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Problem

In scholarly debates on the origin of DA, the corpus of OA texts has not received full attention. Thus, there is a lack of comparative studies between DA and OA. This type of study serves a twofold purpose: It contributes to providing an answer to the questions of origin of DA, and it provides fresh insights into both OA and DA.

Method

This study of OA texts has been organized into seven sections which pertain to the literary and linguistic character of every one of the inscriptions: Description, Nature, Structure, Vocabulary, Orthography
and Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax. The discussion of each of these sections has brought its corresponding subject into contact with the text of DA.

Eight OA inscriptions dating from the ninth to the seventh centuries B.C. have been studied. To this six other inscriptions have been added since they come from a period of transition from OA into OfA.

Results

The text of DA in its present form contains a significant amount of material similar to OA texts. Literary evidence presented in this study on structure and vocabulary, as well as grammar (especially orthography) and syntax, points to the presence of early material in DA.

This contextual study of OA texts contributes to the present discussions on DA in that it presents the answers to certain objections raised regarding the traditional dating of DA. The study has produced a number of parallels which provide a better understanding of the literary, historical, and cultural situations of both dialects.

Three factors have to be accounted for in any conclusion on DA: geography, chronology, and the literary character of the text. The desideratum of this study is that the search for early dated features in DA should be pursued more intensively in the future.
To Bożana and Jonathan,
also to Daniel, a diligent student
with major in "sepher ulešôn kaśdim"
("the language and literature of
the Chaldeans" Dan 1:4)
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Preliminary Remarks

The Aramaic of Daniel (DA), together with the Aramaic of Ezra, a verse from Jeremiah, and two words of Genesis, forms an Aramaic dialect called Biblical Aramaic (BA), which is one of the three great languages in which the Bible was originally written. Yet, BA is

... only part of the mass of Aramaic material, for the language shares a place with Assyrian, Greek, Latin and French as an important international language of diplomacy and commerce. Hebrew is tremendously significant for its biblical association, but Aramaic was of even greater significance as a cultural medium in the ancient Near East.¹

The Aramaic language, having become the lingua

---


franca of the ancient Near East, covered a huge territory of the ancient world and consequently had a wide spectrum of dialects. Part of the difficulty in its study is that Aramaic was not definitely tied to any single national or ethnic group. "Most Aramaic we possess was not written by Arameans or within any particular Aramean state,"¹ and the same is true for BA, which probably was written by two exiled Jewish writers.

DA is not a problematic dialect per se, but its origin has been complicated by different approaches used in the studies on its origin and character.² This question is in need of a fresh approach, because of the material that has come up on the scene in the field of Aramaeology, and Old Aramaic (OA) inscriptions are noteworthy in this regard.³

For a Bible student, DA can be a starting point of interest, while OA the starting point of research. In this process of comparison, a normal historical approach would be to start from the older element of comparison, and based on that proceed into the more recent material. The opposite approach does not do justice to the older material. Having today a more complete picture of the

²This (fact) is seen in our survey of the debate on DA.
³Especially the Tell Fakhriyah inscription to which most of the second chapter in this study is devoted.
corpus of OA inscriptions, this task seems to be facilitated as never before. Yet, the consideration of OA texts in their total literary as well as grammatical context is highly desirable in a study of this character.

In this regard the question is raised whether OA texts can be efficiently used for the understanding, on the one hand, of the text of DA, and also to contribute to one's evaluation of the issues on the debate of the origin of DA. To this is closely related the question: Can the often assumed uniformity of the corpus of OA still be maintained, making that corpus an isolated ground in the discussions on DA? In other words, is there any fluidity in the grammar of OA texts, and do linguistic differences among them contribute to the discussions on DA?

The following study attempts to answer questions of this kind, and at the same time encourages more diligent work in seeking solutions to those questions. It points to a new direction, suggesting a fresh approach so needed in this ongoing debate. In the very beginning, however, one recognizes certain linguistic problems in dealing with the question of dating DA.

Problems in Dating DA

The problem of dating BA and, even more precisely, DA is a difficult one. There are many factors, uncertainties, and presuppositions involved in dealing
with the problem. We can recognize some of the most important ones:¹

1. First, one notes the confusion that comes about as a result of different opinions on the date of BA. Regardless of whether one dates DA in the second, fifth, or the sixth century B.C., it is BA that many scholars take as having the position de référence or the starting point for dating other Aramaic documents. This confusion has been evident in the different dates proposed for some Qumran documents such as the Genesis Apocryphon (lQapGen) and the Targum to Job (11Q). S. A. Kaufman, for example, is forced to go against his own conclusion and redate the Qumran documents because the book of Daniel "cannot have reached its final form until the middle of that [second] century."²

2. Another problem related to this field is the fact that we have no absolute dating technique in linguistics for Aramaic documents which come from a period of history that is so far from our time. Looking at the conclusions of certain studies which deal with the dating of Biblical Hebrew (BH) or BA based on linguistic evidence, one realizes that they have to be regarded in light of the more recent evidence as something that

¹On this the reader may want to check a number of good articles, the most important being E. Y. Kutscher, HAS, pp.347-412, and F. Rosenthal, "Aramaic Studies During the Past Thirty Years," JNES 37 (1978):81-91.

simply belongs to the past. Two examples may be given here in support of this observation. The first is one of F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman's dissertations in which the authors examined selected biblical texts based on their orthographic practices and patterns. In a postscriptum added to the dissertation twenty-five years later, the authors recognized the limitation of their thesis in the light of the presently available evidence.\(^1\) The second example is the confusion that has been witnessed in the dating of the \(1\)QapGen when three prominent scholars in the field assigned to its language three names very different from each other: for M. Black it was the age of the OA;\(^2\) for E. Y. Kutscher OA mixed with Middle Aramaic (MA);\(^3\) while J. Fitzmyer maintained that it was Late Aramaic (LA).\(^4\) Given the state of such uncertainty Fitzmyer acts energetically, not only stating that all three of them refer to the same period to which different names have been applied, but from this he has also developed a new "classification of the Aramaic

\(^1\)Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975). On p. 184 we have the authors themselves stating: "Rereading the dissertation, we recognize it to be a period piece, and reissue it as such."


\(^4\)GAQ, pp. 19-20.
dialects." One cannot help but wonder how much really is known about Aramaic, and how much is not known! The best illustration for this difficulty is that mysterious Deir Alla inscription. More and more scholars disagree that it can be classified as Aramaic. Says J. C. Greenfield:

A disservice was done to scholarship when it was called Aramaic. There is in my opinion, nothing in the inscription proper that qualifies the language in which it is written as Aramaic.\(^2\)

The same conclusion was reached in the study by J. A. Hackett.\(^3\)

F. Rosenthal's opinion is that "we have no criterion for deciding how different Aramaic dialects might originally have been and still be classifiable as Aramaic."\(^4\)

3. A further problem is a general lack of the OfA documents that would give us more evidence for particular phases and dialects of the Aramaic language. This scarcity of Aramaic material in general is stressed by Greenfield:

The student of ancient Near Eastern literature is at a disadvantage when dealing with Aramaic literature

\(^1\)Ibid.


since the corpus of texts at his disposal . . . is limited by the paucity of material that has reached us.

Although today we do possess much more evidence, Greenfield's statement sounds very much like the statement made by P. R. Ackroyd in 1953.2

4. Another, and this time a special intra-biblical problem, is our inability to know how much scribal updating was practiced in the transmission of DA. That there was some updating in this process of transmission is suggested by E. Tov's remark which confirms the study of J. Fischer: "The development of Hebrew orthography makes it likely that the Mss from which the LXX was translated were more 'defective' than MT."3

To this one can add a question recently raised on differences between a written and spoken language (or phonology versus orthography). Diez Macho has emphasized


3J. Fischer, "Zur Septuaginta-Vorlage im Pentateuch," BZAW 42 (1926):1-10., restated in The Text-Critical Use of the LXX in Biblical Research (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), p. 206. Facts like these do not leave much room for Form or Redaction Criticism in general, because in some areas of Aramaic, like studies of the Targums, we have not been able to solve the starting problem whether the first Targums were more literal (like Onkelos and the LXX) and only later expanded or vice-versa. On this see K. Le Daaut, "The Current State of Targumic Studies," BTB 4 (1974):18-22, where the author calls such approaches in this field "entirely arbitrary" (p. 20).
this phenomenon and he has given much evidence for it in Qumran Aramaic.¹ Without discussing the purpose behind his arguments for it, we have to recognize this phenomenon as one of the problems in dating Aramaic material. Questions such as; does the 'aleph or the he represent a consonant or a vowel-letter in a particular case? Is their exchange, in certain cases, due to orthography or phonetics? In many instances these questions have remained unanswered and no absolute conclusion may easily be reached about them.

5. Kutscher² was the scholar who made the most extensive study of problems related to the dialects of OfA and their bearing on the dating of BA. Not all scholars are ready to accept dialectal differences (especially the eastern type) at an early stage,³ yet Kutscher's argumentation seems valid and convincing. The specialized knowledge, however, that is required in order to assess the data and the arguments based on them keeps such a subject within a small circle of those equipped to make an independent judgment on these matters.⁴

6. The last but not the least problem to be

²HAS, pp. 347-404.
³Fitzmyer, GAQ, p. 20.
mentioned here is the role of a theological, exegetical, scholarly or any other presupposition in dealing with the language of the book of Daniel. That the dating of DA is subject to certain presuppositions was rightly recognized by Kenneth Kitchen.\(^1\) To illustrate this, let us examine two studies on the same subject, i.e., a comparison between DA and the Aramaic of 1QapGen. They use similar methodologies and yet they come to two opposite conclusions. In reading their conclusions one cannot help but wonder how different presuppositions may have influenced the conclusions of the scholars involved:

On linguistic grounds there is nothing to preclude a date in the second century B.C., since there is nothing that would require any long interval between the date of the Aramaic of Daniel and the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon*.

The second study concludes in this way:

The fact that Targumic and Talmudic words abound in this first-century document indicates a considerable interval in time between its composition and that of Ezra and Daniel.

If one feels that the latter scholar is just an apologist of an early date for DA, then one may also find that the former is not as objective as one might imagine,

\(^1\) NBD, p. 32.


since he is deliberately supporting an old hypothesis which must be radically reworked in light of the present evidence.¹

In spite of all these problems, scholars tend to agree on a standardized chronological division of the Aramaic language.² This list was first proposed by Fitzmyer³ and consequently adopted by Kutscher⁴:

a. Old Aramaic (900 - 700 B.C.)

b. Official Aramaic (700 - 300 B.C.)

¹Kutscher gives an opposite example worth mentioning: "I cannot refrain from mentioning one point which proves Baumgartner to be not only an excellent Aramaist, but also a modest and honest scholar. It was Baumgartner who tried to prove . . . that the differences between the A of Ezra and Daniel prove the earlier date of Ezra. Here . . . he admits that Schaeder's opinion is to be preferred" (HAS, p. 382).

²Earlier divisions of the Aramaic language were rather geographical than chronological, and they are still used by some scholars, even as recent as Klaus Beyer, Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984).

³Fitzmyer, GAQ, pp. 19-20.

⁴Kutscher, HAS, p. 347.
A Survey of the Debate on DA

To date the book of Daniel based on the dating of its section written in Aramaic (the "Grecisms" included) may be considered to be a practice which derived mainly from the turn of the century. Even before that time, however, some had discussed the Aramaic part of the book with regard to its implications for the dating of the book on a linguistic basis.¹ Chronologically arranged this list includes the names of persons such as:


It is especially from the turn of the century, however, that these studies and analyses have multiplied and been put on a more directly comparative linguistic basis. Only a short time span elapsed between some of those studies. Often two or more of them appeared in the same year. These statements and studies have brought different, often opposite, stands to this debated subject. Those who have been among the most prominent students on this subject include: A. A. Bevan, S. R. Driver, C. C. Torrey, R. D. Wilson, W. Clark

Genuineness of Daniel and the Integrity of Zechariah
(Edinburgh: T. Clark, 1847). Hengstenberg gives a very good survey of the debate prior to and in his time, and in answering the challenges he concludes that the exact knowledge of the court languages "that were prevalent in Daniel's time in Babylon—a thing which in the pseudo-Daniel would be difficult to explain—serves for no despicable proof of the genuineness" (p. 251). Hävernick, Neue kritische Untersuchungen über das Buch Daniel (Hamburg: F. Perthes, 1838); von Lengerke, Das Buch Daniel (Königsberg, n. p., 1835), p. lix: "Die Sprache weiset das Buch in die späteste Zeit." Hitzig, Das Buch Daniel erklärt. Kürzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch 10 (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1850), pp. x-xii; Kautzsch, Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen (Leipzig: Verlag von F. C. W. Vogel, 1844), pp. 22-3; Noelleke, "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der aramäischen Dialekte I," ZDMG 21 (1867):182ff; Renan, Histoire générale des langues sémitiques (Paris: M. Levy, 1866), p. 219; DA as compared with the Aramaic of Ezra is "beaucoup plus basse . . . et incline-t-elle beaucoup plus vers la langue du Talmud." Wright, Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (Cambridge: University Press, 1890), p. 16: "About the Aramaic portions of the book of Daniel there is a doubt, for they are, according to the best foreign critics, of much later date, having been written by a Palestinian Jew in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 166 or 165 B. C. This point, however, is one which I am not called upon to settle, and I content myself with merely indicating the doubt."


The dialectal discussion on DA begins about the same time. Bevan, for example, was not explicit and conclusive on the different problems in DA because he had many doubts on this aspect of the subject. He was not quite sure what to do with the temporal factor of the language, but he was much more certain about its geographical factor: "That it [DA] is, on the contrary, a West-Aramaic dialect, has now been conclusively proved."¹ Bevan belongs to a time which I would describe as the time of the "old dialectal debate," when the Aramaic language in general was considered to have had an eastern and a western group. It was also formerly assumed, in the absence of indications to the contrary, that Western Aramaic was of late origin.² Among others, S. R. Driver assigned a late date to Daniel by employing this as a criterion.³

Challenges of the Traditional View

As early as in 1897, S. R. Driver spelled out his

¹Bevan, A Short Commentary, p. viii.

²This is in contrast with Kutscher's right division of OfA into two types of the language of this particular period which I would call the "new dialectal debate."

famous dictum, which was destined to become the starting point for many serious scholarly studies on the problem:

The verdict of the language of Daniel is thus clear. The Persian words presuppose a period after the Persian empire had been well established: the Greek words demand, the Hebrew supports, and the Aramaic permits, a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (3 C. 332). With our present knowledge, this is as much as the language authorizes us definitely to affirm.¹

Notice the force of his arguments in the verdict decreasing down to the level at which Aramaic only "permits" this conclusion, in contrast to demanding and supporting it. It seems that for Driver the argument coming out of DA was the last and weakest one. This leaves the impression that it may be the "Achilles heel" in his dictum.

The two most obvious errors in this dictum are:

(1) That the DA should be classified as a good representative of the western type of Aramaic, and (2) his circular reasoning which produced an analysis that lacked support from external evidence. Driver first finds some Persian words in Daniel which for him automatically placed the book in the Persian period.² Because of the presence of those words in the book, and since DA comes from the West, DA must come from a period posterior to the establishment of the Persian empire. Driver limited his dictum, however, by qualifying it with the words,

¹Ibid., p. 508.
²DILOT, p. 501.
"with our present knowledge." He thus leaves less room for criticism by those who have had more external evidence at their disposal from later discoveries. Just a few years later, in 1903, the famous Elephantine Papyri were discovered and this OftA text offered more material for the study of this subject.

R. D. Wilson opposed Driver by pointing out that the alleged distinction between eastern and western forms of Aramaic was not so clear in the pre-Christian period.\(^1\) In 1909 C. C. Torrey concluded his study on DA, stating that this language belongs somewhere between the second and the third centuries B.C.\(^2\)

The first major commentary on the book of Daniel that picked up this idea of dating the book on the basis of the linguistic features of its Aramaic, and rejected the sixth-century date on the same basis, was the one by Montgomery. Here one reads:

Such evidence is not extensive, but the whole weight of differences . . . forces the present writer to hold that the Aram. of Dan. is not earlier than within the 5th cent., is more likely younger.


certainly is not of the 6th century.\(^1\)

Having noted Driver's "Achilles heel" in his verdict on this subject, H. H. Rowley\(^2\) tried to fill this gap with his extensive work on the problem of BA—a study resting on nine arguments which attempted to substantiate Driver's assertions. Although Rowley did not press for an exact date of DA, for him the traditional proposition of dating it in the sixth century was excluded. His lines of argument for this conclusion ran in his words as follows:

1. **Phonetic Variations:** There are five transitions reflected in BA which give "very important evidence" for dating it subsequent to that of the Papyri. "There is not a single indication that BA might be earlier than the Papyri, but there are many indications that it must be later."\(^3\)

2. The **Forms of the Pronouns:** Daniel's differences from the Targums are paralleled in the Nabatean inscriptions, and this enables one to demonstrate that every usage of Daniel in connection with the pronouns is attested at least as late as the Nabatean inscriptions.

Ezra would seem to stand distinctly nearer to the Papyri than does Daniel, while, on the other hand,

---

1 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, p. 20.
2 See the introduction to *AOT*.
3 *AOT*, p. 38.
Daniel is nearer to Palmyrenee than is Ezra. . . . The evidence, therefore, viewed as a whole, would very strongly suggest that Biblical Aramaic is later than that of the Papyri, and Daniel somewhat later than Ezra while the differences from Palmyrenee and resemblances to the Targums would suggest a definitely Palestinian origin for Biblical Aramaic.

3. The Forms of the Adverbs: BA is in closer accord with the Papyri in this respect than with any other Aramaic dialect we know. "Slight as it [this evidence] is, so far as it goes it once more points to a date for the Aramaic of Daniel somewhat subsequent to that of the Aramaic of Ezra."\(^2\)

4. Prepositions and Conjunctions: From this part of the study one can glean only little that is important for comparison. For these yield but little evidence "but such as it is, it would still suggest that Daniel is intermediate between the Papyri and the later inscriptions and Targums."\(^3\)

5. Interjections and Particles: There is not much determinative evidence from this area.

It will be seen that though Biblical Aramaic differs from the Targums and from Palmyrenee in this respect, no difficulty is provided as against the late date for Biblical Aramaic . . . so far as the evidence goes, it would again suggest that Biblical Aramaic is later than the Papyri, and would point us to the later dialects for the closest connexions.

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 63-4.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 70-1.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 73.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 76.
6. **The Forms of the Verbs:** In this section one encounters much more promising ground for the general view. This part of the study is concluded with the words:

The cumulative effect, therefore, of the study of the relations between Biblical Aramaic and the Papyri, on the one hand, and between Biblical Aramaic and the later Aramaic of the Nabatean and Palmyrene inscriptions and of the Targums, on the other hand, in so far as relates to the verbal forms employed, is the decided impression that Biblical Aramaic is later than that of the Papyri, and stands somewhere between the dialect they contain and these later dialects in its stage of development.  

7. **Syntax:** Seven different points on syntax were assembled in support of this view. Their verdict is the same. Viewed as a whole, the evidence on syntax would again indicate a time intermediate between that of the Papyri and that of the later dialects for BA. This evidence is not all of equal weight, however. For, just because constructions with 1 followed by an infinitive appear in DA, it still is not possible to demonstrate that "the Book of Daniel here represents the usage of the sixth century B.C.—a usage, which was regular and common in that age, but which was superseded a century later, only to recover itself in the age of the Targums and become common once more."  

8. **Vocabulary:** As for vocabulary, one is again "surprised at the fewness" of the differences

\[\text{Ibid., pp. 97-8.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., pp. 106-7.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., p. 108.}\]
evidenced. A careful study of the vocabulary does, however, "reveal a few things that claim remark."\(^1\) This leads to conclude that we have scant ground for distinguishing the position of BA among the dialects of that language on this basis. Some indications point to a period for BA intermediate between that of the Papyri and that of the Targums, but taken by themselves the lexical items did not bear much weight and most of the evidence that comes under the heading of vocabulary must be pronounced quite neutral.\(^2\)

9. "Foreign Elements in the Vocabulary": This is the last part of the study in which "there are but few really important points."\(^3\) Rowley's comment on this topic was,

Our general impression, therefore, from the study of the foreign elements in the Vocabulary of the literature under survey is that the Greek words in Daniel render Babylon in the sixth century B.C. a most unlikely, or even impossible, place and date of origin for the Aramaic sections of that book, and point strongly to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and to Jerusalem.

These particular conclusions have led Rowley to the general conclusion formulated at the end of his study in the following way:

Nowhere, then, do we find any support for the view that Daniel is older than the Papyri, and very much to indicate, on the contrary, that it is younger.

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 109.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp.127-8.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 129.
While many of the points, taken alone, could not be regarded as conclusive, their cumulative weight is conclusive, and in particular, the evidence of the consonantal changes alone is strong enough to sustain this judgment. We may sum up the result of our inquiry, then, by saying that on linguistic grounds we are convinced that Biblical Aramaic is not Babylonian Aramaic, nor is Daniel contemporary with the events it purports to describe. We have found nothing whatever in the course of our study to make a second century date for Daniel impossible or improbable.

Rowley also felt that his thesis was so strong that it allowed him to call for challenges:

It may yet, perhaps, be possible for one to take the position, as Wilson does, that Daniel is older than the Papyri, but not, as Wilson claims, on the basis of this evidence. So far from finding here, as he maintains, a 'proof of the early date of Daniel, we need rather to wait till he or another forward arguments of a serious and weighty character to set against this evidence.

Rowley's work covered much more extra-BA material than previous studies had, yet it still was limited to the existing evidence of his time. The author claimed that he had undertaken an "independent examination of the whole subject of the relations between Biblical Aramaic and the other Early Aramaic dialects," yet, his study was essentially based only on the first batch of the Papyri (AP) which presented relatively little evidence for the demonstration of dialects in Aramaic.

---

1 Ibid., pp. 155-6.
2 Ibid., p. 98.
4 AOT, p. vii.
Although one's conclusion based on the data presented by Rowley may differ from Rowley's own conclusion, it needs to be pointed out that the work of this scholar still contains a great deal of useful comparative data.

Reaction to Rowley's thesis has not been wanting. Although it did not come immediately, scholars began to question his method. Some scholars (Kitchen, Kutscher, Coxon) have studied the problem in detail in light of the new evidence, and have argued that Rowley's conclusions cannot be maintained in the way in which he presented them. Coxon, for example, comments that Rowley consistently failed to notice presumably "late" features in the Papyri themselves.\(^1\) Other non-supporting lines of evidence were sacrificed for the sake of the general argument.\(^2\) For that reason, O. Eissfeldt observed that Rowley did "occasionally derive precise verdicts from very imprecise evidence."\(^3\)

It is interesting to note that a significant


\(^2\)For example, see the conclusions in points 3, 4 and 6 above. In the last section on loan words, the "evidence" was replaced by a "general impression" (_AOT_, p. 129). Even though facts about the similarities between DA and the Papyri are obvious at times, Rowley minimizes them by stating that he has found nothing in the course of study to make a second century date for Daniel impossible or improbable (_AOT_, p. 156).

number of other scholars, however critical they may be of his thesis, accept his final conclusions and assign a late date either to the book of Daniel, or the Aramaic it contains. Yet the arguments which were used to reach that conclusion seem no longer to stand up under scrutiny. It was precisely at this point that Rowley encountered considerable difficulty. Thus the criticisms, many of which are sound, are nevertheless not radical enough. Their influence has often resulted in some modification, but not a general rejection of the Driver-Rowley thesis. According to Rosenthal’s statement made in 1939, the old linguistic "evidence" for a late date for DA has to be laid aside.¹

Evidence from the New Material

Already in 1949, Young made a statement in which he expressed the idea that an updating of some spellings may be present in the text of DA:

Even if it could be conclusively demonstrated that the Aramaic of our Bibles was from the 3rd cent. B.C., this would not preclude authorship by Daniel in the 6th cent. For the present Aramaic may very well have been copied from the original, and later orthography introduced. However, it is not necessary to make such an assumption. Recent discoveries may require that many preconcieved notions as to the characteristic of the Aramaic language will have to be modified.²

This idea has been taken over by Kitchen. In 1965 Kitchen brought out the most thorough critique of

¹Rosenthal, Die Aramaistische Forschung, p. 70.
²Young, The Prophecy of Daniel, p. 23.
Rowley's thesis written up to that time. He took issue with and gave sound counter-arguments for each of Rowley's conclusions. In his study based on both published and still unpublished observations Kitchen concluded as follows on the important points involved:

1. **Vocabulary**: With regards to the Semitic lexicon present, any date from the sixth century B.C. onward is possible. The Persian words present in DA are Old Persian, not Middle Persian. This indicates no independent borrowing of Persian words into Daniel after c. 300 B.C. These facts suggest an origin for the Persian words in DA before c. 300 B.C.\(^1\) A second-century date cannot be based on three Greek words, since "Greek wares reached all over the Ancient Near East from the eighth century B.C. onwards."\(^2\) Kitchen further noted that around 90 percent of the vocabulary of DA is found in the texts from the fifth century or earlier, and we may presuppose their existence in the sixth century as well.

2. **Orthography and Phonetics**: One must differentiate between purely historical spellings in OA and OfA texts and the literary texts of BA where phonetic changes have come about through modernization of spelling sometime after the third century B.C. Here Kitchen insists that one has to account for some modernization and scribal updating of the transmitted text. Because of

---

\(^1\)NBD, p. 77.

\(^2\)Ibid.
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false archaisms and a different history of transmission, the Elephantine Papyri cannot be the final norm for dating DA.\textsuperscript{1} In this Rowley failed to adequately recognize the distinction between orthography and phonetics.\textsuperscript{2}

3. **Grammar:** Since Rowley's arguments in this respect are mostly orthographic, the same criticism applies to this point too. Some alleged "late" forms have turned out to be early. In some cases the effect of a "gradual modernization" has taken place.\textsuperscript{3}

4. **Syntax:** DA (and the Aramaic of Ezra) is neither eastern nor western, but simply Imperial, and it cannot be categorized in this way. Some hints would point to the East, but they do not constitute proof in themselves.\textsuperscript{4}

According to Kitchen's study, it is not on linguistic grounds derived from DA that a definite date for the book should be established, since there is nothing to decide the date of composition of DA on the ground of Aramaic anywhere between the late sixth and the second century B.C.\textsuperscript{5} Kitchen's conclusion on point

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 50-67.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid, p. 31, n. 6.
\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 78.
\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. 79.
number 4 above was expanded and revised in much of the work by Kutscher.

Kutscher argues that BA is an eastern type of the Aramaic language, and that Driver's publication of the Papyri is essential in establishing the existence of the eastern and western branches of OfA. According to him, there are precise characteristics of the eastern type of OfA.

One of the things for which Kutscher criticizes Rowley is his refusal to believe in the modernization of the spelling in DA.

Coxon's recent articles complement Kitchen's and Kutscher's works. He approaches the problem from different angles, yet always comes to the same conclusion, different from Rowley's. The results of Coxon's studies indicate that:

1. Far from exhibiting late affinities, BA bears the marks of historical spelling in much the same manner as OfA of the fifth century B.C. The type of spelling in

---

1HAS, pp. 367-68.
2Ibid., pp. 362ff: (1) Extensive use of the genitive construction plus zy (dy); (2) The use of the proleptic suffix of the type bêtah di; (3) Extensive use of the possessive pronoun zyl (dy)_1 instead of the possessive suffix; (4) A word order in which the object precedes the infinitive and the finite verb; (5) A word order in which the subject often precedes the verb (Akkadian and Babylonian influence); (6) The use of the formula qetil l_ employed as perfect; and (7) The presence of Akkadian and Persian loan words.
Aramaic must also be related to the content of the documents and their literary nature.¹

2. In the field of morphology and phonology in the early period, a richer variety of spellings existed in OfA than was hitherto suspected. Emanating as they do from the eastern part of the OfA language area, the forms suggest that the use of the prosthetic form in Daniel is specifically an eastern feature rather than manifesting evidence for late usage.²

3. In the lexical field BA contains unmistakable traits of OfA. "In his attempt to re-affirm the second century of Daniel Rowley fails to do them justice."³

4. Orthography on its own is no absolute criterion for dating BA. A detailed examination of the factors involved in historical spelling, and in the representation of phonetic development at least opens up the possibility that the orthography of BA belongs to an earlier period and stems from the idiosyncracies of Jewish scribal tradition. We must also be alert to the continuum of scribal influence upon the Aramaic section of the Old Testament. To a lesser degree, the interpretation of late spellings in the Papyri shows the
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effects of the spoken language upon the written language.¹

5. In the area of syntax, Coxon's work complements Kitchen's which was not as detailed in this aspect as it was in others. Consequently, Coxon is closer to Kutscher in his position on the geographic factor of DA: "The syntactical aspects of biblical Aramaic is the area where the most telling symptoms of dialectal affinity manifest themselves."²

In undertaking the study of the syntax of DA, Coxon once again parts company with Rowley because recent discoveries have stimulated a reassessment of DA.³ Coxon gives the examples and concludes that (a) a closer examination reveals that BA is in complete agreement with the Papyri in placing the active participle after the imperfect of hwh; (b) the genitive relationship in DA should be evaluated by means of the nature of the text in question (narrative versus the legal and diplomatic texts) rather than chronologically;⁴ (c) the date of DA cannot be determined with any precision from the evidence provided by the use of the preposition 1 as the marker of the direct object; (d) the Meissner Papyrus (approx. 515 B.C.) has the same style of dating formula as that which

²Ibid., p. 108.
⁴Ibid., pp. 109-12.
is found in DA;\(^1\) and (e) the regular employment of 1 plus the infinitive in Daniel does not necessarily betray late linguistic affinities. "Eastern influence may also account for a syntactical construction in the Aramaic of Daniel which has often led to the expedient of textual emendation."\(^2\)

The Aramaic documents from Qumran, especially the Targum to Job, have been evaluated as pointing quite definitely to a "pre-second-century date for the Aramaic of Daniel."\(^3\)

Faced with such strong evidence against a "late" dating of DA, some scholars have tried to adopt a middle position that would reconcile and satisfy both sides. This modification of Rowley's theory is made by stating that a purposely archaizing writing style, like that of OfA, has been employed in the book, or, as Driver argued much earlier, that "the author of Daniel used in his work a great deal of earlier material."\(^4\) Thus it is concluded today, in spite of a number of difficulties with it, that

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 113-5.

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 119-20.

\(^3\)For details, see Vasholz, "Qumran and the Dating of Daniel," p. 320.

"there can be no doubt that the composition of the book of Daniel must be set in the Hasmonean period."¹

Fitzmyer's opinion is that the final redaction of the book of Daniel is from about 165 B.C. yet he admits that "it may be that part of the Aramaic portions of Daniel derived from an earlier period."² He seems not to be completely closed to the possibility of a pre-second-century dating of DA, because he agrees that BA certainly and undoubtedly belongs to OfA.³

D. C. Snell has no great problem in putting "all or part of Daniel . . . between 167 and 163 B.C.E., since Daniel's Aramaic imitates Ezra's."⁴ If there are some disagreements between the two books in their Aramaic sections, it is because "imitators have a tendency to outdo their models."⁵ Snell is aware of the difficulties with his thesis,⁶ however, but in spite of the difficulties noted above, it is possible that


³A Wandering Aramaic . . . p. 61.

⁴"Why Is There Aramaic?" p. 33.

⁵Ibid., p. 38.

⁶Ibid., p. 43.
Daniel's use of Aramaic is in imitation of Ezra's. The purpose behind using this kind of Aramaic is to lend authenticity in reporting the speech of foreigners.\textsuperscript{1}

Coxon himself sees some difficulties with the dating of at least one part of DA. Starting from Montgomery's suspicion about Daniel 7, he goes on to say:

There are reasons for supposing that although it is written in Aramaic it [i.e., ch. 7] does not belong to the earliest cycle of traditions.

Unfortunately, Coxon does not spell out those "reasons." Rosenthal's statement may go against such an assumption indirectly:

The Aramaic of the Bible as written has preserved the Official Aramaic character. This is what makes it nearly uniform in linguistic appearance.

Klaus Beyer maintains that in general BA comes from the Achaemenid period, but the text itself has suffered intrusions of elements that come from a later period. It is interesting to note that Beyer still uses the arguments that have been abandoned with the new discoveries of Aramaic texts (like 'lyn, yt, assimilation of nun, etc.). Other arguments that he offers may be accepted only if one follows his clearly stated presupposition that BA must be later than its

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 36. We will return to this problem in the following chapters.


\textsuperscript{3}GBA, p. 6.
traditionally proposed date.¹

In concluding his survey of the same debate, K. Koch declares that the radical criticism holding to a late date for the book of Daniel has "lost the game" on the linguistic ground of the chapters in Aramaic in the last 150 years.²

What can we say in concluding this short survey of the scholarly debate on DA? By and large, despite all of the arguments advanced against the Driver-Rowley thesis, the modern critical approach to the book of Daniel and its Aramaic section still clings generally to the conclusions of the anti-traditional theory. It should be evident from a review of the research on this subject that not only peripheral but some quite central problems still remain to be clarified, both by the presentation of an accurate examination of the texts, and from the presentation of evidence from new sources.

The Purpose and the Need of This Study

Today we are witnessing an awakening of interest in Aramaic studies in general.³ Many scholars feel that

¹Die aramäischen Texte, p. 33.
²Das Buch Daniel, pp. 45-46.
³This concerns the Targums, Jewish-Palestinian New Testament backgrounds, BA, and an increasing number of Aramaic inscriptions. In the introduction to a useful overview of Aramaic studies in the last thirty years, J. C. Greenfield states: "There has been a quickening of Aramaic studies in recent years because of discoveries in various areas." "Aramaic Studies and the Bible," p. 110.
this field, which has been neglected for so long, is now becoming a more promising and enriching field and it will have to be more fully explored in the near future.

Narrowing this down to the question of BA, many aspects, like the writing of a new grammar which would include "greatly neglected syntax," are still awaited. As for the DA, there have been studies on Daniel involving detailed linguistic considerations, but rare indeed are extensive works on trans-linguistic issues such as a comparison with the extra-biblical Babylonian and Persian documents, a work similar to Hensley's study on Ezra.

In order to elucidate the problem of the dating of DA, it has usually been systematically and exhaustively compared with the Aramaic documents from the fifth or fourth century B.C. onward. As shown above, this is true for the Egyptian Aramaic Papyri (Rowley, Kitchen), the Qumran Targum to Job (Vasholz, S. A. Kaufman), and the Genesis Apocryphon (Rowley, T. Muraoka, G. Archer). Coxon's articles on specific treatments are useful but they are mostly concerned with OfA material.

A similar concern for OA inscriptions has not yet arisen. A comparison of DA with OA may be a useful

---

1HAS, p. 403. The publication of a recent study on word order in DA by E. Cooke has been announced by Eisenbrauns in 1986.

approach to follow in adding further material to this
general subject. In fact, it was the discoveries of some
of the earliest OA inscriptions that gave rise to
problems for the "late" hypothesis of DA.\(^1\) Greenfield,
commenting on the discoveries of some important OA
documents, makes a remark which illustrates another
important point related to OA texts:

> One of the important conclusions to be drawn from the
new material published during the last thirty years,
when studied in conjunction with that previously
known, is that Aramaic was not a single dialect as
it is usually described. At an early period, as
anyone with linguistic training might assume, there
were already a variety of dialects in use.\(^1\)

Moreover, one can say that there is a lack of
comparative studies between the book of Daniel and OA
inscriptions, not only in the area of linguistics but in
general. To give an example, V. Sasson's recent article
on the Tell Fakhriyah inscription\(^3\) contains many
parallels between this document and the Hebrew Bible, but
it omits some good parallels from the book of Daniel.

P. W. Coxon rightly points out that

> A further examination of the Aramaic of the book of
Daniel remains an urgent desideratum, first because
of the availability of a vastly increased corpus of
Aramaic texts which Rowley was not in a position to
use and which affects the results of his comparative
analysis, and secondly because of dissatisfaction

\(^1\)Like Sefire which yielded the disputed pronoun
\(\text{'ln} \) from DA.

\(^2\)"Aramaic Studies and the Bible," p. 115.

\(^3\)Sasson, ATF.
with the methods he employed.¹

The Scope and the Procedures of the Study

The major weakness in the approach of using LA to date DA is our inability to distinguish what is earlier from that which is contemporary in a given inscription. To use one example, the Palmerene and Nabatean inscriptions are the ones often referred to in the attempt to lower the date of DA.² Yet in these inscriptions by their very nature, "being chiefly inscriptions destined for posterity, there is a strong a priori suspicion that they would be more archaic than, say, contemporary literature . . . Therefore, . . . older linguistic material found in Nabatean and Palmyrene cannot serve as definite proof that it was actually current in contemporary literature."³ For example in Nabatean one finds the spellings zy and znh which are completely absent from DA. Yet, everyone will agree that DA is one or two centuries earlier than these inscriptions.⁴ When it comes to the spellings of the causative and reflexive stems, DA is much older because

²AOT refers to these two dialects very frequently.
³Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon," in HAS, pp. 15-16. Note Fitzmyer's remark on this article: "His [Kutscher] data and conclusions have been checked and have proven valid" (GAQ, p. 24).
⁴Even Rowley in AOT, p. 7.
we have only two cases in which the prefix h is used for
the causative stem in the Nabatean and Palmyrene
inscriptions. Thus it seems that these "late"
inscriptions, by clinging at times to the archaic forms,
show a conservative character.

It can be maintained, therefore, that in contrast
to the usual approach of counting the samples and
substracting that which is in later ones from that which
is in earlier, only a contextual literary and grammatical
study may be helpful in this difficult task. The samples
have to be weighed, not only counted. But this imposes a
limitation to this study which is mostly concerned with
OA inscriptions and their literary and grammatical
particularities.

Our study here, however, has another important
purpose. This work was prompted by an expectation that
whether the traditional opinion stood the test or not,
fresh insights into the characteristics of DA itself
could thus be gained. The language of one dialect could
cast light on the usage of another. Likewise, the point
of some interesting expressions is sharpened when
comparison is made with their correspondences in the
other dialect.

After this introduction an analysis is made next
of the oldest specimens of OA, i.e., those of the ninth
century: the Tell Fakhriyah and Bir-Hadad inscriptions.

1See Kutscher, ibid., and AOT, p. 81.
The chapter following that analysis deals with the eighth- and seventh-century inscriptions, or what is known as Standard OA: Zakkur, Sefire, Hadad, and Panammu. The inscriptions from the transitional period into OfA, the Barrakab, Nerab, and Ashur texts, are also examined in this study.

This study is not intended to be a detailed work on all features and problems of either OA or DA. It concentrates mainly on positive correlations between these two dialects. The procedure followed in analyzing OA documents is to note and record the linguistic features similar in both OA and the DA. At every step of the discussion, priority is given to comparison with documents written in OA dialect, while comparison with OfA and LA is presented in cases where the feature is especially relevant for our study. The study purposely omits the Deir Alla inscription, the language which has not as yet been classified with certainty.

Each of the documents listed above is analyzed according to the following plan:

1. A short description of the document including such data as: a short bibliography on its publication, the location of its discovery, and its most probable dating according to the scholarly consensus. It is important, for example, to note that two OA inscriptions, the most recently discovered inscription from Tell Fakhriyah and the later Ashur Ostracon, originated in a
region more toward the East. This should alert us to possible eastern peculiarities. In the time of Bevan, Driver, Wilson, and Rowley, it had already been noted that the temporal and geographical locations of DA were the two major questions in the debate. In what is now called the "new dialectal debate," Kitchen states that DA is simply Imperial with some eastern features. Kutscher argues that it is eastern in many aspects, and Coxon's research points more and more in the same direction. It would be impossible, therefore, to do a serious study of DA and neglect this aspect of the problem.

2. A consideration of the nature\(^1\) of the documents. It is important to state whether the inscription has a narrative or poetic character, or if it may be classified as a legal document. Here one notes that most of the OA documents are basically different in nature from the text of DA.

3. The literary structure of the document. Since the structure is a vehicle of meaning, it may point to the similarity of the content and meaning in the documents. Going back to the Tell Fakhriyah inscription, one notices that it is bilingual as is the book of Daniel itself. This document does have a clear structure which may be compared to some praise-giving songs in DA.

