs and non-IDs in this article. I hope to incorporate these, along with others I might have missed and more from future developments, into a second edition of the book within several years.

A. IDs and non-IDs in inscriptions **of known authenticity** treated above (all being provenanced) are as follows:

- In *the corpus of reliable IDs*, i.e., those in grades SI+SB, SI, SB, and/or 3[210] in inscriptions of known authenticity, are the following:

   Hadadezer, "the king of Aram"[211] at Damascus and his son, **Benhadad**[212] (two grade 3 reliable IDs **15 & 16 above**[213]): in *IBP*, these would become persons (68a) and (68b), respectively, in inscription [77], the Melqart stele (correcting *IBP*, 237).

---

[209] This summary follows the pattern of presentation described in section I C 1 c above, with the addition of IDs and non-IDs in grades 1, 0, and/or D as they occur.

[210] For definitions of the various grades of IDs and non-IDs, see N 28 above.

[211] Referred to anonymously as "the king of Aram" in 1 Kgs 22:1 through 2 Kgs 6:23.

[212] Assassinated by Hazael, mentioned in 2 Kgs 6:24 through 8:15.

[213] In assigning ID numbers to father-and-son pairs, the lower number goes to the father.

Previously treated in *IBP*, **Shaphan** and his son, **Gemariah** (two grade 3 IDs **27 & 28 above**), *IBP*'s persons (50) and (36) respectively, in inscription [48] city of David bulla *lgmryhw / [b]n špn*, "belonging to *Gəmaryāhû*, [so]n of *Šāpān*," receive stronger, more direct support for a late seventh- to early sixth-century date from the paleography of a letter previously not considered in *IBP*, 139–147, which is corrected above.

It is possible that J(eh)ucal, Shelemiah, Gedaliah, and Pashhur, who are currently considered grade 2 or potentially higher and are listed under the next bullet below as being in the penumbra, might also eventually be listed as grade 3 IDs.

(Outside of the stated scope of *IBP* is a grade 3 virtually certain ID of **Nebo-sarsekim** the Rab-saris of Jer 39:3, whose name appears as *Nabû-šarrussu-(u)kīn rab ša-rēši* in the Neo-Babylonian clay tablet BM 114789 of 595–594 B.C.E., treated above in section V, "Page-By-Page Corrections," at p. 242. This ID was discovered in 2007, therefore not included in *IBP*.)

- Qualified to be in the penumbra composed of reasonable but uncertain IDs, that is, all grade 2 IDs in inscriptions of known authenticity, but potentially to be included above, are currently four IDs which are considered at least grade 2 and possibly higher:

  J(eh)ucal and **Shelemiah** (two grade 2 or potentially higher grade IDs **17 & 18 above**): person (58e) Jehucal or Jucal, son of Shelemiah, and person (58d) his father Shelemiah in inscription [67c] city of David bulla *lyhwkl b / [n] šlmyhw / bn šby*, "belonging to *Yəhûkal*, so / [n] of *Šelemyāhû*, / son of *Šōbî*" (discovered in 2005, therefore not included in *IBP*).

  Gedaliah and **Pashhur** (two grade 2 or potentially higher grade IDs **19 & 20 above**): person (59b) Gedaliah, son of Pashhur, and person (59a) his father Pashhur in inscription [67d] city of David bulla *lgdly-hw. / bn pšḥwr.*, "belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, son of *Pašḥûr*" (discovered in 2008, therefore not included in *IBP*).

  (Outside of the stated scope of *IBP* is a grade 2 ID of **David**, king of Israel, in a 924 B.C.E. inscription of Pharaoh Shoshenq I on the exterior south wall of the Temple of Amun at Karnak in Thebes. David's name is incorporated into the Egyptian GN *hadabiyat-dawit*, "the heights

(or highland) of David," treated above in section V, "Page-By-Page Corrections," at p. 214).

• Other IDs and non-IDs in inscriptions of known authenticity are:

Hazael (grade 1 ID **21 above**): *IBP*'s person (71) Hazael, king of Aram at Damascus, in inscription [82b] an Old Aramaic stele fragment from Tell Afis, Syria, published in 2003, line 5, "*lḥz ʾ*[*l*]" (discovered in 2003, therefore not included in *IBP*).

Gedaliah, son of Ahikam (grade 1 ID **22 above**): upgraded from a grade D non-ID to a grade 1 ID of *IBP*'s person (60) Gedaliah, governor of Judah and son of (39) Ahikam et al. in inscription [68] Tell ed-Duweir (Lachish) bulla *lgdlyhw* / *ʾšr ʿl hbyt*, "Belonging to *Gədalyāhû*, overseer of the palace" (correcting *IBP*, 235, 261).