4. An investigation of the vocabulary. This

\(^{1}\)"Nature" is taken here in the sense of "literary genre."
section points to some statistical data on the percentage of the occurrence of the same word-roots in DA and the inscriptions. Special attention is given to the same or similar expressions and formulae that convey the same thoughts in different documents. The phrase in the Tell Fakhriyah lines 16-17 which reads "m'ny' zy bt hdd" may be paralleled to the one in Dan 5:23, which is almost identical. In examples like this, there may be some overlapping between this section and the one on syntax.

The fact that the choice of words in one inscription is determined by regional and dialectal affinities can be illustrated in the following way: To express the idea of an image or statue that is set up, Samalian used the word "msk'y" (Pan 18) while the Tell Fakhriyah used the words "glm'" and "dmt'". In West OA for a stele with a representation of a human being, the word that is used is "ngb'" (Bir-Hadad 1).

These first four sections deal with the literary analyses of the texts. I would like to point out that scholars in this field are turning their attention more and more to the questions covered in these sections, for they are considered very important in comparative linguistic studies.

H. Tawil remarks that the corpus of OA royal inscriptions has been scrutinized in the past from several distinct perspectives, but with extreme selectivity. For him, some scholars have dealt
exclusively with problems of orthography, while others have restricted their study to morphological features. A third group of scholars has concentrated on lexicographical problems but they have conducted their investigation along the very limited line of inquiry afforded by the study of etymology.

Little or no emphasis has been placed upon systematic isolation of various idioms, formulae, and other literary elements employed in these inscriptions, nor upon elucidation of the stylistic and philological affinities which they exhibit.¹

According to Greenfield, the consequences of this limited approach have been felt in the field of studies on DA. Says Greenfield: "Not enough attention has been given to the older literary material preserved in the present text of Daniel."²

5. Orthography and phonology. Orthography pertains to the ways of spelling (defective or full); and this part also includes phonological phenomena such as the problem of nasalization and consonantal shifts. Brief consideration is given to the importance of proper names. For example, the spelling of Darius in DA is paralleled by the earliest spelling of the same name in Cowley's collection of EgA dated to 495 B.C. and the Meissner


²"Standard Literary Aramaic," p. 285, n. 27.
document from 515 B.C., in contrast to the later spellings among the texts edited by Cowley.¹

6. Morphology. The morphological section seeks to compare grammatical forms of nouns, verbs, and other words. For example, in Sefire I A 39, Fitzmyer notes an early occurrence of the 'Ophal conjugation and, in Sefire III 3, the uses of Haphel and 'Aphel forms from the same verb root, a phenomenon similar to what one often meets in DA.²

7. Syntax. The section on syntax is the most difficult in the study. Yet, this section may clarify the presence of some eastern features in DA. The section on syntax is focused mainly on the question of dialectal differences in order to confirm or deny Kutscher's thesis. The different nature of certain documents that are being compared can determine the syntactical affinities of the given texts.

The text of DA which is considered in this study is the Masoretic text in its final stage of transmission printed in BHS. It is taken as a unit as found in Dan 2:4-7:28. The elements which contribute to the inclusion of chap. 7 in this original corpus of DA come from the alleged disagreement in the form (language) and content

¹AP, p. 1., among the oldest EgA documents, coming from 495 B.C. This point has been discovered independently from Kitchen who already in 1965 discusses it and concludes: "A single name is only very limited evidence, but has to be taken into account." NBD, p. 60.

²AJS, pp. 56, 106.
(not another story but a vision) of this chapter: The first thematic division of the book makes the two distinctive halves very clear—chaps. 1-6 have a narrative character that is prominent here, while the second part is mainly concerned with apocalyptic visions. The second or linguistic division forms two large units—the first one in Aramaic, from chaps. 2:4b-7, and the second, chaps. 8-12, in Hebrew. That both divisions are general and superficial can be demonstrated by various exceptions, the most obvious being chap. 7 and chap. 2 because both deal with apocalyptic visions and both are written in Aramaic.

This gives an indication of a tentative nature of the structural unity of the book based on the location of chap. 7. Schematically this can be shown as follows. In this outline, "A" represents the stylistic division of the book, "B" the division of the languages in the book, and "C" the division according to the person used by the writer. All three are premises and D is the conclusion:

A) 1 Narrative 6 / 7 Apoc. Visions 12

B) 1 Heb. 2:4b Aramaic 7 / 8 Hebrew 12

C) 1 3rd Person Report 7 / 8 1st Person 12

D) 1 The Unity of the Book 12

All three "divisions" follow a good Semitic and
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Old Testament pattern that goes from a general concept to a specific one.¹ They do not allow a simplistic break-up of the unity of the book according to one's preconceived pattern. The exceptions in these divisions work in the same direction. It is the visionary flavor in chap. 2, the presence of Aramaic in chap. 7, and the unusual third-person report in 10:1 which form the crucial points in establishing the unity of the book. Already, E. B. Pusey saw the thematic importance of chap. 7:

The connection is in the subject. The vision of the VIIth chapter is a supplement to the revelation in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. It too relates to the four great empires of the world. It expands that first disclosure to Nebuchadnezzar, fills it up, continues it. The prophecies which follow relate more especially to Israel.²

A. Lenglet rightly argues³ that the Aramaic chapters in Daniel form a concentric structure:

visions of the four kingdoms (chaps. 2 and 7);
persecution and deliverance of the true worshipers

¹The structure of the first part of the book of Genesis can be just one example in this regard. There, for example, the genealogies and promises go from universal content to particular. Cf. C. Westermann, The Promises to the Fathers (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), pp. 119-163. See also O. Cullmann, Christ and Time (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), pp. 217-242.

²Daniel the Prophet (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885), p. 81.

(chaps. 3 and 6); prophecies and their fulfillments in personal experiences of the two kings, Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar (chaps. 4 and 5). The purpose behind the author's plan is to balance these chapters in a symmetrical way.

**Conclusion**

Today we are witnessing an awakening of interest in Aramaic studies in general and in DA in particular. In scholarly debates which have followed as a consequence, however, the corpus of OA texts has not received full attention. Thus, one can see that there is a lack of comparative studies between DA and OA.

It is maintained here that the use of OA texts can serve a twofold purpose: First, it may contribute to understanding the text of DA because fresh insights into both dialects can be gained as a result of the comparison. The idiom and language of one dialect can cast light on the usage of the other. Second, it may also contribute to the research on the issues of the debate of the origin of DA.

Whatever the results of one's study may be, it is difficult to give the final statement on DA based purely on linguistic evidence. Even though some success can be achieved in the use of a philological approach as an aid to dating documents objectively, I agree with Vasholz that "the danger arises when one attempts to make philological criteria carry too great a weight for the
evidence."¹ Especially is this so in a field like this, where we have only tens of samples or less and where we would need hundreds for verification. Philological evidence is only one part of the picture available to aid in dating Biblical and related documents. Even for Kutscher the "Sprachbeweis" is often neutralized, and other criteria should be used to date Daniel.²

¹CJT, pp. 9-10.
²HAS, p. 402.
CHAPTER II

THE EARLIEST OLD ARAMAIC INSCRIPTIONS

Introduction

The oldest specimens of the Aramaic language in our possession today are two valuable inscriptions, Tell Fakhriyah and Bir-Hadad. They both come from the ninth century B.C., exemplifying the earliest texts of Aramaic. The inscriptions come from the north, only one from the northeast, and the other from the northwest. Our special attention should be devoted to the Tell Fakhriyah inscription since it is a relatively long text that comes from such a remote past, and also since it is one of the few that come from the northeast. Recently discovered, this "Aramaic text is, indeed, a welcome addition to the meagre corpus of Old Aramaic inscriptions in our possession."¹

The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

Description

The Assyrian-Aramaic bilingual inscription from Tell Fakhriyah in northeast Syria was discovered February 2, 1979. Its discovery may be considered as one of the

¹ATF, p. 86.
most important in the Aramaic field, and more and more studies are being published on its form and content.\textsuperscript{1}

This study deals primarily with the Aramaic version of this inscription, with reference to the Assyrian only where relevant for the understanding of the Aramaic. In fact, the Assyrian version should help us to understand the inscription, but, as Sasson states, it should not in any case "be allowed to overshadow and minimize the importance of the Aramaic."\textsuperscript{2}

According to the editors (A. Abou-Assaf, P. Bordreuil, and A. R. Millard) of its \textit{editio princeps} (STF), we are probably dealing here with the oldest known Aramaic text and this document contributes largely to our search for new information on the Aramaic language. Many linguistic "problems" occur in this text, or the characteristics that have been unexpected. Two reasons are directly responsible for the problems: namely, the antiquity of the text and scarcity of other OA material.\textsuperscript{3} Obviously the inscription must be studied with constant reference to some major OA inscriptions.


\textsuperscript{2}ATF, p. 88.

\textsuperscript{3}STF, pp. i-ii.
The Aramaic text is of fundamental linguistic importance due to its length, and because it is by far the earliest example of an Aramaic document from the eastern Aramaic-speaking regions, and because—with its companion Assyrian text—it bears living witness to the earliest period of close Akkadian-Aramaic contact.

The statue was discovered in northeastern Syria and is located today in the National Museum of Damascus. The location of the discovery and the language of the inscription makes it "un document isolé provenant d'une marge orientale du monde araméen . . ." Its language may be "le premier example d'un dialecte araméen du haut Khabour," and consequently "ne peut guère contribuer à la datation [de la statue]."

The question arises as to how to date this "oldest extant Aramaic text." When compared with the earliest Phoenician inscriptions (eleventh and tenth centuries B.C.) and the other specimens of Old Aramaic, this inscription has "a very archaic" script. The forms of some letters are unparalleled after the early tenth century B.C. Thus, paleography can suggest that the script should be dated to the end of the second

1RATF, pp. 145-6.
2STF, p. 1.
3Ibid., p. 87.
5SAI, p. 135.
6Ibid., p. 140.
millennium B.C. But a detailed paleographical study by
the editors reveals that a date in the beginning of the
first millennium B.C. can be assigned to the text.¹
Moreover, there are other questions of historical and
cultural importance [like the curses] that favor "a date
in the early first millennium for the statue and its
inscriptions."²

More precisely, data from Assyrian sources help
to determine the time of the historic context of the
statue. It is thus possible to identify Šamaš-nuri,
mentioned in the list of eponyms for the year 866 B.C.,
although the place where he ruled is not mentioned. The
date proposed at present is from the eighth to tenth
centuries B.C., most probably around 850 B.C.³ In case
the proposed data is accepted, the text "preserves the
oldest Aramaic composition so far known, and makes a
major contribution to our knowledge of the history of the
language."⁴

T. Muraoka proposes five main reasons for the
importance of this discovery:

1. First, it is the oldest Aramaic writing known
so far.

2. Its impressive length promises to throw a

¹STF, pp. 87-97.
²NCFT, pp. 48-9.
³STF, pp. 98-112.
⁴SAI, p. 137.
great deal of light on the language of the writer and his period and locale.

3. Since the inscription is bilingual, the Akkadian part is of considerable help in the interpretation of the Aramaic text.

4. The inscription originates from an area which has so far produced very little literary remains in Aramaic of this period, and thus it enables us to see the nature of Aramaic spread there and the nature of interactions with Akkadian.

5. Unlike many other early Aramaic inscriptions, this one has been preserved almost intact, with only a few words presenting some epigraphical difficulty.¹

Nature

The text of this anthropoid statue is constructed from two dedicatory inscriptions, one following upon the other without a break. The first is written "in the older Mesopotamian dedicatory style, while the second is closer to Aramaic and West Semitic models."² The inscriptions were probably composed and inscribed on the occasion of the renewal of the statue of Hadys*i, governor of Gozan, and its rededication to the Hadad temple of Sikan. At the same time inscribed temple vessels were also donated by Hadyis*i. According to Kaufman, almost all of the divine

¹TFEA, p. 79.
²NATF, p. 109.
epithets and motivational clauses "have close or even identical parallels in similar Akkadian inscriptions of the Middle and Neo-Assyrian periods, while the curse formulae have parallels in both Assyria and the West."¹

The Aramaic version, as judged by Greenfield and Shaffer, is "in general fuller, looser and more explicit."² The Aramaic is usually more explicit as to subject and object while the Akkadian is less explicit in this regard. Since we have a large corpus of Assyrian inscriptions, but only a few OA inscriptions, the significance of the discovery at Tell Fakhriyah lies more in the realm of Aramaic than in its contribution to Assyrian linguistics.

In its language the Aramaic affords much of interest to scholars. No other lengthy composition in Aramaic is known from so early a date, or from a site in the eastern part of Syria. With other texts it belongs to OA, "all which witness to the existence of various dialects in the cities of the Arameans."³ In fact, the statue brings evidence for another, Eastern OA dialect. Its editors remark that,

In addition to its own peculiarities, it has some features which are regularly found in the Imperial

¹RATF, p. 158.
²NATF, p. 110.
³SAI, p. 139.
Aramaic of the Persian Empire and biblical Aramaic, but have not been known hitherto in earlier periods. Many have thought the origins of Imperial Aramaic lay in the dialect spoken in Assyria towards the end of the Assyrian Empire, and the new text points in that direction.  

What are the points of interest for DA from this inscription? The inscription is written on a statue (slm) with the neo-Assyrian text engraved on the front and with the Aramaic on its back. Although it belongs to the OA group of texts, it reminds one of another lengthy Aramaic text, from a later period, in which slm takes a prominent place in two of its six chapters (one-third of its content); the text of Daniel. Here follow the most important points of interest:

1. **Linguistic.** The unexpected characteristics of this early OA dialect teach one to show respect for the nature of the language of each individual Aramaic document. One has to allow room for a wider spectrum of different possibilities in classifying them. We may no longer have one OA dialect but three different OA dialects.

2. **Historical.** The background given by Millard's reconstruction of the historical aspect of the text is useful for our understanding of the language and content of other Aramaic texts like that found in the book of Daniel. We know that similar things were happening at the

---

1Ibid. (Italics supplied.)
Babylonian court,¹ where Aramaic played an important role in communications within the empire:

In the earlier period of the Neo-Assyrian empire there appears a symbiosis of peoples, of Assyrians and Arameans. From this may be traced the readiness of Assyrian kings to allow Arameans and others, to hold high office in their court and administration . . . When high officials of foreign stock were to be found linked to the court, it is likely there were many more of their compatriots in lower positions there . . . Aramaic was already a widely understood language with an easily used script. For practical purposes, especially for trade, it offered many advantages Assyrian lacked . . . How fast Aramaic came to dominate over Assyrian in speech cannot be shown . . . That it did is suggested by the term applied to the Aramaic script, in Greek, Hebrew and Egyptian, "Assyrian Writing."²

This reconstruction sheds some light on the position of Daniel's three friends (Dan 3), and furthermore may provide the most probable reason why the author wrote a part of the book in Aramaic. By using this "practical" language and script he was able to spread his belief and a record of the events related to his personal experiences.

3. Exegetical. Scholars have been attracted to the double title and status of Hadysêi (and his father Shamash-nuri).³ He is only a šaknu "governor" in the Assyrian text, but mlk in the Aramean. Although the social and historical implications of this distinction

¹See D. J. Wiseman, Nebuchadnezzar and Babylon (London: Oxford University Press, 1985).


³With the exception of NATF where this is not all clear.
are somewhat obscure, since no other similar cases have been documented, the resolution of this contrast may lie in the linguistic sphere. The Akkadian exhibits a richer geopolitical vocabulary,\(^1\) while the use of the Aramaic word \textit{mlk} here points to a wider range for its meaning (in English either "king" or "ruler"). This instance can contribute to a clarification of the status held by certain persons—like Darius in Dan 6, whose identification and historical role are still debated.\(^2\) In any case, one title of Hadyis\(^3\) would be addressed "to the local population, the other to the suzerain and his representatives."\(^3\)

4. Cultural. Finally, Millard's suggestion for the identification of Shamash-nuri, the father of Hadyis\(^4\), is of special interest again:

\begin{quote}
It seems . . . that he was an Aramean who had an Assyrian name. Conceivably he had spent his youth in the Assyrian court, maybe as a hostage, possibly being a son of a king of Guzan such as the Abi-Salamu who paid tribute to Adad-nirari II in 894 B.C. Like . . . Daniel called Belteshazzar, this man would have received his name at the Assyrian court retaining it when he returned home to ascend the throne as loyal vassal.\(^4\)
\end{quote}

\(^1\)NATF, p. 110.


\(^3\)"Assyrians and Arameans," p. 105. See also idem, "Daniel and Belshazzar in History," BAR 11 (1985): 77. This difference in titles "was probably motivated by regard to different readers." S. Segert, Review of STF, \textit{AfO} 31 (1984):92.

\(^4\)Millard, "Assyrians and Arameans," p. 104. (Italics supplied.)
Thus, there seem to be some interesting things profitable for the study of the one who compares their forms and contents: Similar ideas are expressed in both of them; the erection of a slm appears in both documents, the possibility and fear that a sickness may overtake the king is noted in line 9 and Dan 4, or the threat of punishment for those who profane the temple vessels as in line 16 and Dan 5, etc. Those points of comparison promise a reward to those who examine them and they indicate that the effort invested in such a study should be worthwhile.

Both this inscription and the book of Daniel are bilingual. Yet, there is basic difference between the two texts in this regard. The former is basically one text presented in two languages, the latter is one text presented partly in one language and partly in another. Both texts use Aramaic as an alternate means of

Structure

It has been mentioned above¹ that the text of the statue is constructed from two parts. The first part is a dedicatory inscription complete by itself (lines 1-12a). Students of the inscription maintain that the second part (lines 12b-23) appears to have been composed when the original statue was restored.² Typologically

¹See "Nature."
²ATF, p. 87, and STF, p. 68.
the two parts of the inscriptions are somewhat unusual because "they record two separate dedications; hence, the standard structure of the dedicatory inscription is doubled."¹ This text is set out in ABAB pattern while the book of Daniel follows ABA pattern.² This ABA pattern is specifically applied again in the concentric structure in the chapters written in Aramaic.³ This same plan is not totally absent from the Tell Fakhriyah inscription. To mention just one example, in part 1 there is first a fact (A) reported (line one: "he set up") and then the purpose (B) (lines 8-10: "so that . . ."), and again the fact (A) (line 10: "he erected and offered").

Both BA and this inscription betray the authors' love for lists--Daniel⁴ much more than Ezra. Both Daniel and Ezra have been understood by some as influenced by Persian bureaucratic style, or as a tendency of later Hebrew court tales.⁵ DA lists

¹RATF, p. 158.

²The last word in the book of Daniel, hayyâmîn, which has a unique Aramaic ending, cannot support ABAB pattern since the definite article which goes with it indicates that it is rather Hebrew than Aramaic.


⁵Snell, "Why Is There Aramaic?" p. 48. Ezra's lists: officials (4:9), goods for temple offerings (6:9; 7:17), temple dependents (7:24), and punishments (7:26). Most of these lists are found also in Snell's article.
include: officials (3:2,3,27; 4:4), musical instruments (3:5,7,10,15), names for garments (3:21), material of idols (5:4,23), the lists of magicians (in Hebrew, 2:2; in Aramaic, 2:10,27; 4:4; 5:7,11,15), synonyms for power and glory (2:37; 5:18), etc. When turning to the inscription we find it is also full of lists and enumerations: a list of participles, praising god's merciful activities (line 1-5); lists of petitions with three successive occurrences of wâšîm and no less than nine imperative verbal forms (lines 7-10 and 13-14); and, when we come to the last part, there is nothing present there besides a list of curses.¹

The Tell Fakhriyah text is a dedicatory inscription. The Aramaic version opens differently from the Assyrian, having a dedicatory clause similar to those opening the Bir-Hadad and Zakkur steles.² The editors themselves have proposed a structural analysis which treats both parts of the inscription in the same way, as if they were created according to the same plan: (1) Introduction or dedication (lines 1-6 and 12-15); (2) purpose (6-10 and 12-15); (3) erection (6-10 and 15-16); (4) prayer for restoration and restoration itself (10-11 and 15); and finally (5) curses (11-12 and 16-23).³ The

¹Sasson's arrangement (ATF) is best for noticing these lists.

²Noted by SAI, p. 139. See also STF, pp. 68-71.

³STF, pp. 68-71.
major weakness of this division is in forcing both parts to fit the same mold. This is evident in the repetition of the same lines for different elements of the division.

We have to keep in mind that the first part of the inscription is different from the second which complements it. This is obvious from the fact that not much is said about the deity in this second part, since it takes for granted the content of the first part of the inscription. Moreover, a more detailed and more descriptive structure must be worked out, for the very first part of the inscription appears to be composite in nature. After a dedicatory introduction, it presents a hymn of praise (combined with a prayer) similar to the text in Dan 3 which contains a hymn of praise to God (3:31-33).

For those reasons Sasson's analysis of the structure fits the plan of the inscriptions more accurately:¹ (1) Dedicatory clause (line 1); (2) elaboration on the goodness of the deity (2-6); (3) presentation clause (6-7); (4) a list of the king's prayers, which is the concrete reason for setting up the statue (7-10); (5) completion of the presentation clause (10), and the restoration with a threat of curses (10-12). The second inscription has a different structure: (1) The introduction (12-13); (2) prayers for the king

¹ATF, pp. 8, 92-102.
(13-15); (3) the deity and the statue mentioned (15-16); and (4) a group of curses (16-23).

I would like to propose here a structural analysis that is very close to the one proposed by Sasson, the only difference being that my analysis gives more attention to the chiastic patterns present in the inscription:

A. Prologue
   Dedicatory Clause
   (line 1)

B. Goodness
   of the Deity
   (lines 2-6)

B'. Restoration
   of the Statue
   (line 10b)

C. The Presentation Clause
   Completion of the Presentation Clause
   (lines 6-7) (line 10a)

C'. King's Prayers
   (lines 7-10)

D. Climax
   (lines 11-12)

Both prologue and epilogue are linked together by two similar expressions which come in reversed order: gdm hdd (line 1) is parallel to hdd . . . qblh (line 12). In the following block of this chiastic structure the link is more in content than in form: the perpetual blessings expressed by a series of participles find their echo in the idea of restoration and in the adverb pas (line 11). What comes next is obviously linked together, namely, the presentation clause and its completion. The climax is found in the heart of the inscription and it probably suggests the major theme of the text, the king's
prayers. One finds here a succession of seven different verbs in infinitive form.

The second part of the inscription has a slightly different but still chiastic plan:

C. King and
his Gods
(lines 15-16)

C'. Gods and King's Adversaries
(lines 16-18)

B. Prayers for
the King
(lines 13-15)

B'. Curses
(lines 19-23)

A. A Short Prologue
(lines 12-13)

In this second part, the prologue is without its expected counterpart, an epilogue. Following the prologue there are series of successive verbs in both corresponding parts with a chiastic pattern on a smaller scale: 'ihn . . . 'nān (line 14) is reversed in lines 22-23 'nāwh . . . wmtw . . . nyrq. From these brief analyses, one can see that both parts of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription have chiastic structures. Moreover, these structures form again on their own chiastic patterns on a smaller scale. One should also note a mixture between the units of prose and poetry in the text. The following examples may illustrate chiastic patterns formed on a smaller scale. The first example is the structure of divine epithets:
A. Hadad of SIKAN
   (line 1)

B. Regulator of Waters,
   Abundance, All Lands
   (lines 2,3)

C. A Merciful God
   (line 5)

C'. All Gods His Brothers
   (lines 3b,4a)

B'. Regulator of Rivers,
    Enriches, All Lands
    (lines 4b,5a)

A'. Who Dwells in SIKAN
    (line 6)

The second example is the structure of curses:

A. GODS
   1. May Hadad not accept his bread and water (line 17)
   2. May Sawl not accept his bread and water (line 18)

B. HARVEST
   1. When he sows may he not harvest (line 19)
   2. When he sows barley (1000) may he harvest a fraction (line 19)

C. SUCKLING
   1. Sheep -- not satisfied (line 20)
   2. Cattle -- not satisfied (lines 20,21)
   3. Women -- not satisfied (line 21)

B'. HARVEST
   1. Women baking -- poor harvest (line 22)
   2. Men pick up barley from rubbish (line 22)

A'. GOD
   1. Death, the rod of Nergal (line 23)

   It is interesting to note here the presence of numerical decrease (decrescendo). The first four statements relate to the person himself, the next three to the descendants of people and livestock. The following two statements relate to population of the land in general, and the last single statement pertains to land.

   When both parts of the Aramaic inscription are structurally analyzed, it seems that the two parts of the
Aramaic inscription were designed to be interconnected in
the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Part</th>
<th>Second Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Epithets of God (lines 1-6)</td>
<td>A. -----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Prayers of King (lines 7-10)</td>
<td>B. Prayers of King (lines 14-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Curse for Disturbance (line 12)</td>
<td>C. Curses for Destroyer (lines 17-23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from this comparison that epithets were not
repeated at all, while the three prayers were, and they
were phrased differently though with the same idea. The
curses, however, which were only stated once in the first
part, were elaborated extensively. The contents of the
two parts are thus complementing each other, probably by
direct design.¹

Finally, in the middle of the prayer section one
finds a triplet with a positive character which may be
parallel to another triplet in the middle of curses in a
negative form:

¹One could even look for a quasi-covenant type
structure in the inscription. It would include a
Preamble or identification of king (line 1), Prologue
or epithets of the god (lines 1-6), Stipulations or
prayers appealing for blessing, in other words what
god should do (lines 7-15), Witnesses Hadad, Sawl
and Nergal (lines 16-23), and Curses (lines 12,17-23).
The absence of Blessings is due to both time period
(first millennium B.C.) and Assyrian treaty style in
contrast to Hittite treaties of the second millennium
which contain a list of blessings (G. E. Mendenhall,
Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East
(Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955), pp. 32-34.
A. House — well-being A. Sheep — not satisfied
B. Descendants — well-being B. Cattle — not satisfied
C. Men — well-being C. Women — not satisfied

For the purpose of comparison, W. H. Shea's two articles on literary structures in Dan 2-7 and especially in chaps. 4 and 5 are very valuable here. It is interesting that Shea finds the same chiastic patterns both on large and smaller scales in chaps. 4 and 5. His analysis of the same chapters is even more important for the proposed outline here, because Shea also finds that the chiastic structure of chap. 4 is slightly different from that of chap. 5. When one compares the two studies in detail, one finds structural similarities between the Tell Fakhriyah inscription and Dan 4 and 5.

Contrasting the structures of the two parts, Sasson tries to simplify them so that the differences would be easier to notice. In the first part comes the introductory formula and there follows the elaboration on (1) the deity, (2) the king, and (3) the statue. The second part has the Introduction followed by the reference to (1) the king, (2) the statue, and (3) the curses. Since in the first part of the inscription the deity seems to take a prominent place, structural similarities with DA are easier to detect in that part of the text.

---

This simplified three-element structure of part 1 can be found in both poetic and narrative texts of DA; only in Daniel it may end with a curse, or a threat, or with a blessing which is a part of the hymns of praise. Thus in Daniel's thanksgiving prayer (2:20-23), we discover that he begins with praising God (vs. 20), who establishes kingdoms and kings (vs. 21), and He has revealed to them "the king's matter," i.e., the mystery of the statue seen by the king (vs. 23). The same can be applied to Daniel's speech to the king in 2:27-35. From the present need, Daniel turns to "God in heaven" (vss. 27-28), then he reveals the king's concern prior to the dream and God's willingness to communicate with the king (vss. 29-30), and finally there come things related to the statue and their meaning (vss. 31ff.). One more example will suffice; that is the answer which Daniel's three friends gave to the king in Dan 3:17-18. Their God is able to deliver them (vs. 17a) from the king's hand and the same king should know (vs. 17b-18a) that even if the contrary were true they would not serve the golden statue set up by him (vs. 18b).

In contrast to Ezra, the Aramaic part of Daniel has several short poetic prayers or hymns of praise. They are scattered evenly through the entire Aramaic

---

1 The word statue is not explicitly found in vs. 23.

2 Ezra has only one in Hebrew (7:27).
Almost all of them, after an introduction, open with praise to the beneficence of God. The succession of participles, noted by Sasson in the beginning of the inscription, is parallel to what one finds in DA. There are four participles in this section of the inscription. In DA texts the succession of active participles used in the same way and for the same purpose is striking. Here I count only those describing God's activity: five are found in Daniel's praise-hymn (2:21-22), five in Darius's (6:27-28), and three in Nebuchadnezzar's (4:31-34).

It would be useful now to compare at least one of the hymn-prayers in DA with the hymn-prayer which is so easily noticeable in the first part of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription. The similarities in structures between Dan 2:19-24 and this hymn-prayer are too obvious to be neglected.

Both hymns can be divided into five distinctive sections, with an introduction preceding and a resulting conclusion following. Four of the sections have the purpose of answering two questions: TO WHOM and WHY? The answers are repeated a second time, and following the

---


\(^2\) ATF, p. 92.
good ancient Near Eastern\textsuperscript{1} and Biblical\textsuperscript{2} pattern the first two answers are general, the last two specific. Let us turn now to the details of the proposed structure:

1. First comes an introduction with the name of the author of the hymn. This is followed by the first answer to the question, TO WHOM? The answer contains a general name/title of the deity. In the inscription (line 1) it is Hddskn who is the irrigator of heaven, while in Dan 2:19b-20a it is the God of heaven.

2. Once again, only a general answer comes, this time to the question, WHY? This answer contains a series of four to five participles, praising the active deity for his blessings in general (lines 2-5a,b and Dan 2:20b-22).

3. Coming back to the same question, TO WHOM, section 3 gives a specific title to the deity and mentions the relationship to the petitioner's ancestors. "The great lord who dwells in Sikan" (lines 5c-7a) is paralleled to "You God of my fathers" in Dan 2:23a.

4. The universal scenario is narrowed and made


\textsuperscript{2}For example, Gen 1 and 2 (Jacques B. Doukhan, \textit{The Genesis Creation Story} [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978], p. 35).
concrete once again in the second answer to WHY, where some specific blessings closely related to the petitioner are enumerated. In the inscription it pertains to the future (lines 7b-10a), in Daniel it is already a present experience which deals with the future (vs. 23b,c).

A resulting action from the part of the person who is praying or praising concludes both texts in question. Hadyisći sets up and offers (line 10b), and Daniel "went" immediately into action (vs. 24).

While there is a great deal of similarity in forms between the two texts, demonstrated by the same structure or sometimes by the use of the same words and formulae (see the following section of this study), it is striking to see how the same linguistic and literary forms may be used for expressing different, contrasting, and opposite religious beliefs.¹

Vocabulary

The vocabulary of this Aramaic inscription is not something unfamiliar to a student of BH or BA. The inscription has several loanwords with other unexpected words and forms testifying to a possible dual influence from the East and the West, another significant similarity with DA. The Akkadian loan words present in the Aramaic section of the inscription are: gwgl, 'dgwr, mt, prys, and possibly 'rmwṛd. The words that seem to be

¹See also ATF, p. 102.
"Canaanitisms" are: z't, lm\textsuperscript{c}n, and 'hr kn.\textsuperscript{1}

The inscription contains twenty-three lines the end of the first part and beginning of the second are in line 12. The first part contains 88 words, the second 108, giving a total of 196 words.\textsuperscript{2} There are 75 word divisions in the first part and 93 in the second, totaling 168 word dividers. Altogether, 733 letters are inscribed on this portion of the statue. Allowing for repetitions, there are 107 different words.\textsuperscript{3} Of these, 65 are also used in DA, 30 are not, although five are used in Ezra and the roots of 29 are used in Biblical Hebrew. Nine words are proper names, two are pure Akkadian loanwords and one (composite?) word still awaits a satisfactory reading and explanation (l'r\textsuperscript{m}wrdt or l\textsuperscript{t}rg\textsuperscript{w}rdt\textsuperscript{4}). The result of this counting shows that roughly 70 percent of the different words from the inscription are also found in DA.\textsuperscript{5} These words are

\textsuperscript{1}ATF, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{2}STF, p. 8, gives a total sum of 198 words, a difference due probably to the division of some proper names.

\textsuperscript{3}All words counted except the conjunction w.

\textsuperscript{4}Thus RATF, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{5}This is interesting when viewed in light of the several facts. Most of the scholars working with the inscription maintain that the first part of the inscription is older, coming from an older statue, and that the second part was put together with the first one at a renewal of the statue (STF, p. 68). This had led me to compare the vocabulary of the two parts, which I must admit yields only limited evidence due to the
evenly distributed in both sections A and B.

We now turn to the list of the words from the inscription which are attested in DA, with a short comment on each word that may be important for this study:

'hr (line 10). Whenever this word is followed by another word it normally takes its plural construct state. However, in this first attestation of it in OA it does not ('hr kn). Ahiqar 99 has 'bry kn¹ and DA 'bry dnh. The same is true for BH (Isa 1:26) and Middle Hebrew. This word was hitherto unknown in OA and its usage in OfA was thought to be due to the influence of Old Persian.² In DA it is found in 2:29,45; 7:24.

'kl (1 'klw line 22). The same form is attested in OfA,³ but there it has a normal y prefix instead of a precative 1 as in this case. In DA it is found in 4:30; 7:7,23.

length of the two parts. Leaving proper names aside, there are 95 different words in both parts. Although they come from slightly different periods of time, they were written with the same purpose and use the same literary style. Of those 95 words, only 20 are found in both parts, and 75 are not--38 being found only in part one and 37 only in part two. The percentage of the common words, therefore, in the two parts of this inscription is only 20 percent of the total number of different words. Compared to 70 percent of the words found in the vocabulary of DA, this is a considerably smaller percentage.

¹The same in bH, Isa 1:26, etc.
²RITF, p. 125.
³DISO, p. 13.
'l ("not," lines 17,18,19,20,21,22,23). Often used with the imperfect jussive in this inscription. In DA the same construction is used four times (2:24; 4:16; 5:10 bis).

'1 ("to", "over," lines 14,14,15). In the inscription this directional and comparative preposition is spelled with an 'aleph rather than with an cayin as in DA (Dan 2:10,24,49, etc.). In general, an cayin expresses the intensification of the meaning. This phenomenon "may be due to the like-sounding eli in the Akkadian text, or the choice may be influenced by the preceding occurrences of '1." 1

'lh (singular, line 5; plural, defective spelling, line 14, and full spelling, line 4). In DA it is attested in Dan 2:20; 3:12, etc., in total 51 times.

'lp (line 19). This number is used as the standard round number expressing the idea of completeness (Dan 5:1; 7:10), and also the idea of intensification (Dan 7:10). 2

'mrh ('mrt, lines 10,14). In DA this root is used only for verbal forms (2:7,9; 3:4, etc., in total 66 times).

'nš ('nšn, line 14, 'nšwh, lines 9,22). Its

---

1 NATF, p. 110.

2 In DA (7:10) one notes a poetic numerical increase because of greatness of scenery described 'lp, 'lpym, rbw, rbwn, while in this inscription a poetic numerical decrease is found because of curse ('lp, prys; m'n).
feminine forms are found in lines 21 and 22. In DA it is found in Dan 2:38; 4:13,14, etc., in total 23 times.

'rk (lm'rk, lines 7,14). This form is either an infinitive of the simple stem or a noun. In DA the root is used only for noun 'arkhā (4:24; 7:12).

'rg (line 2). Spelled with a gāph as in other OA material,\(^1\) while in DA an ayin is used (2:35,39 bis etc., in total 20 times).

b (line 22 and bh, line 11). In DA it is used in Dan 2:28 bis, 38 etc.

byt (defective line 17 and byth, line 8). The editors' discussion should include\(^2\) the four defective spellings of this word in Sefire II C 2,7,9,16. DA has the normal full spelling (Dan 4:1,27; 5:10). Sasson understands this word as "referring to the royal family."\(^3\) In Dan 2:17 it can be that the word means "palace," in 4:1 it comes in parallelism with "palace," or it can be just an abbreviation for bēth malku (4:27).

blh/bly (ybl, line 11). Scholars are still divided over the root and correct meaning of this word. Kaufman\(^4\) together with Greenfield and Shaffer\(^5\)

---

\(^1\)SCAI, p. 17.
\(^2\)STF, p. 34.
\(^3\)ATF, p. 95.
\(^4\)RATF, p. 166.
\(^5\)NATF, p. 114.
believe the root to be nbl/npl. Sasson\textsuperscript{1} prefers the editors' proposition to consider it as coming from the root ybl "emporter." The problem is that such a verb, especially in its intensive form (as understood here by its advocates), would require a direct object which is absent in the context. I consider the root blh/bly to be another possibility which is briefly mentioned only by Kaufman.\textsuperscript{2} All three roots are attested in BH, yet blh in both its simple and intensive stems has the closest meaning to this one. In DA, Dan 7:25 has yebhalla\textsuperscript{3} of the root blh meaning "wear down, out." In its simple stem it would mean "to grow old" and would be intransitive.


\textbf{gbr} (line 12). Serving as an adjective in apposition, this noun shows a distinction in the inscription between gbr and 'nš. The same is true for DA, where gbr is found in 2:25; 3:20 bis.

\textbf{gzr} (ygtzzr, line 23). Here the word appears in the reflexive stem with a passive meaning and consonantal metathesis. The root occurs in OA\textsuperscript{3} and OfA,\textsuperscript{4} but never in this stem. Dan 2:34,45 has the same root in the

\textsuperscript{1}ATF, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{2}RATF, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{3}Sefire I A7, 40 bis, etc.
\textsuperscript{4}DISO, p. 49.
same stem, yet no study on the inscription has mentioned this fact thus far.

**dmw** (dmwt', lines 1,15). The first and older reference to the "statue." The only previous attestation known was the nominal form meaning "value" found in EgA.\(^1\) It is used here in the introductory lines of the first part, while **glm** is used in the second part. Other OA inscriptions use the word **ngb'**.\(^2\) It comes in chiasm with **glm** in lines 15 and 16.\(^3\) Since in the Assyrian version only **galmu** is used, Greenfield and Shaffer believe this to be "reminiscent" of their use in Genesis.\(^4\) In DA, **dmh** is a verbal root attested in 3:25 and 7:5.

**hwy** (lhwy, line 12). Sefire II A 6 has **thwy**. This form has a prefixed **lamedh** and is the earliest precative form, which is frequently used in DA (e.g., 2:20,43, etc.).

**z't** (line 15). It is a demonstrative article, feminine singular. In Hebrew it is written **z't**, Ugaritic **dt**, and DA **da'** (4:27: 5:6; 7:3,8).

**zy** (lines 1,1,5,11,13,13,15,17,23). Five times this word expresses genitive relations (lines 1,13,13,17,23) and four times it is used in the relative sense.

---

\(^1\) BMAP, 3:21.

\(^2\) SCAI, p. 111.

\(^3\) NATF, 111.

\(^4\) NCFT, 49.
It has been known with its genitive function in OfA\(^1\) but not in OA. In DA this word appears 116 times as a relative particle and 53 times for the genitive relationship. Later this particle came to be connected to the following word, as it is in 1QapGen, but it is never written this way in BA, with the one possible exception of Ezra 4:9.

\(\text{zrc}^\text{C} \) (l\text{zrc}^\text{C}, lines 19,19). Here the word appears as verb in the jussive imperfect with a prefix \(\text{l}^-\), while in DA it is used only as a nominal form (2:43).

\(\text{zrc}^\text{C} \) (\text{zrc}^\text{Ch}, line 8).

\(\text{by} \) (\text{lbyy}, line 7 and \text{hywh}, line 14). This word is either a noun or Pael infinitive. Scholars like Greenfield and Shaffer are puzzled by the Aramaic translation of the Assyrian word \text{palu} (\text{palīšu}) by \(\text{by} \) (\text{hywh}) in line 14. They blame the translator's incompetence, a proposition rejected by Sasson.\(^2\)

\(\text{tb} \) (\text{tbh}, line 5). In DA it occurs only once (2:32).

\(\text{yd} \) (\text{ydh}, lines 18,18). DA occurrences are

\(^1\)SCAI, pp. 60-62.

\(^2\)ATF, p. 99, n. 11. I conclude from this case that the Aramaic \(\text{by} \) in its plural form may have the meaning of "term of office, reign" and if this is true, that it can throw some light on the same word in Dan 7:12 where ultimate authority was removed from the three beasts, but an extension of their term of office or reign was given for a limited time. This word is also found in Dan 2:30 and 6:21.

yhb (line 10). The meaning of this word suggested by the context is "offer," "hand over," or "present." The same meanings are found for its occurrences in DA (2:21,38; 3:28; 5:28; 7:11,12).

ywm (ywmwh, line 7). Sasson rightly notices that in the Bible the plural forms of this noun "are often used in connection with age or length of life."¹ I would complete his list with a good example from DA's ʿattiq yšmin (Dan 7:9). ywm is found 12 times in DA.

ybt (tybt, line 15). This word is usually classified under the root ʾb in DA (6:24).

ysb (lines 5,16). In DA, this is spelled with ʾ instead of s (Dan 7:9,26).

ytr (hwtr, line 15). This is a form of the causative stem. In DA it is used more as an adjective (e.g., 2:31; 4:33), but also adverbially (3:22; 7:7,19).

kl (kn, lines 3,5, and klm, line 4,4). In DA this word is always spelled in the defective way in accordance with OA and OfA and against lQapGen. In DA, e.g., see 2:35; 3:29.

kn (line 10). Beside DA, this is also attested elsewhere in OA and OfA² (Dan 2:24; 4:11; 6:7; 7:5,23).

krs' (line 13). This word is attested in OA.³

¹Ibid., p. 95.
²SCAT, p. 86.
³Ibid., p. 87.
Sefire III 17 should probably read the same way. In DA it is found in 5:20,29; 7:9.

1 (27 times). It is used 50 times in DA.

\[ l \] (line 22 and \[ lbm \], lines 17,18). This word is found only once in DA (5:1) with the meaning "meal" or "feast."

\[ m'h \] (lines 20,20,21,22). This is translated "hundred." Like the previous word, this one occurs only once in DA (6:2).

\[ m'n \] (\[ m'ny' \], line 16). In DA this word is found three times in chap. 5 (vss. 2,3,23), but it has not been known from OA.

\[ ml' \] (\[ yml'nh \], line 22). Attested elsewhere in OA,\(^1\) and twice in DA (2:35; 3:19).

\[ mlk \] (lines 6,7,13). A common Aramaic word which is attested 135 times in DA (2:4,37,47, etc.).

\[ mn \] (8 times). Translated "from." Nun is rarely assimilated in DA (2:45; 4:22).

\[ mn \] (lines 10,16). Translated "who, whoever." In DA it is found in Dan 3:6,11,15; 4:14,22,29 and 5:21.

\[ mr' \] (6 times). The interpretation of the second form of this word in line 6 is a problem. Sasson, on the basis of the Assyrian version, suggests that it should be viewed as having the third person pronominal suffix.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 99.

\(^2\)ATF, p. 94.
In BA this word is found only in Daniel, and there it occurs four times (2:47; 4:16,21; 5:23).

**nhr** (line 4). This word is not otherwise found in OA or OfA. Dan 7:10 is the only place where it comes in DA.

**nht** (*mhnht*, line 2). This verb is used here in its causative stem. In DA both the simple and causative stems are used, e.g., 4:10,20 and 5:20.

**nyn** (*nwn*, lines 21,22). In OA the usual spelling would be *nyn*. This word is found once in DA (Dan 6:25).

**ntn** (lines 2,3). The participial form is not used in DA, only the infinitive form (e.g., 2:16; 4:14).

**swr** (line 20). Spelled here with *s* and used in the collective sense, just like Sefir 1 A 23. In DA, 4:22,29; 5:21.

**cbd** (line 15). Means "to do." Frequently found in DA in both simple (3:1,22, etc.) and reflexive stems (2:5; 3:29).


**prys** (line 19). Translated "half or a part of something." This is a rare word in DA, where it is spelled defectively in contrast to this spelling here (2:25,28).

**slm** (line 12, *slmh*, line 16). Used in the Bible (2 Kgs 11:18 and Num 33:52) and DA to express concrete
representation of deities for cultic purposes (e.g., 3:1, 19, etc.).

\textit{qbl} (\textit{qblh}, line 12). This word is considered to be either a preposition or a verbal form. Both explanations are parallel to what is present in DA (2:6, 31). As a preposition it is not otherwise found in OA. In DA it usually has the simple meaning "in front of" (3:3), but here it is a derived, metaphoric "against."

\textit{qdm} (lines 1, 15, 15). Two times this is spatial and one time it is temporal. Both meanings are found in the DA (e.g., 2:9; 7:7), where the spatial use is more frequent. DA spelling is defective together with OA, EgA, and 11QtgJob against most of its full spellings found in 1QapGen.

\textit{rb} (line 6). Rendered "great." In DA it is found fifteen times (e.g., 2:14, 31, 48).

\textit{rhmn} (line 5). Used as an adjective or a noun. In DA \textit{rhmn} is taken as a noun (2:18).

\textit{šlh} (line 3). Translated "peace." Scholars have overlooked DA occurrence of \textit{šeleh} (4:1). This root takes a verbal form in Sefire III 3. The Hebrew noun is \textit{šeli̇}.

\textit{šlm} (lšlm, line 8, 8, 8). It could be either a noun or an infinitive. Sasson renders it "safety and well-being"\(^1\) which is in complete agreement with the formula \textit{šelāmekhōn višqē} (Dan 3:31 and 6:26).

\textit{šm} (šmy, lines 11, 16, šmym, line 11 and šmh, line

\(^1\)ATF, p. 95.
The mem in ſmym is considered enclitic, and it could be a sign of the Akkadian influence. This noun is found six times in DA (2:20, 26; 4:5 bis, 16; 5:12).

ﬆm (lines 1, 16, ſyym, line 12, and lům, line 11). The difference between a normal long imperfect and a precative-jussive is clear for this verb. In DA it comes in both simple (3:10, 29, etc.) and reflexive stems (2:5).

Šmy (line 2). It occurs in DA 36 times (2:18, 28; 4:23, etc.).

Šm (lmlšm, line 9). Sasson's Biblical list on hearing one's prayer should be filled out with the good example from Dan 9:17-19. In DA, this word is used in both simple (3:5, 7, 10, etc.) and reflexive stems (7:27).

Šnh (šnwh, line 3). Sefire and BA provide further evidence that this word is masculine. Nun in this word is never assimilated prior to 1QapGen and the Targums. In DA it occurs in 6:1, 3, 15 and 7:1.

tglw (tglwth, lines 5, 9). The nominal intensive form whose root glh/gly is known in OfA and DA (6:10, 11).

The list of the same expressions, formulae, and phrases has a double relevance for this section and the

---

1 So STF, p. 32.
2 ATF, p. 92.
3 AIS, p. 155.
4 DISO, p. 245.
study of the syntax. The very opening words of the inscription—dmwt' . . . zy śm—are paralleled by Dan 3:2—slm' dy hqym, or Dan 3:18—slm . . . dy hqymt. śym and hqm can be interchangeable.¹ The formula ūmyn w'rg.
(line 2) is found in Dan 6:28 surrounded by several participles just as in the inscription. The two nouns come together in parallelism in Dan 4:8 and 4:32 (again with several participles). Sasson notices that the formula is commonly found in the Bible,² but he does not give any example from BA. It is interesting to find that in Jer 10:11 this formula appears twice with slightly different spellings of the word 'rg, the second time being spelled 'rc.

Although there are Aramaic words that are often viewed as "the hyperarchaisms" (like gdbry' in Dan 3:2), the fact that 'rc is always spelled this way and not with a gōph points out that there is no blind or naive tendency in DA to imitate Aramaic archaisms. A deeper study of this formula leads one to conclude that the spelling 'rg is more archaic than 'rc, because formulae are subject to a certain conservatism against changes. This is well illustrated in Jer 10:11 where the 'rg spelling is used in the formula, while 'rc seems to be common in that time.

The formula "god who dwells in X" (lines 5-6) or

¹ATF, p. 92.
²Ibid., p. 93.
abbreviated "god of X" is often used in the ancient Near East. The book of Daniel is in agreement with the Biblical teaching that only God's name is in Jerusalem (9:18-19) while God Himself dwells in heaven (2:11,28, etc.), hence His title as the Lord of Heaven (Dan 5:23).¹ The shortest form of this formula is the euphemism or the metonymic word "Heaven" found, e.g., in Dan 4:8.

¹The formula need not be derived from "a Persian influence" as some scholars have argued, e.g., D. E. Gowan, Bridge between the Testaments (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1982), p. 65.
zy for the genitive construction is well known in DA. For example, Dan 2:14 'aryōkh (rabh tabbāḥayā' dî malkā or šallīṭa' dhî malkā'). The parallel between ygtzar min mth (line 23) and its parallel in Dan 2:45 has not been noted previously. Here the same verbal root in the same reflexive conjugation is found closely connected with min and a noun in the emphatic state.

Orthography and Phonology

The a priori assumption that the whole orthography of DA is late, or else "that [it] has suffered in the development of the vowel-letters"¹ may now be questioned as a gross oversimplification. In 1944 Albright stated that it was customary to omit vowel-letters until the seventh century B.C.,² but already in the 1950s, his students Cross and Freedman formulated their conclusion on the use of the final vowel-letters in the ninth century B.C.,³ the very time of the Tell Fakhariyah inscription. They stated⁴ not only that the center of radiation for this practice was Aramaic, but also that it had a great impact upon the Hebrew

¹Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary, p. 18.
⁴Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry, pp. 31-32.
inscriptions of the time. At first this development related to final syllables, but not long afterwards came the development of medial vowel-letters.¹

Fitzmyer, correcting this thesis, says that it is still valid, but that the problem with it originally "was their reluctance to admit the inceptive use of medial vowel-letters in some Old Aramaic texts, for which the evidence is now clear."² Muraoka agrees with Fitzmyer's modified version of the thesis, but feels that it is in need of further modification because of the new material found especially in the Tell Fakhriyah inscription. "As far as our inscription is concerned, the use of medial vowel letters in it is very much farther advanced than 'inceptive'; it is indeed almost fully developed."³

The consonants used as vowel-letters in this inscription are: y, w, h, ' (possibly in z't).⁴ The sizable number of these spellings is "one of the most striking features of this inscription."⁵ All OA texts use vowel-letters for indication of final long vowels. Their use to denote internal vowels has generally been considered⁶ to be limited to not more than five or six

¹Ibid., p. 41.
²A Wandering Aramean, p. 64.
³TFEA, p. 87.
⁴See ACH, p. 54.
⁵RITF, p. 117.
⁶Ibid., p. 121.
cases in Western OA. Yet in this relatively short
inscription there are no less than fifteen such cases.
almost 15 percent of the total number of different words
used in it. The following words are considered as being
fully spelled: 'dqwr, 'lhyn, dmwt', qwql, mwtn, prys,
y'ryn, tnwr, tglwth, y'sym, Gwn, Hbwr, Nyrgl, Snwry,
Swl.

Because of this, the editors were led to conclude
that already in this period vowel-letters were used in
the middle of a word, which is significantly earlier than
what was generally admitted.\textsuperscript{1} The extent of the use of
matres lectionis in the inscription seems for Muraoka "to
indicate that this process had been underway for quite
some time."\textsuperscript{2} Kaufman's formulation is even more
radical:

In our text every long \textmu and \textnu is indicated, with
the apparent exception of only five words . . . unlike Western Old Aramaic, where internal long
vowels are not indicated, Gozan Aramaic does
indicate them—but, like Official Aramaic, not always
for this particular morpheme, thus indicating that
this orthography was already an archaism by this
time.

A statement like this reminds us that not only in
problems of orthography but in other areas as well DA has
to be evaluated not only by its time but also according
to its geographical characteristics. More and more facts

\textsuperscript{1}STF, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{2}TFEA, 87.
\textsuperscript{3}RATF, p. 156.
bearing on this subject point to the eastern character of DA, as rightly argued by Kutscher.¹

The editors have also noted that inconsistency in the aspect of orthography was not unique to this inscription, but it is important in the larger horizon of OA.² Thus 'lhyn is also spelled defectively. Once again the OA corpus does not seem to be as uniform as used to be maintained. Rosenthal made a similar statement on BA, that it was "a more systematic but still far from consistent application of this kind of vocalization."³

As for the origin of these phenomena at so early a stage, scholars are more and more convinced that it comes as a result of the intensive mutual contact and influence between Akkadian and Upper Mesopotamian Aramaic scribes.⁴ For Muraoka "foreign words and names may have served as a major catalyst for the development of matres lectionis, whether medial or final."⁵

The phonology of the inscription is in many ways in agreement with what had already been known from OA: The substitution of b for p is confined to the word npsych; ḍ is expressed by g in the spelling of two words ('rq and

¹HAS, p. 362ff.
²STF, p. 40. See also NCFT, p. 55-56.
³GBA, p. 8.
⁴See the study by J. Aro, Abnormal Plene Writings in Akkadian Texts. Studia Orientalia 19/11 (Helsinki: SOF, 1953).
⁵TFEA, p. 86.
mrq); and מ is ẓ, except for the verb lwd. The difference comes in the use of samek to indicate phonetic ętr (interdental) where other OA texts have ẓin. Kaufman believes that this "is an orthographic rather than phonological difference."¹

In OA the interdentals were still pronounced, but the alphabet borrowed from Canaanite-speaking people in whose languages these sounds had disappeared had no distinctive characters for them. Thus in these cases ẓ single sign had to be used for more than one sound (e.g., in Phoenician t had merged with ẓin). At Gozan where there was no Phoenician influence, no such "Phoenicianizing" transpired.

The grapheme ẓ was not phonetically univalent in OA. The spelling of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription indicates that. Muraoka can safely conclude that Degen was right in arguing against Stiehl's thesis² because now we can sec that the principle of polyphony must be postulated . . . . The difference in orthography between the two idioms can be accounted for by assuming that one is dealing with two geographically distinct allographs to notate one phoneme.

Coming down to OfA, DA shows a manifest difference from the early material, particularly in the use of the dentals (d,t). On this basis the conclusion

---

¹RATF, p. 146.
²AAG, pp. 33f.
³TFEA, p. 90.
was made that DA was much later than OfA. Rowley followed W. Baumgartner in this reasoning. Rowley stated:

This very important evidence is therefore strongly indicative of a date for Biblical Aramaic subsequent to that of the Papyri. There is not a single indication that Biblical Aramaic might be earlier than the Papyri, but many indications that it must be later.

What Rowley failed to note was the occasional "late" spellings in the early OfA documents, or some "early" spellings in DA, like $kw$ in Dan 6:23. According to the established norms, this was earlier than $dkyn$ of the Papyri. Even if this example were the only exception to his thesis (which is not the case), it still should have hindered him for making such a categorical statement.

Coxon accuses Rowley of ignoring "any serious discussion of the phonetic developments" underlying the spelling in the texts and "any bearing this might have upon the situation in Biblical Aramaic." Coxon perceives that a reason for the variation in OfA may be traced back to the phonetic limitations of the Phoenician alphabet. This is evident in OfA where, although $z$ spellings predominate, there is ample evidence for the phonetic shift to $d$.

---

1 "Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel," p. 81.
2 AOT, p. 38.
3 AP p. 6.
The reasons for Coxon's thesis are phonological and orthographic factors manifested in the difference between historical and "modern" spellings. I presume that his starting point must have been the perception of a non-uniformity in the ways of spelling in almost all OfA documents, and also in a small number of unusual phonetic phenomena in some OA inscriptions. Thus Kutscher mentions mh' from Zakkur A15 (written this way and not mbq) and argues as follows:

The form as established by Landsberger therefore apparently indicated that at that time (eighth century B.C.) the PS /q/ was a ready (sic!) realized as /c/. But in the parallel OA texts it is still the sign /q/ which is employed for the notation of the PS /q/, apparently, because the phone had no sign of its own realization, as is generally assumed at some (previous) time was close to that of /q/ (but not identical with it) . . . Therefore, we are compelled to assume that the OA rqy already represents an historical spelling.1

In his detailed study of the problem, Coxon treats this subject by taking each set of consonants separately. He also considers the series of mutations within the wider context of the comparative Semitic languages. This procedure, according to him, affords the only reliable basis for a valid historical assessment of the orthographic situation in BA vis-à-vis other Aramaic dialects, and in particular the Aramaic Papyri of the sixth-fifth centuries B.C.2 In each case, Rowley's list


of relevant examples is complemented with the omitted as well as more recent examples from the material under study.

Coxon comes up with the proposal that although there was a tendency for ɗ to become more common in the second half of the fifth century, the development took place in the living language already in "the latter part of the sixth century B.C., although it found no uniform expression in the script until after the fifth century."¹ He gives similar conclusions for the use of нные for the interdental fricative ʬ, and of ƙayin for the etymological ɗ. In both cases the older OfA texts sustain the transition and remove any doubts about their pronunciation in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.²

If one takes seriously the evidence advanced by Coxon's study, then one is left with two options in solving most of the phonological problems in DA: First, phonetically the orthography of DA is in agreement with the pronunciation of Aramaic in the latter part of the sixth down to the fifth century. The earliest ɗ spellings are attested even earlier, for example, in a proper name ƙmƙɗry from the sixth or seventh century B.C.³ In OA, Fitzmyer states that if the root lwd that occurs in

¹Ibid., p. 11.
²For the complete lists see AOT, pp. 26-31 and Coxon, "The Problem of Consonantal Mutations," pp. 15-17.
³CIS II vol. 1, pp. 88-89.
several places in Sefire is correctly analyzed and "is related to Hebrew lwz, then there is an interesting case of the early shift z to d in the writing that is now attested."¹ Now this same root has turned up in the Tell Fakhriyah inscription with the same possible shift. In a similar way, the earliest instance of the relative pronoun with d is the one in the eight letters of the Hermopolis Papyri dated paleographically by Naveh to the end of the sixth or the very beginning of the fifth century B.C., or the Persapolis Ritual texts.² The spelling of some words in Jer 10:11 would again support this first option. There we have two spellings corresponding exactly to the spellings in DA.³

Second, the option for the use of "later" spellings would account for a late influence upon the scribes in their revision of the text in order to make it fit the changing pronunciation. The differences between

¹AIS, p. 76, dated in the eighth cent. B.C.
³Jeremiah has the historical spelling in the archaic formula "$\text{smyn}, \ 'rg\)", but contemporary spelling in \'rg\ and \'r\ (=Dan 2:10). Even Baumgartner in his extensive work did not seem to have grasped this distinction between \'rg\ and \'r\ [ZAW 45 (1927):123]. Hartman and Di Lella (AB, p. 77) with some commentaries, reject Jer 10:11 as a late gloss, betrayed by the non-poetic character of the verse. Snell (JSOT 18, 1930, p. 42) states that the verse fits its context. Th. Laetsch (Jeremiah [St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1965], pp. 121-22) gives a good poetical anlysis of the verse in its fitting context. Were the scribes or redactors so naive as to write this gloss in Aramaic (this being the only "gloss" in the OT in Aramaic)?
the fragments of Daniel at Qumran and the Masoretic text would support this view. Occasional hyper-archaisms in the Aramaic papyri (e.g., zyn wzbb) and in DA (gdbry') led H. H. Schaeder to state that a definite revision of the orthography of DA had taken place. In this he took into account the period of textual history involved and the phases of spelling corrections that would go with it.

One also has to take into consideration the literary genres of the texts under study. The texts of the narrative-didactic style, like the DA, Ahiqar, and some of the Behistun fragments, exhibit a higher proportion of an advanced phonetic spelling, while most of the Papyri are of legal-business matters which prefer the traditional archaic terminology and spelling.

Coxon's thesis is attractive, although it will

---

1 The spelling of the Qumran fragments of the DA is closer to the spelling of 1QapGen than to the MT. See the differences noted in D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, Discoveries in the Judean Desert. Qumran Cave I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 150-52, and J. C. Trever, "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave I," RevQ 5 (1965): 323-34.

2 Iranische Beiträge I, pp. 242-5. If this is true, then occasional d spellings in other books of the Bible, like the book of Job, would have to be explained in the same way. A. M. Blommerde (Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job [Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1969], p. 5) gives no less than ten such examples.

have to be modified in some degree, given the data that have come up in the Tell Fakhriyah inscription.¹

The only consonantal metathesis in the inscription is found in the word ygtzr (line 23) where a palatal g changes place with the dental t. In DA a similar change occurs several times, but only between a sibilant and a dental.²

Morphology

The morphology of this inscription shows an interesting mixture of archaic and innovative features. The precative with l and the demonstrative pronoun zlt are archaic. The infinitive peca is always prefixed with m, as in OfA, and DA, etc., and it is not paralleled in other OA texts. The masculine plural ending for the nouns is fully spelled (-yn) two out of five times, as in DA and in contrast to Western OA and OfA.

Despite the fact that the Ketib cannot be taken as absolutely more authentic than Qere in DA,³ there are examples such as Dan 4:16 and 21 which remind us how important it is to take all factors into consideration when one treats the text of DA, which was transmitted, in contrast to the engraved OA texts. The word mrt in the

¹I have in mind at least one place, the bottom of p. 12 of his article. At Gozan, where Phoenician influence seemed to be nil, we still have, for example, the relative or genitive particle spelled with z.

²BLA, p. 55.

³GBA, p. 12.
inscription is spelled in accordance with other OA inscriptions.¹ When the pronominal suffix y is attached to this word, the preceding 'aleph is retained. The same is valid for mr'h in line six. In DA (Ketîb) the 'aleph is found, as in this inscription, both with and without suffixes. Some changes occur in EqA,² while lQapGen elides the 'aleph whenever suffixes are added,³ and the same feature is present in later Palestinian Jewish Aramaic.⁴ The demonstrative z't retains 'aleph but has t. In DA it is just like the rest of OA, i.e., d' (z').

The preformative l on the jussive precative is known from Samalian and the Assur Ostracon⁵ and in a unique form, lhw', in DA.⁶ It is not only archaic but a characteristic of Eastern Aramaic dialect. It is usually understood as coming from Akkadian.⁷ Our text gives as many as twelve forms with the precative proclitic l. In the days of Bevan, when the evidence was quite limited,

¹SCAI, pp. 105-106.
²Like AP 34:6.
³GAQ, p. 235. Without suffixes it is spelled mrh.
⁴Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel," p. 104.
⁵KAI, 233.
the form lhwh in DA was seen as nothing more than a late
targumic/talmudic practice to avoid the writing and
pronunciation of words similar to the
tetragrammaton. Bevan "guessed" that lh1 sounds in
pronunciation as lhwh. At first this looked
attractive, yet Bevan was forced to contradict his own
thesis, stating that at the same time the holy name was
not pronounced anyway, while other forms of the same
type, i.e., lhwn and lhwyn, caused much trouble to him.
One reason for his thesis was the effort to eliminate the
obstacles to his "western" hypothesis for DA.

In Hatra inscriptions the performative for the

1It is found also in Mandaic (AOT, p. 92) and
in at least two places in the Jerusalem Targum (Exod
10:28 and 22:24). In doing research one has to proceed
from something known to unknown. The date of the origin
of the Targums is still very uncertain. They did
originate in a time of great Messianic expectations. The
text of DA may be viewed as one of the sources for those
expectations rather than a product of the same. For this
particular form in the Targums, Bevan also suggests "a
mere imitation of Biblical Aramaic" (p. 35, n. 1).
Analyzing the history of speculations on the date of
Messiah's coming in Judaism, R. T. Beckwith is convinced
that the accumulated data "necessitate a reconsideration
of the common Maccabean dating of the book" ("Daniel 9
and the Date of Messiah's coming in Essene, Hellenistic,
Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation," RevQ
10 [1981]:521). Compare this with the recent proposal
of J. C. Trevar, "The Book of Daniel and the Origin of
of the Qumran Community," BA 48 (1985):89-102, that the
compiler of the book of Daniel was the very Teacher of
Righteousness, based on the similarities between the
teachings of the sect and the content of the book of
Daniel. He certainly overstates the evidence by saying
that linguistic arguments support his view (p. 101).

2A Short Commentary, pp. 35-36.
3KAI 237-257.
prefix tense is regularly ₁ instead of ₇. Today scholars argue for this not only as being a trait of Eastern Aramaic but that "₁ in this position is older than ₇."¹

Two characteristics of the OA jussive precative are: (1) In the second and third masculine plural endings, ₇ is absent; (2) in the non-suffixed persons of the verbs tertiae infirmae, ₇ is replaced with ᵣ. In addition to these, our inscription suggests a shortening in spelling of the hollow verbs. Together with the prefix ₁ the first two characteristics are attested in DA, including the rare form ṣtgry, "let him be called," spelled with a final ᵣod that may be the remnant of an old jussive form.² The third characteristic, according to Muraoka, is not in evidence to a sufficient degree to allow us to determine whether the distinction was universally true of "any inflectional class of verb and there is no absolute reason to think that it must have been universal."³

Somalian attests to the regular syncope of ᵣ in the causative imperfect.⁴ Sefire has seven cases with ᵣ and four without.⁵ DA spellings have the same rat..c

²BLA, p. 89; GBA, pp. 44 and 52.
³TFEA, p. 96.
⁴DLV, pp. 121-22.
⁵AIS, p. 157.
(45 cases: 30 with, 15 without). The Tell Fakhriyah inscription retains h in the imperfect (lhygn̄n, line 21) and the participle (mhn̄ht, line 2) of the causative stem. Elsewhere, the participial form of this stem is found as follows: (1) In OA the only potential occurrence is the form restored by Fitzmyer in Sefire I A 21 which would have an h.1 (2) In DA fifteen different verbal roots take the form of this participle. In ten such forms h is retained, against four where it has the syncope and in one (ydh) it has both forms. (3) Later documents like lQapGen have no causative forms with h in perfect, imperfect, infinitive, or participle.

Our earlier concepts on the syncope of h may have to be changed in the future, because "once again our inscription compels us to rethink the issue."2 We cannot comment on Muraoka's challenges to Kaufman and Degen,3 which have no direct bearing on our discussion, but Coxon's conclusion on a similar problem is difficult to accept. It is true that one example does not constitute proof in itself, yet the causative participle mhn̄ht is significant in that the nasal is not assimilated even in such an early period. This evidence may again go against certain schemes of development whether drawn

---

1Ibid., p. 14.
2TFEA, p. 92.
3Ibid. Muraoka challenges Kaufman's statement that "degemination is a feature of Babylonian Akkadian."
chronologically or geographically. It often shows the inadequacy of hasty or oversimplified conclusions, and compels us to have less rigid paradigms to impose on this language. I cannot see why the Nerab inscription (seventh century B.C.), which can be even considered as an OA text,\(^1\) did not influence Coxon's conclusion that all OA "is bereft of spellings with the N augmentation." According to the same chronological scheme, Coxon concludes that both BA and 11QtgJob reflect "a later stage in the spelling of the Pe Nun verb when the vowelless N is once more assimilated to the following consonant."\(^2\)

The phenomena of nasalization and assimilation in Pe Nun verbs is a complex matter which cannot be solved by one general statement. It has to be studied in respect to a single verb, with each stem separately, taking into consideration the kind of second consonant present in the root of that particular verb.\(^3\) Moreover, Aramaic has


\(^3\)See also an interesting evaluation of Coxon's article, by R. I. Vasholz, "A Further Note On the Problem of Nasalization in Biblical Aramaic, 11 Q tg Job, and 1 Q Genesis Apocryphon," RevQ 10 (1981):95-6: "It seems to me better to trace only those verb forms which occur in the above Aramaic documents rather than to just total the number of verbs en masse. In this way one notes actual changes, not assumptions."
been influenced to an extraordinary degree by the fact that it had to live together with a variety of other languages. "Its vocabulary shows manifold layers of foreign influence which shed light upon the historical development of the language."\(^1\) Based on this observation by Rosenthal, I propose to apply this fact to the problem of nasalization and assimilation in Pe Nun verbs in DA.

There are examples of unassimilated original nun in OfA.\(^2\) In the fifth-century Arsames correspondence, that nun is always preserved. This is very similar to EgA in contrast to the Hermopolis Papyri where the assimilation is the rule with a few exceptions. For J. D. Whitehead the influence of Babylonian Akkadian (especially Middle Babylonian) pointed out by Kaufman, and also Old Persian working in the opposite direction, may be a part of the solution for these phenomena in Aramaic. Says Whitehead:

The evidence suggests that foreign language influence may well lie behind the phenomenon of dialectal preservation of nun in the Imperial Aramaic period and that Babylonian Akkadian may be the source of that influence. In texts which exhibit so much Persian influence, it is interesting to note that, with regard to this feature of the Aramaic, the situation in Old Persian orthography is exactly the opposite.\(^3\)

\(^1\) GBA, p. 57.
\(^2\) DISO, p. 188.
Since BA shows the influence of both Babylonian Akkadian and Old Persian in its vocabulary, this fact combined with the evidence noted above can contribute to our explanation of the presence or the absence of the nun in this particular grammatical context in DA. However, the evidence is still too limited to allow for any final conclusion.

One more problem related to the syncope of h is in the forms kln and klm, where the editors seem to have left two possible ways of explaining them: (1) They can be taken as the suffixes for plural feminine and masculine forms. A few such cases of masculine plural forms are attested in DA and usually explained as mere "Hebraisms."¹ (2) An alternate explanation would be to consider these forms as pronominal suffixes, third person plural, attached to the nouns with the syncope of the h, which would make them unique in form in the Aramaic language.

The prefix m preceding the infinitives of the simple stem is a new feature in OA coming with this inscription. Fitzmyer's position is that it is a Canaanitism,² while Dion maintains that it is a later development in Aramaic,³ but this would go against the examples in our inscription here. As the earliest Aramaic

¹GBA, p. 24.
²A Wandering Aramean, p. 67.
³DLV, pp. 122f.
text it uses only the prefixed form. Thus one can conclude with Muraoka that it is "a genuine, native feature of Aramaic, whilst the non-prefixal form may have come about under a foreign, most likely Canaanite, influence."\textsuperscript{1} DA, just as OfA, uses all prefixed forms of the simple infinitive. Another solution would favor DA more, namely, that the m prefixed infinitive is a Mesopotamian Aramaic innovation which would subsequently become a universal Aramaic feature.\textsuperscript{2}

The infinitive of the derived stem in the inscription has only one occurrence, lknnh (line 11).\textsuperscript{3} According to the study by Vasholz,\textsuperscript{4} all OA infinitives of this type have an h as the ending. This is true for DA, while Ezra has more variety even though h is the rule. The same form seems to predominate in EgA, while 11QtgJob has three uses of the h and one of the 'aleph. Only 'aleph is clearly attested in 1QapGen. Similarly, there are two cases with the 'aleph from Murabbaat. In Palestinian Jewish Aramaic the 'aleph is the rule, h

\textsuperscript{1}TFEA, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{3}This is according to the editors. Dennis Pardee, however, reinterprets this form and argues that it should be taken "as precative l + 3ms. imperfect jussive + 3ms. pronominal suffix." [Review of STF, JNES 43 [1984]: 254.] The same has been argued by Kaufman, RATF, p. 150, and JAOS 104 (1984):572.

\textsuperscript{4}CJT, pp. 57-8.
being rarely used. The consistency of the spelling in DA in this regard should be noted.

I have already noted in the Vocabulary section the comparison of the two reflexive forms for *qer* in DA and the inscription under study. A troublesome spelling of this form in Dan 2:45 is *itpeśel* instead of *hitpeśel* as in vs. 34. In the apparatus of the BHS, a number of manuscripts are listed that testify to the existence of this earlier form in Dan 2:45.

Syntax

In the study of the vocabulary and formulae, at least a dozen parallel phrases or expressions were compared between the DA and the inscription. This seems to be quite significant for this section of this study. Some similarities seem to be very striking. For example, Kaufman comments twice on line 15 and the phrase 'l zy gdm nwtr as being "a direct calque of the usual Assyrian formula eli ša mahri ušātir."¹ He then goes on to say that such Akkadianisms, both grammatical and lexical, are simple calques from the Assyrian Vorlage, but they "are not found in subsequent Aramaic dialects (i.e., they are conscious Akkadianisms, not part of normal spoken or written Aramaic)." On the other hand, where the text uses an Akkadianism not paralleled in the Akkadian text, it is "a feature that can also be found in Official (Imperial)

¹RATF, pp. 152,168.
Aramaic and/or other later Aramaic dialects.\(^1\) Although I would not question the soundness of Kaufman's proposal, I would like to turn attention to a strikingly similar "calque" in Dan 3:19 which reads \(^1\)dy bzh lmzyh\(^2\) and which, though not easy to analyze, is almost identical in form with the one in the inscription.\(^2\)

The word \(^1\) negating the imperfect jussive is found eight times in the second part of the inscription. The same is attested four times in DA (2:24; 4:16; 5:10 bis). In giving a list the Assyrian version omits the conjunction, while Aramaic, following the West Semitic pattern, uses the copula extensively. Therefore the Aramaic is explicitly conjunctive while the Akkadian is asyndetic. "Of the forty cases of \(^w\) in the Aramaic, eight are represented in the Akkadian, a ratio of 5:1."\(^3\) In a similar way the Aramaic is characterized by frequent use of \(^l\) directive. In the section beginning in line 13, one can count that "one \(^a\) in the Akkadian version corresponds to six \(^l\) in the Aramaic,"\(^4\) where the whole ratio is about 1:3.

It is important to note that in the last two

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 152.

\(^2\)Notice that lmzyh is an infinitive and that hwtr in the inscription can formally be not only a perfect but an infinitive causative as well, although the Akkadian shows that it is a perfect.

\(^3\)NATF, p. 111.

\(^4\)Ibid.
points a significant syntactical departure of DA from the Aramaic of Gozan occurs, the former approaching the Assyrian (Akkadian) style closer than its Aramaic relative. Can one conclude that on this point DA is "more eastern" than the dialect from Gozan?\(^1\) The occurrence of the copula is moderate in DA, having in mind the narrative style of the running text. Yet, in most of its lists, DA seems rather to omit the waw (e.g., 3:2,3,5 etc.). As for the second point where the Aramaic uses \(\text{^1}\) in front of each of the infinitives (of purpose) in a series, \(\text{^1}\) does not seem to be present in the same case in DA (e.g., Dan 5:12). This preposition does come up in a case different from this one in the inscription, namely, the \(\text{^1}\) precedes an infinitive only if that infinitive is followed directly by another (finite) verb (e.g., Dan 5:14-16; 2:9-10) or if it follows a prohibitory \(\text{^1}\) (e.g., Dan 6:9). The situation is not so clear for the extensive use of \(\text{kl}\) in lines 3 to 6. Here four of its occurrences appear in comparison to only one in the Assyrian version. DA seems to employ the latter pattern, although such verses as Dan 2:10 remind us that one cannot be too certain on this point.

In the introductory chapter, the shifts in DA from the third person report to the first person and

\(^1\) In his brief analysis of part B, Segert wonders whether here the Aramaic text "was the original, and the Assyrian one its translation?" Review of STF, Afo 31 (1984):93.
vice-versa were noted. This is paralleled in the inscription (which is much shorter than DA), in the Aramaic part (lines 11-12) as well as the Akkadian (especially lines 13-17). Both are paralleled by the Assyrian royal inscriptions of the first millennium B.C.

As Kaufman has noticed, in three cases an apparently singular form occurs in a plural context: at (kln) (lines 3, 5); nhr (kim) (line 4), and (m'h) swr (line 20). He maintains that "there is no satisfactory explanation of this strange feature," or else one simply has to assume the use of internal plurals. Sasson's example from the Sefire I A 23, where the singular šwrn occurs among plural nouns, is helpful in this case. For him there is no doubt that the nouns here must have a collective sense and its function here can be distributive, "every land." In DA kl occurs only twice with plural pronominal suffixes and following several collective singular nouns (Dan 2:38; 7:19). The same word does have a distributive emphasis in the same two places. Furthermore, DA often has the interchange of singular and plural nouns, e.g., Dan 4:22, 30 ('nš not 'nšym).

The determinative pronoun zy is used as the

---

1 See p. 42.
2 NATF, p. 111.
3 RATF, p. 148.
4 ATF, p. 101.
genitive particle linking two or more noun phrases where a classical Semitic language would have a direct synthetic and not an analytical linkage.\(^1\) In fact, the construction "x zy y" is used no less than five times (lines 1,13, bis,17,23). There may be some early attested examples in OA,\(^2\) although this is more common in OfA.\(^3\) It has already been noted that this feature is nothing short of a literal translation from Akkadian \(\#a\).\(^4\) That the frequency of this usage (the ratio of the use of the construct state to this analytical construction is 11:5) is due to Akkadian syntactic influence receives substantial support from this document. Therefore, it seems that "l'usage génitivale de zy était alors déjà bien intégré à la langue [araméenne du 9e siècle]," according to the editors.\(^5\) Or to take Muraoka's words, the use of the analytical zy had its origin "in the sphere of Akkadian influence, namely in

\(^1\)TFEA, p. 101.
\(^2\)Sefire I A 10 and III 7. See AAG, p. 89, where Degen is defending its usage in OA. Kutscher seemed to maintain the same: "However, since he [M. M. Bravmann] disregards OA and the possibility of AK influence, his conclusions drawn from BA can scarcely be regarded as decisive." HAS, p. 353.
\(^3\)SCAI, pp. 60-62.
\(^5\)STF, p. 57.
the East, at a fairly early period."\(^1\) A similar conclusion is given by Kaufman who bases it on examples from the Aramaic which have no parallel in the Assyrian version: "Some of the Akkadianisms in this dialect are not the result of translation-language but have already been absorbed by the local Aramaic dialect."\(^2\)

The question can be raised how old this usage really is. For Muraoka it is not as early as the editors appear to suggest,\(^3\) but it probably arose in the East under Akkadian influence and spread extensively during the time of OfA. Thus it remains particularly eastern. In this regard it is interesting to note that the first part of the inscription (lines 1-12) contains three out of four occurrences of \(zy\) as relative particle; the only occurrence in the second part is part of an idiom. When it comes to the genitive role of \(zy\), the second part has four out of five occurrences. Since the Assyrian version seems to be the original, we consider the absence of the introductory section in the first part, where the only "genitive \(zy\)" is found, as possible evidence that this section was added only at the occasion of the later restoration, a fact that explains the frequent use of the genitive \(zy\) in that part.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) TFEA, p. 102.
\(^2\) RATF, p. 152.
\(^3\) TFEA, p. 102.
\(^4\) Along the same lines Fales, "Le double
M. Z. Kaddari has undertaken a thorough study of the same subject as evidenced in OfA, BA, and LA, each time in its geographical and stylistic contexts, respectively. Using some of his data I have made a table with the ratios in the most representative documents of OfA, BA, and LA, together with the ratio found in the Tell Fakhriyah. In table 1 the first number represents the number of the construct chains in the document, the second number the occurrences of the analogical ẓy, and the last number represents the ratio of the two. The Behistun Inscription has the lowest ratio since it is a rigid "literal translation from a Babylonian Vorlage."

**TABLE 1**

**SYNTACTICAL AFFINITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>No. of Cstr. Chains</th>
<th>No. of ẓy constr.</th>
<th>Ratio Between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behistun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Fakhriyah</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BA of Ezra</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley's Papyri</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahiqar</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QapGen</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaddari, ibid.

Ibid., p. 103.
From this table one notes that DA comes close to the OA document and the documents under the eastern influence. Coxon notes Rowley's difficulty in attempting to lower the date of DA on the basis of this particular issue: "It is difficult to follow Rowley's argument here since he is implying that Daniel follows a later usage."¹ Comparing the Papyri and DA on this point, the difference in settings should not be disregarded. DA is a piece of historical narrative and the other texts have legal and diplomatic character where, for example, the nomen regens preceding the particle zy is often determined.

Three points on the similarities between the usage of the "genitive zy" in this inscription and DA can be pointed out: (1) From the numerical point of view, the construct state is far more frequent in both texts than the periphrases, and sometimes the choice between the two is arbitrary, yet such arbitrariness should not be taken for granted. (2) With the help of zy, it is possible to join several nouns which constitute a semantically unified phrase, one after another in both texts under the study (Dan 5:5=TF, line 13). (3) The use of zy is convenient when a series of nouns to be unified into a phrase contains a further sub-unit, i.e., a construct chain. This construct chain may (a) precede or (b) follow the relative zy. Two examples are as follows: (1) mlk

This section on syntax can be concluded with one of the most important features for the issues on the debate over DA, namely, the word order of the inscription as compared to the same in DA. In the verbal clauses the finite verb is not pushed to the end of the sentence as normally in this Akkadian (Assyrian) text, neither is it at the beginning as in West Aramaic. According to Kaufman, with the exception of the lines 14-18, the standard order is SUBJECT-VERB-OBJECT. The Aramaic of the inscription has a free word order, however; something in which it is similar to Akkadian. Yet, since the Assyrian version, which is as important as the Aramaic on this point, has a uniform verbal final word order, Kaufman is willing to revise slightly his thesis of a direct influence into a rather "longer Assyrian-Aramaic contact."