Immer (grade 0 non-ID **23 above**): person (53b) Immer the priest, father of Pašḫûr, in inscription [62b] Jerusalem-area bulla / –*lyhw* / *ʾmr*, " / –*lyāhû*, / (son of) *ʾImmēr*." (discovered in 2005, therefore not included in *IBP*).

Azzur of Gibeon, father of Hananiah the false prophet (grade 0 non-ID **24 above**): downgraded because of date from a previous grade 2 ID in [66 group] the Gibeon jar handles inscribed *gbʿn* / *gdr* / *ʿzryhw*, "Gibeon. / Wall of / *ʿĂzaryāhû*" (correcting *IBP*, 234, 257).

Joash, king of Israel (grade 0 non-ID **25 above**) in inscription [10b], Kuntillet ʿAjrud pithos 1 inscription *ʾmr ʾ . . . hm . . . k* (discovered in 1975–1976 and published in 1978 but not included in *IBP*).

Goliath (grade D non-ID **26 above**: person (65b) Goliath of Gath, having a grade D non-ID in inscription [73b] Tel eṣ-Ṣafi ostracon in proto-Canaanite letters, *ʾlwt wlt* (discovered in 2005, therefore not included in *IBP*).

Balaam and his father, **Beor** (folk-tradition level 3 IDs **29 & 30** above, which do not include historicity of the persons) cannot be considered normal, historical, grade 3 IDs, because [72] the Tell Deir ʿAllā wall inscription on plaster supplies no date for the inscriptional persons (correcting *IBP*, 236, 252).

B. Conditional IDs and non-IDs in inscriptions **of unknown authenticity** treated above (all are unprovenanced) are as follows:

- *Candidates for the corpus of reliable IDs* (above), i.e., conditional IDs that would be in grades SI+SB, SI, SB, and/or 3, except that they cannot be considered reliable unless their authenticity has been demonstrated, are as follows:

   Esarhaddon (conditional grade SI ID **12 above**): a candidate for a grade SI ID is person (75b) Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, in inscription [87b] Aramean commercial clay tablet in the Moussaieff collection that begins with the PN *ʾAyaʿarāʰ* or *ʾAyaʿadāʰ*. Verso lines 16–17 are the date formula: *bymt.srḥdn.* / *mlk ʾ.*, "in the days of *Sarḥaddon*, / the king" (published in 2001 but not included in *IBP*).

- *Candidates for the penumbra* composed of reasonable but uncertain IDs (all in grade 2), i.e., conditional IDs that cannot become part of the penumbra unless their authenticity has been demonstrated, are:

   Jerahmeel, the king's son (conditional grade 2 ID **9 above**): *IBP*'s person (48) in unprovenanced [59] bulla "of *Yərahmə ʾēl*, / the king's son," formerly a conditional grade 3 "virtually certain" ID, must now be downgraded to a conditional grade 2 "reasonable but uncertain" ID (correcting *IBP*, 191–196, 232, 251).

   Hanan and **Igdaliah** (conditional grade 2 IDs **13 & 14 above**): the two candidates are person (58c) Hanan, son of Igdaliah, and person (58b) his father Igdaliah in [67b] unprovenanced bulla *lḥnnyhw b* / *n gdlyhw*, "belonging to *Ḥănanyāhû*, so / n of *Gədalyāhû*" (*WSS*, no. 504; ID published in 2003, therefore not included in *IBP*).

- Non-IDs in inscriptions of unknown authenticity are:

   Mikneiah, a Levitical singer and lyrist (grade D non-ID **10 above**): *IBP*'s person (4) in inscription [5] the seal of "*Miqnēyāw*, / minister of *Yahweh*," should be downgraded from a conditional grade 2 ID to grade D, disqualified, correcting a simple error involving the date (correcting *IBP*, 215, 253).

   Ahab, king of Israel (grade D non-ID **11 above**): person (8b) in unprovenanced inscription [8b] sixth-century bronze seal ring which bears the text, " *ʾAḥa ʾ . . . .*" (*IBP*, 260, n. 54) is disqualified because of

name and date (this non-ID should be inserted into Appendixes B and C, *IBP*, 216, 261, respectively).

C. Disqualified non-IDs in inscriptions that are forgeries, possible forgeries, probable forgeries, or fakes:

Baruch and **Neriah** (grade DF2 non-IDs **1 & 2 above**): persons (47) and (46), respectively, in [57 group] the two bullae "belonging to *Berekyāhû*, son of *Nērîyāhû*, the scribe," which are now understood to be probable forgeries (correcting *IBP*, 67–73, 188–190, 231–232, 251).

J(eh)oash, king of Israel, and **Josiah**, king of Judah (grade DF1 non-IDs **3** and **5 above**): persons (11) and (35) respectively, formerly considered two of the three candidates for one "possibly certain" grade SB conditional ID in inscription [10a] the "three shekels" ostracon, which is now disqualified as a modern forgery (correcting *IBP*, 216–217, 228, 247–248).