Muraoka compared the two versions in terms of

---

1RATF, pp. 153-54; DLX, p. 288; HAS, p. 362.
2STF, pp. 70-1, also notices line 10.
3RATF, p. 154.
4Segert finds that "the presence of linguistic features which appear much later in Imperial Aramaic supports the hypothesis of its eastern origin" (Review of STF, p. 94).
5RATF, p. 154.
some contrasting patterns and here I give a summary of his results.¹ The same sentences are compared in the two versions: Three times: OBJECT-VERB (Assyr.)=VERB-OBJECT (Aram.); two times: OBJECT-INFINITIVE (Assyr.)=INFINITIVE-OBJECT (Aram.); once: SUBJECT-VERB (Assyr.)=VERB-SUBJECT (Aram.); once: SUBJECT-ADVERB-VERB (Assyr.)=SUBJECT-VERB-ADVERB (Aram.); once: SUBJECT-ADVERB-VERB (both), SUBJECT-OBJECT-VERB (both), and ADVERB-OBJECT-VERB (both); finally four times in both, OBJECT-VERB.

The conclusion one can draw from the above is that the translator did attempt on occasion to free himself from the foreign (Assyrian) influence, but he also followed the foreign word order pattern. What are the implications for DA? It has been mentioned earlier that Kutscher had elaborated the main syntactical characteristics for Eastern OfA: (1) The object comes before the infinitive; (2) before the finite verb; and (3) the subject often precedes the verb, which is pushed to the end of the sentence. All of these characteristics fit much better with the Assyrian examples than with the Aramaic version. Once again, DA comes closer to the former at the expense of the latter. Coxon concluded that "an intriguing feature is the apparent 'eastern' word order which distinguished the Aramaic of Daniel from

¹TFEA, pp. 103f.
Official Aramaic and the later dialects."¹

Just as in Akkadian, the position of words in a verbal sentence of DA is free or flexible, yet preference is shown for the sequence of OBJECT-VERB-SUBJECT or SUBJECT-VERB. OBJECT-INFINITIVE order can be either Akkadian or Old Persian in influence.² The direct object can precede the verb.³ DA also favors the position of the verb at the end of the sentence.⁴ This confirms Kutscher's view that BA is Eastern in origin. According to a study of this scholar, Jewish-Palestinian Aramaic stands in contrast to this.⁵ For example, lQapGen has the normal "Semitic" word order VERB-SUBJECT-OBJECT.⁶

It has been observed that Akkadian influence in the early OfA is more pervasive than in the later OfA, like EgA.⁷ It was in the East that Aramaic first rose to a position of prominence as the lingua franca. Loosed from Mesopotamian connections, the linguistic texture of

²RATF, p. 154. Kaufman dismisses the Akkadian influence on this point.
³GBA, p. 56.
⁴Coxon, "The Syntax of the Aramaic," pp. 120f.
⁵See also CJT, pp. 70-1.
OfA in the fifth century "appears to conform to the more ancient sequence VERB-SUBJECT-OBJECT, in accordance with North-West Semitic usage."¹

Bir-Hadad Inscription
Description

The Melqart stele which bears this inscription was discovered in 1939. It was found in an ancient cemetery near Aleppo, though not in situ. Today it is displayed in the museum of that city. Its inscription has only five formulaic lines of OA, yet it should be included in this study for the sake of completeness. This inscription, which dates from the mid-ninth century, was the oldest substantial text in Aramaic prior to the discovery of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription.

Since the initial publication by M. Dunand in 1939,² it has been the subject of scholarly debate regarding its identification and reading. Albright himself started up the controversy by identifying the erector of the stele Bir-hadad with Ben-Hadad I and accommodating the reading of the inscription to this interpretation.³ Dunand reacted energetically by stating that Albright's reading of the second line could

¹Ibid.

²"Stèle araméenne dédiée à Melqart," Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth 3 (1939): 65-76.
not be accepted. R. de Vaux joined Dunand, stating that Albright's "restitution me paraît impossible." Ever since that time, scholars have been divided as to their reading of the inscription. For example, J. Starcky and B. Mazar favor Dunand's reading, while M. Black and Rosenthal have inclined towards the one proposed by Albright.

In 1972 Cross took a fresh look at the inscription. With the publication of new photographs of the stele in various lightings, he felt certain he could "determine the correct reading of the entire text including the second line." Three years later in 1975 two books on OA inscriptions were published. In the one J. C. L. Gibson followed Albright's reading paralleled by the alternative second line proposed by Cross. In the other, E. Lipiński proposed his own reading of line 2,

---

1 As quoted by F. M. Cross in BASOR 205 (1972): 37.
5 ANET, p. 655.
7 TSI, p. 3.
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which departed from the previous readings not only in what concerns the proper names in the inscription but also in the reading of other words in the text. In 1979, Shea suggested a new reading for Bir-Hadad's father. Ç>r dmsq brmn. It needs to be mentioned, however, that almost all the differences in reading the inscription which actually divide the scholars pertain to the proper names in line 2, and not to the rest of the text under this study.

The paleographic dating of the inscription, according to Cross, leads us to the time of the Amman Citadel inscription, both inscriptions having "distinctly less developed [script] than the script of the Zakir Stele (ca. 800 B.C.)." What concerns its location, not only the place of discovery but the text itself, leads us to classify its Aramaic as a western type of OA. This needs to be pointed out before we proceed with the linguistic analysis and the comparison with DA.

Nature

Like many other OA monumental inscriptions, the stele has a votive-dedicatory inscription on it. It was made for Melqart, a Phoenician god, and it was erected by


1 "The Kings of the Melqart Stela," MAARAV 1/2 (1979): 159-76.

a certain Bir-Hadad. The text is short and the style is very much formulaic in nature.

A Phoenician votive-style model is clearly followed in the wording of the inscription. But, as Gibson has noticed, in some ways the language itself did not absorb much from this influence. This is evident from words like nzr, nsb and mtr which are pure Aramaic words, not Hebrew or Phoenician.

Structure

This short inscription can be divided into two parts. First comes the Introductory formula including the statement of erection of the statue, the erector's name together with his patronymic—which can be Tbrmn br Hzyn (Albright), Czr māgy' (Cross), Czr šmš (Lipiński), or else Czr dmāq brmn (Shea). In the second part, the name of the deity to whom dedication is made occurs, and the reason is given for this act of dedication. Put in a simplified way, the inscription answers four basic questions: WHAT? (the statement of the matter or the object of the inscription); WHO? (the subject concerned with the matter or the erector's name); WHAT DEITY? (a full formulaic name of the deity); and WHY? (the reason for the matter). The statue was erected by Bir-hadad to his god Melqart (abbrev. of mlk qrt), because when he

\[^{1}

TSI, p. 2.

---
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(Bir-hadad) made a vow to him (Melqart), he listened to his (Bir-hadad's) voice.

Let us compare this structural pattern with two of Daniel's speeches to the King Nebuchadnezzar. The first one is in Dan 2:36-38: Daniel describes the statue seen by the king in his dream (vs. 36), addresses the king whose title is the king of kings (vs. 37a), mentions the God of Heaven ('lh šmy') who is the king's protector (vs. 37b), and finally the reason for the dream (vss. 38ff). The other speech with a similar structure is recorded in Dan 4:16-24: the king in his dream had seen a tree (vss. 16-18), which concerns and represents the king himself (vv. 18-20); God the Most High is holding the king's lot in His hands (vs. 21), and then the reasons for the dream follow (vss. 22-24).

In the light of what has been seen on the structure of the previous inscription together with this one, it seems that DA employs structural patterns common in the Aramaic-speaking areas--the patterns which are older than the traditional dating of DA.

Vocabulary

Bir-Hadad is another inscription which has a vocabulary that is familiar to a student of BA or BH. A total of fifteen different words are used in it. Five of these are proper names. This leaves ten different words and nine of these words or their roots with the same or
similar meanings are found in DA.¹ The only word that is not found is the verb *nzr*, which is, however, attested in BH, Phoenician, and Ugaritic.² Because of the length of this inscription, the evidence based on its vocabulary is quite limited.

There are several formulae in the text which are present in DA in the same or similar form. Their syntactical importance is discussed in the section on syntax. The dedicatory formula in the introduction is rather common and in form with other OA inscriptions. *nṣ b 1 zy ʿm . . . l* is identical with the one in the Zakkur inscription, while the Tell Fakhriyah inscription has *dmwt' . . . zy ʿm qdm*. In the second part of that inscription, *glm* is the word used instead of *dmwt'*. The former is used in the introduction to the story of Dan 3, in the expression similar to what has been pointed out above concerning the OA inscriptions. *glm' dy hqym nbwkdnṣr mlk'* occurs not less than three times in Dan 3:2-3 and six more times in an almost identical form in the rest of chap. 3 (vss. 5,7,12,14,15,18). This makes a total of nine occurrences, in the same chapter, of an expression common among OA inscriptions.

A somewhat problematic expression *zy nzr lh* (line 4), on which more is said in the study on syntax, is

---

¹*nṣ b*, *zy*, *ʿm*, *br*, *mlk*, *l*, *mr'*, *ʿm c*, and *ql*.

paralleled by five formulae in DA, all having the same form \( zv \) plus a verbal form and plus an \( l \) with a pronominal suffix (Dan 2:23,37; 5:12; 6:17,21). Also the phrase \( \text{ym}^c \text{lqlh} \) from the same fourth line is attested four times in Dan 3:5,7,10,15, but in DA the \( l \) does not precede the word \( gl \).

Phonology and Orthography

By way of spelling, Bir-Hadad is in agreement with other OA texts. The rule of defective spelling governs its orthography, and indeed a case of extremely defective writing is found in the very first word, \( n\text{sb}' \) (read: \( n\text{giba}' \), or \( n\text{agsebha}' \)). This may represent a Qatî type of noun, spelled without a \( ycd \).

In phonology we encounter a normal western OA practice, where the interdental \( d \) is represented by \( z \). This is evident in words like \( zv \), \( nzr \), and \( czr \). In this regard the phonology of the inscription is different from what we have in DA. Lipinski, who has done extensive work on Aramaic onomastics, finds many early spellings of \( d \) as both \( d \) and \( z \) in the early Aramaic Onomasticon, some examples coming from a period as early as the beginning of the eighth century B.C.\(^2\) The root \( czr \) is often used in the Onomasticon with such a spelling. The word \( nzr \) is

\[^1\text{ACH, p. 20.}\]

\[^2\text{Lipiński, "Studies in Aramaic," p. 17.}\]
also interesting, for although the root \( nzr \) is attested in the Niphal and Hiphil stems in Hebrew, in the Qal stem it is spelled with \( ndr \), as in Phoenician and Ugaritic.\(^1\) On the other hand, if one follows the reading proposed by Cross, one finds a similar phenomenon, to Cross's own surprise, that in "Old Aramaic we should expect \( 
{d}i \) maṣq to be written \( zmāq \), the adjective \( msqy' \)."\(^2\) This suggests that \( d \) spellings are not totally absent from early Aramaic material.

**Morphology**

The emphatic ending on the word \( ṇsb' \) is significant because features like this point to an Aramaic dialect as the language of the inscription. The word \( mr'h \) did not suffer an elision of the 'aleph preceding a pronominal suffix, and this is in agreement with OA, OfA,\(^3\) and DA against some Qumranic material like 1QapGen and Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, where the elision occurs.\(^4\)

**Syntax**

The formula of the introduction \( ṇsb' zy šm . . . \) has its similar parallel nine times in Dan 3 and the word

---

\(^1\) TSI, p. 4.
\(^3\) SCAI, pp. 105-106.
\(^4\) GAQ, p. 213.
order in both formulae is identical. Furthermore, the
word order of lmr’h lmlqr (lines 3,4) is just the
opposite of what we would expect. In other words, it is
the rule that mlk or mr’ come together with a proper name
and follow the name. This applies not only to OA,¹
but, as Rowley says, to the Aramaic of Lydia, Babylon,
the Papyri, the Nabatean inscriptions, and BA of
Ezra.² This order is observed in many cases in DA,
however, except in six occurrences of the word mlk’ when
it comes in apposition with a proper name (2:28,46; 5:11,
etc.). Since this shift in word order is found in the
Targums, it suggested an additional argument for a late
date of DA.³

The form of this formula in the Bir-Hadad
inscription does not support that conclusion, since the
word order is the same as the six examples from DA. Coxon
calls attention to the fact that almost all examples from
OA are located within the framework of introductory
date-formulae, whereas the six mentioned examples in DA
are found scattered in the narrative body of the text. It
is only there, where a date formula occurs in DA, that
the order is like that of the other Aramaic texts.⁴ Our
inscription does seem to support Coxon's proposal.

¹On this see SCAI, pp. 105-106.
²ACT, p. 104.
³Ibid.
Moreover, a new occurrence of this "reversed" order of the formula is found in the Meissner Papyrus dating from 515 B.C.,\(^1\) being but a part of a date-formula.

While the word \textit{zy} has the function of the relative particle two times, the same does not occur in a genitive construction. The construct state is the only way to express possession even if three nouns come together in the chain.

It is the second occurrence of that relative \textit{zy} which creates the ambiguity in syntactical understanding of line 4, which is sometimes translated "to whom he made a vow," where \textit{zy} stands for Melcarth, or other times it is rendered "which he vowed to him," \textit{zy} standing for \textit{n\textsuperscript{g}b'}. In DA a similar syntactical feature is found at least five times. In four of these cases there does not seen to be any doubt regarding the function of \textit{zy}. In all four cases (Dan 2:37; 5:12; 6:17,21) \textit{zy} stands either as a resumptive or as an anticipatory relative pronoun, taking the place of an indirect object. In Dan 2:23 an ambiguous case is present like that which we have in this inscription: \textit{dy} may stand either for \textit{'lh} or \textit{'nh}. Since \textit{'nh} has the function of an indirect object in this phrase, which is a smaller part of the complete sentence (where also \textit{'lh} is a direct object), it is more likely that \textit{dy} is related to \textit{'nh}.

If this conclusion can be carried over into the

\(^1\text{Ibid.}\)
Bir-Hadad inscription, then zy in this text would stand for Melcarth (and its resumptive pron. suffix) rather than for nṣb'.

**Conclusion**

This first step of the study seems to indicate a number of features significant for the subject treated here. Indeed, there are some interesting points profitable for the study of the one who compares DA with these two oldest texts of OA.

It has been pointed out that both the Tell Fakhriyah inscription and the book of Daniel are bilingual, and they are so because they use the practical Aramaic language and script as an alternate means of communication to a large audience. In the case of the book of Daniel, Aramaic is used because of the universal character of the message that is found in that part of the book, while Hebrew is utilized to convey the message to a more specific audience.

Both texts, that of Tell Fakhriyah and DA, are linked by similar ideas and motifs: The erection of a glm by a king; the possibility and fear that a sickness may overtake the king (line 9 and Dan 4); the threat of punishment for those who profane the temple vessels (line 16 and Dan 5).

The meaning of the mlk in the inscription can be particularly instructive. Matching the word šaknu from the Assyrian version, it shows here to have a wider range.
of meanings, a fact very useful in clarification of the status held by Darius according to Dan 6:7.

Structural similarities are manifested in that both Tell Fakhriyah and DA show their authors' love for lists and enumerations. Their texts are a harmonious mixture of narrative units and hymns of praise. Both the inscription and Dan 4 and 5 have chiastic patterns on large and also smaller scales. Yet the chiastic patterns in the one part are not slavishly reproduced in the other.

The plan of one of the hymn-prayers in DA (2:19-24) agrees well with the hymn-prayer in the first part of the inscription. The most obvious connection between these two texts is the succession of participles praising the beneficence of the god. The structure of Bir-Hadad is similar to the ones in Dan 2:36-38 and 4:16-24.

The vocabulary of the two inscriptions is familiar to a student of BA and BH, because 70 percent of the different words from Tell Fakhriyah and nine out of ten words from Bir-Hadad are found in DA. The word bywh (line 14) is in the plural and has here the meaning of "term of office, reign." Thus it can throw some light on the same word in Dan 7:12 where ultimate authority was removed from the beasts, but an extension of their term of office or reign was given for a limited time.

In the area of orthography it has been seen that fifteen different words with internal vowel-letters in
the earliest Aramaic text suggest an alternate explanation for the presence of the same phenomena in DA, rather than an indication that DA was of late development. Since this inscription comes from the east, it points to the possible place of origin of DA. Certain fluidity is found in the way of spelling the plural of some masculine nouns, and this shows the absence of rigid consistency in the choice of defective or full spelling.

A similar observation can be made on phonology which is not totally uniform in our texts. Thus, samek is used for phonetic ֲ, and d spellings in the verbal root ֶֹ inDA and in the eighth-century early Aramaic Onomasticon. The word ֶֹ is spelled in the same way as in DA in contrast to EgA and LA. This word is found in both of our inscriptions. Preformative ֶֶ on the jussive, found in Tell Fakhriyah, points to the East. It cannot be a late rabbinical practice. The characteristics of the jussive preceptive can be found in both the inscription and DA.

מֹ (line 2) testifies to non-assimilation of nun in some verbal forms. The text of DA, in this aspect, does not need to be a later stage in the spelling, but its cases of nasalization and assimilation may rather be viewed as being under a double (Babylonian and Old Persian) influence, a fact also attested by the presence of loan words from these two languages.

Moreover, if ֶ is viewed as the suffix for the
plural masculine, then -ym in Dan 4:14, etc., does not have to be a Hebraism. The mem prefix to the infinitive is not a later development in Aramaic, but could be a Mesopotamian Aramaic innovation that had spread universally. Finally, the infinitive of the derived stem is spelled with h ending in lknmh (line 11), and this practice is constant in OA and DA. More variety is found in Ezra, EgA, and llQtgJob.

DA has an important parallel to a rare expression ḫz ᵇṣdm ᴱwṬ which is a direct calque from Assyrian. In the use of copula and l directive, DA seems to be closer to the Assyrian version than the Aramaic. Singular forms of nouns can be found in a plural context (lines 3-5, 20), and this is a good illustration for the examples in Dan 2:38 and 7:19.

When a comparison was made between the ratios of usages of the ḫz construction and the construct chain in the most representative documents of OfA, BA, LA, and Tell Fakhriyah, the following results emerged: DA comes close to the OA document and the documents under eastern influence. The study of the word order yields similar results. In both texts it is free and flexible with a preference for putting the nominal word at the beginning of the sentence. In Sir-Hadad (lines 3,4) lmr’h lmlgrṭ, the word order shows that the same in DA can be dated earlier than a practice from the times of the Targums.

Finally, it is illustrated in at least one case
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that the text of DA may help in solving a problem in an OA text. We refer here to the syntactical position of the relative *zy* in Bir-Hadad 4, which is paralleled no less than five times.

It is therefore safe to conclude that the two earliest texts of OA offer various interesting parallels with DA. These parallels can only contribute to and in no way hinder our advancement of knowledge on the two dialects. The texts receive more of their full richness, thanks to the comparison, and the new light helps to reexamine some of the arguments behind the discussions on the origin of DA. The parallels do point to an interesting amount of the common material in DA and OA—often in contrast to LA.
CHAPTER III

OTHER OLD ARAMAIC INSCRIPTIONS

Introduction

In a brief note in an article, Kaufman has made an interesting suggestion for a present tentative division of OA dialects:

It appears that we are going to have to change our terminology once again! Let us use "Old Aramaic" to refer to all Aramaic antedating the Neo-Babylonian period. This is to be divided into at least three dialects: Northern (Samalian), Western (formerly Old Aramaic, e.g., Zakur and Sefire), and Eastern (i.e., Mesopotamian). Given the differences among these three groups, the language of the Deir Alla texts can easily be fit into an Aramaic framework—Southern Old Aramaic, of course . . . The prior consensus that saw no geographical dialect distinctions in Aramaic before the first millennium C. E. is clearly now inadequate.¹

One can see how far we have advanced now from what used to be the general consensus on the uniformity of OA (Western) dialect. No one can deny the major role played by the single discovery of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription, which has changed in many ways our whole picture of the Aramaic language. Beyond that particular text, however, we must also examine the eighth-century OA

texts, to see what evidence they bring to the study of this subject.

**Zakkur (and Graffiti)**

**Description**

The Zakkur inscription\(^1\) was discovered in 1903 in Afis, thirty miles southwest of Aleppo. In its complete form it must have been a relatively long inscription, for in its present condition it is possible to decipher and reconstruct around forty-five lines. Its erector was Zakkur, a king of Hamath, and the text is dated to the years 780-775 B.C.\(^2\)

H. Pognon published the text in 1907.\(^3\) Since that time a number of studies dealing with the inscription have appeared. Students of this inscription include J. A. Montgomery, Albright, J. Friedrich, J. C. L. Gibson,\(^4\) etc. It is clear that, as Gibson puts it, "the phonological system and the system of endings in nouns place the language of the inscr. firmly among the


\(^{2}\)TSI, p. 7.

\(^{3}\)Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mésopotamie et de la Région de Mossoul (Paris: Librairie V. Lecoffre, 1907), p. 156.

Old Aram. dialects."¹ I would add to this that the language of the inscription, its phonology as well as its syntax, agrees with the place of its discovery.

Nature

This inscription is written with the purpose of demonstrating gratitude to the god Baal Shamayin who delivered the king at a critical point in his reign. It has, therefore, a dedicatory purpose. The text exhibits more of a narrative character than the other OA monumental inscriptions. That is why it comes very close to the text of DA in some places. For this reason Albright was led to read in this text, in two places where reconstruction was necessary, a well-known formula for introducing direct speech in DA.²

Structure

Section A opens with a formula common to OA monumental texts. Then follows the description of the problem, the call upon a divine being, and the deliverance provided. Section B describes the prosperity of the king and his kingdom together with the actions undertaken to please the god, such as rebuilding his temple, etc. This stele also carries a warning against all who try to damage it.

¹Gibson, TSI, p. 7.
This narrative structure is often encountered in different stories of DA. It can be traced through various narratives from Dan 2 to 6. The most striking similarity is between the beginning of section A and Nebuchadnezzar's speech in Dan 3:31-4:1ff. In both texts the same first person report follows the introduction and ascription of power and dominion to the deity.

Vocabulary

In its present condition this inscription has forty-five lines. Allowing for repetitions there are fifty-six different words in addition to a number of proper names. The analysis and the meaning of one word (yhg, B16) is not yet settled. We are thus left with fifty-five different words, forty-four or 80 percent of which are found in DA. Of the eleven words that are left, one is attested in the BA of Ezra and nine of the remaining ten have their counterpart in BH. Only one word (cdd A12) is not found in any of the biblical texts. It is usually explained by comparison with related words in Arabic.1 From this overview it may be stated that the vocabulary of this inscription presents no problem to the student of the original languages of the OT text.

The word cnh in A 2 has been grammatically understood to be a passive participle acting here as an adjective. Some of the various interpretations proposed

for this word include the following: Scholars who translate this word as "humble"\(^1\) point to Zakkur's humble origins since he was not born of a royal family. Lipiński\(^2\) suggests this king might have been afflicted or oppressed prior to his taking the throne, and thus this word would emphasize his past situation. For scholars like Gibson,\(^3\) the biblical parallels, together with the parallels from Panammu \(i,19\) and Barrakab I \(4\) (\(gdq\) used in both inscriptions), lead to an understanding of Zakkur's confession as his statement of being "pious," his religious nature. This is an attractive proposal which agrees with the content of the inscription. All this discussion is interesting for DA, since the same word in its plural form is found in Dan 4:24. A number of scholars\(^4\) have argued that the meaning of this root has a religious connotation in the Old Testament, especially in the book of Psalms.

Albright, on the other hand, proposed a reading of the word as part of the formula frequently used in DA, \(\text{Cnh \text{w'smr}} \) "answered and said."\(^5\) This proposal has not

\(^{1}\) F. Rosenthal, *ANET*, p. 655.  
\(^{2}\) *Studies in Aramaic*, p. 22.  
\(^{3}\) *TSI*, pp. 9, 12-13.  
\(^{5}\) Albright, ibid.
been accepted very widely since Albright suggested it. He could also have noted the occurrence of that same formula in A 11, which would have given even more credibility to his proposal. On the other hand, the emphatic occurrence of the personal pronoun 'nh is preceded by a participial active form of a verb in Dan 2:8.

The name of the Zakkur's god, bC1šmy n, is the Canaanite form of the Aramaic title mr' Šmy' (Dan 5:23). In A 10 there are two expressions in the form of VERB X min X, and they are used for the purpose of comparison. The same sequence of these elements can be found in one phrase in Dan 7:3. The word ky (A 13) appears only here and in Sefire III 22, and it is probably a reflection of the use of a West OA dialect. It is absent from DA. The particle 'yt (B s) is present in a number of Semitic languages and Aramaic dialects and often has slightly different spellings: Phoenician, 'yt; Arabic, 'iyya; Hebrew, 't; Zenjirli, wt; DA and later Aramaic, yt. This was once one of the arguments used to prove that DA was late in origin, because earlier researchers found it in LA. But because of its occurrence in OA dialects and in early EgA (BMAP 3:22), this argument cannot be valid any longer. This situation is similar to mn qdm coming before the name of a deity, as found in DA and the

1See also Ahiqar 99: ky Czyz 'rb pm mn 'rb mlbm.
2DISO, pp. 28-29.
Targums. Its occurrence here in the partly reconstructed line B 19 assures us that its provenance is from earlier times.

'\( \text{lh} \text{ymyn} \) in B 25 can be compared to several places in Dan 2 where '\( \text{lh} \text{ymy} \) occurs (Dan 2:18, etc.).

Orthography and Phonology

There are a number of final vowel-letters and at least one internal vowel-letter in this inscription. The \( w \) in \( \text{\textswri} \) (A 17) provides an example of the internal vowel-letter. Still in question as possible internal vowel-letters are three cases which are less clear: \( w \) in \( \text{mbnwt} \) (A 9), and \( y \) in \( \text{\'yt} \) (B 5).

No other irregularities in orthography appear in this inscription. The emphatic forms end with 'aleph, but there is one instance of its being written with he in the graffiti,\(^1\) revealing an early exchange of 'aleph with he. In DA there are six cases of the masculine emphatic state spelled with the he in lieu of the usual 'aleph.\(^2\) The same is attested thirteen times in Sefire and a few times in Elephantine Papyri.\(^3\) 1\text{QtgJob} agrees with DA against 1\text{QapGen} and the later Targums. Rowley was aware of the evidence from the Papyri in his study of this phenomenon, yet it did not have much impact upon his

\(^1\)\text{KAI} 203. Both the Zakkur inscription and the graffiti come from approximately the same time period.

\(^2\)see \text{BLA}, pp. 209-10.

\(^3\)\text{CJT}, p. 48.
conclusion that DA was later than most of the Papyri.¹

Morphology and Syntax

Since the following remarks pertain to both morphology and syntax it is preferred to have them in one common section. The direct-object particle 'yt is spelled with an 'aleph just as in Sefire, while DA has only yt. The pronoun hmw (A 9) is comparable to its form in Dan 2:34.

There is a problem in finding out the exact number of kings who joined together to fight against Zakkur. In two places the text is broken and different reconstructions have been proposed to solve the problem. Friedrich² proposes a combination of what is clear in both lines A 4ṣ... ṣr and ṣb... in A 8. This combination gives ṣbCṭCṣr as the reasonable reading for both places. Lines 5 to 8 would then give just a summary of the most important kings. Although Gibson does not accept this proposal,³ Old Aramaic⁴ and DA (Dan 4:26) are in agreement with this order in Zakkur. This is in contrast to Cowley's edition of the Papyri⁵ and LA⁶

¹AOT, p. 41.
³TSI, p. 15, yet Degen accepted it in AAG, p. 6.
⁴CIS II vol. 1, p. 2.
⁵AP, 26:10, 11.
⁶CIS II vol. 1, pp. 76,228; vol. 3, pp. 50-51.
(Palmyrean and Nabatean), which have the opposite word order in numbers, where the units follow C'sr.

The introductory formula ngs' zv zr zkr mlk is very much like the one found nine times in Dan 3. But unlike DA, there are several consecutive waws with the imperfect in this text. This type of syntax is attested in Hebrew, Phoenician, Moabite, and epigraphic South Arabic. Gibson argues that this is not uncommon in Aramaic. For him it is significant that there are several examples of the imperfect with past meanings in BA. This offers a way of explaining this feature within Aramaic. The absence of this phenomenon in DA could be an additional indication of its eastern character. As for Gibson's argument that the imperfect can have a past meaning in DA, it could be noted that the perfect is used on occasion in DA to indicate the future (Dan 7:27). This shows a fluidity in the use of tenses in DA.

The word order in the inscription is purely West Semitic (the verbal element precedes the nominal subject), following that normal pattern from the beginning to the end of the text.

---


2Ezra 4:12; 5:5 and Dan 4:2,31.

3TSI, pp. 7-8.

4GBA, p. 56.
The Sefire Inscriptions

Description

The Sefire inscriptions are the most outstanding representatives of the West OA dialect because of the length of their texts and also because of the number of studies dealing with those texts. The inscriptions under consideration here are in fact a combination of three stelae which earlier were known as the inscriptions from Sugin. They were discovered in 1930 in Sefire, which is ten miles southeast of Aleppo.

Because of their length (around 200 lines), the language of these inscriptions represents an important group in the division of OA texts. "The three stelae together comprise the most substantial stretch of text in Syrian Sem. epigraphy."¹ At the same time "these inscriptions scarcely reflect all the aspects of Aramaic grammar in the period of 'Old Aramaic.'"² The Aramaic of this period is undoubtedly under Canaanite influence.

Stelae II and III have very fragmentary forms in their present state of preservation. The writing belongs to the mid-eighth century B.C., although the exact dating is not easy to determine. "The terminus ante quem for the three inscriptions is certainly 740 B.C."³

¹TSI, p. 19.
²AIS, p. 139.
³AIS, p. 2. See also, A. Lemaire and J. Durand, Les Inscriptions de Sfrîrî, pp. 89-90.
The inscriptions have been worked over well by many scholars. Since S. Ronzevalle's initial publication of the text, many studies have been produced dealing directly or indirectly with the Sefire inscriptions. The following exhaustive studies deserve special attention because they form the principal sources for the discussion that follows: Degen, AAG; H. Donner and W. Röllig, KAI; Koopmans, ACH; Fitzmyer, AIS; and Gibson, TSI.

Despite the extensive amount of study given to these inscriptions there are still many parts of them that remain obscure. There are at least two reasons for this. First and most important is the fact that the text is poorly preserved. Second, the use of scripta continua is the rule throughout, placing several difficult passages in dispute as to where their words should be divided. Since Fitzmyer's reading and translation is the most exhaustive study of this text, it has been followed most closely here. He admits that his "own study has not


3Only Donner is responsible for the Aramaic section.

solved all these problems either, but as Kutscher noted, Fitzmyer's "comprehensive, clear and very solid work leaves very little room for criticism."\(^2\)

Nature and Structure

The format and phraseology of the Sefire inscriptions resemble Hittite and Assyrian treaties of the early first millennium B.C.\(^3\) They are also close to biblical passages with the themes of covenant or covenant blessings and curses. When it comes to the explanation of these parallels Gibson is right in saying that these are "likely . . . common formulas for the making of agreements current throughout the ancient Near East. . . ."\(^4\)

Unfortunately, it is difficult to compare this text with DA, since the Sefire inscriptions differ in nature, as treaty documents, while DA is narrative in character. In his study of the stylistic features of these inscriptions, Greenfield concludes that literary Aramaic was highly idiomatic in expression even in legal documents.\(^5\) He also makes a detailed analysis of the poetic and literary technique represented in the

\(^1\)AIS, p. 4.
\(^2\)HAS, p. 348.
\(^3\)Thus Fitzmyer, AIS, pp. 121-25.
\(^4\)TSI, p. 23.
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inscriptions, yet in giving biblical and other parallels, important stylistic and literary similarities between these stelae and material in DA could be pointed out. The following points given by Greenfield and comparable to DA can be proposed here:

1. The stylistic use of the "grouped idiom"\(^1\) is very frequent in DA; one example would be 'kl qrs in Dan 3:8 and 6:25. This idiom, which literally would be "eat pieces of," really means "slander," and as Kaufman shows it is a loan from Akkadian.\(^2\) The grouped idiom is usually formed in DA by the use of two verbs together.\(^3\)

2. The use of different kinds of parallelism like complementary parallelism in Sefire is paralleled in DA by such expressions as 'l-ybhlwk r\(\text{cywnk wzywyk 'l-y\^stnw (Dan 5:10), p\(\text{aryn lmp\(\text{r w\(\text{gryn lms\(r' (Dan 5:16), or else hlm' lsn'yk wp\(\text{rh l\(\text{ryk (Dan 4:16).}

3. Greenfield presents several interesting instances of repetition of a set phrase for emphasis like w\(\text{b}^\text{C} x . . . w'1 . . . (I A 21-24). This can be compared with Dan 5:19,

\[
\text{dy hwh sb' hw' qtl}
\]

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 1-18.
\(^2\)Akkadian Influences on Aramaic, p. 63.
\(^3\)E. g., bns wqsp (Dan 2:12) "angry and enraged," or bt twt (Dan 6:19) "spent the night fasting." For the examples from Sefire, see Greenfield, "Stylistic Aspects," pp. 2-7.
4. Both texts share literary cliches found in other Semitic literature: seven years or time units as a period of dire events (I A 27-28 and Dan 4:13,20,22,29); the number seven as the standard round number expressing intensification or completeness (I A 21-24 and Dan 3:10). An interesting comparison between the sequence of the three animals, the lion, the bear, and the leopard, is the same in Sefire II A 9 and Dan 7.¹

Another literary feature which is frequent in both texts is the use of metaphoric language. Compare the series of pictures from Sefire I A 35-42, or the expression mlkth kmlkt ḫl in I A 25, with expressions like ḍdy ʾṣrh knšryn ṛbh wḥprwḥ ḫṣpryn in Dan 4:30.

5. Both narratives also stress the importance of an oral expression of one's thoughts: whn ysq ʾlbbk ṭs' ʾšptyk (III 14-15) and ṭd mlṭ bpm mlk (Dan 4:28).

Vocabulary

Because of the specific literary character of these inscriptions, their vocabulary is not as familiar

¹On this, see Th. Wittstruck, "The Influence of Treaty Curse Imagery on the Beast Imagery of Daniel 7," JBL 97 (1978):100-102. The name of the second animal is only reconstructed by Wittstruck, and is missing from the text. For the occurrence of ḏḥ in Sefire, see AIS, pp. 48-9.
to the biblical scholar as is the case with other OA documents. For example, there is a great deal of nature vocabulary, cult imagery, and legal terminology present in them. The fragmentary state of the stelae makes it difficult to determine the meaning of many of their words.

When they are connected, the inscriptions provide a relatively long text. It is possible to read or reconstruct almost 200 lines from them. These contain several hundred different words. Allowing for repetitions there are 238 different words which can be read with certainty. Of these 134 are also found in DA, while 104 are not. This gives 57 percent of the words of the Sefire inscriptions which are also attested in DA. Nine of the others not found in DA are found in the BA of Ezra.

With regard to common formulae and expressions, Greenfield has stated that he finds that the treaty is remarkably rich in idiomatic expressions. Many of these have direct Hebrew equivalents. He lists no less than eleven such expressions, even though he maintains that his list is not intended to be exhaustive.¹ The results of his study show that in their style and their idiomatic expressions the Sefire inscriptions are much closer to Hebrew and other Northwest Semitic literature (Ugaritic) and to some extent East Semitic (Akkadian), rather than

to other Aramaic material.¹

The following expressions and formulae have parallels in DA: In Sefire I A 5, ħv ṣqnb bʾšrh can be compared with wbtrk tqwm in Dan 2:39 (7:6,7) where the preposition šr (ʾtx) takes a pronominal suffix and is used with a verb in the imperfect. qzr in I A 7,40 is used figuratively, just as it is in Dan 4:14 and 21. The meaning of this verb in these two instances is not necessarily identical.

A more complicated phrase is the title wqdm ʾl wʾly (I A 11) parallel to ʾlywnyn in DA, a parallel seldom cited in previous studies. It is widely maintained, as expressed by Fitzmyer, that this title which denotes a "pair of gods" in Sefire is West Semitic or Canaanite.² Fitzmyer is also right in noting that the relation of the Aramaic ʾEl wa-ʾlyān to the Hebrew ʾEl ʾlyān is complicated by the fact that "in Ugaritic we have divine names sometimes used alone and sometimes connected by w̱ ʾ which apparently denote one god"³ like Qdš wʾmrr or Ktr wʾḥ ṣ, both being double names and used with a singular verb.

The absence of the waw in the Hebrew ʾEl ʾlyān may then clarify the role of the same in its Aramaic

¹This is probably due to the content and language of those texts.
²AIS, p. 37.
³Ibid., pp. 37-38.
form, namely, the waw here should be taken as an explicative waw. This fact is strengthened by the use of similar "pair names" in this section, like šmē wnē (I A 9) where wnē may be related to the Akkadian nūru which serves as an epithet for various gods which are connected with light.\(^1\) In Ugaritic the same word appears as an epithet of the moon-god.\(^2\) In Esarhaddon’s Vassal Treaties (line 422) šmē and wnē come together in the expression nur šammē u qaggari "the light of the heavens and earth."\(^3\) On the basis of these parallels šmē wnē here might be considered as a title which should be rendered "šmē which is wnē". wnē could stand as an appositional noun or an attribute.

If this is accepted then the Hebrew 'El CElôn might be taken in the same way, as its abbreviated form Clynyn in Dan 7.\(^4\) Moreover, in Dan 4 there is a similar problem with Cîr weqaddiš (vss. 10, 20), a double name which takes only a singular verb. For Bauer-Leander\(^5\) this is just the case, and the waw here is


\(^{3}\)AIS, p. 35.

\(^{4}\)This form is usually considered as a double plural form or imitating the Hebrew "Elohim."

\(^{5}\)BLA, p. 324g: "w nicht anreihend, sondern explikativ ('und zwar')." See also Dan 4:12 for another case of the explicative waw.
doubtlessly explicative, so it can be rendered "und zwar."

The interesting admonition pqhw Cynylm lbzyh (I A 13) is paralleled only in the Hebrew of Daniel, in Daniel's prayer to God (Dan 9:18). Kaufman has made a connection between the Sefire I A 24 and a similar idea from the Tell Fakhriyah inscription in attempting to improve the reading for this difficult line.¹

The compound preposition mzy (I A 25) was interpreted by Fitzmyer as a temporal conjunction mn zy related to mn dy of Dan 4:23.² Gibson reminds Fitzmyer that the meaning of the expression in the two contexts would be different, and he is right in that respect.³ Yet a recent examination of the text by two paleographers does not favor Fitzmyer's reading.⁴ Thus, the reading here is disputed, and it cannot be of value for comparative study.

Scholars have been puzzled over b'S (I A 35) which is usually feminine, especially in later Aramaic.⁵ Although 'S of DA is often said to be a feminine singular noun (accounting for a shift from he to

---

¹RATF, pp. 170–72.
²AIS, p. 45.
³TSI, p. 39.
⁴A. Lemaire and J. Durand, Les Inscriptions de Sfīrē, p. 133.
⁵See examples in AIS, p. 53.
'aleph), Fitzmyer is right in stating: "There is no reason why it could not be the emp. sg. m., related to the form found here."¹

There is one case where mlk (read mulk I B 6 ? I C 6)² could be taken as having the meaning "reign, kingship," since "great king" would rather be mlk' rb'. This is parallel to the idea found in Dan 7:17. On the other hand, the doubtful restoration 'š' h' proposed in I C 21 and based on Zakkur A 2 would favor the form 'vš which is abundantly attested in later Aramaic³ but not in DA where 'nš is found all the way through the text.

The partially reconstructed lclmn (I B 7) is different from C clm (III 24,25), or lkl C lmnyn of 1QapGen (lines 12,20 etc.), but it is identical with lC lmnyn found four times in DA (2:4,44; 3:9; 5:10).

zy yC yrn (II B4) is translated "who are watchful" and the context suggests that it is related to divine beings, just like C yr of Dan 4. The verb C št (wét C št II B 5) is a rather rare word in Aramaic, and it could have any one of three interrelated meanings in Aramaic: (1) to think, (2) to plan, devise, and (3) to plot against. The first meaning would fit the context well, while the second is found in Dan 6:4.⁴

¹AIS, p. 53.
²Thus Fitzmyer, AIS, pp. 74-5.
³Ibid., p. 77.
⁴For other occurrences, see AIS, p. 87.
rbrby (II A 7) is the reduplicated form of the plural of rab. Elsewhere in Sefire it is only rbwh. DA has both of these forms (2:31; 7:8). mn yd (II B 14) is quite common in OA. In the Hadad inscription (line 12) mn ydy comes at the end of the sentence. In Tell Fakhriyah, mn ydh occurs twice (lines 17, 18). In all these cases yd means "power." The expression also appears in Sefire III 11 and Dan 3:15.

wyzbl h' mn (II C 6) can be compared with wdblyn mn qdm from Dan 6:27. On bd (III 1) Fitzmyer comments: "The indefinite use of the numeral in the sense of 'a' or 'one' is frequent in this stele; see line 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 17, 19 (with a suffix), 22." There are at least three interesting expressions in DA where bd has the same role: slm bd (Dan 2:31), kṣ h bdh (4:16), and 'bn bdh (6:18).

With regard to mll mn lbyt (III 2), it is interesting that both the subject noun and the verb are used in the expression wmlyn lsd ḫy' yml in Dan 7:25 with a similar contextual meaning. hn lhn (III 4) is another interesting phrase and in DA it would be whn l' (2:5).

nsk lhm (III 5, 7) uses the verb nsk in the sense of "to provide," just as Dan 2:46 does where the king

1See also Zakkur A 13.

2AIS, p. 102. In 1926 G. R. Driver stated that bd used as an indefinite article permitted "a date as early as the papyri but" it did not "disallow a later date" ("The Aramaic of the Book of Daniel," p. 112).
commands literally to "shower" offerings for Daniel. Likewise, šlw (III 5) should be related to šlh of Dan 4:1, and rwm nbš (III 5-6) corresponds to rwm ldū of Dan 5:20. Koopmans thinks that mn bd (read man had) in III 9 has to be related to mn dy i in DA.¹

br 'ns (III 16) is an expression that has undergone almost numberless studies.² This seems to be the earliest occurrence of the term with the meaning "a man" in the generic sense. The term is encountered in Dan 7:13 with a much more specific meaning. Were it not for this occurrence in DA it would have never become so important. Notice, however, that in DA it has a comparative inseparable preposition k attached to it, a detail which plays an important role in interpreting the Danielic use of it.

zy ly (III 20) may be taken as one word. It is not frequent in Sefire nor in other OA texts. dy-lh in Dan 2:20 may also be taken as one word, but LA uses this frequently.³ wkzy (III 24) is also a compound word, common in the Elephantine Papyri,⁴ and it occurs in DA five times (2:13; 3:7; 5:20; 6:11, 15).

¹ACH, p. 65.
²For extensive bibliography on this subject, the reader is referred to two studies: Arthur J. Ferch, The Son of Man in Daniel 7 (Berrien Springs, Mi.: Andrews University Press, 1983); Fitzmyer, A Wandering Aramean, pp. 143-60.
³As well as Syriac.
⁴AP, p. 291.
A study of the orthography of such early inscriptions depends to some extent on the vocalization of the words appearing in them. Fitzmyer mentions three sources for vocalization: LA, BA, and the cognate Semitic languages.¹

The inscription contains a significant number of final vowel-letters and, according to Gibson, at least six internal. These are the following:² tw'm (I A 34; a place name), y'^cn (I A 35), y'^zn (II B 4), kym (III 1), rwh (III 2), and ymwt (III 16). These examples are discussed below and Gibson's list is expanded with other possible cases of internal vowel-letters.

The proper name tw'm is not clear, but most scholars, including Fitzmyer,³ believe that it has a full spelling here. y'^zn could be the simple stem imperfect from the root ^zn with the long u fully written. The meaning and function of rwh is certain so scholars have to admit that it is spelled plene, "though scriptio plena of a long vowel in a medial position is peculiar in an Aramaic inscription of the eighth century."⁴ Another case of a medial long u fully written is in ymwt as well as wmwt (I B 30). The latter

¹AIS, p. 139.
²TSI, p. 20.
³AIS, p. 51.
⁴ibid., p. 104.
is an infinitive of the same verb-root.

Nrgl, the proper name of a deity (I A 9), is spelled defectively here in contrast to the spelling we have seen at Tell Fakhriyah. Fitzmyer thinks that hmwn in I A 29 should be identified as a case of scriptio plena. Koopmans makes an observation on za (I A 35), which according to certain scholars contains an early case of matres lectionis. Finally, the interesting form ἱσβ (III 24) should be classified under the same type of spelling in the early stage of Aramaic.

With regard to ywm (I A 12), Fitzmyer tries to explain this plena scriptio as "the normal practice for uncontracted diphthongs in the Aramaic of this period." Yet in order to explain the very next word in the same line (wylh), he uses just the opposite way of reasoning, going against the thesis advanced by Cross and Freedman as well as what G. Garbini and Segert maintain. He says: "A dissimilation of the diphthongs has produced the contraction in the last syllable; which

1Ibid., p. 48.
2ACH, p. 54: "das ist hier, nach CROSS and (! sic) FREEDMAN noch Konsonant, aber eher nach GARBINI (Lit. 88) 246 schon m. 1., cf. Nr 9, Had., 17."
3AIS, p. 38.
contraction is indicated by he.\(^1\)

It is usually maintained that the final a sound in such words as 'yk or the verbal suffix on the first person plural perfect was either not pronounced or, if it was, it was at least suppressed in writing. Yet in Sefire I A in three successive lines we have two ways of spelling for the same word occurring three times: 'yk \(\text{zy}\) (I A 35), 'ykh \(\text{zy}\) (37), and back to the first form w'yk \(\text{zy}\) (39). Should this be taken as evidence for the pronunciation of this final long \(\text{A}\) in OA? It may be concluded from these cases that the way of writing vowel-letters in OA is sometimes fluid rather than rigid.

Diphthong reduction is evidenced by bnyhm and bny (III 18,21) and possibly by bty (II C 3). At the same time these cases do testify to a custom of an extremely defective spelling practice by the scribe who wrote in this dialect. But for bty we also have the alternative "normal" forms of this same word in the inscriptions. Again, these show the "inconsistencies" in writing at an early stage. When the same thing happens in DA, one does not have to appeal to a 'later scribal revision of the text" for the purpose of making the text look more "archaic."

The word r'\(\text{g}\) in the text of DA (2:32, etc.) has the same defective spelling as is found in the text of


\(^1\)AIS, p. 38.
Sefire (II B 8, III 11), Egyptian Aramaic, the BA of Ezra (5:10), and 11QtgJob (29:25). A variant spelling r'iṣ occurs in 11QapGen (17:9,11; 30:3,29) and in Palestinian Jewish Aramaic.

According to Gibson's conclusion on the orthography, the inscription shows a marked advance upon Zakkur in this respect, and the next step in this development is the dialect of Zenjirli. If this line of reasoning is followed, then it is also necessary to state that in the light of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription, we can now trace this line of "development" chronologically only for the West OA dialect.

In the phonology of the Sefire inscriptions, one should take note of certain "anomalies" present in the text. Fitzmyer overstates the case, however, by stating that the treatment of the interdentals in these inscriptions "conforms (sic!) entirely to that found in the other Old Aramaic inscriptions." The treatment of some Proto-Semitic sounds has a Caananite quality, yet it differs from it in a significant number of "exceptional cases."

Thus some early consonantal shifts are already

\[1\text{AP } 6:1; 10:6, \text{ etc.}; \text{BMAP } 2:8,9; 7:22,25.\]
\[2\text{M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York: Pardes, 1950), pp. 1477-78.}\]
\[3\text{TSI, p. 20.}\]
\[4\text{AIS, p. 149.}\]
noticeable: yrg (I C 24) instead of yr" which did not take place generally in Aram. till the Persian period;¹ hgr (I A 28) is written instead of hgr; tll (I B 42) for the expected sll; lwd (I C 18) instead of lwz;² zrpt (I A 8) for the Akkadian šarpanītu; ctrs mk (I A 1) looks rather suspicious, and the occasional b/p shifts, present elsewhere in OA, are present here too.

ygrn (I B 8), however, is spelled "normally," in contrast to ntr in the DA (7:28) and the Elephantine Papyri.³

¹Sm (I C 25 and II A 4) is understood as the word for "name," šm, with a prosthetic 'aleph. It is also found in II B 7 and in Hadad 16 and 21. The presence of the prosthetic 'aleph is no longer viewed as clear evidence of late borrowing in DA.⁴ We now have to argue for a richer variety of spellings, not only in OfA, but in OA as well. Coxon concludes his short report on his study of the subject with the following statement:

It is suggested in this note that the so-called prosthetic spellings in Dan corroborate his [E. Y. Kutscher's] thesis of the early and eastern

¹TSI, p. 43. Koopmans comments on this word: "Man erwartet hier noch $^8$, aber im 7. Jahrh. steht hinweilen schon $^6$ statt $^5$" (ACH, p. 59).

²The usually assumed root lwd is not otherwise known. "If the root is correctly analyzed as lwd and is related to Hebrew lwz, then there is an interesting case of the early shift of $z$ to $d$ in the writing that is now attested here" (AIS, p. 76).

³AIS, p. 61.

⁴E.g., Baumgartner takes it "als Beweis für späte Entstehung" ("Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel," p. 88,n.4).
provenance of the Aramaic of the book.¹

Finally, a case of the metathesis of the sibilants t and š occurs in yšht (I A 32), but not in ytšm (I A 29), as is the case in Dan 7:27.

Morphology

In the area of morphology there are a number of points which have been discussed in different studies on the inscriptions, but in this study we are concerned only with those peculiarities that are somehow related to DA. In this regard it is the verbs that show most of the interesting features for this subject.

Particular similarities have already been noticed in the previous works: There is a Peîl (impf. type yugtal) verb stem in ygzr (I A 40), tšbr (I A 38), ygzrn (I A 40), yĉrrn (I A 41), as well as Hithpeel (ytšm) I A 29), both with passive meaning. These cases are similar to DA, which uses these same stems.² Instead of the later Ittaphal, the inscriptions have the Huphal stem (yĉ I A 39) formed just as the same stem is treated in DA (hqynt Dan 7:4 and hqmt v.5).³ yĉ also "shows elision of [h] in the imperf., a feature also found with the Hithpeel and Haphel, i.e., Ithpeel and Aphel."⁴

¹"A Philological Note on ḤSTYM," pp. 275-76.
²GBA, pp. 42-43.
³BLA, p. 116.
⁴TSI, p. 24.
The absence or the presence of the final nun in the plural imperfect can be an indicator of the difference between a jussive and an indicative form. This was first determined for DA, and it was only with the publication of the Sefire stelae that Degen was able to distinguish between a "Kurz" and "Langimperfekt" in OA. As in DA, however, this is not a rigid rule, and the example of yšlhn (I A 30), which is still jussive in its meaning though not in form, tends to confirm this.

In his study of the language of the Arsames correspondence, Whitehead tries to draw a parallel in the spelling of the causative conjugation between the language of these documents and OA documents:

As in Old Aramaic, there is no 'aphel form attested. However, in other Imperial Aramaic texts (Hermopolis, Egyptian, and Biblical Aramaic), both 'aphel and haphel forms occur.

In a footnote with this statement, Whitehead cites Degen in lightly dismissing Fitzmyer's "attempt to identify three examples of an 'aphel imperfect." In this regard, Whitehead's statement is not up to date with other studies which are more and more inclined to confirm Fitzmyer's thesis. The following examples are

2. AAG, pp. 64-65.
4. NBD, p. 70, TSI, p. 24, etc.
noteworthy here: $y^C_r$ (I A 39), $y^C_{skr}$ (III 3), $y^C_{brnh}$ (III 17), and $t^C_{1lmn}$ (I B 24).

If one takes Fitzmyer's exhaustive study as seriously as we do here, then one should notice that in his morphology section on verbs he lists seven examples of verbs in the causative stem imperfect spelled with $h$ and four without.\footnote{AIS, p. 157.} This ratio can be compared with the ratio of the two ways of spelling the imperfect in DA, where there are twenty-nine forms with $h$ and sixteen without. The conclusion seems to be clear at this point, that the ratio of the Haphe/aphel stems of the imperfect in Sefer and DA is very close. Moreover, $y^C_{skr}$ (III 3) is of special interest here since it has its counterpart form $y^C_{shskr}$ in the same line in the text. This two-way spelling of the same form is found in a similar way in several examples of DA: the perfect $y^C_{gymh}$ (3:1) and $h^C_{gymh}$ (5:11); the imperfect $y^C_{gym}$ (2:44; 4:14) and $y^C_{hgym}$ (5:21; 6:16); the participle $m^C_{hdg}$ (2:40); and $m^C_{gh}$ (7:7,19), $m^C_{hgs'}$ (2:15) and $m^C_{hgs'}$ (3:22), $m^C_{w'd}$ (2:23) and $m^C_{w'd}$ (6:11). Scholars who are ready to explain $y^C_{skr}$ as a mere "Schreibfehler"\footnote{S. Segert, "Zur Schrift und Orthographie," p. 121, followed by TSI, p. 20, and others.} are not inclined to give the same explanation for the forms in DA listed above. The problem with this explanation is that peculiar or "unexpected" forms should not always be ascribed to the
"Schreibfehler" classification.

With regard to the reflexive stem in the imperfect, DA is viewed as even more conservative than the inscriptions. Fitzmyer counts three cases of Ithpeel and one of Ithpaal.1 In DA, in the same chapter (2), we have both Hithpeel and Ithpeel variants for the same form, although in Dan 2:45, where the Ithpeel is found, a number of manuscripts have the form of Hithpeel as the reading.

_yhwnnh_ (II B 16) is another problematic form. This verb is probably a Haphel imperfect of _yn_ with an energetic _nun_ before the pronominal suffix. Energic _nun_ is often found in DA (e.g., 5:7; 2:5, etc.). The variation of _ywh_ (II A 4) in I A 25,32 and II A 6 as _thw_ should also be noted here as an alternative spelling. The verb _hik_ has the assimilation of _l_, as in DA.2

_’hbd_ (II C 5) is different from _’h’bd_ (II C 4). The _’aleph_ here seems to be lost by quiescence. This is important for DA where the same phenomenon occurs occasionally.3

Commenting on _’mrn_ (I C 1), Fitzmyer says that "There is no indication that the final long _a_, found in later Aram., was written or pronounced." However, he

---

1_AIS_, p. 157.
2_GBA_, p. 54.
3_Ibid., pp. 12-13. Also _KAI_, p. 263, where "Laryngalelision" is suggested.
recognizes "fluctuation in this regard as early as the first letter in Cowley's collection (dated 495 B.C.)."\(^1\) The similar point has been maintained for 'yk, yet we now have evidence for the scribal dilemma, coming probably from the way of pronunciation, expressed in 'yk (I A 37) and 'yk (I A 35,39). A similar case is found in bnwh (I A 5) because its suffix is -awhî in Syriac and -ôhi in BA. Scholars disagree on its OA vocalization. For Cross and Freedman "the form can hardly be vocalized awhî because the final î is regularly indicated by the vowel letter in these texts."\(^2\) So for Fitzmyer "the preferable vocalization would be awh with consonantal he."\(^3\) But, according to Koopmans, "Das i von ôhi könnte aber auch kurz sein und braucht in der Schrift nicht ausgedruckt zu werden."\(^4\) For Kutscher there was no doubt that the suffix had a final vowel in Proto-Semitic.\(^5\)

Just the opposite process can be followed in tracing the forms of the relative pronoun dy and the masculine demonstrative pronoun dnh, which in the post-BA period tend more and more to take forms d and dn, respectively. It is significant that DA ranks closely

---

\(^1\)AIS, p. 73.

\(^2\)Early Hebrew Orthography, p. 29.

\(^3\)AIS, p. 31.

\(^4\)ACH, p. 45.

\(^5\)HAS, p. 350.
with OA in this respect. Moreover, DA has no exception to this rule, in contrast to the BA of Ezra and Egyptian Aramaic.¹

There seem to be two ways of reading line 6 in section I A, because "die Formulierung ist unklar" for some scholars.² If the reading is kl C1 lbyt mlk, it agrees well with C1 lbyth (Dan 6:11), but C1 in DA has the form of a perfect, while C1 in Sefire seems to be a participle. The second reading proposed, kl C11 byt mlk, is also supported by DA, since the reading of the Ketib gives C11yn (4:4; 5:8) as a form of participle that could be older than the Qere. A difficulty with this argument is that the form in DA is in the plural, while the Sefire form is singular. In Dan 5:10 we do have the Ketib C11t in the singular, but it is not a participle any more. The three following options can be proposed here:³ (1) There is a case of haplography in Sefire which could have produced two Is instead of three. (2) C11 lbyt and C11 byt are two equivalent forms, optional in writing. (3) The verbal forms with double 1 seem to be older in DA for both participles and perfects, and together with OA these forms stand in contrast to later Syriac-like forms. As a consequence, the reading kl C11 byt mlk is favored here.

¹CJT, pp. 28-29, 33-34. The exceptions are: dhv' in Ezra 4:9 and zn in AP 17:3 (bis).
²KAI, p. 245.
³See the discussion by Fitzmyer in AIS, p. 32.
When Rowley made his extensive study on DA in 1929, the form 'ln, taken as a possible form of the demonstrative pronoun in plural, was attested only in DA and late Palmyrene. Then the Sefire inscriptions were discovered in 1931, and they yielded new evidence on this point, presenting no less than sixteen occurrences of this form of the pronoun. Eleven of those can be read clearly, while three are partially reconstructed, and two are readings proposed to fill in lacunae.

Syntax

The word order in these inscriptions is just as is expected from a dialect of West-Semitic language. The direct object of the infinitive usually follows the verb as in other OA texts, OfA, and LA—which is just the opposite of DA. In some sections like I A 8-12 the copula and other prepositions are often repeated according to the western dialect style, unlike what is found in the narrative of DA.

Commenting on the collective use of the noun slyh (I A 22), Fitzmyer makes the following statement: "In later Aramaic (Imperial and Biblical)
the noun used with cardinal numbers is usually in the plural." In the light of recent evidence this statement is no longer satisfactory. This particularity should be explained by geography rather than chronology. Four cases where a cardinal number takes a noun in plural appear in the Tell Fakhriyah inscription (lines 19-22) just like that which occurs in DA (4:13,20,22,29). Only one of them (swr in line 20) agrees with those from Sefire.

The personal pronoun h' is used here as demonstrative in I C 22. The same is the case with hw' in nw' slm' in Dan 2:32. kol mlky' (III 7) is one instance of casus pendens which is paralleled by a number of cases in Dan 5 and 7.¹

There is at least one example of zy (III 7) expressing a genitive relationship as a substitute for a construct chain. Degen also suggests such a reconstruction with a genitive for zy in I A 10, and others in III 19.² This, however, is not a characteristic of this dialect, where even a construct chain can take the role of nomen rectum. In I A 6 c m kl c l l byt mlk there are three construct elements bound together to form a construct chain. Two other instances are mn hd byt 'by (III 9) and dy b c ly ktk (I A 4).

¹The most striking examples from both chapters are 5:10 and 7:24.

²AAG, p. 89.
The Inscriptions of Hadad and Panammu

Description

Having dealt with what is sometimes called "Early Standard Aramaic," we now turn to the dialect called Samalian spoken in far northern Syria.

The original discovery of these texts goes back to the time of German-Ottoman cooperation in the Middle East before the turn of this century. The exact date of discovery falls between 1888 and 1890. At the time when these two inscriptions and the Barrakab inscriptions were discovered, no other document existed which could be designated as OA. Some time afterwards, the corpus of the Elephantine Papyri was discovered (1906), but it was only in 1907 that another text, the Zakkur stele, came to expand our rather meager corpus of OA inscriptions.

The two inscriptions under study here—Hadad and Panammu—were written in the national dialect of Samal, which is different from the language of several shorter inscriptions found at Zenjirli. It took some time before scholars realized that the Aramaic of Hadad and Panammu was different from the Aramaic of the Barrakab inscriptions. This difference went unnoticed for a time because it was held, as one scholar stated, that "the

---

1 Bir Hadad, Zakkur, and the Sefire inscriptions are meant. The term itself is taken from Greenfield's "The Dialects of Early Aramaic," JNES 37 (1978):94.

2 DLY, pp. 7-15.
same king cannot speak two Aramaic languages.\textsuperscript{1} Today, this language is often considered as "typologically earlier than the division of Northwest Semitic into Canaanite and Aramaic."\textsuperscript{2}

There were also some early doubts about whether this dialect could truly be classified as Aramaic. Thanks to the publication of other OA texts, especially the Sefire stelae, a more traditional view bracketing Samalian with Aramaic has been espoused. Samalian has been classified as Aramaic because of its phonology, grammar, and vocabulary, but it also has some strongly Canaanite features in its vocabulary.\textsuperscript{3} On the other hand, some features independent of both Aramaic and Canaanite may come from a time which antedates the division of these two language groups in Northwest Semitic. Says Gibson: "We may regard it as standing in an analogous relation to the Aram. dialects as Moabite does to Hebrew."\textsuperscript{4} Dion has carried out what we could call the most extensive and detailed study on this subject. His conclusion from his study of this subject is summarized in the form of an article. There he states:

Sam'alian would therefore seem to be a branch of


\textsuperscript{3}DLV, pp. 331-333.

\textsuperscript{4}TSI, 62.
Aramaic which became increasingly independent around 1000 B.C. and which failed to follow Aramaic through its subsequent innovations.¹

Other thorough studies of these inscriptions have been carried out by Koopmans, Cooke, Gibson, and Donner and Röllig.²

With regard to the age of the language, this appears to be the closest OA relative to the Sefire inscriptions. The Statue of Hadad, based on historical evidence,³ is by at least three decades the older of the two. This is also based on its archaic paleography and stricter adherence to defective style of spelling in its orthography.⁴ On the other hand, the writing of the old Zakkur inscription is less conservative than the writing of these two inscriptions.

The texts of both Hadad and Panammu are poorly preserved because of the damage the statues have suffered. Only fifty-seven lines are traceable today, many of which are fragmentary. The words are separated by

¹Dion, "The Language Spoken," p. 118. The monograph is the publication of the author's Ph. D. dissertation at the University of Toronto and is entitled La Langue de Ya'udi. Description et classement de l'ancien parler de Zencirli dans le cadre des langues sémítiques du nord-ouest (Waterloo, Ont.: Editions SR, 1974).

²Koopmans, ACH, pp. 30-41 and 70-6; Cooke, A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903), pp. 159-91; Gibson, TSI, pp. 60-86; Donner-Röllig, NAI 214,215. Only Donner is responsible for the Aramaic section.

³TSI, pp. 60-62.

⁴DLY, p. 3.
dots, and even though this practice is not completely consistent it helps in the linguistic analysis of the text. Students of these inscriptions have pointed out many of their "writing errors,"¹ but some of these cases may simply be unclear to us because they have forms which do not correspond to their anticipated forms.

Nature

Unlike the preceding Sefire stelae but like most of the other OA monumental inscriptions, Hadad and Panammu are technically classified as votive inscriptions. We can also say that their complete form is uncertain due to the significant portion of them that is unreadable now.

Structure

Although both inscriptions are of the same nature and have similar content and structure, the inscription of Hadad seems to demonstrate its structure in a clearer way. In his attempt to present the content and plan of this inscription, Gibson rightly sorted out the basic key terms which are characteristic for each section. Following some of those analyses, the following structural analysis of the inscription may be proposed.

The text can be divided into six sections. In their original sequence each of these sections

¹For example, Gibson finds nine possible errors in Hadad (TSI, p. 62).
corresponded in their use of key themes to the six successive chapters of DA. The sections, in regard to their thematic organisation, can be outlined as follows:

1. The introductory part (lines 1-13) speaks of the erection of the stele and names the five gods who stood with the king from his youth and gave him whatever he asked from them. The king's authority thus derives from the gods, and his prosperity is the consequence of their caring for his reign. Basically this corresponds especially to Dan 2 in DA.

2. The next section (lines 13-16) speaks of the erection of the statue with an order to sacrifice to "this Hadad." This provides a rather direct thematic connection with Dan 3.

3. The third section (lines 17-19) mentions the king's soul, his submission to the god, and the building of his house. It corresponds thematically to some elements in Dan 4.

4. In the fourth section (lines 20-24) the successor is warned of the dire consequences which follow his disobedience, something very similar to Daniel's speech to Belshazzar in Dan 5.

5. From lines 24 to 26 we have the problems in the royal house, trials, justice, and punishments. Chapter 6 in Daniel describes a similar case of intrigue directed against someone who as an officer "excelled in his spirit."
6. The concept which prevails in the last section of the inscription is really a continuation of the previous section. Succession is the final preoccupation of the text. Punishment is followed by vengeance and persecution of rivals. This section could be paralleled with Dan 7 and its contents.

It seems, therefore, that this OA inscription presents some parallels with the structure of DA, with regards to the literary organization of the themes present.1

Vocabulary

It is difficult to make any firm statement on the vocabulary of the inscriptions like Hadad and Panammu. Much still remains uncertain about the Samalian dialect, especially its classification and the explanation of the words that are used in its texts. Beyond this there is the problem of reconstructing the words and lines that are badly damaged in these inscriptions. It is still difficult, therefore, to make sense out of some parts of the inscriptions. For instance, Panammu line 21 is simply "untranslatable" for some scholars.2

All in all the vocabulary here is rich and a number of rare and uncertain words are present. When one

1Could it be that this is due to their common purpose, i.e., communicating a message to a wider or universal audience?

2E.g., TSI, p. 81.
counts all of their intelligible words, the total comes
to about 150 different words. Of these 87 are also found
in DA. This is just under 60 percent of the total.
Another 62 words are not found in DA.

The following expressions are of interest for
comparison: wntn bydy (Hadad 2) has the same meaning as
yhb bydk in Dan 2:38; hn (Hadad 29) meaning "if" is used
in this text, just as in DA, e.g., Dan 2:6.1 In LA and
Syriac this word became 'n. hqmt nš (Hadad 1) is to be
notated because in Panammu 1 a different verb—sym—is
used.2 Dan 3 uses gšm' dy hqym.3 The word prs (Pan 6)
has been noted in other OA texts and it is rightly
related to prsyn of Dan 5:25,28.

An interesting exclamatory phrase is found in
Panammu 22: wzkr znh h' and this reminds one of the
king's words in Dan 4:27: d' hy' bbl. Pan 23, gdm 'lhy
wgdm nš, has its parallel in Dan 6:23: gdmwhy ['lhy] ..
. w'p qdmyk mlk'. The first part of this expression is
just like gdm 'lhh of Dan 6:11,12.

The conjunction p or p' is found more frequently
in LA (Nabatean and Palmyrenean), but it is not attested

---

1 It is also attested many times in Sefire
and Nerab, SCAI, p. 44.

2 For the interchangeability of the two verbs
see ATF, p. 92.

3 For the interdialectal distribution of this and
similar formulae, see Tawil, "Some Literary Elements,"
pp. 40-65.
in DA.\(^1\) pmz in Had 3 is explained as a compound of p, mh, and zy. The last two particles are found together in Dan 2:28, etc.

Orthography and Phonology

To enumerate the words that end with vowel-letters would require a long list. The presence of internal vowel-letters is much more significant for orthographic implications of these inscriptions. Basically two characters, the waw and the yod, are used for that purpose. The occurrence of the same words in other Aramaic texts from different time periods, plus the presence of the same words in other cognate languages, help us to determine whether there is or is not an unexpected internal full spelling of that word. The words that have internal vowel-letters are: qyr\(t\) (Had 10; Pan 4), kpyrv (Had 10; Pan 10), yhbyt (Had 11), biyl\(l\) (Had 24), mwmt (Had 24), mwddy-yh (Had 24, 27), 'yhyh (Had 27, 28, 30, and 'ybyh in 28, 31), pltw\(h\) (Pan 2), 'byh (Pan 2), 'byy (Pan 3), hwyt (Pan 5), šwrh (Pan 6, 9), qytlt and qnw'\(l\) (Pan 8), hytbh (Pan 9), mwkrw (Pan 10), mwq' (Pan 13, 14), and ywh (Pan 21).

Sometimes the same word is spelled in both ways, fully and defectively. The following by-forms should be added to the list given above: 'šwr (Pan 7), but 'šr (Pan 18); m\(s\)wt (Had 21), but m\(s\)t (Had 6); wbywmy/-h (Pan

\(^1\)DISO, p. 225.
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9,10,18), but wbymy (Had 9,12). It is significant that in these texts where we have a total of 150 different words, more than twenty have an internal vowel-letter in these eighth-century inscriptions.

Moreover, with regard to the way in which words are spelled in Hadad and Panammu, we notice a certain freedom or fluidity in the spelling of some words. This fluidity may be found even in those words that are very short, like conjunctions, particles, or pronouns. For example, the transition in Samalian from ŋnk (Had 1) to ŋnky (Pan 19) did not require centuries, it took place in a matter of decades or years. zn (Had 1) is also spelled znh in Pan 22. 1 ŋkm (Had 29) is plene in ŋyby (Pan 3), in ŋybh (Had 30), and in its feminine form ŋybh (Had 31). ŋybh (Had 11,34) is ŋn in Pan 23 and ŋnŋ in Had 16 and 30. p’ (Had 17) is the conjunction p written plene, 3 and a third form is py in Pan 11, 4 like lbn’ (Had 30,31), which can be written as lbnŋ (Had 20).

Dion is correct in his statement on the use of medial vowel-letters, that a simple look at the Samalian

---

1Is ŋnky (Pan 19) a "historical spelling" as Gibson would like to have it (TSI, p. 63), or an alternative form of ŋnk used here interchangeably?

2I am not certain what Gibson means by saying that the ending h was "no longer pronounced" (TSI, p. 63).

3KAI, p. 219.

4See TSI, p. 84.
texts is sufficient to demonstrate that they used waw and yod as internal vowel-letters more often than other contemporary OA inscriptions. The only inscription which fits this practice is the Tell Fakhriyah inscription which is not a Western OA text. According to Dion, yod and waw can at times indicate the presence of diphthongs as in byt (Pan 4) or hw£bny (Pan 62), but such double forms as bywmyh in Pan 35 and wbymy in Had 15 "oblige à reconnaitre une voyelle pure, contrairement à l'interprétation commune de formes semblable de l'araméen antique."2

This suggests that some conclusions which have been made in the past on OA represent but partial observations on this dialect and are based on a dialect of OA rather than encompassing all the "variations" found in OA. When one remembers that in Sefire 1 in three successive lines there were two different spellings of the same word, and puts that together with this evidence from Samalian, we can see much less uniformity in orthographical practices used in OA.

The writers of these inscriptions preferred 'aleph or yod to be in representing long ê.3 So bm' in Had 33 could be a feminine form found also as bmh in Dan

---

1DLY, p. 68.

2Ibid. This case was for Dion "most intriguing."

3DLY, p. 57.
3:13,19. śt' (Had 9) has replaced h with an 'aleph.¹
This leads Dion to say that he believes he has enough
evidence to suppose that very early in the first
millennium "on s'est servi assez libérament d'aleph,
non comme matres lectionis proprement dite . . . mais
comme simple signal de la presence d'une voyelle
quelconque."²

Phonology of this dialect can be judged as rather
conservative and close to the Western OA phonology, but
not without one exception: 'rg in Hadad 13, but sry in
Hadad 30 is like hgr in Sefire I A 28. The letter 'aleph
is the single most interesting element to consider here.
In forms like mr'h (Pan 12) where this word takes a
pronominal suffix, there is no elision of the 'aleph
before the suffix just as in OA and DA in contrast to LA.
Yet, this same consonant is elided in words like bd/h
(Had 27, Pan 5), ytmr (Had 10), 'bz (Had 3),³ and brš
(Pan 12). This change occurs when 'aleph precedes letters
h, t, š. In DA there are many words in which 'aleph does

¹The early interchanges of the 'aleph and he are
in a word from an inscription dated 725 B.C. (CIS II
vol. 1, pp. 3-4), and in a graffito (KAI 203). The
letters from Hermopolis (6th-5th cent. B.C.) often use
he instead of 'aleph.

²DLX, p. 84. Notice also the conjunction
spelled as w' in Pan 12.

³Concerning the pronunciation, contrast Gibson,
for whom the absence of a second 'aleph does not mean
that this consonant was not pronounced (TSI, p. 70), and
Dion, according to whom the 'aleph completing the first
syllable was not to be written because it was not
pronounced (DLX, p. 51).
not seem to be pronounced any longer according to the Masoretic vowel system. The most interesting word is b'tr (Dan 7:6, 7) which experienced the elision of the 'aleph in dialects subsequent to DA. At the same time, in DA once it takes a pronominal suffix, it drops the 'aleph in front of the taw, yielding btrak (Dan 2:39).

No firm conclusion can be made on this single example, but it is relevant here to the discussion of the frequent dissimilation of 'aleph in Samalian, and the agreement of DA with the OA is to be noted. This case seems to give some support to those who see the stress change as the major factor in this process of dissimilation. As in Samalian and other Aramaic texts like Ofa, DA does have some cases of interchange between 'aleph and he in spelling of the nouns, but the phenomenon is limited to a certain number of cases and it is not as frequent as in LA.

---

2 CJT, pp. 46-47.  
3 In DLV, p. 118, Dion adds other explanations to this proposed here.  
4 A detailed list was given by Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel," pp. 90-94. Vasholz's study of final aleph and he on proper names seems to favor an early date for DA (CJT, pp. 25-26). He reached the same conclusions in studying the spellings of the words mh, kmh, tmh (CJT, pp. 34-36), the spelling of the personal pronoun 'nh (pp. 53-54), and the endings of the infinitive in derived stems (pp. 57-8).  
5 GBA, p. 23.  
6 One example is the text of 1QapGen where the
In the text of the Hadad and Panammu inscriptions, there seems to be a significant number of words with a prosthetic 'aleph. The most certain case is the word 'shm (Had 16, 21), but scholars are inclined to consider other words as belonging to this category as well: 'rgvph (Had 11), 'rqw (Had 13), 'zh (Pan 2), 'qm (Pan 5), and 'snb (Pan 6). These examples represent quite a few occurrences for an OA dialect, and 'shm is attested also in Sefire I C 25 and II B 7. All that can be said here is that it cannot be maintained that this is an indication for a late date of DA, and if this is an eastern feature in OfA, as Coxon would have it, it certainly is not only an eastern feature in OA, as is indicated by the frequency of the phenomenon in Samalian.

In concluding this section on orthography and phonology of Samalian, some remarks should be made on a word that in Aramaic dialects appears in three different written forms because of consonantal shifts within the dialect. The Hebrew word qtl is written qtl in OfA, qtl in Panammu and Sefire, and ktl in Nerab and Ahiqar. Likewise we have word qvg in Hebrew, which is qyt in DA, consonant he is rarely found as the ending of a feminine noun. See GAQ, p. 187.

1 Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel," pp. 88-89.
3 See DISO, p. 257.
and kyṣ' in Barrakab.¹ The orthography of the first word has been explained in three different ways: (1) the original t was later assimilated to g thus giving ḫ;²
or (2) kṭl experienced a shift from k to g;³ or (3) qṭl was the initial form which developed two later forms by the process of dissimilation.⁴ The variety of these possibilities illustrates the fact that phonology is a branch of linguistics where, at least in the earlier strata of the Aramaic language, it is difficult to come to simple and final conclusions on specific phenomena.

Morphology

The most noticeable characteristic of Samalian in the matter of morphology is the absence of an emphatic state of nouns. This has been explained in various ways, but the two dominant theories are that this is either because of the Assyrian influence, or that there was an emphatic-state in pronunciation but it was not expressed in writing.⁵

The importance of the use of the prefix ɬ with precative imperfect in OA in relation to DA has already been pointed out in this study. It turns out not to be a

¹See the example mentioned on p. 186.
²E.g., Degen in AAG, p. 41.
⁵DLY, pp. 13-14.
late feature of Aramaic but rather, as Dion indicates, a free use of the precative prefix which can safely be ascribed "to second millennium Aramaic . . . features retained by eighth century Sam'alian."¹ The following is the list of verbs with a precative 1^-.

There are five such cases: lytkh (Had 23), lmn (Had 24), ltgmrw (Had 30), plktšh, and plktšnh (Had 31). It is interesting to note that all these cases are found in the Hadad inscription which is normally dated earlier than Panammu on the basis of its other linguistic features.

The verbs having nun as their first radical show clearly the assimilation of that nun in their prefixed forms. The same letter is assimilated in the personal pronoun 'nt which is in Samalian 't. In BA the primae nun verbs assimilate the nun, but a certain number of cases occur where this does not take place. Rosenthal's opinion on this feature of DA is that here there is "substitution of nasalization for gemination," and he explains this process by stating that "where original n appears unassimilated, secondary nasalization, instead of retention of the original sound, may be involved."²

The third masculine plural imperfect has only u as at Nerab, in some cases in Sefire, in DA and EgA.³ Again a certain freedom in spelling is evident in lbr.'

¹ "The Language Spoken," p. 118.
² GBA, pp. 16-17.
³ For DA see BLA, p. 118, and GBA, p. 44.
(Had 13) which is spelled with 'aleph. This can be called a "false vocalization" of this tertiae yod verb. bnyt
(Had 14) is another interesting form which, according to
DA can be vocalized either bnayt (Dan 4:27) or bnēt (Dan
4:2).

There are some cases of the causative stem in the
imperfect which is written without the prefix h in
Samalian: lytkh (Had 23), yqm (Had 28), ywg1 (Had 21),
yzkr (Had 16), and possibly yrṣy (Had 27). It seems,
therefore, that an Aphel stem had developed in the
imperfect at an early stage of Samalian.

šmrg, which is found in Panammu 16, is usually
explained as a šafCel formation of mrd.1 There are
four such formations in DA. Some scholars see the šafCel
formation as borrowed from Akkadian,2 while others
like C. Rabin argue that its source was Amorite.3

The direct object marker in Samalian is spelled
wt (wth in Had 28). From this single instance it is
obvious that it had at least two similar characteristics
with its counterpart in DA: It occurs rarely in older
Aramaic texts in contrast to LA texts,4 and it takes a

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \text{HAS, p. 354.} \\
2 & \text{GBA, p. 53.} \\
3 & \text{"The Nature and Origin of the šafCel in Hebrew and Aramaic," Eretz-Israe}l \text{ 9 (1969):150. \ Also DLV, pp. 203f.} \\
4 & \text{Qumran, Murabbaat, the Targums, and Galilean Aramaic.}
\end{align*}
\]
This independent object pronoun exhibits somewhat different spellings in other Aramaic dialects and other cognate languages. All these forms may be linked etymologically, but the chronological development of this pronoun is not determined with certainty. It occurs in Hebrew and Moabite as 't, in the Sefire and Phoenician as 'yt, in DA and EgA as yt, and here in Samalian as wt. Its vocalization is also uncertain in some dialects. The only thing of which we can be certain is that the yod "must be regarded as a consonant."  

In 1929, the written form of this pronoun as found in DA, yt, was known only from LA texts (Nabatean, Palmyrene). This gave support to H. L. Ginsberg's argument as late as 1942: "As for the accusative particle yāt (Dan 3:12), its literary use is not only late but characteristic of the west and rare in the east." Subsequently, however, the same spelling of this pronoun turned up in a fifth-century Brooklyn Papyrus. 

In a study published two decades later, Koopmans presented his scheme of chronological development of this particle, and this goes in a direction different from...
Ginsberg's conclusions. He agrees with Ginsberg's hypothetical postulate that yt had developed from wt. From there on he follows H. Bauer\(^1\) in tracing the next development from \(yt\) to 'yt.\(^2\) Thus the complete development would go from \(wt\) to \(yt\) to 'yt.