J(eh)oash, king of Judah and son of Ahaziah king of Judah (grade DF1 non-IDs **4** and **8 above**): a grade DF1 non-ID must be made regarding this J(eh)oash, *IBP*'s person (18)—formerly considered one of three candidates for one "possibly certain" grade SB conditional ID—in inscription [10a] the "three shekels" ostracon (correcting *IBP*, 218, 247–248). A second grade DF1 non-ID of this J(eh)oash, *IBP*'s person (18), must be made in inscription[16b], the so-called "J(eh) oash" plaque (published in 2003, therefore not included in *IBP*). Both of these inscriptions are now disqualified as modern forgeries.

Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, the priest (grade DF1 non-ID **6 above**): *IBP*'s person (19) in inscription [10a] the "three shekels" ostracon, disqualified as a modern forgery (correcting *IBP*, 218, 259).

Ahaziah, king of Judah, father of J(eh)oash, king of Judah (grade DF1 non-ID **7 above**): *IBP*'s person (17) in inscription [16b], the so-called "J(eh)oash" plaque, disqualified as a modern forgery (published in 2003, therefore not included in *IBP*).

VII. PERSONAL NAME INDEX

This article includes IDs and non-IDs of the following biblical persons as numbered herein. Note: the lower number goes to the father when this article assigns ID numbers to father-and-son pairs, as in *IBP*, in order to follow chronological order.

Ahab, king of Israel: grade D non-ID **11 above. UNPROVENANCED**

Ahaziah, king of Judah: grade DF non-ID **7 above. FORGERY**

Azzur of Gibeon (father of Hananiah the false prophet): grade 0 non-ID **24 above. AUTHENTIC**

Balaam, son of Beor: folk-tradition level 3 ID, **not including historicity, 30 above. AUTHENTIC**

Baruch the scribe, son of Neriah: grade DF2 non-ID **2 above. PROBABLE FORGERY**

Ben-hadad, son of Hadadezer, king of Aram at Damascus:[214] grade 3 ID **16 above. AUTHENTIC**

Beor, father of Balaam: folk-tradition level 3 ID, **not including historicity, 29 above. AUTHENTIC**

David, king of Israel: grade 2 ID in section V above, for p. 214. **AUTHENTIC**

Esarhaddon, king of Assyria: conditional grade SI ID **12 above. UNPROVENANCED**

Gedaliah, son of Ahikam and governor of Judah: grade 1 ID **22 above. AUTHENTIC**

Gedaliah, son of Pashhur: grade 2 or potentially higher grade ID **20 above. AUTHENTIC**

Gemariah, son of Shaphan the scribe: grade 3 ID **28 above. AUTHENTIC**

Goliath of Gath: grade D non-ID **26 above. AUTHENTIC**

Hadadezer, king of Aram at Damascus:[215] grade 3 ID **15 above. AUTHENTIC**

Hanan, son of Igdaliah: conditional grade 2 ID **14 above. UNPROVENANCED**

Hazael, king of Aram at Damascus: grade 1 ID **21 above. AUTHENTIC**

Igdaliah, father of Hanan: conditional grade 2 ID **13 above. UNPROVENANCED**

Immer the priest, father of Pashhur: grade 0 non-ID **23 above**. **AUTHENTIC**

J(eh)oash, king of Israel: grade DF1 non-ID **3 above. FORGERY** and grade 0 non-ID **25 above. PROVENANCED**

J(eh)oash, king of Judah: grade DF1 non-IDS **4 and 8 above. FORGERY**

J(eh)ucal, son of Shelemiah: grade 2 or potentially higher grade ID **18 above. AUTHENTIC**

---

[214] Assassinated by Hazael, mentioned in 2 Kgs 6:24 through 8:15.

[215] Referred to anonymously as "the king of Aram" in 1 Kgs 22:1 through 2 Kgs 6:23.

Jerahmeel, the king's son: conditional grade 2 ID **9 above. UNPROVENANCED**

Josiah, king of Judah: grade DF1 non-ID **5 above. FORGERY**

Mikneiah, a Levitical singer and lyrist: grade D non-ID **10 above. UNPROVENANCED**

Nebo-sarsekim the Rab-saris: grade 3 virtually certain ID in section V above, for p. 242. **AUTHENTIC**

Neriah, father of Baruch the scribe: grade DF2 non-ID **1 above. PROBABLE FORGERY**

Pashhur, father of Gedaliah: grade 2 or potentially higher grade ID **19 above. AUTHENTIC**

Shaphan the scribe, father of Gemariah: grade 3 ID **27 above. AUTHENTIC**

Shelemiah, father of J(eh)ucal: grade 2 or potentially higher grade ID **17 above. AUTHENTIC**

Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, the priest: grade DF1 non-ID **6 above. FORGERY**