Since the development to 'yt is demonstrated in eighth-century Western OA inscriptions, and this is also the form found in DA, it need not be considered either late or belonging to "the West."

A word should be said on the 'aleph which appears in front of this particle. Should this character be explained here by "the cumulative evidence of initial 'aleph-yod interchange attested in various Semitic languages,"\(^3\) or could it simply be considered as a prosthetic 'aleph? Either of these possibilities would favor Dion's comment noted earlier that this consonant was treated rather freely in the texts of the early first millennium B.C.\(^4\)

Syntax

There seems to be only superficial agreement in word order between the West OA and Samalian. Dion clearly takes issue with Degen on this subject. He finds more

\(^1\)"Semitische Sprachprobleme," ZDMG 68 (1914):370.
\(^2\)ACH, p. 39.
\(^4\)PLY, p. 84.
than twenty cases of the NOUN-VERB word order in OA.
which Degen has lightly dismissed.\(^1\) On the other hand,
Samalian has a more conservative order of VERB-NOUN.
Fitzmyer considers the word order at Sefire rather
mixed,\(^2\) while Kutscher finds "about 45 cases of the
order of verb-subject against 15 of subject-verb" in the
same inscriptions.\(^3\)

In Hadad 10, where two infinitives are used in
sequence, both have a *lamed* which precedes them. In other
words, that *lamed* is repeated before the second
infinitive. A similar syntactical feature can be observed
in Sefire II B 7 and III 11. At least one verse in DA
(5:16) presents two occurrences of this phenomenon.

In line 2 of the same inscription, the verb *ntn*
is used in its singular form with a list of subjects, and
this can be found often in Daniel, i.e., Dan 3:29 and
5:14.\(^4\)

\[^{cd\text{ yzkr nb}^{s}\text{ pnmw}}\text{ (Had 17)}\text{ is a temporal}\]

\[^\text{proposition which expresses the future. In DA this is the}\]
case with \(^{cd\text{ dy}}\text{ which can have the same function in Dan}\]
4:20,22,29. In Ezra 4:21, on the other hand, \(^{cd}\text{ alone is}\]

\[^1\text{DLY, p. 289. This particular point teaches us}\]

\[^\text{again that Aramaic studies today are dynamic and bring}\]

\[^\text{new light on these well-known texts: "Degen a formulé}\]

\[^\text{sa règle et écarté les exceptons possible de façon trop}\]

\[^\text{systématique."}\]

\[^2\text{AIS, p. 168.}\]

\[^3\text{HAS, p. 362.}\]

\[^4\text{TSI, p. 70.}\]
the word which suffices for this purpose.

Conclusion

This chapter had for purpose examination of the two inscriptions which form "Early Standard Aramaic" and two inscriptions written in Samalian dialect, in order to see how much of their content can be paralleled to DA.

The Sefire stelae have a nature of their text different from the one of DA, because it shows paraphrastic legal style. This is in contrast with Zakkur and Samalian. The following literary parallels have been noted:

In the Zakkur inscription opening, section A resembles the text of Dan 3:31-4:1ff. The connecting link between the two texts is the first-person report with ascription of power and dominion to the deity.

The Sefire inscriptions share common stylistic features with DA that are mostly evident in the highly idiomatic style of expression. The common techniques to be noted are as follows:

1. The use of a grouped idiom
2. The use of different kinds of parallelism, such as complementary parallelism
3. Repetition of a set of phrases for emphasis
4. Common literary cliches, such as the numbers seven and three
5. Frequent metaphoric language

The structural outline of Hadad is demonstrated...
in a clearer way than the outline of Panammu. The six-element structure of Hadad corresponds to the use of six key themes in the six successive chapters of DA.

In the sections on orthography, it has been remarked that in contrast to West OA, Samalian has the percentage of words written out fully close to the number of the same in Tell Fakhriyah. In addition to this, all texts exhibit a number of spelling inconsistencies, which again confirms the absence of uniformity or rigid rules in their way of expression. Likewise, it is reasonable to expect the same in DA, and when such phenomena are encountered in Daniel to match them with the ones from OA.

Graffiti and the Sefire stelae have some cases of interchange between 'aleph and he. In Sefire alone we have counted five cases of unusual phonological expressions.

Prosthetic 'aleph, whose presence in DA was used as an argument for the late date for this text, appears in Sefire, Hadad, and Samalian.

Several points are interesting in the area of morphology. Samalian attests the archaic origin of the preformative _(' on the jussive precative found also in DA. In Sefire there are two other signs of the jussive precative: masculine plural ending -n absent and in the non-suffixed persons of the verb tertiae infirmae h is replaced with ỹ. The syncope of ę in the causative
imperfect has the same ratio in DA and Sefire. The situation is similar in Samalian.

The following three rare verb conjugations are found in the texts under comparison: Peîl—four times in Sefire; Huphal instead of the late Ittaphal, also in Sefire; and in Samalian a šaphel stem may be added to this list. When compared with other OA texts, DA has a rather conservative spelling of the reflexive verbal stem.

The occasional quiescence of 'aleph in DA is evident also in some particular words in Sefire, and Samalian uses the same consonant rather freely. Finally, the occurrence of such rare words as yt (Sefire, and Samalian), hmw (Sefire), 'ln (at least eleven times in Sefire), and the reduplicated form rbrbn is noted.

Syntactical features manifested mainly in word order of a sentence show a rather western word order in contrast to DA. Yet some instructive parallels are present here, too. For example, when a singular noun is found in a plural context in DA, that feature need not be regarded as late. The proof is the presence of the same phenomenon in OA.

The conclusion of this chapter is similar to that of the previous chapter. Parallels in the two corpora of literature are illuminative for study of both texts.
CHAPTER IV

TRANSITION FROM OLD TO OFFICIAL ARAMAIC

Introduction

As the first known textual language which differed from Standard Western OA, the Samalian dialect provided the starting point that indicated the existence of different OA dialects. Its gradual absorption from a local dialect into Standard Early Aramaic can be traced. It is unanimously accepted today that three inscriptions known as the Barrakab inscriptions do not belong to the same Aramaic dialect as Hadad and Panammu. Hoffman's question of how the same king could speak two Aramaic languages has received an indirect answer by Greenfield's statement:

From the vantage point of Zincirly, one can see the interplay of language and politics, for Bar-Rakib of Sam'al set up the memorial inscription outlining the accomplishments of his father Panamu in Samalian Aramaic; but his own inscriptions (KAI 216, etc.), in which he emphasized the fact that he was a loyal vassal of Tiglath-pileser, were in a different dialect.

Another point, and this one is still debated, is

\[\text{1"The Dialects of Early Aramaic," p. 95.}\]
\[\text{2"Aramäische Inschriften aus Nerab bei Aleppo," p. 233.}\]
\[\text{3Ibid.}\]
the proper classification of the inscriptions under study in this chapter. Even though one would not treat the language of the Barrakab inscriptions as being the same as Hadad and Panammu today, as Cooke did in 1903,\(^1\) nevertheless, their classification in an OA dialect group seems plausible.

Fitzmyer, however, was surprised by Gibson's classification of both the Barrakab and Nerab inscriptions in the section entitled "Early Inscriptions in Imperial or Official Aramaic."\(^2\) For him, these inscriptions are "the earliest to employ the language commonly called official or imperial Aram."\(^3\) Gibson's classification is probably based on the fact that these inscriptions, representing "Mesopotamian Aramaic," are closer to OfA than to OA. The problem is that this designation of "Mesopotamian Aramaic" is not used in the same way by different scholars.\(^4\)

For A. Dupont-Sommer, both the Barrakab and Nerab inscriptions, which come from the eighth and seventh centuries, are still understood as "Ancient Aramaic Monumental Inscriptions."\(^5\) Degen's position regarding

\(^1\) A Text-Book, p. 180.
\(^2\) The review of TSI in JBL 96 (1977):426.
\(^3\) TSI, p. 88.
\(^5\) F. Rosenthal, ed. An Aramaic Handbook I/1
Barrakab was the same. \(^1\) Kaufman had difficulty with the classification of the Nerab stelae. He hoped that in his final analysis "they will be shown to be Imperial Aramaic."\(^2\) In Segert's study, even the Ashur Ostracon is classified as "früharamäische."\(^3\) But it was Fitzmyer who, in his review of Gibson's work, really took issue with him on this point. Says Fitzmyer:

> But I fail to see why the Bar-Rakib inscriptions I-III are classed as early examples of Imperial or Official Aramaic, not to mention the Neirab inscriptions . . . he [Gibson] gives no reasons for separating the first five inscriptions of section 3 from the Old Aramaic inscriptions of section 1, to which, in my opinion, they are obviously related.

Our title for this chapter, "Transition from Old to Official Aramaic," may be judged as lacking precision, but this ambiguity is purposely used here not only to attempt to satisfy both sides in this discussion but also because the final word on the classification of these inscriptions has not as yet been pronounced.

**The Barrakab Inscriptions**

**Description**

The first three of the Barrakab Inscriptions\(^5\)

\(^1\) *AAG*, pp. 8-9.
\(^2\) *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, p. 9, n. 16.
\(^3\) *Altaramäische Grammatik*, p. 39.
\(^4\) The review of *TSI* in *JBL* 96 (1977):426.
\(^5\) Variously read by scholars as: Bar-Rakib, Barrakab, Barrakkab, or Bar-Rakub.
were unearthed in an excavation in 1891. They were carved in stone, and the relief on the block stone with the first inscription on it represents Barrakab dressed in an Assyrian style. This inscription is located today in the Museum of Antiquities at Istanbul. The other two are in the Staatliche Museen in Berlin.

The inscriptions are dated to around 730 B.C. and, therefore, are slightly later than Panammu. They have been worked over by a number of scholars and the scholars selected here—Cooke, Koopmans, Donner-Röllig, Degen, and Gibson—are those who have produced the most prominent studies on their language.¹

Nature

All three inscriptions, just like Hadad and Panammu, are of memorial character, outlining and recounting the accomplishments of the king who erected them. In this respect they come closer to the nature of the text in DA than other OA inscriptions. Thus Dan 4 uses the personal pronoun 'ihn extensively to convey the first-person report of King Nebuchadnezzar,² and the first inscription here demonstrates a similar use of this pronoun. Moreover, the distribution of the occurrences of this word is such that it comes in the beginning and at

¹Cooke, A Text Book, pp. 180-4; Koopmans, ACH, pp. 76-79; Donner, KAI, pp. 232-7 (only Donner was responsible for the Aramaic section); Degen, AAG, pp. 8-9; Gibson, TSI, pp. 87-93.

²Dan 4:1,4,6,15,27,31,34.
the end in the narrative in order to introduce and close the king's direct speech. In this way, it is distributed in the same way that the same word is found in the first inscription. There it comes once in line 1 and once in the last line, line 20.

Structure

It is only possible to analyze inscription I, which is complete. The second is only partially preserved and probably did not exceed twelve lines. The third inscription has only five words.

A comparison can be made between inscription I and Dan 4:31-34, since both texts appear to have a similar purpose, namely, to relate to a larger audience a concise biographical sketch of an experience of the king in life.

Both texts can be divided into five distinctive parts. Each of these parts has its own motif:

1. First comes an introduction which is noticeable in both texts because of the use of 'nh together with the name of the king (lines 1-3a and Dan 4:31a).

2. Then follows praise to the superior lord and the reason why this god established the king. This occurred at the king's initiative (lines 3b-6a and Dan 4:31b-32).

3. The establishment of the king is then expressed (lines 6b-8a and Dan 4:33a).
4. Great prosperity of the king is recited next, utilizing the key word **rbrbn** in both texts (lines 8b-15 and Dan 4:33b).

5. At the end both texts close with a description of the king's prosperity excelling the past (lines 16-20 and Dan 4:33c-34). The key expression is 'nh followed by the name of the king. It is used emphatically and is repeated in both texts.

The basic difference in the content between the texts is that Barrakab ascribes much to himself, while Nebuchadnezzar ascribes everything to God. This contrast is expressed in the forms of verbs that are used. Active forms appear in Barrakab while passive forms occur in DA.¹

Vocabulary

The inscriptions together have only thirty short lines with a total of forty-seven different words that are used. Of these, thirty-six can be found also in DA, while eleven cannot. This means that 77 percent of the total different words are attested also in DA.

The following expressions have corresponding phrases in DA:

\[\text{hwšbny . . . krs'} 'by (I 5-7)\] is composed of a verb in the causative stem, and the noun krs' followed by

---

¹E.g., contrast 'bztt (line 11) and htnnt with hwspt (vs. 33).
its modifier. In Dan 5:20 the same pattern is followed in
hnht . . . mn krs' mlkwth.

wbyt 'by Cml mn kl (I 7-8) is made up of a noun
functioning as the subject, the verb as the predicate,
and the adverbial mn kl. This can be compared to why' 
mšnyh mn kl (Dan 7:7), or to dy hwt šnyh mn klhw (vs.
19), or to dy tšn' mn kl (vs. 23), or 'rbC mlkyn yqwmwn
mn 'rC' (vs. 17). All four parallels in DA come from
chap. 7.

mr'y mlk (I 9) is almost identical with mr'y
mlk' in Dan 4:21. Both texts use the title mr' for a king
and god, respectively.

wby[t] tb lyšh l'bhy (I 15-16) has the same word
order as wbbl l' 'yty bhwn in Dan 3:25. Also, lyšh (I 16)
is often found in Dan 2, e.g., l' 'yty in Dan 2:11.

b' (I 17) "behold" is used as in Dan 3:25 in
contrast to hn, hnw of the Hadad inscription.

w'nh bnyt byt' znh (I 20) is very interesting
because it seems to have at least four corresponding
expressions in DA where one can trace the same pattern:
conjunction or preposition, the pronoun 'nh, a verb in
the perfect or a participle, and an object followed by
its modifier: h' 'nh žzh gbrn 'rb'C (Dan 3:25); 'nh .
. . Žlh hwyty bbyty (4:1); 'nh bnyth lbyt mlkw (4:27);
'nh . . . msbh wmrwmm wmdr lmlk šmy' (4:34).
Orthography and Phonology

In this respect our inscriptions do not depart significantly from what is found in OA texts. Only two internal vowel-letters are present and both in foreign proper names: tgltplysr (I 3) and 'šwr (I 9). It is interesting that these inscriptions, which are chronologically later than Hadad and Panammu, and which seem to exhibit less of the "archaic" forms often found in Samalian, have fewer internal vowel-letters than those two inscriptions. This goes against a normal chronological tracing of this orthographical practice. The b in nbšt (II 7) is in addition to Sefire found in this text, too, while k in kys' is the "only clear instance of Akkad. influence on the phonology," according to Gibson.¹

The word mr'y (III) has preserved its 'aleph before a pronominal suffix just as is the case in other OA material and DA, as has been demonstrated above. The case is not the same with krs' (I 7) which does not take suffixes in these inscriptions. In Dan 5:20 we have the same spelling, but when this word takes pronominal suffixes it drops the 'aleph: krswn and krsyh (Dan 7:9). This 'aleph is preserved in a single case in the

¹TSI, p. 88. Greenfield's conclusion is that this should be viewed in light of the fact that "Assyrian words and names are spelled with /g/ for intervocalic /k/ ("Dialects of Early Aramaic," p. 95). Millard reminds me that Mesopotamian influence on the syntax of Barrakab joins this particular form.
Papyri. Since the use of this word with a suffix in older Aramaic texts is very scarce, it is difficult to make any statement on its exact orthography and phonology. All we can say on this is that we have already seen that in Samalian the 'aleph behaves in a very irregular way. This phenomenon, however, is similar to that in DA, but it is remote from the practices which become regular in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic. There ṁr', for example, occurs in its absolute state spelled regularly as ṁrh.²

Morphology

It is interesting to note the presence of the word ᴲʳʳᵇʳⁿ (I 10,13). This is a reduplicated form which is also found in DA and it is frequent in Palestinian Aramaic. The above-mentioned lyḥ (I 16) might have dropped the 'aleph. Here we have just the opposite development of what we have seen with the direct object marker which in OA was spelled ṭ'y and ṭ'y in DA. The question remains whether the 'aleph in the form ṭ'yty could be considered as prosthetic.

Syntax

The syntax of the Barrakab inscriptions cannot be designated simply as West Semitic. Mesopotamian influence is visible here. The noun can precede the verbal

---

¹AP 6:2.
²GAQ, p. 213.
predicate, and thus the word order can be described as rather free.

Take, for example, the best illustration of this, which is found in line 7: wbyt 'by cml mn kl. There the word order is just the opposite of West Semitic which would more likely be w'by cml byt mn kl. In our study on the vocabulary we have pointed out a dozen expressions from DA which have their direct correspondences in this short text. The similarity in word order, which often departs from West Semitic word order and shows eastern influence, is significant.

The Nerab Stelae

Description

Two short stelae were found in 1891 at Nerab, somewhat less than five miles southeast of Aleppo. They accompany the bas-reliefs of two priests of the local sanctuary executed in the Assyrian manner.

The inscriptions were first published in 1897 by Ch. Clermont-Ganneau1 and are usually dated early in the seventh century B.C.2 Since that time they have become well-known in different studies, and their various linguistic points have been discussed extensively. The most important discussions of these texts have been

---

1In Etudes d'archéologie orientale 2 (1897):182ff.
2TSI, p. 94.
carried out by Donner-Röllig, Koopmans, Cooke, and Gibson.¹

**Nature and Structure**

The two stelae have sepulchral-memorial inscriptions with a text somewhat religious in character. The nature and structure of the text, however, are so different from DA that they do not have a very important bearing on our comparison with DA.

**Vocabulary**

The two inscriptions together have only twenty-four short lines. One can count forty-nine different words in them. Thirty-nine are also attested in DA, while ten are not. Therefore, 78 percent of the words from the stelae occur in DA. Among the ten which do not, there are some loan words like ʾrqst (I 4), which is Akkadian, and ʾlmcn (II 7), which is attested only in Hebrew, and hwm (II 6), a noun not attested anywhere else in Aramaic.

On the other hand, byn (I 10) is used in the same way as bbyyn of Dan 7:12. ʾbrh (I 13) is usually understood as taking the he locative, which is temporal here and translated adverbially "in the future."² In

---

¹Donner, KAI, pp. 274-6; Koopmans, ACH, pp. 92-95; Cooke, A Text-Book, pp. 186-91; Gibson, TSI, pp. 93-96.

²E.g., TSI, p. 96: "in the future may yours be guarded."
In this case the following verb ynsr would have to be in the "Niphal or Qal passive". In light of 'hrn in Dan 2:39f., I would prefer to read 'hrn as a substantive (abstract?) and render the entire phrase "another will guard yours." Koopmans seems to suggest this possibility in a similar way. gdqty (II 2) is feminine, like the same word in Dan 4:24, but in contrast to Panammu 1 where it is masculine.

A few expressions seem to be present in both this text and DA:

zy lk (I 14) is like dy lh hy' (Dan 2:20). This relative construction is found only once in DA, but it becomes much more common in EgA, LA, and in Syriac.

šym šm tb (II 3) is just like šm šmh bltš'gr in Dan 5:12, and both tb and bltš'gr have the appositional function in these two expressions.

pmy . . . mln (II 4) is similar to ml t' bpm of Dan 4:28.

m'n ksp wnhš (II 6-7) can be compared with Dan 5:2, lm'ny dhb' wksp'.

Orthography and Phonology

What has been said for the Barrakab inscriptions

---

1 KAI, p. 276.
2 ACH, p. 93.
3 BLA, p. 359.
4 E.g., GAQ, p. 209.
could be repeated here. The text of the stelae does not differ much from what is known in OA texts. There are two clear cases of internal vowel-letters, only this time they are not found in foreign words. These occur in yktlwk (I 11) and śmwny (II 7). The number of these occurrences is smaller than what has been seen in the older texts of the Samalian dialect.

In phonology s takes the place of g more often, as in 'rgth (I 4,12). There is a case of phonological dissimilation of g in yktlwk (I 11).

When it comes to the 'aleph-he interchange, the demonstrative pronoun znh is always spelled with he in this text, just as it is in all cases of DA (and BA). Although this pronoun is frequent in EgA, the dn' spelling is found only once in a case of a clear dittography where the first spelling is dnh and the second dn'. In the Qumran fragments of DA that have been published thus far, dnh cannot be found, but in several other places 'aleph takes the place of he. Finally in 1QapGen we find only the spelling dn'.

The situation is different for our text with

1BLA, p. 82, erroneously gives dn' as a variant found in Dan 2:18 and Jer 10:11.

2BMAP 9:16, dated at 404 B.C.

3nhw' (Dan 2:4), ch' (2:5), b'tbhln (3:24), and dm' (3:25).

4GAQ, p. 209.
regard to the marker of the emphatic state of nouns. In fact, here he takes the place of 'aleph twice: 'brh (I 13) and 'brth (II 10). In DA the same phenomenon is attested in a few cases. Rowley counted seven such examples, but a more thorough study of these examples reveals that this should be reduced to only two or three cases where this shift is attested. In addition, all seven examples mentioned by Rowley are spelled elsewhere in DA with an 'aleph.

*yh'bdw* (I 11) has retained both he, like *yehpl* (Dan 7:24), and *hwbd* in DA. In the latter word *waw* has taken the place of the *'aleph*.

The nun is assimilated in *yshw* (I 9, from the root *nsh*). However, *yngr* (I 13) and *tngr* (I 12) show that the assimilation of nun is not consistent in this text and may even be considered as "irregular nasalization." This phenomenon in OfA is called "nasalization substituted for gemination" by Rosenthal. It is considered a common feature of EgA and BA and is attributed to Akkadian influence. DA is similar to our text in this respect, since the process of nasalization

---

1 *AOT*, p. 41. Three words may be taken as having a third masculine singular pronominal suffix (*p'rh* in 2:7, *ygrh* in 5:20, and *r'nh* in 2:38), and the two occurrences of *ktbh* (5:7,15) may point to a feminine form of this noun (*Cf. mlh kdnh* in 2:10).

2 See Dan 2:25,37; 5:24; 6:15.

3 *GBA*, p. 16.

4 *TSI*, p. 96.
is not consistent there either, as can be illustrated by
differences between Ketib and Qere of the Masoretic text,
or by the two forms together from one verse: lhnsgq is
spelled with a nun but not whsq (Dan 6:24).

Morphology

The nun is absent once again in 't (I 5), in
contrast to EgA and DA where a nun is found before the
taw. There are two more cases of the causative stem
imperfect (in addition to yh'bdw, I 11) where the he is
preserved in contrast to some OA cases: thns (I 6) and
yhb'sw (II 9).

On the other hand, the reflexive stem in the
perfect omits the he in favor of an 'aleph. This is
evident in two cases, l't'hz (II 4) and 'thmw (II 6).

Says Gibson:

There are several examples in the Old Aram. inscrs.
of h being dropped in the imperf. Haph., Hithpe.,
etc., but this is the earliest instance of its
omission in a perf.

The spelling of the same stem in DA is even more
conservative than what we have in this seventh-century
text.

Scholars are divided when it comes to the
interpretation of mhzh 'nh (II 5). It used to be regarded
simply as Oratio directa in earlier studies. Thus Donner-
Röllig's analysis gives two elements of this compound
word: mh, an interrogative pronoun, and hzh, an active

1Ibid., p. 98.
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participle. Yet, as early as 1912, Torrey preferred not to separate this word but to consider its mem as a kind of participial preformative. Thus Fitzmyer goes against Rosenthal's translation—"and with my eyes, what do I see?"—and suggests that this verb in the Pael has this mem as the sign of the participle and "should be translated, 'and with my eyes I gazed upon my children to the fourth generation.'" Koopmans is open to both options but prefers the traditional reading of this word. Gibson praises Fitzmyer's reading because of "a more felicitous syntax than the usual interpretation."

From what we have seen in expressions which use the pronoun 'nh in both our texts and DA, it seems that the answer lies in Gibson's idea of the syntactical solution, but working in the opposite direction from what he suggests. If this were a Pael participle followed by its subject 'nh, this subject should precede the participle and not follow it. If the mem is interrogative here, however, this could be taken as the explanation for

1KAI, p. 276.
3ANET, p. 505.
4AIS, p. 40.
5ACH, p. 94.
6TSI, p. 98.
the apparently reversed word order, for the purpose of emphasis.

Syntax

The word order in our texts can again be termed "free." In lines 9-10 we have a list of gods as the subject, followed by the verbal predicate and a direct object, and then comes an adverb of place. Likewise, in II 4,10, the direct object precedes both an infinite and a finite verb.

Used as an adjective, the demonstrative pronoun $dnh$ usually follows the noun to which it is related.\(^1\) It is clear from these cases, however, as Bauer and Laander\(^2\) have noted, that only in a nominal phrase does this $dnh$ come before the predicate and under the following conditions: when $dnh$ is the substantive having the role of a subject, and when the following noun has the role of a nominal predicate. Rosenthal supports this idea and it may be assumed that the "reversed word-order" is just another option.\(^3\)

Thus we have $znh$ $glmh$ $w^rsgth$ (I 3-4) and $znh$ $glmh$ (II 2) in contrast to $glm'$ $znh$ $w^rsg't$ (I 6-7) and $glm'$ $w^rsg't$ $z'$ (I 12). In general, this similarity in word-order with DA seems to give support to the name

\(^1\)Dan 2:18; 7:8; 4:24; 6:29.
\(^2\)BLA, p. 82.
\(^3\)GBA, p. 21. Complete his list with Dan 2:36; 4:21,25.
given to this dialect as a "Mesopotamian dialect." This agrees with the result of Kaufman's analysis that the language is "to be Imperial Aramaic."¹

The Ashur Ostracon

Description

The Ashur Ostracon, a letter written on a potsherd from which six fragments were found in the excavations at Ashur from 1903-13, is now located in the Berlin Museum. It is dated to the time of the reign of Assurbanipal, more precisely in 650 B.C.

This text shows that in this time Aramaic plays an important role in Assyrian correspondence, because here we have an Assyrian soldier who writes in Aramaic, though with some Assyrian elements.² The word dividers and scripta continua are mixed together. Says Gibson:

I have counted a total of twenty-three missing spaces of which no less than seventeen seem to possess some significance, either for phonology or for syntax or for both.

At times, the reading of the entire set of lines is uncertain.

The first publication of this text was by M. Lidzbarski.⁴ Other important studies include those by

¹The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic, p. 10, n. 16.
²For similar texts see Kaufman's Akkadian Influences, p. 9, n. 14.
³TSI, pp. 99-100.
⁴In ZA 31 (1917):193f.
Donner-Röllig, Koopmans, A. Dupont-Sommer, and Gibson.¹

Nature and Structure

Because of the very fragmentary state of this letter, it is not possible to reconstruct its content in totality.

Vocabulary

In twenty-one lines of the fragmentary text, there are sixty-two different words of which forty-eight are attested also in DA, while fourteen are not. Thus 77 percent of the words are found in DA.

Akkadian influence seems to be present in the vocabulary. The following words may be noted in this connection: 'grt' (line 4), 'ks' (lines 16,18), and 'lbt ml' (line 19).² Some scholars have suggested a possible link between 'rh' (line 19) and 'ry of Dan 7:2,5,13. In a similar way 'hlw, which is often used in this narrative, can be compared with 'lw or 'rw of DA. Furthermore, '3y (I 6) is a word similar to 'dyn of DA and EgA. Finally, 'grg' (line 9) is a problematic word, and Koopmans, in tracing its development, makes connections between it and 'grg of Dan 3:8, 6:25.³

²TSI, pp. 98-100.
³ACH, p. 83.
A number of expressions in our text are similar or identical to those in DA:

lmry mlk' (line 6) and mr'y mlk' (lines 7, 8) can be paralleled to °1 mr'y mlk' (Dan 4:21).

kyz' z' (line 8) meaning "this and that" is an asyndeton and reminds one of d' ld' (Dan 5:6) and d' mn d' (7:3).

wqymt gdmy (line 9) is similar to gdmwhy yq'mwn of Dan 7:10.

ydyhm ktbt (line 9) is compared with yd' dy ktbh (Dan 5:5).

hgd' hny mly' (line 12) has two parallels in DA: mlt' mny 'zd' hn (2:5) and dy 'zd' mny mlt' (2:8).

Finally, zly (line 13) is used once like dy lh in Dan 2:20.

Orthography and Phonology

There are six cases of internal vowel-letters in the text: Five of these six cases are found in (foreign) proper names, bpyrw (line 5), nbwzrkn (line 10), 'šwr (line 11), nbwšlm (line 14), nbwzrš (line 19), and one is the noun 'bwrk (line 1).

In phonology there is an early instance of t instead of šin, and it is found in yhtb (line 11), but not in partly reconstructed 'šwr (line 16). The 'aleph in

1In a similar way wmr' mlkyn (Dan 2:47) is comparable to '1 mr' mlkn from the Adon Letter from c. 600 B. C. (TSI, p. 113, No. 21, line 1).
lmry (line 6) has suffered elision, but not in mr'v (lines 7, 8, 17). DA preserves the same in its written transmission of the text.

ymn appears in line 16 where one would expect ywmn in OA. Scholars call this a case of diphthong reduction and some cases of the same phenomenon in DA should probably be explained in the same way. They should not be ascribed to alleged revisions of the text or cases of intentional "archaizing." In a similar way the freedom in spelling is suggested by the difference between thzh (line 20) and 'hz' (line 14), just like the alternative spellings of the same forms in DA and EgA.¹

Morphology

There are three interesting points in the text that are useful for our discussion here: (1) ydmn (lines 5, 9) has a he written before the pronominal suffix. This is not consistent in the text, however, because in that same line 9 we also have ydyhm. The forms 'bhty or šmhthn of DA may be of help here, since that same he is found preceding the pronominal suffix there, too.

(2) If it is true that the word hny (line 12) is like 'nyn (Dan 7:17), a third person feminine personal pronoun, then one would have to account for a possible shift from he to 'aleph in this word from DA.

(3) hsd' (line 12). The same word in Dan 3:14 is

¹TSI, p. 109.
often "explained as the interrogative particle with an adverb ga', possibly meaning 'truly' (?)."¹ A more obscure word in DA is 'zd' (Dan 2:5,8) and if the two words can be related, with a possible phonetic shift, then the preceding 'aleph in the word can be taken as prosthetic. This correlation would justify the traditional translation of this word.

Syntax

Apart from the significance of the mixed word-order in this text, we have clear cases of the pronoun zy used for the purpose of expressing genitive relationship: zbyt 'wrkn (line 13), zy byt cdn (line 14), and in the above-mentioned expression zly (line 13). This points clearly to the eastern provenance of our text. As in DA, the construct state of nouns is present in the text, like mlky 'Âwr (line 16), but the zy-genitival phrase also serves the same purpose.

Conclusion

Although the final agreement on chronological classification of these inscriptions has not been reached yet, they are included in this study to satisfy those scholars who argue that they belong to the corpus of OA.

The first of the three Barrakab inscriptions uses the personal pronoun 'nh for the same purpose and the same distribution as a text in DA (4:31-34). Moreover,

¹GBA, p. 40.
the structure of this inscription is like one in the text of DA.

It can be stated that in the lexical field, all three groups of inscriptions have a rather high percentage of the same words with DA. The composition of a significant number of phrases and sentences runs closely or identically with those from DA. This is true for Barrakab; in Nerab there are four and in Ashur seven such expressions. One can note in Ashur a peculiar occurrence of the words which are difficult to find elsewhere, but which are occasionally found in DA. Here is the list of those words from DA: 'ry, 'lw or 'rw, 'zy, qrg, 'nyn, hsd'. At times the comparison is especially illuminating as in the case of h in the two words in DA: 'bhty and ʰmḥtn.

The area of phonology and orthography presents the following results: Barrakab and Nerab have only two internal vowel-letters each, in contrast to Ashur which has six. It is interesting that these inscriptions, which are chronologically later than Hadad and Panammu, seem to exhibit fewer of the "archaic" forms often found in Samalian. They also have fewer internal vowel-letters than those two inscriptions. This goes against a normal chronological tracing of this orthographical practice.

Conservative spelling of the pronoun znh (dnh) in Nerab and DA, is to be contrasted with LA. The marker of the emphatic state of nouns is h twice in Nerab and a few
times in DA, although in DA all these words have the alternative spellings with an 'aleph.

A certain amount of inconsistency in the phenomenon of nasalization is to be noted in Nerab. ysbw (I 9) has the opposite spelling of ynsr (I 13) or tnsr (I 12). In DA in one verse we have lhnsg and whsq (Dan 6:24). It seems that at times we have to recognize inconsistencies rather than impose artificial paradigms upon the text. In phonology it is interesting to note that Ashur yields a word in which t is used where sin would be expected. 'brn in Dan 2:39 could be used to clarify 'brh of Nerab I 13.

The study of syntax shows that we are no longer in West CA but rather in the Mesopotamian realm with free and flexible word order. Likewise, zy genitivale is found in three constructions in the letter from Ashur.

These texts enrich the study of DA, and they are particularly close to DA because of their Mesopotamian character.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

Preliminary Remarks

The problem of dating DA is a difficult one for at least three main reasons: (1) A general lack of precise data on the Aramaic language originating from an early period in history; (2) the transmission of the text of DA which extended over a period of more than a millennium; and (3) the different presuppositions involved in dealing with the problem, which make the task of clarifying its origin even more complicated. To this problem of dating DA, another problem is closely connected; namely, the enigma of the geographical origin of this Aramaic dialect.

For these reasons a statement on the origin of DA based purely on study of the language cannot be final. Arguments from studies or comparisons of languages or dialects can be viewed as only one part of the picture that contributes to dating of a Biblical book.

The evidence coming from the new material that has been published recently plays an important role in solving some of the problems. Consequently, now we are witnessing an awakening of interest in Aramaic studies in
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general and in DA in particular. In scholarly debates which have followed as a consequence, the corpus of OA texts has not received the full attention that it should. There has been a lack of comparative studies between DA and OA.

This study of OA texts has been organized into seven sections: Description, Nature, Structure, Vocabulary, Orthography and Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax. The discussion of each of these sections has brought its corresponding subject into contact with the text of DA.

Eight OA inscriptions have been studied here. They range in date from the ninth to the seventh centuries B.C. To these six other inscriptions have been added since they come from a period of transition from OA into OfA. Some, but not all, scholars tend to include these in the corpus of OA texts. A similar amount of attention has been paid to the text of DA, which has been taken as a unit (chaps. 2-7) for the purpose of this study.

The publication of OA inscriptions began before the turn of the twentieth century and has continued to the publication of the most recent primary OA source, that of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription in 1981. All of these texts have been studied in detail by various students in the Aramaic field, and their studies are the
basis or starting points for the discussion presented here.

The place in which the inscriptions were written is relevant to the dialectal debate in OA. This debate has intensified in the 1980s with the arrival of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription on the scene of action. This is the only OA text that was written at such an early date and which comes from northeastern Syria. The only earlier indication of the presence of different dialects within the corpus of OA was the peculiar character of the texts from the north of Syria. These were written in what has been called the Samalian dialect. Kaufman's proposal to divide OA into three or four dialects will probably serve as the basis for new grammars and textbooks on OA.

The inscriptions representing OA dialects exhibit various literary styles. Some inscriptions have a short and formulaic votive style, while others use repetitive and formulaic phrases of a legal character. Although none of the inscriptions can be classified as purely poetic, most of them use figurative language and phraseology together with additional poetic devices.

The nature of the text in the Tell Fakhriyah inscription is such that it exhibits a narrative style which is colored with units of poetry or poetic-like speech. Its character could really be described as a mixture between the units of narrative and poetic material, or poetic prose. The next two inscriptions, the
Bir-Hadad and the Zakkur, demonstrate a votive dedicatory style. This is especially the case in the former inscription with its laconic and formulaic style.

The Sefire stelae, on the other hand, are characterized by a paraphrastic legal style. Larger units making up these treaties appear over and over again in the text. The Hadad and Panammu inscriptions, like most OA texts, also have a votive and commemorative style, as do the Barrakab inscriptions. The Nerab stelae may be classified in the same category, but this time should be identified as sepulchral memorial monuments. The Ashur ostracon is an exception, and if it could be properly reconstructed, it probably would show the even more simple narrative style of a letter.

The text of DA is, in its largest units, narrative in style. It also contains poetic passages scattered through its narratives. These short hymns are not the only indicators of the presence of poetry in DA. Even the narrative passages are colored with clear poetic affinities. Moreover, some examples of legal style are found in this text, and all of these give to DA a composite and colorful writing style.

The study has revealed a number of features significant for better understanding of DA, and the following conclusions have been reached in that regard. A contextual study of OA inscriptions contributes to the
study of DA in the following way.

Better Understanding of the Literary and Historical Contexts of DA

The corpus of OA royal inscriptions has usually been analyzed with extreme selectivity in previous studies. To utilize Tawil's opinion, little or no emphasis has been placed upon the use of various idioms, formulae, and other literary elements for the purpose of elucidation of the stylistic and philological affinities which they exhibit. In regard to the consequences of this limited approach, as Greenfield points out, not enough attention has been given to the older literary material preserved in DA.

One of the neglected areas is the study of structure. This is being recognized today as a vehicle of meaning, and it points directly to the similarity in content and meaning in the documents under study. Both the Tell Fakhriyah inscription and the book of Daniel use two languages, and the Aramaic language serves as an alternate means of communication with a larger audience.

Literary similarities are evidenced in the fact that both Tell Fakhriyah and DA betray their authors' love for lists and enumerations. In addition to that, their texts are harmonious mixtures of narrative units and praise-hymns. Both the inscription and Dan 4 and 5 have chiastic patterns on large and smaller scales. These
chiastic patterns in one part, however, are not slavishly reproduced in the other.

The plan of the hymn-prayer in Dan 2:19-24 agrees well with the hymn-prayer in the first part of the inscription. The most noticeable connection between the two hymns is the succession of participles praising the beneficience of the god. The change of the person of report in the book of Daniel is parallel to the same in this much shorter text where the third-person report shifts to the first (lines 11 and 12).

The short Bir-Hadad inscription has a structure that looks very much like two of Daniel's speeches to Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 2:36-38 and 4:16-24.

In the opening of the Zakkur inscription, section A resembles the text of Dan 3:31-4:1ff. The connecting link between the two texts is the first-person report with ascription of power and dominion to the deity.

The nature of the Sefire inscriptions is different from that of DA in that they use legal paraphrastic style. Yet they share common stylistic features with DA that are evident mostly in the highly idiomatic style of expression. The common techniques to be noted are as follows:

1. The use of a grouped idiom.
2. The use of different kinds of parallelism, such as complementary parallelism.
3. Repetition of a set of phrases for emphasis.
4. Common literary cliches, such as the numbers seven and three.
5. Frequent metaphoric language.

The structural outline of Hadad is demonstrated in a clearer way than the outline of Panammu. The six-element structure of Hadad corresponds to the use of six key terms in the six successive chapters of DA.

The Barrakab Inscription I is complete and has the same purpose as Dan 4:31-34. Both appear to share similar structures. All five distinct parts of the inscription with their five different motifs can be compared with their respective correspondences in the text of Dan 4. There is, however, a significant difference with regards to their contents. Barrakab ascribes much to himself, while Nebuchadnezzar ascribes everything to God.

In the light of what has been seen in such structures, DA seems to employ structural patterns common to Aramaic-speaking areas. These may be significantly older than the proposed traditional date of DA. Thus OA texts present some important parallels with the structure of DA even with regards to the literary organization of the themes it presents. This similarity does not favor the idea that DA contains late Hebrew court-tales.

Lexical data suggest not only that the vocabulary of OA inscriptions is familiar to a student of BA and BH,
but also that there is a certain closeness between the two dialects under the study. This may be concluded from the percentage of the words in an OA inscription that are also attested in DA, and by the number of same and similar expressions, phrases or sentences.

Study of the vocabulary of OA inscriptions reveals that an average OA inscription has over 65 percent of its vocabulary also attested in DA. Table 2 presents these data for each of the inscriptions under study here. The first number represents the total of different words in an inscription, the second stands for the number of words that are found also in DA, and the third number is the percentage:

**TABLE 2**

**VOCABULARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>No. of Diff. Words</th>
<th>Words Found in DA</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Fakhriyah</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir-Hadad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakkur</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefire</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadad and Panammu</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrakab</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerab</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tell Fakhriyah inscription has a considerably high percentage, although it is centuries earlier than DA. The most notable exception to this percentage is
Sefire. This is not only due to the different nature of this text but also to the vocabulary which has a great deal of nature, cult imagery, and legal terminology in the text.¹

Other interesting points in the lexical field can be particularly instructive for this subject. The word gbr in Tell Fakhriyah is distinguished from 'nḥ just as was seen in DA. The same inscription uses some rather rare words found in DA: pryṣ, ẓlh, bhl, etc. Some word-roots and forms from this inscription that are also attested in DA are for the first time found in an OA text: 'hr, gor (in the reflexive stem as vyqtr), dmr, lhwy (its precative form), ẓy (with its genitive function), m'n, nhr, qbl, and gh. ¹

This study of vocabulary yields similar results when comparison is made with the common or similar expressions, formulae, and phrases in OA texts. No less than fifty-four such expressions are common to both texts. One of these expressions from OA texts may have two, three, or up to nine correspondences within DA. The

¹For the sake of statistical completeness of the study, the different words were counted in DA and compared with the words found in OA texts. DA contains a total of 468 different words. Of these 32 are considered to be loan words. One is left, therefore, with 436 different Aramaic words in DA. Of these 197 are attested in OA inscriptions in this study and 239 are not. We conclude that 45 percent of the Aramaic vocabulary of DA is found in OA inscriptions dating from the ninth to the mid-seventh century B.C.
number of these in Barrakab and Ashur is noticeable and shows that DA may not be far from Mesopotamian influence.

The most important difference between OA texts and DA is that the former were engraved in stone or written down once for all, while the text of DA had been transmitted through centuries, copied a number of times, and thus exposed to possible changes.

Historical and cultural backgrounds, according to this study, can be helpful in understanding the context in which DA was written. Millard's historical reconstruction of the role Arameans played in the Assyrian empire is paralleled by Wiseman's historical description of the same role these people had in the Babylonian empire. Both can illuminate elements in Daniel, such as the positions held by Daniel's three friends, the change of their names; ideas like the erection of a glm, the king's fear of illness, and the punishment for profanation of the temple vessels. These are found in both Tell Fakhriyah and DA. Both authors seem to use the practical Aramaic language and script as an alternate means of communication with a large audience. In the case of the book of Daniel Aramaic may have been used because of the universal character of its message.

Thus it seems fair to state that a contextual study of OA texts is profitable in many ways for the
student's understanding of the literary, historical, and cultural situations of both OA texts and the text of DA.

**Better Understanding of the Linguistic Context of DA**

It has been noted that a contextual study of OA inscriptions can help the student better to understand some of the arguments used in the debate on DA, and especially those arguments utilized in an effort to show that DA is late in origin.

**Assumed Uniformity of DA**

First comes the often assumed uniformity of OA versus later texts. When this assumption is followed, then the corpus of OA texts is an isolated ground for the discussions on DA. A study of the grammar of OA inscriptions gives a different picture of this aspect of OA texts.

It cannot be maintained any longer that the presence of vowel-letters in DA, which are often absent from OA texts, is only an indication of a late orthography of the former. It seems rather that already in OA dialects one can find more of this practice. In all likelihood it originated under the influence of Akkadian, and the earliest cases are mostly in the spelling of foreign words (like 𒌆𒆠). Thus the sizable number of these phenomena in the Tell Fakhriyah inscription is one of the most striking features of its text. This inscription has no less than
fifteen cases of internal vowel letters, which appear in about 15 percent of the total number of different words used in the text. The conclusion drawn by scholars is that internal vowel-letters are not only normally used in this period (ninth century B.C.) but that this process had been under way for quite some time or that this practice must have been an archaism by the time the inscription was written.

We are reminded once again, therefore, that geography must go hand in hand with chronology when Aramaic documents are being dated. Moreover, the inconsistency in spelling encountered in this text makes this task even more difficult. At the same time it shows us that the corpus of OA texts is not as uniform as had been previously thought, but that it was flexible even in orthography. Facts like these have to be taken into consideration in studies on orthography in DA.

Even in the Western OA dialect and Samalian, not enough attention has been paid to the surprising number of internal vowel-letters. The occurrence of the same words in the Aramaic texts from different periods, plus the presence of the same words in cognate languages, help us to determine whether there is or is not an unexpected internal full spelling of a word.

In Western and Samalian OA one can count forty-six different words which contain at least one internal vowel-letter. These words sometimes occur three or more
times in our texts. Table 3 presents the number of occurrences of internal vowel-letters in OA texts.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>No. of Internal Vowel Letters</th>
<th>No. of Diff. Words and Proper Names</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Fakhriyah</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir Hadad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakkur</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefire</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadad and Panammu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrakab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some important conclusions may be drawn from this list. It is clear that only the Western OA dialect is characterized by a rather defective writing. In contrast to this, Hadad and Panammu have almost the same percentage of words written out fully as does the Tell Fakhriyah inscription. In addition to this, Samalian ranks close to this inscription in exhibiting a number of spelling inconsistencies. In this respect Barrakab is more Western than Northern, having only two internal vowel-letters and those both being found only in foreign proper names.

Nerab stelae have the same number of these cases as Barrakab, only in this case they are not found in proper names. In contrast to these, Ashur exhibits more
cases, six in total. Two facts seem to be clear from this evidence: First, as Dion concludes from his study on the Samalian dialect, non-Western OA inscriptions use internal matres lectionis more often, and second, this evidence does not always fit our chronological schemes of the development of this practice. Barrakab, which is later in time than Hadad and Panammu, has a smaller number of such occurrences, but Ashur, which comes even later, has more of them than Barrakab.

The situation is different in the area of phonology because the standard OA writing practice is dominant in all of the texts. Yet, this practice was not uniform because exceptions are present in every inscription. The Tell Fakhriyah inscription seems to reaffirm the spelling of the verbal root lwd, but in representing phonetic t, it uses samek rather than sin. Because of the dialectal differences within OA, two geographically distinct allophones may represent one phoneme.

Graffiti and the Sefire stelae have some cases of interchange between 'aleph and he. An early instance of the spelling with d instead of z may be found in the reading of dmēq in the Bir-Hadad inscription, a reading implied by Cross and proposed by Shea. In Sefire alone we have counted five cases of unusual phonological expressions.

Prosthetic 'aleph, whose presence in DA was used
as an argument for the late date for this text, appears in Sefire, Hadad, and Samalian. It has been shown that the spelling of two words qtl and qye (as in Hebrew) is very different in various Aramaic-speaking areas. This has led me to the conclusion that it is not wise to make simple and hasty conclusions on specific irregularities and polyphony in the area of Aramaic phonology. The same thing can be said about the phonology in DA.

Phonetically the orthography of DA is different from that of OA. But, as Coxon argues, it is in agreement with the pronunciation of Aramaic in the latter part of the sixth down to the fifth century B.C. For example, the earliest d spellings in proper names come from the sixth or seventh centuries B.C., or, according to Lipiński, even from the eighth century B.C. The only verse of Aramaic in the book of Jeremiah (10:11) supports this view.

At the same time, a comparison of the Masoretic text with the fragments of Daniel at Qumran gives support to the thesis that the scribes did have their influence in copying the text of DA. Although accepted by many scholars, this fact should not be overstated. A better proposal should receive greater attention. The text of the DA, being of a narrative-didactic character, exhibits a higher proportion of advanced phonetic spellings than do the texts with more formal and legal-type matters which prefer traditional archaic terminology and
spellings, as is the case with most of the Papyri. The two different spellings 'rq' and 'r' in Jer 10:11 seem to give support to this thesis.

That the final a sound was probably pronounced in OA, and not consistently suppressed in writing, can be seen in the spelling of 'yk in Sefire I A 35-39. There in three successive lines one finds the following spellings: 'yk, 'ykh, and 'yk. This is relevant for the correct reading of words like 'mrn—which in DA has a final vowel-letter—and being written as they are does not mean they have to be late. Similar cases of spelling freedom are found in Samalian: 'nk or 'nky, zn or znh, etc.

One often feels, when reading the secondary literature on DA, that the text of DA is later in time than the Papyri or is close to LA because of its "transitional character," in contrast to a much more "standardized" OA dialect. The new insight developed here from OA documents suggests that one should accord much more freedom to the people who wrote OA inscriptions. When one sees that in three successive lines of Sefire I we find two different spellings of the same word can be found together with the evidence from Samalian, we can understand why there is much less uniformity in the writing style of the people who wrote in OA. A study of OA inscriptions can help to place better the "transitional" character of DA.
Crucial for understanding the dialectal debate is the study of syntax. In making comparison between the texts some relevant syntactical conclusions can be drawn.

In the vocabulary section, fifty-four phrases from OA that are similar or identical to those found in DA have been noted, together with the difficult phrase 'l zy qdm hwtr from the Tell Fakhriyah inscription. A number of other common features have been detected. These include:

1. The negative particle 'l with the imperfect jussive which occurs eight times at Tell Fakhriyah and four times in DA.

2. The presence of a singular noun in a plural context (Sefire, Tell Fakh.).

3. Shifts from third- to first-person report and vice-versa which are present in both the Akkadian and the Aramaic version of Tell Fakhriyah. This is again parallel to the Assyrian royal inscriptions of the first millennium B.C.

4. The use of copula and the directive 1 which is shared by the Akkadian version at Tell Fakh. and DA, rather than by the Aramaic version of that inscription.

5. The genitival use of the pronoun zy which is due to the influence of Akkadian. The fact that it occurs for the first time in Aramaic in the second part of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription may indicate its approximate
date of origin in that language. It is also found in the letter from Ashur. According to the ratio of its occurrence in the Aramaic texts from the East and the number of construct chains used in the same texts, DA seems to take the place of its traditionally assigned date in that list.

6. The three different ways in which this genitival pronoun is used at Tell Fakhriyah in the text of DA,--with several examples for each case.

7. A cardinal number which can take a noun in plural (at Tell Fakh. four times and once at Sefire).

8. The prepositional l which is repeated in front of two successive infinitives (Sefire, Samalian).

9. The peculiar use of the compound zly which is found in Ashur and DA.

10. The word-order of DA which is once again found to be eastern in character and thus comes closer to the Akkadian version of Tell Fakhriyah than to its Aramaic version. The only other OA texts which show this word-order are the documents from the "transitional period" where they are merging into OfA. In this way their designation as part of a "Mesopotamian dialect" seems to be correct. This can be well illustrated by a rather free order in Nerab, where one can find: znh glmh (I 3-4), but glm' znh (I 6-7), and glm' w'rst' z' (I 12).

Specific Words

The occurrence of certain words which are found
in DA, but which because of lack of evidence in a given time were used to show how DA is late, is important for this subject.

1. "lhw" is found in Tell Fakhriyah line 12 and is considered as the earliest jussive-precative form. It does not have to be in DA a late rabbinical practice, because this characteristic of the jussive is found in several verbal cases in both texts. In this position 1 is probably earlier than 7, and the five cases from Samalian suggest the same.

2. Only one occurrence of the particle "yt in DA was the reason for putting DA close to the time of the written Targums. Yet with slightly different spelling this particle is found among other Semitic languages and in at least three other Aramaic dialects: Early Standard or West OA (Zakkur and Sefire), Samalian "wt, and OfA (BMAP 3:22), which has the same spelling as DA. In a similar way "mqdm, found in front of a divine name, is found in the partly reconstructed line B 19.

3. The presence of the prosthetic 'aleph is no longer viewed as clear evidence of late borrowing by DA. This phenomenon is attested in both Sefire and Samalian in a number of cases. Coxon argues that it is an eastern feature which corroborates Kutscher's theses on the eastern provenance of DA.

4. The demonstrative pronoun 'ln in DA again is
not late, since it is frequently found in Sefire (at least eleven certain readings).

5. The use of a noun with cardinal numbers and in the plural is not an indication that the text is "later." Geographical location would be the preferred explanation here, since four such cases are found in the Tell Fakhriyah.

6. The mem prefix to the infinitive is not a later development in Aramaic, it could be viewed as a Mesopotamian Aramaic innovation that spread universally. The oldest Aramaic text also indicates that the plural of nouns can be spelled either defectively or fully. Also, the infinitive of the derived stem is spelled with h in liknh (TF line 11), a practice that is consistent in DA in contrast to more varieties in Ezra, EgA, and 11QtgJob.

7. ytqry—a rare verbal form—has received more light, thanks to the oldest OA text where a certain freedom is noticed in the spelling of the precative forms (the last consonant either h or y).

8. In the OA text one can find the following verbal stems, and consequently they need not be judged as late in DA: Peîl (impr. type yuqtal), Hithpeel, Huphal (instead of the later Ittaphal) and Šaphel. Likewise, occasional instances of Aphel and Ithpeel are found in OA and the ratio between the use of Haphel and Aphel in the imperfect in Sefire and DA is very close. Aphel imperfect is found in five words in Samalian. When
compared with other OA texts, DA has a rather conservative spelling of the reflexive verbal stem.

The Behavior of 'aleph

Questions have been raised regarding the way 'aleph behaves in the text of DA. The occasional quiescence of 'aleph in the word btrk is evident also in some particular words in Sefire, while Samalian uses the same consonant freely. In the Ashur letter, for example, one finds lmry mlk' and also mr'y mlk' (lines 6-8). In DA one can notice a rather regular spelling of the 'aleph in the word mr'.

The same could be stated on the phenomena of the exchanges between the letters h and 'aleph. Already the graffiti testify to the spelling of the emphatic nominal ending with h, and two similar cases have been found in the Nerab stelae. A few cases of this interchange are found in DA, but the text of DA has for each of those roots the regular spellings with 'aleph.

The Puzzle of mhnbt

Finally, mhnbt from the Tell Fakhriyah still puzzles scholars. It seems that in the texts where cases of both nasalization and assimilation are found, one has to account for the working of a dual influence (Akkadian and Old Persian). The vocabulary of DA supports this conclusion, and thus DA should not be judged as late because of its mixed practice in this regard. In the
Nerab stelae, for example, we have yshw (I 9) and yngn (I 13) rather close to each other. It is unfortunate that some of those outdated arguments are still perpetuated in current writings on this subject. The caution exercised in treating the origin of DA has not been stressed sufficiently.

**Better Understanding of the Specific Words and Expressions**

**Specific Words**

1. **mlk** in Aramaic seems to have a wider range of meanings, according to its use as the translation of šaknu in Tell Fakhriyah. This can help the understanding of its occurrence in Dan 6:7.

2. **bywh** (EF 14) in the plural form seems to have the meaning "term of office, reign"; we have related it to that in Dan 7:12.

3. **cnh** (Zakkur A 2) may help in the understanding of the same word in Dan 4:24, and vice-versa. Grammatically this is true for three other words: **hmw** (Zakkur A 9 and Dan 2:34); **b'h** (Sefire I A 35 and 'h' of DA); and **ydyhm** (Ashur 5, 9), which is related to 'bhty and ſmhtyn of DA.

4. **bhr** (Nerab I 13) can be better understood if compared with **brn** (Dan 2:39f.) and translated as "another" rather than "in the future," a reading which agrees better with the accompanying verb.
Specific Expressions

1. \( br \ 'n\) (Sefire III 16) is almost identical with \( kbr \ 'n\) in Dan 7:13. Yet, it has been pointed out that it is important to notice the comparative particle \( k\) for the correct interpretation of the Danielic usage of this expression.

2. \( 'l w^clyn\) (Sefire I A 11) has a waw explicative. This is important in interpreting the same phenomena in the well-known Aramaic expression from DA--\( Cyr \ wqdy\) (4:10, 20).

3. \( nsk \ lbm\) (Sefire III 5, 7) shows an interesting use of \( nsk\) with the meaning "to provide." If this is carried over into Dan 2:46, then the king commands literally that the people "provide" or shower offerings for Daniel.

DA Used to Clarify Passages of OA

1. \( 'l zy qdm \ hwtr\) (TF 15) is a direct calque from Assyrian and is a very unusual construction. A parallel from DA can be offered here: \( g\ dy hzh \ lmzyh\) (3:19).

2. Two different readings have been proposed for \( kl^Cilbyt \ mlk\) (Sefire I A 6). Three verses from DA (4:4; 5:8; 6:11) have been used to facilitate this reading.

Concluding Remarks

This study indicates that OA texts offer various interesting and important parallels with the text of DA. These parallels are illuminating for the study of both
texts and show that a contextual study of OA inscriptions for the purpose of comparison with DA serves to provide a better understanding of the literary, historical, and cultural settings of both OA texts and DA. It also contributes to a better understanding of the linguistic setting of this dialect and aids research on the issues raised regarding its provenance. These issues have to be evaluated in light of the evidence from OA available today. Previous studies have been rather hesitant to make more detailed comparisons between these bodies of text. Some conclusions which have been made in the past on OA represent but partial observations on this dialect and are based on a dialect of OA rather than encompassing all the variations found in OA.

A study of this kind assists the student in his analysis of both texts. Specific parallels should be brought together from the different texts (see Appendix II). Three factors which have to be accounted for in any conclusion on DA are: geography, chronology, and the literary character of the text.

In the course of this study, a number of specific arguments were mentioned, that have been advanced with the purpose of demonstrating that DA is late. They pertain to the past and present debate on the origin of DA. Although the conclusion of this study is not definite or absolute, its results have raised questions about certain arguments based uniquely on evidence from LA. The
evidence based on these arguments is neutralized when the presence of the same case is demonstrated in OA. (See the discussion of those arguments in the "Linguistic background" section of this chapter.) This observation may not be sufficient to allow one to set a precise date on the origin of DA based purely on this linguistic evidence; but it at least affects the research on the issues raised in that debate.
APPENDIX I

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

The text of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription is taken from its editio princeps (STF) and is accompanied by a fairly literal translation. All other texts and translations are from Gibson's TSI, except the one of the Sefire stelae which is not complete in that textbook and had to be taken from Fitzmyer's exhaustive study of these texts.

Tell Fakhriyah
Aramaic Text

The Aramaic text of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription reads, according to its editors,\(^1\) as follows:

1. dmwt'. zy. hdys\(^c\)y: zy: śm: qdm: hddskn.
9. 'nšwḥ: wlmld: mrq: mnḥ: wlmšm\(^c\): tšlwth: wš

\(^1\)STF, pp. 23-24.
The following is my fairly literal translation of the Aramaic text:

1. The image of Had-yisci which he has set up before Hadad of Sikan,

\[1\text{RATF (p. 167) reads } \text{ltry, and the same reading is found in NATF, p. 112. TFEA (p. 82) follows STF.}\]
2. regulator of the waters of heaven and earth, who
   showers down abundance and gives pasture
3. and watering places to all lands, who gives rest¹ and
   vessels of food
4. to all the gods, his brothers; regulator of all rivers
   who enriches
5. all lands; a merciful god to whom it is good to
   pray,² who dwells
6. in Sikan; the great lord, the lord Had-yis³i, king of
   Gozan, son of
7. Sas-nuri, king of Gozan: so that his soul may
   live,³ so that his days may be long,
8. so that his years may be increased, so that his
   household may enjoy well-being, so that his
   descendants may enjoy well-being, so that his men
9. may enjoy well-being; so that illness may be removed
   from him, so that his prayers may be heard, so
10. that his words may be accepted (this image) he set up
    and offered to him. And let anyone, when

¹RITF (p. 117) relates this word to DA and
suggests the meaning "prosperity." RATF (p. 164), on
the other hand finds here the verb gly "to draw
water" in order to be faithful to the Assyrian text.
TFEA (p. 82) goes even further suggesting the
translation "a basket."
²Or, "whose prayer is good" (RATF, p. 161).
³RATF (p. 162) renders it "to keep him in
good health." The same rendering is found in NATF,
p. 113.
11. it becomes worn, erect a new one, and let him put my name on it. But whoever erases my name from it
12. and puts his name instead, may Hadad, the hero, be his enemy. The statue of Had-yisći, 
13. king of Gozan and of Sikan and of Azran: so that his throne may flourish,
14. so that his life may be long, and so that his words may please gods and people,
15. this image he made better than before. In the presence of Hadad
16. who dwells in Sikan, Lord of the Habur, he has set up his statue. Whoever removes my name from the furnishings
17. of the temple of Hadad, my lord, may my lord Hadad not accept his bread and water from
18. his hand: may my lady Sawl not accept his bread and water from his hand. And
19. when he sows may he not harvest, and when he sows a thousand measures may he take only a fraction of it.

---

1 Thus KATF, p. 162.

2 The different reading proposed by RATF has the following translation: "In order to set aright the foundation (?) of his throne" (p. 162).

3 The translation here follows the proposal given by D. Pardee (Review of STF, p. 254): ".. the curse consists in a bad harvest, not in having to sow."

4 NATF (p. 115): יָכָרְנ is not "barley" but "measure" (Gen 26:12). TFEA has the same (p. 83), and RITF (p. 119) renders it "measure of cereals."
20. Though a hundred ewes suckle one lamb, let it not be
satisfied; though a hundred cows suckle
21. one calf, let it not be satisfied; though a hundred
women suckle one infant, let it not be satisfied;
22. may a hundred women bake bread in one oven but not be
able to fill it. And would that his men pick up
barley from a rubbish dump to eat;
23. may death, the rod of Nergal, never cease from his
land.

Bir-Hadad

Text

1. nṣb': zy: śm brh
2. dd: br ṭb[r(m)]n ṣr: [ḥz]ŷ₇
3. mlk: 'rm: 1mr'h: 1mlqr
4. t: zy nzr 1h wšmⁿ: 1q₁
5. h

Translation

1. Statue which Barhadad,
2. son of Tobrimmon, son of Hezion²
3. king of Aram, raised for his lord Melcarth,

¹Variously read and interpreted by different
scholars. For a detailed survey of readings, see the
section entitled "Description" of Bir-Hadad in this
study.

²Variously read and interpreted by different
scholars. For a detailed survey of readings, see the
section entitled "Description" of Bir-Hadad in this
study.
4, 5. to whom he made a vow when he listened to his voice.

Zakkur

Text


[mr'h]


5. [ʾšt]: cʾr: mlkn: brhdd: wṃḥnt: wbrgš:

wṃḥnt: w[m]


[wml]ḥ[nth: wmlk:]


"ḥrṇ: ]


"c1: ḥzrk[k:]


1For Friedrich's emendations in lines 5 and 8, see the section "Morphology" of Zakkur in this study. Degen follows this proposal in AAG, p. 6.

2For Friedrich's emendations in lines 5 and 8, see the section "Morphology" of Zakkur in this study. Degen follows this proposal in AAG, p. 6.
Translation

A 1. The stele, which Zakir, king of Hamath and Lu'ath,  
set up for Ilwer, [his lord].

2. I am Zakir, king of Hamath and Lu'ath. A pious¹  
man was I, and Baalshamayn [delivered]  
me, and stood with me; Baalshamayn made me king in  

4. Hadrach. Then Barhadad son of Hazael, king of Aram,  
organized against me an alliance of  

5. [six]teen kings—Barhadad and his army, Sargush and  
his army, the  

6. [king] of Kue and his army, the king of Umq and  
his army, the king of Gurgum

¹A. Dupont-Sommer renders this word "a humble  
man," "humble" pertaining to Zakkur's origin [An  
Aramaic Handbook (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967),  
p. 1]. KAI (p. 204) has: "ein demütiger Mensch." See  
the discussion in "Vocabulary" of Zakkur.
7. and his army, the king of Sam'al and his army
    the king of Melitene and his army, [the king
8. of ..... and his army, the king of ..... and
    his army], and seven [others]
9. together with their armies. All these kings laid
    siege to Hadrach;
10. they put a rampart higher than the wall of
    Hadrach, and dug a trench deeper than its moat.
11. But I lifted up my hands to Baalshamayn, and
    Baalshamayn answered me, and Baalshamayn [spoke]
12. to me through seers and messengers; and Baalshamayn
    [said
13. to me], Fear not, because it was I who made
    you king, [and I
14. shall stand] with you, and I shall deliver you
    from all [these kings who]
15. have forced a siege upon you. Then [Baalshamayn]
    said to me,
16. all these kings who forced [a siege upon you]
    ........
17. ..... and this rampart which [they put up]
    (shall be cast down).

B 1. ..... Hadrach ..... 
2. ..... for rider and horse 
3. ..... its king in its midst. I
4. (then) [rebuilt] Hadrach, and I added
5. [to it] a whole cicle of
6. [strongholds]; and I established it (once more)
   as my kingdom,
7. and established it as [my land. I built
8. all] these strongholds throughout my whole
territory,
9. and I built temples for gods throughout my
whole
10. [land]. Then I rebuilt ...... [and
11. I rebuilt] Afis; and [I gave a resting-place to
12. the gods] in the temple of [Ilwer
13. in Afis]; and I have set up
14. this stele before [Ilwer], and [written]
15. thereon the story of my achievements.
16. Now, whoever effaces the story
17. [of the achievements] of Zakir, king of
   Hamath and
18. Lu'ath, from this stele, and whoever
19. removes this stele from
20. Ilwer's [presence], and drags it away [from
21. its place], or whoever sends
22. [his son] ......,
23. let Baalshamayn and Ilwer
24. and ...... and Shemesh and Sahar
25. and ...... and the gods of heaven
26. [and the gods] of earth and the Baal of
27. ... [execute] the man and
28. [his son and his whole] stock.

C 1. [(But) for ever let]
2. the name of Zakir and the name [of his house
   endure].

Graffiti
Text
i 'dnlrm: skń[: b]yt: mlkh
ii 1l'bdครบltn
iii ṣbh 'nn
iv ḥmh
v ḥnn

Sefire
Text
I A 1. Ṱdy br g'yh mlk ktk Ṱm mtᶜ¹ br
   Ṱtrsmk mlk ['rpdt wᶜ]
2. dy bny br g'yh Ṱm bny mtᶜ¹ l wᶜdy bny bny br
   g'[yah wᶜqr]
3. h Ṱm Ṱqr mtᶜ¹ br Ṱtrsmk mlk 'rpdt wᶜdy ktk
   Ṱm[ᶜdy]
4. 'rpdt wᶜdy bᶜly ktk Ṱm Ṱdy bᶜly 'rpdt wᶜdy
   ḫb[r ..]
5. w Ṱm 'rm klh wᶜm msṛ wᶜm bnwh zy yṣqn bʾṣk[h]
   w[ᶜm mlky]
For the most probable division of the words in this line, see comments in "Morphology" of Sefire in this study.

Reconstruction proposed by Dupont-Summer (p. 3) and followed by KAI and AIS. AAG has this part of the line empty while Lemaire and Durand have \textit{wm(ly' zy bspr' zn)h} (p. 113).

The reconstruction proposed by Lemaire-Durand is \textit{'s(w)\text{r}'} (p. 113).
KAI (I, p. 41) and AAG (pp. 10-11) have kmlkt bl mlkt hlm zy ... Lemaire and Durand follow TSI (p. 39) and continuing the text with zy yml k's (p. 113). See the discussion under "Vocabulary" of Sefire.

Lemaire-Durand read dbr'h (p. 114).
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32. Člh qq btr [ys]tšt lgsмн 'žwh wthwy 'rpd tl rbg sy w] 
33. ŝby wьc1 w'rbn wšrn w’dh w.. w’cqh w’l t’mr qr(yt' h' w] 
34. md’ wmrh w’mbh wšrn wtw’m wbyt'l wbyyn w[... w'] 
35. rnh w’åz w’dm 'yk zy tgd sČwt' z' b’s kn tgd 
'rpd w(bnth r) 
36. bt wyzc bhn hdd mlh wšllyn w'll t’mr qnb' znw w[nbš' z'] 
37. mt'c1 wnbš h' 'ykh zy tgd sČwt' z' b's kn yqd m[t’c1 b'] 
38. š w’yk zy tšbr qšt' wššy' 'ln kn yšbr 'nrt whdd [qšt mt'c1] 
39. wqšt rbwh w’yk zy y’cr gbr sČwt' kn y’cr mt'c1[I w’yk z] 
40. [y] ygr s’gl' znw kn ygr mt'c1 wygzrn rbwh [w’yk zy t’c] 
41. [rr z]n[yh] kn y’crzn nšy mt’c1 wnsy sqrh wnsy r(rbwh w’yk z] 
42. [y tkh gbgt sČwt' z']wymš' c1 'pyh kn yqhn [nšy mt’c1 w] 

I B 1. [rsmk mlk 'r]pd w’dy bny br g’yh cm bny mt’c1 w’dy [b] 
2. [ny bny br] g’yh cm cqr mt’c1 w’cm cm cqr kl 
   mh mlk zy 
3. [ysq wylmk] b’srh w’cm bny gš w’cm byt śll w’cm 'r 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
4. [m klh w^d]y ktk c\'m c'dy 'rpd w^c'dy b^c'ly ktk c\'m c
5. [dy b^c'ly 'r]rd w^c'm c'mh w^c'dy 'lhy ktk c\'m c'dy 'r
6. [lhy 'rpd w]c'dy 'lhn hm zy c'mw 'lhn tby mlk
7. [br g'yh l^c'] mn mlk rb w^c'[dy]' 'l[n ...]
w^s'myn w^c'dy'
8. 'l'n kl 'lhy' y^srn w'l t\'stq h\'dh mn mly spr' zn
9. [h wyt\'sm\'n mn] c'rqw w^c'd y'd[ ' w]bz mn lbnn w^c'd yb
10. [rdw wmn dms^q w^c'd c'rw w'mn..w [wm]n b^c't w^c'd ktk
11. [......b]yt g\'s w^c'mh c\'m 'skrthm c'dy' 'l
12. [n. .....] yth h\'sk. hw'.. bmsr wmrbh
13. ........ d\'s .... tm lmt\'c'1 br
14. c\'trsak ........
21. [.....] lbytkm w\'ly\'sm\' c't'c'l [w\'ly\'sm\'n
bnwh w\'ly\'sm\' c\'m]
22. [l w\'ly\'sm\'n kl mlky' zy ymlkn b'rdpl 1 .....]
23. ..... lmynn \'qr\'tm kkl 'lhy c'dy' z[y bspr' znh whn]
24. [t\'sm\'n wt\'jlmn c'dy' 'l'n wt'mr ghr c'dn h'
[ 'nh l'khl l']
25. [\'s\'l\'h yd bk w\'lykhl bry [l]y\'s\'l\'h yd bbr[k] w^c'qry
b^c'q[rk whn m]
26. [l\'h yml\'l c'ly h\'d mlkn 'w h\'d sn'y wt'mr l[kl]mh
mlk mh t[c'bd wy\'s]
27. [l\'h yd b]bry w\'yq\'tlnh wy\'s\'h ydh wyq\'h mn 'r\'qy 'w
mn mqny \'s[q]
28. [rt b^c'd'y' zy bspr' zn\'n whn y'\'rh h\'d mlkn
wysbn[y] y'\'rh h[ylk]
The reading and interpretation is only conjectural.
41. [......]bh brk wlygz[rn m]fh mlky '[rpd] mnhm zy Cdn ḥy
42. [n hm .....]h .... tll h' wsḥ h' wbl h' ntrḥm lnbš ḫ 'm.
43. [......] ..... kC mk kn tgzr 'pl' whn ....
44. [......] nq.... yCzz qlbt byty C1 ...1.ḥ.'y 'ql
45. [......] ..[C]l bry 'w C1yrsy wyqraq ḥdhm wy't[h...]

I C 1. kh 'mrn [wkh k]tbn mh
  2. ktbt '[nh mtC]'l lzk
  3. rn lbry [wlbrj] bry z
  4. y ysqn b[šr]y lṭbt
  5. ['] yCbd[w tḥt] šmš'
  6. [lb]yt m[lky z]y kl lḥ
  7. yh lttCbd C1] byt m
  8. tC[1 wbrh wbr] brh C[d]
  9. [C1m .....]
15. yṣrw 'lhn mn yw
16. mh wmn byth wmn
17. lyṣr mly spr' zy bnsb' znh
18. wy'mr 'hld mn mlw
19. h 'w 'hpk ṭbt' w'sm
20. [l]ḥyt bywm zy yCb
21. [d] kn yḥpkw 'lhn 'š
22. [' h'] wbyth wkl zy [b]
23. h wyśmw tḥtyth [l]
24. [C]lyth w'l yrt šr
14. [zn]h 'yt m'l wbrh wbr brh
15. w'q rh wkl mlky 'rpd wkl rb
16. wh w'mhm mn btyhm wmn
17. ywmyhm

III 1. 'w 'l brk 'w 'l qrk 'w 'l ḥd mlky 'rpd
   wy[m]l [C]ly 'w 'l bry 'w 'l br bry
   'w 'l qry kym kl gb
2. r zy yb'ch rwō 'pwh wymū mln ḥyty l'Cly[...]..
   tqē mly' mn ydh hskr thskrhm bydy wb
3. rk yhskr lbry w'q yrk yskr l'Cqy w'q r[ḥd ṣl]ky
   'rpd yhskrn ly mh ṭb b'Cyny 'Cḥd lhm w
4. hn lhn šqrtn lkl 'lhy Cdy' zy bspr' [zn]h whn
   yqrq mny qrq ḥd pqdy 'w ḥd 'ḥy 'w ḥd
5. srsy 'w ḥd Cm' zy bydy wyhkn ḥlb lts[k l]hm
   lhm lt'mr lhm shw C'll 'šrk wthrm n
6. bshn mny rgh trqhm wthšbhm ly whn ly[šb]n b'rqk
   rqw šm C'd 'hk 'nh w'rqhm whn thrm nbsh
7. m mny wtsk lhm lhm wt'mr lhm šbw lḥtk[m] w'il
   tnpn b'šrh šqrtn b'Cdy' 'ln wkl mlky' zy s
8. ḥrty 'w kl zy rḥm h' ly w'slh ml'ky '[l]wh
   lšlm 'w lkl ḫpsy 'w yšlḥ ml'kh 'ly pṭḥ
9. h ly 'rḥ' ltmšl by bz' wltṛšn ly Cly[h w]hn
   lhn š[q]rt b'Cdy' 'ln whn mn ḥd 'ḥy 'w mn ḥd
   by
10. t 'by 'w mn ḥd bny 'w mn ḥd ngdy 'w mn ḥd
    [p]qdy 'w mn ḥd Cmy' zy bydy 'w mn ḥd śn'y w
The treaty of Bir-Ga'yah, king of KTK, with Maticel, the son of Attarsamak, the king of Arpad; and the treaty of the sons of Bir-Ga'yah with the sons of Maticel; and the treaty of the grandsons of Bir-Ga'yah and his offspring with the offspring of Maticel, the son of Attarsamak, the king of Arpad; and the treaty of KTK with Arpad; and the treaty of the lords of KTK with Arpad; and the treaty of the union of all Aram and with the king of Musr and with his sons who will come after him, and with all the kings of Upper-Aram and Lower-Aram and with all who
enter the royal palace. And the stele with this inscription
7. he has set up, as well as this treaty. Now (it is) this treaty which Bir-Ga'yyah has concluded [in the presence of .......]
8. and Mullesh, in the presence of Marduk and Zarpanit, in the presence of Nabu and T[ashmet, in the presence of 'Ir and Nus]k,
9. in the presence of Nergal and Las, in the presence of Shamash and Nur, in the presence of Sin and Nikkal, in the presence
10. of Nikkar and Kadi'ah, in the presence of all the gods of Ra[h]bah and 'Adam [... in the presence of Nadad of A]leppo,
11. in the presence of Sibitti, in the presence of 'El and C'Elyan, in the presence of Heaven and Earth, in the presence of (the) Abyss
12. and (the) Springs, and in the presence of Day and Night - all the god[s of KTK and the gods of Ar]pad (are) witnesses (to it).
13. Open your eyes (O gods!), to gaze upon the treaty of Bir-Ga'yyah [with Mati'el, the king of Arpad]. Now if Mati'el, the son of At[arsamak, the king of Arpad] should be false [to Bir-Ga'yyah, the
14. king of KTK, and if the offspring of Mati'el
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should be false [to the offspring of Bir-Ga'yah ...]

16. [... and if the Bene-]Gush should be false

.............]

20. [ ] from YM[.......]

21. [..... and should seven rams cover] a ewe, may
she not conceive; and should seven nurses] anoint
[their breasts and]

22. nurse a young boy, may he not have his fill; and
should seven mares suckle a colt, may it not be
sated; and should seven]

23. cows give suck to a calf, may it not have its
fill; and should seven ewes suckle a lamb, [may
it not be sa]ted;

24. and should seven hens go looking for food, may
they not kill (anything)! And if Mati[ Cel] should
be false <to Bir-Ga'yah> [and to]

25. his son and to his offspring, may his kingdom
become like a kingdom of sand, a kingdom of sand,
as long as Assur rules! (And) [may Ha]dad [pour
(over it)]

26. every sort of evil (which exists) on earth and in
heaven and every sort of trouble; and may he

---

1 KAI (II 239) has "like a kingdom of sand, a
kingdom of dream over which Ashur reigns." TSI (p. 31)
has slightly different ending: "that fade away like fire."
See the discussion in "Vocabulary" of Sefire.
shower upon Arpad [ha]il-[stones]!

27. For seven years may the locust devour (Arpad), and for seven years may the worm eat, and for seven [years may]

28. TWY come up upon the face of its land! May the grass not come forth so that no green may be seen; and may its

29. vegetation not be [seen]! Nor may the sound of the lyre be heard in Arpad; but among its people (let there rather be) the din of affliction and the noi[se of cry]ing

30. and lamentation! May the gods send every sort of devourar against Arpad and against its people! [May the mo]uth

31. of a snake [eat], the mouth of a scorpion, the mouth of a bear, the mouth of a panther! And may a moth and a louse and a [. . . become]

32. to it a serpent's throat! May its vegetation be destroyed unto desolation! And may Arpad become a mound to [house the desert animal]: the

33. gazelle and the fox and the hare and the wild-cat and the owl and the [ ] and the magpie! May [this] ci[ty] not be mentioned (any more), [nor]

34. MDR' nor MRBH nor MZH nor MBLH nor Sharun nor

\[1\] Lemaire-Durand translate dbī as "abeille, gûepe" (p. 134).
Tu'im nor Bethel nor BYNN nor [.... nor 'Ar]neh

35. nor Hazaz nor 'Adam! Just as this wax is burned by fire, so may Arpad be burned and [her gr]eat [daughter-cities]!

36. May Hadad sow in them salt and weeds, and may it not be mentioned (again)! This GNB' and [ ]

37. (are) MatiCel; it is his person. Just as this wax is burned by fire, so may MatiCel be burned by fire!

38. Just as (this) bow and these arrows are broken, so may 'Inurta and Hadad break [the bow of MatiCel],

39. and the bow of his nobles! And just as a man of wax is blinded, so may MatiCel be blinded!

[Just as]

40. this calf is cut in two, so may MatiCel be cut in two, and may his nobles be cut in two! [And just as]

41. a [ha]r[lot is stripped naked], so may the wives of MatiCel be stripped naked, and the wives of his offspring and the wives of [his] nobles! And just as

42. this wax woman is taken] and one strikes her on the face, so may the [wives of MatiCel] be taken [and .... The treaty of Bir-Ga'yah, king of KTK, with MatiCel, son of Attarsamak,

I B 1. the king of Ar]pad ; and the treaty of the son of
Bir-Ga'yah with the sons of Mati Cel; and the
treaty of the [grandsons of
2. Bir]-Ga'yah with the offspring of mati Cel and
with the offspring of any king who
3. [will come up and rule] in his place, and with
the Bene-Gush and with Bet-SLL and with
4. [all] Ar[am; and the trea]ty of KTK with the
treaty of Arpad; and the treaty of the lords of
KTK with the trea[ty
5. of the lords of Ar]pad and with its people; and
the treaty of the gods of KTK with the treaty of
the g[ods
6. of Arpad; for] this is the treaty of gods, which
gods have concluded. Happy forever be the reign
of1
7. [Bir-Ga'yah], a great king, and from this treaty
[ ] and heaven.
8. [All the gods] will guard [this] treaty. Let not
one of the words of thi[s] inscription be silent,
9. [but let them be heard from] CArqu to Ya'd[i and]
BZ, from Lebanon to Yabrud,
10. from Damascus to CAru and M..W, [and fr]om the
Valley to KTK
11. [......... in Be]t-Gush and its people with their

1Various translations have been proposed for
this line but the exact meaning remains uncertain.
sanctuary this treaty

12. [..........]YTH HSK.HW'.. in Musr and MRBH

13. [..........] DS .....TM to MatiCel, son [of 
   Attarsmak ....]

21. [..........] to your house. And (if) MatiCel will 
   not obey [and (if) his sons will not obey, and 
   (if) his people will not obey, 

22. and (if)] all the kings who will rule over Arpad 
   [will not obey] the .[.........]

23. [......].LMNYN, you will have been false to all 
   the gods of the treaty wh[ich is in this 
   inscription. But if 

24. you obey and ful]fill this treaty and say, "[I] 
   am an ally," [I shall not be able to 

25. raise a hand] against you; nor will my son be 
   able to raise a hand against [your] son, nor my 
   offspring against [your] offspr[ing. And if] 

26. one of (the) kings [should speak a word] against 
   me or one of my enemies (should so speak) and you 
   say to any king, "What are you [going to do?" and 
   he 

27. should raise a hand against] my son and kill him 
   and raise his hand to take some of my land or 
   some of my possessions, you will have been fa[lse 
   to 

28. the treaty] which is in this inscription. If one
of (the) kings comes and surrounds me, [your]
army must come

29. [to me with] every archer and every sort [of
weapon], and you must surround those who surround
me and you must draw for me [.....

30. .....] and I shall pile corpse upon corpse in
Ar[pad] ... some king L'WYN WMWT

31. [.....] and if on a day when (the) gods [.....]
MRHY', you (sg.) do not come with your army and
(if)

32. [you (pl.) do not] come with your (pl.) armies to
strengthen my house and [if your] offspring
does not] come to strengthen [my] offspring,

33. [you will have been false to] the gods of the
treaty which is in this inscription. And (when)
[...] YCPN with me, I shall be able [to drink]
water

34. [of the well of...]]L; whoever lives around that
well will not be able to destroy (it) or raise a
hand against the water of[the] well.[l]

35. [And the king] who will enter and take LBKH or H
....... , who will take .... BČH.

36. [..... to] destroy 'NGD' .. MLHM .. M.. KD in the
town of 'YM'M. And if (you do) not (do) so, you
will have been fal[se]

37. [to the treaty] <which is in> this<inscription>.
And if Q. LY L'K.L...LHMY.Y.NS', you shall send ..'.

38. [......]M, and if you do not give (me) my provisions, [or] deduct provisions from me, and do not deliver (them), you will have been false to this treaty.

39. [.... You] can[not] deduct provisions 'NH K'YM YQM LK, and you yourself will seek and will go

40. [.........]TK and to your house YN. ZR'. for myself [and for eve]ry person of my household and for T.

41. [.........] in it your son; and the kings of Ar[pad] will not cu[t any]thing off them because it is a living pact.

42. [.........] H .... TIL H' WSH H' WBL H' NTRHM for yourself 'M.

43. [.........]......... K'C. with you; so you will cut the 'PL'. And if......

44. [.........] NQ .... he will strengthen the QLBT of my house against ... L.H.'Y 'QL....

45. [.........].. [against] my son or against one of my courtiers; and (if) one of them flees and com[es....]

I C 1. Thus have we spoken [and thus have we writ]ten.

What

2. I, [Mati]C;el, have written (is to act) as a
reminder

3. for my son [and] my [grand]son who
4. will come after me. May they
5. make good relations [beneath] the sun
6. [for (the sake of) my] royal house that no evil may
7. be done against] the house of Mat[iCel
8. and his son and] his [grand]son forever. ...

..... ...

15. may (the) gods keep [all evils] away from his day
16. and from his house. Whoever
17. will not observe the words of the inscription
   which is on this stele
18. or will say, "I shall efface some of his (its)
   words,"
19. or "I shall upset the good relations and turn
   (them)
20. [to] evil," on any day on which he will do
21. so, may the gods overturn
22. that man and his house and all that (is) in
23. it; and may they make its lower part
24. its upper part! May his scion inherit no
25. name! .....[and should seven mares

II A 1. sucle a colt, may it not be sated; and should

1 Lemaire-Durand (p. 141) take this word as the root šnh "to change."
seven cows give suck to a calf, may it not have its fill; and should seven

2. [ewes suckle a lamb, may it not be sated; and should seven goats suckle a kid, may it not be sated;

3. and should seven hens go looking for food, may they not kill (anything). And if Mati\textsuperscript{el} should be unfaithful to Bir-Ga'yah and to

4. [his son and to his offspring, may be forgotten, and may

5. [his grave be .... .... [and for seven years thorns, SB[...]

6. [... and for seven years may there be [...]

7. [...] among all the nobles of ...

8. [...] and his land. And a cry

9. [...] and may] the mouth of a lion [eat] and the mouth of [a ...] and the mouth of a panther

10. [...] (Lines 10-14 are practically illegible.)

II B 1. .........

2. the treaty and the amity wh[ich] the gods have made in [Arpad and among its people; and (if) Mati\textsuperscript{el} will not obey], and (if) his sons will not obey,

3. (if) his nobles will not obey, and (if) his people will not obey, and (if) [all the kings of Arpad] will not o[bey ...]
4. YM who are watchful. But if you obey, (may) tranquility [... And]
5. if you say in your soul and think in your mind, ["I am an ally, and I shall obey Bir-Ga'yah]
6. and his sons and his offspring," then I shall not be able to raise a ha[nd against you, nor my son against your son, nor my offspring against your offspring],
7. neither to strike them, nor to destroy their name. And [if one of my sons says, "I shall sit upon the throne]
8. of my father, for he is babbling and grows old," or (if) my son seeks [my head to kill me and you say in your soul,
9. "Let him kill whomever he would kill," (then) you will have been false to all the gods [of the treaty which is in this inscription....]
10. [...]NK and Bet-Gush and Bet-SLL and [...] 
11. [...] and corpse ... upon corpse [...] 
12. [...] and on a day of wrath for all [...] 
13. [...] will come to my son and [my] grandsons [...] 
   sons of [my] sons [...] 
14. from the hand of my enemies and [...], you will have been false [to this treaty....]
15. RB'B..KMY ... SMR WBSQ. [...] 
16. and let no one oppress him. If he oppresses (him)
in QR[...]

17. LHW.H... if you should seek and not...

18. you [will have been false to] all the [gods of the
treaty which is in [this] inscription[...]

19. [..]LYC [...] he will surpass you until

20. [..]HN [...] who will be stronger than you[...]

II C 1. [...] [and whoever will] give

2. orders to efface [th]ese inscriptions from the

3. bethels, where they are [wr]itten and

4. [will] say, "I shall destroy the inscriptions and
   with impunity

5. shall I destroy KTK and its king,"

6. should that (man) be frightened from effacing the
   inscriptions

7. from the bethels and say to

8. someone who does not understand, "I shall reward
   (you) indeed," and (then)

9. order (him), "Efface these inscriptions from the
   bethels,"¹

10. may [he] and his son die by oppressive torment.

12. [...] 

13. and all the gods of the [treaty which is in
    [this] inscription will[...]

¹Or "temples" J. C. Greenfield [JBL 88 (1968): 241], followed by Lemaire-Durand (p. 128) "maisons des
dieux."
14. Mati Cel and his son and his grandson
15. and his offspring and all the kings of Arpad and
   all his nobles
16. and their people from their homes and from
17. their days.¹

III [ . . . And whoever will come to you]
1. or to your son or to your offspring or to one of
   the kings of Arpad and will s[pea]k [ag]ainst me
   or against my son or against my grandson or
   against my offspring, indeed, any man
2. who rants² and utters evil words against me [ . .
   . . . ] you must [not] accept such words from
   him; you must hand them (i.e., the men) over into
   my hands and your son
3. must hand (them) over to my son and your
   offspring must hand (them) over to my offspring
   and the offspring of [any of the kings of Arpad
   must hand (them) over to me. Whatever is good in
   my sight, I shall do to them. And
4. if (you do) not (do) so, you will have been false
   to all the gods of the treaty which is in [this]
   inscription. Now if a fugitive flees from me, one

¹ TSI renders mn "as long as" (p. 45).
² "Seeking asylum" is rendered by TSI (p. 47),
   while Lemaire-Durand have "qui cherche le soufle de ses
   narines" (p. 128).
of my officials or one of my brothers or one of

5. my courtiers or one of the people who are under
my control, and they go to Aleppo, you must not
give them food nor say to them, "Stay quietly
in your place"; and you must not incite

6. them against me.¹ You must placate them and
return them to me.² And if they [do] not [dwell]
in your land, placate (them) there, until I come
and placate them. But if you incite them

7. against me and give them food and say to them,
"Stay where [you] are and do not (re)turn to his
region," you will have been false to this treaty.

Now (as for) all the kings of my

8. vicinity or any one who is a friend of mine, when
I send my ambassador to him for peace or for any
of my business or (when) he sends his ambassador
to me,

9. the road shall be open to me. You must not (try
to) dominate me in this (respect) nor assert your
authority over me concerning [it]. [And] if (you
do) not (do) so, you will be false to this
treaty. Now if any of my brothers or any of my

10. father's household of any one of my sons or any
one of my officers of any one of my [of]ficials

¹Lemaire-Durand (p. 129) have: "Tu ne les
eleveras pas eux-mêmes au dessus de moi," while TSI
(p. 47) renders "nor shall you alienate them from me."

²Thus also Lemaire-Durand p. 129.
or any one of the people under my control or any
one of my enemies
11. seeks my head to kill me and to kill my son and
my offspring -- if they kill m[e], you must come
and avenge my blood from the hand of my enemies.
Your son must come
12. (and) avenge the blood of my son from his
enemies; and your grandson must come (and) avenge
the blo[od of] my grandson. Your offspring must
come (and) avenge the blood of my offspring. If
it is a city, you must
13. strike it with a sword. If it is one of my
brothers or one of my slaves or [one] of my
officials or one of the people who are under my
control, you must strike him and his offspring,
his nobles
14. and his friends with a sword. And if (you do) not
(do) so, you will have been false to all the gods
of the [tr]eaty which is in this inscription. If
the idea should come to your mind and you should
express with your lips (the intention)
15. to kill me; and if the idea should come to the
mind of your grandson and he should express with
his lips (the intention) to kill my grandson; or
if the idea should come to the mind of your
offspring
16. and he should express with his lips (the
intention) to kill my offspring; and if the idea should come to the [mi]nd of the kings of Arpad, in whatever way a man shall die, you will have been false to all

17. the gods of the treaty which is in this inscription. If [my] son, who sits upon my throne, quarrels (with) one of his brothers and he would remove him, you shall not interfere

18. with them, saying to him, "Kill your brother or imprison him and do no[t] let him go free." But if you really make peace between them, he will not kill and will not imprison (him).

19. But if you do not make peace between them, you will have been false to this treaty. And as for [k]ings [of my vicin]ity, if a fugitive of mine flees to one of them, and a fugitive of theirs flees

20. and comes to me, if he has restored mine, I shall return [his; and] you yourself shall [no]t (try to) hinder me. And if (you do) not (do) so, you will have been false to this treaty.

21. You shall not interfere in my house nor (with) my grandsons nor (with) the sons of my bro[thers nor (with) the sons of my off]spring nor (with) the sons of my people, saying to them, "Kill your lord

22. and be his successor! For he is not better than
you."¹ Someone will avenge [my blood. If you do commit treachery against me or against my sons or against [my] offspring,

23. you will have been false to all the gods of the treaty which is in th[is] inscription. [Tal'ay]im its villages, its lords, and its territory (belong) to my father and to

24. [his house for]ever. When (the) gods struck [my father's] house, [it came to belong] to another. Now, however, (the) gods have brought about the return of my

25. [father's ho]use [and] my father's [house ....] and Tal'ayim has returned to [Bir Ga'y]ah and to his son and to his grandson and to his offspring forever.

26. [If my son quarrels and (if) my [grand]son quarrels and (if) my offspring quarrels [with your offspring a]bout Tal'ayim and its villages and its lords, whoever will raise

27. [.......... the ki]ngs of Arpad [.......... ....]LNH, you will have been false to this treaty. And if

28. [..........] and they bribe every king who will

¹Thus also TSI, p. 51, while Lemaire-Durand have "car ce ne (serait) pas bien de ta part" (p. 130).
29. [........... all that is beautiful and all that is good]
30. [.............].

**Hadad**

**Text**

1. 'nk[: ] pnmw: br: qrl: mlk: y'dy: zy: hqmt:
   nšb: zn: lhdd: b^clmy[: ]
2. qmw: cmy: 'nhw: ddd: w'l: wršp: wrkb'l:
   wšmš: wntn: bydy: hdd: w'l:
   pmz: 'hz:
4. byd[y]_ _ _μ': plḥ_ ṣy: wzm: 'ṣ'[l: mn:] 'lhy:
   ytnw: ly: wšnm: c1: wyw:2
5. ............. ḥ:_ 'rq: ᵇcry': h'c
6. ............. ['rq: ḫty[: w'rq[: ] śmy[: ]
7. w'rq..........': b_ _ _ _ Špy........ y_cbdw: 'rq:
   wkrm:
   mšb: 'by: wntn: [h]dd[: ! by[d]y:
   wbymy: gm: 'kl: wš'[[: y']dy[: ]
10. wbymy: ytmr: ḥ:_ _ _ _ y. lnšb: qyt: wlnšb:

---

1. lhwd hdd read by ACH (p. 5), KAI (I, p. 38), and Cooke (p. 159). However, DLV (p. 26) reads 'lw: hdd.

2. DLV (p. 27), ACH (p. 5), KAI (I, p. 38), and Cooke (p. 159) all read ḫwyw.
zrry: wlbry: kpyry: ḥlt[y. g]m. yqḥ[w:
11. āt[. yḥ[b]yt: h[d]d_ _ _ l: wrkb': l: wšmš:
w'rqršp: wkbrw: ntnh: ly: w'mn: krt:
12. by: wbymy: ḥlt[y:] _āt_: 'ḥb: l'lhy: wmt:
ḥdd: mt: ḡ[y: m]t[. yqrny: lbn': wbnlbbty:
14. ntn: āt: ḡ[m]t[. qr]: 1[n]y:] 'bn': pbnyt: āt:
w[h]qmt: nšb: ḥdd: zn: wāqm: pnmw. br: qrl:
mlk:
15. y'dy[.]: wmn: 'n: ḡ[d]: l pnw: 2 bny: yʾhz[:
ḥṭ]r: wʾš: ʾc: mšby: wʾšd: 'brw: wʾzbḥ:
16. ḥdd: zn[: p': yʾ[. m]t[. āt[. nšy: wʾzbḥ: [ḥdd:
z]: ḡš[. tq']: yʾzbḥ: ḥdd: wʾzk: ʾšm: ḥdd: 'w:
17. q': p': yʾmż[. [: tʾkl: nbš: pnmw: ʾc: mk: wʾš[ty:
n]: šš[. ḡš[. çpnw[. ʾc: mk: ʾc: d: yʾzk: nbš: pnmw:
ʾc[.]
18. [h]d[d]. bym_ _ _ _ bʾḥ[.]: Ṧ: ṭn: ḡ[ḥdd:
wʾrqr: bh[: ṣy[.]: l ḥdd: wʾl': wlrkbʾl: wʾšm: ʾn
19. _ _ _ _ _ mʾ_ _ _ _ _ bʾ _ _ _ _ _ ʾy: qʾz[: pʾn
[yʾ]h: wʾhsʾt: bḥ: 'lhy: wʾblbbṭḥ: ḡnʾt:
20. [wʾlhw:] ntnw: ly: zʾc: ḡʾḥ': _ _ _ Ṯmn[.:

1 ʾš rʾyḥ read by DLY, ACH, KAI, and Cooke ibid.
2 ʾc m nšb ḡd[w] mnmn read by: KAI (I, p. 39),
ACH (ibid.), Cooke (p. 160), and DLY (p. 29).
yzk]: 'sm: pmw: [y'mr[kl: nbš: pmw[:]
22. Cm: hdd: wš'ty: nbš: pmw: Cm: h[dd]: h': ...
hhn: zbh: w'l: yrqy[1] bh[1]: w'mz:
yš'l: 'l: ytn: lh: hdd: whdd: hr': lbtkh1......

[']l: ytn: lh: l'kl: brgz:
24. wsnh: lmnC: mnh: bly1: wdlh: ntn: l[h]......

25. y'hz: htr: by'd[y]: wysb: C1: mšby: wyml[k:
C1: _ _ 'i[1] ywmw: mt: 'w: C1: qšth: 'w:
C1: 'mrt:
27. .................[']hh: yršy: šht: bšr: ţd: 'yyly: 'w:
bšr: ţd: mwddyh: 'w: bšr:

nš: y'mr: hñ: 'm: šmt: 'mrt: 'l: bpm:
30. z: 'mr: qm: cyny: 'w: dly: 'w[1: šmt 'mrt'y:
bpm: 'nšy: šry: p'nw: zkr. h: ltgmrw: 'y[y:
31. zkrw: plktš: b'bny: whnw: zç...[ltgm]rn:

'y[yt[h]: plktšnh: b'bny: whnw: lw: šht:

1lytkh read by DLy (p. 32), ACH (p. 6), and KAI (ibid.).
2yqnb read by DLy (p. 33), KAI, and ACH (ibid.).
Translation

1. I am Panammu, son of QRL, king of Y'DY, who has raised this statue for Hadad. In my youth

2. there stood with me the gods Hadad and El and Rasheph and Rakkabel and Shemesh, and into my hands did Hadad and El

3. and Rakkabel and Shemesh and Resheph give the sceptre of authority; and Resheph stood with me.
   So whatever I grasped

4. with my hand ...... cultivated; and whatever I asked from the gods they used to give to me; .......

5. ............. a land of barley it was over

6. ............. a land of wheat, and a land of garlic,

7. and a land ............. they used to till land and vineyard;

8. there did dwell ............. with Panammu. Moreover, I sat on my father's throne, and Hadad gave into my hands

\footnote{\textsuperscript{1}y\textsuperscript{r}\={s}h\textsuperscript{r} read by DLV (p. 35), KAI (ibid.), ACH (p. 7), and Cooke (p. 161).}
9. the sceptre of authority; [he also cut off] sword
and slander from my father's house; and in my days
also Y'DY ate and drank.

10. In my days command was given ............ to
establish cities and establish towns; and to the
inhabitants of the villages my authority extended;
the

11. districts received the bounty of Hadad and El and
Rakkabel and Shemesh and 'RQRSP; and greatness was
granted to me, and a sure covenant struck

12. with me. In the days of my authority ........ would
I offer to the gods, and they used to accept (them)
from my hand; and what I asked from the gods, they
used always to give

13. to me. Favour did my god ........ the son of QRL
continually. Then if ever Hadad gave to me, he used
always to call on me to build; and during my rule

14. he did always give, and did always call on me to
build. So I have built, and I have raised a statue
for this Hadad, and a place for Panammu, son of QRL,
king

15. of Y'DY. Now, if one of Panammu's sons should
grasp the sceptre and sit on my throne and maintain
power and do sacrifice

16. to this Hadad, and should say, By thee I swear,
and do sacrifice to [this Hadad], whether in this
way he does sacrifice to Hadad and invokes the name of Hadad or

17. in another, let him then say, May the soul of Panammu [eat] with thee, and may the soul of Panammu drink with thee. Let him keep remembering the soul of Panammu with

18. Hadad; in the days .......... this ..... let him give to [Hadad], and may he look favourable upon it as a tributo to Hadad and El and Rakkabel and Shemesh;

19. .......... this .......; so I built it, and I have made my god to dwell in it, and in his authority I have found rest.

20. [Now the gods] have granted me a seed to cherish .......... If (however), [any] of my sons should grasp the sceptre and sit on my throne as king

21. over [Y'DY] and maintain power and do sacrifice [to this Hadad, and should not] remember the name Panammu, saying, May the soul of Panammu eat

22. with Hadad, and may the soul of Panammu drink with Hadad, as for him .......... his sacrifice, and may he not look favourably upon it, and what

23. he asks, may Hadad not give to him, but with wrath may Hadad confound him, .......... may he not allow him to eat because of rage,

24. and sleep may he withhold from him in the night,
and may terror be given to him ....................
my kinsmen or relatives ...... put to death ......

25. (and) he should grasp the sceptre in Y'DY and sit
on my throne and reign [as king, let him not] put
forth his hand with a sword against my [father's
house], either

26. [in anger or in] violence; let him not do murder,
either in rage or by ........; let no one be put
to death, either by his bow or by his command.

27. ....................... his kinsman should plot
the ruin of one of hid kinsmen or one of his
relatives or

28. one of his kinswomen, [or if any member of my
house] should plot ruin, let him (sc. the king)
assemble his male relatives, and stand him before
a hundred (of them). On his oath

29. let him (sc. the aggrieved party) say, You brother
has caused (my) ruin. If (he denies it, and) he
(sc. the aggrieved party) lifts up his hands to
the god of his father, and says on his oath, If
I have put these words in the mouth

30. of a stranger, say that my eye is fixed or fearful
or [that I have put my words] in the mouth of
enemies, then if it is a male (sc. who has plotted),
let his male relatives

31. be assembled, and let them pound him with stones,
and if it is ......., let her kinswomen be
assembled, and let them pound her with stones. But
if you (sc. the king) have persecuted any such,
32. your eye being wearied by him, either on account
of ........ or of his bow or of his power of of
his command
33. or of his instigation—yes you--, then he is in
the right, you are .........., and if ............
or you slay him in violence or in anger, or
34. you issue a decree about him, or you incite a
stranger to slay him, may (the gods) ............
slay ..............

Panammu

Text

   y'dy] _ _ ý: _ _ b_: šnt[: ] ṁpt[h: ']by: pn[m]w[:]
b[š]dq
bbyt: 'bwh: wqhm: 'lh: ḫd[d: c]m[: w]q _ _ _ mšbh:
   ṅl[: ] w _ _ w _ _ l'dwš _ _ _ : šḥt _ _
   _ _ _ _ _ : _ l: rkb: _ h: _ _ _ _ bk: ṅm _ _ _ _
k: bć1 _ _ _ ħil[: b]n[y:] pnmü[: ] br: q[rl]

---

1The reading of this word in TSI is supported by ACH (p. 11) and A. Dupont-Sommer (p. 7). DLV (p. 36) and KAI (I, p. 39) read 'zh.
yābt ....... tšm[w]
5. ḥrb: bbyty: wthrqw: ḥd: bny: w'gm: hwyt: ḥrb: b'rq:
y'ydy: whl[lw:] 'l: ṭnmw[: ] b[r:] qrl: '{b: 'b]: 'by _ 
m_ dm: bńř: 'bd ......
   šḥt: mn: byt: 'bh[: ] _ _ _ mn: 'ṣrt1[: b]k[l]:
   'rq[: ] y'dy: mn: bām ......
nšy: bs ...... 'b': byt: qtylt: wqm'1 .......
   wš'h: wšwr: bywmyh: w'z[: ] 'kl[t[: ] wštyt: ......
    wbcly: rkb: w _ h _ b[: ] 'by: pnmw: bmsć'h ......
    pŷ: 'ḥz: bknṗ: ṭ[r]: mlk: 'šwr: r[b] ............
12. 'šwr: phŷ: w'ḥy: y'ydy: wḥn'h: mr'h: mlk: 'šwr:
    c'l: mlky: kbr[y]: bṛš ......
13. bgql: mr'h: tgltplesr: mlk: 'šwr: mḥnt: t_: mn:
    mwq': šmsy: w'd: mcrb .........
    mcrb: ybl: mw[q': šjmš: w'b[y]......[whwp: l]

1'sr is read here by DLV (p. 38), KAI, ACH,
and Dupont-Sommer (all ibid.).
grgm. _ _ _ wý: [w']by: pmnw: br: b[ršɾ] ........

16. šmrg:¹ vgm: mt: 'by: pmnw: blgry: mèh: tghtpls:
mlk: 'šwrt: bmknt: gm[: bkyh: mèh: tghtpls: mlk:
'šwrt]

klh: wlgł̄: mèh[: mlk: ['šwrt ........ [t'kl: wšt]

dmsg: l'šř: bywmy: šř ........... [wbk]


br: bšr: wmlkt: bț

21. w'mr: bmsɔt: c̄: ybl: 'mn: ysm[k]: mlk _ _ _ _ _:
wbl: ywš:² qdm: qbr: 'by: pmnw ........

22. wžkr: znh: h': p': hdd: w'l: wrkb'l: c̄: byt:
wšmš: wkl: lhy: y'dy ............ [byt]

23. y: qdm: lhy: wqdm: nš:

Translation

1. This statue has Barrakkab set up for his father
Panammut, son of Barsur, king of [Y'DY] ....... the

¹Thus read by DLV (p. 41) et al. šmgr in TSI
is a misprint.

²The reconstruction yw(q)' is found in DLV
(p. 42) and Dupont-Sommer (p. 8).
year of his deliverence. As for my father Panammu, because of his father's righteousness

2. the gods of Y'DY delivered him from destruction.
There was a curse on his father's house, but the god Hadad stood with him and ...... his throne against
............... he destroyed ......

3. in his father's house, and he slew his father Barsur, and he slew seventy kinsmen of his father .......... ...... (the commander) of the cavalry ................. the commander of ...... he executed the sons of Panammu, son of QRL;

4. and with the rest of them he kept on filling the prisons; and desolate towns he made more numerous than inhabited towns ......................... shall you set

5. the sword against my house, and slay one of my sons? So have I caused the sword to fall upon the land of Y'DY. Then these men executed Panammu, son of QRL, my [great-grand]father ........ perished .......... 

6. corn and millet and wheat and barley; and a peres stood at a shekel, and a STREH of ...... at a shekel, and a 'SNB o:' ...... at a shekel. Then my father carried ................

7. to the king of Assyria, and he made him king over his father's house; and he slew the stone of
destruction, ridding his father's house of it
.............. from treasuries throughout the land
of Y'DY, from .................

8. and he made away with the prison-houses, and
released the captives of Y'DY; and my father arose
and released the women in ............ the house of
the women who had been killed; and QNW'L . .......

9. his father's house, and he made it better than
it was before; and wheat and barley and corn and
millet were plentiful in his days; and then did
(the land) eat and drink .................

10. cheapness of price. In the days of my father
Panammu he always appointed commanders in the
villages and commanders of the cavalry; and he
gave my father Panammu authority in its midst
.............

11. my father, though he possessed silver and though
he possessed gold, because of his wisdom and his
righteousness. Then did he grasp the skirt of his
lord, the [great] king of Assyria ..............

12. of Assyria; then did he live, and Y'DY lived; and
his lord, the king of Assyria, positioned him
over powerful kings as the head ..............

13. (ran) at the wheel of his lord Tiglathpileser,
king of Assyria, in campaigns from the east to the
14. (over) the four quarters of the earth. The daughters of the east he brought to the west, and the daughters of the west he brought to the east; and my father ................ [and added to]

15. his territory did his lord Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, towns from the territory of Gurgum ..........; and my father Panammu, son of Barsur ...............

16. ............. Then my father Panammu died while following his lord, Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, in the campaigns; even [his lord, Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, wept for him],

17. and his brother kings wept for him, and the whole camp of his lord, the king of Assyria, wept for him. His lord, the king of Assyria, took .................

18. his soul [eat and drink]; and he set up an image for him by the way, and brought my father across from Damascus to Assyria. In my days ..............

19. all his house [wept] for him. Then me Barrakkab, son of Panammu, because of my father's righteousness and my own righteousness, did my lord [Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria,] make to sit [upon the throne]
20. of my father Panammu, son of Barsur; and I set up
this statue for my father Panammu, son of Barsur;
and I have become king in ..................

21. ................ (untranslatable) .................

22. which this memorial is, then may Hadad and El and
Rakkabel, lord of the dynasty, and Shemesh and all
the gods of Y'DY ......................... [my house]

23. before the gods and before men.

Barrakab
Text

i 1. 'nh: br[r]kb:
   2. br: pnmw: mlk: śm
   3. 'l: "bd: tglṭpysr: mr':
   4. rbc'y: 'rq': bšdq: 'by: wbşd
   5. qy: hwšbnny: mr'y: rkb'r:
   6. wmr'y: tglṭpysr: ġl:
   7. krs': 'by: wbyt: 'by: ġ
   8. ml: mn: kl: wršt: bglgl:
   9. mr'y: mlk: 'šr: bmsg
10. t: mlkn: rbrbn: bgl'y: k
11. sp: wbgl'y: zhb: w'ḥzt:
12. byt: 'by: whyṭbth:
13. mn: byt: ḫd: mlkn: rbrb:
14. n: whtn'bw: 'ḥy: mlky
15. ': 1kl: mh: ṭbt: byty. w
16. by: ṭb: lyšh: l'bhy: m
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17. 1ky: șm'l: h': byt: klm
18.  w: lhm: ph': byt: ștw': l
19.  hm: wh': byt: kys': w
20.  'nh: bnyt: byt': znh:

    2. lysr: mr': rbçy: 'rq': șbd: _ _ _
    4. r'y: wçm: șbdy: byt[ m: r'y: mlk: șwr]
    7. nbșt: hm: ........ [wntn: r]
    8. kb'l: șny: șd[m: mr'y: mlk]
    9.  'șwr: wqdm[: b .................

iii 1. mr'y: bc1hrn: 'nh: brrkb: br: pnm[ w]

Translation

i 1. I am Barrakkab,
    2. the son of Panammu, king of
    3. Sam'al servant of Tiglathpileser, lord
    4. of the four quarters of the earth. Because of my
       father's righteousness and
    5. my own righteousness, my lord Rakkabel
    6. and my lord Tiglathpileser seated me upon
    7. my father's throne. My father's house
    8. laboured more than all others; and I have run
       at the wheel
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9. of my lord, the king of Assyria, in the midst
10. of powerful kings, possessors of
11. silver and possessors of gold. I have taken over
12. my father's house, and I have made better
13. than the house of my powerful king.
14. My brother kings were envious
15. because of all the good fortune of my house. Now,
16. my fathers, the kings of Sam'al, had no suitable
   palace.
17. They had indeed the palace of Kilamuwa,
18. and it was their winter palace
19. and also their summer palace.
20. But I have built this palace.

ii 1. I am Barrakkab, the son of Panammu, king of Sam'al, [servant of Tiglath]
2. pileser, lord of the four quarters of the earth,
   [servant of ....]  
3. and of the gods of my father's house. [Loyal have I been towards]
4. my lord and towards the servants of the house [of my lord, the king of Assyria.]
5. Loyal have I been towards [him more than any other, and loyal have my sons been]
6. more than the sons of any other ............
7. their souls ..............................
8. Rakkabel [has shown] favour to me in the presence
[of my lord, the king of] Assyria and in the presence of ..........

iii 1. My lord is Baal Harran. I am Barrakkab, the son of Panammu.

---

Text

i 1. šnzrbn\(^1\) kmr
2. šhr bnrb mt
3. wznh šlmh
4. w'rsth
5. mn 't
6. thns šlm'
7. znh w'rst'
8. mn 'šrh
9. šhr wšmš wnkl wnśk yshw
10. šmk w'šrk mn ḫyn wmt lḥh
11. ykṭlwk wyh'bdw zr'k whn
12. tnṣr šlm' w'rśt' z'
13. 'ḥrh ynṣr
14. zy lk

ii 1. š'qbr kmr šhr bnrb
2. znh šlmh bdqty qdmwh
3. šuny šm ḥb wh'rk ywmy

---

\(^1\)šnzrbn read by KAI (I 45), ACH (p. 21), and Dupont-Sommer (p. 9).
Translation

1. Sin-zer-ibni, priest
2. of Sahar at Nerab, deceased.
3. This is his picture
4. and his grave.
5. Whoever you are
6. who drag this picture
7. and grave
8. away from its place,
9. may Sahar and Shamash and Nikkal and Nusk pluck
d 10. your name and your place out of life, and an evil
death
11. make you die; and may they cause your seed to
   perish! But if
12. you guard this picture and grave,

---

1 The genitive š- is related to Akkadian emphatic ša, and used in the sense "belonging to." Yet, as Gibson (p. 96) says, the reading of this letter is based on some traces in contrast to an exceptionally clear text. Moreover, š with this function is found nowhere else in Aramaic.
13, 14. in the future may yours be guarded! ¹

ii 1. Si'-gabbari, priest of Sahar at Nerab.
2. This is his picture. Because of my righteousness
   before him,
3. he afforded me a good name, and prolonged my days.
4. On the day I died, my mouth was not closed to
   words,
5. and with my eyes I was beholding² children of
   the fourth generation: they wept
6. for me, and were greatly distraught. They did not
   lay with me any vessel
7. of silver or bronze; with my garments (only) they
   laid me, so that
8. in the future my grave should not be dragged away.
   Whoever you are who do wrong
9. and drag me away, may Sahar and Nikkal and Nusk
   make
10. his dying odious, and may his posterity perish!

The Ashur Ostracon

Text
1. ['l ']ḥy prwr ṭḥwk bltr šlm lš........
2. [ _ _ _ _ _ ] ḫmy 't bmtkdy w'nh ṭmrby wm......

¹In light of ḫyrn (Dan 2:39), one can translate this expression "another will guard yours."

²For different analyses of mbzh see, "Morphology" of Nerab in this study.
17. ................ 1'mr qrqy 'l thzw m..............
   'šwr 'šh 'klthm wmr'ı mlk' pqd ['yty]
18. lm. ňd' _ _ _ _ _ qrqy 'šwr yks'n
19. lnbwizš[bš] _ _ _ _ 'rh ml'kty 'šlh lk wh............
   hltby ml' 't ibt 'lh' zy_ţy.....
20. lnh lbty ml' ['t] wkš_ _ _ _ _ 'py'š_ _q.....
   ['py' kzy thzh w_ _ _ _šnh ššnh..........
21. bbytdbl' l_ _ _ _ n š[wđ]n h_ _ zy hmrtk zy 't......
   šwdn zy být dbl'

Translation

1. To my brother Pir'i-Amurri, your brother Bel-etir,
   greetings ............
2. ........ you were with me in Akkad; and I Arbai and
   ......
3. ...... ycu [departed] from Uruk with Ger-Saphon and
   with WGHR ............
4. I ............... Bit-Amuukkan. They were four in
   number. A letter of the king of Babylon ..........
5. in their hands, [which began, To those of] Bit-
   Amuukkan. At Hafiru in the desert we captured them
   ....
6. them ............. I dispatched to my lord, the
   king. Then we captured [Abai] ..........
7. and I came ........ before my [lord], the king. Our
   ...... had been put with the dogs. My lord, the king,
   said to me, They [belong to you]. So they did not
(any longer) grind (grain) for him. Let this decision be accepted! You have seen .............. [With those]

9. of Bit-Amukkani they were. Their own hands have written and established (it) before eyes. They had indeed defected. I tell you, they were in Bir-Amukkani. From [their] hands ........

10. Abai, which began, From Shemehyaqar, Nabu-zer-ukin, Ahashai and WLWL. As for Nabu-zer-ukin Ahashai, Upaqa-ana-Arbaili has put ............

11. As for WLWL, Shemehyaqar and Abai, they ........ When Upaqa-ana-Arbaili arrives at Ashur, let him immediately return them to Upaqa[-ana-Arbaili. And if]

12. Pileser asks, Are these words true?, Bel-etir, my name, is written on their hands. Call them (and) ask them, Are these

13. [words] true? I tell you, they are slaves who belong to me. They had defected. I tell you, they were [with] those of Bir-Amukkani. Note that I have sent Naid-Marduk, your assistant, to [you]

14. (to fetch) them. I would like to see them. Dispatch to us also the son of NM---BN and the son of B---ZBN, Zaban-iddina and Nabu-ushallim of Bit-Adini. Furthermore,

15. (you will know) that Tiglathpileser deported prisoners from Bit-Amukkani, and Ululai deported
[prisoners] from Bit-Adini, and Sargon deported prisoners from Dur-Sin,

15. and Sennacherib [deported] prisoners from K-sh. And .......... [the kings of] Assyria ............... (who) defected from here, and let them pursue them! And down the years the kings of [Assyria]

17. ..................... saying, Have no regard for defectors from my service! (If any defect from) Ashur, fire will consume them. Now, my lord, the king, commanded [me]

18. to .................., Let those who defect from Assyria be pursued!

19. To Nabu-zer-ushabshi ........ I shall send my report to you ...................... Is it against me that you are filled with anger (or) against the god who ............... 

20. Why are you filled with anger against me? And now .. .............

21. At Bit-Dibla ........... Shum-iddin ........ who made you feel bitter ...................... Shum-iddin of Bit-Dibla.
APPENDIX II

LIST OF COMPARABLE EXPRESSIONS

dmwt' .. zy śm (TF 1) -- șlm' dy hqym (Dan 3:2,18, etc.)
štyn w'rqq (+several ptcs, 2) -- (6:28)
wlm'rk ḫywh (14) -- w'rkh ḫyyn (7:12)
'l 'lhh w'l 'nšn (14) -- kl 'nš .. mn kl 'lh (7:13)
'l zy qdm hwtr (15) -- '1 dy ḥz' ımzy' (3:19)
m'ny' zy bt Hdd (16-17) -- wlm'ny' dy byth (5:23)
ylq̃ mn ydh (18) -- yšyżbnkwn mn ydy (3:15)
wtn - šbt zy nyrq̃ (23) -- 1'rywk - šlyt' dy mlk' (2:15)
ygtzr mn mth (23) -- mżwr: 'tgzrt (2:45)
nsb' zy śm (BH 1) -- șlm' dy hqym (3:2, etc.)
zj nzt lh (4) -- dy .. yhbty lj (2:23, etc.)
šq̃ lq̃l (4-5) -- dy tšm'wn q̃ (3:5, etc.)
whrmw šr mn šr .. whcq̃mqw hrš mn hr[sh] (Zak A 10) -- śnyń
d' mn d' (7:3)
zj ysq̃n bšśh (Sf I A 5) -- wbtrk tq̃m (2:39, etc.)
wq̃l h' mn (II C 6) -- wdḥlyn mn qdm (6:27)
mll mlm lh̃yt (II 2) -- wmlyn lṣd 'ly' yml̃ (7:25)
rwm nbś (III 5-6) -- rwm lbb (5:20)
br 'nś (III 16) -- kbr 'nś (7:13)
zj ly (III 20) -- dy-lh (2:20)
wtn bydy (Had 2) -- yhb bydk (2:38)
wzkr znh h' (Pan 22) -- d' hy' bbl (4:27)
qdm 'lhy wqdm 'nś (23) -- qdmwhy ['lhy] .. w'p qdmyk mlk' (6:23)
-- qdm 'lhh (6:11-12)
hwšbny .. krs' 'by (Bar I 5-7) -- hnḥt .. mn krs' mlkwh (5:20)
wbyt 'by ċml mn kl (I 7-8) -- why' mšnyh mn kl (7:7)
-- dy hwt šnyh mn klhwn (7:19)
-- dy tšn' mn kl (7:23)
-- 'rb'h mlkyn yqwmwn mn 'r' (7:17)
m'r'y mlk (I 9) -- m'r'y mlk' (4:21)
wby[t] tb lysh l'bhy (I 15-16) -- wḥbl l' 'yty bhwn (3:25)
w'nḥ bnyt byt' znh (I 20) -- h' 'nh hḥḥ qbrun 'rb'h (3:25, see 4:1, 27, 34).
zy lk (Ner I 14) -- dy lh hy' (2:20)
śm śm ṭb (II 3) -- śm šmh blṭš'sr (5:12)
pmy .. mln (II 4) -- mlṭ' bpm (4:28)
m'n ksp wnḥś (II 6-7) -- lm'ny dhb' wksp' (5:2)
lmr' mlk' .. m'r'y mlk' (Ashur 6-8) -- ċ1 m'r'y mlk' (4:21)
kyz' z' (8) -- d' ld' (5-6) -- d' mn d' (7:3)
wqymt qdmy (9) -- qdmwhy yqwmwn (7:10)
ydyhm ktbh (9) -- yd' dy ktbh (5:5)
hšd' hny mly' (12) -- mlṭ' mny 'zd' hn (2:5)
-- dy 'zd' mny mlṭ' (2:8)
zly (13) -- dy-lḥ (2:20)
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